UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 88th CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 110—PART 18

SEPTEMBER 29, 1964, TO OCTOBER 3, 1964
(PAGES 23017 TO 24370)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1964

J
11
.R
v. 110
no. 18

DEPOSITED BY THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 88th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

SENATE

TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 29, 1964

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. METCALF).

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord, our God, whose love will not let us go, but followest us all the way: We bow before Thee in gratitude at the remembrance of all Thy mercy and all Thy mercies.

We would bring our restless lives into the quiet sanctuary of Thy presence, that we may be still and know that Thou art God.

In spite of all the evil that stalks the earth with threats and shackles and chains, we thank Thee for human kindness, for hope that shines undimmed, for faith that is dauntless, and for all the qualities of high personality that cannot be bribed.

Let Thy beauty, O Lord, be upon us, that our spirits may be radiant as in Thy strength we face the perplexities of these troubled days. Use us, we pray, in all our human relationships as ambassadors of good will, so that at the end of the day we may be able to say, "I have kept the faith."

In the Redeemer's name we ask it. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, September 28, 1964, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 367) authorizing the Clerk of the House to correct the enrollment of the bill (H.R. 6593) for the relief of Earnest O. Scott, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

On request by Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements during the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to consider the nomination on the Executive Calendar.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Lt. Col. John H. Glenn, Jr., U.S. Marine Corps, for appointment to the grade of colonel, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Commerce:

Thomas H. Rutledge, James F. Hunt, and Walter N. Warschun, members of the Coast Guard Reserve, to be permanent commissioned officers in the Regular Coast Guard;

James G. Grunwell, for permanent appointment in the Coast and Geodetic Survey;

Frederic G. Donner, of New York, George Meany, of Maryland, and Clark Kerr, of California, to be members of the board of directors of the Communications Satellite Corp.; and

Robert A. Ganse, and sundry other persons, for permanent appointment in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the nomination on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Charles A. Muecke, of Arizona, to be a U.S. district judge for the district of Arizona.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of this nomination.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

On motion of Mr. MANSFIELD, the Senate resumed consideration of legislative business.

EARNEST O. SCOTT—CORRECTION OF ENROLLMENT OF BILL

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a concurrent resolution from the House of Representatives which the clerk will read.

The Chief Clerk read the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 367), as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That in the enrollment of the bill (H.R. 6593) entitled "An Act for the relief of Earnest O. Scott", the Clerk of the House of Representatives is authorized and directed to make the following correction:

On page 2, line 7 of the engrossed House bill, strike out "some" and insert "any sums".

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was considered and agreed to.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communication and letters, which were referred as indicated:

PROPOSED APPROPRIATION, 1965, FOR APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION (S. DOC. NO. 105)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed appropriation for the fiscal year 1965 in the amount of $800,000, for the Appalachian Regional Commission (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON TITLE I AGREEMENTS UNDER AGRICULTURAL TRADE DEVELOPMENT AND ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1954

A letter from the Associate Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on title I agreements under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, for the month of August 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Report on Reapportionment of an Appropriation

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, reporting, pursuant to law, that the appropriation to the Civil Service Commission for "Government payment for annuitants, employees health benefits fund," for the fiscal year 1965, had been apportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Report on Federal Contributions—Personnel and Administration

A letter from the Director of Civil Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on Federal contributions—personnel and administration, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Joint Contracts for Supplies and Services for District of Columbia

A letter from the Acting President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to enter into joint contracts for supplies and services on behalf of the District of Columbia and for other political divisions and subdivisions in the National Capital region (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Report on Summary of Deficiencies Related to the Inadequate Administration of Military Budget Support Funds Provided to Certain Countries Under the Foreign Assistance Program

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on summary of deficiencies related to the inadequate administration of military budget support funds provided to certain countries under the foreign assistance program, dated September 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report Reviewing the Military Assistance Program for a Far East Country

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a secret report reviewing the military assistance program for a Far East country, identity classified (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Reply to Comptroller General on a Certain Report

A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Administration, Agency for International Development, Department of State, transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a copy of that Agency's reply to the Comptroller General of the United States, relating to his report on a review of certain problems relating to administration of the "Economic and Technical Assistance Program for Vietnam 1958–62, Part I," and review of the administration of assistance for financing commercial imports and other financial elements under the "Economic and Technical Assistance Program for Vietnam 1958–62, Part II," transmitted to the Senate on July 24, 1964 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Government Operations.

PETITION

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter in the nature of a petition from the Compton, Calif., Chamber of Commerce, signed by Ray N. Gesell, executive secretary, favoring action by the Congress to delay the effect of the Supreme Court reapportionment ruling, which was ordered to lie on the table.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. KUCHEL, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

H.R. 6218. An act to amend the act of June 29, 1960, to authorize additional extensions of time for final proof by certain entrymen under the desert land laws and to make such additional extensions available to the successors in interest of such entrymen (Rept. No. 1603).

By Mr. PASTORE, from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments:

H.R. 11812. An act making appropriations for foreign assistance and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1605); and

H.R. 12633. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1604).

DESIGNATION AND ADMINISTRATION OF THE ICE AGE NATIONAL SCIENTIFIC RESERVE IN THE STATE OF WISCONSIN—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—MINORITY AND INDIVIDUAL VIEWS (S. REPT. NO. 1606)

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I report favorably, without amendment, the bill (H.R. 1096) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to cooperate with the State of Wisconsin in the designation and administration of the Ice Age National Scientific Reserve in the State of Wisconsin, and for other purposes, and I submit a report thereon. I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed, together with the minority views of Senators ALLOTT, SIMPSON, and DOMINICK, and the individual views of the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL].

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and the bill will be placed on the calendar; and, without objection, the report will be printed, as requested by the Senator from Wisconsin.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 3225. A bill to amend the Federal Employee's Group Life Insurance Act of 1954 so as to increase the maximum amount for which an employee may be insured under such act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. DIRKSEN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MCNAMARA (for Mr. HARTKE):

S. 3226. A bill for the relief of Armando Alfandari, Irene Alfandari, Alessandra Alfandari, and Elena Alfandari; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEE'S GROUP LIFE INSURANCE ACT OF 1954, TO INCREASE THE MAXIMUM AMOUNT FOR WHICH AN EMPLOYEE MAY BE INSURED

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, in view of the approval of the pay act, some time ago, we felt it necessary that, in the case of the Federal Employee's Group Life Insurance Act, the amounts be increased to conform to the Federal Pay Act.

Accordingly, I submit a bill for that purpose, and ask that it be appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RANDOLPH in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3225) to amend the Federal Employee's Group Life Insurance Act of 1954 so as to increase the maximum amount for which an employee may be insured under such act, introduced by Mr. DIRKSEN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

NOTICE OF MOTION TO SUSPEND THE RULE—AMENDMENT TO SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL

AMENDMENT NO. 1278

Mr. KUCHEL submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H.R. 12633) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes, the following amendment; namely, at the appropriate place in the chapter on public works under "Construction, general" strike out "$2,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof: "$2,860,000, of which not to exceed $860,000 shall be available for emergency flood control construction of debris basins and channel clearing in the Santa Barbara, California, area affected by recent fires, and such work is hereby authorized."

Mr. KUCHEL also submitted an amendment (No. 1278) intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 12633, making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

HIGHER EDUCATION STUDENT ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1964—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENTS NOS. 1276 AND 1277

Mr. JAVITS submitted two amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 3140) to provide assistance for students in higher education by establishing programs for scholarships, loan insurance, and work study, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

ESTES KEFAUVER WILL NOT BE FORGOTTEN

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an editorial published in the Lexington Leader, on August 26, 1964, which pays a deserved tribute to our late colleague, Senator Estes Kefauver.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

We May Not Remember Kefauver but We Benefit From His Effort

Estes Kefauver, the gangling, coonskin-cap-affecting Senator from Tennessee, died a little over a year ago.

As a form of memorial to him, a book called "The Real Voice" has been published, telling of Kefauver's fight for the Senate bill that eventually became the Drug Amendment Act of 1962.

It was one of the longest, costliest and fiercest legislative battles in recent history.

The title of the book is taken from a statement by Woodrow Wilson:

"Things get very lonely in Washington sometimes. The real voice of the great people of America sometimes sounds faint and distant in that strange city."

Seldom has this been better exemplified than in the investigations of the pricing, manufacturing, testing, selling, advertising, and licensing methods of the drug industry and, in Kefauver's words, "the ins and outs, the ups and downs, and the dirty dealings" involved in getting a bill through Congress.

The significant thing, however, is not that legislators are less honest, less dedicated, more self-seeking than ordinary men; they are not. It is that they can occasionally rise above the enormous pressures that beat upon them from every side (there are 10 lobbyists in Washington for every Congressman) and actually serve the public welfare.

In the end, it was the thalidomide tragedy—which the United States escaped because of the stubbornness of Dr. Frances O. Kelsey of the Food and Drug Administration in refusing to OK the drug—that aroused "the real voice" and provided the impetus to push the bill into law.

History does repeat itself. It had taken another drug tragedy in 1937, in which 107 people died, to inspire the Food, Drug, and Cosmetics Act in 1938. Before that, the Government had no control at all over drug safety.

Although the public today is better protected against experimental drugs, Kefauver failed in his primary aim—to institute free enterprise measures that would have resulted in lowered drug prices, some of which he asserted were inflated 1,000 percent or more above cost. It was the sacrifice that had to be made to get any sort of bill passed.

The drug manufacturers' explanation—then and now—for their prices is that profits must be sufficient to finance necessary research. An executive of a small drug company testified at the Kefauver hearings, however, that the Government spends almost as much as the drug industry on such research and that private foundations, universities, charitable organizations and individuals contribute more to drug and medical research than either the drug industry or the Government.

The Salk polio vaccine, for instance, was paid for largely by public donations (though only five drug companies shared the profits of its manufacture).

Another quotation from "The Real Voice" is a statement made on the floor of the Senate by Thomas Dodd, of Connecticut, after the final rollcall and after everyone—including many who had opposed the bill all along—had made their little speeches of self-congratulation. Said Dodd:

"I have an idea that the Senator from Tennessee will be remembered long after all of us in this Chamber at this hour are gone."

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION RELATING TO THE SUCCESSION TO PRESIDENCY AND VICE PRESIDENCY

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, yesterday, a highly important piece of legislation, Senate Joint Resolution 139 passed the Senate. It is an elaborate joint resolution concerning the Presidency and the possible succession of the Vice President to the Presidency, and with a provision for an Acting President, which would repeal an existing section of the Constitution.

I have not had an opportunity to discuss this with the majority leader, but as one who is eligible under the rule to make a motion to reconsider—I do not know whether it is in order during the morning hour—I wish to give notice that when I can obtain the floor for that purpose I shall make a motion to reconsider.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator may make his motion at any time.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Chair.

I wish to make clear that I am not in opposition to the joint resolution. I will support it. I support its great purposes; but, at the same time, without anyone being at fault, there was no prior notice given that this joint resolution would be up for passage—at least none that I received. I was present yesterday and in my office all afternoon and until far into the night, with reference to other official business.

The press reports that the measure passed at a time when only nine Senators were present. I do not know whether that is correct. The record does show that only nine Senators addressed themselves to the subject. The record does not show that there was any recorded quorum call prior to the vote. I received no notice of a quorum call.

I am not blaming anyone. It is a condition which existed. But the Constitution of the United States does not contemplate the approval of a resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States at a time when only nine Members of the Senate are present.

Clearly the Constitution requires, and its spirit demands, that there be a showing on the face of the record that there was at least a quorum present, and that two-thirds of the Senators present and voting voted for the proposal.

Without going into the legal aspects, I refer to a case decided in 1920 on this question. One of of the conclusions of the Court, as found in 253 U.S. 350, 386, had this to say:

> The two-thirds vote in each House which is required in proposing an amendment is a vote of two-thirds of the Members present—assuming the presence of a quorum—and not a vote of two-thirds of the entire membership, present and absent.

I have not had time to go into this question in detail. I do not propose to make an exhaustive argument now—nor at any other time—except that I do wish to bring this matter to the attention of the Senate. I have no doubt as to what the Senate will do, and I hope that no motion will be made immediately to table the motion to reconsider, because I do believe that the matter should be more closely examined. When I can obtain the floor for that purpose, I shall make a motion to reconsider.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the Senator from Mississippi making his motion to reconsider now?

Mr. STENNIS. I should like first to yield to the majority leader. I have not had an opportunity to discuss this question with him. I assume there will not be an immediate motion to table until this matter has been fully discussed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Let me say to the Senator from Mississippi that this is the first knowledge I have had of his feelings on the matter. I believe that the Senate acted entirely within the rules of this body, that there had been a quorum on this floor earlier in the day, and that every Senator present voted in favor of the constitutional amendment. There was no opposition voiced whatsoever to it.

If a motion is made to reconsider for the purpose of reopening this question and having extended debate, I shall object. I should like the Senator to know that. If he wishes to make a motion to reconsider to vote at a time certain today, but letting other business intervene, and have a yea-and-nay vote, that will be fine, but under no other circumstances today——

Mr. STENNIS. Let me assure the Senator from Montana that I have already stated that no one is to blame, and that no one was misled. It was merely a matter of lack of information.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct.

Mr. STENNIS. I have no desire to postpone the matter and will agree to a vote at any time convenient to the leadership. However, I believe there should be an opportunity for further debate; this question should be fully presented and discussed, and then a vote should be taken, which will reflect affirmatively the presence of a quorum and two-thirds of the quorum voting for the amendment. I believe that will give it a better start.

I ask unanimous consent that I may have an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, may I say to the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Stennis] and likewise to the distinguished majority leader, that the joint resolution was the subject of long hearings in the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments of the Committee on the Judiciary. I do not remember how many witnesses were heard. But the witnesses were of a very high order.

The joint resolution was then reported to the full committee. The full committee had a substantial discussion of the matter. If I remember correctly—and I was present—there was no dissenting voice in the Committee on the Judiciary. As a consequence, it was reported to the

Senate floor in that fashion. I was in and out most of the time on various chores, but I detected no opposition to the joint resolution. That probably accounted for the fact that there were not too many Senators on the floor.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator that the resolution has great merit. I want to support it. I do not know of any Senator who is opposed to it. But I make the point that we ought, in all cases on a constitutional amendment, to let the record speak for itself. The record should show that a quorum was present and that two-thirds of the Senators present voted in the affirmative. Otherwise, I believe it would be subject to attack. And the Supreme Court has so held, if this case is correctly reported.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am happy to propose a unanimous-consent request which I hope the Senate will grant.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent—and this is an extraordinary circumstance—that there be a yea-and-nay vote on this Senate Joint Resolution 139 at 2:30 this afternoon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and I do not object, the time that is proposed would permit a little over 2 hours within which to look into this matter and get ready.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct.

Mr. STENNIS. Could the majority leader make that 3:30? That would give a little more time to read the cases and make a comparison. I believe there is a clear-cut case here that requires a quorum to be present. I believe that it is worth while to look into it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, there was a quorum present yesterday. There was no quorum at the time the joint resolution was passed. That is true. But, so far as I can ascertain, we complied with the rules of the Senate. Therefore, we acted properly in proceeding as we did. But, I would be delighted to change the time to 3:30 this afternoon.

Mr. STENNIS. Could we make that tomorrow?

Mr. MANSFIELD. A quorum is present today.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have an additional 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] has the floor by unanimous consent.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I have listened with interest to the comments of the distinguished Senator from Mississippi. While I do not see any violation of the rules with respect to the action taken yesterday, I agree with the Senator from Mississippi that such an important subject as the proposed constitutional amendment ought to have the consideration of at least a quorum at the time the vote is taken on it.

Not only is the action that we take upon it important, but the House also must take action. Beyond that, we must consider the weight that will be given to the action of the Senate by the States, their legislatures and peoples in the constitutional process of confirmation. I support the Senator from Mississippi in asking that the vote be put over until tomorrow.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I would hope that the Senators would not press that request. We are having a very difficult time maintaining a quorum. We have a quorum at present. I believe we ought to take advantage of that fact. We had 4 or 5 hours of debate on the joint resolution yesterday. There was no sign of any opposition whatsoever. I believe that agreeing to the suggestion of the Senator from Mississippi that there be a rollcall vote at 3:30 would be about as far as we could go at this time.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the Senator from Mississippi can be ready at 3:30. But there may be other Senators who could not be ready. If the majority leader cannot agree to putting the vote over until tomorrow, does he have another day in mind?

Mr. MANSFIELD. No; only today. I believe we have gone as far as we can on the matter of reconsidering the vote.

Mr. STENNIS. At 4 o'clock?

Mr. MANSFIELD. At 4 o'clock. But that is the end.

Mr. STENNIS. All right. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I have gone from 2:30 to 3:30, to 4 o'clock. This is the end.

Mr. STENNIS. After all, this is a constitutional amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct. I was present for 5 hours yesterday listening to the debate.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator knows that no notice was given that there would be a vote. The Senator from Mississippi understood that there would be no vote—but not from the majority leader. But that is neither here nor there; 4 o'clock is all right with me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

LAYMEN'S NATIONAL COMMITTEE, INC., CITATION OF MERIT FOR 1964 TO NATHANIEL LEVERONE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on October 14, 1964, Mr. Nathaniel Leverone, founder of Automatic Canteen Co. of America, will receive a citation of merit from the Laymen's National Committee, Inc., for his many years of devoted service to the cause of Christianity. The citation will be issued in connection with the observance of National Bible Week. It is so richly deserved and I know of my own knowledge the great contributions which Mr. Leverone has made to this exalted cause. I ask unanimous consent that this citation be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the citation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LAYMEN'S NATIONAL COMMITTEE, INC., CITATION OF MERIT, 1964

To Nathaniel Leverone, on behalf of what he has done in helping to further the cause of religious education and the fundamental principles of God's words, the Laymen's National Committee, Inc., therefore presents this citation of merit, not only in gratitude for his unselfish work for this committee, but for a lifelong devotion to bringing the goodness and kindness of the Almighty to a world that he knew could only survive through God.

BEN H. WILLINGHAM,
National Chairman, National Bible Week.

SIXTY-FOUR YEARS OF FEDERAL SPENDING, DEBT GROWTH, AND SHARE BY EACH AMERICAN, 1899-1964

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, my staff has compiled a record of Government spending, deficits, increased spending per capita, the increased annual debt service, and related matters. The data has been arranged in tabular form to show, among other things, the political party in power, the population, the Federal spending in millions, the per capita, the Federal debt, the debt per capita, and the change in the U.S. debt status from administration to administration since 1899. This is truly an impressive piece of work and shows what has happened to us in the fiscal field.

The Government has had surpluses over expenditures in 25 of the last 64 years—20 years in Republican administrations and 5 years in Democrat administrations. In the same 64 years "deficits" were produced by 12 Republican and 27 Democrat administrations—page 81 of Bureau of the Budget Document of 1964.

My compilation of debt growth shows how very slight has been the effort to meet the ever-growing national debt obligation. We have had 19 separate Presidential administrations in 64 years, including the short term by Coolidge and another by President Johnson. Of these 19 administrations, 10 have been under Republican Presidents for a total of 32 years, and 9 have covered 32 years under Democrat Presidents. What has each of these contributed to enlarging or lowering the national debt and per capita of that debt? Let us have a look:

Additions to the 1899 national debt of $1.437 billion have been:

By 10 Republican administrations—32 years—$22,372 billion.

By 9 Democrat administrations—32 years—$287,929 billion.

Of the 19 administrations serving during the 64-year span, only 5 reduced the national debt, and these 5 were all Republican adminstrations.

As relates to administrations affording increases in the share per person of the national debt:

Seven of nine Democrat administrations in 32 years added $1,842.

One of ten Republican administrations in 32 years added $9.24.

As relates to administrations affording decreases in the share per person of the national debt:

Two of nine Democrat administrations—in 32 years—accomplished decreases totaling $67.44.

Nine of ten Republican administrations—in 32 years—accomplished decreases totaling $142.97.

To summarize: Sixty-four years ago the per capita national debt was $18.80. In 1964, that individual share in the debt has reached $1,641.

Nineteen Presidential administrations have served through those years—9 Democrat, 10 Republican.

The 32 years under Democrat administrations saw the per capita debt increased by $1,774.66.

The 32 years under Republican administrations saw the per capital debt decreased by $133.73.

Let no one say that all of the 32 Democrat administration years were war years. After all, even the Democrat administrations have had peace years to their credit.

WARS AND DEBT

Of course, wars have played a part in occasioning borrowing by the Government. In the last 64 years we have had four wars to fight—not counting our present involvement in the Far East which the Johnson Democrat administration does not like to have called war, even though it is costing many American lives.

One of the four, the war with Spain, was fought under the Republican McKinley administration. Strangely, it was the only war of the four which did not call for any ultimate increase in the per capita debt of the Nation.

The remaining three wars, World War I, World War II, and the war in Korea—all under Democrat administrations—piled up terrifying increases in the national debt and in the per capita sharing of that debt.

One can understand why the cost of war cannot be met on a pay-as-you-go basis.

But what hurts is the evidence at hand demonstrating that we do not seem to want to pay off the war debt in the years after the wars are won.

Instead, the years of peace following the wars find us annually adding to the debt by spending more than we receive in revenues.

INVESTMENT IN GOVERNMENT PROPERTY

There are those who attempt to sweeten my thinking about this growing debt by telling me first, that our $311 billion debt is investment in Government-owned property and installations, and second, that the doubling of our gross national product in the last 10 or 12 years offsets the degree of burden involved in the national debt.

Now, how much sense does that make?

Are we about to sell these Government-owned properties and installations and pay off the debt with the financial return? No. And it is still the taxpayers among the 190 million now making up our population, not these Government-owned properties, who are paying interest on the debt. Instead of selling properties, our Government more often abandons and replaces with more costly properties.

GROSS NATIONAL PRODUCT EASES THE DEBT

This stuff about the relationship of national debt to the gross national product is nonsense. What has the steady increase in the gross national product contributed toward paying our war bills and reducing the national debt? It ought to be known by everyone that though the gross national product increases, so does the national debt increase along with the proportionate share of 190 million citizens in that debt.

INFLATION HAS EASED DEBT BURDEN

Then somebody up and springs the tale that inflation has eased the burden of national debt upon everybody. That is when I burn up.

In my early productive years, I bought with preinflation dollars enough life and retirement insurance to make certain that my wife and I, or she alone perhaps, could have comfort and security in our lives of retirement. Now, with inflation having taken its bite out of our actual return from that insurance, we are left wondering how much longer we can afford to live without falling back as dependents upon our children or holding out our hand for the kind of Government handout the welfare-state boys are urging.

Have we reached now that day when everyone should cease worrying about the future and adopt the theory that, come what may to each and all of us, the Government will take care of us?

I hope one will get from my compilation of national debt facts, what I have learned. It is my conviction that we had better be waking up to what Government borrowing and spending is doing to us of this day and to the generations which will be following in our steps. It is either wake up or let us continue charging our spending to our kids and their kids.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the tabulation be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

64 years of Federal spending, debt growth, and share by each American, 1899–1964

	Year and party	Population	Federal spending in 1 year	Per capita Federal spending	Federal debt	Per capita Federal debt	Change in status of Federal debt
		Millions	*Millions*		*Millions*		
At close of war with Spain, McKinley administration	1899, Republican	75			$1,437	$18.80	
At close of McKinley administration in	1900, Republican	76	$521	$6.86	1,263	16.62	Debt down $174,000,000; per capita down $2.48.
At close of 1st T. R. Roosevelt 4-year administration in	1904, Republican	82	584	7.12	1,136	14.00	Debt down $127,000,000; per capita down $2.62.
At close of 2d T. R. Roosevelt 4-year administration in	1908, Republican	88	659	7.49	1,178	13.40	Debt up $42,000,000; per capita down $0.60.
At close of the Taft 4-year administration in	1912, Republican	95	690	7.26	1,194	12.57	Debt up $16,000,000; per capita down $0.83.
At close of 1st Wilson administration in	1916, Democratic	101	713	7.06	1,225	12.13	Debt up $31,000,000; per capita down $0.44.
At close of World War I and 2d Wilson administration in	1920, Democratic	106	6,357	59.99	24,299	229.15	Debt up $23,000,000,000; per capita up $217.
At close of Harding 3-year administration in	1923, Republican	111	3,137	28.26	22,350	201.35	Debt down $1,900,000,000; per capita down $27.80.
At close of 1 year of Coolidge administration in	1924, Republican	114	2,890	25.35	21,251	186.40	Debt down $1,100,000,000; per capita down $15.
At close of 4 years of Coolidge administration in	1928, Republican	120	2,933	24.44	17,604	146.66	Debt down $3,600,000,000; per capita down $39.74.
At close of the Hoover administration in	1932, Republican	125	4,659	38.00	19,487	155.90	Debt up $1,900,000,000; per capita up $9.24.
At close of 1st F. D. Roosevelt administration in	1936, Democratic	128	8,422	66.00	33,779	263.90	Debt up $14,300,000,000; per capita up $108.
At close of 2d F. D. Roosevelt administration in	1940, Democratic	131	9,055	69.00	42,968	328.00	Debt up $9,100,000,000; per capita up $64.
At close of 3d F. D. Roosevelt administration in	1944, Democratic	139	94,986	683.00	201,003	1,446.00	Debt up $158,000,000,000; per capita up $1,118.
At close of 1st Truman administration in	1948, Democratic	146	32,955	226.00	252,292	1,728.00	Debt up $51,200,000,000; per capita up $282.
At close of 2d Truman administration in	1952, Democratic	156	65,303	418.00	259,105	1,661.00	Debt up $6,800,000,000; per capita down $67.
At close of 1st Eisenhower administration, and finish of war in Korea, in.	1956, Republican	168	66,224	394.00	272,751	1,623.52	Debt up $13,600,000,000; per capita down $37.48.
At close of Eisenhower 2d administration in	1960, Republican	179	76,539	428.00	286,331	1,600.00	Debt up $13,500,000,000; per capita down $23.52.
At close of 3-year Kennedy administration in	1963, Democratic	187	92,642	495.00	305,860	1,635.30	Debt up $19,500,000,000; per capita up $35.30.
At close of 1st year of Johnson administration, estimated, in	1964, Democratic	190	98,405	517.00	311,800	1,641.00	Debt up $6,000,000,000; per capita up $5.70.

Data sources: Census and Doc. 20402, "The Budget in Brief," of Jan. 24, 1964.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION RELATING TO THE SUCCESSION TO PRESIDENCY AND VICE PRESIDENCY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, to make the RECORD clear, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate reconsider Senate Joint Resolution 139.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a yea-and-nay vote on Senate Joint Resolution 139 at 4 o'clock this afternoon.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, how much time for debate does the distinguished majority leader have in mind?

Mr. MANSFIELD. It was understood that there would be a vote on this measure at 4 o'clock. So far as debate is concerned, I assume that Senators would have to debate the measure before the vote and during discussion of pending legislation.

There were 5 hours of debate yesterday.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from Mississippi does not agree to the unanimous-consent request.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I hope the Senator will reconsider before the matter goes too far. As the Senator knows, I would have been opposed to a tabling motion.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the agreement to vote implies that the measure will be heard.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I said specifically that it would be for that purpose only that the question was raised, and not by me, in the beginning. There will be time available for debate on the measure. How much, I do not know, because I would like to take up some other business as well.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from Mississippi does not desire a great amount of time. The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] is interested in the question. It would take me approximately 30 minutes to present my statement. I should like 30 minutes for those who are in favor of the motion to reconsider.

Mr. MANSFIELD. We shall be most reasonable.

Mr. STENNIS. I agree to the request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

WATERSHED PROJECTS AND PUBLIC BUILDINGS APPROVED BY THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, in order that the Senate and other interested parties may be advised of various projects approved by the Committee on Public Works, I submit for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, information on this matter.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Projects approved by the Committee on Public Works on Sept. 28, 1964, under the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, Public Law 566, 83d Cong., as amended

	Estimated Federal cost
Montpelier Creek, Idaho	$1,455,525
Sutherlin Creek, Oreg	645,555
Total	2,101,080

Projects approved by the Committee on Public Works on Sept. 28, 1964, under the Public Buildings Act of 1959, Public Law 249, 86th Cong.

	Estimated Federal cost
GSA Facility, Naval Supply Center, Stockton, Calif. (alteration)	$2,500,000
Federal Motor Vehicle Facility, Houston, Tex. (construction)	891,000
Veterans Administration Regional Office, Waco, Tex. (leased office building) annual lease charge (10-year firm lease)	134,810

THE POVERTY PROGRAM GETS UNDERWAY

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, the speed with which the economic opportunity programs are being launched, and the speed with which Indian people generally and Indian tribes in South Dakota are taking advantage of the programs it offers, are very gratifying to me and should be to all of those Members of the Senate who supported the President's antipoverty bill.

A meeting to explain the program was held in South Dakota last week. It was well attended. The Oglala Sioux Tribe of Indians had already started development of a community project. Members of the staff of the State university had also made a proposal for forestry work around the reservoir lakes of the Missouri river which is being developed. And plans are underway for 2 work-study camps in the Black Hills National Forest.

The response in South Dakota has thus been excellent, and the program assuredly is going to give our State—particularly young people in need of employment to continue their educational work—greatly needed assistance.

There is evidence that a similar response is being met generally. Dr. Robert Russell, of Arizona State University, told the South Dakota meeting last week that inquiries to 16 Indian tribes about their interest in community projects revealed that all 16 are starting development of proposals.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article from the September 24 issue of the Sioux Falls Argus Leader reporting on the poverty program conference in Pierre, S. Dak., last week indicating the constructive response the program is receiving.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEVERAL COMMUNITIES MAY BENEFIT: OGLALA SIOUX FIRST TO PREPARE FOR ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AID

PIERRE.—The Pine Ridge Oglala Sioux are the first Indians in South Dakota to begin a program to get Federal funds under the Government's Economic Opportunity Act.

Dr. Robert Russell of the Arizona State University told an information meeting on the act here that the Economic Opportunity Act could be a great help to the Indian people.

A list of 16 Indian tribes across the Nation initially prepared to get reactions of the tribal leaders and the Indian people toward the act has been extremely successful, he said. Russell added that there was some doubt that the tribes would be able or want to take part in the program, but all 16 of the original 16 have begun programs to get funds under the act.

OTHERS BENEFIT

The act, which is part of President Johnson's war on poverty, would also make funds available for the migrant worker, small businessman, farmer, and unemployed family head.

Programs designed to give poverty stricken people the money by which to take themselves out of the poverty classification is the single most important purpose of the act, William Finale, deputy assistant commissioner of the Community Services Bureau in Washington, D.C., said.

Finale said the migrant worker could improve his living conditions. the small businessman his management practices, the farmers their method of operations and the unemployed could begin to find jobs. The act is also aimed directly at the youth of the Nation, Finale said, through programs in the community and work camps which would be established throughout the Nation.

One provision would make Federal funds available to communities wishing to take care of the dropouts or those students in danger of dropping out of school.

STUDENT JOBS

The funds would be made available to nonprofit organizations in the community for the purpose of giving students in school jobs within the school itself, in addition to giving work and improving skills of those who already have dropped out of school.

Finale said students would be allowed to work in the school as teachers' aids and other positions up to 15 hours per week. College students, if the local school officials felt money was the factor in the student having to leave school, could receive jobs by which they could earn and continue to learn, Finale added.

He said, however, in no case could the students take jobs that would eliminate a position held by a wage earner. The students who have quit school could work in a community in a number of jobs ranging from park workers to assistants in a variety of positions within the community.

Several South Dakota communities might take part in programs under the Federal Government's antipoverty program before the end of the present fiscal year. Finale said.

The act would provide in part, for the establishment of work camps which would give young persons the opportunity to receive basic educational and vocational courses while working on public works projects.

Martin N. B. Holm, Aberdeen, area director of the Economic Opportunity Act told some 200 persons at the meeting that local initiative is the single most important factor in getting a work camp established in a community.

Holm said a community must first express a desire for a camp and make an application to the Federal Government for funds to establish such a facility. The Federal Government could provide up to 90 percent of the money under the act.

Camps would serve at least 100 students between the ages of 16 and 21, but not more than 200 and would be manned by a staff of 14 persons. Work portion of the camp would be handled by the Interior and Agriculture Departments with the educational portion to be run in connection with local colleges and universities.

AIMED AT DROPOUTS

"The program is aimed at students who are in school but in danger of dropping out, in addition to those students who already have left school," Holm said. "Students would be enrolled in the camps for 1 year, with a limit of 2 years, but would not necessarily be forced to stay the whole year," he said.

Finale said, "the only restrictions placed on a community seeking a camp is that there must be a need, there must be no opposition to the camp and the Governor must approve the site."

He said, "the group is interested in exploring several sites in South Dakota for possible job camps." Several officials at South Dakota State University have expressed the need for such a camp along the Missouri River.

NO SCHOOL SUBSTITUTE

Finale said, "the camps are not intended to be a substitute for school. The sole purpose is to reach the dropouts or potential dropouts." He added, "That the program is a project that deals with people and helps them help themselves."

He said, "the Federal Government has no intention of taking the program over but is simply assisting local interests in the establishment of such programs."

Finale said, "the main purpose of the Economic Opportunity Act is to seek out the causes of poverty and do away with them. It would also seek to raise the level of all areas of unemployment and economic depression."

Holm said "We do not have all of the answers as yet, but we do need to start talking about the act."

ENDORSEMENT OF SENATOR PROXMIRE FOR REELECTION

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, one of the oldest and most responsible independent Republican newspapers in the State of Wisconsin, the Beloit Daily News, has endorsed the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] for reelection to the Senate.

Those of us who have worked with Senator PROXMIRE know him to be one of the most energetic, courageous, and conscientious Members in the Senate. We know him to be a good ally in difficult fights. He wears no man's collar.

It is, therefore, heartening to find that these qualities by which we know Senator PROXMIRE, have been recognized by one of the most important and responsible newspapers in his State. It is a great pleasure for me to read the editorial by the Beloit Daily News endorsing him for reelection, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Beloit (Wis.) Daily News, Sept. 22, 1964]

WE ENDORSE PROXMIRE

The Daily News today announces its support and endorsement of Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE in his bid for reelection to the U.S. Senate. If this comes as a shock to readers and friends of the Daily News, the simple and direct explanation is that the Daily News management believes Senator PROXMIRE has done a good job, is the best man in the field, and deserves to be returned to Washington.

This newspaper, which traces its parentage 125 years in the Beloit community, traditionally has been Independent Republican. It supported Abraham Lincoln in his bid for the Presidency during the infancy of the Republican Party. It has endorsed and assisted in the election of numerous Republicans over the span of years, but this does not obligate the Daily News to limit its support only to Republican candidates ad infinitum.

As publisher of an independent newspaper, the management of the Daily News feels it has an obligation to itself and its reading public to examine the records and qualifications of candidates, and to support the one best in its judgment regardless of party label. This it has done, and endorses Senator PROXMIRE.

Senator PROXMIRE has been budget and economy minded, opposing the Kennedy administration on numerous occasions when spending seemed excessive or unnecessary. He understands the problems of the farmer, and his grasp of the perplexities facing both labor and management are appreciated. He is working to reduce unemployment through retraining and support of vocational education, and he knows the benefits of putting Government business in the plants of his home State. Here in Beloit he has taken a personal interest in the procurement of work for community small businesses.

There are those who charge that "BILL PROXMIRE never stops campaigning." If this means that BILL PROXMIRE gets back home and around among his constituents often, we like that. If it means BILL PROXMIRE will answer a letter and try to do something about the questions in the letter, we like that. And if this means BILL PROXMIRE admits his mistakes when he hires one, tells the people what he is thinking and doing, we like that, too.

With this announcement the Daily News does not close its columns to Candidate Wilbur Renk or anyone else who seeks political office. The news columns are open to all comers, but the management's editorial policy support is behind BILL PROXMIRE. He isn't perfect, but he's done his job. And we think he deserves a chance to keep doing it.

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I bring to the attention of the Senate some vital facts about Czechoslovakia.

On October 3, this year, Americans of Czeck and Slovak descent will commemorate the 46th anniversary of the birth of free Czechoslovakia and the 20th anniversary of the Slovak national uprising. Throughout a difficult history, the Czech and Slovak peoples have, with little armament but the strength of their convictions, defended freedom against aggressing tyrannies of the right and the left. If we learn from history, we learn from Czechoslovak history that the price of freedom is very great, and that, in the final accounting, moral fortitude may make up the balance.

Chairman Khrushchev recently falsely claimed that the Slovak national uprising against the invading German Army in 1944 was a Communist action. It is important that we let the people of Czechoslovakia know that we do not accept that assertion. In fact, the Soviet Union never came to the aid of the resisting fighters, as had been promised; and the Slovaks went to a grim and gradual defeat, much as did the heroes of the Warsaw uprising.

That the cause of the Allies was helped by the Slovak uprising is beyond doubt. Indeed, we note that the U.S. Government recognized the Slovak fighters as an Allied "combat force operating against Germany."

On this dual anniversary I recall our gratitude and our respect for the courageous people of Czechoslovakia who, over many years, have laid down their lives for the right to direct their nation according to their own cherished ideals and traditions.

I ask unanimous consent that a statement by the Czechoslovak National Council of America be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TWENTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SLOVAK NATIONAL UPRISING

Khrushchev recently visited Bánska Bystrica, Slovakia, headquarters of the Slovak insurgents in 1944, to commemorate the 20th anniversary of the Slovak national uprising and to claim it as a heroic Communist act, thereby falsifying history; he also made cruel fun of Captive Nations Week in the United States and our efforts on behalf of the captive people. Therefore, it becomes necessary to speak out clearly to unmask the Communist hoax: The Slovak national uprising was a great patriotic protest of the entire nation, despite the efforts of the Soviet Union to pervert it and to seize control.

To disprove the Communist lie and to honor those who gave their life in our common cause, Slovak and Czech Americans will commemorate the anniversary on October 3, in the Morton West High School auditorium, Berwyn, Chicago, Ill.

Former President Dwight D. Eisenhower has already sent a message for this occasion, which reads in part: "During World War II, the resistance of local populations to the Nazi armies contributed importantly to the eventual victory of the Allied forces. The 1944 uprising in Slovakia was a particularly notable example of the refusal of a brave people to yield the enemy an easy victory. Regular and irregular Czechoslovak forces held out for many months against overwhelming odds. The uprising was a heroic though sad time for the Czechoslovak people and for the Allied cause."

A FEW FACTS ABOUT THE SLOVAK NATIONAL UPRISING

On August 29, 1944, the German Army entered Slovakia, a vassal state of the Third Reich, in order to occupy and transform it into a bastion against the Allies. The Slovak people, traditionally pro-Western, democratic, and faithful to the Czechoslovak Republic, took up arms against the German aggressors, placing themselves unequivocally on the side of the Allies. For 2 months of regular combat, up to 70,000 men of the Slovak army and 12,000 members of partisan units held off successfully several well-equipped German divisions which otherwise would have been used against Allied armed forces; for another 6 months irregular partisan-type fighting disrupted Nazi transportation to the front and otherwise harassed the enemy.

In the declaration of September 7, 1944, the U.S. Government recognized the insurgent army in Slovakia as an allied "combat force operating against Germany." On October 28, 1944, President Franklin Delano Roosevelt, in his message to Dr. Eduard Benes, the exiled President of Czechoslovakia, highly praised the contribution of the Slovak insurgents toward the liberation of their homeland and the rest of Europe.

From the outset, the effort of the Slovak insurgents was hampered by a critical shortage of arms and military equipment. Promised military aid from the Soviet Union was not forthcoming; in fact, as soon as the Soviet Union realized it could not control the uprising to suit its own ends, it stopped the Western Allies from transporting into Slovakia allied equipment for 10,000 men. The fate of the Slovak fighters was very similar to that of the Polish insurgents of the Warsaw uprising: both were deliberately deprived of outside assistance by the Soviet Union and thus left to suffer the inevitable consequences in an unequal struggle against well armed superior German forces.

Our commemoration in the free world on October 3 aims to pay homage to the numerous victims of the Slovak national uprising and to stress the lasting friendship of the Czechoslovak people for the United States. We hope that our voice will be heard behind the Iron Curtain and that our message will give assurance to our silenced friends that the truth about the Slovak national uprising is known to the free world and that it will not be distorted by Khrushchev's visit to Slovakia nor buried under the Communist lie.

On October 3 we shall also celebrate the 46th anniversary of the birth of free Czechoslovakia in 1918, to declare thereby our faith in a better future for the oppressed people. To his cause we—the free—shall rededicate our efforts.

STEVE PAPÁNEK,
Chairman, Commemorative Committee of the Slovak National Uprising.
VLASTA VRAZ,
President, Czechoslovak National Council of America.

WHICH WAY, SALMON?

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, there is no finer food fish in the world than Pacific salmon. The fishing and packing of salmon have been the mainstay of Alaska's economy for many years. As might be expected, there are yearly variations in the number of cases packed; but the sad truth is that the total in these latter years, whatever it may be, represents a tremendous decline from the catches of 30 and 40 years ago.

Are salmon runs to continue to decline? Will man permit sufficient escapement in the thousands of spawning streams to permit the species to survive? These and other questions are considered by Dr. William F. Royce, director of the Fisheries Research Institute of the University of Washington College of Fisheries. Happily, we discover that Dr. Royce, a noted biologist, takes an optimistic view of the future. His projections of what can be done appear in the September 1964 issue of the Pacific Fisherman, as condensed from a speech he made not long since in Alaska. Because of the general interest in this subject, I take pleasure now in asking unanimous consent that the article be printed as part of the RECORD, following by remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROSPECTS FOR ALASKA SALMON: LET ME BE AN OPTIMIST

(By Wm. F. Royce)

Alaska has most of North America's salmon resource, and most of the salmon problems.

Alaska now produces about 3 times as much salmon as British Columbia, and about 5 times as much salmon as the other Pacific coast States. Yet Alaska now produces only about half as much salmon as in the 1920 and 1930 decades. Almost all of the runs have declined in production and one of the major runs—southeast Alaska pink salmon—has declined to only one-fifth of its former sustained production level.

Many Alaskans are pessimistic about the future of the salmon, and about the possibilities of protecting the resource from foreign fishermen. George Rogers, in his book about the future of Alaska did not even consider the possibility of expanding salmon production.

Let me be an optimist.

I believe the United States will be successful in protecting salmon of Alaska origin from foreign fishermen; and I believe that it is technically possible and economically practical to double the production of Alaska salmon. I believe it is within our means to restore Alaska salmon production at least to the sustained level of 30 years ago. After all, there have been no significant physical changes in Alaska salmon streams and lakes.

1. What does doubling production mean? Doubling Alaska salmon production means an additional 3 million cases of salmon worth about $75 million, a major addition to the product of Alaska, a substantial source of income and a broadened base for taxes. In another sense, it means catching approximately 50 million more adult salmon, and allowing about 20 million more adult salmon to spawn.

2. How can production be doubled? This can be stated very simply, but it is enormously difficult in the practice. It is merely this: that we must regulate the runs precisely. We must protect the weak runs and harvest the surplus from the big ones. Some weak runs require total protection while the big runs can be harvested at a rate of 85 to 90 percent. A uniform catch rate such as the 50 percent rate formerly imposed by the Federal Government is now recognized as nonsense.

3. Aren't Alaska salmon runs being regulated precisely? The answer to this question is a flat "No," despite the efforts of a dedicated group of able men in the Alaska Department of Fish and Game.

For example, in 1963 in Bristol Bay the overall run was miserably poor because the big Kvichak run was at the bottom of its cycle. This Kvichak run is the most important in North America, and in its good years can produce $50 million worth of canned salmon.

The recent escapements have varied from 250,000 to 15 million. Our best estimate is that the peak escapement should be 6 million, with intervening escapements of about 2 million to 4 million to make full use of the rearing capacity of the lakes. Only three out of nine recent Kvichak escapements have been in this ideal range; the balance either wastefully large or too small. We are finding that too large escapements are especially wasteful. More of the adults die before spawning or dig out each others' spawn. If the eggs hatch, the overabundant young will grow more slowly and die in greater numbers in the lakes. The smaller, less vigorous young which do go to sea have less chance of surviving, and tend to return as adults a year later than they would if they had the opportunity of being well reared.

On the other hand, in the Icy Strait area of southeast Alaska in 1963 there was a near-record catch of Pink salmon, but no one knows how many Pink salmon entered Icy Strait, or the number of each race which was present. We had no forecast of this big run. We do not know why it happened. This run was a fortunate accident—not a planned production. It probably went under-harvested.

It is an unfortunate fact that no one knows the size of any significant returning Pink salmon runs to Alaska. Of course we know the catch, but it is impossible to associate this catch with specific numbers of fish spawning in specific streams. Nor does anyone know the size of the Chum salmon runs. Obviously, the regulation of these runs is largely guesswork.

4. Why is regulation so difficult?

First, there are several thousand separate spawning populations or races of salmon in Alaska. This is the crux of the difficulty. These populations are not interchangeable. The units must be regulated separately.

Second, the natural variation in survival produces runs which may vary 100 times in their size. Some runs must be given almost total protection from fishing, others may be caught at a rate of 80 to 90 percent. The pattern of uniform control which Alaska inherited from the Federal Government has resulted in the decimation of many races of salmon and Alaska's present system of regulation still permits serious overfishing of weak runs, while underfishing strong ones.

Third, the critical decisions about how much fishing to allow must be made before the catch is made and sometimes weeks before the escapement is obtained. Everyone has 20/20 hindsight about what should have been done, but the evidence on which the decisions must be based is always scanty, or worse. Resource managers frequently have no choice except to make decisions about opening or closing a fishing area or a fishing period on the basis of observations of a few jumpers seen from an airplane and on the basis of fragmentary catch reports.

Such decisions frequently involve the harvest of a million dollars worth of salmon in a few days. This is a remarkable contrast with a million dollar decision made by a banker, who completes elaborate studies before arriving at a decision. This is no criticism of present management. Able, professional, men do the best possible job with the means they have.

5. Why not hatcheries or fish farms?

Proposals have been made from time to time to put in hatcheries, to start fish farms, to fertilize lakes or to construct fishways. All of these methods together cannot possibly produce the 70 million Alaska salmon needed to restore production to its previous level. None of them can be used effectively without precise regulation of the fishing. All of the 40-odd salmon hatcheries of the Pacific Northwest, which cost about $3 million a year to operate, now produce only about 1 million adult salmon, and these are Silvers or Chinooks. There has been no successful experience in artificially raising large numbers of Pinks, Reds, or Chums. Some techniques in certain special situations will deserve serious consideration, but they should be evaluated critically. Money should never be diverted from the main task of regulating the fishery unless there is an exceptional economic justification.

6. What is needed to impove regulation? The salmon runs to any area require that we know the following things about them:

(a) What are the races, and how can we recognize them before they reach their streams? Sometimes this can be done by place at the time of their migration, sometimes it can be done by their scales or by the size of the fish, or by other means. We need to know the races to define them, and to follow them in their migration.

(b) We need accurate statistics on catch and escapement by races and by age groups. This is basic, and we now obtain little except catch data.

(c) With all big runs that fluctuate markedly, we need forecasts which will allow the resource managers to protect them, or the industry to harvest them.

(d) We need to know with assurance how many spawners are actually required to use fully the available streams and lakes, and how this may vary between years of a cycle.

(e) We need to know how to control the fishing gear and the fishing time in order to get the required spawners to spawning grounds; no more and no less.

The control of the fishing is perhaps the most difficult of all the requirements because of the free movements of the fishing fleet and free entry into the fishery. The matter of entry into the fishery must be solved in order to solve the conservation problem.

The Alaska Book of Regulations concerning commercial fishing contains some 120 pages, and almost all of them are devoted to regulations which have little to do with conservation in the sense of producing the maximum sustainable yield. These regulations force fishermen to be inefficient in order to divide the catch among all who want to fish. They control the size of boats, the size of nets, the size of mesh, the place and the time of fishing. The real conservation regulations are the field announcements which control the actual time and place of fishing, and hence the actual escapement, race by race.

7. What proof is there that precise regulations will work? The proof has been furnished annually in recent years by the International Pacific Salmon Fisheries Commission, which regulates the sockeye and pink runs to the Fraser River. Since 1958 this Commission has been obtaining record or near-record catches from many of the sockeye and pink salmon races. They have done this simply by knowing each year how many spawners were needed in each unit of the population and getting them to the spawning grounds in good condition. First they got them up the river past some obstructions, second, they have gotten them through the fishery. They have a system of statistical and biological data collection which allows precise daily control of the catch. They even divide the catch equally between the United States and Canadian fishermen. It costs about a half million dollars a year for such regulations, but it has paid off in canned salmon worth about $25 million annually.

Similar regulation can pay off in Alaska. The salmon runs in the southern half of southeastern Alaska for example, are roughly comparable in complexity to the salmon of the Fraser River, and have a similar productive potential. If we invest a half million dollars a year in the regulation of the fisheries of this area by a professional staff which will thoroughly learn how to regulate the fisheries, we can expect the restoration of the bountiful pink salmon.

Consider another example which I have mentioned earlier—the Kvichak run of red salmon. The total investment from State, Federal, and industry sources is about $100,000 per year for this area. Precise regulation of this $30 million run is probably much easier than the Fraser, but even if a half million dollars is needed for regulation it would be a good investment. Regulation of the Alaska salmon runs as a whole is much more complicated than the regulation of the Fraser River runs. Alaska has major runs occurring along thousands of miles of coastline, most of which is relatively remote, and some of the major runs are biologically more complicated. Bristol Bay sockeye, for example, return at ages of 4, 5, or 6 years; whereas Fraser sockeye return predominately at 4 years of age. I would judge very roughly that as a whole the regulation of Alaskan runs is 8 or 10 times as complicated as the regulation of the Fraser runs, which means that precise regulation would cost near $5 million annually, instead of less than $2 million which it is now costing.

Unquestionably, an increase of $3 million in the Alaska State fisheries budget is a major fiscal problem for Alaska, but that the increase should not occur suddenly, because the professional people required simply could not be obtained. Rather the principle of precise regulation should be applied to one area at a time and gradually extended as funds and personnel become available. The high probability that investment of this kind can pay off at a rate of $25 in wholesale value of the pack for each $1 invested should appeal to any businessman. (It is paying off at a rate of nearly 50 to 1 in the Fraser.)

APPALACHIA IN MARYLAND

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, the editorial page of this morning's Baltimore Sun contains an article by Ernest Baugh, a distinguished Maryland journalist.

The article, entitled "Appalachia in Maryland," puts in perspective the historical and economic background of this important section of my State. More important, it emphasizes the efforts which the people of this section of my State have made, on their own, to sustain and expand the economies of Washington, Garrett, and Allegany Counties.

My cosponsorship of the Appalachian Regional Development Act, which was passed by the Senate on Friday, stemmed from my belief, apparently shared by Mr. Baugh, that the additional resources of the Federal Government could bring the regional effort to an even more successful and more rapid conclusion.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Appalachia in Maryland

(By Ernest V. Baugh)

The Maryland section of Appalachia is not large, in Appalachia as a whole. It contains less than 1 percent of the 165,000 square miles in the mountain region stretching from lower New York to upper Alabama and Georgia. In terms of Maryland, though, it is large; its 1,567 square miles represent more than 15 percent of the State's total area.

In population the Maryland section of Appalachia has slightly less than 1.3 percent of the mountain region's 15.3 million residents. But Maryland's Appalachia accounts for about 6.3 percent of the State's population.

Washington, Allegany, and Garrett Counties, which make up Maryland's Appalachia, are not in the Atlantic coast corridor, with its population explosion and economic expansion. Western Maryland in a sense is far away, reaching as it does into the Mississippi watershed. In easy labels, Maryland is a coastal, not a mountain, State and its economy has a tidewater base.

Back in colonial times and well into the 19th century the people in the urban areas along the coast considered the Appalachians something to get through on the way to new, developing western lands, not a place to settle in.

George Washington's road pioneering through western Maryland was done solely to establish a trade route to the Ohio River. He took the path he did not because he liked Appalachia but because the Narrows at Cumberland provided a slash through part of the mountains.

It was to open up the new West that the Federal Government built the national road in the early part of the last century. As for the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad and the Chesapeake & Ohio Canal, their names indicate their goals and those goals were not in the mountains. True the canal did not get beyond Cumberland but only because the railroad could do the job of passing through the mountains quicker and better.

Later came the exploitation of Appalachia's natural resources, primarily coal. This brought people into the mountains to remain, not to pass through. But the boom was based on an extractive economy and when the natural resources were depleted hard times came.

True, there was some industry but not enough to absorb the unemployment pool. People began to drift away; the area generally became depressed, except in a few of the urban spots where manufacturing had flourished. What is the answer?

There has been much talk about turning large areas of Appalachia into recreation centers. Steps toward that end have long since been taken in the Maryland section: witness the big State forests and parks and the development around Garrett County's Deep Creek Lake. However, some of those who have become experts in Appalachia's problems hold that recreation is not the answer, that the best promise rests in an expansion in manufacturing.

Here again western Maryland has not been sitting on its hands. Manufacturing has been expanded, particularly in the Hagerstown and Cumberland areas. According to a recent report western Maryland accounts for 8 percent of the State's manufacturing employment, a figure that runs higher than its share in the State's population.

Appalachia, along with the rest of the country, has shared in Federal aid programs: unemployment relief, retraining, forest rehabilitation, attacks on stream pollution, highway construction, and so forth. Now, if the House approves the Senate-passed administration bill for a $1.6 billion relief and rehabilitation program, Appalachia will be given a special uplift.

The time is ripe for such an uplift and, parochial though it may be to say so, particularly in our section of the mountain areas. The people up there have done a lot on their own to raise the economic level in the three counties; with a proper boost from the outside they could go much further and much faster—western Maryland is not without assets for development.

LEGISLATIVE REAPPORTIONMENT

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the Washington Sunday Star of September 27 published an editorial entitled "Not a Rush Job." The editorial points out that in California, 6 million people from Los Angeles County have in the California State Legislature a single senator, while in another district in that State 1 senator represents only 14,000 people.

We have a somewhat similar situation in New Mexico, where 1 county has 1,874 people and another county has 262,199. This indicates the difficulty of a present problem, and suggests that, while there is no urgent need for haste, the courts should make it their business to see that these serious inequities are minimized.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, Sept. 27, 1964]

NOT A RUSH JOB

The Senate's 6-week reapportionment struggle has ended with nothing more than a mild appeal to the courts for a measure of commonsense restraint in requiring compliance with the Supreme Court's "one man, one vote" ruling. The specific suggestions proposed by the Senate, however, are entirely reasonable—and the courts should give them full consideration.

There was a good deal of conversation during the debate as to whether this subject is any of Congress business. Of course it is. The "sense of Congress" resolution is wholly proper. In fact, we think it would have been appropriate to have gone one step further, as Senators MANSFIELD and DIRKSEN were on the verge of proposing at one point, and to place the resolution's sensible guidelines within the context of a directive to the courts.

For reapportionment is clearly a legislative function, and there is some basis for the deep concern which many constitutional lawyers feel about the courts having entered this arena at all. The basic responsibility rests, of course, with the legislatures of the States. And it was their refusal over a long period of years to correct malapportionment which provided the occasion for court intervention.

Now that the courts have stepped in, reapportionment must proceed. The grievances of misrepresentation are not imaginary. With the growth of urban concentrations, these evils have attained very serious proportions in many places. In California, for instance, the 6 million people of Los Angeles County have a single senator, while in another district of that State 1 senator speaks for only 14,000. How can anyone defend such imbalances?

Having said this, however, we think the courts have an obligation to give the States reasonable time in which to correct such conditions. Surely the 15-day period which a Colorado court gave that State legislature to come into session—and to reapportion itself—was not reasonable. Surely it is not necessary to so disrupt the orderly conduct of State affairs that three separate elections, as in New York, are required to reconstitute that legislature.

The States should not be permitted to stall in fair readjustment of their assemblies. But the courts have no magic wand by which this complex process can be easily achieved. And there is no such urgent need for haste as to justify the hardship and damage that would result from precipitate action. The courts should make it their business to see that these effects are minimized.

THE CHRISTIAN AND HIS FREEDOM

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I have just had the opportunity to read an outstanding sermon delivered last July by Dr. John R. Richardson, pastor of Westminster Presbyterian Church in Atlanta.

The sermon, entitled "The Christian and His Freedom," brings a message which is both thought-provoking and extremely timely. Dr. Richardson declares that the preservation of freedom and individual liberty is the overriding issue of our time; that, and I quote from his sermon, "the erosion of freedom is America's paramount peril."

Mr. President, I commend this splendid sermon to Members of the Senate and to the American people, and I ask that we think on what Dr. Richardson has to say and to heed his words.

I ask unanimous consent that this sermon be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the sermon was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CHRISTIAN AND HIS FREEDOM

"With a great sum obtained I this freedom."—Acts 22: 28.

"If the Son therefore shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed."—John 8: 36.

God alone is completely free. He is answerable only to Himself. To no other is God accountable. At no time is God under compulsion except to the law of His own Being. While this is necessary it is also the highest freedom.

The freedom of God is His rational self-determination. God has reasons for acting as He does. God's actions were induced from perfect motives. In each act, however, God acts from the posture of freedom.

It should be obvious to any intelligent reader of the Bible that the free God is deeply concerned about freedom. What God takes so seriously should not be lightly considered by Christians. The person who learns to think Biblically will soon become dedicated to freedom.

If ever man needed clear Biblical guidance on the subject of freedom, the time is now. We must be prepared to listen to what God has to communicate to us as we study the Scriptures.

The idea of freedom as the happy state of not being a slave prevails throughout the Bible. Freedom is looked upon as a supernatural blessing. It is unattainable apart from God. Only through God's favor can it be maintained. Disobedience to God inevitably means the loss of freedom.

Many false notions are being propagated regarding freedom. Some have the idea that to be free is to do anything we like. It is the right to have our own way at all times. The lad who is chafing under parental discipline says, "I want to be free." He means he wants to have his way and no questions should be asked. The husband or wife tired of family responsibilities says, "I want to be free." The result is that some excuse is manufactured for a divorce.

Another common mistake is to limit freedom to political liberty. No sane person would minimize the value of political freedom but history demonstrates that in itself it cannot really make men free. The French Revolution is a classic example of the fallacy of this nation. Upon the monuments of the French Revolution were inscribed the motto, "Liberty, equality, fraternity." What followed? Political liberty alone brought the imposition of a reign of terror and the abridgement of other liberties.

The paramount issue of our day is the survival of freedom. Here is where we must draw the line and fight. The Duke of Wellington was an astute military commander. He said a smart military leader must give intensive thought to the choice of the battlefield where he will take his stand. This he did when he decreed to mass his armies on the heights at Waterloo.

As informed Christians in the contemporary world we must choose the battlefield where we shall take our stand. It must be the battlefield of human freedom in a world that is rapidly losing its freedoms. Here is where we should concentrate our energies and our efforts.

Freedom has not fared well during the past three decades. The prospects for the future are not bright. Some are praying that 1964 will be a banner year for freedom. God will determine whether or not we deserve freedom.

How shall we think of freedom? I do not have a perfect definition to offer. In this study on the Christian and his freedom I submit two, either of which may be considered satisfactory. One: "Freedom is the state in which a person is not subject to coercion by the arbitrary will of another or others." Two: "Freedom is the right to do what is good and right and fair in every area of life."

When can it be said that a person is free? When one is free from something, in something and for something. A man may be said to be free when he is free to choose without coercion. It is freedom to choose between good and evil, and choose between good things.

Freedom for all practical purposes is the power of self-determination. The Book of Proverbs describes a freeman as one who governs his own spirit. A free society is one that determines the form and function of its government and the structures of its social life.

I. THE CHRISTIAN MUST BE ALERT TO THE FACT THAT FREEDOM MAY EASILY BE LOST

Any student of the history of human beings must be aware of the ease in which men lose their freedom. Freedom can be lost suddenly, but it can also be nibbled away. This goes for every kind of freedom. It is especially noticeable in reference to men's personal, political, and economic freedoms.

God originally made man a free being. This freedom was an integral part of man's native endowment. God so made man that he could say "Yes" or "No" to his Creator. In this respect man was superior to the animal creation. Animals are regulated by instinct instead of volition. In nature there is no such thing as we call freedom. Nature operates by necessity. Nature cannot lose its freedom because it has none.

God tested man's ability to handle his freedom. The test was made on the basis of obedience. God informed man that there is a sphere that is reserved to the Creator alone. There is a fruit of which human beings may not eat. God alone knows what is good and evil. Man must recognize that he is a creature and accept his creaturely limitations.

Seduced by Satanic suggestions man failed to meet the test. The record is one of failure. The idea that man would not have to give an account to a higher power was quickly exploded. Man instantly realized that he was not his own master, and that his freedom was under God. Thus from the start sacred history reveals how swiftly man can lose his personal freedom and become a slave to sin. The first 11 chapters of the Bible graphically depict the consequences that follow the loss of freedom.

For a conspicuous instance of the case in which men lose their political and economic freedom let us learn from secular history. This time let us review a portion of the history of ancient Greece. Greece at one time had a passion for freedom but lost it. How?

Most of us who have studied Grecian history recall Pericles. He started a sort of public works administration. Desiring popularity he initiated certain giveaway programs. To promote these schemes it was necessary for Pericles to dip freely into the public treasury.

Pericles became more and more popular as he sponsored these measures. He was elected 15 times to a position similar to the Presidency of the United States. As time passed Pericles requested and was granted more and more power. So much power was concentrated in his hands that he could decide the issue of war or peace.

When the popularity of Pericles began to wane he started a war with Sparta. This Peloponesian war was wholly unnecessary. But Pericles believed that this was the best way to bolster his fading power and popularity. When things looked shaky Pericles promised the people government money. When something more dramatic was required he was ready to start a war.

Then came along a citizen by the name of Cleon. He desired the position held by Pericles. He decided that the surest way to secure it was to outpromise Pericles. This he did. He promised increased pay and shorter hours. The populace began to listen to him. He proposed more government. The people thought this was fine.

Finally Pericles lost out and Cleon took over. It was imperative that Cleon should make good on his promises. To increase government the money had to come from somewhere. To procure it Cleon was ready to extort it from every possible source. Taxation became almost equivalent to confiscation. Cleon put more and more people on the public payroll. A vast parasitic bureaucracy resulted from this device.

When in the third century Philip of Macedon destroyed Greece he found the people ground down by poverty and resigned to a dependence on the state for their crusts of bread. The rise of a huge centralized government brought about the loss of freedom. An irresponsible government had cost Athens her freedom.

A well-known observation on human behavior applies here. Those who choose to ignore the mistakes of history are condemned to repeat them.

When the Constitutional Convention had done its work, Benjamin Franklin was walking down a Philadelphia street. A woman accosted him with the inquiry: "Well, Doctor, what have we got, a republic or a monarchy?" "A republic, Madam," he replied tersely, "if we can keep it." This is the exalted task for each American.

II. THE CHRISTIAN MUST NEVER FORGET THAT OUR AMERICAN FOREBEARS WERE NOT CONTENT TO PAY LIPSERVICE TO FREEDOM, BUT SOUGHT TO GUARANTEE TO EVERY MAN HIS LEGAL INDEPENDENCE OF THE ARBITRARY WILL OF ANOTHER

Our American Government was founded by men who believed there should be a minimum of interference with human freedom. They abhorred coercion in any form. They had suffered from oppression and tyranny and were determined to establish a government that would respect the demands of freedom. They sought to make it impossible for the state to usurp man's inalienable rights.

It was the conviction of the architects of our civil government that it should be the function of government to protect its citizens against internal and external aggression, but should otherwise leave alone people to work out, unhampered, their own problems and aspirations. On this point there was no dissent.

One of the chief political beliefs of these wise men was that persons who make wise choices are entitled to enjoy the benefits of such choices. At the same time they consistently held that those who make foolish choices must suffer the consequences, and have no right to demand that the government pay for their mistakes.

It is evident from the records of the early days of our Republic that our forebears fearlessly maintained that every citizen has the right to use and enjoy his honestly acquired property. This right gave the owner the privilege of trading it, selling it, regulating it, or even to donate it if he so desired.

When we compare our present condition in reference to freedom with conditions a century ago we shall quickly see how great a change there has been and not for the better. In 1852 Carl Schurz, a wise young man who visited our country, wrote home and gave some of his observations on American life. As quoted in the Saturday Evening Post, the letter said, "Here in America you can see how slightly a people needs to be governed * * * Here are governments, but no rulers—governors, but they are clerks.

"All the great educational establishments, the churches, the great means of transportation, etc. that are being organized here—almost all of these owe their existence not to official authority but the spontaneous cooperation of private individuals. It is only here that you realize how superfluous governments are in many affairs in which, in Europe, they are considered entirely indispensable, and how the opportunity of doing something inspires a desire to do it.

"It is my firm conviction that the European revolutionists will drive the next revolution into a reaction merely through their lust for government, through their desire to improve things quickly and positively. Every glance into the political life of America strengthens my conviction that the aim of a revolution can be nothing else than to make room for the will of the people—in other words, to break every authority which has its organization in the life of the State, and as far as possible, to overturn the barriers to individual liberty."

This eloquent plea for strictly limited government and individual liberty is urgently needed in 1964. Once more we need to heed the trenchant remark of Woodrow Wilson, "The history of the development of freedom is the history of the limitation of the power of the government and not the growth thereof." This applies to all governments, for all tend to abuse their power. It is most distressing to find that many so-called molders of opinion are promoting the philosophy of an ever-expanding government.

Dr. Howard E. Kershner in his brilliant booklet called "The Hangman's Rope" exposes the movement in our Nation that is pushing hard for more and more executive and judicial usurpation. He reminds us that Executive order and court decree are prime planks in the Communist platform.

Vastly important, therefore, is the necessity to return to the original American conviction that there must be only a minimum of interference on the part of the Federal Government with the human freedom. Every department of our National Government should be overhauled and restructured to conform to the original American idea. Then the movement on the part of the institution of government to deny or suppress human freedom would be halted and Americans could again breathe the fresh air of liberty. Two pertinent questions for the consideration of this point are: Where do I fit into this picture? Shall I be a link in the chain of American freedom?

III. THE CHRISTIAN MUST BE AWARE OF THE FACT THAT IN EVERY CENTURY FREEDOM HAS CARRIED A HIGH PRICE TAG

Human freedom is a hard-bought thing. Said the chief captain to Paul, "With a great sum obtained I this freedom." (Acts 22: 28.) Human freedom is never cheap. It is costly. Somebody has had to pay for it. The cost involves struggles and sacrifices. Frequently pain is required to purchase and maintain freedom. In every century freedom has carried a high price tag.

Our forebears braved all the hardships and perils of the vast ocean and uncharted American wilderness that they might find freedom in a new world. They, too, were conscious that they could say, "With a great sum obtained we this freedom."

Half the population of the world today is living without the enjoyment of their fundamental freedoms. The other half is in danger of losing theirs. Lovers of freedom must be seriously concerned about this situation. This condition constitutes a ringing challenge to all who still enjoy some measure of freedom's holy light.

We are challenged to sacrifice our time to think through the problems of freedom. We are in the midst of a world revolution. The issues that divide us in the East and West are not to be settled on the battlefield, but in the minds of men. Just as the early Christians "outthought" the pagans of their day so we must "outthink" the pagans of our day. It is incumbent upon us to think sanely about human freedom to persuade others as to the truths of our beliefs. Church resolutions have proven to be ineffective in this area. The issue of freedom challenges our best thought.

Often the challenge of freedom is for the sacrifice of life. To overthrow the bid of the totalitarians for the complete domination of the world, many brave souls have had to sacrifice their lives. To destroy the nazism of Germany, the imperialism of Japan, the fascism of Italy, and the communism of Russia large numbers yielded their blood.

Patriots and martyrs speak to us from their graves that freedom is expensive. The voices of these men and women who have advanced the cause of human freedom in the world are still ringing down the centuries telling us that freedom is purchased by a great sum but it is worth all that it costs.

There are many names inscribed on the honor roll of human freedom. One of the most conspicuous is the French maid, Joan of Arc. Her's is a voice that still resounds down through the centuries.

In 1429, Orleans was besieged by by English armies. The French King was insane. The two major political parties among the nobles were involved in bitter disputes. Henry V took a well equipped army across the channel and captured the principal towns of Normandy, and methodically ravaged the country as he passed through it.

Joan of Arc felt divinely called to break the siege of Orleans and save her country. Despite the opposition of her family she said, "Before mid-Lent I must be with the King, if even to get there I must wear off my legs to the knees." She cut off her long hair, put on male garments and set out under an escort in February 1429. She found a terrified and broken French Army. Soon she filled the soldiers with enthusiasm and determination. Orleans was saved.

Captured by the British she paid the price that freedom required. By English hands she was burned. The execution took place May 30, 1431, in the public fish market of the old city of Rouen. The ashes of Joan were carried by the executioners to the Seine and thrown in, so that no vestige of that saint should be left.

This patriot loved France dearly. She believed that France should be free to develop her own type of life and institutions without meddling from other nations. Her motivation was not hatred. She said, "Of hate for the English I know nothing; I only know they must be driven out of France, for this is not their country." The dynamic motivation of her career was freedom. In our generation may the same passion be for freedom, and a willingness to pay the price even to the uttermost farthing.

IV. THE CHRISTIAN WHO IS SENSITIVE TO NATIONAL TRENDS MUST BE KEENLY CONSCIOUS OF THE FACT THAT THE EROSION OF FREEDOM IS AMERICA'S PARAMOUNT PERIL

The erosion of freedom is America's paramount peril. Thoughtful people recognize that something is radically wrong with our country. There is a growing uneasiness that something tragic is happening to American life. American morals are at a new low. Some colleges and universities are teaching that morality is "relative" and "one person's opinion is as good as another's." There are no moral absolutes, we are told.

Alarming is the breakdown in family life and family discipline. Parents are pampering their children and they are becoming irresponsible and soft. Children are permitted to indulge in anything that the crowd does.

But our paramount peril is the loss of our individual rights and freedoms. Too many of our decisions are reached under coercion, and coercion damages the exercise of the will. Our power of self-determination is progressively impaired with the passing of each year. The book of Proverbs describes a free man as one who governs his spirit, and a free society is a people that determines the form and function of its government and the structures of its social life.

This peril is noticed in many areas of American life. It is particularly visible in the sphere of economics. Some appear not to be concerned about the hazard in this area because they are unaware of the truth that without economic freedom all other freedoms are in serious jeopardy.

Those who lean heavily to the economic left would make it appear that a free market economy is incompatible with Christianity. The very opposite is the truth. Christian ethics require economic freedom. We cannot afford to be ignorant of this truth.

Collectivists frequently affirm that they began their acceptance of socialism for moral reasons. This fallacy should be exposed as contrary to sound reasoning. Our commonsense should teach us that a superior economic order that results in abundance is more moral than one that issues in scarcity and ultimate bankruptcy. The twin pillars of socialism are social planning and nationalization. Experience shows that such a program inevitably leads to waste, disorder, and a lower level of productivity.

Experience demonstrates that economic activity is better left to the voluntary cooperation of all individuals through a free market, unregulated prices, and open competition. The record of one European country after another reveals that socialism is the sure way to poverty, economic disorder, and economic imbalance. The remarkable recovery of West Germany under Erhart since 1948 is a brilliant example of the fact that everybody is better off as the result of a free economy.

We need to learn that socialism in its enthusiasm for bureaucratic organization, political centralization, economic regimentation, and subordination to the whims of the state is committed to a program that is not harmonious with the requirements of human freedom.

On moral grounds the Christian must ever be skeptical of the tenets of socialism. It is simply not moral to support a system that eventuates in social disorder, inefficiency, and poverty. Such a system that operates by coercion cannot be ethically defended. Free people outproduce, and it is not right to "muzzle the ox that treadeth out the corn."

Here, then, is our peril. Once a government gains control of the economic area of life it can control every facet of your life. History underscores the truth that once this power is acquired sooner or later all of our activities are subjected to governmental regulation and exploitation to political ends. When a free economy is gone, it will not be long until other freedoms will disappear with it.

V. THE CHRISTIAN SHOULD BE ABLE TO IDENTIFY THE DEFENDERS AND PROMOTERS OF FREEDOM

Who are the defenders and promoters of freedom? People everywhere claim to believe in freedom, even the Communist. In fact, "peace and freedom" appear to be their favorite words. Yet Communist countries are bereft of freedom. This question will be answered first from the negative standpoint and then affirmatively. Let us now try to identify both the enemies and friends of freedom.

Freedom has not fared well among many of our legislators. We thank God for men in our legislative halls who are devoted to freedom. From all appearances this group is relatively small. Many of our legislatures are conducting funeral services for freedom. They are burying freedom under legislation. We have too many manmade laws. God gave through Moses 10 laws for the regulation of the human race. Christ consolidated the 10 into 2 commandments. It would serve the cause of freedom if some bold candidate would adopt a platform to repeal legislation that militates against freedom.

Freedom is not usually defended by lobbyists and pressure groups. Of course they all claim altruistic motives and goals. The fact is most of them represent special interests and work for selfish advantages. They tend to restrict and threaten freedom. It has been said that there are over 400 pressure groups in Washington.

The cause of freedom is not defended or promoted by those who say that patriotism is outdated and one's loyalty should be to the whole world. However plausible this may sound it does not work in the interest of freedom. It only serves to make it easy for gullible people to embrace alien idealogies under the guise of what is popularly called the new internationalism.

Freedom finds no defenders and promoters among the demonstrators on the streets and in public places. The place to take grievances is the court of justice. To trespass on private property is a violation of the essence of freedom. Such a practice is certainly not helping the cause of freedom.

The cause of freedom is impaired by executives in Government who phone Members of the Congress to threaten or bribe them into a course of action to enhance their political prestige. The legislative branch of Government should be left alone by the executive branch in order that legislation be enacted without coercion.

Those who plead for a policy of coexistence with systems that are the antithesis of freedom are not defenders and promoters of freedom. Such a policy is destined to undermine freedom. It is simply a trap to catch the support of unsuspecting people. Such a policy is designed to lull people to sleep. While good men sleep the enemy gets his opportunity to sow tares.

Our best defenders and promoters of freedom are those who take seriously the teachings of the Bible. The Bible is freedom's greatest bulwark. The Bible denies that the state has the right to use man as a mere tool to further its godless ends. The Bible heaps denunciation upon those who would rob man of freedom. The influence of the Bible is always on the side of freedom. The Bible inspires one to resent every repressive act of government whether it affects him directly or not.

We must also include in the list of defenders and promoters of freedom those who teach and maximize the provisions of our U.S. Constitution. The aim of the U.S. Constitution is to safeguard individual liberty. This it does when interpreted in its plain meaning as it relates to limited government powers and the division of these powers. The language is so understandable that court decisions ought to be predictable by judicially minded men.

Finally, the defenders and promoters of freedom are those who so passionately desire it that they will pray for it. Each day our prayer should be for freedom for ourselves and for others. Pray that "long may our land be bright with freedom's holy light." We should include in our prayers petitions for the restoration of the freedoms that have been lost, the preservation of what is left, and the extension of freedom to those who are fettered in bondage.

VI. THE CHRISTIAN MUST PROCLAIM CHRIST AS THE SUPERLATIVE LIBERATOR OF MEN

If the quest for freedom is to be one of the great aims of our lives it would be a major tragedy to fail to recognize that Christ is the superlative liberator of men. Freedom was His aim. Freedom is a derivative from Christ. He saw around Him many kinds of tyrannies. His own country was frightfully oppressed. There were multitudes who were slaves to their own baser passions.

One of Christ's major claims was His ability to liberate men. "If the Son shall make you free, you shall be free indeed." (John 8:36). Many had promised freedom but their promises were bogus. Some were simply demagogs. Others were mistaken as to the right way to secure freedom. One discerning thinker expressed the thought this way: "Christ's Gospel did not promise freedom, yet it gave it: More surely than conqueror, reformer, or patriot, the Gospel will bring about a true liberty at last."

Moral bondage is the worst form of servitude. It has been observed that the worst type of slavery is that which cramps the noblest powers. Go to the alcoholic and study him. He is a slave. He would stop this destructive habit, but he cannot. He has sold out to this sinful practice and cannot liberate himself. He needs a supernatural liberator. He needs Christ. From the thraldom of drink nothing but Christ and His truth can deliver. The testimony of Morgan Blake in his book read by many Atlantans can be duplicated by thousands of others.

Since the unregenerate man is destitute of freedom, he has to be made free. This is why Christ insisted, "If the Son," meaning the Lord Jesus Christ, "make you free, you shall be free indeed." He is fully competent to liberate those who are under the tyranny of sin and the dominion of Satan. This, He said, is the central reason for His coming into the world. To this end He was anointed to preach "deliverance to the captives and set at liberty them that are bound."

It is the glory of Christ the Liberator that He emancipates the Christian from the dominion of sin, from the wrath of God, from the power of Satan, and from the unwarranted authority of men. From the positive standpoint, Christ the Liberator frees the Christian to serve the Lord. The Scripture puts the idea this way: "that being delivered out of the hands of our enemies, we might serve Him without fear, in holiness and righteousness before Him, all the days of our life."

Of interest to note is the means that Christ employs in the establishment of freedom. The means He proposed was what He called "the truth." It is Biblical truth that has brought freedom to those who have suffered under various forms of despotism. "You shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free." (John 8: 32.)

Force, at times, has helped the cause of freedom. Wherever it has been employed to this end we respect it. We enthusiastically honor the liberators of nations. But Christ knew the limitation of force in the acquisition of freedom. Thousands would have followed Him had He proposed a revolt and the use of force in removing the Romans. This, He realized, would have been abortive.

Education, if the right kind, may help the freedom movement. But secular education by itself has never been able to make or keep men free. Often it enslaves men to their own intellectual pride. Christ never said, "You shall be educated, and education shall make you free." What He had in mind was something distinct from what we call education.

It is the truth about God, the truth about man, the truth about salvation, the truth about destiny beyond death that makes men free. It is this kind of truth that fits men for freedom and makes them free. Isn't it about time that we learn this?

CONCLUSION

The study on freedom must now come to a close. I trust it will be the beginning of a fuller devotion to freedom. A few concluding remarks are in order.

We must support education for freedom. Freedom schools that are sound should be encouraged. One such school is in Colorado Springs. Robert LeFevre is president. The minds of our young people should be saturated with freedom literature. Maybe we can start a Library of Freedom. The day for the conservative thinker has arrived. There are readers ready to see what we have to say about the disease that is afflicting America, and the remedy.

Every valuable article has its counterfeit. There is an ersatz freedom. In line with such we read about freedom from the Ten Commandments, freedom from the need for thrift, freedom from work, freedom from the past, etc. Such fictitious ideas lead to human bondage. It has always done so. We should benefit from the experience of others.

Freedom must be guarded even in the church. It has been betrayed within the church and our age has not escaped it. Think of this in the matter of our giving. Ecclesiastical bureaucrats endeavor to force God's people to give to a cause whether or not they believe in it or prefer to support another cause. We need to learn afresh this principle: "That to compel a man to furnish contributions of money for the propagation of ideas which he disbelieves and abhors is sinful and tyrannical." This is our justification for refusing to support the National Council of Churches.

Is freedom still an issue? Skeptically some ask the question, "Is it wise to continue to crusade for freedom when so many other good causes demand our time and energies?" The answer is freedom is not just an issue, it is the issue of our day. It is the issue to all who are alert to the signs of the times. For what shall it profit a nation if it shall seek to create an image to please foreigners and forfeit its own freedom? And before we can export freedom abroad we must make sure it is not a lost cause at home.

As I grow older it becomes clearer to me that many times in life people do not know what is best for them. They do not see the end from the beginning. They are swayed by some immediate consideration and unconscious of their own ultimate interest. Many a voter has been bribed with his own money to vote for a certain candidate only later to be disillusioned. It would be a salutary procedure if each voter would cast his ballot in favor of freedom. A vote for freedom brings no regrets.

My last word is a plea to once again reaffirm our belief in God the Author of Liberty. It is from God we claim our freedom. From Him flow our liberties. They are God given and not state given. Remove God and the structure of our system of freedom collapses. George Washington said, "Let us raise a standard to which the wise and honest can repair." We raise high the standard of freedom and ask you to stand with us in the unending conflict between freedom and servitude. Since God is free we must believe that He wills men to be free. "Make a firm stand then, never slip into any yoke of servitude."

THE REAPPORTIONMENT OF STATE LEGISLATURES

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, the Charlotte News for September 11, 1964, published an editorial entitled "The Chamber Off Course," which contains some sage observations concerning the recent decisions of the Supreme Court in respect to the reapportionment of membership in State legislatures.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Charlotte News of Sept. 11, 1964]

THE CHAMBER OFF COURSE

The position of Charlotte Chamber of Commerce directors on reapportionment is sound as far as it goes. Unfortunately, it does not go very far.

In its letter to Senators ERVIN and JORDAN and Representative JONAS, the chamber expresses a laudable caution on the subject of a constitutional amendment that would limit the Supreme Court in the field of apportionment. It urges "the broadest possible study and debate" before such an amendment is approved for submission to the States.

So far, so good. But the letter gives no support to the Dirksen bill which is the only means of making possible the study and debate the chamber desires.

The bill that Senators DIRKSEN and MANSFIELD have worked out in their capacities as party heads in Congress simply calls for a delay of approximately 15 months in the applicability of the Supreme Court's latest apportionment decision. As matters stand now, the one-man, one-vote concept which the Court has imposed on the States could be enforced by the courts immediately. State legislatures would have to reapportion under emergency conditions or run the risk of having elections challenged. The results of inaction by Congress thus might well be impossible to undo.

Contrary to the impression left by those who oppose the measure, the Dirksen bill would not read the courts out of apportionment and leave State legislatures at the mercy of rural minorities. It would give Congress the time for "the broadest possible study and debate"—to use the chamber's phrase—on the vital question of what Congress can do to show the Court that the judiciary's powers in this field are not unlimited, as the Court seems to think.

In our opinion—and somehow we can't believe that the chamber really disagrees here—the Court went too far when it decreed as an absolute constitutional principle that every house of every State legislature must be apportioned on the basis of "one man, one vote." The one-man, one-vote concept may be a perfectly sound one in apportionment; but nothing in this Nation's constitutional history or in earlier Court decisions suggests that it is the only one.

The task of Congress, in our view, is to find a way to get this message across to a Supreme Court that isn't even paying attention to the honest apprehensions of its friends these days. The Dirksen bill would give Congress the chance to do just this. It is now or never. The "sense of Congress" resolution being backed by the administration is a sham, worse than useless.

The Dirksen bill is not some fiendish device to perpetuate malapportionment and rural advantage in State legislatures. It is a last-chance measure aimed ultimately at reserving to States some rights—as well as responsibilities—in this field.

The chamber's congressional action committee, which approved the Dirksen bill, understood that. It's regrettable that the board of directors did not choose to second the committee's support of the Dirksen measure.

SURPLUS STOCKPILE MATERIALS AVAILABLE TO SCHOOLS AND HOSPITALS

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, recently I introduced a bill which would make surplus stockpile materials available to schools and hospitals, under the donable surplus property program. When I introduced the bill, I said that I wanted to determine exactly how schools and hospitals could make use of raw materials in teaching and research programs. In working with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, I have asked various educational centers and hospitals to evaluate my proposal and to give me an indication of the uses to which stockpiled materials might be put in their institutions.

I have also had the benefit of the advice of the National Association of State Agencies for Surplus Property. The State agencies are the approved bodies through which surplus property has been donated to schools and hospitals under Public Law 152. Mr. Robert H. Arnold, the president of the National Association, has written to me concerning my proposal to extend the surplus property program. I shall insert his letter in the RECORD; but first I quote a part of it which may command special interest this year. Mr. Arnold wrote:

> By making the reserve and stockpile materials available for donation prior to sale, as provided for in your amendment, the beginning, and continuation of many health and educational program could result. Too often new programs, especially in the field of research, are impossible because of the high commercial costs of materials like those in question. The costs of acquiring them through the donation program would be almost negligible.

In 1964, we have passed antipoverty legislation which marks a giant step in the struggle to extend economic opportunity to all our citizens. I hope that in 1965 many other Senators will join me in sponsoring a bill which will help research programs at schools and universities that are not wealthy enough to finance adequate research programs by themselves.

Some of the schools and colleges were notified of my amendment to S. 2272 by their State agency for surplus property. Also, I have written to schools of mining, in order to determine to what extent raw materials might be used in educational programs. I am happy to say that the response to my proposal has been deeply encouraging. The University of Alaska needs cadmium, lead, and mercury for scientific research. From the Department of Education of the State of Arkansas, I have learned that the Arkansas Vocational Technical School uses large quantities of raw materials. San Jose State College, in California, has need for copper, rubber, iodine, and tungsten.

The list goes on. The Colorado School of Mines, through its president, Orlo E. Childs, has expressed a strong interest in my proposal. The school uses lead in radiation laboratories for shielding purposes; and aluminum is used as a noncorrosive material in fume hoods. Also, asbestos sheeting is valuable as a lining for hoods and furnaces which are kept at high temperatures.

From the University of Florida, in Gainesville, I have received word that aluminum, nickel, tin, tungsten, and zinc are needed in a rapidly expanding graduate program. And the Dudley M. Hughes Vocational School, in Macon, Ga., has stated:

> The surplus property program for educational use is one of the best administered and most helpful services, with the least cost to the taxpayers, that is being furnished by any Federal agency at the present time.

The University of Illinois can make good use of copper and copper base alloys; and the University of Kansas has expressed special interest in acquiring copper, mercury, and nickel. Also, the University of Mississippi has been strongly supporting my proposal.

The Missouri School of Mines and Metallurgy has written me a letter which is an excellent outline of ways in which a mining school can use raw materials from the national stockpile. The new Materials Research Center at the University of Missouri School of Mines will investigate the physical-chemical behavior of materials, for the purpose of developing materials with properties and reliability needed in our Nation's space and defense programs. For this center, stockpiled raw materials would be extremely useful. After reading this excellent letter, my opinion is that no better investment can be made with our raw materials than to donate them to vital research programs at colleges and universities. The defense capability, the educational level, and the all-around vitality of the Nation will be increased. The research programs will be spread over more of the Nation than now is the case, and the less wealthy institutions will be able to breathe life into their struggling laboratories.

I hope all Senators will read the letters which I shall have printed in the RECORD. Hastings College, in Nebraska, has a constant need for mercury, copper, lead, and tin. The South Dakota School of Mines needs copper and manganese dioxide in its laboratory programs. From Tennessee, Austin Peay State College has expressed a desire to obtain lead, graphite, and cadmium for radioisotope work. The physics department at Midwestern University, in Texas, states that aluminum and zinc would be of "inestimable value." Finally, the State of Vermont, through its department of education, has stated that my proposal, if enacted, would "prove invaluable to science programs in all levels of Vermont's educational system."

I am grateful to the National Association of State Agencies for Surplus Property for notifying so many educational institutions of my proposal. And I deeply appreciate the enthusiastic response of the schools, hospitals, colleges, and universities throughout America. I think the extension of the donable surplus property program to include surplus raw materials will be logical and useful. In an age in which America as a nation is committed to the development of educational excellence, such an extension is really a necessity. This bill is very important to me; and I welcome the support of all Senators who in the past have been backers of the surplus property program, and who are interested in expanding it to meet present and future needs.

I ask unanimous consent that the letters and telegrams I have received on my proposal be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters and telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

August 7, 1964.

Hon. LEE METCALF,
Room 140, Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: The National Association of State Agencies for Surplus Property is vitally interested in your amendment to Senate bill S. 2272, the Materials Reserve and Stockpile Act of 1964.

As you are aware, the donation program, as approved under Public Law 152, 81st Congress, provides a method whereby surplus property no longer required by the Federal Government is distributed to and through approved State agencies for health, educational, and civil defense purposes.

Since its inception, the donation program has been of untold benefit to the schools, hospitals, and civil defense units throughout the 50 States. The origination and furtherance of many programs have resulted from donations of Federal surplus property, especially in the field of education.

By making the reserve and stockpile materials available for donation prior to sale, as provided for in your amendment, the beginning and continuation of many health and educational programs could result. Too often new programs, especially in the field of research, are impossible because of the high commercial costs of materials like those in question. The costs of acquiring them through the donation program would be almost negligible.

We further believe the commercial impact on producers and manufacturers of these materials would be far less if the property were donated rather than being sold.

The National Association of State Agencies for Surplus Property wishes to go on record as supporting your amendment in every way possible. We know of its potential benefits to health and education throughout the United States.

Respectfully,

ROBERT H. ARNOLD,
President, NASASP.

UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA,
July 21, 1964.

Hon. LEE METCALF,
U.S. Senate,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: I have just heard of your proposed amendment to the Materials Reserve and Stockpile Act of 1964. I would like to point out that we, here at the University of Alaska, do have need, from time to time, for materials that are held on the present stockpile listings. Specifically for scientific research purposes are cadmium, lead and mercury. These metals are used in moderate quantities and would not affect the overall amounts greatly. However, if they would be made available on a donation basis, as certain surplus items are, it would save us purchasing them from Federal research and development moneys.

The lead is utilized as shielding for various AEC materials utilized in experimental work and the mercury has and will continue to be an important part of our vacuum systems in research laboratory procedures. The cadmium is utilized in chemical assay work in our marine science group to indicate to you some of the areas of utilization that are appropriate for such stockpile materials. I have not taken time to screen the whole campus on this matter but these are materials that I am aware of at present.

Your efforts on our behalf are most appreciated.

Sincerely,

ALFRED H. GEORGE,
Assistant Comptroller for Research.

STATE OF ARKANSAS,
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
Pine Bluff, August 4, 1964.

Senator LEE METCALF,
Room 427, Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: I have been advised that you are prepared to offer an amendment to Senator SYMINGTON's bill S. 2272 which would provide for donation of property in the Federal reserve stockpile prior to its disposal by sale.

I believe your amendment would greatly benefit education and would be to the best interest of the Nation as a whole.

The Arkansas Vocational Technical School of which I am director uses large quantities of raw material in our training program, and we could save the taxpayers of this State a considerable amount if we could receive some of the raw materials for our program through the Federal surplus property donation program.

Yours very truly,

ARKANSAS VOCATIONAL TECHNICAL SCHOOL,
LEON COKER, *Director.*

BRADLEY COUNTY MEMORIAL HOSPITAL,
Warren, Ark., August 4, 1964.

Re Senate bill 2272
Senator LEE METCALF,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: It has come to my attention that you have submitted an amendment to the Material and Stockpile Act of 1964 with the captioned bill.

Please be assured that I wish you every success in your efforts to pass this bill.

Sincerely,

JOE CARMICAL,
Administrator.

SOUTHERN STATE COLLEGE,
Magnolia, Ark., August 3, 1964.

Senator LEE METCALF,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: Southern State College has benefited greatly from the surplus property it has received through the Arkansas State Department of Education. We appreciate your interest in acquiring additional surplus property for public institutions and your amendment to Senate bill S. 2272.

We sincerely hope that you will be able to get favorable action on this amendment as well as the bill itself.

Yours very truly,

IMON E. BRUCE,
President.

ARROYO GRANDE UNION
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT,
Arroyo Grande, Calif., July 24, 1964.

Hon. LEE METCALF,
U.S. Senator, Montana,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: It has come to my attention that the Federal Government is presently negotiating for the sale of certain stockpiled items to foreign countries. Some of the items under consideration for sale are the following: Asbestos, mercury, bismuth, aluminum, cadmium, copper, cartage and fibers, carborundum, feathers and down, iodine, lead, magnesium, graphite, nickel, shellac, rubber, silicone carbide, talcum, tin, tungsten, and zinc.

Of this partial list, to use one example alone, is the metal mercury which has great application and use for the teaching of science. If I seek to buy this item through ordinary sources the costs are prohibitive for a junior high school educational program. However, when made available through educational surplus this item alone improves the quality of the educational program in science and the savings for the purchase of mercury can be applied toward the purchase of books in such courses as mathematics, history, geography, etc. It would be possible to use many other examples from this limited list to demonstrate how the instructional program can be improved if these items are made available through educational surplus.

I urge your continued effort to make these items available for educational consumption out of Federal stockpiles rather than have these items sold on international markets.

Thank you for your work on behalf of the schools of America.

Respectfully,
Douglas A. Campbell.

Ravenswood City School District,
Palo Alto, Calif., July 24, 1964.
Hon. Lee Metcalf,
U.S. Senator, Montana,
Washington D.C.

Hon. Lee Metcalf: Please be informed that we, a small public school district in northern California, do use and do need metals and materials that are occasionally released from the stockpile of strategic materials for consumption by public agencies.

We recommend the support of your proposed legislation in this matter.

Sincerely,
Craig A. Snasdell,
Assistant Superintendent,
Business Services.

College of San Mateo,
San Mateo, Calif, July 24, 1964.
Hon. Lee Metcalf,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator: This school district, as well as other school districts, in my opinion have use for items such as aluminum, magnesium, copper, lead, graphite, tin, zinc, tungsten, and other materials that are on the strategic list now being considered for release to school districts.

I would like to state that I would support legislation to make these items available to schools. Such legislation would put these surplus materials to beneficial use and would provide savings to the school districts throughout the Nation.

Your support of this legislation will be greatly appreciated.

Yours truly,
Matteo V. Fasanaro,
Business Manager.

Crescent Union School District,
Crescent City, Calif., July 24, 1964.
Hon. Lee Metcalf,
U.S. Senator, Montana,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Metcalf: We have just learned that many surplus items have sometimes been made available for sale rather than to educational agencies through the donation program.

Among these items are aluminum sheet, asbestos, bismuth, cadmium, copper, cordage and fiber, feathers and down material, graphite, iodine, lead, magnesium, nickel, rubber, shellac, silicon carbide, tin, tungsten, and zinc.

We recognize many of these items as being desirable for our educational programs. Inasmuch as our district has been able to acquire many things that otherwise we would have had to do without, and our program is better because of the many surplus items available to us, may we suggest that the donation program be given the opportunity of acquiring the above items, so that we can more economically meet our educational needs.

Very truly yours,
D. DeVar Felshaw,
District Superintendent.

San Jose State College,
San Jose, Calif., July 24, 1964.
Hon. Lee Metcalf,
U.S. Senator, Washington, D.C.

We are in favor of your proposal to release stockpile materials for use in schools prior to outside sale.

For instance, we use considerable quantities of mercury, asbestos, copper, cordage, fibers, lead, rubber, shellac, silicons, and zinc. We use medium quantities of aluminum, carborundum, and tin; we use small quantities of graphite, iodine, magnesium, nickel, talc, and tungsten.

Our large engineering, science, industrial arts, and aeronautics instructional programs use most of the materials. Other instructional courses and plant operations use the materials in various quantities and in special projects.

We are a conscientious user of educational surplus property and would like to see you expand the program.

D. C. Petersen,
Purchasing Officer.

Hayward Unified School District,
Hayward, Calif., July 28, 1964.
Hon. Lee Metcalf,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Metcalf: We are requesting your support of an amendment to Senate bill 2272 in which you are offering to make all surplus stockpile items available to schools prior to their being offered to commercial sources. We are particularly interested in items which are manufactured with ingredients including mercury, aluminum, and copper. These aforementioned items are in great demand by our school district and we feel that we would realize a large financial saving if we could be offered these items on a priority basis.

Thank you very much for any consideration which you may give us in this very important matter and we will certainly support your amendment in whatever way you feel we are able.

Respectfully,
H. Marshall Hansen,
Business Manager.

Colorado School of Mines,
Golden, Colo., July 21, 1964.
Senator Metcalf,
The Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: We would like to express our gratitude to the Senators and committeemen who have been helpful in keeping the surplus property program on the very active basis which it has been extended to the schools and colleges of our country. We have had many and varied uses for the wonderful items that have been offered for our use. We would like to let you know that we have uses constantly in different ways for the following items:

Lead is used in our radiation labs for shielding sources. It is also used in many of our experiments in metallurgy and so forth.

Mercury is used in some application or another in nearly all of our labs, and we are constantly buying this item on the open market.

Aluminum in both the sheet and rod forms is used as a noncorrosive material in our fume hoods and in building a great deal of equipment where we have a high corrosive factor.

Copper in both the sheet and rod form is used throughout the labs in a great many ways.

Asbestos sheeting is used to line a few hoods and furnaces where high heat concentration burns out most other products of this type. We also use raw asbestos as an insulator for both heat and cold.

Pearl silicones are used as greases in our petroleum labs and in many other places throughout the school.

We have appreciated your help in the past on needs pertaining to surplus property and solicit your support in continuing the program in the future.

Very truly yours,
Ernest E. Waters,
Purchasing Agent.

Colorado School of Mines,
Golden, Colo., August 3, 1964.
Senator Lee Metcalf,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Metcalf: I read your letter of July 8 concerning possible donation of surplus property to schools and hospitals with considerable interest. Our faculty has indicated desire to secure some of the materials you mentioned for research purposes. I am attaching a statement containing some details concerning potential uses of certain of the materials. Other possibilities will certainly develop in the future.

You will note that, in addition to research, certain of the materials would be useful to use in student laboratories and in constructing apparatus for these laboratories. In fact, small amounts of most of these materials are always in demand for routine laboratory use.

I appreciate having this matter called to my attention. I hope that this answer will be helpful to you.

Very truly yours,
Orlo E. Childs,
President.

Copper: A minimum of 500 pounds to be used in the foundry program and to be used in construction of equipment for teaching and research.

Corundum: 2 pounds for experimental flotation studies.

Diamond dies: 2 sets suitable for use in laboratory equipment to reduce metal rods to metal wire of small diameter.

Graphite, iodine, and manganese dioxide: 5 pounds each for use as chemicals in experimental programs.

Mercury: 100 pounds to be used chiefly in pressure measuring instruments.

Ruby: Small quantity (possibly 100 grams) to be used for experimental purposes.

Selenium: 5 pounds of high purity selenium to be used in the study of selenium alloys with other metals.

University of Florida,
Gainesville, July 16, 1964.
Hon. Lee Metcalf,
Senator from Montana,
Old Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Metcalf: During the past several years the University of Florida has obtained through the Federal surplus property program, many important items of equipment. In one instance we were successful in obtaining at considerable savings, all of the major items of equipment needed to establish our campus laundry.

Greater emphasis is now being placed on our graduate programs and on sponsored research. These two areas of emphasis often require our laboratory technicians and metalworking craftsmen to fabricate parts and components of various sizes and shapes. These when assembled become laboratory and field test equipment that must perform under varied and extreme conditions of operation, weather, etc.

The above described graduate and research program will require our obtaining varying amounts of the following materials: Aluminum, bismuth,[1] cadmium,[1] corundum,[1] copper, copper base alloys, graphite, lead, magnesium,[1] mercury,[1] nickel, rubber,[1] silicon carbide, tin, tungsten, and zinc.

If any of the above now in the strategic materials stockpile were offered to us through the Federal surplus property program, prior to sale to industry, considerable savings would be realized by the University of Florida.

Any assistance that you or your committee might be in obtaining the release of the above type of materials to the Federal surplus property program would be appreciated by all colleges and universities.

It is my hope that you and your committee will continue your outstanding work in making available to educational institutions numerous items of equipment surplus to the needs of our Federal Government.

Cordially yours,

J. WAYNE REITZ,
President.

THE FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY,
Tallahassee, July 15, 1964.

Senator LEE METCALF,
Old Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: It is my understanding that you are sponsoring an amendment to the Material Reserve and Stockpile Act of 1964 which will permit the donable surplus property program for health and education institutions the opportunity to review and request materials declared excess to stockpile needs.

Such an amendment would be of tremendous value to educational institutions such as ours which have large basic research programs, and which also place great emphasis on teaching the physical sciences. Our research program is supported by machine shops on the campus that make the many intricate pieces of equipment required for experimental work. The need for lead, stainless steel, and aluminum is evident for such equipment. Our chemistry and biological sciences departments, both in teaching and research, have need for magnesium, antimony, mercury, iodine, and the like.

With the Government now placing great emphasis on assisting the universities in enlarging their teaching and academic facilities, the possibility of obtaining certain stock materials is most inviting.

Yours very truly,

R. K. SHAW,
Business Manager.

UNIVERSITY OF MIAMI,
Coral Gables, Fla., July 17, 1964.

Hon. LEE METCALF,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Information regarding your proposed amendment to the Strategic Stockpile Act has just reached us.

A canvas of the departments most likely to benefit from the amendment, engineering, physics, Institute of Marine Science and Chemistry, evoked a unanimous affirmative as to their needs for the materials concerned.

These materials will greatly benefit general science education. Also in many cases the above mentioned departments are constructing equipment and research apparatus under Government contracts which heretofore have supplied the funds to buy these materials, thus any materials received through your efforts will result in a direct saving to the Government.

Sincerely,

U. J. HISS,
Director of Property Control.

MERCER UNIVERSITY,
Macon, Ga., July 20, 1964.

Hon. LEE METCALF,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: It is my understanding that Senate bill, S. 2272, providing for the continuing stockpiling of certain critical materials by the Federal Government to insure their availability in case of emergency will have acted upon an amendment, designated as amendment No. 517, providing that the material cannot be disposed of under this subsection without it being offered for donation purposes prior to its sale. I am now told that some of our Senators feel that this material is of no use for educational and health purposes and therefore are not in favor of the amendment.

I thought, perhaps, it would be of value to you to know the approximate annual needs of Mercer University for materials covered under this subsection and I have requested our science departments to give me an indication, which I shall itemize for you as follows: Aluminum, 5 pounds; asbestos, 1 pound; bismuth, 2 pounds; cadmium, 1 pound; copper and copper base alloy, 5 pounds; graphite, 1 pound; iodine, 5 pounds; lead, 2 pounds; magnesium, 1 pound; mercury, 10 pounds; nickel, 1 pound; zinc, 5 pounds.

Mercer University, as you know, is a small liberal arts college of some 1,500 students and I am sure that our annual needs as indicated above for these materials would represent only a small percentage of the total needs of all institutions of higher learning in the United States. I trust that when this amendment comes before your committee, and before the Senate, that you will support it since it will be of significant value to all American higher education.

Yours very truly,

WILLIAM T. HAYWOOD,
Business Manager.

PIEDMONT COLLEGE,
Demorest, Ga., July 17, 1964.

Senator LEE METCALF,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: Apparently there is some question about the usefulness of certain materials in educational programs. I am writing to assure you that our building and construction program has and would find the following stockpile items to be useful: asbestos, lead, sheet cover, shellac, talc, feathers and down.

Our superintendent of construction and maintenance, Mr. Wilton Duckett, joins with me and all of our staff in expressing appreciation for the many ways in which the commodities provided by Georgia State Agency for Surplus Property have strengthened the total program of education for the young people in Appalachia.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES E. WALTER.

DUDLEY M. HUGHES VOCATIONAL SCHOOL, BIBB COUNTY BOARD OF EDUCATION,
Macon, Ga., July 20, 1964.

Senator LEE METCALF,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: I am writing in regard to amendment No. 517 to Senate bill S. 2272. This amendment is of vital interest to our vocational-technical training program in Georgia.

The surplus property program in Georgia is the major source of metals, machine shop "stock" and material for welding training. If we did not have this source of materials for these areas of training the cost of buying these materials on the open market would cause drastic curtailment of many of our training programs in the metalworking and welding fields.

All of the new metals developed have to be introduced to the technicians who are going to use them. All that we ask is that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare be allowed to send his surplus property screeners and select whatever metals that we can use at such time that they might become available as surplus to the national stockpile.

It is my thinking that the surplus property program for educational use is one of the best administered and most helpful services with the least cost to the taxpayers that is being furnished by any Federal agency at the present time.

I wish that you could visit our school and see some of the fine uses that we are making of many types of property secured through this program.

We earnestly ask you to give all the support possible to the subject amendment and we assure you that this material will be utilized to the fullest extent in our school.

Sincerely,

RAYMONDE M. KELLEY,
Director, Vocational Education.

ATTACHMENT TO LETTER TO SENATOR LEE METCALF DATED JULY 20, 1964

Listed below are some materials that from time to time could be used in the 26 major training areas covered by Dudley M. Hughes Vocational-Technical School, Macon. Ga.:

Aluminum
Asbestos
Bismuth
Cadmium
Copper and copper base alloy
Cardage fibers
Corundum
Feathers and down
Graphite
Iodine
Lead
Magnesium
Mercury
Nickel
Rubber
Shellac
Silicon carbide
Talc
Tungsten
Zinc

MUSCOGEE COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT,
Columbus, Ga., July 15, 1964.

Hon. LEE METCALF,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: Muscogee County School District is interested in securing additional surplus materials from the Federal Government. Therefore, we are interested in amendment No. 517 to S. 2272.

This school system, along with others, cannot maintain required standards of operation without the benefit of surplus trucks, equipment, and other materials which have been available in the last several years. Some of the materials referred to as having been stockpiled, which could be available to public schools, are used and needed both in the maintenance plant and the instructional program. Reference is made specifically to aluminum, which is used in the industrial arts, vocational, and adult training programs. Aluminum in certain forms can be used in the maintenance of plant. Other materials can be used in similar fashion, particularly copper, copper base alloy, shellac, and other materials commonly used in training situations.

Your continued interest and support of the program to make these materials available to the public schools of this country is appreciated. We request that you do everything possible to help the schools obtain additional surplus property.

NATHAN M. PATTERSON,
Assistant Superintendent
for Special Services.

---

[1] Amount required is small.

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS,
Urbana, Ill., July 17, 1964.
Subject: Strategic Materials Stockpile.
Senator LEE METCALF,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: The University of Illinois participates in the Federal surplus property utilization program, through the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in the State of Illinois, at the warehouse located in Springfield.

We have been advised that certain items which are of particular need to our research programs are stockpiled, and under consideration for release. The items which we could utilize to the most advantage are mercury, aluminum, copper, and copper base alloys.

Very truly yours,
D. L. HARTMAN,
Buyer.

THE UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS,
DEPARTMENT OF PHYSICS AND ASTRONOMY,
Lawrence, Kans., August 3, 1964.
Senator LEE METCALF,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: It has come to my attention that a bill is pending which would provide for the release of certain strategic materials from stockpile. I believe that this has been referred to as the "Materials Reserve and Stockpile Act of 1964." I have also been informed concerning the proposed Metcalf amendment which would provide for making available many of these materials to schools and hospitals throughout the United States.

In speaking for the Department of Physics at the University of Kansas, I would say that this department would be extremely happy to receive material which would be available, especially aluminum, copper, mercury, and nickel. It would be my feeling that this department, as well as many similar departments over the country, would benefit greatly from the availability of these stockpiled items.

Respectfully yours,
G. M. MCGONIGLE,
Laboratory Supervisor.

THE UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS, DEPARTMENT OF METALLURGY AND MATERIALS ENGINEERING,
Lawrence, Kans., July 29, 1964.
Senator LEE METCALF,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: I have been informed that you propose to amend the Materials Reserve and Stockpile Act of 1964 so that the material would become available to schools and hospitals.

Whether or not the materials would be useful depends upon the condition in which it is stored; whether ingot or finished sheet for metals, bulk or packaged for the nonmetals. If the materials were available in reasonable amounts, say in 100-pound units, our metallurgy department could use the following:

1. All of the metals for use in our metals casting laboratory and experimental alloy work.

2. Graphite, if in block form, for crucibles and electric resistant heaters.

3. Rubber, if not crude, as vibration absorber pads in the laboratory mounting of machinery.

4. Nonmetallics (corundum, asbestos, silicon carbide, and talc are usable in experimental ceramic compositional work).

We appear to have no use for feathers and down, iodine or cordage fibers.

Yours truly,
MAYNARD P. BAULEKE,
Associate Professor.

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY,
Manhattan, Kans., July 30, 1964.
Hon. LEE METCALF,
U.S. Senator from Montana,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: I support your efforts to make strategic materials from stockpile available to schools and hospitals prior to their general release. Such a provision would be most advantageous to certain of the departments in the College of Arts and Sciences of Kansas State University.

Our chemistry department uses large quantities of bismuth, cadmium, copper, and copper base allows, iodine, lead, magnesium, mercury, nickel, tin, tungsten, and zinc for demonstration experiments in the teaching program of the department and for certain research purposes. Mercury in particular is used extensively. The department of physics also uses several hundred pounds of mercury each year in their instructional and research programs. The department of psychology uses considerable amounts of aluminum in various sizes for the construction of different pieces of equipment, particularly in some of of their animal behavior studies.

I appreciate your concern for the needs of educational institutions.

Sincerely yours,
JOHN CHALMERS,
Dean.

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY,
Manhattan, Kans., July 22, 1964.
Hon. LEE METCALF,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: It has come to my attention that the Materials Reserve and Stock Pile Act of 1964 may release strategic materials for use by educational institutions. I have conferred with the department heads in the College of Engineering and find an enthusiastic response regarding the availability of such materials for our academic program.

Specifically, the Departments of Chemical, Civil, Electrical, Industrial, and Mechanical Engineering of Kansas State University would have need for the following surplus materials: Aluminum, bismuth, cadmium, copper, corundum, graphite, lead, magnesium, mercury, nickel, tin, tungsten, and zinc.

These materials would be used extensively, both in the instructional and the research programs, with a few of the applications listed as follows:

1. Thermal conductivity experiments; thermocouples.
2. Liquid metal heat transfer.
3. Hydraulic laboratory manometers.
4. Heat transfer under vacuum.
5. Plasma studies.
6. Investigations on engineering properties of materials.

I can assure you that this surplus material would be a significant contribution to our academic program, and that efficient use of it would be made by our engineering faculty.

Sincerely yours,
JOHN W. SHUPE,
FOR PAUL E. RUSSELL,
Dean.

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY,
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
Frankfort, Ky., July 15, 1964.
Senator LEE METCALF,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: This letter is to express appreciation on behalf of a large number of colleges, technical schools, secondary schools, and hospitals in Kentucky for the effort you are making to allow strategic and critical materials now in stockpile to become available through the donation program.

One can assume that not all categories of material will be needed nor usable by such institutions; however, many can be used and would be of great value as well as withholding that portion off the market thus not disrupting our economy to that extent.

The donation program has been of unestimable value to the institutions in Kentucky as is attested to by the large number of communications and expressions we have received. To make such materials as shellac, aluminum, copper and copper alloys, mercury, graphite, etc., available will mean much in furthering our technical, science, and research programs that would otherwise be hampered if this class of material were not made available through this program.

We therefore urge you and the other members of your committee to "leave no stone unturned" in bringing about a successful conclusion.

Sincerely yours,
J. B. WILLIAMS,
Director, Division of Surplus Property.

THE UNIVERSITY OF MISSISSIPPI,
University, Miss., July 18, 1964.
Senator LEE METCALF,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: We have learned that you wish to amend the Materials Reserve and Stockpile Act of 1964 to provide that when such materials are found to be surplus to present need, they be released only after being offered for donation to schools and hospitals under the donable surplus property program on the same basis as other Federal surplus property.

This would be an excellent thing to the institutions of higher learning and one that would aid these institutions considerably. We hope that you are successful with amending this act.

Very respectfully yours,
H. E. HANEY,
Purchasing Agent.

THE UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI AT ROLLA,
Rolla, Mo., July 20, 1964.
Hon. LEE METCALF,
Committee on Labor and Public Welfare,
U.S. Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: This is in reference to your letter of July 8 regarding your proposed amendment of S. 2272. The university, like others devoted primarily or entirely to science and engineering training, has a continuing need for materials, both raw and finished, in both undergraduate instructional and graduate research programs. Our needs for any one material at any one time would, of course, be very small, but the purchase of all our materials requirements consumes a significant portion of our operating capital each fiscal year.

Our use of such materials, as listed in the second paragraph of your letter, may be briefly summarized as follows:

1. In research—the university is establishing a materials research center. Starting in September this facility will have a staff of four senior researchers in ceramics, metallurgy, physics, and chemistry and some five research assistants in various fields devoted to investigation of the physical-chemical behavior of materials for the purpose of developing materials with properties and reliability needed in our Nation's space and defense programs. The primary objective of the center will be, however, the training of engineers and scientists at the graduate level for materials research and development programs.

2. The undergraduate laboratories and graduate research in both science and engineering require a wide variety of materials. In particular metallurgical engineering uses a rather full spectrum of metals, both ferrous

and nonferrous, in its laboratory course work. The mechanical engineering, mechanics, civil engineering, and chemical engineering employ a wide spectrum of both metallic and nonmetallic materials in undergraduate laboratories, as do the departments of physics and chemistry. Oxides and silicates are used in rather significant quantities in ceramic engineering.

Of the materials listed in paragraph 2 of your letter, we have need for all of those items during the academic year, with the possible exception of feathers. If some of our materials needs could be fulfilled on a donation basis from the materials in the national stockpile, these would be gratefully received, inasmuch as this would permit moneys currently expended for these needs to be used to develop further our instructional program.

On behalf of the university administration I wish to thank you for affording us an opportunity to express interest in your proposed amendment.

Sincerely yours,

T. J. PLANJE,
Director.

MONTANA SCHOOL OF MINES,
Butte, Mont., July 16, 1964.

Hon. LEE METCALF,
Committee on Labor and Public Welfare,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: Your letter of July 8 regarding a possible amendment to S. 2272, the Materials Reserve and Stockpile Act of 1964, has arrived during Dr. Koch's absence from the campus. Because he expects to be absent for several days, I have contacted the associate director of our Montana Bureau of Mines and Geology and he has furnished the following information in answer to questions asked in your letter.

In answer to your question as to what ways this institution might use strategic materials listed in your letter, we are presuming that these materials are of commercial grade rather than crude ores or materials. If this is true, I do not believe that either the school or the bureau of mines and geology could use very much of most of the materials, and some of them would be of no use to us at all. Following is some indication of the use which might be made of the materials listed:

1. Asbestos: It may be that we could use small amounts for steel pipe insulation.
2. Copper: Small amounts might be used in metallurgical research.
3. Corundum: We have no use for corundum, as such, but do use small quantities of abrasives in manufactured forms such as wheels.
4. Diamond dies: These might possibly be used in metallurgical research.
5. Feathers: We have no use for this material.
6. Graphite: We would have no use for this material as Montana has graphite deposits which would be used on any research problems.
7. Iodine: This would be of no use to us.
8. Manganese dioxide: Small quantities might be used in metallurgical processes.
9. Mercury: Small quantities could be used in research.
10. Pyrethrum: We would have no use for this material.
11. Ruby: Probably all available supply could be used.
12. Selenium: This might be used in metallurgical research.
13. Shellac: This could be used by maintenance department.

I hope the above information will be of some help to you. As you can see, our need for any of these materials for research or instructional programs would be quite small.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. LOUISE HUNGERFORD,
Secretary to the President.

HASTINGS COLLEGE,
Hastings, Nebr., July 15, 1964.

Senator LEE METCALF,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: We wish to advise you that we can use to good advantage critical materials as surplus for education.

We have a constant need for mercury, copper, lead, tin, zinc, and many other metals. We urge you to recommend that these surplus metals, and other materials be given to education. The surplus property program has been very vital to Hastings College. Please use your influence to support the Materials Reserve and Stockpile Act of 1964.

Sincerely,

JOHN T. KONZACK,
Associate Professor, Math and Physics, and Surplus Property Coordinator.

THE UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA,
Lincoln, Nebr., July 16, 1964.

Senator LEE METCALF,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Avery J. Linn, director of the Nebraska State Agency for Surplus Property, has supplied the university with a list of materials and requested that we indicate those which would have the most use to the various departments.

After checking the users of such materials the following are found to be most in demand: aluminum, asbestos, copper and copper base alloys, graphite, lead, mercury, nickel, rubber, silicon, tin, tungsten, and zinc.

The University of Nebraska has a very close working relationship with the surplus property program in this State and a great deal of pride is taken in the conscientious use of Government surplus.

This program has been of great value to many departments within the university, especially in agricultural and scientific research.

Very truly yours,

L. J. LEGG,
Inventory Manager.

SOUTH DAKOTA SCHOOL
OF MINES, AND TECHNOLOGY,
Rapid City, S.D., July 15, 1964.

Hon. LEE METCALF,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: This is in reply to yours of July 8, 1964, relative to your intended amendment to S. 2272, the Materials Reserve and Stockpile Act of 1964.

We have inquired in a number of departments regarding the question which you have asked. We would request and, if made available to us, use substantial amounts of several of the items which you enumerate. Specifically and on this first inquiry, they would be mercury, manganese dioxide, asbestos, and probably copper. They would be used for general laboratory purposes, for research, and for plant operation and maintenance. The principal use would be in research. In this activity, they would provide a very substantial assistance and I assure you we would appreciate it greatly.

I trust that this is the kind of information which you desire.

Very truly yours,

F. L. PARTLO, *President.*

BETHEL COLLEGE,
McKenzie, Tenn., July 15, 1964.

Senator LEE METCALF,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: We understand that you have introduced a bill in the U.S. Senate in reference to the disposal of surplus stockpile materials. Such bill would offer these materials free to health and educational institutions before they were offered for public sale.

We believe that this is a good bill and that its provisions will be of no small benefit to the Nation's colleges. Although we do not know the entire list of stockpiled materials, we wish to suggest that such things as sheet aluminum, lead, zinc, and tin are used considerably in general maintenance as well as in the making of various scientific equipment. No doubt there are other materials such as iodine, other metals, and miscellaneous items that could be of value to chemistry, and physics, and engineering departments.

We hope that your bill will receive favorable action from the entire Congress and the President.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE E. ROUSE,
Head, Department of Physical Science.

TREVECCA NAZARENE COLLEGE,
Nashville, Tenn., July 15, 1964.

Senator LEE METCALF,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: We are pleased to learn of your proposed amendment to the Materials Reserve and Stockpile Act of 1964, which provides materials to educational institutions. The Science Department of Trevecca Nazarene College could certainly use the following materials: Aluminum, copper and copper base alloys, cordage fibers, iodine, lead, magesium, mercury, nickel, shellac, talc, and zinc.

Sincerely,

JOHN W. DIX,
Chairman, Science Department.

DAVID LIPSCOMB COLLEGE,
Nashville, Tenn., July 15, 1964.

Re strategic materials stockpile.

SENATOR LEE METCALF,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: It would be of great benefit in the teaching program of David Lipscomb College if the college could receive some of the materials being released from the strategic materials stockpile. In conference with the departments of science of the college, it has been determined that important use could be made of the following materials: aluminum, bismuth, cadmium, copper and copper base alloys, iodine, lead, magnesium, mercury, nickel, tin, tungsten, and zinc.

I, therefore, sincerely hope that the bill you have introduced in the U.S. Senate to amend the Materials Reserve and Stock Pile Act of 1964 will pass, so that any property being released from the stockpile may be offered for donation to health and educational institutions before it is sold. This would be of great assistance to the science program of David Lipscomb College.

Sincerely yours,

ATHENS CLAY PULLIAS.

CHRISTIAN BROTHERS COLLEGE,
Memphis, Tenn., July 16, 1964.

Senator LEE METCALF,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: In reference to the bill you are introducing to amend the Materials Reserve and Stockpile Act of 1964 to provide property to educational institutions by donation, I would like to encourage you. Many institutions could use the following materials for construction or direct laboratory use: Aluminum, bismuth, cadmium, copper and copper base alloys, lead, magnesium, mercury, nickel, rubber, shellac, tin, and zinc.

Sincerely yours,

BROTHER J. EDWARD, PH. D.,
Chairman, Chemistry Department.

Madison College,
Madison, Tenn., July 17, 1964.
Senator Lee Metcalf,
U.S. Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Metcalf: I recently learned of your proposal to offer for donation to health and educational institutions before it is sold, any property being released from the Nation's stockpile of strategic materials. I think this is a fine idea, provided it can be implemented with a minimum of waste and cost to the taxpayer.

Depending on the physical form and/or minimum packaged quantity, Madison College could use asbestos, iodine, lead, magnesium, mercury, talc, tin, zinc, and possibly others.

Very truly yours,
Wiley C. Austin,
Head, Department of Chemistry.

Houghton, Mich.,
July 20, 1964.
Senator Lee Metcalf,
Committee on Labor and Public Welfare,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Metcalf: Your amendment to S. 2272 would be most helpful in providing the quantities of strategic materials such as asbestos, aluminum, magnesium, and others for our undergraduate, graduate, research, and physical plant maintenance program.

Michigan Technological University,
Dr. R. L. Smith,
Coordinator of Research.
Prof. G. A. Hellman,
Director of Physical Plant.

Chattanooga, Tenn.,
July 20, 1964.
Senator Lee Metcalf,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Chemistry, engineering, physics departments use the chemicals and metals which are now stored in Federal strategic materials stockpiles. University of Chattanooga would benefit greatly if these materials were donated to educational institutions.

Robert W. Fenix,
Comptroller, University of Chattanooga.

Memphis State University,
Memphis, Tenn., July 16, 1964.
Hon. Lee Metcalf,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Metcalf: Recently you introduced a bill in the Senate to amend the Materials Reserve and Stockpile Act of 1964 to provide for property being released from the governmental stockpile to be offered for donation to health and educational institutions throughout the Nation.

As chairman of the Department of Chemistry and Physics at Memphis State University, we have greatly benefited from surplus materials released to us to be used in instruction of young men and young women in chemistry and physics.

We are a fast growing metropolitan university whose enrollment has more than doubled during the past 5 years, and the anticipated enrollment for the fall of 1964 will exceed 10,000 students. The legislature of the State of Tennessee has not made adequate provision for the growth of the university and supplemental assistance is greatly needed. For this reason I am complimenting you for your interest in providing surplus materials for educational institutions and urge the passage of this act.

Gratefully,
J. W. Fox,
Chairman, Department of Chemistry and Physics.

The University of Tennessee,
Knoxville, Tenn., July 16, 1964.
Senator Lee Metcalf,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Metcalf: We at the University of Tennessee heartily endorse your efforts to amend the Materials Reserve and Stockpile Act of 1964, making it possible for property in the stockpile to be given to health and educational institutions for use in research and instructional programs.

Like other similar universities, our institution has a need for many of the materials being reserved and stockpiled, and we believe it will serve in the public interest for the Government to assist us by filling such needs.

I am asking Mr. David Johnson of our Department of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering to send you any further details he thinks will be of value to you in promoting the passage of your bill. Mr. Johnson coordinates the university's program of acquiring surplus properties, and he is cognizant of the value of this program.

Please be assured that your interest in strengthening the Nation's institutions of higher education is certainly appreciated.

Sincerely yours,
A. D. Holt,
President.

Siena College,
Memphis, Tenn., July 20, 1964.
Senator Lee Metcalf,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Metcalf: I am writing in regard to some materials which are a part of the stockpile of surplus property. Some of these things would be of great value to our biology and chemistry departments. Listed are the items which we would find most useful: Aluminum, asbestos, bismuth, cadmium, graphite, iodine, lead, magnesium, mercury, nickel, shellac, tin, tungsten, and zinc.

Thank you for your help in this regard.

Sincerely yours,
Sister Adrian Marie, O.P.,
Biology Instructor.

Lambuth College,
Jackson, Tenn., July 16, 1964.
Hon. Lee Metcalf,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Metcalf: I have heard that you have introduced a bill to amend the Materials Reserve and Stockpile Act of 1964 to provide that any property being released from stockpile be offered to health and education institutions by donation before it is sold.

On behalf of our college and other small colleges throughout the country I would like to express our sincere interest in this program and hope that you may succeed in getting the bill approved. I realize that we could not use all of the materials that might be offered, but am sure that such materials would be beneficial and give us a chance to get necessary materials that we do not have funds to purchase.

Sincerely,
J. R. Blanton,
Business Manager.

Austin Peay State College,
Clarksville, Tenn., July 16, 1964.
Hon. Lee Metcalf,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Metcalf: The bill which you introduced in the Senate to amend the Materials Reserve and Stockpile Act of 1964 has very recently come to my attention. I should like to comment. Your amendment could be beneficial to any educational institution doing scientific research, and significantly beneficial to schools like Austin Peay State College which are in the early stages of research growth. Although modest research programs have recently been initiated by all of the natural science departments of the college, each department is operating without the basic stockroom supplies necessary for effective use of the time and talent of the faculty which we possess.

The people responsible for the research in our science departments have informed me that they are in general need of brass, copper, and aluminum stock, plus mercury, shellac, and glyptol. Specifically needed are lead, graphite, and cadmium for the radioisotope work. These are all materials which are constantly required in varying forms and quantities, yet their purchase in even moderate amounts is a serious drain on our limited financial resources. Your amendment would remove this drain and thus make available more funds for use in acquiring the specialized apparatus necessary for increased efficiency and sophistication in scientific investigations at Austin Peay State College.

I thank you for your interest in the welfare of science in higher education, and I shall send copies of this letter to your colleagues from Tennessee urging them to support your amendment.

Sincerely yours,
Joe Morgan,
President.

Sam Houston State
Teachers College,
Huntsville, Tex., July 16, 1964.
Senator Lee Metcalf,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Metcalf: We have noticed that you have introduced a bill in the Senate to make surplus national stockpile materials available to institutions. We are constantly in need of aluminum, asbestos, copper, lead, rubber, shellac, and tin. These materials could be used in our instructional program as well as maintenance and repair. We feel that passage of this bill would be of great benefit to this institution as well as other institutions of higher learning in this vicinity.

Yours very truly,
D. C. Holleman,
Comptroller.

Midwestern University,
Wichita Falls, Tex., July 16, 1964.
Hon. Lee Metcalf,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Metcalf: I have heard that you have introduced a bill in the Senate to make surplus materials from our national stockpile available for donation to educational and research programs in institutions of higher education. Because of the limited funds under which we operate and the fact that there is seldom a time when we are not in need bordering on the desperate for materials which may be available, I just want to express to you my appreciation for your thoughtfulness in getting this kind of bill before the legislators of this country. I sincerely hope that it does pass.

Some of the items which would be of inestimable value to us, if and when they may be available, are aluminum, copper, lead, tin and zinc (particularly in sheets), which could be used in our physics department. Mercury would also be very useful for this department. This department offers a major and is in the process of considerable expansion. We are in short supply on much of this type of thing. Our chemistry department, as well, could use most of these materials. The geology department, which has shown an upswing in students in the last 2 years, could also make very valuable use of these items I have mentioned and kindred items. For example, shellac would be very useful for the finishing and protection of geological and biological specimens. Our biology department is constantly in need of asbestos, iodine and the shellac which I have just mentioned.

I sincerely hope that any surplus which develops in our national stockpile can be made available to some of us who need it.

Once again, thank you for your efforts on behalf of higher education. I just wish for you every success in the handling of this bill.

Very sincerely yours,
TRAVIS WHITE,
President.

LAMAR STATE COLLEGE OF TECHNOLOGY,
Beaumont, Tex., July 14, 1964.
Senator LEE METCALF,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: It has been brought to my attention that you have introduced in the Senate a bill amending the Material Reserve and Stockpile Act of 1964.

As I understand, this amendment is to provide the excess material in the stockpile for institutions of higher learning. I would like to state that if these materials become available that Lamar State College of Technology can use aluminum, mercury, lead, shellac, and some of the other materials in this category.

This material has been used in our teaching field and also in connection with our research programs.

I wish to express my appreciation to you for your efforts in scheduling these excess materials for institutional needs.

Sincerely yours,
H. C. GALLOWAY,
Comptroller.

ABILENE CHRISTIAN COLLEGE,
Abilene, Tex., July 27, 1964.
Senator LEE METCALF,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: We understand there is a possibility of some reserve materials from the national reserve stockpile being made available to institutions of higher learning. Our science department and industrial arts department are interested in this matter and, of course, appreciate being able to acquire some of these items, especially the following: Aluminum, asbestos, copper and copper base alloys, corundum, graphite, lead, nickel, shellac, silicon carbide, tin, and zinc.

We understand that you have introduced a bill making the donations of some of these items to colleges possible, and we appreciate very much your interest in our work.

Sincerely yours,
LAWRENCE L. SMITH,
Bursar.

SAN ANTONIO COLLEGE,
San Antonio, Tex., July 16, 1964.
Senator LEE METCALF,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: The information has come to me that you have introduced a bill in the Senate to make surplus national stockpile material available for donation to schools and colleges.

In the teaching of our sciences, especially chemistry, we do have constant need for aluminum, copper (wire and power), corundum, iodine, lead, magnesium (ribbon), mercury, silicon carbide, tin and zinc. If your bill is passed making such materials available on a donation basis, it would be of help to educational institutions in their instructional and research programs.

On behalf of the administration and faculty of San Antonio College, may I thank you for your help in solving our problems.

Very truly yours,
WAYLAND P. MOODY,
President.

STATE OF VERMONT,
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
Montpelier, Vt., July 16, 1964.
Senator LEE METCALF,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: I was recently informed that you have introduced an amendment to the Materials Reserve and Stockpile Act of 1964, which would provide that any such materials that are found to be surplus to present needs, be first offered for donation to schools and hospitals under the donable surplus property program.

As executive director of special services in the Vermont Department of Education I am in daily contact with local educators, therefore, I am in a position to know that your amendment, if passed, would prove invaluable to science progras in all levels of Vermont's educational system.

I hope your amendment receives enough support to insure its passage.

Sincerely yours,
RUPERT J. SPENCER,
Executive Director.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

ROLLO OSKEY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, do I correctly understand that the unfinished business is Calendar No. 1131, the bill (S. 724) for the relief of Rollo Oskey?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That bill was made the unfinished business only for the purpose of filling a gap, so to speak. I ask unanimous consent that the bill no longer be the unfinished business and that the bill be returned to the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INDIANA DUNES NATIONAL LAKESHORE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1298, the bill (S. 2249).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 2249) to provide for the establishment of the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments, on page 2, line 8, after the word "dated", to strike out "September 1963" and insert "July 1964"; at the beginning of line 10, to strike out "LNPNE 1000 ID" and insert LNPNE 1003 ID"; in line 21, after the word "public", to strike out "access" and insert "access: (1) to the waters of the Little Calumet River and its valley flood plain, except in side drainages, up to the 630-foot elevation or, generally, to the tops of the river banks, and (2) along"; in line 25, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out "to"; on page 4, line 18, after the word "before", to strike out "April 20, 1961" and insert "October 21, 1963"; on page 8, line 20, after "Sec. 7.", to insert "(a)"; on page 9, after line 2, to insert:

(b) In order that the lakeshore shall be permanently preserved in its present state, no development or plan for the convenience of visitors shall be undertaken therein which would be incompatible with the preservation of the unique flora and fauna or the physiographic conditions now prevailing or with the preservation of such historic sites and structures as the Secretary may designate: *Provided,* That the Secretary may provide for the public enjoyment and understanding of the unique natural, historic, and scientific features within the lakeshore by establishing such trails, observation points and exhibits and providing such services as he may deem desirable for such public enjoyment and understanding: *Provided further,* That the Secretary may develop for appropriate public uses such portions of the lakeshore as he deems especially adaptable for such uses.

In line 24, after the word "follows:", to strike out "(1) two members to be appointed from recommendations made by Porter County, Indiana; (2) two members to be appointed from recommendations made by La Porte County, Indiana; (3) two members to be appointed from recommendations made by the Governor of the State of Indiana; and (4) one member to be designated by the Secretary." and insert "(1) one member who is year-round resident of Porter County to be appointed from recommendations made by the commissioners of such county; (2) one member who is a year-round resident of the town of Beverly Shores to be appointed from the recommendations made by the board of trustees of such town; (3) one member who is a year-round resident of the towns of Porter, Dune Acres, Portage, Pines, Chesterton, Ogden Dunes, or the village of Tremont, such member to be appointed from recommendations made by the boards of trustees or the trustee of the affected town or township; (4) one member who is a year-round resident of the city of Michigan City to be appointed from recommendations made by such city; (5) two members to be appointed from recommendations made by the Governor of the State of Indiana; and (6) one member to be designated by the Secretary."; on page 11, line 15, after the word "There", to strike out "are" and insert "is"; and in line 16, after the word "appropriated", to strike out "such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act" and insert "not more than $23,000,000 for the acquisition of land and interests in land pursuant to this Act"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in order to preserve for the educational, inspirational, and recreational use of the public certain portions of the Indiana dunes and other areas of scenic, scientific, and historic interest and recreational value in the State of Indiana, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to establish and administer the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore (hereinafter referred to as the "lakeshore") in accordance with the provisions of this Act. The lakeshore shall comprise the area within the boundaries delineated on a map identified as "A Proposed Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore", dated July 1964, and bearing the number "LNPNE 1003 ID", which map is on file and available for public inspection in the Office of the Director of the National Park Service, Department of the Interior.

SEC. 2. Within the boundaries of the lakeshore the Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") is authorized to acquire lands, waters, and other property, or any interest therein, by donation, purchase with donated or appropriated funds, exchange, or otherwise. In order to enhance the recreational benefits of this Act, the Secretary also is authorized to acquire such easements or other interests as he deems necessary to assure public access: (1) to the waters of the Little Calumet River and its valley flood plain, except in side drainages, up to the 630-foot elevation or, generally, to the tops of the river banks, and (2) along the beach and waters of Lake Michigan continuously from the western boundary of the lakeshore in section 21 township 37 north, Indiana base, range 6 west, second principal Indiana meridian, to the easternmost point of intersection of the lakeshore boundary with the shoreline. The Indiana Dunes State Park may be acquired only with the consent of the State of Indiana, and the Secretary is hereby directed to negotiate with the State for the acquisition of said park. In exercising his authority to acquire property by exchange for the purposes of this Act, the Secretary may accept title to non-Federal property located within the area described in section 1 of this Act and convey to the grantor of such property any federally owned property under the jurisdiction of the Secretary. Properties so exchanged shall be approximately equal in fair market value, as determined by the Secretary who may, in his discretion, base his determination on an independent appraisal obtained by him: *Provided*, That the Secretary may accept cash from or pay cash to the grantor in such an exchange in order to equalize the values of the properties exchanged.

SEC. 3. As soon as practicable after the effective date of this Act and following the acquisition by the Secretary of an acreage within the boundaries of the area described in section 1 of this Act which in his opinion is efficiently administrable for the purpose of this Act, he shall establish the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore by publication of notice thereof in the Federal Register. Following such establishment and subject to the limitations and conditions prescribed in section 1 hereof, the Secretary may continue to acquire lands and interests in lands for the lakeshore.

SEC. 4. (a) The Secretary's authority to acquire property by condemnation shall be suspended with respect to all improved property located within the boundaries of the lakeshore for one year following the effective date of this Act. Thereafter such authority shall be suspended with respect to all improved property located within the boundaries of the lakeshore during all times when an appropriate zoning agency shall have in force and applicable to such property a duly adopted, valid zoning ordinance approved by the Secretary in accordance with the provisions of section 5 of this Act.

(b) The term "improved property", whenever used in this Act, shall mean a detached, one-family dwelling, construction of which was begun before October 21, 1963, together with so much of the land on which the dwelling is situated, the said land being in the same ownership as the dwelling, as the Secretary shall designate to be reasonably necessary for the enjoyment of the dwelling for the sole purpose of noncommercial residential use, together with any structures accessory to the dwelling which are situated on the lands so designated. The amount of the land so designated shall in every case be not more than three acres in area, and in making such designation the Secretary shall take into account the manner of noncommercial residential use in which the dwelling and land have customarily been enjoyed: *Provided*, That the Secretary may exclude from the land so designated any beach or waters, together with so much of the land adjoining such beach or waters, as he may deem necessary for public access thereto.

SEC. 5. (a) As soon as practicable after enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall issue regulations specifying standards for approval by him of zoning ordinances for the purposes of sections 4 and 6 of this Act. The Secretary may issue amended regulations specifying standards for approval by him of zoning ordinances whenever he shall consider such amended regulations to be desirable due to changed or unforeseen conditions. The Secretary shall approve any zoning ordinance and any amendment to any approved zoning ordinance submitted to him which conforms to the standards contained in the regulations in effect at the time of adoption of such ordinance or amendment by the zoning agency. Such approval shall not be withdrawn or revoked, by issuance of any amended regulations after the date of such approval, for so long as such ordinance or amendment remains in effect as approved.

(b) The standards specified in such regulations and amended regulations for approval of any zoning ordinance or zoning ordinance amendment shall contribute to the effect of (1) prohibiting the commercial and industrial use, other than any commercial or industrial use which is permitted by the Secretary, of all property covered by the ordinance within the boundaries of the lakeshore; and (2) promoting the preservation and development, in accordance with the purposes of this Act, of the area covered by the ordinance within the lakeshore by means of acreage, frontage, and setback requirements and other provisions which may be required by such regulations to be included in a zoning ordinance consistent with the laws of the State of Indiana.

(c) No zoning ordinance or amendment thereof shall be approved by the Secretary which (1) contains any provision which he may consider adverse to the preservation and development, in accordance with the purposes of this Act, of the area comprising the lakeshore; or (2) fails to have the effect of providing that the Secretary shall receive notice of any variance granted under and any exception made to the application of such ordinance or amendment.

(d) If any improved property, with respect to which the Secretary's authority to acquire by condemnation has been suspended according to the provisions of this Act, is made the subject of a variance under or exception to such zoning ordinance, or is subjected to any use, which variance, exception, or use fails to conform to or is inconsistent with any applicable standard contained in regulations issued pursuant to this section and in effect at the time of passage of such ordinance, the Secretary may, in his discretion, terminate the suspension of his authority to acquire such improved property by condemnation.

(e) The Secretary shall furnish to any party in interest requesting the same a certificate indicating, with respect to any property located within the lakeshore as to which the Secretary's authority to acquire such property by condemnation has been suspended in accordance with provisions of this Act, that such authority has been so suspended and the reasons therefor.

SEC. 6. (a) Any owner or owners of improved property on the date of its acquisition by the Secretary may, as a condition to such acquisition, retain the right of use and occupancy of the improved property for noncommercial residential purposes for a term of twenty-five years, or for such lesser time as the said owner or owners may elect at the time of acquisition by the Secretary. Where any such owner retains a right of use and occupancy as herein provided, such right during its existence may be conveyed or leased for noncommercial residential purposes. The Secretary shall pay to the owner the fair market value of the property on the date of such acquisition, less the fair market value on such date of the right retained by the owner.

(b) The Secretary shall have authority to terminate any right of use and occupancy retained as provided in subsection (a) of this section at any time after the date upon which any use occurs with respect to such property which fails to conform or is in any manner opposed to or inconsistent with the applicable standards contained in regulations issued pursuant to section 5 of this Act and which is in effect on said date: *Provided*, That no use which is in conformity with the provisions of a zoning ordinance approved in accordance with said section 5 and applicable to such property shall be held to fail to conform or be opposed to or inconsistent with any such standard. In the event the Secretary terminates a right of use and occupancy under this subsection, he shall pay to the owner of the right so terminated an amount equal to the fair market value of the portion of said right which remained unexpired on the date of termination.

SEC. 7. (a) In the administration of the lakeshore the Secretary may utilize such statutory authorities relating to areas of the national park system and such statutory authority otherwise available to him for the conservation and management of natural resources as he deems appropriate to carry out the purposes of this Act. Appropriate user fees may be collected notwithstanding any limitation on such authority by any provision of law.

(b) In order that the lakeshore shall be permanently preserved in its present state, no development or plan for the convenience of visitors shall be undertaken therein which would be incompatible with the preservation of the unique flora and fauna or the physiographic conditions now prevailing or with the preservation of such historic sites and structures as the Secretary may designate: *Provided*, That the Secretary may provide for the public enjoyment and understanding of the unique natural, historic, and scientific features within the lakeshore by establishing such trails, observation points and exhibits and providing such services as he may deem desirable for such public enjoyment and understanding: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may develop for appropriate public uses such portions of the lakeshore as he deems especially adaptable for such uses.

SEC. 8. (a) There is hereby established an Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore Advisory Commission. Said Commission shall terminate ten years after the date of establishment of the national lakeshore pursuant to this Act.

(b) The Commission shall be composed of seven members, each appointed for a term of two years by the Secretary, as follows: (1) one member who is year-round resident of Porter County to be appointed from recommendations made by the commissioners of such county; (2) one member who is a year-round resident of the town of Beverly Shores to be appointed from the recommendations made by the board of trustees of such town;

(3) one member who is a year-round resident of the towns of Porter, Dune Acres, Portage, Pines, Chesterton, Ogden Dunes, or the village of Tremont, such member to be appointed from recommendations made by the boards of trustees or the trustee of the affected town or township; (4) one member who is a year-round resident of the city of Michigan City to be appointed from recommendations made by such city; (5) two members to be appointed from recommendations made by the Governor of the State of Indiana; and (6) one member to be designated by the Secretary.

(c) The Secretary shall designate one member to be Chairman. Any vacancy in the Commission shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(d) A member of the Commission shall serve without compensation as such. The Secretary is authorized to pay the expense reasonably incurred by the Commission in carrying out its responsibilities under this Act on vouchers signed by the Chairman.

(e) The Secretary or his designee shall, from time to time, consult with the Commission with respect to matters relating to the development of the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore and with respect to the provisions of sections 4, 5, and 6 of this Act.

SEC. 9. Nothing in this Act shall deprive any State or political subdivision thereof of its civil and criminal jurisdiction over the lands within this lakeshore, or of its right to tax persons, corporations, franchises, or other non-Federal property on the lands included in such lakeshore.

SEC. 10. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated not more than $23,000,000 for the acquisition of land and interests in land pursuant to this Act.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be considered and agreed to en bloc; and that the bill, as amended, be considered as original text.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I thank the majority leader for bringing up the bill. On behalf of the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE] and the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], I offer an amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2 it is proposed to strike out the amendment applying to the Little Calumet River Valley.

On page 3, following section 2, it is proposed to add this additional subsection:

(b) The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to seek such cooperative arrangements with the State of Indiana, political subdivisions thereof, and property owners as are required to provide public access to segments of the Little Calumet River and the adjacent river banks between the lakeshore boundary and the east line of section 31 and the Secretary may acquire, other than by condemnation, such easements and other interests in lands or waters as he deems necessary to further the purposes of this subsection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I am very appreciative of the bill's having been brought up for action. It has been before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs for many years. During the course of the discussion two steel finishing mills have been built along the most beautiful section of the Indiana dunes, and there is threatened construction of two basic steel rolling mills on the lake front.

In order to get the bill through, we have, therefore, been compelled by the force of circumstances to exempt several thousand of what were the most beautiful acres, which have now been largely ruined. But we are including for development approximately 11,772 acres, including the 2,100 acres in the Indiana Dunes State Park.

I think I should add that there is no proposal to acquire the Indiana Dunes State Park, but merely to provide for joint arrangement for use between the State of Indiana, if it so chooses, and the National Park Service, for the cooperative development of the area. We propose to add approximately 1,000 acres or more west of Ogden Dunes, which will be used as a mass bathing beach and which will permit other areas of the park to be appreciated and kept in their natural wild state. This will include approximately all of what is known as Dune Acres except for the highly residential portion. This lies some 4 miles to the east of Ogden Dunes and directly west of the Indiana Dunes State Park. Then, flanking the Indiana Dunes State Park on the east, we are including all of Beverly Shores. We are doing this upon the decision of the residents of Beverly Shores.

We are providing that there shall be a permanent possession of improved property on the part of present owners and granting them complete freedom to dispose of their property, subject to local zoning regulations, which must also be approved by the Secretary of the Interior.

This bill does not interfere with the proposal to erect a harbor midway between the property of National Steel and Bethlehem Steel, the two companies which have erected their finishing steel plants. Indeed, it may be the only way in which this harbor can be secured.

The bill is a compromise bill. I regret that we could not save the entire area. Life moved too fast for us, and the forces of conservation were not strong enough to save the entire area. But we are providing a relatively beautiful area of 11,700 acres located within 40 miles of the city of Chicago and some 11 miles east of the city of Gary, Ind.

Within the metropolitan area which stretches from Gary up to Kenosha and Racine in Wisconsin, there are now probably close to 7 million people, and there is great need—as there is in all the metropolitan centers of the country—for beautiful recreational sites which are close in to the population.

The national parks of this country are indeed beautiful. I have had the privilege of visting and tramping in nearly all of them, but they are located far away from the great metropolitan centers of the Nation, and it takes days to get to them, and, therefore, access to them is relatively limited.

The Outdoor Recreation Commission, which was headed by Mr. Laurence Rockefeller, reported that the great need was for beautiful recreational areas which are close to metropolitan centers and which can be reached in a short period of time. The Indiana Dunes fit this prescription like a glove.

I am delighted that we have begun to meet those needs. I supported the bill which was recently passed to provide that Fire Island should become a national park. This will provide swimming and recreational facilities for the people of the great New York metropolitan complex. I supported the bill to set aside a park north of San Francisco at Point Reyes. We need many such facilities. The Midwest is badly in need of them.

The metropolitan complex which now stretches from Gary to Racine and Kenosha, but which will shortly probably stretch from South Bend to Milwaukee and then will include at least 10 million people, needs an area such as this perhaps more than any section of the country.

I hope very much that the bill will be passed today. And that House action may be speedily taken. If House action is not taken at this session, we shall be in a better position to act early in the next Congress. The long hard discouraging fight may be on the point of successful conclusion. Let us take the next step now.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President I regret that I was not present when the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] spoke in favor of the pending bill. Minority views have been issued on the bill. For the purposes of the record, I should like to read into the RECORD, what the report of the minority views is, so we can have some exposition of the other position.

In our minority report, which, incidentally, is also signed by my senior colleague [Mr. ALLOTT] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON], we say:

MINORITY VIEWS ON S. 2249

Although we are conscious of the everincreasing need for outdoor recreation fa-

> cilities, and we recognize the wisdom of acquiring suitable lands at an early date, we feel compelled to oppose this bill because of the inclusion of certain noncontiguous tracts of marshy land. These noncontiguous tracts are not only unrelated to the main body of the proposed national lakeshore geographically, but are also unrelated insofar as proposed development and utilization are concerned. Our further concern is that the patchwork taking authorized by this bill may later be used as a precedent to take the best part of a landowner's holdings and leave him with only the scraps. It is our belief that the many problems of administration that are present without the inclusion of these noncontiguous tracts are simply compounded by their inclusion, and this is amplified by the fact that they are located many miles from the main body of the national lakeshore. The map of this proposed national lakeshore has the appearance of a crazy quilt.
>
> If it desirable to preserve these unrelated noncontiguous tracts in their present condition, the State of Indiana should take the initiative. As in the case of Cape Cod, Point Reyes, Padre Island, and others, we recognize the desirability of setting aside these areas under equitable principles to insure their preservation for the enjoyment of future generations, but it is not necessary to join unrelated tracts and to assume functions that the State rightfully ought to assume.

Mr. President, that is the minority report. Only this morning, in the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, we considered a bill dealing with certain property in Wisconsin in connection with the Ice Age National Scientific Reserve. This land is owned two-thirds by the State of Wisconsin. We are once again authorizing funds to be advanced to the State of Wisconsin, for the purpose of acquiring noncontiguous tracts of land, and once again to have them presumably turned over to the State of Wisconsin as a part of the State park system, and then presumably once again having it charged against Wisconsin under the Land and Water Conservation Act at a later date.

Therefore, when we say we are concerned that this noncontiguous principle may provide a precedent, I would say that once again here is a specific example of what we claim today. What happened this morning may again prove to be a pattern under which money from the Treasury will be taken in the future for other situations of like incompatible and noncontiguous tracts of land.

I say to the Senator from Illinois that I believe it is extremely important to be concerned specifically about the fact that the National Government should go in and say, "This is an appropriation of a man's land that we want to acquire for utilization for everybody in the national park system," and then leave him with nothing but the outlying areas.

This is a part of our concern with respect to establishing this type of precedent.

We have included in the RECORD the minority report. It was signed by the three Senators whom I have named, including myself. It forms a part of the pattern of opposition, so that future Congresses may consider this question when they are considering similar situations in the future.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I have just come from an Appropriations Committee meeting, and I did not have an opportunity to hear the remarks of my colleague from Colorado. However, we have discussed this subject on many occasions, and I know I can join in his general views on this subject.

This subject has been before Congress for a long time. Many hearings have been held on the so-called Indiana Dunes project. There are many things that I personally feel are great mistakes in connection with the pending bill. First, apparently there has been very little done to consider the impact of the bill on the communities in the lakeshore itself. Secondly, there are included in the bill several noncontiguous tracts which bear no reasonable relationship to the lakeshore area itself.

From the pictures, they seem to be very nice tracts, little sylvan glades, in which people might like to sit on an afternoon, and perhaps have a picnic lunch. However, they will not accommodate very many people before their pristine character will be destroyed. They are not lakeshore areas. They are not identified with the ordinary recreation and relaxation that is associated with a lakeshore area. Some of them are 4 or 5 or 6 miles inland. They bear no reasonable relationship to the lakeshore, nor do they bear any reasonable relationship from the standpoint of administration. A separate administration will have to be provided. Separate policemen or separate watchmen or separate guards will have to be provided for each of those areas. Consequently, they are not feasible from the standpoint of efficient administration.

Also, it seems to me that with the passage of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act, which Congress has passed and which the President has signed into law, it was the intent of Congress that the fund be used for this particular purpose. These particular noncontiguous areas can not logically be associated with the beach itself, but, rather they are the type of thing that Congress had in mind when it passed the Land and Water Conservation Fund bill, so that the States, with assistance from that fund, would be able to develop these areas under a State plan.

Most States would be glad to have the opportunity to assume responsibility for such areas as this. By the same token, there is no justifiable argument for the U.S. Government to take up such noncontiguous tracts as this, which have no development and no particular value from any standpoint, despite the loose words that have been spoken in the testimony, and having the Government bear the expense of administering them. This was a function of the State. If the State wishes to do it, it should do it under the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act.

Third, we have made an error. When I say we have made an error, I want to make it clear that in the committee I have done everything I could to correct it. I believe the areas south of the main highway, which is roughly 1½ miles from the beach, should be eliminated from the bill. The reasons for this are that to operate it practically as a lakeshore or recreation area it is necessary that it be generally in one unit. The units south of the road, of course, are relatively undeveloped. I believe there are some farms located in those areas. The point is that it does not form a reasonably compact unit. In addition to it being necessary to cross the main highway, it is also necessary to cross a railroad track. Therefore these two areas are separated by the highway and the railroad track. The part below and generally south of the road does not contribute to the practical development and enjoyment of the lakeshore area.

I believe that the other Senators who have signed the minority report, the Senator from Wyoming and my distinguished colleague from Colorado, were in general agreement on these principles.

For that reason, I wish to make my own position clear. I cannot support the bill. I do not support it in its present form. I have always supported a proposal for a lakeshore area in Indiana, just as I supported the Cape Cod, Point Reyes, and Padre Island areas. Strangely enough, in the Padre Island case, while there were differences and disagreements, the main item on which the senior Senator from Colorado disagreed with some of his colleagues was that there was not enough development proposed. The Senator from Colorado wanted full development of the area. He wanted to have a highway constructed the length of Padre Island, so that it would be fully accessible to the people who would use it.

So it is on these grounds that I wish to place myself on record as being opposed to the bill in its present form. If the particular items which I have discussed were amended out of the bill, I think the bill would then be in such form that I could support it; although problems still remain that I believe the other House will have to deal with, with respect to the corporate inholdings of this area, which deserve attention. The people in that area deserve more equitable treatment than the bill provides them.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I aline myself with the views of the Senators from Colorado with respect to my opposition on this measure. I speak on this subject with some trepidation because of the caliber and frankness of the Senators from Indiana and the senior Senator from Illinois.

I wish to add to what the Senators from Colorado have said that I realize there is a growing need for such recreation facilities near the more densely populated areas. I have always supported reasonable legislation which was needed by the local governments to assist them in satisfying the needs of the people. However, I do not feel that it is advisable for the Federal Government to force its plans for providing recreational facilities upon a State or local government when the needs are being met, and the proposed plan would bring hardship, dissension, and conflict to and between the people of the area and the various levels of government.

The Governor of Indiana made a bitter denunciation of the bill because it would take away a most important revenue-producing feature, the Indiana Dunes State Park. He made a more equivocal statement later; but he has never, to date, disavowed the statement he originally made, namely, that he feels that the "general assembly and the conservation department would be most reluctant to simply give this park away." Governor Welsh said that the Indiana Dunes State Park is Indiana's "greatest revenue producer and helps to sustain other parks in the State system."

The record of the hearings is replete with the dissension that has now arisen concerning this proposal. I have seen these things happen in my own part of the country, where the dissension has been so widespread and persistent that it has extended over a period of 20 or 25 years. Because so many people and so many agencies of the State government are opposed to the proposal, Congress should be extremely chary in the approach it takes toward establishing such a facility against the will of so many people.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I wish to speak in support of S. 2249, which would establish for the use, benefit, and enjoyment of the people of the United States the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore, which is located in Kentucky's neighboring State of Indiana.

I have noted the arguments made against its establishment; nevertheless, I support the bill because I believe such an area and other areas of unusual beauty ought to be preserved as a national benefit for the education and recreation of the people of our country, both those of our generation and the millions who will come after us. The population of our country is increasing by leaps and bounds. It is estimated that in only a few years the population will be more than 200 million. Unless such areas as the Dunes are saved, the millions who will live in the future will never know that our country was once graced with dunes, forests, streams, and waterfalls.

We know that the demands of necessary public works, such as roads and river facilities, and the increasing growth of industry, will swallow up in time the last areas of such beauty in our country, unless we act now to preserve them. This is particularly true in the eastern part of the United States, where there are not many such areas left. Only this year, the Congress made a decision to preserve in Kentucky and Tennessee an area of unusual natural characteristics and beauty between the Cumberland and Tennessee Rivers—called "Between the Lakes." The Dunes and other natural areas in the East may not be considered by some as striking as are other areas in the West, or even in the mountain regions of the eastern United States. Yet the Dunes have a peculiar quality of beauty which cannot be found elsewhere in the United States.

I do not know whether it is true, but many in our country say that this great Nation, beautiful as it has been and is today, may be stripped of its beauty unless its people and their representatives, by action in communities, in States, and at the Federal level, act to save and preserve its places and areas of beauty and its natural wonders. I think we can help avoid having our country lose its great beauty by creating parks and other places of natural attraction, so that they will be preserved for our people to enjoy.

I have noted the efforts and the fight made by the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] for years, to preserve the dunes against the demands of our industrial world. Progress is inevitable and needed, but at the same time that we locate new industry and public works in many places, we can preserve other locations of beauty. Senator DOUGLAS has continued his fight throughout the years and has had the support of many in his own State and throughout the country, including my State of Kentucky. His fight has been worthwhile. So I congratulate him and his cosponsors; and as a Senator from a neighboring State, I am glad to support the bill.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, first I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD excerpts from a statement I made before the committee when it was hearing testimony on the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM STATEMENT BY SENATOR BAYH ON PROPOSED CREATION OF NATIONAL LAKESHORE IN THE INDIANA DUNES AREA

I speak today as a cosponsor of S. 2249, a bill to create a national lakeshore in the Indiana dunes area, and as a representative of the State of Indiana, in which the proposed national lakeshore is located.

I support this bill because it fills the basic need for conserving the natural beauty of the Indiana dunes area and will provide in the years to come the badly needed recreational facility for the millions of citizens of Indiana, Illinois, and Michigan who are building the great industrial complex around the southern tip of Lake Michigan.

The area is of such significant value for conservation that if it were located hundreds of miles from an area of dense population concentration it would be well worth the cost of acquisition and management. Since it is located in the center of the Midwest and the middle of the rapidly growing industrial center at the southern tip of Lake Michigan, it is even more valuable and it is essential that the Senate act promptly to provide for a national lakeshore in this area.

Scientific and recreation experts have testified to the value of the land in question and the adaptability for development as a national lakeshore and recreation area. Scientific experts have and will testify to the desirability of preserving the natural botanical, geological, and pure scientific phenomena which are found in this area. I accept their testimony and concur that this area has tremendous value for conservation, scientific, and recreational development.

There is also testimony that this particular lakeshore configuration will prove to be a hindrance to the future economic development and growth of this section of my State. I disagree with this and tend to believe that the development of Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore will be complementary to the economic development of the Calumet area and will tend in years to come to be a great asset to the industry and the workers in that industry who are attracted by the industrial potential of our area.

I have introduced and tend to work vigorously for the passage of S. 2204, a bill to provide for authorization for Federal improvements for a harbor at Burns Waterway, Ind. This port has become a symbol of the industrial development of the area, and I think that it is possible to support in good conscience both the construction of this harbor, the economic development of the steel industry in northern Porter County, and this national lakeshore preserve.

We in Indiana are deeply concerned about the establishment of a National Lakeshore Indiana Dunes area. Senate bill 2249 is now before a Senate committee. I wish to remind Senators of the importance of this measure, and I ask them to follow it as it goes through the legislative channels, for I believe this is a great opportunity to serve not only the northern part of Indiana, but also the tri-State area of Indiana, Michigan, and Illinois.

Indiana badly needs the thousands of jobs which will be provided by the industrial development of this area. The workers who will come to serve the industries will badly need Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore for recreation in their leisure time. The report of the Chief of Engineers on the Burns waterway harbor stipulates that adequate air- and water-pollution control must be provided so as to protect the adjoining areas. This should prove to be sufficient for the development of an abatement program which will allow the complementary use of beaches and park areas.

I want to make it clear that I am intensely interested in the problem of providing jobs for people in my State. I believe that the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore will tend to provide a community facility which will be an additional stimulus and attraction for new industry. The relatively small acreage involved in the lakeshore, when compared to the industrial area, will not detract from future expansion by existing industry and by the future industrial citizens of this section. I support then this bill and am in agreement with its aims and purposes.

I have visited the area personally and have had meetings with the citizens of the area. Members of my staff have also been in contact with long-time residents of the area and community leaders of the section and of our State.

* * * * *

I would also like to make the record very clear that I am concerned about several other problems which I believe cannot be dealt with in this legislation but which would require the careful attention of the Secretary of the Interior when administration of this park and its acquisition begins.

The first is the problem that is caused by the taking of a large amount of land off the tax rolls in the community of Beverly Shores. It would appear that approximately 60 percent of the taxable property in the town of Beverly Shores would be lost from that corporation for tax purposes. Since the property tax is the principal source of revenue for this community, this would cause either a great reduction in municipal services or a tremendous increase in the tax rate of the community. Both seem to be undesirable. I believe that the administrator of the Park Service can work out some equitable arrangements on the division of community responsibility which will allow for continued municipal services without an increased tax rate. Certain municipal services which account for a major share of expenditures of this community are for services which will accrue benefits to the Park Service. I am hopeful that the Director of the Park Service will be able to negotiate for continuation of these services as warranted by the park and as needed by the residents of the community. Maintenance of roads and providing adequate police and fire protection seem to be matters in which the National Park Service has as great an interest as the residents of the community. If the Park Service can provide either a certain amount of these services or contract for providing these services by the town corporation, the municipal services can be maintained without increasing the tax burden on the community.

The town of Beverly Shores is the community which is most adversely affected by this problem of removing land from the tax base. I am confident that the industrial impact and the increased attractiveness of this area because of the building of this park and the building of an industrial complex will create significant new tax revenues for these tax units. The benefits which will accrue to the local tax units from other improvements will in a very short period of time prove to be much greater than the loss which is to be suffered by the taking of this park land.

There are several plans for school reorganization currently existing in the area. Under the present circumstances, the town of Beverly Shores, again, is the school corporation most adversely affected by this problem. It would appear, however, that impacted-area aid would be available to this corporation if it should continue in its present form. There is likelihood that local school reorganization may result in the creation of larger school-tax units. In this eventuality, the new tax units would probably not qualify for Federal assistance. There is also a likelihood that this larger taxing unit will not include the tremendously improved industrial areas to the west which would provide an adequate new tax base. This could be quite a serious problem and one which we must wait to see what develops in the local school reorganization plans before any logical action can be taken by the Congress or by the Park Service.

I want also, Mr. President, to express my concern over the possibility that the individual citizens will be adversely affected by the freeze on real estate transactions which will occur with the enactment of this particular lakeshore. While it is true that titles to these lands will remain negotiable, I think it is safe to assume that there will be very little demand for unimproved property in this area, and there is a possibility that there will be limited demand for the improved property.

I know that the Park Service has every intention of purchasing improved and unimproved property whenever a legitimate offer of sale is made. I know that their experience has shown that this is genuinely feasible in most of their acquisition problems. I want to go on record, however, Mr. President, suggesting that in their appropriation request they provide generously for the possibility that many landowners will want to sell to the Park Service immediately. There are, of course, emergency cases, and there are those who will genuinely object to living in a national park area. I believe the Park Service should try as far as possible to provide in their appropriation request adequate reserve to take care of these transactions as well as those normal buying patterns which are planned into their acquisition program.

This is a very vital issue to my State and one over which I am very deeply concerned. I ask consideration of the amendments which I have suggested. They are completely consistent with the aims of the bill and serve only to perfect and increase the benefit of the park either to the user or to the people in the area. I do not think any of these recommendations I have made detract in any way from the desirability of the lakeshore as a recreation or conservation area, but will serve to improve the acceptability and the desirability of the park area.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, as one of the two Senators from the State involved, I feel compelled to make a brief statement to stress the need for this particular type of park facility. It is only right and just that in passing legislation we should try to adhere to a policy that will conform to a pattern that will be applied equally throughout the country. However, it is rather unrealistic to feel that there can be any basic pattern for park legislation which would apply with equal validity to any area in the country. For this reason, I should like to speak to the unique position in which we find ourselves in Indiana, so far as concerns the lake shore park which the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] has pursued with such diligence and for so long, and for which he stated the case so eloquently a moment ago.

On the lake shore in northern Indiana is a rare and beautiful display of nature which is surrounded by a fast growing industrial complex. Thus, there exist two circumstances which seemingly cannot and do not exist together in this country; namely, a natural area which can be readily used for recreation, and closely associated thereto resources which are presently being used for industry and to provide jobs in a rapidly growing economy.

I urge Senators to accept this proposed legislation. It would provide adequate natural recreational facilities in a broad sense; namely, bathing, camps, folklore and nature lore, such as are found in only a few places in this country. At the same time, it is located in an area of dense population. People finding jobs in rapidly growing industries can utilize these recreational facilities much better than if they had to travel halfway across the continent to find them.

I agree that this is a patchwork effort. There is a certain basic fairness, however, to the inclusion of the so-called patchwork parts of the park.

In conclusion, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] knows—although I have always had the greatest respect for him and his record in the Senate, long before I had the pleasure of meeting him—that we have not always seen eye to eye on the validity and importance of this project.

We in Indiana are faced with a controversy which I feel confronts us with two great opportunities, rather than with two irreconcilable opportunities.

First, by passing the lakeshore bill today, we can provide recreational facilities unsurpassed for this area; and second, by another piece of legislation, which I do not ask that the Senator from Illinois support at this time—but I shall attempt to do so later—I hope that we can provide port facilities on the northern lakeshore which will bring Illinois markets, Indiana markets, and midwestern markets in general, closer to the terminal facilities around the world.

It seems to me that with the election so close, there are some persons aspiring to public office, or who wish to be reelected, who are trying to make a political controversy out of this question, on the ground that by passing the dunes bill we are selling out the port facilities.

I wish the RECORD to show clearly that I have felt from the beginning that it was ridiculous to say that we could not have both. We can have the great facilities of the park and at the same time we can give to the Indiana merchants, farmers, and manufacturers the benefit of foreign markets at reduced transportation rates, which can be enacted, I hope, in the next session of Congress to enable us to build this structure in Indiana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (S. 2249) was passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in order to preserve for the educational, inspirational, and recreational use of the public certain portions of the Indiana dunes and other areas of scenic, scientific, and historic interest and recreational value in the State of Indiana, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to establish and administer the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore (hereinafter referred to as the "lakeshore") in accordance with the provisions of this Act. The lakeshore shall comprise the area within the boundaries delineated on a map identified as "A Proposed Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore", dated July 1964, and bearing the number "LNPNE 1003 ID", which map is on file and available for public inspection in the Office of the Director of the National Park Service, Department of the Interior.

SEC. 2. (a) Within the boundaries of the lakeshore the Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") is authorized to acquire lands, waters, and other property, or any interest therein, by donation, purchase with donated or appropriated funds, exchange, or otherwise. In order to enhance the recreational benefits of this Act, the Secretary also is authorized to acquire such easements or other interests as he deems necessary to assure public access to the beach and waters of Lake Michigan continuously from the western boundary of the lakeshore in section 21 township 37 north, Indiana base, range 6 west, second principal Indiana meridian, to the easternmost point of intersection of the lakeshore boundary with the shoreline. The Indiana Dunes State Park may be acquired only with the consent of the State of Indiana, and the Secretary is hereby directed to negotiate with the State for the acquisition of said park. In exercising his authority to acquire property by exchange for the purposes of this Act, the Secretary may accept title to non-Federal property located within the area described in section 1 of this Act and convey to the grantor of such property any federally owned property under the jurisdiction of the Secretary. Properties so exchanged shall be approximately equal in fair market value, as determined by the Secretary who may, in his discretion, base his determination on an independent appraisal obtained by him: *Provided,* That the Secretary may accept cash from or pay cash to the grantor in such an exchange in order to equalize the values of the properties exchanged.

(b) The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to seek such cooperative arrangements with the State of Indiana, political subdivisions thereof, and property owners as are required to provide public access to segments of the Little Calumet River and the adjacent river banks between the lakeshore boundary and the east line of section 31 and the Secretary may acquire, other than by condemnation, such easements and other interests in lands or waters as he deems necessary to further the purpose of this subsection.

SEC. 3. As soon as practicable after the effective date of this Act and following the acquisition by the Secretary of an acreage within the boundaries of the area described in section 1 of this Act which in his opinion is efficiently administrable for the purposes of this Act, he shall establish the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore by publication of notice thereof in the Federal Register. Following such establishment and subject to the limitations and conditions prescribed in section 1 hereof, the Secretary may continue to acquire lands and interests in lands for the lakeshore.

SEC. 4. (a) The Secretary's authority to acquire property by condemnation shall be suspended with respect to all improved property located within the boundaries of the lakeshore for one year following the effective date of this Act. Thereafter such authority shall be suspended with respect to all improved property located within the boundaries of the lakeshore during all times when an appropriate zoning agency shall have in force and applicable to such property a duly adopted, valid zoning ordinance approved by the Secretary in accordance with the provisions of section 5 of this Act.

(b) The term "improved property", whenever used in this Act, shall mean a detached, one-family dwelling, construction of which was begun before October 21, 1963, together with so much of the land on which the dwelling is situated, the said land being in the same ownership as the dwelling, as the Secretary shall designate to be reasonably necessary for the enjoyment of the dwelling for the sole purpose of noncommercial residential use, together with any structures accessory to the dwelling which are situated on the lands so designated. The amount of the land so designated shall in every case be not more than three acres in area, and in making such designation the Secretary shall take into account the manner of noncommercial residential use in which the dwelling and land have customarily been enjoyed: *Provided*, That the Secretary may exclude from the land so designated any beach or waters, together with so much of the land adjoining such beach or waters, as he may deem necessary for public access thereto.

SEC. 5. (a) As soon as practicable after enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall issue regulations specifying standards for approval by him of zoning ordinances for the purposes of sections 4 and 6 of this Act. The Secretary may issue amended regulations specifying standards for approval by him of zoning ordinances whenever he shall consider such amended regulations to be desirable due to changed or unforeseen conditions. The Secretary shall approve any zoning ordinance and any amendment to any approved zoning ordinance submitted to him which conforms to the standards contained in the regulations in effect at the time of adoption of such ordinance or amendment by the zoning agency. Such approval shall not be withdrawn or revoked, by issuance of any amended regulations after the date of such approval, for so long as such ordinance or amendment remains in effect as approved.

(b) The standards specified in such regulations and amended regulations for approval of any zoning ordinance or zoning ordinance amendment shall contribute to the effect of (1) prohibiting the commercial and industrial use, other than any commercial or industrial use which is permitted by the Secretary, of all property covered by the ordinance within the boundaries of the lakeshore; and (2) promoting the preservation and development, in accordance with the purposes of this Act, of the area covered by the ordinance within the lakeshore by means of acreage, frontage, and setback requirements and other provisions which may be required by such regulations to be included in a zoning ordinance consistent with the laws of the State of Indiana.

(c) No zoning ordinance or amendment thereof shall be approved by the Secretary which (1) contains any provision which he may consider adverse to the preservation and development, in accordance with the purposes of this Act, of the area comprising the lakeshore; or (2) fails to have the effect of providing that the Secretary shall receive notice of any variance granted under and any exception made to the application of such ordinance or amendment.

(d) If any improved property, with respect to which the Secretary's authority to acquire by condemnation has been suspended according to the provisions of this Act, is made the subject of a variance under or exception to such zoning ordinance, or is subjected to any use, which variance, exception, or use fails to conform to or is inconsistent with any applicable standard contained in regulations issued pursuant to this section and in effect at the time of passage of such ordinance, the Secretary may, in his discretion, terminate the suspension of his authority to acquire such improved property by condemnation.

(e) The Secretary shall furnish to any party in interest requesting the same a certificate indicating, with respect to any property located within the lakeshore as to which the Secretary's authority to acquire such property by condemnation has been suspended in accordance with provisions of this Act, that such authority has been so suspended and the reasons therefor.

SEC. 6. (a) Any owner or owners of improved property on the date of its acquisition by the Secretary may, as a condition to such acquisition, retain the right of use and occupancy of the improved property for noncommercial residential purposes for a term of twenty-five years, or for such lesser time as the said owner or owners may elect at the time of acquisition by the Secretary. Where any such owner retains a right of use and occupancy as herein provided, such right during its existence may be conveyed or leased for noncommercial residential purposes. The Secretary shall pay to the owner the fair market value of the property on the date of such acquisition, less the fair market value on such date of the right retained by the owner.

(b) The Secretary shall have authority to terminate any right of use and occupancy retained as provided in subsection (a) of this section at any time after the date upon which any use occurs with respect to such property which fails to conform or is in any manner opposed to or inconsistent with the applicable standards contained in regulations issued pursuant to section 5 of this Act and which is in effect on said date; *Provided*, That no use which is in conformity with the provisions of a zoning ordinance approved in accordance with said section 5 and applicable to such property shall be held to fail to conform or be opposed to or inconsistent with any such standard. In the event the Secretary terminates a right of use and occupancy under this subsection, he shall pay to the owner of the right so terminated an amount equal to the fair market value of the portion of said right which remained unexpired on the date of termination.

SEC. 7 (a) In the administration of the lakeshore the Secretary may utilize such statutory authorities relating to areas of the national park system and such statutory authority otherwise available to him for the conservation and management of natural resources as he deems appropriate to carry out the purposes of this Act. Appropriate user fees may be collected notwithstanding any limitation on such authority by any provision of law.

(b) In order that the lakeshore shall be permanently preserved in its present state, no development or plan for the convenience of visitors shall be undertaken therein which would be incompatible with the preservation of the unique flora and fauna or the physiographic conditions now prevailing or with the preservation of such historic sites and structures as the Secretary may designate: *Provided*, That the Secretary may provide for the public enjoyment and understanding of the unique natural, historic, and scientific features within the lakeshore by establishing such trails, observation points and exhibits and providing such services as he may deem desirable for such public enjoyment and understanding: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may develop for appropriate public uses such portions of the lakeshore as he deems especially adaptable for such uses.

SEC. 8. (a) There is hereby established an Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore Advisory Commission. Said Commission shall terminate ten years after the date of establishment of the national lakeshore pursuant to this Act.

(b) The Commission shall be composed of seven members, each appointed for a term of two years by the Secretary, as follows: (1) one member who is year-round resident of Porter County to be appointed from recommendations made by the commissioners of such county; (2) one member who is a year-round resident of the town of Beverly Shores to be appointed from the recommendations made by the board of trustees of such town; (3) one member who is a year-round resident of the towns of Porter, Dune Acres, Portage, Pines, Chesterton, Ogden Dunes, or the village of Tremont, such member to be appointed from recommendations made by the boards of trustees or the trustee of the affected town or township; (4) one member who is a year-round resident of the city of Michigan City to be appointed from recommendations made by such city; (5) two members to be appointed from recommendations made by the Governor of the State of Indiana; and (6) one member to be designated by the Secretary.

(c) The Secretary shall designate one member to be Chairman. Any vacancy in the Commission shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(d) A member of the Commission shall serve without compensation as such. The Secretary is authorized to pay the expense reasonably incurred by the Commission in carrying out its responsibilities under this Act on vouchers signed by the Chairman.

(e) The Secretary or his designee shall, from time to time, consult with the Commission with respect to matters relating to the development of the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore and with respect to the provisions of sections 4, 5, and 6 of this Act.

SEC. 9. Nothing in this Act shall deprive any State or political subdivision thereof of its civil and criminal jurisdiction over the lands within this lakeshore, or of its right to tax persons, corporations, franchises, or other non-Federal property on the lands included in such lakeshore.

SEC. 10. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated not more than $23,000,000 for the acquisition of land and interests in land pursuant to this Act.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

CORRECTION OF CERTAIN ERRORS IN THE TARIFF SCHEDULES OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1541, H.R. 12253.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. An act to correct certain errors in the Tariff Schedules of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance, with amendments.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, I strongly support the amendment to H.R. 12253 which was designed to close a loophole in the tariff schedule. Under the present law "button blanks" can be imported at a rate of 36 percent whereas imported finished buttons are dutiable at a rate which is equivalent to ad valorem rates ranging up to 140 percent. In the last 3 years there has been a marked increase in the importation of "button blanks." One might properly inquire why. First it will be helpful if I define what is meant by button blanks. Button blanks are the raw materials from which many types of buttons may be made. The answer is clear. Importers discovered a device whereby they could import almost finished buttons at the lower rate for button blanks. Now, Mr. President, these almost finished buttons were not button blanks or the raw material. In fact, 75 percent of the value has already been added when the almost finished buttons arrived in this country. This represented a discovery of a loophole in our tariff schedules and, as one can imagine, opened the floodgates to the importation of these almost finished buttons to the detriment of the domestic button industry. This amendment will plug this loophole and protect the domestic button industry as the tariff originally intended.

Since Maryland has a domestic button industry, I am naturally greatly interested and keenly aware of the industry's problem. I feel the closing of this loophole, which is clearly a tariff avoidance device, will be most helpful to those who are employed in this important industry.

I also would like to take this opportunity to commend the Finance Committee for their wisdom in deleting section 15 which deals with V-belts. A reduction in the tariff schedule, as approved by the House, would have resulted in severe hardship to our domestic producers. The committee's amendment wisely proposes to continue the present 16-percent duty on imported V-belts.

REMEMBERING MAYOR LA GUARDIA

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the La Guardia Memorial Association, according to its tradition, held services at the grave of the late and beloved mayor of New York, Fiorello H. La Guardia, on September 20, the 17th anniversary of his death.

During the ceremony at Woodlawn Cemetery, Morris S. Novik, who was director of the city's radio station, WNYC, during the La Guardia administration and who is now a radio consultant in New York and a member of the Advisory Committee on International Information, spoke about the "Little Flower's" remarkable talent for communicating with the people of his city. Through this talent, the people of New York City closely identified themselves with the aspirations of their mayor, and made him the most beloved city official in modern times.

I ask unanimous consent to insert Mr. Novik's remarks on this occasion into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

On this, the 17th anniversary of the death of Fiorello H. La Guardia, we assemble as we have done every year to pay tribute to a man we loved.

As the years go by, each of us attempts to assess the man. We try to explain the imprints he made, not only on our lives in general, but also on our personal lives.

The legacy of La Guardia was his identification with the people; they loved him and he loved them.

Each of us, as the years go by, see Fiorello La Guardia, naturally enough, through his own eyes. Objective though we try to be, we cannot but think in terms of our own personal relationship with him.

All of us knew La Guardia as a great man—as a great mayor—as a great leader. It was my fortune to know La Guardia as a great communicator.

There are many explanations for the La Guardia phenomenon. One seems to dominate. He was able to talk to the widest audience and not only be heard, but understood. His phrase was not elegant. It often was not eloquent, but it was always direct, earnest, and completely understandable. It was as though his heart had a tongue that spoke to other hearts. This understanding was not limited to any one group. It reached everyone.

La Guardia pioneered in the use of radio. He understood that it was not merely a medium for making speeches. It was to him, a medium for talking personally with real people about real-life problems.

He talked to people about their problems in their own terms. When he talked about the price of tomatoes on radio, he wanted to help people with limited earnings to make every penny count. He was trying to help them live better and more rewarding lives. Radio helped him ring each doorbell. Talk with each person, and help every one of them with the problems of everyday living.

This personal recollection of La Guardia is more than a sentimentalized memory. La Guardia saw radio, and in his last years, television—practically an extension of personal conversation. Many did not agree with La Guardia but they always listened.

WNYC was in existence for many years prior to Mayor La Guardia taking office. In many ways, it was regarded as an orphan or stepchild of the city government. In fact, previous administrations literally hid its antenna behind the statue on top of the municipal building and assigned the station to the housekeeping agency of the city, concerned with maintenance of buildings and bridges—the department of plants and structure.

It was Mayor La Guardia who first recognized the value of a city radio station. It was he who was responsible for the establishment of the radio station as an independent municipal department. Then began the long-range campaign to establish WNYC as a vital force in the affairs and lives of the people of the city of New York. This led into the prolonged struggle with the Federal Communications Commission to obtain recognition for the unique services rendered by WNYC and for its right to have full time on the air. A major step in winning that battle was actually achieved only recently, 25 years later. Hopefully the final victory will not be long in coming.

During the crucial years of World War II La Guardia saw radio as a personal line of communication between government—local government—and the people. From day to day the people wanted to know not only about the events of the day, but how those events were evaluated by someone they trusted. They trusted Fiorello La Guardia.

When the war broke out in 1941, the mayor was the first to realize the importance of radio and WNYC in supporting the war effort on the homefront, in civil defense, and in keeping people informed of where and how they could help.

Mayor La Guardia never missed a Sunday broadcast during the war. In the heat of summer—and city hall was not air conditioned in those days—and in the dead of winter, Fiorello La Guardia left his home to face the WNYC microphone and press every Sunday to report to the people of New York on city affairs and the contribution the city was making to the war effort.

He reported how and where they could help—when to collect tin cans, what changes were being made in rationing, how to conserve vital energies needed for the war effort.

He told them of what he thought about everything connected with the war effort. He lifted high the hope and strengthened the courage and the morale of the people of the world's greatest city.

Just as the bells of the Tower of Parliament inspired the beleaguered people of Great Britain, so WNYC broadcast the historic chimes of our city hall, followed by the identification "WNYC in a city where over 7 million people live in peace and enjoy the benefits of democracy."

La Guardia wanted the station to be a living service to the city. He wanted it to draw the people closer to each other and to their city. He wanted it to help, to teach, to entertain, to serve, to unite—and to continue.

Regularly during the war, the civil defense programs and services of WNYC were transmitted to the commercial stations in the city for rebroadcast. WNYC was the keystone in the arch that never cracked security during almost 4 years of voluntary censorship and self-regulation.

Many are commemorated by statues, monuments or public facilities named in their honor such as airports, bridges, and tunnels.

While one of the great New York airports bears his name, I prefer to think that Mayor La Guardia's principal monument is radio station WNYC. The station established a standard of excellence and a code of public service for broadcasting that even today is still unique. The station still plays a leading role in the cultural and civic affairs in the city.

That is the monument on the ether waves to Fiorello La Guardia. It is a voice that still speaks long after its innovator has passed from us. It is a voice that has meaning and responsibility. It is listened to because of its authority.

It is a living thing, a monument to his patience, his fortitude, his fighting spirit.

Perhaps I have spoken too much about La Guardia's great contributions to WNYC and the field of communications. That is natural for me.

On this the 17th anniversary of his death, I know that all of us here feel his presence. We still miss him for his concern with a hundred causes.

We miss him as a man. We miss him as a friend. He was sometimes difficult. He was sometimes violent. He could be gay. He could be sad.

Fiorello La Guardia is missed, and he will never be forgotten.

NEW YORK STATE'S ATTACK ON ILLITERACY

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, in solving our domestic problems—especially those involving the welfare of our underprivileged citizens—I have always advocated cooperation between local, State, and the Federal Governments. I have offered amendments to bills establishing Federal programs in many of these areas that would have allowed local and State governments to show initiative in designing programs particularly suited to local problems.

Last week, the State of New York provided an outstanding example of such initiative. Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller on Thursday announced that the New York State Department of Labor, in cooperation with the State and New York City's departments of education, and the Federal Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare had developed a large-scale attack on illiteracy and unemployment in New York City.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the statement by Governor Rockefeller's office explaining the program, and an article which was published in the New York Times of September 25 on the same subject.

There being no objection, the statement and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT FROM OFFICE OF GOVERNOR OF NEW YORK

Governor Rockefeller today announced an occupational training project for 6,000 unemployed and underemployed New York City residents, the largest such program in the Nation.

The project was initiated, planned, and developed by the New York State Labor Department's Division of Employment, in cooperation with the State department of education, the New York City Board of Education, the U.S. Department of Labor, and the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The division of employment will recruit and select the trainees through its local employment service offices—including centers of the youth employment service—and in cooperation with community agencies. Upon completion of training, the employment service will provide job placement services for the graduates.

The project, with an estimated cost of $12 million, is designed to train 4,000 disadvantaged youths and 2,000 jobless or underemployed adults under the Federal-State Manpower Development and Training Act. The multioccupation program encompasses vocational training in a number of selected fields where shortages exist or where there is a continuing demand for labor.

Novel in its large-scale attack on illiteracy, recognized as one of the causes of hard-core unemployment, the project will include basic remedial education geared to the individual trainee's needs in reading, writing, basic arithemtic, spelling, and language skills.

"Without such corrective training, the disadvantaged worker cannot hope to break the chain of illiteracy that links one generation to the next," Governor Rockefeller said. "We must first help the disadvantaged, regardless of age, to acquire the basic tools, the three R's of the world of work."

Vocational training for youths aged 16 through 21 and adults over 22 will be provided for entry jobs, as well as for some semiskilled and skilled occupations in the following fields of work: automotive services, such as mechanic and station attendant; building maintenance services; commercial occupations, including bookkeeping machine operator, stenographer, and typist; costume jewelry; equipment and material checking; electronics; food preparation and service; hospital and institutional care; machine shop; merchandising, including sales clerks and grocery checkers; metal fabricating; printing, bookbinding and paper goods, and silk screen printing.

For the most part, classes will be held in various public high schools as facilities become available throughout the city.

Job counseling and aptitude testing of trainees will be given by New York State Employment Service counselors to determine the broad field of work to which each trainee is assigned. Employment service counselors will also oversee the individual trainee's progress. In addition, the New York City Board of Education guidance counselors will provide appropriate educational counseling to assist those trainees who lack the proper motivation to make them ready for employment after training.

The program is designed so that the trainees can benefit from the project's flexibility and can move up the skill ladder within the chosen field of work. Accordingly, a qualified trainee can start training in an entry occupation and move on to a course for a semiskilled occupation in the same field of work or in a different field.

One of the principal objectives of the project is to discover and develop the trainee's work potential and thereby enhance his employability at his highest skill level.

Unemployment figures show higher rates among the less educated, with joblessness occurring more frequently and lasting longer. Of the approximately 145,000 young people entering the labor market during 1964 and 1965 in New York City, about 60,000 will be school dropouts. December 1963 estimates show a rate of unemployment of 9 percent among youth as against 5.2 percent for the city's entire labor force. The figure for nonwhite unemployed youth is still higher. Unemployed adults with less than a high school education have considerable difficulty in becoming reemployed. Many find their skills have become outmoded during this period of rapid technological change.

The first course is expected to get underway within the next few weeks. Weekly training allowances will be paid to those trainees who qualify under the provisions of the Manpower Development and Training Act (MDTA).

[From the New York Times, Sept. 25, 1964]

STATE WILL TEACH JOBLESS THE THREE R'S—$12 MILLION PROGRAM HERE IS CALLED NOVEL IN SCOPE OF ATTACK ON ILLITERACY—BEGINS IN A FEW WEEKS—SCHOOL DROPOUTS AND ADULTS ARE ALSO SCHEDULED TO GET VOCATIONAL TRAINING

ALBANY, September 24.—A large-scale attack on illiteracy and unemployment in New York City was announced today by Governor Rockefeller.

Starting in a few weeks, the first of 6,000 unemployed persons, including a large proportion of school dropouts, will begin a basic remedial education program consisting of courses in reading, writing, arithmetic, and spelling.

The program, which will cost $12 million, was developed by the State labor department in cooperation with the State and city education departments and Federal agencies.

Mr. Rockefeller called the program novel in the scope of its attack on illiteracy.

"Without such corrective training, the disadvantaged worker cannot hope to break the chain of illiteracy that links one generation to the next," the Governor said. "We must first help the disadvantaged, regardless of age, to acquire the basic tools, the three R's of the world of work."

SPECIAL COURSES PLANNED

Students will progress according to their ability. Once they have completed work in the basic skills, they will be tested for aptitude and permitted to take specialized courses.

Training will be provided in the following fields: automotive services, building maintenance, bookkeeping, stenography, costume jewelry, equipment and material checking, electronics, food preparation and service, and hospital and institutional care among other vocations.

Classes will be held in public high schools. Counselors of the State employment service will provide job counseling and aptitude tests.

In addition, New York City Board of Education guidance counselors will assist trainees "who lack the proper motivation to make them ready for employment after training."

Weekly allowances will be paid to the trainees to qualify under provisions of the Federal Manpower Development and Training Act.

EMPLOYMENT AID OFFERED

Trainees will be recruited through the State labor department's division of employment, which will also provide job placement services for the graduates.

A labor department spokesman said that the program involved more people, put more emphasis on reading and writing and cost more than any other of its type.

Until July 1965 it will be financed entirely by the Federal Government. After that, the State must match Federal funds.

The project is designed to train 4,000 disadvantaged youths (mostly dropouts) and 2,000 jobless or underemployed adults.

The project will be one of many operating here. The city sponsors such projects as JOIN (Job Opportunities in Neighborhoods) to train youths, a literacy training program for 800 persons, and education projects for school dropouts.

CONGRESSIONAL CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the summer 1964 issue of the Federal Bar Journal contains a most valuable symposium on the subject of conflicts of interest, covering a wide range of applications as well as the general philosophy. The legislative, judicial, and executive branches of the Federal Government are treated fully in this series, as are the separate fields of securities, industry, and business, the news media, and State government. Indeed, while the entire series is well worthy of reproduction in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, certainly the two excellent comprehensive contributions on the very current subject of congressional ethics should be brought to the attention of the Congress. Accordingly, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks the articles contributed by my colleague from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], who is recognized as a leader on this issue in the Senate, and jointly by Erwin G. Krasnow, a past president of the Capitol Hill chapter of the Federal Bar Association, and Congressman RICHARD E. LANKFORD, past president and first vice president of the Federal Bar Association.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CONGRESS AND ITS DOUBLE STANDARD

(By Senator CLIFFORD P. CASE[1])

On Capitol Hill, the majestic dome of the Capitol rises newly white and strong against a background of the Mall and downtown buildings of the executive branch. Its new gleam was accomplished during the course of an extensive repair and renovation program ordered by the Congress when the east front of the building showed unmistakable signs of deterioration.

The signs of the need for a rehabilitation program of the Congress itself are at least equally plain, but so far they have gone largely unheeded. One such sign is the low esteem in which Congress is currently held by many Americans. A recent poll reported that a majority of those questioned believe Congress tends to represent "special interests working for private gains."[1a]

This conclusion may not be surprising after the many months of piecemeal and still incomplete accounts of the activities of Bobby Baker and some of his associates. But the Baker case, and especially the handling of it, are only the latest demonstration of a basic cause of public mistrust and cynicism; i.e., the double standard so long practiced by Congress—one standard for the executive branch, another lesser standard for its own members.

"We are not investigating Senators,"[2] said the chairman of the Senate Rules Committee when queried about the scope of the Baker investigation. In that one sentence, he expressed a view that is all too characteristic of the Congress. It shows up in many ways.

I remember, for example, a meeting several years ago, when I was a member of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, to consider a Presidential nomination for a vacancy on the Federal Communications Commission. The nominee, a lawyer by profession, had previously served the Government with distinction. His qualifications were not questioned. Nonetheless, the nominee was there to withdraw his nomination. The explanation helps to highlight the double standard that today prevails in Washington.

The Federal Communications Act provides, inter alia:[3]

No member of the Commission or person in its employ shall be financially interested in the manufacture or sale of radio apparatus or of apparatus for wire or radio communication; in communication by wire or radio or in radio transmission of energy; in any company furnishing services or such apparatus to any company engaged in communication by wire or radio or to any company manufacturing or selling apparatus used for communication by wire or radio; or in any company owning stocks, bonds, or other securities of any such company; nor be in the employ of or hold any official relation to any person subject to any of the provisions of this chapter, nor own stocks, bonds, or other securities of any corporation subject to any of the provisions of this chapter.

As it happened, the nominee had a prudent father. Some years before, he had established a small, and irrevocable, trust fund for his two sons, to be managed by trustees outside the family. Soon after its establishment the trustees invested a portion of the funds in stock of a well-known electrical firm which manufactures, among other things, equipment in the communications field. Over the years the stock had greatly increased in value. At the time of the hearing the trustees could not justify, in the light of their fiduciary duty toward the beneficiaries, sale of the stock. Since neither beneficiary had any control over the investments made by the trust and the trust itself was irrevocable, there was no way in which the nominee could divest himself of this involuntary financial interest.

The committee agreed it came within the proscription of the act. The provisions of the act are clear, and I do not question them or the rightness of the decision to withdraw. However, I could not help thinking of the contrast between the stringent restrictions on membership on the Federal Communications Commission and the complete absence of any restriction on membership on the Senate committee which oversees it and passes on legislation in the communications field.

Another hearing on a Presidential nomination comes to mind. The nominee, from private industry, had worked for his firm through the first 6 months of the year in which he was nominated. He had relinquished all financial interest in the firm, which did some work for the Government, but was hopeful that he might be permitted to take a half year's share in the profit-sharing plan of the company in line with his employment for the first half of the year. With some reluctance I felt obliged to point out that this seemed inconsistent with the clear intent of the law inasmuch as the company's profits were calculated for the purposes of its profit-sharing plan on a yearly basis, and the value of a 6-months share would be determined partly by the profits realized in the second half of the year. The committee agreed.

Again our action highlighted the difference between standards applied to executive appointees and the Members of Congress. For Members of Congress may, and do, sit on committees which act on measures that, directly or indirectly, affect their personal financial interests. And, on occasion, Members of Congress have attempted to influence the actions or decisions of an executive agency from which they may stand to benefit personally.

In 1962, Congress revised the statute covering bribery, graft, and conflicts of interest.[4] The revision has been described as both strengthening and liberalizing the prior statute. But, whatever one's view of the specific provisions adopted, they represent an attempt to deal with the problems presented by the postwar growth in the Government's use of consultants and part-time advisers and the past employment activities of former Government employees. By contrast no effort was made to reach the problems of conflicts of interest in the legislative branch. The Congress once again concentrated its attention on the executive arm of Government. Certain provisions such as those covering bribery[5] continue to apply specifically to Members of Congress as well as to others. Others such as section 208 dealing with "acts affecting a personal financial interest" apply only to officers and employees of the executive branch.[6] It was upon the precursor[7] of section 208 that the Dixon-Yates affair turned.

The overall public policy embodied in these provisions was described by Chief Justice Warren in *United States* v. *Mississippi Valley Generating Co.*, the litigation that became known as the Dixon-Yates case.

"The moral principle upon which the statute is based has its foundation in the Biblical admonition that no man may serve two masters, Mathew 6: 24, a maxim which is especially pertinent if one of the masters happens to be economic self-interest. Consonant with this salutary moral purpose, Congress has drafted a statute which speaks in very comprehensive terms.

"The statute establishes an objective standard of conduct, and that whenever a Government agent fails to act in accordance with that standard, he is guilty of violating the statute, regardless of whether there is positive corruption. The statute is thus directed not only at dishonor, but also at conduct that tempts dishonor. This broad proscription embodies a recognition of the fact that an impairment of impartial judgment can occur in even the most well-meaning men when their personal economic interests are affected by the business they transact on behalf of the Government. To this extent, therefore, the statute is more concerned with what might have happened in a given situation than with what actually happened.

"The statute is directed at an evil which endangers the very fabric of a democratic society, for a democracy is effective only if the people have faith in those who govern, and that faith is bound to be shattered when high officials and their appointees engage in activities which arouse suspicions of malfeasance and corruption."[8]

If this is good public policy for Congress to proscribe for the Government generally, is it any less good for the Congress itself?

To put it another way: If a Member of Congress applies "pressure" in his capacity as a Member of Congress to an executive agency to maintain or expand a program which will benefit the company in which he holds stock, is it any less reprehensible than if he were acting as a paid representative of the company?

Does the fact that he is a Member of Congress dispel the possibility of suspicion which the statute seeks to avoid?

Such actions may be infrequent but they are not unknown. I think it is probable that when a Member of Congress does exert pressure in such circumstances, he does so with a sincere conviction that the action sought is in the national interest. But sincerity is not the test. Nor is it in point that private and public interest may, and sometimes do, coincide. Rather the question is: If "What's good for General Motors is good for the country" is considered at best naive when expressed by a member of the executive branch, it is less so when proclaimed by a member of the legislative branch?

It would be unrealistic, I believe, to suggest that Members of Congress should be required to divest themselves of all financial interests which might conceivably be affected by legislation or by action of executive agencies under the purview of a committee on which a Member serves. But should a Member of Congress, whose law firm represents a common carrier, act as a committee member, or vote on the floor, on measures affecting common carriers? Or should one with business associations in the mining industry pass on such measures as depletion allowances for income tax purposes?

---

[1] U.S. Senator from New Jersey since 1955; Member House of Representatives, 1945–53; A.B., Rutgers, 1925; LL. B., Columbia, 1928.

[1a] The Washington Post, Apr. 20, 1964, sec. A, p. 2.

[2] The Washington Post, Jan. 15, 1964, sec. A, p. 7, col. 2.

[3] 48 Stat. 1066 (1936), 47 U.S.C. 154(b).

[4] 18 U.S.C. 201, 35 Stat. 1096 (1909) was amended by Public Law 87–849, 87th Cong., Oct. 23, 1962; 76 Stat. 1119.

[5] Note 4, supra. See also sec. 203 barring services before the departments and agencies but not services in court rendered for compensation solicited or received.

[6] 18 U.S.C. Sec. 205 bars services rendered with or without compensation before the court as well as the departments and agencies. Certain limited exceptions are provided.

[7] Former sec. 434 of 18 U.S.C.; 35 Stat. 1106 (1909).

[8] 364 U.S. 520, 549, 550, 562 (1960), rehearing denied, 365 U.S. 855 (1961).

Every lawyer is familiar with his obligation not to represent conflicting interests. Canon 6 of the American Bar Association's canons explicitly states the "* * * duty of a lawyer at the time of retainer to disclose to the client all the circumstances of his relations to the parties, and any interest in or connection with the controversy, which might influence the client in the selection of counsel."[9] We expect a Member of the judicial branch to disqualify himself from sitting in a case where his personal interests or associations might be thought to color his view. A member of the executive branch has a similar obligation. The public could reasonably look to Congress to follow this practice. And it is a matter of record that some Members of Congress have refrained from voting on particular measures because they had a direct personal interest affected by them.

It would, I think, be impossible to frame statutory prohibitions adequately safeguarding against conflicts of interest in the infinitely broad and varied situations with which Congress, and Members of Congress, have had to deal. But there is, I believe, a way in which Congress can provide better protection than now exists for the public interest, and in a manner consonant with its elective status. That is by applying the principle of public disclosure to the financial interests of members and the top staffs of the legislative branch and to their dealing with executive agencies at the behest of a particular party of interest.

Specifically, I have proposed in this and three preceding Congresses legislation that would require that all top officials in the legislative, as well as the executive branch report annually their sources of income including gifts of $100 or more in value and their financial assets and liabilities.[10] The reports would also include a statement of all dealings in securities or commodities and all purchases and sales of real property or any interest therein. They would be filed with the Comptroller General as public records available to both press and public.

A second part of my bill would also apply the disclosure principle to both oral and written communications concerning particular cases to regulatory agencies, whether from a Member of Congress or a member of the executive branch outside the agency involved. For example, all communications, routine or otherwise, from a Member of Congress in behalf of a particular application for a broadcasting license from the Federal Communications Commission would be made a part of the public record of the proceeding. Failure to cover ex parte contacts with regulatory agencies, as recommended by President Kennedy, is another notable omission of the 1962 revision of section 201 of title 18.

Public disclosure is not a new principle. Preventive rather than punitive in approach, it already applies, in part, to the area of campaign contributions and expenditures. It is the principle behind the requirement that lobbyists register and report expenditures to the Congress.

For another application of the principle, it is notable that in the 1963 Judicial Conference the problem of financial activities of judges was fully discussed. The Conference adopted a resolution forbidding any Federal justice or judge from serving as an officer, director, or employee of a corporation organized for profit.[11] The Conference disapproved of a Senate bill to require each judge to submit regularly complete financial reports open for inspection by any member of the judicial council of each circuit but the action was taken on the ground that "regardless of the merits of the proposal, judges should not be singled out from other officials of the U.S. Government to make such reports."[12]

Public disclosure is particularly appropriate in an area where a flat prohibition might raise questions of infringement upon the right of the people to elect the representative of their choice, be he rogue or shining knight. Certainly, it would help to give the electorate a better basis on which to judge.

For the Congress as a whole and for the individual Members of it, a requirement for disclosure of financial interests would help to dispel the cynicism and disdain with which so many citizens view the political practitioner. This attitude is, I am convinced, for the most part unfair. Yet it certainly has some historical basis. It was, after all, Daniel Webster who reminded officials of the Second Bank of the United States "* * * my retainer has not been renewed or refreshed as usual."[13]

The venality and corruption of many State legislatures in the mid-19th and early 20th centuries were notorious. I am confident that the Congresses in modern times compare very favorably with those of an earlier day. Certainly, in my experience, the great bulk of Members of Congress, for example, are honest, conscientious men, trying to do the best job they can in the interests of the Nation and their State or district.

For officials in the executive branch and particularly in regulatory and semijudicial agencies, the obligation to file regular financial reports would be both preventive and salutary. The maintenance of public confidence in the integrity of these agencies is essential. With them rest determinations that may vitally affect the well-being of a particular enterprise or industry and the communities of which they are part. The necessity to make such a report would serve as a stop-and-think warning. In conjunction with the requirement for disclosure of communications, it would also tend to check the all too prevalent inclination of the general public to ascribe, without tangible grounds, any particular decision to "influence" or a "fix." Contrary to common supposition, they are, I believe, the exception rather than the rule.

Support for the principle of disclosure is growing. For example, at this writing, 30 Members of the Congress, including this writer, have made public financial statements.

To accomplish the objective, however, disclosure should, as the Judicial Conference report suggests, apply equally to all, and to the same extent. And it should include all sources of income.

Adoption of this disclosure requirement will not, of course, resolve all of the conflicts-of-interest problems with which Congress is confronted. By no means do all conflicts-of-interest problems fall in the category of pecuniary interest, at least in the direct sense. Every Member of Congress is confronted, at one time or another, with the problem of drawing the line between legitimate representation of constituent interest and so-called improper influence or pressure. Every Member has also, I venture, at some time wondered whether the offer of a particular campaign contribution was made in the expectation of a subsequent favor even though it was proffered solely as the fruit of a laudable desire to return a worthy official to office. Further, there are a host of other problems, large and small, that trouble many Members of Congress. More than one Member with limited personal resources has to tussle with the problem of how to meet the expenses which serving as a Member of Congress entails.

Travel, for example, is a costly item for most Members. Once upon a time, Congress met for 4 to 6 months and adjourned for the rest of the year. Since the war, sessions have been steadily lengthening. In 1963 the session ended only when Christmas impended. There is an official travel allowance, but in the Senate it covers only three round trips a year. This does not begin to meet the needs of most Members who are rightly expected to get back home far more frequently. The cases of use of official transportation for personal purposes justifiably provoke headlines. But little notice is given to the fact that most Members spend 10 to 20 percent of their salaries on travel to and from their home States or districts for necessary functions and meetings.

A pay raise would provide a partial answer to some of these problems but it would not go to the fundamental considerations involved. To consider them, my bill would establish a Commission on Legislative Standards.

But there are still other areas in which Congress itself can act immediately to eliminate the double standard that now prevails, e.g., accountability in the expenditure of public funds. Congress demands a scrupulous accounting by the executive branch, but takes a far less stringent view of its own expenditures.

One result is that congressional travel abroad has gotten a bad name in many quarters. And understandably so. Yet, with a substantial part of our military forces dispersed around the globe and with millions of U.S. tax dollars being spent in foreign assistance, Congress has a responsibility which legitimately involves, indeed requires, some on-the-spot inspection and firsthand observation. The "junkets" of a few have tended to make all such trips suspect. Fortunately, a few years ago Congress did act, after repeated exposés, to impose minimal requirements for reporting expenditures on the use of counterpart funds by committee members and staff traveling overseas. The scope of these reports should be broadened to include all committee expenditures, domestic as well as abroad, and in greater detail than is now prescribed.

Another spot vulnerable to criticism is the process of appropriating for the legislative branch. Congress tends to regard legislative expenditures as its own business while it treats those of other governmental agencies as public business. Comity between the Houses normally precludes any real questioning of appropriations for its own use approved by the other body. But even within each body too many expenditures are shrouded in secrecy and the budget is approved without most Members knowing what it may really provide by way of swimming pools or draperies, not to speak of more major matters.

This is perhaps understandable. In a body of 100 or 435 peers—some of them more equal than others—it is unrealistic to expect the kind of scrutiny that occurs between independent though coordinate branches of government.

Through the years, Congress has shown it cannot, will not, police itself. One need go back no further than the McCarthy era to see the futility of expecting the Congress to exercise effective self-discipline.[14]

---

[9] "Canons of Professional and Judicial Ethics, Opinions of Committee on Professional Ethics and Grievances" 3, American Bar Association (1957).

[10] S. 1233, 87th Cong., 1st sess. (1961); S. 1332, 86th Cong., 1st sess. (1959); S. 4223, 85th Cong., 2d sess. (1958).

[11] "Report of the Proceedings of the Judicial Conference of the United States," 1963, p. 62, Government Printing Office, Washington (1964).

[12] Id. at 63; S. 1613, 88th Cong., 1st sess. (1963).

[13] Schlesinger, "The Age of Jackson" 84 (Little Brown, Boston, 1950).

At this writing, the Senate Rules Committee is considering the recommendations it was directed to make under Senate Resolution 212 to "make a study and investigation * * * whether additional laws, rules, or regulations are necessary or desirable" and to "report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of its study and investigation together with such recommendations as it may deem desirable."

Some members of the committee have proposed a code of ethics with the sanction of censure. Promulgation of such a code is all very well as an expression of sentiment, but more than another hortatory exercise [15] is needed.

Historically, as well as practically, it is the watchful eye of the press and public that exerts the strongest pressure to keep to the straight and narrow. That is why I believe continuing information, readily available to both public and press, covering the financial interests of Members of Congress is the most promising solution to the problem. It would not be a cure-all, but it would go a long way toward protecting the public interest in the integrity of the legislative process. And, after the initial shock, I suspect the vast majority of the Members of Congress would find it a positive help in carrying out their official responsibilites.

Congressional Conflicts of Interest: Who Watches the Watchers?

(By Erwin G. Krasnow [1] and Congressman Richard E. Lankford [1a])

INTRODUCTION

The 1st session of the 88th Congress was marked by an early flurry of interest in conflict-of-interest situations and remedies for Members of Congress which resulted in a stream of legislation introduced in both the House and the Senate to prevent conflict-of-interest abuses that many Members felt existed but were understandably unwilling to lay bare in public. In addition, it led an unprecedented number of Senators and Representatives to dramatize their concern for more ethical behavior by making public disclosures of their finances in the Congressional Record.[2]

The recent legislative attention to this problem was originally spurred by the prosecution of Representatives Thomas F. Johnson, of Maryland, and Frank W. Boykin, of Alabama, on conspiracy and conflict-of-interest charges, the case of Phillipine's lobbyist John A. O'Donnell, and the accusations of congressional corruption by columnist Jack Anderson.[2a] This spark of interest was fanned by the revelations of certain business and financial activities of former Senate secretary to the majority, Robert G. Baker, and led to unanimous Senate adoption of Senate Resolution 212, introduced by Senator John J. Williams, of Delaware, authorizing and directing the Committee on Rules and Administration to investigate the financial and business interests or activities of Senate officers and employees.[3] While the report of the Rules and Administration Committee was primarily concerned with the activities of staff employees, two of its recommendations directly pertained to Members of the Senate. Both proposals, however, met with defeat on the Senate floor.[4]

Previous to the 88th Congress, the most intensive congressional study on the subject of conflicts of interest was conducted by a special subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare during the 82d Congress in 1951. This study resulted in the issuance of a report [5] recommending a series of legislative proposals for the improvement of the ethical standards of the Congress, as well as those of the executive branch. This excellent report stated the core of the conflict-of-interest problem for Members of Congress in the following manner:

"The problem of economic involvement is probably more difficult for Members of the Congress than for administrators. There are fewer traditional safeguards, temptation is more subtle, there is no higher authority, and discipline is rare even for illegalities. Men tinged with sovereignty can easily feel that the king can do no wrong, and in American politics as it now is, it is easy to feel that many things are justified which one heartily wishes were not necessary." [6]

The authors propose to investigate this statement by the subcommittee with respect to congressional conflict-of-interest problems in light of its historical and statutory background, with an analysis of the various proposals for reform and a suggested approach to a solution palatable to both the Congress and the public at large.

CONFLICTS OF INTEREST DEFINED

In 1960, a special committee of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York completed a study of Federal conflict-of-interest laws. The committee's report, entitled "Conflicts of Interest and Federal Service," [7] made passing reference to congressional conflict-of-interest problems, concluding that they are current, complex, controversial, and largely unresolved. In searching for a definition of a "conflict of interest," one may observe why this whole area is enmeshed with complexity, controversy, and irresolution. A definition evolved in the monumental New York City Bar Association study, which applied specifically to members of the executive branch but appears to apply equally as well to all persons enveloped with the public trust, was as follows: whenever the interest of the public official in the proper administration of his office clashes, or appears to clash wtih the official's interest in his private affairs, a conflict of interest arises.[8] Thus, a conflict of interest may be merely an apparent conflict whose appearance alone tends to undermine public confidence in the official's conduct.

---

[14] Of the more than 250 cases summarized in "Senate Election, Expulsion and Censure Cases from 1789 to 1960", by far the greater number involved a challenge of credentials or charges of election irregularities. Only a handful involved the conduct of the office of Senator; and in the last century the Senate acted to condemn or censure in only two of these cases. The case study was compiled for the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration (S. Doc. No. 71, 87th Cong., 2d sess. (1962)).

[15] On July 11, 1958, the Congress passed a Code of Ethics for Government Service which sent out 10 tenets to which "any person in Government service should" adhere. H.R. Doc. No. 103, 86th Cong., 1st sess. (1958).

[1] A.B., 1958, summa cum laude, Boston University; LL.B., 1961, Harvard Law School; member of the Massachusetts and District of Columbia bars; formerly administrative assistant to U.S. Representative Torbert H. Macdonald; associate, Kirkland, Ellis, Hodson, Chaffetz, and Masters, Washington, D.C.; past president of the Capitol Hill chapter, Federal Bar Association.

[1a] B.S., 1937, University of Virginia; LL.B., 1940, University of Maryland; member of the Maryland bar; Member of Congress, Fifth Congressional District, Maryland (1953 to present); president (1962–63) and first vice president (1961–62), Federal Bar Association.

[2] Those making disclosures in the Congressional Record include: Senator Clark (Pa.), Mar. 15, 1963; Senator Javits (N.Y.), Mar. 4, 1963; Representative John A. Blatnik (Minn.), Apr. 10, 1963; Representative Don Edwards (Calif.), Apr. 10, 1963; Representative Edith Green (Oreg.), Apr. 10, 1963; Representative Robert W. Kastenmeier (Wis.), Apr. 10, 1963; Representative Clark MacGregor (Minn.), May 2, 1963; Representative Henry S. Reuss (Wis.), Apr. 10, 1963; Representative William Fitts Ryan (N.Y.), Apr. 10, 1963; Representative Morris K. Udall (Ariz.), Apr. 10, 1963; Representative Lionel Van Deerlin (Calif.), Apr. 29, 1963; Representative Frank Bow (Ohio), Apr. 11, 1963; Representative John W. Byrnes (Wis.), Nov. 21, 1963; Representative Stanley Tupper (Maine), Nov. 13, 1963; Representative Charles W. Weltner (Ga.), Nov. 20, 1963; Senator William Proxmire (Wis)., Dec. 3, 1963.

[2a] For a general discussion of the background on the above-named incidents, see, "An Ethical Guide Sought for Congressional Behavior," Congressional Quarterly Weekly Report, May 8, 1963.

[3] S. Res. 212, 88th Congress, agreed to on Oct. 10, 1963, provides: "*Resolved,* That the Committee on Rules and Administration or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof is authorized and directed to make a study and investigation with respect to any financial or business interests or activities of any officer or employee or former officer or employee of the Senate, for the purpose of ascertaining (1) whether any such interests or activities have involved conflicts of interest or other impropriety, and (2) whether additional laws, rules, or regulations are necessary or desirable for the purpose of prohibiting or restricting any such interests or activities. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as it may deem desirable."

[4] See Senate Committee on Rules and Administration. "Financial or Business Interests of Officers or Employees of the Senate," S. Rept. No. 1175, 88th Cong., 2d sess. (1964). One of the recommendations of the Committee on Rules and Administration was incorporated in S. Res. 338, which provided that the committee shall have jurisdiction to investigate any violation of the rules of the Senate by a Member or employee, make appropriate findings of facts and conclusions with respect thereto, and upon determination of a violation, recommend to the Senate disciplinary action, including "reprimand, censure, suspension from office or employment, or expulsion from office or employment." On July 24, 1964, the Senate adopted a substitute measure introduced by Senator John Sherman Cooper, of Kentucky, to create a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct in lieu of the proposal recommended by the Committee on Rules and Administration. The other recommendation of the Committee on Rules and Administration was embodied in S. Res. 337, which would require Senators and Senate employees to make public disclosure of those outside business and professional interests which have a pecuniary value equal to or in excess of one-half of their annual salary and the identity of profit-making business and professional organizations with which they are affiliated as an officer, director, partner, or serve in some executive, managerial, or advisory capacity. However, on July 27, 1964, the Senate adopted a motion by Senator Everett Dirksen of Illinois to recommit the resolution to the Committee on Rules and Administration with instructions to report back immediately in lieu thereof a joint resolution to establish a Commission on Ethics in the Federal Government for the purpose of studying the problem of conflicts of interest in all three branches of the Government.

[5] Special Subcommittee on the Establishment of a Commission on Ethics in Government, Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, 82d Cong., 1st sess., "Ethical Standards in Government" (committee print 1951), hereinafter cited as "Douglas report" after its subcommittee chairman, Senator Paul H. Douglas.

[6] Id. at 24.

[7] The Association of the Bar of the City of New York, special committee on the Federal conflict of interest laws (1960), hereinafter cited as "bar association report."

It should be stated at the outset that a conflict of interest does not mean that if a legislator favors his private economic interests, it will necessarily result in his acting against the public interest. The contrary is often the case. Nor is the most vital consideration in conflict-of-interest legislation whether a public official will in fact resolve the conflict to his own personal advantage and to the detriment of his public duties and responsibilities. The regulation of conflicts of interest seeks to prevent situations and appearances of temptation from arising and may be characterized as the regulation of evil before the event and against potential harm. Such regulatory legislation attempts to stop the public official at the doorstep of temptation and relieve the prosecutor of the burden of proving actual bribery or influence. However, even the most precise and illuminating regulatory legislation cannot comprehend all situations or legislative behavior.

Accordingly, there is a "gray zone" of legislative behavior, which has been defined by Ralph Eisenberg, assistant professor of political science at the University of South Carolina, as that area "lying between behavior that is 'clean as a hound's tooth' and behavior obviously improper and illegal, involving such things as bribery, embezzlement and theft." [9] Included in this behavioral gray zone are an endless variety of activities such as promises of more government contracts to elicit campaign contributions, use of official position to gain special advantages or privileges, acceptance of favors from industry lobbyists, investing on the basis of inside information, and misuse of stationery and various funds entrusted to a Member's management.

According to Professor Eisenberg, the problem of dealing with conflicts of interest becomes apparent in attempting to catalog such activities as "proper" or "improper" either generally or in individual situations.[10] One of the difficulties in drafting conflict-of-interest legislation is defining such shadowy conflict situations to achieve sufficient protection for the interests of both the public at large and the elected representative. The goal of conflicts legislation for elected officials on all levels of government is to promote both the actual practice and the public appearance of impartiality and objectivity in legislative activities without disqualifying present and potential public servants through excessively rigid restrictions.

LEGISLATIVE-EXECUTIVE SITUATIONS REFINED

The subject of conflicts of interest for Members of Congress is one which has received surprisingly little commentary in the legal journals. The scholarly writings, consonant with the laws enacted by the Congress, have centered on conflict-of-interest regulation of officials and employees in the executive branch. For example, the House Committee on Government Operations recently issued a report entitled "Avoiding Conflicts of Interest in Defense Contracting and Employment," [11] which was a study of conflict-of-interest issues affecting employees, advisers, and consultants in the executive branch. However, such studies are of little value in formulating proposals for restraining conflicts situations in the legislative branch. The New York City Bar Association study indicates that the analysis and research required for a study of the congressional conflict-of-interest problem would differ materially from that of a study of the executive branch. In addition, any attempt to apply conclusions drawn from the executive study to one for the legislative would be dangerous and at least in part unworkable.[12] This is due to the fundamental differences between the executive and legislative branches which hopelessly complicate formulating a standard code which could apply equally to both branches.

First, the basic difference between an administrator and an elected official is the latter's role as a representative. As a representative of a particular district or State, a Senator and especially a Member of the House of Representatives, is deemed to be the spokesman of the people and the economic interests of his constituency. It is often the case that a Congressman's economic self-interest is similar, even identical, to that of a major group in his constituency. The New York City Bar Association study summarized the implications of a Congressman's representative capacity by stating:

"It is common to talk of the Farm Bloc, or the Silver Senators. We would think odd a fishing State congressman who was not mindful of the interests of the fishing industry—though his campaign funds come in part from this source. This kind of representation is considered inevitable and, indeed, generally applauded. Sterile application of an abstract rule against acting in situations involving self-interest would prevent the farmer Senator from voting on farm legislation or the Negro Congressman from speaking on civil rights bills. At some point a purist attitude toward the evils of conflict of interest in Congress runs afoul of the basic premises of American representative government." [13]

The spokesman for the view that Congressmen should have outside economic involvements was the late Senator Robert S. Kerr, of Oklahoma, a multimillionaire oil-and-gas producer and, through his corporations, the largest single supplier of uranium to the Atomic Energy Commission. Senator Kerr colorfully and forcefully expressed his views on the folly of a purist attitude restricting all economic conflicts of interest among Members of Congress:

"I represent the farmers of Oklahoma, although I have large farm interests. I represent the oil business in Oklahoma, because it is Oklahoma's second largest business, and I am in the oil business. I represent the financial institutions in Oklahoma, and I am interested in them, and they know that and that is the reason they elect me. They don't want to send a man here who has no community of interest with them, because he wouldn't be worth a nickel to them." [14]

In stark contrast to the philosophy of the late Senator Kerr is the conduct of Senator STEPHEN M. YOUNG, of Ohio. Upon his selection as a member of the Senate Aeronautical and Space Committee, Senator YOUNG disposed of the shares of stock he owned in Pan American Airways, a prime contractor at Cape Kennedy.[15]

A second major difference is that Members of Congress must stand for election periodically in contrast to the career status of most Government executive officials and employees. Theoretically, congressional elections and primaries act as a smoking out process of an elected official's improprieties. However, this theory loses its force in an area where there is not a strong two party system and in those elections where the public is not well informed. Advocates of the remedy of disclosure [16] as a means of deterring economic conflicts of interest claim that the public is presently prevented from being able to vote intelligently and knowledgeably on an elected official's full record.

An important principle of democratic government should be noted in connection with the view that campaigns act as a smoking out process and elections as ultimate conflict-of-interest sanctions for legislators. This principle states that one privilege of a constituency in a democracy is to elect a man of its own choosing. It is the voter's privilege to elect a man to public office in spite of improprieties in his actions or interests. Representative Thomas J. Lane, of Massachusetts pleaded guilty to willful tax evasion in 1956, and served 4 months in jail, but the voice of the people returned him to three more terms in Congress. However, the indictment of Representative Thomas F. Johnson, of Maryland, on October 16, 1962, on conspiracy and conflict-of-interest charges, probably contributed heavily to his defeat in the subsequent November elections. The illict operations of Billie Sol Estes implicated Representatives J. T. Rutherford, of Texas, and H. Carl Andersen, of Minnesota, and were perhaps a major factor in their defeat in November of 1962.

The continued surveillance of an elected official's behavior by the press, by his campaign opponents, and ultimately by the voters does result in some measure of deterrence as evidenced in three of the above examples. However, it is unrealistic to expect that an election contest—assuming that an incumbent does not run unopposed—will expose the dirty linen or unethical activities of a legislator. In the first place, the conflict-of-interest area touches upon many subtle ethical problems which are not susceptible to the usual black and white character in which political campaign issues are framed. Furthermore, even though an opponent may uncover unethical conduct, he may fear repercussions in opening this area as a campaign issue, both in terms of his own past conduct and the possible impact on the fair play concepts of the electorate. Reliance upon the voters to police conflicts situations provides an inconsistent and sporadic sanction devoid of any rational set of standards by which legislators may measure a projected action before the fact.[17]

Primarily it is the problem of getting elected which spurs U.S. solons to seek campaign contributions, dole out patronage, and make various and sundry promises. The periodic election faced by each Congressman highlights two problems foremost in his mind. First, he must be prepared to spend thousands, perhaps hundreds of thousands, of dollars to pay for the increasingly high cost of electioneering. Secondly, the possibility that the voters may put an abrupt end to his political career forces him to give consideration to possible outside sources of income and future gainful employment to meet that eventuality. The executive branch does not face this reelection problem.

Since the cost of a campaign invariably exceeds the salary of a Member of Congress, a complete ban on contributions would be unrealistic. A Member cannot rely on the average party member to finance his campaign, and therefore, usually the candidate's only recourse is to accept contributions from the more actively interested persons or groups who are donating money in order to protect their interests. Consequently, conflict-of-interest problems frequently arise when such individuals and groups lobbying for special interests later attempt to exert pressure and influence upon the donee. The Nation's Capital is the headquarters of well-heeled lobbying groups of virtually every economic, political, and social cause whose "raison d'etre" is to influence Representatives and Senators.

---

[8] Id., at 3.

[9] Eisenberg, "Conflicts of Interest Situations and Remedies," 13 Rutgers Law Review 666 (1959).

[10] Ibid.

[11] H. Rept. No. 917, 88th Cong., 1st sess. (1963).

[12] Bar Association report, 15–16.

[13] Id. at 14.

[14] "Senator Kerr Talks About Conflict of Interest," U.S. News & World Report, Sept. 3, 1962, p. 86.

[15] Note 2, supra at 4.

[16] See sec. IV, proposed conflict-of-interest regulation for Members of Congress, disclosure of financial interests, infra.

[17] Note, "Conflicts of Interest of State Legislators," 76 Harvard Law Review 1209, 1214 (1963).

Furthermore, the ethical problem caused by financial pressure does not end with the completion of the primary and election campaigns. It is increasingly difficult—termed impossible by some—for a Congressman to subsist on his salary alone. The Senator and Representative have many unique expenses. A U.S. lawmaker has to divide his time between Washington, D.C., and his own congressional district. Almost every Congressman maintains two residences, one in Washington and the other in his home district. The Congressman receives three round-trip tickets to his district each session, but it is not unusual for Senators and Representatives to travel home virtually each weekend. Frequently Members have to pay for stationery supplies and long-distance telephone calls from their own pockets when their allowance is exceeded. Large expenditures of money are also necessary for entertaining and charitable giving each year both in Washington and at home, in order for a Member of Congress to nurture a reputation among his constituents as a gracious host and selfless philanthropist. The insufficient salaries of a Congressman, together with the high costs of campaigning, force many Members to continue their outside economic activities.

One of the difficulties, however, in gaining agreement in the Congress on the question of proper economic involvement is presented by the differing views on whether the office of Congressman is full time. When conflicts-of-interest legislation was first passed by the Congress in the 19th century, the Congress was a part-time legislative body, meeting 6 or less months a year. However, the office of the 20th-century Congressman is a year-round responsibility, and little time is left for conscientious Members to dabble in business or professional activities. The Douglas committee report noted that many lawyer-members accept fees for giving advice and counsel and for other legal services but frequently have time to give only perfunctory service. In this connection, the question is whether they are being paid "for their influence and to influence their perspective."[18] Moreover, when a Congressman accepts a large honorarium for speaking before a special interest group, a similar question is raised as to the reasonableness of the compensation in relation to services rendered. The issue is whether (and how) to regulate this area of fees and retainers so as to insure that a Congressman does not jeopardize, both in appearance and in fact, his ability to represent the public.

In addition, the special influence and power of the Congress generally, and each Senator and Representative in particular, pose difficult questions in regulating conflicts of interest. One of the most important is the power and influence of Senators and Representatives to shape the Nation's laws and policies during closed executive sessions of their committees and subcommittees. The executive agencies listen to Members of Congress with respect, especially legislators with seniority, as the extent of authority, the size of the appropriation, and the future of each administrative agency or executive department depends on the will of the Congress. In this connection, it is significant to note that a large amount of time is consumed by Members of Congress in assisting constituents in their dealings with Federal departments and agencies. The "errand boy" functions expected of each Member of Congress include getting a serviceman transferred to a base nearer to his home, helping a local company obtain a Small Business Administration loan, recommending constituents for Federal jobs, and urging a Federal installation to be located in a certain community. It is in large part a good thing for legislators to serve as an informal board of inspectors over the administrative bureaucracy. Congressional intervention often serves to counteract administrative errors, inaction, and redtape. However, problems arise where congressional channels are used to promote the private economic interests of the individual Senator or Representative.

Finally, the legislator differs from the administrator in the area of special immunities and rewards bestowed on Members of Congress to assist them in the proper performance of the office.

Article I, section 6, of the Constitution grants Members of Congress freedom from arrest, except for treason, felony, and breach of the peace, while engaged in their legislative duties, and immunity from possible slander and libel suits for statements while involved in debate on the floor of the Congress. In addition, whereas the "red ink" side of the Congressman's budget book was depicted earlier, it should be noted that a Member does receive free office space in Washington and his home district, a liberal budget for secretarial help and supplies, facilities for making television and radio broadcasts at low rates, and, very important, the franking privilege.

A delicate balance must be maintained whenever special privileges and rewards are conferred upon the office of Congressman. The office must be secure enough for the Member of Congress to perform his functions but not so secure that there is no competition, nor so rewarding that the stakes of the office are too high. For example, the standard for remuneration of a Member of Congress should represent a balance between compensation sufficient for the Member to be independent in his legislative actions and one which is not so lucrative that a Member would wish to hold on to his position for the sake of the salary alone. In order that Congress is not made the pawn of conflicting forces which themselves are to be controlled, it is necessary that both the Congress as a body and its individual Members have some degree of independence and autonomy. In this regard, any conflict-of-interest proposal that is too sweeping in nature and overly punitive in its manner of enforcement would tend to thwart these goals.

PRESENT CONFLICT-OF-INTEREST REGULATION FOR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

This section will attempt to set forth the various conflict-of-interest statutes and regulations which are applicable to Members of Congress. Since the statutory regulations mainly take the form of criminal penalties,[19] the Justice Department is extremely reluctant to prosecute a Member of Congress unless his alleged misconduct is of a very grave nature, which appears to be evidenced by the fact that less than a dozen Members of Congress have ever been indicted under these century-old statutes. The present Code of Ethics, enacted in 1958 by the 85th Congress,[20] sets a standard of conduct for Congressmen without any means of enforcement. Although the American Bar Association's Canons of Ethics apply to lawyer Members of Congress, many such Members appear to continue to enjoy a robust law practice without the intervention of any professional ethics committee either of the national or local bar associations.[21]

Section 203. Compensation to Members of Congress, officers, and others in matters affecting the Government

Section 203 proscribes the payment of compensation to Members of Congress for services rendered before Federal agencies in matters in which the United States "is interested." The penalty for conviction is a fine of not more than $10,000 and imprisonment for not more than 2 years, or both. While section 203 contains the same basic prohibitions as its statutory predecessor, section 281, the category of proceedings to which the disqualification applied are broadened. This section, inter alia, also extends the penalty to the giving as well as the receipt of compensation to Members of Congress. The list of proceedings has been extended to include "application" and "request" for a "ruling or other determination." According to the House report on the bill, the list was augmented to make clear that the enumeration is comprehensive of all matters that come before a Federal department or agency.[22] The "interest" required by the Government is now defined as "direct and substantial," replacing a prior "directly or indirectly interested" test. Since this is a criminal statute, the change was made to set up a clearer test of the proscribed interest to replace the vaguer phrase under section 281.

Section 203 is regarded as the keystone of the legislation in this field and has been the most litigated of the laws on conflicts of interest. This is because section 203 covers the principal situation of conflicts of interest, namely the acceptance of compensation from private sources for Government-related services. The section is broadly worded in order to cover all the multifarious forms of influence, peddling whereby a Member of Congress accepts compensation for acts and decisions made in his official capacity.

The breadth of section 203 may be seen from an analysis of two cases under section 281 (the predecessor to section 203) which involved Members of Congress. The first of these cases *Burton* v. *United States*,[23] involved Senator Joseph Burton, of Kansas, who served in the Senate from 1901 to 1906. Senator Burton was charged with agreeing to appear before the Post Office Department on behalf of the Rialto Grain & Securities Co., of St. Louis in return for $2,500. The company was about to lose its right to receive mail because it was allegedly involved in a scheme to defraud. The defendant argued, inter alia, that section 281 (then section 1782) was unconstitutional as it interfered with the legitimate functions, privileges and rights of Senators, and impinged upon the authority and powers of the Senate over its Members. The Supreme Court rejected this argument as the Senate itself voted to enact this provision. This opinion,[24] written by Justice John Marshall Harlan, contains an excellent statement on the underlying purpose of this section:

---

[18] Douglas report, 25.

[19] Act of Oct. 13, 1962, 18 U.S.C. 201–218. For analysis of the act, see Department of Justice, Office of the Attorney General, "Memorandum Regarding Conflict of Interest Provisions of Public Law 87–849," Jan. 28, 1963, 28 Fed. Reg. 985 (1963). See also "Federal Conflict of Interest Legislation," hearings of June 1 and 2, 1961, before the House Antitrust Subcommittee, 87th Cong., 1st sess., ser. 3; H. Rept. No. 748, 87th Cong., 1st sess. "Conflicts of Interest," hearing of June 21, 1962, before the Senate Judiciary Committee, 87th Cong., 2d sess.; S. Rept. No. 2213, 87th Cong., 2d sess.; CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 107, pt. 11, p. 14774; CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 108, pt. 16, pp. 21975, 22311.

[20] H. Con. Res. 175 (85th Cong.).

[21] An attorney engaged in the practice of law is held to the same highest standard of ethical and moral uprightness and fair dealing when acting as a businessman or when acting as a lawyer and is subject to disciplinary action if he fails to maintain those standards in either capacity. "Canons of Professional Ethics," American Bar Association, canons 6 and 37. On the basis of canons 26 and 32, the committee on professional ethics of the American Bar Association has ruled that "a law firm could not accept employment to appear before a legislative committee while a member of the firm is serving in the legislature * * * [and that] a full disclosure before the committee would not alter this ruling nor would it be changed by the fact that the member of the legislature would not share in the fee received thereby." Opinion 296, Aug. 1, 1959, 45 American Bar Association Journal 1272 (1959).

[22] H. Rept. No. 748, 87th Cong., 1st sess. 20 (1961).

[23] 202 U.S. 344 (1906).

"Evidently the statute has for its main object to secure the integrity of executive action against undue influence upon the part of members of that branch of the Government whose favor may have much to do with the appointment to, or retention in, public position of those whose official action it is sought to control or direct. The evils attending such a situation are apparent and are increased when those seeking to influence executive officers are spurred by hopes of pecuniary reward." [25]

The Burton case is the leading court decision on the scope of the section 281 phrase referring to a matter or proceeding "in which the United States is a party or directly or indirectly interested," as the Court adopted the view that a direct moneyed or pecuniary interest of the United States was not required. Although section 203, as reenacted in 1962, sets up a new statutory test, namely, "direct and substantial," it appears that the holding in the Burton case would be the same if the Supreme Court were presently construing this phrase, based on the language found in the case denominating the Government's interest in protecting its postal facilities against improper use as a "direct" interest.[25] The Burton decision, even in view of the new statutory test, virtually forecloses all administrative law practice by Members of Congress for compensation, and as revised, section 203(a)(2) extends the type of matter proscribed from receiving compensation to "any proceeding, application, and request for a ruling or other determination."

Another case worthy of mention arising under section 281 is *United States* v. *Quinn*.[26] Representative T. Vincent Quinn, now a magistrate in New York City, was charged with violating section 281 as a result of his sharing profits from cases in which his law firm represented clients before the Internal Revenue Service. The Quinn case is important as it represents the first prosecution of a Congressman for the rendition of services through partners and not personally. Quinn, who had already left Congress, was acquitted. The Quinn case held that while it is not necessary to find a specific criminal intent, in the sense of a conscious purpose of wrongdoing or evil motive, the defendant must know that partnership profits received by him are for services rendered by the partnership before an agency during the period he is a Member of Congress, and he must have knowingly received such compensation. Quinn never met the clients, was not retained by them, and did not personally appear or render any services for them before officials of the Internal Revenue Service.

Dictum in Quinn states that mere inquiries by a Congressman, without proof of a receipt of fees for services rendered, concerning the status of matters pending before a Federal bureau, without discussion of the merits of the case, did not constitute rendition of "services" within the contemplation of the statute.[27] The Court stated that as an essential element for sustaining a conviction there must be a finding "that compensation was received in return for services rendered for the purpose of interceding with, or with the intent to influence and persuade, officers and employees of the Internal Revenue Bureau to obtain favorable decisions and actions in matters pending before the Bureau." [28]

This view seems to be contrary to the express language of section 281 and the legislative history of the statute. Congress prohibited the rendering of services within the scope of the duties of the Member of Congress for compensation. Although the object of the statute is to prevent the use or abuse of official position to influence agency action, there is no requirement that the officer actually tried to influence such action.[29] This view was expressed in *May* v. *United States* [30] where the Court commented that "the gist of the offense is the receipt of compensation, not the nature of the act done by the recipient in consequence thereof." [31] In this case, Representative Andrew Jackson May, of Kentucky, then chairman of the House Committee on Military Affairs, was charged with accepting $50,000 from Murray W. and Henry W. Garsson during World War II in return for his aid in getting war contracts for them. The Court commented:

"If the money was received by May as compensation for acts done by him for the Garssons, it is immaterial that those acts were patriotic, legitimate, and within the scope of his official duties as a Congressman." [32]

The Court affirmed the conviction, holding that even if the service rendered by a Member of Congress is otherwise proper, the receipt of compensation therefore renders it illegal.

Limitation of the practice of law by a Member of Congress

Lawyers traditionally have far outnumbered other professions in the U.S. Congress. Of the 535 Members of the 88th Congress, 315 are lawyers. While there is no Federal law which flatly prohibits the private practice of law by a Member of Congress, several statutes narrowly restrict the scope of such practice.

An informal survey, which appeared in the Saturday Evening Post of the methods by which lawyer-legislators run their private law practices evidenced "an astonishing variety of methods." [33] Great disparity was found between the standards of those Members who have an active law practice as to cases involving Federal agencies and the Federal courts. The partnership arrangements were characterized by their lack of a common pattern as to what cases would be accepted and how the common revenues were to be divided. Since there are few clear-cut guidelines in this area, what one Member considered to be a perfectly ethical practice of law the next may consider highly improper.

Section 204. Practice in Court of Claims by Members of Congress

This section forbids a Member of Congress to practice in the Court of Claims. The penalty for conviction is a fine of not more than $10,000, or imprisonment of not more than 2 years, or both. Moreover, conviction under this provision also bars a Member of Congress from ever holding "any office of honor, trust, or profit under the United States."

Section 201. Bribery of public officials and witnesses

The bribery section is not actually an integral part of a conflict-of-interest study. As stated earlier, regulation of conflicts of interest has been in the past the attempt to regulate the evil before its occurrence. Conflicts regulation is in essence derived or secondary—once removed from the ultimate misconduct feared. The bribe is forbidden because its effect is to subvert the official's judgment; a conflict of interest is regulated not only because it may have this effect but also because it looks to the public as though it does have this effect. Thus, bribery is a collateral problem of a conflict-of-interest study.

The 87th Congress combined into a single provision sections 201 through 213 of title 18 of the United States Code, which comprises nine general bribery sections and four sections prohibiting bribery in special cases. Under section 201 as revised, it is unlawful for anyone to bribe or attempt to bribe a Member of Congress either before or after he is qualified, by corruptly giving, offering, or promising him or any person selected by him something of value to influence him to commit or allow any fraud on the United States, or to induce him to do or omit to do any act in violation of his lawful duty.[34]

Section 201(c) prohibits a Member of Congress from soliciting, accepting, or agreeing to take a bribe. The theory of this section thereby runs counter to the classic advice of Lord Bacon, who said: "While never missing a chance to take a bribe, one should never let the taking of the bribe influence his conduct in the slightest." This subsection also makes clear that a Member of Congress cannot accept something of value, which while not of benefit to himself, will be of advantage to another person in whose well-being he is interested.

Other statutory provisions

There are two other statutory provisions which directly apply to Members of Congress who are lawyers: 46 U.S.C. 1223(e) makes it unlawful for any contractor or charterer who holds any contract made under the authority of the Merchant Marine Act to employ a Member of Congress as an attorney either with or without compensations; 25 U.S.C. 706 forbids a Member of Congress to practice before the Indian Claims Commission.

Canons of ethics

Conflict of interest guidelines for lawyer Members of Congress, as was mentioned earlier, are provided by the American Bar

---

[24] The Court stated: "That such proceeding or matter involved the pecuniary interests of the defendant's clients is not denied. That it also involved the use of the property as well as postal facilities furnished by the United States for carrying and transporting mail matter must also be admitted. What the Post Office Department aimed to do in the execution of the acts of Congress and the regulations established under those acts was to protect the mails of the United States from being used, in violation of law, to promote schemes for obtaining money and property by means of false and fraudulent pretenses, representations and promises * * *. And it is, we think, a mistake to say that the United States was not interested, directly or indirectly, in protecting its property, that is, its mails and postal facilities, against improper and illegal use, and in the enforcement, through the agency of one of its Departments, of a statute regulating such use." Id. at 370–371.

[25] Id. at 368.

[26] 141 F. Supp. 622 (S.D. N.Y. 1956).

[27] Id. at 629.

[28] Id. at 626–627.

[29] "Hearings on Federal Conflict of Interest Legislation Before the House Antitrust Subcommittee," 86th Cong., 2d sess., ser. 17, pt. 2 at 643 (1960).

[30] 175 F. 2d 994 (D.C. Cir. 1949).

[31] Id. at 1006.

[32] Ibid.

[33] Bagdikian and Oberdorfer, "Conflict of Interest, Can Congress Crack Down on Its Own Members?" Saturday Evening Post, Nov. 12, 1964, p. 34.

[34] See sec. 201(b) thereunder.

Association Canons of Professional Ethics. For example, Canon No. 36 states:

"A lawyer, having once held public office or having been in the public employ, should not after his retirement accept employment in connection with any matter which he has investigated or passed upon while in such office or employ."

This canon has been construed to bar a law firm from rendering services in any situation where any member of the firm is barred.[35]

Disqualification

An additional area of the overall conflicts-of-interest problem is based on the view that a legislator should not vote on a matter in which he has a private economic interest. The purist view, as expressed by Thomas Jefferson in his manual of parliamentary practice, provides that:

"Where the private interests of a Member are concerned in a bill or question he is to withdraw. And where such an interest has appeared, his voice has been disallowed, even after a division. In a case so contrary, not only to the laws of decency, but to the fundamental principle of the social compact, which denies to any man to be a judge in his own cause, it is for the honor of the House that this rule of immemorial observance should be strictly adhered to." [36]

From the rules of the House of Representatives, rule VIII, the following broadly worded limitation is placed on a Member's right to vote:

"Every Member * * * shall vote on each question put, unless he has a direct personal or pecuniary interest in the event of such question." [37]

Although the annotation of this rule notes that the weight of authority favors the idea that there is no authority in the House to deprive a Member of the right to vote, in one or two instances the Speaker of the House has decided that a Member should not vote because of a personal interest. Generally, however, past Speakers have held that the Member himself should decide the question of the propriety of his voting on a particular matter. The disqualifying interest has been held to be such as affects the Member directly and not as one of a class.

The rule of "immemorial observance" runs counter to the actual state of affairs during the 19th century. A frequently cited example of the standard of public morality in the early years of Congress was the private correspondence between Senator Daniel Webster and Nicholas Biddle, president of the National Bank, in which Senator Webster suggested that Biddle might wish the Senator to bring the matter of President Jackson's proposed withdrawal of U.S. deposits from the bank before the Senate. He wrote:

"Since I have arrived here, I have had an application to be concerned, professionally, against the bank, which I have declined, of course, although I believe my retainer has not been renewed, or refreshed as usual. If it be wished that my relation to the bank should be continued, it may be well to send me the usual retainers." [38]

It was such common practice for Members of Congress to represent people prosecuting claims against the Government that during the Civil War some Members of Congress even advertised in newspapers of their availability to represent claimants against the Government.

With respect to the enforcement of the rule concerning disqualification, each Speaker of the House has had a different practice. However, the rule has never been considered to encompass a Member's committee activity where, because of the importance of the work of committees in the framework of Congress, it would be most effective. Some of the difficulties inherent in a rule against voting due to personal interest may be seen from an incident which occurred in the House on April 11, 1874. The issue to be decided by the Speaker of the House was whether three Congressmen should vote on a national bank taxation measure since they were officers of national banks. Representative James G. Blaine, the Speaker, ruled that Members could vote their private interests if the measure was not for their exclusive benefit. At that time, Speaker Blaine was offering his services to the Little Rock and Fort Smith Railroad in return for their stock.

Code of ethics for Government service

An enumeration of conflict-of-interest provisions would not be complete without mention of House Concurrent Resolution 175, which was passed by the Senate on July 11, 1958, and approved by the House on August 28, 1957. This concurrent resolution declares it to be the sense of the Congress that a "Code of Ethics for Government Service" should be adhered to by "all Government employees, including officeholders." The report of the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service states that this resolution is intended to apply to Members of Congress.[39]

The code of ethics contains 10 general principles which are so broad as to shed little illumination and true guidance for the public servant. For example, the first principle states that any person in Government service should "put loyalty to the highest moral principles and to country above loyalty to persons, party, or Government department." Other principles includes upholding the Constitution and laws of the land, giving "a full day's labor for a full day's pay," never discriminating unfairly by the dispensing of special favors or privileges to anyone, and exposing corruption wherever discovered. Two members of the Senate committee wrote a concurring report to stress the fact that while the code is a "statement of principles without enforcement provisions," it was their hope that it would "be reinforced in the early future by reforms of greater stringency and efficacy." [40] The Congress might have embraced the code within its own rules and employed its principles on an ad hoc basis. However, no provision for enforcement was ever made. Since previous efforts to secure action by the Congress had been unsuccessful, the code of ethics marked a breakthrough albeit a minor one.

PROPOSED CONFLICT-OF-INTEREST REGULATION FOR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

In an impassioned speech on the House floor, Congressman **William Jennings Bryan Dorn**, of South Carolina called for an exhaustive study of many allegedly shameful practices which are threatening to undermine this great institution we all love—the Congress of the United States.[41] He used a dramatic, perhaps melodramatic, analogy from the past:

"We have from history the example of the Roman Senate, whose power was eroded and corrupted by the Roman Emperor, and they sank into oblivion with presents, gifts, luxurious chariots, villas, and nepotism. Through such conduct, the doom of the Roman Republic was sealed forever." [42]

Although the prophecy of doom may be part of congressional histrionics, no one disputes the harmful potential of conflicts between the official duties of a Member of Congress and his personal economic advantage. Basically, the problem is not whether to have a system of legal restraints on conflict of interests, but how to design a system which achieves the maximum protection for both the Members of Congress and the public, and a minimum of undesirable collateral results.

Disclosure of financial interests

One of the most frequently recommended of the conflict-of-interest proposals advanced by Members of Congress is the publicizing of the personal financial interests of Senators and Representatives. This solution recognizes the difficulty of defining what is and what is not proper interest and leaves to the public both the information and the determination. A Member of Congress, if forced to disclose his private sources of income, has to decide what the effects of his known interests will be, and to make adjustments and bear responsibility accordingly.

Senator **Wayne Morse** has introduced a bill in each session of the Congress since 1947 to require Members of Congress to file public statements relating to amount, sources of income, and dealings in securities and commodities. Senator **Morse** told a Senate committee that he calls this disclosure legislation "my Caesar's wife bill because I think that a public servant ought to want to be above suspicion and I think this will help place him above suspicion." [43]

Bills calling for mandatory disclosure of income and financial interests take on varying forms. A representative example is H.R. 4747, introduced by Congresswoman **Edith Green**, of Oregon, during the 88th Congress. This bill provides that each Member of the Senate and House shall file yearly with the clerk of the Senate and Clerk of the House, respectively, a report which shall be made public containing a full and complete statement of financial interests. Five items of disclosure are required: (1) The amount and resources of all income and gifts (including speaking fees) of more than $100 received from any one source during the preceding calendar year; (2) the value of each asset held by or entrusted to him, or by him and to him and any other person, including his spouse; (3) the amount and source of all contributions during the preceding calendar year received by him or any associate, including his spouse and minor children, or on his behalf or subject to his direction or control; (4) an annual report listing all transactions in real estate, securities, or commodities by the Member or by any person, including his spouse, acting on his behalf; (5) the name of any relative who is also an employee of the Federal Government.

One of the best arguments in favor of compulsory disclosure proposals was made by the Douglas subcommittee which recommended legislation providing for the mandatory disclosure of income, assets, and certain transactions by all Members of Congress and for higher administrative officials of the Federal Government. The report of the subcommittee noted that there was more general agreement with respect to this proposal and its general effectiveness, than upon any other; it gave the following justification for such a proposal.

---

[35] See *United States* v. *Standard Oil Co.*, 136 F. Supp. 345, 360 (S.D. N.Y. 1955), and cases cited therein.

[36] "Jefferson's Manual and Rules of the House of Representatives," H.R. Doc. No. 459, 86th Cong., 2d sess. 171 (1961).

[37] Id. at 318.

[38] Letters from Daniel Webster to Nicholas Biddle, Oct. 29, 1833, Dec. 21, 1833, in McGrane, "The Correspondence of Nicholas Biddle," 216–217, 218 (1919), quoted in bar association report at 30.

[39] S. Rept. No. 1812, 85th Cong., 2d sess. 1 (1958).

[40] Id. at 3.

[41] Congressional Record, vol. 109, pt. 4, p. 4927.

[42] Ibid.

[43] "Hearings on the Evaluation of the Effects of Laws Enacted to Reorganize the Legislative Branch of the Government Before the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments," 82d Cong., 1st sess. 239 (1951).

"Disclosure is like an antibiotic which can deal with ethical sickness in the field of public affairs. It avoids difficult decisions as to what may be right or wrong. In that sense it is not even diagnostic, yet there is confidence that it will be helpful in dealing with many questionable or improper practices. It would sharpen men's own judgments of right and wrong, since they would be less likely to do wrong things if they knew these acts would be challenged." [44]

However, in 1958, a staff report of the House Committee on the Judiciary concluded that legislative doubt as to precise boundaries of propriety did not justify a wholesale inquisition into private affairs.[45] The staff report used the simile of disclosure as an antibiotic, which was utilized in the Douglas report, as a clue to the reason why Congress has not adopted this recommendation:

"Since the initial enthusiasm with which the medical profession prescribed wonder drugs, troublesome side effects have been encountered whose full impact on the human organism has yet to be plumbed. Today, these drugs are used more sparingly. The potential side effects of compulsory disclosure of the financial affairs of all high Federal officials seem similarly to demand utmost caution in its prescription. Much added study is recommended before any broad scale and indiscriminate adoption of this remedy." [46]

The main argument of the staff report was that added reporting requirements would be a great inconvenience to most officials. They would be required, the report noted, to forgo the privacy that ordinary citizens enjoy with respect to their holdings and transactions which, in a preponderance of instances, would have no remote bearing on their public service. Furthermore, the report seriously questioned whether such an added sacrifice should be demanded of those who are called to public office.

The approach to congressional disclosure advocated by Senators Kenneth Keating and Jacob Javits, of New York, provides a middle ground between the onerous task of listing all financial holdings and the present system of disclosure on a purely voluntary basis. Their proposal, embodied in Senate Concurrent Resolution 5 (88th Cong.), provides that Members of Congress "having a financial interest, direct or indirect, having a value of $5,000 or more, in any activity which is subject to the jurisdiction of a regulatory agency," shall make the nature of such interest a matter of public record by filing a statement with the Comptroller General. The statement would set forth this interest "in such reasonable detail and in accordance with such regulations as shall be prescribed by the Comptroller General."

Disqualification

A proposal which goes beyond disclosure is that of disqualification from voting where the Member of Congress has a personal interest in a matter which he is called upon to vote or make a decision. That this is one of the most perplexing areas of conflicts-of-interest situations is shown by the rhetorical questions raised by Representative Edith Green in a speech on the House floor, on March 11, 1963:

"Now, I suppose that no one believes a Member of Congress should disqualify himself from taking part in a housing bill because he owns a house. But what if he is president or a member of the board of directors of a local urban renewal agency or a large residential construction company?

"No Member of Congress should disqualify himself from taking part in legislation involving oil or gas because his house is heated by gas or oil. But what if he is a major stockholder or officer in a gas transmission line, or the owner of a dozen oil wells?

"No Member of Congress should disqualify himself from shaping commodity legislation because he owns a farm or a ranch. But what if this Member serves as a consultant to an economic interest that seeks to knead and shape the legislation to its own ends?" [47]

Thus, the very nature of a legislator's role as a representative of the interests of his constituency makes rigid enforcement of the disqualification rule impracticable.[48]

The disqualification remedy is one that is already adopted as one of the "housekeeping" rules of the Senate and the House. However, it is rarely used and is not given serious consideration by most Members of Congress. When Senater Wayne Morse reminded the late Senator Robert Kerr that under rule XII of the Senate he should not vote on a natural gas bill because of his own gas investments, Kerr "exploded in anger" and proceeded to vote anyway.[49] Although both the Senate and the House clearly have the power to enforce these rules with sanctions, no machinery has ever been set up to police them.

Ex parte communications by Members of Congress

Ex parte communication is not primarily a conflict-of-interest problem; rather, it is concerned with fair hearing and adjudicatory procedures in quasi-judicial agencies. However, ex parte communications sometimes form part of a pattern of improper influence through threats, bribery, favors, or other means. A conflict-of-interest problem is created whenever an administrative official permits himself to be put in a compromising position as a result of such ex parte communication.

In recent years, Members of both Houses have introduced legislation which would require that all ex parte communications from Members of Congress relating to agency adjudications be made matters of public record. Ex parte communication legislation usually provides that all written and oral communications made by a Member, or a member of his staff, to an officer or employee of an executive branch department or agency shall become part of the public record of any case upon which a query is made. The record is then to include the name of the caller, the time, the matter queried, the proceeding, if any, involved, and the nature of the inquiry.

Proponents of ex parte communication legislation contend that this disclosure would be a strong safeguard against improper attempts to influence agency decisions. The argument is stated in its tersest form by Senator Keating: "I can conceive of no circumstances under which it would be proper to do so without some notice to the parties in the agency proceedings." [50] Such proposals would not prohibit or limit contacts by Members of Congress with the administrative agencies but are designed to curb abuses "by exposing every such contact to the light of day." [51]

Commission of Ethics

The main recommendation of the Douglas report [52] was the establishment of a Commission on Ethics in Government. This Commission would be established by a joint resolution of Congress to focus primarily on the legislative and executive branches. It would consist of 15 members, with 5 appointed by the President, 5 by the President of the Senate (the Vice President) and 5 by the Speaker of the House. Only two persons chosen by each appointing officer would be from within the Government, the other three would be from private life. The Commission would have the power to hold hearings and secure testimony and evidence, authority to employ a staff and be given funds to carry on its work. This group would have 2 years to submit a report and recommendations to the President and the Congress.

The theory of the Douglas report proposal is that it is far more likely that reform will be accomplished if an outside nonpartisan group of eminent citizens is brought in to study the problem. There is a rule of the congressional fraternity that no Member shall expose publicly the transgressions of another. While some Members of Congress feel the need for such legislation, they are unwilling to point the finger of guilt at any of their colleagues. In this respect, an editorial in the Washington Post quipped: "Experience has shown that the prospect of getting a full disclosure of abuses from Congress is almost equivalent to that of getting complete military inspections in the Soviet Union." [53]

Favorable initial action has been taken by the Senate recently on Senate Joint Resolution 187, which establishes a Commission on Ethics in the Federal Government for the purpose of studying conflicts of interest in all three branches of the Government. This legislation, sponsored by Senator Everett Dirksen, of Illinois, incorporates many of the recommendations of the Douglas report relating to the composition and the sphere of activity of such a "blue ribbon" commission. However, the Dirksen proposal specifically empowers the Commission on Ethics to make investigations, when necessary, of Members of Congress and legislative staff as well as of officials and employees of the executive and judicial branches. On July 27, 1964, the Senate adopted a motion to recommit to the Committee on Rules and Administration the disclosure proposal recommended by that committee with instructions to report back immediately the Dirksen measure. Subsequently, on July 28, Senate Joint Resolution 187 was placed on the Senate Calendar. The Dirksen proposal seeks to take the formulation and execution of conflicts of interest regulations out of the hands of the Congress and thus there is some doubt whether such a measure will receive the support needed in the House and Senate to be enacted into law.

Another variation of the "blue ribbon" commission idea is the Commission on Legislative Ethics suggested by Representative Edith Green. The composition and goals of the Commission on Legislative Ethics would be similar to those of the Commission on Ethics in Government, except the former would concentrate exclusively on ethical problems within the Congress.

---

[44] Douglas report, 37.

[45] Staff report to the House Antitrust Subcommittee, 85th Cong., 2d sess., "Federal Conflict of Interest Legislation," 11 (committee print, 1958).

[46] Ibid.

[47] Congressional Record, vol. 109, pt. 3, p. 3945.

[48] Senator Eugene McCarthy, of Minnesota, raises this point in commenting on whether Members should refrain from voting on matters involving personal advantage to them: "For the most part the gain to the individual Congressman includes advantage or the advancement of an interest which is shared by many other persons, including constituents. Consequently all of these would be unrepresented and would suffer if the individual Member refrained." Speech delivered to the 16th Conference on Science, Philosophy, and Religion in Their Relations to the Democratic Way of Life, Aug. 30, 1960.

[49] Pearson, "Congress Needs a Code of Ethics," Washington Post, Apr. 13, 1963, p. B25.

[50] Congressional Record, vol. 108, pt. 16, p. 21988.

[51] Ibid.

[52] Douglas report, 24.

[53] "Congressional Ethics," editorial, Washington Post, Apr. 15, 1963.

Another type of commission suggested is similar to the grievance or ethics committees of bar associations, medical societies, and other professional organizations. This group would be comprised solely of Members of Congress. Senators KEATING and JAVITS and Representative JOHN V. LINDSAY, of New York, three of the most vocal spokesmen for congressional conflict-of-interest regulation, have proposed the creation of a Joint House-Senate Committee on Ethics during the past three Congresses. Under the Javits-Keating-Lindsay proposal, a Joint Congressional Committee on Ethics would be established within the Congress to make a study of conflict of interest problems. The Rules Committee of the House and the Senate, respectively, would be given duties similar to those of a grievance or ethics committee of a professional organization, such as a bar association. This committee would be granted authority to give advisory opinions to the Members on conflict of interest questions and to issue public interpretative opinions for the guidance of Members either on request or on its own initiative. In addition to having a group provide general guidelines for action, machinery would be established for resolving specific congressional conflict-of-interest problems.

Same standards for executive and legislative branches

One of the remaining major proposals calls for extension of the present conflicts laws, which apply only to the executive branch, to Members of Congress. The underlying theme of this view was expressed by former Senator John A. Carroll, of Colorado, in the 1962 Senate report on House Resolution 8140, proposing legislation to strengthen the criminal laws relating to bribery, graft, and conflicts of interest. Senator Carroll stated: "There can be no double standard. The high standard of conduct that we in the legislative branch expect of the executive branch must be equally applied to ourselves."[54]

These proposals provide for extending the coverage of sections 205, 207, 208, and 209 of title 18 of the United States Code to Members of Congress.[55] Such an equal treatment approach fails to take into account the special role and status of the legislator. As discussed earlier, the congressional problem differs from that of the executive in fundamental respects. It is submitted that the Congressman's representative status makes a conflict-of-interest approach which is tailored to govern the conduct of officials in the executive branch unworkable both in theory and in practice. For example, extension of section 205's coverage to Members of Congress would have the bizarre result of forbidding U.S. solons from rendering gratuitous services before Federal agencies on behalf of their own constituents. Furthermore, such an approach defines congressional conflicts of interest solely in terms of a criminal statute whereby conviction may lead to imprisonment, fine, or disqualification from ever holding a Federal office, or various combinations of the three. The history of congressional conflict-of-interest regulation points to the inadequacy of embracing within the concept of criminality the classic conflicts situations wherein activities may appear evil on the surface but involve no real misconduct.

A SUGGESTED APPROACH

Who watches the watchers? It has been suggested many times that Congress cannot lift itself by its bootstraps and is unwilling to take any positive steps with regard to legislative conflicts of interest. In the long run, however, Congress cannot afford to follow a double standard of ethics or assume a holier-than-thou attitude if it expects to enjoy public confidence. Unless Congress takes steps to regulate its internal affairs in a reasonable and effective manner—and convinces the public it is doing so—it cannot hope to maintain its traditional role as proctor of the other two branches of Government. If its Members cannot agree on ethical standards for themselves, Congress thereby weakens its own image as arbiter of what is proper in the society at large.

The complexity and subtlety of conflicts-of-interest problems preclude a simple answer. While criminal sanctions are appropriate for easily delineated and proscribed behavior, such as bribery, blackmail, or dishonest election practices, the gray and shadowy areas of legislative ethics militate against broad and sweeping legislation as the proper solution. In a system of government characterized by dual loyalties with a full spectrum of competing interests of the legislator and the public, codification of abstract moral principles is surely not the answer. Furthermore, pitting glib general standards of official behavior against the elements of a concrete conflicts problem rarely produces any assistance in evaluating the problem.[56] The evolution of a situational or case-by-case approach, therefore, seems to be the proper method of defining and resolving conflicts situations. In addition, any long-range solution to the problem must provide continuing machinery for defining, preventing, exposing and, where appropriate, punishing congressional conduct which falls below the designated standard.

The main impediment to regulation has been the unwillingness of the policeman to police himself. Representative OMAR BURLESON, of Texas, chairman of the House Administration Committee, stated that he is willing to let his committee act on congressional ethics bills "when the House desires. So far the leadership has indicated no strong interest (to do so)."[57] However, a significant step in regulating its internal conflicts problems was taken in the Senate in its adoption of a resolution sponsored by Senator JOHN SHERMAN COOPER, of Kentucky, which creates a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct, to be composed of Members, three from each of the political parties, to be appointed by the President of the Senate. This bipartisan committee is authorized to receive complaints of unethical conduct of Members, officers, or employees of the Senate, make investigations of allegations of such conduct, propose rules and regulations, and make recommendations to the Senate regarding disciplinary action.

The establishment of a bipartisan watchdog committee, without anything more, leaves much to be desired. While commending the select committee as a "useful device," a New York Times editorial went on to criticize such a measure as being clearly inadequate:

"It is unlikely to put a stop to either disquieting suspicions or actual malpractices, for it would be investigating matters brought to its attention, which is like locking the barn door after the horse has been stolen."[58]

The creation of a bipartisan investigating committee will take on real significance only when Congress is provided with the means by which it might operate effectively. In this connection, it is submitted that the legislative approach to conflicts of interest situations sponsored jointly by Senators JAVITS and KEATING and Representative LINDSAY is one that deserves full and serious consideration by the Congress. The Javits-Keating-Lindsay proposal employs the following three-step approach: (1) Creation of a Joint House-Senate Committee on Ethics to investigate and recommend a specific code of ethics for the Congress; (2) adoption of an interim code of ethics and system of disclosure of financial interests which would be in force during the joint committee's study; and (3) a grant of authority to the House and Senate Committees on Rules and Administration, respectively, to receive complaints and issue advisory opinions to Members of Congress on conflict-of-interest problems. In addition, these legislators cosponsored a companion bill which would require that communications between Members of Congress or their staffs and regulatory agencies be made part of the public record of the cases to which they refer.

The main Javits-Keating-Lindsay proposal, which was discussed earlier, contemplates both the formulation and execution of ethical standards by the Congress itself, with no outside intervention. The Joint Committee on Ethics would be entirely composed of Representatives and Senators, with seven members appointed by the President of the Senate and seven chosen by the Speaker of the House. The committee would study to what extent existing conflict-of-interest laws or regulations applicable to the legislative branch should be strengthened and recommend a comprehensive code of ethics covering a wide range of ethical problems ranging from outside employment to use of confidential information for personal advantage. In order to prevent establishment of the committee as a mere stalling device, it is suggested that a 6-month deadline be given within which the committee must submit its report and recommendations.

The second part of the proposal, an interim code of ethics, establishes in general terms the standards of conduct reasonably to be expected of Members of Congress. The main and all-embracing standard in the interim code provides:

"No Member of Congress, or officer or employee of the legislative branch should have any interest, financial or otherwise, direct or indirect or engage in any business transaction, or professional activity or incur any obligation of any nature whether financial or moral, which is in substantial conflict with the proper discharge of his duties in the public interest; nor should any Member of Congress, officer or employee of the legislative branch give substantial and reasonable cause to the public to believe that he is acting in breach of the public trust."[59]

In addition to this general rule, several standards are set forth with regard to certain specified situations, such as confidential information and outside employment. Although these broadly stated standards provide no definitive assistance to the judgment process in individual situations, they do serve the purpose of stating in advance both to the Member of Congress and the public what is acceptable behavior, as well as providing standards by which the appropriate congressional committee may be guided in the exploration of a particular case before it.

In addition to the enunciation of a code of ethics to guide congressional behavior, the interim proposal requires disclosure of Members' financial interests having a value of $5,000 or more[60] in any activity subject to the jurisdiction of a regulatory agency. As mentioned earlier, such statements would set forth this interest in such reasonable detail and in accordance with regulations as prescribed by the Comptroller General. While such disclosures would be filed with the Comptroller General, consideration should also be given to disclosure proposals which call for filing such reports with the Secretary of the Senate and the House, respectively. However, the designation of a depository for such statements is only incidental to the requirement that all such statements shall be available for public inspection. This proposal represents a middle ground between proposals discussed earlier, ranging from the detailed reporting requirements advocated by Representative GREEN of all sources of income and gifts of more than $100, to the less onerous but more general disclosure recommended by the Senate Rules and Administration Committee.[61] Public disclosure, as long as the extent of reporting required is sufficiently extensive to cover those circumstances from which a conflict of interest might be inferred, is an important step in fostering public confidence in the integrity of Congress as an institution. This remedy avoids the extreme solution of outlawing all outside sources of income, dealings in stock, and receipt of fees for any reason. Thus, a Member of Congress would be allowed to receive any type of income or incur any financial obligation which he is willing to justify.

---

[54] S. Rept. No. 2213, 87th Cong., 2d sess. 16 (1962).

[55] The House passed H.R. 11049 on June 11, 1964, and the Senate passed an amended version of this legislation on July 2, 1964.

[56] Eisenberg, supra, note 9 at 669.

[57] "House Tackles Problem of Congressional Ethics," Roll Call, May 1, 1963, p. 2.

[58] "Code for Congress," editorial, New York Times, July 27, 1964.

[59] S. Con. Res. 5, 88th Cong., 1st sess., sec. 6(a).

[60] Statement of Senator JAVITS, hearings before the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, U.S. Senate, 88th Cong., 1st and 2d sessions, "Financial or Business Interests of Officers or Employees of the Senate," pt. 22, p. 1905 (May 26, 1964).

Another type of disclosure is contained in the companion bill which would require all communications between Members of Congress or their staffs and regulatory agencies be made part of the public record of the cases to which they refer. Such a proposal was advocated by the late President Kennedy, in his message to the Congress on April 27, 1961, in which he stated that some of the most spectacular examples of official misconduct have involved ex parte communication. By requiring that congressional intervention in any case under deliberation by an administrative agency be reduced to writing for the record, a simple answer is provided to the question of legitimate versus illegitimate influence by Members of Congress on administrative decisionmaking.

An important part of any comprehensive conflicts of interest proposal is that in addition to the promulgation of an interim code of ethics, effective machinery is provided for investigating and resolving specific congressional conflicts of problems as soon as the situation arises. The Javits-Keating-Lindsay proposal authorizes the Rules and Administration Committees of the Senate and House, respectively, to perform duties similar to those of grievance or ethics committees of bar associations, medical societies, and other professional organizations. It would have authority to receive complaints and to issue public interpretative opinions for the guidance of Members either on request or on its own initiative. Consideration should also be given to the alternative of vesting such power in a bipartisan Select Committee on Ethics, similar in composition to the one recently created by the Senate. Unlike the Rules and Administration Committees of the House and Senate which are assigned a number of important housekeeping functions, a special committee would be able to devote its full and undivided time to the task of defining, preventing, exposing and punishing improper congressional conduct.

Finally, since the problems of conflict of interest cut across the entire fabric of the American political and constitutional tradition, any major reform would necessarily include a complete reevaluation and revision of present campaign contribution and spending laws. Such a study would have to come to grips with the problem of which campaign contributions are properly acceptable and which are not. Politics is not classified as philanthropy for tax purposes and as a result the main sources of campaign contributions are from well-heeled lobbying groups and individuals who frequently look upon their contribution as an investment. Proposals for reform meriting serious consideration include providing tax deductions for political contributions of up to $100 and the placing of a ceiling upon the amount that any one individual or group may contribute. Furthermore, until the time that a Member of Congress can live on his salary, he will be forced to look to outside earning possibilities and contributions from lobbying groups. An encouraging step in attacking this problem, which is one of the main sources of congressional conflicts situations, was the passage of legislation this session raising the annual salaries of Members of Congress to $30,000.

The Douglas report stated: "The standards of the public will be raised if leaders in public life practice vigorous integrity. They will be lowered if these leaders are lax in their personal or official behavior."[62] It should be added that the standards of the leaders will be raised if the public both practices vigorous integrity and demands the highest standards of ethical behavior.

RECESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is the intention of the leadership to move that the Senate stand in recess until 2 o'clock p.m., but I would hope that before that motion is made the attachés of the Senate would notify Senators on both sides of the aisle that there will be a yea-and-nay vote at 4 o'clock p.m. on the constitutional amendment which was passed yesterday, and that when the Senate returns, even though the tariff bill will be the pending business, there will be an opportunity for discussion prior to the time of the vote.

Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 2 o'clock p.m., this afternoon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 5 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess until 2 o'clock p.m., the same day.

At 2 o'clock p.m., the Senate reassembled, when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. KUCHEL in the chair).

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 1082) to establish in the Treasury a correctional industries fund for the government of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H.R. 5871. An act to amend section 11 of the act of April 1, 1942, in order to modify the retirement benefits of the judges of the District of Columbia court of general sessions, the District of Columbia court of appeals, and the juvenile court of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 6233. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain land of the United States to the Pascua Yaqui Association, Inc.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 1927) to amend title 38, United States Code, to revise the pension program for veterans of World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict, and their widows and children, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. TEAGUE of Texas, Mr. DORN, Mr. HALEY, Mr. BARING, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. AYRES, Mr. ADAIR, and Mr. SAYLOR were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H.R. 1851) for the relief of Chester A. Brothers and Anna Brothers, his wife, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

CORRECTION OF CERTAIN ERRORS IN THE TARIFF SCHEDULES OF THE UNITED STATES

The Senate resumed the consideration of H.R. 12253, an act to correct certain errors in the tariff schedules of the United States.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. INOUYE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

SENATOR McNAMARA'S POSITION ON PROGRAM OF HOSPITAL INSURANCE FOR THE ELDERLY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the fanatic opposition of the "medicrats" of the American Medical Association to a program of hospital insurance for the elderly reached an absolute bottom last Friday.

Dr. Edward R. Annis, chief propagandist for the AMA, appeared on NBC television's "Today" show.

During the course of being interviewed, Dr. Annis suddenly launched into a vicious personal attack on the motives and integrity of the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan, PAT McNAMARA. By implication, Dr. Annis extended his rusty scalpel to include those of us who have the privilege of serving with PAT McNAMARA on the Subcommittee on Health of the Elderly of the Special Committee on Aging.

In his usual glib and phony fashion, Dr. Annis was unctuously singing the praises of the Kerr-Mills program and private health insurance, claiming that these approaches rendered a social security plan unnecessary. The interviewer on the program upset Dr. Annis' composure through rebuttal based upon reports of the Subcommittee on Health of the Elderly. At that point, Dr. Annis lashed out with this statement:

---

[61] See note 4, supra.

[62] Douglas report, 7.

> I could have written Senator McNamara's report before he ever had his committee action. No one is ever surprised with what he finds. He knows ahead of time what he's going to report. He's been doing this for a number of years.

Mr. President, seven Senators signed the last two reports of the Subcommittee on Health of the Elderly in addition to Pat McNamara. I am proud to have been one of those seven.

Anyone with a moderately "open mind" who has read those reports realizes the validity of their conclusions. Anyone who has read those reports is aware of the enormous documentation and factual material included in those studies which made the findings of the subcommittee valid and inevitable.

With regard to the Kerr-Mills program, we found it inadequate, inequitable, and inappropriate as the major Federal answer to the health care financing problems of the elderly. Dr. Annis, unable to face these hard facts, or deny them, resorts to vilification of Senator McNamara.

But listen to what the Republican chairman of Iowa's State Board of Social Welfare, who is also chairman of the State senate's appropriations committee, had to say about public assistance health care financing. Senator Lawrence Putney told the Iowa State Medical Society:

> We in the department of social welfare, are concerned over the fact that many persons are receiving old age assistance today almost entirely because of their medical care needs. In other words, were it not for medical care bills, these aged would be self-supporting.
>
> I wonder how many Americans feel that it is a sound practice to force a person to go on public relief in order to receive medical care. It seems to me that this is unsound in theory and is not in accordance with American tradition.

I wonder what Dr. Annis will say about Senator Putney?

Our last report, thoroughly documented the inability of private health insurance to meet the needs of the elderly. Dr. Annis' hackles rose over our daring to challenge another section of the AMA's dogma. But, listen to what Iowa has to say about the adequacy of private health insurance:

> Many of those approved for MAA (42.2 percent) stated that they have some form of health insurance. Evidently most policies did not adequately cover medical expenses as only 8.8 percent said their medical bills were paid primarily from this source.

We in the Senate know Pat McNamara. He is not given to phoneying official documents of this body. I suppose it is an old tactic to ascribe your own base motives and methods to your opponents. This would appear to be the case in view of the absolute falsity of Dr. Annis' poisonous assault on a great Senator.

The Annis attack on Pat McNamara and his subcommittee is nothing less than an expression of contempt for all the Members of the Senate. It is a direct attack on the integrity and motives of a distinguished chairman and the members of his committee.

The Senate has indicated, in approving a medicare bill, its readiness to face facts and to do what is necessary. We passed the medicare bill despite the distortions and malevolence of the AMA lobby. The same distortions and malevolence evidenced in the unprincipled "know nothing" vitriol unleased on Pat McNamara.

The Senate recognized its obligation to act in behalf of our older people. I trust that the members of the conference will also recognize their duty. We cannot let Dr. Annis and his cohorts dictate to the U.S. Congress.

Dr. Annis and his ilk in the American Medical Association have time and time again demonstrated a lack of social conscience, and time and time again have made it perfectly clear that they wish to continue to foist upon the suffering old people of this country their profit dollars, placing the dollar sign above the great ethics of what should be a noble profession—and many of our doctors are noblemen. But, Mr. President, that does not include the propagandists within the American Medical Association who wish to capitalize upon human suffering. The medical profession should never have opened its doors to their interests in the first place. But let the profiteers in the American Medical Association who wish to make huge profits out of human suffering recognize that the day is coming when the American people will take their reckoning. The American people will make clear to the American medical profession that only those with a social conscience have any right to remain in it, and only those with a social conscience can serve the health needs of this country.

I say to the doctors of this country, "This is an issue on which you are going to lose, because the social welfare of the American people inevitably will win. You can have all the lying propagandists and all the vitriol mongers, such as your Dr. Annis and the rest of your political propagandists of the American Medical Association; but within the next few years the doctors of America will get their answer from an aroused American public opinion and we shall provide a medical care bill that will keep faith with the basic teaching of the Christian religion."

The attitude of those in the American medical profession who have demonstrated their lack of social conscience cannot be squared with Christian principles, and I care not for the hypocritical propaganda of men such as Dr. Annis. But this great Christian principle will finally prevail, and we shall proceed to be our brother's keeper. We shall proceed to carry out the teaching of the good Samaritan, and we shall stop the profiteers within the medical profession who work to put the dollar above their clear moral obligation to serve humanity through the medical profession.

Doctors who talk about socialized medicine as a great scarecrow to frighten the American people are the recipients, to a greater extent than any other profession in this country, of the largesse of the American taxpayer.

We hear doctors talk about what it has cost them to obtain their medical education. They are the recipients of one great subsidy after another supplied by the American taxpayer. Who builds the hospitals? Who provides for the great assistance that the medical profession gets so that it can even practice medicine? The American taxpayer.

We pass one bill after another for the aid of the medical profession by way of our bills providing for the construction of hospital facilities and various other bills related to health that are naught but huge grants of millions of dollars of the American taxpayers as a subsidy to the American medical profession.

Within the American medical profession are those with an avarice without any limit who wish to take out of human suffering bodies the last penny that they can exact by way of profit.

It is regrettable that we have doctors of that type. I feel sorry for them. Most of them are down to their last five Cadillacs. But they have picked this fight, and the American people will finish it. When they finish it, they will finish it by bringing the medical profession under the reasonable regulations that it needs to be brought under, and we shall start with the passage of a medicare bill within the next few years. We ought to do it before the present session adjourns; but certainly within the next few years we ought to pass a bill which would bring some hope and encouragement to the elderly. Over the rooftops of our elderly people hovers a constant fear that what little life savings they have been able to gather can be swept away by one serious illness. Yet we have a man such as Dr. Annis who calls himself a doctor, but by calling himself a doctor, in my judgment, he does not bring credit upon the title when he engages in the kind of attack that he engaged in in his attack upon Pat McNamara.

I rise to defend this great Senator and personal friend of mine. I say to Dr. Annis that I can give him back everything that he wishes to pour out, because I am right and he is wrong, and that makes all the difference in the world.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Record the shocking, disgraceful, and uncalled for attack by Dr. Annis on the "Today" show.

There being no objection, the excerpt of the transcript was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Excerpt From the "Today" Show, Station WRC–TV and NBC–TV Network, September 25, 1964, 7 a.m., Washington, D.C.

(Note.—Dr. Edward R. Annis, immediate past president of the American Medical Association was interviewed by Herb Kaplow in Washington. Various aspects of the medicare bill were discussed, and the following was heard in part.)

Kaplow. On the other side, we have the fact, what they claim—the supporters of the King-Anderson and its refinement—that while there is an increase in the number of people making use of various health insurance plans, that the elderly people are not in this group by and large.

Annis. They are in error——

Kaplow. Or they're not getting adequate health protection.

Annis. Well you see these have been the statements they've been making for a long period of time without bothering to check the record. But the record presented before the Ways and Means Committee of the House, the testimony presented there by the health insurance industry of this Nation shows and can document the truth of what I just stated to you.

Kaplow. Well now, did not the McNamara committee, which looked into this, come up with figures which would seem to support those favoring the——

Annis. I could have written Senator McNamara's report before he ever had his committee action. No one is ever surprised with what he finds. He knows ahead of time what he's going to report. He's been doing this for a number of years. I'm asking you to look at the records before the Ways and Means Committee of the House——

Kaplow. Senator McNamara might vouch for the authenticity of his own committee, and you have as head of the Ways and Means Committee, Wilbur Mills, who at least to this point, is opposed to the medicare.

Annis. The only thing I can tell you is that when McNamara's report came out a year ago that the overall chairman of the committee decried the negative character of the report. All we say is this, right today, we have programs in this Nation, to see that no one is denied medical care, because of inability to pay—old or young. And we think that a responsible administration will work with the medical profession to see to it that senior citizens who need medical care, or junior citizens, are given all of that care, already available to them, that many people don't ask for because they don't even know that these programs exist.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. There is no man of greater integrity or honesty in this body than the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNamara]. He is an unusual man. We always know where Pat McNamara stands; and when he makes a statement, it is almost always, if not always, backed by facts.

I am delighted to have this opportunity to state publicly my high esteem for the Senator from Michigan, who has represented his State so well, who has done so much for the Nation, and who has sought out of the kindness of his heart and on the basis of his most responsible position to do what he could to bring about a better era for our elderly citizens.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. HART. It was not until I came to the floor of the Senate a few minutes ago that I learned of the comments that Dr. Annis had made concerning my distinguished senior colleague. In the brief moment that I have had opportunity, I have seen some of the excerpts from the "Today" show as were reported by the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse]. I am grateful to both the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse] and our majority leader, the Senator from Montana [Mr. Mansfield], that they should have so promptly, publicly, and effectively made reply. I suppose that it would be expected that the junior Senator would rise to the defense of his senior colleague, whatever his true feeling might be. I wish that were not the assumption, because in truth I would like to hope I would not do so if I felt that any colleague was in error.

I rise because of a deep conviction which developed long before I came to the Senate and was permitted to sit with my colleague [Mr. McNamara] that few men in public life are more forthright in their statements of opinion and position and more sincere in their conviction behind the statement than Pat McNamara. As the Record will clearly show, my colleague and I on occasions have differed. In a few instances we have differed on major legislative proposals.

I know Pat McNamara a great deal better than Dr. Annis knows him. It has never crossed my mind on occasions when we have differed that Senator McNamara had any motives other than to seek what he believed to be the right answer. Sometimes some of those questions are so complex that only time will give us the absolutely correct answer, if it is ever reached.

No Member of this body is more concerned about correctly resolving any public question than is my senior colleague; and, having reached a conclusion, no one is more willing clearly to state it and fight for it.

Parenthetically, on the matter of medical care for elderly citizens, it has sometimes been said that those who support this cause do so in search of votes. For those who do not know Pat McNamara as I do, let me make clear that many years ago, when I was still in college, and when medical care for older people was only a little cloud on a horizon few thought we would ever reach, Pat McNamara, in the early 1930's, was chairman of a committee seeking to achieve that objective. There were no votes involved then. It was a thankless undertaking. I am delighted that he has been given the years to see the day when we are about to attain that objective.

I regret very much that, on a national television show, the implication should have been voiced which suggested that the motivation was anything other than decent and right.

I thank the Senator from Oregon for bringing this matter to our attention.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator very much.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNamara in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

CORRECTION OF CERTAIN ERRORS IN THE TARIFF SCHEDULES OF THE UNITED STATES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 12253), to correct certain errors in the tariff schedules of the United States.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business is H.R. 12253, a bill to correct certain errors in the tariff schedules of the United States.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION RELATING TO THE SUCCESSION TO PRESIDENCY AND VICE-PRESIDENCY

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 139) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the succession to the Presidency and Vice-Presidency and to cases where the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I wish to address myself briefly to Senate Joint Resolution 139, which was passed yesterday. It has to do with a proposed constitutional amendment.

Earlier today I made the suggestion that I would make a motion to reconsider the vote by which the joint resolution was passed yesterday. Thereupon, in colloquy with the senior Senator from Montana, it was agreed by unanimous consent that the joint resolution would be recalled and placed on the calendar and then would be taken up today; further, that there would be a yea-and-nay vote on it at 4 p.m. today.

I address myself briefly to the matters that prompted me to make the motion to reconsider; but really the point that I had in mind has been attained by having reached an agreement on a yea-and-nay vote on Senate Joint Resolution 139.

Nevertheless, I believe some matters ought to be covered. First I wish to make it clear that the steps I am taking here today are prompted solely by the desire to have a record made of this consideration, particularly to have a yea-and-nay vote on the proposal. I in no way intend to find fault with any Senator's action, or to blame any Senator. No one is to blame for anything—especially not the majority leader, the minority leader, or the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Bayh], who so ably handled the joint resolution on the floor. I also thank the Senator from Indiana for his fine attitude toward reconsideration of the joint resolution.

Yesterday, the joint resolution, a highly important measure, passed the Senate without a yea-and-nay vote, although there was an able discussion of the measure. The newspapers this morning reported that only nine Senators were in the Chamber when the measure was passed. Frankly, as a practical matter, so small an attendance would give any proposed amendment to the Constitution a "limping start" toward final passage in the other body and approval by the States of the United States. It would be much better that a measure of such great worth—and this one has great worth—should start by having the express approval of two-thirds of a quorum of the Senate. I do not question the fact that under a strict interpretation of Senate precedents, the amendment was legally passed yesterday. But I believe the whole tenor and spirit of the Constitution of the United States require that a proposal of this nature should have the RECORD show affirmatively that a quorum was actually present at that time and passed on the measure. I know the precedents do not require that, and I am not questioning that the action taken yesterday will be reconsidered, but I believe the Senate should adopt a pattern of procedure with reference to passing upon amendments to the Constitution. Article 5 of the U.S. Constitution provides:

> The Congress, whenever two-thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose amendments to this Constitution.

That calls for an affirmative expression. It has been held, and properly, I believe, that the two-thirds requirement does not mean two-thirds of the entire membership, but rather two-thirds of a quorum present and voting on the measure.

I have before me a case decided in 1920, in which the express point was before the Supreme Court for decision. I refer to the National Prohibition Cases, reported in 253 U.S. 350. In passing on a question of a constitutional proposal, the Supreme Court, at page 386, said:

> The two-thirds vote in each House which is required in proposing an amendment is a vote of two-thirds of the Members present—assuming the presence of a quorum—and not a vote of two-thirds of the entire membership present and absent.

The Court then cited another case, decided 2 or 3 years earlier. The Court said that the two-thirds vote required assumed the presence of a quorum. So far as the RECORD goes, I am sure that if it were shown that the Senate had a quorum early in the day, and unless that quorum were shown to have been broken, it would be presumed to have continued. But that still falls short of affirmative proof that two-thirds of a quorum—not of the membership—actually passed on this question.

Further, to carry out the spirit of the constitutional provision with reference to amending the Constitution, it would be well for the Senate to adopt a rule, or if not a rule, a practice, to provide affirmatively that there shall be a yea-and-nay vote, to show positively the number of Senators comprising the quorum who favored the proposal, and which ones they were, so that the positions they held with reference to the proposal would be known.

A few years ago, the Senate had fallen into the habit of approving treaties by a voice vote, although the Constitution requires the approval of two-thirds of a quorum. Sometimes only two or three Senators would be in the Chamber. As I recall, the Senate amended its rules so as to require a yea-and-nay vote. I have not verified that, but I know that the Senate had dropped into a habit of not having yea-and-nay votes on the approval of treaties. However, I believe the rule was changed. Certainly if a treaty, however small, is worthy of a yea-and-nay vote, a proposal by this august body to the States of the United States that a constitutional amendment be adopted should be subject to a yea-and-nay vote. I shall examine further into this question to see if a satisfactory solution can be reached.

Since I have raised this point, I shall speak for a moment on the merits of the proposed amendment itself. I commend the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH] for the excellent work he has done on it this year. He has been diligent and industrious. He has shown a deep understanding of the problem. I remember a conference I had with him at the first of the year in which we discussed the major problem, the selection of a Vice President in the event that office became vacant. The Senator from Indiana presented the case for the amendment yesterday.

I did not hear him then, because I did not know that it was his intention to speak on the subject and had understood that there would not be a vote, even though the joint resolution would be taken up.

But to return to the merits of the amendment, I believe that the committee selected the best way of dealing with the problem of a vacancy in the office of Vice President of the United States when, for any reason, the office of the Vice Presidency becomes vacant. Many different plans were proposed. All were weighed, considered, and discussed. In my opinion, the best and most practical plan was adopted. That lends importance, too, to the weight of this amendment and the gravity of not passing it except by a two-thirds rollcall vote of a quorum.

The amendment proposes the creation of a new way of selecting the person who may become President of the United States. That in itself is a tremendous step and carries with it all the gravity, solemnity, and seriousness that any legislation could possibly have. The subject resolution presents a satisfactory solution, as nearly as can be done. It provides that the President may select a Vice President, subject to the approval of a majority vote of the two branches of Congress. That in itself is major legislation of the gravest kind. Not only does it remedy a deficiency in the Constitution, but it relates to the most momentous single event that occurs in the Nation every 4 years. We pray, of course, that the question of presidential succession may not arise again.

In addition, the amendment provides for the creation of a body that would be called to pass upon the ability or disability of one who had already been elected to the office of President of the United States. The question of removing him from office, in the event of disability, without his consent and judgment is a tremendous responsibility. So the committee has also taken an important step forward in this respect.

I am glad to join in commending this particular joint resolution. I am also glad, indeed, that the committee has worked it out and has presented it, because it is necessary for the soundness of our Government. However, I wish to get it off to as good a start as possible with a yea-and-nay vote, perhaps with no votes against it, but certainly to get it off to a good start, and an understanding before the people, which would lend strength to it.

I hope that the vote on the joint resolution will establish a precedent with reference to passing on all future constitutional proposals—whether I may or may not favor them. That has nothing to do with it.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALTERS in the chair). Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. BAYH. I thank the Senator from Mississippi for bringing this question of the need to establish a precedent to the attention of the Senate. I join him in the hope that it will be established by this vote.

The Senator—and, indeed, other Senators—are aware of the efforts which the committee made, very early in the deliberations, to acquaint each Senator with all the facts and what went on in the deliberations. The subcommittee held extensive hearings. The committee discussed the issue at some length. The chief counsel of the subcommittee distributed to each Senator vast quantities of information, so that he could have at his disposal the complete information concerning what the subcommittee felt was a most important subject.

As the Senator pointed out, the precedent which was followed yesterday was according to that which had been established previously. The leadership and I have acted in the best of faith. There was a quorum call of an hour and a half to two hours, prior to the deliberations on this question.

Frankly, I am quick to admit that if I had my choice, I would much prefer the system which we shall follow this afternoon. However, in this colloquy, we should also include, perhaps, a bit of admonition to each of us as Senators, that we should make an effort to help the leadership carry on the burdens of leadership in its drive to close down deliberations for this session. It is faced with a gigantic task, trying to wind up the odds and ends. Some of these odds and ends, of course, are serious pieces of proposed legislation. One of the things which increases the difficulty of its task is the fact that it is almost impossible, at times, to obtain a quorum—although we did get a quorum yesterday prior to the deliberations on the proposed legislation.

For the RECORD, let me say to the Senator, in case he did not know it, that we went to some lengths, including two long-distance telephone calls to Senators who had earlier expressed opposition, and we proceeded to follow the pattern which had been followed before, to obtain the consent of those two Senators to going ahead and proceeding without them, and the promise that they would voice no objection.

I should like to raise my voice and admit that I have been one of the transgressors, from time to time, and have not been in the Chamber because I have been engaged in other deliberations.

In closing, let me point out that, perhaps, when we are closer to the vote this afternoon, I should like to make a quick summary of the issue. Speaking to the point the Senator from Mississippi has so aptly raised, it would behoove each of us in this body to be a little more diligent about what is on the calendar, to be a little more diligent about being in the Chamber and helping the leadership to maintain a quorum so that we can go ahead and transact the business of the Senate, so that Senators can go about the business which so many of us have in our own constituencies.

Mr. STENNIS. If I may interrupt the Senator, I agree with him on the great burden the leadership carries. In ordinary times, it is heavy enough, but now, toward the close of the session, it is even heavier. I am compelled to say, in this case, in view of the Senator's remarks, however, that I inquired yesterday of the Senate aids about the vote, and they told me there would be no vote. Theoretically, I know that that is not enough, and that a Senator is supposed to be in the Chamber. This is an illustration of what we are up against. I was in my office yesterday until 11 o'clock last night, as is the Senator from Indiana frequently, I know. But, I have no complaint. I merely want to make the Record clear.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield once more?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. BAYH. I believe the leadership acted in good faith, through my office, and through one of the aids on the floor, in going to some trouble to contact Senators who had voiced objection. I believe that they will agree, and I will agree with the Senator from Mississippi, on a matter of this importance. I am glad to have the Record show the vote. I wish to see each Senator's vote recorded, I hope favorably; nevertheless, I wish each Senator to have his right to dissent.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, this morning, the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Stennis] suggested that it would be appropriate and, in fact, constitutional for a quorum of the Senate to vote, by recorded vote, upon this important proposed constitutional amendment. I supported him in his statement and in his request.

I did so because I believe that his suggestion is proper and carries great force. The proposed constitutional amendment before us is of such importance that even if there were no constitutional question relating to the necessity of a quorum, it should be voted upon at minimum by 51 Senators who would make up a quorum.

I suggested this morning—and repeat the suggestion again—that the record vote would carry great weight in the House, and in the legislatures of the States which, according to our constitutional process, provided for by article V of the Constitution, must ratify the proposed amendment by the approval of three-fourths of the State legislatures. A recorded vote by a quorum of the Senate, and I hope by as full as attendance of all Members as is possible, will also give proof to the people of our country of our belief in the necessity of this resolution, for the people's support is of most importance.

The Senator from Mississippi has rendered a service to the Senate and to the country. His objective is achieved now that a record vote is required for a quorum will be necessary to obtain a vote upon the proposed amendment.

The majority leader, the Senator from Montana [Mr. Mansfield], recognized the importance of his request and joined the Senator from Mississippi this morning in securing reconsideration of yesterdays voice vote.

I do not in any way derogate the importance of the proposed constitutional amendment by making this statement. In fact my purpose is, with that of the Senator from Mississippi, to indicate its great importance, and the necessity that it carry with it the strength and the support which a vote of 51 or more Senators will accord it when it is considered by the House, and I hope favorably by the legislatures of the States.

I also congratulate the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Bayh].

It was his creative idea, his initiative, and his force which brought the proposed constitutional amendment to the floor of the Senate—and I hope adoption and approval by the States.

His achievement is a tribute to his ability and statesmanship. It is a service to the country, which will be long remembered. At his request, I was happy to be a cosponsor of this resolution.

Its very importance, as the Senator from Mississippi has stated, and in whose statement I concur and I believe the Senator from Indiana will also concur, requires that it have the full support, and recorded support, of at least a quorum of the Senate.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Kentucky for his kind remarks.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for his patience and cooperation in yielding to me again. I thank the Senator from Kentucky, who knows that we discussed this subject privately. I concur with him and with the Senator from Mississippi.

As I stated a moment ago, we should put the vote on the record. A matter of this importance, any constitutional amendment, but particularly this one that deals with the ready transfer of the Presidency should be placed on the record. We hope we shall never have to use it. Nevertheless, it should be available for the safety and welfare of the country.

I thank the Senator from Kentucky and the Senator from Mississippi for lending their voices in support of this particular piece of legislation. They are extremely able attorneys. As a freshman Member of the Senate, it is very comforting and rewarding to me to have their support. I particularly thank the Senator for cosponsoring this measure. Putting the name "Cooper" on the resolution is like putting the name "sterling" on silver. I appreciate it very much.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I have prepared some brief remarks. I do not wish to detain the Senate by reading them. I ask unanimous consent that they may be printed at this point in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The statement of Mr. Stennis is as follows:

As the Record for this date will reflect, I have previously moved to reconsider the vote by which Senate Joint Resolution 139 was passed by the Senate on September 28, 1964. The Record will likewise reflect my reasons for making this motion, but I want to briefly expand on these remarks at this time.

My desire to reconsider this vote was certainly not based on any objection to the merits of the resolution. To the contrary, I believe it absolutely necessary that the records of the Senate affirmatively show that Senate Joint Resolution 139 has the support of an overwhelming majority of the Members of the Senate. Not in the tenure of the office of the Senator from Mississippi has a more important measure been before the Senate. It is one which should be passed by the Congress and ratified by the States without undue delay.

As all Members of the Senate know, the purpose of Senate Joint Resolution 139 is twofold: (1) to provide a method to fill the office of the vice presidency in the event of a vacancy in that office; and (2) to provide a positive means of determining, in any event, if the President is unable to perform the duties and responsibilities of his office. This measure is of such great importance to our Nation that, in my opinion, the records should reflect that it has the approval of at least two-thirds of the Members of this body. Yet, an examination of the Senate proceedings on September 28, 1964, when this measure was passed, does not reflect that a quorum was present, nor was there a record vote to positively establish the fact that this resolution was adopted in accordance with the requirements of article V of the Constitution.

While the Record reflects that a quorum was present at the time of the convening of the Senate yesterday, there was nothing to indicate whether a quorum was present at the time of the consideration and vote on this resolution. Although the absence of a quorum was suggested immediately prior to the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 139, proceedings under the quorum call were dispensed with and the Record does not reflect that a quorum was present. I respectfully suggest that on a matter of such great importance as determining who shall exercise the powers of the Presidency, it is incumbent on the Senate to conduct its proceedings in such a manner as to affirmatively show the presence of a quorum. I do not question the fact that, under a strict interpretation of the rules of the Senate, there was no infraction, although there is judicial precedence that a quorum should be present in any proceeding under article V of the Constitution. In a series of cases in which the Supreme Court rendered a collective opinion, the Court was called upon to interpret article V as to whether an absolute two-thirds majority of each House of the Congress is required to propose a constitutional amendment, and the Court stated: "The two-thirds vote in each House which is required in proposing an amendment is a vote of two-thirds of the Members present—assuming the presence of a quorum—and not a vote of two-thirds of the entire membership, present and absent."

The Court made this statement in the *National Prohibition Cases,* 253 U.S. 350 (1920) at page 386.

I repeat for emphasis that the Court stated that a two-thirds vote of the Members present "assuming the presence of a quorum" is required to propose a constitutional amendment. The Court does recognize the importance, and, in effect, the necessity of a quorum being present in Congress during the consideration of an amendment.

It is abundantly clear that the spirit, even the letter, of the Constitution demands that a quorum be present in both the House and Senate when a constitutional amendment is approved. I believe it is the duty of each House to proceed in such a manner that the Record will reflect the presence of a quorum in such circumstances.

I further believe that in all matters of such importance the Senate should record its support by means of a yea-and-nay vote. Such proceedings will lend weight and significance to any amendment thus approved. It is for this reason that I, not only move for the reconsideration of Senate Joint Resolution 139, but also request the yea-and-nay vote on the question of its final passage.

Although I do not intend to comment in detail on the merits and substantive provisions of Senate Joint Resolution 139, I do want to show for the Record my recognition of the great importance of this measure and my support. As I previously stated, the two basic purposes of this resolution are to provide for a method of filling the office of the Vice Presidency in the event of a vacancy and to provide a method of affirmatively determining, in any given event, that the President is unable to carry out the duties of his office. I believe the provisions of Senate Joint Resolution 139 effectively resolve these two questions which have arisen on numerous occasions during the history of our Nation. It is fitting and proper that the President have the authority, with the consent of Congress, to determine who shall be the Vice President in the event of the death, resignation, or removal of the Vice President. The method proposed by Senate Joint Resolution 139 effectively satisfies these requirements. At the same time, it should be a function of the executive branch of government to determine when the Chief Executive is disabled or, for any reason, is unable to perform his duties. Again, however, Senate Joint Resolution 139 provides a system of checks and balances on this power of the Cabinet.

The third purpose of this resolution clarifies the question of whether a Vice President who assumes the powers of the Presidency in the event of the disability of the President actually becomes President or merely acts as President during the disability. This also is a very needed improvement in our constitutional provisions as they now exist.

I, therefore, strongly support the passage of Senate Joint Resolution 139. I again want to assure the majority leader and all Members of the Senate that my action in moving for reconsideration of this resolution was motivated by a sincere desire to strengthen the position of the Senate in adopting this resolution. As a result of this reconsideration the permanent Record will positively reflect the presence of the quorum and, I believe, the overwhelming support of the Senate.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS SUBJECT TO CALL OF THE CHAIR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair until not later than 3:45 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(At 3 o'clock and 16 minutes p.m., the Senate took a recess subject to the call of the Chair.)

At 3 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m., the Senate reassembled, when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. Talmadge in the chair).

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, prior to the recess we were discussing the issue which will be before the Senate for a formal vote at 4 o'clock; namely, Senate Joint Resolution 139.

Senate Joint Resolution 139 is designed to correct certain provisions in the Constitution relating to a continuity of executive power.

The problems which are dealt with by the joint resolution can be briefly stated as follows:

First, today, because of the tragedy that occurred in Dallas last November, we have no Vice President. Although there is not a soul in the Senate who will ever forget those tragic days, nevertheless, I wonder how many of us remember that this is the 16th time in the history of our country that we have had no Vice President. Indeed, over a total of more than 37 years the United States of America has not had a Vice President. We have had no Vice President 16 times. Eight Presidents died in office, seven Vice Presidents died in office, and one Vice President resigned.

Most of us are aware of the fact that over the past few years there has been a great development of the office of Vice President. Today the Vice Presidency is no longer a one-way ticket to oblivion, as it has been described by some of our Vice Presidents of the past. The Vice President has numerous tasks assigned to him.

First, the Vice President sits with the National Security Council. Second, he plays an important part in the area of space and aeronautics. Third, he is Chairman of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. In addition to these official jobs, I believe it is fair to say that the Vice President today is really our No. 1 ambassador.

Vice President Nixon, in the previous administration, traveled thousands of miles outside our country, twice as much as did President Eisenhower, carrying the good will and the flag of the United States. So it was with the present President of the United States, when, as Vice President, Mr. Johnson served in this capacity.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. BAYH. I am glad to yield to the distinguished senior Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. ERVIN. Will not the Senator from Indiana agree with me that it is a far cry from the day when a distinguished citizen of his State, Thomas Riley Marshall, served as Vice President?

Mr. BAYH. That is correct.

Mr. ERVIN. I feel certain that the Senator from Indiana will agree with the Senator from North Carolina that Thomas Riley Marshall, in his inimitable way, suggested the esteem in which the office of the Vice President used to be held in the old days, when he said, on one occasion, that there were two brothers, one of whom went to sea, and the other was elected Vice President, and neither of them was ever heard from again.

Mr. BAYH. Yes; that is a very famous tale. The Senator is correct. It is a far cry from those days, from the days depicted by that famous Hoosier, Thomas Marshall. Today, the Vice President is a full-time assistant to the President. He is one heartbeat away from the office of President. How important it is to have in that office one who can spend his full time in carrying out the duties of office that will best serve him in the event tragedy should strike the Nation again.

The second aspect of the problem is the one of disability. Three instances are called to mind when the executive authority of the United States has rested rather tenuously in the hands of a President who was seriously ill.

The first occasion was the assassination of President Garfield, when for 80 days President Garfield lay between life and death and signed only one extradition paper, at a time when many other problems were confronting the United States.

The second, and the one which has created a great deal of stir, because of the publication of a recent best selling book was the instance of the stroke suffered by President Wilson. President Wilson lay paralyzed and disabled for 16 months while such serious problems as the League of Nations confronted the country. He was unable, because of his affliction, to fulfill all the powers and duties of his office. More recently, we all remember the three serious illnesses suffered by President Eisenhower.

We seek to deal with a problem which today offers no legal means of transferring, even temporarily, for sickness, the power which rests on the shoulders of the President. There are no such means, other than a private agreement, such as that entered into between President Eisenhower and Vice President Nixon, subsequently between President Kennedy and Vice President Johnson, and most recently between President

Johnson and Speaker McCormack. But these are private agreements which have no legal basis.

Steps have been taken previously by Congress. Efforts have been made by Members of the Senate. Perhaps the foremost advocate of this type of reform was the late Senator Kefauver, who, despite waging a strong battle, was unable to have the measure reported by the committee.

But I am happy, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments of the Committee on the Judiciary, that the committee has been able to report a constitutional amendment because of the recognition by Members of this body, including the distinguished Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Ervin], the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper], the distinguished majority leader [Mr. Mansfield], and others, that it is time action was taken. We have achieved this success by working closely with nongovernment groups, including the American Bar Association.

We are fast reaching the place where we realize that we must put aside our petty differences and adopt the best solution we possibly can. Basically, there are three criteria for the best solution. First, it must be a solution which, if it must be implemented—God forbid that it must—but history has shown us that we will not be spared—if our future can be judged by the past, we shall be faced with crises or tragedies in this area. So such an amendment must be presented in the best form or formula to be acceptable to the people.

Second, it must be workable from an administration standpoint.

Third, it must arose sufficient support in Congress and in State legislatures to obtain the necessary votes to make it a part of the U.S. Constitution. The proposal of Senate Joint Resolution 139 meets these three criteria.

First, the joint resolution provides that in the event a vacancy exists in the Office of Vice President, the President, the one who must work closely with the Vice President, shall nominate a person for the Office and submit the name to Congress. Thereupon, the nomination shall be confirmed or the person elected or chosen Vice President by a majority of both Houses of Congress.

This requirement will accomplish two purposes. First, it will guarantee that there will be a Vice President, who will be able to work with the President. Second, it guarantees to the people that their representatives in Congress, those who are most responsive to the wishes of the people at any given time, will be able to express the voice of those whom they represent.

Third, in the event the President becomes unable to perform the powers and duties of his Office, the joint resolution provides that, first, the President may declare his own disability. In the event he knows that he will have a serious operation or feels that a serious illness is coming on, he may declare his own disability in writing and submit it to Congress. Second, in the event he is unable to do so—perhaps he might have a serious heart attack, or he might be captured by the enemy—we have tried to think of every eventuality—the Vice President, acting with the consent of a majority of the members of the Cabinet, the executive officers who are closest to the President, will assume the duties and powers of the President.

We believe that this arrangement will protect the President from any possible coup or destruction of the power of his Office. The Vice President, operating with the consent of a majority of the members of the Cabinet, could assume the powers and duties of the President as Acting President. I emphasize the words "Acting President" because it was their desire not to become President that kept Thomas Marshall and Chester Arthur—and, indeed, I think seriously inhibited Richard Nixon—from assuming the powers and duties of the Office during the illnesses I described earlier.

The last contingency is that in the event—this is not likely, but is possible—there is a dispute between the President, on the one hand, saying he is able or that he has recovered, and the Vice President and a majority of the Cabinet, on the other, saying that he is still unable to perform his duties, Congress shall settle the question.

As the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Ervin] and I disclosed in our colloquy yesterday, we do not feel that the power of the Presidency—the Executive power—should be treated lightly. For that reason, we have said that a two-thirds vote of both Houses of Congress should be required to take Executive power away from the President.

Although there might have been a time when the Vice Presidency was a step to oblivion, this is no longer true. We are living in an age different from that which confronted our forefathers, when they almost forgot to mention the Vice Presidency in writing the Constitution. Rather, today we are living in an age when mankind has at its disposal the ability to wipe out civilization in a matter of minutes. Armies can be moved half way around the world in a matter of hours. In these times we must have able-bodied individuals as President and Vice President, persons who will always be capable of performing the powers and duties of President, to make that difficult decision which we pray God will never have to be made. We need able-bodied individuals at all times.

Considering the difficult problems and heavy burdens carried by the President today, we must have an assistant President, a Vice President, always standing at his side, helping to hold the torch for this great country.

In terminating my remarks, I feel it is only fair, and I feel compelled to say that had it not been for the cooperation of my colleagues, this measure would not have come to pass. Never before has Congress come this far with a proposal of this type of legislation.

In addition, had it not been for the willingness of the majority leader to cooperate and go out of his way, despite the tremendous burdens he carries in the closing days of the session, and his willingness to have this important measure considered, and his recognition of the urgency of the problem and the necessity for solving it, this measure would not have come to pass.

This is the best possible example we can have of the Senate at work. We considered 13 different suggestions and have resolved upon one, subject to the vote of the Senate, which we hope will ultimately be passed by the Senate and the House and ratified by three-fourths of the general assemblies of the individual States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 4 o'clock having arrived, the Chair, under the previous unanimous-consent agreement, lays before the Senate Senate Joint Resolution 139, which the clerk will report by title.

The Chief Clerk. A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 139) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the succession to the Presidency and Vice Presidency and to cases where the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, a yea-and-nay vote is ordered on the question of its passage, and the clerk will therefore call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Burdick], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. Cannon], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Johnston], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Long], and the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. Neuberger] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Edmondson], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Hartke], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. Humphrey], the Senator from Washington [Mr. Jackson], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGovern], the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss], the Senator from Maine [Mr. Muskie], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pell], the Senator from California [Mr. Salinger], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Symington], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Williams], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Yarborough] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Hill] are absent because of illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Edmondson], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Hartke], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGovern], the Senator from California [Mr. Salinger], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Williams], the Senator from Texas [Mr. Yarborough], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. Neuberger], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. Jackson] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Beall], the Senators from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS and Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MECHEM], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the Senators from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS and Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] would each vote "yea."

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 65, nays 0, as follows:

[No. 588 Leg.]

YEAS—65

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Bartlett
Bayh
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Carlson
Case
Church
Clark
Cooper
Cotton
Dirksen
Dominick
Douglas
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Fong
Fulbright
Gore
Hart
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Holland
Inouye
Javits
Jordan, N.C.
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McIntyre
McNamara
Metcalf
Monroney
Morse
Morton
Nelson
Pastore
Pearson
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Robertson
Russell
Saltonstall
Simpson
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Talmadge
Walters
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—35

Beall
Burdick
Cannon
Curtis
Dodd
Edmondson
Goldwater
Gruening
Hartke
Hill
Hruska
Humphrey
Jackson
Johnston
Jordan, Idaho
Keating
Kennedy
Long, Mo.
McGee
McGovern
Mechem
Miller
Moss
Mundt
Muskie
Neuberger
Pell
Salinger
Scott
Symington
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Yarborough

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Two-thirds of the Senators present having voted in the affirmative, the joint resolution is passed.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the joint resolution was passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AUTHORIZATION FOR THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS TO FILE TWO REPORTS DURING ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Small Business be authorized during the adjournment of the 2d session of the 88th Congress to file with the Secretary of the Senate two reports, entitled "The Role of Small Business in Government Procurement, 1964," and "The Role and Effect of Technology in the Nation's Economy," and that the reports be printed, along with any individual, supplemental, or minority views.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

FRANK B. ROWLETT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending business be laid aside temporarily and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1494, H.R. 7348.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 7348) for the relief of Frank B. Rowlett.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill? There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I suspect that that is the bill that the Treasury Department objects to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it seems to be a habit for the past 3 or 4 days to reconsider bills. So, once again, though the bill has been cleared on both sides, I ask that H.R. 7348, which was just passed, be reconsidered and placed on the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ACTIVITIES OF THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS—88TH CONGRESS

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Government Operations, I submit for the information of the Senate, a brief summary of the activities of the committee in the 88th Congress, as of this date.

A full, detailed report on the activities of the committee and its four subcommittees in the present Congress will be submitted upon the convening of the next session of Congress, as has been the custom in the past.

The following is a condensation of the actions taken by the committee with brief explanation of some of the legislation processed, which was enacted into law, or approved by the Senate. Included are bills and subjects on which hearings were held and/or reports issued.

Of the total of 127 bills and resolutions referred to the committee during the 88th Congress, 15 were enacted into law. Twenty-eight resolutions were adopted by the Senate, and 12 bills were approved by the Senate but were not acted upon in the House of Representatives.

Those bills which became law or on which the Senate acted are listed under appropriate headings. No listing was made of property transfer proposals, or other bills on which the committee took no action.

BUDGETING AND ACCOUNTING

The Committee on Government Operations again reported favorably, and the Senate approved, as it has in five preceding Congresses, a bill (S. 537) proposing the creation of a Joint Committee on the Budget. This proposed legislation, with 77 Senators as sponsors, was developed and perfected by the committee over a period of 14 years, and has repeatedly passed the Senate. It is designed to remedy serious deficiencies in appropriation procedures and to improve the congressional surveillance over the expenditure of public funds. It constitutes a positive approach to the elimination of extravagance, waste, and needless or excessive expenditures.

The creation of a joint committee, as proposed, and its staff would serve in the appropriation field in a manner comparable to that in which the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation and its staff in the field of taxation serve the House Committee on Ways and Means and the Senate Committee on Finance. The Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation has, for more than a quarter of a century, proved its great worth and service in the revenue field. In the view of the committee, a like joint committee and service is needed in the appropriation and expenditure field. The bill was referred to the House Committee on Rules on May 21, 1963, but no further action was taken.

Other fiscal legislation approved by the committee and enacted into law included, first, an act to permit the use of statistical sampling procedures in the examination of vouchers—Public Law 88-521; second, an amendment to the Government Corporation Control Act changing the General Accounting Office audit to a calendar year basis in the case of the Federal home loan banks and the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation—Public Law 88-518; third, authorizing the payment of per diem in lieu of subsistence to certain Federal employees assigned to duty on the California offshore islands—Public Law 88-538; fourth, authorizing the payment of the expenses of certain Government student trainees—Public Law 88-146; fifth, authorizing the payment of the cost of transportation of privately owned vehicles of Government employees assigned to duty in Alaska—Public Law 88-266; and, sixth, extension for 2 years the period for which payments in lieu of taxes may be made with respect to certain real property transferred by RFC to other Government agencies—Public Law 88-330.

Another proposal S. 2670, recommended by the Civil Service Commission, which would amend the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 to provide for reimbursement of certain moving expenses of employees, and to authorize payment of expenses for storage of household goods and personal effects of employees assigned to isolated duty stations within the continental United States, requires further study and consideration of suggested amendments, before the committee can report it to the Senate.

Pursuant to the requirements of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, and the rules of the Senate, a total of 570 audit reports and other communications relating to fiscal and related operations of the Government were submitted to the Senate by the Comptroller General of the United States, and referred to the committee. These reports are reviewed by the staff of the committee and, if warranted, by the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations. The great majority of the reports relate to excessive expenditures or agency actions which are considered to be irregular or not in accord with existing law. Unless some specific action was suggested by the Comptroller General, the committee took no action on these reports. In some instances, however, other committees having direct oversight jurisdiction over the subject covered by the reports have developed additional information concerning the appropriate agencies with the objective of correcting deficiencies in the basic laws in accord with the report of the Comptroller General.

REORGANIZATION OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH OF THE GOVERNMENT

The Reorganization Act of 1949, Public Law 109, 81st Congress, as amended and extended in previous Congresses, the basic statute under which the President was authorized to submit reorganization plans to the Congress, expired on June 1, 1963. The act was further extended by the 88th Congress, which included an amendment eliminating the provision which authorized the President to submit reorganization plans proposing the creation of new Cabinet departments—Senate Report No. 1057; Public Law 88-351.

Under the provisions of the act as extended, reorganization plans submitted to the Congress by the President prior to June 1, 1965, become law within 60 calendar days after submission to the Congress, unless disapproved by a majority of either the House or the Senate by the adoption of a resolution of disapproval.

Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1963, providing for the reorganization of certain functions relating to the Franklin D. Roosevelt Library, was submitted on May 27, 1963, under the authority of the act before it expired. The plan became effective on July 27, 1963, as neither the House nor the Senate adopted a resolution of disapproval.

The Presidential Transition Act of 1963, originally proposed in the 87th Congress as a part of the President's program based upon a recommendation of the President's Commission on Campaign Costs, established by Executive Order No. 10974 of November 8, 1961, was approved in the present Congress—H.R. 4638, Senate Report No. 448—as Public Law 88-277 on March 7, 1964.

Under the provisions of this act, the Administrator of General Services is vested with the authority to provide, upon request, to each President-elect and each Vice-President-elect necessary services and facilities, including suitable office space, payment of staff salaries, travel expenses, communications services, printing and binding, and postage, subject to appropriations provided therefor during the transition period between election and inauguration, not to exceed $900,000 in any transition period. The bill also authorized the Administrator of General Services to provide, upon request, to each former President and each former Vice President, for a period not to exceed 6 months from the date of the expiration of his term of office as President or Vice President similar services and facilities for use in winding up the affairs of his office, which shall be in addition to those authorized by the terms of 3 U.S.C. 102.

As initiated in the 80th Congress, the committee continued the compilation of an annual organization chart and report reflecting, by calendar year, all reorganizations and changes effected in the basic structure and increases or decreases in personnel of all departments and agencies in the executive branch of the Government. The chart and accompanying report for calendar year 1962, reflecting date as of January 1, 1963, were submitted to the Senate on April 4, 1963—Committee Report No. 23; the chart and accompanying report for calendar year 1963 were submitted to the Senate on March 23, 1964—Committee Report No. 24. The charts contain a tabulation of personnel assignments to major operating components of each department and agency. The reports contain complete details concerning major reorganizations effected, the resulting improvements in administration as reported by the agencies, as well as the total reductions or increases in Federal personnel.

SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

On February 18, 1963, the chairman of the committee, joined by seven other Members of the Senate, introduced a bill (S. 816) providing for the establishment of a Commission on Science and Technology. This bill was somewhat similar to S. 1851 and S. 2771, reported favorably by the committee in the 86th and 87th Congresses, proposing the creation of a Commission on Science and Technology. S. 2771 was approved by the Senate on August 8, 1962, but no further action was taken in the House.

The bill, as revised, contained a broad declaration of congressional policy and objectives and placed more emphasis upon the need for a study of the problems relating to the improvement of Federal programs for the processing and retrieval of scientific information.

At the hearings held during the 86th and 87th Congresses testimony developed the need for further study as to whether or not a Department of Science and Technology should be created, or whether the Federal science functions may be reorganized effectively within the existing structure of the Federal Government without the necessity of creating a new Cabinet post.

The bill was directed at providing the President and the Congress with the necessary information to enable the development of an adequate legislative program to meet the needs of the Federal Government in the increasingly important field of science and technology. The chairman commented at length on the proposed legislation on January 31, 1962, and again on March 12, 1962. The bill again passed the Senate under unanimous consent on March 8, 1963, and was referred to the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, where no further consideration was given to it.

Senate Report No. 16 on S. 816 set forth complete background information leading to the recommendations for enactment of the bill, as well as extracts from testimony of witnesses who appeared at the hearings. The witnesses consisted of officials of the Federal Government, representatives of science, engineering, and industrial organizations, and technical research administrators. The committee, in recommending enactment of the bill, pointed out that it was necessary that the Congress and the President obtain the essential information proposed to be developed in order to enable them to enact legislation required to authorize by law a properly coordinated program for the efficient and economical administration of Federal programs operating in the fields of science and technology.

Other proposed legislation—S. 1577 and H.R. 5171—with provisions having direct and important science and technological impacts, would authorize the Administrator of General Services to coordinate and otherwise provide for the economic and efficient purchase, lease, maintenance, operation, and utilization of automatic data processing equipment by Federal departments and agencies.

On September 21, 1964, the chairman of the committee submitted a full report on the legislative background and status of H.R. 5171 to the Senate—Congressional Record, pages 22362-22369.

GENERAL SERVICES

There were a number of bills which affected the activities of the General Services Administration in various areas, which first, were designed to broaden or clarify the authority of the Administrator, officers, or employees designated to act in his behalf, or to broaden the functions and activities of GSA; second, provide general authority with respect to certain types of surplus property disposals; third, relate to the transfer of surplus property; fourth, broaden the donable property program; and, fifth, deal with procurement procedures.

The committee, in carrying out its oversight jurisdiction over these operations of GSA, took action on a number of legislative proposals coming within one or more of the above categories. The following two bills were enacted into law, as a part of the GSA legislative program for the 88th Congress:

First. An amendment to the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 authorized grants for the collection, reproduction, and publication of documentary source material significant to the history of the United States—Public Law 88-383. Under the provisions of this bill—H.R. 6237—the Administrator of General Services is authorized to expend up to $500,000 annually in appropriated funds, together with whatever donated funds may be available, to make allocations and grants to Federal, State, and local agencies, and nonprofit organizations and institutions, for the collection and publication of documentary source material significant to the history of the United States. The Administrator will be guided by the advice and recommendations of the National Historical Publications Commission. This Commission is also authorized to establish special advisory committees for the purpose of consultation on its various endeavors, and the National Historical Publications Commission may reimburse members of such advisory committees for transportation costs and other expenses.

Second. Another bill amended the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (H.R. 5801), granting authority to certain Government officials to authorize the Administrator of General Services to certify to facts and make administrative determinations on the basis of information contained in records transferred from their agencies to the General Services Administration.

Under existing authority of law (44 U.S.C. 396) any official of the Government who is authorized to certify to facts on the basis of records in his custody is permitted to continue to certify on the basis of records which he or his predecessor has transferred to the General Services Administration. This bill amended this section of the law so that the Administrator of General Services could be authorized by the agency concerned to certify as to facts and make administrative determinations from the records in his custody.

The Administrator of General Services was also authorized to delegate and authorize redelegation of such authority under the provisions of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949. The bill was approved by the House on November 4, 1963, referred to this committee, reported to the Senate—Senate Report No. 828—and approved as Public Law 88-265 on February 5, 1964.

In addition, the following four measures were reported favorably, and were approved by the Senate, but no action was taken on them in the House of Representatives:

First. To amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act (S. 572) to provide uniformity and equality in Government contracting for public utility services and in the purchase of natural gas, coal, or oil for the production of such utilities, by providing that all such contracts may be made for periods not exceeding 10 years. The bill was reported—Senate Report No. 183—on May 23, passed the Senate on May 27, and was referred to the House Committee on Government Operations on May 28, 1963, where no further action was taken.

Second. A proposal (S. 1232) to make the modern code of procurement procedures contained in title III of the act directly applicable by statute to executive agencies of the Government not now so covered. At the present time, use of this modern code by such agencies is entirely on a permissive, delegated basis. This code would replace use of the limited provisions of section 3709, Revised Statutes, governing advertising and negotiation. A common statutory foundation of procurement authority would enable the Administrator of General Services to prescribe uniform procurement policies and procedures for agencies and so develop uniform procurement practices for the benefit both of the Government and the businessman contracting with the Government.

The bill would exclude the procurement of personal services from the operation of title III, which is essentially a property management code of procedures. It would make certain limitations of section 304 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949—concerning fees of cost-type contracts, contingent fees, examination of records, and so forth—applicable to contracts negotiated by executive agencies under any law, not only title III.

The bill was reported—Senate Report No. 1059—on June 4, 1964, passed the Senate June 19 and referred to the House Committee on Government Operations, where no action was taken.

Third. Another proposal (S. 1233) approved by the Senate would permit the Administrator of General Services to enter into contracts with private concerns for the inspection, maintenance, and repair of fixed equipment and equipment systems in Federal buildings for periods not to exceed 5 years.

Under existing authority of law contracts for such services are executed on an annual basis. The Administrator of General Services reported that authority to enter into contracts for a longer period of time will make possible greater economy, safety, and efficiency in the maintenance and operation of Federal Buildings and equipment at less cost to the Government than is possible under the requirement that such contracts be negotiated on an annual basis.

The Administrator of General Services reported to the committee that the fixed equipment and equipment systems intended to be serviced, inspected, or repaired under the authority of this amendment, would include air conditioning, heating systems, elevators, plumbing, pneumatic tube systems, and other similar equipment which has been installed in Federal buildings. A substantial part of the servicing of this equipment can be performed by private firms which specialize in the maintenance of this type of equipment.

The bill was reported—Senate Report No. 866—on February 3, 1964, passed the Senate February 7, and was referred to the House Committee on Government Operations where no action was taken thereon.

Fourth. A fourth bill in this category, S. 1509, introduced at the request of the Administrator of General Services, would authorize the heads of Federal departments and agencies for whom land or an interest therein is acquired, to reimburse the owners or tenants of such land for any expense, loss, or damage incurred by such persons in moving themselves, their families, and possessions to another residence or location.

The bill provided that reimbursement shall be in addition to, but not in duplication of, other payments authorized by law. The bill further provided that the total reimbursement shall not exceed 25 percent of the fair market value of the property as determined by the head of the agency, and that no payment may be made unless an application is submitted to the head of the agency within 1 year from first, the date the interest is to be vacated under an agreement with the Government, or, second, the date the parcel is actually vacated, whichever first occurs.

This bill was reported June 29—Senate Report No. 1126—passed the Senate on June 30, and was referred to the House Committee on Public Works, which has taken no action.

There were 23 other bills referred to the committee, involving surplus property transfers and disposals to local or State governments or for other public purposes, 5 of which were approved by the Senate, with 4 becoming law. Three of the remaining 18 proposals were implemented through administrative action, in cooperation with the committee and the sponsors of the bills, thus requiring no further consideration by the committee.

Twelve proposals were filed to extend the donable provisions of the Federal Property Act to other public and welfare groups, but in view of the opposition of the operating departments and agencies administering existing programs for the benefit of education, health, and civil defense programs now covered, the committee took no action on these measures.

A total of 170 proposals for the negotiated sale of surplus property was submitted to the committee by the General Services Administration—167—and the Department of Defense—3—pursuant to section 203(e) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 377). These proposals were submitted to the two Senators from the States in which the property was located, for their information and approval. Also, if the fair market value and other factors warranted, copies of the proposals were also submitted to the members of the committee. Should there be no objection to the proposed sale by any Senator, it is consummated by the GSA or other agency designated as the disposal authority, after the expiration of 30 days. All except three of these proposals were processed either within the 30-day period, or after certain questions regarding the sale which had arisen had been resolved. In two instances objections arose which required consideration by the committee.

MISCELLANEOUS HEARINGS

In addition to hearings held on legislation pending before the committee, as set forth in the respective sections of this report, the committee held hearings on two negotiated sales proposals, as follows:

First. On January 11, 1963, the proposed negotiated sale of seven surplus C-74—Globemaster—aircraft to William J. Chalk Associates, Toronto, Canada, by the Defense Supply Agency.

At the request of Senator GRUENING, who objected to the sale of these aircraft on the proposed terms and conditions, the committee held hearings to review the merits of this particular sale as well as the broader questions involved relating to the Government's general policy with regard to disposition of surplus aircraft.

As a result of this hearing, the committee requested that the pending sale of these aircraft be withdrawn, and that no further action be taken until a thorough review and revamping of the Government's policy with regard to the disposal of surplus aircraft had been completed. This policy review and realinement was subsequently accomplished, and the surplus C–74 aircraft disposed of in such a manner as to assure that they would not be used in a way inimical to the interests of the United States.

Second. On March 25, 1963, the proposed negotiated sale of some 435 acres of surplus land and improvements, formerly Mitchel Field, to the county of Nassau, State of New York.

At the request of the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], who expressed reservations over the terms of this sale, the committee held a hearing to determine the merits of Nassau County's contention that it should not be required to pay the full market price for this property since a good portion of it would be used for park, recreational, educational, and health purposes. Following a thorough review of the terms of this proposed sale, the contention of the county authorities, as well as an analysis of the statute involved—Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended—and its applicability to this matter, the committee concluded that the General Services Administration had acted in accord with existing regulations and statutes and, therefore, withdrew its objection to the sale.

GENERAL LEGISLATION

The committee also gave consideration to a number of other bills of general application. These included two bills which would, first, authorize Government agencies to provide quarters and facilities to civilian officers and employees of the United States (S. 1833), with the objective of restating and clarifying existing statutory authority and regulations which authorize the Government to provide rental quarters and certain related services for Government personnel—Public Law 88–459; and, second (S. 1543), to repeal that portion of the act of March 3, 1893, which prohibits the employment, in any Government service or by any officer of the District of Columbia, of any employee of the Pinkerton Detective Agency or any similar agency. Its objective was to repeal that portion of the act of March 3, 1893, set forth in title 5, United States Code, section 53 (27 Stat. 591), which, in effect, prohibits the Federal Government or the District of Columbia from employing, for any purposes, employees of organizations which engage in investigative work. The bill passed the Senate on October 17, 1963—Senate Report No. 447—following the adoption of an amendment which repealed the original statutory prohibition, but continued a prohibition against the employment by the U.S. Government or the government of the District of Columbia of detective agencies or their employees for investigative work. It was referred to the House Committee on Government Operations on October 21, 1963, where no further action was taken.

Proposed legislation (S. 12), identical to a bill introduced in the 87th Congress on which hearings were held, would amend the Randolph-Sheppard Vending Stand Act. Following the reintroduction of the legislation, continued conferences were held with the executive agencies involved, which resulted in the required administrative action being taken, thus eliminating the need for further action on the bill.

A bill (S. 1896), recommended by the Civil Service Commission, which proposed to amend section 7 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 to provide for the payment of travel cost for applicants invited by a department to visit it for purposes connected with employment, was acted upon favorably by the committee, but the report to the Senate was not filed due to subsequent developments involving proposed amendments to which the committee did not have an opportunity to give further consideration.

The committee withheld action on 18 other legislative proposals which were referred to it, because of opposition which developed, lack of agreement on suggested amendments, or because the authors of the bills did not request that the committee process the bills. Among these were several bills providing for the establishment of committees or offices to study and develop programs directed toward the solution of consumer and community problems.

There was a total of 63 Executive communications from department and agencies addressed to the President of the Senate and referred to the committee. In some instances, the agencies submitted reports required by law on certain specified activities or expenditures, or for the information of the Congress; in others the communications suggested legislation as a part of the agency's proposed legislative program.

Of the 32 resolutions introduced, which related to activities of the committee, 28 were adopted by the Senate. Of these, 10 provided authority and funds for the operations of the four subcommittees in the first and second sessions of the 88th Congress, 11 authorized the reprinting of hearings and reports of the committee and the subcommittees, and 7 authorized the appearance of the chairman or members of the staff at court proceedings resulting from testimony before the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations. The four remaining resolutions were not reported.

REPORTS AND SPECIAL STUDIES

During the 88th Congress, the committee issued several reports and special studies on subjects which were considered to be of special interest to the Congress and the public generally. Among them were studies entitled "The Authority of the Senate To Originate Appropriation Bills," issued on April 30, 1963, as Senate Document No. 17, 88th Congress, and "Government Competition With Private Enterprise," issued on June 21, 1963, as a committee print.

The study on the right of the Senate to originate appropriation bills consisted of a review and analysis of the debates and actions of the Constitutional Convention of 1787, and other pertinent materials. It demonstrated clearly that it was the intention of the Founding Fathers at the 1787 Convention to vest in the Senate of the United States the authority, coequal with the House of Representatives, to originate appropriation bills.

In the 88th Congress, the committee had before it three bills and two resolutions dealing with various aspects of Government competition with private enterprise. The basic bill, S. 1093, had as its objective the statutory establishment of Federal policy directed toward the reduction or elimination of commercial-industrial activities which are competitive with private enterprise. The two resolutions, Senate Resolution 100 and Senate Resolution 299, merely authorized the Committee on Government Operations or any of its duly authorized subcommittees to make a full and complete study of the entire field of Government competition with private enterprise. Two additional bills, S. 2254 and S. 2268, were indirectly related to the general subject, in that they would have required agencies and departments of the Federal Government to procure certain types of services from commercial suppliers whenever economy would result from such procurement and the national interest would not be adversely affected.

Following the introduction of S. 1093 and Senate Resolution 100, the staff of the committee was directed to make a comprehensive study of the entire subject. This study reviewed and analyzed, first, the nature, extent, and history of business-type operations carried on by the Federal Government; second, congressional studies and proposals over a period of some 30 years; third, executive branch action during the past 10 years; and, fourth, current executive branch policy and action. The report concluded that, first, considerable progress had been made in reducing or terminating those Government activities which are competitive with private enterprise; second, there are certain activities which the Government will continue to carry on, without regard to whether they compete with private enterprise, either because the public interest or national security requires such continuance, or because of cost factors involved; and, third, there are undoubtedly some activities still being carried on which should be reduced or terminated.

ACTIVITIES OF SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

In addition to the legislative actions set forth in the preceding sections of this report, the committee referred 10 other measures to its Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations for hearings and recommendations for full committee consideration.

Two of these bills (S. 855, S. 2114) were reported to the Senate by the full committee upon recommendation of the subcommittee, passed the Senate, and were referred to the Committee on Government Operations in the House where no action was taken.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, the report of the Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations, which includes actions taken on those bills reported to the Senate, as well as an outline of the other measures and special studies and reports made by the subcommittee.

There being no objection, the reports were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ACTIVITIES OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

The Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations, chaired by Senator EDMUND S. MUSKIE, of the Senate Committee on Government Operations, was legally constituted on July 12, 1962. During the more than 2 years it has existed, the subcommittee has taken seriously its mandate "to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of intergovernmental relations * * * including an evaluation of studies, reports, and recommendations made thereon and submitted to the Congress by the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations."

The subcommittee's activities have divided into two major categories, legislative and research. Under the former, three major legislative recommendations initiated or strongly approved by the Advisory Commission have been the subcommittee's basic concerns during the 88th Congress.

The first, S. 855, was introduced by Senator MUSKIE on February 19, 1963. It implements the Advisory Commission's June 1961 recommendation that certain Federal grant-in-aid applications be reviewed by metropolitan area planning bodies. Hearings on this measure, and on Senator CLIFFORD CASE'S somewhat more ambitious metropolitan planning bill, S. 915, were held May 21–23, 1963. Testimony was heard from 22 witnesses, and the official reports of 10 governmental departments, as well as statements on behalf of 17 private organizations, were received and made part of the hearing record. The bill as amended and the accompanying report (S. Rept. No. 821) were approved by the subcommittee and subsequently by the parent committee. S. 855 passed the Senate unanimously on January 23 of this year and is now pending before the House Committee on Government Operations.

A bill (S. 815) to permit Federal agencies to restore to States certain jurisdictional authority now vested in the United States which could be better administered by State authorities, was introduced on February 18, 1963, as an administration bill at the request of the Attorney General. It is identical to legislation originally drafted by the committee staff with the cooperation of the Justice Department, in order to implement recommendations outlined in the "Report of the Interdepartmental Committee for the Study of Jurisdiction Over Federal Areas Within the States."

The Advisory Commission, in its June 1961 "Report on State and Local Taxation of Privately Owned Property Located in Federal Areas: Proposed Amendment to the Buck Act," supported the retrocession of legislative jurisdiction in such areas to the States and indicated its approval of a similar bill then pending before the 86th Congress. Hearings on S. 815 were held by the Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations on August 20–22, 1963. Some 20-odd witnesses testified, and official reports from 19 governmental departments were received and made part of the record. Three executive sessions were held on the bill, and it is still pending in the subcommittee.

The third major legislative measure of concern to the subcommittee is S. 2114, introduced by Senator MUSKIE on September 4, 1963, which implements the Advisory Commission's June 1961 report, "Periodic Congressional Reassessment of Federal Grants-in-Aid to State and Local Governments." Thirty-nine other Senators joined in sponsoring this measure. Hearings were held in January of this year, and the bill as amended and the accompanying report (S. Rept. No. 1056) were approved by the subcommittee and subsequently by the parent committee. On June 19 the measure unanimously passed the Senate, was favorably reported by the House Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee, and is now before the House Committee on Government Operations.

The question of the future disposition of Ellis Island has been a continuing responsibility of the subcommittee. The parent committee referred the following five bills dealing with the subject to the subcommittee soon after its establishment: S. 2596, Ellis Island for Higher Education, Inc.; S. 2582, the Training School at Vineland, N.J.; and S. 867, S. 1118, and S. 1198, which included slightly different programs for health, education, and housing for the elderly. As a follow-up, S. 1090, the Training School at Vineland, N.J., and S. 1300, Ellis Island for Higher Education, Inc., were also assigned to the subcommittee.

In September 1962 the subcommittee held hearings to "gain a broader and more detailed understanding of the fundamental issues and questions involved,"[1] following which the chairman of the subcommittee requested the General Services Administration to withhold action on final transfer of title to the island until the subcommittee and the full committee had concluded their review of the disposal problem. Additional subcommittee hearings were held in New York City in December, during which numerous proposals were advanced. Additional recommendations have been received since the conclusion of these hearings.

Since no one proposal has had sufficient widespread support or stood out as being more meritorious than the others, the subcommittee attempted to promote cooperation among the various sponsors. Extensive communications and conferences failed to produce a multipurpose plan. In April 1963, 11 major foundations were requested by Chairman MUSKIE to assess and comment upon "the feasibility of the financing, public benefit, practicality, and probability of ultimate realization" of the various noncommercial proposals. Some replies favored one or another of the plans, but none indicated a willingness to support any one or a combination of the proposals.

In July 1963, the chairman contacted congressional representatives and State officials of New York and New Jersey, as well as the mayors of New York City and Jersey City, requesting their assistance in the subcommittee's deliberations on the disposal question. At the suggestion of Senator JACOB JAVITS, a meeting of such officials was held in September "to arrive at a consensus as to what should be the disposition of Ellis Island." While it was not possible at that time to decide on a specific course of action, none of the officials favored commercial development of the island. The chairman raised the question of whether the proposed redevelopment of the New Jersey shoreline "might enhance the possibilities of using the island for a national park, monument, or recreational purposes."[2] He asked the Interior Department's National Park Service to review the proposal in light of New Jersey's redevelopment plan, which ultimately led to a recommendation by the Secretary of the Interior in June 1964 for the conversion of Ellis Island to a national historic site dedicated to public park and recreation uses.[3] The subcommittee is presently exploring the merits of this proposal.

In the realm of research and investigation, the subcommittee has engaged in various undertakings. Advisory commission studies and reports have been examined and analyzed so they will get the careful consideration they deserve. In June 1963, the subcommittee joined with the House Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee to sponsor 3 days of joint hearings on the manifold problems confronting governments in the New York metropolitan area. These proceedings clearly demonstrated that one of the most important single problems in the field of intergovernmental relations is the emergence of a metropolitan America.

During the spring and summer of 1963, the subcommittee staff continued to process its questionnaire that had been distributed earlier, resulting in the publication in December 1963 of a committee print entitled "The Federal System As Seen by State and Local Officials." As a followup on this attempt to determine the views of interested public officials on crucial intergovernmental relations issues, a second questionnaire was sent out in March 1964 to Federal departments and agencies.[4]

As part of its continuing survey of the impact of urban area problems on our Federal system, in December 1963 the subcommittee published a report entitled "National Survey of Metropolitan Planning," prepared by the U.S. Housing and Home Finance Agency.

In a probe of the nature and extent of urban research currently being conducted under Federal auspices, on April 15, 1964, the subcommittee issued another study, prepared at its request by the Bureau of the Budget.[5] This survey prompted the recent establishment, at the chairman's suggestion, of a centralized system for reporting and listing all urban research projects financed by Federal funds, to be done by the Science Information Exchange of the National Science Foundation. Such clearinghouse activities should eliminate much of the duplication and overlapping among such projects and provide needed information relating to urban research to interested Federal agencies.

Indicative of the subcommittee's perennial concern with the need for more effective coordination of joint local-Federal projects was the issuance in May of this year of a survey conducted by the Advisory Commission entitled "Impact of Federal Urban Development

---

[1] "Disposal of Ellis Island (New York harbor)," hearings before the Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations, Committee on Government Operations, U.S. Senate, 87th Cong., 2d sess., pursuant to S. Res. 359; p. 2.

[2] "Discussion on the Disposal of Ellis Island," before the Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations, Committee on Government Operations, U.S. Senate, 88th Cong., 1st sess., pursuant to S. Res. 45 (committee print), pp. 1 and 2.

[3] "A Study Report on Ellis Island," by the National Park Service in cooperation with the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, U.S. Department of the Interior, June 1964.

[4] "Problems of Federal-State-Local Relations, Questionnaire No. 2," prepared by the Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations, Committee on Government Operations, U.S. Senate, 88th Cong., 2d sess., pursuant to S. Res. 280 (committee print).

[5] "Urban Research Under Federal Auspices," a survey prepared for the Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations, Committee on Government Operations, U.S. Senate, by the Bureau of the Budget (committee print).

Programs on Local Government Organization and Planning." A few weeks later, pursuant to a July 1963 contract with the MIT-Harvard Joint Center for Urban Studies, the subcommittee published an expert analysis of the present condition of metropolitan planning in America. This study discusses many aspects of S. 855 in addition to more general problems relating to orderly metropolitan development.[6]

In response to numerous requests, the subcommittee prepared and distributed in August of this year a select bibliography entitled "Metropolitan America."

The publications cited highlight in various ways the challenge that massive urbanization presents to our traditional system of Federal-State-local relations. They have greatly assisted the subcommittee in its legislative deliberations and there is considerable indirect evidence that legislative and executive officials at all levels of government have found these research efforts of value.

Finally, in an attempt to merely define the scope of its second major focal point of research interest, the subcommittee this summer distributed a "Catalog of Federal Aids to State and Local Governments," prepared by Mr. I. M. Labovitz, of the Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress. It covers all forms of Federal aids effective as of April 1, 1964, and more than 40,000 copies have been requested by Members of Congress and interested State and local officials.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS PUBLICATIONS, 88TH CONGRESS

HEARINGS

"Role of the Federal Government in Metropolitan Areas," December 13 and 14, 1963.

"Metropolitan Planning (S. 855 and S. 915)," May 21–23, 1963.

"Government in Metropolitan Areas (New York Metropolitan Region)," (joint hearings with House Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations, held June 7, 8, and 10, 1963, in New York City).

"Adjustment of Legislative Jurisdiction on Federal Enclaves (S. 815)," August 20–22, 1963.

"Periodic Congressional Review of Federal Grants-in-Aid (S. 2114)," January 14–16, 1964.

REPORTS

"Activities Report of Subcommittee (S. Rept. No. 84, Apr. 1, 1963)," (includes as appendix D the GSA assessment of legal status of Ellis Island).

"Planning in Metropolitan Areas (S. Rept. No. 821)," to accompany S. 855, January 22, 1964.

"Periodic Congressional Review of Federal Grants in Aid (S. Rept. No. 1056)," to accompany S. 2114, June 1964.

COMMITTEE PRINTS

"Discussion on the Disposal of Ellis Island (Sept. 4, 1963)."

"The Federal System as Seen by State and Local Officials (December 1963)."

"National Survey of Metropolitan Planning (HHFA) (December 1963)."

"Questionnaire No. 2 (March 1964)."

"Urban Research Under Federal Auspices (BuBud) (Apr. 15, 1964)."

"Catalog of Federal Aids to State and Local Governments (Apr. 15, 1964)."

"Impact of Federal Urban Development Programs on Local Government Organization and Planning (ACIR) (May 30, 1964)."

"The Effectiveness of Metropolitan Planning (MIT-Harvard Joint Center) (June 1964)."

"Metropolitan America (Bibliography) (August 1964)."

SUMMARY OF ACTIVITIES OF THE SENATE PERMANENT SUBCOMMITTEE ON INVESTIGATIONS

The Senate authorized the Committee on Government Operations to conduct investigations during the 88th Congress into 3 fields of jurisdiction, and the committee delegated this duty to its permanent Subcommittee on Investigations. The three areas are:

1. Waste, inefficiency, and kindred matters in Federal executive agencies.

2. Crimes and improper activities in the labor and management fields.

3. Activities of organized crime which utilizes facilities of interstate or international commerce to violate Federal laws.

Major investigations under these broad powers in 1963 and 1964 resulted in public and executive hearings, as follows:

1. The Procurement of the TFX aircraft by the Department of Defense.

2. Organized crime hearings concerning the first major breakthrough in the traditional barrier of silence that has always surrounded the criminal organization known as the Mafia (Cosa Nostra). Mafia gangster Joseph Valachi's testimony was described as a criminal intelligence weapon of great importance by police officials of major metropolitan areas.

3. International and interstate traffic in illicit narcotics. The hearings examined the network of organized crime which operates the traffic, and studied the problems of treatment and rehabilitation of narcotic addicts.

Numerous other inquiries were carried out by the subcommittee without public hearings. Many of these investigations resulted in corrective action by agencies or organizations involved; others produced no evidence to substantiate information or allegations received, and several are being continued. Examples of such inquiries are:

1. An investigation of reports of falsification of records by personnel of the U.S. Employment Service.

2. A study of gambling and bribery of players in professional and college sports.

3. An investigation of the infiltration of hoodlums into legitimate business and industry.

Disclosures made to the subcommittee resulted in the introduction of the following bills, among others, pending before the Senate:

S. 287, introduced by Senator McCLELLAN, would amend the antitrust laws to prohibit certain activities of labor organizations in restraint of trade.

S. 288, introduced by Senator McCLELLAN, would prohibit strikes by employees in certain strategic defense facilities.

S. 1308, introduced by Senator McCLELLAN, would prohibit wiretapping by persons other than duly authorized law-enforcement officers engaged in the investigation or prevention of specified categories of criminal offenses.

S. 3009, introduced by Senator McCLELLAN, would grant immunity to certain witnesses in order to compel testimony in racketeering cases.

It is likely that the subcommittee's recent hearings will result in other legislative proposals in the fields of organized crime and illicit narcotic traffic. The subcommittee has worked closely with the Department of Justice and the Bureau of Narcotics in these areas, and is presently studying proposals made during its hearings. Among these are proposals that would make it a crime to belong to a criminal organization like the Mafia, and that would make it a crime to obstruct justice by threatening witnesses prior to the formal initiation of judicial proceedings. Other legislative proposals are likely in the field of treatment and rehabilitation for narcotic addicts.

During the 1st session of the 89th Congress, the subcommittee's efforts will be directed toward investigations in the following major areas, among others:

1. To complete the inquiry into the procurement of the TFX aircraft by the Department of Defense.

2. An inquiry into criminal activities of certain officials of a building construction union in New York.

3. An inquiry into the national urban renewal program to determine whether there have been improper practices, frauds, and waste in certain of its 350 individual programs.

4. An inquiry into contract and procurement irregularities and possible conflicts of interest in a branch of one of the armed services.

5. An inquiry into allocations of certain foreign aid funds to pay for wasteful and ineffective airline operations in one of the new nations of Africa.

6. A continuing inquiry into operations of the Commodity Exchange Authority, Department of Agriculture, in connection with the operations of Allied Crude Vegetable Oil Refining Corp. (Anthony DeAngelis).

7. A continuing inquiry into certain aspects of foreign aid to Iran.

SUMMARY OF THE ACTIVITIES OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL SECURITY STAFFING AND OPERATIONS

In the 88th Congress, the Subcommittee on National Security Staffing and Operations has conducted a major study on the administration of national security in Washington and in the field and has issued findings and proposals for improvement.

These findings are set forth in three short and highly readable staff reports: "Basic Issues," an analysis of the fundamental dilemmas and problems of national security administration; "The Secretary of State," analysis of the Secretary of State's dilemma and his relations with the Congress, and the problems of the Department of State, with specific recommendations for improvement; "The American Ambassador," analysis of the modern ambassador's functions with particular emphasis on the nature of support given him from Washington, with recommendations for changes in staffing procedures and operations.

Many of the recommendations contained in these reports have been or are now being acted upon by the Government; others are being weighed.

During the 2 years, the subcommittee has held a comprehensive set of hearings on basic issues of national security operations, on the role of the State Department in the policy process, and on the role of U.S. Ambassadors and the missions they head in the conduct of our relations with other nations. Issued in nine parts, this testimony includes contributions from present and former government officials, military leaders, and expert students of national security operations:

Gen. Lauris Norstad, former Supreme Allied Commander, Europe.

The Honorable W. Averell Harriman, Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs.

Dr. Richard E. Neustadt, professor of government, Columbia University.

Dr. Robert W. Tufts, professor of economics, Oberlin College.

The Honorable Ellis O. Briggs, career Ambassador, retired.

The Honorable H. Freeman Matthews, career Ambassador, retired.

The Honorable Edwin O. Reischauer, U.S. Ambassador to Japan.

The Honorable David K. E. Bruce, U.S. Ambassador to Great Britain.

---

[6] "The Effectiveness of Metropolitan Planning," prepared in cooperation with the Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations, Committee on Government Operations, U.S. Senate, by the Joint Center for Urban Studies of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and Harvard University, June 30, 1964 (committee print).

The Honorable Samuel D. Berger, former U.S. Ambassador to the Republic of Korea.

The Honorable William J. Crockett, Deputy Under Secretary of State for Administration.

The Honorable George F. Kennan, former U.S. Ambassador to Yugoslavia.

The Honorable Lincoln Gordon, U.S. Ambassador to Brazil.

The Honorable Donald M. Wilson, Deputy Director, U.S. Information Agency.

The Honorable Kermit Gordon, Director, Bureau of the Budget.

The Honorable William P. Bundy, Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs.

The Honorable Dean Rusk, Secretary of State.

The Honorable Livingston T. Merchant, career Ambassador, retired.

The Honorable Edmund A. Gullion, former U.S. Ambassador to the Republic of the Congo.

The Honorable Foy D. Kohler, U.S. Ambassador to the Soviet Union.

Col. George A. Lincoln, professor of social sciences, U.S. Military Academy, West Point, N.Y.

In addition, background studies have been prepared by the subcommittee staff in cooperation with the executive branch and the Library of Congress. The following studies have been published: "Administration of National Security: A Bibliography," an up-to-date, annotated bibliography; "Staffing Procedures and Problems in Communist China," a study of the recruitment and management of personnel in the making of national policy in Red China; "Staffing Procedures and Problems in the Soviet Union," a study of the recruitment and management of personnel in the making of national policy in the Soviet Union; "The Ambassador and the Problem of Coordination," a historical study of the coordination of U.S. policies and operations in individual countries abroad.

The subcommittee's hearings and publications have found a wide audience not only in official circles in Washington and abroad, but also in universities, colleges, research centers, and among private citizens.

The subcommittee has received the full cooperation of the executive branch and has approached its task in a nonpartisan and professional manner.

SUMMARY OF ACTIVITIES OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON REORGANIZATION AND INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

Two principal studies and a number of miscellaneous reviews comprised the work of this subcommittee during 1963 and 1964.

The two major studies related to (1) interagency coordination on drug research and regulation, and (2) interagency coordination on environmental hazards—pesticides.

Each of these studies has involved the examination of governmentwide cooperation, efficiency, and economy in scientific and regulatory programs.

1. COORDINATION ON DRUGS

In August 1962, the subcommittee began a study of Federal drug problems. The immediate basis for the study was the problem of drug safety. This problem was illustrated by the international tragedy of the birth abroad of thousands of babies, deformed by a "harmless sedative," known as thalidomide.

Problems of drug safety and drug efficacy, drug information, research, purchases and regulation occupied the subcommittee's attention throughout 1963. The hearings ended on May 28, 1964. The final report is now in process.

Publications: In addition to its first volume in 1962, the subcommittee issued, during 1963-64, five hearing-exhibit volumes and a committee print on "Drug Literature."

Achievements: The chairman of the subcommittee, Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, has presented to the Senate a series of statements, describing significant achievements by the subcommittee in fulfillment of its mission. These achievements relate both to cooperation between agencies and strengthening of intra-agency programs, notably those within the Food and Drug Administration.

Fiscal significance of study: The study of Federal drug problems has involved the scrutiny of over $¼ billion annually in direct Federal expenditures. This includes around $90 million in purchases of drugs used in the three Federal hospital systems (those of the Veterans' Administration, the Department of Defense, and the U.S. Public Health Service). Indirectly, much larger sums of money are involved. The reason is that drug therapy plays a crucial role in Federal inpatient and outpatient clinical programs (over and above those in our basic system of private medicine throughout the Nation).

2. COORDINATION ON DEVICES

Medical devices and materiel: In connection with the interagency drug study, evidence emerged of the need for increased coordination in the separate agencies' procurement of medical supplies and equipment. As a result of the subcommittee's efforts, steps are underway in an Interagency Procurement Advisory Council toward increased cooperation in this respect, as well.

Fiscal significance: Purchases of medical devices by Federal agencies involve over $100 million annually. The safety and effectiveness of this equipment also involves, however, the health and well-being of vast numbers of patients.

3. COORDINATION ON PESTICIDES

In May 1963, the subcommittee held the first of a series of hearings on Federal pesticide policies and programs. The review has been conducted under the acting chairmanship of the former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Senator ABRAHAM RIBICOFF.

Significance: Pesticide programs are vital to the Nation's production of food and fiber. The programs may likewise involve health in many instances.

Hearings and publications: Close to 100 witnesses, representing every shade of opinion on this very complex and controversial subject have been heard to date. Cabinet officers, Federal and State scientific experts, conservationists, university agricultural scientists, pesticide industry representatives, and the late Rachel Carson have presented their views.

Printed transcripts of the record, covering over 1,000 pages, in 4 volumes, have been made public. The background material used by the President's Science Advisory Committee in developing its 1963 "Report on the Use of Pesticides" will be released by the subcommittee at a very early date in a 4-volume set covering an additional 1,000 pages. The transcript of the more recent hearings, which may comprise 10 additional volumes of printed hearings, is being prepared for early publication.

Achievements: Considerable progress in interagency coordination has occurred during the past year and a half. This progress is due in considerable measure to contributions by the subcommittee.

Subcommittee's own economy: The subcommittee has endeavored to serve as a model of economy in its own right. For example, the pesticide study has been conducted with the services of only a single clerical-stenographic employee on the payroll of the subcommittee. Editing work has been performed by existing subcommittee staff and all other professional duties by staff loaned from the office of the Acting Chairman.

4. OTHER AREAS OF COORDINATION

During the 88th Congress, the subcommittee and its staff maintained close contact with Federal agencies on a number of other areas of interagency coordination on which the subcommittee had been active in previous years.

(a) The most important of these areas was interagency coordination on scientific information, documentation, and communication. The subcommittee's interest in this topic dates from August 1957. It involved in earlier years an extensive series of hearings, reports, committee prints, Senate documents, and studies by the staff of the full committee and the subcommittee.

It should be noted that the efficiency of numerous agencies' science information programs vitally affects the success of the over $15 billion in federally supported research, development, testing, and evaluation. During 1963 and 1964, much additional progress on the information front resulted from the subcommittee's efforts.

The subcommittee also endeavored to stimulate governmentwide teamwork in a number of other areas.

The subcommittee chairman has summarized a few of the miscellaneous results obtained in 1963-64, as follows:

(b) Study of interagency coordination in international technical assistance programs resulting in increased partnership between the Agency for International Development and domestic departments and agencies (e.g., U.S. Department of Agriculture, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare) in the furnishing of technical aid overseas.

(c) Interagency coordination in international athletic programs, resulting in the issuance by President John F. Kennedy of an Executive order, establishing an Interagency Committee on International Athletics (a mechanism useful in encouraging both fitness of American youths and an adequate American effort in the world of Olympics).

(d) Interagency coordination in behavioral studies relating to war or peace, resulting in the establishment in March 1964 of a Social Science Advisory Board by the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

Manual: As part of other diverse activities, the subcommittee published in August 1963 a revised edition of the "Federal Disaster Relief Manual." First published 4 years earlier, the manual, prepared by cooperating Federal agencies, has served as a useful handbook. It outlines, on a governmentwide basis, programs available to States and communities stricken by floods, hurricanes, and other disasters.

GAO studies: In addition, during the 88th Congress, two studies were made by the General Accounting Office, at the subcommittee's request: A study of waste, resulting from inadequate planning and tardy termination of a radio telescope in Sugar Grove, W. Va., by the Department of the Navy; and a study of mismanagement of National Science Foundation grant funds by the American Institute of Biological Sciences.

Study of foreign aid: In October 1962, the subcommittee issued as a committee print a study of American foreign aid programs by Senator ERNEST GRUENING. The study was based on his on-the-scene analysis of U.S. aid in 10 Middle Eastern and African countries.

THE DRAFT IS NOT A PARTISAN ISSUE

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, during the past year, the late President Kennedy, President Johnson, Secretary McNamara, and many distinguished Members of the Senate gave increasing attention to the problem of our outmoded military draft.

Three months ago, on June 29, 1964, I discussed the draft in a detailed Senate

speech, proposing specific legislation directing the Secretary of Defense to submit a step by step plan for the full, responsible elimination of the draft by 1967, when present draft laws expire.

In this connection, of course, Senator Goldwater's recent, somewhat vague, proposal that the draft be ended "as soon as possible" is a welcome one. There is a danger, however, that the tone and context of the Senator's remarks may cast the issue in partisan terms, which would be a disservice to the Nation.

I would like, therefore, to review the record of the last year to show that there is a growing and nonpartisan consensus that the Selective Service System must be revised, and that Senator Goldwater is a latecomer to this consensus.

On September 6, 1963, John F. Kennedy noted in a letter to James G. Patton, president of the National Farmers Union, that "the growing pool of eligible manpower is far in excess of the needs of the armed services, short of national emergency." The President told Mr. Patton that he was "starting to study carefully all the steps that we can take to free young men from doubt about their status, and from inequities under the present law."

Accordingly, President Kennedy issued an Executive order on September 10 providing for the deferment of all married men from the draft.

Far from resisting change in the present Selective Service System, the Department of Defense has begun to try to find possible alternatives to it. As the New York Times reported on January 6, 1964, the Pentagon was already studying the draft laws early this year "with an eye to possible major revision."

On January 16, Senator Keating introduced a bill to establish a commission of 14 which would provide a "comprehensive study and investigation of the adequacy of the present system of compulsory military training under the Universal Military Training and Service Act." Senator Keating was joined in sponsoring this bill by a bipartisan group of 12 Senators, including myself.

On April 19, President Johnson announced plans for a full review of the draft system, indicating the hope that it would be replaced within 10 years, and on June 22, Secretary McNamara approved a $1 million manpower study program which was expected to lead to the elimination of the program or drastic revision of it.

So the administration had already taken all of these definite steps indicating its desire to revise the present Selective Service System, when I introduced, on June 29, legislation aimed at eliminating the draft by 1967. My bill, S. 2960, would direct the Secretary of Defense to formulate and submit to Congress for its consideration at least 2 years prior to the expiration of the present program, an alternative designed to meet our military manpower requirements on a voluntary basis.

I introduced this bill because I believe the Congress has a responsibility to express itself on this major issue. And I believe we should take action to establish a definite schedule for ending the draft by 1967.

Mr. President, the primary fear of those who feel that we must maintain an involuntary system is that the armed services might not be able to attract enough volunteers if the threat of the draft were not hanging over the heads of potential enlistees. On July 8 I presented to the Senate evidence based on Army and Air Force surveys of enlistees showing that the draft is not needed as a threat to get men to volunteer. If the main elements of my plan are implemented—increased military pay and other incentives for enlistment, the elimination of arbitrary standards which bar many capable men from enlisting, and the use of more civilians in noncombat jobs—I believe conscription will be unnecessary.

On August 14, the Pentagon announced plans to enlist 60,000 draft rejectees over the next 3 years for a 6-month rehabilitation and training period in the Army. The major aim of this program will be to test one of the assumptions embodied in my bill: that certain arbitrary standards for enlistment could be lowered without harm to the quality of our Armed Forces.

The Department's program follows a smaller experiment undertaken early this year. After a 6-week intensive training course 11 men who had failed the enlistment screening test scored high enough to meet draft standards. Administered by the National Committee for Children and Youth, and joined by the Departments of Labor and Defense, the program showed that revisions in present standards are possible.

The record shows, I think, that the draft is under serious and responsible attack. Indeed, by this summer, the winds of change had become so strong that the membership of our major parties reached a consensus on the desirability of ending the draft as soon as possible.

On July 14 the Republican Party signified its agreement with the goal of the administration's announced actions. The Republican platform pledged a "reevaluation of the Armed Forces' manpower procurement programs with the goal of replacing involuntary inductions as soon as possible by an efficient voluntary system, offering real career incentives."

On August 25, the Democratic Convention promised in its platform to "pursue our examination of the selective service program to make certain that it is continued only as long as it is necessary and that we meet our manpower needs without social or economic injustice."

Thus, it was almost a year after President Kennedy had begun to take another look at the draft that the Republican candidate on September 2 joined those who oppose the present system. To my knowledge, his proposal to end the draft was the first time that the Senator from Arizona had publicly commented on the issue, and his statement came when all the necessary steps for ending the draft had been proposed.

We are happy to welcome Senator Goldwater to the cause, but frankly, there is some doubt about his complete dedication to it. In the same September 2 speech, he charged that the Johnson administration is using the draft for "political and social schemes."

Without further clarification, we are once again left in uncertainty about what the Senator really means, but if he includes in his condemnation the program which was announced by the Pentagon on August 14, his determination to end the draft must certainly be questioned. The expressed purpose of the first program, as I pointed out earlier, is simply to see if young men who would like to volunteer for the services but are rejected, can meet the qualification standards after a brief training program. More importantly, this test program will, if successful, answer part of the problem of a voluntary system, for if we can use men who are presently excluded from the draft, it would mean a great addition of enlisted men to our present forces.

I do not see how Senator Goldwater can proclaim his intention to end the draft and at the same time dismiss this kind of program, which is a preliminary to creating a new system, as a "political" or "social" scheme. It would seem that either the Senator does not understand the draft, or he is not very serious about doing something about it.

Those of us who have taken an active interest in changing our manpower procurement system know that this is not a partisan effort. There is now a broad consensus that the draft should be eliminated as soon as possible. The remaining differences are matters of method and of timing, and I am hopeful that agreement can be reached on these during the next session of Congress among all who are genuinely concerned.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that several articles relating to the draft be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Jan. 6, 1964]

Draft Overhaul Being Considered—Repeal of Law Held Doubtful, but Pentagon Review May Lead to Major Changes

(By Jack Raymond)

Washington, January 5.—The Pentagon is studying the draft laws and how they are carried out with an eye to possible major revision.

Officials point out, however, that total abandonment of some form of conscription is not likely without a far more drastic reduction of military forces than is now foreseen.

There are now 2.7 million men in the Armed Forces and no major reductions are pending, despite certain cutbacks for economy reasons.

According to Defense Department experts, the size of the Armed Forces would have to be reduced at least one-third and probably more to permit recruitment of an entirely voluntary force.

Nevertheless, studies have been undertaken on all aspects of conscription, including its possible abandonment. They are directed by William Gorham, a Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower.

Mr. Gorham was in charge of the studies that were prepared for President Kennedy last September, when the President halted the draft of married men by giving them deferred status.

The United States never had a peacetime draft law before 1940. It was extended by one vote in the House of Representatives in 1941, on the eve of World War II, after a fierce debate in which then Representative Lyndon B. Johnson played a major role.

Mr. Johnson, favoring the draft among other forms of military preparedness, arranged for Secretary of State Cordell Hull, a former Member of the House, to send an appeal to the House requesting extension of the Draft Act. The message was applauded and presumably won over some Members.

EXTENDED WITHOUT DEBATE

After the war conscription and proposals for universal military training were hotly debated. The Universal Military Training and Service Act of 1951, however, has been extended by Congress regularly virtually without debate.

The Senate last year took 10 minutes to extend the act. The House did not take much longer, although a handful of its Members argued for a reassessment of military manpower needs in view of the growing population and complaints of inequalities.

One of the proposals, by Representative Robert Kastenmeier, Democrat, of Wisconsin, called for a Presidential commission on the utilization of military manpower that would make recommendations on personnel requirements of the future.

President Kennedy, although supporting the draft, concerned himself with the complaints about it. His exchange of letters with James G. Patton, president of the National Farmers Union, was an example.

Mr. Patton wrote the President last August, reporting that in traveling around the country he had found "that an increasing number of Americans are becoming deeply concerned over the ineffectiveness, inequality, and consequent injustice of our national policy on the procurement of military manpower."

Pointing out that the policy and program had been established a long time ago, but that times had changed, Mr. Patton went on:

"Experts appear to agree that the draft no longer meets the needs of our armed services for skilled manpower and that, in addition, it unequally and undemocratically distributes the burden of defending our society.

"Isn't it time for a thorough-going reappraisal of our military manpower problem?"

Mr. Kennedy, in a "Dear Jim" reply said:

"I am sure that all of us agree that the Selective Service Act is administered as fairly as it can be but falls far short of being perfect. Certainly there are inequalities in its results."

NEW STUDY URGED

The President added that it was "especially important" to survey the problem again because "the growing pool of eligible manpower is far in excess of the needs of the armed services, short of a national emergency."

Mr. Kennedy added, however, that he was "in complete agreement" that some sort of Selective Service System must be kept in operation for an emergency.

The President then called attention to his plan to permit deferment of married men.

"But that is only an initial step, and we are now starting to study carefully all the steps that we can take to free young men from doubt about their status, and from inequities under the present law," Mr. Kennedy said.

With his letter to Mr. Patton, Mr. Kennedy forwarded an extract from a Pentagon memorandum outlining certain reasons for maintaining the Selective Service System.

The extract suggested that some of the inequities in the draft were due to increased voluntary recruitment. Conceivably, it observed, efforts to increase the attractiveness of military service could lead to elimination of the need for military conscription.

"Nevertheless," the Pentagon warned, "until we actually have attained this objective it would be a grave gamble with national security to terminate the authority."

Because the Armed Forces do not need all the men that the draft makes available, deferment possibilities have been broadened over the years and physical and mental standards raised.

TESTS ORDERED AT 18

In raising the standards, the Government has been dismayed at the number of youths exempted for psychological disorders. The Army Surgeon General's Office found that nearly one-eighth of those who failed to meet minimum standards between 1953 and 1958 were psychologically unfit.

This concern led to an order, issued yesterday by President Johnson, moving up to 18 years old the age for physical and mental testing for the draft. At present the examinations are generally given at 22 or 23. The idea of the earlier examinations is to try to spot those youths who need help as soon as possible.

The broadening of deferment possibilities has brought charges that the young men with enough money to get married or enter college have an advantage over those who must go to work immediately out of high school.

While selective service decisions are subject to appeal in Washington, it is said that regulations are often applied differently in various communities. A youth who would be drafted in one locality is spared in another, and some young men are reported to have moved their residences for that reason.

At the Pentagon, the manpower experts assert that about 500,000 new recruits are needed annually to keep the active duty force at 2.7 million and that 100,000 more new men a year are required to maintain an Active Reserve force of 1 million.

Although the Army is the only military service that uses the draft, it is agreed that without it the Navy and Air Force would be hard put to maintain their strengths through recruitment. Many young men, facing the draft, volunteer for the Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps or Coast Guard in preference to Army service.

As alternatives to the draft, suggestions have been made for increasing pay and making military service so attractive that its appeal would permit recruitment; a nationwide lottery, in which the various deferment and exemption practices would be eliminated and the luck of the draw substituted; and the Hershey plan.

The latter plan, named for Lt. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, Director of the Selective Service System, would introduce a form of universal military service. Existing mental and physical requirements would be lowered considerably, although not abandoned, in order to bring virtually every young man of draft age into a training program for a period of as little as 3 months.

The plan has other features but it is based essentially on the premise that virtually all young men should serve, that many who do would choose to stay in uniform, and that those who don't stay would be wasteful of the training effort anyway.

[From the Milwaukee Journal, Jan. 9, 1964]

Draft Investigation Needed

Inequities of the Draft Act become increasingly apparent as the pool of draft-age young men increases without an increase in the number needed by the Armed Forces.

Universal military training is not universal. Many young men avoid service. Deferments are liberally granted to college students and men in "critical" occupations. Under the latest draft rules married men are not taken.

Defense authorities concede that the Draft Act is not so much a program for conscription as a "hot breath" that spurs young men to enlist. They say that without the draft enlistments would fall off drastically.

Some critics urge abandonment of selective service. They think volunteer service could be made sufficiently attractive with better pay and fringe benefits so that all the men needed would volunteer. Dr. Eli Ginzberg, the Columbia University manpower specialist, does not go that far but he thinks the draft should be reformed. Recently he suggested a lottery. Each boy upon reaching 18 would pull a number from an urn. On the basis of the number drawn he would be classified as immediately available, available if needed, available in a serious emergency. Nobody would be permanently exempt but all would have a clear idea, early in adulthood, about the chances of being called.

Senator Keating, Republican, of New York, and six other Senators have now introduced a bill calling for an investigation of the Draft Act. The legislation proposes that a study commission of 14 members be created. It could have no more than five military men.

The Pentagon already has a committee at work making a similar study, but the draft is essentially a civilian operation. A commission authorized by Congress is the appropriate body to make the study. By the time the present act expires July 1, 1967, detailed information and recommendations should be available.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 10, 1964]

Revising the Draft

The new studies by the Defense Department of means and methods of procuring military manpower are welcome—though tardy. They should be supplemented by investigations by appropriate congressional committees and by private groups.

For it is none too soon to begin to consider alternatives to or major revisions of the draft law, which expires in June 1967. It has been clear for some time that the inequities in the present law and the great increase in the draft-age population, plus technological changes in the armed services, require a major reexamination of how to select, recruit, and retain the numbers of men required annually.

There is much that is wrong with the present draft law. It is in no sense universal: only about 58 percent of the men reaching age 26 (the upper induction level) ever serve. There are all sorts of exemptions. Aside from the inequities, the draft per se (except when applied en masse in wartime) is a wasteful system. Shocking, too, are the high percentages of those rejected for mental or physical defects or illnesses.

The studies ought to be directed primarily at two objectives:

Can the services be maintained at required levels without the compulsion of the draft? Without additional inducements toward professionalism—higher pay, quicker promotion, more psychic rewards, or what not—this seems doubtful. We cannot afford to gamble with security. Britain has discarded the draft and as a result she has not been able to maintain her army at a size commensurate to her needs or plans. The United States may be able to do so, but only if we provide more inducements to volunteers.

What can be done about the intolerably high rate of rejections? President Johnson has made the first partial move by directing that all 18-year-olds be examined immediately upon reaching draft age to permit correction of, or treatment for, remedial defects. But this is a palliative. The large number of men rejected as psychiatrically unfit is a challenge to the Nation's program of mental health. How is it to be met? Where are such men to be treated? Who is to treat them?

Answers to these and scores of other questions dealing with the procurement of military manpower—and indirectly with the social health of the Nation—are long overdue.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 23, 1964]

OVERHAULING THE DRAFT

The comprehensive review of the Selective Service System launched by President Johnson carries no implication of a softer approach to our world problems. Although it coincides with a relaxation of tension between the United States and the Soviet Union, the President's chief motive appears to be adjustment of the draft to current domestic realities. The fact that the present law has been in effect for 15 years and that the fairness of its operation is being increasingly questioned is sufficient reason for a thoroughgoing review.

In wartime the draft was imperative because of the heavy demands of the military services for manpower. Through the cold-war period the Selective Service Act has been repeatedly renewed because the country has looked upon it as the best means of sharing the obligations of military service equally, as the President has said, through a "fair and just system." But the country is certainly not committed to compulsory military service any longer than it is necessary to the national defense.

The study which the President has ordered may lead to the conclusion that the draft is no longer the best means of recruiting the type of men that the services need. It may indicate that the registration of 9 million men between the ages of 18 and 26 is a wasteful way of recruiting the 500,000 who are actually inducted each year. Or the President's study group may find that the draft is still essential and that it can be made to operate more satisfactorily.

Whatever the outcome, further emphasis should be focused on the plight of the young men, nearly one-half of the total, who are deemed to be physically or educationally unfit for military service. The Nation cannot afford this continued waste of manpower. Here is one of the most vital segments of the administration's campaign to rehabilitate the disadvantaged.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, May 14, 1964]

HOW UNITED STATES FINDS MILITARY MANPOWER

(By Neal Stanford)

WASHINGTON.—Practically every American male, 18 through 26 (who is not deferred and is physically and mentally fit), can expect to do military service.

It will come some time during those 8 years—sooner or later—depending on whether he waits for the draft.

What so drastically cuts down the size of the 9-million-man draft pool in this country is the size and number of those exempt and deferred—plus those who enlist.

MINIMUM STANDARDS

Roughly a third of the country's male population ages 18–26, is judged unfit for peacetime service.

These men cannot meet the physical and mental tests given all entering the military services.

This suggests that, as Norman Paul, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower, said not long ago:

"If the needs of the armed services were simply for aggregate numbers of men under arms, irrespective of trainability or skill, it is possible that we could procure the number of individuals needed in all services today without recourse to the draft. As a practical matter, certain minimum mental, physical, and moral standards of acceptability for military service have been essential at all times * * *."

Since 1951 all enlistees and all draftees are examined under the same physical standards and under a common mental test. Each service also uses its own specialized supplemental aptitude screening tests.

The physical standards are essentially the same as in World War II.

ABILITY TO ABSORB

The mental test (Armed Forces Qualification Test) is aimed at measuring a person's general ability to absorb military training within a reasonable period of time.

The minimum passing score for inductees, set by Congress in 1951, corresponded to about a fifth-grade level of education.

The Korean war, however, showed this level too low for the "higher qualitative requirements" of the services in modern warfare.

In 1958 Congress allowed a supplemental aptitude test. This disqualified the lowest 15 percent of the draft-liable population.

ONE-THIRD ELIMINATED

Still, about a third of inductees are drawn from group 4, or the lowest acceptable mental category.

Physical and mental standards, then, eliminate about one-third of all young men examined for service—volunteers as well as draftees.

Next came the deferrables—married men, students, those engaged in an exempt occupation—generally something to do with defense, security.

Draft boards are sympathetic to the educational efforts of those eligible for selective service.

They invariably permit high school students to finish their schooling. They generally permit those that want to go to college to do so. They even allow most of those wanting to work for a master's degree to work for it.

HESITANT ON PH. D.'S

But they are hesitant to allow work for a Ph. D. It is argued that a young man, by stretching out his education that far and getting regular deferments could reach 26 before finishing his schooling—and avoid (or evade) the draft.

High school students, however, are deferred not just because selective service is sympathetic to education in general, but because in practice 18- and 19-year-olds, even 20-year-olds are not called up, as older men are taken.

Fathers have been deferred all along.

Last September, the late President Kennedy deferred married men without children.

This was done primarily to cut back the size of the draft pool that was growing much faster at the bottom than it was being siphoned off at the top.

NO RUSH INTO MARRIAGE

His ruling did not though, as some thought it would, create a rush to the marriage bureaus.

Before Mr. Kennedy's ruling, 3 out of 10 in the draft pool were married.

Now it is only about 33 out of 100.

However, the elimination of married men has lowered the average age of draftees by 1 full year—from about 23 to 22.

The explanation is the way the draft boards pick men to be inducted.

The first group called are the so-called draft delinquents.

They are not juvenile delinquents—but those who in some way or other have tried to skip the draft, avoid the call—gone a.w.o.l., and so on.

They catch these boys first. It is a small group.

NEXT THE 26-YEAR-OLDS

Then they take those not exempt or deferred by age order, starting with the 26-year-olds who have not yet done their military service.

They want to be sure that except for those exempt or deferred, everyone does his time in the service.

When all 26-year-olds are taken, then the 25-year-olds, and so on down the age list.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, May 15, 1964]

EIGHTEEN-YEAR-OLDS FACE PUZZLE

(By Neal Stanford)

WASHINGTON.—Eighteen-year-olds face a problem: Should they enlist or wait to be drafted?

If they enlist, they are in for 4 years if they choose Air Force or Navy, or 3 years if they choose Army.

If they wait for the draft the stretch is only 2 years. But if they enlist, they can get their tour of duty over by the time they are 22.

If they wait for the draft (as things are now) they won't be tagged until they are 22.

If they enlist they can choose their service. If they wait to be drafted, they automatically go into the Army.

At some point, if single and physically and mentally fit, they are going to be called before they reach 26.

However, somewhere between 18 and 22 or 23 (when the draft might get them) they may get married. That would defer them.

Therefore, unless they are really looking forward to military service (which is not the rule) they can well miss it.

Congressmen have made it quite clear they don't particularly approve of deferring all married men. Fathers, yes. But childless married men, no.

Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL, Democrat, of Georgia, chairman of the powerful Senate Committee on Armed Services, said early this year: "That was a serious mistake. It should never have been done."

EXEMPTION CRITICIZED

His argument was that local boards knew better the circumstances in each case and could use judgment and discretion in making deferments of married men.

"This blanket exemption," he charged, "naturally is going to drive some of these young men into marriage before they are ready for it. It just is not fair. It brings a new element of unfairness into a situation that was already crowded with unfairness."

Eighteen-year-olds face the fact that under the draft system they are not going to be taken until they are 22 or 23.

They could, if through high school, start learning a trade, or go to a junior college, or get married at 21 or 22 and never be inducted.

But if they don't get married they will eventually get called (unless the rules change), and it will not be at their pleasure but at the Government's.

EDUCATION PLANNED

That is another reason why many enlist—they want to decide when to do their military service and how to plan their future education, if any, not leave it to chance and the Government.

As things now stand they cannot be drafted at 18 and get out at 20. This is because only the older age draft groups are called, due to the size of the draft pool and the desire not to let the older men escape.

True, at 18 they can enlist and get their military duty over within 3 or 4 years, depending on the service they join. Then they can go on with their education or a career.

One thing 18-year-olds find hard today is to get a job with the draft hanging over them, even though 3 or 4 years off.

Employers don't want to hire someone who is going into the Army a year or two or three later.

Four out of every ten enlistees admit that they volunteered rather than await the certainty of the draft but the uncertainty of the time they would be drafted.

It is quite apparent that the draft has given impetus to voluntary enlistments.

CHANGE LOOMS

Without a draft the other services (which don't use it to get their manpower quotas) would have a hard time filling their ranks. Gen. Earle G. Wheeler, Chief of Staff of the Army, put it this way recently: "The other services would suffer without a draft because to a certain degree the fact that the Army has a draft makes some people volunteer for the Air Force and Navy."

There is one draft uncertainty facing the 18-year-old that is being eliminated this coming fiscal year. It is surprising it wasn't done earlier.

The practice is, and has been, to defer the physical and mental examinations of draft registrants until they were called up.

That has meant that 18-year-olds had to wait until they were 22 or 23 to find out if they met the physical and educational standards of the military services.

BENEFITS SEEN

With one out of every three men not meeting current standards, it became obvious that this particular draft uncertainty—disrupting the work, schooling, plans of so many young men—needed to be eliminated.

Eighteen-year-olds ought to, and before long will, know if they are physically and educationally unfit for the services, instead of waiting 3 or 4 years to find out.

The benefits are obvious.

It will permit those with deficiencies to go ahead with their plans and possibly start remedial action.

It will let the others know they are going to be drafted eventually, unless they enlist or marry, and let them plan accordingly.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, May 16, 1964]

LEGISLATORS RESTUDY DRAFT

(By Neal Stanford)

WASHINGTON.—What's wrong with the draft—or UMT as the Universal Military Training Act is known?

Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL, Democrat, of Georgia, has called it "unfair."

Representative THOMAS B. CURTIS, Republican, of Missouri, says it is "neither universal, military, nor training."

More and more Congressmen are asking for changes in the law, or for doing away with it altogether.

Senator KENNETH B. KEATING, Republican, of New York, has asked for a Presidential commission to study defects in the law and recommend changes.

Mr. CURTIS has a bill before Congress to set up a joint congressional committee to study possible substitutes.

CONSIDERATION ORDERED

President Johnson has ordered Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara to consider "alternatives" to the present selective service system.

There seems to be a widespread feeling that there's something wrong with the draft. What is it?

Here are the major criticisms floating around the Capital:

1. The draft should be, as it was before Pearl Harbor, only used in wartime—there is something un-American about it in peacetime;

2. The only thing universal about it is that everybody has to register; exemptions and deferments make a mockery of universality;

3. It is really a program to spur men to enlist for 4 years, rather than wait to be drafted for 2;

4. It makes a "hardship" case out of marriage, by linking it in deferment with parenthood, which can really be a "hardship";

5. It doesn't provide the increased demands under modern warfare for qualified technicians;

6. It keeps the 18- or 19-year-old in suspense as to his military prospects, making it difficult for him to get a job or go on with his schooling;

7. It discriminates in favor of the rich boy, encouraging him to continue his education and possibly evade military service;

8. Its system of screening and placements is haphazard and inadequate, wasting a lot of manpower.

9. Its physical and mental standards are obviously inadequate when a man like Cassius Clay is turned down;

10. It is providing such an ever-increasing draft pool that escaping the draft will become easier and easier.

While the peacetime draft is something new in American life, most Americans seem to have accepted it as a necessity. The contention of the military, that they need it to get the men required, has so far persuaded, if not pleased, the Congress.

It is true that UMT is far from universal. A third of the men in the draft pool are ruled out for physical or mental defects. Possibly 40 percent avoid it by enlisting. Another 10 percent or so are deferred because married or having dependents.

VOLUNTEERS SOUGHT

Another 10 percent stay out to continue their education or because of specialized talents. It is universal then for less than 10 percent—after exemptions, deferments, and enlistments.

It does spur enlistments, which is what the services want. They want volunteers as opposed to forced-duty inductees. They prefer young men, around 18 and 19—who make up most of the volunteers—to older 25- and 26-year-olds more set in their ways—who make up most of the draftees. And they want men for 4 years (3 for the Army) rather than just 2.

TECHNICIANS REQUIRED

The decision to defer married men, as well as fathers, has caused some young men to rush into marriage to avoid the draft, but not as many as expected. Still the possibility of using marriage to avoid the draft disturbs a lot of Congressmen.

The draft does not consider the dramatic shift in military manpower needs since Korea—particularly for electronics specialists. Actually today the enlisted force requires more electronics technicians than infantrymen, more aircraft mechanics than cooks and drivers. This change in the required force structure of the services, plus the revolutionary changes in military technology have occurred, but with no change in the basic draft system.

While the deferment for education is approved by Congress, Congressmen are disturbed lest college and particularly master of arts and doctor of philosophy work be used to avoid the draft. Deferment has been left to the judgment of local draft boards, but there is considerable variation in the way the rule is applied. Obviously deferment for schooling favors those who can afford it.

COMMENTS DRAWN

The case of Cassius Clay (the heavyweight boxer who lifted the boxing crown from Sonny Liston but who could not pass the Army's mental tests) has caused a lot of talk and some resentment. But surprisingly enough less than a dozen poeple have written to either President Johnson or Mr. McNamara criticizing his exemption from the draft.

He is said to have an intelligence quotient of about 78, below a fifth grade educational level.

It is practically certain that Mr. Clay did not fake his low mental rating. The best psychologists the Army had saw to that. Actually Mr. Clay, "the greatest," would have made a marginal soldier at best. Most of the cries against his deferment came from the press, not the public.

A real danger to the draft system comes from the startling expansion of the draft pool. The military need stays constant, but the size of the pool increases each year.

Deferment of married men was a quick way of reducing the pool.

When it gets too big the possibility of escaping it obviously increases.

THE DRAFT IS OUTDATED

(A column by James G. Patton, president of the National Farmer's Union, distributed July 7, 1964)

In August 1963, I wrote President Kennedy that I was deeply concerned over the ineffectiveness, inequality, and injustices of our national policy on the procurement of military manpower. I pointed out that the draft no longer meets the needs of our Armed Forces for skilled manpower and that, in addition, it unequally and undemocratically distributes the burden of defending our society. I suggested to President Kennedy that it was time for a thoroughgoing reappraisal of our military manpower policies.

In September, President Kennedy responded that he agreed with the necessity for a careful study of the inequities under the present law and that such a study would be undertaken. He also said that he was planning to issue an Executive order deferring married men. This he did the following week.

In October I wrote President Kennedy expressing my appreciation for his proposed action and raised with him two additional questions:

1. Are our present Reserve, ROTC, and National Guard policies and programs realistic in the nuclear age? My impression is that they are badly outdated and highly wasteful.

2. Shouldn't the Secretary of Defense be give meaningful authority over military assignments, transfers, and promotions? It is difficult for an administrator to function effectively without genuine control over the personnel in his agency.

Finally, I suggested that he appoint a Presidential Commission to look into the whole problem of military manpower purposes and programs and I sent him a detailed memorandum dealing with the proposed responsibilities of such a Commission.

Before further action could be taken, the tragedy at Dallas was upon us and we had a new President in the White House.

In February of this year, I wrote President Johnson telling him of my earlier correspondence with President Kennedy and sent him a copy of my memorandum urging the establishment of a National Military Manpower Commission.

Naturally, I am extremely gratified with the President's announcement of last month that a broad study of the draft is being undertaken and that $1 million is being devoted to these studies designed to explore the feasibility of discontinuing military conscription. I was only disappointed in one aspect of the President's plans. It seems to me that the problem of involuntary military service in peacetime is so fundamental in American life that the study should be undertaken by a Presidential Commission composed of distinguished citizens and reporting directly to the President. I think it would be a mistake to have primary control over the project rest in the Pentagon.

I am confident that a well formulated program can be achieved which will eliminate the draft, modernize reserve programs and achieve huge savings in man-years and budget dollars. Such a program would justifiably generate widespread public support and enthusiasm. Most important, it would bring strengthened civilian control and simple human justice into our huge military manpower structure.

[From the Washington Post, July 21, 1964]

ELIMINATION OF THE DRAFT SEEN BY 1967

(By John G. Norris)

An exhaustive Government review of military conscription now underway is likely to result in the Nation's shifting to all-volunteer recruitment in the Armed Forces, on a trial basis, by 1967.

At the least, the broad study ordered by President Johnson will bring major changes in the selective service law that has been a key factor in American life for most of the last quarter century.

Should present indications prove wrong and continuation of some type of draft be ruled necessary, an annual lottery for 19-year-olds to determine who serves and who is exempt is probable.

These forecasts can be safely made, even though Pentagon officials in charge of the review are withholding predictions of what they will recommend until their study is completed late next winter. The facts all point toward far-reaching changes in military manpower policies.

The chief factor is the postwar bumper baby crop. By next year or the year after, it is expected that some 1.9 million young men will be reaching military age annually—nearly double the total up until last year.

This key fact is important in two respects: it will multiply existing doubts about the equity of the present draft system; and, with some increase in incentives for voluntary enlistment and other steps, probably make it possible for the armed services to get the numbers of men they need without conscription.

But major questions remain. Can the Armed Forces, without the spur of the draft to encourage voluntary enlistments, get the quality of young men they need? Will enough youths enter the officer procurement programs to provide the required number of young leaders if they have no legal military obligation to fulfill?

HALF MILLION NEEDED

Can today's services, which require more electronics technicians than infantrymen, obtain sufficient recruits with high IQ's if career incentives replace the draft incentive?

The services need nearly a half million men from each class coming of military age to supply their needs. At present, close to 100,000 are drafted into the Army each year, and the remainder enlist in the service of their choice for longer periods than the 24-month required draft service.

It has always been assumed that without the draft law the other services would not get enough volunteers to maintain their required strengths and the Army its specialist needs, with the Armed Forces at their present 2,700,000-man total.

Part of the governmentwide review of the conscription system now in progress under the direction of Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense William Gorham is to determine what is the prime motivation for enlistment in the Armed Forces today: a military career, specialist training that will qualify for a civilian job, or simply fulfillment of the present legal military service obligation.

Intensive surveys among servicemen and high school students are planned to help answer this question, which, in turn, will help in answering the broader question whether the draft is indeed necessary.

Among the imponderables involved is whether the draft now and in the future will generally be accepted as meeting reasonable standards of equity. Arithmetic will make this question more acute during the next several years.

Until last year, about 1 million young men reached military age annually. Of this total, about one-third were found mentally or physically unfit. Of the remainder, almost all served unless deferred under constantly liberalized criteria, culminating in the virtual exemption of all married men last year. This has kept the manpower pool of 18-to-26-year-old registrants roughly in balance with needs.

But with the big increase in men coming of military age, only about half of those eligible under present standards will be needed to meet Armed Forces needs.

In looking into a substitute volunteer system for the draft, the Pentagon is considering both how to raise the supply of volunteers and how to reduce some military manpower commitments. One method would be to raise military pay and fringe benefits. The entrance pay for both officers and enlisted men now is well below civilian standards.

Another possibility under study is to cut requirements for some skills and leadership posts and rely on longer training for slower learners. This raises the basic question of the advisability of lowering military manpower requirements to achieve an all-volunteer service.

A final answer to what the United States will do about the future of the draft will depend on the results of current studies, including the added cost of a volunteer system. The odds now favor reenacting the selective service law when it expires in 1967, with a number of changes, and a trial period of keeping draft calls on a standby basis.

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 14, 1964]

ARMY TO ENLIST 60,000 REJECTEES ON 6-MONTH REHABILITATION TRIAL

(By John G. Norris)

The Pentagon announced plans yesterday to enlist 60,000 young draft rejectees over the next 3 years for a 6-month trial rehabilitation and training period in the Army.

The major aim, Pentagon officials said, is to determine whether an expanded program along these lines could provide many more volunteers who could be made acceptable for service and thus help end the draft.

The program, starting in November, also would provide an additional program for rehabilitating high school dropouts and other poor youths who are unable to find work, as a further step under President Johnson's war on poverty.

President Johnson is reported interested in the plan. He has expressed concern about the high rate of draft rejection for mental and physical reasons. A major study of the draft is already in progress.

The Journal of the Armed Forces reported that some in the Army did not like getting the military into "health, education, and welfare functions," and dub the plan the "Military Youth Corps" and "Moron Corps."

But Army officers said the pilot program should provide experience in emergency preparations of men who do not now meet mental and physical standards but who would be called in a mobilization.

Understandably, however, military chiefs would rather take the better qualified recruits and draftees that they have been getting under higher standards set in 1958.

Under the new program, the Army will accept an average training level of 11,000 previously rejected men for 3-year conditional enlistments. They will receive basic training and special educational instruction. Men with minor, correctable, physical defects such as bad teeth or hernias will be accepted and the defects will be remedied.

After 6 to 12 months, those found to be acceptable—either by passing the Armed Force qualification test after educational help or proving they were good soldiers—will be offered regular enlistments. Others will be released to civilian life. Volunteers only will be taken under the plan. The trainees will not count as part of Regular Army strength.

It is expected that training will be conducted at a single, as yet undetermined, camp.

Last year, of 532,000 men who took preinduction examinations, 265,000 qualified and 266,000 were rejected. Of those, 115,000 failed mentally and nearly half were classified 1–Y and 4–F.

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 20, 1964]

HOPEFUL EXPERIMENT

The Pentagon's plan to enlist 60,000 young men rejected for the draft in a program of training and rehabilitation is conservationist in the best sense of the word. In many instances young men are turned down for military service because of decayed teeth or easily correctable physical defects. In other instances they are turned away because of inadequate education. It is inexcusably wasteful merely to reject these men and do nothing about their disabilities.

Some objection has been raised to getting the Armed Forces into the business of health, education, and rehabilitation. But these are vital elements in the building of any military force. The only difference in the special rehabilitation and training program is that men of somewhat lower qualifications will be taken and the conditioning process will have to be somewhat more extensive. But this would seem to be a wholly proper burden to place upon services that are making large demands upon the country's manpower.

Volunteers for the rehabilitation program will be offered regular enlistments if they qualify at the end of 6 to 12 months. Others will be released with the advantage of improved education and health as a reward for their willingness to seek military service. In either event, there should be a net advantage to the country as a whole. It would be a mistake to belittle this advantage even from the military point of view, for the men who will be helped by this training would inevitably be swept into the military under a general mobilization.

The new experiment will be especially useful if it helps to remove the necessity for the draft. Extra training and health aids for unprepared young men who wish to join the services would be a small price to pay for elimination of compulsory service. We hope that this promising experiment will be carried out with full appreciation of its potential value for the entire country.

[From the New York Times, Sept. 4, 1964]

THE PENTAGON SAYS IT WELCOMES GOLDWATER IDEA THAT DRAFT END

WASHINGTON, September 3.—The Defense Department said today that the military draft should be ended "as soon as possible," and that it was glad Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, of Arizona, the Republican presidential nominee, agreed.

A Pentagon statement said, however, that it was irresponsible to suggest ending the draft before there were other adequate means for recruiting manpower for the Armed Forces.

Replying to the speech in which Mr. GOLDWATER formally opened his campaign, the Pentagon cited a quotation from former President Dwight D. Eisenhower about making a political issue of the Selective Service.

The Pentagon said:

"Any suggestion that the draft be ended without providing adequate substitute means to recruit soldiers for our Armed Forces is the kind of irresponsibility that was described by President Eisenhower in 1956 when he said, 'The issue of our military draft is no matter of a technical point to be scored in a political debate.'"

PLEDGED TO END DRAFT

Senator GOLDWATER said in a speech prepared for delivery today at Prescott, Ariz., that a Republican adminstration would "end the draft altogether, and as soon as possible." He also said the Democrats were using the draft, for "social schemes," as well as military needs.

Nils A. Lennartson, Deputy Assistant Defense Secretary for Public Affairs, issued the Pentagon's reply.

"We are glad to know that the Republican candidate agrees with the administration that the draft should be ended as soon as possible," the statement said.

"The fact is that more than 4 months ago President Johnson directed a study to reach this result," Mr. Lennartson said. He said the study would be completed next April.

When he announced the study last April, Mr. Johnson said the Pentagon would search for alternatives to the draft system, including the possibility of going to an all-voluntary basis.

Mr. Johnson said then that the draft was clearly needed at present but that a comprehensive study of the system was required.

SYSTEM WAS HELD INDISPENSABLE

Up to that time, the Defense Department had contended that the draft, although it took few men each month, was an indispensable means not only of meeting Army manpower requirements but also of influencing men to enlist or volunteer for officer programs in all services.

The Pentagon said the draft would be "ended today" if voluntary enlistment could meet all military manpower needs.

Mr. Lennartson's statement said the Defense Department could not understand Senator GOLDWATER's charge that the draft was used for anything but military purposes.

The statement mentioned two programs of the type that Mr. GOLDWATER's press secretary, Paul F. Wagner, said the Senator meant when he spoke of the draft being used for social schemes.

One program is the newly announced plan to take in volunteers who fail to meet physical and mental standards of the Army. They would be rehabilitated while taking basic military training. Plans call for taking in 60,000 over a 3-year period.

That program is for volunteers. Another plan, developed by the Pentagon and several other Government agencies, calls for helping draft rejectees to qualify themselves for either voluntary military service or useful civilian employment "so that they can become taxpayers and not taxeaters."

[From the New York Times Magazine, Sept. 27, 1964]

Should We End the Draft? Our Way of Procuring Military Manpower, Now a Campaign Issue, Is Reexamined

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

(Hanson W. Baldwin is military editor of the New York Times. His most recent book is "World War I: An Outline History.")

"Peacetime conscription is repugnant to the spirit of democracy and the soul of republican institutions."

"By handing boys over to the arbitrary and complete domination of the Government, we put it in the power of the Government to indoctrinate them with the political doctrines then popular with the Government. * * * In wartime it is bad enough; in peacetime it would be intolerable."

These comments were made respectively by Senators Arthur Vanderberg and Robert A. Taft, Sr., less than 25 years ago. And the opinion they expressed—that peacetime conscription was intolerable in the United States—reflected at the time the basic attitudes of millions of citizens, many of whose parents had migrated to America to escape what they considered the tyranny of European conscription.

Despite such ingrained feelings, the United States has had a military draft system—except for a brief 17-month interlude—ever since the emergency brought on by World War II in 1940. It was renamed, during the Korean war, the Universal Military Training and Service Act, and has been extended repeatedly for 4-year periods. Last year Congress gave the draft some cursory hearings and debate before voting overwhelmingly to extend it until 1967, but until recently, it appeared that the draft had little opposition today and was here to stay.

Now Senator GOLDWATER—as Adlai Stevenson tried to do in 1956—has made the draft a political issue in the presidential campaign, branding it "outmoded and unfair" and promising, if elected, to end it "as soon as possible." To which the administration has retorted that the Pentagon is already embarked on a study, to be completed next April, which will explore the feasibility of ending the draft, but that it is irresponsible to suggest ending the draft without providing adequate substitutes for recruiting necessary military manpower.

The total strength of the Armed Forces today is approximately 2,700,000 men, and it is expected to remain at about this level in the immediate future. There is a major turnover in personnel, particularly in the lower ranks and grades, which amounts to about 20 percent annually. New replacements come through voluntary enlistment, officer candidate schools, ROTC programs, pilot training programs, the Reserves and, of course, the draft.

About 100,000 men a year are currently being drafted for 2-year terms—a figure which represents some 20 percent of the roughly 500,000 men the services require yearly for replacements. All the rest are volunteers, in name at least. The services—the Army particularly—believe that the "hot breath" of the draft is what persuades many young men to volunteer. Actually, the Army is the only service utilizing draftees at the present time. The other services, because they are smaller or more technical, or have more of a reputation for glamor, sustain their strength solely by volunteers. But many of these volunteers, it is suspected, enlist in the service of their choice in order to make sure they are not drafted into the Army.

There are many other factors which influence men to volunteer for terms varying from 2 years to a lifetime. Among them are the opportunities provided by the services for education and technical training; the security of a Government paycheck; pension rights and other so-called "fringe benefits"; travel and adventure; "escape"; the inability to find a satisfactory civilian job, and so on.

It is this system of procuring military manpower—combining compulsion with inducements, the carrot and the stick—that is now under heavy fire, particularly the compulsory part of it.

Objections to the draft fall into four major categories—military, political, social and economic.

In the military view, Armed Forces composed of long-term professionals are likely to have better morale, to be better trained, more ready and generally more effective than short-term, semitrained conscripts. If one thinks in terms of the kind of combat waged in World War I and II, then mass-drafted armies would still have considerable importance. But today's technological revolution and the nuclear age have reduced the demand for "bodies" and the "Big Battalions" and have accentuated, instead, the need for "brains" and for the "Ready Battalions." The soldiers, sailors, airmen and marines of today must be highly intelligent, highly trained men. For many key specialists the schooling and training required may take longer than the 2-year term of the draftee. And the large turnover annually in personnel—whether of drafted men or volunteers—reduces the readiness of the services and makes them more training schools than combat forces.

The political arguments against the draft center on two basic objections; first, that conscription is inherently incompatible with democracy and freedom, and second, that the so-called universal training and selective service act is in no way universal or even selective, but rather discriminatory, inequitable and unfair.

It is true that the concentration and centralization of military power tends to restrict individual freedom; career planning, for instance, is complicated—sometimes completely distorted—by the draft. The Federal Government has utilized draft deferments, as Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, Director of Selective Service, has testified, as "the carrot * * * to try to get individuals into occupations and professions" considered by Government to be necessary ones. In a free society the draft does, then, serve to promote regimentation.

The personal inequities and hardships caused by the draft as it now operates are legion. Today, only about 48 percent of the approximately 1.1 million men reaching the age of 26 (the de facto cutoff age for the peacetime draft) have ever donned a uniform; by 1965, this may drop to 40 percent. Instead of being inducted at the age of 18 or 19, after high school graduation, men are taken now at about the age of 22 or 23, just when they are trying to finish college or start their careers. The reason they are not drafted earlier is that there is such a large pool of potential draftees—one that is still increasing.

Moreover, young men can now be deferred for so many reasons that the majority can—and do—escape all service. Farming, special occupations, physical deficiencies, educational deferments, marriage, and fatherhood—all these and many others are reasons for draft postponement. Some critics believe that the educational deferments are particularly unfair and dangerous, and are creating a kind of "oligarchy of brains." Educational deferment, it is charged, tends to favor the rich or the well-endowed at the expense of the poor or the less well-endowed. These discriminations, and the fact that one selective service board drafts one man while another man with virtually the same history is deferred or rejected, document in an increasing number of cases the charges of unfairness. And unfairness to constituents is political dynamite on Capitol Hill.

Those who object to the draft on social grounds say that it is disruptive because the uncertainty about deferments and age of induction make planning for a career or family life difficult. And since the late President

Kennedy added marriage (fathers had already been deferred) to the list of deferments, which meant virtual exemption from the draft, there have been reports of youthful marriages contracted or materially hastened in order to make the man draft exempt. Needless to say, many of these hasty marriages end in the divorce courts.

The economic consequences of the draft parallel some of the social liabilities. Employers do not like to hire young men who are uncertain when, if ever, they will be called into uniform. As Representative ROBERT TAFT, JR., of Ohio, has stated: "The draft most certainly contributes to the high unemployment rate found among young men in their late teens and early twenties."

These are some of the criticisms of the draft stressed by those who believe it should be ended. But the debate is by no means all black or white; there are many valid arguments that support continuation of compulsory military service.

First and most important are the requirements of security. Despite the comforts with which most Americans live and the Nation's booming economy, few in Government regard the present era as peacetime. We are still involved with recurrent paramilitary crises, such as Vietnam, Cyprus, and Cuba, and anticipate being so for an indefinite future.

We live, too, in the atomic age—the age of speed and power unlimited—and the Nation cannot possibly afford to drop its guard, or even appear to drop its guard. Elimination of the draft would have international political and psychological effects—some of them adverse to the image we have tried to project of a strong and determined America. In other words, democracy, as usual, must be prepared to give up some of its internal freedoms if necessary to protect itself against external enemies.

The draft is the only way, according to a study by the House Armed Services Committee last year, by which the required size of the Armed Forces can be maintained. Without the compulsion of the draft, voluntary recruitment might slough off, and the size of the services might diminish to a point of danger. The United Kingdom eliminated draft, and the British Army, despite increased emoluments, has never since been of sufficient size to meet adequately all of its commitments.

In addition to its influence upon the size of the Active Forces, the draft is important to the size and quality of the Reserves, particularly the Army's ground units of National Guard and Reserves. Because of the draft, with its requirements for a minimum of 6 months of active training (plus 6 years of Reserve training), some of the ground units of the Reserves are in a higher state of readiness than they have ever been. Elimination of the draft might reduce the readiness and effectiveness of Reserve units and increase their difficulty in recruiting the necessary personnel.

Compulsory military service has also brought many byproducts which have strengthened the political, social, and economic fabric of the Nation.

The services operate the largest and in some ways most advanced technical training and educational institutions in the Nation. Annually scores of thousands of technicians doff their uniforms to form the backbone of trained labor staffs in electronic, aerodynamic, automotive, and other industries. Most of the country's airline pilots were trained by the military. Many of the Nation's best management specialists are exmilitary officers. More linguists, though perhaps not the best linguists, have been trained by the services than by our universities. In training aids, in methods of language instruction, and in other areas the services have been preeminent. Assuredly, though the large annual turnover of military personnel hurts the efficiency of the Armed Forces, many of those who graduate from uniform represent a major contribution to the Nation's skills and knowledge.

But behind the immediate debate about the draft is a larger problem, one that goes beyond compulsory military training alone. It is the problem of how best to mesh the requirements of the services with the best interests of a free society.

There is not much doubt that long-term professional services—Active and Reserve—are better suited to the military requirements of the atomic age than large, semitrained rapid-turnover forces drafted or induced to serve by the prospect of the draft.

Whether the young men of America would volunteer in sufficient numbers to maintain forces of the requisite size once Uncle Sam was no longer breathing down their necks depends primarily upon three factors:

1. The size of the military manpower pool. The "baby boom" of the postwar years is now steadily increasing that pool; in 1962, 1,476,000 youths reached the draft age of 18; in 1966, this figure will approximate 1,880,000. Today there are 10.6 million American men between 18½ and 26½; by 1967, this pool will grow to 12.4 million. Some experts believe—and the Pentagon study is plumbing these beliefs—that it will be possible to recruit voluntarily all our military needs from the swollen population of tomorrow.

2. The inducements provided to voluntary recruits and would-be officers. Pay and other incentives are important material considerations which influence men to undertake a service career. So, too, are the psychic inducements—the sense of a job worth doing, of loyalty and tradition, a pride of uniform and a feeling that the Nation is proud of the men who serve it. Certainly the inducements offered today will not be adequate to meet the military manpower needs of tomorrow without compulsion. A sharp improvement in service pay scales, pensions, housing and other benefits, and a revision in the methods of procuring service manpower, in service career patterns, in stability of assignments and in other areas will be essential before sufficient volunteers of high motivation and intelligence eliminate the need for compulsion.

3. The reduction of present service standards. It has been suggested that one way of obtaining volunteers would be to lower the present strict physical and mental standards to a more realistic level. About one-third of all men examined by the services—volunteers and draftees—are now rejected, some for physical defects, some because they are in the lowest mental and intelligence classification, some because of emotional or psychiatric problems. President Johnson, in attempts to help these men, recently ordered the Government to provide those who wished it with educational, physical, or other aid.

The President also ordered the start of a pilot program. The Army, in each of the next 3 years, plans to induct 20,000 below-standard volunteers for experimental training. Some of these may be taught to read and write or will receive other basic education; others, with remediable physical defects, will receive medical care; all of them will be given 6 to 12 months' training to determine their usefulness to the Army. Those who make the grade may be retained in service for a full 3-year enlistment.

Actually, this program is not startlingly new. The Army taught men to read and write, and accepted far lower category recruits in World War II and in the Korean conflict than it does now. A mass Army and a mobilization numbered in millions required the use of all manpower categories.

From the strictly military point of view, the utilization of lower-category personnel no longer appears to be necessary, while past experience with such personnel has been disappointing. As recently as 1957–58, the Army, convinced that its low-category personnel was causing an undue amount of trouble, weeded out, with the approval of Congress, the low performers. Since then, the guardhouse and prison population has materially declined, and overall performance has increased. Any reduction of standards—particularly if it should admit large numbers of low-category personnel—would undoubtedly reduce quality, and hence combat effectiveness, to a dangerous degree. While it may well be desirable, for the sake of society, to educate and train the backward, sickly and depressed, is the Army the place to do it?

Thus the problem of the draft is broad and complex; whether it is retained or eliminated or modified, the effects will be widely felt—in the services, throughout society, around the world.

From this weighing of the pros and cons several clear-cut conclusions emerge.

First, there is absolutely no doubt, in my opinion, that the present system of procuring military manpower, including the draft, must be revised. The annual turnover in the military services is too large and the inducements to professionalism too small. The Navy, for instance, is able to retain as regular, long-term officers only about 15 percent of the graduates from its officer candidate school—a major source of officer procurement. Electronic specialists are no sooner trained than their term of enlistment expires and they doff the uniform. Largely although not entirely because of the turnover there is far too little stability of assignment; men become expert sonar operators aboard a ship one year only to be transferred to new duty the next; a battalion or a company may have a new commanding officer every year or two. To correct this, not only must the annual manpower input be reduced and more officers and enlisted men induced to make military careers their life work, but service career patterns and assignment policies must be modified.

Second, there is no doubt that it would be desirable to end the draft entirely. Military effectiveness—in terms of highly trained professionals instantly ready—would be greatly improved if professional motivation could be substituted for compulsion. Certainly a voluntary system of recruitment is more compatible with past American traditions and with our concept of political freedom than conscription. The younger generation would be able to plan its important beginning years with far greater certainty than is now possible, and the somewhat corrosive effects upon morale of the present system of deferments and exemptions would be ended. Militarily, politically, and socially then, it seems desirable to end the draft.

Third, the first priority of the foreseeable future is still national security. While it may be desirable to end the draft, the price would be too high if it meant enforced reduction in the size of the armed services, or a watering down of quality. If there is no other way to maintain the quantitative and qualitative strength of the Armed Forces at approximately the present plateau, the principle of compulsion for military service must be continued, although its application should be modified.

Fourth, far more intense and detailed studies are needed before any final decision can be made. The study now underway in the Pentagon is an essential beginning. But it is not enough. It should be followed by a much broader and more comprehensive examination of the entire problem of the effects of the draft upon our society and of the procurement of military manpower. A joint bipartisan congressional committee or a specially appointed Presidential Commission should undertake such a study, calling upon experts from all fields.

Finally, if the facts then clearly indicate that voluntary recruitment and long-term professionalism, encouraged by improved incentives, might supply service needs, the draft should be ended. But if there is doubt, the principle of compulsion might then be suspended, rather than eliminated, for a stated period, in order to test and try a new system, one more compatible with "the soul of republican institutions."

THE ECONOMY OF THE MIDWEST

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, for more than 1 year now I have been conducting a study of the economic problems of the Middle West as related to federally sponsored research and development.

On June 23, 1964, I urged the development of a new national policy on the distribution of Federal funds for research and development.

In 1940, we were spending $74 million for research and development. In the current fiscal year, we will spend $15 billion. During the period when this form of Federal spending has increased so dramatically there has been surprisingly little attention paid to the overall manner in which this money is spent or to the place where it is spent.

Some time ago, I learned that the presidents of our outstanding Midwestern universities were becoming increasingly concerned about the effects of Federal spending for research and development on the future of higher education and on industrial development.

I have been corresponding with some of these educators and with others interested in this subject and I want to report some of their comments to the Senate which I am sure shares my concern about this vast investment which our taxpayers are making in research and development.

Our progress in science and technology is without equal and we must expand and build on our past accomplishments. More than this, however, we need to evaluate the effects of our scientific activities from points of view other than just the scientific. Expenditures for research and development should be viewed as one category of governmental purchase. We need to ask if we are purchasing what we want and if our purchases are having the most constructive effects.

For various reasons Federal support of scientific research has been concentrated on the coasts of our country. This concentration of funds, scholars, equipment, and experience in working with the Government creates great competence which, in turn, begets more governmental support.

Thus cycles are established and it becomes very difficult for regions or industries outside the established cycle to compete. The States of the Middle West have excellent universities and train many of the scientists and engineers who conduct the various scientific activities of the Government. F. E. Mills, associate director of the Midwestern Universities Research Association, has written in a letter to me:

> We find, however, that we not only educate our own young and send them to these large federally supported research areas, but that we also pay for the education of the young people from these (out-of-State) areas and then send them back. Viewed this way, one sees that these universities are a major national asset in a region being neglected by the Federal Government. We already have strong evidence that this situation cannot persist but is leading to the deterioration of these very institutions. Any one of a dozen university presidents can testify to the difficulty of maintaining topflight staff in this situation.

The fact is we don't have any definite national policy today on the pattern to be followed in allocating Federal funds for research and development. The pattern which we have followed almost unintentionally is having an unfavorable effect on the Midwest, home of many of our greatest industries and our greatest universities, which are the real strength of America. Federal funds come from all the taxpayers, including 50 million or more people in the Midwest. We cannot pursue a policy, even unintentionally, which has the effect of wasting the industrial and intellectual potential of the American heartland.

This point is expressed well in a letter to me from W. Clarke Wescoe, chancellor of the University of Kansas. He states:

> The Nation cannot afford to allow the deterioration of the economic position of any significant sector of the country, but particularly of the Midwest which has shown itself the backbone and sinews of agriculture, military materiel production, vital transportation and communications networks, and broad education at all levels, particularly the training of graduate students in critical manpower areas of science and engineering. The demonstrated potential of our region in these crucial fields must not be ignored and allowed to wither while vast investments of Federal funds are made to build from much more meager foundations new industrial and technical complexes in regions which must import their capabilities, nurse and develop their educational and research institutions, and look to far markets for their products.

The vitality of any region is greatly dependent upon its intellectual resources. When federally suported activities are located preponderantly in one region or another, bright young scientists tend to flock to the attractive and challenging new fields. Mr. Wescoe continues:

> The scientific aspect of the problem is similar and similarly disturbing. The Midwest is far from lacking intellectual capacity and scientific capability, but the current patterns of placement of Federal funds for research and development certainly do little to foster the growth of this capacity; in fact, they operate to drain away much of our newly trained young scientific and technical manpower. Yet the solution is not a simple geographical or population-based allocation of funds. There must be a rigorously applied philosophy and policy of recognizing the Nation's long-term interest in the broad developments of its scientific and technological resources and needs.

Harlan Hatcher, president of the University of Michigan, writes to me:

> Your statement pointing out that there must be some consideration given to a reasonable distribution of defense contract work and other Government support in areas besides the two coasts is one to which the University of Michigan heartily subscribes. We believe that this point must be made strongly and repeatedly until a recognition of the seriousness of the situation is aroused in the administration and in Congress, and through them in the Government agencies.

Not all the blame for lack of Federal research and development activity can be attributed to the Government. The industries and universities of the Middle West have not in all cases been as aggressive as they should have been in seeking Federal contracts. In this regard, Marshall W. Keith, associate director of the Midwestern Universities Research Association, has written to me:

> To illustrate, in the middle 1950's when I was with the Office of Naval Research, I spent a day at a well-known Racine manufacturing plant begging them to take a research contract that they were well equipped, both personnel- and equipmentwise, to carry out. On another occasion the same year, the Chief of Naval Research and I spent 2 days with a Minneapolis firm begging them to take a contract in a field in which they were specialists. In both instances we were turned down. Can you, by any stretch of imagination, see one of the California companies acting thus?
>
> I am afraid that the pioneering spirit that built the Midwest immigrated to the coasts sometime in the last 50 or 100 years.

The universities of the Middle West and the other neglected regions need assistance in building their competence for training and teaching as well as for conducting research. A National Science Foundation program to begin in 1965 will aim at increasing the number and quality of university science departments. This is but a small first step, although it may prove to be the method best suited to vastly increasing our competence in training scientists in future years. However, the most immediate need is for increasing support for the present excellent universities. J. B. Page, vice president for research and dean, the Graduate College of Iowa State University, writes to me:

> We would not oppose the establishment of new centers; what we do propose is that it is clearly in the national interest to support through research and facilities grants existing strong universities to the absolute limit of their ability to take additional students or to train additional numbers without diluting quality. This support should be immediate and adequate so that our present strengths are not eroded away and dissipated for the sake of gaining greater geographical distribution. It takes from 3 to 8 years to train the best qualified student after their bachelor's degree to the Ph. D. level. The training and bringing together of well-qualified, able graduate faculties in the numbers envisaged may well take two to three times that long.

Our first effort must be to maintain and to strengthen our existing graduate faculties to the ultimate of their capabilities. Only when this can be assured should additional efforts be directed toward building up additional centers of excellence.

Long range planning for scientific activities is needed and manpower needs must be evaluated. The very challenging recommendations made by the Committee on Utilization of Scientific and Engineering Manpower is reason alone for us here in the Congress to reconsider the scientific activities which are supported by the Government. The committee states:

> Government must assess in advance the effects of its decisions on the deployment of large numbers of scientists and engineers, both in undertaking new projects and in discontinuing old ones.

Further the committee recommends:

> Before the Government reaches a decision to undertake a great technological program it should make a careful assessment of the impact of the decision on the deployment and utilization of scientists and engineers.

I cannot urge forcefully enough that we consider our scientific stature carefully. As a Senator from the Middle West, I sincerely hope that, through increased industrial and scientific enterprise, the economy of the Middle West can be improved. Cooperative effort by industries and universities in the Middle West is needed and machinery for cooperation and communication is being set up already in several of the States. This united front in the States is the most important ingredient for increasing the competitive position of the Middle West. Also needed is guidance and leadership from Washington. Here we must see that all the regions of our country are given a chance to develop and contribute on a fair and equal basis.

I ask unanimous consent that some correspondence with officials of universities of the Middle West be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Midwestern Universities Research
Association,
Stoughton, Wis., July 16, 1964.
Senator Gaylord Nelson,
U.S. Senate, Washinton, D.C.

Dear Senator Nelson: I have had an opportunity to read your "Statement to the Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Development of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics." I find it to be a most thoughtful and challenging document. I am interested in this problem myself and have come face to face with it several times in the 8 years I have spent at MURA. I hope you will continue your efforts in this subject and can make the problem widely known.

I should like to add several comments about my own thoughts and experiences. You have correctly pointed out that the enormous growth of science-oriented industry in diverse parts of the country is not due to investment in scientific training by citizens of these areas. Rather, this trained cadre of engineers and scientists is largely due to the efforts of Midwestern universities in coping with the problem of maintaining high standards of education while providing education for the great masses of people. Contrast this to the attitude, for example in the East, where little attempt is made to provide this education. This is the source of a problem which is common to all of the Midwestern universities: the enormous influx of out-of-State students. Now we certainly want to make this education available to all who can profitably use it. We find, however, that we not only educate our own young and send them to these large federally supported research areas, but that we also pay for the education of the young people from these areas and then send them back. Viewed this way, one sees that these universities are a major national asset in a region being neglected by the Federal Government. We already have strong evidence that this situation cannot persist but is leading to the deterioration of these very institutions. Any one of a dozen university presidents can testify to the difficulty of maintaining topflight staff in this situation.

Another observation I should like to offer concerns the local attitudes of people essential to the growth of science-oriented industry. In the Madison area, I have seen the attitude of people in general shift to a point where they understand very well the implications of science-oriented industry. Indeed, these implications are apparent in their daily life. These people want to take part in this technological revolution and want their communities to grow with the rest of the country. For example, farming is an industry which has benefited perhaps the most from research. I have discovered in talking to people in small farming communities that they are very aware of the function of research and education in society, and in discussing MURA and its role; they really only need to learn the details, not the overall situation. On the other hand, I find a reticence in some of the larger manufacturers to strike out in these new fields and commit themselves to the future. I have no suggestion about how to overcome this attitude, but it must be done to make progress in the future.

I appreciate the chance to read and comment upon this statement and strongly urge you to continue your efforts.

Sincerely yours,
F. E. Mills,
Associate Director.

The University of Kansas,
Lawrence, July 21, 1964.
Hon. Gaylord Nelson,
U.S. Senator from Wisconsin,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Nelson: Thank you for your letter of July 9 and the opportunity to comment on the matter of federally sponsored research and development.

The distribution of Federal research and development funds has become a matter of major economic as well as scientific importance to the Nation. Your statement describes well, and documents, the economic aspects of the problem. The Nation cannot afford to allow the deterioration of the economic position of any significant sector of the country, but particularly of the Midwest which has shown itself the backbone and sinews of agriculture, military material production, vital transportation and communications networks, and broad education at all levels, particularly the training of graduate students in critical manpower areas of science and engineering. The demonstrated potential of our region in these crucial fields must not be ignored and allowed to wither while vast investments of Federal funds are made to build from much more meager foundations new industrial and technical complexes in regions which must import their capabilities, nurse and develop their educational and research institutions, and look to far markets for their products.

The scientific aspect of the problem is similar and similarly disturbing. The Midwest is far from lacking in intellectual capacity and scientific capability, but the current patterns of placement of Federal funds for research and development certainly do little to foster the growth of this capacity; in fact, they operate to drain away much of our newly trained young scientific and technical manpower. Yet the solution is not a simple geographical or population-based allocation of funds. There must be a rigorously applied philosophy and policy of recognizing the Nation's long-term interest in the broad development of its scientific and technological resources and needs. There must be a practice of placing Federal funds where past performance, present capability, and future potential guarantee research and development of high quality and when several different regions seem to offer equal promise, then habit, inattention, default, parochialism, or political expedience must not be allowed to sacrifice the Midwest and imperil the Nation's future.

Sincerely yours,
W. Clarke Wescoe,
Chancellor.

The University of Michigan,
Ann Arbor, July 28, 1964.
Hon. Gaylord Nelson,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Nelson: The University of Michigan is much concerned about the problem discussed in your letter of July 9 and in your statement to the Subcommittee on Science, Research and Development of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics. The university appreciates the research and effort that you have devoted to this problem and wants to be of help.

When the location of the new NASA Electronics Research Center was being considered, the University of Michigan in cooperation with the other universities in southeastern Michigan and with the government of the State made a determined effort to try to bring this Center to the Midwest and if possible to Michigan. A location proposal was prepared and a presentation was made to the NASA Committee in Washington. I enclose a copy of this proposal. You will see that it brings out a number of the same points that you make with regard to the strong position of the Midwest as a manufacturing center, the recent decline in Defense and Government contracts in this area, and the very strong position of the area in the preparation of Ph. D.'s in science and engineering, most of whom have to leave the area to find employment.

The committee's report justifying its location of this facility in the Boston area took the position that the Center should go to Boston because of the strength of that area in electronics research. The fact that the Midwest had completely adequate and unutilized resources in electronics did not carry sufficient weight. If it continues to be the position both of Government agencies and of industries that it is desirable to congregate in areas where these research-based industries are already strongly represented, the situation can only get worse.

Your statement pointing out that there must be some consideration given to a reasonable distribution of defense contract work and other Government support in areas besides the two coasts is one to which the University of Michigan heartily subscribes. We believe that this point must be made strongly and repeatedly until a recognition of the seriousness of the situation is aroused in the administration and in Congress, and through them in the Government agencies.

The University of Michigan wishes to help in this problem of industrial strengthening of the Midwest. It has established, with support of the Michigan Legislature in its Institute of Science and Technology, a division of industrial cooperation. This division, with about $1 million in State funds annually, is undertaking to strengthen the cooperation between industry and the university and to make known the advantages of this area for research-based industry. The University of Michigan believes that not only the universities of the State of Michigan but also the universities, governments, and industries throughout the whole Midwest must cooperate in this undertaking and desires to be of any assistance possible. We are assured of support from our Michigan Senators and congressional delegation and will be ready to cooperate in any regional efforts to improve the situation.

Sincerely,

HARLAN HATCHER.

MIDWESTERN UNIVERSITIES
RESEARCH ASSOCIATION,
Stoughton, Wis., July 15, 1964.

Senator GAYLORD NELSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR NELSON: Thank you for your letter of July 9, 1964, which enclosed a copy of your statement to the Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Development of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics.

I have read and reread both your letter and statement and am very much impressed with the thought, research, and analysis that went into the preparation of both. There is, in my mind, absolutely no question as to the veracity and accuracy of your statements, and I am only sorry that every Member of Congress and all citizens and taxpayers cannot be forced to read your statement and made to understand it and its implications, as they involve not only the welfare of the Midwest but of the Nation. I am particularly concerned at what I consider to be the rather stupid attitude of some of our larger State industries who would still be making horsedrawn plows and harnesses if their more progressive competitors in other States had not forced them into the tractor business. I am rather certain that all of the blame for concentration of Federal funds cannot be placed on the Federal Government. To illustrate, in the middle 1950's when I was with the Office of Naval Research, I spent a day at a well-known Racine manufacturing plant begging them to take a research contract that they were well equipped, both personnel and equipment wise, to carry out; on another occasion the same year, the Chief of Naval Research and I spent 2 days with a Minneapolis firm begging them to take a contract in a field in which they were specialists; in both instances we were turned down. Can you, by any stretch of imagination, see one of the California companies acting thus?

I am afraid that the pioneering spirit that built the Midwest immigrated to the coasts sometime in the last 50 or 100 years.

Your presentation covered all of the vital points as to the need for support of research and development work in the Midwest except one that most people don't even like to think about; that is the strategic danger of concentrating all of our top research and development and important defense work in a few areas. I believe that a half dozen well placed nuclear weapons could wipe out our entire defense potential and leave us at the mercy of any potential aggressor.

I have shown your letter to a number of our senior staff and asked that they write to you, giving any comments they have that might be of use to you.

Thank you again for an opportunity to review this material and for your continued interest in MURA.

Sincerely yours,

MARSHALL W. KEITH,
Associate Director.

IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY,
Ames, Iowa, August 11, 1964.

Hon. GAYLORD NELSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR NELSON: Your recent very welcome letter to President Hilton was received at a time when he was out of the State. It has been handed to me for a reply and comment which I am most happy to give.

We are very pleased with the excellent summary you have prepared for the Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Development of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics. Your summary is excellent and it presents an unusually lucid analysis of what is an alarming situation and a potentially serious problem both for the region and for the Nation as a whole.

It is clear that there are two ways in which this alarming trend could be halted or reversed: (1) by modifying existing procurement policies to the end that existing industrial and human resources of the Midwest are more adequately recognized and utilized and that a more equitable distribution of procurement is achieved, or (2) recognition that the major educational resource with respect to production of Ph. D. scientists and engineers is in the Midwest region and taking steps to strengthen and protect this vital national resource.

The first of these is receiving attention in many quarters and it is clear that much can and must be done if this region is not to find itself at an even greater disadvantage with respect to the rest of the country. Political considerations will certainly be of great consequence. It is encouraging that the congressional Representatives, the Governors, the educational and business leaders of the Midwest region are joining together to point out the magnitude of the problem and to urge that corrective steps be taken.

The second area in which changes need to be made may be equally, if not more, significant, but I fear that less attention has been directed, and less public concern has been expressed, over what is clearly beginning to happen to our great educational institutions in the Midwest region. You have pointed out in your excellent summary that of the 10 top States in the production of Ph. D.'s, 6 are in the Midwest. The great publicly supported universities, with the addition of a smaller number of privately supported universities in this region, do constitute an educational resource of inestimable value to the Nation as a whole. There has been significant Federal support, but in general the individual States and the region have supported and maintained a unique concentration of great universities presently producing more Ph. D.'s than are being absorbed in the region which supports and provides for their education and training.

Strong pressures are being exerted for the creation of new centers of excellence and for the wider distribution of educational facilities across the country. These are worthy goals with considerable emotional appeal, yet the hard facts are that such centers cannot be created overnight and that if a crash program is undertaken, the needed faculties can only be assembled by raiding the faculties in our universities which have already achieved excellence. Even the President's Science Advisory Committee has pointed out the fallacy and the danger of assuming: that existing first-rate universities are at saturation, that our national capabilities to produce highly qualified scientists and engineers can be doubled or tripled by the simple expedient of large Federal grants to universities newly involved in graduate work, or by failing to recognize that there is a critical mass of high quality professors in related subject areas with associated expensive and extensive facilities which must be brought together in one place if graduate education of quality is to result.

The great universities in the Midwest are faced with a brain drain which could far surpass the exodus which has so alarmed the Government and press in Britain. The announced manpower goals are to more than double our outturn of Ph. D scientists and engineers by 1970. This clearly means that existing faculties and existing facilities will carry the brunt of this effort if the goal is to be reached. It is fallacious to assume that new centers can be staffed at the expense of existing well-qualified and capable universities and get the job done.

We would not oppose the establishment of new centers; what we do propose is that it is clearly in the national interest to support through research and facilities grants, through expanded fellowship programs, and through direct institutional grants existing strong universities to the absolute limit of their ability to take additional students or to train additional numbers without diluting quality. This support should be immediate and adequate so that our present strengths are not eroded away and dissipated for the sake of gaining greater geographical distribution. It takes from 3 to 8 years to train the best qualified students after their bachelor's degree to the Ph. D level. The training and bringing together of well-qualified, able graduate faculties in the numbers envisaged may well take two to three times that long.

Our first effort must be to maintain and to strengthen our existing graduate faculties to the ultimate of their capabilities. Only when this can be assured should additional efforts be directed toward building up additional centers of excellence. If our Midwest universities are kept strong, we will have the strongest possible argument for attracting new science-oriented industries into our region. If we allow our existing strong universities to be weakened or our existing strong faculties to emigrate, there will really be little point to efforts to attract science-oriented industries regardless of what political pressures may be brought to bear.

The rather strong position I have taken above results not just from self-interest, but from a very deep conviction that we have not only an imbalance of industry and Government contracts, but an immediate emergency situation which would clearly be in both the national and the regional interest not to allow it to deteriorate further. Corrective steps would be fairly easy to undertake; the emergency is upon us now and the States do not have it within their own resources to support adequately what we must now recognize as a prime national resource, namely, the combined capabilities of the great universities of the Midwest to train the large numbers of scientists and engineers needed by our Nation.

Very sincerely yours,

J.B. PAGE,
Vice President for Research and Dean,
The Graduate College.

UNIVERSITY OF NOTRE DAME,
Notre Dame, Ind., July 23, 1964.

Hon. GAYLORD NELSON,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: All of us who have been so closely associated with MURA are heartened by your continuing interest in the regional problems created by the Federal research and development programs. Your statement to the Subcommittee on Science, Research and Development of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics documents these problems forcefully.

Through membership on the National Science Board, I am a party to the policy established for National Science Foundation under which geographical distribution of funds has been an important, if not the controlling factor, in awards for basic research and science education programs. I am glad to say NSF has effected a distribution of these funds that varies from the general population pattern only to the extent it favors somewhat the less populous and affluent States and regions. Of course, NSF is only a small part of the national $15 billion research and development effort but its experimentation with institutional grants and the science development program just approved by the House for fiscal year 1965 may chart new paths to the effective accomplishment of the objectives you have so well stated.

On the local scene, the demise of automobile production by Studebaker has sharpened the sensitivity of our business community to the increasingly dominant role of science and technology in economic growth. To strengthen our position to compete effectively in the Federal research and development programs, the university is continuing to expand the capability of its faculty in science and engineering, is establishing a program of continuing education to serve both the university and the local community and is studying the feasibility of an industrial research program including, possibly, joint sponsorship with the local community of an industrial research park.

In the long run, however, I concur in your judgment that more rational and coordinated planning is needed at the Federal level to insure that the great economic benefits flowing from the national research and development effort are realized in every region of the Nation.

If there is any particular constructive action you think I can now take in furthering the development of our Midwest region through increasingly effective participation in the national research and development effort, please do not hesitate to advise me of it. Meanwhile, you have my very best wishes for your personal happiness in serving our country so devotedly.

Cordially yours,
Rev. THEODORE M. HESBURGH, C.S.C.,
President.

INDIANA UNIVERSITY,
Bloomington, Ind., July 24, 1964.

Senator GAYLORD NELSON,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR NELSON: It is heartening to know that you are continuing to press for more attention to the research and development problems of the Midwest. I was most interested in reading your statement to the Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Development of the House Committee on Science and Mathematics.

Attaining a fairer geographical distribution of Federal research and development funds is surely a good cause. I have, for some time, wondered at the Midwest's meeting its educational obligations to the Nation in producing scientists and engineers and the lower rate of scientists produced elsewhere in the country. Yet, most research funds, which are certainly needed to keep this educational process alive, seem to go elsewhere than the Midwest. It seems that the production of scientists and engineers on the coasts does not keep pace with the volume of research funds and the educational obligations that implies.

The equally important problem of the distribution of development funds is of concern to the Midwest. A much closer cooperation and support by midwestern industries for its universities may be a solution to this geographical inequity.

I hope you will continue to devote your energies in calling the attention of the Nation to these problems and the far-reaching consequences of this trend.

Sincerely yours,
HERMAN B. WELLS,
Chancellor.

CORRECTION OF CERTAIN ERRORS IN THE TARIFF SCHEDULES OF THE UNITED STATES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 12253) to correct certain errors in the tariff schedules of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, H.R. 12253, the Tariff Technical Amendments Act of 1964, contains 74 sections making technical, clarifying and other changes in the Tariff Schedules of the United States, which became effective on August 31, 1963. Largely, these changes correct errors and omissions, reaverage certain rates and conform the schedules to recent court decisions and customs rulings.

The amendments provided for in H.R. 12253 in some instances increase the rates of duty on imported articles and, in other instances, decrease the rates of duty. A number of the amendments are merely clarifying in nature and involve no changes in rates of duty on imported products. Generally speaking, the rate changes provided for are for the purpose of restoring to the particular imported articles involved the actual or approximate tariff rate levels that had previously applied under the old tariff provisions in effect prior to August 31, 1963. In some cases this involved arriving at a weighted average of several different rates. I ask unanimous consent that a table illustrating the purpose of the provisions of the bill as reported by the committee be printed at the conclusion of my statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, this bill as it came from the House was not regarded as controversial. Its passage by the House on August 17, under suspension of the rules testifies to this. However, after the Senate received the bill, considerable objection was received with respect to three or four provisions. For instance, the treatment of V-belts by the House bill has caused considerable concern among domestic manufacturers of this product. And the classification of zipper tapes as provided by the House bill was seriously questioned.

These objections and others were carefully reviewed by the Committee on Finance. As the result of this study, five provisions of the House bill were deleted and three were amended. The provisions deleted are those relating to V-belts, wood particleboard, certain ball bearings, sausage casings, and round wire. The provisions amended by the committee relate to commutators, fabrics of manmade fiber, and zipper parts. The amendment to the zipper parts provision assures that the American zipper industry will continue to receive the full benefit of a recent customs ruling classifying zipper tape without teeth as "zipper parts" rather than as "narrow fabrics."

In addition to these provisions of the House bill which were deleted or amended, the Committee on Finance added several provisions to the House bill. Two of these, the first relating to certain wool fabrics and the other relating to button blanks, eliminate tariff avoidance devices. In the case of the wool fabrics, it developed that under the new tariff structure a small quantity of high value vegetable fiber, such as flax or ramie, could be combined with a large quantity of low-value reclaimed wool with the result that the completed fabric, although a woolen product for all practical purposes, would be treated for duty purposes as a vegetable fabric thereby avoiding the higher woolen duties. This was not possible under the old tariff structure. The committee amendment deals with this situation by largely restoring the rates which would have applied to this product prior to August 31, 1963.

The button blank problem is similar. The duty on blanks is 36 percent while the duty on finished polester buttons ranges up to about 140 percent. Because of this disparity, the practice has developed of importing buttons which are finished in every material respect, except that no holes have been drilled in them. The only commercial value of this is to avoid the button rate. Under the committee bill, these almost-finished buttons will be subject to the appropriate button rates.

Other amendments added to the bill by the committee eliminate the duty on limestone chips and spalls, certain agricultural machinery and implements, polyethylene imine, and mass spectrometers imported for the use of Pomona College in California and the University of New Hampshire.

The committee bill also includes an amendment dealing with the treatment of continuous cast aluminum. Under the present tariff structure this continuous cast product is treated as unwrought aluminum, dutiable at 1.25 cents per pound, although it may be competitive in many respects with aluminum which has been processed into rods, plates, and shapes which are dutiable at a higher 2.5 cents per pound rate. The committee has adopted a use-test approach as a solution to the problem. Under this amendment continuous cast aluminum imported to be used for unwrought purposes—that is, for melting, ruling, forging, drawing, or extruding—would continue to be dutiable at the unwrought rate of 1.25 cents per pound, while continuous cast aluminum imported for other uses competitive with wrought aluminum would be dutiable at the higher rate of 2.5 cents per pound.

The committee also added the text of H.R. 5986 to this bill. This amendment, which passed the House unanimously, imposes a specific duty of 24 cents on brooms made of broomcorn valued at not over 96 cents, and a duty of 8 cents on each whiskbroom not valued over 32 cents. This amendment largely carries out the recommendations of the Tariff Commission in its 1962 report on the differences in cost of production of brooms in this country and in the principal supplying foreign country, Mexico. I might add that a somewhat similar amendment was adopted by the Senate in 1962 as an amendment to a House-passed bill. However, Congress adjourned then before the House could act on the Senate amendment.

Mr. President, the administration is quite anxious that the Congress act on this bill before adjournment, since the correction of the errors and omissions in the tariff schedules, which this bill accomplishes, will improve our bargaining stature in the forthcoming trade talks at Geneva by making our law more certain.

I urge that the bill as reported by the committee be approved.

EXHIBIT 1

H.R. 12253—Tariff Schedules Technical Amendments Act of 1964—Outline of provisions

Section	Article	Purpose
7	Agricultural bins and sprayers	Rate decrease to free.
37	Agricultural and horticultural machinery and implements	Clarify.
25	Aluminum, unwrought	Clarify (rate increase).
46	Anesthetic apparatus	Court ruling (rate decrease).
69	Articles assembled abroad	Clarify.
68	Articles of hair	Clarify (increase or decrease).
28	Automobile, etc., parts	Generally clarifying.
	Automatic voltage-current regulators	New provision (rate decrease).
	Electrical articles, parts of	Clarify (rate increase or decrease).
	Furniture designed for motor vehicle use	New provision (rate decrease).
	Hairsprings	Do.
	Hinges and fittings, etc	Do.
	Ignition wiring sets, etc	Do.
	Lighting equipment	Do.
	Permanent magnets	Re-averaging (rate decrease).
	Pumps for liquids	New provision; re-averaging (rate decrease).
	Repair kits	New provision; ease administration (rate decrease).
	Speedometers and tachometers	New provision (rate decrease).
8	Boxes and cases, certain covered or lined with textile fabrics	Simplification (rate increase and decrease).
43	Brake regulators	Rate decrease.
63	Brooms of broomcorn	Tariff Commission investigation (rate increase).
58	Buckles and buckle slides	Court ruling (rate decrease).
57	Button blanks	Correct avoidance (rate increase).
32	Camping and picnic sets, certain	Clarify (rate decrease).
18	Cellulose compounds; lignin	Clarify (rate increase).
34	Chain and chains	Clarify.
71	Coconut, palm oils	Rate decrease.
66	Colostomy bags	Do.
39	Commutators	Do.
48	Comparators	Clarify.
20	Concrete	Do.
42	Conductors, copper insulated	New provision (rate increase).
4	Containers not imported empty	Clarify.
40	Dictation machines	Rate decrease.
32	Dissecting tools fitted into cases containing microscopes	Clarify (rate decrease).
50	Editors and combination editor splicers for motion-picture films	Customs ruling (rate increase).
17	Esters of monohydric alcohols	Clarify.
13	Fabrics, ornamented or with tucks	Correct potential avoidance (rate increase).
30	Files and rasps	Clarify (rate decrease).
64	Fireworks	Rate decrease.
6	Florist articles	Clarify.
67	Fly ribbons	New provision (rate decrease).
9	Gasketing materials of ground or pulverized cork	Do.
23	Glass, colored or special	Conforming (rate decrease).
5	Grape juice	Rate increase.
51	Halftone screens made photographically on plastics material	New provision (rate decrease).
73	Handbags and luggage, certain	Temporary retroactive rate decrease.
33	Handtool, parts of	Clarify.
45	Headwear of fur not on the skin	Do.
44	Headwear of pandan	New provision (rate decrease).
35	Horseshoes	New provision (rate increase).
72	Import restrictions (sec. 22, Agricultural Adjustment Act)	Eliminates administrative burden.
38	Jacquard cards; parts of taps, valves, etc	Clarify (rate increase).
59	Jewelry clasps	New provision (rate decrease).
56	Jewelry, costume	Rate increase.
21	Limestone spalls, etc	Rate decrease to free.
15	Labels of manmade fibers	Court decision (rate decrease).
16	Lactic acid	Re-averaging of rates (increase).
53	Magnetic tape, recordings on, etc	Re-averaging of rates (decrease).
12	Manmade fabrics, certain	Correct avoidance (rate increase).
74	Mass spectrometer for certain universities	Rate decrease to free.
36	Metal products, enameled, miscellaneous	Clarify.
54	Musical instruments, electronic	New provision (rate increase).
52	Papers, heat-sensitive	Re-averaging of rates (decrease).
31	Pencil sharpeners and lead and crayon pointers	Clarify.
29	Picks and mattocks	Re-averaging of rates (decrease).
24	Platinum, certain semimanufactured	Rate decrease to free.
55	Playing cards	Rate decrease.
70	Polyethylene imine	Rate decrease to free.
65	Rubber and plastic film, strips, sheets, and plates	Redefinition of sizes (increase and decrease).
10	Shoeboard	Rate increase.
60	Slide-fastener parts	Clarify (rate decrease).
46	Stethoscopes	Court ruling (rate decrease).
22	Subporcelain refractory articles	Clarify (rate increase).
47	Surveying compasses	Rate increase.
39	Synchronous motors	Rate decrease.
19	Synthetic resins and plastic materials	Clarify (rate decrease).
14	Swiss-type curtains and drapes	Do.
26	Tableware and household utensils	Court ruling (rate increase or decrease).
11	Textile fabrics, coated, filled, or laminated with rubber or plastics; articles made from such fabrics	Clarify (rate decrease).
41	Television picture tubes	New provision (rate increase).
62	Toothbrushes, electric	Rate increase.
49	Watch or clock movements, combination articles containing	Correct potential avoidance (rate increase).
27	Wire fencing, certain galvanized	Court ruling (rate decrease).
12	Wool fabrics, certain	Correct avoidance (rate increase).
61	Wreaths, etc., dried	Rate decrease.
12	Yarns, measure of certain	Clerical.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be agreed to en bloc, and that the bill as amended be considered as original text for purposes of amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I think we had better have the RECORD show what the amendments are.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I have done so already. All I am asking is that the committee amendments be agreed to en bloc and that the bill as amended be considered as original text for purposes of amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendments agreed to en bloc are as follow:

On page 2, line 12, after "(a)", to strike out "The" and insert "Except as provided in sections 21(c), 63(b), and 70(b), the"; in line 25, after the word "amendments", to insert "(other than the amendments made by sections 21(a) and 70(a))"; on page 4, at the beginning of line 3, to strike out "69" and insert "72"; on page 6, after the chart following line 4, to strike out:

"SEC. 10. WOOD PARTICLE BOARD.

"Item 245.50 (p. 98) is amended by striking out '12% ad val,' and inserting in lieu thereof '20% ad val.'."

At the beginning of line 8, to change the section number from "11" to "10"; at the beginning of line 11, to change the section number from "12" to "11"; on page 9, at the beginning of line 12, to change the section number from "13" to "12"; in the heading at the beginning of line 14, to strike out "Fibers" and insert "Fibers or Wool"; on page 10, in the heading in line 4, after the word "Made", to strike out "Fibers" and insert "Fibers or Wool"; after line 6, to strike out:

" 335.60	Over 50 percent by weight of yarns which yarns are composed of fibers not exceeding 5 inches in length and contain not less than 50 percent by weight of manmade fibers	25¢ per lb. + 22.5% ad val.	45¢ per lb. + 70% ad val. "

And, in lieu thereof, to insert:

" 335.55	Containing over 17 percent of wool by weight	30¢ per lb. +45% ad val.	40¢ per lb. +55% ad val.
335.60	Fabrics, other than the foregoing, containing over 50 percent by weight of yarns which yarns are composed wholly of fibers not exceeding 5 inches in length and contain not less than 50 percent by weight of manmade fibers	25¢ per lb. +22.5% ad val.	45¢ per lb. +70% ad val. "

At the beginning of line 7, to change the section number from "14" to "13"; on page 11, after line 11, to strike out:

"SEC. 15 BELTING AND BELTS FOR MACHINERY.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—Items 358.05 and 358.10 (p. 147) and the article descriptions preceding such items are repealed and there is inserted in lieu thereof the following:

"	Belting and belts, for machinery, of textile fibers or of such fibers and rubber or plastics:		
358.02	V-belts	8.5% ad val.	25% ad val.
	Other:		
	Of vegetable fibers, or of such fibers and rubber or plastics:		
358.05	Not in part of rubber or plastics	12% ad val.	30% ad val.
358.06	In part of rubber or plastics	16% ad val.	30% ad val.
	Of wool:		
358.08	Woven	37.5¢ per lb.+ 15% ad val.	50¢ per lb.+ 60% ad val.
358.09	Other	32% ad val.	50% ad val.
358.11	Of silk	27.5% ad val.	65% ad val.
358.14	Of man-made fibers	25¢ per lb.+ 30% ad val.	45¢ per lb.+ 65% ad val.
358.16	Other	12.5% ad val.	25% ad val. '

"(b) MACHINERY BELTS NOT CONTAINING TEXTILE FIBERS.—Item 773.35 (p. 395) is amended by striking out 'vegetable fibers' and inserting in lieu thereof 'textile fibers'."

On page 12, at the beginning of line 5, to change the section number from "16" to "14"; at the beginning of line 13, to change the section number from "17" to "15"; at the beginning of line 16, to change the section number from "18" to "16"; on page 13, at the beginning of line 3, to change the section number from "19" to "17"; at the beginning of line 8, to change the section number from "20" to "18"; on page 14, at the beginning of line 6, to change the section number from "21" to "19"; at the beginning of line 17, to change the section number from "22" to "20"; at the top of page 15, to insert a new section, as follows:

"SEC. 21. LIMESTONE CHIPS AND SPALLS, ETC.

"(a) FREE ENTRY.—Item 513.34 (p. 226) and item 514.11 (p. 227) are each amended—

"(1) by striking out '20¢ per short ton' and inserting in lieu thereof 'Free', and

"(2) by striking out '$1 per short ton' and inserting in lieu thereof 'Free'.

"(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

"(1) Item 480.05 (p. 215) is repealed.

"(2) Schedule 5, part 1, subpart C, headnote 1 (p. 226) is amended by striking out subparagraph (i), and by redesignating subparagraphs (ii) through (vi) as subparagraphs (i) through (v), respectively.

"(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) shall apply with respect to articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption after the date of the enactment of this Act."

At the beginning of line 18, to change the section number from "23" to "22"; on page 16, at the beginning of line 1, to change the section number from "24" to "23"; at the beginning of line 6, to change the section number from "25" to "24"; after line 10, to strike out:

"SEC. 26. ROUND WIRE.

"Schedule 6, part 2 is amended by striking out items 609.40 and 609.42 and the article descriptions preceding item 609.40 (p. 271) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

" '	Round wire:		
	Other than alloy iron or steel:		
609.40	Under 0.060 inch in diameter	8.5% ad val.	25% ad val.
	0.060 inch or more in diameter:		
609.41	Containing not over 0.25 percent by weight of carbon	0.3¢ per lb.	1.25¢ per lb.
609.43	Containing over 0.25 percent by weight of carbon	8.5% ad val.	25% ad val. ' "

And, in lieu thereof, to insert:

"SEC. 25. UNWROUGHT ALUMINUM.

"Schedule 6, part 2 is amended by striking out item 618.01 and the article description preceding such item, item 618.02 and the article description preceding such item, item 618.04 and the article description preceding such item, and item 618.06 (p. 279) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

" '	Unwrought aluminum:		
618.03	Aluminum silicon	2.125¢ per lb.	5¢ per lb.
618.05	Other:		
	Products of uniform cross-section throughout their length (except any such product the least cross-sectional dimension of which is not greater than 0.375 inch, in coils) imported to be melted, rolled, forged, drawn, or extruded; and products other than those of uniform cross-section throughout their length	1.25¢ per lb.	4¢ per lb.
618.07	Other	2.5¢ per lb.	7¢ per lb. ' "

On page 17, at the beginning of line 1, where it appears the second time, to change the section number from "27" to "26"; on page 18, at the beginning of line 1, to change the section number from "28" to "27"; at the beginning of line 13, to change the section number from "29" to "28"; on page 19, after the table following line 5, to strike out:

"(e) BALL BEARINGS WITH INTEGRAL SHAFTS.—Item 680.35 (p. 319) is repealed and there is inserted in lieu thereof the following:

	Ball or roller bearings, including such bearings with integral shafts, and parts thereof:		
680.34	Ball bearings with integral shafts	12% ad val.	35% ad val.
680.35	Other	3.4¢ per lb. +15% ad val.	10¢ per lb. +45% ad val. ' "

At the beginning of line 9, to strike out "(f)" and insert "(e)"; on page 20, at the beginning of line 1, to strike out "(g)" and insert "(f)"; at the beginning of line 12, to strike out "(h)" and insert "(g)"; at the beginning of line 15, to strike out "(i)" and insert "(h)"; at the beginning of line 18, to strike out "(j)" and insert "(i)"; on page 21, at the beginning of line 3, to strike out "(k)" and insert "(j)"; on page 22, at the beginning of line 4, to strike out "(l)" and insert "(k)"; at the beginning of line 7, to change the section number from "30" to "29"; at the beginning of line 10, to change the section number from "31" to "30"; at the beginning of line 14, to change the section number from "32" to "31"; on page 23, at the beginning of line 1, to change the section number from "33" to "32"; on page 24, at the beginning of line 3, to change the section number from "34" to "33"; at the beginning of line 7, to change the section number from "35" to "34"; at the beginning of line 21, to change the section number from "36" to "35"; on page 25, at the beginning of line 1, to change the section number from "37" to "36"; after line 7, to insert:

"SEC. 37. AGRICULTURAL AND HORTICULTURAL MACHINERY AND IMPLEMENTS, AND PARTS THEREOF.

"The article description for item 666.00 (p. 313) is amended by inserting after 'farm wagons and carts,' the following: 'milking machines, on-farm equipment for the handling or drying of agricultural or horticultural products,'."

On page 26, to strike out the table after line 8, as follows:

"

682.52	Commutators	12.5% ad val.	35% ad val.

'

And insert in lieu thereof:

"

682.52	Commutators:		
	With diameter of brush surface not over 1½ inches	8½% ad val.	35% ad val.
682.53	With diameter of brush surface over 1½ inches	12½% ad val.	35% ad val.

"

After the amendment just above stated, to insert a new section, as follows:

"SEC. 40. DICTATION RECORDING AND TRANSCRIBING MACHINES.

"Schedule 6, part 5, is amended by striking out items 685.40 and 685.42 and the article description preceding item 685.40 (p. 323) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"'

685.40	Tape recorders and dictation recording and transcribing machines, and parts thereof	11.5% ad val.	35% ad val.

'"

At the beginning of line 14, to change the section number from "40" to "41"; on page 27, at the beginning of line 1, to change the section number from "41" to "42"; at the beginning of line 4, to change the section number from "42" to "43"; at the beginning of line 8, to change the section number from "43" to "44"; at the beginning of line 11, to change the section number from "44" to "45"; at the beginning of line 15, to change the section number from "45" to "46"; on page 28, at the beginning of line 6, to change the section number from "46" to "47"; at the beginning of line 10, to change the section number from "47" to "48"; at the beginning of line 14, to change the section number from "48" to "49"; on page 29, at the beginning of line 17, to change the section number from "49" to "50"; on page 30, at the beginning of line 1, to change the section number from "50" to "51"; at the beginning of line 6, to change the section number from "51" to "52"; at the beginning of line 9, to change the section number from "51" to "52"; at the beginning of line 9, to change the section number from "52" to "53"; at the beginning of line 15, to change the section number from "53" to "54"; on page 31, at the beginning of line 1, to change the section number from "54" to "55"; at the beginning of line 4, to change the section number from "55" to "56"; after line 10, to insert a new section, as follows:

"SEC. 57. BUTTON BLANKS.

"The article description for item 745.40 (p. 380) is amended by striking out 'Button blanks and molds,' and inserting in lieu thereof 'Button molds,'."

At the beginning of line 15, to change the section number from "56" to "58"; on page 32, at the beginning of line 1, to change the section number from "57" to "59"; at the beginning of line 4, to change the section number from "58" to "60"; in line 8, after the word "lengths", to strike out "but not including tapes wholly of textile fibers"; at the beginning of line 10, to change the section number from "59" to "61"; at the beginning of line 14, to change the section number from "60" to "62"; on page 33, after line 3, to insert a new section, as follows:

"SEC. 63. BROOMS MADE OF BROOM CORN.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—Schedule 7, part 8, subpart A is amended by striking out items 750.30 and 750.31 (p. 383) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

" '

	Brooms and brushes consisting of vegetable materials bound together but not mounted or set in a block or head, with or without handles:		
	Brooms wholly or in part of broom corn:		
	Whiskbrooms:		
750.28	Valued not over 32¢ each	8¢ each	8¢ each
750.29	Valued over 32¢ each	25% ad val.	25% ad val.
	Other brooms:		
750.30	Valued not over 96¢ each	24¢ each	24¢ each
750.31	Valued over 96¢ each	25% ad val.	25% ad val.
750.32	Other	25% ad val.	25% ad val.
750.33	If product of Cuba	20% ad val.(s)	

'

"(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the 30th day after the date of the enactment of this Act."

At the beginning of line 12, to change the section number from "61" to "64"; on page 34, at the beginning of line 1, to change the section number from "62" to "65"; at the beginning of line 10, to change the section number from "63" to "66"; at the beginning of line 13, to change the section number from "64" to "67"; after the table following line 15, to strike out:

"SEC. 65. SAUSAGE CASINGS.

"Item 790.45 (p. 397) is amended by striking out '16% ad val.' and inserting in lieu thereof '12.5% ad val.'."

At the beginning of line 19, to change the section number from "66" to "68"; on page 35, at the beginning of line 1, to change the section number from "67" to "69"; after line 12, to insert a new section, as follows:

"SEC. 70. POLYETHYLENE IMINE.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—Part 1, subpart B of the appendix is amended by inserting immediately below item 907.30 (p. 432) the following new item:

" '

907.40	Polyethylene imine (provided for in item 445.50, item 493.50, or item 425.52)	Free	Free	On or before 6/30/67

'

"(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption after the date of the enactment of this Act."

On page 36, at the beginning of line 1, to change the section number from "68" to "71"; at the beginning of line 6, to change the section number from "68" to "72"; after line 21, to insert a new section, as follows:

"SEC. 73. CERTAIN LUGGAGE AND HANDBAGS.

"In the case of an article (other than flat goods) provided for in item 706.24 of the Tariff Schedules of the United States, if—

"(1) the textile materials of chief value in such article are fabrics coated or filled, or laminated, with rubber or plastics,

"(2) such article was imported before September 1, 1964, and

"(3) such article was entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption after August 30, 1963, and before December 31, 1964,

such article shall be treated as if it were provided for in item 706.60 of such schedules. This section shall apply in the case of any such article entered or withdrawn before the date of the enactment of this Act only upon request filed with the collector of customs concerned on or before the 120th day after the date of enactment of this Act, and upon such request the entry or withdrawal of such article shall, notwithstanding the provisions of section 514 of the Tariff Act of 1930 or any other provision of law, be liquidated or reliquidated in accordance with the provisions of this section."

And, on page 37, after line 18, to insert a new section, as follows:

"SEC. 74. MASS SPECTROMETERS IMPORTED FOR USE OF CERTAIN COLLEGES.

"(a) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to admit free of duty one mass spectrometer for the use of Pomona College, Claremont, California.

"(b) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to admit free of duty one mass spectrometer for the use of the University of New Hampshire.

"(c) Subsections (a) and (b) shall apply to the articles described therein whether such articles were entered before the date of the enactment of this Act or are entered on or after such date. If any such article was entered before such date, the entry involved shall, notwithstanding the provisions of section 514 of the Tariff Act of 1930 or any other provision of law, be liquidated or reliquidated in accordance with the provisions of this section."

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk, which would make two clerical changes in the bill. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the proposed changes?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. They are clerical changes.

Mr. KUCHEL. I am sure that is all the amendment embraces, but my attention was distracted for a moment.

All I wish to know is—and I am sure that my able friend will confirm that that is the situation—that any of us who desire to direct ourselves by way of an amendment to any provision of the bill as it has come from the committee will have the right to do so.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Of course.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk proceeded to read the amendment.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none and it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 37, line 7, after "and" insert "on or".

On page 37, line 14, after "date of" insert "the".

Mr. SMATHERS and Mr. JAVITS addressed the Chair.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I had agreed to yield first to the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS]. Then I shall be happy to yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, with respect to section 25 of the bill, which deals with aluminum, I have received a number of telegrams from people who are in the business of making window sills and using molding aluminum. That industry provides many jobs for many people in my State and elsewhere throughout the United States. It is their contention that the particular section to which I have referred, which the Senate Finance Committee adopted, as I understand, would raise the tariff considerably on imported aluminum, the basic quality of aluminum which those people use, and the increase would be very detrimental to their particular business. I did not hear the Senator's full remarks, but I did hear him make some reference to aluminum. I wonder if he has any view on this particular section.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. What we have in the bill involves a problem that arises from changing over from a "product" concept to a "process" concept of classification, and that is a subject with which we shall have to deal in conference. It will be in conference between the Senate and the House. The domestic aluminum industry feels that it has been victimized by the practice that is being used, which I discussed in my speech, of bringing in large amounts of aluminum which should be taxed at the higher rate and instead is taxed at the lower rate. If the Senator would care to have me do so, I should be happy to repeat that portion of my speech.

Mr. SMATHERS. I wonder if I may first make a brief statement and then have the Senator's comment on it, because he may be able to answer the question.

As I understand, section 25 should be deleted because, first, it proposes to increase the duty on continuous cast aluminum, which proposal was fully reviewed and rejected by the Tariff Commission and by the Committee on Ways and Means.

Second, a Bureau of Customs ruling of September 28, 1962, relating to continuous cast aluminum does not reflect any existing or past customs practice, and was reviewed and found by the Tariff Commission to provide no basis for modifying its findings.

I am informed that actual importations of continuous cast aluminum have for many years been uniformly assessed for duty as crude, that is, unwrought aluminum.

I am further informed that continuous cast aluminum is not commercially interchangeable in use with "comparable" shapes that are "wrought".

I am further informed that the proposed "use" tests would double the existing duty on some crude products and create difficult administrative problems and long delays in final settlement of the duty liability.

Finally, I am informed that existing tariff schedules are clear and provide adequate tests for classification of aluminum.

Therefore, if this amendment which was added in the Finance Committee should now be dropped——

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The reason why the Ways and Means Committee did nothing about this was that its members studied the problem and did not have time to find an answer to it. What we are recommending is not what the domestic industry really wanted. What we are recommending is a solution which represents what the Finance Committee felt was what the appropriate answer should be.

Mr. SMATHERS. Will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. It is my understanding that the Tariff Commission rejected the proposal to increase the duty on continuous cast aluminum.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Commission did not reject what is in the bill. This provision is in the bill with the technical advice of the Tariff Commission staff. What the industry was asking for, and what was declined in the House, was far more favorable to the domestic industry than what we are proposing. As I understand, this amendment is necessary in order to clarify the law. Its necessity arises because we are changing from one method of classification to another. It used to be classified on a product basis. Now we are to classify it on a process basis, depending on the particular use of the imported aluminum.

As I understand, the reason for the amendment and the reason why it is necessary is that continuous cast aluminum is not distinguishable from rolled aluminum, and rolled aluminum is clearly dutiable at the higher rate. Since the two are not distinguishable the rate of duty on them should be the same and that is what the committee amendment proposes.

Mr. SMATHERS. Many businesses have as their basic product continuous cast aluminum. If they have to pay an 8.5 percent duty on this aluminum, which they now import, and which goes into all kinds of kitchen utensils, windows, louvers, and products of that kind, they will be forced out of business. When this problem was brought up with the Tariff Commission, the Tariff Commission rejected the recommendation for a higher tariff on continuous cast aluminum.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The problem is that if companies are using the product as a raw material, they pay the raw material rate, which is the lower rate. If they are using it as a manufactured or semimanufactured product, they will have to pay the rate that is applicable to a manufactured or semimanufactured product. That is what they should pay. The Tariff Commission declined to do what the domestic industry was asking for initially. It still does. That is the kind of proposal that was declined by the Ways and Means Committee of the House. The Ways and Means Committee did not have the advice possessed by the Senate Finance Committee. We had an opportunity to study the problem. A former majority leader used to say to me, "Don't bring me any more problems. Bring me the answers; I have all the problems I want now." We have the problem. This is the solution we offer.

Mr. SMATHERS. I agree with the Senator when he says, "Do not bring me any more problems." The reason I am bringing him this problem is that the problem was brought to me by small manufacturers of windows, louvers, and products of that character, not only in my State but in other States. The difficulty is in distinguishing between continuous cast aluminum and rolled aluminum. Therefore the Finance Committee has decided against the little businessman, it seems to me, and decided in favor of the big corporations—unintentionally, I believe.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The manufacturers of whom the Senator from Florida is speaking should be protected. The Senator is going to be a conferee, if the bill ever goes to conference, and he will be in a position to look after their interests. The little manufacturer should be able to get the raw material at the raw material rate, if he wants to get it to manufacture into a finished product. If what the manufacturer is getting is in effect the manufactured or semimanufactured product rather than the raw material, he should pay on the manufactured product basis.

The Senator will be one of the conferees. He will be able to devise some protection for those who are affected and who should not be adversely affected by the provision. But if the manufacturers who use the material are obtaining that material as a manufactured or semimanufactured product, they should pay the rate in effect for manufactured or semimanufactured products. The existing problem arises because of the change made from a product basis to a process basis.

That change advantages our Canadian friends to the detriment of American producers. We want to clarify the law to the extent that those entitled to the lower rate will get it, and those who should be paying the rate for a finished commodity will pay that rate for it.

This question will be in conference. The House considered a similar problem. It did not have the answer. The House may reject this amendment, but the Senator will be able to try to help adjust the matter. We do not want to hurt anyone who has a proper, reasonable basis to be given favorable consideration.

Mr. SMATHERS. I thank the Senator. I know from his past record that he is always endeavoring to help the small manufacturer and the small businessman. If we can obtain a clarification in the interest of the small manufacturer—and, therefore, the employees of that manufacturer will likewise be served—we shall be performing the task which we are trying to do.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It is my honor to occupy a seat beside the Senator on the Small Business Committee. The Senator from Florida is sitting next to the chairman of that committee, who has been on that committee since its institution. I have been on the committee since that time. I am interested in seeing that small business is not in any way injured, and in giving it the consideration to which it is entitled.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thank the committee for putting in the bill section 21, which relates to limestone. I hope it will be sustained in conference. Once before, near the end of a session, we lost it in conference. I hope this section will be sustained in conference. I do not want the provision to be lost, because it involves a peculiar problem in my State, where the crude stone is alongside the border and the plant is on the other side of the border. A negligible amount moves, but the difference of 20 cents a short ton means the difference between whether or not two or three companies on the border can remain in business.

I thank the Senator for including this provision. I hope the conference will sustain it.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I thank the Senator. This provision was agreed to by the Senate 2 years ago. Unfortunately the House adjourned before we could obtain action on it. I hope that does not happen again.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I hope not.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. I wish to return to the discussion of aluminum which was carried on by the Senator from Louisiana and the Senator from Florida.

Some concern has been expressed to me about this section of the bill. The Senator from Louisiana has expressed the thought very well, indeed. The subject will be in conference. As a matter of usual procedure I shall probably be a conferee. I shall try to be helpful in meeting this problem if some changes must be made. There are some who are concerned about the situation which might develop.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I note the presence in the Chamber of a distinguished Member of the House of Representatives who is observing the proceedings. In view of the fact that the House has declined to do anything on this subject, we can be pretty sure that no violence will be done, because the House is not easy to persuade on some matters.

Mr. CARLSON. Having served as a conferee on matters in conference with the House I can readily appreciate the remarks of the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I wish to say to the acting chairman of the Committee on Finance, my able friend from Louisiana, that there are in the bill some items which are not noncontroversial, but concerning which there is vigorous dispute as to whether they should be included in the bill.

In a moment I shall call up an amendment, on behalf of my able friend the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], and myself, to strike from the bill certain language on page 33 of the bill, dealing with brooms.

I ask that the amendment be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 33 it is proposed to strike out lines 4 through 11—section 63—of the bill, as follows:

SEC. 63. BROOMS MADE OF BROOM CORN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Schedule 7, part 8, subpart A is amended by striking out items 750.30 and 750.31 (p. 383) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

“

	Brooms and brushes consisting of vegetable materials bound together but not mounted or set in a block or head, with or without handles:		
	Brooms wholly or in part of broom corn:		
	Whiskbrooms:		
750. 28	Valued not over 32¢ each	8¢ each	8¢ each
750. 29	Valued over 32¢ each	25% ad val.	25% ad val.
	Other brooms:		
750. 30	Valued not over 96¢ each	24¢ each	24¢ each
750. 31	Valued over 96¢ each	25% ad val.	25% ad val.
750. 32	Other	25% ad val.	25% ad val.
750. 33	If product of Cuba	25% ad val.(s)	

”

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the 30th day after the date of the enactment of this Act.

And to renumber the succeeding sections.

Mr. KUCHEL. It is my understanding that this language, which the Senator from New York and I seek to have stricken from the bill, was not the subject of any testimony in either the House committee or in the Senate committee. Is that correct?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. A discussion was held in executive session in the Ways and Means Committee, at which representatives of the executive branch of the Government appeared and explained the views of the executive branch with regard to this problem. No public hearing was held, however.

Mr. KUCHEL. No testimony was taken and printed?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I do not believe any public testimony was taken.

Mr. KUCHEL. Neither was any testimony taken in the Senate Finance Committee. Is that correct?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Not in the Finance Committee; no.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, it is most regrettable that a problem that is controversial does not come to the Senate in a form in which Members of the Senate have an opportunity to read for themselves the testimony, pro and con, on that subject.

What we talk about in this part of the bill is a situation that deals with the importation into the American economy of brooms. The American market today is controlled by the American producers of brooms to the extent of 98 percent of the market. About 2 percent of the market is occupied by foreign importation of brooms.

Our neighbor to the south of us, Mexico, is responsible for about half of the amount of the importation.

With respect to what is sought to be done in the bill, a few years ago the Tariff Commission held a hearing. It did not find that the American producer of brooms was damaged. It did say that, with respect to the problem of equalizing the costs, the tariff on brooms ought to be increased if we measure the difference in terms of the American selling price.

The late President of the United States, John F. Kennedy, overruled the determination of the Tariff Commission.

This year, the Senate has received from the House of Representatives a bill to do that which was overruled by the late President, and it is sought to be done without benefit of any testimony pro or con.

Statements were filed with the Committee on Finance by the Treasury, the Department of Commerce, the Department of Agriculture, and the Department of State. All of them objected to the enactment of the bill.

Representatives of the State Department asked for an opportunity to testify, but were not called. American producers occupy 98 percent of the American market. Some are located in the State which I represent. Some of them have asked me to oppose the proposal which would increase the duty on the importation of 2 percent of the brooms sold in this country on a sliding scale basis, which would vary from 120 to 125 percent.

With respect to the pending amendment, the Senate should strike from the provisions of this "noncontroversial and technical bill" provisions which are neither noncontroversial nor technical, and give an opportunity to the people who are interested to come forward and testify before the Senate and Congress makes its decision up or down on a controversial issue.

In all that I have said I have made no statement with respect to our neighbor. I devotedly believe in strengthening the ties which exist between the Government and the people of the United States and the Government and people of Mexico and Canada. I believe in hemispheric solidarity. I wish to see the Alliance for Progress work. I voted for the Trade Expansion Act, which is now the law of the land. I did so having clearly in mind the policy set forth in the legislation, to expand trade.

With respect to trade between the United States and the Republic of Mexico, the United States, in 1963, the last year for which figures are available, sold to Mexico $830 million worth of U.S. goods, and Mexico sold to the United States $595 million worth of goods. The favorable balance on our side is almost a quarter of a billion dollars; $235 million, to be precise.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Which are the nations that are mainly interested in selling brooms to our country?

Mr. KUCHEL. Mexico occupies about one-half of the 2-percent market.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What other countries?

Mr. KUCHEL. Italy is one of them. There are a number of others which occupy the 2-percent market.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It is proposed to increase the tariff on this 2 percent of broom imports, and this is objected to by our broom manufacturers?

Mr. KUCHEL. By some of our broom manufacturers; but, for the purpose of the record, by the Senator from California. Also, it was objected to by the late President of the United States, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, and is now objected to by the Department of Commerce, the Department of Agriculture, the Treasury Department, and the State Department.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is it the position of the Senator from California that the increase on this 2 percent of imports ought not to stand in the way of maintaining our good relations around the world?

Mr. KUCHEL. The position of the Senator from California is that if Congress deals with tariff schedules, there ought to be a public hearing at which the pros and cons can be heard, and the committee—the Senator from Ohio and I not being members of the Committee on Finance—can determine whether they believe a case has been made for a change in the schedule.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is the Senator from California for or against the change?

Mr. KUCHEL. I favor taking this controversial item out of this generally noncontroversial bill, so that a hearing might be held and witnesses may come forward to testify.

Mr. LAUSCHE. If we settle the broom question and settle the button question, will that button up the tariff argument?

Mr. KUCHEL. Only God knows; I do not.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Can I feel that this bill will be buttoned up if we settle the button question?

Mr. KUCHEL. I cannot answer the question: I do not know.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Does not the Senator have any belief that further complications might be involved in the consideration of the bill? Is there any talk about throwing the medicare bill into the tariff bill?

Mr. KUCHEL. Into this bill?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes.

Mr. KUCHEL. I had never heard of that until the Senator asked me the question.

Mr. LAUSCHE. If we button up the button aspect of the bill, will that mean that the tariff bill has been buttoned up? That is a peculiar question, but it sounds all right to me.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, so that I may reply?

Mr. KUCHEL. The Senator from California has the floor; I am delighted to yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. BENNETT. I should like to inform my friend from Ohio that I have an amendment to try to solve the sugar problem, and I shall offer it to this bill.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The solution of the button controversy will not button up the tariff bill. How long will we stay here with these various problems, trying to get them through the Senate, not letting Senators return home to duly and fully consider issues, without pressure of time?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Until Christmas.

Mr. KUCHEL. Would the Senator prefer that I button up my mouth and not raise in the Senate what I believe to be an issue that the Senate ought to pass on?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I have been intrigued by the button and broom aspects of the bill. Are we going to use the broom to sweep everything into the bill, and the button to button everything up?

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank my able friend for his contribution.

Mr. President, I have received a letter from Assistant Secretary of State Thomas Mann, an able career officer in the Foreign Service of the country. He formerly was U.S. Ambassador to Mexico. I have high respect for him. I shall read what he has written to me; then I shall conclude:

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE,
Washington, D.C., September 28, 1964.

HON. THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR KUCHEL: May I call your attention to the facts surrounding H.R. 5986, a bill to increase by 500 percent the duty applying to import of brooms made of broomcorn which has now been added to the provisions of H.R. 12253.

As you know, the Department has opposed the increased tariff on brooms since it would adversely affect U.S. efforts to maintain and enlarge foreign markets for U.S. products under the Trade Expansion Act and would have particularly adverse effects on our neighbor, Mexico. Almost all the brooms which Mexico (the principal supplying country) ships to us are made in Cadereyta, a small town of 10,000 people in northeastern Mexico. Since the majority of the population of Cadereyta is employed either in growing broomcorn or in making brooms, the passage of the broom tariff would therefore have a serious effect on this small community. I should also like to point out that the value of broom imports from Mexico is negligible, equivalent to only 1 percent of U.S. broom production.

On the other hand, trade is vital to the success of the Alliance for Progress. I therefore do not believe the passage of this tariff on brooms to be in our own national interest.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS C. MANN.

Mr. President, I can only add that the importation from Mexico amounts to less than half a million dollars a year. The American production of brooms has increased each year to the point where it occupies 98 percent of the American market, running now into some $33 million or more.

If the bill were passed as it is before us, it would destroy a community in Mexico. It would not destroy the Mexican economy; that is true. Nevertheless, it would smack the good-neighbor policy in the face. I do not believe we ought to do that kind of legislating in the U.S. Senate.

Therefore, I hope that the amendment that the able Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and I have offered together may be approved by the Senate, so that this controversy can be scrutinized and a decision made as the result of a complete hearing, when the pros and the cons may come forward, through representatives, and there will be a confrontation with cross-examination. Then let Congress work its will, rather than in this fashion summarily overruling the executive branch and many other people in this country, and register an affront to a good neighbor.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I support the amendment, of which I am a cosponsor. The amendment does not involve a large sum of money. It does not involve a monumental product. However, the Senate Finance Committee's action on brooms seems to typify within itself everything that is happening to erode the foreign policy of the United States and to destroy the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. That act, which was considered a landmark of heroic action by Congress in the national interest, apparently is an illustration of our thinking upon the great foreign policy problem of trade. We seem to be well able to take some great initiative across the board by enacting an extensive law to rationalize the trade relationships of the United States with the whole world in order to expand trade, which is absolutely indispensable to America's strength in the world, as I shall illustrate in a moment.

Having done that, having taken that broad point of view illustrating the majesty and power of our country, we promptly proceed to nibble away at it, to backtrack, to get down to cases, and destroy it.

We are well in the process of doing that now. All of a sudden, the Kennedy round will fail, our trade policy will blow up in our faces, the European Common Market will go protectionist, and we shall have great difficulty in Latin America of a kind we have not yet experienced—notwithstanding that we have had some trouble there already. Then we shall say to ourselves, "Why did not someone tell us that all these little acts would cause all this trouble?"

We are telling ourselves now, so that there can be no mistake about it. The cumulative effects of the restriction on beef imports, notwithstanding they are standbys, or the buy American amendment to the mass transit bill, or a nettling little thing like the tariff increase on brooms and other matters of the same general character, will torpedo American foreign policy unless we put a stop to it.

The Senator from California is rendering a signal service in giving us an opportunity to put a stop to the Finance Committee's broom amendment on a basis which is certainly not harmful, in terms of money and quantity, and in terms of its effects on our own interests.

There is always someone—including me—or there is always some State which is adversely affected by a protective device of this character, or by the denial of it. We cannot depend upon the vote of a Senator from that State because of what needs to be done. The way the Senate is organized, we cannot expect him to do anything but try to protect the interests of his State. We have to depend upon the good sense of the rest of the Senators who kindly, graciously, understandingly, but nonetheless firmly, will do what must be done in the national interest. If the rest of us abdicate our duty, the country is in great trouble. That is exactly what is happening in the minor amendments, such as those we are discussing at the present moment. They are meaningful to the policy of our Nation. Let me point out why.

A new President of Mexico, Gustavo Diaz Ordaz, will be sworn in as President on December 1. He ran on a platform of great friendship for the United States.

The present President of Mexico, Lopez Mateos, is a great friend of the United States. Diaz Ordaz is supposed to be an even greater friend of the United States.

Mr. President, what are we going to greet him with when he comes into office? Are we going to greet him with an act against which he must—because he is a politician, too—retaliate? Retaliation can be expensive in matters of this kind. It will be far more expensive to us than to Mexico, because the whole foreign policy of this Nation is pinioned upon the fact that it has an export surplus—approximately $6.5 billion a year, notwithstanding our difficulties in the international balance of payments, which at maximum runs to an adverse balance of $3 billion a year.

If we did not have this big export surplus, we would be literally unable to maintain our Armed Forces, the diplomatic establishments, the aid programs, and the exchange programs which represent the essence of American foreign policy. This policy is built upon a practical and realistic base. That base is a $6.5 billion minimum trade surplus. It should be $9 billion in terms of the viability of the American financial system and American standing in the world. These little mouthfuls, this chipping away, will destroy that system and our standing, and will destroy the whole economic base upon which our country stands.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield at that point?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to reinforce the arguments of the Senator from New York by reading a letter which I have received from the vice president of New York Merchandise Co., Inc. Let me inquire of the Chair whether the Senate is under any time limitation. It will take me only a minute to read it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no time limitation.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, Mr. J. M. Constantine, of the New York Merchandise Co., Inc., of Portland, Oreg., expressed his concern over the amendment relative to the rate of duty applicable to imports of certain brooms made of broom corn. Mr. Constantine's wire of the 24th reads as follows:

> Urgently request your assistance in eliminating corn broom amendment from Tariff classification bill, H.R. 12253. Bill itself is desirable, as essential and noncontroversial corrective measure, but corn broom rider which triples existing duties and will force stopping importations of corn brooms is highly controversial and does not pertain to the classification bill. Corn broom rider was originally a separate bill and was attached to the classification bill as a rider without hearings of importers. It would hurt the essential U.S. trade goals and since no urgency exists, it should be considered in public hearings next session. Respectfully yours.

Mr. Constantine's wire was supplemented by a letter dated September 25, addressed to me by Mr. Posner, vice president of New York Merchandise Co., Inc. I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Posner's letter printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> NEW YORK MERCHANDISE CO., INC.,
> *New York, N.Y., September 25, 1964.*
>
> Senator WAYNE MORSE,
> *Senate Office Building,*
> *Washington, D.C.*
>
> DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Our branch office in Portland, Oreg., 1900 NW 22d Avenue, has taken the liberty of sending you a wire, addressed to your Washington office regarding H.R. 12253, and in particular, regarding the attached rider, H.R. 5986, concerning duties on corn house brooms and corn whiskbrooms.
>
> We are importers, with our head office in New York City, and branch offices also in Los Angeles, Calif., and Dallas, Tex. Among the important commodities which we handle are corn brooms and whiskbrooms made of corn, from Poland, Mexico, and Hungary.
>
> We are concerned about the H.R. 5986, which increases duties on our type of brooms and whiskbrooms by three times or more. For all practical purposes, such duty increase will result in discontinuing importations of our type of brooms.
>
> Technically, my greatest worry is that this particular H.R. 5986 has now been attached as a rider to the very desirable, corrective H.R. 12253.
>
> It is our feeling, and the feeling of all importers of this commodity, that H.R. 5986, increasing the duty on brooms has been passed by the House, and approved by the Committee on Finance, in the Senate, without giving a hearing to the importers. We believe that if we receive such a hearing we will be able to convince the Senate that the suggested duty increase should not be passed, for various reasons. For example; we believe that we can prove that the import of this type of price range of broom actually did not injure the domestic industry.
>
> Also, we believe that statements made by the domestic manufacturers regarding the comparable cost of production are not in accordance with the facts. For example; the domestic producers have stated that the cost of production of a corn broom in the United States is somewhere around an average of $11. This statement was made without comparing this particular domestic corn broom with the imported broom. At the same time, they stated that the cost of the production of the imported broom is somewhere between $5 and $6.
>
> We claim that different types of brooms have been compared. Furthermore, we will prove that the domestic brooms are being sold to U.S. retailers at a price of $7.20 per dozen, which is far below the stated cost of production.
>
> We also would like to have the opportunity to state our opinion that such an increase of duties, resulting in the stopping of importation, is contrary to the goal of our foreign trade policy, and also contrary to the principles of Alliance for Progress.
>
> Since H.R. 5986 most certainly does not represent an urgent measure, we think that importers should be given a proper committee hearing.
>
> Your kind assistance in this matter will be immensely appreciated.
>
> Respectfully yours,
> GEORGE POSNER,
> *Vice President.*

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the Senator from New York whether he is planning to seek to remove the corn broom provision from the bill.

Mr. JAVITS. The pending amendment is one proposed by the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] and me.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to join in that amendment, if I may.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] be added as a cosponsor of my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. The argument which my constituent makes is in support of the position of the Senator from California and the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. I am grateful to the Senator from Oregon for his comments.

Mr. President, the present situation is a classic illustration of almost every facet of this whole trap. These small but meaningful moves toward protectionism and away from international trade are of the greatest importance to us. The U.S. export surplus indicated for the first several months of 1964 is $6 billion—$24 billion in exports and over $18 billion in imports.

If we wish to sell, we must buy. If we buy from abroad and thereby create competition for domestic industry—which is of critical importance, incidentally, to the consumer who should have that, too, in terms of a better price and quality—someone, somewhere, somehow, will be hurt.

Although it has been stated time and time again, it is still a fact that the automobile forced those manufacturers of horse carriages out of business who were not smart enough to turn to manufacturing automobile bodies.

It is also a fact that the advent of radio had an effect upon the phonograph industry. I remember, when I was a boy, that the long-horned phonograph was a big seller. Yet there were many manufacturers of long-horns for phonographs who went broke, because they did not realize what was happening to their business, so that they could then turn to the manufacture of radio loudspeakers, or go into some other line of business.

If the United States is in fact a private enterprise society, should it give a guarantee to everyone in business in this country, regardless of the effects of competition, that it will keep him in business and protect him against foreign competition?

The committee's amendment illustrates a classic defect in policy. The amendment will not work because, as the Senator from California has pointed out, imports of the commodity in question—brooms of broom corn—are—let us say, 3 percent—of domestic production. If, in fact, our broom manufacturers are being hurt, they are not hurt by imports. What is hurting them perhaps is synthetic brooms.

There is also the compassionate element to consider. I do not know whether it has been mentioned as yet in debate, because I was not in the Chamber to listen to all of the speech by the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL]. However, there are workshops for the blind in this country where brooms are made, with approximately 1,000 persons engaged in that activity.

Certainly, it is extremely vital and important in terms of our hearts and our spirits that these people should be encouraged to put their hands to some use. A heavy proportion of their output is sold to institutions, housewives, to State and Federal agencies and are protected by various preferences in respect to such sales. It is doubtful that imports play an important part in the level of their sales.

We shall hear those arguments, nevertheless without any question. It illustrates the classic technique in respect to protectionism: "Because it is a special circumstance and affects people to whom our hearts go out, let us not be cruel Senators. Let us let this one ride."

We are missing completely that what is at stake is the interest of the country, without which nothing in the Nation can stand up—workshops for the blind, or anything else.

In every case involved in this protectionist problem, we can muster evidence of this character. If that is going to be the determination we sweep the whole reciprocal trade problem out of the window.

What about the workers in the export industry? What about the millions of workers who create the $24 billion in exports that the United States has? Are they to be discriminated against? Are we to forget about those workers in our concern for the infinitely smaller number?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the point that the Senator from New York has just made is very telling. I do not know what the figures are specifically. But, I believe we ought to know more than we do about the number of American workers who are working in industries which are dependent upon exports. And with the balance in trade in our favor, I believe it would be interesting to have a counting of noses to see whether those who sometimes seem to talk about going back to Smoot Hawley are really advocating something that is to the long-time best interest of the wage workers of this country. I believe that the point that the Senator from New York has made is very powerful.

Mr. JAVITS. There was a general debate on the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. Contrary to the ideas of so many, it was overwhelmingly approved in the House and Senate. The facts of economic life impress themselves upon us in terms of the basic products involved. There is grave danger that the policies which would best serve our national interest will be laid aside. When we make such exceptions, as we have begun to make them in Congress since the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 was enacted, we run into the grave danger of experiencing serious trouble.

Mr. President, I conclude upon this note. Lest we think that we can hide our heads in the sand and that no one will pay any real attention to what we do about these matters, let me point out our experience with respect to raising the tariffs on velour carpets and rolled glass in June 1962, as they affected the major exporters to us of those commodities—notably Belgium. What happened is that they immediately retaliated. Indeed, they retaliated in an amount that was about equal the amount of the imports that we inhibited by our increase in tariff, except that they retaliated in another area. They retaliated in the chemical field.

As I pointed out, we do not save domestic producers by these measures. But whatever we may have gained for the workers in the velour carpet and the glass industry—and it is highly dubious as to whether we gained anything—we know that we lost work for the workers in the chemical business. In that industry, they were disadvantaged. I think the relative figure was $55 million which we inhibited or curtailed in imports, as compared with the $44 million in U.S. exports in the chemical field which they promptly retaliated against us for.

If the relations between us and the Mexicans are materially disturbed by a thing like this, we would regret the day that we ever thought of it.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. Can the Senator indicate how many brooms are manufactured from broom corn and what section of the country or what States are affected? From what source does the amendment come?

Years ago, as people know who live in the rural areas, every farmer raised a little broom corn to make brooms for his own use. There was broom corn production for the manufacture of brooms. I did not realize that it was so important now.

Mr. JAVITS. I call attention to the U.S. Tariff Commission's 1962 report on broom corn, which indicates a production in this country of approximately 2.5 million dozens in 1960, valued at $26¼ million. The greatest concentration of broom factories, according to the Tariff Commission, is in Illinois, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, California, and Texas.

These are, generally speaking, the orders of magnitude which are involved. That is about the ambit of the situation. It is the basis for the figure of around 2 to 3 percent in imports, which figure has been referred to by the Senator from California.

I deeply feel that we are now dealing with a process which has a serious effect on the economic policy of the United States. I appreciate the very heart appealing program of the workshops for the blind. I deeply feel that the same ingenuity and the same generosity—I myself, and many others are great supporters of these workshops—that have brought about the particular type of work for the workshops will see to it that the workshops continue their effectiveness in terms of work for the individuals concerned.

As I said before, a substantial proportion of broom making by the blind and those made by prisoners can in any case continue because it would involve State and Federal institution purchases. I make that statement again because I yield to no one in my deep-hearted concern for that particular situation. I feel that in our general appreciation of what is at stake, we must understand that the proposal is a step in a process, and we must not accept the argument that only a small sum of money is involved, a small order of magnitude, and one country, substantially, is involved, namely, Mexico; therefore, why cavil or argue; let it ride and go on to the next order of business.

I believe that the Senate ought to decide to let the question go to a considered hearing so at least we may have the benefit of all the aspects of the problem which can be presented in a hearing, including, incidentally, the problem of workshops for the blind. We should not proceed to erode away the trade expansion structure, which we erected with such painstaking care, by small but very meaningful exceptions.

I yield the floor.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, if there is one amendment that does not need any further study it is the amendment before the Senate. We can decide, if we wish to do so, to let the small businesses in America continue to manufacture brooms, or to run them out of business. If Senators wish to run them out of business, go ahead and accept the amendment. If Senators wish to permit 345 small businesses manufacturing brooms to remain in business, then vote against the proposal offered by the Senator from California to strike out the committee amendment.

The facts show that between 1953 and 1958 there were 450 broom manufacturers in America who went out of business because down in Mexico, and in other foreign countries, brooms can be manufactured much cheaper than they can be manufactured in this country. Mexico can do so because of its low labor cost. We cannot compete with brooms manufactured in Mexico. We have remaining, 345 small businesses engaged in that production. What could those small businesses do?

They went to the Tariff Commission and asked for help. They explained their plight. The Tariff Commission recommended that we give them a tariff based upon the American selling price, which would have permitted them to continue in business.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I shall yield in a few moments. Other Senators have been discussing the subject for an hour or so, and I should like to say a few words at this time.

The Tariff Commission recommended that the domestic manufacturers obtain appropriate relief. Unfortunately, the State Department felt that the proposal might conflict with trade negotiations. What we have here would not in anywise conflict with GATT. The State Department has taken the Mexican side; the Tariff Commission has taken the side of the domestic industry.

Mr. President, we can leave the domestic industries in business or we can put them out of business. It is that simple.

These people are being run out in large numbers. A few are left. There are about 19 factories left in Illinois, which is so ably represented by the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the minority leader. Sixteen broom factories are left in North Carolina; about 12 factories are left in Pennsylvania; California and Texas have about 9 factories each. So a few are left.

But the disparity is so great between the Mexican cost of manufacture and the American cost that the American producers cannot survive if we do not give them the proposed protection.

We have heard a great deal of crying on the floor of the Senate about how we must not discriminate against Mexico. We have heard that we must not raise the tariff against an industry in Mexico if Mexico wishes to ship us some commodity.

What has Mexico done to our broom manufacturers? Mexico has a tariff of $4.50 a dozen on brooms and her price is half of ours. What do we charge Mexico? $1.01 a dozen.

Mr. President, no country on earth, except ours, is ashamed to say, "We have a legitimate and respected industry which is being driven out by foreign competition and we have a duty to protect and look after our own. Charity begins at home."

How long did it take the Common Market in Europe to decide to do what it did to us in respect to chickens? They took the chicken market away from us, which was a direct violation of their pledged word given to our country.

The proposal would not be in violation of an agreement.

Mexico made an agreement with us in relation to oil on a most-favored-nation basis. She made a trade compact with us, and she agreed that she would live up to certain obligations in respect to oil. One of them was not to confiscate or to nationalize American investments down there. She proceeded to break her word with us and nationalized our investments and discriminated against our imports. Notwithstanding that action, we made a trade agreement with Venezuela to reduce the tariff on oil and gave Mexico the benefit of it, although Mexico is in violation of her pledged word in other respects on trade agreements.

What we have proposed is something which any other nation under the sun would do if it had a similar problem.

Representatives of the industry went to the Tariff Commission. The Tariff Commission studied the problem and recommended relief. Two years ago we passed a bill which would have given the people in the industry the kind of relief that the Tariff Commission recommended, but it was in a form that was more objectionable to the State Department than the language we now propose, because then the action was based upon the American selling price.

The State Department very much objected to that. But when we impose a tariff of a specific amount on an item in order to more nearly equalize the costs of manufacturing brooms in the two countries than the present duty, we are told that it is wrong, even though it is not as much as we did 2 years ago.

More people are involved than the manufacturers of brooms. There are thousands of blind people in this country. One of the few things that blind people can do to make a few dollars is to make brooms. Blind people make brooms and make a few dollars out of the work. Do Senators wish to let them make a few dollars or do they wish to put those blind people out of business?

One of the few things that a prisoner can be taught to do so that he can learn an occupation and find work on the outside is to put brooms together, sitting in a prison cell. Here is a letter from a prisoner who desires parole. He must say that he can make a living, and he must demonstrate that he is not likely to return to theft or committing some kind of robbery in order to make a living when he gets out of the penitentiary. He is looking for an opportunity to make a few brooms. That is one skill that a person can learn while he is still a prisoner in a prison cell. He is urging us to let the broom industry stay in business because he had an opportunity to learn how to manufacture brooms in prison and wants to follow that work when he gets out.

We can put all those people out of business if we wish to do so. We can turn down our blind people. We can say that Mexico is more important, even though it has broken its word, and we can give it every advantage. We are afraid to give our people the same protection that Mexico gives hers. We can do that. We can turn our backs on the domestic industry. We can turn our backs on our blind people. We can turn our backs on the prisoners who are trying to rehabilitate themselves, and we can say, "Mexico must come first. It can do anything it wishes. It can break its word, but we would not think of breaking ours." If Senators wish to take that view, they are entitled to do so.

Furthermore, I point out that the Mexicans are not the only people in the broom business. Communist countries are in the business. Hungary is in the broom business; Poland is in the broom business. While we would be attempting to protect Mexico, we would be looking after those communistic countries. Why are Senators turning their backs on their own?

The amendment has been considered by the Senate previously. It has been agreed to by the Senate before. It has been recommended by the Tariff Commission. It is the kind of consideration that American people who elect us are entitled to receive. They are entitled to some kind of representation.

Mr. President, I could be a statesman on the question. So far as I know, every broom manufacturer in Louisiana has been driven out of business. I am speaking only about the other industries that might follow. We have a chart which indicates that there might be two left in Louisiana, but I do not think that there are any left, for I have not heard from any in my State. They have all been run out.

There are a few broom industries left in Illinois. The Senator from Illinois has a good case. The Tariff Commission has a good case. The Senate has a good case. I would say that if we cannot provide this little protection to 345 small businesses in America, if we cannot provide for this minimal amount of help, to give the people in that industry a tariff so as to more nearly equalize the cost between American-made and Mexican-made brooms—if we cannot give them that kind of protection when Mexico has had more than a $4 tariff on our brooms, and their cost is half of ours—why are we so ashamed to vote some kind of protection for our own industry?

We can go to conference, if this is voted, and see if the House will not agree, after the conferees consider it, to some reasonable sort of protection.

I hope the amendment will be rejected.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on one occasion or another I have bled as I have heard the great concepts of national interest expounded on this floor. It is always done so eloquently that I fairly weep and my heart murmurs in a deep concordance of sympathy. Then I see a little fellow in the water, and he is foundering. He is about to go down. He has been operating a little broom shop in a pineboard factory, and he shouts "Help!"

We are asked to stand there and say, "Save yourself. Think of the national interest. Think of all the great relationships we have across the world. Hold your peace. Do you not know that this is in the national interest? Do you not know that we are trying to do something for a town in Mexico? Do you not know that we are trying to do something for an importer in California? Yes, I know you have $50,000 in capital investment. You have 25 people employed in your plant. You are just reaching out to touch bottom. You are afraid you are going to sink in a minute. But you ought to remember, as you go down for the third time, it is in the national interest."

Mr. President, do Senators think that is overdoing? Some 450 small broom plants have gone out of business since 1953.

Like my distinguished friend from Louisiana, I shall bleed for them a little, and I shall forget all the great, overriding concepts. There is a broom plant in Virginia, the State of the distinguished chairman of the Finance Committee, where Seventh Day Adventist students manage to get enough together to go to school. There are 2,000 such students working in broom plants throughout the country. They make enough to get a college education.

My friend from Louisiana has pointed out the number of blind people who work in broom factories. That is one thing they can do. They can, by feel, run a stitching machine and form the brooms. Something was said about synthetic material. I point out that these brooms are all made from broom corn.

It is rather interesting that only a few days ago the Senate passed the Appalachia bill. One billion dollars was involved. I fairly fell to the floor of the Senate Chamber when I heard my distinguished friend from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] round out that amount. I thought, "Is there that much money in the world?" There must be, because we are going to spend $850 million for highways in Appalachia and $150 million for sewage disposal plants, hospitals, schools, and nurseries. I wondered somewhat where we are going to find a market for the coal, for the durable jobs, after the highways are built. It is perfectly good to have a fine highway, so that a 10-ton truck can operate over it, but the question is, Is there a buyer for the coal?

I was about to say that there are 30 broom companies in Appalachia. That word has a wonderful sound. I suppose I shall be using it a good deal in many sections of the country. Perhaps I shall give it a "Latin twist" and say "Ahppalahchia."

Why did we pass the Appalachia bill? To make jobs, so it was said. This I have to see. But while we are making jobs with $1 billion for Appalachia, we may be putting 30 plants out of the broom business in Appalachia—and they will not like it.

I remember one time when I went to Wyoming to campaign against our old friend Joe O'Mahoney. When I got to the airport I called him up. I said, "Joe, I am in town." He said, "Yes, Everett. I read the papers. I knew you were coming." I said, "I am going to talk at the rodeo." He said, "I wish you well on any mission you have in life except the one that brings you here." I said, "Joe, you know I had an awful time finding a text for this speech, and it was not until I left Omaha that, with my disagreeably evil mind I suddenly remembered the first line of an article Senator O'Mahoney wrote for the Reader's Digest. That line was, 'They are remaking America, and you won't like it.' "

Perhaps it is all right, but I wonder if it is all right to find some jobs for carpet workers and let the broom workers go down the drain. There they are. I do not know how many have been put out of business, but they are told, "Hush your mouth. It is in the national interest. So go down for the third time. Let us have it over with. We cannot be concerned about you."

Mr. President, I am concerned about them. Congress has provided a small business investment organization through which small business loans can be obtained. We want to help small business enterprise. Then we come along and, by this strange device, undertake to put them out of business because they cannot make the grade.

Mr. President, I have been in several lines of business. It is not always the quantity that comes into this country that counts. There can be a small amount of merchandise from abroad, but if it is put in the finest department store window, with signs around it saying it is from Hungary or Czechoslovakia or Mexico, or some other place, it has a great lure, and the price is always lower. The price of the domestic merchandise must be reduced in price to compete. It may be only 1 percent of the volume of business in that town, but that is the effect of it. I have seen it and experienced it.

What are we trying to do? We are trying to equalize a little. It has been said there have been no hearings on this proposal. Let me show my colleagues the tome of the U.S. Tariff Commission, entitled "Report to the President on the Differences in the Cost of the Manufacture of Brooms Made of Broom Corn in the United States and the Principal Competing Countries."

Mr. President, what do Senators think the difference is? The Mexican brooms, for which there has been lamentation this afternoon, are delivered in this country for $5.73 a dozen. What does it cost to deliver the equivalent American brooms? Does it cost $5.73? No. It costs $11.15. That is almost twice as much. When the manufacturers went before the Tariff Commission, the Commission unanimously reported that the price ought to be equalized and that the American selling cost should be used to do that.

The President rejected the unanimous report of the Tariff Commission, after all the pages of testimony that had been taken.

It is said that no hearing has been held. Is it necessary to have a hearing before a Senate committee? A hearing was held before an executive agency. It went into the subject very thoroughly. How are we to equalize, and how are we to carry out what the Tariff Commission thinks ought to be done in order to give the little fellows a chance to survive? That is the reason why this provision is in the bill. We are told that it is a tariff revision and that it does not belong here. Mr. President, there are quite a number of tariff revisions in the bill. There is a list of them in the Tariff Classification Act. The list is as long as your arm, Mr. President.

We had quite a time wrestling with this problem. Very properly it is entitled to be here. It involves relief for a small American industry.

They have no great superlobby. They cannot come down here and fairly overwhelm committees of Congress and executive agencies. They have a fellow out in the cornfields of Douglas County in Illinois. He is a county chairman on occasion. But he also helps to operate the Broom Corn Association. He knows what is going on. He comes down here and says, "Please, sirs; 450 of my boys have been put out of business since 1953. Can't you stop it? Can't you give us a break? Isn't it possible that you can equalize this in line with what the Tariff Commission said to the President of the United States, or are you going to say to them, as they begin to flounder, and cannot pick up their loans at the bank, 'Hush your mouth; it is in the national interest; just go down for the third time and then we won't have to bother about you.' "

It is about time that we bleed a little for some of our own little people.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. This has not been pointed out by me or by my friend from Illinois, but it should be said that many farmers in Colorado, Texas, and Oklahoma look upon the broom corn as a very material crop. They would lose that crop. Naturally, if more broom industries go out of business, there will be no purchasers for the broom corn. Furthermore, in the manufacture of the brooms, handles are used. The people who manufacture handles will go out of business. Wire is also used. That means that wire manufacturers will lose business.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The operation involves packing boxes, and many other things.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. There is more involved than merely broom corn. I appeal to the Senate to give thought for a moment to a little industry. This is not General Motors. This is not Henry Ford III. This is not Chrysler. This is not International Harvester. This is a little industry, where youngsters who obtain an education and who are affiliated with the Seventh-day Adventist faith can put themselves through school. It is an industry in which people whose sight has been destroyed and who can do only limited things, with subtle fingers, can find work and make a livelihood.

When, on top of all that, the Tariff Commission itself says these people have a case, and the Commission makes a unanimous report, I do not know what else can be said to the Senate, unless we want them to sink. They will sink under competition when brooms are brought in from abroad and delivered at one-half the price that it costs to deliver domestic brooms.

That is all we ask. I cannot be beguiled by the distinguished arguments of my friend from New York and my beloved and affable friend from California. I know he bleeds for that little town in Mexico. So do I. Some day, if I have a great deal of time, I shall go down there. I shall take the Senator along. Let us hope it will not be too hot a day, so we will not have to wear coats and ties. We shall walk in on Mr. Lopez Mateos and tell him the whole story.

We will tell him, "Your country bleeds for you because you have a tariff much higher than ours. Do you think we did anything wrong when we bled a little for our little guys who are just like you, except that they do not speak Spanish?"

Mr. President, that is the story. I hope the amendment will be rejected. I have nothing more to add. If I do I shall think of the 450 little proprietors who are swimming around in the deep sea, ready to go down. I am afraid I shall weaken. I am afraid that all these things I have heard will suddenly salve my conscience and my consciousness, and I shall say, "It is in the national interest."

Mr. President, this is for the interest of the people, including blind people. May it never be said that the Senate is insensible to their problem, because of some broad concept with which we might be at variance.

Therefore, may the amendment of my friend from California be rejected by a resounding vote. I would not like to ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. EASTLAND. Let us ask for them.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I shall not ask for them. If we can have enough lusty voices to boom out a resounding "No," I shall be satisfied.

Mr. KUCHEL. "Leader, you are great." I would like to associate myself with my leader with respect to my desire to take care of my fellow Americans. "Leader, you are wiser than I am."

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator flatters me.

Mr. KUCHEL. I am not even the equivalent of 20 or 10 percent of the able legislator that the Senator from Illinois is. "Leader, you are acquainted with the facts, but I want to give you these facts, too." The facts are that in 1954 the American industry sold $25 million worth of brooms made in the United States. Last year, $33 million worth of brooms manufactured in the United States were sold in the United States.

I do not know how my friend from Louisiana can talk about the damage that is being caused, when less than 2 percent out of 100 percent of the brooms are coming into the country.

Do we want to build a wall around the United States and say, "Get out of here. We don't want to have anything to do with you"? Of course not. I say most sincerely that if the American industry were damaged, it would be our joint responsibility to do something about it. But I ask my beloved leader and senior colleague: In this instance, who in the Senate can say, when the United States has 98 percent of the market, that the American industry will be damaged by 2 percent?

I add one more fact that is important to me. Last year $830 million worth of American goods were sold to Mexico. Mexico sold $595 million worth of her goods to the United States. So we have a balance of trade with Mexico of almost $250 million. Now it is proposed to spank Mexico and say that the $400,000 worth of brooms that Mexico is selling in this country must be kept out of the United States; that we are not going to let Mexico send brooms into this country.

I have a recommendation to make, because I know when the giants in this Chamber are on the march. I should like to propose an alternative amendment as an appeal to Senators, especially to the leader of my party and to the acting chairman of the Committee on Finance. I should like to modify my amendment. I should like to offer to the Senate an amendment which would provide that the present duties or levies shall continue on the amount of brooms which came into this country in 1963; but that if anyone abroad wanted to send in another broom, the new schedule, which has been written into the big bill before us, shall be applied.

I should like to add a second section to the modified amendment, and give the President discretion to allocate the quantity of brooms, but never above the amount imported in 1963, which I shall spell out.

Finally, the modified amendment would provide that the revised schedule would become effective on January 1, 1965. On behalf of the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and myself, I should like to offer that as a good-faith attempt to reach an agreement, and my Republican leader knows I am trying to make a good-faith amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I believe the amendment provides for 340,000 dozen brooms to be imported duty free.

Mr. KUCHEL. Not duty free.

Mr. DIRKSEN. At the present duty—340,000 dozen brooms.

Mr. KUCHEL. That is correct; 140,000 dozen whiskbrooms and 210,000 dozen brooms above that size.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Our best information is that in 1963, the last year for which we have information, 310,340 dozen brooms came into the country. If the Senator wishes to propose an amendment, I suggest that he use the 1963 figure, which is a total of 310,340 dozen.

Mr. KUCHEL. I was giving figures representing the importation in 1963, but I would not quibble on a question of arithmetic. If the Senator from Louisiana and the Senate were to adopt our proposal, the precise figures could be supplied to coincide with the facts.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am afraid my distinguished friend from California offers me a horse-and-rabbit deal. By that I refer to the barbecue man who was called upon by the health commissioner to explain how he made rabbit sandwiches. He said, "50–50, one horse to one rabbit." I do not think that is quite the kind of deal I would like to see; but I will make the Senator a counterdeal. Before I do so, I shall have to straighten him out as to his figures.

In 1952, 7,300 dozen brooms were imported from Mexico. In 1953, the number had risen to 14,000 dozen brooms. That was 11 years ago. In 1963, the importation had risen to 140,000 dozen. The Senator says we cannot build a wall around those people.

Mr. KUCHEL. Is not the American share of the market 98 percent today?

Mr. DIRKSEN. No. I do not want to build a wall around those people. I am reaching down by the hand to get them out of the water, so that they will not founder. I have to have something to offer them, so I will tell the Senator what I will do. Suppose we take an average of the importations of 1958, 1959, 1960, 1961, and 1963, omitting 1962, because the importations for 1962 jumped away up. But if we will take the average, that will be 277,000 dozen on which the present tariff will apply. On everything above that, the new duty, suggested in the pending bill, would apply.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield, so that the absence of a quorum may be suggested and I might commune with him a moment?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his suggestion of the absence of a quorum, so that I may make a brief statement?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Does the Senator propose to discuss brooms?

Mr. CLARK. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Does the Senator know something about brooms?

Mr. CLARK. I think I know enough about them, although perhaps not too much.

Mr. DIRKSEN. So long as we are sweeping up the place, we might as well talk about brooms.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Certainly.

Mr. CLARK. I hope that the Senators in charge of the bill, who I take it to be my friend from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] and the learned minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN], will accept the substance of the amendment offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL].

It so happens that in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania brooms are both made by local manufacturers and imported from Mexico and elsewhere in substantial amounts. This means that so far as the economy of Pennsylvania is concerned, it is a difficult task for a U.S. Senator to make up his mind where the economic interests of the manufacturers and the businessmen of his State lie.

It occurs to me that the compromise suggested by the Senator from California and the Senator from New York is a happy one. It would place a ceiling on the importation of brooms from abroad, except under a penalty of paying a substantially higher tariff. Thus, to that extent, supporting the position of the domestic broom manufacturers. On the other hand, it would permit the importations to continue at the rate that has prevailed for the last several years.

It is my understanding that the imported brooms, which would be subject to the increased tariff if the committee proposal were adopted, constitute no more than 5 percent of the total number of brooms sold in the country.

(At this point Mr. HART took the chair as Presiding Officer.)

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, as some Senators no doubt know, these are cheap brooms, many of them selling for less than a dollar. I believe that if we were to place a ceiling on the importation of brooms equal to the amount of imports in the last year, and permit them to come in under the present tariff, and then impose the additional tariff on all importations over and above the so-established quota, we would arrive at a compromise which should be satisfactory both to the domestic producers and to the importers.

Therefore, I hope that the compromise suggestion will be acceptable to the Senator in charge of the bill.

If, however, the Senator is insistent that the tariff go across the board, as presently proposed, I shall vote against the proposal and in favor of any amendment which may be offered to strike it. In my opinion, what we are beginning to do in the bill—which I very much deplore—is to get back to the old, discredited days of Smoot-Hawley, and all the other tariffs which went before it when Congress, by the theory of logrolling deals between the economic interests in the various States, undertook to fix tariff rates.

I believe that the reciprocal trade agreements provisions, initiated under Cordell Hull, moved us away from that rather discreditable chapter in the history of Congress. I should dislike to see Congress returning to that, through the mechanism called a technical adjustment of the tariff schedule. The bill is entitled "An act to correct certain errors in the tariff schedules of the United States." I believe, in fact, that this is, rather, a junior tariff bill.

I see that I have the rapt attention of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG]. I urge upon him, once more, acceptance of the compromise presented by the two Republican Senators across the aisle. I should like the Senator from Louisiana to know that a compromise also has Democratic support. It will also have some effect on the economy of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, so far as the manufacturing and importation of brooms are concerned.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], has the floor.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, is there anything to be swept under the rug here?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I send to the desk, on behalf of the distinguished senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], the distinguished minority leader, the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and me, a proposal in lieu of the amendment now pending.

I ask that the reading of the amendment be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, is as follows:

On page 33, strike out lines 4 through 11, and insert the following:

"SEC. 63. BROOMS.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—Schedule 7, part 8, subpart A is amended by striking out items 750.30 and 750.31 and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"'

	Brooms and brushes consisting of vegetable materials bound together but not mounted or set in a block or head, with or without handles:		
	Brooms wholly or in part of broom corn:		
	Whiskbrooms:		
	Valued not over 32¢ each:		
750.26	In any calendar year prior to the entry, or withdrawal from warehouse, for consumption of 112,000 dozen whiskbrooms classifiable under items 750.26 to 750.28	25% ad val.	25% ad val.
750.27	Other	8¢ each.	8¢ each.
750.28	Valued over 32¢ each	25% ad val.	25% ad val.
	Other brooms:		
	Valued not over 96¢ each:		
750 29	In any calendar year prior to the entry, or withdrawal from warehouse, for consumption of 168,000 dozen brooms classifiable under items 750.29 to 750.31	25% ad val.	25% ad val.
750.30	Other	24¢ each.	24¢ each.
750.31	Valued over 96¢ each	25% ad val.	25% ad val.
750.32	Other	25% ad val.	25% ad val.
750.33	If product of Cuba	20% ad val. (s)	

'

"(b) ALLOCATION.—The headnotes for schedule 7, part 8, subpart A are amended by adding at the end thereof the following headnote:

"'3. The President may, if he determines such action to be in the national interest, allocate the quantity provided for in item 750.26 and 750.29 among supplying countries on the basis of exports during a previous representative period.'

"(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) shall apply with respect to articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after January 1, 1965."

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the amendment would provide that the present rates shall apply in the future on the first 112,000 dozen whiskbrooms, and the first 168,000 dozens of other brooms. Thereafter, it would provide that the rates proposed in the bill as it came from the committee shall apply.

It is a matter of regret to me that quite apparently the Senate was not disposed to look with favor on the original proposal which the senior Senator from New York and I offered. But the action just taken is prior to a conference—and I have spoken to the distinguished leader of my party—is indicative of the fact that the Senate desires to operate on the theory of a quota with respect to this item, by reason of the national interest.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I believe that two things have been accomplished.

First. The principles of imports have been sustained. The legislative history should show a rounded-off figure roughly between the imports for 1960 and 1961, in the same proportions as the two types of products are at present generally approved by the Tariff Commission, based upon generally existing experience.

Second. Notwithstanding my strong feelings on the question of trade, I have been somewhat moved myself by the problem of the blind who work upon these things, although, I do not believe that has made any difference.

The record should show that the domestic industry has increased roughly by $1.5 million a year in the last few years in its own production, notwithstanding the fact that these tariffs have been allegedly too low.

Finally, the Senate has expressed itself as not excluding exports from a friendly neighboring country. That, I believe, is very important in terms of the principal workers involved here.

So like my colleague, the Senator from California, and without trying to go into a detailed reply to the Senator from Illinois—and we may have other occasions to do so—his statement was so delicious and charming that I do not think hardly anyone would wish to debate the subject.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Are we agreed?

Mr. JAVITS. I stand with my colleague, the Senator from California.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Then, if we are agreed, let me throw a rope around the flounderers on the floor.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield to my able friend from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I know that the Senator is interested in his whiskbrooms. I know that the amendment is important to the people who are employed in making whiskbrooms. But the clothespin industry is equally important to the people who make clothespins, particularly the people in the States of Maine and Vermont, where most of them are made.

I wonder if the Senator would object to having the same conditions apply to the importation of clothespins that he is requesting for the whiskbroom industry and other broom industries?

Mr. KUCHEL. My friend from Vermont makes a powerful speech. I am moved by it. I would want to treat the industries located in his State with the greatest compassion and sympathy. But I suggest to my able friend that perhaps we could do that tomorrow morning.

Mr. AIKEN. Clothespins are still very important.

Mr. KUCHEL. Indeed, they are.

Mr. AIKEN. In view of the population explosion, we still must have clothespins.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. The Senator's point is a very pregnant one.

Mr. DIRKSEN. So long as the crop of three-cornered-pants wearers grows, there will be need for clothespins.

Mr. AIKEN. But we wish the American producers of clothespins to maintain at least their present position in the marketing field, and it is only with difficulty that they have been holding that position during the last few years.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The bill will be before the Senate all day tomorrow, I am sure.

Mr. AIKEN. We still use clothespins. We are not like the fellow who went into the store and bought some diapers. The salesgirl said, "That will be $2 for the diapers and 10 cents for the tax."

The fellow replied, "I don't want the 'tacks.' We use safety pins." [Laughter.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. AIKEN. Possibly tomorrow we shall consider that subject.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wish to say only a word or two. I opposed the amendment in the committee. I am not in favor of it now. I am not in favor of even the substitute, although I recognize that it is better than the language of the bill as reported. I favor the original proposal of the Senator from California. It is regrettable that we should pick up a small item like this and do serious harm to our relations with a friendly country and no particular good to our own citizens.

The argument about the blind, I believe, is wholly irrelevant, because the total output of the blind, I am informed, is taken up by charitable organizations, which make special arrangements for the brooms made by the blind and by Government agencies.

Furthermore, there was no really serious testimony taken in the committee. This is another example of improvident and imprudent action in the last days of a Congress. I regret that the subject has come up in this fashion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KUCHEL. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, on behalf of the majority leader, I submit a unanimous-consent request and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The request will be stated.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Ordered, That, effective on September 30, 1964, at the conclusion of routine morning business, during the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 12253) to correct certain errors in the Tariff Schedules of the United States, debate on any amendment, motion, or appeal, except a motion to lay on the table, shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of any such amendment or motion and the majority leader: *Provided,* That in the event the majority leader is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some Senator designated by him.

Ordered further, That on the question of the final passage of the said bill debate shall be limited to 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the majority and minority leaders: *Provided,* That the said leaders, or either of them, may, from the time under their control on the passage of the said bill, allot additional time to any Senator during the consideration of any amendment, motion, or appeal.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, is there any expectation that there will be offered to the tariff bill an amendment which would attach to the bill the medicare bill?

Mr. KUCHEL. Where did the Senator get that information?

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, the Senator from Louisiana might have more information than I have, but I had heard earlier today that there might be some prospects of that, but I have heard subsequently—in fact, only a few moments ago—that it would not be done.

Mr. LAUSCHE. If there are prospects of such amendments being offered, because of the very great importance of that subject, I object to the unanimous-consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I wish to amend the unanimous-consent request.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It is time that we close the present session of Congress. It is folly to try to hurry through important proposed legislation without adequate consideration. Many items of great importance will come before this body which have been inadequately considered, and they will be passed upon. I have heard the argument in relation to the folly of attaching the reapportionment amendment to the foreign aid authorization bill. Now we would attach a medicare bill to a tariff bill.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, may I speak to the question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator wishes the Congress to wind up its work. So does the junior Senator from Louisiana. I am not sure that we shall be able to adjourn this Congress unless we do something about national health insurance. This Senator did not vote for it. But I am on notice that other Senators will not let us vote on a social security bill to help the aged, or public welfare amendments to help the needy and to help the old folks, the orphaned children and everyone else unless we obtain from the House its answer on health insurance. We might be confronted with a situation in which we shall have raised our own pay by $7,500 and raised everyone else's pay in varying amounts with a big tax cut for everyone who is doing well. We would have taken good care of ourselves and everyone else except the needy.

That would be a very unfortunate vote for the Congress to adjourn upon.

We are in conference on medicare. The Senate voted on medicare. There are Senators who are thinking about not permitting that conference report to come to a vote unless the House tells us what it is willing to do on that subject.

This is where we stand in conference. The House has been willing to talk about an approach to medicare completely at variance with the Senate amendment. It will be easy enough to explain to the Senator the difference between what we voted and what the House might consider. I think I could explain it to him simply enough if we could sit down and discuss it. What we are talking about in conference, which perhaps could be considered, and which the House conferees might be willing to consider, would be subject to a point of order if it went back to the House, so that a single House Member could then kill the proposed compromise on the medicare problem. The problem could be bypassed by a Senate amendment to the tariff bill proposing the kind of compromise which the House might be willing to consider. We could then go to conference with an amendment on the tariff bill, which would not then be subject to a point of order, in the event the House agreed to go to conference.

As one Senator who did not vote for medicare—I fought against it to the best of my ability—if my vote on this floor is required in order to get the medicare proposition on this bill, or anything in the field of national health insurance, I do not expect to vote for it; but, on the other hand, so far as this Congress is concerned, I doubt very much that those who are for health insurance are going to let us go home until we give them a good faith answer on the health insurance feature.

If the amendment were to be offered and considered, it would be one of the few possible ways in which we might be able to arrive at some kind of compromise between the House and Senate in this difficult field. I am frank to say I do not think we are going to be able to go home unless we work out something on that score.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I have the floor——

Mr. DIRKSEN. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard to the unanimous-consent request.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I think I have the floor. I should like to finish my statement.

The Senator from Louisiana bases his argument on the fact that we raised our salaries from $22,500 to $30,000 and therefore we cannot deny petitions of others for similar treatment.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. That is one good reason.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I did not vote for the increase to $30,000, and when I voted against the increase to $30,000 I stated that we would never be able to reject inordinate demands as a result of our giving ourselves a 33-percent increase in salary.

I am on sound ground on this item. If the Senator from Illinois had not objected, I would have objected.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. If Senators wish to keep the Senate from voting on an amendment, Senators should be prepared to speak at length on the matter. So far as I am concerned, if any Senator wishes to offer an amendment, he has a right to offer it, and if he thinks he has the votes to have it adopted, I hope he has a chance to have it voted on.

So far as the salary matter is concerned, Senators who voted for it will have considerable difficulty going home and explaining to their people why they insisted on adjourning when the Congress had taken care of everybody but the needy, everybody but the blind, everybody but the aged. This Congress has a magnificent record of taking care of everybody except those who need help the most.

I do not believe Congress will go home on that note. My guess is that Members of Congress who are advocating health insurance—and I am not for it—are going to keep us here until we do something about health care insurance.

Senators can do as they wish, but I am desirous of achieving the same result the Senator from Ohio is. I wish to achieve results and go home. That was the object in asking unanimous consent. The Senator's objection is all right with me. We can debate the question from now until kingdom come, so far as this Senator is concerned.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, by trying, in an election year, to give everybody everything he demands, we exhibited a lack of character which in my opinion was astounding. I refused to do it. I will not listen to this type of argument based upon the proposition that we have given to everybody everything they have asked, though they may not have been entitled to it, and now we must pick up the others who have been left out and give them what they ask. Members of Congress may as well stew and boil and roast in the fire which they created.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 35 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, September 30, 1964, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate September 29, 1964:

In the Marine Corps

Lt. Col. John H. Glenn, Jr., U.S. Marine Corps, for appointment to the grade of colonel.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate, September 29, 1964:

Department of Justice

Charles A. Muecke, of Arizona, to be U.S. district judge for the district of Arizona.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 29, 1964

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Psalm 118: 24: *This is the day which the Lord hath made; we will rejoice and be glad in it.*

Almighty God, we thank Thee for the gift of this new day, affording us many opportunities for growth in nobility of character and service.

Help us to believe that the crowning glory and joy of life is one that is characterized by inward goodness and outgoing service.

Show us how we may undergird the moral and spiritual well-being of our beloved country.

Give us the courage to drive out those vicious influences which corrupt the youth of our cities and communities.

Grant that we may encourage all those cooperative organizations of State and church which are striving to unify their efforts to build a social order which has in it the spirit of brotherhood and good will.

Inspire us to break through and break down the barriers of prejudice and selfishness.

May we have a clear understanding and appreciation of the worth and dignity of mankind.

Enable us to awaken within our own hearts the contagion and capacity for a joyous and victorious spirit.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 1851. An act for the relief of Chester A. Brothers and Anna Brothers, his wife.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 1927. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to revise the pension program for veterans of World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict, and their widows and children, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House upon the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. Byrd of Virginia, Mr. Long of Louisiana, Mr. Smathers, Mr. Anderson, Mr. Douglas, Mr. Williams of Delaware, Mr. Carlson, and Mr. Bennett to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 8050. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide tax-exempt status for nonprofit nurses' professional registries operated by nurses' professional associations.

The message further announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House upon the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. Byrd of Virginia, Mr. Long of Louisiana, Mr. Smathers, Mr. Williams of Delaware, and Mr. Carlson to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 9124. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to vitalize the Reserve Officers' Training Corps programs of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 653. An act to provide an adequate basis for administration of the Lake Mead National Recreation Area, Arizona and Nevada, and for other purposes; and

S. 1024. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to pay relocation costs made necessary by actions of the District of Columbia government, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the President pro tempore, pursuant to Public Law 88–606, had appointed Mr. Jackson, Mr. Anderson, Mr. Bible, Mr. Kuchel, Mr. Allott, and Mr. Jordan of Idaho to be members, on the part of the Senate, of the Public Land Law Review Commission.

LEGISLATION NEEDED TO MAKE IT FEDERAL OFFENSE TO ASSAULT OR ASSASSINATE THE PRESIDENT OR VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. Speaker, immediately following the tragic events of last November 22 I called to the attention of my colleagues the fact that assassination of the President of the United States is not a Federal crime. A number of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle joined me in introducing legislation making it a Federal offense to assault or assassinate the President or Vice President.

Today, 10 months later, we have made no progress toward enacting this legislation. The Warren Commission has included in its recommendations announced yesterday a plea for passage of legislation such as that for which my colleagues and I have been pressing.

Assaults on many lesser officials are now specifically covered by Federal statutes. These include U.S. attorneys, judges of the United States, U.S. marshals, FBI and Secret Service agents, and some employees of agencies such as the Department of Interior and Department of Agriculture.

It is inconceivable to me that the protection of Federal jurisdiction offered to a number of our Federal officials has not been available to our President and Vice President. Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues to support this legislation. I think we ought not to delay any longer.

SECRET SERVICE PROTECTION TO CANDIDATES FOR PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to a point of indignation. On August 11, 1964, I introduced H.R. 12337, a bill to extend Secret Service protection to candidates for President and Vice President. It appeared at the time that bipartisan support for this proposal was so overwhelming that we could pass the bill by unanimous consent. I discussed the matter with the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER]. He indicated that he would bring the matter up himself, requesting unanimous consent. I discussed the matter with both the Republican and Democratic leadership of the House. I discussed the matter with the leadership of the Senate. There was and can be nothing partisan in such a proposal to give our leaders minimum protection during a time of great emotional ferment.

With all the bipartisan support for my proposal, suddenly a hitch developed. The gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] abruptly indicated he could not bring the matter up under unanimous consent. The Speaker voiced misgivings. In order to avoid a controversy where controversy was unnecessary, I discussed the matter at great length with the leadership. No specific technical objections to the language of the bill were raised. There was some inference that anyone desiring Secret Service protection was exhibiting cowardice; that this kind of protection had never been extended before to candidates; and that maybe two or three Secret Service people could be assigned "if BARRY GOLDWATER and BILL MILLER appeared before a committee and requested it."

After repeated oral requests, on September 3, 1964, I telegraphed Mr. CELLER requesting immediate and expeditious hearings on my bill. I did not even receive the courtesy of a reply to my request. I have repeated the request for action on a bipartisan basis on this proposal.

Mr. Speaker, with the release of the Warren report we are all once again profoundly bestirred by the memory of that awful event on November 22, 1963. The Warren report recommends that we take action to improve the Secret Service protection of our President. Let us do so to the maximum extent that we can, consistent with our free and open way of life. But there is something we can do right now to minimize the chance of another monumental disaster shaking the very foundations of our Nation. HUBERT HUMPHREY, BARRY GOLDWATER, and BILL MILLER do not even have the inadequate Secret Service protection criticized by the Warren report.

What kind of a national and constitutional crisis would occur tomorrow if one of these fine and dedicated Americans was assassinated? And how would you and I feel if we had neglected to give them the minimum protection that is so readily available?

I have consulted with the Secret Service officials. They take no policy position either for or against H.R. 12337, but they have indicated unqualifiedly to me that if Congress passes this bill they can implement it immediately and effectively.

Mr. Speaker, I implore my colleagues to take this action now—by unanimous consent, or whatever other device the leadership chooses. There is no partisanship when the basic interests of our beloved country are at stake and certainly the safety of our national leaders in both parties is basic to our national interests.

IMPORTATION AND SALE OF PIRANHA FISH

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, recently I had informed the House of the increasing importation and sale in the United States of the South American piranha fish. This marked increase posed a definite threat to the residents of south Florida where all authorities agreed that there was a possibility that the tiny flesh-eating fish could establish themselves if given the chance.

I have been in touch with the Department of the Interior in regard to this matter and have been informed by that Department that new regulations are to be issued shortly which will curb the uncontrolled sale of the piranha. I assure you that the residents of Florida will greet this news with a sigh of relief. Our hundreds of miles of recreational waterways are a source of great pleasure as well as a vital part of the tourist attraction which brings thousands of people into our area each year. It, therefore, is of great satisfaction to all the people of Florida that the Department of the Interior is in the process of drawing up new regulations which will insure that these waterways will not be the future home of the tiny flesh-eating piranhas.

Mr. Speaker, I along with the other residents of Florida look forward to the issuance of these new regulations which will secure the permanent safety of our recreational waterways from the piranha fish.

SENATOR GOLDWATER'S HEALTH

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, we are in the midst of the most important presidential election campaign in many decades. If we probe to the core of this contest, we can see that the issues are clear and the alternatives are distinct. And it is most vitally important that the American people see and understand those issues and alternatives so that their choice, at the polls on November 3, will be based on fact rather than fantasy.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the clear issues on this campaign are being deliberately blurred. I submit that the "big lie" is being used to an extent never before seen in American politics. I submit that the hate-peddlers and the fright-peddlers and the muckrakers are deliberately vilifying Senator BARRY GOLDWATER. The truth is not in them, Mr. Speaker, and they are without honor. Apparently there is no limit to their desperate and depraved attempts to portray a U.S. Senator and a presidential candidate as mentally incompetent.

As this campaign started, it was inconceivable to think that Senator GOLDWATER's health could possibly be a campaign issue. He enjoys unusually robust health, both physically and mentally—and that fact has been apparent all his active life. He rides, he hunts, he hikes, he swims, he explores. He is a pilot, a jet pilot, checked out by the U.S. Air Force this year to fly faster-than-sound airplanes. It requires, as I am sure you are aware, Mr. Speaker, excellent physical coordination, mental judgment and nervous control to fly a jet airplane. Senator GOLDWATER has been a member of the military or its reserves for nearly 25 years and has passed every examination during that time.

Let me be specific about one big lie being aimed at this honorable, honest and healthy man.

This lie is receiving circulation in the form of a full-page ad placed in such newspapers as the New York Times, the New York Herald Tribune, the New York Journal American and the New York World Telegram & Sun. I am told, Mr. Speaker, that these papers charge about $4,000 and $5,000 for a full-page ad. I personally know of 5 ads that have been placed, costing about $25,000 total. It would be interesting to know where the money came from.

The ads were placed by one Ralph Ginzberg, publisher of a magazine which is curiously named Fact. The ads question Senator GOLDWATER's mental stability and promote an article, soon to be published in Mr. Ginzberg's magazine, about the Senator's supposed state of mental health. The ad is vicious and it is cruelly distorted. It alleges that the article is based on responses made to a poll by psychiatrists across the country.

Psychiatrists are scientists, doctors of medicine, and any one of them worth the name will recognize the dishonest and disreputable nature of what Fact magazine is doing. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, I think we should have on the record what medical societies say about Mr. Ginzberg's project—and I quote, in part, from their statements:

From the American Medical Association:

> AMA did not cooperate in any way in the taking of the poll. The AMA condemns this obviously scurrilous unscientific questionnaire * * * The AMA intends to register the strongest protest with Fact for using the name and reputation of AMA for obvious propaganda and financial purposes.

That is from Dr. F. J. L. Blasingame, executive vice president of AMA.

From the American Psychiatric Association:

> Let me assure you that we share your sense of outrage and indignation that Fact magazine proposes to publish what purports to be an analysis of psychiatric opinion regarding the psychological fitness of Mr. GOLDWATER to be President of the United States. We alerted the officers of our district branches to the mischief afoot and asked them to urge members not to write to Fact magazine, but, there was not time to reach all 14,000 members individually and, of course, many of them sent some form of a "response." It is our estimate, judging from the letters we have on file from our members, that ever so many of these responses were in essence expressions of indignation at having been sent the questionnaire.
>
> I want to assure you that we will proceed with our plan to disavow the validity of any so-called psychiatric opinion of Mr. GOLDWATER's relative psychological fitness to be President that the magazine may publish.

From Dr. Walter E. Barton, medical director, American Psychiatric Association.

From the American Association of Physicians and Surgeons:

> We do object to the inane method of attempting to judge the psychological fitness of an individual through long-range diagnosis. We do deplore the slanted presentation which encourages only one kind of vote, and which, apparently, is for the purpose of vilifying and destroying the character of an individual citizen.

These are excerpts from the AAPS News Letter of September 1964, by Dr. Thomas Parker, president.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the real and indisputable fact is that Fact magazine is the most misnamed publication in America. And its publisher, Ralph Ginzberg, is now appealing a jail sentence and heavy fine for sending pornographic material through the mails.

I understand that Mr. Ginzberg is going to report the results of his so-called poll this Wednesday, September 30, in a speech at the University of Southern California. No doubt he will claim his poll is scientific and impartial. But will he say that the American Medical Association, the American Psychiatric Association, and the Association of American Physicians and Surgeons have already repudiated his poll? I doubt it, Mr. Speaker, I doubt it.

And I believe the American people will join these distinguished organizations in repudiating Mr. Ginzberg's vile effort to assassinate the character and reputation of Senator BARRY GOLDWATER.

It behooves all of us, Mr. Speaker, to expose this evil effort and to present the facts openly, and to help give the electorate a true picture of the issues and the candidates.

The American people have an important choice to make November 3. Let them make that choice on the basis of truth, not in a poisonous climate of fear engendered by fiction and fantasy.

LABOR SHORTAGE IN CALIFORNIA

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, farmers in California, as well as other employing States, are still awaiting an answer to the supplemental labor problem which they will face next January 1.

We have heard many comments in recent days acknowledging that a labor shortage does exist. But, we have not heard many solutions proposed.

Recently, I received copies of correspondence from Mr. Jesse Frye, the general manager of the Ventura County Farm Labor Association. Mr. Frye had written to each of the State departments of employment concerning the possibility of recruiting able, qualified, domestic farmworkers in the various States. The replies point up emphatically the shortage of such workers almost everywhere.

In view of this situation, it is essential that a program for supplemental labor be devised and made known immediately. Statements by public officials that crops will not perish in the fields for lack of labor are not enough. Farmers need to know now what they can expect.

Every Californian is affected in some way by the condition of California agriculture. The absence of an adequate and qualified supplemental labor force would mean disaster for many California farmers. The entire State would suffer.

This problem is not going to vanish. On the contrary, it is becoming more aggravated daily. This administration owes it to farmers to develop and announce at once a program for supplemental labor that will enable them to meet their needs under fair and reasonable conditions.

The methods for accomplishing this exist. It is time that they were used and farmers relieved of the uncertainty which they now face.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, due to circumstances entirely beyond my control I was unable to be on the floor on Tuesday, April 14, 1964, when the vote was taken on H.R. 10809, and on Tuesday, September 1, 1964, when the vote was taken on S. 2701.

Had I been present on these days, I would have voted yea on both bills.

THREE MILLION DOLLARS SAVED, BUT NOT UNTIL FIVE MILLION DOLLARS WAS WASTED—PRC-47 PROCUREMENT

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, time and again in the past, I have proven where the military can save money by allowing competitive bidding for electronics equipment after the equipment is properly developed. Here is another case which proves:

First. When the Marine Corps wasted over $5 million of the taxpayers' dollars in buying the AN/PRC-47 walkie-talkie radio.

Second. It also paid $250,000 for development of the radio, then allowed one producer to, for all intents and purposes, keep the results of the Government-sponsored development.

Third. When competitive bidding was forced upon it, the price for the radio dropped to less than half the sole-source price.

Fourth. Under competitive conditions, the former sole-source producer trimmed its price by 43 percent; and

Fifth. The Marines showed favoritism for a preferred company.

Mr. Speaker, you would think this object lesson would be enough to start a flood of competitive purchasing. This is just another example of what I have been bringing to the floor now for years. Each one helps change the direction of the procurement current from sole source to competitive bidding.

The mainstream of this current, however, is still much—far too much—in favor of sole-source buying. I say this in the knowledge that my study has succeeded in prodding Secretary of Defense McNamara and his procurement officers into exceeding their competitive procurement schedules by 2 years.

Mr. Speaker, the AN/PRC-47 radio was developed under a Government contract. Under terms of the contract the Government was to pay $250,000 for five of the radios. In return the Government got five radios and the plans and specifications.

This, you would think, would allow competitive bidding. It could—and it should. But, it did not.

The Marine Corps entered into a contract—NOm-72362—in December 1961 for over $8 million worth of these radios at average unit price of $4,523.77 each. This was a sole-source contract. Only one company was allowed to bid—the company paid by the Government to develop the equipment.

Studying another radio in 1962, I came across the PRC–47 case and started asking questions about it, to buttress my file about the other radio. Imagine my surprise when, in October 1963, I received a call from a civil servant alerting me that another big sole-source purchase was coming up for the PRC–47 radio.

In October 1963, the Marine Corps was asked to fill me in, to answer questions and supply documentation on the equipment. All this work takes months, Mr. Speaker. In the interim the Marines shoved this second sole-source purchase through—for almost $1 million worth of radios at an average price of $5,734.60 each.

Such disregard for the taxpayer literally makes my blood boil. I contacted the Marine Corps, both formally and informally, and strongly urged that all future procurements of this radio be competitive. I even suggested the $1 million contract be abolished. My suggestion went unheeded at the time.

Some weeks ago, however, I was informed that a competitive procurement had finally been forced for the AN/PRC–47 radio.

Mr. Speaker, on September 4, 1964 the bids for this radio were opened and here is a tabulation of bids a member of my staff recorded at that time:

AN/PRC–47( ): Prior development by Collins Radio at Marine Corps expense, followon production by Collins $7.5 million at $4,500; also urgent delivery NOm–72986 June 25, 1964, to Collins Radio for $806,806—at unit price of $5,734.60.

Note: For ease of comparison, the unit prices for 12 quantity ranges plus the option were multiplied, so that the following sequence gives you from low bidder to high bidder with total bid, and average system price for the 1,133 maximum (including optional) units:

Name of firm bidding, IFB 25-65, and terms	System	Average total bid price
1. Bendix Corp., Baltimore, Md., D. L. Gunter, market manager, terms net	$2,794.21	$3,165,844.00
2. Admiral Corp., 3800 West Cortland St., Chicago, Ill., R. M. Jones, vice president, net	2,846.48	3,225,070.00
3. ITT Federal Labs, 500 Washington Ave., Nutley, N.J., G. Banino, president, terms net	2,977.99	3,374,063.71
4. Dalmo Victor Co., Belmont, Calif., P. H. Friedman, vice president, marketing, net	3,199.00	3,624,517.00
5. Collins Radio Co., Cedar Rapids, Iowa, W. G. Kane, contract administration, terms net	3,257.75	3,691,026.00
6. Avco Corp., Electronics Division, 2630 Glendale Melford, Cincinnati, Ohio, C. A. Lenn, assistant comptroller	3,728.72	4,224,649.00
7. Radio Corp. of America, defense electronic products, Cambridge, Ohio, net	4,093.12	4,637,514.00

(Note.—Contract NOm–72986 awarded Collins Radio, Cedar Rapids, Iowa, under date of May 18, 1964, on a sole-source noncompetitive basis due to urgency of delivery for Army requirements, covering 124 units of the AN/PRC–47 Radio Set per CSY–3–FY62–3 and amendment No. 1, where the radio carried a unit price of $5,734.60; plus 124 blower 199Q–1 Collins part No. 522–3856–00 at a unit price of $199.40; plus 124 sets of repair parts consisting of 20 amp fuse, 5 amp fuse, 1 each of each, plus 2 lamps 262–0179–00 and 262–0556–00 (2 each of each) at $1.54 per set * * * where 100 units had to be delivered before October 15, 1964, with 24 units to be delivered by November 16, 1964 * * * with several exceptions in the specifications: water splash for water spray; frequency stability of equipment after warmup for 2 minute shall be sufficient to maintain operating frequencies over a period of 60 days, within ±15 cps; 3.310.2 substitute 150 for 120; 160 for 130, and 15 for 14, etc. The development of this radio was in September 1959 covered by NOm–71453 for five units of a team pack single sideband radio set per CSY–3–FY–59–11 at a unit price of $50,000 each. December 1961: NOm–72362 awarded Collins for 1,375 units of the AN/PRC–47( ) Radio at a total liability starting at $7,558,022.92—subsequently increased to $8,047,520.46 with unit price at $4,502.56, and others.

You will notice that the Bendix Corp., Baltimore, Md., was the low bidder—quoting an average price of $2,794.21—less than half the sole-source price.

You will also note that the former sole-source producer—Collins Radio Co.—quoted an average price of $3,257.75—43 percent less than they quoted for the same radio just a few months ago when they had no competition.

This proves that the Marines literally squandered over $5 million of the money spent thus far for this radio. And it proves that forcing the Marines to go competitive on this purchase has saved the taxpayers over $3 million.

Mr. Speaker, I was speechless when I learned that on one hand a contract can be handed sole source to a firm so capriciously and without regard for cost, and the minute competition comes into the window this same sole-source producer trims its price so dramatically.

The PRC–47 is not an isolated instance. The same circumstances surround one after another of the cases I have developed. The AN/TRC–75 radio is another example. The Navy wasted about $25 million on this radio. One of my colleagues is working on this case right now, so I will leave the details for him to present at a future time.

Mr. Speaker, in an effort to be perfectly fair about this case, I requested the Comptroller General to make a technical evaluation of the different radio procurements to ascertain whether or not the radios purchased noncompetitively were identical to the others. September 11, 1964, Mr. Campbell informed me:

Comptroller General
of the United States,
Washington, September 11, 1964.

The Honorable Earl Wilson,
House of Representatives.

Dear Mr. Wilson: Reference is made to your letter of August 24, 1964, requesting information pertaining to various procurements of the AN/PRC–47 radio, an evaluation of Collins Radio Co.'s patent claims with respect to the AN/PRC–47 radio, a comparison of the technical requirements of various specifications involving the radio, and a tabulation of bids recorded in connection with the Marine Corps invitation for bid No. 25–65.

We have initiated a review for the purpose of obtaining and evaluating the data necessary to prepare a report on the matters referred to in your request. In view of the complexity of the matters involved, we estimate that the review and report will require approximately 90 days to complete.

Sincerely yours,

Joseph Campbell,
Comptroller General of the United States.

Realizing how busy Mr. Campbell is, I personally conducted a technical review of the negotiated contracts with Collins and the competitive procurement for the AN/PRC–47. I found the equipments to be basically identical, but that the sole-source producer did not have to make a preproduction unit, was released from a guarantee clause and had other concessions. This saved Collins at least $150,000 and should have made its manufacture much less expensive than the competitive price. But, as we have seen, the facts are just the other way around.

For the Record, here is my survey of specifications for the two procurements involved here:

Radio set AN/PRC–47 specification comparison

Subject	Paragraph	Contract NOm-72986	Paragraph	IFB No. 25–65
Specifications	2.1	Calls out MIL–T-1374A, truck, utility, ¼-ton, 4x4, M38A1.	2.1	Not called out.
		Calls out MIL–STD-752, equipment spectrum signatures.		Do.
		Not called out		Calls out "Drawing 5116-522-2433-011 and associated drawings, lists, etc."
Preproduction samples	3.1	Preproduction sample included in quantity to be shipped. (Note.—Contract eliminates need for preproduction.)	3.1	Preproduction samples not included in quantity to be delivered.
Type and function	3.1.1	A watertight transit case shall be provided which is capable of enclosing all components and accessories except the rucksack frames.	3.1.1	A watertight transit case shall be provided which is capable of enclosing all components and accessories.
Type of construction	3.1.2	All of the basic components shall be splashproof when assembled in operating condition or constructed of materials, which, when exposed to the elements, shall not affect the operating capability of the equipment. Convection cooling of the equipment shall be used throughout except as noted herein.	3.1.2	All of the basic components shall be splashproof when assembled in operating condition or constructed of materials, which, when exposed to the elements, shall not adversely affect the operating capability of the equipment. Convection cooling of the equipment shall be used throughout.

Radio set AN/PRC-47 specification comparison—Continued

Subject	Paragraph	Contract NOm-72986	Paragraph	IFB No. 25-65
Case CY-3762		Not called out by specific type number. May be subsequent assignment of nomenclature.	3.1.2.1.8	The receiver-transmitter case shall be of aluminum and balsa sandwich construction. When the front panel cover, CW-647/PRC-47, is in place, the receiver-transmitter shall be waterproof.
Cases	3.3.1	The transit case and cases for the basic units shall be watertight.	3.3.1	The transit case and transceiver case shall be watertight.
Service conditions	3.3.3.1	Not listed	3.3.3.1	1—Temperature shock; par. 4.7 applies.
Frequency stability	3.3.4.3	±40 cycles −40° to −30° C ±25 cycles −29° to +20° C ±15 cycles +21° to +30° C ±25 cycles +31° to +60° C	3.3.4.3	±40 cycles −40° to −30° C. ±25 cycles −30° to +20° C. ±15 cycles +20° to +40° C. ±25 cycles +40° to +60° C.
MTBF—Mean time between failure		Not called out as such. Par. 3.3.4.1 requires 200 hours' operation without failure.	3.3.5.1	230 hours under AGREE-3 test procedures.
Interchangeability	3.3.6	The components, modules, and accessories of this equipment shall conform to the interchangeability requirements of specification MIL-E-16400. Every effort shall be made to utilize standard parts and components currently available in the Marine Corps supply system.	3.3.6	All components and parts of the equipment shall be physically, functionally, mechanically, and electrically interchangeable with the corresponding components and parts of the Government-furnished AN/PRC-47.
Interference	3.3.18	Does not contain table I	3.3.17	Contains table I, delineating specification deviations for interference and front end rejection.
Performance requirements	3.4	Specifies minimum warmup period of 20 minutes. (Since this warmup period was changed in other sections to 2 minutes, this may be a typographical error.)	3.4	Specifies minimum warmup period of 2 minutes.
Sensitivity	3.4.2.1	Does not include this relief	3.4.2.1	Includes statement that the requirement does not apply at certain frequencies.
Duty cycle	3.4.3.2	Not called out	3.4.3.2	In FSK-Hi power operation the duty cycle will be 9 minutes receive, 2 minutes transmit for 1 hour.
FSK	3.3.11.3	Details the use and nonuse of external blowers in the 2 modes of frequency shift keyed operation.	3.3.11.3	Does not mention blowers, merely states source of audio tones.
Whip antenna	3.5.3.1	Specifies fiberglas	3.5.3.1	Does not specify fiberglas.
Antenna accessories	3.5.4.3b	Requires furnishing an antenna lead wire for use when transceiver is mounted on ¼-ton truck.		Not required.
Audio accessories	3.5.4.2	Calls out headset H-233/PRC-47	3.5.4.2 3.7	Calls out headset H-223/PRC-47. Calls out headset H-233/PRC-47 (probable typographical error).
	3.5.4.2g	Requires a blower to be furnished. This is listed in the contract as a separate item, at additional cost.		Not required.
Government-furnished material		Not included	3.6	Specifies 2 PRC-47 sets to be GFE'd, to be tested by the contractor.
Equipment listing		Does not appear as such in the specifications; however, there is a comparable listing in the contract, and there is general conformance to the listing in Bid/Spec IFB 25-65. Some differences seem to be due to the use of different words to describe an item; some are indicative of configuration differences.	3.7	Detailed listing of items to be furnished.
Tests	4.2.1.1	Requires −25° C. temperature test as part of sampling test.	4.2.1	Not required.
	4.2.1.1	Requires watertightness test as part of sampling test.	4.2.1	Not required. Watertightness test only required for preproduction tests.
		Not required	4.2.1	Primary power variation test required during preproduction and sampling tests.
Test procedures		Not required (understandable, because of prior contract).	4.2.1.1	Submission and approval of test procedures required 1 month prior to tests.
Tests		Not specified	4.2.1.2	Specifies quantities of radio sets to be subjected to various tests: Preproduction, production, sample.
Intended use	6.1	Includes requirement: Provisions are to be made for vehicular mounting.	6.1	Not included.
Government-furnished equipment		These 2 items are to be furnished by the contractor.		LS-166/U loudspeaker and J-45 telegraph key are to be furnished by the Government.
Guarantee		Clause deleted		Guarantee applicable.

Mr. Speaker, I requested of the commanding officer of the Marine Corps a detailed bill of materials—priced—from Collins together with the DD-633 form supplied by Collins under its sole-source contract, but he has indicated an obscure regulation which prohibits this, and has forwarded the hot potato to the Secretary of the Navy, thus:

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
HEADQUARTERS U.S. MARINE CORPS,
Washington, D.C., September 17, 1964.
Hon. EARL WILSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. WILSON: The information requested in the second paragraph of your letter of September 8, 1964, relative to contract No. 72986 with the Collins Radio Co., would necessitate the disclosure of business confidential information. Pursuant to Armed Services Procurement Regulation 1-1006, this matter is being referred to the Secretary of the Navy.

The following information is furnished with regard to Mr. J. F. Maguire: His rating is GS-14; his annual salary is $16,130, and he has never been disciplined, suspended, or officially reprimanded.

Sincerely yours,
W. P. BATTELL,
Major General, U.S. Marine Corps, Quartermaster General of the Marine Corps, by direction of the Commandant of the Marine Corps.

Mr. Speaker, since this is a very serious matter, and goes to the very heart of the problem of waste in military purchasing, I have today requested the General Accounting Office to audit contract No. 72986 line for line, item for item. I want to know where the money went.

It is obvious that no firm can or should show a profit factor of 45 percent on any single contract and go unquestioned.

When the report comes back, I shall make it public.

There are several individuals connected with this case, Mr. Speaker, who must explain their actions. One is J. F. Maguire, who is employed by the Marine Corps as a contract negotiator. The people of this country pay him $16,300 a year or thereabouts to have their best interests at heart when he obligates their money—in tax dollars.

Mr. Maguire is the contract negotiator who has sat on the top of this procurement. How wisely has he spent the taxpayers' money? Has he been worth the money we are paying him? I hardly think so, and that is as charitable as I can be toward Mr. Maguire.

I am going to have more to say about Mr. Maguire in the future. My study of the way in which he performs his job is still going on. I can say now, however, that his file jacket would make interesting reading even if it were published in incomplete form today.

The commanding general of the Marine Corps should relieve Mr. Maguire of any sole-source purchasing duties, at least until the audit of the PRC-47 contracts are concluded. In that way, the Treasury and the taxpayers will be protected.

THE HONORABLE RICHARD E. LANKFORD

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, the Fifth Congressional District of Maryland is one of the largest in the United States both in population and geographic area. Because of its unusual size, its close proximity to the Nation's Capital and its wide variety of interests, the Fifth District is also one of the most difficult to represent in the Congress.

The people of the Fifth District have been very fortunate to have been represented in the Congress during the past 10 years by a dedicated public servant who has rendered them effective, responsible service and has given assiduous attention to their concerns and problems. I refer to our distinguished colleague, the Honorable RICHARD E. LANKFORD.

Congressman LANKFORD has decided not to seek reelection and will leave the Halls of Congress at the end of this session. The achievements and solid accomplishments of Congressman LANKFORD in the years since he took his seat in this body in January 1955, are too numerous to list here.

Those of us who have been privileged to serve with him during these years have come to know him as one of the ablest and most effective Members of the House. He has worked diligently in the interests not only of those whom he served but the State and Nation as well with an honesty and devotion to principle that has been inspiring and has earned him the respect and confidence of his colleagues of both parties.

Congressman LANKFORD has written a great record of service in the Halls of the Congress. His voice and his vote always have been in support of those policies and those programs designed to make the United States a better place in which to live. He is deserving of high commendation for the substantial and continuing contributions that he has made to national defense as a member of the House Armed Services Committee.

Members of Congress usually fall into one or two categories—they are either workhorses or showhorses. A workhorse Congressman spends his time attending long and grueling committee meetings where the real work of Congress is done and in looking after the needs of his constituents and his district. From the standpoint of hard work and solid accomplishment Congressman LANKFORD can claim membership in the workhorse fraternity. He has been a competent and useful Member of Congress. He has been a credit not only to the House but to the entire U.S. Congress.

When Congressman LANKFORD vacates his congressional seat at the end of this session the loss will be felt not only in this body where he will leave a void that will be hard to fill, but also in the Fifth Congressional District and the State of Maryland where he has consistently championed the just causes of all people.

I know I do not speak for myself alone when I extend to Congressman LANKFORD best wishes for continued good health and success in whatever pursuits he may follow in the years to come.

THE HONORABLE RICHARD E. LANKFORD

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, I view with regret the pending retirement of my colleague and close friend, RICHARD E. LANKFORD, Representative of the Fifth Congressional District of Maryland, upon completion of this 88th session of Congress. He has chosen not to seek reelection and therefore, will terminate a career of 10 years distinguished and dedicated service to the constituents of his district, and to his country.

Though he has forsaken the hallowed Hall of Congress to return to the private practice of law, we shall long remember the devoted and effective service he has rendered as a Member of this body and as a ranking member of the 37-man House Armed Services Committee. Through his seniority on this committee, he was chosen this year to serve on the Special Investigations Subcommittee which was created by a House resolution to conduct a full and complete investigation of all matters pertaining to our national defense and security.

In 1962 Congressman LANKFORD was selected to fill the vacancy on the House Government Operations Committee of Representative JOHN W. MCCORMACK, upon the occasion of his appointment to the Speaker of the House and was subsequently assigned to its two most important subcommittees, the Military Operations Subcommittee, where I had the privilege of serving with him, and the Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee.

His committee assignments gave Maryland representation on two of the most important committees of the House and was particularly effective in view of the heavy concentration of defense and other Government activities in our State.

When Congressman LANKFORD leaves office at the close of this 88th session of Congress, his loss will be felt not only among his colleagues but also his constituents of the Fifth Congressional District of Maryland.

Although we all will miss him, I am sure you will join me in wishing him good health and happiness in the years ahead and utmost success in all his future endeavors.

THE HONORABLE RICHARD E. LANKFORD

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to join our dean of the Maryland delegation in paying tribute to our good friend and distinguished colleague, DICK LANKFORD.

I am very sorry that DICK has decided not to seek reelection from the Fifth District of Maryland but I respect his wishes in this matter. He has a long and honorable record of service to the people of his district and to the Nation, and has merited our gratitude and esteem.

Before coming to the House of Representatives, DICK LANKFORD served in the U.S. Navy in Europe during World War II. From 1948 until 1953 he was a member of the Maryland House of Delegates and served on its legislative council. In addition, he engaged in many civic and charitable activities and was elected vice president, then president of the Federal Bar Association.

When DICK LANKFORD took his seat in the House of Representatives in the 84th Congress he immediately distinguished himself as a hard-working Congressman, a man you can rely on to consider all points of view and vote according to his conscience.

As a member of the very important Armed Services Committee, DICK has been in the forefront in our constant fight to maintain a strong national defense and has always considered the best interests of our men in uniform in the service of their country. Through his activities on the Government Operations Committee he has been instrumental in the enactment of legislation which has saved our Government millions of dollars.

Mr. Speaker, it has been an honor and privilege for me to serve with DICK LANKFORD in this body for the past 10 years. I think he has been an outstanding Congressman and I have benefited by his cooperation and counsel in matters affecting our State. Maryland is truly proud of this man who has an enviable record as Navy veteran, farmer, distinguished lawyer, civic leader, and legislator.

The House of Representatives will not seem the same without DICK LANKFORD but we wish him good health, happiness, success, and prosperity in the future.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, when I came to the House of Representatives in the 87th Congress I was the only Republican in the Maryland delegation. But the center aisle was not too wide for DICK LANKFORD to extend the hand of welcome and the hand of friendship. I shall always remember and appreciate his many acts of kindness to me in my first days here.

Dick Lankford helped to initiate me in some of the parliamentary procedures of the House of Representatives. He helped to explain some of the rules of the House. Without this type of personal guidance, a new Member here has a difficult time.

We may have differed on many issues during the period that we have served here together. But I believe that Dick Lankford and I have shared together a profound concern and interest for the welfare of the United States and of the State of Maryland.

There have been many occasions when I have had problems in the Sixth Congressional District of Maryland which have concerned matters involving the armed services. Because of Dick Lankford's membership on the Committee on Armed Services I have appealed to him for guidance and help, and without exception, he always lent himself generously to any job which involved the welfare of our people in the State of Maryland.

Dick Lankford's interest in industry in the State of Maryland has been outstanding. He has made a contribution to the improvement of the conditions of employment and the business climate which will not soon be forgotten.

Mr. Speaker, all of us thank Dick Lankford for his days in the House of Representatives. We thank his family for sharing him with us. Our best wishes go with him. God bless him.

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Morton] and the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Long] be given permission to extend their remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, we shall regret the absence of Richard E. Lankford upon his retirement from Congress at the close of this session. As a fellow member of the Armed Services Committee, I have been privileged to observe his keen analysis of our Nation's defense programs. As a fellow Marylander, and Democrat, I have admired his tireless campaigning for our party. As a Congressman, I have been impressed by the testimony of his own constituents, who elected him to the House of Representatives by overwhelming majorities. We shall miss the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Lankford] in this Chamber, and we wish him well in his future pursuits.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in expressing appreciation to Congressman Lankford for the cooperation he has given me and the rest of the Maryland delegation on projects and programs in which we have had a common interest and a common purpose.

He has always been willing to do his share of any assignment and it has been a pleasure for me to work with him.

I wish him the best of success in whatever undertaking he plans for the future. I am sure he will continue to work for the benefit of our State of Maryland and the Nation.

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, I welcome this opportunity to add my voice to the other voices that we have heard from the delegation of the State of Maryland in recognition of the great service which Dick Lankford has rendered to the State of Maryland and to this Nation. I refer particularly to the services which have been rendered to the Fifth Congressional District by the Honorable Richard E. Lankford, our Congressman.

Richard E. Lankford was first elected to represent the Fifth District in Congress in 1954 after serving a 6-year apprenticeship in the Maryland Legislature. He was reelected in 1956, 1958, 1960, and 1962.

The Fifth Congressional District is the largest in Maryland and the fifth largest in the country with a total population of 711,045. The national average is 410,481 persons per district; the average for the State of Maryland is 442,956 persons per congressional district.

The Fifth District includes the counties of Prince Georges, Anne Arundel, St. Marys, Charles, Howard, and Calvert, and precincts 12 to 19 in the 25th ward in Baltimore city.

Congressman Lankford has lived in the district all of his adult life, and was actively engaged in many of its numerous business and civic activities before going to Congress. He has been a lawyer, a small businessman, a tobacco farmer, and for a brief period prior to his active duty with the Navy in World War II, he was a Federal employee.

Congressman Lankford is now serving his fifth term—10 years—as a member of the House Armed Services Committee. He ranks 10th in seniority on this 37-man committee. As a result of his seniority he was selected this year to serve on the special investigations subcommittee which was created by a House resolution to conduct a full and complete investigation of all matters pertaining to the national defense and security. He ranks second on this subcommittee behind Chairman Porter Hardy, of Virginia.

In 1962 Congressman Lankford was selected to fill the vacancy on the House Government Operations Committee created by the resignation of Representative John W. McCormack, of Massachusetts, upon the occasion of Congressman McCormack's election to Speaker of the House. At the beginning of the 88th Congress he was elected to a full 2-year term on the committee and assigned to two of its most important subcommittees, Military Operations and Legal and Monetary Affairs.

Because of its jurisdiction over Government activities at all levels, the Government Operations Committee is commonly referred to as the House's "watchdog" committee. It maintains a continuing study of the operations of the Federal Government, both at home and abroad, with a view to maintaining maximum economy and efficiency.

Congressman Lankford's committee assignments give Maryland's Fifth District representation on two of the most important committees of the House, particularly in view of the heavy concentration of defense and other Government activities in the area.

Congressman Lankford has introduced and worked for passage of legislation raising the pay and improving the working conditions of Government employees.

He has sponsored passage of legislation helping the farmers, the watermen, the veterans, the small businessmen, and has worked steadily to improve the living conditions of the working men and women. He has also consistently and vigorously supported measures strengthening our public schools. He led the fight which defeated efforts to reduce and eliminate Federal aid to schools crowded beyond normal with children of Government employees and military personnel. Maryland schools receive over $10 million a year under this program. Should it be eliminated it would be necessary to raise taxes to meet school needs.

From his strategic position on the Armed Services Committee, Congressman Lankford triggered an investigation into Navy's failure to utilize fully Indian Head Naval Propellant Plant; and continued the fight until layoffs were halted and rehiring begun, saving important payroll for southern Maryland. He also conducted a successful fight to get 1,100-acre Greenbelt tract developed into recreational park to be enjoyed by district residents and millions of annual visitors to the Nation's Capital.

Congressman Lankford was born July 22, 1914. He attended Maryland grade school and in 1937 took a B.S. in political science from the University of Virginia. In 1940 he took his law degree from the University of Maryland. He practiced law and engaged in active management of tobacco and cattle farms from 1940 until 1942 when he was commissioned an ensign in the U.S. Navy and went on active duty, serving 2½ years overseas. Released from duty in 1948 with the rank of lieutenant, Congressman Lankford resumed his law practice and tobacco farm management.

A former vestryman of St. Anne's Protestant Episcopal Church of Annapolis, Congressman Lankford has been active in civic affairs. He is a former member of the advisory board, Anne Arundel General Hospital; advisory board, Salvation Army, chairman of the 1950 and 1953 Anne Arundel County Community Chest campaigns, chairman of the 1947 Annapolis Red Cross drive and member of the executive council of the Anne Arundel County area Boy Scouts of America

Mr. Speaker, I speak with a personal note in my voice with respect to Dick because I first met the gentleman from Maryland [Mr Lankford] back in 1954 when he and Mary Elizabeth became our very close friends at a time when we were both campaigning for public office. At that time I was campaigning for the State legislature.

So, Mr. Speaker, DICK LANKFORD has been my Congressman for 10 years. As a matter of fact, he is still my Congressman, because I live in his district.

Mr. Speaker, oftentimes remarks such as these sound more like sort of a requiem, but let me say that nothing could be further from the truth. I saw Congressman LANKFORD just a few minutes ago and he is just as bright-eyed and bushy-tailed now as he has ever been. I hope we may continue to have the service of DICK LANKFORD to our community that we have had for the last 10 years.

Mr. Speaker, I know that DICK has been active, even before he came to Congress, in many of the civic, church, and other activities of our area. He has made a great impact on southern Maryland. He has been one of those who has helped to improve the image of the "politician" in our community.

Time limits me in saying all the nice things I would like to say about DICK LANKFORD. The nicest thing I can say about him is that he has personified a model legislator: hardworking, and conscientious. He has been right on the issues. I have watched him very closely.

I say Godspeed to DICK LANKFORD, his wife, Mary Elizabeth; his son, Richard; and daughter, Sallie; and also say thank God for the DICK LANKFORDS of yesterday, today, and those who are to come tomorrow for their great contribution to the American dream.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SICKLES. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I want to join the members of the Maryland delegation in this tribute to our distinguished colleague, DICK LANKFORD of Maryland, and to express my own feeling of personal loss at his leaving us. He has been an able and dedicated Member of this body and we are understandably reluctant to be deprived of his skills and his presence. I wish him and Mrs. Lankford Godspeed in their new undertakings. It has been a privilege, indeed, to have served with DICK LANKFORD and to have been able to number him among my friends.

THE 144TH LEGISLATIVE DAY OF THE PRESENT SESSION

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I am not enthused for 1 minute about being here today for I think Congress should have adjourned long ago. But I would like to call the attention of the Members of the House to the fact that, according to the House Calendar, this is the 144th legislative day of this session.

A dozen multiplied by 12 is 144, and 144 equals 1 gross.

If there is not a quorum call, I want to designate my presence on the House floor on this occasion.

TO AMEND TITLE 38, UNITED STATES CODE, TO REVISE THE PENSION PROGRAM FOR VETERANS OF WORLD WAR I, WORLD WAR II, AND THE KOREAN CONFLICT, AND THEIR WIDOWS AND CHILDREN

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 1927) to amend title 38, United States Code, to revise the pension program for veterans of World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict, and their widows and children, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

The chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. TEAGUE of Texas, DORN, HALEY, BARING, EVERETT, AYRES, ADAIR, and SAYLOR.

TO AMEND TITLE 38, UNITED STATES CODE, TO REVISE THE PENSION PROGRAM FOR VETERANS OF WORLD WAR I, WORLD WAR II, AND THE KOREAN CONFLICT, AND THEIR WIDOWS AND CHILDREN

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. LIBONATI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, the Senate, in passing H.R. 1927, liberalizing the pension benefits of veterans and the families of deceased veterans, are to be complimented for their action. The changes advocated in H.R. 1927 were the result of an exhausting study of pension legislation by the Veterans' Administration under Administrator Jack Gleason, and the members of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs and Chairman OLIN E. TEAGUE. As a result of this study, several changes were proposed in order to prevent certain injustices noted and also others to perfect a realistic standard of solution of the problems confronting the recipients. To the credit of the national commanders of the servicemen's organizations, certain compromises were accepted—resulting in the unanimous House vote of 388 to 0.

The Finance Committee of the Senate—Chairman HARRY F. BYRD, after hearings, reported the measure with technical modifications and an amendment reopening the national service life insurance for 1 year.

Although I was in favor of this amendment, and having participated in the debate on the floor of the House during its consideration for passage in the 87th Congress—I feared that being a highly controversial subject, and because time is of the essence, that H.R. 1927 would be placed in jeopardy for passage in the House as amended; that in case of disagreement, and the appointment of a conference committee—the Senate conferees refusing to recede, or the House conferees to concur, that the 2½ years of work represented by the provisions incorporated in the House bill would be lost.

H.R. 1927 is a meritorious bill that provides beneficial changes in favor of the veteran and his family—widows and orphans. It is our responsibility to grant such benefits where the need is the greatest. This facet of the legislation is the prime consideration met by the provisions of H.R. 1927—and I am doubly proud to vote for its enactment because of the action of our distinguished Chairman OLIN E. TEAGUE and the members of the committee who greatly honored my feeble efforts in behalf of the veteran over the years selecting my bill, H.R. 1927, for passage—calling it the Libonati bill.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LANDS OF THE UNITED STATES TO THE PASCUA YAQUI ASSOCIATION, INC.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 6233) to provide for the conveyance of certain land of the United States to the Pascua Yaqui Association, Inc., with Senate amendment thereto, and agree to the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment as follows:

> Page 3, after line 11, insert:
>
> "SEC. 4. Nothing in this Act shall make such Yaqui Indians eligible for any services performed by the United States for Indians because of their status as Indians, and none of the statutes of the United States which affect Indians because of their status as Indians shall be applicable to the Yaqui Indians."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

Mr. HALEY. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Arizona tell us exactly what this Senate amendment does? We recognize that this language does not cost the Government anything and does not give this group of Indians any right they do not have.

Mr. UDALL. The gentleman has stated the language correctly. The House bill had a similar amendment in it. This merely clarifies the language.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BUSINESS

The SPEAKER. This is the day for the consideration of District of Columbia bills. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. MCMILLAN], chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia.

RETIREMENT BENEFITS OF CERTAIN JUDGES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 5871) to amend section 11 of the act of April 1, 1942, in order to modify the retirement benefits of the judges of the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions, the District of Columbia Court of Appeals, and the Juvenile Court of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: That section 11 of the Act entitled "An Act to consolidate the Police Court of the District of Columbia and the Municipal Court of the District of Columbia, to be known as 'the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia', to create 'the Municipal Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia', and for other purposes", approved April 1, 1942 (D.C. Code, sec. 11-776), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 11. (a) (1) Any judge of the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions, any judge of the District of Columbia Court of Appeals (as established by this Act), or any judge of the Juvenile Court of the District of Columbia who is subject to this subsection shall hereafter be eligible to retire after having served as a judge of such court or courts for a period or periods aggregating ten years or more, whether continuously or not. Any judge who so retires shall receive annually in equal monthly installments, during the remainder of his life, a sum equal to such proportion of the salary received by such judge at the date of such retirement as the total of his aggregate years of service bears to the period of thirty years, the same to be paid in the same manner as the salary of such judge: *Provided*, That if any such judge shall retire after twenty or more years of service, other than for permanent disability, his retirement salary shall not commence until he shall have reached the age of fifty: *Provided further, however*, That if any such judge shall retire after less than twenty years of service, other than for permanent disability, his retirement salary shall not commence until he shall have reached the age of sixty-two, except that such judge may elect to receive a reduced retirement salary beginning at the age of fifty-five or at the date of his retirement if subsequent to that age, the reduction in retirement salary in such case to be one-half of 1 per centum for each month or fraction of a month the judge is under the age of sixty-two at the time of commencement of his reduced retirement salary. In no event shall the sum received by any judge as retirement salary under this subsection be in excess of 80 per centum of the salary of such judge at the date of such retirement. In computing the years of service under this section, service in either the Police Court of the District of Columbia or the Municipal Court of the District of Columbia, or the Juvenile Court of the District of Columbia, the District of Columbia Court of Appeals, or the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions, as heretofore constituted, shall be included whether or not such service be continuous. The terms 'retire' and 'retirement' as used in this section shall mean retirement, resignation, or failure of reappointment upon the expiration of the term of office of an incumbent.

"(2) Any judge subject to this subsection may hereafter retire after having served five years or more and having become permanently disabled from performing his duties. Such judge may retire for disability by furnishing to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia a certificate of disability signed by a duly licensed physician and approved by the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service. A judge who retires for disability under this subsection shall receive annually in equal monthly installments, during the remainder of his life, a sum equal to such proportion of the salary received by such judge at the date of such retirement as the total of his aggregate years of service bears to the period of thirty years, the same to be paid in the same manner as the salary of such judge, except that in no event shall the sum received by any judge as retirement salary hereunder be in excess of 80 per centum of the salary of such judge at the date of such retirement for disability.

"(3) Any judge receiving retirement salary under the provisions of this subsection or under the provisions of this section as it existed immediately prior to its amendment by the District of Columbia Judges Retirement Act of 1964 may be called upon by the chief judge of the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions, or the chief judge of the District of Columbia Court of Appeals, or the chief judge of the Juvenile Court of the District of Columbia, to perform such judicial duties as may be requested of him in any of such courts, but in any event no such retired judge shall be required to render such service for a total of more than ninety days in any calendar year after such retirement. Any judge called upon pursuant to this subsection to perform judicial duties who, for any reason except illness or disability, fails to perform such duties so requested shall forfeit all right to retired pay under this section for the one-year period which begins on the first day on which he so fails to perform such duties. In case of illness or disability precluding the rendering of such service such judge shall be fully relieved of any such duty during such illness or disability.

"(4) From and after the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after the effective date of the District of Columbia Judges Retirement Act of 1964, there shall be deducted and withheld from the basic salary of each judge subject to the provisions of this subsection an amount equal to 3½ per centum of such judge's basic salary. The amounts so deducted and withheld shall, in accordance with such procedures as may be prescribed by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, be deposited in the District of Columbia Judicial Retirement and Survivors Annuity Fund established pursuant to paragraph (1) of subsection (d) of this section. Each judge subject to the provisions of this subsection shall be deemed to consent and agree to such deductions from basic salary and payment less such deductions shall be a full and complete discharge and acquittance of all claims and demands whatsoever for all regular service during the period covered by such payment, except the right to the benefits to which he shall be entitled under this subsection, notwithstanding any law, rule, or regulation affecting the individual's salary.

"(5) Each judge subject to the provisions of this subsection shall deposit, with interest at 4 per centum per annum to December 31, 1947, and 3 per centum per annum thereafter, compounded on December 31 of each year, in the fund, a sum equal to 3½ per centum of his salary received for judicial service performed by him as a judge of any court referred to in paragraph (1) of subsection (a) prior to the date he became subject to the provisions of this subsection. Each judge may elect to make such deposits in installments during the continuance of his judicial service in such amounts as may be determined in each instance by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia. Notwithstanding the failure of any such judge to make such deposits, credit shall be allowed for the service rendered but the retirement pay of such judge shall be reduced by 10 per centum of such deposit remaining unpaid, unless such judge shall elect to eliminate the service involved for purposes of retirement salary computation.

"(6) If any judge who is subject to the provisions of this subsection resigns from his judicial office otherwise than under the provisions of this subsection, all amounts deducted from his salary under paragraph (4) and deposited by him under paragraph (5), together with interest at 4 per centum per annum to December 31, 1947, and 3 per centum per annum thereafter, compounded on December 31 of each year, to the date of his relinquishment of office, shall be returned to him. In any case in which any such judge, who has not elected to bring himself within the purview of subsection (b) of this section, dies while in regular active service, all amounts so deducted from his salary and deposited by him under this subsection remaining in the fund at the time of his death, together with interest at 4 per centum per annum to December 31, 1947, and 3 per centum per annum thereafter, compounded on December 31 of each year, to the date of his death, shall be paid, upon the establishment of a valid claim therefor, to the person or persons surviving him in the order of precedence provided for in paragraph (7) of subsection (b). Such payments shall be a bar to recovery by any other person.

"(7) All judges of the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions, the District of Columbia Court of Appeals, and the Juvenile Court of the District of Columbia shall be subject to the provisions of this subsection, except that any such judge who is serving as such on the effective date of the District of Columbia Judges Retirement Act of 1964 shall be subject to this subsection (except paragraph (3) of this subsection) only if, within one year following such date, such judge files with the Commissioners of the District of Columbia a written election to come within the purview of this subsection. Such election once made shall be irrevocable. If no election is made within such one-year period, such judge shall have his right to retirement salary and the amount thereof determined as though the District of Columbia Judges Retirement Act of 1964 had not been enacted.

"(b) (1) Any judge of any of the courts referred to in paragraph (1) of subsection (a), whether or not subject to the provisions of subsection (a) of this section, or any judge retired under the provisions of this section as it existed prior to the enactment of the District of Columbia Judges Retirement Act of 1964, may, by written election filed with the Commissioners of the District of Columbia within six months after the date on which he takes office, or is reappointed to office (or within six months after the effective date of the District of Columbia Judges Retirement Act of 1964), bring himself within the purview of this subsection.

"(2) There shall be deducted and withheld from the salary of each judge electing to bring himself within the purview of this subsection a sum equal to 3 per centum of such judge's salary, including salary paid after retirement under the provisions of this section. The amounts so deducted and withheld from the salary of each such judge shall, in accordance with such procedure as may be prescribed by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, be deposited in the fund. Every judge who elects to bring himself within the purview of this subsection shall be deemed thereby to consent and agree to the deductions from his salary as provided in this subsection, and payment less such deductions shall be a full and complete discharge and acquittance of all claims and demands whatsoever for all judicial services rendered by such judge during the period covered by such payment, except the right to the benefits to which he or his survivors shall be entitled under the provisions of this subsection.

"(3) Each judge who has elected to bring himself within the purview of this subsection shall deposit, with interest at 4 per centum per annum to December 31, 1947, and 3 per centum per annum thereafter, compounded on December 31 of each year, to the credit of the fund, a sum equal to 3 per centum of his salary received for service as a judge of any of the courts referred to in paragraph (1) of subsection (a), including salary received after retirement, and of his basic salary, pay, or compensation for services as a Senator, Representative, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner in Congress and for any other civilian service within the purview of section 3 of the Civil Service Retirement Act (5 U.S.C. 2253). Such interest shall not be required for any period during which the judge was separated from all such service and was not receiving retirement salary under this section. Each judge may elect to make such deposits in installments during the continuance of his judicial service in such amounts as may be determined in each instance by the Commissioners. Notwithstanding the failure of a judge to make such deposit, credit shall be allowed for the service rendered, but the annuity of the widow of such judge shall be reduced by an amount equal to 10 per centum of the amount of such deposit, computed as of the date of the death of such judge, unless such widow shall elect to eliminate such service entirely from credit under paragraph (13) of this subsection: *Provided,* That no deposit shall be required from a judge for any service rendered prior to August 1, 1920, or for any honorable service in the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard of the United States.

"(4) If any judge who has elected to bring himself within the purview of this subsection resigns from office otherwise than under the provisions of this section, the amount credited to his individual account under this subsection, together with interest at 4 per centum per annum to December 31, 1947, and 3 per centum per annum, thereafter, compounded on December 31 of each year, to the date of his relinquishment of office, shall be returned to him.

"(5) In case any judge who has elected to bring himself within the purview of this subsection shall die while in regular active service or after having retired from such service under the provisions of this section, after having rendered at least five years of civilian service computed as prescribed in paragraph (13) of this subsection for the last five years of which the salary deductions provided for by paragraph (2) of this subsection or the deposits required by paragraph (3) of this subsection have actually been made—

"(A) If such judge is survived by a widow but not by a dependent child, there shall be paid to such widow an annuity beginning with the day of the death of the judge or following the widow's attainment of the age of fifty years, whichever is later, in an amount computed as provided in paragraph (12) of this subsection; or

"(B) if such judge is survived by a widow and a dependent child or children, there shall be paid to such widow an immediate annuity in an amount computed as provided in paragraph (12) of this subsection and there shall also be paid to or on behalf of each such child an immediate annuity equal to one-half the amount of the annuity of such widow, but not to exceed $900 per year divided by the number of such children or $360 per year, whichever is lesser; or

"(C) if such judge leaves no surviving widow or widower but leaves a surviving dependent child or children, there shall be paid to or on behalf of each such child an immediate annuity equal to the amount of the annuity to which such widow would have been entitled under paragraph (A) of this subsection had she survived, but not to exceed $480 per year.

The annuity payable to a widow under this subsection shall be terminable upon her death or remarriage. The annuity payable to a child under this subsection shall be terminable upon (i) his attaining the age of eighteen years, (ii) his marriage, or (iii) his death, whichever first occurs except that if such child is incapable of self-support by reason of mental or physical disability his annuity shall be terminable only upon death, marriage, or recovery from such disability after attaining the age of eighteen years. In case of the death of a widow of a judge leaving a dependent child or children of the judge surviving her the annuity of such child or children shall be recomputed and paid as provided in subparagraph (C) of this paragraph. In any case in which the annuity of a dependent child, under this subsection, is terminated, the annuities of any remaining dependent child or children, based upon the service of the same judge, shall be recomputed and paid as though the child whose annuity was so terminated had not survived such judge.

"(6) As used in this subsection—

"(A) The term 'widow' means a surviving wife of an individual who either (i) shall have been married to such individual for at least two years immediately preceding his death or (ii) is the mother of issue by such marriage, and who has not remarried.

"(B) The term 'dependent child' means an unmarried child, including a dependent stepchild or an adopted child, who is under the age of eighteen years or who because of physical or mental disability is incapable of self-support.

Questions of dependency and disability arising under this subsection shall be determined by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia. The Commissioners may order or direct at any time such medical or other examinations as they shall deem necessary to determine the facts relative to the nature and degree of disability of any dependent child who is an annuitant or applicant for annuity under this subsection, and may suspend or deny any such annuity for failure to submit to any examination.

"(7) In any case in which (A) a judge who has elected to bring himself within the purview of this subsection shall die (i) while in regular active service after having rendered five years of civilian service computed as prescribed in paragraph (13) of this subsection, or while receiving retirement salary under this section, but without a survivor or survivors entitled or who, upon attaining the age of fifty, will become entitled, to annuity benefits provided by paragraph (5) of this subsection, or (ii) while in regular active service but before having rendered five years of such civilian service or (B) the right of all persons entitled to an annuity under paragraph (5) of this subsection based on the service of such judge shall terminate before a valid claim therefor shall have been established, the total amount credited to an individual account of such judge under this section, with interest at 4 per centum per annum to December 31, 1947, and 3 per centum per annum, thereafter, compounded on December 31 of each year, to the date of the death of such judge, shall be paid, upon the establishment of a valid claim therefor, to the person or persons surviving at the date title to the payment arises, in the following order of precedence, and such payment shall be a bar to recovery by any other person:

"First, to the beneficiary or beneficiaries whom the judge may have designated by a writing received by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia prior to his death;

"Second, if there be no such beneficiary, to the widow of such judge;

"Third, if none of the above, to the child or children of such judge and the descendants of any deceased children by representation;

"Fourth, if none of the above, to the parents of such judge or the survivor of them;

"Fifth, if none of the above, to the duly appointed executor or administrator of the estate of such judge;

"Sixth, if none of the above, to such other next of kin of such judge as may be determined by the Commissioners to be entitled under the laws of the domicile of such judge at the time of his death.

Determination as to the widow or child of a judge for the purposes of this subsection shall be made by the Commissioners without regard to the definition of these terms stated in paragraph (6) of this subsection.

"(8) In any case in which the annuities of all persons entitled to annuity based upon the service of a judge shall terminate before the aggregate amount of annuity paid (together with any amounts received by the judge as retirement salary) equals the total amount credited to the individual account of such judge under this section, with interest at 4 per centum per annum to December 31, 1947, and 3 per centum per annum thereafter, compounded on December 31 of each year, to the date of the death of such judge, the difference shall be paid, upon establishment of a valid claim therefor, in the order of precedence prescribed in paragraph (7) of this subsection.

"(9) Any accrued annuity remaining unpaid upon the termination (other than by reason of death) of the annuity of any person based upon the service of a judge shall be paid to such person. Any accrued annuity remaining unpaid upon the death of any person receiving an annuity upon the service of a judge shall be paid, upon establishment of a valid claim therefor, in the following order of precedence:

"First, to the duly appointed executor or administrator of the estate of such person;

"Second, if there is no such executor or administrator, payment may be made, after the expiration of thirty days from the date of the death of such person, to such individual or individuals as may appear in the judgment of the Commissioners to be legally entitled thereto, and such payments shall be a bar to recovery by any other individual.

"(10) Where any payment under this subsection is to be made to a minor or to a person mentally incompetent or under other legal disability adjudged by a court of competent jurisdiction, such payment may be made to the person who is constituted guardian or other fiduciary by the law of the jurisdiction wherein the claimant resides or is otherwise legally vested with the care of the claimant or his estate. Where no guardian or other fiduciary of the person under legal disability has been appointed under the laws of the jurisdiction wherein the claimant resides, the Commissioners shall determine the person who is otherwise legally vested with the care of the claimant or his estate.

"(11) Annuities granted under the terms of this subsection shall accrue monthly and shall be due and payable in monthly installments on the first business day of the month following the month or other period for which the annuity shall have accrued.

"(12) The annuity of the widow of a judge who has elected to bring himself within the purview of this subsection shall be an amount equal to the sum of (A) 1¼ per centum of the average annual salary received by such judge for judicial service and any other prior allowable service during the last five years of such service prior to his death, or retirement from office under this section, multiplied by the sum of his years of judicial service, his years of prior allowable service as a Senator, Representative, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner in Congress, his years of prior allowable service performed as a member of the Armed Forces of the United States, and his years, not exceeding fifteen, of prior allowable service performed as an employee described in section 1(c) of the Civil Service Retirement Act and (B) three-fourths of 1 per centum of such average annual salary multiplied by his years of any other prior allowable service, but such annuity shall not exceed 37½ per centum of such average annual salary and shall be further reduced in accordance with paragraph (3) of this subsection, if applicable.

"(13) Subject to the provisions of paragraph (3) of this subsection, the years of service of a judge which are allowable as the basis for calculating the amount of the annuity of his widow shall include his years of service as a judge of one of the courts referred to in paragraph (1) of subsection (a) of this section (whether in regular active service or retired from such service under this section), his years of service as a Senator, Representative, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner in Congress, his years of active service as a member of the Armed Forces of the United States not exceeding five years in the aggregate and not including any such service for which credit is allowed for the purposes of retirement or retired pay under any other provision of law, and his years of any other civilian service within the purview of section 3 of the Civil Service Retirement Act.

"(14) Nothing contained in this subsection shall be construed to prevent a widow eligible therefor from simultaneously receiving an annuity under this subsection and any annuity to which she would otherwise be entitled under any other law without regard to this subsection, but in computing such other annuity, service used in the computation of her annuity under this subsection shall not be credited.

"(c) Nothing contained in this section shall be construed to prevent a judge eligible therefor from simultaneously receiving his retirement salary under this section and any annuity to which he would otherwise be entitled under any other law without regard to this section, but in computing such annuity, service used in the computation of retirement salary under this section shall not be credited: *Provided, however,* That nothing contained in this section shall be construed to prevent a judge of any court referred to in paragraph (1) of subsection (a) who is serving on the effective date of the District of Columbia Judges Retirement Act of 1964, and who does not elect under paragraph (7) of subsection (a) to come within the purview of such subsection, from electing to waive the provisions of this section regarding retirement salary and crediting service hereunder in computing an annuity to which he would otherwise be entitled under any other law without regard to this section; nor shall anything contained in this section (except paragraph (7) of subsection (a) of this section) or in any other law be construed to require any such judge eligible therefor to elect to waive either the provisions of this section regarding retirement salary and annuities or the provisions of any other law relating to retirement salary or annuities prior to the date of his retirement.

"(d)(1) There is hereby established in the Treasury of the United States a fund to be known as the 'District of Columbia Judicial Retirement and Survivors Annuity Fund', and such fund is hereby appropriated for the payment of retirement salaries, annuities, refunds, and allowances as provided in this section. If, at any time, the balance in such fund is not sufficient to pay current obligations arising pursuant to the provisions of this section, there is authorized to be appropriated to such fund, out of any moneys in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the District of Columbia not otherwise appropriated, such amounts as may be necessary to pay such current obligations. The Secretary of the Treasury shall prepare the estimates of the annual appropriations required to be made to such fund, and shall make actuarial valuations of such fund at intervals of five years, or more after if deemed necessary by the Secretary.

"(2) The Secretary of the Treasury shall invest, from time to time, in interest-bearing securities of the United States or Federal farm loan bonds, any portions of such fund as in his judgment may not be immediately required for payments from the fund, and the income derived from such investments shall constitute a part of the fund.

"(3) All amounts deposited by, or deducted and withheld from the salary of, any judge as provided under this section for credit to the fund shall, under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, be credited to an individual account of such judge.

"(4) None of the moneys mentioned in this section shall be assignable, either in law or in equity, or be subject to execution, levy, attachment, garnishment, or other legal process.

"(5) Whenever used in this section, the term 'fund' shall mean the District of Columbia Judicial Retirement and Survivors Annuity Fund established under paragraph (1) of this subsection."

SEC. 2. This Act may be cited as the "District of Columbia Judges Retirement Act of 1964."

SEC. 3. This Act shall be effective on and after the first day of the first month following the date of its enactment.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to amend existing law—56 Stat. 197—to provide a more equitable and realistic retirement law for the judges of the several courts for the District of Columbia.

The bill, as amended by the other body, is an improved bill, and the House Committee on the District of Columbia concurs in the Senate amendment.

In brief, the changes made by the Senate are as follows:

First. The bill as passed by the House provided that if judges elect to come within the survivor benefits provisions they will be required to pay into a retirement fund 3 percent of their salaries, including salaries paid after retirement from regular active service.

The Senate amended the House bill to provide for a deduction of an additional 3½ percent for judges electing to come under the retirement provision of this bill. Hence, under the House bill as amended by the Senate, the total of 6½ percent—rather than 3 percent—would be deducted from the salary of judges electing to come under the provisions of the bill.

Second. The bill as passed by the House provided, under the method included for computing retirement salary, the payment of not more than 100 percent of salary.

The Senate amended this section to permit payment of not more than 80 percent of their salary.

Third. The bill as amended by the Senate further provides that judges now serving on the bench may elect, within a period of 1 year from the enactment, to come under the provisions of the bill. If no election is made by a judge, he remains under the existing retirement system.

Judges appointed to the bench subsequent to the enactment of this legislation will not have such an election but will receive only the retirement benefits set forth in this bill.

This legislation has the approval of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, the Judges of the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions, District of Columbia Court of Appeals, and the Juvenile Court of the District of Columbia, as well as the Bar Association of the District of Columbia.

EXISTING LAW

Under existing law there are two retirement programs available to judges of the several courts of the District of Columbia. A judge is automatically subject to the Civil Service Retirement Act upon appointment unless and until such time as he may exclude himself from coverage under such act by electing to be covered under the noncontributory judicial retirement provisions established by the act of April 1, 1942.—District of Columbia Code, 11–776. This special noncontributory program provides retirement benefits regardless of age only after at least 20 years' service as a judge in the courts of the District of Columbia. Under the retirement program, provided for by the act of April 1, 1942, there are no provisions to enable a judge to retire for disability, or to provide survivorship benefits for his widow and children.

H.R. 5871 corrects the inadequacy of existing law as follows:

The bill requires judges to be age 50 before becoming eligible to retire after 20 years of service with salary and reduces the minimum service required on the bench for retirement with salary from 20 to 10 years. The bill retains the present method of computing retirement salary; i.e., one-thirtieth of a judge's salary at the time of retirement for each year served on the bench, but not to exceed 80 percent of salary. In the case of 10-year retirement, a judge must be 62 years of age to receive full accrued retirement benefits. However, a 10-year retiree may elect to receive a retirement annuity commencing at age 55 but such annuity would be subject to being reduced by an amount computed at the rate of one-half of 1 percent for each month or fraction of a month the judge is under age 62.

Comparison of Present Basic Retirement Benefits for District of Columbia Municipal Judges With Those Proposed Under H.R. 5871, as Amended

PRESENT LAW	H.R. 5871
Permissive retirement after 20 or more years service. No minimum age.	Ten or more years service but less than 20, must be 62 years of age, or elect reduced annuity at age 55. Twenty or more years of service, must be age 50.
Pension: Proportioned on basis of aggregate years of service to 30 years computed on salary at time of retirement, or 3⅓ percent of salary per year.	Same, except no judge can receive sum in excess of 80 percent of the salary of such judge at time of retirement.
Contribution to pension: None.	Three and one-half percent of salary.
Disability retirement: None.	After 5 years of service if a certificate of disability signed by a duly licensed physician is furnished the Attorney General and approved by the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service.
Survivor benefits: None.	For widows, not to exceed 37½ percent of average salary as determined by service formula. For dependent child, one-half of widow's annuity not exceeding $900 per year divided by the number of children or $360 per year, whichever is lesser.
Contributions for survivor benefits: None.	Three percent of salary in fund subject to control of Secretary of Treasury. Should fund be inadequate, District of Columbia required to provide necessary funds to meet obligations.

(Note.—Incumbent judges may elect to remain under existing law or convert to H.R. 5871, as amended, if enacted. Such election is irrevocable.)

REQUIRING PREMARITAL EXAMINATIONS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H.R. 11302) to require premarital examinations in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That all applications for marriage licenses shall be open to inspection as public records. All such applications upon which licenses have not yet been issued shall be kept together in a separate file readily accessible to public examination.

Sec. 2. No application for marriage license shall be accepted unless there shall be filed therewith a statement or statements, signed by a person in the District of Columbia certified by the Department of Public Health as duly qualified to administer and interpret such test, or by a physician licensed to practice medicine in the District of Columbia or in a State or territory of the United States, or by a commissioned medical officer in the Army, Navy, or Public Health Service of the United States, that the applicant has submitted to a standard laboratory blood test within thirty days prior to the filing of such application, and that, in the opinion of such physician, or medical officer, or certified person based upon the result of that test, the applicant is not infected with syphilis in a stage of that disease in which it can be transmitted to another person, but such statement shall not disclose the technical data upon which it is based. Any such statement shall include the name of the person or laboratory administering the test, the name of the test administered, the exact name of the applicant, and the date of the test.

Sec. 3. No marriage license shall be issued until the fifth day following the filing of the application.

Sec. 4. For good cause a judge of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia shall have the power to waive the provisions of either or both of the foregoing two sections and, upon his certificate that public policy or the physical condition of either of the parties requires the intended marriage to be celebrated without delay, a license may be issued without compliance with the provisions of the section so waived.

Sec. 5. Any applicant for marriage license, physician, or representative of a laboratory who shall misrepresent his identity or any of the facts called for by the certificate form prescribed by this article; or any licensing officer who shall issue a marriage license without having received the certificate form or an order from the court, or who shall have reason to believe that any of the facts on the certificate form have been misrepresented, and shall nevertheless issue a marriage license; or any person who shall otherwise fail to comply with the provisions of this article shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and punishable accordingly.

Sec. 6. This Act shall be so interpreted and construed as to effectuate its general purpose to make uniform the law of those States which enact it.

Sec. 7. This Act may be cited as the Uniform Marriage License Application Act.

Sec. 8. All Acts or parts of Acts which are inconsistent with provisions of this Act are hereby repealed.

Sec. 9. This Act shall take effect upon the expiration of ninety days after the date of its enactment.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 5, strike out "Army, Navy" and insert in lieu thereof "military service".

Page 2, line 18, strike out "the fifth day" and insert in lieu thereof "twenty-four hours".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Roudebush] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill is to require laboratory tests of persons who are contemplating marriage, with a view to ascertaining whether they are affected with syphilis in a communicable stage. The bill provides that no license would be issued without certification by a physician or authorized designated person that the parties contemplating marriage are not infected with such disease, or if infected, that such disease is not in such stage to be transmitted to another person.

The bill is based upon the Uniform Marriage Application Act proposed by the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Law in 1950. Forty-five States now require by statute some form of premarital examination or routine serological testing for syphilis as a condition precedent to the issuance of a marriage license. Nearby Virginia has such a requirement although Maryland does not.

Your committee has been disturbed by reports made of the high percentage of infectious syphilis cases reported in the District of Columbia.

From 1956 to 1963, the number of reported cases of infectious syphilis in the District of Columbia increased from 36 to 711. This was an increase from 4.3 cases per hundred thousand population to 92.3 cases. In 1963, among cities of 200,000 population or over, Washington, D.C., was second only to Newark, N.J., and there were only four other cities with a rate of over 50 cases per 100,000 population. During the period from 1956 to 1963, the national rate also increased, but not nearly so dramatically from 4.1 cases per hundred thousand population to 11.9 cases.

While some of the indicated increase in the District of Columbia may be the result of better case findings and better reporting, the indications are that the major part of the increase is an actual increase. This is confirmed by reports from 63 cities throughout the country, 28 of which have attributed the major part of their own increase to an actual increase in cases.

How many cases exist which are not reported is not estimated, but the above figures are so impressive as to confirm the necessity of the enactment of legislation such as proposed in this bill. The District of Columbia Commissioners in the past have favored such legislation and it is certainly the hope of those concerned therewith that these tests will materially contribute to education of the public and to the avoidance and treatment of this disease, thereby curtailing its spread as well as materially contributing to the prevention of congenital syphilis in the District of Columbia.

The Department of Public Health in the District of Columbia estimates that the enactment of the bill would require between 19,000 and 20,000 serologic tests each year, approximately 75 percent of which would be performed by this Department, the other 25 percent estimated to be handled by private or hospital laboratories.

The extra services and supplies required by the Department of Public Health is estimated to cost less than $10,000 per year, a very small price to pay for attempting to remove this disgrace from the Nation's Capital.

CORRECTIONAL INDUSTRIES FUND FOR THE GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (S. 1082) to establish in the Treasury a correctional industries fund for the government of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there is hereby established in the Treasury a revolving fund for the government of the District of Columbia to be known as the correctional industries fund (hereinafter referred to as the "fund") to replace the working capital fund created by Public Law 493, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved July 9, 1946 (60 Stat. 514), as amended.

Sec. 2. The fund shall be available without fiscal-year limitation and shall be used for the performance of such services and the production of such commodities as, in the judgment of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia (hereinafter referred to as "Commissioners"), will contribute to the rehabilitation, knowledge, and skill in trades and occupations of inmates of the institutions in the Department of Corrections of the District of Columbia, thereby equipping them with a means of livelihood upon release. The accounting for the fund shall be maintained on the accrual basis, including provision for employees' accrued annual leave and depreciation of fixed assets, and financial reports shall be prepared on the basis of such accounting.

Sec. 3. Products and services produced by utilization of the fund may be purchased, at fair market prices as determined by the Commissioners, by any department or agency of the District of Columbia government, the Federal Government, any State or subdivision of a State or any Commonwealth, territory, or possession of the United States. Receipts from the sales of products and services shall be deposited to the credit of the fund. The fund shall be used for all necessary expenses directly related to the fund, including personal services; payments to inmates, or payments to their dependents, of such pecuniary earnings as the Commissioners deem proper; purchase, repair, and maintenance of equipment; purchase of raw materials and supplies; payment of dues and expenses of attendance at meetings and conventions, as approved by the Commissioners; maintenance and repair of buildings used for fund purposes; alteration of existing facilities used for fund purposes where the total project cost does not exceed $10,000; and, within the limits of amounts provided in annual appropriation Acts, acquisition and improvement of real property.

Sec. 4. Not later than six months after the end of each fiscal year, the Director of the Department of Corrections of the District of Columbia shall submit to the Commissioners a report of the financial condition of the fund and the results of operations for such fiscal year. The Commissioners shall review such report and determine the disposition to be made of realized profits. The Commissioners are empowered to authorize retention of accumulated profits for the purpose of acquiring or improving personal property, or to increase working capital to planned operating levels. In no case, however, shall such profits retained for these purposes increase the net worth of the fund beyond $2,500,000. The Commissioners are also empowered to authorize retention of accumulated profits for payments to inmates, other than those employed in industrial operations, or for payments to their dependents, of such amounts as the Commissioners deem proper. Accumulated profits not retained or used for the aforementioned purposes, or which exceed the limitation imposed, shall be deposited to the credit of the general revenues of the District of Columbia.

Sec. 5. All assets except buildings and all liabilities or other obligations which at the time of enactment of this Act are components of the working capital fund, Workhouse and Reformatory, as created by Public Law 493, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved July 9, 1946 (60 Stat. 514, ch. 544, sec. 1), shall be transferred to the fund created by the first section of this Act.

Sec. 6. The paragraph beginning with the caption "WORKING CAPITAL FUND" under the heading "ADULT CORRECTIONAL SERVICE" in the first section of the Act approved July 9, 1946 (60 Stat. 514, ch. 544), creating the working capital fund for the industrial enterprises at the Workhouse and Reformatory, and the proviso in the paragraph following the caption "OPERATING EXPENSES" under the heading "DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS" in the first section of the Act approved July 5, 1952 (66 Stat. 380), authorizing the retention of not to exceed $50,000 of accumulated profits in the working capital fund as additional working capital, are hereby repealed.

Sec. 7. Nothing in this Act shall be construed so as to affect the authority vested in the Commissioners by Reorganization Plan Numbered 5 of 1952 (66 Stat. 824). The performance of any function vested by this Act in the Commissioners or in any office or agency under the jurisdiction and control of said Commissioners may be performed by the Commissioners or may be delegated by said Commissioners in accordance with section 3 of such plan.

Sec. 8. This Act shall take effect July 1, 1963.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this proposed legislation is to establish a revolving fund for the District of Columbia government, to be known as the correctional industries fund, with a maximum net worth limitation of $2,500,000. This correctional industries fund is to replace the present working capital fund of the District of Columbia Department of Corrections, and is to be used for the performance and production of such services as will contribute to the rehabilitation, skill in trades, and occupations of inmates of the institutions in the District of Columbia Department of Corrections.

In addition to establishing a correctional industries fund, the bill also provides—

First. Transfer of all assets (except buildings) and all liabilities or other obligations from the working capital fund to the correctional industries fund;

Second. Authorization for the sale to the States and possessions of the United States at fair market values of all services and products financed by the correctional industries fund;

Third. Authorization for the use of receipts from the sale of products and services for all necessary expenses directly related to the fund, including personal services, payments to inmates, purchase and repair of equipment, purchase of raw materials and supplies, maintenance and repairs of buildings, and alteration of facilities where cost does not exceed $10,000; and

Fourth. Accounting for the fund shall be maintained on the accrual basis, and financial reports shall be prepared and submitted to the Commissioners.

HISTORY OF THE WORKING CAPITAL FUND OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS

Commencing in 1915, the Congress included provisions in appropriation legislation relating to the sale of products of the correctional institutions of the District of Columbia. Similar legislation enacted in 1928 provided for working capital for industrial enterprise at the District of Columbia Workhouse and the Reformatory, and designated the Commissioners to transfer to a fund, to be known as the working capital fund, such amounts that may be appropriated but not to exceed $25,000. In 1929, similar legislation increased that amount to $50,000. Pursuant to this authorizing authority, varying amounts ranging from $25,000 to $50,000 were appropriated for each of the fiscal years from 1929 through 1946. Since the 1928 legislation did not include a provision for any profits from the operation of the working capital fund to be returned to the District of Columbia general fund, the appropriations and profits were used to build up the amount of the working capital fund that was reflected in raw materials, supplies, equipment, and finished goods inventories. Thus, over the years, the appropriations and profits were capitalized until the net worth of the fund now amounts to approximately $900,000.

In 1946, the Congress enacted appropriation legislation (60 Stat. 514) establishing a $50,000 working capital fund to be used as a permanent revolving fund. Provision was also made in the 1946 legislation for the Commissioners to transfer all accumulated profits arising from the year's operations under the fund to the general revenue of the District of Columbia for each fiscal year. The Congress followed with similar legislation in 1952 that authorized the retention of $50,000 of accumulated profits from operations under the working capital fund as additional working capital, thereby increasing the authorized working cash to $100,000.

The following statement of annual profits returned to the District of Columbia general fund by the operation of the working capital fund was submitted to your committee by the District of Columbia Department of Corrections:

DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA INDUSTRIES DIVISION

Schedule of returnable profits

Fiscal year:	*Returnable profits (adjusted)*
1956	$64, 265. 96
1957	67, 966. 37
1958	(7, 038. 96)
1959	91, 799. 00
1960	64, 705. 25
1961	123, 303. 11
1962	118, 223. 20
1963	128, 534. 51
1964	116, 323. 89

Your committee is informed further that in the District of Columbia Workhouse and Reformatory at Lorton, Va., there are presently some 1,400 inmates and they are offered instruction, by reason of the working capital fund, in machine shop practices, funiture refinishing, tailoring, laundry services, patternmaking, foundry work, broom making, and mattress manufacture and renovation. Also, their shops make automobile license plates for the District of Columbia

REASONS FOR THE BILL

The basis for the legislation proposed in S. 1082 stems from certain weaknesses that the General Accounting Office found to exist in the financial and management controls of the Department of Corrections of the District of Columbia. An examination and review of the Department of Corrections management controls by the General Accounting Office was made pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U.S.C. 67). After the General Accounting Office completed its management review, a report was made to the Congress by the Comptroller General which was entitled "Review of Management Controls of the Department of Corrections, District of Columbia Government, October 1958."

The report of the Comptroller General, in addition to presenting a careful analysis of the corrections institutions' management controls, also pointed out certain management deficiencies on the part of the Department of Corrections that included, first, an improper retention of working capital funds and, second, utilization of an inadequate accounting system to control costs and work programs.

The enactment of the pending bill will serve as remedial legislation for these deficiencies. The first of the two deficiencies will be corrected by a provision of the bill providing authority for the establishment, within the Department of Corrections, of a correctional industries fund with a net worth limitation of $2,500,000.

Actually, your committee is informed that the accounting practice which was criticized by the General Accounting Office as resulting in improper retention of working capital funds, as mentioned in item (1) above, has been corrected. The District of Columbia Accounting Manual was changed in this respect, and the practice was discontinued several years ago.

The principal advantage of this bill is to provide a true permanent revolving fund, with a specific limitation upon its total accumulated assets of $2,500,000, for the operation of the industries of the District of Columbia's correctional institutions. This will provide the Department of Corrections' Superintendent of Industries with a knowledge of the limitation within which he may plan future operations, to a degree which is not possible at present because these limitations are not definitely established under present law.

Another new advantage which will result from the enactment of this bill is that it will authorize the sale of the Department's products and services to all the States and possessions of the United States. At present, they may be sold only to agencies of the Federal or District of Columbia Governments.

At a public hearing conducted by Subcommittee No. 2 on September 15, 1964, approval of this proposed legislation was expressed on behalf of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, the District of Columbia Department of Corrections, the District of Columbia Budget Office, the General Accounting Office, and the U.S. Bureau of the Budget. No opposition to the bill was expressed.

FURTHER NECESSITY FOR THE LEGISLATION

The working capital fund for the District of Columbia Department of Corrections was originally established by legislative provisions in an appropriation act many years ago. Subsequent amendments relating to this fund were likewise included in appropriation acts. The result has been the creation of a fund which has the character of a revolving fund and which has been operated on a continuing basis without the benefit of the usual procedures for legislative authorization.

Since this capital fund permitted the reuse of moneys appropriated and the use of income derived from the use of appropriated funds, income was received and public moneys were spent without being subject to regular review by any committee of the Congress.

This fund has grown from the original appropriation of $25,000, and from a later increase of $50,000, to a gross value of approximately $1 million in cash and other assets. The operation of the fund was not routinely reported to the Committee on Appropriations, nor was there any presentation of information regarding the use of these public funds to the Appropriations Committee for review.

While the Committee on the District of Columbia recognizes the possible desirability of a continuing fund of this nature, the committee believes that without provisions for periodic reports or review, the establishment of such continuing revolving funds is a questionable procedure.

The pending bill gives to the working capital fund for the District of Columbia Department of Corrections the usual legislative authorization for the existence and continued operation of the fund but requires that reports be filed on an annual basis concerning the use of public funds involved.

This particular fund and use of public moneys may be distinguished from the more than 100 other separate legislative items, in appropriation acts for the District of Columbia. Once this fund was established there was no necessity for annual provision of funds by the Appropriations Committee, which is not the case with the more than 100 other items.

It is the purpose of the Committee on the District of Columbia to require that the Commissioners for the District of Columbia have legislative authority for all annual appropriations. Toward this objective, the Board of Commissioners for the District of Columbia, more than 6 months ago, was asked to submit drafts of appropriate legislation covering each of the items for which public funds are required but for which no specific legislative authority has been provided as of this date.

In a sense, the pending bill is a forerunner to this effort of the House District Committee to relieve the Appropriations Subcommittee on the District of Columbia from the necessity of including legislative provisions in the District of Columbia appropriation bill, annually, for such activities.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REDEVELOPMENT ACT

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, House Subcommittee No. 4 after several months of open hearings added 10 amendments to the bill S. 628. We had discussed with the other body this proposed legislation and we were advised that they would not agree to all the amendments proposed by the House District of Columbia Committee. However, the members of the House subcommittee met in my office and we ironed out what amendments we thought would be agreeable to the other body. However, our agreement of course did not bind all the other 14 members of the committee and the House. I have read several proposed amendments that would be offered on the floor this afternoon and some of them I must agree would strengthen S. 628. In fact, 11 Members of the House that I had talked with all had pending amendments and 2 Members had as high as five amendments each to offer and some of them certainly would have been adopted. Knowing what the other body would accept, I had no alternative other than to propose the bill.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that the unanimous-consent request is not necessary if the gentleman decides not to call the bill up. Has the gentleman decided not to call the bill up?

Mr. McMILLAN. That is correct, Mr. Speaker. Under present circumstances, I believe since the city already has several urban renewal projects under construction this project can easily wait until January.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SPRINGER. May I say to the distinguished gentleman, my chairman, I have no desire to embarrass anybody with reference to this situation. However, this bill, may I say to my colleagues in the House, has been pending in committee for many months now. My distinguished chariman has tried to work in every way that I know to get a bill out here without some kind of fight over it.

Apparently, that cannot be done. From what he has said here this morning, there will be amendments offered and the chairman thinks possibly some of them might be passed. However, since this bill has been pending, and we have had an agreement with the Senate that they would take the bill with certain amendments, and the subcommittee agreed on this we ought to proceed today with the bill and have this matter out, one way or the other.

We have done everything we possibly can to get something that would be agreeable to everybody. Here we are this morning apparently in a situation where there is going to be a fight on it. If this has to be let us get on with it.

I want to say to my distinguished chairman, I think he has done everything he could to get this bill through by some kind of an agreement so that we can get it through the Senate also. It is apparent that cannot be done—so why not let us go ahead—let the chips fall where they may. The District of Columbia is entitled to know where it stands on urban renewal. It cannot proceed without this legislation.

May I say to my colleagues of the House that this bill as it came over from the Senate was not satisfactory to many Members of the House. Personally, I was more in favor of the Senate bill than I was with the House bill. There were many of us on that side of the aisle and on this side of the asile who felt that the Senate bill represented the better position. We modified our position and agreed to accept certain amendments, in order to get the present bill to the floor for a vote.

The other side who were opposed to the Senate bill also made some concessions. I think this bill has been conceed to by those of us who felt the Senate bill represented the best position. I think there have been some concessions made by those people who believed the Senate bill did not represent the best position insofar as urban redevelopment in the District of Columbia is concerned. But it just seems to me today that we ought to proceed with the bill, S. 628, and vote it up or down.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. If I have the floor, I yield to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS].

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois, the ranking minority member of the House District Committee. I think there were provisions in the committee amendments to this bill that were unacceptable to many members of the committee and many Members of the House as well. We have gone a long way in compromising these positions in the interest of avoiding further unconscionable delay. I think we accepted some things that we would not under other circumstances have accepted. But in spite of this we are at a point where apparently there has got to be a fight, and if there needs to be a fight, I think we ought to have it now, even if it takes all night. Progress waits in the wings in Washington pending action of the House on this legislation. If there needs to be a fight, let us have it today and get it over with.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I am of course somewhat concerned, after what I believed was a very firm agreement that the bill would be scheduled and would be brought before the House today. As has already been indicated, some of us have worked on this legislation and have worked on the problem for a great many months. In fact, for the past 2 years this matter has been constantly before the Committee on the District of Columbia.

I realize that there are differences of opinion as to exactly what the bill should contain, but there has been long and rather arduous work and effort and concessions on both sides. Certainly I am swallowing very hard to accept some of the amendments which were to be offered in the compromise proposal here today, as I am sure the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOWDY] had reservations about some that were to be stricken out. But this was a firm agreement on the part of our committee.

I believe it will be most unfortunate if the House is denied an opportunity to work its will on this subject, which has now been pending for the past 2 years.

It seems fantastic to me that this method could be used to kill legislation which is so important to the District and upon which I firmly believe this House should have the right to pass. Further, it is hard to believe this in view of the fact that legislation identical to S. 628, as passed by the Senate, passed this House in the 87th Congress by unanimous consent and here we have a situation where we are not even going to be given the opportunity to vote on amendments or even to pass on the basic issues contained in the legislation. The objective sought to be achieved by the initial legislation introduced in both the House and Senate was to place Washington, D.C., on an even par with cities throughout the 50 States. Now, as a result of this action today, we are continuing the discrimination which has so long existed in the area of urban renewal. It seems to me that the reasonable approach for the enemies of urban renewal, and there are some, would be to attack the national legislation when it is pending before the Banking and Currency Committee, which has jurisdiction over the department of urban renewal.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois and of the gentleman from California in urging that this matter be brought before the House.

What we are asking is that the House be given an opportunity to act on a bill which has already been very carefully and very thoroughly considered. It is a bill which essentially would allow the District of Columbia to do no more and no less than any other American city—to use the urban renewal program to redevelop and revitalize its commercial and residential areas.

A good bill to this effect was passed by this House in 1962, and passed without a dissenting vote.

The Senate passed this identical bill in July of 1963.

Earlier this year the House Committee on the District of Columbia reported an emasculated version of this same bill, so badly distorted that it would have had the practical effect of virtually destroying all urban renewal efforts in the District of Columbia.

Fortunately, this bill was reconsidered by the committee.

It has now been reported, although with some remaining defects, in a version which would allow the urban renewal job which needs to be done in our Nation's Capital, to be done.

I am personally very disappointed that the chairman of the House Committee on the District of Columbia has declined to call this bill to the floor today.

It has been approved by the committee with broad support.

It was actually placed on the House Calendar for consideration. Most of all it is urgently needed.

I hope and urge that the chairman of the committee will reconsider his position and that the House will be given an opportunity to act on this bill before adjournment.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, it appears that the bill, S. 628, will not be called up, and because it will not be called up I suggest that there are many things which the Redevelopment Land Agency and the other agencies in control of housing and slum clearance in the District can do between now and the time the bill will be called up.

I have reread this morning the criticism by the Agency of the report of the District Committee.

At this point I should like to say to the House that the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK], in referring to an agreement by the committee, meant an agreement by the subcommittee and not the full committee.

As to the criticism of the report by the Agency, I say that instead of arguing with the committee, it should actually develop some plans for low-income housing and middle-income housing in the District, and also some plans for protecting small business in the District of Columbia. If the District agencies devote themselves to that, I believe that when the bill is called up it will have a much easier road, and probably can be enacted. The agencies by their actions can eliminate the necessity for some of the proposed amendments.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, may I supplement my chairman's remarks concerning our colleagues who have expressed an intent and desire to offer amendments to this bill? Seven Members of this House have informed me they have amendments, and those amendments as related to me are material proposals, which would demand considerable discussion and debates and certainly these gentlemen are entitled to be heard and have their proposals considered. They cannot and should not be cut off merely because of an agreement between a handful of other Members. I understand the wish that no controversy should be brought up at this late date about this matter. In addition to being inadvisable, it would serve no purpose.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] referred to the criticism of our committee by the Chairman of the Redevelopment Land Agency, Neville Miller. As chairman of Subcommittee No. 4, I replied to Mr. Miller's epistle, and ask that my reply with the cover letter be here incorporated in my remarks:

SEPTEMBER 28, 1964.

NEVILLE MILLER, Esq.,
Chairman, Redevelopment Land Agency,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MILLER: This is in response to the letter of August 10, 1964, signed by you as Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Redevelopment Land Agency for the District of Columbia, in reference to House Report 1481, which accompanied S. 628, entitled "District of Columbia Redevelopment Act Amendments of 1964," as reported to the House with committee amendments.

It may be observed that the above bill had been reported by the Committee on the District of Columbia and had been pending on the House Calendar for nearly 2 months prior to the date of your letter. I am sure that members of the committee and of the House welcome valid criticism and constructive suggestions in connection with pending legislation. The more than 7 weeks period from the date of the committee report to the date of your letter afforded generous time to present any comments concerning the bill.

Your letter was addressed to the chairman of the full committee. The dating of the letter and its transmission to other Members of Congress on the date the bill was scheduled for consideration by the House on August 10, appears to have been purely coincidental. The legislation would have been considered and disposed of on that date except for the fact that the House adjourned out of respect to a distinguished Member from Michigan who died over that weekend.

Agency lobbying, using public facilities and funds, aside from the question of propriety, may take curious forms. Such activity, designed to inform rather than confuse and distort, might be excused. No response to your letter was felt necessary insofar as Members of Congress were concerned since they have access to the information and reports and have the capacity to judge the merit of the statements in your letter. However, it now appears that your letter is being circulated outside the usual legislative circles for the purpose of leading others to believe that it is an accurate and responsive comment on the 28 committee disclosures stated in House Report 1481.

Accordingly, so that others may examine for themselves the statements in your letter, along with the committee report text, the enclosed analysis is directed in reply to you in correspondingly numbered paragraphs.

Briefly, I find that the separate numbered statements in your letter fall into the following classifications: (1) the language of the law and the intent expressed by Congress is conveniently ignored; (2) technicalities are raised and the substance of the committee report statement is avoided; (3) issues unrelated to the committee report statement are disguised as explanations or answers; (4) statements which neither deny or refute or cite inaccuracies in the committee statements, which apply to the majority of your separate comments.

The two unnumbered paragraphs on page 2 of your letter require separate comment. The first paragraph covers low-rent housing and public housing together and states that the report attempts "to prove that the Redevelopment Land Agency would be wrong * * * irrespective of what course of action it had taken." Any casual attention to the law and the clearly expressed intent of Congress regarding low-rent housing sustains the committee report. As to scattered-site public housing, the corporation counsel rendered an opinion finding it contrary to the Redevelopment Act. Had there been a gesture at observing the provisions of the Redevelopment Act, neither of these questions would have arisen.

The second of these two paragraphs relates to the statement in the committee report that no public, low-rent, or middle-income housing has been built in any urban renewal area. Your letter states that the "committee certainly knows" that the pending plans call for such housing. I would observe that the committee "certainly knows" that such is the case and that plans are not officially adopted urban renewal project plans. The committee likewise knows that low-rent housing was included in the first project plans in 1952 for Southwest area B. Finally, the committee knows that despite the appearances, expressions of concern and justification of projects to rehouse low-income families as intended by Congress, nothing has been accomplished after 12 years.

After you have reviewed the enclosed analysis, any further comments will be welcomed.

Sincerely yours,
JOHN DOWDY,
Member of Congress,
Chairman, Subcommittee No. 4.

ANALYSIS OF LETTER OF NEVILLE MILLER, CHAIRMAN, REDEVELOPMENT LAND AGENCY, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, AUGUST 10, 1964, RELATING TO HOUSE REPORT NO. 1481, 2D SESSION, 88TH CONGRESS, ACCOMPANYING S. 628

Introductory note: The following analysis involves a brief treatment of each of the numbered paragraphs in Mr. Miller's letter. The answers assume a substantial familiarity with the committee report and public hearings before Subcommittee No. 4 of the House Committee on the District of Columbia.

PARAGRAPH 1

RLA statement: "There is not any requirement in the definitions of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945, as amended, that the land be used for housing at a particular price for a particular income group."

Answer: District of Columbia Code section 5–702(f) states as follows: "Low-rent housing means safe and sanitary housing within the financial reach of families of comparatively low income and, as a guide for the standard of rental to be used as a maximum at the time of enactment of this law but not necessarily thereafter, it is specified that such housing shall be rented at not more than $13 per room per month, excluding utilities."

"This Agency (the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency) is especially intended to assemble some property, substandard housing, and vacant land in such manner as to make it available for development of low-rent housing by private enterprise." (S. Rept. 591, p. 2; 79th Cong.)

"These development plans shall not only cover the uses to be made of the land but also the maximum rentals which may be charged to tenants of the housing on the properties." (S. Rept. 591, H. Rept. 2465; 79th Cong.; S. Rept., p. 2; H. Rept., p. 3.)

"In substance it is the purpose of this bill to provide private enterprise in the District of Columbia with an opportunity to meet the need here for low-rent housing. * * *" (H. Rept. 2465, 79th Cong., p. 4.)

"The act provides the necessary Government machinery to assemble and to sell or lease it (land) to private owners for low-rent housing purposes." House Report No. 2465, 79th Congress, page 4.

PARAGRAPH 2

RLA statement: "Paragraph 2 merely states that the Agency, over a 14-year period, has expended $100 million of public funds. I presume the intention is to suggest that the program has been operated imprudently and improperly, although no such charge is made."

Answer: This paragraph of the committee report specifically cites the annual report of the Agency and the amounts shown as having been spent as of the end of June 1963. No inference or statement concerning the successes or shortcomings of the program is included in this paragraph.

PARAGRAPH 3

RLA statement: "I have already commented on the provision of low-rent publicly financed housing adjacent to the southwest urban renewal projects."

Answer: The statement of the committee report is "not one unit of low-rent or public housing has been built in Washington under any urban renewal project plan, nor has the program provided any middle-income housing."

The statement in the committee report remains a fact unrefuted by the RLA statement.

RLA statement: "Moreover, the urban renewal plans adopted by the National Capital Planning Commission for project Adams-Morgan and project Northwest No. 1 specify land to be used for both low- and middle-income housing."

Answer: The plans mentioned in the RLA statement are not official urban renewal project plans approved by the Board of Commissioners for the District of Columbia.

Further, low-rent housing has been a part of approved project plans in the past but such housing has been removed by project plan changes. The statement in the report that no such housing has been built in an urban renewal project area will stand until low-rent housing, public housing, or middle-income housing is constructed under an urban renewal project plan.

PARAGRAPH 4

RLA statement: "As pointed out under paragraph 1, there is an apparent misunderstanding by the authors of the committee report that there is a legal requirement that land in an urban renewal project in Washington, D.C., must be used only for housing to be rented to families of low to middle incomes."

Answer: The statement in the report is that the powers provided in the law, to meet urgent needs for eliminating existing substandard housing and providing low-rent housing, have been used to produce high-rent, luxury-type residential units. (H. Rept. 1481, 88th Cong., pp. 9–15.) There is no misunderstanding since the Redevelopment Act text and the committee reports, expressing the intent and purposes of the Congress, at no point mention the need to exercise powers of the act for the construction of high-rent housing which was being produced in abundance by private enterprise. The facts, showing the production of abundance of the latter type housing not mentioned by the Congress, to the exclusion of the needed low-rent housing specifically mentioned by the Congress leaves the committee report statement unchallenged.

PARAGRAPH 5

RLA statement: "In all cases, the Board of Directors of the Redevelopment Land Agency has attempted to pursue a course of action it thought best suited to the public interest at the time the action was taken."

Answer: The committee report states that "chosen instrument" redevelopers for urban renewal projects have been selected many months before any official approval of a project plan."

The statement of the committee report is neither denied nor refuted. If the action of the Board has accomplished the purposes and intent of the Congress, no defense is needed.

PARAGRAPH 6

RLA statement: "The Agency has conducted four architectural competitions. However, except for complaint of one contestant, the Redevelopment Land Agency has not been found wanting in its efforts to afford each competitor equal opportunity."

Answer: The committee report stated that contestants in such competitions "were not equally notified and informed as to specifications." The statement is neither denied nor refuted. Further, the fact that only one complaint was filed with the Agency does not deny the fact that other complaints were filed with or heard by other government bodies. It is not a question of whether a complaint was made but whether the complaint was justified.

PARAGRAPH 7

RLA statement: "It need only be noted that any Agency accepting signed statements does so on the basis that the persons signing them did so in full knowledge of the documents he signed."

Answer: The RLA answer does not deny or refute the committee report statement that a financially responsible person denied under oath that he authorized the use of his name or was responsible financially on a project where his name had been used to lend color of financial responsibility to a project. The RLA statement otherwise avoids the real issue and the legal implications and evades the question of government agency responsibility to act after notice of such defect.

PARAGRAPH 8

RLA statement: "The waterfront land is not reserved for the redeveloper with whom the memorandum of understanding was executed."

Answer: The committee report stated that the Agency had agreed years before approval of any project plans to sell to a redeveloper, without knowledge or consent of Congress, lands belonging to the U.S. Government. The RLA statement neither refutes nor denies the statement in the committee report. It merely states that the "waterfront land is not reserved for the redeveloper." The memorandum in volume 1 of the committee hearings, page 192, reveals the substance of the agreement and the exchange of the waterfront lands committed to Webb & Knapp Co., for other urban renewal lands following action by Congress to preserve relocation rights for businesses displaced from the waterfront area.

PARAGRAPH 9

RLA statement: "The '50-percent rule' referred to in paragraph 9 was not adopted by the Agency's Board of Directors."

Answer: The committee report stated as follows: "The Agency has used an unauthorized and secret formula for the disposition of project area land." The RLA statement neither denies now refutes the statement in the committee report. The facts of the record show that while the minutes of the RLA Board of Directors are silent concerning the official adoption of the '50-percent rule,' a memorandum shows clearly that such rule was made known to the Chairman of the RLA Board and was used regardless of whether it was an official expression of the Board of Directors.

PARAGRAPH 10

RLA statement: "This paragraph raises a question as to the validity of the Federal Housing Administration's evaluation methods."

Answer: The committee report states that residual land use appraisals were used to establish land disposition prices at less than the fair market value and such appraisals were not by appraisers selected pursuant to contracts under the Redevelopment Land Agency. The RLA statement neither refutes nor denies the committee report statement.

PARAGRAPH 11

RLA statement: "The Agency could not have procured appraisal services without informing the redeveloper as to the limitations to be placed on utilization of land in the project area."

Answer: The RLA statement neither refutes nor denies the statement in the committee report. The fact is that the act gives to the redeveloper no right to determine or influence the land disposition price which is to be the fair market value for the highest and best use permitted under the plan.

PARAGRAPH 12

RLA statement: "There has never been any gerrymandering of the boundary of an urban renewal project. When Congress adopted the Housing Act of 1954, the intention of Congress was that conservation areas have, as boundaries, major thoroughfares or natural geographical features bounding a neighborhood."

Answer: The statement in the committee report was that there had been gerrymandering of urban renewal boundaries so as to include single family housing areas which were free from substandard housing and blight.

The RLA statement denies any gerrymandering. The statement does not deny that urban renewal boundaries were established so as to include single family housing areas not affected by slum or blight conditions.

The substance of the RLA objection is to the use of the term "gerrymandering" as applied to the practice of including nonslum and nonblighted areas within urban renewal boundaries.

The second reference of the RLA to the Housing Act of 1954 relates to an uncited statement of intent regarding the establishment of boundaries. Even though such statement of intent was expressed by the Congress, it does not apply in the instance referred to; namely, the Adams-Morgan project, since the area identified in committee hearings as being without slum and blight was separated from the balance of the area by a major thoroughfare which could serve as a boundary and exclude the area in question. The documents and the survey of the RLA and the reports of the Housing Enforcement Branch of the Department of Licenses and Inspections showed no substandard conditions in the excellent residential area included within the urban renewal boundaries.

PARAGRAPH 13

RLA statement: "This paragraph oversimplifies the very difficult problem of determining whether the slum and blighted conditions in an area are such as to warrant public action."

Answer: The RLA statement neither refutes nor denies the statement in the committee report that project plans for an urban renewal area were approved when not one substandard housing unit existed within the project area on the date of the approval of the plan.

While the above statement of fact has never been challenged, there is a difference as to the application of the law as interpreted by the Redevelopment Land Agency and the HHFA compared to the interpretation contained in the committee report. The latter interpretation endeavors to delineate the language of the Redevelopment Act and the intent of Congress as applying to areas having existing substandard housing and blight conditions and which areas are residential in character. The RLA and HHFA interpretation would permit urban renewal under existing law in both residential and nonresidential areas with or without the existence of substandard housing within the area. The action of officials was based, according to testimony and documents, on a survey which showed existing substandard housing as of an earlier date, but which housing had been removed prior to the official action of approval of the project plan. The action of officials was predicated upon the acceptance of survey data which was no longer accurate in fact on the date of the action of the Commissioners in approving the project plan.

PARAGRAPHS 14 AND 20

RLA statement: "Every effort was made to explain to the subcommittee that the National Housing Act of 1939, as amended, prohibits the use of Federal funds for compensation of a municipality for vacated streets and prohibits the dedication of land purchased with Federal financial assistance to the municipality for the use as a part of a federally aided highway system. Apparently these paragraphs are based on a misunderstanding of the act."

Answer: The RLA statement neither denies nor refutes the committee report statements in paragraphs 14 and 20.

The committee report statement in paragraph 14 was that the District of Columbia paid $2 million for land when it could have exchanged land for public uses without cost to the public.

Committee report statement in paragraph 20 was that the Agency charged the District $23.11 per square foot for land, but sold land of the same value to the redeveloper at $14.88 per square foot.

No statement in the committee report indicates any misunderstanding or other interpretation of law concerning the use of publicly owned rights-of-way in connection with urban renewal projects.

PARAGRAPH 15

RLA statement: "The assertion that 'private industry was ready, willing, and able to redevelop' is demonstrably not true."

Answer: The RLA statement endeavors to refute the statement in the committee report by basing their contention on an assumption which is not demonstrated. The documents referred to in the committee report statement indicate the willingness and ability of the owners of the majority of the land to redevelop the area without cost to the public, or under an approved urban renewal plan. The record and evidence indicates no response was ever made to the latter expressed purpose of the owners of the majority of the property.

PARAGRAPH 16

RLA statement: "This criticism ignores the fact that appraisals were obtained from competent disinterested appraisers who determined that there was no increment in land values resulting from the changes in the plan for the Columbia Plaza project."

Answer: The RLA statement avoids the substance of the statement in the committee report. The RLA refers to increment in land values. The statement of the committee report, alluding to the findings made by the appraisers is factual and correct in that by reason of the changes in the project plan the income to the redeveloper was increased substantially above the amounts the redeveloper would receive had there been no changes in the project plan.

PARAGRAPH 17

RLA statement: "The Redevelopment Land Agency is of the opinion that the assertion in paragraph 17 was not the subject of the inquiry during any of the hearings conducted over a 4-year period."

Answer: The RLA statement neither denies nor refutes the statement in the committee report. The fact is that studies made by the General Accounting Office, which are part of the committee records, raised the question as to the propriety of residual land use appraisals which appraisals are not based upon the highest and best use of the land permitted under a plan. Evidence in the record indicated the transmission of redevelopers plans to appraisers, which plans were used in the course of determining the land reuse value rather than establishing such values on the highest and best use permitted under the plan.

PARAGRAPH 18

RLA statement: "The comments noted under paragraph 17 are applicable to this paragraph."

Answer: The RLA answer neither refutes nor denies nor is any way responsive to the statement in the committee report. The statement in the committee report was to the effect that the assembly of lands by private industry for private industry redevelopment had been discouraged by the imposition of an urban renewal program on such an area when private assembly of land had reached a point of substantial completion.

PARAGRAPH 19

RLA statement: "It is within the authority of the District of Columbia Commissioners to consider factors in designated urban renewal areas other than the failure of structures to meet their requirements of local codes."

Answer: The RLA statement neither refutes nor denies the statement in the committee report which was that the Agency used more restrictive housing standards than those used by the District of Columbia to classify housing structures as substandard.

The factors which the Commissioners of the District of Columbia may consider in establishing an urban renewal area are determined by the Redevelopment Act enacted by Congress for application in the District and not by any other law. That act requires a finding that there is existing substandard housing conditions in order to qualify an area as a project area. The Agency represented the existence of substandard housing conditions based on its restrictive criteria and no examination of or comparison of such criteria with the District of Columbia Housing Code was made prior to committee hearings. There is no authority in the Redevelopment Act or in the District of Columbia Code or the Commissioners to arbitrarily establish more restrictive housing code standards in one area of the city than in another.

PARAGRAPH 20

(See comments on par. 14 above.)

PARAGRAPH 21

RLA statement: "* * * the redevelopment plan for the project in effect at the time of the execution of the contract provided that one-third of the dwelling units were to be rented at the rate of $17 per room per month, plus utilities. The plan was changed in this respect by virtue of the fact that at the time construction began it was not economically feasible to construct housing with this rental limitation, and it was determined to remove the restriction."

Answer: The RLA statement attempts to refute by avoidance the substance of the committee report statement that an original requirement of a developer that he construct low-rent housing was changed and high-rent housing only was built.

The RLA statement is correct only by playing on the word "contract" as distinct from the urban renewal plan. The contract while not specifying the types in rentals for housing to be provided, did require the carrying out of the urban renewal project plan, which plan required the construction of one-third of the housing units to be rented at a rate of $17 per room.

The RLA statement admits accomplishing the result stated in the committee report statement through the device of changing the project plan to which the contracts applied.

The RLA statement that low-rent housing at $17 per room was not economically feasible betrays an agency avoidance of the specific language and purposes of the Redevelopment Act. In the definition of "low-rent housing" in the act, Congress provided a formula for determining the rental rate per room per month to be applied in the future because of changing economic circumstances. The Agency chose to avoid the intent of Congress, remove the low-rent housing from the project by ignoring the formula provided by Congress to make such housing economically feasible.

PARAGRAPH 22

RLA statement: "This misstates the facts. The redeveloper was not in default under its contract in Project Area B. Because of delays occasioned by procurement of adequate financing and approvals of building site plans, it appeared that it would be impossible to proceed with the construction as necessary to comply with the contract."

Answer: The RLA statement denies the technicality but affirms the substance of the committee report statement that redevelopers who have defaulted or faced default were given new contracts, extensions of contracts, cancellation of penalties in some cases, or the execution of a more favorable contract.

The RLA statement alludes to Project Area B. The records show that with about 60 days remaining in the contract period during which performance was required, the redeveloper faced the physical impossibility of executing the contract and beginning and completing the construction of numerous housing units which would require a matter of months. The contract in every substantive sense was in default and would have been in default within 60 days except for the technicality that prior to such default a new contract was drawn, the old contract canceled, and the security for the performance under the old contract was released to the redeveloper.

Further, the statement in the committee report did not refer solely to Project Area B

The RLA further states: "* * * in consideration of the Agency's agreement to extend time periods, numerous provisions of benefit to the Agency were included in the amended contract. The provisions included an increase in the ground rental rate from 5 to 6 percent, a requirement for a security deposit in the amount of 10 percent of the appraised value of the site, and payment of carrying charges at the rate of 3½ percent per annum of the appraised value of the property upon execution of each lease agreement."

Answer: While these statements do not deny or refute the statement in the committee report, they are an attempt to justify the Agency action. Questions which arise from the RLA statement are: (1) Why did the contract specify 5 percent ground rental rate when other contracts specified 6 percent; (2) why did the RLA surrender its performance security on the initial contract in the face of oncoming and obvious default; (3) why did not the original contract require the payment of 3½ percent carrying charges when the redeveloper had agreed to acquire the land but left the public paying the expense of taxes and interest on the acquired land?

PARAGRAPH 23

RLA statement: "The value established by the Agency was equal to the acquisition cost and in excess of the value placed upon it by the Agency's appraisers."

Answer: The RLA statement in substance admits the committee report statement that the Agency conveyed Government-owned land to the redeveloper to reduce the unit land cost to the redeveloper.

The RLA statement is correct that the price to the redeveloper equaled the price of acquisition of the land actually purchased by the Agency. The Government-owned land cost the Agency nothing and was included as part of the area conveyed to the redeveloper. The obvious result was a lowering of the unit cost to the redeveloper.

The further fact not mentioned in the committee report statement nor by the RLA was the fact that there was a collateral side agreement between the redeveloper and the owners of the private unacquired land, calling for the payment of more than $600,000 by the redeveloper to the original landowners

PARAGRAPH 24

RLA statement: "This deficiency (low-income and public housing) is primarily due to the fact that the National Capital Housing Authority has been unable to procure available sites within the District of Columbia for public housing."

Answer: The RLA statement neither denies nor refutes the committee report statement that a deficiency of more than 8,000 units of such housing has developed in the District of Columbia. NCHA has repeatedly expressed the desire to purchase sites within the urban renewal project areas, but has been excluded. Residential lands in urban renewal have been disposed of at prices ranging from $0.90 to $3.65 per square foot. The Housing Authority meanwhile was compelled to pay top prices, in instances almost equal to the highest residential land prices charged by the RLA.

RLA statement: "Even though it is essential that the public housing program be expanded to provide units for eligible families * * * we do not believe that social progress would be achieved by adoption of a policy of deferring urban renewal projects and other governmental activities until all families eligible for a publicly owned dwelling unit have been relocated."

Answer: The RLA statement does not deny or refute the statement in the committee report nor does it acknowledge the basic intent of Congress that the urban renewal program had as a first purpose the rehousing of displaced persons in low-rent or public housing where needed.

The RLA statement goes contrary to every concept and expression of intent in the National Housing Act, as amended, including the language in the pending housing bill, and the Redevelopment Act, as amended. The statement in substance says that the policy of the Agency is to continue high-rise luxury apartment development and commercial development regardless of the availability of low-rent housing for displaced persons and families.

PARAGRAPH 25

RLA statement: "We disagree with the stated observation of the Comptroller General that under criteria established by the urban renewal administration any building could be substandard and scheduled for acquisition and demolition."

Answer: The Comptroller General has had examinations made on numerous urban renewal projects throughout the United States and has published numerous reports stating the General Accounting Office findings. The Comptroller General is the one agency and the most experienced agency in government in interpreting the application of the language of the law and the intent of Congress. The RLA may disagree but when a valid question is raised, the RLA must go to the General Accounting Office for interpretation and is bound by the decision of the Comptroller General.

RLA statement: "The committee amendments in S. 628 relating to the definition of slum and blighted areas would preclude acquisition and demolition of structures unless they were so structurally unsound that they could not be rehabilitated without major constructural improvements."

Answer: The RLA statement distorts the reasonable meaning of the language of the committee amendment relating to slum and blight by stating that structures would have to be in total ruins before an area would be eligible for urban renewal. Such distortion is clearly apparent since existing law for the removal of unsafe and unsanitary buildings and the housing code for the District of Columbia would prevent the existence of any such structures in "total ruin" regardless of any provisions in the Redevelopment Act.

The restatement of the committee amendment in the affirmative rather than the negative is clearly the precise meaning of the language and the detailed expression of intent carried in the committee report and might read as follows:

"And that a sufficient number of structures exist, excepting those which can be rehabilitated so as to remove such dangers and detriments by making minor structural changes, improvements, or both."

Congress has stated no policy or intent in the Redevelopment Act that the Agency be permitted to designate as slum or substandard, for purposes of urban renewal, those structures which require only minor structural changes, and improvements, or both. Such deficiencies are or can be corrected by code enforcement.

PARAGRAPH 26

RLA statement: "This is a misstatement of the proposed plan. The urban renewal plan provision referred to in this paragraph was not intended to be used to acquire single family dwellings for the sole purpose of reselling them to the National Capital Authority for use as publicly financed units."

Answer: The RLA neither denies nor refutes the committee report statement. It injects the very important words "the sole purpose" into the substance of the committee report statement. This device enables the discussion of and the intermixture of two different concepts which confuse the issue rather than clarify it.

The committee report stated that the proposed project plan in question calls for scattered site public housing in a fine residential area. This type of housing was recommended in the 1955 report entitled, "No Slums in 10 years" prepared by Financier Consultant Roush, of Baltimore, and the former slum clearance Administrator Keith, of HHFA, while serving as consultants for the Redevelopment Land Agency. This program is a means of injecting subsidized single family housing units into residential areas on a scattered basis.

PARAGRAPH 27

RLA statement: "The delays referred to are not wholly the responsibility of the Redevelopment Land Agency inasmuch as the law under which the program is conducted requires action by a large number of agencies other than the Redevelopment Land Agency and acts of Congress have contributed to the delay."

Answer: The RLA statement neither denies nor refutes the substance of the committee report statement that the RLA has approximately twice as many projects less than 50 percent completed than was the case 4 years ago when the Rabaut bill was approved calling for a moratorium on new urban renewal projects.

The delays, if they are such, caused by the Federal Government or Congress, involve only a small percentage of project area lands and those have no relationship whatsoever to redevelopments for private uses which are woefully delayed and behind schedule in southwest Washington.

The RLA answer is essentially a plea that, regardless of the lack of progress made toward completion of projects, the Congress should not provide any limitations on the number of new projects undertaken.

PARAGRAPH 28

RLA statement: "The reasons given in this paragraph for the action were not the reasons why the action was taken."

Answer: Regardless of the collateral reasons given by the RLA in its statement, the substance of the statement in the committee report was one of principal reasons presented in the documents urging HHFA approval of the plan for financing a private corporation to take over the Washington Channel waterfront area.

Testimony and documents received in committee hearings indicated an intent to avoid the relocation of displaced businesses on the waterfront on the priority basis provided by an act of Congress. It is worthy of note that at the end of the statutory period of 180 days after notice by the Agency during which time dislocated businesses might exercise their priority relocation rights, not one displaced business has succeeded in securing any type of agreement or understanding with the Agency despite their expressions in writing requesting such opportunity.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to advise the House that it would appear to be the part of wisdom for Members to be present during the remainder of the week and to make arrangements accordingly. We do have important matters to dispose of which may come up this week, and, of course, Members must be present in order for us to transact business.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. As the majority leader knows, I have discussed with him personally the matter of the business for this week and when we might vote to adjourn sine die. I said to him a moment ago that I would forgo any further statements on my part until tomorrow, when we might possibly know better what the prospects may be.

In respect to tomorrow, because I have looked at the whip notice, may I say that I had understood there would be a request today to send the foreign aid bill to conference. I had some information that while there might be a motion to instruct the conferees, possibly that would not take too much time.

Could the gentleman tell us, except for sending the foreign aid bill to conference, what would be likely to come up tomorrow?

Mr. ALBERT. Of course, the distinguished minority leader knows that there are bills on the whip notice which have been programed and they may be called up tomorrow. There is the matter of sending the foreign aid bill to conference and there is the likelihood later in the week that any one of several important conference reports which are pending, particularly the one on the National Defense Education Act, might be called up this week.

Mr. HALLECK. I appreciate that, and I just want to express the hope at this time, with the indulgence of the majority leader, that tomorrow in respect to conference reports on the National Defense Education Act and possibly social security and as to what we might be finally doing this week as far as the Appalachia bill is concerned, that information could be given to the Members with respect to those matters so that they might know just how to plan their affairs. I am sure the gentleman knows, as I do on my side, that we are now in the midst of a political campaign. This is a representative form of government and can only function as the people who have come here in the House of Representatives particularly are permitted to know and to find out what their constituents are thinking about. They stand for reelection. It is no more than fair and right that they have an opportunity to get home. So I shall not press the matter further. I want to say to the majority leader that as far as I know he is in complete sympathy with my feeling that we should have a definite determination as quickly as possible.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in response to the minority leader, I assure him and Members of the House that I will not withhold any information from Members, and I will be glad to advise them—and this is the position of the leadership—of any new developments as promptly as we can do so. Some of these things are not within the immediate control, as the minority leader knows, of the leadership. Conference reports are within the control of conference committees. However, we will try to advise Members and keep them informed of progress toward our goal, which, of course, is to finish our business and adjourn as soon as possible.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KYL. When the gentleman from Oklahoma says it will be advisable to remain here on duty the rest of this week, does he include Saturday as a part of that week.

Mr. ALBERT. I would like to advise the gentleman that I do not know of any business that might come up on Saturday, but with the legislative schedule we have and the session being what it is, I would think it would be the better part of wisdom to keep a flexible schedule. I cannot go beyond that.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. ALBERT. Yes. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. Might I just say that I had hoped some of these bills would be sent to conference as quickly as possible. I overheard this morning that there has now been another delay with reference to the National Defense Education Act which would not enable it to be acted on by tomorrow. That is impossible now, is it?

Mr. ALBERT. According to my understanding it may be called up later in the week but not tomorrow.

Mr. ARENDS. That is good enough. Just so we can get it done this week.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

SPENDING EXPLOSION IN WASHINGTON

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, the average citizen may sometimes wonder how he is affected by the combination of the spending explosion in Washington and accompanying scandals such as the Bobby Baker case.

What does it mean to the average citizen when the high cost of government is made even higher by the kickbacks and political payoffs?

One way to illustrate is to make some comparisons which bring home the real costs to ourselves and our children. The third House Office Building being built in Washington already has cost the taxpayers $85 million, twice the original estimate, and even this much-revised estimate will go higher before it is completed.

By comparison, the annual combined budgets of Springfield and Joplin in the Seventh Congressional District of Missouri is approximately $10 million. That includes everything, salaries, materials, road maintenance, fire and police protection, and the hundreds of other services provided by local government.

Thus, the cost of one single annex in Washington—the third building for Members of the House, excluding any Senate housing costs—would be sufficient to run the cities of Springfield and Joplin together for over 8 years.

Springfield, our largest city of over 100,000 people, could be operated for 13 years on the cost of a single building at Washington prices. That is the price we pay for the spending fetish that grips the Federal Capital under the Johnson administration. The most efficient government we have in America today is furnished at the local level—the most extravagant, wasteful, and corrupt-prone exists at the Federal level where there is so much honey to attract the bees. And the blame lies squarely on the philosophy which prevails here in L.B.J. land that waste and inefficiency—even kickbacks are acceptable as long as the money is used to "stimulate the economy." I suggest that this is a high price to pay for pumping money into the economy. It is not the people who benefit, it is the Billy Sol Estes', the Bobby Bakers', and others who drink at the public trough, while official heads are turned and eyelids closed.

If the tax dollars that are soaked up in Washington could be kept at the local level where they originated, cities like Springfield and Joplin, or for that matter, New York and Chicago, would not be forced to come hat in hand to Washington for Federal handouts. If tax sources now preempted by Washington could be returned to our local communities so they could meet local problems, we could begin the task of reducing the size of the Federal budget, which now costs every American family, an average of four, $222 a year in interest charges alone.

That is the cause for which we are fighting. To restore not only morality to government, but to stop living as though the Federal Government only needs to run the printing presses a little longer each night to make up the cost of kickbacks and payoffs. We disregard the tax famine that exists in many of our cities and States, while the Johnson administration builds ivory towers here in Washington.

Otherwise, Lord Macaulay was correct when he told Thomas Jefferson's biographer that our good idea of a republic would reach an early demise as soon as the people learned they could vote themselves unlimited benefits from the Public Treasury.

Have they, through us, reached this stage?

REAPPORTIONMENT IN MISSOURI

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, Missouri has been sold down the river by the Democrat platform through its failure to take any kind of position on the reapportionment issue now before the Congress.

If the Johnson administration stifles action on this, it will jeopardize the State legislative representation of 19 of the 21 counties in the Seventh Congressional District. Under the Supreme Court ruling, if the size of the Missouri house remains at 163 members, only those counties with over 28,000 population would be assured of individual representation in the Missouri House of Representatives. The Democrat machines in the two largest cities would dominate both the Missouri House and Senate and completely destroy Missouri's little Federal systems and its system of checks and balances patterned after the Federal Government.

The Supreme Court by assuming the authority to make law rather than to interpret it, has destroyed each State's historic right to have a bicameral system if that is what its citizens want. What sense would it make to have two houses both patterned on exactly the same basis without regard to geographical, economic, and other factors? One would merely serve as a rubber stamp for the other.

The Republican platform adopted at San Francisco clearly reaffirms the historic rights of the States to apportion at least one of their two State legislative bodies on factors other than population alone.

But the Democrat platform ignores this most crucial issue altogether, even though their leader in the Senate and their No. 2 man in the House of Representatives are supporting the Republican position. Not only do they ignore it, but the Johnson administration spokesman in Detroit, Walter Ruether, says in his publication Washington Report, volume IV, No. 35, dated August 31, 1964, that the reason the Democrat platform dodged the reapportionment issue is that a firm pledge was given by the White House to block any move to overturn the Supreme Court ruling when it hits the Senate.

If there is anybody who knows what went on behind the scenes at Atlantic City it is Walter Ruether.

Even the end does not justify the means, because many problems which Kansas City and St. Louis have had in the Missouri Legislature often stem, not from any rural-urban impasse, but from differences of opinion among the city legislators themselves.

Both rural and urban interests are protected by our two house system which helps assure that the final product will not be strongly detrimental to either.

I think that candidates for public office in southwest Missouri should make clear whether they support the Republican platform position on the reapportionment issue or whether they support the Democrat platform which sweeps the issue under the rug along with Bobby Baker, Billie Sol Estes and the TFX contract.

Let there be no doubt in anyone's mind. I support the Republican position and believe citizens should have an opportunity to vote on a constitutional amendment to restore each State's historic right to apportion at least one house on the basis of factors other than strict population.

INSPECTION OF EUROPEAN ATOMIC ENERGY INSTALLATIONS

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANDERSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I recently returned from an intensive inspection tour of European atomic energy installations while participating as an official representative to the Third International Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy at Geneva, Switzerland.

At the request of the Department of State, the Speaker appointed four Members of the House—Vice Chairman HOLIFIELD and three other members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, to participate in this Conference. I was designated as an alternate to Mr. BATES, of Massachusetts.

This was indeed an enlightening and gratifying experience. The opportunities provided by this personal participation in the Conference and visits to the various installations, permitted me to have a better insight into various aspects of atomic energy research and development, both domestic and foreign. The superior U.S. accomplishments, both public and private, in the field of peaceful uses of nuclear energy was evident not only at the Conference talks and exhibits, but at the other installations and facilities that I visited in Europe.

In West Berlin, that island of freedom surrounded by a hateful mortar and barbed wire wall, I visited the Hahn-Meitner Nuclear Research Institute. Here, in association with the Free and Technical Universities of Berlin, basic research is carried out on the fundamentals of nuclear science.

Available to the scientists of this institute for such research is a 50-kilowatt homogeneous nuclear reactor built by Atomics International, a U.S.-based subsidiary of the North American Aviation Co.

Research into the atom and its nucleus is also carried out with high energy particle accelerators or atom smashers. At the Hahn-Meitner Institute, a 5½-million electron volt Van de Graaff generator built in the United States will soon be installed.

In Scauro, Italy, about 60 miles south of Rome and 35 miles north of Naples just off the Mediterranean Sea is a 150-megawatt electric reactor, built by the General Electric Co. for Italy's electric power utility agency. This reactor, the largest in operation in continental Europe, known as the Senn reactor, is producing blocks of power for the industries of Rome and the developing industries of Naples.

The Senn reactor is indeed impressive on the valley floor of the Garigliano River. It became operational in 1964. This reactor was developed, with U.S. assistance, under the Agreement for Cooperation between the United States and Euratom, the multinational European organization for the peaceful developments of nuclear energy.

In my own home State of Illinois at the Argonne National Laboratory the basic concepts for the Senn reactor and for all boiling water reactors were developed. The first full-scale commercial power reactor of this type—the Senn reactor type—was built by the General Electric Co. for the Commonwealth Edison Co. also in Illinois and is known as the Dresden Nuclear Power Station. The Dresden reactor went critical in 1959 and has produced electricity from the nuclei of atoms totaling more than 3.6 billion kilowatt-hours since that time.

My interests in Italy were not totally devoted to peaceful uses of atomic energy. I also had the opportunity to visit the U.S. Southern European Task Force Headquarters in Verona, Italy, and to meet and discuss with the commander of SETAF, Maj. Gen. G. W. Power, the defense problems of NATO's southern flank.

Together with General Power I visited several SETAF installations near Verona and at Vicenza; I found that the U.S. Army in northern Italy is indeed making a significant contribution to NATO's state of readiness.

On August 30, I arrived in Geneva to begin my participation in the Third International Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy. The Conference formally opened on August 31. Here again, I was impressed with the major contributions that the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission and U.S. private industry have made to the development of nuclear technology for peaceful uses in supplying energy on the ground and potential space power for our satellites.

Aside from the many technical papers presented by U.S. delegates and the delegates from other nations, there was an exhibit held in the center of Geneva. The exhibit hall contained many different national exhibits. Our own country's exhibits certainly revealed the great progress we had made in the last 6 years since the 1958 Second Geneva Conference in advancing the atom for peaceful purposes.

Here, I cannot do more than just briefly hint at some of the highlights of this Conference. This Conference was devoted primarily to nuclear power for the production of electricity. It is clear that 1964 is an ascendant year for nuclear power. It has been demonstrated this year that there are many places in the United States and more such places in Europe and elsewhere in the world where nuclear power is on the threshold of becoming competitive with fossil fueled electric power.

Technical conferences are usually just full of future promise, rather than exemplary of present accomplishments. Although very optimistic with regard to the economics of nuclear power, this Conference, unlike the last one which was held in 1958, could point to real present accomplishments in the utilization of nuclear power for peaceful purposes. In the immediate future even further reductions in both capital and fuel costs are predicted, with assurance that further development of newer type reactors would lead to economic breeder reactors; that is, reactors that produce more nuclear fuel than they consume.

Of course, this is not a case of getting something for nothing. Scarce supplies of uranium will be utilized in producing power and plutonium, the latter in turn can be burnt in a reactor to produce energy, but you cannot make plutonium without uranium. As our needs for energy increase and more and more of our electricity comes from nuclear fuel, both economics and conservation will dictate the development of economic and efficient breeder reactors.

For the more distant future, there is hope in spite of mountainous difficulties that power will be available from controlled fusion devices. If controlled fusion becomes possible, the amounts of heavy hydrogen, the fuel for fusion, that is available in the oceans of the earth are sufficient for thousands of years of even-increasing power requirements. Papers on controlled thermonuclear developments were presented at Geneva by the United States, the Soviet Union, and other nations. The United States did not have any exhibits this time on controlled fusion. The U.S. paper presented gave a realistic and practical outlook with regard to harnessing fusion power. The Soviet Union, on the other hand, exhibited at Geneva a full handful of models of laboratory machines used to investigate fusion reactions.

In exhibiting these models of experimental fusion devices, devices which cannot presently produce more power than they consume, the Soviets rightfully claim to be looking to the future. However, I could not help thinking that this overstressing of what may be, in contrast to what is—is illustrative of the Communist philosophy. The good things, the good life, in the Communist world is always promised for tomorrow. The benefits for their people today, with or without the peaceful atom, are very meager.

There was one Soviet exhibit of especial interest—the "ROMASHKA" reactor. A paper was also presented on this reactor. This is a device which converts the nuclear reactor heat directly to electricity by use of the thermoelectric effect. By heating silicon-germanium semiconductors, electricity is produced. The amounts of electricity promised to be available is 500 to 800 watts. This is small, but such small quantities can be used most effectively for space applications. The Soviet exhibit clearly indicated that their existing device is earthbound; however, a Soviet film on this reactor showed a mockup of this as flying in space. This device is very similar to the U.S. SNAP-10A—a 500-watt nuclear reactor-thermoelectric power supply for space purposes. I must note here that were it not for action taken by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy last January the SNAP-10A program would have been a dead program. At Geneva we would then have been treated to a Soviet accomplishment, which would have led the administration to react with a crash program to the Soviets. Thanks to action by the Joint Committee we do not have to react. We have a going program where a reactor, and not a mockup, is scheduled to be flown and tested in space next spring. The Soviet "ROMASHKA" is not ready for testing in space. With a successful SNAP-10A flight in space next year we will be able to claim a first—another first in nuclear reactor technology and a first in space. Like many other firsts in nuclear technology—military and peaceful—nudging of the Atomic Energy Commission and the administration by the Joint Committee was an initial requirement.

Another highlight of this Conference was the presentation by Dr. Gerald W. Johnson, Associate Director of the Lawrence Radiation Laboratory at Livermore, Calif., of a paper on the engineering applications of nuclear explosives. This is our Project Plowshare. We have demonstrated in this country that a single nuclear explosion can be used to move millions of tons of earth and rock. There is still much to learn, however, about containing radioactivity and utilizing these methods for large-scale excavation and mining purposes.

In the 1958 Conference when the U.S. delegation first announced efforts planned for Plowshare, Soviet delegates, including Professor Emelyanov, denounced this program and stated that it could not serve constructive technical ends but only political ones.

In 1964, the Plowshare presentation by the U.S. delegate, Dr. Johnson, received a most friendly and enthusiastic reception. Not only did neutral nation delegates like one from the United Arab Republic show a technical interest in this program, but a senior Rumanian delegate queried Dr. Johnson as to the possibilities of cooperating in this area through the International Atomic Energy Agency. Professor Emelyanov also showed great interest and discussed with Dr. Johnson the possibilities of United States and Soviet cooperation in this area. Without concluding as to what the official U.S. position should be in this regard, I cite the above as an example of an area of research pursued by the United States in spite of initial international and some national criticism, and today many who previously criticized are beating a path to our door.

For me an especially satisfying highlight of my trip to Europe was flying up to Sweden from Geneva with Chairman Seaborg and many heads of other delegations to take an overnight cruise on the U.S. nuclear ship *Savannah*.

The N.S. *Savannah* had docked earlier at Hälsingborg, Sweden. The party boarded the ship there and for the next 5½ hours toured the various parts of the ship and had a detailed explanation of the ship's performance capabilities while the ship was en route to Malmö, the port at the southern tip of Sweden where the party disembarked for a return flight to Geneva and a resumption of conference activities.

Time and time again while I was aboard the *Savannah* I heard repeated exclamations from the delegates of the almost score of foreign countries who were with us on this brief sailing of how impressed they were with this practical demonstration of U.S. know-how in the field of the use of nuclear energy for surface ship propulsion. Dr. Seaborg, our AEC chairman, deserves a great deal of praise for this highly effective means of communicating to some of the most important countries in the world our actual technical prowess in this field.

Capable of steaming for about 350,000 miles or 14 times around the world on a single loading of fuel the N.S. *Savannah* fully justifies the confidence we had placed in her as a useful demonstration of this particular application of the peaceful use of the atom.

Unfortunately, I was not able to stay in Geneva till the end of the Conference. I returned to Washington on Sunday, September 6. The Conference went on until September 9. During the last days of the Conference the use of nuclear power to produce fresh water from salt water as well as simultaneously producing electricity for power was discussed. James T. Ramey, U.S. Atomic Energy Commissioner, and former staff director of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy gave a paper on this subject. It is requested that this paper and Chairman Seaborg's summary paper on the Conference be reproduced here along with my remarks.

In summary, it was quite clear at the Conference in listening to both the general session and technical papers, as well as in visiting installations in other nations, that the United States is the preeminent leader in the field of nuclear energy—both as to its practical developments and its research effort. Such preeminence, however, is not going unchallenged. Many nations are developing their own capabilities in nuclear energy and related research, and this was fully demonstrated at Geneva.

Continued leadership by the United States in all aspects of nuclear energy can only be maintained in the future by greater efforts and fuller utilization of the resources—scientific and technological—that are available in the United States. Complacency on the part of the United States as a result of the great strides made by us in the last few years can only lead to our being overtaken in one field after another in the peaceful uses of atomic energy.

The competition is not solely from the Soviet Union; France, the United Kingdom, West Germany, and Japan are on the threshold of developing nuclear technology—a technology which can compete not only for prestige but for commercial leadership as well.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I ask unanimous consent to include with my remarks a summary of the Third United Nations International Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy as presented by Dr. Glenn T. Seaborg, Chairman of the U.S. Atomic Energy Committee on September 8, 1964.

SUMMARY OF THE THIRD UNITED NATIONS INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON THE PEACEFUL USES OF ATOMIC ENERGY BY DR. GLENN T. SEABORG, PALAIS DES NATIONS, GENEVA, SWITZERLAND, SEPTEMBER 8, 1964

INTRODUCTION

It is a great honor to be assigned the task of summing up this memorable Conference. After attempting to digest the enormous and diversified content of the sessions, I assure you that the challenge is equal to the honor. I therefore approach the task with humility. I ask the indulgence of the distinguished scientists and engineers assembled here; for in attempting to distill the essence from this notable meeting, I am painfully conscious that I shall be forced to leave out reference to work and points of view that are highly significant for world nuclear science and development. Fortunately, the deficiencies of this summary will be repaired by the publication of the full proceedings. Actually, I believe we shall all be affected by the Conference for a long time to come, and that we shall be able to integrate the profusion of technical material presented here only after reflection in the weeks and months ahead.

Before I begin my discussion of the Conference itself, I should like to remark briefly upon a matter of historical significance which has been noted by other speakers. We have met in approximately the 25th anniversary year of the great discoveries which are responsible for our being here today.

Fittingly, we have seen during this silver anniversary year the first ripening of our labors. We have achieved economic nuclear power in limited but important areas. I believe this Conference marks the beginning of the age of nuclear power. We can now foresee the end of the spector of an energy shortage which has haunted the world since the beginning of the industrial revolution. As nuclear power technology progresses, I believe we can provide in the future enough energy for all of the peoples of the world—the energy that is central to the banishment of hunger, poverty and fear of the future.

The magnitude of the accomplishment in this quarter of a century can be appreciated by retrospection. Some of you will recall, as I do, the impact on nuclear science laboratories around the world of the startling reports in late 1938 and early 1939 of the discovery in Germany of nuclear fission by Otto Hahn and Fritz Strassman, with elucidations by Lis Meitner and Otto Frisch. In only 4 years the late Enrico Fermi and his colleagues had operated a reactor. Even so, in this period many of us would have been content with the thought that nuclear power might be an economic reality by the turn of the century. I find it astonishing that so much has been accomplished in only 25 years.

The contribution of the three international conferences to this stage of progress has been immeasurable. The first conference, in

1955, dropped the shrouds of secrecy from many aspects of nuclear energy, and began a renewal of the channels of communication between nuclear scientists and engineers of the world. In the second conference, communications and international cooperation were further expanded, and fusion research was removed from the pale of secrecy. The third conference bringing us to the borders of the age of nuclear power, might be called the conference of fulfillment.

And, now, let me turn to my attempt to distill the essence of this notable Conference.

GENERAL REMARKS

Let me begin with some general remarks, directed first to world power needs and the place of nuclear power in meeting those needs and second to what some of us consider to be the three phases of nuclear power.

The Conference has dramatized the fact that the world will require huge increases in available energy during the remainder of the century. The accelerating pace of the scientific revolution in the developed countries will require huge new increments of power. At the same time, we sorely need to bring the developing nations into the orbit of today's technologies. As Secretary U Thant reminded us in his opening remarks: "The main theme of the present Conference is nuclear power and this is a key issue for the long-term development of over half the world. If per capita consumption of electricity in the developing areas in our day is to compare with that now found in the major industrialized nations, the amount of additional power required will be so vast as to dwarf even the earth's immense reserves of fossil fuels and hydroelectric power."

Dr. Bhabha of India observed, "there is no power as expensive as no power."

What does the Conference seem to have concluded regarding the advantages of nuclear power in meeting these energy needs? These advantages go beyond economics alone. They permit nations to manage wisely their fossil fuel resources as irreplaceable raw materials rather than as sources of heat. As President Emelyanov observed in his opening remarks, "The raw materials for the chemical industry, for the manufacture of plastics, fabrics, artificial leather and similar products are natural gas, oil, and coal. Organic fuels provide the chemical industry with its primary materials. If we go on using oil at the present rate, all our oil will soon be burnt up, and the chemical industry will be deprived of a most important source of raw material."

Let us see how the Conference gives us reason to believe in the future of nuclear power. Perhaps the most impressive indication of progress can be seen on the first slide. Here one can see how the installed nuclear capacity of the world has grown—from 1955 with only five megawatts to 1958 with 185 megawatts. Today, in 1964, we have about 5,000 megawatts. The future prognosis is also excellent. One can see that by 1970 the total world nuclear power capacity will be about 25,000 megawatts and by 1980 this will have increased to 150,000 to 250,000 megawatts.

As Commissioner Tape of the United States observed, "In the next century nuclear power could well, as wood, coal, and fluid hydrocarbons have all in their turn done, furnish over one-half of the Nation's energy."

The testimony of the technical papers to the fact that nuclear power has come of age is supported by corridor discussions reflecting the entry of commercial competition. This in itself is a strong sign of economic arrival and I should like to think that it has not intruded too heavily on the Conference. However, competition—sometimes aggressive—inevitably accompanies economic development. It plays an important role in driving costs down. Perhaps it is pertinent to note the observation of one delegate which implied that aggressive techniques are sometimes needed to convince conservative financiers and utility engineers of the value of new developments.

It should be noted that our projections of nuclear power development do not assume a breakthrough in controlled thermonuclear fusion or in any now-unknown energy source. Such a development is not on the horizon, but could occur. If fusion does become practical and if it is economical, I am sure there will be time to modify our plans.

The subject of my second group of general remarks deals with reactors as we find them today and as we expect them to be in the future. Many of the delegates to this Conference view nuclear power in three phases, as shown in the second slide.

The first is that phase reached in the past year or so—the coming of age of the three types of presently economic reactors: the graphite moderated, gas cooled reactor; the heavy water moderated, heavy water cooled reactor; and the light water moderated, light water cooled reactor.

The second phase of nuclear power is the improved or advanced converted reactors, including near breeders. These reactors, as indicated on the slide, run a gamut of types—including D_2O moderated, graphite moderated, H_2O moderated and even types using a variable moderation of D_2O and H_2O. This phase of nuclear power development promises to bring greater fuel utilization, preparation of fuel for breeders at a faster rate, and potentially even lower cost power than today's reactor. It must be recognized, however, that continued improvement of the present reactor types will probably keep them economically competitive during most of this time.

The third and somewhat concurrent phase of nuclear progress is the development of breeder reactors. This Conference has heard considerable discussion of fast breeder reactors using the plutonium and uranium 238 fuel cycle. Perhaps less discussion than they merit has been given to thermal breeders fueled on the thorium and uranium 233 fuel cycle. In either case these breeder reactors promise to extend by an order of magnitude and more the fuel utilization of our uranium and thorium resources since they will produce more fissionable material than they consume. In essence, they are our key to unlocking the energy stores in the nonfissionable but extremely abundant isotopes—uranium 238 and thorium 232.

It is important to note that not all delegates agree that these three phases can be arranged in a progression from the presently economic reactors to improved converters capable of even greater economies to a somewhat concurrent pursuit of a longer term program on breeder reactors. Some delegates feel there is no need for the intermediate converter phase and that nuclear power development programs of the respective countries should proceed directly to the breeder reactor phase as shown by the dash line on the slide. But the uncertainties still associated with the long-term economic outlook of breeder reactors would seem to provide a strong rationale for the concurrent and more immediate development of improved converters for many countries. Conversely, there are some delegates that feel that no appreciable effort should be expended on breeders at this time since the present reactor types and improved converters could provide abundant power for many decades to come. If, as reported to the Conference by the United Kingdom, it will be possible to produce uranium from seawater at prices not higher than $20/lb. of U_3O_8, this view may be considerably strengthened.

Clearly, the Conference shows that the aim of all of the nations is to achieve abundant economic nuclear power. We are approaching this goal in different ways, and it appears fortunate that alternative explorations are being made. It seems likely that the nuclear power base for some time to come will consist of a number of different systems paralleling each other in time. We are not likely to find a sharp cutoff point at which one type of reactor will cease to be useful. Moreover, it is unlikely that any advanced system—converter or breeder—will be widely adopted if it does not become economical. In my opinion, we will not see breeders in wide use, for example, if the technology is not advanced to the economically competitive stage. One, in fact, can see circumstances in which breeders could only become economic if the price of fuel is driven up high enough.

The proceedings here show that the focus of competitive nuclear power today is on large-size plants, 500 megawatts of electrical output each. Plans for even larger plants of 1,000 electrical megawatts each are just quietly assumed. When we look toward the reactors for desalination of sea water—one of the most remarkable future human benefits spilling from the cornucopia of nuclear energy—we consider plant sizes as large as 2,500 Mw(e). But the other end of the spectrum also requires attention. Not all countries can use power in these large blocks. Hopefully, one of the outcomes of the large-scale development of nuclear power will be the advent of economic power reactors in the smaller sizes more suited to many of the developing countries. As we have heard, nuclear reactors below the 500-megawatt size are already showing economic benefits in certain of these countries.

ECONOMICS OF NUCLEAR POWER

Let me turn now to details, first by following the central thread in my general remarks; that is, the economics of nuclear power. The next slide attempts to give a comparison of the three presently developed types of nuclear powerplants. This slide shows some of the costs of reactor plants which have been reported to the Conference. I feel a word of warning is necessary here since some in the audience will be tempted to compare the figures from one country with those of another. Without considering the specifics that go into making up these figures, it is very much like comparing apples and oranges. I might state it in another way, which I overheard during the Conference: These are the opinions upon which I base my facts.

As you know, the cost of power from any generating station, nuclear or conventional, is generally governed by four main factors: construction costs, operating costs, fixed or carrying charge rate, and system characteristics which determine the plant capacity factor. Except for the fixed-charge rate, these subjects have been extensively discussed in various sessions of the Conference. It is perhaps unfortunate that more consideration was not given to fixed charges, since apparently much of the controversy over the relative merits of various reactor systems stems from differences in this fixed-charge rate. In fact, some efforts toward international standardization of the bases for computing reactor economics would probably have been welcomed.

Technical and economic factors have restricted the number of reactor types that are well enough developed to be candidates at present for immediate large-scale power programs. The reported prospective construction costs for the three predominant reactor types in the world today are only about one-half the costs of the first large reactors.

These construction costs range from $140 to $280 per kilowatt.

Running costs range from 1.3 to 2.8 mills per kilowatt hour. I have not attempted to combine construction and operating costs to arrive at total power costs due to the difference in fixed-charge rates between countries.

The significant fact is that those systems which tend to have high capital costs tend to have low running costs. Those countries which have concentrated on the development of those reactors with low fuel costs have low fixed-charge rates which tend to offset their higher capital costs. In fact, the lower carrying charges were one of the main reasons which made these lines of reactor development attractive. It speaks well for these reactor technologies that they have been able to become more competitive with other fuels in their own countries in spite of increases in some elements of the fixed charges such as the interest rate increases noted by both Dr. Lewis and Sir William Penney. This has been very severe in the case of the United Kingdom program where the rate of earnings used for economic assessment of reactor costs has risen from 4 percent in 1955 to 7½ percent at present.

All of these reactor types still have considerable potential for economic improvement through increased unit size, through multiple unit stations, through large-scale production by replication of designs, and through steady engineering improvements of the type that have substantially reduced the cost of conventional stations over the years. The reported improvements by the United Kingdom in their initial 5,000 Mw(e) national power program based on the magnox reactors are illustrative of this.

Experience has also demonstrated that many power reactors can operate safely at power levels considerably higher than their initial design ratings, thus substantially reducing unit costs. The Yankee reactor has had its power level increased from 110 Mw(e) initially to 175 Mw(e). Reactors now in the design and construction stage still have this "stretch capability." For example, the Oyster Creek plant has a minimum capability of 515 Mw(e) but if the expected power density is achieved in the core, 640 Mw(e) is possible. Soviet experience with the first 210 megawatt unit at Norovoronezh has made it possible to increase the capacity of the second unit, which is a modernized version of the first, to 365 megawatts or more. As experience accumulates, new plants will increasingly be rated initially closer to their ultimate capacity.

The reports have further indicated that there remains the possibility of substantial reductions in fuel cycle costs. The reductions to be achieved between the costs we have experienced up to now and future costs may be much greater than the 50 percent by which we have already reduced capital costs, although the amount of reduction will vary with reactor type. Fuel fabrication costs will be greatly reduced as we go on to develop improved fabrication techniques and increase the scale of the fabrication industry. Illustrative of this is the United Kingdom experience in fabricating almost 2 million magnox elements. The French reports on scaling up their fabrication efforts are also noteworthy. Increases in irradiation levels, which reduce fuel cycle costs, are also in prospect for all types of reactor fuels. Again, the recent increase of the guaranteed irradiation level of the magnox fuel from 3,000 to 4,000 Mwd/T is clear evidence of these achievements. Other components of operation, maintenance, and fuel cycle costs such as the reprocessing of spent fuels, also have potential for cost reduction.

As far as the fuel itself is concerned, possibilities for further savings have also been reported. Natural uranium prices are currently well below the cost of the uranium used in the early cores of existing reactors. The widely quoted $6/lb. figure is probably only an upper limit at present. Over a period of years this will help the economics of reactors fueled with both natural uranium and enriched uranium. Utilization of increased percentages of the uranium material mined, as conversion ratios increase, will also tend to reduce costs. However, certain of these potential reductions in fuel cycle costs may require some concomitant increase in capital costs just as the choice of natural uranium fueled reactors necessitates higher capital costs to start.

Perhaps the most encouraging economic evidence of all lies in the projections of nuclear power growth given to this Conference. It appears quite certain that nuclear energy will play an increasing role in meeting the electrical power needs of many countries. The role of nuclear power will vary from country to country depending upon the extent and costs of their conventional resources. In this respect, the relative economics of nuclear power will be most important. The managers of the electric utility systems in all countries seem to insist, quite naturally, on economic competitiveness before they will engage in large-scale nuclear power programs.

FUTURE OF NUCLEAR POWER DEVELOPMENT

The present economic types of power reactors, as developed to date, represent only a first step. Many reports on forthcoming converter reactors promise substantial improvements in economics and fuel utilization. While opinions may differ on the paths to pursue for the future, there is substantial agreement that we must develop improved converters to obtain these greater efficiencies. In looking toward ultimate future needs, there is almost general agreement as to the need to develop breeder reactors although some nations, like Canada, support the opinion that breeder reactors may not be required for many years in the future, if at all. The general consensus, however, is evidenced by the program plans reported upon by the United Kingdom, U.S.S.R., France, Germany and the United States.

A variety of forthcoming converter reactor types is presently under study and development in many parts of the world. Some of the potential advantages of these reactors include such properties as high conversion ratios, high specific power with resultant lower fuel inventory, high temperature and high thermal efficiency, larger single unit capacity, more efficient use of natural uranium, thorium, and plutonium, and a potential contribution toward ultimate breeding systems. In some cases these converter concepts are based on design variations and extensions and combinations of the technology of the proven reactor types. In other cases, they represent innovations in technology.

As an example, heavy water moderated reactors, long of interest to many countries, represent a class of reactors which has good long-range as well as short-range potential. Reported at the Conference were extensions of the heavy water moderated technology to designs which are under study and development, incorporating such coolants as gas, organic compounds, water and steam. The organic cooled, heavy water concept, being developed under the ORGEL project, by Euratom, the OCDRE project in Canada, the DON project in Spain and the recently planned program in the United States in connection with desalting appear to offer considerable promise, as do the French and Czechoslovakian programs using gas cooling with a heavy water moderator and the United Kingdom work with steam cooling. It is clear from the scope of organic work planned that many countries have now mastered the handling of organics as coolants in reactors, by establishing and maintaining satisfactory purity standards in the cooling system.

Other examples of the evolution of advanced converter reactors from the present types of large power reactors are the spectral shift reactor design (employing a variable mixture of light and heavy water), the Swedish designs for pressurized and boiling heavy water reactors, the seed and blanket pressurized water concept, and nuclear superheating. The experience in Sweden in achieving a very low heavy water leakage rate is very encouraging. The work in superheating appears to be particularly advanced in the U.S.S.R. with the operation of the Beloyarsk power station.

Advanced reactor versions of graphite moderated gas-cooled reactors are also being developed leading to high temperature, improved fuel cycle, and higher conversion ratio performance. The AGR and Dragon projects in the United Kingdom (the latter a broad multination effort) and the HTGR in the United States represent principal efforts in this direction.

We find substantial development effort is also being directed toward sodium-cooled reactors. The development of the sodium-cooled graphite-moderated reactor in the United States has as it prime objective an economic, high temperature large power reactor system; in addition it is also contributing a significant amount of sodium technology which is applicable to the sodium-cooled fast reactor systems. It is noteworthy that the Hallam Nuclear Power Facility in the United States, a reactor of this type, is the largest sodium-cooled reactor in operation today. As a part of its overall reactor program, Germany is developing the KNX reactor project which will use a sodium-cooled and zirconium hydride moderated reactor. The U.S.S.R. program also indicates substantial development of sodium components.

The reports reflect that emphasis on fast reactors has increased spectacularly in many countries during recent years. Germany, the United Kingdom, United States, and U.S.S.R. all have announced or reaffirmed their intentions to proceed with relatively large prototype reactors, of several hundred Mw(e) capacity. We have heard reports from the U.S.S.R. and the United Kingdom on their operating experience with fast reactors, the BR–5 and Dounreay plants, respectively. The integrated power of Dounreay has reached a total of 9,080 MWD and total electric power production is over 36 million kwh. Dounreay has been successfully demonstrated at full power and its continued use as a fuel test facility should contribute significantly to the United Kingdom's fast reactor program.

It has been reported that the EBR II at the U.S. National Reactor Testing Station is now producing power and it is anticipated that this reactor, as well as the Enrico Fermi plant, will produce valuable information on fuels, components performance, and systems reliability. In France, the Rapsodie fast reactor is being constructed which will give important data on physics behavior, including the kinetics of fast reactor cores. The program in Germany is progressing rapidly with an intensive evaluation being made of the various coolants and systems which may be applied in fast reactor technology.

In the programs just described there has been major emphasis placed on the eventual use of the plutonium and uranium 238 cycle to effectively use these materials by taking advantage of the high breeding ratios which appear feasible with this cycle. Both metallic and ceramic fuels are being evaluated for achieving high efficiency, low-cost performance. This has led to the development of strong programs directed toward evaluation of the neutronics and of inherent safety of such fast reactor fuel systems.

On the fuel evaluation side, we find that a series of experimental fuel assemblies are being irradiated in the United Kingdom Dounreay reactor. Fuel material also has been irradiated to some 6 percent burnup in the U.S.S.R.'s BR–5. There are firm plans to carry out sample and fuel subassembly irradiations in the very near future in Rapsodie, Fermi, EBR II and in the fast flux loop in Belgium's BR–5. Further, the United States is building a fast test reactor, FARET, in which valuable physics measurements will be made and in which small cores can be tested at high power densities and to high burnups. The U.S.S.R. also announced plans for their 60 Mw(e) reactor, BR–60, in which they hope to demonstrate fuel burnups in excess of 10 percent.

On the safety studies side, Doppler and sodium void coefficient measurements for fast reactor systems are under theoretical and experimental investigation in several countries. The session papers and discussions indicate general agreement on Doppler coefficient contributions to reactor kinetics and safety—it will be negative, large and reliable. Experimental work is being carried on in the critical facilities: Zebra, Vera, and Quagga in the United Kingdom, ZPR–III and ZPR–VI in the United States, Bfs in the U.S.S.R., and FR–0 in Sweden. A number of facilities are planned for operation within the next 5 years; namely, Masurka in France, Sneak in Germany, and ZPPR in the United States. Another planned fast reactor project is the Southwest Experimental Fast Oxide Reactor, SEFOR, which is being undertaken in an international partnership of Euratom, Federal Republic of West Germany, Southwest Atomic Energy Associates (a group of American utilities), General Electric Co., and the USAEC. SEFOR will be used to measure Doppler and sodium temperature coefficients on mixed plutonium-uranium oxide cores under transient conditions.

Although the main effort in breeder reactor development is in the direction of sodium-cooled fast reactors, the reports here reflect that other fast reactor systems are being studied which would use other coolants such as gas and steam. During this Conference a paper by the Swiss delegation describing a fast gas-cooled system and a paper on the evaluation of different coolant systems in Germany were presented.

Work in several countries which may lead to thermal breeder reactors also was presented, utilizing the thorium and uranium 238 fuel cycle. Three of the reactor concepts described which offer the potential of utilizing the important energy reserves now locked in thorium, and eventually of breeding, are the high temperature gas-graphite system, the heavy-water system, and the seed and blanket pressurized light-water system. The potential advantages of fluid fuel reactors, such as the slurry-oxide or molten-salt systems, for thermal breeding also should be noted.

NUCLEAR FUEL CYCLE

Let me turn to the manufacture of nuclear fuel, one of the most important technologies of nuclear power, where we find steady improvement through a diversity of approaches. These improvements have accounted for a slow, steady gain in fuel performance over the years, with operating temperatures becoming higher and an increase in the heat output of each unit of fuel throughout.

While the number of separate reactor concepts being pursued has narrowed somewhat in recent years, there are still many options as to the fuel cycle. Uranium metals are being used in low-exposure natural uranium systems. For water-cooled reactors the presently favored and most thoroughly proven fuel material is uranium oxide. The results reported to this Conference indicate that this fuel will continue to be favored in these reactors because it can sustain high irradiation exposures. A number of papers suggest that carbide fuels appear quite promising for nonwater reactors. Other compounds such as nitride, sulfide, silicide, etc., are also being studied, and have been reported upon.

Stainless steel and zirconium alloys continue to be prominent cladding materials, although fuel designers continue to be concerned about high temperature embrittlement under irradiation. Magnesium alloys have been serving well in low-temperature gas-cooled systems. For future applications ceramic fuel particles coated with carbon offer a good fuel for high-temperature gas-cooled reactors.

In Canada, typical fuels are natural uranium oxide clad in zirconium with fuel exposures estimated at 10 MWD/KgU. In France, the fuel is natural uranium metal with magnesium alloy cladding with fuel exposures around 3½ MWD/KgU. In the U.S.S.R., the light water reactors use enriched uranium oxide clad in stainless steel alloys and will produce greater than 20 MWD/KgU. At the present in the United Kingdom, "adjusted" natural uranium metal is clad in magnesium alloy and produces 4 to 5 MWD/KgU.

In the United States the fuel is largely UO_2 clad in stainless steel or zircaloy with exposure expectations of 16 to 25 MWD/KgU.

A number of fluid fuel concepts such as molten salt, molten plutonium and aqueous slurries are also being studied and developed. These concepts are very intriguing and offer the promise of significant reductions in fuel cycle economics, but they pose formidable problems that are still to be solved.

In view of the excellent progress experienced in developing long endurance fuel and reducing the costs of the various unit operations required to support the fuel cycle, it now appears that the economic optimum fuel exposure for converter type reactors will be in the same neighborhood as a reasonable integrity lifetime of the fuels.

There have been several reports on the final phase of the fuel cycle—spent fuel reprocessing where there are a number of competing methods. At present the aqueous solvent extraction process is the accepted means for recovery of nuclear fuels. Other recovery processes such as pyrometallurgical and pyrochemical processing, however, are advancing rapidly. In the end, the types of fuels that need to be processed will largely determine the most economic fuel recovery process.

As reported, the economic recycle of the bred fuels—plutonium and uranium 233—can now be clearly foreseen. Within a few more years, plutonium recycle should be demonstrated in large commercial power reactors and it will be an important step in assuring the economics of the complete fuel cycle. Similarly, recycle of uranium 233 will follow a few years later.

NUCLEAR SAFETY AND WASTE MANAGEMENT

An important factor in the development and application of the peaceful uses of atomic energy—as important as its economic and scientific impact, has been the continuing concern for and emphasis on nuclear safety and reasoned management of nuclear wastes. The public has manifested concern in many countries over the safety considerations associated with the location, design, construction, and operation of nuclear powerplants. This is only natural in view of the increasing number of nuclear plants actually being operated, built or planned, and the desire to place these plants nearer to the centers of the electrical power needs.

Fortunately safety has been a foremost consideration, from the start, in developing the peaceful applications of nuclear energy. The remarkable safety record is powerful and eloquent testimony to the high degree of importance attached to this aspect of nuclear energy activities, and to the efforts and accomplishments by workers in this field throughout the world. For example, the United States has been operating reactors of various types for about 20 years—with an accumulation of over 1,200 reactor years of operating experience. In that time there has been no known instance of public injury or even public inconvenience outside an immediate plant site that can be attributed to a reactor operation or accident.

From the reports given at this Conference it would appear that throughout the world a general safety philosophy is developing for these nuclear reactor systems. The approach appears to be based largely on two related but separated and conservative paths. First, to prevent accidents, the reactor is generally designed conservatively, taking into account the kinetic or neutronic behavior of the system, the characteristics of the materials used in its construction, and the incorporation of redundant instrumentation and control systems made as fail safe as possible. In addition, reactor operators are carefully trained and detailed plant operating procedures are carefully followed. Second, most power reactors are equipped with a variety of engineered safeguards and emergency systems to minimize the consequences of an accident should it somehow occur. For example, in some countries it is common practice to enclose the entire reactor system in a containment structure built to withstand considerable pressure and with a high degree of leak tightness.

To support these policies, extensive nuclear safety research, development, and test programs are conducted in almost all countries supporting reactor development programs. I believe we can be quite confident that these investigations, which cover a broad spectrum of subjects from reactor kinetics to fission product behavior and materials research, and in which a rather wide variety of scientific and technical disciplines are involved, will continue to contribute to nuclear energy's generally excellent safety record and will keep pace with the requirements of the industry as it develops.

The concern for nuclear safety does not cease with the continued safe operation of nuclear reactors. Their radioactive wastes must also be disposed of safely. Significant advances during the past years have been made and reported on here by Czechoslovakia, France, India, and the United States in the handling of radioactive waste products from nuclear energy operations, including power reactor installations. There has been a strong impetus throughout the world for vigorous waste management research and development programs directed at further reduction in the quantities of radioactive materials being discharged to the environment.

As indicated in reports by France and the United States, the strict management and disposal of radioactive waste at nuclear power stations are not limiting the development of large-scale and widespread nuclear power generation, and it may be noted, also, that during the past years, these waste handling operations have not resulted in any abnormal release of radioactivity to the environment. Radioactivity concentrations in power reactor plant effluents, with no environmental dilution, have been in the low range of 1 to 3 percent of the internationally accepted radiation protection standards.

The disposal of certain types of solid and liquid low-level waste effluents to the ground has proven to be safe and acceptable in many countries, including Canada, the United States, and the U.S.S.R. The growth of land burial or storage sites, with the resulting economies, have essentially eliminated ocean disposal as an important waste management operation in many nations of the world with available land area.

More than 15 years' experience in the United Kingdom, the United States, and the U.S.S.R. with the improving methods of handling highly radioactive liquid waste from fuel reprocessing by storage in special underground tanks has shown such storage to be a safe and practical interim measure. The long-term usefulness of this method is limited, however, by the long, effective life of the waste (hundreds of years) and the comparatively short life of storage tanks, estimated at several decades. Accordingly, a number of countries are developing means to convert high level liquid waste to stable solids.

After high level liquid wastes are converted to solids, there still exists a requirement for permanent storage of these solid wastes. Manmade structures may not be adequate to last for the hundreds of years that must pass before the wastes become relatively harmless; underground salt formations appear to offer an attractive alternate site for solids and concentrated liquids wastes because of their unique geologic characteristics. Salt formations are dry, impermeable, have good structural strength and thermal conductivity, and are not associated with usable ground water sources, and they exist in many parts of the world. Future developmental work in several countries along this path will be watched with interest.

With continued attention to this area of nuclear safety and waste management, I firmly believe that we can achieve the potential benefits of nuclear power and at the same time protect—or even improve—our general standards of public health and safety. The increasing use of nuclear power may indeed help to lessen atmospheric pollution, largely a result of the widespread use of fossil fuels.

ADVANCES IN ENERGY CONVERSION

To this point my remarks have been largely limited to nuclear reactors providing the heat for the conventional generation of electricity. The progress reported to this Conference in the area of energy conversion techniques, nuclear thermoelectric and thermionic conversion and magneto hydrodynamics, is opening new vistas for power generation.

The conversion of the heat of nuclear fission directly into electrical energy by means of the thermionic emission of electrons has been demonstrated as a practical concept in the short time since the last Conference. The potential of this concept is perhaps best indicated by the extent of the effort, reported at this Conference, underway in the United Kingdom, U.S.S.R., France, and the United States. Out-of-pile tests of converters with both uranium carbide and refractory metal emitters have shown lifetimes of thousands of hours. In-pile tests with both uranium carbide and uranium oxide fueled converters have operated for several hundreds of hours. Naturally the potential of these devices has stimulated materials development. As the technology of refractory metals is advanced to allow higher temperatures in reactors, the efficiency of the thermionic concept increases to the point where there is more and more incentive to overcome the many remaining problems.

The generation of electric power using magneto hydrodynamics techniques is being actively pursued in a number of laboratories. Here again the high temperatures of the plasmas required pose serious materials problems although the use of an inert working fluid would reduce the severity of the materials problem. The closed cycle converter operated in conjunction with a high-temperature gas-cooled nucelar reactor appears attractive. Proposals have been reported upon in this connection for reactors operating in the temperature range of 1,800–2,000° C.

Generation of electric energy by the direct thermoelectric conversion of the decay heat of radioisotopes has become an established technology since the last Conference. The technology is now being demonstrated not only in space but also in a number of terrestrial applications including weather stations, navigation buoys and lighthouses. The barge-mounted weather station powered by a 60-watt strontium 90 generator on exhibit here in Geneva is identical to the U.S. station operating in the Gulf of Mexico. The U.S.S.R. reports the successful operation of an automatic weather station in the middle part of their country powered, by a 5 watt Ce^{144} fueled generator.

The direct thermoelectric conversion of the fission heat of a nuclear reactor has been demonstrated. The efforts in the U.S.S.R. which culminated in "Romashka" are of great interest. This uranium dicarbide (UC_2) fueled fast reactor, coupled to Si-Ge thermocouples, has been operating at about 1,800° C and generating power at a level of several hundred watts since the middle of August.

The United States hopes to demonstrate in the spring of 1965, with a developmental orbital flight of SNAP–10A, a 500-watt reactor unit also employing thermoelectric power conversion. This uranium 235 fueled and zirconium-hydride moderated reactor with liquid metal coolant will weigh less than 1,000 pounds, including payload shieldings. These reactor units in larger sizes will permit future communication satellites to broadcast simultaneously several channels of television directly to individual homes.

It seems clear that these reactor concepts, SNAP and Romashka, while receiving their impetus from the needs for space power, will find equally important roles as compact, reliable terrestrial power sources.

NUCLEAR DESALINATION

As I indicated earlier, one of the more exciting new applications for nuclear reactors is the desalting of sea water. We have heard reports of the U.S. studies for combination power and desalting application and the studies by Israel and Tunisia and Mexico. The U.S.S.R. and France have presented interesting data on reactors for process applications such as would be the case in desalting situations. We are encouraged by these reports and expect that one or more combination nuclear power and desalting installations producing millions of gallons per day of fresh water will be constructed and in operation within the next 4 to 8 years.

The potential of nuclear energy in the combined production of power and water is not only a very fascinating peaceful use of the atom, but one which can provide tremendous benefits for all mankind. The availability of economic power and water could open new frontiers throughout the world for population growth and industrialization. To achieve these benefits, however, nations of the world must work together. We have witnessed a step in this direction just today in the IAEA panel meeting on desalting. During the Conference we also have heard of other steps such as the cooperative efforts between various nations in nuclear desalting to meet their future water and power needs. These steps are a commendable start.

The studies that have been undertaken to date indicate that combination nuclear installations in the next few decades will be able to produce fresh water and electric power at costs which may be attractive for many municipal and industrial needs throughout the world. The water from these combination plants may even find economic potential for selected agricultural use when compared with other alternatives in specific situations.

As the nations of the world develop and populations increase, the economic natural water sources are likely to become depleted, especially in some geographical regions. Other areas, already deficient in water, will need water for development to support larger populations. Thus, desalting of sea water by nuclear energy will become more and more important. What today is a matter of interest could well become tomorrow's necessity.

Portable nuclear power plants: Another immediate application of nuclear reactors is to supply power and heat in remote locations. We have heard a Soviet Union report on the 750 Kw(e) ARBUS organic cooled and moderated package plant. This plant, which began operation in the summer of 1963, uses a carbon steel primary loop and pumps and auxiliaries available from the oil industry for lower cost, and consists of 19 packages each weighing not more than 20 tons. Soviet scientists have also described the 1,500 Kw(e), TES–3, a pressurized water plant arranged on four large, tracked vehicles. U.S. scientists described their portable pressurized water reactors, using compact cores of UO_2-stainless steel cermet fuel, together with details of operating experience at several sites in the United States, the Arctic, and the Antarctic. The success of these plants which generate up to 2,000 Kw(e) in addition to a substantial quantity of space heat provides the technology which is applicable to any small nuclear powerplant for remote installations, be it for mining, a scientific mission, or for other needs.

MARITIME NUCLEAR PROPULSION

The hopeful outlook for the maritime application of nuclear power expressed in the 1958 Conference can now be supported by successful operating experience with two nuclear powered vessels. The icebreaker *Lenin*, during its nearly 5 years of operation, has demonstrated the advantages of nuclear power for this important service. The N.S. *Savannah* is now completing its second European voyage and is also meeting its expectations.

Two countries, West Germany and Japan, already have firm projects for construction of their first nuclear powered ships. Others are carrying on development in preparation for future projects, and the U.S.S.R. announced during the Conference that it expects to build two new nuclear icebreakers, with the first one coming into operation in 1971.

Thus, with successful operating experience amounting to well over 100,000 miles for the two existing ships and with new prospectively economic projects already under way or planned, we can have confidence in the ultimate success of expanding nuclear propulsion programs for the merchant marine.

PEACEFUL NUCLEAR EXPLOSIVES

The U.S. plowshare program for developing peaceful uses of nuclear explosives has received considerable attention. Despite the fact that this program is in an early stage of development and many data are needed before useful projects can be undertaken, the potential for use of nuclear explosives in excavation, mining, recovery of gas and oil and as a research tool appears promising. Significant suggestions for methods of international collaboration and participation have been proposed by delegates from a number of nations. It is hoped that through such international support and cooperation that nuclear weapon technology can be converted into a valuable research and engineering tool for the benefit of all mankind.

RESEARCH AND HIGH-FLUX REACTORS

Although nuclear power has been the major focus of interest at this Conference, there has been considerable discussion of research and high-flux reactors and their associated programs, and the applications of radioisotopes to the physical and life sciences.

Conference papers suggest that the uses of newer research reactors fall plainly into three main kinds of activity: First, there is the continuing examination of radiation effects on materials for the construction, moderation and fueling of reactors. Second is the more fundamental and better controlled kind of physical research made possible by reactors designed to meet more specific research needs. A good example of this is the work reported on pulsed reactors. The third area is the production of radioisotopes for medical therapy, for tracer uses and now for the production of relatively large quantities of transplutonium elements, in both the United States and the U.S.S.R.

My personal bias is evident when I say that the prospect of performing basic and exploratory research on gram quantities of californium isotopes, hundreds of milligrams of berkelium, milligrams of einsteinium and up to a milligram of fermium produced in these reactors is one of the most exciting to which we have been exposed in decades.

The shift from all-purpose to specialized research reactors is most clear when one considers the construction of high-flux reactors for either materials testing or isotope production. In operation or shortly to be in operation, are the HFIR, HFBR, and ATR in the United States, the MP, MPR, and SM-2 in the U.S.S.R., and the PEGASE in France.

This desire for higher neutron fluxes has stimulated technological developments of an order of magnitude, or more in some cases, beyond the conditions existing in present power reactors, thus paving the way for further improvements in power reactors. Such major advances include the development of fuel elements and cores to operate at very high power densities and heat fluxes.

We have also learned how to specially tailor the flux in experimental areas, and through past experience have come to appreciate the need to carefully coordinate the design and construction of the reactor with our research needs. The new knowledge has resulted in such notable experimental facilities as fuel element testing loops in the U.S.S.R. MR reactor and the French PEGASE reactor, the high temperature gas-cooled loop in the United Kingdom Pluto reactor, the liquid hydrogen cold sink in the French high-flux beam reactor and the liquid hydrogen moderator chamber in the British DIDO reactor.

RADIOISOTOPES

Another area exemplifying the research applications of nuclear energy is that of radioisotopes. More than 30 papers at this Conference have been devoted specifically to radioisotopes, their applications, and their methods of production or separation. If I were to include papers on subjects of a closely related nature, such as high-flux reactors, stable isotopes, and the productive utilization of ionizing radiation, the number would increase substantially.

It is clear that the technology associated with isotopes now permeates every scientific and engineering field. It is indeed one outgrowth of the atomic age that can be employed by all countries regardless of size or state of technological advancement.

In my judgment, an outstanding technical accomplishment of the past few years—as represented by papers presented here—has been the effort to produce, separate, and purify radioisotopes in quantities sufficient to permit consideration of their use as sources of thermal and radiation power. Several countries have reported major progress in this area. Another area of outstanding achievement has been the use of radioisotopes in medicine to alleviate man's suffering; this is the domain of what I have called "The humane atom."

From the scientific viewpoint, the widespread establishment of neutron activation analysis as a standard technique for measurement of trace quantities of almost every element in the periodic table represents a contribution of immeasurable value to medicine, agriculture, and the physical sciences, In fact, its application has been extended even to law enforcement.

Ionizing radiation—whether the source be radioisotopes, machines, or reactors—is finding a place in the processing of organic chemicals, plastics, and other materials in sterilization of medical supplies and in the preservation of foods.

CONTROLLED THERMONUCLEAR REACTIONS

The disclosure of previously classified research on controlled thermonuclear reactions was one of the main features of the 1958 conference. That year and its aftermath was an age of innocence for this intriguing field of research—a field of research which could lead to the extraction of an inexhaustible supply of energy from the oceans. The papers presented here show that we have learned a great deal in the intervening years. Plasma physicists now know well the hard scientific and engineering realities of suspending, squeezing, and holding in space gases with temperatures of the order of those found in the stars. They have learned that the prospects for an easy engineering shortcut to controlled fusion are not bright. They have demonstrated, to the satisfaction of themselves and the nuclear community, that controlled fusion is one of the most difficult scientific and engineering problems ever encountered.

The early optimism followed by the sobering experience of the last 6 years should not, however, blind us to the truly significant progress that has been made. An important and exciting new area of fundamental science in plasma physics has grown up. I shall mention three of the many evidences of the maturing of plasma physics. One is the increasing sophistication of the field, represented in part by the development of a new language which is getting beyond the comprehension of the rest of us in the nuclear field. The second is sheer size—the general increase in the number of scientists in controlled fusion research, the increased investment in scientific facilities by governments, and the expanding literature. The number of scientific papers per year on plasma physics has increased about 45 percent since 1959, as have the number of workers in the field. A rough count indicates that work is now going on with 10 major experimental devices in the U.S.S.R., 14 in the United Kingdom and Western Europe, 4 in Japan and Australia, and 10 in the United States.

The most important indicator of growth, however, lies in the scientific results of these years, contained in papers presented here. Whereas in 1958, plasma scientists were only on the verge of producing fusion reactions with thermal neutrons truly attributable to the reaction, a number of laboratories today regularly produce plasma with ion-energies exceeding the so-called minimum ignition temperature.

A usable controlled fusion reaction would require nuclear reactions of adequate duration, temperature, and density of plasma.

Today one machine may best approach the production of the required temperature, another the required duration of nuclear reactions, and another the desirable destiny of plasma, but no one machine is capable of meeting all three requirements. The aim now—and it is a long-range one—is to achieve reactions combining all of these factors satisfactorily in a single machine.

An important foundation of knowledge has been erected on the most important problems of controlled fusion, namely plasma stability. The pioneering work of Ioffe in the Soviet Union on the confinement of plasma in a region where the pressure of the magnetic field is at a minimum, the so-called minimum-B confinement, is to be admired. It is also encouraging to learn of the many new experiments underway to measure the limits of plasma stability under varying conditions, such as the NTSE in the United Kingdom, DECA in France, and the DCX-2 in the United States.

There is a growing ability to predict plasma behavior. Numerous good checks between experiment and theory have been achieved—for example, in the Phoenix experiments in the United Kingdom, and in the Levitron and ALICE experiments in the United States. Such agreements did not exist in any laboratory results in 1958, and these are a strong indication of the growing maturity of plasma science.

We cannot be absolutely sure that controlled thermonuclear power can be developed, although the general feeling at the Conference is that this will be accomplished at some time—perhaps before the end of the century. Certainly the benefit—essentially unlimited power for the earth's population for all time—is one we cannot overlook. Indeed, I agree with expressions of some of the delegates that the approximately $100 million spent worldwide each year in the nuclear fusion field is too low an investment for research with such vast potential benefit.

EXHIBITS

A word should also be said about the many fine scientific exhibits displayed here in Geneva in connection with this Third Conference. Also I am sure many of you have been impressed as I was by the excellent quality of the scientific films prepared for this Conference by many of the countries. These will certainly be a lasting contribution. The many people involved in these exhibits and films should be congratulated for their excellent efforts.

CONCLUSION

In my closing remarks, I should like to depart again from the form of the technical progress summary. I wish to review some of the human implications, especially in an international context, of what has been said here. The degree of international cooperation in the development of this coming major energy resource in the last decade is surely unusual, and perhaps unique, in world history. We can point to these conferences, to the work of the International Atomic Energy Agency, the variety of cooperative programs among nations, and to the nuclear assistance programs of a number of nations. Important specific projects are the Norway-Poland-Yugoslavia project, the Dragon project and the SEFOR project. Close at hand is CERN, one of the outstanding examples of international cooperation in science, which many of us have had an opportunity to visit during this Conference.

The Conference has demonstrated many reasons why international cooperation must be continued and strengthened. The free flow of information, not only in science but also at the more restrictive technological level, is the key to the most rapid technical progress for all people.

This international collaboration practiced so successfully in nuclear energy gives further strength to the thesis that science can serve as a common ground between all nations of the world. A uranium or plutonium atom knows no nationality. Through international conferences such as this, and other broader and more intensive progress of exchange and collaboration, science may be a leading factor in resolving the differences which still remain between countries.

The Conference has also dramatized the fact that practical achievement of material well-being for the peoples of the developing nations rests upon this structure of close international cooperation. The Conference has again made us aware of the relative shortages of fossil fuels and hydroelectric potentials in many of these nations. For these nations to reach and maintain living standards presently found in the developed countries by the end of the century will require nuclear power energy on a large scale. Indeed, we see the possibility that through nuclear power the developing nations may partially circumvent the long years of the Industrial Revolution and greatly telescope the time required for those nations to enter the scientific revolution upon which so many of the developed nations have already embarked.

Such a hope will be illusory, however, without a solid foundation consisting of cadres of scientists, engineers, and technicians as well as facilities for productive work. Secretary General U Thant of the United Nations, reminded us that "the development of certain scientific institutions and the training of at least a small number of scientists in some of the advanced disciplines is by no means a luxury for any of the new nations."

Technologically advanced nations and the International Atomic Energy Agency have already made progress in training and in establishing science centers in the developing nations. Much more needs to be done by a number of the developed nations. We need to find ways, especially through science centers, to enable trained scientists and engineers of high caliber to do meaningful work in their own countries. We have found that they otherwise migrate to advanced centers of science abroad.

It is clear that these efforts should not be limited to nuclear science and technology. The nuclear field, however, has much more to offer than nulcear power. The breadth and attractiveness of nuclear science and technology make the field an excellent focal point for a start in broader research and development. We are all aware of a number of good examples of such beginnings with the nuclear field.

If we are to implement the major conclusion of this Conference—that nuclear power will become an increasingly powerful force in the world's work—it will be necessary to evolve as rapidly as possible an appropriate world body of nuclear law. Considerable progress has been made in the development and application of appropriate safeguards under the aegis of the International Atomic Energy Agency. As Dr. Sigvard Eklund, Director General of the IAEA, told us, it is important to have accepted an "international safeguard system now when the number of power reactors is still small." The future growth of the international atom must be paralleled by the future growth of an effective safeguards system.

By the turn of the century, our Conference suggests, more than half of the world's electricity will be generated by nuclear energy. Nuclear energy is, therefore, the hope of the peoples of the world for a good life. If the major future energy base of the world continues to evolve in an environment of international development and law, nuclear energy can be an important unifying force in a world of peace, security, and human well-being.

Nuclear power: megawatts past, present, and future

	1955	1958	1964	1970	1980
Belgium	------	------	12	------	------
Canada	------	------	20	------	------
France	------	------	150	------	------
Germany	------	------	15	------	------
Italy	------	------	525	------	------
Japan	------	------	12	------	------
Sweden	------	------	9	------	------
United Kingdom	------	120	2,300	------	------
United States	------	60	1,057	------	------
U.S.S.R	5	5	,900	------	------
Other	------	------	------	------	------
Total	5	185	5,000	25,000	150,000/ 250,000

(Chart omitted from the RECORD.)

OUR POLITICAL PARTIES—SOME DIFFERENCES

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McDADE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, in the 64 years since the turn of the century, the control of the U.S. Government has rested in the hands of the Democratic Party for 30 years, and in the hands of the Republican Party for 34 years. For two of those years, 1947 and 1948, Mr. Truman was in the White House, but the years are assigned to the Republican Party because they controlled Congress during that time, and Mr. Truman disclaimed any legislation put through by the 80th Congress.

With such an even distribution of time since 1900, it is possible to examine now what has happened in America, and to America, during the years when each party was in power. In making this examination, I have chosen a limited number of items of reference, items which are important and which have a truly current application. The items I have selected are: spending, unemployment, taxes, and corruption in government.

SPENDING

There is a current myth that spending Federal money is something that touches us very lightly, if at all. This is false. You pay, or your children pay, or their children.

In 34 years of control of the Government, the Republican Party had 22 balanced budgets, 12 unbalanced budgets. It accumulated a national debt of $13.4 billion in that time. This is 4.4 percent of our national debt.

In 30 years of control, the Democratic Party had three balanced budgets, 27 unbalanced budgets. It accumulated a debt of $293 billion. This is 95.6 percent of the national debt. It is significant to note that if you subtract the total deficits accumulated during three wars when the Democrats were in power, the total still comes to over $70 billion.

UNEMPLOYMENT

Every 4 years the specter of unemployment and depression is hauled out of the closet by some of our opponents, and the promise of prosperity is heard in the land. But it is interesting to note the unemployment statistics during the years each party was in power.

During 34 years of power the Republican Party saw unemployment top 5 percent for 14 years. For 20 of its years the unemployment rate stayed safely below that figure.

During 30 years in power the Democratic Party saw unemployment top 5 per cent for 16 years. For 14 years the mark stayed below that figure. But in all fairness, four of those years when unemployment was low during the Democratic regimes, we were in the Second World War, and unemployment was unthinkable.

During its 34 years in power the Republican Party saw an average unemployment rate of 5.6 percent.

During its 30 years in power, the Democratic Party saw an average unemployment rate of 8.5 percent.

TAXES

There have been 9 reductions in taxes and 15 increases in taxes since the tax law was passed in 1913. The Republican Party was responsible for eight reductions and two increases. The Democratic Party was responsible for three reductions and 13 increases.

In 1932 the personal exemption was $1,000 for an individual and $2,300 for a married couple. The normal tax rate was 4 percent. By the end of the New Deal and Fair Deal, the exemption had been lowered to $500 and the tax rate had risen to 20 percent—an increase of 500 percent. The Republican 80th Congress raised the exemption to $600—over the veto of Mr. Truman; the same Republican 80th Congress raised exemptions for all over 65 from $500 to $1,200—again over the veto of Mr. Truman.

CORRUPTION

Virtue is not the private possession of any one political party. We will always have people in government who cheat, who use their influence for crooked ends, or who hedge on virtue while not actually crossing the line into criminal behavior.

The Teapot Dome scandal occurred during a Republican administration. But the moment the scandal broke, the President suspended the Attorney General and put two men, one a Democrat and one a Republican, to work to ferret out every bit and piece of that scandal for all to see.

A comparable scandal broke during the Truman administration. Mr. Truman denounced the investigators. He denied any possibility of scandal. When the investigators finished their work, 88 members of the Treasury Department were suspended for accepting bribes; 40 suspended for embezzling Government funds; 51 failed to pay their own taxes; 3 were indicted for operating a blackmail ring; and 2 were convicted of operating as bookies in their tax offices. A total of 101 indictments were obtained for Federal crimes, including a former Commissioner of Internal Revenue, an Assistant Commissioner of Internal Revenue, a Chief of the Alcohol Tax Unit, a top official heading the Income Tax Division in the Department of Justice, and a top White House aide.

In the present administration, a new cloud has arisen out of the office of one Bobby Baker, Democratic majority clerk of the Senate, the man who was described by the then majority leader, Lyndon B. Johnson, as his "strong right arm." We had an investigation of this scandal. It was the sort of investigation where the minority members of the committee were permitted to call not a single witness. The investigation of the scandal has become itself a scandal—and it is clearly a Democratic scandal.

SUMMARY

That is the record of the 20th century. In its 34 years in power the Republican Party has worked to build this country into a magnificent power in the world. It has exercised wise fiscal prudence. It fought to give the taxpayer every possible chance to keep enough of his money to give himself and his family a decent living in the most prosperous nation in history. It fought, too, to provide the jobs for the people of America. It worked with clean hands, and when soiled hands attempted to move into government, the hands were driven out with dispatch.

Above all, it did not give to the children and their children a legacy of debt that will linger for generations to come.

For the other party—the record speaks for itself.

THE HONORABLE WALTER NORBLAD

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, the facts of any man's life may be recounted in a very brief space, but the grief which his passing leaves in the hearts of those who knew and admired him cannot really be expressed at all.

I had the great pleasure of knowing the Honorable WALTER NORBLAD, of the First District of Oregon, as a colleague whose integrity, warmth, humor, goodwill, and ability were outstanding among men noted for the possession of these qualities. Moreover, he was my neighbor in the halls of the House Office Building where we occupied adjoining offices. I find it difficult to come to terms with the realization that I shall now never be able to greet him as he walks along the corridor to his office, see his friendly smile, or hear again his cheerful hello.

He was the son of a former Governor of the State of Oregon, and served in the Oregon Legislature from 1935 to 1939. He was born in Escanaba, Mich., and was reared in Astoria. He attended the New Mexico Military Institute, the University of Oregon, and the University of Oregon Law School. He pursued graduate legal studies at the Harvard Law School, and was admitted to the Oregon bar in 1932.

During the war he served as a combat intelligence officer in the Eighth Air Force, and was awarded the Air Medal. Returning to civilian life, he was elected to the 79th Congress in a special election in January of 1946, and was reelected to each succeeding Congress.

He strived unceasingly as a member of the Armed Services Committee to assure the taxpayers of America strong and efficient military and naval forces. His constant concern for the well-being of his devoted constituents was always apparent. His high reputation among his fellow Members of the House of Representatives testified to his high competence as a legislator and his character as as man and a friend.

WALTER NORBLAD will be sorely missed in the Halls of Congress by his colleagues, his constituents, and his loyal and faithful office staff. Sharing their grief, I extend my deepest sympathy to his loved ones, his wife, his son, his sister, and his mother.

ELLIS ARNALL—THE COASTAL STATES EXCITER

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FLYNT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, in the August 1964 issue of the Southern Insurance magazine, Louie E. Throgmorton has sketched a "Profile" worthy of preservation. The article entitled, "Ellis Arnall—the Coastal States Exciter" is more than justified in the tribute it pays to such a magnanimous personality.

Ellis Arnall's efforts as chairman of the board of the Coastal States Life Insurance Co. of Georgia, which could tell the story of that company's success, are inspiring in themselves. But delving further into the career of this resourceful man, we discover that his accomplishments do not begin nor will they likely end here. As former State assemblyman, attorney general, and Georgia's youngest Governor at age 36, Ellis Arnall's versatility, ingenuity, and tireless energy bespeak the qualities of a great American.

The synthesis of these qualities with a gentle nature and a profound sense of fair play exemplify the ideal American success story and serve as a "confirmation of our American way of life."

A man of dynamic leadership, faultless integrity, and inestimable accomplishment, Ellis Arnall stands a man among men.

It is with pleasure that I recommend the reading of this article and include it as an extension of my remarks:

ELLIS ARNALL—THE COASTAL STATES EXCITER

(By Louie E. Throgmorton)

The story of the career of Ellis Gibbs Arnall, chairman of the board of the Coastal States Life, approaches pure fiction. When his full story is told by posterity, and placed in a book, the librarian will be tempetd to file it under fiction. Running along, side by side, is the story of the Coastal States Life of Georgia. The birth and growth of CSL is downright fascinating. This exciting company, with the big thrust now in progress, overcame mountaintop difficulties. Claude Poindexter, its beloved organizer and president, had to make many decisions and properly exercise the various options of difficulties. The breakthrough came and the seat belt sign is down, despite the fact that Claude and CSL are ever climbing higher.

I have been asked often, "What is the difference between company A and company B?" My answer, after years of participation and observation is people. The people who run them. Their imagination, their spunk, dedication, and loyalty, plus their honesty and beneficent purpose, and chiefly their ability to make things happen.

Ellis Arnall and Claude Poindexter fit this formula. Mr. Poindexter is the big dynamo that generates the power, and I like to think Ellis, the exciter needed in every powerplant. These two great men are the David and Jonathan of the insurance world. Their paths crossed early in their business life. Claude was a furniture dealer and doubling as a funeral director, with a charter to write burial insurance. The story of how he acquired the insurance idea will come in another essay. Ellis was the attorney general for good old Georgia. Ellis grew up in Newnan, Ga., and Claude's business was in Baxley, Ga. Their meeting was at opposite ends of a long table, while trying to work out the ragged details necessary to the granting of a charter. Later the charter was granted, signalizing the beginning of the present Coastal States Life.

Later, in 1953 and 1955, Ellis Arnall and Claude Poindexter really teamed up. Mr. Arnall was president of Dixie Life of Newnan, and Claude approached him on merging the two companies. At last this happened. Ellis became chairman of the board and Claude, chief officer and president. This partnership has been perfect, and harmony has existed over the years. Their singular talents are dedicated to giving Georgia and the South another financial giant.

I have known former Governor Arnall for 20 years. I consider him a genius. The things he has accomplished astound me. All the Who's Who in America list his accomplishments, and I can say I don't understand how one man could and still does accomplish so much. He has a card index mind. He can study a difficult situation and come up with a workable solution. He is a prober after facts. It seems to me that Shakespeare had his caliber in mind when he wrote, "His life is so gentle and all the elements so mixed in him that nature might stand up and say to the world, here is a man."

Mr. Arnall and his career represent a confirmation of our American way of life. He has verified that America offers "meritoracy" at its best. (Meritoracy means the power of merit.) His hometown of Newnan is a friendly Georgia city, with the usual signs upon the edge of the city reading Newnan, Ga., city limits. Of course this is physical. The human "unlimits" of at least three native sons have influenced America and the world. William (Bill) Terry, star first baseman and later manager of the New York Giants, is from Newnan, and internationally known Baptist minister, Dr. Landrum P. Leavall, and Ellis Arnall. These three went beyond the city limits. However, Ellis so loved Newnan he refuses to leave, and so he commutes to Atlanta where he has an enormous law office.

HE KNEW WHERE AND WHAT

Early in life Ellis knew where he wanted to go. He also knew what it would take for him to attain it. As a kid he wasted no time. Even on trips with the Newnan football team he was observing. He learned much from his grandfather and from his retail groceryman father. Here is where Ellis began to grasp the wonder of business. Ellis had an urge for politics, after getting out of college. He opened up as a lawyer in his hometown. He could charm a dog off a meat wagon, and everybody loved him. So he lit out to test his political possibilities by running for his county's seat in the Assembly of Georgia. He won this. However, he wanted to be the speaker pro tem. He was barely age 26 and looked even younger. He filled his jalopy with white gas and buttonholed every representative in every county of that large State. This mission was accomplished. He made good. Natural ability was demonstrated and the call to run for the office of attorney general came. At age 32 he was elected. These 4 years gave Ellis rich experiences and confidence. As any boy would dream, the office of governor beckoned. Believe it or not, at age 36 Georgia had its youngest Governor.

His work as attorney general must be reckoned with. It was here that he began to give to Georgia the impetus to expand. The big thrust came because of Mr. Arnall's courage to fight and break the vicious hold the northern railroads had on the South at that time. Ellis as the attorney general began to break these chains and tear down the barriers. Space won't permit to tell the real story of this impact, so I recommend buying a copy of "The Shore Dimly Seen" and read some startling prophecies made by Mr. Arnall that have now been accomplished. You might also get a copy of "What the People Want." Through his effort, the State of Georgia became the empire state of the South. His beloved Atlanta was the first city of the South to reach the million mark. The one big accomplishment of the attorney general and his staff was the crushing of the stranglehold the northern railroads had upon the South through the rate structures. This fight, all the way to the Supreme Court, is known, as the "Northern Railroad Conspiracy." I hope the next face carved on the famed Stone Mountain will be that of Ellis Arnall, in just tribute to his zeal in fighting for his State and the South.

Alex DeTocqueville wrote many years ago this accurate statement: "It is true that around every man a fatal circle is drawn, beyond which he cannot pass, but within that range he is powerful and free." Within his own circle Ellis used his own slingshot to fight his Goliath.

Here is a man fully endowed with the knowledge of our constitutional law, the American dream and the ability to get results, working with and through others. He has a sense of fairness and always rises above small politics. He, to me, is the perfect example of what a President of our country must have. I sincerely wish he could have been. However, he had two strikes against him; he was born in the South. All Ellis would have had to do, to make a great President, was just take the blueprint of what he did for Georgia while its Governor.

WIPED OUT STATE DEBT

Here are some of his accomplishments. The State was debt free for the first time in over a hundred years—in spite of this he operated the State on a budget of less than $50 million a year—and managed to leave $34 million in surplus. He raised teachers' salaries by a third, he eliminated the poll tax and lowered the voting age to 18. He started the University of Georgia on a building program that is still going on.

Mr. Arnall, along with Claude Poindexter, is giving the Coastal States Life the same type of dynamic leadership. Their results are the talk of the insurance world just now. The Coastal States Life is in the center of the stage and the spotlight of outside interest is upon it. Stockholders are in every State of the Union and in eight foreign countries. Insurance in force is within shaking-hands distance of one-half billion. Their goal is a billion by 1970, and I predict this will be reached by late 1968 or early 1969; I don't see how they can miss. Oh, to be 39 again and grab a hold of the wings of the morning of the Coastal States Life, and flop around the world. Talk about new frontiers: Here is one.

I think of Browning's verse when I think of the future of Coastal States Life:

Grow old along with me,
The best is yet to be
The last for which the first was made.

I have but one word for Ellis Arnall—the word is magnanimity. He is gracious at all times, and he, like Will Rogers, never met a man he didn't like. I have been with Mr. Arnall on many occasions and never heard him speak ill of any man, even his toughest political opponents.

THE ARNALL FAMILY

The family is God's masterpiece. The Arnall family is a masterpiece. His wife, the beautiful Mildred DeLaney Siemons, is his inspiration and partner. Reams could be written about his delightful daughter Alice. "Princess Alice," as she is known, has won beauty contests and about every honor available at Hollins College in Virginia. Alice is now a student there. She was born in the Governor's Mansion at Atlanta while her daddy was Governor. Her visit there recently was the subject of a story in the Sunday magazine of the Atlanta Constitution of September 13, 1963. My favorite writer of the Sunday magazine, Doris Lockerman, did a swell job. Princess Alice has beauty, charm, and brains. This combination will never spoil her. Her daddy may.

Their son Alvan is equally famous. He—now in his twenties—is assistant attorney general of Georgia, but right now is doing a stint for his country. He is a Marine and a first lieutenant.

Arthur Mayer of the Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer Motion Picture Co., drank this toast to Ellis—"To Ellis Arnall with profound admiration for his services not only to the movies—but to all phases of American life—with admiration and affection."

What a Supreme Court Justice Ellis Arnall would make. I know he would rank along with Oliver Wendell Holmes. He has the daring of a Ty Cobb, the poise of a Bobby Jones, the love of Georgia of a Margaret Mitchell, and the sportsmanship of a Bobby Dodd. In addition, he has the warm prose power of a Grantland Rice. For Ellis Arnall, the family of the Coastal States Life is thankful, and the life insurance industry is a little taller because of him.

THE LATE HONORABLE WALTER NORBLAD, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF OREGON

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. Green] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. House of Representatives has lost a most able and intelligent legislator with the death of Representative Walter Norblad, and I have lost a personal friend. It is, therefore, with great sadness that I rise today to pay tribute to our late colleague whose death deprived the First Oregon Congressional District of the dedicated and hard-working Representative. Since 1946, Walter Norblad has been relentless and unceasing in his determination to discover how to serve best the interest of his district, the State of Oregon, and the country.

I wish to speak of Walter Norblad as a friend and colleague—a kind and valued colleague. When I first came to the House in January 1955, I found in Walter Norblad a person who was more than anxious to be of assistance and to share with me the wealth of experience that was his. We worked together on many occasions on Oregon projects and programs and consulted frequently on problems which were common to the Northwest. During these last 10 years, as I came to know him better, I came to admire him more and more for his fairness and his intellectual courage.

He always showed great kindness to all. I have never known him to utter an unkind remark about another person, which is indeed a rare quality in public service. He always looked for and emphasized the positive qualities in his friends and colleagues. In going about his congressional duties, Walter Norblad carried himself with affability, warmth, and humor. The observation that courage is grace under pressure is most suited to Walter Norblad.

His able service on the Armed Services Committee is known to all. There he was second ranking Republican and there he dedicated his efforts to make sure that this would be a safe and secure Nation. Many, many people will miss him, but one group of citizens which will particularly miss Walter Norblad will be those members of the armed services whose welfare and well-being were a constant concern of his.

This summer, Walter was stricken with a heart condition. He was urged to slow his pace and let the burdens of the office be carried by other colleagues and members of his most capable congressional office staff. But Walter Norblad had a restive spirit and his dedication and concern drew him back to his congressional duties.

Now he is gone. We shall miss him in Oregon; we shall miss him in the House and I shall miss him as a friend.

I wish to express my sorrow to his immediate family; his wife, Elizabeth, his son, Albin Walter, and his mother. I hope that they will find comfort and solace in knowing that Walter Norblad's good work has literally affected the lives, the future, and the welfare of countless individuals in our land.

The editor of the Oregon Journal expressed very well the sentiments of countless Oregon citizens when he wrote on September 22:

[From the Portland (Oreg.) Journal, Sept. 22, 1964]

Walter Norblad Sound Legislator

U.S. Representative Walter Norblad, who served more than 18 years in the Congress of the United States, was a man who "wore well" with the folks at home and with his colleagues in the legislative halls.

A good share of his life, following his admission to the Oregon bar in 1932, was in public service. He served in the Oregon Legislature from 1935 to 1939, was in military service from 1942 to 1945, and has represented the First Oregon District in Congress since January 11, 1946.

Norblad took a dim view of the lightning and thunder type of political oratory, and he was seldom in the midst of hot controversy, but he was alert and sympathetic to the needs and wishes of his constituents. He took a special interest in military affairs, and was the second ranking Republican on the Armed Services Committee. On matters affecting the military security of the United States in the cold war, he was considered one of the best informed men in Congress.

Although Norblad was the only Republican in the Oregon congressional delegation, he concentrated more on serving his State than on partisan politics, usually being in what might be called the moderate camp. The State has lost a veteran legislator who never lost his sense of balance or sense of values in the heat and swirl of political battles.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be inserted in the Record immediately following my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Marsh). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Yes; I would be very happy to yield to my distinguished colleague, the majority leader from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked to learn that my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Oregon, WALTER NORBLAD, had passed away. WALTER and I served together almost from the beginning of our careers in the House of Representatives. He was my dear friend over the years.

He was a distinguished Member of the House who represented his constituency and the Nation with ability and dedication. His talents won him the respect of his colleagues; his fineness and gentility won him their affection.

I had no idea that WALTER's health was not good. I have never heard him complain. The last time I talked with him he appeared to be in the best of spirits and in good health. His youthful appearance belied his years, even though he was still in the prime of life. His death was a shock and leaves a void in this House. I shall miss him.

I extend my heartfelt sympathy to his loved ones.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I am very happy to yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with the gentlewoman from Oregon in paying my respects to our late colleague, WALTER NORBLAD.

Mr. Speaker, it is very difficult for me to come to a realization that WALTER NORBLAD is no longer with us. WALTER and I were the closest of friends. Our families were close. We enjoyed many wonderful times together.

For the last 10 years or so we have also been neighbors, living in the same area.

I suppose if there is any one adjective that could be used to describe WALTER, it is that he was an extremely kind man. The gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN] has referred to this fact.

In all the years and in all the times I have been with WALTER and we visited together, I never heard him say an unkind thing about any of his colleagues or any person he knew. He always looked for the best in people.

WALTER was a conscientious Member of this Congress; he was a conscientious citizen. He tried always to do what he thought was not only best for his country, best for his district, but best as far as the individual citizen was concerned.

WALTER was a warm person. He loved people. He liked to get into conversations with perfect strangers just to be able to visit with them and talk to them and express, as it were, mutual feelings on various subjects.

It is difficult for me to speak with respect to him, because I feel his departure most deeply, but I must say that WALTER will live in my memory as long as I am on this earth because to me he was one of my finest and closest friends.

My sympathy and that of Mrs. Byrnes goes to his wife, Elizabeth, his son Albin, whom we have seen grow from a small boy to a young man, and to WALTER's mother.

We know that words cannot heal the grief that they have, but at least the knowledge that all who knew him loved him and feel a great loss in his passing, I hope may be of some solace to them.

We have lost an able colleague. I have lost a very dear friend.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana, our minority leader.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, when I first came to the Congress quite some time ago I had already been familiar with the name of Norblad in the great State of Oregon. After WALTER came here I came to know him very, very well, and I considered him to be one of the most able, honest, trustworthy and conscientious Members of this body. He was my good friend and, as I am sure he understood, I was his friend. He came to this body with a fine background, a man of high educational qualifications who had served his country in World War II with distinction.

So, in his passing this body has lost one of its truly distinguished Members, and I have lost a great personal friend. I mourn his passing. I wish he could still be with us. We all appreciate that while he died much too young, none of us determines when the inevitable shall come about. This is something all of us must understand. So to his family I extend my heartfelt sympathy in the hope that they will gain consolation from the knowledge that WALTER NORBLAD's life and career and his accomplishments will stand as a real hallmark of achievement of which those who survive him may well be proud.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join the gentlewoman from Oregon in paying tribute to one of the real great men that we have had the privilege of serving with here in the House of Representatives.

WALTER NORBLAD was a very close friend of mine, and I feel I am the prime beneficiary of that friendship. For several years we were neighbors in the House Office Building, and on several occasions he and I have had occasion to spend several days together in connection with our official duties in places other than Washington.

I concur in the splendid statements that the gentlewoman from Oregon has made about his traits of character. Certainly no man was more trustworthy, more diligent, or more able than was WALTER NORBLAD.

It was always a happy occasion for the people in my office that often in the late afternoons, as WALTER would be leaving his office he would come by and make some pleasant remark to the people working in the office.

He was in his last illness in the hospital when an accident occurred in my own family. While out in Denver, Colo., I was quite pleasantly surprised to receive a letter handwritten by WALTER from his hospital room expressing concern about one who really was not the subject of as much concern as was he.

To me, this gentler side of this great man will be one of the many things that will remain in my mind and memory and will be the cause of a feeling of great appreciation for having had the privilege of being associated with the late gentleman from Oregon, WALTER NORBLAD.

Mrs. Whitener joins me in extending deepest sympathy to the family of our departed friend and colleague.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS].

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I, too, was terribly distressed to learn of the passing of our colleague, WALTER NORBLAD. I was in Illinois when the news came to me, and although I knew he had been ill I had hoped that the good Lord would restore him to good health.

WALT NORBLAD to me was one of the finest gentleman I ever knew. As a member of the Committee on Armed Services we sat side by side over the many, many years he was privileged to serve in this Congress. WALT NORBLAD took an intense interest in his work on the Armed Services Committee. He was devoted to the purpose of having the finest national defense our country could possibly have. He was always diligent in those things which he felt would be in the best interests of his country, his State, and his district.

WALT NORBLAD was one of those fellows I could always say, "I am proud to call him my friend"; lovable, fair, honest, honorable, and objective. As time goes on I am sure he will be appreciated more and more by those he was privileged to represent.

To his fine wife and son I extend my sincere sympathy in this time of their bereavement.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER].

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I join the gentlewoman from Oregon in mourning the passing of WALT NORBLAD. I had the privilege of knowing him when he served on Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee under the able leadership of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. TOLLEFSON]. At that time we recognized Mr. NORBLAD as being a fine Member of Congress. I have always recalled the pleasant relationship that took place between Mr. TOLLEFSON, Mr. NORBLAD, and myself. I regretted it when he left the committee because I saw him serve faithfully and loyally there. I watched him on the floor of the House and observed him in the duties he was assigned to later. I noticed he was always diligent, thorough, and fair. It is my opinion that his friendships existed on both sides of the aisle, as has been demonstrated here this afternoon. I shall miss him greatly, because I considered him an outstanding Member of this body. I regret very much his passing, and express my deepest sympathy to his family.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, with the passing of WALTER NORBLAD, I like many others in the House of Representatives lost one of our closest personal friends. He had many, many friends on both sides of the aisle. Everyone who knew him thought WALTER NORBLAD was a wonderful fellow.

I knew WALTER intimately for 16 years. During that period of time his family and our family were very close. We enjoyed a great many family get togethers over the years. WALTER and his wonderful wife were the godparents of our youngest child, Susan who adored him. Our families used to get together quite frequently for the holidays, particularly on Christmas Eve. Their fine son, Albin, was always a great favorite with our children. Our whole family lost a real friend with WALTER's untimely passing.

But aside from the close associations that our families had, during my contacts with WALTER in the House of Representatives, I learned to appreciate what a fine, outstanding job he did in carrying out his responsibilities in representing his constituents in the State of Oregon. He was not a flamboyant type. He was not the kind who made many speeches in the House Chamber. Nevertheless, he did his job and did it most effectively. Because of his long service on the Committee on Armed Services he became an authority on military matters and was highly respected by our military leaders for his fairness, his sound judgment, and devotion to a strong national defense. When the chips were down and when the hard, controversial issues had to be resolved, there was never any failure on his part to stand up and be counted.

I know, we all know, that during the time that he served here, almost 20 years, the people of his congressional district in Oregon were most ably represented by a mighty fine person who took very seriously his responsibilities as their Representative. His constituents, the State of Oregon, and our country have profited from his efforts. WALTER NORBLAD will be greatly missed.

I was shocked to get the news of WALTER's passing. Unfortunately, he had been ill for several months prior to his death. We all hoped—we all prayed—we all thought that he was making a recovery. He has left us but we have countless memories of a wonderful person. He has left an indelible mark on each of us personally and on the House as a whole.

In closing I wish to say from the bottom of my heart that our whole family extends to his wonderful wife, Elizabeth, and to his fine son, Albin, our deepest sympathies and condolences.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DUNCAN].

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I learned within hours of the passing of my friend, WALTER NORBLAD, while I was deep in the wild country of the lower Rogue River a week ago Sunday. How the sad word got into that country devoid as it is of telephone or telegraph connections, I do not know. But I do know that every Oregonian who brought me this news was as touched and as saddened as I was by the passing of my friend, WALTER NORBLAD.

There is no one who was any more hospitable and who was any more kind to my family and me when we first came to the Congress 2 years ago than was WALTER and his wife, Elizabeth.

Different political affiliations did not and could not dampen the very genuine friendship and respect which I came to feel for WALTER NORBLAD.

I will miss him and so will his colleagues in the House who knew him as an honest, compassionate and dedicated public servant incapable of malice or rancor.

Because he had a deep and rugged inner sense of character, because he was unafraid of the truth, because he always kept his word, and because he understood and fulfilled his full responsibilities as a public official and as a man, I am proud to have known WALTER NORBLAD and to have been able to call him my friend. Many there are who feel he would still be with us had he been willing to take the time from his congressional duties to rest and restore his health. But all of us saw him day after day on the floor of the House which claimed so many years of his life and finally his life, itself.

He, as his father before him, leaves behind a long record of service to his State and to his Nation. His family's loss is shared by all who knew him. My wife and I extend to his wife, to his son, and to his mother our deepest sympathy.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, WALTER NORBLAD was my good friend. We lived in the same neighborhood in Washington, D.C., for many years, and our only sons were playmates in grade school.

I recall that last July, before I went to San Francisco to attend the Republican Convention, I received a little note from WALTER, who was then in the hospital, expressing the hope that I would look up his son Albin, who was a member of the Oregon delegation—I believe the youngest Republican delegate attending the convention. I did see Albin and we had a delightful visit.

WALTER NORBLAD loved his boy, his only child. On many occasions, he and I discussed the welfare of his son and my own son. Our two boys ripened our friendship of many years.

Furthermore, WALT NORBLAD's office was on my floor in the Longworth Building, and we have had rather an intimate acquaintance throughout our joint service in the Congress.

WALT NORBLAD was a good man who was kind and considerate of his fellows. He had a pleasing personality and was well liked by all who knew him. WALT kept in constant touch with his constituents, and I often marveled at the way mail poured out of his office to the folks back home. WALT was a good citizen and a great American who served well his day and generation. Mrs. Hoeven joins me in extending our deepest sympathy to WALTER's wife Elizabeth, and his son Albin.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I yield to my colleague from Oregon.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, WALTER NORBLAD's untimely death was a heavy blow to all of us who knew him, who loved and admired him, and who were proud to call him a friend. Our State and our Nation have suffered a great loss.

WALTER NORBLAD had those qualities of personal warmth, sincere good will, and a generous concern for his fellow men that made him loved and revered by all who came in contact with him. He had an unusual capacity for genuine friendship—and went out of his way to make the path of his fellow men a bit easier. From the time I came to Congress, I always found him ready with a helping hand.

Only one other Oregonian served longer in the House than WALTER NORBLAD. WALTER came here in 1946 serving quietly and effectively for 18 years. He sought neither headlines nor controversy, preferring to live at peace with his fellow men, handling his problems on a personal basis.

WALTER NORBLAD never resorted to narrow partisanship. He was respected and admired on both sides of the aisle.

From the time Mrs. Ullman and I first met them, Elizabeth and WALTER NORBLAD have been our good friends. Their genuine warmth of heart, their open candor, and their total lack of affectation were all in the finest traditions of the beautiful western Oregon area that WALTER represented.

To Elizabeth and their son, Al, Mrs. Ullman and I offer our heartfelt condolences. Their loss is a heavy one and words have little power to ease their burden. May God bring comfort to their hearts in these difficult hours.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad privilege today to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to a departed brother who served so long and so well in the House of Representatives. I well remember when WALTER NORBLAD came to Congress in the special election following the death in office of James Wheaton Mott on November 12, 1945. In the past score of years, I had come to know WALTER well and to admire him greatly.

He was like a breath of fresh air out of the West. He was immensely effective in the representation of his district and of his constituency. He had an enormous capacity and gift for making friends.

So, it is not surprising that so many fine things are being said of WALTER today and have been said of him in the days following his death—compliments and tributes like that paid him by Joe McCaffrey, of ABC, on his broadcast last week; reassurances like that of the splendid sermon delivered by the Chaplain of the Senate, Dr. Frederick B. Harris, at the services held for WALTER in Alexandria, Va.

It was again my sad privilege to join the funeral delegation which attended the service held in the First Presbyterian Church of Astoria, Oreg. There I heard the Reverend L. E. Knoll, pastor of that church, deliver another fine sermon. Dr. Knoll included in his sermon two poems which were favorites of the Norbald family and which were often quoted by them. And, because it is strangely true that the poetry which attracts families is reflective of their mores and morals and explains so much of their conduct, I would like to repeat these poems here:

HE GIVETH MORE

(By Annie Johnson Flint)

He giveth more grace when the burdens grow greater,
He sendeth more strength when the labors increase;
To added affliction He addeth His mercy,
To multiplied trials, His multiplied peace.

When we have exhausted our store of endurance,
When our strength has failed ere the day is half done,
When we reach the end of our hoarded resources,
Our Father's full giving is only begun.

His love has no limit, His grace has no measure,
His power no boundary known unto men;
For out of His infinite riches in Jesus
He giveth and giveth and giveth again.

Dr. Knoll concluded his sermon with this poem:

SOMETIME WE'LL UNDERSTAND

(By Maxwell N. Cornelius)

Not now, but in the coming years,
It may be in the better land,
We'll read the meaning of our tears,
And there, sometime, we'll understand.

Then trust in God thro' all the days;
Fear not, for He doth hold thy hand;
Though dark the way, still sing and praise,
Sometime, sometime, we'll understand.

WALTER has left us, it is true, but in the hearts of all of us who knew him, there remains a warmth that is a living monument to his memory. Mrs. Horan joins me in extending our deepest and most sincere sympathies to his widow, Elizabeth, and to their son, Albin Walter III.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. TOLLEFSON].

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from Oregon for the very fine tribute that she has paid to our deceased colleague, WALTER NORBLAD. I think she has expressed most accurately the sentiments of all of us who have known WALTER NORBLAD over the years. He had many friends in the House, and I am proud to have been counted as one of them. I am sure that his people will miss him tremendously. They recognized him as one of the most able Members of the House of Representatives. Through his death they have lost a great spokesman for their cause. The House of Representatives has lost a splendid Member. We will miss him in the years ahead. I counted him as one of my first friends in the House of Representatives. We officed close together, and I have always found him a most helpful, most considerate, and cooperative Member of the House of Representatives. I shall personally miss him. My family and I knew his wife and son very well. Mrs. Tollefson and I desire to extend to his wife and to his son Albin and to WALTER's mother, Mrs. Norblad, our deepest sympathies.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I grieve the passing of my esteemed friend the honorable WALTER NORBLAD. My heart goes out to Mrs. Norblad and to their fine son and their entire family. May the same God who called WALTER to his heavenly home give his loved ones strength to bear the great loss they have suffered. God rest his soul.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES].

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to join with my colleagues in expressing our sympathy to Mrs. Norblad and Albin and our sense of loss at the passing of our colleague, WALTER NORBLAD. WALTER NORBLAD was a blithe spirit. Meeting him on the House floor always made the day seem brighter. We who have served with him in the House feel much better because we have known him.

He was an effective and capable Member of this body. He had a great love for his constituents, for his colleagues in the House and a great regard for the House as an institution.

After WALTER's first illness, he came back to the House to vote. In fact, he spent a lot of time here. One day I said to him, "WALTER, why do you not adjourn? I do not know when the House is going to adjourn, but why do you not adjourn?" And he said, "I have thought of it, but I am sure that I would worry if I were away. I think I am better off here. This is where I like to be." And this is where he was right up to the time of his final illness.

The devotion to duty which he exemplified, the fine work which he did as a member of the very important Committee on Armed Services, the duties which he performed not only as a Member of the House but as a Representative of his people in the Nation's Capital, all have endeared him to the people of the Nation, to the people of his State, the people of his district and his colleagues in the House. The people of the country have lost, in the passing of WALTER NORBLAD, a great legislator, a great friend, a fine American, and an articulate exponent of our way of life.

Mrs. Rhodes joins me in extending our deepest sympathy to Elizabeth and Albin and to the constituents of WALTER NORBLAD in Oregon, because I know they are grieving for his passing as deeply as are any of his other friends.

May God rest his soul.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. BATTIN].

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Speaker, today is a sad one for me. Today we pay our respect to a departed friend. WALTER NORBLAD was one of the first Members of Congress that I had the opportunity to meet when I arrived here in Washington. He was quick to extend a welcome hand and continued to do so the rest of his life.

Many of those who knew him and had the pleasure to call him friend will find a great void in their lives. I was a neighbor of WALTER and my children used to run in and out of his home. When we told them WALTER had passed away their comment was "I am sure he has gone to heaven." This I am sure is correct.

We cannot say enough but from my personal point of view, my life is far richer from having known him.

To his wife and family my wife and I extend our sincere sympathy.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES].

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, we do not know what the hereafter holds. However, I must say to the gentlewoman from Oregon that if in that "great beyond" it is possible to still observe the activities on earth, our departed colleague, WALTER NORBLAD, would be more than pleased with the tribute the gentlewoman paid him in her opening remarks. I think perhaps she summed up what all of us think. We all recall at such a time when we lose a colleague, that passage, "By their deeds ye shall know them."

Mr. Speaker, one of the finest things that I have heard about WALTER was the comment that was made by those wives who knew WALTER and his charming wife Elizabeth so well.

Mr. Speaker, I recall that shortly after we met WALTER my own wife said, "Isn't he always so nice to Elizabeth," a great quality in every man.

Also, having observed WALTER's association with his son Albin over 14 years it became very apparent the great inspiration the father was to the son. I remember out at a little cottage on Scientists' Cliffs when Albin was just a lad, he had purchased, probably with the help of his father, his first .22 rifle. He came out into the woods to try it out. I shall never forget WALTER saying to him, "Albin, that is not the way to do it. You will hurt yourself." He was just as gentle as he could be, without a word of criticism. He showed his son the art of handling that weapon.

As the years went by he became an inspiration to WALTER, and as was mentioned earlier, WALTER made certain that those of us who were going to be attending the Republican Convention in San Francisco carried his personal message down to Albin. He said to me, "When you see the boy, tell him the old man is all right." He knew his condition was of concern and worry to Albin.

Then, Mr. Speaker, right up to the very last WALTER was worried about his obligations—what he thought was an obligation to his colleagues. Many of you know we have an organization here in the Congress which was organized before I came here, among the Republican Members, that meets once a week to discuss legislation and various political situations throughout the country. It is called the "Chowder and Marching Society." WALTER seemed to have a premonition that something was going to happen to him before our next meeting on Friday before he died. His staff people called me out in Akron, Ohio, and asked if I could take the meeting, that WALTER did not believe he would be up to it, it being his turn. I came back to Washington. We did not meet. Instead we attended the funeral here the day before.

But, Mr. Speaker, up until the very last WALTER was concerned about what he felt was his obligation. Of course, all of us, knowing his condition, realized that WALTER had no obligation, but not WALTER. Then, too, when one is recognized by those who know him best, those are the comments that really count.

Mr. Speaker, WALTER was very close to the editor of our Capitol Hill newspaper, "Roll Call." I believe the tribute that Mr. Yudain paid to WALTER in his editorial, commenting on WALTER's death, is most appropriate because here is a publication read by his colleagues and written by a man who had known WALTER for a number of years:

> WALTER NORBLAD
>
> A man involved in national politics for 18 years is bound to incur the enmity of some of those who share his path. Yet, it seems that WALTER NORBLAD was a friend of everyone who was privileged to know him. His passing over the weekend brought sadness to the Hill community—from messenger boys to congressional leadership.
>
> WALTER NORBLAD was a Republican, but his personality was such that most of his friends and acquaintances regarded him as a fine fellow first, a partisan second. His many acts of kindness to staffers and his colleagues will long be remembered. His geniality and his intense interest in congressional life and the game of politics endeared him to all on the Hill.

It will be a long time before another WALTER NORBLAD comes along.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, we were all saddened to learn of the sudden death of our beloved colleague from Oregon, WALTER NORBLAD. He was honored and respected by all who knew him. He was friendly and understanding. You never had to worry about WALTER because he was always willing to cooperate.

We who had the privilege of knowing him through the many years he was a Member of this Congress knew that his heart was in the right place. It was my privilege to become well acquainted with him, as well as with many other people in Oregon who subsequently came to my district. The respect and honor we pay to him today is a small tribute to the sacrifice he has made for his country.

I extend my sympathy to his wife and son.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, WALTER NORBLAD and I came to the Congress in the same year. It was my privilege to serve on the Committee on Armed Services with WALTER, and to serve with him on the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. We traveled extensively together. I do not know where you get to know a man better than through travel with him in foreign lands. Although we did not see eye to eye on political matters, I had a warm feeling for him. You never found him partisan, you never found him mean. He was a congenial, likable fellow.

I know that we all miss him here, and I want to join other Members in extending to his good wife and family my sincerest sympathy.

Mr. HARDING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. HARDING. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for this opportunity to join the gentlewoman from Oregon in paying tribute to our late colleague WALTER NORBLAD. I know that I as a freshman Democratic Member of this body was truly amazed at the friendliness, helpfulness, and cooperative attitude the gentleman from Oregon displayed toward me. He was one of the first Members of the House to introduce himself and to make me feel at home in the House of Representatives.

I can say that on this side of the aisle I have never heard an unkind word said about WALTER NORBLAD. He was an outstanding statesman, a great American in every way in addition to being a devoted family man and friend. WALTER NORBLAD truly followed the teaching of Christ, "do unto others as you would have others do unto you."

I am sure we all were shocked to learn of his sudden passing, and I join the gentlewoman from Oregon and my many colleagues offering my condolences and sympathy to his family and loved ones.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, to the list of other dear friends who have been lost to us during the 88th Congress must now be added that of the Honorable WALTER NORBLAD, of the First District of Oregon. He served long and ably in the House of Representatives which he loved. Elected to the Congress in a special election in 1946, he soon became a valued friend and colleague.

As a member of the Armed Services Committee his labors were unceasing to protect the taxpayers of America from unjustified expenditures while preserving our military and naval strength at peak efficiency. His quick intelligence, his legal acumen, his patriotism, his great good will, all will be greatly missed. He served his district, the House of Representatives, and his country with great ability and devotion. The citizens of the First District of Oregon have lost a distinguished representative and the Members of the House of Representatives have lost a friend.

May I extend to his grieving wife and son my deepest sympathy. His career as a Member of this House was a credit to them and to those he represented here.

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, with heavy heart I join with those others of my colleagues who have noted the passing of our friend and colleague, WALTER NORBLAD, of Oregon.

In the past several months, all of us have been aware of the physical problem faced by our friend but, while I am sure he was equally aware of the severity of his condition, he did not dwell on it to us, nor allow it—insofar as he was able—to interfere with his fulfillment of those congressional responsibilities which he has carried out so well, here, since early in January of 1946. Throughout these past few weeks, WALTER NORBLAD—in the finest tradition of public service—was a "good soldier" just as he, in fact, was earlier in his career when he served with distinction in the 8th Air Force during World War II.

WALT was not, perhaps, one to give his friendship lightly. It was almost as if he wished to think about you, and watch you a bit, before he did so. But once he tendered you the greatest gift one man can give another, he did so without reservation—without qualification. I am grateful to have been his friend.

In thinking of WALT—and in seeking better in my own mind to assess the loss we all feel so deeply—I am reminded of these lines written by Sir William Osler, the noted Canadian physician who died in 1919:

> I have three personal ideals. One, to do the day's work well and not to bother about tomorrow. The second ideal has been to act the Golden Rule, as far as in me lay, toward my professional brethren and toward (those) committed to my care. And the third has been to cultivate such a measure of equanimity as would enable me to bear success with humility, the affection of my friends without pride, and to be ready when the day of sorrow and grief came to meet it with the courage befitting a man.

WALTER NORBLAD measured fully up to those ideals and, as a result, his contributions as a respected and beloved Member of this House cannot be assessed solely on the basis of service to his State and Nation, but in terms of what we, who now continue on, have learned from him, as well.

Mrs. Robison joins me in expressing our deepest sympathy and regrets to his wife, Elizabeth, and to their son, Albin Walter Norblad III.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, WALTER NORBLAD, was one of my closest and dearest friends in the House of Representatives. He was one of the first Members with whom I became acquainted in 1953 when I first entered the Congress and throughout the years our friendship grew. There were many occasions when his help and assistance to me was invaluable. He was always generous with his time and efforts in behalf of a colleague.

We all knew him to be an honest, courageous, and sincere Member of this body who was dedicated to the service of his beloved country. He gave great ingenuity, ability, and a devotion to duty unexcelled.

The Congress of the United States and his congressional district in Oregon will suffer as a result of the passing away of WALTER NORBLAD.

I join with my colleagues in expressing our grief and sympathy to his beloved family in this hour.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, we join today to pay tribute to the memory of our colleague, the Honorable WALTER NORBLAD, late a Representative from Oregon. We are privileged for having made the acquaintance of his congenial personality and having shared in his conscientious efforts as a fellow Member of the House of Representatives.

WALTER NORBLAD served long and well as Oregon's Representative from the first district, in the 79th Congress and in all of the succeeding ones thereafter.

His career as a Congressman was marked by the loyal dedication he accorded his position as the second ranking minority member of the Armed Services Committee. He devoted ceaseless time and energy to the cause of our national defense. The waste of public funds anywhere and their utilization for a better American was of continuing concern to him.

Mrs. Flynt joins me in extending our heartfelt condolences to Mrs. Norblad and to the members of his family.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, we gather today in the lengthening shadows of this session of Congress to honor a man who answered his last call of the House and has now adjourned to that place where the law and order of nature reign supreme.

WALTER NORBLAD was a man among men. He stood tall in these Chambers, with his height measured in dedication, performance, understanding and wisdom. His was a life of accomplishment that ended all too soon.

WALTER NORBLAD's memory will be with us for a long, long time. His example will remain for all of us to follow. While we will never again see him on this earth, his presence will be felt.

WALTER's work on the Armed Services Committee will long be remembered for its high quality and tireless effort. He ranked as number two minority member on that committee, working his way up the ladder through 18 years of service. It was an assignment for which WALTER was particularly fitted. He not only had the probing mind of a successful attorney, but had the understanding necessary to deal with the problems facing our Armed Forces. His own military career was distinguished. He served in World War II as a combat intelligence officer with the 8th Air Force and was awarded the air medal for combat flights.

WALTER NORBLAD's critical eye has saved the taxpayers of this Nation untold millions of dollars. His unique qualifications and talents enabled him to work for a strong America through wiser use of defense appropriations. He was critical of any and every segment of our Government that spent money on unnecessary frills and luxuries. He believed that the affairs of this Nation constituted a deadly serious business that should be conducted in the best interests of the people who paid the bills. We who remain might well follow his example.

The stories of WALTER NORBLAD's fearless encounters with high-ranking military men and bureaucrats are legion. He never criticized unduly, but expected top performance from the men who had been entrusted with our Nation's future.

The Nation knew what to expect from WALTER NORBLAD the very first year he served in the Congress, back in 1946. He startled all when he arrived at the House restaurant and dined on canned pork, dehydrated cranberries and lemonade made from canned lemon juice powder. All of the ingredients had been rescued from a Navy garbage dump, and that famous dinner was to prove WALTER's point that the Navy was discarding good food.

He criticized such things as too many high-ranking brass in relation to the number of men under them, of fashion coordinators being hired by the Air Force, using Marines in Hollywood motion-picture films, and a host of other situations where taxpayers dollars were being misused. But during all of this, he proved to be the servicemen's best friend, showing a genuine concern for the living conditions and future of our men and women in uniform.

In 1955, WALTER NORBLAD again startled the Nation by recommending that a post office be closed in his congressional district. Why? Because it was not needed. This was courage that is seldom seen in these Halls.

The conscience of the armed services and of this Congress has left our midst. But his record of accomplishment and his concern for America's future will live on.

I was one of WALTER NORBLAD's friends. To be his friend was an honor, a privilege, a rare experience that left you stronger for it. A bit of WALTER will live on through all of the people he has known, because you cannot have known him without absorbing at least a portion of his wisdom and philosophy.

His family will grieve him, and it is hoped that time will work its inexorable magic in easing the pain of parting. Perhaps the only words that seem appropriate for us and his family are that a rich life, fully lived, is in itself the only lasting monument to a man. WALTER NORBLAD was such a man.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, Representative WALTER NORBLAD was a highly respected gentleman whose analytical legal mind contributed much to the passage of worthwhile legislation in the public interest.

His decisions were based on realistic factual data and were unassailable. He was a friendly person who was interested in the problems of his State and the Nation.

He came to the Congress well prepared for his legislative duties having served from 1935 to 1939 in the legislature of his State.

His retiring nature belied his mental brilliancy. He was a rugged individualist who knew a man in his study of the human personality. His dedicated services to the Congress for nearly 20 years made him a proud Member. He enjoyed the confidence and trust of his constituents and his colleagues. He was a fair foe and a good friend.

His courage under fire was reflected in the honor conferred upon him by our Government—air medal—in World War II for services beyond the call of duty as a member of the 8th Air Force for combat flights—1942–45.

The members of the Illinois congressional delegation extend to his dear wife Elizabeth and his son Albin Walter, our deep sympathy and heartfelt condolences.

The State of Oregon has lost one of its most celebrated sons and the Nation a valiant patriot and distinguished lawmaker.

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in expressing deep sorrow over the untimely death of a good friend and associate, WALTER NORBLAD. He was an able legislator and dedicated public servant in the highest tradition of this body, and was never reluctant to draw on his fund of experience to help a younger Member define the right approach to a difficult problem.

A man of high principle, strong personal integrity, and extreme dedication to the work of the Congress, his fine personal qualities and rare capacity for clear-sighted leadership will be severely missed in the coming years.

We cannot hope to convey to his family the measure of sorrow we feel, but we can hope that they will gain some comfort from the knowledge that he will not be soon forgotten. I extend to them my most sincere condolences.

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, it was a real privilege for me to know and have the friendship of our departed colleague, WALTER NORBLAD.

I traveled with him on several occasions on official business and I found him to be a most congenial man—a pleasant companion.

Only a few weeks ago, he told me that he was going to stand for one more term in Congress and then retire. He planned to do so, knowing full well that his health was failing.

But, that is the kind of man WALTER NORBLAD was. He had high ideals and gave the most of himself for the preservation of his country and the goals he sought for it.

He had a thorough knowledge of the Armed Forces of the United States and served with considerable distinction on the Armed Services Committee.

Many times I sought his advice on military matters and always found his counsel extremely helpful.

WALTER NORBLAD was a great friend of military servicemen. He always had their welfare close to his heart and fought many legislative battles on their behalf.

We will miss WALTER NORBLAD. The State of Oregon and our country has lost a faithful servant.

To his family I offer my deepest sympathy. Although he has departed, his service to his country and his people will not be forgotten.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, the loss of WALTER NORBLAD is an unexpected tragedy, the more grievous because we have been deprived of a vigorous and capable colleague in the very prime of his life and patriotic service.

His death came toward the end of this long and brutally strenuous 88th Congress, and he might well be counted a victim of the heartbreaking demands these last two sessions have made on Members of the House. He was a man who did not spare himself in his dedicated work for his constituents and his Nation. Almost all of his life was given to public service, from the day he became a member of the Oregon Legislature nearly 30 years ago, through his heroic combat service with the 8th Air Force in World War II, up to the moment of his untimely death September 19.

We shall miss his keen and effective work in this Chamber, we shall miss his pleasant camaraderie. The State of Oregon and the Nation are deprived of the many additional years of his devotion we all assumed would be his.

My heartfelt condolences are extended to Mrs. Norblad and their son.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I rise today to pay my personal tribute to the memory of my departed friend, WALTER NORBLAD. I could scarcely believe my ears when, upon returning from a brief visit to North Carolina a week ago, I learned of his sudden passing. I, of course, knew that he had not been well but believed that he was recovering, as he himself told me on several recent occasions, and I had looked forward to the day when he would be fully restored to health and be his old self again. So the news of his tragic and sudden death was a shock from which I have not fully recovered.

One of the satisfactions of serving in Congress, in intimate association with other Members, is the opportunity it gives us to form close and lasting friendships. I had no better friend in this House than WALTER and this friendship, which began shortly after I first took my seat here in January of 1953, ripened as the years passed and became so close that I feel his loss as if he were a member of my own family.

And aside from my own personal sense of loss, I am thinking today of the loss that has been suffered by the people he so ably represented in Congress, and of the loss sustained by the State of Oregon and the Nation. It is a tragedy that one so able and distinguished in his service to district, State, and Nation should be stricken down at the height of his career and when he had so much to offer his people. It will not be easy to find one who can fill his shoes.

I am thinking also of the sadness that has come to his beloved wife, Elizabeth, and his son, Albin. As great as his loss is to us, it cannot begin to compare with the loss to them of a devoted husband and father. My heart goes out to them in sorrowful sympathy and with the prayer that God in His infinite mercy will help them bear up under their grief, and that a deep faith will help sustain them in this period of sorrow.

I join WALTER's many friends in mourning his passing.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, the tragic and untimely passing of the distinguished gentleman from the First District of Oregon has been deeply and personally felt by all those who had the opportunity of knowing him.

For the last 6 years I have had the good fortune of serving with him on the great House Committee on Armed Services. I particularly got to know him on several special investigating assignments.

WALTER NORBLAD was a distinguished lawyer, a great airman, and a devoted servant of his Oregon district. By some of us he will be especially remembered for his rare and delightful sense of humor. I shall miss him as will all his colleagues on the committee.

This country has lost a fine and conscientious legislator and we a good and able friend.

Mrs. Cohelan joins with me in extending heartfelt condolences to his wife and son.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in paying tribute to the Honorable WALTER NORBLAD, our esteemed colleague so recently departed.

He was indeed a most distinguished Member of this body, an outstanding American, and a good friend. It was a privilege to serve with him these many years in the House of Representatives. He was a man who served his district, his home State of Oregon, and our Nation with ability and distinction.

He will be remembered for his interest in the armed services and his efforts toward the welfare of servicemen. He will be remembered by his colleagues for his jovial, cheerful, and friendly attitude. He always had a kind word and warm greeting for all. He was considerate of and sympathetic to the problems of his fellow man.

My wife joins me in expressing deep sympathy to his wife and his son. May they derive some consolation from the thought that we all share in their deep grief.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my other colleagues in paying tribute to our departed colleague, the Honorable WALTER NORBLAD, of the State of Oregon.

During the 15 years I have served in the Congress I worked intimately with him on the House Armed Services Committee where we sat side by side. I have traveled with him on armed services inspections in many of the farflung areas of the world where our servicemen are stationed and, in some cases, fighting. He was a quiet man who spoke only infrequently but when he did so his thoughts were the reflection of a broad experience and a penetrating mind. He was a pleasant individual and I never heard him speak unkindly of any man. He was respected by those who served with him in the Congress and we shall miss his guidance as well as his congenial personality which made association with him a pleasing experience.

I wish there was something I could say to lessen the grief which has befallen his family. Perhaps they can take some comfort in the knowledge that while he lived he performed an outstanding service for the country which he loved and the deep affection in which he held his family is something of which they must be very, very proud.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to the life and service of our departed colleague, WALTER NORBLAD.

It would be superfluous to say here that I express my sorrow, because every Member knows of the fondness and friendship in which WALT was held by his fellow Members. We all mourn his passing, in particular because WALT always had a kind word for each of us, and I do not know any Member of the House who had more friends or a warmer personality.

As to the public service of WALTER NORBLAD, I can speak personally as to his interest in fisheries. He constantly asked me, because of my membership on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, about pending fishery bills and matters of that nature. But, of course, his great contribution was as a member of the Committee on Armed Services. Here, again, he kept me and others I know of posted on developments which he thought were important to us and our districts.

Mr. Speaker, I think that especially WALT NORBLAD's important public service is recognized in his efforts to eliminate waste and unnecessary spending of the taxpayers' money. But, actually, his talents were not limited to any one field; he was—as those of us who served with him know—a well-rounded, able and conscientious Representative. He was close to his constituents and served them well.

Of even greater importance, however, he was a U.S. Representative whose first consideration always was the welfare of the entire country.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, it has been a privilege to associate with WALT, day in and day out, now, for the first six terms I have been here. I am going to miss him, but I will always remember him with respect and affection.

Meanwhile, my wife and I extend to his beloved wife and son our deepest sympathy.

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, Representative WALTER NORBLAD was a good friend of mine and his wife was a good friend of my wife. We were terribly distressed to hear the sad news about WALTER. He was not only an alert, able, and distinguished Member of Congress with a great record, but on top of that he had a most engaging personality. Just being in his company was a lot of fun. We shall miss him and extend to his family our deepest sympathy.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, the passing of WALTER NORBLAD is a cause of great sadness among us. He truly was one of the best liked, and most respected Members of this body.

Having served 12 years with him on the Armed Services Committee, I had come to know him quite well. I know that his judgment in the military affairs of this Nation was of considerable influence on the committee. Through his years of experience with our armed services, he had developed a skeptical view when skepticism was justified; but he also had an experienced understanding which helped the committee to act intelligently and with dispatch on many occasions.

It also became obvious that WALTER's strong sense of humor made him many friends in the House, and his ability to see things with some perspective was another much respected characteristic.

Knowing of his previous attacks, many of us wondered what kept him plugging along, working diligently and seeking reelection. I am convinced it was a strong sense of duty and of dedication to this country and to this body.

To his widow and children, we extend our deepest sympathy and we share greatly in their sense of loss.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked to learn of the passing of my good friend, the Honorable WALTER NORBLAD, of Oregon. WALTER was one of the strong, stabilizing Members of the House, and his experience, thorough knowledge of his committee assignment, and sound judgment were respected by all.

He was a student of government and always thought in terms of what was best for all the people. He worked hard, was always on the job, and never considered his own personal welfare. We are especially saddened when we reflect on the fact that while suffering a series of physical setbacks this year, WALTER NORBLAD conscientiously pursued his duties as Representative, feeling at all times his first obligation was to his constituents in Oregon. His firm belief in the fundamental virtues of our Nation was reflected in the dedicated representation he gave to the people of his district for 19 years.

However, WALTER NORBLAD was also a true friend and will be missed by the Members who knew him as well. He was always calm, helpful, and thoughtful in his dealings with other Members and left an indelible impression on all who knew him.

I join my colleagues in paying tribute to this great Member of Congress, and Mrs. Derwinski joins me in extending to his wife and son our deep sorrow at their great loss.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I am taking this occasion to express my sadness over the passing of our beloved colleague, WALT NORBLAD. In my 12 years in the House, I have valued his friendship and wise counsel very highly. I am going to miss WALT greatly but shall always treasure the memory of his warm personality with affection.

WALT NORBLAD was a dedicated public servant, able and conscientious in the performance of his duties to his constituents, the people of Oregon, and his country. He probably will be remembered best for his hard and effective work on the Armed Services Committee, where he labored with great zeal in the interests of a strong and secure United States. His views on defense matters always commanded the respect of his colleagues, both on the Committee and in this House as a whole, because he was considered one of the best informed Members on matters affecting the military security of our country in the cold war.

Because of WALT's kindness, his gentility, his fairness, and his trustworthiness, I am sure we may all agree that he enjoyed the friendship and respect of as many of his colleagues on both sides of the aisle as does any Member of this body. Everyone who ever knew him will remember him as a fine and honorable man.

Mrs. Hosmer and I extend our deepest sympathy to his wife, Elizabeth, and their son, Albin.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, it was a great shock when I learned of the untimely passing of our colleague, the Honorable WALTER NORBLAD, of Oregon. WALTER was a conscientious and able legislator, and ever since he was elected to the House of Representatives by special election in 1946, he was dedicated to fulfilling the duties of his office with loyalty and distinction. As a member of the Armed Services Committee, WALTER was critical of unnecessary expenditures but the welfare of our men and women in uniform was always his first concern.

Because of WALTER NORBLAD's personable ways, there was no partisanship in the respect and affection which the Members on both sides of the aisle felt for him. He was my friend and I shall greatly miss him.

To his wife, his son, and his mother I extend my deepest sympathy in their great loss.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I am very much distressed to learn of the sudden death of WALTER NORBLAD, whose friendship I cherished and whose example of devoted service to his country I admired.

He was a man of the highest ideals and his courage in living up to them and expressing his feelings without fear was a great inspiration. He served his country well in times of war and in times of peace and his passing leaves a great void in the hearts of his many friends.

I extend my deepest sympathy to his widow and son and I hope that the memory of his example of a good life will sustain and comfort them.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, the late WALTER NORBLAD was one of the most honorable men I have ever known. He was a dedicated public servant who never faltered in his devotion to duty. Throughout his service here in this body he was my personal friend. I respected him very much. During his long period of service he made an enviable record in behalf of the people he represented, and in behalf of the national interest. I extend to his wife and family my deepest sympathy in their bereavement.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, during my entire service here in the House, it has been my pleasure to know and serve with WALTER NORBLAD. I have never known a more dedicated, faithful, and conscientious Member of the House. He loved this House as a great institution directly responsible to and close to the people. He gave the best years of his life to his country in war and to preserve the peace and promote the strength of this Nation through his service in Congress. He early recognized the importance of the Western Pacific to the security of the United States and the free world. WALTER NORBLAD supported a strong national defense and a forthright stand against aggression as the only means to contain the Communist menace.

We have lost a great Member and the American people have lost a devoted, patriotic, public servant. The Congress has been fortunate to have known and associated with WALTER NORBLAD.

Mrs. Dorn joins me in my deepest sympathy to Mrs. Norblad and his outstanding son.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, we people in Congress have friends, and it is always so hard to lose a personal friend that we have enjoyed, admired, and respected.

WALTER NORBLAD, "WALT" to so many of us, certainly was in my group of "good friends." Regretfully, both his family and good friends must note his untimely passing.

I did enjoy WALT NORBLAD's good humor, ready wit, and constant activity, and recall with pleasure and friendship our hours, talks, and trips together.

As a member of the House Armed Services Committee, he gave good service, and was interested in economy and efficiency of the branches of the U.S. armed services, and particularly in the welfare and security of the men and women who serve our good country.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the life and character of the late WALTER NORBLAD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MARSH). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

CAMPAIGNING IN THE 14TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT, OHIO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, since Labor Day, Vice Presidential Candidate Hubert Humphrey, our First Lady, Lady Bird Johnson, Secretary of Commerce Luther Hodges, and Under Secretary Franklin D. Roosevelt Jr., have been campaigning in my 14th Congressional District. Yet to come, I have been told, will be the President of the United States, former President Truman, Ambassador to the United Nations Adlai Stevenson, Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Anthony Celebrezze, Postmaster General John Gronouski, and Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara.

This is indeed a most formidable list of prominent officials. They come not to campaign for the national ticket but in support of my opponent in the congressional race. I would not be so presumptuous as to make this statement if the full evidence was not so convincing. Senator HUMPHREY spent his entire time in my district with my opponent at his side. Mrs. Johnson frankly stated that she was in the district to assist the candidacy of the lady opposing me. She put in the whole day speaking for her. Franklin Roosevelt, Jr., devoted his entire speech to a bitter attack on me.

I need not tell you that it was a personal attack full of untruths about my voting record. All of you know full well Mr. Franklin Roosevelt's ability as a character assassin. One has but to recall his attacks on Senator Hubert Humphrey in the 1960 Democratic national primary campaign. Among other things, he branded him as a draft dodger, a statement that angered me.

Many Members of the House are puzzled by the priority given to my opponent. Colleagues from both political parties have expressed their wonderment to me and have asked me as to the reason for this effort to purge me. No one, watching the activity in my district, can doubt that this is a "purge."

Thirty-nine Democratic Members of this House are in marginal districts. Many others are in peril of losing their seats. They have asked for help. They would be happy to have any one of the prominent officials that are coming into my district. They would think that they were indeed blessed if all of the top level of Government was coming to their aid.

Before continuing further, I would make clear to you that I have no complaint about this method of attempting to cause my defeat. I have never stood for reelection on any other platform than my record in this Congress and my service to my constituents. I have never requested outside help. A Member of Congress speaks for the people of his district. They have no other voice but his. He should be chosen for and only for his merits.

Let us review some of the possibilities for this attempt to purge me. Many reasons have been brought forward.

Some say that it is because the Democratic Party is making an all-out drive to carry my State of Ohio. If this were true most certainly they would not concentrate solely on the 14th District. Ohio has 23 districts. A recent poll of this district by the Akron Beacon Journal showed that Lyndon Johnson would receive 62 percent of the votes. No poll in any other district gives him that advantage.

I have been asked whether my opponent had so great a strength that she could help the national ticket. Once more I refer to the Akron Beacon Journal poll. It showed that she would only secure 21 percent of the votes against 72 percent for me. If projected this would give me a 50,000-vote plurality. This is certainly not an indication of a strong candidate. Instead this is an indication of a candidate without public support.

Mike Di Salle, when he attempted reelection as Governor of Ohio 2 years ago, never received such support and he was a candidate at the request of a President. Senator Young, up for reelection now, is not receiving it. According to what I have seen in my district, they have practically abandoned him. My opponent, and my opponent alone was given the spot in the sun.

One could well understand such support by the President, the Democratic National Committee, the First Lady, and the President's Cabinet if it was directed toward the reelection of some of the Democratic leaders of this body. By their all-out support of the President, often at the peril of their own political future, they have earned such aid. I know of no case where it has been forthcoming in anywhere near the degree that it has been for the person running against me.

Cleveland is but 30 miles away from my hometown of Akron. It has not received this attention. In the next district to me, two nonincumbents are engaged in a close battle. The distinguished people who came into my district gave its Democratic aspirant no recognition.

There can be but one conclusion. The entire power of the administration and the Democratic National Committee is determined to use its influence and wealth that I be removed from office.

As I have said earlier many Members of this House, both Democrats and Republicans, have told me that they cannot understand why I have been chosen for this purge.

They know that I was among the very first to call for the support of President Johnson in all international affairs when he took office after the assassination of President Kennedy. I appeared on every radio and television program available to me, to assure the people of our Nation that the future of our country was in safe hands. I spoke highly of the President's first speech to this Congress.

That there be no question about this, I, under unanimous consent, include my television and radio speech, made the second day that President Johnson assumed the reins of Government, in the Record at this point:

SPEECH BY HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES

I believe that it is my duty as a Member of Congress to make a complete report to you on the state of the Nation following the cruel assassination of President Kennedy. This report will be both objective and nonpartisan. I will not minimize the dangers nor enlarge upon them.

I, too, felt the tremendous shock at the death of the President. Despite the differences that we felt on certain types of legislation, we had a friendship of 13 years standing. We, also, had a mutual respect for each others views. I had long believed that the President of the United States should be entitled to have his proposals be considered by the whole Congress. With this thought in mind, I voted for the enlargement of the House Rules Committee.

I was in my district when the news came to me of his death. I returned to Washington. We, in Government, cannot allow ourselves the luxury of a mourning period. Above all things there must be a continuance of Government. We are not without enemies who might take full advantage of any lapse in concentration of our functions. It was necessary to show the world—friend and foe alike—that the operation of the U.S. Government and all of its facilities would continue with a united front. Many of the countries of the world do not understand the American political way of life. In these countries, the assassination of the head of government is considered an opportunity for rival parties to seize the control of that government. They do not understand that here Republicans and Democrats alike consider themselves Americans first and party members after. This is doubly true in the times of possible international crisis.

A new President was at the head of our Government. The world had to be told that he was the spokesman for all the people of these United States of America—thus his voice on international affairs was the voice of both the majority and minority parties. The governments of the world knew that he had the support of his own party. It needed to know that we members of his opposition party were in complete support of his international position. This has been done. Too, President Johnson had to have this same assurance. This was also accomplished within minutes of his return to Washington. Before any action could be taken by any foreign nation, they knew that the United States of America had united in complete support of the new President.

We must remember that the United States has assumed a position of leadership in world affairs. Any sign of weakness during a transition period could have cost us dearly.

We also had a wish that the citizens of our own Nation might not have concern for the future of their Government. They were entitled to immediate assurance that we—their representatives in Washington—recognized our responsibilities in the perpetuation of Government.

It was indeed with a heavy heart that we went about our duties. As one of those assigned to represent the Congress at the late President's funeral, I had a deep compassion for the widow and children of my late friend.

Our indignation at the murder of President Kennedy was as strong as yours. I have—together with others—called for a full investigation of the assassination. The results of the investigation should be made public. I recall the rumors, many of which have persisted to this day, which followed the assassination of Abraham Lincoln. If there are others who contributed in any way to the murder of our President, they should be brought to justice.

At the first session of the Congress following our late President's funeral, I introduced a bill that would make the killing of a President or Vice President, any Member of the Congress or a member of the President's Cabinet a Federal offense. Without meaning it as a censure of any local police force, I felt that the highly trained men of our national law-enforcement agencies should be permitted to function. These agencies are equipped with the most scientific crime detection equipment and can operate beyond municipal or State boundaries.

The greatest precautionary measures can but lessen the opportunities for the murder of a public official. We who assume national office must recognize that we can be the target of an assassin's weapon. It is not a common thing in this country but from time to time, it does occur here. I can still remember the day that I stood on the floor of the House of Representatives and heard gunfire—looking up, I saw men in the gallery shooting down upon us. They fired 30 shots—five of my colleagues were struck down. The rest of us who survived that baptism of fire continued on with the affairs of Government.

The founders of this great Nation made provisions that the Government of the United States would continue despite any assassination. This is one of our securities.

Within 3 days after the murder of our President, the great leaders of the world were gathered in Washington to pay their respects to his memory. As I sat in St. Matthews Cathedral but a few feet away from such leaders as President de Gaulle of France, King Baudoin of the Belgians, Emperor Haile Selassie of Ethiopia, Queen Frederika of Greece, Chancellor Erhard of West Germany, Prime Minister Douglas-Home and Prince Philip of Great Britain, Soviety Deputy Premier Mikoyan, Prime Minister Ikeda of Japan, and 83 other heads of government or their representatives, I had the assurance that they would carry back the message to the entire world that there was no weakness here.

Incidentally, the responsibility of the Secret Service was great here. Can you imagine the effects on the nations of the world if a bomb had exploded here?

I would not close this phase of my talk without paying homage to the widow of our slain patriotic President. She set aside her own feelings that her countrymen and the representatives of the other nations of the world might pay tribute to her martyred husband. A truly great First Lady.

This has been my report on the crisis that our Nation faced upon the killing of President Kennedy. We are a strong, unified country and our allies and enemies know it well.

The crisis is now past history. We must now turn to the future. I shall speak of that now.

As I sat in the Congress listening to President Johnson's speech, I was pleased by some of the points that he made. He spelled out to the friendly nations that they had our continued support. He also emphasized to our enemies that any testing of our courage will find us strong.

We, who had served with the President in the Congress, knew that as a Member of that body, he was a firm believer in the division of the Government into the legislative, executive, and judicial branches—each branch to have complete freedom of action. We now wished to be told that as Chief Executive that he retained that viewpoint. I quote his remarks on this subject: "I firmly believe in the independence and integrity of the legislative branch. I promise you that I shall always respect this"—end of the quotation. By this statement, he disavowed any wish for a rubberstamp Congress. Earlier in his remarks, he said, and again I quote President Johnson: "Our American unity does not depend upon unanimity. We have differences; but now, as in the past, we can derive from those differences strength, not weakness; wisdom, not despair. Both as a people and as a Government, we can unite upon a program which is wise, just, and constructive," end of President Johnson's quotation.

We firmly believe in a program that is "wise, just, and constructive." Such a program cannot be enacted in a wave of emotionalism during the few days remaining in this session of the Congress. I think that all would agree that it should take place in the calmer atmosphere of the next session of the Congress which would convene but a few short weeks from now. I noted that President Johnson set no deadline for pending legislation.

I also noted that our new President pledged "thrift and frugality" in government. I had hoped that he would have mentioned a balancing of the national budget. This then is my report on the state of our Nation.

We are a strong Nation fully able to meet any crisis. It is needful that we use our strength wisely.

President Johnson has pointed out that we are a "representative" form of government.

As an elected Representative—your voice in the U.S. Congress—I pledge to you that my principal concern shall be the protection of the welfare and liberties of our great Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I have never voted in blind opposition to the wishes of the administration. I voted for the enlargement of the Rules Committee in the belief that the President's legislative requests should be brought to the floor of this House for final disposition.

In committee, I have cooperated with my chairman so that sound legislation might be enacted. As the ranking Republican on the House Veterans' Committee, I have never allowed any partisan feelings to interfere with my dealings with the distinguished chairman of that committee. The welfare of the veteran was our only concern. As the second ranking Republican on the Education and Labor Committee, I have worked toward the solution of all problems that have been brought before us.

I firmly believe that I have voted the wishes of my constituency. They have returned me to office six times. The present polls in my district show that they overwhelmingly believe that I have truly represented them in the Congress. My support is not limited to members of my own party. Certainly the administration must know that they might alienate these people by such an obvious effort to purge me.

I run my office in a nonpartisan manner. Every person in my district is entitled to and receives equal service. I have never checked the voting record of any constituent asking for aid. I serve all of the people of my district.

In speaking of my cooperation with the administration, I would not mislead you. It has only been so when I in good conscience felt that it should be done. My arm does not lend itself to twisting—even by a master twister.

I did not rise today to protest the opposition to my candidacy by the Democratic Party. The able Democratic congressional committee has aided all of my opponents. This is fair and just—but they have not aided them to a degree in excess of other Democratic congressional candidates.

President Johnson but recently said, and I quote him:

> This Congress has enacted more major legislation, met more national needs, and disposed of more national issues than any other session in this century or the last.

Can anyone say that this was despite my actions? Can anyone deny me a small share in this praise?

Administration purges are not new. We, in Ohio, saw such an attempt in 1950. The victim was to have been that great Senator, Robert A. Taft. National forces opposed him with all of their might and wealth. They attempted to tear down his character. Despite their despicable tactics, the people of our State rose in his defense and overwhelmingly returned him to his seat in the Senate. He carried every Democratic district in the State. Attempted administration purges are also well known by my Democratic colleagues in the Congress. They too have either been subject to such attempts or have suffered the threats of them.

These efforts are only made when the administration would usurp the powers of the legislative branch. If Senator Taft had been defeated in 1950, his opponents would have been able to threaten every other Member of the Congress with like treatment unless they acceded to their demands. His victory was a victory for a truly representative form of the Congress.

This election contest in my district is another such test. My defeat would be a threat to every Member of this Congress who did not vote 100 percent with the administration. You may be certain that my opponent made that agreement before she secured such support. The people of the 14th Ohio District would lose their voice in this body if she was elected.

Certainly you will agree, as I do, that my national importance is not great enough to justify such an attack of might and power. Why then, you might well ask, have I been so selected?

There has been but one action on my part in this Congress that could have brought this about.

During the debate on the antipoverty bill, I revealed several sections of a letter written by that high member of the administration, Mr. Adam Yarmolinsky. In that letter, written to an executive of the Defense Department, Mr. Yarmolinsky stated methods of administering that act that were in opposition to the methods that the proponents of that measure had assured us would be done. He also outlined the method by which political advantage might be taken.

The distinguished author of the antipoverty bill then stated on this floor that Mr. Yarmolinsky would not be considered for the high position in this program for which he had been scheduled. The President later confirmed this. Mr. Yarmolinsky has been returned to his position as Special Assistant to the Secretary of Defense.

Those of us who have observed Mr. Yarmolinsky in his lobbying activities around this Congress, were made aware of his high place in the administration.

Vengeance for this action of mine seems to be the order of the day.

I enter the fray with confidence. The people of the 14th Congressional District of Ohio are not easily misled. The electorate will cast their ballots for the candidate who has done more rather than one who claims that they can do more. They are people of firm convictions. They can see through the camouflage.

All of the might of Washington will not dictate their choice on the ballot. They are for me because they know that I am for them. I shall be returned to this Congress.

THE ATTITUDES AND THE ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE PEOPLE OF DALLAS, TEX.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. LIBONATI], is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, last week I attended the American Legion National Convention at Dallas, Tex. As our plane reached the city proper, the sight of the tall structures, built and being built, silhouetted against the silver clouds, tintingly reflecting the golden hues of the setting sun, was an inspiring spectacle.

As our plane glided over the sparkling waters of Lake Bachman, on its approach to the runway of Love Field, I felt a returning sadness in my heart, of what transpired here, months ago. The people of Dallas, to this day, display a spirit of sensitive remorse as a silent tribute to their martyred President.

I was received at the airport by two intimate, long-time friends, chairman of the distinguished guests committee, Al Starshak, of Chicago, and Robert F. Murphy, assistant director of the National Legislative Commission of the American Legion's Washington headquarters.

As we drove past the square, Dealey Plaza, below the scene of the tragedy—at the stone facades at either side—were flowered wreaths and bouquets deposited by these patriotic Americans, in memory of President John Kennedy. There is not a day passes but that these floral offerings are placed there as a tribute to his memory, manifesting the sympathetic admiration of a grateful people, saddened by the assassination of their courageous and indomitable leader.

Dallas, a commercial and industrial city, cotton market, and oil center, with beautiful parks and highways, theaters, and museums. Of interest are the John Neely Bryan Cabin, Dallas Cotton Exchange, Southern Methodist University, Museum of Fine Arts.

Dallas is progressing rapidly in its cultural, commercial, spiritual, and realty development, toward ultimately becoming the giant city of Texas and the Southwest. The beautiful, spaciously modern homes are testimonial to the affluence and aggressive determination to succeed of its citizens.

The advance of architectural art in design and structural plan of the hotels and motels, together with the most modern room accommodations and services, can be enjoyed by the most particular guests. Swimming pools add to the recreational features of these hostelries. Skyscrapers of tremendous heights dot the area—others are being rushed to completion. Dallas is spreading out—good fortune has blessed her with vast areas of land for expansion. The convention hall in municipal auditorium, is one of the largest in the Nation. Her place among the leading convention cities of the Nation is assured.

The citizens, ever alert to the needs of their city, have spared no expense to further internal public improvements. The people of Dallas were kind, considerate, and proud in their heartfelt welcome, extended to every Legionnaire. The rugged nature of the Texan was never better displayed than when they stood by the thousands, for hours, in the rain, watching the parade of the American Legion State units on Monday. Their happy spirits, applause and cheers as we passed on, tingled our American pride.

Our martyred President John F. Kennedy, and his darling wife, Jacqueline, and the then Vice President Lyndon Johnson and the lovely Lady Bird experienced the same warm hospitality and friendly greetings on that fateful day—and yet it could have happened anywhere—but the people of Dallas, today with heavy hearts, mourn his death, and cannot forget the desecration of the sacred soil of their beloved city through this nefarious deed.

The prosperity of any community can best be measured by the ingress and egress of individuals through the avenues of transportation. The economy is stimulated through the activities of traveling representatives of concerns doing business with the community.

Being interested in the operations and facilities of Love Field, a representative of the chamber of commerce, Kenneth Tubbs, transportation manager, made it possible to arrange a conference with the director, Mr. George Coker, Jr., and his assistant, Mr. Howard Megredy.

The interview was educational and interesting. The several problems confronting the management were discussed and analyzed by these individuals.

One of the important questions involved the location of the field being proximate to the city—an important advantage to travelers—but objectionable to residents in realty developments near the airport—the explosive vibrations of jets, et cetera, and the constant arrival and departure of aircraft, continuously disturbs the enjoyment of their property rights.

In this instance, Love Field was in operation years before the realty developments existed—the choice of residential proximity to Love Field was considered as their responsibility. The Congress has given attention to this problem and appropriated moneys for research in this field, to alleviate the harmful effects resulting from sonic boom.

Another situation that vexes the Authority is the proposed merging of operations with Greater Southwest International Airport, Fort Worth, and the abandonment of Love Field only 6½ miles distant from the city of Dallas. The Authority is adamant in its opposition to this plan. After a thorough study and survey it was determined that the greater distance, 18 miles, from Dallas would diminish the passenger patronage and create freight problems that were disturbing, not only increasing costs of the truck haul to Dallas, but, also, deprive the community of an efficient, timesaving relationship with those having business conferences. And further, Dallas' loss, on a competitive basis, would redound to Fort Worth's gain. Naturally, this is a decisive point to negate the idea.

To the credit of the Authority, Love Field and Redbird Airport have established an enviable record as a major airport, doing extraordinary business. The passenger and freight traffic has grown by leaps and bounds. The record is outstanding. The following tables depict the development of not only the airport, but reflects the importance of Dallas as a center of tremendous growth in business.

The 22 "domestic operations of large hubs" [1] *in America's air transportation system, calendar year 1963*

Airline service volume		Passenger traffic volume		Airmail volume		Air cargo volume	
Community	Aircraft departures	Community	Total enplaned	Community	Tons enplaned	Community	Tons enplaned
Chicago, Ill	166,045	Chicago, Ill	6,914,545	Chicago, Ill	36,092.8	Chicago, Ill	92,765.2
New York, N.Y	129,844	New York, N.Y	5,626,772	New York, N.Y	25,686.0	New York, N.Y	72,075.3
Washington, D.C	110,506	Los Angeles, Calif	3,797,161	Los Angeles, Calif	17,173.1	Los Angeles, Calif	64,032.5
Los Angeles, Calif	96,990	Washington, D.C	2,980,898	San Francisco, Calif	12,699.5	San Francisco, Calif	39,450.2
Atlanta, Ga	80,569	Atlanta, Ga	2,453,074	Washington, D.C	10,524.7	Newark, N.J.[2]	37,695.4
San Francisco, Calif	65,017	San Francisco, Calif	2,416,230	Atlanta, Ga	8,808.2	Detroit, Mich	30,342.1
Newark, N.J.[2]	62,160	Boston, Mass	2,090,438	Dallas, Texas	8,578.4	Dallas, Tex	24,419.7
Dallas, Tex	60,879	Dallas, Tex	2,068,067	Newark, N.J.[2]	5,640.5	Boston, Mass	23,499.4
Boston, Mass	60,024	Newark, N.J.[2]	2,042,094	Detroit, Mich	4,811.2	Cleveland, Ohio	21,646.6
Philadelphia, Pa	56,946	Miami-Fort Lauderdale, Fla	1,738,183	Denver, Colo	4,559.6	Atlanta, Ga	18,641.8
Detroit, Mich	56,606	Detroit, Mich	1,546,860	Seattle-Tacoma, Wash	4,450.6	Philadelphia, Pa	18,625.5
Pittsburgh, Pa	49,701	Pittsburgh, Pa	1,379,175	Miami-Fort Lauderdale, Fla	3,934.7	Washington, D.C	15,204.6
Cleveland, Ohio	49,228	Philadelphia, Pa	1,328,430	Philadelphia, Pa	3,921.1	Miami-Fort Lauderdale, Fla.	12,369.0
Miami-Fort Lauderdale, Fla.	46,254	Denver, Colo	1,317,329	Cleveland, Ohio	3,781.4	St. Louis, Mo	11,098.6
St. Louis, Mo	42,009	Cleveland, Ohio	1,290,831	Boston, Mass	3,753.2	Cincinnati, Ohio	10,380.9
Denver, Colo	38,441	St. Louis, Mo	1,198,891	St. Louis, Mo	3,502.5	Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minn	10,221.3
Kansas City, Mo	33,502	Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minn	1,067,522	Kansas City, Mo	3,329.1	Denver, Colo	9,256.7
New Orleans, La	33,022	Kansas City, Mo	993,667	Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minn	3,173.1	Kansas City, Mo	8,983.8
Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minn.	32,643	Houston, Tex	926,085	Pittsburgh, Pa	3,020.8	Pittsburgh, Pa	8,162.5
Cincinnati, Ohio	31,407	New Orleans, La	856,657	Houston, Tex	2,529.1	Houston, Tex	6,605.3
Houston, Tex	30,247	Seattle-Tacoma, Wash	762,925	Cincinnati, Ohio	1,810.8	Seattle-Tacoma, Wash	6,278.0
Seattle-Tacoma, Wash	24,284	Cincinnati, Ohio	680,462	New Orleans, La	1,618.6	New Orleans, La	3,794.6

[1] "Large hubs" as defined by the Federal Aviation Agency (1 percent or more of total U.S. enplaned passengers).

[2] Newark, N.J., in previous reports, was included in the figures for New York, N.Y.

Source: "Airport Activity Statistics," 12 months ended Dec. 31, 1963, Federal Aviation Agency and Civil Aeronautics Board.

Dallas Love Field enplaned 2,068,067 passengers in calendar year 1963[1]

[Airlines obtained average of 34.3 passengers per scheduled departure]

Dallas Love Field	1963	1962	1961	1960	Percent change 1960-63
	1. Annual totals				
Scheduled departures	60, 247	59, 874	57, 190	62, 041	−2. 8
Enplaned passengers	2, 068, 067	1, 811, 377	1, 575, 125	1, 313, 158	+57. 4
Enplaned passengers per scheduled departure	34. 3	30. 2	27. 5	21. 2	+61. 7
	2. Scheduled departures, by airlines				
Trunklines:					
American	14, 063	14, 560	14, 447	16, 906	−16. 8
Braniff	19, 878	19, 161	18, 820	20, 263	−1. 9
Continental	4, 599	4, 857	5, 453	6, 490	−29. 1
Delta	8, 348	7, 692	6, 338	6, 587	+26. 7
Eastern [2]	1, 033	1, 350	938		
Local service lines:					
Central	5, 025	5, 887	4, 648	4, 877	+3. 0
Trans-Texas	7, 301	6, 367	6, 546	6, 927	+5. 3
	3. Enplaned passengers, by airlines				
Trunklines:					
American	672, 510	580, 776	504, 782	431, 668	+55. 7
Braniff	778, 986	705, 630	632, 099	463, 868	+67. 9
Continental	118, 261	118, 021	119, 991	112, 687	+4. 8
Delta	311, 746	260, 149	213, 518	226, 552	+37. 6
Eastern [2]	37, 036	22, 507	10, 655		
Local service lines:					
Central	43, 534	41, 759	26, 352	21, 389	+103. 5
Trans-Texas	105, 994	82, 535	67, 728	56, 994	+85. 9
	4. Enplaned passengers per scheduled departure by airlines				
Trunklines:					
American	47. 8	39. 8	34. 9	25. 5	+87. 4
Braniff	39. 1	36. 8	33. 5	22. 9	+70. 7
Continental	25. 7	24. 3	22. 0	17. 4	+47. 7
Delta	37. 3	33. 8	33. 6	34. 4	+8. 6
Eastern [2]	35. 8	16. 6	11. 3		
Local service lines:					
Central	8. 6	7. 1	5. 7	4. 4	+95. 8
Trans-Texas	14. 5	12. 9	10. 3	8. 2	+76. 4

[1] Domestic service only. Dallas international enplaned passengers, 36,183.

[2] Service inaugurated 2d quarter 1961.

Source: "Airport Activity Statistics," 12 months ended Dec. 31, 1963, Federal Aviation Agency and Civil Aeronautics Board, as compiled by the Dallas Chamber of Commerce.

Scheduled departures and enplaned passengers at Dallas and Fort Worth, 1963

1. DEPARTURES AND PASSENGERS, BY AIRLINES[1]

Carrier	Dallas		Fort Worth	
	Scheduled departures	Enplaned passengers	Scheduled departures	Enplaned passengers
American	14, 063	672, 510	1, 636	16, 421
Braniff	19, 878	778, 986	3, 532	14, 135
Central	5, 025	43, 534	2, 237	3, 084
Continental	4, 599	118, 261	1, 668	3, 521
Delta	8, 348	311, 746	844	1, 717
Eastern	1, 033	37, 036	322	961
Trans-Texas	7, 301	105, 994	3, 656	6, 468
Total	60, 247	2, 068, 067	13, 895	46, 312

2. ENPLANED PASSENGERS PER SCHEDULED DEPARTURE

	Dallas	Fort Worth
American	47. 8	10. 0
Braniff	39. 1	4. 0
Central	8. 6	1. 3
Continental	25. 7	2. 1
Delta	37. 3	2. 0
Eastern	35. 8	2. 9
Trans-Texas	14. 5	1. 7
Average	34. 3	3. 3

3. TRENDS IN AIR PASSENGERS AND SERVICE AT DALLAS AND FORT WORTH, 1960-63

	1960	1961	1962	1963	Percent of change 1960-63
Scheduled departures:					
Dallas	62, 041	57, 190	59, 874	60, 247	−2. 8
Fort Worth	24, 614	19, 991	16, 651	13, 895	−43. 5
Enplaned passengers:					
Dallas	1, 313, 158	1, 575, 125	1, 811, 377	2, 068, 067	+57. 4
Fort Worth	148, 585	113, 020	56, 925	46, 312	−73. 5

[1] Domestic service only. International service: Dallas enplaned passengers, 36,183; Fort Worth enplaned passengers, 0.

Source: "Airport Activity Statistics," 12 months ended Dec. 31, 1963, Federal Aviation Agency and Civil Aeronautics Board, as compiled by the Dallas Chamber of Commerce.

The comparative tables, with cities of greater community population in the Nation, is noteworthy. Its central location, no doubt, has contributed much to its importance as the key city in air traffic activity in the Southwest.

The people of Dallas are not living in the clouds—they are Doers—one need only visit this fair city, the jewel in the Texas crown of achievement, to observe the great prosperity, through laborious effort and careful city planning, that resulted from their efforts to achieve success in building a great city. Mayor Eric Jonsson has contributed much to this progress, as well as the chamber of commerce, civic organizations, spiritual, business, and union leaders.

Congressmen **Joe R. Pool** and **Bruce Alger** are most highly regarded in the community.

The police of Dallas have borne the brunt of national public criticism, since the fatal attack on Oswald—the fact that he killed Officer Tippit to prevent his arrest, is forgotten, as well as the courageous action of Patrolman N. M. McDonald, who was slugged by Oswald, with a drawn gun that misfired, as he was grappled to the ground by the officer. The solution of several bank robberies in Dallas, last week, carried no significance in recognizing excellent police work. The courageous and dedicated police work of members of the Dallas Police Force, in carrying out their duties to a public trust, are appreciated by the citizens of Dallas. Authorities in police work know that its police department ranks, under Chief Curry, among the best in law enforcement in the Nation.

The purpose of this discourse and compilation of data is to, in some significant way, register the sentiments of the Legionnaires about the attitudes and the accomplishments of the people of Dallas, and their officials—whose kind, courteous, and solicitous treatment was impressive and appreciated—as patriotic Americans, we were in search of the truth, and we found it in Dallas.

I dedicate this poem to the people of Dallas:

NOT OUR SIN

Oh, Lord—ill deeds have ere been done
Throughout this glorious Nation.
But seldom one so cruel, to numb
The hearts of generations.

We bow in shame for this ill fame
That fate has cast upon us,
And pray to Him, whose Holy Name
Has given Christians justice.

To one who died—our Nation's pride,
We kneel in supplication,
And mourn the fatal day he died—
A martyr to the Nation.

DALLAS CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Dallas, Tex., September 18, 1964.
Congressman ROLAND V. LIBONATI,
Dallas, Tex.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: Gen. Phil Bethune has told us that you have indicated an interest in Dallas Love Field and its operation.

I have tried to reach you several times by telephone, but so far have been unsuccessful. My purpose in trying to get in touch with you was to assure you that if there is any information which we can supply you with respect to Love Field, its operations, its traffic statistics, its place among national airports, etc. we would be glad to hear from you.

It would be our pleasure to call upon you during your stay in Dallas, or to mail you any information which you might desire.

Sincerely,
KENNETH P. TUBBS,
Manager, Transportation Department.

DATES IN HISTORY OF DALLAS LOVE FIELD

LOVE FIELD

Love Field was set up as an Army base in 1917 and was maintained as such until 1928. The city of Dallas purchased Love Field from the Army in 1928. This purchase consisted of an initial investment of $325,000 for 327 acres.

Love Field was named by the Army in 1917, honoring a Lt. Moss Love, who was a cavalry officer killed during World War I in a noncombatant accident in California and who actually had never seen Love Field.

Year 1917: U.S. Army selects site northwest of Dallas for a new flying field.

October 19, 1917: Army names new flying field "Love Field."

August 28, 1925: Chamber of Commerce guarantees 100 pounds of air mail per day to Chicago for 6 months.

January 1926: First boundary lights installed for night flying.

May 12, 1926: A National Air Transport plane piloted by Herbert Kindred took off from Love Field for Chicago with first air mail.

September 17, 1927: A full load of three passengers went out of Love Field for Chicago on National Air Transport plane.

December 15, 1927: Taxpayers authorize a $400,000 bond issue to be used for purchase and development of a municipal airport.

June 22, 1928: City of Dallas acquires 167.10 acres of land at a price of $325,000.

October 31, 1928: First land purchased for second airport—"Hensley."

Year 1929: Safeway Airline established—later sold to American.

June 1, 1929: Delta Air Service, Inc., starts first passenger service from Dallas to Jackson, Miss., via Shreveport and Monroe, La.

August 9, 1929: Dallas' second airport officially named "Hensley."

September 1, 1929: Braniff Airlines begins express and package freight services at Love Field.

October 15, 1930: Southern Air Fast Express, Inc., starts mail and passenger service between Dallas Love Field and Los Angeles, Calif.

April 9, 1932: First paved runways at Love Field completed.

May 17, 1934: Braniff Airways begins service to Love Field on Chicago-Kansas City—Tulsa-Dallas mail route.

July 4, 1934: Delta starts air mail service from Dallas Love Field to Charleston, S.C.

January 1, 1935: Braniff moves home base to Love Field from Oklahoma City, Okla.

July 1, 1935: Delta operates first night schedule at Love Field.

February 1, 1937: Dallas begins operation of control tower at Love Field.

October 6, 1940: Love Field terminal building dedicated.

April 1, 1941: AMF opened at Love Field.

May 16, 1942: CAA takes over operation for control tower.

September 1943: Construction completed on northwest-southeast and north-south runways to 5,200 feet.

October 15, 1943: Delta Airlines start service from Dallas to New Orleans.

Year 1944: City purchased 1,026 acres of land 7 miles southwest of city—Redbird Airport.

May 16, 1945: City officially adopts master plan for Love Field.

January 29, 1947: CAA commissions ILS at Love Field.

February 19, 1947: Pioneer Air Lines begins service at Love Field.

October 11, 1947: Trans-Texas Airways begins service at Love Field.

March 16, 1948: City officially adopts amended master plan for Love Field.

March 9, 1948: East wing of terminal building completed.

August 10, 1948: North wing of terminal building completed.

September 1949: Central Airlines begins service at Love Field.

May 8, 1950: Pioneer Air Lines moves base from Houston to Love Field.

March 26, 1952: Extension of northwest-southeast runway to 6,200 feet completed.

April 19, 1954: CAA, commissions ASR at Love Field.

June 1, 1954: East-west runway closed.

December 3, 1954: Extension of northwest-southeast runway to 7,750 feet completed.

August 5, 1955: Work order issued for construction of new terminal building. Contractor given 22 months to complete terminal building.

December 1955: CAB awarded to Braniff and Delta new routes to Washington and New York.

October 20–27, 1957: Open house in new terminal.

January 20, 1958: New terminal placed in commission.

April 1, 1959: Continental Airlines placed jet schedules into Love Field, with Viscounts.

July 12, 1959: America started first Turbojet service.

July 23, 1962: Contract awarded for construction of parallel northwest-southeast runway.

July 11, 1963: Work order issued for parallel northwest-southeast runway.

October 1963: Work finished on demolition of old terminal.

Dallas Love Field: Enplaned passengers

Year:	*Number*
1932	12,993
1933	13,741
1934	11,989
1935	24,557
1936	28,587
1937	33,434
1938	41,119
1939	58,721
1940	102,045
1941	127,884
1947	368,520
1948	361,030
1949	438,640
1950	442,450
1951	610,444
1952	704,814
1953	623,511
1954	713,350
1955	868,037
1956	994,871
1957	1,004,545
1958	1,036,103
1959	1,236,846
1960	1,387,517
1961	1,575,125
1962	1,844,160
1963	2,026,580

DALLAS LOVE FIELD

Plane movements, takeoffs and landings

Year	Air carrier	Civil	Army	Navy	Local	Total
1932						25,296
1933						27,365
1937	13,178					78,758
1938	15,189					72,325
1939	20,179					97,959
1940	26,371					89,638
1941	26,748					[1] 95,500
1942	[1] 22,524					[1] 106,932
1943	23,926	1,002	43,986		124,572	193,486
1944	32,551	1,212	190,695		27,596	252,054
1945	47,708	6,037	169,219		7,741	230,705
1946	61,912	34,662	34,195		11,479	142,248
1947	64,562	50,224	575		6,059	121,520
1948						
1949	[2] 67,083					139,239
1950	[2] 79,270	59,051	4,096	1,360	8,769	152,546
1951	[2] 91,402	64,576	11,870	3,021	10,167	181,036
1952	[2] 99,132	64,668	15,792	2,837	18,514	200,944
1953	[2] 102,209	66,829	13,470	4,340	30,633	217,481
1954	[2] 105,234	69,533	9,762	3,740	20,181	208,450
1955	[2] 114,891	76,301	11,361	4,310	16,565	223,428
1956	[2] 122,201	79,113	13,085	5,723	15,440	235,562
1957	[2] 158,461	104,618	15,406	7,087	22,780	308,352
1958	[2] 162,674	98,327	15,127	4,467	19,449	300,044
1959	[2] 146,965	96,681	7,163	1,088	8,945	260,842
1960	[2] 147,874	95,442	5,674	259	9,443	258,692
1961	[2] 134,558	98,937	4,374	290	7,193	245,352
1962	[2] 133,770	104,644	3,842	695	6,140	249,091
1963	[2] 122,569	93,862	3,288	287	5,480	225,486

[1] Estimated.

[2] Taken from city, fiscal year ending Sept. 30.

Operating revenue and expenses

Fiscal year	Revenue	Expenses	Available for debt service	Fiscal year	Revenue	Expenses	Available for debt service
1931-32	$7,767	$11,695	(−$3,928)	1947-48	$272,097	$128,406	$143,691
1932-33	8,680	12,373	(−3,693)	1948-49	298,485	117,627	180,858
1933-34	7,746	10,234	(−2,488)	1949-50	306,675	110,622	196,053
1934-35	8,812	11,586	(−2,774)	1950-51	343,141	152,317	190,824
1935-36	7,076	11,158	(−4,082)	1951-52	402,486	143,682	258,804
1936-37	8,775	13,026	(−4,251)	1952-53	425,558	154,475	271,083
1937-38	9,746	15,483	(−5,737)	1953-54	407,614	201,419	206,195
1938-39	9,154	16,610	(−7,456)	1954-55	468,095	214,722	253,373
1939-40	13,689	26,135	(−12,446)	1955-56	505,732	238,215	267,517
1940-41	41,702	50,700	(−8,998)	1956-57	1,153,450	172,675	980,775
1941-42	44,179	47,727	(−3,548)	1957-58	1,614,185	441,564	1,172,621
1942-43	59,676	39,603	20,073	1958-59	1,949,736	562,573	1,387,163
1943-44	66,503	51,026	15,477	1959-60	2,042,342	669,972	1,372,370
1944-45	77,042	67,693	9,349	1960-61	2,103,537	704,389	1,399,148
1945-46	105,055	78,382	26,673	1961-62	2,154,133	727,414	1,426,719
1946-47	262,859	132,102	130,750	1962-63 [1]	2,338,352	782,973	1,555,379

[1] Not audited as of this date.

Investment in Dallas Love Field as of Nov. 1, 1963

Item		Amount
I. Land [1]		$11,972,249.92
II. Runways, ramps, lighting taxiways and roadways [1]		9,538,646.87
III. Equipment [1]		155,376.57
IV. Buildings and related facilities:		
(a) Old terminal [2]	[1] $567,229.22	
(b) New terminal [2]	8,218,412.28	
(c) Continental hangar [3]	290,743.95	
(d) American hangar [3]	1,363,040.99	
(e) American kitchen [3]	523,373.33	
(f) Braniff hangar [3]	6,306,965.44	
(g) Delta hangar [3]	1,152,225.71	
IV. Buildings and related facilities—Continued		
(h) Southwest Airmotive Co.: [3]		
(1) Hangar buildings	$2,940,300.64	
(2) Paving	351,926.67	
(3) Engine shops	812.618.36	
		$21,959,607.37
(i) Auto parking deck [2]		11,015.50
(j) Love Field fueling facility [4]		1,164,942.79
(k) Surplus Government property [5]		2,575,000.00
(l) Cross Roads Aviation [4]		71,500.00
(m) Mustang Aviation Co. [4]		87,230.00
(n) Investment on privately owned property on airport [4]		2,000,000.00
Total investment on airport		49,535,569.02

[1] Old terminal now demolished; not included in total.

[2] By city.

[3] Through revenue bonds and private investment. Revenue bonds to be paid off by operator.

[4] Private investment only.

[5] $1,000,000 (estimated). Runway, taxiway, and lighting, $1,575,000. Approximately 100 acres of land.

Dallas Love Field employment summary, July 1, 1963

Activity	Airport ground base employees		Flight personnel		Off-airport personnel		Total	
	Number	Annual salary	Number	Annual salary	Number	Annual salary	Number	Annual salary
I. Airlines: Total airlines	2,234	$14,390,787.76	1,628	$19,176,726.70	1,266	$7,672,999.00	5,128	$41,240,513.46
II. Concessions: Total concessions	304	914,393.00			44	181,880.00	348	1,096,273.00
III. Nonairline: Total nonairline	346	1,520,372.28					346	1,520,372.28
IV. Federal Government: Total Federal agencies	243	1,797,331.00					243	1,797,331.00
V. City of Dallas: Total city employees	122	458,638.44					122	458,638.44
VI. Private aviation: Total private aviation	1,078	6,259,858.06	27	214,843.28	56	233,502.52	1,161	6,708,203.86
Grand total	4,327	25,341,380.54	1,655	19,391,569.98	1,366	8,088,381.52	7,348	52,821,332.04

Total of ground and flight personnel, 5,982; $44,732,950.52.

Dallas Love Field: Sources of revenue

Source	Amount
(a) Rental (off airport)	$27,563.68
(b) Rental (on airport)	663,479.34
(c) Fees	315,676.46
(d) Concessions	1,138,502.57
(e) Service charges	20,570.09
(f) Miscellaneous	6,102.44
(g) Interest on bank balance	105,610.10
(h) Taxicabs	13,193.82
(i) Sales outlay	47,653.23
Total	2,338,351.73

EXPLANATION OF

(a) Rental of acquired expansion properties until needed and regarded as "recapture of capital outlay."

(b) Rental of ground space and offices in terminal building, but excluding revenue bond payments by airlines, which are made directly to special accounts held by city auditor to meet sinking fund requirements.

(c) Airline landing fees and gasoline fees paid by private aviation.

(i) Sale of improvements from airport expansion property purchased for enlargement of airfield.

Other items are self-explanatory.

Estimated investments by Federal Government as of Nov. 1, 1963

Item	Amount
(I) Runways, taxiways	$1,000,000
(II) Federal Airport aid in airfield improvements	429,604
(III) Land purchased and deeded to city (approximately 100 acres)	1,575,000
(IV) Equipment, navigational and landing aids	1,585,000
Total	4,589,604

INVESTMENTS AND COMMITMENTS AT DALLAS LOVE FIELD BY AIRLINES, OPERATORS, AND CONCESSIONAIRES (AS OF NOV. 1, 1963)

Item		
(I) Underground fueling facility by airlines		$1,164,943
(II) Concessionaires in terminal building:		
(a) Leasehold improvements	$600,443	
(b) Equipment and fixtures	520,162	
Total		1,120,605
(III) Privately owned hangars, shops, etc		2,000,000
Total		4,285,548

HISTORY OF REDBIRD AIRPORT

The City of Dallas acquired the Redbird Airport site—1,030 acres—in 1945. The municipal investment there, prior to 1954, totaled approximately $1,785,000.

Preliminary development at the airport included grading and drainage for three runways—only one of which was paved (100 feet by 3,000 feet).

Two steel hangars each 146 feet by 161 feet were erected by the City of Dallas, one of which was leased to Texair, Inc., a fixed base operator, and the other of which was leased by Collins Radio Co. for use in its installations of aircraft communications and navigational systems.

Lack of balanced facilities prevented Redbird from making more substantial contributions toward meeting Dallas' development airport requirements.

When the $12.5 million airport bond issue was submitted to Dallas taxpayers in January 1953, $2 million were earmarked for further development of Redbird.

After taxpayers approved the airport bond issue, the Dallas City Council ordered a complete master plan study of Redbird Airport to determine the role which it could best serve in the community's aviation program, and to establish a realistic, carefully timed program for its further development.

The Redbird master plan study was received by the city of Dallas late in 1953. On the basis of master plan recommendations, the city of Dallas proceeded with the improvements which are now being completed.

REDBIRD'S ROLE

The Redbird master plan contemplates this airport's continuing development to:

(1) Serve the nonairline airport requirements of the portion of Dallas south and west of the Trinity River.

(2) Provide sites for prospective airport-based industries.

The master plan contemplates that facilities at Redbird will be provided on a progressive basis, as demand develops.

Obviously, balanced facilities were required before Redbird could attract substantial usage—before it could begin to fulfill the role for which it was originally provided.

DESCRIPTION OF REDBIRD AIRPORT

Current improvements

Additional acreage was acquired, to bring the land area of the airport to approximately 1,200 acres.

The northwest-southeast (instrument) runway, which had been paved to a width of 100 feet and a length of 3,000 feet, was widened to 150 feet and extended to 4,450 feet.

The master plan contemplates that this runway will ultimately be 150 feet by 6,250 feet.

A north-south runway was paved, 150 feet by 3,800 feet.

Paralleling taxi strips, 50 feet wide, were paved for both runways.

Medium intensity lighting has been installed on both runways, to permit night flying operations.

A rotating lighting beacon, and obstacle lighting, have been provided.

A new terminal building and control tower has been built and staffed.

Entrance road has been improved and parking lot in front of terminal building has been built and lighted.

Control tower has been completed and aircraft traffic into and out of Redbird is now controlled from the Federal Aviation Agency manned control tower.

Current activities at Redbird

(a) Airhaven, Inc.: Fixed base operation, with storage and overhaul of airplanes, as well as gasoline and sale of supplies to planes.

(b) Aviation Enterprises of Dallas: Fixed base operation and pilot training, with overhaul, storage of planes and sale of gasoline and supplies to planes.

(c) Executive Aircraft, Inc.: Overhaul and reconditioning of planes inside and out.

(d) Modern Aero Sales: Fixed base operation with storage and overhaul of airplanes, as well as sale of gasoline and supplies to planes.

(e) Texair, Inc.: Fixed base operation with storage and overhaul of airplanes, as well as sale of gasoline and supplies to planes.

(f) Redbird Airport Restaurant: Restaurant operation in the terminal building, as well as catering to planes.

CITY INVESTMENT IN REDBIRD AIRPORT

Land has been purchased and added to the airport in accordance with the master plan. The airport now consists of approximately 1,230 acres to facilitate expansion as it is justified and necessary.

The current city of Dallas investment in Redbird Airport is $3,435,601.42, including land, buildings, roadways, parking lots, runways, taxiways and airport lighting.

AIRCRAFT TRAFFIC—REDBIRD AIRPORT

The new airport traffic control tower, as constructed by the city of Dallas, was opened and placed into operation in June 1962. This control tower is equipped and operated by the U.S. Federal Aviation Agency and only 1 fiscal year's operation has been completed with a control tower in operation.

During the Federal fiscal year of from July 1, 1962, through June 30, 1963, the following aircraft movements were accommodated at Redbird Airport:

	Itinerant movements	Local movements	Total
Redbird	48,539	36,408	84,947
Shreveport	48,629	52,800	101,429
Corpus Christi	40,253	87,646	127,899
Wichita Falls	46,401	57,388	103,789
San Angelo	30,119	39,354	69,473
Waco	32,896	61,574	94,470

An itinerant movement is a landing or a takeoff involving a flight that arrived from or departed to a point other than Redbird Airport.

A local movement is a landing or a takeoff involving a flight that involves only the Redbird Airport, such as a test flight or a training flight.

Redbird airport—operating revenue and expenses

Fiscal year	Operating income	Operating expenses	Operating P/L
1950–51	$12,101.14	$6,120.61	$5,980.53
1951–52	18,541.92	5,615.18	12,926.74
1952–53	15,696.12	5,751.42	9,944.70
1953–54	14,915.78	5,493.96	9,421.82
1954–55	15,386.82	5,764.53	9,622.29
1955–56	17,467.71	6,772.04	10,695.67
1956–57	17,394.08	7,836.56	9,557.52
1957–58	18,417.42	10,604.84	7,812.58
1958–59	22,496.36	8,677.76	13,818.60
1959–60[1]	25,580.97	25,250.61	330.36
1960–61	27,418.50	52,144.81	−(24,726.31)
1961–62	29,397.21	55,110.02	−(25,712.81)
1962–63	40,280.98	63,769.05	−(23,488.07)

[1] Opened new terminal building August 1960.

NOTE.—Operating expenses include 10 percent of aviation department administrative expense and 5 percent of "off-airport" rental collections as made by property department.

WHO LOSES IN A SMEAR CAMPAIGN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. BATTIN], is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Speaker, in signing the code of fair campaign practices today, I could not help but think about past campaigns and compare them to the one presently at hand. This year the smear artists are already at work practicing their trade.

The tactics used in an attempt to smear my name and confuse the issues before the voters of Montana have reached alarming proportions and are about the same as reported in other parts of the Nation. Subtle in approach, based upon half-truths and lies, they put out false charges designed to create doubt.

The people involved in this deceptive practice do a great disservice to the candidate they support and the party he represents. Apparently, they have no feelings, no personal ethics, no regard for family and must be lacking in Christian teaching. They must believe their own propaganda and lose all sense of direction. Certainly they have a warped understanding of American Government and the American voter. They ask the voter to elect a man to office but use divisive means to secure their goal.

The tactics vary. Organizations are formed with names similar to those of well-established groups and by innuendo and by association an attempt is made to take on the dignity and respect of the original group. I think particularly of an organization in central Montana that uses the name League of Men Voters and by this means it trades on the name of the League of Women Voters, a nonpartisan group which does an outstanding service for the voting public by publishing the candidates' stand on the issues.

Another approach the smear artist uses is that of the so-called shocker. Charges are made which are false on their face but since they are heard over radio or television or found published in a newspaper, many well-meaning people think they must be true. This technique is designed to force the candidate to spend all his time answering false charges and none of the time talking about the issues. It is a dangerous course the smear artist follows, for he goes over the edge on libel and slander and opens the way for a lawsuit against himself and the news media. Most radio, television, and newspaper companies are careful to screen advertising; but there are those who look upon an election year as a windfall, for a great deal of advertising is done by the candidates for public office.

I think specifically of the charge often made that a candidate is financed by big corporations or associations. Here again the person making the charge knows that most people are not acquainted with the law and by the time the voter can find out what the facts are or what the law is, the election is over. For example, the Congress passed a law many years ago which prohibits a corporation from making any contribution to a political candidate or political party. The law further restricts any individual from contributing more than a specified sum to any political candidate or political party. In my own case and that of every candidate for office in Montana, we must file a statement under oath of contributions received and expenditures made with the secretary of state and these files are on record for all voters to see. I have always been proud that a great number of people contribute and help finance my campaign. Then, too, we should remember that both great political parties have made a national effort to solicit door to door to raise funds and secure more grassroots support for political activity. All this, for some reason, is overlooked by the peddlers of the "big lie."

Unfortunately, few people realize that the truth is readily available. We have accurate public records on all votes before both Houses of Congress and the law requires vouchers for the expenditure of all public money. However, the smear artist has figured out that most people are unaware of this fact or will not take the time to find out.

Mr. Speaker, I take the floor of the House today to point out that we do have in our society those who believe that "the end justifies the means." Theirs is the course of divide and conquer.

This year, Mr. Speaker, there seems to be more of this type of underhanded activity than usual. The rumor mills, the whispering campaign, the handbill approach, planted stories, false advertising—all are calculated to destroy the person seeking public office. I am sure that every Member of this House is willing to discuss any vote that he had made or any action that was taken. But how do you answer the warped minds of those who will do anything and say anything to achieve their purpose?

The question is often asked why we seek public office and subject ourselves to slanderous charges and outrageous stories. The typical remark, I believe, is, "Politics is a dirty business." The answer is obvious. We are not willing to turn over, without a fair fight, responsible elective positions in government to people who use the gutter and the back alley to fight their political wars. Ask yourself the next question. What would these same people do if they found themselves in a position to influence legislation?

Every Member of this House is proud of his name and proud to be a Member of this great legislative body. We disagree on political questions but use the civilized method of debate to win our point. I have never heard a Member of this House attack another on the basis of personality or hearsay. No, the attack comes on the issues. The character assassin has no place in our great society. If the artist of the big-lie technique wins, the people lose—remember, this is our Government.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that all candidates, whether they sign the code or not, will live up to the code of fair campaign practices, which has been endorsed by both political parties. In the name of honesty and decency, I hope the coming campaign will be waged on the issues and not in the gutter—the voters of this country have a right to know the truth and should demand the answers.

In order that the reader of this RECORD can see and judge for himself just what the code of fair campaign practices calls for and how necessary it is, I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that it be included at this point in the RECORD:

CODE OF FAIR CAMPAIGN PRACTICES

There are basic principles of decency, honesty and fair play which every candidate for public office in the United States has a moral obligation to observe and uphold, in order that, after vigorously contested but fairly conducted campaigns, our citizens may exercise their constitutional right to a free and untrammeled choice and the will of the people may be fully and clearly expressed on the issues before the country; therefore:

I shall conduct my campaign in the best American tradition, discussing the issues as I see them, presenting my record and policies with sincerity and frankness, and criticizing without fear or favor the record and policies of my opponent and his party which merit such criticism.

I shall defend and uphold the right of every qualified American voter to full and equal participation in the electoral process.

I shall condemn the use of personal vilification, character defamation, whispering campaign, libel, slander, or scurrilous attacks on any candidate or his personal or family life.

I shall condemn the use of campaign material of any sort which misrepresents, distorts, or otherwise falsifies the facts regarding any candidate, as well as the use of malicious or unfounded accusations against any candidate which aim at creating or exploiting doubts, without justification, as to his loyalty and patriotism.

I shall condemn any appeal to prejudice based on race, creed, or national origin.

I shall condemn any dishonest or unethical practice which tends to corrupt or undermine our American system of free elections or which hampers or prevents the full and free expression of the will of the voters.

I shall immediately and publicly repudiate support deriving from any individual or group which resorts, on behalf of my candidacy or in opposition to that of my opponent, to the methods and tactics which I condemn.

I, the undersigned, candidate for election to public office in the United States of America, hereby endorse, subscribe to, and solemnly pledge myself to conduct my campaigns in accordance with the above principles and practices, so help me God.

Date:__________ Signature:____________

RESOLUTION TO BRING JUSTICE TO CYPRUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI], is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a House concurrent resolution which expresses the sense of Congress that the historical American principle of self-determination should be applied to Cyprus and that the people of Cyprus should be assured against any further military attacks against their island by Turkish forces.

The resolution further provides that there should be no partition of Cyprus; that there should be no military aid sent to Cyprus either by the Soviet Union itself or Soviet sinews sent through the United Arab Republic; and that the strengthening of democratic principles on the island, including the principle of self-determination, will enable the people of Cyprus to promulgate such programs which, in keeping with the highest principles of freedom and human dignity, would assure freedom and security of life, religion, and property for all minorities on Cyprus.

It is my hope, Mr. Speaker, that the Congress will accept this resolution as an expression of our determination that Cyprus shall remain within the orbit of free people and not become but another victim in the cold war.

I believe this resolution is most timely because of the serious situation which now prevails in Cyprus.

It has been my long contention that the Greek Cypriots should first of all be assured of their freedom to self-determination, and if the majority of Cypriots choose enosis—union with their motherland, Greece—they should have the privilege to make such a determination as free people.

The free world must take a stand regarding justice for Cyprus. The alternative is to leave this very important bastion of freedom in the Mediterranean an easy prey for Communist subversion.

We can all be grateful that President Johnson has diligently been trying to resolve the difficult problem which now exists in Cyprus. The United States as early as 1947 supported the doctrine of enosis for Cyprus, and it is my hope that this principle will again be forcefully reaffirmed.

It would also be my hope that the United States will serve notice upon the Soviet Union that sending any of its military aid into Greece will be viewed by this Nation and the free world with the same vigor and determination which led to the removal of such equipment from the island of Cuba in 1962.

The Cypriots must be given an opportunity to resolve their internal difficulties through the process of self-determination and without any outside interference.

It is my hope that the United States will continue to take the lead in removing outside influences from interfering with the Cypriots' right to resolve their own problems. It is my hope that the free world will insist on retaining NATO forces as the only peacekeeping force on Cyprus until the Cypriots have had a chance to resolve their own differences through free elections.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution I have introduced today follows:

H. CON. RES. 369

(Introduced by Representative ROMAN C. PUCINSKI in House of Representatives Sept. 23, 1964)

Whereas the people of the United States respect the principle of self-determination and majority rule for all nations; and

Whereas the people of the United States deplore the violence and civil conflict that has erupted on the island of Cyprus where the right of the people of Cyprus to majority rule has been restricted; and

Whereas this conflict has brought two NATO allies into a quarrel endangering the long-term interests of both nations and of the Western alliance; and

Whereas the principal benefactors of the conflict are Communist nations and neutralist dictators trying to destroy NATO and eliminate American defenses and Western influence throughout the eastern Mediterranean; and

Whereas self-determination for the people of Cyprus, including possible union with Greece, would strengthen democratic rule in Cyprus; would reduce Communist infiltration in Cyprus; would bring Cyprus within NATO, and would eliminate the threat of war between Greece and Turkey: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Congress that the historic American principle of self-determination should be applied to Cyprus; that the people of Cyprus should be assured against any further military attacks against the island by Turkish forces; that there shall be no partition of Cyprus; that there shall be no military aid sent to Cyprus either by the Soviet Union itself or Soviet sinews sent through the United Arab Republic, and that the strengthening of democratic principles on the island, including the principle of self-determination, will enable the people of Cyprus to promulgate such programs which, in keeping with the highest principles of freedom and human dignity, would assure freedom and security of life, religion, and property for all minorities on Cyprus.

REPUBLICANS ENDANGER CALIFORNIA JOBS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, the American people expect to find many charges, attacks, and even smears leveled during the course of a presidential election campaign. This is consistent with our political tradition, and though at times these tactics can be carried too far and can become distasteful they are anticipated by the voting public.

It is rare, however, that a major political party will lie to the American people, and stoop to outright distortion and deceit to gain a few extra votes. But such is the situation in this year of 1964.

Members of the Republican Party, in the most cynical way possible, are attempting to perpetrate a hoax and fiction on the people of California by confusing and distorting the employment picture in my State. On the one hand we find Republican candidates demanding that more jobs be brought to the west coast, and on the other hand we find California Republicans in this House voting against the bills which are the very life blood of Federal job opportunities in my State.

Just how brazenly false is the Republican boast of "We can do more for California" I shall soon demonstrate. Just how dangerous is the real Republican policy toward California defense and aerospace employment I shall soon make clear.

On August 13 of this year the appropriation bill for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration was approved on the floor of the House of Representatives. Republican Members of Congress bitterly attacked the whole concept of our space research, and made a strong effort to cutback the Project Apollo program.

Before examining the Republican Party vote on the Project Apollo program it will be of interest to study the impact defense and aerospace industry employment has had on our California economy.

As of 1963, aerospace and related industry employment provided jobs for 524,000 people in my State. This industry in fact accounts for 37 percent of all manufacturing employees in California, and no other State in the country has such a high ratio of workers involved in the space race. At the present time, 10 percent of all nonagricultural wage and salary workers in California are employed by the aerospace and related industries.

In the nonspace field, California also has more Federal employees than any other State. In 1963 Federal employment provided jobs for 266,500 people in my State, and this reflects a 40-percent increase over the past 12 years. Today, California has nearly 15 percent of all the Defense Department employees in the United States, and 9 percent of all Federal nondefense workers.

It is clear from the figures I have cited that any cutback in defense, aerospace, or other Federal spending would have a damaging effect upon the California economy. A logical person would expect to find all California Republicans in Congress, if they are honestly concerned about the unemployment problem in our great State, united with the California Democrats in opposing such a move from any quarter.

Such, however, is not the case. The Project Apollo program is almost entirely a California work project, but as the Congressional Record of August 13, 1963 plainly shows on the Republican motion to cut $200 million from this space program the 15 Republicans from California in the House of Representatives voted as follows:

Five voted for the cut, and two others were absent or did not vote. The eight remaining Republicans to their credit voted against the proposed cutback this year, but this cannot hide the fact that almost half the Republican delegation from California were prepared to endanger the jobs of thousands of Californians.

No California Democrat voted to support the slash at our vital space program, but of course the issue of whether America is to be first in the race for space leadership far overrides the interests of any one State. Our prestige as the major world power, and perhaps our very survival as a free people hinges upon our scientific supremacy. Despite this fact, in 1964 a total of 109 Republicans voted to support the irresponsible cutback and only 55 Republicans opposed it. The contrast between the two parties is clearly shown when we note that only 5 Democrats supported the proposed cut, while 215 Democrats opposed it and soundly defeated it.

Election year considerations, moreover, may have had something to do with the August 13 vote of Republican Members. Bad as it is—their vote a year ago on the same Project Apollo program was even worse. In 1963 a similar attempt was made to cut $200 million from this California work project. At that time 126 Republicans supported the cut and only 15 Republicans opposed it. The entire Republican delegation from California supported the attempted cutback in 1963 except for four members, and two of those were either absent or did not vote.

Once again we find that deeds count for more than cynical electioneering propaganda. In 1963 two-thirds of the Republicans from California, and the Republican Party as a whole by an 8 to 1 majority were prepared to inflict a serious blow upon our prosperity in California. The 1964 vote on the same issue shows almost half the Republicans from my State, and the Republican Party as a whole by a 2 to 1 majority determined to pursue the same course of action. We can be thankful both these attempts failed.

Another often-heard boast from unprincipled Republican candidates is the claim, "we can bring more Federal contracts to California." Now, Mr. Speaker, my State is but one of 50 States and yet after only 4 years of Democratic leadership in Washington the record in this area stands as follows:

In fiscal year 1963 the National Aeronautics and Space Administration placed almost $2 billion in contracts and procurement orders with California companies. This high figure is in fact 50.4 percent of all the business done by NASA during this period. To demonstrate how massive is California's share of NASA contract awards we need only see that the second-placed State in receipt of NASA contracts received only 9 percent of the total business for the year. My State alone, therefore, is performing half or more than half of all the work on our national space programs, and I wonder just how our Republican candidates plan to improve upon this figure.

In the nonspace field, California also leads the Nation in the number and amount of Department of Defense contracts and procurement awards received. During fiscal year 1963 approximately 25 percent of all Defense Department orders came to California, and no other State in the country receives anywhere close to this much business. I wonder once again just how our Republican candidates expect to improve upon this figure.

For the past 3 years, without any help from the Republican Party, we have had accelerating prosperity in this country. In fact, the past 3-year period has been one of the longest continuous peacetime booms since the great depression. President Johnson's ability to create harmonious labor-management relations, and the general aura of good will between the White House and the business community guarantees continued good prospects for the future.

In southern California business activity maintains a brisk pace reflecting the buoyancy of conditions at the national level. Led by sizable increases in building, real estate, and automobile sales the local economy has been operating between 7 and 8 percent above the first-quarter levels of 1963. Total employment in California has risen 2.5 percent from a year ago, and this increase is slightly above the national increase for the same period.

Unemployment, however, remains at the same level in California as a year ago, and this is the one dark cloud in an otherwise bright economic picture. I understand that some Republican candidates are offering magic cures to solve this problem also, but when we consider the Republican Party opposition to the war on poverty program and the general disregard on the part of Republican officeholders for the welfare of the working men and women of California we know that in this area too we can expect no help from the GOP.

Simply stated, the fact of the matter is that under the leadership of the Democratic Party our country is experiencing the best conditions—for the largest number of people—in history. California is receiving its full share of this prosperity, and many citizens of other States believe we are receiving much more than our fair share of the national good fortune. Any candidate for public office who makes the claim he can bring more Federal work to California, or who claims that the Democratic Party has not done enough for California is either ignorant of the true situation or is deliberately attempting to mislead and confuse the people.

In some instances these same Republican candidates have attempted to paint a frightening picture of America's image in overseas countries. Our national prestige was low in 1960, but the determination displayed by President Kennedy during the Cuban missile crisis, and the courage shown recently by President Johnson in answering attacks made upon our warships in the Tonkin Gulf have assured the world of our intention to resist Communist aggression wherever and whenever necessary.

I think it is interesting to recall that both the Berlin blockade and the Cuban quarantine were instituted by Democratic Party Presidents, and these policies enhanced rather than detracted from our prestige overseas. Our policy to isolate Communist Cuba has been so successful in fact that now only one Latin American country still maintains diplomatic relations with the island.

Mr. Speaker, the United States of America is in excellent condition, and in spite of the irresponsible statements of Senator GOLDWATER and Congressman MILLER our national prestige has never been greater. The policies of the Democratic Party, both foreign and domestic, have clearly established our Nation as the unchallenged leader of the free world, and as the one nation wherein the average man can enjoy, to an extent undreamed of a hundred years ago, the fruits of his labor.

This does not mean, of course, that no problems remain to be dealt with either at home or abroad. Difficult problems are present and they require speedy solutions. Our young people must be encouraged to a greater extent to apply themselves and learn a skilled trade or profession. Young people who have left school, and older workers faced with the threat of automation, must be trained in the skills that will provide them with a better than minimum standard of living. Our older citizens must receive dignified treatment in their senior years, and they must not be left to the whim of charity or the ruinous costs and hazardous protection of private medical care when they are sick.

Yes, many problems remain for our attention and concern, but I know the Democratic Party will tackle them and we will not rest or relax until realistic solutions are found. I point with pride to the record of my party over the past 2 years, and it has been a great honor for me to have participated in the accomplishments of the 88th Congress. It should be clear to all, on the other hand, that the Republican leadership did not add in any great measure to the progress made during the past historic session and no amount of campaign demagoguery on their part can hide this fact.

President Johnson has dedicated himself to the building of a "great society" for all Americans. I intend to assist the President in this most worthy enterprise, and I am sure this program meets with the overwhelming approval of the great majority of our citizens. I hope the members of the Republican Party will lay down their fears and prejudices and join with us in building a better life for all Americans. This is their choice to make, and I believe this is also their responsibility.

URBAN RENEWAL IN THE NATION'S CAPITAL NEEDS PERFECTING AMENDMENTS

Mr. WHALLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post of September 29, 1964, states editorially, on behalf of the proponents of the compromise version of S. 628, which was brought to the House floor earlier today, that:

> The purpose of the bill is to permit Washington to redevelop the declining commercial section between the White House and the Capitol. This legislation would carry no power that Congress has not already offered to every other city in the country.

The proponents also say, as today's Washington Post reports Acting Attorney Nicholas deB. Katzenbach as stating, that the compromise version of S. 628 brought to the floor by the House District Committee today will give District property owners adequate and "appropriate" protections, and that it will prevent local officials from undertaking arbitrary and capricious renewal projects.

Let us examine these assertions in some detail.

First, let us look at the assertion that this legislation would carry no power that Congress has not already offered to every other city in the country.

It is my belief that this bill departs from what Congress has offered other cities, for, as President Lyndon B. Johnson said, in signing the Housing Act of 1964 at the White House on September 2:

> The plight of property owners in urban renewal areas is recognized in this measure. Provision is made so that they can rehabilitate their homes and businesses instead of having to move from the path of the bulldozers.

The Housing Administrator, Robert C. Weaver, in a letter published only yesterday, September 28, in the New York Times, declares that:

> The Housing Act of 1964 affords new tools for coping with rehabilitation and relocation. The act provides that no displacement of families or business can be made from a renewal area until the Housing Administrator has determined that rehabilitation is not suitable for the area.

Enactment of S. 628 by the Congress, the compromise measure reported by the House District Committee, would change the District's housing legislation.

The Comptroller General, in his analysis of S. 628 as submitted to the House District of Columbia Committee—hearings, "Urban Renewal in the District of Columbia, Part 4"—stated:

> We also should like to call your attention to the definition in the bill of a "slum or blighted area," as contained in the amended subsection (r) to section 3 of the act. In our opinion, the definition is so broad that any area of the District of Columbia could conceivably be classified as a slum or blighted area. The bill provides that one or more of several factors must be prevalent in order for an area to be so classified. These factors may include, but are not necessarily confined to, such conditions as deteriorating buildings, obsolete buildings, and overcrowded buildings. In the absence of more precise guidelines, such factors can be applied to an area on the basis of subjective determinations.
>
> * * * * *
>
> We note, also, that the definition of a slum or blighted area gives no cognizance to the degree or severity of deterioration, dilapidation, et cetera. Thus, an area may be considered to be a slum and may be scheduled for large-scale demolition even though the blighting factors can be readily corrected. For example, an overcrowded or deteriorating building may be substantially improved through normal enforcement of codes or through normal maintenance. Although the bill does recognize degree in a sense, it does so in terms (e.g., severe social liability, impaired sound growth) which are also susceptible to subjective evaluations.

I have prepared two amendments which incorporate the housing regulations issued by the Housing Administrator, and which he requires of communities throughout the Nation in connection with both commercial and residential urban renewal areas, as well as urban renewal areas which combine both commercial and residential areas. I commend these two amendments to my colleagues for their consideration in providing true urban renewal in the Nation's Capital. Should there be objections to these amendments, and insistence on the present language in the compromise version of S. 628, then I ask where the present language defining slum and blight in the compromise version of S. 628 came from. It obviously did not come from the housing regulations and requirements which apply to all other communities of our country.

If the proponents of this compromise version of S. 628 want only what other communities have, no more and no less, then they should be willing to adopt my proposed amendments.

I include the text of these proposed amendments to the compromise version of S. 628 at this point in my remarks. I also include the text of a third amendment to S. 628, which I consider necessary because of the concentration of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency on luxury housing and prime office space and its complete unwillingness to heed the District Commissioners' recent request to provide a substantial amount of moderate income housing in the Southwest urban renewal project area.

These amendments, as well as the disclosures in committee hearings, as shown in House Report No. 1481, 88th Congress, 2d session, filed June 15, 1964, by the chairman of the House Committee on the District of Columbia, are included at this point in my remarks:

AMENDMENT NO. 1

Page 7, strike out line 17, and all that follows down through line 3 on page 8 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(r) 'Slum area' or 'blighted area' is a residential or nonresidential area, or combination thereof—

"(1) which contains at least two environmental deficiencies, "(2) in which at least 20 percent of the buildings contain at least one building deficiency, and

"(3) in all parts of which environmental or building deficiencies are present to a reasonable degree (unless the redevelopment objectives or the necessity of bringing the project to a sound boundary require otherwise).

"(s) 'Environmental deficiency' means—

"(1) overcrowding or improper location of structures on the land.

"(2) excessive dwelling unit density,

"(3) conversions to incompatible types of uses, such as rooming-houses among family dwellings,

"(4) obsolete building types, such as large residences or other buildings which through lack of use or maintenance have a blighting influence,

"(5) detrimental land uses or conditions, such as incompatible uses, structures in mixed use, or adverse influences from noise, smoke, or fumes,

"(6) unsafe, congested, poorly designed, or otherwise deficient streets,

"(7) inadequate public utilities or community facilities contributing to unsatisfactory living conditions or economic decline, or

"(8) other equally significant environment deficiencies.

"(t) 'Building deficiency' means—

"(1) defects to a point warranting clearance,

"(2) deteriorating condition because of a defect not correctable by normal maintenance,

"(3) extensive minor defects which, taken collectively are causing the building to have a deteriorating effect on the surrounding area,

"(4) inadequate original construction or alterations,

"(5) inadequate or unsafe plumbing, heating, or electrical facilities, or

"(6) other equally significant building deficiencies."

AMENDMENT No. 2

Add after section 11 the following new section:

"SEC. 12. The District of Columbia Redevelopment Act, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

" 'SEC. 25. Notwithstanding subsection (1) of section 20 or any other provision of this Act, after the date of enactment of this section the District Commissioners shall not approve any slum clearance and redevelopment project (as such term was defined in section 110(c) of the Housing Act of 1949 as amended by section 311 of the Housing Act of 1954) unless the project area is an area—

" '(1) in which either—

" '(A) more than 50 percent of the buildings (other than accessory outbuildings) are structurally substandard to a degree requiring clearance, or

" '(B) more than 20 percent of the buildings are structurally substandard to a degree requiring clearance, and additional clearance, in an amount bringing the total to more than 50 percent of the buildings, is warranted to effectively remove blighting influences; and

" '(2) which does not contain—

" '(A) an unjustifiably large number (i) of buildings proposed to be cleared which are structurally sound or (ii) of parcels proposed to be acquired which are of basically sound property involving high acquisition costs, or

" '(B) any building proposed to be cleared which is (i) of such quality and potential use that its retention is compatible with the achievement of the redevelopment objectives for the affected area, and (ii) capable of being improved and successfully integrated into such area after redevelopment.' "

AMENDMENT No. 3

Page 12, after line 24, insert the following new section:

"SEC. 6. Subsection (d) of section 7 of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945 (District of Columbia Code, sec. 5-706 (d)) is amended by striking out 'and (3)' and inserting in lieu thereof the following: '(3) give satisfactory assurances that not less than fifty percent of any rental housing or cooperative housing which may be constructed on such real property under the plan will be designed primarily for occupancy by persons from the low- and middle-income segments of the population (as determined by the Agency); and (4)'."

And redesignate the succeeding sections accordingly.

EXCERPTS FROM HOUSE REPORT NO. 1481, 88TH CONGRESS, 2D SESSION, FILED JUNE 15, 1964

DISCLOSURES IN COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Following are brief statements of disclosures regarding the District of Columbia urban renewal program received by your committee in more than 5,000 pages of transcript of testimony and from records submitted in public hearings held by four subcommittees in the past 4 years.

1. The purpose and intent of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act for the District of Columbia, discussed hereafter, has been severely distorted, to the utter neglect of the clearly stated purpose of the act. The present law was designed to eliminate substandard housing conditions existing in the District of Columbia and to provide decent, safe, and sanitary low-rent housing, or public housing when needed, by the redevelopment of cleared, urban renewal project areas (S. Rept. 591, 79th Cong., Sept. 25, 1945; H. Rept. 2465, 79th Cong., July 8, 1946).

2. The financial statement of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency as of June 30, 1963, shows an expenditure of at least $100 million of public funds during the nearly 14 years of operation by the Agency (District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency Annual Report balance sheet, June 30, 1963).

3. Not one unit of low-rent or public housing has been built in Washington under any urban renewal project plan, nor has the program provided any middle income housing.

4. The use of the powers in the present District of Columbia Redevelopment Act have been diverted to provide high-rent and luxury-type residential units at monthly rentals upward of $40 per room, to plush family units to be sold for as much as $75,000 per unit, which redevelopment invades the type of housing facilities which can be and are being furnished abundantly by private enterprise at no cost to the public (Area B, hearings, vol. 4, p. 1590 et seq.; Harbour Square, hearings, vol. 2, p. 1115; Columbia Plaza, vol. 2, p. 1105).

5. "Chosen instrument" redevelopers for renewal projects have been selected many months before any official approval of a project plan (Columbia Plaza, hearings, vol. 2).

6. Architectural design competitions have been conducted in which competitors were not equally notified and informed as to specifications and plan requirements with the result of award to the designers having the benefit of knowledge of the changed requirements (Tiber Island, vol. 4, p. 1084, hearings).

7. The District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency received, and the Housing and Home Finance Agency accepted, required forms showing financial responsibility of a developer of a $20 million project, which representation of financial responsibility was without authorization and denied in sworn testimony before your committee (Columbia Plaza, hearings, vol. 2, p. 1135).

8. The District of Columbia Redevelopment Agency entered into agreements to sell U.S. Government property to "chosen instrument" redevelopers years before the approval of any project plan and without any knowledge or consent of Congress (Washington Channel waterfront, hearings, vol. 1, p. 192).

9. The Agency has used an unauthorized and secret formula for the disposition of project area land to a "chosen instrument" redeveloper, knowledge of which formula was withheld from other interested developers fully qualified under the formula (Columbia Plaza, 50 percent rule, hearings, vol. 2, pp. 253-254; 720; 770; 899-903).

10. Land disposition prices for high-rent housing have been established at less than the fair market value by means of residual land-use appraisals and use of appraisals not conducted by the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency (Hearings, vol. 4, p. 1590u).

11. The Agency has prepared land-use appraisals to establish fair market value for sale of project lands before the approval of any project plan under which land usage was established (Columbia Plaza, hearings, vol. 2, chronology, p. III.)

12. The National Capital Planning Commission and the Agency have resorted to a gerrymandering of urban renewal boundaries so as to include choice, single-family housing areas which were free from any substandard housing and blight (Adams-Morgan hearing transcript, pp. 1150-1168).

13. Project plans for an urban renewal area have been approved in an area in which there existed not one substandard housing unit within the project area boundaries on the date of approval of the project plan (Columbia Plaza, hearings, vol. 2, pp. 530-536; 1176).

14. The District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency charged the District of Columbia $2 million plus for land needed for public use in a project area, when public land could have been exchanged without cost to the public (Columbia Plaza, hearings, vol. 2, pp. 1344-1345; vol. 1. pp. 295-297).

15. The Agency has made application for public funds to redevelop land where private industry was ready, willing, and able to redevelop without the use of public funds (Columbia Plaza, hearings, vol. 2, pp. 638-654).

16. The Agency has approved changes in urban renewal plans without adjustment in land costs where increased uses provided windfall profits to the redeveloper instead of lowering the project cost to the public (Columbia Plaza, area B, hearings, vol. 2, pp. 1087-1111; vol. 4, pp. 1590g-1590h).

17. Low land appraisals have been based upon the redeveloper's proposed use of the land rather than upon the highest and best use of land provided in the redevelopment plan.

18. Clearance and redevelopment by private industry in the District of Columbia has been discouraged by the action of the Planning Commission and the Agency in imposing urban renewal project plan on an area in which almost all the property had been assembled under one ownership which had substantially demonstrated accomplishment toward the purpose of private development (Columbia Plaza, hearings, vol. 2, pp. 1253-1256, 619-668).

19. The Planning Commission and the Agency have used special housing standards, more restrictive than those used by the District of Columbia government, to classify housing structures as substandard in order to provide the quantity of existing substandard housing to qualify an area as an urban renewal area (Adams-Morgan hearing transcript, pp. 1173-1185).

20. In a project area where the District of Columbia required land for public use, the Agency charged the District $23.11 per square foot but sold equally valuable land noncompetitively to the redeveloper at $14.88

per square foot (Columbia Plaza, hearings, vol. 2, pp. 310–313).

21. An original contract for land disposition to a redeveloper, who was to build a substantial number of low-rent housing units, was changed to provide for the construction of high-rent housing only (area B, hearings, vol. 4, p. 1590g).

22. The Agency has released redevelopers from the obligations of redevelopment contracts after default or in face of default, and in some cases there followed a cancellation of penalties, extension of the contract, or execution of a new more favorable contract (area B, vol. 4, pp. 1590p–1590t).

23. The Agency conveyed to a "chosen instrument" redeveloper, U.S. Government-owned land of approximately $2 million value in order to reduce the unit land cost to the redeveloper (Columbia Plaza, hearings, vol. 2, p. 323).

24. A deficiency of more than 8,000 units of low-rent or public housing units has developed in the District of Columbia even though the present law requires that there be assurance that decent, safe, and sanitary housing will be available for dislocated people (Commissioner's housing report, 1962).

25. Concerning the first three sections of S. 628 as referred to your committee, the Comptroller General observed that under Urban Renewal Administration criteria, any building could be considered as substandard and scheduled for acquisition and demolition. The American Law Division of the Library of Congress stated that the limits of the increased breadth of authority could not be stated (hearings, vol. 3, p. 1508a). Committee's amendments are designed to require more selective treatment of private property without hindering redevelopment authorized and intended by Congress.

26. The Agency and the Planning Commission proposed a project plan providing for the acquisition of single family dwellings in a fine residential neighborhood for use as scattered site public housing for subsidized rent tenancy (Adams-Morgan, hearing transcript).

27. Despite the favorable action of your committee and the House of Representatives in 1960 proposing a moratorium on new projects until existing projects were 50 percent completed, four additional projects have since been approved, or are in the preliminary stages, and only one project plan is more than 50-percent complete after 12 years.

28. In 1961 the Agency, financed and aided in the organization of a private corporation to undertake functions of the Agency relating to the Southwest area C waterfront 11-acre parcel and justified the action on the ground that its staff was too overburdened by projects to devote sufficient time to the small waterfront area (Washington Channel waterfront, hearings, vol. 1, p. 222).

Mr. Speaker, the second point made by the proponents of the compromise version of S. 628 is that it will prevent local officials from undertaking "arbitrary and capricious" renewal projects, and that it gives District property owners adequate and "appropriate" protections.

On the other hand, the recently formed Committee for the Rights of the Washington Business Community says this is not so, and says that the compromise bill provides no compensation for loss of goodwill by businesses forced to move.

The fact of the matter is that the compromise version of S. 628 does not provide full and just compensation for the District's businessmen, and homeowners, and the powers of eminent domain have been abused, not only in the Nation's Capital but throughout the country. It was to alleviate these abuses that the Republican housing bill, H.R. 9771, which I developed and which was cosponsored by Senator JOHN TOWER, and several of my colleagues in the House, included a far-reaching title which would provide just compensation.

The House of Representatives recognized the manifest abuses of eminent domain when it created the Select Subcommittee on Real Property Acquisition in the House Committee on Public Works. This subcommittee has held hearings around the country, it has published these hearings, and it will shortly bring out its report. The House and Senate Housing Subcommittees have promised to act early next year in providing full and just compensation. The Acting Attorney General, Nicholas deB. Katzenbach, certainly knows of these significant and long overdue steps the Congress is taking in this neglected field, but his curbstone opinion, which was reported by the Washington Post this morning—September 29—in time to help influence the vote on the compromise version of S. 628, completely ignores these congressional developments. Why?

The Sunday Star of September 27, 1964, reported that when the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency began buying property in one 80-acre tract in southwest Washington 11 years ago there were 914 individual parcels owned by 686 persons or firms. Today, all the residential property is owned by James H. Scheuer and the HRH Corp., both of New York City. According to the Sunday Star:

> In getting rid of the slums in area B, the renewal agency also got rid of multiple ownership of the residences. The present 1,739 dwellings are of the rental type including the 400 townhouse units, and there are no individually owned homes.

The Star newspaper report points out that luxury apartments in the southwest urban renewal project rent up to $500 a month, and that:

> A total of 288,752 square feet of land in the area was sold by RLA to the District for the Southwest Expressway at a price of $1,607,919, or more than $5.50 a square foot. Townhouse and apartment land was leased at a fee value of from 91 cents a square foot to $2.50 a square foot.

The compromise version of S. 628 would continue and, in fact, actually increase these kinds of practices throughout the District of Columbia, and this is not anything which this Congress should fasten on the voteless citizens of the Nation's Capital.

I include here a letter I sent to the able and distinguished chairman of the House Committee on the District of Columbia, as well as several newspaper articles, which will shed light on the subject I have been discussing:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C. September 4, 1964.
Hon. JOHN L. MCMILLAN,
Chairman, House District of Columbia Committee, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MCMILLAN: I appreciate your recent letter thanking me for my statement on urban renewal in the District of Columbia.

I took the trouble to make this insertion because the president of the Federation of Citizens Associations requested it. Also, the newspapers have not given a balanced picture in their news columns, or in their editorials about urban renewal and the work of your committee and Subcommittee No. 4 under Congressman JOHN DOWDY. There seems to be a paper curtain. Actually, the radio and television stations are doing a much better job, for some reason.

Having said this, I would like to say that I am considering offering some amendments to S. 628 to strengthen it if and when it reaches the floor. Among the amendments I have in mind are (1) the amendment offered by Senator JACK MILLER to S. 628 in the Senate last year; (2) an amendment providing that not less than 50 percent of any rental housing or cooperative housing in an urban renewal area will be designed primarily for occupancy by persons from the low- and middle-income segments of the population; and (3) amendments similar to those I offered in my H.R. 9771 to make certain that relocation housing would be provided to displacees. These are the three main areas which I think should be given particular consideration by S. 628.

The Washington Post today said editorially that the District Commissioners are trying to work out a compromise redevelopment bill with the House District Committee, but clearly opposes the amendments included in S. 628 by the House District Committee. My own view is that these amendments should be retained, and the bill be strengthened by the amendments I have outlined above.

I would appreciate the opportunity of talking with you about the amendments I suggest at your earliest opportunity. I enclose them here for your consideration.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM B. WIDNALL.

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 29, 1964]

AN ACCEPTABLE COMPROMISE

At last the House District Committee has arrived at a compromise in its long internal struggle over urban renewal in Washington. The new version of the bill drops the most malicious of the amendments written into it, earlier this year, by Mr. Garber, the committee's counsel. The compromise now deserves to be passed.

The purpose of the bill is to permit Washington to redevelop the declining commercial section between the White House and the Capitol. This legislation would carry no power that Congress has not already offered to every other city in the country. From Alexandria and Baltimore to the Pacific coast, American cities are already at work rebuilding their commercial centers and protecting the tax bases upon which city schools and welfare services depend.

The compromise bill still contains several unfortunate additions. It will generally require redevelopment land to go to the highest bidder, a procedure full of hazards as Alexandria recently discovered. It will require further legislation before the Anacostia-Bolling site can be redeveloped. But on balance the merits of even this compromise vastly outweigh its defects, and the city's interest will be greatly served by its enactment. The elimination of the Garber amendments is owed to the leadership of Congressmen SISK and SPRINGER, who correctly perceived them to be an attack on urban renewal, not merely in Washington, but throughout the country.

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 22, 1964]

RENEWAL SHOWDOWN STIRS FINAL MOVES

Washington's compromise downtown renewal bill stirred last minute moves by its backers and its critics yesterday as it neared a showdown in the House.

Representative B. F. Sisk, Democrat, of California, one of the leading backers of commercial renewal powers for the District, cited support from the Justice Department.

Opponents distributed flyers warning downtown merchants that the bill "leaves the small businessmen out in the cold." Members of the recently formed Committee for the Rights of the Washington Business Community urged the businessmen to wire Congressmen to defeat the measure.

The House is expected to vote on it today.

SAFEGUARDS ADEQUATE

Sisk disclosed that acting Atty. Gen. Nicholas deB. Katzenbach considers the safeguards in the measure more than adequate in preventing local officials from undertaking "arbitrary and capricious" renewal projects.

Sisk said he hoped Katzenbach's report would stem fears about the guideline accepted by a House District Subcommittee last week.

The bill passed the Senate last year as a simple piece of legislation designed to let the city use urban renewal powers in nonresidential neighborhoods. All other major cities have the authority.

But a divided House District Committee added a string of amendments that an 11-member minority complained would virtually halt urban renewal in Washington.

Under a compromise worked out last week, committee members of both sides agreed to accept the Senate-passed standards for determining just what constitutes a slum eligible for urban renewal.

In his opinion, Katzenbach said this would give the District property owners adequate and appropriate protections.

Under the House Committee's restrictions, he said, "presumably only the cores of slums could be urban renewal areas.

"The public investment in renewal areas," Katzenbach added, "might thus be jeopardized because those areas would be surrounded by deteriorating areas that had been excluded from renewal because most of the buildings were not yet physically dangerous."

The House version would have tied urban renewal solely to the structural condition of buildings in a proposed project area while the Senate bill would allow consideration of conditions that represent "a serious and growing threat to the public health, safety, morals, or welfare."

Katzenbach said the House restriction was weaker than the Senate provision in some spots since it would allow urban renewal for buildings that are "detrimental" rather than "a serious and growing threat."

FOES PRESS DRIVE

The fight over the measure will apparently continue down to the wire.

In flyers entitled "The Bulldozer Is at Your Door," members of the recently formed committee for the Rights of the Washington Business Community called for a last-minute campaign to defeat the renewal bill.

Atty. James F. O'Donnell, a committee spokesman, said the bill provides no compensation for "loss of goodwill" by businesses forced to move.

And without any restrictions limiting renewal to physical building conditions, he maintained, property owners will be left at the mercy of local urban renewal officials.

"Even buildings and businesses in strict compliance with the District of Columbia Building Code can be declared blighted under the new amendments," the committee charged.

[From the Washington Star, Sept. 27, 1964]

A BRANDNEW NEIGHBORHOOD IS BORN

(By Robert J. Lewis)

Tucked away in Southwest Washington is an elegant new neighborhood of special interest and believe-it-or-not rarity. It is the first urban renewal project area to be started in Washington. Soon it will be marked "completed."

Popularly, this 80-acre section, one of three projects in the much-delayed 560-acre Southwest Washington renewal area, is known as the Capitol Park neighborhood. It takes this name from the Capitol Park development of apartments and townhouses of which it is almost entirely composed.

Legally, this first renewal project in Washington's history is known as "Southwest Urban Renewal Project Area B." Planning for it started almost as soon as the District Redevelopment Land Agency's operations were begun 14 years ago. But not until 12 years ago was a redevelopment plan adopted for the area.

As now bounded, Capitol Park roughly extends from Fourth Street to Half Street and from the Southwest Expressway to I Street SW. Besides this area, Southwest Area B also contains the Amidon playground, the Randall Junior High School, the uncompleted Randall Recreation Center and the Skyline Motel at South Capitol and I Streets SW.

Also included is the Southwest Market Center and the Phillips Petroleum gasoline station, along E Street, north of the expressway.

When RLA began buying property in the area 11 years ago, there were 914 individual parcels owned by 686 persons or firms. Much of it was slum property.

Ninety-nine percent of all the buildings were demolished and the land was either leased or sold by RLA. Today all the residential property is listed as owned by James H. Scheuer and the HRH Corp., both of New York.

The residential land earlier was earmarked for lease by RLA to Mr. Scheuer and Roger L. Stevens, New York real estate dealer and theatrical producer who heads the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts.

Subsequently, Mr. Stevens disposed of his interest. HRH Corp. was brought in as an owner and builder after the first apartment building at 800 Fourth Street SW., was completed 5 years ago.

Since then, 3 additional apartment buildings and 400 townhouses have been completed. A fifth apartment building is expected to be finished early in 1965.

With completion of this building, the project area itself will be largely completed. It will have 1,339 apartments in 5 elevator buildings, plus 400 rental units in the townhouses, many of which are 2-unit apartments.

In getting rid of the slums in area B, the renewal agency also got rid of multiple ownership of the residences. The present 1,739 dwellings are of the rental type including the 400 townhouse units, and there are no individually owned homes.

Developers of the Capitol Park area are generally credited with having achieved an outstanding architectural result by having retained Architect Chloethiel Woodard Smith to design the development.

An early area development plan by Elbert Peets, former member of the Fine Arts Commission, emphasized rehabilitation rather than demolition of dwellings, but it was scrapped by RLA and the National Capital Planning Commission. The plan calling for demolition was drawn up by Mrs. Smith and Louis Justement.

The Federal Government, contributed $4,564,345 as a grant to carry out the work, and the District government spent $5,761,994, RLA said. The District contribution was $2,319,881 in excess of legal requirements, the agency said.

A total of 288,752 square feet of land in the area was sold by RLA to the District for the Southwest Expressway at a price of $1,607,919, or more than $5.50 a square foot. Townhouse and apartment land was leased at a fee value of from 91 cents a square foot to $2.50 a square foot.

Townhouse rentals in the Capitol Park development range from $190 for each of two apartments in a single dwelling, to a maximum of $310 monthly for an entire four-bedroom house, with utility costs extra.

Elevator apartment rentals range from a minimum of $135 monthly for the lowest-price efficiencies to a maximum of $500 a month for the highest rent two-bedroom apartments. The highest rent apartments will be located in the building to be completed early next year.

Except for eight of these apartments in the $450 to $500 range in the final elevator building, the maximum apartment rental in the other buildings is $280 monthly for two bedrooms. One-bedroom rentals range up to $218 monthly.

SYMBOLS AND REALITIES IN REPUBLICAN ECONOMICS

Mr. WHALLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Widnall] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, a recent article by Dr. Henry Wallich, professor of economics at Yale University, provides a clear, decisive presentation of the basis of much Republican economic thought. The article, "Symbols and Realities in Republican Economics," which was prepared for the Journal of Commerce, dismisses the myths and shibboleths associated by the opposition with Republican economic thinking and discusses the underlying realities.

Because a symbol or phrase, such as the "balanced budget," often clouds the real issue it is intended to identify, Professor Wallich concentrates on what are the three most commonly confused, and abused symbols. These are the balanced budget, gold, and the dangers of the public debt.

The balanced budget as a symbol is frequently misinterpreted as requiring a budget in exact balance every year. Few Republicans believe in such a rigid interpretation, but rather see a balance over the business cycle. Too rigid an interpretation, of course, would eliminate the role of surpluses which should be used to retire part of the public debt. As Dr. Wallich points out:

> When the Government runs a surplus, it is generating savings through the budget. These take the form of debt repayment, and the funds become available for private investment. This in turn contributes to the rate of economic growth.

He adds that the goal of a balanced budget fulfills another, more basic, function. It serves as a "means of maintaining fiscal discipline and fiscal responsibility." Republican concentration on the goal of a balanced budget, Dr. Wallich observes, expresses a concern over the size of the public sector which Republicans know can become a threat to individual freedom.

Dr. Wallich points out that gold still retains international importance with world confidence in the dollar resting in large part on our gold stock. He also suggests another reason why gold is an important issue in Republican economic thinking. He states that "gold and its symbolism provide a useful counterpoise to inflationism."

The concern over the public debt is the third Republican economic symbol dealt with in the article. Here again, this concern reflects the larger, more fundamental issue of fiscal responsibility. Republicans believe, as Dr. Wallich points out, that "the public debt handled irresponsibly can become a great menace." This is another example of a key Republican concept being used as a measuring rod to test the fiscal performance of the administration in power.

I include Dr. Wallich's article, "Symbols and Realities in Republican Economics," at this point:

SYMBOLS AND REALITIES IN REPUBLICAN ECONOMICS

(By Henry C. Wallich)

With the approach of the election campaign, both parties are reformulating and sharpening their philosophy and their rhetoric.

The parties have real differences, although between the middle of the roaders of both sides these are not unbridgeable. Both parties, however, also have symbols which they believe, or try to make believe, to stand for these real differences. These symbols—"balanced budget," "full employment," "gold," "public needs," and many more—become the focus of discussion and confuse a realistic analysis.

If taken seriously by the politicians, they will also confound good policy making.

I shall pick out here three Republican symbols: The balanced budget, gold, and the dangers of the public debt. All three have a perfectly sound grounding in the real issues. All three issues are in danger of becoming hopelessly muddled by their respective symbols.

THE BALANCED BUDGET

A balanced budget is a frequently voiced Republican demand. If the speaker is a liberal Republican, he may argue for balancing the budget over the business cycle with deficits in recessions and surpluses in booms. But deficits are always tainted.

What is the underlying reality? Basically, it is concern over the size of the public sector of the economy. This concern in the last analysis is a concern less over money than over governmental power. Republicans object not only to large scale Government activities, they object to the extension of Government power because of the threat they see in it to individual freedom.

There are many other facets, of course, to the Republican rejection of a large public sector. People in the upper income brackets dislike it because under a progressive tax system, they pay a disproportionate part of the bill. Many of the services the Government provides go to the lower income groups. Big Government also implies the prospect of greater dependence of business upon Government, expanded controls and "intervention."

At the same time, the experience of the last few years does little to refute the critics of a large public sector. Government expenditures are up sharply, but are "public needs" really substantially better taken care of? Has the "public squalor" of which Galbraith complained been significantly remedied? Many things need to be improved in our society, but more spending for them does not seem to guarantee a solution.

There are the realities of the case against a large public sector and big Government spending. Obviously they have to do with a balanced budget, but this symbol falls short of covering the case. And insistence on a balanced budget as a means of limiting big spending creates difficulties for a rational fiscal policy which the advocates of the balanced budget seem wholly to disregard.

To begin with, the budget is a highly arbitrary collection of figures in two columns, the equality of whose sums is not particularly meaningful. About 30 percent of Federal expenditures are outside the administrative budget in any event. The Government's books are kept on principles so primitive that a businessman might have great difficulty living with them.

The Government cannot capitalize any of its expenditures. If a rapidly growing business were compelled to expense all its investment outlays, it might very often find itself operating in the red. It does not follow from this that the Government should have a capital budget—this would invite even larger spending. But the difference between governmental and business bookkeeping should be borne in mind.

In political rhetoric, deficits are automatically equated with inflation. They are indeed inflationary if they create a scarcity of resources, or if they are financed by money creation that in turn generates excessive private demand. But business "deficits" in the Government bookkeeping sense, i.e., investment expenditures financed by borrowing, are equally inflationary under the same conditions. Soundly financed, and in the absence of a strain on resources, neither public nor private deficits are inflationary.

An analogy frequently is drawn between Government deficits and business deficits. Quite aside from the difference in bookkeeping, the analogy is wholly misleading. Profitable operation is indeed the test of efficiency for an enterprise. Government operation may be inefficient or not, but a surplus or deficit in the budget is not the test.

On grounds quite different from those of political rhetoric, however, a good case can be made for keeping deficits down and even trying to achieve a surplus. The case has nothing to do with the supposed merits of a balanced budget, but with the contribution to economic growth that Government savings can make.

When the Government runs a surplus, it is generating savings through the budget. These take the form of debt repayment, and the funds become available for private investment. This in turn contributes to the rate of economic growth.

Whether such a policy is possible depends on whether high employment can be maintained in the face of surpluses. Monetary policy can help here. If interest rates can be kept sufficiently low, investment of the funds repaid by the Treasury is facilitated. A proper tax structure can help, which gives incentives to investment.

The conclusion, for fiscal policy, is that under some conditions there are merits in surpluses, under others in deficits. Surpluses are preferable, because they can help speed up growth. But when these conditions cannot be met, the case of deficits must be faced. In neither circumstance is there a special value in a balanced budget. It just happens to be the middle between the two.

Nevertheless, the popular symbol of the balanced budget, with all its defects, has merits of a different sort that Republicans should not easily sacrifice. The ideal of a balanced budget serves as a means of maintaining fiscal discipline and fiscal responsibility. Perhaps that is the reason why so many public figures, who are quite well informed about the economics nevertheless continue to harp on budget balancing.

The pressures for spending are always great. We know that ordinarily we shall spend a little more and take in a little less than we ought. From the reasonable position that deficits are appropriate under some circumstances, it is only too easy to move to the belief that they are appropriate under all.

The proper analysis of what is appropriate in a given situation is bound to be difficult. There is a large group among politicians and voters who are hard to persuade that there are limits in any particular case. This calls for a counter bias, which is provided by the balanced budget symbol.

The symbol does not stand up under technical analysis. But it admirably fits what Dr. Walter Heller, Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, has called the puritan ethic of the American people.

As a brake on excesses, it has its value. Its virtues lie in the preaching rather than in the execution.

So long as the preaching it not taken too literally, so long as politicians do not fall for their own propaganda, the balanced budget performs a genuine service.

GOLD

Gold is another of the symbols that in political rhetoric takes the place of complex realities.

These symbols can get badly in the way of rational policy. Taken with a large dose of political salt, however, they do have value.

Gold, in addition to being valuable, has the advantage as a symbol of being mysterious. Few people feel quite sure that they understand what it is about. Any tampering with it nevertheless brings strong outcries.

When the Kennedy administration, a couple of years ago, moved to abolish the 25 percent gold requirement for the Federal Reserve, the outraged onslaught of the opposition forced retreat in short order. What are the realities behind the gold symbol?

Gold symbolizes sound money. This means two things: Stable prices at home, a fixed and secure value for our currency abroad. Both are economic objectives of the first order.

The relation of gold to stable prices is less strong than it was before the domestic gold circulation was ended in 1933, but it was tenuous even then. The Federal Reserve was managing the currency, and a stable price level was its primary objective.

But gold did little to enforce this objective. The Federal Reserve, at almost all times, had substantial excess reserves. The discipline of gold would not have prevented an increase in the price level, although substantial inflation no doubt would quickly have caused leakages of gold abroad and into domestic hoarding.

Today gold does not serve as a backing, nor gives value to our currency in any meaningful sense. Americans are no longer allowed to own it, at home or abroad. Yet the opposition to a removal of the 25-percent Federal Reserve requirement is strong, even virulent.

The relation of gold to a stable international value of the dollar is more direct. A country that wants to serve as banker to the world must have large liquid reserves. It must inspire confidence abroad that it can meet its liability without a shadow of doubt.

Given this confidence, however, the United States can conduct its international financial operations very largely on the basis of credit. In the financing of our huge balance-of-payments deficit of the last 6 years, credit has played a much greater role than gold payments. The world has been willing to accept dollars in payments, and to hold them.

With some justification it has been said that gold is on a dollar standard, and so is the rest of the world. If the United States were to devalue dollars, it is a virtual certainty that the rest of the world would follow suit. Gold would be worth more in terms of all foreign currencies. The dollar, in all likelihood, would be worth what it was before.

Under these conditions, a good case can be made for removing the 25-percent Federal Reserve requirement.

It would make all our gold available for international support of the dollar. It would demonstrate to the world that we are prepared to use our full resources to meet our obligations.

Our determination to maintain the internal and external value of the dollar would be in no way reduced thereby. If a policy of stable prices and stable exchange rates is pursued, as it must, the compelling element is the good economic sense of these objectives. It is not the limitation imposed upon our actions by our gold holdings.

Nevertheless, I would not today recommend removing the 25-percent requirement. This is mainly because of the terrific fight that would be provoked, and the uncertainty of the outcome. But one must recognize also that the symbol of gold has a stabilizing value.

In the perpetual struggle between those who believe that stable money is an essential basis of a free economy, and those who want to push the economy beyond the limits of its capacity regardless of inflation, gold and its symbolism provide a useful counterpoise to inflationism. In defense of our gold reserve, policies become feasible for which otherwise it might be hard to rally a majority.

Gold is an anchor not to be pulled up lightly.

THE PUBLIC DEBT

The crushing burden of the public debt is another of the great Republican symbols that never fails to attract attention when the national conventions meet.

Political rhetoric sees the country mortgaging its future. A ruinous burden is being passed on to future generations to pay, it is said, and we must do all we can to pay it off now.

What are the realities behind the symbol? The fundamental issue is fiscal responsibility. The public debt, handled irresponsibly, can become a great menace.

If the counsels of those prevail who want to keep the Government's interest payments down, want to finance the debt cheaply through the banking system, we are in for serious inflation. And if it should be widely accepted that the public debt does not matter, because we owe it to ourselves, some further restraints on big spending and on the enlargement of the public sector will have been removed.

But symbolism strays very far from realism in the way it pictures the burden of the debt. There is no analogy between the debt burden of an individual or business and the debt burden of the Federal Government. The debt of the Nation is the assets of millions of citizens. The interest is their income.

To say that "we owe it to ourselves" is, to be sure, an oversimplification. The debt is not altogether with adverse effects, even when it is properly managed. Higher taxes must be levied, with their inevitable disincentive effects. The interest charge crowds other expenditures out of the budget that otherwise might be worthwhile.

Perhaps the best way of describing the situation is to say that the public debt is like a debt owed to one's father-in-law, it is within the family, but it can create friction. The overriding fact nevertheless is that it is within the family.

The public debt is not particularly large relative to our economy and to the budget. The annual interest of $11 billion is 1.8 percent of the gross national product and 11 percent of the budget. In 1929, the interest of not quite $1 billion was 1.1 percent of GNP and 11 percent of the budget. In 1920, it was 1.2 percent of the GNP and 16 percent of the budget. Ever since World War II, of course, the dollar value of the debt has been shrinking in relation to the GNP and to other debt, although the interest charge has crept up.

It is particularly noteworthy that during the postwar period the Federal Government has gone into debt much more slowly than other debtors. Business, consumers, houseowners, the State and local authorities have all been stepping up their indebtedness at rates commensurate with the growth of the economy or a good deal faster. The Federal debt has inched up slowly.

This is as it should be: the Government should not deprive the private sector of full access to the Nation's savings when there is strong demand for them. Preferably, it would at such times repay debt in order to increase the supply of investible funds.

This was done during the 1920's, with very beneficial results for the rate of economic growth. In any event the facts indicate that the Federal debt is in no way becoming a crushing burden.

Neither need we be concerned about passing the debt on to our children. After all, we are also passing on the corresponding assets. Each generation bears the main burden of the public debt created during its lifetime. In our case, the burden took the form of the material waste of World War II, during which hard work was done with not much in the way of consumption or investment to show for it.

The consequences in the shape of a somewhat smaller economy, due to low investment during those years, do also touch our children. But in general, what we are passing on is not the burden of the debt, but the problems of managing it.

Nor need we worry if we fail to pay off the debt. I have indicated why it would be advantageous to do so; under favorable conditions, this is a means of speeding economic growth. But a going concern need not eliminate its debt, so long as it can expect to have the earnings to pay the interest. Many of our leading corporations give no sign of reducing the volume of their debt.

Corporate debt, to be sure, is reflected in productive assets. Whether this can be said of the Federal Government is questionable. But what counts is not assets, but earning power. The assets of a bankrupt enterprise are of limited value to its creditors. About the "earning power" of the Federal Government there can be little doubt.

The "earning power" of the Federal Government is its tax base, and that means the American economy itself. Any single enterprise may eventually decline. But the American economy is likely to grow, barring nuclear disaster, and so will the tax base. At the level of a nation, even death is not sure, but taxes are.

Yet with all the misunderstandings that surround the public debt, it remains a useful symbol helping to enforce fiscal responsibility. It would be a disaster if some of the things said about the debt were taken literally, and if all our policies were bent toward reducing it under all circumstances. Taken with the appropriate dose of salt and treated accordingly, proper concern about the public debt and its management is an essential Republican symbol.

FATHER JUNIPERO SERRA ESSAY WINNERS

Mr. WHALLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. TALCOTT], may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, the Native Daughters of the Golden West recently sponsored an essay contest throughout all of the schools in California on "The Place of Fray Junipero Serra in California History and the Importance to the Development of California of the Missions He Established." Mrs. Elmarie Hurlbert Dyke, of Pacific Grove, Calif., past grand president of the Native Daughters of the Golden West was chairman of the Fray Junipero Serra essay contest.

I am proud and pleased to report that the first and fourth place winners came from my congressional district. It is not surprising that a high percentage of the winners should come from my district. Seven of the 21 California missions are located therein.

The author of the first place essay is Miss Mary Helen McCommons, Salinas, Calif., who attends Santa Catalina School for Girls at Monterey. The fourth place winner is Miss Denise Mallette, Box 4301, Carmel-by-the-Sea, who attends Junipero Memorial High School in Monterey.

I submit these winning essays to be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point in my remarks:

The Place of Fray Junipero Serra in California History and the Importance to the Development of California of the Missions He Established

(First place essay by Miss Mary Helen McCommons, 108 Sycamore Road, Salinas, Calif.; Santa Catalina School for Girls at Monterey; instructor: Sister M. Isabel O.P.)

Miguel Jose Serra was 56 years old in the spring of 1769. For 20 years, as Fray Junipero Serra, he had established missions in New Spain and Lower California and labored to bring the faith to the Indians of the Spanish New World. But in March of 1769 this commission ended. Alarmed by the increasing Russian colonization of northern California, the Government of Mexico initiated plans for an expedition of soldiers and missionaries to settle and civilize the fertile lands of California. Led by Captain Portola, then Governor of Lower California, the party set out from Loreto. With them walked the gray-robed Father Serra, perhaps a little more slowly than the others, for Fray Junipero was lame in one leg. Those were the first steps in building what was to become Father Serra's rosary of missions. With a prayer and a dream, he trod the difficult path northward.

Fray Junipero had already carried his dream for half a century and across half a world by that spring of 1769, but the light of his hope never failed him in the dangerous and discouraging months and years following his departure from Mexico.

When Portola decided to return the weary, starving band to Mexico, less than a year after the founding of the first mission at San Diego, it was Fray Junipero's prayers and faith which saved the seemingly doomed expedition. When this same mission was completely razed by hostile Indians, he was more convinced than ever of the necessity of his work. The Franciscans rebuilt the mission and Padre Serra continued to set the gems of his "rosary" along a bejewelled sea from San Francisco to San Diego, separated by the length of dawn to sunset.

In a decade and a half Father Serra had brought a new way of life to the Indians of California and played a leading role in the colonization of one of the brightest jewels in the Spanish crown. He had converted and educated thousands, a tireless example to both his converts and his brother missionaries. Besides bringing them the way of life, he had taught them a way of living: the embryonic industries of agriculture and cattle raising were centered around the missions, citrus orchards and vineyards sprawling over the surrounding hills; weaving and sandal making, saddlery and candle dipping were learned at the hands of the gray-robed friars. A legacy of language and liturgy, fraternity and love echoed from the bells of the mission towers, and resounds even today against the rolling hills which skirt the thunderous sea. The vineyards still exist, and the citrus groves, their size hardly dreamed of by the gentle Fray Junipero. The loveliest homes in California reflect the influence of the old mission style, and daily speech reechoes the soft tones of the Spanish tongue: streets and cities, festivals and holidays, mountains and seas and rivers still bear their proud Spanish names, recalling the missionaries of two centuries ago.

But perhaps more important than the tangible legacy left by Fray Junipero Serra is the pride in a heritage won not by gun nor greed nor bloodshed, but by the cross of love and the peace of understanding. It was devotion when discouragement seemed the only end, and a passion for the fulfillment of a dream, that inspired Father Serra, and, in turn, inspired others to follow him. He has taken his place as the Father of California, and his place is undisputed.

Father Serra died on August 28, 1784, in his beloved Mission Carmel, a tired but never defeated man. He had seen a wilderness become a prosperous colony, and he knew that he had taken part in the transformation. He knew, also, that the work was far from finished, and he entrusted it to those who followed him—the gray-robed friars, the Indians—and you—and me.

The Place of Father Junipero Serra in California History and the Importance to California of His Missions

(Fourth place essay by Miss Denise Mallette, Box 4301, Carmel-by-the-Sea, Calif., Junipero Memorial High School, Monterey, instructor: Sister M. Colette, O.P.)

Once there was a man of faith and vision—

Fray Junipero Serra was a Spanish Franciscan whose writings and works give witness both to a deep and sincere faith and to broad vision. At the dedication of Mission San Antonio in 1770, Serra summed up what was at once his life work and his contribution to the California of today when he spoke of his trust in God and expressed the hope that the mission would become a great town of many Christians.[1]

Father Serra was the spiritual and physical force behind the California missions. He faced the ignorance of the natives, the opposition of the Spanish governors, and the physical hardships of 18th-century California, but his courage and faith never failed him. When the Spanish wished to leave San Diego in 1770 soon after its foundation, it was Serra's persistence that prevented the abandonment of the fort and the mission. Fray Francisco Palou wrote that "He [Serra] felt that if the port were then abandoned, after formal possession and settlement had been effected, it might easily happen that many centuries would pass before it would be settled again."[2]

Between 1769 and 1782 Serra founded the missions of San Carlos Borromeo at Monterey, San Antonio de Padua, San Luis Obispo, San Juan Capistrano, and San Buenaventura, and he dedicated, or repeatedly visited San Gabriel, San Francisco and Santa Clara which had been founded with his encouragement by his coworkers.

The establishment of San Carlos Borromeo demonstrates the commonsense and foresight that characterized so much of Serra's work. He decided that the mission should not remain at its original site: it lacked ground for cultivation; there was little water for irrigation. Serra therefore moved the mission to nearby Carmel Valley where conditions were better and where there was good land, sufficient water, timber, and a large Indian population.

Another example of Serra's good planning is found in a letter written in 1777 to Palou in which he noted that "the procession of missions is very disjointed" and that to achieve unity it would be necessary to make three foundations along the Santa Barbara Channel.[3] In time, San Buenaventura, La Purisima Concepcion and Santa Barbara filled in the gap.

Today, all the mission sites established by Father Serra are surrounded by thriving towns or cities. None has been abandoned. His practical approach in selecting the best locations for a future generation is evidenced by the fact that even later, Californians could find no better places in which to settle.

The tremendous growth of present day California, the achievements that have brought the State to top rank in population, in agriculture, in trade, and in education, all had their beginnings in the Spanish period. As a contemporary writer has pointed out: "The first Spanish explorer is mentioned more often than the builder of the first cement plant. The Franciscan Fathers are much better known than the fathers of irrigation, the citrus industry, or refrigeration and canning."[4]

Not least among the men who put their mark on 20th-century California was Father Junipero Serra, and as Palou so accurately foretold, "His memory shall not fail, because the work he performed when alive shall be impressed in the minds of the dwellers of this new California; despite the ravages of time, they shall not be forgotten."[5]

Once there was a man of faith and vision—and his work has endured.

FIVE STARS DUE ADM. RAYMOND A. SPRUANCE

Mr. WHALLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California (Mr. TALCOTT) may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, in my reading and study of naval history of World War II, it becomes increasingly apparent that one of our greatest naval tacticians was never given the honor which he earned and still deserves. His command in the Battle of Midway achieved for him the title "Victor of Midway," according to Samuel Eliot Morison, the foremost naval historian in America. Combined with the leadership of Admiral Fletcher, he is credited with turning the tide of World War II in the Pacific.

He led the 5th Fleet in taking the Gilbert Islands, the Marshall Islands, and supported General MacArthur's return with raids on Truk, Palau Islands, the Caroline Islands, and Hollandia. History has proved that his direction of the Battle of the Philippine Sea was a master stroke. Other actions in which his fleet participated included the conquest of Iwo Jima and Okinawa.

Adm. Raymond A. Spruance is the man who built this amazing record of accomplishments. He deserves no less recognition than being awarded the rank of five-star admiral. I welcome the support of my colleagues and all interested parties across the United States in bringing about this late, but deserved, recognition.

To quickly refresh memories and remind those who today are secure in the Pacific by dint of his unsurpassed ability and extraordinary achievement, I recall some significant aspects of the World War II career of our greatest admiral, Raymond A. Spruance.

In the first months of World War II, Admiral Spruance commanded the cruisers in a carrier task force commanded by Admiral Halsey. He participated with Halsey in the carrier raids on the Marshalls, Wake, and Marcus, and in the Doolittle raid on Tokyo.

Halsey then became ill, whereupon Spruance took command of his carrier force, and the overall fleet command in the Battle of Midway—June 1942—went to Admiral Fletcher. Both Spruance and Fletcher are credited with the amazing feat of sinking four Japanese carriers and turning the tide of war, but in that action Fletcher's flagship *Yorktown* was torpedoed, whereupon Fletcher turned the command over to Spruance. In the remaining 2 days of the battle, Spruance handled the fleet with such skill and good judgment that Morison calls him "the victor of Midway." Admiral Nimitz was so impressed that he ordered Spruance to Pearl Harbor to be his chief of staff and to groom him for command of the great Central Pacific Fleet, then building.

Meanwhile, Halsey, now out of the hospital, was ordered by Nimitz to take command of the South Pacific Force and area with headquarters at Noumea, New Caledonia. In this position he gave general direction to the conquest of Guadalcanal and the rest of the Solomons and the neutralizing of the great Japanese base at Rabaul.

As Halsey was completing his reconquest of the Solomons, Spruance assumed command of the new Central Pacific Fleet—designated 5th Fleet—and in November 1943, led it in the assault and reconquest of the Gilbert Islands, including Tarawa. The following February, he led the 5th Fleet in the conquest of the Marshall Islands. He then supported MacArthur's advance on New Guinea with raids on Truk, the Palau Islands, the Caroline Islands, and Hollandia.

In June 1944, Spruance led the 5th Fleet in an invasion of the Mariana Islands, which would provide airfields within bombing range of Japan. At last now the Japanese fleet came out to offer battle. Spruance shifted his flagship from the amphibious force to the carrier force and gave general direction to the 2-day battle of the Philippine Sea. He was criticized at the time for not advancing to meet the enemy—instead of letting the enemy come to him. He refused, however, to run the risk of letting an enemy naval force get between him and the beachhead, which it was his primary duty to protect. Had he uncovered the beachhead, he might have sunk more enemy carriers only three were sunk during the battle. But by remaining near the beachhead and attacking enemy aircraft with fighters and antiaircraft fire, he stripped the Japanese fleet of planes, "the Marianas Turkey Shoot," the Americans called it. Admirals King and Nimitz supported Spruance's decision at the time, and practically everybody supports it now. For we now know that Japan was most vulnerable in her aircraft pilot training program. She simply could not train enough aviators in time to replace those lost in the Battle of the Philippine Sea.

---

[1] Maynard J. Geiger, "Life of Fray Junipero Serra" (Washington, D.C., 1959), I, 281.

[2] Francisco Palou, "Life of Fray Junipero Serra" (Washington, D.C., 1955), translated by Maynard J. Geiger, 86.

[3] Geiger, op. cit., II, 209.

[4] John W. Caughey, "California" (New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1953), 593.

[5] Palou, op. cit., 256.

Meanwhile, Admiral Nimitz had worked out a switch on the old stagecoach plan of changing horses. In the Central Pacific Fleet, he would keep the horses and change drivers. While Spruance was driving from the Gilberts to the Marianas, Nimitz had called Halsey and his staff to Pearl Harbor and set them to planning future operations in the Central Pacific. In August 1944, after Spruance's conquest of the Marianas, Spruance, and his top commanders were relieved by Halsey and his top commanders, and the 5th Fleet changed its name to 3d Fleet. Spruance and his officers went to Pearl Harbor to plan for operations when they should resume command.

Halsey's 3d Fleet supported the invasion of the Palau Islands in preparation for the invasion of Leyte, Philippine Islands, in October 1944. The invasion of the Philippines brought about the Battle for Leyte Gulf, the last standup naval battle of World War II, a battle which for complexity, and magnitude is without parallel in naval history.

In some respects the battle for Leyte Gulf was a duplicate of Spruance's battle of the Philippine Sea. There were, however, two important differences: First, this time there actually were powerful Japanese surface fleets advancing through the Philippines' to attack the American beachhead, and Halsey knew it; and second, when Halsey learned that a Japanese carrier group was coming down from the north, he uncovered the beachhead and went after it with his 3d Fleet. What Halsey did not know was that the Japanese carriers had no properly trained aviators. The carrier group had been sent down as a decoy to entice Halsey into doing exactly what he was doing—so that the beachhead would be exposed to attack by the Japanese surface forces.

The next morning Halsey's carrier aircraft had all four Japanese carriers in a sinking condition when he learned that during the night the main Japanese surface fleet had penetrated to the Pacific and was approaching the American beachhead. On a radio prod from Nimitz, he detached all his 3d Fleet battleships and a carrier group and with them headed back south. He thus had left inferior American forces both north and south. By great good luck and Japanese miscalculation, neither the landing force nor the inferior naval forces were annihilated. Before Halsey could get back south, the confused commander of the main Japanese surface force had slipped back through San Bernardino Strait. Meanwhile, through the heat of the battle, all six battleships of the 3d Fleet, with Halsey in the battleship *New Jersey*, were racing 300 miles north and then 300 miles back south without ever making contact with the enemy.

After the Battle for Leyte Gulf, Halsey and the 3d Fleet valiantly supported MacArthur in his conquest of Leyte, Mindoro, and Luzon. Then at the end of January 1945, Halsey delivered the fleet to Spruance, and it changed its name back to 5th Fleet.

Under Spruance's command, the 5th Fleet supported the conquest of Iwo Jima and then went on to support the invasion of Okinawa. To assure that a steady stream of vital supplies should reach the Americans on Okinawa, the 5th Fleet had to remain in Japanese waters for weeks. Here it came under heavy attacks by Kamikazes and took appalling losses. The strain on the top commanders, who never left the area, was so great that Nimitz took the unprecedented step of relieving them in the midst of a campaign. As the Okinawa campaign approached its end, Halsey and his senior officers replaced Spruance and his, and the fleet continued to take punishment under the name 3d Fleet.

After the conquest of Okinawa, Halsey paraded his 3d Fleet up and down the Japanese coast, raiding almost at will. He was thus occupied when he received word of the cease fire. He thereupon radioed his aviators over Japan that if they met enemy planes they were to shoot them down, "not vindictively but in friendly fashion."

There is no doubt that Spruance and Halsey were among the most effective officers of World War II. Halsey had one quality that Spruance lacked—a bellicose personality that not only made headlines but lifted the hearts of men under his command. Our forces on Guadalcanal were on the verge of defeat when Halsey took command in the South Pacific and somehow infused into them confidence and a will to win. Spruance, quiet, distant, intellectual, shunned publicity and rarely showed himself. He inspired confidence not by personality or salty statements but merely by the realization in his command that, when he took over, things ran more smoothly and more efficiently.

To Halsey's name we attach the word "daring." Time and time again his daring paid off.

To Spruance's name we attach the word "prudent," but I know of no case where his prudence did not point to the wisest course. He was criticized in 1942 for withdrawing eastward in the night of June 4–5 in the Battle of Midway, but we now know that this move avoided a night battle with a powerful Japanese surface force that was looking for him. He was criticized in 1944 for remaining near the Saipan beachhead, but by doing so he avoided exposing his amphibious forces, kept his fleet damages to a negligible minimum, and fatally hurt the Japanese where they were most vulnerable.

Both were men of strategic vision as well as tactical skill. We have Halsey to thank for the suggestion of a landing at Leyte instead of at Mindanao, as MacArthur had planned—a move that shortened the war by 3 months. We have Spruance to thank for the suggestion of the conquest of Okinawa, a move that enabled American bombers to attack southern Japan and to mine the Sea of Japan, thereby sealing Japan off from the continent.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Libonati, for 15 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter and tables and charts.

Mr. Ryan of New York, for 1 hour, on Thursday, and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. Battin (at the request of Mr. Arends), for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. Murphy of New York (at the request of Mr. Marsh), for 30 minutes, on October 1, and to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Charles H. Wilson (at the request of Mr. Marsh), for 15 minutes, today, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Pucinski (at the request of Mr. Marsh), for 15 minutes, today, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. Collier.

Mr. Gary and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Madden.

Mr. Minshall.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. Arends) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mrs. Reid of Illinois.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Marsh) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Fascell in six instances.

Mr. Edmondson.

Mr. Dent.

Mr. Carey.

Mr. Charles H. Wilson.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Whalley) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Fulton of Pennsylvania in two instances.

Mr. Oliver P. Bolton.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 3162. An act to amend section 105(a) of the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1965, with respect to the disclosure in reports required thereunder of the names of persons who have appeared as witnesses before committees sitting in executive session; to the Committee on House Administration.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1851. An act for the relief of Chester A. Brothers and Anna Brothers, his wife.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on September 28, 1964, present to the President, for his approval, bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1853. An act for the relief of Patti Jean Fulton;

H.R. 2509. An act to authorize Reserve officers to combine service in more than one Reserve component in computing the 4 years of satisfactory Federal service necessary to qualify for the uniform maintenance allowance;

H.R. 2753. An act to disclaim any title of the United States to certain real property in Modoc County, Calif.;

H.R. 2859. An act to provide for the promulgation of rules of practice and procedure under the Bankruptcy Act, and for other purposes;

H.R. 3642. An act for the relief of Mike Mizokami, Sam Mizokami, Tom Mizokami, and Hatsuyo Mizokami;

H.R. 4972. An act for the relief of Robert E. McKee General Contractor, Inc., and Kaufman & Broad Building Co., a joint venture;

H.R. 4989. An act to amend title 28 of the United States Code to transfer the counties of Genesee and Shiawassee in the State of Michigan from the northern division to the southern division of the eastern judicial district and to authorize a term of court at Ann Arbor;

H.R. 5042. An act for the relief of certain officers of the naval service erroneously in receipt of compensation based upon an incorrect computation of service for basic pay;

H.R. 5500. An act for the relief of Lt. John P. Mann;

H.R. 5759. An act for the relief of Connecticut Beverage Co., Inc.;

H.R. 5932. An act to amend the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 so as to authorize certain teachers employed by the Board of Education of the District of Columbia to participate in a health benefits plan established pursuant to such act, to amend the Federal Employees Group Life Insurance Act of 1954 so as to extend insurance coverage to such teachers, to provide for retroactive salary increases for certain civilian employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes;

H.R. 7788. An act for the relief of Jack B. Fisher;

H.R. 8300. An act for the relief of Gordon W. McGrew;

H.R. 8596. An act for the relief of Patrick J. Clyne;

H.R. 9201. An act for the relief of Capt. Charles H. Glassett, Jr.;

H.R. 9435. An act to improve judicial procedures for serving documents, obtaining evidence, and proving documents in litigation with international aspects;

H.R. 10204. An act to extend the Osage mineral reservation for an indefinite period;

H.R. 10294. An act for the relief of Mrs. Lois Graybill;

H.R. 10328. An act for the relief of certain commissioned officers of the Army or Air Force who were erroneously paid uniform allowance under the provisions of section 305 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes;

H.R. 10526. An act for the relief of Marvin S. Kline;

H.R. 10634. An act for the relief of the Quality Bedding Co.;

H.R. 11332. An act to authorize certain veterans' benefits for disability or death resulting from injuries sustained prior to January 1, 1957, by reservists while proceeding directly to or returning directly from active duty for training or inactive duty training;

H.R. 11626. An act to authorize the payment of expenses incident to the evacuation of dependents of military personnel from Panama and Cyprus;

H.R. 11913. An act to authorize the disposal, without regard to the prescribed 6-month waiting period, of antimony from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile;

H.R. 12033. An act to further amend the transitional provisions of the act approved September 6, 1958, entitled "An act to protect the public health by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to prohibit the use in food of additives which have not been adequately tested to establish their safety," and for other purposes;

H.R. 12091. An act to authorize the disposal, without regard to the prescribed 6-month waiting period, of approximately 9,500,000 pounds of sisal from the national stockpile;

H.R. 12289. An act to establish the Lewis and Clark Trail Commission, and for other purposes;

H.J. Res. 753. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim October 15 of each year as White Cane Safety Day; and

H.J. Res. 793. Joint resolution authorizing the United Spanish War Veterans to erect a memorial in the District of Columbia or its environs.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 56 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, September 30, 1964, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2573. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, transmitting report on title I, Public Law 480, agreement with the Republic of the Congo and including copies of previous agreements with the Republic of Guinea, the Governments of Tunisia, Greece, Vietnam, and the United Arab Republic, pursuant to Public Law 85–128; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2574. A report that the appropriation to the Civil Service Commission for "Government payment for annuitants, employees health benefits fund," for the fiscal year 1965, has been apportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 665; to the Committee on Appropriations.

2575. A letter from the Director of Civil Defense, Office of the Secretary of the Army, transmitting report of Federal contributions—personnel and administration—obligations by States, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, pursuant to subsection 205 of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2576. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, report on summary of deficiencies related to the inadequate administration of military budget support funds provided to certain countries under the foreign assistance program; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2577. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Administration, Agency for International Development, Department of State, transmitting the Agency's reply to the Comptroller General relative to a report submitted July 24, 1964, concerning certain administrative problems in Vietnam; to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ELLIOTT: Select Committee on Government Research. A report of the Select Committee on Government Research on Manpower for Research and Development (Rept. No. 1907). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARRY:

H.R. 12707. A bill to establish the Hudson River Conservation Commission; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 12708. A bill making Columbus Day a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONG of Maryland:

H.R. 12709. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to make certain acts against the person of the President or Vice President of the United States and certain other Federal officers a Federal crime; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PILLION:

H.R. 12710. A bill making Columbus Day a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN of New York:

H.R. 12711. A bill to repeal section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act so as to protect the rights of employees and employers, in industries affecting commerce, to enter into union shop agreements; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H.R. 12712. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp to commemorate the 20th anniversary of the death of Ernie Pyle; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BARRY:

H. Con. Res. 368. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to encouraging participation by additional free-world countries in the activities of the Inter-American Development Bank; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. EVINS:

H. Res. 890. Resolution providing for printing hearings on tax-exempt foundations and charitable trusts; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON:

H.R. 12713. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mildred C. Cadwell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H.R. 12714. A bill for the relief of Domenico Dell 'Aera; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 12715. A bill for the relief of Mohammed Ali Amool and his wife, Sedighi Tan Hai; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 12716. A bill for the relief of Nadina Nasi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINNEGAN:

H.R. 12717. A bill for the relief of Demetrios Nicas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12718. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Emma Kada and Mr. Gabor Kada; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 12719. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Fillingeri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 12720. A bill for the relief of Helen H. Charles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12721. A bill for the relief of Immacolata Napoli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12722. A bill for the relief of Elfiadis Veronica Nelson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts:

H.R. 12723. A bill for the relief of Emilio S. Binavince; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H.R. 12724. A bill for the relief of Carolina Milazzo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY of Illinois:

H.R. 12725. A bill for the relief of Nandalal Yepuri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H.R. 12726. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Arsena; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12727. A bill for the relief of Calogero DiPeri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 12728. A bill for the relief of Etheline Garriques; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12729. A bill for the relief of Fitz Neptune (also known as Fitz Mims); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN of New York.

H.R. 12730. A bill for the relief of Dr. Ricardo Jara, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.R. 12731. A bill for the relief of Joseph Codrini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UTT:

H.R. 12732. A bill for the relief of Elena Fernandez Castillo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1046. By Mr. MILLER of California: Petition of Harry Reynolds, San Leandro, Calif., relative to the Bill of Rights-U.S. Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1047. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Henry Stoner, New York, N.Y., petitioning consideration of his petition with reference to the erection of a memorial to the late President Kennedy; to the Committee on House Administration.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Loans to Optometry Students

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 29, 1964

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, a bill is pending before the House which provides loans to students of optometry. I wholeheartedly support this legislation and strongly urge its passage by this body.

The bill, H.R. 8546, authorizes loans up to $2,000 a year to students of optometry and it establishes the administration of this program under the Health Professions Education Assistance Act.

This legislation is vitally needed. Today we are short on trained optometrists. It is generally recognized in the profession that we need one optometrist for every 7,000 of our citizens in order to render adequate care. However, today we have only 1 optometrist for every 10,300 people.

H.R. 8546 will help solve the problem in at least two ways by providing more money in loans to these students and by giving a 3-year grace period after graduation during which time no repayment of the loan is required.

The optometrist affects the lives of nearly every American. He performs 65 to 70 percent of all eyesight examinations in the United States. The optometrist does 75 percent of all contact lense work. He performs 80 percent of all work in orthoptics and visual training. In short about three-fourths of all persons who seek vision care turn first to an optometrist.

The optometrist renders about 85 percent of all eyesight treatment to the members of our Armed Forces in every branch: Army, Navy, and Air Force.

Statistics show that the number of optometrists in the United States is declining in proportion to the growth of our population.

H.R. 8546 certainly does not solve completely this growing shortage of optometrists. However, this program of liberalized loans to students will help considerably, and I am hopeful the bill will receive strong support in the House.

Winning the Cold War: The U.S. Ideological Offensive—Introduction, I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 29, 1964

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, since the Communists seized power in Czechoslovakia by "peaceful" means in 1948, our foreign policymakers have been confronted with a new and serious problem:

How can the United States best meet the Communist challenge on the political and ideological level?

What must we do, apart from our military programs and our international economic aid and trade undertakings, in order to first, counter Communist efforts to penetrate and subvert the free world nations; second, help prevent complete communization of countries already under Communist control; and third, more effectively advance U.S. foreign policy objectives on the world scene?

These questions have concerned both our policymakers and the American public for more than 15 years. This concern has been fully justified because of the profound change which took place since the end of World War II in the conduct of international relations.

Events transpiring since 1945 have demonstrated clearly that the traditional tools of foreign policy—diplomacy, military power, and economic policy—no longer suffice to advance the legitimate objectives of a nation in its relations with the rest of the world.

The concurrent revolutions of the 20th century—in communications, science, education, and in other fields—have opened a new dimension for foreign policy operations. On a scale unmatched in the past, they brought the masses of people into direct contact with the conduct of foreign relations.

The revolution in communications has played an important role in this development. By using modern means and techniques of communication, governments can now appeal to target audiences in foreign countries over the heads of their leaders. They can inform, convince, even strive to motivate entire populations to a specific course of action.

In turn, these foreign audiences exert increasing pressures on their own governments to continue, or to change, given policies.

In this new dimension of foreign policy operations, the ideological and psychological, words and ideas serve as weapons. Persuasion is the goal—and, frequently, the principal means for the attainment of political objectives.

The Communists have been quick to appreciate the potential of this new dimension of foreign policy. They adopted ideological warfare—political agitation and propaganda—as a key instrument for carrying out the strategy of Communist world revolution. Their massive effort in this field, and the political successes it has achieved, presented the governments of the free world with a serious challenge.

During the past two decades, the U.S. Government has used a variety of programs in coping with the Communist challenge on this plane. These programs range from exchanges of persons and oversea information activities to strategic psychological operations. All of them are intended to serve a single overriding purpose: to provide support abroad for U.S. foreign policy by combating Communist propaganda, by counteracting Communist political agitation, by promoting understanding of U.S. foreign policy goals, and in other ways.

How well are these programs administered? Are they fulfilling their primary mission? Do they meet the requirements of our foreign policy? Are they effective in meeting the Communist challenge in the cold war, and advancing our foreign policy objectives?

These are legitimate questions. Unfortunately, the answers to them have not been forthcoming very readily.

The Congress, of course, periodically reviews these programs. Generally, however, a given congressional committee will look only at those programs which come under its immediate jurisdiction. For years now, there has been no overall review of all the programs in this category, of their relationship to each other, and to our foreign policy, and of their effectiveness in coping with the threat posed by the Communist ideological offensive. The last congressional inquiry which concerned itself with such questions as they related to our oversea information programs, took place over a decade ago.

Because of this, the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements of the Committee on Foreign Affairs decided in March 1963, to undertake a comprehensive review of all programs which operate in the fourth dimension of our foreign policy. As chairman of the subcommittee, I am taking this opportunity to report to the House of Representatives on our undertaking and on its progress during the two sessions of the 88th Congress.

In initiating this study, the subcommittee concentrated on four immediate tasks. We decided:

First, to inquire into the nature of the ideological challenge presented by the international Communist movement, and to explore different views about the best ways to meet it;

Second, to inventory all governmental programs which are neither strictly military nor strictly economic in nature, but which are intended to provide support abroad, on the ideological and psychological level, for our foreign policy;

Third, to study the relationships which exist between these programs, and to see how they are coordinated and brought to bear on the conduct of U.S. foreign policy; and

Fourth, to survey the oversea programs of private U.S. organizations which have an impact on the American image abroad and thus either directly or incidentally affect the implementation of our foreign policy.

In subsequent parts of this report I shall describe what my subcommittee did during the past 18 months in carrying out the above-described plan. In the sixth and concluding part I will comment on some of the changes which took place, partly as a result of our subcommittee's activities, in the administration of various governmental programs. I will also attempt to outline very briefly the job that remains to be done before this study can be considered successfully completed.

Immigration Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 29, 1964

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the Republican presidential and vice-presidential candidates seem to delight in misrepresenting the facts regarding immigration legislation in this session of Congress.

The following statement by the Democratic vice-presidential candidate, Senator HUMPHREY, outlines the true facts concerning this legislation.

The New York Post editorial of September 11, 1964, gives valuable facts on U.S. Immigration legislation.

HUMPHREY SCORCHES MILLER ON IMMIGRATION STATEMENT

Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY today assailed as "patently false and nonsense" the claim by Representative WILLIAM E. MILLER that President Johnson's immigration bill would triple immigration and cause unemployment.

Noting that "we are a nation of immigrants," HUMPHREY asked:

"When did Congressman MILLER lose faith in America?"

The Democratic vice-presidential nominee pointed out that if present laws were effective 100 years ago Senator BARRY GOLDWATER'S grandfather possibly could not have come to the United States.

MILLER, in a speech on Monday in South Bend, Ind., said that if the administration bill passed, "the number of immigrants next year will increase threefold."

Following is the text of Senator HUMPHREY'S statement:

"First of all, Congressman MILLER has his facts wrong. He states that if President Johnson's immigration bill is passed, 'the number of immigrants next year will increase threefold.' Now, of course that is patently false and nonsense. The present law allows 155,500 persons to enter the United States each year. The President's immigration bill increases this by only 14,500. Now that surely doesn't mean a threefold increase. That kind of arithmetic just doesn't make sense.

"But the important question is: When did Congressman MILLER lose faith in America? Why, we are a nation of immigrants. Not 6 weeks ago Senator DIRKSEN, Republican leader in the Senate, offered in nomination a man whom he described as 'the grandson of a peddler, a proud honorable and spirited man who left his ancestral home in Europe at an early age and came to this land a century ago.' Now it is a fact that for the past 40 years our immigration law has in effect, discriminated against some peoples because of race, creed or national origin. In fact if the present law had been in effect 100 years ago, Senator GOLDWATER'S grandfather possibly could not have come to the United States.

"Now this is an area of discrimination in our national life that we have not yet brought into line with the rest of our laws and we ought to change that pattern of law. If Congressman MILLER is against the change that's his business. But we are for it and the people can make their choice on November 3."

[From the New York (N.Y.) Post, Sept. 11, 1964]

GOP Vice-Presidential Candidate MILLER'S attack on the administration's proposals for immigration reform has quickly backfired. And well it should have.

MILLER asserted that the administration's immigration proposals "would open the floodgates for virtually any and all who would wish to come and work in this country."

This happens to be nonsense. The purpose of the bill is not a substantial rise in the annual number of immigrants but abolition of a national origins quota system which discriminates against immigrants from eastern and southern Europe and contains overtones of bigotry.

As President Johnson has said, our question to an immigrant from Italy or Poland should not be, "Where do you come from?" but "What can you contribute to America?"

The administration's bill would carry out objectives originally projected by President Truman and reaffirmed by Presidents Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson. All party platforms except the 1964 GOP document have favored the goals it embodies. The measure bears the support of many distinguished GOP Congressmen.

Once again Mr. MILLER was as misinformed about his facts as he was impoverished in spirit. Has he ever visited the Statue of Liberty?

Winning the Cold War: The U.S. Ideological Offensive—The Communist Challenge, II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 29, 1964

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, what are the basic elements of the Communist strategy for winning the cold war—a strategy that employs ideological as well as military and economic weapons?

What part do the ideological elements—Communist doctrine, propaganda and political agitation—play in that strategy?

What can the U.S. Government do to counter Communist efforts on this nonmilitary plane?

What role can private initiative—business, labor, the academic community, and other private organizations—play in the struggle to win men's minds?

The answers to such questions were sought by the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements during the initial part of a study which we initiated in March 1963.

To obtain the answers, the subcommittee invited a cross section of leaders in business, industry, labor, and in communications, as well as writers, commentators, and other interested persons, to present their views in open hearings.

The hearings opened on March 28, 1963, with the testimony of Edward R. Murrow, Director of the U.S. Information Agency, and continued intermittently through September 13. In the course of those 6 months, the subcommittee received testimony from 53 witnesses, as follows:

Thomas Aitken, Jr., vice president, INFOPLAN, of Interpublic, Inc., New York, N.Y.

Mrs. Mariada Arensberg, executive secretary, Cuban Freedom Committee, Washington, D.C.

Hon. WILLIAM H. AYRES, a Representative in Congress from the State of Ohio.

Stanley Ballard, secretary, American Federation of Musicians, AFL–CIO.

Adrian Berwick, senior editor, the Reader's Digest international editions, Pleasantville, N.Y.

Theodore Bikel, actor, council member, Actors' Equity Association.

Ralf Brent, president, Radio New York Worldwide, New York, N.Y.

Edward S. Butler, Executive Vice President, Information Council of the Americas, New Orleans, La.

Leo Cherne, executive director, Research Institute of America, Inc., New York, N.Y.

Louis Cheskin, of Louis Cheskin Associates, Chicago, Ill.

James B. Conkling, president, International Educational Broadcasting Corp., Sherman Oaks, Calif.

Hon. George P. Delaney, Special Assistant to the Secretary of State and Coordinator on International Labor.

Angus Duncan, executive secretary, Actors' Equity Association.

George Englund, motion picture producer-director, Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer Studios, Culver City, Calif.

Lionel C. Epstein, attorney, Ginsburg & Leventhal, Washington, D.C., and member of board of trustees of the Experiment in International Living.

Hy Faine, National executive secretary, American Guild of Musical Artists.

Rudolph Faupl, U.S. Worker Representative to the International Labor Organization and international representative, International Association of Machinists.

Lloyd A. Free, president, Institute for International Social Research, Princeton, N.J.

John W. Gardner, Chairman, U.S. Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs.

Carl Harms, actor, recording secretary, Actors' Equity Association.

Miss Melissa Hayden, prima ballerina, New York City Ballet Co.

Hal Holbrook, actor, member Actors' Equity Association.

Dr. Kenneth Holland, president, Institute of International Education, New York, N.Y.

Dr. Robert T. Holt, department of political science, University of Minnesota.

Earle Hyman, actor, council member, Actors' Equity Association.

Richard A. Humphrey, Director, Commission on International Education, Washington, D.C.

Walter Joyce, managing editor, Printers' Ink, New York, N.Y.

Herman Kenin, president, American Federation of Musicians, AFL–CIO.

Dan Lacy, managing director, American Book Publishers Council, New York.

John E. Lawyer, Acting Director, Office of International Organization Affairs, International Affairs Bureau, Department of Labor.

Dr. Arthur H. Litchfield, chairman of the board, Governmental Affairs Institute.

John McMullan, news director, Washington Bureau, Knight Newspapers.

Henry Mayers, president, the Mayers Co., Los Angeles, Calif., and chairman, Cold War Council.

Rosario Mazzeo, personnel manager, Boston Symphony Orchestra.

George Meaney, president, AFL–CIO.

Herbert C. Merillat, executive director, American Society of International Law.

H. Philip Mettger, president, Governmental Affairs Institute.

Dick Moore, editor, Equity magazine.

John D. J. Moore, vice president, W. R. Grace Co., and chairman, U.S. Inter-American Council.

Hon. Edward R. Murrow, Director, U.S. Information Agency.

Stanley Plesent, General Counsel and Congressional Liaison, USIA.

Stanley F. Reed, president, Reed Research Foundation, and president, Technology Audit Corp., Washington, D.C.

Hon. J. Leonard Reinsch, Chairman, U.S. Advisory Commission on Information.

John Richardson, Jr., president, Free Europe Committee, New York, N.Y.

Hon. James Roosevelt, a Representative in Congress from the State of California.

Kermit Roosevelt, vice president, Governmental Relations Department, Gulf Oil Corp., Washington, D.C.

Robert H. School, director of public relations, Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey), New York.

Eric Sevareid, author, commentator, and news analyst, New York, N.Y.

Thomas C. Sorenson, Deputy Director for Policy and Plans, USIA.

Miss Blanche Thebom, concert and opera singer, Metropolitan Opera Co.

Dr. Theodore Vallance, director, Special Operations Research Office, American University, Washington, D.C.

Hon. George L–P Weaver, Assistant Secretary of Labor for International Affairs.

Eddie Weston, actor, second vice president, Actors' Equity Association.

In addition, the subcommittee received a number of written statements which addressed themselves to the subject under study and which were prepared by civic-minded citizens, without cost to the U.S. Government.

The testimony of witnesses who appeared before the subcommittee, together with a number of additional statements, has been printed under the title "Winning the Cold War: The U.S. Ideological Offensive—Hearings Before the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements, Parts I Through V." Other papers submitted to the subcommittee have also been of help to its members and were retained for possible future publication.

The five volumes of hearings mentioned above make fascinating reading and in the opinion of at least one news correspondent, point to several far-reaching conclusions.

First, that ideological activities—teaching of the Communist doctrine, persuading people to its cause, and motivating them to take political action in support of Communist objectives—constitute an integral and eminent part of the Communist strategy of world revolution.

Second, that the thrust of the Communist ideological effort, added to the impact of the concurrent revolutions of the 20th century in science, education, communications, and rising expectations of the masses of people of the underdeveloped countries, has profoundly influenced the entire character of the East-West confrontation and created serious challenge for the foreign policy of the United States. This conclusion—that the nonmilitary conflict is not only significant but may prove decisive to the outcome of the global struggle between the world Communist movement and those who oppose it—was underscored in a statement made by the late President John F. Kennedy on April 2, 1961, and cited by one of the witnesses who appeared before our subcommittee. President Kennedy said:

> We dare not fail to see the insidious nature of this new and deeper struggle. We dare not fail to grasp the new concepts, the new tools, the new sense of urgency we will need to combat it, whether in Cuba or South Vietnam. And we dare not fail to realize it is this struggle which is taking place every day without arms or fanfare, in thousands of villages and markets and classrooms all over the globe. * * * No greater task faces this Nation or this administration. * * * Too long have we fixed our eyes on the traditional military needs; on the armies prepared to cross borders; on missiles poised for flight. Now it should be clear this is no longer enough; that our security may be lost piece by piece, country by country, without the firing of a single missile or the crossing of a single border.

Third, that the U.S. Government has not attempted to meet the nonmilitary challenge posed by the Communist movement, and to advance our own foreign policy objectives abroad, with anything approaching a well-coordinated campaign of the size and scope of our other foreign policy undertakings. Rather, in the opinion of several witnesses, the U.S. Government has pitted a handful of limited, fragmented and frequently uncoordinated programs, against a massive, integrated, worldwide Communist ideological offensive.

Fourth, that private American initiative, embodied in programs conducted abroad by private American individuals and organizations, may play a vital role in deciding the outcome of the cold war—and that this realization was slowly beginning to produce positive results.

These broad conclusions emerged from the testimony of witnesses who appeared before our subcommittee during the initial part of our study. This does not mean that all of the witnesses agreed upon each and every conclusion—nor even that two or more witnesses would define any single conclusion in precisely the manner in which it appears above. Any attempt such as this to summarize the rich variety of views and ideas advanced by a group of thoughtful and well-informed persons is bound to do some injustice to each individual presentation. The same, of course, applies to the membership of our subcommittee. I know that each of its members could well improve upon this summary.

Nevertheless, these four tentative conclusions became the base from which the subcommittee continued its study. We were fully conscious of them as we moved into the next phase of our undertaking. That phase will be the subject of part III of my report.

Joseph J. Lombardo, Brooklyn, N.Y., Completes Term as Commander in Chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 29, 1964

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, on August 28, the then national commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, and my good and longtime friend, Mr. Joseph J. Lombardo, a distinguished attorney of Brooklyn, N.Y., completed his tenure as the highest official of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

He was succeeded in the office of commander in chief of the VFW by another outstanding patriot, Mr. John A. "Buck" Jenkins, of Birmingham, Ala. I rise at this time to express, not only for myself, but I am confident, on behalf of the many Members of this House who know and admire Joe Lombardo, our deepest appreciation for the truly important services which he has rendered to our Nation and to the cause of freedom throughout the world during his year as commander in chief of the VFW.

It would be impossible, due to limitation of time, to itemize even briefly his many acts of constructive leadership. However, there are some things which Joe Lombardo did during his time as commander in chief of the VFW, which especially merit our attention and gratitude.

Throughout the past year he has demonstrated abundantly his qualifications to join that long list of veteran leaders who have risen to the high position as commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and who have, additionally, demonstrated high qualities of national leadership. During his tenure, the VFW, and veterans as a whole, had in Joe Lombardo a truly wise, strong, and effective spokesman.

He championed, logically and forcefully, every just cause of U.S. war veterans. As Members of this House, I am sure, are aware, the important veterans' legislation passed in this session is a reflection, in large measure, of the understanding and effort with which Joe Lombardo fought for those things which our Nation's veterans so rightfully deserve. Examples of legislation, which the VFW, under Joe Lombardo's leadership, helped bring to successful accomplishment are the new laws providing nursing care for aging invalid veterans, and providing educational assistance for children of veterans totally disabled in service.

Although continually and deeply interested in the specific problems of veterans, Joe Lombardo, as commander in chief of the VFW, also exerted a strong and wholesome influence on our Nation's defense and foreign policy. Under his leadership the VFW continued its role in the forefront of national organizations supporting a strong military posture for our Nation, and a sound commonsensed, and farsighted foreign policy. Repeatedly, during his year as head of the VFW, his statements with respect to South Vietnam, Cuba, and our military weapons helped pinpoint basic issues and contributed toward a better understanding of these issues by our citizens.

I believe it particularly pertinent to point out that although he never played favorites and never pulled his punches, Joe Lombardo's views are recognized as fair, forthright, and based upon logic and reason. While not slow to criticize, neither was he slow to praise. His consistent public support of our Government's policy of resisting Communist aggression in South Vietnam is but one example of how the VFW, under Joe Lombardo's leadership, has helped strengthen our Nation.

One of the things that gained such widespread admiration and respect for Joe Lombardo was the fact that in discussing defense and foreign policy matters, he knew what he was talking about. He was not an "armchair strategist." Almost invariably, his press releases and policy speeches were based upon his personal observations.

During his tenure as commander in chief of the VFW he saw communism in action: He stood at the Berlin wall. He saw the indispensable role being performed by a great naval base in Guantanamo Base, Cuba. He visited the Far Eastern outpost of freedom—the embattled island of Quemoy. He visited the outpost of combat in South Vietnam. There, incidentally, he went far north into the mountainous area and met with the American, South Vietnamese, and tribal leaders who had been fighting to turn back Communist aggression.

He has visited our fleets at sea, and our Strategic Air Command headquarters.

And each place where Commander in Chief Lombardo went, he carried with him an inspiring message of the VFW's support of, and faith in, our men in uniform.

But, the VFW, under the leadership of Joe Lombardo, as under his predecessors, knows that in spite of highly technical upon which our Defense Establishment, and complicated weapons, it is still people in the final analysis, rests.

During his time as commander in chief, Joe Lombardo continued to give meaning to the VFW's determined efforts to protect the interests and improve the lot of our military personnel: Active, retired, and their dependents. With good reason, the VFW has continued to be looked upon as an understanding and effective champion of our servicemen.

Our Nation is, indeed, fortunate to have veterans organizations that produce leaders such as Joe Lombardo. We who are his longtime neighbors and friends in Brooklyn are proud of Joe Lombardo. We know that he has served his Nation well as commander in chief of the VFW, and we know, too, he will continue to serve his community, and his Nation in the future.

I am confident Joe Lombardo's many friends in this House join with me in expressing sincerest appreciation for the services which he has performed for the VFW, for veterans everywhere, and for our Nation.

Excerpts From Speech by Congressman Bob Taft, Jr., at the Republican Veterans Convention, Marietta, Ohio, September 19, 1964

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIVER P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 29, 1964

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, recently, the Honorable ROBERT TAFT, JR., before a group of Ohio veterans, did much to cast away the cobwebs of doubletalk and obfuscation from a question that has troubled Americans for many years: Should the present military draft laws be changed?

This is just one of many national issues that have been avoided purposely in this year's campaign dialog by the incumbent administration. In the following remarks, Mr. TAFT does much to dispel the cloud of fog that has been permitted to surround this question of vital importance to millions of our Nation's young men, their wives and mothers.

Because of its high degree of clarity and conciseness, I recommend Bob Taft's remarks to my colleagues in the House and Senate who—sooner or later—must finally come to grips with this problem:

Excerpts From Speech by Congressman Bob Taft, Jr., at the Republican Veterans Convention, Marietta, Ohio, September 19, 1964

Under present draft laws, we continue to play with the liberties and opportunities of millions of American young men. We do so unfairly and unnecessarily.

Yet the Johnson administration and the congressional majority continue to stall. They are studying the problem to death in an apparent attempt to forestall both criticism and change. Tragically, it appears certain that Congress will adjourn without taking action on any of the meaningful bills which propose a comprehensive congressional study of the draft system.

The excuse to be given? It's this: Because the Defense Department has initiated its own study of the selective service program, both it and the Bureau of the Budget—two arms of the Presidency—are opposed to any independent study by Congress.

Completely overlooked is the fact that the draft has far deeper implications than mere manpower procurement for military purposes. Then again, perhaps the point isn't missed at all. There may be those who view the draft as a sociomilitary scheme directed to other ends which justify its perpetuation.

I am certain the American people do not agree with this contention.

The draft system is a congressional responsibility, especially so since it is the most direct of all Federal interferences with individual liberty. Only the Congress can and should decide what policies to follow. The special interests of the social and military planners should disqualify any report they may submit.

In view of the explosive nature of the issue, it is not surprising to see it played down in an election year. Still, the Nation must make a choice. The voice of the people, as expressed in the Congress, deserves a chance to be heard.

The degree of administration opposition to a congressional draft study can be seen in its refusal to consider a prompt moratorium on induction of young men to judge its effect upon enlistments, something I suggested more than a year ago. Such a test might prove conclusively the absence of a need for the draft.

Some claim such a test would be discriminatory in that a number of young men would be freed of their service obligations during the test period. But how could it be any more so than the present hit-or-miss system of exemptions for fathers, deferrals for students, and rejections for physical misfits?

There are many other valid reasons for criticism of the present system. A number of them were outlined recently by Congressman Thomas Curtis, of Missouri. He said:

"1. The draft is an invasion of individual liberty. The existence of an aggressive world Communist conspiracy necessarily means that freemen must relinquish some freedom of choice in order that the great remainder can be preserved. But individual liberty should be infringed upon only when no effective alternative means exist for achieving the goal. Conscription should be the last resort, not the first expedient.

"2. The draft actually impairs national security. Men who enter the services of their own free will make far better servicemen than those who are drafted or who enlist from the threat of the draft. The high personnel turnover produced by the draft system—73 percent of Army first-term enlistees, 97 percent of all draftees—means that the Armed Forces lose far too many reliable and experienced men and must fill those positions with fresh trainees. The draft produces draftees at age 22, about 4 years older than the Army would like.

"3. The draft is inequitable. Today every other young man never enters any form of military service. The draft favors the physically and mentally unfit, those who marry early, those who can afford to stay in college to age 26, criminals, perverts, and those who can obtain an occupational or hardship deferment. The principle of universality, upon which the present system was sold to the public years ago, is today a transparent falsehood.

"4. The draft produces the evasion mentality. Young men attempt to avoid induction. If unsuccessful, they attempt to avoid responsibility while in the service. Upon their discharge, should we be surprised if they evade their responsibilities to their community, their nation, and their fellow man? The existence of a whole generation of men imbued in various degrees with the evasion mentality is a matter of the gravest concern to society and especially to Republicans.

"5. The draft has harmful social effects. It encourages early marriages, which in turn raise the national birth and divorce rates. The higher incidence of broken homes results in an increase of psychological and welfare problems both for parents and for children. The draft contributes to youth unemployment because employers are reluctant to hire a man who may be snatched away by the draft after expensive training. Thus, many youths float around until draft age, 22, unable to get a job, but unwilling to volunteer for induction or enlistment because they know they have a good chance of avoiding service altogether.

"6. The draft is inefficient. Instead of recruiting men with the needed skills by offering incentives comparable to the private sector, the services are forced to spend great sums on personnel training. Thus, instead of attracting experienced, middle-aged bakers, who can bake if not fight, the Army drafts an unskilled 18-year-old, trains him to be a baker, and most likely watches him depart in 2 years.

"7. The draft is costly. The high turnover rate caused by the draft system is extremely wasteful of training funds. Without the need to justify the draft, many functions could be transferred to the private sector at a saving.

"8. The draft law, as written, is unworkable. It forces administrators to find ways of circumventing the clear intent of the law. This is always a dangerous practice in a democracy. Administrators should be given a law that will work as written and not be forced to resort to tricks of interpretation."

But perhaps even more important than any of these, to the individuals threatened, is the adverse effect of the draft on employment opportunities. As I stated on April 21 on the floor of the House:

"We have found in our studies on manpower and employment in the Committee on Education and Labor in various hearings that we have had on measures before us in this session of the Congress, that the rate of unemployment of those under the age of 22 in this country is double the rate of unemployment of those over the age of 22, or indeed of the entire unemployed labor force.

"The rate is now, I believe, somewhere in the neighborhood of 10 or 11 percent. Certainly, without doubt, one of the contributing causes for the unemployment rate has been and continues to be the fact that the average induction age under the draft is now about 22 years of age. This means that many employers or potential employers, who seek someone for a particular job in existence today, must give careful consideration to any young man who perhaps is out of high school—who may or may not be a dropout—or who may have completed his high school training. Employers are faced with a problem. Employers know that if they hire this young man, within a year or two he may have to leave his employment and go elsewhere, and he will return with employment rights—which he should have. Nevertheless, the employer is faced with that possibility, and the employment of older men under these circumstances is far more likely, with the rejection of the younger man, who has not yet completed his military obligation."

Certainly, all of us agree that we cannot—and we will not—endanger our national security by cutting off the draft permanently, without assurances of a substitute procurement policy adequate to our defense needs.

But the problems created by the present system are so serious as to justify some immediate action and a trial suspension of inductions, higher pay, if necessary, and a fairminded bipartisan study of the entire problem by the legislative branch of the Federal Government.

A Rousing Speech by the Postmaster General

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES H. WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 29, 1964

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, the Democratic Party and the Nation is privileged to have the services of the Honorable John A. Gronouski in the office of Postmaster General. As well as being a most able public official, Mr. Gronouski is making himself noteworthy as a public speaker in this election year.

It was with great pleasure that I and several other Los Angeles Congressmen were the honored guests at a gathering of postal workers this past week, and we were doubly honored to have the Postmaster General as the main speaker for the evening. I consider Mr. Gronouski's speech to be of interest to all my colleagues and to the country at large, and I therefore submit it at this time for the attention of all concerned with the future of our country:

Address by John A. Gronouski, Postmaster General

I am delighted to be here among my fellow Democrats. It's such a pleasure belonging to a political party that isn't ashamed of its leaders. That's quite a contrast with the Republicans, you know. I've traveled all over the country during the past several months, and no matter where I go, local Republican leaders and candidates are trying to pretend they've never heard of Barry Goldwater. We Democrats have had to refresh their memory a bit.

And isn't it wonderful that we have a real two-party system again? A party of hope and a party of memory. For all this we can thank Mr. Goldwater. He was determined from the beginning to give the Nation "a choice, not an echo."

Some choice.

The Republican Party hasn't had a progressive idea since Calvin Coolidge decided not to seek reelection in 1928. And now they're desperately trying to stamp out the ideals of Abraham Lincoln.

Well, if the Republicans don't want Lincoln, we'll take him—and everything he stood for.

Here in California you have a U.S. Senator who has never been afraid to stand up and be counted when questions of human decency arise. And that Senator's name is Pierre Salinger. Pierre is an old and close friend of mine and I know that he has strong convictions about the dignity of the individual—all individuals—and I also know that he has the courage to back up those convictions.

I believe, too, that the vast majority of Americans feel the same way. I believe that Americans have a heritage of fairplay and respect for their fellow man. I believe they would rather follow the honorable lead of a George Brown or a Gus Hawkins or an Ed Roybal or a Charlie Wilson—rather than the lead of bigoted men who seek to fan the flames of hate and discrimination to promote their own political ends.

And in this context, I must say I am tremendously impressed with the quality of your representation here in the Los Angeles area. Your four Congressmen—freshmen all—have already earned reputations for themselves, in Washington and in California, that far exceed their length of service. I could speak extensively about their records, their dedication to their jobs and their abilities, but I think there is one example I can give you that sums it all up.

As you know, President Lyndon B. Johnson recently signed into law the Economic Opportunity Act—better known as the Anti-Poverty Act. It represents the most massive attack on poverty in the history of mankind. One of the unique aspects of this law is that it places on the local communities the responsibility for developing their own programs. The National Government will assist—and will supply the funds—but the local government must decide what needs to be done and how to do it.

Thanks to the foresight of Congressmen Brown, Hawkins, Roybal, and Wilson, an organization has already been set up that will probably give this area a decided headstart over much of the rest of the Nation.

I speak, of course, of the Los Angeles Area Economic Development Agency. This organization, which has already done so much good for your poor, your needy, your youth, your aged and your unemployed, will now dovetail with the antipoverty program to bring a new dawn of hope to hundreds of thousands of less fortunate citizens in this area.

The way of the Los Angeles area is the way of progress: progress through Congressmen of outstanding experience, demonstrated vision, and forthright convictions.

Such, I am sorry to say, are not qualities readily found in the Republican Party under the temporary leadership of Barry Goldwater.

Experience?

Mr. Goldwater has been a Member of the Senate for 12 years, and in that time, he has compiled one of the most lackluster records of any Senator of our generation. The fact is that not a single piece of major legislation bears his name.

Vision?

Senator Goldwater is afraid of the future—and you don't wonder when you hear what he proposes to do. In his own words he tells us: "My aim is not to pass laws, but to repeal them. It is not to inaugurate new programs, but to cancel old ones."

Convictions?

They certainly don't concern the welfare of the citizens of this Nation or this State. You have only to look at the record.

This administration—under the leadership of President Johnson—is committed to a realistic and humane program of health care for the aged; a program designed to assure them "dignity in sickness, as well as in health."

And the Republican nominee has turned his back on the aged by voting against medicare.

This administration believes that our generation—for the first time in history—has the knowledge, the wealth and the tools to eradicate poverty in America; to give all our citizens, no matter how lowly their station or inadequate their education, a new opportunity to help themselves.

And the Republican nominee has turned his back on the poor by voting against the antipoverty bill.

This administration believes that social security represents one of the great social achievements of our century, providing peace of mind and a better life for millions of retired citizens.

And the Republican nominee has turned his back on these people by advocating policies which would destroy the very fabric of our social security system.

This administration is committed to the proposition that our workers are entitled to a decent salary for an honest day's work.

And the Republican nominee has turned his back on labor by voting against increases in the minimum wage.

This administration is determined to wipe out the cancer of long-term unemployment and hopelessness in the chronically depressed sections of our Nation.

And the Republican nominee has turned his back on the unemployed by voting repeatedly against area redevelopment.

This administration believes that every child in America deserves a decent meal, no matter who his parents may be.

And the Republican nominee has turned his back on hundreds of thousands of hungry children by opposing the food stamp and the school lunch programs.

This administration believes that our Nation cannot achieve its full measure of greatness until our young men and women—all of them—have an opportunity to develop their minds to their full capacities.

And the Republican nominee has turned his back on our young people by voting against aid to education.

This administration believes that every man, woman, and child has the constitutional right to an equal opportunity in our society, regardless of the color of his skin or his religion or the accent with which he speaks.

And the Republican nominee has turned his back on millions of Americans by voting against the Civil Rights Act.

This administration believes it has the moral and awesome responsibility of protecting every living creature from the poisonous effects of radioactive fallout.

And the Republican nominee has turned his back on all the people by opposing the test ban treaty.

Yes, Senator Goldwater has turned his back.

While President Johnson seeks to unify our people behind a great national cause, the opposition seeks to obstruct, divide, and conquer.

And the hallmark of its approach is extremism.

I know there is an effort being made to hide extremism under the elephant's trunk. I know the temporary Republican leader went to Gettysburg and began talking like a "moderate" for the sake of party unity.

But I also remember what he said in San Francisco: "Extremism in the defense of liberty is no vice," and "Moderation in the pursuit of justice is no virtue."

The echo of those infamous words will be reverberating throughout this Nation long after the last ballot is cast next November 3. They represent an open invitation to any radical of the left or right to take the law into his own hands by wrapping the American flag around his devious ends.

Extremism is hate and divisiveness. It is spitting on the Ambassador to the United Nations. It is labeling the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court a traitor and a Communist. It is storing up arms against what is called a "Communist menace," against the day when you brand everyone who disagrees with you a Communist.

Extremism is a racial issue. It is justification for turning dogs loose on Negroes, or bombing churches, or pouring acid into newly integrated swimming pools.

It is a program to foment prejudice among ethnic groups by playing on their economic insecurity. And it is a cynical disdain of those same ethnic groups by perpetuating a discriminatory immigration policy.

Extremism is encouraging lawlessness by stirring the passions of the disgruntled and the maladjusted.

And finally, extremism is reckless and suicidal nuclear irresponsibility. It is the surrender of life-and-death decisionmaking authority from the President of the United States to military field commanders.

But Barry Goldwater insists that "extremism in the defense of liberty is no vice."

Hate: "in the defense of liberty."

Suspicion: "in the defense of liberty."

Prejudice: "in the defense of liberty."

Fear: "in the defense of liberty."

Assassination: "in the defense of liberty."

Divisiveness: "in the defense of liberty."

Economic deprivation: "in the defense of liberty."

And nuclear holocaust: "in the defense of liberty."

This Nation cannot afford such a "defense of liberty"—and neither can liberty itself. Because in the end, it would be liberty as defined by a rabid group of radicals—which means liberty for them to rule as they see fit.

We have long since passed the point where we can treat the radical elements among us as a joke. There is no shrugging it off. This is a grave national threat.

The extremists are organized, well financed, disciplined, and highly motivated. They have captured a major political party. The only way to defeat them is to expose them to the voters; to tell the American people that these people are not traveling the road of freedom and liberty; they are traveling the road to anarchy and chaos.

They must be repudiated before they poison our system completely. And the time to repudiate them is now.

Thank you.

Winning the Cold War: The U.S. Ideological Offensive—Government Agencies and Programs, III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 29, 1964

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, in an earlier part of this report, I indicated that the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements, of which I am the chairman, was deeply concerned about the apparent lack of meaningful information relating to one important part of our Government's effort in the cold war.

We knew, of course, what our Government was doing on the economic plane because the foreign aid program and our foreign trade policies are subject to a systematic, regular review by the Congress.

We knew, also, what our Government has been doing to meet the Communist threat on the military plane. Our national defense budget and our military assistance program are studied each year by the appropriate congressional committees and debated at length by both Houses of the Congress.

We did not have readily available, however, similar information about the total U.S. Government effort on the ideological plane: an effort designed to counter the Communist ideological offensive and to provide support abroad for our foreign policy through oversea information programs, exchanges of persons, strategic psychological operations, and related activities.

There was no single document, congressional or executive, no single source, which contained adequate information about the full range of these activities—who was doing what, why, and at what cost to the U.S. taxpayer.

And we had to have this information before we could begin to study these activities and reach some judgment about their worth and effectiveness.

In order to meet this need, the subcommittee directed its staff to prepare an inventory of governmental programs operating in this field. The inventory was to be brief in order to be suitable for quick and easy reference. Also, it was not to contain any material with a security classification. Such material could not be published but had to remain in appropriate files, available to Members of Congress and other authorized personnel.

In cooperation with the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, the work on the compilation of the inventory began in May 1963. Dr. Allan S. Nanes, analyst in U.S. foreign policy in the Legislative Reference Service, prepared the document under the supervision of the subcommittee and its staff. It was published on January 3, 1964, as a committee print, entitled "The U.S. Ideological Effort: Government Agencies and Programs."

With the publication of this document, the subcommittee and the Congress as a whole had available to them an extremely useful reference work which contained the answers to the basic questions: who was doing what, under what authority, and, generally, at what cost to the U.S. taxpayer.

I shall not attempt at this point to describe the inventory in detail because it is readily available to all Members of Congress. I would like, however, to comment on its three main features.

First, the inventory revealed that over 20 Government departments and agencies are currently engaged in conducting programs which are neither strictly military nor strictly economic in character but which can provide support for U.S. foreign policy.

Second, it indicated that the annual expenditures on these programs are in excess of $500 million per year.

Third, it pointed to an area of apparent weakness in the U.S. ideological effort: lack of adequate coordination.

This third point became the subject of the next step in the subcommittee's inquiry.

Having inquired into the nature of the challenge confronting our foreign policy on the ideological plane;

Having brought together information about governmental programs operating on this plane;

The subcommittee was now ready to take a closer look at the programs themselves. And we began at the top by inquiring into the direction and the management of the U.S. ideological effort in the cold war.

Congressman Harold R. Collier Reports to the People of the 10th District of Illinois

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 29, 1964

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit herewith the report to the residents of the 10th Congressional District of Illinois covering a résumé of major legislation and my activities as their Representative in Washington.

The 2d session of the 88th Congress convened the first Tuesday in January and extended more than 9 months before its preelection adjournment. The combined first and second sessions were the longest in peacetime history. Adjournment of the first session did not come until Christmas Eve, leaving less than 2 weeks between sessions instead of the usual 3 or 4 months.

Several legislative programs which were instituted under the administration of the late President Kennedy became law during the first 6 months of this year.

The tax bill of 1963, which was written last year by the House Ways and Means Committee, of which I am a member, was adopted with few changes in the Senate and subsequently returned for final passage in late January. Following the enactment of this important legislation, the administration's civil rights bill, which had been passed out of the Judiciary Committee late last year, came to the floor and was finally passed after several days of heated debate during which time 14 amendments were adopted. It was signed into law by President Johnson on July 4.

Later in this report, I will outline other major legislative action of the second session of this Congress.

While the Federal budget announced by President Johnson was $98.6 billion, slightly higher than that of the previous year, Federal spending is actually well over $6 billion above what Congress appropriated. It is $23 billion higher than President Eisenhower's suggested 1961 fiscal budget which will carry the total spending figure to $105 billion for the current fiscal year. This exceeds the highest spending during World War II and promises a deficit of nearly $10 billion which is twice the deficit of the current fiscal year. Significant is the fact that this budget contains $6 billion in Federal agency expansion for the fiscal year which began on July 1. Whether one likes it or not, the sale of $2.3 billion in Government assets and an additional billion dollars in trick bookkeeping in the Commodity Credit Corporation were used to make the budget figure look lower. This was because CCC losses for fiscal 1964 are more than $2½ billion. Notwithstanding this fact the budget asked for only $1.1 billion because the administration canceled out $931 million in interest of it to the Treasury by the CCC. It is interesting to note, too, that back-door spending of $1.4 billion for urban renewal will actually be paid by the taxpayers even though it does not show up in the budget. These facts are not generally known because the result will not show up until the turn of the year.

Our international monetary situation is still the source of great concern although it is quietly being tucked aside this election year of 1964. U.S. gold stocks have been reduced from $24.5 billion to a current reserve of slightly more than $15½ billion. Presently, our legal gold requirements are $14.62 billion which includes $12.7 required for our domestic fiscal needs together with borrowing from the International Monetary Fund, foreign currency borrowing by the Federal Reserve bank, and foreign currency borrowing by the Treasury. This would appear to leave $833 million but such is not the case since aggregate foreign claims of approximately $26 billion are outstanding at the present time. This year foreigners have drawn only $50 million from our gold reserve which would lead to the conclusion that the dollar which has been inconvertible at home for more than three decades has become inconvertible de facto abroad.

Perhaps the readers of this report might wonder why I am presenting this summary of our domestic and international fiscal situation in a legislative report of this nature. I do so because I do not believe we can afford to ignore this situation in evaluating the legislative actions of the Congress obviously because they are tempered—or certainly ought to be—by these fiscal facts. To suggest that there is no direct relationship would be folly. In fact, ignoring the fiscal problems of the United States either at home or abroad in legislative deliberations would merely be heading blindly toward economic and fiscal chaos.

In the presentation of this report, I shall provide a breakdown of the major legislative activities on a category basis since it would be impossible to list all important legislation in these respective areas.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AND INTERNAL SECURITY

Seventeen bills including authorization and appropriation measures will probably have been signed into law by November 1 of this year. The total defense budget for fiscal 1964–65 is $39.6 billion. Of this sum, nearly $17 billion was for procurement and construction of planes, missiles, ships, and research and development. Another $5 billion has been earmarked for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for 1965 research, development, construction, and administration. This includes $2.6 billion for the Apollo man-to-moon project. The Atomic Energy Commission will draw an additional $2.6 billion and another billion and a half is earmarked for construction projects at Armed Forces bases at home and abroad.

INTERNAL AFFAIRS

The major legislation in this area was the authorization of $3.25 billion for foreign aid and a proposal to provide a $750 million increase in the lending capital of the International Development Association along with 16 other participating nations. A bill to increase U.S. participation in the Inter-American Development Bank and an expansion of Peace Corps operating costs to $115 million for fiscal 1965 were approved and signed into law.

Interestingly enough was a House joint resolution expressing the sense of Congress that every effort be made to obtain payment of dues of delinquent nations, including the Soviet Union, was adopted. It provides for pressing for the penalty of the voting rights in the General Assembly for those who fail to pay. However, it will be more interesting to see whether a conscientious and determined effort will be made to force the "dead beat" nations in the United Nations to pay their dues as well as special assessments since the United States has been the prime contributor since the inception of the U.N.

NATIONAL ECONOMY

Never before in the history of the country has as much legislation been enacted in a single session of Congress to deal with economic programs as well as provide the means of increasing or extending revenues. A bill creating an Office of Economic Opportunity, better known as the antipoverty program, was passed in the sum of $947.5 million for fiscal 1965. An authorization to provide $1.1 billion annually for fiscal years 1966–67 as the Federal contribution to construction costs of State highways and various road projects was approved along with the extension for 3 years of aid to States and communities in the amount of $75 million for the construction of airports on a matching-fund basis. Another bill to increase from 33⅓ to 55 percent the subsidy for construction of fishing vessels was approved, including an extension program for 5 years to July 1, 1968, with authorization of $10 million annually. In the area of our domestic economy were several bills which were reported by the committee of which I am a member, Ways and Means; including the 1964 tax bill discussed previously, extension of current schedule of excise taxes on liquor, cigarettes, automobiles and parts, telephone service, and airline tickets. The committee also voted to impose taxes on the purchase of certain foreign securities as well as a 3-year proposal of $375 million in grants and loans to States and communities for mass-transit facilities. Needless to say, it is again necessary to raise the national debt by $9 billion from $315 billion to $324 billion for fiscal year ending July 1, 1965. This represents an overall high in the public debt and an aggregate increase in the debt ceiling of $24 billion in 2 years' time.

GOVERNMENTAL REORGANIZATION

The Civil Rights Act of 1964 was the major piece of legislation in this field although 11 others were approved and signed into law, including an act to increase and adjust basic pay rates of postal and classified employees as well as officers of all three branches of the Federal Government.

SOCIAL SECURITY, HEALTH AND PUBLIC WELFARE

In the area of social security, both the House and the Senate passed bills to increase monthly payments to 19½ million old-age survivors and disability beneficiaries. It also liberalizes eligibility provisions and lowers the retirement age of widows to 60 years. This, of course, means increasing the social security tax again beginning January 1, 1965, and continuing on a rising scale thereafter to 1971. As of the time this report was written, the House and Senate conferees had not reached any agreement with regard to the medicare provisions under the bill.

In a separate item of legislation, Congress extended to June 30, 1967, authority of the HEW to provide temporary assistance to U.S. citizens returning from a foreign country under emergency hardship circumstances. Both Houses also extended to June 30, 1967, the provision of the Social Security Act permitting States to transfer dependent children from unsuitable foster homes to nonprofit institutions.

The National Defense Education Act was extended for 3 years to July 1, 1967, and increased authorization for college student loans from $135 million currently to $195 million for fiscal 1969.

VETERANS AND SERVICEMEN

Pay increases totaling $275 million monthly for all men and officers in the Armed Forces was approved and became law in midyear. The bill excepted those in the service less than 2 years, however. Approved also was a 5-year, $5 million per year program of aid to States on a matching basis for nursing home facilities and State veteran homes, and another measure which liberalizes nonservice-connected pensions for needy veterans and widows, and revising limits of permissible income without loss of pension. H.R. 2664, a bill exempting from draft induction a sole surviving son of a family whose father died as a result of military service was enacted into law. Congress also voted to raise the authorized strength of the Cadet Corps of the U.S. Air Force and Military Academies and fixing the period of obligated service now at 5 years.

AGRICULTURE

Most controversial and important of farm legislation this past session was the passage of the bill which continues cotton price support and the subsidy for exporters as well as providing a new subsidy for domestic processors. In the same bill was an authorization for a new wheat marketing program to maintain a $2-a-bushel price support domestically and a minimum of $1.55 for export. Other agricultural bills included one requiring registration of all pesticides before they can be sold to the public, extension of the food-for-peace program, and a bill to permit the purchase of process food grains by the Commodity Credit Corporation for donation under domestic welfare and foreign aid programs. Because of the sharp drop in domestic beef prices, a bill restricting importation of beef, veal, lamb, and mutton to 6.5 percent of domestic consumption was passed as a compromise to several more restrictive import bills.

NATURAL RESOURCES

Most important of the natural resource legislation was Senate bill, S. 4, establishing a national wilderness reservation system on 35 million acres closed to commercial use and retained in their preservative state. In other bipartisan supported legislation, authorization of a 10-year, $82.5 million program to finance water resource research centers in colleges and universities was approved as was a $2 billion land and water conservation fund to assist States in developing outdoor recreation programs. Senate bill, S. 1363, providing for increased payments to counties in which wildlife refuges are located became law this year, also.

Bills which I introduced during the 88th Congress were:

H.R. 1904, to amend the Internal Revenue Code to exclude from gross income gain from sale of his principal residence by a taxpayer at age 60. Included as provision in Revenue Act of 1964.

H.R. 3286, Commission on Aircraft Noise.

H.R. 3927, to provide for medical and hospital care through voluntary health insurance.

H.R. 5501, for the relief of Wieslawa Marianna Borczon. Approved and signed into law July 11, 1964.

H.R. 5986, amend duty on broomcorn. Passed by both the House and the Senate.

H.R. 6490, repeal excise tax on communications.

H.R. 6926, increase the amount of outside earnings under social security.

H.R. 8204, remove inequities from Federal Employees Compensation Act for survivors.

H.R. 8535, right to be represented by an attorney before Federal agencies.

H.R. 9804, amend title II of the Social Security Act. Amend benefits for a person forced to retire at 60 years.

H.R. 9805, amend Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to deduct higher education expenses.

H.R. 9978, amend Internal Revenue Code relating to manufacturers excise tax on TV sets.

H.R. 10838, to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921.

H.R. 11385, establish a U.S. mint in Lake or Cook County, Ill.

H.R. 11767, amend Trade Expansion Act of 1962.

H.R. 12512, amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase widows' benefits.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Since the Congress has jurisdiction in many areas in legislation affecting the District of Columbia, it passed a dozen major items of legislation ranging from pay increases for District of Columbia teachers and Metropolitan Police and Fire Departments, to strengthening enforcement procedures against owners of unsafe structures in the District. Bills to permit suspension or dismissal of unruly school pupils, increase the number of man-dog teams authorized for the District of Columbia Police Department, and legislation permitting principals and teachers to use reasonable force in maintaining order in public schools were passed in the House but did not get through the Senate this year.

PERSONAL REPORT

The spring and summer months of 1964 were marked by the greatest influx of tourists of any of my 8 years in the Congress. The 10th Congressional District, which has the largest population of any in Illinois and is among the largest congressional districts in the country, naturally had perhaps the largest number of visitors than any district of its distance from the Nation's Capital. Families who normally spend their vacations in other sections of the country came to Washington en route to the World's Fair in New York this year in great numbers. Our guest book shows more than 500 residents of our district visited my office where members of my staff arranged for visits to the White House, Gallery passes for both the House and Senate, and tours of places of historical interest in the Nation's Capital.

Congressional mail, expected to be heavier this election year than in previous years, actually maintained a normal volume. The number of personal problems with the various agencies of Government referred to us by constituents during the course of the year increased sharply, however. These range from matters pertaining to assistance in social security, immigration, and servicemen and veterans' requests. Each of these was handled on an individual basis and every possible assistance given each inquiry.

In closing, let me state that while the 2d session of the 88th Congress was marked by certain achievements and admitted failures, we must expect to make even more difficult decisions next year. New crises in many areas of the world have cast their shadow over U.S. foreign policy and the need for changes in our posture abroad.

Although this report appears to be lengthy, it is actually but a brief and comprehensive analysis of the legislative activity of the Congress during the past year. For this reason, my office is prepared to provide detailed information on any and all bills of special interest to my constituents. Requests may be made either by writing to my Washington office, room 1026, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, D.C., or by telephoning my district office at 749-4115.

Urban Renewal in Norfolk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. J. VAUGHAN GARY

OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 29, 1964

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, the city of Norfolk is an acknowledged leader in the urban renewal program and is a dramatic example of how an older city can be rejuvenated. The effort to modernize Norfolk and clear out and rehabilitate its rundown areas has the broadest possible support among business and civic leaders. Those who have not seen the city for 15 or 20 years would hardly recognize the new Norfolk. Through urban renewal and other programs, and through the enlightened leadership of the city, tremendous new investment has been generated and employment and civic pride have grown apace.

This progress has been well described by Norfolk's Representative, our distinguished colleague, the Honorable PORTER HARDY, JR., in an article which appeared in the New Norfolk, published by the Norfolk Chamber of Commerce. I regret that we cannot include the illustrations which show the dramatic changes, but the gentleman from Virginia's [Mr. HARDY] words well describe the modernization of Norfolk. I hope all of my colleagues will give them careful attention:

AFTER 15 YEARS OF URBAN RENEWAL, NORFOLK SHINING EXAMPLE

(By Hon. PORTER HARDY, JR.)

The lack of decent housing for millions of Americans in slums, and the growing decay of our cities in the past, presented overwhelming problems. No individual, no private organization, nor even any local government could successfully tackle them alone.

The urban renewal program was established by Congress in 1949 during the Truman administration. It grew out of a recognition that blight in urban areas and all its attendant evils constituted problems that had to be faced. The sound growth and development of our cities was recognized as an important goal of national policy and the accomplishment of this goal required Federal encouragement and assistance.

Urban renewal has been a bipartisan program from the start, sponsored and approved by Republicans and Democrats alike. Senator Robert A. Taft was one of its original three sponsors, together with Senator Ellender of Louisiana, and Senator Wagner, of New York. During the Eisenhower administration in 1954, and again in 1956 and 1959, it was expanded and strengthened. Substantial improvements were made and additional funds were authorized by the Congress in 1961, the first year of the Kennedy administration.

Urban renewal has not been limited to any particular region of the United States, nor has it been limited to big cities. In 1963, nearly one-half of more than 700 localities actively participating in the program had populations of less than 25,000—many of them in the Southeast. Of 1,556 federally assisted urban renewal projects or activities in the Nation at the end of 1963, a total of 339 were in the Southeastern States, and 35 in Virginia. This has become truly an effective national program, serving well all sections of the country.

The Congress stipulated in its 1949 declaration of national housing policy that "private enterprise shall be encouraged to serve as large a part of the total need as it can" in order to attain "a decent home and a suitable living environment for every American family, thus contributing to the development and redevelopment of communities, and to the advancement of the growth, wealth, and security of the Nation."

The primary emphasis on private enterprise has remained a basic principle of the American urban renewal program.

Through urban renewal, local governments help and support private industry to achieve what it cannot do alone. The Federal Government, pursuant to requests from the localities, provides necessary additional funds and technical know-how which local governments cannot supply from their own resources.

FOUR BILLION DOLLARS SPENT TO DATE

The total Federal expenditure authorized by the Congress for urban renewal to date is nearly $4 billion. That is a lot of money. But compared to some other Federal programs it is relatively small. Notwithstanding the few instances of mismanagement which have been identified, the results this $4 billion has achieved are tangible and truly phenomenal. Aside from helping to build the physical environment we want for ourselves and our children, it is proving to be a good investment financially.

Recent congressional hearings on urban renewal legislation have brought out the impressive fact that every dollar of Federal investment in urban renewal generates about $6 in private investment—in building construction and related activities that are of direct benefit to the growth of our national economy, and of permanent financial gain to cities and local governments.

With mushrooming increases in municipal costs and limited tax sources, local governments need money. Cities, through urban renewal, have been able to raise their revenues to realistic and responsible levels, to strengthen their economic sinews through real estate tax gains. They have increased commercial and industrial activity and achieved higher returns from land put to new and better uses and more receipts from business privilege taxes. New jobs, new markets, and business expansion have resulted from better location, improved traffic, and adequate parking. There has been considerable attraction of new enterprises—particularly distributive and wholesale firms—that do not want to be trapped in undesirable sites. Thus cities, through urban renewal, once again can stand on their own feet.

NEW BUILDINGS STRENGTHEN TAX BASE

One building in a 35-acre section of one urban renewal area in Norfolk today pays two times the taxes formerly received from the entire section. One new downtown hotel, on 5 acres of former crime- and disease-infested slum, produces 18 times the real estate tax revenue of the structures it replaced.

It is well established that city governments cannot be strong without a sound real estate tax base. I know of no public program which can do more to strengthen and reestablish American local government to its rightful place than urban renewal.

No city wants to sit and rot. Now most of them are working out of this dilemma through our national housing legislation and are voluntarily initiating their own programs of urban renewal. There is no compulsion about it. Urban renewal is planned, initiated, and executed locally. The full responsibility for carrying out the program rests with the community.

All of us are proud that Norfolk has been a pioneer in urban renewal, and proud that it was cited in congressional hearings as an outstanding example among cities that are building and rebuilding with confidence for the future. Norfolk's preurban renewal expenses for crime prevention, public health, police and fire protection, and other slum costs were tremendous. Its slum areas were a festering drain on the city's resources, a drain that could not be allowed to continue without ultimately destroying the community.

BEST IN COUNTRY

Today, after 15 years of urban renewal, Norfolk is a shining example of what urban renewal can help to achieve—a growing, thriving metropolis that is well on its way to clearing most of its slums, providing improved and more efficient locations for business and industry, and for new educational and cultural facilities. Norfolk has carried out its urban renewal and related community development activities, trade expansion projects, and transportation improvements, in fulfillment of the intent of Congress that urban renewal should be a program for the benefit of the cities and the people of the land.

The ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Housing in the U.S. House of Representatives, the Honorable WILLIAM B. WIDNALL, Republican, of New Jersey, was so impressed by Norfolk's achievements that he made the following statement on October 24, 1963, to Norfolk officials who had just finished their congressional testimony for this subcommittee headed by the Honorable ALBERT RAINS, Democrat, of Alabama:

"I certainly want to congratulate you on having what appears to be the best urban renewal program in the country.

"For some time many of us who are interested in urban renewal, have understood that you used all the tools that are necessary to make an urban renewal program work. We wish you good luck in the future.

"Keep up the good work, and I hope that you can still continue your good, sound program."

Norfolk has undergone a transformation which only those who have seen it can realize and appreciate. I am proud that my colleagues in the Congress on both sides of the aisle have been outspoken in recognition of the fact that the rest of the Nation looks to Norfolk, a bustling world seaport and naval base to maintain leadership in urban renewal.

Explanation of Voting Positions of Representative James G. Fulton, of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 29, 1964

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, September 22, 1964, and on Wednesday, September 23, 1964, I was in my Pittsburgh congressional office making myself available for consultations and conferences with my constituents. This saves trips to Washington, D.C., for my local people, and I am glad to cooperate by making these appointments in Pittsburgh. As the present session of Congress has extended much longer than expected, it is necessary for me to meet these commitments previously made.

On rollcall No. 260, Tuesday, September 22, 1964, on the final passage of H.R. 12633, making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, I would have voted "yea."

On rollcall No. 262, September 23, 1964, on the final passage of the National Ice Age Scientific Reserve, I would have voted "nay."

Winning the Cold War: The U.S. Ideological Offensive—The Uncoordinated Effort, IV

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 29, 1964

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I referred earlier to the fourth dimension of foreign policy: the ideological and psychological.

This dimension embraces a wide range of programs and activities which are intended to communicate information and ideas to foreign audiences, to influence them, or to move them to a particular course of action.

Included in this category are radio and television broadcasting, distribution of publications, community relations projects, educational and cultural exchanges, strategic psychological operations, and a host of other programs.

As shown in the inventory published by the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements ("The U.S. Ideological Effort: Government Agencies and Programs," Foreign Affairs Committee Print, 1964), operations of this type are currently conducted by more than 20 departments and agencies of the U.S. Government. Their cost runs into hundreds of millions of dollars annually. They constitute the third and increasingly important dimension of U.S. foreign policy.

How do these programs operate? How are they coordinated with each other? How is the experience and information derived through these programs channeled and brought to bear on the formulation of foreign policy decisions? How are foreign policy decisions transmitted to the operational heads of these programs and implemented?

In a series of executive hearings held in January and February 1964, the subcommittee addressed these and many other questions to the representatives of the four governmental agencies principally involved in foreign policy decisions: the Department of State, the U.S. Information Agency, the Agency for International Development, and the Department of Defense.

The testimony of these witnesses, after the required security deletions, was published under the title, "Winning the Cold War: The U.S. Ideological Offensive—Hearings Before the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements, Parts VI Through VIII." In addition, this three-volume set contains an appraisal of "The Cold War Since 1960," prepared by the Department of State, as well as several research studies of the U.S. Information Agency.

On the basis of information received in the course of the two sets of hearings conducted by the subcommittee—March-September 1963 and January-February 1964—the subcommittee issued report No. 2 entitled "Ideological Operations and Foreign Policy," House Report No. 1352, 88th Congress, 2d session, 1964. The subcommittee's findings, outlined in that report, may be summarized as follows:

First. The basic goals of U.S. foreign policy have been expressed clearly and have remained fairly constant. They are designed to advance our national interests and security by encouraging a peaceful world community of free and independent countries whose governments are responsive to the just aspirations of their people, and by combating Communist designs for world domination.

Second. The concurrent revolutions of the 20th century—in science, warfare, communications, education, and other aspects of life—have in turn revolutionized the practice of diplomacy. Foreign policy operations have acquired a new dimension: the ideological or psychological. This revolution has been recognized only recently by the United States—much later, in fact, than by many other countries.

Third. In the pursuit of its basic objectives in the world, the United States, unlike the Soviet Union, has assigned relatively low priority to the ideological and psychological area of foreign policy operations. The attention and the resources devoted to these operations do not begin to approach those expended on foreign military and economic activities.

Fourth. There exists in the executive branch a broad range of nonmilitary and noneconomic programs which are directed at foreign audiences and can provide support for U.S. foreign policy. These, however, are yet to be orchestrated into an effective instrument of our foreign policy. The concept of an "ideological offensive"—of coordinating these programs and their application—thus far has been only partially implemented by the executive branch.

Fifth. A number of U.S. Government programs which operate in the third dimension of foreign policy suffer from fuzziness of concept. Their purposes and the roles which they are supposed to play in the execution of U.S. foreign policy have not been clearly defined.

Sixth. The coordination of programs operating in a particular field—for instance, information, research, exchanges of persons—is less than fully effective. While considerable progress has been made in recent years to improve coordination, there is evidence that greater effort will be required to complete the job and to eliminate duplication and underutilization of resources.

Seventh. The implementation of the country team concept has improved the oversea coordination of U.S. programs. Careful selection and adequate training of personnel placed in charge of U.S. country teams is indispensable to the success of U.S. operations abroad.

Eighth. Perhaps the weakest aspect of the U.S. ideological effort in support of foreign policy is the apparent lack of a clearly defined, operational authority. Such direction is necessary, in our opinion, to coordinate programs operating on this plane and thereby maximize the effectiveness of our effort.

Ninth. The fragmentation of congressional supervision over programs comprising the third dimension of U.S. foreign policy presents another problem. At least six major committees and an even larger number of subcommittees exercise jurisdiction over programs in this area of foreign policy operations. From the standpoint of legislative authorizations and appropriations, programs are judged, supported, or criticized, as the case may be, on an individual basis rather than in the context of the total effort in support of U.S. foreign policy.

Tenth. Too little effort has been expended in exploring the contribution of private American citizens and organizations abroad to the advancement of U.S. foreign policy objectives. These private operations have a tremendous potential.

At the conclusion of its report, the subcommittee made the following recommendations:

First. The need for organizing U.S. Government operations on the ideological and psychological plane and blending them into an effective effort in support of U.S. foreign policy, particularly with respect to the cold war challenge on this plane, should be acknowledged at the highest level in our Government.

Second. Operational authority for the management of ideological and psychological activities in support of U.S. foreign policy should be unified and placed at an appropriately high level in the executive branch.

Third. A systematic evaluation of all Government programs with a potential for influencing the attitudes of foreign audiences should be undertaken with a view to eliminating duplication, abandoning programs which are no longer related to the requirements of our foreign policy, and providing those which are, with a clearly defined mission.

Fourth. The coordination of programs operating in each of the several fields—exchanges of persons, information, strategic psychological operations, and others—should be greatly improved. The implementation of recommendation No. 2 appears indispensable to the attainment of this objective. In addition, responsibility for coordination at lower levels should be clearly defined and adequate authority provided to make possible effective discharge of such responsibility. The cumbersome structure of interdepartmental coordinating committees should be streamlined by reducing the number of such committees to the minimum required for effective operation.

Fifth. To the extent possible, educational and informational activities should be brought into a single agency or department—as suggested by the U.S. Advisory Commission on Information. Existing division of operations and responsibility between the Department of State, the U.S. Information Agency, and, to some extent, the Agency for International Development, is illogical and not conducive to efficiency and economy.

Sixth. Government officials and personnel responsible for the conduct of ideological and psychological operations should be trained in the requirements and techniques of ideological warfare. It is not practical to try to bring all of these activities into a single Government department or agency. It is both feasible and necessary, however, to provide appropriate training to the personnel of Government departments involved in this type of foreign operations.

Seventh. The input of the ideological and psychological dimension of foreign policy—particularly in the field of basic research in behavioral sciences—should be increased.

Eighth. Cooperation with private enterprise should be strengthened. Prompt attention should be given to ways and means of achieving that goal.

After issuing report No. 2, the subcommittee turned its attention to programs conducted abroad by private American organizations. That subject will be discussed in the next part of my report.

Winning the Cold War: The U.S. Ideological Offensive—The Impact of Private Initiative, V

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 29, 1964

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, in submitting its Report No. 2 to the Congress, the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements stressed the important role of programs conducted abroad by private U.S. citizens and organizations. The subcommittee found that—

> These private activities—personal contacts, exchanges, assistance programs, mass media communications activities, and other endeavors—and in large part responsible for the conditions of the U.S. image abroad. These activities mirror the diversity of our people's interests, talents, and convictions. They serve as an excellent indicator of the condition of life attainable in a free, democratic society. And they demonstrate to the world the peaceful, humanitarian sentiments of the American people.

The subcommittee further suggested that because of their diversity and volume, these private endeavors undoubtedly have "some implication for the attainment of U.S. foreign policy goals." Unfortunately, the subcommittee was in no position to gage the impact of these activities because information relating to their direction and scope, available to the subcommittee, was frequently inadequate and inconclusive.

The need to explore the potential of private American initiative abroad without attempting to bring it under Government control, was explained in the following passage from the subcommittee's report:

> The subcommittee is convinced that it would be improper and harmful for the Federal Government to attempt to control or direct for political purposes the activities abroad of private American citizens and organizations. At the same time, the subcommittee believes that closer contacts should be established between responsible Government officials and private efforts in particular fields. On the one hand, the Government ought to know at all times what private American individuals and organizations are doing in a given country—if for no other reason than simply to prevent duplication of effort and waste of scarce resources. On the other hand, ways and means could be devised to keep such private individuals and entities informed about U.S. policies and programs in particular regions or fields of endeavor—again, to prevent duplication, to point out areas into which private effort could be channeled constructively, and to indicate in what respects private undertakings might work at cross-purposes with Government programs.

In an effort to help meet the need clearly evident in this area, the subcommittee undertook to survey the oversea activities of private American organizations. A questionnaire designed to elicit information about the size and scope of such undertakings, their direction and relationships—if any—to U.S. Government-sponsored programs, and related factors, was prepared by the subcommittee staff under my direction. This questionnaire was mailed earlier this month to a sample of approximately 1,500 foundations, universities, labor organizations, church-related groups, voluntary organizations, and people-to-people projects.

We are hopeful that the results of this survey will prove of interest and help not only to our committee and to the Congress, but also to the many private American organizations which are interested in, or are conducting, oversea programs. We are planning to release the results early next year.

Space Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 29, 1964

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

SEPTEMBER 25, 1964.

Hon. JAMES G. FULTON,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. FULTON: Enclosed herewith is copy of a paper entitled "The Boundary

Between Territorial Airspace and International Outer Space." This was read for me at the Federal bar meeting in Washington while I was in South America at an aviation meeting. I consider the subject matter of this paper of real importance.

The present administration on several occasions has indicated that it is too early to negotiate an international convention fixing the boundary between airspace and outer space. But this does not answer the need for the United States to fix its own boundary. We must, in my judgment, continue to insist on full control of all flight in the airspace which we use for our normal military and civil flight. We need the legal veto applicable to any flight in that area. Now, however, we have agreed that outer space is free for all international peaceful flight, and perhaps for military flight as well. Obviously, there must be a decision as to the height above our lands and waters where our right of national control comes to an end.

The problem is somewhat similar to territorial waters, as I have pointed out in this article. We have no international agreement as to the outer boundary of these waters, but this has never deterred us from asserting our own outer boundary as against all other nations.

I realize that this session in the House has about ended, and nothing can be done this year. However, I would like to suggest that you ask the staff of the House Space Committee to study the problem. I feel strongly that a bill should be introduced in the early days of the next House session, which would fix a definite boundary above the surface of our lands and waters as the upper boundary of national airspace.

Hoping that this letter will reach you personally, I am sending the original by special delivery to Washington and a copy to your Pittsburgh office.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN COBB COOPER.

SEPTEMBER 29, 1964.

Mr. JOHN COBB COOPER,
Princeton, N.J.

DEAR MR. COOPER: It is a pleasure to receive your letter of September 25, 1964, together with your paper entitled, "The Boundary Between Territorial Airspace and International Outer Space," which was read at the Federal bar meeting in Washington, D.C.

I have read your article with interest, and am placing it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as I feel it deserves wide recognition by Members of Congress and the American people.

In addition, I will be glad to introduce a bill in the next House session for a congressional commission to study the question of a definite boundary above the surface of our lands and waters, as the upper boundary of national airspace.

Any time my office in Pittsburgh or Washington can be of assistance to you, let us hear, and we will be glad to cooperate.

Sincerely,

JAMES G. FULTON.

INTERNATIONAL SYMPOSIUM ON SPACE LAW—FEDERAL BAR ASSOCIATION NATIONAL CONVENTION, WASHINGTON, D.C., SEPTEMBER 11, 1964

THE BOUNDARY BETWEEN TERRITORIAL AIRSPACE AND INTERNATIONAL OUTER SPACE

(By John Cobb Cooper)

The United States should not delay longer in stating a definitive position as to the upper boundary of its territorial airspace. The unanimous adoption of the United Nations on December 13, 1963, of Resolution 1962 (XVIII) has created a new and urgent situation. It is understood that the United States assisted in drafting the resolution and the United Nations records clearly show vigorous American support. One of the major purposes of that resolution was to fix the legal status of the areas generally called "outer space" in which satellites and other spacecraft may operate with minimum interference from the earth's atmosphere. The effect of the resolution was to declare that such outer space is a highway which is and must remain open for the use of all nations, free of any claim or rights of sovereign control by any nation. The declaration of principles set out in the United Nations resolution contains the following statements:

"Outer space and celestial bodies are free for exploration and use by all states on a basis of equality and in accordance with international law."

"Outer space and celestial bodies are not subject to national appropriation by claim of sovereignty, by means of use or occupation, or by any other means."

The legal status of outer space as thus stated is in direct conflict with the accepted legal principles applicable to our national airspace.

The legal status of national airspace as part of our territory is not subject to question. The United States assisted in drafting the Paris Convention of 1919 with its much quoted statement in article I that the parties to the convention "recognize that every power has complete and exclusive sovereignty over the airspace above its territory." For other reasons we did not ratify the Paris Convention, but in adopting the Air Commerce Act of 1926 a provision was carefully inserted in section 6 to the effect "that the Government of the United States has to the exclusion of all foreign nations, complete sovereignty of the airspace over the lands and waters above the United States."

This was the declaration to the effect that such airspace is part of our territory. The same principle was even more forcefully stated in section 9 of the same act defining the term "United States":

"The term 'United States,' when used in a geographical sense, means the territory comprising the several States, Territories, possessions, and the District of Columbia (including the territorial waters thereof), and the overlying airspace; but shall not include the Canal Zone."

Substantially the same definition was carried forward into section 1(31) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 (omitting the reference to the Canal Zone) and has since been repeated in subsequent statutes. The United States has thus firmly declared that the airspace over its lands and waters is part of its national territory.

As a result the United States has the same right to complete unilateral control of all foreign movement within its airspace as it has in other parts of its territory. The only recognized exception to this right of absolute control is that which is enjoyed by foreign merchant ships in time of peace passing through the territorial waters of the United States. But even this limited right has never been accorded to foreign aircraft flying in the airspace over our territorial waters.

While it is true that the 1963 United Nations resolution quoted above has not yet been incorporated into our statutes nor into a duly ratified treaty, nevertheless it would be most difficult for the United States hereafter to claim any rights of territorial control in "outer space."

Admittedly there is as yet no general agreement as to the lower boundary of outer space but this does not obviate the necessity for the United States to fix its own upper boundary of its national airspace territory.

It has been said that there is no general agreement as to the outer boundary of territorial waters and this fact has been used as an argument to support delay in reaching agreement as to the boundary between the airspace and outer space. The argument is unsound so far as it applies to our national action. It overlooks the fact that every State which has maritime boundaries has formally asserted a fixed outer boundary for its territorial waters so that no other State can question its position. The high seas are an international highway open to all. A ship leaving a U.S. port passes through part of our territory which we call territorial waters and thence into the high seas which is not part of our territory. Since the early years of our history, we have repeatedly asserted that there is a definitive boundary out to which the United States has territorial control of all foreign movement. In these territorial waters we are sovereign. In the high seas we are not. Similarly in national airspace over our lands and waters we are sovereign, but with the passage of the United Nations 1963 resolution we have joined other states in asserting that there can be no claim of sovereignty in outer space.

To prevent international misunderstanding we have always asserted the right to fix an outer boundary for our territorial waters. Exactly the same situation now exists as to flight. We have the right to control all flight in our territorial airspace. We have in substance surrendered that right, if it ever existed, in the area termed "outer space." But where lies the boundary between these areas? Can any logical reason be brought forward as to why the United States must not promptly assert its upper airspace boundary so as to give notice to the world of the area above its lands and waters in which it reserves the right to control all flight?

The time is not far distant, and in fact may be with us today, when the right of foreign spacecraft to pass through our territorial airspace will require an immediate and vigorous answer. Are foreign spacecraft, military or civil, to be permitted to fly within 25 miles above our lands and waters, or 50 miles, or 100 miles? A decision must be made.

This decision is necessarily political. It involves consideration of matters of great importance both civil and military. The accepted boundary should have reasonable scientific background. For example, 25 miles above sea level is perhaps the maximum height for the practical use of aircraft requiring aerodynamic support to sustain flight and using air-breathing motive power. Fifty miles above sea level is perhaps the maximum height at which the atmosphere is sufficiently dense to provide any appreciable aerodynamic lift. A point somewhere between 75 miles and 90 miles is perhaps the lowest point of practical orbital unpowered flight around the earth.

The most urgent reason for an early decision is the problem of the flight of spacecraft through the airspace when ascending or descending. Careful examination of the known records of past successful flights into or from outer space indicate that no such flights have ever been recorded at an altitude below 75 miles above a foreign state. Perhaps 90 miles might be an even more correct figure. But this will not continue. Problems of launching and landing are becoming more complex.

Until now flights have passed only through the airspace of the state of launching or the airspace over the high seas when ascending toward or descending from outer space. The airspace over the high seas is as free for flight use as are the high seas themselves for shipping. The spacecraft launced into orbit from Cape Kennedy (formerly Cape Canaveral) have ascended through airspace over the United States lands and territorial waters and thence over the high seas into outer space. When descending, our manned orbital flights have started the descent in outer space over the Pacific Ocean and have thence proceeded downward through the airspace over the United States and finally through the airspace over the Atlantic Ocean to a landing at sea. No foreign airspace has been used. It is understood that Russian spacecraft when being put into orbit or brought back for landing have passed solely through Russian airspace before entering the outer space and before landing at the end of orbital flight. The enormous Russian national landmass permits this procedure.

But, as orbital flights become more frequent and diverse, it is certain that we will face the very practical question of whether or not foreign spacecraft should be permitted to use our territorial airspace for ascent and descent, and we will certainly wish to know whether we have similar privileges in the airspace of other states.

The adoption of the United Nations resolution discussed earlier did not directly or indirectly grant any privileges of passage to foreign spacecraft through the national airspace of any state. In the case of the United States, national airspace has by statute been made a part of the territory of the United States, carrying with it our right to determine unilaterally what flight instrumentalities may enter or otherwise use such airspace. No resolution of the United Nations could alter our law so as to grant rights of passage. Historically the United States has permitted foreign aircraft to enter and use United States airspace only when and to the extent that such use has been authorized by treaty or other international agreement to which the United States is a party, or at times by special permission or authority. No general rights of passage for foreign aircraft exist in the United States airspace even though we accept the rule of international law that the airspace over the high seas is free. In other words, an aircraft approaching our shores and intending to land here cannot proceed past the outer boundary of the airspace above our territorial waters unless it has specific authority so to do. Obviously the same rule is applicable legally to the use of United States airspace by any foreign spacecraft.

But it must be noted that academic suggestions have been made that the United Nations resolutions as to the freedom of use of outer space have carried with them a consequential privilege of passage by spacecraft through foreign airspace in order to enjoy the rights of use of outer space. To some this theory may be politically attractive, but it is certainly legally unsound. The United States, for its part, should without delay fix a definite statutory upper boundary of its national airspace. When this is done, existing law will without question require the operator of any foreign spacecraft to seek authority to use our airspace if such use is found necessary in connection with the free international use of outer space.

When the upper limit of our national airspace has been fixed and our unconditional sovereignty thus reasserted, the United States will be in a position to deal reciprocally either by general convention, or through bilateral arrangements, so that the United States will enjoy for its spacecraft the same privileges extended to the spacecraft of other states who are parties to such arrangement.

Ultimately, a broad international convention will certainly be arrived at fixing the height of national airspace and determining what rights of passage, if any, will be permitted. In a convention of this kind the United States might alter its own upper national airspace boundary if then deemed useful, and could also determine what rights of passage, if any, foreign spacecraft would reciprocally enjoy.

Certainly the unilateral right of each state to control all flight in its national airspace can be modified only by direct national act, or international agreement, and not by inference or interpretation based on any theoretical effect of any agreement for the use of outer space. The legal status of territorial airspace and international outer space is diametrically opposed. May I say that I have long recognized the need to determine by international agreement any rights of airspace passage for spacecraft. In the convention which I proposed in 1956 to the American Society of International Law, this problem was considered. I suggested that a new convention might include the following as then stated:

"(a) Reaffirm article I of the Chicago Convention, giving the subjacent state full sovereignty in the areas of atmospheric space above it, up to the height where 'aircraft' as now defined, may be operated, such areas to be designated 'territorial space.'

"(b) Extend the sovereignty of the subjacent state upward to 300 miles above the earth's surface, designating this second area as 'contiguous space,' and provide for a right of transit through this zone for all nonmilitary flight instrumentalities when ascending or descending.

"(c) Accept the principle that all space above 'contiguous space' is free for the passage of all instrumentalities."

As I have often explained, my 1956 suggestion of 300 miles in paragraph (b) above was based on erroneous scientific views existing before sputnik that atmospheric conditions below a 300 mile altitude would make free satellite orbital flights difficult, if not impossible. Subsequent developments have indicated that this scientific position was not correct and that satellite flight is practical at much lower altitudes. It will be noted, however, that I carefully recommended rights of transit through the extended sovereignty zone for nonmilitary flight instrumentalities when ascending or descending. So far as I recall, this is the first time that the problem was considered.

Considering present conditions, scientific, political, and legal, the type of international convention which I proposed in 1956 might be very practical if the upper boundary of territorial space were now fixed at 25 miles above sea level and the upper limit of "contiguous space" were fixed at 75 miles, or in the alternative, at such other figure as might be scientifically determined to be the lowest limit of practical free orbital flight. The principle that all space above what I called "contiguous space" should be free for the passage of all flight instrumentalities has now been accepted by the United Nations resolutions with the strong support of the United States. The principle that the United States has full and absolute sovereignty in its airspace is still part of our law.

A convention of this kind is desirable as an early goal. But this objective does not minimize the urgency of present definitive action by the United States fixing the upper limit of its territorial airspace, thus notifying the world of its assertion of unilateral sovereign control of the usable areas below this national boundary. This control is applicable to all flight instrumentalities, whether they be rockets, missiles, aircraft, spacecraft, or any combination of these basic types.

Security Agents Told To Burn Records

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLOTTE T. REID

OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 29, 1964

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have received the following letter from a typical American mother who lives in the 15th District of Illinois, which it is my privilege to represent:

Bob and I are extremely concerned over this article and would appreciate it if you would investigate the directive and, if possible, instigate a movement to have it abolished. Please note the time limit of October 1:

"U.S. SECURITY AGENTS TOLD TO BURN RECORDS

"(By Willard Edwards)

"WASHINGTON, September 24.—The State Department's Security Office has directed its agents in 20 major cities of the United States to destroy the bulk of their field office records, containing data on Government security risks.

"By October 1, according to a directive dated August 28, resident agents 'will destroy all completed investigative reports by burning process with a special agent in attendance,' as a witness.

" 'RAW FILES' TO GO

"The Department's security agents investigate State Department employees and applicants for employment to ascertain if they are loyal to their country, have Communist connections, or have difficulties in character, such as drunkenness or homosexuality, which would make them potential security risks. They also investigate passport frauds.

"The data to be destroyed will include not only copies of reports forwarded to Washington but what intelligence agents call 'raw files.' These include data useful in subsequent investigations such as names of prospective witnesses and leads to subversive activities.

"A field agent has complained to his Senator that the destruction of his records will seriously impair his usefulness in the future and hamper his inquiries into the background of State Department employees.

"Henceforth, under the order, the agents will receive only that information which the Office of Security in Washington sends them and they are forbidden to accumulate data for future use. All security records will be based in the Washington headquarters.

"In issuing the order, the Office of Security asserted it was designed to effect efficiency and economy.

"These agents, especially veterans of many years' service, have accumulated filing cases full of data which they must now burn, with a witness looking on. They may keep no records in the future of their cases. They will dictate a report and send it to the field office which, in turn, will transmit it to Washington.

" 'He—the agent—will be operating out of his hat,' commented an intelligence authority. 'The new system is calculated to handicap investigative work, if nothing worse.'

"The Office of Security maintains field offices in Boston, New York, Washington, Miami, Chicago, San Francisco, and Los Angeles."

The clipping which she attaches appeared in the Chicago Tribune of September 25. Other Members of the House from the Chicago area have received equally strong protests from their districts.

I have written the Secretary of State as follows:

Hon. DEAN RUSK,
Secretary, Department of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I have before me State Department Office of Security letters C–64/17 dated August 6, 1964, and C–64/18 dated August 28, 1964. These obviously will curtail field office activities of your security division. I should like to know the reasons underlying such a decision. If you have evidence which establishes that the threat of Communist imperialism has lessened to a degree which permits relaxation of security procedures in your Department, I believe the Congress and the people should share this information. If, however, this is an economy measure, I would like to know if there is not some activity which could be curtailed with less risk to our Nation.

A story based on these letters appeared in the Chicago Tribune, September 25, 1964, and has aroused grave concern among the people of Illinois. It appears from this article that the August 28 letter will, in the opinion of some of your employees, handicap the investigative work of the State Department. If their understanding of this order is incorrect, I suggest immediate clarification in the interest of maintaining the high level of security and efficiency which I am certain we both wish to see in all of the activities of your Department.

I feel that in fairness I must withhold judgment in this matter until I have heard what Mr. Rusk has to say. Nonetheless, the timing of this action is strange. Last Sunday the Washington Star reported a Presidential directive demanding tighter security checks on Government appointees. According to that paper the directive reads as follows:

TEXT OF MEMORANDUM

We have been somewhat concerned about our procedures in requesting security name checks, particularly from the files of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, for appointees to the Federal service. Such procedures are an essential part of any effective security program.

In most instances it would seem desirable to request such checks prior to serious consideration being given to an individual, and most certainly before a firm commitment is made to the interested party or parties. Not only should this be observed in the respective departments and agencies, but also in instances in which recommendations for appointments are made by departments or agencies to the White House.

These procedures can prevent considerable embarrassment both to the Government and to the potential employee himself. Irreparable harm can be done to a person's reputation in instances where publicity is given to his possible appointment to a Government position, yet subsequent security checks result in a decision to suspend action on the appointment.

SOUND BUSINESS SENSE

It would be unfortunate if undesirable individuals were put on the Federal payroll simply because sufficient precautions were not taken prior to their appointment. This is merely sound business sense and should not be construed as an unwarranted invasion of privacy or violation of any person's constitutional rights.

Commonsense must naturally be exercised in the administration of name checks requests. For example, high-ranking military personnel who have possessed top-ranking clearance normally would not require security checks prior to appointment in the civilian service.

It would be desirable for all departments to examine their procedures in the above regard. This practice is in effect at the White House now and will be strictly adhered to in the future.

As we all know, a subcommittee of the other body has recently completed a 2-year investigation of security procedures in the State Department, which I am told will be made public sometime after the first week in November. I think Mr. Rusk would have been wise to see what that committee had to say before making these changes. It is also strange that Mr. Rusk has curtailed security activities at a time when the President has decided that stricter security investigations are necessary.

I am confident Secretary Rusk will provide an early explanation of this seeming difference of opinion within the administration.

Winning the Cold War: The U.S. Ideological Offensive—An Encouraging Beginning, VI

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 29, 1964

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, in parts 1 through 5 of this report, I outlined briefly the progress of the investigation undertaken 18 months ago by the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. This investigation is concerned solely with programs which comprise the fourth dimension of our foreign policy; namely, programs which provide support for our foreign policy by reaching, informing, and influencing foreign audiences. Our activities in this dimension of foreign policy, their effectiveness and success, may well decide the outcome of the cold war.

In summary, during the past 18 months, my subcommittee:

First. Held two series of hearings during which we received testimony from some 70 witnesses. These hearings have been published in eight volumes;

Second. Had prepared under its direction, and published, an inventory of governmental programs operating in the third dimension of foreign policy;

Third. Issued two reports which included a number of specific recommendations for strengthening our effort in this field; and

Fourth. Initiated a survey of activities conducted abroad by private U.S. citizens and organizations—activities which have a bearing on the implementation of our foreign policy.

This summary of the subcommittee's activities does not convey, of course, the full impact of our undertaking. I say this because it is often impossible to measure the indirect effects of an investigation of this type. We have concentrated primarily on getting together a body of information about the subject under study. Simultaneously, however, we have pointed out shortcomings which exist in some of our programs, suggested areas in which new approaches could be tried, and lent our support to innovations and improvements which, in some cases, were being considered in the executive branch and which, on the basis of our investigation, appeared sound to us.

The results of our efforts in such cases are reflected in a number of tangible improvements which have been put into effect during the past year and a half. We do not claim full credit for them. But I believe that our activities were at least partly instrumental in bringing them about.

Last month, for instance, the President issued a memorandum to the heads of executive departments and agencies, directing them to exert every effort to assure that competent, qualified citizens of the United States be available for service on the staffs of international agencies—a development which has been of interest to our subcommittee and which was dealt with in our Report No. 1 on "U.S. Participation in the International Labor Organization."

Similarly, earlier this year there was established in the executive branch an interdepartmental Foreign Area Research Coordinating Group—an innovation which was strongly recommended by our subcommittee in Report No. 2. In that report, we dealt at length with the shortcomings in the coordination of governmental research in foreign affairs. We also made this recommendation:

> Effective methods must be evolved to insure that the results of research conducted by Government agencies are promptly made available to all agencies concerned with foreign policy operations. Other arrangements must be worked out to divide research assignments and make certain that all requirements are covered to the extent that funds are available. A system of priorities must be established and enforced to insure that scarce resources—human and financial—are applied first to the most urgent tasks.

The establishment of the coordinating group is a step in the direction recommended by this subcommittee.

Similarly, the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency earlier this year established a Social Science Advisory Board to advise the Agency on matters of social science research—another innovation which our subcommittee considers significant and desirable from the standpoint of foreign policy operations.

In still another field, the representatives of several government agencies who have contact with private American organizations operating abroad, have put their heads together and are trying to devise steps which will promote more effective cooperation—a development which we have encouraged.

There is one more area that I would like to mention—the area of cultural and educational exchanges—in which our subcommittee has been active. We have seen a number of improvements in these programs in recent times. For example, greater effort is being made to evaluate and to improve current methods for handling foreign nationals brought to the United States under Government sponsorship for education, training, or observation. These visitors are being afforded much greater exposure than ever before to our way of life, our political and social institutions, our philosophy of government, and the goals of our foreign policy. This has been vigorously advocated by our subcommittee.

These are but a few examples of changes which have been put into effect during the past year and a half with the encouragement and support of this subcommittee.

On the negative side, there are a number of recommendations which our subcommittee has made but which have not been implemented to date. I hope that we will see some improvement in this situation during the coming year.

Mr. Speaker, in concluding this report, I want to make one thing clear: while the beginning has been encouraging, the job which our subcommittee undertook is far from being completed. We have much work ahead of us. And we intend to see it done.

I want to take this opportunity to express my sincere appreciation to Dr. THOMAS E. MORGAN, of Pennsylvania, chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, whose understanding and support have made our project possible.

I also want to thank the distinguished members of my subcommittee: Representatives L. H. FOUNTAIN, of North Carolina; OMAR BURLESON, of Texas; DONALD M. FRASER, of Minnesota; PETER H. B. FRELINGHUYSEN, of New Jersey; ROBERT R. BARRY, of New York; and H. R. GROSS, of Iowa, whose ability, patience, and tact have enabled us to move as far as we have during these past 18 months. Their devotion to the public good warrants the respect of every patriotic American.

A Bill To Amend Public Law 874, Federal Impact Aid Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 29, 1964

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, as we near the end of this session we leave some very important unfinished business.

One of the laws needing serious study and amendment is the so-called Federal impact aid bill, which pays Federal funds to school districts impacted by Federal peoples and properties.

In this regard I place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following news release on H.R. 12670 as well as the full text of this proposed act for the information of the membership of the House.

With 306 out of 435 Members of this House representing districts receiving this type of aid it is imperative that all of us understand the proposals fully.

The material follows:

Congressman JOHN H. DENT, Democrat of Pennsylvania, chairman of the Select Subcommittee on Education of the U.S. House of Representatives, introduced a new bill, H.R. 12670, for the purpose of amending Public Law 874, commonly known as the Federal impacted aid law.

This legislation as now written extends Federal aid presumably to those areas injured taxwise by the activities of Federal installations and the excessive influx of Federal employees' families into school districts.

Congressman DENT, after a series of hearings and extensive studies on the Federal impact problems, believes that in a substantial number of areas the impacted conditions caused by Federal activities benefit the total economy of the communities involved rather than injure them.

Impact payments under the present law are based on the loss of taxes from real property which has been removed from local tax rolls due to Federal activities. Based on this formula, many of the school districts which have excellent financial positions are receiving this assistance while a much larger number of needy school districts are unable to qualify for these funds. This new proposal of the Congressman will not injure any school district presently receiving Federal impact assistance but will simply permit school districts, which are impacted as a result of the presence of certain federally connected needy children, to qualify for this aid.

In his new bill, H.R. 12670, Congressman DENT seeks to broaden the base of Public Law 874 to include new categories for elementary and secondary schools. The Congressman proposes to further schedule a series of "grassroots" hearings in a selected number of areas in order to fully crystallize the subcommittee's opinion on this important issue.

In recent hearings on this problem in Los Angeles, Calif., the subcommittee found that due to one of the inequities in the present law, Los Angeles failed to qualify for approximately $10 million because Public Law 874 requires that districts of over 35,000 children in average daily attendance must be federally impacted by a minimum of 6 percent—Los Angeles was impacted by only 5.6 percent. Practically all the $300-odd million appropriated last year for the impact program has been paid to small districts which under the present law qualify with an impact of as little as 3 percent while larger communities with far more federally connected children, numerically, have been denied any assistance under the present program.

The Congressman pointed out this same type of restriction existed in the Library Services Act until he introduced a bill and successfully guided it through Congress which removed restrictive features and included all libraries on a fair and equitable basis.

Mr. DENT said that his new bill, H.R. 12670, will amend Public Law 874:

(1) To recognize the Federal connection for school district payment purposes of:

(a) Children of school age on whose behalf parents are currently receiving payments under the Aid to Dependent Children welfare program.

(b) Children of persons residing in local school districts who have exhausted their entitlement to unemployment compensation.

(c) Children of persons residing in the local school districts who received payments pursuant to titles, I, X, XIV, or XVI of the Social Security Act for a period of 6 or more months during the previous fiscal year.

(2) The bill provides that if the number of children of school age in one or more of these three new categories and the old category "B" (during the previous fiscal year) is 10 or more and amounts to 5 percent or more of the total number of children who were in daily average attendance during the fiscal year for which payment is being sought, the local educational agency would be entitled to a payment for each child equal to 25 percent of the payment made under Public Law 874 for a child whose parent both works and lives on Federal property (category "A" children).

H.R. 12670

A bill to amend Public Law 874, Eighty-first Congress, relating to assistance for schools in federally affected areas, to provide assistance in certain cases on account of children in needy families

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act of September 30, 1950 (Public Law 874, Eighty-first Congress), as amended (20 U.S.C. 236–244), is further amended as follows:

(a) Section 3(a) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. (a) For the purpose of computing the amount to which a local educational agency is entitled under this section for any fiscal year, the Commissioner shall determine the total number of children who were in the membership of the schools of such agency at any time during the previous fiscal year and for whom such agency provided free public education and who, while in attendance at such schools, resided on Federal property and (1) did so with a parent employed on Federal property situated in whole or in part in the same State as the school district of such agency or situated within reasonable commuting distance from the school district of such agency, or (2) had a parent who was on active duty in the uniformed services (as defined in section 101 of title 37, United States Code)."

(b) Section 3(b) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) For the purpose of computing the amount to which a local educational agency is entitled under this section for any fiscal year, the Commissioner shall also determine the total number of children (other than children to whom subsection (a) applies) who were in the membership of the schools of such agency at any time during the previous fiscal year and for whom such agency provided free public education and who, while in attendance at such schools, either resided on Federal property, or resided with a parent employed on Federal property situated in whole or in part in the same State as such agency or situated within reasonable commuting distance from the school district of such agency. A child of a parent who commenced residing in or near the school district of such agency while assigned to employment, as a member of the Armed Forces (as defined in section 101 of title 37, United States Code) on active duty, on Federal property (situated in whole or in part in the same State as the school district of such agency or within reasonable commuting distance from such school district) and who was subsequently assigned elsewhere on active duty as a member of the Armed Forces, shall continue to be considered as residing with a parent employed on such Federal property for so long as the parent is so assigned elsewhere."

(c) Paragraph (1) of section 3(c) is amended to read as follows:

"(c)(1) The amount to which a local educational agency is entitled under this section for any fiscal year shall be an amount equal to (A) the local contribution rate (determined under subsection (d)) multiplied by (B) the sum of the number of children determined under subsection (a) and one-quarter of the sum of (i) the number of children determined under subsection (b), (ii) the number of dependent children residing in the local school district for whom payments pursuant to title IV of the Social Security Act were made for a period of three or more months during the previous fiscal year, (iii) the number of children of persons residing in the local school district whose entitlement to unemployment compensation under State law or title XV of the Social Security Act was exhausted during the previous fiscal year, and (iv) the number of children of persons residing in the local school district who received public assistance grants under title I, X, XIV, or XVI of the Social Security Act for six months or more during the previous fiscal year. In determining the number of children for the purposes of subsections (a) and (b) and of this paragraph, the Commissioner may rely on a certification of the number of children to be counted by the State or local educational agency official or official administering the applicable Social Security Act program or State unemployment compensation program."

(d) Paragraph (2) of section 3(c) is amended to read as follows:

"(2) No local educational agency shall be entitled to receive any payment for a fiscal year with respect to a number of children determined under subsection (a) unless the number of children determined for the previous fiscal year is ten or more. No local educational agency shall be entitled to receive any payment for a fiscal year with respect to a number of children determined under subsection (b) and clauses (ii), (iii), and (iv) of subsection (c) unless the number of children determined for the previous fiscal year is ten or more, amounts to 5 per centum or more of the total number of children who were in average daily attendance during the fiscal year for which payment is sought and for whom such agency provided free public education, except that such 5 per centum requirement need not be met by such agency for any period of two fiscal years which follows a fiscal year during which such agency was entitled to payment under the provisions of this section, but the payment, under the provisions of this section to such agency for the second fiscal year of any such two-year period during which such requirement is not met, shall be reduced by 50 per centum of the amount thereof. However, the Commissioner may waive the 5 per centum condition of entitlement wherever, in his judgment, exceptional circumstances exist which would make the application of such condition inequitable and would defeat the purposes of this Act."

(e) Paragraph (3) of section 3(c) is repealed.

(f) Paragraph (5) of section 3(c) is amended to read as follows:

"(5) No payment shall be made to a local educational agency if the Commissioner determines that for the preceding fiscal year the State has reduced its contributions to the school district of that local educational agency because of Federal contributions under this Act."

(g) Section 4(a) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 4. (a) If the Commissioner determines for any fiscal year ending prior to July 1, 1965—

"(1) that, as a direct result of activities of the United States (carried on either directly or through a contractor) an increase has occurred in the number of children who were in the membership of the schools of any local educational agency at any time during the previous fiscal year, which increase so resulting from activities of the United States is equal to at least 5 per centum of the difference between the number of children who were in the membership of the schools of such agency during the second preceding fiscal year and the number of such children whose attendance during such first previous fiscal year resulted from activities of the United States (including children who resided on Federal property or with a parent employed on Federal property);

"(2) that such activities of the United States have placed on such agency a substantial and continuing financial burden; and

"(3) that such agency is making a reasonable tax effort and is exercising due diligence in availing itself of State and other financial assistance but is unable to secure sufficient funds to meet the increased educational costs involved,

then such agency shall be entitled to receive for such fiscal year an amount equal to the product of—

"(A) the number of children which the Commissioner determines to be the increase, so resulting from activities of the United States, in membership during such previous fiscal year; and

"(B) the amount which the Commissioner determines to be the current expenditures per child necessary to provide free public education to such additional children during such year, minus the amount which the Commissioner determines to be available from State, local, and Federal sources for such purpose (not counting as available for such purpose either payments under this Act or funds from local sources necessary to provide free public education to other children).

Any payment which such agency would otherwise be entitled to receive under section 3 for the next fiscal year (except where the determination under the preceding sentence has been made with respect to the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965) shall be reduced by the amount of the payment under this subsection for the preceding fiscal year. The determination under clause (B) shall be made by the Commissioner after considering the current expenditures per child in providing free public education in those school districts in the State which, in the judgment of the Commissioner, are generally comparable to the school district of the local educational agency for which the computation is being made."

(h) Section 9 of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(11) The membership of schools shall be determined in accordance with State law or, in the absence of State law governing such a determination, in accordance with regulations of the Commissioner; except that, notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, where the local educational agency of the school district in which any child resides makes or contracts to make a tuition payment for the free public education of such child in a school situated in another school district, for purposes of this Act the membership of such child shall be held and considered—

"(A) if the two local educational agencies concerned so agree, and if such agreement is approved by the Commissioner, as membership of a school of the local educational agency receiving such tuition payment;

"(B) in the absence of any such approved agreement, as membership of a school of the local educational agency so making or contracting to make such tuition payment.

In any determination of membership of schools, children who are not provided free public education (as defined in paragraph (4)) shall not be counted."

SEC. 2. The amendments made by this Act shall take effect July 1, 1965.

Congressman Minshall Report of the 2d Session of 88th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 29, 1964

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, the 2d session of the 88th Congress is nearing adjournment after more than 9 months in session.

The House of Representatives passed nearly 400 public bills out of the more than 3,000 introduced. It also approved more than 100 Senate bills. Of this number more than 300 will have been signed into law by the President by the time Congress adjourns.

During my 10 years in Congress I have answered literally thousands of rollcalls and my attendance record on votes has been better than 91 percent. However, bare statistics do not accurately represent the long hours spent by each of us in committee work alone. It is in committee that the major portion of actual legislating is done. There the bills are painstakingly studied, analyzed, discussed, often amended. Those measures favorably reported by a committee are again studied and debated when they reach the floor of the House, but the spadework is accomplished in committee.

My own Appropriations Committee assignments include a massive amount of detail and work. As a member of two of the most important subcommittees in the entire Congress—the Department of Defense appropriations and foreign operations appropriations—I spend many long hours in locked-door sessions with our Nation's highest civilian and military officials. I have access to top-secret information pertaining to our defense posture and planning. These two subcommittees have a great responsibility in taking initial action on budget requests submitted by the executive branch. My Defense Subcommittee scrutinizes military expenditures, which account for more than one-half of the entire Federal outlay. My Foreign Operations Subcommittee makes the dollar appropriation on economic and military assistance to foreign nations.

I have an intense interest in both of my committee assignments, and I feel that fulfilling them is one of my important services as a Representative in Congress.

Although there are occasional sharp differences of opinion among members of the subcommittees, I can report to you that every member works diligently in what he believes to be the best interests of his country.

My report on the second session of the 88th Congress follows:

NATIONAL DEFENSE

Unanimous support was given by the whole House for the Defense Appropriation, $46.7 billion for fiscal year 1965, a figure the Senate basically agreed to. It represented a reduction of nearly half a billion from the previous fiscal year, and a reduction of $718 million less than Pentagon requests. In addition to this amount, nearly $1.57 billion was appropriated for military construction.

Chief dispute in the House over the Defense measure centered around the Pentagon's too-heavy reliance upon cost-effectiveness studies, failure to develop major new weapons, and political censorship of testimony given before my Defense Subcommittee.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

A spirited attempt to cut the foreign aid bill by $247.8 million was waged by the chairman of my Foreign Operations Subcommittee, allied with most of the minority members of the group. This economy move was defeated on the floor of the House by a mere 10 votes in a 198 to 208 rollcall. The House approved a total of $3.7 billion for the entire aid program. The Senate authorized nearly the same amount and their appropriation bill awaits final action as this is written. A rider attached to the Senate foreign aid authorization delayed action somewhat on reapportionment of State legislatures, as ordered by the Supreme Court.

International Development Agency: Public and congressional reaction to the seemingly endless flow of American dollars overseas was reflected by the House when it rejected funds for IDA late in February, later reconsidered and passed the necessary legislation by a narrow margin in May.

Laos Commission: House floor debate was heated over authorization of payment of the U.S. contribution of $683,000 for 1964 to the International Commission for Supervision and Control in Laos. Dispute was over the Commission's failure to prevent funneling of Communist troops and supplies through Laos to Vietnam. Payment was approved in a 268 to 89 rollcall vote.

Vietnam resolution: Following the Bay of Tonkin clash in early August, the Congress approved a resolution in support of the President's action in the crisis and reaffirming the United States determination to assist any member of the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization which asks for aid in defense of its freedom.

United National Charter: As the Soviet Union remained intransigent in its refusal to pay certain of its financial obligations to the U.N., the House unanimously approved a resolution expressing its sense that the President should direct our permanent delegate to the U.N. to continue efforts toward securing payment of assessments, and that if such arrears are not paid article 19 of the U.N. Charter should be invoked penalizing nonpayment by revoking the right to vote in the Assembly.

The Panama Canal may soon reach the point where it will not be able to meet the demand of increased size and number of vessels. Congress authorized a study to determine a site for construction of a new and larger sea-level canal between the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans.

DEBTS AND TAXES

For the sixth time since January 1961, the House voted to increase the national debt ceiling, this time from a "temporary" $315 billion ceiling to a "temporary" $324 billion limitation. On an average, there has been an increase of about $8 billion a year each year since 1961.

An omnibus tax bill, provided for $11.5 billion reduction in rates, lowering individual and corporate taxes, but repealing the 4 percent dividend credit, and tightening allowable deductions for certain State and local taxes, casualty losses, sick pay, and certain oil and gas income. Too low withholding on payrolls may leave many unhappy taxpayers with money due Internal Revenue next April.

An attempt to repeal wartime-imposed excise taxes on jewelry, fur, luggage, handbags, and toilet preparations was defeated by a scant 22 votes in the House, and continued for another year.

Social security benefits were increased by 5 percent across-the-board by the House, with limited benefits extended to some 600,000 formerly ineligible persons. Self-employed physicians were added to compulsory coverage, firemen were included on a voluntary basis. Increased payroll tax rates for employers and employees will be 3.8 percent each starting January 1, 1965, spiraling upward to 4.8 percent each by 1971. Increased self-employed tax rate will be 5.7 percent as of January 1, 1965, reaching 7.2 percent in 1971. House and Senate conferees are presently meeting to resolve differences. The controversial "medicare" amendment is likely to be shelved until next Congress.

DOMESTIC AFFAIRS

Mass Transportation Act: The $375 million mass transportation act was given congressional approval for the purpose of making Federal grants and loans to States and communities to acquire, construct and improve land, rolling stock and terminal facilities for mass transportation systems owned or leased by a public transportation authority. Of the $375 million authorized, $75 million is to be appropriated in 1965, the balance in fiscal years 1966 and 1967.

Federal pay raise: Proposed increases in the salaries of Members of Congress caused many of us who have always supported pay raises for Federal employees to vote against this bill as a protest against raising our own salaries at a time of heavy national deficit spending. The $10,000 increase for Members was defeated in early 1964, but a majority of the House voted for the bill the second time it was considered, when it limited the congressional raise to $7,500. Although I strongly felt that the average 4.3-percent raise for Federal workers and 5.6-percent raise for postal employees carried in the bill was justified, I voted against the congressional pay raise, feeling that any increase would be inappropriate for Congress at this time.

Another military pay raise totaling $207.5 million monthly was voted into effect during this past year.

Civil Rights Act: As enacted into law, voting rights are afforded stronger protection; public school desegregation will be accelerated, discrimination will be eliminated from all programs receiving Federal assistance. Most controversy and debate centered around the public accommodations provision, which outlaws discrimination in hotels, motels, restaurants, lunch counters, movie houses, theaters, and stadiums, or by any establishment which offers its services to patrons of the covered establishment, such as a barbershop located in a hotel; and the Equal Employment Commission, whose task will be to prevent discrimination in hiring, promoting, firing, apprenticing, or job assignment.

A National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress, composed of 14 members, was authorized to report legislative recommendations to Congress by January 1, 1966.

Wilderness bill: After many years' delay in Congress, the wilderness bill finally received congressional approval. The legislation places 9.1 million acres of Federal land already classified as "wilderness," "wild," or "canoe" land, under a permanent protective wilderness system. The Secretary of Agriculture is assigned to review 5.4 million acres of primitive national forest areas and the Secretary of the Interior some 22.1 million roadless park areas and 24.4 million wildlife refuges and game ranges and to recommend their inclusion or exclusion from the wilderness system. Congress would be required to act before such recommendations would become effective.

Economic Opportunity Act: Better known as the antipoverty bill this new law revives a number of work programs from the 1930's and launches several new ones. The 3-year program, authorizing specific appropriations of just under $1 billion, provides for 10 separate programs under the supervision of the Director of the new Office of Economic Opportunity. The act provides for a Job Corps training youth in conservation camps and in urban and rural residential training centers, a work-training program for youth on the community level, community action programs involving Federal aid and direction to civic groups and other private organizations, a Domestic Peace Corps to be known as VISTA—Volunteers in Service to America—and a number of programs for rural areas.

Appalachia bill: The Senate passed a bill to provide public works and economic development programs, as well as the planning and coordination needed to assist in the development of this whole region. The House bill awaits floor action in the near future.

Fish and wildlife protection from the use of insecticides and pesticides was furthered in legislation passed by Congress as the result of Rachel Carson's bestseller, "Silent Spring."

National Defense Education Act: The 1958 measure is to be extended for another 3 years and college student loan funds increased from $135 million to $195 million for fiscal 1968. The bill also includes the 50-percent loan forgiveness to student teachers in private institutions as well as public ones. The House will take action on the conference report prepared by conferees from both Houses late this week.

Housing and health: The Housing Act authorizes $1.2 billion for urban renewal, 37,500 low-cost public housing units, loans to elderly citizens and farmers, and some relaxation of FHA conditions and requirements for home mortgages.

The Hill-Burton Act for construction and modernization of hospitals was extended for 5 years and authorized $1.3 billion on a 50–50 State-Federal matching basis.

Other bills authorized a total of nearly $360 million to provide aid to education of nurses and other professional personnel in the health field.

Highways: $1.1 billion annually for 1966 and 1967 was earmarked for the Federal contribution to our national road system. It should be of interest to know that in the past 2 years 33 Federal-aid highway projects were authorized for Cuyahoga County, having an estimated total cost of $95 million. This covers improvements to a combined length of 17.9 miles and the construction of 31 bridges in the greater Cleveland area.

Veterans: Several bills were passed in both sessions to liberalize the veterans' pension laws. Of most interest this session is the House passed bill to increase non-service-connected pensions for veterans and their widows, and to revise upward limits of permissible income without loss of pension. This measure is on the Senate Calendar awaiting action.

PUBLIC WORKS

Over $3.5 million will go into survey work, construction, and operation and maintenance of Cleveland harbor and river facilities in 1965.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare will spend $709,000 on the Lake Erie portion of a comprehensive study of the Great Lakes to find a solution to the problem of pollution of lake waters.

It is an honor to represent the nearly half a million residents of the 23d district, one of the most highly informed and articulate congressional districts in the entire Nation. I take particular pride in the fact that these citizens have awarded me their confidence and support during the decade I have served them in the U.S. House of Representatives.

My Cleveland and Washington offices are always ready to provide counsel or assistance for constitutents who are involved in the increasingly complex problems of Federal Government.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 30, 1964

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

I Corinthians 4: 2: *Moreover it is required in stewards, that a man be found faithful.*

Almighty God, as we go forth into the hours of this day, may we put to good account all the talents and capacities for service with which we have been endowed and entrusted.

We humbly acknowledge that we are frequently content to merely do our bit and follow the way of least resistance.

Grant that we may be inspired with a lofty sense of mission and give the very best of mind and heart to discharge, faithfully and well, our duties and responsibilities.

In seeking to please and find favor with our fellow men, may we never betray or surrender our most assured convictions and cherished principles.

May we seek to win and possess the peace of the joyous victor, whose conscience gives him the glorious prospect that he belongs to that blessed company of the faithful, who have no vain regrets and no shattered ruins to lament over.

To Thy name we shall ascribe all the praise. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 367. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Clerk of the House to correct the enrollment of the bill H.R. 6593.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill and a joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2249. An act to provide for the establishment of the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore, and for other purposes; and

S.J. Res. 139. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to succession to the Presidency and Vice Presidency and to cases where the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office.

APPROVAL OF PUBLIC WORKS PLANS

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication which was read and referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., September 25, 1964.

The Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the provisions of section 2 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended, the Committee on Public Works has approved the work plans transmitted to you which were referred to this committee. The work plans involved are:

State, watershed, executive communication No., committee approval:

Colorado, Home Supply, 2428, September 24, 1964.

Georgia, Beaverdam Creek, 2428, September 24, 1964.

Georgia, South Fork of Little River, 2428, September 24, 1964.

North Carolina, Crabtree Creek, 2428, September 24, 1964.

Oklahoma, Four-Mile Creek, 2428, September 24, 1964.

South Carolina, Three and Twenty Creek, 2428, September 24, 1964.

Idaho, Montpelier Creek, 2539, September 24, 1964.

Oregon, Sutherlin Creek, 2539, September 24, 1964.

Sincerely yours,
CHARLES A. BUCKLEY, M.C.,
Chairman, Committee on Public Works.

THE LEGISLATIVE SITUATION

The HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time in order to see if we might clarify the legislative situation here in the House of Representatives for the balance of this week and for next week, if we are to be here next week.

Before I make the inquiry I think it should be said for the record that on this side of the aisle, as I am sure is the case on the other side of the aisle, many of us have had no doubt but what this session of Congress would have been adjourned before this time. We have made commitments to be home in our districts where we have a right to be and, as a matter of fact, where we have an obligation to be, because we are now in an election year.

Candidates seeking reelection from the House feel this obligation to be in their districts and they have a responsibility to meet the commitments they made in all good faith. Having gone this long and, may I say, Mr. Speaker, far beyond any reasonable time in my opinion that we should have gone, certainly there is great concern on my side of the aisle as I am sure there is on the other side, as to just what the timetable is.

When Republicans were in charge of the 80th Congress we adjourned the 2d session June 20.

When Republicans were again in charge of the 83d Congress we adjourned the 2d session August 20.

Both of these Congresses were highly productive in the best interests of the country. We did the job that needed to be done with dispatch.

Now, with a Democratic administration and a Congress that is controlled by an overwhelming Democrat majority, we find a situation in which this body cannot seem to legislate and, for some strange reason beyond my comprehension, does not know how to quit and go home.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in response to the distinguished minority leader may I advise that the hope that he expressed that we can complete the business of the session is felt, I think, pretty generally.

Mr. Speaker, all Members would like to go home. Most Members have to campaign. Most Members, like myself, are canceling speaking engagements daily. I canceled three of mine this morning.

But, of course, the obligation to be in our districts is also qualified, I think, by the obligation to complete the necessary business pending before the House and the Congress.

The gentleman knows full well that neither the authorization act nor the appropriation act for foreign aid has been signed into law. The gentleman also knows that both of those acts were passed by the House of Representatives by the end of the last fiscal year. I believe the Foreign Aid Appropriation Act was passed in the House about the first day of this fiscal year. The authorization bill had been previously passed. We hope to dispose of those matters expeditiously.

Also, the gentleman knows that the House has passed all of its appropriation bills in due time this year. And, he knows further that the social security bill is still in conference. The gentleman knows that many matters of top priority are under consideration in connection with that bill, not only the matter of increased retirement benefits, but the matter of hospitalization for our senior citizens.

The gentleman knows that that subject is still before the Congress and that in trying to give it adequate consideration even at this stage of the session, the House is responding, I think, not only to a national demand but to a great national need.

The gentleman is aware, as I am, that in this country there are 17.5 million-plus senior citizens, forecasted to increase to 25 million by 1980. Those are conservative estimates. The gentleman further knows that the average senior citizen's income is approximately 50 percent of that of Americans below the age of 65. Almost one-half of those over 65 years of age who are living alone have incomes of less than $1,000 per year. Of those who are married the income average is less than one-half of that of the average married couple in the United States.

The plight of our older people is a major national problem to which we hope to give and to which we owe adequate consideration.

I am sure the gentleman would not disagree with me that this is a subject that deserves adequate consideration, because toward these people to whom employment opportunities are no longer open, toward these people whose incidence of illness is extremely high, the Congress has a moral obligation, having carried the matter this far, to give it full consideration.

The gentleman knows that, and the gentleman will agree with me on that subject. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, as a matter of fact, the Speaker has elongated my 1 minute, and I appreciate the speech the majority leader has made in respect to what I believe is a matter that cannot be adopted in this session of the Congress. It has been around here for years and years, and never has been adopted by the House of Representatives, and I am quite sure it is not going to be. In any event, the matter is in conference and could be reported back to the House by the conferees in a very short time and acted upon yet this week.

Mr. Speaker, what I am trying to get at is this: We were here in session until Christmas Eve last year. We are now being kept here in an election year half way through the campaign, and no one knows, as far as I can discover, just what we are still supposed to do. I understand we are supposed to pass an Appalachia bill. But may I say that rule has been out for 41 days and nights. That is one more than the Biblical rate. It has not been called up, but according to the press we have still got to deal with that bill. How much longer, may I ask, are we supposed to stay here in session, as we have been for weeks and weeks, doing practically nothing, when, as I say, if representative government is to function we must have an opportunity to get back to our home districts and talk to our people?

I realize there are Members on the Democratic side of the aisle who are already elected. I am quite sure a lot of people in some of the big city controlled districts have been reelected, or what amounts to that, and it would not make any difference whether they went home or not.

There have been some suggestions that maybe this is part of a sinister plot to keep us here so that we cannot go home and campaign, referring to Members on this side of the aisle. I do not subscribe to that. I know the Speaker and the majority leader will expedite the business of the Government. We have already expedited it in this Congress.

Tomorrow will we have the National Defense Education Act conference report up for consideration?

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in reference to the programing of the conference report on the National Defense Education Act, I hope that it will be ready tomorrow, and it may well be called up for consideration at that time. But I do not have complete jurisdiction over the matter of the National Defense Education Act conference report. I will say to the gentleman, first, that the disposition of the conference report on the National Defense Education Act will not be a matter that would in any wise affect the adjournment date. We do have important conference reports that are not ready to be called up and that must be acted on before we can adjourn.

The gentleman knows that so long as that remains the case the matter of when the Appalachia bill will be programed is not really a matter material to adjournment.

Mr. HALLECK. Am I correct in understanding that a rule providing for a 15-day continuing resolution in respect to appropriations was voted out today?

Mr. ALBERT. It is my understanding that the resolution covers a period of 10 days. I may say to the gentleman that as far as the leadership is concerned we will endeavor not to ask the Committee on Appropriations for any further continuing resolutions.

Mr. HALLECK. That would be wonderful, because we have been having so many. But would it be anticipated that resolution will come up tomorrow?

Mr. ALBERT. Yes.

VISITORS FROM FRANCE

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure a bit ago to entertain about 30 people from France who came over here at their own expense because they are friends of the United States. We had a question and answer period in the Committee on Foreign Affairs committee room. I cannot violate the rules; if I could, I would tell you where they are now.

I think it is significant, in this time we are here when the press keeps emphasizing the differences between the United States and France, that this many people would voluntarily, paying for it out of their own pockets, come to this country for a month or so, to show they are friends of ours and that the ties that have existed between the United States and France for so many years are still strong in the hearts of the French people. After all, France is America's oldest ally. I appreciate their coming here. This is not the first group of this kind, and I know it will not be the last group.

WE MUST RETAIN OUR ESSENTIAL WEAPONS

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I have served as chairman of the Agricultural Appropriations Subcommittee for more than 15 years. This year we have provided substantial funds, $25,500,000, to increase our efforts to find and use all means to protect ourselves and our source of food from insects and disease. We mean to see that this effort is speeded up, for we have been working in this field for many years.

In the meantime, we must not prohibit the use of proven weapons, of effective agricultural pesticides which are so essential to our standard of living and to our welfare—where there is no evidence of injury to our people, simply because we come up with a new test which shows an infinitesimal amount of residue, which in itself has not been determined to be dangerous.

We must provide for reasonable tolerance on pesticides and a standard test, if we are to protect the cheapest, the best, the widest variety of foods ever enjoyed by any nation, as each year our life expectancy increases. If we do not take action in this area, the consumer will be at the whim of local authorities, where health is not endangered, as in the Washington milk situation. I regret to see some say that elimination of chemicals might cut production; that it would be a good thing in view of our surpluses.

This is a shortsighted viewpoint, which ignores several extremely important factors—the world's food and population situations and the contest between us and Communist-dominated countries.

Aside from the possibility of nuclear conflict, probably the foremost problem in the world today is hunger. Approximately half of the world's 3 billion people suffer from malnutrition and the World Food Congress was told in 1963 that around 10,000 persons die every day from starvation. India has a food crisis just now due to bad weather. We are rushing wheat and other foods from our surpluses in an effort to avert chaos. I said that India has a food crisis. I should have said "an accentuated food crisis" since that vast subcontinent has a year-round hunger problem. So do many other areas in the world, mostly the underdeveloped ones. Moreover, hunger probably will grow more and more intense with the passage of time. The world's population increase is almost unbelievable. Each year births exceed deaths by almost 60 million. The way things are going now, it looks as if this globe will have close to 6 billion persons by the year 2000.

As Senator GRUENING, of Alaska, said in a speech in 1963:

> Two grim specters beckon mankind toward oblivion today. One offers instant and wholesale death by nuclear means. The alternative guarantees eventual starvation when the human population exceeds the food supply.

Also, the efficiency of American agriculture is a most important and practical weapon in the struggle with communism. The failure of Communist agriculture, a failure which is chronic and deep seated, has tremendous implications to the hundreds of millions constantly plagued by hunger. The Communist inability to produce efficiently and abundantly plainly tells them—if they get the message—that there is little hope along the Communist road.

If they follow this path—as they are being urged to do every day—all they have to look forward to is more starvation and misery.

In my opinion, this contrast between our systems, the contrasts in agriculture, should be used to the fullest. I cannot think of any better answer to Communist propaganda. As Don Paarlberg, of Purdue University, in his book, "American Farm Policy," said:

> Agriculture represents our greatest absolute advantage over the Communist world.

Modern agricultural production would be impossible without the use of chemical pesticides and herbicides. Even with their use, destructive insects do damage every year approximating $4 billion. One of the primary reasons for world hunger and human diseases is the absence of effective chemical pesticides in extensive areas of the world. I know for I have seen many of these countries. In India, where, as I have pointed out, hunger is endemic, destructive insects work almost unhindered. For example, it is almost impossible to maintain supplies of stored grain in that country because of the depredations of weevils and beetles, including that pest of pests, the Khapra beetle.

If there is to be any improvement in the food situation abroad, we must not only use our food reserves to combat hunger; we must keep our agricultural products available and offered on the markets of the world.

Mr. Speaker, in our recent bill providing funds for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for fiscal year 1965 the Congress provided approximately $25,500,000 for increased research on the handling of insects and insect diseases of man and animal and plant life. Pending results from such efforts we must not permit anything to take away our present weapons, where there is no evidence of danger to human health.

Since our report on the appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies, I have made a rather thorough study of the overall problem of chemical pesticides and the alternatives, research for which we financed in that bill. It is our agricultural chemicals, our machinery, and improved and prolific varieties of plants which make it possible for so few to provide for so many. Without these agricultural tools a great many of our people would have to go back to the farm, possibly as many as half. Should that occur, we would not have the many things which make our life so much better than that of the rest of the world.

I am convinced the American people cannot do without farm machinery, improved varieties of plants or the new, better, and more lasting pesticides which are essential if we are to keep insects and diseases from seriously damaging our food supply.

What makes the situation doubly bad is that so many of our people in key positions apparently want to capitalize on a public opinion built up by a wonderfully written book, a mixture of fact and fantasy, by the late Miss Rachel Carson; yet our leading scientists all point out that it is not a scientific book at all but a marvelously written narrative, really a rather nostalgic plea for a return of yesterday, though its warning as to proper use is both timely and helpful.

Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks we all have been aware of the burning of thousands of acres of timber, of homes and buildings in the Santa Barbara watershed area of California. Today we are told that more than 80,000 acres will have to be replanted with trees for which $1 million is requested and I know if we don't protect these young seedlings with effective pesticides, the seedlings will be cut down by rodents as fast as they are set out.

Last week the House of Representatives provided for payment by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare of $8,800,000 in damages incurred in the Washington, D.C., area by milk being condemned by the local health department, because of new tests and the residues which they showed, without any evidence of danger to public health. All authorities I have studied clearly prove that chemical residues do not continue to build up in humans, and I have found no evidence that injury has resulted where chemical pesticides have been properly used. What makes the situation bad is the fact that writers have gone from discussion of injury by misuse right into "residues," where there is no evidence of potential injury.

During a recent debate someone talked about the Mississippi River fish kill. I have read the hearings on this case; the fish were almost all salt water fish and died just below a spot where one of our major cities dumps 17 million gallons of sewage daily—500 miles down river from Memphis, Tenn., where it was claimed pesticide residues were allowed to enter the river.

Much has been made of the bird kills. Instead of fewer birds we have had a bird population increase of explosive proportions as chemicals have held down mites, rodents, and other pests and animals which destroy bird life.

One of the most effective chemicals has been DDT, which without doubt has saved many lives in and since World War II. However, the use of DDT and other chlorinated hydrocarbon chemicals has been banned, to all intent and purposes, on lands administered by the Department of the Interior. Insofar as I have been able to ascertain, there is no evidence of damage to wildlife, or any other form of life, to sustain this ban. It is true that DDT, improperly used, has killed fish and other forms of wildlife, just as it is true that aspirin, improperly used, has killed human beings—more every year, and all by misuse incidentally, than pesticides, where, too, it has all been from misuse. But DDT and some other of the chlorinated hydrocarbons are very efficient agents in combating destructive insects. They are efficient because their effects are long lasting and persistent. One application lasts quite awhile, which is why they do the job.

In announcing the ban on the chlorinated hydrocarbons, the Interior Department did not announce any new proof of injury or hazard. I can only hope that within a year or two insect damage on some of the forest lands administered by Interior has not proceeded to the point where there has been havoc from such pests as the spruce budworm, together with great damage to watersheds and an enhancement of the threat of fire in areas in the West.

In 1963 the Connecticut legislature failed to approve money for pesticides to spray forests against the gypsy moth. As a result, there was drastic curtailment of pesticide use against the pest. In 1964 a sharp rise in damage from the moth in Connecticut has been evident. In the absence of preventive measures, we may expect this damage to increase every year and the major danger is fire which would be disastrous to hundreds of watersheds and cities below throughout the country.

In connection with the theory that pesticides accumulate threateningly in the water and soil, I went hunting not long ago in Mississippi for doves. We hunted in an area where pesticides, the chlorinated hydrocarbons, had been used in large quantities for years and years. Yet game was plentiful, so plentiful that the hundreds of hunters got the overall limit, 12 each, in a very few hours.

The Mississippi Delta, or a large portion of it, is in my district. Pesticides, the persistent kind, have been used to literally drench much of the delta for years in order to protect crops. Nevertheless, fish and game flourish and thrive. Moreover, my constituents of the area are vigorous and healthy. Their lifespan like that of the people of the Nation has risen sharply since the use of DDT eliminated the malarial mosquito and the disease itself. In addition to the scientific evidence, the evidence of commonsense is against the present charges.

I quote from the report of our Appropriations Committee:

THE PESTICIDE RESIDUE PROBLEM

The need for additional research on development, testing, and use of pesticides and insecticides, together with the effects of sprays or other residues from products used in agricultural production is very acute. Recent well-publicized books and articles, not always based on complete and objective information, have increased public concern about this matter. Current statements in the press which make certain claims concerning the effect of agricultural pesticides on fish in the lower Mississippi River present a completely one-sided point of view, and in this instance it is not claimed that health is affected.

To enable the Department to protect agriculture and the consumer by developing and presenting full and complete facts on this matter and to develop improved methods of insect and pest control, some expansion of research activities in this area is necessary. Congress provided for the establishment of a weed-control laboratory last year. Since the work at this location will be directly concerned with the use of pesticides, insecticides, other agricultural chemicals, materials, and methods, plans for this facility should be modified to permit testing and development of pesticides, insecticides and other materials necessary to agriculture, including effects of residues.

For expanded research on use of pesticides and control of insects and pests, the committee included approximately $25,500,000 in the final bill for next year, including such amount as may be needed for the modification of plans at the weed-control laboratory provided last year to include this type of research.

Both the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Department of Agriculture are deeply interested in protecting the public health. Both Departments have responsibility for approving materials for use as pesticides and insecticides for agricultural purposes.

Neither Department, we are sure, would want to needlessly deprive the American consumer of any part of the finest and cheapest food any nation has ever enjoyed. In recent weeks, however, after materials have been approved and put into use, new means of detection of minute amounts of residue have resulted in news releases, press accounts, and headlines which needlessly frighten the consumer, do financial damage to the manufacturer and the farmer, and lessen the supply of food for the consuming public, though there is no claim that the public health is endangered. Neither the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, nor the Department of Agriculture would want to needlessly destroy any American business or agricultural enterprise. Yet that is what present policies are doing in cases where there is no evidence of danger to the public health.

The members of the committee recall the cranberry incident in 1960, when a whole industry was practically destroyed by reckless statements and charges. It took $10 million recommended by President Eisenhower to compensate for the damage and bring back public acceptance of this commodity. The public health must be protected. However, the supply of food and the processes which make food and fiber plentiful and cheap must also be protected where there is no evidence that public health is endangered.

In an effort to prevent further financial damage to American producers and loss of food for consumers as a result of reckless handling of this problem, the committee has set up $250,000 for the use of the Secretary of Agriculture to collaborate with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in working out rules and regulations including the recommendation of such changes in the law as may be necessary to protect our high standard of living with the most plentiful, cheapest and finest food and fiber any nation ever had—while at the same time protecting the public health.

The food supply shortage is said to be Russia's "Achilles heel." Russia's monumental failure to provide food for her people and their allies is her chief weakness in the world of today. We must prevent our Nation, where only 18 percent of total income goes for food, from sinking to Russia's level, where some 50 percent or more of national income is spent for food.

It is the firm belief of this committee that news releases or other public statements regarding any pesticide or other material which such Departments have authorized for use should not be made unless at least one of such Departments states that there is evidence that the continued use of such material would injure the public health.

Further, some provision should be made for payment of financial losses to any producer, processor, or manufacturer resulting from statements or actions concerning the use of approved pesticides, insecticides, chemicals or other materials, where there is no evidence that their use endangers the public health. The payment for such damages should be made by the Department issuing or negligently permitting the issuance of such statement or action.

PROTECTION FROM DISEASE AND PESTILENCE

It is estimated by officials of the Department that, if it were not for the use of fertilizers, insecticides and pesticides, in 5 years the cost of a very inferior quality of food to the American consumer would double, and in 10 to 15 years the people of this Nation would be short of essential foods.

The threat from insects and diseases becomes increasingly serious as the speed and volume of travel increases between all areas of the world. Nearly 57 million more persons entered the United States during fiscal year 1963 than in 1954. The number of planes, ships and other carriers in 1963 was over 26 million as compared to 14 million in 1954. The number of pieces of baggage inspected increased threefold in 6 years—from 9 million in 1957 to over 27 million in 1963.

The opening of additional ports along the St. Lawrence Seaway and increased nonstop oversea air flights to airports in the interior of the country are also increasing the threat of introduction of new pests from abroad.

It has been estimated by agriculture experts that the damage to crops by the more than 600 different kinds of major destructive plant insects in the United States amounts to nearly $4 billion each year. Cotton insects account for nearly $600 million annually, cereal and forage insects account for some $400 million annually, and stored grain and household insects cause annual damage of over $1 billion. It is further estimated that annual losses caused by plant diseases total $2,500 million, and that livestock losses due to diseases and parasites exceed $2 billion per year.

If foot-and-mouth disease should become established in this country, it is estimated that annual losses would be in the billions of dollars. It is further predicted that the introduction of fowl pest in this country could virtually eliminate the poultry industry. The introduction of rinderpest would cost the Nation $1 billion annually.

To fully appreciate the effects of these destructive diseases and pests, it is necessary only to look to other parts of the world where food production is subject to their ravages. In the Middle East, desert locusts have been sweeping the semiarid lands for centuries, leaving ruined crops and starvation in their wake. In Pakistan, severe locust, caterpillar, and cricket outbreaks have caused losses as high as 80 percent in some areas. It is almost impossible to maintain supplies of grain in storage in India because of the ravages of weevils, bran beetles, and the world's worst pest of stored grain—the khapra beetle, which is now a threat in the United States.

Stored-grain pests are so bad in tropical areas of the world that the race to eat the grain before insects devour it results in frequent periods of starvation. The people compete with the pests for survival. Their low standard of living thus becomes understandable.

The distribution of cattle in Africa is determined primarily by the presence or absence of the tsetse fly. This is a major reason why an African child, once weaned, may never again taste milk. The cattle tick and the human warble or torsalo fly cause tremendous losses to hides, beef, and milk production in Central and South America. Mortality among calves may be as high as 70 percent in some of the most heavily infested areas.

A recent report from Argentina indicates that 50,000 calves succumbed in 1 year's time to screw-worm—the same one found in this country. The Argentines have had no effective means of dealing with this pest.

PROTECTION OF MARKETS FOR LABOR AND INDUSTRY

The economic welfare of each segment of the Nation's economy is dependent on the economic strength of each of the others. History demonstrates that our Nation is prosperous only to the extent that our agricultural economy is strong and healthy.

Agriculture is the principal source of new wealth. It is the main provider of basic raw materials which support all segments of business and industry. Around 65 percent of the basic raw materials used in industry come from the farm. Reliable estimates indicate that each dollar of wealth taken from the soil generates $7 of income throughout the rest of our economy.

Agriculture is our largest industry. It employs 12 times the number of people in the steel industry, 9 times the number in the automobile industry, and twice the number in the transportation and public utility industries. In addition, it supports directly another 10 percent of our nonfarm population which supplies the farmer with his needs and processes and markets his products.

Agriculture is a major dollar earner in world markets and is playing an important role in solving our balance-of-payments problems. It is expected that agricultural exports will represent 25 percent of our total exports in fiscal year 1964 as compared to 22 percent in fiscal year 1956.

Agriculture is one of the major markets for the products of labor and industry. Agriculture uses more steel in a year than is used for a year's output of passenger cars. It uses more petroleum products than any other industry in the country. It uses more rubber each year than is required to produce tires for 6 million automobiles. Its inventory of machinery and equipment exceeds the assets of the steel industry, and is five times that of the automobile industry.

Urban workers benefit directly from this rural demand for machinery, equipment, supplies, and the other items used on the Nation's farms. Significant changes in this demand, therefore, have a direct effect on business and employment in urban areas.

Every major business recession in this country has been preceded by the loss of income and purchasing power at the farm level.

This important rural market must be protected by the assurance of adequate income to the producers of farm commodities and maintenance of farm purchasing power. Business prosperity and full employment in the cities is dependent on a strong and dependable agricultural market, including both large and small farms.

The programs of the Department which help the producer to market his commodities at home and abroad efficiently and profitably, as well as the activities of the Commodity Credit Corporation and other agencies which have an effect on production and commodity prices, have done much to maintain agricultural income and thereby protect this important market for labor and industry. The committee has attempted to provide sufficient funds in the bill for fiscal year 1965 to make certain that these essential services will be available to the producer and their benefits will be available to the consumer during the coming year.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works may have until midnight tonight to file reports on the bills S. 1147, S. 2968, and S. 1282.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file certain privileged reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that following the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore granted, I may be permitted to address the House tomorrow for 30 minutes.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, we could not hear the request of the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri reserves the right to object, because he did not hear the request. Will the gentleman from Ohio repeat his request?

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that following the disposition of all business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore granted that I may be permitted to address the House tomorrow for 30 minutes.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF CONGRESS THAT PERSECUTION OF ANY PERSONS BECAUSE OF RELIGION BY SOVIET UNION BE CONDEMNED

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, since the Foreign Assistance Act of 1964 will now go to conference, I wish to take this opportunity to urge the House conferees to accept the Senate amendment to the bill expressing the sense of the Congress that "persecution of any persons because of their religion by the Soviet Union be condemned, and that the Soviet Union in the name of decency and humanity cease executing persons for alleged economic offenses, and fully permit the free exercise of religion and the pursuit of culture by Jews and all others within its borders."

This amendment, Mr. Speaker, which I have quoted only in part, is similar to the resolution—House Resolution 872—which I introduced on September 1, 1964, and which has been referred to the House Foreign Affairs Committee. My resolution is only one of many that have been introduced on this important subject in both the House and the Senate. Because of the approaching adjournment of the Congress, these resolutions cannot possibly be given consideration, but by the adoption of the Senate amendment to H.R. 11380, the Congress of the United States can go on record, now, against the infringement of one of man's most basic rights—that of freedom of religion.

Although there is no doubt that the religious difficulties faced by the Jews in the Soviet Union are shared by other religious faiths, the reports of anti-Semitism in other fields, particularly in the suppression of alleged economic crimes, gives evidence that the leaders of the Soviet Union have made the Jewish citizens of their land the target of dangerous propaganda, which cannot be justified for any reason, at any time.

An important staff study published in the summer 1964 issue of the "Journal of the International Commission of Jurists" discusses the extent to which the repression of economic crimes is linked with anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union. This study documents in great detail actual court cases involving so-called economic crimes and in what respects these cases may be linked to anti-Semitism. The study concludes that Jewish participation in economic crimes has been magnified and that the Jews of the Soviet Union have been made the "scapegoat for the transgressions of those whose guilt it would be dangerous to make public."

I commend this revealing report to my colleagues. The "Journal of the International Commission of Jurists"—summer, 1964—is available through the Library of Congress.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, being absent on necessary official business on several occasions during the session, I am not recorded on rollcall votes Nos. 35, 145, 198, and 199. Had I been present I would have voted "nay" on rollcall votes 35, 145, 198, and 199.

TO VITALIZE THE RESERVE OFFICERS' TRAINING CORPS PROGRAMS OF THE ARMY, NAVY, AND AIR FORCE

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 9124) an act to amend title 10, United States Code, to vitalize the Reserve Officers' Training Corps programs of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, and for other purposes, with an amendment of the Senate thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That this Act may be cited as the 'Reserve Officers' Training Corps Vitalization Act of 1964'.

"TITLE I—JUNIOR RESERVE OFFICERS' TRAINING CORPS PROGRAM

"SEC. 101. Title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

"(1) Subtitle A is amended by adding the following new chapter after chapter 101:

" 'Chapter 102.—Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps

" 'Sec.

" '2031. Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps.

" '§ 2031. Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps

" '(a) The Secretary of each military department shall establish and maintain a Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps, organized into units, at public and private secondary educational institutions which apply for a unit and meet the standards and criteria prescribed pursuant to this section. Not more than 200 units may be established by all of the military departments each year beginning with the calendar year 1966, and the total number of units which may be established and maintained by all of the military departments under authority of this section, including those units already established on the date of enactment of this section, may not exceed 1,200. The President shall promulgate regulations prescribing the standards and criteria to be followed by the military departments in selecting the institutions at which units are to be established and maintained and shall provide for the fair and equitable distribution of such units throughout the Nation.

" '(b) No unit may be established or maintained at an institution unless—

" '(1) the unit contains at least 100 physically fit male students who are at least 14 years of age and are citizens of the United States;

" '(2) the institution has adequate facilities for classroom instruction, storage of arms and other equipment which may be furnished in support of the unit, and adequate drill areas at or in the immediate vicinity of the institution, as determined by the Secretary of the military department concerned;

" '(3) the institution provides a course of military instruction of not less than three academic years' duration, as prescribed by the Secretary of the military department concerned; and

"'(4) the institution agrees to limit membership in the unit to students who maintain acceptable standards of academic achievement and conduct, as prescribed by the Secretary of the military department concerned.

"'(c) The Secretary of the military department concerned shall, to support the Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps program—

"'(1) detail noncommissioned and commissioned officers of an armed force under his jurisdiction to institutions having units of the Corps as administrators and instructors;

"'(2) provide necessary text materials, equipment, and uniforms; and

"'(3) establish minimum acceptable standards for performance and achievement for qualified units.

"'(d) Instead of, or in addition to, detailing noncommissioned and commissioned officers on active duty under subsection (c)(1), the Secretary of the military department concerned may authorize qualified institutions to employ, as administrators and instructors in the program, retired noncommissioned and commissioned officers, and members of the Fleet Reserve and Fleet Marine Corps Reserve, whose qualifications are approved by the Secretary and the institution concerned and who request such employment, subject to the following:

"'(1) retired members so employed are entitled to receive their retired or retainer pay and an additional amount of not more than the difference between their retired pay and the active duty pay and allowances which they would receive if ordered to active duty, and one-half of that additional amount shall be paid to the institution concerned by the Secretary of the military department concerned from funds appropriated for that purpose.

"'(2) notwithstanding any other provision of law, such a retired member is not, while so employed, considered to be on active duty or inactive duty training for any purpose.'

"(2) The chapter analysis of subtitle A, and the chapter analysis of part III of subtitle A, are each amended by inserting the following new item:

"'102. Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps .... 2031'

"SEC. 102. Regulations implementing section 201(a) of title 10, United States Code, shall be issued by the President and by the Secretary of each military department not later than January 1, 1966.

"TITLE II—SENIOR RESERVE OFFICERS' TRAINING CORPS PROGRAM

"SEC. 201. Title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

"(1) Subtitle A is amended by adding the following new chapter after chapter 102:

"'Chapter 103.—Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps

"'Sec.

"'2101. Definitions.

"'2102. Establishment.

"'2103. Eligibility for membership.

"'2104. Advanced training; eligibility for.

"'2105. Advanced training; failure to complete or to accept commission.

"'2106. Advanced training; commission on completion.

"'2107. Financial assistance program for specially selected members.

"'2108. Advanced standing; interruption of training; delay in starting obligated service, release from program.

"'2109. Field training; practice cruises.

"'2110. Logistical support.

"'2111. Personnel: administrators and instructors.

"'§ 2101. Definitions

"'In this chapter—

"'(1) "program" means the Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps of an armed force;

"'(2) "member of the program" means a student who is enrolled in the Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps of an armed force; and

"'(3) "advanced training" means the training and instruction offered in the Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps to students in the third and fourth years of a four-year Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps course, or the equivalent period of training in an approved two-year Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps course.

"'§ 2102. Establishment

"'(a) For the purpose of preparing selected students for commissioned service in the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps, the Secretary of each military department, under regulations prescribed by the President, may establish and maintain a Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps program, organized into one or more units, at any accredited civilian educational institution authorized to grant baccalaureate degrees, and at any school essentially military that does not confer baccalaureate degrees, upon the request of the authorities at that institution.

"'(b) No unit may be established or maintained at an institution unless—

"'(1) the senior commissioned officer of the armed force concerned who is assigned to the program at that institution is given the academic rank of professor;

"'(2) the institution fulfills the terms of its agreement with the Secretary of the military department concerned; and

"'(3) the institution adopts, as a part of its curriculum, a four-year course of military instruction or a two-year course of advanced training of military instruction, or both, which the Secretary of the military department concerned prescribes and conducts.

"'(c) At those institutions where a unit of the program is established membership of students in the program shall be elective or compulsory as provided by State law or the authorities of the institution concerned.

"'§ 2103. Eligibility for membership

"'(a) To be eligible for membership in the program a person must be a student at an institution where a unit of the Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps is established. However, a student at an institution that does not have a unit of the Corps is eligible, if otherwise qualified, to be a member of a unit at another institution.

"'(b) Persons from foreign countries may be enrolled as members of the program when their enrollment is approved by the Secretary of the military department concerned under criteria approved by the Secretary of State.

"'(c) A medical, dental, pharmacy, veterinary, or sciences allied to medicine, student may be admitted to a unit of the program for a course of training consisting of 90 hours of instruction a year for four academic years.

"'(d) Under such conditions as the Secretary of the military department concerned may prescribe, a medical, dental, pharmacy, veterinary, or sciences allied to medicine, student who is a commissioned officer of a reserve component of an armed force may be admitted to and trained in a unit of the program.

"'§ 2104. Advanced training; eligibility for

"'(a) Advanced training shall be provided to eligible members of the program and, if the institution concerned so requests, to eligible applicants for membership in the program, who have two academic years remaining at such educational institution.

"'(b) To be eligible for continuation, or initial enrollment, in the program for advanced training, a person must—

"'(1) be a citizen of the United States;

"'(2) be selected for advanced training under procedures prescribed by the Secretary of the military department concerned;

"'(3) enlist in a reserve component of an armed force under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the military department concerned for the period prescribed by the Secretary;

"'(4) contract, with the consent of his parent or guardian if he is a minor, with the Secretary of the military department concerned, or his designated representative, to serve for the period required by the program;

"'(5) agree in writing that he will accept an appointment, if offered, as a commissioned officer in the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps, as the case may be, and that he will serve in the armed forces for the period prescribed by the Secretary; and

"'(6) complete successfully—

"'(A) the first two years of a four-year Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps course; or

"'(B) field training or a practice cruise of not less than six weeks' duration which is prescribed by the Secretary concerned as a preliminary requirement for admission to the advanced course.

"'(c) A member of the program who is ineligible under subsection (b) for advanced training shall be released from the program.

"'(d) This section does not apply to cadets and midshipmen appointed under section 2107, or foreign students enrolled under section 2103(b), of this title.

"'§ 2105. Advanced training; failure to complete or to accept commission

"'A member of the program who is selected for advanced training under section 2104 of this title, and who does not complete the course of instruction, or who completes the course but declines to accept a commission when offered, may be ordered to active duty by the Secretary of the military department concerned to serve in his enlisted grade or rating for such period of time as the Secretary prescribes but not for more than two years.

"'§ 2106. Advanced training; commission on completion

"'(a) Upon satisfactorily completing the academic and military requirements of the program of advanced training, a member of the program who was selected for advanced training under section 2104 of this title may be appointed as a regular or reserve officer in the appropriate armed force in the grade of second lieutenant or ensign, even though he is under 21 years of age.

"'(b) The date of rank of officers appointed under this section in May or June of any year is the date of graduation of cadets or midshipmen from the United States Military Academy, the United States Naval Academy, or the United States Air Force Academy, as the case may be, in that year. The Secretary of the military department concerned shall establish the date of rank of all other officers appointed under this section.

"'(c) In computing length of service for any purpose, an officer appointed under this section may not be credited with enlisted service for the period covered by his advanced training.

"'§ 2107. Financial assistance program for specially selected members

"'(a) The Secretary of the military department concerned may appoint as a cadet or midshipman, as appropriate, in the reserve of an armed force under his jurisdiction any eligible member of the program who will be under 25 years of age on June 30 of the calendar year in which he is eligible under this section for appointment as an ensign in the Navy or as a second lieutenant in the Army, Air Force, or Marine Corps, as the case may be. However, a member whose enrollment in the Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps program contemplates less than four years of participation in the program may not be appointed a cadet or midshipman under this section, or receive any financial assistance authorized by this section.

"'(b) To be eligible for appointment as a cadet or midshipman under this section a member must—

"'(1) be a citizen of the United States;

"'be specially selected for the financial assistance program under procedures prescribed by the Secretary of the military department concerned;

"'(3) enlist in the reserve component of the armed force in which he is appointed as a cadet or midshipman for the period prescribed by the Secretary of the military department concerned;

"'(4) contract, with the consent of his parent or guardian if he is a minor, with the Secretary of the military department concerned, or his designated representative, to serve for the period required by the program;

"'(5) agree in writing that he will accept an appointment, if offered, as a commissioned officer in the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps, as the case may be, and that, if he is commissioned as a regular officer and his regular commission is terminated before the sixth anniversary of his date of rank, he will accept an appointment, if offered, in the reserve component of that armed force and not resign before that anniversary; and

"'(6) agree in writing to serve on active duty for four or more years.

"'(c) The Secretary of the military department concerned may provide for the payment of all expenses in his department of administering the financial assistance program under this section, including fees, books, and laboratory expenses.

"'(d) Upon satisfactorily completing the academic and military requirements of the four-year program, a cadet or midshipman may be appointed as a regular or reserve officer in the appropriate armed force in the grade of second lieutenant or ensign, even though he is under 21 years of age.

"'(e) The date of rank of officers appointed under this section in May or June of any year is the date of graduation of cadets or midshipmen from the United States Military Academy, the United States Naval Academy, or the United States Air Force Academy, as the case may be in that year. The Secretary of the military department concerned shall establish the date of rank of all other officers appointed under this section.

"'(f) A cadet or midshipman who does not complete the four-year course of instruction, or who completes the course but declines to accept a commission when offered, may be ordered to active duty by the Secretary of the military department concerned to serve in his enlisted grade or rating for such period of time as the Secretary prescribes but not for more than four years.

"'(g) In computing length of service for any purpose, an officer appointed under this section may not be credited with service either as a cadet or midshipman or concurrent enlisted service.

"'(h) Not more than the following numbers of cadets and midshipmen appointed under section 2107 of this title may be in the financial assistance programs at any one time:

"'Army program: 5,500.

"'Navy program: 5,500.

"'Air Force program: 5,500.

"'§ 2108. Advanced standing; interruption of training; delay in starting obligated service; release from program

"'(a) The Secretary of the military department concerned may give to any enlisted member of an armed force under his jurisdiction, or any person who has served on active duty in any armed force, such advanced standing in the program as may be justified by his education and training.

"'(b) In determining a member's eligibility for advanced training, the Secretary of the military department concerned may credit him with any military training that is substantially equivalent in kind to that prescribed for admission to advanced training and was received while he was taking a course of instruction in a program under the jurisdiction of another armed force or while he was on active duty in the armed forces.

"'(c) The Secretary of the military department concerned may excuse from a portion of the prescribed course of military instruction, including field training and practice cruises, any person found qualified on the basis of his previous education, military experience, or both.

"'(d) A person may become, remain, or be readmitted as, a member of the advanced training program after receiving a baccalaureate degree or completing pre-professional studies if he has not completed the course of military instruction or all field training or practice cruises prescribed by the Secretary of the military department concerned. If a member of the program has been accepted for resident graduate or professional study, the Secretary of the military department concerned may delay the commencement of that member's obligated period of active duty until the member has completed that study.

"'(e) The Secretary of the military department concerned may, when he determines that the interest of the service so requires, release any person from the program and discharge him from his armed force.

"'§ 2109. Field training; practice cruises

"'(a) For the further practical instruction of members of the program, the Secretary of the military department concerned may prescribe and conduct field training and practice cruises (other than field training and practice cruises prescribed under section 2104 (b)(6)(B) of this title) which members must complete before they are commissioned.

"'(b) The Secretary of the military department concerned may—

"'(1) transport members of the program to and from the places designated for field training or practice cruises and furnish them subsistence while traveling to and from those places, or, instead of furnishing them transportation and subsistence, pay them a travel allowance at the rate prescribed for cadets and midshipmen at the United States Military, Naval, and Air Force Academies for travel by the shortest usually traveled route from the places from which they are authorized to proceed to the place designated for the training or cruise and return, and pay the allowance for the return trip in advance;

"'(2) furnish medical attendance and supplies to members of the program while attending field training and practice cruises, and admit them to military hospitals;

"'(3) furnish subsistence, uniform clothing, and equipment to members of the program while attending field training or practice cruises or, instead of furnishing uniform clothing, pay them allowances at such rates as he may prescribe;

"'(4) use any member of an armed force, or any employee of the department, under his jurisdiction, and such property of the United States as he considers necessary, for the training and administration of members of the program at the places designated for training or practice cruises.

"'§ 2110. Logistical support

"'(a) The Secretary of the military department concerned may issue to institutions having units of the program, or to the officers of the armed force concerned who are designated as accountable or responsible for such property—

"'(1) supplies, means of transportation including aircraft, arms and ammunition, and military textbooks and education materials; and

"'(2) uniform clothing, except that he may pay monetary allowances for uniform clothing at such rate as he may prescribe.

"'(b) The Secretary of the military department concerned may provide, or contract with civilian flying or aviation schools or educational institutions to provide, the personnel, aircraft, supplies, facilities, services, and instruction necessary for flight instruction and orientation for properly designated members of the program. The Secretary of each military department shall report to Congress in January of each year on the progress of the flight instruction program.

"'(c) The Secretary of the military department concerned may transport members of, and designated applicants for membership in, the program to and from installations when it is necessary for them to undergo medical or other examinations or for the purposes of making visits of observation. He may also furnish them subsistence, quarters, and necessary medical care, including hospitalization, while they are at, or traveling to or from, such an installation.

"'(d) The Secretary of the military department concerned may authorize members of, and designated applicants for membership in, the program to participate in aerial flights in military aircraft and in indoctrination cruises in naval vessels.

"'(e) The Secretary of the military department concerned may authorize such expenditures as he considers necessary for the efficient maintenance of the program.

"'(f) The Secretary of the military department concerned shall require, from each institution to which property is issued under subsection (a), a bond or other indemnity in such amount as he considers adequate, but not less than $5,000, for the care and safekeeping of all property so issued except uniforms, expendable articles, and supplies expended in operation, maintenance, and instruction. The Secretary may accept a bond without surety if the institution to which the property is issued furnishes to him satisfactory evidence of its financial responsibility.

"'§ 2111. Personnel: administrators and instructors

"'The Secretary of the military department concerned may detail regular or reserve members of an armed force under his jurisdiction (including retired members and members of the Fleet Reserve and Fleet Marine Corps Reserve recalled to active duty with their consent) for instructional and administrative duties at educational institutions where units of the program are maintained.'

"(2) The chapter analysis of subtitle A, and the chapter analysis of part III of subtitle A, are each amended by inserting the following new item:

"'103. Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps.................................. 2101.'

"SEC. 202. Title 37, United States Code, is amended as follows:

"(1) Section 205 is amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

"'(e) Notwithstanding subsection (a), a commissioned officer may not count in computing his basic pay any period of service after the enactment of this subsection that he performed concurrently as a member of a uniformed service and as a member of the Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps.'

"(2) Section 209 is amended to read as follows:

"'§ 209. Members of Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps

"'(a) Except when on active duty, a member of the Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps who is selected for advanced training under section 2104 of title 10, United States Code, is entitled to retainer pay at the rate of not less than $40 per month or more than $50 per month beginning on the day he starts advanced training and ending upon the completion of his instruction under that section, but in no event shall any member receive such pay for more than twenty months. Retainer pay under this section may not be considered financial assistance requiring additional service within the meaning of the third sentence of section 6(d)(1) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended (50 U.S.C. App. 456(d)(1)).

"'(b) Except when on active duty, a cadet or midshipman appointed under section 2107 of title 10 is entitled to retainer pay at the rate of $50 a month beginning on the day that he starts his first term of college work under that section and ending upon the completion of his instruction under that section, but not for more than four years.

"'(c) A member of the Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps is entitled, while he is attending field training or practice cruises under section 2109 of title 10, to pay at the rate prescribed for cadets and midshipmen at the United States Military, Naval, and Air Force Academies under section 201(c) of this title. An applicant for membership who is attending field training or practice cruises to satisfy the requirement of section 2104(b)(6)(B) of title 10, United States Code, for admission to advanced training is entitled, while so attending, to pay at the rate prescribed in section 203 of this title for enlisted members of the uniformed services in pay grade E–1 (under 4 months).'

"(3) Sections 415(a) and 416(a) are each amended by striking out the words 'or an officer of the Army, or the Air Force, without specification of component,' and inserting in place thereof ', an officer of the Army or the Air Force without specification of component, or a regular officer of an armed force appointed under section 2106 or 2107 of title 10, United States Code,'.

"(4) Section 422 is amended—

"(A) by amending the catchline to read:

"'§ 422. Cadets and midshipmen';

"(B) by amending subsection (c) to read as follows:

"'(c) A cadet or midshipman appointed under section 2107 of title 10, United States Code, is entitled to the same allowances as are provided for cadets and midshipmen at the United States Military, Naval, and Air Force Academies for—

"'(1) initial travel to the educational institution in which matriculated;

"'(2) travel while under orders; and

"'(3) travel on discharge.

However, no allowance for travel on discharge may be paid to a discharged cadet or midshipman who continues his scholastic instruction at the same educational institution.'

"(C) by striking out subsection (d).

"(5) The analysis of chapter 3 is amended by striking out the following item:

"'209. Members of naval officer candidate programs.'

and inserting the following item in place thereof:

"'209. Members of Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps.'

"(6) The analysis of chapter 7 is amended by striking out the following item:

"'422. Cadets, midshipmen, and naval officer candidates.'

and inserting the following item in place thereof:

"'422. Cadets and midshipmen.'

"TITLE III—CONFORMING AMENDMENTS AND REPEALS

"SEC. 301. Title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

"(1) Section 1475(a)(4) is amended by adding at the end thereof the words 'any applicant for membership in a reserve officers' training corps who dies while attending field training or a practice cruise under section 2104(b)(6)(B) of this title or while performing authorized travel to or from the place where the training or cruise is conducted; or'."

"(2) Section 1478(a)(4) is amended—

"(A) by striking out 'section 4385(c) or 9385(c) of this title' and inserting in place thereof 'the first sentence of section 209(c) of title 37, United States Code'; and

"(B) by adding the following sentence at the end thereof: 'A person covered by section 1475(a)(4) of this title who dies while attending field training or a practice cruise under section 2104(b)(6)(B) of this title, or while traveling directly to or from the place where the training or cruise is conducted, is considered to have been entitled, on the date of his death, to the pay prescribed by the second sentence of section 209(c) of title 37, United States Code.'

"(3) Section 1481(a)(4) is amended by striking out the words 'the Army Reserve Officers' Training Corps, Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps, or Air Force Reserve Officers' Training Corps' and inserting the words ', or applicant for membership in, a reserve officers' training corps' in place thereof.

"(4) Section 3201 is amended—

"(A) by inserting the words 'in a reserve officers' training corps or' after the word 'members' in clause (5) of subsection (a); and

"(B) by inserting the words 'in a reserve officers' training corps or' after the word 'members' in clause (4) of subsection (b).

"(5) Section 3355 is repealed.

"(6) The analysis of chapter 337 is amended by striking out the following item:

"'3355. Commissioned officers; Army Reserve: appointment; R.O.T.C. graduates.'

"(7) Section 3540 is repealed.

"(8) The analysis of chapter 343 is amended by striking out the following item:

"'3540. Educational institutions: detail of members of regular or reserve components as professors and instructors in military science and tactics.'

"(9) Section 4348 is amended by inserting the designation '(a)' before the word 'Each' and by adding a new subsection (b) to read as follows:

"'(b) A cadet who does not fulfill his agreement under subsection (a) may be transferred by the Secretary of the Army to the Army Reserve in an appropriate enlisted grade and, notwithstanding section 651 of this title, may be ordered to active duty to serve in that grade for such period of time as the Secretary prescribes but not for more than four years.'

"(10) Chapter 405 is repealed.

"(11) The chapter analysis of subtitle B, and the chapter analysis of part III of subtitle B, are each amended by striking out the following item:

"'405. Reserve Officers' Training Corps_ 4381.'

"(12) Section 5404(b) is amended—

"(A) by inserting 'and' at the end of clause (3);

"(B) by striking out '; and' at the end of clause (4) and inserting a period in place thereof; and

"(C) by striking out clause (5).

"(13) Section 5504(h) is amended by striking out '5573, 6904, 6906' and inserting '2106, 2107, 5573' in place thereof.

"(14) Chapter 541 is amended—

"(A) by striking out the following item in the analysis:

"'5652b. Regular Navy: lieutenants (junior grade) originally appointed as ensigns under section 5573, 6904, 6906, or 6909 of this title.'

and inserting the following item in place thereof:

"'5652b. Regular Navy: lieutenants (junior grade) originally appointed as ensigns under section 2106, 2107, 5573, or 6909 of this title'; and

"(B) by striking out from the catchline and the text of section 5652b '5573, 6904, 6906' and inserting '2106, 2107, 5573' in place thereof.

"(15) Section 6023(a) is amended by striking out clause (2) and renumbering clause (3) as clause '(2)'.

"(16) Section 6387(a) is amended by striking out '6904, 6906,' and inserting '2106, 2107,' in place thereof.

"(17) Chapter 601 is amended by repealing sections 6901, 6902, 6903, 6904, 6905, 6906, 6908, and 6910.

"(18) The analysis of chapter 601 is amended by striking out the following items:

"'6901. Naval Reserve Officers Training Corps: administration.

"'6902. Transfer of graduates of Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps to Regular Navy.

"'6903. Officer candidate training program: administration; qualifications for enrollment.

"'6904. Officer candidate training program: members enrolled from Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps; appointment as midshipmen; pay; allowances; commissioning.

"'6905. Officer candidate training program: members enrolled as naval aviation officer candidates; instruction; pay; allowances.

"'6906. Officer candidate training program: naval aviation candidates; appointment as midshipmen; flight training; appointment as ensigns.

"'6908. Officer candidate training program: naval aviators; retention or transfer to reserve.

"'* * * * *

"'6910. Payment of expenses.'

"(19) Section 6959 is amended by inserting the designation '(a)' before the word 'Each' and by adding a new subsection (b) to read as follows:

"'(b) A midshipman who does not fulfill his agreement under subsection (a) may be transferred by the Secretary of the Navy to the Naval Reserve or the Marine Corps Reserve in an appropriate enlisted grade or rating, and, notwithstanding section 651 of this title, may be ordered to active duty to serve in that grade or rating for such period of time as the Secretary prescribes but not for more than four years.'

"(20) Section 8201 is amended—

"(A) by inserting the words 'in a reserve officers' training corps or' after the word 'members' in clause (6) of subsection (a); and

"(B) by inserting the words 'in a reserve officers' training corps or' after the word 'members' in clause (4) of subsection (b).

"(21) Section 8355 is repealed.

"(22) The analysis of chapter 837 is amended by striking out the following item:

"'8355. Commissioned officers; Air Force Reserve: appointment; A.F. R.O.T.C. graduates.'

"(23) Section 8540 is repealed.

"(24) The analysis of chapter 843 is amended by striking out the following item:

"'8540. Educational institutions: detail of members of regular or reserve components as professors and instructors in air science and tactics.'

"(25) Section 9348 is amended by inserting the designation '(a)' before the word 'Each' and by adding a new subsection (b) to read as follows:

"'(b) A cadet who does not fulfill his agreement under subsection (a) may be transferred by the Secretary of the Air Force to the Air Force Reserve in an appropriate enlisted grade and, notwithstanding section 651 of this title, may be ordered to active duty to serve in that grade for such period of time as the Secretary prescribes but not for more than four years.'

"(26) Chapter 905 is repealed.

"(27) The chapter analysis of subtitle D, and the chapter analysis of part III of subtitle D, are each amended by striking out the following item:

"'905. Air Force Reserve Officers' Training Corps .... 9381.

"SEC. 302. Section 4 of the Act of August 1, 1956, chapter 830 (5 U.S.C. 802), is amended as follows:

"(1) Subsection (a) is amended to read as follows:

"'(a) The Federal Employees' Compensation Act (ch. 458, 39 Stat. 742), as amended (5 U.S.C. 751–793, applies in the case of the disability or death of the following members of, and applicants for membership in, the Reserve Officers' Training Corps of the Army, Navy, and Air Force:

"'(1) Any member or applicant for membership who suffers disability or death from an injury incurred in line of duty while engaged in a flight or in flight instruction under chapter 103 of title 10, United States Code; or

"'(2) Any member or applicant for membership who suffers disability or death from an injury incurred in line of duty while performing authorized travel to or from, or while attending, field training or a practice cruise under chapter 103 of title 10, United States Code.

"'For the purposes of this section, an injury shall be considered to have been incurred in line of duty only if it is the proximate result of the performance of military training by the member concerned, or of his travel to or from that military training, during the periods of time indicated in clause (2). Any member or applicant for membership who contracts a disease or illness which is the proximate result of the performance of training during the periods of time indicated in clause (2) shall be considered for the purposes of this section to have been injured in line of duty during that period.'

"(2) The last sentence of subsection (d) is amended to read as follows: 'However, reimbursement may not be made for any hospitalization or medical or surgical care provided a person while attending field training or a practice cruise under chapter 103 of title 10, United States Code.'

"TITLE IV—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

"SEC. 401. All payments made and supplies issued under sections 9385–9387 of title 10, United States Code, in connection with the training of a person at an Air Force Reserve Officers' Training Corps unit while such person was a student at a civil educational institution where a unit of the corps was not established, are hereby validated.

"SEC. 402. If a part of this Act is invalid, all valid parts that are severable from the invalid part remain in effect. If a part of this Act is invalid in one or more of its applications, the part remains in effect in all valid applications that are severable from the invalid applications.

"SEC. 403. Insofar as it relates to the Army program and the Air Force program, section 2107(h) of title 10, United States Code, becomes effective on September 1, 1968. Until that date, not more than four thousand cadets may be in either of those programs at any one time. So far as it relates to the Navy program, section 2107(h) of title 10 becomes effective on September 1, 1965."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I hope the gentleman from Louisiana will explain the Senate amendment for the benefit of the House. This matter was discussed in our committee yesterday and adopted unanimously, but I think for the benefit of the House the gentleman should explain the Senate amendment at this time.

Mr. HÉBERT. I will be very happy to do so.

Mr. Speaker, the bill H.R. 9124, as reported by the Senate Armed Services Committee on August 20, 1964, struck all after the enacting clause of the House-passed bill and substituted new language. The bill as amended was passed by the Senate on Monday, September 28, 1964.

The substitute language adopted, in principle, all the important features of the House-passed bill. The changes were essentially a matter of degree rather than principle.

The significant changes reflected in the Senate amendment are, as follows:

First. The Senate amendment deleted title I, which contained a general statement of the "policy and intent of Congress" in connection with the ROTC program. The deletion of this language, therefore, affected no substantive change in the ROTC program as outlined in H.R. 9124.

Second. The Senate amendment adopted the House proposal for the junior ROTC program with the following exceptions: First, it reduced the maximum number of schools at which the junior ROTC program could be established from 2,000 units to 1,200 units and provided that the expansion of the program could not exceed 200 units per year beginning with calendar year 1966; second, the Senate bill authorizes the use of regular, reserve, or retired military personnel to conduct the junior ROTC program. It also subscribes to the supplemental payment plan proposed by the House for the hiring of retired personnel by individual schools. However, it deleted the House provision which stated that retired personnel called to active duty in connection with the program would not be chargeable against limitations in existing law relating to numbers and grades of officers on active duty. Similarly, it deleted the provision which precluded the enhancement of retired pay as the result of employment in the junior ROTC program; and, third, it deleted from the House bill as surplusage the provision which required the Department to request from Congress necessary annual appropriations to support the junior ROTC program.

Third. The Senate bill incorporates all the substantive provisions of the House bill relating to the senior ROTC program with the following exceptions:

First. In the so-called nonscholarship or "contract" program, the House authorized a retainer payment of $50 per month, whereas the Senate language would require a retainer payment of not less than $40 a month which may be increased to $50 by the Department.

It should be noted that the retainer payment of $50 per month to all "scholarship" students would be retained as provided in the House bill.

Second. The Senate amendment reduces the number of students authorized to be in the "scholarship program" from the 8,000 specified in the House bill for each department, to 5,500 for each department.

The ceiling of 5,500 approximates the total number of regular students presently receiving scholarship assistance from the Navy in the Holloway plan. The Army and Air Force would be limited initially to a maximum of 4,000 students in the scholarship program. This maximum would be increased after 4 years to the 5,500 maximum applying to the Navy.

Third. The Senate amendment adds a new provision not appearing in the House version. This provision prohibits a commissioned officer from counting for basic pay purposes service performed concurrently as a member of a uniformed service and the senior ROTC program.

Fourth. The Senate amendment adds another new provision not appearing in the House bill. This provision would provide authority to the Secretaries of the individual military departments to transfer a cadet or midshipman who breaches his agreement relating to training at one of the service academies, to the appropriate Reserve component and then order him to active duty for not more than 4 years.

This parallels similar authority provided the Secretaries in respect to members in the senior ROTC program. In the case of nonscholarship students, the Secretary is authorized to take such action with the limitation that active duty not exceed 2 years; and with the scholarship program, a limitation of 4 years would apply.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO AUTHORIZE CREDITING OF CERTAIN MILITARY SERVICE FOR PURPOSES OF RESERVE RETIRED PAY

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 9718) to authorize the crediting of certain military service for purposes of Reserve retired pay, with Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, strike out lines 7 to 13, inclusive and insert:

"SEC. 2. The amendments made by this Act shall apply to any period before enactment of this Act during which the Commissioned Corps of the Public Health Service has had the status of a military service, and to any period before enactment of this Act during which commissioned personnel of the Coast and Geodetic Survey were transferred to the service and jurisdiction of a military department."

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the House bill is to authorize the crediting, for Reserve retirement purposes, of wartime military service performed by members of the U.S. Public Health Service or the U.S. Coast and Geodetic Survey when such agencies were under the jurisdiction of a military department.

The bill as passed by the House accomplished the purpose of the legislation and provided that such service could be credited both retroactively and prospectively. The Department of Defense advised the committee that it had no objection to the bill.

The Senate amended the bill to permit the retroactive crediting of such service; however, it deleted the prospective application of this provision. The Senate explained that it would be unwise to make provision for crediting future service since the conditions and circumstances surrounding such future service cannot be known at this time.

The basic purpose of the original legislation as passed by the House is also incorporated in the Senate amendment. Therefore, it is recommended that the House accept the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STATUS OF MEMBERS OF NATIONAL GUARD AT NATIONAL GUARD SCHOOLS

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 2512) to clarify the status of members of the National Guard while attending or instructing at National Guard schools established under the authority of the Secretary of the Army or Secretary of the Air Force, as the case may be, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

> Page 1, line 8, strike out all after "Guard" over to and including "(a)."" in line 2 on page 2 and insert "may—".
>
> Page 2, after line 2, insert:
>
> "(1) without his consent, but with the pay and allowances provided by law; or
>
> "(2) with his consent, either with or without pay and allowances;
>
> be ordered to perform training or other duty in addition to that prescribed under subsection (a). Duty without pay shall be considered for all purposes as if it were duty with pay."

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this legislation is to clearly indicate the eligibility of National Guard personnel for the protective provisions of statutes providing disability and death benefits to reservists who suffer disability or death while performing drills or other authorized training duty.

The bill as passed by the House on November 18, 1963, accomplishes the purpose for which the bill was introduced and clearly indicates the eligibility of Guard personnel for the protective provisions of the law while participating in authorized training functions beyond the 48 unit drills and 15 days' training now specifically authorized by law (32 U.S.C. 502, 504).

The Department of Defense urged passage of the legislation.

The Senate, on September 15, 1964, passed H.R. 2512 with a number of technical amendments. The technical amendments effected no substantive change to the bill and were simply designed to clarify the eligibility of National Guard personnel to statutory disability protection, and so forth, while performing training duty beyond regular drill periods or while in attendance at schools.

It is recommended that the House accept the Senate amendments since they make no practical substantive change in the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROMOTION OF QUALIFIED RESERVE OFFICERS OF THE ARMY AND THE AIR FORCE TO EXISTING UNIT VACANCIES

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 2501) to authorize the promotion of qualified Reserve officers of the Army and the Air Force to existing unit vacancies, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

> Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That clauses (6) and (48), section 1, of the Act of June 30, 1960, Public Law 86–559 (74 Stat. 264), are each amended by striking out 'July 1, 1964' in the last sentence and inserting 'July 1, 1965' in place thereof.
>
> "SEC. 2. Section 3383(e) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking out 'July 1, 1964' and inserting 'July 1, 1965' in place thereof."

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, the bill authorizes the Army and Air Force to continue to exceed present statutory grade ceilings on the number of Reserve officers authorized in each grade below lieutenant colonel in promoting Reserve officers to fill unit vacancies and to appoint Reserve officers to fill mobilization requirements.

The bill as passed by the House on July 21, 1964, would have provided permanent authority to the Army and Air Force to effect Reserve officer promotions in the unit promotion system without regard to the statutory grade ceilings.

The bill, as amended by the Senate on August 31, 1964, simply extended the former temporary authority for the Department of the Army and the Air Force to effect unit promotions without regard to statutory grade ceilings until July 1, 1965. This is the action recommended by the Department of Defense.

It is recommended that the House accept the Senate amendment since it will assure the Army and the Air Force of authority to continue unit promotions until July 1, 1965.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVAL OF FLIGHT HAZARD AT U.S. NAVAL AIR STATION, NORFOLK, VA.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 12308) to authorize removal of a flight hazard at the U.S. Naval Air Station, Norfolk, Va., with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment as follows:

> Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to remove an existing flight hazard at the Naval Air Station, Norfolk, Virginia; but no funds may be expended for such purpose unless specifically appropriated for such purpose."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FOREIGN SERVICE ANNUITY ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1964

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 745) to provide for adjustments in annuities under the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability System, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 1898)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 745) to provide for adjustments in annuities under the Foreign Service retirement and disability system, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

"That this Act may be cited as the 'Foreign Service Annuity Adjustment Act of 1964'.

"SEC. 2. (a) Annuities paid from the Foreign Service retirement and disability fund on the date of enactment of this Act, based on service performed by annuitants which terminated prior to October 16, 1960, shall be adjusted under the provisions of section 821(b) of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, relating to the formula for reduction in annuity to provide for a surviving widow, as though such provisions had been in effect on the date of the annuitant's separation from the Service, or, in the case of any annuitant who makes an election under paragraph (1) or (2) of this subsection, in accordance with the following:

"(1) An annuitant who at time of retirement was married to a wife who is still living (and to whom he is married on the date of enactment of this Act), and for whom he has not elected a widow survivor benefit before such date of enactment, may, within one hundred and twenty days after such date of enactment, elect to provide a widow survivor benefit of $2,400 per annum. The annuity of an annuitant who makes an election under this paragraph shall be reduced by $300 per annum.

"(2) An annuitant who at time of retirement was married to a wife who is still living (and to whom he is married on the date of enactment of this Act) and for whom he has elected, before such date of enactment, a widow survivor benefit of less than $2,400 per annum, may, within one hundred and twenty days after such date of enactment, elect to provide a widow survivor benefit of $2,400 per annum. The annuity of an annuitant who makes an election under this paragraph shall be reduced by $300 per annum in lieu of any reductions of his annuity in effect on the date of enactment of this Act because of elections made by him before such date of enactment in connection with the provision of a widow survivor annuity.

"(b) If an annuitant referred to in paragraph (a)(1) or (a)(2) of this section dies within one hundred and twenty days after the date of enactment of this Act, without having made an election under such paragraph (a)(1) or (a)(2), his surviving widow shall be paid the greater of—

"(1) $2,400; or

"(2) the annuity to which she may be entitled from the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability Fund as his widow under any provision of law in effect on the date of the death of the annuitant.

"(c) Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this section, each annuitant who makes an election under paragraph (1) of subsection (a) shall pay into the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability Fund an amount equal to the amount by which (A) the total annuity received by the annuitant during the period beginning October 16, 1960, and ending on the effective date of any adjustment in his annuity pursuant to such election exceeds (B) the total annuity which he would have received during such period had he elected a survivor annuity of $2,400 per annum on October 16, 1960. The Secretary of State may permit the payment required by this subsection to be made in installments of not less than $25 per month. In any case in which the Secretary permits payment in monthly installments, the monthly annuity of the annuitant shall be reduced by the amount of such installment until the required amount has been paid into the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability Fund or until the date of his death, whichever first occurs; and if the latter date first occurs any remaining portion of such required amount shall be deemed to have been paid into such Fund as of that date.

"SEC. 3. If a former participant whose service as a class 4 Foreign Service officer was terminated prior to October 16, 1960, and who elected a deferred annuity, dies before becoming eligible to receive an annuity, the benefit of the surviving widow, if she was eligible under the terms of the law in effect upon his separation from the Service, shall not be less than $2,400 per annum.

"SEC. 4. In any case in which an annuitant who retired prior to October 16, 1960, dies before the date of enactment of this Act, leaving a widow to whom he was married at time of retirement who is not entitled to receive an annuity under the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability System, and who is not receiving benefits as a widow under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, the Secretary of State shall grant such widow, whether remarried or not, an annuity of $2,400 per annum.

"SEC. 5. The annuity of each widow survivor annuitant who, on the date of enactment of this Act, is receiving a survivor annuity from the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability Fund of less than $2,400 per annum is hereby increased to $2,400 per annum.

"SEC. 6. The annuity benefits elected or provided with respect to any widow under section 2, 3, 4, or 5 of this Act shall be in lieu of any annuity benefits to which such widow otherwise would be entitled as the widow of the Foreign Service officer with respect to whom such annuity benefits are so elected or provided.

"SEC. 7. Any increase, adjustment, or grant of an annuity under section 2, 4, or 5 of this Act shall commence on the first day of the month following the expiration of the 120-day period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, and the monthly rate payable shall be fixed at the nearest dollar.

"SEC. 8. Annuity benefits provided by this Act shall be paid from the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability Fund; except that, no part of such Fund shall be applied toward the payment of any benefits under section 2, 4, or 5 of this Act until an appropriation is made to such fund in an amount which the Secretary of the Treasury estimates to be necessary to prevent an increase in the unfunded liability to such fund for the first fiscal year during which such benefits are payable.

"SEC. 9. Title VIII of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, is amended as follows:

"(1) Section 821(b) of such Act (22 U.S.C. 1076(b)) is amended to read as follows:

" '(b)(1) At the time of retirement, any married female participant may elect to receive a reduced annuity and to provide for an annuity payable to her husband, commencing on the date following such participant's death and terminating upon the death of such surviving husband. The annuity payable to the surviving husband after such participant's death shall be 50 per centum of the amount of the participant's annuity computed as prescribed in paragraph (a) of this section, up to the full amount of such annuity specified by her as the base for the survivor benefits. The annuity of the participant making such election shall be reduced by 2½ per centum of any amount up to $2,400 she specifies as the base for the survivor benefits plus 10 per centum of any amount over $2,400 so specified.

" '(2) At the time of retirement, the annuity of each married male participant computed as prescribed in paragraph (a) of this section shall be reduced by $300 to provide for his surviving wife a minimum annuity of $2,400; except that, if his annuity is more than $4,800, he may elect up to 50 per centum of such annuity for his surviving wife, and if such election is made, his annuity shall be further reduced by 10 per centum of the difference between $4,800 and the base he specifies for the survivor benefit.'

"(2) The first sentence of section 832(b) of such Act (22 U.S.C. 1082(b)) is amended by inserting immediately before the period at the end thereof the following: '; except that the annuity of any widow shall not be less than $2,400'.

"(3) At the end of title VIII of such Act add the following:

" 'PART J—COST-OF-LIVING ADJUSTMENTS OF ANNUITIES

" 'SEC. 882. (a) On the basis of determination made by the Civil Service Commission pursuant to section 18 of the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, pertaining to per centum change in the price index, the following adjustments shall be made:

" '(1) Effective April 1, 1964, if the change in the price index from 1962 to 1963 shall have equaled a rise of at least 3 per centum, each annuity payable from the fund which has a commencing date earlier than January 2, 1963, shall be increased by the per centum rise in the price index adjusted to the nearest one-tenth of 1 per centum.

" '(2) Effective April 1 of any year other than 1964 after the price index change shall have equaled a rise of at least 3 per centum, each annuity payable from the fund which has a commencing date earlier than January 2 of the preceding year shall be increased by the per centum rise in the price index adjusted to the nearest one-tenth of 1 per centum.

" '(b) Eligibility for an annuity increase under this section shall be governed by the commencing date of each annuity payable from the fund as of the effective date of an increase, except as follows:

" '(1) Effective from the date of the first increase under this section, an annuity payable from the fund to an annuitant's survivor (other than a child entitled under section 821(c)), which annuity commenced the day after the annuitant's death, shall be increased as provided in subsection (a)(1) or (a)(2) if the commencing date of annuity to the annuitant was earlier than January 2 of the year preceding the first increase.

" '(2) Effective from its commencing date, an annuity payable from the fund to an annuitant's survivor (other than a child entitled under section 821(c)), which annuity commences the day after the annuitant's death and after the effective date of the first increase under this section, shall be increased by the total per centum increase the annuitant was receiving under this section at death.

" '(3) For purposes of computing an annuity which commences after the effective date of the first increase under this section to a child under section 821(c), the items $600, $720, $1,800, and $2,160 appearing in section 821(c) shall be increased by the total per centum increase allowed and in force under this section and, in case of a deceased annuitant, the items 40 per centum and 50 per centum appearing in section 821(c) shall be increased by the total per centum increase allowed and in force under this section to the annuitant at death. Effective from the date of the first increase under this section, the provisions of this paragraph shall apply as if such first increase were in effect with respect to computation of a child's annuity under section 821(c) which commenced between January 2 of the year preceding the first increase and the effective date of the first increase.

"'(c) No increase in annuity provided by this section shall be computed on any additional annuity purchased at retirement by voluntary contributions.

"'(d) No increase in annuity provided by this section shall apply to amounts paid under authority of section 5 of Public Law 84-503, as amended, section 4 of the Foreign Service Annuity Adjustment Act of 1964, or any other law authorizing annuity grants to widows.

"'(e) The monthly installment of annuity after adjustment under this section shall be fixed at the nearest dollar.'"

And the House agree to the same.

WAYNE L. HAYS,
EDNA F. KELLY,
CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI,
E. ROSS ADAIR,
VERNON W. THOMSON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

J. W. FULBRIGHT,
JOHN SPARKMAN,
HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER,
GEORGE D. AIKEN,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 745) to provide for adjustments in annuities under the Foreign Service retirement and disability system, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The House amendment struck out all of the Senate bill after the enacting clause and inserted a substitute text.

With respect to the amendment of the House to the text of the Senate bill, the committee of conference recommends that the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House with an amendment which is a substitute for both the text of the Senate bill and the text of the House amendment and that the House agree to the same.

The bill as agreed to in conference follows closely the substitute amendment which the House made to the Senate bill.

Except for clerical and minor drafting changes, the differences between the House amendment and the substitute agreed to in conference are noted below.

The Senate bill provided that a Foreign Service officer who retired before October 16, 1960, and did not elect a survivor annuity could elect such an annuity if he paid into the Foreign Service retirement and disability fund the full amount that would have been deducted from his annuity from the date of his retirement. In addition his annuity would have been reduced by the amount he would pay for a survivor annuity under the more liberal provisions of law that became effective on October 16, 1960.

The House amendment did not provide for payment into the fund of sums covering past periods. For a $2,400 survivor annuity the annuitant would pay $300 per year as computed under the formula in effect since October 16, 1960.

The managers on the part of the House agreed that Foreign Service officers who retired before October 16, 1960, and who made no election to provide an annuity for their widows should be permitted to elect an annuity of $2,400 at the current cost of such an annuity; i.e., $300 per annum. In addition each annuitant who elects a $2,400 survivor annuity under the conference substitute would be required to pay into the retirement fund the sum of $300 per year covering the period from October 16, 1960, to the effective date of his election. Under the language of the conference substitute such election must be made within 120 days from the effective date of the bill. Repayment may be made at the rate of not less than $25 per month or in a lump sum. Should the retired officer die before he has completed repayment, the widow would not be held liable for the unpaid balance. If the 177 retired officers covered by this provision avail themselves of its benefits, their payments into the fund would total about $212,000.

Both the Senate bill and the House amendment authorized the Secretary of State to grant an annuity of $2,400 to widows of deceased annuitants who failed to provide for a survivor annuity if such widows have not been granted annuities under previous legislation. There are 27 widows in this category.

The Senate bill disqualified a widow for an annuity under this provision if she was receiving benefits under the Federal Employees Compensation Act as the widow of a Foreign Service officer or anyone else.

The House amendment disqualified a widow only if she was receiving benefits under the Federal Employees Compensation Act as the widow of the Foreign Service officer.

The substitute agreed to in conference follows the language of the Senate bill.

WAYNE L. HAYS,
EDNA F. KELLY,
CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI,
E. ROSS ADAIR,
VERNON W. THOMSON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, this is a unanimous report. In addition to myself, the conferees were Mrs. KELLY, Mr. ZABLOCKI, Mr. ADAIR, and Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. I want to pay tribute to all of the conferees who are also members of the subcommittee that worked on the bill. They were diligent in their attendance at the hearings. They played an active part in writing the bill. We came out with what we thought was a pretty good piece of legislation.

There were eight points of disagreement between the Senate and the House. The Senate receded on six points. The House accepted the Senate language on one item dealing with widows, which disqualifies a widow from receiving a grant if she is receiving Federal Employees' Compensation Act benefits as the widow of the Foreign Service officer or anyone else. The major difference concerned 177 annuitants who made no provision for a widow's annuity. We accepted part of the Senate language which requires that if they elect a survivor's annuity of $2,400 at the more favorable cost available since 1960, they will have to make a repayment back as far as 1960 of $300 a year. The repayment may be in a lump sum or at the rate of $25 per month.

If they make such an election and if the wife dies before the retired Foreign Service officer completes the repayments, the widow is relieved of any liability for the unpaid balance. This repayment is in addition to the annuitant's current payment of $300 for a survivor annuity.

Mr. Speaker, I urge acceptance of the conference report. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR].

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, let me say that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS] has correctly stated the facts with respect to the action of the conferees and the contents of the bill. The bill will apply to a very limited number of persons. I believe 354 is the maximum number that can be affected. It is a somewhat technical piece of legislation. It remedies a situation which is in existence. I think it is proper legislation, and I join the gentleman in asking that it be adopted.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING OF REPORT OF MEETING OF AMERICAN INSTRUCTORS OF THE DEAF

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up Senate Concurrent Resolution 78 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the report of the proceedings of the International Congress on Education of the Deaf, and of the forty-first meeting of the Convention of American Instructors of the Deaf, held in Washington, District of Columbia, in June 1963, be printed with illustrations as a Senate document; and that five thousand additional copies be printed for the use of the Joint Committee on Printing.

The Senate concurrent resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING AS A HOUSE DOCUMENT "COMPILATION OF SOCIAL SECURITY LAWS"

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 856 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the compilation of social security laws, prepared by the Social Security Administration for the use of the Committee on Ways and Means, be printed as a House document; and that two thousand additional copies be printed of which one thousand shall be for the use of the Committee on Ways and Means, two hundred copies shall be for the use of the Senate Committee on Finance, and eight hundred copies shall be for the use of the House Document Room.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING OF "OBLIGATIONS FOR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT, AND RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PLANT"

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution

877 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Science and Astronautics, House of Representatives, one thousand two hundred additional copies of the study entitled "Obligations for Research and Development, and Research and Development Plant".

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING OF "IMMIGRATION HEARINGS BEFORE SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 1 OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, PARTS 1, 2, AND 3"

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Concurrent Resolution 358 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, five thousand additional copies each, to be printed concurrently with the publications entitled "Immigration Hearings Before Subcommittee No. 1 of the Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, parts 1, 2, and 3", Eighty-eighth Congress, second session.

With the following committee amendment:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, five thousand additional copies of part 1, "Immigration Hearings Before Subcommittee No. 1 of the Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives; and five thousand additional copies, each, of parts 2 and 3 to be printed concurrently with the publications entitled "Immigration Hearings Before Subcommittee No. 1 of the Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives", Eighty-eighth Congress, second session.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

"STUDY OF POPULATION AND IMMIGRATION PROBLEMS; POPULATION OF THE UNITED STATES"

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 364) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there shall be printed one thousand additional copies of the documents entitled "Study of Population and Immigration Problems; Population of the United States", with illustrations and maps, special series 1 through 16, inclusive, for the use of the House Committee on the Judiciary.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

"CATALOG OF FEDERAL AIDS TO STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS"

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 96) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Senate Committee on Government Operations eighteen thousand additional copies of its committee print of the Eighty-eighth Congress, second session, entitled "Catalog of Federal Aids to State and Local Governments", a study prepared by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress for the Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

"INDEX OF U.S. DEFENSE POLICIES FROM WORLD WAR II THROUGH 1963"

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 889) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the document entitled "Index of United States Defense Policies From World War II Through 1963" prepared by Charles H. Donnelly, Library of Congress, be printed as a House document.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARING ON TAX-EXEMPT FOUNDATIONS AND CHARITABLE TRUSTS

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 890) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be printed for the use of the Select Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives one thousand five hundred additional copies of the record of the hearings held by Subcommittee Numbered 1 of that committee during July, August, and September 1964, regarding Tax-Exempt Foundations and Charitable Trusts: Their Impact on Small Business.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 263]

Abbitt
Alger
Aspinall
Avery
Becker
Berry
Betts
Blatnik
Bolton, Frances P.
Bolton, Oliver P.
Brademas
Brock
Bromwell
Brown, Ohio
Buckley
Burton, Calif.
Carey
Clancy
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Denton
Derounian
Devine
Diggs
Downing
Dulski
Edmondson
Fascell
Flynt
Ford
Fraser
Fulton, Tenn.
Gibbons
Gill
Grant
Griffiths
Hagan, Ga.
Hansen
Harvey, Ind.
Healey
Hoffman
Horton
Hull
Jones, Ala.
Kee
Kilburn
King, Calif.
Knox
Landrum
Lankford
Latta
Leggett
Lesinski
McCulloch
McIntire
MacGregor
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Matsunaga
Matthews
Meader
Michel
Miller, N.Y.
Montoya
Morris
Morrison
Morton
O'Hara, Mich.
Patman
Pickle
Pilcher
Pillion
Powell
Pucinski
Reifel
Riehlman
Rivers, Alaska
Rivers, S.C.
Rostenkowski
Roudebush
St. George
St Germain
Schadeberg
Schenck
Schwengel
Scott
Selden
Sheppard
Shriver
Smith, Calif.
Snyder
Staebler
Stafford
Stratton
Sullivan
Taft
Talcott
Thompson, La.
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Toll
Tupper
Ullman
Weltner
White
Willis
Wilson, Ind.
Wyman

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 319 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1964

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 11380) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT AMENDMENTS

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (S. 3060), to amend and extend the National Defense Education Act of 1958 and to extend Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress—federally affected areas.

LOANS TO STUDENTS OF OPTOMETRY

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 8546), to amend title VII of the Public Health Service Act so as to extend to qualified schools of optometry and students of optometry those provisions thereof relating to student loan programs.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 8546, with Mr. ROOSEVELT in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ROBERTS] will be recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ROBERTS].

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, it is a pleasure to speak to this House in support of H.R. 8546 and the many identical bills which my distinguished colleagues from both parties have introduced during this Congress.

The Nation's need for more optometrists to serve the visual welfare of its citizens was clearly demonstrated by the witnesses appearing before the Subcommittee on Public Health and Safety. We must double the rate of graduates from optometric schools and colleges to take care of our current requirements.

Optometry is licensed as a health profession in all the 50 States, the outlying territories, and the District of Columbia. The costs and needs for training of an optometric student are comparable to those of medicine, dentistry, and osteopathy, which are the only professions now listed under the loan provisions of the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act, which is Public Law 88–129.

Until passage of Public Law 88–129, all students of the health professions were eligible to obtain loans under the National Defense Education Act. The average National Defense Education Act loan to students of medicine, dentistry, osteopathy, and optometry were approximately the same regardless of the health profession chosen as a career by the students. With the exception that 30 percent of all osteopathic students received National Defense Education Act loans, the same approximate percentage of students in the health professions took advantage of these loans, whether they studied medicine, dentistry, or optometry.

We are not giving a new group of students a new loan program. Under this bill we are only transferring a group from one loan program to another program which is far more suitable to the health requirements of our Nation. We have a Health Professions Educational Assistance Act. Optometry is a health profession. This Congress would be inconsistent if it did not place the optometric student in the appropriate category for loans to pursue his education.

My interest in this legislation is further prompted by the fact that my home State of Alabama needs twice the number of the well-qualified and dedicated optometrists now serving the vision needs of its people. We now have approximately 200 licensed optometrists in my State serving a population of more than 3 million persons. We need twice that number to help our young people achieve in school, to reduce the accidents on our highways which are attributable to poor vision, to improve the efficiency and safety of our industrial workers, to enable our partially sighted to function as normal people, and to help our older citizens to get more out of life through better vision.

I firmly believe that those in my State desiring to become members of the optometric profession should be entitled to the same rights and privileges as far as student loans are concerned as we in this 88th Congress gave to students of medicine, dentistry, and osteopathy.

This Nation needs better vision and relies on the optometric profession to provide it. The need for more members of the optometric profession is great and growing progressively more urgent. This bill should help us provide our country with more men such as Dr. Donald Springer, my own optometrist, who I proudly inform you is president of the American Academy of Optometry, an organization dedicated to improving the art and science of vision care.

Dr. Springer testified before our committee in favor of this legislation. He pointed out to us the costs an optometrist will face during the period immediately after his graduation in setting up his practice, as follows:

> The cost of establishing an optometric practice today is not insignificant. To properly equip a new office today will run in the neighborhood of $12,000.
>
> Now, this is easy to break down, and I have a list of equipment that one of the leading optical supply companies has provided me with that totals up to $12,162. I have pictures here of some of the equipment such as the ophthalmic chair which runs $2,800, projector chart which is around $350, a troposcope which is a diagnostic and training device for binocularity problems which runs close to $700, a radiuscope for contact lens analysis, a simple trial frame which, it is hard to believe, runs $90 now.
>
> A minimum possible setup for the new graduate will approximate $7,000. This would be using secondhand equipment that is still functional, a minimal reception area, and so forth.
>
> Now, I have not mentioned any of the special equipment that would be required for contact lens work. The diagnostic sets, and other devices to do this properly, will run $700 to $800. An eikonometer, which is a device for determining relative size of the two retinal images, a condition called aniseikonia, requires an instrument that costs over $1,000; the new electronic tonometer, which enables the optometrist to most accurately measure the intraocular pressure of the eye, runs $1,875. The figure $12,000 truly is probably quite conservative.
>
> Of course, after getting this large amount of money together to properly equip the office, the optometrist then must go through the period of establishing himself as any other professional man must. This period may take several months or it may take several years. Provision must be made for the optometrist to subsist in this small town during this period. This is probably the most critical time in an optometrist's career, and the reason I think discussing it is important here is that so many men go to these rural areas where they are needed but they do not have sufficient financial backing to remain there, and we find them becoming defeatist in their attitude, returning to the larger cities, seeking associations with established practices, and we are back in our situation of no one to serve the rural people.
>
> I do honestly believe that passage of this legislation will help solve this problem, and I know that it will in Alabama. We have many counties that do not even have an optometrist, and I hope that you will give this favorable consideration because it is a tragedy when we train these men, certainly partially at public expense, and they are unable to engage in the proper practice of the profession.

Mr. Chairman, the bill before us today will help meet this problem facing the graduating optometrist, by providing a period of 3 years after his graduation before he is required to begin repayment of his loan.

More than 60 Members of this Congress have sponsored similar legislation in the House and in the other body. I urge all remaining Members of this Congress to join us in suport of this important measure, which can do much to improve the visual well-being of America.

I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues the following letter I have received from Dr. Franklin C. Minton, O.D., president of the Alabama Optometric Association, expressing support of this legislation. Dr. Minton's letter is as follows:

THE ALABAMA OPTOMETRIC ASSOCIATION,
May 21, 1964.

Re H.R. 8546.
Hon. KENNETH A. ROBERTS,
Subcommitee on Health of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR KENNETH: I want to take this opportunity and means to again thank you for introducing this amendment to Public Law 88–129 so that the loan provision of the Health Professions Education Assistance Act of 1963 might be available to optometry students.

As you know, we have no optometry college in Alabama and our State government provides no support whatsoever to our students of optometry, who must go into other States for their education. Net result of this is the fact that some 17 Alabama counties do not have the full-time services of an optometrist. This dire shortage of optometrists is on the increase as far as Alabama is concerned and we see little hope for improvement for the future except through this and other worthy legislation.

Again, thank you for all your past efforts on behalf of optometry. Thank you for calling the May 26 subcommittee hearing on this bill. May I ask that this letter be included in the records of this hearing?

Yours most sincerely,
FRANKLIN C. MINTON, O.D.,
President.

Mr. Chairman, there is much more that I could say about this legislation but I know that some 30 Members have introduced bills on this matter and many of them would like to be heard on this bill.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman what is the need for this other than that the optometrists want to be listed in former H.R. 12 with the doctors and dentists, and so forth. What other purpose is there? I understand, according to the letter from the Secretary of HEW, Mr. Celebrezze, that he is opposed to it. He says that they can get sufficient loans now under the National Defense Education Act. He refers to the National Defense Education Act and prior to the changes that we expect to come about with the action in amendment of the National Defense Education Act program this year, all the loans will be increased to $2,500 a year, under National Defense Education Act.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, regardless of the position of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, we know that we have one optometrist to about 11,000 of our population. We have one medical doctor to about 841 people. So we did not need any great, long study by the Secretary to tell us that we need more optometrists. Secondly, under the National Defense Education Act program, an optometrist would have to start paying his loan back within a year after he completed his professional education.

Mr. Chairman, let me say this to the gentleman. There is a great deal of difference in the way an otpometrist starts out and the manner in which a medical doctor starts out. The doctor can go into a hospital, or he can go into a military program and can get his internship and residency at the expense of the Federal Government, with equipment furnished by the services, if he prefers that route. If he goes into private practice he has available to him hospitals that are fully equipped. An optometrist has to buy his own equipment. So there is a great need, we think, for more flexibility and more room in which to pay back the loan.

Then, too, I think—and the gentleman may disagree with what I am about to say, but this goes back to the matter of who should do this, whether the Labor and Education Committee should do it, or not. The gentleman says that is not true. But the fact of the matter is, every fight we have had has arisen out of a difference in philosophy. We say that optometry is a health profession. We think we have adequately demonstrated that in our hearings. The gentleman says that the Education and Labor Committee ought to have full jurisdiction over all education. They fought us on title III in S. 1576, now Public Law 88-164, when we sought to educate people in the matter of rehabilitating the deaf and the blind.

The gentleman said that that was not a health or a therapeutic matter. We disagreed. We think that if the optometrists want to come this way, we can give them a little bit more time in which to pay back their loans. We think the need has been established and we feel that this is a just and proper piece of legislation.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, what makes it difficult for an optometrist to pay back his loan after he has had a year? He does not go into a residency, as a doctor does. He goes into the practice of his profession.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Not necessarily. It depends upon what part of optometry he goes into. He may specialize just as the doctor may specialize. A doctor may come out as a general practitioner or if he wants to specialize he may continue his studies. The same is true of an optometrist.

Mr. QUIE. If an optometrist secures a loan under the National Defense Education Act and goes into further training and then he specializes, he may extend the moratorium on his loan until he has finished that training.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I cannot tell the gentleman much more than I have already as to why they do not want to come under the National Defense Education Act program, except that I think, in addition to the above reasons, it is a matter of recognition to them. They feel that they are in a health profession and that they should be so recognized.

I think they should be so recognized, because these people are the first ones who catch defects in vision and they pass it on to the ophthalmologists and others who can do something about it.

These are the people who are at the grassroots and who treat at least 70 percent of the people who go for better eye care.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, how can you get more people to enter the field of optometry if they receive their loan under the same program that the doctors do than if they got the same amount of money under National Defense Education Act?

The National Defense Education Act does not tell the health professions people to borrow the money for them.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. The gentleman asked me a question and I shall try to answer it.

The fact of the matter is that I am not contending this is any panacea or that it will fill the needs. I am saying they are not doing it under the present situation. There must be some good reason for it. Perhaps it is known or perhaps it is not known to the rest of the people engaged in this type of work. The fact of the matter is that something is going to have to be tried in order to correct the situation.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. I yield to the gentlewoman from Oregon.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Do I understand the gentleman to say that the optometry students do not want to come under the provisions of the National Defense Education Act?

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. I have not said that, except I do not think they would be making the effort to get this legislation if they were satisfied with the present setup.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, the fact is that the optometrists have borrowed under the National Defense Education Act for the last 6 years.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. That is true.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. If the gentleman will yield further, is it not also true that whereas only 8 percent of the general students in the colleges have borrowed under the National Defense Education Act, 14 percent of the optometry students have borrowed, or about twice as many percentagewise across the country?

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Well, I believe there is some dispute about that figure. I had it called to my attention the other day. I am under the impression that the American Optometric Association is somewhat unimpressed with that figure.

Later on in the debate I shall try to get that material. I do not have it at the desk with me at the present time.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. If the gentleman will yield further——

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. I am glad to yield further to the gentlewoman from Oregon.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. These are the figures which the Office of Education has furnished the committee, that 8 percent of the general students have borrowed under the National Defense Education Act and 14 percent of the optometry students have borrowed under the program.

If the gentleman will yield further, I have a couple of other questions which I would like to direct to him.

It is true, is it not, that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is opposed to this legislation?

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Well, I do not know whether one can say they are opposed to it or not. They did not have any figures, although they knew that this group had been included in the construction provisions when we passed H.R. 12. And, if they do not have the figures, I think they should have had the figures and we so told them when they came before our committee, because they knew this was one of the problems that had to be met. The members of our committee—and I was one of them—were quite exercised about this, and rightly so I believe, because they did not have some investigation made of the situation.

However—and I have had this experience with departments many, many times, since many of the safety bills which I have had the honor of sponsoring and obtaining passage have met with opposition from the departments—I do not feel that that is the final test. I believe Congress ought to write the laws and not because someone down in the department does not want the law written.

I might point out to the gentlewoman from Oregon that when we first started in this session of Congress, the Department did not have an air pollution bill either and it did not come around to one until we had hearings in the House of Representatives. We wrote the bill in our committee. They finally indorsed it in the Senate.

So, I do not believe that is any argument against this bill at all.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. If the gentleman will yield further, do I understand the gentleman to say he does not know whether the Department had come out against it?

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. They did not say. They did not seem to object too much to the legislation. They just said they did not have the figures on the need.

I do not know how much more time we should give people in the Department to get these figures when I feel they would be something fairly easy to obtain.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. If the gentleman from Alabama will yield further, may I read from the report of your own committee—the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in regard to this question of loans to students of optometry?

This is a letter from Mr. Celebrezze, the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and I quote:

> Because of the relatively lower cost of education to optometry students and because of the adequacy of the national defense student loan program to meet these requirements, we believe that the new loan program for medical and dental students should not now be extended to cover students of optometry, and we therefore recommend against the enactment of H.R. 8522.

This is a different numbered bill, but it is the same bill which I understand the gentleman is presenting today insofar as the substance of the legislation is concerned.

If the gentleman will yield for another question, in the same report is it not true that the Bureau of the Budget also recommended against adoption of this particular additional student loan program?

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. I think that is a true statement. However, I say again that is not controlling because we are not asking for any more money. We are asking to use a part of the money that has been appropriated to carry out H.R. 12.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. This is for professional students? For their graduate work?

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Yes.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. When an optometry student starts his work at a college, during his first year where would he get his loan money?

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. You mean his first year of optometric graduate work?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. The first year of his college work.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. I suppose he would get it under National Defense Education Act.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. During the second year where would he get the money for his loan?

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. I think he could follow the same course.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Then the same person would borrow for 3 or 4 years under the National Defense Education Act and suddenly under your legislation he would be no longer eligible under the National Defense Education Act. Then he would have to make a new loan under a different loan program in the same college under another branch of the Federal Government. So you are in effect requiring this one college to set up two loan programs to accommodate the same student. And you are providing two different departments or bureaus at the national level to provide loans for the same student to continue his education at the same college?

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. We did that same thing for the doctors and dentists, and the gentlewoman agreed to the amendment that the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas offered on the floor to accomplish it for the nurses, if I remember the situation correctly.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I was not here when the nurses' bill went through or I would have objected. As I have said I see no point in adding to the administration costs at the Federal level and at the college level.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. I think the gentlewoman will find she was here. The gentleman offered his amendment after conference with the gentlewoman, and it was accepted by the House.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. I think the gentleman has in mind not the nurses' program but the bill extending the National Defense Education Act on which the conference report was just filed a few minutes ago. That was the amendment referred to in the colloquy with the distinguished gentlewoman from Oregon.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. I accept the gentleman's correction.

Mr. HARRIS. Since we are talking about this, there seems to be quite a record being made. I think probably it would be advisable, if the gentleman will yield, to get some of these questions straightened out a little bit.

Let us take the position of the Department of HEW. Is it not a fact that the HEW witnesses insisted they did not want the act to be extended any further than medical and dental students?

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Yes.

Mr. HARRIS. Is it not true that notwithstanding the position of HEW at that time, pharmaceutical students and a number of others considered to be in the health profession were included in the construction provisions of the original act?

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. That is true.

Mr. HARRIS. Is it not true that the position of HEW at that time with respect to those categories has been precisely the same since, and this is still the position of HEW?

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Yes.

Mr. HARRIS. Is it not true that the subcommittee requested HEW to provide for the record information to substantiate the position it had taken before the committee?

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. That is correct.

Mr. HARRIS. Is it not true that HEW failed to supply information showing that a need did not exist?

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. That is correct. The request was made by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. HARRIS. Second, are we not now extending to the students of optometry the same rights, privileges and opportunities, in order to meet the needs of the country, as we have extended to medical students, dental students, and students of osteopathy?

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. That is what we hope to do here.

Mr. HARRIS. As to need, is it not a fact that there are only approximately 17,000 practicing doctors of optometry?

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. That is correct.

Mr. HARRIS. There are only 17,000 optometrists to meet the needs of 192 million people.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. That is correct.

Mr. HARRIS. Is that not what the record shows?

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. That is what the record shows.

Mr. HARRIS. Is it not also true that it was estimated by everyone who presented the case to the committee that we should have 30,000 optometrists to meet the needs of the people, and then there would be about 1 per 7,000 population?

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. We had testimony which I showed that we needed at least 1,000 graduate optometrists a year and we are getting about half that number at the present time.

Mr. HARRIS. That is the actual record of what it is now. If something is not done to meet the need we are going to have a shortage. Is it not a fact that the record shows that there are two loan programs, which were discussed a moment ago? The first, of course, is the program under Health Professions Educational Assistance Act and the other the National Defense Education Act? The Health Professions Act is specifically intended for students seeking a career in a health profession, and students of optometry were omitted from the loan program when it passed the Congress. That is true, is it not?

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. That is correct.

Mr. HARRIS. Is it not also true that under the National Defense Education Act special consideration is required to be given to, first, students with a superior academic background who express a desire to teach in elementary or secondary schools, and, second, students whose academic background indicates a superior capacity or preparation in science, mathematics, engineering, or a modern foreign language?

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. I am not an expert on the National Defense Education Act, but I think that is correct.

Mr. HARRIS. I should like to ask the distinguished gentlewoman from Oregon if that is not true.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. No. All of that language has been eliminated from the National Defense Education Act as it passed the House. The conference report will be on the floor of the House tomorrow. So there is no special preference as the gentleman has just indicated. A teacher, or student of law or engineering or optometry or any other discipline is as eligible as the other for the loan as long as he needs the money to continue his education. No optometry student has ever complained to me that he has not been able to obtain a student loan. Their loans average $628. This means many are much higher than that figure.

Mr. HARRIS. We must go by the record. Let us see what the record is in that field. The record shows that thus far there has been $103,727,964 advanced for these positions on the academic level. I would like to call attention to the fact that in the professional health field there have been 3,263 students receiving aid in the medical profession. There are 1,948 in the dental profession and only 174 students in the profession of optometry who have been aided.

I should think that, because of the limited number of students who have been able to get assistance under this program this demand has been made.

I think when you compare the cost of an education in optometry with the cost of education of a student in the other professional health fields and the average costs in the academic field, you will see then why it is necessary for the students of optometry, if we are going to get them in the numbers necessary to meet the needs of the people, are going to have to be helped beyond the $500 or $600 or $700 a year they have been getting under National Defense Education Act. As a matter of fact, the cost is much greater than that.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama has consumed 25 minutes.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, this legislation is designed to permit schools of optometry to establish student loan funds under the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act, under which students of optometry may receive loans up to $2,000 per year while pursing their course of education as optometrists.

Our committee received considerable testimony from witnesses on behalf of the American Optometric Association which indicated that there was a current shortage of optometrists in the United States and that if present trends continue, this shortage will grow more acute in the future.

Today there is approximately 1 optometrist in the United States for every 11,000 persons, but it has been stated that the vision care requirements of the American people require not less than 1 optometrist for every 7,000 persons. Trends in enrollment in schools of optometry in recent years have been progressively downward. In 1952, after the large number of students attending schools of optometry under the GI bill had completed their training, there were 636 optometrists graduated; in 1954, there were 674. By 1956, this number had dropped to 333, and except for a modest increase in the past few years, the number has remained around that level.

There is a table in the commitee report on page 3 which shows the population of the United States per licensed optometrist in 1958. These are the latest figures which we had available to us, and it is probable that the ratio of optometrists to population has declined since that date.

This legislation would encourage students to take up the study of optometry, by providing additional financial assistance to them through the student loan program established under the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act. Under this program, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare will be authorized to enter into agreements with schools of optometry for the establishment of student loan funds which will consist of 90 percent Federal funds and 10 percent funds provided from other sources, and which will be used for making loans to students pursuing a full-time course of study at these schools.

The loans may not exceed $2,000 for any academic year and shall be made on such terms and conditions as the school may determine. The loans will be repayable in periodic installments over the 10-year period which begins 3 years after the student ceases to pursue a full-time course of study at the school, excluding from such 10-year period all periods—up to 3 years—of active duty performed by the borrower as a member of a uniformed service, or periods of service as a volunteer under the Peace Corps Act.

Liability to repay the loans shall be canceled upon the death or total permanent disability of the borrower. The loans shall bear interest at whichever is higher, 3 percent per annum or the going Federal rate, and where any part of the loan or interest is canceled, the school will be reimbursed for its proportionate share of the canceled portion.

The legislation does not provide any increase in authorization for appropriations, and if applications for allotments to loan funds under the legislation by all schools which are eligible exceed the total appropriations, amounts allotted to the schools are subject to reduction in accordance with a formula set out in the law.

Mr. Chairman, hearings were held on this bill before the Subcommittee on Public Health and Safety, and the bill was reported out of our committee without dissenting vote.

I recommend its adoption by the House.

SPONSORS OF OPTOMETRY BILLS

DEMOCRATS

Mr. Patman of Texas, Mr. Roberts of Alabama, Mr. Hagen of California, Mr. Rogers of Texas, Mr. Cameron of California, Mr. Patten of New Jersey, Mr. Thompson of New Jersey, Mr. Trimble of Arkansas, Mr. Garmatz of Maryland, Mr. Leggett of California, Mr. Joelson of New Jersey, Mrs. Hansen of Washington, Mr. Fisher of Texas, Mr. Shipley of Illinois, Mr. Dorn of South Carolina, Mr. Macdonald of Massachusetts, Mr. Grabowski of Connecticut, Mr. Bass of Tennessee, and Mr. Clark of Pennsylvania.

REPUBLICANS

Mrs. Baker of Tennessee, Mr. Harrison of Wyoming, Mr. Thomson of Wisconsin, Mr. Cleveland of New Hampshire, Mr. McIntire of Maine, Mr. Glenn of New Jersey, Mr. Anderson of Illinois, Mr. Van Pelt of Wisconsin, Mr. Halpern of New York, Mrs. Dwyer of New Jersey, Mr. Laird of Wisconsin, and Mr. Robison of New York.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Rogers].

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I want to rise in support of this legislation. We have had very extensive hearings on this bill and have gone into this two separate times that I know of personally.

First of all, a need has been shown and I think this is a most important thing to consider—if there is a need or if there is not a need. This need has been established by the record. All you have to do is to look at the record and you can see the problem we are getting into in the profession of optometry.

Furthermore, I think many of us do not realize that optometrists supply an estimated two-thirds of all vision care to the general public and about 85 percent of all vision care to members of the armed services. So this is not just a small profession that has no effect on the American people. It has a very direct effect.

We see many of these problems in the schools and find that the problems that children have in their schoolwork often go back to the fact that they have not had sufficient eye care and that they could have been taken care of if we had had sufficient doctors and optometrists. This bill is to help correct that situation.

It has been pointed out already that we are supplying only about one doctor for a little over 11,000 people while we ought to have no more than a ratio of one doctor to 7,000 people at the least.

Furthermore there has been a drop in the number of optometrists from the year 1960 to 1962 of some 775 optometrists. The schools simply have not been turning out as many optometrists.

So this is simply an effort to do what we have done for the doctors and for the dentists. We are attempting to take care of the medical needs of the American people.

Mr. Chairman, this is not an exceptional bill. This is not a novel approach. This is the same thing that we have been doing with the medical profession to provide help for the care of our people in the United States.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GOODELL. The gentleman will concede that the optometry students now are eligible under the National Defense Education Act for loans?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Yes, that is correct. But may I point out that the doctors were before and so were the dentists.

Mr. GOODELL. That is correct. It seems to me the debate thus far has established that there is a shortage of optometrists. I do not believe it is established that there is a shortage of law. In the new National Defense Education Act bill, as amended, it will actually make the optometrists eligible for a more favorable loan program than this bill will.

Apparently we are going to meet the shortage of optometrists by offering a new program less favorable in loan terms and total amounts than the program available to them under National Defense Education Act.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. The gentleman must admit that what we are trying to do is to handle these people as we handle the doctors and those in the other medical professions. Does the gentleman see any reason why we should handle the optometrists in the category with engineers, and so on?

Mr. GOODELL. I see no reason for expanding this.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Are they not actually allied with the medical profession?

Mr. GOODELL. I see no reason for expanding further the overlap in the programs, when there is no indication of need.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. This would not be an overlap, because they would not qualify under the National Defense Education Act.

Mr. GOODELL. They could qualify under one or the other, but they could qualify, if the school desired, under the National Defense Education Act program rather than under the optometry program.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. If they qualify under the bill now before us, they would not be able to qualify under the National Defense Education Act.

Mr. GOODELL. In applying this, by setting up the program it would be possible to have optometry students given loans under the program, and other optometry students in other schools still would be eligible under the National Defense Education Act.

Nationally the optometry students would be taken care of both under the National Defense Education Act and under the optometry program. This is the overlap, and it is not necessary.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. This overlap would exist for a man in undergraduate work.

Mr. GOODELL. The National Defense Education Act takes care of the man in undergraduate work.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. That is what I say. He could go under that program.

Mr. GOODELL. Certainly those eligible under the National Defense Education Act program can take advantage of it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Florida 3 additional minutes.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I yield to the gentlewoman from Oregon.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. The gentleman has correctly pointed out the need for optometrists. So is there a shortage in every professional area—teachers—scientists—social workers, ministers, and so forth. But today we are talking about whether there is a need for another student loan program. The facts are that the optometry students have come under the NDEA act during the past 6 years.

The gentleman from Arkansas pointed out the number of student loans to optometry students. Fourteen percent of all optometry students obtained loans under the National Defense Education Act, whereas only about 8 percent of the total full-time students in the country have obtained National Defense Education Act loans.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. May I respond on that point? I believe that emphasizes the need for the bill. The demand for the optometry scholarships exceeds the average for the National Defense Education Act. I would think the gentlewoman would wish to help take care of this problem, since there is a great need.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me on that point?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. Of course, if there are only 10 students involved or a total of 10 involved, and we provide for 10, that takes care of 100 percent. Percentages do not mean anything, when we consider 174 involved as against 3,000 or more. Therefore, if we are going to use percentages in this field to try to obtain the facts, we get only an illusion.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for another question?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I yield to the gentlewoman from Oregon.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Can the gentleman tell me if there has ever been any complaint by any optometry student in any college that he could not obtain a loan under the National Defense Education Act, toward his education?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. We have had the optometrists come in to testify before the committee. The whole organization came in to say that they need this, as the doctors came in and as the dentists came in, and as all other medical professions did. They feel they should be under this and should be able to qualify.

Does the gentlewoman believe it would be better under the National Defense Education Act, because they could get loans up to $2,500? Is this the point the gentlewoman is trying to make?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. That is not the point I am trying to make. Will the gentleman yield for another question?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I yield to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. The question I raise is in regard to the advisability of another program which will increase the administrative costs. When there is a proliferation of student loan programs we thereby require the individual college to have two or three sets of books. We require them to have different kinds of repayment programs for the same students in college. We would set up two bureaus here at the national level which also would increase administrative costs.

May I give the gentleman an example? Pacific University, in Oregon, has one of the best optometry schools in the country. It is the only accredited school of optometry in the Pacific Northwest.

They are doing an excellent job, but this is only one part of the Pacific University, that is, the school of optometry. It is an excellent liberal arts college. The university has fewer than 1,000 students. Of those, only a fraction are in the school of optometry.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Florida 6 additional minutes.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I yield to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Pacific University has a loan program under the National Defense Education Act. The optometry students at Pacific University have borrowed under the National Defense Education Act. I have never had any complaint—and this school is located about 30 miles from my city—never any complaint that any optometry student could not borrow under the National Defense Education Act. If we adopt the bill before the House today, what do we do? We require Pacific University, which has fewer than 1,000 students, to establish 2 loan programs, not only under the National Defense Education Act but this additional program. This requires this small college to set up two sets of books in its offices. In addition, what does it do to the student? The student who starts as a freshman there may not have decided to go into optometry, so he applies for a loan, if he is needy, under the National Defense Education Act. He secures a loan under the National Defense Education Act, and during his sophomore year he secures a loan under the National Defense Education Act. Perhaps in his junior year he is not entitled to borrow for optometry, so maybe he has 3 or 4 years of loans under the National Defense Education Act which has provided sufficient funds, up to $1,000 for undergraduate students, and suddenly, if we adopt this bill, we say that at that moment when he goes into graduate work, he is no longer eligible to borrow under the National Defense Education Act but must borrow under this program.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. If the gentlewoman will allow me, this could be true with dentists and it is true also with medical people. Here is a school of optometry dedicated to health. This is a health problem just like handling medical doctors and dentists is. All that we are doing in this bill is recognizing that this is a health problem. We already have the legislation. This is just amending the bill and saying that students of optometry will be included in this bill just like medical doctors and dentists. That is all it does. This is no great change of programing, because we have it set up. There is no administrative change. It has already been passed in the law. It is simply an extension of what we have done, and it is a reasonable thing. Everyone admits there is a need. No one disputed that need. It is simply a matter of continuing and going right ahead with the program and recognizing that optometry does affect the health of the American people. We are attempting to help to provide sufficient optometrists in order to supply optometrists to the Armed Forces and to supply them to the American people and to try to improve the eyesight of the American people through the use of these doctors who will be trained in this field.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. If I understood the gentleman correctly, you said this was a health problem?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Yes, it is.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Then, if a student is going to study law and he is a junior in the law school and needs some money to continue his education in law, does this become a legal problem?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I think the gentlewoman knows this has already been done. Is the gentlewoman saying we should not have any program for doctors or dentists? I thought the gentlewoman supported this program earlier. Will the gentlewoman answer that?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I have never favored a proliferation of student loan programs. I think it would be far more intelligent to have one student loan program, because I do not consider it a legal problem or a health problem but, rather, an education problem. We make loans to students studying teaching or law or medicine or science or optometry in order that they may get an education.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I realize that the gentlewoman has that feeling and I understand it along with that of her committee. However, the House of Representatives and the Senate have not shared this belief with her. Because of the jurisdiction of her committee, where she would like to have all of these programs under the National Defense Education Act, I can understand that and sympathize with her feeling, but it has been felt that the better way to handle the program is to emphasize those areas where there is a dramatic need. That is what these bills will do. To provide that aid we have to try to handle the problem in order to get something done rather than to get involved in legalistic debates and jurisdictional problems. Let us try to solve the need as provided by the simple amendment to a law which is now on the books and which was just approved by the Congress.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, even though I am a member of the Committee on Education and Labor, I should hope that we could keep this from being simply a dispute between members of different committees.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I share the gentleman's feeling on that and if we did I think we would have no argument.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. But, Mr. Chairman, I must say that I am very much opposed to the bill that the gentleman is advocating. The gentleman has suggested that there is a need and that we must meet the need. But we are assuming that the need is to develop more optometrists, and the question is how best to do that.

As I understand the gentleman, he is advocating that a less generous program which will be available to optometrists if this bill should be enacted will develop more optometrists than the more generous program which is already in existence under the National Defense Education Act. I would suggest that a proliferation of Federal assistance programs is not going to eliminate the need more quickly. It does seem to me to make sense to have, insofar as possible, a single source of Federal assistance under the National Defense Education Act.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, may I point out to the gentleman that there is a great difference in the approach to what we are trying to do and the other approach. The gentleman will agree that we should not separate the optometrists from the doctors and dentists in the way we handle this. For instance, the repayment period is greatly different. In the bill that we approved for doctors and dentists they do not have to start repayment until 3 years whereas under the National Defense Education Act here it is 1 year.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has again expired.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, first I would like to say to my colleagues that those members on the Committee on Education and Labor who differ with us on this matter I take it do so in good conscience, and I personally find nothing wrong with that approach. But I think first we ought to come back to the fundamentals, as I see them, of this legislation. If optometry does not fall within the health category, as our committee believes, then this bill ought to be voted down. But if Members believe that this is a proper health activity then it ought to fall within the same category as that of doctors and dentists and be covered by equal provisions.

The question has been raised here whether this ought to come specifically under the National Defense Education Act. I find nothing wrong with the National Defense Education Act. I have supported it all through the years. I have found that it works satisfactorily out in my district to a certain extent, but with this modification—and I think my colleagues ought to know this.

There is so much money appropriated for the National Defense Education Act. Do you want to know how it works as a practical matter? If you do, all you have to do is to go to your own college, go to your own university in your own district and find out how it works. Let us say that we say to the University of Illinois, There is $50,000. Let us say that there are a certain number of students who apply and they find that all those people are in need. What you do is divide that money up.

How does it come out? In some universities it comes out to $300 a year. In some cases it comes out to $500 a year. That is not what we are trying to do, to divide up a lot of money so that the optometrists will get some of it. We are trying here to get optometrists in these areas where they are needed. We are doing it by separate legislation, to give them the full amount of $2,000 for each one of the years they are going to be in it, not $300 or $500, or some such figure. That is not the purpose of the legislation.

If all you want to do is to divide up the money under the National Defense Education Act, you might as well forget about this bill, because you are not going to help optometry students. This has to be a bill where the ones who are going to get into the profession are fully capitalized. I hope I am making clear the differentiation between what we are trying to do, or what we believe we are trying to do, and what you are trying to do under the National Defense Education Act.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, the gentleman has explained the National Defense Education Act program incorrectly. They do not take the amount of money that is available and divide it among the needy students equally. Some students receive as much as $1,000 and others may receive as little as $100.

Is the gentleman saying you are going to drop the question of need for optometry students and take the need and divide it into the amount of money available?

Mr. SPRINGER. Certainly not. That is not what we are trying to do if we are going to help them. All we are asking to be done is that those who need assistance get the full $2,000 per year.

If the gentleman will go to his University of Minnesota he will find that the amount of money available is divided almost equally among them. If the gentleman does not believe this, just go to the university and ask, because I have asked and this is what I find.

Mr. QUIE. If the gentleman will yield further, the reason for this was the fact that we had a $250,000 limitation for each institution. That limitation has been removed. If there is money available, we do not have that hamstringing of the program at the large institutions.

Mr. SPRINGER. Let me say to the gentleman that I do not admit that is true. That is the gentleman's statement and he may make it. However, I am not finding that to be true.

Mr. QUIE. If the gentleman will yield further, you can find it in the record of the hearings of last year and this year. But even in the health professions they were not in a separate category. What about the podiatrists and the osteopaths, as well as the psychiatrists?

Mr. SPRINGER. Podiatrists have applied. However, I am against adding podiatrists.

Mr. QUIE. Why? They are a health profession.

Mr. SPRINGER. Because I do not believe it is a kind of health profession shortage where we need to have this kind of assistance.

I hope I have not left the impression with the gentleman from Minnesota that we have agreed with everyone who applies for assistance to our committee. We do not automatically bring out a bill to relieve and help everyone who would like assistance and claims a national health need.

However, I became convinced, after listening to the testimony, that there was a need and the next question to follow was how we were going to handle it. We did discuss the provisions of the National Defense Education Act. But we did not believe the National Defense Education Act as it was set up, fitted the program and that is the reason why we did not so write it in this bill.

I hope I am getting over to my colleagues what we are attempting to do is not what you are attempting to do under the National Defense Education Act program which is a broad assistance program for not hundreds of thousands but for millions of students who will apply for assistance under the program in the future.

Mr. QUIE. If the gentleman will yield further, would the gentleman tell me how you can get more optometry students if you give them $1,000 under the health services loan program rather than $1,000 under the National Defense Education Act program?

Mr. SPRINGER. For the simple reason that we do not believe the student will get the full $2,000 set out and which we believe is necessary to an optometry student.

The only reason you are benefiting these students under this program is because there is a health need. Otherwise, we could never justify this legislation by any stretch of the imagination.

I am trying to distinguish between what we are trying to do in this bill and what is being done already under established programs such as the National Defense Education Act.

If the gentleman is relying on the theory that this is no more important than the average undergraduate student who will apply, then we are wrong on the theory of this legislation.

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROBISON. I am one of the cosponsors of this legislation in this body and I associate myself with the remarks which have been made by the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this bill passes.

Is it not correct, since the gentleman has mentioned some other professions in the so-called health field, if optometry is not one of the three health professions—and I believe there are only three—that is licensed in all 50 States of the Union?

Mr. SPRINGER. Optometry is one of the three health professions in the United States which are licensed in all of the 50 States, territories, to examine clinically and prescribe for human patients.

Mr. ROBISON. That is my understanding.

Mr. SPRINGER. There were 31 Members of this House who introduced this identical bill, and I believe I am correct in saying this is the greatest number of Members of Congress who have introduced an identical bill before our committee during this session of Congress.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I wonder if the distinguished gentleman from Illinois could tell us whether or not the passage of this bill would improve the vision of BARRY GOLDWATER?

Mr. SPRINGER. May I say to my distinguished friend from New York this legislation will have nothing to do with that, nor do I anticipate it will improve the vision of the distinguished gentleman who now occupies the White House.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I was prompted to ask that question because I had a silly telegram which said if we did not vote for this legislation we would ruin the eyesight of the American public.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, the importance of H.R. 8546 is an increasing one and I feel that this is not generally realized. The grave and growing need of optometrists has long been of concern to me and before coming to this Congress, I worked diligently on the passage of legislation in the State Legislature of Florida which provides scholarships up to $1,000 a year over a period of 3 years to students who are citizens of Florida and who will agree to practice in designated areas of our State upon completing their optometric education. I am very proud to say that Florida is one of only five States which have taken the initiative in an attempt to rectify the problem our Nation is facing due to the lack of optometrists.

Our Government has encouraged the establishment of student loans for the professions of medicine, dentistry and osteopathy, and this has placed the schools and colleges of optometry in an almost competitive status for students. The loans that are available to the students of optometry at this time are not adequate and, in most instances, are not able to take into consideration the financial problems of the young graduate entering practice.

The importance of the field of optometry is self-evident in our day and age when we take account of the varied areas to which this type of medicine has been applied; such as military optometry, motorists' vision and highway safety, occupational vision, visual problems of aeronautics and space, vision aid to the partially blind, visual problems of children and youth are a few of these. The profession has resulted in being able to claim an important role both to our national defense and to our industrial strength.

The demand upon the men in the profession of optometry is a fantastic one since this country has about 1 optometrist for every 12,000 persons, whereas the recognized minimum is 1 for every 7,000 persons. The deficiency is one which is mounting since the Bureau of the Census considers that by 1970 there will be an attrition of 10 percent of the optometrists currently licensed. The optometric profession itself has made an attempt to provide the means for student loans, but their efforts fall far short of such great and rising demands.

I feel it is time that our Federal Government recognizes the importance of the need we are facing due to the lack of optometrists; and that in recognizing this need, our Government will become aware of the exigency of financial assistance for the student of optometry, just as has been given other medical professions. I trust this Congress will give H.R. 8546 favorable support and "open its eyes" to the serious nature of providing for help to young people who qualify for and are interested in the preservation of the sight of this Nation's people.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HAGEN of California. I am one of the cosponsors of this bill.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, I am also one of the cosponsors of this legislation.

I introduced a companion bill to the one now being considered. This measure has been thoroughly considered and explained by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER] and others. The measure would authorize a loan program for students in the field of optometry. This would be comparable to existing student loan programs in other fields. In fact, it has become evident that optometry was inadvertently omitted from prior programs, and this provides a chance to rectify that error.

There can be no question about the importance of this profession and the public need for an adequate well trained and qualified number of optometrists throughout the land. It is estimated that at present only about one-half of the requirements is being met by graduates, and the need for additional ones is self-evident. Because of this need, and the fact that this profession has been discriminated against in the student loan field, I earnestly hope the pending bill will be promptly enacted.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Chairman, I am also a cosponsor of this legislation. I made extensive remarks in support of this recently, appearing at page 22655 the RECORD. I wish to be associated with my colleagues in support of this legislation.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, I want to say that as a member of the committee we went into this quite thoroughly. It is unfortunate that every time we bring up a bill of this kind the opposition comes from one committee, the Committee on Education and Labor. They seem not to be able to distinguish between ordinary education and specific education; such as medicine, dentistry, and optometry.

I am for the bill, and join my colleagues in support of it.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and wish to join the gentleman in his remarks. I also wish to compliment the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and other members of that committee for bringing this bill out today. I am a strong supporter of this legislation.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I should like to compliment the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for the best record that has been made since I have been a Member of Congress. It has brought out more legislation affecting the people of our country this year and last year than in any other session I know of. This is good, sound legislation, and I dislike having to listen to this dispute between the two committees.

The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, in my opinion, has jurisdiction. This is good legislation, and I hope it will be passed by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. SPRINGER. May I say in conclusion, Mr. Chairman, each time this has been before us we have tried not to step over into someone else's business. We have tried not to get into the jurisdiction of other committees, and we have tried not to duplicate programs.

We do believe this is a program which was within the jurisdiction of our committee, and for which we were responsible, and we therefore felt we had to bring forth this legislation.

I want to speak as kindly as I can. I certainly do respect the opinions of those on that great Committee on Education and Labor. They have brought forth much good legislation, led by the distinguished gentlewoman from Oregon.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentlewoman from Oregon.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I join with the gentleman from New Jersey in saying we did not consider this as a jurisdictional dispute. We would like to consider it with reference to the amount of cost to the individual university, and the number of dollars spent by the Federal Government. I do not understand how there can be any other explanation. If so many dollars were provided in universities for student loans, and if you have a good loan program with one administration and one set of books, there will be more dollars available to students to get an education. This is an education bill to provide loans, and we are trying to provide money to needy students so they can finish college.

At the Federal level if there are so many dollars available for student loans, and if we require two bureaus and several departments to establish two different loan programs, that means more money is going to be spent on the bureaus and on administration costs, and less money will be available for students.

This is my concern, that we cut down as much as possible on the administrative cost and that we make the dollars that are available go as far as possible to students who need to go to school.

Again, I would say that we have done this for the last 6 years. So it is not a jurisdictional dispute, it is something we have had in operation for 6 years, loans for students of optometry, lawyers, veterinarians, teachers, nurses, every other classification. Everybody who is going to college can now get a loan. I think there is serious question as to whether this Congress is acting wisely when we increase the administrative costs and go on with the proliferation of loans that are unnecessary.

Mr. SPRINGER. I thank the gentlewoman. I respect her opinion. Does the program which the gentlewoman has in mind do the job which we visualize in this legislation? She believes it does. We do not believe it does. The gentlewoman's committee was given adequate consideration because we expected to meet you on the floor today. We expected it when we came before this body. We had to think about this addition to doctors and dentists—that it ought to be viewed as a part of the health needs of this country. That is why we came here today with this legislation.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. First of all, I do not consider this is in any way a proliferation of loan programs. I think to assume that overlooks the purpose of this program. The gentlewoman from Oregon mentioned the fact that the National Defense Education Act has been in existence 6 years. I think there has been the experience of those 6 years in the medical and dental fields.

The field of optometry is a health program. It should be administered by those who are in charge of health programs, because when we get all involved in this program as an educational program, then in view of the needs involved here as far as the health of the people of the country is concerned, it is like the tail wagging the dog. That is precisely the reason for our concern here. You know and the House knows that in the last Congress I took the position that this is a health problem. What we are trying to do is provide personnel to do something about the health of the country. We feel that if it is a health program it ought to be administered by the Public Health Service of the Government. Experience has shown that when you are dealing with a specific field like health and other items in that field, it is necessary to have someone who knows something about those special fields administer the program. I would challenge anyone about that, as much as I have regard for the educational field of this Nation and for the Office of Education of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

My father was a schoolteacher for 37 years, and I think I know something about this field. But the record shows that where you need anyone specialized in the field of the health needs of this country, they are frequently delayed in obtaining assistance. The record shows it today, in the field of optometry, where it showed only 174 have obtained loans in the field of optometry during the time the National Defense Education Act has existed. What we are trying to do here is to provide for health needs of the people of the country through a program to be administered by the Public Health Service, where it ought to be.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina, a member of the committee.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I subscribe to and endorse the views and remarks of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER] and the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS]. This legislation came from the great House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce without dissenting vote. This legislation recognizes a need that exists in the country, to encourage the training of professional experts in the field of eye care. This legislation creates a loan fund that will enable and encourage more students to enter optometry school. Other legislation passed by the Congress recognizes other professions and fields of service in the creation of student loan funds specifically tailored to the needs and requirements of these professions. It is an undeniable fact that the profession of optometry is one calling for a high degree of education, training, and proficiency in the techniques of the profession. This bill will authorize a loan fund for students of optometry, a fund that will be operated on a sound, progressive basis, a fund that will be operated in such a way that the health care of the Nation will be better met. I urge the passage of this legislation.

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN].

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I hope this is not being interpreted merely as a struggle between two standing committees of the House. As I understand the gentleman from Arkansas, he has challenged anyone to indicate why it was not necessary for the Public Health Service to extend Federal assistance to students who may be planning careers in public health. I would like to suggest, I see absolutely no justification for saying that only such a service can be provided to those who are going in the field of public health. It seems to me what we are talking about is assistance to students. If we should concede, as the gentleman from Arkansas argues, that the Public Health Service must administer these programs of assistance to students going into the field of public health, we would have also to argue that the National Science Foundation should have the programs of assistance to those who are going in the fields of engineering and science. This does strike me as an absurdity.

It must be admitted that because two standing committees of the House have different jurisdictions we have two programs which to some extent already overlap. It is my feeling that we should not increase the extent of the overlap. We should not suggest a less generous program now being advocated is going to do something about eliminating this problem of the shortage of optometrists so long as we have a more generous program under the National Defense Education Act. I would think we could argue this on the basis of logic and commonsense. Surely it is not a position of commonsense to say that no one but the Public Health Service can administer programs that provide Federal assistance to those public health students.

Mr. SPRINGER. May I say in reply, when you talk about a generous program under the National Defense Education Act, it is true it is now up to $10,000. The important thing is does the National Defense Education Act actually provide $10,000? My experience with these programs in four colleges is that it will not do this or come anywhere close to doing the job. We expect our program to be funded at a figure which will produce $2,000 a year for each one of these needy optometry students—for students who really need this kind of assistance. This is the difference between the National Defense Education Act program and this program. The only reason we justify this program is simply because it is a health matter and not strictly an educational matter.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill and subscribe to the views expressed by the gentleman from Illinois and the gentleman from Arkansas, the chairman of the committee.

The purpose of this bill is to amend the provisions of H.R. 12, which was enacted into law last year, by including optometry, along with medicine, osteopathy, dentistry, and others. The testimony before the committee indicated that there is a great shortage of optometrists in the country today. In fact, the ratio is one optometrist to every 11,279 persons. The ratio is even greater than the national average in my State of North Carolina, inasmuch as there are only 317 optometrists licensed in the State, which results in only one optometrist for every 14,189 persons.

The need is obvious and the need is compelling. Eyesight and visual aids are of the utmost importance to the Nation. I have long felt that the shortage of health personnel is one of the greatest causes of the many problems which we have in the area of health and physical fitness.

This bill does not provide for doles, gifts, or grants, but for loans to qualified students who otherwise cannot finance their education. These loans will be repaid with interest, both in money and in the tremendous benefits which an educated and trained specialist can render to his people and his country. I urge the favorable consideration of this bill.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Chairman, I am privileged to speak in behalf of the legislation presently before us. It is intended to extend to schools and students of optometry the loan provisions of the Health Professions Assistance Act of 1963.

I cosponsored this legislation, my bill being H.R. 8788, and I remain convinced that it is eminently just and fair.

Under the Health Professions Assistance Act, which the Congress passed during the first session, the establishment and operation of student loan funds is provided at schools of medicine, osteopathy, and dentistry. These fields are recognized as health professions. It is my feeling that optometry cannot be excluded.

In all of our 50 States, optometry is 1 of the 3 health professions accorded licenses.

The hearings before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee indicate that educational costs are comparable to requirements in medicine and dentistry. This is similarly a profession where the student should find advantages accorded the other professions.

There are, I believe, 10 qualified optometry schools in the country. Four of the ten require 4 full years of study. The Association of Schools and Colleges of Optometry has announced that all optometry schools will be expected to institute a 4-year course by 1966.

I earnestly hope that H.R. 8546 will receive enthusiastic endorsement today.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to add my voice to those of my distinguished colleagues in support of H.R. 8546 and related measures to provide for loans to students of optometry.

I concur with the remarks of my colleague, the able Congressman from Alabama, KENNETH ROBERTS, chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Health which approved this badly needed legislation.

I was very much concerned when E. D. Nelson, O.D., president of the Kansas Optometric Association, Topeka, wrote me last May about the shortage of optometrists in Kansas. Kansas today has fewer practicing optometrists than 10 years ago with a larger number of people to be served. Another alarming fact is that of the optometrists practicing in Kansas, at least one-third are 60 years of age or over.

The anticipated 10-year population increase indicates the need to almost double the number of optometry graduates coming into my State of Kansas.

While we have no optometric schools in Kansas, we are fully aware of the need for proper vision care and the professionally trained optometrist. We appreciate these men in Kansas and we need far more of them to provide proper eye care for our growing population.

Optometry is a licensed health profession in every State, territory, and the District of Columbia, and deserves to be on an equal par with the other health professions. Unfortunately, when the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act was passed last year, optometry was not included along with medicine, dentistry, and osteopathy. H.R. 8546 would correct this oversight and place the optometrists on a par with professions in the health field.

The need for trained optometrists to serve the visual welfare of our Nation becomes more acute each year. The American Optometric Association estimates that we must double the rate of our optometric school graduates just to meet current requirements.

Mr. Chairman, this legislation deserves the wholehearted support of the House.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to speak in support of S. 2180, providing loans to students of optometry.

This bill will permit the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to enter into agreements with schools of optometry for the establishment of student loan funds under which students of optometry could receive loans up to $2,000 a year while pursuing full-time courses of study, and would terminate authority for students of optometry to receive student loans under the National Defense Education Act.

Testimony presented to the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, of which I am a member, indicated that the cost of education for a student of optometry averages $2,200 per year, which is not markedly different from the cost of educating a student in any discipline requiring laboratory instruction.

Tuition fees range from $840 to $1,280 per year, the average being $1,050. In addition, each student must purchase certain instruments and tools, at a total average cost of $300, as well as books and academic supplies. Scholarships are available at all 10 schools of optometry, but they are limited in number, and modest in amount; usually between $50 and $400 per year each. Five States—Florida, South Carolina, Georgia, Kentucky and Texas—have passed legislation providing scholarships for home State students to study optometry.

Testimony presented to the committee indicates that there are currently approximately 17,000 practicing optometrists in the United States for a population of 191 million people; a ratio of 1 optometrist to every 11,279 persons. The American Optometric Association estimates that the U.S. vision-care requirements require not less than 1 optometrist for every 7,000 Americans.

Dr. Gordon Heath, O.D., president of the Association of Schools and Colleges of Optometry, stated as follows:

> To put it another way, a nation of 200 million people needs a minimum of 30,000 optometrists to care for its vision needs. This is a conservative figure. Yet to reach it, we will have to graduate a thousand new optometrists a year. At the present time we are not graduating half that number. This last year we had enrollment in the optometry schools of slightly over 550 new students.

Optometrists are needed by the Armed Forces of the United States, and provde care of the vision requirements of 85 percent of the members of our Armed

Forces. There are at present over 400 optometrists serving in the Army, Navy, and Air Force.

The Public Health Services Act provides that loans can be made to students of medicine, dentistry, and osteopathy—and a similar provision should exist for loans to optometry students because optometry is recognized in all 50 States as one of the healing professions. We are asking today simply that the rights given to the other healing professions be extended to students of optometry. Failure to allow this right would be an overt act of discrimination against this fine group. It is not a duplication because under the provisions of this bill loans to the students under the National Defense Education Act would be terminated and, thus, all four of the above healing professions would be put under the same program.

I do agree that there exist a definite need to coordinate student loans under the various education and health bills. This is not the time, however, to attempt such a coordinated program. To settle this matter will require a great deal of study to delineate certain jurisdictional lines. I have assured the members of the Education and Labor Committee I agree with them that the administration of these loans should not be proliferated. At the same time, it is not fair to say to optometry students today that you cannot have the same rights as the other healing professions. This bill should be passed and then we should all join hands to make a valiant effort to delineate jurisdictional lines. Members of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, who are charged specifically with the administration of bills which affect the public health, will be reasonable and fair in attempting to coordinate their activities with those members of the Education and Labor Committee which have jurisdiction over educational matters. Admittedly, the matter should be resolved, but I earnestly submit that it is not fair to delay passage of this bill pending a jurisdictional distinction between the two House committees.

I would like to also say that I personally take pleasure in speaking in behalf of this measure because of my association with the Texas Optometric Association. For 4 years I served as the executive secretary of this State association and during this time I came in personal contact with every member of this professional group. I worked with them day and night. I know them to be dedicated, honorable professional men and I appreciate the experiences I have had with this group and the pleasures I have enjoyed in associating with these dedicated men.

These people are the guardians and protectors of our Nation's vision. I want to see students aspiring to become optometrists receive the best training possible. These loans would help do this. I urge passage of this bill.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to add my support to H.R. 8546, which grants loans to students of optometry and was approved by the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

This bill provides necessary and needed help to this most important health profession. It is vital to our Nation's well-being that every American has adequate vision care. This legislation will help to train the necessary number of optometrists required for the vision needs of our country.

We are very proud of our optometrists in Rhode Island. My brother, Dr. T. Francis Fogarty, Providence, R.I., is himself a member of this noble health profession, and one of the best, I am told, and I am pleased to include as my friends many of this small, overworked, and dedicated group of health practitioners. One of the leaders in the American Optometric Association is Dr. Hayvis Woolf, from Cranston, R.I. Dr. Woolf is chairman of AOA's Committee on Administrative Agencies, and president of the Rhode Island Optometric Association. He is a credit to his profession. We are thankful for men like Dr. Woolf and his fellow optometrists.

Americans, including those in the armed services, are dependent upon members of the optometry profession for most of their vision care needs or for referrals, when indicated, to physicians for medical attention. It is therefore a matter of critical importance that there be a sufficient number of practicing optometrists to meet the needs of our country.

A survey conducted by the American Optometric Association indicates that 7 percent of the optometrists in practice in 1959 were 59 years or older. At least the equivalent of this percentage will die or retire within the next decade. Thus, if optometry is even to be maintained at its present inadequate level, at least 1,190 optometrists must be added annually to its ranks just as replacements over the next 10 years. The profession must be brought progressively up to the full strength demanded for our population—1 for each 7,000 persons. To fulfill the need created by our population growth, we must graduate an additional 465 optometrists annually from our overworked schools.

It is estimated that approximately 32,000 practicing optometrists will be needed by 1974 to care for the vision of 224 million Americans. The schools of optometry must graduate about 1,600 optometrists annually to keep pace with the Nation's minimum requirements.

This legislation is a positive and constructive step in the direction of better health care for our Nation.

I am pleased to support H.R. 8546, to grant loans to students and schools of optometry.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that the opportunity did not present itself earlier to extend my warm commendation to the able gentleman from Texas [Mr. PICKLE], and the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, for their splendid work in bringing to the House and securing the passage of H.R. 8546 having to do with extending to qualified schools of optometry and students of optometry, those provisions of the Public Health Service Act the same treatment with respect to student loans as are provided in those sections for students of medicine, osteopathy and dentistry. This consists of 90 percent Federal funds and 10 percent funds provided from other sources for making loans to students on a full-time course of study at these schools. Small scholarships will be available in all 10 schools of optometry and my State of Florida has already passed legislation providing scholarships for home State students of optometry. The 3 percent interest rates per year over a 10-year period would begin 3 years after the student ceases to pursue the full-time course of study and the $2,000 per year loan would meet the cost of their education.

For some time there has been a growing evidence of the need for optometrists since 191 million people in the United States are now being served by only 17,000 optometrists. I believe we have done the right thing for the young people of America in providing this much-needed legislation to allow them to pursue this career and at the same time insure the continued humanitarian work of the optometrist in the preservation of sight.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

All time has expired.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 8546

A bill to amend title VII of the Public Health Service Act so as to extend to qualified schools of optometry and students of optometry those provisions thereof relating to student loan programs

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 740(a) of the Public Health Service Act is amended by striking out "or dentistry" and inserting "dentistry or optometry".

(b) Section 740(b)(4) of such Act is amended by striking out "or doctor of osteopathy" and inserting "doctor of osteopathy, or doctor of optometry or an equivalent degree".

(c) Section 741(b) of such Act is amended by striking out "doctor of osteopathy" and inserting "doctor of osteopathy, or doctor of optometry or an equivalent degree".

(d) Section 741(c) of such Act is amended by striking out "or dentistry" and inserting "dentistry, or optometry".

Mr. DORN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I returned to Washington last night purely to support and vote for this bill. In my State of South Carolina, there are only 161 licensed optometrists today—1 optometrist for each 14,720 people. The American Optometric Association recommends 1 optometrist for every 7,000 people. The average for the United States is 1 optometrist for every 11,279 people.

The United States is a rapidly growing Nation. In a year or two, our population will exceed 200 million. To fill the need for optometrists, we will have to graduate 1,000 optometrists each year—at the present time we are graduating only approximately 500. This is not nearly enough, Mr. Chairman, to fill the need of our Armed Forces and our civilian population.

This bill is urgently needed. This is a fair bill which will put the optometrists in the same category as the dentists, and medical students. Under this bill, a student of optometry could receive a loan up to $2,000 a year. This bill will permit the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to enter into agreements with schools of optometry to make these student loans available. It is estimated that it will cost a student of optometry on the average, $2,200 per year.

Mr. Chairman, I hope and believe this bill will pass by an overwhelming majority. I urge my colleagues here today to stand up, be counted and do justice to this great profession so dedicated to the public good.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have not asked for this time with any thought that I can contribute in depth to the debate on the pending bill. I have found the debate informative, interesting and at times exciting, and from it I have been led to the conclusion that there is a very definite relationship between good vision and intellectuality.

The speakers on both sides of the question have made it clear that the more optometrists we have the higher will be the vision rating of our people and that good vision and good brains go hand in hand, very much a perfect team.

My colleagues who have visited the State of Illinois, or have become acquainted with our people when touring, doubtless have marveled at the high intellectuality of the people of Illinois.

The debate today, and especially the table on page 3 of the report, have served the useful purpose of highlighting one of the reasons for this proud distinction enjoyed by Illinois.

All 50 States of our beloved Union are listed in the table on page 3, with the population of each and the number of its licensed optometrists and its population per licensed optometrist. The table shows that Illinois has more licensed eye doctors than any other State in the Union, 2,402 in all, or 1 for every 4,012 persons in the State. New York has 2,003, or 1 to every 7,932 persons in that State. Arkansas, the State of the distinguished chairman of the committee reporting this bill, has 1 optometrist to every 11,700 persons in that great State, and Oregon, the home State of the distinguished gentlewoman who graces another great committee of the House, has 1 optometrist for every 6,733 persons.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know that what I have said will influence anyone's voting today, but I do believe my remarks should be noted by everyone in America in search of the perfect land where good vision is everyone's birthright, and if one's eyes start dimming up there are more good and licensed eye doctors to set them aright than in any other place in America, or in all the wide world.

Good men and good women who want to live the happy life and the full life and with vision to take it all in should move to Illinois.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ROOSEVELT, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 8546) to amend title VII of the Public Health Service Act so as to extend to qualified schools of optometry and students of optometry those provisions thereof relating to student loan programs, pursuant to House Resolution 884, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. QUIE) there were—ayes 72, noes 15.

So the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 884, I call from the Speaker's table for immediate consideration the bill S. 2180.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H.R. 8546) was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to extend their remarks in the body of the RECORD during the debate on the bill (H.R. 8546) just concluded.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

SELECT COMMITTEE TO STUDY FACTORS RELATING TO WELFARE AND EDUCATION OF CONGRESSIONAL PAGES

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 847 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That there is hereby created a select committee to be composed of five Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker, one of whom he shall designate as chairman. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

The Committee is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of all of the factors relating to the general welfare and education of congressional pages, including, but not limited to, a study and investigation of the residential, dining, recreational, educational, and physical training facilities and opportunities for such pages, and rates of pay, hours of work, and other conditions governing the employment of such pages.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the Committee, or any subcommittee thereof authorized by the Committee to hold hearings, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the District of Columbia, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or adjourned, and to hold such hearings as it deems necessary; except that neither the Committee nor any subcommittee thereof may sit while the House is meeting unless special leave to sit shall have been obtained from the House.

The Committee shall report to the House as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its investigation and study, together with recommendations regarding the feasibility and desirability of raising the minimum age for Capitol pages to eighteen years, of requiring secondary school graduation as a prerequisite for appointment as a Capitol page, and of providing for the establishment and construction of a Capitol page school and residence, and such other recommendations as it deems advisable. Any such report which is made when the House is not in session shall be filed with the Clerk of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ELLIOTT] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require, after which I shall yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. Speaker, the House resolution before us covers a subject about which there has been a considerable amount of discussion over a period of the past several years. It simply provides that a select committee of five members will be created, and that its members are to be appointed by the Speaker. The committee is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of all of the factors relating to the general welfare and education of congressional pages, including, but not limited to, a study and investigation of the residential, dining, recreational, educational, and physical training facilities and opportunities for the pages, and rates of pay, hours of work, and other conditions governing the employment of pages of the U.S. House of Representatives.

This resolution clearly and concisely states that this select committee having to do with the pages of the House will sit and act during the present Congress. The resolution specifically provides that the committee shall report to the House as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its investigation and study.

I hope that the resolution will be adopted. I feel that this is an opportunity for a select committee to do an excellent and outstanding job in determining the role of the pages of the House for the future. It is a committee that can look specifically into that question without giving consideration to matters that are not connected with it. Its report will be accepted, I am sure, by the House and considered at the appropriate time during the forthcoming session of Congress.

This resolution was introduced by the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN]. I know from discussions I have had with her that she has given much time, thought, and consideration to this problem, as she has done to all matters pertaining to education throughout the time she has served here. Mrs. GREEN has identified this problem, and I think the fact that she is concerned with it brings its solution much nearer. Personally, I regret that I will not be a Member of the House next year and will not be able to work with her. We need to make policy for our pages.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ELLIOTT] has correctly stated the purpose of this resolution. I do not know whether he mentioned that originally, this year, when the Committee on Rules was considering legislation with respect to the extension of the National Defense Education Act there was a provision in that bill for the authorization of funds to construct a school for the pages. The committee at that time questioned whether this was an advisable step, and whether or not in fact we had adequate information with respect to the whole page system to act on that particular provision.

It was wisely decided, I think, that in lieu thereof this particular resolution setting up a select or special committee to look into the entire page system be created.

I remember that, I believe a few months ago, there was a very excellent series of articles in one of the local papers calling attention to the grave concern that some Members of this body have had from time to time over the condition and the welfare of the pages employed by the House, both with respect to their living quarters and some of the other standards that obtain.

I think, as the gentleman from Alabama has said, this resolution will put us on the right course and that with the kind of information we may expect them to come up with, the House will then be prepared to deal intelligently with the page system and to make its recommendations and propose such legislation as may be necessary to correct any unsalutary conditions that may exist at the present time.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no opposition to the adoption of the resolution and I join in urging its adoption.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADDITION TO THE PROGRAM FOR TOMORROW

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I have taken this time for the purpose of announcing an addition to the program for tomorrow. I have been requested to announce that H.R. 6151, to increase the appropriation authorization for the completion of the construction of the irrigation power systems, Flathead Indian irrigation project, Montana, will be brought up.

FEDERAL LOAN GUARANTEE VERSUS PRIVATE

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, an editorial from the Abilene Reporter-News, Abilene, Tex., calls attention to a situation in my city which deserves, yes, demands, remedial action on the part of those who have the responsibility. I want to see the FHA and the Veterans' Administration maintain a good reputation and record for fine Federal service and no suggestion is made that these agencies are derelict. It is suggested that policies, practices, and judgment be exercised to prevent conditions referred to in the following editorial:

DEFAULTS FEW ON PRIVATE LOANS; CONTRAST NOTABLE

> A survey by the Reporter-News, published Thursday afternoon, shows that there are relatively few foreclosures on conventionally financed home loans in Abilene.
>
> These are loans made by insurance companies and other private lending agencies which are not federally insured, either by FHA or the Veterans' Administration.
>
> In Abilene, in recent years, as in other cities, there have been hundreds of FHA-insured loans on homes defaulted and a few VA loans. It has become commonplace for occupants simply to drive off and leave their homes and the loan falls back on the Government.
>
> Some Abilene real estate dealers queried estimated that defaulted conventional home loans amount to less than 5 percent of the total here. But one dealer thinks the percentage is less than 1 percent of all loans foreclosed.
>
> The real estate dealers say persons with conventional home loans usually own more equity in their homes, thus they have more incentive to pay them off.
>
> But undoubtedly there is a more important reason responsible for the conventional loan record. As noted, these are loans that the companies make entirely on their own. If a loan is defaulted, the companies are directly the losers. The Federal Government does not step in and pay off.
>
> Therefore the requirements are more rigid, an applicant's financial condition and credit record are more thoroughly checked, a minimum of risk is involved before the loan is accepted.
>
> The conclusions to be drawn from the contrasting record of foreclosures as between Government-insured and private loans are obvious.
>
> The vast number of defaulted federally insured loans over the country is shocking. It behooves Congress to investigate this problem and take whatever remedial action is required. And it might be well for citizens to make just such a suggestion to their lawmakers in Washington.

CONTROL OF THE MANNED SPACE PROGRAM

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, we have been hearing a great deal about the various and varied positions being taken by the Republican Party's standard bearer on matters of importance to the future of our Nation.

Despite his almost desperate efforts to paraphrase and recant original statements, the image which has been created in the minds of the American people is that of a man who is overly militant. One contribution to this image has not received the attention it deserves.

I refer to an article in the June issue of the magazine, Science and Mechanics. The article entitled, "A Realistic Space Program for America," was written by Senator BARRY GOLDWATER.

In it he made this recommendation:

> All manned space research should be directed by the military, with national security and control of the access to space as primary goals.

To turn all manned space research over to the military would be contrary to the purposes and goals this Nation established even before the beginning of the space age. It is so contrary it can be considered reason for the greatest of alarm.

It is contrary to the admonition of President Eisenhower given in his farewell address before relinquishing that high office. These are Mr. Eisenhower's words:

> In the councils of government we must guard against the acquisition of unwarranted influence, whether sought or unsought, by the military-industrial complex. The potential for the disastrous rise of misplaced power exists and will persist.

I say today, Mr. Speaker, that to give control of the manned space program over to the military would violate the very spirit as well as the underlying principles of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958. To cause a change in such control would create distrust throughout the world about our intentions.

For example, many of our tracking stations are located in other countries. These stations are vital to the success of our program. We were permitted, in many instances, to locate these bases only because we were able to convince the country involved that the bases are not related to the military and are there for peaceful pursuits only.

If we suddenly announce a change in our goal of conquering space for peaceful reasons to one of military reasons I am convinced we would lose a number of these bases. Even more important we would lose the confidence of the world in our stand that we are a peaceloving nation.

For the past 6 years I have had a close and intimate association with our space program. I have an appreciation for the tremendous contributions made by the program to the cause of the free world. I see in the manned space flight program great contributions to our national security. But more than that I see a program which will contribute greatly to the cause of peace.

Candidate GOLDWATER's views again do not represent the mainstream of American thought. His views again do not express convictions which are consistent with recognized American goals.

KEATING RECORD

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, before this session ends, it is my hope that the House will take action on a bill which was authored by the distinguished junior Senator from New York, Mr. KEATING. This bill, which has already been passed by the Senate, would make Columbus Day a national holiday. It would be a fitting commemoration of a great Italian, and a tribute to all Americans of Italian ancestry.

This measure is one of a number of actions which have distinguished Senator KEATING in the eyes of the Italian community. Throughout his 18 years in the Congress, the Rochester Republican has earned the plaudits of Americans of Italian descent by his espousal of causes in their interest. Foremost among these legislative achievements are his dedicated efforts to reform and to liberalize the immigration laws which discriminate against the people of Italy and other Mediterranean countries. In both the House and the Senate, he has made it possible for many individual Italians to enter the United States, through his introduction of private bills in their behalf, and through his intervention with the immigration authorities.

Referring to Senator KEATING's helpful efforts in the case of one young Italian, Capt. Vincent Rossini, the national director of the American Bill of Rights Day Association, wrote:

> You, better than others in Congress, showed and proved a deep interest for a man who deserves help, sympathy, and assistance for himself and his family. * * * We wish to extend to you again the sincerest thanks of many, many Americans of Italian origin.

Senator KEATING's efforts in immigration were recognized by the American Committee on Italian Migration which bestowed upon him a special citation for "his outstanding contribution to the liberalization of the immigration laws of the United States."

The Societa Valguarnera of Rochester made him an honorary president "in recognition for services rendered to the Italian-American people of the United States of America."

In July of 1959, Senator KEATING wrote to Attorney General William Rogers objecting to the defamation of Americans of Italian origin by associating them with criminal gang activities given wide publicity by the Mafia hearings. The Attorney General's sympathetic reply prompted this comment on Senator KEATING's efforts by the Italian News of Boston, Mass.:

> It is most encouraging that this Senator, elected by the people of a great State, has seen fit to bring this issue before the public at a time when others, who should be expected to be more concerned with the subject, have chosen to remain silent.
>
> The action of this man should not go unnoticed. Upon looking over his background, one cannot help but think highly of a political system that can produce a public servant so dedicated to the common weal.
>
> It is evident that serving the public is nothing new for this man. Neither is he afraid of hazardous duty, whether it be on the field of battle or espousing causes for which there may be no immediate political return, but which he knows to be right and in the best interests of all Americans. Our country is indeed fortunate to have such a man in her service. We could certainly use more like him.

Senator KEATING voiced similar protests to Attorney General Kennedy on the occasion of the more recent Valachi hearings. KEATING stated:

> If there is one principle that ought to be well established by our experience in this country, it is that guilt is personal and that no group has a monopoly on either sin or virtue.

As a member of the House, Senator KEATING supported Marshall plan aid for Italy during the crucial postwar years. He is a Knight of Malta—only a few have that honor—and an honorary member of the board of trustees of the Italian Historical Society. He has been the sponsor of legislation to incorporate the Italian-American War Veterans.

Senator KEATING has consistently taken occasion, on commemorative days, to remind the Congress and the Nation of the contribution of Italy and the Italians to the history and growth of the United States and to voice American concern for the maintenance of a free government in Italy. Occasions when he thus spoke out include Alberti Day, Columbus Day, and the anniversary of the Italian Republic.

He has received from the President of the Italian Republic the Cross of Grande Ufficiale in the Order of Merit of the Italian Republic.

Senator KEATING's bill, which he successfully guided through the Senate to recognize Columbus Day as a national holiday, is just another indication of his respect and admiration for the achievements of Italian Americans. As evidence of their respect and admiration for him, I ask unanimous consent that the text of certain messages from Italian-American individuals and groups be printed at this point in the RECORD.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
August 13, 1964.

Hon. KENNETH B. KEATING,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.:

Our organization greatly appreciates the efforts of your committee to provide the foundation that will give to Columbus the recognition he so richly deserves in having October 12 declared a national holiday.

AUGUSTINE J. ANASTASI,
President, Washington, D.C., Police Department, Columbia Association.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
August 14, 1964.

Hon. KENNETH B. KEATING,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.:

Our organization greatly appreciates the efforts of your committee to provide the foundation that will give to Columbus the recognition he so richly deserves in having October 12 declared a national holiday.

THE BERGINO ASSOCIATION, INC.,
ANDREW GIOVINGO,
Executive Officer, Corona, Long Island.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
August 13, 1964.

Hon. KENNETH B. KEATING,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.:

We express our appreciation to you and your committee for providing an opportunity to support S. 108.

FRED J. MIGNOGNA,
President, Long Island City, N.Y., Post Office, Columbia Association.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
August 13, 1964.

Hon. KENNETH B. KEATING,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.:

Greatly appreciate your sincere interest in Columbus Day national holiday. Will never forget. House of Representatives must do likewise.

Sincerely,

LUIGI ANTONINI,
President, United Italian-American Labor Council.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
August 13, 1964.

Hon. KENNETH B. KEATING,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.:

We express our appreciation to you and your committee for providing an opportunity to support S. 108.

JAMES DI PIETRO,
President, New York City Police Department, Columbia Association.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
August 13, 1964.

Hon. KENNETH B. KEATING,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.:

Our organization greatly appreciates the efforts of your committee to provide the foundation that will give to Columbus the recognition he so richly deserves in having October 12 declared a national holiday.

HENRY W. TIRONE,
President, Nassau County Employees' Columbia Association.

BROOKLYN, N.Y.,
August 13, 1964.

Hon. KENNETH B. KEATING,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR KEATING: Please accept my thanks and appreciation for the courtesy and cooperation extended to the committee headed by Mario Biagio and for your usual excellent service in sponsoring bill S. 108, making Columbus Day a national holiday.

LOU PULIPAN,
President, Master Mechanics and Foremans Associations, Brooklyn Navy Yard.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
August 13, 1964.

Hon. KENNETH B. KEATING,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.:

Our organization is grateful for your efforts as well as the other distinguished

Senators on behalf S. 108, which would make Columbus Day a national holiday.

ALEX DI CLEMENTE,
President, National Association of Government Employees, New York Naval Shipyard Local No. 21.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
August 13, 1964.

Hon. KENNETH B. KEATING,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.:

Our organization is grateful for your efforts as well as the other distinguished Senators on behalf S. 108, which would make Columbus Day a national holiday.

ANTHONY LETTERAL,
President, Shop Planners Association, New York Naval Shipyard.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
August 13, 1964.

Hon. KENNETH B. KEATING,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.:

Our organization is grateful for your efforts as well as the other distinguished Senators on behalf S. 108 which would make Columbus Day a national holiday.

Mrs. LUCILE DE GEORGE,
Founder, Amita, Inc.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
August 13, 1964.

Hon. KENNETH B. KEATING,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.:

Grateful for your efforts as well as the other distinguished Senators on behalf of S. 108 which would make Columbus Day a national holiday in fitting tribute to the man who provided the beginning of a great country's history.

GENEROSO POPE, Jr.,
Publisher, National Enquirer.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
August 13, 1964.

Hon. KENNETH B. KEATING,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.:

Our membership of 50,000 police officers throughout New York State expresses its sincere appreciation to your committee for its efforts it expended on S. 108

AL SGAGLIONE,
President, New York State Police Conference.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
August 13, 1964.

Hon. KENNETH B. KEATING,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.:

Our organization is grateful for your efforts as well as the other distinguished Senators on behalf S. 108 which would make Columbus Day a national holiday.

FREDERICK CUTTITTA,
President,
New York City Board of Education.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
August 14, 1964.

Hon. KENNETH B. KEATING,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.:

Our organization is grateful for your efforts as well as the other distinguished Senators on behalf S. 108 which would make Columbus Day a national holiday.

NICHOLAS A. GENTILE,
President, New York City Department of Highways, Columbia Association.

Hon. KENNETH B. KEATING,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.:

Our organization is grateful for your efforts as well as the other distinguished Senators on behalf S. 108 which would make Columbus Day a national holiday.

We heartily endorse the efforts and statement made by Lt. Mario Biaggi, president of the Grand Council of Columbia Associations in Civil Service, Inc., in his testimony before your committee.

Comdr. JAMES MONTUORI,
Disabled American Veterans, Chapter No. 94, New York Naval Shipyard, Brooklyn, N.Y.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
August 14, 1964.

Hon. KENNETH B. KEATING,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.:

We express our appreciation to you and your committee for providing an opportunity to support S. 108.

ANTHONY J. CARRANO,
President,
Mabstoa Columbia Association.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
August 13, 1964.

Hon. KENNETH B. KEATING,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.:

Our organization is grateful for your efforts as well as the other distinguished Senators on behalf of S. 108 which would make Columbus Day a national holiday.

ANTHONY C. MERONE,
President, New York City Court Attachés, Columbia Association.

NEW YORK CITY, N.Y.,
August 13, 1964.

Hon. KENNETH B. KEATING,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.:

Our organization is grateful for your efforts as well as the other distinguished Senators on behalf of S. 108 which would make Columbus Day a national holiday.

GAETANO V. MANGANO,
President, Brooklyn Post Office, Columbia Association.

NEW YORK CITY, N.Y.,
August 13, 1964.

Hon. KENNETH B. KEATING,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.:

Our organization is grateful for your efforts as well as the other distinguished Senators on behalf of S. 108 which would make Columbus Day a national holiday.

DONALD J. MALLOZZI,
President, Flushing, N.Y., Postal District, Columbia Association.

NEW YORK CITY, N.Y.,
August 13, 1964.

Hon. KENNETH B. KEATING,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.:

Our organization is grateful for your efforts as well as the other distinguished Senators on behalf of S. 108 which would make Columbus Day a national holiday.

JOSEPH A. SALUZZI,
President, New York City Housing Authority, Columbia Association.

NEW YORK CITY, N.Y.,
August 13, 1964.

Hon. KENNETH B. KEATING,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.:

We express our appreciation to you and your committee for providing an opportunity to support S. 108.

DOMINIC PIRRELLO,
President, New York City Housing, Police Columbia Association.

NEW YORK CITY, N.Y.,
August 13, 1964.

Hon. KENNETH B. KEATING,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.:

Our organization is grateful for your efforts as well as the other distinguished Senators on behalf of S. 108 which would make Columbus Day a national holiday.

JAMES V. BOCHICCHIO,
President, New York City Department of Buildings, Columbia Association.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
August 13, 1964.

Hon. KENNETH B. KEATING,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.:

Our organization is grateful for your efforts as well as the other distinguished Senators on behalf S. 108 which would make Columbus Day a national holiday.

JACK DOMFORT,
Commander, American Legion, Adm. Charles P. Plunkett Post, No. 1129.
MICHAEL CARUSO,
Past Commander.

NEW YORK, N.Y., *August 13, 1964.*

Hon. KENNETH B. KEATING,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.:

Our organization is grateful for your efforts as well as the other distinguished Senators on behalf of S. 108 which would make Columbus Day a national holiday.

HARRY YANNONE,
Commander, Veterans Association of Federal Employees, New York Naval Shipyard.

NEW YORK, N.Y., *August 13, 1964.*

Hon. KENNETH B. KEATING,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.:

Our organization is grateful for your efforts as well as the other distinguished Senators on behalf of S. 108 which would make Columbus Day a national holiday.

JOHN CATHOLIC WAR VETERANS
POST No. 1813,
New York Naval Shipyard, Brooklyn, N.Y.

NEW YORK, N.Y., *August 13, 1964.*

Hon. KENNETH B. KEATING,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.:

We express our appreciation to you and your committee for providing an opportunity to support S. 108.

GUIDO BLANDA,
President, Metropolitan Federal Employees of New York City, Columbia Association.

AUGUST 13, 1964.

Hon. KENNETH B. KEATING,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.:

We express our appreciation to you and your committee for providing an opportunity to support S. 108.

FRANK CARUSO,
President, New York City Department of Markets, Columbia Association.

Hon. KENNETH B. KEATING,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.:

Our organization is grateful for your efforts as well as the other distinguished Senators on behalf of S. 108 which would make Columbus Day a national holiday.

JOSEPH RAITI,
Chairman, Procurement Committee, New York Naval Shipyard.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
August 14, 1964.

Hon. KENNETH B. KEATING,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.:

Our organization greatly appreciates the efforts of your committee to provide the foundation that will give to Columbus the recognition he so richly deserves in having October 12 declared a national holiday.

RALPH MERIGLIANO,
President, Westchester County Postal Employees, Columbia Association.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
August 14, 1964.

Hon. KENNETH B. KEATING,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.:

We express our appreciation to you and your committee for providing an opportunity to support S. 108.

CARL LO FASO,
President, Jamaica, N.Y., Post Office, Columbia Association.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
August 13, 1964.

Hon. KENNETH B. KEATING,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.:

Our organization is grateful for your efforts as well as the other distinguished Senators on behalf of S. 108 which would make Columbus Day a national holiday.

CHARLES ROZZELLE,
President, National Association of Supervisors, New York Naval Shipyard.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
August 13, 1964.

Hon. KENNETH B. KEATING,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.:

Our organization is grateful for your efforts as well as the other distinguished Senators on behalf of S. 108 which would make Columbus Day a national holiday.

CHARLES LA SALA,
President, Flame Cutters Association, New York Naval Shipyard.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
August 13, 1964.

Hon. KENNETH B. KEATING,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.:

Our organization is grateful for your efforts as well as the other distinguished Senators on behalf of S. 108 which would make Columbus Day a national holiday.

LOUIS HAMMER,
Commander, Veterans of Foreign Wars Post No. 110.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
August 14, 1964.

Hon. KENNETH B. KEATING,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.:

Our organization greatly appreciates the efforts of your committee to provide the foundation that will give to Columbus the recognition he so richly deserves in having October 12 declared a national holiday.

Lt. FRANK CORIALE,
President, Utica, N.Y., Chapter, Columbia Association.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
August 14, 1964.

Senator KENNETH B. KEATING,
Washington, D.C.:

Our organization is grateful for your efforts as well as the other distinguished Senators on behalf of S. 108 which would make Columbus Day a national holiday.

ROCCO EMANICIPATOR,
President, Columbia Association, Brooklyn Naval Shipyard.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
August 14, 1964.

Hon. KENNETH B. KEATING,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.:

Heartily endorse the statements made by Lt. Mario Biaggi, president of the Grand Council of Columbia Associations in Civil Service, Inc., in his testimony before your committee and urge the favorable passage of S. 108.

We are grateful to you and the members of the committee for providing this opportunity.

WILLIAM SPADOLA,
President, New York State Insurance Fund, Columbia Association.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
August 14, 1964.

Hon. KENNETH B. KEATING,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.:

We heartily endorse the statements made by Lt. Mario Biaggi, President of the Grand Council of Columbia Associations in Civil Service, Inc., in his testimony before your committee and urge the favorable passage of S. 108.

We are grateful to you and the members of the committee for providing this opportunity.

ANTHONY PICARELLO,
President, New York State Public Utilities, Columbia Association.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
August 14, 1964.

Hon. KENNETH B. KEATING,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.:

We heartily endorse the statements made by Lt. Mario Biaggi, president of the Grand Council of Columbia Associations in Civil Service, Inc., in his testimony before your committee and urge the favorable passage of S. 108.

We are grateful to you and the members of the committee for providing this opportunity.

ANTHONY PICARELLO,
JAMES J. BONAUITO,
President, Custodian and Custodians Employees, New York City Board of Education, Columbia Association.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
August 14, 1964.

Hon. KENNETH B. KEATING,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.:

Our organization greatly appreciates the efforts of your committee to provide the foundation that will give to Columbus the recognition he so richly deserves in having October 12 declared a national holiday.

DONATO IOVINO,
President, U.S. Military Supply Depot.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
August 14, 1964.

Hon. KENNETH B. KEATING,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.:

Our organization greatly appreciates the efforts of your committee to provide the foundation that will give to Columbus the recognition he so richly deserves in having October 12 declared a national holiday.

PASQUALE F. SCHIANO,
President, New York City Department of Welfare, Columbia Association.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
August 14, 1964.

Hon. KENNETH B. KEATING,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.:

We heartily endorse the statements made by Lt. Mario Biaggi, president of the Grand Council of Columbia Associations in Civil Service, Inc., in his testimony before your committee and urge the favorable passage of S. 108.

We are grateful to you and the members of the committee for providing this opportunity.

JOHN GARUFI,
President, New York Post Office, Columbia Association.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
August 14, 1964.

Hon. KENNETH B. KEATING,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.:

We heartily endorse the statements made by Lt. Mario Biaggi, president of the Grand Council of Columbia Associations in Civil Service, Inc., in his testimony before your committee and urge the favorable passage of S. 108.

We are grateful to you and the members of the committee for providing this opportunity.

FRANK TAMBURELLO,
President, New York Port Authority, Columbia Association.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
August 14, 1964.

Hon. KENNETH B. KEATING,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.:

We heartily endorse the statements made by Lt. Mario Biaggi, president of the Grand Council of Columbia Associations in Civil Service, Inc., in his testimony before your committee and urge the favorable passage of S. 108.

We are grateful to you and the members of the committee for providing this opportunity.

JOSEPH DE RENZI,
President, New York City Department of Parks, Columbia Association.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
August 14, 1964.

Hon. KENNETH B. KEATING,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.:

We heartily endorse the statements made by Lt. Mario Biaggi, president of the Grand Council of Columbia Associations in Civil Service, Inc., in his testimony before your committee and urge the favorable passage of S. 108.

We are grateful to you and the members of the committee for providing this opportunity.

ALFRED SARNO,
President, New York State Employees, Columbia Association.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
August 14, 1964.

Hon. KENNETH B. KEATING,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.:

We heartily endorse the statements made by Lt. Mario Biaggi, president of the Grand Council of Columbia Associations in Civil Service, Inc., in his testimony before your committee and urge the favorable passage of S. 108.

We are grateful to you and the members of the committee for providing this opportunity.

CHARLES SALMIERI,
President, New York City Transit Police Department, Columbia Association.

INTER-AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK

Mr. WHALLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARRY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, within the Inter-American system the Latin American countries are making great efforts toward coordinating their economic and social policies. At the same time these countries are looking toward better economic, financial, and political relationships with countries beyond the American perimeter and especially to Europe.

There is today a great need for external financial and technical assistance to Latin America. The Inter-American Development Bank has been particularly active in stimulating noninflationary capital for long-term projects. However, there is a great need for Latin America to obtain additional capital from the industrialized nations of Europe. This is especially necessary since European capital now going to these countries is still very limited. The natural instrument for channeling a large part of new capital into Latin America is the Inter-American Development Bank, which has the expertise of financing multilateral development in the area.

Mr. Felipe Herrera, President of the Inter-American Development Bank, has coordinated some of his efforts with me and has found a favorable atmosphere, and an excellent disposition of certain European countries to participate in the Bank's activities. Recently a joint group from the Inter-American Committee on the Alliance for Progress and the Inter-American Development Bank presented proposals to the Development Assistance Committee—DAC—of the OECD in Paris to increase capital in order to improve the quantity and distribution of financial aid from DAC members to Latin America by utilizing the services of the Inter-American Development Bank.

I have discussed this matter in hearings of the Banking and Currency Committee at which members of the House Foreign Affairs Committee were invited. In my colloquy with Secretary Dillon and later with Secretary Rusk, I found great acceptance and enthusiasm for the idea. In January of this year, I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 260 encouraging participation in the activities of the Bank by the industrialized free world countries. Yesterday, I introduced a somewhat similar resolution which expresses the sense of this Congress that the purpose of the Inter-American Development Bank could be further implemented by permitting and encouraging industrialized nations' participation in Inter-American Bank activities, and that the United States should cooperate fully with the efforts of Inter-American Development Bank to attract this participation.

I am informed that a committee of the Executive Directors of the Bank is actively studying the adoption of such measures necessary to facilitate the participation of countries which presently are not members. With the unanimous consent of this Congress, we, as the largest participant in the Inter-American Bank can let it be known that we welcome and encourage the interest recently expressed by nonmember countries in assisting Latin American development.

LETTER FROM THOMAS S. GATES TO HON. ROBERT S. McNAMARA

Mr. WHALLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, a number of outstanding citizens have served as Secretary of Defense, among them my very good friend Tom Gates. In World War II Tom Gates and I served together on the aircraft carrier, USS *Monterey* (CVL 26). During the Eisenhower administration while he served as Secretary of the Navy, Under Secretary of Defense, and later as Secretary of Defense we worked closely together to build and maintain the military strength of our country.

It is my strong conviction that Tom Gates did an excellent job in all of his assignments in the executive branch of the Government under President Eisenhower, and in my opinion Tom Gates while Secretary of Defense made a significant contribution to our Nation's national security. Any comment to the contrary is unfair and unwarranted.

Because of my great respect for him and our long friendship, I am including as a part of my remarks a letter from Thomas S. Gates to his successor as Secretary of Defense, the Honorable Robert S. McNamara.

The letter follows:

SEPTEMBER 15, 1964.

Hon. ROBERT S. McNAMARA,
Secretary of Defense,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BOB: This is in acknowledgment of the dispatch which you sent to me via Dow Air Force Base while I was in Maine. It also is intended to convey to you my answer to certain statements you made in your appearance before the Democratic Party platform committee on August 17.

The text of your presentation to that committee, as printed in the New York Times, included the following statement relating to conditions as you found them on taking office as Secretary of Defense:

"In 1961, we found military strategy to be the stepchild of a predetermined budget. A financial ceiling was placed on national security and funds were allocated, not on the basis of military requirements, but according to the dictates of an arbitrary fiscal policy."

In your presentation you also:

1. Charged that the Defense Establishment under the previous administration had been operating with but a single strategy;
2. Described the planning of the respective military services as being without coordination;
3. Characterized the weapons inventory as "completely lacking in certain major elements required for combat readiness;"
4. Alleged that the Nation's strategic nuclear force was vulnerable to surprise missile attack.

I submit that these statements are not a true representation of the Department of Defense of which you assumed charge in 1961. Since you have often given me and the Eisenhower administration great credit for having provided a proper background and framework for your own policies, and since you took over your present office in what I think we have agreed was an orderly and fruitful transition, I cannot believe that you agree with these statements yourself. I am totally unable to reconcile what you told the platform committee with the tone and content of your dispatch to me.

The characterization you gave before the platform committee of national defense as it existed under the Eisenhower administration was a direct attack on the judgment and competence of President Eisenhower as Commander in Chief, and of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Service Secretaries, and the Secretaries of Defense who bore the responsibility for national defense under his leadership.

If the conditions actually had been as you have described them, then I could not conscientiously have remained in office—nor would I have been allowed to; in fact, if our defense posture then had actually been in the state of disorder you have painted, I doubt that anyone could have corrected it in the time you have been in office.

If the allegations you made, at complete variance not only with the content of your dispatch to me but also with a number of statements you had earlier put on the public record, were inserted in your presentation to serve a political purpose, then August 17 was an unfortunate day for the process of Government in this Nation. I can understand easily that there come times when the defense policies and programs of an administration must be defended. You may recall that I had that experience when I was obliged to combat and clarify publicly the phony issue of a so-called missile gap.

I agree completely that the national interest and the credibility of our defense posture require the Secretary of Defense to speak out. I would not have chosen the forum of a national political platform committee as the place to do this; but even in that forum, it would have been possible to defend administration policies affirmatively and aggressively without making charges against those who preceded you and did their best to insure the Nation's security, and whose efforts you earlier had found frequent occasion to commend.

In 1960 I testified in open hearing before the Committee on Government Operations and the Subcommittee on National Security Staffing and Operations, headed by Senator JACKSON of Washington, stating my belief that the Secretary of Defense should not be involved in politics, and in due course I hoped the office would become truly nonpartisan in character. I have not made any public statements or speeches dealing with national defense during the nearly 4 years since I left public office. When called upon, I have tried to be helpful because I know, as you do, how difficult the job is, and I am conscious that only the long future will judge how well anyone has administered the inexact science of national defense.

I am no more desirous than you of becoming involved in political arguments concerning the Nation's security. Because of this, and because of our friendship, I regret that it is necessary to make public reply to the charges you have lodged, but you have placed them on the public record and I cannot let them stand without challenge. I, therefore, intend to release this letter publicly after it has been delivered to your office. Since your statements before the platform committee are already on the record, I would hope that you also will make public your dispatch to me, to which I have referred in this letter.

Sincerely,

THOMAS S. GATES.

FROGS AND FREEDOM

Mr. WHALLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAGUE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, history records that the advance of socialism has usually been a deliberate process rather than one of violent revolution. Indeed, the constant appeal of those who offer some new benefit out of the government grab-bag usually results in a gradual loss of freedom until finally the nation finds itself thoroughly enmeshed in the toils of bureaucracy.

Those who decry the attachment of state hospitalization to social security are firmly persuaded that the end result will be socialized medicine and the possible collapse of our basic retirement program. And Federal aid to education must inevitably result in federally controlled public schools, since the Supreme Court has ruled that whatever the Government subsidizes it must control.

One of my valued constituents, Mrs. George D. Conn, of Malvern, Pa., has just sent me a leaflet entitled "Frogs and Freedom," a dissertation on the subtlety of those who promote "the great society" and a reminder that we had better jump before it is too late. I commend it to your perusal:

FROGS AND FREEDOM

There is an old story that says you cannot kill a frog by dropping him in boiling water. He reacts so quickly to the sudden heat that he jumps out before he is hurt. But if you put him in cold water and then warm it up gradually, he never decides to jump till it is too late. By then he is cooked.

Men are just as foolish. Take away their freedom overnight, and you have got a violent revolution. But steal it from them gradually (under the guise of "security," "peace," or "progress") and you can paralyze an entire generation. Look at the income tax. It started out as a harmless sounding of 1 percent. It would have been easy to jump out of water as tepid as this, but like the frog, we waited while it climbed ever higher. (Try jumping now.)

Worst of all, we never learn. Even today we cannot believe that medicare is the same warm water that will one day boil us in socialized medicine. We see no connection between farm price supports and nationalized agriculture. And if we draw a parallel between subsidized teachers' pay and Federal control of education, we are called extremist.

The tragedies of history are always repeated by those who refuse to learn them. To seek guidance from the past is not "turning the clock back" as we are so often told. It is merely a good way to keep out of hot water.

LOANS TO STUDENTS OF OPTOMETRY

Mr. WHALLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANDERSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 8546, which would permit the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to enter into agreements with schools of optometry for the establishment of student loan funds under which students of optometry could receive loans up to $2,000 a year while pursuing full-time courses of study.

I am a sponsor of a similar bill that was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. In fact, I was privileged to appear personally before that committee to give testimony lending my enthusiastic support for early action by the Congress as is now proposed in the bill before us today.

It is my firm belief that in all fairness we ought to approve this measure today. This bill now before us would amend existing legislation to the extent that it would provide the same treatment with respect to student loans for students of optometry that is now provided for students of medicine, osteopathy, and dentistry.

Surely, the student of optometry faces the same financial problems, long years of study, and other difficulties encountered by every other student seeking a career in a major health profession. To exclude this group that provides vision care to some 100 million people in the United States who are estimated to be in need of such care would surely be grossly unfair.

I would also like to take this time to point out to my colleagues here today that there is an existing severe shortage of licensed optometrists. Our yearly needs for graduate optometrists run in the neighborhood of some 1,000 new optometrists per year, while this last year we had enrollment in the optometry schools of slightly over 550 new students. The repayable loan program contemplated by this measure will surely go a long way in alleviating such a shortage, which otherwise might grow worse. We have an expanding population that is coupled with an increase in longevity, all of which is resulting in an increasing demand for optometrists in industry, research, and in our armed services.

DUMPING PRACTICES DEPRESSING FARM PRICES

Mr. WHALLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. KYL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, once again the "dumping" practices of the Agriculture Department are depressing farm prices and posing another crisis for our farmers.

The Government has sold more than 104 million bushels of wheat through September 18, compared with 65 million for the comparable period a year earlier. The sales have made the floor price the ceiling price and have actually dropped U.S. prices below world levels.

The Department itself points to the seriousness of the situation. In its Outlook issue, the Department predicts that use of wheat for feed will more than quadruple this year compared with last year. The official report itself says "the increase would stem from competitiveness between wheat and feed grain prices."

The Chicago brokerage firm of Hayden, Stone, noting the price situation, has recommended that "feed dealers take advantage of the situation by using wheat as a primary ingredient in feed preparations."

This year, farmers felt the result of dumping feed grains on the market when livestock prices dipped to disastrously low levels. Midwest feed grain producers now face the other barrel of the shotgun because the dumping of wheat, according to the Department's own testimony, will cut the utilization of feed grains. Not only is the wheat price being depressed, but the competing feed grains will suffer a similar or worse fate.

The dumping practice must be halted.

THE STATE OF OUR ECONOMY

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, September 17, our distinguished Secretary of the Treasury, Hon. Douglas Dillon, made a most informative and perceptive speech on the state of our economy before the National Industrial Conference Board. I commend this thoughtful speech to my colleagues:

REMARKS BY THE HONORABLE DOUGLAS DILLON, SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY, BEFORE THE NATIONAL INDUSTRIAL CONFERENCE BOARD AT THE WALDORF-ASTORIA HOTEL, NEW YORK, N.Y., SEPTEMBER 17, 1964

In assessing the economic outlook for 1965, it is important that we take stock of where we are and how we got here. It is also important, in the buoyant, even exuberant, economic climate of this fall, to recall how different was the climate in the fall of 1960. I have read no better description of those days than the words of your president, Bruce Palmer, who, in setting the tone for this meeting, said, and I quote:

"At the beginning of the sixties both the short-term and the long-term business outlook were clouded with uncertainty. In particular, much attention was directed to the fact that the postwar expansions were getting shorter, and that the rate of economic growth appeared to be slowing. The unemployment rate seemed to be deteriorating progressively, and business expansion and investment were being held in check by narrowing profit margins."

Then, Mr. Palmer sums up the present by saying:

"In the past several years, however, American business has enjoyed one of the longest peacetime recoveries of this century. The vitality of the current recovery is reassuring evidence of the underlying strength of the economy."

This remarkable change did not just happen. It was due to the conscious and successful efforts of Government to provide a climate in which our free enterprise system could flourish—a conscious decision to place primary emphasis on stimulating the private sector of our economy rather than on massive governmental action.

Before discussing these policies let us look at the record. The current recovery, as you know, is now well into its fourth year, and—if we measure it against previous experience—should long ago have drawn its last breath. Nevertheless, the expansion continues to display remarkable vigor and balance. This record of longevity, strength, and balance, is particularly impressive in view of the successively shorter lives of earlier postwar expansions.

From the first quarter of 1961 to the second quarter of 1964, our gross national product in constant dollars has risen by $93.7 billion—an annual rate of increase in real terms of about 5.3 percent. The Federal Reserve Board's index of industrial production has risen even more sharply. By August of this year, the production index was 28.9 percent above its February 1961 level—an annual rate of increase of 7.3 percent.

When previous expansions temporarily achieved corresponding gains in output, those gains were frequently accompanied by sharp rises in costs and prices. This time, no such disruptive increases have occurred. They need not occur, and, if we hope to maintain the current expansion, they must not occur. To forestall them, it is essential that we continue to make large productivity increases and to exercise overall restraint in wage bargaining and in pricing policy.

More than anything else, it has been the rapid strides in productivity over the past 3½ years that have helped to keep manufacturing labor costs per unit of output from rising, despite steady increases in wages. Wholesale price levels have been stable since early 1961, and increases in consumer prices have been very moderate. Profits have steadily expanded. As a result, our competitive position abroad has become much stronger—and, here at home, the gains from a more productive economy are being widely and equitably shared, instead of being eaten up by price increases.

We have also made good progress in reducing unemployment, although we still have a long way to go. Since February 1961, nonfarm employment has risen by 4.8 million. Unemployment as a percentage of the civilian labor force has fallen from 6.9 percent in February 1961 to last month's 5.1 percent. During that same period, the rate of unemployment for married men—an important indicator—declined even more sharply, from 4.7 to 2.6 percent.

As the economy continues to rise we will continue to bring the unemployment rate down. However, the closer we come to our interim goal of 4 percent unemployment, the nearer we get to so-called "hard-core," or "structural," unemployment. Policies designed to speed overall economic growth cannot in themselves alleviate that kind of unemployment, which calls for special measures, both Government and private, specifically designed to root out its causes. That is a major goal of the recently enacted antipoverty bill, the most powerful and imaginative attack on "hardcore" unemployment in our history.

Long-range gains in employment and output also depend critically upon our ability to carry on a high rate of capital formation—not just in fits and starts, but steadily over time, in response to expanding markets and emerging profit opportunities. There was a disturbing tendency in the 1950's for business fixed investment to decline as a percentage of total national output. Even worse, that decline was permitted to occur at a time when many other countries were rapidly expanding their capital facilities and replacing obsolescent plant and equipment. As a result, those countries became increasingly formidable competitors in international markets.

When we were confronted with this situation in early 1961, we recognized that American free enterprise was hampered by policies that had long been restricting investment. We believed that American business ingenuity and drive, freed of artificial brakes upon expansion and given proper Government encouragement, could not only meet the challenge of foreign competition but could also provide the jobs that were so badly needed here at home. We saw no reason to continue with policies that hindered investment. So we moved quickly to carry out two major fiscal steps that would provide substantial and long overdue increases in the incentives for private domestic investment in new plant and equipment:

First, the Treasury completely revised depreciation guidelines for tax purposes. That was the first such revision in more than 20 years—although those 20 years had witnessed vast changes in industrial practice.

Second, a tax credit of 7 percent on new investment in machinery and equipment was included as a key element in the Revenue Act of 1962, and was further strengthened in the Revenue Act of 1964.

The combined effect of those two measures has been to increase the profitability of a typical investment in new equipment by more than 25 percent. Their impact in terms of incentives to invest was equivalent to a reduction in the corporate profits tax from 52 percent to about 38 percent.

In this connection, the Treasury has, as you know, contracted with the National Industrial Conference Board to conduct a survey of company experience with the 1962 depreciation guidelines and rules. The results of that survey, which will be available in a few weeks, should provide valuable data for a broad review of those guidelines and in particular of the reserve ratio test. They should be most helpful in determining what, if any, adjustments may be necessary in our current regulations.

This year we took another—and even larger—fiscal step in encouraging greater capital formation and faster economic growth. This was, of course, the 1964 tax cut, which reduced individual and corporate income taxes by $11.5 billion. Those reductions could not prudently have been proposed any sooner. For, from the beginning of 1961, it was clear that an increase in Government outlays for defense and space was inevitable, and we had to expect continued moderate increases in the interest cost on the national debt.

Because of those unavoidable increases for defense, space, and debt service, it was imperative that we exercise the closest control over all other budget costs. In this we have been supremely successful, as one simple comparison makes crystal clear: Over the 4 fiscal years 1961 through 1965, expenditure increases, incurred and planned, on all Federal budget items other than defense, space, and interest, will have been limited to a total of about $4 billion.

I wonder how those who have recently characterized that increase as "a wild spending spree" would characterize the record of the preceding 4 fiscal years, 1957–61, when those same expenditure items increased by a full $6 billion—or by half again as much? As a former member of President Eisenhower's administration, I can testify that he worked long and hard to hold down Government spending. For that very reason I believe that President Johnson, and President Kennedy before him, deserve the fullest credit for their success in reducing that earlier $6 billion increase by a full 33 percent.

I recognize that this comparison between administrations leave out the substantial—and unavoidable—increases in defense expenditures since 1960. But I do not think that in these days any responsible person can question the national need for an adequate military defense. That comparison also leaves out the basic policy decision to step up our space program and regain the lead we lost to the Soviet Union at the time of sputnik. However much one may disagree with that decision, it alone cannot be used to characterize the record of the past 4 years as a "spending spree."

On the contrary, with all items included, Federal budget expenditures in fiscal 1965, as a percentage of gross national product, will be at their lowest point since 1951, and the national debt, also as a percentage of gross national product, will be lower than it was in 1939 before the onset of World War II. Ten years ago, 33.3 percent of all Government employees were Federal; today, only 24.9 percent are.

Beginning with his first budget message, President Johnson has demonstrated amply and repeatedly his conviction that Government must apply the sternest tests of efficiency and frugality to all of its activities. For example, he has ordered three successive drops in Federal employment ceilings, and actual Federal employment at the end of this past fiscal year was more than 20,000 below the level of a year earlier. For another example, in my own Treasury Department we have had an active management improvement program in effect for the past 18 years. Yet fiscal 1964 saw the highest annual recurring savings ever achieved under this program. Moreover, fiscal 1962 and 1963 were the third and fourth best years of the entire program. Our 4-year total savings exceed those of any earlier 4-year period by almost 50 percent.

With this I rest my case. The figures speak for themselves. They show that the past 4 years have witnessed the most frugal operation of our Federal Government in many years.

It is precisely because expenditure increases since 1961 have been so strictly limited to clearly essential items that it was possible in 1963 to propose—and this year to set in motion—the large additional boost in investment incentives contained in the Revenue Act of 1964. The stimulative effect of that tax cut, together with depreciation reform and the investment tax credit, will be large and lasting. The response is already clearly evident: Plant and equipment expenditures for the full year 1964 are now expected to exceed $44 billion—13 percent more than in 1963.

Our satisfaction over such economic advances is compounded by our success in achieving a record of price stability unexcelled by any other major industrialized country in the entire free world.

An essential element in maintaining price stability has been the Treasury's successful effort to finance our budget deficits in a conservative, noninflationary manner. Since January 1961, commercial bank holdings of Government securities have declined by $3½ billion. Not only have our deficits been completely financed outside the commercial banking system, but we have lengthened the average maturity of the marketable debt from 4 years and 6 months in January 1961, to 5 years and 4 months at the end of last month, the highest since mid-1956. The total increase in the Government's marketable debt from January 1961 to August 1964 amounted to $18½ billion. This has been more than matched by an increase of $26 billion in the marketable debt maturing in more than 5 years, while at the same time the under-5-year debt has been reduced by $7½ billion. By thus lengthening the average maturity of the debt and placing large amounts of longer term securities in the hands of institutional investors, we have avoided any buildup in inflationary potential.

As you know, one of the basic beliefs underlying our economic policies is that the chronic budget deficits which began in the midfifties are not the willful product of wasteful spending. Instead, we view them as the unwanted, unwelcome children of a delinquent economy—an economy that has not lived up to its potential. Today, the rising revenues generated by a growing economy are carrying us toward one of our primary goals—a balanced budget in a balanced economy. Our policy of tax reduction, coupled with rigorous expenditure control, is clearly working and working well.

These buoyant results raise the prospect of further tax cuts in the future. By next year, we should be in a position to undertake an overhaul of the welter of excise taxes remaining from World War II days. We have about 75 categories of such taxes on the books today, and their labyrinthine complexity requires, not the random repeal of a few taxes, but a thoroughgoing revision based on a comprehensive study of them all, which the Treasury already has well underway. It will benefit enormously from the evidence amassed by the House Ways and Means Committee during public hearings this past summer. And once our excise system is revamped, further economic advances can open the way to additional reductions in income taxes in the years ahead.

A word about timing may be in order here: Taxes are all-pervasive and deeply influence all facets of our lives. They should be changed only after the most careful study. It was for this reason that the Treasury opposed a "quickie" tax cut in the summer of 1962, even though many economists and business leaders were calling for just such a cut because they feared that a recession was imminent. And it was for this very same reason that the Treasury last spring strongly opposed the fiscally irresponsible attempt to attach, without the slightest examination in the proper congressional committees an additional half-billion-dollar excise tax cut to this year's carefully considered income tax reductions.

And it is precisely the same reason that no one with the slightest understanding of fiscal affairs and economic events—with the slightest awareness of how fluid is their current shape, let alone their future course—could countenance the prospect of blindly and irrevocably binding us to annual tax cuts for many years ahead regardless of the future state of the economy.

In the conduct of economic policy, moderation is no vice—it is an absolute and virtuous necessity. It is that quality, among others, that has accounted, not only for the remarkable progress in our domestic economy during the past 3½ years, but also for our satisfactory progress in reducing the deficit in our balance of payments.

As you know, our international accounts are much improved. In the first half of last year, the balance-of-payments deficit on regular transactions ran at an annual rate of $5 billion. In the first half of this year, the deficit on this same basis was reduced by over 60 percent to an annual rate of $1.8 billion. We can credit this sharp improvement to smaller capital outflows as a result of the special measures we took in July of 1963, to the continued improvement in our exports, and to continuing reductions in Government spending overseas.

We have also stemmed the decline in our gold stock. Gold losses, which began on a large scale in 1958, averaged $1.7 billion annually for the 3 years 1958 through 1960. We managed to approximately halve those losses in 1961 and 1962, and then cut them to well under $500 million in 1963. So far this year, our total gold stock has actually increased. And that is not all. On August 31, for the first time since 1957, when the Suez crises sent gold pouring to our shores, our total gold stock showed a modest gain over the previous year. Twelve months without a loss of a single ounce of gold—a far cry from the situation just 4 years ago, when fears for the soundness of our dollar sent the price of gold in London skyrocketing to over $40 an ounce. Having returned only a few days ago from the annual meetings of the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank in Tokyo, I can certify that today, unlike 4 years ago, there is everywhere the firmest confidence in our ability to maintain the fixed relationship between gold and the dollar that anchors the entire international financial system. Behind these gains lies constant effort to strengthen our competitive position in the world and to limit our commitments to our capabilities. That effort must be continued and intensified until we reach our goal of full balance in our international payments.

We have accomplished much in nearly 4 years, but there is much more to be accomplished. No future challenge will be more crucial than maintaining our excellent record of cost-price stability and avoiding the inflation that could easily eat up the gains we have struggled so hard to achieve, that could once again threaten the value of our dollar, and that could destroy all our efforts to bring our international payments into balance.

As we stand, then, on the threshold of 1965, we find ourselves on firm economic ground, on the secure foundation of 3½ years of unparalleled progress on all economic fronts. Equally great gains lie before us if only we adhere to the policies to whose soundness and success our economy attests on every hand as it continues its record-breaking march.

Those policies are distinguished by their practicality—by their flexibility—by their prudence—by their freedom from extremes and from rigid dogma—and by their ability to adapt to the needs of our rapidly changing economic scene. It is those characteristics that have enabled us to simultaneously achieve different, even disparate, economic goals. Only policies that are responsive to events can be equal to events. Should we ever revert to policies that neither respect nor reflect the rapidly changing realities of today's world, then we must be prepared once again to be overwhelmed by events.

If, indeed, we have the will to persevere with economic policies that have proved themselves to be both sound and sensible, realistic, and responsible—then there is every prospect that the solid accomplishments of the past 3½ years cannot only be sustained, but surpassed.

LOANS TO STUDENTS OF OPTOMETRY

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GRABOWSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, as a cosponsor of H.R. 8546, I wish to impress my colleagues with the importance of extending to students of optometry the same privilege granted medical students, osteopathic, and dental students—the privilege of participating in the student loan programs set up by the Federal Government.

As originally conceived the law would encourage young men and women in their pursuit of an education in the health professions and thereby help to alleviate the shortage of qualified personnel which has become increasingly more apparent throughout the Nation.

For those who would dedicate themselves to a lifetime of service to others and who under ordinary circumstances could not afford the expenditure for the necessary education, a loan of up to $2,000 a year, permitting full-time study, has been a great boon.

The loans are repayable over a period of 10 years beginning 3 years after the student has completed his course of study. As far as I am concerned this is one of the most beneficial educational programs we have developed both for the individual student and for the entire Nation.

Though these provisions are already in effect for students in the fields of medicine, osteopathy, and dentistry, as has been mentioned, optometry was not included in the original legislation. I am convinced it is essential to rectify this oversight. A career in optometry should be awarded equivalent advantages as a career in medicine or dentistry for it is one of the three health professions in the United States licensed by all 50 States, territories, and the District of Columbia.

We have been presented with and have met many challenges in the past months, but none touching on so basic an issue—the health of the human eye—as faces us today. Optometry colleges should be graduating 1,000 students a year to meet the needs of our population. At present they graduate approximately half that number.

According to the electric population clock in the Department of Commerce there were 192,825,327 people in our country this very morning. Our population increases by 300 persons every hour—17,000 practicing optometrists—this is the American Optometric Association's own figure—can meet barely half our needs.

When did we become a nation satisfied by halfway measures? Can we afford halfway measures?

We would be shortsighted and certainly in need of a qualified optometrist to clinically examine and prescribe for us if we fail to favorably act on H.R. 8546. There are, indeed, none so blind as those who cannot or will not see.

EDUCATION AND THE EASTON, PA., AREA HIGH SCHOOL

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ROONEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, knowing the deep and enlightened concern a vast majority of my distinguished colleagues have for a constantly improving educational system for America's children, I would like to call attention, today, to the record established by one of the many excellent schools in my district.

This Nation's future lies in the hands of young men and young women who are now enrolled in our public and private schools. We of the 15th Congressional District are proud of the growing support we have given to good education at the local level. I think we have a right, also, to be proud of the way in which these schools, their administrators, and faculty members have worked cooperatively to raise the standard of classroom teaching and diversify the curriculums offered from kindergarten through graduation.

The new Easton Area High School in Easton, Pa., is one of the most talked about and written about American high schools in the last 10 years. It is the most famous of the large new senior high schools built in the past 5 years.

It is known for its school within a school program: Three grade level principals, one for each grade; head principal coordinates entire program. There are only 40 of these schools in the entire United States. The school has an enrollment of 2,100 and a staff of 100.

It is known primarily for the Easton Area High School team teaching program, one of the best known team teaching programs in the country. In this program teachers instruct students in groups of 100 one day, and on following days work individually with pupils on an advanced, college-level basis. The school has produced 20 national merit scholarship finalists and 53 letters of commendation winners in the past 4 years.

Edward Tracy, Easton's Superintendent of Schools, initiated the school within a school concept and the team teaching program, and the enterprise has achieved its present eminence through the close support and enlightened attitude of the Easton Area Joint School Committee, headed by Charles W. G. Fuller, chairman. Carl H. Peterson is high school principal.

In the past 2 years, the school has averaged 70 visitors per month from all over the United States, Canada, Europe, and Great Britain. It has played host to guests interested in the building and the program from every State in the Union.

Ninety-six German architects spent an entire day examining the school and observing its program. The "Prime Minister" of Bath, England, spent a day at the school. A school is now going up in Quebec, Canada, which is modeled on the Easton Area High School as a result of a Canadian delegation's visit to the school. The school and its program were featured on a half-hour television show out of Philadelphia last year. Staff members have served as speakers at over 100 educational conferences and workshops in the past 3 years. The school received the American Registered Architects' Association first-place award for all secondary schools at the ARA convention in Chicago in 1962. The award was given to Buchart Associates, Lancaster, Pa., architects and engineers, for the school, in recognition of outstanding work for excellence of design.

The school has carefully documented its curricular innovations. It has published its own brochure, the Easton Area High School team teaching program, sent out on request to over 200 school systems throughout the country.

Other curriculum publications printed by the school in its own printshop are as follows:

"The Conant Report and Easton High School."

"Easton Area High School Student Guide."

"Easton Area High School Curriculum Brochure."

"Course of Study in English."

"Course of Study in Social Studies."

"Course of Study in Mathematics."

"Course of Study in Science."

"Course of Study in Foreign Languages."

"Course of Study in Business Education."

"Course of Study in Art."

"Course of Study in Music."

"Course of Study in Physical Education (includes Driver Education)."

"Course of Study in Technical-Industrial."

"Course of Study in Guidance."

"Course of Study in Health."

"Course of Study in Library."

"Easton Area High School Administrative Handbook."

The staff has written a number of articles, published in various educational magazines, about the school:

"Is Team Teaching for Your School?" C. Peterson, American School Board Journal, October 1962.

This article is being reprinted in a forthcoming book by Smith & McGuigg, "Secondary Schools Today," Houghton Miflin Co.

"The Easton Area High School Team Teaching Program," C. Peterson and E. Tracy, NASSP Journal, January 1962.

"School Size and Diverse Offerings Keys to the Effective Secondary School Curriculum," C. Peterson, Scribe, March 1963.

"Team Teaching's Three Variables," C. Peterson, American School Board Journal, October or November 1964.

"Team Teaching in the High School," C. Peterson, Education magazine, coming fall issue, 1964.

Forthcoming book by EAHS Principal C. H. Peterson: "The Easton Area High School System—An Effective Team Teaching Program for Your School."

"Classroom Control for New Teachers," C. Peterson, the Clearing House, 1962.

One of the school's curriculum publications: "The Conant Report and Easton Area High School," has been reprinted in a book entitled "Curriculum Improvement," A. Oliver, Dodd & Mead, 1963.

It is one of the only two high schools in the country with a federally sponsored research grant to determine more effective uses of language laboratories, using the school's own equipment and personnel.

Administrators of the school have spoken on the school's advanced methods of dealing with students on an independent study basis at educational conventions in St. Louis, Mo., and Chicago, Ill.

Mr. Raymond Troxell, social studies department head, received a Valley Forge Freedom's Foundation award last year for the outstanding teaching of democratic principles and concepts of freedom to his students. The school is cooperating with Mr. Kenneth Wells, head of the Freedom's Foundation, in forthcoming foundation enterprises.

Mrs. Kathryn Granahan, Treasurer of the United States, visited the school in 1963 and was honored as its most distinguished former graduate.

The school offers over 110 major academic and vocational courses, including nine 3-year vocational programs ranging from auto body and auto mechanics to technical design and electrical technology.

Its student body has distinguished itself by being, as far as is known, the only secondary school student body which sends four teachers a year to graduate school on a "teacher scholarship" program which provides one-half the cost of a 3-semester-hour course for each teacher.

Finally, if the school were known for nothing else, it would be known for its husky 60-pound purebred English bulldog mascot, purchased and cared for by the students themselves, who lives in the head principal's office and also serves as official greeter for the high school.

The Easton Area High School has proved that good schools can benefit surrounding communities by a sharing of prestige and a good name. The Easton area community and the entire eastern section of Pennsylvania is richer by far having a school such as the new Easton Area High School within its boundaries.

GIOVANNI DA VERRAZANO

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, when I was a small boy in Brooklyn, N.Y., I began to share with my Italian-American playmates a great love and admiration for Giovanni da Verrazano. This admiration has increased over the years to the extent that I was most happy to sponsor legislation to assure the great Narrows Bridge under construction would bear his name. I have also pressed our Post Office Department several times to honor Verrazano with a commemorative stamp.

Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to announce that these efforts and those of my colleagues to so honor Verrazano have borne results. On September 8, 1964, the Honorable John A. Gronouski, Postmaster General of the United States, informed me by letter of his decision to issue a stamp commemorating the great engineering achievement in the buildng of the bridge and honoring Giovanni da Verrazano for whom the bridge is named. No bridge in America will have more significance than this one which will reach from Brooklyn to Staten Island and under which every ship entering New York harbor must pass.

Mr. Speaker, I insert with these remarks the text of Mr. Gronouski's letter. I do so because of the importance of this decision to all Americans and most particularly to Americans of Italian birth and descent. It is also of great importance to my friends in Brooklyn for whom the new bridge will bring essential traffic relief.

I think it is highly desirable for all of us to recall prior to the formal opening of this bridge and the issuance of this stamp on November 21 next, the importance of the explorations which the intrepid Italian navigator, Giovanni da Verrazano, made to this country. There is ample justification indeed for us to give him the timeless honor of having the bridge bear his name, for to him goes the credit of discovering New York as well as Narragansett Bay.

As a boy Giovanni was so thrilled with the stories of the exploits of Christopher Columbus, that he decided he too would chart the unknown and fearsome areas of the New World.

At the age of 29 Giovanni succeeded in getting a commission from King Francis I of France to lead an expedition to the Northern Hemisphere. These explorations in 1524 led him along the North American coast from the vicinity of Cape Fear northward probably as far as Cape Breton.

Not content with the fame which this expedition won for him, the eager navigator set forth again in 1528 for a similar exploration of the Southern Hemisphere, ostensibly in search of an easy passage to Asia. The stories are many but the truth is still not known as to the tragic end of this voyage. The circumstances of his death still remain a dark mystery, although the most accepted and plausible story is that he was killed and eaten by the natives of an "Island of Darien"—Panama.

Much of the credit for the beginning of a rapid and successful colonization of the eastern seaboard area goes to Giovanni da Verrazano whose maps, charts, and descriptions created confidence in and enthusiasm for the areas he explored. It is, therefore, most fitting that the name of this gallant explorer—the first to discover and explore New York and its environs—should be honored by the issuance of a commemorative stamp celebrating the opening of the bridge which will for all time bear his name.

THE POSTMASTER GENERAL,
Washington, D.C., September 18, 1964.

Hon. JOHN J. ROONEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: It gives me great pleasure to inform you that I have approved a stamp commemorating the opening of the Verrazano-Narrows Bridge for issuance on November 21, 1964.

Because of your special interest in this subject, I thought you would like to know the status of the stamp.

Your endorsement contributed significantly to my decision to issue this stamp commemorating this great engineering achievement and honoring Giovanni da Verrazano for whom the bridge is named.

Sincerely yours,
JOHN A. GRONOUSKI,
Postmaster General.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF FURTHER LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time for the purpose of announcing a further program for tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to those matters heretofore mentioned it is expected that the conference report on the National Defense Education Act amendments will be called up tomorrow. We also expect to call up a continuing resolution on appropriations and the bill sending the foreign aid authorization bill to conference, if a rule is granted.

THE SECURITY OF OUR NATION IS OF VITAL CONCERN AND WARRANTS A BRIEF REVIEW

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BURLESON). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the security of our Nation is of vital concern to all of us and some old and recent facts have come to my attention which I believe warrant at least a brief review.

To this end, I ask the question of whether the administration is ignoring serious breaches of national security in order to protect the imprudent activities of some individuals?

I refer first of all to the situation which received worldwide publicity a year ago—the situation involving a 27-year-old German woman who was virtually shanghaied and rushed out of the country overnight when it was discovered she was traveling in high administration echelons and indulging in intimacies with important people.

There was at that time a story in Life magazine—the November 22, 1963, issue—which told of the amount of Washington business which was being done to the accompaniment of wine, women, and song. In the course of this article, the author detailed the hijinks at a party given by a defense contractor whose guests included "an admiral and a general and a figure high in the executive echelons of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration."

One of the performers on this stage was Mrs. Elly Rometsch, the German woman, who was speeded out of the country before she could be questioned by anyone seeking to learn the facts about what had been taking place in high circles. It is evident, however, that her activities were such as to make Christine Keeler look like a schoolgirl.

The Life magazine article indicated she was closely involved with a defense contractor; Lyndon Johnson's protege and former top assistant Bobby Baker, and in the parties which were frequently given by the defense contractor.

Information recently taken in a deposition, plus other information which has come to me, has pinpointed beyond doubt the identity of some of the individuals involved in the party which was detailed by Life magazine. Because of their positions in our Nation's security system, I insist we should know all the facts to determine whether our missile secrets have been fed behind the Iron Curtain via the callgirl apparatus.

My information is that the defense contractor who maintains an apartment in Washington for some of the revelries that have been taking place, is the president of a firm which produces an important component for a missile, considered to be a part of the backbone of our national defense.

The corporation president testified in a recent deposition that he does rent an apartment on Massachusetts Avenue for the purpose of entertaining business associates and others. He has conceded that the executive of the National Space and Aeronautics Administration is his friend and has visited the apartment on numerous occasions.

Is it possible that there are industrial firms in this country, operating almost wholly on defense contracts, who are by devious means, charging off the entertainment they provide, including employment of callgirls, to their contracts and thus unloading on the taxpayers, in the name of preparedness, the costs of their revelries?

The evidence is conclusive that the party detailed by Life magazine in its November 22, 1963, issue, the party which ended in a nude champagne bath for Elly Rometsch and the other girls concerned, took place in the apartment of the defense contractor and among those in attendance was the executive of the National Space and Aeronautics Administration.

I realize the serious nature of these charges. Why do I bring them to light?

I do so because I believe the activities of the German girl, Elly Rometsch—who seemed to move freely in high administration and Capitol Hill circles—lent themselves ideally to the theft of missile secrets. None may have been stolen, but the administration owes the American people an honest effort to discover if that is the case, and apparently no such effort has been made. If it has been made we have not been told about it.

If someone has been loose-tongued, we should know about it and the guilty party or parties should be punished. If no damage has been done, the American people will have the confidence which now has been lost by virtue of the administration having swept this matter under a convenient rug.

Let me review some of the background of Elly Rometsch. There are at least a few points that should give any reasonable person cause to wonder just what she was doing when she bestowed her favors upon Washington's high and mighty.

Elly Rometsch entered the country in April 1961, when her husband, a West German soldier, was assigned to Washington by the Bonn government. It is a curious fact that Elly Rometsch had come from East Germany, was divorced, and in fact did not marry her husband until after he had been assigned to this country.

Her activities after her arrival have been well traced by the press. Apparently Lyndon Johnson's former assistant, Bobby Baker, took over the management of her affairs as he did the management of many other things on Capitol Hill. She was a visitor at the lavender carpeted townhouse which Baker purchased for his secretary, Carole Tyler, to live and entertain in, and soon she was the life of the party—any party, any place.

She told her husband she worked as a model, and apparently her work paid off, for she quickly acquired a variety of minks and diamonds.

Nor were her activities confined to Washington, D.C. In May 1963, Elly Rometsch, accompanied by Carole Tyler, Bobby Baker, and Paul A. Aguirre, a Puerto Rican, flew to New Orleans for a stay of several days. It is doubtful that this was a golfing foursome.

Yes, life apparently was a gay round of parties until the growing stench became too strong for even the nostrils of the State Department. In addition to the parties thrown by the defense contractor for administration and Capitol Hill friends, Elly was also attending parties at certain embassies, among them at least one embassy of an unfriendly government.

It was at that point—August 21, 1963—that Elly Rometsch was suddenly packed up and shipped to West Germany. It is reported she is again divorced and isolated on a farm near Hamburg, guarded by armed men.

So much for Elly. There seems no doubt that we have seen the last of her. Our interest returns to some of the questions that have never been answered.

Her close associates, such as Bobby Baker, the defense contractor, and others, certainly were privy to important national secrets. Has the administration taken steps to assure that none of these secrets fell into her hands or those of some of her associates in unfriendly powers?

If there was no national security involved, why was she so unceremoniously shipped out of the country? We have no explanation for her departure except vague references in the press quoting "officials" who claimed she was not deported. If she was not deported, what did happen?

More than a moral issue must be involved for this Government does not throw out all foreign visitors for reasons of morals nor does it prevent visitors from entering the country with such past records.

I cannot help but conclude that there was either some breach of security about which we have no knowledge, or that the executive branch of Government—the Justice Department, State Department, or White House—acted to protect the reputations of administration and Capitol Hill figures.

We are treated to the information via the press that "U.S. officials and Bonn officials say she—Elly Rometsch—had no known Communist ties." She could scarcely attend the affairs that she did without making some contacts, just as she could scarcely attend the defense contractor's parties without making contacts with certain high American officials who were there.

This is a situation which cannot be dismissed lightly. We have seen ample evidence over the years that one of the Communists' favorite techniques for prying secrets from Western governments was to use the lure of good looking women. We saw the sordid results not too long ago in the case of the Foreign Service officer by the name of Scarbeck who is now serving a prison sentence for his indiscretions with a Communist girl friend in Poland. We would be naive to think this could not happen here.

There are those who have accused the British of being lax in protecting state secrets. But when Christine Keeler's simultaneous relationship with John Profumo and a Russian official was made public, the British Government did make an investigation and Profumo was forced out of office.

I doubt that anyone will deny that Elly Rometsch's activities in Washington apparently eclipsed, both in scope and originality, the performance of Christine Keeler.

Those who knew of the Rometsch activities say she flitted back and forth between gay affairs sponsored by Americans and representatives of unfriendly governments. I say again that it defies the imagination to believe she did not pick up information on both ends of the party circuit, and once more I ask the question of what assurance do we have that she was not passing it on to our detriment and damage?

There have been many things—too many—swept under the rug in the alleged investigation of Bobby Baker. Our national security is too important for such cynical treatment. Congress and the public have the right to know what secrets this German call girl had access to, what she might have done with them, and why she was hustled out of the country if she was not a source of danger to someone.

There is little reason to believe that the Rules Committee of the other body, in view of its previous whitewash of the Bobby Baker scandals, will properly probe the threat to national security that is slowly coming to light. Time after time, members of the minority on the Rules Committee requested that witnesses be brought before the committee and questioned concerning the use of call girls as a part of the promotion and transaction of business with the Federal Government. Their requests were denied by the majority.

The Internal Security Committee needs no mandate from Congress to make a thorough investigation and settle the grave question of whether national security has been or is being jeopardized by some of those who have occupied places of trust and responsibility both in and out of Government. I urge that the Internal Security Committee move immediately into this phase of the investigation.

I also urge that President Johnson make immediately available to Congress the information which former Attorney General Robert Kennedy collected with respect to the Bobby Baker scandals and related matters.

The public is entitled to the truth regarding the operation of their Government. And let the fallout descend upon those who are corrupt and immoral as well as those who have condoned the evils of both.

THE HONORABLE ALBERT RAINS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BURLESON). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ROBERTS] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Alabama delegation, I have requested this time in order to give the membership of the House an opportunity to join with us in paying tribute to an outstanding Member of this body who is retiring at the end of this session. I speak of ALBERT RAINS, a worthy son of Alabama.

ALBERT was born in De Kalb County, Ala., on March 11, 1902, which makes him a young man—one of this generation. While young in years and in spirit, he is old in legislative experience and is certainly one of the best, if not the best, debaters in the House.

After attending the public schools of De Kalb County, he attended Snead Seminary which is now Snead College, being a member of the board of trustees of this fine institution and also of Jacksonville State Teachers College and the University of Alabama.

The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RAINS] is a lawyer by profession, having been admitted to the bar in 1928, and commenced practice in Gadsden where he has since resided. He served as city attorney of Gadsden for 10 years, was a member of the house of representatives of the Alabama Legislature from Etowah County where he distinguished himself as a leader. He was an officer in many local organizations and has always given of his time and energies to many patriotic, fraternal, and religious causes. He is married to the former Allison Blair of Centre, Ala., who has been most helpful to him in his career.

The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RAINS] has been quite active in speaking for the Democratic Party, both in his own State and throughout the Nation. He is a Democrat in every sense of the word. While he espouses the philosophy of the Democratic Party and really fights for it every inch of the way, no one can charge that he is so blinded to partisanship that he does not fight fair or ever hit below the belt

Yesterday during the debate on the housing legislation, many Members took the occasion to pay tribute to ALBERT'S service here in the House. He is most worthy of these fine tributes. His retiring from Congress is a loss to his State and to the Nation. He is recognized throughout this country as the architect of housing legislation here in the House.

He leaves this body as a builder—what more could one wish?

Whatever the future may hold for ALBERT RAINS, I am sure that the Members of this House join with the Alabama delegation in wishing for him and his lovely wife, Allison, all of the good things of life.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to have this chance to talk about ALBERT RAINS.

Here in the U.S. House of Representatives, ALBERT RAINS has translated his fine abilities into great accomplishments in the public service.

ALBERT and I both are leaving Congress—albeit for different reasons, and let me say I had rather have his reason than mine. I shall miss my association with him very much. In my time here I have not met an abler man nor a more effective legislator than he is.

The thing that has impressed me most about ALBERT RAINS has been his determination at all times to vote in what I have considered to be the public interest. Just recently I was comparing his vote and mine from 1949 to 1964—the years that we have served together—and I found our votes to be substantially the same on just about every important issue.

After all, it is a Congressman's vote that really counts. Pretty words are pleasant, and I think perhaps none of us say enough of them about our friends; but more important than pretty words in determining the real record of a Congressman is his vote here in the most important legislative body on earth. You can tell where a man has really stood when you examine his vote and I would like to say to ALBERT RAINS, as one of his constituents now, since for the past 2 years we have had no congressional districts in Alabama, that I heartily approve his voting record in Congress.

The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RAINS] leaves many monuments to his public service. The greatest of these is a system of housing laws that express the underlying feeling that in the United States of America a citizen is entitled to the opportunity to have a comfortable home. In America, we believe that children should have the privilege of growing up in comfortable surroundings. In America, we believe that the breadwinner in every family should have an opportunity to own a comfortable home, or if he chooses he should have the privilege of renting a comfortable home. In America, we believe that the sick and the infirm should have an opportunity to live in surroundings that are conducive to the improvement, or at least the sufferance of their illness. In America, we believe that the elderly should have housing that is in keeping with the condition of their years. In America, we believe there should be some public housing to accommodate the needs of those who qualify for it. We believe that the veteran of our wars should have an opportunity to own a home. ALBERT RAINS has translated these national aspirations into the realities of concrete, wood, steel, and stone—into housing for the American people. That is the great monument to his service here.

It is a long journey from a Sand Mountain cotton patch to a place of eminence in the legislative history of our country. ALBERT RAINS has made that journey. He can now go home filled with the pride that comes of the knowledge that he has earned the respect of all with whom he has served.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, I did not realize this afternoon, when the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ROBERTS] took the well, that he was going to pay tribute to ALBERT RAINS.

There are Members of this House who have been here much longer than I have and who know ALBERT RAINS perhaps a little better than I do. I do not profess to have known ALBERT for a long time, but as he leaves this Congress of his own free will and accord I must say to Americans everywhere that the U.S. Congress is indeed losing one of its most distinguished Members.

I know there will be those who will say, upon his retirement, that they have not agreed with some of his actions in Congress, but the same can be said of any or every Member who leaves the halls of this Congress.

I do not believe it can be said that ALBERT RAINS has ever, during his tenure in the Congress, acted in bad faith. If ALBERT RAINS has made mistakes while he has been here in the Congress, they have been mistakes of the mind and not mistakes of the heart.

I have enjoyed my personal dealings with ALBERT. I consider him a personal friend. I consider him as capable as any man in this House of Representatives and do so without reservation. As a less experienced colleague he has assisted me and my constituents over and over again.

He is a great American and I know that the good people of Alabama and the American people everywhere are going to miss his services here in this Congress. I only wish him God's blessing in these remaining years of his life. His successor had better have big feet because he will be called upon to fill the shoes of a big man. Mark my words and mark them well. History will record that his footprints have left their imprint in the sands of time. History will record him worthy of being remembered. He will be remembered.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman and I yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ANDREWS].

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, as the 88th Congress draws to a close I would like to take this opportunity to express my deep regret that Congressman ALBERT RAINS, of the great State of Alabama, will not be with us when the 89th Congress convenes in January. ALBERT has decided to retire. I personally regret that he felt it best to retire, because a man with his ability is sorely needed in Washington.

ALBERT is an expert on housing. He has been deeply interested in housing since he arrived in the House of Representatives in 1945. At that time he became a member of the Banking and Currency Committee, and in his first 5 years displayed his talents in housing legislation. He soon agreed to head a special subcommittee to explore the explosive subject of shoddy housing construction, and as a result, and because of this thoroughness, Congress authorized a permanent Housing Subcommittee, headed by ALBERT.

He has enjoyed such great respect in Congress that he has been able to marshal necessary support for housing and to secure enactment into law. Millions of Americans have roofs over their heads today due to his untiring efforts, perseverance, and leadership.

ALBERT is one of the best orators I have ever known, and has developed into one of the best presiding officers in the House. During the past few years he presided over many of the most difficult bills in the House.

The way he guided through the 1961 omnibus housing bill—writing into law the first significant lower middle income housing program—proved to his colleagues that he is an expert on housing and truly earned the title "Mr. Housing." The benefits of his work are across the length and breadth of our land.

ALBERT RAINS has served in this House with distinction and honor for 20 years. He has not only been indefatigable in his efforts in behalf of his own district, but he has been constantly alert for the interest of all the people of our State and Nation. He is a rare and unusual gifted public servant and leader.

Leaving Congress with the respect of his colleagues as he does, I wish ALBERT and his loyal wife, Allison, the best of everything. My hope is that the years ahead will be happy ones for them.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the distinguished majority leader [Mr. ALBERT].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I certainly could not let the opportunity go by to join the distinguished members of the Alabama delegation in paying tribute to the outstanding service of our colleague, ALBERT RAINS.

I have served with hundreds of men and women during my years in the House of Representatives. Among them there was not one person who had greater ability, greater dedication, or who was held in higher esteem by the House and by the country than the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RAINS].

In the field of housing legislation, of course, he was preeminent. Probably no one in the history of the House had such specialized knowledge, has made as many significant contributions in this very vital area of legislation. He has piloted through the House numerous historic statutes in the housing field.

He was, of course, outstanding in all of the areas in which he worked. ALBERT RAINS was not one of those who involved himself in every matter that came along, but he was one of those who became the complete and absolute master of whatever project he undertook. He was one of the finest debaters in the House, one of its most articulate Members. He was a great progressive and one of the most original and creative Members of this body. His service will long be remembered by all who knew him and who served with him. The legislative record which he wrote and the good deeds which he performed, will not only be remembered, but will react to the betterment of the American people and of mankind for generations to come. The gentleman from Alabama has left his indelible stamp on the housing records of this country. As a great human being he has also left an indelible mark on the hearts of his colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, I wish my distinguished colleague good fortune in whatever new ventures he may engage in during the years ahead. I am sure that he will continue to exercise constructive leadership in his State and in this country, and I hope that he may enjoy good health and a long and satisfying life.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I regret very much that this moment has come during my service in the House of Representatives, for I had hoped that the country would long have the useful service of a great American, a distinguished Member of this body, and the loyal son of a great State, the Honorable ALBERT RAINS, of Alabama. And particularly does it come with some misgivings on the part of those of us who are privileged to represent districts in the larger cities of the country for, in our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RAINS], we knew we had a genuine friend who was studious, thoughtful, and effective in an area in which it was not too easy, on occasions, to legislate.

The genuine warmth and affection which he has generated on the part of those who represent those city districts and on the part of countless thousands and millions of people within those districts, is a great tribute to the effectiveness of his work as a legislator.

Mr. Speaker, we know that all our places will be filled but I daresay that it will be with great difficulty that one assumes to fill the void that will be created by the retirement of our great and good friend. I should not be very much surprised, Mr. Speaker, if not before too long he will necessarily be drafted into further and, if possible, higher, useful public service.

But, whatever the future holds for him he knows that he leaves with the genuine confidence, trust, and affection of all his colleagues, for he has served his country with distinction and is entitled to a future filled with all the things he has so richly earned and which we hope he will fully receive.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I thank the gentleman for yielding so that I may join in a tribute with the Members of the Alabama delegation to pay our respect to a strong Member of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, ALBERT RAINS, as we know, has for 20 years been very diligent in the duties assigned to him. During that period of time he developed a reputation of thoroughly analyzing problems that were presented to him and to his committee. He so understood those problems that he could readily take the floor of the House of Representatives and explain them in simple fashion so that we could understand the complicated pieces of legislation, be it FHA, public housing, urban renewal, or any other phase of the housing that was presented to Congress.

Mr. Speaker, Members of the House will miss him in the future. When he presented legislation to the House and made an explanation of it we could rely upon that interpretation. That was one great attribute that ALBERT RAINS possessed.

Mr. Speaker, we will miss him in the future. All I can say is good luck to you, ALBERT, as I know that you will have a long and delightful life after you retire.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. I thank the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Alabama, ALBERT RAINS, has been one of the greatest Members of this body that has ever served, in my opinion, during the entire history of our country. That is a broad statement to make, but based upon his record it is absolutely a correct statement.

Mr. Speaker, I have never served with a man who was more dedicated to public service than ALBERT RAINS. Thoroughly and completely respected by his colleagues, when he took the floor of the House of Representatives in the handling of a bill, he commanded the attention, the respect and the support of the Members of the House.

As majority leader, and now as Speaker, I recognize how very important it is in the transaction of matters pending before the House that the Member in charge of a bill be one who commands the respect and admiration of his colleagues. As majority leader, and now as Speaker, my problems are greatly solved when a Member is handling a bill who commands the deep respect and admiration of the Members of the House. ALBERT RAINS was one of those Members who in the handling of a bill could always accomplish the maximum of support in connection with the passage of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, his refreshing progressive outlook on legislation has made a profound impression upon all of his colleagues.

His service in support of a strong military defense and a firm foreign policy has also made marked contributions to the strength of our country during this trying period of the world's history.

Mr. Speaker, ALBERT RAINS' future is still before him, in my opinion, in public life. While he has voluntarily retired from Congress and from public life as a result of that voluntary retirement, in my opinion his retirement is only temporary. As one of my colleagues heretofore said, the people of Alabama will look to him for further leadership and further service in some other important position of public trust and particularly in the elective field.

So I join with my colleagues who have spoken today, and all colleagues of the House, in expressing the deep respect we have for ALBERT RAINS on his retirement from the Halls of Congress. I wish to express my sincere hope for his future happiness and success. I have confidence that his separation from public service here is only temporary, and that the people of Alabama will call upon him in the near future to serve them in some other important capacity.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my colleague yielding to me and giving me the opportunity of paying tribute to one of his colleagues from Alabama and one of our colleagues in the House, a distinguished American and a good friend, the gentleman from Alabama, ALBERT RAINS.

He is a sincere and dedicated public servant. He walks humbly with his God. His whole life reflects credit on his native State of Alabama and on the U.S. House of Representatives.

The following poem, I believe, typifies the gentleman from Alabama, ALBERT RAINS, more than I can express:

I have to live with myself, and so
I want to be fit for myself to know;
I want to be able as the days go by
Always to look myself in the eye.
I don't want to stand with the setting sun
And hate myself for the things I've done.

Certainly the gentleman from Alabama, ALBERT RAINS, exemplifies those words. He deserves the respect of every Member of the House of Representatives, I am sure, from both sides of the aisle. I hope that God in Heaven will watch over him and his family and give them comfort in the remaining years of their lives. I am sure the gentleman from Alabama, ALBERT RAINS, will continue serving his fellow man and his native State of Alabama—and the Nation. We extend to him our very best wishes.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to express my sincere appreciation for having had the privilege of serving and working with the very distinguished and able gentleman from Alabama, the Honorable ALBERT RAINS. His retirement will be a great loss to our Nation and its Government, yet we can certainly find no fault with his desire to retire from public life in view of the tremendous service which he has rendered in the House of Representatives for the past 20 years.

ALBERT is a dedicated and extremely effective public servant. He will be badly missed. He was first elected to Congress in 1944, and is generally recognized as one of our more respected debaters and floor strategists. He has been called the House's No. 1 expert on the Federal housing program, having served as chairman of the Housing Subcommittee for 14 years. Also, he has been a ranking member of the Banking and Currency Committee.

We will miss ALBERT and his very lovely wife, Allison, but wish them many more happy and enjoyable years while away from Washington.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the able gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ROBERTS] for giving me an opportunity to say a few words in tribute to our esteemed colleague and our devoted friend, the gentleman from Alabama, ALBERT RAINS.

A little while ago Winston Churchill gave an affectionate farewell in the House of Commons Chamber, to which he had been honored for many years. The whole world was saddened, for not alone had Britain lost one of its most distinguished sons and greatest statesmen, but the cause of freedom and progress in the world had lost one of its greatest and noblest leaders. I am sure the sentiment of every Member of this House and the other body and the people of America, who are concerned about their Government, is that they are suffering an irreparable loss in the passage from this body of the gentleman from Alabama, ALBERT RAINS.

I was born and reared in the Fifth Congressional District of Alabama. So that district always has been and always will be close to my heart, as will all of my native State of Alabama. When I came to the other body and got to know the members of the Alabama delegation I was particularly interested in the Member who represented the old Fifth Congressional District in which as a little boy I sat by my father's side and listened to my Congressman speak on many public occasions.

I found in the gentleman from Alabama, ALBERT RAINS, representative of the then Fifth Congressional District of Alabama, a man who has left here in this House a great tradition of statesmanship, a man whose heartthrob is with his people; a man with great vistas of vision; a man dedicated in his heart to his country and to his country's cause. I came therefore to have admiration and tribute in my heart for this man who represented my old congressional district. Through the years my admiration for the gentleman from Alabama, ALBERT RAINS, has grown greater and greater and I cherish as a treasure his noble friendship.

After I came to this House I had the honor to serve on the House Committee on Banking and Currency, of which he was one of the noted and esteemed leaders. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Housing, as the leader in many of the important features of legislation which have come out of that committee, I have seen him here in this Chamber nobly and greatly serve America and the cause of democracy and freedom in the world.

I am sorry to see him go, as is every one of his colleagues, for today in this critical time America needs statesmen, men who have the courage to stand up for what they believe to be right, who are not frightened by unfavorable or even hostile political sounds, to do what in their heart and conscience they believe to be in the best interests of the country and their countrymen.

ALBERT RAINS never faltered. He never failed to meet the challenge of the public good. Here in this House he has been recognized for the superiority of his eloquence and the excellence of his capacity to debate. When he took the floor and carried a cause to his colleagues he persuaded them of the rightness of it because he believed fervently in it and they believed in him.

So I regard this as only the temporary departure of ALBERT RAINS from the leadership of American public life. I know he has the character and the courage and he has the moral stamina to realize that his kind of man can never be defeated. He always wins because of the fidelity with which he serves an honorable course. So his spirit will be here, if his person is not, for the foreseeable future. America needs in its leadership men of the intellect, character, competence, and the courage of the gentleman from Alabama [ALBERT RAINS].

So we want to say to him, ALBERT, America admires you and loves you. America is grateful to you for your faithful service of all of its noble aims and aspirations. America will look to you in the years ahead to continue your magnificent leadership, for you are the kind of man America must count upon to meet the challenge of the days that lie ahead.

Of him in life I know of no words more expressive than those Shakespeare tells us Anthony uttered on the battlefield of Philippi, as he gazed on the noble figure of the fallen Brutus:

> His life was gentle, and the elements
> So mix'd in him that Nature might stand up
> And say to all the world, "This was a man!"

So is ALBERT RAINS.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Florida.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. STEPHENS].

Mr. STEPHENS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate having an opportunity to say a few words about my friend, the gentleman from Alabama, ALBERT RAINS, as he leaves the House of Representatives. I came here 4 years ago, and I joined the Committee on Banking and Currency. ALBERT RAINS both figuratively and actually put his arm around my shoulders and since then has led me in the way I think I should have gone on the Banking and Currency Committee because I have found that he knows what he is talking about. He has always had the courage of his convictions to stand up for what he knows is right. I have never hesitated to follow him because he has never in any way misled me on any matter in the business of our committee or the business of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I admire his ability to do what someone back in history said Alexander Hamilton did when the Constitution of the United States was framed. It was said that Alexander Hamilton convinced people by a "sweet reasonableness." That is the way I will remember the advocacy of the gentleman from Alabama, ALBERT RAINS, in his espousal of the causes in which he believed. He has always done so with a humor and with a sweet nature and in a reasonable and logical way that none of us have been able to withstand because he has done it in such a fashion that we knew he was right. I hate to see the gentleman from Alabama, ALBERT RAINS, leave the Committee on Banking and Currency and leave the Congress of the United States because I personally will miss his leadership immeasurably.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. I thank my colleague.

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, I appreciate the distinguished gentleman granting me a few moments to add just a brief word to the wonderful tributes that have been paid by his colleagues to the gentleman from Alabama, ALBERT RAINS.

I served five terms in the Georgia House of Representatives and one term in the Senate before coming to the Congress, and I am now serving my second term in this body.

I have known a lot of men in government during my years—men who have meant much to me and who have been of great help to me. But early in the beginning of my first year in the Congress, one of the first men I became acquainted with was ALBERT RAINS of Alabama about whom I had heard a great deal. At the time there was a matter pending which was of great importance to the people of my district and, of course, to me as their Representative. So I went to see the gentleman from Alabama, ALBERT RAINS. I have never seen a more charming individual act in such a ready and capable manner, to be of service, to a fellow who did not think he could even expect to get such cooperation and attention as was given to me by the gentleman from Alabama, ALBERT RAINS. Of course, he won me to him at that very moment. The action he took in my behalf and in the interest of my district meant a great deal to me.

During the succeeding years of my service in the Congress, I have found him to be not only a friend but one of the most capable legislators and one of the most capable individuals I have seen during my legislative experience. In addition, I have found him to be a warmhearted friend on and off the floor of the House of Representatives. We all know him and respect him for his many fine accomplishments as a Representative from the State of Alabama. We all know him as Mr. Housing in this country, and the people of this Nation of ours are living better today because of the services in this Congress of Albert Rains of Alabama.

There are many things I would like to say to express my true feelings and my personal regret that I will have the privilege of serving only 2 terms with this fine gentleman.

I will close my remarks by saying that this Nation has needed his services. This Nation is better off because of the services that he has rendered not only to the people of his district and to the State of Alabama but to the Nation as a whole.

In spite of the long years of service he has given, the gentleman from Alabama [Albert Rains] is still a young man and I hope he gets in some fine rest and relaxation for a time down in Alabama.

But, I do not believe that the people of Alabama or of the entire country, who know him so well, are going to let the gentleman from Alabama, Albert Rains, stay fishing very long. I believe we will see further service in some capacity for the able talents of this fine and capable gentleman.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I am thrilled and I am awed by this tribute to one of the truly great Members of this House today. In fact, my feelings are intermingled.

I feel pleased, I feel privileged, and I feel proud to participate.

I feel pleased to see this time taken today to pay tribute to a man retiring from our ranks physically but who will never retire from our hearts or from the work of the Congresses to come.

I said I feel privileged. I am privileged—privileged to be able to join in this tribute and to say how beloved he is, what warm personal affection I have for him, and how truly admiring I am of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Rains].

I said I feel proud. Yes, I am proud—proud to be a Member of the House and to have the opportunity of knowing such a fine colleague, so beautiful a human, and so able a public servant.

I have learned much from Al Rains. From the first day I became a member of the Banking and Currency Committee I took notice of Al. One could not help but notice him—his calmness and collectiveness under stress and during difficult sessions attracted me immediately.

His unique grasp of the issues at hand, his scope of knowledge, his analytical mind, his sense of fairness, his tasteful humor and his brilliance are truly exceptional.

I have been privileged to have served with Al Rains in the committee and in this House. My life and my own public service have been much enriched by having had this experience, and I feel certain that many, many other Members of the House feel the same as I do.

I am particularly honored to be able to join in this tribute to our colleague today and to wish him many, many years of good health and happiness.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. I thank the gentleman from New York.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I have not had the privilege of serving long years with the distinguished gentleman from Alabama that other speakers who have preceded me have had.

Any man who walks on the floor of the House as a new Member knows he has a certain amount of apprehension. One of the first things he learns is to look for someone he can follow and someone with whom he can talk. I have found that has been true with respect to the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Rains].

I was particularly impressed by his handling of the National Housing Act. I had some doubts about the measure myself. Some of the most experienced Members of the Texas delegation told me, "Just listen to Albert Rains and you will get the information and you will get the facts straight." I did. That was certainly true.

The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Rains] is a real leader. I believe I speak for the freshmen Members of Congress and the younger Members of this body when I say that at all times we have felt the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Rains] is the type of man we could go to to discuss problems. He has received us in a friendly and gracious manner and made us feel at home. He is a man we recognize as a leader. Always with a great deal of confidence we have been able to present our problems to him. When he took the podium or was in the well, we knew there was a man with the facts and there was a leader we could follow.

It is with a great deal of pleasure as a new Member that today I salute the gentleman from Alabama and wish him the very best in the years ahead.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Forrester] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, it is a great privilege to pay tribute to a wonderful personal friend, a splendid neighbor, a thoroughly Christian gentleman, and one of the greatest legislators that has ever come to Congress.

It has been a benediction to know Albert Rains. He has my unqualified approval and affection. I know no better man. I know no better public servant. I am a better man for having had the privilege of association and service with him. I wish Albert and his wonderful wife God's richest blessings, and, in my judgment, every Member of this great body will remember Albert as a magnificent American.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Rogers] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the House will lose the services of one of its most able and experienced Members this year on the retirement of our colleague from Alabama, Albert Rains.

Albert Rains has served the people of Alabama and the Nation with distinction and has left his mark on our times, particularly in the field of housing legislation.

It is to be noted that he will be remembered by those of us honored to serve with him as a kind, considerate, and gentle man who enjoyed the respect of all.

The people of Alabama are losing a man of great talent and devotion to duty in the Congress, and the Congress will sincerely miss his leadership. We are confident, however, that he will continue his devotion to his country in all his future undertakings.

I would like to join with all our colleagues in wishing Albert and his lovely wife a long and happy future.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Multer] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I want to reemphasize some of the things that have been said about our very distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Rains].

The omnibus housing bill, H.R. 12175, which we passed recently, will be one more legislative monument to a truly great statesman.

This is a man who is a gentleman in every possible interpretation of the word; a great scholar, a diplomat, and a legislator who will long be remembered in this House.

When I first came to the House in 1947 he was already a senior member of the Banking and Currency Committee which I joined that year. But more than a senior member, he was a top member, "tops" so far as the respect and esteem of his colleagues was concerned, not only on the committee but in all of the House.

I dare say that there is more than one very good piece of legislation that would have been lost in committee and on the floor were it not for the statesmanship of this great man. He has done a yeomanlike job in all these undertakings, with respect for all views, no matter how strongly he might have differed with them. He reconciled differences of opinion that seemed irreconcilable. He will be sorely missed by his colleagues on the committee and in the House.

I am happy indeed to be able to call him "friend." I know that I have been a better man because of that friendship which I hope will endure as long as the Lord spares us.

I want to echo all that has been said by the Members who have preceded me and by our distinguished majority leader.

Albert, you will be sorely missed here. We wish you well in all that you undertake in the years ahead. We know that what you have done in your years of service will always be a landmark to those who will try to follow, as good legislators do, your fine example in representing not only their constituents but the entire country in bringing to it the finest legislation that we in the Congress can give to them.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Reuss] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, Alabama does well to honor Albert Rains today, and I appreciate the opportunity to join with his friends from his native State, because we from the rest of the country love him as much.

Much as we regret Albert Rains' retirement after 20 devoted years of congressional service, we can still rejoice in the legacies he leaves us.

We are legislators. Our business is to conduct ourselves in a parliamentary body. As far as I am concerned, Albert Rains is about as perfect an example of a legislator as this House has ever seen, or ever will see. His formula for his conduct as a legislator is simple: know your subject thoroughly; know your colleagues intimately; know every nuance of parliamentary law; and most important of all, be absolutely fair and honest in all your dealings. Out of such stuff is legislative greatness made, and Albert Rains has been a truly great legislator.

Albert's specialty, as we all know, has been housing. It is no accident that his term here in the House has coincided with the greatest growth of home building and urban redevelopment in our history. Millions of modest-income people, elderly people, farm people and city people, owe the attractive and decent homes in which they now live to Albert Rains' leadership. Now that our Federal housing programs are growing beyond the provision of shelter, and are concerning themselves with the redevelopment of our cities, the planning of new communities, and with the provision of open space, Albert Rains' vision and guidance will be sorely missed.

In times of tension like today, history will honor most those who combined zealous and sensitive representation for their own areas with a true sense of national unity and national purpose. I do not intend to diminish in any way Albert Rains' role as a representative of Alabama when I say that he has been in a true sense representative of all our people.

To Albert Rains and his gracious wife, Allison, go our sincerest good wishes for many, many more happy and productive years.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, for those of us on the Committee on Banking and Currency, and particularly on the Subcommittee on Housing, August 13 was "Albert M. Rains Day" in the House of Representatives. Most of the Members who participated in the debate on the housing bill cited the outstanding contributions made by Congressman Rains to the housing laws of this country over the past 20 years. This spontaneous flood of tributes attested to the high regard this House holds for the gentleman from Alabama as a legislator and, more importantly, as a person. I do not know of any Member who does not regard Mr. Rains as one of the finest of our colleagues. This does not mean that everyone always agrees with Mr. Rains on every subject, but he always argues his point of view on legislation with such deep sincerity and honesty that he never fails to be persuasive.

Mr. Speaker, I tried to indicate on August 13 in my remarks on the housing bill and in the speech delivered in St. Louis which I inserted in the Record, how proud I am to have had the opportunity to serve on the Housing Subcommittee with Mr. Rains. If these proceedings today are to be reprinted in the form of a tribute to Mr. Rains, then I would certainly be grateful if my remarks as they appear on pages 19307–19310 of the Congressional Record could be included at this point in such a document. I join my colleagues today in wishing Congressman Rains everything he wishes for himself. While he has certainly done more than his share of public service, I am sure there are many assignments he will be performing for the public good and for the country, from other vantage points than membership in the Congress.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, the retirement of the Honorable Albert Rains removes from the Congress the most formidable authority in the field of housing. Since his election to the Congress in 1944 he has been the driving force for the enactment of housing legislation—the crowning accomplishment being the omnibus housing bill in 1961.

He held the respect and admiration of every Member of the House. His ardent interest in the plight of the homeless and those living in subnormal and slum areas reflect the unselfish, kindly attitude of this great leader.

His contribution to the welfare of thousands of unfortunates won for him throughout the Nation the appreciation and admiration of millions of his countrymen.

His handling of the legislation on the floor of the Congress won the supporting votes of many of his colleagues who having great confidence in the sincere representations that he advanced in argument changed their position on the matter.

Albert Rains will be sadly missed by the membership. We wish for him the blessings of the Almighty and greater success in whatever undertaking he may seek in the future. He has earned the highest honors that a dedicated public servant can aspire to. As a true son of the great State of Alabama and the peerless leader of democratic principles in the interest of the Nation—we, his sincere colleagues, salute him, and wish for him and his sweet wife Allison, great happiness and abundant health.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, it has been a unique and gratifying experience for me to preside as Speaker while tribute was paid to our colleague Albert Rains, who is voluntarily retiring from Congress. In listening to the remarks of my colleagues, I could echo every word. He is esteemed by all who have served with him in this House of Representatives.

Albert Rains and I do not always agree—we have not always voted together—but I know we have always shared a warm friendship which I shall value and cherish the remainder of my life.

I join with those who have spoken so eloquently of his impeccable character, the warmth of his personality, his considerateness and other virtues which we all admire and I join others in wishing for him and his lovely wife the best of good things.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, with the close of the 88th Congress rapidly approaching, the sad thought comes to me that many of the faces we see here today will not be here when the 89th Congress convenes in January 1965. Many Members have announced that they are resigning or retiring at the end of this session of Congress, and when we adjourn sine die we will say farewell to many whose friendships we have enjoyed during our association over the years. Some of the Members who will not be returning have devoted many years of their lives to the service of this Nation, and it is appropriate we acknowledge the important parts they played in the development and growth of our great country.

Among this group is one of my dearest friends, the Honorable Albert Rains, who has announced that he is retiring at the end of the session and will return to the practice of law. He is one of the most able men to be elected from the State of Alabama and has made a great reputation here in the House of Representatives as a progressive legislator. He has come to be known as Mr. Housing, the foremost authority on the subject in this country.

Albert Rains first came to Congress in 1945, and for many years our offices were in the same corridor. His friendship over the years has meant a great deal to me, and I do want to take this opportunity of wishing him the very best in his law practice. I am sure that he will continue to be just as successful in any endeavor he undertakes as he was in representing his district and the State of Alabama in the U.S. House of Representatives.

To Albert and his lovely wife, Allison, may I say "good luck," and may they have many, many more years of happiness and good health.

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. Mr. Speaker, many fine tributes have been accorded our friend and colleague Albert Rains today upon his retirement from Congress. It is an honor and privilege to add my remarks to this richly deserved accolade.

Since coming to the House of Representatives in 1944, he has served in many capacities and always with outstanding ability and distinction. As chairman of the important Subcommittee on Housing of the House Banking and Currency Committee, he has left his mark on every housing bill that has been approved by the Congress in recent years. He has established himself as a recognized authority on housing matters, and his leadership and knowledge in this field will be sorely missed in the years ahead.

I feel a genuine sense of personal loss at his retirement. I well remember his many kindnesses and great courtesy when I first came to Congress. His sympathetic understanding meant much to a green Congressman, and I am truly grateful to him for his help and advice and for the real interest he has shown in Kentucky's housing needs.

Our good friend can look back upon the past 20 years and take just pride in his numerous legislative accomplishments which have so tremendously benefited so many Americans. He has greatly contributed to the betterment of our society, and when he leaves, it will be with the knowledge of a job well done.

I extend to him every good wish for happiness and continued success in his return to private life but want him to know that he will leave among us here in the House a void that will be impossible to fill.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I like to think that the testimony I am about to give in tribute to Representative Albert Rains, of Gadsden, Ala., enjoys the integrity, the authenticity and the informed judgment, that characterized the language, the data and the sincerity of Representative Rains himself when he functioned so brilliantly and so successfully among us here in the House. I like to think that when I speak of Representative Rains I do it from a special position of close and intimate knowledge, just as he himself never rose on this floor to offer a judgment, influence a vote, or sponsor a piece of legislation unless his words were solidly bulwarked by honesty of conviction and exact information. Those of us who know the meaning of Representative Rains' service to his State and to the Nation—and that is a considerable company—must feel a certain sense of failure in the democratic process itself because of the fact that he is to retire from the Congress. He is only in his early sixties.

For me it seems that the loss from our midst of such a talent in legislation and leadership, when there is yet so much more of it to be had, ought not to be allowed to occur. I wish somehow I had the power—the benign power of course—to alter this decision and keep Albert Rains on the job here in strategic positions with the key committees to which he contributed so much. When I say that my knowledge of his effectiveness, his skill, his diplomatic handling of many men of talent and decision, is grounded upon a very special vantage point, I mean, of course, that Albert Rains and I worked together in committee.

We conferred, we studied, we poured over reports and documents, we consulted our colleagues, we sought to master the problems and the differences among men, and we even disputed. Always Albert Rains toiled in the interests of better and better legislation, and always in the interest of decision and success. As a fellow legislator on the same legislative team, so to speak, with Albert Rains, I am particularly grateful to him, for he made the burden of our job less arduous.

I feel that no credit attaches to me that I, as chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House, had him constantly at my side and then appointed him chairman of the Subcommittee on Housing. He had been chairman of the Subcommittee on Housing in the committee under the chairmanship of the Honorable Brent Spence of Kentucky for many years, and had become our outstanding expert on the subject of housing. It took no special genius to recognize that here, in this great man from Alabama, was the foresight, the capacity for direction, the progressive legislative point of view, that constitute the very heart-blood of leadership for the public good in a democracy. And his experience as a lawyer and in public service in Alabama before he came here in 1944, his affection and enthusiasm for people, all made for the kind of service in this House that is stamped forever upon the history of our country.

It is a service that is remarkably significant in the legislation for housing in which he was a great technician and an expert not only, but a statesman of profound understanding. I am an old hand myself at the business of legislation, often under great difficulty and greater pressure. For more than 3 decades I have watched the democratic process in this Chamber and before that in Texas.

I know something of the indispensability of men like Albert Rains.

And I know what the great law firms of our country, or private industry, or banking and management would do to count men like Rains in the top echelons of their leadership. It is my firm conviction, however, that Albert Rains belongs in Government, belongs in service to his fellow man for whom he feels so deeply and works so hard. I earnestly hope that he will be returned soon to the public service, in one capacity or another.

We are, Mr. Speaker, in the midst of a harsh and sometimes bitter presidential campaign. I have, with great pain and anguish, heard words spoken that downgrade and disparage the profession of politics, as if politics were some unpleasant business charged with corruption and ignorance, and devoid of moral dignity. I pray that the often unwitting traducers of the political profession could come to this House, this Chamber, Mr. Speaker, and see and talk with, and learn about men like Albert Rains of Alabama. For there is nothing in the whole spectrum of human endeavor that is so symbolic of the noblest quality in human nature, the finest aspirations, the most diligent endeavors, as the public and private life of a man like Albert Rains.

It gives me personally a tremendous sense of loss to see him retire. But it gives me also a concomitant sense of gratitude to know that politicians like Albert Rains give dignity and stature, distinction and honor to the profession of politics and to the democratic process in our country.

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Alabama delegation, I have requested this time in order to give the membership of the House an opportunity to join with us in paying tribute to an outstanding Member of this body who is retiring at the end of this session. I speak of Albert Rains, a worthy son of Alabama.

Albert was born in DeKalb County, Ala., on March 11, 1902, which makes him a young man—one of this generation. While young in years and in spirit, he is old in legislative experience and is certainly one of, if not the best, debaters in the House.

After attending the public schools of DeKalb County, he attended Snead Seminary which is now Snead College, being a member of the board of trustees of this fine institution and also of Jacksonville State Teachers College and the University of Alabama.

Mr. Rains is a lawyer by profession, having been admitted to the bar in 1928, and commenced practice in Gadsden where he has since resided. He served as city attorney of Gadsden for 10 years, was a member of the house of representatives of the Alabama Legislature from Etowah County where he distinguished himself as a leader. He was an officer in many local organizations and has always given of his time and energies to many patriotic, fraternal, and religious causes. He is married to the former Allison Blair of Centre, Ala., who has been most helpful to him in his career.

Congressman Rains has been quite active in speaking for the Democratic Party, both in his own State and throughout the Nation. He is a Democrat in every sense of the word. While he espouses the philosophy of the Democratic Party and really fights for it every inch of the way, no one can charge that he was so blinded to partisanship that he did not fight fair or ever hit below the belt.

Yesterday during the debate on the Housing legislation, many Members took the occasion to pay tribute to Albert's service here in the House. He is most worthy of these fine tributes. His retiring from Congress is a loss to his State and to the Nation. He is recognized throughout this country as the architect of housing legislation here in the House. He leaves this body as a builder—what more could one wish?

Whatever the future may hold for Albert Rains, I am sure that the Members of this House join with the Alabama delegation in wishing for him and his lovely wife, Allison, all of the good things of life.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I know that all of us in the House will greatly miss our colleague, the gentleman from Alabama, ALBERT RAINS, who is retiring from the Congress.

Since coming to the Congress in 1944, ALBERT RAINS has served his district and the Nation with dignity and devotion. The people of his district and State can feel justifiably proud of the representation he has given them. His colleagues on the Banking and Currency Committee will miss his valued counsel, as we in the House will also.

I extend to Congressman and Mrs. Rains my best wishes for continued success and happiness.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleague from Alabama, Congressman ALBERT RAINS, is completing a tenure in the Congress which can fill him with profound satisfaction and many of us in the public service with pardonable envy. Within the 20 years of his service in the House, ALBERT RAINS literally helped change the face of the Nation, upgraded our American way of living and in so doing, strengthened our democracy. Millions of American children have grown up in comfortable homes in decent surroundings because of ALBERT RAINS. The home construction industry continues to flourish and its leaders and its publications have vied with each other in praising our colleague for his vision and idealism, coupled with a shrewd appreciation of the builders' problems and abilities.

ALBERT RAINS earned the respect of the 10 Congresses in which he served. He won the universal acclaim of homebuilders and real estate practitioners and should have the gratitude of the millions of Americans who actually owe him their homes, because his legislation made it possible for them to finance their housing.

The common tendency of many to associate a man who had had brilliant success in one endeavor with that effort alone operates to the disadvantage of our colleague, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RAINS]. RAINS and housing are something of a synonym around the country. But the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RAINS] made his mark as a lawyer before coming to the Congress and his legal background contributed to his talents as a parliamentarian and a most efficient investigator and committee chairman. His deep knowledge of what improves a State's economy engaged his active interest in development of natural resources, highways, and waterways and his wide interests made him a tower of strength within our Alabama delegation. An old friend, he also was a good adviser and consultant for me. I will miss his keen analysis of the most complex issues and problems.

When he came to the House from Gadsden, Ala., in 1944, he was assigned to the Banking and Currency Committee. He immediately immersed himself in the very complex and then not so glamorous problems of housing. Strange as it may seem now, this required extracurricular study and even courage. At the time, Federal participation in provision of housing for other than the very lowest income groups was a subject of hot controversy. Within a few years, the congressional leadership recognized ALBERT RAINS as a committee member who did his homework and he acquired the tag of "Mr. Housing."

There was a quick recognition that ALBERT RAINS in his views and legislation looked beyond bricks and mortar and was motivated alone by what he believed was the best interests of the American people and the country. Every housing bill passed by the Congress since the landmark housing legislation of 1949 bears the unmistakable stamp of ALBERT RAINS' knowledge, enterprise and dedication to an ideal.

In the 1950's there was a rush by some of the unscrupulous and the fast-buck crowd to cash in on the postwar housing shortage and the housing needs of war veterans, with shoddy construction their mark. Without hesitation, ALBERT RAINS headed the subcommittee of investigation. With complete objectivity and fairness, he put the facts on the record and his suggestions for safeguarding the home buyers' dollars, not only exposes poor building methods but resulted in nationwide standards which have benefited every American who buys a home.

Whenever legislation came before the Congress concerning housing, ALBERT RAINS invariably took a position which was fair to all segments of the industry, but always in the best interests of our people. He had the rare ability to take the most explosive and controversial issues in their proper perspective. Influential and trusted for his counsel by his colleagues, he is one of the main reasons our country has achieved the splendid record it has made since the close of the last World War in meeting what was a staggering problem in human engineering, consisting of provision of adequate housing for an expanding population.

His retirement from the Congress is regrettable because it will leave a gap in the expertise on housing problems in which he was a leader. We wish him well and he leaves with a unanimous "well done," by those who will be inspired by his record of splendid service, which always will be marked in congressional annals.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, ALBERT RAINS, who has devoted the best part of his life to representing his fellow man in the legislative halls of both the State legislature of his native State of Alabama and the House of Representatives in Washington, D.C., has announced his retirement from the House.

It has often been said that probably one of the largest investments the average man will ever make in his life is the purchase of a home, and ALBERT RAINS has worked hard and long to provide the best home loan program in the world. He is recognized as a foremost authority in this field. Many of his bills to provide better farm housing, college housing, and nursing homes are now law of the land.

ALBERT RAINS was always concerned with the little man, and I know that whatever he undertakes in the future, this concern will always be with him.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, over the years as his colleagues here saw ALBERT RAINS guide important legislation through this House, we saw a man dedicated always to the National welfare. ALBERT RAINS' service here was always characterized by loyalty to his community, his congressional district, his great State, while at the same time placing the national interest above every other consideration. As a result of ALBERT RAINS, devotion to our country, each section and every class has benefited from his legislative genius and skill. Our Nation is a stronger nation economically because of the untiring efforts of ALBERT RAINS. In the history of this House, he will be recorded as one of the greatest Members of all time. He will rank with Speaker Bankhead and other outstanding Alabama statesmen.

We will miss his great oratory here on the floor, his genial and affable manner. ALBERT RAINS typified the true southern gentleman. His distinguished service here with us has elevated the standards of us all.

Mrs. Dorn joins me in wishing for him the very best always and we believe he will be called upon to again serve his people as U.S. Senator, Governor, or in the executive department or agencies of the Federal Government.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, in closing I would like to thank the friends of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RAINS], and of the Alabama delegation who participated in this tribute to him. I know that there are many Members of the House who, had they known that this special order was set for today, would have made it their business to be here. The dean of our delegation had previously obtained time and other members of the Alabama delegation, because of illnesses and one death in a Member's family, could not be here today.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on this subject.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BURLESON). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

REPORT ON THE 88TH CONGRESS

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. REID] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the responses which I have received from my monthly newsletter when I have explained legislation at the time it was being considered by the House of Representatives show how really interested the American people are in their Government. Therefore, I am making this statement today to summarize some of the major legislation already enacted into law in this 88th Congress.

When this 88th Congress finally adjourns sine die, it will undoubtedly have gained the distinction of remaining in session for the longest period of time in peacetime history. The first session did not adjourn until December 30, 1963.

During this 88th Congress, we have already been in session 500 calendar days; 18,081 bills and resolutions have been introduced; and 946 bills and resolutions have already been enacted into law. These figures, impressive as they may be, only tell a small part of the story. They definitely do not reveal the hours and hours devoted to consideration of legislation by the various congressional committees, and by individual Members of Congress.

Abraham Lincoln said:

> There are few things wholly evil or wholly good. Almost everything, especially of Government policy, is an inseparable compound of the two, so that our best judgment between them is continually demanded.

I have found this so true as I carefully study the records of the hearings, committee reports, and the individual pieces of legislation line by line before casting my votes.

In making my decision as to how to vote on final passage of a bill, I study all available facts and weigh the good features against the bad—keeping in mind always the best interests of my constituents. When I decide that the bad features outweigh the good, I must—in good conscience—vote against the bill, no matter how appealing the title may be or how worthy the aim. I have welcomed the counsel contained in correspondence from citizens of the 15th District of Illinois; and I have tried to live up to my campaign pledges to fight for economy in government, decentralization of Federal power, and freedom of the individual.

Since serving as Representative from the 15th District of Illinois, I have attempted to keep my constituents fully informed on my views and my votes on major issues through periodic newsletters, press releases, radio newscasts, and personal correspondence. In addition, of course, rollcall votes are a matter of public record in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

This present report, therefore, is limited to a brief summary of just a few of the major bills already enacted into law during this 88th Congress.

AGRICULTURE

Public Law 88–74 authorizes an estimated $12 million in Federal assistance to States to help finance additional research facilities for State agricultural experiment stations. Rulemaking power in the law permits the Secretary of Agriculture to refuse to aid State projects unless he approves of the research program to be undertaken.

Public Law 88–297: Costs for this wheat-cotton law are undetermined—but price of wheat is down and prices to consumers are up since its enactment. This law authorizes a new wheat marketing certificate program and contains most of the program rejected previously by the wheat farmers in the national referendum of 1963. This law also provides a new subsidy for cotton mills as well as continues past cotton price support and subsidies. Senator AIKEN stated:

> It would have paid us better to have bought all these imports coming in from foreign countries and given them to the people of the underdeveloped countries of the world and we would have still saved some money.

Public Law 88–482 directs the President to impose import quotas, starting January 1, 1965, whenever imports of chilled, frozen, or fresh beef, veal, mutton, and goat meat threatens to rise 10 percent or more above annual average 1959–63 import levels, adjusted to allow for growth of the U.S. market.

EDUCATION

Public Law 88–129 authorizes $205.7 million in matching grants to expand teaching and research facilities of medical, dental, and related-type colleges and for student loans to increase health personnel.

Public Law 88–204 authorizes $1.2 billion for 3-year program of loans and grants to aid colleges and universities in financing construction of academic and related facilities.

Public Law 88–120 authorizes $921 million for expansion of vocational education programs through fiscal year 1967, and authorizes $417,946,000 for extension of National Defense Education and Aid to Impacted Areas Acts to June 30, 1965.

Public Law 88–214 authorizes $411 million for fiscal year 1965 and $285 million for fiscal year 1966 for carrying out provisions of Manpower Development and Training Act—providing literacy and vocational training to unemployed, assistance to relocate unemployed, and a broadened program to train uneducated and jobless youth. Waives for 1965 the requirement that States match Federal grants for training allowances for unemployed.

Public Law 88–269 authorizes $45 million for 1964 to extend Federal assistance under the Library Services Act to urban areas—providing matching grants for construction of library buildings.

Public Law 88–497 authorizes $70 million—extending for 5 years the programs for traineeships to increase number of professional public health personnel and expanding health project grants to schools of medicine, dentistry, engineering, social work, and pharmacy.

Public Law 88–581 authorizes $287 million for a 5-year program to combat shortage of nurses. Includes grants for construction and rebuilding of school and college facilities, traineeships for advanced professionals, and loans for students.

FOREIGN AID

Authorization of $4.7 billion to extend for 2 years the food-for-peace program under Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act. Expands loans from counterpart funds to private enterprise abroad; authorizes sales of surplus U.S. agricultural commodities to other nations for their currencies; and authorizes donations of U.S. surplus farm goods for emergency disaster relief and for support of economic development projects.

When this Congress finally adjourns, authorizations for the mutual assistance program alone will total more than $6 billion for a 2-year-period. This includes allowance for U.S. tax dollars to aid Communist countries as well as so-called neutral countries who vote with Russia in the United Nations more than they do with the United States. This $6 billion figure does not include amounts allotted for other foreign aid programs such as food for peace, participation in International Development Association, and the Inter-American Development Bank, the Peace Corps, and so forth.

HEALTH AND WELFARE

Public Law 88–156 authorizes $282.2 million for fiscal years 1964–68; $48 million for fiscal year 1969, and $58 million for fiscal year 1970 and each year thereafter for purpose of increasing aid to States for maternal and child health services and for crippled children's programs—and grants for maternity care and research projects to prevent mental retardation.

Public Law 88–164 authorizes $329 million for 5-year program to aid States in providing mental retardation research facilities, construction of community mental health centers, and grants for training teachers of the deaf.

Public Law 88–210 authorizes $95 million for fiscal years 1964–67 to improve, strengthen, and accelerate programs for prevention and abatement of air pollution.

Public Law 88–352: The Civil Rights Act of 1964 authorizes unlimited funds to enforce the existing civil rights and extend the jurisdiction of the Federal Government to enforce integration in public accommodations, public facilities, and State programs which receive Federal funds. The law also establishes a Federal Fair Employment Practices Commission called the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission to supervise employment practices in private business, and authorizes the Attorney General to intervene in private suits.

Public Law 88–443 authorizes $1.3 billion to extend for 5 years the Hill-Burton Act, providing Federal aid for construction, modernization of hospitals, nursing homes, and other medical centers—including funds for areawide planning of health facilities on a 50–50 matching basis.

Public Law 88–452 authorizes $947.5 million for fiscal year 1965 to finance just the first year of operation of an entirely new broad Federal assistance program. This Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 authorizes, in fiscal years 1965 through 1967, 10 separate programs under the supervision of the Director of the newly established Office of Economic Opportunity. Key sections of the bill authorize a Job Corps to provide work experience and training to youths in conservation camps and in urban and rural residential training centers, a work-training program to employ youths locally, a community action program under which the Federal Government would assist a variety of local efforts to combat poverty, a domestic peace corps called VISTA—Volunteers in Service to America—and a series of programs to assist the poor in rural areas.

Public Law 88-525 authorizes $375 million over fiscal years 1965-67 to meet costs of expanding the pilot food stamp program initiated by administrative order in 1961. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to administer a food stamp plan aimed at augmenting the diets of low-income families. Needy families in participating communities could buy, for a small fixed amount, food stamps worth a larger amount when presented for payment in local food stores.

Public Law 88-560 authorizes $1.2 billion for Housing Act of 1964 which provides for urban renewal grants, 37,500 new low-rent public housing units, loans for housing for elderly, for farm housing, and other existing programs; includes facilities for migrant farm workers; extends maturity of FHA-financed home mortgages and lowers down payments; and provides compensation for persons and businesses dislocated by urban renewal projects.

NATURAL RESOURCES

Public Law 88-29 authorizes development and coordination of Federal and State outdoor recreation plans through studies, research, and education programs under guidance of the Secretary of the Interior.

Public Law 88-253 authorizes $816.8 million 2-year program of improvements in 11 river basins and navigable streams, flood control, waterpower projects of Army Engineers, and 1-year authorization for Bureau of Reclamation projects.

Public Law 88-309 authorizes $28.5 million for 5-year program of aid to States for development of commercial fisheries.

Public Law 88-379 authorizes $82.5 million for a 10-year program to finance water resources research centers at land-grant colleges and State universities—and encourages similar projects at other institutions.

Public Law 88-577 establishes a National Wilderness Preservation System—placing 9.1 million acres of land already owned by the Federal Government in a National Wilderness System immediately. Additional land owned by the Federal Government can be placed in the system in the future with congressional action.

Public Law 88-578 establishes a $2 billion, 10-year land and water conservation fund to provide assistance to the States on a matching basis in developing recreational facilities for public enjoyment—with the cost to be met from a combination of sources, including admission and user fees and the existing Federal motorboat fuel tax.

CONCLUSION

The current membership of the 88th Congress is as follows: 254 Democrats to 176 Republicans in the House, and 66 Democrats to 34 Republicans in the Senate.

At the same time that this 88th Congress was authorizing huge new and expanded programs, it raised the national debt limit by $19 billion—to a new high of $324 billion—while at the same time providing a tax cut totaling $11.5 billion, partially effective in 1964. Each taxpayer, however, should look into the actual tax he will be required to pay next April. The withholding rates were reduced more than taxes. Thus, many taxpayers will owe the Government money when they file their returns next year. Be sure to watch this.

This brief report of bills actually enacted into law merely scratches the surface of congressional action during 1963 and 1964—but I hope it will give you an idea of the scope of legislative action and the growth of the Federal Government.

I voted for those measures which I felt to be in your best interest and against those which I honestly believed would result in a waste of your tax money or which were an unnecessary encroachment by the Federal Government into matters which could and should be handled at the local levels. I do hope my efforts in your behalf have met with your approval. If you missed seeing a report on my vote on any specific issue or if you wish to have further details on any particular law, please let me know.

Above all, I hope this report will confirm the great importance for each and every one of you to take an active interest in Government affairs and that you will vote on election day. Your vote this November will determine the future course of your Government. Remember: "Vote and the choice is yours. Don't vote and the choice is theirs."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 263 today I was on important business pertaining to my district in other parts of the Capitol and I was not present at the time of that rollcall.

PROJECT HOPE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, today the good ship *Hope* sails on its fourth mission of mercy. When it weighs anchor in New York City at 2 o'clock, the S.S. *Hope* starts its maiden voyage to Africa—the third continent to benefit from its services.

During the past 4 years the doctors and nurses of this privately financed program of medical education and healing have trained thousands of physicians, surgeons, dentists, nurses, and medical technicians in Indonesia, South Vietnam, Peru, and Ecuador.

While carrying out its primary goal of medical education, HOPE has treated and inoculated millions who had known only poverty, disease, and ignorance. Now they have hope.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to represent the district in which HOPE was conceived and developed.

Montgomery County is the home of the founder and president of Project HOPE: Dr. William B. Walsh, who also is a noted internist and heart specialist in Washington, and is an assistant professor of internal medicine at Georgetown University.

Maryland's Sixth District is also the home of HOPE's vice president, Joseph T. Geuting, Jr., manager of the Utility Airplane Council of the Aerospace Industries Association.

Eugene M. Zuckert, U.S. Secretary of the Air Force, and instrumental in the founding of HOPE, also resides in Montgomery County.

Mr. Speaker, the list of distinguished area residents who have helped build Project HOPE is unending. It includes Mr. Edward J. Clarke, president of C. & C. Elite Linen Services, who was the original chairman of the Metropolitan Washington Committee for Project HOPE and this year was designated the official founder of the committee.

Replacing Mr. Clarke as chairman is the equally able Mr. Foster Shannon, president of the Shannon & Luchs Realty Co. Assisting Mr. Clarke is an executive committee of outstanding civic servants, and I would like to read their names into the RECORD.

They are: Mr. Alvin Q. Ehrlich, Mrs. Eugene R. Jacobsen, Jr., Dr. William T. Joyce, Mrs. Garfield I. Kass, Mr. Benjamin B. Newton, and Mrs. Oscar D. Nohowel.

These are just a few of the persons in my district who have donated their valuable time and extraordinary talents to the fostering of Project HOPE, while raising nearly $250,000 in 3 years.

Mr. Speaker, I wish at this time to commend these people for their unselfish devotion to such a worthy project.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama, for 1 hour, today.

Mr. O'NEILL, for 30 minutes, on tomorrow, October 1.

Mr. VANIK, for 15 minutes, tomorrow.

Mr. MATHIAS (at the request of Mr. WHALLEY), for 15 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. HAYS and to include two articles.

Mr. HARRIS to extend his remarks following the remarks of Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama in the Committee of the Whole on H.R. 8546, and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DANIELS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. EDMONDSON.
Mr. CORMAN.
Mr. LANDRUM.
Mr. EDWARDS.
Mr. VAN DEERLIN.

SENATE BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A bill and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2249. An act to provide for the establishment of the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S.J. Res. 139. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to succession to the Presidency and Vice Presidency and to cases where the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 6233. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain land of the United States to the Pascua Yaqui Association, Inc.; and

H.R. 6593. An act for the relief of Earnest O. Scott.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 653. An act to provide an adequate basis for administration of the Lake Mead National Recreation Area, Ariz., and Nev., and for other purposes;

S. 1024. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to pay relocation costs made necessary by actions of the District of Columbia government, and for other purposes; and

S. 1082. An act to establish in the Treasury a correctional industries fund for the government of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 29 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, October 1, 1964, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2578. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting report on review of military assistance program for a Far East country, Department of Defense (pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 53 and 31 U.S.C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2579. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, report on unnecessary cost to the Government through the leasing of electronic data processing systems by the Bacchus Works, Hercules Powder Co., Magna, Utah, Department of Defense; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2580. A letter from the Acting President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting draft of proposed legislation entitled, "A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to enter into joint contracts for supplies and services on behalf of the District of Columbia and for other political divisions and subdivisions in the National Capital region"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2581. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a report of the use of NASA funds for the construction and renovation of research facilities at New York University, New York, N.Y. (pursuant to 77 Stat. 141, 142, and 77 Stat. 425, 439); to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

2582. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a report of the use of NASA funds to provide additional research facilities for the Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn, N.Y. (pursuant to 77 Stat. 141, 142, and 77 Stat. 425, 439); to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. Senate Concurrent Resolution 78. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of the report of the meeting of the American Instructors of the Deaf as a Senate document and providing for additional copies; without amendment (Rept. No. 1908). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 856. Resolution providing for printing as a House document the "Compilation of Social Security Laws"; without amendment (Rept. No. 1909). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 877. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the study entitled "Obligations for Research and Development, and Research and Development Plant"; without amendment (Rept. No. 1910). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 358. Concurrent resolution to provide for the printing of 5,000 additional copies of "Immigration Hearings Before Subcommittee No. 1 of the Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, parts 1, 2, and 3"; without amendment (Rept. No. 1911). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 364. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of an additional 1,000 copies of the document entitled "Study of Population and Immigration Problems; Population of the United States"; without amendment (Rept. No. 1912). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. Senate Concurrent Resolution 96. Concurrent resolution to print additional copies of a committee print entitled "Catalog of Federal Aids to State and Local Governments"; without amendment (Rept. No. 1913). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 889. Resolution that the document entitled "Index of U.S. Defense Policies From World War II Through 1963" prepared by Charles H. Donnelly, Library of Congress, be printed as a House document; without amendment (Rept. No. 1914). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 890. Resolution providing for printing hearings on "Tax-Exempt Foundations and Charitable Trusts"; without amendment (Rept. No. 1915). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. POWELL: Committee of conference. S. 3060. An act to amend and extend the National Defense Education Act of 1958 and to extend Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress (federally affected areas) (Rept. No. 1916). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 892. Resolution for consideration of House Joint Resolution 1183, joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1965, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1917). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SISK. Committee on Rules. House Resolution 893. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 6151, a bill to increase the appropriation authorization for the completion of the construction of the irrigation and power systems of the Flathead Indian irrigation project, Montana; without amendment (Rept. No. 1918). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. YOUNG: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 894. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 12318, a bill to provide an equitable system for the classification of certain positions under the House of Representatives and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1919). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. FALLON: Committee on Public Works. S. 1147. An act to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to construct and maintain an adequate system of roads and trails for the national forests, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1920). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FALLON: Committee on Public Works. S. 2968. An act to amend subsection 120(f) of title 23, United States Code; with amendment (Rept. No. 1921). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 895. Resolution for sending to conference of H.R. 11380, a bill to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1922). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MOORE:

H.R. 12733. A bill to provide for the acquisition and preservation of the real property known as the West Virginia Independence Hall as a national historical site; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PIRNIE:

H.R. 12734. A bill to provide for the recognition of the Masonic War Veterans of the State of New York, Inc., by the Secretary of Defense and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 12735. A bill to provide for payments to certain locomotive firemen whose separation allowance under the award made by Arbitration Board No. 282 was reduced by reason of their service in the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WYDLER:

H.R. 12736. A bill making Columbus Day a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAHON:

H.J. Res. 1183. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1965, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BARRY:

H.J. Res. 1184. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to permit any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population with the approval of a majority of its voters; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARSHA:

H.J. Res. 1185. Joint resolution providing for the establishment of a joint committee of the two Houses of the Congress to study matters relating to the implementation of the award of the Board established under Public Law 88–108 to arbitrate a labor dispute between certain carriers by railroad and their employees; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia (by request):

H.J. Res. 1186. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim National Volunteer Fireman's Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H.J. Res. 1187. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide that no person may be a Member of Congress unless such person, when elected or appointed, possesses the qualifications of electors of the most numerous branch of the legislature of the State from which he is chosen, and has been an inhabitant for at least 5 years of such State; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H. Con. Res. 369. Concurrent resolution to bring justice to Cyprus; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H. Res. 891. Resolution authorizing a review of national policy for local airline service; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia (by request):

H.R. 12737. A bill for the relief of Marion W. Campbell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12738. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Suat-Lieu Soong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12739. A bill for the relief of William H. Stewart; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H.R. 12740. A bill for the relief of Angelo Drakos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KARTH:

H.R. 12741. A bill for the relief of Fotini Ralli Hohlfelder; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H.R. 12742. A bill for the relief of Georgios P. Sotos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 12743. A bill for the relief of the estate of Charley Conley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY of New York:

H.R. 12744. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Pitino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN of New York:

H.R. 12745. A bill for the relief of Rita Castillo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12746. A bill for the relief of Jorge Antonio Cabrera; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12747. A bill for the relief of Seoung Lek Rim and his wife, Chun Hye Rim (nee Choe); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALLHAUSER:

H.R. 12748. A bill for the relief of Frank Murphy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

1048. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Henry Stoner, New York, N.Y., requesting consideration of his petition with reference to proposing legislation to make it a Federal crime to attempt to assault or murder any Federal official receiving $25,000 or more annual salary, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

◆

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 30, 1964

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou Father of our spirits, who heareth prayer, breathe upon us now, we beseech Thee, the benediction of Thy holy calm. Soothe the anxieties of our so often baffled minds, so that with the shield of Thy peace and the sword of Thy truth, we may face, free and fearless, whatever tests this day may hold.

Kindle on the altar of our hearts, we pray, a flame of devotion to freedom's cause in all the world, that in its white heat every grosser passion may be consumed. Heal the divisions which shorten the arm of our national might as we stand at this crossroad of history. Override the errors of our faulty judgments. So shall Thy kingdom come and Thy will be done in our lives and in all the earth.

In the dear Redeemer's name, we ask it. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request by Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, September 29, 1964, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the following concurrent resolutions of the Senate:

S. Con. Res. 78. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of the report of the meeting of the American Instructors of the Deaf as a Senate document and providing for additional copies; and

S. Con. Res. 96. Concurrent resolution to print additional copies of a committee print entitled "Catalog of Federal Aids to State and Local Governments."

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 745) to provide for adjustments in annuities under the Foreign Service retirement and disability system.

The message further announced that the House had severally agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the following bills of the House:

H.R. 2501. An act to authorize the promotion of qualified Reserve officers of the Army and the Air Force to existing unit vacancies;

H.R. 9124. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to vitalize the Reserve Officers' Training Corps programs of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, and for other purposes;

H.R. 9718. An act to authorize the crediting of certain military service for purposes of Reserve retired pay; and

H.R. 12308. An act to authorize removal of a flight hazard at the U.S. Naval Air Station, Norfolk, Va.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2512) to clarify the status of members of the National Guard while attending or instructing at National Guard schools established under the authority of the Secretary of the Army or Secretary of the Air Force, as the case may be, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 11302) to require premarital examinations in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 653. An act to provide an adequate basis for administration of the Lake Mead National Recreation Area, Ariz. and Nev., and for other purposes;

S. 1024. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to pay relocation costs made necessary by actions of the District of Columbia government, and for other purposes;

S. 1082. An act to establish in the Treasury a correctional industries fund for the government of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H.R. 6233. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain land of the United States to the Pascua Yaqui Association, Inc.; and

H.R. 6593. An act for the relief of Earnest O. Scott.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 11302) to require premarital examinations in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

ADJUSTMENTS IN ANNUITIES UNDER THE FOREIGN SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY SYSTEM

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, if the conference report is brought up on the bill (S. 745) to provide for adjustments in annuities under the Foreign Service retirement and disability system, I shall ask for a yea-and-nay vote and will want to be apprised of it.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

On request by Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements during the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

COMMUNICATIONS SATELLITE CORP.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Communications Satellite Corp.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

COAST GUARD

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Coast Guard.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

On motion by Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

RETIREMENT TODAY OF JERRY O'LEARY, WASHINGTON EVENING STAR REPORTER

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, there is always cause for a touch of sadness when one of the most beloved members of the fourth estate reaches the time of retirement. It is especially so, in this particular instance, when we note that today marks the retirement of our old and valued, tried and true friend, Jerry O'Leary, Sr., of the Washington Evening Star.

In my opinion, the members of the fourth estate have treated Congress with great impartiality, consideration, and understanding down through the years. They have used their bylines to to give us credit which sometimes we did not deserve, and to criticize us on occasions when we deserved it; but, on the whole, they have treated us impartially and well.

At this time, with the approval of my colleagues in the Senate, I should like to furnish the byline, instead of Jerry O'Leary.

Jerry O'Leary is a native Washingtonian. For 50 years he has been a newspaperman. He started on the old Washington Herald in 1914. After brief periods on the Washington Times and the Washington Post, he joined the staff of the Washington Evening Star and the Washington Sunday Star in 1917.

After 8 years of general assignments covering the District Building, he was made a member of the Capitol staff in 1925 and has covered the proceedings of the Senate for 39 years.

He has also covered the national conventions of both parties since 1932. He has followed the campaign trail for presidential and vice-presidential candidates since 1940.

In my book, Jerry O'Leary is one of the finest, gentlest, fairest, and kindest men I have ever known.

Although he will be retiring today, he will not be leaving us, because we need men like Jerry O'Leary to continue to decipher this body, to understand what makes Congress "tick," and to understand, also, the makeup of the men and women who comprise this body and the House of Representatives.

Let me say publicly that it is with regret that I note the retirement of this great and fine newspaperman. It is with anticipation that I look forward to our continued friendship in the years ahead. I assure Jerry that I will continue to depend upon him for advice and counsel from time to time.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial published in Roll Call of September 24, 1964, entitled "Retiring Jerry O'Leary Recalls Good Old Days."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RETIRING JERRY O'LEARY RECALLS GOOD OLD DAYS

Jeremiah O'Leary, Sr., whose seniority dates from 1925, when he first began covering the Senate for the Evening Star, will retire at the end of this month.

Surveying the changes he's seen in the Senate during those years, Mr. O'Leary says the most striking ones are of style—in oratory, in dress and debate.

"It may be the influence of that informal television delivery," he said, "but you just don't hear flowery thunder-and-damnation speeches any more. I doubt if anyone even learns to declaim in that fashion any more. I suppose the last of the old style speakers was Senator Clyde Hoey (Democrat, of North Carolina)."

Senator Hoey, who died in 1954, was also a prime practitioner of the art of dressing like a Senator. He always wore a stiff collar and morning coat. Another snappy dresser, Mr. O'Leary recalls fondly, was J. Ham Lewis, of Illinois, who also sported a Van Dyck.

"They wore frock coats, white vests, striped trousers. They looked the part. They didn't want to dress like other people."

Another past glory in the Senate was the cut-and-thrust debate.

"There used to be a lot of that give and take in the Senate." Mr. O'Leary said, "but it's given way to set-piece speeches. I guess they do most of their battling in committee now."

Another thing of the past is the really last-ditch, bitter end filibuster. The last one Mr. O'Leary recalls was on an atomic energy bill, when the Senate stayed in session continuously, night and day, from Monday through Saturday as weary opponents tried to talk the bill to death. Nowadays, the Senate leadership doesn't make life that disagreeable for filibusters. Though, of course, it could.

But the glory of the Senate in his younger days, Mr. O'Leary says, was its orators.

"When Bill Borah was going to speak, the word would get out and the galleries would fill with people waiting for that 4th of July oratory."

However, Mr. O'Leary says, the changes in the Senate are on the surface only. "It's not as picturesque as it was," he says, "but it's just as important. I guess it's modernizing, like everything else."

Mr. O'Leary, whose son, Jerry, also works for the Star, says he's made no special plans for his retirement. Friends think he'll intensify his rooting for the Washington Senators. All he's sure of is that he won't be writing a book.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. INOUYE in the chair). Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, it is something of a novelty that Jerry O'Leary is a native Washingtonian, because they are rather few and far between in a town which was captured and taken over by us "outlanders" ever since the beginning of the Republic. Every time I meet a native Washingtonian, I look at him two or three times because he is a kind of distinctive breed unto himself.

The memorandum I hold in my hand about Jerry does not indicate how old he is, but if he became a reporter in 1914, that is when I was 18 years old. I cannot rightly say where I was, but I believe that I was carrying a dinner bucket in a factory in my hometown.

So, here was Jerry O'Leary working on the old Washington Herald. Those must have been great days, because the world was shaken with dizzy adventure. In those days, I do not suppose that Jerry had to be on shoe leather too much, in order to find copy. It was fairly running out of his ears, even though he may have been a young reporter.

Jerry has had a variety of experience on nearly every Washington paper, I suppose, except the Washington Daily News. He went to the Washington Evening Star in 1917. Where was I in 1917? Either I was in the Army or Uncle Sam had already measured me for my new Easter suit and did not ask me what color I preferred. Jerry was doing business in Washington at that time and he has been going on ever since.

Mr. President, Jerry O'Leary is not going to retire. There is a young Jerry O'Leary, and there is an old Jerry O'Leary. I am not sure which is youngest in spirit, because I read both their headlines.

If Jerry retires today, he will be around these "diggings" tomorrow and start asking about civil rights, tariff specifications, tariffs on brooms, and all that sort of thing. I am delighted that he will be around, especially when he does these special stories. If and when I run again for office, I am going to make sure that he does a very special story about me—even though he does not believe it when he writes it—so that I can use it as campaign material.

The Senate salutes Jerry O'Leary for the affable, able, and agreeable person he is.

One would think that members of the fourth estate would lose their tempers as a result of the cavalier way in which we sometimes treat them.

A boy would come in the Chamber and say, "O'Leary wants to see you." The reply would be, "Tell him I am busy." Or the boy might say, "Jerry O'Leary wants to see you at the front door." The reply might be, "Tell him I am on the way to my office post haste, and I have no time to bother."

One would think that would make Jerry mad. That does not make him mad. That only sharpens his wit. He would go immediately to the Senator's office. That is the stuff that makes a great newspaperman. He has been a great newspaperman for 50 long years. In this accelerated age it is really something for one to stay with the same craft for half a century, and to improve with each shining day.

I believe Jerry O'Leary is better now as a newspaperman than he ever was. When the Washington Star editor reads the RECORD, I hope he will get him back to work and keep him up here.

Reporters are all like old shoes. I like to have them around. I like to go to the Press Gallery twice a week, sit down and visit, and let the questions come thick and fast. And what a fellowship it really is. There is nothing to equal it. So, I salute a great newspaperman and one whom I esteem as a great friend.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I am glad to associate myself with the sentiments that have been expressed by the distinguished majority and minority leaders with respect to the announced retirement of one of Washington's most able and popular news reporters, Jerry O'Leary.

I do not know just when I first became acquainted with him, but I have known Jerry for several years. I first knew him when he was reporting the proceedings of the Congress here on the Hill.

I have long admired him because of his capacity, and the competent and efficient way he performed his duties to the public and for the great newspaper that he represented. I admire him for his courtesy and consideration for those of us who sometimes make news and who have the heavy responsibilities of legislating for the greatest country in the world.

I was always impressed with his diligence in searching out the news and his determination to get the information and facts as accurately as possible before reporting them. I have found Jerry to be fair and objective in reporting the facts. He tried to convey the truth to his readers as he saw it. My contacts with him over the years have been most pleasant. I have always enjoyed my interviews with him.

Whenever committees on which I have served and particularly those committees on which I have had the honor of serving as chairman made news, whenever we took any action or performed any service that was newsworthy, Jerry endeavored to report it in its proper perspective and to convey the facts in their true light to the readers of his article.

We regret his retirement. I shall miss seeing him at work daily here with the other reporters.

I join with all other Senators and his friends in wishing him the reward of happiness and contentment that I trust will attend him in his retirement years and also in any other avocation or activity of life that he wishes to follow.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I do not believe there is a Member of the Senate who regrets the retirement of Jerry O'Leary more than I.

During the many years that I have been here, Jerry has enjoyed the respect and the confidence of Senators in a manner which has not been exceeded by any other member of the news media, although we respect nearly all of them.

Jerry has been a true reporter, concentrating on the facts. I have never known him to slant a story or to write a biased story. He has always been without prejudice.

I believe that what makes Jerry this way is the nature of the man himself. But it has occurred to me that perhaps being a voteless Washingtonian for so long has enabled him to judge us impartially and without bias.

My hope for Jerry is that he has a good and adequate retirement and will not forget to come back to see us frequently.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I join my colleagues in the words of laudation that have been expressed concerning Jerry O'Leary.

My contact with Jerry has been rather limited. He probably does not know that, although our contact was limited, there has been a communication between us which has caused me to develop great affection for him.

Frequently in life, we develop admiration for individuals who never have knowledge of such admiration. I occupy that position with regard to Mr. O'Leary. I have talked to him. And I have listened to his genial and gentle voice. He called me last night on the telephone. I immediately recognized his voice because of its gentility and humility.

I have read his articles, and to the extent that I have had knowledge of the subjects which he discussed in those articles, I have always found them replete with objectivity and honesty.

Nothing that we could say about Mr. O'Leary would add luster to the distinguished service that he has rendered this area as a newspaperman. He has built a monument for himself in the newspaper world. He has developed for himself the respect of Members of Congress.

I offer my felicitations to him. I thank him for the extraordinary work that he has done as a servant of the public for 50 years. I wish him many years of good health, happiness, and comfort.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I shall always recall with pleasure that on the day before a friend of 31 years' standing decided to retire after 50 years of labor in the vineyard, he handed me a copy of the speech that I shall make in the Senate today on the subject of how an alien tree from Japan has crowded out of the sun a native solid oak. I am reminded of the lopsided effect that the Supreme Court has had on our Constitution.

Few Senators can join Jerry O'Leary and me in saying that we have labored in the vineyard for 50 years. He started his journalistic career in the same year that I started my political career. I participated in a kind of runoff convention in 1914 which decided who would be a candidate from that area for the State senate. I was defeated by one vote. That was the only time in my life that I have ever been defeated in any convention. After that I stayed out of conventions as much as possible. In 1915 I ran for the Senate in the primary, and so my legislative career covers only 48 years.

Of course, I have known Jerry better since I moved over to the Senate side in the winter of 1946. He has been a credit and an honor to the journalistic profession. He has not always given publicity to some of the speeches that I have made in the Senate, but whenever he wrote about one of my speeches he always was accurate. He was never unfair.

I regret to see Jerry O'Leary retire because I am more or less in the same shoes. If I should retire, what would I do? When one has been in one undertaking for 50 years, he cannot hunt and fish all the time. One must have something to do or he will rust out rapidly. I think I shall ask for a little conference with my friend Jerry to see if I can find some type of work which would be appropriate and, in line with his wonderful training, and, as Adams said of Jefferson, his felicity of expression, perhaps I can find the way.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, I join other Senators in expressing my great admiration for Jerry O'Leary. I wish to tell him publicly that I am, indeed, sorry that he is leaving us. I have greatly admired his writings and his work. I have not known him as well as have the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] and some others. I am certain of that. But

I have followed his writings with a great deal of interest. I thoroughly concur in everything that other Senators have said about him. The Senate gallery will not be the same with Mr. O'Leary gone. I am sure he will be back on occasions to visit us.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I deeply regret that Jerry A. O'Leary has made the decision to retire from the active ranks of the Washington newspaper corps.

I fully realize that he has more than earned relief from the exacting tasks of his profession after reporting from the Washington scene for 50 years.

I can understand how he feels in need of a rest, and how his family believes this is to be in the interest of his good health and long life.

I am sure every Member of the U.S. Senate, which he has covered for 39 years, wishes for Jerry O'Leary the complete fulfillment of his personal desires.

I have been in the Senate nearly 32 of the years he has been looking down on us from the Press Gallery, and I want to be in the forefront of those who wish him well.

I shall miss him as a friend. The Senate will miss the accuracy of his reports. The Star will miss the caliber of his work. The country will miss his contributions to current information.

Speaking from my long experience in the Senate, and as chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, I can truthfully say that I do not believe Jerry O'Leary's coverage of the Senate and the committee can be surpassed for faithful accuracy, knowledgeable background, and fairness.

And when I say this about the way he mastered his profession, I intend it to speak for the man himself. Jerry O'Leary is a man who governs himself and possesses himself.

He has never laid himself open to reproach, because the caliber of his work is irreproachable. His own respect for his responsibilities contributes to the respect others hold for him.

I have watched Jerry O'Leary work with admiration, and I have read the informative product of his enterprise and effort with interest and never a doubt as to its authenticity.

He is a man of highest character, a fine sense of proportion, and a capacity for distinguishing. He lays hold of the news with study and investigation, and presents the ensemble with conciseness and clarity.

He is never a man for the careless use of words. Jerry O'Leary is a newspaperman completely emancipated from error, known to us all for his dedication to the constructive use of his talents, powers, intellect, and experience.

I know that the trademarks of a good news story these days are a short beginning, and a short ending—close together.

For Jerry O'Leary I hope his retirement will have a long beginning and a long ending—far apart—unless he should decide to come back to the Senate Press Gallery.

Meanwhile, I hope he will drop around to see his old friends of the Senate whether they are at work or at home.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I know that it is with a deep sense of regret that we on both sides of the aisle received the news that Jerry O'Leary, one of the Nation's outstanding newspaper reporters is retiring after 40 years of outstanding service with the Washington Star.

Jerry is well known to all of us. His objective and fair coverage of the activities in the Congress have brought great credit and great pride to the newspaper profession. I know from personal experience of the great respect with which he is held not only by myself but by all of us here in the Congress.

Though he has unquestionably earned retirement, we all sincerely hope that he will return frequently to Capitol Hill.

I want to take this opportunity to express my sincere best wishes to both Jerry and Mrs. O'Leary, his devoted wife, and my hope that they will enjoy many, many more years of health and happiness together. I sincerely wish Jerry well in all future endeavors. He is unquestionably not only a great reporter but a great American.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent at this time that there be inserted in the body of the RECORD with my remarks a copy of a letter which Jerry received from the President of the United States, extolling his virtues as a great reporter and newspaperman.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEPTEMBER 30, 1964.

MR. JEREMIAH A. O'LEARY,
The Washington Star,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JERRY: Your retirement today after 40 years with the Washington Star is yet another landmark in the story of the 88th Congress.

However, you have served the Senate through your informed and incisive reporting even longer than any present Member of that body. You have had an unparalleled opportunity to study and know the life of that great deliberative assembly. I know from personal experience that many legislators and countless readers have benefited from your judgment and wisdom.

Surely you will sustain your deep interest in Congress and political affairs, but it is good to know that you will be able to do so now in reasonable leisure. Also, I am confident that you and your fine family will have many more years of happiness together.

Sincerely,

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON RESEARCH FACILITIES FOR POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE, BROOKLYN, N.Y.

A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, on the provision of additional research facilities for the Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn, N.Y.; to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

REPORT ON RESEARCH FACILITIES AT NEW YORK UNIVERSITY, NEW YORK, N.Y.

A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, on the construction and renovation of research facilities at New York University, New York, N.Y.; to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

REPORT ON UNNECESSARY COST TO THE GOVERNMENT THROUGH THE LEASING OF ELECTRONIC DATA PROCESSING SYSTEMS BY THE BACCHUS WORKS, HERCULES POWDER CO., MAGNA, UTAH

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on unnecessary cost to the Government through the leasing of electronic data processing systems by the Bacchus Works, Hercules Powder Co., Magna, Utah, Department of Defense, dated September 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ENTITLED "DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE HANDLING OF POOLED COTTON ALLOTMENTS OF BILLIE SOL ESTES"—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—INDIVIDUAL, SUPPLEMENTAL, AND ADDITIONAL VIEWS (S. REPT. NO. 1607)

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senate Government Operations Committee, I am filing a report of the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of its study relating to certain operations of the Department of Agriculture and of relationships existing between personnel of that Department and Billie Sol Estes.

About 2½ years ago, Billie Sol Estes was arrested in Pecos, Tex. This arrest marked the beginning of a prolonged period of public attention centered on him. Our investigation was undertaken at a time when Estes was the subject of almost daily headline news stories; and when there were current rumors of cotton allotment manipulations favoring him in the Department of Agriculture.

The appearance of Billie Sol Estes before the subcommittee had to be postponed for more than a year. This postponement was in harmony with our longstanding policy of being scrupulous not to infringe on or prejudice the rights of defendants who were under indictment and awaiting trial on criminal charges. At the conclusion of our original series of hearings, when Estes would normally have been called to testify, there were both Federal and State indictments pending against him. At the request of Estes' attorney and the attorney general of Texas, and later because of similar requests by the Department of Justice and the Federal judge before whom Estes was to be tried, we delayed his appearance until these court trials were finished. We called him before the subcommittee to testify on November 12, 1963. He invoked the fifth amendment in response to all pertinent questions.

Immediately thereafter a report was drafted and on December 18, 1963, this proposed report was distributed to the members of the subcommittee for their study, suggestions, and recommendations or approval. It was not until a few days ago that the subcommittee arrived at and agreed to the basic report which I now submit. It was further agreed that each member who desired to supplement the basic report with his own views could do so. Accordingly, in addition to the principal report, the document I am submitting contains the separate views of Senator KARL E. MUNDT, jointly with Senator CARL T. CURTIS, and those of Senator SAM J. ERVIN, Jr., jointly with Senator EDMUND S. MUSKIE. I am also submitting separate individual views of my own.

I believe much good has resulted from this investigation. As this report sets forth, many needed reforms have been brought about in the areas in which weaknesses or deficiencies were revealed by evidence adduced at the hearings. It is probable that the reforms would not have been made except for these revelations. Revisions and improvement in organization are among the major benefits that usually result from the work of this subcommittee.

Mr. President, I offer for filing with the Senate the report entitled "Department of Agriculture Handling of Pooled Cotton Allotments of Billie Sol Estes," and ask that it be printed, together with the separate and individual views.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. INOUYE in the chair). The report will be received, and, without objection, the report will be printed, as requested by the Senator from Arkansas.

REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES—FEDERAL EMPLOYMENT AND PAY

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, I submit a report on Federal employment and pay for the month of August 1964. In accordance with the practice of several years' standing, I ask unanimous consent to have the report printed in the RECORD, together with a statement by me.

There being no objection, the report and the statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL PERSONNEL IN EXECUTIVE BRANCH, AUGUST 1964 AND JULY 1964, AND PAY, JULY 1964 AND JUNE 1964

PERSONNEL AND PAY SUMMARY

(See table I)

Information in monthly personnel reports for August 1964 submitted to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures is summarized as follows:

Total and major categories	Civilian personnel in executive branch: In August numbered—	In July numbered—	Increase (+) or decrease (−)	Payroll (in thousands) in executive branch: In July was—	In June was—	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
Total[1]	2,495,604	2,492,061	+3,543	$1,430,729	$1,389,857	+$40,872
Agencies exclusive of Department of Defense	1,461,958	1,461,345	+613	835,445	798,017	+37,428
Department of Defense	1,033,646	1,030,716	+2,930	595,284	591,840	+3,444
Inside the United States	2,337,527	2,336,638	+889			
Outside the United States	158,077	155,423	+2,654			
Industrial employment	550,996	551,298	−302			
Foreign nationals	135,516	136,707	−1,191	25,106	26,047	−941

[1] Exclusive of foreign nationals shown in the last line of this summary.

Table I breaks down the above figures on employment and pay by agencies.

Table II breaks down the above employment figures to show the number inside the United States by agencies.

Table III breaks down the above employment figures to show the number outside the United States by agencies.

Table IV breaks down the above employment figures to show the number in industrial-type activities by agencies.

Table V shows foreign nationals by agencies not included in tables I, II, III, and IV.

TABLE I.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during August 1964, and comparison with July 1964, and pay for July 1964, and comparison with June 1964*

Department or agency	Personnel: August	July	Increase	Decrease	Pay (in thousands): July	June	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):								
Agriculture	111,637	[1] 112,212		575	$62,470	$56,250	$6,220	
Commerce	32,345	32,461		116	23,471	21,865	1,606	
Health, Education, and Welfare	83,813	84,048		235	48,817	47,320	1,497	
Interior	68,237	[1] 69,814		1,577	43,428	40,499	2,929	
Justice	32,802	32,668	134		24,165	22,738	1,427	
Labor	9,313	9,393		80	6,628	6,340	288	
Post Office	593,196	588,065	5,131		301,721	289,604	12,117	
State [2] [3]	41,678	41,697		19	24,289	22,854	1,435	
Treasury	87,393	88,041		648	58,294	55,481	2,813	
Executive Office of the President:								
White House Office	350	353		3	268	253	15	
Bureau of the Budget	514	524		10	517	463	54	
Council of Economic Advisers	41	47		6	41	37	4	
Executive Mansion and Grounds	77	76	1		56	56		
National Aeronautics and Space Council	26	25	1		25	24	1	
National Security Council	42	43		1	40	38	2	
Office of Emergency Planning	336	351		15	333	321	12	
Office of Science and Technology	76	119		43	55	44	11	
Office of the Special Representative for Trade Negotiations	32	30	2		29	27	2	
President's Commission on the Assassination of President Kennedy	22	21	1		27	34		$7
President's Committee on Consumer Interests	12	13		1	15	9	6	
President's Committee on Equal Opportunity in Housing	10	10			8	5	3	
Independent agencies:								
Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations	26	26			31	24	7	
American Battle Monuments Commission	440	442		2	103	98	5	
Atomic Energy Commission	7,317	7,363		46	6,220	5,950	270	
Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System	637	638		1	471	440	31	
Civil Aeronautics Board	838	843		5	736	700	36	
Civil Service Commission	3,812	3,850		38	2,624	2,489	135	
Civil War Centennial Commission	5	5			5	5		
Commission of Fine Arts	6	6			6	6		
Commission on Civil Rights	93	97		4	60	51	9	
Delaware River Basin Commission	2	2			3	3		
Export-Import Bank of Washington	295	295			210	223		$13
Farm Credit Administration	227	229		2	205	182	23	
Federal Aviation Agency	45,480	45,431	49		36,576	35,588	988	
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review	7	7			5	5		
Federal Communications Commission	1,520	1,531		11	1,210	1,140	70	
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,355	1,342	13		998	917	81	
Federal Home Loan Bank Board	1,283	1,299		16	985	887	98	
Federal Maritime Commission	238	237	1		205	193	12	
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	416	411	5		412	390	22	

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE I.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during August 1964, and comparison with July 1964, and pay for July 1964, and comparison with June 1964*—Continued

Department or agency	Personnel				Pay (in thousands)			
	August	July	Increase	Decrease	July	June	Increase	Decrease
Independent agencies—Continued								
Federal Power Commission	1,099	1,131		32	$899	$852	47	
Federal Radiation Council	4	4			4	4		
Federal Reconstruction and Development Planning Commission for Alaska	6	6			5	5		
Federal Trade Commission	1,140	1,148		8	950	896	$54	
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	215	205	10		119	117	2	
General Accounting Office	4,355	4,363		8	3,273	3,090	183	
General Service Administration	34,974	35,140		166	19,033	18,110	923	
Government Printing Office	7,415	7,369	46		4,984	4,583	401	
Housing and Home Finance Agency	13,779	13,883		104	9,739	9,379	360	
Indian Claims Commission	20	20			21	31		10
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,395	2,390	5		1,851	1,789	62	
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	33,066	33,153		87	27,485	26,895	560	
National Capital Housing Authority	439	431	8		224	232		8
National Capital Planning Commission	55	58		3	48	45	3	
National Capital Transportation Agency	36	37		1	43	40	3	
National Gallery of Art	318	319		1	155	144	11	
National Labor Relations Board	2,095	2,075	20		1,651	1,557	94	
National Mediation Board	127	136		9	127	121	6	
National Science Foundation	943	1,019		76	766	761	5	
Panama Canal	14,679	14,795		116	4,194	5,282		1,088
President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity	62	63		1	47	43	4	
Railroad Retirement Board	1,823	1,845		22	1,186	1,134	52	
Renegotiation Board	199	202		3	195	192	3	
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation	161	163		2	111	108	3	
Securities and Exchange Commission	1,379	1,375	4		1,078	1,025	53	
Selective Service System	7,128	7,130		2	2,503	2,393	110	
Small Business Administration	3,401	3,384	17		2,503	2,363	140	
Smithsonian Institution	1,697	1,731		34	962	852	110	
Soldiers' Home	1,120	1,113	7		403	381	22	
Subversive Activities Control Board	28	29		1	24	24		
Tariff Commission	283	291		8	233	222	11	
Tax Court of the United States	157	155	2		147	137	10	
Tennessee Valley Authority	17,612	17,551	61		12,230	11,538	692	
U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency	159	174		15	158	147	11	
U.S. Information Agency	11,911	11,936		25	4,763	6,223		$1,460
United States-Puerto Rico Commission on the Status of Puerto Rico [4]	4	[1] 3	1		1		1	
Veterans' Administration	171,273	171,884		611	87,364	83,601	3,763	
Virgin Islands Corporation	451	568		117	204	148	56	
Woodrow Wilson Memorial Commission	1	1			(5)	(5)		
Total, excluding Department of Defense	1,461,958	1,461,345	5,519	4,906	835,445	798,017	40,014	2,586
Net increase, excluding Department of Defense			613				37,428	
Department of Defense:								
Office of the Secretary of Defense	2,084	2,135		51	1,967	1,785	182	
Department of the Army	372,206	370,445	1,761		204,209	[1] 210,183		5,974
Department of the Navy	330,165	330,048	117		[6] 202,084	194,294	7,790	
Department of the Air Force	293,343	292,406	937		166,948	[1] 164,454	2,494	
Defense Atomic Support Agency	1,911	1,917		6	1,070	1,039	31	
Defense Communications Agency	908	891	17		741	551	190	
Defense Intelligence Agency	2,110	2,087	23		1,636	1,599	37	
Defense Supply Agency	30,389	30,264	125		16,302	17,616		1,314
U.S. Court of Military Appeals	41	41			38	36	2	
Interdepartmental activities	8	8			5	6		1
International military activities	55	55			44	41	3	
Armed Forces information and education activities	426	419	7		240	236	4	
Total, Department of Defense	1,033,646	1,030,716	2.987	57	595,284	591,840	10,733	7,289
Net increase, Department of Defense			2,930				3,444	
Grand total, including Department of Defense [7]	2,495,604	2,492,061	8,506	4,963	1,430,729	1,389,857	50,747	9,875
Net increase, including Department of Defense			3,543				40,872	

---

[1] Revised on basis of later information.

[2] August figure includes 15,564 employees of the Agency for International Development as compared with 15,545 in July and their pay. These AID figures include employees who are paid from foreign currencies deposited by foreign governments in a trust fund for this purpose. The August figure includes 4,083 of these trust fund employees, and the July figure includes 4,070.

[3] August figure includes 1,139 employees of the Peace Corps as compared with 1,171 in July and their pay.

[4] New agency, created pursuant to Public Law 88–271.

[5] Less than $500.

[6] Subject to revision.

[7] Exclusive of personnel and pay of the Central Intelligence Agency and the National Security Agency.

TABLE II.—*Federal personnel inside the United States employed by the executive agencies during August 1964, and comparison with July 1964*

Department or agency	August	July	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture	110,402	[1] 111,021		619
Commerce	31,687	31,816		129
Health, Education, and Welfare	83,122	83,353		231
Interior	67,640	[1] 69,218		1,578
Justice	32,437	32,310	127	
Labor	9,215	9,310		95
Post Office	591,596	586,479	5,117	
State [2] [3]	11,113	11,107	6	
Treasury	86,718	87,376		658
Executive Office of the President:				
White House Office	350	353		3
Bureau of the Budget	514	524		10
Council of Economic Advisers	41	47		6
Executive Office of the President—Continued				
Executive Mansion and Grounds	77	76	1	
National Aeronautics and Space Council	26	25	1	
National Security Council	42	43		1
Office of Emergency Planning	336	351		15
Office of Science and Technology	76	119		43
Office of the Special Representative for Trade Negotiations	32	30	2	
President's Commission on the Assassination of President Kennedy	22	21	1	
President's Committee on Consumer Interests	12	13		1
President's Committee on Equal Opportunity in Housing	10	10		

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE II.—*Federal personnel inside the United States employed by the executive agencies during August 1964, and comparison with July 1964*—Continued

Department or agency	August	July	Increase	Decrease
Independent agencies:				
Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations	26	26	--------	--------
American Battle Monuments Commission	7	7	--------	--------
Atomic Energy Commission	7,281	7,330	--------	49
Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System	637	638	--------	1
Civil Aeronautics Board	838	843	--------	5
Civil Service Commission	3,810	3,847	--------	37
Civil War Centennial Commission	5	5	--------	--------
Commission of Fine Arts	6	6	--------	--------
Commission on Civil Rights	93	97	--------	4
Delaware River Basin Commission	2	2	--------	--------
Export-Import Bank of Washington	295	295	--------	--------
Farm Credit Administration	227	229	--------	2
Federal Aviation Agency	44,367	44,325	42	--------
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review	7	7	--------	--------
Federal Communications Commission	1,517	1,528	--------	11
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,353	1,340	13	--------
Federal Home Loan Bank Board	1,283	1,299	--------	16
Federal Maritime Commission	238	237	1	--------
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	416	411	5	--------
Federal Power Commission	1,099	1,131	--------	32
Federal Radiation Council	4	4	--------	--------
Federal Reconstruction and Development Planning Commission for Alaska	6	6	--------	--------
Federal Trade Commission	1,140	1,148	--------	8
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	183	174	9	--------
General Accounting Office	4,287	4,287	--------	--------
General Services Administration	34,950	35,116	--------	166
Government Printing Office	7,415	7,369	46	--------
Housing and Home Finance Agency	13,576	13,678	--------	102
Indian Claims Commission	20	20	--------	--------
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,395	2,390	5	--------
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	33,054	33,140	--------	86
National Capital Housing Authority	439	431	8	--------
National Capital Planning Commission	55	58	--------	3
National Capital Transportation Agency	36	37	--------	1
National Gallery of Art	318	319	--------	1
National Labor Relations Board	2,061	2,042	19	--------
National Mediation Board	127	136	--------	9
National Science Foundation	940	1,015	--------	75
Panama Canal	169	169	--------	--------
President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity	62	63	--------	1
Railroad Retirement Board	1,823	1,845	--------	22
Independent agencies—Continued				
Renegotiation Board	199	202	--------	3
Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation	161	163	--------	2
Securities and Exchange Commission	1,379	1,375	4	--------
Selective Service System	6,978	6,981	--------	3
Small Business Administration	3,343	3,326	17	--------
Smithsonian Institution	1,677	1,713	--------	36
Soldiers' Home	1,120	1,113	7	--------
Subversive Activities Control Board	28	29	--------	1
Tariff Commission	283	291	--------	8
Tax Court of the United States	157	155	2	--------
Tennessee Valley Authority	17,610	17,549	61	--------
U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency	159	174	--------	15
United States Information Agency	3,485	3,483	2	--------
United States-Puerto Rico Commission on the Status of Puerto Rico [4]	4	[1] 3	1	--------
Veterans' Administration	170,285	170,897	--------	612
Woodrow Wilson Memorial Commission	1	1	--------	--------
Total, excluding Department of Defense	1,398,904	1,398,107	5,497	4,700
Net increase, excluding Department of Defense	--------	--------	797	
Department of Defense:				
Office of the Secretary of Defense	2,035	2,088	--------	53
Department of the Army	324,207	324,143	64	--------
Department of the Navy	307,221	307,314	--------	93
Department of the Air Force	269,381	269,373	8	--------
Defense Atomic Support Agency	1,911	1,917	--------	6
Defense Communications Agency	860	843	17	--------
Defense Intelligence Agency	2,110	2,087	23	--------
Defense Supply Agency	30,389	30,264	125	--------
U.S. Court of Military Appeals	41	41	--------	--------
Interdepartmental activities	8	8	--------	--------
International military activities	34	34	--------	--------
Armed Forces information and education activities	426	419	7	--------
Total, Department of Defense	938,623	938,531	244	152
Net increase, Department of Defense	--------	--------	92	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	2,337,527	2,336,638	5,741	4,852
Net increase, including Department of Defense	--------	--------	889	

---

[1] Revised on basis of later information.

[2] August figure includes 3,110 employees of the Agency for International Development as compared with 3,068 in July.

[3] August figure includes 748 employees of the Peace Corps as compared with 777 in July.

[4] New agency, created pursuant to Public Law 88-271.

TABLE III.—*Federal personnel outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during August 1964, and comparison with July 1964*

Department or agency	August	July	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture	1,235	1,191	44	--------
Commerce	658	645	13	--------
Health, Education, and Welfare	691	695	--------	4
Interior	597	596	1	--------
Justice	365	358	7	--------
Labor	98	83	15	--------
Post Office	1,600	1,586	14	--------
State [1] [2]	30,565	30,590	--------	25
Treasury	675	665	10	--------
Independent agencies:				
American Battle Monuments Commission	433	435	--------	2
Atomic Energy Commission	36	33	3	--------
Civil Service Commission	2	3	--------	1
Federal Aviation Agency	1,113	1,106	7	--------
Federal Communications Commission	3	3	--------	--------
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	2	2	--------	--------
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	32	31	1	--------
General Accounting Office	68	76	--------	8
General Services Administration	24	24	--------	--------
Housing and Home Finance Agency	203	205	--------	2
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	12	13	--------	1
National Labor Relations Board	34	33	1	--------
National Science Foundation	3	4	--------	1
Panama Canal	14,510	14,626	--------	116
Selective Service System	150	149	1	--------
Independent agencies—Continued				
Small Business Administration	58	58	--------	--------
Smithsonian Institution	20	18	2	--------
Tennessee Valley Authority	2	2	--------	--------
U.S. Information Agency	8,426	8,453	--------	27
Veterans' Administration	988	987	1	--------
Virgin Islands Corporation	451	568	--------	117
Total, excluding Department of Defense	63,054	63,238	120	304
Net decrease, excluding Department of Defense	--------	--------	184	
Department of Defense:				
Office of the Secretary of Defense	49	47	2	--------
Department of the Army	47,999	46,302	1,697	--------
Department of the Navy	22,944	22,734	210	--------
Department of the Air Force	23,962	23,033	929	--------
Defense Communications Agency	48	48	--------	--------
International military activities	21	21	--------	--------
Total, Department of Defense	95,023	92,185	2,838	--------
Net increase, Department of Defense	--------	--------	2,838	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	158,077	155,423	2,958	304
Net increase, including Department of Defense	--------	--------	2,654	

---

[1] August figure includes 12,454 employees of the Agency for International Development as compared with 12,477 in July. These AID figures include employees who are paid from foreign currencies deposited by foreign governments in a trust fund for this purpose. The August figure includes 4,083 of these trust fund employees and the July figure includes 4,070.

[2] August figure includes 301 employees of the Peace Corps as compared with 394 in July.

TABLE IV.—*Industrial employees of the Federal Government inside and outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during August 1964, and comparison with July 1964*

Department or agency	August	July	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture	3,594	3,911	--------	317
Commerce	5,769	5,787	--------	18
Interior	9,635	9,470	165	--------
Post Office	276	275	1	--------
Treasury	5,410	5,389	21	--------
Independent agencies:				
Atomic Energy Commission	272	278	--------	6
Federal Aviation Agency	2,709	2,661	58	--------
General Services Administration	2,061	2,001	60	--------
Government Printing Office	7,415	7,369	46	--------
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	33,066	33,153	--------	87
Panama Canal	7,282	7,318	--------	36
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation	160	159	1	--------
Tennessee Valley Authority	14,477	14,417	60	--------
Virgin Islands Corporation	451	568	--------	117
Total, excluding Department of Defense	92,577	92,756	420	581
Net decrease, excluding Department of of Defense	--------	--------	179	
Department of Defense:				
Department of the Army:				
Inside the United States	[1] 137,099	[2] 137,073	26	
Outside the United States	[1] 4,259	[2] 4,109	150	--------
Department of the Navy:				
Inside the United States	186,360	186,513	--------	153
Outside the United States	1,274	1,275	--------	1
Department of the Air Force:				
Inside the United States	126,922	126,973	--------	51
Outside the United States	886	966	--------	80
Defense Supply Agency:				
Inside the United States	1,619	1,633	--------	14
Total, Department of Defense	458,419	458,542	176	299
Net decrease, Department of Defense	--------	--------	123	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	550,996	551,298	578	880
Net decrease, including Department of Defense	--------	--------	302	

---

[1] Subject to revision.

[2] Revised on basis of later information.

TABLE V.—*Foreign nationals working under U.S. agencies overseas, excluded from tables I through IV of this report, whose services are provided by contractual agreement between the United States and foreign governments, or because of the nature of their work or the source of funds which they are paid, as of August 1964, and comparison with July 1964*

Country	Total		Army		Navy		Air Force	
	August	July	August	July	August	July	August	July
Crete	83	85	--------	--------	--------	--------	83	85
England	2,470	2,490	--------	--------	83	97	2,387	2,393
France	16,295	16,411	13,011	13,097	9	9	3,275	3,305
Germany	67,226	67,827	56,635	57,130	71	71	10,520	10,626
Greece	294	285	--------	--------	35	35	259	250
Japan	42,655	43,065	14,688	14,792	12,502	12,520	15,465	15,753
Korea	5,471	5,506	5,471	5,506	--------	--------	--------	--------
Morocco	609	626	--------	--------	609	626	--------	--------
Netherlands	53	54	--------	--------	--------	--------	53	54
Trinidad	360	358	--------	--------	360	358	--------	--------
Total	135,516	136,707	89,805	90,525	13,669	13,716	32,042	32,466

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD OF VIRGINIA

Executive agencies of the Federal Government reported civilian employment in the month of August totaling 2,495,604. This was a net increase of 3,543, as compared with employment reported in the preceding month of July.

Civilian employment reported by the executive agencies of the Federal Government, by months in fiscal year 1965, which began July 1, 1964, follows:

Month	Employment	Increase	Decrease
July	2,492,061	10,479	----------
August	2,495,604	3,543	----------

Total Federal employment in civilian agencies for the month of August was 1,461,958, an increase of 613 as compared with the July total of 1,461,345. Total civilian employment in the military agencies in August was 1,033,646, an increase of 2,930 as compared with 1,030,716, in July.

Among the civilian agencies the largest increase was reported by the Post Office Department with 5,131. The larger decreases were reported by Interior Department with 1,577, Treasury Department with 648, Veterans Administration with 611, and Agriculture Department with 575.

In the Department of Defense the largest increases in civilian employment were reported by the Department of the Army with 1,761, and the Department of the Air Force with 937.

Total employment inside the United States in August was 2,337,527, an increase of 889 as compared with July. Total employment outside the United States in August was 158,077, an increase of 2,654 as compared with July. Industrial employment by Federal agencies in August totaled 550,996, a decrease of 302.

These figures are from reports certified by the agencies as compiled by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

FOREIGN NATIONALS

The total of 2,495,604 civilian employees certified to the committee by Federal agencies in their regular monthly personnel reports includes some foreign nationals employed in U.S. Government activities abroad, but in addition to these there were 135,516 foreign nationals working for U.S. agencies overseas during August who were not counted in the usual personnel reports. The number in July was 136,707. A breakdown of this employment for August follows:

Country	Total	Army	Navy	Air Force
Crete	83	--------	--------	83
England	2,470	--------	83	2,387
France	16,295	13,011	9	3,275
Germany	67,226	56,635	71	10,520
Greece	294	--------	35	259
Japan	42,655	14,688	12,502	15,465
Korea	5,471	5,471	--------	--------
Morocco	609	--------	609	--------
Netherlands	53	--------	--------	53
Trinidad	360	--------	360	--------
Total	135,516	89,805	13,669	32,042

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MANSFIELD (for Mr. HUMPHREY):

S. 3227. A bill for the relief of Dr. Darius Khorsand;

S. 3228. A bill to facilitate the entry of alien skilled specialists and the spouse and children of such specialists; and

S. 3229. A bill for the relief of Maria Carmen Arias de Cidre; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DODD:

S. 3230. A bill for the relief of Vukota Vukadinovic;

S. 3231. A bill for the relief of Mitar Damjanovic;

S. 3232. A bill for the relief of Angel D. Cortes, his wife, Concepcion Marti Cortes, and their children, Maria de los Angeles Cortes, Juan Francisco Cortes, and Avelina Cortes; and

S. 3233. A bill for the relief of George A. Halaby; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG of Ohio:

S. 3234. A bill for the relief of Susana Juh-Mei Chen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BAYH (for Mr. HARTKE):

S. 3235. A bill for the relief of Violet Shina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG of Ohio:

S.J. Res. 208. Joint resolution to require reasonable standards of fire prevention and protection in the institutional care of public assistance recipients; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. YOUNG of Ohio when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTION

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF SENATE DOCUMENT NO. 79, ENTITLED "REMARKS AND SPEECHES OF JOHN F. KENNEDY IN THE HOUSE AND SENATE"

Mr. MANSFIELD (for himself and Mr. DIRKSEN) submitted a resolution (S. Res. 377) providing for the printing of additional copies of Senate Document No. 79, entitled "Remarks and Speeches of John F. Kennedy in the House and Senate", which was considered and agreed to.

REQUIREMENT OF REASONABLE STANDARDS OF FIRE PREVENTION AND SAFETY IN THE MAINTENANCE OF NURSING HOMES

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, in the past, the Nation has experienced periodic shock over one tragic fire after another in nursing homes providing care to elderly men and women.

The Federal Government must assume some of the responsibility for those terrible occurrences, many of which could have been prevented had proper safeguards been in existence. The majority of elderly persons in nursing homes are public assistance recipients. The Federal Government pays over half of the more than $300 million spent annually for their care.

Late last year 63 elderly people were burned to death in a firetrap functioning as a nursing home in Fitchville, Ohio, very close to where I was born and reared—26 of those 63 persons were public assistance recipients. Federal money helped pay the cost of maintaining them in what turned out to be a deathtrap.

Mr. President, we have a responsibility to see to it that those unfortunate people on public assistance can go to sleep at night without the terrifying and all-too-often real fear of awakening in a burning building. We also have a responsibility to the families of these elderly men and women. We must assure them that their parents and grandparents and loved ones are safe.

I intend to meet my responsibility. I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution which would prohibit the use of Federal assistance funds to pay for care of elderly persons in nursing homes which fail to meet high standards of fire safety and protection acceptable to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

I am aware that substandard institutions will not be able to improve the quality of their structures overnight. For that reason, my resolution authorizes the Secretary to afford such institutions reasonable time and opportunity for compliance.

It is my hope that the States will increase their allowances for nursing home care in order to meet such additional costs as may be entailed by the necessity of meeting necessary standards of safety. However, even if such allowances are not increased, there is absolutely no way that we, in good conscience, can justify continued Federal participation in the cost of maintaining assistance recipients in unsafe institutions.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent not only that the joint resolution be appropriately referred but that it be printed as a part of my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 208) to require reasonable standards of fire prevention and protection in the institutional care of public assistance recipients, introduced by Mr. YOUNG of Ohio, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the conscience of the Nation has been shocked too often by such tragic occurrences as the recent nursing home fire in Fitchville, Ohio, in which the lives of sixty-three aged, bed-ridden patients were brought to a terrible end; and

Whereas twenty-six of those sixty-three unfortunate citizens who lost their lives in that holocaust were public assistance recipients whose expenses in that nursing home were being paid for in part by Federal funds; and

Whereas throughout the country more than half of the cost of care of public assistance recipients in nursing homes is being paid for by Federal funds; and

Whereas the Congress has an obligation to assure that Federal funds are not used to place or maintain public assistance recipients in unsafe institutions; and

Whereas it has been demonstrated in instance after instance that such fires would not have occurred and lives would not have been lost if reasonable standards of fire prevention and protection has been fully observed: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That no funds hereafter appropriated to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare shall be made available to any State for the purpose of defraying any part of the cost of caring for public assistance recipients in any nursing home or similar institution (other than a hospital) which, after reasonable opportunity for compliance, has failed to meet reasonable standards of fire prevention and protection prescribed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

INDONESIA'S AGGRESSION AGAINST MALAYSIA—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF SENATE RESOLUTION 376

Mr. HART. Mr. President, the United States is on record as supporting Malaysia's independence and territorial integrity. President Johnson was specific on this matter in his meeting with the Prime Minister of Malaysia last July. In the U.N. Security Council earlier this month Ambassador Stevenson reaffirmed America's position, and rightly termed "dangerous" the arguments used by the Indonesian Ambassador to justify the power play of the dictator, Sukarno.

The quackery argued by Indonesia in the U.N. is contrary to international law and convention. It is out of line with the U.N. Charter. It tramples on the right of self-determination, and the principles of international conduct piously professed by the Indonesian Government.

The situation in Malaysia, Mr. President, involves more than local mischief-making. As Senators know, a relatively mild resolution on Indonesia's aggression was vetoed in the Security Council by the Soviet Union—in defiance, Mr. President, of the orderly procedure and commonsense overwhelmingly supported by the Council members. Hopefully, this accomplice in aggression will not be given the last word. And I am confident this will not be the case.

The Uniting for Peace Resolution, adopted by the Council Assembly in 1950, offers a proper alternative. The resolution declares that the Security Council's failure to exercise its responsibility because of a lack of unanimity of its permanent members "does not relieve the United Nations of its responsibility under the charter to maintain international peace and security."

The resolution authorizes the General Assembly to consider and make recommendations on any situation where the Security Council has failed to act, and "where there appears to be a threat to the peace or a breach of the peace or an act of aggression."

It would seem reasonable to suggest that our Government make every effort to implement the United for Peace Resolution in the case of Indonesia's aggression, and seek to place the matter on the agenda of the forthcoming meeting of the U.N. General Assembly. In my book, Mr. President, this would serve the cause of world stability and peace, the security of the smaller nations, and, hopefully, the future welfare of the U.N. as an effective forum for the settlement of disputes.

Last week the distinguished senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] introduced Senate Resolution 376. The resolution is intended to express the sense of the Senate on the subject of Indonesia's aggression along the lines I have indicated.

Mr. President, I request that I be listed as a cosponsor of this resolution. I firmly believe that passage of this resolution would strengthen the hand of President Johnson, the Secretary of State, and especially the U.S. delegation to the U.N., as they continue with other governments to cope with an undeniable case of aggression.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, September 30, 1964, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 653. An act to provide an adequate basis for administration of the Lake Mead National Recreation Area, Ariz. and Nev., and for other purposes;

S. 1024. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to pay relocation costs made necessary by actions of the District of Columbia government, and for other purposes; and

S. 1082. An act to establish in the Treasury a correctional industries fund for the government of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR HERBERT WALTERS

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, I should like to make a few remarks about a colleague who will soon retire. That is Senator HERBERT WALTERS, who took the place of the distinguished Senator Estes Kefauver from Tennessee. Senator WALTERS has been with us only a few months. I had the pleasure of knowing him a long time before he came to the Senate. He was a national committeeman—I believe he still is—from the State of Tennessee. I was national committeeman from the State of North Carolina, and we had many happy associations over the years in working for the Democratic Party, our States, and our local organizations.

I was delighted to see HERB WALTERS come to the Senate. In the brief years I have been here I have seen about 40 new Senators come into the Senate, and I do not recall a single one who ever moved in with greater ease, grace, and desire to work than did HERB WALTERS. He is present at nearly every rollcall. He is on hand for the consideration of every piece of legislation.

He has caught on quickly. He is moving rapidly in the circles of the Senate. He is admired and respected by every other Senator and those who are employed in the Senate. He has endeared himself to them by his kindness, his graciousness, and his loyalty, not only to his State, but to the institution of which he is now a part. He is not running for reelection. He will not return to the Senate, as he told us the other day. I say to him again that he will always be a Senator. He will always be welcome to these Chambers and to all the institutions that pertain to the Senate, and we hope that he will come back and visit with us as often as he can. We shall miss him. We wish him the greatest of all pleasures when he goes back to his native State of Tennessee.

As the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] pointed out in relation to Jerry O'Leary, I am certain that HERB WALTERS will not return to Tennessee and sit down, because he is not a sitter. He is a worker. He will be working in his chosen field for the good of his State and for the good of humanity wherever he is.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, long before Senator WALTERS ever came to this body I came to know him exceedingly well in the State of Tennessee. First, he was a man of affairs and a doer if ever I saw one. My interest sprang from the fact that I have a son-in-law, a daughter, and two grandchildren living in Tennessee, and on the occasions when I went there to visit, almost invariably I would encounter Mr. WALTERS. He is one of the most gentle persons I have ever known. While he was a Democrat, he was a Democrat with restraint and a gentleman under every circumstance. That obtained even though he was a Democratic national committeeman from the State of Tennessee.

I salute the friendship that has existed between us over a long period of years, and I salute a very great gentleman and a great citizen of Tennessee. While he was here by appointment for only one session, he certainly has been diligent. He has accepted all the chores that have been assigned to him, and we shall certainly miss him on his departure from this body.

CONSTITUTIONAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, 26 years ago, it was my high honor and coveted privilege to speak for the Daughters of the American Revolution on the front lawn of the U.S. Supreme Court Building on the occasion of planting a scarlet oak tree, as an emblem of the perpetuity of constitutional government. On that occasion, I addressed myself, first, to the importance of trees and the fact that trees are the oldest living things on earth and the knowledge of their use an indicator of man's progress from the stone age to the mastery of the seas. I concluded the dedication of that scarlet oak tree by saying:

> In planting this oak tree on the grounds of the Supreme Court Building the Daughters of the American Revolution serve notice on all who may seek, openly or covertly, to destroy or undermine our edifice of constitutional American liberty, "We have just begun to fight." Constitutional American liberty is our richest heritage. We intend to pass it on to those who come after us.

Time after time, in the past 10 years, I have had occasion to complain of what the Supreme Court, in a naked grasp for power, has done to undermine our edifice of constitutional American liberty. It has construed the due process clause of the 14th amendment as an unlimited grant of power to invade the legislative prerogatives of the Congress, on the one hand, and to nullify the constitutional rights of the States, on the other; leaving in a lopsided condition a great instrument, intended to create three equal and coordinate branches of a Federal Union, composed of sovereign States.

Recently, I had occasion to examine the scarlet oak that I helped to plant in the Supreme Court yard on the 19th of April in 1938 and was distressed to find that an alien tree, said to be a product of Japan, had made the same type of inroad upon our American scarlet oak that the Supreme Court has made upon our Constitution. The Supreme Court groundskeeper informs me that the alien tree is a Sophora Japonica—a name that indicates, of course, that it is a Japanese tree. Twenty-six years ago, it was a relatively small tree. But that foreign tree, like many foreign ideas such as communism, made such a rapid growth that it completely blocked the growth of the scarlet oak on the side next to the Sophora Japonica.

Mr. President, I ask all lovers of trees, and all lovers of the Constitution, to visit the front lawn of the marble palace that houses our Highest Court and see what has happened in the brief span of 26 years to a tree that the Daughters of the American Revolution dedicated to the perpetuity of constitutional liberty. Then they will better understand why I am so distressed over what has happened to our Constitution in the intervening years and why I do not think that, because a majority of the Supreme Court thinks a particular reform is desirable, this gives them constitutional authority to rewrite laws or to amend the Constitution so as to carry out their so-called reforms.

Mr. President, I was elected to the House of Representatives in November 1932 on a Democratic platform that promised the Nation economy and the preservation of a system of private enterprise within the framework of the Constitution. Therefore, I frankly confess that it has been a source of genuine sorrow to me that in this historic session of the 88th Congress I have so frequently found it necessary to vote against bills that I thought were unconstitutional and against measures that I thought involved either imprudent spending or would create a trend toward a welfare state. As evidence, Mr. President, of my consistent support of the principles of Jefferson and Jackson, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, at this point, the speech I made on April 19, 1938, at the dedication of a scarlet oak tree, in which I stressed my adherence to a system of private enterprise within the framework of constitutional liberty.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> Madam Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, it was indeed a happy thought for the descendants of those who fought for freedom and framed for us a Constitution under which we enjoy constitutional liberty to dedicate on these historic grounds, to the perpetuity of constitutional government, a noble oak.
>
> Trees are the oldest living things on earth, and are, therefore, fitting emblems of institutions which we wish to see endure. Sequoia trees in California have been definitely ascertained to be as much as 4,000 years old, and next June a tree in the Sequoia National Park will be dedicated to the memory of that great American woman, Susan B. Anthony, which is estimated to be at least 3,000 years old. What better monument could there be to the progress of mankind than a noble tree that knew the sunshine and the rain long before King Solomon floated the tall cedars of Lebanon to Joppa for his marvelous temple and that has withstood all of the vicissitudes of the elements through the intervening centuries?
>
> The scientists, who apparently derive pleasure from a rationalistic philosophy of life, tell us that the earth was probably formed by a mighty star passing close to the sun at great speed, pulling from the sun's surface a great chunk of matter that became suspended in the universe and later known to us as the earth. For me, a simpler and more satisfying belief, especially since our scientists have as yet offered no rational explanation of the existence of the sun, is the story of creation as recounted in Genesis. Those of us who believe that story believe that God created the earth and all living things thereon. We believe it was no mere accident that the earth was so formed, that a part of it was dry land and a part of it seas, and the whole so shaped, as Solomon

tells us, that all of the rivers of the earth flow into the sea yet the sea is never filled. Neither do we believe it was any mere accident that God made the earth habitable for man by producing trees before he produced man. Being a fundamentalist in my beliefs, I accept the story of Genesis that on the third day of creation, whether that day be 24 hours or 24 billion hours, before He created any other living thing God created grass, shrubs, and every kind of tree that yields seed. Therefore, the tree is not only the oldest living thing on earth, but it likewise was the first living thing.

Our meager knowledge of the Garden of Eden is almost limited to the fact that it contained trees. The flaming sword that drove Adam and Eve from the Garden of Eden spared the trees. A great painter has pictured Eve in old age being borne on a stretcher, and pointing to a clump of trees in the distance she appears to be saying to her son Seth: "That is paradise." For us, trees should ever be symbolic of paradise regained.

The story of the use of trees is the story of civilization. When early mankind learned to use trees in the making of ships his real progress commenced. Long before the Egyptians invented the wheel, ships made of trees were man's principal means of transportation. Not only were they the bearers of early commerce of the world but likewise the bearers of the world's discoverers. Without ships there would have been no discovery of America and there would have been no settlement of the white man at Jamestown and Plymouth. And what a contribution trees made to the life of those early pioneers. They furnished homes and the furniture of those homes. They furnished fire, and at times their nuts and berries furnished food. They preserved the flow and purity of the drinking water, and the decomposition of their leaves through the centuries built up the fertility of the soil. Every town in America started as a town of wooden houses, and even the first iron horse was fired with wood and run upon wooden rails. With little capital and no factories the colonists found the timber resources of the land constituted their principal wealth, and the working of that timber their principal activity.

Through the use of the magnificent white oak and live oak trees of North America, we as a young Nation produced the clipper ships that threatened the supremacy of Great Britain upon the high seas. In fact, before the Revolutionary War, British shipping interests became so alarmed over our rapidly growing commerce that Parliament passed an act prohibiting the import in the colonies of the products of the West Indies except in British bottoms.

Of the great variety of trees that the American settler found in this new land of promise, the oak was the most important and the one with which he was the most familiar. To me it is a significant fact that wherever we find the oak we find a sturdy, independent, and liberty-loving people—a type of people that has made the greater progress in civilization. One of the grounds of complaint preferred by the barons against King John was the fact that he had set aside for royal use some of the finest oak forests of England, denying to the people even the pleasure of hunting in those forests. And late in the 17th century England attempted to reserve for the use of the Royal Navy the choicest timber in the New England territory, marking with the Crown symbol—the broad arrow—the finest oaks. That invasion of New England liberty helped to bring on the Revolutionary War. It is, therefore, but natural that the character of the oaks represents to us strength, permanence, and independence.

Of the 55 species of oak which are native to North America, the Scarlet Oak is one of the prettiest and most showy, while partaking of the inherent sturdiness of the oak family. When the Midas hand of fall touches the greenness of our mountainsides and our hardwood trees in gold and crimson dresses bid farewell to summer, the maple, the black gum, and the dogwood must yield the crown to the scarlet oak, the most brilliant of all and the last to part with its finery.

But it is not primarily as an ornament that we are dedicating here today a member of the oak family. We have selected the oak because it symbolizes our struggle for liberty and our inherited English system of self-government.

"What gnarled stretch, what depth of shade, is his!
There needs no crown to mark the forest's king;
How in his leaves outshines full summer's bliss!
Sun, storm, rain, dew, to him their tribute bring.
Which he with such benignant royalty
Accepts, as overpayeth what is lent;
All nature seems his vassal proud to be,
And cunning only for his ornament.

"So, from oft converse with life's wintry gales,
Should man learn how to clasp with tougher roots
The inspiring earth; how otherwise avails
The leaf-creating sap that sunward shoots?
So every year that falls with noiseless flake
Should fill old scars upon the stormward side,
And make hoar age revered for age's sake,
Not for traditions of youth's leafy pride."

Our Nation has experienced 7 lean years, 7 troublesome years. No longer is there free land in the West for those who find themselves displaced in industry. Through a prodigal and most unwise use of a great sustaining resource, our forests, the millions who depend upon the soil for a livelihood have found their income greatly reduced. Never was there greater need for the people of this Nation to take stock of the natural resources that are left and to renew their allegiance to the soil from whence comes all true wealth. And in doing so, we should likewise take stock of those principles of character which are best exemplified in the character of the oak. We need in our land today a rebirth of the pioneer spirit; a rebirth of sturdiness, independence, and self-reliance; a rebirth of the fundamental belief that the prosperity of a nation comes and can only come from toil and self-sacrifice. Whether you are a rationalist or a fundamentalist, I believe you will agree with me that no act of the Congress can repeal this law of Genesis: "In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread until thou return unto the ground." When we face life's wintry gales, we should learn from the sturdy oak, the uncrowned king of the forests, how to "clasp with tougher roots the inspiring earth."

May the tree that we are planting today also teach us how to protect and preserve with greater faith, with greater confidence, and with greater strength the form of government handed down to us by our revolutionary ancestors. There are some in our land today who take that form of government for granted and are indifferent as to its blessings. There are some who are openly opposed to it, but, fortunately, their number is relatively small. There is still another group which, to my mind, is even more dangerous than either of those I have mentioned; namely, the group while professing to believe in constitutional government would nevertheless undermine in insidious ways the great instrument under which that form of government has been enjoyed in this country for a century and a half. Men of that type are not new to this age.

The great statesman Daniel Webster knew and recognized them in his day and time. Standing on the steps of the Capitol on the 100th anniversary of the birth of our greatest American, George Washington, Daniel Webster said of the destruction of the Constitution: "Other misfortunes may be borne, or their effects overcome. If disastrous wars should sweep our commerce from the ocean, another generation may renew it; if it exhaust our Treasury, future industry may replenish it; if it desolate and lay waste our fields, still under a new cultivation, they will grow green again, and ripen to future harvests. It were but a trifle even if the walls of yonder Capitol were to crumble, if its lofty pillars should fall, and its gorgeous decorations be all covered by the dust of the valley. All these may be rebuilt. But who shall reconstruct the fabric of demolished government? Who shall rear again the well-proportioned columns of constitutional liberty? Who shall frame together the skillful architecture which unites national sovereignty with State rights, individual security, and public prosperity? No; if these columns fall, they will be raised not again. Like the Coliseum and the Parthenon, they will be destined to a mournful, and a melancholy immortality. Bitterer tears, however, will flow over them than were ever shed over the monuments of Roman or Grecian art; for they will be the monuments of a more glorious edifice than Greece or Rome ever saw, the edifice of constitutional American liberty."

In planting this oak tree on the grounds of the Supreme Court Building the Daughters of the American Revolution serve notice on all who may seek, openly or covertly, to destroy or undermine our edifice of constitutional American liberty, "We have just begun to fight." Constitutional American liberty is our richest heritage. We intend to pass it on to those who come after us.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF SENATE DOCUMENT NO. 79, ENTITLED "REMARKS AND SPEECHES OF JOHN F. KENNEDY IN THE HOUSE AND SENATE"

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, after conferring with the distinguished minority leader, I send to the desk, on behalf of myself and the distinguished minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN], a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution providing for the printing of additional copies of Senate Document No. 79, entitled "Remarks and Speeches of John F. Kennedy in the House and Senate."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the reason for the resolution is that we understand under the resolution passed by the Senate there will be only 500 copies. This resolution will provide for an additional 900 copies.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 377) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Appropriations nine hundred additional copies of Senate Document No. 79, Eighty-eighth Congress, second session, entitled "Remarks and Speeches of John F. Kennedy in the House and Senate."

GOLDWATER NO "DEMAGOG"

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, this morning there appeared in the Washington Post a column by John Chamberlain, who writes under the general byline of "These Days." In this particular column, styled "Goldwater No 'Demagog'," he writes on the whole question of extremism.

It has occurred to me that within the next few days we shall observe the anniversary of the discovery of America by a man who, in his time, was one of the greatest of all extremists. His name was Christopher Columbus. Together with his brother Bartholomew, who was a mapmaker, he insisted that the world was round. The wonder is that, with such heretical utterances back in 1492, Christopher Columbus was not burned at the stake. The professors at the university simply could not countenance, nor could the church countenance, that kind of doctrine. If it had not been for the gracious Queen Isabella, he would not have been able to sail westward with the *Nina*, the *Pinta*, and the *Santa Maria* to find what he thought would be gold and spices. Instead, he found an island in the Caribbean, where he landed on the 12th of October.

So as we observe the 472d anniversary of the discovery of America, we can think of one of the world's greatest extremists.

John Chamberlain, a man of considerable talent, has done an exceptionally fine piece of work in this article with respect to Senator GOLDWATER. I ask unanimous consent that it be placed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THESE DAYS—GOLDWATER NO "DEMAGOG"

(By John Chamberlain)

Whatever may be the faults of BARRY GOLDWATER, he is not one of "those who rave and rant" about anything. So far as his own personal speechmaking is concerned, he has been waging the least demagogic national campaign that anyone now alive could possibly remember.

Just consider how he has been breaking all the more cynical campaign rules. He goes into West Virginia and unburdens himself on the subject of the current antipoverty campaign for the allegiance of the Appalachian States. He says a mere billion dollars will do practically nothing toward eliminating poverty, which is certainly a true statement. But it is not the sort of thing that a demagogic ranter and raver would choose to tell an audience in the heart of the region that will be getting the money.

On his swing through the South, Mr. GOLDWATER stops in Tennessee. There, where it is supposed to be political suicide to attack the TVA, he reaffirms his proposal to sell certain TVA appendages, such as fertilizer plants, to private owners.

Moving on into Texas, he speaks at Fort Worth, where the local plant of General Dynamics Corp. has been awarded a $6 billion contract to manufacture the TFX aircraft. He tells the Texans that the TFX contract was "politically oriented," and that it should have gone to Boeing in Seattle, a company which, Senator GOLDWATER said, was in a position to make a better plane.

Mr. GOLDWATER's refusal to play it safe is cause for almost ecstatic wonder in a most unlikely place, the little Freedom and Union magazine put out by Clarence Streit, the prophet of a federation of the Atlantic democracies. When Mr. GOLDWATER made clear at San Francisco that "Atlantic union is a key issue to him," says Streit, "the extreme nationalists in the Goldwater camp and his extreme critics in the other who seem convinced that he is dominated by 'isolationists,' 'Birchers,' and 'Fascists' * * * were struck dumb." Streit finds Mr. GOLDWATER far more satisfactory than Lyndon Johnson on the subject of Atlantic community, for the Johnson acceptance speech at Atlantic City "made no reference to Atlantica, whose flowering had so big a place in Senator GOLDWATER's acceptance."

As the GOLDWATER campaign unfolds, it becomes increasingly apparent that we have a most unpolitical nominee contending for the Presidency. The man seems extreme because he is extremely honest. It is true, of course, that GOLDWATER hasn't been talking recently about making social security voluntary, which might be construed as a retreat.

But the reason for the silence, I think, is that Mr. GOLDWATER despairs of making himself understood on the subject in a campaign year. The original Goldwater statement on social security followed the publication of a poll taken in Britain which indicated that more than 50 percent of the English voters would like to have the opportunity to contract out of Government welfare schemes. "Contracting out" implies that welfare must be kept up, but that a choice would be allowed between the public and private kinds.

Now it is not true that the American Government is powerless to find a way to finance a social security system that would permit a person to select a public or a private old-age insurance policy, the qualifying stipulation being that he must maintain either one or the other. But a presidential candidate would have to take a battery of insurance actuaries along with him to be convincing on this point. And very few people would hang around long enough to listen.

Senator GOLDWATER's honesty, which transcends the call of duty, recalls that of John Stuart Mill in Victorian times. When he was campaigning for the English Parliament in 1865, Mill was confronted by a group of workingmen who asked him if he had authored a quote that said "the lower classes, though mostly habitual liars, are ashamed of lying." Mill looked the workingmen in the eye and said, "I did." Whereupon they cheered him and voted for him—and he won his seat in Commons.

That, however, was a century ago. And besides, it was in another country.

THE FUTURE OF TRUTH-IN-PACKAGING LEGISLATION

Mr. HART. Mr. President, at this point in the history of the 88th Congress—when pressures mount to adjourn, Members are eager to go home and a few are apprehensive that they will not be allowed to return—I take comfort from one small political fact of life. It is that on this Hill there are some "deaths" which need not be accepted as final.

Therefore, Mr. President, I rise now not to eulogize a dear friend of mine—truth in packaging—now "dying" in the Judiciary Committee, but to announce that—granted the opportunity—I shall breathe new life into it next Congress.

Further, I pledge to devote fresh vigor and new dedication to its enactment as the law of the land.

One camp of observers will greet this announcement with either amusement at my folly or fear of my success. However, I feel certain that millions of consumers over our Nation would want it no other way and would be deeply disappointed in me if I behaved otherwise.

Certainly, I am not so naive as to think that the achievement of my promise will be easy. The opposition began lining up in June of 1961, when investigative hearings opened. The last time we counted noses, we found companies representing more than $100 billion in annual sales—almost one-sixth of our gross national product—opposing S. 387.

Thus far, the success of this opposition is apparent—success achieved mainly with only the weak allegation of "unnecessary and unwanted."

Yet, these same critics who oppose the legislation as "unnecessary and unwanted" eagerly participated in the drafting of a model administrative ruling proposed to the States by the National Conference of Weights and Measures on the prominence and placement of quantity statements on package labels. It is true that by their participation, industry spokesmen watered down the original recommendations of the State weights and measures officials. Nevertheless, some minimum standards for type size were adopted by the conference on June 18 of this year.

Surely, my colleagues will allow me a bit of amusement at the irony involved not only in this proposal but in a headline in the August 1964 issue of Modern Packaging which heralded its adoption. The headline was "Standards at Last for Conspicuous Labeling." My amusement over this article comes, of course, because the ruling adopts the philosophy of the first three sections of the truth-in-packaging bill—a bill so violently condemned by industry. In fact, some witnesses at our hearings said that these exact sections would amount to confusing the American housewife—that confusion to come, I gather, by telling her clearly how much is in a package.

Frankly, the adoption of this ruling and its warm acceptance by industry spokesmen came about, I think, because business has discovered that the information and protection truth in packaging seeks to give the consumer is far from "unwanted and unnecessary."

There have been many indications of the consumer demand. For instance, a survey to determine consumer attitudes was conducted by the Institute for Design Analysis in the San Francisco Bay area in July 1963.

Mr. President, in summarizing their findings, the institute said:

> The survey revealed a widespread dissatisfaction and distrust of present consumer goods packaging practices.

Those who would blame one PHILIP A. HART for planting this seed of dissatisfaction might be interested in the fact that while more than 50 percent of the total felt that packages and labels do not give enough information, less than 25 percent had heard of the Hart bill.

But how effective can this recommendation by the national conference be? The suggested regulation does not have the force of law—unless adopted by the 50 individual States of the Union—a formidable, if not hopeless task.

In the meantime, industry is free to disregard the standards at will. And if one firm sees fit not to go along, who can blame those who must compete if they do the same? We heard too many ethical businessmen say that they could not get off the merry-go-round of bad practices, until some minimum guideliness for all were established, to hold much hope for voluntary action.

However, there are other sections of the bill aimed at practices which continue unabated and upon which no action has been taken. One of these is the discretionary authority S. 387 grants to FTC and FDA to establish standards on a product line basis to eliminate deceptive sizes.

This from the beginning—and up to this minute—has been one of the most strongly attacked sections of the bill by industry.

In fact, the Modern Packaging article to which I referred reports:

> About all that remains in the Hart bill are its demands for standardization of package sizes and elimination of fractional weights—both of which, industry can prove, would result not in benefits to the consumer, but in higher cost.

Mr. President, the Hart bill does not intend to "standardize" in the sense of the word used by the article. All it asks is a reasonable relationship between package size and quantity of contents.

It seems to me that one enlightened manufacturer of dry cereals—a manufacturer who, I am happy to say, has headquarters in Michigan—has recently proven that not only is it not necessary to raise prices when you adopt a compact package but the consumer acceptance acclaim is well worth any cost of changing.

The bill seeks also to assure that, where necessary, reasonable weights and measures will be used instead of the proliferation of odd sizes in many product lines which make rational price comparisons almost an impossibility.

How necessary is this? Well, Modern Packaging has an article in its September issue entitled "The Case for Standardization." The editorial concludes:

> Participation in the new international movement toward standardization of package sizes seems to us a "must" for American packages—not merely as a defensive measure, but for the real advantages that it may bring.

The editorial refers to advantages for manufacturers. The advantages to the consumer are just as obvious.

My own State of Michigan has recently adopted the first revision of its weights and measures law since 1913. It is heartening to note that some provisions aimed at practices exposed by the truth-in-packaging hearings are included in this bill.

Certainly, the minimum protection offered by this measure to the citizens of Michigan should be available to all citizens of these United States.

The Trade Press, voice of the industries involved, has expressed increasing concern with the problems manufacturers face in packaging products for the many diverse State standards prevalent in the country.

Only by the flexible approach to nationwide standards encompassed in the truth-in-packaging bill can a measure of uniformity and consumer assistance be achieved in the next decade.

No, Mr. President, truth in packaging ought not be allowed to die. There is too much work yet to be done. I believe experience will prove it to be of benefit to packagers and consumers alike.

At this time, Mr. President, I should also like to express my thanks to the members of the Judiciary Committee who have authorized the subcommittee report on the truth in-packaging bill to be published as a committee print. Hopefully, this report will be available for distribution in approximately 1 month.

GREAT LAKES WATER LEVELS

Mr. HART. Mr. President, this morning's papers carry the welcome word that Governor Romney has joined me and my colleagues from the Midwest States in requesting an International Joint Commission study of the Great Lakes water levels problems.

I made exactly this proposal to Secretary of State Dean Rusk on April 15 of this year. Senators Nelson and Proxmire, Humphrey and McCarthy, Bayh and Hartke, Clark, and Douglas all associated themselves with this request.

On May 8 and June 5, I reported to the Senate on the progress of this proposal, noting that it had been well received in virtually all quarters. On July 24 the Senate Commerce Committee held a public hearing—which I chaired—on the status of the matter, with the principal executive departments involved reporting on the steps that had been taken to implement my proposal. Since Governor Romney was in Washington at the time, I invited him to appear at that hearing and he presented some helpful but necessarily extemporaneous remarks.

At that July 24 hearing, as I reported to a public meeting in Lansing on July 28, the representative of the Department of State informed us that upon receipt of my letter to Secretary Rusk "first proposing that the Department discuss with the Canadian Government the possibility of a reference to the IJC on the problem of the water levels of the Great Lakes," agreement had been sought among the interested Federal agencies; that such agreement had been reached; that the proposal had been transmitted to the Canadian Government as an official proposal having the full support of the administration; that agreement had been reached on the Canadian side on the proposed draft of the reference which they wish to submit to the IJC; that there remained only the task of reconciling the terms of the two Governments' drafts.

We therefore welcome the support of Governor Romney and will welcome the interest and cooperation of other officials and interested citizens on both sides of the border.

An article in the September 28, 1964, issue of U.S. News & World Report, "When Water Runs Short in the Great Lakes," well points out that these problems affect Canada as much as they do the United States, and that we must jointly seek out the answers.

However beneficial a control of the lake levels might be, my own thinking is that we are going to have to look ahead in terms of diversion of additional water into the Great Lakes Basin. This water, as far as we now know, could come only from Canada. And to anyone whose instinctive reaction might be "but the Canadians would not want to divert any of their rivers down into the Great Lakes," I point out that turning unused or little-used waters into the basin would be of enormous benefit to the heartland of Canadian industry and shipping.

The pros and cons of this proposal and others will, I hope, be the subject of study by the appropriate body, the International Joint Commission.

While we are on this subject, Mr. President, I want to make one thing very clear, as I did at our public hearing on July 24. Yes, the levels of the Great Lakes present a serious problem now and, absent any action on our part, could become disastrous. We would be derelict if we did not put our best minds to work on possible and economically feasible solutions. However, we resent slanted advertisements that seek to discourage shipping from our Great Lakes routes. I point out that at the present time any ship that can transit the seaway locks, which provide for ships of a maximum draft of 25½ feet, can be accommodated in the Detroit port. The water depth for the entire route between Detroit and the seaway is presently 27 feet, or better. Through the end of August, seaway commerce had reached the total of 24 million net tons, compared to 18 million net tons last year.

Because we have the prudence and the foresight to want to look ahead and make sure that our magnificent water resource will serve the needs of the future as well as the needs of today, this should not be used to penalize lake ports through adverse "scare" publicity.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the U.S. News & World Report article referred to above be inserted in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

WHEN WATER RUNS SHORT IN THE GREAT LAKES

(Once again the Great Lakes and their rivers have dropped below normal levels—bringing heavy losses and hardships to people and cities on their shores. What causes the lakes to rise and fall so much? Can anything be done about it? Are new remedies going to be tried? Both Canada and the United States are agreed that more controls are needed. But they will be costly.)

The violent ups and downs of the Great Lakes are fast becoming one of the most ticklish problems ever faced by the United States and Canada.

Only 12 years ago, high water was overflowing the Great Lakes basin, creating havoc on both sides of the international boundary. Today, abnormally low water is proving equally disastrous.

Hydropower generation has had to be cut back. Ships cannot carry full cargoes up and down the St. Lawrence Seaway. Ports and harbors are losing business. Changing shorelines have left lakeshore cottages and resorts high and dry. Industries and cities are finding pollution harder to handle.

The current water shortage has added new urgency to a centuries-old problem that has grown more acute with each passing year: preserving and conserving the Great Lakes for future generations.

Alarmed authorities in the United States and Canada met three times this past summer in emergency conference.

They found no quick and simple answers, but they agreed that long-term corrective action must be started soon to safeguard North America's most priceless fresh water supply.

KEY TO AN EMPIRE

The Great Lakes, twisting westward a third of the way across the continent, are the largest source of fresh water in the world.

Along the shores of this huge water system, a rich industrial empire has developed and thrived.

More than 80 million people live in the 8 U.S. States and 2 Canadian Provinces flanking the Great Lakes. Directly and indirectly, their fortunes are tied to North America's inland seas.

Fresh water is becoming increasingly scarce. Water already is used again and again—in homes and factories, for transportation, power generation, recreation, fishing and farming.

WATER TO MAKE STEEL

It takes 500 tons of water to make a ton of steel, twice as much to grow a ton of wheat. A city like Chicago must have over a billion gallons a day.

Needs are multiplying everywhere. Water used per person, now more than 200 gallons a day in some places, is expected to be double that by 1980.

Consequently, the wasteful and destructive cycle of high and low levels on the Great Lakes, unchecked since the lakes were scoured out by retreating glaciers 20,000 years ago, is no longer tolerable, according to experts.

Taming the Great Lakes, however, runs into the unique geography of the lake region.

Almost one-third of the surface of the 295,000 square miles in the Great Lakes' watershed is water. In most watersheds only about one-tenth of the surface is water. This relative lack of land surface in the lake region is a handicap, exaggerating the impact of changes in rainfall, runoff and evaporation—the major influences on water levels and supply.

Thus a drought in the Great Lakes basin has unusually severe effects.

Consider the past 3½ years: Rainfall in this period has been almost 1 foot below normal on Lake Michigan and Lake Erie, and around 7 inches under par on Lake Superior, Lake Huron, and Lake Ontario.

Such dry spells, with fewer clouds and more sunshine, accelerate the rate of evaporation. And evaporation losses, which vary from lake to lake, are bad enough at any time, ranging as high as 34 inches—almost 3 feet—on Lake Erie even in an average year.

As a result of the recent drought, each month this year new record lows have been noted on the Great Lakes, with a drop of more than 3 feet in the level of Lake Michigan and Lake Huron.

COSTLY INCHES

Experts calculate that a drop of 1 inch in water levels means a $1 million loss per year for power producers and a decrease of 60 to 100 tons in the payload of every ship.

Iron-ore carriers estimate lost revenues from smaller loads may reach $13 million in 1964 alone, and other cargo carriers also are suffering.

At the same time, the water shortage has reduced hydropower output. In the past 19 months, the Ontario Hydro-Electric Power Commission has burned up $20 million worth of coal to replace lost hydrocapacity. This experience has been matched by producers of power in northern New York.

Add the cost of extra dredging, of relocating docks, of ruined fishing grounds, and aggravated pollution, and the toll taken by this low-water cycle has already reached $100 million or more, according to some estimates.

High water can be just as destructive, flooding out powerplants, eroding shorelines, and destroying waterfront properties. Damage from the last high-water cycle in 1952–53 totaled at least $100 million.

A PRACTICAL QUESTION

With bills like these to be paid, both the United States and Canada are agreed on the need to stabilize Great Lakes levels. The question yet to be decided is how much control is practical and economical.

Because of the vast area covered by the lakes, fantastic volumes of water are involved in the most modest change in lake levels.

For example, if 10,000 cubic feet of water could be emptied into Lake Superior every second for the next 5½ years and held there, the level of the lake would rise only 1 foot.

By comparison, nature's changes are on an awesome scale.

Indications are that Lake Michigan has been up to 60 feet higher than its present level, and as much as 350 feet lower, since the last ice age. But the biggest variation since records were started in 1860 has been 6.6 feet.

Rainfall, or lack of it, still makes the big difference, but other factors also influence water levels and supplies. These include diversions, changes in lake outlets, and other manmade controls.

MAN'S TINKERING

Man has been tinkering with the Great Lakes for years. The flow of water over Niagara Falls, which is at the eastern end of Lake Erie, is strictly regulated day and night.

Ship's channels have been deepened in the rivers that connect the lakes. Large volumes of water are diverted both in and out of the lakes for sanitation, power, and navigation purposes.

All these manmade checks and balances have effects, lowering some lakes and raising others. Communities, companies, and individuals living along the lakes or on rivers that are affected by them have a big stake in any changes now or in the future in lake controls.

As indicated on the map on page 99, the levels of two lakes—Superior at the western end of the chain and Ontario at the eastern end—are now held within certain limits by a complicated system of navigation locks, powerplants, and dams with gates that can be opened and closed. Comparable control is being urged for the three other lakes. But the big puzzle is how to do it. As yet no one appears to know exactly what can or should be done.

The first move is up to leaders in Washington and Ottawa. They are expected to authorize a comprehensive study soon of the Great Lakes water system—past, present, and future. Plans for remedies will be based on this survey.

Whatever the diagnosis, the cure is bound to be difficult and expensive, particularly for Lake Huron and Lake Michigan, which are in reality one huge lake with only a single outlet. That at least, is the conclusion of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, based on extensive investigation of lake levels.

The Engineers' report, due to be filed in December, will stress the need for a lake-sized "faucet" at the lower end of Lake Huron that could be turned off, and on. This plan would involve a dam with gates, to back up water and dole it out when levels are low, plus some method of discharging large volumes of water when levels are high.

THE TOUGHER PROBLEM

The high-water problem is the one that poses the most difficulty. Engineers estimate that at times it would take a discharge of water equal to 2½ St. Clair and Detroit rivers to flush away the excess water on the twin lakes of Michigan and Huron.

In fact, the Engineers suggest it would not be economically feasible now to install the complicated plumbing needed to regulate Lakes Michigan, Huron, and Erie. The cost of this plumbing is unofficially estimated at around $1 billion—twice as much as the St. Lawrence Seaway.

However, the new study now planned will consider all aspects of water in the Great Lakes basin and may permit a more favorable verdict.

A 12-GOVERNMENT TASK

Political complications involved in any decision to regulate the lakes cannot be minimized. Twelve governments will have to cooperate: the Government of Canada and two Canadian Provinces on one side; the U.S. Government and eight States on the other side. But the climate for cooperation is improving.

"We made more progress at three meetings this summer than we have in the last 3 years," says A. J. Meserow, chairman of the Great Lakes Commission, an action group formed by the eight U.S. States bordering the lakes. He is confident that all the Great Lakes can and will be regulated.

Will adequate controls of the lakes assure enough fresh water for future needs in North America's industrial heartland? Experts differ, but the consensus is: Yes—for a while, provided pollution can be controlled.

In the long run the final answer may be to bring surplus water from Canada's northern river systems and deliver it to the Great Lakes, the western plains, and perhaps as far south as Mexico. These imaginative, costly schemes for reversing Canada's northern rivers are still on the drawing boards, but hardheaded politicians do not dismiss them lightly.

"Within 10 years, a start will be made on diverting our northern waters to southern use," prophesies Arthur Laing, Canada's Minister of Northern Affairs and Natural Resources.

THE WARREN COMMISSION REPORT ON THE ASSASSINATION OF PRESIDENT KENNEDY

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I call the Senate's attention to an editorial printed in this morning's Baltimore Sun.

Certainly the Warren Commission report is, and should be, in the minds of all thinking Americans today. Perhaps the press, more than any other segment of our society, will look at it most thoughtfully. Every major newspaper will undoubtedly editorialize on the merits of the report's criticism—not only of the press, but of all others who played important parts in the events of that tragic day in Dallas.

The Sun's dispassionate analysis is, I believe, an outstanding piece of editorializing, and I am in complete agreement with it. This newspaper agrees with the report—admits the fault of the press in the bizarre proceedings following the tragedy—and continues:

> It is impossible to imagine any rules the press could have imposed on itself in advance. * * * It is a matter of conscience.

It is not, in our opinion, a matter for a formal code of professional ethics.

No one can deny that, in the development of our democracy, the press has played a major role in the protection of our essential freedoms. Without a free press, there is truly no freedom for any segment of our society. Certainly the press has been difficult at times. No one in public life can deny this. But in the vast majority of cases, the free and uninhibited atmosphere in which the press operates has nurtured the seeds of liberty and brought them to bloom.

Any limitation of this atmosphere must be imposed by the press itself, through, as the Sun has indicated, its own conscience. It is unthinkable that any governmental authority should attempt to establish the sort of controls which, too often, we witness in other countries.

Quite the contrary—it seems to me that, in cases which do not involve national security, members of the press should be given greater latitude, should be allowed access to more material rather than being spoon fed only that information which is deemed necessary for favorable coverage. None can deny the tendency of administrators, officials, and politicians to hide the unpleasant and, in the words of the lyricist, "accentuate the positive."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this excellent editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PRESS AND DALLAS

The press, by which is meant here the newsgatherers for daily and other publications, for the press associations and for television and radio, including cameramen and technicians, cannot ignore the Warren Commission's finding that its operations contributed to the confusion amid which Jack Ruby killed Lee Harvey Oswald in the Dallas police building last November 24.

The Commission expressed the belief, on the basis of its intensive investigation, that "the news media, as well as the police authorities, who failed to impose conditions more in keeping with the orderly processes of justice, must share responsibility for the failure of law enforcement which occurred in connection with the death of Oswald." The Commission said further that "the promulgation of a code of professional ethics governing representatives of all news media would be welcome evidence that the press had profited by the lesson of Dallas," and noted "the need for the exercise of self-restraint by the news media in periods when the demand for information must be tempered by other fundamental requirements of our society."

It does not suffice to reply in general terms that the press constantly exercises a considerable degree of self-restraint, in matters of the national security and in matters of the processes of law; for in this particular instance the presence of the press in great numbers unquestionably helped to create a situation in which a man was killed, and a situation which, had he lived, would have worked against his fair and impartial trial.

Nor does it quite suffice to agree with the Commission's findings that for that situation the Dallas police were chiefly at fault, in not laying down rules for the press and seeing that they were complied with, in not refraining from an almost continuous stream of revelations of evidence—some accurate, some in error—and in the failure to check unauthorized visitors that permitted Ruby not only to be in the basement of the police building to kill Oswald on Sunday but also to visit the third floor on Friday and to appear at the bizarre Oswald "press conference" just after midnight that night.

The point is that if the press had not been there, with its persistence and its number and its lights and cameras and microphones and cables, the killing might possibly not have occurred, and the evidence would probably not have been given out the way it was.

The press has been increasingly conscious, in recent years of fuller communications and a proliferation of kinds of media, of the difficulties posed by "mass reporting." Reporting en masse works sometimes against accuracy, and sometimes makes for a certain shallowness of information—on the whole, people in the news talk more glibly to many people than to few—and often causes confusion, though almost never matching in magnitude the confusion of Dallas.

For those 2 days in Dallas were a terrible and extraordinary 2 days: and it is impossible to imagine any rules the press could have imposed on itself in advance. It has subsequently been suggested that the press pool its reporters and photographers for major news events. Pooling indeed has been done in the past, particularly in time of war, in the main because of limited facilities, and is still sometimes done. But its practice is confined to predictable happenings. What happened in Dallas was not just a major news event. It was a catastrophe, and there chanced to be on hand more than 300 newsmen, American and foreign, national and Texan, trying desperately to tell just what did happen, and in truth doing their jobs well.

Except for one quoted remark by a reporter who taunted the police with alleged mistreatment of Oswald, the Warren Commission cited no specific instance of unethical behavior. Its criticism was broader, and in those terms the press cannot deny that it has justice in it. Because of last November, the press is more deeply concerned than ever about how it comports itself as it goes about its work, and about its heavy public responsibilities.

It is a matter of conscience. It is not, in our opinion, a matter for a formal code of professional ethics. Among the characteristics of a free press is the characteristic of self-discipline, and the characteristic also that nobody, outside the press or in, has the authority to impose formal and binding rules.

AMERICANS CAN BE PROUD

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, from a 7-year-old who lives in the State of New York, to the President of the United States, over the past 6 months Alaskans have received precious treasures of sympathy and help. During this period of Alaska's travail, priceless ingredients of faith, determination, friendship, and dedication have been vividly demonstrated.

Nowhere on this continent has a catastrophe been so devastating as that which struck Alaska on Good Friday, March 27. We shall not soon forget the terrible events which had their beginning at 5:36 p.m., Alaska standard time, when the earth shifted and the seas ran high.

Those events, which bred devastation beyond imagination, also bred imagination to conquer that devastation. It is time, Mr. President, to pay tribute to the great spirit which on that terrible night moved Alaskans to unite and to begin the awesome task of reconstruction before the earth stopped moving under their feet. The same spirit moved our President, the Congress, organizations, and individuals to pledge themselves to the recovery effort.

The assistance has been massive, and in many instances unprecedented. Much of the story has been told in two official reports, published during recent days, by the Office of Emergency Planning and the Federal Reconstruction and Development Commission for Alaska. At several points in this address, I shall quote from these reports.

But nowhere in the reports is recorded the proper measure of thanks which Americans, including all Alaskans, owe to Director Edward A. McDermott, of the Office of Emergency Planning; to Senator Clinton P. Anderson, who only a few days after the earthquake was named by President Johnson to be chairman of the newly created Federal Reconstruction Commission; to Administrator Eugene P. Foley, of the Small Business Administration; to Dwight A. Ink, Executive Director of the Commission; and to so many others. On them and on all who have worked with them, the burden has been heavy, but never overwhelming. Their contributions have inspired and made possible the recovery of the 49th State, a task which 6 months ago seemed almost insurmountable. Much remains to be done; but the foundations have been well laid, and hopes for Alaska's future are high.

Where does one begin, Mr. President, to chronicle the deeds; to record the names of those who have done so much; to list the work of the Federal, State, and local governments; to tell the story of the earthquake and subsequent events? It cannot be done adequately. The work of countless individuals, both in and out of government, has been invaluable. Perhaps some day the assistance in dollars can be added up; but how does one total the intangibles of human spirit and giving?

In the report of the Federal Reconstruction Commission, an effort has been made to list the help which poured out to Alaska from places far and near. That record is admittedly far from complete. It does not, for example, mention the thousands of dollars contributed to Valdez by the employees and management of the International Telephone & Telegraph Corp. It does not mention the thousands of messages relayed throughout America by amateur "ham" radio operators from Alaska at a time when regular communication channels were closed. It does not mention the donations from many communities throughout this land, such as those from Allentown, Pa., which were driven across the country by volunteers of the International Teamsters Union. It does not mention the faith shown in Alaska's future by the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers by investing more than $1 million with an Alaska bank, to help provide financing for new Alaska homes. It does not mention perhaps the most appealing contribution of all, which was sent to Mayor George Sharrock, of

Anchorage, by John Loeb Beaty, of Port Jefferson, N.Y. This 7-year-old wrote:

> I wanted to send my Easter basket but my daddy said the eggs would not last. I am sending you $1 instead.

But the Commission's report, recorded here, at least tells much of the story—the response of neighbor to neighbor, stranger to stranger, foreigner to Alaskan, American to American:

RESCUE WORK OF THE PRIVATE SECTOR

The success of the immediate recovery effort in Alaska can be attributed, to a large degree, to the prompt and efficient help which came from the private sector. Charitable and professional organizations, clubs, and church groups immediately set up emergency housing, prepared food, and performed rescue missions. By the time the recovery activities of the private sector are complete, over 20 organizations will have spent more than $1.5 million. Throughout the recovery effort, the Alaska Civil Defense Office coordinated the relief activities of the private sector.

Red Cross: The Red Cross sent representatives to Anchorage, Cordova, Homer, Kenai, Kodiak, Seldovia, Seward, and Valdez. They established their national disaster team headquarters in the Anchorage YMCA building on March 28, bringing supplies, blankets, sheets, and funds to supplement the YMCA's depleted stocks. This made it possible for the YMCA to continue its food and shelter service. Later in the recovery effort the Red Cross moved its headquarters to the American Baptist Church in Anchorage.

The Red Cross cooperated closely with Federal, State, and local groups in providing food, clothing, and medical care. They also repaired and rebuilt homes, replaced household furniture, replaced or repaired occupational supplies and equipment, handled welfare inquiries concerning Alaskan residents, and gave grants to needy families.

The Red Cross not only helped people in the disaster area, but also cared for earthquake victims taken to Glenallen and Fairbanks, and moved some families to Seattle. By the end of June, the Red Cross had spent $739,500 on 907 families who were homeless, hungry, or in need of some kind of assistance. The Red Cross has also earmarked $398,000 for native villages, to supplement the funds of the Bureau of Indian Affairs—the Federal agency which is organizing the immediate recovery and long-range reconstruction in native villages. All Red Cross assistance is an outright grant requiring no repayment. Total Red Cross expenditures to date as reported by the Red Cross Washington Office are $825,225. By the time all relief cases are closed, Red Cross expenditures will be well over $1 million.

YMCA: Immediately after the disaster, the YMCA prepared their Anchorage building for recovery efforts. The Y set up an area to serve food, and arranged housing for homeless people. YMCA personnel recruited volunteers to maintain the building and to set up beds in the clubrooms and in the auditorium.

On the first night, over 200 people were housed and hundreds more were served coffee and sandwiches. In the first 5 days over 1,000 persons were housed; thousands more were fed. With the help of church groups, the Girls' Service Organization, the Equipment Club (Air Force and Army men), a 15-man crew from Northwest Airlines who were forced to evacuate the Westward Hotel, and others, the YMCA maintained a 24-hour food and shelter service. The Explorer Scouts set up a Civil Defense radio contact in the YMCA building to send and receive pertinent information concerning people who needed help, the availability of shelter and food, and the location of areas which were too dangerous to travel. YMCA relief efforts were continued for about 1 month, with expenditures totaling between $10,000 and $12,000.

Salvation Army: The Salvation Army was active in Anchorage, Cordova, English Bay, Glenallen, Homer, Hope, Kodiak, Portage, Seldovia, Seward, Valdez, and in more remote sections of southeastern Alaska. In Anchorage 682 families were given groceries, staples, and grants; 302 families were given clothing and bedding; 3,443 sitdown meals were served at the social center; and there were 100,350 canteen servings. In other towns the Salvation Army provided food, clothing, rescue equipment, mobile homes, and repair service for needed buildings which had been damaged in the quake. As of June 11, the Salvation Army had spent or committed $186,000.

American Legion: Shortly after the earthquake, the national commander of the American Legion asked the 17,000 Legion posts and 14,000 auxiliary units to help the earthquake victims. As of June 11, the Legion had collected $50,635 in donations. With part of this money the Legion provided 82 families in Alaska with grants to enable them to purchase needed items which were lost in the quake.

Lions Club, district 49: This organization "adopted" the community of Afognak, which was evacuated and resettled on Kodiak Island. The Lions Club had earmarked $35,000 for the project, but ended up spending $50,000. In gratitude to the club, the new village was named "Port Lions."

Alaska Bar Association: The association provided a legal aid service for several weeks following the earthquake. The service was available to all persons in the Anchorage area who needed immediate relief from legal obligations.

Boy Scouts of America: Before communications were restored, the boys served as "runners" between State civil defense and other agencies. They directed traffic, served as guards around civil defense and damage areas, and also served as drivers to deliver supplies and messages to relief headquarters within the city. Fifty-three Explorer Scouts contributed 2,720 man-hours.

Alaska Council of Churches: The council acted as a clearinghouse for welfare information between churches, and as a coordinating agency to prevent duplication of relief work. The council distributed funds of the member churches on the basis of demonstrated need. The aid given by the churches is usually for long-range building repairs. Individual churches, however, extended the assistance to include emergency housing and food supplies. Many churches which are not council members also contributed to the recovery effort. Total council expenditures will total $15,000.

Veterans of Foreign Wars: The Veterans of Foreign Wars were active in many communities in Alaska, donating $80,000 in relief assistance to veterans and their families.

Anchorage Panhellenic Association: The association worked with West High School counselors to help graduating girls continue their plans to go to college. They helped the girls find summer employment, oncampus employment at Alaska Methodist University, scholarship aid, and group transportation rates. The association plans to offer free room and board to girls in other towns who wish to attend college in Anchorage.

Anchorage Junior Chamber of Commerce: The Jaycees have planned a "Quake—Alaska" (Quick United Action To Kindle the Economy of Alaska) project. The project consists of two phases: publicizing the need for legislation to assist recovery, and soliciting funds from other Jaycee locals for the recovery effort. The Jaycee assistance is both immediate and long-range. The Jaycee-ettes have donated $100 to the "Quake—Alaska" project.

Governor's Fund: Shortly after the earthquake the Governor of Alaska, William A. Egan, established the Governor's Reconstruction Fund. As of July 30, 1964, the fund contained $115,403.97 in donations. Money has come from all over the Nation, and from foreign countries.

Some of the largest donations have come from Japan. Within a few days after the earthquake, the Japanese Consul General in Seattle presented Governor Egan with a $10,000 check from the Japanese Government. Japan, which has also been the victim of earthquakes, is well aware of the hardships Alaskans are enduring. The Japanese Fisheries Association gave the State of Alaska $5,000 on April 7; and on June 8 the Governor of Kanagawa, Japan, presented the Secretary of State for Alaska with $4,933.49 in donations from the citizens of Kanagawa.

A $1,500 contribution was sent by Louis M. Suiter, chairman of the board of trustees of the Bell Helicopter Co. Humanity Fund. The money represented contributions from individual employees of the company.

One large gift was a check for $3,824.97—a contribution from west coast lumber dealers and manufacturers in the States of Washington and Oregon. The check was in addition to a shipment of lumber and other building materials donated by the companies in May.

Lumber donations: On May 2 the *Coastal Monarch* left the harbor at Portland, Oreg., for Alaska with 4,100 tons of lumber and other building materials. The supplies were a donation from companies in Washington and Oregon. The ship arrived at Kodiak, where 1,608 tons were unloaded, on May 8. The rest of the supplies were unloaded at Seward on May 14. The Army Transportation Corps, which supplied the transportation, the Bureau of Yards and Docks, which did the unloading at Kodiak, and the Corps of Engineers, which did the unloading at Seward, were all reimbursed by OEP for transportation and stevedore costs.

AFL–CIO: The unions' headquarters in Washington, D.C., donated $25,000 for Alaskan reconstruction.

Others: The Alaska Educational Association disbursed about $30,000 as of May 1, 1964, to teachers who lost members of their families in the quake. The League of Women Voters has aided in relief, both on an immediate and a long-range basis, by helping to get information out to the public.

Many other organizations were ready to help if needed, and have plans for helping in the long-range reconstruction program. Among these are the Alaska Nurses Association, the Anchorage Community Chest, the Anchorage Women's Club, the local Order of Moose No. 1534, the Rainbow Demolay, the PEO Sisterhood, the National Association of Legal Secretaries, and the Anchorage Tuberculosis Association, Inc.

Finally, there were two new organizations formed as a result of the disaster: the Alaska Earthquake Disaster Fund and the Rebuild Alaska Committee.

The Alaska Earthquake Disaster Fund was organized in Fairbanks as a result of people from all over Alaska expressing a desire to contribute money for recovery. A trusteeship with three banks participating was set up to handle the donation fund. A special three-man committee, representing the fund, flew to Valdez. Some victims were evacuated, and housed and fed in Fairbanks. Arrangements were made for others to travel to the Lower 48.

The Rebuild Alaska Committee is a statewide incorporated organization attempting to raise money through a nationwide radio and television appeal sponsored by the National Association of Broadcasters. The committee plans to make capital available to affected businesses and communities. As of August 15, the committee had $10,000 in available funds with a lot of mail not yet opened.

It is recognized that many other organizations and individuals made contributions and assisted Alaska in other ways, and that it would be impossible to assure appropriate recognition to all of the companies, labor unions, eleemosynary organizations, and individuals.

In the first few days after the March 27 earthquake, which was the fourth most intense in recorded history, and was made all the more unbearable and damaging because of its duration, it was impossible to assess the damage. What was known was that the Richter scale recorded an intensity of 8.4, one of the most violent ever experienced throughout the world. What was known was that the earthquake and subsequent waves had struck at the heart of Alaska's economic and population center. The disaster area encompassed 60 percent of Alaska's population, which produces over 55 percent of Alaska's revenue.

The Commission's report stated:

> In a State with broad-based economy, such a blow would have been awesome. For Alaska, it was calamitous.

In the weeks and months which followed, more firm estimates have been possible. The report of the Office of Emergency Planning tells in these words of the damage:

> The earthquake which struck south central Alaska on the evening of March 27, 1964, resulted in one of the greatest disasters in the recorded history of the United States.
>
> The violent upheaval and subsidence of land caused by the quake itself and the mammoth tidal waves triggered by the seismic disturbance combined to produce major damage to homes, harbors, transportation systems, and public facilities over an area of about 50,000 square miles.
>
> The severest damage occurred on the Kenai Peninsula—Cook Inlet area which includes Anchorage, Whittier, Homer, Seldovia, and Seward; Kodiak Island; and Valdez and Cordova on the northern and eastern shores of Prince William Sound.
>
> Though this triangle comprises less than 10 percent of the land area of Alaska, nearly half of the population live and work in the affected area. It is the economic heart of the State. The major rail and highway lines to the interior pass through the damaged area. The fishing industry, the principal industrial and commercial firms, the major military bases, and the ports which feed the vast interior of the State are centered here.
>
> Casualties were remarkably light; physical damage, in proportion to the total resources of the State, was extraordinarily heavy, with total public and private losses running to slightly over $300 million.
>
> In a wealthier State a disaster of this magnitude would have caused great economic disruption. To Alaska, the economic consequences of the earthquake were catastrophic.
>
> All Alaskan ports in the earthquake area were inoperable except the port of Anchorage where operations were severely restricted until emergency repairs could be made.
>
> Approximately 150 miles of the single track Alaska Railroad from Seward north to Fairbanks suffered intermittent damage, principally at Seward, Whittier, Portage, Turnagain Arm, and Anchorage. Highways running through the area were affected by the collapse of bridges, landslides, and the subsidence of foundations.
>
> Excessive damage occurred to the fishing fleet, small boat harbors, processing plants, and other waterfront installations vital to the fishing industry, upon which the economy of Alaska is largely dependent.
>
> Military installations, including Fort Richardson, Elmendorf Air Force Base, and the naval station on Kodiak, suffered damages of about $36 million. Other Federal property also sustained damage in the amount of about $36 million.
>
> Gross damage to public facilities of State and local governments is currently estimated at $110 million. This includes public buildings, schools, hospitals, airfields, city-owned docks, and public utilities. In addition, it is estimated that some $56 million will be required to restore State and local roads to preearthquake condition.
>
> Private real property damaged or destroyed by the earthquake and tidal waves runs to about $77 million. Personal property losses have not been calculated.

The OEP estimate of damage of over $300 million compares with earlier damage estimates of between $400 and $500 million. The present figure derives from an August 12 OEP report, and is exclusive of personal property losses and losses in income:

Federal:	
Military	$35,610,000
Nonmilitary	35,641,000
Non-Federal:	
State and local	107,373,000
Highways	55,568,000
Real Private Property	77,000,000
Total	311,092,000

The first days after the disaster brought vital assistance and magnificent cooperation from the military establishment in Alaska, headed by Lt. Gen. Raymond J. Reeves, Commander in Chief of the Alaskan Command. At all times, he and all officers and men under his command moved in concert with civilian officials. The story of this assistance is told in these words from the Commission's report:

> During the first 48 hours following the earthquake, while the Federal Government was organizing its relief effort and bringing assistance into Alaska, the military components in Alaska initiated emergency relief measures to supplement State and local efforts.
>
> The earthquake had completely disrupted normal civilian communications in the disaster area. Within minutes after the earthquake, the Command Post of the Alaskan Military Command at Anchorage became the center through which communications were reestablished between Alaska and Washington and between State and city civil defense headquarters in south-central Alaska.
>
> The Military Affiliate Radio System (MARS) on Elmendorf Air Force Base went into operation on emergency power in less than 1 hour after the earthquake, and maintained a 24-hour schedule until April 15. MARS handled 9,379 messages.
>
> Military communications personnel and signal battalions worked with civilian companies to restore communication service and to assure continuous service.
>
> Assistance to the Greater Anchorage area began immediately. Military water trailers were supplying water to the Greater Anchorage area within 3 hours after the earthquake. Within 48 hours, four water purification units were flown in from the 4th Infantry Division at Fort Lewis, Wash.
>
> At dawn, on the morning after the earthquake, a massive airlift began. Seventeen Provider (C–123) military transports of the Alaska Air Command carried relief supplies and equipment (provided largely from military stocks) to Seward, Valdez, Kodiak, and other isolated communities.
>
> Also that same morning, Fort Richardson opened four field messhalls operating around the clock. One mess alone served 7,462 meals and used 198 pounds of coffee. Elmendorf's 5040th Food Service Squadron also went on 24-hour shifts, and during the 4 days following the earthquake served 44,487 regular meals and 11,820 C-ration meals.
>
> Both Elmendorf and Richardson arranged emergency housing for displaced personnel. Within 2 hours, structures at those bases still safe for occupancy were identified; and bedding, rations, and field kitchens were available for about 5,000 people.
>
> In response to a request from Anchorage officials, military authorities assigned troops to assist in security and travel control. Assignments were completed within 2 hours after the earthquake. By the second day after the earthquake, there were approximately 1,000 Army troops manning guard posts 24 hours a day in Anchorage.
>
> In addition to the extensive assistance given by the military to the major urban area of Greater Anchorage, aid was given to virtually all other stricken areas. For example, at Kodiak, the Navy committed 1,135 men for 190,374 man-hours of emergency assistance work. The Navy distributed about 1,000 blankets which were flown in from Seattle and Whidbey Island; served 12,000 meals to evacuees during the first 48 hours; and supplied generators, pumps, medicine, rope, sleeping bags, and similar items urgently needed in Kodiak.
>
> Additional materials and supplies made available by the military to civilian communities and Government agencies included hundreds of sleeping bags, beds, cases of C-rations, mattresses, blankets, wire, lime, sanitation kit, radio receivers, and arctic gear.
>
> Military doctors and nurses assisted local medical authorities. The morning following the earthquake, a military medical team of 5 doctors, 10 nurses, 2 anesthetists and 20 medical specialists were flown to Alaska from Fort Lewis, Wash.
>
> Local fuel distributors were provided 244,000 gallons of fuel oil from military stocks for relief of the local populace.
>
> Military trucks, cranes, wreckers, bulldozers, and mobile radio units with drivers and operators were sent to assist civilian authorities.
>
> This was the military community responding to the civilian community in a time of need.

An immediate personal inspection in Alaska was made by Director McDermott, at President Johnson's request, and by the Alaska congressional delegation. A few days later, the two Alaska Senators met with the President, Representative RALPH J. RIVERS having remained in the earthquake area, to lend assistance wherever possible. That meeting was also attended by Director McDermott and Director Kermit Gordon, of the Bureau of the Budget, and by members of their staffs.

It was then that the decision was made to organize the Federal Reconstruction and Development Planning Commission for Alaska.

It was then that President Johnson suggested that Senator ANDERSON head the Commission.

It was on the same day, April 2, that the President signed Executive Order No. 11150, establishing the Commission, and designating Senator ANDERSON as its Chairman, and the following as members: The Secretaries of Defense, Interior, Agriculture, Commerce, Labor Health, Education, and Welfare; the Administrators of the Federal Aviation Agency, the Small Business Administration and the Housing and Home Finance

Agency; the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission; and the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning.

The following, taken from the Commission's report, tells in a brief way of the task forces created and the work of the Alaska Field Committee, and lists the personnel who, by their devoted hours of hard work, have earned the gratitude of all Alaskans:

THE FEDERAL COMMISSION'S TASK FORCES AND THE ALASKA FIELD COMMITTEE

I. TASK FORCES

At a meeting of the Federal Reconstruction and Development Planning Commission for Alaska on April 7, 1964, agreement was reached to establish eight special task forces composed of representatives from selected Federal agencies.

Each of the task forces was given one specific area to study in order to assist the Federal Commission in developing coordinated reconstruction and long-range development plans for Alaska. These task forces were:

1. Community facilities.
2. Economic stabilization.
3. Financial institutions.
4. Housing.
5. Industrial development.
6. Natural resources.
7. Ports and fishing.
8. Transportation.

A Scientific and Engineering Task Force was established a short time later, after the need for this type of task force became evident.

II. ALASKA FIELD COMMITTEE

At the Federal Commission's meeting on April 7, it was decided that a field committee should be established in Alaska within the framework of the Commission. The membership was composed of representatives of agencies serving on the Federal Commission which have staffs in Alaska.

This committee provided coordination at the field level for those problems which cut across agency lines of responsibility. It helped to bridge the geographical gap of over 3,000 miles between Washington and the site of the reconstruction effort in Alaska. Through the field committee, information concerning the progress of reconstruction was forwarded directly to the Executive Director in Washington at the same time it was moving upward through channels in the responsible agencies. Problems in one agency affecting the work of other agencies were flagged at an early stage for both the interested agencies and the Commission.

Although the field committee did not have authority to direct actions of the various agencies, the drawing together of agency representatives in the field committee was one method of coordination used by the Federal Commission. As the design phase neared completion, special project management sessions were called by the chairman of the field committee involving those agencies having responsibility for reconstruction of public facilities. Primary purpose of these sessions was to flag problems and agree upon action to be taken.

TASK FORCE MEMBERSHIP

Community facilities

Crow, John O., Deputy Commissioner, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Interior.

Lund, Chester B., Office of Field Administrator, Health, Education, and Welfare.

Phillips, Robert Y., Director, Government Readiness, Office of Emergency Planning.

Wadsworth, John G., Deputy Assistant Commissioner for Buildings Management, General Services Administration.

Woolner, Sidney H., Commissioner, Community Facilities Administration, Housing and Home Finance Agency (Chairman).

Economic stabilization

Lundquist, Clarence T., Administrator, Wage and Hour Public Contracts Division, Labor.

Skubal, Leonard A., Chief, Economic Stabilization Division, Office of Emergency Planning (Chairman).

Financial institutions

Carlock, John K., Fiscal Assistant Secretary, Treasury (Chairman).

Leef, Pierron R., Small Business Administration.

Solomon, Frederic, Director, Division of Examinations, Federal Reserve System.

Tracy, Frank E., Assistant to Board of Directors, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

Walters, Lawrence M., Deputy Director, Division of Supervision and Examinations, Federal Home Loan Bank Board.

Housing

Brickfield, Cyril F., Chief Benefits Director, Veterans' Administration.

Cowles, Clarence, Director, Office of Financial Services, Small Business Administration.

Malotky, Louis D., Director, Rural Housing Loan Division, Farmers Home Administration, Agriculture.

Schussheim, Morton J., Assistant Administrator, Program Policy, Housing and Home Finance Agency (Chairman).

Walters, Lawrence M., Deputy Director, Division of Supervision and Examinations, Federal Home Loan Bank Board.

Industrial development

Bertsch, Anthony A., Assistant Administrator, Industrial Mobilization, Commerce.

Cass, Millard, Deputy Under Secretary, Labor.

Donat, George, Administrator, Business and Defense Services, Commerce (Chairman).

Eno, Lloyd, Office of Emergency Planning.

Struby, William F., Assistant to Director, Office of Financial Services, Small Business Administration.

Tidd, J. Thomas, Deputy Director, Office of Policy Development, Federal Aviation Agency.

Natural resources development

Green, John C., Director, Office of Research, Office of Emergency Planning.

Johnson, Wendell E., Civil Works, Office of Chief of Engineers, Department of Army, Defense.

Rettie, James B., Jr., Senior Economist, Office of the Secretary, Interior (Chairman).

Tomlinson, George E., Deputy Chief, Bureau of Power, Federal Power Commission.

Walter, George H., Deputy Assistant to the Secretary, Agriculture.

Ports and fishing

Gurnee, Mark S., Civil Works, Office of Chief of Engineers, Department of Army, Defense.

Laferty, John G., Chief, Food, Welfare and Fuels Resources, Resources Readiness Division, Office of Emergency Planning.

McKernan, Donald L. Director, Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, Interior (Chairman).

Struby, William F., Assistant to Director, Office of Financial Services, Small Business Administration.

Scientific and engineering

Algermissen, S. T., Data Analysis and Research Branch, Coast and Geodetic Survey, Commerce.

Dobrovolny, Ernest, Engineering Geology Branch, Geological Survey, Interior.

Eberlein, G. D., Alaskan Geology Branch, Geological Survey, Interior.

Gates, George O., U.S. Geological Survey, Interior (alternate to Eberlein).

Nesbitt, R. H., Civil Works, Office of Chief of Engineers, Department of Army, Defense.

Schaem, William E., Military Construction, Office of Chief of Engineers, Department of Army, Defense (Chairman).

Whitten, C. A., Office of Physical Sciences, Coast and Geodetic Survey, Commerce.

Scientific and engineering field team

Carstensen, Ove, North Pacific Division, Corps of Engineers, Department of Army, Defense.

Cloud, William K., Seismological Field Survey, Coast and Geodetic Survey, Commerce.

Dobrovolny, Ernest, Engineer, Geology Branch, Geological Survey, Interior.

Eckel, Edwin B., Special Projects Branch, Geological Survey, Interior (Chairman).

Stuart, W. Harold, North Pacific Division, Corps of Engineers, Department of Army, Defense.

Transportation

Bridwell, Lowell K., Special Assistant to Under Secretary for Transportation, Commerce (Chairman).

Caputo, Vincent F., Director, Transportation and Warehousing Policy, Installation and Logistics, Defense.

Mangan, Robert M., The Alaska Railroad, Interior.

May, Timothy J., Managing Director, Federal Maritime Commission.

Revelle, Paul, Office of Emergency Planning.

Tidd, J. Thomas, Deputy Director, Office of Policy Development, Federal Aviation Agency.

ALASKA FIELD COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

Burke Riley, Regional Coordinator, Department of the Interior (Chairman).

Francis Anderson, Corps of Engineers.

Robert Butler, Branch Manager, Small Business Administration.

Dr. Ardell B. Colyar, Deputy Regional Director, Arctic Health Research Center.

Clyde S. Courtnage, Director, Alaska Field Office, U.S. Department of Commerce.

Col. Clare F. Farley (replaced Colonel Sawyer on August 22, 1964), District Engineer, Corps of Engineers, U.S. Army.

Joseph Fiala, State Supervisor, Department of Labor.

Victor Fischer, Assistant Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency.

Joseph H. FitzGerald, Coordinator, Alaska Reconstruction and Development Planning Commission.

Dr. Jack A. King, Veterinarian in Charge, U.S. Department of Agriculture.

John Manley, General Manager, Alaska Railroad.

Dr. Allan Mick, Director, Experimental Station, Agriculture.

Nile Paull, Urban Renewal Administration, Housing and Home Finance Agency.

James G. Rogers, Director, Federal Aviation Agency.

Col. K. T. Sawyer, District Engineer, Corps of Engineers, U.S. Army.

A. Q. Stine, Farmers Home Administration, Agriculture.

Creath A. Tooley, Office of Emergency Planning, Representative.

Roger Waller, Coordinator, U.S. Geological Survey.

Dr. Holman Wherritt, Deputy Area Medical Officer in Charge, Public Health Service.

R. H. Willman, Office of Emergency Planning, Representative.

FEDERAL RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT PLANNING COMMISSION FOR ALASKA

Staff members[1]

Dwight A. Ink, Executive Director, Atomic Energy Commission.

Frank C. DiLuzio, Assistant to the Chairman.

Wilmot L. Averill, Deputy Executive Director.

Col. Harry N. Tufts, Senate Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee.

---

[1] The majority of the Commission staff were on loan part time from other agencies.

Howard Bray, Press Secretary to the Chairman.

Col. Harold F. Dyer, Corps of Engineers.

David B. Finnegan, Department of the Interior.

Lewis David Gelfan, Information Advisor.

Hugh A. Johnson, Department of Agriculture.

Eugene Keith, Atomic Energy Commission.

Milton M. Mayer, Housing and Home Finance Agency.

John McCollum, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Col. William J. Penly, Corps of Engineers.

Joseph E. Reeve, Bureau of the Budget.

Robert M. Webb, Department of Agriculture.

Dale E. Zimmerman, Department of Interior.

Jean L. Barker, Secretary.

Luna E. Diamond, Secretarial Assistant to the Chairman.

Margaret S. Dougherty, Secretary.

Thelma V. Fleming, Atomic Energy Commission.

Rhoda W. Gorman, Administrative Assistant.

Helen Marmoll, Editorial Assistant.

Marlou Quintana, Clerical Assistant to the Chairman.

Zell Skillern, Senate Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee.

Sandra V. Watson, Clerk-Stenographer.

On the day following the creation of the Federal Reconstruction Commission, Alaska's Gov. William A. Egan—whose leadership has been remarkable in every way—established the Alaska Reconstruction and Development Planning Commission, which worked with the Federal Commission in the restoration of Alaska. Governor Egan sent to Washington, to remain here for many weeks, George N. Hayes, Alaska's able and energetic attorney general, who, only recently, returned to the private practice of law. His contributions were many, and important. Enough credit cannot be heaped upon him. The Governor also called upon the abilities of Joseph H. FitzGerald, by naming him coordinator of the State's commission.

In the meantime, the Office of Emergency Planning had moved into high gear, under the authority of the Federal Disaster Act, Public Law 81-875. In major disaster areas, funds are allocated from the President's Disaster Fund to supplement State and local efforts for the protection of life and property and the emergency repair of essential public facilities.

As described in the OEP's recent report to the President, here is how the program was applied in Alaska:

> On the recommendation of OEP, the President, on April 3, approved an initial allocation of $5 million for disaster relief operations in Alaska. A second allocation in the amount of $12 million was made on June 12. Further allocations will be recommended to the President as the Public Law 81-857 work progresses. Most of the money made available by the President will be used for the reimbursement of Federal agencies performing work at the request of OEP.
>
> While restoration of public facilities under the Federal Disaster Act is limited to "emergency repairs and temporary replacements," much of the work authorized by OEP in Alaska will, nevertheless, contribute to the permanent reconstruction program. Through close coordination of the plans and actions of the several departments and agencies represented on the Federal Reconstruction and Development Planning Commission for Alaska, which was established by executive order on April 2, an orderly and effective progression from the immediate post-disaster phase to the recovery and eventual rehabilitation periods is now underway.
>
> As plans for the meshing of immediate recovery and long-range reconstruction activities proceeded in Washington, a wide range of emergency activities continued in the disaster area, directed and coordinated by the OEP field office in Anchorage.
>
> Much of the work was performed by other Federal agencies under direct assignment from OEP. Other work was undertaken under the statutory authorities of other agencies.
>
> OEP assigned specific missions to individual agencies consistent with their day-to-day responsibilities. The Corps of Engineers was requested to perform demolition and debris clearance; the emergency restoration of public utilities; and the rebuilding of docks, schools, hospitals, and other essential facilities in most damaged areas of the State. The Navy's Bureau of Yards and Docks was asked to perform similar functions on Kodiak Island. The Federal Aviation Agency was requested to repair damaged State and municipal airports. The Housing and Home Finance Agency was asked to develop plans for meeting emergency housing needs.
>
> First priority was given to the emergency repair of damaged water and sewage systems whose disruption constituted an immediate health hazard. Power and communications systems essential to the public welfare were also given prompt attention.
>
> Demolition of damaged structures and the clearance of debris and wreckage from disaster-affected areas was begun immediately.
>
> The various modes of transportation serving Alaska were restored to service in a relatively short time, though permanent repair and replacement will require large expenditures and up to 3 years of construction.
>
> To insure that damaged or destroyed facilities would be reconstructed on sound building sites, OEP directed that scientific studies of soil foundations and altered land configurations be made at selected locations throughout the damaged area. Permanent reconstruction activities depend to a large degree on the results of this preliminary and exploratory work. Where work could proceed without awaiting the results of these tests, OEP authorized immediate repairs to essential public facilities.
>
> Current estimates for work authorized under Public Law 875 range between $60 and $70 million. Twenty-seven percent of the authorized work was under contract by mid-August, and about 15 percent of the total work is now complete.

Mr. President, many Federal agencies have rendered assistance and are giving it. Damaged military installations are being repaired by the Department of Defense; the Alaska Railroad and dock and rail facilities at Seward are being rebuilt; roads and bridges in the forests and on the Federal Aid Highway System are being reconstructed; small boat harbors, so vital to Alaska's fishing industry, will be restored; native villages are being restored or relocated by the Bureau of Indian Affairs, with the assistance of the Red Cross, the Lions Club, and other private organizations and individuals; and schools are being rebuilt. What seemed an impossible task is being conquered.

Many other steps were taken by Federal agencies within existing authority. Every agency has worked hard to assist. Laws and regulations have been interpreted as liberally as possible; and concrete help, through waivers, forgiveness of debts where possible, expanded loan programs and other help, has come from such agencies as the Small Business Administration, the Housing and Home Finance Agency, the Rural Electrification Administration, the Farmers Home Administration, the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, the Internal Revenue Service, and the Veterans' Administration. From them has come the kind of help which will go far to make Alaska whole again.

Of particular importance to Alaska's recovery has been the disaster loan program of the SBA, as put into effect by Alaska's great friend, Administrator Eugene P. Foley. Mr. Foley rushed financial experts to Alaska, and opened emergency offices in Anchorage, Kodiak, Seward, Homer, Seldovia, and Valdez. Disaster loans have been made to repair or replace homes and businesses. Such loans are made at an interest rate of 3 percent; and Mr. Foley established amortization periods as long as 30 years, where warranted. A moratorium on interest for 1 year and on the payment of the principal for 5 years has been granted in many instances.

As of September 23, the SBA had approved for Alaska:

455 home disaster loans	$9,014,594
490 business disaster loans	41,555,985
Total	50,570,579

Of this total, 814 checks, for $33,279,727, had been issued.

Another example of Federal loan assistance comes from the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries. The fishing industry, a major factor in Alaska's economy, suffered about $14 million in damages to, and losses of, boats, canneries, and gear. Under special 3-percent interest disaster terms, the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries has, from its fisheries loan program, approved 59 applications, amounting to $9,575,000, following the Alaska disaster.

The loan programs of the Federal Government have been intelligently applied to meet the need and to demonstrate the Government's faith in the future of Alaska.

From the beginning, Mr. President, Congress showed a determination to stand by the State of Alaska. Unprecedented speed attended its first action. In 1 day, both the House and the Senate voted to replenish the President's disaster fund by $50 million, not specifically appropriated for Alaska, but understood to be used there in large measure.

The passage by Congress of several other vital measures was swift.

I would be reciting a far different story today if Congress had not demonstrated its sympathy and goodwill by the passage of concrete and helpful legislation. Alaskans will always be grateful to all the Members of Congress, and particularly to the leadership on both sides of the aisle, to the chairmen of the House and Senate Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs, and to the chairmen of the House and Senate Appropriations Committees and the other members of those four committees.

The legislative history of the Alaska disaster measures for both the public and the private sectors of Alaska's economy is recorded in the report of the Federal Reconstruction Commission, as is a table setting forth in summary Federal assistance for Alaska which has been given and which it is estimated will be required, as follows:

SPECIAL LEGISLATION

Although unparalleled Federal assistance was being provided, it was soon apparent that Alaska would require even more Federal disaster aid than could be provided under existing programs.

TRANSITIONAL GRANTS

In 1959, Congress appropriated $28.5 million in transitional grants for a 5-year period in order to help Alaska assume responsibility for public services previously provided by the Federal Government. This authority expired on June 30, 1964.

In order to maintain essential local and State services after the earthquake, the President requested a $22.5 million authorization in new transitional grants for the period through June 30, 1966. The loss of tax revenue and emergency expenditures jeopardized the continuation of many State and local government services. Municipal operations in several small communities would have been crippled without Federal assistance. The Bureau of the Budget estimated there would be a requirement for $22.5 million to meet the shortfall in Alaska's anticipated revenues and to provide for extraordinary State and local expenditures.

Congress increased the President's request for transitional grant funds from $22.5 to $23.5 million to allow for loss of revenue by the Anchorage Independent School District. On May 25, the President requested a $17 million appropriation from this authorization as part of a broad request for $52.2 million to meet various program requirements in Alaska. Except for $500,000 allocated to the Federal Aviation Agency to continue airport operations, all of the $17 million transitional grant money has been turned over to the State. The total amount appropriated by the Congress was about $41 million after major deletions of $5.2 million for the Alaska Railroad, and $5.6 million for Corps of Engineers small-boat harbor expansion projects.

RETROACTIVE INSURANCE

Senator **HENRY M. JACKSON** of Washington, chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, introduced S. 2719 which was a measure to provide retroactive earthquake insurance to Alaskans. Hearings were held on this bill. The administration witnesses objected to the proposal and recommended that the problem of earthquake insurance be part of the study that would be authorized by S. 2032.

AMENDMENTS TO ALASKA OMNIBUS ACT

While the task forces and special committees were gathering data for their reports to the Commission, Federal agencies were preparing recommendations concerning needs for special legislation. Following a careful review of various legislative proposals submitted by the several Federal agencies, the Commission recommended a broad legislative package to the President.

In drafting this legislation, the Commission, recognizing the need for early passage limited the legislation to Alaska and the disaster area to avoid issues unrelated to the Alaska disaster. The proposed legislation amended the Alaska Omnibus Act and provided additional, and in most cases, new types of assistance for highways, urban renewal, debt adjustment, harbor, and disaster loans.

In transmitting this proposal to Congress on May 27, 1964, the President said:

"The legislation which I am proposing—based on recommendations of the Federal Reconstruction and Development Planning Commission for Alaska—will provide greater flexibility in Federal programs to cope with the extraordinary circumstances arising out of the earthquake.

"Concern for our fellow citizen alone compels prompt action on this proposal but practical considerations are also most important. The construction season in Alaska is about to begin and is of short duration. The sooner Alaska can complete its reconstruction efforts the sooner it can begin to devote its efforts toward the further development of the State's resources."

The legislation was introduced as S. 2881 and H.R. 11438 and was referred to the Interior and Insular Affairs Committees of both Houses to expedite handling, since these committees had jurisdiction over the Alaska Statehood Act and the Alaska Omnibus Act 6 years earlier.

One of the immediate needs in Alaska was restoration of severely-damaged roads. To repair and reconstruct the Federal-aid highways outside the national forests, the new legislation provides for an increase in the Federal share of reconstruction costs from 50 to 94.9 percent. This adopts the same formula used in determining the Federal share of costs for new construction of Federal-aid highways in Alaska. To cover this increase, appropriations for this purpose were not to exceed $51 million.

The legislation authorizes the Corps of Engineers to make modifications on previously authorized civil works projects, if modification was needed to overcome the adverse effects of the earthquake. This legislation was designed primarily to assist in the expansion of small-boat harbors to provide for current and reasonably prospective requirements.

The legislation also authorizes the Farmers Home Administration, the Rural Electrification Administration and the Housing and Home Finance Agency to adjust the indebtedness of some of their borrowers, thereby enabling them to overcome some earthquake losses. The purpose of this amendment to adjust indebtedness was to place the programs of these agencies on the same general footing as other Federal loan programs.

Another amendment to the Omnibus Act authorizes the Administrator of HHFA to enter into contracts for grants not exceeding $25 million for urban renewal projects in the Alaskan disaster area. Such authorization was in addition to and separate from that in the Housing Act of 1949. The Commission did not recommend any percentage increase in the Federal share for urban renewal projects.

In order to restore the State's credit and to help finance the State's earthquake-related capital projects, the legislation authorizes purchase by the Federal Government of up to $25 million of State of Alaska bonds or the loan of $25 million to the State.

The Federal Commission hoped that the State's ability to sell bonds at a near normal interest rate (3.5 to 4 percent) might encourage the sale of Alaska bonds in the private market. If not, as soon as the State's credit was restored, the bonds could either be sold in the private market by the Federal Government, or refinanced in the private market by the State.

Congress amended the Commission-sponsored legislation in three principal areas:

First, the Federal share of urban renewal projects in the Alaskan disaster area was increased from 75 percent to 90 percent of the net project cost. After the initial cost estimates were substantially reduced, and land stabilization measures found necessary, the Commission agreed that an increase in the Federal share to 90 percent was justified.

Second, Congress authorized HHFA to purchase (as part of the $25 million bond authorization provision) up to $7.2 million in State of Alaska bonds for completing State capital improvement programs. Before the earthquake, these bonds had been approved by the State but not issued.

Third, Congress provided authority for Federal grants to help adjust or retire the outstanding mortgage obligations on the 1- to 4-family properties which were severely damaged or destroyed by the earthquake. In carrying out this provision, the President may make grants to the State not to exceed $5.5 million, to match State funds on a 50-50 basis.

The mortgage retirement provision specifies that in order for the State to receive a grant, it must submit an implementing plan to be approved by the President. This plan must: designate the State agency responsible for retiring or adjusting the mortgages; assure that the mortgagor will absorb the damage loss to the extent of his equity in the property in addition to paying $1,000 on his outstanding mortgage obligation; limit the payments on a single property to $30,000; issue regulations providing equitable treatment for all; prevent unjustified windfalls to the State, mortgagees, or mortgagors; and make such reports as the President requests.

Congress completed action on this legislation on August 8, 1964; and the President signed the bill on August 19, 1964. These amendments were the culmination of legislative proposals designed to aid in the reconstruction of Alaska. The following is a table summarizing actual and anticipated Federal assistance to Alaska.

Estimated Federal assistance to Alaska resulting from Mar. 27, 1964, earthquake

[In millions]

	Total Federal costs[1]
Federal aid to State and local governments:	
Disaster relief (OEP)	$60.0 to $70.0
Transitional grants (President)	17.0 to 23.5
Highways (Commerce)	43.0 to 63.0
Urban Renewal grants (HHFA)	25.0 to 40.0
Purchase of Alaska bonds (HHFA)	10.0 to 25.0
Planning advances (HHFA)	.3 to .4
Subtotal	155.3 to 221.9
Federal aid to private individuals and groups:	
Loans by SBA, Interior, Agriculture	60.0 to 70.0
Forgiveness and other adjustments on outstanding loans (Agriculture, HHFA, VA, and President)	7.0 to 10.0
Tax refunds and offsets (Treasury)	20.0 to 30.0
Subtotal	87.0 to 110.0
Restoration of Federal facilities and direct Federal operations:	
Defense facilities, etc. (Defense)	$35.6
Alaska Railroad (Interior)	27.0
All other Federal agencies	19.6
Subtotal	82.2
Grand total (nearest million)	325.0 to 414.0

[1] Single figures have been added into both totals.

How did the Federal Government go about its monumental task, when faced, as it was, with Alaska's short construction season and problems of immense dimensions? Here are excerpts from the

Commission's report on reconstruction plans and scheduling:

These plans were developed by Federal, State, and local officials in cooperation with the Commission staff. In addition, staff representatives worked closely with OEP and the Department of Defense personnel in expediting work schedules.

The Commission has, however, avoided placing all work on a crash basis in order to lessen inflation pressures, discourage the importation of non-Alaskan labor and pace the reconstruction period for noncritical work. The Commission believes that this policy will strengthen the Alaskan economy. The Office of Emergency Planning estimates that about two-thirds of the Public Law 81–875 funds available to Alaska will be under contract by the end of 1964. By this time, at least one-third of the emergency reconstruction will be completed.

A pattern was followed during reconstruction planning in order to insure a sound reconstruction program. First, the responsible agencies made emergency repairs to the utilities and highways. Second, extensive geology and soils studies were made to determine where these facilities should be permanently reconstructed. Third, the projects were designed. (In order to expedite the reconstruction, project design often paralleled the soil studies.) Finally, proposals from potential contractors were evaluated and contracts awarded. Because of the short construction season, almost every step was telescoped in time over that normally required. The Commission has urged the use of double shifts, incentive contracts, and more stringent project control methods, whenever necessary.

WATER AND SEWERS

Top priority has been given to the restoration of water and sewer lines. Within a few days after the earthquake, emergency repairs were started by the Department of Defense at the request of OEP. Irrigation pipes were laid above ground and garden hoses connected to houses as a temporary water system in many areas.

Permanent reconstruction and restoration of all seriously damaged waterlines were scheduled for completion by early fall. All major breaks in sewerlines will be restored this summer and fall.

HIGHWAYS

Except for the highway around Turnagain Arm and along Copper River, all highways have been temporarily repaired and can handle normal traffic loads at reduced speeds. Permanent reconstruction has been scheduled over a 3-year period. Reconstructing all damaged highways to present design standards would cost a maximum of $65 million. This figure includes the $29 million required for repair and replacement of forest highways, and $36 million for other highways in the Federal-aid system.

A major problem is the highway which runs for many miles along the coast at the base of mountains around Turnagain Arm. Because of the general subsidence of land in that part of Alaska, much of the highway is flooded at high tide. The State highway commission, utilizing 94.9 percent Federal grant funds made available under the Omnibus Act, has made a major effort to raise the level of the road sufficiently to withstand the high tides expected in September, October and November of 1964. The high tides, accompanied by unfavorable winds, could tear out substantial portions of the road already restored.

ALASKA RAILROAD

Alaska Railroad reconstruction is being accomplished by internal resources, by contract and through the Corps of Engineers (Seward port facilities). Excluding the Seward facilities and the rail line from Portage to Seward, the railroad will be restored to prequake standards by the end of the year. The railroad is currently carrying more freight than last year at this time.

The railroad around Turnagain Arm, however, is confronted with inundation following high tides this fall similar to the problem of the highway. Land subsidence has placed much of the track below water level, but the roadbed is being raised and armored with riprap as rapidly as possible, in a race against the high fall tides.

SCHOOLS

Repair of most of the schools will be finished in time for the 1964 fall term. Where permanent new buildings are required, however, completion is scheduled for the opening of school in 1965. Double shifts will be necessary in only two or three schools this fall as a result of earthquake damage.

AIRFIELDS

Because air transportation plays a major role in Alaska, airport facilities had to be restored as rapidly as possible. Accordingly, the Federal Aviation Agency effort was directed toward the repair, either permanent or temporary, of FAA owned and operated air navigation and traffic control facilities. Almost all of the FAA facilities were operable within 9 hours after the earthquake.

Although the runways and taxiways at Anchorage International Airport were operable, the earthquake destroyed the traffic control tower. Emergency measures were taken immediately; and within an hour, air traffic was being controlled from an FAA-owned aircraft parked on the field. Later, a temporary traffic control tower was established at Lake Hood. This facility will be used until the new traffic control tower is constructed this fall.

In the Seward area, a mobile air traffic control tower was also established. Destruction of harbor and railroad facilities, and severe damage to the Seward-Anchorage road link, made air transportation the chief means of support in Seward for 40 days. FAA also repaired communications systems used by the Weather Bureau.

Considerable FAA effort has been devoted to the inspection of remote airfields and the development of plans for repairing the nine State- or municipally-owned fields. Most of the necessary repairs will be completed this fall.

PORTS

Port facilities are vital to the economy of Alaska, and their reconstruction has been assigned a priority second only to that of water and sewers. Almost all of the goods going to and from central Alaska pass through these port facilities. Further, the economies of most of the small towns in this area depend heavily upon the fishing industries and require docks and small-boat harbors for their existence.

Planning for small-boat harbor construction has been complicated by delays in the passage of the omnibus act brought about by prolonged consideration of certain amendments. However, the design has not been delayed and restoration work is about to begin.

The first objective has been to proceed fast enough with construction to provide limited protection for small fishing boats during this winter. Completion of the harbors is scheduled for winter or early spring, in order to be ready for the spring fishing season. The omnibus act authorized expansion of harbors in several communities beyond that which existed at the time of the earthquake. (Funds had not yet been appropriated at the time of this report.) Dock rebuilding schedules are similar to those of small-boat harbors.

POWER

The largest nonmilitary power project in Alaska, the Eklutna hydroelectric project, received only minor damage and was able to continue normal operations after the earthquake. The second largest nonmilitary generating plant, the Cooper Lake project of the Chugach Electric Cooperative Association, also received only minor damage although there was major damage to part of the Anchorage transmission line. The line has been restored on a temporary basis. Service to Kenai Peninsula was not interrupted.

A number of the smaller powerplants in the earthquake area were damaged; but service was quickly restored through interconnections with other sources, and through utilization of mobile generating units provided by the military. Immediately following the earthquake, the Federal Power Commission sent a team of engineers to Alaska. The resulting FPC report was given to all agencies concerned.

Reconstruction efforts have included urban renewal project planning for Anchorage, Valdez, Seldovia, Kodiak, Seward, and Cordova; and special terms were written into the Alaska Omnibus Act for a helpful matching ratio of 90 to 10 on the Federal-local share of net project costs. It is expected that the Federal share will be in the neighborhood of $25 million.

Exclusive of any urban renewal assistance which may be given, the Commission's report gives the following summary of reconstruction activities in the Communities of Anchorage, Cordova, Homer, Kodiak, Seldovia, Seward, Valdez, and Whittier:

ANCHORAGE

In addition to structural damage from the magnitude and duration of the quake, major destruction was caused by quake-induced landslides. Anchorage did not receive serious damage from the tsunami. The major destruction occurred from four slides: Fourth Avenue, L Street, Turnagain Heights, and Government Hill. An extensive geological and soils exploration and evaluation project which provided reconstruction guidance was made. In order that reconstruction in the suspected landslide areas would not be delayed until the final reports were completed, arrangements were made for priority of four preliminary reports. This allowed earlier initiation of reconstruction.

All emergency work has been completed, including temporary (summer) sewer and water repairs, temporary power system repairs, city dock repair, emergency repairs to Anchorage International Airport, a temporary bulk petroleum tanker unloading facility, and necessary demolition and cleanup.

Permanent repairs to utilities are scheduled for completion as follows: Muncipal light and power repair—August 1965, with the priority work to be done in 1964; water system—completed in November 1964, with priority work done by September 1964; sanitary sewers—completed July 1965, with priority work done in 1964; storm sewers—completed July 1965, with priority work done in 1964.

Repairs to city-owned public buildings are scheduled for completion in November 1964. Repairs to schools in the Anchorage Independent School District are scheduled to be completed in August 1964, in time for the fall term—except for West High School which will be rebuilt by September 1965; the Denali Elementary School, by December 1964; and Government Hill Elementary School which should occupy a new building by July 1965.

Permanent repairs to Anchorage International Airport are underway. The new control tower is scheduled for completion in November 1964. Reconstruction and repairs to the Alaska Railroad building complex in Anchorage will be complete in November

1964, and the marshaling yard should be restored by November 1965.

The urban renewal project for the central business district is underway with the design of large-scale landslide stabilization measures designed to protect adjacent private property valued at many millions of dollars. The reconstruction phase of the projects, if approved, will be completed in 1965. The city has decided to go forward with a pilot stabilization project in the residential area of Turnagain, using urban renewal funds.

As of August 20, 1964, the Office of Emergency Planning has estimated eligible reconstruction projects for this community at $17,260,000. The Anchorage Independent School District has eligible projects estimated to cost $5,529,000.

CORDOVA

The tsunami which reached Cordova elevated the water 5 feet above the highest high-tide line; and extensive damage to piers, docks and houses resulted along the waterfront. The vicinity was further affected by a general uplift between +6.5 and +7.5 feet which impaired the utilization of the shoreline installations by the lowered water levels. The restoration of the small-boat harbor is scheduled to begin about mid-September and be completed about the end of this year. Repair and extension of the sewer outfall was completed at the end of August. Restoration of the water system will proceed on a priority basis with completion scheduled this fall. Two urban renewal projects to rehabilitate the shoreline facilities are being formulated.

As of August 20, 1964, the Office of Emergency Planning has approved reconstruction projects for this community at an estimated total cost of $1,421,000.

HOMER

Losses on the 5-mile Homer Spit, resulting from land subsidence and high water, included serious damage to the highway, the city dock, the small-boat harbor, POL tankage, canneries, and tourist facilities.

A temporary dock has been built and a permanent city dock is to be completed by November 15, 1964. Replacement of the small-boat harbor and facilities began in August and is scheduled for completion June 15, 1965, with a usable portion to be completed by this winter. The highway reconstruction on a higher grade to compensate for the subsidence will be delayed until next spring to permit evaluation of the new pattern of erosion or deposition to be established over the winter season. Hospital and grade school repairs are minor and are scheduled for completion by August 30, 1964.

As of August 20, 1964, the Office of Emergency Planning has approved reconstruction projects for this community at an estimated total cost of $1,565,000.

KODIAK

The disaster struck Kodiak in three phases—quake, inundations, and 100-knot winds. The industrial waterfront and the low-lying commercial area were severely damaged.

Demolition of unsafe structures and cleanup of debris are complete. Repairs to the sewage lift station are complete. Repairs to sidewalks, sewer, water, and storm drain systems are scheduled for completion in October 1964. A contract for a displaced persons trailer camp has been awarded. A new city dock is being built using, in part, a grant in lieu of repair. Completion is scheduled for July 1965, with a usable facility by December 1964.

The raising of both breakwaters has been completed. Contracts for restoration of small-boat harbor facilities (floats, parking lot, etc.) were let in August and are scheduled for completion in January 1965; inner floats, October 31, 1964.

An urban renewal project for the heavily damaged commercial area has been agreed upon; and land acquisition to permit utility installations before severe weather is being expedited. The lower portion of the commercial section is being filled to compensate for the general subsidence of Kodiak of 5 to 6 feet.

As of August 20, 1964, the Office of Emergency Planning has approved reconstruction projects for this community at an estimated total cost of $3,194,000.

SEWARD

Damage at Seward was caused by shoreline and offshore slides, tsunamis, and fire. The fire, resulting from the ruptured oil tanks, was carried by the tsunamis and slide-induced waves.

The small-boat harbor disappeared. Most of the railroad trackage within the city, a large portion of the water, sewer, and powerlines, the electric generating station, and most of the petroleum bulk storage tanks were lost.

Debris cleanup, except for the Alaska Railroad area, is complete. Most emergency repairs are complete and reconstruction has begun.

Repairs to the Seward Airport are scheduled for completion in September 1964. Seward's city dock should be usable by November 1964, and completely restored by September 1965. Restoration of water and sewage lines has been assigned high priority to insure restoration of services in October 1964, before the cold weather. The city hospital and public school repairs should be finished by September 1964.

The electric distribution system should be restored by November 1964. Permament restoration of the powerplant is scheduled for completion October 30, 1965. Meanwhile, arrangements have been made to provide emergency standby power.

The small-boat basin is scheduled for completion by March 1965, and the floats and other inner harbor facilities should be installed by May 1965. Design of the railroad dock warehouses and marshaling yard is complete, but the project completion date has not yet been established.

An urban renewal project is being planned for the waterfront area of the city where most of the extensive earthquake and tsunami damage occurred in Seward. The new plan places the port facilities where they are less vulnerable to slides resulting from earthquakes.

As of August 20, 1964, the Office of Emergency Planning has approved reconstruction projects for this community at an estimated total cost of $10,268,000.

SELDOVIA

Seldovia's quake-resultant problem is land subsidence. In relation to the tides, Seldovia's waterfront is several feet lower than before, and because much of the town is on pilings along the boardwalk, it is in jeopardy when high winds combine with high tides.

The airport and the airport road repairs are scheduled for completion in September 1964. The rock breakwaters at Seldovia are being raised and replacement of boat and seaplane floats are scheduled for completion in September 1964. An emergency proposal to provide storm wave protection during high tides by sinking four surplus ships offshore from the endangered facilities is being evaluated.

An urban renewal project has been proposed for Seldovia and the preliminary work necessary for preparing a project plan is in process. Under this project, land will be developed on which buildings now threatened by high tides can move to higher ground. The city will receive a Public Law 875 grant in lieu of raising its boardwalk which will supplement the urban renewal funds.

As of August 20, 1964, the Office of Emergency Planning has approved reconstruction projects for this community at an estimated total cost of $1,035,000.

VALDEZ

The quake and tsunamis caused the industrial waterfront to slide into the bay and most of the remaining village was severely damaged by the inundations. The proposal of the town to abandon the damaged townsite in favor of the Mineral Creek site was strongly endorsed by the Scientific and Engineering Task Force and is being made possible under the aegis of an urban renewal project and Public Law 81–875. The major expenditure of funds, therefore, is for the new site with only the minimum effort required to enable residents to live at the existing site during the winter is being scheduled.

Emergency repairs to the city hospital and the old ferry landing were completed on May 22, 1964. Debris removal was completed in June. Priority was given to the winterizing of the sewer and water systems in the existing townsite which was completed in August 1964. Temporary repair of those portions of the junior-senior high school to be used this winter is scheduled for completion in September 1964.

Valdez Airport and the Robe Lake Seaplane Base repairs are scheduled for completion by the end of September 1964.

The urban renewal project for the new Mineral Creek townsite was utilized to comprehensively plan land utilization, utility and street layouts as well as integrate the waterfront and town development.

The old road to the new townsite is being maintained until it is replaced by a permanent highway.

Replacement of the grade school at the new townsite is scheduled for completion in September 1964. A usable city dock facility at the new townsite will be available in November 1964, with completion by August 30, 1965.

The small-boat basin and inner-harbor facilities at the new site should be completed in May 1965, although the scheduled progress will permit limited use this winter. Reconstruction of the State mental health hospital and the highway administration facilities at the new townsite is being scheduled by the State.

As of August 20, 1964, the Office of Emergency Planning has approved reconstruction projects for this community at an estimated total cost of $5,977,000.

WHITTIER

Although seismic shock damaged some of the structures, more destruction was caused by the high water and the fire which followed. Except for a small amount of debris clearance, minimum restoration of rail and rail unloading facilities has been accomplished by the Department of Interior. It is anticipated that on the completion of the rail dock, yard, and warehouse complex in Seward, all functions but the seatrain activity currently in Whittier will be relocated at Seward.

As of August 20, 1964, the Office of Emergency Planning has approved reconstruction projects for this community at an estimated total cost of $14,000.

Plus the following from the OEP report:

Old Harbor and Kaguyak, coastal communities on Kodiak Island, were completely wiped out by the tidal wave. Ouzinkie, at the northeast tip of the island, was also severely damaged. All three villages are being rebuilt with assistance from the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

The high school at Palmer, north of Anchorage, suffered minor damage. Repairs were completed in May at a cost of $10,000.

Kenai Central High School sustained $15,000 in eligible Public Law 875 damage.

Emergency repairs will be accomplished in September.

Klawock, on Prince of Wales Island far to the southeast of the area of major destruction, lost its harbor floats. They are being replaced by OEP at a cost of $25,000.

Girdwood and Soldatna on the Kenai Peninsula, sustained some damage to transportation facilities, but service was quickly restored.

In his report to the President, the OEP's Director McDermott has reached the following conclusions:

> The Federal family has learned much from this unprecedented experience and these lessons, properly applied, can substantially improve our capability to deal with any emergency that may confront us. For example:
>
> (a) The validity of our present approach to resources management, known as the comprehensive program, has been verified and the early extension of this capability to all States and territories is highly desirable.
>
> (b) There is no substitute for preplanned and tested procedures to deal with the problems of disaster.
>
> (c) Damage assessment techniques must be improved and developmental work on a national system for the management of resources in an emergency must be continued as a priority nonmilitary preparedness program.
>
> (d) Recovery from any disaster can best be expedited by centralized authority, direction and control of the many elements of government, at all levels, that contribute to the rehabilitation effort.

In its report to President Johnson, the Federal Reconstruction Commission submits 13 recommendations, as follows:

RECOMMENDATIONS

> In order to minimize destruction and loss of life in future earthquakes, the Federal Commission offers the following recommendations:
>
> (a) Conduct additional research on earthquake prediction techniques and on the propagation of seismic waves on land and sea.
>
> (b) Establish a seismic sea-wave warning system in Alaska to provide the earliest possible warning to coastal areas of that State. The Honolulu service is wholly inadequate when an earthquake occurs in or near Alaska. It is necessary to improve and extend our sea-wave warning system in order to predict the magnitude of the wave, as well as the time of arrival.
>
> (c) Utilizing all available information, initiate an earthquake hazard study of those populated areas within the U.S. portion of the circum-Pacific seismic belt which are of special interest from engineering, geologic and seismic standpoints. Principal types of earth materials should be classified with respect to recorded seismic activity, their probable response to seismic shock and the likelihood of damage to buildings.
>
> (d) In those coastal areas in which dock and other port installations are subject to potential sliding, undertake coastal and marine geologic studies to assess potential hazards and develop recommendations for protective measures, or abandonment, as appropriate. In addition, further studies should be devoted to gaining an understanding of the mechanics of submarine landslides and the resultant local turbulent wave actions which cause excessive damage. Also, in areas potentially jeopardized by precipitous mountain terrain similar geologic studies should be made.
>
> (e) Review the experience gained in Alaska and study building damages in order to develop any new criteria which might result in more effective or advanced building codes and zoning plans for seismic areas. More emphasis should be given to effective enforcement of current standards as recommended by Task Force Nine.
>
> (f) The U.S. Coast and Geodetic Survey, the U.S. Geological Survey, the National Academy of Sciences, and other scientific and technical organizations should be urged to improve existing seismic equipment and develop more responsive automatic instrumentation. The experience of the Alaskan disaster pointed out very dramatically the need for more and better instrumentation. If one considers instrumentation developed for navigation aids, guidance and control systems by the combined military establishments and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, this Nation's present seismic equipment could be considered at least one generation behind.
>
> (g) Review Federal aid policies for hazardous areas. It is impossible and often undesirable to avoid private or public construction in all areas in which there may be some slight risk of a future disaster. However, in those areas which engineers or scientists regard as particularly hazardous, Federal policies ought not to encourage further development. To do so it to help perpetuate an unnecessary risk to life and property.
>
> (h) Discuss with Japan methods of relief and reconstruction. Japanese earthquake seismologists and engineers visited Alaska soon after the March 27 earthquake to analyze its effects. At this time, they offered not only technical assistance in the form of personnel, but also workable instrumentation for the detection of after-shocks. Discussions with Japanese officials indicate an interest in exchange of information concerning earthquakes and reconstruction policies in the two countries. Such exchanges should be encouraged.
>
> (i) There is much evidence that under the auspices of UNESCO a worldwide effort is being mounted for active participation in analyzing earthquake phenomena and for sharing information among participating nations. At a recent meeting in Paris, participating nations agreed that such meetings and exchange of information would be on a continuing basis. International cooperation in earthquake warnings and scientific studies of earthquake dynamics should be encouraged. The possibility of expanding the United Nations role in this area should also be carefully considered.
>
> (j) The activities of the Commission and the participating agencies should be examined to determine if this experience indicates desirable modifications to Public Law 81–875 to insure the most effective Federal response possible to future disasters.
>
> (k) The unique approaches utilized to meet the Alaskan disaster should not necessarily be used as precedents for other disasters. The work of the Commission, however, underscores the importance of the President's desire for a prompt and thorough review of Federal assistance policies and programs for the private sector. This should include study and consideration of the possibility of adequate, private, disaster insurance coverage (earthquake, flood, or other) at reasonable costs.
>
> (l) A study should be made to develop recommendations for improving Federal Government natural disaster planning. Practical measures for minimizing damage and loss should be identified and developed in advance and their adoption by both the private and public sectors should be encouraged. Even a nominal amount of such advance planning might substantially reduce the severity of loss if realistically related to those areas of the United States known to be particularly vulnerable and exposed to specific types of natural disasters such as earthquakes.
>
> (m) Where properties in a disaster area are in continuing danger of damage which would constitute a hazard to people, authority should be given to an agency by which appropriate protective measures could be taken such as the moving of buildings to a new site.

All these recommendations are, no doubt, important in larger or smaller degree. Ranked near the top, it would seem, is the need for serious study of a disaster-insurance program for the entire country. Alaska's terrible ordeal is but one example of the unpredictable whims of nature which this year have caused havoc and distress throughout the country. The form of those whims has varied from earthquake to flood, from hurricane to fire; but the results have cut a similar pattern of destruction and damage. Surely there must be a way to mitigate the physical losses to property in major disasters. We should find that way.

Above all else, these disasters, and especially the Good Friday catastrophe in Alaska, have underscored a basic premise that makes this country great.

Therefore, a salute to the resiliency, the strength, and the resources of the human spirit.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] had this to say in his foreword to the Commission's report:

> It has been said that the Federal Government has grown so large that it has lost its capacity to function quickly and effectively in response to domestic problems and that its great size has left it cold to the needs of the American people.
>
> No surer refutation of this misconception comes to my mind than the manner in which the Government acted in the aftermath of the Alaska earthquake. Under existing laws, Federal agencies moved immediately to protect life and health from further harm and took steps to begin the herculean task of rebuilding what Nature had laid waste.
>
> The degree of assistance was unparalleled and yet, even though this aid exceeded any previously provided a disaster-stricken State, the Federal Government looked beyond the immediate catastrophe toward providing a firm base for rebuilding an even better Alaska—a vigorous economy to match a vigorous spirit. The responsibility for this undertaking was assigned by the President to the Federal Reconstruction and Development Planning Commission for Alaska.
>
> The Federal Commission staff and the Federal departments and agencies represented on the Commission have had the finest degree of cooperation from the State of Alaska, from State agencies and local governments, from private Alaskan institutions, from the citizens of Alaska, and from a small army of individuals who volunteered their experience and unique talent for the reconstruction effort. Theirs is a story of which all Americans can be proud.

Indeed, Americans are proud, and Alaskans are grateful. So much has been done in so little time.

So, Mr. President, a salute to all those, named and unnamed, known and unknown, who have made it possible for me to say: "The faith of so many was well planted. Alaska is on the way back."

MUNICIPAL LEADERSHIP IN OUR FEDERAL SYSTEM OF GOVERNMENT

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON] has for many months served with distinction with me on the Senate Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations. Our activities there have clearly shown that in the future greater attention must be given to problems of Federal-State-local relationships. One of the principal conclusions we have reached during our work has been that a major reason for the marked growth of the Federal Government is the tendency to bypass local government, and to look to the Federal Government for assistance in seeking solutions to local problems.

In an address which Senator PEARSON delivered before the League of Kansas Municipalities, in Wichita, Kans., on September 21, he stated that local government is the frontline of democracy, and is the point in our Federal system where the problems of the people first emerge. He pointed out that we must strive to strengthen and concentrate more upon our local governments. Senator PEARSON underscored the challenges which local leadership must face, and outlined the problems that local leadership can best handle. He emphasized that effective municipal action and dynamic local leadership constitute one of our greatest national strengths. He concluded that "the opportunity for municipal leadership in the Federal system was never greater."

I ask unanimous consent that his address be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MUNICIPAL LEADERSHIP IN OUR FEDERAL SYSTEM OF GOVERNMENT

(Address by Senator PEARSON at 54th annual city convention of League of Kansas Municipalities, Wichita, Kans., on September 21, 1964)

Local government is the front line of democracy. It is the point in our Federal system where the problems of people, living together in an organized society, first emerge.

It is in our cities, school districts, and counties where the governed and those who govern come into daily contact. It is here where we sense the obligation of citizenship, the meaning of public decisions, and the responsibility of public office. This intimate and essential relationship of government and people makes the municipal role in the Federal system a vital one.

Local government, as we exercise it, is a major deterrent against the conformist type of civilization in which the mandates of a central government set the direction of every public policy and the pace of their execution.

Our urban and rural communities, like individuals, have great differences. The first pilgrims landing on these shores, the first family driving its wagons over Kansas plains and setting in place their sod hut, the eager student studying at today's school, the astronaut waiting on the pad at Cape Kennedy, all possess different objectives in life, different wants, different satisfactions. We have made room for all and have encouraged each.

While seeking common, broad national goals, we have sought to encourage the same range of local initiative on the part of local government. Local government has offered to each community the opportunity to pursue its own objectives as its people determine them. This Nation and its people have grown and prospered in the diversity which its local government encourages. The diverse interests of our society makes it imperative that local government remains influential in our Federal system.

In Kansas, cities have been urged to seek new ways to satisfy particular local needs. The home rule amendment to the Kansas Constitution, which the league developed and sponsored, is certainly an expression of confidence of Kansans in this concept and in their cities as vital instruments of accomplishment. The judicious use of this broad new authority is certainly a tribute to the integrity of many sincere local government officials who have been chosen to guide such local efforts. Kansas municipal leadership has been revitalized with new tools with which to meet its challenges. Municipal leadership throughout the Nation needs to recognize its new challenges and devise the tools to cope with them.

We as a nation are confronted with a vast array of very difficult and complicated problems as we try to deal with our diverse society. These problems are compounded by the pressures arising from our national obligations.

Our gross national product is growing at a surprising rate, but unemployment and relief recipients remain constantly high. How do we make it possible for all Americans to participate in the fruits of an expanding economy?

Our domestic economy is intimately related to our ability to maintain a high level of exports, but foreign trade is a two-way proposition. How do we maintain a high level of exports and still deal with the distressing effects of massive imports of oil, beef, watches, umbrellas and typewriters?

Our national security and many aspects of our economy are threatened by a rapidly changing military technology. Can we safely phase out manned bombers without the benefit of battle-tested missile systems to replace them? How do we discontinue certain military production and close military bases without doing great damage to local economies?

Our military force deployment is conditioned upon agreements with our allies and commitments through international organizations such as NATO and SEATO. Will the domestic politics of our allies mesh with our security needs if a crisis occurs?

These are indeed sizable and difficult problems. They will trouble any national administration and any Congress for a long time to come.

There are troubles of equal proportion, however, in the tasks which face local government.

The increasing competition for adequate revenue from local sources has historically troubled you. How much more can local governments improve their efficiency to further stretch their limited dollars? Can you continue to minimize service without jeopardizing your ability to fulfill responsible municipal objectives?

Central cities, and particularly the cores of those cities, are experiencing serious problems as physical facilities deteriorate and businesses and people seek new and modern surroundings. How can these essential parts of a vigorous community be salvaged and restored?

The growth of suburbs, satellite cities, special districts, and overlapping county operations confuse orderly urban growth. Shifting population leaves some cities with long histories merely shells of yesteryear. Can order be expected in urban growth? Can dying cities be salvaged?

These are questions to test the ingenuity of any local government official. They need not take a back seat to our national or international problems in either difficulty or importance.

I suspect, however, that at this point we could draw some generally accepted observations about these problems and some conclusion about the direction to which we must look for possible solutions.

Revenue: The local tax base must be broadened and the States must accept greater fiscal responsibility for financing functions which are a legitimate statewide responsibility.

Central cities: Sprawling urban areas are here to stay. The central city will probably never recapture the people, the industry and the land uses it once possessed. It must revitalize itself but it may have to perform different functions than in the past.

Suburbs: They are a fact. The task is not to destroy suburbs and satellite communities but to make them a social and economic part of the whole urban complex. Neat and tidy structures of governments will be the exception, not the rule. The real job is to learn how to develop metropolitanwide policies and how to efficiently manage metropolitan confusion.

Declining cities: All cities do not have the same future. Many will grow. Some will just hang on. Some will actually die. This is a hard fact to accept, especially if yours is one of those which is not growing. But it is a matter of historical fact that no Federal program, no State aid, and no local campaign can compete for long with the massive forces of technology and economics which dictate the existence, form and character of cities.

These observations will not find unanimous agreement but they do possess a high degree of acceptance—because they have been the subject of extensive debate.

Our municipal struggles are well defined, as evidenced by these observations. We have sought to secure efficient local government and honest administration. Cities are, as a result, well run enterprises.

More recently, Americans have become infatuated with the administrative structure of metropolitan areas and the physical plant of our city. At all levels of government, major attention has been focused on seeking new forms of government and on programs to construct or reconstruct more efficient street systems and more modern and eye-pleasing buildings. These efforts have produced sporadic successes.

We have finally reached the point where attention is focusing on the needs of people in our cities. Government, after all, is to serve people but somehow we have allowed our attention to become so centered on the fixtures of government that its real purpose has too frequently disappeared from view.

The human needs of the city must become the focus of our attention. It is here that local leadership faces its greatest challenge. It is in dealing with this vital need that local government can once more come into its own. It is in leading a struggle to satisfy the human problems which confront 70 percent of our citizens as they seek a better life in urban areas that municipalities can exert a new leadership in the Federal system.

As attorneys, accountants, engineers, planners, and building inspectors, we have examined the legal, physical, and financial aspects of our cities in detail. We know what is legal, and what is not. We know where the water comes from and how to treat it. We know what a safe building is and when one should be condemned. We know how to seal coat a street or paint a long-lasting stripe on it.

As mayors, managers, and councilmen, we know how to put together a package of community services, budget funds to finance them and administer city business in an efficient manner.

We really are quite knowledgeable about many aspects of the city.

In spite of this extensive knowledge, we don't know why our young people drop out of school or how to keep them in. We don't know why juvenile delinquency continues to climb in our better educated and more effluent urban society. We haven't found a way to protect our cities from growing numbers of dwellings which are a community blight and a personal disgrace to those who occupy them. We have only begun to recognize that many of our people are not prepared to compete for the benefits of an expanding economy and we certainly haven't begun to devise programs which will relieve their plight.

People entangled in these conditions have traditionally been good Americans and good local citizens. They have, however, become a part of an America, and a part of a community, which has passed them by. The accumulation of these conditions has made these elements of many of our major cities ripe for agitators and violence. In frustration, and with proper stimulation, they have succumbed to the way of the mob.

It is appalling that violence and racial strife should be necessary to focus local attention on the needs of our neighbors. It is indeed unfortunate that these problems should become a national issue on such a tide. It will be tragic if the National Government finds it necessary to prescribe in detail the countermeasures.

These human problems, which come into sharpest focus in our urban areas, are of long standing and they are deeply rooted. Corrective measures will not be found in a national crusade. At the national level, there is too great a tendency to manipulate the symbols and the emotions associated with these problems for personal political gain. This is cruel and destructive of positive effort.

These are the problems which demand the kind of attention local interests under local leadership can provide best. Community action is constantly tempered by the cool intimacy of local knowledge and personal contact.

The manner in which local government resolves this vital responsibility will, in my opinion, determine the future influence of municipal leadership in our Federal system.

It is necessary that cities accept this responsibility. The spark has been struck. Urban residents are increasingly aware of the negative influence of congestion, pollution, blight, slums and poverty, upon their personal well-being. National political leadership is equally aware that it need not rely on transcient local political figures to deliver block votes if these issues can be profitably manipulated through Federal programs. Only effective municipal action can preserve the integrity of cities and project municipal leadership into a sphere of meaningful national influence.

It is proper that cities act. Today we in America are becoming more diversified and more pluralistic. The evidence is abundant. Instead of encouraging such characteristics as tight family ties, strong neighborhood commitments, and deep personal concern for the problems of others common to the more conformists cultures, our sociologists complain of just the opposite. In this climate, simple solutions to problems evade us. We find many painful dilemmas. Troublesome controversy appears at every turn. If we are to remain consistent to our past and support one of our greatest strengths, this increasing diversity must be accommodated. This certainly will not be accomplished by a politically inspired national program which imposes a nationwide pattern. It can be done through local programs.

It is possible for cities to act. City government leadership is in the most effective position to initiate action for the community. Further, as city officials you have at your call a broad range of community leadership and almost unlimited technical assistance. Municipal government leadership may have to broaden its concept of urban leadership to deal with some of the issues I have discussed. The city government itself may actually assume a secondary role in the final resolution of its problems. But the key, it seems to me, is a local solution—a solution in which the city government itself may only be the activator.

The opportunity for municipal leadership in the Federal system was never greater. If cities will concern themselves with the fundamental problems of their people, the city will emerge as the critical leadership element in the Federal system.

THE COMPARATIVE VOTING RECORDS OF PRESIDENT JOHNSON AND SENATOR GOLDWATER

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I submit, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, the comparative voting records of President Lyndon B. Johnson, when he was a Member of the U.S. Senate, and of Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, on conservation, recreation, and resource development legislation. This memorandum is enlightening, and this information should be made available to the growing group of conservation-minded citizens who are concerned with preservation of our natural resources and their wise use and economical development at all stages of government and private enterprise.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMPARATIVE VOTING RECORDS OF SENATORS LYNDON B. JOHNSON AND BARRY GOLDWATER RELATIVE TO CONSERVATION AND NATURAL RESOURCES LEGISLATION

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

There is no better place to begin than to examine the great Tennessee Valley Authority project. Senator GOLDWATER's opinion and position with respect to this tremendous regional resource project is well known.

The TVA Financing Act of 1957 (S. 1869): Senator GOLDWATER offered a motion to recommit S. 1869 to the Senate Committee on Public Works. Senator GOLDWATER contended: (1) Congress should not permit any agency of the Federal Government to finance its own operations; (2) TVA should be taken over by the States in the area it serves; and (3) TVA should never have been created. The opponents contended that even President Eisenhower recommended against dismembering TVA and for enactment of the measure which would let TVA finance its own development out of its own power revenues. These increased developments were needed to meet growing needs of an area of more than 5 million people. The Goldwater motion was rejected 61 to 22. Senator GOLDWATER, of course, voted for his motion to recommit. Senator Lyndon Johnson voted against recommital of this bill.

The second amendment on S. 1869 concerned the Saltonstall amendment to remove from the Board of Directors of TVA their entire authority of issuing bonds and to place this authority in the Secretary of the Treasury. This amendment was rejected 46 to 37. Senator Johnson voted "no"; Senator GOLDWATER voted "yea." If adopted this amendment would have defeated the purpose of the self-financing bill by taking the management out of the hands of the Directors of TVA—the responsibility which the Directors have exercised through the years. On final passage, this bill was approved in the Senate 61 to 20. Senator Johnson voted "yea" for passage while Senator GOLDWATER voted "no" against passage. The bill would have authorized TVA to issue and sell up to $750 million in revenue bonds outstanding at any one time to assist in financing its power program. The bill died in the House.

The next item is the Tennessee Valley Authority Financing Act of 1959 (H.R. 3460). The votes that took place on the bill of 1957 paved the way for action on the 1959 proposal. The major vote came on the Cotton motion to recommit the bill to the Senate Public Works Committee. This motion was rejected by 73 to 17. Senator Johnson voted against recommital; Senator GOLDWATER voted for recommittal. This bill was passed subsequent to that recommittal vote by a voice vote on July 9, 1959. It authorized the TVA to issue and sell revenue bonds up to the $750 million figure outstanding at any one time to assist in financing additions to its power system and for construction, acquisition, enlargement, improvement or replacement of any plant or any other facility. The principal and interest on the bonds are payable from TVA's power revenues. This bill became Public Law 86–137. Senator GOLDWATER's position was in opposition to the proper development of the water resources of the Tennessee Valley area. President Johnson's vote was a vote in support of the full development and utilization of the water and power resources of this important region. The TVA has brought light to a former regional area of darkness. By so doing, the entire Nation has benefited from the glow.

WATER POLLUTION

Water Pollution Control Act of 1959 (H.R. 3610): H.R. 3610 was a bill which would have authorized the Public Health Service to stimulate construction of much needed municipal waste treatment facilities to prevent untreated or inadequately treated sewage or other waste from being discharged into any waters. This would have increased construction grants for projects from a quarter of a million dollars to $400,000 for each individual project. It would allow the cities and municipalities to join together to build joint treatment facilities. It would have authorized $80 million annually for construction instead of $50 million which was presently in effect. It was a total authorization of an $800 million expenditure in the field of water pollution control. This was in 1959 and it came to the Senate after having first passed the House. It was approved by the Senate by a vote of 61 to 27. Senator Johnson voted for the bill; Senator GOLDWATER voted "No." Unfortunately, the bill was vetoed by President Eisenhower.

WILDERNESS PRESERVATION

Although President Johnson was Vice President in 1961 when the first record vote came on the Senate floor on the wilderness bill and he was President on September 3, 1964, when he signed into law S. 4, the bill to establish a national wilderness preservation system. It is interesting to note the opposite positions taken on this significant conservation measure. In 1961 Senator GOLDWATER voted in favor of the motion to refer the wilderness bill (S. 174) to the Committee on Agriculture. The Senate Interior Committee, which has jurisdiction over the legislation, had acted on the bill and for the first time, after many years of struggle, had reported the bill to the Senate for its consideration. Fortunately, this motion to refer which amounted to recommittal of the bill was defeated 41 to 32. Senator GOLDWATER announced for the decision to rerefer the bill to Agriculture. He voted for two crippling amendments which were offered by opponents of the measure, and he was paired against the final passage of the bill. The bill passed 78 to 8, but it died in the House of Representatives.

However, when S. 4 was introduced in the 88th Congress, the Senate Interior Committee again promptly considered this measure, and it was reported to the Senate for action. Senator GOLDWATER once demonstrated his opposition to this important proposal to preserve a portion of our wild areas for generations yet unborn. He voted for every crippling amendment which was offered and he was one of 12 Members of the Senate who voted against final passage. The bill passed overwhelmingly by a vote of 73 to 12. The majority of the Members of both parties expressed their approval for this important measure as did President Johnson when he signed it into law this year at a ceremony which he described of historic importance in the conservation movement.

WATER RESOURCES RESEARCH ACT OF 1964

In recent years there has been a growing awareness that no future problem facing our Nation is of greater significance than that of preventing a shortage of our water resources. In recognition of this, the Senate established a Select Committee on National Water Resources, chaired by the late Senator Kerr of Oklahoma. The Select Committee held extensive hearings, in all parts of the Nation, and published several significant and important studies. Recommendations were submitted which, if implemented, would greatly contribute toward the solution of this growing national problem. One of the recommendations called for more intensive research in basic hydrological sciences. As a result of this recommendation, in the 88th Congress Senator ANDERSON, of New Mexico, introduced S. 2, a bill to establish water resources research centers at State colleges and universities and to stimulate water research at other centers of competence. The basic purpose of this act was to promote a more adequate program of water research in utilizing our universities in this effort. Not only do we need to know more about water, but also we need to train more scientists who can help solve our water problems.

The Senate Interior Committee reported the bill to the Senate for consideration. On the floor of the Senate there were two significant amendments offered by the opponents of this type of Federal action. The first amendment was offered by Senator ALLOTT, Republican, of Colorado. His amendment: (1) would have reduced the authorizations for water resources research to such an extent that the program would have been unworkable; (2) it would have terminated the program in 5 years; and (3) it would have limited the scope of research projects which would have rendered the bill absolutely meaningless. The simple effect of his amendment would have been to have "gutted" the bill. Fortunately, the amendment was rejected by almost 2 to 1. The Senator from Arizona, Mr. GOLDWATER, voted for this crippling amendment. The administration was against this amendment.

The second amendment was offered by Senator COTTON, Republican, of New Hampshire. His amendment was intended to reduce by 20 percent the authorization for water resources research, except for the land-grant college program. His amendment was also rejected, but Senator GOLDWATER voted for it. After this amendment failed, S. 2 was passed by a voice vote. As passed by the Senate and the House this act will stimulate more effective research at industrial, State and local levels and will contribute toward the training of additional scientists by our colleges and universities around the country. It was for these reasons that President Lyndon Johnson signed this bill into law this year. If Senator GOLDWATER and his philosophy had prevailed, one more backward step would have been taken in our efforts to meet the needs of our people with our available resources.

PACIFIC NORTHWEST-PACIFIC SOUTHWEST POWER INTERTIE

Recently, President Johnson signed into law, S. 1007, a bill which paved the way for completion of the proposal to establish the Pacific Northwest-Pacific Southwest intertie project. This legislation was the final step in the long journey to implement this concept whereby the surplus power resources in one region of the country may be utilized where they are urgently needed in another region, while at the same time providing for the needed protection for the people and industry at the source of origin. This was a significant step forward in the full utilization of our national resources. This effort demonstrated the kind of cooperation entire regions can display and will ultimately result in benefits for all of our people. However, in the 87th Congress, when initial efforts were made to enact this legislation, the Senate Interior Committee reported the predecessor bill to S. 1007, which was S. 3153. Republican Senator SCOTT offered a motion to recommit the bill to the committee. This was long after extensive hearings had been held and after the committee had reported the bill to the Senate for final consideration. Fortunately, the motion to recommit was rejected by a vote of 53 to 33. Senator GOLDWATER, who had argued against this bill on the floor of the Senate several days prior to actual voting, was paired for the motion to recommit. After the defeat of this motion, the bill was passed by a vote of 51 to 36 and sent to the House of Representatives. Senator GOLDWATER was also paired against final passage. Unfortunately, in the 87th Congress, the bill did not get through the House of Representatives. The proponents of the measure were successful in passing it in the 88th Congress and thus allowing President Johnson to sign it into law with his strong support and approval. There were no record votes on the measure in the Senate in the 88th Congress, but Senator GOLDWATER had amply demonstrated his opposition to this kind of far-reaching proposal, even though his native State of Arizona in the Southwest will be one of the prime beneficiaries of the surplus power generated in the Northwest.

THE HELLS CANYON DAM ACT OF 1956 (S. 1333)

The first of the Senate record votes on the great battle to develop the water resources of the Snake River between Idaho and Oregon came in 1956. Both Senator GOLDWATER and President Johnson were Members of the Senate and had an opportunity to demonstrate their positions on the question of how and whether our natural resources shall be harnessed to work for the good of all of our people. The bill failed of passage in the Senate in 1956 by a vote of 51 to 41. Forty-three of those Senators opposing it were members of the Republican Party. Senator GOLDWATER voted against passage of this bill. Thirty-nine of the 41 Senators who voted for the bill were Democrats; among them was Senator Lyndon B. Johnson.

THE HELLS CANYON DAM ACT OF 1957 (S. 555)

In 1957 the proposal to authorize Federal construction of Hells Canyon Dam once more came before the Senate. This time, the vote was reversed. The measure passed 45 to 38. Senator Johnson indicated his support of this proposal in 1957 as he had in 1956. He was paired in favor of final passage of the bill. Senator GOLDWATER voted "no." He continued his vehement opposition against the bill. He had consistently demonstrated that he is opposed to any projects which do not benefit directly the local interest of his own constituency. Although he has supported Colorado River development by the Federal Government and has asked all of the people of the United States to spend over $1 billion to construct the central Arizona project he has failed to provide the same kind of support to other areas of the Nation where projects of equal merit need to be developed.

THE COLUMBIA RIVER POWER-PRIEST RAPIDS ACT OF 1954 (H.R. 7664)

This power project in the State of Washington passed by a voice vote and became Public Law 544 of the 83d Congress. It permitted a Washington State power agency to construct Priest Rapids Dam on the Columbia River. The significant vote that occurred on this bill in the Senate was an amendment which was offered by Senators MAGNUSON and JACKSON of Washington State. Their amendment would have given preference in sales of power to rural cooperatives and municipalities. Unfortunately, this amendment, which would have benefitted the small co-ops and public agencies was rejected by a vote of 45 to 29. Senator Lyndon Johnson voted "yea" as an indication of his support for the co-ops and for the application of power preference for municipalities. Senator GOLDWATER voted against the amendment, clearly going on record as being opposed to the preference provision for the public agencies.

LEAD-ZINC ACT OF 1960 (H.R. 8860)

This bill was intended to help stabilize the domestic lead and zinc mining industry by aiding the small producers of this important commodity. The bill aimed to conserve our domestic reserves and to provide jobs for the unemployed miners in depressed lead-zinc communities. The problems besetting the domestic lead and zinc industry have been multiplying over the years. This legislation was an effort to help the small lead-zinc producer and the Senate passed it by a vote of 59 to 28. Senator Johnson voted in favor of the bill; Senator GOLDWATER voted against the bill. The bill passed both Houses, but President Eisenhower pocket vetoed the measure. When Mr. Johnson moved up to the Vice Presidency in 1961, the new administration supported a small producer's lead and zinc bill, and it became public law. In 1963, during the 1st session of the 88th Congress, clarifying legislation was introduced to amend the act in order to insure that the purposes behind the original introduction were achieved. The Congress intended this bill to provide aid only for the small producer of lead and zinc. It was enacted for the miner whose principal product was lead and zinc and whose lead and zinc production was not a byproduct of some other mineral he was producing. However, when this legislation to amend the basic act was considered on the floor of the Senate, Senator WILLIAMS, Republican, of Delaware, offered an amendment to terminate the entire program on February 15, 1964, instead of December 31, 1965, as provided by the act. His amendment was rejected by a vote of 50 to 32. Senator GOLDWATER voted for the amendment which would have ended the progam almost 2 years earlier than was originally provided. The administration opposed Senator WILLIAMS' amendment which was vigorously supported by Senator GOLDWATER. If the Williams amendment had carried, it would have dealt a severe blow to the economies of several of our States where the independent small producers account for much of the lead-zinc production.

RECREATION AREAS AND NATIONAL PARKS

Probably in no other area of resource management has so much progress been made in the last 4 years than in the development of our Nation's outdoor recreational opportunities. Since the beginning of the Kennedy-Johnson era, the administration and the Congress have cooperated in making a record that is unequaled in achievement in any comparable period. For instance, after several years of little activity, three great national recreational areas were added to our national park system. They were the national seashores at Cape Cod in Massachusetts, at Point Reyes in California, and at Padre Island, Tex., in the Gulf of Mexico. These additions to our national park system covered each of the great ocean shorelines of our Nation. Due to tremendous support and organization of both the executive and legislative branches of Government, these measures were enacted with a minimum of meaningful opposition. This is not to say that there were not those who were opposed to this type of legislation, just as there are always in our midst those who are opposed to the development of our Nation's resources for the good of all the people.

The decisive battle on the three recreation areas came on S. 4, the bill to establish the Padre Island National Seashore in the 87th Congress. The bill was reported by our committee, and on the floor a motion was offered by Senator TOWER, of Texas, to recommit the bill to the Interior Committee. This in effect would have killed the bill and the prospect for establishing a great public national recreation area on the Gulf of Mexico. Fortunately, the motion to recommit was rejected by a vote of 45 to 39. Senator GOLDWATER voted for the motion to recommit. Subsequently, another amendment was offered which would have directed the Secretary of the Interior to establish a road through the entire length of the seashore area, with access roads to the mainland from the north and south ends of the island. This proposal was opposed by the administration and by those who were interested in preserving insofar as possible the natural quality and beauty of this area. In addition, such a proposal would have been extremely expensive and it was put forth by those who had originally opposed the concept of establishing this national recreation area. Therefore, this amendment was contradictory to the record of its proponents and was merely put forth as a delaying tactic and an effort to thwart the proposal. This amendment was rejected over 2 to 1 by a vote of 58 to 24. Senator GOLDWATER voted for this amendment. The bill subsequently was passed by a voice vote and became Public Law 87–712.

Probably no more significant legislation has been passed in the last 4 years dealing with the development of our recreational resources than H.R. 3846, the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act which was enacted in the 2d session of the 88th Congress. President Johnson signed it into law on September 3, 1964. This bill, in the Senate was attacked by several members of the Goldwater wing of the Republican Part, and three crippling amendments were offered to the proposal which, fortunately, were overwhelmingly defeated. Senator GOLDWATER was absent and did not vote on these proposals, but members of his wing of the Republican Party were recorded in favor of each crippling amendment.

SUMMARY

This effort has been made to point out the basic differences in philosophy of these two men toward the conservation and development of our Nation's natural resources for the benefit of all our citizens.

A search has been made of issues on which the positions of each were recorded and were found to represent different basic approaches to the treatment of the problems in this significant area of national concern. There were other examples which could have been detailed relating to individual votes on numerous appropriation bills and amendments thereto. However, I believe the trend has clearly been established by this examination into the public positions expressed on fundamental and specific issues over the years.

It appears that this year's campaign by the Goldwater wing of the Republican Party is calling attention to some strange knowledge alleged to be stored in one's heart, and that if one will just carefully examine deep into his heart he will recognize that what Mr. GOLDWATER is saying is really true. When it comes to the field of conservation of our resources, deep in my heart a careful examination of Mr. GOLDWATER's record results in a severe case of heartburn.

Goldwater voting record on major legislation

NATURAL RESOURCES

	Goldwater	Republican majority	Democratic majority
Interior appropriations for 1962:			
Amendment providing $2,000,000 to rehabilitate and conserve rangelands in the Western States. (Passed 42 to 28 June 11, 1962.)	No	88 percent no	87 percent yes.
Amendment to provide $6,000,000 for access roads. (Passed 49 to 40, June 12, 1962)	No	78 percent no	74 percent yes.
Motion to recommit bill to Appropriations Committee with instructions to reduce it to House total of $868,595,000. (Defeated 26 to 60, June 12, 1962.)	Yes	77 percent yes	95 percent no.
Lead-zinc subsidies, 1960: Passage of bill authorizing subsidies to small lead and zinc producers. (Passed 59 to 28, Aug. 19, 1960).	No	62 percent no	83 percent yes.
Migratory waterfowl conservation, 1961: Passage of bill authorizing $50,000,000 over a 5-year period to accelerate Federal acquisitions of wetlands for migratory waterfowl. (Passed 65 to 8, Aug. 28, 1961.)	No	76 percent yes	98 percent yes.
National Wilderness Preservation System, 1961: Passage of bill providing for a complete review of all wilderness-type areas in order to open certain lands on which commercial activities are currently barred. (Passed 78 to 8, Sept. 6, 1961.)	Paired no	80 percent yes	96 percent yes.
National Fisheries and Aquarium Center: Passage of bill authorizing the construction of a $10,000,000 National Fisheries Center and Aquarium in the District of Columbia, displaying fresh water, marine and shellfish, and other aquatic resources for educational, recreational, cultural, and scientific purposes. (Passed 42 to 20, Sept. 21, 1962.)	Paired no	52 percent no	77 percent yes.
Oceanography, 1961: Passage of bill authorizing a $700,000,000, 10-year program of oceanographic and Great Lakes research. (Passed 50 to 32, July 28, 1961.)	Paired no	83 percent no	87 percent yes.
Submerged lands, 1953: Amendment to set aside offshore oil funds for health and other purposes. (Defeated 27 to 64, May 5, 1953.)	No	95 percent no	52 percent yes.
Water pollution control, 1959: Bill authorizing Federal grants of $80,000,000 over a 10-year period to help communities build sewage plants. (Passed 61 to 27, Sept. 9, 1959.)	No	59 percent no	86 percent yes.
PUBLIC POWER			
Atomic Energy Act of 1954:			
Amendment to bar AEC from entering into the Dixon-Yates contract. (Defeated 36 to 55, July 21, 1954.)	Paired no	96 percent no	75 percent yes.
Amendment to permit Government generation of atomic power and to require that preference be given to public bodies and cooperatives in disposing of Government-generated power from Government plants. (Passed 45 to 41, July 22, 1954.)	No	85 percent no	86 percent yes.
Motion to table amendment which would permit President to deal with more than 1 nation in setting up an exchange of atomic information in an international pool. (Passed 46 to 41, July 23, 1954.)	Yes	98 percent yes	95 percent no.
Motion to table amendment which would require compulsory licensing of patents obtained in atomic energy field. (Passed 41 to 37, July 23, 1954.)	Yes	100 percent yes	97 percent no.
Amendment to provide that companies given AEC licenses for production of commercial power be subject to regulatory features of Federal Power Act. (Defeated 23 to 54, July 26, 1954.)	No	98 percent no	58 percent yes.
Adoption of House-Senate conference report without provision for compulsory sharing of patents and with an ineffective "preference" provision. (Defeated 41 to 48, Aug. 13, 1954.)	Yes	89 percent yes	95 percent no.
Atomic reactors: Bill authorizing $400,000,000 over 5-year period for development of atomic reactors for electric power. (Passed 49 to 40, July 12, 1956.)	No	93 percent no	100 percent yes.
Atomic construction, 1957:			
Amendment to delete authorizations for natural uranium reactor and plutonium recycling plant. (Defeated 34 to 42, Aug. 16, 1957.)	Announced yes	89 percent yes	95 percent no.
Amendment to delete provision that Atomic Energy Commission work on cooperative power reactor demonstration program. (Defeated 34 to 42, Aug. 16, 1957.) Bill passed by voice vote.	Announced yes	86 percent yes	95 percent no.
Atomic Energy Commission authorization for fiscal 1962: Amendment to delete $95,000,000 authorization for construction of electric generating facilities for the new Hanford, Wash., plutonium-producing reactor. (Defeated 36 to 54, July 18, 1961.) Bill passed by voice vote.	Yes	81 percent yes	81 percent no.
Columbia River power project, 1954: Amendment to give preference in sales of power to rural cooperatives and municipalities. (Defeated 29 to 45, July 12, 1954.)	No	98 percent no	84 percent yes.
Hells Canyon Dam, 1956: Bill providing for Federal high dam at Hells Canyon on Snake River at Idaho-Oregon border. (Defeated 41 to 51, July 19, 1956.)	No	96 percent no	83 percent yes.
Hells Canyon Dam, 1957: Bill authorizing the construction, operation, and maintenance of a Federal high dam on the Snake River. (Passed 45 to 38, June 21. 1957.)	No	87 percent no	89 percent yes.

Goldwater voting record on major legislation—Continued

PUBLIC POWER

	Goldwater	Republican majority	Democratic majority
Pacific Northwest power, 1962: Bill to provide permanent priority on Pacific Northwest power to public or private consumers of electricity from Bonneville Power's marketing area. (Passed 51 to 36, Aug. 8, 1962.)	Paired, no	90 percent no	84 percent yes.
Niagara power development, 1956: Passage of bill authorizing New York State development of Niagara River in accordance with Federal preference clause requirements. (Passed 48 to 39, May 16, 1956.)	Paired no	80 percent no	87 percent yes.
TVA financing, 1957:			
Amendment to take from TVA directors their authority for issuing bonds. (Defeated 37 to 46, Aug. 9, 1957.)	Yes	74 percent yes	85 percent no.
Passage of TVA financing bill. (Passed 61 to 20, Aug. 9, 1957.)	No	63 percent yes	88 percent yes.
TVA financing, 1959: Motion to recommit (kill) bill. (Defeated 17 to 73, July 9, 1959.)	Yes	53 percent no	97 percent no.

PUBLIC WORKS

Community Facilities Act, 1958:			
Amendment to lower interest rates from 3.5 to 3 percent. (Defeated 40 to 41, Apr. 15, 1958)	No	95 percent no	95 percent yes.
Amendment to reduce authorization by half. (Defeated 33 to 52, Apr. 16, 1958.)	Paired yes	76 percent yes	95 percent no.
Passage of bill authorizing $1,000,000,000 in loans to State and local governments for construction of such community facilities as new water systems, sewer systems, hospitals, school buildings, and other public works, etc. (Passed 60 to 26, Apr. 16, 1958.)	Announced no	55 percent no	93 percent yes.
Disaster insurance, 1956:			
Amendment to require States to pay part of the cost of the program after June 30, 1959. (Passed 39 to 31, May 10, 1956.) Bill passed 61 to 7, May 10, 1956; Goldwater for.	Yes	92 percent yes	88 percent no.
Flood Control Act of 1959: Bill authorizing $1,500,000,000 for construction of 132 rivers and harbors and flood control projects. (Passed 70 to 5, June 17, 1960.)	No	85 percent yes	98 percent yes.
Revised public works appropriation for 1960:			
Bill appropriating $1,176,579,834 for public works in fiscal 1960. (Passed 73 to 15, Sept. 8, 1959.)	No	56 percent yes	98 percent yes.
Passage of appropriation over President's veto. (Passed 72 to 23, Sept. 10, 1959.)	No	64 percent no	97 percent yes.
Public works appropriations 1962:			
Amendment to cut from $500,000,000 to $300,000,000 in funds already authorized. (Defeated 16 to 44, Sept. 29, 1962.)	Paired yes	68 percent yes	93 percent no.
Passage of bill appropriating $5,200,000,000 for public works projects and the Atomic Energy Commission in fiscal 1963. (Passed 64 to 8, Oct. 1, 1962.)	No	77 percent yes	96 percent yes.
Standby Public Works Act of 1962:			
Amendment to authorize appropriation of $750,000,000 (instead $600,000,000) for an immediate program of public works projects in areas of heavy unemployment. (Passed 43 to 32, May 28, 1962.)	Announced no	97 percent no	91 percent yes.
Amendment to authorize appropriations of $750,000,000 for a standby public works program after June 20, 1963. (Passed 37 to 36, May 28, 1962.)	Announced no	100 percent no	88 percent yes.
Passage of bill. (Passed 44 to 32; May 28, 1962.)	No	83 percent no	83 percent yes.
Supplemental public works, 1963: Amendment to cut $200,000,000 from the proposed $450,000,000 for new public works projects. The accelerated public works program is designed to provide quick, temporary employment in areas suffering prolonged joblessness. (Defeated 26 to 60, May 1, 1963.)	Paired yes	75 percent yes	91 percent no.
Omnibus rivers and harbors, 1957: Motion to recommit bill to committee with instructions to reduce total authorization by at least $350,000,000. (Defeated 27 to 55, Mar. 28, 1957.) Bill passed 42 to 22, Mar. 28, 1957; Goldwater absent.	Yes	55 percent yes	88 percent no.
River and Harbor and Flood Control Act, 1958: Passage of bill authorizing $1,500,000,000 for river and harbor, beach erosion, and flood control for 150 projects. (Passed 52 to 11, Apr. 2, 1958.)	No	72 percent yes	94 percent yes.
Santa Maria project, 1954: Amendment to continue 160-acre limitation reclamation law. (Defeated 17 to 45, Aug. 18, 1954.)	No	100 percent no	58 perent yes

CIVIL RIGHTS

Civil Rights Act of 1957: Passage of bill. (Passed 72 to 18, August 7, 1957.)	Yes	100 percent yes	80 percent yes.
Civil Rights Amendments of 1960:			
Motion to invoke cloture. (Defeated 42 to 53, March 10, 1960.)	No	63 percent no	52 percent no.
Bill making obstruction of all Federal court orders a crime, outlawing all bombings and bomb threats, etc. (Passed 71 to 18, April 8. 1960.)	Announced yes	100 percent yes	70 percent yes.
Civil Rights Act of 1964:			
Motion to invoke cloture. (Passed 71 to 29, June 10, 1964.)	No	82 percent yes	66 percent yes.
Bill to enforce the constitutional right to vote, to confer jurisdiction on the U.S. district courts to provide injunctive relief against discrimination in public accommodations, to authorize the Attorney General to institute suits to protect the constitutional rights in public facilities and public education, to extend the Commission on Civil Rights, to prevent discrimination in federally assisted programs and to establish a Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity. (Passed 73 to 27, June 19, 1964.)	No	82 percent yes	69 percent yes.

NORTH CAROLINA SIGNERS OF THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, some weeks ago my good friend, Wade Lucas, public information officer of the North Carolina Department of Conservation and Development, visited Independence National Historical Park, in Philadelphia, Pa., and was prompted by his visit to write an article relating to the North Carolinians who signed the Declaration of Independence and participated in the framing of the Constitution of the United States. The article was published on September 20, 1964, in the Goldsboro News-Argus, of Goldsboro, N.C. Since the signing and drafting of these great national charters are of general interest throughout the country, I ask unanimous consent that the article by Mr. Lucas be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Goldsboro (N.C.) News-Argus of Sept. 20, 1964]

NORTH CAROLINA LEADERS GET LITTLE NOTE IN INDEPENDENCE HALL GALLERY

(By Wade Lucas)

PHILADELPHIA, PA.—A touring North Carolinian, who likes to tell people in other States about the glorious history that North Carolina has, cannot but help having something akin to a letdown feeling when he visits Independence National Historical Park here.

For within this enclosure are such historical buildings as Independence Hall, where the Declaration of Independence was signed and where the Federal Constitution was adopted, are located.

Also within this enclosure is Congress Hall, where the fledgling American Congress held its sessions from 1790 to 1800, where the First and Second Banks of the United States were established, and where other historical buildings, like Carpenters' Hall, just seem to ooze history.

Considerable work is being done to refurbish Independence Hall, where George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, James Monroe, and so many others, known today as the Founding Fathers, labored to lay the groundwork of what are now the United States of America.

It was in Congress Hall, located on the left of Independence Hall, where the touring North Carolinian got that letdown feeling as he gazed at the portraits of the notables who served in the American Congress from 1790 to 1800 when the seat of government was moved to Washington, D.C.

This Tar Heel, who likes his history and who likes to boast that North Carolina is one of the Thirteen Original Colonies, looked at portrait after portrait in Congress Hall before he found one of a North Carolinian. And it was the only one.

That portrait shows the likeness of former Gov. Richard Dobbs Spaight, who served in Congress from North Carolina from 1798 to 1801 and who was killed in a duel at New

Bern in 1802 in the aftermath of a political quarrel with John Stanley. That, incidentally, was the last duel of major importance fought in North Carolina, according to that eminent historian, Gertrude Carraway, director of the Tryon Palace Restoration at New Bern.

Governor Spaight's portrait hangs in what is known as the Conference Room. It is located just off the Chamber in which the Members of the House of Representatives held their session on the third floor.

And to reach the third floor takes a bit of doing, especially for a slightly overweight Tar Heel. But it is worth the climb.

A National Park Service guide, chatting briefly with the visiting Tar Heel, commented rather dryly that "I'll bet old John Adams found the going rough up those stairs."

The guide had reference to John Adams, a Member of that early House of Representatives from Massachusetts and who later became the second President of the United States. Mr. Adams was more than slightly on the obese side, his portraits show.

Somewhat disturbed about the fact he could find the portrait of only one North Carolinian hanging in Independence Hall, where William Hooper, John Penn, and Joseph Hewes were the North Carolinians to affix their signatures to the Declaration of Independence in July 1776, and in Congress Hall, the visiting Tar Heel asked some questions.

He even went so far as to visit Melford O. Anderson, National Park Service superintendent in charge of what must be the most famous bit of historical ground in all America, and asked why there were no more portraits of North Carolinians visible other than that of Richard Dobbs Spaight.

Anderson had what he apparently considered a ready answer. He said the National Park Service, which is under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior and which took over the supervision and maintenance of this historical area by act of Congress in 1951, is currently engaged in a vast refurbishing job as a part of the NPS's Mission 66.

This Mission 66, designed to help preserve many of America's most historical areas, will hardly be completed insofar as Independence National Park is concerned by 1966. It may be 1976, as one park service employee told the visiting Tar Heel.

Anderson said there are numerous pictures of America's early statesmen stored in the vault of the old First Bank of the United States. But he did not know how many of them are portraits of such North Carolinians as William Hooper, John Penn, and Joseph Hewes, who bravely signed the Declaration of Independence and incurred the wrath of King George III, of Great Britain, or was it England at that time?

Nor did he know whether that vault in a bank, where the Nation's first bank robbery was said to have occurred under the very noses of those early statesmen, contains portraits of the three North Carolinians who signed the Federal Constitution in 1787.

Superintendent Anderson did attempt to locate the curator, but he could not be found.

Those North Carolina signers of the Federal Constitution in 1787 at the Constitutional Convention in September of that year were:

Dr. Hugh Williamson, a Member of Congress and who is buried near his old hometown of Edenton.

William Blount, a Member of the Continental Congress and who is buried near Windsor.

And Richard Dobbs Spaight, Governor of North Carolina from 1792 to 1795 and later Member of Congress from 1798 to 1801.

Since this is Constitution Week, it is appropriate that mention should be made that the 54 delegates met in Independence Hall from May 25, 1787, and labored for 4 months before they fashioned a U.S. Constitution, which has been much amended and, to hear some people, much flouted since its adoption in September 1787.

But it was not until 1789 that North Carolina ratified the Federal Constitution at the North Carolina Convention of 1789 held in the old State House in Fayetteville. The reason was that many North Carolinians did not like some parts of that Constitution then even as some do not like it now.

But the touring Tar Heel, making his first visit to Philadelphia, liked what he saw. He saw and admired the Liberty Bell. He saw where a modern touch to this old cradle of American Liberty has been given by the placing of a bronze marker in front of Independence Hall where the late President John F. Kennedy stood on July 4, 1962, and made his famed "Unity of Nations" speech. But he though then—and thinks now—that this historical area, visited annually by more than 2 million people, ought to have more about North Carolina than it now has.

CONFERENCE AGREEMENTS ON S. 3060, NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT AND PUBLIC LAW 815—PUBLIC LAW 874 AMENDMENTS AND EXTENSION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a number of my colleagues have made inquiry of me regarding the agreements reached by the conference committee on S. 3060, the bill to expand and extend the National Defense Education Act and its impacted area legislation.

As Senators are aware, it is planned that this matter will be brought up first in the House of Representatives at an early date. However, in order that the basic funds breakdown under the conference report may be available to Senators, I ask unanimous consent that there appear at this point in my remarks a summary by the Office of Education of the contents of the conference version of S. 3060, title by title together with a series of tables relating to certain of the titles.

There being no objection, the summary and tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT AMENDMENTS, S. 3060, AMENDMENTS AGREED UPON BY SENATE-HOUSE CONFEREES, SEPTEMBER 24, 1964

CONFERENCE REPORT

Three-year extension of the entire act.

TITLE I—GENERAL PROVISIONS

After reference to imbalances in our educational programs omits the language: "which have led to an insufficient proportion of our population educated in science, mathematics and modern foreign languages and trained in technology."

TITLE II—STUDENT LOANS

Increases authorization to $163.3 million in fiscal year 1965 from present $135 million, $179.3 million in 1966, $190 million in 1967, and $195 million in 1968.

Removes annual institutional ceiling of $800,000.

Extends loan program to accredited postsecondary business schools and technical institutions, public, and nonprofit private.

Defines eligible institutions of higher education to make specific reference to public and other nonprofit collegiate and associate degree schools of nursing.

Eliminates special consideration provision for prospective elementary school teachers and for students with superior background in science, mathematics, engineering, and language. Replaces with provision giving priority for the granting of loans to students with "superior academic background."

Increases yearly limit on loans to graduate and professional students from $1,000 to $2,500; increases aggregate limit for such students from $5,000 to $10,000.

Authorizes institutions to extend moratorium on loan repayments (but not on accrual of interest) to part-time students.

Extends "forgiveness" to teachers in nonprofit private elementary and secondary schools and institutions of higher education.

Allows part-time students carrying at least a one-half academic workload to receive loans.

TITLE III—FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR STRENGTHENING INSTRUCTION IN SCIENCE, MATHEMATICS, MODERN FOREIGN LANGUAGES, AND OTHER CRITICAL SUBJECTS

Expands the program for equipment acquisition and State supervision by adding English, reading, history, geography, civics; increases authorization from present $70 million annually to $90 million for acquisition of equipment; from present $5 million annually to $10 million for State supervision and administration.

Provides for promulgation of allotment ratio biennially, and increases the minimum yearly allotment to each State to $50,000.

Authorizes schools to use equipment for other subjects "if there exists a critical need therefor."

Provides for the computation of the rate of interest on loans to nonprofit private schools for each fiscal year rather than for each month.

TITLE IV—NATIONAL DEFENSE FELLOWSHIPS

Increases maximum number of fellowships to 3,000 in fiscal year 1965; 6,000 in 1966; 7,500 in 1967; and 7,500 in 1968. In fiscal year 1965, one-half of the fellowships, and not less than one-third of the fellowships in fiscal years 1966, 1967, and 1968 must be in "new or expanded" study programs.

In determining number of fellowships to be awarded for study at any one institution, Commissioner must consider national and regional need for facilities.

Limits award to include any person studying for a Ph. D. and intending to teach, or continue to teach, in an institution of higher education.

No awards for study at a "school or department of divinity."

Adjusts fellowship stipends for full calendar year of study and permits awards for any 3 years of graduate study.

TITLE V—GUIDANCE, COUNSELING, AND TESTING

Increases authorizations to $24 million in fiscal year 1965 from present $17.5 million; $24.5 million in 1966; $30 million in 1967; and $30 million in 1968.

Extends program to all elementary grades, public junior colleges and public technical institutes.

Authorizes guidance and counseling institutes at not less than the present level of $7.25 million. These institutes are for counseling and guidance personnel in elementary or secondary schools, or in institutions of higher education (including junior colleges and technical institutes).

TITLE VI—LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT

Increases authorization for language development program (VI–A) to $13 million in fiscal year 1965 from present $8 million;

$14 million in 1966; $16 million in 1967; and $18 million in 1968.

Modern language institutes (see title XI).

TITLE X—ADMINISTRATION AND IMPROVEMENT OF STATE STATISTICAL SERVICES

Requires State agency to keep records and afford access thereto.

Requires accounting procedures to assure proper disbursement of Federal funds, "including such funds paid by the State to the local educational agencies."

TITLE XI—TRAINING INSTITUTES

Authorizes guidance and counseling institutes at not less than the present level of $7.25 million. These institutes are for counseling and guidance personnel in elementary or secondary schools, or in institutions of higher education (including junior colleges and technical institutes).

Authorizes $32.75 million each for fiscal years 1965–68 for institutes for teacher or supervisors (or student teachers or supervisors) of modern foreign language reading, history, geography, English, disadvantaged youth, school library personnel, educational media specialists.

Stipends may be paid to all who attend institutes.

FEDERALLY AFFECTED AREAS

Extends the federally impacted areas legislation (Public Laws 815, 874) for 1 year and directs a study of the effects of these laws. Includes District of Columbia in this program.

Estimated distribution of legislative authorizations, National Defense Education Act of 1958, title II, sec. 202(a), as proposed to be amended by Senate-House conference, Sept. 24, 1964

STUDENT LOANS

State	Fiscal year 1965	Fiscal year 1966	Fiscal year 1967	Fiscal year 1968
United States and outlying parts	$163,300,000	$179,300,000	$190,000,000	$195,000,000
50 States and District of Columbia	162,176,927	178,066,889	188,693,302	193,658,914
Alabama	2,245,349	2,465,346	2,612,470	2,681,219
Alaska	65,807	72,255	76,567	78.581
Arizona	1,660,469	1,823,161	1,931,961	1,982,802
Arkansas	1,453,648	1,596,075	1,691,323	1,735,832
California	16,936,492	18,595,915	19,705,653	20,224,225
Colorado	2,270,206	2,492,639	2,641,391	2,710.901
Connecticut	2,071,351	2,274,300	2,410,023	2,473,444
Delaware	318,837	350,076	370,968	380,730
Florida	3,709,141	4,072,560	4,315,596	4,429,164
Georgia	2,704,085	2,969,029	3,146,211	3,229,006
Hawaii	568,096	623,757	660,981	678,375
Idaho	641,498	704,351	746,385	766,026
Illinois	8,082,566	8,874,490	9,404,088	9,651,564
Indiana	4,678,718	5,137,135	5,443,701	5,586,956
Iowa	3,103,388	3,407,456	3,610,801	3,705,822
Kansas	2,659,417	2,919,985	3,094,240	3,175,667
Kentucky	2,307,863	2,533,985	2,685,205	2,755,868
Louisiana	2,969,172	3,260,089	3,454,640	3,545,551
Maine	672,622	738,525	782,598	803,192
Maryland	2,298,143	2,523,313	2,673,896	2,744,262
Massachusetts	6,283,631	6,899,296	7,311,022	7,503,418
Michigan	7,057,009	7,748,449	8,210,849	8,426,924
Minnesota	3,954,895	4,342,392	4,601,531	4,722,624
Mississippi	1,931,505	2,120,752	2,247,311	2,306,451
Missouri	4,036,476	4,431,967	4,696,451	4,820,042
Montana	744,378	817,311	866,085	888,877
Nebraska	$1,546,967	$1,698,538	$1,799,901	$1,847,266
Nevada	176,388	193,670	205,228	210,629
New Hampshire	660,512	725,229	768,508	788,732
New Jersey	3,140,674	3,448,394	3,654,182	3,750,345
New Mexico	832,864	914,467	969,039	994,540
New York	13,144,547	14,432,439	15,293,716	15,696,183
North Carolina	4,104,514	4,506.671	4,775,613	4,901,287
North Dakota	786,815	863,906	915,461	939,552
Ohio	7,977,456	8,759,081	9,281,792	9,526,050
Oklahoma	2,636,526	2,894,850	3,067,605	3,148,331
Oregon	2,221,926	2.439,629	2,585,217	2,653,249
Pennsylvania	8,563,875	9,402,957	9,964,093	10,226,306
Rhode Island	861,757	946,192	1,002,657	1,029,043
South Carolina	1,640,605	1,801,350	1,908,849	1,959,082
South Dakota	758,931	833,290	883,018	906,255
Tennessee	3,205,418	3.519,483	3,729,513	3.827.658
Texas	8,943,740	9,820,040	10,406,065	10,679,909
Utah	1,844,824	2.025,579	2,146,458	2,202,944
Vermont	563,741	618.975	655,914	673,175
Virginia	2,706,635	2,971,829	3,149,177	3,232,050
Washington	3,265,223	3,585,147	3,799,097	3,899,073
West Virginia	1,424,223	1,563.767	1,657,088	1,700,695
Wisconsin	3,981,929	4,372,076	4,632,986	4,754,906
Wyoming	339,392	372,645	394,883	405,275
District of Columbia	1,422,683	1,562,076	1,655,295	1.698,856
American Samoa	----------	----------	----------	----------
Canal Zone	23,157	25,426	26,944	27,653
Guam	16,890	18,545	19,651	20,169
Puerto Rico	1,081,698	1,187,682	1,258,558	1,291,678
Virgin Islands	1,328	1,458	1,545	1,586

NOTE.—Distribution of all amounts estimated on the basis of full-time degree credit enrollment (excluding U.S. service schools), fall 1963.

Estimated distribution of legislative authorizations, National Defense Education Act of 1958, title III, sec. 302(a), as proposed to be amended by Senate-House conference, Sept. 24, 1964, for each of fiscal years 1965, 1966, 1967, and 1968

State	Acquisition of equipment for science, mathematics, modern foreign languages, and other critical subjects		State administration and supervision
	Grants for public schools	Loans for nonpublic schools	
United States and outlying parts	$79,200,000	$10,800,000	$10,000,000
50 States and District of Columbia	77,769,460	10,672,056	9,837,327
Alabama	2,089,073	53,059	188,955
Alaska	95,345	3,727	50,000
Arizona	825,045	56,075	82,976
Arkansas	1,096,763	21,472	99,201
California	4,692,896	693,843	849,066
Colorado	866,393	76,660	100,434
Connecticut	707,227	194,312	127,955
Delaware	133,952	33,894	50,000
Florida	2,256,586	154,385	264,126
Georgia	2,513,700	46,138	227,362
Hawaii	274,115	53,946	50,000
Idaho	430,778	15,971	50,000
Illinois	2,836,888	929,856	494,570
Indiana	2,028,256	227,141	245,847
Iowa	1,361,199	171,598	144,386
Kansas	1,025,334	91,211	113,784
Kentucky	1,852,916	155,272	167,595
Louisiana	2,141,299	250,387	193,679
Maine	494,084	62,641	50,525
Maryland	1,306,554	242,402	170,060
Massachusetts	1,528,454	461,379	247,901
Michigan	3,281,426	594,469	436,240
Minnesota	1,730,299	297,944	186,490
Mississippi	1,482,787	33,716	134,117
Missouri	1,684,094	294,573	210,521
Montana	353,453	36,733	50,000
Nebraska	687,541	100,261	73,734
Nevada	$96,991	$7,098	$50,000
New Hampshire	271,085	61,931	50,000
New Jersey	1,681,223	525,262	304,177
New Mexico	667,596	48,090	60,383
New York	4,443,154	1,486,173	803,881
North Carolina	2,915,620	34,426	263,716
North Dakota	397,376	36,378	50,000
Ohio	3,755,845	674,145	524,761
Oklahoma	1,266,671	37,798	124,464
Oregon	799,514	62,109	94,888
Pennsylvania	4,186,466	1,082,466	557,418
Rhode Island	297,661	93,518	50,000
South Carolina	1,621,303	28,038	146,646
South Dakota	441,994	41,347	50,000
Tennessee	2,159,466	55,011	195,322
Texas	5,374,317	266,180	550,229
Utah	616,541	10,825	57,713
Vermont	203,123	31,232	50,000
Virginia	2,262,271	98,487	224,487
Washington	1,235,333	102,213	157,326
West Virginia	1,105,846	30,699	100,023
Wisconsin	1,852,429	454,281	212,369
Wyoming	165,221	6,921	50,000
District of Columbia	175,957	44,363	50,000
American Samoa	50,000	2,307	10,000
Canal Zone	50,000	1,242	10,000
Guam	50,000	8,695	10,000
Puerto Rico	1,230,540	110,199	122,673
Virgin Islands	50,000	5,501	10,000

Estimated distribution of legislative authorizations, National Defense Education Act of 1958, title V, pt. A, sec. 501, as proposed to be amended by Senate-House conference, Sept. 24, 1964

GUIDANCE COUNSELING AND TESTING

State	Fiscal year 1965	Fiscal year 1966	Fiscal year 1967	Fiscal year 1968
United States and outlying parts	$24,000,000	$24,500,000	$30,000,000	$30,000,000
50 States and District of Columbia	23,616,000	24,108,000	29,520,000	29,520,000
Alabama	465,334	475,091	582,223	582,223
Alaska	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Arizona	204,342	208,627	255,672	255,672
Arkansas	244,301	249,423	305,667	305,667
California	2,090,971	2,134,810	2,616,209	2,616,209
Colorado	247,335	252,521	309,464	309,464
Connecticut	315,112	321,719	394,267	394,267
Delaware	59,684	60,936	74,676	74,676
Florida	650,456	664,094	813,847	813,847
Georgia	559,919	571,658	700,567	700,567
Hawaii	93,067	95,018	116,445	116,445
Idaho	99,136	101,215	124,039	124,039
Illinois	1,217,962	1,243,498	1,523,907	1,523,907
Indiana	605,440	618,134	757,523	757,523
Iowa	355,576	363,031	444,895	444,895
Kansas	280,212	286,087	350,600	350,600
Kentucky	412,731	421,385	516,407	516,407
Louisiana	476,968	486,968	596,779	596,779
Maine	124,426	127,035	155,681	155,681
Maryland	418,801	427,582	524,001	524,001
Massachusetts	610,498	623,298	763,852	763,852
Michigan	1,074,315	1,096,840	1,344,177	1,344,177
Minnesota	459,265	468,894	574,629	574,629
Mississippi	330,286	337,211	413,252	413,252
Missouri	518,443	529,313	648,673	648,673
Montana	95,090	97,084	118,976	118,976
Nebraska	181,582	185,389	227,194	227,194
Nevada	$50,000	$50,000	$52,527	$52,527
New Hampshire	76,376	77,977	95,561	95,561
New Jersey	749,087	764,793	937,253	937,253
New Mexico	148,705	151,822	186,058	186,058
New York	1,979,695	2,021,201	2,476,982	2,476,982
North Carolina	649,445	663,061	812,581	812,581
North Dakota	88,515	90,371	110,749	110,749
Ohio	1,292,314	1,319,410	1,616,936	1,616,936
Oklahoma	306,514	312,940	383,508	383,508
Oregon	233,679	238,578	292,377	292,377
Pennsylvania	1,372,736	1,401,518	1,717,559	1,717,559
Rhode Island	101,665	103,797	127,203	127,203
South Carolina	361,140	368,712	451,856	451,856
South Dakota	98,631	100,699	123,406	123,406
Tennessee	481,014	491,099	601,842	601,842
Texas	1,355,033	1,383,444	1,695,409	1,695,409
Utah	142,129	145,109	177,831	177,831
Vermont	50,074	51,124	62,652	62,652
Virginia	552,837	564,428	691,707	691,707
Washington	387;441	395,565	484,764	484,764
West Virginia	246,324	251,488	308,199	308,199
Wisconsin	522,995	533,961	654,369	654,369
Wyoming	50,000	50,000	56,957	56,957
District of Columbia	78,399	80,042	98,092	98,092
Outlying parts	384,000	392,000	480,000	480,000
American Samoa	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000
Canal Zone	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000
Guam	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000
Puerto Rico	304,000	312,000	400,000	400,000
Virgin Islands	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000

NOTE.—Distribution of all amounts estimated on the basis of school-age (5 to 17) population as of July 1, 1962, for the 50 States, District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico and as of Apr. 1, 1960, for the other outlying parts.

"THE ELECTION: WHAT'S GOOD FOR HOUSING?"

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD an editorial published in the October issue of House & Home, which subscribers are receiving today. House & Home is a business publication with well over 100,000 subscribers—builders, architects, lenders, and so forth—who make up the giant housing industry. It is by all odds the most important publication in its field. Until August this year, it was published by Time, Inc.: it is now published by another giant, the McGraw-Hill Publishing Co. This editorial, by Editor Richard O'Neill, is a landmark, for the magazine has never before openly supported a candidate for President.

I believe that this editorial is both forthright and an outstanding service to the homebuilding industry; and I am glad this magazine is endorsing Lyndon Johnson for election to the Presidency.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ELECTION: WHAT'S GOOD FOR HOUSING?

(By Richard W. O'Neill)

In its proposals to both Republican and Democratic platform committees, NAHB urged that "the Government-industry partnership should try to achieve a decent home for all Americans." House & Home agrees. "Government-industry partnership," always basic to housing, takes on added importance this year.

Like it or not, the Federal Government is inextricably and inevitably involved in housing. Both parties have good records in housing legislation. And in both there are many men and factions who understand both the need for housing and the ability of our industry to provide it.

Except in the war years, housing has prospered under every administration since 1934. In the past 3½ years 5.3 million new housing units have been built, and we are now building at an annual rate of almost 1.6 million units. There is every reason to believe that if present patterns of Federal housing legislation are continued, we could reach a yearly rate of 2 million units by 1968. By any measure that is good business. To insure good business, the housing industry must now look hard at the choice to be made next month. President Johnson's record—and philosophy—is written into the 1964 Housing Act for all to see. His opponent is a far less known quantity.

Lacking any assurances from Senator GOLDWATER, we can only judge him on his voting record.

Since 1954 GOLDWATER has voted against every congressional measure that would have created more housing and for every measure that would have curtailed housing. We cannot judge his understanding of housing's problems and responsibilities, since he has so rarely discussed them—either on the Senate floor or in public speeches. But if the Republican platform is any criterion, his understanding is sketchy and confused. Items:

The platform blames the Democrats for urban renewal programs that "created new slums by forcing the poor from their homes to make room for luxury apartments." The fact is urban renewal has not created new slums. What's more, both major parties have supported renewal ever since its inception in the 1949 Housing Act—and as recently as last month in the 1964 Housing Act.

The platform accuses the Johnson administration of failing to attract more private capital to housing. But more than 95 percent of all capital in housing is already private capital.* So attracting more can hardly be a major problem.

In light of the Republican platform and in light of GOLDWATER's voting record, the housing industry has a right to demand a clear statement of the role his administration would play in housing—what laws he would enact and what laws he would repeal. True, the office of the Presidency might change GOLDWATER's attitude toward housing as it has changed the attitudes of other Chief Executives.

The question is will the Senator change his views enough to cope with the huge problems in urban growth—and hence housing—that lie just ahead? The United States is undergoing a process of urbanization that will, in a few years, have 8 out of 10 Americans living in and around our cities. Before 1999 we will rebuild almost all of our urban centers. The forces behind intensified urbanization—migrating populations, industrial growth, and regional economic changes—are all well above and beyond local determination and local control. The Federal Government should take a more vital role in housing by providing monetary and legislative tools that private industry needs to handle new housing problems created by this urbanization. In the face of these forces, GOLDWATER's espousal of Federal withdrawal from local affairs could be bad news for housing.

The record of both candidates is clear. GOLDWATER could curtail Federal involvement in housing. There is no question where Johnson stands. His approach to housing and urban problems is one that should be readily understood by every housing professional: "The solution to these problems does not rest on a massive program in Washington. Nor can it rely solely on the strained resources of local authorities. They require us to create new concepts of cooperation—a creative federalism—between the National Capital and the leaders of local communities.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

CORRECTION OF CERTAIN ERRORS IN THE TARIFF SCHEDULES OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is H.R. 12253.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 12253) to correct certain errors in the tariff schedules of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FRANK B. ROWLETT

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to consider Calendar No. 1494, H.R. 7348.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered; and the bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 7348) for the relief of Frank B. Rowlett.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I call up my amendment at the desk and ask to have it stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, it is proposed to strike out line 6 and insert the following: "which sum shall be considered a payment in consideration of a transfer by Frank B. Rowlett of property consisting of all substantial rights to a patent within the meaning of section 1235 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, in full settlement."

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, this amendment is offered to meet Treasury Department objection to the bill. It is my opinion that the bill is meritorious and should be passed. However, the Treasury Department objects to the tax principle involved in one provision, and it may be compelled to advocate a veto of the bill because of this tax principle involved, although the bill in other respects is meritorious.

I move adoption of the amendment, in order to meet the Treasury Department's objection, and I trust that the bill will be enacted into law.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, this is a bill which provides for an award to Mr. Frank B. Rowlett of $100,000 for the contributions he has made in the field of crypto-analysis and cryptography. He was associated with a Mr. William F. Friedman in this work, which goes back many years. About 8 years ago Mr. Friedman was awarded a like sum. The Defense Department felt that Mr. Rowlett was fully entitled to this amount for the contributions he has made and the inventions which he has sponsored in the field of cryptography. Mr. Rowlett is still in Government service with a rating of GS-18.

This question was considered at length by the Judiciary Committee of the Senate, but one objection was raised with respect to the tax feature.

I join in the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Louisiana to make this amount subject to a capital gains tax; although, I must say that it runs a little against the grain. If the man has done outstanding work and the Government itself wants to reward him and give him an award for work well done, let us give it to him, and not try to let the heavy hand of the Treasury reach out and pull away $25,000 of the $100,000. That sounds too much like Indian giving to me. I would rather have it across the board. When Government does that, one must assume that somehow the heart is not quite in it. As recited in "The Vision of Sir Launfal":

> For the gift without the giver is bare.

I believe that in this case the Government, as the giver, is just a little bare when it comes to fully expressing its appreciation. But if this measure is in danger of a veto, or if it is in danger of opposition by the Treasury—I learned long ago that three-fourths of a loaf is much better than no bread at all—I shall concur in it under circumstances in which I have no other choice to pursue.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, the Senator was much more generous in compromising last night.

He had the votes to defeat the amendment last night. I believe he is making a very fine compromise. He feels that without the amendment, the bill would be vetoed, and there would be no bill. I believe he is making an exceedingly good compromise. I believe it would be a fine thing to pass the bill in this form, in view of the fact that the Treasury is very much concerned about the principles involved because of the tax features.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the committee, beginning on the first page of the report, be printed at this point in the RECORD in its entirety. It is in some detail.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT

The facts surrounding this legislation are set forth in House Report 1689 on H.R. 7348, as follows:

"In its report to the committee on the bill, the Department of Defense stated that it had examined the merits of the case and strongly recommended that Mr. Rowlett be granted relief. The Department further stated that Mr. Rowlett has had a long and distinguished career in the field of cryptology. According to its records, he conceived fundamental principles which assured the high security capability of major cryptographic systems and equipment used so successfully by the United States during World War II. These are still in use and held in a classified status, and have significant commercial potential value which is probably greatly in excess of the payment proposed by the bill.

"Mr. Rowlett began his Government service on April 1, 1930, as a junior cryptanalyst, P-1, in the Office of the Chief Signal Officer, Signal Corps, U.S. Army. Between 1930 and 1935 Mr. Rowlett, still a junior cryptanalyst, pioneered in the development of concepts, techniques, and devices which established the practicality of applying computerlike devices to the general field of cryptography. During this same period he also conceived the basic principles underlying the inventions cited in the proposed bill, and jointly with Mr. William F. Friedman invented methods for the practical application of these principles. In 1935 he was listed in official memorandums as principal assistant to Mr. Friedman, chief cryptanalyst for the Office of the Chief Signal Officer since 1921. The following year, 1936, he was promoted to assistant cryptanalyst, P-2. Just prior to World War II he was responsible for the specific direction and coordination of U.S. Army activities which culminated in the successful breaking of a Japanese cipher machine of major importance. When he was furloughed for military duty on February 16, 1942, Mr. Rowlett had advanced to the position of senior cryptanalyst, P-5. Commissioned as a second lieutenant in the Signal Corps, U.S. Army, he was assigned the MOS of cryptanalytic officer. During his military service, he was awarded the Legion of Merit (United States) and the Order of the British Empire (British). He was separated from the service as a colonel. On May 2, 1946, Mr. Rowlett returned to his civilian employment with the Office of the Chief Signal Officer as a research analyst (cryptanalytic), P-8. He continued to serve with this agency until September 30, 1949, when he transferred to the newly created Armed Forces Security Agency (the predecessor of the National Security Agency) and assumed a key position, Technical Director, Operations. On February 15, 1952, he resigned his position with NSA and accepted an appointment with the Central Intelligence Agency. During his employment with CIA, he served as a senior staff officer in grades GS-16 and GS-17 and was awarded the Distinguished Intelligence Medal. On July 12, 1958, he returned to the National Security Agency as Special Assistant to the Director, GS-18, a position he still holds. He has continued to make significant contributions to the science of cryptography, and in April 1960 received the National Security Agency Exceptional Civilian Service Award.

"Patent applications for the two inventions cited in the proposed bill were filed by the Army in 1936 (serial No. 70,412) and 1942 (serial No. 443,320), respectively. Mr. Friedman and Mr. Rowlett, then principal assistant to Mr. Friedman, were listed as co-inventors in both applications. It is these two inventions that have resulted in the high degree of security capability for U.S. communications beginning before World War II and continuing to the present. A memorandum written to the Signal Corps Patent Office by Mr. Friedman and Mr. Rowlett on August 31, 1935, credits Mr. Rowlett with contributing the fundamental principle and three of the five subsidiary principles and Mr. Friedman with contributing two of the five subsidiary principles. With respect to the first invention, it appears that Mr. Rowlett's contribution was the greater. A Navy document entitled 'The Contribution of the Signal Corps,' dated November 2, 1943, and prepared by Capt. L. S. Stafford, U.S. Navy, states in part:

"'Rowlett is entitled to full credit for his discovery of the principle * * * and Friedman and Rowlett jointly are entitled to full credit for their joint invention of methods of applying and reducing his principle to practical form.' (NOTE.—Classified portions deleted.)

"The respective contributions of the two men to the second invention are not officially recorded. Since Mr. Rowlett and Mr. Friedman were joint inventors in both inventions, however, they have equal rights in these inventions and their losses due to the imposition of secrecy by the Government would be the same.

"In the early 1950's several private bills were introduced in behalf of Mr. Friedman, each proposing an award to compensate him for his loss of commercial rights to cryptologic inventions covered by applications for patents held in secrecy by the Government. In 1956 one of these bills was enacted and became Private Law 625, 84th Congress. Although two of the inventions for which Mr. Friedman received his award are the same inventions upon which the present bill is founded, Mr. Rowlett did not become a party of any of the private bills which sought to compensate Mr. Friedman. In the memorandum he prepared on September 20, 1962, when he formally sought the Department's permission to seek legislative relief, Mr. Rowlett explained in paragraph 3:

"'I was asked by Mr. Friedman sometime prior to 1952 to join him in presenting his case to Congress. I declined, pointing out to him that I thought the Government should take the initiative in recognizing our contributions if they were worthy of monetary award. While I still feel the Government should take the initiative, enough time has elapsed since Friedman received his award to cause me to conclude it is most unlikely that my contributions will be recognized unless I take positive steps to bring their merits to the attention of the Congress.'

"The records of the Department of Defense disclose that, in his appeal for relief, Mr. Friedman stressed the importance of the two inventions of which he was coinventor with Mr. Rowlett over the five additional inventions to which he held sole patent rights, and that he associated his loss mainly to his inability to exploit these two inventions. Of the seven inventions he stressed the importance of the 1936 invention (patent application serial No. 70,412) above all others and placed the 1942 invention (patent application serial No. 443,320) next in importance. He then developed detailed evidence which convinced the Department and the Congress that, if he had been able to exploit these two inventions domestically and among allied foreign governments, he would have obtained amounts of money far in excess of the sum of money he sought from Congress.

"In its report to the committee on the bill, the Department of Defense stated that the Department's views today are properly reflected by the following extract from a letter dated July 6, 1953, which the Honorable Robert T. Stevens, Secretary of the Army, sent to the Honorable Chauncey W. Reed, then chairman of the House Committee on the Judiciary, with respect to H.R. 1152, 83d Congress, a bill for the relief of William F. Friedman:

"'When the fruit of an inventor's labor has been of substantial benefit to his government and his right to seek reward for his efforts is impaired for so great a period of time for security reasons, it is equitable that he be compensated for his loss. This view is in accord with the policy of the Department of encouraging technological advancement. To deny an inventor the right to seek gain from his inventions merely because they are vital to our national defense and the security of the Government, while permitting such pursuit by inventors in other fields where security interests are not paramount, would be discriminatory and would discourage advancement in matters vital to our national defense.'

"In recommending favorable consideration of the bill while opposing the tax exemption provision, the Department of Defense stated:

"'The Department of Defense considers that, in view of the available evidence, Mr. Rowlett is equitably entitled to compensation equal to that of Mr. Friedman. Accordingly, the Department favors the grant of an award of $100,000 to Mr. Rowlett in full settlement for his rights in the inventions which are referred to in H.R. 7348. The Department opposes, however, the provision in H.R. 7348 which would exempt the award to Mr. Rowlett from taxation for the reasons expressed in the enclosed copy of a letter of February 17, 1964, from the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget.'

"The Treasury Department in a letter which accompanied the Defense Department report took the view that this payment is 'compensatory in nature' and that this fact supports subjecting it to taxation. The committee has considered the arguments advanced by the Treasury Department, but is of the opinion that the tax exemption feature should be retained in the bill. The payment in this instance could be said to be based upon the years of service and outstanding contributions of Mr. Rowlett, as well as upon a moral obligation on the part of the United States to pay equitable compensation for inventions subject to security restrictions. In this sense, it can be stated that the award is for meritorious service. In this connection, the committee feels that it is relevant to note that the income tax law itself contains an exemption for amounts received as prizes and awards made primarily in recognition of scientific achievement (26 U.S.C. 74(b)). The exemption of section 74(b) is made subject to the conditions that the recipient was selected without any action on his part to enter a contest or proceeding and is not required to render future services as a condition to receiving a reward. Also, it should be noted that Private Law 87-578 providing for an award to the estate of an inventor was amended on August 15, 1963, to extend tax exemption to the award authorized by the private law. In view of this precedent and in view of the particular circumstances of this case, it is recommended that the tax exemption be retained and that the bill be considered favorably.

"The committee is advised that an attorney has rendered services in connection with this matter. The bill, therefore, carries the usual 10-percent limitation upon attorney's fees."

The committee has received a supplemental report from the Treasury Department, which is hereto attached. After consideration of the report the committee believes that circumstances warrant the same treatment as was given in Private Law 87-578, as amended by Private Law 88-32, in regard to the tax exemption.

After a review of the foregoing, the committee concurs in the action of the House of Representatives and recommends that the bill, H.R. 7348, be considered favorably.

Attached hereto and made a part hereof are reports submitted by the Department of Commerce, the Department of Defense, and the Treasury Department on H.R. 7348.

GENERAL COUNSEL,
OF THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D.C. September 17, 1963.

Hon. EMANUEL CELLER,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This letter is in reply to your request for the views of the Department of Commerce with respect to H.R. 7348, a bill for the relief of Frank B. Rowlett.

You are advised that while the language of H.R. 7348 undertakes to identify certain patent applications involved and although the administration of the patent law relating to issuance of patents is a responsibility of the Department of Commerce, the merits of the issue presented by the bill—whether a payment, as compensation for services rendered to the Government, in the proposed amount or otherwise, is appropriate—is a matter concerning which this Department is not informed. We defer in this matter to the agencies which may have been benefited from the activities of Mr. Rowlett.

The Bureau of the Budget advised there would be no objection to the submission of this report from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely,

ROBERT E. GILES.

GENERAL COUNSEL
OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D.C., March 19, 1964.

Hon. EMANUEL CELLER,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: You have requested the views of the Department of Defense on H.R. 7348, 88th Congress, a bill for the relief of Frank B. Rowlett, who is presently employed by the National Security Agency. The specific purpose of the bill is to authorize a lump-sum payment to Mr. Rowlett as equitable compensation for his loss of opportunity to realize benefit from his commercial rights to cryptologic inventions which the Government uses and holds in classified status.

The Department has examined the merits of the case and strongly recommends that Mr. Rowlett be granted relief. Mr. Rowlett has had a long and distinguished career in the field of cryptology. According to our records, he conceived fundamental principles which assured the high security capability of major cryptographic systems and equipment used so successfully by the United States during World War II. These are still in use and held in a classified status, and have significant commercial potential value which is probably greatly in excess of the payment proposed by the bill.

Mr. Rowlett began his Government service on April 1, 1930, as a junior cryptanalyst, P-1, in the Office of the Chief Signal Officer, Signal Corps, U.S. Army. Between 1930 and 1935 Mr. Rowlett, still a junior cryptanalyst, pioneered in the development of concepts, techniques, and devices which established the practicality of applying computerlike devices to the general field of cryptography. During this same period he also conceived the basic principles underlying the inventions cited in the proposed bill, and jointly with Mr. William F. Friedman invented methods for the practical application of these principles. In 1935 he was listed in official memorandums as principal assistant to Mr. Friedman, chief cryptanalyst for the Office of the Chief Signal Officer since 1921. The following year, 1936, he was promoted to assistant cryptanalyst, P-2. Just prior to World War II he was responsible for the specific direction and coordination of U.S. Army activities which culminated in the successful breaking of a Japanese cipher machine of major importance. When he was furloughed for military duty on February 16, 1942, Mr. Rowlett had advanced to the position of senior cryptanalyst, P-5. Commissioned as a second lieutenant in the Signal Corps, U.S. Army, he was assigned the MOS of crytanalytic officer. During his military service he was awarded the Legion of Merit (United States) and the Order of the British Empire (British). He was separated from the service as a colonel. On May 2, 1946, Mr. Rowlett returned to his civilian employment with the Office of the Chief Signal Officer as a research analyst (cryptanalytic), P-8. He continued to serve with this agency until September 30, 1949, when he transferred to the newly created Armed Forces Security Agency (the predecessor of the National Security Agency) and assumed a key position, Technical Director, Operations. On February 15, 1952, he resigned his position with NSA and accepted an appointment with the Central Intelligence Agency. During his employment with CIA he served as a senior staff officer in grades GS-16 and GS-17 and was awarded the Distinguished Intelligence

Medal. On July 12, 1958, he returned to the National Security Agency as Special Assistant to the Director, GS–18, a position he still holds. He has continued to make significant contributions to the science of cryptography, and in April 1960 received the National Security Agency Exceptional Civilian Service Award.

Patent applications for the two inventions cited in the proposed bill were filed by the Army in 1936 (serial No. 70,412) and 1942 (serial No. 443,320) respectively. Mr. Friedman and Mr. Rowlett, then principal assistant to Mr. Friedman were listed as co-inventors in both applications. It is these two inventions that have resulted in the high degree of security capability for U.S. communications beginning before World War II and continuing to the present. A memorandum written to the Signal Corps Patent Office by Mr. Friedman and Mr. Rowlett on August 31, 1935, credits Mr. Rowlett with contributing the fundamental principle and three of the five subsidiary principles and Mr. Friedman with contributing two of the five subsidiary principles. With respect to the first invention, it appears that Mr. Rowlett's contribution was the greater. A Navy document entitled "The Contribution of the Signal Corps," dated November 2, 1943, and prepared by Capt. L. S. Safford, U.S. Navy, states in part: "Rowlett is entitled to full credit for his discovery of the principle * * * and Friedman and Rowlett jointly are entitled to full credit for their joint invention of methods of applying and reducing this principle to practical form." (NOTE.—Classified portions deleted.) The respective contributions of the two men to the second invention are not officially recorded. Since Mr. Rowlett and Mr. Friedman were joint inventors in both inventions, however, they have equal rights in these inventions and their losses due to the imposition of secrecy by the Government would be the same.

In the early 1950's several private bills were introduced in behalf of Mr. Friedman, each proposing an award to compensate him for his loss of commercial rights to cryptologic inventions covered by applications for patents held in secrecy by the Government. In 1956 one of these bills was enacted and became Private Law 625, 84th Congress. Although two of the inventions for which Mr. Friedman received his award are the same inventions upon which the present bill is founded, Mr. Rowlett did not become a party to any of the private bills which sought to compensate Mr. Friedman. In the memorandum he prepared on September 20, 1962. when he formally sought the Department's permission to seek legislative relief, Mr. Rowlett explained in paragraph 3:

"I was asked by Mr. Friedman sometime prior to 1952 to join him in presenting his case to Congress. I declined, pointing out to him that I thought the Government should take the initiative in recognizing our contributions if they were worthy of monetary award. While I still feel the Government should take the initiative, enough time has elapsed since Friedman received his award to cause me to conclude it is most unlikely that my contributions will be recognized unless I take positive steps to bring their merits to the attention of the Congress."

The Department's records disclose that, in his appeal for relief, Mr. Friedman stressed the importance of the two inventions of which he was coinventor with Mr. Rowlett over the five additional inventions to which he held sole patent rights, and that he associated his loss mainly to his inability to exploit these two inventions. Of the seven inventions he stressed the importance of the 1936 invention (patent application serial No. 70,412) above all others and placed the 1942 invention (patent application serial No. 443,320) next in importance. He then developed detailed evidence which convinces the Department and the Congress that, if he had been able to exploit these two inventions domestically and among allied foreign governments, he would have obtained amounts of money far in excess of the sum of money he sought from Congress.

The Department's views today are properly reflected by the following extract from a letter dated July 6, 1953, which the Honorable Robert T. Stevens, Secretary of the Army, sent to the Honorable Chauncey W. Reed, then chairman of the House Committee on the Judiciary, with respect to H.R. 1152, 83d Congress, a bill for the relief of William F. Friedman:

"Where the fruits of an inventor's labor has been of substantial benefit to his Government and his right to seek reward for his efforts is impaired for so great a period of time for security reasons, it is equitable that he be compensated for his loss. This view is in accord with the policy of the Department of encouraging technological advancement. To deny an inventor the right to seek gain from his inventions merely because they are vital to our national defense and the security of the Government, while permitting such pursuit by inventors in other fields where security interests are not paramount, would be discriminatory and would discourage advancement in matters vital to our national defense."

The Department of Defense considers that, in view of the available evidence, Mr. Rowlett is equitably entitled to compensation equal to that of Mr. Friedman. Accordingly, the Department favors the grant of an award of $100,000 to Mr. Rowlett in full settlement for his rights in the inventions which are referred to in H.R. 7348. The Department opposes, however, the provision in H.R. 7348 which would exempt the award to Mr. Rowlett from taxation for the reasons expressed in the enclosed copy of a letter of February 17, 1964, from the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that, from the standpoint of the administration's program, there is no objection to the submission of this report for the consideration of the committee.

Sincerely,

L. NIEDERLEHNER
(For John T. McNaughton).

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D.C., February 17, 1964.

Hon. KERMIT GORDON,
Director, Bureau of the Budget,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. GORDON: You requested the views of this Department on the fact that H.R. 7348, a bill for the relief of Frank B. Rowlett, provides that the sum which will be paid to Mr. Rowlett shall be exempt from all taxation.

The specific purpose of H.R. 7348 is to authorize a lump sum payment to Mr. Rowlett as equitable compensation for his loss of opportunity to realize benefit from his commercial rights to cryptologic inventions which the Government uses and holds in a classified status. The Department of Defense has examined the merits of the case and strongly recommends that Mr. Rowlett be granted relief.

We have considered the general question of whether private relief bills should exempt the payments made by their terms from taxation. Of course, exemption, even if proper in cases like the present one where the award is compensatory in nature, would not be appropriate where actual compensation to the recipient of relief is not involved, as, for example, where the private bill lengthens the period of a statute of limitations.

Several reasons have been advanced to justify an exemption from taxation for compensatory awards in private relief bills, but we believe these reasons are not overly persuasive.

It has been argued that it is difficult in some cases for Congress to form a sound judgment on whether an award was appropriate in light of the taxes which would be payable upon it. This is because of problems in determining how the award should be taxed and the fact that the amount of tax imposed upon the award will frequently depend upon the other taxable income of the individual receiving relief. It has also been urged that if such awards are to be subject to tax, Congress, despite the difficulties mentioned above, may increase the amount of such awards to allow for the tax. However, these arguments overemphasize the difficulties in reaching a fair determination of appropriate compensation where an amount is to be subject to tax.

In addition, it has been urged that such awards frequently provide for lump sum payments to compensate for a loss of income which would have been received over a number of years. Thus, the taxation of such awards may be excessive because the lump payment is taxed in 1 year. However, assuming the enactment of the Revenue Act of 1964, the averaging provision adopted therein will operate to mitigate any unfair tax consequences which might result from the receipt of a compensatory award in a lump sum.

Where an award is compensatory in nature, that fact alone strongly supports subjecting it to taxation. The President of the United States, in approving H.R. 3662, for the relief of Mrs. Margaret Patterson Bartlett, expressed the hope that provisions exempting awards under private relief bills from taxation would not find their way into future private legislation and outlined some of the reasons why such exemptions are not proper. The President stated that the moral and equitable considerations supporting these awards argue strongly in favor of making them subject to the income tax laws. He stated that there was no valid reason for treating recipients of these compassionate awards more favorably than the taxpayers who must finance them and who receive no special treatment in meeting comparable tax obligations. The President expressed the view that the adjustment of the amount of the award by Congress did not provide an adequate basis for tax exemption since such action was inconsistent with the sound, prevailing practice under which an individual receives compensation or other payments and then has his tax liability computed under general tax law and, among other things, in relation to other sources of income.

For the foregoing reasons, the Treasury Department opposes exempting such awards from taxation. Therefore, it opposes such a provision in H.R. 7348.

Sincerely yours,

STANLEY S. SURREY,
Assistant Secretary.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D.C., September 10, 1964.

Hon. JAMES O. EASTLAND,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This letter supplements the Treasury Department's views on H.R. 7348, a bill for the relief of Frank B. Rowlett, which is now being considered by your committee. Our previous expression of views is set forth in the report of the House Committee on the Judiciary on this bill.

H.R. 7348 would pay $100,000 to Frank B. Rowlett in full settlement of all rights in respect to his cryptologic inventions which have been placed in secrecy status by the

Department of Defense. The Treasury Department is opposed to the provision in this bill which would exempt the $100,000 payment from all taxation.

The report of the House Committee on the Judiciary, in approving the exemption from tax, implies that section 74(b) of the Internal Revenue Code is a precedent for the exemption. The committee noted that "the income tax law itself contains an exemption for amounts received as prizes and award made primarily in recognition of scientific achievement (26 U.S.C. 74(b)). The exemption of section 74(b) is made subject to the conditions that the recipient was selected without any action on his part to enter a contest or proceeding and is not required to render future services as a condition to receiving a reward."

The Department believes that the congressional intent expressed in section 74(b) not only does not support exemption from tax for the $100,000 payment to Mr. Rowlett, but is contrary to such exemption. Section 74 was adopted by Congress in 1954 to overrule certain cases which held that some prizes or awards were not subject to tax, and laid down the general rule that gross income includes amounts received as prizes and awards. The narrow exemption in section 74(b) was intended to exempt such awards as the Nobel and Pulitzer Prizes. However, the reports of the congressional tax committees specifically stated that section 74(b) "is not intended to exclude prizes or awards from an employer to an employee in recognition of some achievement in connection with his employment." This rule is also set forth in the Treasury Department regulations. Therefore, even if one could view the payment to Mr. Rowlett as not being of a compensatory nature, which view the Treasury Department does not share, the payment would nevertheless constitute in substance an award from an employer to an employee in recognition of an achievement connected with his employment, and thus includible in gross income.

The Treasury Department believes that a tax exemption for this $100,000 payment to Mr. Rowlett would discriminate against other taxpayers similarly situated. For example, in 1956 Congress awarded $100,000 to Mr. Friedman, Mr. Rowlett's colleague, for his contribution to the two inventions for which Mr. Rowlett now seeks compensation. (Private Law 625, 84th Cong.) No tax exemption was provided for Mr. Friedman who did not have two tax benefits now available to Mr. Rowlett in the form of the recently enacted reduced rates of Federal income tax and the provision for income averaging. Similar awards of $100,000 also were made in the 85th Congress to Mr. Lawrence F. Safford for cryptographic systems developed by him, and in the 86th Congress to Col. John A. Ryan, Jr., for his development of a new bombing system (Private Law 494, 85th Cong.; Private Law 492, 86th Cong.). No exemption from tax was provided by Congress for these taxpayers.

The discrimination inherent in a tax exemption provision can be more fully appreciated by noting that, to have provided Mr. Rowlett's colleague, Mr. Friedman, with $100,000 of disposable income, after Federal income taxes at 1956 rates, would have required an award in excess of $500,000. This estimate assumes that Mr. Friedman's taxable income would have equaled the amount of the award and that he filed a joint return.

The report of the House Judiciary Committee also notes that Private Law 87–578, which provided an award of $100,000 to the estate of an inventor, was retroactively amended to extend tax exemption to the award. (Private Law 32, 88th Cong.) The Department believes that the tax exemption provided by Private Law 88–32, for the relief of the estate of Gregory J. Kessenich, should not be relied upon as a precedent to deviate from the prior uniform congressional practice of not providing tax exemption for awards of this nature. As set forth in your committee's report on the Kessenich bill, a Treasury Department staff memorandum noted that the income-averaging proposal contained in President Kennedy's 1963 tax message would, if enacted, accord relief for the future to taxpayers in situations where income is bunched in 1 year. Moreover, reduced rates of income taxation then being considered by Congress would provide additional relief. Your committee's report on the Kessenich bill further stated that your "committee does not approve of a tax-free amount as a matter of policy generally in bills for payments to individuals, but on occasion there are special circumstances which indicate that such a freedom from tax liability should be recognized." Perhaps the fact that income-averaging provisions of general applicability were then being considered by Congress was a significant factor in your committee's departure from its general policy in the Kessenich case.

Your committee's general policy of not approving a tax-free amount in bills for payments to individuals was subsequently endorsed by President Johnson in December 1963 when, in approving H.R. 3663 for the relief of Mrs. Margaret Patterson Bartlett, he expressed the hope that provisions exempting from taxation awards under private relief bills would not find their way into future private legislation and outlined some of the reasons why such exemptions are inappropriate. The President stated that the moral and equitable considerations supporting these awards argue strongly in favor of making them subject to the income tax laws. He stated that there was no valid reason for treating recipients of these compassionate awards more favorably than the taxpayers who must finance them and who receive no special treatment in meeting comparable tax obligations. The President expressed the view that the adjustment of the amount of the award by Congress did not provide an adequate basis for tax exemption since such action was inconsistent with the sound, prevailing practice under which an individual receives compensation or other payments and then has his tax liability computed under general tax law, and, among other things, in relation to other sources of income.

In summary, the Treasury Department believes that exempting from tax the $100,000 payment to Mr. Rowlett would discriminate against other taxpayers similarly situated, and particularly against Mr. Rowlett's colleague, Mr. Friedman, as well as other inventors whose $100,000 awards were subject to tax. The Department also believes that the recent enactment by Congress of reduced rates of income tax and the income-averaging provisions remove any special circumstances justifying freedom from tax liability in cases such as this.

For the foregoing reasons, the Treasury Department opposes the tax exemption provisions contained in H.R. 7348.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised the Treasury Department that there is no objection from the standpoint of the administration's program to the presentation of this report.

Sincerely yours,

STANLEY S. SURREY,
Assistant Secretary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG].

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be offered, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H.R. 7348) was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

CORRECTION OF CERTAIN ERRORS IN THE TARIFF SCHEDULES OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I move that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Louisiana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 12253) to correct certain errors in the tariff schedules of the United States.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to the pending bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], on behalf of himself, the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART] as follows:

On page 15, strike out lines 1 through 17 (section 21 of the bill).

Renumber the succeeding sections.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, my amendment would strike from the bill a provision that removes the 20-percent duty now imposed against the importation of Canadian limestone chips and spalls. A bill on this subject has been pending in the House.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I suggest that if the Senator wishes to offer the amendment, we could suggest the absence of a quorum in order that Senators who are interested in supporting the amendment and those who are particularly affected by it might be present to speak for their position.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I merely send the amendment to the desk at this time.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator is not calling the amendment up at this time?

Mr. LAUSCHE. No.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Very well.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the amendment which was adopted by the committee, but which was not in the original bill, would remove the 20-percent duty on limestone.

The Great Lakes States of Minnesota, Michigan, Wisconsin, Illinois, Indiana, and Ohio are vitally affected by the amendment that was adopted by the committee. We had no knowledge of the fact that this amendment was to be taken up.

We have not had an opportunity to make inquiry about what the real impact of the duty would be. I have tried to consult Senators from the Great Lakes area of the country. I have learned from them that the industry would be greatly harmed by the committee amendment to the bill.

I intend to make further inquiry concerning the real impact of the removal of this duty upon industries in Ohio, which are vitally interested. I shall later determine whether I shall press for the adoption of the measure.

Mr. President, I ask that the Record show that the amendment is cosponsored by my colleague, the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. Young], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Bayh], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hart], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Nelson].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is ordered.

The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk on behalf of myself, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCarthy], the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. Holland], the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers], the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. Hartke], the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska], the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Curtis], the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Young], the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. Carlson], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. Simpson], the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. Allott], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. Mundt], the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. Dominick], the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hart], the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. Bayh], the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Ellender], the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. Pearson], the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. Hickenlooper], the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long], and the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. Jordan].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The Legislative Clerk. At the end of the bill, it is proposed to insert a new section, as follows:

Section ——. Amendments to the Sugar Act of 1948.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill insert a new section as follows:

"Sec. —. Amendments to the Sugar Act of 1948.

"(a) Section 202(c) of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended (relating to quotas for foreign countries) is amended by striking out '1963 and 1964' in each place it appears therein, and inserting in lieu thereof "1963 through the first six months of 1965", and by adding a new subparagraph (7) at the end thereof as follows:

"'(7) The quantities established for the first six months of 1965 shall be one-half of the annnual quantities provided for in the other subparagraphs of this subsection (c).

"(b) Section 213 of such Act is amended (1) by striking from section 213(c) the language 'during the years 1962, 1963, and 1964, which fee in each such year shall be respectively 10, 20, and 30 per centum' and inserting in lieu thereof 'during the years 1962, 1963, and 1964 and the first six months of 1965, which fee shall be 10 per centum in 1962, 20 per centum in 1963 and 30 per centum in 1964 and the first six months of 1965'; and (2) by striking from section 213 (c) the language 'during the years 1962, 1963, and 1964 shall be respectively 0.1, 0.2, and 0.3 of one cent per pound' and inserting in lieu thereof 'during the years 1962, 1963, 1964 and first six months of 1965 shall be in 1962 0.1 of one cent, in 1963 0.2 of one cent, and in 1964 and the first six months of 1965 0.3 of one cent per pound'.

"(c) The following new paragraph (3) is added at the end of section 202(a) of such Act:

"'(3) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the domestic beet sugar area and the mainland cane sugar area may be permitted to market in 1964, as determined by the Secretary, in addition to the quota established for such area in 1964, a quantity of sugar not exceeding 275,000 short tons, raw value, and 225,000 short tons, raw value, respectively, and such additional quantities of sugar shall be deducted from the quantities of sugar which otherwise may be authorized for purchase and importation in 1964 pursuant to section 202(c) (4) (A) of this Act.'"

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, the purpose of this amendment is to carry out the intention and wishes that the administration expressed over the past 2 years, and to meet a situation which has developed within the past few weeks.

The amendment has three essential purposes—first, to extend the foreign quota provisions of the Sugar Act until June 30, 1965, as recommended this week in a letter dated September 25, 1964, from the Under Secretary of the Department of Agriculture, Mr. Murphy. This letter was addressed to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House.

The second provision would leave the fee on the global sugar quota intact at the full rate, and keep the fee on statutory sugar quotas applicable from January 1 to June 30, 1965, at 30 percent of the full rate on global sugar.

This, too, was recommended by Under Secretary Murphy in his letter of September 25, and in the letter dated September 28 from the State Department to Chairman Cooley, of the House Committee on Agriculture. It was recommended that any change in the fee be deferred for the time being.

The third purpose of the amendment is to permit domestic beet and mainland cane sugar areas to market up to 275,000 tons of beet and 225,000 tons of cane, respectively, of the extra sugar produced at Government request in 1963, but which they are now unable to market without congressional action.

This represents only a small part of the extra sugar which these two areas produced at Government request from the 1963 crops, and which are now being produced from the 1964 crop.

The fact that the Government urged these two areas to produce the extra sugar is well documented. The administration is also firmly on record as favoring congressional action to permit the marketing of the extra sugar. The administration has recommended that the 1964 domestic marketings be completely unlimited. This was done by the Secretary of Agriculture in December of 1963, and by the President himself in his message on the agricultural program in January of this year.

In the interest of orderly marketing, the bill does not go as far in regard to extra 1964 marketings as the administration recommended. It places the limits that I have mentioned, 275,000 tons for mainland beet, and 225,000 tons for mainland cane marketings.

Under the proposed amendment even these amounts could be less, if in the opinion of the Secretary of Agriculture, authorization of the full amounts would contribute to disorderly marketing. Permitting the domestic market to market up to a total of 500,000 tons of additional sugar this year would not reduce the imports from any foreign country by one pound.

That extra allocation would come from the unallocated portion of the global quota. The remaining portion of the old Cuban quota had already been reserved by the Department of Agriculture earlier this year for the specific purpose of permitting some extra domestic marketings this year. Our American farmers desperately need the marketing relief which the bill would provide, modest as it is. In the absence of such relief, they would be forced to store sugar at great expense to themselves, even though the Government had urged them to produce it to sell and not to store.

Mr. President, in my opening statement I referred to certain expressions of policy by the administration. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a copy of the U.S. Department of Agriculture Release No. 848–63, dated March 14, 1963.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

No Sugarbeet Acreage Restrictions in 1964

Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman announced today that there will be no acreage restrictions (proportionate shares) on the 1964 crop of sugarbeets.

The 1963 domestic beet sugar marketing quota is approximately 2,700,000 tons. Stocks of beet sugar on hand January 1, 1963, amounted to 1,368,000 tons and it is anticipated that 616,000 tons will be produced from 1962-crop beets to be harvested in 1963. This provides a supply of 1,984,000 tons of beet sugar to meet requirements until new-crop sugar reaches the market next fall. Marketings of beet sugar in the last quarter of the year will be heavy. A larger quantity of old-crop sugar would have promoted more orderly marketing throughout the year in accordance with the present quota.

Production of sugar from the 1962 crop of beets had been estimated at 2,580,000 tons by the beet sugar industry. Even a large increase in 1963 production would not result in excessive reserve supplies.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture indicated it is too early to determine whether restrictions will be necessary on the 1965 crop. However, it observed that production will have to exceed marketings sufficiently to create safe and reasonable stocks before acreage restrictions could be reimposed.

It is assumed that the industry will attempt in 1963 to produce at the maximum capacity of its plants. Today's action is expected to encourage plant expansion.

First, it should encourage existing plants to modernize and expand their facilities since they can now be assured of at least 2 years of unrestricted operations.

Second, new plants under construction for operation in 1963 and 1964 could be expanded immediately to their ultimate capacity so as to take advantage of this opportunity for full production and the building of production and marketing history in excess of the tonnage provided from the national acreage reserve.

USDA suggests that when acreage restrictions are reimposed, major consideration should be given to production history in the period immediately preceding the resumption of controls. That should provide fair treatment for those who increase production sufficiently to meet prospective marketing quotas and stock requirements.

Mr. BENNETT. The release states, among other things—

> It is assumed that the industry will attempt in 1963 to produce at the maximum capacity of its plants. Today's action is expected to encourage plant expansion.

That action was an announcement that there would be no acreage restrictions in the 1964 crop of sugarbeets. It stated—

> First, it should encourage existing plants to modernize and expand their facilities since they can now be assured of at least 2 years of unrestricted operations; second, new plants under construction for operation in 1963 and 1964 could be expanded immediately to their ultimate capacity so as to take advantage of this opportunity for full production and the building of production and marketing history in excess of the tonnage provided from the national acreage reserve.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD USDA Bulletin No. 1500–63 dated May 6 of that year.

There being no objection, the bulletin was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

No Sugarbeet Acreage Restrictions for 1965 Crop

The U.S. Department of Agriculture announced today that acreage restrictions (proportionate shares) would not be established for the 1965 crop of sugarbeets.

This announcement was made concurrently with action taken by the Department which increased 1963 domestic sugar requirements (total quotas) from 9,800,000 tons to 10,400,000 tons. At the same time the 291,537 tons of 1963 quota increase accruing to the beet area was reallocated to the foreign countries because the anticipated supplies of beet sugar available this year make it unlikely that the area would market the additional sugar.

On March 14, 1963 (USDA 848–63), the Department announced that 1964 crop sugarbeet plantings would not be restricted. At that time, it was observed that beet sugar production would have to exceed marketings sufficiently to create safe and reasonable stock levels before acreage restrictions could be reimposed. Today's action establishing the 1963 requirements at 10,400,000 tons, with accompanying quotas for the beet area of 2,990,127 short tons, reemphasizes the need for additional beet stocks to permit the area to meet future marketing opportunities.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, on June 5 Mr. Murphy, Under Secretary of Agriculture, testifying before the Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, said—

> One of the major objectives of the Department in announcing that restrictions would not be imposed upon sugarbeet production in 1964 and 1965 was to encourage the modernization and expansion of existing factories and the enlargement of factories now under construction.

On page 26 of the printed record of hearings on sugar prices before the Senate Finance Committee on May 29 and June 6, Mr. Lawrence Myers, then Director of the Sugar Policy staff of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, appeared with the Under Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Murphy. Mr. Murphy said, in response to the question of the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS]—

> Certainly we would hope that production will increase as a result of this action.

In a statement before the same subcommittee Mr. Myers said—and it was for exactly that reason, as the Secretary pointed out in his testimony this morning—that—

> The industry is assured that acreage restrictions will not be applied in either 1964 or 1965 to encourage this modernization and expansion immediately, so that they would get on this higher basis of production.

Mr. President, there are other materials that I should like to offer for the RECORD without taking the time to read them. They include, first, a statement by Tom O. Murphy, Director of Sugar Policy Staff of the Agriculture Stabilization Conservation Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, and second, a statement by Charles Murphy, the Under Secretary of Agriculture.

There being no objection, the materials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Importance of Domestic Sugar Supplies

"Let me take this occasion to congratulate on two scores the farmers who grow sugarbeets and the companies which process them into sugar: First, that they were successful in producing a tremendous crop of sugar when it was needed. Second, that although they raised their prices last year they did not raise them as much as the cane sugar refiners did."—Tom O. Murphy, Director, Sugar Policy Staff, Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, at the annual meeting of the California Beet Growers Association, in San Francisco, January 31, 1964.

"Finally, let me say that all of us should be grateful for our Sugar Act and the assurance it makes possible for sugar supplies at this time. It should be abundantly clear that U.S. sugar supplies today would be infinitely more precarious if we had not had the protection of this law and the quota system over the past 30 years. For without this system, our domestic sugar industry might not have survived the disastrously low world prices of 1960–62. U.S. farmers today are producing and the U.S. processing industry is manufacturing 6 million tons of sugar that constitute nearly 60 percent of our sugar supplies. The protection that the Sugar Act has afforded over the years has maintained a healthy and growing domestic sugar industry which is indispensable in such a period of world shortage"—Charles S. Murphy, Under Secretary of Agriculture in testimony at hearings on sugar prices conducted by Senate Finance Committee, May 29 and June 6, 1963. (From p. 10 of printed record of hearings.)

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, the reason why the beet and domestic cane producers were urged to increase their production in 1963—and that urging fell particularly on the beet producers—was that in that year the world price skyrocketed, and the supply of beet sugar helped to prevent the world price spiral from carrying the domestic price through the ceiling also.

Early in 1962 the world price of raw sugar was 2½ cents f.o.b. Caribbean ports. In mid-1962 the price began to rise. By 1963 the world price had doubled to roughly 5 cents. By the spring of 1963 world prices really began to spiral as world sugar supplies became tight as the result of a combination of three factors—First, a severe drop in sugar production following the application of Castro's economic policy from a sugar production of 7 million tons to 5 million tons in 1962 and then to 4 million tons in 1963 and 1964.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENNETT. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I have discussed with a number of Senators who are interested in this subject the possibility of limiting debate on the amendment. I should like to ask unanimous consent that the debate on the Bennett amendment be limited to 1 hour on each side, the hour to be controlled by the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] and the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE], in opposition; that any amendment to the amendment be germane; and that time on the amendment to the amendment be one-half hour, the time to be equally divided between the proponents of such amendment and the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, do I correctly understand that the time has already been appropriated? If one of us should need a little time, would it be available under the proposed limitation?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the majority leader, or, in his absence, the Senator in charge of the bill, allocate as much as 10 minutes to Senators who might not be able to obtain sufficient time to express their views with regard to the amendment or to the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. BENNETT. Reserving the right to object, does the Senator from Utah correctly understand that the time required to say what he has already said will not be charged against the time allotted to him if the request of the Senator is agreed to?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator is correct.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, will the Senator restate his request?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. One hour would be provided for the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the sponsor of the amendment, and 1 hour would be controled by the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE], in opposition to the amendment; a half hour, which would be equally divided, would be provided for any amendment to the amendment, which must be germane. That half hour would be equally divided betwen the majority leader and the Senator in charge of the bill, who would have permission to allocate as much as 10 minutes to Senators who might be unable to obtain time from the controlled time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I was discussing the reason for the change in the world price in 1963.

In addition to the situation in Cuba, there were two poor sugarbeet crops in Europe and an increased per capita consumption. By March 1963, the U.S. price began to respond sharply to world sugar prices.

Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator may proceed.

Mr. BENNETT. In 1963, the U.S. price began to respond sharply to the world sugar price, and scare buying began. By the end of March, the world price was about 7 cents. The U.S. price was 7¼ cents. When we add the cost of freight and duty, the world price in the United States was 8 cents. By late April and early May, prices really took off. The peak price was May 22 and 23, when the raw sugar price was $13.20 a ton, and the comparable world price was $13.67. This represented a doubling of the U.S. price since 1962.

During the early part of 1963, when the U.S. raw sugar price was $13.20 and the refined cane sugar price was $16.30, beet sugar sold from 1 to 3 cents a pound below the refined cane price.

Beet sugar sellers raised their prices about an average of 10 percent during the period, but the beet sugar industry both had the sugar and an attitude of self-restraint which made it possible to limit the rise in the United States price even as much as it was limited.

The unrestricted 1964 crop of beet sugar is expected to be about 3.4 to 3.5 million tons, some 300,000 to 400,000 tons higher than the 1963 crop, and 700,000 to 800,00 tons higher than the 1964 quota. This extra sugar was produced at Government request. The beet sugar producers are asking for Congressional action to permit them to market some of the extra sugar, just as the domestic cane growers are asking for the right to sell a part of their extra production.

The amendment I have offered would permit them to market a small part of that extra sugar, not more than 275,000 tons of beet sugar and not more than 225,000 tons of cane sugar, and this only if the Secretary of Agriculture approves.

I am happy to yield at this time to the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG].

How much time does the Senator from North Dakota wish?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 3 minutes?

Mr. BENNETT. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I am very much pleased to join with my colleague, the senior Senator from Utah, in sponsoring this amendment which will extend the foreign sugar quotas for 6 months and which will also provide an increase in the marketing quotas for mainland cane sugar of 225,000 tons and for beet sugar of 275,000 tons. These increases are only for 1964.

The Senator from Utah has made an excellent case for this legislation. If we were looking only for cheap sugar supplies in the immediate future, perhaps the consumers would be better off if Congress did not extend the act; but the best assurance consumers have of continued adequate supplies of sugar at reasonable prices is to continue a healthy sugar industry in this country. Even more important is the need to maintain adequate sugar production in this country in the event of a future war. In the past two wars we had to depend on Cuba for much of our sugar supply. This supply will not be forthcoming in the future.

Under the Sugar Act the quotas for domestic areas and the Philippines do not expire until the end of 1966. However, the quotas for other foreign countries terminate this year.

It had been my hope that this Congress, prior to adjourning, would have enacted new sugar legislation—legislation which would have given greater recognition to our domestic sugar producers. Unfortunately, however, it appears now that it will be impossible to consider such legislation. This amendment will merely extend the foreign quota provision for 6 months and will also provide for the continuation of the import fees on country quota sugar and on global quota sugar.

A 6-month extension of existing foreign quotas will permit the next Congress to review our sugar program, including, I would hope, increasing the quotas to our domestic sugar producers. To do nothing at this time will result in a disorderly marketing situation for the early months of next year or until sugar legislation is enacted. This amendment, if adopted, will maintain the status quo in the sugar industry with respect to foreign quotas, but, in addition, will permit our domestic producers to market a portion of the sugar which they now have on hand, and which is in excess of their present marketing quotas. This excess sugar has been produced and refined with the encouragement of the U.S. Government.

When early in 1963 a critical foreign sugar supply situation became apparent, the Department of Agriculture turned to the domestic beet sugar industry as the quickest dependable source of greater production, and announced that there would be no acreage restrictions on sugarbeet planting in the years 1963, 1964, and 1965. The producers and the industry responded with immediate and substantial increases in production.

This increase in production was the sole reason why prices in this country ceased to skyrocket. Had not the sugarbeet cane producers increased production as they did, consumers would have been short of supply and would have paid much higher prices for their sugar.

These increases have been to the extent that we now have on hand a considerable amount of sugar in excess of our marketing quotas. The small added consideration given our domestic producers as the result of this amendment is, I believe, only keeping faith with them.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 3 or 4 minutes?

Mr. BENNETT. I am happy to yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I am pleased to cosponsor the amendment proposed by the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], which would extend for 6 months the present act, with permission to market additional tonnages of present production of sugar.

This is not exactly what the Senator from Kansas would have desired in sugar legislation, but we have arrived at a situation in which it is necessary to take action to prevent what I believe would be serious results, in the sugar market of the world and our own Nation, with a particularly serious effect on our producers.

Large areas of western Kansas are blessed by an almost unlimited supply of underground water which can be economically used for irrigation. Hundreds of farmers have irrigation wells in this part of the State. Irrigation has been used extensively to increase production of grain sorghums and, to a lesser extent, wheat, both surplus crops. Soil in this area is deep and rich, ideally suited to the production of sugarbeets, and needless to say, increased production of beets would aid immeasurably in crop diversification, and contribute materially to acreage reduction of crops now in surplus.

For 57 years sugarbeets have been successfully grown in the Arkansas River Valley of southwest Kansas and in the past decade successfully grown on irrigated acreage outside the Arkansas River Valley. Production records indicate for example, that in 1962 the tonnage of beets produced in Finney, Kearny, Haskell, Grant, and Stanton Counties was 133,056. The per acre production was 18.73 tons and sugar content 14.62.

Mr. President, our excellent results in the production of sugar have proved that our State can and does produce an excellent quality of sugarbeets. The problem in our State has been the lack of refining capacity.

Many changes have taken place in the sugar producing areas of the world since Congress passed the extension of the Sugar Act in 1962. There is no longer a world surplus of sugar. World reserve stocks of sugar which were substantial in mid-1962, are almost nonexistent. This was brought home very readily to the American housewife last summer when the price of sugar skyrocketed as the result of a scarcity of this very essential commodity.

Nearly one-third of world sugar production is under Communist control. Instability and political unrest plague many of the sugar-producing nations of the world.

I feel, therefore, that it is in the public interest that the domestic sugar industry have an additional increase in the percentage of our total sugar supplies, which this amendment does not provide, but which I hope we can in the future support.

Great areas in northwest and southwest Kansas have proved their ability to produce sugarbeets. It is my hope that next year, when the Committee on Finance considers new sugar legislation, we may be able to obtain additional acreage for our sugarbeet producing areas.

Mr. **BENNETT**. Mr. President, I understand that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] has an amendment to offer to the pending amendment. Under the circumstances, I suggest that the Senate consider it now. I understand it can be considered now.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Is there objection to the Senator from Delaware offering his amendment at this time? The Chair hears none. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. Section 212 of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, 7 United States Code, section 1122, is proposed to be amended by striking out "distillation" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "production."

Mr. **WILLIAMS** of Delaware. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute. I do not believe I shall need more than that.

In the Sugar Act Amendments of 1962, a technical language change was enacted to define "alcohol" as including all polyhydric alcohols. Since all polyhydric alcohols are not made by distillation, the technical language change is not fully effective unless a broader method of manufacture is specified in the statute.

In order to permit the manufacture of polyhydric alcohols from sugar, which is not subject to the restrictions of the Sugar Act, the word "distillation" in title 7 United States Code Annotated, section 1122(4) should be replaced by the word "production."

I understand there is no objection to the amendment. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. **BENNETT**. Mr. President, I do not know who controls the time in opposition. If I do, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. All time for debate has been yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware to the amendment offered by the Senator from Utah and other Senators.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. **BENNETT**. I yield 4 minutes to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. **McCARTHY**. Mr. President, I join the Senator from Utah in offering his amendment. I am confident that even the adoption of this amendment, for a 6 months' extension of the Sugar Act, would not correct all the pressing difficulties which exist in the administration of the sugar program. Some of the difficulties and uncertainties that have arisen must be dealt with by the sugar producers of the United States, and these will not altogether be removed, but at least this extension will permit the necessary adjustments to be made. These are adjustments that must take place.

The amendment would extend the foreign quota provisions of the act until June 30, 1965. This is supported by the administration. I believe the 6 months' extension is necessary at this time, although Senators will recall that I was highly critical of the administration proposal of 2 years ago with respect to the handling of the global foreign quota.

I am hopeful that in the next session of Congress the administration, and, if not the administration, the Senate itself, will take up the problem and hold orderly hearings on the sugar program.

The second objective of the amendment—and this again is approved by the administration—is to leave the fee on the global sugar intact at the full rate, and keep the fee on statutory sugar quotas applicable for the January 1–June 30, 1965 period at 30 percent of the full rate on global sugar.

This proposal is designed to maintain the status quo, so far as we can, in this 6-month extension.

Finally, the amendment would permit the domestic beet and mainland cane sugar areas to market up to 275,000 and 225,000 tons, respectively, of the extra sugar produced at Government request, but which they are unable to market without congressional action. This represents only a small part of extra sugar which these two areas produced, at Government request, from 1963 crops and now from the 1964 crops. Here again I point out that I was very critical of the administration's policy 2 years ago.

When the Sugar Act was drastically revised, I indicated that I thought there would be a serious problem of short supply in the market and that the price of sugar would rise as much as 10 cents a pound. I regret to say that this is exactly what happened. I would rather have been proved to be in error.

In response to the urgings of the administration, the cane and beet sugar producers in the United States dramatically expanded their production. This section of our amendment would ease the period of adjustment, if adjustment is called for, and give Congress time to plan the necessary statutory changes which are called for by virtue of what we learned in 1963 and 1964, and from the changes which have taken place in both the production and the marketing of sugar in the past 2 years.

The fact that the Government urged these two sugar producing industries to produce extra sugar is well documented. The administration is also firmly on record as favoring congressional action to permit the marketing of the extra sugar. The administration has recommended that 1964 domestic marketings be completely unlimited. This was done by the Secretary of Agriculture, in December of 1963, and by the President himself in January of this year. In the interest of orderly marketing, the amendment does not go as far in regard to extra 1964 marketings as the administration recommended, or as far as the administration's recommendation would have permitted. It would place a limit of 275,000 tons on beet sugar and a limit of 225,000 tons on mainland cane marketings. Even these amounts can be reduced if in the opinion of the Secretary of Agriculture authorization of the full amounts would contribute to disorderly marketings.

Permitting domestic areas to market up to 500,000 tons of additional sugar this year would not reduce the quota of any foreign country by 1 pound. It would come from the unallocated portion of the global quota—the remaining portion of the old Cuba quota—which was reserved by the Department of Agriculture earlier this year for the specific purpose of permitting some extra domestic marketings this year.

It is my opinion that the adoption of the amendment would meet the moral commitment which the Department of Agriculture undertook.

It would help to insure the orderly marketing of surplus sugar which has been produced in the United States.

Third, it would provide time in which to give attention and consideration to planning a more or less permanent sugar program, one which would do justice to domestic producers and also take into account some of our commitments and obligations to foreign producers and suppliers for the American market.

I thank the Senator from Utah for yielding.

Mr. **INOUYE**. Mr. President, I was prepared to speak at great length on the Bennett amendment. Last night I was tempted to carry on an educational debate, because I believe this matter is of great importance, not especially to the State of Hawaii, but to the economy of the Nation. I should like to spend a few minutes discussing some of the allegations that have been made by the proponents of the Bennett amendment and to present what I consider are the facts in the case.

First, we should all realize that no real need exists today for any change in the basic law with respect to domestic quotas. The Bennett amendment has three sections. The first two sections relate to foreign quotas. I am not opposed to those two sections.

But the third section applies to domestic quotas. The only reason why the Sugar Act is being reviewed by the Senate is that the foreign quota provisions will expire at the end of 1964. Possibly something should be done, although I am satisfied that the present law can meet this contingency.

I note from the discussions today that the beet sugar industry is taking advantage of this limited reopening of the law to seek for itself a 275,000-ton or 10-percent, increase in its basic quota, and the mainland cane sugar industry a 225,000-ton, or approximately 20-percent, increase. It should be noted that this would be in addition to the substantial quota increase given the beet area in the 1962 act, the act that is in effect at this time. This is the increase that the beet industry publicly has said was to carry it through until 1966 only.

Now I should like to list 14 allegations and give 14 answers.

This afternoon the proponent of the amendment stated that our Government called upon the beet industry to produce all the sugar it could produce, and produce to the hilt, in 1963 and 1964. It is contended that the beet producers "patriotically responded" to the Government appeal, and that they, therefore, should be properly compensated for this patriotism with a quota increase. I should like to set forth the following:

The so-called Government appeals, which the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] has noted, were in the form of two press releases issued by the Department of Agriculture in the spring of 1963, announcing that no acreage limitations would be imposed on the 1964 and 1965 beet crops. Since 1960, because of the beet industry's reported crop shortages in marketings, the Department has permitted unrestricted plantings in an effort to have the industry build up and carry adequate inventory reserves. The two 1963 press releases were merely a continuation of that effort.

There has been no significant beet sugar response to either "appeal." The increase in sugarbeet acreage which occurred in 1963 was decided upon and contracted for before the Department's press releases were issued. The increase was not the result of press relations or Government appeals.

The additional acreage in 1964 was the result of two distinct factors: First, the "new grower" acreage reserve provisions of the 1962 act; second, some small new acreage to service the increased physical capacity of existing plants resulting from normal equipment replacement or improvement. Neither factor had anything to do with either of the Department's press releases. The additional acreage planted in the 1963 and 1964 crops was an understandable reaction to good prices and what appeared to be an attractive business opportunity. It was in no sense a sacrifice, a burden, or a patriotic response on the part of the beet industry to any so-called Government appeal.

The second allegation made by the distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] is that the failure to increase their quota above the level established in 1962 would create a hardship because of the substantial capital investment made to expand capacity, again in response to the so-called Government appeals in the spring of 1963.

Except for several new plants operating or under construction in the new areas, under the so-called new-grower protection provision of the 1962 amendments, the primary capital investments made by the producers of beet sugar have been, according to their own annual reports, the normal routine ones for replacement, modernization, and improvement. Such investments have nothing to do with the Government's decision to leave the industry without acreage restrictions in 1964 and 1965. Most of the investment, if any, made by the growers in the expansion of the beet industry is protected by acreage reserve grants to new plants or for old plant expansion.

Furthermore, as the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] said in a recent letter to the Secretary of Agriculture, from which I quote a part:

> After all, beet growers purchase seed each year which is for a one-crop investment. They have switched from the production of one farm commodity to another in the past and can do so again.

The third allegation is that the beet industry is now faced with a burdensome sugar surplus, first with respect to production from the 1963 crop, and again with respect to the crop to be harvested this fall.

The facts are as follows: By January 1 of this year, their claim with respect to the 1963 crop was proved false by official U.S. Department of Agriculture records. Yet spokesmen for the beet industry have continued to foster the impression that they now have surplus 1963 crop sugar on hand. The beet industry ended 1963 with record marketings, particularly in the last few weeks of the year, which not only avoided any burdensome carryover into 1964, but actually left them with inadequate inventories for servicing their current quota in an orderly manner.

Nor will 1964 crop sugar create any inventory problems with the beet industry this year. While there has been some increase in beet acreage, the yield of the 1964 crop cannot be accurately measured until the beets have matured and are ready for processing.

Moreover, during 1964, only two-thirds of the current crop will be physically processed, and normally less than half of this would be marketed. Whether the inventory carryover into 1965 will exceed the reasonable level which the Department of Agriculture has continually pleaded with the industry to carry, and whether any relief might result in a continuation of an inadequate inventory level, cannot be actually determined until 1965. I have just been advised that by the end of October 1964, the warehouses will be nearly empty.

The next allegation of the beet industry is that foreign raw sugar producers currently selling in the U.S. market will not be hurt by cutting U.S. sugar imports, and that they really do not care about supplying the United States with sugar over and above the statutory quotas.

The foreign producers recognize that the sugar which they supply over and above their statutory quotas could be lost to them if a friendly, pro-United States Cuba were reestablished. Nonetheless, so long as Cuba continues in the Communist camp, the foreign producers quite naturally hope to be rewarded by adding to their permanent statutory quotas at least a portion of the global sugar which they have supplied. Meanwhile, our imports of global quota sugar provide an important part of the dollar earnings they need, if their purchases of American farm and factory products are to be kept at present levels.

I have noted that the Senator from Utah alleges that the beet sugar interests make a great point as to their "reliability" as suppliers. The beet interests claim that, beacuse they exist on the mainland of the United States, their production can be regarded as assured.

The beet industry has a history of erratic performance, particularly during periods of emergency or great need.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Hawaii yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BAYH in the chair). Does the Senator from Hawaii yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. INOUYE. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. TALMADGE. How long has the Sugar Act been on the statute books?

Mr. INOUYE. Since 1934.

Mr. TALMADGE. Is it not true that during all that period of time any legislation relating to the Sugar Act has originated in the House, as required under the Constitution, because it is a revenue act, and that it has had normal legislative hearings and has gone through the normal legislative process and has not been attached by way of an amendment as a rider to a nongermane bill?

Mr. INOUYE. The Senator is absolutely correct. I believe that precedents are replete in this area.

Mr. TALMADGE. Does not the Senator believe that an issue of this importance, not only to the sugarbeet industry but also to many segments of the economy, should have hearings and should follow the normal legislative routine of the Congress?

Mr. INOUYE. With that statement, I am in full agreement.

Mr. TALMADGE. Does the Senator from Hawaii know how many sugarbeet producers there are in the United States?

Mr. INOUYE. According to an estimate submitted by the beet industry, there are approximately 23,000.

Mr. TALMADGE. Does the Senator have any idea how many people are engaged in the refining industry in various capacities throughout the country, in the transportation of the product, the marketing of the product, the railroad industry's involvement therein, the stevedores, the shipping, and in various other areas?

Mr. INOUYE. I have no information as to the exact number of people involved, but I know that the investments made by the refineries along the eastern seaboard of the United States amount to more than half a billion dollars.

Mr. TALMADGE. Does not the Senator share my view that these also have an interest in the sugar bill and should have an opportunity to be heard and considered, and that this is something that vitally affects their interests, and that of their stockholders in the area, and their States?

Mr. INOUYE. The Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. TALMADGE. Are not some 20-odd countries also vitally interested in the proposed legislation with relation to marketing quotas?

Mr. INOUYE. The Senator is correct. Most of the 20 countries involved are in the Western Hemisphere, in Latin America. At this time, our Nation is trying to do its best to foster good relations with our friends in South America. Enactment of this bill would be a horrible Christmas present to give them.

Mr. TALMADGE. Are there not some 20-odd countries which have a vital stake in this issue, most of which are Latin American countries which we are trying to assist in the Alliance for Progress?

Mr. INOUYE. The Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. TALMADGE. Does not the Senator believe that if we should enact this proposed legislation, it would prejudice their marketing quotas, and would prejudice our international relations with these 20-odd countries with which we are trying so desperately to foster good will, even to the extent of spending about a billion dollars of the American taxpayers' money there?

Mr. INOUYE. The Senator suggests in the most eloquent fashion the position of the State Department on this question. The State Department is afraid that this may be the consequence of the adoption of the amendment offered by the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT].

Mr. TALMADGE. Is it not also true that the executive branch of the Government sent Congress a proposed resolution which would extend the present law, and present law only, for a period of some 6 months, until Congress, next year, in due course, after notice and hearing, could give consideration to all the matters involved in this complex proposed legislation?

Mr. INOUYE. The Senator is correct. In the latter part of September of this year, a leading official in the Department of Agriculture submitted a request from the executive department for a simple extension of the foreign provisions of the Sugar Act of 1962 for 6 months.

Mr. TALMADGE. Is it not true that the consumers of this country—190 million people—also have a vital interest in the proposed sugar legislation?

Mr. INOUYE. I believe that the consumers of this country are the most important people involved in this discussion.

Mr. TALMADGE. Does not the Senator believe that the American consumers should have an opportunity to be given notice, and to present testimony to be considered in connection with something so far reaching as this proposed legislation?

Mr. INOUYE. With that statement I am in complete agreement.

Mr. TALMADGE. Is it not true that the Committee on Agriculture, which met yesterday, refused to take action on this proposed type of amendment?

Mr. INOUYE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. TALMADGE. Does not the Senator believe that the Senate would be acting futilely if it were to adopt this amendment, because the House would refuse to accept it?

Mr. INOUYE. Under precedents of the past, I assume that if this amendment were adopted, the House of Representatives would return the bill with a request to the Senate to delete therefrom the Bennett amendment. This has been done in the past; and as the Senator has just said, it would be an exercise in futility on the part of the Senate.

Mr. TALMADGE. Is it not true that every segment of the sugar industry, except those which produce sugarbeets, wished to act on the administration's resolution, and that the sugarbeet producers were the only segment of the industry which opposed the administration's resolution?

Mr. INOUYE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Hawaii yield to me on my own time?

Mr. INOUYE. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. BENNETT. That is the story that was released by Representative COOLEY, who has always been an enemy of the sugarbeet industry; but if the Senator will examine the list of sponsors of the Bennett amendment, he will find that all four Senators representing the cane producers on the mainland area are sponsors of the amendment. So while Representative COOLEY tried to leave that impression, it is obvious that the American cane producers, as well as the American beet producers, were anxious to have their quotas freed.

Mr. TALMADGE. I thank the Senator from Utah for clarifying that point. I notice that the cane producers are also getting 275,000 tons in additional quotas, which may be one reason why the cane producers are interested in having this particular amendment adopted.

Mr. BENNETT. That is the same reason why the beet producers are interested in having the amendment adopted.

Mr. TALMADGE. It is my understanding that the cane producers, while opposing the quota, were in agreement that the administration's proposed resolution should be passed. The refiners were also in agreement. Everyone in the industry agreed except the sugarbeet producers, who were opposed to it. That is the reason we cannot get this proposed legislation by normal routine methods of legislation—that is, hearings in the House, to have the bill originate in the House because under the Constitution it is a revenue measure, and then to come to the Senate for appropriate and final action.

Mr. BENNETT. I have the impression that Representative COOLEY adjourned the meeting of his committee when he realized that the majority of the committee wished a bill substantially the same as that which I have introduced. As its chairman, he had the power to adjourn the committee without completing the testimony, or without giving the committee an opportunity to vote. Therefore, if we were to have any action taken on sugar, in view of the action of the chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, it became necessary, this year, to have it taken on the Senate side.

Mr. TALMADGE. I am not aware of what occurred in the committee. I am aware of the fact that the Agriculture Committee of the House took no action. The proposed legislation involves many millions of people, the interests of beet producers, and the cane producers, the refiners and their employees, the shipping industry, the railroad industry, and labor—and finally most important of all, the American consumers, who should have an opportunity to be heard.

They ought to have an opportunity to testify. They ought to have an opportunity to cross-examine. Committees ought to have an opportunity to study and make a decision without reporting a bill of this magnitude on the spur of the moment, without an opportunity for notice, hearings, and testimony by those concerned.

I thank the Senator from Hawaii for yielding to me.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Georgia for his contribution. I appreciate it very much.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. INOUYE. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, all that the beet sugar producers are asking—and I believe the same is true for the cane sugar producers—is to supply a part of our consumption that Cuba formerly supplied to the United States. Americans ought to be able to supply at least that part of the sugar needs of the country that Cuba formerly supplied. It seems to me that this is a reasonable position to take.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, before I proceed, I believe that in fairness to the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, I should say a few words.

I was privileged to sit as a member of the House Committee on Agriculture during my two terms in the House of Representatives. I was also privileged to serve under the leadership of Mr. COOLEY, of North Carolina, when the 1962 Sugar Act was passed. I was also privileged to work very closely with the chairman of the Finance Committee. I was appointed as a member of the conference committee to meet with the Senate conferees.

I know that Mr. COOLEY is very fair with the beet industry. In fact, the 1962 Sugar Act was extremely fair to the beet industry. That is agreed upon by the beet industry. The sole spokesman for the national sugar industry—and that covers refiners, industrial users, mainland cane, mainland beet, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands—happened to be president of one of the largest beet companies in the United States. He represented the industry. It was this proposal that was adopted by the committee, from what I can gather.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. INOUYE. I yield.

Mr. BENNETT. I believe the record of what happened this week is that Mr. COOLEY adjourned the committee without finishing the hearings and without taking a vote, up or down, on the administration proposal.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I dislike to use my time on a discussion of what happened in the House. However, I believe this is a part of the discussion. I believe I should clarify it.

I have been advised that the chairman of the House committee sent inquiries to various segments of our sugar industry in the United States, to find out whether they would go along with a 6 months' extension of the foreign provisions under the 1962 Sugar Act. All of the industry approved with the exception of the beet segment. They wanted to increase their acreage, and their tonnages.

When they held a meeting the other day, contrary to the contentions of the distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the House Committee on Agriculture adjourned pursuant to a vote. It was not pursuant to the sole action of the chairman. The yeas and nays were taken. And if the supporters of the beet industry desired it, they could have had a rollcall. They did not ask for a rollcall.

I am certain that if the beet industry had gone along with a simple extension of the foreign provision, the House committee would have come forth with a bill. But, being threatened with the possibility of revising and passing a new sugar bill in the House, the chairman and the majority of the committee felt this would not be in the best interest of the economy of the United States.

Mr. President, there are a few additional allegations that I would like to cover. It has been said that in order to justify the desire of the beet industry for further increases, they have alleged, without offering any proof—because none exists—that friendly foreign sugar suppliers failed to provide needed supplies during the period of high demand several months ago.

The Department of Agriculture statistics prove that needed raw sugarcane supplies were forthcoming from foreign producers, and that sugarcane refineries operated at record levels to turn out all the refined cane sugar demanded by consumers.

Furthermore, in May 1963, the Department belatedly turned to our foreign suppliers for the additional sugar required to meet the increased demands of the consumers and to break the price spiral. In explaining in a press release of November 5, 1963, why total sugar stocks in the United States as we entered 1964 would be at an alltime high, the Department concluded that it was: "due to the fulfillment by foreign suppliers of both their 1963 country quotas and their global quota commitments."

There is another allegation made by supporters of the beet industry. They say that beet interests justify their increased quota demand by claiming that such increased beet production would help alleviate our surplus problems with respect to other farm commodities, such as cotton, corn, and wheat.

Sugarbeets are grown on only 23,000 farms out of 3,500,000. This represents less than 1 percent of the total number of farms in the United States. It accounts for only approximately four-tenths of 1 percent of the total cropland acreage. Sugarbeets are grown primarily on irrigated land. Thus, as a practical matter, such crops are not interchangeable with other crops. It is unlikely, therefore, that any substantial diversion of acreage from surplus crops to beets would occur.

It is certain, however, that a cutback in quotas, and hence in imports from countries supplying domestic cane refiners with raw sugar would reduce export sales of cotton, corn, wheat, rice, tobacco, and other farm commodities.

As the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] so eloquently pointed out, by cutting down the quotas for our friends in South America, we are actually taking dollars away from them with which they could buy cotton, corn, tobacco, and farm equipment.

If the Bennett amendment is agreed to, that will be the first step toward effectuating such a program. The Senator from Utah is justifiably proud of having so many cosponsors on the amendment. It leaves the impression, by naming the cosponsors, that the beet industry is a nationwide industry.

Statistics have been cited to the effect that beets are produced in 20 States, and shortly will be produced in 23 States. But the facts are very simple. In some of those States, there are as few as four farms producing beets. Two-thirds of the industry production comes from only four States. Sugarbeets constitute an insignificant part of the agriculture in most of the other States in which they are grown.

In view of the protection they are afforded, and the generous quota they were given as recently as 1962, I believe it can be aptly said of them, in the rearranged words of a former great world statesman: "Never have so few owed so much to so many."

There are two other allegations which I would like to answer at this time. It is alleged that the beet industry suppliers, the various elements of the American sugar industry and the executive agencies of the Government concerned with the sugar situation, were parties to an agreement in 1962 regarding domestic quotas.

In 1962 I was privileged to sit as a member of the House Committee on Agriculture. I know the trials and tribulations which had to be endured by all supporters. For several months, representatives of all segments of our sugar industry—the refiners, the industrial users, the mainland beet producers, the mainland cane producers, Hawaii, Puerto Rico and Virgin Islands—sat together in conference after conference. They finally came forth with a measure which they unanimously agreed upon. That agreement became the basis for the 1962 act. The beet sugar industry is now saying that there was no agreement.

It should be further noted that representatives of the executive branch of the Government, including the Department of Agriculture, participated in those conferences. They offered advice and also concurred in what was done. So there resulted a gentleman's agreement in effect, although there was no written agreement, as such.

Mr. President, we should give the 1962 act an opportunity to work. It has 2 more years left. We have not reached the expiration of the 1962 act. It is only fair that we give it a trial. To date, the act has worked beautifully with the exception of a few months, when, because of a shortage of European sugar and Cuban sugar, problems arose in the United States.

The last allegation, which is the one about which we hear the most, is that the beet interests claim that the American consumer would benefit from an increase in the beet sugar quota.

The U.S. consumer is best served by having an ample supply of sugar continually available at reasonable and stable prices. A review of the experience of the past years is persuasive that the beet quota proposal threatens those interests. The beet industry seeks not an increase in the total supply of sugar available in the United States of America, which is the principal factor determining prices, but merely an increase in its share of the quota pie, the additional subsidy, and related costs resulting therefrom.

Several Senators have said that the proposal would be a temporary measure for 6 months as far as an increase in the tonnage is concerned. I am certain that all of us know that temporary measures have a tendency to become very permanent.

Before I close, I should like to say a few more words. At present world prices and present national prices, for each ton taken away from the global quota—and in the present case the amendment proposes to take away 500,000 tons—the cost to the U.S. Treasury would be approximately $70 per ton, or $35 million a year.

It breaks down to $40 a ton on import fees under the quota system, $12.50 a ton for the tariff, and $17.50 on the compliance payment, making a total, roughly, of $69 or $70. That is something of which the consumer and all taxpayers should be fully aware. The proposal involves nothing free. It means a great deal to the beet industry, and I believe it means a great deal also to the other important segments of the sugar industry which oppose the measure.

Mr. President, at an appropriate time I shall offer an amendment to strike out section 3 of the amendment offered by the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT].

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. INOUYE. How many minutes have I remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii has 25 minutes remaining.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I wished to add a few words in support of the Senator, but I should be happy to have the Senator yield first to his colleague.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, how much time does the Senator desire?

Mr. FONG. Fifteen minutes.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I yield 15 minutes to my senior colleague.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my name be added as a cosponsor of the amendment submitted by my distinguished colleague from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE].

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I strongly oppose the pending Bennett amendment.

This amendment, in effect, rewrites the Sugar Act of 1962. That act provided for foreign quotas on sugar until December 31, 1964 and domestic quotas until December 31, 1966.

The pending amendment calling for a 500,000-ton increase in the marketing allotment for beet sugar would substantially alter the domestic cane and beet sugar share of the U.S. market, in favor of beet producers to the great detriment of the cane industry. This would have a profound and adverse impact on the sugar industry of our Nation's greatest sugar-producing State—Hawaii.

Sugar is a mainstay of our Island State's economy and Hawaii's leading income producer. In 1963, sugar—all cane—brought $188 million into the State's economy.

Sugar plantations provide a year-round employment for about 13,000 workers with a total payroll of approximately $62 million.

Sugar production in Hawaii is amazingly efficient, attaining the world's highest yields per acre. Hawaii's sugar workers have achieved the highest rate of productivity of sugar in the world. The man-hours required per ton to produce sugar are the lowest in the world.

The state of health of Hawaii's sugar industry and its future well-being are of utmost concern to Hawaii.

The proposed amendment would be directly harmful to Hawaii.

Beet sugar is grown mainly in the Western States. Hawaiian cane sugar is marketed mostly in the West. As beet sugar is a substandard wage industry, it offers unfair competition to Hawaiian sugar in Western markets.

Beetworkers are paid less than half as much as Hawaiian caneworkers. Beetfieldworkers in 1962 earned an average of only $1.16 an hour, compared to $2 an hour for Hawaiian canefieldworkers. Beetworkers received fringe benefits worth from 2 to 19 cents an hour, while Hawaiian caneworkers received 74 cents in fringe benefits an hour.

It is certainly not in the interest of labor or the Nation's economy to allow an industry paying substandard wages to push out companies that pay a living wage. Yet this is what the pending amendment would do.

The beet proposal would upset established marketing patterns, and thereby in the long run raise the level of consumer prices.

Whenever it becomes more profitable for beet sugar growers to raise a different crop, they would do so, resulting in a widely fluctuating supply of domestic sugar. This would affect the price of sugar. When supplies are down, prices go up.

The beet proposal would reduce cane sugar quotas of South American nations, and so reduce their dollar earnings and their capacity to buy U.S. exports. It would depress and hurt foreign trade and aggravate our already unfavorable balance of payments.

Thus, the beet sugar industry's demand that its marketing allotment be increased by 500,000 tons conflicts with the basic objectives of the Sugar Act as amended, which seeks to promote the welfare of all elements of America's sugar industry, to protect consumers, and to promote foreign trade.

To increase the 1964 marketing allotment for beet sugar without imposing acreage restrictions opens the door to further demands next year for greater marketing allotments and so the cane sugar situation would be further aggravated.

When sugar legislation was before the Congress in 1962, there were many conflicting proposals advanced. Seeking to attain a workable measure, the Department of Agriculture sponsored a series of meetings resulting in a compromise with which the diverse segments of America's sugar industry could live.

The stability and duration of the understanding were integral and fundamental parts of the agreement.

Domestic provisions, it was agreed, would continue in effect without amendment through calendar year 1966. Only because of this understanding were Members of Hawaii's congressional delegation and the Hawaiian sugar industry able to support the compromise Sugar Act of July 1962.

This compromise included very sizable increases in the quotas for both the beet and mainland cane sugar interests, as well as an increased share in the annual growth for both groups.

About three-fourths of Hawaii's raw sugar, approximately 750,000 tons, is refined each year at the Crockett, Calif., refinery, the industry's cooperative agricultural marketing association. The refined sugar is then sold throughout the States west of the Mississippi.

This is a market which Hawaiian sugar has helped develop, has grown with, and has served in war and in peace, good times and bad, for well over half a century. It is the closest and most natural market for Hawaiian sugar.

The increased beet production allowed under the 1962 Sugar Act in this market necessitated revised marketing practices in the traditional Hawaiian sugar markets. As the 1962 Sugar Act fixed quotas for a 5-year period, the Hawaiian sugar industry was willing to go along with the 1962 compromise.

Now just 2 years later, the beet industry proposes a tremendous increase in its marketing allotment and is unwilling to agree to any acreage restrictions, so that, instead of stability, the domestic sugar industry would face substantial yearly upheaval.

It requires 22 to 24 months for cane sugar to mature in Hawaii. Under these circumstances, it is impossible for the Hawaiian sugar industry to adjust to frequent fluctuation. Reasonable duration of domestic sugar provisions is vital to the progress and well-being of Hawaii's sugar industry and its thousands of employees.

In behalf of Hawaiian sugar producers and workers, I must vigorously oppose any changes in the domestic provisions of the Sugar Act amendments of 1962.

I should like to point out that responsible west coast organizations in Hawaii's prime market areas such as the Solano County Central Labor Council, the Contra Costa Central Labor Council, and the Contra Costa Board of Supervisors in California likewise have also come out against changes in the domestic provisions of existing law.

On June 23 this year, the San Francisco World Trade Association—after intense review and study of sugar legislation and after hearing both cane and beet sugar representatives—adopted a resolution opposing changes in the domestic features of the 1962 Sugar Act.

I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the resolution be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Resolution by the San Francisco Area World Trade Association

Whereas the San Francisco Area World Trade Association subscribes to the policy of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, and to the view that the long-range best interests of California, of the United States of America, and of the world community as a whole, are best served by the expansion of international trade; and

Whereas it is the opinion of the San Francisco Area World Trade Association, after study, that the proposed amendments to the Sugar Act of 1948 incorporated in S. 2657 and H.R. 10565 are contrary to the policy of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962; would, if enacted, result in a contraction in international trade and, in particular, in restricting the present and future exports to the United States of America of a number of friendly foreign nations many of whom are located in the Western Hemisphere and with whom this country enjoys a substantial favorable balance of trade and incidentally, in reduced Federal receipts from duties and excise taxes on imported sugar and increased Federal expenditures from subsidies on domestic sugar; and will, in the long run, prove inimical to the overall interests of California and of the United States of America, as well as of the world community; it is therefore

Resolved, That the President make known the above views of this asociation in an appropriate manner.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, the domestic beet interests have been sponsoring bills in the Congress to increase their sugar quota by 750,000 tons or more in 1964 and to increase the mainland cane quota by 250,000 tons. Having failed in this effort, the current drive to obtain authorization for extra marketings above their present quota is a last minute effort to get a part of their desired quota increase now, preparatory to their efforts to again seek the larger increase next year.

These proposed increases would replace imports of equal amounts of raw cane sugar from foreign countries. We are talking about an annual value of $124 million or more.

This cutback will have a telling impact on the economies of the foreign suppliers of raw cane sugar. Earning the dollars needed to pay for American products they import is no simple matter for these lesser developed nations. They have a limited number of products to offer. They must rely on sugar and a handful of other products to earn most of their dollars.

In 1962 these nations earned $501.3 million by exporting sugar to the United States. Sugar accounted for a large share of the dollars they earned. For example, the Dominican Republic earned 62.8 percent of its dollars from sugar, the Philippines 46.8 percent, and Peru 31.4 percent. These are the countries we are concerned with in foreign aid, the Alliance for Progress, and so forth.

The attempt to replace our purchases from these countries with domestic production can be summed up as forcing the United States further into a position of "aid, not trade."

This substantial loss abroad would be matched in the United States. Total U.S. exports to these nations in 1962 were valued at $5.2 billion, and we had a favorable balance of trade with these nations of $713.2 million. U.S. export industries would lose an equivalent amount of sales, and transportation and material handling industries would also suffer. To move a million tons of sugar to this country would require over 100 ships, whose employment would be lost if foreign quotas are reduced. In addition, the ports and the hundreds of thousands of persons who derive their livelihood from port and maritime services would be immediately affected.

The ports of Los Angeles and San Francisco will certainly feel this loss. Total values of exports from their customs districts to sugar producing countries in 1960—latest year for which data are available—was $76.1 million and $145.6 million, respectively. These values are 17.1 percent and 22.7 percent, respectively, of the total export volume of these customs districts for that year—significant amounts, and worthy of our concerted efforts to protect.

Another direct result of an increased beet quota vitally affects trade with Hawaii. General commodities worth an estimated $105 million were moved through the port of Los Angeles to Hawaii in 1960. The local maritime industry in San Francisco moves approximately 800,000 tons of Hawaiian raw sugar into San Francisco Bay annually. On the return haul, general commodities valued at $191 million are moved through bay ports. To the extent the Hawaiian economy is injured by increased beet sugar production, its ability to purchase this volume of goods is curtailed, and all segments of the local shipping and maritime communities will suffer accordingly.

To protect against loss of a substantial volume of foreign and domestic commerce through the ports of Los Angeles and San Francisco, I urge rejection of the Bennett proposal to increase beet and mainland cane sugar quotas. Other major ports along all our seacoasts would be similarly affected, and statistics could easily be developed to show these effects just as specifically as in the case of Los Angeles and San Francisco. In fact, the damage would be even more severe in the case of some of the great east coast and southern ports.

BENEFITS TO ORGANIZED LABOR

Raw cane sugar ranks in tonnage among the most important commodities imported through many U.S. ports—first in New Orleans and Galveston; second in New York and Boston; third in Philadelphia and Savannah; fifth in Baltimore. It is one of the leading inbound cargoes in San Francisco. In 1962, 6,322,000 tons of raw sugar moved into these ports requiring over 630 ships.

This raw sugar imported in 1962 was valued at over $816 million. Recent studies show that this amount of imported sugar generated an estimated $379 million more in business for these areas.

Cane sugar refiners have played an important role in the progress of these business communities for many years. In the eight cities listed above, for example, they provide direct employment for about 14,250 individuals and maintain annual payrolls which total approximately $88,850,000.

Other segments of the economy also benefit from importation of raw cane sugar. For example, each year almost 13 billion pounds of sugar products move out of refineries in these cities by truck and rail, providing many man-hours of employment to transportation workers.

Housewives buying small packages of sugar; the industrial users—bakers, confectioners, canners, bottlers, ice cream manufacturers and other food processors located in States where cane sugar refineries are located and in nearby States—rely heavily on these refineries to fill quickly their divergent sugar needs at reasonable prices. These States are important sugar consuming markets.

HIGH PAY JOBS VERSUS LOW PAY JOBS

What would be the direct impact on business and organized labor in these areas if 500,000 tons of sugar quota were taken away from the foreign suppliers?

First of all, there would definitely be a reduction of jobs at U.S. cane refineries. It is true that the sugar taken away from the foreign suppliers and given mainly to the beet producers would provide additional employment for the beet industry. But this would be a poor exchange for organized labor, especially the cane refinery workers who would lose their jobs to the beet sugar industry.

The proposed 500,000-ton reduction in the foreign sugar quota represents 16 days of work or 2 million man-hours for the entire cane refining industry and a loss of more than $6 million in refinery workers' wages alone.

U.S. cane refinery workers are among the highest paid and receive some of the highest benefits in American industry. They are also assured of year-round employment. In contrast, the beet processing factory jobs are seasonal, at lower pay, with lesser benefits.

For example, cane refinery production workers average around $3 an hour and fringe benefits are in the neighborhood of 75 cents an hour. Government studies for 1961, the latest year for which figures are available, show that beet production workers received an average of $2.20 an hour on a seasonal basis, primarily during a 4-month period—October through January. Field laborers earned an average of $1.16 per hour. U.S. production workers as a whole are paid an average of $2.49 an hour, according to reports of the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

DROP IN EXPORTS CUTS BUSINESS AND JOBS TOO

Many segments of the economy would suffer by reduction of raw cane sugar imports. The sugar-producing nations must sell their products to the United States to obtain dollars—dollars needed to purchase goods produced in the United States.

U.S. exports of everything from machinery and chemicals to wheat and vegetables provide hundreds of thousands of jobs and millions of dollars in factory wages and farm income. For example, in 1961, New York and New Jersey exported an estimated $455 million worth of manufactured and farm goods to sugar-producing nations. These exports from this area alone provided an estimated 50,000 jobs and $275 million in wages and farm income.

Nationally, studies show that 1 out of 10 factory jobs and, in port areas, 1 out of every 4 jobs, are dependent on foreign trade. The harvest of 1 out of every 5 acres goes abroad.

I urge my colleagues to reject the ill-timed, ill-advised Bennett amendment, which will be very disruptive to the sugar industry in America and lead to undesirable long-term sugar difficulties.

This 11th-hour amendment proposes a raid on the sugar markets. It has far-reaching ramifications which in these remarks I have only touched upon.

It has not been studied nor considered by the Senate Finance Committee. We have no hearings of the committee to consult to obtain all viewpoints. We have no committee report nor recommendations to guide us.

The amendment has not been recommended by the administration. The administration has requested only a 6-month extension of the foreign quota provisions, without amendment.

It would be most unwise to act upon this far-reaching amendment now, in the haste and confusion of these closing days of the session.

It is only 3 months until a new Congress will convene.

It would be far better to consider sugar legislation after public hearings have been held and everyone has had an opportunity to express his views and we who legislate have an opportunity to give thorough study and consideration to the entire matter.

I strongly urge rejection of the Bennett amendment.

I support the amendment of my colleague [Mr. Inouye], which I am pleased to cosponsor, to strike the 500,000-ton increased marketing allotment for beet sugar and to extend existing foreign provisions of the 1962 Sugar Act.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to the Bennett amendment and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The Legislative Clerk. It is proposed to strike out section 3 of the amendment to eliminate the addition of a new paragraph (3) at the end of section 202(a) of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended.

Mr. INOUYE. I ask unanimous consent that my senior colleague from Hawaii [Mr. Fong] may be listed as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

How much time does the Senator from Hawaii yield himself?

Mr. INOUYE. I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. President, the amendment would merely strike section 3 of the so-called Bennett amendment to H.R. 12253. It has but one purpose—to conform his amendment to the Sugar Act, presently before the Senate, to the bill submitted to the Congress by the Department of Agriculture on September 25—on last Friday. This is the position of the administration.

Charles Murphy, Acting Secretary of Agriculture, pointed out in his letter of transmittal to the Congress, that the provisions of the Sugar Act relating to quotas for the domestic areas and the Philippines do not expire until 1966. The only part of the Sugar Act that will expire on December 31 of this year is that part pertaining to foreign quotas.

If my amendment to the pending amendment is adopted, the remaining sections, namely sections 1 and 2, would deal only with those provisions of the act which will expire on December 31 of this year. Thus the foreign quota provisions of the Sugar Act would be extended for 6 months to preserve the sugar quota structure beyond December 31. The amendment would then preserve the status quo—no more, no less. It would not diminish or increase any of the rights of any groups affected by the Sugar Act. It would not give any special group any preferential rights they do not now have.

Unless the amendment before the Senate is amended, as I have proposed, certain domestic areas will be favored at the expenses of other domestic producing areas, the domestic cane sugar refining industry and its workers, and our foreign friends in Latin America who provide us with raw sugar under the present Sugar Act.

The amendment of the Senator from Utah in its proposed form, unless amended, is so one-sided that it is bound to create controversy that will keep us in session for many more days. The Department of Agriculture recognized that any bill, other than a simple bill to preserve the status quo, would create a controversy which cannot be settled in the final days of the present session of Congress. We must also recognize this fact.

This is a very simple amendment. It would merely strike out section 3 of the Bennett amendment. I hope Senators will support it.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. INOUYE. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I shall take some time of my own, which I hope the Senator will yield to me, to state my reasons why I think the consumers should support the amendment of the Senator from Hawaii.

I should like to ask the Senator a question. Is it a fact that the beet and cane sugar farmers, who will get an increase in the quota, themselves have the benefit of agricultural adjustment laws of the United States, so that the Treasury supports the price for them as it does for other farm commodities?

Mr. INOUYE. Yes; these are compliance payments.

Mr. JAVITS. This proposal would give them an additional call upon the Treasury for more price subsidies?

Mr. INOUYE. The 500,000 tons, it has been estimated, would cost approximately $35 million a year.

Mr. JAVITS. In this kind of underwriting which we give the farmers generally?

Mr. INOUYE. Yes.

I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I rise to support the amendment of the Senator from Hawaii, for two reasons.

First, as has been pointed out by the Senator from New York, the amendment of the Senator from Utah, if it is adopted without the amendment of the Senator from Hawaii, will cost the Treasury a substantial amount of money.

Second, from the standpoint of our industry in Massachusetts, it is my understanding that we use about 10 million tons of sugar a year. Six million tons are from domestic production in the beet sugar industry. The remainder, 4 million tons, comes from abroad and from the Philippines. The Philippines, as I understand, bring in approximately 1 million tons. This amount would not be subject to the terms of the bill. The remainder of 3 million tons is subject to the discretion of the Department of Agriculture at the present time.

The amendment of the Senator from Hawaii merely leaves the status quo for 6 months, and does not try to change the status quo in the last few months of the congressional session without the benefit of any hearings on the subject.

Let me show how it would affect us in Massachusetts. In Boston, according to the latest available statistics, we imported 418,000 tons of raw sugar. This was valued at $54 million. It generated $25 million more in business. It required 70 ships to bring this production into the Boston area.

Our Boston refining industry has about 1,000 employees. The annual payroll is $7,500,000. If the amendment of the Senator from Utah were adopted, much of the refining would be eliminated or reduced.

In addition, we send approximately $75 million worth of exports from Massachusetts. The port of Boston is involved in bringing in $54 million worth of sugar and exporting approximately $75 million worth of goods to our sugar-producing neighbors in the various Caribbean and Central American countries.

This would be substantially eliminated without an opportunity for hearing, without an opportunity to determine what would be the result.

I believe that for the next 6 months the domestic beet sugar-producing States will not suffer. The Department of Agriculture has discretion to carry on with 3 million tons. Therefore, I believe that the Senate should adopt the amendment of the Senator from Hawaii. I say this in the national interest and also from the standpoint of lowering the cost to the consumer, and from the standpoint of imposing a lighter burden on the Treasury so far as subsidies are concerned. From the local point of view, the port of Boston and our refining industry would be affected. The amendment of the Senator from Hawaii should be adopted, and the matter should be left in status quo for the next 6 months. I hope the amendment of the Senator from Hawaii to the amendment of the Senator from Utah will be adopted.

Mr. INOUYE. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I shall support the amendment of the Senator from Hawaii. I heard with the greatest interest and the greatest enlightenment his speech, and also the speech of my colleague from Hawaii [Mr. Fong] with respect to the whole situation.

My main support of the amendment of the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Inouye] is based upon the impact of this situation on the consumers. This would be my main feeling. In addition, the question of the foreign policy of the United States also is involved.

The port of New York is the largest center of cane sugar refining in the world. Raw cane sugar ranks second in tonnage among the commodities imported through the port—by far the most important food product. In 1962, more than 1,500,000 tons of sugar moved into New York, requiring some 150 ships.

This sugar was destined for five of the Nation's largest refineries—the Brooklyn plant of the American Sugar Co.—Domino Sugars; the Long Island City plant of the National Sugar Refining Co.—Jack Frost Sugars; the Brooklyn plant of SuCrest Corp.—SuCrest Sugar; the Yonkers plant of Refined Syrups & Sugars, Inc.—Flo-Sweet Sugars; and the liquid sugar plant of the Pepsi-Cola Co. in Long Island City.

The raw sugar imported into the port of New York was valued at more than $190 million. According to the latest studies, the 1½ million tons of sugar imported generated an estimated $80 million more in business for the New York area.

New York's sugar refining industry has played an important role in the progress of the business community of the city for more than 300 years. The five refineries, alone, provide direct employment for nearly 5,000 individuals and maintain an annual payroll of approximately $25 million. In addition, there are hundreds of home office employees of sugar companies whose jobs depend on the importation of sugar.

Another segment of New York labor also benefits from imports of raw cane sugar. For example, each year over 3 billon pounds of sugar products move out of these refineries by barge, truck, and providing many man-hours of employment to transportation workers alone.

Housewives buying small packages of sugar; the industrial users—bakers, confectioners, canners, bottlers, ice cream manufacturers, and other food processors—located in New York, New Jersey, and the other surrounding States rely heavily on New York sugar refineries to fill quickly their divergent sugar needs at reasonable prices. New York and New Jersey, with a total sugar consumption of more than 2.6 billion pounds annually, is the Nation's most important sugar consuming market.

What would be the direct impact on business and labor concerned with the importation of sugar into the Port of New York if 500,000 tons of sugar quota were taken away from the foreign suppliers?

First of all, there would be a loss of incoming cargo. Second, there would be a loss of outgoing cargo due to a reduction of exports. Here is why:

The sugar-producing nations depend on the sale of raw sugar to the United States to help earn the dollars needed to import manufactured and agricultural goods from the United States. These goods, $4.2 billion worth in 1962, must flow out through U.S. ports.

Any drop in U.S. imports of raw sugar will, most assuredly, be followed by a decrease in U.S. exports to sugar-producing nations. Sugar is the third most important dollar earner for all of Latin America.

New York and New Jersey, in 1961, exported an estimated $455 million worth of manufactured and farm goods to the sugar-producing nations, most of it through the Port of New York. These exports of everything from highly intricate electronic equipment to clothes and malt provided an estimated 50,000 jobs and $275 million in wages and farm income.

There would definitely be a reduction of jobs at the five New York cane refineries. It is true that sugar taken away from the foreign suppliers and given mainly to the beet producers would provide additional employment for the beet industry. But this would be a poor exchange for organized labor, and especially for east coast cane refinery workers who would lose their jobs to the beet industry mainly in Western States.

The proposed 500,000-ton reduction in the foreign sugar quota represents 16 days or 1,720,000 man-hours of work for the entire cane refining industry and a loss of more than $6,200,000 in refinery workers' wages alone.

The harmful consequences of lopping 500,000 tons of sugar from the foreign quota can be graphically measured in stark terms if the full impact were to be concentrated on the Port of New York. Such a cutback in importation would be enough to eliminate approximately one-half of the business and job-stimulating activities of the fleets carrying sugar to the port, and to wipe out two or three of New York's cane sugar refineries, some 2,500 refinery jobs, and the $12,500,000 in annual payroll.

Of course, New York would not by itself suffer the full impact of a reduction in foreign sugar quotas. Nonetheless, it is fair and factual to state that New York's share of the sugar import loss would result in a serious reduction of jobs in the five new York refineries.

U.S. cane refinery workers are among the highest paid and receive some of the highest benefits in American industry. They are also assured of year-round employment. In contrast, the beet processing factory jobs are seasonal, at lower pay, with lesser benefits.

For example, cane refinery production workers average around $3 an hour and fringe benefits are in the neighborhood of 75 cents an hour. The New York plants provide steady employment throughout the year. According to the latest Government studies, beet production workers receive an average of $2.20 an hour on a seasonsal basis, primarily during a 4-month period—October through January. U.S. production workers as a whole are paid an average of $2.49 an hour, the Bureau of Labor Statistics reports.

The replacement of cane sugar by beet sugar also will result in higher prices to the unionist as well as to all consumers. Besides being one of the most highly subsidized farm commodities, beet sugar must be shipped into the highly populous east coast by truck and train from the western beet States. This combination—high subsidies and freight costs—results, in times of normal supply, in a higher cost of sugar to the housewife and the industrial user.

As to the foreign policy aspect, we are always inclined, as we were when we discussed this subject yesterday, with respect to another tariff matter, to look at these things through the wrong end of the telescope. We are fighting a battle with Europe with respect to the rationalization of Europe's farm production. We say to Europe, "Do not produce wheat and other farm products uneconomically. Buy them from us economically." This stimulates trade both ways, because the European cost of production is infinitely greater than ours. Yet we are now asked to turn completely around and engage in the very same protectionist device we are asking Europe to avoid, by asking our people to produce more sugar, which we know is more expensive to produce than it is in the places from which we import it. The more we encourage American production on an expensive economic level, the more we are encouraging the building up of agricultural subsidies and price guarantees, against which so many of us have been inveighing for years, and which, in my judgment, have dragged down American agriculture to a position of almost constant depression.

In my judgment, from the point of view of the most rational approach to the totality of the United States, the amendment of the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE] should be adopted. The very most we should do is to extend the situation as it exists today for an additional 6 months.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I approve and agree with what the Senator from New York has said. **However, is there not** one further point? If the amendment of the Senator from Utah were adopted in full, it would cut down an industry which is refining and importing, and thus giving cheaper supplies to our consumers.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator is absolutely correct. The New York area receives some 150 ships a year. I heard the Senator from Massachusetts say that Boston receives 70 ships a year. For New York, this is an important industry, directly employing 5,000 persons. I would not be justified in arguing this case upon that ground alone, any more than I feel it is justifiable to argue the case on the other side in terms of increasing domestic production merely because to do so would provide American farmers with more work to do. What we must have in America is rational farm production based upon what, in economic terms, is the best and most economical for us to raise.

We are not dealing with a problem of national security. It cannot be said that if we did not give this authority to the American farmer, the security of the United States would be imperiled. We are dealing with no shortage of supplies of sugar. The Department of Agriculture has withheld 500,000 tons from the quota. The effort is to latch on to that 500,000 tons in a way which, in my judgment, and with all respect to those on the other side, is uneconomical to the American taxpayer, as the Senator from Massachusetts has emphasized.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Would it not be more economical, based on the argument the Senator from New York has made, to import all the textiles we use? We could buy textiles from Japan cheaper than they can be made here. We could buy beef and electrical equipment cheaper from abroad. Would not the same argument pertain to all the other articles that American consumers need?

Mr. JAVITS. That is not the case, because it is a fact that many textiles—the overwhelming volume of textiles—are made better and cheaper in the United States and to the greater satisfaction of the American consumer.

Actually, American electrical appliances are the most highly desired in the world. Although they are somewhat higher in price, they are one of our best export commodities because of their quality.

We are talking about sugar, which has been traditionally a large import commodity. I am arguing against breaking the balance which has existed for many years. What is sought to be done now is to shift that balance more to American production. That is what I am arguing against.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. In the construction of the huge hydroelectric dams in the United States, foreign companies have sought to furnish the big generators, which can be bought much cheaper in foreign countries. Should we buy such equipment from them and put our own people out of work?

Mr. JAVITS. I have dealt with that question before. In that case we have a national security situation. We should buy a reasonable proportion abroad, but we should not put our domestic industry out of business. In this instance, it is proposed to do something which has not heretofore been the case.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Is there not more of a national security problem connected with sugar? In the event of another war, we would not have the benefit of acquiring Cuban sugar.

Mr. JAVITS. We have managed to get our sugar very heavily from Latin America, and that is exactly the source that would be discriminated against if we did what the Senator from Utah wishes us to do by his amendment.

Let me say, however, that I am not at all unmindful of the desires and needs of the farmers of my State. I fought hard and succeeded on January 10, 1964, in obtaining the allocation of 29,500 acres from the national sugarbeet acreage reserve for 1965, 1966, and 1967, to farms in counties in central New York, yielding 50,000 short tons of sugar. This development is very important to the economic well-being of the eight counties in central New York involved and I am glad that I have played a role in making this possible.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I am about to suggest the absence of a quorum. Before doing so, I ask unanimous consent that the time for the quorum call not be charged to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah desire to use his time before the call for a quorum?

Mr. BENNETT. I shall use it after the quorum call.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the request of the Senator from Hawaii is granted. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, on my amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes from the time on my amendment rather than on the amendment of the Senator from Hawaii.

During his introductory remarks, the Senator from Hawaii made some interesting references to my statement, calling it "allegations." I confess that I was not able to write them all down, but one or two things need to be straightened out.

The Senator from Hawaii in all of his discussion of the proposal spoke only of the beet producers, as though it were only the beet people who would benefit from this proposal. Under my amendment, the amount which could be allotted to the sugarbeet industry is 275,000 tons, which is approximately 10 percent of its current allotment. The amount that could be allotted to the mainland cane producers is 225,000 tons, which is better than 20 percent of its total. The mainland cane producers have a far more serious problem than do the beet producers. Their oversupply, the weight of their surplus inventory, is percentagewise much heavier than that of the beet producers.

As I said earlier, the names of four Senators from mainland cane-sugar-producing States are included as sponsors of the amendment I have submitted. So I hope that no Senator will think that this is only an attempt of the beet-sugar producers to take care of their situation. This is a program to take care of all the mainland sugar producers; and, as I say, the need of the mainland cane producers is relatively much more drastic than the need of the mainland beet producers.

The Senator from Hawaii ridiculed my statement that the administration encouraged the production of domestic sugar. I have, and shall offer for the RECORD, a letter addressed by Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman to Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK, Speaker of the House of Representatives, dated December 20, 1963.

Attached to that letter was a resolution which the Secretary asked the Speaker of the House to have introduced for consideration. Let me read the resolution and the letter to the Senate:

DECEMBER 20, 1963.

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker, House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Transmitted herewith for the consideration of the Congress is a proposed joint resolution to amend the Sugar Act of 1948 to permit unlimited marketings of sugar by the domestic sugar producing areas during the calendar year 1964. Under the Sugar Act the U.S. sugar market is divided by a quota system among various groups of suppliers—the domestic beet sugar area, the mainland cane sugar area, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, individual foreign countries and foreign countries as a group which supply sugar under the global quota.

Early this year, when it became clear that world supplies of sugar would be tight, all acreage restrictions on domestic producers for this year and next year were removed. Both beet and sugarcane producers in the continental United States are harvesting all-time high record crops. Beet sugar production is expected to be 20 percent and mainland cane 40 percent above last year's levels. It is estimated that sugar production in the continental United States from the current crop could be as much as 500,000 tons more than the sum of the mainland beet and cane quotas for 1964.

The world price for raw sugar as of November 26 was 11 cents per pound as compared to 8.10 cents at the end of September. The rapid rise has been attributed primarily to reports of disappointing crops in U.S.S.R. and Poland and to damage to the Cuban crop by hurricane Flora. The price for raw sugar imported into the United States is substantially below the world price. For instance, on November 26 it was 3.4 cents lower than adjusted to reflect duty and freight, but still 2 cents above the price reference in section 201 of the act. Our market is separated from the world market because of the large import commitments that we have this year.

The proposal to permit our domestic areas to market all available sugar next year would result in lower imports of sugar from the world market and would lessen upward pressures on prices which are far above normal.

The Department recommends the adoption of the proposed resolution.

To the extent that this resolution reduces imports of sugar into the United States and eventually increases the production of domestic sugar, tariff revenue to the Treasury will be reduced by $12.50 per ton of sugar and direct Government payments to producers of mainland sugar crops increased by about $15 per ton. Thus, if imports are curtailed by 250,000 tons in 1964, tariff revenue would be reduced by $3,125,000 in that year. In future years, if domestic stocks of sugar are replenished by a corresponding quantity, Government payments to domestic producers would be increased by $3,750,000.

On the other hand, the proposed resolution would not only provide additional assurance to sugar consumers against high prices in the period while world stocks are being replenished but would substantially benefit our balance-of-payment accounts. A reduction of 250,000 tons in our imports in 1964—calculated on the basis of the domestic c.i.f. price of November 26—would amount to $42 million. Calculated in line with the price referred to in section 201 of the act, the savings would be $31 million. Furthermore, to the extent that the proposed resolution would lower the price of that sugar which is imported, both sugar consumers and the balance-of-payment accounts would benefit. Such benefits would be many times the cost referred to in the preceding paragraph.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the presentation of this proposed joint resolution from the standpoint of the administration's program.

A similar letter is being sent to the President pro tempore of the Senate.

Sincerely yours,
ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
Secretary.

JOINT RESOLUTION TO SUSPEND DURING THE CALENDAR YEAR 1964, RESTRICTIONS ON MARKETING OF DOMESTICALLY PRODUCED SUGAR UNDER THE SUGAR ACT OF 1948, AS AMENDED

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That notwithstanding any provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, the quantity of sugar produced from sugarbeets or sugarcane grown in the continental United States, and the quantity of raw sugar produced from sugarcane grown in Hawaii, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands may be marketed during the calendar year 1964 without regard to any quotas, penalties or other restrictions provided for in such Act.

Mr. President, what did the Speaker of the House do with that letter? He placed it in a pigeonhole and forgot it.

It may be just coincidence that he also comes from Boston where there are many large sugar refineries and he was not anxious to see the proposal of the Secretary of Agriculture adopted.

Let me read to the Senate from President Johnson's agricultural message to Congress of January 31, 1964—this year:

[From President Johnson's agricultural message to Congress, Jan. 31, 1964]

4. Sugar: The rise in sugar prices in 1963 reflected a reduction in world supplies. The Cuban crop was about one-half the pre-Castro level. Europe had two poor sugarbeet crops. But the fears voiced last year that the United States would be unable to obtain sufficient sugar proved groundless.

> Action by the Department of Agriculture assured sugar users an adequate supply and helped halt the price increases that attended heavy buying in anticipation of shortages.
>
> However, the experience of the past year—and the fact that foreign sugar quotas expire at the end of 1964—highlight the need for some action at this session of Congress to assure ample supplies of sugar to consumers at fair prices.
>
> I recommend the removal of marketing restrictions on the sale of domestically produced sugar during the calendar year 1964. This legislation will relieve the pressure on world market supplies at a time when these supplies are short.
>
> The effectiveness of our present arrangements for foreign sugar procurement are under intensive study. On the basis of this study I shall—early in this session—make recommendations for remedial legislation.

I do not know how anyone could obtain a stronger statement as to the position of the administration than this statement made by the President and the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield?

Mr. BENNETT. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. BENNETT. If the Senator from Louisiana will yield himself 10 minutes of his own time.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. If I recall correctly, the amendment the Senator is offering is the amendment being proposed by the Johnson administration, as the answer made by the Secretary of Agriculture. My understanding is that this is what the Department of Agriculture believes is needed, in order to alleviate a serious situation which exists for the sugarcane producers and the sugarbeet producers in this country, based on their performance and relying upon the word of the Secretary of Agriculture; is that not correct?

Mr. BENNETT. The record shows that in December of last year the Secretary of Agriculture sent up a resolution asking for its consideration. It was ignored by the Speaker of the House and the chairman of the House Agriculture Committee. Less than a month later, it was followed up by a statement from the President himself recommending that the marketing allotments be eliminated for the year 1964.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. So that we understand the Senator correctly, the position of the Senator—as he stands on the Republican side of the aisle—is the position of the administration—that is, this Democratic administration. It is an administration-supported measure which he is offering as an amendment. This is what the Secretary of Agriculture and the President feel is needed to fulfill the commitments they made to the sugarbeet producers and the sugarcane producers, when they told them to go ahead and produce sugar. Now they find they have a surplus running out of their ears, we might say. They have sugar everywhere. They need a market for it, and thus they need a quota to sell it. What the Senator is trying to get agreement on is not only what the producers need but also what the administration is asking for.

Mr. BENNETT. The administration certainly asked for it in December 1963, and January of this year.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. BENNETT. The Senator from Louisiana is on limited time.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Let me make just one reply. As I understand it, 1964 is the year the administration was asking for, not 1965.

Mr. BENNETT. No. This bill allows increased marketing quotas only for the remainder of 1964. There is no request in my amendment for an increase in quotas beyond December 31, 1964. I am happy to correct the impression the Senator from Massachusetts may have.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield, on my own time?

Mr. BENNETT. I yield.

Mr. INOUYE. For the RECORD, I should like to state that last Friday the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Murphy, submitted a message to the House and the Senate, with a copy of a bill; and this was the administration's position, and this was the administration's bill. That bill provided for one simple thing: a 6-month extension from the quota section of the Sugar Act of 1962. It had nothing to do with increased tonnage or acreage restrictions. It was simply a 6-month extension.

Mr. BENNETT. I am making the point which the Senator from Hawaii discussed earlier, that a year ago the administration was encouraging the production of mainland sugar. In addition that was not the full administration proposal. I cannot think of anything more encouraging than the statements which were made in December and January.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield?

Mr. BENNETT. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. As I understand it, at the end of this crop year, our producers will have on hand a million and a half tons of sugar for which they have no quotas. What we are trying to do is allow them to sell some of their sugar, because they need to be able to sell it. Some of the producers are new concerns which were financed by money borrowed from the Government, in some instances—also co-ops trying to find ways to sell their sugar, having raised and produced the sugar at the urging of the U.S. Government at a time when sugar was 13 cents a pound.

Mr. BENNETT. That is the problem. I am going back to another part of the discussion of the Senator from Hawaii. The Hawaiians produce raw sugar which has to be refined. Most of it is refined by the California & Hawaiian Sugar Co. on the west coast. The statement has been made by the Senator from Massachusetts, I believe, that those who are opposed to the Bennett amendment are fighting for lower prices on sugar, and that if the amendment should be adopted, the price will rise, and that beet sugar prices are always higher than the prices of sugar made from cane.

I hold in my hand the annual report of the California & Hawaiian Sugar Co. for 1963. I read from the president's statement, and it is interesting material:

> Under terms of the beet purchase contract, the price that beet processors pay for sugar beets is determined by the price at which they sell refined sugar thus, even in such a period as we experienced in 1963, beet processors were able to hold down the price of their principal raw material simply by not raising the refined price.
>
> * * * * *
>
> Beet processors took full advantage of the situation. Despite the necessity of higher cane refined prices, some beet processors chose to continue to supply customers at close to former prices. At times during May, the beet price in the northwest was $40 per ton below California and Hawaiian prices in the same areas, and $71 per ton below prices in the northeast.

Mr. President, I believe that the blanket charge that beet sugar is always more expensive than cane sugar has been blown out of the water forever by this statement.

The president of the company goes on to say:

> We attempted to keep our refined prices in reasonable relation to raw quotations. To achieve this, California and Hawaii were forced to lead in every west coast price increase except one, and still we were only partially successful.

Except one.

Continuing to read:

> Our pressure to increase prices was a calculated risk with the negative consequences being a serious strain on customer relations and a loss of some business to competitors.

For a long time, the beet industry has been held up as the "bogeyman" responsible for the high price of sugar to all consumers.

We have gone through an experience which indicated that this is not so. And there was, as the result of this situation, the ability of the beet industry and the mainland cane industry to produce sugar and sell it at prices below the price of foreign sugar in 1963, that led to the Secretary's recommendation and the President's mention of a need for unlimited marketing quotas in the year 1964.

The Senator from Hawaii and I had an argument about what happened in the House Committee on Agriculture on yesterday. I have a joint news release released by Representatives CATHERINE MAY and DON SHORT, both of whom were present at that meeting. It makes very interesting reading. I should like to read part of it. It reads:

> Immediately after an executive meeting of the committee this noon, Chairman HAROLD D. COOLEY, Democrat, of North Carolina, reportedly had told newsmen, "We called the meeting to see who was going to kill cock robin, now we know. It was the beet producers."
>
> The May-Short statement said:
>
> "We don't wonder that the chairman used the cock robin analogy in referring to the committee hearings, because both the perfunctory open hearing and the abruptly

adjourned executive meeting which followed were strictly for the birds.

"It came as a great surprise to us, after all these months of delay, that the chairman called any open hearing at all. But when he did, he broke committee precedent on hearing witnesses in an even more surprising way. He didn't even show the common courtesy of asking the Department of Agriculture and the Department of State witnesses who were present to testify on the bill that their own administration had proposed. Then, out of a room packed with representatives from all portions of the industry, he called only two witnesses—one for the beet producers and one for the mainland cane producers. Both of these witnesses gave execellent and convincing reasons why our American growers should be permitted to market part of the sugar which their own government had asked them to produce as a means of stabilizing the chaotic sugar market last year. Following these statements, the chairman summarily dismissed all the others who had come to testify and announced there would be an immediate executive session.

"In other words we were not permitted to hear the administration's justification for proposing an extension of the Sugar Act without any relief for the American sugar producer. Nor were we permitted to question the cane sugar refiners' representatives. Perhaps the leadership on the committee felt that such questions would result in some feathers being ruffled, maybe even a few being plucked.

"But in the executive session that followed it became clear that it was the influences of refiners of foreign cane on the committee leadership—and the threat of that influence on the House leadership—that made sitting ducks of those of us who sought relief for the American sugar farmer."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator wish to yield additional time to himself? The 10 minutes have expired.

Mr. BENNETT. The Senator will yield himself 3 additional minutes. The time being limited, I ask unanimous consent that the entire news release be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the news release was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Release From the Offices of U.S. Representative Catherine May and Representative Don Short

Washington.—The arguments swirling around Capitol Hill today as to "who killed cock robin"—two sugar bills, subject of brief House Agriculture Committee meeting this morning—by late afternoon stood 3 to 1 in favor of blaming U.S. refiners of foreign cane sugar.

Congresswoman Catherine May, Republican, of Washington, and Congressman Don Short, Republican, of North Dakota, issued a joint statement agreeing in essence with an earlier verdict by Congressman Harlan Hagen, Democrat, of California, that the committee failed to report out a bill because of possible blocking action in the House by cane refining interests.

Immediately after an executive meeting of the committee this noon, Chairman Harold D. Cooley, Democrat, of North Carolina, reportedly had told newsmen, "We called the meeting to see who was going to kill cock robin; now we know. It was the beet producers."

The May-Short statement said:

"We don't wonder that the chairman used the cock robin analogy in referring to the committee hearings, because both the perfunctory open hearing and the abruptly adjourned executive meeting which followed were strictly for the birds.

"It came as a great surprise to us, after all these months of delay, that the chairman called any open hearing at all. But when he did, he broke committee precedent on hearing witnesses in an even more surprising way. He didn't even show the common courtesy of asking the Department of Agriculture and the Department of State witnesses who were present to testify on the bill that their own administration had proposed. Then, out of a room packed with representatives from all portions of the industry, he called only two witnesses—one for the beet producers and one for the mainland cane producers. Both of these witnesses gave excellent and convincing reasons why our American growers should be permitted to market part of the sugar which their own Government had asked them to produce as a means of stabilizing the chaotic sugar market last year. Following these statements, the chairman summarily dismissed all the others who had come to testify and announced there would be an immediate executive session.

"In other words we were not permitted to hear the administration's justification for proposing an extension of the Sugar Act without any relief for the American sugar producer. Nor were we permitted to question the cane sugar refiners' representatives. Perhaps the leadership on the committee felt that such questions would result in some feathers being ruffled, maybe even a few being plucked.

"But in the executive session that followed it became clear that it was the influences of refiners of foreign cane on the committee leadership—and the threat of that influence on the House leadership—that made sitting ducks of those of us who sought relief for the American sugar farmer.

"It was well known by all members of the committee that the refiners of foreign cane sugar would not support legislation that would authorize relief marketing for the domestic sugar producers. Nevertheless, a majority of the committee felt that additional marketing authorization should be included in any sugar bill the committee might report. We felt all Members of Congress should have a chance to decide, after full and open debate on the floors of both Houses, whether our domestic sugar farmers could market this extra sugar, or whether they should be penalized through having to pay burdensome storage charges on the sugar they produced at the request of the U.S. Government.

"But our request for an opportunity to vote on this issue was denied. After much discussion by some members of the committee on the possible action of the cane sugar refiners' votes in Congress, the meeting was abruptly adjourned."

Congressmen Short and May then added, "We're not confused by cock robin stories. American sugar farmers won't be confused either. The determination of our chairman to refuse any increase in marketing was the arrow that shot down their bluebird of hope."

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I wish to read these particularly important words:

It was well known by all members of the committee that the refiners of foreign cane sugar would not support legislation that would authorize relief marketing for the domestic sugar producers. Nevertheless, a majority of the committee felt that additional marketing authorization should be included in any sugar bill the committee might report. We felt all Members of Congress should have a chance to decide, after full and open debate on the floors of both Houses, whether our domestic sugar farmers could market this extra sugar, or whether they should be penalized through having to pay burdensome storage charges on the sugar they produced at the request of the U.S. Government.

But our request for an opportunity to vote on this issue was denied. After much discussion by some members of the committee on the possible action of the cane sugar refiners' votes in Congress, the meeting was abruptly adjourned.

Congressmen Short and May then added, "We're not confused by cock robin stories. American sugar farmers won't be confused either. The determination of our chairman to refuse any increase in marketing was the arrow that shot down their bluebird of hope."

I repeat that this bill would help the domestic cane producers more than the domestic beet producers, in the proportion of 2 to 1. The bill would not provide automatic quotas. It would merely allow the Secretary to authorize additional marketing quotas up to the figures that I have given. I hope that the amendment of the Senator from Hawaii will be rejected.

Mr. President, I have had a request from the Senator from Delaware [Mr. Williams] to yield 5 minutes to him out of the time allowed on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware [Mr. Williams] is recognized.

THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA STADIUM CONTRACT

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the following item appeared on Monday on the wire service:

> Acting Attorney General Nicholas Katzenbach said yesterday that Bobby Baker will be treated like any other "potential criminal * * * because that's the way President Johnson wants it."
>
> Katzenbach said the Justice Department would ask for an indictment against the former Senate majority secretary if there were evidence "we can show in court." But he said that the Department does not now have such evidence.

This is a shocking admission on the part of the Acting Attorney General that he is discussing the question of criminal prosecution in the case of Mr. Bobby Baker with the President of the United States. The Attorney General of the United States is supposed to enforce the laws on the basis of equality to all men and not on the basis of how well the individual involved may know the President.

I strongly question the propriety of the Attorney General in making any such statements, especially when his Department is supposed to still be investigating this case upon orders of the President.

Furthermore, Mr. Katzenbach's statement that his Department as yet has no evidence with which to seek an indictment means that the Attorney General sees no violation of the law:

First. When an individual, especially an employee of the U.S. Government, accepts kickbacks or payoffs from contractors doing business with the U.S. Government.

Second. For an individual, especially an employee of the U.S. Government, to keep $40,000 to $50,000 in $100 bills always readily available in a file drawer in his office—apparently no questions are to be asked either by the Departments of Justice or Treasury as to how he got this money.

Third. When an individual applying for a Government loan files a false financial statement.

Fourth. When an individual or company filing its tax returns forges the name of a responsible accountant as having prepared such returns.

Fifth. When an employee of the U.S. Senate enters into business arrangements financed by Mr. James Hoffa of the Teamsters Union while at the same time a Senate committee and the Department of Justice are investigating Mr. Hoffa's activities.

Sixth. For an employee of the Government to file a false statement with the Federal Housing Administration in order to obtain attractive living quarters for his secretary.

Seventh. For an employee of the United States to use his official position to encourage the enactment of legislation and then in turn accept kickbacks or profitable arrangements from the individuals benefiting.

Eighth. When an employee of the U.S. Senate accepts a $600 or $800 stereo set as a gift while serving as an employee of the U.S. Government.

Ninth. When an employee of the U.S. Government helps a company in a foreign country to get its inspection certificate and then accepts a brokerage on all meat imported from that country.

Tenth. When an employee of the Senate accepts kickbacks from the salaries of his subordinates.

Eleventh. When an employee of the Government helps a company get a special ruling from a Government agency and then in turn buys stock in that company for approximately 10 percent of the prevailing market price.

Twelfth. When an employee of the Senate charges his personal as well as his business long-distance telephone calls to the U.S. Government.

Thirteenth. When an employee of the Senate charges to the American taxpayers a substantial part of the cost of the grand opening of his motel by using the facilities and equipment of the Senate restaurant at a very low fee.

Fourteenth. When an employee of the Senate arranges with an airline which is seeking Government contracts to furnish free transportation for 80 public officials from Washington to Nevada to attend a Democratic fundraising dinner—that company later got its contracts.

Fifteenth. When a Senate employee for a payment of only $4,600 accepts stock with a quoted market value in excess of $30,000 from a Washington lobbyist who has a special interest in the legislation proposals being dealt with by the Senate.

Sixteenth. When an individual, especially an employee of the U.S. Government, charges off on his income tax returns several thousand dollars annually under the label of expenses for doing business without providing any itemized breakdown whatsoever.

And finally—

Seventeenth. When any individual—particularly an employee of the U.S. Government—pyramids his net worth from $80,000 to $2¼ million in a 4-year period, creating very little if any tax liability with no questions asked.

Of course, as I outline the above items to point out just what the Attorney General's statement means as to how the law will be interpreted for Mr. Robert Baker I should call one important point to the attention of all other American citizens before they try to get away with this same procedure; and that is, to be very sure that just as in this case the Attorney General has first cleared their cases with higher authorities.

Mr. Katzenbach's statement clearly establishes that the administration is determined to whitewash the Bobby Baker case, and after reading his statement, I can now understand why his representatives, in a most recent conference in my office, were more interested in where I was getting my information than in the information itself.

CORRECTION OF CERTAIN ERRORS IN THE TARIFF SCHEDULES OF THE UNITED STATES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 12253) to correct certain errors in the tariff schedules of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah wish to yield back his time?

Mr. BENNETT. Does any Senator wish time on the amendment?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. BENNETT. Just a moment. Is this in favor of the amendment?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, under the unanimous consent agreement, I reserved the right to yield as much as 10 minutes to any Senator.

Mr. BENNETT. I understand.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, before the Senate votes on the question, I hope that Senators will consider carefully what is proposed. A very serious situation might result from the proposal. The statement has been made that the bill is an administration bill. It is not an administration bill at all. The position of the administration is clearly outlined in the letter of the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture. A 6 months' extension has been requested. The administration does not desire the quota question to be brought into that subject. Comity between the two Houses of Congress is involved.

We know what the proposal is designed to do. It would permit the bill to go to the Ways and Means Committee of the House, even though we know that proposed sugar legislation has always been handled by the House Committee on Agriculture. The amendment is intended to short circuit the House Committee on Agriculture.

It is a frightful proposal. If the Senate wishes to remain here for the remainder of the year, this is a good way to be sure that it will. The chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, Mr. COOLEY, is in a similar position in relation to his committee in the House as is the Senator from New Mexico in relation to the committee of which he is chairman. Mr. COOLEY is the chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture. How would Senators like it if the next time a sugar bill should come up, it would be tacked on to an agriculture bill of the House, so that it would go to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the Senate, thus taking away jurisdiction of the subject from the Senate Finance Committee? Senators would shriek about how awful it was to take it away from the distinguished chairman of the Finance Committee, a man whom I greatly revere and respect, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. That would be a horrible thing to do. But some Senators believe that it would be all right to take the subject of the bill from HAROLD COOLEY if he does not agree with the position of certain Senators.

Mr. President, I believe the proposal is disgraceful.

If the Senate wishes to pass a measure which would extend the act for 6 months, fine. But let us not use the proposal as a vehicle to short circuit the Agriculture Committee of the House. The Agriculture Committee of the House has thought about it, has considered it, and has turned it down. Never mind how, why, or anything else. It has taken action. I hope that we shall not try to do something here which would violate the comity which exists between the two Houses of Congress.

If Senators wish to imply or state that the bill is an administration bill, I suggest that they state what the administration has asked for. Do not tack on something that the administration does not want at this time. The administration has asked for all it wanted. If it wanted more, representatives of the administration know how to write the English language and they could have submitted their request. But they did not. The message of the administration which was sent to the Congress did not include that last paragraph. It should not be foisted on the Senate as an administration program because it is not in accordance with the expressed desire of the administration. I think we should say so frankly and not discuss the question in any other way.

Mr. President, I do not like the Sugar Act. Many Senators know that I do not like the Sugar Act. I do not believe that it is proper legislation at all. But proper revision should be made by the appropriate committees of the Congress, which are the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives. The Senate committee has not considered the question at all.

A great deal has been said on the floor of the Senate about the fact that a health care bill came to the Senate without a recommendation from the Finance Committee. At least we know that it was considered by the Finance Committee. The committee had an opportunity to vote on the measure. The Finance Committee voted it down. But it is now proposed that the Finance Committee shall not have an opportunity to look at the amendment.

Mr. President, it would be a horrible thing to do. I have tried to defend the rights of the committees of Congress in relation to agricultural subjects. The measure should go to the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture in the House. I would not like it if Members of the House cooked up a scheme which would short circuit the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the Senate, whose chairman is the able Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER].

Mr. President, that is what the proposal would do. We might as well call it what it is.

It is a device to get around the ordinary rules of parliamentary procedure to keep an agriculture committee from getting its hand on a bill which rightfully belongs to that committee.

Mr. President, it would be a great mistake.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The question as to whether the members of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House or the members of the House Committee on Agriculture should be the conferees on the bill is a matter for the House to decide. It is not the privilege of the Senate. The Senate has no power to tell the House whom the House shall name as conferees on a bill. That is a question which the House of Representatives will decide for itself. The Speaker of the House, the Parliamentarian, and the Representatives in the House will assist in making that decision.

The Senate Committee on Finance has jurisdiction over the Sugar Act. The Sugar Act involves a tariff. It involves a quota. It involves a tax. It is a question for the Senate Finance Committee, and we must wait until a bill comes from the House involving our jurisdiction in order to attach to such a bill an amendment of the type proposed, because the whole thing is a tax-tariff-quota arrangement, all of which is within the jurisdiction of the Senate Finance Committee.

If other Senators can come to the floor of the Senate and offer amendments, as they have done in good conscience and in good faith, the senior member of the Finance Committee can come here and offer an amendment on a Finance Committee bill.

A large number of senior members of the Committee on Finance support the amendment. Why did the administration not ask for something in the way of a marketing quota? Because over on the House side Mr. COOLEY has taken the side of the refiners as against the side of the producers. I do not blame him. The people whom he represents do not produce sugar. They refine it. On the other hand, on the Finance Committee are Senators who need to save sugar producers from a dire situation that will happen if the act expires. These people wish to sell the sugar they produce under the urging of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Tax and tariff bills must originate in the House. The only bills that we can amend in the Senate are House-passed tax bills. So far as committee jurisdiction is concerned, we must amend a bill that comes from the Senate Finance Committee.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. If no proposed legislation were enacted, what would happen to the beet quotas that have been assigned to the States of Maine and New York? I believe 40,000 acres were assigned to Maine and a number of acres to New York? Would those States not lose those quotas?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I do not believe that the proposal would have any effect on those quotas.

Mr. AIKEN. Would it have no effect?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Not on the quotas, but I am advised that the price of sugar would collapse. The price of sugar to producers in my State and elsewhere would be cut drastically.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. The measure would bear on sugar which was produced last year and would have no bearing on sugar produced this year. It would have no bearing on the new acreage which has been allotted.

Mr. AIKEN. What would happen to the sugar produced on the new acres?

Mr. McCARTHY. Those acres would go into production.

Mr. AIKEN. In 6 months it will be too late to plant beets in the Northern States.

Mr. McCARTHY. They will have an allocation, and they will have a market.

Mr. AIKEN. Would they plant just the same whether or not there was a law on the subject?

Mr. McCARTHY. They have authority to plant now. The measure would have no bearing whatsoever on their operations. In effect, it is stated that 500,000 tons of the domestic market quota that would otherwise go to the global quota would be reserved for American production. If that were not done, it would mean that in addition to the excess supply which we now have, we would bring 500,000 additional tons into the domestic market from foreign sources. That action would unquestionably have a depressing effect on the market price, which I believe would be depressed in any event.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Minnesota is from a beet producing State.

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes; my State is an important beet producing State. Between North Dakota and Minnesota a new plant will be going into effect. So if the proposal were in anywise to disadvantage that plant, we would have to weigh the situation.

Mr. AIKEN. They would not be able to get the maximum benefit from the new quotas unless proposed legislation were enacted.

Mr. McCARTHY. They could obtain a full quota. The problem we have is that assigned acreage was expanded because of the sugar situation last year. What we are dealing with is excess production which came from acreage allotments—acreage which was not in the ordinary allocation, but expanded acreage.

Mr. AIKEN. Then the quota which was assigned to New York and Maine would not be dependent on the allocation of new acreage to beet production. Is that correct?

Mr. McCARTHY. When these areas came into production, as they certainly would, if they came in in 1965, the prices that the producers would receive would be somewhat improved by virtue of the action proposed to be taken today. They would have their acreage and their market. The refiners would take their production, and they would have a production in a market which would have, in addition to what it now has, an additional 500,000 tons.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, the Senator from Utah is prepared to yield back the remainder of his time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having either expired or been yielded back, the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE] to the amendment of the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT]. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll, and Mr. AIKEN voted "nay."

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair advises the Senator that the senior Senator from Vermont has voted. The rollcall will proceed.

The legislative clerk resumed and concluded the call of the roll.

Mr. MAGNUSON (after having voted in the negative). Mr. President, on this vote I have a pair with the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea"; if I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I withdraw my vote.

Mr. COTTON (after having voted in the negative). Mr. President, on this vote I have a pair with the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea"; if I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I therefore withdraw my vote.

Mr. METCALF (after having voted in the negative). Mr. President, on this vote I have a pair with the Senator from California [Mr. SALINGER]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea";

if I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I therefore withdraw my vote.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Burdick], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. Cannon] the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Church], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Johnston], the Senator from Texas [Mr. Yarborough], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Young], and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Hayden] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy] and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Hill] are absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Edmondson], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Hartke], the Senator from Florida [Mr. Holland], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. Humphrey], the Senator from Washington [Mr. Jackson], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGovern], the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss], the Senator from Maine [Mr. Muskie], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. Neuberger], the Senator from California [Mr. Salinger], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Symington] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Burdick], the Senator from Washington [Mr. Jackson], the Senator from Florida [Mr. Holland], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Hartke], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Young] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Dominick], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Beall], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Case], the Senators from Nebraska [Mr. Curtis and Mr. Hruska], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Goldwater], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Jordan], the Senator from New York [Mr. Keating], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Morton], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Thurmond], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Dominick], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Jordan], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Beall] is paired with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska]. If present and voting, the Senator from Maryland would vote "yea" and the Senator from Nebraska would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott] is paired with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Curtis]. If present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "yea" and the Senator from Nebraska would vote "nay."

The pair of the Senator from New York [Mr. Keating] has been previously announced.

The result was announced—yeas 27, nays 34, as follows:

[No. 589 Leg.]

YEAS—27

Anderson
Bartlett
Brewster
Byrd, W. Va.
Dodd
Douglas
Ervin
Fong
Fulbright
Gore
Inouye
Javits
Jordan, N.C.
McIntyre
Monroney
Nelson
Pastore
Pell
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Russell
Saltonstall
Sparkman
Talmadge
Walters
Williams, N.J.

NAYS—34

Aiken
Allott
Bayh
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Byrd, Va.
Carlson
Cooper
Dirksen
Eastland
Ellender
Hart
Hickenlooper
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McNamara
Mechem
Morse
Mundt
Pearson
Prouty
Robertson
Simpson
Smathers
Smith
Stennis
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.

NOT VOTING—39

Beall
Burdick
Cannon
Case
Church
Clark
Cotton
Curtis
Dominick
Edmondson
Goldwater
Gruening
Hartke
Hayden
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Humphrey
Jackson
Johnston
Jordan, Idaho
Keating
Kennedy
Magnuson
McGee
McGovern
Metcalf
Miller
Morton
Moss
Muskie
Neuberger
Salinger
Scott
Symington
Thurmond
Tower
Yarborough
Young, Ohio

So Mr. Inouye's amendment to Mr. Bennett's amendment was rejected.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. KUCHEL. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that the Senator from Louisiana has only 1 minute remaining.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. My understanding was—and there might be some misunderstanding about this—that I would be privileged to yield as much as 10 minutes to any Senator. I had in mind a Senator who might wish to say something about a pending amendment, inasmuch as no time was allotted under the bill. Therefore it was my understanding that I could yield 10 minutes, as the Senator in charge of the bill, to any Senator who might feel that perhaps he had been prejudiced because he could not get an adequate allocation of time. That is what I had in mind when I asked that I might be permitted to yield 10 minutes to any Senator.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that 2 hours be allowed on the bill, to be equally divided.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would like to inquire whether the Senator from Illinois now proposes a unanimous-consent request concerning time on the bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. This is a unanimous-consent request to allow 2 hours for debate on the bill.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. To be equally divided.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President——

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield me half a minute?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield 30 seconds, on the bill, to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, my colleague from Washington, the junior Senator [Mr. Jackson], if present, would have voted "nay" on the Inouye amendment, and would vote "yea" on the Bennett amendment. I would have done the same thing. However, I received a personal call from the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy], who wished to be recorded on the amendment. As a matter of courtesy I felt that I should pair with him. I want the Record to show that Senator would have voted "nay" on the last vote. He could not obtain a pair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair wishes to advise the Senator from Louisiana that he was not occupying the chair at the time the unanimous-consent agreement was entered and did not understand that the agreement as to yielding additional time was as the Senator from Louisiana stated. Therefore, without objection, the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen] is agreed to.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished Senator from New York.

ADELA: A PARTNERSHIP FOR FREEDOM

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, today's announcement from Paris that the ADELA Investment Co.—Atlantic Community Development Group for Latin America—is now organized and open for business is one of the most historic and important developments since the end of World War II in the struggle to accelerate the development of the industrially underdeveloped areas of the free world. ADELA is concerned with Latin America, but its effects could be worldwide.

The company gives substance to the principle that the resources and technical know-how of private enterprise in the Atlantic Community and elsewhere must be effectively organized and coordinated and used if the free world is to win its struggle to develop the nonindustrial areas of the world in accord with the principles of freedom.

ADELA is the first major effort of leading elements of private business and banking in Europe, the United States, Japan, and Latin America, to come to the aid of the private enterprise system in the underdeveloped areas of the free world. It signals a partnership between private enterprise of the industrially developed and the underdeveloped countries which, I am convinced, holds within itself the key to success of the free world in Latin America, Africa, the Middle East, and Asia.

ADELA is a multinational, private investment group with shareholders representing 51 industrial firms, banks, and financial institutions in Western Europe, the United States, Canada, and Japan. In the words of Marcus Wallenberg, Sr., of Sweden, who has just been elected chairman of the ADELA board, this effort will be widely recognized as a "model" for similar efforts in other parts of the world.

It is interesting to note that the ADELA concept was first initiated in November 1962 by the Economic Committee of the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference, of which I am Chairman. To me, it is an outstanding example of the effective cooperation that can be made for freedom and for an effective policy to win over communism by the legislators and private sectors of the free world nations.

I call attention to the fact that ADELA will cooperate with private enterprise in Latin America as well as with international private and public agencies, not only in seeking projects attractive from an investment standpoint, but most importantly, projects that promise to be useful and significant for the economic development of Latin American countries.

This organization, which starts with an investment capital of $16 million—and will be capitalized at $20 million by the yearend—should be tremendously encouraging to the people of Latin America. They should know that private enterprise is the best means of attaining higher standards of living and victory over their age-old enemies of disease, poverty, and ignorance. The list of ADELA subscribers, including some of the leading banks and industrial concerns in the free world, gives assurances of the potential effectiveness of ADELA's action, of the tremendous technical assistance it can provide, which itself far overshadows the investment capital involved. The list of subscribers also reflects great credit on the willingness of the private enterprise system to undertake a monumental project in the public interest.

The people of the United States and the world should be grateful to the industrial and banking leaders who have been at the forefront of this effort. They include: Howard C. Petersen, president of the Fidelity-Philadelphia Trust Co., who was elected vice chairman of the ADELA Board; Emilio G. Collado, director of the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, and George S. Moore, president of the First National City Bank of New York, directors of ADELA, and Dr. Giovanni Agnelli, of Italy, vice chairman of Fiat, both members of the ADELA Executive Committee; and Ernest Keller, of Peru, managing director of ADELA. For the last 9 months Mr. Collado and Mr. Moore, together with other associates, including Forrest Murden and Jack Bennett, both of New York, have devoted themselves indefatigably to the details of organizing ADELA.

This activity followed a meeting in January in Paris, which marked the transition of the ADELA project from the research and exploratory stage to a practical working company. A debt of gratitude is also owed to the three executive directors of the project, who carried on the tremendous labors of the research and exploratory phase: Dr. Aurelio Peccei, of Rome, was loaned to the project by Fiat, of Italy; Warren Wilhelm, of New York, loaned by the Texaco Corp.; and Julio del Solar, of the Inter-American Development Bank.

Between November 1962 and this January the work of organizing ADELA was carried on by myself, as chairman of the Working Party of the NATO Parliamentarians Conference, and Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, who at my invitation, acted with me. We received financial help from the Ford Foundation and other benefactors.

Now that ADELA has been formally launched, with the active support of so many of the free world's major firms, I believe its successes will exceed even the hopes of those who helped it on its way. I believe that ADELA will be a model for the private sectors of the free world, providing the base for formation of similar groups to bring the vitality and initiative of the private enterprise system into the monumental task of building the basis for free institutions in the underdeveloped nations of the world.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the press release announcing the organization of ADELA.

There being no objection, the press release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADELA Holds First Board Meeting—Multination Investment Group for Latin America Reports Subscription of Over $16 Million

PARIS, September 30.—The ADELA Investment Co.—a unique multination private investment group for Latin America—held its first board of directors meeting here today, selected a chairman and officers and reported that more than US$16 million has already been subscribed.

ADELA, which was incorporated in Luxembourg on September 24 with an authorized capital of US$40 million, will provide private enterprise in Latin America with equity capital and technical and managerial resources on a sound investment basis.

The group's shareholders are 51 important industrial companies, banks and financial institutions in Western Europe, the United States, Canada and Japan (see list of subscribers attached).

At the first board meeting today Marcus Wallenberg, Sr., of Sweden was elected chairman. Howard C. Petersen of the United States was elected vice chairman. Dr. Wallenberg is vice chairman of the Stockholms Enskilda Bank. Mr. Petersen is president of the Fidelity-Philadelphia Trust Co.

ADELA will be active in those Latin American countries which maintain a favorable investment climate with reasonable political, economic and monetary stability and furnish adequate assurances for the development of private enterprise. It will cooperate with Latin American entrepreneurs and with national and international industrial, banking and financial institutions in projects which are attractive from an investment standpoint and at the same time promise to be useful and significant for the economic development of Latin American countries. Consultation with interested Latin American international and national institutions has indicated that this effort is being well received.

The company has been developed over an 18-month period, and during the last 9 months was under the direct supervision of an international organizing committee under the cochairmanship of Dr. Giovanni Agnelli, of Italy, vice chairman of Fiat, and Mr. Emilio G. Collado, of the United States, director and vice president of Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey. The newly formed ADELA company confirmed the $500,000 equity investment made earlier in its name in Forjas de Colombia, a new forge plant in Bucaramanga, Colombia. This investment was made in collaboration with the International Finance Corporation, and with Colombian and German investors.

Dr. Wallenberg called the formation of ADELA "a historic undertaking in the field of international private enterprise." He said that ADELA's multinational character, its large number of participants and the substantial financial, technical, and managerial resources they are able to bring to Latin America are unprecedented.

"Every one of ADELA's shareholders expects ADELA to participate in sound business investments on a realistic basis," Dr. Wallenberg declared. "ADELA, therefore, is a vote of confidence in the future of private investment in Latin America. We hope it will be a model for similar investment projects in other parts of the world."

Dr. Wallenberg added that by the end of the year he expected a number of additional shareholders to join ADELA, bringing the total amount subscribed to more than $20 million. It is anticipated that additional companies, including several from countries not now represented, will join ADELA in the coming months, and directors from these will be chosen at a special shareholders' meeting of ADELA in early 1965.

At today's meeting the board also elected an executive committee including the chairman and vice chairman, Dr. Giovanni Agnelli, of Italy, Emilo G. Collado, of the United States, and Ernst Keller, of Peru. Mr. Keller, a Swiss national, was formerly managing director and chief executive officer of Peruinvest, a private, multinational investment banking company in Lima, Peru, and senior partner, Ernst Keller & Associates, S.A., management consultants and consulting engineers. Mr. Keller was also elected managing director and chief executive officer of ADELA.

Other officers experienced in Latin America and in the field of development financing will be appointed at later meetings of the executive committee.

List of Subscribers, ADELA Investment Co.

Belgium: Petrofina S.A., Sybetra S.A.

Canada: Bank of Montreal, the Bank of Nova Scotia, Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce, the Royal Bank of Canada.

Denmark: The East Asiatic Co., Ltd.

Germany: Deutsche Bank A.G., Dresdner Bank A.G., Dr. August Oetker (Einzelhandelsfirma).

Italy: Banca Commerciale Italiana, Fiat, Istituto Mobiliare Italiano.

Japan: Bank of Tokyo, Ltd., the Fuji Bank, Ltd., the Industrial Bank of Japan, Ltd., the Mitsubishi Bank, Ltd., the Sumitomo Bank, Ltd.

Luxembourg: Kredietbank S.A. Luxembourgeoisie.

Netherlands: Amsterdam-Rotterdam Bank N.V.

Sweden: Allmanna Svenska Elektriska AB, Rederi AB Nordstjernan (Johnson Line), AB Scania-Vabis, Skandinaviska Banken, Svenska Handelsbanken, AB Svenska Kullagerfabriken (SKF), Telefon AB L M. Ericsson, Trafikaktiebolaget Grangesberg-Oxelosund, AB Volvo.

Switzerland: Nestlé Alimentana Co. (S.A.), Swiss Bank Corp.

United Kingdom: The Shell Petroleum Co., Ltd.

United States: The Battelle Development Corp., Caterpillar Tractor Co., the Company for Investing Abroad (affiliate of Fidelity-Philadelphia Trust Co.), Continental International Finance Corp., the Dow Chemical Co., First National City Overseas Investment Corp., Ford Motor Co., Gulf Oil Corp., IBM World Trade Corp., Insurance Company of North America, Irving International Financing Corp., Carl M. Loeb, Rhoades & Co., Manufacturers-Detroit International Corp., Northwest International Bank, Pullman, Inc., Joseph E. Seagram & Sons, Ltd., Inc., Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, Wells Fargo Bank International Corp., White Weld & Co.

ADELA INVESTMENT CO. DIRECTORS

Chairman: Marcus Wallenberg, Sr., vice chairman, Stockholms Enskilda Bank.

Vice chairman: Howard C. Petersen, president, Fidelity-Philadelphia Trust Co.

Directors (in addition to chairman and vice chairman):

Herman J. Abs, managing director, Deutsche Bank A.G.

Giovanni Agnelli, vice chairman and managing director, Fiat.

Robert B. Bennett, treasurer, the Dow Chemical Co.

William Blackie, president, Caterpillar Tractor Co.

Edgar M. Bronfman, president, Joseph E. Seagram & Sons, Ltd., Inc.

Tore Browaldh, chief general manager, Svenska Handelsbanken.

Emilio G. Collado, director and vice president, Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey.

Ransom Cook, president, Wells Fargo Bank.

Henry Ford, II, chairman, Ford Motor Co.

G. Arnold Hart, president, Bank of Montreal.

Gilbert Edward Jones, president, IBM World Trade Corp.

Ernst Keller, managing director, ADELA Investment Co., S.A.

Armand Kemps, executive vice president, Sybetra.

David Kennedy, chairman, Continental Illinois National Bank & Trust Co. of Chicago.

John Hugo Loudon, managing director, the Shell Petroleum Co., Ltd.

Neil J. McKinnon, chairman and chief executive officer, Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce.

Roland A. Mewhort, president, Manufacturers National Bank of Detroit.

Kunio Miki, managing director, Bank of Tokyo, Ltd.

George S. Moore, president, First National City Bank.

Oskar Nathan, managing director, Dresdner Bank A.G.

F. William Nicks, chairman and president, the Bank of Nova Scotia.

Samuel Schweizer, chairman, Swiss Bank Corp.

Bradford Smith, Jr., president, Insurance Co. of North America.

Alexander de Takacsy, European representative, the Royal Bank of Canada, and president, the Royal Bank of Canada (France).

B. D. Thomas, president, Battelle Memorial Institute.

Lars-Erik Thunholm, managing director, Skandinaviska Banken.

Antonio Tonello, U.S. representative, Istituto Mobiliare Italiano.

W. K. Whiteford, chairman, Gulf Oil Corp.

Laurent Wolters, president, Petrofina S.A.

[From Business Week, Sept. 26, 1964]

INTERNATIONAL OUTLOOK

PRIVATE FUND FOR LATIN DEVELOPMENT

Fifty major banks and big industrial companies in the United States, Canada, Europe, and Japan are pooling some of their resources to boost private investment in Latin America.

Their unique venture, scheduled to be formally set up this week, could set a pattern for joint investment companies in other developing areas of the world.

GIANTS WILL HELP

Latin America, though, will be the one to benefit from the plans of ADELA Investment Co. ADELA's shareholders come from 12 countries and include such major companies as Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, Ford, IBM, and First National City Bank, from the United States; Deutsche Bank and Dresdner Bank, from Germany; and other stars like Swiss Bank Corp., and Petrofina.

ADELA's first stockholders will put up $15.5 million. More participants are expected to join and capital is likely to reach $20 million by yearend.

A top European banker is slated for election as ADELA's board chairman at a directors' meeting in Paris next week.

Aim of the project is to strengthen private investment in Latin America by using ADELA's leverage to mobilize several times its own capital for joint ventures with local business in manufacturing, commerce, and agriculture.

Extra financing is likely to come from the World Bank's International Finance Corp. and the Inter-American Development Bank.

Already, ADELA's interim organizing committee has put $500,000 into one project—a $14 million steel forging plant in Colombia.

THOSE WHO BEHAVE

From such deals, it's hoped, will come a better climate for private investment in Latin America.

That climate has been sour during the 5 years of political instability that followed the Cuban revolution; it is only just beginning to recover.

But ADELA won't be stepping too far off the beaten path: It will put its money in countries where conditions are most favorable for private investment. This may well encourage other Latin American countries to ease their policies in order to attract some of the new capital.

CORRECTION OF CERTAIN ERRORS IN THE TARIFF SCHEDULES OF THE UNITED STATES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 12253) to correct certain errors in the tariff schedules of the United States.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I oppose the Bennett amendment. I do so not in behalf of the cane sugar, the refiners, or other producing interests, but rather in behalf of the American consumers and taxpayers. We sometimes forget how much the cost of sugar subsidies increase the cost of living of the American people. I have calculated that the direct subsidies paid to American producers of sugar in the last 30 years amounted to $1.7 billion. In the last year, they amounted to $91 million. The subsidies are about evenly divided among the beet sugar, on the one hand and the mainland cane, and the oversea cane producers on the other. These subsidies are paid by the American taxpayers. In addition, of course, indirect subsidies also are paid by American consumers.

With the exception of 16 months during the last 30 years, the world price of sugar has been markedly below the domestic price. The domestic price of sugar has been kept up by the low quotas given to foreign sugar and the relatively high quotas given to domestic sugar.

On the average, over the past 30 years, with the exception of those 16 months, the domestic price of sugar has been about 2 cents a pound above the world price. That comes to $40 a ton. Americans consume approximately 10 million tons of sugar a year. So there has been an indirect subsidy of around $400 million a year to be added to the present $90 million cash subsidy. At present the difference between the world and the domestic price is about 2½ cents a pound (6.25 minus 3.7) or $50 a ton or at the rate of $500 million a year.

This is a very high price to pay, indeed, in a rational world; and I know it is hard to transpose a somewhat irrational world into a rational world. In a rational world, we would get the bulk of our sugar from the Caribbean. It would be relatively low-cost sugar, and it would help the American consumer. The American consumer and housewife would pay less than she now pays. The purchasing power she would save would then be used to purchase other commodities and services, and thus build up a demand for American goods in fields where we would have a comparative advantage.

At the very least, we should do what the Senate some 3 years ago started to do at the suggestion of some of us; namely, such sugar as we import should come in not at the domestic price, but at the foreign price, and a tariff should then be levied upon it equal to the difference between the domestic price and the foreign price and this should be paid into the Treasury. In all probability, this would net something like $150 million a year. This savings would not go to the consumers, but it would reduce the burden upon the taxpayers.

This proposal to increase the quantity of beet sugar produced domestically can only result in higher prices to the American consumers.

It can only result in making it more difficult to overthrow Castro. He has behaved abominably toward American interests, toward our Government, and toward the American people. We wish the Cuban people to overthrow Castro, but it will be hard to have him overthrown if the Cuban people know that their market in the United States will still be shut off. There must be some hope held out to them that if they throw him out they can then recover the American market.

For all these reasons, because I believe the program as a whole is very bad, because it would penalize American taxpayers and American consumers, because it would directly operate against a more rational world and serve to keep Castro in power, I oppose the Bennett amendment. For it makes a bad matter worse.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a table showing the direct Sugar Act payments or cash subsidies for the years 1933 to 1963 be inserted in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Sugar Act payments [1]

[Millions of dollars]

	Beet	Mainland cane	Hawaii	Puerto Rico	Virgin Islands	Total
1933	2.6	----------	----------	----------	----------	2.6
1934	19.6	8.9	4.7	12.8	----------	46.0
1935	9.5	3.4	8.6	1.7	----------	23.2
1936	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------
1937	17.1	5.4	4.2	9.5	----------	36.2
1938	22.1	6.3	8.6	8.9	----------	45.9
1939	21.4	5.4	9.0	10.6	----------	46.4
1940	23.3	3.9	8.9	9.6	----------	45.7
1941	19.0	4.6	8.6	11.2	----------	43.4
1942	29.8	7.0	8.1	13.1	0.03	58.0
1943	17.6	7.4	8.3	12.2	.1	45.6
1944	18.6	6.6	8.2	13.1	.04	46.5
1945	22.9	6.8	8.1	13.3	.1	51.2
1946	27.7	6.5	6.6	15.1	.1	56.0
1947	32.3	6.3	8.1	15.5	.04	62.2
1948	23.2	7.2	7.6	17.7	.1	55.8
1949	26.6	7.1	8.4	17.5	.1	59.7
1950	33.7	7.8	8.5	17.1	.1	67.2
1951	25.9	6.5	9.1	18.9	.1	60.5
1952	24.7	8.0	9.4	17.0	.1	59.2
1953	30.0	8.6	10.2	16.7	.2	65.7
1954	33.2	8.1	9.9	16.2	.1	67.5
1955	29.1	7.6	10.5	16.0	.1	63.3
1956	31.3	7.3	10.2	14.7	.2	63.7
1957	36.4	7.3	10.1	13.5	.2	67.5
1958	36.2	7.4	7.4	14.9	.1	66.0
1959	38.9	7.9	9.3	14.2	.2	70.5
1960	39.3	8.2	8.8	14.9	.1	71.3
1961	42.4	10.9	10.0	13.6	.2	77.2
1962	44.5	11.5	10.2	13.5	.1	79.8
1963 [2]	50.8	15.0	10.1	15.0	.2	91.1
Total	829.7	214.9	249.7	398.1	2.5	1,694.9

[1] Includes abandonment and deficiency payments.

[2] Estimated.

Source: U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Do I understand correctly that the Senator said the sugar program has cost the American taxpayers approximately $1.7 billion?

Mr. DOUGLAS. No; I said that over 30 years the cost has approximated $1.7 billion.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is approximately $91 million in 1 year. That is the direct cost. Then there is the indirect cost of a higher price of approximately 2 cents or 2½ cents a pound, or $40 or $50 a ton on 10 million tons, or approximately $400 million a year which now comes out of the consumers' pockets. It may run as high as $500 million.

Mr. PROXMIRE. So the $400 million additional cost is an annual cost?

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator is correct. The cash subsidy is now $90 million on an annual basis.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Would it not make it more difficult for those struggling for freedom in Cuba to overthrow the Castro regime if this amendment should pass?

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator is correct, because it would serve to shut off the American market which otherwise would be theirs because of their low production costs.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I congratulate the Senator from Illinois from the standpoint of the taxpayer, from the standpoint of the consumer, and from the standpoint of patriotic Americans, those who love freedom and wish to see the Castro regime overthrown. It seems to me that the Bennett amendment should be defeated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, when I arrived this afternoon, I had three amendments to propose to the Senate. A few moments ago we resolved the first amendment.

Mr. President, I am a practical man. It is obvious from the vote that the opponents of the Bennett amendment just do not have enough bodies in the Senate today.

However, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the two amendments and the explanations.

There being no objection, the amendments and explanations were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMENDMENT TO BENNETT AMENDMENT TO H.R. 12253 PROPOSED BY SENATORS INOUYE AND FONG

At the end of section 3 of the bill, insert a colon and add the following as a proviso to section 202(a)(3) of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended:

"*Provided*, That the Secretary shall authorize the marketing of such sugar in excess of established quotas only if: (i) the amount so authorized is necessary to meet the requirements of consumers in the calendar year 1964, and (ii) the domestic price for raw sugar is higher than the level which would fulfill the domestic price objective set forth in section 201 for a period of at least seven consecutive days in the thirty days immediately preceding any such authorization. If marketing of sugar by any area in excess of its established quota is authorized pursuant to this paragraph (3), the Secretary shall not permit constructive or warehouse deliveries to be charged against such area's 1964 quota or authorized marketings in excess of such quota, nor shall the Secretary permit similar devices to be used as a means of charging deliveries in 1965 against 1964 quotas or authorized marketings in excess of such quotas."

EXPLANATION

The amendment I am offering simply adds a proviso to section 3 of the amendment of the senior Senator from Utah. My proviso would establish certain criteria to guide the Secretary of Agriculture in making a determination whether to permit marketings in 1964 in excess of the established quotas of the domestic beet sugar and the mainland cane areas. The amendment offered by my colleagues, in its present form, leaves the matter within the absolute discretion of the Secretary without any guide whatever.

My proviso provides that overquota marketings should be authroized only to meet the requirements of consumers and only if the price objective of the act is being maintained. Finally, if overquota marketings are authorized, this proviso would prohibit the use in 1964 of artificial marketing devices which permit deliveries in 1 year to be charged to the quota in a prior year.

The limitations the proviso imposes on action by the Secretary are necessary if the integrity of the Sugar Act quota system is to be maintained. Unless the consumer needs the additional sugar, overquota marketings will be dumped in the market to the detriment of other segments of the industry. The quota system is based on a critical balance of supply and demand and any marketings of sugar not required by consumers will necessarily wreak havoc on the sugar program.

If the demand for sugar increases and the target price for sugar established by section 201 of the act is achieved, then, and only then, should additional sugars be permitted to be marketed. If such marketings are permitted in the face of ample supplies the quota system will become ineffective.

Finally, the proviso contained in my substitute will protect the quotas for 1965 from being raided in 1964 by means of constructive deliveries. Such deliveries and similar devices have been used in the past to permit areas with overly large quotas to fill their quotas by using deliveries physically made in the next year. If overquota marketings are permitted there is no excuse for the use of such devices, because the marketing relief being granted is to take care of surplus sugars on hand this year.

The quota system established by the Sugar Act must not be emasculated by indirection. Unless section 3 of my substitute is adopted, the sugar program will suffer and the future of the program will be imperiled.

The beet and mainland cane producers have asked for 500,000 tons of marketing relief in 1964. Section 3 of my substitute would give them such relief and still preserve the sugar quota system established by the Sugar Act.

AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE TO BENNETT AMENDMENT TO H.R. 12253 PROPOSED BY SENATORS INOUYE AND FONG

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following sections and renumber sections accordingly:

"The Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, is amended as follows:

"'SECTION 1. That section 202(c) of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended (relating to quotas for foreign countries) is amended by striking out "1963 and 1964" in each place it appears therein, and inserting in lieu thereof "1963 through the first six months of

1965", and by adding a new subparagraph (7) at the end thereof as follows:

"'"(7) The quantities established for the first six months of 1965 shall be one-half of the annual quantities provided for in the other subparagraphs of this subsection (c)."'

"'Sec. 2. Section 213 of such Act is amended (1) by striking from section 213(c) the language "during the years 1962, 1963, and 1964, which fee in each such year shall be respectively 10, 20 and 30 per centum" and inserting in lieu thereof "during the years 1962, 1963, 1964 and the first six months of 1965, which fee shall be 10 per centum in 1962, 20 per centum in 1963 and 30 per centum in 1964 and the first six months of 1965"; and (2) by striking from section 213 (c) the language "during the years 1962, 1963 and 1964 shall be respectively 0.1, 0.2, and 0.3, of one cent per pound" and inserting in lieu thereof "during the years 1962, 1963, 1964 and first six months of 1965 shall be in 1962 0.1 of one cent, in 1963 0.2 of one cent, and in 1964 and the first six months of 1965 0.3 of one cent per pound."

"'Sec. 3. The following new paragraph (3) is added at the end of section 202(a) of such Act:

"'"(3) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the domestic beet sugar area and the mainland cane sugar area may be permitted to market in 1964, as determined by the Secretary, in addition to the quota established for such area in 1964, a quantity of sugar not exceeding 275,000 short tons, raw value, and 225,000 short tons, raw value, respectively, and such additional quantities of sugar shall be deducted from the quantities of sugar which otherwise may be authorized for purchase and importation in 1964 pursuant to section 202(c) (4) (A) of this Act: *Provided*, that the Secretary shall authorize the marketing of such sugar in excess of established quotas only if: (i) the amount so authorized is necessary to meet the requirements of consumers in the calendar year 1964, and (ii) the domestic price for raw sugar is higher than the level which would fulfill the domestic price objective set forth in section 201 for a period of at least seven consecutive days in the thirty days immediately preceding any such authorization. If marketing of sugar by any area in excess of its established quota is authorized pursuant to this paragraph (3), the Secretary shall not permit constructive or warehouse deliveries to be charged against such area's 1964 quota or authorized marketings in excess of such quota, nor shall the Secretary permit similar devices to be used as a means of charging deliveries in 1965 against 1964 quotas or authorized marketings in excess of such quotas."

"'Sec. 4. Section 302(b)(1) of such Act (relating to farm proportionate shares) is amended by adding the following language at the end thereof: "Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this paragraph in regard to when proportionate shares for farms are to be established, the Secretary shall establish proportionate shares for farms in the domestic beet sugar area and in the mainland cane sugar area for the 1965 crop of sugarbeets and sugarcane. The total acreage of proportionate shares established for the beet sugar area for the 1965 crop shall be not more than 80 per centum of the acreage planted to sugarbeets of the 1964 crop. The total acreage of proportionate shares established for the mainland cane sugar area for the 1965 crop shall be not more than 85 per centum of the acreage of the 1964 crop of sugarcane planted in such area prior to May 1, 1964."'"

EXPLANATION

This proposal consists of four sections and does four separate things.

Like the amendment under discussion, my proposal would extend for 6 months those provisions of the Sugar Act relating to quotas for foreign countries. It would extend the foreign quota provisions as they now exist in the act from December 31, 1964, through June 30, 1965.

Second, like the amendment for which it will serve as a substitute, it extends the import fee for 6 months. During that 6-month period, the fee on global quota sugar would represent a 100-percent recapture of the difference between the world price and the domestic price. The import fee on quotas assigned to specified countries, other than the Philippines, would be extended at the 1964 level; namely, 30 percent of the global quota fee or, to put it another way, 30 percent of the difference between the world price and the domestic price as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Third, the amendment would authorize the Secretary under certain conditions to release for consumption in 1964 up to 275,000 tons of beet sugar over and above the quota set in the 1962 Sugar Act amendments for the beet sugar area. It would authorize the Secretary under the same conditions to release up to 225,000 tons of Louisiana-Florida sugar in excess of the 1964 quota established in the 1962 Sugar Act amendments for that area. I will explain the conditions under which the Secretary would be permitted to release this sugar for consumption in 1964 at a later point in my remarks.

Fourth, my substitute amendment would require the Secretary to establish proportionate shares on the 1965 crop—would require the Secretary to impose acreage restrictions—and to prevent further overproduction by these two mainland areas. In the case of the beet area, acreage restrictions would be established at no more than 80 percent of the acreage planted in that area in 1964. In the case of Louisiana-Florida, acreage restrictions would be established at no more than 85 percent of the 1964 crop of sugarcane planted in that area prior to May 1, 1964. I'll have more to say about this later in my remarks.

I call attention to the fact that the first two sections of my substitute are identical in content to a bill sent to the Speaker of the House and President of the Senate on Friday, September 25, by the Department of Agriculture. The first two sections, therefore, represent the Department's recommendations on sugar legislation at this session of Congress. These two sections represent the bill sent to the Congress by the Department of Agriculture in an effort to avoid the impasse which had been reached as a result of the breakdown in negotiations within the domestic sugar industry itself—after 9 months of effort to reach an agreement.

Section 3 of the amendment I am offering simply adds a proviso to the amendment of the senior Senator from Utah. My proviso would establish certain criteria to guide the Secretary of Agriculture in making a determination whether to permit marketings in 1964 in excess of the established quotas of the domestic beet sugar and the mainland cane areas. The amendment offered by my colleague, in its present form, leaves the matter within the absolute discretion of the Secretary without any guide whatever.

My proviso provides that overquota marketings should be authorized only to meet the requirements of consumers and only if the price objective of the act is being maintained. Finally, if overquota marketings are authorized, this proviso would prohibit the use in 1964 of artificial marketing devices which permit deliveries in 1 year to be charged to the quota in a prior year.

The limitations the proviso imposes on action by the Secretary are necessary if the integrity of the Sugar Act quota system is to be maintained. Unless the consumer needs the additional sugar, overquota marketings will be dumped in the market to the detriment of other segments of the industry. The quota system is based on a critical balance of supply and demand and any marketings of sugar not required by consumers will necessarily wreak havoc on the sugar program.

If the demand for sugar increases and the target price for sugar established by section 201 of the act is achieved, then, and only then, should additional sugars be permitted to be marketed. If such marketings are permitted in the face of ample supplies the quota system will become ineffective.

Finally, the proviso contained in my substitute will protect the quotas for 1965 from being raided in 1964 by means of constructive deliveries. Such deliveries and similar devices have been used in the past to permit areas with overly large quotas to fill their quotas by using deliveries physically made in the next year. If overquota marketings are permitted there is no excuse for the use of such devices, because the marketing relief being granted is to take care of surplus sugars on hand this year.

The quota system established by the Sugar Act must not be emasculated by indirection. Unless section 3 of my substitute is adopted, the sugar program will suffer and the future of the program will be imperiled.

The beet and mainland cane producers have asked for 500,000 tons of marketing relief in 1964. Section 3 of my substitute would give them such relief and still preserve the sugar quota system established by the Sugar Act.

Earlier in my remarks I stated that section 4 of my substitute deals with proportionate shares—acreage restrictions—on the 1965 crop in the beet and mainland cane sugar producing areas. Let me elaborate.

The amendment stipulates that proportionate shares (acreage restrictions) shall be established for the beet sugar area for the 1965 crop at not more than 80 percent of the acreage planted to sugarbeets for the 1964 crop. It stipulates further that the total acreage of proportionate shares established for the mainland cane sugar area for the 1965 crop shall be not more than 85 percent of the acreage of the 1964 crop of sugarcane planted in that area prior to May 1, 1964.

The net effect of this part of my substitute amendment, in the sugarbeet area would be to insure that in 1965 sugarbeet growers do not produce sugar in excess of their 1966 quota. Unless this amendment is adopted, the sugarbeet industry will again produce in excess of its quota and again that industry will be coming to the Congress crying crocodile tears that they must be bailed out of the mess they will have created for themselves.

The net effect of this amendment on the mainland cane sugar area would be to insure that their plantings this fall will be reduced to a point where they can by further restrictions in 1966 be brought within the quota allotted to them under the 1962 amendments to the Sugar Act. My proposal is to require the mainland cane area to get back within its quota in two steps. The amendment would require the beet area to get back within its quota in one step.

The amendment draws a logical distinction between the two areas. Let me explain.

Beets are an annual crop. All a beet farmer has to do to get back within his proportionate share is to refrain from planting sugarbeets next year. He can utilize the land taken out of sugarbeets for whatever crops he grew prior to the time he diverted those acres to sugarbeets. My amendment would require the Secretary of Agriculture to establish proportionate shares for the 1965 crop thereby insuring that each farmer in the Nation growing sugarbeets in so-called "old areas" take his proportionate share of this acreage reduction.

It's true that farmers growing sugarbeets for the new plants that were authorized in the 1962 Sugar Act amendments would not be cut. I call the attention of my colleagues, however, to the fact that the sugarbeet industry, itself, agreed to exempt new growers for new plants from acreage reductions for a specified period. This is a bed, therefore, which the industry, itself, has made—a bed which the beet industry itself must lie in.

In the case of sugarcrane, the situation is different. The nature of the crop makes it different. Normally, three cuttings of sugarcane in the Louisiana area are made before replanting is required. Most sugarcane growers in the mainland cane areas, therefore, replant about one-quarter of their acreage each year. If the cane growers were required to take their acreage adjustment in a single year, it would work some hardship. Certainly, however, they can and should make the adjustment in two steps.

Now, the basic fight within the sugar industry throughout this whole year has centered around two things. First, the beet and mainland cane areas have sought to obtain the privilege of marketing sugar in 1964 and in 1965 in excess of the quotas established for them in the 1962 Sugar Act amendments. By agreement within the domestic sugar industry, concurred in by the administration and the Congress, the beet and mainland cane quotas were established through 1966. Those quotas do not expire this year. They are a part of the statute. They are set by law. Nonetheless, as I said earlier, the two areas have sought to obtain privileges of marketing sugar in excess of their legal quotas.

The second point in the sugar industry fight centers around acreage restrictions. The rest of the domestic sugar industry has been willing to grant some marketing relief to the beet and mainland cane areas provided these two areas were willing to adjust their 1965 crops to the quotas provided for them in the Sugar Act. The rest of the industry, in effect, has said: "If you want marketing relief for your 1964 overproduction, then reduce your 1965 crop—reduce your 1965 acreage—so you will not repeat this overproduction in the coming crop year." This seems a reasonable position, and my amendment is designed to insure against overproduction again in 1965.

The Sugar Act controls the supply of sugar in the U.S. market. Each producing area is assigned a quota. If one area produces in excess of its quota and markets in excess of its quota, all other areas are penalized. If the beet area produces and markets more sugar, cane areas market less sugar. If one area expands, such expansion must come at the expense of some other area. If a domestic area expands, foreign imports are reduced. If more beet sugar is sold in the country, the tonnage must be taken away from the cane sugar refining industry. If one group of businessmen is favored, another group of American businessmen is penalized. This is the way a quota system works, and my friends here from beet and cane growing States know that as well as I do.

Now it seems to me that those who benefit most from the quota system should have the greatest stake in preserving it. The beet area—the beet industry—gets more out of the quota system than any other single segment of the domestic sugar industry. First, the beet growers get direct payments from the Federal Treasury at the rate of almost 90 cents per 100 pounds of refined sugar they produce. This amounts to about $18 per ton. If they produce 3 million tons of sugar, these direct payments amount to about $54 million. Second, the beet industry gets tariff protection—as do other U.S. sugar producers—of about 67 cents per 100 pounds on a refined sugar basis. This amounts to approximately $13 per ton. Third, they get the benefit of a price which, at the present time, is approximately $2 higher than the world price. This protection amounts to about $40 per ton.

At the present time, the difference between the world price and the U.S. price is $2 per 100 pounds or $40 per ton. This is on a raw sugar basis.

The duty on imported sugar on a raw sugar basis is 62½ cents per 100 pounds or $12.50 per ton.

The payment received by beet growers is approximately 85 cents per 100 pounds on a raw sugar basis or about $17 per ton.

If we add these together we get a total of approximately $69. The significance of this figure is that every ton of sugar transferred from the global quota to the beet area costs the Treasury, in one form or another, almost $70 per ton.

Direct Treasury payments received by the mainland cane area are slightly less than those made to the beet area, but if we average the two they come to about $65 per ton.

The amendment some of my colleagues are proposing would transfer 500,000 tons of sugar from the global quota to the beet and mainland cane areas. The cost to the U.S. Treasury and to the American taxpayers and consumers would be almost $35 million. This is a tidy sum.

Now I know that we must pay something to keep the sugar industry alive in this country. I doubt that any beet sugar and very little cane sugar could be grown domestically without the Sugar Act—without the quota system. If we are going to have such a system, all producers must live within it—and all segments of the industry must live within it. We certainly are not justified in asking the consumer and the taxpayer to pay the higher cost the quota system entails without, at the same time, insisting that all areas live within that system.

I now go back to my amendment. It is designed to insure that we don't have a repeat performance in 1965 by the beet area and that the mainland cane area take the first step toward preventing a repeat performance on its part. If there is to be any marketing relief for the overproduction these two areas have experienced, then, in my humble judgment there must be acreage restrictions to bring them back within the quota pattern.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Hawaii yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McINTYRE in the chair). Does the Senator from Hawaii yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. INOUYE. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I should like to be recognized for 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from Illinois, and add that I realize, after some 15 years of trying to thwart the sugar organizations of this country, it is a rather hopeless undertaking, because we have tried to do so on many occasions. I shall vote against the Bennett amendment.

I intend to vote against the bill because of the amendment.

In the last days of Congress, it is too bad that bills are being loaded down with amendments which have not been duly considered by the proper committees, or brought out in the regular manner. No doubt they could bring out some kind of bill—as they always do; but it is improvident and unwise to add such an irrelevant amendment to a bill which should be enacted.

I regret very much the action of the Senate in rejecting the amendment offered by the Senator from Hawaii, which I believe would have made the amendment acceptable.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. In the vote against the Inouye amendment, the argument is interesting. The argument is interesting because it means that we should not have a sugar industry. The Senator from Hawaii comes in with an amendment to the bill. I come from one of the principal sugar-producing States in the Union. His supporters get up and say that there should not be any sugar bill, that we should go out of the sugar-industry business. The State of Hawaii could no more produce sugar than Louisiana if it had to sell it at the world price.

This is a very unusual argument to be made by a Senator who comes from a State where sugar is the principal crop. If we are for the sugar industry, and wish it to stay in business, we should be against the Inouye amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 more minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Let me say further that my friend, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], has always had the idea that we should not produce sugar in America.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If the Senator will yield, I have not had any such idea——

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. If the Senator will permit me to complete my statement first, then I shall be glad to yield to him and we shall find out what his reply will be.

Let me point out to my good friend the Senator from Arkansas, that he stated that we should benefit the rice producers, that we should not produce sugar in America, that we should produce rice and send it to Cuba; and Cuba would, in turn, sell us its sugar.

Suppose we had followed the program of the Senator from Arkansas—and I heard him advocate his position relative to rice producers. We were paying 13 cents a pound last year for sugar. We would be paying 50 cents a pound for sugar today under the Fulbright program, if we had followed his advice.

We need a sugar industry. Every country in the world protects itself with enough sugar, because it is an essential, basic commodity and requirement of life. We have to protect the sugar industry, if we wish sugar producers to thrive. This is a bill to provide that sugar producers will be treated fairly, just as we would try to treat every other American businessman fairly.

I do not know what is in this amendment. I suspect it is something the refiners wish, in their fight to try to depress the price of raw sugar and depress the price of beets, so that they can bring the producers to their knees and make them meet the terms of the refiners. That is what the amendment is all about.

If we are for the farmer out in the beet fields using his hands, if we are for the cane farmer who is working hard at low pay, we should vote against the amendment and in favor of the farmer.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. INOUYE. I should like the distinguished Senator from Louisiana to know—as he does—that the people of Hawaii support the Sugar Act. We were happy with the results of the 1962 negotiations between mainland cane and mainland beet sugar refiners—Hawaiian cane—Puerto Rican—the Virgin Islands—the industrial users—this was the result of many, many months of negotiations. We believe in this law. We know that this is a law which has made it possible for housewives to purchase sugar at reasonable prices. It has supported workers' employment. That is why I submitted the amendment, because I felt that the Bennett amendment would wreak havoc with the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended.

Those who oppose the Bennett amendment are those who really love the Sugar Act.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Will the Senator from Louisiana yield me 1 minute?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Arkansas 1 minute, on my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I have never said anything at any time to the effect that we do not wish any sugar industry in this country.

The rice and sugar discussion, to which the Senator from Louisiana is referring took place 15 years ago. This was before Castro—as the Senator well knows. The biggest customer for rice was Cuba. They sold us sugar at reasonable prices; is that not true?

I took the position that artificially expanding an uneconomic industry in this country at the expense of another industry—and at that time I was speaking of rice—would be a great mistake. It was not that I wished to destroy what was already in being, but that I was opposed to its expansion—as I am at present.

The sugar industry is not an economic industry. There are other things I believe which can be done. As the Senator from Illinois has pointed out, we have poured out almost $2 billion in subsidies which is far more than cotton, tobacco, peanuts, or any other crop.

This has been the biggest boondoggle of all boondoggles. I suppose we could grow bananas and coffee in this country if we wished to put up enough money. I only said that this was an uneconomic industry, and I thought that the legitimate rice producer should be allowed to stay in business, because he was not getting anything like this kind of money, rather than be squeezed out by the action taken at that time. But as I said a moment ago, the sugar producers are so well organized, there is so much money in this industry available for lobbying and influence, that I have given up trying to defeat it.

I merely express my opinion.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes. If we had followed the Senator's program at that time, we would not have expanded sugar production in America. We would have curtailed sugar production in America. Then, when Castro took over Cuba, as he did, the situation would have been different. Last year, we did not have enough sugar. The price went to 13 cents a pound. We would have had much less sugar. Furthermore, as far as I know, almost every advanced nation on earth stockpiles larger supplies of sugar than this country does. All those countries have a program to protect themselves by the production of domestic sugar.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Would the Senator compare the domestic and the world prices of sugar? I have here a copy of the New York Times for this morning. Would the Senator from Louisiana be interested enough to compare the prices?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I have no doubt that sugar would be substantially cheaper if we did not have a tariff and the Sugar Act. Last year, if we did not have that protection, we could not have bought any sugar at all.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Since the Senator has made the general admission, perhaps he would be interested in the specific facts. I quote from the New York Times of this morning, at page 66, the commodity cash price of sugar, world price, 3.7 cents; while raw, domestic sugar is 6.25 cents. That is a difference of more than 2½ cents a pound, or $50 a ton, or 10 million tons at a cost of $500 million a year, plus the $90 million cash subsidy out of the pockets of the American taxpayers. Where is free enterprise which the advocates of this amendment like to talk about?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute.

Last year the world market price was 13 cents on sugar. We could not have obtained it at 13 cents.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That was the only year.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. We could not have obtained it on the world market if we had not had domestic prices.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That was the only year out of 33 years in which the support price was in excess of the domestic price.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to my colleague.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I did not intend to enter into the debate. But my good friend, the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] has stated that in a period of over 30 years, the entire cost of the sugar program was $1,600 million. This year, we shall spend $1,200 million as a subsidy for corn and other feed grains. That figure is for merely 1 year.

I do not want to get into the area of comparative market prices. Regardless of contentions to the contrary, the Sugar Act has saved the people of America much money. Last year sugar prices skyrocketed. It was thought that there was a shortage. The Department of Agriculture notified the growers in this country that there was not a world shortage, but that it was difficult to get the sugar in here because of a lack of ships. So the prices went up. Speculators gained control.

Last year, as my distinguished colleague pointed out, the Department of Agriculture was desirous of permitting the sale of at least 500,000 tons of sugar. The administration recommended the removal of all marketing restrictions for 1964.

The message from the President indicated that producers should be allowed to sell all they produced during 1964. But, finally, a 500,000-ton increase in the domestic allotment was agreed upon. That bill was not even submitted to the Senate. I believe that if the bill had been submitted and passed, it would have affected the then high price of sugar.

I recall that Congress did not take action to permit us to dispose of all the sugar that we now have on hand. Unless this legislation is enacted, on January 1, a flood of sugar from abroad will cause a surplus of sugar and work to the great detriment of the beet and sugar cane growers of our country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the senior Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, if the bill is enacted, it will give the Secretary of Agriculture the privilege, if he sees fit, to dispose of 500,000 tons of sugar derived from mainland cane and sugarbeets.

I believe the bill should pass. I do not believe that the price of raw sugar will be very high this year. I doubt that it will be over 6 cents, 6¼ cents, or 7 cents. I believe that is a very reasonable price to pay for raw sugar.

I am very hopeful that the amendment will be agreed to. I hope that next year we shall be able to sit around the table with the proper committees in order to go into the entire question of foreign and domestic allotments. I am very hopeful that we shall be able to do that in January.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, when sugar shortage was imminent last year and sugar prices threatened to skyrocket, domestic beet and cane producers answered the call of the Secretary of Agriculture to produce more sugar to alleviate this situation. The Secretary removed acreage limitations, and unlimited marketings were recommended by the President in his agricultural message, January 31, 1964. Based upon these actions by the administration the domestic sugar industry in good faith planted and produced sugar in excess of its quota. However, on September 14, 1964, marketing quotas were reestablished on domestic beet sugar at the 1962 level in spite of the fact that the sugarbeets were already in the ground and were nearly ready to be harvested. This will leave the beet sugar processors with a surplusage of approximately 800,000 tons, which surplusage has resulted directly from emergency actions taken by the administration. Similar action is contemplated with regard to mainland cane sugar producers. Failure to grant this extra marketing authority to help relieve the domestic producer would be nothing less than an act of bad faith on the part of the Government. It is my understanding that there is a surplusage of 800,000 tons of beet sugar and 600,000 tons of cane sugar, for a total of about 1,400,000 tons. This legislation would only authorize 275,000 tons for beet sugar marketings and 225,000 tons for mainland cane marketings, for a total of 500,000 tons of additional marketings in 1964, and has no effect upon marketing quotas in future years.

Without the extension of foreign quotas and the continuation of the import fees on the global quotas as provided by this amendment, not only will our trade relations be jeopardized, at least to some extent, by leaving this important economic factor of many of the importing countries in a state of limbo, but may very well cause the United States to become a dumping ground for excess foreign sugar that has no other home. This could have a disastrous effect upon the domestic price of sugar, causing severe damage to an industry that not only has had a tremendous stabilizing effect upon American agriculture as a whole, but has also proved its responsiveness to the needs of the consumer and the Nation in a time of crisis.

In conclusion, there is no agricultural act of any kind in this country that has ever been as successful as the Sugar Act. A search through the entire list of commodities produced in the United States will not disclose a single commodity that has experienced as relatively low an increase in price as sugar has over the years. It is a bargain even at 12 or 13 cents a pound.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I yield 1 additional minute to the Senator from Colorado.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado is recognized for 1 additional minute.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, this is a far better bargain than we can show with respect to any other commodity, no matter which commodity it is, whether raw material or manufactured material.

The proof of the pudding is in the eating. Last year, as a result of the Sugar Act and the patriotic actions of the domestic producer, there was a constant supply of sugar, which otherwise we would not have had. We must not turn our backs upon the domestic producer now that the crisis is over.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record a telegram from Dennis O'Rourke, president of the Holly Sugar Corp. This telegram urges passage of the amendment.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

COLORADO SPRINGS, COLO.,
September 30, 1964.

Hon. GORDON L. ALLOTT,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Understand Senators McCARTHY and BENNETT will today offer amendment to tariff reclassification bill, H.R. 12253, so as to extend foreign provisions of Sugar Act for 6 months and to provide extra 1964 sugar marketing rights of up to 275,000 tons for beet area and 225,000 for mainland cane area. This of vital importance to beet industry and will be very important to future production plans. Respectfully and earnestly request you join with Senators McCARTHY and BENNETT in this endeavor and that you urge other Senate friends of domestic sugar industry to do likewise.

Best regards.

DENNIS O'ROURKE,
President, Holly Sugar Corp.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BENNETT. What is the question now before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Utah, on which question the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. BENNETT. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I am prepared to yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I yield myself 30 seconds.

The distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] has stated that if the Bennett amendment is rejected, foreign sugar will flood American markets. I advise Senators that two provisions in our laws—first, section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act; and second, section 403 of the Sugar Act—provide for such emergencies. For example, section 22 of the act authorizes the President of the United States to restrict the importation of commodities—which in this case would be sugar—by quota or by tariff, if such importation interferes with the successful operation of a domestic agricultural program.

So if Senators are fearful that failure of the adoption of the amendment might jeopardize the program, I assure them that the most eminent attorneys in Washington, D.C., have assured me that such will not happen.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. BENNETT. While it is true that, under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, such action would be possible, does the Senator believe that the President of the United States would infuriate our friends by imposing quotas in such a situation? I doubt it very much. Instead, I believe that they would do what they could to persuade him otherwise.

I think we shall find the same situation existing that existed once before. Ships will stand offshore waiting until midnight, December 31, to get their cargoes of sugar into the United States before the President would have an opportunity to act.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I am glad to note that the Senator from Utah has seen fit to express this fear. The amendment that I proposed would prevent what the Senator has spoken of. I, too, was afraid that the Bennett amendment, if adopted, would infuriate our friends in South America, because it would take away from them 500,000 tons of the sugar quota. I am happy to note that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] does have some concern for our friends in South America.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. BENNETT. There are 500,000 tons of the quota reserve which have never been assigned to our friends abroad. To say that by allocating any amount of that quota to the domestic producers we would actually take something away from a country that feels it is entitled to that quota is, to the Senator from Utah, quite a stretch of the imagination.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may propound a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. BENNETT. I am happy to yield to my friend the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah ask unanimous consent that the name of the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS] be added as a cosponsor of the amendment?

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS] be added as a cosponsor of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having been yielded back, the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT]. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. What is the pending question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Utah. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. COTTON (after having voted in the affirmative). Mr. President, on this vote I have a pair with the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. Keating]. If he were present and voting he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I therefore withdraw my vote.

Mr. JAVITS (after having voted in the negative). Mr. President, on this vote I have a live pair with the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. Dominick]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I therefore withdraw my vote.

Mr. PELL (after having voted in the negative). Mr. President, on this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hart]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I therefore withdraw my vote.

Mr. MANSFIELD (after having voted in the affirmative). Mr. President, on this vote I have a pair with the distinquished junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Burdick], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. Cannon], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Johnston], the Senator from Montana [Mr. Metcalf], the Senator from Texas [Mr. Yarborough], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Young], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hart], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Hill] are absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Edmondson], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Hartke], the Senator from Florida [Mr. Holland], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. Humphrey], the Senator from Washington [Mr. Jackson], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGovern], the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss], the Senator from Maine [Mr. Muskie], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. Neuberger], the Senator from California [Mr. Salinger], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Symington] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Burdick], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Hartke], the Senator from Montana [Mr. Metcalf], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Young] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark] is paired with the Senator from Florida [Mr. Holland]. If present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "nay" and the Senator from Florida would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Washington [Mr. Jackson] is paired with the Senator from California [Mr. Salinger]. If present and voting, the Senator from California would vote "nay" and the Senator from Washington would vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Dominick], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Beall], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Case], the Senators from Nebraska [Mr. Curtis and Mr. Hruska], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Goldwater], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Jordan], the Senator from New York [Mr. Keating], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Morton], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Thurmond] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Jordan] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska] is paired with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Beall]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea" and the Senator from Maryland would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Curtis] is paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea" and the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "nay."

The pair of the Senator from New York [Mr. Keating] has been previously announced.

The pair of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Dominick] has been previously announced.

The result was announced—yeas 37, nays 23, as follows:

[No. 590 Leg.]

YEAS—37

Aiken
Allott
Bayh
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Carlson
Church
Cooper
Dirksen
Eastland
Ellender
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
McCarthy
McClellan
McNamara
Mechem
Morse
Mundt
Pearson
Prouty
Robertson
Simpson
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—23

Anderson
Bartlett
Brewster
Dodd
Douglas
Ervin
Fong
Fulbright
Gore
Inouye
Jordan, N.C.
McIntyre
Monroney
Nelson
Pastore
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Russell
Saltonstall
Talmadge
Walters
Williams, N.J.

NOT VOTING—40

Beall
Burdick
Cannon
Case
Clark
Cotton
Curtis
Dominick
Edmondson
Goldwater
Gruening
Hart
Hartke
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Humphrey
Jackson
Javits
Johnston
Jordan, Idaho
Keating
Kennedy
Mansfield
McGee
McGovern
Metcalf
Miller
Morton
Moss
Muskie
Neuberger
Pell
Salinger
Scott
Symington
Thurmond
Tower
Yarborough
Young, Ohio

So Mr. Bennett's amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the amendment, as follows:

> At the proper place in the bill, insert the following:
>
> "Section 205(a) of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, is amended by inserting after the third sentence thereof the following new sentence: 'The Secretary is also authorized and directed in making such allotments of the quotas for the mainland cane sugar area for 1964, 1965, and 1966, to take into consideration, in lieu of or in addition to the foregoing factors of processing, past marketings and ability to market, the need of establishing an allotment which will permit such marketing of sugar as is necessary for reasonably efficient operation during the calendar years 1964, 1965, and 1966 of any new sugarcane processing mill or factory that for the first time in 1964 begins the production of sugar from sugarcane: *Provided*, That the Secretary is authorized and if necessary shall reopen any hearing and amend any order alloting the 1964 quota in order to effectuate the provisions of this sentence.' "

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, this amendment would not affect anyone except the producers of sugar in Louisiana and Florida.

It will be recalled that during this debate, quotations were given from the President's message of last year on sugar, wherein he recommended the removal of marketing restrictions on the domestically produced sugar during the calendar year 1964. As all of us know, there was a shortage of sugar then.

Relying on the statement of the President, a sugarcane cooperative was organized in Louisiana. It was composed of 220 farmers, who had a long history of sugarcane production.

Included were 160 sugarcane farmers in Iberia Parish and 60 farmers in St. Martin Parish, who had pledged 320,000 tons of cane and invested $1,300,000 in class B stock to finance their own sugar mill. Four hundred and fifty area businessmen invested $700,000 in class A stock. The sugar production is estimated to be 30,000 to 32,000 tons.

At least 95 percent of the cane pledged to the co-op is proportionate share cane and already has a historical background for allotment, a large portion of which was processed in 10 sugar mills outside the home parish in 1961–63.

These producers had been selling to mills which had a marketing quota. It was expected that a quota would be allotted to the new mill to which these 220 farmers had contributed construction funds. This expectation was based on the statement made by the President, to the effect that there would be no marketing restrictions for the 1964 crop.

I would like to quote the pertinent part of the President's January 31, 1964, farm message:

> Sugar: The rise in sugar prices in 1963 reflected a reduction in world supplies. The Cuban crop was about one-half the pre-

> Castro level. Europe had two poor sugarbeet crops. But the fears voiced last year that the United States would be unable to obtain sufficient sugar proved groundless. Action by the Department of Agriculture assured sugar users an adequate supply and helped hold the price increases that attended heavy buying in anticipation of shortages. However, the experience of the past year—and the fact that foreign sugar quotas expire at the end of 1964—highlight the need for some action at this session of Congress to assure ample supplies of sugar to consumers at fair prices. I recommend the removal of marketing restrictions on the sale of domestically produced sugar during the calendar year 1964. This legislation will relieve the pressure on world market supplies at a time when these supplies are short.

In addition, I would like to point out that, in the event the co-op is unable to market in 1964 a substantial portion of its sugar as it is produced, it shall be unable to pay for the 320,000 tons of pledged cane as it is delivered. The result would be, not a hardship, but an economic disaster to the co-op, its investors, creditors and the entire community.

My amendment merely permits the Secretary of Agriculture to take into consideration certain necessary matters in order to ascertain the quantity of sugar that should be allocated to the new mill in an effort to be fair and equitable to all concerned.

I realize that there is a little difference of opinion among the producers of sugar with respect to the amendment. I have discussed the question with my good friend from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] and my distinguished colleague from Louisiana [Mr. LONG]. They are agreeable to taking the matter to conference, in the hope that something can be worked out in connection with this very equitable case.

There is a similar situation in another part of Louisiana, and another one in the State of Florida. Mills were constructed, and the sugarcane being ground at these new mills is sugarcane that would have been sent to other factories in those States to which a marketing quota was allowed.

As I said, the amendment simply gives the Secretary the right to adjust the quota in the hope that the new mills that had been constructed during 1964, and are in operation in 1964, will be entitled to a marketing quota.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. BENNETT. Is the understanding of the Senator from Utah correct that the amendment will not increase the total of 225,000 pounds?

Mr. ELLENDER. It will not.

Mr. BENNETT. It will not increase it?

Mr. ELLENDER. It will not.

Mr. BENNETT. It gives the Secretary power to distribute it differently than it might have been done without the amendment?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes, that is what we discussed. It will be in conference. It will be left to the conference committee to make that decision.

On the other hand, the amendment as drafted would permit the Secretary to allot a certain amount of tonnage in the sugarcane quota to Florida and Louisiana.

As I said, in conference this matter will be worked out. I am very hopeful that it will be done to the satisfaction of everyone.

Mr. BENNETT. So far as the Senator from Utah is concerned, this is a problem in which only the producers of cane sugar are involved. I certainly believe it would be an excellent idea to take the matter to conference, to see if the details can be worked out.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The amendment does not increase the amount of sugar that can be sold. So far as the consuming States are concerned, it makes no difference whatever; it is irrelevant. However, it makes considerable difference in the States of Louisiana and Florida as to which mill will grind sugar and which will not grind sugar.

In Louisiana, if I recall, in the New Iberia area about 267 farmers got together and built a mill. They wish to grind their cane in that mill.

In the meantime, the mill which had previously ground the sugar planted more sugar, anticipating it would lose these old customers.

If the amendment is not agreed to, these farmers who own the cooperative, built with money borrowed from the Federal Government——

Mr. ELLENDER. To some extent.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. These farmers would be left in the situation where they would not be able to grind their cane. We have tried to work out simple justice for the people in Louisiana. The people in Florida, to some extent, have a different problem. I have a tacit understanding with the Senator from Florida that we will try to work it out in conference, to do the fair and just thing, and that if we can solve the local problem in Louisiana, we will not create a parallel problem in Florida. The Senator from Florida is aware of that situation.

This does not involve the question of whether we should have a sugar act or no sugar act, or how many tons should come into the country. This is a matter as between the sugarcane producers as to what should be done for the people who find themselves in this situation, particularly with the old mill increasing its product, to take advantage of the fact that it had lost some of its old customers.

Mr. DOUGLAS. May I have the assurance of both Senators from Louisiana that the adoption of the amendment will not result in an increased production of high cost domestic cane sugar and a corresponding loss of low cost imported sugar?

Mr. ELLENDER. Ninety-five percent of the growers who are selling cane to the new mill were selling it to the old mills.

Mr. DOUGLAS. With that assurance, I will not oppose the amendment.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I speak not only for myself, but also for my senior colleague, who is unavoidably absent today. He vigorously supported the Bennett amendment. He recognizes, as I do, that there is considerable merit in the amendment which has been offered by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER].

However, as the amendment pertains to our State, and as it pertains to other cane producers as well, in the form in which it is drafted, we cannot help but feel that inadvertently it would encourage people who are not now in the sugar business to get into the sugar business in some fashion or other, in the belief that eventually the Government would finally bail them out.

We talked this matter over, as the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana has said. We have talked about amending or modifying the amendment to some extent.

That seems to be agreeable. We in Florida and the people in Louisiana have a common problem. I believe we can arrive at a satisfactory adjustment. I hope the manager of the bill will be willing to take it to conference.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I thank the Senator.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KUCHEL. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], and myself, I offer the amendments which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments offered by the Senator from Vermont will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the amendments, offered by Mr. PROUTY for himself and Mr. AIKEN, as follows:

> At the end of the bill add the following new section:
>
> "SEC. 75. SPRING-TYPE CLOTHESPINS.
>
> "(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF QUOTA.—The headnotes for schedule 7, part 13, subpart A (p. 397) are amended by adding at the end thereof the following new headnote:
>
> " '3. The quantity of articles specified in items 790.05 and 790.06 which may be entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption during any calendar year shall not exceed 650,000 gross.'
>
> "(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after January 1, 1965."
>
> On page 2, line 13, strike out "and 70 (b)" and insert "70(b), and 75(b)".

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, the amendments offered by me and my distinguished senior colleague from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] again proposes to establish a quota for spring-type clothespins. The amendment provides that imports of this type of clothespin should not exceed 650,000 gross a year.

Mr. President, a curious and difficult situation confronts the spring clothespin industry. On September 10, 1957, the U.S. Tariff Commission determined that spring clothespins were being imported in such increased quantities as to cause serious injury to the domestic industry. It recommended imposition of an annual import quota of 650,000 gross as the only possible means of remedying such injury.

Section 225(b) of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 requires that an article as to which such a Tariff Commission determination has been made must be reserved from negotiation if "the Tariff Commission finds and advises the President that economic conditions in such industry have not substantially improved" since the date of the finding of injury.

On April 22, 1964, the Tariff Commission, after a hearing and investigation, filed a report with the President in which three of the Commissioners found that economic conditions in the domestic spring clothespin industry had not substantially improved since September 10, 1957, and three found a substantial improvement in such conditions.

Under this three-to-three split of opinion the President is free to authorize, without qualm of conscience, the negotiations of trade liberalization on spring clothespins.

In a floor speech on April 24 of this year, I pointed out this curious facet of our tariff laws and noted that it would be prudent "in any situation where the Tariff Commission is unable to agree on any industry's ability to withstand further trade relaxations, to give the industry the benefit of the doubt—a presumption of inability to brave the onslaught from new trade liberalizations—particularly where, as here, the industry is an amalgam of small businesses located in areas of substantial unemployment."

Mr. President, to my way of thinking it is an extremely significant factor that this industry was able to persuade three members of the Tariff Commission that there still was likelihood of substantial injury to the industry.

I doubt that there is a Member of the Senate who could say in good conscience that the Tariff Commission is a protectionist body. To my knowledge, since the enactment of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 there has not been a single escape clause proceeding in which a majority of the Commission has found the likelihood of injury to a domestic industry because of trade concessions. To my mind there has been not a single instance in which the Commission has granted adjustment assistance under the provisions of that act.

The fact that the Commission was evenly divided on the question of the likelihood of continued injury to the spring clothespin industry is a point of greatest significance. The Commission does not lightly arrive at such conclusions.

At this point the spring clothespin industry finds itself in an extremely difficult position. It is a small industry, a small business. It has become smaller with the impact of imported spring clothespins. It is clearly the kind of industry that we ought to protect in our concern for the preservation of small business. It is an industry whose fate is in the hands of others. With the fell swoop of a pen this industry can be destroyed.

If Congress is to be concerned with the maintenance of a sound free enterprise system in which small business flourishes it must be prepared to back away from absolutist principles of free trade in an eventuality such as this where a small business, operating under the strictures of the American labor and merchandising market, meets the pains and penalties of foreign competition thriving under a different system.

Another congressional policy stands to be thwarted by our failure to act affirmatively on this amendment. We have constantly sought to improve the employment pattern of our small towns and rural communities. Under the Area Redevelopment Act we sought to alleviate the pressures of unemployment in areas already undergoing the ravages of jobless people.

Five plants, survivors of the loss of 25 percent of the domestic market to imports, are located in Mattawaumkeag, Dixfield, and West Paris, Maine, and in Waterbury and Montpelier, Vt. A man does not just leave his job in these areas and find new work. If his place of employment closes, he faces insuperable problems. Is he too old to move his family, sell his house, find a new job in a marketplace seeking young skilled workers? Is he to try and eke out a living from the land itself? Where is he to go? What is he to do? How is he to eat? What will his family wear?

The spring clothespin industry provides jobs to a substantial percentage of the employable in these small towns. In addition, many hundreds of farmers in both Maine and Vermont are entirely dependent upon these plants as a market for wood cut from their farms. Their sales of wood to the clothespin people provide them with money to buy plows, tractors, food, and clothing.

If we were not to adopt this amendment substantial harm could come to what remains of this industry. Three members of the Tariff Commission agree. The fact that three disagree with them ought not to be controlling. We face the evenly divided possibility that this difference of opinion may result in the ultimate destruction of a small business operating primarily in areas of substantial unemployment.

The mere possibility of such an occurrence ought to be reason enough to cast a presumption in their favor and offer them what assurances we can, that, within the quota recommended by the Tariff Commission, they will not be destroyed.

I offer the amendments in the hope that this small business, this small industry, can be kept alive to maintain employment for a relatively few American workers.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROUTY. I am happy to yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I commend my colleague from Vermont for his able discussion of the situation in which the spring clothespin industry finds itself. As usual, my colleague is fighting for the small industries of America—in this case, for a particular small industry peculiar to New England.

The industry may be small in the eyes of many people. Probably it furnishes employment to not more than 1,000 or, at the most, 1,200 persons in the shops and on the farms; but it is very important to those people. I know some of them. I know that this particular industry employs people who would find it difficult, if not impossible, to obtain another job should it close down.

For several years, the clothespin industry has had to struggle for its existence. It had to fight against competition which in some cases has bordered on the unfair, such as the misleading labeling of packages. It has had to struggle against cutthroat pricing. But with the help of the Tariff Commission, or of some of the members of the Tariff Commission, it has been able to exist up to now, and it still furnishes employment to a good many people in the small towns.

This is only one small industry; but it is small industry in the aggregate that determines whether we shall have a prosperous or a depressed economy in the United States.

I fully support what my colleague from Vermont has said. Again, I commend him for his alertness, his watchfulness, and his willingness to go to bat for the small industries of our area.

Mr. PROUTY. I appreciate the pertinent observations of my colleague from Vermont. As he has so well said, this proposal concerns not only the employees of the industry, but also the farmers in the area.

We find that 1,200 persons, including farmers, are involved. I invite the attention of the Senator from Louisiana to this fact. In 1955, this industry employed 437 individuals. The man-hours worked in that year were 874,000.

Mr. AIKEN. That is in the plants alone.

Mr. PROUTY. The Senator is correct. I am talking about the clothespins plants.

In 1963, the figure had dropped to 363 workers employed, and 502,000 man-hours of work. Therefore, there is a trend downward. This small industry is not going to survive unless it has some protection, which I believe is most important.

This year, imports from abroad are at the rate of $2,135,024 gross. This is a significant figure. If it continues, this small industry will be put out of business.

I hope very much that the Senate will look with favor upon my amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Illinois.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, it is with great regret that I must oppose the amendment of the Senator from Vermont. We all have the highest opinion of both the junior Senator and the senior

Senator from Vermont, but the amendment which they have just offered is another example of logrolling on the tariff bill which we thought we had eliminated when we passed the Hull Tariff Act of 1934 or 1935.

The act which is really before us is a Tariff Schedules Technical Amendments Act. It is now being loaded down with measures which would diminish low-cost, low-price foreign imports from foreign countries and lead to the production of additional quantities of high-cost, high-priced domestic articles which will increase the cost of living to hard-pressed American families.

I well understand the pressures which operate upon Representatives and Senators to protect specific, local industries. I have no words of reproof whatsoever for the two Senators from Vermont; but I remind the Senate of certain obvious facts; namely, that when we shut off imports we also automatically shut off exports. If we do not import from other countries, or if we reduce the amount of money which they have to buy from us, we hurt our exports. So, while we may think that we are protecting clothespins—and perhaps we are—saving on 70 jobs in Vermont, nevertheless, we are restricting exports from abroad—possibly from Canada. What we are doing is encouraging high-cost and high-price domestic industry to flourish and discourage the low-cost and low-price domestic industry to export. In addition the hardworking housewife who does her own washing will have to pay more for hanging up her clothes.

We cannot have it both ways. I thought we had realized these facts when the Hull Act was enacted. I thought we had realized it when we passed the Trade Expansion Act 2 years ago, which was intended to increase the total volume of international trade.

I know that it is easy to make a general declaration of purpose and to swear off a bad habit in general, but when each individual temptation comes along, we yield to it.

I believe that we have gone rather far this afternoon. I regret that this has been done. I do not believe that we should compound the error and further hamper international trade and the exchange of commodities and services between nations. For that enables each nation to specialize in the articles which it can best produce.

Therefore, Mr. President, I must regretfully oppose the amendment of the Senators from Vermont—much as I esteem them.

Mr. PROUTY. Let me say to the Senator from Illinois that this is an unusual situation. As I pointed out earlier, in 1957 the Tariff Commission recommended that this quota be established. This year, by a vote of 3 to 3, they were evenly divided. The three who voted in favor must have found sufficient evidence that this small industry could not exist without assistance of this kind.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I appreciate the comments of the Senator from Vermont. I do not blame him in the slightest. We are all exposed to these difficulties. However, the fact, that in 1957 the Tariff Commission recommended that a quota be established should not be controlling, because the Tariff Commission in that year was a high Tariff Commission. President Eisenhower had many virtues, but he packed the Tariff Commission with high tariff men. They tended to view each industry by itself and not consider the general interest. I know that it is hard to rise above local interests when specific measures are before us, but it is all too easy to think of the effect upon a specific industry—in this case, the clothespin industry and to disregard the effect on trade and production of the country as a whole.

Mr. AIKEN. I am consumed with curiosity. I am wondering whether the Senator from Illinois can tell us where the clothespins imported into the United States are manufactured?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I assume they probably come from Canada.

Mr. AIKEN. Not a single clothespin comes from Canada. They come from countries which have favorable trade balances with this country. None comes from our Canadian neighbor.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Then I would make the same point in connection with them that I made in connection with Canada, that if we shut off imports from those countries we also automatically shut off or restrict our exports. This is one of the simple rules. We are trying to expand trade, trying to produce a situation in which each country can do its best absolutely or comparatively and so that the total gross national product for the world will therefore be increased by greater freedom of trade, which it is now proposed to be restricted.

Mr. PROUTY. I point out that a substantial amount of the imports of clothespins comes from Hong Kong and Poland. There are some from Belgium, Sweden—I believe a few from the Netherlands—but the volume is so small that it would have little if any economic effect in those countries abroad; but it would put this small industry out of business at home.

Mr. DOUGLAS. We all remember Washington Irving's story of Rip Van Winkle who would swear off drinking, but whenever a drink was placed before him he would take it and say, "I won't count this time." But that was the way he became steadily more alcoholic.

The clothespin industry is a relatively small industry. This is not an issue of great magnitude, but I should say that we have been taking too many potions of protectionist drink; and if we really wish to swear off, the time to do it is now.

Mr. PROUTY. It is a matter of great magnitude to the people working in this industry and to the farmers who supply the raw material. It is a matter of life or death to them, economically speaking.

Mr. AIKEN. I ask the Senator from Illinois if he does not believe that the time to swear off, as he has suggested, would have been before the added protection was given to the whiskbroom industry, which is a subject in which the Senator from Illinois seems to be very much interested.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I voted against the broom proposal, and——

Mr. AIKEN. It was a voice vote.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I voted against it in committee also.

Mr. AIKEN. That would have been the time to have sworn off.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I also voted against it on the floor of the Senate.

I do not pretend to be perfect in consistency. I frequently am inconsistent. However, in this particular instance, my friend, the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], has not caught me in an inconsistency, because I was one of the two members on the Committee on Finance who voted against the restriction on brooms. I believe, in general, the Senator will find that on the Finance Committee almost without exception I vote for lower tariffs.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator from Illinois for his explanation, which points up the fact that there might be a divergence of opinion within his home State——

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is true, but when there is a divergence——

Mr. AIKEN. So far as whiskbrooms are concerned.

Mr. DOUGLAS. As regards such matters, I should like to be consistent. I do not say I have perfect success. But in general I have voted for the national interest and for consumers as a whole even when producers in my own State are involved. So I can, with perfect consistency, oppose the clothespin amendment which our friends from Vermont are trying to foist upon the public. But we should also realize that while consumers tend to be inarticulate because their interests are different, they also need to be represented. They are ignored too often on the floor of Congress.

It is always much easier to be consistent in relation to the other fellow's product than on one's own. But I have taken this medicine myself, I can assure the Senator.

Mr. President, I have no illusions about the general interest being contrary to the specific interest. I want the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], whom I feel are excellent Senators, to know that there is nothing personal in my expression of opinion.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, the committee has not had an opportunity to study the amendment. I say to the Senator that I earnestly wish he had offered his amendment before the committee so that the committee could have studied it, looked into the merits, and decided whether they thought relief was appropriate.

From what I have been able to determine, this is not a situation in which relief is called for. To provide relief now would violate our trade agreements. The Tariff Commission split on this measure 3 to 3. Three members of the Commission were strongly in favor of the proposal and the other three were equally strongly opposed to it.

The Senator could have presented the amendment to our committee if he had wished to do so. I understood that he did not wish to do so.

If the Senator desires to seek relief in this area, I wish he would come to the committee when Congress meets next year. I wish he would base this proposal on its own merits. This is a bill that needs to be acted upon.

I hope that the Senate will not insist on making a snap judgment on a matter of this sort and vote in a quota provision which, as I understand, does not even provide for any importation beyond a certain quota, even if they pay a higher tariff.

I believe it would be most unwise to act on this kind of proposal or make a snap judgment on it.

I believe it is a bad precedent to act in this case, when the measure could be presented in an orderly fashion, carefully considered, and recommendations brought to the Senate. In that event, we could have the advice of the executive branch of our Government at the time we act on the measure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Prouty]. (Putting the question.)

The "ayes" appear to have it.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDIING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection it is so ordered.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the pending amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Prouty]. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Anderson], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Bayh], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Burdick], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. Cannon], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hart], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Johnston], the Senator from Texas [Mr. Yarborough], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCarthy], the Senator from Montana [Mr. Metcalf], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Robertson], the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Young] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Edmondson], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Hartke], the Senator from Florida [Mr. Holland], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. Humphrey], the Senator from Washington [Mr. Jackson], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGovern], the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss], the Senator from Maine [Mr. Muskie], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. Neuberger], the Senator from California [Mr. Salinger], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Symington] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Hill], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy], are absent because of illness.

I also announce that if present and voting, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph] would vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Dominick], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Beall], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Case], the Senators from Nebraska [Mr. Curtis and Mr. Hruska], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Goldwater], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Jordan], the Senator from New York [Mr. Keating], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Morton], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Thurmond], the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. Williams] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper] is detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Curtis], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Dominick], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Jordan], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska] is paired with the Senator from New York [Mr. Keating]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea" and the Senator from New York would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 22, nays 32, as follows:

[No. 591 Leg.]

YEAS—22

Aiken
Allott
Bartlett
Bennett
Boggs
Byrd, W. Va.
Cotton
Dirksen
Dodd
Hickenlooper
Magnuson
Mansfield
McIntyre
Mechem
Mundt
Pearson
Prouty
Saltonstall
Simpson
Smith
Sparkman
Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—32

Bible
Brewster
Carlson
Church
Douglas
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Fong
Gore
Hayden
Inouye
Javits
Jordan, N.C.
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
McClellan
McNamara
Monroney
Morse
Nelson
Pastore
Pell
Proxmire
Ribicoff
Russell
Stennis
Talmadge
Walters
Williams, N.J.

NOT VOTING—46

Anderson
Bayh
Beall
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Cannon
Case
Clark
Cooper
Curtis
Dominick
Edmondson
Fulbright
Goldwater
Gruening
Hart
Hartke
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Humphrey
Jackson
Johnston
Jordan, Idaho
Keating
Kennedy
McCarthy
McGee
McGovern
Metcalf
Miller
Morton
Moss
Muskie
Neuberger
Randolph
Robertson
Salinger
Scott
Smathers
Symington
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, Ohio

So Mr. Prouty's amendment was rejected.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM—POSSIBLE ADJOURNMENT PLANS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished majority leader, insofar as he knows, about the program for the remainder of the week and what he can say with respect to the session next week. I am informed that the House Rules Committee has cleared a rule providing for a continuing resolution relating to appropriaton bills yet either unpassed or unsigned, to endure for a period of 10 days. That would certainly encompass all of next week. From that, one might readily divine that Congress would be in session perhaps for another week. I presume the distinguished majority leader has current information on this matter.

The reason I ask the question is that I have been the target of inquiry from ever so many Members with respect to engagements they have in the field. I am willing to confess to the Senator that I am going to Phoenix, Ariz., win, lose, or draw. I shall be back Friday noon. I shall have to be available on Tuesday, in order to try to avoid what is becoming a frightfully embarrassing and awkward situation, not only for the cancelor but the cancelee.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, may I ask whose side this time is coming from?

Mr. MANSFIELD. No one's.

Mr. DIRKSEN. So I now supplicate and fairly entreat the distinguished majority leader to give us some words of comfort, because I had nurtured the hope that at the end of the week we could get hold of the curtain, pull it down, and say, "That is the end of the 2d session, 88th Congress."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the fount for my information is the distinguished minority leader, who informed me a short while ago that the Rules Committee in the House had reported favorably an extension of the remaining appropriation bills. I, too, had hoped we could complete our business by this Saturday night, but in view of the development just noted, it would appear that the prospects are that we shall be in session all of next week if we remain.

A number of Senators on this side of the aisle are absent, and evidently they are not alone. Other Senators told me they intend to return to their home States this weekend. I always take a Senator at his word.

At the present time in conference are the coffee agreement, the foreign aid authorization bill, and the social security health care bill; and out of conference, the NDEA conference report, on which the House will act first and on which there seems to be some difficulty at the moment.

The following bills have passed the Senate and are awaiting House action: Appalachia, ARA, water pollution, and water resources.

The following appropriation bills are awaiting Senate action: The supplemental appropriation bill, which will at least be laid before the Senate tonight, and very likely disposed of tomorrow; and the foreign aid appropriation bill, which will not be taken up until the authorization bill now in conference is agreed to by both Houses.

I should like to ask the distinguished minority leader and other Members of the Senate what their reaction would be to recessing next Saturday, going home, and coming back on November 15.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the minority leader long ago learned to adapt and adjust himself to the conditions and requirements of the situation. However, I advanced this idea only as something that was in the air when we held our policy meeting on Tuesday morning. The air was about to take on a slightly blue cast as a result. From that, one can divine that there was no great felicity or happiness among the Members as they contemplated coming back after election. But I have come back after other elections. I recognize the responsibility of the majority leader always, because he is the conductor of the business of the Senate; and whatever the exigencies require, I adjust myself accordingly.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I make the suggestion without any enthusiasm, but in the realization of what confronts us at the moment and what may confront us in the days, if not weeks, ahead.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I know the majority leader is trying to do his best to get us out of here. Would he amend his request so that the Senate might adjourn on Saturday and not return until January 3?

Mr. MANSFIELD. No.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me to make a request that I think is a perfectly legitimate request? With the consent of the majority leader, I state that since August 24 I have canceled some 15 or 20 speaking engagements and meetings in my home State, every one of them nonpolitical in nature. Since I have made this sacrifice, I ask the consent of the Senate to be absent from noon next Monday until noon of the Monday following, so that I may keep about six other engagements which I have not canceled, all of which are nonpolitical engagements. Two or three are REA meetings; there are a couple of dairy meetings; and some others. I feel obligated to keep the other engagements. I would not be able to go out of the State. I would do the best I could to explain the intricacies of the Senate and the reason we are what we are. I assure the Senate that they would be entirely nonpartisan.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Nonpartisan political meetings.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none——

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. If there is a bottleneck at all, I think the bottleneck is in the other branch of Congress for reasons it knows better than we do. I notice that the distinguished majority leader has said that the Senate will consider during this week the supplemental appropriation bill, but that it will not consider the foreign aid appropriation bill until such time as the authorization bill is agreed to. I hope the majority leader will reconsider that statement. After all, the House passed the appropriation bill before there was agreement on the authorization bill, and sent it over to the Senate.

I assure Senators that the foreign aid appropriation bill reported by the committee is in the same amount, and not in a larger amount, as the authorization passed by the Senate. The amount is under the authorization amount passed in the House and under the appropriation amount passed in the House. So the Senate could safely act upon the appropriation bill, send it to the House, and then await the action of the House, without delaying any procedure, and without offending the House of Representatives in any way.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The usual procedure, however, is to wait until the authorizations have been attended to.

Mr. PASTORE. Yes; but the House did not do that. We waited until after our authorization bill. We passed our authorization bill. The appropriation bill that we have agreed to is lower than our own authorization bill. It is lower than the House authorization bill. It is lower than the House appropriation bill.

We could pass the appropriation bill and then leave it until such time as the authorization bill is agreed to. We could then forget about the continuing resolution.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The two Houses are independent bodies. There is no way for the Senate to coerce the House into any kind of action. They are preparing to do this, so I am informed. That means, as the majority leader well says, that we shall probably be here most of next week. With an election coming on, one can readily understand the necessity for action, as Senators wish to get back home.

I am doing this only in order to gain some assurance as to what the schedule will be. Then if they know, they can determine for themselves whether or not to be absent, whether to cancel a meeting, or whether to be present.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator knows that from time to time, when we have been held up in the Senate, the House has taken long recesses, awaiting action by the Senate.

Only three important bills remain here. They are the tariff bill, the supplemental appropriation bill, and the foreign aid appropriation bill. If we get those out of the way, we can recess and go back and meet our engagements, and await action by the House. That is all I am saying. We could do the work we have to do. We can do our job and go back home and build up our fences while the other body dillydallies.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Some conference reports remain to be disposed of. I should like to ask the majority leader one more question. I should like to ask him whether he seriously entertains, and whether he knows whether the other body seriously entertains, the idea of a recess on Saturday of this week to last, let us say, until November 15, or any other time?

Mr. MANSFIELD. My answer would be in the affirmative.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That it is under serious consideration?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The majority leader very thoughtfully and cooperatively asked for expressions of opinion, not only from the leadership, but also from this side of the aisle. Therefore, I feel at liberty to express an opinion.

There was a policy meeting on last Tuesday, attended by almost all the Republicans who were in the city.

I believe I can say without fear of contradiction that while Senators on this side of the aisle rather frequently disagree in some degree or measure on their voting and in their opinions on certain matters, at no time have I ever seen more nearly complete unanimity expressed against a recess until, say, November 15, or any other time after election.

I am bound to say to the majority leader that there will be some vocal expressions of objection if it is proposed to recess the Congress until sometime in November. The reason why it was discussed was that, with all due respect to everyone, and the desire of Senators to get away, most of us have failed to see any sustainable reason for a delay in the adjournment of Congress, up until now.

I assure the majority leader that I am in accord with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE]. I am on the conference that is meeting on the foreign aid authorization bill. That conference, in my judgment, can be completed tomorrow afternoon.

I do not know what the parliamentary situation is or what points of order are involved, but I do know that the House has passed an appropriation bill subject to passage of the authorization bill. The appropriation bill cannot come into effect until the authorization bill has been passed. While there is a little hassle in the other body about the appointment of conferees on the authorization bill, I believe that problem has been straightened out. I believe the conferees in the House will be officially appointed early tomorrow afternoon, under a rule. We have met informally with the House conferees, even though they have not been officially appointed. Pleasurably, some very fine and distinguished Members of the other body have been acting in a totally unofficial capacity as conferees. However, we have been conferring. As soon as they become official conferees, the two or three items which are still to be resolved can be resolved with considerable speed. I am hopeful that the conference will come to an agreement if we can have a meeting tomorrow afternoon. We shall meet the conferees of the House unofficially tomorrow morning. We may come to a tentative agreement, awaiting only the official confirmation of the appointment of conferees. I see no reason why the conference cannot come to an agreement tomorrow.

On the other hand, and agreeing with the Senator from Rhode Island, unless there is a parliamentary situation here that I do not know anything about—the Appropriations Committee, which has already arrived at its conclusions, with a bill that is below the House figure and below the Senate figure—they know what the figures are, and have arrived at them unofficially—I see no reason why the appropriation bill cannot be passed in any event. I believe these matters can be expedited. I see no reason why we cannot get out by Saturday night, if there is a will to get out.

I am not talking about the will of the majority leader. I know he is anxious to get out. We all know that. I am not trying to assess where the fault lies. We have been asked for an expression of opinion. That is what I am giving. I have stated the unanimous opinion of our meeting. It is a unanimous objection. I am not being quite as parliamentarily diplomatic as our beloved minority leader in the answer he gave. I say to the majority leader that there will be vociferous objection to any dilly-dallying, for one reason or another, which many of us believe to be inexcusable, and that will force us to come back on November 15. I can only say to the majority leader what I feel to be the honest answer to the question he asked of us.

Mr. MANSFIELD. As always, I appreciate the Senator's frankness.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, it comes perhaps with poor grace from any Senator who is not a candidate for reelection to be too vociferous about staying here and causing Senators on both sides of the aisle embarrassment in their engagements.

I know that the majority leader is doing everything in his power in this matter. So far as the senior Senator from New Hampshire is concerned, whatever the majority leader determines, he will get the full cooperation of the Senator from New Hampshire, and not criticism. But one thing we do know is that if we recess until November 15 and return on that day, human nature being as it is, we shall be in session until the next Congress convenes in January. That is just as certain as that day follows night.

Many persons have said, perhaps quite aptly, that if we did not have air conditioning in Washington, the sessions of Congress would stop in the spring. There is one great motivation forcing Congress to adjourn, and that is that every Member of the other House and many Members of this branch are in a campaign for reelection and want to get home to campaign. With that as a lever, it seems to me—and I am not suggesting, as did the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], that the session should end on Saturday night—that the proposal by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] is an exceedingly thoughtful, cogent one. I hope that the leadership will give it careful consideration.

Once we let some of the controversial issues go over until after the election, we shall debate them and bring in many other measures and be here until the next Congress convenes.

While it may not be so important, it sets a bad precedent, because the purpose of the Norris amendment to the Constitution was to put an end to lame-duck sessions. That is what we shall be starting again if what has been proposed takes place. It is easy for Senators not running for reelection to say, "I will come back next week or after election." I do not want to say that. It is not fair to Senators who are running. But it seems to me that if we followed the suggestion of the Senator from Rhode Island, that we do what we have to do now and make our speeches, and not wait until the House has acted, we might avoid being stuck here the whole fall, and would not have to return until next January.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire has spoken well and ably on this subject. I appreciate his remarks. I shall give careful consideration to the suggestion of the Senator from Rhode Island. Although it is a bit unusual, I would hope we would not encounter any difficulties in so doing.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 A.M. TOMORROW; AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION TO MEET DURING THE MORNING TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to make a unanimous-consent request having a double proviso.

First, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

I also ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules and Administration be permitted to meet during the morning tomorrow, regardless of the convening of the Senate at 11 o'clock.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana will state it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Will the Chair inform the Senate if the precedents of the Senate would allow the passage of the foreign aid appropriation bill before the conference report on the foreign aid authorization bill has been agreed to?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McINTYRE in the chair). The parliamentarian informs the Chair that it would be in order to take up the foreign aid appropriation bill, as suggested by the Senator from Montana, and cites paragraph 1 of rule XVI as authority for his statement.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in view of the ruling of the Chair, and with the concurrence of the Senate as a whole, the leadership will endeavor to have the supplemental appropriation bill followed by the foreign aid appropriation bill, but with the hope, in light of what the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] has said, that the conferees on the foreign aid authorization bill will get together as expeditiously as possible and report as quickly as possible an agreement which will be attested to by both the House and the Senate.

I further assure the Senate that before any action of any kind having to do with an adjournment or a recess of Congress is undertaken, there will be a conference with the distinguished minority leader, so that, insofar as it will be possible to do so—and it always has been so far—we shall act in accord with one another's views.

CORRECTION OF CERTAIN ERRORS IN THE TARIFF SCHEDULES OF THE UNITED STATES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 12253) to correct certain errors in the tariff schedules of the United States.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask for its immediate consideration. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment not be read but that it be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill add the following new section:

"SEC. — ROUGH IRON CASTINGS

"Schedule 6, part 4, subpart A, is amended by striking out item 661.95 (p. 311) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"'	Other:		
661.92	Cast-iron (except malleable cast-iron) parts, not alloyed and not advanced beyond cleaning, and machined only for the removal of fins, gates, sprues and risers or to permit location in finishing machinery............	3% ad val.	10% ad val.
661.95	Other............	11.5% ad val.	35% ad val.'"

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] is a cosponsor of the amendment.

Under the Tariff Schedules of the United States of 1963, the net effect of various changes is that rough iron castings are now regarded as "parts" of the various machines in which they will ultimately, after machining and other treatment, be used. Under this new approach, the great bulk of imports of castings has become dutiable at the rate of 11.5 and 12 percent, which are the rates applicable to filtration and clarification equipment and pumps. This represents an increase of almost 300 percent.

At no time has the Tariff Commission or Congress issued a statement of explanation or other indication concerning an intention to increase the duty rate applicable to rough castings, although such explanations were published in the case of many other articles involving much less significant changes in rate. It seems evident that neither the Tariff Commission nor Congress intended that the rate of duty on such castings be increased. My amendment would restore the original duty. I urge the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, my understanding is that the amendment would merely restore the old tariff structure, for fear the new structure would damage someone. I am prepared to accept the amendment.

Mr. RIBICOFF. I thank the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, my able colleague from Connecticut [Mr. Ribicoff] has explained why this is a fair and a necessary amendment, so I will be brief.

It simply restores the tariff on imported, unfinished, or rough castings to the lower rate which has been in effect for some years.

The Customs Bureau has held recently that these unfinished castings are "parts" with the result that a higher duty would have to be charged without some clarification in the statutes.

Our amendment will result in substantial savings to companies that import these products in quantity and we are grateful to the distinguished floor manager of the bill, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long], for agreeing to accept it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I call up an amendment which is at the desk and ask that it be read. The amendment is offered in behalf of myself and Mr. Young of Ohio, Mr. Bayh, and Mr. Hart.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

On page 15, strike out lines 1 through 17 (section 21 of the bill).

Renumber succeeding sections.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the issue in this amendment is the removal of the duty on the importation of limestone from Canada. The present law imposes a 20-cent duty against the importation of limestone into the United States.

I ask the chairman to allow me to have placed in the Record a tabulation of the importance of this business to the Great Lakes States. By the Great Lakes States I mean Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Wisconsin.

When the bill was before the Committee on Finance, it did not contain a provision to remove the duty against the importation of limestone from Canada.

In the Committee on Finance, an amendment was adopted making provision for the importation of what are called fragments and finds of limestone.

It seems that in the State of Washington two companies have a situation that is unique. They are in the business of processing limestone and are separated by a river from a limestone quarry in Canada. If they were to buy limestone in the United States, it would have to come from southern Oregon or southern California or from areas in the Great Lakes States.

I should like to be of aid to companies in the State of Washington, but I cannot do so if to be of aid to them means imposing a penalty upon the limestone quarries in the Great Lakes States.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. Douglas] is in the Chamber. I should like to inform him that his State mines 36 million tons of limestone a year. It is a $54 million business in Illinois. Only the State of Pennsylvania exceeds Illinois in the quantity of limestone which is mined.

I should like to help companies in the State of Washington, but I cannot do it at the expense of the Ohio quarries which are engaged in the business of mining limestone.

The duty imposed upon the importation of limestone from Canada is 20 cents a ton; and 20 cents a ton means approximately 14 cents ad valorem tax. If we allow this importation, what the impact will be upon the industries in the Great Lakes area, I cannot foretell.

Vermont is also deeply interested, as is the State of New Hampshire—in fact, all of the States along the St. Lawrence Seaway.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator from Ohio understand that hearings were held on the proposal to eliminate the tariff on limestone?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I do not believe that any hearings were held in the Finance Committee. There was a limited discussion about it. I make this statement on the basis of the request I made: No one seems to have any recollection of a solidified, combined discussion leading to a judgment on what should be done.

Mr. AIKEN. If the Senator from Ohio will yield further, I should like to state what the limestone industry means to my small State.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Bartlett in the chair). Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. In 1962, 1,141,508 tons were produced. In 1963 it went up 50,000 tons, to 1,194,379 tons. The 20 cents protection would mean approximately $250,000 a year. That is only one small State—one small area. If we lost that protection, it would mean that with the price of limestone being competitive, as it is, and agricultural lime being competitive——

Mr. MAGNUSON. I believe that——

Mr. LAUSCHE. I have the floor.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Excuse me.

Mr. AIKEN. Limestone is used for a variety of purposes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What is the principal use of limestone?

Mr. AIKEN. I believe that its principal use is in the steel industry. Republic Steel buys a great deal of limestone, because it considers it to be of high quality for its purposes. If there could be some way to transport it from the quarries to the Great Lakes more economically than can be done at present—in other words, we need the Champlain waterway approved so that it could be transported more cheaply, and business would increase vastly. But it is about 1,100,000 tons a year, exclusive of agricultural limestone.

I do not know what the effect of the amendment would be. That is why I am willing——

Mr. LAUSCHE. Neither do I.

Mr. AIKEN. I am willing to support the amendment of the Senator from Ohio, hoping that we would have an opportunity before next winter to find out what its effect will be. Perhaps we sell it to Canada. I do not know. There has not been time to obtain the information.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Let me say, in response to the Senator from Vermont, that the perplexing problem confronting me is that I do not know what the exact impact will be, because of the rather precipitate notice that was given about what the Finance Committee has done. Let me further say that in 1960 the duty was 25 cents a ton. In 1961, it was 25 cents a ton. In 1962, it was reduced to 22½ cents a ton; in 1963, to 20 cents a ton.

We propose to eliminate all of the duty.

Let me say to the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson] that I wish to be of help to him, but I cannot do so at the expense of my State, or the States in the Great Lakes region. I do not know what the impact will be; hence, I feel that the amendment should be considered.

The Senator from Washington made some compromise proposal to me, and I wish that my associate Senators in the Great Lakes region would listen to it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, this has been a matter which has been discussed in the Committee on Finance on three or four occasions. Paragraph 203 of the present act was enacted approximately 40 years ago, solely for the protection of two quarries at Puget Sound, which are now extinct.

Two other quarries now exist in that area, one a very small one, the other not of great size. In its report, the Department states that it is negligible. Up there, the limestone is on one side, the processing is done on the other side. It amounts to very little, in toto.

All the executive departments—the State Department, the Commerce Department, the Treasury Department, the

Interior Department, the Labor Department, the Bureau of the Budget, and the Tariff Commission—merely stated that they had no objection. I was corrected, and rightly so, by the Senator from Ohio. They do not make recommendations.

What we are trying to do is to change this 40-year-old paragraph 203 which came into existence in the old logrolling days for two quarries in Puget Sound, and to make it reasonable so that those people can operate.

One of the reasons we have to do this—as was well pointed out by the Senator from Vermont—is that we cannot transport limestone very far today unless water routes are available. With the opening of the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence Seaway, I can say that there might be some great effect in that area if a better way to transport crude limestone can be found.

Limestone mined in the Puget Sound area can be used only for cement. I do not know of any other purpose for which it is used. Limestone is a great source of fertilizer. We could use more of it. But this is used only for cement, so far as I know.

The operators of one quarry in Baker, Oreg., objected to the amendment, and we received some letters from them. They have since withdrawn their objection. Everyone in the Senate would agree that if they still objected, there would be Senators in the Chamber to talk about it. But they withdrew their objection. I have, therefore, talked with the minority leader, the Senator from Ohio, and two or three other Senators—the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNamara] among them—and I am suggesting this amendment. I believe that it will take care of the situation as a substitute amendment which will, in effect, be limited to the manufacturer only of cement and limit the time on it until January 1, 1966. Then we can see what effect this may or may not have. It will be limited. The amendment I suggest is: "Limestone imported to be used in the manufacture of cement."

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The persons in the Government, in a position to know, say that they ought to have about 18 months. That would run it down to about June 30.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That would be all right—18 months. That would take care of any problems we have.

I have talked to people who are involved in this problem. The Senate passed this bill once and sent it to the House. But in order to remove all possible objections to the enactment of the amendment, the proponents are willing, reluctantly, to restrict the applicability to cement.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator know how the quantity of limestone used in cement manufacture compares with the quantity of limestone used in steel manufacture?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not know.

The quarries that I am talking about are only for cement. They are not used for anything else that I know of. But, the chemical technology has started to do some great things with limestone deposits for fertilizer.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It is used for various purposes. It is used in aggregates for highway construction purposes. It is used for fertilizer. And it is used in metallurgical work.

Mr. McNAMARA. It is also used in terrazzo.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct. Some limestone is used in pulp and paper manufacture.

Mr. President, I send to the desk a substitute amendment for the amendment of the Senator from Ohio and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment to the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed on page 5, strike out lines 1 through 7 and insert the following:

SEC. 21. LIMESTONE USED FOR CEMENT MAKING PURPOSES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Part 1, subpart B of the appendix is amended by inserting immediately after item 907.88 (p. 433) the following new item:

"	909.00	Limestone provided for in items 513.34 and 514.11, when imported to be used in the manufacture of cement	Free	Free	On or before 6/30/66	"

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption after the date of the enactment of this act.

On page 2, line 12, strike out "21(c)" and insert "21(b)".

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, with reference to the substitute amendment, I have a perfecting proposal. That perfecting proposal is to accept the substitute amendment of the Senator from Washington, but change it to the effect that the right to import shall be limited to June 30, 1966.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is very acceptable to me. Then we can actually find out how this may or may not affect it.

I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to modify my amendment to insert that date.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Washington, as modified, in the nature of a substitute for the amendment of the Senator from Ohio.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, in reading H.R. 12253, as reported out by the Senate Finance Committee on September 25, and which we are considering today, I notice that on page 15 the committee proposes to eliminate all tariffs on "limestone chips and spalls, and so forth." It has been called to my attention by the limestone industry around the Great Lakes area that the stone business is becoming increasingly demoralized by the importation of stone into that area.

In 1930, the duty on "limestone, crude or crushed" was $1 per ton. This has been reduced by various stages. In 1960, the duty was 25 cents per ton. This was reduced in two stages and it currently is 20 cents per ton.

Even now it is in the President's list of articles for possible consideration in trade agreement negotiations which could lead to a reduction of 50 percent or 10 cents per ton. I am opposed to any reduction in this duty which is so vitally affecting this industry, not only in my area but clear across the northern border of our country.

Let me show you what the effect of reducing this tariff has had in recent years as developed from the customs records:

Limestone crude or crushed imported to the United States, 1960–63

Year	Tons	Value	Duty per ton
1960	121,449	$269,435	$0.25
1961	286,823	440,698	.25
1962	469,897	617,875	.22½
1963	744,162	1,073,587	.20

I want to stress the fact that in 1960 when the tariff was 25 cents per ton, only 121,000 tons with a value of $269,000 were imported. In 1963 when the duty was reduced to 20 cents per ton the tonnage rose to 744,000 which had a value of $1,074,000. This represents a tonnage increase of 600 percent within a 4-year period.

If the tariff is eliminated as proposed in this bill, to what heights will the imports rise? Will they continue to increase at the rate or will they jump in proportion to the tariff reduction? In any event it will further demoralize the industry and result in putting many companies out of business; not only along the northern border of this country but will extend southward as these companies seek new markets to replace those they have lost to these imports.

The committee held no hearings on this amendment which was added to H.R. 12253 as passed by the House. This item is only 1 of about 20 changes made by the committee and it seems to me that in each case where the public has had no opportunity to express its view on how those industries would be affected, the public should be given such an opportunity.

Total limestone tonnage and sales, 1962

State	Tons	Amount
Illinois	36,360,000	$54,405,000
Indiana	17,911,000	33,998,000
Michigan	28,504,000	28,763,000
Minnesota	3,486,000	6,008,000
New York	24,035,000	37,913,000
Ohio	33,098,000	49,760,000
Pennsylvania	41,500,000	62,400,000
Wisconsin	11,662,000	13,641,000
Total	196,556,000	286,888,000

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a summary of reasons for the passage of the legislation removing duty from limestone.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Summary of Reasons for the Passage of the Legislation Removing Duty from Limestone

1. Paragraph 203 of the present act was enacted approximately 40 years ago solely for the protection of one or two quarries in Puget Sound, neither of which is now in existence.

2. The economic reasons advanced for the protection of these two defunct quarries is vastly different today.

3. Due to the unavailability of limerock, commercially accessible in the Pacific Northwest for industries in that region and the necessity to import limerock from Canada, industries in the Pacific Northwest will receive substantial benefits.

4. All of the executive departments consulted, to wit: State, Commerce, Treasury, Interior, and Labor, as well as the Bureau of the Budget and the Tariff Commission have sent in reports approving the bill or indicating that they are not opposed thereto.

5. The bill is virtually noncontroversial, the only objections having been raised by the owner of the quarries at Sumas, Wash., and by the owner of a quarry at Baker, Oreg. The former has withdrawn its objection and we fail to see how the latter would be adversely affected as his operation at Baker, Oreg., has never, to our knowledge, supplied limestone to any of the large consumers in the Seattle, Portland, Tacoma or other tidewater areas. The overriding national interest and particularly the interest of the industries in the Pacific Northwest is overwhelming.

6. In order to remove all objections to the enactment of the bill, the proponents are willing, reluctantly, to restrict its applicability to cement, as a result of which the quarry at Baker, Oreg., would be unaffected.

7. Although reluctantly willing to restrict the bill to the importation of limestone for cementmaking purposes, we believe that the overall interest of American industry, including that in the Pacific Northwest and including pulp and paper companies, the metallurgical industry and others should prompt Congress to favor the broad form of the bill.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I call attention to two amendments which were inserted in the bill by the Finance Committee, and both of which relate to section 12(b). The committee report states that both amendments are designed to correct an alleged abuse of the tariff laws.

One involves the duty on fabrics of manmade fibers mixed with vegetable fibers and in chief value of vegetable fiber. Such fabrics are presently dutiable at a rate of 6½ or 10 percent.

The other relates to certain woven fabrics of vegetable fibers containing wool. Such fabrics are also presently dutiable at 6½ or 10 percent.

The committee's action on fabrics of manmade fibers is surrounded by a great deal of confusion and is based at least partially on misinformation. It should be deleted from this omnibus tariff measure by the House-Senate conferees and made the subject of hearings before any further action is taken on it.

In setting forth the reason for the drastic increase in the rate of duty applicable to blended fabrics of manmade and vegetable fibers, the Finance Committee report states that "the vegetable fiber content is increased beyond that which is needed to produce a commercially marketable product, in order to obtain the advantage of the lower rate."

This is not in agreement with the facts at my disposal. There are two known fabrics that would be affected. One is a rayon-ramie blend, as to which, I am told, there has been absolutely no manipulation. Quite to the contrary, this fabric has been imported with the same fiber composition and at the lower rate for over a decade. The importers of the other fabric apparently covered by the section—a rayon-flax blend—state that they are unaware of any manipulation of the content of their product.

The rate of duty applicable to these fabrics will be increased from 6.5 or 10 percent to an ad valorem equivalent in excess of 50 percent.

In view of these facts, this amendment should be deleted from the bill and the conflicting views should be submitted to the scrutiny of a public hearing.

I want to make clear that this amendment will not affect the provisions of the bill relating to a wool-ramie fabric that some Senators are concerned about.

In the case of the wool fabric with vegetable fiber added, I received many complaints from importers because the committee action would result in a change of duty from 6.5 or 10 percent to 30 cents per pound plus 45 percent ad valorem. Such a sudden increase in duty would be disastrous to importers who have already made contracts in good faith on the basis of the rate of tariff, the duty treatment, administered at present with respect to that type of fabric. In this instance importers have had no opportunity to present their case at public hearings.

I make this statement to alert the conferees to the fact that there are very serious and substantive questions involved in both amendments and that in all justice, before anything is finalized with respect to them in the bill, the most careful factual inquiry should be made. A determination should be made as to the charges that a protectionist device is being used under the guise of an effort to close the loophole, and that an unfairness is being perpetrated; also the fact that importers who have already made contracts on the strength of the present rate of duty in good faith would be seriously prejudiced. Both those questions should have the urgent attention of the conferees.

I am confident that the conferees would not wish to perpetrate an unfairness, especially in relation to questions which have not been the subject of a hearing before a committee, so that the parties in interest might have an opportunity to have a day in court and present the issues.

I trust that the conferees will take careful note of the statement which I have made in connection with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared for delivery by my colleague [Mr. DOMINICK] be printed in the RECORD at a point just prior to the vote on H.R. 12253, a bill to correct certain errors in the tariff schedules of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Statement by Senator Dominick

Although I am not a member of the Senate Finance Committee, I have watched the progress of H.R. 12253 with interest. This bill is titled the "Tariff Schedules Technical Amendments Act of 1964." As such, it purports to correct certain technical errors, inadvertencies, and oversights in the Tariff Schedules of 1962. I believe that the announcement of December 13, 1963, by the House Ways and Means Committee made these objectives clear.

Therefore, I was quite surprised to learn that some provisions of the bill, as it came from the House, were more in the nature of substantive changes in the Tariff Schedules. I am referring specifically to section 15 of the House bill. This section dealt with the tariff treatment of machinery belts and belting composed of textile materials or of textile materials and rubber or plastics. The Senate committee, very wisely I think, deleted this particular section from the bill. Quoting from the Senate report, the committee reasoned:

"V-belts—The committee deleted the amendment which would have provided a duty of 8.5 percent (rather than 16 percent) on V-belts. Although your committee agrees with the action of the House in providing a separate classification for V-belts, an important and distinctive article of commerce, it is concerned that the 8.5-percent rate passed by the House would have a substantial impact upon V-belts for industrial purposes which comprise the greater part of domestic production and which presently are dutiable at 16 percent. This 16-percent rate also applied to these industrial belts under the old tariff schedules. Importation of these industrial V-belts would be unduly advantaged if the duty were to be cut by nearly 50 percent under this bill. For this reason, your committee feels it desirable to defer action on this provision until appropriate means can be devised to preserve the tariff status of such V-belts."

I commend the committee for this action.

In order to understand the significance of this move, perhaps a few words of explanation are necessary.

In the manufacture of rubber V-belts alone, we are dealing with a $75 million per year American industry. In my State, the Gates Rubber Company, one of our largest employers in the Denver area, would be affected.

Under the Tariff Classification Act of 1962, a minimum duty of 16 percent is established for V-belts used for industrial purposes and V-belts used for automotive purposes have a duty rate of 8.5 percent. Under the original section 15 of the House bill the lower rate of 8.5 percent duty would have been used for both classifications of V-belts. The manufacture of industrial V-belts is the most important segment of the industry and is also the area where there is the most competition with foreign imports.

It has been suggested that the Customs Bureau has a difficult time in classifying industrial as opposed to automotive V-belts. However, if this is so, then any change in the duty should be thoroughly explored, allowing the affected industry ample opportunity to be heard. Such a drastic move should not be accomplished under the guise of technical or corrective legislation such as we now have pending.

I strongly concur in the committee's action in eliminating this provision from this type of a bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, all remaining time on the bill is yielded back. The question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (H.R. 12253) was passed.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendments and request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. BYRD of Virigina, Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware, and Mr. CARLSON conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (H.R. 12253) be printed with the amendments of the Senate numbered; and that in the engrossment of the amendments of the Senate to the bill, the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to make all necessary technical and clerical changes and corrections, including corrections in section, subsection, and so forth, and designations and cross-references thereto.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1965

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Calendar No. 1544, H.R. 12633, the supplemental appropriations bill, be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H.R. 12633) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, the total recommended by the Committee on Appropriations is $1,208,213,068; $1,037,300,000—or about 86 percent—of this is provided in four items. The recommendation for the Office of Economic Opportunity is $861,550,000; $65,750,000 for the defense educational activities of the Office of Education; $60 million for mass transportation grants; and $50 million for the revolving fund of the Small Business Administration. The balance — $170,913,068 — is distributed among some 70 items. The details concerning these recommendations are found in the committee report numbered 1604, with narrative explanations covering all the items and the usual summary statistical table comparing recommendations with budget estimates and the House bill.

I shall be happy to try to answer any and all questions concerning these matters which Members of the Senate may require.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be agreed to en bloc, and that the bill as thus amended be considered for the purpose of amendment as original text; provided, however, that no point of order against any amendment shall be deemed to have been waived by the adoption of this agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The amendments agreed to en bloc are are follows:

On page 2, line 6, after the word "inspection", to strike out "$1,225,000" and insert "$1,357,000".

On page 2, after line 6, to insert:

"SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

"Flood prevention

"For an additional amount for emergency measures for runoff retardation and soil-erosion prevention as provided by section 216 of the Flood Control Act of 1950, $900,000."

On page 2, line 15, after the numerals "1964", to strike out "$15,000,000" and insert "$25,000,000", and after the amendment just above stated, to strike out the semicolon and "and in addition $10,250,000 to be transferred from funds made available for the purposes of section 32 of the Act of August 14, 1935 (7 U.S.C. 612c), including not to exceed $250,000 to be transferred to the appropriation "Administrative and operating expenses, Federal Crop Insurance Corporation" and insert a colon and *"Provided,* That hereafter appropriations under this head shall be made in accordance with the provisions of Public Law 88–525".

At the top of page 3, to insert:

"FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION

"Rural housing for domestic farm labor

"For financial assistance pursuant to section 516 of title V of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended by Public Law 88–560, approved September 2, 1964, $4,000,000."

On page 3, after line 5, to insert:

"Salaries and expenses

"For an additional amount for 'Salaries and expenses', $200,000, to be derived from the charges collected in connection with the insurance of loans as authorized by section 309(e) of the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961, as amended, and section 514(b)(3) of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended."

On page 3, after line 12, to insert:

"FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE CORPORATION

"Administrative and operating expenses

"For an additional amount for 'Administrative and operating expenses', $250,000."

At the top of page 4, to insert:

"CHAPTER II"

On page 4, after line 1, to insert:

"DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—MILITARY

"Operation and maintenance, Navy

"Not to exceed $860,000 of this appropriation may be transferred to the appropriation 'Salaries and Expenses', Weather Bureau, Department of Commerce, fiscal year 1965 for the operation of ocean weather stations."

On page 4, after line 7, to insert:

"OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE

"Not to exceed $150,000 of this appropriation may be transferred to the appropriation 'Salaries and Expenses', Weather Bureau, Department of Commerce, fiscal year 1965 for the operation of the Marcus Island upper-air station."

On page 4, after line 12, to insert:

"RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION DEFENSE AGENCIES

"Not to exceed $990,000 of this appropriation may be transferred to the appropriation 'Salaries and Expenses', Coast and Geodetic Survey, Department of Commerce, fiscal year 1965 for the expenses of the Worldwide Seismological Network Program."

On page 4, line 20, to change the chapter number from "II" to "III".

On page 4, line 26, after the word "expenses", to strike out "$17,100" and insert "$42,100".

On page 5, line 14, to change the chapter number from "III" to "IV".

On page 6, line 15, after the word "expended", to strike out "$75,000,000" and insert "$60,000,000".

On page 6, line 18, after "(78 Stat. 302)", to strike out "$2,500,000" and insert "$5,000,000".

On page 7, after line 8, to insert:

"OPEN SPACE LAND GRANTS

"For an additional amount for 'Open space land grants,' $10,000,000: *Provided,* That not to exceed $138,000 may be used for administrative expenses and technical assistance, and no part of this appropriation shall be used for administrative expenses in connection with grants requiring payments in excess of the amount herein appropriated therefor."

On page 8, after line 7, to insert:

"PUBLIC HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

"Administrative expenses

"For an additional amount for 'Administrative expenses', $50,000."

On page 9, line 1, after the word "Progress", to strike out "$650,000" and insert "$1,000,000".

On page 9, line 6, after "$6,500,000", to strike out the comma and "of which not to exceed $3,000,000 may be used for additional personnel".

On page 9, line 12, to change the chapter number from "IV" to "V".

On page 10, line 2, after the word "vehicles", to strike out "$1,400,000" and insert "$1,530,000".

On page 10, after line 8, to insert:

"Construction of fishing vessels

"For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Act of June 12, 1960 (74 Stat. 212), as amended by the Act of August 30, 1964 (78 Stat. 614), to assist in the construction of fishing vessels, $3,000,000".

On page 10, line 19, after the word "Construction", to strike out "$825,000" and insert "$916,600".

On page 11, line 7, after the word "property", to strike out "$6,700,000" and insert "$8,984,000".

On page 11, after line 13, to insert:

"Construction

"For an additional amount for 'Construction', $146,000".

On page 11, after line 15, to insert:

"GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

"Surveys, investigations, and research

"For an additional amount for 'Surveys, investigations, and research', $160,000".

On page 11, after line 19, to insert:

"BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

"Management of lands and resources

"For an additional amount for 'Management of lands and resources', $1,000,000".

On page 12, after line 14, to insert:

"BATTLE OF NEW ORLEANS SESQUICENTENNIAL CELEBRATION COMMISSION

"For necessary expenses of the Battle of New Orleans Sesquicentennial Celebration Commission, established by the Act of September 12, 1964 (Public Law 88–591), $25,000, to remain available until expended".

On page 12, after line 20, to insert:

"SAINT AUGUSTINE QUADRICENTENNIAL COMMISSION

"For necessary expenses of the Saint Augustine Quadricentennial Commission, established by the Act of August 14, 1962 (Public Law 87–586), $25,000, to remain available until expended".

On page 13, after line 2, to insert:

"INDEPENDENT OFFICES

"PUBLIC LAND LAW REVIEW COMMISSION

"Salaries and expenses

"For necessary expenses of the Public Land Law Review Commission, established by Public Law 88–606, approved September 19, 1964, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), $350,000, to remain available until expended."

On page 13, after line 10, to insert:

"EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

"NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE ARTS

"Salaries and expenses

"For necessary expenses of the National Council on the Arts, established by Public Law 88–579, approved September 3, 1964, $100,000."

On page 13, line 17, to change the chapter number from "V" to "VI".

On page 13, after line 18, to insert:

"MANPOWER ADMINISTRATION

"Farm labor contractor registration activities

"For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Farm Labor Contractor Registration Act of 1963, $350,000."

On page 14, line 5, after the word "Handicapped", to strike out "$40,000" and insert "$50,000".

On page 14, after line 9, to strike out:

"For an additional amount for 'Defense educational activities', $48,750,000, of which $10,300,000 shall be for capital contributions to student loan funds and loans for non-Federal capital contributions (not to exceed $300,000) to student loan funds, and $3,000,000 shall be for grants to States for testing, guidance, and counseling: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available only upon enactment of S. 3060, Eighty-eighth Congress, or similar legislation, amending the National Defense Education Act of 1958".

And in lieu thereof, to insert:

"For an additional amount for 'Defense educational activities,' $65,750,000, of which $10,300,000 shall be for capital contributions to student loan funds and loans for non-Federal capital contributions (not to exceed $300,000) to student loan funds, $10,000,000 shall be for grants to States for equipment and minor remodeling of facilities for the purposes included in section 301 of Public Law 85–864, as amended, and for supervisory and other services, $3,000,000 shall be for grants to States for testing, guidance, and counseling, and $5,000,000 shall be for transfer to the appropriation account 'Payments to school districts': *Provided*, That, in lieu of amounts heretofore specified, allotments for grants to States under sections 302(a) and 305 for acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling shall be made on the basis of $70,400,000, allotments for loans to private nonprofit schools shall be made on the basis of $9,600,000, and allotments under section 302(b) for supervisory and other services shall be made on the basis of $6,000,000: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be available only upon enactment of S. 3060, Eighty-eighth Congress, or similar legislation, amending the National Defense Education Act of 1958".

On page 15, after line 15, to insert:

"Salaries and expenses

"For an additional amount for 'Salaries and expenses,' $1,000,000: *Provided*, That this amount shall be available only upon enactment into law of S. 3060, Eighty-eighth Congress, or similar legislation amending the National Defense Education Act of 1958."

On page 15, after line 21, to insert:

"PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

"Community health practice and research

"For an additional amount for 'Community Health Practice and Research', $5,000,000."

On page 16, in line 6, after "(Public Law 88–452, approved August 20, 1964)", to strike out "$750,000,000" and insert "$861,550,000"; on page 17, line 4, after the word "months", to strike out the colon and "*Provided further*, That this appropriation shall not be available for more than 4,000 permanent Federal positions"; and in line 11, after the word "chemical", to insert a colon and "*Provided further*, That $2,000,000 of this appropriation shall be transferred to 'Grants to States for public assistance' to carry out existing projects authorized by section 1115 of the Social Security Act, as amended."

On page 17, line 16, to change the chapter number from "VI" to "VII".

On page 17, after line 17, to insert:

"SENATE

"For payment to Lucretia C. Engle, widow of Clair Engle, late a Senator from the State of California, $22,500."

On page 18, after line 8, to insert:

"JOINT ITEMS

"CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE HOUSE

"Capitol Police

"Capitol Police Board

"For an additional amount, fiscal year 1964, to reimburse the Commissioners of the District of Columbia for salaries of additional personnel detailed from the Metropolitan Police Department, $22,100."

On page 18, after line 16, to insert:

"CHAPTER VIII

On page 18, after line 17, to insert:

"PUBLIC WORKS

"DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL FUNCTIONS

"Department of the Army

"Rivers and Harbors and Flood Control Construction, General

"For an additional amount for 'Construction, general', $2,000,000".

At the top of page 19, to insert:

"INTEROCEANIC CANAL COMMISSION

"Salaries and expenses

"For expenses necessary for an investigation and study, including surveys, to determine the feasibility of, and the most suitable site for construction of a sea-level canal connecting the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, $400,000 to remain available until expended".

On page 19, after line 7, to insert:

"BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

"Construction and rehabilitation

"For an additional amount for 'Construction and rehabilitation', $364,000".

On page 19, after line 11, to insert:

"Upper Colorado River storage project

"For an additional amount for the 'Upper Colorado River storage project', $155,000".

On page 19, line 15, to change the chapter number from "VII" to "IX".

On page 19, after line 20, to insert:

"INTERNATIONAL BOUNDARY AND WATER COMMISSION, UNITED STATES AND MEXICO

"Construction

"For an additional amount of "International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, Construction, $300,000."

On page 20, after line 2, to insert:

"THE JUDICIARY COURTS OF APPEALS, DISTRICT COURTS, AND OTHER JUDICIAL SERVICES

"Salaries of referees

"For an additional amount for 'Salaries of referees', $60,000, to be derived from the Referees' salary and expense fund established in pursuance of the Act of June 28, 1946, as amended (11 U.S.C. 68)".

On page 20, after line 10, to insert:

"SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

"Revolving fund

"For additional capital for the revolving fund authorized by the Small Business Act of 1953, as amended, to be available without fiscal year limitation, $50,000,000".

On page 20, after line 15, to insert:

"APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION

"Salaries and expenses

"For necessary expenses of the Federal representative and his alternate on the Appalachian Regional Commission and for payment of the administrative expenses of the Commission, as authorized by law, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), and hire of passenger motor vehicles, $800,000".

On page 21, after line 1, to insert:

"GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

"Participation in Alaska Centennial Celebration

"For expenses necessary to cooperate with the Alaska Centennial Commission, and to conduct a study to determine the manner and extent of any participation by the United States in the Alaska Centennial Celebration, as authorized by law, $15,000".

On page 22, line 9, after "$295,000", to insert a colon and "*Provided*, That the proviso under this heading in the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1965, shall not apply during the current fiscal year."

On page 22, line 18, after the numerals "1964", to strike out "$2,500,000" and insert "$1,500,000".

On page 23, line 19, after the word "in", to insert "Senate Document Numbered 101, Eighty-eighth Congress, and", and in line 21, after the word "Congress", to strike out "$32,284,904" and insert "$33,309,898".

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, H.R. 12633, the supplemental appropriation bill for fiscal year 1965, carries funds for many noteworthy activities. I am particularly interested, however, in the appropriation of $800,000 for the establishment of an Appalachian Regional Commission. This is the amount requested by the President to be included in the supplemental bill, and it was my privilege to offer the amendment to add the $800,000 at the time the Senate Appropriations Committee, of which I am a member, marked up the bill.

The Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1964 was passed by the Senate a few days ago and it is presently pending in the House of Representatives. That legislation will provide public works and economic development programs needed to assist in the development of the Appalachian region. Eleven States will be directly affected, although the entire country will be benefited. My State of West Virginia is the one State, among the 11, which will be wholly included in the region to which the authorization bill is directed.

Title 1 of the authorization bill establishes an Appalachian Regional Commission, and this Commission will coordinate action between the States of the Appalachian region and the Federal Government. Thus will be permitted a more efficient and effective operation of the Appalachian aid program.

The Commission, according to the committee report which accompanied the authorization measure, will be a clearinghouse for expert opinion which can be shared throughout the Appalachian region. It will sponsor research and demonstration projects, and its recommendations for action will be based in part upon the information gained therefrom. It will be authorized to recommend revisions of existing laws at all levels of government in order to promote the objective of developing the economic and industrial potential of the Appalachian region. It will initate comprehensive plans for regional development and will be the principal and focal policymaking entity for such development, although it will have no authority over any other agency of government at any level.

The Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1964 authorizes an appropriation of $2,200,000 for the operation of the Commission over the next 2 fiscal years. It is imperative that the Commission be established and that it be allowed to proceed with preliminary planning and other activities at the very earliest moment following the enactment by Congress and signature by the President of the Appalachian Regional Development Act. Therefore, it was deemed necessary to include an appropriation in the bill before us which would permit the establishment of the Commission in the event the House of Representatives acts favorably upon the Senate-passed authorization bill before Congress adjourns. The appropriation of the $800,000 is conditioned upon congressional enactment of the measure.

Had this money not been added, and were the House to act favorably upon the Appalachian Regional Development Act before adjournment, there would be no money for the Commission, the establishment of which constitutes a necessary and vital first step in the implementation of the Appalachian aid program. A delay of several months would ensue before moneys could be appropriated by the Congress, inasmuch as we would have to wait until a new Congress had before it a regular or a supplemental appropriation measure. Such a delay would prove unwise and it would result in the program's getting off to a slow start. The Appalachian region and the people who live and have their homes there would suffer most, but the entire national economy would also suffer.

Consequently, it is highly important that we move ahead now to approve the measure which includes the $800,000 appropriation so that the Commission's establishment may follow quickly the enactment of the authorization bill. In my judgment, this program, like the accelerated public works program, will be highly beneficial to the communities and the people who live in areas plagued with chronic unemployment. Approval of this appropriation will, therefore, give impetus to President Johnson's program to develop Appalachia, an area which I have often referred to as a ribbon of neglect stretching from Pennsylvania to Alabama.

Also of interest to my State in this supplemental appropriation bill are the additional funds to expand the Federal food stamp program throughout the country.

The program was launched in May 1961, in McDowell County of West Virginia and has been operating on a pilot basis in that and three other counties—Logan, Mingo, and Wayne.

Mr. W. Bernard Smith, Director of Public Welfare for West Virginia, has asked that the food stamp program be extended to all 55 counties in the State. The Senate Appropriations Committee has allowed $25 million in this bill, which, when added to the $35 million in the regular bill making fiscal year 1965 appropriations for the Department of Agriculture, constitutes a total of $60 million for the expansion.

I have already seen the good effect of food purchased with these stamps and I would like to see it benefit others in my State.

As an indication of its use in my State, I would like to cite these figures. More than 31,000 persons in West Virginia took part in the program last year. In fiscal year 1964, the stamps purchased in my State amounted to $3,595,365, and bonus stamps awarded amounted to $2,396,728, making a total of $5,992,093 spent for food.

This, I believe, is the excellent evidence of the success of the program.

MR. AND MRS. HARLEY BREWER

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending business be laid aside temporarily and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 770, H.R. 2772.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 2772) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Harley Brewer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXTENSIONS OF TIME FOR FINAL PROOF BY CERTAIN ENTRYMEN UNDER THE DESERT LAND LAWS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1543, H.R. 6218.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 6218) to amend the act of June 29, 1960, to authorize additional extensions of time for final proof by certain entrymen under the desert land laws and to make such additional extensions available to the successors in interest of such entrymen.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S BELIEF IN ECONOMY IN GOVERNMENT

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, perhaps the most important asset of President Johnson since assuming the office of Chief Executive has been his insistence on economy in Government.

The first order of business when he became President was to keep Federal spending even with or below the previous year's level. He succeeded, to the amazement of all, and he continues to hold tight rein on the budget.

His reasoning is sound. As he said, the American people must be convinced first that the Government will spend its tax dollars wisely and well before they will lend their support to the Government's efforts to solve problems and satisfy needs.

An excellent column on the President's work in economizing Federal spending and his reasons for it appeared in the Tuesday, September 22 edition of the New York Herald Tribune.

I ask unanimous consent that this article entitled "Tight Fist and Open Mind," by Joseph R. Slevin, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TIGHT FIST AND OPEN MIND

(By Joseph R. Slevin)

WASHINGTON.—President Johnson is keeping his Cabinet under heavy pressure to hold down Federal spending.

Government outlays are bouncing along just under $100 billion and Mr. Johnson is making it bluntly clear that he intends to produce a new budget that will stay below that magic figure.

The President spelled out his objectives in a confidential "guidelines" message that he sent to top officials last month. He gave each agency a spending ceiling and they all add up to less than the $100 billion limit he has set for the entire Government.

"It's amazing what the attitude in the White House can do," a high official said. "The language in the guidelines message was tougher than usual. The ceilings are very tough. But no one is complaining very much or very loudly."

"I think the President has them cowed," an administration veteran declared.

Mr. Johnson made the economy issue his own immediately after he entered the White House. There still is snickering about "Light Bulb Johnson" the electricity saver. But officials also remember that there were 20 appeals pending from Budget Bureau cuts when President Kennedy was assassinated and all were quietly withdrawn during the following month.

Mr. Johnson was delighted last summer when the fiscal 1964 report showed that the Government had spent only $97.7 billion, a full $700 million less than the $98.4 billion that he had anticipated in January.

But the President is telling his Cabinet that they cannot afford to yield to the temptation to "ease up." He told a recent Cabinet meeting that the Democrats have to convince the people that they are running the Government more efficiently than any administration ever has before.

"I covet a reputation for good management," Mr. Johnson said. "I want to feel, and I want each of you to feel, that we are spending the taxpayers' money as if it were his own.

"If only the American people are really convinced on this will they approve the new programs which our Nation needs. If the Federal Government is to make its contribution to the achievement of the great society, it must first convince the American people that it is managed as efficiently as any private business. This is a high standard but one I am determined to realize."

The President had a copy of his remarks sent to each Cabinet member who had been at the White House session and to the head of each of the major agencies.

Mr. Johnson is keenly aware that he has set himself a difficult assignment. The country is growing, which means that there are mounting demands for the Federal Government to expand its existing services. Money also must be found to pay for the new programs that Mr. Johnson wants to introduce.

Maurice Stans, President Eisenhower's last Budget Director, once estimated that the Federal spending budget has a built-in rise of $2.5 billion a year. He predicted that spending will rise by this amount even if there are no new national activities.

What Mr. Johnson now is trying to do is to eliminate the built-in rise by achieving greater efficiency and by weeding out established programs that no longer are needed.

"It is not a matter of taste," a White House adviser said. "It is an arithmetic imperative."

The President told his Cabinet that he knows that it took more than "waving a wand" to achieve the savings they already can point to.

"I know that it took hard work, difficult decisions, late hours, and considerable anguish to accomplish what we did last year," he declared.

Mr. Johnson said he wants his officials to concentrate on cutting employment, on increasing productivity, reducing costs, and eliminating unnecessary reports.

"I want this administration to have a tight fist and an open mind—a tight fist on money and an open mind on the needs of America," he asserted.

SPEECH BY SENATOR RIBICOFF BEFORE THE CONNECTICUT STUDENT NURSES ASSOCIATION

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, there is no group more dedicated to the service of mankind than the nurses of our country. Members of a proud profession with a distinguished record of loyalty, skill, and devotion to duty, nurses are too often forgotten heroes in the exciting battles waged by modern medicine against sickness and disease.

To assure that our country will have enough nurses well trained for their exacting work is one of the great challenges before us. One of the organizations playing a major role in this effort is the Connecticut Student Nurses Association, which held its annual fall convention in Hartford last week. I had the honor of preparing an address for this organization, and I ask unanimous consent to have that speech printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR ABRAHAM RIBICOFF, BEFORE THE ANNUAL FALL CONVENTION, CONNECTICUT STUDENT NURSES ASSOCIATION, HARTFORD, CONN., SEPTEMBER 24, 1964

Very often people read the newspapers and then write to me to give me their opinion about what they have read—and their advice.

The other day, after the announcement of my appearance before you student nurses, I received some especially sage advice.

It came from a well-known highly experienced nurse in New Britain. She wrote to a mutual friend: "I see by the paper that Senator RIBICOFF is going to address a Connecticut student nursing organization."

And she continued: "I would like to write the speech for him. I hope he will stress that nursing is rooted in the needs of humanity and founded on the ideal of service, and that it is a challenge to give equal consideration in sympathy, tact, and understanding to people of all creeds—rich and poor. * * * I could," she added, "go on and on."

Well, all I can say is that I wish she had gone on and on. She would have written this speech, and saved me the work—and—if I'm a judge of people—done a better job than I.

For she is wise. In nursing, you young people have indeed chosen an admirable profession. It is a profession of service, of compassion, of humane concern. Its challenge is compelling.

After all, when each of you is a full-fledged nurse, you will be the person—of all of those on the health team—who has the most immediate contact with a sick patient. You will be most likely to know and understand him as a human being and know his family. You will observe and report changes in his condition—his reaction to drugs—new signs or symptoms. Your services will be the key to a speedy and comfortable recovery. What work could be more important?

The health of every individual, young or old, rich or poor, is very much a concern—and of our whole Nation. As you student nurses already know well, the power of a sick man is brought low. His purpose is blunted and dissipated. His highest possibilities wait and wither—unrealized. His contribution to our society is partly or entirely lost.

Health is the Nation's business because healthy people build a nation.

But, even more important, health is the business of a democratic country because the fulfillment of the individual—impossible without good health—is one of its highest goals.

Now you are studying about the fundamental changes that have taken place—and are still taking place—in medicine as in all our society.

Medical research moves ahead with giant steps. The miracles that medicine have wrought have improved the human condition immeasurably in a very short span of time. They have conquered ancient scourges, restored strength, and eased pain.

And these medical advances have resulted in increased population. Age groupings are different. People are living longer, and so they are subject to different diseases—mental illness and other chronic ailments, for example, are more common. Thus the very patterns of health needs and of the services which should be established to meet these needs are changing.

For instance: more people than ever before are entering our hospitals to receive more complex, more effective, treatment for the well-known diseases—as well as for new and strange ailments which we did not recognize or could not diagnose until recent years. We have new knowledge and new procedures—immunization against diseases and allergies; screening for detection of tuberculosis, diabetes, glaucoma, heart disease; control procedures for communicable diseases—to name just a few. But the new knowledge—the new procedures—can be applied only through the trained minds and skilled hands of the members of our health professions. And these are in serious short supply. We suffer health personnel shortages that could make hollow victories of our other advances.

Obviously the nurse is a vital member of the health alliance. New scientific advances are expanding her role—and the shortage of doctors has increased her burden too. She must do many things once routinely done by physicians.

Still, we do not have enough nurses—in any field or at any level. And nurses do not have enough educational opportunities. Economic and other working conditions for nurses are not, in many places and many ways, as good as they should be. And though the public demands more nursing services, it is frequently apathetic to the needs of the people who supply them. Perhaps it just is not aware of what these needs are—it takes nurses for granted.

These things were dramatically highlighted by a landmark report made last year by the Surgeon General's Consultant Group on Nursing. Incidentally, this was a group of distinguished experts, appointed, I am proud to say, while I was Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. Headed by Dr. Alvin Eurich, vice president of the Ford Foundation's Fund for Advancement of Education, their task was to study the Nation's longstanding, complex nursing needs, to confront problems in the field of nursing and to recommend an action program.

The group's findings were startling. From 1950 to 1962 the number of professional nurses in practice increased from 375,000 to 550,000 or from 249 to 297 per 100,000 population. However, 70,000 of the number of nurses added since 1950 were part-time workers. Also the ratio of nurses to population varies widely throughout the country ranging from 123 per 100,000 population in Arkansas to 599 in Connecticut. So, though there are more than half a million active professional nurses in the Nation—though the ranks of professional nursing have grown at a faster rate than the population—we still can by no means meet the demands for nursing services.

For example, in the approximately 6,400 hospitals in the United States, more than 20 percent of the positions of professional nurses are vacant. Again: there are 1,200 faculty vacancies in nursing schools at this time. But, only 10 percent of all employed professional nurses hold college degrees. And, though faculty members engaged in much-needed nursing research should have doctoral degrees, only about 300 nurses now have such a degree.

It's always nice to be in demand, of course. In a way this demand is a tribute to nurses—to the job you have done—on the part of physicians, hospital administrators, and just plain people and patients everywhere.

But the demand for your services is increasing. And it will continue to increase in the future. The trend in all medicine is toward the community. The emphasis is toward the continuity of care—the right service in the right place at the right time. The theme of the majority of the new health proposals is "home care"—the improvement of hospital services for those who are acutely ill—and the development of appropriate service for other patients, elsewhere, in nursing homes, in rehabilitation centers, in their own homes.

By the year 1970, the consultant group estimated, we will need 850,000 nurses if we are to have safe, therapeutically effective nursing services including 300,000 with academic degrees. This is 300,000 more than we have today. At their present strength, our nursing schools can graduate only 30,000 a year.

Government reports are numerous. Usually they are formally presented, printed with fancy covers, and pigeonholed. Not this one. The Congress took the material in this report, studied it, and acted promptly. I was proud to work and vote for the Nurses Training Act of 1964, finally completed and signed by President Lyndon Johnson last September 4.

It didn't get too much publicity—there was no controversy about it—and constructive progress without dispute often receives little attention. But, as President Johnson said, "It is the most significant nursing legislation in the history of our country. I believe that it will enable us to attract many more of our most qualified young people to this great and noble calling."

Briefly, the Nurse Training Act represents the response of an enlightened Congress to an urgent social need.

It has four chief parts:

First, it authorizes a program of grants to build and renovate nursing schools. Obviously the existing schools cannot increase the number of their annual graduates by 70 percent, as is called for by our goal for 1970, without enlarging their facilities. All three types of nursing schools—diploma, associate degree, and collegiate—will be eligible under the new bill to apply for financial help to meet costs of needed construction.

The Surgeon General's consultant group on nursing recommended that each year there be added 15,000 graduates of diploma schools—4,000 more graduates of junior college programs—and 4,000 more graduates of collegiate programs. At the same time, the number receiving master's degrees should increase from the present 1,000 to a total of 3,000 a year.

Second, the act establishes a program to help schools of nursing strengthen and improve nurse training and to help diploma schools of nursing meet the costs which will come with increased enrollment. Many of the newer teaching concepts and methods could be applied to nursing education, with teacher time and student the gainer. The shortage of teachers and the tremendous increase in the body of knowledge necessary for modern nursing make this improvement most important.

The cost of providing nursing education is substantially higher than the income received by the school from tuition and fees. Many schools, particularly hospital schools, have been forced to close because they cannot continue to take a loss on the training of nursing students. The Nurse Training Act is intended to increase the number of enrollees in these schools, and for hospital schools this will impose serious hardship. Therefore, accredited diploma schools will be reimbursed under the act to some extent for the added costs of increased enrollment.

Third, to attract into the nursing profession the numbers of students necessary to meet the 1970 goal set by the Surgeon General's consultant group, we must greatly increase the number of qualified talented applicants for admission. Studies have shown that the initial cost of the education programs are a major deterrent to young people who might otherwise undertake training for professional nursing.

So the act sets up a loan program to lower the financial barrier to entering schools of nursing and already the letters are pouring in to congressional offices and the executive branch about these loans. They began to arrive the day the bill was signed, and has been increasing steadily since. I must say this justifies the need for student loans for students of nursing.

Students who are pursuing a full-time course of study in an accredited school of nursing, and who are in need of financial assistance are eligible for loans. They may receive up to $1,000 for any academic year. Loans are repayable over a 10-year period beginning after the first year following graduation. However, a "forgiveness" clause permits students to cancel up to 50 percent of their loans at the rate of 10 percent for each complete year of service as a nurse in a public institution. This cancellation provides an incentive for nurses to continue to practice nursing following graduation. Loan funds can be established in collegiate, junior college, and hospital schools of nursing.

Fourth, the professional nurse traineeship program, which has substantially improved the preparation of nurses in leadership positions over the past 7 years, is continued and expanded for another 5 years under the Nurse Training Act. A total of 106 schools have participated in this program since its start in 1956, and traineeships for full-time study have been awarded to over 11,000 nurses. There have been more than 400 courses under the short-term program to assist nurses to update management and teaching skills, in which 14,000 nurses took part. The new act adds professional nursing specialties, "determined by the Surgeon General to require advanced training," to the fields of study for which advanced traineeships may be given.

Connecticut has already benefited from the Government's recognition of the importance of nursing. Since 1957, 178 professional nurses have been trained in our State through more than half a million dollars in Federal traineeship grants.

Since 1961, 15 public health nurses have been trained under Federal grants at the University of Bridgeport, and the university is developing—with more than $100,000 in Federal help—a program to train many more. More than $1¼ million in nursing research grants and fellowships from the Public Health Service have been used in Connecticut to produce significant new advances in the science of nursing care.

All of this will have great meaning for you students, and for other deserving young people like yourselves, who wish to enter the proud profession of nursing—and to excel at what they do.

I cannot speak before a group of student nurses without pointing out one more thing. It is something, I think, in which the nurse who wanted to write this speech for me today would be interested, and that is this:

Nurses—individually and as a group—have supported some of the most significant legislation of this century—including the Nursing Act of 1964.

Your positions on legislation have been determined by a genuine concern for the good of the patient. This is consonant with the very highest ethics of the healing professions. It is in accord with the injunction given to all of us, almost 4 years ago, by our martyred President, John F. Kennedy: "Ask not what your country can do for you: Ask what you can do for your country."

You have supported many needed measures—maternal and child health care—hospital care for the aged—expansion of community mental health centers—and assistance in the field of mental retardation. And you have spoken up for civil rights, the program to eliminate poverty, and equal opportunity in employment.

The reason that nurses support this sort of compassionate program is tied up with the work you do. For after all, your work gives you a sensitive insight into the needs of people. You see the whole man as he lives his everyday life, as he works at a job or conducts himself as a father—you just don't see a cardiogram or X-ray or a chest disease.

I wish you luck in the selfless job ahead of you. I wish you expert skills, fulfillment in your work—for yourselves and for others. Your Government has acted constructively to improve your chances—and your patients.

Make the most of your new opportunities. And as you advance as a skilled practitioner, a vital part of the health team, remain a "student" in a field that is constantly changing and moving forward.

ELIHU BURRITT

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, October will mark the 100th anniversary of the appointment of a distinguished native son of New Britain, Conn., to the Consular Service of the Department of State. The man was Elihu Burritt, and he made his mark on history as "The Learned Blacksmith."

Elihu Burritt was a self-educated philosopher, scholar, and linguist, who dedicated his life to a crusade for peace and brotherhood. His crusade took him throughout the Nation and the world.

Leo Michaloski—a native of New Britain, Conn., and the deputy security officer in the Department of Justice—has written for the October issue of the Foreign Service Journal an interesting description of Elihu Burritt's career. I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from Mr. Michaloski's article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE LEARNED BLACKSMITH BECOMES A CONSUL

(By Leo J. Michaloski)

Near the end of Lincoln's first term in office, as a war-weary nation awaited election day with growing apprehension, Elihu Burritt of New Britain, Conn., was appointed U.S. Consular Agent at Birmingham, England. New Britain, birthplace of the "learned blacksmith," as he was popularly known, will mark this event this month with commemorative exercises that include the presentation to the Secretary of State of a portrait of Burritt. The painting will be hung in the State Department.

At the time of his appointment to the consular service, Burritt was 53 years old and had attained a worldwide reputation as a self-educated scholar, linguist, and crusader for peace and universal brotherhood.

Zebina Eastman, American Consul at Bristol, who had responsibility over the Birmingham consulate, went to see Burritt at Manchester on one of his stops during a foot tour of England. The tour resulted in three charming volumes of "Walks," i.e., "A Walk from London to John O'Groats" (1864), "A Walk From London to Lands Ends" (1865), and "Walk in the Black Country" (1866). Eastman persuaded Burritt to take the job of U.S. consular agent (a term once used synonymously with vice consul and referring to officers who served in the outposts of a consular district) and then dispatched a letter to the Secretary of State,

* * * * *

The Secretary of State was more than casually interested in Burritt's appointment for he was well acquainted with the Yankee blacksmith and, as U.S. Senator from New York, had introduced legislative proposals at his behest including one for "compensated emancipation of the Negro." The Secretary knew that Burritt lacked the political support so indispensable for appointment to the foreign service and even more important, he had heard disquieting rumors only a short time before that Burritt had allegedly tried to get his friend Charles Sumner, the brilliant Massachusetts solon, to lead an end-the-war movement. Nevertheless, Seward, on October 8, 1864, signed Burritt's commission. It was a magnanimous act considering the intense bitterness then prevailing against people such as Burritt whose antiwar sympathies were equated with disloyalty.

In due course, the news of Burritt's appointment reached President Lincoln's desk. He, too, was familiar with the "learned blacksmith" and his schemes for reform. One that probably appealed to Lincoln was called compensated emancipation for the Negro, which Burritt espoused in speeches and through the columns of the Citizen of the World as the sanest, safest, cheapest, and most equitable way of extinguishing slavery. He urged the sale of public lands in the West; revenue would be used to buy freedom for slaves. William Lloyd Garrison and other radical abolitionists—who advocated freeing slaves without compensation to the slaveowners—ridiculed Burritt's scheme, and Garrison sarcastically referred to it as paying a thief for stolen property. Enduring formidable hardships Burritt carried on his campaign traveling from Maine to Iowa one winter and just when it looked as if his scheme might be recognized by Congress as a legitimate proposition, another Connecticut abolitionist with more drastic plans attacked the U.S. arsenal at Harper's Ferry, Va. The attack shattered Burritt's hopes for a peaceful extinction of slavery. Oddly enough the adventurer's name lives on in song—"John Brown's body lies a-mouldering in the grave"—while Burritt's epic effort is now an obscure footnote to history. Burritt returned to his farm in New Britain a brokenhearted man who felt the keenest agony because not one bona fide offer had been made by the North to share with the South what he called the task and duty of lifting slavery from the bosom of the Nation.

Both Lincoln and the Yankee blacksmith had high hopes that the pay-for-slaves scheme would wipe out the institution of slavery. In his autobiography, Burritt called it one of the most promising labors of his life. Benjamin Quarles in his book "Lincoln and the Negro" (New York, 1962) says that of all the measures relating to the Negro the one that was closest to Lincoln's heart was that of compensated emancipation. Lincoln pressed this scheme until almost the end of the war. In February 1865, he called his Cabinet together to discuss a proposal to Congress requesting payment to the Confederated States of $400 million as compensation for the slaves. Not one of his Cabinet supported him in this last brave effort to end the war.

Lincoln interposed no objection to Burritt's appointment.

How he came to be known as the learned blacksmith was explained by Burritt in a letter:

"I was the youngest of many brethren and my parents were poor. My means of education were limited to the advantages of a district school; and those, again, were circumscribed by my father's death which deprived me at the age of 15 of those scanty opportunities which I had previously enjoyed. * * * A few months after his decease, I apprenticed myself to a blacksmith in my native village. Thither I carried an indomitable taste for reading which I had previously acquired through the medium of the social library, all the historical works which I had at the time perused * * * I completed my Virgil during the evenings of one winter * * * After some time devoted to Cicero * * * I commenced the Greek * * * Still I carried my Greek grammar in my hat, and often found a moment when I was heating some large iron when I could place my book open before me, against the chimney of my forge, and go through tupto, tupteis, tuptei."

Thus the Yankee blacksmith pursued a course of self-education during the intervals at the smithy.

* * * * *

By the time he was 30 Burritt had mastered 18 ancient and modern languages and 22 dialects. During his lifetime he wrote 30 books on a diversity of subjects ranging from the charming "Children of the Bible" to the erudite "The Year Book of Nations," as well as books for the study of Arabic, Hebrew, Hindustani, Persian, and Turkish, and the first book in Sanskrit in the United States. In recognition of his scholarship Yale University, Williams and Amherst colleges conferred honorary degrees on him. Governor Edward Everett of Massachusetts, on behalf of a group of affluent Harvard University alumni including Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, offered him a scholarship but Burritt declined the offer preferring to continue his studies in conjunction with manual labor.

But eventually, Burritt put aside his leather apron and hammer. His first public activities were as lecturer on the subject "Application and Genius" in which he argued that genius was nothing more than the result of persistent will and application. For a time he tried editing a monthly magazine, The Literary Geminae, which was made up of articles and translations from his own pen. At about that time strong drink was a matter of growing national concern and it was natural that the Connecticut reformist should join the temperance movement.

* * * * *

In 1844 Burritt started a weekly newspaper known as the Christian Citizen which voiced his views on the burning issues of the day such as antislavery, temperance, and peace. It should be mentioned that the Christian Citizen is said to have been the first American journal to devote substantial space to the advocacy of peace. When the slogan "Fifty-four Forty or Fight" echoed throughout the Union and threatened warfare between England and the United States over the Northwest Boundary, Burritt, who was alarmed at the bitterness of the controversy and the possibility that it would erupt into armed conflict, decided to try and pacify the hostile feelings. Working in cooperation with humanitarians in Manchester, England—the same group that was doing so much for social reforms in England—he launched a campaign of so-called "Friendly International Addresses." These were letters exchanged between American and English cities signed by its leading citizens "entreating their cooperation in bringing about an amicable settlement."

Eight hundred newspapers printed them. In addition Burritt took two letters bearing some of England's most prominent names to Washington where John Calhoun and other Senators expressed interest in this novel hands-across-the-ocean diplomacy. Even though historians ascribe the signing of the Oregon Treaty to other reasons it can be said with historical accuracy that Burritt and his English colleagues played a most effective role in forcing Congress and Parliament to agree on a pacific settlement of our present boundary.

In appreciation of Burritt's work in the Oregon crisis his English friends invited him for a visit. Burritt accepted. In May 1846 he sailed for England where his contemplated 3-month visit was extended to 3 years. There he found encouragement and inspiration to unfold a grand design for world peace. The first step was to organize the League of Universal Brotherhood. This took place in July 1846. Each member of the league was pledged to the task of promoting international harmony and good will between nations. Within 2 years the league had more than 20,000 members in England and about the same number in the United States.

Burritt began a campaign for lower transoceanic postal rates as an effective means of diffusing knowledge, lessening national prejudice, and getting different races and nations to see the common interest in peaceful intercourse. He traveled widely lecturing on this subject, and in addition wrote a tract entitled "Ocean Penny Postage—Will It Pay?" It is credited with pressuring Congress and Parliament into liberalizing rates for oversea mail which then were exorbitant.

Next Burritt launched his most important work, a series of international peace congresses that drew worldwide attention and earned for him the appellation "Apostle of Peace and Universal Brotherhood." The first of these conclaves was planned for Paris in 1848, but because of the February Revolution and the bloody Parisian siege in June he was forced to switch the site to Brussels, where it was held in September with the official recognition of the Belgian Government. In successive years similar gatherings were held at Paris, Frankfurt, London, and Edinburgh. It should be noted that only a man of Burritt's intrepidity would dare to undertake such a task, for we know that the French Revolution had spread its contagion to almost all of Europe. Moreover, the public's apathy toward peace manifestations was understandable as was the scorn of the legislators and national leaders, for Europe was then in the midst of a seemingly endless bloody and hopeless process of nationalism, international rivalries and armaments race. In spite of this, the Peace Congresses, which incidentally brought delegates from most of Europe, England, and the United States, were spectacularly successful and are credited with changing the moral and spiritual view toward peace, and creating a will to peace. To a large extent this may be attributed to the fact that the congresses were able to convince many of the writers, artists, scientists, and intellectuals of the world that their interests were identical and inspired them to rally behind the causes espoused by Burritt and his distinguished colleagues.

* * * * *

Some notion of the sweep of the congresses can be had from the resolutions that were adopted at the Brussels Congress. For example, the assembly approved proportionate and simultaneous reduction in armaments, the doctrine of compulsory arbitration, a Congress of Nations, a World Court, international communication, postal reform, standard weights and measures and coinage, and education toward the eradication of national prejudices.

In 1852 Burritt was again involved in historymaking diplomacy. It was during the Frankfurt Peace Congress that a delegation of Constitutionalists from Schleswig-Holstein appealed for an investigation of its dispute with Denmark. Burritt was named to a committee to endeavor to mediate the controversy. Again, just as success seemed within reach, the Austrians at Bismarck's insistence marched in and put an end to Burritt's magnificent effort to interpose pacific proposals between two embittered parties. In spite of the unhappy conclusion to this episode Burritt received the plaudits of the press and from diplomatic circles as well.

In 1847 Burritt visited Ireland during the peak of the potato famine that was sweeping that unfortunate country "to expose the depth of the distress of the potato famine, and to describe it * * * to the people of the United States." Burritt went from cabin to cabin in Skibbereen, the most hard-hit district. The result was "Four Days at Skibbereen," a poignant record of human suffering. The article appeared in his Christian Citizen and was reprinted in newspapers throughout the United States. The generosity of the Americans was overwhelming. To Burritt's great delight the U.S. Government detailed two warships (one of which had been captured from the British in the War of 1812) to carry the people's offering to Ireland. Not satisfied with this result he sailed for the United States where he personally arranged for a boatload of provisions bound for Cork which he helped to distribute. This experience got Burritt to consider establishing a permanent international organization that would provide the relief in future catastrophies. Fate, as we know, reserved this honor for Jean Henri Duhant who founded the International Red Cross a decade later.

It was in January 1865 that Burritt joined the ranks of the 487 who comprised our consular service in 36 countries.

* * * * *

Birmingham was one of 20 American consulates in England. The top ranking diplomat was Charles Francis Adams, son of President John Quincy Adams who had once served as Minister to the Court of St. James. His title was Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary with an annual salary of $17,500. Our highest ranking consular officer in England was a former Congressman, Freeman Harlow Morse, consul at London. His salary was $7,500 as compared with Burritt's $1,500. Oddly enough when President Grant ousted Morse in 1873 to make room for his friend General Adam Badeau, Morse got so irate that he refused to return to America, choosing to give up his American citizenship.

One of the main functions of the consulate was to certify the invoices of goods intended for shipment to the United States. At times the load was so heavy that Burritt and his clerk worked late into the night to get the job done, for Birmingham was then shipping about $5 million worth of goods annually to the United States.

Another task, and one which Burritt handled with aplomb, was that of ameliorating United States-English strains resulting from the so-called Alabama Claims which arose from damage to our shipping by the British-built sea raider, *Alabama*, that destroyed 60–70 merchant vessels before being sent to the bottom by the U.S.S. *Kearsarge* in July 1864.

Burritt remained in office until August 1869, when President U. S. Grant replaced him "to make room for more importunate claimants for the situation." Before his departure Burritt received many testimonials of esteem from the inhabitants of Birmingham. The one he prized most was a set of Shakespeare which was presented to him by the Vicar of Hanborne (suburb of Birmingham) with the following tribute: "We have heard with most unfeigned regret that your residence amongst us is about to terminate. During your 4 years of sojourn in the parish of Hanborne we have ever found you a kind and sincere friend, and a warm and generous supporter of every good and philanthropic work. We are only expressing our hearts' true feeling in saying that we very deeply deplore your anticipated departure and shall ever remember with the liveliest emotion your oft acts of courteous kindness."

Burritt returned to New Britain where he continued to write and teach. Despite failing health he nevertheless went on to champion the causes that were so dear to him. One in particular to which he had devoted much time and energy was the establishment of an international court as first proposed by William Ladd.

Burritt died on March 6, 1879. Tributes, like the following, were written to his memory by the press of the country:

The Philadelphia Inquirer said: "Though more widely known as the 'Learned Blacksmith' than by any other appellation, the title of Universal Philanthropist could better describe him." The Hartford Courant wrote: "Mr. Burritt was a man of unbounded and unfailing charity and true benevolence of the kindest feelings. He was everywhere a power for good * * * he was in his interest and views in every philanthropic movement many years in advance of his times. He felt that he was on the side of God and so labored with an unfaltering belief in the righteousness of his efforts."

New Britain is justly proud of Burritt. It has named streets, schools and a bank in his memory. On the walls of the city hall are painted a series of pictures and mottoes showing the highlights of his life. In addition there is a statue in his honor in a park that faces the high school.

New Britain looks forward to the centennial observance of Burritt's appointment to the consular service. It will afford its citizens an opportunity to express its admiration for his career on behalf of humanity.

THE HAGUE PROTOCOL—U.S. GOVERNMENT DISCRIMINATION AGAINST AMERICANS

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, 8 months ago I called the attention of the Senate to what can only be described as an unfair, inequitable, and discriminatory situation applying to thousands of Americans flying overseas.

Then, as now, these travelers were faced with a potentially serious penalty because of our failure to ratify an obscure, little-known treaty called the Hague protocol.

The treaty, in effect, increases the value of an American life from $8,300 to $16,600. Our refusal to accept the treaty keeps the lower value in effect for Americans, despite the fact that the higher figure is already applicable to the citizens of more than 30 nations.

Most international air travel originates in or terminates in the United States, and most of these travelers are U.S. citizens. They come from the country with the highest living standard in the world. Yet, in a key aspect, their lives are worth only half as much as the life of a Frenchman, an Italian, a German, a Russia, or a Mexican.

This is the unmistakable result of our refusal to ratify the Hague protocol with its doubling of the liability of international air carriers in the event a passenger is killed or injured.

Thus our failure to ratify the Hague protocol has created for the international air traveler a situation as potentially tragic as it is currently confusing.

Here, briefly, is the situation:

Thirty-five years ago, when international air travel was new, most of the countries of the world agreed on certain standards to facilitate international movement of the air traveler and his baggage and to afford some protection for his dependents in the event of his death. The agreement is called the Warsaw Convention of 1929.

More than 70 countries signed it, including the United States, which became a party to it in 1934.

Basically, the convention provides uniformity of documentation and legal rights in international travel.

It also established a limit of $8,300 on the liability of an international air carrier in the event of a passenger's injury or death. However, in the event of proven willful misconduct by the carrier or its agents, the liability is unlimited.

Clearly, this liability limit of $8,300 on the life of a passenger is too low today, especially by the standards which have prevailed for years in the United States and other countries. Realizing this, the Eisenhower administration played a leading role in securing agreement on a modification of the Warsaw Convention raising the liability to $16,600. The new modification, known as the Hague protocol, also allows the recovery of attorney fees, in addition to the $16,600 in compensation for death or injury.

More than 30 nations, including such key airline countries as Germany, France, Canada, and Italy, are parties to the protocol, which has been in full force and effect for more than a year.

Unfortunately, however, the U.S. Government has not become a party to the Hague protocol. The Senate has not ratified it.

The strange injustice of the current situation can best be illustrated by a specific example.

Let us look at two passengers sitting side by side on the same flight.

Passenger A in Mexico buys a round-trip ticket to New York. Passenger B in New York buys a round-trip ticket to Mexico. If these passengers were later sitting side by side on the trip from Mexico City to New York and an accident occurred, passenger A, who bought his ticket in Mexico, would be covered by the $16,600 liability limit. Passenger B, who bought his ticket in New York, would be covered by the older, out-of-date limit of $8,300 and his life would legally have only half the value.

This unjust situation would exist because Mexico has ratified the Hague protocol while the United States has not. And a passenger buying a round-trip ticket originating and terminating in a country which is a party to the Hague protocol is covered by the protocol, even though he stops in a country which is not a party to the protocol.

Thus, the person whose international air flight originates and terminates in the United States, as is the case with most Americans, is severely discriminated against in terms of legal protection, and the discrimination is caused by the failure of his own Government to act.

While airline travel is safe, and accidents are relatively rare, this is still a serious matter, and one whose tragic potential is all too obvious.

Why does this situation exist? Why has not something been done about it? I do not know the full answer.

The Hague protocol was submitted to the Senate in 1959 and referred to the Foreign Relations Committee. In 1961, when the new Kennedy-Johnson administration took over, it announced that it was reexamining the Government's position with respect to the protocol and requested the committee to take no action. This reexamination was finally completed last month, when on August 7, 1964, the Secretary of State recommended ratification of the Hague Protocol.

It would not, Mr. President, be fair to conclude that it took the present administration 3½ years to decide that the life of an American was worth as much as the life of a person who lived somewhere else in the world, despite appearances to the contrary. The issue is complex. There can be valid debate about limitations of liability. But, in my view, there can be no question about the inequity and injustice of our present posture—our approval of a limit of $8,300 on the value of a life and our refusal to approve the higher amount of the Hague protocol.

In any event, the administration last month reached its decision and recommended ratification of the Hague protocol, along with the enactment of legislation requiring airlines to carry additional insurance on the lives of all their passengers. The legislation, I am confident, will be fully and promptly considered next year by the Senate Commerce Committee, to which it was referred. It has been pending before the committee for about 5 weeks.

The treaty has been pending before the Foreign Relations Committee for 5 years. It is not a myth, but a hard reality of key importance to the thousands and thousands of Americans who fly overseas every month.

Nothing can be gained by delay. The Senate can still act. It can ratify the treaty now, without impairing its right to take additional action on legislation next year.

I hope the committee will take a new look at the facts in this situation and initiate prompt steps to bring the treaty before the Senate without delay.

The interests of Americans traveling overseas demand action before the end of this session. Tragedy may be the alternative.

MEDICAL RESEARCH

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the need for a Federal program of health care for the aging has been based in part on the dramatic increase in the population of our Nation over 65 years of age.

Much of the progress in medical science which has made this possible has come as the result of medical research financed by the Federal Government. The involvement of the various departments of the Federal Government in medical research totaled $924 million in 1963, and the outlook in the future is for increased expenditures in this field not only by the Federal Government but also by industry and philanthropy as well.

At the same time estimates of the number of professional workers needed in the field have been revised sharply upward. This also means that we must have medical schools to teach many more doctors than our medical schools are now capable of graduating.

The facts for these conclusions have been summarized by the Health Information Foundation of the University of Chicago. I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD the article entitled "Expenditures for Medical Research," as published in Progress in Health Services, September–October, 1964.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXPENDITURES FOR MEDICAL RESEARCH

Expenditures for medical research[1] in the United States during 1963 amounted to approximately $1,470 million[2] with a further $99 million spent by the Federal Government on new buildings for research. Excluding the amount spent for construction, about two-thirds of this money came from Government funds and one-quarter from the pharmaceutical industry. The remaining one-tenth was from contributions of private foundations and other private sources.

Medical research accounts for approximately 8 percent of the total amount ($18.5 billion) spent on all research and development in the United States. The research endeavor of the Nation represents 3 percent of expenditures for all goods and services.[3] Research activities accounted for 4.7 percent, or $1,550 million, of the $33 billion[4] (5.8 percent of the gross national product) spent on health care in the fiscal year 1962–63.

Medical research has been growing in importance and expenditures have increased greatly in recent years. Expenditures for medical research in 1963 were 74 percent higher than in 1960 and about 1,600 percent higher than in 1947. If this trend continues at the rate of expansion projected by the Jones committee, annual national expenditures for medical research will be in the range of $2.8 billion to $3.3 billion[5] in 1970. Estimates by the National Institutes of Health based on these figures indicate that 77,000 scientific and professional health personnel will be needed in 1970, almost double the 39,700 such workers in 1960.

TRENDS

The Federal Government has come to play an increasingly important role. Between 1947 and 1963, medical research financed by the Federal Government increased 34 times, from $27 million to $924 million, while expenditures by all other sources increased 9 times, from $60 million to $546 million. Thus, as a proportion of total national medical research expenditures, Federal expenditures increased from 31 to 63 percent.

TABLE 1.—*Total and Federal medical research expenditures, United States, selected years, 1947–63*

	Total national medical research (millions)	Federal as percent of total
1947	$87	31
1957	440	52
1959	648	54
1961	1,045	55
1963	1,470	63

As a proportion of total Federal expenditures for all research and development, expenditures for medical research increased from 3.9 percent to 7.3 percent between 1947 and 1963. The 7.3 percent spent for medical research compares with 63 percent allocated for national defense[6] (Department of Defense and Atomic Energy Commission), 25 percent for space exploration (National Aeronautics and Space Administration), and 4.3 percent for research in other areas. National defense still claims a major portion of the total Federal expenditures for all research and development although its part declined from a high of 91 percent in 1953 to the 1963 level of 63 percent.

As a proportion of the Nation's total expenditures for all research and development, however, medical research expenditures changed little. The $161 million expended for medical research in 1950 was about 6 percent of the total for all research and development. By 1963 it has increased to 8 percent, or $1.5 billion of the national total of $18.5 billion.

The pattern of Federal support of medical research has shifted from research at Federal installations to grants for research conducted elsewhere such as universities. In 1947, 36 percent of the total Federal money for medical research was allocated to outside agencies; in 1963 it was 74 percent. In 1962 the Federal Government financed 61 percent of the Nation's total expenditures for medical research, but Federal agencies conducted only 19 percent of the total. Colleges and universities conducted 37 percent of the Nation's total medical research and 48 percent of the Federal total. Other nonprofit institutions performed 18 percent of the Nation's total and 19 percent of the Federal total.[7] In 1962, most of the research supported by industry was conducted under its own sponsorship. Industry performed 26 percent of the national total and expended the same amount for medical research, but approximately 14 percent of the industrial total of $336 million was allocated to outside institutions, while industry received about the same amount from the Federal Government.

---

[1] Defined broadly as scientific inquiry aimed ultimately at the improvement of human health and the conquest of disease.

[2] All figures related to 1963 and thereafter are estimates. Unless specified otherwise, all data are from the U.S. National Institutes of Health, "Resources for Medical Research Report" No. 3, January 1963, and No. 4, August 1963; and "Basic Data Relating to the National Institutes of Health," February 1964.

[3] The Gross National Product was $585 billion in 1963. Source: U.S. Office of Business Economics, "Survey of Current Business," February 1964, p. 13.

[4] Preliminary estimates made for fiscal year 1962–63. Hence, they differ from those for 1963. Source: U.S. Social Security Administration, "Social Security Bulletin," November 1963, pp. 10 and 11.

[5] Boisfeuillet Jones, Chairman, "Federal Support of Medical Research," report of the Committee of Consultants on Medical Research, May 1960, p. 79. The range of expenditures is from the committee's alternative projections D and E.

[6] Excluding medical research programs of these agencies.

[7] "Other nonprofit organizations" include foreign ones as well as those which do not strictly fit into the classification of nonprofit organizations.

Colleges and universities performed only 9 percent[8] of all research and development in fiscal year 1961–62. Industry accounted for 74 percent, the Federal Government 14 percent, and other nonprofit organizations the remaining 3 percent. However, support for all research and development came from sources similar to those for medical research. The Federal Government contributed 65 percent of the national total, industry 32 percent, colleges and universities 2 percent and other nonprofit institutions 1 percent in the 1961–62 fiscal year.

Grants by the National Institutes of Health last year were 33 percent of the total Federal support ($956 million) of all categories of research at colleges and universities. The Department of Defense provided 31 percent, National Science Foundation 12 percent and other Federal agencies the remaining 24 percent. In 1952 the share of the National Institutes of Health was 9 percent of the total ($151 million), while that of the Department of Defense was 70 percent.

Among the agencies with general health objectives (the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Veterans' Administration), the National Institutes of Health, a constituent agency of the Public Health Service in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the principal medical research agency of the Federal Government, provides 64 percent of the total Federal support of medical research—about $625 million in 1963. In 1947, less than one-third of the total Federal support of medical research was channeled through the then National Institutes of Health.[9] The proportion had increased to 55 percent in 1957 and to about 65 percent in 1961.

The medical research programs of the Defense Department represent about 8 percent of the total Federal medical research program—$81 million in 1963. Although its outlay represents a tenfold increase over 1947, Federal medical research funds allocated through the Defense Department declined from 31 percent of the total to 8 percent during the 1947–63 period. The Atomic Energy Commission has a medical research program roughly equal to that of the Defense Department in magnitude—$76 million in 1963. The National Aeronautics and Space Administration expended $38 million for medical research in 1963, about 4 percent of the total for all Federal medical research. Medical research expenditures by other Federal agencies with civilian objectives amounted to $46 million or about 5 percent of the total Federal medical research funds.

In 1963, 78 percent of the total Federal medical research program of $924 million was conducted in the medical sciences, both clinical and basic, 12 percent in the biological sciences, 4 percent in the physical sciences, and the remaining 6 percent in other fields. This distribution has remained stable since 1961 (the earliest year for which data are available). Biomedical sciences consistently commanded about 90 percent of the total Federal medical research funds.

Between 1947 and 1963, the Federal Government expended $535 million for provision of new buildings for medical research, of which 38 percent was for construction of Federal sites. Capital expenditure for medical research by the Federal Government has grown rapidly over the years, reaching $99 million in 1963 from $6 million in 1948. However, the expansion has followed a fluctuating path with the trough located in the 1953–56 period with $4.5 million spent in 1955. The distribution of funds between construction of Federal sites and others also varied widely over the years. For the construction of Federal sites, 76 to 96 percent of Federal funds were allocated during 1951–55; since 1960 the proportion has been 23 to 36 percent.

HISTORY

The era of private support for medical research in this country was 1895 to 1940. During this period medicine and medical research were the chief beneficiaries of the large private funds. In 1902, the Rockefeller Board (later known as the Rockefeller Foundation) was established and provided $1 million in initial endowment. Thereafter, numerous organizations followed until in 1940, 134 foundations gave $12.2 million[10] to medicine and public health. In 1963 private support other than that from industry provided $141 million for medical research or 10 percent of the Nation's total.

The first Federal support of medical research through grants extended to universities was initiated by the National Board of Health in 1879. The grant-in-aid program was, however, discontinued in 1882, and was not reinstituted until World War I, when it was used to support research in the control of venereal disease. In 1912, when the Public Health and Marine Hospital Service became the Public Health Service, Federal support of health research broadened from control of epidemic and infectious disease to study and investigation of all diseases of man.

In 1930, the Hygienic Laboratory became the National Institute of Health, thus receiving more formal recognition from Congress. The research program of the Institute continued, however, to be strictly intramural. In 1937 the passage of the National Cancer Act established the National Cancer Institute, and for the first time permanent authority was created for making grants for Federal support of medical research in non-Federal organizations. Between 1938 and 1940, the Institute considered 137 applications for grants and awarded 33 grants involving a total of $220 million.

World War II saw further impetus for medical research with the organization in 1941 of the Committee on Medical Research of the Office of Scientific Research and Development to "initiate and support scientific research on medical problems affecting the national defense." Under the guidance and advice of various advisory committees of the National Research Council, the medical research programs of the Committee were carried out by contract with universities, hospitals, and other organizations. By June 30, 1944, 496 research contracts had been executed with 120 institutions involving over $15 million. The passage of the Public Health Service Act of 1944 provided broad authority to the Public Health Service for conduct and support of all kinds of medical research.

Federal support of medical research expanded rapidly in the years following World War II. The National Institutes of Health were given central responsibility for administering research grants. Six additional Institutes were established: Heart, Microbiological (to become Allergy), and Dental Research in 1948; Mental Health in 1949; Neurology and Experimental Biology (to become Arthritis) in 1950.[11] Between fiscal years 1945–46 and 1949–50 annual appropriations to the National Institutes of Health for extramural research grants alone increased from $780,000 per year to $14 million. In 1957, for the first time, Federal money accounted for more than one-half of the Nation's total spending for medical research.

PROGRAMS OF NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

There has been a shift in Federal support of research over the last 14 years. The National Institutes of Health are now receiving a larger share of the Federal dollar than are all other health agencies combined. Excluding construction grants, the National Institutes of Health appropriation increased 19 times from $52 million in 1949–50 to $968 million in 1963–64 fiscal year, while all Federal expenditures for medical research increased 14 times between 1949 and 1963 calendar years.

Most of the growth has taken place in the research activities supported outside of the National Institutes of Health. Between 1949–50 and 1962–63 fiscal years, funds obligated for extramural research increased from $15 million to $472 million, while those for intramural research increased from $13 million to $98 million.

Research project grants have shown the greatest rate of increase and constitute the largest segment of the extramural activities of the National Institutes of Health. Between fiscal years 1949–50 and 1963–64, funds appropriated for research grants by the National Institutes of Health increased from $14 million to $529 million. In fiscal year 1963–64 55 percent of the total National Institutes of Health appropriations, including construction grants, was allocated for research grants to agencies, mainly academic ones, outside the Institutes. Fourteen years ago, in the 1949–50 fiscal year, the ratio of grants to total appropriations was 1 to 4.

For its training program, the National Institutes of Health awarded a total of $145 million in the 1962–63 fiscal year. Of this amount, 80 percent was for training grants and the remaining 20 percent for fellowships of various types. Postdoctoral fellowships comprised the largest single category—40 percent of the $20.4 million awarded for all full-time regular fellows.

The National Institutes of Health distributed its $968 million appropriations in 1963–64 fiscal year among three categories of programs: (1) Support and conduct of research through research grants, direct studies and collaborative studies (68 percent of the total National Institutes of Health appropriations); (2) development of health care resources through training awards and construction grants (28 percent of the total); and (3) other operations, such as State control programs, professional and technical assistance, training (4 percent of the total).

Colleges and universities received $292 million in research grants from National Institutes of Health in fiscal year 1962–63. This was about 73 percent of the total National Institutes of Health research grants of $401 million (excluding general research support). This proportion had been consistently maintained since the 1957–58 fiscal year. In 1962–63, hospitals received 13 percent of the research grants, nonprofit organizations 7 percent, and the rest were distributed to other institutions, including foreign ones. This pattern of distribution has remained stable over the years. Medical schools received about two-thirds of the research grants to colleges and universities in 1962–63.

The National Institutes of Health awarded $270 million as grants for medical research facilities construction during the 7-year period from fiscal year 1956–57 to fiscal year 1963–64. Half of this amount has been granted to medical schools and an additional 29 percent to other academic institutions. Private nonprofit institutions, primarily hospitals, received 17 percent of the total and other public institutions the remaining 4 percent.

---

[8] All figures in this paragraph are from the U.S. National Science Foundation, "Reviews of Data on Research and Development," No. 41, September 1963.

[9] National Institutes of Health took its name in 1948 from National Institute of Health.

[10] Richard H. Shryock, "American Medical Research: Past and Present," New York, 1947, p. 101. "It is difficult to say how much of its [$12.2 million] went into research." Figures from before 1947 in the following three paragraphs are from the same source.

[11] In 1963, two more institutes, General Medical Sciences, and Child Health were created.

COMMENTS ON INCREASED MEDICAL RESEARCH FUNDS

One and a half billion dollars a year is being spent on medical research in this country. Such expenditures, financed by governmental and private agencies, are 1,600 percent greater than the sums expended in 1947.

Because of the sharp increase in expenditures for medical research, there has been public concern that growth has been too rapid. Criticisms have tended to focus on whether research funds have been too easily available to be used effectively, and whether scientific personnel have been available for staffing the increased number of research projects.

Although expenditure for all research in this country increased sharply between 1950 and 1963, the portion of national research expenditure going for medical research increased only from 6 to 8 percent over the same period. Looked at solely as a proportion of the national investment in medical care, the research investment seems proper. About $33 billion is being spent annually for all types of medical care; 4.7 percent of this amount goes for medical research. The obvious importance of new medical knowledge warrants disproportionate investment in research in this field.

There may never be a surplus of qualified research scientists, but the health field would seem not to be confronted with a greater problem than is true of research generally. Attention has been given to increasing the supply of scientists by universities and Government. Currently, about 23 percent of the annual National Institutes of Health appropriation is allocated for training awards.

Concern also has been expressed that there has been a disproportionate increase in Government support for medical research, and that as a result private funds would decrease. In the past 16 years Government support of such research has multiplied 34 times, but private expenditures, rather than decreasing, have increased by nine times during the same period.

Analysis of current research expenditures, while not answering all questions raised by critics, is reassuring. Such analysis seems to support the several expert committees appointed by Government which have recommended a continuing increase in medical research expenditures.

THE WARREN REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, all of us who are concerned with freedom of the press, and accompanying responsibility for the fourth estate, must weigh the Warren report's criticisms of news coverage of President Kennedy's assassination and subsequent events. Specifically mentioned in the report were lack of "self-discipline" and "general disorder."

I understand that Miles Wolff, president of the American Society of Newspaper Editors, has asked Al Friendly, chairman of the ASNE Committee on News Access, to meet with representatives of Sigma Delta Chi, honorary journalistic fraternity, the Radio-Television News Directors Association, the National Association of Broadcasters, and other press groups to consider the Warren report recommendations.

Two articles in the Washington Post yesterday offered valuable questions for our consideration. One was the conviction expressed by an editorial that the quick intelligence from Dallas, in spite of imperfections, kept the Nation on an even keel, and sufficiently satisfied the public curiosity to prevent panic. I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial, "The Evil We Escaped," follow my remarks in the RECORD.

I also ask unanimous consent for the insertion of a column by Alfred Friendly, managing editor of the Post, entitled, "On Blaming the Press." The ASNE News Access Committee, of which he is chairman, recently recommended the device of pooling newsmen in certain circumstances where the presence of unlimited numbers of reporters and photographers could prove disturbing. Friendly points out in this article, however, that when the press observes reasonable limitations, they must be set by the only people who can set them; that is, those in charge of an event being reported.

As to whether the press was too aggressive at Dallas, Friendly asks his readers whether a docile press or a demanding one is good for the country. He also questions the consequences in Dallas and elsewhere if information about the crime had not been made public as it was collected.

I agree with the Warren Commission that the news situation in Dallas was not properly handled. The TV coverage at the police station appeared more like a junior riot than an orderly dissemination of fact or information for a news story of worldwide impact.

The responsibilities and the good taste implied in the great freedom of the press must be observed and respected. Where a story of such magnitude as the assassination of a President is breaking, however, the obligation is with the source of the news to plan for an orderly flow of current fact, either by pooling or by frequent press conferences.

The heart of an alert press is the competitive effort to be first with the most about a fast-breaking story of local, national, or international interest. This competition cannot be removed, nor should either the press or the Government attempt to control it. Through the proposed discussion among the press, the bar, and law enforcement agencies, however, it will be possible to improve the standards for news reports in such emergencies.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the editorial page of the Washington Post, Sept. 29, 1964]

THE EVIL WE ESCAPED

The Warren Commission's factual recital of the news coverage of the arrest and detention of Lee Harvey Oswald is enough to persuade everyone that the circumstances in Dallas did not contribute either to orderly processes of justice or the clear information of the public.

Such confusion is likely to occur, it must be acknowledged, in the case of crimes of this nature. Some degree of confusion probably could not be avoided. Still, the news media and the authorities can do better than this and under the prodding of the report's recommendations no doubt they will.

While we struggle with the evils that we have, however, we should not forget the evils that we escaped. If the information about the crime, because of the speed with which reports were gathered and transmitted, was not wholly accurate, the understanding conveyed by the press, in reports instantly disseminated, communicated to the country a general description of events which the months-long study of the Commission has not basically changed. This quick intelligence, in spite of imperfections, kept the whole Nation on an even keel, sufficiently satisfied the public curiosity to prevent hysteria and panic, and was detailed enough to prevent rumor and suspicion that might have otherwise directed popular vengeance at innocent individuals or groups. This is a great gain and sight of it must not be lost in debate over how the news media performance could have been made better and how it could have been kept from interfering with the normal processes of justice.

No doubt the bar and the media, with proper study, can improve the standards of collection and presentation of such news; but any system that would totally preclude some confusion in a crisis of this kind no doubt would preclude the routine press coverage upon which citizens depend for the honest working of our law-enforcement agencies. To achieve the ideal functioning of officials, bar and press in an abnormal situation we must not sacrifice their proper functioning in normal times. The faults of officials, lawyers, and newsmen arising from an excessive zeal to get and print the facts are often, as in this case, disquieting. The flaws of a system devoid of that zeal might be even more alarming.

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 29, 1964]

ON BLAMING THE PRESS: WARREN COMMISSION'S COMPLAINT

(By Alfred Friendly)

Those parts of the Warren Commission's report bearing on the responsibility of the news media for some of the dreadful aftermath of President Kennedy's assassination raise troublesome problems about the press in a democratic society. And the Commission's remedial proposals are only the beginning of an argument, not end of one.

A difficulty to be recognized at the outset is that all of our guarantees of freedom have reverse sides to them, full of imperfections and liabilities. Freedom of assembly can lead to riots, and privileged talk in courts and Congress leads to a certain amount of false and evil utterances; and habeas corpus can let a felon free to sin again.

So with freedom of the press. At Dallas, one consequence was an epidemic of rumors of plot and conspiracy, created by inconsistent and contradictory reports issued to the press by law-enforcement officials, and relayed by the press to the public. But is this the only ingredient to be considered in a discussion on whether to modify the present philosophy about freedom of the press?

The Commission is ambivalent about assessing the blame for the engendering of the hurtful rumors. Its harshest reproach is to the law-enforcement officials who issued the information, some true, some erroneous. And whether true or not, the Commission charges, the issuance gravely jeopardized Lee Harvey Oswald's right to a fair trial had he lived to be tried. Presumably, to the extent the press printed that information, it contributed to a denial of that right.

But the Commission's complaint about the press is not so much that it printed what it learned, but rather that it pressed so aggressively for information, even to the point, the Commission seems to feel, of bullying the police into disclosures.

The question here would seem to be what kind of a press is good for the country: A docile one, or a demanding one. The President had been murdered. Was the press wrong to seek information about it with furious diligence? Or was this a situation where the usual—and usually desired—energy and toughness of reporters should have been set aside?

The Commission declares: "Neither the press nor the public had the right to be contemporaneously informed by the police or prosecuting authorities of the details being accumulated against Oswald * * * its curiosity should not have been satisfied at the expense of the accused's right to trial by an impartial jury."

With the legal and moral principle there can be no argument. But the question may be asked whether, in any practical, feasible way, the great principle could have been secured, at Dallas last year or any place else whenever a President is assassinated. It is also fair to ask what the consequences might have been in Dallas and elsewhere had information about the crime and the suspect not been swiftly made public as it was collected. What would have been the crop of rumors in that case? And what would have been the action taken on the basis of those rumors?

The Commission chides the press for its lack of self-discipline. The behavior of reporters and photographers was not such as to make any newsman proud or complacent or even indifferent. But admitting this, one must next ask about the existence of means by which self-discipline could have been instituted.

The press is not a licensed body, operating through legal rules or step by step through enforceable procedural regulations. It is not an entity, much less one into which admission can be controlled and where operations can be subjected to official prescriptions. For the most part, it has shown itself willing to accept reasonable limitations when they are set by the only people who can set them; i.e., those in charge of an event being reported. But the members of the press have no effective way of setting limitations, except each man upon himself; no one member has the authority to limit his brother.

The Commission points out, however, that the press did not heed repeated requests from the Dallas police to clear the corridors, and disobeying orders not to ask Oswald questions at two of his appearances.

But the question is whether the police tried very hard to keep the corridors clear, or asked for a limitation of the number of newsmen, or even checked credentials (except on one occasion, where the checking was so intense as to have permitted Jack Ruby to walk into the building, unchallenged, and kill Oswald).

There is no indication that the police proposed to install any orderly procedures, such as pooling of cameramen or regularized briefings. In the past, the press has willingly agreed to such devices particularly in situations where it was obvious that otherwise there would be chaos. It agrees on them here and elsewhere every day in the year, and abides by them.

But it is difficult, at short notice, for the press to initiate those devices, and at Dallas it would appear to have been downright impossible. If the police chief or mayor or some other official did not prescribe the rules, or give the local editors the mandate to do so, who was to organize the system? The senior correspondent of the Associated Press? Or of the United Press International? Or of CBS? Or the gentleman from the New York Times?

And lacking that, could each member of the world's press, at the scene of the most newsladen murder since 1914, voluntarily forsake the center of news information, in some epidemic of self-abnegation?

The press was not pretty in Dallas. But it may not be fair to accuse it for failure to embrace a system that was not its to prescribe nor perhaps in its ability to create.

CONSERVATION ACHIEVEMENTS

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, yesterday the Senate passed the bill establishing the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore. In so doing, this body added another distinction to this session's already distinguished record on conservation.

The earlier enactment of legislation establishing the Fire Island National Seashore and the passage of the Land and Water Conservation Fund bill were milestones in this distinguished record—to say nothing of final enactment of the long-sought wilderness bill.

Mr. President, the Senate Subcommittee on Public Lands, under the able chairmanship of Senator ALAN BIBLE, deserves the congratulations and gratitude of millions of Americans of this and future generations for the foresight its chairman and its members have shown. No committee of the Congress can be said to have made a greater contribution to the future of this great Nation and the health and happiness of its citizens.

In addition to these achievements, the Public Lands Subcommittee has held a preliminary hearing on the establishment of a national seashore on Assateague Island, a presently undeveloped, but potentially priceless, national asset. The chairman of the committee has agreed to hold additional hearings on this proposal early in the next session.

Mr. President, Assateague Island represents one of the last great natural outdoor recreational areas on the Atlantic seaboard. As our Nation becomes increasingly urbanized, with a future population of perhaps 10 million in the Baltimore-Washington area alone, there will be precious few places in these United States—and especially in the eastern United States—where a man can stand on a clean beach and can fish or swim or simply lie in the sand and listen to the soft sound of the sea.

The chairman and members of the Subcommittee on Public Lands have looked clearly into the future, and have helped to provide our children and their children with the priceless heritages that still lie in our power to provide, but will not be in their power to take unto themselves in the years ahead.

The distinguished record of this Senate committee gives confidence to those of us who already have done so much to encourage the preservation of this unique natural recreation area.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial entitled "The Conservation Congress," which was published in the September 20 edition of the New York Times, be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks. I join the editors of the Times in paying tribute to the distinguished Members of the Congress whose names are mentioned in the editorial. The accolade bestowed on Secretary Udall is most deserved. Americans of succeeding generations will have reason to be grateful to him.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Sept. 20, 1964]

THE CONSERVATION CONGRESS

When President Johnson signed into law the bill creating the Fire Island National Seashore, he not only established the first such park in New York State, but also made a notable contribution to the splendid record of the 88th Congress in the conservation field. The Wilderness Act he signed earlier this month represented nearly a decade of effort by conservationists to keep a small part of our country in the primeval state our pioneers saw. As a start the law protects 9,200,000 acres in 13 States and provides, if Congress in the future agrees, for adding another 5,500,000 acres over the next 10 years.

The Land and Water Conservation Fund Act was a major companion piece of legislation. This law establishes for the first time a permanent fund of $2 billion in the next decade to finance the acquisition and development of land to be used for recreation and for new wildlife refuges. The fund is derived primarily from the proceeds of the existing tax on motorboat fuels and from admission and user fees to be paid by those who use camping sites and other facilities on Government-owned land. The fund's establishment underscores the interdependence of conservation and recreation. If we as a people use common prudence, a happy balance can be struck between developing some of our outdoor areas for sports and recreation and still maintaining other areas as wilderness and as game and bird refuges.

Congress in this past year also passed the Ozark national scenic riverways bill which saved the beautiful Current River and its tributary Jacks Fork, in southern Missouri from exploitation. Another bill, just made law, established the Canyonlands National Park in the magnificent mountain country of southern Utah.

One of the many unfinished tasks is the rescue of the Indiana dunes. Their fate demonstrates the importance of timeliness in conservation. Because a previous Congress failed to intervene, the Bethlehem Steel Co. has already bulldozed and irreparably destroyed some of the most beautiful dunes, a total of 2,000 acres. If the House Interior Committee moves promptly, however, there is still time for the 88th Congress to protect the remaining dune lands.

Many men and organizations share in the credit for the accomplishments of this Congress. The late Dr. Howard Zahniser of the Wilderness Society died this year before the wilderness system which he did so much to foster finally became law. The effort in Congress was bipartisan. Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, Democrat of New Mexico, and Representative JOHN P. SAYLOR, Republican of Pennsylvania, and many other Congressmen worked tirelessly on these laws. A special word of tribute should go to Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall. Among his modern predecessors only the redoubtable Harold L. Ickes equaled him in zeal and effectiveness in the cause of conservation. Secretary Udall's work in this field bestows great distinction upon the Johnson administration.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1965

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 12633) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The supplemental appropriations bill, 1965.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 A.M.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate at this time, I move, pursuant to the order previously entered, that the Senate adjourn until 11 a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 24 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Thursday, October 1, 1964, at 11 o'clock a.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate September 30, 1964:

COMMUNICATIONS SATELLITE CORP.

The following-named persons to be members of the board of directors of the Communications Satellite Corp. for the terms indicated:

Frederic G. Donner, of New York, for a term from September 17, 1964, until the date of the annual meeting of the corporation in 1965.

George Meany, of Maryland, for a term from September 17, 1964, until the date of the annual meeting of the corporation in 1966.

Clark Kerr, of California, for a term from September 17, 1964, until the date of the annual meeting of the corporation in 1967.

COAST GUARD

The following members of the Coast Guard Reserve to be permanent commissioned officers in the Regular Coast Guard in the grades indicated.

To be lieutenant commander

Thomas H. Rutledge.

To be lieutenants (junior grade)

James F. Hunt.
Walter N. Warschun.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

Subject to qualifications provided by law, the following for permanent appointment to the grades indicated in the Coast and Geodetic Survey:

To be lieutenants

James G. Grunwell
Robert A. Ganse
David V. Sibila
James H. Allred

To be lieutenants (junior grade)

Stephen Z. Bezuk
David G. Hickerson
Gerald W. Hohmann
Richard H. Allbritton
Frank H. Branca
Richard A. Rader
William L. Newton III
Edward R. Dohrman
Christopher E. Krusa
Richard P. Williamson
Richard J. De Rycke
Allan Jenks
Ned C. Austin
James J. Lium
Bruce L. McCartney
Larry L. Lewis
Ronald K. Brewer
Jeffrey G. Carlen
David L. Des Jardins, Jr.
Gordon E. Mills

To be ensigns

William R. Klesse
Gerald M. Ward
William S. Plank
Richard V. O'Connell
Philip L. Richardson
Ralph H. Rhudy
Walter S. Simmons
Frederick G. Pualsen
Jeffrey L. Gammon
Peter K. Reichert
Ellis G. Campbell III
Gary E. Rorvig
Bobby D. Edwards
Donald R. Rich
Marshall A. Levitan
A. David Schuldt
George M. Ensign
Richard M. Petryczanko
Clifford A. Wells
Floyd S. Ito

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Help for Narcotics Addicts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LIONEL VAN DEERLIN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 30, 1964

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, just 2 years ago, Robert J. Driver, a resident of Solana Beach, in San Diego County, Calif., organized a group of San Diego citizens to stimulate community interest and raise the money necessary to establish a center for the treatment of drug addiction in San Diego.

Driver himself is addicted only by a desire to serve his fellowman. His family background is one of active participation in the business and social communities of the city, dynamic support of their political party and of their church.

At the time of his initial interest in the potentially heartbreaking problem of narcotics addiction, Driver was 24 years old, married to his high school sweetheart and the father of two boys. He was securely employed in an insurance corporation bearing his father's name.

A pragmatically religious man, Driver says he was motivated by an interest in the dynamics of goal-directed groups, but his subsequent involvement indicates an empathy with people and a feeling of personal obligation for their welfare.

Initial investigation of the symptoms of the disease indicated to Driver that medical, penal, sociological, and neuropsychiatric authorities were generally agreed that there could be no lasting cure.

Driver, however, heard of a group of voluntarily withdrawn addicts in Santa Monica who were successfully avoiding the use of drugs or narcotics through a program of self-administered discipline and specifically adapted group psychotherapy. This movement—calling itself "Synanon"—first came to national attention through the interest and efforts of U.S. Senator THOMAS DODD, of Connecticut.

After visiting the group's headquarters in Santa Monica, young Driver was convinced that their program, though still in its formative stage, was of conceivable value to the San Diego community.

It was then that Driver organized the Sponsors of Synanon in San Diego. His first recruits were his sister, Sandra Driver, and an assistant district attorney, Norbert Ehrenfreund.

Driver organized speaking committees within the group as it grew to contact San Diego service clubs and organizations expressing interest. At first Driver filled most of the speaking engagements himself.

Interest in the Sponsors of Synanon was faltering and erratic, but enough money was raised to secure a large house in which the addicted members of Synanon could live and work toward physical and social rehabilitation.

This was a little over 2 years ago.

Today, five houses are used for the various Synanon functions in San Diego. The group has a small fleet of vehicles donated by citizens and service groups at the suggestion of the Sponsors of Synanon. One hundred and fifty addicts are undergoing treatment in San Diego.

The Sponsors of Synanon have raised better than $40,000 a year for the last 2 years to support the program. Some of San Diego's leading citizens are now members of Driver's group, among them Mrs. C. Arnholt Smith, Frank Alessio, and Councilwoman Helen Cobb.

Early next year the Synanon members, guided by the Sponsors of Synanon, will assume the full-time operation of a profitmaking goods and services facility here. They are already engaged in a small manufacturing endeavor, working toward the goal of their founder, Chuck Dederich:

> It has always been the feeling that an organization whose philosophy is based on self-reliance must one day be self-reliant.

When this self-reliance occurs in San Diego and throughout the country it will be due in large part to groups like the Sponsors of Synanon, and the dedication of people like Robert J. Driver.

The Hayward Morning News Begins Publication

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 30, 1964

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure and pride that I announce the beginning of publication of a fine new newspaper in California's Ninth Congressional District. I am referring to the Hayward Morning News which will serve Hayward, Castro Valley, and southern Alameda County, and is published every day except Sunday. The publisher is Mr. Abe Kofman, one of the most distinguished publishers and businessmen of California. His talented staff includes Mort Kofman, assistant publisher, and Harre DeMoro, editor.

I feel, Mr. Speaker, that the newspaper is especially fortunate in obtaining the services of Mr. DeMoro as its editor. Although young in years, Mr. DeMoro has enjoyed a productive career as one of our most thoughtful columnists and newspaper reporters.

I have had a number of communications from constituents living in the area to be served by the Hayward Morning News, expressing their delight and pleasure that Mr. Kofman has commenced publication. It will be a hard-hitting, independent, and progressive journal in the tradition of the great free newspapers of our country.

Mr. Speaker, I know that the Hayward Morning News will enjoy success and long life, and I offer the editors and the staff my heartiest congratulations.

New Television Program Depicts Life of Legislator

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 30, 1964

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, the public image of the modern politician is not always drawn by a sympathetic hand. Perhaps this is because politics is a controversial area of our society, and its practitioners must expect to be treated harshly from time to time.

It gives me a great deal of satisfaction, therefore, to call this Chamber's attention to a depiction of a modern legislator that is at once realistic and sympathetic, that is both fair and discerning. I refer, Mr. Speaker, to the first effort of the television industry to dramatize the life of a lawmaker, in "Slattery's People," seen on the Columbia Broadcasting System's television network.

The leading player in this dramatic series is a young actor whose grasp of a legislator's point of view is remarkable. His name is Richard Crenna, a resident of the great San Fernando Valley which I help to represent here in the House. In his role, Mr. Crenna depicts the minority leader of the lower house of a State legislature. The first drama on the series illustrated the conflict that sometimes arises when a legislator must choose between the interests of his own district and the interests of his State as a whole.

The man chiefly responsible for pioneering into this new arena in television is James E. Moser, another San Fernando Valley resident, who created "Slattery's People" after spending more than 8 months researching the program by working beside legislators in the California State capital of Sacramento. This is typical of Moser's exhaustive approach and concern for realism, which first was noticed in the famous "Dragnet" series of several years ago.

I think that this series and the men responsible for it at Bing Crosby Productions, Inc., deserve a great deal of credit for pioneering into this new dramatic field on television. I am pleased that they have taken the high road to show a legislator's life, and have not pandered to sensationalism or unreality to stimulate an audience following. In an industry that has received its share of criticism for the quality of its product, I am happy to extend this salute to one effort that deserves our respect and praise.

President Johnson Dedicates Lake Eufaula Dam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 30, 1964

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, last Friday, September 25, was a day of great historic significance for Oklahoma and the entire Southwest.

On that day, more than 50,000 Oklahomans and our friends from nearby States gathered at Lake Eufaula for the dedication by President Lyndon Johnson of the Eufaula Dam.

Completion of this great reservoir is the greatest milestone of this century in Oklahoma's march of progress. I think it was most fitting that the dedication speech was delivered by one of the all-time congressional champions of water resource development—President Johnson.

As the years have gone by, the Eufaula project more and more has come to be a bipartisan undertaking with support by both Democrats and Republicans in Congress. This is the way we would like to have it.

However, history will forever record that Eufaula Dam and Reservoir was initiated by Democrats in Congress, it was authorized for the first time by a Democratic Congress, and appropriated for the first time by a Democratic Congress over the very determined opposition of a Republican President.

President Lyndon Johnson on the other hand has been a stalwart champion of the Arkansas River from its very inception and he continues to be a champion today.

We in Oklahoma are proud of President Johnson for his great record as a leader in water resource and natural resource development. He is not afraid of the future. President Johnson knows that money spent in developing our great inland waterways is truly an investment in the future of America and the dividends far exceed the investment.

In addition to President Johnson, Oklahomans were fortunate to have on hand another great champion of natural resource development, the Honorable Mike Kirwan. We were proud to have Congressman Kirwan share our joy on that historic day.

Eufaula Dam and Reservoir is a vital link in the multipurpose program of developing the Arkansas River. With this great dam now dedicated, we look forward to the completion of navigation on the Arkansas River and we are ready to go on with the work to complete the entire project.

Oklahomans shall long remember the words President Johnson spoke at the dedication ceremonies. His message has significance for all Americans. At this time, I wish to insert into the Record the complete text of the President's remarks:

The President. Governor Bellmon, Senator Monroney, Senator Edmondson, Governor Connally, of Texas, Congressman Albert, our great Majority Leader, Ed Edmondson, and other distinguished members of the Oklahoma delegation to the Congress, all of whom are making a great contribution to our country—and I want to say on behalf of all the people of this Nation that we, the people of the United States, are deeply in the debt of the people of Oklahoma for the quality of the men that they send to the U.S. Congress. I could talk about your Senators, Monroney and Edmondson; I could spend days talking about your House delegation, particularly your majority leader; but I want to say that none of the things that we have accomplished this year, and this is one of the finest years, one of the finest hours of the U.S. Congress, could have happened except under the leadership of the Oklahoma delegation, and particularly that fine, young Majority Leader, Carl Albert.

This is a great day for the Sooners. I thank you for letting a Texan have a little slice of it. But Texans and the people of Oklahoma alike share the memories of the days before dams like this remade the earth. I grew up on land like this back in Texas. I am going back to it when I finish here this evening. That land is thin soil, scrub oak and blackjack trees. The Pedernales River that runs in front of my little farmhouse was just a trickle in the dry season, but when the rains came down from the hills, the Pedernales always drowned all of us.

Many of us remember those days. We remember the want and the despair, the devastating cycle of flood and drought, the ruined crops and the Dust Bowl. Worst of all was the great waste, the waste of resources, the waste of crops, the waste of men and women.

I went to Washington then to serve in Congress under a great leader, Franklin Delano Roosevelt. Over the years of progress which he began, we have seen our States change from brown to green, from dry, eroded country to grassy land dotted with lakes and pools. We saw a nation afraid become a nation of hope. We saw a people divided become a people united, and to the memory of that progress, and to the determination that our children will never suffer that neglect, I have come to the great State of Oklahoma today to dedicate this great dam to you great people.

I have devoted much of my 30 years of public career to the conservation of America's natural resources. So have Mike Monroney and Howard Edmondson and Carl Albert and Ed Edmondson. So did our great beloved friend, the giant of them all, Bob Kerr, who is watching down on us today. This dam was one of his dreams, and I only wish that he could be here with us.

You know, in 1940, after I had been in Congress several years, I looked up the number of homes with electric lighting in my State, and we had 59 out of every 100. Today we have 100 percent rural electrification. In Oklahoma they had 55 percent of their homes electrified in 1940. Today they have 100. In Louisiana they had 49. Today 100. In Arkansas they had 33, today 100. Arkansas had 45 percent of its homes that had running water in 1940. Today it has 72. Louisiana had 44 with running water. Today it is 87. Oklahoma had 46; today it is 89. Texas had 56; today it is 91.

The percentage of homes that use wood for cooking, 76 out of every 100 in Arkansas in 1940. Louisiana had 50; today it has 4. Oklahoma had 32—32 homes out of every 100 used wood for cooking. Today only 2 out of every 100.

In the number of autos, Oklahoma had 387,000 autos in 1933. Today she has 982,000—3 to 1. Arkansas had 155,000; today she has 589,000. Louisiana had 190,000; today she has 1,042,000. Texas had 1,015,000 in 1933. Today she has 4,000,011.

The percentage of homes with refrigerators, Texas had 36 in 1940, per 100. Today she has 98. Oklahoma had 31; today she has 98. Louisiana had 24; today she has 98.

The percentage of farmer-owned occupied farms, Arkansas had 37 that had homeownership out of every 100. Today she had 76. Louisiana had 33; today she has 75. Oklahoma in 1930 had only 38 out of every 100 farms owned by the man that lived on them. Today not 38 in Oklahoma, but 80. And Texas was 38 in 1930, and 78 today.

So you can see the progress that we have made with the help of men that you have sent to Congress in that period of 20 or 30 years in homeownership, in lighting our homes, in improving our standard of living, and to the memory of that progress and to the determination of the people who led the way, I salute you today.

Our very first President, George Washington, looked at the vast possibilities of harnessing our great rivers and prayed, "Would God that we may have the wisdom and the courage to improve them." Improve these rivers as you have done. For years we ignored his warning. Reckless exploitation and ruthless plunder lay waste the rich earth. But then some farsighted men, men of every party and of every section, men like Theodore Roosevelt, men like Franklin Roosevelt, men like John F. Kennedy, men like Robert S. Kerr, men like Mike Monroney and your House delegation, all began to act and to protect and to develop the natural resources, not only of Oklahoma, but of all the Nation, and the result has been a fuller and a richer life for all of our people, and a much better life for those people that will grow up. These men knew that conservation was not a "pork barrel," that it was not make-work, that it was not a giveaway. It was an investment in the future of America. It was the best kind of economy. In this way we could assure our children the natural resources.

I remember coming to Oklahoma to help dedicate Bob Kerr's book, "Land, Wood and Water," on which the strength of our Nation and the prosperity of our people depended. The Government has a responsibility never to waste taxpayers' money, but the Government also had a responsibility never to waste the Nation's resources. The real wasters, the real spendthrifts, are those who are neglecting the needs of today and destroying the hopes of tomorrow. Our country just cannot afford this kind of waste.

Only 35 years ago we began to open up the Ohio River Basin. Then men of little vision cried out against this as "pork barrel." They were against this progress. Well, we ignored their warnings. We moved ahead. Since World War II alone, over $21 billion of new industry development has taken place in the counties along the Ohio and its navigable tributaries, and one of the great statesmen of Ohio is here today. He not only participated in developing the State of Ohio, he has been one of the ringleaders in developing the State of Oklahoma. I want to call his name. His name is the Honorable MIKE KIRWAN, Congressman from the State of Ohio. Stand up, MIKE.

New jobs and new business, and a steadily improving life, have come to all the people of the area. Men like Congressman KIRWAN have not been content just to look after their own State or their own section. They have been men with national vision. As a result of their national vision you have the monument here to them today.

So that is the story of the development of the United States, and that is the story of the development of the Arkansas River Basin. The Eufaula Dam is a key part of the development of the Arkansas River. It will provide a new link between the Southwest and our industrial heartland. It will provide relief from devastating floods and give us electricity to homes and businesses. It will mean new industry, new jobs, and new opportunities for the people. It will mean a stronger Oklahoma, a more prosperous Oklahoma, a richer Oklahoma, and a stronger United States.

That development will go ahead, and as President, I am here to promise you that it will go on schedule.

I just had to break my budget one time this year. I had a very prudent budget. I had $1 billion less in the budget this year than last year. I was determined to keep it that way until MIKE MONRONEY, CARL ALBERT, JOHN MCCLELLAN, and all this bunch of highjackers from Oklahoma came down there and pounded that Cabinet desk one afternoon and it cost me $14 million, but it got your Arkansas River development back on schedule.

But I would like to look beyond the celebration of today to the challenge of tomorrow, especially to your growing need for water, for this is a land which knows the meaning of water. By the year 2000 more than 300 million Americans will require 888 billion gallons of water a day. This is three times what you are using now. We cannot meet that challenge by looking backward. We cannot meet it by finding things wrong with our Government. We cannot meet it by complaining.

We must meet it by dreaming and executing those dreams. We must meet it by looking forward to the real, and to the men of tomorrow. We must meet it first by going full speed ahead at every level of government in the comprehensive development of our river basins. We cannot approach the problems of water conservation and flood control and recreation and navigation on a piecemeal and divided basis. We must develop river basins as a whole, to use all of our resources while preserving scenic values.

Second, we must step up our efforts to fight the destructive cycle of flood and drought. We have increased flood control programs by more than 50 percent, but we cannot rest on past achievements if we are to rescue our land from the ravages of nature.

Third, we must develop a national policy to attack the pollution of our water, and the pollution of the air that we breathe. This must require research, this will require increased construction of treatment plants and better methods of control. Polluted water is wasted water, and America cannot afford such waste.

Fourth, we will continue to press ahead with weather satellites, deep sea nuclear weather stations, and other scientific advances so that we can understand the weather and so that we can become its master.

Fifth, I am asking for early passage of the Water Resources Planning Act to help us look ahead to future patterns of water needs, to look ahead to plan our projects so that supply will be ready for demand.

Sixth, we will begin to draw fresh water from the oceans before very long. We already have plants in operation that are converting salt and brackish water into 2½ million gallons of fresh water every day, and within a few years desalted water will be an actual reality for millions of Americans.

Three things, and three things only, sustain life on this planet. They are—a thin layer of soil, a cover of atmosphere, and a little rainfall. This is all that the good Lord has given us except one thing: He has given us a choice of what we will do with it. We can waste it. We can pollute it. We can neglect it. Or we can conserve it, and we can protect it, and we can develop it, and we can pass it along to our children, more promising, more abundant than we found it when we discovered America.

I know, I think, what your answer wants to be. I think I know what you ought to do about it. I think your answer is here in this great dam that was built because of your confidence, built because of your support, built not only to make life more pleasant and more productive and more prosperous for you, but for your children and for your grandchildren.

The West was not settled by men who looked back. It was not settled by men who called a halt to progress. It is not held by such men today. Let me say just one thing more:

It was about 10 months ago that we had a great tragedy in Dallas, Tex., and the awesome responsibility of being President of all the people of this country fell into my lap. Although I had spent 33 years in Washington as a clerk, as a Congressman, as a Senator, as a minority leader, as a majority leader, as Vice President, I still felt inadequate to the responsibilities of leading 190 million people and trying to provide hope and leadership for the other free people that live in a world that is made up of 3 billions.

I asked for God's help and for yours. I have done my dead-level best. I have worked with everything that God gave me. I have spent all the energy that I had. I have tried to be careful and prudent. I have tried to be fair and judicious. I have tried to be farsighted and foresighted. I have tried to look forward and not backward. I have tried to develop the land that I would be proud of, and my children would enjoy living in. I found that we had much to preserve and much to protect.

We have the greatest system of government in all the world. We have the highest standard of living of any people anywhere. We have a minimum wage that says to our workers they must pay you this minimum and they must work you this maximum, and in just the short period that I have been in Congress we have gone from 25 cents minimum to $1.25 minimum. Just the short time I have been there we are working less hours per day and less days per week, and less weeks per year. We have more time for recreation, more time for the luxuries of life than our fathers and grandfathers had, to come out to lakes like this and dams like this.

We have a social security system that will give us a modicum of income when we reach our maturity and are no longer able to stay in the labor market. We are proud of the farm programs that we have had that have raised the income of our tenant farmers, that have raised our homeownership, that have brought us rural electrification. I flew over this afternoon from Muskogee and looked at all the little ponds that were filled with water that had been built here in just the last few years. I said to Senator MONRONEY he must be mighty proud of the efforts that he and other Congressmen from Oklahoma had made because that was a tribute not only to them, but to their people, that they had made this soil better, through their own efforts.

Well, there are voices that have questioned me about minimum wage. When I voted for the first bill it was 25 cents an hour, and they told me it would ruin me and they said it would ruin the labor organizations, too, but we are all here, and it looks to me like we are doing better at $1.25 than we were at 25 cents.

I remember before I was elected when I was just a kid secretary talking to my Congressman about voting for social security, and I heard all the scare arguments and all the fright that they tried to put into men. They said it is socialistic, it is compulsory, it is evil, it will destroy our form of government. I think we are better for it. I think we are stronger for it. I think we are richer for it. I don't think many people would like to do away with either our minimum wage or our social security.

As your President, I deal every day with the problems that affect your freedom and affect the peace of the world. Those problems may be remote from this peaceful site out here this afternoon. Not many of you get waked up in the night about Cyprus, or Zanzibar, or Vietnam, but I never send a reconnaissance mission out about 11 o'clock, with our planes and our boys guiding them to take a look at what is developing, and realize they have to be back at 3:30 in the morning, but what promptly at 3:25 I wake up without an alarm clock, because I want to be sure my boys got back, and sometimes they don't come back. There are those that say you ought to go North and drop bombs, to try to wipe out the supply lines, and they think that would escalate the war.

We don't want our American boys to do the fighting for Asian boys. We don't want to get involved in a nation with 700 million people and get tied down in a land war in Asia. There are some that say we ought to go south and get out and come home, but we don't like to break our treaties and we don't like to walk off and leave people who are searching for freedom, and suffering to obtain it, and walk out on them. We remember when we wanted our freedom from Great Britain, and we remember the people that helped us with it, and we'll never forget them. So we don't want to run out on them.

So what are we doing? We're staying there and supplying them with some of the things that we have, some of the things that the richest, most powerful nation in the world has developed. We have some tanks, some planes, and some helicopters. We have 20,000 men out there advising and helping them, and we're hoping that some way, somehow, these people that are invading them and trying to envelop them and trying to take their freedom away from them will some day decide that it's not worth the price and they will leave their neighbors alone and we can have peace in the world. But we are not about to start another war and we're not about to run away from where we are.

Now, our hopes for the future, our hopes for peace, rest on our strength, and I can look you in the eye and I tell you in truth and sincerity today that we are better prepared than we have ever been prepared in our lifetime, and we are prepared because of the strength that you are building here and the qualities that you bring to your work.

I ask each of you to look back to your own lives. Remember not too far back. Just look at the 1930's that I was talking about a moment ago, or the early 1940's, and see if there are any of you, if there's one among you, who are not better clothed, doesn't make more money, doesn't pay more taxes and doesn't live in a stronger, a richer, a better, and finer nation.

Now, what we have in the future and how we rank in the world will depend largely upon you people. If you invited me down here this afternoon and expected me to tell you all that was wrong with your country, and how we have failed, and how everything was in a mess, then you invited the wrong fellow. Today we have more fellows working than we've ever had in the history of the United States. They're living in better homes, they're eating better food and more of it. They are wearing better clothes, they are driving better automobiles, they have got more savings, they have got higher wages, they have got better income, their children are better educated, their health is better, their doctors are better, their hospitals are better, they have more of the pleasures of life.

The strength of America today, the strength of America in the years to come, will depend upon you and you must build that strength, because it depends upon the vision of the people, and on their willingness to look to the future and not to the past. Here's your look at the future. That's what you dreamed, that's what you want, that's what you have. Aren't you proud of Oklahoma? I am.

If any of you have martyr complexes, you are going to be disappointed. If any of you are distressed and depressed with yourself and expect me to come down here and feel sorry for you, you are going to be disappointed. I'm proud of you. I recognize what you have done. I recognize what this Government has done with your help, and I want to tell you we not only have much to preserve and much to protect, but we have much to learn.

If you will just go back to the Good Book and practice some of the teachings of the Lord, if we will just follow the Golden Rule and do unto others as we would have them do unto us, if we just engage in a little introspection and look where we were and where we are, we won't be unhappy very long. We won't feel sorry for ourselves very long.

We have done mighty well. We have a lot to be thankful for, and one of the things that I am thankful for at present is the prayers and the support and the good will and the faith of God-fearing men and women like you, and like this great delegation that you sent there to help me. We are not out of the woods. Some of our friends talk about a crisis a week. Well, sometimes I don't think they know much about the Government until we have a crisis a day and a crisis an hour, and we're always having crises. But we're not going to be crybabies. We're going to stand up like men and face them, and we're going to win.

We're going to win because we have faith and because we have the support of people and because we're builders and because we look forward to leaving this world a better place than we found it.

Thank you for inviting us here. I wish I could stay all day, but I have two other engagements along the road down here in Arkansas and back in Texas tonight, but if you will invite me back sometime, I'll bring my boat and we'll have a good sail together. Thank you.

Federal Aid Flow Proves Hays' Critics Wrong

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE L. HAYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 30, 1964

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, apparently, from what is going on again, some people never learn. Two years ago the opposition in the campaign against me used the big lie technique by repeating all over eastern Ohio that I had not done anything to help my district economically. The result was that 8 months after the election the following editorial appeared in one of the leading newspapers in the 18th Congressional District, the Martins Ferry-Bellaire Times Leader:

FEDERAL AID FLOW PROVES HAYS' CRITICS WRONG

In the last 18th District congressional campaign, the opponents of Congressman WAYNE L. HAYS charged that he hadn't done much for the district, and that he had overlooked its economic problems while concentrating on foreign affairs.

The charge was ridiculous, and the voters were wise enough, as they usually are, to see through it. As a result, the Congressman was elected to his eighth consecutive term.

Let's look at what's happened since then.

Belmont County is just one of the counties in the district. In just the past 8 months, here are some of the projects in Belmont County alone for which HAYS has been instrumental in getting Federal funds.

Martins Ferry industrial planning, $86,065.

Brookside sewage system, $5,000.

Shadyside water improvement, $280,500.

Powhatan Street improvement, $2,210.

Martins Ferry Post Office, $171,703.

Barnesville waterworks, $604,000.

Barnesville Hospital, $157,148.

Belmont County sewer system, $571,000.

Martins Ferry Hospital, $569,000.

Belmont County Sewer District No. 1, $223,000.

In addition, new post offices will be built in Flushing, Bethesda, and Belmont at a cost of approximately $180,000.

The Warren Township Water Authority, which is partly in Belmont County, has received a loan of $115,000.

HAYS didn't do all these things himself. The communities had to qualify for aid, and then he helped obtain approval.

The efforts of HAYS were also a factor in getting the Interstate Route 70 projects, involving an expenditure of some $20 million (90 percent Federal money), advanced 2 years because the county is an economically depressed area.

Since some of the Congressman's critics raised the point of whether he was sufficiently aware of the district's economic problems, this compilation of the projects he has been associated with is in order.

Sort of proves the voters knew what they were doing, doesn't it?

Since the last campaign, the following other projects have been attained through the assistance of my office:

Jefferson County Sewer District No. 1, $6,000.

Columbiana County sewage treatment plant, $270,000.

Lisbon Nursing Home, $200,000.

Adena, Ohio, preliminary planning for sewer facilities, $5,000.

Minerva, Ohio, Carroll County, new topping and widening of streets, $36,500.

St. Clair Township, Columbiana County, sewer facility for several sections of township, $4,780.

Jefferson County sewer facilities, $15,000 advance for preliminary planning.

Flushing, Ohio, extension of water main, relocation of waterplant, new wells, and equipment, $23,000.

Atwood Lake project, Carroll County, three accelerated public works projects totaling grants of $794,000.

Steubenville, Ohio, advance for final planning of sanitary sewerage and draining system, $24,000.

Steubenville housing project, $66,000 advance.

Lock and dam No. 11, Ohio Power Co. located in Brilliant, $125 million project.

Salem City Hospital, $99,000.

Wintersville, Ohio, water pollution control grant, $153,810.

Columbiana County, new sanitary sewerage system for Southeastern Water and Sewage District, $8,710 advance planning.

Belmont Electric Cooperative, St. Clairsville, Ohio, loan from Department of Agriculture, $469,000.

Salem Trade Extension Training School, $7,640.

East Liverpool urban planning program, $86,120 to Ohio Department of Development to aid East Liverpool and Marion in comprehensive planning.

Jefferson County water and sewer projects, Island Creek Township, $3,100; New Alexandria and Overlook Hills, $5,000.

Yorkville, Ohio, flood disaster, $5,830.

Bellaire, Ohio, flood disaster, $26,706.

Brilliant, Ohio, flood disaster, $4,218.

Martins Ferry, Ohio, flood disaster, $30,426.

Empire, Ohio, flood disaster, $14,560.

Bridgeport, Ohio, flood disaster, $1,392.

Powhatan Point, Ohio, flood disaster, $2,723.

Stratton, Ohio, flood disaster, $6,557.

The following new post offices either completed or approved for construction:

Bellaire, Ohio; Bloomingdale, Ohio; Dillonvale, Ohio; East Liverpool, Ohio, station A; Freeport, Ohio; Jewett, Ohio; Lafferty, Ohio; Lisbon, Ohio; Mount Pleasant, Ohio; Neffs, Ohio; Richmond, Ohio; Salem, Ohio; Salineville, Ohio; Scio, Ohio; Shadyside, Ohio; Tiltonsville, Ohio; Columbiana, Ohio, addition and remodeling; Steubenville, Ohio, extension and remodeling; Wellsville, Ohio.

Congressman John E. Fogarty Honored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHIL M. LANDRUM

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 30, 1964

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island, Mr. JOHN E. FOGARTY, has been cited over the years for his many achievements in health and welfare. The legislative record of his Subcommittee on Appropriations and his personal sponsorship of legislation have identified him with a number of significant advances in these important fields.

Of increasing importance is the work that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] has been doing in behalf of the cause of education. As the membership of this body well knows, he has been identified with programs for handicapped children, vocational education, library services, aid to federally affected areas, and the appropriations of the National Defense Education Act. He has been particularly effective in his research program in the field of education. His work in furthering the research and development programs of the Office of Education was recently recognized by the Air Force Association. On September 9, 1964, he received the Citation of Honor presented by the Air Force Association at its 18th national convention held in Washington. I am pleased at this time to insert the wording of the citation presented to Mr. FOGARTY and also to call to everyone's attention his remarks upon acceptance of this award.

CITATION OF HONOR

Air Force Association pays tribute to JOHN E. FOGARTY, Member of Congress, Second District, Rhode Island, for pioneering efforts and legislative leadership in establishing Federal support for educational research and development as the cornerstone of future progress.

REMARKS BY CONGRESSMAN JOHN E. FOGARTY, OF RHODE ISLAND, ON RECEIVING THE CITATION OF HONOR OF THE AEROSPACE EDUCATION FOUNDATION

It is with the deepest appreciation that I accept your Citation of Honor here today. I do so with keen awareness that in recognizing my own efforts in Congress on behalf of educational research, you are rightfully recognizing one of the long-needed, long-neglected, and truly essential foundations for the future of American education.

A few weeks ago, President Johnson said that "the first work of our times and the first work of our society is education." He spoke of the present 88th Congress as the education Congress and outlined its many legislative acts for education, for libraries, and higher education, for medical education and vocational training, for teaching the handicapped and reaching the poor, and for research into better ways and means of improving the whole learning process from the primary on to the postgraduate school.

Never has so much been expected of education as today. We seek to educate and prepare our youth for a day of profound technological and social and global challenge. We seek to create in fact the universal education we have long promised ourselves, an equality of educational opportunity for all our people, whoever they are and wherever they live.

But what we expect from education must clearly be equaled by what we give to education, the quality of minds, as well as the quantity of funds we allot to its basic research. No one knows better than you, who represent the most far-reaching scientific accomplishments of history, that we can only take out at one end of the channel what we put in at the other.

In accepting your citation, I wish I could say that educational research is now well underway, that we have fully met our responsibility to support and encourage it. Unfortunately, this is not true. Instead, in educational research we are only at the beginning.

Since the end of World War II we have seen an enormous growth in the research funds of industry and of government. America's industries now devote up to 10 percent of their gross revenues to research—and more than that to product development. Throughout our economy we now spend more than $18 billion on research and development every year.

But what of education? What do we now devote to research and development for the improvement of our schools?

American education today is America's largest enterprise. It embraces 125,000 schools, 47 million elementary and secondary pupils, 1,800,000 teachers. On all levels of education today, we spend $34 billion annually.

Out of these $34 billion we spend on education, we devote only $72 million to research and development—only one-fifth of 1 percent of our educational funds to this task which lies at the heart of knowledge and of human development.

But this is a beginning. Back in 1960, only 4 years ago, our national allotment for educational research was $33 million. It has doubled since then. Back in 1960, one of the most vital areas of basic educational research—the Office of Education's cooperative research program—was budgeted at $3 million. Today, these funds have increased to about $16 million or more than fivefold the 1960 level.

With this modest beginning we are now starting to see new and promising prospects. The cooperative research program is now recruiting some of the best minds in education to examine some of the basic problems which have long hampered education.

It is exploring new ways to detect and discover talented youth in the arts and humanities as well as the sciences.

It is seeking new and better ways to teach our English language in a Nation that can no longer afford illiteracy anywhere or any place.

It is searching out methods of teaching the mentally retarded and the handicapped to the limit of their capacities.

It is investigating better means of teaching and of learning in a day of ever-expanding knowledge.

And it is testing out these findings in new proving grounds for education at university centers where the best of research may be soundly examined and developed and then transmitted to our schools.

Through this emerging pattern, I see our great opportunity to give to education a prospect of fulfilling the great expectations we have of education in the years to come.

SENATE

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 1, 1964

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by Hon. DANIEL K. INOUYE, a Senator from the State of Hawaii.

Rev. Edward B. Lewis, minister, Capitol Hill Methodist Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, we find in the thought of Thee, the love that never forgets, the light that never fails, the life that never ends. Humbly, in this place of government of the Nation we love, we seek Thee in prayer.

As we bow with our leaders who are burdened with responsibility, may the cares of life, the demands of the day, and the decisions of the hour become easier to bear because of these moments of spiritual fellowship.

Teach us as a people to live from day to day, remembering that we are sons of the most high God. When we are forced to walk with the people of the world in dark paths, make us to be children of light.

We thank Thee for men who see visions too great to be reached in their lifetime, for statesmen who are willing to go down in defeat in support of causes they know to be right and true, for great men and women who suffer misrepresentation and false accusation in the service of justice, truth, and brotherhood.

Give to these, our friends, the deeper joy and satisfaction of serving the people.

knowing that our prayers to God will surround them with love, light, and life in their days of decision and service.

In the name of Jesus Christ, our Lord and Saviour, we pray. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The Chief Clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., October 1, 1964.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. DANIEL K. INOUYE, a Senator from the State of Hawaii, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

LEE METCALF,
Acting President pro tempore.

Mr. INOUYE thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request by Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, September 30, 1964, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 2180) to amend title VII of the Public Health Service Act so as to extend to qualified schools of optometry and students of optometry those provisions thereof relating to student loan programs.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

On request by Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements during the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Rules and Administration was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

Amendment of Navigation Rules Relating to Certain Vessels

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the inland, Great Lakes, and western rivers rules concerning sailing vessels and vessels under 65 feet in length (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Commerce.

Reports of Comptroller General

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on violations of price reductions clause in Federal supply schedule contracts for purchase of drugs and pharmaceutical products, General Services Administration and Veterans' Administration, dated September 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on unnecessary costs incurred for commercial ocean transportation by the Panama Canal Company, dated September 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on excessive costs incurred for training activities at the Federal Aviation Agency Academy, dated September 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Amendment of Chapter XI of Bankruptcy Act, To Give the Court Supervisory Power Over All Fees Paid

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend chapter XI of the Bankruptcy Act to give the court supervisory power over all fees paid from whatever source (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Amendment of Bankruptcy Act, Relating to Part-Time Referees in Bankruptcy

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Bankruptcy Act to prohibit a part-time referee in bankruptcy from serving as trustee in any proceeding under the Bankruptcy Act (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Disposition of Executive Papers

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. JOHNSTON and Mr. CARLSON members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Raul H. Castro, of Arizona, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to El Salvador.

By Mr. JOHNSTON, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service: Thirty-nine postmaster nominations.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, from the Committee on Armed Services, I report favorably the nominations of 551 Army officers in the grade of colonel and below, and 1,050 Air Force officers in the grade of major and below. Since these names have already appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in order to save the expense of printing on the Executive Calendar, I ask unanimous consent that they be ordered to lie on the Secretary's desk for the information of any Senator.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nominations are as follows:

Robert Abraham, and sundry other officers, for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States; and

Robert W. Goodnow, and sundry other persons, for appointment in the Regular Air Force.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. McCLELLAN:

S. 3236. A bill to promote an orderly arrangement between the United States and the States with respect to certain regulatory authority involving intergovernmental relationships between the United States and the States; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. CLARK:

S. 3237. A bill to provide for specific employment policies in order to promote maximum employment, to reduce unemployment to its minimum acceptable levels, to promote an adequate rate of economic growth and to preserve reasonable price stability; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. CLARK when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTION

REQUIRING A YEA-AND-NAY VOTE ON THE PASSAGE OF A PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

Mr. STENNIS submitted a resolution (S. Res. 378) requiring a yea-and-nay on the passage of a proposed constitutional amendment, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. STENNIS, which appears under a separate heading.)

PLEA TO PRESIDENTIAL AND VICE-PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATES NOT TO EXPOSE THEMSELVES TO UNNECESSARY PERSONAL DANGER IN THE CONDUCT OF THEIR CAMPAIGNS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the observations and recommendations of the Warren report touch upon a matter of delicacy and gravity with respect to the present national campaign. It is not for me to tell the President and the other three major candidates how to conduct their campaigns. But I do share the concern of many Americans about the risks to which all of them are exposed in the process of presenting their views and themselves before great crowds of people.

The Warren report underscores American political history in showing that the disaster of an assassination of a national figure not only can be but is likely to be the work of a single warped mind. That is all it takes—that plus a combination of fatal circumstances in an otherwise friendly gathering of tens of thousands of Americans bent upon expressing their interest in or affection for the person involved.

It is for that reason that I am impelled to address a plea to the President and the three other candidates for national office. I urge them to avoid exposing themselves unnecessarily to this danger. The national responsibilities of the incumbent President and the great importance of all four candidates in this national election to our democratic processes make it imperative to do whatever may be reasonably done to avoid a catastrophe. It is a matter of basic prudence and has nothing whatsoever to do with personal courage or confidence in the people of the United States.

A national campaign in the United States requires, and rightly so, that the candidates present themselves in person throughout the Nation. And, as the Warren Commission points out, it is impossible under all conditions to insure absolute security. But certain precautions can be taken to reduce the risks to the President and the other candidates.

In this connection, I would note that the distinguished minority leader, myself, and others have introduced legislation to extend Secret Service protection of the kind given to the President, to Mr. GOLDWATER, and to the two principal vice-presidential candidates. In any event, I would strongly urge them all, at the very least, to accommodate themselves so far as possible, to the guidance of the Secret Service, or local or other security officers charged with safeguarding their persons. Much of the responsibility rests with the President and the candidates themselves. I repeat, I strongly urge all of them in the interests of the Nation to follow the procedures designed to provide for their safety, even if at times it means leaving a few hands left unshaken or some autograph books unsigned.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I completely agree with the comments which the distinguished majority leader has made.

In my judgment, if Members of the Senate and House of Representatives had an opportunity to vote for legislation of the type introduced by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] and by my Republican leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], to provide protection to all candidates for President and Vice President, such legislation would receive unanimous approval. Perhaps it is a vain wish, but I hope that it might be approved at this session.

In any event, if it is possible—as the Senator from Montana has indicated in the comments he has just made—for the Secret Service and other appropriate Federal agencies in the various communities across the country, under present law, to offer some insulation, some advice, some protection, to all four national candidates, I hope that maximum exertions by them along those lines might be made.

The point the Senator from Montana is making is a telling one. Candidates for the Office of Chief Executive of our country and for Vice President need the type of protection which the Senator from Montana has suggested.

SENATE SPACE COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, by far the most important piece of legislation considered by the Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee during calendar year 1964 was S. 2446—NASA's authorization request for fiscal year 1965. Beginning early in January NASA's budget request for $5,304 million was analyzed in detail by the staff prior to public hearings. The committee held 7 days of public hearings during which time NASA's scientific and technical programs were discussed in depth by Administrator Webb and other NASA officials. The space programs of the Department of Defense were discussed by Dr. Brown, Director of Defense Research and Engineering, Gen. Bernard A. Shriever, Commander, Air Force Systems Command, and Dr. Albert C. Hall, Deputy Director—Space—Office of the Director of Defense Research and Engineering.

After an opportunity to again analyze the voluminous testimony received by the committee, the committee met in executive session for 5 days during which time the markup of the bill was accomplished by an item by item coverage of NASA's request. The committee reported out its bill in the form of amendments to H.R. 10456 in an amount of $5,246,293,250. The Senate passed the authorization bill in this amount and in conference between the House and Senate a total sum in the amount of $5,227,506,000 was agreed upon.

NASA's appropriation is contained in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act and members of the committee participated with the Senate Appropriations Committee in connection with such appropriation. Subsequent to the reporting out of H.R. 11296, the Independent Offices Appropriation Act for fiscal year 1965, a total of $5,250 million was appropriated for NASA.

The committee has continued its interest in the international aspects of space and NASA's participation. During calendar year 1964 procedures have been developed under which representatives of NASA and the State Department meet currently with the staff in order that these activities can be kept current. At the present time a comprehensive report on the international aspects of outer space is being edited and should be available in the near future.

PROPOSED CHANGE IN THE SENATE RULES CONCERNING JOINT RESOLUTIONS PROPOSING AMENDMENTS TO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I send to the desk, and ask that it be appropriately referred, a Senate resolution proposing to add to the Standing Rules of the Senate a new rule to be designated as "Rule XLI."

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 378) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

> *Resolved,* That the Standing Rules of the Senate are amended by adding at the end thereof the following new rule:
>
> "RULE XLI
>
> "The question of the passage of a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution shall be determined by a yea-and-nay vote upon a call of the roll of the Senate."

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the new rule I propose would require a yea-and-nay vote on any joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution. Its purpose is to insure that the permanent RECORD of the Senate in any such measure will affirmatively reflect that it received the approval of two-thirds of Senators present and voting on the resolution, or that it failed to receive such approval.

The adoption of this rule would insure Senate compliance with both the letter and the spirit of article V of the Constitution, which provides in part:

> The Congress, whenever two-thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose amendments to this Constitution.

Mr. President, the substance of the proposed rule is as follows:

> The question of the passage of a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution shall be determined by a yea-and-nay vote upon a call of the roll of the Senate.

In addition to the strong reasons for this as a permanent rule, I refer to the last resolution proposing an amendment. The record in favor of the resolution was greatly strengthened with a yea-and-nay vote, which showed for the permanent RECORD a vote of 65 in favor and none opposed.

Mr. President, in my opinion, the spirit as well as the letter of the Constitution requires that the permanent RECORD of the Senate affirmatively show that any amendment proposed for ratification by the several States passed the Senate by a two-thirds majority of those Senators present and voting.

In this provision I do not include any reference to the House of Representatives because I personally believe, with equal logic and reasoning, that it would also apply there. However, the matter of Senate rules is solely within our province and discretion.

Likewise, the RECORD should reflect that a quorum was present at the time of the adoption of such a resolution. The rule which I now introduce would meet both those objectives.

I believe that the Senate should adopt this practice in the consideration of matters of such importance as amending the Constitution. The adoption of an amendment, changing the basic law of the land, is an extraordinary procedure. It deserves and requires extraordinary consideration.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the proposed new rule be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the proposed new rule was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RULE XLI

The question of the passage of a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution shall be determined by a yea-and-nay vote upon a call of the roll of the Senate.

HERBERT SANFORD WALTERS, A GREAT AMERICAN

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, the home of HERBERT WALTERS in Morristown, Tenn., and my home in Morganton, N.C., are separated by the beautiful mountains "with hills at their knees," which mark the dividing line between the Old North State and her daughter, Tennessee. One of my most treasured recollections of my service in the Senate during the 88th Congress will be my association with HERBERT WALTERS, whom I had admired at a distance for many years before this association afforded me an opportunity to learn in full measure the reasons why all Tennesseans admire him for the qualities of his head and love him for the qualities of his heart.

Before HERBERT WALTERS came to the Senate, I knew he was like Tennyson's character Ulysses, who could say:

> I am a part of all that I have met.

I knew that he had played a leading role in the civic affairs of Morristown and Tennessee, as a member of the Morristown Kiwanis Club, president of the Morristown Chamber of Commerce, chairman of the Morristown Water and Electric Light Commission, member of the Tennessee State Department of Highways and Public Works, and in other ways past numbering. Moreover, I knew something of his great contributions to the industrial development of Morristown and Tennessee in engineering, contracting, banking, and other fields of endeavor.

I likewise had some knowledge of the great devotion which he had manifested to the Democratic Party, as chairman of the Tennessee State Democratic Executive Committee, as Democratic national committeeman from Tennessee, and in many other capacities. Besides, I was not altogether unaware of his contributions to the fraternal, educational, and spiritual life of his community and State, as a distinguished member of the Masonic Lodge, as a diligent trustee of King College, and as a dedicated member of the Presbyterian Church.

Since I have served with HERBERT WALTERS in the Senate, I have been privileged to learn that his essential greatness cannot be measured simply by his external accomplishments, great as they have been. He combines in the highest possible degree the four qualities which are the hallmarks of man in his highest possible state: industry, intelligence, integrity, and courage. HERBERT WALTERS has exhibited these qualities on all occasions during his service in the Senate. As a Senator, he has been diligent in his study of the problems which have confronted us. His intelligence and his integrity have enabled him on all occasions to reach conclusions in respect to these problems which were both intelligent and intellectually honest. And his courage has prompted him to carry such conclusions into effect.

As a consequence of these things, all of his colleagues in the Senate have learned to admire HERBERT WALTERS as a great Senator who has placed the welfare of his country above all other considerations during his service with us.

What I have said would be incomplete if I did not add that the feelings of his colleagues in the Senate toward HERBERT WALTERS far exceed mere admiration. The truth is that all of us who have been privileged to know him intimately during his sojourn here have acquired for him a deep affection. It was inevitable that this should be so, because we have found him to be a most genial companion and the possessor of an understanding heart.

I deeply regret that HERBERT WALTERS is retiring from the Senate, because he possesses in the highest degree the character and the intellect essential for the performance of the highest public service. Mrs. Ervin joins me in wishing Senator WALTERS and his charming wife much happiness in the days ahead.

A TRIBUTE TO THE CZECHOSLOVAKIAN PEOPLE

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, 46 years ago, the democratic Republic of Czechoslovakia was declared independent by the National Committee meeting at Prague. Czechoslovakia, composed of two ethnic races, the Czechs, and the Slovaks, had gained its sovereignty following the dismemberment of the Austro-Hungarian Empire during World War I. Sanctioned by the Allied powers, the people of this heterogenous country strove valiantly to create an ideal state based on democratic principles. Led by such renowned nationals as Thomas Masaryk, the first President of the Republic, by his son, Jan, and by Eduard Benes, who became the President following World War II, this small Central European state did become a model for others to emulate.

Unfortunately, the machinations and designs of the Nazi Germans upon Czechoslovakian territories soon tolled the death-knell for this nation. By the time the opening guns of World War II had resounded throughout the world, Czechoslovakia had ceased to exist as an independent country. Parts of its provinces had been incorporated into Germany, Hungary, and Poland. Even the eastern half, under duress, had declared itself independent from the western half.

Resistance, however, during the war to German occupation erupted immediately and the heroics of the people will be remembered for all times. Lidice, a village erased from the map by Nazi tyranny, will never be forgotten, but will go down as a memorial to the gallant struggle of a desperate people for freedom.

The Communist regime which now controls the fate and destiny of the Czechoslovakian people is unable to stamp out the democratic principles in which the common man believes so fervently. Reports reaching the free world denote unrest in Czechoslovakia. Demands for more freedom of speech and more personal liberty are recited in the Western press and have even brought about a lessening of some strict controls in the fields of literature and poetry. The lesson of the Hungarian uprising is well remembered.

But we in the free world must not be lulled with these slight glimmers of reaction to tyranny. We must continue to strive, we must continue to hope and pray that soon the people of Czechoslovakia will enjoy once more the freedom and rights of mankind which we, as Americans, hold in sacred trust.

COMMUNISM'S SECRET WEAPON

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, communism has always regarded capitalism's fanatical preoccupation with profits and business as usual as the greatest weakness of its enemies. Until recently, the West, in taking cognizance of this Achilles' heel, had refused to grant credit beyond a 5-year period to the Soviet Union and its satellites.

The founder and chairman of the International Latex Corp., A. N. Spanel, has taken a long and objective look at business as usual in the context of the cold war, and has reached the conclusion that "long-term Western credits are the Communists newest secret weapon. Long-term credit, we repeat, is a trap."

In a very salient advertisement in today's Washington Post—an ad which is the most readable thing in this particular edition of the administration's Washington hate sheet—Mr. Spanel points out:

> Long-term credits obviously give the creditors a stake in the health and prosperity of the debtors. The West will thus have to help the Communist nations prosper, even if it means aid in suppressing their internal resistance movements.

Mr. President, I request that this advertisement, another in the continuous effort of International Latex's Spanel to put thought and veracity into pages where little of either is to be found, be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with my remarks.

There being no objection, the advertisement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMUNISTS' SECRET WEAPON

(By A. N. Spanel, founder-chairman, International Latex Corp.)

World communism has set a trap for unwary free men and free nations. It is baited with profits, on the theory that "capitalists" can no more resist its sweet smell than mice can resist cheese.

The trap is trade. And the smell of profits is all that the victims are likely to get, considering the Communist record. Soviet Russia, it is well to remember, is the only country that has failed to make even a token payment on the $11 billion it owes the United States from the Second World War.

To trade or not to trade with Communist bloc nations: this has been a serious policy problem for the free world. Should the products of our free economy be made available to strengthen those who are openly and passionately dedicated to destroying that freedom? Should we help Red regimes to survive the great economic defects of their system by giving them access to the abundance produced by our system?

Commonsense says "No." Communist imports from the free world, even of so-called nonstrategic goods, releases their manpower and materials for military uses. The distinction between strategic and nonstrategic categories is therefore largely meaningless.

Do we learn nothing from experience? Before World War II we helped build up a budding enemy's war machine by selling scrap iron to Japan. The very memory is still painful to the American people. Even more suicidal was the propaganda that democratic nations "must do business as usual" with Nazi Germany, thereby enabling Hitler to build his engines of destruction more swiftly.

ECONOMIC INSANITY

Neither commonsense nor experience, unfortunately, can stand up against the lure of profits. Free nations are trading with the Communists and no doubt will continue to do so. They will again invent self-deluding arguments and alibis. Thus while a total boycott of the Red world appears impossible, the trading could be kept within rational limits.

Because the Red countries are unable to balance their imports with exports—they simply do not have enough of what we can use—they are dependent on credits. Accordingly, as a brake on a runaway race for uncertain profits the leading free industrial nations had set for themselves a limit of 5 years upon credits to Soviet Russia and its satellite colonies.

Now England has broken that understanding. It has granted to Moscow an 18-year credit for a chemical plant. This has caused shocked consternation in Washington. Paris, Bonn, Rome, and other Western capitals have been thrown into confusion.

Once again the West is subjected to a disastrous course seemingly mapped a century ago when Lord Palmerston pronounced: "We have no perpetual allies and we have no perpetual enemies, our interests are perpetual."

London is known to be negotiating other such deals with the Kremlin, Czechoslovakia, and other Communist states. By the confused logic of this conduct, shouldn't the "liberal" policy of long-term credits be extended to Red China as well?

What does it all mean? It means that the ramparts of economic sanity have been breached. It is not merely likely but inevitable that other free nations under our competitive system will be forced to take their cue from Britain. The Communists will thus obtain what they most need to thrive, which is long-term credits in the markets of the West. It means that the free world, in the measure that it follows the British lead, will help finance the rapid expansion of the already swollen Communist war potential.

The mischief cuts a lot deeper. These credits, in themselves, become a powerful weapon in Communist hands to wreck Western economies. All that the Kremlin, for instance, needs to do is deliberately to multiply these credits, in order to aggravate what is already a credit-heavy problem dangerous to the West.

WE HAVE BEEN WARNED

The eminent French monetary authority, Jacques Rueff, has repeatedly warned the free world in the last few years of a coming credit crisis. And M. Rueff is not alone in this fear. Five thousand years of history teaches that when a nation permits the blind abuse of its monetary system it impoverishes and corrupts its people, thus slowly destroying itself and its economic and political influence in the world.

Yet the free world appears to be entrusting this power to corrupt into the hands of those who are firmly committed to our destruction. The West, in financing the Communists, is not only fortifying the warmaking capacity of its sworn enemies but is giving them a stranglehold on its economic life—the right to siphon off our fiscal vitality to suit their hostile purposes.

Long-term Western credits are the Communists' newest secret weapon. Historians in the future surely will marvel at the cupidity and stupidity of the civilization which put that terrifying weapon in the hands of its self-appointed executioners. They will repeat, with better cause than ever, that those whom the gods would destroy they first make mad.

Another fact: Long-term credits obviously give the creditors a stake in the health and prosperity of the debtors. The West will thus have to help the Communist nations prosper, even if it means aid in suppressing their internal resistance movements. The monumental irony of it.

Conversely, this credit policy gives the Communists a double stake in hastening the bankruptcy and demise of the West, since that would also wash out their planned mountain of indebtedness.

Our minds have been numbed by the beguiling talk of peaceful coexistence. But it means something quite different to Moscow than it does to us. The Communists have not retreated 1 inch from their objective of world dominion. Khrushchev has repeatedly ridiculed Westerners who kid themselves that the slogan implies the end of the cold war. On the contrary, he sees it as a means to intensify the cold war and assure Communist victory.

WE CAN DEFUSE THIS PERIL

As recently as September 19, Khrushchev assured 2,000 delegates to a youth forum in Moscow—Latin Americans, Asians, Africans—that Soviet Russia will supply them with arms when they make war on their "oppressors." How can we square that candid assertion of continuing hostilities with a credit policy that enhances Communist military might? The shocking truth is that we will be providing the weapons which the Kremlin promises to dispense to its cohorts all over the world.

Long-term credits, we repeat, is a trap. The Western World appears to be entering it with closed eyes, like sleepwalkers. It is late, but not too late, one hopes, to come fully awake to the menace; for if the United States, France, England, and Germany were really united, this deadly peril could be defused.

Lenin once wisecracked that when the time comes to hang capitalists, they will be competing for the sale of the rope. The hunger for profits, he implied, blots out logic and even the will to survive. Are we really intent upon proving that Lenin was right? This is the crucial question that should be pondered by London and Washington, by Paris and Bonn, by all peoples who cherish human freedom and rate it higher than business as usual.

(Presented as a public service by International Latex Corp., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York City. "You and every man in business are trustees of this Nation and the world.")

ACTIVITIES OF THE BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE IN 1964

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, during the 2d session of the 88th Congress the Banking and Currency Committee and its subcommittees have held hearings on 25 days, involving 37 bills and 7 nominations. Fourteen bills have been reported during the session, of which 10 have become law. Four bills reported by the committee have been passed by the Senate and are pending in the House. The Senate has also taken action during the 2d session of the 88th Congress on six bills for which the committee was responsible, but without formal committee action during this session, and these bills are now law. One bill passed by the Senate in 1963 was passed by the House in 1964 without amendment and became law. In all, 17 bills for which the committee was responsible became law during the second session.

Several major bills handled by the Banking and Currency Committee were enacted during the 2d session of the 88th Congress. Early in the year, two committee bills which passed the Senate in the first session became law: S. 298, amending the Small Business Investment Act, after a conference, became Public Law 88–273, approved February 28, 1964; S. 1309, amending the Small Business Act, became Public Law 88–264, approved February 5, 1964, when the Senate concurred in the House amendments.

S. 6, the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964, became Public Law 88–365, approved July 9, 1964, when the Senate concurred in the House amendments.

S. 1642, the Securities Acts Amendments of 1964, extending disclosure requirements to the over-the-counter market and providing for additional control over entering into the securities business, became Public Law 88–467, approved August 20, 1964, when the Senate concurred in the House amendments.

S. 3049, the Housing Act of 1964, extending existing housing programs and amending the investment powers of Federal savings and loan associations and national banks, became Public Law 88–560, approved September 2, 1964.

H.R. 12267, requiring the disclosure of the changes in the control of insured banks, was passed by the Senate without formal reference to the Committee on Banking and Currency, which considered the bill informally and recommended that the House-passed bill be acted on directly by the Senate. This bill was approved September 12, 1964, and became Public Law 88–593.

The committee and its subcommittees have held hearings on a number of bills which have not been reported to the Senate. Hearings on S. 750, Senator DOUGLAS' bill to require disclosure of finance charges, were held in Boston on January 11, 1964. The Subcommittee on Production and Stabilization reported the bill to the full committee, which sent the bill back to the subcommittee for further consideration of amendments submitted to the full committee.

On April 1 and 2, 1964, hearings were held on S. 2671, a bill to redefine the silver content in silver coins. No action was taken on this bill pending the results of the survey being conducted by the Treasury Department, but the committee took an active interest in the grant of appropriations to the Treasury to construct the new Philadelphia mint authorized in 1963 and additional appropriations to provide further supplies of coins. In addition, the committee held hearings on S. 2950, authorizing the mint to inscribe the figure "1964" on coins minted until adequate supplies are available. This bill became Public Law 88–580, approved September 3, 1964.

The committee also held hearings on the relation between the inventory provisions of the Defense Production Act of 1950—which the committee had previously amended and extended by H.R. 10000, which became Public Law 88–343, approved June 30, 1964—and S. 2272, the proposed Materials Reserve and Stockpile Act of 1964. No further action was taken by the committee.

Hearings on several bills to provide for insurance and a secondary market for conventional mortgages were held in February and March 1964. These bills were S. 810, S. 811, and S. 2130.

Among the nominations considered by the committee were those of Joseph W. Barr and Kenneth A. Randall, to be members of the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation; Hugh F. Owens, Hamer H. Budge, and Francis M. Wheat, to be members of the Securities and Exchange Commission; James Louis Robertson, who was reappointed as a member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System; Elizabeth S. May, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank; and Otto Eckstein, to be a member of the Council of Economic Advisers.

Attached is a list of committee bills which became law or were otherwise acted on during the 2d session of the 88th Congress:

Bills Which Became Law

S. 2079, authorizing medals to commemorate three New York historical sites. Senate Report No. 633, November 7, 1963; passed Senate November 8, 1963; passed House January 20, 1964; Public Law 88–262, January 31, 1964.

S. 1309, amendments to the Small Business Act. Hearings May 1963; Senate report No. 640, November 8, 1963; passed Senate November 21, 1963; passed House January 20, 1964; Senate concurred in House amendment January 27, 1964; Public Law 88–264, February 5, 1964.

H.R. 9076, St. Louis 200th anniversary medals. Passed House January 20, 1964; Senate report No. 831, January 28, 1964; passed Senate January 29, 1964; Public Law 88–270, February 11, 1964.

S. 298, Small Business Investment Act Amendments. Hearings May and September 1963; Senate report No. 639, November 8, 1963; passed Senate November 21, 1963; passed House January 20, 1964; conference report filed February 5, 1964; Public Law 88–273, February 28, 1964.

House Joint Resolution 889, galvano for golden anniversary of Naval Air Station, Pensacola, Fla. Passed House May 18, 1964; Committee on Banking and Currency discharged and Senate passed bill June 5, 1964; Public Law 88–318, June 12, 1964.

House Joint Resolution 1041, extension of rural elderly housing program. Passed House June 15, 1964; Senate report No. 1108, June 25, 1964; passed Senate June 26, 1964; Public Law 88–340, June 30, 1964.

H.R. 8230, national bank forest tract loans. Passed House February 17, 1964; hearings March 1964; Senate report No. 1077, June 15, 1964; passed Senate June 19, 1964; Public Law 88–341, June 30, 1964.

H.R. 10000, amendment and extension of Defense Production Act. Passed House June 15, 1964; hearings June 24, 1964; Senate report No. 1110, June 25, 1964; passed Senate June 26, 1964; Public Law 88–343, June 30, 1964.

H.R. 11499, extension of Federal Reserve direct purchase authority. Passed House June 15, 1964; hearings June 24, 1964; Senate report No. 1109, June 25, 1964; passed Senate June 26, 1964; Public Law 88–344, June 30, 1964.

H.R. 8459, Federal Credit Union Act Amendments. Passed House December 17, 1963; hearings March 1964; Senate report No. 1078, June 15, 1964; passed Senate June 19, 1964; Public Law 88–353, July 2, 1964.

S. 6, Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964. Hearings February and March 1963; Senate report No. 82, March 14, 1963; passed Senate April 4, 1963; passed House June 25, 1964; Senate concurred in House amendment June 30, 1964; Public Law 88–365, July 9, 1964.

H.R. 248, to provide assistance to get specially adapted housing for certain blind veterans who have suffered the loss or loss of use of a lower extremity. Passed House April 1, 1963; Senate report No. 1235, July 23, 1964; passed Senate July 24, 1964; Public Law 88–401, August 4, 1964.

H.R. 6652, to authorize the Veterans' Administration to sell direct loans to veterans. Passed House February 17, 1964; Senate report No. 1236, July 23, 1964; passed Senate July 24, 1964; Public Law 88–402, August 4, 1964.

S. 1642, Securities Acts Amendments of 1964. Hearings June 1963; Senate report No. 379, July 24, 1963; passed Senate July 30, 1963; passed House August 5, 1964; Senate concurred in House amendments August 6, 1964; Public Law 88–467, August 20, 1964.

S. 3049, Housing Act of 1964. Senate report No. 1265, July 29, 1964; passed Senate July 31, 1964; passed House August 13, 1964; conference report filed August 18, 1964; Public Law 88–560, September 2, 1964.

S. 2950, to keep "1964" on coins during shortage. Hearings July 21, 1964; Senate report No. 1237, July 23, 1964; passed Senate July 24, 1964; passed House August 20, 1964; Senate concurred in House amendment August 21, 1964; Public Law 88–580, September 3, 1964.

H.R. 12267, to provide for notice of change in control of management of insured banks. Passed House September 1, 1964; passed Senate September 2, 1964; Public Law 88–593, September 12, 1964.

Bills Reported and Passed by Senate but Not Enacted Into Law (Sept. 29, 1964)

S. 2115, authorizing the use of reserved foreign currencies instead of dollars. Senate report No. 932, March 3, 1964; passed Senate March 6, 1964.

S. 2470, to authorize the Veterans' Administration to extend aid on account of defects in properties purchased with financing assistance under chapter 37, title 38, United States Code. Hearings February and March 1964; Senate report No. 1246, July 28, 1964; passed Senate July 29, 1964.

S. 3174, to remove the ceiling on appropriations to the Joint Economic Committee. Senate report No. 1590, September 21, 1964; passed Senate September 24, 1964.

S. 3199, to transfer to the Small Business Administrator authority to administer program of loans to development companies. Senate report No. 1594, September 24, 1964; passed Senate September 25, 1964.

ANNOUNCEMENT FOR POLITICAL PURPOSES OF NEW MILITARY AIRCRAFT

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, the announcement, yesterday, of a new 2,000 m.p.h. fighter plane further advances the "silly season" in the development of new aircraft for purely political purposes. I refer to the YF–12A. My concern is not that the airplane is presently entering its third designation of as many different lives, but, rather with how our aircraft posture compares with that of potential enemies. We cannot continue "trotting" out a new designation for the same plane every time a new defense announcement is needed for a political speech.

This process of building one plane with three political heads is becoming the "joke of the year" in American aviation circles. Yesterday's plane is not a new development; and we shall delude ourselves into dangerous slumber if we relax and point proudly to the tripling of military power by simply adding three designations to one plane.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an editorial entitled, "The All-Purpose Aircraft," from the August 3, 1964, Aviation Week & Space Technology magazine.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The All-Purpose Aircraft

Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara has been searching with limited success for an all-purpose aircraft during the 3½ years of his Pentagon stewardship. But it remained for President Lyndon B. Johnson to discover the perfect all-purpose aircraft that can meet technical and political requirements with equal ease. It is the Lockheed A–11, commissioned by the Central Intelligence agency in 1959. The A–11 was designed during the last years of President Eisenhower's administration, began flight-testing in President Kennedy's administration and became a television star under President Johnson's tutelage.

President Johnson has appeared in nationally televised press conferences twice in the last 6 months to extoll the technical virtues of the A–11 and demonstrate its political flexibility, and all of its wonders have not yet been fully revealed. We predict that the A–11 will become a regular performer during the presidential campaign television season, although even some of its closest associates may have difficulty recognizing it in the costumes that may be devised for campaign purposes.

There is no argument among either technical or political experts on the fact that the A–11 is a cleverly bred aerial racehorse and a genuine engineering tour de force by Designer Clarence (Kelly) Johnson and his Lockheed "Skonk Works" team. The area of argument, which seems certain to increase in acrimony and rise in decibels as the presidential campaign progresses, is in the various guises in which the basic A–11 has been presented to the American people by President Johnson and its unusual deployment in a political fire brigade.

At the time of President Johnson's first A–11 announcement, his administration and Defense Secretary McNamara were engaged in a bitter fight with Congress over whether some $40 million should be appropriated for initial development of a new long-range supersonic interceptor for the air defense system. In his initial announcement, President Johnson said A–11's were then at Edwards AFB, "undergoing extensive tests to determine their capabilities as long-range interceptors." This was substantially correct, since the first A–11 arrived at Edwards a few hours before President Johnson appeared on television, and eventually some tests were made with rocket armament installed internally and externally on a A–11 designated YF–12A for this purpose.

We predict that the results of these tests will remain forever buried under a security blanket. Young pilots of the Air Defense Command will grow old before an A–11, YF–12A or any similar beast of this design will grace their operational flight lines. However, Defense Secretary McNamara went even further than the President and told his press conference that the A–11 had been developed originally as an interceptor and implied that the $40 million was not for the start of a new aircraft design but simply for furthering of the A–11 program. Neither of these statements was accurate. This produced sufficient confusion among the legislators for Congress to drop the $40 million from the budget, thus killing development of any new generation of interceptor aircraft. Skillful piloting of the A–11 scored its first political victory.

At the same time, the U.S. supersonic transport program was in the doldrums. More than a dozen foreign airlines that had made cash deposits for places on a nonexistent production line were wondering whether they had bet on the wrong horse. President Johnson quickly dispelled their gloom by noting that, "the development of supersonic commercial transport aircraft will also be greatly assisted by lessons learned from this A–11 program, for example, one of the most important technological achievements in this project has been the mastery of metallurgy and fabrication of titanium metal."

How the mastery of titanium had been achieved in mach 3 A–11 aircraft already flying, at the same time the perils of titanium were cited by Defense Secretary McNamara as a reason for rejecting the Boeing mach 2 F–111 (TFX) design, has never been clearly explained. Nor is it likely to be. But the A–11 scored another political victory.

Now President Johnson finds himself facing a Republican opponent who holds an Air Force major general's reserve commission and is an active jet pilot with thousands of hours of flying time in his logbook. This candidate, Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, has severely criticized the administration for its failure to continue development of manned aircraft with strategic capability to supplement ballistic missiles, and has indicated he will make defense policy a major issue.

On July 24, 9 days after Senator GOLDWATER won the Republican nomination, President Johnson "revealed" development of a new manned mach 3 strategic reconnaissance system called the "SR–71." The only mention of the A–11 in this statement was the notation that the "SR–71" used the same type J58 engine as the A–11. Later, Pentagon spokesmen reluctantly admitted that Lockheed built the "SR–71." The "SR–71" was, of course, the A–11 with still another designation pasted on its titanium skin. But many Congressmen were fooled, and unthinking daily newspapermen and wire service reporters failed to catch the deception and spread the news across the Nation of the "new" billion-dollar aircraft program.

The inception of this program also was conveniently shifted from 1959 in the Eisenhower administration to 1963 in the Kennedy administration. Anybody familiar with aircraft development cycles knows that if this program were really started in 1963, it would be impossible to deliver operational aircraft to Strategic Air Command in 1965, as President Johnson stated.

But in the confusion that now reigns on what the "SR–71" really is, much of the thrust of Senator GOLDWATER's criticism has been blunted and the A–11, YF–12A, "SR–71," and supersonic transport research aircraft has scored its third political victory. Only two more to go to become a genuine ace.

We suspect that the next chapter in the checkered career of the A–11 will be the "revelation" at the most opportune political moment that it can be a bomber, too, thus eliminating any further need for development of the B–70, AMSS, or any other type of advanced manned striking system.

For a new aircraft that is either 5 or 2 years old, depending on which television program you watched, the A–11 has had an amazingly versatile career. We wonder if Lockheed has the facilities to build as many of them as the Defense Department obviously will request.

ROBERT HOTZ.

Mr. PEARSON. This editorial, printed nearly 2 months ago, outlined the story of the A–11, or SR–71, or YF–12A. It appears to be a multipurpose plane adopted for use as a multipolitical instrument, rather than advanced hardware for the defense of this Nation.

Probably one of the most significant facts about this plane is its development time. Anyone familiar with the leadtime required for the production of planes of such an exotic character knows it cannot be accomplished in a matter of months, or even in a few years. This fighter-interceptor, which first was put on the drawing boards in 1959, under the Eisenhower administration, was originally planned as a followup to the U–2 reconnaissance aircraft.

Mr. President, as I have indicated, this plane is rapidly and justifiably becoming the brunt of political jokes and editorial comment. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an editorial from the Wichita, Kans., Beacon of August 20, 1964.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLITICAL AIRCRAFT BEING BORN, REBORN

It would appear there's been a blizzard of military aircraft activity in the past 6 months, but close examination shows the developments are more political than technological.

Defense Secretary McNamara has been criticized for the razzle-dazzle way he operates in the Pentagon. But he has now been eclipsed by President Johnson, with the latter simply borrowing McNamara's projects and using them for their fullest political effect.

On August 15 the President told a White House news conference the Navy had been ordered to proceed at flank speed in developing a new light, armed, reconnaissance airplane (LARA) specifically tailored for COIN (counterinsurgency) application. North American Aviation, Columbus, Ohio, received the nod to design, build and flight-test seven units of the version it had proposed.

Aviation observers have followed this on-again-off-again program closely from the outset. It has been anyone's guess whether this competition would ever result in hardware. Especially so in light of the recent remark by McNamara, who said: "We are well equipped at the present time with aircraft for counterinsurgency purposes and we have no need for new aircraft * * * in the near future."

There has been much debate between the services as to how the plane would be used and how many are needed.

Has the Secretary changed his view? Nobody can be sure. But it is not unreasonable to believe that he has not—that the doubts have not been resolved. However, when the President needs something to announce, he gets it.

While awaiting further developments on the LARA–COIN from Columbus, we don't expect to be left idle. To divert our attention we have the great all-purpose Lockheed development, the A–11, sometimes called the YF–12A and more recently, the SR–71.

President Johnson brought the plane to world attention February 29. In its television debut of that date it was hailed as a technological accomplishment and was being developed as a "long-range interceptor." Development of the plane was also to help in development of this Nation's supersonic transport (SST).

Then a couple of weeks ago President Johnson again trotted the plane onstage, this time as the "SR–71," a new development.

North American's XB–70 is scheduled to make its first flight this month. Observers close to the program feel it will come at a time convenient for another White House announcement, say concurrent with appearance of President Johnson at the Democratic National Convention in Atlantic City.

POSTSCRIPT TO ABOVE

In light of the article on this page about the A–11 aircraft, it may not be farfetched to imagine the following telephone conversation between the White House and the Pentagon:

"Hello, Bob? This is Lyndon. Say, I need something new to announce at tomorrow's press conference. What have you got on the front burner?"

"Well, Mr. President, nothing special except the A–11 and you have already announced it three times. You wouldn't want to do it again would you? Mr. President, are you still there?"

"Yes, Bob, I'm thinking."

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, our new fighter-interceptor could be the world's fastest and highest flying plane; but even the Defense Department doubts that it will reach the operational stage. An article which was published at the same time as the third announcement of the same plane in today's Washington Post also suggests no future for the YF–12A. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article entitled, "New 2,000-M.P.H. Air Force Plane May Never Go Into Service," written by John G. Norris be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Oct. 1, 1964]

OTHER PROJECTS HAVE PRIORITY: NEW 2,000-M.P.H. AIR FORCE PLANE MAY NEVER GO INTO ACTIVE SERVICE

(By John G. Norris)

The Air Force's new 2,000-mile-an-hour YF–12A fighter-interceptor, publicly shown and flown for the first time yesterday, may never go into service.

Pentagon officials are in disagreement as to the need for building operational versions of the exceptional new aircraft—formerly known as the A–11—for assignment to the North American Air Defense Command.

Air Force chiefs insist that a new high-performance interceptor is required to meet the threat of attack by supersonic Russian bombers firing standoff missiles.

Russia now has a supersonic bomber in production. The "Blinder" is a relatively short-range aircraft, capable of being refueled in the air, with a speed somewhere around 1,000 miles an hour. It is regarded as inferior to the U.S. Air Force's B–58.

Existing U.S. supersonic fighters probably would be effective against the Blinder. The real danger whould come if the Soviets were to introduce a 1,700 to 2,000-mile-an-hour, long-range bomber. There is evidence now that the Soviet Union is working on a transport plane with such characteristics, and traditionally it has brought out both bomber and civilian versions of a new aircraft.

Unless the United States builds a new generation of high-speed, long-range interceptors, the Air Force notes that it will be unable to intercept new supersonic transports now on the drawing boards in many countries and determine if they are harmless airliners or deadly bombers.

Moreover, the advent of ballastic missiles has made existing U.S. interceptors much less reliable than heretofore, because they operate under the control of ground radar stations. These stations would be among the first targets hit in a mass missile attack and the interceptors would be virtually useless without such ground direction.

The YF-12A, however, carries its own radar for locating bombers and directing the fire of its missiles against them. Its great speed and range, far in excess of existing fighters, moreover, would enable it to intercept enemy bombers in the far north before they fire missiles at U.S. targets.

Top Defense officials concede that a new generation interceptor may be ultimately needed by the North American Air Defense Command. But they feel that the F-111B—Navy version of the TFX to be used for fleet air defense—can be adapted for the job and do it nearly as well at much less cost. Building a force of YF-12A interceptors would cost over $4 billion.

Defense officials admit that such an interceptor force would save millions of lives in case of nuclear war. But they feel that both a $3.5 billion shelter program—which has not been accepted by Congress—and a $15 billion Nike-X anti-missile missile program—not yet accepted by Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara—have priority over a new 2,000-mile-an-hour interceptor.

In light of these Defense objections, why was the YF-12A built? The answer is that it was well on its way to completion before the present administration took over, as an offshoot of the SR-71 reconnaissance plane, successor to the U-2.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, I am deeply concerned that in the heat of a political campaign we have permitted our entire Defense Establishment to become a political handmaiden to every whim of the administration.

How many more new aircraft will be announced in disguise, and then, at the appropriate time, stripped off their mask and given a new title, for a second curtain call? Will the YF-12A be announced next week as a bomber?

The world is in a state of confusion, compounded by Communist threats to many small nations, as well as by the specter of Red China's possession of nuclear capacity. Our Nation cannot afford to drop its force for defense and retaliation, nor can it afford to lose the respect of the rest of the world by fielding one plane with three names. If such practices are permitted to continue, we are following dangerous policies.

UTAH AND THE SPACE AGE—A SAD WASTE

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, over the past 10 years there has been built up in Utah what I consider to be one of this Nation's great human resources. It is a pool of outstanding professional and technical missile and rocket experts. This massive concentration of talent and ability occurred under the Eisenhower administration when, as part of the policy of strategic dispersal of production facilities for the sake of security, several topflight missile installations were set up in my State.

UTAH BYPASSED BY SPACE AGENCY

One would think that the space agency would take advantage of this great resource. Instead, Utah has been almost completely bypassed. And as our defense missile stockpile moves toward its goal, we are losing out in defense business as well. Thus, not only is this resource being dissipated, but in contrast to the rest of the Nation, Utah's unemployment rate is climbing.

Of the $15.8 billion authorized to be spent by NASA over the past 4 years, Utah has received only $1,098,000, or a yearly average of a mere $275,000. The following table shows the distribution of the total NASA budget and Utah's portion:

Fiscal year	NASA budget	Utah portion	Utah share
			Percent
1962	$1,825,000,000	$58,000	0.0032
1963	3,674,000,000	340,000	.0094
1964	5,100,000,000	500,000	.0098
1965	5,300,000,000	200,000	.0038

The table reveals that out of the space budget for the coming fiscal year, of fully $5.3 billion, Utah will receive only $200,000. This is an alarmingly low level of 0.0038 percent—just under four-thousandths of 1 percent. This year then, Utah will receive a mere 20 cents per person from the space budget. Contrast this to Texas which will get $250 million, or $25 per person along with a new space center at Houston. California, even with its great populaton, will receive $143 per person.

DRASTIC MISSILE EMPLOYMENT DROP

One would think that after its outstanding record, Utah's missile industry would at least continue to be used in the defense missile field. Unfortunately, there is very little left in the pipeline for the future. Since 1961, Utah has received only small research allotments, chiefly for the MMRBM and for the 156-inch booster program, both Air Force projects which are in the relatively early planning stages. Unfortunately the Johnson administration has abandoned the MMRBM which has high priority support from the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs and by our NATO commander in Europe where the weapon would be particularly useful. At the moment there is still hope that some of this talent may be used on the 156-inch booster.

It was my privilege this week to announce that Thiokol has received an Air Force request to submit proposals on a propulsion phase of this new large booster.

UTAH FROZEN OUT

But, the jobs available for this research are a pitiful few compared with what could have been available if Utah had had any share of the space program. The effect of the Johnson administration freezeout against Utah is revealed in the unemployment figures. For the first time since 1952, Utah's unemployment percentage has jumped above the national average—Utah 5.8, national average 5.1.

In fact, since President Johnson took office, Utah's seasonally adjusted unemployment has risen from 4.6 to 5.8 percent, an increase of more than 26 percent.

Within the past 18 months, employment in Utah's missile industry has dropped alarmingly, from 17,400 persons to 11,500 or almost 34 percent, and this is continuing at an increasing rate. Just within the past few months Thiokol has cut its staff by 1,800 persons, Hercules by 2,000, and Sperry by 1,200. Other smaller companies acting as subcontractors for these major producers have also had to reduce their staffs.

MISTAKEN POLITICAL CLAIMS

These figures have particular significance because this is an election year. Both in 1962 and this year the Democratic candidates for the Senate in Utah made missile and space contracts a political issue. My opponent in 1962 claimed that because he had been on the Space Committee in the House, he could assure Utah's share of the space budget. The obvious inference to be drawn from this statement was that these contracts were to be awarded on a political basis.

Interestingly enough, my 1962 opponent is running again for a House seat. He is making the same claims. Yet during the 4 years he served in the House on the Space Committee, our Utah companies received an average of only $26,000 a year in space business. Since he was defeated in 1962, the Utah average has gone up to $347,000. This is still shockingly low, but we are more than 13 times better off now than when he was serving on the Space Committee.

Moreover, Utah has had a Democratic Senator for the past 6 years, a man who is now himself a candidate. If the assumption were true that politics figure importantly in the award of space or defense contracts, one could expect that the Johnson administration would award contracts to Utah companies. This would be done to protect their candidates, but it has not happened. In fact, no new major missile or space contracts have been awarded to Utah since 1961. Moreover all of Utah's missile plants were established under the Eisenhower administration. Yet in the face of these facts, the same mistaken political claims are being made by Democratic candidates in this election. If the claims were not true in 1962, then obviously on the record they are not true in 1964.

Instead of relyng on political promises, the people of Utah must look at the record, and they will see the sorry contrast between the claims made by the Utah Democrats and the facts. The Republican administration delivered, the Democratic administration has not.

In closing, let me repeat that Utah has an outstanding natural scientific resource, that the Government has available in Utah not only an outstanding array of top-level talent, but a tremendous investment in laboratory facilities and production plants, which if used, could save many millions in the cost of the space program.

Thus, we are not asking that the space and defense programs be turned into WPA relief measures. Our people are qualified.

Regardless of the outcome of the election, I hope this shocking waste will end.

CZECHOSLOVAKIA REMEMBERED

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the past decade could be called "the era of emerging nations," for with each succeeding year, more and more independent states have come into being to join the ever-growing world community. There still remains numerous colonial dependencies and territories, however, which will in future years evolve politically and economically into independent countries. There are others, too, which are designated as sovereign states and members of the United Nations, yet are in reality enslaved by the colonial despotism of Soviet communism. Such a country is Czechoslovakia.

With the disruption and dismemberment of the Ottoman and Central European Empire following World War I, there occurred a previous period of emerging nations, one which saw created the buffer states surrounding Soviet Russia. Czechoslovakia gained its independence at this time on October 28, 1918, a democratic republic proclaimed by the Czechoslovak National Assembly.

Although we celebrate this year the 46th anniversary of that noble undertaking, the people of Czechoslovakia were to enjoy rights and freedom as a sovereign people for only 20 years. The designs of the Nazi German war machine precluded any chance for survival as an independent state. With lightning rapidity, portions of the Czech and Slovak homelands were distributed to Germany, Poland, and Hungary. Furthermore, under coercion from Berlin, the Slovak portion of the country was proclaimed independent, yet dependent upon the dictates of the Nazi warlords.

Even though the Czechoslovak nation itself ceased to exist, its people still lived for a future where they could once again claim liberty. Resistance to Nazi occupation and directives began as soon as the terms of the Munich agreement were announced. Throughout the years of the war, examples of Czech and Slovak heroism were extolled everywhere as instances of noteworthy reaction to tyranny. The assassination of Heydrich, the Nazi conqueror and butcher of Czechoslovakia, resulted in the annihilation of the town of Lidice, a name now commemorated throughout the world as a symbol of national patriotism and martyrdom.

As the Allied armies neared the borders of their country—the Russians from the east, the Americans from the West—the Czechs and Slovaks rose up en masse against their captors, intending to disrupt Nazi supply lines and liberate, if possible, their homelands. They had hoped, too, to receive assistance from the Allies. Unfortunately, American forces were prevented by prior agreement from extending succor. Czechoslovakia was within the sphere of Russian influence. The Soviet Union was to supply the much-needed arms and men. Seventy thousand soldiers of the Slovak Army joined the fight for freedom, only to find themselves defeated, betrayed by Communist strategy. No help was forthcoming.

This year the Communists in Czechoslovakia celebrated with pomp and circumstance this historic occasion of a desperate people who refused to bow down to occupation and suppression. Yet the festivities, attended by Premier Khrushchev, were nothing more than a mockery. The people are still enslaved by a Communist regime subservient to the dictates and power of Moscow. There is no freedom of elections, no rights of the common man. All that remains is hope, hope that democracy will prevail in the future, hope that the children of Czechoslovakia will be able to enjoy the same rights for which their forefathers had fought and died.

We, as leader of the free world, extend our hopes and wishes to the people of Czechoslovakia, that this may come to pass in the near future, when they will be able to walk upright in a realm governed by democracy, rather than to remain bowed to the subservient dogma of communism.

CONGRATULATIONS TO NAVAL RESERVE SURFACE DIVISION 6-50, TAMPA, FLA.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, the late President John F. Kennedy presented a challenge to the American people in January of 1961, by stating:

> Ask not what your country can do for you; ask what you can do for your country.

A group of dedicated Naval Reserve officers and men in Tampa, Fla., have responded to this challenge with a determined and sustained effort that is unprecedented in excellence in Naval Reserve history.

At that time Naval Reserve Surface Division 6-50, with just 97 officers and men, had been ranked in 116th place in the national Naval Reserve standings. Inspired, they mounted a massive recruiting effort, and organized a determined unit drive to achieve excellence in all areas. With the leadership of Comdr. William T. Driscoll, Jr., the strength of the unit increased to 245 officers and men. A submarine section was formed, and was incorporated into the division, with Lt. Comdr. Ernest L. Carlson serving as officer in charge. Within a year the unit was transformed into the finest Naval Reserve unit in the Nation. By the end of the competitive year in 1961, Naval Reserve Surface Division 6-50 had become the largest unit in the program, and had achieved a higher rating than all other divisions in the medium classification; it is also exceeded all large divisions. For this accomplishment, the Fleet Admiral William F. Halsey, Jr., Trophy was awarded by the Under Secretary of the Navy, Hon. Paul B. Fay, Jr.

Recognizing the increased size of the unit, the Navy officially reclassified 6-50 as a large surface unit; and in 1962 it entered a new phase of competition. Continuing their efforts, the officers and men of the Tampa unit swept through and, in their first year in competition, won the James Forrestal Trophy, the highest honor awarded a Naval Reserve unit. In the words of the Honorable Paul B. Fay, Jr.:

> Such a repeat win was unprecedented in Naval Reserve history.

An editorial published in the Tampa Tribune commented at the time:

> What distinguishes the outstanding from the ordinary is that extra effort.

To provide training facilities for increasing numbers of experienced petty officers, a crew was formed, from the members of 6-50, to man and train aboard a PCS. Under the leadership of Lt. Comdr. S. Thomas Duncan, this crew provided additional, realistic fleet training for Tampa men.

During 1963, URSD 6-50 continued the sustained effort and drive to excellence, and, in the words of the late Adm. Claude V. Ricketts, accomplished a "superb achievement" by winning the James Forrestal trophy a second time.

It might seem that the momentum of this vigorous drive to achieve excellence would eventually expire. Instead, it continues, and the activities of 6-50 continue to expand. In 1964, the Tampa unit actively moved forward, and again emerged as the finest of the almost 500 Naval Reserve units, and for the third time was awarded the James Forrestal trophy. In addition, it received the most valued words of praise a sailor can receive: from Adm. David L. McDonald, Chief of Naval Operations, "Well done."

The officers and men of Naval Reserve Surface Division 6-50 have answered the challenge of what they can do for their country well. A measurement of its contribution in terms of trophies won, grants only a limited recognition of its true achievements. The real measure of its accomplishments is demonstrated by the numbers of young men from Tampa and the surrounding areas who have participated in the training activities of the unit during the past 4 years: 1,350 men have taken part in this effort; 463 have gone on to active duty with the fleet, including 100 to serve in submarines. At the present time, 242 men from the Tampa unit are serving with the fleet, in every type of ship in every area of the world. In addition, in order to provide training opportunities for men returning to civilian life, the Tampa unit has expanded the PCS crew to a fully manned and ready destroyer crew. Thus, many more experienced petty officers are given the chance to keep their naval skills current and to make an additional destroyer available for immediate active duty in times of emergency.

All the original group of officers and men, plus the men who have participated during the 4 years of excellence, have contributed immeasurably to this unique response to President Kennedy's challenge. The continuity and dedication of the hard core officers and petty officers—that is, those who have participated for the entire period—deserve special mention. They are:

William T. Driscoll, Jr., commander, U.S. Naval Reserve, retired.

Edward R. Martineau, commander (CHC), U.S. Naval Reserve, retired.

Raymond O. McDonald, Jr., commander (SC), U.S. Naval Reserve, retired.

Ernest L. Carlson, lieutenant commander, U.S. Naval Reserve, retired.

S. Thomas Duncan, Jr., lieutenant commander, U.S. Naval Reserve, retired.

Jerome S. Beckett, lieutenant commander, U.S. Naval Reserve, retired.

Robert I. Gray, lieutenant commander (MSC), U.S. Naval Reserve, retired.

William M. Register, Jr., lieutenant commander, U.S. Naval Reserve, retired.

Emmett J. Boggs, lieutenant commander, U.S. Naval Reserve, retired.

James E. Lehan, lieutenant, U.S. Naval Reserve, retired.

Kenneth T. Williams, lieutenant, U.S. Naval Reserve, retired.

Robert C. Florio, SKC.
A. R. Humphrey, AMCS.
K. R. Bailey, SKC.
L. M. Black, HMC.
F. R. Collins, MM1.
A. J. Fernandez, SFM3.
K. M. Hart, CS2 (SS).
J. M. Marzolf, TET2.
W. E. Keen, IC2.
G. Fulcher, BM2.
R. G. Murray, SFM2.
F. R. Bruggerman, BM3.
J. F. Shepherd, PN3.

Three petty officers, among the active-duty personnel attached to the Tampa Training Center, under the leadership of Hillman B. Myres, commander, U.S. Naval Reserve, have contributed materially to the effort. They are:

P. Holladay, SKC.
M. L. Puckett, PN1.
T. C. Grove, QMC.

In the American concept of military forces, we have always depended on the reserves of civilian sailors and soldiers to be ready to serve in defense of their country in times of need. In Tampa, the civilian-sailors are setting an unequaled example of personal sacrifice and willingness to serve their country. In fact, all members of Naval Reserve Surface Division 6-50, Tampa, Fla., from the 17-year-old recruit to the grizzled veteran of former wars, daily answer the question of what they can do for their country, for they stand ready to defend their country.

POSITION OF SENATOR HUMPHREY ON THE SUGAR AMENDMENT

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I have just received a communication from the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], who has asked me to convey to the Senate a statement concerning his position in wholehearted support of the Bennett-McCarthy amendment to H.R. 12253, which the Senate passed yesterday.

Senator HUMPHREY's statement is as follows:

> Please convey to the Senate my sincere regrets that I was necessarily absent from Washington yesterday during consideration of the Bennett-McCarthy amendment to H.R. 12253.
>
> The amendment provides that the domestic beet sugar producers and the mainland cane sugar producers will have authority to market, this year, some of the additional sugar they have produced at the insistent urging of the U.S. Government, and keeps intact certain features of the present Sugar Act concerning sugar imports. Had I been present when this amendment was introduced, I would have been honored to add my name to the list of distinguished cosponsors; and had I been present when the measure was being considered by the Senate, I would have given the measure my wholehearted and vigorous support on the floor of the Senate, and I would have voted "aye" for adoption of the amendment.
>
> The Bennett-McCarthy amendment is entirely consistent with the intent and spirit of my letter of September 2, 1964, to the Secretary of Agriculture, in which I strongly urged that the administration propose stopgap sugar legislation which would provide for additional marketing of domestically produced sugar. It is my hope now that the other body will fully support the Bennett-McCarthy amendment as H.R. 12253 moves through the rest of the legislative process and is enacted into law.
>
> My position on this important subject is today what it always has been. I am firmly convinced of the importance to our Nation of a strong and healthy domestic sugar-producing industry, and I believe that passage of this measure is essential.
>
> HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

Mr. President, I am honored to have presented this message to the Senate in behalf of the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR LEN B. JORDAN

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, today I would like to point out the success that one of our Members has had in casting aside political expediency and concentrating on sound programs for his State. The way was not always easy and his political opponents and yes, even some so-called political friends, have attempted to harass and ridicule these attempts. However, today he stands as a man who has led the way in the 88th Congress for sound water resource development.

I speak of our colleague LEN B. JORDAN, the Senator from Idaho. LEN JORDAN is no novice in the water resource development field which is so important to the development of Idaho and of all Western States. As a young man he worked in sheep camps where water was a most precious item coveted by one and all. Later, he acquired his own sheep operations in the Hells Canyon of the Snake River where while water was plentiful at the home ranch, the ranges high above the canyon bottom were often valueless because of a lack of water. LEN JORDAN quickly and earnestly learned the need of getting water on the land as the most important use of water.

In his first venture into politics, JORDAN was elected to the Idaho State Legislature which is constantly dealing with water problems. Here he quickly became a leader in water legislation and this was later to propel him to the Governor's chair in Idaho's State capitol in Boise. In this role every day brought some touch with water problems. After serving as Governor, he was then selected as chairman of the U.S. section of the International Joint Commission dealing with water problems between the United States and Canada. In this role he was also a water adviser to the Eisenhower administration. With this background, it was natural that LEN JORDAN should take quickly to water legislation in the Senate Interior Committee of which he is a member.

In 1963, he raised doubts about the good that the proposed Burns Creek Dam on the Upper Snake River would be to Idaho and the taxpayers of the Nation who were being asked to advance the money for the project. This brought an immediate stream of protest from those who had been playing political football with the project over the years. Senator JORDAN stated that rather than the inadequate Burns Creek that construction of the Fremont Dam, Ririe Dam, study of storing water in the lava beds to the west of the Upper Snake and a revised Burns Creek study would better serve both Idaho and the Nation.

Today, as we prepare to end the work of this Congress, both Ririe and Fremont have been authorized, studies are underway concerning storing of water in the lava beds. Truly, Senator JORDAN has led the way. He is also quick to point out that this progress was made possible with bipartisan support and especially with the cosponsorship of his colleague, Senator FRANK CHURCH.

Even the controversial Burns Creek project which was repeatedly turned down by Congress has been given a new lease on life through the study and diligence of LEN JORDAN. After several months, Senator JORDAN noted that the stretch of the Upper Snake which included Burns Creek was much like the Auburn-Folsom project area of California. He studied this project carefully and asked questions of many connected with the project. The result was a Jordan plan for a much larger dam than Burns Creek which would more fully utilize the water resources of the area. It would provide more storage with far greater irrigation, flood control, power, and recreation benefits than the original ill-fated Burns Creek.

This project has also been given a new designation, the Crandall Dam, in honor of Lynn Crandall, a long-time water resource leader in eastern Idaho who passed away recently. Today, those who had only been throwing brickbats at Senator JORDAN for daring to suggest that there was a more feasible, more acceptable project than Burns Creek are clamoring to climb aboard the bandwagon for the Crandall Dam proposed by Senator JORDAN.

LEN JORDAN is truly a water statesman and realizes that no one can be allowed to continually waste water needed by others. He is firm in his conviction that every drop of water that originates in a State should be used by the State until all of its needs, present and future, are met. However, he has been impressed by the need for additional water in the Colorado River Basin where he finds good friends often at each other's throats trying to divide up an insufficient water supply. JORDAN has therefore, proposed that Congress and the Federal water agencies study plans for bringing water, now wasting to the ocean at the mouth of the Columbia, overland to Lake Mead for use in the Colorado Basin. Again, shortsighted water leaders have been after JORDAN's hide, but this time the crowd has diminished and most are waiting to see what can be done on this Jordan program to meet water needs and develop water resources to the benefit of all concerned.

Idaho and the Nation have a true leader in the water resource development field in Idaho's Senator LEN JORDAN.

TRANSPORTATION EXPENDITURES FOR 1963 INDICATE SUBSTANTIAL INCREASE IN TRAVEL AND SHIPMENTS

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the Transportation Association of America has just released a helpful report which reviews the growth and expansion which transportation industries have undergone, and indicates the vital nature of these services in the continued viability of our economy. I shall discuss briefly selected statistics which correctly reveal our Nation's dependence on transportation in a rapidly changing world.

In the year 1963, total transportation outlays amounted to $116.5 billion, an increase of 5.4 percent over the preceding 12 months. This is the second successive year in which growth in transport expenditures has exceeded the rate of expansion of the gross national product. The gross national product was up 5 percent in 1963.

In this period, passenger movement amounted to $64.7 billion, with freight shipments placed at $50 billion and Government expenditures for public transportation facilities at $4.4 billion. About $56 billion was spent on automobiles and related expenses alone.

Air expenditures for private transportation, business use included, amounted to $992 million, according to the TAA report.

The following table gives an indication of the money spent by Americans in personal and business use of their automobiles last year:

Purchase of new and used cars, $22 billion; cost of gasoline and oil, $15 billion; repairs and incidental maintenance, nearly $7 billion; tires, tubes, and accessories, $4 billion; insurance premiums, $2.4 billion; interest on debt, $3.1 billion; tolls, $401 million; registration fees, $983 million.

Hired transportation in 1963 remained at a level comparable to the previous year; local transportation cost $2.8 billion; intercity movement of passengers required $3.7 billion.

Outlays for international travel rose from $7.5 billion in 1962 to $7.7 billion last year.

Mr. President, I commend the Transportation Association of America for compiling and making available this reliable and instructive information.

The TAA is an effectively functioning organization which represents the myriad interests of the transportation industry in the United States. With a membership of more than one thousand corporations, the association performs a significant role in the gathering of information and in the decisionmaking process as it relates to all forms of transport.

Represented in that body are air carriers, railroads, truck lines, bus lines, freight forwarders, oil pipeline concerns, and steamship and barge companies. Users and investors are also included, as are a large number of informed individuals in the transportation field.

Chairman of the board of the Transportation Association of America is Dr. George P. Baker, dean, Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration, an able and experienced educator who is knowledgeable in all areas of transportation.

President of TAA is my longtime friend and associate Harold F. Hammond. Mr. Hammond's keen insights, aided by a capable staff, have been responsible for an important portion of the progress recorded in transportation in recent years.

SENATOR HERBERT WALTERS RECEIVES MERITED RECOGNITION FOR EXCELLENT LEGISLATIVE RECORD

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, my comments concern Senator HERBERT WALTERS who, as we well know, will soon retire from service in this body. I use the word retire with reservation, for I am certain that his future activities will be directed toward new and worthwhile endeavors.

In August of 1963, when Senator WALTERS came here, he brought with him an enviable record of public service within the State of Tennessee. Since that time, he has enlarged on this record through his dedicated work in the Senate. Although his tenure has been relatively brief, he has won the respect and admiration of his colleagues. He has gained a reputation for his attention to senatorial duties, cooperation, and effective participation in our deliberations. His contributions have been such that the citizens of Tennessee are proud of him, and of his Senate labors.

Equally impressive are the personal characteristics which Senator WALTERS has manifested on every occasion. He is a true gentleman, courteous and gracious in all situations. I personally and officially have cherished his friendship and help. All of us will miss the diligent efforts of our friend and we wish him continued health, success, and happiness as he returns to his native State.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1965

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 12633) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, last evening in a colloquy with the distinguished minority leader I asked for the advice and guidance of the Senate on the matter of terminating the work of the 88th Congress. I have considered the matter further since then in discussions with various Members of the Senate and in further discussions with the distinguished minority leader.

This is the way the situation now appears to us. With the completion of two or three measures already on the calendar, the Senate will have completed all the work that this body, acting alone, can reasonably be expected to finish this session. These measures would include the supplemental appropriations bill and the foreign aid appropriations bill. It would be our hope that both measures can be disposed of in the Senate today and tomorrow and that, in addition, we would clear up any business which might emerge in the form of conference reports during this time.

In any event, it is my present intention to suggest to the Senate in the form of a consent agreement that commencing on Monday, the Senate go into pro forma sessions, meeting every 3 days and recessing immediately while it awaits the pleasure of the House.

May I say that the House, together with the Senate, has done a magnificent job of legislating during this session of the 88th Congress as well as over the past 4 years. I am hopeful that the House and the conference committees will be able to resolve the questions remaining as soon as possible to the end that the Congress might then tie up the ends and go into sine die adjournment.

But pending clarification of the situation in the House and in the conferences, I see no point in attempting to keep the Senate in regular session. It is my intention, at an appropriate time, to offer a consent agreement which, in effect, would put the Senate on a standby basis, prepared at any time to come back into regular session in order to terminate the work of this Congress.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. I am grateful to the majority leader for indicating to the Senate today what his intention is with respect to holding the Senate in a standby posture until the House of Representatives may have determined what its membership will seek to accomplish on the proposed legislation presently in dispute and in the hands of several conference committees. The Republican leader of the Senate is necessarily absent today and will return tomorrow. I have no doubt it will be his desire to consult with the Members of the minority in order to determine the views of Senators on this side of the aisle. Meanwhile, the announcement of the majority leader will give us an opportunity to discuss among ourselves the suggestion which my able friend has made.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I compliment the majority leader upon the proposed solution. I think it is a much wiser one than the idea of coming back in November, which in my judgment—and I am not running for reelection; my colleague from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] sounded the note yesterday—would disable us from that very important process in nonelection times of having some of the benefit of communion with our own constituencies.

I commend the proposal very strongly to the majority leader's judgment and to the judgment of the Senate. It is absolutely essential to revivify our spirits and our understanding of the needs of our States by letting us go back in nonelection periods in order to have close and intimate relationship and talk with our own constituents. Mine in New York is particularly large. It means at least 6 to 8 weeks before one can feel back home in a real sense. So I welcome the interim solution of the majority leader and compliment him upon it.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I join other Senators in commending the majority leader upon the proposal that we concentrate on the unfinished business, which primarily consists of two appropriation bills, and that we pass those bills and urge our distinguished colleagues on the House side to return to Washington and concur in that action and let us adjourn sine die.

Mr. President, fortunately I am not up for reelection; but I realize that Senators who are seeking reelection cannot take everything for granted. They are entitled to at least 1 month to campaign. We should end this session, so far as they are concerned, this week.

In addition, those of us who have been here and who are chairmen of important committees, and those who have ranking positions on the Appropriations Committee, are loaded down with work. We have to turn down invitations from our home State that we would like to accept, but we reserve the brief period that we have to keep contact with our people back home, even though we are not up for reelection. In my opinion, it would be most unfortunate if we were brought back here on November 15. It would mean that we would remain here until Christmas. It will not do us any political good. It will certainly not do us any good physically. I doubt if it will do the country any kind of good.

Even though I could have some comments to make on these appropriation bills, I am willing to pass that opportunity up and, if I have anything to say, merely put those remarks in the RECORD. I am for completing action today and the rest of the week as far as we can. With all due deference to the House, I think it could come back for one day to complete action and then let us adjourn.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. PASTORE. What is the unfinished business?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The supplemental appropriation bill.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1965

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 12633) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, yesterday afternoon I made a statement on the supplemental appropriation bill. It was not a long statement, but Members of the Senate have copies of the committee report, which is quite explicit with respect to the items contained in the supplemental appropriation bill.

I should like at this time to send an amendment to the desk and have it stated.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment offered by the Senator from Rhode Island will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed, on page 10, line 20, to strike out "$916,600" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,041,600."

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of that item?

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, this is an increase of $125,000 in the amount recommended by the Senate committee, and will provide for repair of damaged facilities at Bulls Island, Cape Romain National Wildlife Refuge, S.C.

The House of Representatives added this amount to the bill without a budget estimate. The Senate Committee on Appropriations felt that more information was necessary as to the urgency of the proposed work. Investigation develops that unless a landing dock and mooring facilities which were destroyed by an unusual mudslide are replaced, it will be necessary to continue use of a temporary hazardous floating facility.

The dock to be constructed will be accessible at all tides; a boat shelter for refuge and concessioners' boats and mooring facilities for a vessel owned by the wildlife refuge will be built.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Rhode Island (putting the question).

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I do not know anything about this amendment.

Mr. PASTORE. I just explained the amendment. This relates to $125,000 which was eliminated. It was included in the House item. It was eliminated in the Senate committee because it was unbudgeted. The difficulty has been resolved. I have explained it. It brings the item back to the House figure. It is not a new item.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Is there a budget estimate for it?

Mr. PASTORE. No.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I am the ranking minority member of the subcommittee handling this bill, and it was not brought to my attention. It is a rather strange thing.

Mr. PASTORE. It was in committee. The Senator will recall that it was my suggestion that it be eliminated, because there was no budget estimate for it. Since that time, there has been consultation with House Members. The item was approved by the House. I am moving that the item adopted by the House be restored.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, let me explain the item further.

On November 29, 1963, a combination of high winds and an extremely low tide resulted in a landslide of mud in Wharf Creek at Bulls Island, Cape Romain National Wildlife Refuge, located near Charleston, S.C. This mudslide caused $125,000 in damaged facilities and destroyed the landing dock and mooring facilities at Bulls Island.

Bulls Island is one of the most unique areas in the national wildlife refuge system; in addition to providing a wintering site for thousands of waterfowl, it possesses a rare combination of flora and fauna. The island, though accessible only by boat, is visited annually by hundreds of people, many of whom travel great distances, primarily for bird study and wildlife photography. Overnight accommodations are provided on the island by the Bureau through a concessionaire.

To take care of the many visitors, to facilitate handling of supplies and materials which are brought to the island by boats and barges for refuge and concession operations, and to provide for safe mooring and floating equipment, adequate docking facilities are essential. Since the freak mudslide occurred, refuge personnel and visitors have had to get by with only a small temporary floating dock. This provides, at best, an inconvenient and hazardous facility. The fluctuation of water levels, due to normal tides, adds to the hazard. There is also no longer any protected mooring facility for boats during frequent storms which occur in this area.

One hundred and twenty-five thousand dollars will permit construction of a dock which will be accessible at all tides, a boat shelter for refuge and concessionaire's boats, and mooring facilities for the refuge LCM which is used for equipment transport.

There was no budget item on this item. It was passed by the House. There are many items that the Senate committee has adopted without budget estimates. Because of that fact, when we receive further information from the House, we put the item back in the bill.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. This item apparently has much merit to it, but I wonder how many more items are going to be proposed

Mr. PASTORE. Many more were put in by the Senate committee. Give us time and we will come to them.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, the yeas and nays have been requested.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The yeas and nays have been requested.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the yeas and nays be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair put the question.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Rhode Island.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 1278.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment offered by the Senator from California will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the amendment, as follows:

> At the appropriate place in the chapter on public works under "Construction, general" strike out "$2,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof: "$2,860,000, of which not to exceed $860,000 shall be available for emergency flood control construction of debris basins and channel clearing in the Santa Barbara, California, area affected by recent fires, and such work is hereby authorized".

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, may we have order? This is a very important item. It is not a budgeted item, but it is a very important item.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the tragic fact is that in the past few weeks, great and awesome forest fires have been raging all across the State which I have the honor to represent. Approximately 80,000 acres in northern California, from Napa Valley to Santa Rosa, have been denuded and charred. In the southern part of my State, in historic, beautiful Santa Barbara County, fearful walls of fire, reaching 200 feet in the air, have eaten their devastating way through some 80,000 acres. In the Santa Barbara area are great national forests now black and burned. It is estimated by the Corps of Engineers that those forests, and the mountains on which they have grown, all owned by the U.S. Government, have been terribly damaged, and the watersheds destroyed, to the total sum of $15 to $16 million. Property damage, public and private, has amounted to almost $4 million. I am, nevertheless, glad to report that the fires, as of this morning, have been brought under control, or are rapidly being brought under control.

Meanwhile, several thousand people, firefighting employees of the Federal, State, and local governments, military personnel, and civilian volunteers, have been valiantly fighting the fires. One man was burned to death, some 16 other persons remain in the hospital, and dozens of others were injured. The damage has been tremendous.

There is an equally great menace facing the people who live below the mountains on out to the sea. When the rainy season finally does come to my semiarid State, later this year, another holocaust will confront the people of Santa Barbara—the hazard of flood.

With the forest lands denuded, down the mountainside will come torrents of water, along with all the accumulated muck, burned and broken trees, rocks and boulders, to sweep away anything which may lie in their downward path.

Property, public and private, sewerage systems, and water mains, homes and schools, and public buildings all stand to suffer damages running into tens or hundreds of millions of damage.

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers proposes the construction of 10 debris basins, to be built so as to catch and hold the debris and to hold some of the floodwaters estimated at 550,000 cubic feet a square mile, as inevitably they will crash down the mountainside on their way to the sea.

The Corps of Engineers has responded to my inquiry in this constructive fashion. I have a profound respect for the Corps of Engineers. It estimates that the cost of constructing the debris basins and the channelization which will be required would amount, in toto, to $860,000.

In order to provide the necessary preventive measures, the Corps of Engineers will need both money and authority. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I move that the Senate committee provide an appropriation of $860,000 for this purpose, and that it include in the bill the following language:

> Of which not to exceed $860,000 shall be available for emergency flood control construction of debris basins and channel clearing in the Santa Barbara, Calif., area affected by recent fires, and such work is hereby authorized.

Mr. Chairman, some of these structures will be located on national forest lands and the Forest Service has agreed to permit such construction. Others will be located on private lands and local interests have agreed to provide the necessary lands, easements, and rights-of-way for construction, and for subsequent maintenance of the structures. I urge the adoption of this amendment.

There has been no time for a budget estimate. The amendment which I now ask the Senate to approve will contain within itself authorization. The emergency requires rapid congressional action and these extraordinary procedures.

I am glad to say that I discussed this matter in the Committee on Appropriations and it received the sympathetic understanding of Senators there.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As one minority member of the committee—and I believe I can speak for the chairman, who is present—I can state that there was no objection, and only encouragement to the Senator from California to move for a suspension of rule so that he could offer the amendment and have it accepted.

Mr. KUCHEL. I am very grateful to my dear friend from Massachusetts. His comments reflect the views which were expressed on the floor several days ago in colloquy with the distinguished chairman of the committee, the dean of the Senate [Mr. HAYDEN], and in other conversations, including one with the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE].

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. First of all, I assure the Senate that what the distinguished Senator from California is doing is following the suggestion that was made in committee.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank my friend.

Mr. PASTORE. The suggestion was that he bring this amendment to the floor of the Senate, rather than have us consider it in committee. It is not a question of having had the amendment rejected in committee, and having it now renewed on the floor. This was the understanding of the members of the committee. This is a matter for the Senate to decide.

There is one point that I believe should be emphasized. Is it not correct to say that time is of the essence? I understand that the rains will come in the month of November, and unless this work gets underway there will be havoc and irreparable damage.

Mr. KUCHEL. The Senator is completely correct. This constitutes an emergency. The amendment is proposed on that basis.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from California.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KUCHEL. I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PASTORE. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. KUCHEL. There is one further point that I should like to bring to the attention of the Senate. The Committee on Appropriations considered and approved; and the Senate has already adopted, an amendment to provide additional funds of $900,000 for the Department of Agriculture to use in reseeding and for run-off retardation and other types of work in the fire areas in both the Santa Barbara area and the northern California area, spread across the north from Napa and its fertile hills and valley to Sonoma County.

I wish the legislative record to be completely clear. The report on that item, as it appears in our committee report, states:

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

FLOOD PREVENTION

The attention of the committee has been directed to the extensive damage resulting from recent forest fires in the State of California, where for example in the Santa Barbara area, it is estimated that approximately 70,000 acres have been burned over and the fire has not yet been brought under firm control. Due to the highly erosive nature of most of the soil affected by the fire damage, it is essential that rehabilitation measures be promptly undertaken, such as reseeding and rehabilitating land which has been denuded of its vegetative cover. Unless conservation and rehabilitation measures are promptly undertaken there may be further threat to Santa Barbara and neighboring communities, including their water supply later in the fall and winter. The committee believes that it is essential that adequate funds be provided to meet this emergency need, as well as to meet other emergency situations which may arise, and has included in the bill a recommendation for an additional appropriation of $900,000 for emergency erosion measures to retard runoff and prevent soil erosion.

The recommended appropriation is pursuant to the authority contained in section 216 of the Flood Control Act of 1950.

This program would provide for reseeding of the public lands involved under appropriate Federal legislation, and, I am told, entering into a cooperative venture with respect to other property in the fire area for the purpose of reseeding with respect to denuded areas caused by the fire.

For the RECORD, I ask the chairman whether or not it is correct to say that the intention of the committee in approving this item was that the benefits of it would be made available to all fire damaged areas in California, particularly Napa and Santa Barbara.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, for myself and the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] who has taken a leading role in support of the Appalachian bill I send an amendment to the desk.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 18, after "Rivers and Harbors and Flood Control," line 22, and before "Construction, General," line 23, it is proposed to insert:

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

For an additional amount for "General Investigations," $350,000; Provided that this appropriation shall become effective only upon enactment into law of S. 2782 or similar legislation.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, after action yesterday by the Senate Appropriations Committee in which they provided $800,000 for establishment of the Appalachia Regional Development Commission but did not provide funds for the complicated and comprehensive water resources study authorized in S. 2782, I requested from the Corps of Engineers an estimate of minimum funds necessary to begin this important study. I ask unanimous consent to insert the reply from the corps at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. ARMY ENGINEER DIVISION, OHIO
RIVER, CORPS OF ENGINEERS,
Cincinnati, Ohio, September 30, 1964.

Hon. JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR RANDOLPH: I have been working with General Leber in preparing to carry out his responsibilities in executing the water resources survey authorized and directed by section 206 of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1964. Since I was in Washington, General Leber telephoned me and asked that I supply you the information you requested of him today concerning the preparations made by the Corps of Engineers in this matter.

After the Public Works Committee added section 206 to the act, the corps convened an ad hoc group in Washington to develop a plan of attack. It was decided that a survey of the magnitude and complexity envisioned could be executed most effectively in the time specified by establishing an office to coordinate inputs from the 11 Corps of Engineers districts involved, and to work closely with the Appalachian Regional Commission and the State and Federal agencies also concerned.

An organization of the office has been developed and approved. Recruiting can start immediately on receipt of authorization and funds.

A tentative plan of survey has been written and is ready for issue.

The corps has conducted feasibility studies for office space in the region, and has located several promising sites.

Initial reconnaissances throughout Appalachia, and initiation of local coordination in the field with other agencies have been made.

As to your request for information concerning the minimum in funds that would permit limited initiation of this survey, an appropriation of $350,000 would permit staffing the new office at about half strength, establishing liaison and working relationships with the Commission, initiating the inventory of authorized and prospective water resources projects that is the first step, and starting (in conjunction with the Commission) the economic studies and developmental projections that are required by the act. The amount of $350,000 is about one-third of the funds needed to execute the presently planned work program at the pace that would fully meet the intent of the Congress in the time stipulated in the act. Nevertheless, appropriations in this amount, and intensification of the effort at a later date, may make it possible to complete the survey in the time allowed.

Sincerely yours,
JOHN C. H. LEE, Jr.
Colonel, Corps of Engineers, Assistant.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I am most grateful to the committee. I have discussed this proposal with my good friend, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], who is floor manager of this measure, and I am appreciative of the attitude he has expressed to me personally. I believe this is a most necessary item.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator from West Virginia has already explained exactly what this proposal is designed to do, and why it is necessary to appropriate the money at this time. I understand that the authorization for this particular phase of the Appalachia bill is $5 million. The Senator is asking for $350,000 on the recommendation being made by the Corps of Army Engineers, because this work will have to get underway, and the $800,000 provided for in the bill would not cover this phase.

The RECORD ought to disclose why it is necessary to appropriate the additional money at this time and why it cannot be or will not be included in the $800,000.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, it is only after careful deliberation that I decided to discuss the decision by the Appropriations Committee regarding the amount of funds recommended for starting the Appalachian development program. I feel some reluctance to take this action due to my esteem and affection for the manager of H.R. 12633, the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE].

My friend has long been in support of the development program for Appalachia. He was one of the original cosponsors of S. 2782, and was a champion of the cause during the debate on September 25, 1964, after which the Senate passed the measure by a vote of 45 to 13. I have no doubt, therefore, that the Senator from Rhode Island was an effective advocate for initial funds for Appalachia in the Appropriations Committee executive sessions. And I am grateful that the committee has recommended funds for the establishment of the Appalachian Regional Development Commission in the amount of $800,000.

I hope, therefore, that members of the committee and especially my esteemed colleague from Rhode Island, will not consider it inappropriate if I suggest that they may have given undue weight to the request of the Bureau of the Budget in contrast to the carefully thought-out request of the senior Senator from West Virginia for $3 million in initial funds for this program. I ask unanimous consent to include at this point in my remarks a copy of the letter to the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], in support of the amount, copies of which letter were also delivered to the distinguished subcommittee chairman, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the capable junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], and to my colleague, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD].

Mr. President, I am grateful to my colleague, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] who effectively offered and argued for the budget request for $800,000 for the Appalachian Commission funds. I commend my colleague for his valuable support.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS,
September 29, 1964.

Hon. CARL HAYDEN,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Appropriations, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: As you know, the Senate passed S. 2782, the Appalachian Regional Development Act, on September 25 by a vote of 45 to 13. It is my hope that the House will act favorably on the measure this week. However, with the prospect of possible adjournment by the Congress at the end of this week or next, it is questionable whether the Congress will be able to act on the Appalachian supplemental appropriation measure which is being prepared by the administration.

It is of the most critical importance that this program, which is due to expire July 1, 1970, be implemented at the earliest possible time. Though the funds required to operate the Appalachian Commission at the outset are relatively small, they are vital. To insure against the prospect of congressional adjournment without appropriations for the Appalachian development program, I therefore respectfully suggest that starting funds be included in H.R. 12633, making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965.

It would be my hope that the Appropriations Committee could act affirmatively on the following:

1. $500,000 for the establishment and administrative expenses of the Commission;

2. $1 million to initiate the water resources survey authorized in section 206 of S. 2782.

It is vital that the Corps of Engineers initiate this survey at the earliest possible time since the Congress has instructed the corps to report to the Commission in time for the President to submit his recommendations to the Congress not later than December 31, 1967.

3. $1,500,000 for studies, research, and demonstration projects authorized under section 302 of S. 2782.

This request for $3 million while relatively insignificant in terms of the total of $1,060 million authorized by S. 2782, is of vital importance in launching the program for the development of the Appalachian region and the relief of its citizens. Your consideration will be most sincerely appreciated.

With warm personal regards,

Truly,

JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
U.S. Senate.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I shall briefly explain the reasons for my having asked for $3 million to implement the Appalachian Regional Development Act. But first, let me remind the Members of this body that the Senate endorsed this program by a majority of more than 3 to 1. It has the aid of both parties, with affirmative votes of Republican Senators, literally from Maine to California, and with more than half of the Republicans present voting in favor of S. 2782. There is no question, therefore, of the nationwide bipartisan support for the measure as expressed in this body.

The only question that exists is how we can best utilize the next 5 or 6 months before final action on a supplemental appropriations measure for Appalachia in the 89th Congress—assuming that the House of Representatives acts affirmatively on the bill before adjournment. I suggest that the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, Dr. Kermit Gordon, gave only superficial consideration to this question.

On September 29, when the Appropriations Committee was considering this item, a member of the Public Works Committee staff, at my request, conferred by telephone with the Director of the Bureau of the Budget. We learned at that time that the request of the Budget Bureau for $800,000 was based on a simple arithmetical prorating of the $1.1 million authorized for fiscal 1965. Only casual consideration was given to the complicated and unprecedented water resource survey which was authorized by the Senate at $5 million. Apparently no thought was given to other kinds of economic and resource studies which this body authorized at the level of $5,500,000.

In my letter of September 29, to the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, $500,000 was urged to establish the Commission and administer it until the 89th Congress can enact its full appropriations.

I asked also for $1 million to implement the water resources study to be conducted by the Corps of Engineers. Section 206 of S. 2782 requires the President to transmit his recommendations for development of Appalachia's water resources no later than December 31, 1967. This means that the Corps of Engineers, in order to coordinate its plan with other interested departments and agencies and the Bureau of the Budget, must complete its work on this monumental study no later than July 1967. With at least two major comprehensive river basin studies and literally scores of individual site studies to coordinate, the next 5 or 6 months will be of critical importance in giving the Corps of Engineers sufficient time to do their portion of the work. I have been informed that the Corps of Engineers cannot meet its deadline if it must wait until the middle of next year to begin, and we cannot ask that the corps reprogram its funds and slight other areas, as has been suggested by the Bureau of the Budget. I therefore asked for $1 million of the $5 million authorized in order to start early action on this study.

Section 302 of S. 2782 authorizes $5,500,000 for administrative expenses of local development districts and research, studies and demonstration projects. This section, in my opinion, may be second in importance only to the road program in the longrun benefits to the Appalachian area and its people. I asked the Appropriations Committee to report $1,500,000 of the money authorized, which is a close approximation of the prorated amount for fiscal 1965, if we assume that the 89th Congress acts on Appalachian appropriations by February or March of 1965.

Senate debate on S. 2782 indicated that we have much to learn regarding the actual dynamics of economic and social rehabilitation of the area. I maintain that now is the time to begin learning, and my request for $1,500,000 in research funds is vital to that task. As recently as yesterday I spoke with executives of one of our country's great defense industries; they are interested in applying systems management techniques to the development of Appalachia. This is an exciting concept, but it can be tested and demonstrated only if we have the necessary funds.

Mr. President, the next 6 months can be used for constructive and creative research on the problems of Appalachia. But following the recommendation of the Bureau of the Budget would deny us this opportunity. The Appalachian Regional Development Act will expire on July 1, 1970. And except for the road program, the funds are authorized only through fiscal 1966. Therefore, by the time the 89th Congress acts, the authorizing period will be almost half expired, and much precious time for research and study will have passed.

I have not asked for money to build roads, or health facilities or sewage works, prior to establishment of the Commission and careful consideration of location of these facilities. I did ask for $3 million to establish the Commission, assist the formation of local development districts, and conduct the initial research so vital to the well-being of 16 million Americans.

At this time, however, after discussion yesterday with the capable floor manager of H.R. 12633, I concede the difficulty of fulfilling my earlier request. The Appropriations Committee has reported $800,000 for the establishment of the Commission; I, therefore, ask at this time for $350,000 to begin work on the water resources survey—which is about one-third the amount necessary to carry the work forward at the required level.

I have therefore offered this amendment in behalf of myself and the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] with whom I have worked so closely and cooperatively on this legislation.

Mr. President, this is not a large sum. It will enable action to proceed under section 206 of S. 2782 at about one-third the level required—but they will be able to begin.

I have been intimately associated with the legislation from the very beginning, as the Senator from Rhode Island knows. I believe that the Bureau of the Budget overlooked the need for this item when it sent up the request merely to provide for the expenses of the Commission.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I am happy to yield to my friend from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The committee included in the appropriation bill $800,000 for the administration of the Appalachia program, if it becomes law. Do I correctly understand that the recommendation that is now being made or the amendment that is now being considered would provide an additional $350,000 if the Appalachia bill should become law?

Mr. RANDOLPH. That is correct; if it becomes law, although the pending amendment falls under a different section of the act.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. So if the Appalachia program becomes law and we decide what the ultimate appropriation shall be, we can take into consideration the two items totaling $1,150,000 which we are now considering?

Mr. RANDOLPH. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I would have no objection, from this side of the aisle, if the Appalachia bill were enacted. The money must be properly spent to make certain that the planning is done.

Mr. RANDOLPH. That is correct. I am grateful to the Senator from Massachusetts for this expression and for his previous indication of support for the Appalachian program when the Senate passed it on September 25.

Mr. PASTORE. The distinguished senior Senator from West Virginia has been very close to the study of Appalachia. No Member of the Senate understands the problem better. He has had several discussions with me concerning the request in the amendment now pending. I felt that while I was in no position to accept it and take it to conference, because it was not discussed with the members of the Committee on Appropriations, personally I was amenable to it. I shall support it and shall vote for it.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I thank the Senator from Rhode Island.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from West Virginia.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I wish to address a series of questions to the Senator from Rhode Island, who is in charge of the bill. First, will he give the Senate an explanation of exactly what took place with respect to urban transportation activities under the Housing and Home Finance Agency, as referred to on page 8 of the committee report? This is a subject of burning concern to us in the great urban areas—and, of course, the State of the Senator from Rhode Island has a great urban area in Providence, so the Senator knows something about big-city problems.

It will be noted that the urban mass transportation provisions were cut by nearly two-thirds in the House. The Senate committee, apparently not content with that rather drastic cut, made an even further cut in the bill by $15 million. The only restoration was $2,500,000 for loans; so there is, over and above the amount of the House cut, a $12,500,000 net cut in the Senate bill. May we have from the Senator from Rhode Island some explanation of why that was done?

Mr. PASTORE. I assure the distinguished Senator from New York that I am on his side, but I was on the losing side in committee. The committee cut $15 million from the appropriation for fiscal 1965. Then a request was made for $150 million for 1966. It was an anticipatory appropriation. The committee felt at that time that there was no precedent for it, and that there was no need at this time to appropriate for fiscal 1966 grants that were to be made to communities.

The argument made before us was that unless communities knew that this money was appropriated, it would not facilitate either the holding of referendums or the sale of bonds. A majority of the members of the committee did not go along with that argument. They felt that there would be sufficient time to discuss the problem after Congress returns in January. That is why the Senate Committee on Appropriations followed the House in the deletion of the $150 million which was requested for 1966.

Then the Senator from Rhode Island thought he should insist upon the full appropriation of $75 million for 1965. The committee wanted to reduce the amount even below $60 million. After considerable discussion to and fro, it was agreed to leave the amount at $60 million. However, I assure the Senator from New York that, so far as the Senator from Rhode Island is concerned, this proposal will get the program underway. I believe it should get underway.

When we return in January, if any deficiencies develop in this program—and I believe in the program—the Senator from New York will find the Senator from Rhode Island, if the Senator from Rhode Island is reelected on November 3, standing side by side with him in his crusade in this body.

Mr. JAVITS. Can the Senator from Rhode Island communicate to us something of the temper of the committee: If it should appear in January that there is a really legitimate and hardheaded need for more than has been appropriated—because this is a rather sharp cut in a critically important program—does he believe there will be an open door for further consideration?

Mr. PASTORE. So far as I am concerned, that is so. We meet this problem every time. It is regrettable, but there is little that we can do about it. These laws are passed either in the summer or in the fall of the current fiscal year. To get the programs going, they come before the Supplemental Appropriation Subcommittee. That always raises some hesitancy and some resistance.

It is regrettable that it has to be that way. The committee feels, after all, that this is a new program, that we should give it a start, and that the regular subcommittees should consider it. There is a certain amount of logic to that, but we are mindful of the fact that the authorization laws are passed by Congress in 1964; and if we wait for the regular subcommittee to act on them we do not get them going until they are already a year old. That is not fair, because that thwarts the intention of Congress to that extent. But let me assure the Senator from New York that insofar as I am concerned, if this program is not being fully implemented—I know what the Senator is going to do—I do not know what the Appropriations Committee will do—I am on the side of the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the amendment was agreed to be reconsidered.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have two other items about which I should like to inquire of the Senator from Rhode Island, who is so gracious in answering. First, I direct attention to the urban planning grants.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield on that first point for a moment?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As one who voted to put in the $60 million instead of the $75 million, and voted against including the other $66 million at this time, I agree with what the Senator from Rhode Island has said. My vote was very much influenced by the fact that the chairman of the subcommittee which would consider the subject believed it would not be put in at this time, and that there would be ample opportunity in the next session of the Congress to do it. That is what influenced the feeling of the committee. There were no pros or cons as to the advisability of doing nothing or appropriating $150 million, but that it was not deemed wise to do so at the moment.

Mr. JAVITS. I appreciate the assurance of the Senator from Massachusetts. There is the great urban complex in Boston which is directly affected by this problem.

Mr. President, returning to the urban planning grants, it will be noted that the urban planning grants provision of the new Housing Act takes in the larger as well as the smaller counties of the country by amendments made to the law, and now includes 450 of the largest counties in the United States. Nonetheless, on this rather large, new demand for urban planning grants, the allowance has been cut in half, both by the House and by the Senate. I would deeply appreciate it if the Senator from Rhode Island would explain that.

Mr. PASTORE. On September 2, the authorization was expanded for this activity, rather much to my satisfaction. The House cut the budget request, which was for $22,650,000, I believe, and the House made it $11,325,000. The Senate Appropriations Committee went along. It is not in good taste for me to say this, but I would hope the Senator from New York would realize that this is an election year. No one frightens more easily than a politician. It is tough to have some of these items restored. That is my feeling, at least. But so far as I am concerned, when we come back in January—and I hope both the Senator from New York and I are here—we can continue this crusade.

Mr. JAVITS. As a matter of importance to the agency administering the law, would it have a reasonable right to go ahead and work with the larger counties which now, for the first time, come into the program, in the expectation that there is a fair hope, given a good case and hardheaded need for additional appropriations, that the Senate would give sympathetic consideration to that concept? As the Senator knows, there are great variations among the ways in which a department can work with people. It can listen to them, or it can entertain their plans, or not do so.

Mr. PASTORE. I do not have that assurance from the Appropriations Committee, or from the House. I do not have that assurance from the Senate. All I can say is that insofar as the Senator from New York and I are concerned, they have that assurance for what it is worth. However, I cannot speak for anyone else.

Mr. JAVITS. There is no fundamental determination to prevent the implementation of this expansion of the urban planning grant program by the fact that the funds were cut in half?

Mr. PASTORE. What we are doing is vitiating the intent of Congress when it authorizes an additional $30 million. While this is a modest compliance or implementation compared with the authorization of $30 million, we take cognizance of the fact that this is an overall expanded program which was authorized by Congress, and I hope it will not be vitiated through the medium of appropriations.

Mr. JAVITS. There is no such intention?

Mr. PASTORE. Of course, there is no such intention.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. President, one further point. I invite attention to the provisions for the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, for which the supplemental estimate was $2.5 million. The House allowed the $2.5 million. In this case, it is the Senate which cut it down to $1.5 million. We should bear in mind that this is an area of great sensitivity, that the evil which we are seeking to deal with has been responsible for a considerable amount of disorder in critically important parts of the Nation, that we fought a great legislative battle on the floor of the Senate to carry the Civil Rights Act of 1964—probably one of the most historic pieces of legislation ever passed in the Senate. Here, first crack out of the box, in one of the most sensitive areas of that legislation, it is the Senate—where the battle was fought—which makes this vast cut in the appropriation—40 percent—when the House is willing to allow the whole amount.

Mr. PASTORE. That is true; but the only answer I can give at this time is that that was the vote of the Appropriations Committee. The $1 million plus will be in conference. I hope that serious consideration will be given to the difference when we discuss it in conference. That was the will of the Appropriations Committee. That is the decision it made. But this is a supplemental bill. The door is always open for further consideration in the public interest.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALTERS in the chair). Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Let me say, in addition to what the Senator from Rhode Island has said, that there was some feeling that nothing should be appropriated this year. A compromise was made of $1½ million, on the ground that the enforcement activities of the Committee would not be going into effect for another year, so that the educational facilities for the remainder of the fiscal year could be handled with the money allowed.

As one who strongly advocated this project in the authorization, and who believes in it thoroughly, and believes it to be the proper way to work at the whole problem, I shall be sympathetic to what the Senator from New York has said. The reason we did what we did was a compromise between those who did not wish any money and those who believed that the Commission should be set up so that it could go forward with its educational work.

Mr. JAVITS. Let me ask the Senator from Massachusetts whether we would have the right to assume that if, in the course of the conference, the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from Rhode Island were presented with hard evidence that the $1.5 million was not enough to deal with educational and technical assistance activities, which will have to be undertaken before the enforcement activities, they would be openminded as to the extent to which there should be a compromise with the House figure?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The conference committee is always openminded. I wish to do everything to see that the Civil Rights Act, which we enacted into law after a great deal of difficulty, will be carried out.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts. The Senator from Rhode Island has heard this colloquy and, knowing him as I do, I am sure that he feels exactly the same way.

Mr. PASTORE. I thank the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. So there are at least two strong voices in the conference committee on the subject.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I call up my amendment and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 20, after line 23, it is proposed to insert the following new paragraph:

COMMISSION ON INTERNATIONAL RULES OF JUDICIAL PROCEDURE

Salaries and expenses

For expenses necessary for the Commission on International Rules of Judicial Procedure, $75,000.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, this is a very small amendment. I regret that I was inadvertently absent when this item was taken up by the Committee on Appropriations. I regret also that the chairman of the Subcommittee on Deficiencies and Supplementals was absent at that time.

This amendment would provide for an appropriation of only $75,000, in lieu of the budget request of $158,000 that was presented to the committee, to continue the work of the Commission on International Rules of Judicial Procedure. This is an item that has been authorized by the Committee on the Judiciary of both Houses since 1958. It is a study that is strongly supported by the American Bar Association, as evidenced on page 674 of the hearings, where Mr. Benjamin Busch said:

> I am authorized by the American Bar Association to testify as chairman of its committee on international judicial cooperation, and as chairman of its committee on comparative practice and procedure.

In his testimony, Mr. Busch said:

> By reason of the studies made by our section of the American Bar Association and as a result of the everyday experience of lawyers in matters of private international law, I can attest to the splendid work done to date by the Commission, and I can also attest to the prejudice and injury to the bar and to the community at large if this Commission cannot fully accomplish its important work because of the failure of financial support by the Congress.

This has been authorized since 1958 by the Committees on the Judiciary of Congress, but not supported strongly by the House Committee on Appropriations. Thus, it has lost practically all opportunity for funding. It was funded only by $10,000 in the supplemental act. But in the Senate, the amount was $20,000 in 1963. It was reduced in the conference committee to $10,000, with the instruction that they intended to appropriate no more. That was stated by the House conferees.

An amount of money has been reauthorized to establish this high level study Commission. On August 30, 1964, the measure passed by the Committee on the Judiciary of both the House and the Senate. There is a budget estimate of $158,000. All I am asking for is $75,000 so that this work can continue this year. This is to try to provide for standard rules of procedure so that Americans who are sued abroad or who have cases here against persons abroad can have standardization established in the eventual treaties that will be worked out for the presentation of evidence of nationals of foreign countries who cannot be brought here to testify on behalf of our litigants because of the lack of treaty or agreement.

This study has strong support. It is supported by the American Bar Associations. The United States has taken the leadership in trying to do something about it.

I ask that this amount be appropriated. It is needed to carry on this work. Up to this date, the funds have had to be funded from educational and charitable foundations. The Carnegie Foundation carried on the work for a long time.

I hope that the committee will agree to accept the amendment.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I am not unalterably opposed to considering appropriation items that have not been regularly budgeted. I am not unalterably opposed to floor action in order to obtain the adoption of an amendment concerning an appropriation that was not approved by the committee. I know that there are circumstances which arise that have to be, and properly should be, taken into account, in some instances, which would justify the action that is proposed today.

I am concerned about the procedures that are being followed in bypassing the House—apparently deliberately—and then seeking to get appropriations from the Senate. The proponents did not go before the House last year to seek an appropriation. They did not go before the budget committee in the regular course and seek a budget request. They waited until after the bill passed the

House each time. Then they came over here and asked to have the Senate insert these amendments.

The House was not happy with that action before. Therefore, as has been stated by the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], it reluctantly agreed to $10,000 with the statement that this would be the end. It said that it did not intend to make any other appropriation for this Commission.

Subsequently, this amendment to the statute has been enacted. I believe the proponents should have gone back to the House and presented this matter with regard to the supplemental bill. This bill was passed and became law. They knew it was in the process of being passed.

It became law some 22 days before the House passed the appropriation bill. They had an opportunity to present it to the House. I believe they had the duty to present it to the House, since the House is the body that indicated its unwillingness to go any further.

I believe we are in the situation that if we agree to this amendment, we shall go to conference with it after the House has been ignored. We may find stubborn opposition to it. I believe that the better course would be to let the matter come before the regular committees in due course next year, and undertake to make appropriations that may be justified.

I do not want to be on record as absolutely opposing this program. It may be justified. But I believe this practice is not proper. Apparently, this is what the procedure is to be. This situation has happened twice. At the last minute an appropriation is asked from the Senate.

I want the record to show that the matter came up in the Committee on Appropriations. There was no objection to excluding it at the time. The Senator was absent. The committee might have agreed to some small sum, had the Senator been in attendance and had presented the matter. As I understand, the Senator is seeking enough money to keep the Commission alive until a proper showing can be made. Is that correct?

Mr. MONRONEY. That is correct. This money would pay for a slight amount that is due the staff for the past fiscal year. It would keep the Commission going until they come before the Committee on Appropriations and state their case and have a genuine hearing concerning their right to have an authorization that has been passed as late as August 30, 1964.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is correct. What I object to is that they have not done that. I believe they will find, because of the procedure that has been undertaken, that there will be opposition. I believe $75,000 is much more than is necessary to keep the Commission alive. I do not support it with any enthusiasm under these circumstances. I shall not support it.

If the Senator would reduce the amount to, say, $40,000, that would hold the situation until we could at least see if the House would agree. If there is real merit to the measure, we could see whether the House would agree to the financing of this Commission.

I believe it would serve as a warning to the Commission that if it expects to obtain appropriations, it should show due deference to each Chamber of Congress.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I say this in full modesty. I do not know any Senator who has been closer to the controversy over the Commission than the senior Senator from Rhode Island. These people have visited me from time to time at my office. They have appeared before the Subcommittee on Deficiencies and Supplementals. I would hope that this matter would go before a regular subcommittee. It should be looked into.

I would hope that the issue would go before the regular subcommittee, because it needs to be gone into. We ought to bear in mind the valuable work that this Commission intends to do. First, the Commission is composed of members of the bar who serve without compensation. An appropriation is made which takes care of the staff in order that much of the work which is being done and needs to be done can be put together.

The purpose of the Commission is as follows: There is no conformity or uniformity of laws on the service of process in various countries of the world. For example, if an American brings suit in an American court and he needs the testimony, let us say, of a witness who lives in England, France, Japan, Italy, or Switzerland, there is no way that the American litigant, in order to further his claim in an American court, can get the testimony of that witness because we do not have the necessary legal process.

I am told that one time there was a suit on the part of the American Government that involved $3 million, and because we could not get the testimony of a foreign witness in that country, the suit had to be abandoned.

All that the Commission is trying to do is to bring about a uniformity so that when a suit involving American citizens is filed, and testimony or records in a foreign country are needed, there will be some process in the foreign country by which a witness can be compelled to appear in order to be interrogated so that justice may be done in the pending suit.

The argument has been made from time immemorial that the program started out with a $5,000 appropriation. Anyone who is versed in the law—and there is no one in the law who is more adequately and profoundly versed than the distinguished Senator from Arkansas—knows that we could not begin to scratch the surface with $5,000. That would be ridiculous. First, we must consult the other governments. We must talk with members of the bar of those governments. We must try to bring about an understanding. The ultimate objective is to bring about treaties between the countries whereby, if a suit is brought in Italy, for example, a witness can be compelled to appear in America so that depositions may be taken, and vice versa. If a suit is brought in America and testimony of a witness in Italy is needed, his appearance could be compelled and the testimony could be obtained.

That is what the Commission is trying to do. It is very important work. But the approach is impractical. They are going about it in the wrong way. The appropriation comes always before the Subcommittee on Supplemental Appropriations. It does not belong there. It should never come before that subcommittee. Why it was not brought before the House committee I do not know. Whether it would have been in time I do not know. Whether the request was made and the proponents were told that they could not come in because it was too late, I do not know. But I am happy that the question has been discussed on the floor of the Senate.

I hope that the Senator from Arkansas will be generous of heart. We are asking for $75,000. The Senator has suggested $40,000. The chairman of the subcommittee desires to be a Solomon. Let us make it $50,000 and keep moving.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I have not undertaken to say, and I am not of the opinion, that the Commission has no worthwhile function to perform. That is not the position of the Senator from Arkansas. The Commission has been financed from private sources to the tune of $350,000. Apparently when those funds ran out and the life of the Commission, as authorized by Congress, expired, a request was made for an extension of the life of the Commission and also then, last year, for an appropriation of $34,000, which finally resulted in the conference report granting $10,000 of the $20,000 that the Senate had allowed.

An extension of the authorization was obtained to December 1966. That is 27 months from now. But when representatives of the Commission came in and testified on the supplemental appropriation bill, they told us that it would require $200,000 a year for the next 5 years, if they could get through in 5 years. But they have asked for an extension of the life of the Commission only until December 1966. That situation arouses an interest in the question as to what we are doing. Are we creating a permanent commission to go on and on The Director of the Commission draws a salary of $24,500 a year.

Mr. President, possibly the work of the Commission ought to be done, but I do not believe it will take the lifetime of the Commissioners to get it done if we will give them some money and say "Do it." I think we ought to have those interested in the program come before the Committee on Appropriations in due course and before the Budget Bureau and make a case. I shall not make any further statement. If the distinguished chairman of the committee, the Senator in charge of the bill, wishes to modify his amendment to make the figure read "$50,000" and permit us to go to conference with that figure, very well. But I believe the record should be made, and I have tried to make it.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be modified so that the figure will be "$50,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], as modified.

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

FUNDS FOR REHABILITATION LOANS: THE WILL OF THE CONGRESS MUST NOT BE THWARTED

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I am about to do what is for me an unusual act. I shall offer an amendment for myself and the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] proposing an addition of $10 million to the supplemental bill. I shall ask that the amendment be stated, and when it has been stated, I shall suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Illinois will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 7, after line 15, it is proposed to insert the following:

REHABILITATION LOANS

For the revolving fund established pursuant to section 312(d) of the Housing Act of 1964 (Public Law 88-560), including necessary administrative expenses, $10,000,000.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I am about to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his request?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I withhold the request.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As one member of the committee, I shall be glad to take the amendment to conference because I believe it is along the right lines. A loan program rather than a grant, has been proposed, and it is intended for rehabilitation of homes and businesses in urban renewal areas and not new construction.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the Housing Act of 1964 contained an authorization of $50 million for a program of direct loans by the Housing and Home Finance Agency to rehabilitate homes and small businesses in urban renewal areas. Section 312 of that bill would authorize 3-percent loans with a maximum maturity of 20 years to help save the so-called gray areas, or the deteriorating areas in the Nation's towns and cities. Let me say that the program was originally proposed by Representative WIDNALL, of New Jersey, and other Republicans on the House Banking and Currency Committee. I think it is one of the most constructive suggestions which have been made in the field of housing in a great many years and Congressman WIDNALL is deserving of great praise. He has been very constructive throughout and has shown public spirit of the highest order.

The housing bill which the Congress enacted contained this new rehabilitation loan proposal. I have pointed out that it is vital that an effective rehabilitation loan program be implemented since the existing rehabilitation programs have not been fully successful.

Mr. President, the situation that we have faced has been roughly as follows: Areas are allowed to deteriorate because the owners and occupants do not have the money to rehabilitate the buildings in which they live. Because we do not have adequate programs to rehabilitate these areas, they continue to slide rapidly downhill until they are marked for bulldozing under the urban renewal program. In too many cases the families and small businesses in these areas are forced to relocate elsewhere because large numbers of high-rent dwelling and business units are constructed on the site which has been cleared with Federal grant funds.

This new loan program would prevent the bulldozing of areas suitable for rehabilitation and would permit individuals owning property in those areas to preserve them so they would not have to be completely bulldozed and destroyed.

The members of the Banking and Currency Committee who were conferees on the housing bill strongly supported the new loan program and the conference report drew attention to it. When the President signed the bill on the second of September, he specifically endorsed this new loan program. The President said:

> The plight of property owners in urban renewal areas is recognized in this measure. Provision is made so that they can rehabilitate their homes and businesses instead of having to move from the path of the bulldozers.

In spite of the strong support from the President and Congress, apparently the Budget Bureau has been opposing any formal request for funds to implement the program. Therefore the question of funding this program was not raised in the Appropriations Committee during its consideration of the supplemental bill. I have a generally high opinion of the work of the Budget Bureau. I think a majority of the staff is made up of devoted public servants. But there is a tendency on the part of certain officials who have bureaucratic views to become infuriated at congressional proposals or new ideas generated by the Congress.

The Budget Bureau, in this instance, reminds me of the cruel Marshall Davoust, one of Napoleon's generals. Passing down the lines of his troops for review, Davoust screamed in fury "They breathe." Angered that they should show signs of animation, Davoust tore out from their roots the mustaches of several of his grenadiers.

The Bureau of the Budget appears to have been behaving in a similar fashion over the initiative of Congress in developing good housing programs. It is time it was put in its place. It should be "on tap" but not "on top."

This is a proposal joined in by the Republicans and the Democrats. I am glad in this case our distinguished friend from New York, Senator JAVITS, is a cosponsor.

I think it is about time that we in the Congress assert our rights when the Bureau of the Budget stands in the way of programs, when the Bureau tries to impose bureaucratic opposition not only against Congress but a program which the President of the United States has endorsed.

It is perhaps unusual for me to be proposing an additional $10 million of expenditures, but in this case I feel that it is imperative that the will of Congress be expressed vigorously. I hope that this amendment will be accepted.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I should like to support very strongly the comments just made by the Senator from Illinois. I am a member of the Subcommittee on Housing. I was a conferee on the Housing Act of 1964. Everything which the Senator from Illinois has just said is entirely correct.

The new program, which was originated in the Congress, was approved by the conferees, in specific language authorizing appropriations of $50 million for these loans. The conferees stated that the Housing Administration should seek the appropriation of the full amount authorized for this urgently needed program.

As the Senator from Illinois pointed out, on September 2 the President of the United States gave personal endorsement to this program when he pointed out the plight of property owners in urban renewal areas and when he said the provision was needed to help people rehabilitate their homes and businesses instead of having to remove them from the path of the bulldozer.

In view of this, I am astounded by the action of the Bureau of the Budget. I can only conclude that the original program eminating from Congress, which under the Constitution is supposed to initiate legislation—and every now and then we do—was thought to be inadequate and improper. In this case this initiation was very much to the credit of the Congress.

I hope the amendment can be approved by the chairman of the subcommittee. At the risk of having him become impatient, which I hope I shall not do, I should like to take another minute to say that the Bureau of the Budget and the House conferees deserve equal condemnation.

I invite the attention of my friend from New York and my friend from Illinois to title VIII of the Housing Act, which deals with training and fellowship programs. The first part of title VIII, which was put in at the expense of a good deal of blood, sweat, and tears, calls for Federal-State training programs for the purpose of training individuals who are in short supply for the operation for various provisions of the Housing Act for which it is intended to enlist Federal support and aid.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator from Rhode Island is very sympathetic and amenable to the argument being made by the Senator from Pennsylvania. I suppose the same objection could be raised to that statement as could be raised to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois, but inasmuch as the amendment of the Senator from Illinois is a suggestion to the members of the Appropriations Committee, I think we have a slightly different situation. I assure the Senator from Pennsylvania that when we return in January there will be another supplemental appropriation bill, if we cannot wait for the regular subcommittee to consider the matter by that time. I hope the committee can go into this matter quite thoroughly. It is not because the Senator from Rhode Island is afraid of the amendment, but might raise some objections that might not only delay, but injure this measure if we adopted it.

Mr. CLARK. I am in deep sympathy with the position of the Senator from Rhode Island. As was suggested informally a minute or two ago, it is really my fault, and that of several other members of the Housing Subcommittee, that this matter was not called to his attention before the hearings on the appropriation bill were concluded. I only ask the Senator from Rhode Island to be patient——

Mr. PASTORE. I am very patient. I have all day.

Mr. CLARK. In perhaps 5 minutes I can place in the RECORD what the Bureau of the Budget, and to some extent the House Appropriations Committee, have done to programs that were authorized by the Congress which are not being implemented by appropriations. I do not intend at this time to offer an amendment to remedy it, but I wish to have the RECORD contain a statement now so that when we come back next year the Bureau of the Budget, the administration, and the Appropriations Committees may be advised of the views of some of us, and I think the majority of us, on the Housing Committee. I return to title 8 of the Housing Act, training and fellowship programs. The purpose is as stated in section 801(a):

> The Congress finds that the rapid expansion of the Nation's urban areas and urban population has caused severe problems in urban and suburban development and created a national need to (1) provide special training in skills needed for economic and efficient community development and (2) support research in new or improved methods of dealing with community development problems.

The section continues:

> It is the purpose of this part to assist and encourage the States, the cooperation with public or private universities and colleges and urban centers, to (1) organize, initiate, develop, and expand programs which will provide special training in skills needed for economic and efficient community development to those technical and professional people who are, or are training to be, employed by a governmental or public body which has responsibilities for community development; and (2) support State and local research that is needed in connection with housing programs and needs.

To implement that part, the Housing and Home Finance Administration requested $5,075,000 which would be used to match grants by States to train planners, professionals, and research people who are in short supply in the general area of housing and home finance, urban renewal, community development, and the like.

This entire amount was stricken out of the bill by the House Appropriations Committee. I regret that some of us were not sufficiently alert to request the Senate Appropriations Committee to restore the amount.

I should like to make it clear now that a number of us on the Housing Subcommittee will request that this amount be restored to the appropriation bill when the supplemental bill comes before the Senate next year.

Perhaps significantly—and I see the Senator from Alabama on the floor at this time—part 2 of title VIII of the act reads:

> PART 2—FELLOWSHIPS FOR CITY PLANNING AND URBAN STUDIES
>
> SEC. 810. (a) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $500,000 annually, for a three-year period commencing on July 1, 1964, to be used by the Housing and Home Finance Administrator for the purpose of providing fellowships for the graduate training of professional city planning and urban and housing technicians and specialists as herein provided. Persons shall be selected for such fellowships solely on the basis of ability and upon the recommendation of the Urban Studies Fellowship Advisory Board established pursuant to subsection (b). Fellowships shall be solely for training in public and private nonprofit institutions of higher education having programs of graduate study in the field of city planning or in related fields (including architecture, civil engineering, economics, municipal finance, public administration, and sociology), which programs are oriented to training for careers in city and regional planning, housing, urban renewal, and community development.

This provision was not in the administration bill. Therefore, the appropriation request was eliminated by the Bureau of the Budget. It is a relatively small amount, $500,000 a year for 3 years.

Urban renewal planning experts and city planners are in desperately short supply, as every Senator who follows these matters in his own urban community knows.

I ask the Senator from Alabama if I am not correct in saying that he and I tried for 6 or 7 years to get this provision into the housing bill, and that at long last we succeeded in getting it into the bill this year. The House accepted the provision, the bill was passed, and the President signed it. Now the Bureau of the Budget says we cannot have any money to implement it.

I thank my friend from Rhode Island for his patience in this regard; and I say to him that this is something that we will bring before him next year. It is our fault that we did not get to him earlier this year.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, the Senator's statement about our working on this problem is correct. It passed the Senate on two separate occasions, but the conferees on the House side in past years declined to accept it.

Finally, this time we got it all the way through. I trust that in the coming year the Bureau of the Budget will make allowances for this fine program.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President——

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, may I speak for 2 minutes with the Senator's indulgence? I must leave to attend a conference committee meeting.

Mr. JAVITS. I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator without losing my right to the floor. I am always glad to yield to the Senator from Alabama.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I am pleased that this discussion has taken place. The housing bill that was passed this year is not a big bill, but it is one of the best bills that we have ever had. There are some very good features in it.

The feature which has been discussed by the Senator from Pennsylvania is one of them. The subject matter of the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Illinois is a very fine program.

After the House had passed the supplemental bill I had occasion to discuss this subject briefly with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], and I found him quite friendly. The Senate committee did a very good job in restoring some of the money.

I can understand this item being left out, because there was no budget provision for it. However, I believe it is a good program. It is one that both Houses of Congress decided ought to be put into effect. I believe that when a program such as this is enacted by Congress, steps should be taken to implement the program. I am very glad that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] has offered his amendment. I trust that the Senate will approve it.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator from Alabama for his support. I shall be very brief.

I am honored to join with the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] in the sponsorship of this amendment. I am delighted by the support which it has aroused.

Representative WIDNALL and other Representatives thought up this idea for the first time, and had it enacted into law. They brought it into being by a show of great creativity. It seems to me that when Congress originates something, it is entitled to as much good faith and support as something that the Executive thinks up. That is the genius of our American system. It is a part of our bipartisan approach to matters like housing, civil rights, and other measures. When the initiative comes from the minority side, it is very generous of those in the majority to accept it. We would be penalizing, not rewarding, initiative if we did not approve the amendment, as I hope the Senate will do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I call up an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 22, line 18, it is proposed to strike out "$1,500,000" and insert "$2,500,000".

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the amendment would restore the appropriation for the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission to the figure of $2.5 million, as provided by the House. I should like to explain to my friend from Rhode Island why I have done this. I have gone over the material which was offered to the Appropriations Committee in substantiation of this appropriation. I should like to call that material to the Senator's attention, so that he will see what I am aiming at.

The Commission has not been appointed. That is the situation we face. Nonetheless, the President has authorized the Secretary to ask for an appropriation on the ground that the Commission would be appointed and its work would have to go forward. The appropriation is intended not only to cover the work of the Federal Commission, but also the work in this field of 22 States. That is one thing we did not cover in the colloquy we had earlier today.

There are 22 States which have fair employment laws. Those 22 States were represented in the request for the appropriation, as it was considered in the other body, by $900,000 of the $2.5 million which was provided. At the very least, we ought to know whether the cut of a million dollars means that there will be no State work. That is the first question.

Secondly, I should like to address myself to my colleagues in the Senate, not in any adversary sense, but in a sense of deepest communion of interest.

We have passed a historic bill, the Civil Rights Act of 1964. One of the key provisions in the act is the equal employment opportunity provision. We established a Commission, heavily charged with the responsibility for arriving at a solution with respect to this matter. Everyone knows that this is a very difficult and trying problem.

The President first asked for $2.5 million in order to establish the Commission and give it an opportunity to begin to do something for this first year. But the first thing we do in the Senate, notwithstanding what the House did, is to cut the amount 40 percent. Everyone who reads about this will have the right to ask, "What happened? Can we not even allow this very modest sum of money, which the House was willing to allow, to permit a critically important activity to start?"

No Member of the Senate is more vigorous in the cause I have set forth than is the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE]. That is equally true of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]. But they themselves were caught, as I have been caught, in the committee deliberations, where there is give and take, and where it is necessary to get to the end of business, where it is necessary to turn out a big bill.

The Senator from Rhode Island has a great responsibility. Sitting with his head in his hands, I know he wishes that he could be doing what I am doing. He wishes he could be doing exactly what I am doing—raising a question which is as deep in his heart as it is in mine. But he is in charge of the bill. I understand that only too well. I would do the same thing. If the Senator from Rhode Island should rise and vigorously oppose me, I would still affirm what I know to be the case.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. I shall not oppose the Senator. I could not in good conscience vote against the amendment if it came to a vote. I am not bound by the action of the committee. It is true that I am in charge of the bill. I hope that the bill will be preserved as it was reported by the committee, for the reasons I have given. But if there is any deficiency, we can add to the amount later. I quite agree with everything the Senator from New York has said. But the bill will go to conference. In all probability the proposal will be opposed by the Senator from Massachusetts.

I tell the Senator from New York frankly that I was called to the White House for luncheon at the time this item was voted upon. I regret that very much, because had I been in committee at the time, I would have made the argument that is being made by the distinguished Senator from New York on the floor of the Senate today.

But I hope that after he has made his case, he will be willing to leave it to us to consider in conference. This item was allowed in toto by the House. The House allowed all the civil rights items in toto. But this one was cut. The Senator has explained why, in all probability, it might have been cut.

But after he has made his argument in support of his amendment, I hope that he will leave the amendment for future deliberation. I think we would reach a more practical solution and perhaps a more favorable result.

If there is to be a yea-and-nay vote, I should dislike very much to have this amendment defeated, because then we might not have the latitude and flexibility we would want to have in conference. That is the only appeal I make to the Senator. I cannot refute or dispute anything he has said, because he has spoken from his heart, and in doing so has echoed what is in mine.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I shall not withdraw the amendment. If it is defeated on a yea-and-nay vote, or even if the amount is not cut $1 million, I believe it is time for the Senate to face its responsibility for the things it does. We fought, we bled, and nearly died on the floor of the Senate for months to pass the Civil Rights Act of 1964. No sooner have we passed it, and no sooner has it become law, than again the opponents of that measure concentrate upon us, and we are cut down. For what? A million dollars—and this Government spends $100 billion a year.

I am not running for anything. I do not know whether I will run for anything. But one thing I know: I am here to do my duty. I am here to see to it that the Senate faces its conscience. It is outrageous that the Senate should cut an appropriation like this by $1 million, after all we went through to pass the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and after the House has passed a bill to provide $2.5 million. Now the Senate is haggling about a $2.5 million provision for such an item as this.

The Senator from Rhode Island has just spoken with me. In order to bring the debate to a conclusion—because I am not silly or stiff necked about it; I just do not feel we ought to allow this cut under these circumstances—I understand that it may be agreeable to the committee to accept a figure of $2 million.

Mr. PASTORE. I have already discussed the proposal with the Senator from Massachusetts, who reduced the amount in committee. He is amenable to an increase of $500,000. If that is agreed upon by all concerned, I am perfectly willing to accept it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In committee, there was a strong argument against making any appropriation for this purpose. An amendment was made to reduce the amount to $500,000. A motion was then made to increase it to $1.5 million. That amount was unanimously adopted by the committee.

This is one of the most important parts of the whole Civil Rights Act. I am heartily in favor of it. But I believe this proposal was agreeable to the committee as a whole.

I am perfectly willing to join the Senator from Rhode Island in taking to conference an additional amount of $500,000, to see what can be done.

Mr. JAVITS. In view of the principle that is being established, a principle for which I have just been arguing, and that, I repeat, is just as deep in the hearts of the Senator from Rhode Island and the Senator from Massachusetts, and in the hearts of all other Members of the Senate who are in the Chamber, as it is in mine, I modify my amendment to make the increase $500,000 instead of $1 million, so as to make the total amount $2 million.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment of the Senator from New York.

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. JAVITS. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, it is with great pleasure and satisfaction that I speak today on the Senate floor in support of funds to implement the urban mass transportation bill which was signed into law only a little less than 3 months ago.

Many of us in Congress have worked and fought for years to establish this program and it is indeed gratifying to help approve the funds that are needed to start the grants and loans moving into the urban areas where this mass transit assistance is so desperately needed.

My colleagues know how critical the commutation problem is in New York City and the surrounding areas.

Financial assistance for the New Haven Railroad, to defray some of the large cost of replacing obsolete equipment and facilities or to help pay for a special project to provide more efficient and more comfortable commuter services can be a great help and give us a chance to prevent the further deterioration of the essential passenger services this railroad provides.

Also in Connecticut, Hartford, New Haven, Bridgeport, New Britain, and other cities are trying to cope with difficult transportation problems. Some Federal assistance under this program could make all the difference in the world in getting these and other medium-sized and small cities throughout the country started in the direction of solving their mass transit problems.

Sixty million dollars in grants and five million dollars in loans, as provided for in the Senate version of the supplemental appropriations bill, is not enough money so that every urban area in need of help will receive it.

Not even the House figures of $75 million in grants and $2.5 million in loans would permit this.

But I am confident that areas where the situation is especially acute, such as I have described in my State, will be among the first to qualify for assistance.

This year the Federal Government has finally given official recognition to the fact that the 70 percent of the American people who live in urban areas have urgent mass transportation problems.

Final approval of this appropriations bill will set into motion the program which can help meet our responsibilities in this important area.

THE DIXIE PROJECT FUNDS URGENTLY NEEDED

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I once again voice my complete and enthusiastic support of the Dixie project in Washington County, Utah, and call the Senate's attention to the urgent need to commence construction of this vital reclamation project at the earliest possible date. The Senate Appropriations Committee in the supplemental appropriations bill wisely added $364,000 to the House-passed bill to complete the final plans preparatory to commencement of construction of the Dixie project. This is the amount which the Bureau of Reclamation has advised me can be profitably used this year, and which will save a full year's time in getting the Dixie project underway.

Congress this year approved legislation, of which I was a sponsor, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Dixie project, Utah.

AVOID DELAY

We, in Utah, are very concerned about getting the project underway as soon as possible, and the sum of $364,000 is needed this fiscal year to enable the Bureau of Reclamation to complete the definite plan report on the project and other final details. This would advance preconstruction work to the point where actual construction can commence the following fiscal year. The inclusion of funds now will thus advance the project a full year.

Time is of the essence. The towns of southern Utah are undergoing a period of transition and reappraisal. Modern interstate highways are already bypassing communities whose lack of water and many natural resources has forced them to lean heavily on the tourist trade.

The climate of the Dixie project area is arid, with rainfall averaging about 8 inches a year, and an adequate and dependable water supply for irrigation and for municipal use is its paramount need. The unregulated waters of the Virgin and Santa Clara Rivers present the area with extreme drought conditions some years. Yet, at times periodic flash floods destroy crops and wash away valuable farmlands.

KEY TO FUTURE GROWTH

Development of water storage facilities in the Dixie project area will provide for the conservation and orderly release of water that is now wasted in floods. The project also will permit the conservation of those portions of normal flows which are in excess of immediate requirements for irrigation and other purposes.

The Dixie project would bring the assurance of plentiful water, electric power, recreation resources, and other values to the area. It will serve as the foundation for a revitalized and modernized agricultural development and will permit local industry and population growth. The future of the entire area is dependent upon the Dixie project.

The Dixie project is a proposed multiple-purpose water resource development in the Virgin River Basin in southwestern Utah. By regulation of flows of the Virgin River and its tributary, the Santa Clara River, the project would provide supplemental irrigation water to 9,455 acres of presently developed land and a full water supply for 11,615 acres of new land. The city of St. George would be provided with 5,000 acre-feet of water annually for municipal and industrial purposes. Construction of three powerplants would produce about 44,500,000 kilowatt-hours of firm electric energy and about 1,900,000 kilowatt-hours of secondary energy for sale annually. In addition, there would be minor flood control benefits, as well as fish, wildlife, and recreation benefits.

The major benefits of the project, of course, would accrue to Washington County, Utah's Dixie, in which the main facilities will be located.

Cedar City, in Iron County, will also be benefited through an amendment which points out the already existing contractual arrangement under which the Cedar City area would receive 8,000 acre-feet of water annually. This language was written so that Cedar City's citizens would be fully protected.

LOCAL PEOPLE UNITED IN SUPPORT

During the course of the hearings on the Dixie project, it was repeatedly illustrated that the people of Utah are united in their earnest desire to see the Dixie project built after it has been under study by the Bureau of Reclamation since at least 1918. It was only World War II which blocked much earlier construction of the project at a cost that would have been but a relatively small fraction of the burdens that the people of Utah's Dixie are willing to undertake today so that the project may become a reality. In order to make the project economically feasible, the local people have agreed to impose an almost unprecedented high tax burden of 5 mills to repay their share of the costs. In addition, they have established the Washington County Water Conservancy District to demonstrate their full backing of the project. The project costs will be repaid with interest in 50 years. It is economically sound, having a cost-benefit ratio of 2.2 to 1.

The need for the project is urgent. With the sum of $364,000, all preconstruction planning and studies can be completed and construction commenced without delay.

I again thank the committee for approving my request. I urge the Senate to approve it today and hope it will be approved in the joint Senate-House conference committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H.R. 12633) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments and request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer (Mr. Nelson in the chair) appointed Mr. Pastore, Mr. Holland, Mr. Hayden, Mr. Russell, Mr. Ellender, Mr. McClellan, Mr. Monroney, Mr. Bartlett, Mr. Young of North Dakota, Mr. Saltonstall, Mr. Mundt, and Mrs. Smith conferees on the part of the Senate.

FOREIGN AID AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1965

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1545, H.R. 11812.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (H.R. 11812) making appropriations for foreign assistance and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. **MANSFIELD.** Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. **PASTORE.** Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** (Mr. NELSON in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. **PASTORE.** Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from Rhode Island will state it.

Mr. **PASTORE.** What is the pending business?

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The foreign aid appropriations bill.

Mr. **PASTORE.** Mr. President, the foreign aid and related agencies appropriation bill for fiscal year 1965, which is now before the Senate, recommends appropriations of new obligational authority in the amount of $3,712,077,000. This amount is $246,300,000 below the budget estimate and it is $27,172,400 under the amount appropriated by the House.

In reporting this bill to the Senate, the committee was faced with the fact that an authorization bill for the foreign aid program—title I—had not been enacted into law and precise figures of authorization were not available. For title I, the committee has followed the lead of the Senate and has recommended an appropriation of $3.3 billion, the amount of the authorization bill as it passed the Senate. The authorization bill when it is enacted will authorize funds for the fiscal year 1965 and the committee recognizes that should it exceed the appropriations in this bill, there will remain balances which have been authorized but not appropriated.

A summary of the bill, included on page 2 of the committee's report to the Senate, sets out the comparisons of the three titles of the bill, including the budget estimates, the bill as it passed the House, and the amount recommended by the Senate committee. I ask unanimous consent to have this table printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Summary of the bill

Title	Item	Budget estimates	Bill as it passed House	Recommended by Senate Committee	Increase (+) or decrease (−) Senate bill compared with—	
					Budget estimate	Bill as it passed House
I	Foreign assistance	$3,516,700,000	$3,316,572,400	$3,300,000,000	−$216,700,000	−$16,572,400
II	Foreign assistance (other)	441,677,000	422,677,000	412,077,000	−29,600,000	−10,600,000
III	Export-Import Bank of Washington (limitation)	(1,353,841,000)	(1,353,841,000)	(1,353,841,000)	--------	--------
		3,958,377,000	3,739,249,400	3,712,077,000	−246,300,000	−27,172,400

Mr. **PASTORE.** Mr. President, I might point out that approximately 90 percent of the amounts appropriated in the bill is carried in title I of the bill under the hearing of "Foreign Assistance." For this purpose for fiscal year 1965, the committee has recommended a total of $3,300 million which is $300 million more than the $3 billion of new obligational authority made available in fiscal year 1964.

Though Congress had made only $3 billion of new obligational authority available for fiscal year 1964, because of the reappropriation of unobligated balances, the reimbursements and receipts brought into the various appropriations in title I, and the authority granted to the Agency for International Development to reobligate funds derived from deobligations and decommitments, it was possible for AID to carry out a foreign aid program aggregating approximately $3,650 million in fiscal year 1964.

For fiscal year 1965, the amount of $3,300 million recommended by the committee will fund a program totaling $3,463,800,000 which is approximately $185 million less than the foreign aid program for fiscal year 1964.

Mr. President, to get a true comparative picture of the size of our foreign aid program, it is essential to look not only at the amount of new obligational authority appropriated by Congress, but also to the unobligated balances, the reimbursements and receipts, and the deobligated funds which are available to AID for reobligation. A much more meaningful picture is vividly portrayed in the table appearing on page 5 of the committee's report, wherein the actual amounts obligated in fiscal year 1964, the program requirements of the program for fiscal year 1965, and the program approved in House and Senate bills are set forth. Mr. President, I believe this table should also appear in the RECORD, and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Summary of title I of the bill

Item	Fiscal year 1964 obligations	Fiscal year 1965 program			Increase (+) or decrease (−) Senate bill compared with—	
		Submitted to Congress	Approved by House	Recommended by Senate	Fiscal year 1965 program submitted to Congress	House bill
Economic assistance:						
Technical cooperation and development grants	$211,759,759	$234,800,000	$220,800,000	$220,800,000	−$14,000,000	--------
American schools and hospitals abroad	20,700,000	18,000,000	19,200,000	18,000,000	--------	−$1,200,000
Surveys of investment opportunities	1,100,310	2,400,000	2,900,000	2,400,000	--------	−500,000
International organizations and programs	116,336,227	134,400,000	134,272,400	134,272,400	−127,600	--------
Supporting assistance	364,375,971	418,600,000	422,600,000	418,600,000	--------	−4,000,000
Contingency funds	108,173,666	150,000,000	150,800,000	150,000,000	--------	−800,000
Alliance for Progress:						
Inter-American social and economic cooperation program	135,000,000	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------
Technical cooperation and development grants	89,586,845	88,000,000	88,300,000	88,000,000	--------	−300,000
Development loans	469,517,879	482,300,000	435,000,000	435,000,000	−47,300,000	--------
Development loans	845,240,761	960,200,000	807,200,000	798,727,600	−161,472,400	−8,472,400
Administrative expenses:						
AID	54,028,274	53,500,000	54,800,000	53,500,000	--------	−1,300,000
State	2,715,304	2,900,000	2,900,000	2,900,000	--------	--------
Subtotal, economic assistance	2,418,534,996	2,545,100,000	2,338,772,400	2,322,200,000	−222,900,000	−16,572,400
Military assistance	1,231,763,647	1,215,000,000	1,141,600,000	1,141,600,000	−73,400,000	--------
Total, economic and military assistance	3,650,328,643	3,760,100,000	3,480,372,400	3,463,800,000	−296,300,000	−16,572,400

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield at that point for a very brief statement by me, because I am in conference and must return there immediately?

Mr. PASTORE. I am delighted to yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Rhode Island.

As the Senator from Rhode Island and other members of the Appropriations Committee know, I do not favor an appropriation bill for foreign aid of more than $3 billion. I prefer one for $2.5 billion. Therefore, I wish to go on record as being against the conference report when it comes up.

I am fully aware of the problems which face the Senator from Rhode Island. I am also fully aware of the fact that I am in the minority, but I now incorporate by reference every argument which I have made in the many months passed against the foreign-aid program.

Next year, I hope that the administration will come to its senses and carry out what I am assured by some in the State Department will be a plan to propose some domestic reforms in the foreign-aid program. If, as, and when they do, I shall once again be supporting foreign aid, but not until then.

I wish the RECORD to show that I am against the recommendation of the Appropriations Committee. I appreciate the fact that the committee is bringing forth appropriations not in excess of the amount authorized by the Senate, but I was against that amount of authorization by the Senate. I voted against the authorization. I shall vote against the appropriation.

I thank the Senator from Rhode Island for yielding to me.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will my good friend the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] yield to me for just a moment, for a very brief statement?

Mr. PASTORE. I am happy to yield to the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I opposed the passage of the foreign aid authorization bill. I am also opposed to the passage of the appropriation for foreign aid.

I thank the Senator from Rhode Island for yielding to me.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be agreed to en bloc, and that the bill as thus amended be regarded as original text for the purpose of amendment; provided, that no point of order shall be considered to have been waived by reason thereof.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

On page 2, at the beginning of line 2, to strike out "Development grants" and insert "Technical cooperation and development grants".

On page 2, line 6, after "section 214(c)", to strike out "$18,000,000" and insert "$16,-800,000".

On page 2, line 8, after "section 232", to strike out "$2,100,000" and insert "$1,600,-000".

On page 2, line 12, after "section 402", to strike out "$405,000,000" and insert "$401,-000,000".

On page 2, line 14, after "section 451(a)", to strike out "$150,000,000" and insert "$149,-200,000".

On page 2, line 16, after "section 252", to strike out "$85,000,000" and insert "$84,700,000".

On page 2, line 21, after "section 202(a)", to strike out "$782,200,000" and insert "$773,727,600".

On page 3, line 2, after "section 637(a)", to strike out "$52,500,000" and insert "$51-200,000".

On page 4, line 10, after the word "projects", to insert "or programs".

On page 5, line 16, after the word "fund", to insert " "Alliance for Progress, development loans",".

On page 8, line 6, after the word "Any", to strike out "obligation" and insert "expenditure", and in line 14, after the word "not", to strike out "adversely affect the economy of the United States" and insert "result in adverse effects upon the economy of the United States or the industrial mobilization base which outweigh the economic or other advantages to United States of less costly procurement outside the United States".

On page 10, line 21, after the word "than", to strike out "$6,000,000" and insert "$15,-000,000".

On page 12, at the beginning of line 16, to strike out "$20,500,000" and insert "$20,-850,000".

On page 14, line 20, after "(5 U.S.C. 55a)", to strike out "$45,400,000" and insert "$34,-800,000 together with the unobligated balance of the appropriation under this head for the fiscal year 1964: *Provided*, That the final sentence in section 2(e) of the Migration and Refugee Assistance Act of 1962 is hereby repealed".

On page 19, after line 14, to insert a new section, as follows:

"SEC. 404. The appropriations, funds, other authorizations, and authority with respect thereto in this Act shall be available from October 1, 1964, for the purposes provided in such appropriations, funds, other authorizations, and authority. All obligations incurred during the period between September 30, 1964, and the date of enactment of this Act in anticipation of such appropriations, funds, other authorizations, and authority are hereby ratified and confirmed if in accordance with the terms thereof."

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, title I, which embraces the foreign assistance program, includes a total of 12 separate items. For the first of these items, "Technical Cooperation and Development Grants", the committee has allowed $220,800,000. This amount compares with $211,759,759 obligated in fiscal year 1964, and a program presented to Congress of $234,800,000. I point out that the funds appropriated hereunder are used principally to hire experts and technicians to help underdeveloped countries help themselves. Furthermore, these funds will permit countries, other than those located in Latin America—which are financed under a separate item in this bill—to train teachers, health workers, agricultural extension agents, and other skilled persons, all sorely needed to achieve economic progress in these countries.

The second item, "American Schools and Hospitals Abroad", will be fully financed for fiscal year 1965 by the $16,800,000 in new obligational authority, made available by the committee, and by the reappropriation of an unobligated balance amounting to $1,200,000, making a total of $18 million available for this program, the same amount as the budget estimate and $1,200,000 under the House allowance.

By far the greatest portion of the money appropriated for "American Schools and Hospitals Abroad," in fact exactly $10,500,000, will go to the Medical Center of the American University of Beirut to provide a modern patient care facility. When this sum is combined with the clinical teaching, research and outpatient facilities which were previously financed by a $5 million U.S. grant, there will be placed in being the most modern medical center in the Middle East. In addition to this very worthy project, $4,900,000 of the amount appropriated under this item will be allocated to a number of American schools and colleges located in various foreign countries. Furthermore, there is $1,500,000 appropriated under this title for assistance to Project Hope, and there will also be available $1,100,000 of local currency for the use of the American University in Cairo.

The third item comes under the heading of "Surveys of Investment Opportunities." For this item, the committee has recommended an apropriation of $1,600,000, which, together with $500,000 in newly determined unobligated carryover and $300,000 in estimated recoveries, will provide the financing of the full program of $2,400,000 requested by the administration.

While not requiring a great amount of funds, this is one of the most important programs operated in our foreign aid Program, because it encourages the entrance of private capital into the foreign assistance field. Under this program, the Agency for International Development may enter into agreements to pay up to one-half of the cost of investment surveys undertaken by prospective U.S. investors. If the survey results in an investment, the investor must bear the full cost of it. If, on the other hand, after a reasonable period of time, the prospective investor decides that the project is not one which warrants the taking of a risk, the Agency for International Development pays the agreed portion of the cost of the survey, takes title to it, and then makes it available to any other potential U.S. investor.

I should also add, Mr. President, that, during the course of the hearings on the bill, the committee was informed that this program is attracting increasing interest among prospective investors, and that it is definitely proving to be an effective instrument for the infusion of private investment in some of the underdeveloped countries.

The fourth item incorporated in title I of this bill is "International Organization and Programs." Under this item, funds are provided to permit the continued participation of the United States in the following United Nations and other international programs:

U.N. Expanded Program of Technical Assistance and Special Fund	$60,000,000
U.N. Technical and Operational Assistance to the Congo	5,000,000
U.N. Emergency Force (Near East)	850,000

U.N. Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees	16,000,000
U.N. Children's Fund	12,000,000
U.N. Food and Agricultural Organization World Food Program	2,300,000
International Atomic Energy Operational Program	1,000,000
Indus Basin Development Fund	37,000,000
International Peace Corps Secretariat	22,400

With the exception of the U.N. Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees, wherein the percentage of U.S. contribution totals 70 percent of the total amount contributed, the percentage of U.S. contribution for the other items funded under this title lies between 33⅓ and 40 percent of the total amount contributed by the various donors.

The next item in title I is "Supporting Assistance." For this item, the committee has recommended an appropriation of $401 million which, when added to the carryover of $17,600,000, makes a total of $418,600,000 available for obligation in fiscal year 1965, the same amount requested.

Supporting assistance is economic aid which is employed to advance U.S. national security and foreign policy objectives in those situations, where the basic economic conditions prevailing in the particular underdeveloped countries make the strict criteria for developmental type of assistance inapplicable. Most of the supporting assistance goes to countries where aid is needed to help establish the external and internal security which must precede meaningful economic and social development. The objective of supporting assistance is to move a country out of this aid category as rapidly as conditions within the country permit. Mr. President, there is no question that this objective has been effected in the past. This is evidenced by the continued reductions which have been made in the last few years in supporting assistance. Actually almost 85 percent of the funds appropriated under this title will be used in four countries, namely Vietnam, Korea, Laos, and Jordan. The remaining approximately 15 percent will be employed in nine other countries.

Over the past decade there have been three phases through which a number of countries have moved in recovering from political and/or military upheavals with external help. In the first phase, external security and a minimum of internal law and order are established. In the second, political and economic institutions are strengthened and the economy is stabilized. In the third, economic growth picks up speed and dependence on extraordinary assistance is steadily reduced and then eliminated.

Mr. President, good illustrations of countries which have moved from one phase to another are Greece and Taiwan. While these countries depended heavily upon supporting assistance in the past, they are no longer recipients of such aid. They have moved through the three phases to which I alluded, in a period spanning 8 to 10 years, and in the future, I feel confident that a number of countries presently receiving supporting assistance will emulate them.

For the next item in title I, namely the "Contingency Fund" the committee has recommended that the full amount of the budget estimate of $150 million, which is also the same amount allowed by the House Appropriations Committee, be appropriated for fiscal year 1965.

Mr. President, during the past few years, while the foreign assistance bill has been considered by Congress in both the authorization and appropriation stages, many attacks have been made upon the President's contingency fund. Many opponents of the foreign assistance program have felt that the contingency fund has been abused and misused by the administrators of the AID program. Mr. President, this just is not so.

The contingency fund is necessary for the successful attainment of the total objectives of the foreign assistance program. It is used to meet urgent and unforeseen assistance needs, or needs which could be defined with reasonable accuracy at the time the budget estimates were presented to the Congress. It is necessary for the contingency fund to be used in several different types of situations, and I would like to enumerate these.

First, there are the cases in which there is an urgent need to expand assistance to a country, the security of which is threatened by new or intensified Communist attack, threat, or subversion. Past examples of this type of use have occurred in both Laos and Thailand.

The second type of situation, and for which by far the most frequent use of the contingency fund is made is alleviated by the rendering to various nations on account of earthquakes, floods, or other disasters. Disasters in the very recent past, occasioning the use of the contingency fund to preserve the lives of countless people afflicted by disaster, have occurred in Yugoslavia and Trinidad-Tobago, in the aftermath of the Skopje earthquake and Hurricane Flora. While this is the most frequent use of the fund, the amount of funds employed for this purpose is far less than the amounts which are used in the other situations.

The third type of situation, wherein the contingency fund may be employed to further the U.S. national interest, is in those cases where unexpected economic or political crises occur, and where prompt economic aid—even though it may not meet the criteria of development assistance—must be used to protect both the short- and long-run U.S. interests in the country aided.

Thus, Mr. President, whether it be used for preventing Communist infiltration, to relieve the people afflicted by disaster, or to protect the short- and long-run U.S. interest in a particular country, there is no question but that a prompt and flexible U.S. response in meeting a legitimate assistance need has been attained through the use of the contingency fund. I submit, Mr. President, that the President of the United States needs the contingency fund which has served as the indispensable means to obtain these laudable objectives.

Under the Alliance for Progress, three different appropriation items were funded in the foreign aid appropriation bill for fiscal year 1964. These included $135 million which was made available for the inter-American social and economic cooperation program, more commonly known as the social program trust fund, $89 million plus for technical cooperation and development grants, and almost $470 million for development loans.

For fiscal year 1965, no funds are required for the social program trust fund, and thus, in the bill presently being considered by the Senate, only two appropriation items are funded under the Alliance for Progress; namely, technical cooperation and development grants in the amount of $88,300,000 and development loans in the amount of $435 million. Actually, in making available $88,300,000 for technical cooperation and development grants in Latin America, the committee has only appropriated a total of $84,700,000 in new obligational authority, which actually is a reduction of $300,000 under the House allowance. This reduction is made possible because, in its initial request, the administration contemplated a program requiring $85 million in so-called new funds, plus $3 million in carryover balances from fiscal year 1964 for a total program of $88 million. Subsequently it was made known at the hearings of the committee that this carryover balance will be increased to $3,300,000—an increase of $300,000 over the original estimate. This enabled the committee to appropriate new obligational authority of $84,700,000 which is $300,000 less than the new obligational authority requested and appropriated by the House.

I do not think it is necessary that I describe the technical cooperation program for Latin America, because earlier I defined it when I discussed the worldwide technical cooperation program. I do wish, however, to point out that the committee was very pleased to note that grants for capital items, which have been objected to by many of the committee members in the past, have been eliminated from this program, and for this worthy accomplishment, the committee, in its report, has commended the administrators of the Agency for International Development.

The other item in the Alliance for Progress program, development loans, has been funded by the committee by an appropriation amounting to $435 million, which is the same as the amount appropriated by the House, but it is $47,300,000 less than the budget estimate.

The Alliance for Progress record which has been written in fiscal years 1963 and 1964 makes it perfectly clear that the performance by the United States and Latin America requires mutual fulfillment of Alliance projects. Our aid to Latin America is going to those countries which are taking the necessary steps to effect social, land, and tax reforms, and which are employing the necessary self-help measures. While there is much to be done by many of the countries in Latin America along these lines, progress nevertheless has been and is being made.

Our development loan fund and our investment guarantee fund seek to encourage private entrepreneurs from both Latin America and the United States to invest in the countries to the south of us. To spur local investment, the Agency for International Development has invested to date $280 million in development banks in Latin America, which is providing capital for farm credit, for development of small business and industries, and for home building. While the road toward successful attainment of the goals sought by the Alliance for Progress is long and arduous, the objectives nevertheless are now in sight though they may be afar on the horizon.

Our development lending program in Latin America will continue to emphasize provision for further economic and social progress. It will continue to be a concentrated program in that 90 percent of development lending is proposed for six countries and the Central Economic Community. This program is getting the job done, and it deserves the continued unqualified approval of the Congress.

The next item funded under title I of the bill now before the Senate is the largest single item of economic assistance. It is the worldwide development loan program, which covers all of the underdeveloped countries of the world other than those in the southern half of our own Western Hemisphere. Initially the administration submitted a development loan program aggregating $960,200,000. To fund this program, the House approved a total of $807,200,000, made up of $782,200,000 in new funds, and $25 million in carryover and deobligated funds. The Senate Appropriations Committee has recommended $798,727,600 for this program for fiscal year 1965, which consists of $773,727,600 in new funds, plus $25 million of carryover and deobligated funds.

Everything I said about the development loan program for Latin America has equal applicability to the loan program conducted by the Agency for International Development in the rest of the world. While the loan program in Latin America is heavily concentrated in two countries, namely, Chile and Colombia, similar concentration is found in the worldwide development program in five countries, namely, India, Nigeria, Pakistan, Tunisia, and Turkey. In fact, Mr. President, 67 percent of the total of all development lending contemplated for fiscal year 1965 is going to be concentrated in these seven countries. The remaining 33 percent will be spread among 41 countries.

I would be remiss if I did not point out that the Agency for International Development does not go about helter-skelter disbursing money out of the two development loan funds. Actually the level of loan assistance proposed for a particular country is based on the country's overall balance of payments and investment needs—the extent to which these needs can be met from other sources and the effect that giving, or withholding, loans is likely to have on sound fiscal policies and self-help measures, as well as on the more specific ability of the country to prepare sound projects for loan financing. Primarily for these reasons, loan funds are heavily concentrated in the seven key countries previously mentioned as their importance and international development efforts merit our strong support.

The last two items funded under economic assistance, namely, administrative expenses for the Agency for International Development and administrative expenses to be reimbursed to the State Department, have been fully funded by the appropriations recommended by the committee.

For administrative expenses for the Agency for International Development, the committee recommends an appropriation of $51,200,000 which, though it is $1,300,000 under the House allowance, together with an unobligated balance of $2,300,000, which the committee has recommended be reappropriated, will fund the full program of $53,500,000 requested by AID.

The Agency for International Development requested $2,900,000 to finance the administrative expenses incurred by the State Department in connection with its responsibility in the administration of the Mutual Defense Control Act, and in support of the U.S. mission to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and the European regional operations. As just pointed out, the committee recommends that the full amount of this budget estimate be appropriated in this bill.

For the last item contained in title I of the bill, namely, military assistance, the committee recommends an appropriation of $1,055 million which is the same amount as the budget estimate and the amount allowed by the House.

In view of the grave threat of external aggression, as well as internal subversion, which faces the many nations of the world assisted by us under the military assistance program, I do not believe it is necessary for me to delineate for the Senate today why the committee appropriated this amount for military assistance. Nevertheless, I would like to point out that, in southeast Asia and the Far East, our military assistance program is of special importance for, as you well know, many of the countries in these areas face a carefully planned combination of subversion and outright attack. In South Vietnam, the intensified terrorist action has necessitated an upward revision by $125 million in the original budget request for economic and military assistance. Of this total increase of $125 million, $55 million is for the military assistance program and is included in the appropriation recommended by the committee.

I should also like to state that the military assistance program augments the security of the United States by helping to assure continued access to those oversea installations which are vital to the effective deployment of American military strength. Furthermore, I wish to emphasize that the military assistance program contributes in no small way to the attainment of the political objectives sought by the United States through its program of training in our country numerous present and future military leaders of various foreign nations.

Before proceeding to discuss the action taken by the committee in connection with title II of the bill, I would like briefly to discuss the language provisions incorporated in the bill which pertain solely to title I.

Most of the language provisions which have been included in the foreign assistance bill in prior years have been continued in the bill pending before the Senate by both the House and the committee.

Nevertheless, there were certain language provisions included by the House which your committee felt should be either deleted from the bill or modified. The language on page 4, lines 5 to 12 of the bill, which reads as follows: "Of the foregoing amounts for economic assistance, $300 million shall be available for obligation only through the apportionment review and approval procedure prescribed by law in such amounts and at such times as may be determined by the President in the national interest that funds otherwise available for the purposes of programs under this title are insufficient to meet the cost of additional authorized projects," has been amended by the committee by the addition of the words "or programs" after the words "projects" in order to clarify the amendment and make it parallel other sections of foreign aid legislation.

The executive branch had requested that this House amendment be deleted from the bill. However, it was the consensus of the committee that its inclusion afforded increased control of the program, and it merely perfected the House language.

For a number of years now the appropriations bill has contained language which has limited the amount of funds which may be available for obligation during the last month of the fiscal year to not more than 20 percent of any appropriation item, excepting therefrom both the Development Loan Fund and the contingency fund, since limitations on these two items are not considered to be plausible because of the nature of the appropriations. However, the Development Loan Fund appearing under the Alliance for Progress has been subject to the 20 percent. The committee felt that this fund should be placed on the same footing as the regular Development Loan Fund since, in substance, it is identical, and has included language making the Development Loan Fund of the Alliance for Progress also an exception to the 20 percent limitation clause.

Section 108 has been included in the bill for several years, and provides:

> Any obligation made from funds provided in this title for procurement outside the United States of any commodity in bulk and in excess of $100,000 shall be reported to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives at least twice annually: *Provided*, That each such report shall state the reasons for which the President determined, pursuant to criteria set forth in section 604(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, that foreign procurement will not adversely affect the economy of the United States.

Unfortunately, this language has not attained the goals it sought. Since its appearance in the bill, no reports have been submitted to Congress because of the determination of the administration that the language is not meaningful.

During the course of the hearings on the bill, Mr. Bell pointed out to the committee that, to state accurately the criteria set forth in section 604(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act, the words "adversely affect the economy of the United States" would have to be deleted, and the following words substituted therefor: "result in adverse effects upon the economy of the United States or the industrial mobilization base which outweigh the economic or other advantages to United States of less costly procurement outside the United States." Furthermore, he asked the committee to change the word "obligation" in the section to "expenditure" in order to make the reports hereunder more meaningful. The committee has amended section 108 of the bill accordingly.

Since fiscal year 1962, section 113, placing a limitation on the use of development grant funds for research purposes, has been included in the bill. This provision, which was included by the House, reads as follows:

> Of the funds appropriated or made available pursuant to this Act not more than $6,000,000 may be used during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, in carrying out section 241 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended.

This provision came into being a few years ago when development grant funds were initially used for research purposes. At that time there were some abuses which provoked some Members of the Congress and which brought this limitation provision into the bill.

The shortcomings and defects which harassed the research program in its incipient stage have now been eliminated, and the reason for this limitation no longer exists. Though it was not the consensus of the committee to completely eliminate this provision, it nevertheless increased the limitation to $15 million, the amount programed for research by the administration.

If we are to improve our foreign aid program, a sound research program is absolutely essential and it should not be weighted down by meaningless limitations. The foreign aid research program is directed toward a better understanding of the development processes, discovery of improved techniques, determination of the proper equipment and procedures in promoting development, and the improvement of methods to assist the results of AID project proposals. To obtain the best personnel for the research program, extensive use is made of expert consultants in other Government agencies and in the research community of our Nation.

I wish to emphasize another point. Even though the committee has provided the full amount of $15 million for research, Congress can be assured it will not result in any hasty or ill-considered pyramiding of research activities. The present control procedures insure a careful, solid, step-by-step growth in the AID research program based on a scrupulous, careful review of all proposals, and upon insistence on the same high standards of research which have led to high quality research results in practically all of our Government programs. In concluding my statement on this item, I may add that research and analysis proposals are screened on the basis of their relevance, importance, and scientific soundness, and are thoroughly checked to avoid any type of duplication.

Mr. President, I should like to turn to title II of the bill. This title includes appropriations for such related agencies as the Peace Corps; the Army administration of the Ryukyu Islands; assistance to refugees in the United States, administered by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; the migration and refugee assistance program, administered by the Department of State; and the funds appropriated to the President for the Inter-American Development Bank and for the International Development Association, commonly known as IDA.

For title II, a total of $412,077,000 has been recommended by the committee, and this amount is $10,600,000 less than the sum appropriated by the House, and $29,600,000 less than the budget estimate.

In the case of the Army administration of the Ryukyu Islands, the migration and refugee assistance administered by the Department of State, the increase of callable capital of the Inter-American Development Bank, and the fifth and final installment on our initial subscription to the International Development Association, the committee has recommended the same amounts as recommended by the House, and which are contained in the budget estimates.

However, in the case of the remaining items, the committee recommendations differ from both the House amount and the amount requested in the budget.

For the Peace Corps, the committee recommends an appropriation of $87,100,000, which is the same as the amount allowed in the House bill. In addition, the committee has concurred in the reappropriation of $17 million of unobligated balances approved by the House, thus making a total of $104,100,000 available for the Peace Corps for fiscal year 1965.

However, the committee has disagreed with the administrative expense limitation allowed by the House of $20,500,000 and has increased this amount to $20,850,000. While this increase in allowance for administrative expenses recommended by the committee over the amount allowed by the House is relatively small, it will insure that there be no downward adjustment from the 14,000 volunteer level which the Peace Corps is striving to reach by the time all of its 65 summer training programs have begun.

For assistance to refugees in the United States, the so-called Cuban refugee program, which is administered by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the committee has recommended an appropriation of $34,800,000. This amount is $10,600,000 under the House bill and the budget estimate.

Nevertheless, the amount allowed by the committee will provide full funding of the program requested by the administration. This is so because the committee has included language in the bill which will authorize the use of unobligated balances in the amount of $7,600,000 which, when added to the new obligational authority of $34,800,000 recommended by the committee, will finance a total program of $42,400,000 exclusive of the $3 million requested for contingencies. In its report, the committee has made it clear that, if contingencies develop in connection with the Cuban refugee program, a supplemental request can be considered at some future date.

Furthermore, in connection with the Cuban refugee program, the committee was concerned by a misunderstanding which developed last year and again this year in connection with the unobligated balances under this program. To avoid any future misunderstandings the committee has included language in the bill which, it is hoped, will make it very lucid that appropriations for the assistance of refugees programs are available for the year for which they are appropriated and do not remain available until expended.

Turning now to the final section of the bill, title III, which covers the Export-Import Bank of Washington, I report to the Senate that the committee has not recommended the appropriation of any new obligational authority for fiscal year 1965, because the Export-Import Bank is financed, not through the appropriation of new obligational authority but through direct borrowing from the U.S. Treasury.

Despite the fact that the Appropriations Committee cannot directly recommend the amount of obligational authority the Export-Import Bank should have in any year, it nevertheless has the duty to make recommendations placing ceilings on the bank's operational and administrative expenses. This has been done in title III of the bill, wherein the committee has concurred with the action taken by the House in, first, placing a limitation of $1,350,060,000 on the program for the Export-Import Bank for fiscal year 1965, and second, in limiting the administrative expenses to $3,781,000 for fiscal year 1965.

Mr. President, your Appropriations Committee has reported a good foreign aid bill. I invite attention of Senators to the additional facts covering this bill in particular and the foreign aid program in general.

The committee heard detailed testimony which was presented by Secretary of State Dean Rusk, Secretary of Defense McNamara, AID Administrator Bell, General Wood, the Director of military assistance program, and others on the bill. I believe they all made a good case of emphasizing the necessity for continuing our foreign aid program which, needless to say, has been a vital instrument of our foreign policy for many years. During the course of the hearings, considerable facts were brought to light. I should like to highlight some of them at this time.

Fifteen years ago, as much as 86 percent of foreign assistance was channeled into Western Europe and Japan. Today, those countries receive none of our economic aid and very little military aid, which, by the way, primarily derives from the pipeline of past appropriations. As warranted by changes in conditions and circumstances, economic aid has been directed to the underdeveloped countries of Latin America, Asia, and Africa, and military aid has been reserved primarily for those countries bordering the Communist bloc.

As late as 10 years ago, 60 percent of the aid program was utilized for military assistance; today the great bulk of the aid extended is economic. Just 5 years ago, more than half of the aid program was on a grant basis; today two-thirds of the aid assistance is financed by loans repayable, not in soft currencies, but in hard dollars. I could go on and on with other facts appearing in the 700 pages of hearings on each Senator's desk, but I have no intention of detaining the Senate any longer.

In concluding my remarks on the pending bill, economic AID dollars 5 years ago were expended in countries in which world prices were lowest, and less than half of the AID dollars were spent in the United States; but, for fiscal year 1964, more than 80 percent of the funds appropriated were committed to purchases of U.S. goods and services, and it is estimated that the percentage will be even higher for fiscal year 1965. In 1949 we were spending almost 2 percent of our gross national product for foreign assistance. The anticipated expenditures for fiscal year 1965 will be six-tenths of 1 percent of our gross national product. In 1949 foreign aid expenditures amounted to 11.5 percent of the Federal budget, and for the current fiscal year they are expected to be just 3.5 percent of this budget.

I wish to point out that the committee has also included in the bill a validating clause in order to avoid the necessity of passing another continuing resolution. This clause is included in section 404 of the bill and has also been incorporated on pages 16 and 17 of the committee's report on the bill. It reads as follows:

> SEC. 404. The appropriations, funds, other authorizations, and authority with respect thereto in this Act shall be available from October 1, 1964, for the purposes provided in such appropriations, funds, other authorizations, and authority. All obligations incurred during the period between September 30, 1964, and the date of enactment of this Act in anticipation of such appropriations, funds, other authorizations, and authority are hereby ratified and confirmed if in accordance with the terms thereof.

Once again, Mr. President, I urge the Senate to accept the bill reported by the committee.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I support the Senator from Rhode Island in relation to the foreign aid appropriation. I have a brief statement regarding the figures on what the committee has done.

I congratulate the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] for the excellent work and leadership he has given us in consideration of the foreign aid bill.

The Senate Committee on Appropriations held extensive hearings on this bill and has had the advantage of ample time to study both the recommendations on the authorization bill of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. We have also had time in which to evaluate the recommendations and report on this bill from the House Committee on Appropriations. The Senate Committee on Appropriations has followed the lead of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. The amounts recommended in this appropriation bill are consistent with the amounts in the Senate authorization bill.

I should like to highlight some of the financial aspects of the bill. The bill is about $200 million under the budget request but is the full amount voted in the Senate authorization bill. Last year, the new money voted by the Congress for title I was an even $3 billion, but this year's bill is smaller than last year's in granting permission for actual expenditures. There were larger carryover funds and unobligated balances last year, so that total obligations for fiscal year 1964 for title I were $3,650,328,643. When we add carried-over balances and anticipated recoupments totaling $163,800,000 to the recommended new money to be appropriated this year, the total is $3,463,800,000, which is almost $200 million less for expenditure this year than was obligated last year.

In short, the administration had requested funds for a program equal to last year's program and we have cut it by approximately $200 million. In reducing title I by $16 million below the House Appropriations Committee figure, the Senate committee had the advantage of acting later in time and, therefore, having before it the very latest figure on carryover funds and recoupments. The Senate has cut $8,472,400 under the House allowance for development loans, leaving a total of $798,727,600, of which $25 million is not new money but is the estimated total of carryover and deobligated funds.

The only other cut under the House Appropriations Committee figure is the item in title II for assistance to refugees in the United States, which are funds for the rehabilitation of Cubans in this country. We reduced the House figure by $10.6 million while at the same time reappropriating available funds totaling $7,600,000. Thus, the total reduction is $3 million and represents a sum which the committee was informed may not be needed for the various programs for Cuban refugees this year.

The several language provisions and changes in the bill were covered by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE]. I will just say here that I have studied these language provisions and agree to them. It has been an unusual sequence of events, wherein the House Appropriations Committee, and now the Senate Appropriations Committee, have acted prior to the issuance and approval of the conference report on the authorization bill. I believe, however, that this will do no harm in this instance, as the Senate Appropriations Committee action is within the bounds of both the Senate authorization bill and, of course, the higher House authorization bill. It closely reflects the action taken by the House Appropriations Committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask for its immediate consideration. My amendment would provide $12 million for development research during the fiscal year 1965.

In section 113 on page 10 of the bill, the House limited the amount for development research to $6 million. The Senate Appropriations Committee, on September 29, increased this sum to $15 million, which is the full amount of the budget estimate.

There is a good possibility that if this amendment is agreed to, it will be unnecessary for the foreign aid appropriation bill to be sent to conference since, to the best of my knowledge, the Senate amendments are agreeable to the House.

Should there be a need for a conference on this bill, the amount agreed to in conference for development research would undoubtedly be somewhere between $6 million and $15 million. With the $12 million I am proposing, the administration will have twice as much as they would have had in the House bill, and I believe that this is a reasonable compromise.

When the bill was reported, there were discussions with the chairman of the subcommittee—that is the Representative who managed the bill on the floor of the House, Representative J. VAUGHAN GARY.

He advised me that if we reduced the limitation to $12 million, there would be a strong possibility that the House might accept the Senate bill without a conference.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, would the Senator agree to the figure $10 million instead of $12 million?

Mr. PASTORE. I do not believe I have that authority in view of what has transpired. I believe that it ought to remain at $12 million. I have had discussions with Mr. Bell. Mr. Bell stated that he could go along with the figure of $12 million. I am afraid that if we cut it any further, we would have to negotiate.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I was in favor of $6 million. But, if the bill would be passed at $12 million, and be acceptable without a conference, I agree.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 10, line 21, in the amendment of the committee, it is proposed to strike out "$15,000,000" and insert "$12,000,000".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the senior Senator from Rhode Island to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I did not know that the foreign assistance appropriation bill would come up so quickly. I have just returned from lunch and I will need a few moments to present my amendment. I hope that I may be allowed the necessary time to prepare my presentation to the Senate.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk to reduce the appropriation for the contingency fund by $50 million.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed, on page 2, line 14, to strike out "$149,200,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$99,200,000".

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I am disappointed with the bill reported by the Appropriations Committee, and I would like to see reductions made in the bill of $500 million. However, I am aware of the adjournment drive that is presently on, and I will not place obstacles in the path of the "adjournment express" because we have been in session long enough. Therefore, Mr. President, the sole amendment that I have offered provides that the contingency fund be funded with $100 million for fiscal year 1965 instead of the $150 million provided by the committee. To give the Agency an amount greater than this would amount to Congress condoning the countless misuses and abuses that have been made of this fund not only during the past year but ever since it was established 6 years ago.

Mr. President, permit me to cite some of the most recent abuses of the contingency fund:

As of April 30, 1964, just 2 months before the end of the fiscal year 1964, there was obligated out of the contingency fund a total of only $7,907,000.

There was available in the contingency fund for obligation during fiscal year 1964, a total of $184,774,000. Thus, there was still available for obligation as of April 30, just 2 months before the end of the fiscal year, approximately $177 million. During the last 2 months of this fiscal year all but $746,000 of the $184 million was obligated.

Mr. President, in this connection, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point exhibits A and B which were prepared by the Agency for International Development and which substantiate the facts I have just presented.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXHIBIT A

Mutual defense and development program—Uses of the contingency fund, fiscal year 1964

[In thousands of dollars]

Country	Amount programed as of May 20, 1964	Amount obligated as of Apr. 30, 1964	Purpose
Far East:			
Laos	7,325	6,233	Air support costs and subsistence and other commercial consumables.
Thailand	485	100	Cost of transportation, essential spare parts, installation, maintenance, and operation of a U.S. Army portable radio transmitter lent to the Thai Government.
Vietnam	21,500	10	Funds required for procurement of essential commodities under the commodity impact program and for the counterinsurgency program, and for a counterinsurgency project.
Latin America:			
Bolivia	4,450		For expenses deferred when emergency expenses arising from a crisis in the national tin mines were financed.
Panama	3,150	105	Budgetary support and architectural and engineering services shortfall for school construction.
U.N. peacekeeping, Cyprus	424		For contribution to the special fund established by the Secretary General of the United Nations for support of a UN peacekeeping force on Cyprus.
Disaster relief, worldwide	4,079	1,459	For the relief of victims of natural disasters and civil strife.
Total	41,413	7,907	

Uses of the contingency fund, fiscal year 1964—detail of amounts programed for disaster relief, worldwide, as of May 20, 1964

[In thousands of dollars]

Country	Purpose	Amount
Under Ambassador's authority:		
Costa Rica	Flood	10
Dominican Republic	Hurricane	1
Fiji Islands	Flood	10
India	Kashmir earthquake	5
Italy	Bellino Dam break	5
Libya	Flood	10
Martinique	Hurricane Edith	10
Nepal	Smallpox epidemic	1
Pakistan	Cyclone	10
Tanganyika	Earthquake	10
Thailand	Lopburi locust infestation	5
Reserve		53
Under AID/W approvals:		
Brazil	Bahia flood	20
Costa Rica	Volcano and flood	3,000
Cyprus	Civil strife	30
Haiti	Hurricane Flora	250
Korea	Cholera epidemic	35
Saudi Arabia	Flash flood	40
Trinidad-Tobago	Hurricane Flora	63
Total		4,079

EXHIBIT B

Foreign Assistance: Title I.—Status of fiscal year 1964 contingency fund as of June 30, 1964 (preliminary)

[In thousands of dollars]

Resources	Amount	Uses	Amount
Appropriation	50,000	Sec. 610 transfer to other appropriations:	
		To military assistance program	75,000
Other availabilities:		To Americal schools and hospitals abroad	1,600
Unobligated carryover	127,099		
Reimbursements	2,400		76,600
Recoveries (deobligations)	5,275	Obligations [1]	107,428
		Unobligated balance	746
	134,774	Total	184,774
Total available	184,774		

[1] Contingency fund obligations:

Country:	*Thousands*
Laos	$8,850
Thailand	300
Vietnam	38,026
Bolivia	3,412
Brazil	50,000
Panama	150
U.N. peacekeeping—Cyprus	2,724
Disaster relief	3,966
Total obligations	107,428

REMARKS

Air support costs and subsistence, and other commercial consumables.

Costs in connection with U.S. Army portable transmitter loaned to Thai Government.

Commodities for counter insurgency program and commercial import program.

Funds for budgetary support.

Loan for procurement of essential commodities.

A and E services shortfall for school construction.

To meet U.S. pledge to U.N. peacekeeping force in Cyprus.

Relief of victims of natural disasters and civil strife.

Mr. ELLENDER. Actually, Mr. President, during fiscal year 1964, about $7 million of the obligations of these funds qualified as bona fide contingencies. This amount consists of approximately $4 million spent for the relief of victims of natural disasters and civil strife. And a little over $2.5 million spent to keep the peace in Cyprus. These amounts are shown in exhibit "A" which I have previously incorporated in the RECORD. Some of the nonemergency types of uses included the following: $3,412,000 for budgetary support in Bolivia and $50 million for a loan to Brazil.

Mr. President, I submit that there is no question but that in the case of both Bolivia and Brazil the Contingency Fund was abused. But even worse than these abuses was the transfer of funds from the Contingency Fund to other appropriation items.

The transfer of funds to other appropriations is permitted under section 610 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended. This section provides that up to 10 percent of any appropriation item may be transferred to another appropriation item, provided it does not exceed 20 percent of the appropriation item to which it has been transferred. To determine the amount that could be transferred from the Contingency Fund in fiscal year 1964 it is necessary to know what total funds were available in the fund for fiscal year 1964. This availability follows:

New appropriations	$50,000,000
Reimbursements during year	2,400,000
Unobligated carryover	127,099,000
Recoveries resulting from deobligations	5,275,000
Making the total available	184,774,000

Thus, Mr. President, it was possible under the law to transfer from the Contingency Fund up to 10 percent of the total amount available, or $18,477,000. Actually, during the last 2 months of fiscal year 1964, there was transferred from the Contingency Fund $75 million to the military assistance appropriation and $1,600,000 to the appropriation of American schools and hospitals abroad, making the total transfers for the fiscal year 1964, $76,600,000, or more than 40 percent of the total moneys available in the Contingency Fund.

Since there is this 10 percent limitation in section 610 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 as amended, how can more than 40 percent be transferred from the Contingency Fund to other appropriation items? Mr. President, the answer is found in section 614(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended. This section provides that, whenever the President deems it necessary, he may use up to $250 million that may be found anywhere in the bill, plus up to $100 million of foreign currencies that can be found anywhere, subject only to the limitation that not more than $50 million may be used in any one particular country.

The President saw fit to transfer $75 million from the regular Contingency Fund to the military assistance appropriation rather than use the authority contained in section 510 of the act which has been established to provide for unforeseen emergencies occurring in the military field. This section provides that the President may, if he so determines, draw down from the military stock of the Department of Defense up to $300 million of military equipment and supplies. Why was this authority not used?

The answer is simple. The contingency fund was raided instead of using the section 510 authority because it would be necessary for the Department of Defense to be reimbursed in the subsequent fiscal year for any equipment that may have been obtained under this authority.

Mr. President, the bill reported by the Appropriations Committee provides new obligational authority that is $300 million more than the Congress appropriated for foreign aid last year, and if my amendment is adopted the administration will still have new obligational authority for fiscal year 1965 exceeding the amount provided last year by $250 million.

Mr. President, under the authorization bill as it is now on the statute books, the President has almost unlimited transfer authority. He is able to shift funds from one item to another at will. But even if this flexibility is not enough, I submit that if any additional funds are necessary for military or economic purposes, he can submit his request to Congress when it convenes in January.

I believe it is important for the Senate to recall that when the authorization bill passed this way, we provided $3.3 billion for fiscal year 1965. In addition, there was added to that bill an amendment, offered by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGOVERN], providing that $50 million be earmarked for the purchase of beef, poultry, and other high protein foods. I have reason to believe that the conferees on the authorization bill are going to strike that amendment; thus making the Senate authorization $3,250 million instead of $3.3 billion.

I wish to say to my good friend from Rhode Island that if my amendment is accepted the pending bill will be in line with the action that is anticipated on the authorization bill.

Mr. President, I urge the Senate to adopt my amendment and thereby save $50 million for our taxpayers. Let us at least lighten their burden by this amount, and at the same time provide for some tightening of our foreign aid program.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. I have discussed the subject with the ranking Republican member of the Appropriations Committee. While I am not in a position to agree with the Senator from Louisiana with reference to the use of the contingency fund in the case of Brazil—and I have discussed this at some length—the fact is that there is language in the authorization bill making $50 million available for the purchase of meat and poultry. I understand that provision will be eliminated from the authorization bill. Yet, the amount that was provided for these purposes has been left in the authorization bill.

For this reason, Mr. President, I shall not resist the Senator's amendment if it is put to a vote.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It is my understanding that the $50 million appropriation has been stricken out.

Mr. PASTORE. It was $50 million. There was language stating that $50 million must be used for the purchase of beef and poultry.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. They had to spend up to $50 million.

Mr. PASTORE. Yes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The $50 million amount was left in the bill.

Mr. PASTORE. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I am glad to go along with the Senator from Rhode Island.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be offered, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (H.R. 11812) was passed.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask that the RECORD show that I voted against the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the RECORD will so indicate.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF EMPLOYMENT ACT OF 1946

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill amending the Employment Act of 1946. I ask that it remain on the desk for 1 week for cosponsors and that the text of the bill be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The contents of this bill are derived from the work of the Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower which I have had the privilege to chair in the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

It is one of the two major bills which I plan to introduce dealing with the urgent problem of unemployment. This bill which deals with economic and employment policy and a proposed companion measure dealing with manpower policy can provide this country for the first time with a coordinated manpower and employment policy.

In the 4 years of the Kennedy-Johnson administration we have crossed a major watershed in the application of our economic know-how to improve the fortunes of working Americans. These years have seen the overwhelmingly successful application of fiscal policy—in this case, a tax cut—to restore the economy to its full efficiency. These years have also seen the passage of the Area Redevelopment Act, the Accelerated Public Works Act, the Manpower Development and Training Act, the Trade Expansion Act, and several other milestone measures in the fields of education, manpower, and economic policy.

Together, these new measures have lifted the country from the chronic stagnation and lethargy of the Eisenhower years and given us over 40 months of the longest-lived period of expansion in our peacetime history.

The Kennedy-Johnson administration has lived up to its promise to get this country moving again.

Personal income is increasing at a rate a full percentage point higher than last year.

The amount of take-home pay families can spend for other than the necessities of life has increased at a rate of 2 percentage points greater than last year.

We are heading into a period of really substantial increases in consumer spending and capital investment.

And—best news of all—the unemployment rate is dropping steadily. We must not allow it to rise again. We must keep this economy rolling.

President Johnson is devoted to accomplishing just that. Not satisfied with the general performance of the economy, he has been determined to get at the roots of chronic and persistent unemployment and poverty. We have already approved the war on poverty bill and the Appalachia bill.

We are on the verge of a breakthrough in the United States. We can eliminate the business cycle, just as several European nations have succeeded in doing through the intelligent application of fiscal and monetary policy as well as manpower policy.

We will suceed in this effort if we can only further relax the weakening grip of old and outdated myths upon our understanding of how this country's economy works. The success of the President's tax cut has dealt those myths a death blow. We must make sure now that they do not revive.

Senators should note that despite this long-lived expansion helped along by the tax cut, the Nation is not plagued by runaway inflation. Indeed, the figures look so good that the pundits are starting to ask if we have not finally laid the business cycle to rest.

Even the august magazine Business Week, in its June 27 issue, has been led to observe that "the current upswing is changing many rules that have applied for more than a century."

I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "A Well-Tempered Boom," published in the June 27 issue of Business Week magazine, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A WELL-TEMPERED BOOM

The longest business upswing on record is changing economic ideas that have been held for more than 100 years. For the first time, a boom has been accompanied by price stability.

At mid-1964, U.S. business finds itself in the midst of an upswing that's changing everybody's thoughts about what a free enterprise economy can do.

Previously, it was believed the United States could not expect to combine economic growth with price stability for more than a short period of time. The current upswing already is the longest on record for normal peacetime years and shows absolutely no signs of topping out (Business Week Mar. 28, 1964, p. 23). But in over 40 months of business advance, industrial prices barely have budged from a horizontal line.

The old idea was that prosperous times create enough distortions between prices and costs, sales and inventories, credit and liquidity, capacity and demand to bring a downturn. Yet a careful look at the economy over the past 40 months shows a record that is singularly free of the kinds of imbalances that always have appeared in past periods of prosperity.

FIRST IN A CENTURY

Indeed, the current upswing is changing many rules that have applied for more than a century. The National Bureau of Economic Research's business cycle chronology, dating back to 1854, covers 27 busines expansions. It shows that the U.S. economy is now writing a wholly new record of stable growth:

Prices have been uniquely stable over the past 40 months. The Federal Reserve Index of industrial production has risen by over 25 percent—a good gain by historic standards. Metals prices have been rising since mid-1963, but cuts in other areas have kept the overall wholesale price index stable.

Past upswings always have brought rising costs. This time, costs have declined. The Census Bureau's Index of unit labor costs in manufacturing (1957–59=100) stood at 98.6 in April, more than three points below the 102.1 figure of February, 1961, when the current business upswing got under way.

Good business always has led previously to higher interest rates. Yet in April of this year, bond yields stood at approximately the same level as in early 1961.

EXPLANATIONS

In seeking to explain these new trends, economists point to a long list of changes in the behavior of government, business, and consumers, all of which make for greater stability of growth.

In sharp contrast to a history of abrupt shifts, the Federal Government has been pursuing smoothly expansionary fiscal policies. Government spending rose by $7 billion to $9 billion in each of the years between 1960 and 1963. The growth of spending is now tapering off. But this year's tax cut of about $9 billion will have a similar expansionary effect.

MONEY SUPPLY

The Federal Reserve Board, too, has abandoned its old stop-start behavior in favor of a policy of allowing the money supply to grow smoothly. Defined to include demand deposits and currency only, the U.S. money supply has grown by $2 billion to $5 billion in each of the past 3 years. Figures up to the end of May lead to the expectation of similar growth in 1964. If the money supply is broadened to include time deposits, the growth of monetary liquidity has been more dramatic, but equally smooth.

For its part, business has rigorously avoided the scramble for inventories that has always occurred in the past when prosperity has led to a big push for sales. In a dramatic change in management policy (Business Week, Apr. 4, 1964, p. 25), companies now see tight inventory management as the right policy during prosperity as well as recessions. The result is a stability of the inventory sales ratio that has lasted throughout the present upswing.

UNDER WRAPS

Business also shows restraint in its long-term planning. The most recent McGraw-Hill capital spending survey showed that companies are planning a 14 percent increase in capacity over the next 3 years. Over the same period, they foresee a 19-percent increase in the physical volume of their sales—an expectation that seems reasonable, even conservative, in the light of the tax cut.

Consumer spending reflects a similar restrained optimism. The cut in personal taxes has led neither to a burst of savings nor a burst of spending. Instead, consumers are spending at close to the normal relation to disposable income. Some analysts have argued that the months since the tax cut have seen abnormally high debt repayments. But the $587 million increase in outstanding installment debt in April is actually the biggest gain posted so far this year, and is above the average monthly increase for 1963.

INVESTMENTS

Cautious optimism carries over into investment behavior. Stocks have made a sharp recovery from the 1962 crash. But because earnings have also grown, price-earning ratios have continued relatively stable.

Particularly in the past year, the benefits of stable growth have been widespread. Profits continue to post new quarterly records. Long-term unemployment, which seemed intractable only a few months ago, is declining. And the United States is making strides in closing both the balance-of-payments deficit and the deficit of the Federal budget.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, surely present performance demonstrates that the state of economic know-how is now such that it is possible for wise public policy to be applied in such a way that it can help assure consistent and sound economic expansion without the threat of runaway inflation.

Naturally, before public economic policies can be wisely applied, there must be some shift in the attitude of the public sector toward their use. Such a shift is underway.

In testimony before our subcommittee, representative spokesmen from business and industry indicated that they were increasingly aware that our corporate society is hardly the model of perfect competition, invoked by those who find presentday economics a hard pill to swallow.

One of the most interesting contributions to this growing discussion in the private sector was published in the Atlantic Monthly for June 1964. It was written by John R. Bunting, vice president of the Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia and is entitled "What's Ahead for Business?" At one point, Mr. Bunting is moved to comment on the peculiar dichotomy which exists in the minds of many private businessmen:

> The schizophrenic businessman incessantly advertises to beguile the consumer into buying his product, but he has never identified himself with programs to raise overall spending at the expense of saving. Perhaps the success of the tax cut, as it works its will, will cure some of this schizophrenia, for that ailment is an affliction which does no one—and particularly business—any good.

I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "What's Ahead for Business?" written by John R. Bunting, and published in the June 1964 issue of the Atlantic Monthly, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

I also ask unanimous consent that the "Report on Washington," published in the same issue of Atlantic Monthly, be printed in the RECORD, for it discusses what I feel to be a most urgent matter—greater flexibility for the President in his discretionary use of tax policy to keep the economy on the upswing.

There being no objection, the article and report were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT'S AHEAD FOR BUSINESS?

(By John R. Bunting)

Since the end of World War II, the American economy has performed with unparalleled efficiency. True, there has been some inflation, especially during the immediate aftermath of the war, but that was neither unexpected nor inexcusable. Four short, shallow recessions blemish the record too; and for the past 5 years Americans have come to be conscious of a persistent balance-of-payments problem, plus an inability to get the economy to a position of full employment.

By any comparative standards, however—whether its own record, or the past or present record of any other national economy—the 18 years since the war have been the most prosperous, trouble-free years in the history of the American economy.

Yet, during this period significant changes have taken place in the basic structure of our economy. At the outset it may be helpful to list three important forces making for modification in the structure of our business society: (1) the Maximum Employment Act; (2) the emerging dominance of the corporate conglomerate; (3) automation.

The Maximum Employment Act was formalized in 1946. In large measure, its spiritual conception occurred a decade earlier in the New Deal. It was a natural outgrowth of the social reform that swept through the United States in the wake of the great depression. Despite the fact that the act has been in existence for some time, few businessmen have properly assimilated into their thinking the tremendous institutional changes it has wrought. Of course, an overwhelming majority of the business community did not agree with this act when it was passed. Many still hold out against it. No businessman, however, should fail to recognize how it has changed the cost structure of business.

Now there is every good economic reason for business to assume everyone in the labor force as a fixed cost. After all, what this act means is that each person in the labor force is to be employed, or to receive income while temporarily unemployed. One way or another, business is going to pay labor whether working or not. Obviously, then, from the point of view of the economy as a whole, operations are more efficient at full employment because the unemployed remain in the overall cost figures, even though they make no contribution to production.

What this could mean in the not too distant future is that big business, at least, will assume all employees as a fixed cost much as industry in Japan and in some of the European countries does. All workers would be put on a salary basis and treated the same as officeworkers. Profits would bear the brunt and reap the reward of the vagaries in business activity.

The likelihood of this eventuality is reinforced by the growing dominance of the corporate conglomerate in the business world. The conglomerate is a large corporation diversified to the extent that within itself separate subcompanies operate in vastly different markets. The idea is to stabilize the income and earnings of the whole unit. But more than just a strong desire for stabilized income and earnings is powering the drive toward conglomeration. Corporations, huge and dominant in their own field, are inhibited by a sense of propriety—and a suspicion of what the "antitrusters" would do—from further expansion there. Awash in depreciation reserves, in retained earnings, and in other vestiges of cash flow, they seek profitable outlets for their funds and skills in other sectors of industry.

Many businessmen who are deeply involved in diversification deplore this trend. They recognize that the actions of the corporate conglomerate frequently are not in strict conformity with a market economy. These businessmen believe strongly that for a market system to work, business must try to maximize profits in each market. But the growth of the diversified large enterprise does not allow them to operate in this manner.

A firm that produces a variety of products and operates across many markets does not necessarily regard a particular market as a separate unit for determining business policy. Therefore, it does not need to attempt to maximize profits in the sale of each of its products. Some products may be classified as moneymaking items, some as convenience goods, and some as loss leaders.

The diversification of the large firm minimizes loss in one part by setting it against profit in another. This is a source of strength to the firm. In economic terms, however, such a spreading of risk nullifies, or at least blunts, the effect of changes in prices, costs, and profits as guides to economic activity. Profits from one activity subsidize the continuance of another. Survival of the fittest is abrogated. The selective forces of competition are ineffective.

Of course, management of a huge firm desiring to maximize profits may expand the profitable facilities and eliminate the others. But this does not follow automatically. The allocation of costs is usually the result rather than a source of a policy decision.

Most important, however, huge size, by necessitating the development of a corporate social conscience, strikes at the very foundations of the market system. The modern corporation cannot play the economic game in the traditional manner. It cannot convince itself, even, that an "invisible hand" will cause its selfish actions to be for the common good. It cannot pull out all stops to kill off competition. It cannot try to make as much profit as it might. Business actions can no longer be predicated on the simple motive of self-interest.

Large firms respect one another. Competition among them is intense, but there is a feeling of live and let live, cooperation, and recognition of priorities of interest in the hope of reciprocal recognition. There are even unwritten rules that cause large firms to refuse to try to win away important customers of a large rival. They have to pull their punches in dealing with smaller rivals, too. Frequently, it is wiser to let them live than to compete so viciously as to kill them off and bring on antimonopoly proceedings of some sort. So the game can never be played on an all-out basis.

This is leading to a new concept of the American economic system. Economists have long held such a concept. Now the businessman himself is slowly coming to the conviction that he has a responsibility to discipline himself. He can no longer enjoy the luxury of believing in an economic system in which the lure of gain and an invisible hand would steer everyone and the whole economy in the right direction and at the right pace.

Recently, we have come to be aware of another factor which is transforming our business system: automation.

Changes growing out of technological innovations have always been notoriously difficult to measure and are almost always much broader than imagined. The automobile, for example, did infinitely more than just supplant the buggy. It replaced staying at home, and is now transplanting cities, towns, and the whole countryside. Now automation may be replacing certain skills; but, more important, it is transforming our educational needs.

I do not mean to suggest that we shall have to train workers to man the new automated equipment. Computers and other forms of automated equipment are giant morons, not giant brains. Even the highly regarded programing of a computer is difficult, not because of the inherent complexity of the computer itself, but because of the need to spell out every step in painstaking detail. Just as most of the jobs replaced by the computer did not call for high intelligence or creative people, neither does most work with the computer. On the other hand, the incessant load of information emptying from the computer begs for more general intelligence in its use and interpretation. A more thoretical bent in education as opposed to our traditional pragmatic bias in this country would seem appropriate if we are to take full advantage of automation.

At the present time, it is quite possible that a structural change is taking place in the role which private capital plays in our economy. All the talk about automation over the past decade or so would suggest that spending for new plant and machinery has been tremendous. Actually, it has been anything but. The shortfall in plant and equipment spending has been obscured by the magnitude of the raw figures. They have been impressive.

The failure of investment in plant and machinery is not a failure to grow, but a failure to grow enough to hold its proportionate part of gross national product. There is a persuasive enough explanation for this. After the shortage-induced postwar boom in capital investment, a letdown was inevitable. Every capital-spending boom is bound to bring in its wake some excess capacity. In fact, the astonishing part is not that there has been a letdown, but that the letdown has been so gentle.

But an important part of the story remains untold. The amount of capital (plant and equipment) required per dollar of output—call it the capital-output ratio—has been declining. The Council of Economic Advisers has estimated that this ratio dropped from 2.3 ($2.30 of capital to $1 of output) in 1929, to about 1.8 in the period since the war. That is more than a 20-percent decline.

Other bits of evidence, difficult to validate, suggest that the capital-output ratio has been falling fairly consistently since 1900. All of this implies that quite possibly the American economy has reached the state where technological development is so productive that less is needed. In other words, the normal increase in productivity per man-hour will come from a lesser increase in capital.

What seems to be happening is that in an evolutionary way scientific processes, not just automation, are bringing the American economy to a point where smaller amounts of capital are producing larger outputs of consumables. In order that a relatively free market economy may adjust to this structural change, consumption expenditures as compared with saving must grow proportionally larger. In the absence of a steady stream of exciting new products, there is little chance of this just happening when needed. For a time, perhaps, the excessiveness of saving is disguised, as funds chase each other in the stock market and find outlet overseas. But if consumer spending stays at the same percentage of income, saving remains redundant and business activity is sluggish. In this situation, modern government moves in. Government spending in ever-increasing doses is prescribed. After a time, however, it becomes obvious that Government spending is growing larger absolutely and proportionately. Businessmen in particular become alarmed, and other antidotes are sought.

Unfortunately, it is particularly difficult for businessmen to see this problem in true perspective. First, they can scarcely admit to themselves the need for ever-larger Government spending and conversely smaller inputs of capital. Instead, they ask for larger profits, greater permissible allowances for depreciation reserves, and the like so that they can hike capital spending back to its former role in the economy. But their own efficiency and inventiveness prevent them from getting it there. It is a paradox not yet sufficiently comprehended that the very productiveness of capitals is, in the spending sense, leading to its diminishing role.

Were he to admit to himself that what is outlined here is really happening, what should be the policy of the businessman? Should he sit back and watch Government spending grow absolutely and proportionally to compensate for the increasing excess of savings over investment needs? I think not. Without being ridiculously conservative about this, I am still persuaded that increasing reliance on Government weakens a society. But I think, too, that misguided efforts to secure tax laws that will restore capital spending to its historic role in the American economy can badly distort our business system. Already, the ability of business to finance itself largely from the internal flow of funds, such as depreciation and undistributed profits, restricts the flow of capital between industries and has helped produce much idle capacity.

Rather, it seems, business should favor measures that would increase consumption at the expense of saving. I say this appreciating the difficulties of accomplishment. The schizophrenic businessman incessantly advertises to beguile the consumer into buying his product, but he has never identified himself with programs to raise overall spending at the expense of saving. This ambiguity has deep roots and will not be easily overcome.

There are measures that might be expected to increase spending at the expense of saving. One of these involves changes in tax rates. A steeply progressive income tax to redistribute income from the wealthy to the poor can reasonably be expected to increase spending. There are two fairly strong arguments against this. It has already been used rather extensively, thereby minimizing potential benefits from further income equalization. Perhaps most important, any increase in "progressiveness" might have most unfortunate side effects. Incentives are blunted as taxes near what high earners consider to be confiscatory levels. Already some in our society seem discouraged by tax rates. To incline the rate more steeply would not seem wise in spite of the fact that it could be expected to raise consumer spending proportionately.

The trend toward security is working in favor of spending increases. Job and income insecurity make prudent rather large savings even for those who are in the low income bracket. Conversely, the partially successful quest for security has raised spending to a larger proportion of income than would otherwise have been the case. If in the future more workers move from a wage to a salary basis, it would enhance the feeling of security and increase spending at the expense of saving.

Dollars going for research and development might mean more consumer spending. A steady stream of new civilian products is much to be desired. Nothing gives more momentum to spending than an exciting new product. Competitive pressure once seemed to squeeze new products out of our business system without a cent being spent directly on research and development. Times have changed. Now huge companies set aside equipment, space, and personnel to work adventurously on new things. Unfortunately, military and space requirements have caused Government needs to dominate research. Civilian needs have suffered.

As unlikely as it may sound, a major change in advertising emphasis could be helpful. Protestations to the contrary, advertising has changed very little, except in technique, from what it was in its infancy. At its most effective it is gimmicky. At its worst it is an insult to the intelligence of ungifted children. Even so-called institutional advertising is usually a thinly disguised recital of the necessity for high profits.

I am not calling for educational advertising. Nothing would be duller than a steady diet of objective, thorough, educational ads. What is needed, I believe, is advertisements with broader perspective, advertisements that would have as their goal the widening of living horizons for Americans, advertising programs that would show Americans the way toward more enjoyable, worthwhile living.

It would be difficult to accomplish this kind of advertising within the present institutional arrangements. Individual companies want identification for their products to increase company sales. I am asking advertising to lift consumers' sights. Individual company sponsorship would prejudice the goals narrowly and defeat the purpose. Mass business support, financial and psychological, would be required. Even more important, divorcement from sponsor pressure would have to be secured for the advertising agency involved. Perhaps the agency handling such an assignment would work on no other. The best marketing, economic, and advertising minds in the country would be called together for such a venture. It could evolve into the American answer to Government planning.

Finally, and perhaps most important, the corporate-profits tax must be eliminated so that total profits of corporations can be reduced. Many industries have a relatively inflexible demand for their products. In other words, sales are not dramatically affected by changes in price within certain limits. Also, some of these industries are dominated by firms with the power to administer prices. Although the case is not black and white, it is very probably true that given these circumstances firms will pass along the incidence of the corporate-profits tax to the consumer in the form of a higher price. Such action restricts demand.

There are those economists who grant the theoretical sense of eliminating the corporate-profits tax, but aver that removal would not result in lower prices. In their view, firms would maintain present price policies and pocket the share now going to the Government. I think they are wrong. The businessman does not admit it openly, but he is aware of the broad changes that have taken place in the American economy.

Truly our business society knows it is unrealistic to expect profits to be as high as in decades past. Formerly, high profits were needed to lure cash from current consumption into necessary investment in productive facilities. Now more current consumption is in order. Formerly, high profits seemed only just compensation for the tremendous risks undertaken. Financial panic could bring on depression, and ruin the soundest corporation. Now depressions are "against the law," and even recessions do not always check yearly advances in GNP. In this changed environment, are high profits necessary to finance proportionally less investment? Formerly, corporations did not generate as much of their investment funds internally. They had to show good profits to get needed money for expansion. Now huge depreciation allowances permit corporations to generate their own funds. It is clear to sophisticated businessmen that profits up to former standards are inappropriate to the times.

What all this means is that business can adjust to the structural change that a steady stream of scientific developments, including automation, is foisting onto our economy. To adjust, however, businessmen will have to change some of their long-cherished biases. They will have to promote policies that will raise consumer spending at the expense of saving, give employees even more security, and accept as normal a somewhat smaller return as profit. Government will have to have the political courage to eliminate the corporate-profits tax. This tax is not what it seems to be. It has caused higher prices and has indirectly influenced corporate policies in a way that results in larger savings. Corporations seeing half of their profits taken by Government, and not sure they can pass the tax on to consumers, probably are led to put emphasis on larger depreciation allowances. To the unsophisticated, however, elimination will seem to be a gift to the businessman.

If society does not go along with something like the prescription I have advocated, it is possible that Government spending as a proportion of total spending will continue to rise.

REPORT ON WASHINGTON—A MORE FLEXIBLE TAX POLICY

Partly to protect the domestic economy and partly to make certain that the United States was in a position to meet its international obligations, President Kennedy made a modest request to Congress early in 1962, which in an orderly world might have provoked little opposition. But his proposal, which would have permitted a small degree of flexibility in fiscal policy, struck a very raw congressional nerve. The opposition was so great that no serious consideration was ever given to the late President's request. No one expects President Johnson to repeat the request in the near future, but someday he may wish Congress had approved his predecessor's proposal.

Many economists in Washington regard the original proposal as a major piece of unfinished business.

Kennedy had asked Congress to give the President standby authority to reduce Federal income taxes if the country were threatened by a recession. He asked only for temporary authority limited to a reduction of up to 5 percentage points. He proposed that if Congress disapproved his decision it could veto it within 31 days by a simple majority vote in both Houses. In any event, the reductions the President might order would be authorized for no more than 1 year unless Congress took action to approve what he had done.

President Kennedy told Congress that the authority was needed to enable the Government to act "more promptly, more flexibly and more forcefully to stabilize the economy." He argued that his proposal combined "assurance of congressional control with provision for the flexibility of action needed to achieve the objectives of maximum employment and output, economic stability and growth." Few Presidential requests have fallen on deafer ears. Congress made it clear at once that it would give the President no such power. The congressional leaders in the tax field said that they would be delegating a part of their constitutional responsibility if they permitted the President any discretion at all over the tax laws.

Today, those who favored Kennedy's 1962 proposal contend that the history of the fight on the tax-reduction bill reinforces their argument that some Executive discretion is urgently needed. President Kennedy was convinced of the need of income tax reductions by the summer of 1962. He considered asking Congress for an immediate cut at that time. However, because he recognized that Congress would not approve a reduction that year, he announced that he would postpone the request until January 1963.

It was not until 18 months after the President wanted to act and not until 13 months after he presented his formal recommendations that the bill was finally passed. In other words, Congress again demonstrated that there is very little flexibility in tax policy. In January of this year, as final work was being done on the tax bill, the Council of Economic Advisers warned that "tax and expenditure policies cannot be adjusted with sufficient speed to cope with the swift changes in private demand that bring recession or inflation." The Council emphasized that it still regarded the proposal President Kennedy made in 1962 as highly desirable.

THE BRITISH CAN MOVE FAST

Nearly all other industrial countries have far more flexible fiscal systems than that of the United States. For example, in the winter of 1962–63 Britain faced the threat of business stagnation and rising unemployment. Without even going to Parliament, the Government late in 1962 ordered a sharp reduction in excise taxes. It has the authority to cut excise and payroll taxes without consulting Parliament.

The British Government then decided that a major income tax cut was needed. In April 1963, it presented a strongly expansionist budget to Parliament, and within a month the lower tax rates were approved. By July, the economic indexes were rising. The unemployment rate, which was 4 percent of the labor force in February, was reduced to 2 percent in less than 6 months. Industrial production rose by more than 13 percent in the same period.

If the American Congress were as responsive to the Executive as the legislature in a parliamentary system, the need for the kind of standby authority President Kennedy requested would not be so great. The fact that in the normal course of events present tax laws produce an additional $5 or $6 billion of revenue each year as a result of population and economic growth strengthens the argument for Executive flexibility. The administration believes that unless this additional collection is matched by tax reductions or by increased Federal expenditures a serious drag on the economy may develop in a short time.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, Congress has shown an understandable reluctance to surrender any of its control over the Nation's purse strings, but as this column points out, nearly all other industrial countries have a far more flexible fiscal system than that of the United States and the difference in economic performance makes the case for greater executive discretion. In the winter of 1962–63, for example, Britain faced the same sluggish economic conditions as the United States. But while the United States spent 18 months dillydallying with the proposed tax cut of the President, it took the United Kingdom less than 4 months to get a tax cut in force and British unemployment was cut in half in less than 6 months.

No doubt our tax cut will bring substantial reductions in unemployment as the months go on. But even the astounding rates of job increase we are getting right now are only a little more than half of what we need to get our unemployment rate down to 4 percent. We are slowly inching toward 4-percent unemployment—the goal set by President Kennedy. But because the impetus of the tax cut is behind us and the present budget level falls below earlier projections, it is quite possible that the rate will rise again next year.

It is increasingly apparent that we now have the economic know-how not only to reach 4 percent and stay there, but also to provide full employment in America—something closer to 3 percent of the labor force looking for work it cannot find. In other words, the 3-percent figure is about what the expert economists figure fractional unmployment amounts to in a large country such as ours. Fractional unemploymnt is defined as that continuing unemployment resulting from certain individuals taking time between jobs while they are unemployed, having terminated one job while they look for another.

We have had a hard time putting that know-how to work because of the dense fog of cliches which shroud this whole area of public concern. It is a travesty that these myths should hold us back because they have not held back any other country of the industrialized West.

Angus Maddison, a distinguished British economist, has made our economic lag all too clear in his new study published by the Twentieh Century Fund entitled "Economic Growth in the West." He is moved to observe at one point that "the business cycle in the classical sense has virtually disappeared in Europe. In the United States, it still remains and acceptance of its existence was a fundamental characteristic of U.S. policy thinking in the 1950's."

These were the Eisenhower years and perhaps with some understandable political bias, I believe that we have come a long way since then. But—to use the phrase of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT]—the "old myths and new realities" are still with us here in Congress.

The time has come, in my judgment, when the Government of the United States must make a firm commitment to full employment. To do less in a time of unparalleled affluence, abundance, and technological progress would be a betrayal of the American working man and woman.

Even Arthur F. Burns, the keeper of the economic wisdom in the Eisenhower administration, has admitted that he believes "the American people are more firmly committed to that ideal of full employment than they were a century ago. If the Employment Act were recast today, it might even be christened 'the Full Employment Act'."

The Eisenhower Commission on National Goals felt no compunction in referring to "our goal of full employment."

Certainly, the work of the Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower over the past year has indicated that more positive policies must be employed to assure reasonably full employment in the coming years, or we run serious risks not only in wasted manpower and idle capacity, but also in rising discontent, social chaos, crime, and delinquency as well.

The time has come to strengthen the Employment Act of 1946 and to reinforce it with a comprehensive and coordinated manpower policy for the United States.

Today, I have just introduced a bill which would help accomplish the first of these tasks by amending the Employment Act so that the President may pursue the goal of full employment with a full range of economic intelligence at his disposal.

The bill would require the President, as part of the Economic Report, to submit to Congress each year a full employment and production budget which would anticipate for both the next fiscal year and the next 5 fiscal years, the projected performance of the national economy and the degree to which this performance will exceed or fall short of conditions necessary to assure full employment and production—which would anticipate both in the next fiscal year and the next 5 fiscal years the projected performance of the national economy, and the degree to which the performance will exceed or fall short of conditions necessary to assure full employment production.

He would also submit, as part of the budget, a Federal full employment budget designed to carry out whatever Federal responsibilities there may be for assuring full employment.

When the Economic Report and the employment and production budget reach Congress, hearings will be held on them by the Joint Economic Committee.

Then, when the Appropriations Committees receive testimony on the budget requests, the chairman and ranking minority member of the Joint Economic Committee—as the anointed economic advisers of Congress—will be invited to testify on their views on whether the Federal full employment budget is in accord with what is required to maintain full employment and production.

This bill is derived from the lessons we have learned in the Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower—hearings which continued into the early months of this year.

I introduce it because it embraces a matter of such vital concern that it should be the subject of discussion and debate during the months before the next Congress convenes.

There is nothing in this bill which should frighten anyone. It really carries out the original intent of the Employment Act of 1946, but it recognizes that certain techniques have been developed which now makes a less ambiguous pursuit of full employment politically possible.

There are those who are not enamored of any proposal that would use the Federal budget as a tool for helping the economy achieve its potential. But surely the impact of the tax cut has demonstrated that the magnitude of public expenditures in this—as well as all other industrialized countries—is such that its influence cannot possibly be ignored. It would certainly seem wise, therefore, to assure that that influence is beneficial, not detrimental, to the economy as a whole.

I return to the study, "Economic Growth in the West," by Angus Maddison. He is moved to observe, quite aptly:

> All economic issues are political to some extent, particularly the choice of policy weapons, but this should not obscure the fact that a large range of problems are more or less of a technical economic character * * *. Parliamentary procedure normally concentrates the main economic debate dramatically on the budget which reflects political and social issues as well as economic ones and arouses unnecessary passions over rather technical questions of economic management which could more properly form the subject of a semicontinuous examination in parliamentary committee.

Mr. Maddison of course is a British economist. Where he uses the word "parliamentary" I suggest that we substitute the word "congressional."

The United States has paid the price for mixing up purely economic issues with the social and political. It has been responsible in large part for our poor performance through most of the Eisenhower years for as Mr. Maddison observes:

> If a country appears consistenly to run into difficulties which others manage to avoid, one is entitled to assume that bad policy played a role.

And, having evolved exceptionally high rates of unemployment in those years, our task is now more difficult, for to quote Mr. Maddison again:

> It is more difficult to get rapid growth started than to keep the economy on a high-growth path.
>
> By contrast with Europe, the United States can scarcely be said to have had a fiscal policy for most of the 1950's, although public discussion and governmental consideration of tax changes were extensive. U.S. tax rates were raised in 1950 and 1951 during the Korean war, and were lowered in 1954, but there was no attempt to compensate for the 1958 or 1960 recessions by fiscal policy or, indeed, to offset the longer term tendency from 1957 onward for the economy to work below full-capacity level. This happened in spite of the fact that the U.S. tax structure is more progressive than that in most European countries, and has a built-in tendency to dampen the growth of private demand.
>
> Why was the U.S. economy untouched by fiscal policy over 8 years in spite of two recessions? Why have the U.S. authorities accepted fluctuations in activity involving absolute falls in output and substantial increases in unemployment as a fact of life, and restricted active policy intervention to the monetary field or to minor variations in public spending? This seems to have been due in part to a misjudgment as to the causes of rising prices, in part to a more old-fashioned attitude to fiscal policy than in Europe, in part to the intellectual influence of a fatalistic school of "business cycle" analysis, and in part to special constitutional difficulties in wielding a fiscal policy. The existence of inadequate demand during the 1950's was fully admitted by the Council of Economic Advisers in its 1963 report:
>
> "In the past 5 years, the economy has been consistently out of balance—with too little demand to match our supply capabilities. In the first postwar decade, when demands were considerably stronger, the balance was frequently tipped in the other direction."[1]

R. A. Gordon of the University of California at Berkeley, one of the finest economists in the United States, has remarked in outlining the differences between United States and European economic policy that:

> 1. No advanced economy in Western Europe gives as low priority to the full employment objective, or interprets it as loosely, as does the United States.
>
> 2. Probably no country in Western Europe, not even Germany, attaches as much importance to price stability as does the United States.
>
> 3. Only a few countries, like England and the Netherlands, whose dependence on foreign trade is far greater than that of the United States, give the balance-of-payments objective the priority that it holds on this side of the Atlantic.
>
> 4. The objective of rapid growth is emphasized more in Europe than in this country, and this objective is more likely to be explicitly incorporated into Government policy programs.
>
> 5. Nowhere in Western Europe is as much emphasis given to fiscal conservatism as in the United States. No European country takes as a major policy goal the need to have current tax receipts cover all government expenditures on both current and capital account, and in no country in Western Europe, including Germany, is holding down government spending considered a paramount objective in and of itself.

Yet why this should be so is difficult to determine. Even the "Goals for Americans" drafted by the President's Commission on National Goals during the Eisenhower administration said:

> The economy should grow at the maximum rate consistent with primary dependence upon free enterprise and the avoidance of marked inflation. Increased investment in the public sector is compatible with this goal.
>
> Such growth is essential to move toward our goal of full employment, to provide jobs for the approximately 13,500,000 net new additions to the work force during the next 10 years; to improve the standard of living; and to assure U.S. competitive strength.
>
> Public policies, particularly an overhaul of the tax system, including depreciation allowances, should seek to improve the climate for new investment and the balancing of investment with consumption. We should give attention to policies favoring completely new ventures which involve a high degree of risk and growth potential.

I agree with this assessment. And on one point the findings of the Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower justify a still stronger position: Full employment will require conscious use of Federal expenditure policy in the years ahead. Throughout the Cold War we have been deceived into believing that, because the Federal Budget has been large, it has been pumping the life into our economy required to keep it operating at high levels. But an overwhelming proportion of our budget has been devoted to highly specialized military needs.

The following table from Mr. Maddison's book reflects what a disproportionate impact expenditures on defense inflict on our total government spending—Federal, State, and local—in comparison to the European countries as a percentage of gross national product:

Government current expenditure on goods and services as a proportion of GNP at current prices

	1870	1913	1938	1950	1960
Belgium	------	------	------	9.8	12.1
Denmark	------	------	9.3	10.3	12.6
France	------	------	13.0	12.9	13.3
Germany	------	------	23.1	14.4	13.6
Italy	9.7	9.8	16.3	11.1	14.5
Netherlands	------	[1]11.0	11.4	12.6	13.5
Norway	3.8	6.3	9.9	10.6	14.6
Sweden	4.7	5.6	[2]10.4	13.9	17.7
Switzerland	------	------	------	------	[3]12.1
United Kingdom	4.9	7.2	13.5	15.6	16.6
Canada	4.6	8.1	10.9	10.6	14.4
United States	[4]3.7	4.2	10.1	10.6	17.2

[1] 1921. [2] 1938–39 average. [3] 1959. [4] 1869–78 average.

Sources: 1950 and 1960, OECD, "General Statistics." 1938 from "Statistics of National Product and Expenditure, No. 2," OEEC, Paris, 1957. The U.S. figures of OEEC and OECD were adjusted to exclude Government investment in machinery (see app. I). Earlier years from national sources cited in app. A.

---

[1] The U.S. emphasis on the virtues of a balanced budget has had no postwar counterpart in Europe, where there are no statutory limits on fiscal policy such as the ceiling on Government debt and on the interest rates payable on longer term Government securities as in the United States. The constitutional system of checks and balances in the United States makes it more difficult for an administration to change taxes quickly than is the case in Europe.

The second shows how much of this is accounted for by the Central Government:

TABLE IV-2.—*Share of Central Government in total Government consumption, 1958*

	Percent
Belgium	65
France	87
Germany	44
Italy	85
Netherlands	70
Norway	68
Sweden	66
United Kingdom	79
United States	68

Source: Statistics of Sources and Uses of Finance 1948–59, OEEC 1960.

The next breaks this down for 1957:

TABLE IV-3.—*Government expenditure as a proportion of GNP in 1957*

[GNP=100]

	Current civil expenditure on goods and services	Defense expenditure	Subsidies	Other transfers	Interest on public debt	Total current expenditure	Total current surplus	Gross asset formation	Overall Government surplus
Austria	11.2	1.4	1.7	11.9	0.5	26.7	6.9	3.7	3.2
Belgium	7.4	3.4	1.2	8.8	1.7	22.6	1.3	1.8	—.5
Denmark [1]	9.6	3.3	.3	6.6	1.4	21.0	4.5	2.1	2.4
France	7.5	6.8	1.9	13.0	1.4	30.6	1.5	1.8	—.3
Germany	10.0	3.0	.8	14.8	.6	29.2	7.3	2.7	4.6
Netherlands	8.8	5.1	1.7	8.2	2.5	26.2	5.7	3.2	2.4
Norway	8.4	3.5	4.3	5.6	.9	22.7	7.5	2.8	4.7
Sweden	12.6	5.0	1.1	6.5	1.5	26.7	4.7	3.0	1.7
United Kingdom	9.8	7.0	1.9	5.9	3.6	28.2	2.8	1.1	1.7
Canada	8.2	5.9	.3	6.7	2.3	23.5	3.4	3.7	—.3
United States	6.6	10.0	0.3	4.3	1.4	22.6	3.4	2.8	.6

[1] 1955.

Source: "Statistics of Sources and Uses of Finance 1948–58," OEEC, 1958.

It shows that in terms of investment in our national wealth—roads, urban renewal, resource development, education, and welfare—the United States stands at the bottom among the industrialized countries of the West. In defense expenditures it stands way at the top.

A forthcoming book written by Frederick C. Mosher and Orville F. Poland entitled "The Costs of American Governments: Facts, Trends, Myths," only reinforces the case. This study has found that while defense and related expenditures have increased enormously, we were actually spending less relative to GNP on our domestic welfare in 1961 than we were in 1936.

It is precisely here that we have fallen down, for while we have concentrated a vast share of our public financial resources on national security expenditures, technological change and other forces have adversely affected the employment potential in production line jobs. Normally, this slack might have been taken up by increased public expenditures in fields such as community renewal, resource development, transportation, and education. But our heavy burden in defense kept us from it.

Consequently, the country is presently plagued with community, resource, and worker obsolescence—obsolescence which must be corrected through a proper arsenal of public investment programs. Now, with the prospect of reduced defense outlays in the offing, we have the opportunity to do just that.

This bill would enable the President to employ our public expenditures, as well as the use of tax cuts and monetary policy, to keep the economy operating at high levels even when there may be some reductions in the defense field.

To further develop some of these questions I ask unanimous consent that, following the text of the bill, there be printed as exhibit 1, a paper delivered by Otto Eckstein, a member of the Council of Economic Advisers, on July 15 entitled, "Perspectives on Employment Under Technical Change"; a paper written by R. A. Gordon entitled, "Full Employment as a Policy Goal"; and an article describing the findings of the OECD regarding U.S. manpower policies entitled, "Seeking a Solution to U.S. Manpower Problems."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill, S. 3237, be referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered, and the bill will be printed and held at the desk, as requested by the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The bill (S. 3237) to provide for specific employment policies in order to promote maximum employment, to reduce unemployment to its minimum acceptable levels, to promote an adequate rate of economic growth and to preserve reasonable price stability, introduced by Mr. CLARK, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SHORT TITLE

SEC. 1. This Act may be cited as the "Employment Act Amendments of 1964".

FINDINGS AND DECLARATIONS OF POLICY

SEC. 2. It is and has been the policy of the United States, set forth in the Employment Act of 1946, to promote maximum employment, production and purchasing power and to create and maintain conditions in the national economy under which useful employment opportunities will be afforded to all those who are able, willing and seeking to work.

The period following the declaration of this policy has been one of profound economic and technological change. These changes have taken place at a time when the rate of economic growth has been substantially less than that necessary to absorb the combined pressures of rapid labor force growth and labor displacement caused by technological change.

These factors, in combination, have tended to impair the development of the maximum employment policies set forth in the Employment Act of 1946, have contributed to the rate of unemployment and underemployment, have limited the Nation's ability to meet its domestic and international commitments, have increased pressures on an already inadequate educational system, have retarded economic opportunity for millions of our citizens and have spawned conditions of deprivation which foster delinquency, crime, racial discrimination, and poverty.

It is accordingly declared that in order to attain maximum employment, production, and purchasing power as set forth under the Employment Act of 1946, specific goals and objectives for the attainment of the policies must be established.

SEC. 3. Section 2 of the Employment Act of 1946 is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. The Congress declares that it is the continuing policy and responsibility of the Federal Government to use all practicable means consistent with its needs and obligations and other essential considerations of national policy, with the assistance and cooperation of industry, agriculture, labor, and State and local governments, to coordinate and utilize all its plans, functions, and resources for the purpose of creating and maintaining, in a manner calculated to foster and promote free competitive enterprise and the general welfare, conditions under which there will be afforded useful employment opportunities, including self-employment, for all who are able, willing, and seeking to work, and to establish a manpower utilization policy designed to promote maximum employment and to reduce unemployment to its lowest acceptable levels, and, to promote as a necessary concomitant thereto, an economic policy designed to develop and maintain rapid economic growth and reasonable price stability."

SEC. 4. Subsection (a) of section 3 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(a) The President shall transmit to the Congress at not later than January 20 of each year an economic report (hereinafter called the 'Economic Report') containing the following information:

"(1) an analysis of the economic and employment conditions in the United States, setting forth: (i) the levels of employment, production, and purchasing power obtaining in the United States and such levels needed to carry out the policy declared in section 2 of this Act; (ii) current and foreseeable trends in the levels of employment, production, and purchasing power; (iii) a review of the economic program of the Federal Government and a review of economic conditions affecting employment in the United States or any considerable portion thereof during the preceding year and of their effect upon employment, production, and purchasing power; and (iv) a program for carrying out the policy declared in section 2 of this Act, together with such recommendations for legislation as he may deem necessary or desirable;

"(2) a National Employment and Production Budget, setting forth: (i) short-range and long-range projections of the size of the labor force; (ii) short-range and long-range projections of the levels of gross national product, Federal, State, and local government expenditures and total employment reasonably anticipated under foreseeable private actions and existing public policies; (iii) short-range and long-range goals or objectives for maximum employment, specifying the amount of total absolute employment required to achieve maximum employment; (iv) short-range and long-range goals or objectives for maximum production, specifying the amount of gross national product representing maximum production; (v) short-range and long-range goals or objectives for attaining maximum purchasing power; and (vi) the extent to which one or more of the basic objectives of maximum employment, production, and purchasing power should be modified in order to maintain the policy of reasonable price stability whenever the President finds that any of these objectives are in conflict with such policy, including the measures which, in the opinion of the President, should be taken in order to reconcile the policy of reasonable price stability with the goals or programs for attaining maximum employment, production, and purchasing power; and

"(3) a Full Employment Federal Budget, setting forth: (i) the estimated gross national product which will be required to attain the maximum employment and production objectives established under paragraph 2 (iii) and (iv) hereof; (ii) a summary of those portions of the National Employment and Production Budget required under paragraph (2)(ii) hereof setting forth the gross national product expected under foreseeable private actions and existing public policies; (iii) a program of such government expenditures and other measures, fiscal and monetary, as he may deem necessary to the attainment of the maximum employment, production, and purchasing power objectives established under paragraph (2) (iii), (iv), and (v) hereof, which program shall include a short-range and long-range proposal for outlays designed to contribute to economic growth and the general welfare which may include but shall not be limited to conservation, development, and reclamation of natural resources, improved transportation systems, urban renewal, public housing, education, agricultural assistance, health, environmental improvements, and public welfare; and (iv) a review of the achievements of the immediate past short-range and long-range Full Employment Federal Budget including the degree to which maximum employment, production, and purchasing power objectives were achieved and the reasons for any failure to achieve objectives previously established."

SEC. 5. Subsection (b)(3) of section 5 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(3) As a guide to the several committees of the Congress dealing with legislation relating to the Economic Report, not later than March 1 of each year, to file a report with the Senate and the House of Representatives and with each appropriate standing committee thereof, containing its findings and recommendations with respect to each of the main recommendations made by the President in the Economic Report, including the sections covering the National Employment and Production Budget and the Full Employment Federal Budget, and from time to time to make such other reports and recommendations to the Senate and the House of Representatives and to each appropriate standing committee thereof as it deems advisable."

SEC. 6. Such Act is further amended by adding the following new sections:

"HEARINGS AND REPORTS BY THE STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE AND HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

"SEC. 6 (a). The Senate and House Appropriations Committees shall each in full committee hold hearings and consider in its entirety the Full Employment Federal Budget and shall report to their respective Houses of Congress as to their findings and recommendations. Among the witnesses to be called at such hearings shall be the Chairman and the ranking minority member of the Joint Economic Committee.

"(b) The standing committees of both Houses of Congress, when holding hearings on legislation substantially affecting the policies of this Act or the realization of its objectives of maximum employment, production, and purchasing power shall hear as witnesses on that legislation the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Joint Economic Committee. Reports pertaining to such legislation shall contain a statement of the Joint Economic Committee's position upon that legislation and the views of the standing committee with respect thereto.

"PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

"Sec. 7. (a) In order that the people of the United States, through their representative leadership may participate effectively in the development of private and public economic policies directed toward maximum employment, production, and purchasing power, there is hereby established a National Economic Advisory Council (hereinafter referred to as the 'Advisory Council') which shall serve in an advisory capacity to the Council of Economic Advisers and shall, among other duties, review annually and publish its recommendations on the national employment and production budget and the full employment budget.

"(b) The Advisory Council shall consist of 20 members to be appointed by the President from among representatives of industry, agriculture, labor consumer, and public interest groups and State and local governments. Members of the Advisory Council shall serve for terms of two years, except that members appointed to fill vacancies caused by death or resignation shall be appointed for the unexpired terms of their predecessors. One of the members shall be designated by the President as Chairman of the Advisory Council.

"(c) Members of the Advisory Council shall be entitled, while attending meetings of the Advisory Council, to receive compensation at a rate to be fixed by the President, but not exceeding $75 per diem, including travel time, and while away from their homes or regular places of business they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence as authorized by law for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

"(d) The Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers shall furnish the Advisory Council with such personnel, facilities and services as may be necessary to enable it to perform its functions.

"IMPROVEMENT FOR BUDGETARY PRACTICE

"SEC. 8. For the purpose of describing to the Congress in more meaningful terms the impact of the Federal Budget upon the economy and to enable the Congress to distinguish more effectively between the various types of expenditures, the President shall in the annual Budget Message:

"(1) present a full and detailed account of the flow of cash payments between the public and the Federal Government and shall specifically indicate the amount of the estimated cash surplus, or estimated cash deficit, as the case may be.

"(2) separate operating expenditures from investment-type expenditures which add to the wealth and prosperity of the country using such definitions and such detail as he shall deem appropriate.

"DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 9. As used in this Act:

"(1) The term 'short-range' means each fiscal year beginning July 1 following the submission of the Economic Report to the Congress and the term 'long-range' means the next succeeding five fiscal years beginning July 1 following the submission of the Economic Report to the Congress.

"(2) For the period ending June 30, 1968, the term 'maximum employment' means a level of unemployment in the civilian labor force not to exceed 4 percent of the labor force. Thereafter, the term 'maximum employment' shall mean a level of unemployment no greater than 3 percent of the civilian labor force.

"(3) 'Maximum production' means that amount of production resulting from maximum employment, commensurate with freedom of choice between employment and leisure, and maximum productivity under conditions reflecting optimum utilization of scientific knowledge, technological improvements, labor force and managerial ability.

"(4) 'Maximum purchasing power' means that amount of purchasing power necessary to maintain maximum employment and production, to make possible adequate economic growth and to assure a minimum adequate personal and family budget to all groups in American society without generating that type of inflationary pressure which results from purchasing power markedly in excess of maximum productive capacities."

SEC. 7(a) Except as provided in subsections (b) and (c) this Act shall take effect on the date of its enactment.

"(b) The provisions of sections 4, 5, and 6 shall become effective January 1, 1965 and shall be applicable to the Economic Report transmitted on January 20, 1966 and each succeeding year thereafter.

"(c) The provisions of section 8 shall be effective with respect to the annual Budget Message for the fiscal year 1966 and each subsequent annual Budget Message."

EXHIBIT 1

PERSPECTIVES ON EMPLOYMENT UNDER TECHNICAL CHANGE

(By Otto Eckstein)

It is a great pleasure for me to participate in this conference devoted to the employment of automation and advanced technology. The papers that will be presented in the next few days will provide useful analyses and exchange of experience.

The problems will not be the same in each country. In some, inadequate supplies of the highly trained personnel to carry through the technological revolution of industry will be the central manpower problem. In others, the resultant dislocations must be the focus of attention.

I shall speak tonight only of the experience of my own country. It is the only one for which I could hope to attempt to keep track of the enormous volume of writing on the subject. And more important, it is the only one in which I can confront the universe of statistics with the observations of the naked eye, to maintain a link between the reported figures and the crude reality.

My country's experience also may be of interest as a laboratory for the rest of the world. Endowed by rich resources, free from war on her soil for a century, the United States has been able to reap the full harvest of technological progress and to achieve an unprecedented abundance of material goods. At the same time, the United States has also experienced the social costs of technical progress as some skills have become obsolete, and some areas have suffered from the decline of their basic industries. We are now in the midst of a major social experiment designed to assure that all the groups in society will share in that progress, and to ease the dislocations caused by the process of change itself.

The United States has also experienced more unemployment than it would wish in the last 6 years. This unemployment has been identified by some observers with the process of technological change. There has been a lively discussion of this diagnosis and I am sure that you will see some of this discussion here in the next few days.

As a useful background for your deliberations, I thought I might give you some general perspectives on the American situation this evening:

First, to show the historical changes in the structure of employment under the process of technological change.

Second, to analyze the development of unemployment within the macroeconomic framework.

Third, to point to the particular structure of unemployment today, and pinpoint the resultant key problems.

Fourth, to discuss the progress already made to alleviate the structural problems and the further progress to be expected from a return to full employment.

Finally, to consider the remaining agenda for public policy.

LONG-RUN CHANGES IN THE STRUCTURE OF EMPLOYMENT

The impact of the technological revolution on the pattern of employment in the United States can be seen from table 1.

TABLE 1.—*Percent distribution of the economically active civilian population, by major occupation group, 1900–63*

Major occupation group	Percent distribution							
	1963 [1]	1960	1950	1940	1930	1920	1910	1900
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
White collar workers	42.9	42.3	36.6	31.1	29.4	24.9	21.3	17.6
Professional, technical, etc	12.1	11.4	8.6	7.5	6.8	5.4	4.7	4.3
Managers, officials, and proprietors, except farm	.4	8.4	8.7	7.3	7.4	6.6	6.6	5.8
Clerical workers, etc	15.2	15.0	12.3	9.6	8.9	8.0	5.3	3.0
Sales workers	7.2	7.5	7.0	6.7	6.3	4.9	4.7	4.5
Blue collar workers	39.6	39.6	41.1	39.8	39.6	40.2	38.2	35.8
Skilled (craftsmen, foremen, etc.)	14.5	14.3	14.1	12.0	12.8	13.0	11.6	10.5
Semiskilled (operatives, etc.)	20.1	19.9	20.4	18.4	15.8	15.6	14.6	12.8
Unskilled (laborers)	5.1	5.4	6.6	9.4	11.0	11.6	12.0	12.5
Service workers	12.3	11.8	10.5	11.7	9.8	7.8	9.6	9.0
Private household workers	2.9	2.8	2.6	4.7	4.1	3.3	5.0	5.4
Service workers, except private household	9.5	9.0	7.9	7.1	5.7	4.5	4.6	3.6
Farm workers	5.2	6.3	11.8	17.4	21.2	27.0	30.9	37.5
Farmers and farm managers	3.3	3.9	7.4	10.4	12.4	15.3	16.5	19.9
Farm laborers and foremen	2.0	2.4	4.4	7.0	8.8	11.7	14.4	17.7

[1] Estimated from data from Monthly Labor Force Survey, using 1960 census data as benchmark.

Source: "Manpower Report of the President," 1963, p. 201, census data.

The changes of this century are so vast as to stagger the imagination. The farm labor force declined from 37.5 percent to just a bit over 5 percent, and that 5 percent manages to produce a surplus. Blue-collar jobs were a roughly constant fraction of the total, but within it the unskilled declined from 12.5 to 5.1 percent, and the skilled increased from 10.5 to 14.5 percent. But the rise of the semiskilled, from 12.8 to 20.1 percent, is the most striking change within the blue-collar group.

The biggest increase, of course, was in the white-collar occupations, which now constitute 42.9 percent of the labor force. Professional and technical workers rose from 4.3 to 12.1 percent, clerical workers from 3 to 15.2 percent.

These changes in occupations were facilitated by a great increase in the education of the labor force. Table 2 provides a long-term perspective:

TABLE 2.—*Percent of young population in school*

Percent of—	1920	1930	1940	1950	1960
15-year-olds in school	72.9	84.7	87.6	91.4	92.6
17-year-olds in school	34.6	47.9	60.9	68.2	75.6
18-year-olds in school	21.7	30.7	36.4	39.8	50.6
20-year-olds in school	8.3	12.1	12.5	17.9	23.5

Source: "Manpower Report of the President," 1964, p. 218.

Forty years ago the common pattern was to leave school at about the age of 16, but today more than half of the 18-year-olds are still in school. There is also a sharp increase in the percentage going on to higher education.

TABLE 3.—*Educational attainment of the civilian labor force 18 years old and over, by sex and color, 1952–62*

	Percent distribution by years of school completed						
	Elementary		High school		College		School years not reported
	Less than 5 years [1]	5 to 8 years	1 to 3 years	4 years	1 to 3 years	4 years or more	
Both sexes, total:							
October 1952 [1]	7.3	30.2	18.5	26.6	8.3	7.9	1.2
March 1962 [1]	4.6	22.4	19.3	32.1	10.7	11.0	(1)

[1] March 1962 data for persons whose educational attainment was not reported were allocated to other categories.

Source: "Manpower Report of the President," 1964, p. 218.

The changes in the educational attainments of the labor force over the last 10 years can be seen in table 3. The fraction with a complete high-school (12-year) education rose from 42.8 to 53.8 percent. The percent who had some higher education increased from 16.2 to 21.7 percent. Today two-thirds of all students finish high school, and of these about half go on to higher education.

These figures also show the declining role of the workers with less than 8 years of education, a group which has loomed large in the discussions of structural unemployment. The fraction of the labor force with 8 years or less of schooling declined from 37.5 to 27 percent in just 10 years. Today this group consists primarily of people beyond the age of 45 and its number is shrinking rapidly.

The changes in occupation and in educational attainments illustrate that the economy has been required to undergo very large structural changes throughout the century. I am sure that at many points in history observers could easily have become frightened at the changes in process and in prospect. But our economy proved capable of adjustment to structural change.

THE MACROECONOMIC PERSPECTIVE ON UNEMPLOYMENT

The second perspective I wish to apply is the macroeconomic one. It treats the broad movements of employment and unemployment as macroeconomic variables which are determined by the behavior of the economy as a whole.

In one version—not the most sophisticated—the theory says the following: A modern economy has a certain secular growth of productive capacity based on the growth of the labor force, capital accumulation, education, and technological progress. When total real demand for goods and services expands at a rate higher than this secular rate, employment will increase by more than normal labor force growth, and unemployment will decline, ultimately reaching the stage of labor shortage. Conversely, if total real demand expands at a slower rate than the secular rate of growth, employment will grow by less than the normal growth of the labor force and unemployment will increase.

The short-run relation between economic growth and unemployment is complicated by two important phenomena: First, productivity responds very favorably to "gap closing" increases in the rate of output in excess of the normal long-run growth rate, reducing the accompanying employment increases. Second, the labor force itself responds to the availability of job opportunities, and when employment expands faster than the long-run trend of the labor force, additional persons seek works and accept jobs. As a result of these two phenomena, a 1 percent extra increase of total output leads to a substantially smaller decline in the unemployment rate.

Elsewhere I have set forth this analysis at greater length,[1] and have used it to account for the U.S. postwar unemployment history. My findings were these: From 1948 to 1960, while the underlying demography should have produced a growth of the labor force of about 800,000 persons a year, the economy had to expand at 3.5 percent a year in order to leave the unemployment rate constant. (See appendix tables A1 to A3.) Of this 3.5 percent, about two-thirds was necessary to create jobs for workers displaced by the general long-run productivity advance, the remaining third to absorb the increase in the labor force.

---

[1] "Aggregate Demand and the Current Unemployment Problem," in "Unemployment and the American Economy," Arthur M. Ross, Wiley & Sons, 1964, ch. 5. A more elaborate analysis, explaining various components of unemployment, can be found in the forthcoming study by Lester C. Thurow.

When the rate of growth of output exceeded 3.5 percent a year, unemployment shrank, with every extra 1 percent of growth a year cutting into unemployment rate by 0.3 to 0.4 percent. Thus, during the rapid expansion from 1948 to 1953, when the real growth rate was 4.7 percent a year, unemployment fell substantially, with the economy reaching the unusually low unemployment rate of 2.9 percent. In the succeeding two business cycles, the rate of expansion was about 2.5 percent a year. As a result, the unemployment rate increased to 4.3 percent at the business cycle peak of 1957, and to 5.6 percent at the peak of 1960.

After 1960, the number of people of working age grew more rapidly and the secular growth of productive capacity accelerated to a figure of 3.8 to 4 percent. The actual rate of expansion was just about sufficient to absorb the increase in the labor force, but not large enough to reduce the unemployment. The unemployment rate of the 1961 recession of 6.7 percent was reduced sharply, but the improvement in the unemployment rate leveled off at 5.6 percent.

Thus, there is no deep mystery to the increase of unemployment in the United States over the last 10 years. The unemployment developed over two business cycles which had a rate of expansion below the secular growth of potential of the economy; when the economy's actual production returned to this secular growth rate, the deterioration of unemployment stopped, but there was no improvement.

Since 1963, and particularly since the massive tax cut enacted at the beginning of this year, the prospect is very much brightened. The real rate of growth of output in the last 12 months—1963–II to 1964–II—has been between 5 and 5½ percent, and in accord with the past macroeconomic relations, has led to an improvement in the unemployment rate of one-half percent, from 5.8 to 5.3 percent. It is hoped that the rate of expansion in the next 12 months also will exceed a real rate of 5 percent, or substantially in excess of the current rate of secular growth of the economy's potential, even allowing for the increase in the growth of the labor force. If the expansion is maintained undiminished, the national unemployment rate for the year 1965 should be below 5 percent.

THE STRUCTURE OF UNEMPLOYMENT IN OUR OWN DAY: WHO IS LEFT WITHOUT A JOB?

While the total level of unemployment has to be explained by broad trends in gross output and labor force growth, its structure depends on changes in the supply and demand for different kinds of labor. The job mix changes under the impact of advancing technology and shifts in desired outputs; the labor force changes with its age structure, and with the steady improvement in its educational attainments.

I shall now single out some of the most important characteristics of unemployment at the present time, discuss the progress that has already been made through Government policy and the current expansion, and take a look at some prospective developments.

The young worker

We are currently going through a period in which there is a very sharp increase in the number of people reaching the age brackets in which they enter the labor force. Young people begin to enter the labor force at 14, mostly on a part-time basis, with age 18 now the most typical age of full-time entry, but at least a third entering later. Using age 18 as a rough indicator of entry, it can be seen from table 4 that the number of people reaching that age increased from a range of from 2 to 2.5 million in the 1950's to about 2.8 million in the first years of the 1960's. The unemployment rate of the teenagers has been high, over 15 percent in 1963. And while this rate has always been more than twice the national average rate, the relative position has deteriorated in the last year, as R. A. Gordon has pointed out in his recent paper.[2]

That the unemployment rate among the young is extremely high at the moment is not surprising. They are coming on to the labor market at a time when there is still some general unemployment, and are finding it difficult to find their first full-time job. In addition, the rising importance of seniority arrangements and the very low quit rates now prevailing in high-wage industries mean that the older workers tend to remain employed, leaving the younger workers to be victims of the overall shortage of jobs.

The problem of the young workers will be intensified over the next few years. The really big jump in their numbers has just begun (see table 4). The postwar change in the birth rate came in 1946, and especially in 1947. From now on, the number of 18-year-olds will be 3.5 to 3.7 million a year, a jump of a million over last year.

TABLE 4.—*Estimates of projections of the number of people reaching 18 years of age, 1951 to 1972*

[Number reaching age 18 (in thousands)]

Year ending July 1:	
1951	2,065
1952	2,045
1953	2,135
1954	2,152
1955	2,150
1956	2,240
1957	2,289
1958	2,296
1959	2,405
1960	2,573
1961	2,911
1962	2,738
1963	2,753
Projection: [1]	
1964	2,700
1965	3,700
1966	3,400
1967	3,400
1968	3,400
1969	3,400
1970	3,500
1971	3,600
1972	3,700

[1] Projections based on present population structure adjusted for mortality and net migration.

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, Population Reports, P–25, No. 276, pp. 3, 14; also P–25, No. 187, p. 13.

The young workers entering the labor force today have had more education than any group before them. They are the most mobile part of the labor force, the most trainable, and the most flexible, with no job attachments to declining industries or obsolete skills. As the economy expands and the total number of jobs rises to the requisite number, they will find their proper slots, and indeed will presently provide a very large pool of highly mobile, flexible manpower than can, if given the chance, reduce the likelihood of labor bottlenecks on the road to full employment. Their immensely rising numbers do mean, however, that any shortage in the total number of jobs will be felt most keenly by this group.

The unskilled and uneducated

The unemployment rate of the unskilled is always above the average and in 1963 was 12.1 percent. This high rate is about what one would expect from the normal historical relation between the national unemployment rate and the unskilled rate[3] but that is cold comfort to the affected individuals.

TABLE 5.—*Teenage unemployment rates versus total unemployment rates*

	Age 14 to 19		Total labor force
	Male	Female	
1947	9.1	7.1	3.6
1948	8.3	7.3	3.4
1949	11.9	11.2	5.5
1950	11.0	10.4	5.0
1951	7.0	7.4	3.0
1952	7.6	7.0	2.7
1953	6.8	6.0	2.5
1954	11.2	10.0	5.0
1955	9.9	9.0	4.0
1956	9.6	9.9	3.8
1957	11.3	10.0	4.3
1958	15.2	13.1	6.8
1959	13.8	12.3	5.5
1960	14.0	12.9	5.6
1961	15.4	14.8	6.7
1962	13.3	13.2	5.6
1963	15.5	15.7	5.7
May 1963 [1]	18.0	19.3	5.6
May 1964 [1]	15.3	18.7	4.9

[1] Not seasonally adjusted.

Source: "President's Manpower Report," 1964, p. 200, and U.S. Department of Labor, Monthly Report on the Labor Force, May 1964, p. 15.

Employers are becoming less and less willing to hire the uneducated even for unskilled jobs. Job specifications are being upgraded to require a high school education. For example, many retail stores are reluctant to hire salesgirls without their diploma. Anybody dealing with the public—and this includes many of the jobs in the expanding service sector must possess basic literacy. What is happening is that a high school education is becoming the entry ticket for most of the attractive jobs. As the general education norm has risen throughout the entire population, the minority of people which fails to meet the norm is frozen out of a progressively larger set of jobs, and faces a dimmer and dimmer future.

These developments make it particularly important that just as large a percentage as possible of the new entrants into the labor force be equipped with a high school education. Every student who drops out before obtaining his diploma must be considered a candidate for recurrent unemployment, low income, and public assistance.[4] For older workers without the basic literacy skills, the adult education provisions of the antipoverty program should offer at least a pilot program.

A return to fuller employment would reduce the unemployment rate of this segment of workers, just as it has on every previous occasion since the war. With a national rate of 4 percent, the unskilled rate should be 7 to 8 percent. This is a great improvement, but far from a satisfactory state of affairs. If the number of unskilled among the new workers were reduced through various programs, our employment goals could be raised, and the unemployment rate among the remaining unskilled improved.

The Federal Government has taken a number of steps to strengthen its program to help the young unskilled with inadequate education. The Vocational Training Act of 1963 increases Federal grants to the States for this purpose. The 1963 amendments to the Manpower Development and Training Act lower the eligibility age for training from 19 to 17. The education program enacted in 1963 particularly expands aid to higher education.

---

[2] R. A. Gordon, "Has Structural Unemployment Worsened?" Industrial Relations, May 1964.

[3] For statistical documentation, see testimony of Walter W. Heller before the Subcommittee on Labor and Manpower, U.S. Senate, reprinted as appendix A, "Economic Report of the President, 1964," p. 177.

[4] See Vera C. Perrella, "Employment of High School Graduates and Dropouts in 1963," Monthly Labor Review, BLS, May 1964.

Other measures are now before the Congress. The antipoverty program would help the new entrants to the labor force by setting up the Job Corps to give basic education, vocational training, and work experience to high school dropouts, living outside their usual unfavorable home environment in special training centers. A work-training program would be set up for the young unemployed, under which they would be able to participate in public service projects. Finally, part-time employment for low-income college students would also be offered by the educational and other public and nonprofit institutions, with the Federal Government bearing much of the cost.

These are important measures. As we gather experience with them, we will be able to perfect them and strengthen them. Other measures will be needed, most of the education and training programs so far advanced would help people once they are about to enter the labor force. Much remains to be done to keep the youngsters on the main educational track in the first 10 grades of school, compensating for cultural deprivation and offering curricula realistically tailored to make the bottom third of the school classes reasonably effective members of society. As our education system as a whole is being upgraded, with curricula being toughened, new means have to be devised to help the group at the bottom. The community action program which is part of the antipoverty proposals could become the vehicle for experimental approaches to these basic difficulties.

Negro unemployment

The "President's Manpower Report for 1964" discusses the problem of Negro unemployment in some detail and I shall not repeat this analysis here. The unemployment rate for Negroes has been running at more than twice the national unemployment rate, and while part of the differential can be explained by the much larger number of unskilled workers in the Negro labor force, this fact alone accounts for only a small part of the difference. Within given skill categories, Negro unemployment rates are much higher than white rates. Particular attention has been focused recently on the astronomical unemployment rates among Negro teenagers. For example, in 1963 this rate was 30 percent.

While I do not believe that the present civil rights crisis and Negro unrest can be primarily explained in economic terms—the time was more than ripe for the Negro to seek true equality in our society—a return to full employment will make an important contribution toward social stability. Negro unemployment would respond favorably to improved general conditions, and while much more is needed, a reduction of the 1963 unemployment rate of 11 percent to the 5 percent which prevailed in the early 1950's or even the 7–8 percent of the mid-fifties, would be a big step in the right direction. This is no substitute for true equality of opportunity and the Government must work toward that goal in many ways.

The fair employment practices provision of the civil rights law just enacted should accelerate the widening of job opportunities for Negroes. The Federal Government now bears the special responsibility to use its training programs to equip Negroes with the skills to take the newly opening positions.

Semiskilled workers in mass production assembly line industries: prime victims of automation

While most of the public attention has been focused on the difficulties of the unskilled workers, a new group of blue-collar workers has seen its situation deteriorate—the semiskilled. In my view the group at the very center of the automation problem consists of the semiskilled who man the assembly lines in such mass production industries as autos, meat packing, rubber, and in continuous process industries such as steel, chemicals, and petroleum refining. These industries completed their initial growth phase by 1930 and were unionized after the passage of the Wagner Act by the new industrial unions. The workers have earned good wages reflecting the high output per man-hour.

In the last 10 years, the technology of assembly lines has been changed by the coming of electronically controlled and programed equipment. The growth of output of these industries was small or nonexistent in the late fifties and early sixties, and with the coming of the automated equipment, the total labor force contracted considerably. These industries have now resumed their output growth and have a bright future before them, but the process of automation is far from complete and the resultant rapid increases of productivity will reduce requirements for additional workers and displace some workers now on the job.

Numerically, the semiskilled as a whole have not suffered from a worsening of their position. In fact, they are now a smaller fraction of all the unemployed than earlier in the postwar period and their unemployment rate is closer to average experience than before.[5] But technological change has put many of the jobs in peril, and when displacement comes, it poses particularly difficult problems of adjustment.

Let me illustrate with the findings of a study which was recently done by John W. Dorsey.[6] He interviewed several hundred workers who lost their jobs when a plant of the Mack Truck Co. was closed in Plainfield, N.J., and relocated in a depressed area in Maryland. Dorsey traced the employment experience of the people who lost their jobs. Some of the skilled workers were able to move with the plant since they were badly needed in the new location. Others readily found comparable jobs in the old area or nearby. The unskilled workers had rather moderate expectations and, on the whole, found other jobs after some delays. But the semiskilled workers who constituted the largest part of the labor force really found themselves in difficulty. It turned out that the skills they have acquired on the assembly lines had very little transferable value. In the open labor market they really were not very different from unskilled workers even though they had a long job history in which they viewed themselves as being skilled, working with complicated equipment, and earning a good rate of pay. Many of the semiskilled were still out of work 6 months or even a year later, and those who did find jobs had to take reductions in pay on the order of 40 percent.

This group of workers will continue to constitute the most serious human problem of adjustment to automation. There will be many other plant closings and partial layoffs. Hardships are imposed when a worker, often no longer young and the head of a household, suddenly finds that his ability to earn an income has been slashed for reasons beyond his control. These are the cases that pose the most difficulties for collective bargaining—how to permit technological progress to continue, yet to limit the human costs for the displaced individuals. The problem is particularly acute in the case of plant closings, when seniority offers less protection to the longtime employee than in the case of partial displacements.

A return to full employment will, of course, preserve relatively more of such jobs since it will take more workers to produce a greater output. Also, it will be much easier for the displaced to find comparable job opportunities in other industries. In this connection let me present to you the interesting findings of the recent study of plant closings by Wilcock and Franke.[7] They analyzed five rather comparable plant closings in different parts of the country, four of them meatpacking plants. They found that the reemployment experience in areas with low and declining unemployment was much better than in areas which had excess unemployment even before the shutdown. After 1 year, 60 percent of the workers were still unemployed in the worst of the areas; in the best of the areas 22 percent were unemployed. Those who found jobs typically took pay cuts. These cuts were especially great in those areas with a low regional wage structure, since the previous jobs had been paid according to a national wage scale. The average reductions in pay ranged from 9 percent in the high-wage area to 41 percent in the low-wage area. The skilled workers suffered the smallest losses because their skills had a transferable value. The wages of the semiskilled sank toward the unskilled levels in their new jobs.

TABLE 6.—*Annual average work force, employed in originally designated 5(a)[1] areas, 1958–63*

	1958	1961	1962	1963
Work force (number)	5,417,500	5,250,000	5,194,700	5,157,000
Employment (number)	4,701,100	4,678,700	4,754,800	4,772,700
Unemployment (number)	716,400	571,300	439,900	384,400
Rate of unemployment (percent) in the designated 5(a) areas	13.2	10.9	8.5	7.5
U.S. rate of unemployment (percent)	6.8	6.7	5.6	5.7

[1] 5(a) areas constitute most of the areas depressed because of unemployment. It does not include some small areas, and the low-income areas.

NOTE.—All data for 61 of the 114 areas originally designated as of June 1961. The remaining 53 areas were excluded because of incomplete data.

Source: Area Redevelopment Administration, Area Redevelopment in Action, April 1964, p. 11.

Prosperity alone will not solve the problems of this group. The manpower retraining program of 1962 will give some of the semiskilled the new skills which will restore their ability to earn the incomes to which they have become accustomed. In the case of older workers, early retirement, extra vacations and other such means may reduce the problem. The President's Labor-Management Advisory Committee held a series of regional conferences on this problem. I assume that much of this conference will also be devoted to the search for new solutions for this group.

---

[5] "Manpower Report of the President, 1964," p. 201.

[6] John W. Dorsey, "The Mack Case: A Study in Unemployment," economics of public expenditure program, Graduate School of Public Administration, Harvard University, sponsored by the Committee on Government Finance, the Brookings Institution. To be published.

[7] Richard C. Wilcock and Walter H. Franke, "Unwanted Workers," the Free Press, 1963.

Depressed areas

Concentration of unemployment in some areas is a long recognized feature of the structure of unemployment and one which has received considerable policy attention. The area redevelopment program of 1961, which makes low interest loans available for private and public investments, and gives some grants, technical assistance, and special training for unemployed workers, has made important contributions toward recovery of these areas. In addition, the classic adjustment processes have also been at work, and together these two factors have gone some distance toward curing the problem. The Congress is presently considering a special program for the development of the mountain region of Appalachia, which has suffered from a decline of employment in coal mining and has little other economic base.

The extent of progress can be seen from table 6, which shows the unemployment experience of 61 areas designated to be redevelopment areas when the program was first started. This group of areas had an average unemployment rate of 13.2 percent in 1958, or about twice the national rate, but in 1963 the rate had declined to 7.5 percent which was only a third above the national average.

The extent of adjustment can be seen by looking at the major labor market areas which had the worst unemployment experience. Table 7 shows the 15 worst areas out of the 150 major labor market areas as of 1959, and their experience in 1962 and 1963. The table also shows the areas that had joined this hapless group as of 1963. The depressed areas of West Virginia and Pennsylvania show marked improvement; but new trouble spots are developing in Puerto Rico and Massachusetts.

These figures show that as an above normal rate of unemployment persists in the economy, the dispersion of that unemployment gradually becomes more even. Some workers move to more prosperous areas, other withdraw from the labor force, and industries are attracted to the depressed areas through policy measures and the availability of labor. As the economy returns to full employment, the number of areas with very high unemployment rates will continue to diminish drastically,[5] as some jobs come to the areas and outmigration is accelerated by the pull of job opportunities elsewhere.

CONCLUSIONS

What then are the conclusions for policy that follow from the preceding discussion?

The continued pursuit of expansionary fiscal and monetary policies is an absolute essential to the solution of unemployment problems. When the national unemployment rate returns to 4 percent, the rates for the components of unemployment will also decline, as they have in every other postwar recovery.

Equally important, a return to full employment is necessary to permit the manpower retraining policies, area redevelopment policies, the new Job Corps and other "structural" measures to become fully effective. In the context of full employment, these policies are certain to add to the national output. Without full employment it is impossible to ascertain whether the jobs filled by the trainees constitute reshuffling of jobs among individuals and areas, or net additions to employment.

TABLE 7.—*Rankings of top 15 major labor market areas, by unemployment rates, 1959, 1962, and 1963*

Area	1959 level	1962 level	1963 level	Rank		
				1959	1962	1963
Johnstown, Pa.	16.5	14.5	10.3	1.0	1.0	4.5
Wilkes-Barre-Hazelton, Pa.	16.0	10.4	9.9	2.0	7.0	8.0
Scranton, Pa.	14.2	11.5	11.3	3.0	5.0	3.0
Wheeling, W. Va.	13.7	12.1	10.3	4.0	4.0	4.5
Ponce, P.R.	13.2	13.3	15.2	5.0	2.0	1.0
Huntington-Ashland, W. Va.	13.1	10.3	8.7	6.0	8.0	10.0
Mayazuez, P.R.	12.3	13.2	14.8	7.0	3.0	2.0
Erie, Pa.[1]	11.2	7.6	7.3	8.5	21.5	20.5
Altoona, Pa.	11.2	10.5	10.0	8.5	6.0	6.5
Flint, Mich.	10.8	3.7	3.0	10.0	123.5	139.5
Duluth-Superior, Minn.	9.9	9.1	7.7	11.0	12.0	18.0
Atlantic City, N.J.	9.5	8.2	8.2	12.0	14.5	13.0
San Juan, P.R.[1]	9.4	6.3	6.5	13.0	38.5	31.5
Beaumont-Port Arthur, Tex.[1]	9.3	6.8	7.1	14.5	28.0	24.0
New Bedford, Mass.	9.3	7.9	8.0	14.5	19.5	15.5
Pittsburgh, Pa.[2]	9.1	9.4	8.0	10.0	9.5	15.5
Lowell, Mass.[2]	8.7	8.0	8.5	18.0	18.0	12.0
Fall River, Mass.[2]	7.9	9.4	10.0	25.0	9.5	6.5
Stockton, Calif.[2]	7.4	8.6	8.6	27.5	13.0	11.0
Brockton, Mass.[2]	7.0	7.6	8.1	33.0	21.5	14.0
Fresno, Calif.	5.9	8.2	7.9	55.5	14.5	17.0
Miami, Fla.[1]	5.6	9.2	9.0	64.5	11.0	9.0
Youngstown-Warren, Ohio	4.8	8.2	6.2	85.5	14.5	36.0
Total, United States	5.5	5.6	5.7			

[1] Area no longer in top 15 in 1963.
[2] Additions to top 15 in 1963.

Source: "Manpower Report of the President," 1964, pp 237-239.

The push toward 4 percent unemployment must be persistent, and one should not expect that the target will be achieved within a few months. If past relations between changes in unemployment and the rate of growth continue, and there is no reason to think otherwise, it will take most of the 2 years at the present rate of growth to return the economy to the 4-percent unemployment level. The massive tax cut of 1964 has put the economy on its proper course, increasing consumption purchases and business investment. But it may be that additional fiscal measures will be needed to keep the expansion at its high rate.

We must not let ourselves become frightened by the "structural" problems before us. Some observers have argued that the composition of our labor force is so out of line with the present-day job requirements that we would run into serious labor shortages even with an unemployment rate of 5 percent. To the best of my knowledge, there is little reason to expect such a turn of events.

Unemployment is not uniquely concentrated in any particular skill or area and, conversely, there are no general labor shortages in prospect for anything but the most narrowly defined skill categories. There may not be enough IBM 7094 programers or economists specializing in the problems of the underdeveloped countries. Nor will every employer find the best qualified machinists or electronic technicians waiting outside his door on the morning he decides to hire some. Good people are always hard to find. There are always shortages such as these. I am sure they could even be found in 1933 when one worker out of four was out of a job. They constitute no reason to keep the demand for total goods and services short of the economy's capacity to produce.

The likely concentration of unemployment among the young workers is the single most important structural characteristic of unemployment today. As the economy moves toward full employment, this pool of teenagers constitutes an opportunity, not a problem. With proper complementary policies of general and vocational education, both public and private, this group can fill the jobs that will open up.

It would be a most serious error if we slackened our efforts to increase the total number of job opportunities by false fears of labor shortages at a time when many workers are victims of general unemployment, and when the number of young people about to begin their search for a full-time job is rising so sharply. We have a long way to go to provide a sufficient number of jobs for the labor force as a whole. There is no surer way to compound our unemployment problems than to ease up on our policies of expansion.

TABLE A-1.—*Population aged 18 to 64, labor force, employment, and unemployment 1948–1964*

Year	Population, 18 to 64 [1]	Labor force [2]	Employment [3]	Unemployment
1948	89,880	62,898	60,573	2,325
1949	90,765	63,721	60,039	3,682
1950	91,897	64,749	61,398	3,351
1951	92,006	65,983	63,884	2,099
1952	92,280	66,560	64,628	1,932
1953	92,772	67,362	65,492	1,870
1954	93,509	67,818	64,240	3,578
1955	94,386	68,898	65,994	2,904
1956	95,171	70,387	67,565	2,822
1957	95,913	70,744	67,808	2,936
1958	96,615	71,284	66,603	4,681
1959	97,405	71,946	68,133	3,813
1960	98,280	73,126	69,195	3,931
1961	99,593	74,175	69,369	4,806
1962	100,634	74,839	70,827	4,012
1963	101,748	75,712	71,546	4,166
May 1963 [4]		75,759	71,457	4,302
May 1964 [4]		77,343	73,502	3,841

[1] Total resident population adjusted to exclude Alaska and Hawaii.
[2] Total labor force, including Armed Forces.
[3] Total civilian employed plus the Armed Forces.
[4] Seasonally adjusted.

Source on population: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. "Current Population Reports." Series P-25, Nos. 37, 39, 265, 276.

Source on labor force, employment, and unemployment: U.S. Department of Commerce. "Business Statistics," 1963 edition. Joint Economic Committee, Economic Indicators, June 1964.

---

[5] Figures for insured unemployment show substantial improvement for 9 of the 16 worst areas of 1963 by May 1964. Only in 4 did unemployment rise in the most recent period.

The real inflationary danger to this expansion does not lie in the imminent labor bottlenecks, but from a renewal of cost-push inflation. So far this expansion has been marked by a remarkable stability of prices, a stability which persisted even through the recent months of 5-percent growth. Because of this absence of inflation, the Government has been free to pursue an expansionist policy. If business and labor set loose an inflationary process, this could disrupt the domestic expansion and force curbs to be placed upon it. And a resumption of price inflation could, of course, undermine and reverse the recent—and needed—gains we have been making in our balance-of-payments position.

The challenging task before us is the development of an optimal mix of demand and labor market policies for expansion. On the one hand, the Government should continue to do everything it can to keep the growth of final demand at a sufficient rate. On the other hand, we must equip the new entrants to the labor force to match the job opportunities, and we must restore the high productivity of workers laid off by technological advance. The combination of these policies will permit us not only to make good our interim employment target but safely to set and achieve higher targets that will promote social justice by giving all the people in the labor force the opportunity to share in the material progress of our society.

TABLE A-2.—*Changes over previous year in population aged 18 to 64, labor force, employment, and unemployment*

Year	Population 18 to 64	Labor force	Employment	Unemployment
1949	885	823	−534	1,357
1950	1,132	1,028	1,359	−331
1951	109	1,234	2,486	−1,252
1952	274	577	744	−167
1953	492	802	864	−62
1954	737	456	−1,252	1,708
1955	877	1,080	1,754	−674
1956	785	1,489	1,571	−82
1957	742	357	243	114
1958	702	540	−1,205	1,745
1959	790	662	1,530	−868
1960	875	1,180	1,062	118
1961	1,313	1,049	174	875
1962	1,041	664	1,458	−794
1963	1,114	873	719	154
May 1963 May 1964		1,584	2,045	−461

Source: Table A-1.

TABLE A-3.—*Population and labor force, employment and unemployment over postwar business cycles, peak to peak*

[In thousands]

Period (increase from—to)	Population, 18 to 64	Annual average increase	Labor force	Annual average increase	Employment	Annual average increase	Unemployment	Annual average change
1948—53	2,892	578	4,464	893	4,919	984	−455	−91
1953—57	3,141	785	3,382	846	2,316	579	1,066	266
1957—60	2,367	789	2,382	794	1,387	462	995	332
1960—63 [1]	3,368	1,156	2,586	862	2,351	784	235	73

[1] Not a peak.

Source: Table A-1.

FULL EMPLOYMENT AS A POLICY GOAL

(By R. A. Gordon, University of California, Berkeley)

(NOTE.—This paper represents a progress report on research the results of which, it is hoped, will be embodied in a monograph concerned with full employment as a policy goal. This is part of the Research Program on Unemployment at the University of California, Berkeley, which is being supported by a grant from the Ford Foundation. The assistance of Mr. Ralph Abascal in the preparation of this paper is gratefully acknowledged.)

It is fair to say that high employment is a primary goal of economic policy today in all the industrially advanced countries of the Western World. We usually refer to this goal as that of "full employment," although there are still objections to the use of this term in the United States. These objections are perhaps less widespread than they were at the beginning of the postwar period, when the Murray Full Employment Bill became the Employment Act of 1946. Thus, in 1960, President Eisenhower's Commission on National Goals apparently felt no compunction in referring to "our goal of full employment." [1] And more recently Arthur F. Burns felt moved to say: "I believe that the American people are more firmly committed to that ideal of full employment than they were a generation ago. If the Employment Act were recast today, it might even be christened 'The Full Employment Act,' as was the original Murray Bill." [2]

THE CONTRAST BETWEEN EUROPE AND THE UNITED STATES

Whether we use the term "full employment" or not, employment policy has not meant the same thing in Western Europe and the United States in recent years. The contrast is a twofold one: in aspiration levels and in success in achieving these aspirations.

The European countries have set their employment goals high. Further, they have raised their sights over the last decade. Rates of unemployment that were considered satisfactory a decade or more ago are now considered to be unacceptably high. One can say that a ratchet effect has been at work. The longer unemployment has remained at levels of 3 or 2 percent or less, the stronger has become the resolve not to permit a return to unemployment levels of 4 or 5 percent or more that once were considered satisfactory or at least acceptable.[3] And the longer overall unemployment has remained at a very low level, the stronger has become the resolve to eliminate remaining pockets of above-average unemployment—which, to the extent that they exist in most Western European countries, reflect regional problems rather than differential opportunities related to age, color, education, or occupation.

The employment goal has been set high in Europe, and the success in achieving the goal has been impressive. Unemployment in the United States has not been below 5 percent since 1957. Contrast this with the record summarized in table 1. If, for the moment, we take these figures at their face value, we see that not a single European country listed had an unemployment rate as high as 4 percent in 1961 or 1962. Of the countries listed, only Italy has experienced unemployment in excess of 4 percent since 1955; and over this same period only Italy again has had an unemployment rate higher than that in the United States in some years (all before 1960). In the last half-dozen years or so, France, West Germany, the Netherlands, Sweden, and the United Kingdom have regularly been operating at unemployment rates well below 3 percent, and usually below 2 percent. The same is true of most of the rest of Western Europe.

But are these figures comparable with the American estimates? The figures in parentheses for 1960–62 in table 1 offer a partial answer to this question. These provide revised unemployment rates adjusted to correspond to American definitions. The revisions were made by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics.[4] Unfortunately, similar revised figures are not available for earlier years.

The adjustments effected by the figures in parentheses are moderate, being largest in the case of France and England. By and large, what we said previously about low unemployment in Europe still holds. Unemployment rates of 3 percent or less—usually much less—have been the rule in recent years. A number of European countries have had serious unemployment problems at some time during the last 15 years; for example, the absorption of refugees in West Germany, some difficult problems of adjustment in Belgium, and the continuing struggle with unemployment and underemployment in Italy's Mezzogiorno. But despite this, unemployment rates as high as 3 percent by American definitions have been the exception rather than the rule in recent years.

This is not to say that it is reasonable to assume that "full employment" in the United States corresponds to as low an unemployment rate as does full employment in these European countries. This is a problem to which we shall return later in this paper. In general, the European countries listed in table I assume that full employment corresponds to an unemployment rate in the neighborhood of 2 percent—perhaps in a range of from less than 2 to 3 percent by American definitions, depending on the country. On the whole, the full employment goal has been set at a high level, and even at this high level the goal in recent years has been much more consistently achieved (or surpassed) than in the United States.

The American record presents, of course, a striking contrast. There is some evidence that, if anything, our sights may have been lowered somewhat. It is true that the magic number of 4 percent is still widely quoted. The Council of Economic Advisers continues to espouse the 4 percent figure as only a first step toward a still lower unemployment rate. But the hard fact remains that the Congress and the American people seem to be prepared to live indefinitely with unemployment of more than 4 percent—and that other economic goals, particularly fiscal conservatism, price stability, and equilibrium in the balance of payments at the present gold value of the dollar, are given precedence over that of full employment defined as unemployment of 4 percent or less of the labor force. Or to put the matter in another way, increasing public insistence on a strict interpretation of the full employment objective is a political fact of life that European governments know they cannot ignore. The record indicates that this has not been the case in the United States.[5] A strict interpretation on the employment objective does not carry the political punch here that it does in Europe.[6]

---

[1] Goals for Americans, Report of the President's Commission on National Goals (New York, Prentice-Hall, 1960), p. 10.

[2] From "Some Reflections on the Employment Act," an address delivered at the Annual Meeting of the American Statistical Association, Minneapolis, Minn., September 7, 1962.

[3] It is interesting to contrast official statements in Germany today with those of 10 years ago. In 1954–55 references were made to the achievement of full employment as the unemployment rate fell below 5 percent. By 1959 the Bundesanstalt für Arbeitsvermittlung und Arbeitslosenversicherung was saying that "earlier opinions on what constitutes the minimum of unemployment during a boom * * * must now be looked at as obsolete." And a year later the same agency declared that unemployment must fall below 3 percent if full employment were to be achieved. See the various issues of Amtliche Nachrichten published by this agency.

[4] The revised estimates for 1960 were first published in the report of the President's Committee to Appraise Employment and Unemployment Statistics, "Measuring Employment and Unemployment" (Washington, Government Printing Office, 1962), chapter X and appendix A. Revised estimates for 1960-62 are presented by Robert J. Myers in "Unemployment in Western Europe and the United States," in Arthur M. Ross, ed., "Unemployment and the American Economy" (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1964), p. 174. It should be noted that some modest standardization of the official figures for the various European countries had already been attempted by the OECD in putting together the figures in table 1.

THE AGGREGATE GOALS IN TERMS OF ECONOMIC WELFARE

Full employment is only one of a battery of "aggregative economic goals" which today are espoused, more or less explicitly, in both Western Europe and the United States. The goals are interrelated; the same instruments of monetary-fiscal policy can, in varying degrees, be used to pursue them. How full employment is defined and what is done to achieve it depends in good part on what is done about the other aggregative goals.

In addition to full employment, these aggregative goals are: rapid economic growth, price stability, balance-of-payments equilibrium, and something which has come to be called incomes policy. I should like now to explore briefly the kinds of social welfare functions which are implied by the way these goals are defined and by the priorities which seem to be attached to these goals in different countries, and by different groups and at different times in the same country.

When these aggregative goals are espoused, it is implied that national economic welfare (Z) is related in some way to the following variables or constraints:

1. The rate of overall unemployment, $\frac{U}{L}$.

2. The rate of growth in total output, $\frac{\dot{Y}}{Y}$.

3. The rate of change in a country's international monetary reserves, $\frac{\dot{A}}{A}$. This is one measure of the degree to which "balance-of-payments equilibrium" is achieved.

4. The rate of change in the general price level, $\frac{\dot{P}}{P}$. And

5. Some measure of wage restraint, for which we might write $\frac{\dot{w}}{w}-\frac{\dot{y}}{y}$, or the difference between the rate of change in wages per man-year and in productivity per man-year.

Let us see now how current debate and policy action suggest total economic welfare is taken to be related to these variables or constraints. Let me first introduce two additional elements.

6. n to represent some notion of the rate of increase in the domestic price level beyond which the functioning of the domestic economy (apart from balance-of-payments considerations) becomes impaired because of "loss of confidence in the currency."

7. Let us also add two additional price variables: P_d, or an index of domestic prices of goods that move in international trade, and P_f, to represent an index of foreign prices of the same goods.

I suggest that the pursuit of our five aggregative goals can now be described as follows:

$$Z=f\left(\frac{U}{L},\frac{\dot{Y}}{Y},\frac{\dot{P}}{P}\right)$$

subject to the following constraints:

$$\frac{\dot{A}}{A}=k\pm e$$

$$\frac{\dot{P}_d}{P_d}-\frac{\dot{P}_f}{P_f}=m\pm f$$

$$\frac{\dot{w}}{w}-\frac{\dot{y}}{y}=\frac{\dot{P}_f}{P_f}+m\pm g$$

$$\frac{\dot{P}}{P}<n$$

$$\frac{U}{L}<q$$

Let us now see what all of this means and what light, if any, it throws on the relations among our aggregative goals.

Let us look first at the expression in parentheses. This tells us that economic welfare changes in some way with changes in the three variables inside the parentheses. These variables relate to only three of our aggregative goals: employment, growth, and price stability. The other two goals are listed as constraints, and prices and unemployment show up again as constraints as well as variables within the parentheses.

The significance of the distinction between what is inside the parentheses of the Z function and what are listed as constraints can be expressed as follows. The variables in parentheses can vary over some range; and, given the policymaker's rough notions about the nature of the function, he can seek very approximately to maximize welfare by seeking to change the values for these "target variables."[7] His freedom to do so is limited by the constraints. These play a negative or restraining role. The policymaker is not free to vary these elements to any significant degree as he seeks to increase his conception of social welfare.

This way of looking at things permits us to differentiate among our aggregative goals. One can say that employment and growth are positive goals. Both can vary over some range, and economic policy can seek to change them so as to increase some notion of economic welfare. Welfare will be increased as the unemployment rate is reduced and as the rate of growth of output is accelerated. Welfare is also related to the rate or change in prices, but in a complex way—and the nature of this relationship throws some light, I think, on the different ways the employment and growth goals have been pursued in various European countries and the United States.

First of all, virtually all governments and the vast majority of their citizens place some positive value on a stable price level, and a movement in the price level either upward or downward presumably detracts from welfare as viewed by the policymaker. But I should like to submit that this relationship, taken by itself, is a relatively weak one. Within a considerable range, variation in the price level in and of itself is not considered to have an important effect on economic welfare. Germany is perhaps an exception to this generalization. Price stability is important, but it is important chiefly as a constraint—and as a constraint at two different levels. To understand this, we have to look at the entire set of constraints listed in connection with our welfare function, beginning with that for the balance of payments.[8]

AGGREGATIVE GOALS AS CONSTRAINTS

We expressed the balance-of-payments constraint as

$$\frac{\dot{A}}{A}=k\pm e$$

This states the condition that the percentage change in international monetary reserves should be equal to k plus or minus a margin of error, e. The value of k might be zero. In this case, no change in the stock of monetary reserves is desired, and any change in excess of e requires compensatory action.

In terms of our social welfare function, what does it mean to say that the balance-of-payments objective should be viewed as a constraint? For simplicity, let us take just two of our other goals—employment and growth—and write the welfare function

$$Z=f\left(\frac{U}{L},\frac{\dot{Y}}{Y}\right)$$

subject to the constraint

$$\frac{\dot{A}}{A}=0\pm e$$

Let us assume now that the constraint is in danger of being violated through disequilibrium in the balance of payments. The overriding need to stay within the limits of the constraint means that $\frac{U}{L}$ and $\frac{\dot{Y}}{Y}$ cease to provide the same guide to policy as before. Steps will be taken to preserve or restore equilibrium even if the needed action has an effect on unemployment and growth that, taken by itself, would reduce welfare.

Paradoxically, one or more of the variables inside the parentheses of our welfare function may now themselves become constraints. Assume that the steps that would ordinarily be taken to reduce the external deficit would also bring about a substantial increase in unemployment. But the policymaker's welfare function may imply an absolute ceiling on the unemployment rate. We have expressed this in our list of constraints as $\frac{U}{L}<q$, where q is the maximum rate of unemployment that would be tolerated. In more usual terms, it may be considered

---

[5] In the words of the late Jack Downey, we have "the contrast between the political cash value which full employment has had in most European countries and the political tolerance for unemployment which has existed, and still exists, in the United States." See his paper in A. M. Ross, ed., "Unemployment and the American Economy," p. 161.

[6] One qualification of some importance should be inserted here. Americans have become more sensitive to wide differences in unemployment rates among different segments of the population than they were a decade or more ago. As a result, there has been some progress in recent years toward the development of a national manpower policy, of which some of the elements are the Area Redevelopment Act, the Manpower Development and Training Act, other Federal programs to develop education and training, the new "war on poverty," civil rights legislation, and so on. Obviously all these elements have not yet been integrated into a coordinated national manpower program. But, as William Haber has put it, "it is clear that the Nation is increasingly involved in manpower policy." (In A. M. Ross, ed., "Unemployment and the American Economy," p. 35.)

[7] Notions as to how welfare is related to changes in these target variables depends on: (1) one's value judgments and (2) one's understanding of how each target variable is related to other variables—both the other target variables and other variables not included in the welfare function that represent costs or benefits to society. The term "target variable" is borrowed from Tinbergen.

[8] For a similar distinction between full employment as a "final objective" and price stability and balance-of-payments equilibrium as "means-to-end-objectives," see C. Weststrate, "Economic Policy in Practice: The Netherlands 1950/1957" (Leiden, H. E. Stenfert Kroese, 1959), esp. pp. 7–8.

"politically impossible" to permit the unemployment rate to rise above, say, 5 percent even for a short period, regardless of the consequences for the balance of payments. In this case, the conflict of the two constraints would lead to unusual steps, depending on the circumstances—from emergency arrangements for international credits to, as a last resort, currency devaluation.

This is a fair approximation of the way these constraints have operated in Europe in the last decade. Various European countries, particularly those for whom foreign trade is particularly important, have been forced from time to time to sacrifice some employment and growth because of the balance-of-payments constraint. But they have been willing to do this only so long as the steps needed to restore external equilibrium did not force unemployment above what was considered politically tolerable. This upper limit on unemployment in Europe has clearly been much lower than in the United States.[9]

Let us now look at the way in which price stability operates as a constraint. I think it is fair to say that the goal of price stability influences policy in three different ways, all of which are represented in the symbols presented earlier.

1. A modest positive value is attached to price stability for its own sake. Hence we have included the rate of change in the price level within the parentheses of our welfare function, the assumption being that welfare is inversely related to the absolute rate of change in the price level.[10] But I am prepared to argue that, in both Europe and the United States, the independent link between domestic price stability and social welfare is relatively weak. Within a wide range of price variation and apart from the balance of payments problem, no Western European government would be prepared to sacrfice any significant degree of employment or growth in order to reduce the rate of change in the price level.[11] On the whole, I think this has been true in the United States, also. The emphasis on price stability in the United States in recent years is associated with the balance-of-payments problem, and to this relationship we now turn.

2. We now come to the second and most important way in which price stability influences policy. This is through its importance as an instrument to achieve balance-of-payments equilibrium. In serving in this capacity, price stability is viewed not as making a positive, independent contribution to welfare in its own right. Instead, it is viewed as a constraint. In this case, it is a constraint of the second order, which is required if the first-order constraint, balance-of-payments equilibrium, is to be observed.

When we think of price stability as playing this role, the relevant target is not stability in the domestic price level but some desired relationship between the domestic price level and that of the country's chief trading partners—between, to put it roughly, domestic and foreign price levels.

Thus we stated this constraint as being of the form

$$\frac{\dot{P}_d}{P_d}-\frac{\dot{P}_f}{P_f}=m\pm f,$$

that is, the difference between the rate of change in the domestic and foreign price levels should not exceed an amount m—plus or minus, in the short run, a margin of error, f. Obviously this constraint does not require a stable price level. If P_f is rising rapidly, P_d may also rise rapidly. All that is required is that P_d rise at a rate no greater than

$$\frac{\dot{P}_f}{P_f}+m.$$

The difference, m, can, of course, be zero or negative. It has been a fundamental tenet of American policy in recent years that m should be negative. The rise in the American price level must be kept below that of the European in order to improve our competitive position and so eventually restore balance-of-payments equilibrium.

Most of the countries in Western Europe have been able to permit their domestic price levels to rise moderately rapidly, since for each of them P_f was also rising and thus m could be kept close to zero. The German revaluation in 1961 represents an exception. The German balance-of-payments surplus might have been eliminated by taking m as a significant positive figure—that is, by encouraging the domestic price level to rise faster than in other countries. Instead, the mark was revalued upward.

3. Now we come to the third way in which the behavior of the price level influences policy. There is some upper limit to the rise in the price level beyond which the functioning of the economy is impaired—through speculation, the development of politically disturbing inequities in the distribution of wealth and income, and the beginnings of a "flight from the currency." This is the rationale usually offered, over and above that involving the balance of payments, for seeking to maintain a stable price level. Germany is the country in which presumably this rationale operates most strongly to influence policy.

I expressed this constraint in the form

$$\frac{\dot{P}}{P}<n.$$

I suggest that n has a much higher value than is generally assumed, and no country in Western Europe has come close to it in the last decade. Several South American countries have exceeded it. My guess is that n is large enough so that it has in fact not been a restraining influence on policy in Europe or the United States in the last decade. And I include Germany in this generalization, despite the numerous official pronouncements that may suggest the contrary.

I might put the matter in another way. Whatever the value of n, it is a powerful constraint if and when it is brought into operation. The governments of the advanced economies on both sides of the Atlantic would feel obliged to make substantial sacrifices in terms of both employment and growth if they thought that inflation threatened to get out of control (apart from balance-of-payments difficulties) and that deflationary policies were necessary to prevent the rise in prices from exceeding their estimate of n. It is clear, however, that this has not happened.

Let me try to summarize. During the last decade, price stability as an aggregative goal has operated primarily as what we have called a second-order constraint, as a constraint imposed by the need to satisfy the primary balance-of-payments constraint. As a result, the goal in fact has taken the form not of stability of the domestic price level but of approximate constancy in the relation between domestic and foreign price levels. Stability in the domestic price level itself has entered positively—but rather weakly—into policymakers' welfare functions. This accounts for the official statements frequently heard that the domestic price level should not rise more than, say, 2 percent per year. But it is fair to say that no Western European government—not even Germany—would be prepared to sacrifice much if any employment to bring the rise in prices down from 4 or 3 percent per annum to 2 percent if not forced to do so by the balance-of-payments constraint.[12]

Let us now turn to "incomes policy," which I can deal with here only very briefly. "Incomes policy" is a polite way of referring to a policy of wage restraint with a quid pro quo—the latter taking the form of some restraint on other incomes, particularly profits. In terms of my welfare formulation, we have here a negative constraint of the third order: wage restraint is needed to meet the price constraint which is a condition for satisfaction of the balance-of-payments constraint. As the OECD has put it, "The purpose of incomes policies is * * * to control the development of costs and prices." [13]

Emphasis on incomes policy is a relatively new development in Europe.[14] It can be said to have been paralleled in the United States by the formulation of the "wage-price guideposts" in the January 1962 Economic Report of the President. The new emphasis on wage restraint reflects the growing inflationary pressures in most European countries and the search for methods of price restraint—from the side of costs—that would not entail the threat to the employment and growth goals that would come from relying only on restriction of aggregate demand through monetary and fiscal policy.[15]

---

[9] Cf. Walter S. Salant et al., "The United States Balance of Payments in 1968" (Washington, The Brookings Institution, 1963) for a good discussion of the role of the balance-of-payments constraint on both sides of the Atlantic.

[10] This, for example, is the position taken in William Fellner et al., "The Problem of Rising Prices" (Paris, OECD, 1961). It might be argued that the prevailing view in most countries, particularly among those groups with some influence on policy, is that the optimum rate of change in the price level is not zero but some positive number—say, 1 or 2 percent per year—because the moderate stimulus thus provided to economic activity more than offsets, in its effects on welfare, the redistributional effects which benefit debtors at the expense of creditors and those on fixed incomes. Contrast this view with the unqualified declaration that "rising prices are not compatible with steady growth" in Fellner, et al., op. cit., p. 75. Among economists, Neil Jacoby may be correct that the prevailing view seems to be that "creeping inflation * * * is in the long run a drag upon national progress, and that it is both feasible and desirable to prevent its occurrence." S. S. Alexander et al., "Economics and the Policy Maker" (Washington, The Brookings Institution, 1959), p. 48; also the references on p. 49. But a number of economists have expressed the contrary view.

[11] Germany seems to be a partial exception. The official emphasis on price stability in that country is well known, and it is probably true, as Herr Erhard declared in his 1963 Economic Report to the Reichstag, that some economic growth would be sacrificed in the interest of greater price stability, apart from balance-of-payments considerations. But my own observations lead me to doubt that it would be considered politically possible to permit the unemployment rate to rise much above, say, 2 percent in order to slow down the rise in prices. This was admitted to me by more than one German official. But, subject to this qualification, it is undoubtedly true that German policy attaches greater positive value to price stability than is the case in other European countries.

[12] A qualification is needed here. If overfull employment existed, a government would be prepared to permit a modest rise in unemployment in order to restrain the rise in prices. The labor market could be so tight that a slight rise in unemployment would be considered as adding to rather than substracting from total welfare. This has in fact been the case recently in Germany and some other European countries.

[13] "Policies for Economic Growth" (Paris, OECD, 1962), p. 38.

[14] The need for a national wages policy was strongly recommended to OECD countries in William Fellner et al., "The Problem of Rising Prices"; see particularly pp. 55 ff. See also the OECD report which followed: "Policies for Price Stability" (Paris, OECD, 1962), especially pp. 23–47. The Netherlands is one country which consciously had and implemented a national wages policy from the end of World War II. "The Problem of Rising Prices," pp. 359–390.

It is clear from the continued upward pressure of prices in most European countries that incomes policy has thus far not provided a very effective constraint. No country has succeeded in keeping wages from rising faster than productivity. Indeed, whatever the official statements, no government has, in fact, tried to enforce such a stringent requirement. We must remember that an incomes policy is merely a means to a means to an end. If rising prices abroad permit prices at home to rise without balance-of-payments difficulties, then there is no need to keep wage increases strictly in line with productivity increases. It will be remembered that we wrote our expression for the incomes goal as:

$$\frac{\dot{w}}{w}-\frac{\dot{y}}{y}=\frac{\dot{P}_f}{P_f}+m\pm g.$$

If foreign prices are rising, wages can rise faster than productivity, subject to whatever differential (m) between the trends in domestic and foreign prices the Government wants to maintain. It has been the hope of the American Government that this country could maintain a negative m virtually as large as the rate of increase in foreign prices so as to improve our competitive position. This does imply holding wage increases down to the rise in average labor productivity. Growing balance-of-payments difficulties in the last couple of years have forced some European countries to try to reduce the value of m to zero or lower—and it is in this recent period that the emphasis on incomes policy has developed.[16]

Some countries, notably The Netherlands, have consciously had and tried to enforce an incomes policy during some part of the postwar period.[17] The term is not officially used in the United States; but, as we have already noted, the "wage-price guideposts," formulated in the January 1962 Economic Report of the President, amount in effect to the statement of an incomes policy. These guidelines have been repeated in subsequent economic reports.

In one important respect, incomes policy stands on a different footing from our other aggregative policies. In economies which emphasize free collective bargaining, the means may not exist effectively to implement the policy. In the absence of centralized wage bargaining on a national scale, with some direct influence by government, an incomes policy is merely—as it has been characterized by the Council of Economic Advisers—a set of guideposts. But, as an OECD report has put it, "Once the guidance has been given, the problem is to get people to follow it, and to do so without damage to democratic values. Many governments have moved very cautiously on incomes policy because of their awareness of the difficulty of securing the necessary cooperation, and of the embarrassing situation which arises if they offer specific guidance which is then rejected." [18] This is true on both sides of the Atlantic.[19]

RAPID GROWTH AS A GOAL

We now come to what we may call our two positive aggregative goals—full employment and rapid economic growth. Limitations of space preclude more than very brief reference to the goal of rapid economic growth.[20] It is not surprising that economic growth should be stressed more in Europe than in the United States. Here again a ratchet effect has been at work. Initial success in generating rapid, sustained growth has led to firm resolves not to permit relapses into relative stagnation—although it is recognized that some of the spectacular growth rates of the past decade cannot be maintained indefinitely.[21]

The new emphasis on growth in the United Kingdom, reflected in the establishment of the National Economic Development Council in early 1962, represents an interesting example of a conscious reformulation of the way national welfare is related to our aggregative target variables. A new emphasis is now put on growth, and an incomes policy has been officially formulated for the first time.[22] Parallel with these restatements of policy objectives has gone an interesting re-examination of the probable relationships among the target variables. The balance-of-payments constraint remains unchallenged, and the price constraint continues as a means of insuring external balance. But there is a new emphasis on achieving relative price stability by accelerating the increase in productivity through stimulating economic growth.[23] This in turn implies the need for an incomes policy to hold wage increases in line with the rise in productivity. Otherwise, the balance-of-payments constraint will from time to time require restrictive measures that will retard or halt growth and increase unemployment.[24]

A good many economists argue that a similar shift in emphasis is called for in the United States—that measures to accelerate growth (and simultaneously reduce unemployment) would accelerate the rise in productivity and thereby reduce the upward pressure on prices. It is also argued that accelerated growth would significantly reduce the outflow of capital. Here again, however, the balance-of-payments constraint requires the existence of a reasonably effective incomes policy; i.e., a policy of wage restraint.[25]

EMPLOYMENT TARGETS IN EUROPE

Now, at long last, we come to employment policy and the target goal of full employment. We have already commented on the marked contrast between Western Europe and the United States with respect to both aspiration levels and success in achieving these levels. European countries set their full employment goal at a lower unemployment rate than does the United States, and they have in recent years been more successful in achieving the goal.

What does this contrast mean in terms of our social welfare function? For one thing it means that the marginal contribution to welfare of declining unemployment, after allowing for associated costs and benefits, is viewed in Europe as remaining positive for a lower range of unemployment rates than is the case in the United States. When a single figure, or a narrow range, is given for the full employment goal—say, 2 percent unemployment in Europe or 4 percent in the United States—this implies that welfare increases as the unemployment rate falls toward the target figure. It also implies that, on net balance, welfare does not increase further or possibly declines as unemployment falls below the target figure. Welfare declines in the latter case because the increased benefit from a further decline in the unemployment rate taken by itself is more than offset by the marginal disutility of side effects—accelerated price and wage increases, effects on the balance of payments, retarded gains in labor productivity, and so on. The reader so inclined can express this more rigorously in terms of marginal rates of substitution and partial derivatives.

Similar considerations hold as to contrasting attitudes toward increases in the unemployment rate above the target figure. For some range of unemployment rates above the target, welfare is apparently considered to decline relatively more rapidly in most European countries than in the United States, even after allowance is made for ancillary benefits from greater price stability and improvement in the balance of payments. We have commented earlier on one corollary of this contrast. European governments would almost certainly be willing (or feel compelled) to override the balance-of-payments constraint at a significantly lower level of unemployment than would be the case in the United States.[26]

---

[15] While it is correct to say, as I have done, that there has been a new emphasis on the need for an income policy in recent years, recognition of the need for wage restraint under conditions of full employment and concern about the "cost-push" aspect of inflation go back to the early postwar years. It is still interesting, in this connection, to reread the Swedish debate in Ralph Turvey, ed., "Wages Policy Under Full Employment" (London: William Hodge, 1952).

[16] See, for example, OECD, "Policies for Price Stability," especially pp. 23 ff.

[17] It is paradoxical that the Dutch policy of wage restraint, which had considerable success during most of the postwar period, has recently run into serious difficulties. Cf. The Economist, Mar. 28, 1964, pp. 1273–74.

[18] "Policies for Price Stability," p. 35.

[19] The following is of interest in this connection. In Sweden in 1963, "the authorities contemplate neither direct intervention in wage negotiations nor the issue of recommendations as to the sort of wage increases compatible with price stability. This attitude is based partly on general political principles. But it is also felt that any official guidance as to the general scope for wage increases would tend to be regarded not as averages, but as minimums to which special claims from individual groups would be added." "Economic Surveys by the OECD: Sweden" (Paris, OECD, April 1963), pp. 17–18.

[20] Cf. OECD, "Policies for Economic Growth." The Netherlands seems not to have had as clearly defined a growth policy as most of the other OECD countries in Europe. Cf. "Economic Surveys by the OECD: Netherlands" (Paris: OECD, April 1963). For a useful brief survey of long-term plans in Western Europe, which by now is not completely up to date, see "Economic Bulletin for Europe," vol. 14 (November 1962), published by the U.N.

[21] For a useful survey of postwar growth trends and policies, see Angus Maddison, "Economic Growth in the West" (New York, 20th Century Fund, 1964).

[22] Cf. National Economic Development Council, "Growth of the United Kingdom Economy to 1966" (London, H.M.S. Office, 1963) and "Conditions Favourable to Faster Growth" (London, H.M.S. Office, 1963); also "Incomes Policy: The Next Step" (Cmd. 1626, London, H.M.S. Office, 1962). See also "Economic Surveys by the OECD: United Kingdom" (Paris, OECD, July 1963). This change in emphasis is said to have begun with proposals put forward in Parliament by Selwyn Lloyd in 1961. See "British Parliamentary Debates (Hansard): House of Commons," 5th series, vol. 645, July 24–Aug. 4, 1961 (London, H.M.S. Office, 1961), pp. 218 ff. Another interesting case of a shift in the priorities attached to the various aggregative goals is to be found in Belgium. Increased emphasis was put on the employment goal from the midfifties on, and in the late fifties a new importance came to be attached to the growth objective.

[23] Cf. "Conditions Favourable to Faster Growth," p. 47.

[24] Ibid., pp. 50–51.

[25] For a useful survey of this range of issues, see Walter S. Salant et al., "The U.S. Balance of Payments in 1968," especially ch. IX.

[26] All of this can be illustrated, in artificially simple terms, by the use of isoquants

We have already referred to the contrast in employment targets between Europe and the United States. We have also noted that sights in Europe have been gradually raised during the postwar period. This has not been the case in the United States.

Today, in Western Europe, 2-percent unemployment is the target most frequently mentioned.[27] When translated into American definitions, this may mean an unemployment rate from something below 2 percent to perhaps 3 percent as a maximum.[28] Virtually all countries are very loath to announce an official quantitative target.[29] But a variety of scraps of evidence permit one to infer the approximate goal which motivates policy. From such scraps of evidence, I should put the goals in some of the leading European countries today, expressed in terms of American definitions, about as follows:

	Percent
France	2.0 to 2.5
Germany	1.5 to 2.0
Sweden	1.2 to 1.5
United Kingdom	1.8 to 2.7

It is to be emphasized that these rough approximations are expressed in terms of American definitions. This makes a significant difference in the case of France and the United Kingdom, whose official figures have to be adjusted upward to correspond to American concepts.[30] Hence, to Frenchmen or Englishmen my estimates of the employment goal may seem high for these countries.

I am sure that none of these targets would be officially admitted by the governments of any of the countries listed. And it may be that in some cases I have understated the range within which the employment goal is presumed to fall. But there is a fair amount of evidence that the welfare functions implicitly conditioning policy action in European capitals suggest employment targets approximately as we have listed them. We shall defer discussion of the targets suggested for the United States until the next section.

As overall unemployment has fallen to levels that seem very low by prewar and early postwar standards, European governments have come to place increasing emphasis on the differentially high unemployment rates that remain for particular sectors of the labor forces. Throughout Europe, the labor force is much more homogeneous than in the United States. There is no color problem; teenagers are readily absorbed into the ranks of the employed, despite an earlier average school-leaving age than in the United States; and there are no particularly marked differentials between average unemployment rates for blue-collar and for white-collar workers. Nearly every country, however, does have some variant of a depressed-area problem—more serious in some countries than in others—and in some countries, particularly the United Kingdom, unemployment rates are relatively high among the unskilled.

The development of an integrated labor market policy to deal with such differential unemployment rates—and more generally to expedite the adjustment of labor supply to the changing pattern of labor demand—began earlier and has proceeded further in Europe than in the United States. The most fully developed of such programs is that of Sweden, which has probably set its employment target higher than in any other country in the West.[31]

THE EMPLOYMENT GOAL IN THE UNITED STATES

I should like to turn now to the problem of formulating a full employment target for the United States. There has been a good deal of debate since the Employment Act was passed in 1946 as to what the quantitative target should be in order to achieve "high," "maximum," or "full" employment. Most of the numbers bandied about fall in the range of from 3 to 5 percent of the labor force.

The early reports of the Council of Economic Advisers suggested a moderate range around 4 percent. Thus the January 1947 report referred to a then current unemployment rate of about 3.9 percent as "close to the minimum unavoidable in a free economy of great mobility such as ours." [32] A year later, a rate of 3.6 percent was referred to as "probably the practical minimum." [33] Again, toward the end of the first Eisenhower administration, full employment was said to have been "practically reached" when the current monthly rate was about 3.6 percent.[34] On the whole, it is fair to say that, between 1946 and 1962, official policy tacitly or explicitly accepted a target goal of about 4 percent, plus or minus a range of perhaps half a percent.[35]

The debate of the last few years, which still goes on, as to whether structural unemployment has been worsening has had an effect on the way the full employment goal is viewed in some circles both in and out of Washington. Those who lean strongly toward the structuralist side say or imply that, in the short run, the full employment target has to be set at an unemployment rate higher than 4 percent—perhaps 5 or even 6 percent. In the long run, through various types of manpower policy centered on education, training and retraining, and the like, the structural-frictional minimum can be reduced until the country can again have a short-run target of 4 percent or less. This view carries weight in the halls of Congress and may have some influence on Federal Reserve thinking; but, as suggested in the following paragraphs, it has not represented the official position of the Kennedy or Johnson administration.

The first Economic Report of the Kennedy administration contained an unusually full and explicit formulation of the employment goal.[36] A temporary target of 4 percent was accepted. "In the existing economic circumstances," this was considered to be "a reasonable and prudent full employment target for stabilization policy." But this was to be only an interim goal. "If we move firmly to reduce the impact of structural unemployment, we will be able to move the unemployment target steadily from 4 percent to successively lower rates." [37] This will still the position being taken in the January 1964 Economic Report.[38]

These targets have been given a more explicit formulation in the recent report of Senator CLARK's Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower, which recommended "that it be declared the public policy of the United States to maintain a level of unemployment no higher than 3 percent of the labor force. The year 1968 should be set as the target for attainment of this goal." [39] Here, as in the 1962 Economic Report, the full employment goal is viewed as being approached in two ways: (1) through eliminating unemployment associated with a deficiency of aggregate demand, given the hard

---

and indifference curves for the case of two target variables—say, the unemployment rate and the rate of change in prices. The indifference curves can be also drawn to reflect some of the constraints previously described.

[27] Frequently in Europe one encounters the triad of numbers: 2–2–4. That is, goals of 2 percent unemployment, increase in the price level not exceeding 2 percent, and 4 percent of growth in GNP.

[28] Swedish policy and experience suggests a target closer to 1 percent.

[29] Thus, "while most governments have accepted the obligation to make the achievement of a high level of employment one of the aims of economic policy, the majority of them do not want this aim to be expressed in any rigid formula embodying an obligation to keep unemployment below a clearly defined level." International Labor Review, vol. 74 (July 1956), p. 2. UNESCO has regularly asked member countries for the submission of quantitative standards, but few have been offered. One was offered by the United Kingdom, which "replied in 1951 that it had adopted a standard of 3 percent although it hoped to maintain unemployment at below 2 percent. It had put the standard at 3 percent, however, in order to make allowances for unfavorable repercussions on employment that might arise from adverse developments in foreign trade." Ibid., p. 3.

[30] It should be noted that the figures in table 1 have already been standardized to a modest extent by OECD. The adjustment factor needed to make the original official measures comparable to the American seems to be a bit less than 100 percent for France and about 50 percent for Britain. See the source cited in footnote (b) of table 1. In this connection, it is worth noting that Beveridge was certainly correct when he said that his proposed target of 3 percent was conservative rather than "unduly hopeful." (Full Employment in a Free Society, p. 128.) By American definitions, his target for England was presumably an overall unemployment rate in excess of 4 percent.

[31] The following by the Director of the Labor Market Board in Sweden is worth quoting: "An active employment policy may be defined as 'measures which affect labor as a factor in production and are so varied, so individualized as—in time—to fit every single person on the employment market'." The main features of such an employment policy are "geographical mobility of manpower, increased training, and retraining, and a policy for the location of industry that is well adapted to prevailing conditions." B. Olsson, "Employment Policy in Sweden," International Labor Review, vol. 87 (May 1963), pp. 411, 413.

[32] Economic Report of the President, January 1947, p. 9. This would have been about 4.3 percent on the basis of the definition now in use.

[33] Economic Report of the President, January 1948, p. 2. See also the report for January 1951, p. 22, where 3.6 percent was again referred to as "near a practical minimum."

[34] Economic Report, January 1956, p. 28. But perhaps I should also include here Arthur Burns' statement to the Joint Economic Committee a year earlier that "although 4 percent of the labor force is nowadays widely regarded as an approximate measure of the average amount of frictional and seasonal unemployment, the Council has not favored this or any other rigid figure to serve as a trigger to governmental action or as a measure of good performance." January 1955 Economic Report of the President: Hearings, 84th Cong., 1st sess. (Washington, Government Printing Office, 1955), p. 45.

[35] This is to say no more than that the official view assumed that, abstracting from the behavior of other associated variables, welfare would rise as the unemployment rate fell until the latter was in the neighborhood of 4 percent. But, when the other target variables were taken into account, the value judgments of successive administrations, as well as their views as to how the target variables were related to each other, might have varied so that "maximum welfare solutions" did not always yield the same unemployment rate as an immediate policy goal.

[36] Economic Report, January 1962, pp. 40–49.

[37] Ibid., p. 46.

[38] See particularly app. A.

[39] Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, "Toward Full Employment: Proposals for a Comprehensive Employment and Manpower Policy in the United States," 88th Cong., 2d. sess. (Washington, Government Printing Office, 1964), p. 40.

core of "frictional" and "structural" unemployment that presumably exists today, and (2) operating through an aggressive and integrated manpower policy to reduce this frictional-structural minimum from its presumed present level of about 4 percent to something like 3 percent.

Statements from the White House or a Senate committee do not by themselves determine de facto policy or fully reflect the goals implicit in such policy. In terms of our welfare function, I should describe the present state of employment policy in the United States about as follows: The 4-percent target is still official policy. The fact that welfare is assumed to decline significantly as unemployment rises above, say, 4.5 percent, is suggested by the recent tax cut. At the same time, the slowness in getting the tax cut, the reluctance of Congress to approve more vigorous fiscal measures, the official and public concern with the balance of payments, and the fact that public discontent with unemployment of 5.5 percent or more for so long has been no greater than it has, all suggest that the rate of decline in welfare associated with a rise in unemployment above the 4-percent target leads to marginal rates of substitution between unemployment and the other target variables such as to maximize the welfare function, under present conditions, at an unemployment rate of more than 4 percent.

In our earlier discussion of the balance-of-payments constraint, we pointed out that this constraint eventually has to give way to another one—the highest unemployment that is politically tolerable. In the current American context, I should make a wild guess that this limit is in the range of 6 to 7 percent for the unemployment rate. To put the matter very crudely, the "ex post" welfare function revealed by policy actions and dominant public opinion is such that welfare declines between the target of 4 percent and the upper constraint of, say, 7 percent—but the decline is moderate by European standards. In Europe, the decline from the target of, say, 2 percent to an upper limit of 3 or 4 percent is apparently relatively sharper. Equally significant is the contrast between other features of the European and American presumed welfare functions. The American function should probably include as additional variables the rate of change in the Federal debt and the rate of change in Federal nondefense expenditures. Both of these are inversely related to congressional and popular notions of national welfare in a way that does not exist in Europe. "Marginal rates of substitution" between unemployment and each of these two variables are such as to yield "maximum welfare solutions" at unemployment rates that seem very high by European standards.[40]

The reader is invited to rewrite the welfare function presented earlier and offer his own surmises regarding the way the function should be interpreted to apply to American conditions. I have suggested that two additional target variables—change in the Federal debt and increase in nondefense spending—should be included within the parentheses. I might add one final comment on such a function. I am prepared to argue that congressional and popular habits of thought are such as to generate notions of a more intimate relation between these two additional variables, on the one hand, and notions of welfare, on the other, than is thought to exist between changes in the price level and welfare—apart from balance-of-payments considerations.[41]

DISAGGREGATING THE FULL EMPLOYMENT GOAL

In this last section, I should like to pick up the theme of the Clark subcommittee report previously cited and consider the following question. If we conceive of an employment policy as being concerned with differentials in unemployment rates as well as the overall rate, how can we formulate a set of targets to take account of this double approach to the problem? We might put the problem in the following manner. The conventional definition of full employment may be thought of as undimensional—in terms of total unemployment of a homogeneous labor force. In effect, the question asked is: How low can aggregate unemployment fall before it becomes resistant to further expansion in aggregate demand? The unemployment that remains is the hard core of frictional and structural unemployment—presumably 4 percent or so in the United States. We seek, instead, to formulate a set of employment targets for the different categories of the labor force—and then to see what overall unemployment rate this implies. The labor force can be classified in a number of ways—by age, sex, color, occupation, education, industry of last employment, and so on. A full-fledged multidimensional employment goal would have targets for each segment of the labor force along each of these dimensions, and the targets would need to be mutually consistent.[42]

Let us define "aggregative full employment" as the percentage of the total labor force employed when, given existing structural-frictional reasons for differential unemployment rates, the unemployment rate for the most favored group ceases to fall in response to an expansion of aggregate demand and the higher rates can be made to fall further only with an unacceptable rise in prices. We then ask: in what ways and at what cost can the structural-frictional differentials existing at aggregative full employment be reduced? If we know the costs involved in reducing these differentials by various amounts, application of our value judgments permits us then to say how far we are prepared to go in narrowing these differentials and thus reducing the aggregate unemployment rate that corresponds to full employment. The recent steps toward the development of a labor market policy in the United States—ARA, OMAT, etc.—suggest that we are now fumbling toward such a multidimensional approach to the problem of redefining the target of full employment.

How far can we expect to go in reducing these frictional-structural differentials? Is Senator CLARK's subcommittee being realistic in urging a target of 3 percent unemployment by 1968? What changes in unemployment-rate differentials are implied by this goal, and are the administration and particularly the Congress likely to value the costs and benefits such as to be moved to take the steps needed to reach the goal—by 1968 or later?[43]

Tables 2 and 3 are presented as a small exploratory step toward answering these questions. Table 2 deals with occupational differentials; table 3 looks at unemployment in terms of age, sex, and color. Both tables are constructed in the same way. Let us look first at table 2.

The table contains four sets of three columns each. Three of the sets present actual data for 1953, 1957, and 1963. The first of these years was probably a year of overfull employment, with an overall unemployment rate of 2.9 percent by current definitions (2.5 percent by the definitions then being used). 1957 was the last year in which unemployment was close to 4 percent. 1963 is included to reflect the recent and current picture. The fourth set of columns investigates the effect of one pattern of reduced differentials on the overall unemployment rate.

By weighting the unemployment rate in each occupation (column (a) for each year) by the fraction of the labor force in the occupation (column (b)), we obtain the contribution of each occupation to the total unemployment rate (column (3) for each year).

In laying out our multidimensional full-employment target, we have to ask two questions. First, what does past experience suggest as to the lowest unemployment rate that is likely to prevail for the most favored groups under full-employment conditions. Second, how much (and by what means) can we hope to reduce the unemployment rates for the less favored occupations that have existed in past periods of full employment. The fourth set of columns in table 2 suggests one possible set of answers to these questions.

Let us look at the first three lines of column (a). These are the occupational groups with the lowest unemployment rates. The highest unemployment rate for any of these groups in 1953 and 1957 was 1.2 percent. For my full employment target, I have taken the unemployment rates as they were in 1957 rather than the somewhat lower rates in 1953. For the remaining occupations I have simply made a guess as to how low we might hope to bring down each unemployment rate under a combination of an adequate level of aggregate demand and an expanded and intensive manpower program.

On the whole, my guesses are perhaps on the conservative side. This is suggested by the fact that my target rates are in most cases higher than the rates which actually prevailed in 1953, though lower than those in 1957.[44] My most radical assumption is in reducing the unemployment rate for laborers from 6.1 percent in 1953 and 9.4 percent in 1957 to 5 percent.

---

[40] "To use deficit financing in order to drive unemployment down below 6 percent is therefore very dangerous. It will tend to do far more harm through inflation than the good it will do by absorbing some of those who are unemployed from seasonal and transitional causes." "When unemployment is between 6 and 8 percent, the governmental budget should at least balance and therefore be neutral in its effects." These statements are by a prominent Senator (and past president of the American Economic Association) who is not generally considered to stand very far to the right in the political spectrum. They are taken from Paul H. Douglas, "Economy in the National Government" (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1952), pp. 253, 254.

[41] Within the limits imposed by the upper price constraint previously described.

[42] For a similar statement of a disaggregated approach to the formulation of a full-employment goal, see Seymour L. Wolfbein, "The First Year of the Manpower Act," in A. M. Ross, ed., op. sit., p. 56. The same approach has, of course, been urged by others, also.

[43] When employment goals are suggested, they are almost always expressed in terms of the numbers of persons seeking employment, not in terms of total man-hours lost through unemployment. In 1963, the percentage of total labor time lost through unemployment was reported as 6.4, whereas in terms of persons the unemployment rate was 5.7 percent. A full-fledged employment goal clearly should take account of involuntary part-time unemployment, as was strongly urged by Thomas K. Hitch over a decade ago in "Meaning and Measurement of 'Full' or 'Maximum' Employment," "Review of Economics and Statistics," vol. 33 (February 1951) pp. 1–11. A 3-percent goal in conventional terms might represent, say, a 3.5 percent goal in terms of manhours. This is a question which will be investigated further in the larger study on which the present paper represents a progress report.

[44] In general, for the middle range of occupations, I have taken unemployment rates which are about halfway between the 1953 and 1957 rates, after the former have been adjusted upward by about 10 percent to allow for the change in definitions that occurred in 1957.

Some perspective on the problem of structural differentials can be gained from looking at the three columns for 1957. Note that all but three groups had unemployment rates below 4 percent. The remaining three occupations, with unemployment rates between 5.1 and 9.4 percent, accounted for a bit more than a third of the labor force and for more than half of total unemployment. It is on these three groups, plus those without previous work experience, that our manpower program obviously needs to be concentrated.

A word about those unemployed without previous work experience, for whom the unemployment rate is always 100 percent, no matter how few or many there are in this group. I have simply assumed that this group would constitute about the same percentage of total unemployment as it did in 1957, despite the current upward trend in the share of the labor force made up of young people.[45]

If we now weigh our assumed unemployment rates by the share of each occupational group in the total labor force in 1963, we get each group's contribution to the total unemployment rate, and the latter turns out to be 3.1 percent—or very close to the goal set by the Clark subcommittee. This, then, is one possible occupational pattern by which a 3-percent overall rate could be substantially achieved. The reader is invited to explore the effect of alternative occupational patterns on the overall unemployment rate.

Our hypothetical full-employment target was computed using 1963 weights. Applications of the same unemployment rates to the occupational distribution of the labor force that has been projected for 1970 yields a slightly lower unemployment rate, about 3.0 percent.[46] (The detailed figures yielding this result are not presented here.) This result arises, of course, because of the expected continued shift away from the relatively unskilled occupations having the highest unemployment rates.

Let us now turn to table 3, the upper part of which presents a breakdown by age and sex and the lower part of which classifies the labor force by color and sex. The four sets of columns are to be interpreted exactly as in table 2. And the hypothetical target unemployment rates in column (a) of the last set of columns were estimated in the same fashion as in table 2. Our targets for the most favored groups (age 25 and over and white workers) represent a compromise between actual experience in 1953 and in 1957. We have then made some guesses as to how much we can hope to reduce unemployment differentials for the younger age groups and nonwhites. The assumptions underlying the nonwhite unemployment rates can be simply put: it is impossible in the foreseeable future to eliminate the nonwhite differential entirely, but it may be possible to bring the nonwhite rate down to 4 percent, a level which was approached in 1953.[47] These assumptions yield a nonwhite-white ratio of unemployment rates of 1.33, compared to about 1.8 in 1953 and about 2 in 1957 (and 2.1 in 1963).

The assumptions embodied in table 2 yield overall unemployment rates of 3.2 percent (for the age-sex breakdown) and 3.1 percent (for the set of color-sex unemployment rates).[48] These are virtually the same as the overall rate derived from the occupational distribution. Apparently our assumptions underlying the three sets of calculations are at least mutually consistent.

Let me emphasize that these calculations are not to be taken either as predictions or as recommendations. They are merely intended to help put in perspective what is implied in setting overall employment targets in the United States and to examine some of the implications of raising the employment target. These implications will be investigated further in the larger study on which this paper is no more than a preliminary report.

---

[45] The percentage of total unemployment with no previous work experience was abnormally low in 1953. See my paper "Has Structural Unemployment Worsened?" in Industrial Relations, vol. 3 (May 1964).

[46] The 1970 occupational projection was taken from Manpower Report of the President, March 1964 (Washington, Government Printing Office, 1964), p. 244.

[47] It is to be remembered that the 1953 figures are based on an old set of definitions which gave an overall rate of 2.5 percent, whereas present definitions would have yielded a rate of 2.9 percent. Presumably, by current definitions, the nonwhite rate in 1953 (both sexes combined) was of the order of 4.5 percent.

[48] Weighting our assumed unemployment rates by the projected age-sex distribution of the labor force in 1970 would have raised the first of these from 3.2 to 3.3 percent.

TABLE 1.—*Percent of civilian labor force unemployed in selected European countries and the United States, 1950–62* [1]

Year	Belgium	France	Germany (Federal Republic)	Italy	Netherlands	Sweden	United Kingdom	United States
1950	4.9	----------	7.2	----------	2.0	2.2	1.2	5.2
1951	4.3	----------	6.4	----------	2.4	1.8	.9	3.2
1952	5.0	----------	6.1	----------	3.5	2.3	1.4	2.9
1953	5.3	----------	5.5	----------	2.5	2.8	1.3	2.8
1954	5.0	1.6	5.2	8.7	1.8	2.6	1.0	5.3
1955	3.8	1.4	3.9	7.5	1.3	2.5	.8	4.2
1956	2.8	1.1	3.1	9.3	.9	1.7	.9	4.0
1957	2.3	.8	2.7	7.4	1.2	1.9	1.1	4.2
1958	3.3	.9	2.7	6.4	2.3	2.5	1.7	6.6
1959	3.9	1.3	1.9	5.4	1.8	2.0	1.7	5.3
1960 [2]	3.3	1.2 (1.9)	.9 (1.0)	4.0 (4.3)	1.1	[3] 1.8	1.3 (2.4)	5.4
1961 [2]	2.6	1.1 (1.7)	.6 (0.5)	3.4 (3.7)	.8	1.7 (1.5)	1.1 (2.2)	6.5
1962 [2]	2.0	1.2 (1.8)	[3] .5	2.9 (3.2)	----------	1.5 (1.5)	1.6 (2.8)	5.4

[1] Source: Manpower Statistics, 1950–62, Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (Paris, 1963), except for Swedish data for 1950–59, which are from International Labor Review, Statistical Supplement, vol. LXX, November 1954, p. 98, and Yearbook of Labour Statistics, 1962, International Labour Office (Geneva, 1962), table 10. The horizontal lines in the Swedish column indicate minor changes in the method of compiling the statistics.

[2] The figures in parentheses for these years are unemployment rates revised to correspond to American definitions. They are taken from Robert J. Myers, "Unemployment in Western Europe and the United States," A. M. Ross (editor), Unemployment in the American Economy, p. 174.

[3] Revised figures not available.

TABLE 2.—*Unemployment by occupation: Hypothetical full employment target compared with actual data for 1953, 1957, and 1963*

Occupation	1953			1957			1963			Full employment target		
	(a) [1]	(b) [2]	(c) [3]	(a) [1]	(b) [2]	(c) [3]	(a) [1]	(b) [2]	(c) [3]	(a) [1]	(b) [2]	(c) [3]
Farmers and farm managers	0.2	6.0	0.01	0.3	4.9	0.01	0.5	3.3	0.02	0.3	3.3	0.01
Managers, officials, proprietors [4]	.9	10.1	.09	1.0	10.0	.10	1.5	10.1	.15	1.0	10.1	.10
Professional, technical	.9	8.6	.08	1.2	9.6	.12	1.8	11.5	.21	1.2	11.5	.14
Clerical	1.7	12.7	.22	2.8	13.8	.39	4.0	14.6	.58	2.5	14.6	.37
Sales	2.1	6.0	.13	2.6	6.2	.16	4.2	6.2	.26	2.5	6.2	.16
Private household workers	2.6	3.0	.08	3.7	3.2	.12	5.2	3.3	.17	3.3	3.3	.11
Farm laborers and foremen	2.5	3.8	.10	3.7	4.2	.16	5.5	3.2	.18	3.3	3.2	.11
Craftsmen, foremen, etc	2.6	13.8	.36	3.8	13.2	.50	4.8	12.7	.61	3.3	12.7	.42
Operatives	3.2	20.6	.66	6.3	19.5	1.23	7.4	18.4	1.36	4.0	18.4	.74
Other service workers	3.6	8.3	.30	5.1	8.6	.44	6.2	9.8	.61	4.0	9.8	.39
Laborers [5]	6.1	6.1	.37	9.4	5.9	.55	12.1	5.5	.67	5.0	5.5	.28
No previous work experience	----------	----------	.11	----------	----------	.44	----------	----------	.84	----------	----------	.30
Total unemployment rate	----------	----------	[6] 2.5	----------	----------	[6] 4.3	----------	----------	[6] 5.7	----------	----------	3.1

[1] Unemployment rate for each occupation (percent of labor force in group).

[2] Percentage of total labor force in each occupation.

[3] Product of cols. (a) and (b), or the contribution of each group to the overall unemployment rate (percent of total labor force).

[4] Excluding farm.

[5] Excluding farm and mine.

[6] As officially reported. The rate for 1953 is based on old definitions. As revised, the rate for 1953 is 2.9 percent.

Source: Actual data are taken or computed from "Manpower Report of the President," March 1964.

TABLE 3.—*Unemployment by age, sex, and color: Hypothetical full employment target compared with actual data for 1953, 1957, and 1963*

Classification of labor force	1953			1957			1963			Full employment target		
	(a) [1]	(b) [2]	(c) [3]	(a) [1]	(b) [2]	(c) [3]	(a) [1]	(b) [2]	(c) [3]	(a) [1]	(b) [2]	(c) [3]
By age and sex:												
Males:												
14 to 19	6.8	4.5	0.31	11.3	4.6	0.52	15.5	5.0	0.78	6.0	5.0	0.30
20 to 24	4.3	4.8	.21	7.8	5.3	.41	8.8	6.2	.55	4.0	6.2	.25
25 to 44	1.8	33.2	.60	3.0	31.4	.94	3.9	28.9	1.13	2.5	28.9	.72
45 to 64	2.1	22.8	.48	3.4	22.6	.77	3.9	22.6	.88	2.9	22.6	.66
65 and over	2.0	4.0	.08	3.4	3.6	.12	4.5	2.9	.13	2.9	2.9	.08
Females:												
14 to 19	6.0	3.0	.18	10.1	3.2	.32	15.7	3.6	.57	5.4	3.6	.19
20 to 24	3.7	3.8	.14	6.0	3.7	.22	8.9	3.8	.34	4.0	3.8	.15
25 to 44	2.4	13.8	.33	4.5	13.8	.62	5.9	13.4	.79	3.7	13.4	.50
45 to 64	1.9	9.0	.17	3.1	10.7	.33	4.0	12.1	.48	2.7	12.1	.33
65 and over	1.3	1.1	.01	3.4	1.2	.04	3.2	1.2	.04	2.5	1.2	.03
Total unemployment rate			[1] 2.5			[1] 4.3			[1] 5.7			3.2
By color and sex:												
White	2.3	89.4	2.06	3.9	89.2	3.48	5.1	88.9	4.53	3.0	88.9	2.67
Male	2.2	62.6	1.38	3.7	61.0	2.26	4.7	59.0	2.77	2.8	59.0	1.65
Female	2.6	26.8	.70	4.3	28.3	1.22	5.8	29.9	1.73	3.4	29.9	1.02
Nonwhite	4.1	10.7	.44	8.0	10.8	.86	10.9	11.1	1.21	4.0	11.1	.44
Male	4.4	6.7	.29	8.4	6.6	.55	10.6	6.6	.70	4.0	6.6	.26
Female	3.7	3.9	.14	7.4	4.2	.31	11.3	4.5	.51	4.0	4.5	.18
Total unemployment rate			[4] 2.5			[4] 4.3			[4] 5.7			3.1

[1] Unemployment rate for each group (percent of labor force in group).

[2] Percentage of total labor force in each group.

[3] Product of cols. (a) and (b), or the contribution of each group to the overall unemployment rate (percent of the total labor force).

[4] As officially reported. The rate for 1953 is based on old definitions. As revised, the rate for 1953 is 2.9 percent.

Source: Actual data are taken or computed from "Manpower Report of the President," March 1964, or were supplied by the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

SEEKING A SOLUTION TO U.S. MANPOWER PROBLEMS

During the last 5 years, unemployment in the United States has never dipped below a yearly average of 5.5 percent of the labor force. After each of the recessions over the last decade, unemployment has settled at a higher level not only absolutely but in percentage terms. Thus during 1962, 4 million people were unemployed on the average, more than a quarter of them for 15 weeks or more. Another 2.7 million were working part-time for economic reasons; e.g., because they could not find a full-time job or because business was slack.

This situation has been a matter of great concern to U.S. authorities not only because of the human problem it presents but because it implies the waste of one of the most important economic resources. It has been roughly estimated that with the present level of unemployment, there may be a potential loss to gross national product of some $30 to $40 billion a year. Further loss results from the failure to use manpower at its highest skill and educational potential. In this connection, the Council of Economic Advisers has suggested that gross national product might rise by another $14 billion a year if the educational achievements of Negroes were fully utilized by the removal of discriminatory recruitment and selection processes.

As one aspect of their endeavor to solve the twin problems of unemployment and underemployment, the U.S. authorities have taken an active part in a study on U.S. manpower policies and practices conducted by the OECD Manpower and Social Affairs Committee. The study, which has just been published, is in four parts: the OECD Manpower and Social Affairs Committee's recommendations; a statement by U.S. authorities; a report on the findings of three OECD examiners[1] and a series of questions and answers by the examiners and the U.S. representatives respectively.

THE SURROUNDING CIRCUMSTANCES

The problem of providing constructive employment in the years ahead will, the report points out, be complicated by the fact that a record number of young people—26 million in all—products of the postwar baby boom, will come of working age during the 1960's. To some extent they will be able to replace older workers who are retiring; but it has been estimated that on balance 13 million new jobs will be needed by 1970 solely to accommodate the newcomers.

At the same time, productivity will be increasing at a rapid rate. As an indication of the magnitude of this increase in the past, the report points to the fact that a 67-percent increase in real national product (excluding general Government expenditures) between 1947 and 1962 entailed a rise in the number of man-hours worked of only 4.5 percent. If productivity continues to increase only as fast as it has in the past, another 2 million jobs per year will be needed for those displaced by technological change. Whether or not the rate of productivity growth will accelerate is an open question, but the report points to the fact that research and development expenditures have increased from $5 billion in 1953–54 to $14 billion in 1960–61.

In any case the new jobs must be provided in a context of constant and rapid change—not only in technology but in the kind of industries that will rise and fall and in the type of skill required. Says examiner W. R. Dymond, "It used to be that a worker could aim for a particular job in which he was able to develop a vested interest and which became his for life. It is clear that the average worker in the U.S. labor force can no longer expect to remain continuously for 40 or 50 years in a single occupation with a given set of unchanging skills. He has constantly to adjust to new employment demands and on occasion even make shifts to completely new occupations, usually at higher levels of education and skill."

The OECD manpower experts agree with other analysts that the failure to achieve full employment in the United States is to an important extent the result of inadequate demand, and that remedies must include fiscal and monetary measures. They point out that growth in output during the past 5 years has been at an annual rate of only 2.9 percent as against 3.8 percent during the decade from 1947 to 1957. But the Manpower Committee adds that "national full employment and growth policies can be pursued more vigorously, with less risk of inflationary pressures from labor shortages where active labor market policies facilitate the movement and adaptability of the labor force to changes in demand."

THE ROLE OF MOBILITY

How mobile and adaptable is the U.S. labor force? Traditionally, as the Department of Labor's Manpower Report to the President noted in March of 1963, "the American people have a characteristic readiness to move." Of the 159 million persons 5 years old and over in the country in 1960, 75 million had changed residence since 1955, one-fifth of them to another State. In 1961 8.1 million workers (one-tenth of those who had jobs) made a change during the course of the year, some to improve their status, about an equal number because they had lost their old jobs. Shifts that involve a change in industry are more common than those involving a change in occupation, but one-half of the switches did involve a change in occupational grouping.

In recent years, however, there have grown up some impediments to mobility. In some cases because of lack of opportunity, the transfers required have been from more highly paid jobs which provide considerable fringe benefits to less productive and less highly paid service jobs. At the same time, certain institutional obstacles to movement have grown up: The increasing prevalence of seniority promotions and other benefits related to seniority tends to make workers reluctant to change jobs; and the growth of pension plans, when these could not be carried from employer to employer may have acted as a bar to movement. The OECD examiners note that "in consequence of these and the many social factors which tie workers to their homes, as well as problems of low education and skill in relation to the employment opportunities, serious pockets of immobile workers have developed in many regions of relatively declining employment," e.g., in West Virginia and Pennsylvania, in the Mesabi range where the iron mines have been worked out, and in certain parts of the Pacific Northwest where there has been a decline in the production of lumber, not to mention the textile and shoe manufacturing regions of New England.

---

[1] Mr. W. R. Dymond, Assistant Deputy Minister in the Canadian Ministry of Labour; Mr. N. Kellgren, Member of Parliament and Special Assistant to the Director-General of the Swedish Labour Market Board; and Mr. H. Zoeteweij, Assistant Economic Adviser of the International Labour Office.

OTHER OBSTACLES TO THE FULL USE OF MANPOWER

Employment possibilities are limited by another factor to which the OECD report gives considerable prominence: Inadequate education. To illustrate: For those who have a college education, the unemployment rate is only 2 percent; the rate is 10 percent for those who have failed to finish primary school. Among young people, those who have finished secondary school have only half the unemployment rate of those who have not. Even though the educational level of the labor force has been rising steadily, it is estimated that unless some action is taken, almost 30 percent of the young people who will be seeking work during the 1960's will not have finished secondary school; a third of these will not even have finished primary school.

This fact takes on particular importance because many of the unskilled professions in which workers without educational qualification have been employed are on the decline; and the fastest growing opportunities are in those fields which require the longest period of education.

Discrimination would appear to be an important obstacle to full employment: Nonwhite workers, though they comprised only 11 percent of the labor force in 1962 accounted for twice that share of unemployment. Particularly hard hit are the young people: The unemployment rate for the nonwhite teenager stood at 21 percent for boys and 28 percent for girls in 1962. In part this reflects the fact that nonwhite workers tend to be concentrated in low-skilled employment. It has been estimated that if nonwhite workers had the same occupational distribution as white workers, their unemployment rate would be cut in half.

EFFORTS AT THE FEDERAL LEVEL

A significant number of people within the United States are aware of these problems, and a vast number of programs have been proposed or put into practice by private firms and trade unions, together or separately, by voluntary groups and by government at its various levels. A considerable number of these plans are described in the 200 pages of the OECD's study.

There is, for example, a growing awareness on the part of unions and companies of the need for encouraging mobility, especially in response to technological change.

One approach which has been taken in collective bargaining to facilitate mobility is enlarging the unit within which a worker's seniority rights apply. A case in point is the contract between the U.S. Steel Co. and the United Steelworkers under which employees who have been working with the company for a certain number of years and are laid off from one plant, have priority in hiring over newcomers in certain of the company's other plants. In some cases a worker who transfers under this arrangement receives a moving allowance.

In other cases, measures to promote mobility have taken the form of buying out accumulated seniority rights with a severance-pay allowance or "vesting" pensions (i.e., allowing employees to retain their accumulated pension rights after they leave a job). Some collectively bargained agreements, e.g., at Kaiser Steel and in the meatpacking industry, provide for a study of the impact of technical change and joint working out of cooperative plans for adaptation.

ACTION TO SOLVE THE PROBLEM

Since 1961 the Federal Government has strengthened its arsenal of weapons with which to fight unemployment. Several acts have been passed designed to increase the mobility of workers occupationally and geographically and to encourage industry to move into those areas where unemployment is unusually high.

Most recent is the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 which sets a new precedent in Federal legislation, providing relocation allowances for workers who are displaced by industry shifts resulting primarily from reductions in tariffs. In addition the act provides for a period of paid retraining at a rate of compensation that can under certain circumstances exceed the amount of unemployment compensation and which can last for as long as a year and a half in certain cases.

The Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 also provides Federal funds for retraining and directs the Department of Labor to mount a unified and comprehensive manpower research program directed toward preventing unemployment and underemployment.

Finally, the Area Redevelopment Act of 1961, which gives financial assistance to firms locating in areas of substantial and persistent unemployment, also provides for retraining of the local labor force. By the end of 1962, 268 projects involving some 15,000 trainees had been approved. Some of the programs for regional development straddle several communities; one includes the entire Appalachian region.

The Federal-State placement service has been granted more funds and is trying to expand its scope. Traditionally its primary concern has been with the unemployed; now it is trying to serve professional groups as well and also workers who wish simply to improve their lot. In the process, authorities hope the number of employers who utilize the service will be augmented.

However, the OECD Committee for Manpower and Social Affairs concludes that what has been done is not enough: "Overall it is our judgment that manpower practices and institutions to date have not been adequate for the United States to achieve in a sound fashion its growth objective. This is a judgment, we note, which is now widely shared in the United States itself, with the result that the United States has embarked on a more active manpower policy as indicated in the President's first annual manpower report. The Committee believes there are considerable opportunities in the United States, as evidenced by continuing efforts of the American authorities to improve the effectiveness of labor market institutions and operations with respect to the training, placement, and utilization of the work force."

More specifically the Committee recommends:

The expansion, diversification, and improvement of educational opportunities to improve the availability and quality of education for both young people and adults, and to develop flexible programs of academic and vocational study at all levels of education.

The rapid extension of training programs to provide for the unemployed for whom new jobs are not immediately available; similar expansion should take place in the opportunities available for the employed, including even highly skilled workers, to assist them in meeting new job demands.

The expansion and strengthening of apprenticeship programs and greater use of preapprenticeship programs.

A strengthening of the employment service's recruitment and placement functions particularly for technicians and professional personnel and for employed persons.

A program of counsel and financial assistance to aid the mobility of workers willing to undertake employment in other communities.

The improvement of collection and use of information on employment and unemployment, particularly—and this is being attempted—initiation of a series on job vacancies sufficiently detailed to be useful for operational purposes.

An enlargement of programs to bring jobs to the worker.

More adequate levels of unemployment compensation so that these payments could act more effectively as an automatic stabilizer of the economy.

Finally the committee suggests that more attention might usefully be given to the question of how the unemployment insurance system could be used constructively to encourage mobility and retraining of unemployed workers; it approves the U.S. Government's efforts to eliminate racial discrimination in the public employment services, in apprenticeship, in the new training programs and in basic education.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 3174) to amend section 5 of the Employment Act of 1946.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H.R. 8427. An act to provide for the establishment and maintenance of a Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System for a limited number of employees, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 9976. An act for the relief of Elmer Levy.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11380) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MORGAN, Mr. ZABLOCKI, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. HAYS, Mr. ADAIR, Mr. MAILLIARD, and Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 2180. An act to amend title VII of the Public Health Service Act so as to extend to qualified school of optometry and students of optometry those provisions thereof relating to student loan programs;

H.R. 2501. An act to authorize the promotion of qualified Reserve officers of the Army and the Air Force to existing unit vacancies;

H.R. 2512. An act to clarify the status of members of the National Guard while attending or instructing at National Guard schools established under the authority of the Secretary of the Army or Secretary of the Air Force, as the case may be, and for other purposes;

H.R. 9718. An act to authorize the crediting of certain military service for purposes of reserve retired pay; and

H.R. 12308. An act to authorize removal of flight hazard at the U.S. Naval Air Station, Norfolk, Va.

ICE AGE NATIONAL SCIENTIFIC RESERVE—WISCONSIN

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1546, House bill 1096.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered; and the clerk will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 1096) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to cooperate with the State of Wisconsin in the designation and administration of the Ice Age National Scientific Reserve in the State of Wisconsin, and for other purposes.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, this is a bill which proposes to create and establish the Ice Age National Scientific Reserve.

The bill is a simple one. It provides for the appropriation of $50,000 by the Federal Government for the purpose of preparing a comprehensive plan to delineate the boundaries and other matters involved in the comprehensive plan.

It identifies the three areas in the State where these distinct geologic formations created by the glacier exist.

The completion of the acquisitions under the bill involving some 12,000 acres, is likely to be done, in part or in whole, under the land and water conservation fund act passed this session of Congress. Any Federal participation in acquisition will be from moneys out of Wisconsin's share of the land and water fund.

This legislation passed the House of Representatives last Wednesday, September 23 by a vote of 180 to 118. It is of great interest to the Nation and to the State of Wisconsin.

Across the northern half of America the ice age left a colossal and beautiful hallmark upon our landscape. It can be seen in the headlands of Cape Cod and in the hills of Michigan. Nowhere, however, is the heritage of the ice age more evident or more impressive than in Wisconsin.

The tremendous work of the continental glacier which covered northern parts of the United States 10,000 years ago is shown in the remarkable features of landscape throughout the heartland of the United States, and especially in the parts of Wisconsin that this legislation would protect. In this region the massive ice sheet altered drainage systems, determined the course of rivers, filled valleys, created hills and plains and thousands of lakes—making the area truly the land of lakes.

After extensive field surveys and other studies of Wisconsin's proposed Ice Age National Scientific Reserve, the U.S. Department of the Interior has recommended that national recognition be given to the significant features of the State's glaciated areas by designating them as the Ice Age National Scientific Reserve.

Included in the areas are outstanding examples of the topographic features peculiar to glaciation—drumlins, kames, eskers, boulder trains, kettle moraines, and, of course, lakes. The Bloomer region in Chippewa County alone contains approximately 300 glacial lakes.

This legislation has the full support of the Johnson administration. It is a key element in the Kennedy-Johnson national park program, and has the solid backing of the Department of the Interior. It has been endorsed by the National Wildlife Federation, the Izaak Walton League, the National Audubon Society, the Sierra Club, the Wilderness Society, and the Wisconsin Federation of Conservation Clubs. Two successive Wisconsin Governors—I and present Governor John Reynolds—the Wisconsin Legislature and the Wisconsin Conservation Commission have endorsed it. All of the Democratic Representatives from Wisconsin have supported this bill and Wisconsin Republican Representatives SCHADEBERG, BYRNES, LAIRD, O'KONSKI, and THOMSON have also given it their support. I want to give special attention and recognition to the hard work of Congressmen LESTER JOHNSON and HENRY REUSS, of Wisconsin, who have worked so hard for this bill in the House. In short, this legislation has broad bipartisan support and I believe can fairly be described as noncontroversial.

Not only will the legislation preserve and recognize an important geological phenomenon, but it will add to our much needed recreational area. The Ice Age National Scientific Reserve will be within easy driving range of one of the greatest population concentrations in the United States, an area that is presently almost entirely without national park systems. The three main areas of the proposed reserve are within a few miles of Wisconsin's main population centers—Milwaukee and the lakeshore cities; Madison; and the Eau Claire-Twin Cities areas.

The legislation will authorize the Department of the Interior and the State of Wisconsin within 2 years to make a comprehensive plan for the Ice Age National Scientific Reserve. The plan is to cost no more than $50,000 and the reserve will be established when, after agreement, the plan is published in the Federal Register.

It is expected that a total of 12,000 additional acres of land will have to be acquired at a total cost of $1.5 million.

The area encompassed by the legislation consists of the following:

First. The Kettle Moraine State Forest northern unit, of which 22,000 acres is already in public ownership, and 5,000 additional acres is needed.

Second. The Devils Lake area in Sauk County, of which 2,500 acres is now in public ownership, with 2,000 additional acres needed.

Third. The Chippewa area in Chippewa County, of which 5,000 acres is now in public ownership, with 5,000 more acres needed.

Fourth. An additional 1,000 acres in various scattered portions, such as the John Muir boyhood home in Marquette County, the Cross Plains area in Dane County, and the Camp Douglas buttes.

The Federal Government's share of the cost of land acquisition—$750,000—will come from funds allocated to Wisconsin under the land and water conservation fund.

The committee report makes it abundantly clear that any Federal participation in financing for the purpose of acquisition will be under the provisions of the land and water conservation fund out of funds allocated to the State of Wisconsin.

I read into the RECORD from the committee report on the bill, dated September 29, 1964, as follows:

> The financing of H.R. 1096 could be accomplished under the provisions of Public Law 88–578 (the land and water conservation fund act). It would not however provide for the designation of the area on a national basis unless this bill is enacted.
>
> The committee wants it made abundantly clear that in approving this legislation the grants made for acquisition under H.R. 1096 to the State of Wisconsin will be deducted from any share of funds that may be allocated to that State under the terms of Public Law 88–578. It is the further understanding of the committee that when appropriations are made to carry out the terms of this bill they will be a charge against the land and water conservation fund and not against the General Treasury.

The reason for the grant authority for acquisition in H.R. 1096 is that the bill was drafted and the House Committee reported it before Congress passed the land and water conservation bill. It is expected that the State and the Secretary of Interior will request any funds for acquisition through the regular procedure to be established pursuant to the Land and Water Fund Act out of the share Wisconsin will be entitled to receive.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NELSON. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I commend my colleague for his exposition of the bill. This is a bill that is very much desired in our State.

As the Senator has said, the conservation organizations are unanimously for it. The public officials have been in favor of it for a long time.

I shall stress one or two things about the bill. In the first place, this area is a national—and I mean a national—resource. This area offers very significant scientific opportunities. Scientists from all over the world, I am sure, will be very interested in studying this depository of scientific treasure. I believe that it is most important that this area be made a national park.

Not only is the scientific aspect of this area important, but it is easily accessible to Chicago, the second greatest metropolitan area of the country. It is only 100 to 150 miles north of Chicago. Another part of the area is very close to Minneapolis and St. Paul. A third and smaller section is very close to Madison, Wis. So it is ideally located for recreational purposes for literally millions of urban people who lack adequate park facilities.

I believe that for these two reasons—that it is a great scientific depository and is a most accessible recreational area—its recognition as a national park would give it real status, both in the scientific community and in the eyes of the general public.

I believe that passage of the bill is most important.

As my colleague made abundantly clear, this bill will cost the taxpayers a very reasonable sum. The total new funds which would be needed to create quite a large national park, with thousands of additional acres, is $50,000.

The $750,000 that the Federal Government would provide to acquire land is available to Wisconsin anyway. Wisconsin would have a claim on it. Wisconsin obviously would use the $750,000 in any event. The entire additional cost of this beautiful territory—valuable for both scientific and recreational purposes—is only $50,000. I believe that under the circumstances, this is a most advantageous investment for the Federal Government. This should be a national park, available to the citizens of Wisconsin and to all citizens of America. I am sure that the citizens of Illinois, Minnesota, and Michigan will take a very vigorous part in it.

In the colloquy in the House of Representatives concerning this bill, one Representatives from Illinois pointed out that, in his judgment, 80 percent of the people who would enjoy this resource would come from outside of the State of Wisconsin—mostly from the State of Illinois.

So I do believe that the area should be a national park not simply a State park. I earnestly hope that the bill will pass.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Clark in the chair). The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado desire to be heard before the third reading?

Mr. ALLOTT. I do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado is recognized.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I was hesitant because the distinguished junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Nelson] had yielded to the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Proxmire] and I was not certain whether the junior Senator from Wisconsin intended to resume the floor or not.

Mr. President, much as I regret having to do so, I shall have to vote against the bill. I shall vote against it because of the illogical method which has been chosen to select the bill and the process of going about its consideration. I shall discuss the question in about four or five points. I shall be brief, but for the future of our entire park system, the points need to be raised. They need to be considered by the Senate.

First, I say to my friends from Wisconsin that there is no question about the beauty of the particular areas involved. I have seen some of them. So far as the North American Continent is concerned, at least, there is no question that the area is the outstanding example, portraying geologically, and most graphically the termination of the ice age on the North American continent. From that standpoint the area is eminently valuable and beautiful. It is worthy of protection for future generations. The points that I raise do not apply to those subjects, nor do they apply to the fact that such an area should be made available to the people of the United States in areas in which large numbers of our population reside. They should be made available not only for the large populous areas, but also for the areas that are of smaller population.

The first point that I should like to mention is as follows:

The bill is entitled "A bill to cooperate with the State of Wisconsin in the designation and administration of the Ice Age National Scientific Reserve."

Mr. President, there is no such category in the national park system and there never has been such a category. The advisory board to the National Park Service, which created and suggested this particular classification, has created a specific classification for this particular reserve. No one else in the United States has ever been able to persuade the advisory committee or the Park Service to make a particular and specific classification for the development of an area for either recreational or scientific values in any State no matter where it might be.

But the real gist of why I object to the area being a national scientific reserve is that the bill would authorize the appropriation of $50,000 which the Federal Government would spend to assist in the planning of a State park.

Once there is tacked onto the bill, as has been done in the present case, the word "national," let no Senator, let no one in the whole Congress, and let no one in the country be confused about the fact that year after year the people who are interested in this particular park will go to the Park Service and say, "We want help on this and we want help on that," and out of the general funds appropriated to the Park Service there will be dished out, year after year, sums of money. Why? Because those interested in that project will then have the unassailable argument, "You must help us. This is an area with a national designation." So year after year, I anticipate—and my belief is based upon the strength of their argument, which is unassailable and irrefutable—that the Park Service will be bled of money appropriated to the National Park Service to support an area which is a State reserve, an area which is owned by the State of Wisconsin, and which should be kept by them.

The argument my friend from Wisconsin uses—and I can be sympathetic in this respect—is that, "We want a 'national' designation because such a designation would bring people to the park."

Despite that, it cannot be denied that, although the area would be owned by the State of Wisconsin, there would be authorized in the bill, and subsequently appropriated, $50,000 for the planning of those three areas. Year after year, out of otherwise unlined items in the appropriation bills, we shall find the Park Service putting more and more money into that area for its development.

The second point I should like to suggest with respect to the proposal—although this might really be an objection on the part of the State of Wisconsin rather than the Federal Government—although we would designate the area a "national" area. Again we would make the same mistake—and we shall find that it is a mistake—that we made with respect to the so-called Indiana Dunes area, in that we would include three parcels which are, as my friend from Wisconsin said, 300 miles apart. Some of them are 500 miles apart. At least one of them is over in the western part of the State.

So there would be three nonadjacent parcels. It would be perfectly logical for the State to develop those areas. But when we start tacking a "national" name on it, it becomes completely incongruous and insensible to try to administer three areas which are dispersed so far apart as those are.

The next point on which I should like to say a few words is the third item in the minority views. On pages 3 and 4 of the House report it is stated:

> If such a measure as H.R. 3846—

That is the land and water conservation fund bill—

> were already law, creation of this scientific reserve could be undertaken in accordance with its terms and the cost to the United States would be about the same as under H.R. 1096. It seems neither necessary nor advisable, however, to await the enactment of such a bill as that before proceeding with the Federal participation in the present proposal.

The House report was filed on December 3, 1963. That bill was passed by the House on September 23, 1964. However, H.R. 3846, the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act, was approved by the President on September 3, 1964—which of course, was before H.R. 1096 was passed by the House and before it was passed by the Senate.

I believe we ought to look for a moment at the Land and Water Conservation Fund bill, which is H.R. 3846. That bill was recently passed for the express purpose of providing a method and means of helping the States and the Federal Government to acquire land for recreational and educational use for the people of the United States.

That bill is financed in three ways.

First of all, we have added greater fees for entrance to all of the park systems and user fees on many other public lands. All of this money goes into the land and water conservation fund. Second, whether or not it is reasonably related to this purpose we have taken proceeds from the sales of real property and reasonably related personal property, and have put all that money into the fund. This could amount to as much as $80 or $90 million in some years. At least, it has in the past and may amount to many times that amount in the future.

Third. We have taken the Federal motor fuel tax for motor boats and have put it all into that fund.

So out of these three sources we have created what will be a very large fund, amounting to hundreds of millions of dollars, for apportionment to the States and Federal Government for the exact purpose for which the bill is before the Senate.

Under the land and water conservation bill, 60 percent will go to the States. Two-fifths of the 60 percent is to be divided equally among the States, and three-fifths is to be divided on the rather nebulous basis of need, which is to be determined by that man of infinite wisdom, the Secretary of the Interior.

The other 40 percent goes to the Federal Government and it can be used for acquisition only, and not for development, 85 percent of the Federal share is to be used for land acquisitions east of the 100th meridian, which means that it is to be used east of a line running roughly through the middle of Kansas. Senators from the West had no objection to that. I do not raise that issue.

So the Federal money must go for acquisition, none for development.

The bill provides that we shall spend $750,000 for the acquisition of land, and that we shall also spend $50,000 for planning and development of what amounts to a State park.

I must say, in all fairness and honesty, that the supporter of the bill in the Senate, the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON] tried his best to meet the one basic objection which came to the bill. In the report, this language appears on page 3:

> The committee wants it made abundantly clear that in approving this legislation the grants made for acquisition under H.R. 1096 to the State of Wisconsin will be deducted from any share of funds that may be allocated to that State under the terms of Public Law 88-578.

That is the land and water conservation fund bill.

Resuming the quotation:

> It is the further understanding of the committee that when appropriations are made to carry out the terms of this bill they will be a charge against the land and water conservation fund and not against the General Treasury.

I personally felt that this language should have been in the bill. In view of the recent decision by the now either Attorney General or Acting Attorney General, I do not believe that any language in the report necessarily has the binding effect of law.

As I have seen the arrogant bureaucracy of this Federal Government grow and progress, I have noticed also less and less attention paid to report language, much less the legislative history, of the Congress. The bureaucrats feel obligated only to obey the letter of the law itself. If the law goes contrary to their wishes, they may even go contrary to the law. This is not an uncommon occurrence; it is now a common occurrence.

So it would have been my wish that this particular provision stating that the funds will be a charge against Wisconsin's share of those funds was a part of the bill and was included in the bill, rather than included in language of the report. I have no doubt that some day along the road of the future we shall be quarreling over whether the Department of the Interior was charged with the responsibility of charging this amount against Wisconsin's share of the land and water conservation fund.

Moving on to another point which I think ought to be considered with respect to this question, I have a firm belief that since Congress has just passed a land and water conservation bill, and it was signed by the President only last month, we should not start mortgaging the future of this particular fund. We do not know as of this moment what share Wisconsin will get. We know Wisconsin will get her prorated share of two-fifths of 60 percent of the money that the fund generates. We know that three-fifths will be left in the hands of the Secretary, to dispose of as he, in his glorious wisdom, decides. But we do not know what part Kansas, Missouri, New York, or any other State will get out of it.

I therefore feel it unwise to start passing bills which mortgage the future of that Fund when we do not know for sure the amount that Wisconsin, in this instance, will be entitled to received from that Fund.

The effect of such an advance is that it will almost compel the Secretary of the Interior, regardless of other equities, to say, "Wisconsin has to have $750,000 to take care of its purchases with respect to the Ice Age Reserve. Therefore, out of our three-fifths of the 60 percent on the basis of need, we are going to have to give it to them." This is without regard to the desires and needs of other States. So a billet-doux will be put on the desk of the Secretary of the Interior and he will be told, "This much has to be taken care of."

So I object to the advance feature of this measure.

Finally, we do not know how much will be generated into this Fund.

I have about concluded my remarks, but since the junior Senator from Wisconsin is in the Chamber, and he has been the chief advocate of this bill, and we are dependent only on language contained in the report, I should like to ask him two or three questions in order that not only the report, but the legislative history of the bill, will be adequately clear as to what the intent of the bill is.

So I ask my friend, with regard to the authorization of $750,000 in this bill, contained in section 3 thereof, if it is his understanding and he is willing to agree, so far as the distinguished junior Senator from Wisconsin and his colleague are concerned, that this will constitute an advance out of the land and water conservation fund and that it will so be treated in their future action.

Mr. NELSON. I wonder if the Senator would rephrase that language. He says "advance." There is no intent or expectation that any money will be advanced to the State of Wisconsin prior to the creation of the fund under the Land and Water Conservation Act. With that understood, I believe I agree with the Senator.

Mr. ALLOTT. The fund is now created. Whether there is any money in it or not, the fund is created. Therefore I believe the word "advance" is used correctly. However, I am glad to take the Senator's own verbiage.

Mr. NELSON. I believe the Senator is correct in saying that under the terms of the language of the bill it is proper to use the word "advance." I believe the legislative history and the committee history intend to make it clear that now that the Land and Water Conservation Act has been enacted, an appropriation made for the purpose designated shall come out of Wisconsin's share under that act, and not prior to the creation of any fund.

That is the intent of the committee, and it is certainly my intent.

The Senator is correct. I appreciate his coming to the floor to clarify this point for the legislative history. This is the intent of the House committee. It is the legislative history on the floor of the House. That was the intent of our Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, of which the distinguished Senator from Colorado is a member.

Mr. ALLOTT. I should like to make one further inquiry. Has the Senator informed the Governor of Wisconsin of the intent of the language of the bill and what the situation will be with respect to treating this matter as a setoff—if the Senator would rather use that phrase, instead of "advance"—against such fund that would be declared available to the State of Wisconsin under the Land and Water Conservation Act?

Mr. NELSON. I have not discussed the matter with the Governor. I discussed it last night on the telephone with the chairman of the acquisition section of the Wisconsin Conservation Commission. I explained it to him. I believe the legislative history should show, if the Senator will permit me to say so, that this in no way binds the State of Wisconsin to expend any money in the further acquisition of land in the Ice Age Reserve. It does not direct the State to make an acquisition at any particular pace. It only provides that if Wisconsin applies for matching funds for an acquisition within the Ice Age Reserve, the Federal moneys furnished shall be furnished from Wisconsin's share of the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the Senator. I should correct a part of my statement. In examining the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act, I find that although the fund is created, it does not become effective until January 1, 1965. The RECORD should show that fact, because that is the situation.

Let me ask the Senator one further question. I wonder if he would give me assurance, to protect everyone concerned with this one phase of the bill, that he will write the Governor of his State, who, after all, is the chief executive officer of the State of Wisconsin, informing him completely about the language in the committee report, and perhaps even forwarding an excerpt of the RECORD carrying this discussion, so that there will be a record in the Governor's office on the effect and intent of the bill.

I see that my friend from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is nodding his head. I am sure he is in full accord with the thought I have expressed.

Mr. NELSON. I shall be happy to do so. Personally I am of the opinion that our Governor, who keeps himself very well informed, is aware of the situation. However, I shall be glad to send him these specific materials, as I have already sent them to the chief of the acquisition section of the Conservation Commission, by mail.

Mr. ALLOTT. The Senator from Wisconsin being the kind of Senator he is, I am sure that he would do this anyway, but I wished to make this request of him because I believe it is important that the Governor have this report.

I conclude with one or two sentences. I believe we are doing something which is unfortunate for the park services of this country, in designating a State park or a State scientific reserve as a national area.

I believe it could have unfortunate consequences, plus being a drain on the Treasury, and the unfortunate demands on the park services that may flow from it. What I have said does not in any way—and I do not intend that it should—detract from the attractiveness or scientific value of what we are discussing. I do not believe the bill is necessary. It contains too many unfortunate precedents, and I shall vote against it, reluctantly.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I share the view of the Senator from Colorado. I join him and his junior colleague [Mr. DOMINICK] in making this statement. I know that the distinguished junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON] realizes that I am not opposed to this proposal as such. I have considerable misgivings and apprehension with respect to entitling this a "national reserve." It is like giving the baby a name and giving it a national name, thereby lending additional beauty and stature, I suppose. It is an unprecedented action, and it is dangerous as well.

Many others will want the "national" nomenclature attached to other proposals. Even though this reserve is entirely within the State of Wisconsin and administered entirely by the State of Wisconsin, the fact remains that this represents a usurpation of the national significance.

I believe we shall be plagued by many more acquisitions of land under the Land and Water Conservation Act.

I call attention to an additional objection, which should be raised at this time. This was spoken of briefly by the Senator from Colorado. I say to the Senator from Wisconsin that this is a beautiful area. He comes from a very beautiful State. This area will grow through further acquisition by the State. The State already owns approximately 20,500 acres. It seeks now to acquire an additional 12,500 acres.

I read from the minority report:

> We do not believe that any State ought to be able to draw an advance on its potential entitlement under the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act. In the first place, under that act, a State must meet certain prerequisites before receiving any of its potential entitlement, including the submission and the Secretary's approval of a comprehensive State plan. In the second place, a State's entitlement is subject to several other contingencies. The State portion of the fund is allocated two-fifths equally among the States and three-fifths among the States according to need. Also the State-Federal allocation of the entire fund may be changed by as much as 15 points during the first 5 years at the discretion of the President. And finally the eventual amount that will be channeled into the fund is by no means certain.

I point out also that there is inherent in the bill another danger. I refer to the additional acquisition of 12,500 acres. There is no denying that the State of Wisconsin has the right of eminent domain. No hearings have been held in the field. It seems to me that the people concerned should have an opportunity to be heard. They have never been given that opportunity.

Mr. NELSON. This is an unusual case, as was stated by the Senator from Wyoming and the Senator from Colorado, because it relates to an unusual area. The area is unique. There is none other of comparable significance anywhere else in the United States. To designate this singular area a "national scientific reserve" isn't completely unusual. It has become necessary under our National Park System to create other brand new names, such as "national seashores," "national recreation areas," "national historical parks," and "national rivers."

Second, as to the question raised by the Senator from Colorado respecting the spending of $50,000 of Federal money for the purpose of creating the plan, I point out that tens of thousands of dollars of Federal money are being spent for the creation of local plans, city plans, county plans, regional plans, and State plans. While I was Governor of Wisconsin, we secured from the Federal Government a grant of $500,000 for the creation of a comprehensive State plan for State purposes. The Southeastern Regional Planning Commission obtained a grant of about $150,000 for the purpose of creating a regional plan covering seven counties. So that aspect is not new.

I recognize the problem and the question raised. I should prefer that this area be acquired completely by the Federal Government, handled by the Federal Government, and paid for by the Federal Government. But the problem is that it is located in three isolated areas, because they are where the glacier made its significant deposits. The glacier did not bother to connect the areas. So the situation is different from that of the Indiana dunes, where man created the various areas, thus making it necessary to have interrupted acquisitions.

Therefore, it became the conclusion of all involved that it would make more sense for the taxpayers of the Nation and of the State, and would make it mechanically simpler for our own conservation department to operate this national scientific reserve with the advice and technical assistance of the Secretary of the Interior.

As the Senator suggests, it will be necessary to submit a comprehensive plan to qualify for funds under the land and water conservation fund bill.

I say to the Senator from Wyoming that, so far as I know, no State in the Nation, except the State of Wisconsin, is prepared today with a comprehensive plan to qualify under the land and water conservation fund bill, when the funds become available.

After careful consideration, the Department of the Interior supported the bill, the late President Kennedy supported the bill, and President Johnson supports the bill.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. NELSON. I yield.

Mr. SIMPSON. Does the Senator know of any State-owned, State-administered park in the United States which has been given national designation?

Mr. NELSON. I am not aware of any. I do not believe that that should ever, under any circumstances, be done unless the circumstances compel it and the area is unique.

Mr. SIMPSON. There are many unique areas in the United States.

Mr. NELSON. I do not think it should ever be done with a State park. There are State parks all over the Nation. But this is the only area of its kind in the United States; there is none comparable. That and the fact that the area is in three separate parcels caused the interested parties to conclude that this was the best way to administer and handle the situation. I should have preferred the other way around.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NELSON. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. In a private conversation with the Senator from Wisconsin the other day, I pointed out the fact that this is the only ice age area or at least the most significant deposit of the ice age in the United States. However, many other geological formations in the United States are of as much interest, and perhaps even of as great importance. For example, in my State of Colorado—and I use it as an example because I am familiar with it—there are mountains west of Corona Pass, less than 100 miles west of Denver, where there are complete turnovers of the deposits of the earth. There can be found the earliest rocks, or close to the earliest rocks. The earliest are pre-Cambrian, and the next are Cambrian. The Cambrian rocks can be found on the very top of the mountain. Then can be found all the subsequent geological strata, including all the sedimentary and metamorphic deposits under them. So the whole structure of the earth is absolutely turned upside down. From a geological standpoint, it is hard to imagine anything of more interest than that.

So perhaps, after I have discussed it with my friend from Wisconsin, I shall seek to have established next year a National Upside-down Geological Reserve, and I hope I shall have the Senator's support when that time comes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill (H.R. 1096) was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. NELSON. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

ORDER FOR RECESS TO 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate move to the consideration of executive business, to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

On motion by Mr. JOHNSTON, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What is the will of the Senate?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SOVIET ANTI-JEWISH PROPAGANDA

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senate to a shocking example of Soviet anti-Jewish propaganda, in view of the fact that the conferees will be dealing with the Foreign Aid Authorization Act containing a resolution which the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] and I and other Senators have sponsored, expressing the protest of the United States over the anti-Jewish acts which we have revealed are taking place in the Soviet Union. I therefore should like to have this matter considered by the conferees.

This is an officially inspired propaganda publication which defames the Jewish faith and accuses Jews in the Soviet Union of disloyalty, and it has just been revealed by B'nai B'rith. It is a new, 96-page anti-Jewish booklet entitled "Contemporary Judaism and Zionism," published in Kishinev, scene of the infamous czarist pogroms of 1905, by the State Publishing House of Moldavian Soviet Socialist Republic.

This is the second vicious book of this type which has come to public attention this year. The first was the Kichko book entitled "Judaism Without Embellishment," and it contained a series of lurid anti-Semitic caricatures with scurrilous captions of the sort that appeared in the Nazi sheet Der Stuermer. The Kichko book was published by the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences, which gave it the prestige of a scholarly production. It was subsequently banned because of worldwide protests including many from Communist periodicals outside the U.S.S.R.

This new anti-Jewish publication contains no tell-tale illustrations but denounces Jews and Judaism through the use of vulgar stereotypes, misquotations and distortions. Its author, F. S. Mayatsky, is known as a Soviet propagandist specializing in this field and has written many anti-Jewish articles and books. Under the guise of promoting so-called "scientific atheism," he seeks to revive the theme of the notorious "Protocols of the Elders of Zion" through such ancient anti-Semitic stereotypes as the "international Jewish conspiracy," this time one in which American spies allegedly work with Israel diplomats through Jews in the Soviet synagogues; and the alleged existence of mysterious elders who plot the involvement of Jewish communal and welfare organizations in political activity designed to undermine the Soviet Government.

Like the Kichko book, this one also attacks Judaism as "a form of religious obscurantism * * * a reactionary, anti-scientific concept, denounces the synagogue as a cover for blackmarket and subversive activities, and describes Israel as a state created by American colonial imperialism. It quotes from letters allegedly written by Jews describing hardships and horrors they have suffered because of their purported error in leaving the Soviet paradise to settle in Israel. Such arrant nonsense would never be taken seriously if it had not been published and distributed by the Soviet Government and if there were not available ample evidence of a Soviet Government policy of anti-Jewish measures calculated to isolate Soviet Jews, make them the scapegoats for Soviet economic difficulties, and eliminate them eventually as a religious minority.

This new anti-Jewish publication is again a scurrilous and disreputable document, which has not yet been repudiated in any way, although we hope that it will be.

I invite the attention of Senators and the people of our Nation to this situation as again illustrating strong reasons why the Senate took the action it did, and why it is urgent that the House of Representatives join us in the conference to allow this to become part of the bill.

Let me apologize to the majority leader for calling off the quorum call, but I knew that he would accede.

Mr. MANSFIELD. No, no, that was perfectly all right.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN EMPLOYEES OF ALASKA RAILROAD

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1640) for the relief of certain employees of the Alaska Railroad, which was, on page 1, line 4, strike out "members of" and insert "represented by".

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House of Representatives to S. 1640.

As will be noted, on line 4, it strikes out "members of" and inserts in lieu thereof, "represented by." I believe this is a good amendment. It should have been worded that way before.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from South Carolina.

The motion was agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT TO 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate at this time, I move, pursuant to the order previously entered, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Friday, October 2, 1964, at 11 o'clock a.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate October 1, 1964:

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

Emory C. Gibbs, Hanceville.

CALIFORNIA

John B. Shamlin, Ceres.
Harold B. James, Guerneville.
Mary S. Black, La Honda.
Arlie D. McCoy, Lockeford.
Robert B. Ross, Orinda.
Salvatore J. Montalbano, Saint Mary's College.

FLORIDA

Harry R. Collier, Deerfield Beach.
Rosa M. Priest, Morriston.

GEORGIA

Leon W. Mott, Albany.
Lucille E. McCurdy, Pine Lake.

KENTUCKY

Russell Gilbert, Irvine.

LOUISIANA

June C. Platt, Swartz.

MICHIGAN

George L. Redding, Addison.
Robert J. Doud, Sr., Comstock.
Evelyn R. Boynton, Union City.

MISSISSIPPI

James F. Bullock, Bogue Chitto.
Mamie L. Holland, Glendora.
Dodd Fortenberry, Tylertown.

MISSOURI

Joseph D. Swan, Fairfax.
John W. Dickey, Jr., Gallatin.
Catherine J. Sinnott, Wayland.

MONTANA

Lawrence A. Wendel, Helena.

NEW JERSEY

John J. Falzarano, Stirling.
Anthony P. Di Venuto, Union.

NEW MEXICO

W. Walden Whipple, Kirtland.
Eleuterio J. Martinez, Santa Fe.

NEW YORK

Wesley W. Mackmer, Collins Center.
George F. Mahar, Copenhagen.
Benjamin T. Smolenski, New Suffolk.
William C. Fleckenstein, West Valley.

NORTH CAROLINA

Loenna M. Warren, Dana.
Allison O. Burns, Riegelwood.

OHIO

Allan E. Reynolds, Newtonsville.
George L. Cassels, Jr., Smithfield.

RHODE ISLAND

Lloyd A. Trewhella, Pascoag.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Norman Assey, Georgetown.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Garey E. Owen, Vienna.

VIRGINIA

Charles M. Thomas, Jr., Woodberry Forest.

* * *

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 1, 1964

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rabbi Henry Okolica, of Congregation Tephereth Israel, New Britain, Conn., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and eternal God: As we gather here today in the presence of the Almighty to convene this session, we ask for spiritual guidance in our work. This Nation under God has divine purpose to exemplify the basic ideals, that we are united in a mighty task to preserve this Nation. Give us the wisdom, O Lord, to understand the meaning of our democratic way of life, to help us to find solutions to our problems.

Today as we open this session to concentrate on legislative matters, let us carry the thought in our hearts and actions, that the builder of life Himself gives us the assurance that those who labor in the name of God shall not labor in vain and a house which is built in the name of the Almighty shall endure.

O God, as we begin our labors and deliberations, instill into us a heart of wisdom, a mind of discernment, a feeling of courage, a spiritual attitude, basic ideals worthy of men, to put their hands to the task of constructive endeavor, so that the name of God be glorified.

Let us be humble and strong, forgiving and fearless, kind and determined, honest and courageous; for to Thee alone, O God, belongs all glory.

May the moment of the hour raise our hopes for a society that is worthy and ready for this challenge. May the spirit of God permeate our lives and actions and grant us peace in truth and honor. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 2772. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Harley Brewer; and

H.R. 6218. An act to amend the act of June 29, 1960, to authorize additional extensions of time for final proof by certain entrymen under the desert land laws and to make such additional extensions available to the successors in interest of such entrymen.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 7348. An act for the relief of Frank B. Rowlett.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 12253. An act to correct certain errors in the Tariff Schedules of the United States.

The message further announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BYRD of Virginia, Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware, and Mr. CARLSON to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 264]

Abbitt
Alger
Ashley
Aspinall
Avery
Barry
Bass
Becker
Berry
Brademas
Brock
Bromwell
Buckley
Burton, Calif.
Clausen,
  Don H.
Clawson, Del
Corman
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Denton
Derounian
Devine
Diggs
Dorn
Edmondson
Evins
Finnegan
Flynt
Forrester
Fraser
Giaimo
Gill
Grant
Griffiths
Hanna
Hardy
Healey
Hébert
Hoffman
Hull
Jones, Ala.
Kee
Landrum
Lankford
Leggett
Lesinski
Long, La.
McIntire
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Matsunaga
Matthews
May
Meader
Michel
Miller, N.Y.
Montoya
Morris
Morrison
Morton
Murray
Pilcher
Pool
Powell
Purcell
Reifel
Rivers, Alaska
Roberts, Ala.
Rostenkowski
Roudebush
St. George
Schadeberg
Scott
Selden
Sheppard
Sikes
Smith, Calif.
Snyder
Staebler
Stafford
Staggers
Sullivan
Talcott
Taylor
Thompson, La.
Thompson, Tex.
Toll
Tuck
Tupper
Weltner
White
Wickersham
Wilson, Ind.
Wyman
Younger

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 333 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

CONGRESSMAN WILLIAM E. MILLER AND POSSIBLE CONFLICT OF INTEREST

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to speak about a matter of gravest concern to the House of Representatives. A recent court decision made clear that where a Member of this body violates his obligations to act solely in the public interests, there still may not be criminal sanction, and that we in this House have the obligation of investigation and disciplinary action. We have an obligation to consider whether such a case is now before us.

Last night Congressman WILLIAM E. MILLER, in a nationally televised interview with several members of the press, stated in response to a question concerning a possible conflict of interest on Mr. MILLER's part in taking certain action in the House of Representatives while he was an officer and director and paid employee of the Lockport Felt Co., that he did not see any conflict of interest and that no responsible Democrat had raised the issue.

Perhaps the gentleman from New York [Mr. MILLER] missed reading the statement by Congressman WAYNE HAYS which appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 22, 1964, at page 22410, where the gentleman from Ohio, Congressman HAYS, raised a number of questions which he thought deserved an answer in connection with the propriety of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MILLER's] action. Perhaps he also missed the statement of Democratic National Committee Chairman John Bailey demanding a full inquiry on the subject. So there can be no chance that he is once again not informed, I personally am going to have the statement I am making today, and the statement I expect to make tomorrow, delivered to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MILLER's] office with the specific request that it be forwarded to him. In addition I am introducing a resolution calling for a full investigation by an appropriate committee of this legislative body.

I have obtained a special order to address the House on this subject for 15 minutes this afternoon, and I have also obtained a special order of 15 minutes tomorrow to discuss certain questions relating to the gentleman from New York, Congressman MILLER's law firm.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce that information on the secret Communist shakedown racket, taken in executive session by our Subcommittee on Immigration and Nationality, went to the Public Printer last evening.

The print of those hearings should be available to Members, the press, and the interested public early next week.

INCREASING ANNUITIES OF RETIRED CIVIL SERVICE EMPLOYEES

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply concerned about H.R. 2155, the bill to increase the annuities of our retired civil service employees.

They have worked so hard and so long for a well-deserved raise. While this is not as much as they are entitled to, it is a good start.

I hope it can be passed this session of the Congress.

CHANGE IN THE HOUSE RULES

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I am one of those who believes the citizens of the Nation are entitled to expose their Representatives to their opinions in the district at least a few weeks between our semiannual election.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly hope when this House reconvenes in January there will be a serious effort to amend the rules of this House. I am not talking about revolutionary amendments but just such a simple one as permitting the leadership to send a bill to conference unless there are at least five objections. In a body of 435 Members, there will always be at least 1 or 2 Members, an extreme minority, who will want to object at the drop of a hat to almost everything. Present bills permit one Member to hold up the proceedings agreed upon by the joint leadership. At least we ought to require five Members to object in order to delay the House. This has wasted several weeks during the last 2 years, and I certainly hope there will be an attempt to amend the rules of the House so that the majority of this body can proceed more efficiently with the business of the Nation.

SUGAR ACT AMENDMENT

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I wonder how long the House of Representatives is going to acquiesce in a practice, followed by the other body, which has the effect of sandbagging the House into accepting amendments, which under the rules of the House would not be germane, but which are accepted by the other body without consideration of any committee and with a minimum amount of debate on the floor. One of the things I am referring to at this time is an amendment to the Sugar Act, adopted as an amendment to a House bill—H.R. 12253—which proposes to correct certain errors in the tariff schedules. The House Committee on Agriculture declined this week to take any action on even a 6-month extension of the Sugar Act, due largely to the fact that it was believed there was insufficient time to hold hearings and agree on a bill before the end of this Congress. Yet, the other body, after about 2 hours' debate has adopted this amendment and sent the original tariff bill back to the House. Commenting on the procedure in the other body, the senior Senator from New Mexico stated with reference to the amendment:

> It is a device to get around the ordinary rules of parliamentary procedure, to keep an Agriculture Committee from getting its hands on a bill which rightfully belongs to that committee, referring of course to the committee of the House of Representatives.

Also, Mr. Speaker, the so-called Mansfield-Dirksen amendment affixed to the foreign aid bill is about as asinine a procedure as one can imagine, and I hope the House takes the proper action in renouncing and denouncing this amendment.

HOUSE SHOULD ADJOURN TO RECONVENE NOVEMBER 16

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, this House should adjourn. Today is the 1st day of October 1964. We have been in session for 21 months.

On November 3, just 34 days from today, each of the 435 Members of this House will either be rejected or elected by their respective constituents.

Each of us share a dual responsibility. We have the responsibility to legislate; but before we can legislate we must be elected by the voting citizens of our respective districts.

Mr. Speaker, I know it has not escaped your notice that the legislative mill is grinding exceedingly slow. There is no indication that its tempo will be speeded up.

I do not criticize the leadership of this House. I am aware of the parliamentary situation. One-third of the Members of the other body are subject to an election. While they are campaigning, the other two-thirds can talk, talk, talk—ad infinitum and sometimes ad absurdum.

This is not so in the House: 435 Members are up for election. It is time for us to go home and talk to the folks.

Mr. Speaker, I have not been recognized to offer a motion to adjourn. However, Mr. Speaker, I respectfully suggest the leadership on both sides of the aisle consider adjournment very soon. If the leadership determines we should not adjourn sine die, then I suggest perhaps the House could recess until about the middle of November. Such a recess would give the other body a chance to return the legislation passed by the House. We could then reconvene and complete House action by the 1st of December.

In the meantime, Mr. Speaker, we could go home and talk to the folks. If the folks are in a favorable mood toward their employees, perhaps most of us could rejoin you for a happy reunion in January 1965.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, although the Democrats have complete control of the Congress, they simply do not know how to adjourn this session of the Congress. There is a complete breakdown and a serious lack of discipline somewhere along the line.

The whole situation is a disgraceful exhibition and most certainly a reflection on the ability of the majority leadership to wind up this session. When the Republicans were in control during the 80th Congress and the 83d Congress they, at least, knew how to adjourn sine die within a reasonable time.

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the remarks made by the gentleman from California, the Honorable CHET HOLIFIELD with regard to adjourning the 88th Congress.

Members on both sides of the aisle are, I am sure, anxious to return to their respective districts and present the issues of this campaign to their constituents.

The 88th Congress has thus far made an excellent record and will no doubt occupy a most prominent place in legislative history. But we still have another responsibility, that of informing the people of America, of debating the issues in open forum, and helping the voters make their choice on November 3.

MANPOWER MANAGEMENT ACHIEVEMENTS

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, today, the Manpower Utilization Subcommittee of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service is releasing its regular 6-month report on manpower management achievements in the departments and agencies of the Federal Government.

This report, which covers the period of January through June 1964, reveals that civilian employment on June 30 this year was 27,500 below a year ago. I might also add that the examples of improved management shown in the subcommittee report reflect economies in excess of $15.7 million and the abolishment of 8,460 positions.

The executive branch is certainly to be congratulated on these accomplishments. This is indeed concrete evidence of progress.

Copies of this report are available to each Member. We will be glad to see that you get a copy.

THE BILLIE SOL ESTES CASE

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I was about to rise to say that I agree with the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD]. But on second thought I add now that I do not agree. We should have adjourned a month ago.

Mr. Speaker, my purpose today is to refer to the report of the Senate Government Operations Committee on the Department of Agriculture handling of pooled cotton allotments of Billie Sol Estes. In this report the Secretary of Agriculture is quoted as having stated during the course of the committee hearings:

> I cannot escape the conclusion that these transfers should never have been approved in the first instance and they would not have been approved if it had not been for the very confused situation that prevailed in 1960 and 1961, a situation which was unknown to me until I had studied the investigation which the Department instituted.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire of Secretary Freeman as to whether the "confused situation" which existed in his Department and more particularly in the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service in 1960 and 1961 was the basis for the distinguished service award bestowed upon Administrator Horace Godfrey in May of 1964. At the time Mr. Godfrey was given this recognition, I commented on his having been reprimanded during the course of the Billie Sol Estes hearings for having coached witnesses and went on to ask whether Mr. Godfrey was being recognized for his coaching ability.

In view of the findings and conclusions of the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations and the quoted statement of the Secretary, it becomes obvious the award could not have been for capability as an administrator. It must have been a coverup award. If such be the case, it could hardly be termed distinguished, since countless individuals in Washington these days should be recognized for their whitewash ability with a coverup award.

PERMISSION TO EXTEND REMARKS ON THE SPEECH OF REPRESENTATIVE HOLIFIELD

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members wishing to add their remarks to those of the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] be permitted to do so, following his remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT SINE DIE, ONE BY ONE

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, if this Congress does not adjourn very shortly sine die, it may set some kind of an historical landmark by being the first Congress in history to adjourn one at a time.

WHY NOT A 12-MILE U.S. FISHING ZONE?

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, in July 1964 Canada, by proclamation, extended her fishing limits to 12 miles. However, in so doing, she announced that these new extended limits would not apply to our U.S. fishing vessels on either the Pacific or Atlantic coasts. In other words, our fishermen who historically have fished up to the old, established 3-mile limit of Canadian waters may continue to do so. Likewise, the historic rights of certain other nations were respected; namely, France, Britain, Portugal, Spain, Italy, Norway, and Denmark. All may continue fishing in the 3- to 12-mile zone off Canada on the Atlantic coast.

Mr. Speaker, now I ask you, why does not our Government proclaim a similar 12-mile territorial sea and fishing zone? What is holding up our action? We have everything to gain now, and little or nothing to lose.

The Soviets have established a 12-mile limit. Japan is the only major fishing nation—outside of ourselves—that maintains a 3-mile limit, and she has nothing to protect. We do have fishing resources to protect.

I hear the administration supports a 2-year study of our domestic fisheries before taking action.

Why 2 years, except to allow Japan and the Soviet Union to establish historic rights?

Mr. Speaker, I call on the Department of State to clarify its position. Let our Government explain why, now that Canada has acted, there is any reason—in the interest of our fisheries—the United States should not follow suit.

Every American fisherman has a right to know the answer to this question before the November 3 election.

REPRESENTATIVE GOVERNMENT IN DANGER

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased that the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] called the attention of the House to this issue of adjournment. The gentleman from California has been a long-time student of proper congressional procedure. I would add the thought that the entire system of representative government is in danger by this lack of discipline and ability on the part of the leaders of the Congress to lead.

We do have a responsibility to report back to our people. Some call it running for reelection. But I think it is also reporting back to the people.

I submit on a nonpartisan basis this is an issue in the present campaign.

Is the Democratic Party capable of organizing and running a Congress in accordance with good discipline and proper procedure?

THE 20TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE UPRISING OF THE CZECHOSLOVAKIAN PEOPLE AGAINST NAZI TYRANNY

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, today I join with many of my colleagues in commemorating the 20th anniversary of the uprising of the Czechoslovakian people against Nazi tyranny. Sadly, Communist tyranny was waiting to replace fascism.

The fate of the Slovak fighters in 1944 resembled that of the Polish Warsaw uprising. Both were systematically denied the necessary outside assistance promised by the Soviet Union. As a result the heroic forces were slaughtered by the vastly larger German forces. No propaganda, however, can conceal the Communist fear of this genuine liberation movement of the Czechoslovakian people. As free men we must remind the world of the true meaning of the 1944 uprising and inform Khrushchev that we do not forget these acts of Communist treachery.

It is my hope that by our observance of this event we renew the hopes of the enslaved people for a better tomorrow. We remind all that America has not forgotten them and we quicken the prospects for the restoration of freedom. Is this too much to ask of the leader of the free world?

ELECTIONS BEING SUSPENDED

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, we are in the process in this country of suspending elections and continuing incumbents in office without election.

On last Friday a three-judge Federal court panel ordered cancellation of the November 3 election of the Connecticut Assembly, on the grounds of the distorted and premature construction of the June 15 ruling of the Supreme Court.

On yesterday I took the unpopular stand of objecting to sending the foreign aid authorization bill to conference. I did that for the simple purpose—and without apology—of assuring debate that would direct attention of the Members of the House to this shameful situation, and to point out as a result of the Senate substitute for the so-called Dirksen amendment relating to legislative apportionment we have now in this bill a provision which underwrites the June 15 Supreme Court decisions and underwrites the authority of the courts to suspend elections.

I think it is time to stop that kind of legislating and go home.

THE NEW HAVEN RAILROAD

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, along with my colleague, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. Sibal], I would call to your attention and to the attention of the Members of the House the deteriorating situation facing the New Haven Railroad. Should this railroad fail, many businesses in New York, Westchester, and throughout New England would be seriously affected. It is essential that the vital commuter services be maintained. In my judgment, this is a matter of concern that should engage the attention of Members of this House, of the regulatory agencies involved, and of the State and county governments of both New York and Connecticut. It is important that the railroad problem in the Northeast be recognized and that both short- and long-term solutions be worked out specifically and promptly in the public interest.

Time is running out on the New Haven, and there is need for prompt and appropriate action at both the State and Federal levels to insure its continuance.

ELMER LEVY

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 9976) for the relief of Elmer Levy, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, line 7, strike out "20" and insert "10".

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESTABLISHMENT AND MAINTENANCE OF A CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY SYSTEM

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 8427) to provide for the establishment and maintenance of a Central Intelligence Agency retirement and disability system for a limited number of employees, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"TITLE I—TITLE AND DEFINITIONS

"Part A—Title

"Sec. 101. This Act may be cited as the 'Central Intelligence Agency Retirement Act of 1964 for Certain Employees.'

"Part B—Definitions

"Sec. 111. When used in this Act, the term—

"(1) 'Agency' means the Central Intelligence Agency;

"(2) 'Director' means the Director of Central Intelligence; and

"(3) 'Qualifying service' means service performed as a participant in the system or, in the case of service prior to designation, service determined by the Director to have been performed in carrying out duties described in section 203.

"TITLE II—THE CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY SYSTEM

"Part A—Establishment of system

"Rules and Regulations

"Sec. 201. (a) The Director may prescribe rules and regulations for the establishment and maintenance of a Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System for a limited number of employees, referred to hereafter as the system; such rules and regulations become effective after approval by the chairman and ranking minority members of the Armed Services Committees of the House and Senate.

"(b) The Director shall administer the system in accordance with such rules and regulations and with the principles established by this Act.

"(c) In the interests of the security of the foreign intelligence activities of the United States and in order further to implement the proviso of section 102(d)(3) of the National Security Act of 1947, as amended (50 U.S.C. 403(d)(3)), that the Director of Central Intelligence shall be responsible for protecting intelligence sources and methods from unauthorized disclosure, and notwithstanding the provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act (5 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.) or any other provisions of law, any determinations by the Director authorized by the provisions of this Act shall be deemed to be final and conclusive and not subject to review by any court.

"Establishment and maintenance of fund

"Sec. 202. There is hereby created a fund to be known as the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability Fund which shall be maintained by the Director. The Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability Fund is referred to hereafter as the fund.

"Participants

"Sec. 203. The Director may designate from time to time such Agency officers and employees whose duties are determined by the Director to be (i) in support of Agency activities abroad hazardous to life or health or (ii) so specialized because of security requirements as to be clearly distinguishable from normal government employment, hereafter referred to as participants, who shall be entitled to the benefits of the system. Any participant who has completed fifteen years of service with the Agency and whose career at that time is adjudged by the Director to be qualifying for the system may elect to remain a participant of such system for the duration of his employment by the Agency and such election shall not be subject to review or approval by the Director. .

"Annuitants

"Sec. 204. (a) Annuitants shall be participants who are receiving annuities from the fund and all persons, including surviving wives and husbands, widows, dependent widowers, children, and beneficiaries of participants or annuitants who shall become entitled to receive annuities in accordance with the provisions of this Act.

"(b) When used in this Act the term—

"(1) 'Widow' means the surviving wife of a participant who was married to such participant for at least two years immediately preceding his death or is the mother of issue by marriage to the participant.

"(2) 'Dependent widower' means the surviving husband of a participant who was married to such participant for at least two years immediately preceding her death or is the father of issue by marriage to the participant, and who is incapable of self-support by reason of mental or physical disability, and who received more than one-half of his support from such participant.

"(3) 'child', for the purposes of sections 221 and 232 of this Act, means an unmarried child, including (i) an adopted child, and (ii) a stepchild or recognized natural child who received more than one-half of his support from and lived with the participant in a regular parent-child relationship, under the age of eighteen years, or such unmarried child regardless of age who because of physical or mental disability incurred before age eighteen is incapable of self-support or such unmarried child between eighteen and twenty-one years of age who is a student regularly pursuing a full-time course of study or training in residence in a high school, trade school, technical or vocational institute, junior college, college, university, or comparable recognized educational institution. A child whose twenty-first birthday occurs prior to July 1 or after August 31 of any calendar year, and while he is regularly pursuing such a course of study or training, shall be deemed for the purposes of this paragraph and section 221(e) of this Act to have attained the age of twenty-one on the first day of July following such birthday. A child who is a student shall not be deemed to have ceased to be a student during any interim between school years if the interim does not exceed four months and if he shows to the satisfaction of the Director that he has a bona fide intention of continuing to pursue a course of study or training in the same or different school during the school semester (or other period into which the school year is divided) immediately following the interim.

"PART B—COMPULSORY CONTRIBUTIONS

"SEC. 211. (a) Six and one-half per centum of the basic salary received by each participant shall be contributed to the fund for the payment of annuities, cash benefits, refunds and allowances. An equal sum shall also be contributed from the respective appropriation or fund which is used for payment of his salary. The amounts deducted and withheld from basic salary together with the amounts so contributed from the appropriation or fund shall be deposited by the Agency to the credit of the fund.

"(b) Each participant shall be deemed to consent and agree to such deductions from basic salary, and payment less such deductions shall be a full and complete discharge and acquittance of all claims and demands whatsoever for all regular services during the period covered by such payment, except the right to the benefits to which he shall be entitled under this Act, notwithstanding any law, rule, or regulation affecting the individual's salary.

"Part C—Computation of annuities

"SEC. 221. (a) The annuity of a participant shall be equal to 2 per centum of his average basic salary for the highest five consecutive years of service, for which full contributions have been made to the fund, multiplied by the number of years, not exceeding thirty-five, of service credit obtained in accordance with the provisions of sections 251 and 252. In determining the aggregate period of service upon which the annuity is to be based, the fractional part of a month, if any, shall not be counted.

"(b) At the time of retirement, any married participant may elect to receive a reduced annuity and to provide for an annuity payable to his wife or her husband, commencing on the date following such participant's death and terminating upon the death or remarriage of such surviving wife or husband. The annuity payable to the surviving wife or husband after such participant's death shall be 55 per centum of the amount of the participant's annuity computed as prescribed in paragraph (a) of this section, up to the full amount of such annuity specified by him as the base for the survivor benefits. The annuity of the participant making such election shall be reduced by 2½ per centum of any amount up to $3,600 he specified as the base for the survivor benefit plus 10 per centum of any amount over $3,600 so specified.

"(c)(1) If an annuitant dies and is survived by a wife or husband and by a child or children, in addition to the annuity payable to the surviving wife or husband, there shall be paid to or on behalf of each child an annuity equal to the smallest of: (i) 40 per centum of the annuitant's average basic salary, as determined under paragraph (a) of this section, divided by the number of children; (ii) $600; or (iii) $1,800 divided by the number of children.

"(2) If an annuitant dies and is not survived by a wife or husband but by a child or children, each surviving child shall be paid an annuity equal to the smallest of: (i) 50 per centum of the annuitant's average basic salary, as determined under paragraph (a) of this section, divided by the number of children; (ii) $720; or (iii) $2,160 divided by the number of children.

"(d) If a surviving wife or husband dies or the annuity of a child is terminated, the annuities of any remaining children shall be recomputed and paid as though such wife, husband, or child had not survived the participant.

"(e) The annuity payable to a child under paragraph (c) or (d) of this section shall begin on the day after the participant dies, and such annuity or any right thereto shall terminate on the last day of the month before (1) his attaining age eighteen unless incapable of self-support, (2) his becoming capable of self-support after age eighteen, (3) his marriage, or (4) his death, except that the annuity of a child who is a student as described in section 204(b)(3) of this Act shall terminate on the last day of the month before (1) his marriage, (2) his death, (3) his ceasing to be such a student, or (4) his attaining age twenty-one.

"(f) Any unmarried participant retiring under the provisions of this Act and found by the Director to be in good health may at the time of retirement elect a reduced annuity, in lieu of the annuity as hereinbefore provided, and designate in writing a person having an insurable interest (as that term is used in section 9(h) of the Civil Service Retirement Act (5 U.S.C. 2259(h))) in the participant to receive an annuity after the participant's death. The annuity payable to the participant making such election shall be reduced by 10 per centum of an annuity computed as provided in paragraph (a) of this section, and by 5 per centum of an annuity so computed for each full five years the person designated is younger than the participant, but such total reduction shall not exceed 40 per centum. The annuity of a survivor designated under this paragraph shall be 55 per centum of the reduced annuity computed as prescribed above. The annuity payable to a beneficiary under the provisions of this paragraph shall begin on the first day of the next month after the participant dies. Upon the death of the surviving beneficiary all payments shall cease and no further annuity payments authorized under this paragraph shall be due or payable.

"Part D—Benefits accruing to certain participants

"Retirement for Disability or Incapacity—Medical Examination—Recovery

"SEC. 231. (a) Any participant who has five years of service credit toward retirement under the system, excluding military or naval service that is credited in accordance with provisions of section 251 or 252(a)(2), and who becomes totally disabled or incapacitated for useful and efficient service by reason of disease, illness, or injury not due to vicious habits, intemperance, or willful misconduct on his part, shall, upon his own application or upon order of the Director, be retired on an annuity computed as prescribed in section 221. If the disabled or incapacitated participant is under sixty and has less than twenty years of service credit toward his retirement under the system at the time he is retired, his annuity shall be computed on the assumption that he has had twenty years of service, but the additional service credit that may accrue to a participant under this provision shall in no case exceed the difference between his age at the time of retirement and age sixty, but this provision shall not increase the annuity of any survivor.

"(b) In each case, the participant shall be given a medical examination by one or more duly qualified physicians or surgeons designated by the Director to conduct examinations, and disability shall be determined by the Director on the basis of the advice of such physicians or surgeons. Unless the disability is permanent, like examinations shall be made annually until the annuitant has reached the statutory mandatory retirement age for his grade as provided in section 235. If the Director determines on the basis of the advice of one or more duly qualified physicians or surgeons conducting such examinations that an annuitant has recovered to the extent that he can return to duty, the annuitant may apply for reinstatement or reappointment in the Agency within one year from the date his recovery is determined. Upon application the Director may reinstate any such recovered disability annuitant in the grade in which he was serving at time of retirement, or the Director may, taking into consideration the age, qualifications, and experience of such annuitant, and the present grade of his contemporaries in the Agency, appoint him to a grade higher than the one in which he was serving prior to retirement. Payment of the annuity shall continue until a date six months after the date of the examination showing recovery or until the date of reinstatement or reappointment in the Agency, whichever is earlier. Fees for examinations under this provision, together with reasonable traveling and other expenses incurred in order to submit to examination, shall be paid out of the fund. If the annuitant fails to submit to examination as required under this section, payment of the annuity shall be suspended until continuance of the disability is satisfactorily established.

"(c) If a recovered disability annuitant whose annuity is discontinued is for any reason not reinstated or reappointed in the Agency, he shall be considered to have been separated within the meaning of paragraphs (a) and (b) of section 234 as of the date he was retired for disability and he shall, after the discontinuance of the disability annuity, be entitled to the benefits of that section or of section 241(a) except that he may elect voluntary retirement in accordance with the provisions of section 233 if he can qualify under its provisions.

"(d) No participant shall be entitled to receive an annuity under this Act and compensation for injury or disability to himself under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act of September 7, 1916, as amended (5 U.S.C. 751 et seq.), covering the same period of time. This provision shall not bar the right of any claimant to the greater benefit conferred by either Act for any part of the same period of time. Neither this provision nor any provision of the said Act of September 7, 1916, as amended, shall be so construed as to deny the right of any participant to receive an annuity under this Act by reason of his own services and to receive concurrently any payment under such Act of September 7, 1916, as amended, by reason of the death of any other person.

"(e) Nothwithstanding any provision of law to the contrary, the right of any person entitled to an annuity under this Act shall not be affected because such person has received an award of compensation in a lump sum under section 14 of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act of September 7, 1916, as amended (5 U.S.C. 764), except that where such annuity is payable on account of the same disability for which compensation under such section has been paid, so much of such compensation as has been paid for any period extended beyond the date such annuity becomes effective, as determined by the Secretary of Labor, shall be refunded to the Department of Labor, to be paid into the Federal employees' compensation fund. Before such person shall receive such annuity he shall (1) refund to the Department of Labor the amount representing such commuted payments for such extended period, or (2) authorize the deduction of such amount from the annuity payable to him under this Act, which amount shall be transmitted to such Department for reimbursement to such fund. Deductions from such annuity may be made from accrued and accruing payments, or may be prorated against and paid from accruing payments in such manner as the Secretary of Labor shall determine, whenever he finds that the financial circumstances of the annuitant are such as to warrant such deferred refunding.

"Death in Service

"Sec. 232. (a) In case a participant dies and no claim for annuity is payable under the provisions of this Act, his contributions to the fund, with interest at the rates prescribed in sections 241(a) and 281(a), shall be paid in the order of precedence shown in section 241(b).

"(b) If a participant, who has at least five years of service credit toward retirement under the system, excluding military or naval service that is credited in accordance with the provisions of section 251 or 252(a)(2), dies before separation or retirement from the Agency and is survived by a widow or a dependent widower, as defined in section 204, such widow or dependent widower shall be entitled to an annuity equal to 55 per centum of the annuity computed in accordance with the provisions of section 221(a). The annuity of such widow or dependent widower shall commence on the date following death of the participant and shall terminate upon death or remarriage of the widow or dependent widower, or upon the dependent widower's becoming capable of self-support.

"(c) If a participant who has at least five years of service credit toward retirement under the system, excluding military or naval service that is credited in accordance with the provisions of section 251 or 252 (a)(2), dies before separation or retirement from the Agency and is survived by a wife or a husband and a child or children, each surviving child shall be entitled to an annuity computed in accordance with the provisions of section 221(c)(1). The child's annuity shall begin and be terminated in accordance with the provisions of section 221(e). Upon the death of the surviving wife or husband or termination of the annuity of a child, the annuities of any remaining children shall be recomputed and paid as though such wife or husband or child had not survived the participant.

"(d) If a participant who has at least five years of service credit toward retirement under the system, excluding military or naval service that is credited in accordance with the provisions of section 251 or 252 (a)(2), dies before separation or retirement from the Agency and is not survived by a wife or husband, but by a child or children, each surviving child shall be entitled to an annuity computed in accordance with the provisions of section 221(c)(2). The child's annuity shall begin and terminate in accordance with the provisions of section 221(e). Upon termination of the annuity of a child, the annuities of any remaining children shall be recomputed and paid as though that child had never been entitled to the benefit.

"Voluntary Retirement

"Sec. 233. Any participant in the system who is at least fifty years of age and has rendered twenty years of service may on his own application and with the consent of the Director be retired from the Agency and receive benefits in accordance with the provisions of section 221 provided he has not less than ten years of service with the Agency of which at least five shall have been qualifying service.

"Discontinued Service Benefits

"Sec. 234. (a) Any participant who separates from the Agency after having performed not less than five years of service with the Agency, may, upon separation from the Agency or at any time prior to becoming eligible for an annuity, elect to have his contributions to the fund returned to him in accordance with the provisions of section 241, or (except in cases where the Director determines that separation was based in whole or in part on the ground of disloyalty to the United States) to leave his contributions in the fund and receive an annuity, computed as prescribed in section 221, commencing at the age of sixty-two years.

"(b) If a participant who has qualified in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (a) of this section to receive a deferred annuity commencing at the age of sixty-two dies before reaching the age of sixty-two his contributions to the fund, with interest, shall be paid in accordance with the provisions of sections 241 and 281.

"Mandatory Retirement

"Sec. 235. (a) The Director may in his discretion place in a retired status any participant who has completed at least twenty-five years of service, or who is at least fifty years of age and has completed at least twenty years of service, provided such participant has not less than ten years of service with the Agency of which at least five shall have been qualifying service. If so retired, such participant shall receive retirement benefits in accordance with the provisions of section 221.

"(b) Any participant in the system receiving compensation at the rate of grade GS-18 or above shall be automatically separated from the Agency upon reaching the age of sixty-five. Any participant in the system receiving compensation at a rate less than grade GS-18 shall be automatically separated from the Agency upon reaching the age of sixty. Such separation shall be effective on the last day of the month in which a participant reaches age sixty or sixty-five, as specified in this section, but whenever the Director shall determine it to be in the public interest, he may extend such participant's service for a period not to exceed five years. A participant separated under the provisions of this section who has completed five years of Agency service shall receive retirement benefits in accordance with the provisions of section 221 of this Act.

"Limitation on Number of Retirements

"Sec. 236. The number of participants retiring on an annuity pursuant to sections 233, 234, and 235 of this Act shall not exceed a total of four hundred during the period ending on June 30, 1969, nor a total of four hundred during the period beginning on July 1, 1969, and ending on June 30, 1974.

"Part E—Disposition of contributions and interest in excess of benefits received

"Sec. 241. (a) Whenever a participant becomes separated from the Agency without becoming eligible for an annuity or a deferred annuity in accordance with the provisions of this Act, the total amount of contributions from his salary with interest thereon at 4 per centum per annum to December 31, 1947, and 3 per centum per annum thereafter compounded annually to December 31, 1956 (or, in the case of a participant separated from the Agency before he has completed five years of service, to the date of separation) and proportionately for the period served during the year of separation including all contributions made during or for such period, except as provided in section 281, shall be returned to him.

"(b) In the event that the total contributions of a retired participant, other than voluntary contributions made in accordance with the provisions of section 281, with interest at the rates provided in paragraph (a) of this section added thereto, exceed the total amount returned to such participant or to an annuitant claiming through him, in the form of annuities, the excess of the accumulated contributions over the accumulated annuity payments shall be paid in the following order of precedence, upon the establishment of a valid claim therefor, and such payment shall be a bar to recovery by any other person:

"(1) To the beneficiary or beneficiaries designated by such participants in writing to the Director;

"(2) If there be no such beneficiary to the surviving wife or husband of such participant;

"(3) If none of the above, to the child or children of such participant and descendants of deceased children by representation;

"(4) If none of the above, to the parents of such participants or the survivor of them;

"(5) If none of the above, to the duly appointed executor or administrator of the estate of such participant;

"(6) If none of the above, to other next of kin of such participant as may be determined by the Director in his judgment to be legally entitled thereto.

"(c) No payments shall be made pursuant to paragraph (b)(6) of this section until after the expiration of thirty days from the death of the retired participant or his surviving annuitant.

"Part F—Period of service for annuities

"Computation of Length of Service

"Sec. 251. For the purpose of this Act, the period of service of a participant shall be computed from the date he becomes a participant under the provisions of this Act, but all periods of separation from the Agency and so much of any leaves of absence without pay as may exceed six months in the aggregate in any calendar year shall be excluded, except leaves of absence while receiving benefits under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act of September 7, 1916, as amended (5 U.S.C. 751 et seq.), and leaves of absence granted participants while performing active and honorable military or naval service in the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard of the United States.

"Prior Service Credit

"Sec. 252. (a) A participant may, subject to the provisions of this section, include in his period of service—

"(1) civilian service in the executive, judicial, and legislative branches of the Federal Government and in the District of Columbia government, prior to becoming a participant; and

"(2) active and honorable military or naval service in the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard of the United States prior to the date of the separation upon which title to annuity is based.

"(b) A participant may obtain prior civilian service credit in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (a)(1) of this section by making a special contribution to the fund equal to the percentage of his basic annual salary for each year of service for which credit is sought specified with respect to such year in the table relating to employees contained in section 4(c) of the Civil Service Retirement Act (5 U.S.C. 2254(c)), together with interest computed as provided in section 4(e) of such Act (5 U.S.C. 2254 (e)). Any such participant may, under such conditions as may be determined in each instance by the Director, pay such special contributions in installments.

"(c)(1) If an officer or employee under some other Government retirement system becomes a participant in the system by direct transfer, such officer or employee's total contributions and deposits, including interest accrued thereon, except voluntary contributions, shall be transferred to the fund effective as of the date such officer or employee becomes a participant in the system. Each such officer or employee shall be deemed to consent to the transfer of such funds and such transfer shall be a complete discharge and acquittance of all claims and demands against the other Government retirement fund on account of service rendered prior to becoming a participant in the system.

"(2) No participant, whose contributions are transferred to the fund in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (c)(1) of this section, shall be required to make contributions in addition to those transferred for periods of service for which full contributions were made to the other Government retirement fund, nor shall any refund be made to any such participant on account of contributions made during any period to the other Government retirement fund at a higher rate than that fixed for employees by section 4(c) of the Civil Service Retirement Act (5 U.S.C. 2254(c)) for contributions to the fund.

"(3) No participant, whose contributions are transferred to the fund in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (c)(1) of this section, shall receive credit for periods of service for which a refund of contributions has been made, or for which no contributions were made to the other Government retirement fund. A participant may, however, obtain credit for such prior service by making a special contribution to the fund in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (b) of this section.

"(d) No participant may obtain prior civilian service credit toward retirement under the system for any period of civilian service on the basis of which he is receiving or will in the future be entitled to receive any annuity under another retirement system covering civilian personnel of the Government.

"(e) A participant may obtain prior military or naval service credit in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (a)(2) of this section by applying for it to the Director prior to retirement or separation from the Agency. However, in the case of a participant who is eligible for and receives retired pay on account of military or naval service, the period of service upon which such retired pay is based shall not be included, except that in the case of a participant who is eligible for and receives retired pay on account of a service-connected disability incurred in combat with an enemy of the United States or caused by an instrumentality of war and incurred in line of duty during a period of war (as that term is used in chapter 11 or title 38, United States Code), or is awarded under chapter 67 of title 10 of the United States Code, the period of such military or naval service shall be included. No contributions to the fund shall be required in connection with military or naval service credited to a participant in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (a)(2) of this section.

"(f) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section or section 253 any military service (other than military service covered by military leave with pay) performed by a participant after December 1956 shall be excluded in determining the aggregate period of service upon which an annuity payable under this Act to such participant or to his widow or child is to be based, if such participant or widow or child is entitled (or would upon proper application be entitled) at the time of such determination, to monthly old-age or survivors' benefits under section 202 of the Social Security Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. 402), based on such participant's wages and self-employment income. If in the case of the participant or widow such military service is not excluded under the preceding sentence, but upon attaining age sixty-two, he or she becomes entitled (or would upon proper application be entitled) to such benefits, the aggregate period of service upon which such annuity is based shall be redetermined, effective as of the first day of the month in which he or she attains such age, so as to exclude such service.

"Credit for Service While on Military Leave

"SEC. 253. (a) A participant who, during the period of any war, or of any national emergency as proclaimed by the President or declared by the Congress, has left or leaves his position to enter the military service shall not be considered, for the purposes of this Act, as separated from his Agency position by reason of such military service, unless he shall apply for and receive a refund of contributions under this Act: *Provided*, That such participant shall not be considered as retaining his Agency position beyond December 31, 1956, or the expiration of five years of such military service, whichever is later.

"(b) Contributions shall not be required covering periods of leave of absence from the Agency granted a participant while performing active military or naval service in the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard of the United States.

"Part G—Moneys

"Estimate of Appropriations Needed

"SEC. 261. The Director shall prepare the estimates of the annual appropriations required to be made to the fund, and shall cause to be made actuarial valuations of the fund at intervals of five years, or oftener if deemed necessary by him.

"Investment of Moneys in the Fund

"SEC. 262. The Director may, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, invest from time to time in interest-bearing securities of the United States such portions of the fund as in his judgment may not be immediately required for the payment of annuities, cash benefits, refunds, and allowances, and the income derived from such investments shall constitute a part of such fund.

"Attachment of Moneys

"SEC. 263. None of the moneys mentioned in this Act shall be assignable either in law or equity, or be subject to execution, levy, attachment, garnishment, or other legal process.

"Part H—Retired participants recalled, reinstated, or reappointed in the Agency, or reemployed in the Government

"Recall

"SEC. 271. (a) The Director may, with the consent of any retired participant, recall such particiant to duty in the Agency whenever he shall determine such recall is in the public interest.

"(b) Any such participant recalled to duty in the Agency in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (a) of this section or reinstated or reappointed in accordance with the provisions of section 231(b) shall, while so serving, be entitled in lieu of his annuity to the full salary of the grade in which he is serving. During such service, he shall make contributions to the fund in accordance with the provisions of section 211. When he reverts to his retired status, his annuity shall be determined anew in accordance with the provisions of section 221.

"Reemployment

"SEC. 272. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a participant retired under the provisions of this Act shall not, by reason of his retired status, be barred from employment in Federal Government service in any appointive position for which he is qualified. An annuitant so reemployed shall serve at the will of the appointing officer.

"Reemployment Compensation

"SEC. 273. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any annuitant who has retired under this Act and who is reemployed in the Federal Government service in any appointive position either on a part-time or full-time basis shall be entitled to receive his annuity payable under this Act, but there shall be deducted from his salary a sum equal to the annuity allocable to the period of actual employment.

"(b) In the event of any overpayment under this section, such overpayment shall be recovered by withholding the amount involved from the salary payable to such reemployed annuitant, or from any other moneys, including his annuity, payable in accordance with the provisions of this Act.

"Part I—Voluntary contributions

"SEC. 281. (a) Any participant may, at his option and under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Director, deposit additional sums in multiples of 1 per centum of his basic salary, but not in excess of 10 per centum of such salary, which amounts together with interest at 3 per centum per annum, compounded annually as of December 31, and proportionately for the period served during the year of his retirement, including all contributions made during or for such period, shall, at the date of his retirement and at his election, be—

"(1) returned to him in lump sum;

"(2) used to purchase an additional life annuity;

"(3) used to purchase an additional life annuity for himself and to provide for a cash payment on his death to a beneficiary whose name shall be notified in writing to the Director by the participant; or

"(4) used to purchase an additional life annuity for himself and a life annuity commencing on his death payable to a beneficiary whose name shall be notified in writing to the Director by the participant with a guaranteed return to the beneficiary or his legal representative of an amount equal to the cash payment referred to in subparagraph (3) above.

"(b) The benefits provided by subparagraphs (2), (3), or (4) of paragraph (a) of this section shall be actuarially equivalent in value to the payment provided for by subparagraph (a)(1) of this section and shall be calculated upon such tables of mortality as may be from time to time prescribed for this purpose by the Director.

"(c) In case a participant shall become separated from the Agency for any reason except retirement on an annuity, the amount of any additional deposits with interest at 3 per centum per annum, compounded as is provided in paragraph (a) of this section, made by him under the provisions of said paragraph (a) shall be refunded in the manner provided in section 241 for the return of contributions and interest in the case of death or separation from the Agency.

"(d) Any benefits payable to a participant or to his beneficiary in respect to the additional deposits provided under this section shall be in addition to the benefits otherwise provided under this Act.

"Part J—Cost-of-living adjustment of annuities

"SEC. 291. (a) On the basis of determinations made by the Civil Service Commission pursuant to section 18 of the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, pertaining to per centum change in the price index, the following adjustments shall be made:

"(1) Effective April 1, 1966, if the change in the price index from 1964 to 1965 shall have equaled a rise of at least 3 per centum, each annuity payable from the fund which has a commencing date earlier than January 2, 1965, shall be increased by the per centum rise in the price index adjusted to the nearest one-tenth of 1 per centum.

"(2) Effective April 1 of any year other than 1966 after the price index change shall have equaled a rise of at least 3 per centum, each annuity payable from the fund which has a commencing date earlier than January 2 of the preceding year shall be increased by the per centum rise in the price index adjusted to the nearest one-tenth of 1 per centum.

"(b) Eligibility for an annuity increase under this section shall be governed by the commencing date of each annuity payable from the fund as of the effective date of an increase, except as follows:

"(1) Effective from the date of the first increase under this section, an annuity payable from the fund to an annuitant's survivor (other than a child entitled under section 221(c)), which annuity commenced the day after the annuitant's death, shall be increased as provided in subsection (a)(1) or (a)(2) if the commencing date of annuity to the annuitant was earlier than January 2 of the year preceding the first increase.

"(2) Effective from its commencing date, an annuity payable from the fund to an annuitant's survivor (other than a child entitled under section 221(c)), which annuity commences the day after the annuitant's death and after the effective date of the first increase under this section, shall be increased by the total per centum increase the annuitant was receiving under this section at death.

"(3) For purposes of computing an annuity which commences after the effective date of the first increase under this section to a child under section 221(c), the items $600, $720, $1,800, and $2,160 appearing in section 221(c) shall be increased by the total per centum increase allowed and in force under this section and, in case of a deceased annuitant, the items 40 per centum and 50 per centum appearing in section 221(c) shall be increased by the total per centum increase allowed and in force under this section to the annuitant at death. Effective from the date of the first increase under this section, the provisions of this paragraph shall apply as if such first increase were in effect with respect to computation of a child's annuity under section 221(c) which commenced between January 2 of the year preceding the first increase and the effective date of the first increase.

"(c) No increase in annuity provided by this section shall be computed on any additional annuity purchased at retirement by voluntary contributions.

"(d) The monthly installment of annuity after adjustment under this section shall be fixed at the nearest dollar."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING SECTION 5 OF THE EMPLOYMENT ACT OF 1946

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 3174) to amend section 5 of the Employment Act of 1946.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 5(e) of the Employment Act of 1946, as amended (15 U.S.C. 1024; 60 Stat. 23, Public Law 304, Seventy-ninth Congress) is amended to read as follows:

"(e) To enable the joint committee to exercise its powers, functions, and duties under this Act, there are authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year such sums as may be necessary, to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate on vouchers signed by the chairman or vice chairman."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MODIFYING RETIREMENT BENEFITS OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA JUDGES

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 370.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Clerk of the House of Representatives in the enrollment of the bill (H.R. 5871) to amend section 11 of the Act of April 1, 1942, in order to modify the retirement benefits of the judges of the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions, the District of Columbia Court of Appeals, and the Juvenile Court of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, is authorized and directed—

(1) to strike out all after the enacting clause down through and including "SEC. 11, (a)(1) Any judge" and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That section 11–1701 of the District of Columbia Code is amended to read as follows:

"'§ 11–1701. Retirement, resignation, and
nonreappointment of judges;
recall

"'(a)(1) Any judge'".

(2) to strike out in the title of the bill "amend section 11 of the Act of April 1, 1942, in order to".

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this concurrent resolution is to direct the Clerk of the House to make a technical amendment in enrolling the bill H.R. 5871:

To amend section 11 of the act of April 1, 1942, in order to modify the retirement benefits of the judges of the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions, the District of Columbia Court of Appeals, and the Juvenile Court of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

Two days ago, the House concurred in the Senate amendments to H.R. 5871, but a technical error remains therein and should be corrected before the bill goes to the President.

Briefly, H.R. 5871 passed the House originally on October 14, 1963, and was sent to the other body. Subsequently, namely, on December 23, 1963, Public Law 88–241 was approved which recodified certain sections of the District of Columbia code, including the section pertaining to the retirement of judges, which H.R. 5871 amends.

Properly thereafter, the other body, when considering H.R. 5871, should have amended the same to refer to the codified section, and that is what the resolution now directs the Clerk of the House to correct.

The concurrent resolution involves no change whatever in substance.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MAKING IN ORDER CONFERENCE ON H.R. 11380, TO AMEND FURTHER THE FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 895 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution the bill (H.R. 11380) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendments thereto, be, and the same hereby is, taken from the Speaker's table, to the end that the Senate amendments be, and the same are hereby, disagreed to and that the conference requested by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses be, and the same is hereby agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], and pending that I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this is a rather important proposition which is going to be presented to the House today. This is a rule to send to conference the foreign aid bill. There are two provisions in it which are quite controversial. One is a Senate amendment with respect to the civil service status of employees of the foreign aid agency. The other is the so-called Dirksen amendment, which was adopted in the other body, which I shall discuss in a few minutes.

Let me say that I understood there would be a motion to instruct the conferees with respect to the first item which I have mentioned. We had before the Rules Committee yesterday the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, who gave us very definite assurances that the House conferees would not agree to that in conference, and that if it were insisted upon by the Senate conferees the House conferees would bring the matter back to the House so that the House could have a vote and either reaffirm or not reaffirm previous action on this matter. I believe it was rejected by the House when the bill was passed.

I hope this meets with the approval of the gentleman who is going to offer the motion to instruct. It would seem to me that would accomplish the object which the gentleman desires to accomplish, of giving the House the opportunity to vote upon the matter. We have a very positive understanding with the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs that that will be done and that the House will be given the opportunity to vote if the conferees cannot strike it out in the conference.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I wish to comment that I appreciate the assurance the gentleman makes with respect to the substitute for the Dirksen amendment and that it conforms to my understanding and meets the purpose I had in objecting yesterday.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. The other matter is the Dirksen amendment. We have had our debates about that in the House, on the so-called Tuck bill. The House has expressed itself by a very substantial majority in favor of the Tuck bill, which would do something about the reapportionment decision of the Supreme Court.

The Dirksen amendment, let me say to you, in my judgment and in the judgment of all of those to whom I have talked, has certainly no binding effect. If it had any binding effect, the tail end of the sentence which gives it its effect would repeal that. However, I am chiefly concerned about the Dirksen amendment because of the concluding paragraph, which is paragraph (b) and which is found on page 27 of the amended foreign aid bill as it comes back to the House. Now, the House has expressed itself very firmly I think on its refusal to recognize the constitutional power of the Supreme Court to enact legislation. Everybody knows that no such thing was contemplated by our Constitution or by any amendment attached thereto. If there is one vital principle about our system of government, it is that we must carefully preserve the basic principle of three separate and distinct branches of the Government—legislative, executive, and judicial—laid down and prescribed in the Constitution itself in very plain words.

Some people may say that this does not affirm by the Congress the right of the Supreme Court to enact legislation. I specifically want to call the attention of the House to the language of that subparagraph (b) on page 27 of the amended bill as it comes to us from the other body because it specifically authorizes and, in fact, it urges the Supreme Court to enact a law. Now in an apportionment bill apportioning the State legislatures that is a law, that is legislation. If some resident of my State or of your State desires to know in what legislative district he is, then he looks at the law enacted by the legislature in accordance with the Constitution. However, if this present policy is pursued, then you do not look in your statute books to find out what the law is. No. If you want to know in what legislative district you live and in what magisterial district of your State you are, because that is what follows, and if you want to know what ward in your city you live in, you do not look at the law written in the law books, but you have to go and get a lawyer or yourself be able to ferret out and read the decision of the Supreme Court in order to know in what legislative or magisterial district you are. There is not any question in the world but that this is plain, simple, 100 percent, without any doubt and without any argument, legislation enacted by the Supreme Court of the United States. This House has within the past few weeks repudiated the idea of the Supreme Court under any circumstances, under any conditions, or any construction of the Constitution being authorized to enact a law.

Now I want to read you this clause in subparagraph (b) and if you agree to this Senate amendment, then here is what you have agreed to. It says:

> (b) In the event that a State fails to apportion representation in the legislature in accordance with the Constitution within the time granted by any order pursuant to this section, the district court having jurisdiction of the action shall apportion representation in such legislature among appropriate districts so as to conform to the constitution and laws of such State insofar as is possible consistent with the requirements—

Now, it says so right there. There is not any question about it. It says that the courts shall apportion. In other words, they must enact a law specifying what the various and sundry districts are. How can a conscientious legislator who has taken the trouble to read—just to read—that sentence ever vote for any such thing as that? I am one of those who would like very much, as most of you know, to enact some legislation that would have some effectiveness that would stop this march of the Supreme Court into the legislative field. Because if you ever agree to this, be forewarned that the Supreme Court of the United States will be your chief legislative body from this day on. And you do not know what they might be legislating on in the next phase of this march toward a foreign system of government which we have never had occasion to encounter before in this country.

This is the first case in any study that I have made of the subject, in which the Federal courts, in all the history of this Nation, have undertaken to write law and take from the legislative bodies of the Federal Government and of the State governments their primary function to enact laws. They may be declared unconstitutional. They may issue an injunction, and they do. But this is the first time, I assert, that they have ever gone so far as to actually physically enact the law which shall be binding upon the people which is the primary function of the legislative body.

So I trust that the conference committee will—and I have the assurance of the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs that the House conferees will reject this Senate amendment which means nothing with respect to the purposes for which it was presumably designed, because it is utterly futile; but means very much, and represents a very deep road into the functions, and the exclusive functions of the legislative bodies of this country, both in the States and the Federal Government.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from New York, the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CELLER. Do you think it would be possible for the Senate conferees, in light of the history of the Dirksen amendment, to agree to that rejection? You remember, there was a filibuster of some 35 days, and we have a sort of a stalemate. We are all anxious to go home. I know this is a rather long question, but does the gentleman agree that the so-called Dirksen amendment is really of no real consequence in the sense that it only expresses the sense of Congress?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, may I suggest to the gentleman that we cannot hear him on this side.

Mr. CELLER. I thought that the Senate conferees might not, in light of the history of the Dirksen amendment, accept the rejection suggested by the gentleman from Virginia of the Dirksen amendment. There was, as we all know, a very prolonged and acrimonious debate in the Senate which resulted in a so-called compromise, which is the last form of the Dirksen amendment. Of course, if the Senate conferees would not accept the rejection of the House conferees, there would be a stalemate and there would exist another reason why we could not possibly get home and do our necessary campaigning.

I am curious to know the gentleman's reaction in that respect.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Well, the gentleman from New York and I usually get along pretty good. But I might say to him in reply that my first reaction to it is that if the gentleman would get busy over in his committee and bring us out a constitutional amendment or bring us out something with some teeth in it, we would not be in this situation. I still hope that he might do that. I know he is conscientious in his view, just as the rest of us are. But this is a serious and vital situation.

I wonder if the gentleman agrees with me that these decisions of the Supreme Court and the decisions of the lower courts in which they undertake to actually write and put upon the people a reapportionment act—the gentleman surely does not disagree with me that that is legislation?

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I do not believe that the gentleman from Virginia puts the proper interpretation upon what the Supreme Court or the lower Federal courts can do with reference to marking out the lines of the various boroughs in the various States for seats in the legislatures of the States.

The courts have equity powers. They simply say to the officials of the States, we feel that these lines should be drawn thus and so.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Oh, no, no, no, they do not.

Mr. CELLER. An order to draw lines thus and so, and if you do not do it, you will be in contempt of the court.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Oh, no, no, no.

Mr. CELLER. It does not follow that the lines must be exactly as the Supreme Court laid them out. They can be appreciably in that manner.

There are a number of decisions in that respect. All the courts do is to say to the State legislature, do away with the so-called rotten boroughs, do away with the maladjustments and establish the principle of one person, one vote. If you do not do it, we will say that you must do it thus and so. But it simply says, in effect, if you do not do it then you are fined for contempt of court.

I do not see that the exercise of the equity powers of the court in that respect is legislation.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Now the gentleman from New York has one of the busiest if not the busiest committee in this House of Representatives. It is certainly one of the busiest committees. I cannot reprimand him for not being able to read all of these Supreme Court decisions, because that would require a good deal of time. But, certainly, the gentleman is wrong. If he will just read the decisions he will find they do not say that we believe you ought to do so and so and we believe you ought to follow such and such lines. If you do not follow such and such lines, you will be in contempt. What they do in these decisions is this:

The Supreme Court has within the past 10 days directed the circuit court in Virginia to the effect that if the State of Virginia did not enact a satisfactory bill to the court within a certain number of days—and they are very few days, by the way—then the court shall reapportion the State in accordance with how they think it ought to be reapportioned. There is not a question of a doubt about that. I am sorry that the gentleman from New York has not had the time to read the decisions.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I do not yield further, because my time is limited.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Brown].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution because I feel very strongly that this bill should go to conference, in the hope that the conferees will be able to bring back a single bill instead of a double-barreled measure.

I have stood on this floor many times in opposition to legislation where the other body has, contrary to the rules of the House, at least, added language that was not germane to the House-passed bill, and sent it back to us with such an amendment, for us to take from the Speaker's desk and accept or reject the amendment. Under such a procedure you have no right to debate the measure in its entirety. You can either accept or reject that which the other body has added to a measure that is in no way germane to the amendment as offered in the other body.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I have asked the gentleman from Ohio to yield to me at this point in order to make an observation or two which I believe is pertinent to the matter now before us, and will also have to do with a resolution that will be offered shortly, as I understand it, a continuing resolution for appropriation bills not yet enacted into law.

Mr. Speaker, we could have had this action a day or two ago if it had been deemed advisable on the part of the majority leaders. But in any event we do have it up today. I agree with the gentleman from Ohio on this matter of conference. I understand that the conferees have been meeting informally, which frequently happens around here when we get toward the closing days of the session, so that when they are finally or officially designated and officially constituted, they can resolve their differences quickly in a conference report.

The point I am making is this: This goes to conference today. The conferees could meet and agree on and file a conference report this evening. The conference report could be debated tomorrow and if it were filed today we could have an arrangement by which it could be considered today. Why is that important in the scheme of things around here? Because the foreign aid appropriation bill and the supplemental appropriation bill are the only ones left not enacted into law.

The Appropriations Committee of the other body has already reported an appropriation bill for foreign aid and, as I understand it, the same is true in respect to the supplemental appropriation bill. If we moved in that fashion the appropriation bills could be concluded this week. We could get these appropriations worked out and finally enacted into law this week, which would achieve the desire as quickly as adoption of the resolution that has been offered for a 10-day continuation which I shall oppose. Then there would be no reason in the world why we cannot adjourn sine die at the end of this week and, if I sense the temper of the Members of the House, that is what needs to be done.

There is pending a social security conference. I see no reason why that conference report cannot be resolved if it is deemed desirable to bring in the very fine and generous provisions that the House enacted in the Social Security Act. That, too, could be acted upon this week.

Except for someone's insistence, for what reason I cannot understand, that we do this and we do that, like Appalachia, where a rule has been pending for 42 days and no action taken, as I say, we can adjourn and go back home, and I hope that is the way we may proceed.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I thank the gentleman from Indiana for that which he has said. I find myself in complete agreement with the statement he has just made.

I am very much concerned over this legislation. The House itself has spoken its belief and its will as far as the Supreme Court decisions on apportionment of votes in State legislatures are concerned. They did it by a strong majority in the House. The Rules Committee has acted on legislation. I believe the House itself has done everything it could to bring about a proper and an orderly solution to the problem that has been created as a result of the recent Supreme Court decisions affecting State legislatures.

I have a strong feeling that the Senate amendment on State reapportionment that was added to the foreign-aid authorization measure is something that could not be done under the rules of the House. It would not have been germane. It has no business in a bill of this kind. We ought to legislate on these two important matters, one on foreign-aid authorization and the other on the apportionment decisions, on their own merits, and not try to tie the two together to endeavor to mislead somebody to say, "Well, in effect we will make it so that in order to get this you will have to vote for that, or vice versa." I do not like that kind of legislating in the Congress of the United States. I do not think it is dignified; I do not think it is proper; I do not think it is in good taste. I am sorry to see we are confronted with legislation of this type. So I am hopeful the House will see fit to send this legislation to conference and that the conferees can work out some sort of arrangement where at least we will have an opportunity to pass upon one question at a time, instead of some joint mixed-up effort such as has been proposed by the legislation sent to us by the other body.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call the attention of the House to the fact that the bill H.R. 1927, which was a pension bill for non-service-connected veterans, is over in the other body now. The conferees on the part of the House have been appointed. We have been advised by the chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Teague], that we are ready to meet at any time. The only thing that is holding up the conference, as I understand it, is that in the other body, the NSLI—the national service life insurance—was added on to the foreign aid bill. Of course, that is a very controversial piece of legislation. As far as the House conferees are concerned, we are awaiting a call from the other body.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. As I understand it, that would not have been germane if it had been offered to the measure in the House.

Mr. AYRES. That is correct. The House turned it down for a number of years. The last time it turned it down was just about a week ago.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, it has been my intention to offer a motion to instruct the conferees with reference to the select-out authorization which was inserted in this bill by the other body as an amendment. However, in view of the statement made by the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Smith], who related the statement made to the Rules Committee on yesterday, that the managers on the part of the House would go to the conference in opposition to Senate amendments numbered 47 and 48; that the managers on the part of the House will oppose this select-out procedure, I may change my mind. However, I should like to have that statement made on the House floor by the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Morgan], the chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Certainly; I am always glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I am going to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Morgan] as soon as the gentleman from Iowa concludes.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman. I would like to have that statement in the Record.

I would like to take just a few minutes to explain to the Members of the House, since this was not an issue when the authorization bill was previously before the House. The same provisions were defeated in the House Committee on Foreign Affairs by a vote of more than 2 to 1, and therefore, I am surprised that the other body would have the audacity to put such authority in the bill, well knowing that the House had knocked it out by that margin. What do the amendments provide? It is proposed to set aside civil service procedures, veterans' preference, and give the AID agency the authority to summarily discharge 100 employees each year for 2 years. So far as I know, no such authority is given to any other agency of Government and this kind of raw power ought not to be given to the AID agency. Every House Member wants the Government to get rid of the deadwood and the inefficients, and let me point out that throughout the Government service last year other agencies and departments brought 36,000 adverse actions against their employees while AID was giving in-grade promotions to every employee except one. If there was so much inefficiency and so much deadwood in the AID agency last year, why did they give all of their employees, with a single exception, in-grade promotions while other agencies of Government that had inefficients and deadwood took 36,000 adverse actions against them?

I say again, this is the rawest kind of power to set aside all civil service procedures and I remind you that the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the AFL-CIO and union organizations dealing with Federal employees all appeared before our committee earlier this year in vigorous opposition to this proposal.

I trust that the chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs will give the House today complete assurance that there will be no temporizing with this issue when the managers on the part of the House go to conference on the bill. I would hope he would further say that there would be no compromise of any kind. If we are by this devious means going to give special privilege to AID, it means we could not deny it to any other department or agency of Government. This would be piecemeal abandonment of the civil service system and the protection that system affords to employees. I say repeal or abandon entirely the civil service procedures, but do not do it by a piecemeal approach as is here proposed.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. The gentleman from Iowa and I do not always agree on foreign policy, but in this matter I agree with the gentleman 100 percent. He is entirely right and he is expressing the sentiment of the great majority of our committee including our chairman.

Mr. GROSS. I would like to say that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'Hara] was one of the strong supporters of the motion I made in the Committee on Foreign Affairs to strike this exact language from the bill.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BECKWORTH. I want to concur in the statement that this would be a piecemeal approach to a very serious problem that exists not only with reference to the AID agency but with reference to other agencies and before it is done if it ever should be it ought to be studied very thoroughly over quite a period of time. I certainly concur with what the gentleman has said that this is a piecemeal approach to this problem. Indeed, it would be unfair to many veterans and career employees, in my opinion. I want the action of our Foreign Affairs Committee in deleting the provision to be sustained.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Morgan].

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to clarify my own position. Yesterday, due to the objection which was made to the Foreign Aid bill being sent to conference, it was necessary to go to the Rules Committee and to get a rule. I was the only one of the proposed conferees who testified before the Rules Committee. My position on this so-called amendment was rigid, and I so stated to the chairman of the Rules Committee. I was speaking for myself and not the others of the proposed six conferees.

Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and also in my capacity as a prospective House conferee on the foreign aid bill, I regard it as an obligation to do my best to secure Senate approval of the provisions voted by the House. I very much hope that we will not send the bill to conference with instructions. I am glad to hear the gentleman from Iowa say he is not going to seek to instruct the conferees.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I have not quite reached that decision, and the gentleman just threw some doubt into my mind when he said he was speaking only for himself.

I believe conferences have been held with Members of the other body, even though this bill has not been formally sent to conference. I believe the gentleman and other members of the conference should have something to say at this time, stating their positions with respect to this issue.

Mr. MORGAN. I can assure the gentleman from Iowa that in the preconference meetings which have been held, this section of the bill has never been reached, so there has been absolutely no discussion with the other proposed six conferees of the House on this particular issue, and I had no opportunity to express other than my own opinion.

Mr. GROSS. If there are other Members who apparently will be selected as House conferees on the House floor, they can save a little time today by making known their positions with respect to this matter.

Mr. MORGAN. I have taken this time in order to clarify my own position for the gentleman from Iowa.

My distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Iowa, is the author of the amendment which struck this provision from the bill. As chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee my vote was the first vote of the 16 cast in favor of his amendment, which was opposed, as he knows, by only 6 Members.

I certainly want to convince the gentleman that my position is the same as his. Otherwise I would not have cast my vote in committee for his amendment to remove both these sections from the foreign aid bill. I have some very strong feelings on this, as the gentleman knows.

The jurisdiction of the Committee on Foreign Affairs has been challenged on this subject, but this is not the issue. The author of the amendment deleting the "selection-out" authority was sincerely concerned over it as a threat to the civil service merit system. I had previously expressed my own view that it was highly controversial and I was reluctant to have the provision remain in the bill, as the gentleman knows, but I did not oppose it on the basis of the jurisdictional fight between the House Committee on Foreign Affairs and the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. I was sincere in my effort to help the gentleman on the case that he made with respect to the attack on the civil service merit system.

As I understand the parliamentary procedure in regard to this, regardless of whether the House conferees are instructed or not, they would have four possible courses of action.

First, we could do our best to have the Senate recede. If successful, then there would be no further problem. Second, if we failed, we could disregard the instructions and reluctantly accept the Senate provisions. Third, we might be able to secure a compromise acceptable to both Houses. Fourth, if we failed to have the Senate recede, we could report Senate amendments Nos. 47 and 48 back in disagreement, bringing the matter back to the House for a separate vote.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield on that point?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Would the gentleman at this time care to assure the House, since he will control all the time, in such an event there would be a reasonable amount of time to discuss the amendments, as they might come back in disagreement from the conference?

Mr. MORGAN. I can assure the gentleman that there will be a reasonable amount of time to discuss the amendments in the hour allotted on the conference report.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I have had the privilege of serving on conference committees with our chairman on numerous occasions. I want to reassure the gentleman from Iowa that the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs always stands fast in adhering to the position of the House. I can assure him that he will do likewise in this instance. As the gentleman from Iowa knows, I, too, voted with the majority in striking out this section in the Committee on Foreign Affairs. Our vote was sustained by the House. We will do our best to maintain the position of the House. I do not think that it would be fair to imply that our chairman will not try to do his best to bring back a bill reflecting the position of the House, by formally instructing him to do that very thing. I do not believe that there is anything in the record of his past performance to justify such lack of confidence.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR].

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, as a prospective conferee upon this bill I can speak only for myself. For myself I will say that I am fully prepared to sustain the position of the House in this matter, and I expect to do so. However, in honesty and frankness, I must point out that the conferees are not yet appointed; that we are not, as the chairman of the committee has said, in a position to speak for all of the conferees collectively; and the Members of the House must have that in mind.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ADAIR. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MORGAN. I have had a check made and I am unable to find any instances in the past 25 years where the Committee on Foreign Affairs conferees have received instructions. This is a pretty good indication that they have lived up to their obligations to support the positions taken by the House and there is no need to deviate from this practice. I assure the House that instructions will not be necessary to assure its acceptance.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL].

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I was happy to learn of the assurance given to the House by the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs that he would make every effort to have the amendment which was adopted by the other body regarding selecting-out authority on the part of the Agency for International Development deleted in that conference. I think all of us can agree here that it is highly desirable to get rid of incompetents and misfits wherever and whenever they exist in any Federal agency. We should always strive to improve the efficiency and the quality of personnel in all Federal agencies. We are constantly trying to do that. We do it every year throughout the year in the various legislative approaches such as here recently where we had an increase in pay and an improvement in retirement benefits. There are many ways in which we try to improve the working conditions. There is no quarrel with the fact that it is desirable to have administrative flexibility insofar as personnel management is concerned. However, we also must have legal guidelines in order that there will not be abuse.

The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS], pointed out several reasons why this amendment should be taken out. I should like to amplify some of those reasons. In fact, just 2 years ago I believe we gave the Agency for International Development similar authority; that is, authority to weed out the so-called misfits. Yet they were unable to do so with the authority we gave them 2 years ago, so what assurance do we have that similar authority here would help them to weed out deadwood now? Why should this agency have such special treatment? They claim they have higher than average personnel. The Agency for International Development claims they have a need for higher than average personnel, but I doubt whether the National Aeronautics and Space Agency will agree or that the Federal Aviation Agency will agree or that the Department of the Army will agree with that. If the Agency for International Development has special authorities, then other agencies have a right to come in and expect them, also.

I believe if we allow this amendment to stand it is going to cause more loss of morale and trust on the part of high level employees in the Agency for International Development, which is going to cause that type of employee to seek employment elsewhere. Therefore in the final analysis, in the long run, it is going to lower the caliber of employees.

As the gentleman from Iowa, [Mr. GROSS], has pointed out, there is ample authority, there are sufficient rules and regulations, to get rid of incompetents. In fact, 36,000 were discharged under civil service laws and regulations last year.

Incidentally—and this is most interesting—the Agency for International Development has had five different personnel officers within the last 4 or 5 years. I think that can lead to the question whether or not this is a matter of administration. Should we actually give new authority and enact a special law in order to overcome the inefficiency of leadership in the Agency for International Development?

I submit, Mr. Chairman, if this special authority is granted to the Agency for International Development, then other agencies of Government have the right to expect the same authority. It is going to open the floodgates for political abuse and pressure and it can have a tendency to destroy confidence in the civil service system. If such special authority is merited, if this is a special and peculiar type of agency, then let the matter be considered by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and have them make a determination as to where this agency differs from other agencies and enact a special amendment to the civil service law.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROYHILL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with the very fine remarks that the gentleman has just made. This is a most important issue. The gentleman has been following it very closely. I think the membership of the House should recognize that our distinguished colleague from Iowa has performed a noble service to the civil service merit system of this country in staying on this issue throughout. It has been most important. I can say, as chairman of the Manpower and Utilization Subcommittee, that the employees of this Nation have been vitally concerned with this proposal that would destroy the merit system. I agree with the gentleman fully that there is ample authority, in our opinion, to remove these employees if they are not able, if they are not competent. If that is not the case then we should enact the necessary legislation to give all agencies such authority.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JOHANSEN].

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, at the outset I associate myself as a member of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service with the statements made by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL] relative to the Senate amendment which they were discussing. I have asked for this time, however, to make some additional remarks respecting Senate amendment No. 60, the amendment relating to legislative apportionment.

Let us understand clearly and quickly what this sense of Congress resolution does.

With respect to delaying the implementing of the June 15 Supreme Court legislative apportionment decisions, this amendment says that the Congress thinks it would be nice if the members of the judiciary would delay implementing those decisions.

Now, Mr. Speaker, they do not have to do this, but the Congress thinks it would be jolly nice of them if they would.

Mr. Speaker, may I point out to my colleagues that Mr. Chief Justice Warren in the majority opinion June 15 said expressly that the courts were under no obligation to implement these decisions instantly if it interfered with or embarrassed an election process already underway.

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, in a word, said he thought it would be nice if they allowed a reasonable delay with respect to the impending election. But some of these Federal courts have no more respect for Mr. Chief Justice Warren's recommendation as to what would be nice than they will have for the Congress if we state that it would be nice if they heeded our sense of Congress resolution.

But in the matter of the last paragraph of amendment No. 60—so ably described by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Smith]—there is the real clincher and the real clinker. This says that it is the sense of Congress that the Federal courts shall redistrict if the legislatures have not acted within the 6 months' time limit provided by the amendment. It says if the legislatures have not acted "pursuant to the Constitution" That means, translated literally, "pursuant to the June 15 decisions of the Court."

This amendment underwrites the very principle repudiated by this House in adoption of the Tuck amendment, the principle that population must be the sole factor of representation in both houses of the State legislature.

This amendment means it would be the sense of Congress if adopted that that is hereafter a constitutional principle.

This means that we would underwrite the abuse of authority I referred to earlier this afternoon in which a 3-judge panel in Connecticut has suspended elections called for by the Constitution or by statute, with respect to the legislative branch in that State.

This means also by further implication that the audacious next step already initiated in my own State of Michigan is underwritten by the sense of the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, a judicial decision—and I hope the Members will hear this—in the State of Michigan has already applied the principle laid down and the authority claimed under the June 15 decisions of the Supreme Court, to the county boards of supervisors in the State of Michigan.

Now this means that we are going to have, if the ultimate logic is pursued, the Federal Judiciary dictating representation on and the makeup of the county boards of supervisors.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. Celler] whom I respect greatly, intimated that we ought not to pursue this matter because it might arouse opposition in the other body and they might resort to another filibuster and thus we might not be able to go home quite so soon.

Mr. Speaker, for what purpose are we here as the sworn representatives of the people if it is not to protect the elective process, if it is not to protect the legislative operations and authority, if it is not to protect the historical principles of representation in our State legislatures, if it is not to curb the interference and usurpation of the judiciary?

Mr. Speaker, I would rather go down to defeat staying here until the last day of this session, until the last day of this year, than acquiesce to this kind of a sense-of-Congress resolution.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Hays].

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, as one of the prospective conferees, I would like to address myself to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Smith], chairman of the Rules Committee. I listened to his remarks very intently. I think he would agree with me that since the Senate did spend 35 days on this section they are not going to give it up, very lightly, and there is a reasonable assumption that the conferees on the House side are going to have difficulty in having this section stricken.

I agree with the gentleman from Virginia that it really does not mean much. He and I agree that section B, which he objects to, as I understand it, more strenuously than any other section, would have at least an implication that the Congress is saying that in case a State fails to apportion, the court will do it. I do not really think that, even though some people in the House might agree, that in case a legislature does not, somebody should. I do not think we ought to approach that in this back door fashion.

So I come to a question which I would like to propound to the gentleman: In view of the fact we are concerned with the situation, if we get section B stricken or modified to where it did not do this, the House conferees would be achieving about as much as they could achieve under the circumstances?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. As to what they can achieve under the circumstances, I think it is essential to go back to the basic application. I feel section B should come out, and I do not believe the House will reverse its position. I will go so far as to say that with section B out I think the provision is a complete nullity. It would not do any good, and probably it would not do any harm.

Mr. HAYS. I thank the gentleman, because I think he and I agree on this section B coming out. I believe he appreciates the situation that the House conferees might be in. It is true, as the minority leader said a while ago, that the prospective conferees have been meeting informally. But we have not discussed this section. However, in view of the 35 days the other body spent on it, I can sense that the conferees of the other body are not going to agree to strike that whole section.

I want to do as much as I can to get the opinion of the House on agreeing to something that will stand up.

I am glad to have the gentleman's statement.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Stratton].

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I do not plan to oppose the resolution to send the foreign aid appropriations bill to conference, but I would like to urge the conferees on the part of the House to press strongly for the replacement of Senate amendment No. 60 on legislative reapportionment with the wording of the original Dirksen-Mansfield rider.

I realize, Mr. Speaker, the time that has been spent in the other body debating this whole subject. But I am disturbed by the fact that the wording ultimately adopted in the other body has no real legal binding effect. It merely expresses the "sense of the Congress" and therefore is unlikely to be of any real help to States like New York, which desperately need more time to deal with the sweeping changes mandated by the June 15 decision of the Supreme Court Amendment No. 60 will not, Mr. Speaker, give us any additional time in New York or anywhere else. Instead, we need the wording of the original Dirksen-Mansfield rider if we are to help my State and other States. I hope the conferees will act to put teeth back into this section and give us the time we need in New York.

In my State, Mr. Speaker, we have already been directed by the Federal court to redistrict our legislature by April 1965. And we have been told by the court that we must hold three successive legislative elections within the next 2 years. Even if there were to be no other action on this subject at the Federal level, even if there were to be no constitutional amendment decreeing a new and different system of State apportionment, my own State of New York still needs more time than has been given to us by the courts to adjust to the changes decreed by the Supreme Court decision.

Our people are most emphatic, Mr. Speaker, in their desire that each of our 62 counties be individually represented in at least one house of our State legislature. But to bring this about even without the aid of the proposed constitutional amendment—would require a much longer period of time. It could be done, for example, by increasing the size of the State assembly. But this requires a constitutional amendment in New York State and would take at least 2 years to be adopted in a Statewide referendum. The same would be true were we to adopt a system of weighted voting in the State assembly, as some have proposed.

And it is unfair and unreasonable, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, to require that candidates for the State legislature run for office three times in 2 years. This is bad for the continuity of our State government. It is bad for those who are interested enough in State government to run for office.

If the House conferees will, therefore, insist on the original Dirksen-Mansfield wording, if they will direct the additional time we need rather than merely go on record as believing that it would be nice to have such time, then we will have performed a real service for my State and for many others as well. I therefore urge the conferees strongly as a representative of the most rural congressional district in New York State to do just this.

There is ample basis, Mr. Speaker, for such action by our House conferees. After all, we passed the so-called Tuck bill on this same subject some weeks ago by a very substantial margin. At that time, as Members may recall, I was one who urged that we should substitute for this Tuck bill the original Dirksen-Mansfield rider. The House however favored a stronger piece of legislation—in fact one that was in my judgment unconstitutional. Now the Senate has passed a much weaker piece of legislation than even the Dirksen-Mansfield rider. So why not compromise on a middle ground? Why not resolve the differences between the Tuck bill and the inadequate "sense of Congress" resolution by supporting the original Dirksen wording as a fair middle ground? This is what I am urging.

Mr. Speaker, no less a person than Walter Lippmann urged this course some days ago. He pointed out the sweeping impact of the June 15 decision for areas similar to the one I have the honor to represent. He pointed out that we have spent 10 years already trying to adjust to the sweeping Supreme Court decision on school desegregation. Surely we ought to be allowed at least 2 years to adjust to another decision with equally sweeping implications.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STRATTON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KUNKEL. I would like to express my strong opposition to the Senate amendment concerning the selecting out of civil service employees in AID. I hope that provision will be removed from the conference report. In other words, my position is the same as that taken by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL], and other Members who have spoken on this specific provision.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints the following conferees: Mr. MORGAN, Mr. ZABLOCKI, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. HAYS, Mr. ADAIR, Mr. MAILLIARD, and Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.

MAKING CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 1965

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I call up House Resolution 892, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 1183), making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1965, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the joint resolution and continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, the joint resolution shall be read for amendment. At the conclusion of the consideration of the joint resolution for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the joint resolution to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], and I now yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as you all know, we have been operating on appropriations under a continuing resolution. That continuing resolution expired today, and with respect to any bills that have not been passed by both Houses and signed by the President the whole matter of the use of money for paying bills or paying wages is just simply paralyzed.

The chairman of the Committee on Appropriations came to the Committee on Rules and asked for a rule to agree to the resolution which would extend that extension for a further period of 10 days. That rule has been granted and that is what is before you today.

Mr. Speaker, when we were asked about this and when the committee yesterday agreed to go along with this extension of 10 days, I thought everybody around here was under the impression that this would aid us to the point of getting a sine die adjournment. Things have happened since that time. I do not know what they are because we ordinary Members of Congress are not in on these conferences that take place on the Hill and off the Hill. But the rumor is very rife today, and I read it in the papers, that the other body has now completed its work—I am certainly glad to hear that, because we have been waiting several months for them to complete their work—and that they were going into 3-day recesses for the House to catch up. The House has already caught up. I do not know how far we ought to go fiddling around with this situation any longer.

It has been very evident from the demonstrations that have taken place here today that the House is practically unanimous in its desire to conclude this session that has kept us in session continuously for the past 20 months. Some of us feel we have done enough and should not attack further legislation, with the absence of so many Members.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Does not the gentleman feel that if we make this continuing resolution to October 3, it might aid this adjournment?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I was just getting to that.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I am sorry I interrupted, then.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Some Members seem to think that if we vote down this resolution it would aid us in getting an adjournment. I do not share that opinion. What I have said may have sounded like I do, but I do not. I had not completed my statement. I think that the fact, which I believe to be a fact and which has been demonstrated here today, is that this House wants to adjourn and adjourn as quickly as possible. It may be impractical and impossible to get the necessary legislation through in the next few days.

I do not see that it would be any help in delaying adjournment to refuse this 10-day delay because then it might reach the point where something so vital was necessary that we would have to go over and take a recess. I, for one, do not expect to vote for any recess. I want to get the business finished and get out of here.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. In order that the gentleman may understand how I feel about this proposal, let me say I do not think it is either impractical or impossible to get our work done in the House of Representatives by Saturday night and, therefore, for whatever it may be worth I want to say that I intend to vote against even this 10-day extension provided for under the resolution. This Congress not only can but should finish its business in the remaining 3 days of this week.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I know the gentleman is very sincere in his views about this. I hope that whatever we do here will result in early adjournment.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. In this morning's "Blatter," the "Washington Blatter" that is, it states:

> Leaders in the House, which is the main bottleneck to a Saturday getaway, acted as though they had never heard of this idea, but it might solve their immediate problem of rounding up enough Members to pass any more controversial bills.

In other words, certain individuals are trying to put the monkey on the back of the House after the other body recently filibustered for more than a month on reapportionment. Now the House is being charged with holding up the adjournment of Congress and I resent it.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HALLECK. The thing that concerns me about this continuing resolution, and I expressed my views to the gentleman from Texas who has no greater friend than I in this body, that if we adopt this 10-day extension today, we in effect will be issuing a sort of open invitation to run the House of Representatives and the Congress for another 10 days. I think the better part of wisdom is to vote this down and put everybody on notice that we can meet whatever requirements there are, if we get the appropriation bills passed before Saturday night, because nobody is going to go without their pay between now and then under any existing situation. So far as I am concerned, just as the minority whip, the gentleman from Illinois has stated, I am not going to vote for this resolution.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I thank the gentleman for his statement, but I just would like to say to him that there are two bodies of the Congress and it is entirely possible, and I am speaking from past observations, that maybe the Senate would not agree with that.

Mr. HALLECK. I have just been reading in the papers that the people on the other side of the Capitol are complaining that the House of Representatives is not moving fast enough. I understand they have already passed the supplemental appropriation bill and the foreign aid appropriation bill; is that correct?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I am informed that is correct.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this resolution, much as I dislike to disagree with the action of the Committee on Rules in reporting this House resolution making in order the consideration of House Joint Resolution 1183, which in simple language is to extend to October 10 the date until which certain appropriations shall continue available to certain agencies and departments of the Government.

This resolution will mean exactly what has been stated here. If we adopt this resolution, and if the other body joins in adopting this House joint resolution, then Congress will be in session for another week. It is apparent that with any real desire, if any real effort is made to conclude the work of this session of the Congress as speedily as it can be done, not only by this body but also by the other body, we can conclude all our labors by not later than Saturday evening of this week.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, in regard to this resolution, if we adopt it there is no guarantee it will be the last extension. Perhaps on next Thursday or Friday, a week from now, we will be faced with another joint resolution to extend for another 10 days or for 2 weeks or for a month the availability of appropriations which are contained in this resolution. There is no end to that which is going on or which can go on, unless this House determines for itself that it is tired of the fiddle-faddle, tired of the continuous bickering between the other body and this body over the delay which has existed in another body and not in this body.

No one has any right to criticize the House of Representatives in connection with the present situation. If any person will look at the facts and study the Congressional Record, reading it back week after week and month after month for the past 6 months, that person will see who is responsible for the present situation, and why and how. That responsibility does not rest with the House of Representatives.

So I hope that this resolution will be voted down and that we will not extend the time that these appropriations will be available. I hope instead we will hold somebody's feet to the fire. I will leave it up to my colleagues to guess whom I have in mind. Let us say, "Go ahead. Do your job. Do your homework. Do your night work, if necessary, and get this Congress adjourned."

Let us get them back here on the job, where they belong. Why, if I recall correctly, for 3 days last week the other body was without a quorum. They could not even find a majority to transact business. This great body did have a majority and did have a sufficient number of Members present to constitute a quorum and to transact business whenever business was ready for action by this House.

So I hope that the resolution will be voted down and that we will not take this action which is proposed. If we do take it, in my opinion it will mean another 10 days of the session, and perhaps there will be added an additional 10 or 20 days later on. Perhaps we will get home then in time to vote on election day, or perhaps we shall have to vote by absentee ballot, staying here in Washington, if that is necessary, if our States have an absentee voter privilege, as my own beloved State does.

Make up your minds what you want to do—whether you want to get to work and finish, as sensible men and women ought to do; or whether you want to continue with this fiddle-faddle, put off, delay, partially do this and do that but not finish up the job and go home, as we should do.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman from Ohio yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. PASSMAN. Does this continuing resolution have to do only with foreign aid?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I believe it also may have something to do with the supplemental appropriation bill, which has not yet cleared the Congress.

Mr. PASSMAN. Will the distinguished gentleman from Ohio permit me to ask the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations if this matter deals only with the continuation of the foreign aid appropriation?

Mr. MAHON. Will the gentleman from Ohio yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Yes. I think I was in error when I said it also might involve the supplemental appropriation bill, because that has not been approved.

Mr. MAHON. Yes. The gentleman is correct. This continuing resolution relates only to the foreign aid appropriation bill which provides for a number of oversea activities of the U.S. Government.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. As far as I am concerned personally, let me say to the gentleman from Texas that I can get along very well without any foreign aid authorization bill.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. PASSMAN. It was my understanding that this matter dealt entirely with the foreign aid appropriation bill. I believe that this has now been confirmed by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. Mahon], as well as the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Brown]. I thank them very much.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Jensen], the ranking minority member of the House Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, it is not often that I oppose a rule, but I am certainly opposed to this one. I remember when as a boy on the farm, in early spring dad would say to my brothers and I, "Get your hoes and get out there and cut those weeds." I remember well the first time dad told us to get our hoes and get out there and cut those weeds I said, "Dad, they are awfully little now, why not wait awhile and cut them later?" Dad said, "Kill 'em off in the spring and they won't bother us in the fall." Mr. Speaker, that is exactly what I want to do with this rule: kill it off now so it will not bother us later on, which would be good for America and for years to come, I am sure.

I would not vote for a 10-minute continuation of this kind of a disgraceful performance that has been going on in this Congress, dictated from 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue for at least the past 10 months. As everyone knows, the orders come from 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue and those orders are constantly "This is must legislation and must be passed." Then they start twisting arms, because quite often they do not have the votes to put over their dictatorial must bills. That is what has been holding this Congress in session not only this year but last year and other years during the past 4 years. The Congress of the United States is now becoming the laughing stock of the American people who really worry about the fiscal situation that exists in this country today. Why, if we did not have the Vietnam war going on, I doubt Congress early in this session would not have passed the foreign aid bill. Of course, about the same situation has existed during the four wars since 1917. It seems we always have to have a war going on in order to get the Congress to do the will of the top boss at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue.

Now, if we pass this continuing resolution today, do not be surprised if we are here not only until October 10 but for another 10 days or more. If the President cannot twist enough arms to pass his Appalachia bill by October 10 you may be sure he will demand another continuing resolution. What a disgraceful performance. Why, even monkeys would not carry on in such a manner. They would know better. Here we are, grown men and women, who have become the laughingstock of the thinking patriotic American people. I say kill this rule now and let us adjourn sine die now.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations [Mr. Mahon].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, it is good to find so much unanimity in the House. We all feel, I believe, that certainly the great majority feel, that we should complete the business of this Congress and return to our districts. I certainly hope that we can complete this action this week, and I believe we can. I doubt that a vote of "no" on this resolution would get us adjourned any earlier. I think that is a misunderstanding of the situation which is confronting us.

A lot has been said recently about obedience to law and authority. Last night at midnight the previous continuing resolution expired and the operations of the Peace Corps, the operations of the Military Assistance Program in South Vietnam and elsewhere, and other activities contained in the foreign aid appropriation bill, came to a halt legally so far as the obligation of any new money is concerned. It is true, however, that expenditures as a result of prior obligations for the Military Assistance Program in Vietnam and elsewhere can and will continue, so there should be no interruption in our military efforts in this country.

For example, if we do not pass this continuing resolution, the agency which makes the necessary arrangements to care for the 45,000 Cuban refugees in Florida would be in violation of the strict and technical letter of the law if it carries out its functions, because the authority to do these things expired last night at midnight.

Another thing I might mention is that in Okinawa, which is one of the greatest oversea military bastions of this Government, the U.S. civilian administration of the Islands is provided for in the foreign aid appropriation bill and it is important that there be no disruption of the situation in this key military area. So it seems to me that we ought to pass this continuing resolution in order to fill the gap until the regular appropriation bill on foreign aid is enacted into law.

I do not want to take any chances of interrupting our operations in Vietnam. I do not believe the Members are in favor of leaving in the lurch the Peace Corps men and women in many parts of the world; so it seems to me for this reason and others we ought to pass this continuing resolution.

The authorizing legislation has not yet become the law. We cannot expect to pass the appropriation bill in final form until the authorization bill has been agreed to in conference and has been finally enacted.

Under these circumstances, we need just a little leeway. All of us, experienced as we are in legislative matters, know that it will take the President a little time to review the bills which come to him before he can afford to sign those bills into law. Therefore, this could run into a matter of several days.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that we have two alternatives: To encourage a sloppy, illegal administration of some of the important functions of the U.S. Government, or else pass this continuing resolution. Its passage would be no indication whatever that we do not feel we should adjourn at the earliest possible moment, and insofar as I am concerned, by Saturday night.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I am glad to yield to my friend the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN.]

Mr. HOEVEN. I was pleased to hear the gentleman say that he thought the Congress could complete its business within a period of 3 days.

If so, I would suggest that the gentleman amend his resolution to read 3 days, which would give you ample time.

Mr. MAHON. It seems to me that it will be more than 3 days before there can be any possibility that the President himself could sign the legislation. So in the interest of orderly procedure and in the interest of these people who would be left in the lurch in all areas of the world, it seems to me most ill advised not to provide for this resolution.

This is not the matter that has been holding up the adjournment of Congress, as everyone knows. There are other matters which have been more significant in holding up the adjournment of Congress.

Permit me to say this: I regretted to hear this morning over the radio that everyone was marking time waiting for the House to finish its business. The Members of the House will remember that all of the appropriation bills had cleared this body on July 1, 1964. We did an excellent job.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. MAHON. I think in getting the appropriation bills through the House by the first of the fiscal year and in undertaking to get the Congress adjourned as early as possible, we have done a good job.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the Members will be willing to go along and permit the legal and orderly continuation of these programs in South Vietnam, in Okinawa, in the Peace Corps areas around the world, and for the procurement of military equipment having to do with our national security. I hope it will be in order to vote for this continuing resolution, which in no way, provides for some extension of time before Congress adjourns.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. MAHON. I am happy to yield to my friend the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GARY. Is it not true that the existing continuing resolution expired at midnight last night?

Mr. MAHON. That is right.

Mr. GARY. Is it not true that these very agencies and activities in Vietnam and elsewhere in the world are being conducted today without legal authorization?

Mr. MAHON. That is right.

Mr. GARY. And is it not true that they will have to be conducted that way not only until we pass the appropriation bill, but until it is actually signed by the President of the United States and then becomes law?

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is again right.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN].

Mr. PASSMAN. With respect to the foreign aid appropriation which you propose to extend, that has only to do with new obligations and has nothing whatsoever to do with expenditures? The money that may be obligated for Vietnam and other places out of this bill possibly might not be expended for 12 or 15 months. Is that the understanding of the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES]?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield to me, yes, that is my understanding. And, is it not also true that the pipeline for military assistance is over $2 billion and that every bit of this pipeline can be reprogramed, if necessary, and be spent in Vietnam, or anywhere else in the world it might be needed?

Mr. PASSMAN. Yes; and expenditures can continue. This resolution has only to do with new obligations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 160, nays 193, not voting 78, as follows:

[Roll No. 265]

YEAS—160

Addabbo
Albert
Ashley
Barrett
Beckworth
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Brown, Calif.
Burke
Burkhalter
Burleson
Byrne, Pa.
Cameron
Carey
Casey
Chelf
Clark
Cohelan
Cooley
Daddario
Daniels
Delaney
Dent
Dingell
Donohue
Downing
Dulski
Duncan
Edwards
Elliott
Everett
Evins
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Flood
Fraser
Friedel
Fulton, Tenn.
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gary
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gonzalez
Grabowski
Green, Pa.
Halpern
Hansen
Harding
Harris
Hawkins
Hays
Healey
Hechler
Holifield
Holland
Jennings
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Wis.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kelly
Keogh
Kilgore
King, Calif.
Kluczynski
Libonati
Long, La.
Long, Md.
McDowell
McFall
McMillan
Macdonald
Madden
Mahon
Matthews
Miller, Calif.
Mills
Minish
Monagan
Moorhead
Morgan
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Natcher
Nedzi
Nix
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill
Patman
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pickle
Pike
Powell
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Rains
Rhodes, Pa.
Roberts, Ala.
Roberts, Tex.
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Tex.
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Roosevelt
Rosenthal
Roush
Roybal
Ryan, Mich.
Ryan, N.Y.
St Germain
St. Onge
Secrest
Senner
Sickles
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Smith, Va.
Staebler
Steed
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Teague, Tex.
Thomas
Thompson, N.J.
Trimble
Tuten
Udall
Van Deerlin
Vanik

Vinson
Watts
White
Wickersham
Willis
Wilson, Charles H.
Wright
Young
Zablocki

NAYS—193

Abele
Abernethy
Adair
Anderson
Andrews, Ala.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashmore
Auchincloss
Ayres
Baker
Baldwin
Baring
Barry
Bates
Battin
Becker
Beermann
Belcher
Bell
Bennett, Fla.
Betts
Bolton, Frances P.
Bolton, Oliver P.
Bonner
Bow
Bray
Bromwell
Broomfield
Brotzman
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Bruce
Burton, Utah
Byrnes, Wis.
Cahill
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Chenoweth
Clancy
Clausen, Don H.
Cleveland
Collier
Colmer
Conte
Corbett
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtis
Dague
Derwinski
Dole
Dowdy
Dwyer
Ellsworth
Findley
Fino
Fisher
Fogarty
Ford
Foreman
Fountain
Frelinghuysen
Fulton, Pa.
Fuqua
Gathings
Glenn
Goodell
Goodling
Green, Oreg.
Griffin
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Harrison
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Henderson
Herlong
Hoeven
Horan
Horton
Hosmer
Huddleston
Hutchinson
Ichord
Jarman
Jensen
Johansen
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Mo.
Keith
Kilburn
King, N.Y.
Kirwan
Knox
Kornegay
Kunkel
Kyl
Laird
Langen
Latta
Lennon
Lindsay
Lipscomb
Lloyd
McClory
McCulloch
McDade
McLoskey
MacGregor
Mailliard
Marsh
Martin, Calif.
Mathias
Milliken
Minshall
Moore
Morse
Morton
Mosher
Murray
Nelsen
O'Konski
Osmers
Ostertag
Passman
Pelly
Pillion
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Quie
Quillen
Randall
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rich
Riehlman
Rivers, S.C.
Robison
Rogers, Fla.
Roudebush
Rumsfeld
Saylor
Schenck
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Schwengel
Shipley
Short
Shriver
Sibal
Siler
Skubitz
Springer
Stinson
Taft
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Thompson, La.
Thomson, Wis.
Tollefson
Tuck
Ullman
Utt
Van Pelt
Waggonner
Wallhauser
Watson
Weaver
Westland
Whalley
Wharton
Whitener
Whitten
Widnall
Williams
Wilson, Bob
Winstead
Wydler
Wyman

NOT VOTING—78

Abbitt
Alger
Aspinall
Avery
Bass
Berry
Brademas
Brock
Brooks
Buckley
Burton, Calif.
Celler
Clawson, Del
Corman
Curtin
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Denton
Derounian
Devine
Diggs
Dorn
Edmondson
Finnegan
Flynt
Forrester
Gill
Grant
Gray
Griffiths
Hanna
Hardy
Hébert
Hoffman
Hull
Jones, Ala.
Kee
Landrum
Lankford
Leggett
Lesinski
McIntire
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Matsunaga
May
Meader
Michel
Miller, N.Y.
Montoya
Morris
Morrison
Pilcher
Pool
Reifel
Reuss
Rivers, Alaska
Rostenkowski
St. George
Schadeberg
Scott
Selden
Sheppard
Sikes
Smith, Calif.
Snyder
Stafford
Staggers
Sullivan
Talcott
Thompson, Tex.
Toll
Tupper
Weltner
Wilson, Ind.
Younger

So the resolution was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Toll for, with Mr. Younger against.

Mr. Rivers of Alaska for, with Mr. Derounian against.

Mr. Brademas for, with Mr. Brock against.

Mr. Rostenkowski for, with Mr. Alger against.

Mr. Hanna for, with Mr. Martin of Nebraska against.

Mr. Burton of California for, with Mrs. May against.

Mr. Celler for, with Mr. Schadeberg against.

Mr. Staggers for, with Mrs. St. George against.

Mr. Leggett for, with Mr. Del Clawson against.

Mr. Matsunaga for, with Mr. Michel against.

Mr. Brooks for, with Mr. Meader against.

Mr. Aspinall for, with Mr. Snyder against.

Mr. Corman for, with Mr. Devine against.

Mrs. Sullivan for, with Mr. Talcott against.

Mr. Denton for, with Mr. Berry against.

Mr. Gray for, with Mr. Reifel against.

Mr. Diggs for, with Mr. Scott against.

Mrs. Griffiths for, with Mr. Hébert against.

Mr. Tupper for, with Mr. Grant against.

Mr. Montoya for, with Mr. Curtin against.

Mr. Morris for, with Mr. McIntire against.

Mr. Buckley for, with Mr. Stafford against.

Mr. Dawson for, with Mr. Smith of California against.

Mr. Finnegan for, with Mr. Hoffman against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Hull with Mrs. Kee.

Mr. Weltner with Mr. Davis of Tennessee.

Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Lankford.

Mr. Edmondson with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.

Mr. Thompson of Texas with Mr. Morrison.

Mr. Pickle with Mr. Sheppard.

Mr. Pool with Mr. Selden.

Mr. Sikes with Mr. Forrester.

Mr. Flynt with Mr. Dorn.

Mr. Bass with Mr. Abbitt.

Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mr. Lesinski.

Mr. Gill with Mr. Harding.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REDEVELOPMENT ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the District of Columbia have until midnight to file a conference report on the bill S. 646, to prohibit the location of chanceries and other business offices of foreign governments in any residential area in the District of Columbia.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

FRANK B. ROWLETT

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 7348) for the relief of Frank B. Rowlett, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

> Page 1, strike out line 6 and insert "which sum shall be considered a payment in consideration of a transfer by Frank B. Rowlett of property consisting of all substantial rights to a patent within the meaning of section 1235 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, in full settlement".

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEES

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk House Resolution 897, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 897

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

Committee on Armed Services: K. W. Stinson, of Washington;

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce: James Harvey, of Michigan.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION AND AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT OF 1958 AND PUBLIC LAWS 815 AND 874, 81ST CONGRESS

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 3060) to amend and extend the National Defense Education Act of 1958 and to extend Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress—federally affected areas—and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

Conference Report (H. Rept. No. 1916)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 3060) to amend and extend the National Defense Education Act of 1958 and to extend Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress (federally affected areas), having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "That this Act may be cited as the 'National Defense Education Act Amendments, 1964.'

"TITLE I—AMENDMENTS OF TITLE I

"Amendment of statement of findings

"SEC. 101. The second sentence of the second paragraph of section 101 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by striking out 'which have led to an insufficient proportion of our population educated in science, mathematics, and modern foreign languages and trained in technology'.

"Schools of nursing

"SEC. 102. The second sentence of section 103(b) of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by striking out 'private' and by striking out '(3),', and by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: ', and includes any school of nursing as defined in subsection (l) of this section'.

"Additional definitions

"SEC. 103. Section 103 of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

" '(l) The term "school of nursing" means a public or other nonprofit collegiate or associate degree school of nursing.

" '(m) The term "collegiate school of nursing" means a department, division, or other administrative unit in a college or university which provides primarily or exclusively an accredited program of education in professional nursing and allied subjects leading to the degree of bachelor of arts, bachelor of science, bachelor of nursing, or to an equivalent degree, or to a graduate degree in nursing.

" '(n) The term "associate degree school of nursing" means a department, division, or other administrative unit in a junior college, community college, college, or university which provides primarily or exclusively an accredited two-year program of education in professional nursing and allied subjects leading to an associate degree in nursing or to an equivalent degree.

" '(o) The term "accredited" when applied to any program of nurse education means a program accredited by a recognized body or bodies approved for such purpose by the Commissioner of Education.'

"TITLE II—AMENDMENTS OF TITLE II

"Appropriations authorized

"SEC. 201. The first sentence of section 201 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by striking out 'and $135,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and such sums for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and each of the next three fiscal years as may be necessary to enable students who have received loans for school years ending prior to July 1, 1965, to continue or complete their education' and inserting in lieu thereof '$163,300,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, $179,300,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, $190,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and $195,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and such sums for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and each of the next three fiscal years as may be necessary to enable students who have received loans for school years ending prior to July 1, 1968, to continue or complete their education'.

"Allotments to States

"SEC. 202. Section 202 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by striking out '1965' wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof '1968'.

"Payment of Federal capital contributions

"SEC. 203. Effective with respect to fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1964, section 203 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is further amended by striking out subsection (b) and by striking out '(a)' after 'SEC. 203.'.

"Conditions of agreements

"SEC. 204. (a) Paragraph (4) of section 204 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended to read as follows:

" '(4) provide that in the selection of students to receive loans from such student loan fund special consideration shall be given to students with a superior academic background; and'.

"(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) of this section shall apply to the selection of students under title II of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 made in or after the second month following the month in which this Act is enacted.

"Terms of loans

"SEC. 205. (a) Subsection (a) of section 205 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended to read as follows:

" '(a) The total of the loans for any academic year or its equivalent, as determined under regulations of the Commissioner, made by institutions of higher education from loan funds established pursuant to agreements under this title may not exceed $2,500 in the case of any graduate or professional student (as defined in regulations of the Commissioner), and may not exceed $1,000 in the case of any other student. The aggregate of the loans for all years from such funds may not exceed $10,000 in the case of any graduate or professional student (as so defined, and including any loans from such funds made to such person before he became a graduate or professional student), or $5,000 in the case of any other student.'

"(b)(1) Paragraph (1) of subsection (b) of such section 205 is amended to read as follows:

" '(1) such a loan shall be made only to a student who (A) is in need of the amount of the loan to pursue a course of study at such institution, and (B) is capable, in the opinion of the institution, of maintaining good standing in such course of study, and (C) has been accepted for enrollment as a student in such institution or, in the case of a student already attending such institution, is in good standing there either as an undergraduate, graduate, or professional student, and (D) is carrying at least one-half the normal full-time academic workload as determined by the institution;'.

"(2) Paragraph (2) of such subsection (b) of such section 205 is amended by striking out 'and (D)' and inserting in lieu thereof the following: '(D) the institution may provide that periodic installments need not be paid during any period or periods, aggregating not in excess of three years, during which the borrower is in part-time attendance at an institution of higher education taking courses which are creditable toward a degree, and may also provide that any such period shall not be included in determining the ten-year period during which the repayment must be completed, but interest shall continue to accrue during any such period, and (E)'.

"(3) Subparagraph (3) of such subsection (b) of such section 205 is amended to read as follows:

" '(3) not to exceed 50 per centum of any such loan (plus interest) shall be canceled for service as a full-time teacher in a public or other nonprofit elementary or secondary school in a State, in an institution of higher education, or in an elementary or secondary school overseas of the Armed Forces of the United States, at the rate of 10 per centum of the amount of such loan plus interest thereon, which was unpaid on the first day of such service for each complete academic year of such service;'.

"(4) Paragraph (4) of subsection (b) of such section 205 is amended by inserting immediately before the semicolon at the end thereof the following: 'in all cases except where the date on which repayment is to begin is suspended by reason of clause (D) of paragraph (2)'.

"(c) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply for purposes of determining the amount of any loans under title II of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 for academic years beginning after the date of enactment of this Act. The amendments made by paragraphs (2) and (4) of subsection (b) shall apply to any loan (under an agreement under title II of the National Defense Education Act of 1958) outstanding on the date of enactment of this Act only with the consent of the institution which made the loan. The amendment made by paragraph (3) of subsection (b) shall apply with respect to service performed during academic years beginning after the enactment of this Act, whether the loan was made before or after such enactment.

"Distribution of assets from student loan funds

"SEC. 206. Section 206 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by striking out '1969' wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof '1972'.

"TITLE III—AMENDMENTS OF TITLE III

"Extension of title

"SEC. 301. Title III of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by striking 'TITLE III—FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR STRENGTHENING SCIENCE, MATHEMATICS, AND MODERN FOREIGN LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION' as it appears as the heading of that title, and inserting in lieu thereof:

" 'TITLE III—FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR STRENGTHENING INSTRUCTION IN SCIENCE, MATHEMATICS, MODERN FOREIGN LANGUAGES, AND OTHER CRITICAL SUBJECTS'

"Appropriations authorized

"SEC. 302. Section 301 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended to read as follows:

" 'Appropriations authorized

" 'SEC. 301. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated $70,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for each of the five succeeding fiscal years, and $90,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for each of the three succeeding fiscal years, for (1) making payments to State educational agencies under this title for the acquisition of equipment and for minor remodeling, described in paragraph (1) of section 303(a), and (2) making loans authorized in section 305. There are also authorized to be appropriated $5,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for each of the five succeeding fiscal years, and $10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for each of the three succeeding fiscal years, for making payments to State educational agencies under this title to carry out the programs described in paragraph (5) of section 303(a).'

"Allotments to States

"SEC. 303. (a) The second sentence of subsection (a)(2) of section 302 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by striking out 'as soon as possible after the enactment of this Act, and again between July 1 and August 31 of 1959' and inserting in lieu thereof 'between July 1 and August 31 of each even-numbered year beginning with calendar year 1964'.

"(b) The third sentence of such subsection is amended to read as follows: 'Each such promulgation shall be conclusive for each of the two fiscal years in the period July 1 next succeeding such promulgation, except that the ratios promulgated in 1959 shall be conclusive for each of the five fiscal years in the period beginning July 1, 1960, and ending June 30, 1965.'

"(c) Effective with respect to allotments under subsection (b) of section 302 of such Act for fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1964, the third sentence of such subsection is amended by striking out '$20,000' wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof '$50,000'.

"State plans

"SEC. 304. (a) Clause (A) of section 303 (a)(1) of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended to read as follows: '(A) acquisition of laboratory and other special equipment (other than supplies consumed in use), including audiovisual materials and equipment, and printed and published materials (other than textbooks), suitable for use in providing education in science, mathematics, history, civics, geography, modern foreign language, English, or reading in public elementary or secondary schools, or both, and of testgrading equipment for such schools and specialized equipment for audiovisual libraries serving such schools, and such equipment may, if there exists a critical need therefor in the judgment of local school authorities, be used when available and suitable in providing education in other subject matter, and'.

"(b) Paragraph (5) of section 303(a) is amended by striking out 'and modern foreign languages' and inserting in lieu thereof 'history, civics, geography, modern foreign languages, English, and reading'.

"Payments to States

"SEC. 305. The second sentence of subsection (b) of section 304 of such Act is amended by striking out 'five' and inserting in lieu thereof 'eight'.

"Interest rates

"SEC. 306. Paragraph (3) of subsection (b) of section 305 of such Act is amended by striking out 'as of the last day of the month' and inserting in lieu thereof the following: 'as computed at the end of the fiscal year next'.

"TITLE IV—FELLOWSHIPS

"SEC. 401. Effective July 1, 1964, section 402(a) of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended to read as follows:

" 'Number of fellowships

" 'SEC. 402. (a) During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, the Commissioner is authorized to award not to exceed three thousand fellowships to be used for study in graduate programs at institutions of higher education, during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, he is authorized to award not to exceed six thousand such fellowships, and during each of the two succeeding fiscal years, he is authorized to award not to exceed seven thousand five hundred such fellowships. Such fellowships may be awarded for such period of study as the Commissioner may determine, but not in excess of three academic years, except that where a fellowship holder pursues his studies as a regularly enrolled student at the institution during periods outside the regular sessions of the graduate program of the institution, a fellowship may be awarded for a period not in excess of three calendar years.'

"Award of fellowships and approval of institutions

"SEC. 402. (a) The first sentence of subsection (a) of section 403 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended to read as follows: 'Of the total number of fellowships authorized by section 402(a) to be awarded during a fiscal year (1) not less than one thousand five hundred of such fellowships awarded during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and not less than one-third of such fellowships awarded during the three succeeding fiscal years shall be awarded to individuals accepted for study in graduate programs approved by the Commissioner under this section, and (2) the remainder shall be awarded on such bases as he may determine, subject to the provisions of subsection (c).' The second sentence of subsection (a) of such section is amended by striking out ', and' at the end of clause (2) and inserting in lieu thereof a period, and by striking out clause (3) thereof.

"(b) Section 403(b) of such Act is amended by striking out 'under this title' and inserting in lieu thereof 'as described in clause (1) of subsection (a)', and by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: ', and the Commissioner shall give consideration to such objective in determining the number of fellowships awarded under this title for attendance at any one institution of higher education'.

"(c) Section 403 of such Act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

" '(c) Recipients of fellowships under this title shall be persons who are interested in teaching, or continuing to teach, in institutions of higher education and are pursuing, or intend to pursue, a course of study leading to a degree of doctor of philosophy or an equivalent degree.

" '(d) No fellowship shall be awarded under this title for study at a school or department of divinity. For the purposes of this subsection, the term 'school or department of divinity' means an institution, or department or branch of an institution, whose program is specifically for the education of students to prepare them to become ministers of religion or to enter upon some other religious vocation or to prepare them to teach theological subjects.'

"(d) The amendments made by this section shall become effective July 1, 1964.

"Fellowship stipends

"SEC. 403. Section 404(a) of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended (1) by striking out 'after the baccalaureate degree,' and (2) by adding at the end thereof the following: 'Where a person awarded a fellowship under this title for study at an institution of higher education pursues his studies as a regularly enrolled student at such institution during periods outside of the regular sessions of the graduate program of the institution, the Commissioner may make appropriate adjustments in his stipends and allowances for dependents.'

"TITLE V—GUIDANCE, COUNSELING, AND TESTING; IDENTIFICATION AND ENCOURAGEMENT OF ABLE STUDENTS

"Appropriations authorized

"SEC. 501. Section 501 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by striking out 'and $17,500,000 each for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and the succeeding fiscal year,' and inserting in lieu thereof '$17,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, $24,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, $24,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and $30,000,000 for each of the two succeeding fiscal years,'.

"State plans

"SEC. 502. Paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 503(a) of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 are amended to read as follows:

" '(1) a program for testing students in the public elementary and secondary schools of such State or in the public junior colleges and technical institutes of such State, and, if authorized by law, in other elementary and secondary schools and in other junior colleges and technical institutes in such State, to identify students with outstanding aptitudes and ability, and the means of testing which will be utilized in carrying out such program; and

" '(2) a program of guidance and counseling at the appropriate levels in the public elementary and secondary schools or public junior colleges and technical institutes of such State (A) to advise students of courses of study best suited to their ability, aptitudes, and skills, (B) to advise students in their decisions as to the type of educational program they should pursue, the vocation they should train for and enter, and the job opportunities in the various fields, and (C) to encourage students with outstanding aptitudes and ability to complete their secondary school education, take the necessary courses for admission to institutions of higher education, and enter such institutions.'

"Payments to States

"SEC. 503. (a) Section 504(a) of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by striking out 'five' and inserting in lieu thereof 'eight'.

"(b) Section 504(b) of such Act is amended by striking out ', who are not below grade 7,', and by striking out 'six' and inserting in lieu thereof 'nine', and by inserting after 'schools' the first time it appears the following: ', or junior colleges or technical institutes,'.

"Junior colleges and technical institutes

"SEC. 504. Title V of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by inserting after section 504 the following new section:

" 'Definitions

" 'SEC. 505. For the purposes of this title, the term "junior colleges or technical institutes" means (1) institutions of higher education which are organized and administered principally to provide a two-year program which is acceptable for full credit toward a bachelor's degree, and (2) institutions which meet the requirements of clauses (1), (2), (4), and (5) of section 103(b) and are organized and administered principally to provide a two-year program in engineering, mathematics, or the physical or biological sciences which is designed to prepare the student to work as a technician and at a semiprofessional level in engineering, scientific, or other technological fields which require the understanding and application of basic engineering, scientific, or mathematical principles or knowledge, and, if a branch of an institution of higher education offering four or more years of higher education, is located in a community different from that in which its parent institution is located.'

"Counseling and guidance training institutes

"SEC. 505. Section 511 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

" 'Authorization

" 'SEC. 511. (a) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated $6,250,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, $7,250,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for each of the eight succeeding fiscal years, to enable the Commissioner to arrange, through grants or contracts, with institutions of higher education for the operation by them of short-term or regular session institutes for advanced study, including study in the use of new materials, to improve the qualification of individuals who are engaged, or are teachers preparing to engage, in counseling and guidance of students in elementary or in secondary schools or in institutions of higher education, including junior colleges and technical institutes as defined in section 505.

" '(b) Each individual who attends an institute operated under the provisions of this part shall be eligible (after application therefor) to receive a stipend at the rate of $75 per week for the period of his attendance at such institute, and each such individual with one or more dependents shall receive an additional stipend at the rate of $15 per week for each such dependent.'

"TITLE VI—LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT

"Extension of title

"Sec. 601. (a) Section 601 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by striking out '1965' wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof '1968'.

"(b) Section 603 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

" 'Appropriations authorized

" 'Sec. 603. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated $8,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, $13,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, $14,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, $16,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and $18,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, to carry out the provisions of this title.'

"Repealer

"Sec. 602. Effective July 1, 1964, title VI of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by striking out the center heading 'Part A—Centers and Research and Studies' and by striking out part B thereof.

"TITLE VII—UTILIZATION OF TELEVISION, RADIO, MOTION PICTURES, AND RELATED MEDIA FOR EDUCATIONAL PURPOSES

"Extension of program

"Sec. 701. Section 763 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by striking out 'six succeeding fiscal years' and inserting in lieu thereof 'nine succeeding fiscal years'.

"TITLE VIII—MISCELLANEOUS

"State administration

"Sec. 801. (a) Subparagraph (2) of section 1004(a) of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by inserting before the semicolon 'and will keep such records and afford such access thereto as the Commissioner may find necessary to assure the correctness and verifications of such reports'.

"(b) Subparagraph (3) of such section 1004(a) is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof '(including such funds paid by the State to the local educational agencies)'.

"Extension of statistical services program

"Sec. 802. Section 1009(a) of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by striking out 'six' and inserting in lieu thereof 'nine'.

"TITLE IX—ADDITIONAL TITLE

"Sec. 901. (a) The National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new title:

" 'TITLE XI—INSTITUTES

" 'Authorization of institutes

" 'Sec. 1101. There are authorized to be appropriated $32,750,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and each of the three succeeding fiscal years, to enable the Commissioner to arrange, through grants or contracts, with institutions of higher education for the operation by them of short-term or regular session institutes for advanced study, including study in the use of new materials, to improve the qualification of individuals—

" '(1) who are engaged in or preparing to engage in the teaching, or supervising or training of teachers, of history, geography, modern foreign languages, reading, or English in elementary or secondary schools,

" '(2) who are engaged in or preparing to engage in the teaching of disadvantaged youth and are, by virtue of their service or future service in elementary or secondary schools enrolling substantial numbers of culturally, economically, socially, and educationally handicapped youth, in need of specialized training; except that no institute may be established under this title for teachers of disadvantaged youth unless such institute will offer a specialized program of instruction designed to assist such teachers in coping with the unique and peculiar problems involved in the teaching of such youth,

" '(3) who are engaged as, or preparing to engage as, library personnel in the elementary or secondary schools, or as supervisors of such personnel, or

" '(4) who are engaged as, or are preparing to engage as, educational media specialists.

" 'Stipends

" 'Sec. 1102. Each individual who attends an institute operated under the provisions of this title shall be eligible (after application therefor) to receive a stipend at the rate of $75 per week for the period of his attendance at such institute, and each such individual with one or more dependents shall receive an additional stipend at the rate of $15 per week for each such dependent.'

"TITLE X—AMENDMENTS OF TABLE OF CONTENTS

"Sec. 1001. The table of contents of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended—

"(1) by striking out

" 'TITLE III—FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR STRENGTHENING SCIENCE, MATHEMATICS, AND MODERN FOREIGN LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION'

and inserting in lieu thereof

" 'TITLE III—FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR STRENGTHENING INSTRUCTION IN SCIENCE, MATHEMATICS, MODERN FOREIGN LANGUAGES, AND OTHER CRITICAL SUBJECTS',

"(2) by inserting after

" 'Sec. 504. Payments to States.'

the following:

" 'Sec. 505. Definitions.';

"(3) by striking out

" 'Part A—Centers and Research and Studies';

"(4) by striking out

" 'Part B—Language Institutes

" 'Sec. 611. Authorization.';

"(5) by inserting at the end thereof the following:

" 'TITLE XI—INSTITUTES

" 'Sec. 1101. Authorization of institutes.

" 'Sec. 1102. Stipends.'

"TITLE XI—FEDERALLY AFFECTED AREAS

"Amendments to Public Law 815

"Sec. 1101. (a) The first sentence of section 3 of the Act of September 23, 1950, as amended (20 U.S.C. 631–645), is amended by striking out '1965' and inserting in lieu thereof '1966'.

"(b) Subsection (b) of section 14 of such Act is amended by striking out '1965' each time it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof '1966'.

"(c) Paragraph (13) of section 15 of such Act is amended by inserting 'the District of Columbia,' after 'Guam,'

"(d) Paragraph (15) of section 15 of such Act is amended by striking out '1962–1963' and inserting in lieu thereof '1963–1964'.

"Amendments to Public Law 874

"Sec. 1102. (a) Sections 2(a), 3(b), and 4(a) of the Act of September 30, 1950, as amended (20 U.S.C. 236–244), are each amended by striking out '1965' each place where it appears and inserting in lieu thereof '1966'.

"(b) Section 9(8) of such Act is amended by inserting 'the District of Columbia,' after 'Guam,'.

"Comprehensive study

"Sec. 1103. The Commissioner of Education shall submit to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for transmission to the Congress on or before June 30, 1965, a full report of the operation of Public Laws 815 and 874, as extended by this Act, and his recommendations as to what amendments to such laws should be made if they are further extended."

And the House agree to the same.

Adam C. Powell,
Carl D. Perkins,
Edith Green,
John Brademas,
James Roosevelt,
Carlton R. Sickles,
Sam M. Gibbons,
John H. Dent,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Wayne Morse,
Pat McNamara,
Ralph Yarborough,
Joseph S. Clark,
Jennings Randolph,
Winston L. Prouty,
Jacob K. Javits,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 3060) to amend and extend the National Defense Education Act of 1958 and to extend Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress (federally affected areas), submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The House amendment strikes out all of the Senate bill after the enacting clause and inserts a substitute. The Senate recedes from its disagreement to the amendment of the House, with an amendment which is a substitute for both the Senate bill and the House amendment.

In most respects the substitute agreed upon in conference is like the House amendment. The differences between the House amendment and the substitute are noted in the following outline, except for incidental changes made necessary by reason of agreements reached by the conferees and minor and clarifying changes.

Extension of National Defense Education Act: The Senate bill extended the programs provided for in the National Defense Education Act of 1958 (hereinafter called the act) for 3 additional years beyond its persent expiration date of June 30, 1965. The House amendment extended the act for only 2 additional years. The substitute agreed upon in conference extends the act for 3 additional years.

Extension and amendment of Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress: The Senate bill extended Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, relating to construction and maintenance and operation of schools in federally affected areas, for 2 additional years and made such laws applicable to the District of Columbia. The House amendment extended these laws for 1 additional year. The conference substitute adopts the House position with respect to the extension of the acts, but adopts the Senate provisions with respect to the inclusion of the District of Columbia.

In including the District of Columbia under the Federal impact legislation (Public Laws 815 and 874) the conferees are well aware that Congress authorizes a Federal payment to the District from general revenues each year for governmental purposes in the District Appropriation Act. We also are aware that this payment is justified because of the large federally owned real estate holdings in the District which cannot be taxed for local purposes and because of other financial burdens imposed on the District government due to the fact that it is the location of the Nation's Capital. Nevertheless, we believe the District also should be included under the impact area laws and receive the educational benefits these programs provide. A number of cogent reasons may be given for this inclusion, chief of which is the fact that the District of Columbia is one of the most heavily impacted school districts in the Nation, as judged by the criteria in Public Law 815 and Public Law 874, and should be treated the same as every jurisdiction in the Nation.

It is the intention of the conferees that the Federal impact funds to be received by the District under Public Law 874 be used by the board of education solely for educational purposes, and that they be in addition to the funds made available for education in the District of Columbia budget. It also is the opinion of the conferees that insofar as is consistent with good educational administration, these funds be used to improve the quality and standards of the educational offerings in the underprivileged attendance areas of the city. The superintendent of schools is requested to report to the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and the House Committee on Education and Labor on the ways in which the availability of these funds during the year has improved the educational program for the children in the low income areas.

Amendments of title I: The House bill defines the term "school of nursing" and specifies that these schools will be considered as institutions of higher education for the purposes of the student loan title of the act. The Senate bill contained no similar provision. In retaining this provision in the conference substitute the conferees did not intend to make changes in existing laws. The inclusion of the definition is merely to insure the continuation of existing administrative practice.

Amendments of title II: The Senate bill authorized appropriations of $145,000,000 for the fiscal year 1965, $165,000,000 for the fiscal year 1966, $180,000,000 for the fiscal year 1967, and $195,000,000 for the fiscal year 1968 for carrying out title II of the act (relating to student loan programs).

The House bill authorized the appropriation of $163,300,000 for the fiscal year 1965, $179,300,000 for the fiscal year 1966, and $200,000,000 for the fiscal year 1967 for carrying out title II.

The conference substitute authorizes the appropriation of $163,300,000 for the fiscal year 1965, $179,300,000 for the fiscal year 1966, $190,000,000 for the fiscal year 1967, and $195,000,000 for the fiscal year 1968 for this purpose.

The Senate bill provided for special consideration in getting loans to "(A) students with a superior academic background who express a desire to teach in elementary or secondary schools, and (B) other students with a superior academic background." The House amendment provided for such special consideration for students with superior academic background. The conference substitute is like the House amendment; but in omitting the mention of persons expressing a desire to teach, the conferees do not wish to indicate any belief that the importance of obtaining teachers for the Nation's elementary and secondary schools has in any way lessened.

The Senate bill permitted institutions of higher education to make loans to part-time students who are carrying at least one-half the normal full-time academic load. The House amendment contained no similar provisions. The conference substitute adopts this provision of the Senate bill.

Amendments of title III: The Senate bill authorizes the appropriation of $90,000,000 for each fiscal year for grants to States to assist them to acquire certain equipment. The House amendment authorizes the appropriation of $70,000,000 per fiscal year for this program. The substitute agreed to in conference adopts the authorization in the Senate amendment. The Senate bill also authorizes the appropriation of $10,000,000 annually for State supervisory services and administration. The House authorized $5,000,000 annually for this purpose. The substitute is like the Senate bill.

The present law authorizes grants for the acquisition of equipment suitable for use in providing education in science, mathematics, or modern foreign language. The Senate bill broadened these categories to include history, civics, geography, English, or remedial reading.

The House amendment broadened these existing categories to include reading and English when taught to persons for whom English is a second language, and also authorized grants for the acquisition of wall maps and globes.

The substitute agreed upon in conference adopts the categories in the Senate provision, except that the House category of reading is included instead of the more limited category of remedial reading contained in the Senate bill.

The same differences existed between the Senate amendment and the House bill with respect to the categories in which assistance can be given for supervisory and related services. These differences are resolved in the same manner as the above.

Amendments of title IV: The Senate bill authorized the Commissioner of Education to award 5,000 fellowships for graduate study during the fiscal year 1965, 7,500 during the fiscal year 1966, and 10,000 during the fiscal years 1967 and 1968.

The House amendment authorized the Commissioner to award 3,000 such fellowships during the fiscal year 1965, 5,000 during the fiscal year 1966, and 6,500 during the fiscal year 1967.

The conference substitute authorizes the Commissioner of Education to award 3,000 fellowships for graduate study during 1965, 6,000 during fiscal year 1966, and 7,500 during fiscal years 1967 and 1968.

The Senate bill provides that of the fellowships to be awarded during a fiscal year not less than one-third of those to be awarded in fiscal years 1965 and 1966, and not less than 2,500 for each fiscal year thereafter, shall be awarded to persons who will study in new or expanded graduate programs approved by the Commissioner under section 403(a). The House amendment provides that for fiscal year 1965, 1,500 of the fellowships awarded must be for study in such new or expanded programs, and that thereafter one-third of such fellowships must be for study in such new and expanded programs. The conference substitute adopts the House provision in this instance.

Amendments of part A of title V: The Senate bill authorized the appropriations of $25,000,000 for the fiscal year 1965, $25,500,000 for the fiscal year 1966, $32,500,000 for the fiscal year 1967, and $37,500,000 for the fiscal year 1968 for carrying out part A of title V (relating to grants for State programs of guidance, counseling, and testing).

The House amendment authorized the appropriation of $23,500,000 for the fiscal year 1965 and the fiscal year 1966, and $28,500,000 for the fiscal year 1967 for this purpose.

The conference substitute authorizes the appropriation of $24,000,000 for the fiscal year 1965, $24,500,000 for the fiscal year 1966, and $30,000,000 for the fiscal years 1967 and 1968.

The Senate bill altered the present law to extend Federal assistance for State testing and guidance and counseling programs to all grades of elementary and secondary schools and to junior colleges and technical institutes. The present act allows Federal assistance only for testing and for guidance and counseling in the seventh and succeeding grades in elementary and secondary schools. The only change in the existing law made by the House amendment was to permit Federal assistance for guidance and counseling in all grades of elementary and secondary schools. The conference substitute follows the Senate bill.

The Senate bill also contained a provision, which was not in the House amendment, broadening the type of counseling and guidance which can be assisted to include advising students in their decisions as to the type of educational program they should pursue, the vocation they should train for and enter, and the job opportunities in the various fields. The conference substitute includes this provision.

Amendments of part B of title V: The Senate bill made several changes in part B of title V of the act which relates to counseling and guidance training institutes. The House amendment contained provisions for guidance and counseling institutes which were, with one exception, the same in substance as those contained in the Senate bill. However, the House provisions were included in a new title XI which grouped all types of institutes in one place. The exception is that under the Senate bill the institutes would be for individuals who are engaged, or are teachers preparing to engage in counseling and guidance of students in elementary or secondary schools or in institutions of higher education, including junior colleges and technical institutes. In contrast, the House amendment provided that the institutes would be for individuals who are engaged, or are preparing to engage in elementary or secondary schools as counseling and guidance personnel.

The conference substitute adopts the provisions of the Senate bill, except that where the Senate bill authorized the appropriation of $10,000,000 for each fiscal year, the substitute authorizes the appropriation of $7,250,000.

Amendments of title VI: The sums authorized to be appropriated were the same in the Senate bill and House amendment, except that the House amendment provided no such authorization for the fiscal year 1968 since it did not extend the program into that year. The conference substitute adopts the Senate authorization of $18,000,000 for the fiscal year 1968. For a description of the conference action with respect to part B of this title, see the discussion of the new title XI.

New title XI: The House amendment added a new title to the act which authorized the Commissioner to arrange with institutions of higher education for carrying out institutes for advanced study for persons in a number of specified fields. These fields included the two fields covered by existing law—that is, guidance and counseling and modern foreign language (including English when taught to persons for whom English is a second language). It then adds provisions for institutes for reading, and for teachers of disadvantaged youth in connection with specified types of schools, and librarians (and supervisors) in elementary or secondary schools. Since the guidance and counseling and modern foreign language institutes would be taken care of in this title, the House bill repealed part B of title V and part B of title VI.

The Senate amendment did not create a new title. Instead it provided for the continuation of the guidance and counseling institutes under title V, and broadened the permissible types of institutes in title VI. The new types of institutes were for school librarians and educational media specialists and for persons who engaged in or are preparing to engage in the teaching, or supervising or training of teachers, of history, civics, geography, English, or remedial reading.

The conference substitute, as has been described, retains the guidance and counseling institutes in part B of title V. The remainder of the institutes are authorized in the new title XI. The new title retains all the categories of institutes provided in the House amendment. In addition it includes educational media specialists and the categories of history, English, and geography from the Senate bill. In agreeing to the inclusion of geography, it is the understanding of the managers on the part of the House that that "geography" does not include the field of study known as geopolitics.

ADAM C. POWELL,
CARL D. PERKINS,
EDITH GREEN,
JOHN BRADEMAS,
JAMES ROOSEVELT,
CARLTON R. SICKLES,
SAM M. GIBBONS,
JOHN H. DENT,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. **POWELL**. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I come before you this afternoon to present a conference report on two of the most important educational measures to be considered before this body.

On August 14, the House passed by an overwhelming vote this bill to extend and amend the National Defense Education Act and Public Laws 815 and 874. Every Congressman present is well aware of the tremendous worth of these measures and the noteworthy achievements made possible in American education because of the Federal support given through these laws to State and local governments. The statement of the managers on the part of the House which was filed with the conference report clearly indicates that the conferees sincerely attempted to maintain to the greatest extent the provisions of the House-passed bill.

Little justification needs to be given at this point in defense of the tremendous worth of the student loan program of title II of the National Defense Education Act. More than 680,000 students have had the opportunity to utilize the resources of the funds provided in order to achieve a college or graduate education. Nearly one-half of these loans have provided the necessary financial assistance to young persons preparing to teach in our ever-expanding elementary and secondary schools. Approximately two-thirds of the loans have gone to prospective teachers or to students possessing superior academic ability or preparation in science, mathematics, engineering, or modern foreign languages.

The bill before you today would expand these opportunities to persons pursuing a life's work in the teaching of English, reading, history, and geography, as well. It would likewise give Federal support to the preparation of teachers working with disadvantaged youth, to librarians, guidance counselors, and educational media specialists. If we are to have a well rounded attack upon the problems of American life, we can no longer concentrate on science and mathematics and modern foreign languages, for who present would deny the fact that a strong democracy depends upon an enlightened citizenry which understands the concepts of our great American tradition and appreciates the expanding frontiers of our geographical pursuits. Our passage of the Economic Opportunity Act called attention most vividly to the tremendous need for personnel who could work understandably and sympathetically with the large numbers of disadvantaged youth in our midst.

Anyone who witnessed last week the excitement of the electronovision presentation of Shakespeare's Hamlet recognized the challenge the schools face in presenting vividly the literary and cultural heritage which is ours.

If we are to realistically face the problems of dropouts, we must revitalize our schools by providing expanded facilities and equipment to present the contents of the curriculum in a creative manner. In like manner, as one beholds with great astonishment the increasing numbers of students to be served by our schools on all levels, it is important that Federal funds be increased to provide fellowships, institutes, and other aids to those teaching or preparing to teach.

The conference report before you in most respects is like the House-passed bill. In summary the provisions include:

First. Extension of the National Defense Education Act for 3 additional years beyond its present expiration date of June 30, 1945.

Second. Extension and amendment of Public Laws 815 and 874 to include 1 additional year beyond its present expiration date of June 30, 1965, and to include the District of Columbia under the Federal impact legislation.

Third. Increase of the authorized appropriation for title II, student loans, to:
(a) $163.3 million for fiscal year 1965;
(b) $179.3 million for fiscal year 1966;
(c) $190.0 million for fiscal year 1967;
(d) $195.0 million for fiscal year 1968.

The amounts agreed to represent the House figures for fiscal years 1965 and 1966.

Fourth. In regard to title III, the agreed upon appropriation for the acquisition of equipment in teaching science, mathematics, modern foreign language, history, civics, geography, English, and reading was increased to $90 million as provided in the Senate bill. The conference report represents an extension agreed to on the basis of the broadened categories passed by both Houses. In view of the increased areas to be included, larger funds were agreed upon for the supervisory activities relating to this title.

Fifth. In reaching an agreement in regard to the number of fellowships to be awarded, the conferees agreed upon an average between the numbers adopted by the House and the Senate. Thus, the conference report recommends that the following awards be made: 3,000 for fiscal year 1965; 6,000 for fiscal year 1966; 7,500 for fiscal year 1967; 7,500 for fiscal year 1968. In determining the percentage of fellowships to be awarded to new or expanding programs the conference substitute adopted the House provision. The Senate receded in its recommendation that a special stipend of $4,800 be awarded to teachers who have had two or more academic years of teaching experience at a college or university.

Sixth. In regard to title V, the appropriations authorized for State programs in guidance counseling and testing represent a compromise figure between the House and Senate adopted measures of $24 million for 1965; $24.5 million for 1966; $30 million for 1967; $30 million for 1968. The guidance and counseling institutes provided in section B of title V in the Senate bill was retained but the authorization was reduced from $10 million as recommended by the Senate to $7,250,000.

Seventh. The Senate has receded also in regard to title X in their recommendation to include a formula under section 1009, the improvement of statistical services of State educational agencies. The House has likewise insisted on its language in the administration of these State plans under section 1004.

Eighth. The House's proposal to include institutes for teachers under one title prevailed except for the one instance of guidance and counseling services. This new title would include institutes for teachers of English, reading, history, geography, modern foreign languages, school librarians, and the educational media specialists. In agreeing to the inclusion of geography, it is the understanding of the managers on the part of the House that "geography" does not include the field of study known as geopolitics.

In reviewing the provisions of the conference report, it is clear that this bill is very similar to that which was reported by the Full Committee on Education and Labor and that the conferees have done all within their power to maintain to the greatest extent the will of the House.

I urge you, therefore, to agree to the conference report so that the children of America may move forward and that our dream for strength through education be more fully realized.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentlewoman from Oregon who has done such a remarkable job as the chairman of the subcommittee which handled this legislation and as the authoress of the National Defense Education Act section of the bill. I do not have enough words with which to compliment her for her very fine work in this field.

Mrs. **GREEN** of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the kind words of the chairman of the committee. It has been a pleasure to serve under his chairmanship for the past 4 years. Certainly all of the members of the committee and all of the conferees worked very hard in order to bring to the Members of the House this conference report today.

First of all, the conference report on the National Defense Education Act extends the legislation for a period of 3 years. It extends the Federal impact legislation for 1 year.

Mr. Speaker, let me briefly, if I may, outline the changes that occur in this particular legislation as this may answer some of the questions that various Members of the House have had during the course of the last several weeks.

First of all, in title I, in the general provisions, we clarify the language in regard to schools of nursing in the definition of institutions of higher education.

We also make it possible for student loans to be extended to nonprofit business schools and technical institutions.

In title II, which, in my opinion, is one of the most important parts of the legislation, we have extended the student loan program for 3 years. We have increased the appropriation from $135 million, which is the current authorization, to $163.3 million; to $179.3 million in 1966, then to $190 million in 1967, and to $195 million in 1968. We have also removed the $800,000 ceiling that has been placed on any single institution, so that all of the institutions, especially the largest ones may make the loans to all needy students who apply.

Mr. Speaker, besides removing the $800,000 ceiling, we have removed restrictions in the original bill which gave special preference to potential teachers or to those students who have a special aptitude in science, mathematics, or foreign languages. This means the loans under the National Defense Education Act will be available to any student whether he be a student of law, a student of education, or medicine, nursing, optometry, engineering, or social work, or some other field of study. There will be no preference except to students with outstanding academic backgrounds. All students will receive the same consideration and the amount of funds is sufficient and any needy able student who needs $1,000 at the undergraduate level or $2,500 at the graduate level should be able to receive that amount from the college or university of his choice.

We also have an additional provision that many of you have inquired about. That is, making loans available to part-time students if they are carrying one-half of the normal full-time workload.

We have another important provision in this title of the bill, an extension of the forgiveness feature. As you know, the present legislation provides forgiveness of 50 percent of the loan to teachers in the public, elementary, or secondary schools. Those of us on the subcommittee felt there was a great injustice or inequity as teachers in private schools were not included. We have provided that up to 50 percent of the loan may be forgiven for any teacher in a private school or for any teacher in an institution of higher education. This is at the rate of 10 percent for each year of teaching.

Mr. Speaker, under the loan provisions of the act, we have enabled 600,000 students in the United States to continue their education. Six hundred thousand students have borrowed under the National Defense Education Act since it was first enacted in 1959. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ELLIOTT] must feel very satisfied and very pleased with the results that have come from the legislation that he pioneered.

It should also be noted that the students have been repaying the loans under this title five times as fast as the law requires.

The Office of Education advised me a few weeks ago that there has been only one student who has been written off as a bad risk in all of the loans that have been made.

In title III of the bill for equipment and strengthening of instruction in certain areas, we have extended the areas beyond the three in the original bill—science, mathematics, and foreign languages. This title is now expanded to include **geography, history, reading,** English, and civics. Some of you have talked about English as a secondary language. This is certainly included when we include the category of English itself.

There was also a provision adopted on the floor when the bill came before the House, which said if the equipment was not being used in the specified areas it might be used in other areas in the schools rather than gathering dust in some corner. This is retained in the conference report.

In title IV of the bill—the Graduate Fellowship Program—we reached a compromise between the House and Senate versions. We have provided 3,000 fellowships for 1965; 6,000, in 1966; 7,500, in 1967; and 7,500, in 1968.

In this we have also maintained the provision that no fellowship can be awarded to those students who attend schools of divinity.

In title V, which pertains to the guidance and counseling and testing programs, the institutes for guidance and counseling personnel are retained. We have also increased the appropriations for testing. Under title V, part A, in the last 6 years $77 million has been spent in guidance and counseling and testing, and of the $77 million, $1.6 million has been spent on the testing; $73.8 million, or over 95 percent of all of the money, has been spent on local teacher salaries of those who are engaged in guidance and counseling work, and $1.5 million for supervisory personnel.

The guidance and counseling program has heretofore been extended only to secondary schools and seventh and eighth grades. It is my personal conviction that the most important time to give guidance and counseling is in the lower grades of the elementary schools. I am very glad that this program has been extended throughout the elementary school system. The Senate provision to extend the program into the junior colleges and technical schools has also been added. Title V, part B, is to be funded at the present amount—$7.25 million.

Title VI contains the program of language area studies and the conference report provides for an increase in the appropriation but with no other major changes.

May I go to title XI, where the other major changes are included. This is the training institutes program. In the House bill, the House included all institutes in title XI with no earmarking of funds. In the conference report we retained guidance and counseling institutes in title V because of a parliamentary situation that could not be solved, but all other institute programs are included in title XI. This, I believe, outside of the student loan program, is probably that part of the National Defense Education Act legislation that offers the most to strengthen the educational programs in the 50 States. We cannot underestimate the work that has been done in these institute programs in the fields of guidance and counseling and modern foreign languages.

The institute program has been extended to include not only the modern foreign language and the guidance and counseling but it also includes institutes in reading, history, geography, and English, and institutes for teachers of disadvantaged youth and for school library personnel, and also for educational media specialists.

We have provided, also, that the stipend may be paid to teachers in private schools as well as public school teachers who attend the institutes. This amounts to $75 a week plus $15 a week for each dependent. Extending the institute programs certainly broadens the legislation and puts as much emphasis on the humanities as we have previously placed on the physical sciences and mathematics.

I am particularly glad that we extended the institute program to include geography and history. In the kind of world in which we live, it is essential that the students in our elementary and secondary schools and colleges have a better understanding of the other countries of the world, their customs and cultures, an understanding of the problems that we face today. Therefore, may I repeat I was especially pleased when geography and history were restored in the conference report. This was included in my original bill.

The last part of the bill is the title which extends the Federal impact legislation for 1 year and also extends this Federal impact to include the District of Columbia. This is long overdue and we have been assured that other appropriations for the District schools will not be cut because this provision has been added. The District of Columbia schools are a major responsibility of this Congress and funds are urgently needed; schools need to be built; programs need to be expanded.

This legislation, in my judgment, will do a great deal to continue to strengthen the educational programs in this country and I urge the adoption of the conference report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished leader of the minority, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, could I ask the gentleman from New York whether he intends to yield the minority 30 minutes in total or somewhat less than that? I would think it would be customary to yield to the ranking Member on this side 30 minutes and have him divide that time among those who may request it of him. I yield to the gentleman from New York in order that he may answer.

Mr. POWELL. I will yield to the Speaker who speaks with much greater authority than I can.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time is within the control of the gentleman from New York and the matter of how much time he yields is within the discretion of the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. That comment by the Speaker comes as no surprise to me, Mr. Speaker. I again ask the gentleman from New York whether he intends to allow the minority 30 minutes of the time, and if so whether he would do it under the customary procedure of allowing the minority Member on this side to allocate that 30 minutes.

Mr. POWELL. In my 20 years in this House, it has been the customary procedure for the Member on the majority side handling a conference report to allot the time and I will yield time to the minority as the debate proceeds.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I am sorry that the gentleman from New York could not even answer my question directly.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Iowa makes the point of order that a quorum is not present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and forty-two Members are present, not a quorum.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 266]

Abbitt
Alger
Aspinall
Auchincloss
Avery
Bass
Becker
Berry
Brademas
Brock
Buckley
Burton, Calif.
Celler
Clawson, Del
Corbett
Corman
Curtin
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Denton
Derounian
Devine
Diggs
Dorn
Edmondson
Ellsworth
Finnegan
Flynt
Forrester
Gill
Grant
Gray
Griffiths
Hanna
Hardy
Healey
Hébert
Hoffman
Hull
Jones, Ala.
Kee
Kilburn
Landrum
Lankford
Leggett
Lesinski
McIntire
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Matsunaga
May
Meader
Michel
Miller, Calif.
Miller, N.Y.
Montoya
Morris
Morrison
Pelly
Pool
Reifel
Reuss
Rivers, Alaska
Rostenkowski
St. George
Schadeberg
Scott
Selden
Sheppard
Sikes
Smith, Calif.
Snyder
Stafford
Staggers
Sullivan
Talcott
Thompson, La.
Thompson, Tex.
Toll
Tupper
Vinson
Watson
Weltner
Wharton
Wilson, Charles H.
Wilson, Ind.
Younger

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). On this rollcall 342 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN].

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, when the point of no quorum was made I was saying that conferees who did not sign the conference report would not be given an opportunity to speak for a few minutes in respect to this conference report. I have it confirmed that the chairman of the full Committee on Education and Labor has refused a conferee the opportunity to speak on this bill. I regret very much he should have taken this action.

I should like to point out this was an unusual conference. There were 22 conferees on this bill. Fifteen of those conferees came from this body, 8 from the majority and 5 from the minority. No member of the minority signed the conference report. This, I might say, was not because we disapproved the basic objectives of the National Defense Education Act. Many of us were cosponsors of the original legislation.

However, as a conferee I feel very strongly that we had the position of the House to maintain in the conference, and on every point of significance concession was made to the point of view of the other body.

You will note that the statement of the managers on the part of the House said:

> In most respects the substitute agreed upon in conference is like the House amendment.

Of course, this is only one of those half truths. This is true only because there was no disagreement between the House and the Senate bills in many respects, but in the points of difference on almost every point the House yielded to the Senate. Simply look at the report of the managers on the part of the House if you want to see what I mean. On the first page, it states that the Senate provisions with respect to the inclusion of the District of Columbia were adopted. That was not in the House bill. The Senate bill broadened the type of counseling and guidance so as to include advising students as to decisions as to the purpose of the program they should follow.

In title VI, relating to new types of institutes, the language used by the Senate was adopted.

With respect to the inclusion of equipment for the teaching of history, English, and civics, the provisions of the Senate bill were adopted and, most importantly, the very significant provisions for federally controlled teacher institutes in English, history, and geography were included, those provisions being suggested by the Senate. We were very concerned that this broadening might well involve too great a participation by the Federal Government in very sensitive areas. It was suggested during the conference that we needed an updating of the teaching of history so that we could have a more modern approach with respect to some of our historical background. If the Federal Government should involve itself directly in the teaching of history with the power to influence the content of these courses, we may very well have the kind of participation by the Federal Government that most of us deplore.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. QUIE. The gentleman will recall in conference the statement of one of the conferees that we needed the institute program for history because we have been teaching it wrong in the past. He said when we studied Civil War history in school we learned that it was fought over the slavery question, but really this was a question of the workers throwing off the yoke of the employer. You can see the philosophy of economic determinism coming up right there.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN].

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, at the outset, may I ask if I understood correctly that I have been yielded only 4 minutes? I thought it was to be 5 minutes.

Mr. POWELL. That is true, but we ran out of time due to the number of conferees that wanted to speak, so we had to cut down on the time allotted each individual.

Mr. GRIFFIN. So then it looks as though the minority will be allotted about 20 minutes out of the hour.

Mr. Speaker, I think the ranking minority Member, the gentleman from New Jersey, has described well the general results of the conference. Whether or not a conferee agrees with a position taken by the House, he is charged when he is appointed as a conferee with the responsibility of representing the House in the conference. I had always thought there should be at least some degree of insistence by House conferees in a conference upon the House position.

I would like to have any Member among the majority conferees get up and say that there was any real insistence on their part upon the House position on any major point of difference.

I should like to focus attention particularly upon title XI which deals with institutes to teach teachers how to teach certain subjects. Many of the Members probably believe that the funds provided in this bill are channeled through the States and that the States are able to determine, to some degree at least, how the funds are to be spent. This is not true with respect to title XI which establishes institutes to teach teachers how to teach.

Under this title, the Commissioner of Education in the Federal Department of Health, Education, and Welfare makes contracts directly with the universities that he selects to set up the institutes to teach teachers how to teach. Originally these institutes were limited to the sciences, mathematics, and modern foreign languages.

Originally, it was the philosophy of the National Defense Education Act that the Federal Government should temporarily strengthen instruction in the areas of math, science, and foreign languages with the idea that the Federal involvement in this limited area of the curriculum would be phased out. Instead of following through with that philosophy, the legislation now before us will extend Federal involvement into the social sciences.

Consider the situation where several universities are competing for a contract to set up an institute to teach teachers how to teach history, geography—and, of course, civics was included in the Senate bill and one of the conferees from the other body said that economics would be included in it next time—suppose one of the universities is dominated in its social science department by rightwingers, and another university by leftwingers, the Commissioner of Education, under this bill, will decide which university will get the contract to teach teachers how to teach the social sciences.

To those who are concerned about Federal control of education, let me warn that we are moving toward the worst kind of Federal control of education—control of the curriculum.

Frankly, we would be better off with a general Federal aid program, which made grants to the States. At least the Federal control would be indirect in that kind of a situation.

Mr. Speaker, I was one of the original sponsors of the National Defense Education Act. I was one of those who developed and sponsored the student loan program which has been such an outstanding success. I favor and strongly support most of the bill that is before us today.

But I believe strongly that the House should insist upon its position with respect to titles III and XI. Therefore, I urge adoption of the recommittal motion that will be offered.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure at this time to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE].

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, the National Defense Education Act is supported by most of us and the impact aid also has the support of most of the Members of this House.

However, when we consider this legislation, let us bear in mind that there is one potentially dangerous provision that we struck from the bill in the House, in the amendment stage, but it is back in again when the Senate provisions were accepted.

Now, how can we say that the subject matters of history, geography, civics, and literature can be dangerous? I think it is dangerous when the Federal Government can influence the subject matter and the course content in these subjects. This is what the bill permits by the language in the conference report. The institutes are set up to retrain teachers. The Federal Government now finances the research into the new type of teaching of subject matter through the cooperative research program. When they choose the institutions that teach the history, the geography and the literature the way they want it done, then they can influence the way our young people will learn these subjects.

There was no way, under the parliamentary procedure, for us to put a barrier between the Federal Government and the institutions and teachers themselves. Some barrier must be put there to prevent Federal direction.

I have received a telegram from the commissioner of education in Minnesota, who is also concerned about this problem. He suggests that at least State department of education approval ought to be necessary for any plan from an institution of higher education before an institute program is set up.

You have seen the manner in which math is being taught, and the change occurring in the teaching of math. I imagine you cannot understand how your children are studying their math, because it is so different. This can happen in respect to history. You may not even recognize the history being taught to tomorrow's students, if this goes through. Math is an exact science. The recent changes do not bother us in the Congress. It bothers some people who are teaching math. It bothers some mathematicians in the country. If the people who are teaching the new math now are incorrect, and this is standardized across the country, the country might suffer, which I doubt, since it is an exact science, but history, geography, and literature are not exact sciences and therefore it is more important that they are protected from Federal influence.

We are treading on dangerous ground. I believe it would be better for us to accept the motion to recommit, so that these subject matters may be left out of the National Defense Education Act for another year, which would permit the Congress to look at this area and to make certain that Federal direction will not happen.

The people who have been promoting Federal aid for a long time at least have said that they opposed Federal control. Here we would be opening the door.

Some people have said, "Let us at least permit these subject matters to come in, and if there is control we will change that later." I say we will not be able to change it later on, because those whose philosophy is given assistance from the Federal Government will be in here pushing as hard as they can to protect their ability to have their ideas put forth in the teaching of these subjects.

If we want a diversity of education and freedom of education in this country, then the motion to recommit which the gentleman from New York is going to offer should be adopted.

In the area of equipment as well, the motion to recommit would drop these subject matters. Here again, if we continue with the categorical aid approach we can see how Federal influence and Federal direction could occur in the schools.

One of the reasons why there are proposals for broadening the categories is that the administrators say there is an overemphasis now. There is special treatment for the teachers of science, math, and modern foreign languages in the schools they say. They want that treatment for other subject matters. When only certain categories are added, the criticism is not remedied. There should not be any categories, if we are going to expand the equipment title and if the motion to recommit does not prevail I believe it is imperative that as soon as possible National Defense Education Act should be liberalized to permit the acquisition of equipment for the teaching of any academic subject. In the institute title, if the motion does not prevail, I believe we ought to then change the law as soon as possible to channel the funds through the State departments of education in order that institutes may be held for any academic subject and therefore set up the State departments of education as a barrier between the institutions of higher education and the U.S. Commissioner of Education and prevent Federal direction.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my brother from New York [Mr. GOODELL], 4 minutes.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, first I should like to point out what the motion to recommit will involve. It will be a motion to recommit, offered by me, to instruct the conferees to strike out the words "history," "civics," and "geography," and to limit the word "English" to the English language arts.

The same type of effect will obtain in both the institute program for teaching the teachers how to teach and the equipment section of the National Defense Education Act.

In addition to that, my recommittal motion will provide for a 2-year extension of the impact legislation, rather than for the 1-year extension in the conference report.

Those are the two major effects of the motion to recommit with instructions. I am confident that if the motion is adopted we can get a bill back to the floor in a very, very short time.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODELL. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. QUIE. Many of my colleagues, as well as people in the field of education, have shown an interest in English. They have felt that when the House passed the bill providing only for assistance in reading it did not go far enough. By having it refer to English language arts, we would add these parts of English to reading linguistics, comprehension, composition, and grammar.

These are methods and ways of instructing in English, but it leaves out literature. When you get into literature, you come into a controversial area. That is why history, civics, and geography are dropped out in the motion to recommit. By listing English language art, it amounts to dropping out the literature part of it.

Mr. GOODELL. In effect, what we are saying in the recommittal motion and instructions is that the Federal institutes have no business going into the question of literature and poetry and how it should be taught in schools and have no business of going into the question of history and how it should be taught. As the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] has pointed out in an exchange with the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN], in the conference one of the conferees did make the point that we should have these institutes for teachers because we have been teaching history about the Civil War wrong. In history as it has been taught up to now, he said, too much emphasis has been given to the question of slavery as the cause of the Civil War. What business is it, I ask you, of the Federal Government and Federal institutes to tell teachers around this country how they should teach history? It is a very dangerous move that we are making in this direction.

I would also emphasize that even if—and I say even if—the recommittal motion is adopted and the conferees should refuse to go along with the instructions, both the National Defense Education Act and the Impacted Areas Act extend through next June 30. We will be back in session, in other words, before they lapse. There is, however, no reason whatsoever why the conferees could not go back into conference immediately and adopt the bill as instructed in the recommittal motion. I urge all Members to vote to instruct the conferees in the manner of the recommittal motion so that we can stop right now this attempt to convert the National Defense Education Act into a general aid to education bill with controls from Washington.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I will be happy to yield 4 minutes to the last objector on the minority side, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Findley].

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, on several occasions direct proposals for general aid to education have been before Congress and each time they have been stymied in committee. This legislation illustrates the back or side door approach which accomplishes general aid to education by small stealthy steps.

It is done in the name of national defense, a term that too often is treated as a sacred cow precluding any scrutiny or amendment.

If we accept the idea that history, reading, and geography are directly related to national defense, then there is no limit to how far this program can be broadened and thus very quickly become a complete general aid to education program.

The only argument made in behalf of adding these institutes has been the financial need of local units. No argument was advanced in an effort to relate these studies directly to national defense. These institutes have no proper part in a national defense program. If we accept this legislation, we open the gate for general aid to education program which inevitably brings with it the Federal controls many of us fear so much.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINDLEY. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. QUIE. I thank the gentleman for yielding in order to point out that this is a more dangerous way of granting what turns out to be practically general aid to education than if we had broad general aid with no direction at all and no categories. It also should be pointed out that this bill, and I am willing to accept it, greatly expands National Defense Education Act. We accepted the change that was in the Senate bill such as to expand the guidance and counseling to the colleges to add education media specialists, English language arts and many others. We ask in the area of major controversy in sensitive subjects that they be dropped from the legislation this year. We can expect the Senate might look at this favorably, because there was no real effort made by the House conferees to get the Senate to accept the House point of view on the institutes or the equipment title as related to these categories. I think we can expect that this bill could be reported back quickly and passed this year. But, as pointed out by the gentleman from New York, this would mean that we would not be in danger of hurting the program if this did not happen because early next year we can pass the legislation, if we cannot do it this year. The present law carries on as do the appropriations until next year. I think the action that we take this afternoon is going to point the Federal direction in education more than anything that has been done since the time general aid to elementary and secondary schools was considered on Calendar Wednesday, just a few years ago.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINDLEY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to emphasize two points. One, that those of us who are speaking, particularly Mr. Quie, Mr. Frelinghuysen, Mr. Griffin, and myself on this side, have been active supporters of the National Defense Education Act. We believe in this legislation. We have supported and helped to develop the expansion in this program as far as student loans and the other good aspects are concerned, particularly with reference to mathematics, science, and foreign language.

The difference comes, however, when they place into this legislation literature, history, civics and geography, areas where there can be tremendous controversy. And they have not inserted any guidelines or standards to keep us from Federal control. They do not involve the States.

I would also emphasize, as my second point, that we extend in this recommittal motion with instructions the impact legislation for 2 years, because we feel that this legislation should be extended so the school boards will have ample warning of what is going to happen in this field.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished ranking Member on my side, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. Perkins], who has done so much in this field.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, when the House and Senate approve this conference report, it will be a great day for American boys and girls. I am surprised to hear the gentlemen on the minority side yell "Federal control" and drag out this old tired bogeyman which is simply a flimsy strategy to defeat good legislation. Especially am I surprised since they say they have been supporting the National Defense Education Act as it applied to science, mathematics, and modern foreign languages. The categories we have added—history, geography, civics, and English will lessen Federal control because it will give the States greater freedom in strengthening those courses of instruction where the need in the local situation is the greatest.

The provisions of the National Defense Education Act providing funds for equipping science, modern foreign language, and mathematics programs in the schools has had a substantial impact on increasing educational opportunities throughout the Nation. As critical as the needs of our Nation were, in 1958 and in subsequent years, for technical and scientific manpower, I have never felt that the welfare of this Nation was best served by ignoring other categories of instruction in our schools. It is obvious that the effectiveness of our educational programs in English, reading, history, and geography have a direct effect on the ability of our school systems to fulfill all of our national educational needs.

I can assure my friends across the aisle that no one is more sympathetic with granting longer extension for Public Laws 815 and 874 than I am. In fact, if pages 17822 through 17826 of the Congressional Record of August 3, 1964, are referred to it will be seen that I urged at that time at least a 2-year extension of this program. At the same time, I inserted in the Record a summary of entitlements for the States under these programs and the tremendous importance of the impacted legislation in a great number of congressional districts. However, no one here should have any doubt whatsoever about the effect of the motion to recommit with these instructions. I can assure my colleagues that the Senate conferees have given every indication that a recommittal under such circumstances will simply mean that any further treatment of either the National Defense Education Act or the impacted areas legislation will have to await the 89th Congress.

Moreover, it should be recalled that the extension of Public Laws 815 and 874 considered by the House in connection with H.R. 11904 on August 14 was pursuant to House Resolution 852 of the House Committee on Rules which stated:

> It shall be in order to consider, without the intervention of any point of order, the text of the bill (H.R. 12363) to extend Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress (federally affected areas), for 1 year until June 30, 1966, as an amendment to the bill.

Mr. Speaker, only a few weeks ago, in August, and last week in conference, I voted the proxy of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Gibbons], along with myself, and if the minority conferees had been sincere then in support of a 2-year extension they could have obtained a 2-year extension last week in conference. However, they did not see fit to go along with a 2-year extension just last week in conference.

I want to make this observation: Right here at the end of the Congress, and knowing just how the conferees of the Senate feel about this measure and how the House conferees feel, there will not be any getting together, there will not be any meeting of minds. If the House fails to approve the conference report, the Members of the House can rest assured that the impacted areas bill will expire on June 30, 1965. As a result, the school people and the districts that are affected throughout the Nation will not have any certainty about just what will be the future. We certainly need to extend this bill for which provision is made in the conference report until June 30, 1966.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield, since he has made some inference with reference to the minority?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. QUIE. I would like to put the Record straight. Does the gentleman from Kentucky recall when we had a conference outside the meeting of the House, that I offered the motion to make it provide for a 2-year extension of the impacted areas bill? I offered it and as I recall I had good support from the minority side.

Mr. PERKINS. Let me say to the gentleman from Minnesota was I not the one who offered the motion that it be a 2-year period?

Mr. QUIE. No; I believe the gentleman is incorrect.

Mr. PERKINS. Well, how many Members on your side voted for the 2-year extension proposal?

Mr. QUIE. Five.

Mr. PERKINS. I do not accept that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Albert). The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee which handled the legislation involving Public Laws 874 and 815, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Dent].

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, since the question of impact legislation has come up, I believe it is important that the Members of the House understand exactly what is happening in this impact area legislation.

Mr. Speaker, the impact area legislation has climbed in the last 4 years from $269 to $390 million.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what is happening? There are certain areas of this country that are impacted physically by installations of the Government but which are not receiving impacted aid. Other districts within the Nation that are impacted physically by the persons who work in these particular institutions or Government installations are receiving aid.

For instance, Mr. Speaker, we have the condition that exists in the city of Los Angeles, where we just attended a public hearing. The city of Los Angeles misses coming within the act by four-tenths of 1 percent, simply because in drafting the act it was stated that all school districts that had less than 35,000 people in the school district would be impacted if they had a 3-percent impaction.

But all that had over 35,000 pupils would be impacted only if they had a 6-percent impact. The city of Los Angeles with 5.6 percent was denied any impacted area money when they only lacked four-tenths of 1 percent of arriving at the 6-percent impact.

On top of that there has been another evil, as I call it, creeping into this situation. When the legislation started out it started out in an honest effort to aid districts that were injured by Federal impact. Now we have 13 States that take credit for some of the money, as high as 55 percent of the money that is paid by the Federal Government to the school district. The State denies the school district that much money from State funds that are expended for public education. So, in truth you have a situation where 13 States are taking impact moneys from the Treasury of the United States and putting it into the general education fund for all of the school districts, impacted or not.

We are anxious to preserve the impacted area legislation for the districts that qualify as Congress intended them, and in so doing we are asking that this legislation be extended for only 1 year, which gives us practically a 2 fiscal year extension because it does not run out until 1965 under the present law. During that time we hope to come to the House with reforms that will give the House a clear-cut picture of exactly what is happening under the impacted area bill. We do not expect to come before the House to deny aid where it is needed, nor do we expect to come in with any reform that would destroy the present school systems receiving aid under the law. We hope to make it more equitable for the school districts now being denied this assistance where they need it. I assure you we have nothing in mind in the 1-year extension except to come before the House with legislation we can defend under any circumstances. I say to you that a close examination of the operation of the law as it is now written would make it difficult for any Member of the House to defend the act as it now is. Therefore those of you 306 Members of this House who have school districts within their districts that need to receive this money would take good advice, I assure you, from a friend in court who is standing before you now, to accept a 1-year extension rather to accept the fake proposal for a 2-year extension by insincere people who would deny all aid under impacted legislation.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. I yield to the gentlewoman from Oregon.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. First, I want to congratulate the gentleman from Pennsylvania who has jurisdiction over this Federal impact legislation. In working with the District of Columbia, is it not true you have been able to work out an arrangement so that if the District of Columbia is included in this, as I hope it will be, the funds will not be cut in some other bill? This will be additional money for desperately needed educational programs and there is assurance that this Federal impact money will go to those schools that need the money most, and not in the most affluent sections of the city?

Mr. DENT. The gentlewoman is right. I fought inclusion of the District of Columbia in the impact bill simply because after a personal inspection of the schools in this district I was not convinced, nor could I believe, because I could not get word from those in charge of the schools in this area, that they would allocate this money to the needy schools. At this time we have the word from those concerned that any moneys will be used for the benefit of the underprivileged districts that now exist within the District of Columbia.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Thompson].

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, this is a particularly interesting performance today. The history of the National Defense Education Act is known to all of us. It is the primary pride and responsibility of two distinguished Members from Alabama, the senior Senator, and Representative Carl Elliott. It is also the product of innumerable hours of work and great interest on the part of a large number of members of the Committee on Education and Labor, on the list of whom is the distinguished gentlewoman from Oregon, and others.

There have been great contributions made by Representatives Frelinghuysen, Quie, Goodell, and other Members on the Republican side of the aisle. The fact of the matter is, as everyone knows, that the National Defense Education Act was passed as a very happy but spontaneous response to sputnik. I have said many times that it reflected a desire on the part of the American people to manufacture through the act instant mathematicians, scientists, and linguists, but it neglected then, and I spoke about it then and I speak about it now, the all-important fields in the humanities.

Support from the other side on this effort, this incredible effort, would mean that the Members of this body want to go back to the day when anyone who could read without moving his lips was suspect. I defy anyone to say and to prove what danger there is in improving the teaching of literature, of the English language, of history, of civics, and of geography. I defy anyone to say that the emphasis must and should still be an emphasis on mathematics, science, and modern foreign languages. This is perfectly absurd. Of course it is a reflection of what is going on in the country today. Anyone who can read and write is a suspicious character.

The fact is that this is a great and a wonderful act. It should have included all of the humanities to begin with, all of the subjects which are being talked about. They should have been included to begin with, and if they had, despite some of the Members of this body who rant and rave about the dangers of teaching people, the Nation would be richer for that.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. Gibbons], a member of the subcommittee, who has made a great contribution to the work of this committee.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I have listened attentively to all of the debate on this subject. The debate today sort of reminds me of one of the election-year jokes I hear going around, when one candidate asked, "How many States do you intend to carry?" and he comes back sharply and says, "All 13 of them." That is about how modern some of the thinking has been on education here today.

Ninety-nine percent of this bill and the good in this bill is noncontroversial. Let us just talk practically, for a little while, about what is supposed to be so bad in this bill.

First of all, we are told that it is bad and it is Federal interference in education and it is going to hurt somebody real bad if we give the people who are teaching English some modern tools to teach English with, or if we give some modern equipment to people who are going to teach geography. I am talking about equipment, such things as maps, globes, overhead projectors, all those nasty things you think will influence some tender mind and put some doctrine in it that we in Congress want to pass off on them. We know that is utterly and completely ridiculous.

Second, what is the really horrible, bad thing, the Federal interference in this bill? We are talking about people going to institutes to upgrade themselves a little bit.

We are not talking about first, second, or third graders. Neither are we talking about high school students or intermediate students or even college students. We are talking about people who have a college degree going to an institute to try to bring up to date and to upgrade the training that they had in college, which sometimes might have been 20 or 30 years ago or in some cases just a few years ago. But all of us know, who have kept in touch, that there are now 50 States and not just 13 States and we know that this world is changing and that this Nation is changing. I submit to you that there is no reason in the world why we cannot let these college graduates go to a voluntary institute where they are not forced to go, where they can have an opportunity to be taught by other intelligent people so that they can update themselves in the area of their own specialty. That is the scare talk that is being thrown into this debate. That is the scare talk that is being thrown against this bill. That is all their argument amounts to—that equipment is going to influence these young, tender people that they are going to be influenced by these projectors and maps and slides. Yes, they might show a country red on a map, but I submit to you that all the talk we have heard here today is baseless scare talk.

This bill is a good bill. It does many fine things for education. It does many fine things for this Nation. It should be adopted in toto. I submit that we will move our country ahead and we will move the world ahead if we look at education today in a rational sense and not in an antiquated sense or in the same sense that we looked at years and years ago when there were no public schools and when very few people had any education at all. We are living in a modern, competitive age. This bill has no Federal influence in it that should scare anybody off.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mr. Natcher). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Labor and also a member of the Subcommittee on Education, the gentleman from California [Mr. Roosevelt] 5 minutes.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I think it becomes obvious that the gentlemen on my left did not get the kind of conference report they wanted and that they are now accusing the Members on this side of the aisle that we did not fight hard enough for what they wanted and that therefore the conference report is no good. Therefore, my friends, it becomes obvious that what we did on our side was to probe as deeply as we could in our conference with the Members of the other body as to where they would stand firm and where they would give. We have come up with what I think is a workable bill and a defensible bill, and a bill that carries out the basic purposes of the National Defense Education Act in the most intelligent manner that could be arrived at in conference.

I want to say one thing as clearly as I can say it. The proposed recommittal motion of the minority would mean, if it were adopted, my friends, that we would not have the impact area legislation in effect on next June 30 when it expires. It is just as plain and as simple as that. In other words, they know, and if they do not know, they should know it, that we do not have a chance to work up in a conference any bill that could be enacted in this session of the Congress. That would mean that when we met next year, this whole matter would come up and it would be completely controversial. All of these impacted area districts would have no way to plan and no way to know what to do. So when June 30 came around, Public Laws 815 and 874 would probably be out of business and we would have no impacted area districts knowing where to move.

So if you want your impacted area districts to be able to plan and to be able to move ahead in the next year, and we all know what the planning involves, the only way to do it is to adopt this conference report now so as to assure yourselves you are going to have that impacted area support in your districts.

May I also say just one word about this claim that we are trying to bring about Federal interference in matters of history and geography.

Let me point out to my good friends that, quite contrary to the letter you have before you, there is nothing about civics in the part of the bill dealing with equipment. That is restricted very definitely to geography and history, and that was worked out in conference.

My friends, in all honesty, would you not want your children to be taught by people who are the best trained in these very important changing subjects which make up such a part of a rounded education today? I believe you would. I believe you also know, if you understand the National Defense Education Act bill at all, that the Federal Government does not pick out the institutes. The Federal Government in no way tries to put in its philosophy, if it has one. It cannot do so under existing law or under the bill as now before you. These institutes are approved by the States and not by the Federal Government.

It becomes obvious, therefore, that the hobgoblin or the scare item raised on the other side is nothing but that. All we are trying to do is to make certain that when these subject matters are taught they be taught by the best trained people we can possibly help to get trained and that they have the best equipment available so that the modern techniques of learning may be applied.

One of my friends on the other side asked whether I could understand how my child was taught mathematics. I have to admit I do not, but I also say that I hope my child is not going to be taught geography the way I was taught geography.

In all of these matters we are not talking about content, but we are talking about training and we are talking about equipment to do the job.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. The equipment likewise is selected by the local school boards in the States and not by the Federal Government; is that correct?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. The gentleman is absolutely correct. In other words, there is no Federal interference involved. I would not be for this bill if there were Federal interference in the bill of any kind.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Is it not true that the more restrictions there are on the curriculum the more control there is, so that as we expand the curriculum we reduce the control?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

My friends, I can say in summary what you have been given and asked to vote for today is merely a proposal to make the National Defense Education Act modern, up to date, and at the same time to preserve the impact area bills which mean so much to so many people of this House.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remainder of the time.

Mr. Speaker, this matter has been under consideration under the chairmanship of the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. Green] for 2 years. This is no hodgepodge, last-minute bill we are bringing before you from the conference. In fact, nearly everything in the conference report bill was passed upon by the Committee on Education and Labor.

We have received not one single telegram nor one letter from anywhere in this Nation against this act.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I ask unanimous consent to include a representative cross section of communications from outstanding educators of this Nation from nearly every single State of the Union—north, south, east, and west—in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

NEW ORLEANS, LA.,
July 23, 1964.

Congressman ADAM CLAYTON POWELL,
Chairman, House Committee on Education and Labor, Washington, D.C.:

As the chairman of our State association of 15 college English department chairmen and as the vice president of the Louisiana Council of Teachers of English, which embraces nearly 800 English teachers, I hope that your committee will recommend a 2-year extension of the National Defense Education Act plus the inclusion of English under provisions of title 3 for the sake of our profession and education everywhere.

CRESAP S. WATSON,
Louisiana State University.

STEVENS POINT, WIS,
July 22, 1964.

Representative ADAM C. POWELL,
Chairman, House Education and Labor Committee, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

Science and technology are beginning to receive the understanding and support they have long deserved however we need to also understand and support the needs that exist in the humanities and the social sciences. I urge that consideration be given these vital areas in the discussions and deliberations of your committee as you consider extending the National Defense Education Act specifically that English be included in order that institutions such as ours might be able to purchase equipment for summer institutes and other programs designed to improve the teaching of English. I will be happy to supply additional comment if more support is needed.

JAMES H. ALBERTSON,
President, Wisconsin State University.

SAN MARCOS, TEX,
July 23, 1964.

Hon. ADAM C. POWELL,
Chairman, House of Representatives Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.:

Recommend earnest consideration inclusion of English studies in extension of National Defense Education Act proposed in H.R. 11904 title 3.

RALPH HOUSTON.

MIAMI, FLA.,
July 24, 1964.

Representative ADAM C. POWELL,
Chairman, House Committee on Education and Labor, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.:

The Dade County Classroom Teachers Association earnestly urges your favorable consideration of H.R. 11904 which incorporates desperately needed improvements in the present National Defense Education Act. We respectfully ask your support and affirmative vote of this bill to help improve the teaching professions desire to set higher standards for educating America's children.

PAT L. TORNILLO, Jr.,
Executive Secretary, Dade County Classroom Teachers Association.

KIRKSVILLE, MO.,
July 23, 1964.

Hon. ADAM C. POWELL,
U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.:

Public school welfare demands approval of English institutes as proposed by Representative GREEN under National Defense Education Act.

LOREN V. GRISSOM.

SAN RAFAEL, CALIF.,
July 24, 1964.

Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.:

Earnestly request your approval of H.R. 11904 with inclusion of English under title III. Would be strong impetus to improving the teaching of English.

JAMES L. PIERCE.

SANTA ROSA, CALIF.,
July 25, 1964.

ADAM CLAYTON POWELL,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.:

I understand hearings on extension of National Defense Education Act programs in English are scheduled. Teachers of English in central California and their students strongly urge favorable consideration.

DOUGLAS CAMPBELL, *President,*
Central California Council of Teachers of English.

CINCINNATI, OHIO,
July 23, 1964.

ADAM C. POWELL,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.:

I strongly urge National Defense Education Act expansion to include features outlined in H.R. 11904.

RAY A. YOUNG, *Superintendent,*
Greenhills Forest Park City Schools.

CONCORD, CALIF.,
July 27, 1964.

ADAM C. POWELL,
Chairman, Select Subcommittee on Education, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.:

I strongly urge that you include English in the National Defense Education Act. Being formulated.

Respectfully.

DICK WORTHEN, *Chairman,*
Curriculum Study Commission.

ST. LOUIS, ILL.,
July 23, 1964.

Hon. ADAM C. POWELL,
U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.:

Inclusion of English urgent in H.R. 11904, extension of National Defense Education Act of 1958.

GLADYS R. STEINMAN.

TALLAHASSEE, FLA.,
August 4, 1964.

Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL,
U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.:

Please vote in favor of H.R. 11904 to expand National Defense Education Act or the Senate version passed Saturday. We in social studies education feel that there is nothing more important in terms of America's future than developing citizens capable of handling 20th century problems. To do this we need teacher institutes, materials for students, and leadership support. I would appreciate having your reaction.

R. J. SKRETTING,
Florida State University.

ALBANY, N.Y.,
July 23, 1964.

Hon. ADAM C. POWELL,
Chairman, Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.:

H.R. 11904 most important improvement to National Defense Education Act. Additional teachers program, increase in student loan, and guidance in public elementary school are significant advances. Urge your favorable consideration.

CLAYTON B. ROSE,
New York State Teachers Association.

NEW ORLEANS, LA.,
July 27, 1964.

Congressman ADAM CLAYTON POWELL,
Chairman, House Committee on Education and Labor, Washington, D.C.:

After several years as chairman, freshman English, in large integrated urban State college, convinced of need to include English under title 3 of National Defense Education Act. Extension reason acute shortage of trained teachers available.

GEORGE REINCKE,
Louisiana State University.

BALTIMORE, MD.,
August 5, 1964.

Hon. ADAM C. POWELL,
Chairman, Committee on Education and Labor, Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on successful committee action under your leadership on H.R. 11904. Urge continued efforts for prompt and favorable congressional action on the expanded National Defense Education Act.

EDYTHE D. MYERS,
Baltimore Public Schools.

VALLEJO, CALIF.,
July 30, 1964.

Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL,
Washington, D.C.:

I urge you to include English in the new National Defense Education Act.

JANE F. JONES.

TALLAHASSEE, FLA.,
August 4, 1964.

Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL,
U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.:

In the interest of developing more effective citizens please aid the teachers of social studies by an affirmative vote for H.R. 11904. Expanded scholarships institutes to update teachers and materials for the classroom are essential to improving the schools contribution to social studies education.

H. D. JACKSON,
Florida State University.

TALLAHASSEE, FLA.,
August 4, 1964.

Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL,
U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.:

As a teacher interested in the future of our country I ask that you vote in favor of H.R. 11904 to extend the National Defense Education Act support to the social studies. Our children need materials and skills in the social studies to match their knowledge in the sciences.

GIFFORD G. HALE,
Florida State University.

IOWA CITY, IOWA,
July 23, 1964.

Hon. ADAM C. POWELL,
U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.:

Have observed over 20 English institutes. Convinced they are best thing yet for training of high school English teachers. Strongly support inclusion of English in H.R. 11904.

JOHN C. GERBER,
University of Iowa.

LEXINGTON, VA.,
July 23, 1964.

Hon. ADAM CLAYTON POWELL,
House Committee on Education and Labor, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.:

Respectfully urge passage of H.R. 11904 amending the National Defense Education Act of 1958.

SEVERN DUVALL,
Washington and Lee University.

Milwaukee, Wis.,
July 23, 1964.

Hon. Adam Powell,
Chairman, House Committee on Education and Labor, Washington, D.C.:

I should like to register strong support of myself and colleagues for H.R. 11904 amending the 1958 National Defense Education Act to include English in title III and title XI.

G. W. Dunleavy,
University of Wisconsin.

Carson City, Nev.,
July 27, 1964.

House Committee on Education and Labor,
U.S. Congress,
Washington, D.C.:

Urge consideration and action to extend National Defense Education Act through H.R. 11904. Act has resulted in upgrading competencies of counselors and guidance services in Nevada schools.

Frank R. Brown,
Nevada Department of Education.

Superior, Nebr.,
August 28, 1964.

Hon. Adam C. Powell,
Chairman, House Committee on Education and Labor, Washington, D.C.:

English elimination from National Defense Education Act endangers progress—new Nebraska English curriculum urge retention.

Mrs. Minnie Campbell.

Phoenix, Ariz.,
August 30, 1964.

Adam Clayton Powell,
House Committee on Education and Labor,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

English most basic of all courses; please help with bill H.R. 11904.

M. Hackett,
Scottsdale, Ariz.

Norfolk, Nebr.,
August 28, 1964.

Hon. Adam Clayton Powell,
Chairman, House Committee on Education and Labor, Washington, D.C.:

New English program just beginning to show encouraging results. Would urge your support of National Defense Education Act.

Mrs. Marvin Fuhrman,
Mrs. Dale Anderson.

Poughkeepsie, N.Y.,
September 1, 1964.

Hon. Adam Clayton Powell,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Vassar College English Department understands reasons for House amendments to bill extending Defense Education Act but strongly urges House Senate conference replace term "reading" by term "English" in amended bill 11904, title XI, section 1101, subheading 2. We know from work with New York teachers that good teaching of reading demands not mere technical skills but range and depth in experience of literature and composition.

Caroline Mercer.

Galesburg, Ill.,
September 2, 1964.

Hon. Adam Clayton Powell,
Chairman, House Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.:

The Knox College English Department strongly urges that word "reading" be replaced with the word "English" in the amended House bill 11904, title XI, section 1101, subheading No. 2.

Howard A. Wilson,
Chairman.

Memphis, Tenn.,
September 1, 1964.

Representative Adam C. Powell,
Chairman, House Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

We earnestly recommend replacement of word "reading" by word "English" in amended bill 11904, title 11, section 1101, subheading No. 2. The need for improving education and professional qualifications of teachers of English all levels is urgent and Federal assistance for this purpose is indispensable in our opinion. We profoundly regret limitation of National Defense Education Act assistance to teaching reading in House version of bill.

Respectfully,

Redding Sugg,
Memphis State University.

Cortland, N.Y.,
August 19, 1964.

Hon. A. C. Powell,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

What does our country need more today then better communication? To promote it, please restore English in title 3 of H.R. 11904, National Defense Education Act extension and support passage of bill.

Respectfully,

Margaret Roohan.

Cortland, N.Y.,
August 19, 1964.

Hon. Adam Clayton Powell,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I urge passage of H.R. 11904 National Defense Education Act extension with English to be included in title 3, effective language essential to all communication.

Doris C. Price.

Cortland, N.Y.,
August 19, 1964.

Hon. Adam C. Powell,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Urge vote for H.R. 11904 English to be included in title 3, National Defense Education Act. Better communication absolutely necessary to American democracy and world relationships. Only better teachers, well trained, can teach communication better.

Beulah R. Pepper.

Cortland, N.Y.,
August 19, 1964.

Hon. Adam C. Powell,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Please support the inclusion of English in title 3, National Defense Education Act, H.R. 11904. Good teaching in English is a basic necessity of education.

Hilda Ennis Hayes.

Charlottesville, Va.,
August 8, 1964.

Representative Adam C. Powell,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Strongly urge broader wording including English institutes like Senate version H.R. 11904.

Fredson Bowers,
University of Virginia.

Ames, Iowa,
September 8, 1964.

Congressman Adam C. Powell,
Chairman, House Committee on Education and Labor, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

We strongly urge that the word "reading" be replaced by "English" in the amended bill H.R. 11904, title 11, section 1101, subhead No. 2.

R. C. Palmer.

Iowa City, Iowa,
September 9, 1964.

Adam C. Powell,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

To improve teaching of English throughout country we must first improve teachers own capacity to read and write, not simply show him techniques for teaching reading skills. Imperative therefore that word "English" replace word "reading" in amended bill H.R. 11904, title 11, section 1101. Hope you will support change strongly.

John C. Gerber.

Richmond, Ind.,
September 9, 1964.

Adam C. Powell,
Chairman, House Committee on Education and Labor, Washington, D.C.:

We urge the changing of "reading" to "English" in connection with institutes provided by amended bill H.R. 11904, title 11, section 1101, subheading No. 2.

Warren Staebler.

Boston, Mass.,
September 6, 1964.

Hon. Adam Clayton Powell,
Chairman, House Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.:

Strongly urge House Subcommittee on Education to broaden wording of amended bill H.R. 11904, title 11, section 1101, subheading No. 2 by replacing "reading" with "English."

Prof. Morton Berman,
Boston University.

Boston, Mass., *September 10, 1964.*

Hon. Adam Clayton Powell,
Chairman, House Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.:

Strongly urge House Subcommittee on Education to broaden wording of amended bill, H.R. 11904, title XI, section 1101, subheading No. 2, by replacing "reading" with "English."

Prof. Morton Berman,
Chairman, Department of English,
Boston University.

Chicago, Ill., *September 9, 1964.*

Hon. Adam C. Powell,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I urge the substitution of English for reading in the amended National Defense Education Act bill 11904, title 11, section 1101 subheading No. 2. Improvement in students' literacy will result only from improvement in the English teacher's own ability to read and to write.

Gwin J. Kolb,
Chairman, Department of English,
University of Chicago.

Fairharbor, N.Y., *July 22, 1964.*

Representative Adam Clayton Powell,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

In view of fundamental importance of English to all other school subjects as well as to vocational and professional competence of adult citizens, I strongly urge you support its inclusion in title 3 of H.R. 11904.

Development of programs with English for cultural aid disadvantaged especially need Government support.

Richard Corbin,
First Vice President,
National Council of Teachers of English.

DENTON, TEX.
July 22, 1964.

ADAM CLAYTON POWELL,
Chairman, House Committee on
Education and Labor,
Washington, D.C.:

As chairman of the committee on the preparation and certification of teachers English, our National Council Teachers English, and as teacher working with teachers in Texas and other States urge inclusion of "English" in provision of H.R. 11904, 2-year extension of National Defense Education Act, title 3. Need is national, immediate, and critical.

AUTREY NELL WILEY.

NEW YORK, N.Y.
July 22, 1964.

Hon. ADAM CLAYTON POWELL,
Chairman, House Committee on Education and Labor, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.:

Urge inclusion of English in H.R. 11904 and extension of National Defense Education Act. English most desperately needed by culturally disadvantaged.

MURIAL CROSBY,
Assistant Superintendent of Schools.

BATON ROUGE, LA.,
July 22, 1964.

Hon. ADAM C. POWELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

I strongly urge that English be included in the National Defense Education Act.

CARL L. MARSHALL,
Chairman, Department of English,
Southern University.

EAST ST. LOUIS, ILL.,
July 22, 1964.

Hon. ADAM CLAYTON POWELL,
Chairman, Education and Labor Committee, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

As private persons we urge favorable consideration of the support of English instruction as part of general educational support provided by H.R. 11904. We are teachers of English participating in English grammar workshop offered by Southern Illinois University, East St. Louis. Favorable committee action will hearten us.

Jeanne McCravy, Edna Tucker, Madeline Shafer, Constance Kitching, Earlene Simmonds, Ethel Alls, Luella Austin, Bessemer Kimbrell, Charles Thomas, Dennis O'Connell, Donna Best, Carol Mercer, R. Kuyyakanon, Gordon Wood, Bill Moody, Ronald Adams, Eleanore Oniell, Mary Kollmann, Marceline Klekamp.

MILWAUKEE, WIS.,
July 23, 1964.

Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

English Association, Greater Milwaukee, strongly urges endorsement title 3, National Defense Education Act.

MARICE WOLFE.

LA GRANGE, GA.,
July 22, 1964.

Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Until boys and girls learn to read, to express their thoughts in writing, and to speak effectively, they will be handicapped in all schoolwork. The teaching of reading, writing, and speaking is part of the job of the English teacher. I urge you to support the inclusion of English in the National Defense Education Act.

Dr. BERNICE FREEMAN,
Chairman, Georgia English Curriculum Guide Committee.

LA GRANGE, GA.,
July 22, 1964.

Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

The La Grange branch, American Association of University Women urges you to support the inclusion of English in H.R. 11901 and the extension of the National Defense Education Act. This we feel is vital to the improvement of learning in all areas.

Mrs. ELWIN A. HAMER,
President, La Grange Branch,
American Association of Women.

BURLINGAME, CALIF.,
July 22, 1964.

Congressman ADAM CLAYTON POWELL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

California Teachers Association certainly supports the broadening of title III of the National Defense Education Act. We particularly urge you to support the specific areas of English, history, and geography.

ARTHUR F. COREY,
State Executive Secretary,
California Teachers Association.

SLIPPERY ROCK, PA.,
July 22, 1964.

Hon. ADAM CLAYTON POWELL,
Committee on Education and Labor,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Appreciating your support of education. Urge passage H.R. 11904.

JOHN A. DEARTH.

MILWAUKEE, WIS.,
July 22, 1964.

Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Because English is basic to effective education, I urge you to support bill title 3 of H.R. 11904 for inclusion of English under the National Defense Education Act.

ELIZABETH M. KERR,
Professor of English,
University of Wisconsin.

KIRKSVILLE, MO.,
July 23, 1964.

Hon. ADAM C. POWELL,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

English institutes as proposed by Represenative GREEN in extending the National Defense Education Act are essential to public good.

C. V. HUENEMANN.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
July 23, 1964.

Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Urgently plead that you vote to extend the National Defense Education Act and H.R. 11904. This should provide sizable appropriations for nationwide teachers training courses, research, and institutes in elementary school reading and English, with particular emphasis on unique methodologies required to teach the urban slum area children.

At present not one teacher in a thousand is adequately equipped to do this job.

Dr. ALDA RAULIN.

MILWUKEE, WIS.,
July 21, 1964.

Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL,
House Select Subcommittee on Education,
Washington, D.C.:

Please support title 3 of H.R. 11904. It will be greatly appreciated.

LURA CARRITHERS,
Professor of Education,
University of Wisconsin.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
July 21, 1964.

Hon. ADAM C. POWELL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We urge your support for H.R. 11904, National Defense Education Act Amendments, 1964. We favor all amendments especially title XI providing expansion of guidance and counseling institutes for personnel in higher education. Prompt adoption of H.R. 11904 important because universities must plan now for best possible use of funds in 1965.

HELEN B. SCHLEMAN,
President, National Association of Women Deans and Counselors.

BERKELEY, CALIF.,
July 21, 1964.

Hon. ADAM CLAYTON POWELL,
Chairman, House Committee on Labor, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.:

U.S. English teaching disgraceful. Language is vital resource today. Imperative extend National Defense Education Act to include English.

KENNETH LANE,
Treasurer, Central California Council of Teachers of English.

STEVENS POINT, WIS.,
July 21, 1964.

Congressman ADAM CLAYTON POWELL,
Chairman, House Committee on Education and Labor, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN POWELL: I am pleased to know that English is included in the proposed extension of the National Defense Education Act. There is much evidence indicating that Engilish is one of the weaker links in the public schools because of the overloading of English teachers and their lack of training. Funds provided by the act would assist in upgrading the training of English teachers and improve their morale by recognition of the importance of their task. I urge you to support the inclusion of English in the act.

LEE A. BURRESS, Jr.,
Chairman, English Department, Wisconsin State University.

ALBANY, CALIF.,
July 22, 1964.

Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL,
Washington, D.C.:

Urge approval of H.R. 11904 with English included under title 3.

EDMUND J. FARRELL,
Past President, California Association of Teachers of English.

RIVER FALLS, WIS.,
July 21, 1964.

Hon. CLAYTON POWELL,
House Committee on Education,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

We urge approval of H.R. 11904 as reported by the subcommittee of your committee and the inclusion of English under title 3. Present conditions in teaching this vital subject in the schools demand immediate efforts to upgrade the training of teachers and to improve instruction since informed teaching in English is the educational basis for learning in all subjects and for mature understanding of democratic human values.

FRANCIS P. CHISHOLM,
GERALD R. RANDOLPH,
ROBERT R. BECK,
EARL E. LEWIS,
Wisconsin State University, River Falls.
CLEMENT M. EYLER,
Tennessee Polytechnic Institute, Cookville.
CHARLES E. BIERLY,
Wisconsin State University, Oshkosh.

University Park, Pa.,
July 21, 1964.

Congressman Adam Clayton Powell,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I hope that you will give your support to the new provision of H.R. 11904. These provisions strengthen the National Defense Education Act. They will help give the less priviledged young people of the Nation means to understand our society and to take their rightful places in it.

Henry W. Sams,
Head, Department of English,
Pennsylvania State University.

Oshkosh, Wis.,
July 21, 1964.

Representative Adam Clayton Powell,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We urge your support of the inclusion of English under title 3 in the 2-year extension of the National Defense Education Act through H.R. 11904. Inability to communicate effectively in speech or writing is and will be highly detrimental to the national interest. Research shows that 50 percent of the Nation's English teachers are inadequately prepared. Further research indicates that 70 percent have had no advance training since certification. Inclusion of English would benefit the Nation by supporting the training programs and additional vital research.

Jarvis E. Bush,
Executive Secretary, Wisconsin Council of Teachers of English.

Chicago, Ill.,
July 21, 1964.

Congressman Adam Clayton Powell,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Strongly urge passage H.R. 11904, especially emphasize importance of provisions for English. The teaching of reading and writing at all levels not a frill at edge of culture. America is more dependent on good communication than any previous society. This bill second most important this session.

Wayne C. Booth,
Pullman Professor of English,
University of Chicago.

New York, N.Y.,
July 21, 1964.

Hon. Adam Clayton Powell,
Chairman, Committee of Education and Labor, House of Representatives, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

The Council on Social Work Education enthusiastically supports H.R. 11904 to amend the National Defense Education Act as the accrediting body for graduate school of social work in the United States. The council is aware of social work manpower shortages and acutely concerned with need to attract able young people and help them get appropriate preparation. Increasing demands for a high quality of service to combat poverty, dependency, delinquency require expansion of schools of social work and increase financial aid for students. We urge your support of H.R. 11904.

Katherine A. Kendall,
Executive Director,
Council on Social Work Education.

Baltimore, Md.,
July 21, 1964.

Hon. Adam Clayton Powell,
Chairman, Committee on Education and Labor, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.:

The members of the English Department, Morgan State College, are deeply concerned about the passage of H.R. 11904. We urge its passage with the proposed provisions of title 3.

Dr. Nick A. Ford,
English Department,
Morgan State College.

Sacramento, Calif.,
September 30, 1964.

Congressman Adam C. Powell,
Chairman of Education and Welfare, House of Representatives, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

National Defense Education Act bill S. 3060 due for House consideration of conference committee report. Urge approval of measure because students enrolling in California State colleges will receive substantial benefits and advance the cause of higher education. College age population in California will increase by 80 percent between 1964 and 1970.

Glenn S. Dumke,
Chancellor, California State Colleges.

St. Louis, Mo.,
September 21, 1964.

Adam Clayton Powell,
Chairman, House Committee on Education and Labor, Washington, D.C.:

Educators, parents, and friends of partially seeing children urge you to support the original Senate language of sections 301 and 611 of S. 3060 amendment to the National Defense Education Act. This original Senate language will best help provide needed improvement of services and training in area of remedial reading.

Maurice Olsen,
Executive Secretary, American Association of Instructors of the Blind.

Brooklyn, N.Y.,
September 18, 1964.

Hon. Adam Clayton Powell,
Hon. Charles Goodell,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

You have before you, S. 3060, amendments to the National Defense Education Act. We are deeply interested in sections 301 and 611 as well as in the liberalizing features of all of these amendments, and we would be deeply grateful indeed if you would use your good offices to urge the passage of these amendments.

We believe that blind children throughout the United States will benefit from this act and we know that you have a very real interest in these children.

Faithfully,

George E. Keane,
Chairman, Legislative Committee, American Association of Workers for the Blind.

Inglewood, Calif.,
August 10, 1964.

Hon. Adam Clayton Powell,
Chairman, House Education and Labor Committee, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

The California State college system with 18 campuses and 133,000 students has more students than any other system in the Western world and the numbers will double in the next 10 years. Urge early approval to extend and expand the National Defense Education Act. Education assistance is an investment, not an expense. We understand bill was passed by Senate and is ready for House action.

Glen S. Dumke,
Chancellor, California State Colleges.

Jamaica, N.Y.,
September 28, 1964.

Representative Adam Clayton Powell,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

In the interest of better education I urge your support for S. 3060 National Defense Education Act, title 3.

Alfred E. Devereaux.

Monterey, Calif.,
September 21, 1964.

Congressman Adam Clayton Powell,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Respectfully urge you support National Defense Education Act, S. 3060 with English.

Michael Nagler.

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts, University of Massachusetts,
Amherst, Mass., September 4, 1964.

Hon. Adam Powell,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

My Dear Mr. Powell: I believe the final National Defense Education Act bill should include provision for English institutes.

The teaching of the mechanics of reading does not help the student select what to read or to determine how to interpret what he reads. These matters are far more vital than the mechanics of reading.

Moreover, the need of the students is to learn the grammar of English and how to write clear and correct English. These basic skills have been totally omitted from the House version of the National Defense Education Act bill.

The great need is to upgrade our English teachers, many of whom were not themselves serious students of English, and have failed to keep up with the great advances in the modern study of English grammar.

Sincerely yours,

Howard O. Brogan,
Department of English.

Lunenburg Public Schools,
Lunenburg, Mass., September 4, 1964.

Congressman Adam Clayton Powell,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Powell: It has come to my attention recently that the House has passed H.R. 11904 which would extend the provisions of Public Law 874 and Public Law 815 for a 1-year period only. As a representative of a community which has received real educational benefits from the funds derived from this source, I am writing to urge you to join with the Senate to extend this law for at least a 2-year period so that we might adequately plan long-range projects which we are able to fulfill as a result of the moneys from this law.

I do not believe in being a part of a selfish pressure group and would not write this letter if I did not truly feel that the money derived from this source had been of real educational value to the young future citizens of our country. With all sincerity, I urge you to lend your support to securing the extension of this law for at least a 2-year period.

Your cooperation in this regard would be very greatly appreciated.

Cordially,

Ralph W. Brown,
Superintendent of Schools.

The National Council of Teachers of English,
Champaign, Ill., September 1, 1964.

Hon. Adam C. Powell,
House of Representatives,
Old House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Powell: On behalf of the National Council of Teachers of English, I would like to express my appreciation for your encouraging speech on the House floor, arguing for the amendments and extension of the National Defense Education Act (H.R. 11904).

The national council is extremely concerned over the House's action in excluding English from H.R. 11904. With the help of Federal legislation, major improvements have been made in science, mathematics, and foreign language programs. Of particular importance has been improvement in quality of teacher education and the training of teachers in new developments in these fields. Teachers in the most basic of all subjects, English, have been denied institute training despite the strong statistical evidence indicating their immediate need for further education. Research of scholars has revealed new developments in the areas of composition, reading, literature, and the study of the language and its grammars. A large majority of teachers of English, however, remain ignorant of these developments. As a result, the student in the classroom is taught material that is all too often outmoded, inaccurate, and ineffective.

May I again congratulate you on your stand. I'm sure you share our hope that English will be reinstated when the committee of conference meets to reconcile H.R. 11904 with S. 3060.

Sincerely yours,

James R. Squire,
Executive Secretary.

The University of Wisconsin,
Milwaukee, Wis., July 21, 1964.
Hon. Adam Clayton Powell,
Chairman, House Committee on Education and Labor, Washington, D.C.

Dear Representative Powell: I urge that your committee strongly recommend passage of H.R. 11904, which provides for a 2-year extension of National Defense Education Act and includes English in title 3. English is in greater need of Federal funds than any other school subject, for inability to handle the language handicaps a student in all his schoolwork and is one of the chief causes of dropouts.

Very truly yours,

Verna L. Newsome,
Professor of English.

Commonwealth of Pennsylvania,
Department of Public Instruction, Indiana State College,
Indiana, Pa., July 20, 1964.
Hon. Adam Clayton Powell,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Education,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Representative Powell: May I call your attention to the enclosed study of English teacher preparation in the State of Pennsylvania. The study strongly points out the need to upgrade immediately the preparation of present English teachers.

Since the House Subcommittee on Education is considering the inclusion of English in the extension of the National Defense Education Act, I know you would be interested in seeing factual evidence that there is an urgent need for this legislation.

I have also sent copies of the study to Representatives Dent and Holland of Pennsylvania, members of your committee.

Respectfully yours,

Craig G. Swauger,
Professor of English.

The University of Nebraska,
Lincoln, Nebr., July 21, 1964.
Representative Adam Clayton Powell,
Chairman, House Committee on Education and Labor, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: I write to urge that your committee support the approval of the select subcommittee's inclusion of English in the provisions of H.R. 19904. Certainly the National Defense Education Act program has enabled us to bring to the teaching of English a number of young men and women who otherwise had been lost to our profession, which needs a sharply increased membership if we are to face the teaching job lying ahead of us. And there is other need in English teaching—for a crash program in the retraining of English teachers—and the need is now.

In my 20 years of teaching, I have witnessed a remarkable growth in scholarship in language, composition, and rhetoric, which has produced a new set of basic assumptions about the teaching of these important subjects—assumptions which are both scientifically more accurate and pedagogically more productive of the results we want to see in our students. We are, of course, teaching our present students these new materials; but older teachers are in a real sense out of touch with new textual materials rapidly appearing, and if they are to make good use of these new materials they must be given concentrated retraining and given it at once.

Your committee is in a position to do a great deal of good for the teaching of English in America, and I am confident that you will bend every effort to see that this good is done.

Yours respectfully,

Dudley Bailey,
Chairman.

Knoxville, Tenn.,
September 23, 1964.
Mr. Adam Clayton Powell,
Chairman, Education and Labor Committee, House of Representatives, Capitol Building, Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: In the newspaper I noticed that conferees from the House and Senate will meet early next week to decide several issues concerning expansion of the National Defense Education Act.

One issue, that of increasing graduate fellowships, has my enthusiastic support. You might be interested in knowing that my wife and I paid my own way 100 percent through graduate school at Duquesne University. I earned my master's degree by going to classes on Saturdays.

The University of Pittsburgh then offered me a graduate fellowship of $2,800 a year toward working for a doctorate in the field of vocational rehabilitation. Very few people hold high degrees in this particular area. My own specific specialty is in education and counseling of the deaf. There are also few qualified clinical psychologists for the deaf. There are numerous psychologists, yes, but can they counsel deaf people when they don't know how to communicate with them?

I have taught mentally retarded deaf adolescents for 4 years and I am now in my second year of full-time guidance counseling in a school for the deaf.

My bachelor's degree was earned at Gallaudet College, a couple stone's throws away from the U.S. Capitol. Hardly any Gallaudet undergraduates have ever obtained a doctor's degree via graduate study in a university—another goal for me to aim for.

My proposed thesis would be about the need for emphasis on self-identification of pupils in schools for the deaf in order to prevent or allay future mental conditions, such as alienation, occurring among our deaf citizens, since the condition of many deaf patients confined to some mental institutions is very tragic and pitiful.

If there is any question of the authenticity of this letter, I would like to refer you to Dr. Boyce Williams, Consultant to the Deaf and Hard of Hearing, Vocational Rehabilitation Administration, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

In conclusion, I'm sure that all sincere and ambitious family men and women (I have a little daughter and another baby coming in December) dedicated to their own vocations and desiring professional growth and practical experience via the process of acquiring higher degrees would be most grateful and appreciative toward you for any increase in graduate fellowships.

Very sincerely,

John C. Barner.

Western State College of Colorado,
Gunnison, Colo., September 21, 1964.
Hon. Adam C. Powell,
Chairman, Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Powell: Because of pressing needs in curriculum development and teacher education in the area of English language arts, I urge you to consider changing the word "reading" to "English" in the compromise bill based upon amended bill 11904, title XI, section 1101, subheading No. 2 which your committee and Senator Hill's are currently considering.

Those of us who work closely with these matters realize, that while reading is of tremendous importance, other problems must not be neglected at this time.

Yours cordially,

Dr. Elizabeth M. Spehar,
Colorado Advisory Council on Language Arts.

Bellevue Public Schools,
Bellevue, Nebr., September 23, 1964.
Hon. Adam C. Powell,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Representative Powell: Our school district which has over 6,000 Federal impact students enrolled, is anxious for a 2-year extension of impact legislation and the National Defense Education Act bill.

We urge you and your colleagues for a liberal extension of these bills. A 2-year extension will do much to stabilize education in districts such as ours. As your conferees meet, we know you will agree on the best possible legislation. However, a 2-year extension will do much to improve education throughout America.

Sincerely yours,

H. Edwin Cramer,
Superintendent.

Council on Education of the Deaf,
September 28, 1964.
Hon. Adam C. Powell,
Chairman, Committee on Education and Labor, Old House Office Building, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Powell: Those of us responsible for maintaining educational programs for deaf children wish to thank you for your support of S. 3060 when it was being considered in conference on September 24. We appreciate especially your inclusion of titles III and VI, which make provision for new classroom techniques and equipment, and for institutes. We believe that with these included, the National Defense Education Act will be of assistance to us.

We are grateful to you for your continued interest in improving educational programs for handicapped children, particularly for childen who are deaf.

Sincerely yours,

George T. Pratt,
Chairman, Committee on Legislation.

University of Minnesota,
College of Liberal Arts,
Minneapolis, Minn., July 20, 1964.
Hon. Adam Clayton Powell,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Powell: Last week I lectured before the 14 participants in the English language workshop held by Tenneseee A. & I. University in Nashville. In the afternoon, at a little party at the home of Earl Sasser, head of the English department, we were talking about the low enrollment (low in comparison with the numbers in 3 other similar workshops where I have spoken recently—25, 200, and 35), and the point was emphatically made that the cost prevents most Negro teachers from such summer upgrading study. Nearly all the participants were directly from Nashville, and could live at home while participating.

Yet, as Professor Sasser observed, the teachers in the Negro schools desperately need all the inservice and summer preparation they can get in order to improve their ability and competence in the field of English. And it strikes me that as, slowly but surely, integration of students will be accompanied by integration of teachers, the Negro teachers will urgently need all the help they can get to compete fairly in an integrated faculty.

This is only one reason, but surely a powerful one, for our support of title 3 in H.R. 11904, up for hearing this coming Thursday, I understand. But this reason is comparable to the others which derive from the general low quality of English education in the Nation. Two years ago, as president of the National Council of Teachers of English, I testified before your committee in favor of a similar provision in the proposed revision of the National Defense Education Act. The testimony I then offered was repeated in detail in the publication of the council, the National Interest and the Teaching of English, a copy of which you then received. Since then an additional study just published as the Continuing Education of the Teacher of English reveals even more sharply the need for present teachers to receive such assistance as that provided by National Defense Education Act to teachers of foreign languages.

As chairman of the language arts advisory committee to the Minnesota Board of Education I am familiar with the need for summer institutes for teachers of English in Minnesota, a need which is acute for teachers in smaller towns. I know that the need is no less acute elsewhere in the Nation.

On behalf of the students of America, all of whom receive English instruction through most of their school experience, I urge you not only to support this title 3 by your ultimate vote but also to work actively for its inclusion in H.R. 11904.

Respectfully yours,

Harold B. Allen,
Professor of English.

The National Council of
Teachers of English,
Champaign, Ill., July 20, 1964.

Memorandum to: members of the House Committee on Labor and Education.

Subject: inclusion of English in H.R. 11904 (a bill to amend and extend the National Defense Education Act of 1958).

Members of the National Council of Teachers of English have directed the national headquarters staff to provide the Congress with factual information concerning the imperative need for strengthening the inservice education of elementary and secondary teachers in English. Results of an extensive national study just published by the council and summarized in the enclosed material should be reviewed by the committee as it considers provisions to include English in H.R. 11904, the revision of the National Defense Education Act of 1958. The National Council of Teachers of English, an independent association of more than 95,000 elementary, secondary, and college members and subscribers, stands ready to assist the Congress in any way that it can. We shall be happy to send you copies of the complete report on the national interest and the continuing education of teachers of English if you so desire.

James R. Squire,
Executive Secretary.

Carnegie Institute of Technology,
Pittsburgh, Pa., July 20, 1964.

Congressman Adam Clayton Powell,
House Subcommittee on Education,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Powell: I am very pleased to see that provisions for improving the teaching of English are included in H.R. 11904, the extension of the National Defense Education Act.

We very much need training institutes to upgrade the ability of our English teachers. Only with such retraining will they be able to deal effectively with the needs of our students.

Such training is particularly important today, when literacy is necessary for survival on the job. Unless their English teachers are well trained, underprivileged youngsters are doomed to failure. I have analyzed that problem at some length in the attached paper.

Similarly, if college-bound youngsters are not really literate, they will get little from college beyond their diplomas.

Competence in English is the key to success at all levels, and we must retrain our English teachers to provide that competence.

Yours truly,

Erwin R. Steinberg,
Dean.

American Nurses' Association, Inc.,
New York, N.Y., September 21, 1964.

Hon. Adam Clayton Powell,
Chairman, House Education and Labor Committee, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Powell: Enclosed is a statement which the American Nurses' Association prepared setting forth our concerns regarding H.R. 11904 and S. 3060.

These two bills extend and amend the National Defense Education Act. I believe that this information will be of value to you when the bills come up in conference.

Sincerely,

Julia C. Thompson,
Director, Washington Office.

American Nurses' Association, Inc.,
New York, N.Y.

The Congress is now considering two bills to extend and amend the National Defense Education Act. One is H.R. 11904. The other is S. 3060. Because provisions in the House bill would adversely affect nursing students, the American Nurses' Association favors the passage of the Senate bill, S. 3060.

Support of the Senate bill is given solely on the basis that provisions of the House bill would seriously curtail the effectiveness of the Nurse Training Act of 1964, H.R. 11241. H.R. 11241 has already passed in the House of Representatives and is shortly due for consideration in the Senate.

We would appreciate your consideration of the attached material which describes the conflicts involved.

H.R. 11904

A bill (H.R. 11904) to amend and extend the National Defense Education Act contains provisions which, if retained, in their present form, could seriously affect efforts which are underway to ease the critical shortage of nurses in all health facilities today. We strongly urge that you give careful consideration to the serious problem of recruiting vital health personnel before approving the amendment in its relationship to nursing education.

The Nurse Training Act of 1964 (H.R. 11241) received unanimous bipartisan approval in the House of Representatives on July 21, 1964. The provisions of this bill were specifically designed to help solve the critical nursing shortage in the United States.

It was emphasized in the report of the Consultant Group on Nursing to the Surgeon General, by the House committee which considered H.R. 11241, and on the floor of the House, that adequate incentives are needed to recruit more young women into nursing schools. More important, incentives were needed to keep them working as professional nurses in all health facilities following graduation.

The most important incentive retained in H.R. 11241 is for undergraduate loans with a 50-percent forgiveness for graduates who work in professional nursing for 5 years. Limiting this loan forgiveness would seriously endanger the incentive purposes of the Nurse Training Act.

Since passage of the Nurse Training Act, a bill to amend the National Defense Education Act has been approved by the House Committee on Education. This amendment includes provisions for nurses in collegiate, diploma, and associate degree nursing programs. Although nursing students would be eligible for loans under the proposed amendment, nurse graduates could only obtain 50-percent debt forgiveness if employed as professional nurses in Federal, State, or local projects designed to eliminate poverty under the provisions of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

In addition, the amendment restricts institutions from participating in more than one student loan program carried on or assisted by HEW. This restriction could have a deleterious effect in recruiting students in collegiate and associate degree nursing programs, as well as any diploma programs associated with a college or university. For should an institution elect the National Defense Education Act loans (which would be most likely since students in more fields of study are covered), the nursing student would be unable to obtain a loan under the provisions of the Nurse Training Act of 1964 which provides the forgiveness feature most likely to attract a greater number of nursing students.

On August 1, 1964, the Senate passed S. 3060, a bill to amend and extend the National Defense Education Act of 1958. This bill does not specifically name nurses in its provisions, and therefore would not endanger the loan provisions already included in the Nurse Training Act of 1964 (H.R. 11241). The American Nurses' Association strongly urges that the Senate bill, S. 3060, be adopted by the Congress.

The provisions in H.R. 11904 would only negate the efforts and intentions of the Nurse Training Act to resolve the serious shortage of professional nurses which now exists. This shortage can only become worse if the provisions of the Nurse Training Act of 1964 cannot be fully implemented.

We would also like to point out that the same provisions of House bill H.R. 11904 which would adversely affect nurses, would also adversely affect other loan programs available to dental and medical students.

Arlington Heights, Ill.,
July 21, 1964.

Hon. Adam Clayton Powell: I am writing you as chairman of the House Education and Labor Committee to ask your support in working toward the passage of H.R. 11904.

This bill would include for the first time, social work training at the graduate and undergraduate level, in providing forgiveness of 50 percent of educational loans.

As a social worker, working in the full-time recruitment of potential social workers, this bill would aid materially in making possible the education these young people need. I urgently request your favorable action on this bill.

Respectively,

MAXINE E. MILLER.

NATIONAL COMMISSION FOR
SOCIAL WORK CAREERS,
New York, N.Y., July 15, 1964.

Hon. ADAM C. POWELL,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. POWELL: The National Commission for Social Work Careers is interested in extension of the National Defense Education Act to assist with social work training on the graduate and undergraduate levels. We are pleased to know of the amendment in bill H.R. 11904 to include prospective social workers in the provision for forgiveness of 50 percent of educational loans.

I am sending you a copy of a fact sheet on the social work manpower situation for your interest and use. These facts make it clear that the demands for a high quality of social service now and in the future necessitates substantial enlargement of the pool of qualified workers.

We urge your vigorous support for extension of the act in the light of personnel needs and growing demands. Our commission will be glad to provide additional information. We will appreciate your interest and support.

Sincerely yours,

FRED DELLIQUADRI,
Chairman.

FACT SHEET ON SOCIAL WORK MANPOWER AND SOCIAL WORK EDUCATION, 1963–64

1. Exclusive of health and education, current expenditures for welfare services in the United States are over $5 billion annually. Of this amount not more than $1.5 billion is from voluntary funds. (Not included in these figures are amounts expended from the social insurance programs under the Social Security Act.)

2. There were 105,000 social welfare workers in the United States in 1960, exclusive of recreation workers.

3. The growing and ever more critical shortage of social workers is shown by the following facts:

a. There are 58 accredited graduate schools of social work in various universities in the United States, 7 in Canada. Students who have completed a bachelor's degree may be admitted to full-time study leading in 2 years to a master's degree.

b. Last year (June 1963) 2,678 students completed their social work education and received their master's degree. This includes 2,505 in the United States, 173 in Canada.

c. The 58 U.S. schools have currently enrolled (November 1963) 6,592 full-time students of whom 40 percent are men. The Canadian schools bring the total enrollment to 7,270.

d. One additional school of social work opened in 1962, a second in September 1963, and two or three more expect to be in operation in September 1964. Each new school may be expected to enroll about 40 students in its first 2 years, prior to review for accreditation.

e. Capacity in the 63 schools accredited in the United States and Canada in 1960 was estimated at 6,100 full-time students—5,600 in the United States, 500 in Canada. Increases in enrollment to a potential of 7,000 full-time students in the United States and 1,000 in Canada by 1965 were believed to be possible if financing could be found for the major additions to teaching staff and field instruction placements that would be required.

f. Estimates (based on sample studies over 5 years ago) indicated at least 10,000 current social work vacancies for which funds were available but for which qualified staff could not be found. Upward of 15,000 persons would have to be recruited annually to replace those leaving the field and to staff necessary expansion of existing services. This requirement has been greatly increased, perhaps doubled, by rapid growth of new services that require social workers, notably the child welfare and family services called for under the 1962 Amendments to the Social Security Act.

g. In the certainty that the numbers graduating from schools of social work cannot fill these manpower requirements, experimentation is taking place in the use of associated personnel without full professional education in related defined positions alongside the professional social worker.

4. Only one-fifth of the persons in social work positions in 1960 had professional education for their work (2 years of graduate work in a school of social work). Public assistance programs, with the largest staffs, have the smallest proportion of professionally educated staff (4 percent). The significance of this can be realized when it is known that these agencies must deal with the most difficult human problems in the people coming to them for help. Lack of professional staff thus tends to perpetuate or create dependency, and to restrict preventive measures, particularly in families with children.

5. Three major factors standing in the way of increasing the supply of full-prepared social workers are:

a. Lack of funds to develop more social work teachers and to engage faculty for class and field instruction.

b. Lack of adequate funds to help students finance tuition and maintenance for the 2-year period.

c. Lack, in many parts of the country, of coordinated, communitywide recruitment efforts and of public understanding.

Salaries for social workers are increasing steadily and must be raised (especially for experienced workers) if they are to be attractive to able people selecting a career. Average salaries of social welfare workers in 1960 had increased 76 percent since 1950, a 43 percent gain in real wages. Average salary for workers who had their master's degree in social work (the first professional degree) was nearly $2,000 higher than the average for the total group. The few with doctoral degrees earned a median salary of $2,500 higher than those with master's degrees.

ROCHESTER, N.Y.,
September 6, 1964.

The Honorable ADAM C. POWELL
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I ask you to give your vigorous support to legislation that would include English in equipment purchasing and institute provisions of NDEA.

English is the language we first hear, then speak, later read, and all our lives it is the language in which we carry on our inner dialog with ourselves. What could be more basic or important?

I am appalled when I read of the number of English classes taught by teachers unprepared to teach English. Many do not have the time or money, because of family responsibilities to overcome the deficiencies in their preparation. And so, our students and future citizens suffer—unless someone helps.

I do not fear that money provided to help teachers become proficient in teaching English will result in a mandatory national curriculum. None of the past programs (GI bill, etc.) have led to Federal control of education.

May I again ask—plead, urge—that you do all in your power to raise the quality of education by providing the means for English teachers to teach more effectively?

Respectfully yours,

(Miss) MARY DEDIE.

THE NEW YORK STATE
ENGLISH COUNCIL,
September 2, 1964.

The Honorable ADAM C. POWELL,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE POWELL: We write regarding Senate bills 3060 and House bills 11904, Rept. 1639.

At the recommendation of our executive committee, our general membership voted unanimously to ask the extension of the National Defense Education Act and to ask also the inclusion of English under the act. The Senate bill has been passed accordingly, while the House bill struck out English. We urge that the joint Senate-House committee recommend to both bodies the passage of the Senate version.

We are not urging such passage simply to underwrite another boondoggle or giveaway program. We urge it because the new discoveries in the field of linguistics, and therefore of the English language, are in their way as revolutionary as are those in science and mathematics. Thousands of English teachers now in our schools have not had the benefit of any retraining consequent upon these linguistic findings. In fact, but a small percentage (5 percent in elementary, 30 percent in secondary) have ever had any course work in the English language at all.

It is precisely some of the newer linguistics approaches that will enable the teacher to do a far better job with those students who most need improvement in their English: those of foreign language extraction; those from underprivileged groups in our culture; those young men and women currently unemployable, or employable in only the most crude lines of work, because their communication is so desperately faulty.

That represents the most crying need for the inclusion of English under the National Defense Education Act. The second need lies in the kinds of technical equipment which, if made generally available to English teachers as it has been made to teachers of other languages, would add no end to the reeducation of teachers themselves and to the application of latest techniques to the teaching of all youngsters, especially those mentioned above.

The correlative concern for the inclusion lies surely in the increasing imbalance between opportunities for training and retraining between the sciences and English and even between other tongues and our native one. Finally, the institutes that would result from the bill passed by the Senate would permit the retraining in English for key people in regional educational districts that is now reaching only a few teachers through the institutes sponsored by voluntary groups, such as the National Council of Teachers of English, the Commission on English, and State bodies like our own. One other pertinent fact: the certification requirements in our field are, happily, being raised almost everywhere; but it remains true, that of the English teachers now in the field less than half have majors in the subject. It is for the vast numbers of the inadequately prepared that we ask the inclusion in the Naional Defense Education Act, not for the small minority who are now emerging with the requisite preparation.

Yours very truly,

HANS GOTTSCHALK,
Executive Secretary.

Rincon High School,
Tucson, Ariz., September 23, 1964.
Representative Adam Clayton Powell,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Representative Powell: In support of Senate bill S. 3060 that is planned to extend and expand the National Defense Education Act and extend Public Laws 8, 15, and 874, I write personally to you in hopes that you will continue to exert all effort possible to see these bills reach a fruition.

As a high school guidance counselor, I have seen the qualitative effect of each area of these bills in a most marvelous fashion. The high school students who receive loans to attend universities are applied in such a way that many students who otherwise would not receive any trained skills whatsoever, receive the financial support they need that is necessary to complete their college training. Of course, extension of guidance is a must, and I am particularly concerned with the extensions of the institute phase to other curricular areas, particularly the humanities and social studies. It appears to me, and I sit in a very strategic spot, that we must do a considerable amount of extending the training of those teachers in humanities and social studies so that they can better equip students to face the challenges as they leave high school.

With the increasing urbanization, population explosion, and the whole host of problems that are occurring around us, it appears to me that these bills represent a tremendous effort to help solve present problems and avoid problems that otherwise may occur. It would be excessively expensive both financially and in the expenditure of human energies if we dont get help in these areas. Therefore, I hope you will pass the necessary measures in these bills.

Respectfully,
Clyde D. Tidwell,
Counselor.

American Council
of the Blind, Inc.,
Conyers, Ga., September 18, 1964.
Hon. Adam Clayton Powell,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

My Dear Congressman: It is our understanding that S. 3060 is under consideration by the joint conference committee of which you are a member. The American Council of the Blind is very anxious to see that the wording of the Senate version of sections 301 and 611 are retained in the bill as it is finally adopted.

These provisions would furnish support for the high school education of handicapped children and for the training of teachers of handicapped children, respectively. The better education which would be made available to handicapped young people will go far toward making these children more economically and socially independent in their adult lives.

We earnestly urge your support for the Senate language in the above mentioned sections of this legislation.

Sincerely,
Ned E. Freeman,
President, American Council of the Blind.

Hunterdon Central High School,
Flemington, N.J., September 17, 1964.
Congressman Adam Clayton Powell,
Chairman, House Education and Labor Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Powell: Recently the House of Representatives passed its bill to extend the National Defense Education Act for 2 years. Also, the Senate passed a similar bill extending the act. Last week a House-Senate conference committee began to work on the differences between the House and Senate versions of the measure.

I would like to specifically call your attention to that section of the House bill which substitutes the word "reading" for "English." The Modern Language Association and the Council of Learned Societies are both on record as opposing this unnecessary change in the House measure.

I would like to urge very strongly that you press for the reinstitution of the word "English" in the measure. As a teacher of English I am constantly aware of the necessity for training teachers in the area of English as well as reading. Two years ago I was fortunate enough to attend one of the summer institutes sponsored by the commission on English of the college entrance examination board. One year ago I was a member of a second planning institute sponsored by the same organization. The benefit derived from institutes of this sort is immeasurable, and I am convinced that the level of English teaching would be raised greatly if the Federal Government would make it possible for more teachers of English to participate in institutes of a similar nature. As you must be aware, similar institutes in the sciences have proven their worth beyond any question of doubt.

The development of literacy and the ability to read and write and understand is indeed as much in the national interest as the development of specific skills in the joint committee will result in a fair and understanding consideration of the proposal I support in this letter. Once again let me stress the importance of this proposal and the necessity of improving the quality of English instruction in the secondary schools of America. This is a matter which cannot long be overlooked.

Very truly yours,
Paul J. McCormick,
English Department.

National Association of Student
Personnel Administrators,
September 16, 1964.
Congressman Adam Clayton Powell,
Representative from New York, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Powell: It is my understanding that the Senate and House will be in conference soon concerning the differences involved in the National Defense Education Act extension bills. On behalf of the more than 30,000 college and university student personnel workers who are members of the eight-member association of the Council of Student Personnel Associations in Higher Education, I wish to bring to your attention the hopes and desires of these people that the institute program under title V be extended to cover counseling and guidance personnel in preparation for work in junior colleges, colleges, universities, and technical institutes.

I do not believe I have to tell you that dropouts in college are a major concern to all citizens. We also find that everywhere we turn these days there is a growing shortage of trained professional counselors.

Never in our Nation's history has the role of the counselor been more vital to our youth. As teaching faculty more and more specialize, and as parents neglect their duties, in the secular society the counselor's role becomes more and more vital. This role is not only to assist the student, but to aid the teaching faculty and parent to take a more responsible role in these matters and not to neglect their traditional role. Counselors are not a form of empire builders.

We would hope you could find your way clear to serious consideration of the Senate version of this National Defense Education Act bill in regard to counseling and Guidance Institute extension to higher education as well as the Senate formula for separate legislative authority for funds for this vital area in the aid of youth.

I wish to thank you as a representative of the American people for your aid on the National Defense Education Act which has always been bipartisan.

The Democratic Party, I am sure, is proud of your leadership in this vital field of education.

Yours truly,
Thomas A. Emmet,
Chairman, Conference of Student Personnel Associations in Higher Education Joint Commission on Professional Preparation and Development.

Metropolitan Atlanta
Association for the Blind, Inc.,
Atlanta, Ga., September 21, 1964.
Hon. Adam Clayton Powell,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

My Dear Congressman: The Bertha Perry Memorial Thrift Club of the Blind earnestly solicits your support for the retention of the Senate wording of sections 301 and 611 of S. 3060, now before the Joint Conference Committee of which you are a member.

Section 301 would provide Federal assistance for improved high school education for handicapped children and section 611 would provide assistance for the training of teachers in the special techniques necessary in the instruction of handicapped students at the high school level.

The Bertha Perry Memorial Thrift Club is a group of about 125 blind Negro men and women and is an affiliate of the American Council of the Blind. We are also associated with the Metropolitan Atlanta Association for the Blind, which serves some 900 blind clients and their families in the five-county area of Metropolitan Atlanta. We are, therefore, familiar with the special needs of the blind for education and vocational training. We know that any blind or other severely handicapped person seeking employment must be better trained and qualified than his nonhandicapped contemporary in order to compete successfully for available employment.

It is for these reasons that we feel that Federal assistance toward the improvement of the education of physically handicapped persons is essential in order that these persons may be enabled to achieve their utmost capabilities for independence and self-sufficiency.

Your cooperation in seeing that the Senate wording of these two sections is retained will be greatly appreciated by blind and other handicapped people throughout the country.

Sincerely,
Dr. P. J. Woods,
Executive Director.

The University of Kansas,
Lawrence, Kans., September 3, 1964.
Hon. Adam C. Powell,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

My Dear Mr. Powell: I should be very grateful if you would try to restore the provision for English institutes which the House eliminated from the extension of the National Defense Education Act.

I know from a good deal of experience how much retraining is needed by high school English teachers and how well these institutes can do the job. In the summer of 1962 I was one of the evaluators for the U.S. Office of Education (Cooperative Research Project No. G–004) for the pilot institutes conducted by the Commission on English, and I initiated a similar institute without Federal support. All of these institutes were a success, and we have learned from experience to make them even better. A report on Cooperative Research Projct No. G–004 is on file in the Office of Education.

In the House version of the bill the substitution of the word "reading" for "English" represents what is certainly a legitimate concern for the teaching of remedial reading, but the restoration of the word "English" would not only take care of this interest but would recognize that—as in science, mathematics, and modern foreign languages—it is the English teacher's own skills and ability which are in need of improvement, not only his methodology.

Your support of these English institutes would be very much appreciated throughout the profession.

Sincerely yours,
W. P. Albrecht,
Dean.

Peru State College,
Peru, Nebr., August 17, 1964.

Hon. Adam C. Powell,
Chairman, House Committee on Education and Labor,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: I am concerned, as many other English teachers are, with the problem of retraining English teachers. We are urging the House to approve, as the Senate has, the inclusion of English in the provisions of H.R. 11905.

Nebraska is gaining a national reputation for its outstanding work in a new English curriculum. The Woods family has for 4 years generously helped finance these summer institutes which have helped develop a great many units of the new curriculum as well as retrain about 40 Nebraska elementary, junior, and senior high English teachers each year. The Woods family have made it clear that they can no longer finance the project. Our new program is at the stage that requires many, many more teachers to be retrained in institutes in order to teach efficiently the new English. Materials that have been developed for the classroom are expensive for schools to purchase as well as the paperbacks needed in teaching the new English. I trust it is not necessary to convince you that a student who cannot read, write, or speak well has a difficult time all his life—in and out of school. It seems evident also that our generation's concentration on mathematics and science has not made for happier or more balanced human beings.

I am a supervisor of English at Peru, a State teachers college. After an 8-weeks' session at the University of Nebraska this summer working with a new English curriculum, it is even more evident to me that retraining English teachers in any number is an impossible task without additional financial assistance. Therefore we urge the extension of the National Defense Education Act with the inclusion of English in provisions of H.R. 11904.

Sincerely,
Genevieve P. Gergen,
Mrs. Jacob N. Gergen,
English Supervisor.

San Francisco, Calif.

Hon. Adam C. Powell,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Representative Powell: I have just received word from the National Council of Teachers of English that H.R. 11904 was amended to exclude English on the basis that "the Government can justify financial assistance (with the exception of remedial reading) falls outside the category of a 'basic subject.'"

Quite frankly, such reasoning is incomprehensible to me. How can the language of our culture, the medium which carries all our meaning in all other subjects, be considered other than basic? Indeed, English—the study of our native language in all its aspects—is the key subject without which all other study becomes futile. It is this strange attitude toward language which allows many people, even some school administrators, unfortunately, to believe that anyone who speaks the language knows whatever there is to be known about it and therefore English teachers need no special training to teach their subject.

As a man who has been involved in the political life of our Nation for many years, I know that I need not cite for you any of the limitless examples of the power of human thought expressed in words. Every force for either good or evil is so expressed and the control over words—either to use them or to comprehend them—is the most fundamental aspect of education.

I urge you, therefore, to try to have English reestablished as one of the subjects in the revised National Defense Education Act. Both teachers and students need this affirmation of the Government's recognition of the central character of English in the life of our Nation.

Yours most sincerely,
Florence Cohen.

Broken Bow, Nebr.,
August 25, 1964.

Hon. Adam C. Powell,
Chairman, House Committee on Education and Labor, Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: We think it is a shame that the institute provisions for English have been eliminated from the revised National Defense Education Act bill. Here in Nebraska the curriculum development center is doing a marvelous work in setting up a good English program, and training teachers to do a better job of teaching English in our schools. Certainly assistance in this program is as important to the welfare of our children as are the other programs covered under the bill. Please reconsider the aspect of the bill which covers the English program.

Sincerely,
Mr. and Mrs. Harry A. Stutzman.

Curriculum Study Commission of the Central California Council of Teachers of English,
Aptos, Calif.. August 25, 1964.

Hon. Adam Clayton Powell,
Chairman, Education Committee,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman: Having devoted a lifetime to the teaching of English, I mourn the exclusion of that truly basic subject from the Federal support provided in H.R. 11904. I trust that, in the forthcoming Senate-House conferences on the extension of the National Defense Education Act of 1958, the combined wisdom of our Senators and Representatives will restore the provisions for the improvement of the teaching of English.

To fragment the teaching of a complex subject and to give too much emphasis to one of the fragments—in this case, remedial reading—seems to me against all reason, especially when the subject is the national means of formulating, recording, and communicating ideas. And, as any teacher can testify, labeling any specific groups of students "culturally deprived" is arriving at a dangerous generality that obscures the fact that every child enters the classroom with his own peculiar strengths and weaknesses in language skills, admittedly polished or inhibited by his economic and ethnic background, but more profoundly governed by his own personality and intelligence.

For the better teaching of English, then, we need, not so much the training of specialists in remedial reading and the problems of the cultural cripple, as the proper training of all teachers in good habits of reading, writing, and speech and a well-coordinated program of research in the teaching of all language skills.

The colleges and universities are doing a good job of training teachers of English. They offer good retraining. But poverty hampers the efforts of many communities in the hiring of fully trained teachers, and many teachers who need and want retraining are unable to afford it. If English were put upon the same basis as science in the National Defense Education Act, these problems would be much alleviated.

Experimentation takes time and money. While the colleges are devoting both to some very important experiments, they can afford enough only to show the need of broader and deeper studies. Besides, there is no coordinating agency to control and correlate the experiments and to make the results available where they are needed. The National Council of Teachers of English, the English Commission of the National College Board, and other volunteer agencies have done much along these lines, but they have neither the means nor the authority to provide the kind of stimulation and control that investigation of the numberless problems of teaching the common tongue demands.

What the National Defense Education Act has done for the teaching of science, it can do for the teaching of English. And since English is basic, not only to the teaching of science, but to everything social, political, and intellectual in American life, the National Defense Education Act should be extended to foster its teaching.

To oppose such extension on the ground that it is a step toward Federal dictation of content is on a par with opposing the postal system as a step toward Government control of the content of letters. Whenever and wherever a teacher faces a class, the content will be controlled by the teacher's knowledge and aims, strongly modified by the skills and understandings of his students. Only a police state could make it otherwise.

Respectfully yours,
Vincent T. Leonard,
Head, English Department Polytechnic High School, San Francisco (retired) Past President, CCCTE, Former Chairman, Curriculum Study Commission CCCTE.

The Ohio National Life Insurance Co.,
Cincinnati, August 17, 1964.

House Education Committee Chairman.

Dear Sirs: Will you please expand the National Defense Education Act (H.R. 11904) to include Federal funds for the teaching of history, civics, geography, English, and reading. As it now stands only public school children stand to benefit.

The Senate did correct inequities in loan forgiveness clauses and teacher institutes. Obviously if the National Defense Education Act passes, the NEA will have achieved a major breakthrough in receiving aid for public school children only.

Please include a fair share for all nonpublic school children.

Respectfully,
Francis Puthoff.

New York, N.Y.,
August 26, 1964.

Hon. Adam C. Powell,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Dr. Powell: As a teacher and as a citizen I am writing to you to urge your support of bill H.R. 11904, titles III and VI.

It is becoming increasingly apparent that we are living through the gravest problems in communication in the entire history of man, equally true on the world as well as the local scene. Anything we can do to promote better learning and better understanding in the language training should be steps in the right direction.

Yours very truly,
GUNNAR A. JOHANSSON.

MESA, ARIZ., *August 30, 1964.*

Representative ADAM C. POWELL,
Chairman, House Committee on Education and Labor, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE POWELL: The recent decision not to extend H.R. 11904 to include English, as it was not a "basic skill and basic subject," shows an extreme lack of educational knowledge on the part of many of your associates.

By the mere fact alone that the art of effective communication is basic to all normal intercourse, is reason enough to call the teaching of communicative skills basic. The insistence upon science as a prime factor of existence over communication comprehension, by extension of the National Defense Education Act in time yet not in scope, belies not so much an interest in solving the problems at hand, but rather in compounding the injustice which is presently at hand.

It is certainly no secret that many of our students are ill prepared in the field known traditionally as English. With an ineffective knowledge of these skills their own logic is hindered as well as their acquisition of further knowledge because of the basic incomprehensibility of the given media—language, either verbal or visual. By not facilitating instructor growth in this area, you are in effect hindering the student.

This suppression of our most important natural resource must cease.

The power to do such was once in your hands, and it will be again—I ask you personally to support this extension and in turn convince your colleagues to aid our youth, not suffocate them.

Yours,
PHILIP R. DEPPE.

HOLDREGE, NEBR., *August 29, 1964.*

Hon. ADAM C. POWELL,
Chairman, House Committee on Education and Labor, Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE SIR: Last summer I enjoyed an 8-week session at the Nebraska Curriculum Development Center at the University of Nebraska where I worked hard and learned much about the subject that I have spent my career teaching—English.

Since its beginning, the English Institute has influenced the program of studies in 100 schools in the State and has proved popular too in other States. I cannot begin to measure the value of the institute, and I would hope that institutes in English, that most important study for effective communication, be continued by receiving Federal funds.

Please give this serious thought.

Sincerely yours,
DOROTHY LARSON.

NEBRASKA COUNCIL OF
TEACHERS OF ENGLISH,
Lincoln, Nebr., August 27, 1964.

Hon. ADAM C. POWELL,
Chairman, House Committee on Education and Labor, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The Nebraska Curriculum for English which is being developed at the University of Nebraska is putting new zest into English instruction for both students and teachers. The curriculum development center and teacher training program, teacher institutes, must be continued and expanded.

Those of us who have been fortunate enough to have received the training are going out to teachers in surrounding schools to explain the curriculum and demonstrate the teaching of the materials. The cry of those whom we visit is, "Where can I get the materials and how can I get to attend a teacher training institute?"

We need assistance to keep these training centers and curriculum development centers active. Teachers will not forsake their old, tried methods and content unless they are shown how to move forward with confidence.

We have started the job—"Now let us continue."

Very sincerely yours,
Mrs. HELEN E. HARRELL,
Past President, Nebraska Council of Teachers of English.

OMAHA, NEBR., *August 27, 1964.*

Hon. ADAM C. POWELL,
Chairman, House Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am much concerned over the House eliminating English institutes provisions from the revised National Defense Education Act.

I was enrolled in the English Institute for Curriculum Revision in Project English at the University of Nebraska during the summer of 1964 and feel that Nebraska is pioneering in a project that will revolutionize the study of English ultimately in America.

Never before has Nebraska had any integrated sequential program in language, composition, and literature. The swing to this program and its component structural linguistics, however, requires the retraining of teachers of English in the State. This cannot be done without Federal aid. I feel that the improvement in the quality of training the grade and high school, as well as the junior high student will receive, as a result of this new curriculum, will surpass that of the new program in science and math, which has received considerable support in dollars in recent years.

I have talked to many teachers throughout the State of Nebraska who feel that this new program upgrades the academic level in English immeasurably. I hope that you will give these facts careful consideration during the meeting of the joint committees of the House and Senate.

The above is a testimonial of a teacher who has taught for 13 years.

Sincerely yours,
ROBERT CAIN.

OMAHA PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
Omaha, Nebr., August 27, 1964.

Hon. ADAM C. POWELL,
Chairman, House Committee on Education and Labor, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: In view of recent findings in regard to the status of the teaching of English in American schools and colleges, the need for intensive work in curriculum building and inservice training of teachers is self-evident. The same kind of effort is necessary in the area of language and composition as is being expended in behalf of mathematics and the physical and natural sciences.

Fortunately, such a program has already started with the assistance of private foundations, but a national effort can hardly be undertaken without Federal help. It is the view of all who are working in the field that an understanding of our language and culture is as vital to our existence as a nation as an ability in the sciences. Indeed, a cleverness in science without an understanding that can be derived only from an understanding of the humanities can lead to disaster.

May I urge you, in behalf of all who are engaged in teaching boys and girls and young men and women, that you look hard at this problem. An investment in the cultural resources of our heritage can be fully as rewarding to the Nation as a similar investment in science and technology.

Sincerely yours,
LLOYD R. RICHARDS,
Coordinator of English, Omaha Public Schools.

DUCHESNE COLLEGE,
Omaha, Nebr., August 28, 1964.

Hon. ADAM C. POWELL,
House Committee on Education and Labor, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: It is with regret that I learn that the House passed the revised National Defense Education Act, which eliminated institute provisions for English, history, etc., although it kept those for remedial reading and the culturally deprived.

Surely you and your colleagues in the Senate must be aware of the dynamic and meaningful work that has been done in the State of Nebraska in curriculum study and planning, in a program which now affects about 100 Nebraska schools. Instructors on all levels—primary, secondary, college, and university—are working together with great eagerness and professional zeal to train skilled teachers so that every child and every student they teach will be soundly instructed, and adequately equipped to meet the challenges of this century and the 21st century.

Retraining centers for teachers are needed; this fact we recognize. Allocation of funds necessary to carry on this vital work of reeducation in Nebraska is essential.

Please urge retention of English in the act under considertaion, the National Defense Education Act.

Science, indeed, has need of special assistance and funds in a space age; but scientists and all those involved in highly technical work for their country can serve their own cause and their country's cause more effectively if they have been taught—and taught well—to master their own language and to handle with skill the tools of communication. The internationally televised conventions this summer should make viewers more aware than ever of the power of the word. The teachers of Nebraska look to you to do all that you can to strengthen provision for English in the National Defense Education Act.

Sincerely,
CATHERINE MCMAHON,
English Department, Duchesne College.

DAWSON, NEBR., *August 29, 1964.*

Hon. ADAM C. POWELL,
Chairman, House Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We of Nebraska are especially concerned with the elimination of institute provisions for English in the NDEA bill. Will you please consider carefully its inclusion in your joint House-Senate committee meeting to settle the differences of the bill as the House and Senate have presented it?

The progress we are making in Nebraska with a new curriculum in English, which is now in about 100 of our schools, makes us see the grave necessity of preparing teachers to handle adequately in the classrooms of our State—and other States, soon we hope—these new methods. With Federal assistance, we should hope to look toward several retraining centers in Nebraska for English teachers. We very seriously need several such centers, and we need them now. The program is at that crucial stage which demands it be taught to our teachers so that they can do their best with the students. There has been enough furor over Johnny's not being able to read, write, and think so that it should not be necessary to "sell" the committee on the fact that English is a basic tool in our national life and in the achievement of our youth.

Yours truly,

MRS. JACOB N. GERGEN,
English Supervisor,
Peru State College, Peru, Nebr.

MINDEN, NEBR.,
August 28, 1964.

Hon. ADAM C. POWELL,
Chairman, House Committee on Education and Labor, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. POWELL: It has been my privilege this summer to be a participant in an institute directed by the Nebraska Curriculum Development Center at the University of Nebraska which had as its purpose the retraining of teachers to handle a new curriculum for English currently being developed in our State. It was a most valuable experience for me and I feel it is a must for other elementary teachers in classrooms in the State of Nebraska. For this reason, I am urging you to do what you can to keep English institutes in the National Defense Education Act. Much progress has been made with a new English curriculum in Nebraska and so much could be done with retraining centers for teachers with Federal assistance for these centers. Because I have had such an opportunity this summer, I can readily see how necessary this is to other teachers.

Sincerely,

MRS. LORETTA GLEASON,
Minden Public Schools.

NORTH PLATTE, NEBR.,
August 29, 1964.

Hon. ADAM C. POWELL,
Chairman, House Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. POWELL: May I urge you to work for long-term Federal assistance toward the improvement of the teaching of English in our public schools.

I was privileged to be one of 44 teachers selected for the Nebraska Cooperative Research Program Curriculum Development Center in 1962. Under the leadership of Dr. Paul Olson and others we wrote a K–12 study program, by far the best I have seen in my 27 years of teaching English. Those who have worked one or more of the past three summers are certainly dedicated disciples of the new English in Nebraska.

To drop this fine work now because of lack of funds would seem shortsighted. English is the foundation for all other areas of study. Research in the English area seems to me to be even more important than research in science and math. English is life, and its values are timeless.

Keep English in the NDEA.

Respectfully yours,

LILLIAN D. EBERHART,
Teacher of English for the past 27 years.

P.S.—Please read the enclosed clipping from the Nebraska Alumnus, January 1963, which I happened to save.

TEACHING ENGLISH THE NEBRASKA WAY

(By Dr. Michael Shugrue)

A perfect blue sky, small waves washing the ocean shore, and a balmy 75° temperature should have been enough to reduce any meeting to a rush for adjournment. Tall, mustached Prof. Frank Rice, codirector of the University of Nebraska Curriculum Center, however, had his audience of more than 100 teachers of English quiet, attentive, and yet strangely excited as he described the progress of the center on a Friday morning during the annual meeting of the National Council of Teachers of English in Miami Beach last November.

The first such center of its kind anywhere in the United States and far and away the most vigorous of the six centers now in existence, the Nebraska Center has aroused the interest of hundreds of teachers of English at every level—elementary, secondary, and college—since its inception in 1962.

Professor Rice had spent an entire week in Miami Beach outlining in workshops, panel discussions, and in speeches the curriculum work done in Nebraska, work easily visible to any observer who inspected the nearly 5,000 pages of curriculum materials for the improved teaching of English language and literature prepared in Nebraska during the past two summers.

The dynamic nature of the Nebraska study in curriculum developments in the teaching of English stems from forces set in motion as early as the spring of 1961 and owes its astonishing success to the leadership of Associate Prof. Paul Olson of the University of Nebraska, to the generosity of the Woods charitable fund, and to the intense interest, careful planning, and hard work of more than 50 Nebraska teachers.

The need to improve the quality of the teaching of English has been long apparent. Clifton Fadiman has summed up the dark picture all too well: In many schools the youngsters are "like a leaden mass of apathetic bodies, eyes wandering, ears cocked for the dismissal bell; poorly constructed machines with a high coefficient of friction endlessly grinding out themes for correction, endlessly muttering without benefit of syntax, half correct answers to half understood questions." Nebraska teachers of English recognized that here in Nebraska not only was too much time in English classes being spent on traditional grammar, but that the recent and exciting developments in linguistics and literary analysis were being ignored. Progress in classes was generally unsystematic and uncoordinated, so much so that the same material was being retaught year after year. Too many children were being taught language myths which claimed that infinitives cannot be split and that sentences cannot end with prepositions. Such an awareness of educational inadequacies is not unique in Nebraska. But Nebraska decided to do something about these conditions.

Breaking through the traditional separation between primary and secondary schools and college level education, the Nebraska Council of Teachers of English organized a curriculum study committee in the spring of 1961. A model for future educational committees, the group consisted of representatives from all levels of instruction in the State. Prof. Paul Olson of the university was named chairman of the committee. And what a fortunate choice he was. Applying himself to the available literature on the problems of curriculum, Professor Olson soon got his committee into action.

The Woods charitable fund, a long-time friend to education in Nebraska, recognized not only the need to improve the teaching of English in the State of Nebraska, but the excitement and dynamic leadership shown by this group and granted $10,000 for a 2-week workshop at the University of Nebraska during August 1961. Meeting at the newly opened Nebraska Center for Continuing Education, the group of approximately 20 participants from all parts of the State—from Chadron to Omaha—listened to lectures by such authorities as Royal Gettman, of the University of Illinois, and developed and wrote a volume entitled "A Curriculum for English," a 400-page guide to curriculum planning printed by the University of Nebraska Press in mid-October. Frank Rice, who participated in that program, calls it "one of the busiest and most exciting times in my 30 years of teaching here in the State of Nebraska."

Though only a blueprint, this curriculum, developed under great pressure by the Nebraska group, immediately aroused the national interest and support of men like John Fisher, associate secretary of the Modern Language Association, and James Squire, executive secretary of the National Council of Teachers of English. Around the country, and especially at the University of Nebraska in both the College of Arts and Sciences and Teachers College, teachers read the curriculum, made suggestions, and looked for the next steps in the booming Nebraska project.

A second appeal to the Woods fund was made in the fall of 1961. Responding to the already proved result of their initial grant, continuously aware of the work to be done, and interested by the provocative contents of the curriculum study, the Woods fund approved a $27,000 grant for an expanded summer institute at the University of Nebraska. The university itself willingly agreed to contribute staff time and to waive tuition for 44 participating teachers.

During that same fall, Professor Olson and his associates also worked on a prospectus for a long-term Nebraska Curriculum Center to present to the U.S. Office of Education a proposal finally submitted in January 1962. In the spring the University of Nebraska was designated as the first of the cooperative research program curriculum development centers, a designation carrying a grant of approximately $250,000 over a 5-year period. Not only was a vigorous program for the summer of 1962 assured, but it became apparent that the University of Nebraska, cooperating with teachers from all over the State, would be able to plan a curriculum, to test it in pilot schools around the State, and to evaluate it over a period of years.

It is interesting to note that the Nebraska proposal to the U.S. Office of Education was not only the first proposal accepted by the Office but the only one accepted unanimously. Five other such centers are now established around the country: Northwestern, Carnegie Institute of Technology, the University of Oregon, the University of Minnesota, and Hunter College are cooperating in a program to develop an articulated cirriculum for the teaching of English. The six schools chosen from dozens of proposals submitted to the U.S. Office were selected not only because of the soundness of the programs which they proposed, but because of the vigor and enthusiasm of those working on curriculum development in the several States.

The 44 teachers who gathered in Andrews Hall in Lincoln early in June for an 8-week session of graduate study and curriculum development little knew how busy the next 2 months would be.

A typical day included three 1-hour classes in the morning. One class emphasized the theory of an articulated curriculum and developed classroom techniques. A second studied seminal literary works and the philosophy of literature. A third dealt in detail with the descriptive and structural approach to English—the study of phonology, morphology, syntax, the history of the language, the purposes and resources of the dictionary, and some aspects of dialect and social usage. Even the noon hours were not free, for committees working on various units in the curriculum ate lunch together every day.

For at least 1 hour every afternoon, the group viewed and judged audiovisual materials which might be of value in either primary or secondary schools. For the remainder of the afternoons, committees met to discuss the problems connected with the preparation of specific units: what works of literature should be taught in third grade; how early students should begin to write; at what level in high school Hamlet and other masterpieces should be taught to students.

And the evenings brought more individual work. Each teacher was responsible for the homework connected with his courses and for writing and evaluating portions of the curriculum units. The casual observer on campus easily noticed the dedicated zeal of this group. When other dormitory lights were out, theirs burned on into the early hours of the morning. Their discussions on campus, over coffee, or at meals were characterized by intensity, high spirits, and unflagging perseverance to their problems at hand. There was so much to do and so little time.

Mrs. Merrell Grant, 47, a 10th-grade teacher at Lincoln High School, summarized the 8-week institute this way: "It is difficult for me to remember a summer which was more pleasurable or more enlightening, both because the instruction opened many new doors to me and because of the fine associations with other capable teachers around the State."

When the exhausted teachers left Lincoln in August, a core staff remained to edit the materials which had been written and to type sections of the curriculum developed during the summer, a monumental work which deserves some close observation.

Consisting of nearly 5,000 pages, the work includes 40 elementary units and 42 secondary units designed both for teacher and student. Although the Nebraska Curriculum Center by Government contract, centered specifically around the teaching of composition, Professor Olson, Professor Rice, and the other teachers involved in the program recognized that such a program could not be developed except in the context of the study of literature and language. As the general introduction to the curriculum states, "The curriculum endeavors through its inductive organization of units to provide students with a sense of how one gathers literary or linguistic evidence and how one formulates conclusions on the basis of such evidence." The materials prepared to be tested experimentally in the hard reality of classroom situations this fall included units in the description of language, logic, formal rhetoric, and literary forms. The group hypothesized that the analytical study of various kinds of literature would help students to write more competently.

An example of one or two typical units would be in order. The ninth grade student who has been studying the Odyssey is asked to compare some translations and to write an essay pointing out variations in writing style. Such matters as metaphor, clarity, diction, rhythm, and sentence construction are to be compared. Not only does such an assignment test the student's close reading and knowledge of poetic techniques, but it gives him an opportunity to display his command of a critical vocabulary and his ability to organize his argument.

In the 10th grade unit, "Man's Picture of Nature," the student, after studying the history of creation as it is given in Genesis, is asked to compare it with other accounts of the creation, selecting from Indian legends, Greek and Roman mythology, Norse mythology, or other mythologies. Hopefully the student learns not only how to handle the techniques of comparison and contrast, but learns to think more critically about the nature of man's existence in the world.

A program as ambitious, as far-reaching, and as potentially important as that developed last summer here at Nebraska needs to be tested in the classroom. Under the general supervision of Professor Rice, who had come to the University of Nebraska as codirector of the curriculum center in June 1962, five school systems agreed to test the program experimentally. Five different kinds of systems were selected for participation: a wealthy suburb, Westside in Omaha; a cosmopolitan center, Omaha itself; a large city, Lincoln; a university community, University High School and Bancroft School; and a small city, York. A total of 19 schools agreed to take part in the pilot program.

This year the materials prepared in the summer are being taught at the 1st-, 4th-, 7th-, and 10th-grade levels. Next year they will be initiated at the next level beyond each of the present four and be repeated at the same level. Within 3 years all the materials prepared for grades 1 through 12 will have been tested.

Teachers in the program are keeping informal records and having their students keep diaries of their day-by-day progress during the course of the year. Mrs. Grant's comments about the pilot program are typical: "I consider it a privilege to be a part of the experimental English program. Though any class may be considered a challenge, with projected or immediate rewards and results, I consider this experience as perhaps one of the finest I have had."

Random quotations from diaries written by Mrs. Grant's students indicate the enthusiasm of her students for the program. One student writes: "This is the most exciting of the classes that I have all day because it is so different." Another comments: "It's too bad that all English classes aren't as much fun as this one." A third notes: "I'm very anxious to get started in this class. Since it's different from the other English classes, it should be very interesting." The remarks of a fourth student would stir any teacher's heart: "Class today started me thinking." At the end of a particularly exciting hour, one student wrote: "I never really thought about all the things we do automatically just to utter one little word."

The measure of success of this experimental program cannot be known, of course, for a number of years. The Curriculum Center at Nebraska is now attempting to devise a testing instrument, especially for elementary level students, to measure the success of the curriculum program. The Nebraska Curriculum Center plans to sponsor summer workshops for the next 4 years with several goals in mind. Present materials must be revised in the light of experience. More Nebraska teachers need to be brought into the summer workshops in order to give them an opportunity to become more intimately acquainted with the program. Testing must be continued and expanded.

Professor Rice and his staff are also gathering curriculum materials from all over the country in an attempt to read, analyze, and evaluate what is being done elsewhere in the hope that it will help the State of Nebraska and the University of Nebraska to develop a continuously growing and improving program.

As wide national interest in the Nebraska program continues, the Nebraska center has an increasing obligation to lead in the field of curriculum development. Under the leadership of men like Professor Olson and Professor Rice, and with the cooperation of Nebraska's dedicated teachers, it cannot help but succeed. It has already brought honor to the university and the State.

State of Illinois,
Department of Public Aid,
Springfield, Ill., August 28, 1964.

Hon. Adam Clayton Powell,
Chairman, House Education and Labor Committee, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Powell: We have been informed that your committee has had before it for consideration H.R. 11904 which amends and extends the National Defense Education Act of 1958. It is our understanding that this bill includes in its coverage for the first time education for the social work profession.

Because of the urgent need for qualified social workers in the public welfare services, we would greatly appreciate your sending us a copy of H.R. 11904, a copy of committee hearings and reports on the bill, and information concerning its present status in the Congress.

We shall appreciate your addressing the material as follows:

Miss Mary-Claire Johnson, Illinois Department of Public Aid, 400 South Spring Street, Room 203, State Office Building, Springfield, Ill. 62706.

Let me again thank you for your many courtesies in sending me bills and reports on the war-on-poverty legislation and other public welfare legislation coming before your committee during the current session.

Sincerely,
Mary-Claire Johnson,
Supervisor, Legislative Research.

Seward, Nebr.,
August 26, 1964.

Hon. Adam C. Powell,
House Committee on Education and Labor, U.S Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: We, here in Nebraska, are just beginning to make progress in an English curriculum that we believe will help so many children and young people in our State and country. I, as a teacher, urge that further aid be given English institutes.

The English program in Nebraska promises so much help in this area, it would be deplorable to discontinue because of lack of Federal assistance.

I urge that you help our cause in retaining English aid as the National Defense Education Act is being revised.

Very truly yours,
Virginia Dowding.

Modern Language Association
of America,
New York, N.Y., August 28, 1964.

Hon. Adam C. Powell,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Powell: I have read with interest the account of the discussion of the bill H.R. 11904 in the Congressional Record for August 14. We are most appreciative of the understanding support you gave to the effort to broaden National Defense Education Act to include English.

What distresses me, however, and will, I feel, distress all English teachers, is the essentially mechanical view it takes of reading. Reading, even remedial reading, is much more than techniques and machines. It depends in the end upon the literacy and general competence of the reader. And, as the National Council of Teachers of English studies have amply demonstrated, the real job is to upgrade inadequately prepared teachers. I fear that institutes devoted merely to improving reading, without the study of linguistics, composition, and literature that must go with it will be of little effect. What is worse, such legislation lends the authority of Congress and will lend the authority of the U.S. Office of Education to the nation that "reading" is a technique that can be divorced from content.

For these reasons, I hope that in conference, your committee will still find it possible to substitute "English" for "reading" in title XI, section 1101, subheading 2 of the amended bill H.R. 11904.

Sincerely yours,
John Hurt Fisher,
Executive Secretary.

MEMORANDUM TO CHAIRMEN OF DEPARTMENTS OF ENGLISH CONCERNING THE FLOOR DEBATE OVER THE BILL H.R. 11904, AUGUST 14, 1964

As most of you know by this time, H.R. 11904 was passed by the House of Representatives in amended form on Friday, August 14. It extends National Defense Education Act for 2 years, continuing the modern foreign language provisions, liberalizing the student loan provisions, and increasing the number of graduate fellowships from 1,500 to 3,000 in 1964–65; to 5,000 in 1965–66; and to 6,500 in 1966–67—of which a good many may go to support students in established graduate programs.

However, in one of the most informed and important debates ever held on the floor of the House, the bill was amended to exclude institutes for English, geography, and history. Instead institutes in "reading" were introduced, institutes for those engaged in preparing disadvantaged youth, and for elementary or secondary school library personnel. The last two have their own raisons d'être, but the rationale behind the substitution of "reading" for "English" bears scrutiny.

The following comments are based upon the Congressional Record, August 14, 1964, pages 19655–19695.

The reasons advanced by Mr. Frelinghuysen, Republican, of New Jersey and Mr. Quie, Republican, of Minnesota, for not extending National Defense Education Act to English, history, and geography are reasonable—if these subjects are included, where can the line be drawn? The Senate bill includes civics with history; as others in the House session argued for industrial arts, political science, and international affairs, it became evident that once other subjects begin to be included under National Defense Education Act, it will be hard to be selective. Furthermore, as Mr. Quie observed, subjects like civics and history are controversial; Federal aid inevitably involves an element of Federal control; new materials developed with the support of the USOE run the risk of developing into a national curriculum; and "we must make certain that out of this we do not develop standardization of our curriculum" (p. 19667).

"Reading" was included because it was felt that it was a technique rather than a subject.

Mr. Goodell, Republican, of New York: "I think the emphasis here should be clear. As a matter of legislative history when we use the word 'reading' we mean such things as remedial reading and perhaps other techniques of reading. The emphasis is on techniques of reading and the process of reading and not on literature and poetry and things of that nature that might be taught in a general course of English" (p. 19670).

Mr. Quie: "That is my understanding * * * Let us consider the case of the disadvantaged youth, the youth who, because of his relationship with his family, does not have the background possessed by a middle-class youth. He may need special help in reading, during the early years, in order to advance as fast as a young person who grew up in a middle-class family. This is part of it. They may not call it 'remedial' because of following along and beginning to learn to read and so on, but this is the kind of special help we mean as to reading * * * There is the improvement of reading and the teaching and techniques of speeding up reading to make a youth better able to read, instead of, let us say, appreciate poetry or anything like that" (p. 19670).

Mrs. Green, Democrat, of Oregon: "The Federal Government does not want to get into the area of outlining a curriculum, so I would not want to venture into that at all today. The intent is to put a special emphasis on remedial reading. Also, I believe there would be included in this the classes to improve speed of reading. Some of us, as Members of Congress, have taken speed reading classes" (p. 19670).

Mr. Brademas, Democrat, of Indiana: "The emphasis is to be on remedial reading, but it is not the intention of the committee that the Federal Government should dictate to local school authorities what is to be read and what is not to be read. I would take it for granted that in a remedial reading course it is not the intention of the gentleman from Minnesota to exclude what is normally considered good literature" (p. 19671).

Mr. Quie: "No. It would be my hope that they would use the best literature possible as they teach remedial reading or speed reading" (p. 19671).

Mr. Griffin, Republican, of Michigan, "The series of amendments which has been worked out will confine the expansion [of National Defense Education Act] to matters which are not controversial in the curriculum. The limited area of reading, for example, involves only a basic skill which is essential to all learning. There have been dramatic strides made in the methods for teaching reading. There are rapid reading courses available with new techniques that are revolutionary. It will be important and valuable to the Nation if those who teach reading can be brought up to date in the use of new methods now available" (p. 19673).

English, geography, and history were eliminated from title III (matching funds for purchasing equipment) as well as from title IX (institutes). Again, however, reading was substituted for English. As Mr. Quie observed, "* * * There is some expensive equipment that can greatly improve the reading ability of the young children that the school may provide." Mr. Goodell cautioned, however, "I believe we have some difference of opinion as to the usefulness of certain types of equipment" (p. 19683).

There is much more of interest in the debate, but these selections are sufficient to indicate its tenor. The House version of the bill provides significant opportunity for improvement. There are techniques and machines which, if properly used, can assist in remedial reading, and the support given by Mr. Brademas and Mr. Quie to using "the best literature possible" is indeed heartening. However, we are left here with an essentially mechanical definition of reading, to be supported (along with foreign language, counseling and guidance, English as a second language, teaching the disadvantaged, and library science) at the rate of $35 million in 1964–65. The emphasis is solely upon techniques and hardware, with no recognition that the literacy of the teacher himself, his own command of language, literature, and composition, is in the end what makes him able to teach others to read and write.

The Senate bill, passed late in July, authorized equipment and institutes for "English." It would be well if the wording of the compromise bill that emerges from the House-Senate conference soon after Labor Day could broaden "reading" by a recognition that—as in science, mathematics, and the modern foreign languages—it is the teacher's own skills and abilities which are in need of improvement, not only his methodology. The easiest way to do this would be to replace "reading" by "English" in the amended bill 11904, title XI, section 1101, subheading No. 2.

This memorandum is informational. The bill contains much that is helpful and the doubts expressed by Messrs. Quie, Frelinghuysen, and Goodell are informed and legitimate. However, since the form in which the House bill emerged is likely to do a disservice to the national conception of how literacy may best be improved, it would be well if the House Subcommittee on Education were urged to broaden the wording of the bill to "English."

Members of the Education Committees of the House and Senate will be meeting soon after the Democratic Convention to bring together the two bills. If you are moved to express yourself on this matter, you should do so at once. In Washington, telegrams count far more than letters.

SENATE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

Democrats: Lister Hill, Alabama, chairman 1964; Pat McNamara, Michigan; Wayne Morse, Oregon; Ralph W. Yarborough, Texas; Joseph S. Clark, Pennsylvania; Jennings Randolph, West Virginia; Harrison A. Williams, Jr., New Jersey; Claiborne Pell, Rhode Island; Edward Kennedy, Massachusetts; Lee Metcalf, Montana.

Republicans: Barry Goldwater, Arizona; Jacob K. Javits, New York; Winston L. Prouty, Vermont; John Tower, Texas; Len B. Jordan, Idaho.

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Democrats: Adam C. Powell, New York, chairman 1964; Carl D. Perkins, Kentucky; Phil M. Landrum, Georgia; Edith Green, Oregon; James Roosevelt, California; Frank Thompson, Jr., New Jersey; Elmer J. Holland, Pennsylvania; Roman C. Pucinski, Illinois; Dominick V. Daniels, New Jersey; John Brademas, Indiana; James G. O'Hara, Michigan; Ralph J. Scott, North Carolina; Hugh Carey, New York; Augustus Hawkins, California; Carlton Sickles, Maryland; Sam Gibbons, Florida; Thomas P. Gill, Hawaii; George E. Brown, Jr., California.

Republicans: Peter Frelinghuysen, Jr., New Jersey; William H. Ayres, Ohio; Robert P. Griffin, Michigan; Albert H. Quie, Minnesota; Charles E. Goodell, New York; Donald C. Bruce, Indiana; John M. Ashbrook, Ohio; Dave Martin, Nebraska; Alphonzo Bell, California; M. G. (Gene) Snyder, Kentucky; Paul Findley, Illinois; Robert Taft, Jr., Ohio.

SUMMARY OF THE NATIONAL INTEREST AND THE CONTINUING EDUCATION OF TEACHERS OF ENGLISH, NCTE (1964)

The following statistics may be of value in refuting the argument that an adequate job is being done nationally in the preparation of teachers of English. These quotations are taken from "The National Interest and the Continuing Education of Teachers of English."

A study of the assistance available to 3,030 elementary teachers and 7,417 secondary teachers from large and small schools in all sections of the country indicates clearly that the Nation's schools and colleges are not providing sufficient opportunities for education to improve the quality of preparation of today's teachers of English.

Over 40 percent of the Nation's elementary teachers began full-time teaching without a baccalaureate degree. Only 15.5 percent of the teachers with 0 to 2 years' experience have begun teaching with less than a bachelor's, but 71.7 percent of those with 16 or more years' experience began without the baccalaureate. At least one-fourth of those elementary teachers who began without a bachelor's degree have not yet reached this minimal level of academic preparation.

Almost half (49.5 percent) of all secondary teachers who conduct English classes lack majors in the subject. These figures for 1963 show little improvement over the figures in a 1961 report which revealed that, depending on the State, only 40 to 60 percent of the high school teachers of English had completed college majors in English.

Only 5.3 percent of the colleges required of elementary education students a course on the English language. More than three-fifths did not require work in grammar and usage.

On the average, the typical elementary teacher in this survey has taught for approximately 9 years, but it has been 6 years since his last English course.

Of the secondary teachers responding to the survey, two-thirds do not feel confident of their preparation in composition, and almost half are insecure in literature and language as well.

Today, only half (51.9 percent) of the secondary teachers consider themselves well prepared to teach literature; slightly more than one-third (36.6 percent), to teach composition; slightly more than half (53.3 percent), to teach the English language. Fewer than one-third (32.7 percent) feel well prepared to teach oral skills, and only one-tenth, to teach reading at the secondary level.

Elementary teachers on the average take one summer session for each 8 years of experience.

Thirty percent of the secondary teachers of English in this survey have not taken a course in English for more than 10 years.

Duke University,
Durham, N.C., July 30, 1964.

Hon. Adam Clayton Powell,
Chairman, Education and Labor Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

My Dear Mr. Powell: I write to express my strong support for the general principles involved in H.R. 11904 which would expand the National Defense Education Act of 1958 to provide institutes for librarians and teachers of history, geography, and English, as well as other kinds of services for education in these fields. It is my earnest hope that you will support proposed legislation designed to implement these principles whenever the opportunity is presented.

Sincerely yours,
William H. Cartwright,
Chairman.

The University of Texas,
Austin, Tex., July 23, 1964.

Hon. Adam C. Powell,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Powell: I wish to express my strong interest in and support of H.R. 11904 and wish to make a special plea for the inclusion of English as a subject to be included in it.

For the past 4 years the department of English has operated a summer institute for the upgrading of the teaching of high school English. In the first year we had foundation support which paid the cost of instruction and subsidy payments to those enrolled. In the second and third years the University of Texas paid instructional cost but the enrollees paid their own fees and subsistence. In the fourth (current) year, the University of Texas was unable to pay even the cost of instruction. Nevertheless, by increasing substantially the teaching loads of the other members of the staff, the department of English offered, belatedly, a curtailed program that enrolled—because of the late announcement—half the usual number. Instruction was carried on by two-thirds of the former staff.

I need not point out to you that the blind cannot lead the blind, the ignorant teach the youth of America. Although we have selected only the best-prepared of our applicants, nothing is more appalling than their collective ignorance of the subject they profess. What must be that of the remainder?

States cannot or will not provide the funds necessary to the upgrading of public school instruction. If the job is to be done, Federal assistance is indispensable. And as a Nation we shall be culpable if we limit this aid to the sciences and mathematics. The person who cannot communicate in modern society is a handicapped person whose disadvantage in life may be more serious than that of most physically handicapped persons.

Instead of canceling our summer institute, we should like to expand it. This we cannot do without Federal assistance. I bespeak your assistance in all ways possible.

Sincerely yours,
C. L. Cline, *Chairman.*

July 30, 1964.

Mr. Adam C. Powell,
Chairman, Committee on Education and Labor, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Powell: I urge you to support House bill 11904 during this coming term. In addition your support of the expansion of the NDEA to include history and geography would be a great asset to our country as a whole.

I would appreciate your efforts in promoting such progressive legislation.

Sincerely,
Joseph L. DeChurch.

The University of New Mexico,
Albuquerque, August 1, 1964.

Hon. Adam C. Powell,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: It is proposed that the revised National Defense Education Act, H.R. 11904, include English. I heartily endorse this proposal. Unless we can provide expanded services, the next few years will see a radical decline in the quality of language teaching. Money spent for the improvement of English teaching is an excellent investment.

Sincerely yours,
Franklin M. Dickey,
Associate Professor, Chairman.

Northeast Missouri
State Teachers College,
Kirksville, Mo., August 3, 1964.

Hon. Adam C. Powell,
U.S. House of Representative,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: I sincerely appreciate your support of H.R. 11904. You are to be congratulated on its success thus far.

If passed, this extension of the National Defense Education Act will at last give needed support to improving English teaching. As a person who is convinced that the quality of education in this country depends heavily on the effectiveness with which the skills of communication are taught and learned, I urge your continued support of this legislation.

Gratefully yours,
Loren V. Grissom,
Professor of English Education.

Drexel Home, Inc.,
Chicago, Ill., July 24, 1964.

Hon. Adam Clayton Powell,
Member of Congress, Chairman, House Education and Labor Committee, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Powell: We have watched with a deep and abiding interest the efforts to amend and extend the National Defense Education Act of 1958, H.R. 11904.

Passage of this bill is most important for our community and country at this time. As a trained social worker and member of the National Association of Social Work, I am most eager to see this bill enacted that would provide social work training on the graduate and undergraduate levels.

In the light of growing personnel needs I urge your support for this most important measure.

Sincerely yours,
Jerome Hammerman,
Executive Director.

Niskayuna High School,
Niskayuna Public Schools,
Schenectady, N.Y., July 24, 1964.

Hon. Adam C. Powell,
Chairman, House Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Chairman: May I respectfully urge your consideration and support of H.R. 11904, a bill to amend and extend the National Defense Education Act to include English and the teaching of English.

I believe there are two basic reasons which argue for passage of the proposed amendment. The first is that it is of crucial importance for this country to reduce the rate of illiteracy, or (to put it more positively) to improve the literacy of all its citizens. Secondly, we need to balance the present stress on mathematics and science by strengthening the humane studies, of which English, the study of our language and literature, is central. In the long run (or even in the short run) the strength of this Nation lies in the essential humaneness of its people, in their growth into full stature as adult, responsible, mature people.

Speaking not only for myself but also as regional director of the New York State English Council, may I express the hope of earnest and rather beleagured English teachers that your committee will approve and support H.R. 11904. Thank you.

Yours truly,
John F. Hogan,
Head, English Department.

Wahpeton, N. Dak.,
August 4, 1964.

Hon. Adam Clayton Powell,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Powell: The North Dakota Council of the Social Studies endorse the extended National Defense Education Act—H.R. 11904.

The executive board will appreciate all favorable consideration given to the passage of the bill.

Yours very truly,
Clara Jung, *Secretary.*

University of Illinois,
Chicago, Ill., July 23, 1964.

Hon. Adam Clayton Powell,
Member of Congress, Chairman, House Education and Labor Committee, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Powell: As chairman of the House Education and Labor Committee you probably are aware of the importance of H.R. 11904. I feel that the move to amend and extend the National Defense Education Act of 1958, which would improve the lot of the social worker, is worthwhile and I exhort you to do everything you can to support its passage.

Sincerely yours,
Harold Klehr, *Director.*

Virginia State College,
Petersburg, Va., July 23, 1964.

Hon. Adam C. Powell,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Powell: It has come to my attention that hearings on the amended National Defense Education Act of 1958 will take place before the House and Senate Subcommittees on Education very soon.

As a professor of English for over 30 years, I have come more and more to sense the need for widespread, concerted effort supported by lay citizens, local school boards, educational institutions of all kinds, and any other agency to clear up the confusion and strengthen the purpose of instruction in English throughout the whole range of our various educational systems.

Accordingly, I earnestly hope that the careful attention you will surely give this matter will lead you to support H.R. 11904, which amends the 1959 National Defense Education Act by including English in title III, under State plans, sec. 303(a) clause A of section 303(a)(1), and by adding title XI, Institutes.

There are tens of thousands of school and college teachers of English, who, if heartened and fortified by the substantial financial support the Government can give, will exert themselves without stint to do the job that needs to be done for our young people but which cannot now be done, owing to the way over many years rapid growth of both enrollment and knowledge has rendered established approaches, methods, and programs ineffective. Only Federal help can give the imperative overall thrust for an immediate step toward improvement.

Yours truly,
Joseph H. Jenkins,
Acting Head, Department of English.

Columbia University in the
City of New York,
July 23, 1964.

Hon. Adam C. Powell,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Powell: May I strongly urge the including among amendments to the National Defense Education Act provisions for establishing institutes for teachers of English in elementary and secondary schools. Language is our first weapon; if we are to succeed in convincing, it must be kept continually sharp.

Yours very sincerely,
Lewis Leary,
Chairman.

Ithaca, N.Y.,
July 23, 1964.

Congressman Adam C. Powell,
House of Representative Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Powell: I would like to urge you to use all of your influence to pass H.R. 11904 in this session of Congress. I am particularly anxious to see the addition of the humanities and the social sciences.

Sincerely,
William T. Lowe.

Huntington, W. Va.,
July 23, 1964.

Hon. Clayton Powell,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Powell: As chairman of the House Committee on Education and Labor, I am sure, you will exert every effort toward passage of H.R. 11904, the bill to extend and amend the 1958 National Defense Education Act to include help for the teaching of English.

West Virginia teachers of English are especially eager for its passage. In a State so depressed as ours, we feel that improvement in communication skills is basic to advancement in all other areas. Our teachers are willing, but we need help in acquiring materials and for in-service training.

Genevieve McDaniel,
Vice President of West Virginia Council of Teachers of English.

Superintendent of Public
Instruction, Jackson County,
Holton, Kans., July 23, 1964.

Mr. Adam C. Powell,
Chairman, Committee on Education and Labor, U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Powell: May I urge you to give your full support to H.R. 11904, the bill which expands the National Defense Education Act to cover English, history, and geography institute programs for teachers, as well as increasing student loan funds and fellowships and extending guidance, counseling and testing programs to public elementary schools.

The present National Defense Education Act program has done much to upgrade the schools of Kansas. Should you desire definite proof I can cite you many examples of its profitable application to schools in Jackson County.

I join teachers, students, parents and other patrons of our county in urging you to favorably report this bill out of the committee and then vote "yes" for its passage.

As a friend of education I support you in promoting better opportunities for our youth and their teachers.

With best wishes, I remain,
Sincerely yours,
Mrs. Corinne Richard,
County Superintendent.

Rhode Island Education Association,
Providence, R.I., July 23, 1964.

Hon. Adam C. Powell,
Chairman, Committee on Education and Labor, U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Powell: The Rhode Island Education Association, the professional organization of over 4,300 schoolteachers and school administrators, urgently urges favorable action on H.R. 11904.

As you, I know, understand, this is not the full general aid bill for education which our association and our national association supports but "half a loaf is better than none."

We therefore fully approve of an expanded National Defense Education Act.

Sincerely yours,
Frank J. Rowe,
Executive Secretary.

University of Wisconsin,
Madison, Wis., July 27, 1964.

Hon. Adam C. Powell,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Representative Powell: I am writing to urge you to support the passage of H.R. 11904, a bill to amend and extend the National Defense Education Act of 1958, introduced by Representative Edith Green, Democrat of Oregon. The inclusion of English in the amendment to the National Defense Education Act is of utmost importance to our national interest, not only in terms of the upgrading of English language teaching in our own country which it can help to provide, but also in terms of the sorely needed upgrading of the teaching of English as a foreign language being carried on in so many corners of the world. For political, economic, and cultural reasons, English ranks today as the principal language of world communication, and the teaching of English on a quality basis ranks as one of the most important and most influential cultural activities to be undertaken by the English-speaking peoples. It would be most unfortunate if, in our national interest in education, the U.S. Government neglected to provide for the needed support to insure the highest professional standards in the teaching of our language.

As chairman of the House Committee on Education and Labor, your support and interest is vital to the passage of this amendment.

My own particular interest is in the teaching of English as a foreign, or second, language—an area which, since World War II, has been of considerable importance to the U.S. Government and its agencies for the contributions that it has made, and can continue to make, in our relations with other nations of the world. I am writing as one who has not only been directly involved in the overseas aspect of this instruction (Afghanistan, 1958–60), but also as one who is presently director of the program in English for foreign students at a university with one of the largest enrollments of foreign students in this country. The title XI portion of the amendments to the National Defense Education Act is of especial importance to me and my colleagues, since institutes for the training of teachers of English are urgently needed if a high professional caliber of instruction in English is to be maintained and furthered.

I urge you, therefore, to give careful thought to this amendment and to use your influence to win the support of your fellow colleagues in the House of Representatives.

Respectfully yours,
Charles T. Scott,
Assistant Professor of English.

The Jane Addams
Graduate School of Social Work,
Chicago, Ill., July 27, 1964.

Hon. Adam Clayton Powell,
Member of Congress, Chairman, House Education and Labor Committee, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Powell: I am writing in support of H.R. 11904 which provides for the inclusion of persons seeking social work education under provisions of the National Defense Education Act.

It is, of course, unnecessary to tell you of the shortage of professional personnel in social work. I did want to tell you of our own experience this year at this school in which the number of applicants increased by almost 50 percent. We are pleased to see this upsurge in interest in training for social work. However, almost without exception these applicants indicated some need for financial aid in order to make professional training possible. We, therefore, believe that favorable action by your committee on this amendment would serve to enhance the numbers of people able to undertake education for social work and consequently a distinct contribution would be made to the overall personnel shortage.

Very truly yours,
W. Paul Simon,
Assistant Director.

Emory University,
Atlanta, Ga., July 28, 1964.

Hon. Adam C. Powell,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Powell: Please forgive my pen, as I am on vacation and away from a typewriter. I have just learned of the hearings on the National Defense Education Act which your committee is holding, and I am writing to urge you to give this act your full support. In particular I am also writing to urge that you support Edith Green's amendment which makes English one of the subjects eligible for governmental support.

This act is an important source of help for Georgia educators. We depend heavily upon National Defense Education Act fellowships for graduate students whom we are training to be high school and college teachers. Mrs. Green's amendment is especially important and sensible, I think. English is certainly one of the essential tools that an educated person must have, and too often the teaching of this subject in school is inferior and old-fashioned. National Defense Education Act support could help correct this.

During the present summer we at Emory University in Atlanta have been running our first English Summer Institute. A small grant from a private foundation (not renewable, I fear) has made this possible. We have 20 high school teachers, including both whites and Negroes, from all parts of the State in the program. We are teaching them basic skills—how to read and write better, and how to teach others to do the same. We would have liked to offer a course in the English language, but funds were not sufficient. I wish you could see the improvement some of these teachers have made after only 1 month of intensive training.

I am persuaded that institutes like this one (even though small in size) can help measurably to improve public school teaching of English all over the country. The cutting edge of economic and social improvement for all culturally deprived Americans (in Appalachia as well as in Harlem) is a fluent command of English. The National Defense Education Act will help achieve this, and I urge you to support the amended bill.

Sincerely,
Albert E. Stone, Jr.,
Professor and Chairman of English.

Duke University,
Durham, N.C., August 3, 1964.
Hon. Adam Clayton Powell,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Powell: It is my wish to express to you my strong personal support for the pending legislation designated H.R. 11904 which calls for an expansion of the National Defense Education Act of 1958. It is my hope that you will see fit to give this particular bill your personal attention, verbal support, and affirmative vote. It is my belief that this bill is of major benefit to present concerns in higher education.

Sincerely yours,
R. L. Tuthill.

Chicago, Ill.,
August 6, 1964.
Hon. Adam Clayton Powell,
Chairman, House Education and Labor Committee, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

My Dear Mr. Powell: I am enclosing a copy of a note which I have just written to Mr. Pucinski, our Chicago Representative who is a member of your Education and Labor Committee.

I hope you also will feel that this is a worthwhile provision and will support it.

Sincerely yours,
Mrs. Christine Wagner.

Chicago, Ill.,
August 6, 1964.
Hon. Roman C. Pucinski,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Pucinski: I am writing you in regard to H.R. 11904, a bill to extend the National Defense Education Act, which I understand is now before the Education and Labor Committee. My interest is particularly in the extension of the provision for forgiveness of 50 percent of educational loans so as to include persons in training for social work.

As a social worker in Chicago for many years I am constantly aware of the need for capable, well-trained people in social work, and of the shortage now. This provision for assistance in training would help young people who are interested but who would otherwise have difficulty in financing their training.

I hope that you also feel that this is a worthwhile provision and will do all that you can to see that it is included.

Sincerely yours,
Mrs. Christine Wagner.

July 24, 1964.
Hon. Adam Clayton Powell,
Member of Congress, Chairman, House Education and Labor Committee, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Dear Friend: I am writing to ask your strong support of H.R. 11904.

The need for trained social workers is so great and the dearth of them so appalling, we shall appreciate everything you can do to provide educational funds. We recruit to the field unceasingly but lack of funds is often a deterrent to continuing in school.

Thank you for your interest and concern.

Sincerely,
Miss Irene Werner, ACSW.,
Director, Family and Child Care Division, Lutheran Social Service of Illinois.

Cortland, N.Y.,
August 3, 1964.
Hon. Adam C. Powell,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman: I urge you to use your good offices on behalf of H.R. 11904, a bill which would extend the Government support of special programs in education and which, specifically, would bring the subject of English under the same sort of program now accorded mathematics, science, and foreign languages.

As Wendell Johnson wrote several years ago "to use language clearly and with validity is basic to personal efficiency and to general development—it is basic to sanity itself—and it is fundamental to intelligent social organization and to the adequate management of national and international problems."

English teachers are given the task—with currently inadequate training—of providing this essential human base.

That the state of English teaching in this country is currently disgraceful is no secret. I urge you to provide a program for its improvement.

Very truly yours,
William W. West,
Assistant Professor of English, State University College.

July 29, 1964.
Chairman Adam C. Powell,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Honorable Powell: In spite of Barry Goldwater's criticism of crime, he has never presented any positive solutions. It is too bad the people of this Nation do not know how simple the solution really is. The root of the problem is education. No local system can cope with the insurmountable costs of poverty, ignorance, idleness, racial tension, and crime. Our Federal Government must lead the way to a fair tax on all the Nation because local taxes are not able to handle local problems. Vote for H.R. 11904. This will enlarge our National Defense Education Act and add more money for education.

Sincerely,
Mrs. Mabel Holmes,
Legislative Chairman, W.C.T.C.

Kansas Council
for the Social Studies,
Topeka, Kans., August 2, 1964.
Hon. Adam Clayton Powell,
Chairman, Committee on Education and Labor, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Powell: I understand that on July 23 the House Education and Labor Committee passed H.R. 11904, National Defense Education Act amendments, 1964, which includes institutes and equipment for teachers of history and geography and State supervisory services in those subjects. I would like to urge your support for the passage of this bill on the floor of the House. It will greatly strengthen the teaching profession as a whole, and is of vital interest to teachers of the social studies.

Sincerely yours,
Marilyn L. Wichers,
President.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Alabama has given to this Nation one of the great contributions given by any Member of the U.S. Congress when he authored this act. Six hundred thousand American boys and girls who could not have gone to school have been able to go to school under this act in past years, and they have repaid the loans 5 times faster than the law requires.

Public Laws 815 and 874 affect the districts of 315 Members of this body, Republicans and Democrats. Those laws will expire within the next few months, in June of next year. It is impossible for State legislatures and for bodies which control education in the States to plan their budgets for the next educational year without a certainty that we in this Congress are not shirking our duty, that we in this Congress are giving to them the basis upon which they can build their budgets and their programs for 1965 and 1966.

Students that will graduate from college in January must now apply for loans if they are going to come under it or before the program expires on June 30. If you vote to recommit this bill, I stand here and say that that is the end of impacted area legislation; that is the end of the loan program of the National Defense Education Act, because I personally will not take this bill back to conference, because I have received direct assurance from the gentlemen, Republican and Democrat, in the other body that they will not go to conference.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, while I can appreciate the partisan warmth of the minority conferees' position, a look at the conference report on S. 3060 should help to set the record straight. Title I of the National Defense Education Act was amended. The Senate receded and took the House language in two places. The House view prevailed in section 101 and in section 103(b). So far as I can see in this title the conference report is the House version of the bill.

Title II is the student loan title. What do we find? In fiscal year 1965 the Senate wanted $145 million, the House authorized $163.3 million. What prevailed? The conference report provides $163.3 million. The same is true for the fiscal year 1966 authorization. The House figure is the conference figure. In fiscal year 1967 the conference figure is $190 million, $10 million less than the House figure, but $10 million more than the Senate figure, and in the final year the amount authorized is but $5 million less than the top House figure of $200 million. The gentleman may not want to provide sums of such magnitude for loan purposes, but I submit he cannot fault the conference managers on the part of the House for failing to maintain the House position with respect to the money in title II, which, as we all know, is the most costly title in the act.

Title III, the equipment title, would seem at first glance to lend some support to the contention, but as I read the conference report, I find that a floor amendment made by the gentleman from New York, known as the Carey amendment, is still in the conference bill. "Reading" the House category, rather than the more restrictive "remedial reading" of the Senate category, seems to have survived despite the clamor which is being made. The House wall maps and globes language, it is true, has been superseded by the category language of geography, but this is as long as it is broad in practical application, I would think.

Title IV on fellowships shows both House and Senate receding, but with House language prevailing for fiscal year

1965, 1,500 fellowships less than the Senate wanted for fiscal year 1966, and 2,500 fewer than the Senate figure for each of the two fiscal years following. House language also prevailed on the award of the fellowships to new and expanding institutions and the Senate lost on the attempt to raise the fellowship stipend. It is hard to see in this title that the House managers gave away much, if anything, in conference.

Title V(a) money was added for the final year but this was inescapable if the additional year's extension was agreed upon. As far as the institutes generally are concerned, some were added which were not in the Senate version, "disadvantaged youth," and some were added which were not in the House version.

Title VI: The Senate took the House version with respect to the institute repealer.

Title X: The Senate took all of the House language.

Public Law 815–874: The Senate took the 1-year extension of the House version but did get the District of Columbia added. Members on the other side of the aisle, I believe, supported the inclusion of the District.

On balance, I cannot feel that there is justified criticism of the House managers.

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the conference report on the National Defense Education Act. Improvement of instruction in basic subjects in our schools remain a vital national concern.

Nearly a half-million needy, but able, college students have been enabled to continue their education under this act, and their contributions to our national strength and progress will extend throughout the years ahead.

This is a constructive, far-seeing act, initiated by President Eisenhower. It deserves our continued support.

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GURNEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, today, in the closing days of the 88th Congress, we are voting on the National Defense Education Act which includes a 1-year extension of the impacted areas program.

I rise in full support of the impact aid program. This extension is of vital importance to my district which has taken the brunt of a huge Federal buildup of employees and their families.

Our school system, especially in Brevard County, have been overburdened and they must rely on the impact aid program to provide assistance in meeting the increasing demands of today's growing school populations.

No one is more acutely aware of this problem than myself. I pledged in my 1962 election campaign that I would vigorously support this program and this I have done.

I supported the impact aid program last year and voted for it on December 12. I plan to vote today for this new extension, which includes funds for Brevard and Orange Counties in my 11th District of Florida.

I have been in close touch both last year and this year with school authorities in my district, especially the superintendent of the board of public instruction for Brevard County.

I know from firsthand discussions with these people how very important this program is to our schools in the 11th District of Florida. I know how much they are dependent on the moneys which will be coming to them under this program.

I can assure you these funds are needed by our school districts, and say to my colleagues in the House that they are fully justified in voting for the extension of this impact aid to education program, as I intend to vote for it.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I fully support the extension and amendment of the National Defense Education Act of 1958, and of Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, as provided in conference report No. 1916, 88th Congress, 2d session, which we are considering here today, and which accompanies S. 3060, the bill which supersedes H.R. 11904, the earlier bill which passed the House April 14, 1964.

This is basic legislation, sorely needed, in which I have long been interested, and it is similar in most respects to the bill, H.R. 10947, which I sponsored. The purposes which I had in mind in introducing H.R. 10947 will be substantially achieved by the adoption of conference report No. 1916.

In view of the long interest of President Dwight D. Eisenhower in Federal aid to education, and his several messages to the Congress recommending such Federal aid, I was surprised to read in the New York Times of September 25, 1964, that House Republican conferees declined to sign conference report No. 1916.

The position of President Eisenhower on the subject of Federal aid to education was well stated by Dr. John A. Perkins, former Under Secretary of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, in a speech to the 56th convention of the American Association of University Women in Kansas City on June 23, 1959. I have in my hand a copy of an Associated Press report on the speech by Dr. Perkins, which was published in the Washington, D.C., Evening Star of June 23, 1959.

According to the Washington, D.C., Evening Star, Dr. Perkins said:

> Federal funds have been the most remarkable influence in advancing knowledge through research in the postwar period that higher education has ever known.

Dr. Perkins said the schools will have to turn first to State governments for help because the cost of higher education may soon become too great for individuals or private groups to handle, and he added:

> The fallacy of this approach, however, is that many States have failed to meet the needs for elementary and secondary schools. Where they have met this need there is too little left for higher education.

Dr. Perkins also told the convention delegates:

> If your State did not appropriate up to 20 percent more (for higher education) than it did last year, then your State did not care enough.

I shall continue to do all that I can to encourage and support financial aid to education at all levels of government, even though my opponent in the congressional race this fall, as reported in the Delaware State News of September 1, 1964, has said that he "opposes Federal aid to education." Here again he endorses and embraces the Goldwater approach to education. Senator GOLDWATER's position would lead to dismantling Federal aid to education. He said, as reported by Richard Rovere in the New Yorker magazine of November 2, 1963:

> If we get back to readin', writin', and 'rithmetic, and an occasional little whack where it will help, then I think our educational system will take care of itself.

Perhaps it would be helpful for my Goldwater Republican opponent to visit with former President Eisenhower, and with Dr. Milton Eisenhower, the distinguished educator and president of Johns Hopkins University, to ascertain what the historic position of the Republican Party in the Nation as a whole is. It certainly is not one of opposition to Federal aid to education, for Federal aid to education has had strong bipartisan support in both major political parties in the Congress for decades.

President Lyndon B. Johnson recently received an invitation from Dr. Milton Eisenhower to visit Johns Hopkins University, an invitation which he clearly indicated he was delighted to accept, and he may be visiting there at this moment.

Just as the University of Delaware has benefited enormously by its long and honorable association with the Federal Government, so Delaware's public schools have benefited from the Federal impacted aid to education program authorized by Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress which is part of the education bill which the conference report we are considering here today deals with.

As president of the University of Delaware, Dr. John A. Perkins heads a land-grant university which was solidified by an act of Congress, the Morrell Act, signed into law by President Abraham Lincoln in 1862. It may be doubted if the University of Delaware could long continue without Federal financial aid, so Dr. Perkins knows at first hand what he is talking about when he strongly supports Federal aid to education. He is not prepared to play politics with the welfare of our country, nor does he rubberstamp educational policies which can only lead to disaster.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time and I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 267]

Abbitt
Alger
Aspinall
Avery
Ayres
Bass
Berry
Brademas
Brock
Buckley
Burton, Calif.
Casey
Celler
Clark
Clawson, Del
Corman
Curtin
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Denton
Derounian
Devine
Diggs
Dorn
Edmondson
Ellsworth
Evins
Finnegan
Flynt
Forrester
Gill
Grant
Griffiths
Hanna
Hardy
Healey
Hébert
Hoffman
Hull
Jones, Ala.
Kee
Landrum
Lankford
Leggett
Lesinski
McIntire
McMillan
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Matsunaga
May
Meader
Michel
Miller, Calif.
Miller, N.Y.
Montoya
Morris
Morrison
Pilcher
Pool
Rains
Reifel
Rivers, Alaska
Rostenkowski
St. George
St Germain
Scott
Selden
Sheppard
Sikes
Smith, Calif.
Snyder
Stafford
Staggers
Sullivan
Talcott
Thompson, Tex.
Toll
Tupper
Weltner
Wilson, Ind.
Younger

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 349 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

EXTENSION AND AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT OF 1958 AND PUBLIC LAWS 815 AND 874, 81ST CONGRESS

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit with instructions.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the conference report?

Mr. GOODELL. In its present form, I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. GOODELL moves to recommit the bill (S. 3060) to the committee of conference, with instructions to the managers on the part of the House to insist upon the following changes in the bill reported by the committee of conference:

(1) Amend title III (financial assistance for instructional equipment) by striking out references to "history, civics, geography", restoring the House-approved reference to wall maps and globes, and substituting "English language arts" for "English";

(2) Amend title IX (teacher institutes) by striking out references to "history, geography", and by substituting "English language arts" for "English";

(3) Amend title XI (federally affected areas) to extend Public Laws 815 and 874 for two years (until June 30, 1967).

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 107, nays 237, not voting 86, as follows:

[Roll No. 268]

YEAS—107

Abele
Abernethy
Anderson
Andrews, Ala.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashmore
Bates
Battin
Becker
Beermann
Belcher
Bell
Bennett, Fla.
Betts
Bolton, Frances P.
Bolton, Oliver P.
Bow
Bromwell
Brown, Ohio
Bruce
Byrnes, Wis.
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Chenoweth
Collier
Colmer
Cramer
Curtis
Dague
Derwinski
Dole
Dowdy
Findley
Fisher
Ford
Foreman
Fountain
Frelinghuysen
Goodell
Goodling
Griffin
Gross
Gubser
Gurney
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Harrison
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Hoeven
Horan
Hosmer
Huddleston
Hutchinson
Jensen
Johansen
Keith
Kilburn
King, N.Y.
Laird
Langen
Latta
Lipscomb
McClory
McCulloch
McLoskey
MacGregor
Mailliard
Marsh
Milliken
Minshall
Morton
Nelsen
Osmers
Passman
Pillion
Poff
Quie
Reid, Ill.
Rhodes, Ariz.
Roberts, Ala.
Rogers, Fla.
Saylor
Schneebeli
Short
Smith, Va.
Springer
Taft
Teague, Calif.
Thomson, Wis.
Tuck
Utt
Van Pelt
Waggonner
Wallhauser
Westland
Wharton
Whitener
Whitten
Widnall
Williams
Wilson, Bob
Winstead
Wyman

NAYS—237

Adair
Addabbo
Albert
Ashley
Ayres
Baker
Baldwin
Baring
Barrett
Barry
Beckworth
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bonner
Bray
Broomfield
Brotzman
Brown, Calif.
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Burke
Burkhalter
Burleson
Burton, Utah
Byrne, Pa.
Cahill
Cameron
Carey
Chelf
Clancy
Clausen, Don H.
Cleveland
Cohelan
Conte
Cooley
Corbett
Cunningham
Daddario
Daniels
Delaney
Dent
Dingell
Donohue
Downing
Dulski
Duncan
Dwyer
Edwards
Elliott
Everett
Evins
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Fino
Flood
Fogarty
Fraser
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gary
Gathings
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Glenn
Gonzalez
Grabowski
Grant
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Grover
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Halpern
Hansen
Harding
Harris
Harsha
Hawkins
Hays
Hechler
Henderson
Herlong
Holifield
Holland
Horton
Ichord
Jarman
Jennings
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Pa.
Johnson, Wis.
Jonas
Jones, Mo.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kelly
Kilgore
King, Calif.
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Knox
Kornegay
Kunkel
Kyl
Lennon
Libonati
Lindsay
Lloyd
Long, La.
Long, Md.
McDade
McDowell
McFall
Macdonald
Madden
Mahon
Martin, Calif.
Mathias
Matthews
May
Mills
Minish
Monagan
Moore
Moorhead
Morgan
Morse
Mosher
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
Natcher
Nedzi
Nix
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill
Ostertag
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pickle
Pike
Pirnie
Poage
Powell
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Randall
Reid, N.Y.
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Rich
Riehlman
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts, Tex.
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Tex.
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Roosevelt
Rosenthal
Roudebush
Roush
Roybal
Rumsfeld
Ryan, Mich.
Ryan, N.Y.
St. Onge
Schenck
Schweiker
Schwengel
Secrest
Senner
Shipley
Shriver
Sibal
Sickles
Siler
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Staebler
Steed
Stephens
Stinson
Stratton
Stubblefield
Taylor
Teague, Tex.
Thomas
Thompson, N.J.
Tollefson
Trimble
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vinson
Watson
Watts
Weaver
Whalley
White
Wickersham
Willis
Wilson, Charles H.
Wright
Wydler
Young
Zablocki

NOT VOTING—86

Abbitt
Alger
Aspinall
Auchincloss
Avery
Bass
Berry
Brademas
Brock
Brooks
Buckley
Burton, Calif.
Casey
Celler
Clark
Clawson, Del
Corman
Curtin
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Denton
Derounian
Devine
Diggs
Dorn
Edmondson
Ellsworth
Finnegan
Flynt
Forrester
Gill
Griffiths
Hanna
Hardy
Healey
Hébert
Hoffman
Hull
Jones, Ala.
Kee
Keogh
Landrum
Lankford
Leggett
Lesinski
McIntire
McMillan
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Matsunaga
Meader
Michel
Miller, Calif.
Miller, N.Y.
Montoya
Morris
Morrison
Pilcher
Pool
Quillen
Rains
Reifel
Rivers, Alaska
Rostenkowski
St. George
St Germain
Schadeberg
Scott
Selden
Sheppard
Sikes
Smith, Calif.
Snyder
Stafford
Staggers
Sullivan
Talcott
Thompson, La.
Thompson, Tex.
Toll
Tupper
Weltner
Wilson, Ind.
Younger

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Smith of California for, with Mr. Brock against.

Mr. Auchincloss for, with Mr. Stafford against.

Mr. Selden for, with Mr. Keogh against.

Mr. Alger for, with Mr. Ellsworth against.

Mr. Schadeberg for, with Mr. Younger against.

Mr. Hoffman for, with Mr. Tupper against.

Mr. Michel for, with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Sikes with Mr. Meader.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Quillen.
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Martin of Nebraska.
Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. Berry.
Mr. Rivers of Alaska with Mr. Derounian.
Mr. Rostenkowski with Mrs. St. George.
Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Reifel.
Mr. Weltner with Mr. Curtin.
Mr. Aspinall with Mr. Devine.
Mr. Brademas with Mr. Wilson of Indiana.
Mr. Hardy with Mr. Snyder.
Mr. Hull with Mr. McIntire.
Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Avery.

Mr. Matsunaga with Mr. Dawson.
Mr. Brooks with Mr. Buckley.
Mr. Casey with Mr. Celler.
Mr. Rains with Mr. Hanna.
Mr. Toll with Mr. Staggers.
Mrs. Sullivan with Mr. Thompson of Texas.
Mr. Burton of California with Mr. Clark.
Mr. Corman with Mr. Davis of Tennessee.
Mr. Denton with Mr. Diggs.
Mr. Edmondson with Mr. Finnegan.
Mr. Leggett with Mr. Jones of Alabama.
Mr. Landrum with Mr. Lankford.
Mr. Montoya with Mr. Pilcher.
Mr. Flynt with Mr. St Germain.
Mr. Scott with Mr. Sheppard.
Mr. Dorn with Mr. Healey.
Mr. Pool with Mr. Lesinski.
Mr. Abbitt with Mrs. Kee.
Mr. Gill with Mr. Bass.
Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. Morris.
Mr. Forrester with Mr. McMillan.

Messrs. CAMERON, WILLIS, BRAY, and GLENN changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. ROBERTS of Alabama and VAN PELT changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken, and there were—yeas 320, nays 20, answered "present" 2, not voting 88, as follows:

[Roll No. 269]

YEAS—320

Abele
Adair
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson
Andrews, N. Dak.
Arends
Ashley
Ashmore
Ayres
Baker
Baldwin
Baring
Barrett
Barry
Bates
Battin
Becker
Beckworth
Beermann
Belcher
Bell
Betts
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bolton, Frances P.
Bolton, Oliver P.
Bonner
Bow
Bray
Bromwell
Broomfield
Brotzman
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Burke
Burkhalter
Burleson
Burton, Utah
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cahill
Cameron
Carey
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Chelf
Chenoweth
Clausen, Don H.
Cleveland
Cohelan
Collier
Conte
Cooley
Corbett
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtis
Daddario
Dague
Daniels
Delaney
Dent
Derwinski
Dingell
Dole
Donohue
Dowdy
Downing
Dulski
Duncan
Dwyer
Edwards
Elliott
Everett
Evins
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Fino
Fisher
Flood
Fogarty
Ford
Foreman
Fountain
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gary
Gathings
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Glenn
Gonzalez
Goodling
Grabowski
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Hall
Halleck
Halpern
Hansen
Harding
Harris
Harrison
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Hawkins
Hays
Healey
Hechler
Henderson
Herlong
Hoeven
Holifield
Holland
Horan
Horton
Hosmer
Ichord
Jarman
Jennings
Jensen
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Pa
Johnson, Wis.
Jonas
Jones, Mo.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Keith
Kelly
Kilgore
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Knox
Kornegay
Kunkel
Kyl
Laird
Langen
Latta
Lennon
Libonati
Lindsay
Lipscomb
Lloyd
Long, La.
Long, Md.
McClory
McCulloch
McDade
McDowell
McFall
McLoskey
Macdonald
MacGregor
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Marsh
Martin, Calif.
Mathias
Matthews
May
Milliken
Mills
Minish
Minshall
Monagan
Moore
Moorhead
Morgan
Morse
Morton
Mosher
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill
Osmers
Ostertag
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pickle
Pike
Pillion
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Powell
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Randall
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Rich
Riehlman
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts, Ala.
Roberts, Tex.
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Roosevelt
Rosenthal
Roudebush
Roush
Roybal
Rumsfeld
Ryan, Mich.
Ryan, N.Y.
St. Onge
Schenck
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Schwengel
Secrest
Senner
Shipley
Shriver
Sibal
Sickles
Siler
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Smith, Va.
Springer
Staebler
Steed
Stephens
Stinson
Stratton
Stubblefield
Taft
Teague, Calif.
Thomas
Thompson, N.J.
Thomson, Wis.
Tollefson
Trimble
Tuck
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Utt
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Van Pelt
Vinson
Waggonner
Wallhauser
Watson
Watts
Weaver
Westland
Whalley
Wharton
White
Whitener
Wickersham
Widnall
Willis
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.
Wright
Wydler
Wyman
Young
Zablocki

NAYS—20

Abernethy
Andrews, Ala.
Ashbrook
Bennett, Fla.
Bruce
Clancy
Colmer
Findley
Griffin
Haley
Huddleston
Hutchinson
Johansen
Passman
Saylor
Short
Teague, Tex.
Whitten
Williams
Winstead

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Goodell
Kilburn

NOT VOTING—88

Abbitt
Alger
Aspinall
Auchincloss
Avery
Bass
Berry
Brademas
Brock
Brooks
Buckley
Burton, Calif.
Casey
Celler
Clark
Clawson, Del
Corman
Curtin
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Denton
Derounian
Devine
Diggs
Dorn
Edmondson
Ellsworth
Finnegan
Flynt
Forrester
Gill
Grant
Griffiths
Hanna
Hardy
Hébert
Hoffman
Hull
Jones, Ala.
Kee
Keogh
Landrum
Lankford
Leggett
Lesinski
McIntire
McMillan
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Matsunaga
Meader
Michel
Miller, Calif.
Miller, N.Y.
Montoya
Morris
Morrison
Nix
Pilcher
Pool
Quillen
Rains
Reifel
Rivers, Alaska
Rostenkowski
St. George
St Germain
Schadeberg
Scott
Selden
Sheppard
Sikes
Smith, Calif.
Snyder
Stafford
Staggers
Sullivan
Talcott
Taylor
Thompson, La.
Thompson, Tex.
Toll
Tupper
Weltner
Wilson, Ind.
Younger

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Keogh for, with Mr. Selden against.

Mr. Schadeberg for, with Mr. Goodell against.

Mr. Talcott for, with Mr. Kilburn against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Hébert with Mrs. St. George.
Mr. Toll with Mr. Curtin.
Mr. Sikes with Mr. Quillen.
Mr. Hardy with Mr. Brock.
Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. Alger.
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Berry.
Mr. Rivers of Alaska with Mr. Snyder.
Mr. Weltner with Mr. Meader.
Mr. Brademas with Mr. Auchincloss.
Mr. Hull with Mr. Del Clawson.
Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Ellsworth.
Mr. Aspinall with Mr. Wilson of Indiana.
Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Stafford.
Mr. Edmondson with Mr. Younger.
Mr. Leggett with Mr. Hoffman.
Mr. Scott with Mr. Reifel.
Mr. Matsunaga with Mr. Martin of Nebraska.
Mr. Staggers with Mr. Smith of California.
Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Tupper.
Mr. St Germain with Mr. Derounian.
Mr. Denton with Mr. Avery.
Mr. Grant with Mr. Devine.
Mr. Hanna with Mr. Michel.
Mr. Rains with Mr. McIntire.
Mr. Thompson of Texas with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.
Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. Sheppard.
Mr. Montoya with Mr. Nix.
Mr. Brooks with Mr. Buckley.
Mr. Burton of California with Mr. Casey.
Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mr. Celler.
Mr. Clark with Mr. Dawson.
Mr. Morris with Mr. Diggs.
Mr. Pool with Mr. Davis of Tennessee.
Mr. Pilcher with Mr. Lesinski.
Mr. Landrum with Mr. Lankford.
Mr. Abbitt with Mrs. Kee.
Mr. Flynt with Mr. Finnegan.
Mr. Gill with Mr. Dorn.
Mr. Corman with Mr. McMillan.
Mrs. Sullivan with Mr. Bass.
Mr. Taylor with Mr. Forrester.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SCHADEBERG]. If he were present he would have voted "yea." I was recorded as voting "nay." I therefore withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from California [Mr. TALCOTT]. If he were present he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I therefore withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report just agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 12633. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. PASTORE, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. MUNDT, and Mrs. SMITH to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 11812. An act making appropriations for foreign assistance and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House have until midnight to file a conference report on the bill H.R. 11380.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I am not sure that I heard the request altogether. May I suggest that the gentleman also ask unanimous consent that if the report cannot be filed until tomorrow, it be in order to take it up tomorrow.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that if the report is not filed by midnight, it be in order to take it up tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. GROSS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I would think that that last motion or request could be taken up tomorrow rather than tonight. I would be constrained to object to the second request. Let us see how things move tomorrow.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I must say that I am very sorry that the gentleman has seen fit to interpose an objection.

I have discussed this matter with many people interested in it on the Foreign Affairs Committee and many people who are interested in disposing of the matter so that we can expedite the adjournment of the Congress.

If the gentleman insists on his objection—of course, that is his right—I am sorry he has seen fit to do so.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, let the RECORD show that I did not say that I would object tomorrow to the same kind of request, but I do object to the request tonight, Mr. Speaker, to the second part of the request which was made.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard. That is the part of the request for which unanimous consent is pending before the House.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who spoke on the extension of the continuing resolution have permission to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1965, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 12633) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. MAHON, THOMAS, KIRWAN, WHITTEN, ROONEY of New York, FOGARTY, JENSEN, HORAN, BOW, and LAIRD.

REQUEST FOR CONSIDERATION OF CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 12633 AS SOON AS FILED

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order to consider the conference report on the supplemental appropriations bill for 1965, H.R. 12633, as soon as it is filed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand that the gentleman bringing the conference report back to the House controls the time. This perhaps will not give some of us time, if the bill is rushed through, to know what is in it.

I, for one, want to know what is in this supplemental appropriation. I understand that the other body has increased the bill as it left the House from something less than $1 billion to some $1.2 billion.

I, for one, will want to know the reasons for this increase.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will permit, copies of the bill as passed by the other body are available. Of course, traditionally, the House will undertake to maintain the House position on the various matters that are before the conference.

It is true that some supplemental items had not been submitted to Congress at the time the House passed it and as it was considered in the other body. But I am sure that the gentleman knows the conferees who have been named on this bill from both sides of the aisle will do everything in their power to perform a workmanlike job and bring back to the House a bill which the Members of the House will generally support.

This request is made for the purpose of enabling us to move more rapidly toward adjournment.

Mr. GROSS. I might say to the gentleman from Texas that I have no desire to detain the House for a minute longer than necessary. But I do want to know what is in these remaining money bills, involving several billion dollars.

With the assurance of the gentleman that reasonable time will be taken to explain the bill, I will have no objection. However, I have been here long enough to know that the chairman of the committee controls all the time and that he can move the previous question at any time he so desires.

Mr. MAHON. Let me say to the gentleman that I believe we will have 1 hour for the conference report. I shall see to it that every Member who wishes to speak, insofar as possible, and especially the gentleman from Iowa, may have an opportunity to be heard and that we may consider carefully all the items involved.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to say that the conferees have agreed to meet tomorrow morning at 10 a.m. I presume we will finish by noon. Then we hope that the conference report will be brought to the floor of the House shortly thereafter, giving sufficient time for the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] and others to examine the bill. We certainly want to do that.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON FOREIGN AID BILL

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order to take up the conference report on the foreign aid bill tomorrow as soon as approved by the conference committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

COMPLETION OF CONSTRUCTION OF IRRIGATION AND POWER SYSTEMS OF THE FLATHEAD INDIAN IRRIGATION PROJECT, MONTANA

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I call up House Resolution 893 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

> *Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 6151) to increase the appropriation authorization for the completion of the construction of the irrigation and power systems of the Flathead Indian irrigation project, Montana. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes of my time to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANDERSON] and pending that I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that this is a matter of some urgency. It is a bill which has passed the other body. It is my understanding also that an identical bill will be presented to the House if this rule is adopted. It does make in order the consideration of H.R. 6151, which is a piece of legislation that would authorize completion of some reclamation work on an irrigation system on the Flathead Indian Reservation of Montana.

It involves an irrigation project which, I understand, is some 60 years old. This would authorize the expenditure of some $4 million to bring this system to completion and to rehabilitate some of the worn-out portions of the system.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the resolution, and reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I think I speak for all Members on the minority side when I say that we have great affection for the Flathead Indians. It is rather a strain to consider a bill of this kind on what we hope will be next to the last day of this session.

The gentleman from California has correctly stated the facts. I shall not oppose the rule making in order consideration of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL].

THE REPUBLICAN PLATFORM ON CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order, and to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to speak on what is basically a comparison of the Republican and Democratic platforms with reference to the issue of civil rights.

I served as assistant to the platform chairman with reference to the domestic affairs section of the Republican platform. I should like to point out to the Members that on the civil rights issue and our commitment for future action, the Republican platform is infinitely more specific and infinitely stronger than the Democratic platform. The Democratic platform with reference to future action is limited to one commitment, one specific commitment, and I quote from page 15 of the Democratic platform:

> The Civil Rights Act of 1964 deserves and requires full observance by every American and fair, effective enforcement if there is any default.

In the Republican platform we have specifically seven commitments for the future. They include full implementation and faithful execution of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, improvement of the civil rights statutes adequate to changing needs of our times, and such additional administrative or legislative actions as may be required to end the denial, for whatever unlawful reason, of the right to vote.

These are commitments which do not appear in the Democratic platform. They are commitments for the future.

In addition, in the Republican platform, with the great help of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCCULLOCH] and others who were architects of the civil rights legislation, we commit ourselves to the heritage of Lincoln in our party with reference to civil rights. We pledge further:

> To implement all applicable laws and never lose sight of the intense need for advancing peaceful progress in human relations in our land. The party of Abraham Lincoln will proudly live up to its heritage of equal rights and equal opportunities for all.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is important at this stage of our history and this stage of the campaign that we recognize that the Republican platform makes a firm commitment to move forward in the field of civil rights much more than the Democratic platform does. As a matter of fact, the Democratic platform fails to take a position for the future but instead has a long series of statements extolling the actions of the past.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODELL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BELL. I commend the gentleman on his statement regarding the Republican Party platform. I am a very strong supporter of civil rights. I am very glad to see that he is carrying on Lincoln's battle for civil rights.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I take the floor of the House today because it is time the Republican platform on civil rights was understood.

Let me start with a flat statement, which I will document in the course of my remarks: The Republican platform makes stronger and better commitments on civil rights than does the Democratic platform of 1964.

As a part of my remarks today, I am including every statement relating to civil rights in the Democratic platform and the Republican platform. Now, what does the Democratic platform pledge for the future? When you read all through the language appearing at great length on pages 15, 26, 50, 59, 65, 77, 84, and 85 of the printed Democratic platform, you find only one meaningful and specific commitment for the future. That is on page 15 as follows:

> The Civil Rights Act of 1964 deserves and requires full observance by every American and fair, effective enforcement if there is any default.

What does the Republican platform contain on civil rights? On pages 14, 15, and 16 are the following specific pledges:

> Full implementation and faithful execution of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and all other civil rights statutes, to assure equal rights and opportunities guaranteed by the Constitution to every citizen;
>
> Improvements of civil rights statutes adequate to changing needs of our times;
>
> Such additional administrative or legislative actions as may be required to end the denial, for whatever unlawful reason, of the right to vote.
>
> Continued opposition to discrimination based on race, creed, national origin, or sex. We recognize that the elimination of any such discrimination is a matter of heart, conscience, and education, as well as of equal rights under law.

We pledge further:

> To implement all applicable laws and never lose sight of the intense need for advancing peaceful progress in human relations in our land. The party of Abraham Lincoln will proudly live up to its heritage of equal rights and equal opportunities for all.
>
> To help assure equal opportunity and a good education for all, while opposing federally sponsored "inverse discrimination," whether by the shifting of jobs, or the abandonment of neighborhood schools, for reasons of race.
>
> To open avenues of peaceful progress in solving racial controversies while discouraging lawlessness and violence.

In addition, our platform indicts the Democratic administration for failing to make training under the Manpower Training Act more available to qualified Negroes, particularly in the South.

Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot of talk about Republicans backing away from previous commitments on civil rights. I say to you, unqualifiedly, that the 1964 Republican platform does not back away; it moves firmly forward on civil rights.

Those who wish to quibble have compared technical language of the 1964 platform to the 1960 platform planks on civil rights. In order to make unmistakably clear that we are building on our previous record and commitments, the following language appears on page 12 of the 1964 Republican platform:

> In the interest of brevity, we do not repeat the commitments of the 1960 Republican platform, "building a better America," and the 1962 "declaration of Republican principles and policy." We incorporate into this platform as pledges renewed those commitments which are relevant to the problems of 1964.

Mr. Speaker, the Democratic platform on civil rights spends all its time talking about the past. This effectively camouflages its failure to make meaningful pledges for the future. Why then have so many observers misread, or perhaps not read at all, the commitments of our two parties on civil rights? Apparently it is because all else has been subordinated to the personal positions of BARRY GOLDWATER and Lyndon Johnson on the 1964 Civil Rights Act. I disagreed with BARRY GOLDWATER as to the constitutionality and the wisdom of the 1964 Civil Rights Act. I was one of the strongest advocates of that act, having been a coauthor of the fair employment practices section that came from the Education and Labor Committee. In some respects, I wanted a stronger civil rights act this year. Yet I respect the fact that BARRY GOLDWATER in his personal and private life has always fought for equal opportunity for all our citizens regardless of race, creed, or color. Whatever BARRY GOLDWATER's personal position, however, there is no excuse for distorting or ignoring the plain language of our party's platform.

I will tell you why I think the public and the press got such a false impression about the party platforms this year. We have a good Republican civil rights platform, but it was written that way by the platform committee itself. The victories in behalf of civil rights were won quietly behind closed doors. I say to you advisedly that they were significant victories. Thereafter, we went to the open convention and a proposal was made to expand even further our civil rights commitments in the Republican platform. The proposed amendment on civil rights was offered by sincere people. It called for further legislative action by Congress in the immediate aftermath of the tortured deliberations over the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

Significantly, the purport of the civil rights amendment proposed to the Republican convention was not even considered for the Democratic platform. The matter is this simple: We Republicans rejected a civil rights proposal that was neither included nor offered by the Democrats in their platform.

Mr. Speaker, the Democrats in their platform praised their past record to the skies, but only made one specific commitment for the future: enforcement of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. We Republicans can be proud that we did much more than that in our platform. I think it is time a few people who have been commenting on the Republican platform took the time to read it. You will find that it has very little resemblance to the public image it has been given. It is a moderate, forward-looking, thoroughly documented platform upon which all our leaders can run with dignity, pride, and inspiration.

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point the full text of the sections of the Democratic platform relating to civil rights and the text of the civil rights amendment offered on the Republican convention floor in San Francisco:

EVERY STATEMENT ON CIVIL RIGHTS IN THE DEMOCRATIC PLATFORM, 1964

The variety of our people is the source of our strength and ought not to be a cause of disunity or discord. The rights of all our citizens must be protected and all the laws of our land obeyed if America is to be safe for democracy.

The Civil Rights Act of 1964 deserves and requires full observance by every American and fair, effective enforcement if there is any default.

Resting upon a national consensus expressed by the overwhelming support of both parties, this new law impairs the rights of no American; it affirms the rights of all Americans. Its purpose is not to divide, but to end division; not to curtail the opportunities of any, but to increase opportunities for all; not to punish, but to promote further our commitment to freedom, the pursuit of justice, and a deeper respect for human dignity.

We reaffirm our belief that lawless disregard for the rights of others is wrong—whether used to deny equal rights or to obtain equal rights.

We cannot and will not tolerate lawlessness. We can and will seek to eliminate its economic and social causes.

True democracy of opportunity will not be served by establishing quotas based on the same false distinctions we seek to erase, nor can the effects of prejudice be neutralized by the expedient of preferential practices. (Page 15.)

We are firmly pledged to continue the Nation's march toward the goals of equal opportunity and equal treatment for all Americans regardless of race, creed, color or national origin. (Page 26.)

In 1960, we insisted that:

"The right to a job requires action to break down artificial and arbitrary barriers to employment based on age, race, sex, religion, or national origin."

The great Civil Rights Act of 1964 is the strongest and most important law against discrimination in employment in the history of the United States.

It states unequivocally that "It shall be an unlawful employment practice for an employer * * * an employment agency * * * or a labor organization" to discriminate against any person because of his or her "race, color, religion, sex, or national origin."

On March 6, 1961, President Kennedy issued an Executive order establishing the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity to combat racial discrimination in the employment policies of Government agencies and private firms holding Government contracts. Then Vice President Johnson, in his capacity as Chairman of the new Committee, assumed personal direction of this program.

As a consequence of the enforcement of the Executive order, not only has discrimination been eliminated in the Federal Government, but strong affirmative measures have been taken to extend meaningful equality of opportunity to compete for Federal employment to all citizens.

The private employers of 8,076,422 men and women, and trade unions with 12,500,000 members, have signed public agreements establishing nondiscriminatory practices.

The Equal Pay Act of 1963, guarantees equal pay to women doing the same work as men, by requiring employers who are covered by the Fair Labor Standards Act to pay equal wages for equal work, regardless of the sex of their workers.

Executive Order 11141, issued by President Johnson on February 12, 1964, establishes for the first time in history a public policy that "contractors and subcontractors engaged in the performance of Federal contracts shall not, in connection with the employment, advancement, or discharge of their employees, or in connection with the terms, conditions, or privileges of their employment, discriminate against persons because of their age." (Pp. 50–51.)

The 1963 Executive order on equal opportunity in housing assures that the benefits of Federal housing programs, and assistance, are available without discrimination as to race, color, creed, or national origin. (P. 59.)

Title X of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 establishes a Community Relations Service "to provide assistance to communities and persons therein in resolving disputes, disagreements, or difficulties relating to discriminatory practices based on race, color, or national origin. (P. 65.)

In 1964, for the first time in history, the Senate voted to limit debate on a civil rights measure, thus permitting the Civil Rights Act to come to a vote, and thereby to be enacted. (P. 77.)

In 1960, we pledged:

"We shall * * * seek to create an affirmative new atmosphere in which to deal with racial divisions and inequalities which threaten both the integrity of our democratic faith and the proposition on which our Nation was founded—that all men are created equal."

That pledge was made from the deepest moral conviction.

It was carried out on the same basis.

From the establishment of the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity, under the chairmanship of the then Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson, on March 6, 1961 to this moment, the efforts of the administration to provide full and equal civil rights for all Americans have never relaxed.

The high point of achievement in this effort was reached with the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the greatest civil rights measure in the history of the American people.

This landmark of our democracy bars discrimination in the use of public accommodations, in employment, and in the administering of federally assisted programs. It makes available effective procedures for assuring the right to vote in Federal elections, directs Federal technical and financial assistance to local public school systems in desegregation, and strengthens the Civil Rights Commission. This comprehensive legislation resolves many of the festering conflicts which had been a source of irritating uncertainty, and smooths the way for favorable resolution of these problems.

We have also insisted upon nondiscrimination in apprenticeships, and have made free, unsegregated access a condition for Federal financial assistance to public libraries, programs for training of teachers of the handicapped, counselling, guidance and foreign language institutes, adult civil defense classes, and manpower development and training programs.

In supporting construction of Hill-Burton hospitals, mental retardation and community health facilities, we have required nondiscrimination in admission and provision of services and granting of staff privileges.

We have been equally firm in opposing any policy of quotas or "discrimination in reverse," and all other arbitrary or irrelevant distinctions in American life.

This, then, is the accounting of our stewardship.

The 1960 platform was not directed to any one sector or group of Americans with particular interest. (Pages 84–85.)

CIVIL RIGHTS AMENDMENT TO THE REPUBLICAN PLATFORM OFFERED ON THE FLOOR OF THE 1964 REPUBLICAN CONVENTION IN SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.

The following to be inserted at various points on page 14:

"(We pledge)—to aid in this enforcement we call for substantial increase in the professional staff of the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice.

"The overwhelming Republican support of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 in Congress reflects our party's deep belief that the Federal Government has constitutional responsibility to assure that all Americans are absolutely guaranteed the right to vote, are assured equal access to public accommodations and public facilities, are guaranteed equal educational and employment opportunities and assured equal protection of the law.

"The Republican Party—the party of progress in civil rights—recognizes that the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 will not cure all ills. Much still remains to be done before equality of opportunity becomes a reality for all Americans.

"Specifically, one decade after the Supreme Court's 1954 ruling on segregation in schools, we support legislation requiring school boards which still maintain segregated school districts, in deliberate violation of that decision, to adopt plans providing for at least first-step compliance with the decision by the following school year; and

"Consideration of measures to assure greater protection of citizens in the exercise of their constitutional rights;

"And, specifically, steps toward implementing section 2 of the 14th amendment and legislation applying the voting guarantees of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to State as well as Federal elections;

"The appointment to Federal judgeships of men devoted to protecting the constitutional rights of citizens;

"Of particular importance is the elimination of discrimination in employment and we urge positive action to promote truly open competition in the job market and to assure that the Federal-State manpower training programs and vocational education courses are in fact benefiting all citizens eligible for such assistance.

"In addition to its pride in that heritage, the Republican Party assumes special responsibilities by virtue of the fact that it is the party of Lincoln.

"We are proud of the Republican Governors who have led the Nation in enactment of fair housing, fair employment, and public accommodation laws. But as Republicans, we believe that civil rights is a responsibility not only of States and localities, it is a national problem and a national responsibility. The Republican Party—the party devoted to preserving the true principles of the Federal system—is dedicated to a responsible doctrine of States rights, but is equally firm in opposing any distortion of this doctrine into an evasion of either State or National responsibilities—or turning it into a weapon against human rights.

"At the State and local level of government, we urge enactment of laws designed to protect constitutional guarantees, and an affirmative approach to the implementation of such laws. We also urge private action at the local level to eliminate the frustrations of minorities in the fields of education, housing, unemployment, and public accommodations.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, how do I get permission to address the Chair and make a motion to adjourn sine die on Saturday evening?

The SPEAKER. The procedure is plainly stated in the rules of the House.

Mr. FOGARTY. Well, Mr. Speaker, what do I do?

The SPEAKER. The Chair has answered the gentleman's question. The rules of the House provide for the procedure to be followed.

INCREASING THE APPROPRIATION AUTHORIZATION FOR THE COMPLETION OF THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE IRRIGATION AND POWER SYSTEMS OF THE FLATHEAD INDIAN IRRIGATION PROJECT, MONTANA

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 6151) to increase the appropriation authorization for the completion of the construction of the irrigation and power systems of the Flathead Indian irrigation project, Montana.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 6151, with Mr. HARRIS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL] will be recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL].

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, in urging the support of our colleagues in the consideration of H.R. 6151, may I first present a brief explanation of its purposes and needs.

Let me divide my explanation into two parts.

First. The project, located entirely within the Flathead Reservation, was authorized in 1904. It presently serves 138,000 acres of irrigable land. Approximately 12 percent of the irrigated land in the project is held in trust for the Salish and Kootenai Indians. Eighty-eight percent is non-Indian ownership. During 1962 the irrigated cropland produced crops valued at over $5 million.

Second. This project provides electric power for some 5,800 customers and more are waiting for service. The load growth of the power system has doubled over the past 8 years.

The bill, in its amended form, will amend the act of May 25, 1948, which related to the Flathead Indian irrigation project, by increasing the appropriation authorization of Federal funds necessary to complete the construction of the irrigation and electric power systems.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we want to know what H.R. 6151 will cost us. First, the amounts to be expended are reimbursable. As of today the project has repaid over $3 million into the Federal Treasury. Second, the increased authorization will not cost $6,200,000.

Section 5(c) of the 1948 act we are amending states as follows:

> For continuing the construction of the irrigation and power systems of the project, $1 million.

The bill seeks to change the $1 million figure to $6,200,000. Since the enactment of the 1948 act, $3,265,000 has been expended for the construction and rehabilitation of the project's irrigation and power system. Each year between 1948 and 1962 amounts ranging from $125,000 to $410,000 have been made available under appropriation acts. No money was allocated or earmarked for the Flathead project in the 1963 or 1964 budgets.

When this bill first came before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs our chairman asked the Bureau of Indian Affairs how much in addition to the $3,265,000 would be required to complete construction and rehabilitate the portions that had been under construction since 1904. The committee was advised that $2,820,452 would do the job.

Now if we add the $3,265,639 that has been spent since 1948 to the $2,820,452 that is yet needed to finish the project, we arrive at a figure slightly less than the $6,200,000 referred to in the bill. This is a rounded-off figure that will cover anticipated completion expenses. Actually, $2,820,452 in new money will be required.

Now I recognize that $2,820,452 is a sizable sum of money but this is a reimbursable project. Since 1949 the irrigation portion of this project has repaid well over $3 million and the power system has returned around $200,000 to the Federal Treasury in accordance with the procedures prescribed in the 1948 act. Let me be specific. For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, $44,700 was expended for the irrigation phase of the project and $97,500 for power for a total of $142,200. For the same period the irrigation phase repaid $335,000 and power phase $100,100 for a total of $435,100. This means that the difference, $292,900, was repaid to the Federal Government. I wish all Indian irrigation projects could enjoy similar success.

I would emphasize again that this is a reimbursable project. Since 1949 the irrigation portion of this project has repaid more than $3 million, and the power system has returned more than $200,000 to the Treasury, in accordance with the 1948 act.

I urge favorable consideration of the bill.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. The gentleman has plainly stated, and I wish to reiterate, that while this bill does carry an appropriation of approximately $2.8 million, all moneys to be expended will be repaid to the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. UDALL. The gentleman is exactly correct. Such payments have been made in the past. This project is current on payments and has an excellent record.

Mr. HALEY. The expenditure of this additional amount of money will allow the project to be expanded and to take in additional people, we might say, thereby affording a better chance for repayment, though repayments have been made in the past on time to the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. UDALL. The gentleman is correct. The project is solvent and sound. It will be even more solvent and sound if this authorization is approved.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman state again why this bill is to increase the sum from an original $1 million to $6.2 million?

Mr. UDALL. That is confusing. I hope I can help the gentleman.

In 1948 an additional $1 million, in addition to what was spent between 1904 and 1948, was authorized. That was $1 million additional. The Appropriations Committee proceeded to appropriate that $1 million over a period of 2 or 3 years, and then went right on appropriating additional amounts. A point of order could have been made at any time with respect to those additional amounts.

They actually have spent, after authorization, not $1 million, but something more than $3 million under the 1948 act. We are merely, one might say, legalizing the previous expenditures and authorizing the final amount necessary to fully complete this project. This is why we have the $6 million in the bill. But it will actually require only $2.8 million of new money.

Mr. GROSS. You are sweeping it up pretty good. There has been appropriated between $3 and $4 million, and you have another $2 million on top of that as a sweetener; is that correct?

Mr. UDALL. If the gentleman will permit, it is not a question of sweetening it up. This is a very sound project, originally planned to include 138,000 acres. Gradually it has been built up to 109,000. There is still more good irrigable land, and still more power is needed. Most of this money will be used to "beef up" the power system to adequately serve the Indians and other people now receiving power.

Mr. GROSS. How much is this going to increase agricultural production?

Mr. UDALL. I do not believe there will be any substantial increase in agricultural production, because most of the money under this bill will be used to "beef up" the electrical system to serve the farmers in that area. I should not believe that any great increase in agricultural production would occur, particularly in respect to surplus crops. The gentleman from Montana probably could explain this better than I.

Mr. GROSS. How much have they paid on this so far?

Mr. UDALL. More than $3 million has been paid to the Treasury on this project since it was founded.

Mr. GROSS. There is a total of $6.2 million involved?

Mr. UDALL. No. The figures are confusing. About $12 million has been spent in the past 60 years to establish this project. The $6 million we would authorize in this bill would cover the difference between the $9 million and the $12 million, the last $3 million that has already been spent, plus an additional $3 million, to take it up to a total of about $15 million.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. May I say to my good friend from Iowa that what we are actually doing here is to more or less legalize what has happened in the past. The original legislation called for the expenditure of $1 million. Apparently in years past additional appropriations have been made without authorization.

Mr. UDALL. Three million dollars worth. We are seeking to legalize that $3 million.

Mr. HALEY. That is all we are doing. We are trying to legalize something that happened a long time ago by amending the original authorization.

Mr. GROSS. One additional question. What do you mean by December 1962 prices? I have never seen this in a bill before, to my knowledge.

Mr. UDALL. This is a formula which the House Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs worked up. It is known in our circles as the Haley amendment. This puts a limit on the amount that can be spent but keys it to construction cost prices at the time when the Department made the study. In other words, you cannot add new features and spend more, but only the amount they estimated at the time of the last study plus whatever inflation there has been in the meantime.

Mr. GROSS. And this additional money cannot be spent at 1964–65 prices. Is that it?

Mr. UDALL. It can be spent, but it cannot exceed the amount in the bill plus whatever changes there have been in cost prices for this kind of construction in the interim. That is all.

Mr. GROSS. What interest do they pay on this project?

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. I would say approximately 3 percent.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KYL. I would like to correct a response to a specific question asked by my colleague from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] regarding the production of crops. The primary production of this area has been in alfalfa and similar hay crops which are utilized in the local area, in a very small radius, as a matter of fact. It is not contemplated that with this project, as in the past, there would be any appreciable increase in production of feed grains, wheat, or any of these products. There is a possibility of some small area being turned over to what we might term horticulture.

Mr. UDALL. I thank the gentleman for bringing that out.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arizona has expired. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MORTON].

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to add for the record the history of this project in the last 2 fiscal years. The fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and the fiscal year ending at the same time 1964 are the years I refer to. The revenues produced an operating profit for this project of $76,000 in 1963 and in 1964 the revenues produced an operating profit of $292,900. This shows that the project, through the sale of power, which increased from $46,000 in 1963 to $335,000 in 1964, is an operation which will produce considerably more profit as this capital is applied that we are authorizing here today.

Therefore, I feel that this is a very good project not only from the aspect of helping these particular Indians to bootstrap themselves, but it will provide a very good return on the capital invested in this operation.

There is no controversy that I know of either in the subcommittee or from our side of the aisle in the full committee on this bill. Mr. Chairman, I urge the passage of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection 5(c) of the Act of May 25, 1948 (62 Stat. 269), is hereby amended by changing "$1,000,000" to "$6,200,000".

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out all of the line and insert in lieu thereof: "to '$6,200,000 (December 1962 prices) plus or minus such amount, if any, as may be required by reason of changes in construction costs as indicated by engineering cost indices applicable to the types of construction involved therein,'."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank the chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs for bringing this bill out. I also want to thank all of the gentlemen who have spoken in behalf of this legislation for their remarks in support thereof. I feel it is meritorious legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I also wish to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] for declaring his vote for my good Flathead Indians as well.

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. BATTIN].

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I would say that with all the criticism of the Indians out there on the part of those who have spoken in opposition to this bill, had they been a little more careful about our immigration laws we would not be here arguing about their problems today.

I do feel, however, that this is a worthwhile piece of legislation. It particularly has the support of at least this Member. I am sure if those who are opposed to it had had an opportunity to read the report and had they had an opportunity to listen to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL] in his explanation, as well as the various figures involved, would come to the conclusion that it is a project which will pay out and we can well do a great deal of good for the tribe involved as well as the area generally.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I shall not take the full 5 minutes allotted to me under my motion. I want to say, however, that regardless of what the gentleman from Pennsylvania may have said here today I am sure that when Indian affairs are up for consideration he is one of the finest friends that the Indians have. We have just recently taken care of a situation up in his home State. The help and assistance that he rendered to the committee with reference to the Seneca Indians and the Kinzua Dam certainly shall be long remembered by the Indians of this Nation.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HARRIS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 6151) to increase the appropriation authorization for the completion of the construction of the irrigation and power systems of the Flathead Indian irrigation project, Montana, pursuant to House Resolution 893, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ASHBROOK), there were—ayes 71, noes 5.

So the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1531) to increase the appropriation authorization for the completion of the construction of the irrigation and power systems of the Flathead Indian irrigation project, Montana, an identical bill to H.R. 6151 just passed.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection 5(c) of the Act of May 25, 1948 (62 Stat. 269), is hereby amended by changing $1,000,000 to "$6,200,000 (December 1962 prices) plus or minus such amount, if any, as may be required by reason of changes in construction costs as indicated by engineering cost indices applicable to the types of construction involved therein,".

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H.R. 6151) was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the passage of the bill, H.R. 6151.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of announcing an addition to the program.

Mr. Speaker, on tomorrow it is expected we will consider the conference report on the supplemental appropriation bill. We may also consider the conference report on the foreign aid authorization bill, and Senate amendments to the Foreign Aid Appropriations Act; also H.R. 12318, House Employees Positions Classification Act.

A STANDBY RECESS

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I have here from the United Press International teletype dispatch No. 54, "Congress," wherein the Democrat leader of the other body proposed today that the Senate go into a standby recess starting Monday while awaiting House action, and to permit a sine die adjournment of the Congress.

It might interest Members to know that such a motion for recess of the House of Representatives pending adjournment has been pending in my files for some time. It is a sad commentary on the relation between the two bodies of Congress when we had to wait 92 days for them to filibuster on the civil rights bill, already passed by the House, and we waited for over 30 days for a minority filibuster by the people of the identically opposite philosophy, in another respect. Whether one filibusters or not, depends on whose ox is being gored.

For the other body to say that they are going into "recess," to permit a sine die adjournment and to meet every 3 days until such time as the House "has completed its business" is unconscionable and I resent it.

If I recall properly, our appropriation bills and all necessary business had been completed before the 30th of July this year, due to the excellent work of our various committees in charge.

I realize there are conference reports outstanding, but I resent bitterly the reflection on the House by the other body on this news report.

CARLTON J. H. HAYES

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, Prof. Carlton J. H. Hayes, a remarkable teacher and a great historian, passed away on September 3, 1964, leaving the academic community bereft of one of its most eminent members, and his thousands of friends and admirers, among whom were devoted former students, stricken with grief.

Carlton Joseph Huntley Hayes was born in Afton, N.Y., on May 16, 1882, the son of Dr. Philetus A. and Permelia M. Huntley Hayes. He was educated at Columbia University, from which he received a bachelor of arts degree in 1904, a master of arts degree in 1905, and a Ph. D. degree in 1909. At Columbia University he was a lecturer in history from 1907 to 1910, an assistant professor from 1910 to 1915, and from 1915 on he was a full professor. He was appointed Seth Low Professor of History in 1939. He retired in January of 1950.

During the First World War, he served as a captain in the Military Intelligence Division of the Army General Staff. He was a major in the Officers' Reserve Corps from 1928 to 1933. From May 1942 until January 1945, he served as the U.S. Ambassador to Spain.

Professor Hayes won international fame during the decades of his historical writing and teaching. His books reached many more students than his lectures did, since they were used as textbooks throughout the United States.

Many of his students came long distances to attend his courses which were famous when he was still a comparatively young man. One former student who became a Columbia professor of philosophy, Irwin Edman, wrote about Professor Hayes in a chapter of his book, "Philosopher's Holiday," entitled "Former Teachers." He there recalled:

> Up to the autumn of 1914 Europe seemed to most American college students a solar system away. In the autumn of 1914, when the war had been going on 2 months, Europe came for the first time in the imagination of many Americans to be vivid and near. European history ceased to be the anthropology and archeology of distant peoples who spoke remote languages. It became as alive as yesterday's events: it was what explained today's news. It was, therefore, no wonder that at the beginning of the college year Carlton Hayes' course in "Europe Since 1815" had become the most popular course in Columbia College. But it was not only the war that accounted for that. Carlton Hayes had for some time been one of the most popular professors in the college. His lectures were the most famous dramatic spectacle on the campus. Nor was it as a performance alone that they were famous. Everyone had heard that Hayes could actually make clear French political parties; I have never met anybody since who could or can * * *. The complicated history of Germany in the second half of the 19th century took shape as well as drama under his presentation of it. And in the midst of being taught and taught clearly, one had the incidental and additional pleasure of hearing a man to whom the great catastrophe of war had its roots in a past he knew, in the traditions of nations among whom he had lived familiarly, and in the desperate mythologies of nationalism, to which he had given special study and concern.

Edman continued:

> One was shaken out of the smugness of the middle-class world in which most students were brought up and out of the provincial Americanism in which most of us had lived * * *. Some of the barbs delivered in a dry voice by this baldish, sharp-featured man in his thirties were directed at us, at our very smugness, at our laziness, or at our fathers: when he was explaining the attitude of the manufacturers of the early industrial revolution, he reminded us that we all knew manufacturers; "Some of your fathers," he drawled, "are manufacturers." During a whole year we sat through a whole century of European history, and Bismarck, Garibaldi, social legislation in England, benevolent Tories like Shaftsbury and reformers like Cobden and Bright, "nationalism" (what devastating force Carlton Hayes put and can still [1938] put into the word), and the Third Republic, became familiar parts of our imagination. In the midst of cries of "pro-German" and "pro-Ally," "preparedness" and "pacificism," during the 3 years before America went into the war, we knew somewhat better than many of our older compatriots what had brought the tornado about. Carlton Hayes had brought European history, as Charles Beard had brought American Government, from the abstraction of a textbook to an experience lived and a problem to be faced. And it always surprised some of us that, in the midst of the lectures (first-rate theatrical performances, words shot out for emphasis, silences sustained for a moment, gestures and movement deployed like those of a good actor) when we looked down at our notes, they were as ordered and clear as if we had listened to a scholastic metronome.

The list of his publications is a long and distinguished one. He wrote many editions of his famous texts, "Political and Social History of Modern Europe" and "Political and Cultural History of Modern Europe." He wrote hundreds of articles for scholarly journals. The vast range of his interests is reflected in the titles of some of his books: "British Social Politics"; "A Brief History of the Great War"; "Essays on Nationalism"; "Historical Evolution of Modern Nationalism"; "A Generation of Materialism"; "Wartime Mission in Spain"; "Christianity and Western Civilization"; "The United States and Spain."

Professor Hayes was a prominent Catholic layman. In a small book called "Patriotism, Nationalism and the Brotherhood of Man," written in 1937 for the Committee on National Attitudes of the Catholic Association for International Peace, he wrote as follows:

> It must regretfully be confessed that many Catholics in this country see little or no connection between their profession of religion and the attitudes they assume in matters of patriotism and nationalism * * *. No one can expect the United States to become more Christian, if professed Catholics become less so. No one can expect the United States to be preserved from pagan nationalism—or communism—unless its Catholic citizens do their part. They should be leaders, and not mere followers. To this end, they must know and live their faith in all its ramifications. Then must apply it, individually and collectively, to public as well as to private life. They must understand the pressing problems of today, not least the problems of contemporary nationalism, and must meet them in accordance with age-long Catholic principles.

It is clear from this statement why Carlton J. H. Hayes was one of the founders of the National Association of Christians and Jews. He served that organization as its Catholic chairman from 1928 to 1946.

Mr. Speaker, Professor Hayes, distinguished scholar and diplomat, will be greatly missed by his friends and neighbors in the Morningside Heights community of New York which I am honored to represent. To Mrs. Carlton Hayes and the family I extend my deepest sympathy.

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point in the RECORD an article which appeared in the New York Times on September 4, 1964, summarizing the distinguished career of Professor Hayes:

DR. CARLTON J. H. HAYES, 82, DIES—HISTORIAN WAS ENVOY TO SPAIN—CREDITED WITH KEEPING FRANCO OUT OF THE WAR—TAUGHT AT COLUMBIA 1907–50

AFTON, N.Y., September 3.—Dr. Carlton J. H. Hayes, retired professor of history at Columbia University and wartime Ambassador to Spain, died of a heart ailment today in Sidney Hospital. His age was 82.

PERIPATETIC LECTURER

On a January morning in 1950 Dr. Hayes strode into a classroom at Columbia, mounted the platform and resumed where he had broken off his previous lecture in modern European history.

Pacing briskly, self-assured, sometimes sarcastic, he appeared not to notice that his audience, larger than usual, had filled every seat and lined the walls. Just before the bell sounded for the end of class, Dr. Hayes reached the year 1950 in his narrative.

"And there I leave you," he said, "facing a great big question mark."

He walked from the room, leaving Columbia after exactly 50 years as student and teacher. He had become an almost legendary figure on Morningside Heights. A contemporary commentator noted:

"He was the elder statesman with the courtly manners who could call a graying colleague 'My dear boy,' and still make it sound quite proper. He taught history with an actor's skill. Looking majestically out into space, he would boom a few sentences, then pause, then boom out again. Sometime he would wrap his double-breasted coat close around him, as if it were a cloak and seem to become Disraeli, Metternich or Bismarck himself."

Dr. Hayes had enrolled as a student at Columbia College as this century began. He joined the faculty in 1907, upon receiving his doctorate there. In time he became Seth Low professor of history.

His long career on Morningside Heights was interrupted twice. He took a leave of absence in World War I to serve as a captain of intelligence in the Army. And from May 1942 to January 1945 he was the U.S. Ambassador to Spain.

BOOK DREW CRITICISM

His World War II assignment and a book he wrote about it, "Wartime Mission in Spain," made him a center of controversy, which he remained to some degree until his death.

He was accused in some circles of being influenced by his religion (he had become a Roman Catholic as an undergraduate) to paint a more favorable picture of Spain and its wartime role under Generalissimo Francisco Franco than the events warranted.

But even his critics gave Dr. Hayes the credit of having dissuaded Generalissimo Franco from giving complete support to the axis powers in the grim days before the tide of war turned in favor of the Allies.

The controversy could not detract in any case from his stature as a teacher and a major historian. Even after his retirement at the age of 68, he continued to lecture and write.

He had already written 23 books, and after retiring he added 4 more. His last work was "Nationalism: A Religion," which appeared late in 1960.

Dr. Hayes made himself a specialist in the history of the Atlantic community. He charmed students and readers with the eloquence of his prose.

He took what has been described as the biographical approach to history, marching the great figures of Europe from 1500 to the 1950's across the stage of his teaching platform.

His two-volume "Political and Social History of Modern Europe," published in 1916, was adopted by many colleges and universities as a standard textbook. It covered the 400 years before the beginning of World War I.

Another work considered a classic was "British Social Politics," published in 1913, which plainly outlined the growing trend of what Dr. Hayes called "state action for the solution of social problems." It was among the earliest treatments of the subject.

Many of his old friends considered it tragic that his book about his years in Spain should have tarnished his position as a historian. He wrote it shortly after his return, and it was thought to lack the cool historical approach of his other writings.

A DIMMER WORLD

On his return to the campus, Dr. Hayes admitted to his students that the world did not seem so bright to him as it had when he faced his first class 43 years earlier. But he hastened to add:

"I don't want anybody to commit suicide over the state of the world today. History's continuity is greater and stronger than its changes."

Carlton Joseph Huntley Hayes was born May 16, 1882, on a farm near Afton. And it was to his Jericho farm in Afton that he returned after leaving Columbia, though he continued to spend the winter months in his apartment at 88 Morningside Drive in New York.

He wrote a booklet on the history of the town and liked to describe himself as "a dirt farmer from Afton." His widow recalled yesterday that before he suffered the first of a series of heart attacks a year and a half ago he used to enjoy long walks and canoe trips on the nearby Susquehanna River.

During his career, he received many honorary degrees, including a doctorate of laws from Columbia in 1929. The University of Notre Dame gave him its Laetare Medal in 1946 for being an outstanding Catholic layman. Other awards included the Catholic Action Medal of St. Bonaventure College in 1956 and the Cardinal Newman Award from the University of New Hampshire in 1957.

His fellow historians of the American Historical Association elected him their president.

Dr. Hayes was a founder of the National Association of Christians and Jews and was its Catholic cochairman from 1928 to 1946.

Besides his widow, the former Miss Mary Evelyn Carroll, Dr. Hayes is survived by a daughter, Mrs. William D. Tucker, Jr.; a son, Carroll J. J. Hayes, and 12 grandchildren.

The children, then teenagers, accompanied their parents to Spain in 1942. Newspaper correspondents called the family "the four Ambassadors."

A funeral service will be held at 10 a.m. tomorrow morning at St. Agnes Catholic Church in Afton.

IMPENDING TRANSPORTATION CRISIS INVOLVING THE NEW HAVEN RAILROAD

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, I take this time today to direct the attention of the House once more to the impending transportation crisis involving the New Haven Railroad. This is not the first crisis this railroad has gone through but it may well be the most critical.

In fact, it involves the entire commuter railroad system serving Metropolitan New York City. The New Jersey railroads are in similar plight and the Long Island Railroad faces a similar crisis in the next 2 years. The present crisis facing the New Haven, however, is the most imminent and pressing.

For 4 years, I have urged that an interstate agency be created to handle commuter transportation. In both the 87th and in the present Congress, I introduced legislation which would ratify such an interstate agreement in principle and in advance of an actual agreement. The principle of advance approval in these cases were specifically endorsed in President Kennedy's message on transportation.

Today, the need for it is more apparent than ever.

September 30, yesterday, marked the passage of a deadline for a plan under which the New Haven would have been able to lease 130 new and rebuilt cars from the Port of New York Authority. These cars are essential to the railroad's present commuter operations but which it cannot possibly afford to buy.

This plan, worked out under the supervision of Federal Judge Robert Anderson, whose court has jurisdiction over the railroad under the Bankruptcy Act, hinged upon the payment of subsidies to the New Haven by the State of Connecticut and by the Westchester County government in New York.

Connecticut met her part of the bargain but the Westchester County Board of Supervisors voted the plan down. Connecticut's payments would have been $450,000 a year and Westchester's $400,000 a year. These are sizable sums but they are no more than an insignificant fraction of the financial loss that would be suffered if commuter railroad service is abandoned.

The loss in real estate values alone and the following collapse of tax revenues would be disastrous.

With the scrapping of the car-lease arrangement, the New Haven is left without resources by which to replace its worn equipment.

The trustees of the railroad notified the public Monday that they would have to ask the Interstate Commerce Commission for permission to reduce commuter service, although they promised they will maintain full service as long as they have cars that can run.

So we are now in the situation where our vital commuter service has nothing to support it. Unless something is done, it will wear away and there will be nothing left to salvage.

A number of long-range plans have been drafted and are being studied to provide for the future of the railroad. But these will avail us nothing unless there is a railroad in existence.

It is clear that public agencies must act to sustain commuter service until such time as the proper long-range program can be put into effect.

I urge again swift action on an interstate compact. And for the long range I repeat my insistence that the New Haven Railroad be included as an integral part of the proposed merger of the New York Central and Pennsylvania Railroads.

THE PRESIDENT'S REMARKS AT TEXARKANA

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include therein speeches made by the President and the First Lady at Texarkana, Ark., last week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, during the course of a presidential political campaign, according to the American tradition, the President as well as his opposition, say some things that people may forget after election day.

When the President spoke in Texarkana last week, he was not talking political pap; he was not talking political nonsense; he was a friend talking to friends. He thinks as a Texan, and we think as Texans. Of course, we welcomed our kissing cousins from Arkansas, Oklahoma, and Louisiana, who came to Texarkana to enjoy the historic occasion of the President's visit. But we Texans were extremely proud to hear Lyndon Baines Johnson speak, and our pride lay in the fact that the President of the United States is a Texan who knows, as most Texans do, precisely what he is saying and what he is doing.

He was not speaking out of several sides of his mouth. There was no explanation needed to interpret what he said. He was not soft-soaping. He was laying the facts of life on the line.

I cannot adequately relate to you my feelings when it came time for me to introduce the President of the United States. In my 36 years as a Congressman I never had a greater thrill.

Four years previously I had introduced our martyred President, a man whom I admired greatly, but he was from Massachusetts. Lyndon Baines Johnson is from Texas.

What President Johnson said in Texarkana becomes part of the historical record. I am pleased now to make available his remarks, which are as follows:

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT. Mr. Russell, Governor and Mrs. Faubus, Governor Connally, Senator Yarborough, Congressman and Mrs. Patman, Congressman and Mrs. Harris, distinguished platform guests, ladies, and gentlemen, first, I want to express my deep regret to all of you and to each of you for our tardiness this evening. It was good of you to want us to come. It was even better of you to be so patient and understanding. We left Washington early this morning, about 4:30 or 5 o'clock your time, and we have been to El Paso, Eufaula Dam, in Oklahoma, Muskogee, Oklahoma City, and everywhere we have gone we have been meeting and visiting with and talking with, and seeing, good people just like you. So because of the crowd and because of our desire to say "Hello" to each of them, we were delayed tonight. I hope that you are good enough to understand that there wasn't much we could do about it.

We do appreciate your coming here and welcoming us back to our home State. We do appreciate the presence of the two great Governors of Arkansas and Texas, and how they honor us on this platform. We are very pleased that we could have with us our own senior Senator from the State of Texas, RALPH YARBOROUGH; our own Congressman, JACK BROOKS.

You know, we in Texas are very proud of our delegation. We have been proud of it for many years in the Congress. When Mr. Garner was Vice President many years ago, and Mr. Rayburn was the majority leader getting ready for the Speakership, someone asked him why Texas had such a fine delegation in the Congress. Mr. Garner replied, "We pick 'em young, we pick 'em honest, we send them there and we keep them there." And the reason that Texas and Arkansas both have such a fine delegation in the Congress today is because you pick 'em young, and you pick 'em honest, and you send 'em there, and you keep them there.

I think I should say to you people in Texarkana, you are a very fortunate lot. For many years you have had two of the ablest Congressmen in the House of Representatives. You know, there was a time in Texas history when we said we give you two Governors for the price of one. Well, in Texarkana you have two Congressmen for the price of one, your own beloved WRIGHT PATMAN and our own beloved OREN HARRIS. Texans will understand this because we are quite a modest lot, but while I have a chance to say something to Arkansas, I want to say this: There is no delegation in the U.S. Congress that has contributed more to the success of that Congress, that has contributed more sound, constructive leadership to the entire Nation, than the great State of Arkansas. There are States in the Union that you can't match in number of tillable acres. There are States in the Union that you can't match in terms of per capita wealth. There are States in the Union that you cannot match in population. But I will tell you, the Arkansas delegation is a match for any delegation in either House of the Congress.

JOHN MCCLELLAN and BILL FULBRIGHT wear proudly the title of Senators from the great State of Arkansas in the greatest deliberative body in the world. WILBUR MILLS, JIM TRIMBLE, OREN HARRIS, the other Members of the Arkansas delegation in the Congress, are always there and on the job, and all of them have reached positions of seniority where they exercise great influence. I have never seen a single one of them when you called upon them but what they knew what they were talking about and they had only one criterion, only one yardstick they applied, and that was this: If this is good for America, it is good for Arkansas and it is good for us.

I say to you tonight that the Arkansas delegation in the Congress has made great contributions to the welfare of all of our people. And I honor them and I salute them.

We have come here, though, to commemorate the great life of a great man—John Fitzgerald Kennedy. Ten thousand words would not honor the 1,000 days that he served us all. Ten times 10,000 words would not express the sorrow in the hearts of each of us tonight. But John Kennedy would be impatient if we spent even 100 words eulogizing him or sorrowing over him. He would want us to honor him as he always honored us, by thinking of tomorrow, by talking of what we must do together to make tomorrow better and brighter, and more secure for all men in our land and for all people around the world.

On that September day 4 years ago when John Fitzgerald Kennedy came here to Texarkana and spoke to you, he had this to say: "Lyndon Johnson and I seek to represent the United States in a very difficult and a very dangerous period. We do not run for the Presidency and the Vice-Presidency promising that if we are elected life will be easier. But we do promise you that if we are elected this country will begin to move again. This country will move forward. This country will stand strong. This country's brightest days will be ahead."

Tonight, you know, and all the world knows, that America is moving forward. America does stand strong, the brightest days that we have ever known are opening before us. And they are opening in every section of the land. I am so proud that we have leadership that is opening those doors to our own beloved section. But I would not want to mislead you. This is still a dangerous and a difficult time. This generation of Americans wants no promise of a life of ease, for we seek to live the life of the free. Our concern tonight is for courage enough to win the contest of our times, for we know this: What we have we cannot keep; what we hope to have we cannot reach, unless we hold to our sure and our steadfast course of strength. America's strength has never been the strength of arms alone. America's missiles are mighty. But the true strength of America lies in the moral might of our cause. It lives in the righteousness of the hearts of the people. The sons of America are welcome tonight in the free lands around the world because all men know that their purpose is peace. And the day must never come when our words or our deeds cause that purpose to be doubted. Who leads America must speak what is deep in the hearts of Americans, not what comes from the top of the head. And deep in the heart of all America is a love for peace. We so devoutly want peace in the world. We want peace in the lives of all of our people. We want our senior citizens and our young folks, our family farmers and our businessmen, our workingmen and our management people, to live without fear of the future.

In your lifetime and mine, great gains have been made in this land, the greatest gains ever made in any land at any time. And there is no time for us tonight to give those gains away or to allow them to be taken from us. But those gains will go, and they will be taken from us, if ever we allow any people to divide us, because the ultimate test of moral fitness for men who seek a public trust is their devotion to perfection of our system and their devotion to justice in our society. All that we are, all that we ever hope to be, is placed in mortal jeopardy by those who would divide us, by those who would set class against class, and creed against creed, and religion against religion, and color against color, and section against section.

Let me remind each of you tonight that here in Texarkana I stand astride the boundary line between the two great States. Only a few miles out yonder and a few miles behind me two other great States joined these two. Almost anywhere else in the world these lines would be marked by fences, or barriers, or walls. But not here in America. As it is among Americans, so it is between us and our neighbors.

Only last week I stood on our border with the Prime Minister of Canada, far away from here. Only today, at noon, I stood on our border with the President of Mexico. On neither border are there fortifications, barbed wire fences, or fears. And this is the way that Americans want to live in the world and at home. And this is another reason why we must guard against those who would erect around our regions or our States prejudice and the barriers of hate or misunderstanding.

My beloved friends, as I stand here before you tonight, looking into your faces and into your eyes, I face to the South. I speak words which were spoken long before when I say, "Abandon all these local animosities and make your sons American." Those are the words of a great son of the South. Those are the words of Robert E. Lee, and they are the words by which all of us may wisely live today. Sixty miles from here my wife was born. In this part of Texas she lived as a young girl and she learned as a young woman. This earth of Texas is part of her, and I am proud to say it is part of me. She has come back home tonight to the soil and to the people that she loves.

One's heart never really leaves home; although thousands of miles may intrude, and you may walk with kings, queens, Prime Ministers and fair ladies, there is forever a part of your birthplace that is bright and that is alive, and gives you pride.

So tonight I speak to you with a heart full of hope and with a heart full of promise, but there are voices abroad in the land that have a strange and a brittle tone. They cry out that we are weak, and America is soft and blind. They insist the way to the future is the road back into the past. They demand suspicion as the price of liberty, and belligerence as the alternate for peace. They just can't seem to find anything right with our beloved country and our beloved people, and all they find about us is wrong.

But thank God truth is eternal. Malice may distort and ignorance may ignore it, and panic may deride it, but the truth is always there. Truth is the weapon of the people, and truth is their shield against dishonor. Truth will protect them from false prophets and truth will save them from cruel hopes.

The truth is simple and the truth is this: Our beloved Nation was never stronger than it is this hour tonight, and our Nation was never more prosperous than it is this hour tonight. You and all of you know that in your heart I am right, because I know where we have been, so it is easy to measure how far we have come.

Tonight social security is the haven for our elderly citizens, and minimum wages have brought a better life to millions of our little people. The TVA and the REA have banished darkness from the countryside, and some of the voices say that this is all wrong, but the truth says that it is right. Tonight our free enterprise system was never healthier. Wages were never larger. Profits were never higher, and job opportunities were never brighter, because more than 72 million have jobs tonight. Some of the voices deny this, but you know in your heart that it is right.

Today we have opened the doors to more education for more people. We have widened the horizons of better conservation of all of our natural resources. This afternoon I saw dozens of miles of long lakes where mothers and fathers will take their children for weekends. I saw dams that will save the farmers downstream from floods. I saw homes that will have electricity because of the energy that is created. Yes, the voices say this conservation is wrong, but you know, and I know, in our hearts that it is right.

Tonight we ask for equality under our Constitution and under our Bill of Rights. We ask for equality and justice and for treatment for all of our citizens under our Constitution, and because of this, some of us are smeared and some of us are told that we should be fearful, but the truth says that it is right. Today we enjoy more freedom than any American ever enjoyed at any time in our history, and what is important, we have more time to enjoy it because we are working fewer hours per day, fewer days per week, fewer weeks per year. The voices deny this, but the truth says that it is right.

Tonight we have a test ban treaty that keeps the air that we breathe—it keeps it clean and free of poison. Some of the voices say that this is a mistake, that this is wrong, but the mothers of America say this is right, and you know in your own heart that this is right.

Tonight we strive for peace, peace in the world through armed strength and through human understanding, through the United Nations and through God's own rule of doing unto others as you would have them do unto you. The voices say this is wrong, but the truth says this is right.

So my fellow countrymen, I have faith in the truth. The truth made us free and the truth shall keep us free. Sometimes in the late of night, when all the Capital city has gone to sleep, I sit by myself behind that big black fence and I read and I think, and oftentimes it is so quiet in the White House that I can almost hear the footsteps of the men who have lived in that house, and the men who have walked its halls and have slept in its rooms, and have stayed awake waiting for the sun to come up—Jefferson, Madison, Jackson, Abraham Lincoln, Theodore Roosevelt, Woodrow Wilson, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Harry Truman, Dwight Eisenhower, and John Fitzgerald Kennedy, and when the problems and the decisions that are part of every President's life weigh heavily upon me, and my shoulders bend because it just seems that you can't carry any more, I always try to remember that this land was born in struggle and has survived and endured in freedom because truth prevailed and because decency ultimately triumphed.

I also remember that the men who lived in this house before me kept one cause and one aim in their hearts: what is right and what is best for the American people.

Well, here on the platform with my beloved friends Oren Harris and Wright Patman, with by great, able, senior Senator Ralph Yarborough, and with the two distinguished Governors, the chief executives of our States, Orville Faubus and John Connally, I want to say to all of you, with God as my witness, that this is my aim, and this is my purpose. What is right and best for the American people is best for all of us, and with your help and with God's guidance, with the strength that comes from your prayers, Lady Bird and I will go back and open the gate and get behind the black iron fence on Monday. We pledge to you for as long as we are privileged to be there that we shall do what is right and what is best for the people of this land.

LADY BIRD JOHNSON'S REMARKS AT TEXARKANA

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, when the President and the First Lady of the land visited Texarkana last week, history was made.

A few days ago I put into the Record reports of that event as carried in the Texarkana Gazette.

Today I wish to place in the Record the remarks of Lady Bird Johnson, who is the most distinguished constituent I have had in my 36 years in the Congress. There were a lot of folks from Karnack there the day she spoke and they, like many thousands who saw and heard her, are proud that such a distinguished lady is—and always will be—one of us. Our pride in her was justified, not alone by what she said but by her gracious bearing.

I am delighted and honored to place in the Record her remarks:

Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson. Friends: My friends, "home" is a mighty sweet word, and when I am in Texarkana I am very close to home. It is wonderful to look around and see that Karnack is so well represented, and I will bet that somewhere out there in the crowd there is Jefferson and Marshall, as well as Texarkana, and so many folks from Arkansas.

It has been a wonderful day of looking into the face of America. It began mighty early this morning, almost as early as if I was back home on the farm. From Washington, we left and went to El Paso for the very colorful and historic ceremony of the Chamizal where we met the President of Mexico and part of his Government, and his family. Then we went on to the dedication of the Eufaula Dam in Oklahoma, and then to the opening of the Oklahoma State Fair, and now here. I think you have really put the big pot in the little one.

You know, there is just one thing that is slightly shocking about coming home for me. I realize how many years have passed. But time has not passed my section by. As we drove in from the airport, I could see that it was burgeoning and growing. Wright Patman, who will always be Mr. East Texas to me, told me about a new plant that has just come here within the last week or two that will bring 700 or so new jobs to this area. I am glad that my part of the country is in the midstream of America that is going forward. I know my husband wants to help get it there.

Thank you for this wonderful welcome, more than I can say.

WALTER LIPPMANN

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I aks unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, the columnist, Walter Lippmann, is perhaps a brilliant man. He is able to count many of America's most serious thinkers among his readers. His influence is great. It is, therefore, doubly tragic that this man should engage in such misrepresentation, and fall victim to such faulty logic, as I find revealed in his column in the September 24 issue of the Washington Post. Entitled "On Warmongering," it could only come from the pen of a man whose passions have obtained control over his honesty and good sense, or is seeking to prove his position with "the establishment."

Here is what Mr. Lippmann says about the foreign policy of Senator Goldwater:

> If one studies his remarks on foreign policy, one finds that his idea of diplomacy is to deliver an ultimatum. If what he means is what he says, he would solve all our difficult problems by issuing an ultimatum to somebody. He would solve the Vietnamese conflict by an ultimatum to Hanoi and an ultimatum to Peiping. He would get rid of the nuisance [Mr. Lippmann's word] in Cuba by an ultimatum to Castro. He would remove the Berlin wall by an ultimatum to the Soviet Government.

Mr. Speaker, this is as gross a misrepresentation of a man's position as I have ever had the misfortune to see in print. Mr. Lippmann is not writing in such a fashion because he does not know better. He is sufficiently well educated and well read to know that what he says is untrue. A very full and complete exposition of Senator Goldwater's views on foreign policy was set forth for Life magazine on January 17, 1964.

There is no talk whatsoever of ultimatums in this article, any more than he is talking today of ultimatums. Rather it is a carefully reasoned argument for a foreign policy which would halt the further advance of communism, while maintaining the peace through such strength that the Communists would never dare to attack. For any of my colleagues and for all those people who may wish to know the truth, I suggest that they compare the two articles at the conclusion of my remarks. I ask unanimous consent that the Lippmann article, "On Warmongering," as well as Senator Goldwater's article from Life magazine, be inserted in the Record. Mr. Lippmann's distortion of the Senator's call for firmness in our foreign policy may flow from his own particular inability to perceive that such firmness is not the same as plunging into war. Mr. Lippmann was, and is, among the most articulate opponents of those who call for the elimination of the Communist base in the Western Hemisphere, Cuba, or reinstituting the Monroe Doctrine. Before the great missile crisis of 1962 he assailed all those who warned that the United States must act. So sure was he that action meant war, that when at last President Kennedy was forced to act, Lippmann was appalled. He criticized the Cuban blockade as "spilt milk." He could not believe that the Soviet ships would not challenge the blockade. And he called immediately for the United States to withdraw its missiles from Turkey as the only hope to avoid war.

Most recently, Mr. Lippmann has made it clear that he opposes the effort to defend the freedom of the people of Vietnam. He argues insistently for the so-called neutralization of Vietnam, on the theory that it probably will not fall to the Communists in such an event; but even if it does this is "all right," because the Communists of Indochina are bound to be "national Communists," who will not be dangerous. In still another column Mr. Lippmann has argued that we do not have to fear the withdrawal of our power from the mainland of southeast Asia because our carrier power will still be available, cruising off the coast. Mr. Lippmann would do well to explain how he, who opposes military action of any kind, would use the Navy, or the Air Force to prevent a Communist takeover of a Vietnam abandoned by American ground forces.

Mr. Speaker, here is a man whose every column portrays the most abysmal ignorance of communism and its methods and who now says of Senator Goldwater, a member of the other body's Armed Services Committee:

> (He) does not live in the daylight world and does not deal with real people, only with the good guys and the bad guys of Superman's imagining.

I leave it to the infinitely better sense of the American people to draw the proper conclusions as to who it who is living in "the darkness of illusion":

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Sept. 24, 1964]

ON WARMONGERING

(By Walter Lippmann)

General Eisenhower says it is "tommyrot" to think that Senator Goldwater is a "warmonger"—that is to say, a man who wants to start a war. But does anybody say that Barry Goldwater wants a war? I know of no one who says it, or thinks it. What is being said is that he is the kind of man who would be much more likely than President Johnson to get us into a big war.

This charge, which is affecting the campaign profoundly, is that Senator Goldwater's admiration of brinkmanship, his impulsive willingness to threaten nuclear war, could put this country in the position where the only choice left was between surrender and nuclear war. It is not that Barry Goldwater wants to have a war; it is that he denounces every alternative to war as surrender, appeasement, or cowardice.

The crucial fallacy of his military thinking and of his ideas about foreign policy is the assumption that the United States must be and will be obeyed by all the rest of the world, by its adversaries, its rivals, its allies. Here again is that unreason of the dreamer: the illusion of superman that all opponents can be commanded to disappear. Of course, the Senator does not want a war. But he is suffering from that most dangerous of all the illusions of a statesman, the illusion of omnipotence.

Thus, if one studies his remarks on foreign policy, one finds that his idea of diplomacy is to deliver an ultimatum. If what he means is what he says, he would solve all our difficult problems by issuing an ultimatum to somebody. He would solve the Vietnamese conflict by an ultimatum to Hanoi and an ultimatum to Peiping. He would get rid of the nuisance in Cuba by an ultimatum to Castro. He would remove the Berlin wall by an ultimatum to the Soviet Government.

He is at pains to deny that he is "trigger-happy," and General Eisenhower is now testifying that no one who has seen a war could want a war. But BARRY GOLDWATER is undeniably ultimatum-happy. And this makes him a very dangerous man. For there are powerful, brave, and proud nations which oppose us on various issues. A President who would conduct foreign policy by ultimatum is failing to realize that other people are like Americans in that, driven to it, they will fight rather than surrender.

This is the specific danger of Goldwaterism in foreign affairs: an instinctive and impulsive preference for the ultimatum rather than for negotiation. That is why, without intending to have a war, he would prove to be a precipitator of warlike crises and perhaps of the ultimate crisis of a war of annihilation. For him the outer world does not really exist: the foreigners who live beyond the seas are not other men with whom we must live on this planet but abstractions who will vanish if the President barks at them.

There has been no serious discussion about foreign affairs in this campaign. There is not likely to be. For the President lives in the daylight world and there he deals with Russians and Chinese and Germans and South Americans and Vietnamese and Cypriots, all of whom are very different and most of whom are very ornery. They all have certain things in common. In the daylight world the President knows that he did not create them. He knows that he does not own them. And he knows that he cannot command them.

But BARRY GOLDWATER does not live in the daylight world and he does not deal with real people, only with the good guys and the bad guys of superman's imagining.

GOLDWATER RESPONDS TO LIFE'S EDITORIAL: "MY PROPOSAL FOR A 'CAN-WIN' FOREIGN POLICY"

(By Senator BARRY GOLDWATER)

The United States is the most powerful Nation on earth. We are living in a world torn by conflict. We are challenged to use our power to achieve freedom and peace throughout the world. We are failing to do it.

The foreign policy of the United States should be the sum of principles and purposes through which we shape our national destiny—a clear statement of our interests, a believable expression of the will to maintain these interests and a vision of the sort of world in which nations like ours can live.

Foreign policy should not be confused with foreign programs. Programs as such stem from policy; they do not form it. To debate programs is to beg the issue and avoid the confrontation with our national conscience which a real foreign policy requires.

It is not enough simply to say that war or peace is the only foreign policy issue. Peace has many complex requirements and war has many faces which we need to know more clearly. But first we need the statement and the vision.

The fundamentals of a decent public order are based upon a view of man as endowed with inherent, intrinsic worth and rights. His worth and his rights must be protected by the rule of law enforced by an impartial judiciary, respect for personal liberty and religion, a free press, diffusion of political and economic power, and emphasis on freedom of creativity for the individual. Since we hold that government derives its just powers from the consent of the governed, a world in which we can live safely by our principles must include both opportunity for all nations to live in the way prescribed by their people's convictions and the assurance that our system will enjoy a decent respect from other governments.

In present-day terms, the major objective of the U.S. foreign policy should be the reduction of Communist power to a level from which it cannot threaten the security of our Nation or the peace of the world. This will require full mobilization of the free world's resolve and its resources to undermine the power now held by Communists and to encourage their eviction from positions of control.

This does not mean war. It means the alternative to war; a way to win peace—to end threats to the Nation—without war. Together the advanced free nations hold the balance of world power. They greatly outproduce the Communist nations, whose economies, now deeply in trouble, would stagnate without constant infusions of Western productivity.

Psychologically, too, we have the advantage. Freedom is our century's most inspiring cry. The Western nations have more freedom than man has ever before enjoyed and have extended it. Communism demonstrably has been freedom's archenemy. But we have tended to hide freedom's light under a bushel of our own reticence. We must remove the bushel so that the light that is there will shine—brilliantly.

If we fail to exploit these other instruments of national power, there eventually will come a time when the military instrument alone will serve and ony the alternative of war or surrender will be available.

Our present policy of coexistence has failed to alter communism's goal of destroying the political and social forms of the non-Communist world. It will continue to fail because it does not counter the aggressive dynamism of Communist expansion.

The Communists would like to present us with the one choice: either give in or face nuclear war. But hot war is not an essential ingredient of the campaign toward reducing Communist power and evicting Communist powerholders. It is the height of folly to equate a can-win policy—the desire to win—with a desire for war, just as it is foolish to suggest that a no-win policy will produce peace.

There is always a risk of war in a world in which possessors of great military power are committed to aggression. But war is a risk to the Communists as well as to us.

The Communists are deterred from risking war today by our preponderant military-technology advantage. That deterrence can last only so long as we keep an unflagging opposition to the total Communist enterprise.

Our present deterrent power was built almost entirely under the Eisenhower administration. There has been no significant addition to it since, and there are no plans for strengthening it. There are, indeed, plans to phase it down.

Easing the arms race will not ease tensions. It will enable a growing impunity for reckless Communist tactics.

We should not fall into the very trap which Communist strategy seeks to set for us—namely, that every time the free world exerts pressure against an exposed Communist salient or marginal position, it incurs the risk of all-out Communist retaliation. Communist leaders have shown themselves cautious strategists when it comes to risking the security of their heartland by opting for war. Thus, one of the principal objectives of free world strategy should be to exploit those situations in which the Communists cannot afford to take risks larger than the stakes are worth.

Our weapons programs—the choice of the right programs, their coordination with one another, and the purposefulness of their execution—are, therefore, matters of crucial national concern, and their revitalization is a matter of grave national necessity.

Does this approach alone doom any hope for the reconciliation of our differences? No. That hope is doomed by communism's objectives and not by any bellicose disposition in the free world.

The Communists' undeviating pursuit of a Communist world is a fundamental fact of world politics here and now. An American foreign policy which does not come to grips with this fundamental fact is about as meaningful as a production of "Hamlet" without the Danish prince. A thousand foreign plans, programs, and proposals only waste our precious resources so long as their authors refuse to face the fact of Red determination.

The suggestion that Khrushchev is a "better" Communist for our purposes and therefore deserves support to prevent a "worse" Communist from taking his place is a Western-style notion. It couldn't get house room in Communist thinking. Communists think of communism in ideological, not personal, terms.

Western governments are concerned with the people's welfare here and now; a free electorate does not tolerate the sacrifice of the living generation—its own generation—for the sake of some utopian fancy. Government which seeks to attain practical goals and is responsive to the people—this is the kind of government with which most of us are familiar. Communist government is not based on these principles. Yet, good naturedly and mistakenly, the democratic peoples are prone to credit these virtues to governments which spurn democracy and brag about it.

We must deal with what is the case and not with what we wish were the case. Demonstrably, the Communists themselves entertain no idea of real peace with their enemies. They consider themselves engaged in an epochal movement of history which, by historical necessity, will end the present age and destroy its society to usher in the new Socialist age.

The Communist conflict machine consists of many parts, any of these dangerous to the United States insofar as it is linked, by a community of purpose and world view, to a Communist power center capable of threatening the United States or other non-Communist nations. At present such a power center exists in the Soviet Union and one may well develop in Communist China. Others may develop in time.

Inner differences between the parts of communism do not remove the threat of any one of them to non-Communist nations so long as the overthrow of the present society remains their common goal. The antagonism between the Soviets and Red China is not based on any difference in ideas as to their enemy (the non-Communist nations, particularly the United States) and his assigned fate (destruction of his society). Thus we can take no comfort from their differences. In fact, the development of two Communist power centers could as easily double our problems as halve them.

Present U.S. foreign policy does not cope squarely with any of these situations. It is a series of unrelated programs, nervous reflexes and unwarranted assumptions. Foreign aid is used, at one and the same time, to strengthen nations against communism and to strengthen nations already dominated by Communists. In those latter cases it has not weakened Communist power but has, instead, eased internal difficulties by making up local commodity deficits.

Our nuclear policies now place more trust in our enemies than in our friends. We speak of an "interdependent" world and yet we deploy our strength so as to isolate ourselves. We are building, in short, the illusory walls of a new fortress America, in an age when such walls may be vaulted with ease. And, most alarmingly, our present policy has permitted our major alliances to decay.

As I see it, we have no realistic purpose around which policy may be formed and through which programs can be sensibly directed.

A determined enemy, faced with this jumbled array, knows that he can nibble away at one point and then another without risk. He is, in short, given assurances of immunity as he alternates between hot and cold, freeze and thaw. On our side, indecision immobilizes us, lack of overriding purpose confuses us and reaction—rather than action—restricts us.

In Latin America, for example, a dollar-stitched patchwork quilt of programs is being torn to shreds by a unified Communist drive to power. We seem to be heading toward acceptance of the substance of Communist rule under the guise of "progressive" nationalism. In Cuba the issue once was communism, but since has become simply the number of Soviet troops on the island.

Africa is said to be swept by what some call the revolution of rising expectations, easily exploitable by the Communists. Firm Western leadership could turn this turmoil in the direction of rising responsibility.

Southeast Asia shows the greatest confusion of purposes. The decision in Laos to conclude a worthless truce and accept a coalition including Communists laid open that country's long boundaries to Communist infiltration. Thailand, once a strong ally, has been left exposed, lonely and virtually forgotten. Cambodia, perceiving the meaning of our abandonment of Laos, now stands ready to hop on the Communist bandwagon. Our attempt to make a policy of concessions in Laos compatible with a policy of resistance in Vietnam was hopeless from the beginning.

There is nothing in these situations that can inspire the rallying together of the non-Communist world, that can strengthen its will or weapons, or reduce the power of the enemy. Instead, on every front there is encouragement for further Communist incursions—and encouragement also for dangerous miscalculations which could force nuclear war.

The present U.S. foreign policy does not encourage—or in some cases even permit—the use of free-world power, short of general war, to counter Communist strategy, undermine Communist power, or encourage the eviction of Communist power holders.

In the central struggle of our time, the power of the United States is crucial, but it does not stand alone.

The broad base of power which can confront, confound, and eventually overcome communism is the Atlantic community of nations, which collectively possesses the preponderant power of the earth and also shares a common cultural heritage. It is the present disarray in the Atlantic alliance which today most seriously weakens us and encourages the expansion of communism.

Our present foreign policy is conducive to this disunity. It has mishandled the delicate problem of relating a number of highly civilized and industrialized nations to U.S. leadership. It has fumbled the problem of sharing our nuclear know-how and weapons with our friends. It has, again and again, misjudged the requirements and sensitivities of our allies and evoked distrust and misunderstanding. Nor has the alliance been strengthened by our tendency to undercut our allies in the immensely complex process of decolonization.

There is a way out of the dilemma and away from the disaster it clearly foreshadows. We must rethink the purpose of the alliance, and the degree to which we are willing to concede to NATO certain prerogatives which we now reserve to ourselves.

As a matter of fact, some of these prerogatives already have been challenged so effectively by our allies that we now possess only their shadow. There is no use telling ourselves, for instance, but we still hold a nuclear monopoly in the alliance and will hold it in the future. Great Britain has such power. France is building it. There are no technological reasons to prevent others from doing the same.

Our allies may be wrong about a number of things, but they are quite right to mistrust our tendency to seek accommodations with communism through bilateral negotiations. France had some reason to look upon the test ban treaty as an agreement arrived at between the United States and the U.S.S.R. at her expense.

The answer which frequently is given to justify our current alliance-fracturing drive toward a détente with the Soviets is that it is difficult to obtain the unanimous consent of 15 allies. That begs the question. What is it that all 15 allies have unanimously agreed upon? They have agreed that they must defend one another, through NATO. If it is still their mutual defense that they are agreed upon and if they still can trust one another to come to each other's defense, they can also agree—as we can—upon the structural changes necessary to enable the alliance to cope with the issues of the times.

The crux of the alliance problem is the failure of the Democratic administration since 1960 to provide for the full participation of our allies in the planning and deployment of the most modern weapons systems, including appropriate nuclear weapons.

In this, the Democratic administration has been pursuing the most potentially disastrous course of isolationism in our history, and no responsible Western leader has failed to be alarmed by it. The American people should be, too.

All NATO forces stationed in Europe, regardless of nationality, should be equipped with and trained in the use of nuclear weapons, particularly of the so-called battlefield or tactical variety. So long as Europeans feel that the United States can veto the defense of their homes by the most modern weapons, they will have reason to view the NATO alliance half in hope and half in fear.

The question of "nuclear sharing" revolves, actually, on a question of trust. Do we, in nuclear matters, trust the Soviets more than we trust our allies?

I have suggested that the supreme commander in Europe be given authority over the tactical nuclear weapons appropriate to NATO's defenses. The best authorization ultimately must be worked out with NATO itself. I am convinced that it can be.

The Atlantic alliance could change the course of world affairs. Agreement on defense matters should be just a beginning.

The highly developed nations of the Atlantic community are perfectly capable of working out common trade and political policies which could bring down the power of communism without war.

Other alliances, such as those of CENTO and SEATO, could be revived to join in pressures against communism in the Middle and Far East. Where are they today? Under the Democratic administration they have been barely remembered, much less encouraged and strengthened.

Common trade and political policies also could provide non-Communist answers to the developmental problems of Latin America, Asia, and Africa. No single nation has the resources to underpin these developments. Present programs, scattered and purposeless, only provide easily squandered money. Really needed are technological, administrative, and educational investments by the entire Atlantic community, lest it forever be the fate of the underdeveloped nations to build appetites without planting sustenance for decent entry into a world of advanced technologies.

Economic warfare against the problem-ridden Communist countries, waged from a base of Atlantic purpose, would be one means of undermining Communist power without shooting warfare. Yet the trade policies of the Western nations—particularly those of the United States, whose leadership is required to turn the tide—are supporting rather than eroding Communist power. Instead of being the "arsenal of democracy," the West is becoming the "warehouse of communism"—enabling Communists to make up for economic shortfalls which otherwise would weaken their power and very probably destroy it eventually.

The policy of relaxing tensions by conciliatory exchanges was tried with Hitler. As a result of "business as usual," Hitler managed to plug the holes of the German economy and to fight the war in much better economic shape than he would have been in had the Western democracies embargoed trade with Germany.

Our current policies in this regard are almost perfect examples of everything we should not be doing. The wheat sale, on Soviet terms, is a case in point.

Does economic pressure to undermine Communist power mean that they would be driven to hot war? Hardly. Countries economically strapped and agriculturally sapped are ill equipped to fight wars.

Psychological warfare, another tool of power short of shooting, must have purpose and direction as well. "Bland" is the toughest word that comes to mind for our present performance in this area.

We have now officially disavowed the attempts of others to change the status quo. We have abandoned even a discussion of it, and we also have dropped our opposition to some Communist regimes or their claims to legitimate control. Once our tendency to accept the status quo has carried us to the point of endorsing the entire Communist empire as a legitimate regime whose interests we are committed to respect, it stands to reason that we can no longer mobilize any psychological resistance to communism.

The United States should publicly and repeatedly proclaim its confident expectation that congenital troublemakers such as the Communists will not forever be tolerated to control civilized nations. Psychological warfare should drive home always this point: Communists are alien rulers even in their own countries. Blame for international crises should be placed squarely where it belongs—on the Communist leadership. When songs of freedom are sung, let them be sung about those who cherish freedom and let the anger of those songs be directed against those who in the world today deny freedom—the Communists.

In the Cuba blockade, we briefly experienced the psychological advantages that accrue to firm action—just as we had earlier in President Truman's actions in Greece and Korea and in President Eisenhower's actions in Lebanon and in the China Straits. All too quickly in Cuba, however, we abandoned a strong course which, even today, could be effective. We went back to the morale-enfeebling course of hat-in-hand diplomacy.

The first barbed wire of the Berlin wall offered an opportunity for decisive action, too. We could have, justifiably and securely, dismantled the crude barriers at the checkpoints. As it is, we have dangerously deferred decision and meekly stood by while communism called the shots.

We should, and morally can, seek to discredit both the Communist ideology and the Communist leadership in the eyes of their subjects, and try to drive wedges between them.

In countries not yet ruled by Communists we should engage in a systematic intellectual and organizational counterattack against the Communists, with the aim of denying them every position of influence.

We should revive the international discussion of issues damaging to the Communists—as, for instance, the Hungarian bloodletting.

No discussion of internal affairs in Western nations—South Africa, as an example—should be permitted without raising the issues of Communist oppression in Russia, China, Poland, East Germany, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, Albania, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, North Korea, North Vietnam, Cuba, Outer Mongolia, Tibet—everywhere and anywhere it exists. There never should be discussion of Communist claims without discussion of freedom's counterclaims, which are designed to lift tyranny from suffering peoples.

Neutralism—an attitude of indifference in this struggle between communism and free societies—is repugnant to freedom. Freemen should not support it. Communism, as an agressive force, will ultimately not permit it. Rare cases of genuine neutrality, self-defended, such as that of Switzerland, are not the same as neutralism, or the attempt to play one side against the other.

Political power, which the West possesses so abundantly, should be wielded forthrightly to dissuade any non-Communist or nonalined nation from supporting communism in foreign policy. As in most areas of human relationships, the wisest and most honorable rule of conduct is to reward one's friends and to punish one's enemies. The Democratic administration, heartlessly and imprudently, stands this rule on its head.

International negotiations, to be sure, are a prime arena for political power. Communists negotiate only for their own practical and ideological purposes and never to achieve peace or genuine harmony. To negotiate with the Communists without a policy that recognizes these facts is always to give and never to gain.

There is an unfortunate tendency these days to use the United Nations as an excuse for not driving hard bargains with the Communists. Such difficulties as we have with the Communists, it is often said, can be ironed out in the U.N. This is not true and the history of the U.N. has proved it abundantly and clearly.

The U.N. is a discussion forum. Attempts to make more of it at this juncture actually weaken whatever good purposes it can serve. More to the point, the U.N. is a forum far different from the one we envisioned and voted for in 1945. Its debates are now devoted almost exclusively to declamations of anticolonialism. Its members are free from even the responsibility to pay their dues. Its charter commitments against internal interference have been critically violated in, for instance, the Congo. Its notion of voting by sovereign nations was falsified at the outset by the allocation of separate votes to political subdivisions of the U.S.S.R.

We should realize in determining our position toward the U.N. that it cannot, as such, bring peace. Its Communist membership prohibits that. The problem of peace with which it might some day be able to deal will be its reasonable province only after its membership is composed of nations genuinely interested in mutual respect and toleration.

In terms of forging peace, I view the NATO alliance—the Atlantic Community—as a far more practical tool than the U.N.

The U.N. in the presence of aggressive communism is, at best, a secondary instrument of international accord. It is useful to the West now for a special reason: it provides a forum in which to discuss Communist violations of the charter. If we will not so use it, its usefulness should be questioned in our Congress, where the most responsible decision regarding our membership can be made.

It is avoidance of responsibility and lack of purpose, not a lack of programs, that most gravely afflict our foreign policy today. The defects will not be cured by proposing more and more programs.

Our foreign economic aid program, for example, is an amalgam of many programs. What is its purpose? Careful study reveals no guiding doctrine for it. But an administration unable to keep together the most reasonable alliance in history—that of the Atlantic Community—could scarcely be expected to provide purposeful direction. It obviously has none. Catch-as-catch-can may be an appropriate approach toward politics. It is not adequate for world politics.

The most effective approach to foreign policy now is to propose a purpose—a policy, if you will—not simply to propose new programs. Most Americans must sense this. Our allies surely do.

The programs evolving from an effective policy must be tailored to fit opportunity. Lacking purpose, they will, as now, just be knee-jerk reactions to Communist hammer taps.

One last word—about the style of our foreign policy. No nation can endure without self-respect. We need, as vitally as daily bread, the return of honor and dignity to our national conduct. We must end the trifling disregard with which our citizens have been treated in various parts of the world. Our Government must again speak and act with the distinction befitting one of history's great nations.

I have tried to propose here a standard which freemen can share and to which they can repair. The achievement of peace by the reduction of Communist power without all-out war should head the list of priorities. Only within the framework of this purpose can intelligent attention be given to the problems of grinding poverty, ignorance, and disease.

The hope that freedom and communism can live peaceably, side by side, is a vain hope, for it takes two to live at peace. The Communists will not—and cannot—live at peace, hog tied as they are by their own militant ideology. Thus, merely to echo the Communist slogan of peaceful coexistence is simply to fall in with Communist propaganda. Most certainly, to accept the division of the world between free and slave does not measure up to worthy and sensible purpose in foreign policy.

Ending the Communist power to distort human life and disrupt world peace is the vision of victory that has the power to inspire and the inspiration to win. It is the victory that would snuff the fuse of war and aggression, liberate peoples, and assure ordered fulfillment of reasonable hopes everywhere.

RAPID TRANSIT SYSTEM

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate the board of trustees of the Federal City Council for their statement issued yesterday urging establishment of a rapid transit rail system between Washington metropolitan points. I think that the Federal City Council trustees are to be particularly congratulated because they have brought to the attention of the Congress and of the country the relationship between the highway program which is developing, however slowly, in the metropolitan area, and the need for rapid transit.

I do not make this statement today because I think it will come as a surprise to Members to learn that I support rapid transit in the Washington area.

I spoke for District of Columbia mass transit and I voted for it when the bill was before us earlier in this session. But I do bring it before the House because it is important that the Congress realize that it has a primary responsibility for assisting in resolving the problems of transportation throughout the Washington metropolitan area.

Under the Constitution the Congress has the sole responsibility for the government of the District of Columbia. We have before us a problem in triplicate involving highways, rapid rail transit, and bus transit; a multiple problem which must be resolved if the Capital is not to be strangled by traffic snarls.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following article from today's Washington Post in connection with this subject:

RAPID TRANSIT RAIL URGED BY POLICY GROUP

(By Paul A. Schuette)

The opening of the Capital Beltway imposes a new urgency on the development of a rail rapid transit system for Washington, the Federal City Council declared yesterday.

In an eight-point policy statement, the council's board of trustees warned that the Beltway can aggravate the problem of urban sprawl because of the rapid acceleration of development along the expressway.

The Beltway soon would become overcrowded, destroying its usefulness, and land uses may develop that will make it difficult, if not impossible, to create a balanced transportation system in the future, the council said.

POLICY LINE DRAWN

"The opportunity to create an exemplary, modern, efficient urban center for the Nation's Capital will have been lost," the council declared.

To counter that possibility, the council proposed a transportation policy intended to spark a renewed drive for transit legislation while sidestepping some of the obstacles of the past.

It calls upon the National Capital Transportation Agency to seek authorization during the next session of Congress for a $400 million, publicly owned, privately operated rail transit system.

The council also fully endorses the District highway program and emphasizes the importance of an improved, expanded bus system.

The proposal was drafted by a joint committee represented the council, the Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade, Downtown Progress, and the Washington Board of Realtors. The latter three organizations have not yet acted on the recommendations.

Miles L. Colean, chairman of the joint committee, said the proposed transit system would be similar to the "bobtailed" plan defeated in the House last year except that the committee recommends a downtown subway loop.

He said the NCTA rejected early construction of the loop because it would not immediately pay its own way. The joint committee considered an effective downtown distribution system all important.

EXPANSION PLANS

The proposal also calls for stronger efforts to establish the interstate compact needed to create a regional transportation authority that would build and control the rail system.

Congress should provide $150 million in grants (including $50 million from the District) and authorize loans for the construction of the $400 million system, the proposal said.

The system should be designed for ultimate expansion into an $800 million rail network similar to that proposed by the NCTA originally, according to the proposal.

Colean said the committee does not believe the all-bus transit system proposed by D.C. Transit President O. Roy Chalk would adequately serve the area.

"I wouldn't consider his plan an ultimate solution," said Colean.

AID TO DISABLED WORKERS

Mr. **CURTIS.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. **CURTIS.** Mr. Speaker, on January 17, 1963, I introduced a measure in this House which would allow a deduction from income tax for transportation expenses to and from their place of employment. When I introduced that bill, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 109, part 1, page 527, I made the following remarks which are still pertinent to the measure which I am introducing today:

> The second proposal would allow a deduction to disabled workers for the costs of transportation to and from work. The disabled worker has special problems in the area of transportation in many cases and, while normally such expenses are not allowed as deductions, permitting it for these workers would encourage them to offer their skills to the Nation's economy. This proposal works hand-in-hand with efforts to rehabilitate disabled workers, to bring them back into a useful and productive life. I think that this is one of the most meaningful of human activities, the rehabilitation of the individual to permit him, as nearly as possible, to live a normal life and this bill would be one small step in helping reach this goal.

Since that time, the Labor Department has had an opportunity to report on the bill which I had introduced. In that report, which took a position in opposition to my bill, there was expressed the concern that the bill would provide coverage for some disabled workers while not others, and there were other exceptions that would not be covered by the bill. At my request, the Solicitor of Labor made some very beneficial suggestions that would clarify the matter raised by my bills. Under unanimous consent I place his letter to me into the RECORD at this point:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR,
Washington, August 25, 1964.

Hon. THOMAS B. CURTIS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CURTIS: The Secretary has asked that I reply to your letter concerning our report on H.R. 1999, which would allow an income tax deduction to certain disabled individuals for transportation expenses to and from work.

We are sympathetic with the bill's objective, but are concerned that it would give a small group of disabled workers special tax privileges which are denied to others equally handicapped. The tax deduction, if as a policy matter it were approved, should apply to any person whose physical impairment makes it unduly difficult to use public transportation in getting to work. To accomplish this, we suggest that the bill be written in general language, rather than listing one or more of the particular disabilities which would prevent a person from using public transportation.

While it deals with a more severe type of disability than is involved in H.R. 1999, section 213 of the Internal Revenue Code (26 U.S.C. 213) provides an approach to this problem which may be helpful. Section 213 provides an increased deduction of medical expenses for an individual who is over 65 and is disabled. It defines "disabled individual" in a general manner; that is, the term includes every person whose disability prevents him from working, and there is no reference to specific disabilities of any kind. Following this approach, the definition of "disabled individual" in H.R. 1999 could be amended to include all persons whose physical impairment makes it impossible to use public transportation in getting to work.

Thank you for your interest in writing us concerning this matter.

Yours sincerely,
CHARLES DONAHUE,
Solicitor of Labor.

This matter is of great importance, and it is for that reason that I am introducing a bill today which would incorporate the suggestions of the Labor Department.

A BILL TO REPEAL THE EXCISE TAX ON BUSINESS MACHINES

Mr. **CURTIS.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. **CURTIS.** Mr. Speaker, several months ago the Ways and Means Committee held hearings on the whole scope of the excise taxes. At that time we heard representatives from the business machines industry who clarified how that industry and particularly the consumers of that industry are affected by the excise tax on business machines. After doing some research on this subject I have decided to introduce a bill to repeal those excise taxes on business machines, which I am doing today.

The present 10 percent manufacturer's excise tax on business machines was enacted in 1941 as an emergency World War II defense measure. Its sole purpose was to discourage civilian consumption, thereby conserving critical materials, and to devote the skills of the business machine industry to the war effort. The enactment of this provision was opposed not only by the business machine industry but also by the Treasury Department and was passed by Congress primarily on the basis of a strong request by the Office of Price Administration and Civilian Supply, whose concern at that time was the curtailing of civilian consumption. It was never considered by any party as permanent legislation appropriate to the peacetime economy.

Basically there are five points to be considered in developing a case against the excise tax on business machines:

First, the tax is contrary to the clear intention of Congress to encourage capital investment. Business machines are virtually 100 percent capital goods items essential to the operation of the modern office. Thus any tax on them would be opposed to the present economic policy of encouraging and stimulating investment in capital goods, as illustrated by the 1962 Revenue Act which was designed with this end in mind. Under the provisions of that act, a 7 percent income tax credit against the purchase of such capital goods was provided. Under the terms of the 1964 Revenue Act, the 7 percent tax credit provision of the law was amended so as to increase even further the incentive for capital investment. As a corollary to the congressional action the Treasury has issued new and more favorable depreciation guidelines on capital goods. Business equipment was specifically listed in these new regulations. But despite these encouragements from the Congress and the Treasury, their effect has been largely nullified by this discriminatory excise tax leveled directly at these items.

The tax on these machines does not primarily victimize the manufacturers of these products. It is passed on to the customer—the purchaser of the machine—and then ultimately the consumers of goods and services who pay the price of this tax.

Second, Mr. Speaker, this tax is a tax on the cost of doing business and is added to the cost of nearly every product and service. Unlike most other types of capital goods, business machines are used in some form or other in virtually every service industry, as well as every level of distribution in all manufacturing and processing industries. Thus the burden of the tax is passed on and pyramided over the cost of most of the products and services in the country. In many States, it is part of the tax base for sales tax purposes and therefore takes on aspects of double taxation.

Thirdly, the excise tax on these machines is becoming increasingly discriminatory against small business. In the 1941 law, which initiated this tax, there were listed some 43 business machines that were in existence at that time. But this list is completely obsolete and inadequate when one considers the many new machines and functions that have been developed since that time. These new machines are, of course, untaxed, and properly so because of their relation to industrial efficiency and of the intent of Congress to stimulate capital investment as a means of increasing industry growth, increasing employment, and enhancing the ability of American business to compete in international trade. As business grows larger, the tendency is to utilize the more modern equipment, which is usually untaxed. On the other hand, the small enterprise is generally dependent on the standard equipment—that which existed in 1941 and is taxable under the law.

Fourth, the tax has become exceedingly difficult to administer, and is raising some serious compliance problems. The technological revolution which this country has seen includes the business machine industry. That being the case, the Treasury Department has been forced to make rulings to interpret the statute. Even so, it has been an almost impossible task for those charged with the duty of collecting the revenue to keep pace with the sweeping technological changes that are taking place in that industry. There are numerous examples where the old law, even with new rulings, is inequitable and producing inconsistent results. A machine for coding documents which uses holes in the coding system is taxable as a punchcard machine. Another system which is not dependent upon holes for the code is not taxable. In another example, the duplicating machines are taxable but the new electrostatic machines, which are competitors are not. The development of the electronic data processing industry alone, has created a vast gray area between the taxable and the nontaxable which is not capable of clarification.

Aside from the burden that it places on the Treasury Department for constant and individual rulings, it is also placing an undue burden on the industry and its customers. Until the Treasury Department rules on the taxability aspect, manufacturers must either collect an amount equivalent to the possible excise tax, which is then held in escrow, or else insert a provision in the contract of sale for later payment by the customer should the item later be taxed. The burdens this imposes are obvious. Either the customer's capital is indefinitely tied up in escrow or else the manufacturer has the impractical job of collecting this added payment on equipment previously sold to the customer, often many years prior to the ruling.

Compounding the administrative problem, which I have mentioned, is the marketing characteristic of the business machine industry in which the customers often desire to rent the equipment rather than purchase it. On such leases, the manufacturer must maintain detailed excise tax records on each piece of equipment, setting forth the monthly rental payments, and what part of them are allocated to the payment of the excise tax, and the cumulative excise tax paid, until the tax paid on the rentals equals the tax that would have been paid if the equipment had been sold. It is interesting to note that it is possible for the user to rent two identical machines—one on which he must pay the excise tax, and not on the other. This inequity arises because it is possible to rent equipment which has been previously rented a sufficient amount of time to pay off the entire excise tax. And it is possible that one user may rent a machine and have to pay the tax while his competitor rents an identical machine and pays none.

The Federal Government is one of the largest renters of business equipment. The Treasury recognizing the complications that I have outlined above, has exempted the collection of excise tax on equipment rented to the Federal Government but still collects it on equipment sold to the Government. This contradiction discriminates severely in favor of those companies which rent to the Government. Furthermore, such divergent treatment complicates the sound evaluation by Government agencies as to the economic desirability of purchase versus rental of equipment.

Fifth, the tax does not produce substantial net revenue for the Federal Government. The increase of new machines and new functions has had a marked effect on this specific tax as a revenue producing agent for the Treasury. Total revenues from this tax in fiscal 1963 were $74.8 million, the lowest collection since 1956. This figure reflects a steady decline in collections from a high of $99 million in 1960. This is due primarily to the increasing proportion of sales of electronic data processing and related equipment. It is expected that 1964 will show an even further erosion of this as a revenue producing measure.

It should be further noted that the gross amount of revenue collected under this excise tax does not represent added income for the Government. Depreciation on the taxed machines is fully deductible for Federal income purposes as a necessary business expense. Therefore, the excise tax itself becomes a deduction which would not otherwise be available and results in lower income tax collections. Moreover, the industry's largest single customer is the Federal Government itself, and all sales to it, which are taxed, do not constitute real revenue, but reflect only a series of such transactions.

Mr. Speaker, for these reasons I am today introducing a bill to repeal the excise tax on business machines sold after December 31, 1964. My bill also takes into account the lease payments made on these business machines and repeals the tax with respect to payments made after December 31, 1964, for leasing periods after that date.

I have also considered in this bill the matter of floor stock refunds. In the case of some types of business machines—typewriters, for example—dealers will have stocks of taxpaid business machines on hand at the time of termination of the tax. If refunds were not provided, they would presumably have to absorb the tax because the customers would have the ready alternative of buying from some dealer who had purchased the equipment from the manufacturer after the termination of the excise tax. In view of this, my bill provides that where dealers have a stock of business machines on hand on the effective date of the repeal of the tax and they have paid the tax on those articles, a tax credit or refund may be claimed on those taxes. These refunds or credits are available only in those cases where the manufacturer has reimbursed the dealer for the tax, or has obtained the dealer's consent to the allowance of the credit or refund.

YOUTH OPPORTUNITIES, UNLIMITED

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, it has become almost commonplace to bemoan the Nation's chronically high rate of unemployment, and particularly the very high teenage unemployment rate, which is nearly three times greater than the overall national rate. Unfortunately, the assumption often is made that a solution to the problem depends solely on action at the Federal level. While there certainly is an important role for the Federal Government to play in upgrading the skills and education of the labor force and in reducing unemployment, we must not overlook nor fail to encourage the private sector in the key role it plays in attacking the problem.

In my own district in St. Louis, a pioneering effort has been launched by the Industrial Relations Club of Greater St. Louis. The plan has three major objectives: First, to motivate high school dropouts to continue their educations; second, to improve the work attitudes and increase the skills of noncollege youth and thus enhance their employability; and third, to promote greater coordination between business and educational institutions in offering training opportunities through active employment. The program, which has been called "Youth Opportunities, Unlimited," is a splendid example of what can be done if private imagination and energy are brought to bear upon a community problem.

The existence of a program such as this strongly suggests that other communities and private businesses are developing programs and techniques which have as their objective the reduction of teenage unemployment, or unemployment generally. The existence of these plans should be known and widely publicized so that the entire Nation can benefit from them. The communities having these programs could themselves benefit in turn by receiving constructive criticism and suggestions from around the country.

It would be perfectly proper and highly constructive for the Federal Government to undertake to identify and publicize efforts in the private sector directed at this problem. I have written Labor Secretary Willard Wirtz to inquire whether or not such activities are now carried on by the Labor Department and, if not, whether he would ask his manpower experts to study the feasibility of such an idea.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of my letter to Secretary Wirtz be included in the RECORD at this point along with a brochure describing the "Youth Opportunities, Unlimited" program in St. Louis:

SEPTEMBER 29, 1964.

Hon. WILLARD W. WIRTZ,
Department of Labor,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Attached is a copy of some remarks which I plan to make in the House, calling attention to the "Youth Opportunities, Unlimited" program, which has been organized by the Industrial Relations Club of Greater St. Louis. Also enclosed is a brochure describing the program.

As you will note, in these remarks I suggest that the Federal Government undertake to identify and publicize programs being developed in the private sector to reduce unemployment generally and teenage unemployment in particular. I would like to know whether any such activity is presently being carried on by the Department and, if not, I should like to request that you examine the feasibility of such an idea. I believe that much could be gained if such information about developments in the private sector were more generally available to the country at large than is now the case.

With very best wishes,

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS B. CURTIS.

YOUTH OPPORTUNITIES, UNLIMITED

(Sponsored by the Industrial Relations Club of Greater St. Louis, June 11, 1964)

OBJECTIVES

The objectives of the program are:

1. To motivate high school dropouts (primarily, but not exclusively) to continue their education until an adequate level of employability has been reached.

2. More specifically, to improve the attitudes and increase the skills and knowledge of St. Louis Metropolitan area youth (ages 16 years through 21 years) who do not graduate from college—and their opportunities for productive, worthwhile employment, and lifetime careers.

3. To achieve this objective by greater coordination between educational institutions and the business community in offering learning opportunities through active employment participation.

THE PROBLEM

In the St. Louis Metropolitan area, two counties on the east side, the city of St. Louis, and three counties on the west side, there are 50,626 young people employed by business in the age bracket 16 to 21 years. At the same time there are 14,000 unemployed in this same age bracket and the number unemployed is estimated to be increasing by 200 every month. Unemployment, therefore, in this group is something over 22 percent. Of the 14,000, however, 300 are "superior" intelligence and another 1,500 to 1,800 in the city are capable of participating in any normal program of education. Of the 6,000 approximately in the county, over 50 percent fall in these two categories so we are not talking entirely of low intelligence students.

Job openings for these people do exist, but the unemployed generally do not have the right skills or attitudes.

Nationally, 80 percent of the young people who enter high school do not graduate from college. This means that they drop out of high school or start college and are unable to finish, or for personal reasons do not continue to attend college until graduation. These include people with both high and low IQ, both Negro and white, but generally with low motivation insofar as academic subjects are concerned.

There are many studies, both national and local, of this problem and many proposals for meeting with various phases of the problem. One very widely suggested proposal involves the greater cooperation of business and labor in solving this problem. So far, little has been done in the St. Louis area in this phase.

BACKGROUND

There are many agencies operating in this youth field in the metropolitan area including social, governmental, educational, charitable, and private. During the past several months members of the Industrial Relations Club committee have held discussions with the individuals or organizations listed in appendix A. Their suggestions and ideas have been incorporated in this outline. Without exception, our basic concept was received enthusiastically.

SOLUTION

Conservation of youth manpower

There are 15,000 employers with eight or more employes in the Metropolitan St. Louis area (workmen's compensation coverage). It is proposed that coordinated efforts be made between business and industry in this area and the secondary schools in providing part-time employment opportunities for potential dropouts, tied in with their willingness and ability to remain in school—thus providing a motivation factor which is now lacking.

This will involve three prime areas of action:

1. More adequate preparation of the youth before getting into the work situation; i.e., employment application, dress, minimum requirements of skill, education, etc.—plus awareness of the disciplines of work.

NOTE.—This responsibility will fall largely upon the secondary school systems, but business can help. This may mean obtaining school commitments from superintendents and school boards involving better training and selection of counselors with time for their duties and time for field trips to visit business and see and listen to employment needs. Also included here would be teachers who are concerned because of their interest in youth problems.

2. Opening doors for the opportunity to seek part-time work.

NOTE.—This is our job as members of business.

3. Some followup training, education and counseling after hire. Many of these types of individuals will need more than the average for jobholders of this age group.

NOTE.—This is our job, but should be coordinated and combined with the school counselors for informational purposes and to tie in with the program of instruction in school.

4. Business must also assume the responsibility for continuing the education of the community and its adults and parents, and keeping the community accurately informed of the progress or needs of such a program.

BENEFITS

For employers

1. Better prospective employees.

2. Upgrade young employees with higher IQ's or higher motivation—thus filling some of the skilled openings which will leave room for unskilled applicants.

3. Reduce United Fund costs.

4. Reduce Federal and State social agency costs.

5. Reduce teenage delinquency.

6. Cooperate with Federal and State poverty programs.

7. Selling the free enterprise system.

For schools

1. Aid secondary, technical, and junior college schools in cooperative and shared work educational programs.

2. Better prepare students (who do not graduate from 4-year colleges) for productive living.

3. Provide opportunities for learning through active participation.

ORGANIZATION

The program suggested should be carried forward by the following organization:

1. An industrial relations club committee of 10 experienced members possessing fairly wide contracts and knowledge to direct and carry out the efforts. The present membership of this committee consists of: K. B. Bernhardt, chairman; E. W. Burr, G. F. Craig, J. R. Hundley, W. Klostermeier, N. Kohn, V. R Lindquist, D. Nicholson, R. W. Smith, J. A. Walsh.

2. A small "professional advisory" committee consisting of trained and experienced people with firsthand contact concerning youths' problems, motivations, ambitions, and personal problems.

Members of this committee should include people such as:

(a) A case worker.

(b) A supervisor in a plant or shop.

(c) A shop labor steward.

(d) An assistant principal or high school counselor familiar with potential drop-outs and discipline cases.

(e) A YMCA or CYC worker.

The recommended size of this committee is as yet unknown, but it probably should remain small and carefully selected.

3. An advisory committee with representation from government, schools, churches, charitable agencies, etc., to coordinate and advise in the many overlapping areas of activities wherein these organizations present mutual interests and resources. This committee should consist primarily of "working type" members who by knowledge and interest are in the best position to contribute to the guidance of the project. It is not anticipated that it would need to meet frequently and, therefore, not involve a great deal of time of any individual member.

4. Somewhere down the line in the not-too-far-distant future when the approach and method of operation have been proven by experience, a top management—"prestige"—sponsoring committee of from 50 to 100 presidents of the largest business organizations in the area plus possibly outstanding labor, civic, religious, and educational leaders be appointed to provide the necessary organizational support from the business community. The project can only be successful if it bears this type of endorsement.

METHODS

1. Receive nominations from school principals (guidance counselors) or MSES (youth division) registrants, after aptitude testing, physical examinations, and examinations of personal files concerning an individual student who is a potential dropout if no work or job is available. This student must be willing and capable of remaining in school, as well as being employable.

2. A member of the youth committee would then contact an IRC member or other business acquaintance and arrange an interview opportunity.

3. The employer would be on his own to hire or not to hire. (But we should strive to gain acceptance of student referrals without expecting only the "best" or "top cut.")

4. The prospective employee would be on his or her own in the employment interview and work position.

However: The results of the interview should be reported to the school counselor or contact and to the IRC committee member.

5. In the subsequent employment situation (a) the employer would advise the school if a problem was developing; and (b) the school would advise the employer if a problem was developing; and (c) in any event, a minimum periodic report of results should be made.

6. The employer should appoint a volunteer sponsor for each employee in this project, either a member of the IRC or a foreman or other supervisor or other more experienced employee on employment problems only. This sponsor would provide the contact mentioned in No. 5 above, working jointly with the school guidance person.

7. This project should start slowly to provide examples of success and to learn from experience. It is suggested that it concentrate its beginning efforts in two high schools in the north part of the city; i.e., Northwest High and Beaumont High and three schools in the county; i.e., Riverview Gardens, Wellston, and Kinloch.

PUBLICITY

We should refrain from any general publicity for this program until we can actually demonstrate employment. A certain amount of publicity will be necessary within IRC circles themselves and among the concerned schools and organizations. Any more beyond that point should be most carefully considered. Any inquiries regarding this program should be referred to the chairman of the IRC committee, Brooks Bernhardt, at WYdown 3-1000.

MEETINGS

Regular meetings of the IRC Youth Opportunities Committee should be held in the beginning to get this underway.

The professional advisory committee would only meet as required to set up general procedures, but not on a regular basis.

The coordinating committee would meet only when necessary to advise the many organizations affected whenever program steps or changes were being made.

The sponsor committee would possibly meet once on official initiation of the project metropolitan areawide and perhaps annually or even less frequently thereafter. This committee and the coordinating committee would undoubtedly receive quarterly reports or an annual report for information.

COSTS

The financing of this project would not involve a large expenditure of money. At this time no consideration has been given to sources of funds, but a number of possibilities exist for support.

FUTURE

As this project unfolds and becomes broader than just a few high school areas, the volume of work entailed would consequently require a paid director with business and some school guidance or disciplinary experience. Clerical help would be required for records, telephone, information on successes and failures, and further classification of participants including IQ, motivation, family background, aggressiveness, etc., for study and guidance of future activities. Office space might be loaned either from a member company, a charitable organization, university, etc.

Eventually it would be desirable to create a nonprofit corporation controlled by IRC board of possibly 10 to 21 men under State charter to control activities, disburse funds, and plan program modification.

Inherent in the goals of this project is the need to meet with appropriate representatives of the elementary and secondary school systems in the Metropolitan St. Louis area to promote more realistic curriculums to better prepare students (who do not graduate from college) for job opportunities and career goals.

NOTE.—The provision of a director who would be business and school system-oriented, should do much to meet this need.

In order for this program to be most successful, it will be necessary to obtain the cooperation of parents and parents associations in the many school districts involved, and involve the neighborhoods through their parents in cooperating and working toward the goal of keeping as many potential dropouts as possible in school at least through graduation from high school.

Some missionary work would be necessary with business and industry by personal contact in order to promote their cooperation in offering various types of part-time employment; i.e., (a) 2 to 3 hours per day; (b) weekend or evening work; (c) cooperative work-education programs; and (d) shared work.

All of these steps are included in the agenda set forth in appendix B, listing items requiring consideration and action as this program moves forward.

APPENDIX A

SOURCES

George Warren Brown School of Social Work, Washington University, Dean Wayne Vasey.

"Gateways for Youth," Nick Demareth, director, Maury Meyer.

White House Conference on Education, Burton Sawyer, Ellen Schwartz, Whitty Cuninggim.

Missouri State Employment Service, Charles DeLargy and all major department heads, Mr. Shanz, State director.

St. Louis public schools, George Mowrer, director, guidance; Ray Sachs, director, vocational and technical education.

St. Louis County schools, Dr. Ivan C. Nicholas, chairman, cooperating school districts.

County technical school, Louis G. Clark, superintendent.

St. Louis juvenile court, John P. O'Brien, administrator.

County juvenile court, Judge Michael J. Carroll.

AFL–CIO Joint Council, Oscar Ehrhardt.

Danforth Foundation, Merrimon Cuninggim, executive director.

United Presbyterian, USA, Dr. David McDowell, Rev. Raymond Bowden.

Episcopal, the Right Reverend George L. Cadigan.

Metropolitan Youth Commission, Gene Schwarz, director.

St. Louis Junior College, Dr. Joseph Cosand.

YOUTH OPPORTUNITIES, UNLIMITED: AGENDA

1. Nonprofit in corporation.
2. Office.
3. Director (loaned?) plus two assistants: (one from school?), (one from business?).
4. Budget.
5. Appointment of advisory "professional" committee.
6. Appointment of coordinating committee.
7. Appointment of business sponsoring committee.
8. Technicalities of hiring teenagers: (a) legal (State law), (b) unions, (c) employer rules, (d) brief description of various plans and terminology; i.e., after hours, weekend, shared work, part-time, trimester co-ops, etc.
9. Publications: (a) brochure for employers, (b) workbook for: students, parents, teachers/counselors, (c) reference materials, directory of adult education, etc.
10. Organization necessary to obtain: (a) School contacts (principal/guidance counselor), (b) business interest and contacts, (c) business acceptance, (d) employers by school areas, (e) trade associations, (f) advertising companies, (g) service organizations (Rotary, Kiwanis, etc.).
11. Youth prospects: (a) preparation for employment, (b) transportation problems, (c) testing and records.
12. Responsibilities on job: (a) indoctrination, (b) "big brother" concept, (c) maintaining contact with the school counselor/assistant principal (tie work program with education), (d) outlook toward work and its values.
13. Participation of community and families: (a) community organizations, (b) parents of children involved.
14. Recordkeeping: (a) application form and employer report, (b) necessary reports—schools or courts, (c) research statistics.

SECRET SERVICE PROTECTION FOR PRESIDENTIAL AND VICE PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATES

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise with sadness in my heart and disbelief in my mind. It was beyond my comprehension that any American, especially any American serving in the Congress of the United States, would oppose minimum safeguards against assassination of presidential and vice-presidential candidates in this great country.

When I introduced H.R. 12337, there was immediate bipartisan support for the proposal. It appeared that we could pass this quickly in both the House and Senate by unanimous consent. The truth is that today, 7 weeks later, no action has been taken, and I must sadly report to the House that the proposal appears to be dead. It has been stricken down by the hands of our leadership, incredible through that may seem. I am told by the chairman of the Judiciary Committee that this proposal is controversial. Is it controversial to provide Secret Service protection to our leading candidates for President and Vice President? I do not think so. The tragedy of Jack Kennedy proved how suddenly and unexpectedly exposure to large crowds could be converted to shocking disaster.

I have been told that anyone who requests Secret Service protection is exhibiting cowardice. Mr. Speaker, I say flatly that that is a 19th century view of the hazards of 1964 campaigning. Admittedly, Secret Service agents cannot guarantee full protection, but they can eliminate the most obvious hazards. They can avert the kinds of assault that are predictable and they have done so many times in the past. The Warren report recommends improvements in Secret Service protection, which I hope can be done. But BARRY GOLDWATER, BILL MILLER, and HUBERT HUMPHREY now do not even have the inadequate protection of the Secret Service.

Mr. Speaker, I hope and fervently pray that 33 days from now we can all heave a sigh of relief and say that we were lucky and my bill turned out to be unnecessary. Yet we, as Members of Congress, must bear the heavy burden of our guilt through these 33 days, because we have not done our duty. I pray that another tragic assassination, and the national crisis it would provoke, will not befall our Nation. It will be upon the conscience of each of those who oppose this bill if such a tragedy occurs.

To my knowledge, the support for my bill is overwhelming in both the Senate and the House. Senators DIRKSEN and MANSFIELD have cosponsored it in the Senate and there are only one or two who have voiced opposition in the House. The lateness of the session, however, permits one or two to block the expeditious action required at this stage. I want to thank and pay tribute to the minority leader, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], for his support in trying to get this bill through the House.

Mr. Speaker, there are few times that I am truly ashamed of the performance of the Congress of the United States, but this is one of them. We have failed three dedicated Americans: HUBERT HUMPHREY, BARRY GOLDWATER, and BILL MILLER. But more tragically, we have failed our fellow Americans and our beloved land whose well-being is merged with the safety of its leadership.

TRIBUTE TO DR. A. FERNÓS-ISERN

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. BELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues today in paying tribute to a devoted and outstanding public servant, Dr. A. FERNÓS-ISERN, Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico.

After 18 years of dedicated and tireless service to his homeland of Puerto Rico, Dr. FERNÓS has earned a rest.

Prior to his coming to Washington as Resident Commissioner in 1946, he served as Commissioner of Health in Puerto Rico. As Resident Commissioner, he was instrumental in the development and promotion of legislation which resulted in Puerto Rico's being declared a Commonwealth in 1952; and largely through his efforts the 81st Congress provided for the establishment of a constitutional government by the people of Puerto Rico. He presided over the ensuing constitutional convention and guided the adopted constitution through Congress.

Relentlessly he went about the task of perfecting other legislation affecting the newly created government and was responsible for no less than 80 bills in Congress becoming law.

In 1953, Dr. FERNÓS-ISERN was selected as Alternate Delegate of the U.S. Delegation to the United Nations. In this capacity, he assisted the Federal Government in presenting the case for Puerto Rico's recognition as a self-governing entity by that organization.

Most recently, Dr. FERNÓS-ISERN participated in the formation of the United States-Puerto Rico Commission on the Status of Puerto Rico. That Commission was established by law in February of 1964.

Such a distinguished public record is an example for all of us and it is indeed appropriate that we should pay tribute to this outstanding gentleman. I join in extending to Dr. FERNÓS-ISERN very best wishes for his retirement.

THE IMPACT AND IMPORTANCE OF RETAILING IN THE FREE ENTERPRISE SYSTEM

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the United States has shown the entire world the ability to produce a vast amount of goods both for industry and consumer in peacetime and in war. This productive capacity has increased enormously over the years. American farms, mines, and forests provide the raw materials that thousands of factories manufacture into finished products—products that make it possible for the average American citizen to maintain a standard of living never before achieved by any civilization. This high standard of living, however, is dependent on the economic and effective distribution of our goods and services. It is therefore axiomatic that increased efficiency in production must be matched by increased efficiency in distribution.

In the area of distribution retailing plays a major part and, according to the latest census of business, is one of the largest fields of business endeavor in this country. The importance of retailing in our free enterprise system is further emphasized by the fact that 1,788,000 business establishments were engaged in retailing in 1958 as estimated by the U.S. Department of Commerce. Daily sales of these businesses ranged from as little as $20 to those with sales of over $100,000 and more each business day. Total retail sales for the United States in 1963 were over $246 billion.

Retailing is an invaluable link in the chain of the distribution of goods from the manufacturer to the consumer. Everyone, consumers and workers, are vitally interested in the marketing or distributing processes by which goods are transferred from producers to consumers.

The retail store is the last and crucial stage of this marketing process before final consumption. The retailer is actually the storekeeper for the community.

The history of retailing reveals that in some form goods have been distributed to meet human needs since the earliest beginnings. The earliest written records and relics of commerce discovered in ancient ruins, show the existence of both wholesale and retail trade. The ancient cities of Carthage, Athens, Alexandria, and Rome were trading centers that served not only their own population but also surrounding areas.

Retailing in America had its beginning with the earliest trading posts which were the outgrowth of the activities of fur traders. From these trading posts evolved the Yankee peddler and the general merchandise store. The general store was one of the most interesting and significant factors contributing to American commercial growth. It not only supplied a wide variety of merchandise but also constituted the social center for the men of the community. Here, politics, religion, and personal problems were discussed. Public opinion of a large part of pioneer America was molded and crystallized in the general store and many important questions were ultimately settled there.

The retailers service to modern society is one that is too often taken for granted. We are accustomed to receiving the benefits of our modern retailing institutions that we fail to realize what a vital and important part the retailer plays in the lives of each of us. Whenever there have been widespread railroad strikes, the public is rudely awakened to its daily dependency upon this mode of transportation. But if, for example, such a thing were to occur to all the retailers in this country, the public would realize how much more dependent upon retailers we are for the fulfillment of our daily needs. For instance when a man wants a suit of clothes he is not likely to know of a factory making men's clothing. If he does not locate one he does not know whether it will sell him one at the price he is willing to pay or whether the suits made there are in the styles he likes. He also lacks a knowledge of the various kinds of cloth, does not know his measurements and so on. All of these details are handled by the retail clothing merchant who is a specialist in his field rendering a complete service to his customers—a service, which in the case of buying a suit of clothes need not take more than a haf an hour. The same could be said for all consumer and industrial products handled by retailers.

The independent retail stores of the Nation serving millions of Americans across this continent have often been referred to as the "cradle" of the American business system. It is here that our production know-how, our distribution methods and our ideas culminate in better products for less money. Retailing and the American free enterprise system go hand-in-hand.

The major types of retail institutions today include independent stores, department stores, mail-order houses, chain stores, cooperative chains, supermarkets, discount houses, to mention a few. Competition among these institutions for the customer's dollar is fierce and the customer is benefiting as a result. Prices are being held down, wider selections and better quality goods are being made available, store decor has been improved, self-service from more attractive merchandise displays has made shopping faster and easier. Parking facilities are more readily accessible and more convenient shopping hours enable the family to shop together. All of this has been done in the spirit of free enterprise.

It is only when we try to visualize a world without the independent and enterprising retailer that we realize how much he does for us and how dependent we are upon him in our daily life.

THE VITAL ROLE PLAYED BY TECHNOLOGY IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE AMERICAN FREE ENTERPRISE SYSTEM

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. **SCHWENGEL**. Mr. Speaker, in a little over a century we have seen the United States become the richest and most highly developed nation in the world. In our study of American economic history during this period, we find that our great Nation has become the industrial leader of the world because our economy, operating under the free enterprise system, has always been highly receptive to change, especially technological change. During the past century we find many instances where both invention and innovation have had a revoluntionary impact on the American free enterprise system. It is obviously impossible to discuss all of the many technological breakthroughs experienced by our Nation during this period. Nevertheless, I would like to cite certain major technological advances which, I believe, have played a vital and indispensable role in making the United States for the past several decades the unquestioned industrial leader of the world.

Looking back to the period before the mid-19th century, we find that our economy was predominately agricultural. With the exception of the textile industry, which had achieved a fairly high level of development by the mid-19th century, most of the goods and services sold in the marketplace were produced or provided by households, shops or small factories located within or near to the local market. Moreover, as of 1850, it was estimated that close to three-fourths of the power was furnished by animal energy, and the muscles of men produced more power than did machines.

Yet, beginning with the decade of the 1850's, America embarked upon an era of economic change which is unprecedented in all of history. This was a period in which rapid technological change encouraged the rapid growth and development of the railroads and other forms of transportation. This was an era which brought the introduction of coal as an important energy source. This was an era when America discovered the usefulness of the high-pressured steam engine, thus soon making waterpower more or less obsolete as the primary direct source of industrial power. And, last but not least, this was an era in which was discovered a highly efficient and cheap method in making steel.

Although agriculture remained to be the primary generator of income in the United States through the decade of the 1870's, this era of great technological change set in motion the rapid substitution of machine for hand methods of production, thereby making it possible for the manufacturing sector of the economy to surpass the agricultural sector by the decade of the 1880's. And by 1900 the annual value of manufacturing output achieved a level which amounted to twice that of agriculture.

Obviously, this rapid transformation from an agricultural to an industrial economy would not have occurred if there had not existed during this time numerous Americans who were willing to take great personal and financial risks in their efforts to introduce new methods of production and distribution. During this glorious period in our Nation's history, we find that the Federal Government consciously refrained from doing anything which would dampen the spirit of individual initiative. Hence, had our great Nation lacked this entrepreneurial spirit on the part of the inventor, the innovator, or the American businessman; or, had the Government not allowed the entrepreneur complete freedom in the pursuit of his stated economic objective, I am sure that industry during the latter part of the 19th century would have continued to play a secondary rather than a dominant role in American economic life.

As our economy continued to grow and become more diversified, competition among the various participants in the free enterprise system naturally became more intense, therefore forcing all enterprising Americans to be constantly on the alert for new and better ways to serve the American consumer. Because of these pressures, along with the continued improvement in transportation and communications and the development of many new and revolutionary industrial processes, the United States after the turn of the century soon became the unquestioned industrial leader of the world. By 1910, American factories were pouring forth goods which in total value amounted to twice that of its nearest rival, Germany. Moreover, until the turn of the 20th century American industry depended mostly on the technological discoveries made by European inventors and innovators. However, soon after America moved into the 20th century it was apparent that it would not be too long before our Nation would become the world leader in scientific research.

In the early part of this century America was the first to realize the importance of automobiles. Through the genius of Henry Ford, the United States was the first to comprehend the full meaning and impact of mass production. Moreover, because of many major technological breakthroughs our Nation was a leader in getting industry to convert to electrical power, thereby greatly enlarging the horizon of industrial development. When we add to this list the well-known technological achievements of many new industries which have developed rapidly since the 1920's, especially in areas dealing with chemicals, metallurgy, electronics, and communications, it is easy to understand why the United States is still today by far the most highly developed and industrialized Nation in the world.

Certainly if we wish for our country to maintain its position of world leadership in the years to come, we must continue to press constantly for further technological advancement and remain fully committed to the ideals of our American free enterprise system. In tracing the evolution of the American economy over the past century, we found that American free enterprise has sought constantly to achieve the maximum benefits from technological change. If American industry can continue to operate under a system in which there is a minimum of Government restraint and intervention in our economic, political, and social affairs, I am confident that we will continue to reap the maximum benefits of our Nation's technological achievements in the years ahead.

DR. ANTONIO FERNÓS-ISERN

Mr. **BEERMANN**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Dague] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. **DAGUE**. Mr. Speaker, the impending retirement from the Congress of our distinguished colleague, Dr. Fernós-Isern, is cause for deep regret on the part of all of us and particularly for those of us who have been intimately associated with this kindly and courtly gentleman in the affairs of our common committee assignments.

On the other hand, we cannot help but applaud his decision to retire to his beautiful homeland, there to spend his remaining years—and God grant that they be many and prosperous—with his delightful family and among the people whom he has served so brilliantly. This legislative commitment becomes increasingly burdensome, and many of us look with nostalgic longing to a lessening of the tensions and the pressures that keep us tied here beyond the prescribed adjournment date. That our respected colleague is taking himself away from the annoyances and frustrations to which we are all subjected reflects only his good commonsense.

We are loath to see you go, our cherished friend, but we want you to know that you take with you our warmest good wishes for a happy retirement and a period of relaxed enjoyment as the fruits of your long and brilliant tour of duty in the service of all the people. And may the blessings of the Almighty go with you and keep you all the way.

NATIONAL CHILD EVANGELISM WEEK

Mr. **BEERMANN**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Ford] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. **FORD**. Mr. Speaker, each year a special week is set aside and proclaimed as National Child Evangelism Week. It is sponsored by the National Child Evangelism Fellowship with headquarters in

Grand Rapids, Mich. National Child Evangelism Week this year will be observed from October 4 through 11.

The work of the fellowship is entirely interdenominational; use is made of dedicated persons from many different religious denominations. The fellowship sponsors Bible study classes called "good news clubs." Children are invited into a home for an hour of learning Bible verses, singing Gospel songs, and hearing and seeing the Bible lesson presented by the teacher who often uses visual aids to tell the story. The National Child Evangelism Fellowship attempts to reach with its religious instruction those children who do not otherwise attend classes in a regular church.

It seems to me that such constructive work on a voluntary basis is indeed significant. Any effective campaign against juvenile delinquency must include religious instruction which is relevant to the moral and spiritual needs of our children.

So many proposed solutions to the delinquency problem seem to ignore these needs of our young people. I know the work being done by the National Child Evangelism Fellowship, the regularly organized churches, and other groups carrying on similar endeavors is a constructive effort meriting the support of all concerned citizens.

PERSONAL APPRECIATION OF CARL ELLIOTT

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, I arise to express my personal appreciation to my distinguished colleague, CARL ELLIOTT. It was my privilege to serve with the great Alabaman on the Education and Labor Committee. During the many years that we jointly served on this committee, I learned to respect his great knowledge of the law. He had the ability of explaining the law so that layman, such as myself, could fully understand all its implications. His great knowledge of constitutional law was of benefit to every member of the committees on which he served.

Too, I served with CARL ELLIOTT on the Veterans' Committee. A veteran of World War II, Representative ELLIOTT was a deep student of every phase of veterans' problems. I know that all of the veterans of the United States greatly benefited from his service on that committee. As the ranking Republican member of the Veterans' Committee, I can say that though CARL ELLIOTT was of the opposite political faith, he was fair and just in all of his dealings with the minority members. This is equally true of his service on the Education and Labor Committee.

Even when my views were contrary to those of his, I always had great respect for those for which he stood. I know that his first interest was always that of his beloved country. CARL ELLIOTT was as great a patriot as any that has sat in the Congress of the United States.

At the time that I voted for the enlargement of the Rules Committee, I had the idea that my great colleague would be appointed to that most important arm of this House. I know that he added a luster to even that most able group of Members.

We shall miss CARL ELLIOTT—both as a Member of this body and as a friend. His integrity and ability brought honor to us all.

I do not know of his future plans, but I do know that they will achieve success for CARL ELLIOTT will bring to them all of his energy and ability.

The United States has indeed benefited by his service. CARL ELLIOTT, I am not delegated to speak for all of our citizenry but for those for whom I do speak, the 14th District of Ohio, I thank you.

REPORT TO THE CITIZENS OF THE FIRST CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CAHILL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, following my usual custom, I am taking this opportunity to review and report the activities of the 88th Congress to the citizens of the First Congressional District of New Jersey, and to express my personal views concerning the achievements and failures of this Congress.

The 1st session of the 88th Congress, although the longest in the peacetime history of our country, produced few accomplishments. On the other hand, the second session has been one of the most productive in our history. The leadership of both political parties, responsible newspaper editors and political writers, and the average citizen, seem to be in agreement as to the meritorious productivity of the 2d session of the 88th Congress.

Regardless of its shortcomings or its accomplishments, the 88th Congress will be remembered in history because it was during this Congress that our late beloved President, John F. Kennedy, was assassinated. November 22, 1963, will long be remembered as a tragic day in American history. His death dramatically emphasized some of the grave shortcomings of our security and the lack of necessary legal machinery to select a Vice President upon the death of the President.

This week has seen the presentation to the President of the report on the assassination by the committee headed by Chief Justice Earl Warren. This report makes several recommendations concerning the safety and security of our Chief Executive. It is my hope that these recommendations will be implemented during the next Congress.

It will, of course, be impossible to discuss all of the legislation introduced or even approved by this Congress. I shall, therefore, confine my remarks and limit my observations to the most important activities of the 88th Congress in relation to international affairs, domestic affairs, and District affairs.

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

The most pressing problems facing the Nation today are still related to the international crises existing throughout the world. Cuba is still a trouble spot, the problem in Berlin has not been solved, and today the Congo, South America, Red China, Cyprus, Turkey, and all of southeast Asia are hazardous areas on the international scene and present unusual problems which can explode at any moment into a world crisis.

At the moment, the most critical area is southeast Asia. While the United States is and should be reluctant to intervene directly in the affairs of another government, the molders of our foreign policy have concluded that we have a definite responsibility to help South Vietnam maintain its independence. For this reason, we have been spending tremendous sums of money in military and economic aid and have furnished approximately 20,000 troops, 300 of whom have already given their lives in this far-removed outpost. It is, therefore, discouraging to all Americans, I am sure, to read and hear of the lack of unity existing amongst the military and civic leaders of South Vietnam, particularly when this country is engaged in a life-and-death struggle with its Communist enemy. I am convinced that our Chief Executive and our State Department must insist that their responsible leaders submerge their personal ambitions and coordinate their efforts with those of the United States to insure that this battle will not be fought in vain and that the lives of American boys will not be sacrificed in vain.

I was gratified and encouraged by the unanimous vote in the House of Representatives supporting the President's action in relation to the unwarranted attacks by North Vietnam upon American vessels in the Gulf of Tonkin. This action emphasized our precarious position and dramatized the necessity for the State Department to require better cooperation and support from all elements of the South Vietnamese Government. It also demonstrated to the world in general and to the Communists in particular that when America is in danger, partisanship is forgotten and all Americans unite as one in support of their President.

The international pressures also resulted in the continuation of our foreign aid program. In the last session, the bill authorized a total appropriation of $3.3 billion. There are still many abuses and eventually these must be eliminated in order to insure the long-range effectiveness of this program. While the foreign aid program gives us an opportunity to help the free world in its struggle against communism and is, in effect, part of our overall national defense, I believe that this program must be carefully and effectively supervised by the State Department and that this aid must not be given to countries which may be our actual or potential enemies.

All Americans are anxious for peace and the elimination, consistent with the safety and welfare of the United States, of the dangers of nuclear war. It was, therefore, gratifying to observe during the last session that the Senate passed the limited test ban treaty, signed by Great Britain, the Soviet Union, and more than 100 other nations. This treaty, I believe, advances our national interest by checking the spread of nuclear weapons and reducing the fallout hazard. The agreement bans nuclear testing in areas where detection is ascertainable—space, atmosphere, and underwater—but the treaty does permit underground testing, and does not restrict the use of nuclear weapons in wartime. It also contains a withdrawal clause if "extraordinary events have jeopardized the supreme interest" of the Nation.

In keeping with our desire to help the underprivileged and in recognition of the past effectiveness of the Peace Corps, the 88th Congress appropriated additional funds to permit that agency to continue its worthwhile projects throughout the world thus aiding the less fortunate and improving the image of America throughout the world.

Since there has been little improvement in our overall international relations, our State Department has been properly criticized on many occasions for its lack of firm policy and its policy of reacting rather than acting. In my opinion, the State Department must adopt policies based on anticipation of occurrences instead of relying on hastily conceived plans after events take place.

DOMESTIC

Due to the necessity for brevity, I shall confine my remarks and limit my observations to what I believe to be the most important matters considered by the 88th Congress on the domestic scene.

First. Highlighting the domestic program was the Revenue Act of 1964. This bill had a most important effect on our citizens since it provided an $11½ billion tax cut for individual and corporate incomes. The largest share of the tax cut went properly to families with incomes of $10,000 or less. Business also gained by way of an investment incentive for modernization and expansion, and with a reduction in corporate taxes amounting to more than $2 billion. I voted in favor of this bill because I believed this reduction, freeing as it will $11 billion for spending purposes, will aid our economy, develop more employment and, in effect, bring into the Treasury more dollars by way of the increase in income to all Americans. The enactment of this legislation, however, does not eliminate the great need for complete overhaul of our entire tax system. Many continuing nuisance World War II taxes should be removed from the tax rolls, loopholes should be eliminated, and the overall tax policy of the United States should be reevaluated in the light of present economic conditions.

Second. As a member of the Judiciary Committee, I assisted in the preparation of the Civil Rights Act of 1963 and later voted for its enactment on the House floor. This act, in my judgment, was made necessary by the failure of some States to give to all Americans their constitutional rights. Prior to the passage of the Federal Act, the State of New Jersey had an effective, strong civil rights act. Briefly stated, the Civil Rights Act of 1963 guarantees the right to vote to all citizens; makes discrimination on the basis of race, religion, or national origin unlawful in establishments serving the public where the operations affect interstate commerce; guarantees equal access and full use of public facilities, such as parks, playgrounds, athletic stadiums; expands the work of the Civil Rights Commission as a clearinghouse and evaluator in desegregation information; denies Federal funds to any projects where discrimination is in effect; prohibits on-the-job discrimination; and establishes an Equal Employment Opportunities Commission. Contrary to popular opinion, it does not establish any quotas whereby one race must be hired to replace another race, nor does it affect the seniority rights of union workers. The Civil Rights Act merely spells out what is inherent in the Constitution and assures the Attorney General the power to implement what is the law of the land.

Third. Important attention was given to the health requirements of our citizens during the last session. I was encouraged by the passage of the Mental Health Act of 1963, since I believe this is one of the most vital problems existing in our Nation today. This act provides grants for the construction of community health centers and authorizes a broad program for the prevention and treatment of mental retardation by providing States and communities with needed research and facilities for rehabilitation and vocational services. It is my opinion that greater efforts must be concentrated in the field of mental health and if I am given the opportunity to represent the First District in 1965, I shall insist upon additional appropriations to provide further research and assistance in this vitally important area.

Other accomplishments in the field of health involved the extension, continuation, and improvement of the Hill-Burton Act which provides Federal assistance for the construction and remodeling of hospitals and nursing homes, and the Nurses Training Act of 1964, which provides aids for the construction of nursing homes and loan programs for schools of nursing. In addition, a program providing $175 million was authorized to expand facilities of medical, dental, and related type colleges.

The 88th Congress also improved the existing program relative to polluted air by accelerating Federal participation and authorizing new programs to encourage interest in local prevention and enforcement activities. Continuing efforts in the field of health are essential and while great progress has been made, breakthroughs in the battle against disease and illness are imperative. Great challenges still remain in the field of health and every effort must be made by the United States to insure its citizens the very best in this highly important field.

Fourth. The 88th Congress has been referred to by the President and many others as the "Education Congress." This designation resulted from the passage of such legislation as the Higher Education Facilities Act, which authorized $1.2 billion for the construction of academic facilities for public and private nonprofit graduate schools, 4-year colleges, 2-year community colleges and public technical schools. We must provide every qualified boy and girl with the opportunity to continue his or her education and particularly must we provide opportunities in graduate fields where the need is great, such as medicine.

To afford greater opportunity for youth interested in the manual skills, this Congress approved authorization of $958 million for a vocational education program. In my judgment this is also one of the great needs of our Nation today, since many youngsters who lack either the desire or ability to obtain a formal education should be given the opportunity to acquire vocational assistance in the various manual skills. There is a broad need for expanded vocational training throughout the entire country.

I cast an affirmative vote for the Health Professions Assistance Act, which provided aid in matching grants for the construction or remodeling of health teaching facilities in medicine, dentistry, osteopathy, nursing, optometry, pharmacy, and public health. In addition, $30 million was provided for low-interest loans to assist students of medicine and dentistry to complete their costly professional education. The Congress did not pass any direct Federal aid to education legislation because the proposed legislation was never approved by the committee having jurisdiction over it and, therefore, the House was never called upon to vote on this type of legislation.

Fifth. The House passed legislation correcting deficiencies in existing pension programs and liberalizing benefits so that veterans of World Wars I and II, and the Korean conflict, together with their widows and children will receive liberalized benefits for their war service. Payments were increased to veterans' widows and the children of veterans who died of service-connected disabilities. The Veterans' Administration was permitted to waive recovery on defaulted home loans in certain hardship cases, children of veterans with total and permanent service disability were provided educational assistance, and disability provisions of National Service Life Insurance policies was extended. The legislation was comprehensive, just and necessary, and I supported it.

Sixth. During the 88th Congress the mass transit bill was approved authorizing $375 million in grants and loans to cities and communities to aid mass transit service. The residents of the First District recognize the great need for improvement in mass transit facilities. With the advance of new crossings over the Delaware, traffic already strangling commerce and impeding rapid transportation on the part of motorists, will become worse unless remedial methods are pursued. It is the first time that the Federal Government has recognized that this problem is not entirely local. New Jersey, being a corridor State, is particularly in need of this type of aid, due to the hundreds of thousands of motorists who use our highways traveling from State to State.

The accelerated public works bill has proven, in my judgment, to be a failure. While it has provided some aid to certain municipalities, it has actually prevented public works from being performed in other municipalities, who have been led to believe that they too will be able to obtain Federal funds. As a result, municipalities which had the financial ability to proceed on their own, have postponed their public works programs awaiting Federal assistance. The applications are far in excess of the funds available, and thus, while a limited number have obtained Federal aid, most of the municipalities have been turned down because of inadequate funds.

The Area Redevelopment Act is likewise, in my judgment, a complete failure and should be abolished. The criteria is unjust and the entire program has been, I believe, motivated by political prejudices. Camden, for example, is not included as a qualified ARA recipient, while Newark is qualified. The city of Philadelphia was separated from the metropolitan labor market, while Camden was refused separation. This favored treatment of Newark and Philadelphia points up one of the great defects in the ARA program. In addition, a great deal of money has been used for the construction of motels, ski resorts, and other recreational projects, which would have been and should have been financed by private moneys. Predicted increases in employment have not materialized and in my judgment, no appreciable contribution was made to the unemployed through ARA. I shall, therefore, vote against any further appropriation for this program.

Seventh. The 88th Congress enacted at the recommendation of the President an antipoverty bill. The most important feature of this bill is the provision giving the youth of our country the opportunity to develop essential skills, to continue their education, and find useful work. The dropout problem has become extremely acute, especially in our larger cities. There is no doubt that this program has some political overtones and some glaring weaknesses. On the other hand, recent explosions in slum areas have dramatically illustrated the neglect of these areas and have pointed out the need for remedial action. The program will expire at the end of 1 year. Its accomplishments or failures will determine, in my judgment, whether it is worthy of continued support.

In addition, the 88th Congress extended the Manpower Development Training Act through 1966, so that once again opportunities for retraining and the development of skills are being recognized and assisted.

Eighth. The Congress passed a housing bill which extended for 1 year FHA urban renewal, public housing, and other similar programs. Several more liberal programs were proposed, such as Federal aid in construction of satellite towns, new public housing programs that would permit leasing or purchasing of homes for rehabilitation, but were not accepted by the Congress. The Federal Housing Administration was given authority to insure one-family homes up to $30,000, instead of the current $25,000. The legislation also provided for construction of special housing for the elderly, funds for urban planning grants, and for open space grants for parks and recreational facilities. The housing bill was again, in my judgment, necessary and reasonable.

Ninth. The Social Security Amendments of 1964 as passed by the House, provide for a 5-percent across-the-board increase in all social security benefits. The minimum individual benefit will, therefore, be raised from $40 to $42, and the maximum from $127 to $143.40. The proposed amendments will also liberalize the eligibility requirements of people 72 years of age or older. The legislation also provides benefits to all dependent children still in school or college until the child reaches 22; the present law ends the child's benefits at age 18, unless the child is disabled. In order to make these additional grants and at the same time keep the social security program fiscally sound, the legislation provided for an increase in payments and the wages upon which the social security tax is based were increased from $4,800 to $5,400. As of this day we are still waiting for the conferees of the Senate and the House to report to us so that we can make a final judgment on this legislation. I would point out to the people of the first district that the Senate attached a medicare program providing for medical care for the aged under social security. If the conferees approve this additional amendment then the House will, of course, be called upon to vote upon the medicare program. If they do not, then the bill as originally passed by the House will be the only matter that will be voted upon by the House during this Congress.

Tenth. The Congress enacted the Wilderness Act which sets aside 54 tracts in 13 States, a total of more than 8 million acres to be preserved in their natural state. These lands are owned by the Government and, therefore, no new authorization for funds was required. No new bureau, committee, nor council was established. This bill, in my judgment, was long overdue in order that we might preserve for future generations some of the natural beauty of America. I supported legislation relating to Tocks Island which will provide outdoor recreational areas, camping facilities, and so forth, to thousands of New Jersey sportsmen. During this Congress, Federal aids were also supplied to our seashore areas as part of a rehabilitation and improvement program. These Federal contributions likewise are beneficial to the citizens of our district.

The Supreme Court decisions in relation to representation in State legislatures if implemented can have an extremely detrimental effect upon Camden, Gloucester, and Salem Counties. Under this decision, the New Jersey Legislature would be apportioned solely on the basis of population. The question naturally presents itself: "Why should there be a double standard in relation to Federal and State legislatures?" An effort to legislatively negate the effect of the Supreme Court decision has delayed the adjournment of this Congress and as of this date, the problem has not yet been resolved. Believing that the South Jersey area and particularly the counties comprising the First Congressional District must have a forceful voice in the New Jersey Legislature, I introduced in the Congress a bill which would permit a State if it so decided to apportion one house of a bicameral legislature on a basis other than population. It is my hope that each State in the Union will be permitted to make its own decision as to the type of legislature it requires and wants.

DISTRICT

I am pleased to report that legislation I introduced giving congressional approval to the compact entered into between Pennsylvania and New Jersey authorizing the Delaware River Port Authority to construct a new bridge across the Delaware between Bridgeport, N.J., and Chester, Pa., and other necessary projects in relation thereto, passed both the House and Senate and was signed into law by President Johnson on the 13th day of June 1964, and became Public Law 88–320. It is my sincere belief that these new crossings over the river will aid immeasurably the economy of the entire South Jersey area with particular advantages accruing to Salem, Gloucester, and Camden Counties.

During the 88th Congress, I was able to get the House Committee on Public Works to authorize the Army Engineers to make a very necessary study of flood conditions in Camden County and to authorize the expenditure of $270,000 for that purpose. To date $150,000 has been appropriated and the study is well on its way to completion. It is my earnest belief and hope that the survey will be completed within the next year when the balance of the money will be appropriated and that it will point up the necessary steps to be taken to alleviate if not completely eliminate flooding conditions in our area. The Middle Neck watershed was aided by authorization to the Soil Conservation Service to assist in the planning of this watershed covering approximately 1,900 acres. When the plans are completed they can be used to obtain Federal assistance in providing drainage, flood control, and so forth. The Army Engineers awarded a contract of approximately a half million dollars for the removal and disposal of material from the Mantua Creek anchorage.

I am happy to report that legislation which I cosponsored passed the House of

Representatives and is now pending in the Senate which would restore tariffs to electron microscopes. The electron microscope was pioneered by RCA in Camden and RCA is still the only major domestic producer of this instrument which is so essential in medical and scientific research today. For many years a duty was imposed on imported electron microscopes. Several years ago this duty was eliminated and at the present time imported electron microscopes come into the United States duty free. This has been a tremendous handicap to RCA and the purpose of this legislation is to restore them to a competitive position in this important field.

I was also pleased to have the Congress pass and the President sign into law a bill which I introduced granting to Little League baseball a Federal corporate charter. This legislation was requested by the officials of Little League who believe that such a charter would better protect the overall interests of this most worthwhile endeavor. It is now Public Law 88-378 and was signed by President Johnson on July 16, 1964.

In addition, I have personally introduced legislation which is still pending to authorize the acquisition of additional land for the Beverly National Cemetery in New Jersey; to amend the Constitution relating to succession to the Presidency and Vice Presidency; to strengthen the law in relation to the prohibition of obscene material from being transmitted through the U.S. mails; to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide that education expenditures for dependent children may be deducted; to permit the mothers and fathers of deceased servicemen to be buried in a national cemetery; to assist 4-H Clubs; to provide waiver of premiums on NSLI policies for totally disabled veterans; to amend the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted; to amend the Small Business Act to include counties such as those whose residents sustained losses along the New Jersey coast during the recent hurricanes; to provide for the construction of a new veterans hospital in South Jersey; to force railroads to provide better facilities for passengers in interstate commerce; and to assist a score or more residents of the First Congressional District by the introduction of private bills to adjust inequities not specifically governed by existing law.

Every effort was made to assist industries, large and small, in adjusting problems with the Federal Government and to promote the assignment of defense contracts to the qualified companies in the First Congressional District.

While the principal function of a Member of Congress is to devote himself to legislation benefiting the United States in general and his own district in particular, he also represents the constituents of his district in their relationship with the Federal Government.

During this session of Congress, my office has processed literally thousands of requests for assistance in this field. We have handled matters relating to social security, veterans' affairs, immigration, watershed problems, small business, area redevelopment, military academies, post offices, and farm problems—to mention but a few. I have been fortunate, too, in receiving expressions of opinion on pending legislation before the Congress from thousands of constituents. This has been most helpful in aiding me in obtaining the views of the citizens of the First District and in focusing my attention on matters of particular import to individuals, businesses, and corporations of the area.

An office has been maintained with a full-time staff in both Washington and Camden for the servicing of the constituency and the solution of the problems presented. Without exception, the correspondence addressed to either the Camden or Washington office has been answered and it is my hope that all citizens received efficient, prompt, and courteous attention.

In closing this report, I wish to express my appreciation to the people of the First Congressional District for the honor of serving them as their Representative in the 86th, 87th, and the 88th Congresses.

THE 1944 SLOVAKIA UPRISING

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, on August 29, 1944, the great armed uprising occurred in Slovakia which now has been historically designated as the Slovak national uprising. This World War II military effort was aimed at ousting Nazi forces from Slovakia and had as its ultimate goal the establishment of a free, democratic Czechoslovakia.

The forces in the uprising were inadequately armed and suffered tremendous losses in battling against the overwhelming firepower of their Nazi occupiers while Soviet troops, in classic repetition of their behavior during the Warsaw uprising, did not move to assistance since it was their intention to impose communism on postwar Czechoslovakia.

Despite the failure of the uprising to achieve its ultimate goal, it remains an inspiration to the Slovak people and is one of the greatest pages in Czechoslovak history.

At this stage in world events, it is well for us to ponder the tragic postwar developments, especially the ill-fated concessions at Yalta and Potsdam to the Soviet imperialist government. The Americans of Slovak and Czech origin in the United States remain a most effective and vital group perpetuating the true traditions of their homelands and working for the day when true freedom can be restored to the present captives in Czechoslovakia. One of the inspiring forces in their activities is the Slovak national uprising of 1944. May it also serve as an inspiration to all captive peoples who recognize that with effective coordination and determination, they can see freedom restored to their homelands rather than watch the subsidy of communism which would perpetuate the tyranny in Eastern Europe.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S STATEMENT ON THE TEXTILE INDUSTRY

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. ST GERMAIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, for a long period of time the Members of Congress from New England, and especially Rhode Island, under the leadership of Senator PASTORE, chairman of the Subcommittee To Study the Domestic Textile Industry, as a team and individually, have worked for the welfare of the textile industry, and particularly the woolen and worsted industry.

It is gratifying to note that the President has taken cognizance of the plight of this industry and we, especially in Rhode Island where so much of the textile industry has suffered, are more than pleased with the President's statement. It is the fond hope of the Rhode Island delegation in the Congress, as well as that of all Rhode Islanders, that concrete, definite, and effective steps will be taken by the administration in the very near future.

The time has come and in fact, has almost gone, for relief to this industry. Our wool and worsted textile industry can wait no longer.

Following is the text of the statement made by President Johnson in Providence, R.I., on Monday, September 28:

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT

I know the significant role that textiles have played in the economic life of New England, and I know of the difficulties this industry has encountered during the past few years. Fortunately, New England could have no better spokesman in Washington than Senator PASTORE. He has been untiring in bringing home to all of us the very real problems faced by New England textiles. I can assure you that there is no major official in this administration who has not been made fully aware of the hardships created every time a mill is shut down or forced to operate on part time. We have worked hard at this problem, and we will continue to do so.

President Kennedy, as a son of New England, knew these problems well. In May 1961, as you recall, he instituted a seven-point program for the textile industry. Under that program, Government-sponsored research for the industry has been launched. We have provided accelerated tax amortization for the textile industry even ahead of similar benefits for other industries. This year I signed legislation that is greatly helping out cotton textile mills by permitting them to buy cotton at world prices for the first time since 1956.

Among our textile problems has, of course, been the increase of imports. This administration has worked out a solution for the import problem of the cotton textile industry. It developed a long-term cotton textile arrangement. Under the administration of this arrangement, cotton textile imports have been stabilized—and we intend to continue keeping imports from disrupting the market.

All of these measures have contributed to restoring the prosperity of the textile industry, which, as a whole, can look forward to greater prosperity in the future.

I say with a great deal of pride that this administration has done more for the textile industry than any administration in history—and our efforts have not been confined merely to cotton textiles. We have stemmed the tide of foreign wool fabrics coming through the Virgin Islands by administrative action. This alone reduced imports 10 million square yards a year. We have closed tariff loopholes which permitted some woolen textiles to enter as paying only one-half the duty they should pay. The Senate Finance Committee has just approved legislation which would close another loophole affecting tariffs on certain types of wool products. We strongly support this legislation.

But the wool textile industry continues to be faced with problems, particularly in New England. In the past 10 years imports have soared from less than 5 to 20 percent of American consumption with particular concentration in worsteds.

The administration has made and will continue to make vigorous efforts to solve this problem. I share with our late, beloved President Kennedy the view that wool textile and apparel imports must be kept at reasonable levels. We have tried to work out effective arrangements with other wool textile-producing countries. Two missions have been sent abroad for this purpose in recent months. Thus far, a multination meeting has not been convened. But we intend to continue our efforts vigorously. I can assure you that we shall work hard at this problem. I consider it essential that the wool textile industry be restored to good health.

THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1964

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Long] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I have this day presented to the Clerk of the House 400 petitions, containing the names of 10,200 individuals from Louisiana and surrounding States. They implore the President of the United States and the Members of this body to give serious consideration to a bill which I introduced July 2, 1964, calling for a national referendum on the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

When I introduced that piece of legislation, on the day that the Civil Rights Act passed into law, I was inspired to do so by a deep-seated feeling that the Civil Rights Act was as important in its consequences as any amendment ever proposed to our Constitution and deserved as much study. As a matter of fact, I believe this act has raised grave constitutional questions which have not been resolved to this day. It was, and is, my feeling that on a matter of such great magnitude the people of the United States have the right to make their personal feelings known. I would not suggest that on every subject of great controversy the Congress should shirk its role and turn the question over to the electorate for a popular vote, but the Civil Rights Act is anything but an ordinary piece of legislation. And the impact on our country is of such great magnitude that it requires the approval of the vast majority of Americans, or it will only lead to more violence and frustration in our attempts to have a stable racial climate.

I am not naive enough to think that the attitude of this Congress has so drastically changed that it would be possible to repeal the Civil Rights Act at this time. My bill would simply allow the States, voluntarily, to poll their citizens as to their feelings about this legislation, the Civil Rights Act of 1964. The bill calls for placing that question on the ballot during this year's presidential election.

However, realism now forces me to admit that there is little chance of passing this referendum bill before Congress adjourns. Therefore, I take this opportunity to plead with my colleagues to consider the adoption of similar legislation during the next Congress. I present as evidence of the deep grassroots resentment against the Civil Rights Act these petitions, nearly all from my one small congressional district. These petitions were placed in country stores and service stations and other places of business by people who voluntarily joined together to express their opinion against the act which is now law of the land.

There are many people, both in my district and in other parts of the country who feel that this act has been forced upon them. I say that unless this question is placed in a public forum and voted upon by the people of this country the bitterness which it has fanned will wipe away any possibility for racial peace in our time. By allowing the issue to be voted upon in a national election, we are saying to the world that we are not afraid to entrust even our most difficult and demanding questions to the voters of this Nation.

If the American people uphold the decision of this Congress, those who have championed the Civil Rights Act will be able to argue their cause more surely. And if, as I suspect, the people of America are dissatisfied with the provisions of this law, their ballots in a national election would be a mandate to the next Congress to reconsider this source of national discord.

CONGRESSMAN MONAGAN'S SPEECH ON WATER POLLUTION CONTROL

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Jones] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the control of air and water pollution has become the Nation's single most desperate national resources problem. They affect every part of our country and directly concern the military strength of the United States.

I am therefore glad to bring to the attention of the Congress that the Air Force, in its fourth annual Bio-Environmental Symposium, has brought together, from every part of our country, many engineer and medical corps officers of the Air Force to discuss these pollution problems and to evolve better and more effective ways of establishing and monitoring environmental pollution control programs at Air Force installations.

The Subcommittee on Natural Resources and Power, of which I have the honor to be chairman, has for the past year and a half devoted extensive effort to investigate the problems of water pollution control and abatement.

When our subcommittee was invited to participate in the Air Force Bio-Environmental Symposium, held at Brooks Air Force Base, San Antonio, Tex., September 29 and 30, 1964, I asked our colleague and very valued subcommittee member, the gentleman from Connecticut, Congressman John S. Monagan, to represent the subcommittee at the symposium. Congressman Monagan delivered a very significant speech at the symposium. I believe his speech will be most informative, both to the Congress and to the country. I commend his speech, and therefore insert it in the Congressional Record so that it will be widely read:

SPEECH OF THE HONORABLE JOHN S. MONAGAN, DEMOCRAT, OF CONNECTICUT, AT THE FOURTH ANNUAL U.S. AIR FORCE MEDICAL SERVICES BIO-ENVIRONMENTAL ENGINEERING SYMPOSIUM, BROOKS AIR FORCE BASE, SAN ANTONIO, TEX., SEPTEMBER 29, 1964

I am delighted to be here today to discuss with you some of the problems of water pollution control and abatement. This symposium will make a significant contribution to the control and abatement of environmental pollution by bringing together from many areas the engineer and medical corps officers of the Air Force who are so deeply involved in aerospace medicine and the detection and control of environmental pollution. I am especially pleased to note that representatives of the Public Health Service and the Texas State Health Department, who are also directly concerned with pollution problems, will be participating in this symposium.

As you know, I am a member of the Natural Resources and Power Subcommittee of the House of Representatives. This subcommittee is a major subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations. During the past year and a half, the subcommittee has devoted extensive time to investigating the problems of water pollution control and abatement. We have held numerous hearings both in Washington and in many regions of the country. These hearings have, thus far, covered the Delaware River Basin, lower Lake Michigan, Connecticut River Basin, the Pacific Northwest, Texas, the Southeast, and the Midwest. Our subcommittee has received testimony and written views from over 250 witnesses, representing Federal, State, and local government agencies, civic groups, individuals and business companies, conservation organizations, and many other persons interested in water pollution control.

Our country is facing a monumental water crisis. This crisis is not so much a shortage of water itself, but a shortage of usable clean water. Our subcommittee hearings have demonstrated quite conclusively that water pollution has become the Nation's single most desperate natural resources problem.

Almost all of the Nation's rivers, streams, and lakes have substantial pollution problems. In many areas this pollution jeopardizes our water supplies, endangers public health, destroys aquatic life, and disgraces our environment. It will adversely affect the continued growth, physical health, and economic development of almost every community in the country, and it directly concerns the military strength of the United States.

The pollution of our country's waters stems from the country's rapid growth in population and increased urbanization, as well as the unprecedented technological advances and changes of industry in the past two decades.

During the lifetime of those of us who are here, our country's population has more than doubled. New towns and cities have sprung up where only farms or wilderness existed. Small villages have become large cities of 50,000 people or more. Cities of 100,000 are approaching or have exceeded a million people. Our urban population of about 30 million in 1900 has quadrupled and is now 125 million. By the year 2000 the urban population in the continental United States will probably exceed 300 million people.

All of these people generate wastes. Even more significantly, the industrial expansion which has raised the standard of living for our growing population is generating ever-increasing quantities of waste products.

The sources of these wastes, almost all of which go into our Nation's rivers and streams, are literally innumerable. Their composition is increasingly diverse and complicated. They include oils, garbage, chemicals, acids draining from mines, new chemicals such as synthetic fibers and detergents, pesticides, radioactive wastes and many other substances. These vast quantities of wastes are ruining our waters while at the same time the Nation's demand for good water is increasing every day.

Water of good quality is not needed only for drinking purposes. It is vitally important for the new and developing industries. It is urgently needed for the conservation of our fish and wildlife resources and for the maintenance of clean waters for recreation such as swimming and boating. It is also essential for the preservation of the esthetic beauty of our country.

As cities and industries grow and as people and communities crowd closer and closer together, we find that we must, more and more, protect our waters, and reuse them, as they pass from the land to the sea.

There is an increasing demand all over the country for bold and concentrated action to protect and enhance the quality of the Nation's waters.

For these reasons the chairman of the Committee on Government Operations, Congressman WILLIAM L. DAWSON, of Illinois, set up the Natural Resources and Power Subcommittee, under the chairmanship of Congressman ROBERT E. JONES, and made it the largest subcommittee of the committee with members from almost every section of the country; namely, Alabama, Connecticut, Indiana, Missouri, Massachusetts, California, Illinois, New Jersey, and New York. The task of our subcommittee is to make an extensive and intensive examination of our Nation's water pollution problems and to determine how effectively Federal and local agencies are dealing with these problems and what can be done to improve both the technological and legal tools for preventing or controlling the rising pollution levels of so many of our Nation's rivers, lakes, and stream waters.

Our subcommittee hearings and investigations have shown that there has been considerable progress in controlling water pollution in the past decade. But they have also shown that the problems of pollution are growing both in volume and complexity, that there is a rapidly growing backlog of needs for more and better treatment facilities and for greater research efforts to learn how to solve the more difficult pollution problems, both old and new; and that there is an increasing urgency to deal with the continuing deterioration of our Nation's waters.

More sewage treatment plants are needed. There are still many millions of Americans who are today not served by any sewers or sewage treatment facilities at all. Furthermore, more treatment facilities are needed to replace or supplement the many existing treatment plants which are inadequate and incapable of handling the increased amounts of sewage and the increasingly complicated types of waste products being shoved into them. Far too much of the pesticides, detergents, and other chemicals now going into the watercourses do not easily respond to biological treatment and therefore persist in streams for a long time.

Everyone has a responsibility to deal with the problem of water pollution. All of the different classes of water users, including industry, must cooperate to assure that the different and sometimes conflicting uses of water are made available to all, safely and equitably.

These problems will require major efforts at every level of government. All agencies of government—Federal, State, and local—will have to expand and strengthen the enforcement of their antipollution laws as well as the educational efforts necessary to enlist the fullest cooperation of all our citizenry in the common task of keeping our waters clean and usable.

There will have to be much more intensive research, by both Government and non-Government agencies, concerning the sources, causes, and effects of water pollution and the techniques, materials, and facilities needed to control such pollution.

While we are conducting this research we must keep aware that water pollution control cannot wait upon the development of all the answers. We must enhance our control and abatement efforts in the light of our present knowledge. We must vigorously enforce existing legal controls to safeguard the public health and welfare and to provide the quality and quantity of water which our rapidly expanding population and economy require.

I am sure that all of you know that the Congress has been deeply concerned with these problems. The grant and research programs set up under the Federal Water Pollution Control Acts of 1956 and 1961 have provided significant leadership toward meeting our growing water pollution problem.

These statutes, and the hundreds of millions of dollars appropriated by the Congress, reflect a rising national concern, and even anxiety, about the growing threats of water pollution. These congressional enactments and appropriations have begun to provide a good legislative basis for the control and abatement of water pollution. They are providing valuable supplementary aid to the increased efforts by State and local governments, by private industry, and others.

One of the major problems which our subcommittee has dealt with during the past year is, I am sure, of particular interest to you. We have been concerned over the fact that many Federal installations still discharge substantial quantities of untreated sewage and industrial wastes directly into surface waters and the ground. I do not mean to suggest that the untreated discharges from Federal installations constitute the major source of pollution of our Nation's waters. The fact is that the total untreated sewage discharged by Federal installations constitutes only 3 percent of the total estimated 1,500 million gallons of municipal sewage which goes into surface and ground waters every day without treatment. Furthermore the untreated industrial wastes which Federal facilities discharge constitute only a very small percentage of the total volume of untreated industrial wastes from all sources which directly reach surface and ground waters every day. Nevertheless, both the Congress and the President have made very clear that Federal installations must provide leadership in the fight to eliminate water pollution. We must clean our own house while we continue to work for better and more effective control and abatement of pollution by the rest of the Nation's pollution sources.

With this in mind, our subcommittee last year inaugurated a Government-wide survey of waste discharge practices at Federal installations. We reviewed the 58-volume inventory on "Waste Water Disposal Practices at Federal Installations" which had been compiled by the General Services Administration and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. From the list of over 22,000 separate discharge points for both waterborne and nonwaterborne wastes we selected for detailed field examination 1,003 Federal installations. The criterion on which we selected these 1,003 places was that each of them discharged to surface waters or the ground (but not into sewers) either untreated sewage or untreated industrial wastes (excluding cooling waters) at a rate of 3,000 or more gallons per day, or nonwaterborne wastes of 200 or more persons per day. We also included those installations which, irrespective of quantity of discharge, had received a notification from a Government agency that a pollution condition existed.

These 1,003 facilities are under the jurisdiction of 18 separate major agencies of the Federal Government. We asked each of these agencies to conduct a field examination in cooperation with the Public Health Service, and to report the results of their examination to our subcommittee.

These field examination reports to our subcommittee are being carefully evaluated. They indicate that considerable progress is being made in tackling the pollution problem. Many installations are working diligently to provide remedial measures. Many others are expediting their planning and engineering studies, advancing their budgeting and construction schedules, and elevating their sights. A few installations, perhaps bedeviled by the enormity of the problem and lack of funds to deal with it, have thus far taken inadequate steps, or no steps, to correct the reported pollution.

Our subcommittee plans to inquire into the circumstances and conditions of the discharge practices and pollution problems at each of these installations. We intend to push for, and to support, full and expanded efforts to eliminate pollution created by Federal activities.

We recognize that at some installations the solution of the problem simply requires additional appropriations. At other installations, there may be need to coordinate the task of pollution abatement of the Federal agencies with the planning, financing, and construction work of local communities. In some cases, the lack of progress on pollution abatement may be affected by imminent or planned changes in the mission of the installation, while at other places the problem may be simply a lack of adequate numbers of trained personnel to do the job.

Our subcommittee is fully cognizant of the severe shortage of qualified people. There are far too few people like yourselves—with sufficient knowledge, training, and experience in sanitary engineering, environmental health and the other specialties needed to cope adequately with the many problems inherent in a proper antipollution program. This shortage of qualified personnel has been a major item of complaint at our hearings by witnesses representing the Public Health Service and other Federal agencies, State health departments, industry, universities, municipalities, and other groups and agencies concerned with abatement of water pollution.

Our subcommittee will, I am sure, recommend to the Congress, to the States, and to the country that increased emphasis be placed on meeting this problem. Additional incentives and funds must be provided for training and hiring more qualified personnel, at grades and ranks commensurate with their ability and responsibility, to further the attack on water pollution.

The subcommittee has already issued reports dealing with other specific problems. For example, a few weeks ago we issued House Report 1633 recommending that the Congress enact legislation to facilitate the Government's ability to remove hazardous substances from navigable waters.

As you know, the existing Refuse Act of 1899 (33 U.S.C. 407) makes it unlawful to discharge refuse matter of any kind into navigable waters; and it also prohibits (33 U.S.C. 403) the obstruction of their navigability. The law authorizes the Government to remove certain obstructions which specially endanger navigation, and to sell any material salvaged from those obstructions or cargo in order to pay the expenses of such removal. However, in many instances the companies or persons who caused a spill or accident through their negligence have refused to clean up or remedy the resulting hazardous condition, and the salvage value of the boat or cargo has been insufficient to pay the Government's cost of removal. There has been considerable litigation as to whether the Federal Government may require the negligent persons to reimburse the Government for those costs.

The legislation we have recommended would make such negligent persons liable to the United States in a civil action for all reasonable necessary costs incurred by the Government in removing obstructions or dangerous material from navigable waters where it endangers either navigation, or life or property of persons using waters of the United States, or substantially endangers desirable marine, aquatic, or other plant life, or substantially impairs the usefulness of navigable waters. This legislation has already been introduced and is pending as H.R. 11822.

One of the most encouraging aspects of our hearings was to learn of the great amount of research being done at all Government levels, and by industry and other private groups. I think that this accelerated research and development work will have a tremendous impact on the overall pollution abatement efforts.

Nevertheless, it is quite plain to us that the research and technical investigation must be stepped up and expanded. This responsibility for research, as well as for the management of water pollution, must be handled at every level—local, State, interstate, and national.

Stream flows do not recognize political boundaries. The problem of pollution is so enormous that everyone must have a share in its solution.

No one can escape the economic loss resulting from pollution of our waters. It affects not only the Nation and the community but also the businessman and every citizen. Some of these losses can be measured by the costs of construction, operation, and maintenance of water treatment facilities; but the bulk of the costs of pollution cannot be measured in dollars.

How do you measure impairment of health? How do you evaluate the loss of recreation facilities, or the depreciation of property values? What dollar figure do you assign to the inability of industry to expand? These indirect consequences of pollution are real and critical barriers to the fulfillment of our national and local economic goals. Thus, when we adopt pollution control measures and alleviate the noxious conditions resulting from polluted water, we produce economic benefits of great value to all of us.

I have sought to strengthen our legislative tools to cope with our national pollution problem. I introduced a bill (H.R. 9007) to amend and strengthen the Federal Water Pollution Control Act. This legislation was passed by the Senate last year as S. 649 (also known as the Blatnik-Muskie bill). When this legislation came before the Public Works Committee of the House of Representatives I testified in its support at the committee hearings. This bill has now been reported by the Public Works Committee with some amendments, and is pending before the House Rules Committee for a rule to take it to the floor of the House.

In brief, this bill would accomplish the following purposes:

1. It would express the national policy "to enhance the quality and value of our water resources and * * * for the prevention, control, and abatement of water pollution."

2. It would establish a Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, under an Assistant Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, to administer comprehensive programs, interstate cooperation, enforcement measures to abate pollution, waste water practices of Federal installations, construction grants, and research grants on combined storm and sanitary sewers.

3. It would authorize appropriation of $20 million annually for 4 years to pay for research and development work by State and municipal agencies, for demonstration projects on combined storm and sanitary sewer systems. These grants would provide up to 50 percent of the reasonable cost of a project, not exceeding 5 percent of the total annual appropriation.

4. It would increase the individual dollar ceiling limitations of Federal grants for construction of waste treatment works from $600,000 to $1 million for a single project, and from $2,400,000 to $4 million for a joint project involving two or more communities.

5. It would authorize an additional 10 percent in the grants for construction of waste treatment works if the project is certified by the State or regional planning agency as confronting with a comprehensive plan for a metropolitan area.

6. It would authorize enforcement measures to abate pollution when any person was prevented from marketing shellfish or shellfish products in interstate commerce as a result of such pollution and the action of Federal, State, or local authorities.

7. It would authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to prepare and to encourage the development of standards of water quality for interstate waters. The Senate version of the bill would authorize the Secretary of HEW to prescribe regulations establishing such standards and to do so in the light, not only of their effect on public health and welfare, but also the use of water for public water supplies, propagation of fish and wildlife, recreational purposes, and agricultural, industrial and other uses. The Secretary would also be authorized to proceed against discharges which violate those standards. The House Committee on Public Works, however, amended this provision to permit the Secretary of HEW only to recommend such standards, and the amended bill specifically provides that no such standard may be enforced unless first adopted by the Governor or State water pollution control agency of each affected State.

8. The Senate bill also would provide that waste water discharges by Federal installations shall be controlled under permits issued by the Secretary of HEW. This provision was omitted in the amendments made in the bill reported by the House committee.

9. The Senate bill would also establish a procedure to evaluate progress in the development of decomposable detergents which will not cause or contribute to the pollution of surface and underground waters, to develop standards of decomposability for such detergents, and to authorize the promulgation of such standards when detergents conforming to the proposed standards of decomposability are generally available to the manufacturers of detergents. This provision also was omitted in the amended bill reported by the House Committee on Public Works.

10. The bill would establish audit procedures concerning expenditure of construction grants.

11. It would clarify the authority of the Secretary of Labor over labor standards governing construction of federally aided waste treatment facilities.

I hope that the House can consider this bill in these last days before adjournment and avoid the delay of having the bill go over to the next session. I do not suggest that this bill will be a panacea, or a cure-all, but I do believe that the provisions of this bill will substantially strengthen the legislative base for dealing with several important water pollution problems.

Achieving cleanliness in our streams will require the making of judgments and the weighing of competing factors of economics and the less tangible benefits of recreational, esthetic, and wildlife values. The lines which must be drawn will vary from area to area, from stream to stream, from basin to basin, and will depend on the different judgments of many people.

There will undoubtedly be disagreements between those who believe in utilizing the full assimilating capacities of the streams, and those who believe that streams are more important for fishing, boating, and swimming. There will be differences between those who believe that water pollution control is solely the job of the locality, the State, or the region, and those who believe that the Federal Government must take an increasingly vigorous role in the control and reduction of pollution.

Our subcommittee recognizes these many problems and differing points of views. We are examining all the available facts, opinions and recommendations on this subject from every part of the country. We are using them to stimulate action in many quarters. From our findings and recommendations will undoubtedly evolve legislation, executive action, research, and new points of view.

The hearings and investigation by our subcommittee are not yet complete. I am convinced, however, that the subcommittee has already created a heightened awareness of the overall problem on the part of government officials, both Federal and State, who are responsible for various water pollution control programs. It has sharpened administrative practices and stimulated more imaginative and creative policies.

The subcommittee's hearings have also served another significant purpose which, I feel, is all too often neglected—that of educating the public. The great number of newspaper reports and articles appearing in professional and trade publications regarding the subcommittee's hearings leave no doubt that we, along with other groups, have made a deep impression on the public conscience. Where before there was apathy, there are now the stirrings of widespread citizen concern over the preservation of our water resources. In a democratic society such as ours, that is the all-important beginning of a solution to a problem.

This fourth annual Bioenvironmental Engineering Symposium will deal with may important aspects of engineering evaluation and control of environmental pollution. You have gathered together here many experts and dedicated scientists, engineers, technicians and administrators.

You are part of the front line in the crusade to preserve our Nation's water resources. Please accept my congratulations and the congratulations of our subcommittee and Chairman Jones, for your devotion and efforts.

I am happy to be here with you and to receive both inspiration and knowledge from you. I hope to do everything I can to assist, encourage, stimulate—even to push—you and your work forward. I know we will succeed in our common endeavor.

LOANS TO STUDENTS OF OPTOMETRY

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Stratton] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to underline my strong support for H.R. 8546, the legislation providing for loan funds to students of optometry similar to those already available for students of medicine, osteopathy, and dentistry. I am proud that we were able to pass this legislation so overwhelmingly on yesterday.

Certainly the profession of optometry deserves the same consideration which we have extended to other branches of the healing art professions. This legislation will provide an important extension of the educational program already enacted by this Congress. And it will also serve greatly to stimulate interest in optometry and thereby help to close the gap in our need for more graduate optometrists to serve our people.

ADDRESS BY MR. TORRES BODET, SECRETARY OF PUBLIC EDUCATION, REPUBLIC OF MEXICO

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Gonzalez] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, on September 17, 1964, the Secretary of Public Education of the Republic of Mexico, Mr. Torres Bodet, delivered a stirring and thoughtful address on the opening of the New National Museum of Anthropology in Mexico City. In his address, Mr. Bodet stressed the fact that if a civilization is to survive and flourish it must hold dear both spiritual and technological values. Mr. Bodet said:

> Cultures, in order to endure, require an inviolable alliance between spirituality and technical control. Before the testimonies of so many crippled civilizations, we solemnly promise never to be disloyal to the high purposes we postulate, nor disloyal to the material effort of adaptation required to preserve the ideals which those purposes imply.

We who have passed laws during this 88th Congress to extend to all persons in the United States equal civil rights, equal job opportunities, and equal educational opportunities, to combat poverty and disease, and to explore the full impact of the advance of technology and automation, can appreciate the significance of Mr. Bodet's statement.

As Mr. Bodet points out, Mexico is truly a bridge for the Americas. Historically, it forms a bridge between the Mediterranean traditions of the Old World and the pre-Columbian traditions of the New World. Geographically, she bridges the cultures of the peoples of Latin America and the cultures of the peoples of North America.

With unanimous consent, I am inserting in the Record the full text of the address by Torres Bodet, Secretary of Public Education, Republic of Mexico:

Address by Mr. Torres Bodet, Secretary of Public Education, at the Opening of the New National Museum of Anthropology, Mexico City, September 17, 1964

The huge austere building, with sober lines and noble spaces, whose construction has been awaited for many years, opens its doors this morning. And it opens them in September, in Chapultepec.

Exceptional indeed, is the soil of this place, near the hill immortalized by the "Niños Héroes." Few sites are worthier of the palace which our Chief Magistrate inaugurates today. And what better time for the ceremony that brings us together? September is the month when our country commemorates its independence and binds up, as the farmer his sheaves, the moral harvest of its liberty. Invoking its past, Mexico sizes up its present and—in thought and action—projects itself toward the future.

A poet of our age and of our America once said that "what the tree displays in flower, springs from what is buried lower." Nothing could be truer. The root is the explanation for the stem, the stem for the branch, the branch for the blossom. The deeper the foundation, the loftier and more daring the tower. And so it is with people. At all times and in all places, we men are living history. History which endures consciously in documents and treaties, portraits and manuscripts, books and newspapers. Or history that is preserved in no archive: tradition that need not be fixed at any date, or any particular anecdote; the impetus which suddenly, on accomplishing the slightest act, reveals an ancient impulse, quiet and undeviating, and wins for us—and sometimes over us—posthumous victories, such as were related by those who believed in the battles which even after his death were won by the Cid.

* * * * *

From the monolith of Coatlinchan, which greets the passerby, to the mysterious Coatlicue—who amazes and attracts the spectator with the violence of a cosmic cry—throughout this museum there unfolds a series of creations, harsh or happy, severe or smiling, almost all of them mystical. Mystical, for the souls who made and loved them lived under the control of religious emotion, the same—if they were Mayan—when they set a concentrated heraldic profile upon the friezes of Uxmal; if from Teotihuacán, when they reproduced the feathered serpent of Quetzalcóatl; if Toltec, when they fashioned the titans of Tula; if Zapotec, when they molded the urns of Monte Albán, or, if they were Aztec, when they sculptured the anguished expectancy of Xochipilli.

We shall always feel encouraged and surprised in the face of so many accomplishments some of them decisive and disdainful in their tragic perfection; others touching, by the tenderness of the frustrated line they cast toward the shapes of a new world.

MAN, UNINTERRUPTED HYPOTHESIS, NEVER-ENDING INVENTION

Our ties with such accomplishments cannot be thought of exclusively in geographical terms, recalling the fact that we live in areas where certain pre-Columbian civilizations with outstanding qualities once shone. Nor can they be thought of only in ethnical terms, because in the veins of our people flows the blood which throbbed in the pulse of Nezahualcóyotl, that stirred the breast of the personage found beneath the geometrical shadows of Palenque or that nourished the eyes of the officers and warriors who have paraded for centuries upon the walls of Bonampak.

Can the mere circumstance of living in the same land and of having received—even in part—the flow of the same blood, suffice to overcome the secret of the desires which those cultures so intensely felt and, in their way, dreamed and claimed? For man is not just a reaction to the place where he happens to be born, to love, suffer, think, and disappear; nor is he a passive entity, subservient to the rule of biology.

A vulnerable, and sometimes an unforseeable answer to the demands of his surroundings and to the appeal of his ancestry, man is also an uninterrupted hypothesis, a never-ending invention, a perennial creation and a constant discovery of the enigmas that his own sphinx propounds to him in the swirling—through light or darkness—of the universe.

GRATEFUL AND RESPECTFUL CUSTODIANS

Let us understand clearly our position. History is irreversible. In pronouncing the word fatherland, we certainly do not suggest a utopian return to the League of Mayapan, to the Teotihuacan theogony, to the warlike ways of Axayacatl or to the sumptuous standards of Montezuma. Nevertheless, our general view of Mexico would be arbitrary and false if we did not frankly admit that the sky at which we gaze, the mountains which protect us and the soil which feeds us, were the frame surrounding a secular evolution, for whose trophies we should acknowledge ourselves the grateful and respectful custodians.

Don Angel María Garibay has said it in a most persuasive way: "After four centuries, there beats in the heart of every Mexican a drop of that blood which throbbed in the emotions before the sun a-borning, incarnate in Huitzilopochtli, or danced in the happy fecundities of the harvests, under the blessing rain of a Tláloc that continues to nourish the sanctified corn, bread of the dark-skinned creatures and joy of the fields, with the song of its leaves and the rustle of its stalks."

Crushed by the conquerors, ignored or despised by the occupying forces—if not, likewise, by some of their legitimate heirs—the native cultures never disappeared altogether. Their temples had been destroyed or abandoned to the greed of the nearby forest. But the new beliefs did not completely banish the old gods. Farmers, the Indians continue the traditional tillage of the soil. Artisans, they still fondle the shapes of their ceramics. And when they decorate certain walls, articles of furniture and many pieces of jewlery, one notes—under the lines of the western patterns—the affirmation of their inalienable concepts of plastic beauty.

How could we permit this great museum to consist merely of a profusion of forgotten relics? Therefore, besides the jewels of sculpture (engraved stanzas of a hymn, inaudible now in its entirety), our coworkers have sought the necessary anthropological accompaniment: the historical and ethnographic background which underlines the artistic value of each particular object, and at the same time offers proof of the permanence of certain customs, still alive in the traditions of many communities in our Republic.

THE THREE FUNCTIONS OF THE MUSEUM: ESTHETIC, EDUCATIONAL, AND SOCIAL

Consequently, this museum has three complementary functions. The first—purely esthetic—fulfills the requirement of presenting to the spectator the work of the past, in the solitude of its pristine bareness. Nothing could take the place of each one's personal discovery before the achievements which here await him. No lesson would reveal as much to the traveler as the masterpieces in their perfection. The space we have attempted to provide in front of each one was designed to facilitate a silent dialog between the visitor, who is enriched by what he admires, and the document which awakens and explains his admiration.

The second of the functions to which I referred earlier is not purely esthetic. It is, above all, educational. It is important that the studiously inclined understand (as far as is practicable, within the limitations of our knowledge) the social significance of the works which charm him. No production can deny the influence of the people who made it possible. And if this is true in general terms, it is even more so in the case of creations that in no way hide their relationship with the world they have tried to perpetuate.

The intention to instruct, which I have mentioned, induced us to request the performance of an additional—and not always easy—task of those who helped us in the realization of this enterprise: the architects, artists, and museologists to whom I owe not only official congratulations, but a deep personal gratitude. That additional task tended (whenever we believed it feasible) to relate the manifestations of each civilization with the physical and ethnic surroundings, the social condition, and the historical period in which scientific research places them. Maps and scenes that are lifelike approximations, and often faithful reproductions, help the public as points of reference, or orientation aids.

At times, such scenes appeal to the spectator in the concrete language of known facts, landscapes, festivals, and rites that it is still possible to observe in reality. Sometimes they stimulate, instead, his poetic sense, encouraging that use of the imagination without whose impulse the visit to any museum would result in disappointment. As a matter of fact, as handsome as we consider this palace to be—in its vast harmony of steel and light, glass, marble, cedar, porous building stone, and reinforced concrete—its positive importance will be in the attitude evoked in the people who wander through it.

BALANCE BETWEEN STONE AND SOUL

In the Museum of Man, near the Seine, are inscribed these words of Valéry: "On the passerby depends whether I become treasure or tomb; whether I speak, or be still."

The author of "La Jeune Parque" was right. The beauty of museums makes itself really understood only by those who know how to question it. And how to question it with wisdom and emotion. The most marvelous sculptures would be sarcophagi if those who contemplate them did not succeed in finding, within its original balance between stone and soul an answer for their doubts, forgiveness for their mistakes, mercy for their failures, and a lesson for their lives.

Original balance between stone and soul. The phrase over which I linger obliges me to consider the immense importance of the third of those functions attributed to this museum: That of inspiring in Mexicans, along with the pride of their inherited history, a sense of their collective responsibility to the history that they are now making and the one they will make in the future. Only the authentic can contribute to the universal. And only that which contributes to the universal can truly increase the legacy of mankind.

The intellectual and moral world expressed by the creators of the cultures represented in these galleries perished suddenly, because the course of events submitted it to the most dramatic of tests: That of struggling against superior techniques. Poetry, daring, intrepidity in battle and stoicism in the face of death—great virtues of these cultures—were not enough to compensate, at the time of the invasion, for what Spengler called "the lack of will for technical strength."

In our day, the lesson I point out is of extreme value. Without confidence in our souls as to what we are, our very existence would lose significance; but without the knowledge and the methods necessary for defending our liberty and our progress, would we not also, like the stone we carve, lose the souls we want to sustain?

SPIRIT AND TECHNIQUE

Cultures, in order to endure, require an inviolable alliance between spirituality and technical control. Before the testimonies of so many crippled civilizations, we solemnly promise never to be disloyal to the high purposes we postulate, nor disloyal to the material effort of adaptation required to preserve the ideals which those purposes imply.

Situated (on a direct line), between the skyscrapers of New York and the plains of Venezuela, midway between Australia and the Bosphorus, and at equal distances from the snows of Alaska and the torrid coasts of Brazil, Mexico seems predestined to a duty of a universal order. History confirms this suggestion of geography. Do we not often speak of three Mexicos superimposed on one another: the pre-Columbian, the viceregal and the independent? The simple enumeration of these three stages demonstrates how energies of a very diverse nature are becoming integrated in our territory, and in our spirit: the evolution prior to the discovery of America, the vital impetus that stimulated the conquistadors, and the yearning for progress in freedom, sought by our people ever since Hidalgo.

Located in a key spot, in time and space, Mexico is fully conscious of its responsibilities as a nation. By its vicinity to the United States and Canada—and to Central and South America—our country forms a bridge between the Latin and Saxon cultures of the New World. Through the origins of its population, it is a historical bridge between the traditions of pre-Columbian America and those of Mediterranean Europe. And, as much by its position on the terrestrial sphere as by the sincerity of its understanding toward all the horizons of mankind, it can be such a bridge—a bridge of truth, of concord and peace—between the peoples who see the dawn earlier than we, and those who watch the sun rise after we do.

Now then, the boldness of every bridge presupposes a guarantee: the solidity of the structure. Mexico is not unaware of this. That explains its fondness for patriotic conciliation. Hence its campaigns for popular education, ever more vigorous and intense. Hence its respect for the forces of culture. And hence, too, its efforts for technical qualification, in both country and city.

DESTINY, THE ESSENTIAL FEAT OF MAN

Many of the works that this museum preserves are really a splendid argument in defense of death. The Mexican who preceded the idea of the Mexico in which we live, had an extraordinarily brilliant concept of inevitable transiency and merciless catastrophe. So penetrating a sense of that which fades, passes, grows weaker every moment and at last dies, persists in many present-day Mexicans. However, that same sense is now enveloped in a fervor for life, because to destiny as fatality, our people wish to oppose destiny as a feat, as an essential exploit of man: the destiny that is created each day with his own work, in freedom and virtue.

Before Coatlicue, mother earth with turgidic skirt of serpents, we bow in painful bliss; but we feel that if "death is in life, as the seed in the fruit," life and death are intermingled, for individuals and for nations, in the rivers of eternity.

THE TREASURES OF CUAUHTÉMOC

The figure of a man, upon whose countenance the stoic smile is now forgiveness, but whose courage will be an example forever, watches invisibly over the doors of this palace. I am thinking of Cuauhtémoc. On an August day, 443 years ago, he saw the capital of his heroic empire fall. He defended it as rarely has been defended a way of life or a line of thought: against the predictions of his seers, against the power of his legends, against the omens of his gods. The treasures he did not surrender are represented here. They did not comprise only—as we now understand—the gold objects that his adversaries attempted to convert into coins. They are the testimonials of the culture of his ancestors and of all the cultures covered, with firm and powerful wings, by the eagle of his lineage.

Because of the treasures he would not surrender, he was unjustly tortured. Under his feet trembled tongues of fire. But the silence of Cuauhtémoc is still resounding. We Mexicans hear it as long as we live. So much so, that such an eloquent silence is an essential part of our lives; it is like a bronze shield for our souls and the deeply ingrained resistance of our being.

Thank you, Mr. President of the Republic, not only for having arranged that thousands of those treasures should be offered the monument which they deserve, but for the enthusiasm and tireless interest with which you examined the plans, considered the difficulties, and oriented the accomplishment of the work. Thank you, architects, historians, anthropologists, museologists, sculptors, painters, men of letters, and all workmen who so diligently assisted us in exhibiting them, within these walls, under the brilliant direction of Pedro Ramírez Vázquez. Thank you, distinguished personalities of this and other nations, who have joined us in the jubilation of this day.

The ceremony which brings us together confirms most admirably that Cuauhtémoc did not die in vain. Beside the remains of what was the grandeur of a heroic world, Mexico arises: laboring, persevering, daring, and faithful.

In honoring the vestiges of its past, Mexico has the conviction that it honors itself, and makes loftier in a universal sense, the prestige of its present and the glory of its future.

JAMES G. McDONALD, A FRIEND OF ISRAEL, PASSES ON

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, my good friend, James Grover McDonald, our first Ambassador to Israel, went to eternal rest on Saturday, September 26, 1964.

Jim McDonald's career in foreign affairs began back in 1919 when he became chairman of the Foreign Policy Association, a position he held until 1933. In that year, he became League of Nations High Commissioner for German Refugees and made possible the resettlement in new homes of three-fourths of the 80,000 refugees from Hitler's Germany. His was a clear voice of warning against Hitler but not many believed him. He foresaw Hitler's plan to exterminate the Jews and exercised Herculean efforts to prevent it.

From 1936 to 1938 he was an editorial writer for the New York Times and later a radio commentator. In 1946 President Truman appointed him to the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry Into Palestine, and in 1948 he became the U.S. Special Representative to Israel. In January of 1949, the President appointed him as our first Ambassador to the new state.

This was the opportune moment for the right man to be our Ambassador in Israel. Mr. McDonald was that man. He immediately grasped the situation. Because of internal differences in the State Department he broke all rules by reporting directly to the President in order to offset opposition to his recommendations. He was instrumental in helping to defeat before the United Nations the so-called Bernadotte plan, which would have brought about the demilitarization of Jerusalem, the loss of the Negev, and the return of the Arab refugees.

I was fortunate enough to be in Israel in those trying days and was entrusted by him with a message which I personally delivered to President Truman. He was fearful if it were entrusted to diplomatic channels, it might never reach the President.

Exhausted by his duties, Jim McDonald resigned as Ambassador in January 1951, at which time President Truman extended to him his deep appreciation for the outstanding service he rendered.

Jim McDonald's contributions to Israel, however, were not ended. He had a great sympathy for and understanding of the Zionist cause and wrote in his book, "My Mission in Israel";

> I had become convinced that the battle against the Jew was the first skirmish in a war on Christianity, on all religion, indeed on all humanity, and I, a Middle Western American of Scotch and German ancestry, a teacher and student by profession and inclination, found myself increasingly engaged in an active career which gave me the privilege of fighting a good fight. The right of the Jew not only to live but to his own life is in its way a symbol of every man's right. It is in that spirit that I have sought, and continue to seek, to champion this right.

All who knew Jim McDonald join me in extending to his grieving widow and children our heartfelt sympathy.

May his memory be for a blessing forever.

HON. ANTONIO FERNÓS-ISERN

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, as the curtain descends upon the 88th Congress, I think it appropriate to pause and salute a distinguished colleague who has decided to retire after 18 years of dedicated service in the Congress. Dr. ANTONIO FERNÓS-ISERN, Resident Commissioner of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico to the United States, is planning to return to his beloved island where he is now a candidate for election as Senator-at-large in the Legislative Assembly of Puerto Rico. We shall miss his wise counsel, sound advice, and convival companionship.

Dr. ANTONIO FERNÓS-ISERN, an experienced physician and the possessor of extensive and distinguished careers in both medicine and public office, has served since 1946 with great distinction in this body.

Dr. FERNÓS-ISERN not only represents the citizens of Puerto Rico in Congress but represents the island Commonwealth before all the executive agencies of the Federal Government. He discusses international problems with the State Department, consults with the Federal Aviation Agency concerning matters relating to Puerto Rican air travel, takes up with the Pentagon situations dealing with military installations and transfers, discusses sugar problems with the Department of Agriculture, and explains his constituents' problems to the Social Security Administration. His casework, like that of most Members, relates to pensions, military transfers, social security problems, service academy appointments, and the like. Because of his special status he receives requests for advice from the relatives in Puerto Rico of those Puerto Ricans who have come to the mainland of the United States and need assistance.

He serves ably on three committees of the House, the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, the Agriculture Committee, and the Armed Services Committee. On the Agriculture Committee he is concerned with the allocation of sugar quotas and with all of the varied aspects of agricultural policy as it affects Puerto Rico. On the Armed Services Committee his special concerns relates to U.S. bases in Puerto Rico. Over the years, his work on the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee has been concerned with the political status of Puerto Rico. In general, he is particularly attentive to bills involving Federal-State relationships, since such bills usually contain provisions relating to Puerto Rico.

His unique status was described by Dr. FERNÓS-ISERN himself on September 12, 1961.

> Although in fact most of my time is taken by congressional duties—

He said—

> by law I am not a Member of Congress. The law provides for the election of a Resident Commissioner who is supposed to be recognized as the spokesman for Puerto Rico by all branches of Government.

Dr. FERNÓS-ISERN was instrumental in the achievement in July 1952, of Commonwealth status for Puerto Rico, the first U.S. Commonwealth. He sponsored the legislation which provided for the organization of a constitutional government for Puerto Rico. When the constitutional convention was convened, Dr. FERNÓS-ISERN served ably as its President from September 13, 1951, to February 5, 1952. He is justly proud of the constitution which was adopted by the people of Puerto Rico and of the fact that he led the successful fight in Congress to approve it. One of his first accomplishments in Congress had been an amendment to the Organic Act of Puerto Rico to permit Puerto Rico to elect its own Governor. Now on July 25, 1952, he watched with pride as Gov. Luis Muñoz Marín proclaimed the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

In order for all of our colleagues to understand better the nature of the relationship which exists between the United States and Puerto Rico, I quote Dr. FERNÓS-ISERN's own words:

> There is no question that Puerto Rico derives great benefits from its status as a commonwealth within the U.S. political system, and from the relationships so created. However, I would be less than honest if I did not call attention to the fact that the benefits of our noble association are reciprocal.
>
> We are citizens of our Commonwealth and citizens of the United States, as residents of New Jersey are citizens of their State and of the United States. As U.S. citizens, we are under the same obligation to defend the Nation as are the citizens of a State. And we have always answered the call without equivocation. The record of the Puerto Ricans in the recent conflict in Korea is second to none. Puerto Rico is a bulwark of the United States in the Caribbean; for the Panama Canal, it is a vital spot in our defense.
>
> Puerto Rico is one of the best oversea markets of the United States, in fact, the sixth best in the new world. More than 90 percent of the imports of Puerto Rico originate in the United States. U.S. goods enjoy the full protection of the U.S. tariff laws.
>
> Puerto Rico is a shining example to the entire world of how peoples of Spanish culture, traditions, and origin can maintain in this new world of ours their individualities, in freedom and security, intimately associated with the free peoples of the U.S. mainland.
>
> With our self-imposed taxes, we maintain our own school system. This is a tremendous task for us. Our proportionate school-age population is much larger than that of any other U.S. community of comparable numbers. The average income in Puerto Rico is lower than the lowest per capita income in any State. It is only about 50 percent of that of Mississippi.
>
> No Federal money is appropriated to maintain our school system. However, not only

> have we endeavored and succeeded to a very impressive extent in creating a school system that will give educational opportunity to all our children, but we have the double task of teaching them the normal curriculum of any school in a modern country, plus a language other than their vernacular, from the very first grade on.
>
> We do this of our own volition and in great earnest because we have chosen to live within the U.S. political system as a Commonwealth. Much as we cherish our cultural traditions as a people, we understand the great value of our people becoming bilingual. Thus, they will be able to communicate freely with their fellow citizens of the mainland, a consummation devoutly to be desired. That is why English is taught in Puerto Rican schools from the very first grade. In 50 years we have reduced illiteracy from 80 to 20 percent; while at the same time trying to be literate in two languages. We have been reasonably successful to say the least.

While Dr. FERNÓS-ISERN hailed the advent of the Commonwealth as "a landmark in the history of the Puerto Rican people and in the evolution of the American political system," he recognized that the political status of Puerto Rico would have to be reexamined and reappraised in the light of experience. Therefore, in 1963 he and Governor Muñoz Marín urged Congress to set up a United States-Puerto Rico Commission on the status of Puerto Rico which would establish a procedure for the prompt settlement, in a democratic manner, of the political status of Puerto Rico. I was happy to join our colleague, Dr. ANTONIO FERNÓS-ISERN, in sponsoring this act which was signed into law by President Johnson on February 20, 1964. I greatly enjoyed working with Dr. FERNÓS-ISERN on this legislation, for it afforded me an opportunity to become better acquainted with our colleague and to appreciate even more his political acumen and his extraordinary talent.

Mr. Speaker, the early career of this able spokesman for his island commonwealth showed his ability, his perseverance, his professional competence, and his dedication to public service, qualities which have increased and deepened during his lifetime.

He was born in San Lorenzo, Puerto Rico, on May 10, 1895. He attended grammar school and high school in Puerto Rico, and then took the medical preparatory course offered by the Bloomsburg (Pa.) State Normal School. He was graduated from the College of Physicians and Surgeons, Baltimore, Md., in 1915.

He then began the practice of medicine in Caguas, Puerto Rico. He became health officer of the city of San Juan, Puerto Rico, in 1918. He was made chief of the Bureau of Transmissible Diseases in the Insular Department of Health in 1919. He rose to the office of Assistant Commissioner of Health in 1919, and became Health Commissioner of Puerto Rico in 1931.

He served as U.S. Delegate to the Fifth Pan American Child Congress held at Havana in 1927, and as chairman of the Child Welfare Board of Puerto Rico and of the Puerto Rico Chapter of the American Red Cross.

He practiced medicine privately from 1933 to 1942, specializing in cardiology. At the same time he was serving as a professor of public health in the School of Tropical Medicine of Puerto Rico.

He worked long and arduously as the chairman of the Puerto Rico Housing Authority from 1941 to 1945. He was the Director of the Civilian Defense Metropolitan Area, the Puerto Rico Food and Supply Commission, and was again Commissioner of Health of Puerto Rico from 1942 to 1946.

He was Puerto Rico's delegate to the first session of the West Indian Conference held in Barbados in 1944 and to the second session of the West Indian Conference held in St. Thomas in 1946 under the auspices of the Caribbean Commission. He also rendered distinguished service as the Acting Governor of Puerto Rico at various times from 1943 to 1946.

On September 11, 1946, he was appointed by the Governor of Puerto Rico to serve an unexpired term as Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico to the United States. He was elected as Resident Commissioner to the United States in 1948, and subsequently reelected in 1952, 1956, and 1960.

He was once asked what he considered to be his most vivid memory of the House of Representatives during the many years of his association with it, and in reply Dr. FERNÓS-ISERN recalled the March 1, 1954, incident of three armed members of the Puerto Rican Nationalist Party firing about 30 shots from a visitors' gallery into a group of Representatives on the floor of the House, wounding five Members.

The next day, Dr. FERNÓS-ISERN recalled, he asked to be recognized as the first speaker. These are some of the things he said on that trying occasion:

> Mr. Speaker, on no occasion could I address this House with deeper sorrow. To add to my consternation, the name of the dear island of my birth was invoked by the reckless vandals who staged this terrible deed yesterday. To know that five of our beloved colleagues in this House have been wounded, the innocent victims of fanaticism, of fanatical terrorism, even though with the help of God their lives have been spared, has brought awe, grief, and indignation to the people of Puerto Rico.
>
> The bullets that were shot did not only sorely hurt five of our colleagues; they all hit the heart of Puerto Rico. May the Lord protect us from greater sorrows.
>
> Mr. Speaker, in the name of the great people of Puerto Rico, I offer condolence, both collective and personal, to our fallen colleagues and their families, to the Congress, and to the whole of the people of the United States.

As Dr. FERNÓS-ISERN walked to the well of the House that day, the House rose and gave him a standing ovation. After speaking, he received another unforgettable ovation.

Today let ovations ring out again as we say Godspeed but not farewell to a founding father of modern Puerto Rico, Dr. ANTONIO FERNÓS-ISERN—a great credit to Puerto Rico, a great credit to the House of Representatives, and a great credit to himself.

Saludos y buena suerte.

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point in the RECORD a telegram I have received from Sergio Santelices, editor of El Diario-La Prensa in New York City, expressing the best wishes of El Diario-La Prensa to Dr. FERNÓS-ISERN and Mrs. Fernós.

> NEW YORK, N.Y.
>
> Hon. WILLIAM F. RYAN,
> *Member of Congress,*
> *New House of Representatives,*
> *Washington, D.C.:*
>
> Congratulate you on wonderful idea of well deserved tribute to Dr. ANTONIO FERNÓS-ISERN, retiring Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico who has done a marvelous job. El Diario-La Prensa joins you and colleagues in such tribute with best wishes for Dr. FERNÓS-ISERN and Mrs. Fernós.
>
> SERGIO SANTELICES,
> *Editor El Diario-La Prensa.*

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RYAN of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, not quite a score of years ago Dr. ANTONIO FERNÓS-ISERN came to the House of Representatives to serve as Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico. These have been busy years for him, inspiring and pleasurable years for those of us who have served with him, years of innovation and progress for Puerto Rico.

Dr. FERNÓS' major accomplishment, the legislative creation of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, is so stellar that it distracts us from recognizing his many other and varied undertakings. Having served with him on the Committee on Agriculture, I am well aware that he is also expert and effective in the handling of sugar legislation, sugar, as is well known, being one of Puerto Rico's major crops and one vital to her economy.

He also served on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs where he made an invaluable contribution because of his special familiarity with insular matters.

In addition, Dr. FERNÓS did a gargantuan job of studying countless legislative proposals over a broad area in order to be able to assist in determining their application to Puerto Rico, and in formulating appropriate language and provisions to insure their applicability.

These are but a few of the vast duties he undertook, duties which not only met his responsibilities but extended far beyond what might be judged as necessary or adequate.

Dr. FERNÓS established in the House a reputation for effective, dedicated work. He also established his place among the greatest of our political geniuses because of his role in the creation of the Commonwealth relationship between Puerto Rico and the United States. Puerto Rico's broadened political ties and major economic and social reforms might never have been realized had Dr. FERNÓS failed to supply the skill and persistence to accomplish the required legislation.

It was he who sponsored the legislation providing for the organization of a constitutional government by the people of Puerto Rico. It was he who presided over Puerto Rico's constitutional convention to draft a constitution to replace the Organic Act under which she had previously been governed. It was he who authored the legislation, later Public Law 447, approved July 3, 1952, approving Puerto Rico's constitution, followed in a few weeks by the election of Puerto

Rico's great Governor, Luis Muñoz-Marín.

Tirelessly, Dr. FERNÓS then undertook to research, draft, and seek enactment of legislation to bring Puerto Rico's laws into line with her new political status. The project of repealing or changing now obsolete provisions of law was enormous but failed to give pause to Puerto Rico's industrious and talented Resident Commissioner.

He offered bills to extend to the Commonwealth the benefits of the social security insurance programs, unemployment compensation, the school lunch program, the Federal deposit insurance program, and other important social and economic benefits enjoyed by citizens of the United States. He arranged for United States-Puerto Rican cooperation in the enforcement of criminal laws and policies and mutual cooperation in other governmental functions.

I think it is important to note that the role of Resident Commissioner is unique in the Congress. The man who serves in this capacity must find his own way among men and women whose status is rather different and in many ways easier. If his role is unusual, certainly Dr. FERNÓS brought unusual talents to it. During his service Puerto Rico established herself as a model and a leader among the developing nations. His contribution to this great political and economic victory is beyond estimate. His hallmarks of personal inventiveness, foresight, and industry are stamped indelibly on the Commonwealth he helped to create and which he served. His place in the ranks of great political leaders is forever secured.

I am saddened by Dr. FERNÓS' departure from the House. He has been not only a colleague whom I admired but one whom I have grown to love. He is my friend. Mrs. Albert and I have had the honor of being with him and Mrs. Fernós in Puerto Rico. We have never known more charming or hospitable people.

Dr. FERNÓS' place in history is immutable, so is his place in my heart—and I am sure in the hearts of all his colleagues.

I understand that he will continue to serve as Senator at Large and for this I am grateful and delighted. His experience and talents should not be lost to Puerto Rico nor to us.

I wish him continued fulfillment in his career, good health, and long life.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RYAN of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I should like to reiterate the remarks made by the distinguished majority leader. The Resident Commissioner of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico has made a magnificent record here. He is admired by every Member of this body on both sides of the aisle. I have had the great pleasure of being closely associated with him. As a matter of fact, he has been my neighbor in the New House Office Building for many years. I, too, have had the pleasure of being with the Commissioner and his lovely wife in Puerto Rico. We shall miss him, and the people of Puerto Rico will miss an outstanding representative.

I thank the gentleman from New York for giving me this opportunity to say these few words about the Resident Commissioner of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

Mr. RYAN of New York. I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RYAN of New York. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I just want to add my words of comendation and praise of one of the finest gentlemen who has ever served in this House, Dr. FERNÓS-ISERN. He is quiet, he is friendly, he is cultured, he represents his people in a fine and effective way.

In saying goodbye to him formally today here in the House of Representatives, although we will see him later, I want to say that his friendship has been treasured by me over the years. He has done a good job for his people and we bid him Godspeed and the best of luck in all his endeavors in the future for him and his family.

Mr. RYAN of New York. I thank my colleague for his contribution.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RYAN of New York. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my few thoughts to those that have already been expressed regarding the distinguished Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico.

I recall that one of the first bills on which I voted after I came to the Congress in 1952 was the bill approving the constitution of the new Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Territorial and Insular Affairs of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs for the last 10 years, I have worked many times with Dr. FERNÓS-ISERN. I think if we were to select one word to describe him in our adieu to him, it would be "gentleman.". I think he has accomplished something that many of us who are elected to this body and who vote in this body would be very proud of. Even though under the law he is not permitted to vote in this House, I think by his very personality and the strong link of friendship that he has built up, he has actually acquired among us more votes than if he had been a voting Member of this House.

To those of us who might regret that Dr. FERNÓS-ISERN is leaving Washington, I think it is heartening to know that even at this stage in his career, when he could be looking forward to a life of ease and comfort and withdrawal from the turbulent stream of politics and public life, that he is going to continue in public service and in public life in his beloved Puerto Rico.

As a member of the commission recently created by the Congress to study the status of Puerto Rico, I am hopeful and I am sure that all the Members of Congress are hopeful that in that very important work we will have Dr. FERNÓS-ISERN constantly at our side advising us and counseling us as he has done during his 18 years of service here. He is a wonderful gentleman and we will all miss him in Washington.

Mr. RYAN of New York. I thank the gentleman for his remarks and for his observations of the great contribution of the Resident Commissioner during his past 18 years of service which are particularly meaningful since he has worked on the committee on which the gentleman serves in determining the political status of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RYAN of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I should like to join my colleagues in tribute to Dr. ANTONIO FERNÓS-ISERN—the able and charming gentleman who has honored this body as Resident Commissioner from the neighboring Commonwealth of Puerto Rico to my own State of Florida. He is a gentleman who has rendered eminent service here, gaining and enjoying the fullest respect of all his colleagues in this House. He will carry back to his own land, which as we are all proud to say, is a great part of our own country, the affection and highest esteem of all those who have had the privilege of serving with him here. He has endeared himself to his colleagues by the graciousness of his manner and the cultivation of his mind. Our affection and fondest wishes go with him and he has our best wishes for his continued success in his career in the future.

Mr. RYAN of New York. I thank the gentleman from Florida for his splendid tribute to our colleague.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RYAN of New York. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from New York for taking the time today to pay tribute to the Resident Commissioner from the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico who is terminating his service as the representative of his people in this body. His 18 years of service here have meant a great deal to his people.

I can testify from personal observation that notwithstanding the 18 years Dr. FERNÓS-ISERN has spent in Washington he has not lost touch with the people of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. Some several years ago it was my privilege to be with him on a trip in the rural area of Puerto Rico and to visit some of the industrial plants there. It was a great privilege to me as a visitor to that beautiful part of the United States to see how affectionately he was received by the people at all levels of economic activity.

The only thing about which I would chide our friend—and I believe I am entitled to do so—is that on numerous occasions he has told me he was coming down to visit in that beautiful section which I am privileged to represent in North Carolina and bring with him one of the loveliest ladies I have had the privilege of knowing, Mrs. Fernós-Isern. This is the only promise I have ever known our distinguished friend to make that he has not kept. While he is still on the mainland I want him to know that we are still looking forward to that visit. If for some reason he cannot make it before returning to Puerto Rico, the planes which fly today will fly with just as much speed and on just as many schedules in the future, I am sure, as they observe today. We still hold him to that promise.

It has been a great privilege for me to know and to serve with Dr. Fernós-Isern. I have been inspired by his diligence and his attention to duty.

Perhaps one of the things which has impressed me the most about him has been the fact that he is one of the outstanding students of the history of the Confederacy. Many folks perhaps do not know that, but I suppose Dr. Fernós-Isern is the equal of most anyone we know in his knowledge of that period of our history in this country. I would hope that after he has finished his Senate term down in Puerto Rico he will find the time to come back to some place in North Carolina or South Carolina or our area and to teach some of our folks some of the history he knows of our section which many of us do not know.

Again I commend the gentleman from New York for bringing this retirement to the attention of all the House, and I join him in expressing regret that our friend has seen fit to leave this circle. I know all of us say to him and to Mrs. Fernós-Isern that we are very devoted to them and we hope they will come back often.

Mr. RYAN of New York. I thank the gentleman for his very fine contribution. I feel sure that Dr. Fernós-Isern will find the opportunity to adhere to his promise to visit the very fine State from which the gentleman hails.

Mr. HARDING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RYAN of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. HARDING. I thank the gentleman for yielding. Four years ago when I first took my seat in the House Committee on Agriculture it was my privilege to be seated between the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. Inouye] and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico, Dr. Fernós-Isern. These two gentlemen, one from an island in the Pacific and the other from an island in the Caribbean, turned out to be two of my closest friends in the Congress.

I was delighted to see our colleague [Mr. Inouye] go on to the U.S. Senate. Today, it is with great pleasure that I join my colleagues today in wishing Dr. Fernós-Isern well as he leaves this body.

He has been a gentleman. He has been considerate and helpful. Certainly he has won the respect of all his colleagues.

I am happy to join with the gentleman from New York in wishing him well, great success, happiness, and Godspeed in whatever he undertakes.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RYAN of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I would like to join in the tribute being paid to Dr. Fernós-Isern. He has been a most able and diligent representative of the interests of his people in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. He is always a gentleman and always a scholar. I certainly want to join with those who are paying tribute to him and wish him every possible success in the future.

Mr. RYAN of New York. We appreciate the gentleman's contribution.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RYAN of New York. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I have had the honor to serve with Dr. Fernós-Isern for 6 years on the House Committee on Agriculture. It has been a privilege for me to know this fine gentleman who has done a commendable job of representing Puerto Rico in the Congress of the United States.

Dr. Antonio Fernós-Isern will be missed from the Agriculture Committee, and his retirement will be a loss to the House of Representatives where his objective and fair counsel added to the stature of our deliberations and decisions.

I want to join with my colleagues in wishing Dr. Fernós-Isern an enjoyable and well-deserved retirement. My only request of the good doctor would be that if and when Congress may have occasion to consider legislation affecting Puerto Rico, he would make himself available for counsel and advice.

I look forward to the possibility of my visiting Puerto Rico, and if I do, it will be my pleasure to stop for a visit with my friend.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Fernós-Isern is a very capable and dedicated gentleman who has served in the Congress for 18 years as Resident Commissioner from the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

It has been my privilege to serve with him during this period and I am an admirer of him. He deserves the high esteem in which he is held by his colleagues and has rendered significant service to the Commonwealth.

I can only wish for him the very best of good health and happiness as he retires to his home in beautiful San Juan.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Antonio Fernós-Isern, Resident Commissioner of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, is going to do what many of us dream about doing. He is retiring from Congress and returning home to enjoy life with his charming wife and his thousands of friends in Puerto Rico.

My good friend, Tony Fernós, has served his constituency with tireless energy for the past 18 years. He has had a fruitful career in Congress and the people of Puerto Rico have been richly rewarded by his effectiveness and dedication. He had been a most able member of our Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and is the senior member in point of longevity. Were he a full-fledged and voting member instead of Resident Commissioner he, instead of I, would be our committee chairman.

I do not know how many public laws Commissioner Fernós-Isern has sponsored but a great many measures bearing his name have been passed by our committee and enacted by Congress. Among them, of major importance to Puerto Rico, is Public Law 600 of the 81st Congress providing for the organization of a constitutional government by the people of Puerto Rico and establishing a framework of relations between the United States and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. Subsequently, a constitutional convention was convened to draft a constitution which replaced the Organic Act under which the island had been administered from 1917 to 1952. It was Commissioner Fernós who presided over the convention that brought the present constitution into being. Shortly thereafter he sponsored Public Law 447 of the 82d Congress that gave congressional approval to the constitution already approved by the people and created the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, proclaimed by Governor Muñoz-Marín on July 25, 1952.

Likewise it was Commissioner Fernós who played a major role in convincing Congress that Puerto Rico was ready to elect its own Governor. Accordingly, the illustrious Governor Luis Muñoz-Marín, was elected to this position in 1947 and is still in office.

More recently, Commissioner Fernós was a leader in the successful drive to study, review, and strengthen the Commonwealth concept which culminated in Public Law 88–271. This public law established the United States-Puerto Rico Commission on the Status of Puerto Rico. This Commission is presently actively engaged in carrying out its functions. It is my hope that Dr. Fernós will maintain his active interest in the implementation of Public Law 88–271.

Not only has Commissioner Fernós been deeply involved in his legislative endeavors, but he has been active in the diplomatic field as well. In 1953, I recall that he was selected as an Alternate Delegate of the U.S. Delegation to the United Nations and assisted our Interior and State Department representatives in convincing that body that Puerto Rico had become fully self-governing and as a consequence would no longer be subject to reporting to it as a non-self-governing territory. After considerable debate, the United Nations accepted the decision and Puerto Rico has submitted no further reports for over a decade.

Besides serving our committee faithfully for 18 years, Dr. Fernós has also shared his time with the Committees on Armed Services and Agriculture.

Earlier in my remarks I stated that Tony Fernós was planning to retire from Congress, but he is not retiring from public life. He has been nominated by his party, the Popular Democratic Party, to serve in the Senate of Puerto Rico as a senator-at-large. For myself, and on behalf of the members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I wish him well in his campaign to further serve his Puerto Rican constituents. The lessons he has learned and the experience he has gained with us will equip him well for his years in the Legislative Assembly of Puerto Rico.

We will miss you, Tony and Mrs. Fernós, as you leave us, but when we visit Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands we know that the same hospitality and friendship we have shared will be continued in San Juan.

Mrs. Aspinall joins me in extending every good wish to both of you.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend my colleague, the gentleman from New York, William Fitts Ryan, for taking this time so that all of us can pay our respects to our beloved and respected colleague, Dr. Antonio Fernós-Isern, Resident Commissioner of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

During his 18 years here great strides toward self-sufficiency have been made on this island, and these strides which have taken place mean more than Operation Bootstrap and the economic uplift which has resulted from this. Great strides have been made in the political and moral attitudes of the members of this Commonwealth. Dr. Fernós-Isern has had a part in all of this. He has represented the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico with restraint, with sincerity, with intelligence, and with dedication.

All of us respect Dr. Fernós-Isern, and it is painful to those of us who have known him for all these 18 years to see him leave us. That he does so voluntarily, that he does so with the pleasing knowledge that his term of office has seen all this progress, must be most reassuring to him. I wish him well, and of course with all my colleagues, we trust that his example here will be followed by whoever attempts to fill his shoes and stand so upright amongst us.

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. Mr. Speaker, it is a real pleasure and distinct honor to join with my colleagues in honoring the Resident Commissioner from the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Dr. Antonio Fernós-Isern.

I have been privileged to know Dr. Fernós-Isern for a number of years, and I am aware of the high esteem, admiration and respect in which he is held by his friends and colleagues.

It has been a pleasure to serve with him on the Agriculture Committee, and I know the diligence and conscientiousness with which he approaches his duties. In particular, we are all impressed with those characteristics which distinguishes him in his public service. He is a man of good will, a man of integrity, and a gentleman in the finest sense, and it has been a real pleasure to be associated with him.

In my service in the Congress, I have never known a more courageous or a more independent representative of the people or one who was more indefatigable in his work for the people or was more devoted and dedicated to the interests and the welfare of all the people.

I salute the people of Puerto Rico for having given us the fine association and comradeship of so noble character as our friend, Dr. Fernós-Isern.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Antonio Fernós-Isern, the Resident Commissioner from the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico to the United States, has served since 1946 with great ability, tact, skill, and good humor. He has made a record here which is a proud one both for himself and for the island Commonwealth which he has represented with such fidelity and devotion.

He has represented the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico in Congress and before the executive agencies of the Government. He has served with distinction on three committees of the House of Representatives—the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, the Agriculture Committee, and the Armed Services Committee. He once described his role in the following words:

> Although in fact most of my time is taken by congressional duties, by law I am not a Member of Congress. The law provides for the election of a Resident Commissioner who is supposed to be recognized as the spokesman for Puerto Rico by all branches of Government.

Dr. Fernós-Isern has also had a distinguished medical career, serving as chief of the bureau of transmissible diseases in the Puerto Rican Department of Health and as Health Commissioner of Puerto Rico. He has practiced medicine privately as a specialist in cardiology, and has been a professor of public health in Puerto Rico's School of Tropical Medicine.

He has endeared himself to his constituents and to his colleagues for the insight and skill he has shown in matters of government and human relations. He has enthusiastically supported the Commonwealth status of his beloved island, and has often lucidly expressed his belief that this status is of mutual benefit to the United States and Puerto Rico.

As he retires to his beautiful island homeland for a well-earned respite from public duty, earned by the labors of a lifetime, he carries with him our admiration and fondest best wishes.

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, with the 2d session of the 88th Congress coming to a close, I am reminded with a deep sense of regret that the Resident Commissioner of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Honorable Antonio Fernós-Isern, will not be with us in the next Congress.

In recognition of the outstanding service he has given and shown during the 18 years as Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico in Congress, his many friends and associates have every right to be proud of him as I am.

His record of cooperation and achievement in the House of Representatives will enable him to continue to make valuable contributions in the best interest of our democratic way of life.

I am happy to join his many friends on this auspicious occasion in extending to him my congratulations and best wishes for continued success and good health in the years ahead.

Mr. WHARTON. Mr. Speaker, it is of sincere regret and deep concern to me to learn that our colleague, Dr. Antonio Fernós-Isern, has decided to retire as Resident Commissioner of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, following 18 years of distinctive service to his constituents.

It has been my pleasure to visit the Commonwealth during his tenure, and the warmth of our official reception and the courtesies extended by our colleague and his associates have rarely been surpassed.

Dr. Fernós-Isern has indeed enjoyed a distinguished career. He has contributed immeasurably to the progress of Puerto Rico, he has represented his constituents faithfully and well, and no man has ever left behind him a finer record of loyalty and devotion to the highest ideals of American tradition.

The redeeming feature of his retirement is that the good doctor is with us today and I am sure, appreciative of the praise that is being heaped upon him on this auspicious occasion. We can only hope that Dr. Fernós-Isern and his good wife will actively continue their avid interest in legislative affairs in Washington and will enjoy many happy years in their native Puerto Rico.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to join with my colleagues in saying goodby and paying tribute to our good friend, the Resident Commissioner from the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Dr. Antonio Fernós-Isern.

I am sure we are unanimous in our feelings of regret over his decision to retire from these Halls after 18 years of effective service to his people. He has served with distinction both in his native Puerto Rico and in the Congress of the United States. A man of utmost sincerity and integrity, Dr. Fernós-Isern has always put his responsibilities to public service high above his responsibilities to himself.

It was my privilege to have served with him on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, where Antonio Fernós-Isern proved to be an able and astute member. His performance relative to committee assignments, as well as his performance in this Chamber, always reflects a quiet thoughtfulness that is so characteristic of this dedicated scholar.

We will certainly miss his presence in this House.

There is, of course, one very happy note to Dr. Fernós-Isern's retirement. Perhaps now he will find more time to enjoy the beauty of his beloved Puerto Rico. It is hoped that the future holds many more years of health and happiness for him.

Dr. Fernós-Isern, please come back and see us often. Your many friends will always be delighted to see you.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my colleagues in the House in paying tribute to my good friend of many years, Dr. Antonio Fernós-Isern.

Dr. Fernós and I have been associated for a long time on the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives. Let me say that I have always been deeply impressed by his keen interest in the work of the Congress and his dedication to the welfare of the people of Puerto Rico. Having had the opportunity of visiting Puerto Rico myself, I know how highly he is esteemed at home—a regard which is well-deserved.

Dr. Fernós has served with distinction for 18 years. This is a long period of commendable public service, and I join with all of you in wishing him good health and Godspeed in the years ahead.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, it is all too seldom that one is able to hear his friends and colleagues extol his virtues. Too often we wait until a loved one is taken from us and then we rise to tell the world what a wonderful individual we have lost. And so it is with mixed emotions that I rise and join with my colleagues in paying tribute to my good friend Dr. ANTONIO FERNÓS-ISERN, Resident Commissioner from the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. I regret that he has decided to leave us but am happy that I—that all of us—have the opportunity to let him know of the high esteem in which he is held by all of us who have had the privilege of serving with him in this body.

I have had the pleasure of visiting Puerto Rico on several occasions and on each such occasion Dr. FERNÓS-ISERN has gone out of his way to make things comfortable for me, to show me the beauty of his community and to bring to my attention the graciousness of his countrymen. Here in the U.S. Congress where he has served with distinction for 18 years, he has represented his people with the greatest of ability, devotion, and loyalty. He has been a stalwart defender of the rights of his people and has aided immeasurably both the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and Governor Muñoz-Marín in their struggle to pull that community up by its bootstraps to become the self-sufficient community it is today.

I shall always remember Dr. FERNÓS-ISERN for his integrity, his warmth, his good will, and his quiet humor. His leaving is a distinct loss to the House of Representatives; we shall miss him; but I know all of my colleagues join me in wishing him well and Godspeed for the future.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, it has been a great pleasure for me to serve for more than 3 years as a colleague of Dr. ANTONIO FERNÓS-ISERN in the House of Representatives and on the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. Dr. FERNÓS-ISERN has rendered great service to his country and to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. He is a highly intelligent and fair-minded man and while I can understand the reasons which prompt him to retire, I can only regret that he will be leaving this House. I wish him well for the future and hope that he will come back to see us, from time to time.

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, it has been my pleasure to know our good friend, the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico, Dr. ANTONIO FERNÓS-ISERN, for the past 2 years. Due to the fact that there are over 5,000 Puerto Ricans in my hometown of Perth Amboy, and many more in my district, I have had occasion to use the services of Dr. FERNÓS frequently. So I wish to join with my colleagues in paying him tribute today since he will not return next year.

Any matter which I bought to his attention received prompt and excellent care. He has really given us leadership and he has been a real ambassador of good will for Puerto Rico.

Because of his pleasant manner, his intelligence, understanding, and spirit of cooperation, I feel the Congress has a very friendly feeling for Puerto Rico and for its people. He can claim some credit for the fact that Puerto Rico and its tremendous economic advancement in the past few years to the credit of the free world and our American system. We know the Puerto Rican people appreciate that the U.S. Government has been very helpful and cooperative and they know that our policy has brought much success to Puerto Rico. Dr. FERNÓS-ISERN introduced the Commonwealth bill which has served us very well. Dr. FERNÓS' successor will find it very hard to reach the hearts of the Congress as he has, and I, for one, will miss him very much.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, Dr. ANTONIO FERNÓS-ISERN, Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico, is retiring this year.

As a Representative to Congress from Hawaii, I have a special interest in Dr. FERNÓS-ISERN and his work, both because as offshore areas we have interests in common, and because many of Hawaii's citizens came to Hawaii from Puerto Rico. It has been my pleasure to meet with him from time to time to confer on our mutual problems. Dr. FERNÓS-ISERN has been an excellent representative of Puerto Rico. Both Puerto Ricans and others may justly feel proud that he has served our Nation in its Congress.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, few men have been given the privilege and responsibility of our admired colleague, Dr. FERNÓS-ISERN, long the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico.

With other eminent leaders of his island home, Dr. FERNÓS-ISERN has earned an honorable place as one of the founding fathers of Puerto Rico. He has been privileged to be one of the leading architects of its admirable rise from being "the poorhouse of the Caribbean," to one of the most progressive of modern commonwealths. He had a full share in putting his people on the road to economic health, with all the humanitarian benefits which have accrued from it. Generations will remember the name and work of Dr. FERNÓS-ISERN with respect and gratitude.

His tenure among us in the House resulted in gains also for continental Americans and not only his own island citizens. His intimate knowledge of the "bootstraps" development of Puerto Rico has been invaluable in advising us how to restore our own undeveloped areas. The dedicated, humanitarian impulses which caused him to be a physician, broadened into an understanding and compassion for the underprivileged everywhere. His unfailing courtesy, his skill as a Member of this House, although a nonvoting one, will be remembered. Although he retired from here, we are sure his efforts for Puerto Rico will continue and he leaves with our sincere belief that it was good to know and work with him and wishes that success will crown his future in Puerto Rico.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, it is a great pleasure to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the distinguished Resident Commissioner from the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, our dedicated friend, Dr. ANTONIO FERNÓS-ISERN.

It has been my pleasure and honor to know Dr. FERNÓS-ISERN during my entire service in the Congress. I have never known a more genial, enthusiastic, patriotic, and devoted public servant.

This Congress is a greater body having known and associated with Dr. FERNÓS-ISERN. His contagious smile and warm personality helped lighten our own burdens.

Dr. FERNÓS-ISERN, we are going to miss you here in Washington. Mrs. Dorn and my children join me in wishing for you and Mrs. FERNÓS-ISERN much happiness and every success always. We hope you will come back to see us at every opportunity. You will always be welcome.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have this opportunity of expressing my high regard for my friend and colleague, the Resident Commissioner from the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Dr. ANTONIO FERNÓS-ISERN.

During my 6 years in the House of Representatives I have observed with great admiration, the able services rendered by Dr. FERNÓS-ISERN in behalf of his constituents and the entire Nation. The people of Puerto Rico have been fortunate to have had him as their Representative in the U.S. Congress.

I welcome this opportunity in paying tribute to Dr. FERNÓS-ISERN upon his retirement. May he have continued success and good health.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, our jovial and distinguished Resident Commissioner of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, ANTONIO FERNÓS-ISERN decided to retire after a fruitful and splendid public career. He was appointed by the Governor of Puerto Rico September 1946 to the vacancy by his predecessor. His appointment was confirmed by the insular senate. He was reelected each term since 1946. Our good Commissioner was graduated at School of Medicine, Maryland University. As a practicing physician since 1916—he has held various public positions in the capacity of Assistant to and Commissioner of Health of Puerto Rico for extended periods covering years: Assistant 1920–21; 1923–31—as Commissioner 1931–33; 1942–46. He enjoyed appointments to professorships at Public Health School of Tropical Medicine. Acted as Governor at periods during 1942–46.

ANTONIO FERNÓS-ISERN is one of the most popular Members of the House. His courteous and gentle manner and gentle demeanor marks him as a true gentleman of the old Spanish school. As a true Latin he is sympathetic to the needs of the unfortunate and the poor. He is an authority on public health problems and throughout his career in official capacity solved many of the problems confronting the people of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. The health reforms inaugurated during his services as Health Commissioner resulted in high standards of control and strict rules of conformity to these standards.

As a Commissioner in the Congress he has influenced the membership in the passage of legislation beneficial to the needs of Puerto Rico. He has acted as mediator and compromiser in matters affecting the Commonwealth.

His marriage to the lovely Tula Delgado in 1920 contributed much to his happiness and the enjoyment of his successful career. It is unfortunate that he saw fit for personal reasons to retire. Puerto Rico will have a difficult time replacing this estimable and influential legislator. It is with a deep sense of regret that we, the members of the Illinois congressional delegation, bid him adieu.

We wish great happiness and continued good health to Commissioner ISERN and his lovely wife, Tula, in their merited retirement. Puerto Rico has lost the services of a potent and influential servant of its people and the U.S. Congress a valuable adviser in the affairs of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and the United States.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, it was with sincere regret that I learned of the impending retirement of our colleague, the distinguished Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico, Dr. ANTONIO FERNÓS-ISERN.

We in Maryland feel a close kinship with Dr. FERNÓS-ISERN because he is a graduate of the College of Physicians and Surgeons and the School of Medicine of the University of Maryland and he holds an honorary doctor of law from this fine institution.

Although the Resident Commissioner of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico does not have a vote in the House of Representatives, Dr. FERNÓS-ISERN has actively represented the people of that island for 18 years. He has devoted all of his time and his considerable talents to improving conditions for the more than 2 million residents of Puerto Rico and they can be justly proud of his accomplishments on their behalf. By his service on the Agriculture, Interior and Insular Affairs, and Armed Services Committees, Dr. FERNÓS-ISERN has made significant contributions to the drafting of appropriate legislation on many diverse subjects.

While Dr. FERNÓS-ISERN is retiring as Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico, his past record indicates that he will not retire from the service of his countrymen. This distinguished doctor, lawyer, professor, and great humanitarian has devoted most of his life to the betterment of conditions for his people and I am proud to have been associated with him for the past 12 years.

Dr. FERNÓS-ISERN has earned our admiration and respect and we will miss him when he returns to Puerto Rico. I think I express the sentiments of many other Members of the House when I wish him continued good health, happiness, and success in the years to come. The people of Puerto Rico will find it hard to replace this dedicated public servant.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is with deepest regret that we face the fact that our colleague Commissioner FERNÓS-ISERN will not return to Congress next year, because of his decision to retire. We will all miss him and the country will miss him. His affable and genial personality will be missed by every Member of Congress. His careful and studious work on committees will be greatly missed, and his effective work for Puerto Rico, which he represents so well. We all send him on his way with regret that we will not be seeing him as often as before, but with the hope that he will enjoy his well earned rest to the fullest.

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, the retirement of Dr. ANTONIO FERNÓS-ISERN, Resident Commissioner from the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, will leave a void in the Congress of the United States.

We who have served with him in the greatest legislative body in the world will greatly miss him. Those of us who have served with him on one of the committees of the House of Representatives and know firsthand the ability and integrity of this favorite son of Puerto Rico will probably miss him the most.

Dr. FERNÓS-ISERN's services on the Committee of Interior and Insular Affairs, of which I am a member, was marked with complete dedication and a vast knowledge of its operations. His concern and knowledge of the problems of Puerto Rico were often manifested by his presentation of the facts, closely outlining the effects of the legislation on the people he so ably represents.

Dr. FERNÓS-ISERN is one of the most respected men in the Congress of the United States. We will miss his services and, above all, his friendliness. As one of four Spanish-speaking Members of the House of Representatives, I can say that I am proud to have had the privilege of serving with him and count him among my most dearest of friends.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, a few years before the turn of the century, and only 3 years before the United States became a world power, one of Spain's oldest colonies provided the birthplace of a Spanish-American who was to serve, almost literally, as a bridge between his native island and the country that adopted him and his people.

On May 10, 1895, ANTONIO FERNÓS-ISERN was born in San Lorenzo, Puerto Rico. After receiving his primary and secondary education on the island, he migrated to the mainland to study medicine. In 1915 he graduated from the College of Physicians and Surgeons at Baltimore, Md. Almost immediately, he returned to his lovely but impoverished isle; and from 1916 to 1918 he practiced general medicine in Caguas, Puerto Rico. From then until 1946 he served, in one capacity or another, as one of Puerto Rico's most public-spirited doctors. Among the many positions he assumed were these: Health officer of the city of San Juan in 1918; assistant commissioner of health of Puerto Rico, 1920–21 and 1923–31; Commissioner of Health of Puerto Rico, 1931–33 and 1942–46; vice chairman, Puerto Rico Housing Authority, 1941–45. Meanwhile, his private practice in cardiology was both successful and extensive.

But TONY FERNÓS was to receive yet another public call—which he was to heed with high distinction for more than 18 years. On September 11, 1946, he was appointed Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico, to fill an unexpired term; 2 years later he was elected to a full 4-year term, and, to our continuing delight, has been with us ever since.

Now he leaves us; and we are dismayed. No predecessor ever graced the office with greater ability or industry or fidelity. It was he who introduced the original bill in Congress which metamorphosed, under the nurturing of FERNÓS-ISERN and Muñoz-Marín, into perhaps the most unique, and successful, political experiment of this century—the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. Slightly less in status than a State, but with certain economic advantages denied the States, the Commonwealth design has transformed the "poorhouse of the Caribbean" into a magnificent confirmation of American democracy.

Hasta luego, TONY; vaya con Dios.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have this opportunity to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to my dear friend, the Honorable ANTONIO FERNÓS-ISERN, Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico.

I have enjoyed a most pleasant relationship with him ever since becoming a Member of Congress. It was with deep regret that I learned that he would not seek reelection this year.

He is a man of the highest integrity and sincerity; he is possessed of outstanding ability. He enjoys the respect and affection of his colleague in the Congress; he is a perfect gentleman in the highest sense of the word; he is a man of warmth and understanding; I deeply value his friendship.

It has been my privilege to work closely with Dr. FERNÓS-ISERN on matters of importance pertaining to Puerto Rico and of interest also to persons of Puerto Rican birth now residing in the United States and in my congressional district. In Dr. FERNÓS-ISERN they had a great champion and brilliant spokesman in the House of Representatives; a man who devoted himself to furthering their best interests, who gave selflessly of his time and talents in their behalf, and who fought for their well-being and their progress.

Dr. FERNÓS-ISERN will be sorely missed by all of us, for we hold for him the greatest regard. He deserves the best that life can offer, and I wish for him all good fortune and happiness in the years ahead.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure in joining in paying tribute to our distinguished colleague, the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico, Dr. ANTONIO FERNÓS-ISERN. I want to wish him every happiness in his retirement. I want him to know that I, and all his friends in the House, will sorely miss his presence here.

Throughout the 10 years I have known him, and, I am sure, during his entire 18 years of service as Resident Commissioner, Dr. FERNÓS-ISERN has displayed remarkable qualities of wisdom and dedication that have brought honor to himself and to this House.

Those of us who represent districts of 4 or 5 hundred thousand people find that there are often more things to be done than hours in which to do them.

The accomplishment of Dr. FERNÓS-ISERN in his excellent representation of almost 2½ million people with problems that our districts do not share is all the more outstanding. As I have said before, his vigorous and thoughtful representation of his constituency should be a model for all of us.

His tenure in Congress has been marked by heartening progress in bringing the peoples of Puerto Rico and the rest of the country into warmer, closer relationships. It has been marked by social, economic, and political progress by the people of Puerto Rico. The participation of the people of Puerto Rico in their own government has been expanded. The people of Puerto Rico, in a constitutional convention presided over by Dr. FERNÓS-ISERN adopted a constitution, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico was established in 1952. Desires for changes in the Commonwealth status prompted the enactment earlier this year of legislation providing for a thorough study of the relationship of Puerto Rico to the United States. This legislation, passed with the support and leadership of Dr. FERNÓS-ISERN, provides the opportunity for significant new progress to achieve, as Dr. FERNÓS-ISERN said, "a political status—for Puerto Rico—in freedom, security, peace, and dignity, within the American political system, with the support of all."

Dr. FERNÓS-ISERN's work in strengthening the ties between a vast continental nation and a small island, between peoples of different languages, and between different social and political traditions is a good example for a divided world. And I am delighted to honor him today for it.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, as he leaves his friends and admirers in the House of Representatives, we welcome this opportunity to say a few words in praise of a man whose achievements have been numerous and whose friendship has been a treasured possession to so many.

Dr. ANTONIO FERNÓS-ISERN has served the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico long and well. He has been a dedicated man who has rendered to the people of Puerto Rico effective and responsible public service. He has won a place in the hearts of his fellow Puerto Ricans and a permanent niche in the memories of those who have served with him here. His ebullient good spirits, his obvious integrity, his warm sympathy and understanding, all of the endearing qualities of this great and good man will be badly missed.

He has also won honors as a member of the medical profession. He served as chief of the bureau of transmissable diseases of the Department of Health of Puerto Rico, practiced his profession as a specialist in cardiology, and made a splendid record as the commissioner of health of Puerto Rico. He was a distinguished professor of public health in Puerto Rico's School of Tropical Medicine.

He has been devoted to his native Puerto Rico and to its citizens all his life. Yet he knows, understands, and admires the institutions and ways of mainland America. He once said:

> Puerto Rico is a shining example to the entire world of how peoples of Spanish culture, traditions, and origin can maintain in this new world of ours their individualities, in freedom and security, intimately associated with the free peoples of the United States mainland.

We bid him goodby as he leaves us for an honorable and deserved retirement after arduous and distinguished service to Puerto Rico. We shall miss him as much as we admire him.

Mrs. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in paying a sincere and deep tribute to our colleague, Dr. FERNÓS-ISERN.

It is a great pleasure and honor to join Congressman RYAN in paying a well-deserved tribute to our distinguished colleague and to wish him the very best during his retirement.

When I first came to Congress, Dr. FERNÓS-ISERN was almost one of my first acquaintances. I had the privilege of serving on the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee and working with him on a number of programs for the well-being of his Commonwealth. He is indeed a dedicated servant of his people and I am sure they regret his loss as do we. However, I am equally sure that they join all of us in wishing him well in retirement.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the citizens of Puerto Rico have been unusually fortunate during these past 18 years to have had as their spokesman and helpmate in Congress, the Honorable ANTONIO FERNÓS-ISERN.

After 18 years of dedicated service, Dr. FERNÓS-ISERN, Resident Commissioner of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico in the United States, is planning to return home where he is a candidate for election as senator at large in the Legislative Assembly of Puerto Rico.

It has been my good fortune to come to know and admire Dr. FERNÓS-ISERN during my service in Congress. He is a warm and affable gentleman for whom all of us in the House have the highest regard. He has done an excellent job for his people and we wish him and his family the best of luck in his future endeavors.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I deem it a great privilege to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to one of the finest gentlemen with whom it has been my pleasure to serve in the House of Representatives. For the past 18 years Puerto Rico has been ably represented by Dr. FERNÓS-ISERN, a distinguished doctor, lawyer, professor and dedicated public servant. He was appointed by the Governor of Puerto Rico in September of 1946 as Resident Commissioner of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico to fill the vacancy in that position, and he was reelected each term since 1946. During his service as Resident Commissioner, Dr. FERNÓS-ISERN has earned the respect and love of his colleagues in the Congress. He is a man of great sincerity, outstanding ability, and integrity. He is known far and wide as Puerto Rico's favorite son and no one possesses a better knowledge of the Commonwealth's problems than he. The people of Puerto Rico have been richly rewarded by his significant service and dedication.

During his tenure in Congress Dr. FERNÓS-ISERN has been responsible for bringing the peoples of Puerto Rico and this country into a much warmer, closer relationship. He played the major role in the creation of the Commonwealth relationship between Puerto Rico and the United States. To him goes much credit for the major economic and social reforms that have been adopted in Puerto Rico in recent years. Under his leadership legislation providing for the organization of constitutional government for the people of Puerto Rico was enacted.

Dr. FERNÓS-ISERN is loved and admired by his colleagues and our best wishes go with him for continued success in all that he undertakes for his beloved homeland.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I will not at this time recite the long and distinguished career and all of the details of it, which we are all familiar with, of the distinguished Resident Commissioner. I think it is clear to all of us that he is really one of the great men of Puerto Rico and one of the great men who served in the U.S. Congress. He is indeed in many respects one of the founding fathers of modern Puerto Rico. The magnificent development we have watched of that island and its economy has been in large measure due to the leadership of our distinguished colleague over the years. I know all of us today bid him Godspeed. I know we feel we are not saying farewell at all to Dr. FERNÓS-ISERN, a great credit to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and a great credit to the House of Representatives and a great credit to himself. Saludas.

Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RYAN of New York. I am delighted to yield to our distinguished Resident Commissioner.

Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN. Mr. Speaker, I feel deeply moved. I thank my colleagues from the bottom of my heart for their very kind and generous words. I thank all Members of the House, those present and those not here at this time. Again I extend my thanks to all of the Members of all of the Congresses I have served in during these 18 years. Some of them have retired to the peace of their homes and others to eternal peace, but to all of them I owe a debt of gratitude.

I came here 18 years ago, the Commissioner from Puerto Rico, without a vote and with many problems that I thought should be solved and could be solved only by the Congress. In those 18 years many things have happened in Puerto Rico and many things have been done in the Congress for Puerto Rico. The people of Puerto Rico deserve a good deal of credit for their efforts during those years; for their Operation Bootstrap; for all the progress they have made; for the fine use that they have made of their political freedom, made possible by the Congress. The Congress of the United States deserves a great deal of credit, because Congress has in many ways made possible the great progress of Puerto Rico.

I refer not only to economic progress, which has been outstanding, but also to the political status which in 18 years has undergone such a change and transformation. Many fundamental laws have been adopted in those 18 years in this Chamber and in the other Chamber. First the enabling act to create the Commonwealth; then the joint resolution approving the constitution adopted by my people, and later sundry amendments to the Puerto Rican Federal Relations Act. During the early months of this session the bill which created a commission to study the political status of Puerto Rico was adopted.

In the economic sense the programs that did not apply prior to 1946, the programs under grant-in-aid laws, that did not then apply, and those that were established under the new laws, were extended to Puerto Rico. Social security was extended to Puerto Rico. This has had a tremendous impact in the well-being and in the economy of Puerto Rico.

After those 18 years, having made so many friends, I revised the concept that I had when I came here. I thought I did not have a vote. But I found that when I needed them I had all the votes necessary to put through a bill; the votes of my friends and the friends of Puerto Rico. After these years, as we say in Puerto Rico, "Jalda Arriba," we have been climbing up the hill.

We have reached now to a plateau; not that we will not climb still higher; beyond the plateau there are higher hills; and now we are headed to those higher levels. But after those 18 years I decided that I should not undertake the new endeavors; the new efforts needed to reach the higher and distant hills ahead. I decided that the new generation, coming behind us, should take over. I thought that it was time that I go back to Puerto Rico and enjoy what years of life I may still be granted by the Lord; to enjoy the breezes and the sunshine and the beautiful views of Puerto Rico. After all so many people go down there at great expense, and I can have such joys without expense.

I know that as I go back there I carry with me the experience that I have gained in this Congress. I will have the opportunity to tell my people in every instance, when problems arise, how to interpret the Congress of the United States. One of the great satisfactions that I have had in these 18 years has been that I think I have been able to interpret Puerto Rico to the Congress and the Congress to Puerto Rico.

Although I think I will be happy in Puerto Rico, it is also true that I am feeling sad. Partings are sad always, and I am leaving behind so many good friends. But I do hope that all my friends in Congress, and that means all of the Congress, will find reasons to come to Puerto Rico. There are always good reasons to come to Puerto Rico. And I hope they will give me always the opportunity to see them when they come down there because I shall be always their good friend and their good colleague. Again, thank you all.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I know I echo the words of praise on the part of all Members of the House of Representatives as to the eloquent words of our colleague, the Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico.

Mr. Speaker, we certainly do have an added incentive to visit Puerto Rico and to visit him in the years ahead as he continues to provide leadership in the development of that magnificent commonwealth.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on this special order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SENNER). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

TEACHER SHORTAGE—A SUGGESTED SOLUTION

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, one of my pleasant duties as a Representative has been the regular reading of the 22 weekly and 8 daily newspapers which circulate in my congressional district. Reading the editorial pages of these papers helps keep me in touch with my district at a time when our continuous sessions make this so important. In addition, it is a good way to keep a proper perspective, badly needed here in Washington at the apex of ever-increasing centralized power. In the edition of the September 23 Colebrook (N.H.) News and Sentinel, there were two editorials which I would like to share with my colleagues. The first echoes a thought that I have occasionally had myself as a possible solution to the teacher shortage problem. Because of the fact that Sherman Adams once represented my district, and was Governor of New Hampshire when I served in the New Hampshire State Senate, I was particularly interested in reading that he will be teaching at the University of New Hampshire this year. Because of my great admiration for Governor Adams, I am especially heartened that the students at our fine university will have an opportunity to benefit from his experience.

The second editorial, Mr. Speaker, comments on the fact that the so-called depressed areas in New Hampshire are not really depressed areas, after all. It is comforting to know that this sort of situation can be viewed with perspective and a bit of humor. The editorials to which I refer, as they appeared in the Colebrook (N.H.) News and Sentinel, follow:

A TREND TO BE ENCOURAGED

From Durham, N.H., comes word that former New Hampshire Governor and Presidential Assistant, Sherman Adams, has engaged to teach government courses at the university this year, with special emphasis on the administration of the Presidency.

Not only does this development represent at least some partial vindication for Mr. Adams, who is living proof that a Republican can get into more hot water by sheer naivete than Democrats can by outright larceny, but it is a very healthy symptom of what might become a trend in education.

For a number of years now we have wondered, occasionally in print, why no attempt has been made to alleviate the supposedly critical teacher shortage by making use of the part-time services of those numerous people resident in every community who are superbly qualified by education, background, or both to teach certain subjects at both the high school and college level. We sort of gave up when we began to realize that this would completely demoralize a system based on certification, which is in turn largly based on "education" courses, and has kept the public school atmosphere pretty hostile to any invasion by well-meaning volunteers, no matter what their qualifications.

Colleges and private schools have always used just such people, since they have perversely refused to become overly concerned about methodology and the "whole child" so long as the potential teacher knows what he is talking about in the subject he is teaching. The burgeoning "new" colleges hereabouts and elsewhere have given this trend a terrific boost as they dredge the academic oysterbeds to employ retired military people and such on their faculties.

Certainly, Mr. Adams didn't have time to pick up "education" credits when he was bossing lumberjacks in Lincoln, and somehow one doubts whether he found occasion to attend night school while he was in Washington. UNH, deciding it can make do with his Dartmouth degree and a lifetime of experience in practical politics, may well be giving a sturdy push to a healthy trend in American education.

TOLD YOU SO

After assorted politicians had gotten all possible mileage out of various projects based on the theory that Coos County was a "depressed area," it turns out it was all a mistake. Seems up this way per capita income is too high, and has been too high all along, for the county to belong in the "depressed" category.

Well, Congressmen and Senators and such are fighting manfully for their constituents, and at this writing it looks as though they aren't really going to take any of the goodies back, but just write the whole thing off as an unfortunate error.

Now, our first temptation is to say, "told you so," since our comment from the very beginning has been that folks in Coos County aren't depressed—just broke, as usual. The second reaction is to burst into wild, hysterical laughter, until sobered by the realization that the victim of the whole farcical business is the taxpayer, as usual.

THE NEW OHIO STATE 65 PLAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SENNER). Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VANIK] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, the legislature of Ohio in the last legislative session provided private insurance companies in Ohio an opportunity, under permissive State legislation, to pool their resources and experience to offer health insurance to residents of Ohio 65 and over. This legislation was enacted in order to see if private insurance companies could provide a health insurance program which could constitute Ohio's rebuttal to the congressional proponents of medicare or hospital insurance under the social security system.

Accordingly, 37 private insurance companies in Ohio have pooled their resources and experience to offer health insurance to those 65 and over in a plan entitled "Ohio State 65 Health Insurance Plan." The cooperative association's enrollment period will end October 31. With the implementation of this State program, Ohio joins seven other States with similar programs.

Although I am happy to see Ohio private insurers make this considerable effort, a careful look at the Ohio 65 program and the experience of other States shows that only a small number of the aged can be expected to benefit from the plan. Under the circumstances I see no other reasonable course on the horizon but vigorous support for the provision of medicare or hospital insurance under social security. It is my hope that this can be accomplished before Congress adjourns.

DESCRIPTION OF THE OHIO STATE 65 PROGRAM

The Ohio 65 program gives the applicant a choice of three plans. The first plan costs $10.50 a month and provides basic hospital and surgical benefits. The second costs $12.50 a month and provides supplemental major medical benefits with a lifetime limit of $10,000 of which no more than $5,000 may be used during any calendar year. The third plan, the "comprehensive plan," is a combination of the first two plans, with a reduction in the deductible applicable in the major medical plan, and costs $23 per month—$276 per year.

Enrollment is open to all persons 65 and over residing in the State and the spouse—regardless of age—of an enrolled resident.

The basic hospital-surgical plan pays hospital room and board charges up to $15 a day for a maximum of 31 days per confinement; other hospital charges for services and supplies up to 75 percent of the first $160 of charges; surgical expenses up to a maximum of $250 according to a surgical schedule; and up to a maximum of $37.50 for anesthetics.

After a beneficiary meets an annual $400 deductible, the major medical plan will pay for the following: Up to $15 a day toward hospital room and board; 75 percent of other covered hospital services; up to $4 per day for doctors' calls in the home, office, convalescent hospital, or hospital; up to a $350 maximum for surgery and radiotherapy; and $5 per day up to 90 days in a convalescent hospital in a year. This plan also pays a percentage or a dollar maximum on expenses arising from the following: anesthetics, out-of-hospital drugs, ambulance, visiting and private duty registered nurse, and diagnostic laboratory and X-ray.

Under the "comprehensive plan" the policyholder has coverage for hospital room and board, hospital extras, anesthetics, and surgical expenses up to the maximums in the major medical plan, beginning with the first dollar of eligible expenses. This plan pays other expenses covered by the major medical plan, subject to an $80 deductible.

The plans do not pay expenses for conditions for which medical attention was received during the 90 days before the issue of the insurance, if the expenses are incurred during the first 9 months of coverage.

ANALYSES OF PLAN

From the experience of State 65 programs in operation in New York, Connecticut, Massachusetts, Texas, California, Virginia, and North Carolina, it is apparent that the Ohio 65 program will be far too costly for a substantial portion of the aged people in the State, particularly those aged people who are most in need of health insurance, those who have low incomes and those who are at present uninsured.

Apparently, the State 65 plans recognize this since promotional information regarding the programs encourages purchase of the plans by younger persons for their aged dependents. It is important to note that 30 percent of the relatively few who joined the Connecticut and Massachusetts programs were enrolled by a relative.

A comparison of the cost of the Ohio 65 program with the income of the aged provides ample evidence that the plan's cost is very high in relation to the resources of those for whom it is intended. An aged couple would have to pay a premium of $552 a year for the combined basic and major medical plan. A premium of this size represents about one-fifth of the median annual income of aged couples in Ohio. And a premium of $276 a year for a single aged person represents about one-quarter of the median annual income of nonmarried aged persons in Ohio.

Another factor in considering the likelihood of the success of this program in meeting the health insurance needs of Ohio's aged is the probability of a premium increase after a relatively short period of operation. The oldest State 65 program, which went into effect in Connecticut in 1961, found it necessary to reduce some benefits and increase premiums on their combined basic and major medical policies by 10 percent after only 2 years of operation. In a recent report on health insurance for the aged, the Senate Subcommittee on Health of the Elderly reviewed data from the three State 65 plans with the longest experience. The subcommittee reported that the claims experience of the plans indicated a pattern of initial high cost coupled with the prospect of further premium increases. The subcommittee reported that other problems facing the State 65 plans are, first, virtually no growth in the number of aged people covered by the plans since their inception; and, second, an average age among participants which is too high to insure any degree of premium stability. Since the plans seem unable to enroll any substantial number of persons currently attaining 65 and in good health, the plans are faced with the prospect of insuring a group of increasingly older people. Simply stated, the greater the average age of the 65 plan group, the greater the requirement for and use of medical care, and this seems to be the prospect for the plans.

INSURERS HAVE DOUBTS

Even the insurers have their doubts. Mr. A. M. Wilson, chairman of the executive committee of Massachusetts 65 was quoted as follows:

> The early enthusiasm for a 65 plan as a means to combat Federal intervention is very rapidly subsiding as companies begin to realize the extent of their financial involvement. We are still a business which cannot function as a private social relief association.

In some 65 plans, after the initial enrollment period the number of those enrolled has dropped, and this even though the number enrolled was relatively small. The experience of the Texas 65 program bears this out. As of November 1, 1963, about 45,000, 6 percent of the State's aged were enrolled and, since then, the enrollment figure has fallen to less than 40,000. Some of these lapses were due to death but many no doubt represented situations where the aged person just could not make the payments out of his limited budget.

Although waiting periods are pretty much a fact of life in individually written private health insurance, the Ohio 65 program's 9-month waiting period before covering health costs arising from the treatment of certain preexisting conditions will force the aged previously insured to either pay two premiums for a 9-month period or do without good protection during this period of time. This exclusion is likely to discourage insured people with preexisting conditions from transferring to the 65 plan.

Furthermore, the plan in any but its most expensive version falls far short of full coverage. An idea of the effectiveness of the coverage that would be provided by the basic plan may be obtained when comparison is made between the actual average hospital bed and board charge for two-bed accommodations, about $30 in Cleveland, and the $15 a day that would be paid by the basic policy. For a 31-day stay in a representative Cleveland hospital, for example, the patient would have to spend more than $400 for hospital room and board charges alone.

Even the insurance provided under the maximum-cost plans would cover only a part of the overall medical care costs. The cost of deductibles, routine doctor's visits, eyeglasses, hearing aids, and other medical appliances, and the charges assessed beyond the indemnity amounts paid by the plans for hospital and other medical services would have to be paid out-of-pocket by the aged person or provided for through some other means so that the plan's benefits help pay only a portion, perhaps two-fifths, of the average total medical costs incurred.

RECOGNITION OF THE PROBLEM

In less than a decade we have witnessed what is to me a very impressive increase in the public awareness of the health care problems of the aged. There is now a general recognition, reflected by the discussions and debates on the subject in the Congress and throughout the Nation, that an area of great need exists here, and that the Federal Government can and should play a part in helping to finance health care for the aged. Specific recognition of this need was shown by the Senate when they voted September 2 to include hospital insurance for the aged in the social security amendments of 1964.

The crux of the problem facing older persons can be stated quite briefly. People 65 and over have twice the medical costs of younger people and only one-half as much income. The average aged couple in the United States has an income of a little more than $55 a week—about $27 per person. The income of the senior citizen who lives alone averages only $22 a week, and nearly half of the elderly live alone. The senior citizen simply cannot stretch this income to pay for the average of two or three spells of hospitalization he can expect in old age. It is even hard to pay day-to-day living expenses on what the average aged people have.

Another important fact is that the aged do not have enough savings or other assets to fall back on when illness strikes. Despite their relative prosperity before retirement, about 1 in 3 aged persons have less than $100 in savings.

COVERAGE UNDER PRIVATE HEALTH INSURANCE

Some who oppose hospital insurance for the aged under social security have asserted that private insurance can meet, in a practical way, the entire problem of insuring older people. About one-half of the aged do not have any health insurance at all.

And many of those who have some form of health insurance have woefully inadequate coverage. The formation of pools such as that in Ohio is evidence that even the insurers see shortcomings in what is available. The inadequacy of present coverage is a result of the high cost of adequate health insurance. The high cost is due in part to the fact that elderly people are poor health risks and it costs more for insurance companies to insure them. Another reason is that most of the working people who have health insurance are enrolled under group contracts, while retired people who are insured are in most cases under nongroup policies. Group coverage on the average provides almost twice as much protection for each health insurance dollar as individual policies.

In looking at the possibility of any further spreading of voluntary health insurance, the fact must be faced that aged people who have protection tend to be in the higher income brackets and in good health and of these, very few have protection that can be considered adequate. It is predominantly the low-income people and the people who are in poor health who are still not covered or covered very poorly. These are the very people who are the poorest risks from a health insurance standpoint, and who can least afford to pay insurance premiums. As things stand now, the prospect for improvements in the health insurance coverage of our elderly citizens is far from bright, despite the energetic and imaginative efforts the private insurance industry and the nonprofit organizations such as Blue Cross have made in seeking solutions to the problem the aged face. The solution to the insurance problem requires a method of financing under which persons would pay part of its costs during their working years when they are best off so that the costs of maintaining adequate health insurance in old age would be within their means.

HOSPITAL INSURANCE FOR THE AGED UNDER SOCIAL SECURITY

I am convinced that the Federal Government must act without further delay to help our older people meet their health care costs. I am equally convinced that this help must be provided in a way that maintains the individual dignity of older people as well as their security.

The hospital insurance for the aged proposal contemplates that the financing of basic hospital insurance protection for the aged through social security would be the keystone of a threefold structure of protection for the aged in meeting the cost of health care. First, basic hospital insurance protection would be afforded the Nation's aged through social security; second, the existence of a program of basic protection would encourage the development of additional protection through individual savings, private insurance, and employer benefit plans which would be added to the basic protection and result in good insurance protection for almost all the aged; third, good medical assistance would become practicable in all States to help the relatively small group not eligible for the basic protection under social security.

Hospital insurance under social security would enable people to pay over their working lifetime, with matching amounts from their employers, for protection against hospital costs in old age. This is the only practical solution to a problem which will only grow in severity unless action is taken now. The U.S. Senate has acted and I sincerely hope the House of Representatives will also act to make hospital insurance for the aged the law—a law which will benefit our young and old alike.

REGULATING THE LOCATION OF CHANCERIES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. MULTER usbmitted a conference report and statement on the bill (S. 646) to prohibit the location of chanceries and other business offices of foreign governments in any residential area in the District of Columbia.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. EDWARDS, for 15 minutes, today; and for 15 minutes, tomorrow, Friday, October 2, 1964, and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama, for 1 hour, today.

Mr. LIBONATI, for 1 hour, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include statistical tables and various extraneous matter.

Mr. BOW, for 30 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. GOODELL, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. EVINS, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. PATMAN, for 1 hour tomorrow, October 2, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter, on the services of the Honorable JOE M. KILGORE, of the 15th Congressional District of Texas.

Mr. LIPSCOMB (at the request of Mr. BEERMANN), for 30 minutes, on October 5, 1964.

Mr. BRUCE (at the request of Mr. BEERMANN), for 60 minutes, on October 2, 1964.

Mr. VANIK (at the request of Mr. UDALL), for 30 minutes, on Friday, October 2, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. RYAN of New York (at the request of Mr. UDALL), for 30 minutes, on Friday, October 2, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. PHILBIN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HORTON and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CURTIS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. NEDZI and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BEERMANN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mrs. REID of Illinois.

Mr. ABELE.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. UDALL) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ROYBAL.

Mr. CORMAN and to include tabular matter.

Mr. POWELL in three instances.

Mr. TOLL in two instances.

Mr. CASEY.

Mr. MURPHY of New York.

Mr. CAMERON.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 2501. An act to authorize the promotion of qualified Reserve officers of the Army and the Air Force to existing unit vacancies;

H.R. 2512. An act to clarify the status of members of the National Guard while attending or instructing at National Guard schools established under the authority of the Secretary of the Army or Secretary of the Air Force, as the case may be, and for other purposes;

H.R. 9718. An act to authorize the crediting of certain military service for purposes of Reserve retired pay; and

H.R. 12308. An act to authorize removal of a flight hazard at the U.S. Naval Air Station, Norfolk, Va.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 2180. An act to amend title VII of the Public Health Service Act so as to extend to qualified schools of optometry and students of optometry those provisions thereof relating to student loan programs.

MR. MILLER'S RELATIONSHIP WITH THE LOCKPORT FELT CO. AND RELATED COMPANIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SENNER). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. EDWARDS] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, in view of the subject matter and as to what I understand will be the remarks of the gentleman from California, I am going to have to reserve the right to object to the extension request only in order that we might know what the gentleman is going to say.

My understanding is that the gentleman is going to talk about a Member of this House. I do not know whether that Member has been advised of that fact. At least, we know he is not present.

Mr. Speaker, we of necessity have to be somewhat cautious that things that appear in the RECORD as though they are said at least be made known to the Members of the House who are present. It is my opinion that all of us are placed in a very difficult situation. However, at least temporarily, until the gentleman has had an opportunity or at least we have had an opportunity to be advised as to the nature of what the gentleman is going to say, I must reserve the right to object to the unanimous-consent request to revise and extend his remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SENNER). The gentleman from California may proceed.

Mr. EDWARDS. From the days of Thomas Jefferson the House of Representatives has proceeded upon certain assumptions, assumptions that have perhaps not always been justified, but nevertheless are necessary if the people of the United States are to have any trust in their elected Representatives. In Jefferson's "Manual and Rules of the House of Representatives," the following is stated:

> Where the private interests of a Member are concerned in a bill or question he is to withdraw. And where such an interest has appeared, his voice has been disallowed, even after a division. In a case so contrary, not only to the laws of decency, but to the fundamental principle of the social compact, which denies to any man to be a judge in his own cause, it is for the honor of the House that this rule of immemorial observance should be strictly adhered to.

This has been followed in the Rules of the House of Representatives, rule VIII, with the right of a Member to vote, limited by the following restriction:

> Every Member * * * shall vote on each question put, unless he has a direct personal or pecuniary interest in the event of such question.

The record of this Congress indisputably shows that on July 23, 1956, and on February 4, 1958, the gentleman from New York, Congressman WILLIAM E. MILLER, took the floor of the House of Representatives to voice objection to certain proposed legislation which was opposed by the Lockport Felt Co.

Mr. MILLER has explained this as merely an act that he would do for any constituent, and has stated that he does not own any stock in the Lockport Felt Co.

Last night Mr. MILLER stated he had been a director and an officer of the Lockport Felt Co. since 1947 and has received a salary of $7,500 a year from that company ever since that time. He denied ever having owned any shares of stock in that company. When, in connection with a recent Federal Trade Commission price-fixing proceeding against the Lockport Felt Co., Mr. MILLER was asked about that matter, he was quoted as saying that he was not in management and not familiar with the matter.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWARDS. I would prefer to yield at the finish of my statement.

Mr. GROSS. Did the gentleman properly notify the gentleman from New York that he was going to make this statement today?

Mr. EDWARDS. I refuse to yield.

Now, I do not know what management is if it does not include a director and officer of a company.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact the gentleman has not notified Mr. MILLER to be here and be present, I think maybe we ought to have a big crowd here to hear what is about to be said.

Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 12 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, October 2, 1964, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2583. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting pursuant to law, report on violations of price reductions clause in Federal supply schedule contracts for purchase of drugs and pharmaceutical products, General Services Administration and Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2584. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting pursuant to law, report on unnecessary costs incurred for commercial ocean transportation by the Panama Canal Company; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2585. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting pursuant to law, report on excessive costs incurred for training activities at the Federal Aviation Agency Academy; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2586. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, General Services Administration, transmitting report on records proposed for disposal under the law; to the Committee on House Administration.

2587. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the Bankruptcy Act to prohibit a part-time referee in bankruptcy from serving as trustee in any proceeding under the Bankruptcy Act"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2588. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend chapter XI of the Bankruptcy Act to give the court supervisory power over all fees paid from whatever source"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2589. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the inland, Great Lakes, and western rivers rules concerning sailing vessels and vessels under 65 feet in length"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

2590. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting report of transfer of research and development funds of NASA to facilities appropriation to provide facilities at Plum Brook Station, Sandusky, Ohio, for testing nonnuclear components of nuclear rocket engines, pursuant to 77 Stats. 141, 143; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FALLON: Committee on Public Works. S. 1593. An act to amend section 14 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1954 concerning the interstate planning and coordination of the Great River Road; without amendment (Rept. No. 1923). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MULTER: Committee of conference. S. 646. An act to prohibit the location of chanceries and other business offices of foreign governments in any residential area in the District of Columbia (Rept. No. 1924). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. MORGAN: Committee of conference. H.R. 11380. A bill to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1925). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CHELF:

H.R. 12749. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code to increase the total mileage of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways by 1,000 miles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H.R. 12750. A bill to allow a deduction for income tax purposes, in the case of a disabled individual, of expenses for transportation to and from work; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 12751. A bill to repeal the excise tax on business machines; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.R. 12752. A bill declaring October 12 to be a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H.R. 12753. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that the computation of an individual's primary insurance amount shall be based on not more than his 5 years of highest earnings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RIEHLMAN:

H.R. 12754. A bill to allow a deduction for income tax purposes, in the case of a disabled individual, of expenses for transportation to and from work; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRAY:

H.R. 12755. A bill to amend the Water Resources Research Act of 1964 in order to eliminate a provision making certain assistance under such act conditional upon approval thereof by committees of the Congress; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HARDING:

H.R. 12756. A bill to require fresh potatoes purchased or sold in interstate commerce to be labeled according to the State in which such potatoes were grown; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WHITE:

H.R. 12757. A bill to require fresh potatoes purchased or sold in interstate commerce to be labeled according to the State in which such potatoes were grown; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DENT (by request):

H.J. Res. 1188. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the third Sunday in October of each year as Free Enterprise Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDWARDS:

H. Res. 896. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the allegations of conflict of interest made against WILLIAM E. MILLER, Representative in Congress from the 40th Congressional District of New York; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARRETT:

H.R. 12758. A bill for the relief of Louisa and Bernardino Pietrangelo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAREY:

H.R. 12759. A bill for the relief of Stamatios Constantellos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12760. A bill for the relief of Petra John; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12761. A bill for the relief of Tiang H. Ong and his wife, Hian Nio Ong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 12762. A bill for the relief of Alfonso Giammo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12763. A bill for the relief of Salomon and Etelca Friedmann Falus; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 12764. A bill for the relief of Gilbert Che Fee Lai; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H.R. 12765. A bill for the relief of certain individuals; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 12766. A bill for the relief of Michele Buffa, his wife Orsola Buffa, and children Juan and Geronima Buffa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H.R. 12767. A bill for the relief of Dr. Kaney Ebisuzaki and Emiko Kato Ebisuzaki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 12768. A bill for the relief of Stella Travlos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STINSON:

H.R. 12769. A bill for the relief of Tong Yung Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12770. A bill for the relief of Zbigniew B. Kasprzyk and Genevieve Kasprzyk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1049. By Mr. STRATTON: Resolution of the Butternut Valley Grange, Gilbertsville, Otsego County, N.Y., disagreeing with the recent decision of the Supreme Court on State legislative redistricting and requesting adoption of a constitutional amendment to keep the system of State apportionment as it existed originally; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1050. Also, petition of the Ontario County Pomona Grange urging adoption of an amendment to the U.S. Constitution which will take the matter of apportionment of State legislatures out of the jurisdiction of the U.S. courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1051. Also, petition of the Ontario County Pomona Grange urging the passage of an amendment to the Constitution reserving to the States the right to apportion one house of their legislatures on the basis of geographical units; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1052. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Henry Stoner, New York, N.Y., requesting consideration of his petition with reference to supporting legislation to require the Social Security Administration, Department of HEW, to repay to bona fide disability cases and those over 62 all moneys paid by said persons into social security when they cannot qualify under social security laws for disablity payments or pensions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

A Safety Record To Be Proud of

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB CASEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 1, 1964

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, in this day when so many Americans are crippled in industrial accidents, it is indeed an honor to call to the attention of my colleagues the distinguished achievement of the employees of Sinclair Petrochemicals, Inc., in our area of Harris County.

For 6 straight years—more than 3 million man-hours of work—there has not been a lost-time accident at Sinclair's plant.

The record they have set is to be envied by every plant employee and management official in our country, for the drain on our economy of industrial accidents is heavy, and the personal tragedy that often accompanies such an accident is tragic.

I am extremely proud of the many Sinclair workers who live within the 22d District for the magnificent safety job being done, and certainly believe congratulations are in order for General Manager Homer C. Wilson, his officers, and all the Sinclair people. I know my colleagues share this feeling.

Columbus Day—A Legal Holiday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 1, 1964

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, the history of America is made to live by the special recognition we accord great historical events in our daily lives. Each year, we set aside 6 days for national devotion to the memory of George Washington, those Americans who gave their lives fighting for freedom, our struggle for independence, organized labor's formation, war veterans, and the pilgrims' thanks to God.

Therefore, I believe it is in keeping with this tradition to institute a holiday memorial to Christopher Columbus, the noble Italian navigator, for realizing his dream of finding a "New World." Many States, including my own New York State, have declared October 12 a legal holiday for many years. Now, I propose that Columbus Day be so decreed by the Congress of the United States.

This action of the Federal Government honoring the man whose discovery of 472 years ago led to the creation of our country would give added substance and meaning to those principles we hold near and dear. It would provide an annual opportunity for Americans to express their pride in our heritage.

I ask that we rededicate ourselves to the motto of the United States, "E Pluribus Unum" or "one out of many," by enacting into law my bill to make Columbus Day a national holiday.

Don't Give Up the Ship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 1, 1964

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

EXCERPT FROM REMARKS OF HON. JOHN M. MURPHY, 16TH DISTRICT, NEW YORK, AT THE 1964 PROPELLER CLUB CONVENTION AND MERCHANT MARINE CONFERENCE, SEPTEMBER 30, 1964, NEW YORK CITY, AMERICAN GRAND BALLROOM AT THE WALDORF ASTORIA

I appreciate this opportunity to meet with the leaders of our American merchant marine and discuss some of the problems as they appear to a freshman in the business.

I have been a member of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries for 2 years and I have been disturbed by the situation in which our shipping finds itself. I feel that my views as a newcomer may be helpful to you in arriving at our mutual goal of a vigorous and prosperous merchant marine working for the benefit of all of us.

In spite of my short time on the committee, I feel that I have been afforded a fairly liberal education since nearly 2 years ago when the committee concerned itself with the labor problems of the American merchant marine and more recently when it has delved at length into the administration of the regulations affecting the operation of American and foreign shipping serving our waterborne commerce.

From the point of view of the men who man our ships, it would appear that a certain lack of statesmanship is evident in their leaders and that a considerably higher degree of cooperation between labor and management is essential to permit the American merchant marine to achieve its proper place in the world.

We need more ships.

We need more business. But in order to get these, we need an assurance that the ships will sail on schedule for the benefit of our commerce. Our record to date in this respect has been poor and it is important that this image be corrected.

Right at the moment, we are confronted with the prospects of another tieup which will strangle our ocean commerce for not only the length of the strike but for a considerable period thereafter because of the necessity of getting things moving again on schedule.

While I feel that labor is certainly entitled to its fair share of the profits in this or any other business, I am not convinced that its course in this case is designed to benefit anyone.

We have seen the situation where the Government and one of our large companies has endeavored to move forward in the direction of automation with the intention of reducing the high costs of operation. And we have seen that with respect to one union there have been efforts to frustrate this aim. I feel that in this particular field the interests of labor dictate full cooperation with any aim to reduce operating costs without reducing the standard of living of the men, since skyrocketing costs have been placing us at a greater and greater disadvantage in relation to our foreign competitors.

I must pay tribute to those leaders who have recognized this truth and have expressed their intention to cooperate fully in achieving this end. Unless we can reduce the cost of ship operation, we are in no position to place more ships in service. Thus, we are in no position to expand our overall labor force in the field. Our commerce is large and growing but unhappily our share in carrying it is dwindling daily.

My researches into the background of our present Marine Marine Act convince me that it has fallen considerably short of the success that its sponsors hoped to achieve. At the time of its enactment in 1936, it represented a gigantic step forward in the continuing desire to provide an American-flag merchant marine for our needs both in peace and war. Unfortunately, however, the number of ships operating under its subsidy provisions has increased very little over the past 38 years. We had about 300 ships then. We have about 300 ships now. True, our present ships, and the new ones as they come out of the shipyards, are larger and faster than their predecessors. But, unhappily, they represent a net decrease in our carrying capacity in relation to the expansion of our commerce.

While our foreign commerce since the dark days of the 1930's has expanded almost unbelievably year by year, the relative share of that commerce carried by our ships is dwindling. I note that this week our active privately owned fleet decreased to less than 900 vessels, which represents a continuing downward trend since World War II. We are presently spending some $200 million a year for operating subsidy and about $100 million for construction subsidy, the latter figure being for our benefit in maintaining active shipyards in the United States.

In the past 15 years, our operating subsidy has increased fourfold without any appreciable effect on the size of our liner fleet. We all recognize the need for operating subsidy to see to it that our seamen maintain their position as first-class citizens of our country but sooner or later a limit on the amount available from the Government for this purpose will be reached. Maritime Administrator Nicholas Johnson, in a speech before the Propeller Club of Los Angeles this month, expressed this view in the following words:

"I am firmly committed to the principle that the American industry's cost disadvantage must be made up with subsidy payments, because without Government assistance the American merchant marine as we now know it—built in America and manned by American citizens—will, I fear now, disappear.

"But I am not firmly committed to the details or the operation of the present parity system; because I do not believe it has given the American shipper and taxpayer, the shipping company, shareholder, and the maritime worker the full shipping capability, profit and job opportunity that is possible."

I have a great deal of respect for the brains and experience in the industry and I am convinced that for their own selfish interests they must come up with some idea to get a greater result from Government expenditures in this field. I am aware that the subsidy given our merchant marine has been unfavorably compared with the subsidy on cheddar cheese, for example, but unhappily, as we in Government are aware, such comparisons do nothing to solve the problem.

There is a limit to the number of dollars available for each particular cause and the demands for that dollar are multitudinous. While, of course, we must continue our efforts to secure more dollars, we must also begin thinking about ways of spending the dollars that we actually get in a way that will produce greater results.

We can be proud of our new freighters that represent amazing advances in the art of ship design and construction. And it is a fact that their greater speed and general attractiveness has increased their carryings in relation to their foreign competitors. Unfortunately, however, to a large extent we are about to lose some of this initial advantage by advocating revenue pooling agreements by which the share of each company in the earnings of a particular service will be frozen irrespective of who moves the traffic. Thus the advantages of our new ships will be lost and we will be placed in the same category of our foreign competitors who for reasons of their own have not chosen to replace their fleets to the extent that we are beginning to do.

While small beginnings have been made in the upgrading of our liner vessels, the necessity of a balanced fleet appears to have been lost sight of. In the passenger business we have the best vessel in the world, the SS *United States*. In spite of the fact that she is about to enter the second decade of her service, there is nothing on the seas that can rival her.

Our committee, some years ago, proposed and there was enacted into law, a bill to authorize a sister ship to the *United States*. Unhappily, the successive administrations have not seen fit to request a single dollar for this purpose.

We are told that passenger ships are in a dying business.

This would be easier to believe if our foreign competitors were not actively building new vessels. We have seen a number of nations, including the Israeli, the Italians, the French, and now the British, building newer and better vessels for passenger service.

I do not believe that any of these hardheaded countries expect to throw their money away. They recognize the continued need for passenger service both for the benefit of peacetime commerce and availability in wartime.

We have heard a great deal about how the plane has replaced the ship as a troop carrier but we forget when the Lebanese crisis arose that the immediate demand was not for more planes but for ships to evacuate American nationals. And in the critical days of the Cuban crisis the demand was not for more planes, but "How soon can you get your passenger ships in position and condition to carry a massive troop lift?"

At the rate we are going, soon we will have no vessels available for this purpose.

And we must not lose sight of the value of the passenger vessel as a dollar earner. We are permitting this source of dollars to go by default to foreign countries. To some slight degree, this trend was reversed when the legislation authorizing cruises by subsidized vessels was enacted, but we cannot stop there. We must make efforts to recapture at least a fair share of the passenger business in the booming transatlantic and other natural passenger service trades.

We have seen the new French liner carrying better than 85 percent capacity since its entry into service. We have seen the Italian lines constantly replacing their fleets with newer vessels. And we have seen the British about to undertake the construction of a new Atlantic Queen.

In other phases we are in even worse shape. We have a grand total of four bulk carriers under our flag, at a time when our natural resources in the form of iron and aluminum ores and similar commodities have been depleted to the point where we are becoming more and more dependent upon foreign sources. An attempt to construct four ore carriers under the American flag just a few years ago was thwarted by the refusal of the Department of Commerce to make available subsidies for their construction. The vessels are constructed—but abroad—and they are operating under foreign flags today.

Within the past year or two, applications have been filed for subsidy for the construction of nine bulk carriers. After long, and presumably agonizing consideration, the administration has announced that it is deferring action pending a whole new study of the problem. While we are studying, the Japanese, Norwegians, and British are building ships to carry our commerce.

In one category at least there has been an increase in vessels under the American flag. At the time of the enactment of the 1936 Merchant Marine Act, there were no American-flag tramp operators. Now there is a fleet of possibly 100 to 150 vessels in that category, but to a large extent they are aging war surplus ships, veterans of World War II. The only relatively modern ships in this category are converted tankers that have been attracted to the field by the availability of cargoes under Government aid programs. The continued need for Government aid abroad has permitted operation of this relative handful of vessels. Unfortunately, there is little or no prospect of their replacement and inevitably they will wear out.

Government policy precludes construction subsidies and our tax laws prevent the accumulation of sufficient capital for replacement of our tramp fleet. Together with the increasing cost of new vessels, this lack of available capital assistance spells the doom of our tramp fleet in the not too far distant future. Presently, Liberty ships are available for not much more than a quarter of a million dollars and their operators can see no prospect of replacing them with modern vessels which would cost possibly 20 times as much. They realize that they cannot compete in world markets because of their costs and the limited availability of American cargo. Relatively low profits do not make additional investment in the field attractive enough to interest new capital.

It is my belief that the future of the American merchant marine rests in your hands and those of your opposite number in labor. Between you, you have virtually all of the experience and background that is available for the improvement of the industry. It behooves you to put on your thinking caps and offer solutions. I know that we in Congress will be receptive to any constructive ideas you may bring forth. But you must have the ideas. We are not in a position to formulate them because we lack the practical experience. We can assist, but the initial impetus must come from you.

Report to the People of the 22d District of California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 1, 1964

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, as the 88th Congress moves toward adjournment, the Members can look back on the most productive and fruitful session in 30 years. President Johnson recently pointed out that we have enacted more than 25 major pieces of legislation. This equals the record of the historic 73d Congress. The Members of this Congress can be proud that they have acted in a positive manner in the national interest.

Last year it was fashionable to criticize Congress for the long session and the alleged failure to enact certain bills. I noted, however, in my report last year, that Congress enacted several important pieces of legislation and laid the foundation for the passage of other bills. Congress should not act in haste. Every proposal should be given careful and deliberate consideration. Our aim should be to find constructive solutions to the Nation's problems.

Our record shows we have done this. To the accomplishments of the first session we have added the civil rights bill, the Tax Reduction and Reform Act, two conservation bills, an extension of the housing law and the start of a campaign to eradicate poverty in America. President Johnson, continuing the excellent cooperation with Congress shown by President Kennedy, deserves a large share of the credit for this excellent record. It is one which everyone who supported these measures can be proud. I believe it is one which will win the support of the American people.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

This year Congress appropriated a total of $46.8 billion to keep our defenses the strongest in the world. This represents a small reduction from last year due to the success of the Defense Department's program to increase efficiency and reduce costs. Obsolete facilities have been terminated, purchasing procedures have been standardized and consolidated and a determined effort made to buy only the amount needed at the lowest sound price.

The savings have been effected without any sacrifice in our preparedness. Our stock of land-based and Polaris missiles is being expanded every day. Our strategic forces are invulnerable. They could withstand an enemy attack and completely destroy the adversary. While we have stressed increasing our nuclear arms in the last 4 years, we have not neglected our arsenal of nonnuclear, conventional weapons. The swift, destructive response of our forces when attacked in the Gulf of Tonkin is proof of their retaliatory power.

It has been charged that our nuclear strength is being reduced by policies of the Defense Department. This is wholly false. Today, we have a 4-to-1 superiority over the Soviet Union in both bombers and intercontinental missiles. In the past 3 years we have produced a 150-percent increase in the number of nuclear warheads and a 200-percent increase in the total megatonnage in our strategic alert forces. There has also been a 60-percent increase in our tactical nuclear forces in Europe. As a result of these actions every citizen is more secure today than at anytime in many years.

The purpose of this vast arsenal is to deter aggression by our enemies. But our strategy is one of peace, not destruction. Our goal is the day when a just and lasting peace will be guaranteed by disarmament with inspection and verification.

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

This past summer marked the first anniversary of the partial nuclear test ban treaty. Originally signed by the United States and the Soviet Union, it has now been ratified by more than 100 other nations. The treaty has fulfilled the hopes of President Kennedy and others who believed it would be a first step away from armed conflict toward the peaceful settlement of international disputes. This is not the only benefit we have derived from the treaty. It has stopped the fallout of deadly radioactive materials from atmospheric tests. And it has prevented the Soviet Union from decreasing our superiority in nuclear weapons. In retrospect, I believe those who doubted the treaty have been proven wrong and President Kennedy right in his judgment that the treaty is in our national interest.

The mutual security legislation met less opposition in Congress this year than in the past. I believe this reflects an increasing understanding of the vital role this program plays in insuring our own national security. Freedom around the world is no stronger than its weakest link. Accordingly, it is in our interest to help build an alliance of strong, free, independent nations which will join us in protecting and advancing the cause of liberty. This is the purpose of our aid program.

Our assistance is largely responsible for the great strides made toward economic independence in the past decade by Israel, Greece, Mexico, Nationalist China, and Venezuela. Aid to these countries should end soon. Substantial progress toward this goal has been made by India, Pakistan, Turkey, Thailand, and Colombia in recent years. Our aid program has set an example which the other free nations are following. The countries of Western Europe, Canada, and Japan have joined us in our effort to assist the developing nations of the world toward providing a better life for their people.

Our military aid and supporting assistance to countries on the edge of the Communist empire is vital to the maintenance of freedom in these areas. Without it, our allies in Laos and Vietnam would be swallowed by Communist subversion. Here is where our aid makes the crucial difference between communism and freedom.

Once again Congress voted to increase the size of the Peace Corps. The success of this program is attested to by the fact that 46 countries are now participating in it, and requests for volunteers still exceed the supply. The Peace Corps is a lasting tribute to the ingenuity and wisdom of President Kennedy.

NATIONAL ECONOMY

The tax cut has now been in effect for more than 6 months and according to every indication it appears to be the success its supporters hoped it would be. It has given consumers increased purchasing power and has resulted in higher profits for business. It has boosted the entire economy and accelerated our growth rate. Unemployment is down and the gross national product is up more than $10 billion. The tax cut has insured the continuance of the economic expansion which began in February 1961, and has lasted for more than 44 months, a peacetime record. During this period the gross national product has risen more than $100 billion. All this has been accomplished without a significant rise in prices.

During the past session, Congress enacted a number of measures to further assist the economy toward full employment of all its resources. The $1.1 billion housing law will advance the construction industry. It will also enable millions of people to raise the standards of their housing through such programs as urban renewal. This has been particularly valuable to Los Angeles. The new law also increases the amount of a mortgage which can be insured and liberalizes the eligibility requirements for housing for the elderly.

A first-class highway system is essential for a growing economy. Congress recognized this and authorized the expenditure of a billion dollars in each of the next 2 years to aid the States in the construction of streets and highways. California will receive $120 million, more than any other State. This will enable our State to maintain its leadership in building the best network of roads in the country.

Under its power to regulate interstate commerce, Congress has the duty to protect the investing public from stock market swindlers. Congress met this responsibility by enacting amendments to the Securities Act to enlarge the safeguards for investors in the over-the-counter market.

SPACE

This year brought additional progress toward our goal of landing one of our astronauts on the moon and returning him safely to earth by 1970. The highlight of our space activities was the success of Ranger VII which has given us the first close-up pictures of the moon. The year was also marked by three successful launchings of the Saturn rockets that will power our spacecraft to the moon. The six manned flights in the Mercury program have been concluded and the Gemini program, the intermediate stage in the lunar project, has begun.

In just 6 years since the establishment of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration we have become the world leader in space technology. Our Mariner spacecraft have explored the sun and the planet Venus. We have launched many weather satellites which provide valuable information, and communications satellites which give us direct radio and television contact with every part of the world. In this way our space activities benefit us in our daily lives. In the years ahead the knowledge we gain from this program will result in new and useful products to make our lives safer, more interesting and pleasant.

Despite the opposition of many Republicans, particularly Senator GOLDWATER, who declared in June that "we are spending entirely too much money on the manned moon program," Congress has recognized the value of this effort and appropriated $5.2 billion for NASA, virtually the entire amount asked for by President Johnson. I continued my wholehearted support for this program by resisting every effort to cut the funds for this vital project.

Once again this year, as in every one of the past 3 years, the number and dollar volume of contracts awarded to firms in the 22d District increased. We can be justifiably proud of the fact that the district is the place of performance of more than $600 million worth of contracts.

CIVIL RIGHTS

The Civil Rights Act of 1964 was the most important piece of legislation of its kind in this century. The law fulfills the promise of full equality made to the Negro more than 100 years ago in the Emancipation Proclamation. But this law is not only for our Negro citizens. It is for every American. It forbids discrimination on the grounds of race, creed, color, or national origin in the exercise of basic citizenship rights. As a member of the House Judiciary Committee I helped in writing this historic bill and worked to secure its passage by an overwhelming majority.

The law is designed to remedy six major injustices suffered by Negroes and others in our society: First, it prohibits interference with the right to vote; second, it declares that all places of public accommodation must be open to all people on an equal basis; third, it provides that State and local tax supported facilities must be open to everyone; fourth, it requires that all programs in which Federal funds are used, such as hospital construction and school lunches, must be administered on a nondiscriminatory basis; fifth, it insures equal job opportunities for all citizens by barring discrimination in employment practices by employers, unions, and employment agencies; and sixth, it forbids segregation in the public schools.

Despite the best efforts of the President and community leaders across the country to promote understanding and acceptance of the new law, it has been much misunderstood. The advocates of extremism have generated fear and mistrust in some segments of the population by spreading false and misleading propaganda about the law. Accordingly, I want to set the record straight concerning three charges frequently made against the law. First, it does not compel a store owner to serve any person who enters. It merely requires that he apply the same standards to all, regardless of their color. Second, it does not affect union seniority, nor will any employer be required to fire any employee to make room for a Negro. And third, it does not give the Federal Government authority to transport children to affect the racial composition of schools.

In California we can be proud that we have been among the leading States in civil rights legislation. We have long had laws guaranteeing the right to vote, equal access to places of public accommodation, and equal opportunity in employment. The fact that people of many races and religions live together in harmony in California is due in large part to the forward-looking attitude of our State and local government. The civil rights laws are comprehensive in scope yet moderate in application. All people of reason and good will can support them. Those who truly believe that all men are created equal can do no less.

LAW ENFORCEMENT

In the 87th Congress, I supported several bills to strengthen the laws against organized crime. I am pleased to report that these measures have achieved the hoped-for results. Due to these new laws there has been a great increase in the number of indictments and convictions of leading underworld figures. Last year there were 288 individuals convicted on charges of racketeering. This total is more than the number convicted on such charges in the previous 3 years combined.

Our Federal law enforcement officials in Los Angeles have compiled a fine record. They have successfully prosecuted and convicted several notorious racketeers. The Justice Department has also been active in fighting corrupt labor practices.

It is implicit in our constitutional system that disputes among individuals and groups must be settled peaceably in the courts, according to law. No person has the right to take the law into his own hands. Rioting and violence in the streets have no place in the American way of life. Law and order must be maintained at all times. It is the duty of every citizen to obey the Constitution and laws of the land.

HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

The Hill-Burton Act, which has aided in the construction of more than 7,000 hospital projects since its inception in 1946, was amended and extended this year to provide more than $1.3 billion in Federal funds for the next 5 years. Emphasis will be on the modernization of existing facilities in urban areas. Hill-Burton stands as a milestone among successful Federal, State, and local grant-in-aid programs. It has helped initiate a more coordinated system of hospitals and has improved the standards of health facilities. Two valley facilities, Olive View Hospital in Sylmar and the Jewish Home for the Aged in Reseda, received funds for construction under the Hill-Burton Act this year.

Another important measure passed by Congress to improve health care was the

Nurses Training Act of 1964. This legislation authorizes $283 million for a comprehensive program of nursing school construction, expanded nurse training programs and student loans.

Under the new amendments to the Library Services Act, public libraries in both urban and rural areas will receive $45 million in Federal funds for construction and service costs to aid them in meeting the increasing need for well-equipped libraries. Removal by this Congress of a restriction limiting Federal funds to libraries in cities with populations of 10,000 or less will permit public libraries in urban areas to receive Federal assistance.

In an attempt to help combat the growing problem of juvenile delinquency, Congress extended the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act for 2 years. The bill authorizes $10 million for this fiscal year to finance special studies of compulsory school attendance and child labor laws to determine their effects on juvenile delinquency. Funds also will go for demonstration projects in cities and for training grants for universities, foundations and other research institutions.

One of the most important bills to be passed by this Congress was President Johnson's Economic Opportunity Act to help combat poverty in the United States. This measure opens to everyone the opportunity for education and training, the opportunity to work and the opportunity to live in decency and dignity. Although this legislation is not expected to eliminate poverty completely, it will provide ways for the poor to help themselves become productive members of society.

Much of the bill is designed to help young people break the vicious circle of poverty. The Job Corps created by the measure will increase the employability of youths between the ages of 16 and 21 by furnishing them with job skills, either in camps or on projects within their own communities. Another section of the Economic Opportunity Act provides part-time jobs for students who have reached college but whose families have no financial means to help them.

In addition, community action programs, designed and administered by local agencies, will receive Federal assistance to combat local poverty. For the most part, this financial assistance will be limited to education, training, social service and other human development programs rather than for construction of facilities.

Clearly, this long-needed measure is not a give-away program but a program of opportunity which attacks the causes of poverty and permits the poor to improve their own standard of living so they may share in some of the abundance which most of this Nation enjoys.

AGRICULTURE AND NATURAL RESOURCES

During the past session, Congress took effective action to reduce our agricultural surpluses and make these commodities available to needy families here and overseas. The food stamp program will enable those who cannot afford enough food for an adequate diet to obtain additional nourishment. The food-for-peace program, which has made millions of friends for the United States in the 10 years it has been in operation, was extended and strengthened. Thus, people overseas will continue to share in our abundance. These programs and other actions of the administration have resulted in a large reduction of our agricultural surpluses and consequently an accumulated savings of a quarter of a billion dollars in storage and other costs.

I am pleased the bracero program, which I always opposed, has finally ended. This program was morally indefensible and there is sufficient domestic labor available. Farmers should not be permitted to import foreign laborers at low wages to harvest their crops when American labor is available at reasonable wages.

This year Congress approved legislation to begin the construction of a vast hydroelectric power network encompassing the entire Pacific coast. Private companies will join with municipal, State, and Federal agencies in the largest electric transmission program in the country. When completed, it will be of great benefit to Los Angeles.

Long-standing attempts to set aside federally owned land as wilderness areas finally met with success in this Congress, as we passed a bill establishing a National Wilderness Preservation System. The Wilderness Act authorizes 35 million acres of federally owned land to be preserved as wilderness areas for the use and enjoyment of the American people today and in future generations. The act insures that these areas will retain their primeval character.

The Land and Water Conservation Act, which was supported by both President Kennedy and President Johnson, will permit us to meet the growing outdoor recreational needs of the American people. This long-term program will develop, improve, and enlarge outdoor recreation areas and facilities of the entire Nation. Funds for this program will come from three sources—earmarking of funds from sales of surplus Federal property, earmarking of the 4-cents-a-gallon Federal tax on fuels for motorboats, and admission or user fees from national parks and forests. The fund is expected to provide nearly $2 billion for outdoor recreation in the next decade.

SERVICEMEN AND VETERANS

This year Congress enacted a pay increase for virtually all military personnel. If we are to attract and retain the top quality men we need in our Armed Forces we must pay them decent salaries. The bill passed this year is a sizable step in that direction.

The World War I pension bill liberalizes veterans benefits for aged, needy veterans suffering non-service-connected disabilities.

To meet the needs of veterans in Los Angeles, Congress approved the construction of an additional hospital.

BILLS I HAVE SPONSORED

One of California's most pressing problems is the need for water to meet the demands of our growing population and industry. As a first step toward solving this problem I introduced a bill which will protect our State's existing water rights and provide for a study to ascertain ways in which the water supply in the Colorado River, from which we get much of our water, can be increased.

My bill enabling homeowners who are liable for the cost of public improvements such as streets and sidewalks to obtain FHA loans to finance their construction, was enacted as part of the 1964 housing law. This provision will be particularly useful to residents of the valley and should speed its orderly growth.

Another bill of mine which was enacted was the one to provide U.S. recognition of the International Exposition for Southern California to be held in 1968. This event should be a great stimulus to the economy of Los Angeles, just as the Seattle and New York Fairs have been to those cities.

It is one of the fundamental principles of any democratic society that no person should be persecuted or coerced because of his religion. Violation of this principle should not be tolerated anywhere in the world. For this reason, I introduced a resolution to condemn persecution of the Jewish people in the Soviet Union.

NEXT YEAR

While Congress accomplished a great deal in the 88th Congress, there were still some matters which were not acted upon. Among the most important is legislation regulating the interstate shipment of firearms, and a law to fill the gap in Presidential succession and disability. High on my personal priority list for next year is revision of the copyright laws so that composers can receive compensation for the jukebox performance of their work and a strengthening of the laws protecting consumers from frauds in lending and packaging. Having been in Washington for 4 years, I am convinced that home rule for the District of Columbia is needed. I will be working for that next year. Citizens of the District of Columbia should also enjoy the benefits of self-government.

The most overriding challenge of all is the preservation of peace and freedom. The absurdity of "better dead than Red" or "better Red than dead" is that we have an alternative. We need be neither Red nor dead. We ought to and we shall pursue a course which preserves our own freedom without nuclear holocaust. Patience, perseverance and intelligence are necessary ingredients for success.

VOTING RECORD

Mr. Speaker, at this point I would like to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a table which lists the major legislative actions of the 2d session of the 88th Congress and my position on each of them.

My position	Issue	Outcome
	NATIONAL DEFENSE AND SPACE	
Supported	Appropriate $46,700,000,000 for defense	Enacted.
Supported	Appropriate $1,600,000,000 for military construction projects	Enacted.
Supported	Appropriate $5,200,000,000 for NASA research and development	Enacted.
Supported	Appropriate $2,600,000,000 for Atomic Energy Commission	Enacted.
Supported	Extend Defense Production Act for 2 years	Enacted.
Supported	Extend Civil Defense Act for 4 years	Enacted.
Supported	Protect visiting heads of foreign states and other visiting officials	Enacted.
	INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS	
Supported	Appropriate $3,250,000,000 for mutual security program	Enacted
Supported	Increase U.S. participation in Inter-American Development Bank	Enacted.
Supported	Expand Peace Corps	Enacted.
Supported	Increase U.S. contribution to International Development Association	Enacted.
Supported	Approve and support Presidential action in southeast Asia	Enacted.
Supported	Extend food-for-peace program	Enacted.
	NATIONAL ECONOMY	
Supported	Tax reduction of $11,500,000,000 and reform tax laws	Enacted.
Supported	Mass Transportation Act	Enacted.
Supported	Interest equalization tax	Enacted.
Supported	Extend current excise taxes	Enacted.
Supported	Appropriate $750,000,000 for Office of Economic Opportunity to administer poverty program	Enacted
Supported	Establish national commission to study trade practices in food marketing	Enacted.
Supported	Establish National Commission on Automation and Technology	Enacted.
Supported	Amend minimum wage law to provide that Federal contractors include prevailing area fringe benefits in computation of wages	Enacted.
Supported	Strengthen Securites and Exchange Commission Act	Enacted.
Supported	Extend program of Federal aid for the construction of airports	Enacted.
Supported	Housing Act of 1964	Enacted.
Supported	Continue Federal highway construction program for 2 years	Enacted.
	CIVIL RIGHTS	
Supported	Civil Rights Act of 1964	Enacted.
	GOVERNMENT ORGANIZATION	
Supported	Establish John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts	Enacted.
Supported	Increase pay of Federal civilian employees	Enacted.
Supported	Establish a National Council on the Arts	Enacted.
Supported	Provide for orderly transition between election and inauguration of a new President	Enacted.
Supported	Prohibit bribery of participants in sporting contests	Enacted.
Opposed	Deprive Federal courts of power to decide cases affecting apportionment of State legislatures	Failed.
Supported	Provide legal counsel for indigent defendants in Federal criminal cases	Enacted.
Opposed	Prohibit Federal Communications Commission from regulating amount of commercials	Passed House.
	HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE	
Supported	Increase social security benefits	In conference.
Supported	Extend program for prevention of juvenile delinquency	Enacted.
Supported	Extend Hill-Burton Hospital Construction Act	Enacted.
Supported	Establish a 5-year program to increase the supply of nurses	Enacted.
Supported	Extend program for training of professional health personnel	Enacted.
Supported	Provide assistance to urban areas in the construction of library facilities	Enacted.
Supported	Extend National Defense Education Act	Enacted
Supported	Appropriate $50,000,000 to aid the victims of the Alaska earthquake	Enacted.
	SERVICEMEN AND VETERANS	
Supported	Pay increase for military personnel	Enacted.
Supported	World War I veterans' pension bill	Enacted
Supported	Acquire land for new VA hospital in Los Angeles	Enacted.
Supported	Provide educational assistance to children by disabled veterans	Enacted.
Supported	Permit conversion or exchange of national life insurance policies to new plan	In conference.
Supported	Establish a 5-year program to assist States in construction of nursing home facilities	Enacted.
Supported	Increase size of cadet corps at service academies	Enacted.
Supported	Extend disability income provisions of national service life insurance through age 65 under certain conditions	Enacted.
	AGRICULTURE AND NATURAL RESOURCES	
Supported	Broaden food stamp program for needy families	Enacted.
Supported	Continue wheat and cotton programs for 1 year	Enacted.
Supported	Require registration of pesticides before sale to the public	Enacted.
Supported	Extend program for distribution of surplus milk to Armed Forces and veterans hospitals	Enacted.
Opposed	Restrict importation of beef, veal, lamb, and mutton	Enacted.
Supported	Establish national wilderness preservation program	Enacted.
Supported	Inaugurate land and water conservation fund to assist States in developing outdoor vocational areas	Enacted.
Supported	Begin research on water resources of the United States	Enacted.
Supported	Authorize construction of hydroelectric power intertie on the Pacific coast	Enacted.
Supported	Preserve congressional control over construction of hydroelectric projects on the Colorado River below Glen Canyon Dam	Enacted.
Supported	Appropriate $1,200,000,000 for public works, including $46,800,000 for 93 projects in California	Enacted.
Supported	Protect wildlife on Pacific flyway	Enacted.
	DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	
Supported	Revise and codify District of Columbia code on judiciary and judicial procedure	Enacted.
Supported	Improve sick leave benefits for employees of District government	Enacted.
Supported	Increase pay for educational leave for teachers	Enacted.
Supported	Increase salaries for teachers, policemen, and firemen	Enacted.

Bill No.	Bills I have sponsored	Status
H.R. 5264	To provide hospital and related services under social security for the elderly	In conference.
H.R. 5544	To provide insurance under the Housing Act for loans to homeowners for the construction of public improvements	Enacted.
H.R. 8882	Authorize reduction of the period under which certain voting records are required to be retained	In committee.
H.J. Res. 543	To establish a U.S. World Film Festival Commission	In committee
H. Res. 696	Condemn Soviet persecution of Jews	In committee.
H.R. 9656	Revise the Immigration Act	In committee.
H.R. 10965	Establish a program for the construction of Veterinary medical educational facilities	In committee.
H.R. 11056	Present a statue of Lincoln to Mexico in honor of its independence	Enacted.
H.R. 11672	Establish uniform period for daylight saving time	In committee.
H.R. 12338	Investigate and report on water resources and requirements and protect existing water rights	In committee.
H.J. Res. 952	Extend recognition to the International Exposition for Southern California for 1968	Enacted.

Salute to Nigeria

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 1, 1964

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, today marks the fourth anniversary of the independence of Nigeria. On this memorable occasion, we wish to take opportunity to extend warm felicitations to His Excellency the President of Nigeria, Anamdi Azikiwe; and to the Chargé d'Affaires Ad Interim, Godwin A. Onyegbula.

It is with pride and pleasure that we salute the Government and people of Nigeria on this occasion. Nigeria, the ninth most populous country in the world, is an effectively functioning democracy, a land of rich and varied resources, and a nation of industrious and education-conscious people.

Nigeria is physically a land of contrasts—from its semidesert Muslim north of ancient high-walled towns to the tropical coastal region of the west, to the forests of the east. The diverse regions of Nigeria—eastern, western, midwestern, and northern—are united in a federal system of government in which each region has its own parliament and executive with fairly extensive powers.

The Nigerian economy has been achieving a steady rate of growth in this stable political climate. Over the past decade the average annual increase in national output has approximated 4 percent, keeping comfortably ahead of the annual estimated population increase of 2 percent. The economy is based heavily on agriculture, but contrary to many of the African economies, crops are widely diversified. Thus, Nigeria's prosperity is not dependent on the success of a single crop. Most observers are confident that the economy will continue to grow at an average rate of 4 percent. Crop production reached record levels in 1963, resulting in an estimated 6 percent gross national product increase during that year, significantly above the 4-percent average over the past decade.

Another promising aspect of the Nigerian economy is the existence of rich fuel and energy resources, as yet largely unexploited. A recent AID special research report on sources of energy in Nigeria notes that Nigeria has ample volumes of petroleum, natural gas, coal, lignite, wood, and hydroelectric power. The report points up eight specific investment possibilities for the consideration of private investors, including carbonization of coal, construction of lead and aluminum smelters, resin manufacture, and production of petroleum coke.

The existence of these energy resources provides the key to Nigeria's future economic development. Energy is a prerequisite to industrialization, and industrialization is essential to support a continuing upward trend in the economy. As yet industry contributes only a small portion of Nigeria's gross national product, but encouragement of private foreign investment for industrial development has already yielded some promising results.

Perhaps most important, the Nigerian Government is intensely aware of Nigeria's need for foreign capital and is determined to do everything possible to encourage and reassure private foreign investors. A national development plan for the years 1962–68 calls for private foreign capital investment of $100 million a year. A special section on Nigeria in the New York Times of January 20, 1964, included a full-page advertisement listing incentives for private foreign investment. The same section contained a message from Prime Minister Abubakar Tafawa Balewa assuring potential investors that oversea capital under mutually satisfactory conditions is most welcome in the Federal Republic of Nigeria, and that the interest of investors will always be safeguarded.

We commend the approach of the Nigerian Government to its economic development problems. We congratulate Nigeria on achieving a democratic, federal system of government. We salute you, Prime Minister Balewa and the people of Nigeria, on the fourth anniversary of your independence and express our sincerest wishes for the continued successful development of your country.

Congressman Abele Reports to the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. ABELE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 1, 1964

Mr. ABELE. Mr. Speaker, today I am including a copy of my latest report to the people of the 10th Congressional District of Ohio. This report deals with the problem of reapportionment that is facing most of our State legislatures. This is a problem of deep concern for every thinking American:

REPORT

On June 15 this year the Supreme Court handed down a decision that shocked all thinking Americans. By a 6-to-3 decision the Supreme Court decided that both houses of a State legislature must be apportioned on the basis of population alone. This decision struck against the very heart of our American system of government. Traditionally and historically, the States have had the right to determine for themselves the manner in which their legislators were elected. This decision, if allowed to stand unchallenged, would change the whole concept of our American form of government. The tradition of a two-house or bicameral legislature is older than the Constitution itself. Most of the colonies, before becoming States, had bicameral legislatures. Indeed, the Constitution itself specifically provides that the legislative branch of the Federal Government be composed of two Houses. All but 1 of our 50 States have two-house legislatures. Traditionally, one of the houses of the legislatures is composed on a basis other than population.

The Supreme Court denies the States the right to determine the manner in which they are to be represented. It does, in effect, do away with the tradition of a two-house legislature. More specifically, it would deny the rights of the people of southeastern Ohio to adequate representation in the general assembly. In this country, we have always concerned ourselves with the problem of majority rule and minority rights. The majority of the people should have the right to rule, but not at the expense of the rights of the minority.

In Ohio we have worked out an equitable solution to the problem of representation. The State senatorial districts are alined on the basis of population and members of the Ohio House of Representatives are apportioned on the basis of population with the provision that each county is entitled to elect one representative regardless of its size. Under this system each county in the 10th Congressional District has 1 representative, while Cuyahoga County has 17. This insures that all the counties have an independent voice in the affairs of state and that their best interests are represented. The people of Ohio have the right to decide for themselves the manner in which they wish to be represented.

The effect of this decision would be to turn control of the State legislature over to the eight most populous counties in the State. This would mean that programs which involve the whole State, and your tax dollars, could be dictated by representatives from these eight metropolitan areas. Too often, our section of the State has been neglected in vital areas such as roads, buildings, and schools. We would be like beggars eating the crumbs off the legislative tables.

What is being done about this decision?

I, along with other Members of Congress, have proposed a constitutional amendment that would guarantee the rights of the State to apportion one house of their legislature on a basis other than population. However, the amendment procedure is a time-consuming process and would require ratification of three-fourths of the States before it becomes the law of the land. Meanwhile the courts are acting to enforce their recent decision.

Some means of buying time is necessary to prevent the disruption of governments. For this reason, I introduced a bill which would take jurisdiction away from the Federal courts in matters regarding reapportionment. A bill similar to the one that I introduced was passed by the House of Representatives. This bill, if passed by the Senate and signed by the President, would give the States time to put their own houses in order, while awaiting the ratification of a constitutional amendment.

What we have seen here is another example of the courts overstepping their bounds and legislating by judicial decree. The Congress has the right to limit judicial authority as given the Congress by the Constitution. Congress must exercise this power to preserve our traditional freedoms.

I would suggest that every citizen in the 10th District of Ohio who wishes to keep our present form of representation write their U.S. Senators or any Senator they may know.

Salute to Guinea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 1, 1964

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow Guinea will celebrate the sixth anniversary of its independence, and we wish to take this opportunity to extend warm felicitations to His Excellency the President of Guinea, Sekou Touré, and to His Excellency the Guinean Ambassador to the United States, Karim Bangoura.

Its history since that fateful day in autumn 1958 is a telling chronicle of the implications of the choice facing all newly independent nations: whether to turn east or west for help. It is a source of reassurance and gratification to the Western World that Guinea, having once turned east to the Communist bloc for aid, has gradually turned back to the west.

The Western World cannot, however, take credit for Guinea's change of mind; the credit belongs rather to Prime Minister Sekou Touré and other Government leaders, whose perceptive self-interest led them to recognize the poor quality of Communist goods and the inferior workmanship of Communist technicians. Guinea has been a testing ground of the East-West offensive in Africa, and the East has failed miserably.

But again, while we cannot help being critical of Guinea for turning to the Communist world for assistance in the first place, we must remember that the causes of this move were interwoven with the independence events of 1958. The first step, it is true, was Guinea's rejection of French President de Gaulle's plan for limited autonomy in September 1958 when all the other French African colonies accepted the De Gaulle program. From then on, Guinea was gradually pushed toward the Communist bloc. French administrators and technicians withdrew immediately, taking equipment with them, and French aid to Guinea was cut off. Guinea's headstrong "non" in the referendum on limited autonomy isolated Guinea from the West, and requests for aid from the United States understandably remained unanswered.

Thus, the price of Guinea's "non" became dependence on the Communist bloc. The Soviet Union was only too happy to answer Guinea's request for help affirmatively, and the Soviet response was the extension of $127 million in aid, mostly in long-term loans. Soon Russia, East European, and Chinese diplomats and technicians began arriving in Guinea. During the first 3 years of its existence, Guinea was considered by many Western observers another Communist satellite.

By the end of 1961, however, a significant change was in the wind. The Guinean economy was lagging badly. State regulation of the economy had resulted in corruption and black marketing. Communist equipment proved ill-suited to the tropics, and spare parts were seldom available. Communist technicians were overbearing and sometimes incompetent. Much Communist aid was designated for useless showpieces rather than for basic essentials. The blowup occurred in late 1961 when evidence of Soviet involvement in an alleged plot against the government was uncovered. In December 1961, Guinea expelled the Russian Ambassador.

The truth of the matter is that the Communists bungled badly in Guinea. With the new year of 1962, Guinea turned back toward the West, and relations between Guinea and the West have steadily improved ever since. The U.S. aid program has been expanded at Guinea's request, amounting to only $0.2 million in 1961 but increasing to $10.4 million in 1962 and $16.1 million in 1963. Guinea has adopted an investment code designed to attract foreign capital. In spring of 1963, American jet flights were inaugurated between New York and Conakry, and an American trade fair visited Guinea. In May 1963, financial differences were settled between France and Guinea.

Thus, on the sixth anniversary of Guinea's independence, relations between Guinea and the West are considerably different from relations 6 years ago. We commend Prime Minister Sekou Touré and the people of Guinea for their determined and successful efforts to secure the fruits of independence amid many difficulties. The sixth anniversary of their independence gives us the opportunity to express our good will toward them, our best wishes for their successful development in the future, and our ardent desire for the continued improvement of relations between our two countries.

Washington Notes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLOTTE T. REID

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 1, 1964

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the Congressional Record the following newsletter reporting to my constituents on the recent activities of the Congress:

October 1, 1964.

Dear Friends: This will be my last newsletter of the 88th Congress—and I want to begin by thanking you for giving me the privilege of serving as your Representative from the great 15th District of Illinois. I do hope my efforts in your behalf have met with your approval. Certainly, I have appreciated your counsel on the many important issues facing us and I hope you will continue to give me your views and to call upon me for any help I may be able to give.

These years that I have served as your Representative have been exciting and challenging. However, I must admit that my efforts to protect your freedom and economic well-being are all too often frustrated by the political maneuvers of the present Administration and the Democratic-controlled Congress. As you know, the current membership of the 88th Congress is 254 Democrats to 176 Republicans in the House, and 66 Democrats to 34 Republicans in the Senate. Thus, it is the Democrats who determine what legislation is to be considered both in committees and on the House and Senate floors.

Adjournment still is uncertain. For a brief period we thought we would finish action on the administration's "must" legislation before the Democratic National Convention. Then adjournment was to be this week. Now we hear varying reports—adjournment the 10th or 12th of October or a recess until after the election. In fact, things are so uncertain that the situation could be completely changed by the time you receive this letter.

These have indeed been strange days. Senators who earlier deplored the use of the filibuster held up adjournment by themselves filibustering on the reapportionment issue. On the House side we have been faced with almost the same vacillation and lack of leadership as are so prevalent in the handling of our foreign policy by the administration. For example, each Member of Congress received official notice on Tuesday morning, September 15, that the Senate-passed social security bill would be considered on the House floor the following Thursday. Less than 2 hours after receiving that notice, the Democratic leadership brought the bill to the floor and it was sent to conference. The conferees are still meeting on this legislation as this letter is being written—with the outcome of the medicare provisions still undecided. My mail has been running heavily in opposition to placing medicare under social security and I have been passing on to the House conferees the views of my constituents on this vital issue.

I am particularly concerned over the failure of the Democratic chairman of the House Judiciary Committee to report a meaningful reapportionment bill—thus making it necessary for those of us interested in the rights of individual citizens in the States to take unusual steps to secure action. Two bills on this matter have now been reported directly to the House by the Rules Committee. One of these bills, H.R. 11926, limits the jurisdiction of the Federal courts in cases on the apportionment of State legislatures and did pass the House with my support. The other bill is a constitutional amendment, but the Democratic leadership has failed to bring this up for a vote on the House floor. In the other body, Senator Dirksen tried to secure adoption of an amendment to the foreign aid authorization bill similar to my own bill, H.R. 12238. This provided for a delay in court orders for reapportionment until 1966 so as to give time to submit the question to the people in the form of a constitutional amendment. H.J. Res. 1139 which I introduced on August 3, 1964, does this. The Senate, however, adopted a substitute simply expressing the "sense of Congress" that Federal district courts are to give State legislatures up to 6 months to comply with an order to carry out the Supreme Court's ruling that both houses of a State legislature must be apportioned on a strict population basis. Senator Dirksen's comment on this was that it "is not worth the paper upon which it is printed." I shall continue to press for a satisfactory solution in this vital matter.

I am equally concerned over the failure of the leadership of this 88th Congress to take action on the prayer amendment and thus preventing the American people from expressing their wishes. Also, I deplore the fact that the Senate has failed to take action on a House-passed bill which would protect each and every one of you from receiving unsolicited obscene mail.

These are just a few of the problems facing the Congress today. In addition, we are plagued by the continued vacillation and uncertainty of the administration in conducting our foreign policy. One day the President states that he has no intention of going into North Vietnam to preserve the freedom of South Vietnam. The next day, the President's Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs, William P. Bundy, said extension of the Vietnamese war outside South Vietnam "could be forced upon us by the increased external pressures of the Communists." The only thing that I can conclude from this is that the President and his Assistant Secretary of State are not coordinating. In fact, it almost makes me wonder if they are speaking to each other.

We also have reports that field agents of the Department of State have been ordered to burn the bulk of field office records containing data on Government security risks. Interestingly enough, the Members of Congress learned about this through an article in the Chicago Tribune. Nothing ever appeared in prior official reports to the Congress or in the Washington newspapers. I have made strong protest in this matter directly to the Secretary of State. This definitely points out the need for House approval of the Information bill, S. 1666, already passed by the Senate, giving citizens the right to file suit in a Federal court to force Government agencies to disclose information which is not injurious to the national security. I definitely believe the American people have the right to know what their Government is doing.

As I witness what is going on in Congress and in the other branches of your Government, I cannot help but wonder if some in government may not have forgotten that they are your servants and not your masters. Each one of you will have the privilege of voting on November 3 to reaffirm the fact that you are the master. Two thousand four hundred years ago Plato said: "The punishments of wise men who refuse to take part in the affairs of Government is to live under the Government of unwise men." This is still so true today.

Remember: "Vote and the choice is yours. Don't vote and the choice is theirs." It only takes one vote to decide the outcome of an election—and that one vote could be yours.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLOTTE T. REID,
Your Member of Congress.

The Fourth Anniversary of Mali

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 1, 1964

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on September 22, the Republic of Mali celebrated the fourth anniversary of her independence. I wish to commemorate this occasion at this time, by extending our warm felicitations to His Excellency the President of the Republic of Mali, Modibo Keita.

Four years ago, President Keita proclaimed the Republic of Mali. He thus closed another chapter in the evolution of his country from the French colony of Soudan to an independent and progressive African state which is trying to transform itself into a modern nation. Envisioning a greater West African nation, two former West African French territories, Senegal and Soudan, united in the Federation of Mali. They chose for their union the name of the great empire that had once spread over much of the area. Internal difficulties soon rent the Federation and Senegal broke away in August 1960.

Left alone, the Soudanese or Malians as they were now called, did not turn back, but instead strove to live up to the name of "Mali," which means hippopotamus in one of their languages and signifies strength. They sought to mobilize the country's resources in order to build a modern, viable state which would not have to rely on other countries for its existence.

To map its progress, the Malian Government instituted an ambitious 5-year plan which takes into account the fact that Mali is a landlocked country and that the country's economy does and will rest for sometime on farming, livestock, and fishing.

Mali is fortunate in possessing an agricultural base which can provide revenue for development. Attention is being paid to this sector of the nation's life and to the construction of industrial plants which will process Mali's agricultural products—meat, cotton, peanuts, vegetables, and fruits—and thus save or provide badly needed foreign exchange. The Government has also tackled the problem of transportation in order to facilitate the movement of goods within Mali itself and to its neighbors whose ports handle Mali's produce.

While it is using all internal resources that it can muster, the Malian Government realizes that it will have to rely in part on outside financial and technical assistance for some time to come. In line with its neutralist posture, Mali has accepted aid from a variety of countries, including the United States. France, who remains its largest trading partner, also provides the greatest number of technicians. However, the final goal is self-sufficiency and already many talented Malians have taken over positions formerly held by outsiders.

On this fourth anniversary of its proclamation as a Republic, I salute Mali on the serious efforts which it has made toward its development and I commend the earnest dedication of the many young Malians who are working hard for the betterment of their fellow citizens. Their endeavors are enabling Mali to live up to what its name means—strength.

Frank Daley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 1, 1964

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I was very deeply touched to learn of the recent untimely passing of my dear and valued friend, Frank Daley.

The notable career of this fine American was marked by an unusual spirit of dedication to his daily tasks and duties. His was a gifted and versatile mind, well stocked with ideas. He was aware, knowledgeable, and effective in probing complex political and governmental problems.

His capability ranged over a wide field, and he was extremely well informed on a great variety of subjects. A publicist of skill and ingenuity, a commentator of eloquent phrasing and penetrating analysis, a champion of many good causes, he was fired by lusty enthusiasm and was anxious to work with zeal and devotion in whatever he undertook.

Frank Daley was esteemed and respected in the Boston and Washington communities, and wherever he was known, for his ready wit, his keen mind, his broad interest and his unflagging labors. He was endowed with rare imagination and the gift of foresight and deep understanding of the problems of government and their reaction upon public opinion. He was an accurate forecaster of political movements and events.

I have known Frank Daley for years and have always held him in highest regard. He was a good, loyal friend, warmhearted and generous spirited, and a considerate, gracious companion, always eager to lend a helping hand.

He was in tune with the pace of modern life and a human being of understanding and love of his fellow man, exceptionally devoted to his family and friends and the cause of his country. We of Massachusetts are very proud of Frank Daley and his unselfish, constructive contributions, and we join in mourning him.

We are all the richer for having known and enjoyed the friendship of this talented publicist and honored public relations specialist, who was widely recognized as one of the best in his field.

Those of us who were his friends, as well as community, State and Nation, have suffered a great and poignant loss and with a sense of deep grief share the great loss which has been sustained by his family and his dear ones and which is felt by all of us who knew him well.

I feel a special sense of personal loss and sorrow, because I entertained deep affection for this fine, devoted, loyal friend, who so greatly and constructively adorned the congressional scene during the time he has been with us, and whose warm personality, sincerity, kindness, good works, counsel, and solid achievements will long remain before us, not only as a very happy memory, but as a true source of gratitude and inspiration.

Frank Daley was a great American and a dear, esteemed friend. I extend my most heartfelt sympathy to his bereaved family and all his dear ones, for whom he had such great love, and hope that the Good Lord will lighten their heavy burden of sorrow and bring them His consoling blessings of comfort, courage, and peace.

May Frank Daley find eternal rest in his heavenly home.

May the Good Lord keep and cherish him.

Foreign Economic Policy: The Herter Lecture Series

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 1, 1964

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, shortly before the opening of the 1st session of the 88th Congress, I had the pleasure of initiating the Christian Herter Lecture

Series at Tufts University. I placed this speech in the Congressional Record, volume 109, part 1, page 581. Because of the interest that has been shown by my colleagues in the matters which I discussed therein, and the pertinency it has to the present GATT trade negotiations, I want to place the matter in the Record again. Under unanimous consent I place the material in the Record at this point:

FOREIGN ECONOMIC POLICY

(Remarks of the Honorable Thomas B. Curtis, Republican, Second Missouri District, at the Herter Lecture, Tufts University, Boston, Mass., Monday, Jan. 7, 1963)

It is a privilege to be a participant in the Christian Herter lecture series established at this great university. It is appropriate that I should discuss foreign trade on this occasion as Christian Herter, the first Chief Trade Negotiator of the United States, pilots this Nation on a new and an uncharted course in the altered archipelago of foreign trade.

I would be remiss if I did not take note of the appearance of Walter Hallstein, the President of the European Economic Community, here at Tufts in April of 1962, to lecture on the dramatic economic developments occurring in Western Europe in the 5 years since the Rome Treaty was signed. This massive emergence is one of the major reasons that old charts and old courses must be abandoned and new ones charted.

The most important provision of the Reciprocal Trades Act of 1962 (Trade Expansion Act) was the creation of the position of Chief Trade Negotiator requiring Presidential appointment and Senate confirmation, carrying with it the rank of Ambassador Plenipotentiary, and investing in it the basic powers of negotiating our trade treaties, and chairing the newly designed Intercabinet Trade Policy Committee.

There are two basic reasons for the importance of this provision. First, it raised the stature of trade negotiating throughout the world. Other countries sent their trade negotiating teams to Geneva headed by top Cabinet officers or other top governmental officials. The United States, on the other hand, frequently and usually sent a team headed or directed by a top civil service employee, a highly competent person with highly competent people to assist him, but one with no stature of his own. His decisions were subject to telephone approvals sought from other faceless officials back in Washington, D.C. Now this has been changed. The decisions now will be made on the spot backed by the authority and integrity of one of the highest officials in our Government, one who is directly responsible to the President.

Second, it raises the stature of trade negotiating in the United States. Personally, I favored the creation of a new Department of Foreign Economics headed by a Cabinet officer who would be the Chief Trade Negotiator, and who would draw together in one place all the various important points where foreign economics impinge upon our domestic economics. As it is, the contact points of foreign economic forces are spread in an uncoordinated fashion throughout our Federal departments, bureaus, and agencies.

I believe foreign trade or, to use the broader terms, foreign economics, has assumed such great importance to our Nation, even though trade itself amounts to less than 10 percent of our gross national product, that we could not possibly deal with the problems it creates under our former administrative setup.

However, I believe it is possible for the Chief Trade Negotiator to develop the powers that are entrusted to him in the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 so that he can deal with the most important of the foreign economic contact points.

The powers that go with preparing for trade negotiating are vested in this newly created office. The powers of conducting the negotiations of course are vested here. Furthermore, if the concept of the Intercabinet Trade Policy Committee that some of us had, and tried to spell out in the committee report and during the congressional debate, is carried out, the compliance with the treaties and agreements negotiated will be supervised by the Chief Trade Negotiator. Finally, the Committee has authority to develop procedures for receiving, hearing, evaluating and recommending remedial action to the President on allegations of unfair trade practices which bear on foreign trade agreements, even though not specifically a part of them.

These charges of unfair trade practices may be directed against foreign or domestic businessmen, I hasten to point out.

At this point, let me state that President Kennedy by appointing a former U.S. Secretary of State to the position of Chief Trade Negotiator has captured the full significance of upgrading the place foreign trade should hold in the council of nations and in the United States. Let me further state that by appointing a person with the wisdom, experience, imagination, and integrity that Christian Herter possesses, we are most likely to develop the governmental machinery the new law makes possible for dealing with the problems presented in the field of foreign economics.

It is in these areas that the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 deserves the oft applied cliche, bold and imaginative. At the same time I make this point I want to make the point that what has been hailed as bold and imaginative in the Trade Expansion Act—the granting to the President of additional trading material to further reduce tariff rates and eliminate many altogether—is shirking and sterotype. This is no more than the last possible move remaining that could be made under the provisions of the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act of 1930. Too many people have forgotten that the Reciprocal Trade Acts were mere amendments to this basic act which remains on the books today. By starting from a level of high tariff rates, we were able to negotiate downward as Congress intermittently gave the President power to do so. Incidentally, the original Reciprocal Trade Act and most of those that followed permitted the President to negotiate upward if he had been so inclined, and so does the present law. This point has not been overlooked by many people who are unsympathetic with the doctrine of freer trade and may have a great significance. Time will tell.

What our trade policy will be, once we have used this last bit of tariff trading material the President now has is one of the questions not yet resolved.

I have said that in this area of trading material the act is shirking, not bold. I justify my choice of words for the following reason. Today tariffs are among the least of the trade barriers that hamper free trade. Quotas, licenses, embargoes, internal excises, monetary policies, exchange rates, governmental subsidies of an infinite variety, state trading, Government sponsored or unrestrained cartels, health and other regulatory laws perverted to embargoes are the major barriers in international trade today. The United States is an offender in these areas, along with the other major trading nations, yet nothing meaningful is said in the Trade Expansion Act about these trade barriers. The GATT, which seeks to eliminate all trade barriers, remains unmentioned in the Trade Expansion Act, either by name or by reference to its principles.

As a matter of fact, the most liberal of all trade barriers is the much abused tariff which is now being abandoned in toto. A tariff at least is a law for all to read, determine, and apply, and courts have been set up to resolve differences of interpretations in accordance with established laws and procedures. The other types of trade barriers I have listed almost without exception require administrative determination without established laws, procedures, or courts. Who gets a quota, and how much, and into what ports in what quantities is the subject of administrative negotiation. This is government by men, not government by law. In this process woe betides the little operator and fortune blesses the operator with political connections and power.

The trade adjustment features in the Trade Expansion Act deserve no such accolade as bold and imaginative. Redundant and defensive are the adjectives that come to my mind to describe them. The adjustment features for the unemployed duplicate the provisions in our unemployment insurance laws, our Manpower Training Act, and our depressed areas legislation. These new provisions can only confuse and damage established programs and do little or no good. The adjustment features which relate to employers are unnecessary for large corporations which can adjust their line of products and services within their own structure, and duplicate for smaller businesses the loan provisions of the Small Business Act. I used the adjective "defensive" because these provisions were placed in the law as a defense mechanism against those who had been claiming for years that foreign competition damaged their business or their jobs. The same reasoning could be applied to any form of competition. The proponents of this defense mechanism fell back on the thesis that this economic damage results from the governmental action in reducing tariff rates and, therefore, the Government should compensate. The same reasoning should then apply when Government moves its contracts from certain businesses in one area to businesses in other areas, or when Government takes any action which has an impact upon the marketplace. This would be quite an undertaking for a government with an annual expenditure of $100 billion.

At this point I would like to make an observation that I have been making for the past few years. I am convinced that most of our people who think they want protection really want fairness in trading—not protection, not an advantage, and definitely not a handout. I have listened for years to the testimony of businessmen, labor, and farm groups who have appeared before the Ways and Means Committee in opposing the Reciprocal Trade Act extension. I have dug into what seemed to be bothering them. Most of their troubles arise from lack of fairness or reciprocity in trade matters on the part of their foreign competitors, from a State subsidy to their competitor, or an embargo, or a quota system, or an unhealthy wage scale—unhealthy to the overall economy of the country which permitted it.

I recall a statement from one of our exporters to Venezuela. He said his company was unable to compete with the Western German companies in that market because the German companies could offer more liberal credit terms financed by the German Government. I posed this case to Secretary of Commerce Hodges during the public hearings on the Trade Expansion Act last year. The Secretary's response worried me. He said, "Well, we will look into that and perhaps we (meaning some governmental agency) can enable the U.S. companies to match this liberal credit extension." My expressed thought was, if we really are talking about freeing up trade, why not negotiate with the German Government to quit subsidizing their businesses? Don't compound the error by subsidizing ours.

Another matter coming out of the hearings comes to my mind which illustrates the point in a somewhat different way. The Secretary of Interior pointed with some pride to the fact that Government loans had been extended to some of our west coast fishermen who otherwise would have been forced out of business by the Japanese. The point was that our fishing boats were obsolete and needed renovation. I asked why the tariff on fish was not increased, if there was to be protection. In that way the most efficient of our fishermen would do the renovation. By a subsidy, the fishermen who were most efficient in presenting their case to the Small Business Administration for the guaranteed loan, not necessarily the best fishermen, would do the renovation. Either way, however, we were not freeing up trade and by the subsidy method we might even be keeping an inefficient operation alive which would be coming back for more subsidy. As a not too irrelevant side point, there was testimony to the effect that it was not the efficiency of the Japanese fishing boats as much as it was the noncompliance by the Japanese with the international fishing agreements set up for conservation purposes which kept our fishermen from competing.

If this latter point turned out to be true, the gravamen of our fishermen's case was not protection of an American industry, but rather, insistence on the mutual observance of good conservation laws. By protecting instead of insisting that a violation cease, we compounded the error and impeded the expansion of trade.

I want to express one other specific point of concern I have about our foreign trade policy. Section 203 of the Agriculture Act which authorizes the President to enter into international cartel agreements in respect to agricultural products and products manufactured therefrom with other nations was not only not repealed by the Congress, but at the request of the administration, its authority was broadened to provide that these agreements would be made binding on nations not party to the international agreement. It was this authority, incidentally, that lay at the base of the International Textile Agreement entered into in Geneva in January of 1962.

I asked Secretary of Commerce Hodges how it was determined how much textile, of what varieties, from what companies, from what countries were to come into what U.S. ports. He replied straight facedly that they were going to use the 1960 census figures. In other words, we are going to freeze the trade pattern as of that date. How expansive and progressive can we get? I know of nothing that more dramatically drives home the point I seek to make of the regressiveness, the stifling aspects of the license-quota type trade barrier. Is this what we are coming to once we have run out of the tariff-rate trading material set up in the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act? This is not an isolated example of our use of quotas and licenses or international type cartel agreements. The Sugar Act is an example. Many of our agricultural products are state traded, under Public Law 480. Indeed, very few agricultural products move without knocking against these kinds of trade barriers and government subsidies. Recently we have been utilizing the quota system instead of tariffs for oil imports.

And now I must relate another important piece of legislation affecting foreign economics which was passed the last session of Congress. I refer to the Revenue Act of 1962; that part which altered the tax treatment of American enterprise abroad. It has been my observation that we cannot separate trade from foreign investment and that anything that deters foreign investment will deter trade. I think this is particularly true in face of the development of the European Common Market. Much has been made of the efficiencies the EEC countries will derive from manufacturing for a mass market. However, these are efficiencies that they should be able to put into effect without too much to do. However, mass manufacturing is based upon mass distribution and mass servicing, a point that seems to escape many economic planners. It requires the economic infrastructure of power, communications, transportation, and education. The United States is just about the only society that has developed the techniques of mass distribution and mass servicing. For this reason I have suggested that the greatest opportunities open to U.S. enterprise in the European Common Market lie in the field of distribution and servicing.

If some question this point, let me give just a practical illustration which may drive it home. I have a friend who mass-produces special pallets to be used in mass warehousing where turnover is fast and handling must be made as efficient as possible. There is no market in Europe, as yet, for his product, because warehousing has not been developed to this point and probably will not be for many years.

We have had so little regard for the distributive and servicing sectors of our economy, probably as a result of what seems to be our mesmerization with mass production, that we really have been unaware of what is going on. We accept packaging as routine and actually curse advertising with an unawareness of the vital economic part they both play in obtaining the efficiencies that can be had in a mass market. Perhaps this point will drive the point home; while employment has been steadily declining in manufacturing in the United States, employment in the service and distributive fields has continued to climb, even during our post-World War II recessions.

Now, to get back to the point I sought to make about foreign investment. If we are going to avail ourselves of the opportunities offered in the European Common Market in the service and distributive fields, we must encourage, not discourage, our capital to move there. All the talk about our manufacturing processes moving to Europe is largely unanalytical. What movement there has been is largely to gain the efficiencies derived from having a crucial part of the manufacturing process nearer to the market for distributive and servicing efficiencies. Actually this process creates more jobs in the United States than it displaces, not less. However, it is true the jobs will be shifted out of manufacturing into distribution and servicing, but they will become better paying and requiring less brawn, but a little more brains.

It certainly is a shortsighted policy which seeks to solve a balance-of-payments problem through discouraging healthy and remunerative private investment going abroad. This is sacrificing gain over the long haul for a very temporary short-term benefit. One of the strongest items in our balance of payments is the income we derive from our foreign investment. And yet Government policy seeks to weaken it.

I do not introduce the subject to argue its merits or demerits. I brought it up primarily to emphasize its inseparable relation to our trade policy. In trade we talk of going one way, toward expansion, to help our balance of payments, and in investment we talk and promote contraction, allegedly for the same purpose. This is a grave inconsistency.

I do not like to mention the relatively trivial items the administration sponsored in the previous Congress, such as increasing the tariffs on the most person to person of all foreign trade, the trade between our tourists and the foreign shopkeeper, and cutting back on military personnel purchasing abroad. But they are straws in the wind which reflect the way the trade policy really is blowing. These two pieces of legislation were also promoted in the name of balance-of-payments problems.

I must mention a major administration policy not referred to the Congress but set by Executive decree. This is the buy-American program, adopted by the Defense Department. This policy requires purchases of military goods to be made in the United States if the U.S. price is not 25 percent greater than the foreign price. Already this has cost the Military Establishment over $100 million; at least, that is the boast of the Defense Department and the administration when they were toting up the effective job they claimed they had done in respect to the balance-of-payments problem.

While the administration talks freer trade, every policy it has followed to date indicates it is pursuing a course of more restricted trade—all in the name of balance of payments.

From this discussion you may be gaining the impression that I am the greatest free trader since Adam Smith. In theory, I guess I may be, but in practice I am a fair trader which puts me in bad with the so-called protectionists with some frequency. I happen to believe that increased trade depends upon free trade and free trade depends upon fair trade. The points at issue revolve around the definition of fair trade. For a starter I will take the definitions set forth in the GATT. What my protectionist friends call protection I find, on analysis, to be usually a differential, reflecting some subsidy or impact of a trade barrier set up on the other side by the competitor. The policy I would have us pursue is to remove the subsidy or the barrier, which is the justification for the differential. However, if a differential is to be used, I would recommend that the most liberal differential possible be used; this happens to be also the most flexible—it is the tariff. I would adopt only as a last recourse the other differentials—those regressive devices of licenses, quotas and subsidies. I would eschew without equivocation health and other regulatory laws used as subterfuges for economic differentials.

I would oppose any differential that created a preference, that is, any differential which went beyond the economic difference sought to be measured for adjustment.

I think our foreign economic policy should be trade wherever possible, not aid; when trade is not possible, then loans rather than grants; where loans are not possible, then know-how rather than money; and when know-how is not possible, then outright gifts, rather than money with a string tied to it. When we get to money with strings tied to it, we move out of economics into diplomacy which is the realm of the State Department.

I am happy that foreign economics is being taken out of the hands of the State Department and is being placed, to some degree, in the hands of a new, independent and possibly coequal agency headed by the Chief Trade Negotiator. This new law serves as the authority to do this. I believe our State Department should be relieved from any control of the details that go to make up our economic arm, just as they have no control of the details that go to make up our military arm. Diplomacy is the area of endeavor of the State Department. In implementing our foreign policy, exercising diplomacy that is, we must be able to utilize the strength of either and both arms, military and economic. To make and keep them as strong as possible, they must be under the direction of their

specialists, not specialists in diplomacy who sometimes are tempted, like Xerxes, to whip the seas when the laws of nature fail to respond to their pleas.

Cameron Voting Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RONALD BROOKS CAMERON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 1, 1964

Mr. CAMERON. Mr. Speaker, this is my final rollcall report to constituents on the representation which I have given them in the 88th Congress. Differing slightly from the many periodic reports which have preceded it, a greater share of its contents is tabular material itemizing my voting and attendance record, rather than commentary on why I voted as I did. This shift in presentation stems from my desire to provide the electorate with my complete voting record—which necessitates having this report appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on the final day of the session—and the increasing number of rollcalls as the House pushed toward adjournment.

Nevertheless, this report does contain my condensed views on several measures which the House has considered since July 1. They include the Land and Water Conservation Fund, free medical care for owners of fishing boats, amendments to the Social Security Act, the wilderness bill, the President's recent action against North Vietnam, antipoverty legislation, increased pensions for veterans, and the Housing Act of 1964.

ROLLCALL NO. 187—LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND

Statistics indicate the emergency nature of establishing a Land and Water Conservation Fund, a proposal which I am happy to note had overwhelming approval of the House and Senate. Our population is increasing at the rate of 1.7 percent annually. Per capita real income is climbing at a comparable rate. People are finding a great deal more leisure time through shorter workweeks, longer retirement, and longer vacations. Attendance at parks and other outdoor recreation areas is jumping about 10 percent a year, or a doubling in attendance every 8 years. It has been reliably estimated that total recreation use in the year 2000 will be 10 times greater than it was a scant 8 years ago.

Faced with this crisis of population versus recreational space, the Land and Water Conservation Fund is aimed at tackling the problem on a Federal-State basis. The program permits the States to plan, acquire, and develop outdoor recreational facilities, while the Federal Government concerns itself only with acquiring recreational areas. To this end, 60 percent of the Fund must be allocated to the States on a 50–50 matching basis. The remaining money will be used by the National Government to purchase ideal recreational sites before the cost of land becomes prohibitive.

A pay-as-you-go program, the Fund will be financed from four sources: admission and user fees charged to persons using Federal outdoor recreation areas designated by the President; proceeds from the sale of Federal surplus real property; proceeds from the existing Federal tax on fuels used in motorboats; and repayable appropriations from the Treasury to help start the Fund. H.R. 3846 represented urgently needed legislation.

It was a carefully drawn bill, and it had my complete support.

ROLLCALL NO. 190—FREE MEDICAL CARE FOR FISHING BOAT OWNERS

In view of the 88th Congress reluctance to act on legislation which would provide senior citizens with medical care financed by social security taxes, it was quite paradoxical—and very regrettable—that both the House and Senate passed a bill which gives owners of fishing boats free medical care at Public Health Service hospitals. In examining the House vote, it was interesting to observe that some of the most stubborn and vocal "conservative" foes of medicare were among those Members voting for passage.

American taxpayers were told that they will have to pay out an estimated $1.8 million annually so that some 10,000 owner-operators of large fishing vessels can get free hospital care. Congress paid no heed to the Bureau of the Budget's recommendation that benefits provided under the bill ought to be paid for by the fishing industry or by the seamen through a user charge, or that there should be an increase in the tonnage tax on vessels.

A key question went unanswered during debate. Why can not the owner of a boat provide his own hospitalization or buy his own health insurance contract? He is able to do so. He is working. He has money.

Until 1954 these boatowners received free medical care, but a decade ago fairness prevailed and they were removed from what the critics of medicare call socialized medicine. Indeed, if medicare is "evil," why the big push to bring owners back under it?

Proponents of the bill had only one argument: to restore a traditional right, one that had been earned because of working at a "hazardous occupation." Using this reasoning, why not provide free medical care for farmers who are apt to lose an arm or a leg while operating cornpickers and other mechanized tools? Certainly the vast majority of farmers are worse off economically than fishing boat entrepreneurs.

As a vigorous proponent of medicare, I could not become a party to hyprocrisy and I voted against the bill.

ROLLCALL NO. 197—WILDERNESS BILL

The wilderness bill has been described as one of the most vital conservation measures ever before the Congress. Sponsored by a bipartisan group of House Members, it was supported by practically all National and State conservation organizations and civic groups having an interest in natural resources and conservation.

The bill, which establishes a national policy for wilderness preservation and a program to make it effective, places 9.2 million acres of our national forests and wild areas in the National Wilderness Preservation System. In addition, it provides that 5.6 million acres may be added during a 10-year review period. Any changes in the system can be made only after public hearings and congressional review.

During floor action a provision was removed which would permit ski commercialization in 3,500 acres of southern California's Mount San Gorgonio Wild Area. It seemed incongruous to embrace legislation which, on the one hand, was designed to preserve primitive areas, yet, at the same time, would allow commercialization of a wilderness site close to my congressional district. Mail from individuals ran heavily in opposition to the so-called ski amendment, whereas organizational or inspired pressure group mail was heavily in favor. I was pleased that the amendment was struck from the bill.

ROLLCALL NO. 210—VIETNAM RESOLUTION

National unity as reflected by the Congress following the unprovoked attacks upon American vessels by North Vietnam came as a stern reminder to friend and foe alike that the United States will protect its own interests and promote the cause of peace wherever and whenever the challenge arises.

After meeting with my colleagues in an executive session of the House Foreign Affairs Committee to hear Secretary of State Rusk, Secretary of Defense McNamara, and General Wheeler, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, give testimony in support of the joint congressional resolution calling for maintenance of international peace and security in southeast Asia, there could be no question that President Johnson took a firm, prudent, and proper course in ordering retaliatory air strikes against North Vietnamese military installations.

The President acted with the dignity and determination appropriate to the leader of the free world's strongest nation, and he deserves the unwavering support of all citizens in any further action which becomes necessary in the critical period ahead. President Johnson proved himself to be a Commander in Chief who is calm under pressure, courageous when challenged, and clear thinking when faced with a complex international crisis.

It is unfortunate, therefore, that the responsible action which he took—action which was widely acclaimed at home and abroad—is now being distorted by issue-hungry politicians who have quick trigger fingers, poor aim, and even worse judgment. Irresponsible allegations to the effect that the President authorized military commanders to use nuclear weapons against North Vietnam were soundly criticized by the press and public, and correctly so. Election year or not, I am sure the American people will not allow such gross distortions, misrepresentations, and falsehoods to go unchallenged. Proof of this is evident in the "yes-I-said-it, no-I-didn't" stance which has now been adopted—as could be expected on the basis of past performance—by President Johnson's principal detractor, a person who, only a few short months ago, himself advocated giving military commanders the option to use nuclear weapons at their own discretion.

ROLLCALLS NOS. 212-216—ANTIPOVERTY BILL

With passage of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 the Congress and the Nation pledged an attack on poverty in the midst of plenty. But the act is no panacea for poverty. It will not wipe out deprivation and dependency with a single stroke. Its fruits will not be harvested in a year or in a decade. But it is a beginning, an acknowledgment that the world's wealthiest and mightiest nation will not stand idly by while millions of its citizens waste away on the vine of degradation and despair. And in extending a helping hand to young and old alike, the poverty program seeks to release them from the harness of the handout. The act seeks to do what its title implies: provide an opportunity for economic self-help.

The program does this in several ways. It establishes a Job Corps for youths 16 to 21 years of age to provide them with education, vocational training, and useful work experience, including conservation work. It sets up a work-training program to employ youth locally, and authorizes Federal aid to colleges and universities to provide part-time jobs for students from low-income families who need the work to continue their studies.

At the heart of the Economic Opportunity Act is the community action program which relies upon the traditional and proven American method of helping organized local communities to help themselves develop antipoverty programs geared to the needs of the individual area. Programs will be conducted by public or private nonprofit agencies with the maximum possible participation by local residents. Funds will be used for education, employment, job training and counseling, health, vocational rehabilitation, housing, home management and welfare.

Another key section of the program provides for loans to small businesses on more liberal terms than the regular loan provisions of the Small Business Administration. The money must be earmarked for training and employment of long-term unemployed persons or to promote management skills.

Contrary to what many partisan critics of the program allege, the Economic Opportunity Act is not a Federal "power grab." It contains specific language to maintain a proper role between the National Government and the individual States and local communities. The Governor of a State has the right to veto the establishment of a Job Corps camp, just as he holds veto power over all antipoverty projects contracted between the Federal Government and a private agency.

The act recognizes that if the war on poverty is to be won all levels of government must pool and coordinate their efforts to promote the common good. As Lincoln observed when he commented on the general welfare more than a century ago:

> If the Nation refuse to make improvements of the more general kind because their benefits may be somewhat local, a State may for the same reason refuse to make an improvement because its benefits may be somewhat general. Thus it is seen that if this argument of inequality is sufficient anywhere, it is sufficient everywhere, and puts an end to improvements altogether.

ROLLCALL NO. 217—VETERANS PENSIONS

When the House unanimously passed H.R. 1927 it renewed its commitment to the men who defended our country in World Wars I and II and the Korean conflict, as well as to their widows and children. The bill was endorsed by all of the Nation's leading veterans organizations, and I was especially pleased that it was supported by W. R. Kime, national commander of the Veterans of World War I, who informed the House Veterans' Affairs Committee that it would "not hear anything more from national headquarters about Discharge Petition No. 4—re H.R. 2332—during my administration."

H.R. 1927, which liberalizes non-service-connected pension payments, is long overdue. Predicated on the basis of need, its benefits are justly deserved. It is an important step toward assuring that veterans and their families will be able to afford a more healthful and fuller life.

The bill, which improves the pension law in several ways, would allow new exclusions from income in determining eligibility. The veteran could exclude 10 percent of the total social security payments he receives in 1 year, guaranteeing that the recent 5-percent increase in social security benefits would not cut his pension. Also excludable is the amount paid for the last illness and burial of his deceased spouse or child, profit from nonbusiness sale of property, any bonus paid by the State, payments received under the War Orphan's Act, and all of a wife's earned income. Under present law, a veteran can exclude only the first $1,200 of her income when calculating his own income.

The bill also removes the present requirement that veterans must be 10-percent disabled and unemployable to receive a pension at age 65. It increases the additional allowance for aid and attendance cases from $70 to $100, and it provides a new rate of $35 additional per month to any veteran who is permanently housebound.

The total cost factor of the bill will not involve a prohibitive cost upon the economy but will stabilize for the next several years at about $100 million annually. This figure compares to an estimated $1 billion annually had H.R. 2332, a proposed pension bill solely for veterans of World War I, been enacted. The cost burden of this measure would be so great—and it in no way relates to the need of the individual recipient—that it would jeopardize existing pension programs for veterans of all wars who have service-connected disabilities. H.R. 1927 properly considered the needs of all veterans and it had my wholehearted support.

ROLLCALLS NOS. 224-225—HOUSING ACT

The Housing Act of 1964 did not authorize any new housing programs but merely extended present programs for another year. It did contain, however, several key provisions designed to tighten administration of the program and correct weaknesses in present law. As the Republican floor manager of the bill said:

> I do not believe there is any reason to fear Federal involvement or control—this is, instead, an effort to promote more local responsibility and a lessening of the need for future Federal assistance and involvement.

The bill's major provisions would: permit lower down payments and higher mortgage amounts on FHA sales and give additional protection against foreclosure for FHA homeowners; authorize additional funds for low-interest direct loans for rental housing for the elderly, and new housing aids for the handicapped; authorize 35,000 additional units of low-rent public housing; provide an additional $25 million in grants for the parks and playgrounds program; and authorize additional grants for the urban renewal program and tighten its requirements to encourage more rehabilitation and code enforcement.

This latter feature, providing for more intensive enforcement of housing codes as they relate to safety and sanitation, could eliminate the first stages of blight and prevent the need for subsequent clearance through urban renewal projects. It also authorizes $50 million in low-interest loans to help homeowners and businessmen to improve their properties before they deteriorate to a level where bulldozers have to be called in to tear them down. There can be little doubt that the cost of these loans will be repaid many times over by the reduced need for demolition of buildings in urban renewal areas.

The 88th Congress—A Record of Achievement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 1, 1964

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, the 88th Congress will probably adjourn in a few days. As has been my practice in the past, I am sending to the citizens of the Fourth Congressional District of Pennsylvania, whom it is my privilege to represent, a report printed at my expense on the work of this Congress.

The year 1963 will mean many things to many people, but history will probably record it as the year the President of the

United States, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, was assassinated. This great young man will long live in our hearts.

In those dark hours of that tragic November 22, and through the succeeding days and weeks, our Nation was blessed to have strong shoulders to which the burdens of the Executive Office could be shifted. President Lyndon B. Johnson picked up the reins without faltering, without permitting any loss in national momentum. He pledged himself to dedicate his efforts to the attainment of President Kennedy's program. He directed his tremendous energy to that task.

The record of the 88th Congress, described by competent and impartial observers as one of the most constructive in our Nation's annals, serves in large part as a tribute to his dedication, his ability, and the success of his efforts.

This Congress has been one of the longest in our country's history. The first session ended the day before Christmas 1963, having been in session through the previous night until 7 a.m. The second session will probably have an October 1964 dateline. While all the legislation considered by this Congress cannot be listed here, I am including some of the major actions.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

At the present time about 60 percent of all money appropriated by the Congress goes for national defense. This sum is eight times more than the total financing of all health, education, labor, and welfare programs, the second largest category of Federal spending, which accounts for only 7.6 percent of the national budget. The cost of maintaining freedom is high.

Yet, by planning military expenditures in 5-year cycles, by avoiding unnecessary duplication in equipment, and by using the competitive purchasing methods of private business, the Defense Department saved $2.5 billion in the fiscal year 1964 over what would have been spent using old methods of procurement.

I have voted for legislation which has made possible the development of our powerful and effective defense structure. President Johnson said on June 3, 1964:

> In every area of national strength America today is stronger than it has ever been before. It is stronger than any adversary or combination of adversaries. It is stronger than the combined might of all nations in the history of the world.

EDUCATION

I have long been interested in local, State, and Federal activity in the field of education. The first bill which I introduced in the present Congress was H.R. 945, to establish a Department of Education. I had introduced this bill in a previous Congress, at which time I said on the House floor:

> Aristotle * * * stated that "a lawgiver should direct his attention above all to the education of youth." What Aristotle said 2,200 years ago remains true today. Education has become the key to both national advancement and national survival. * * * What we do today has the most profound effect on what our world of tomorrow will be like.

Therefore, the actions of the 88th Congress, which may well be recorded in history as the "Education Congress," are particularly gratifying to me. The accomplishments include:

First. Higher Education Facilities Act: It is the first general college aid program ever enacted. It provides $1.2 billion in grants and loans over a 3-year period.

Second. Vocational Education Act: It provides $956 million in matching grants for the expansion of State vocational educational programs in the next 5 years. The law also authorizes work-study grants for needy vocational students.

Third. Medical and Dental School Act: It authorizes $175 million in grants to build such schools; also provides loans for students of medicine, dentistry, and osteopathy.

Fourth. Mental Health Facilities Act: It authorizes grants of $51.5 million over 3 years to train 20,000 teachers of mentally retarded and other handicapped children.

Fifth. National Defense Education Act: It increases funds for college loans; continues programs for science, mathematics, and foreign language training, and for counseling services.

Many worthy Philadelphia students have been able to continue in college because of the loan program under this act. The Federal loan program is acceptable to, and supported by, all elements interested in higher education. It provides for the return of the public funds with interest. It contains special inducements for teachers so that the teacher shortage can be overcome. It helps one of the most vital programs in the United States today.

Sixth. Library Service and Construction Act: It authorizes $25 million to help develop and expand existing libraries to cover urban as well as rural areas; also provides $20 million for new library construction.

TAX BILL

The Revenue Act of 1964 provided the biggest tax cut in our Nation's history—$11.5 billion in individual and corporate income levies. Designed to bring our free enterprise economy to its fullest potential, the largest share of the individual tax cut is going to the workingman, to families with incomes of $10,000 or less—and this group accounts for 85 percent of all taxpayers. Business gains have resulted from the $2.5 billion investment incentive for modernization and expansion, the corporate tax cut of more than $2 billion, and the release of millions of dollars into the spending stream. President Johnson did not underestimate the importance of this act when he called it the single most important step that we have taken to strengthen our economy since World War II.

CIVIL RIGHTS

The most comprehensive civil rights legislation ever enacted was passed with overwhelming bipartisan support by the Congress and was signed into law by President Johnson on July 2, 1964.

The act provides a legal framework for solving problems stemming from the abridgment or denial of civil rights. It emphasizes voluntary compliance, plus local and State enforcement if voluntary efforts fail. Much responsibility rests with the State authorities before Federal intervention.

The legislation is designed to prevent racial discrimination in these five areas: voting in Federal elections; access to public accommodations; the use of public facilities such as parks, libraries, and schools; programs supported by Federal funds, and employment.

In signing the bill, the President said:

> The purpose of this law is simple. It does not restrict the freedom of any American, so long as he respects the rights of others. It does not give special treatment to any citizen. It does say the only limit to a man's hope for happiness, and for the future of his children, shall be his own ability.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT

Last month President Johnson signed into law a bill "to mobilize the human and financial resources of the Nation to combat poverty in the United States." The act provides for a 3-year program, with appropriations of $947.5 million authorized in fiscal 1965 to combat poverty, which affects 20 percent of our Nation's population.

The new Office of Economic Opportunity, headed by Sargent Shriver, will administer the several programs authorized by the new law, including:

First. A Job Corps to provide 100,000 youths, ages 16–21, with a 2-year vocational training and work experience.

Second. A work-training program to enable 200,000 youths to work and train in their own communities on projects selected by local organizations or governments.

Third. A work-study program to provide part-time employment for 140,000 needy students to enable them to continue in college.

Fourth. A community action program to encourage urban and rural communities to prepare long-range plans to assist low-income individuals and families to obtain education, employment, job training and counseling, vocational rehabilitation, housing, and welfare.

Fifth. A corps of volunteers to act as a domestic peace corps among needy Americans.

I was particularly gratified by the passage of this bill, because I regard it not only as a measure designed to combat poverty but as an investment in our Nation's youth. It will meet the needs of idle young men who cannot find a place in today's labor market, because there is no place for them.

URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ACT

Public Law 88–379 authorizes Federal grants for the acquisition, construction, and improvement of facilities and equipment for local mass transit systems. These grants may cover up to two-thirds of the net cost of the new facilities, and may be made to local public authorities to help either publicly owned systems or systems privately owned and operated under a lease arrangement. A total of $300 million is authorized for appropriation over a 3-year period. Loan assistance is also provided by the extension of a provision in existing law authorizing $50 million for this purpose.

The Urban Mass Transportation Act also authorizes a research and development program for new and improved ways of meeting mass transit problems. For this purpose the balance of the $25 million grant authority provided by the Housing Act of 1961, plus up to $30 million of the new grant authority, would be made available.

The passage of Public Law 88–379 was a source of satisfaction to me, as I sponsored mass transportation proposals in the 88th Congress, as well as in the 87th Congress. In urging the House Committee on Banking and Currency to take favorable action, I stated:

> My own district in Philadelphia is in one of the metropolitan areas which is representative of the complex of problems connected with urban transportation. Although it is also one of the most fortunate in having been able to accomplish so much toward solution of at least some of the problems, nevertheless much remains to be done.

SOCIAL SECURITY

Both Houses have approved an increase in social security benefits, as well as a broadening of eligibility requirements for the program. The Senate version of the social security bill includes a modified hospitalization program financed through social security. As this is written, a House-Senate conference is working to iron out the differences in the two bills.

With a few days to go before adjournment, Congress now appears more likely to provide some increase in cash benefits to social security beneficiaries than to pass a health care measure. The latter also is greatly needed, and if not now provided for, I hope a medical care program for the aged will be enacted by the 89th Congress.

VETERANS' BENEFITS

The concern of Congress for veterans' needs is reflected in the following measures. Last year the Congress enacted two laws increasing payments to widows, children, and parents of veterans who died of service-connected disabilities. Other legislation provided additional compensation for service-incurred loss of hearing or speech. Congress also authorized the Veterans' Administration to waive recovery for defaults on home loans in certain hardship cases.

This year the Congress provided for additional assistance for children of veterans with total and permanent service-connected disability. Also authorized is a 5-year, $5 million-a-year program of aid to students on a matching basis for nursing home facilities in State veteran homes. Proposed pension legislation liberalizing the rates and income limitations of all non-service-connected pensions for World War I, World War II, and Korean veterans has been passed by the House and Senate and is now before a conference committee. The main feature of this legislation permits the exclusion of certain types of income in determining income for pension purposes. Cash benefits accruing to veterans under this legislation are estimated at more than $330 million in the next 5 years.

HOUSING

The Housing Act was extended for 1 year. It provided $725 million for urban renewal; permits 37,500 new public housing units; raises to $30,000 the mortgage insurance limit on one-family FHA homes; grants broader lending authority to banks; establishes a new $50 million program to induce property owners to rehabilitate slum properties; authorizes 20-year loans at 3-percent interest to owners and tenants of property in urban renewal areas: up to $10,000 for homes and $50,000 for nonresidential property; establishes $150 million for direct farm housing loans; $75 million for direct housing loans for the elderly; $30 million for urban planning assistance in renewal areas; $25 million for grants to help in purchase of park lands and open space areas; $10 million for a new program of low-rent housing for migrant farmworkers; and finally, sets up relocation payments up to $1,500 for each business, and a rent supplement for families paid over a period of 5 months, for residents and businesses displaced by urban renewal.

CONSERVATION

The passage of the act establishing the National Wilderness Preservation System represents the culmination of numerous years of effort, both in and out of Congress. This action was a source of deep satisfaction to me, as I know it is to the people of my district in Philadelphia who, like those in all other regions of our country, but particularly those of the heavily settled eastern seaboard, are greatly interested in preserving for ourselves and for future generations these "wilderness areas."

Under this legislation 9.1 million acres of federally owned lands are to be permanently preserved in their primeval, untrammeled state. Over the next 10 years the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture are to make recommendations concerning possible inclusion in the system of nearly 52 million more acres of Government land now classified as primitive national forests, national park areas, seashores, and game ranges or refuges.

The land and water conservation fund, also enacted into law this year, will assist the States in providing adequate outdoor recreation facilities to meet growing public needs.

EQUAL PAY

An equal-pay-for-equal-work bill had been introduced in every Congress since 1945 by both Republicans and Democrats. A bill was finally passed in this 88th Congress, Public Law 88–38, prohibiting discrimination in pay on the basis of sex in work that is subject to the minimum wage laws. Because this act excludes from coverage several categories of workers, it is not as strong as those of us who have long worked for equal pay would like it to be. However, it is a step in the right direction.

NUCLEAR TEST BAN TREATY

No commentary on the 88th Congress would be complete without mention of the limited test ban treaty.

On July 26, 1963, President Kennedy, addressing the Nation on radio and television, said:

> This treaty * * * will not resolve all conflicts * * * but it is an important first step—a step toward peace—a step toward reason—a step away from war.
>
> My fellow Americans, let us take that first step. Let us, if we can, get back from the shadows of war and seek out the way of peace. And if that journey is 1,000 miles, or even more, let history record that we, in this land, at this time, took the first step.

Signed by Great Britain, the Soviet Union, and more than 100 other nations, and ratified by an 80 to 19 bipartisan vote in the U.S. Senate, the treaty advances our national interest by checking the spread of nuclear weapons and reducing fallout hazards.

The agreement bans nuclear tests in areas where detection capability is good—space, the atmosphere, and under water. Underground testing can continue, however, as long as radioactive debris does not spread beyond the testing nation's territory. The treaty in no way restricts the use of nuclear weapons in wartime, and it contains a withdrawal clause if "extraordinary events have jeopardized the supreme interests" of the nation. While America does not relax its guard—maintaining on a standby basis testing facilities silenced by the ban—we have demonstrated our genuine interest in the health and peace of the world.

I had hoped that in 1964 the Congress would revise the archaic national origins provisions of our immigration law. The Subcommittee on Immigration and Nationality of the House Judiciary Committee has held extensive hearings, beginning on June 11, on pending immigration proposals, including my bill. I urged the subcommittee to take action designed to correct discriminatory and other iniquitous features of our immigration code.

However, since the last two parts of the hearings have not reached the printing stage as of this writing, it is not expected that Congress will entirely revise the antiquated immigration system in this session.

It has been an honor to represent the 4th Congressional District of Pennsylvania in the 88th Congress and I want to express my appreciation to my constituents for this privilege. If reelected on November 3 to the 89th Congress, I shall diligently continue to keep up with all matters which affect the district and the Nation and to serve my people in every possible way.

Secretary McNamara's Statement Before the Democratic Platform Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUCIEN N. NEDZI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 1, 1964

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, my colleague, Mr. FORD, placed in the RECORD a letter, dated September 15, 1964, from former Defense Secretary Thomas S. Gates to Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara. So that the matter can be viewed in its full context, I feel it would be fitting to place in the RECORD the other items involved in the exchange of correspondence. These consist of a telegram Secretary McNamara sent to Mr. Gates on August 31, 1964, as well as Secretary McNamara's response on September 18, 1964, to Mr. Gates' September 15 letter.

Press Release

Secretary of Defense McNamara today issued the following statement in connection with the exchange of correspondence with former Secretary of Defense Thomas Gates:

"It is unfortunate that any misunderstanding has arisen about my opinion of my predecessor, Thomas Gates. As I emphasized in my telegram of August 31, 1964, to Mr. Gates, which I am releasing at his request, I have the highest regard for him and for the personal contributions he made to our Nation's security as Secretary of Defense."

The Secretary of Defense,
Washington, D.C., August 31, 1964.

Dear Tom: I understand from Doug Dillon that you were concerned about my statement before the Democratic Platform Committee. I recognize the cause of your concern and the importance of keeping the Defense Department out of the partisan political arena. I need hardly tell you how much I appreciate your contributions to the national security and the importance of programs and policies you instituted as Secretary of Defense.

For 3½ years I have tried to prevent Defense policies and programs from being discussed in a partisan context. I have taken every opportunity to make certain that the American people understand that Defense is not a partisan political matter; but rather that it is a complex problem to which you and I and many others in and out of uniform have given and are giving our best efforts in the interest of our national security. I have tried to point this out on numerous occasions. For example,

At a press conference on May 26, 1961, I said, "I think Tom Gates, more than any other Secretary in recent years, did much to establish a close relationship with the chiefs I have endeavored to expand upon that relationship."

At a press conference on July 6, 1962, I said: "The Air Force has in the past year, as a result of work that started long before we entered the Department, introduced a new maintenance system which is substantially increasing the efficiency of their maintenance operations."

Before the American Society of Newspaper Editors on April 20, 1963, I said: "When we took office, we had a firm base from which to work. My predecessor, Tom Gates, had already given strong support to such programs as Minuteman and Polaris, which are designed to ride out any conceivable attack."

In my statement before the Foreign Relations Committee on August 13, 1963, I said: "There have been very substantial increases in our nuclear forces over the last 5 years."

It has been my consistent position that defense matters should be kept outside the partisan political arena. Even responding to charges made by a Republican Task Force on June 29, 1964, I stated:

"I read with regret the partisan attack on our Nation's military program contained in the report of the Republican Policy Committee's Task Force on American Strategy and Strength.

"The national defense has always been a bipartisan activity of the U.S. Government. To date Republicans as well as Democrats have supported the national defense program of the Kennedy-Johnson administration."

My efforts to keep defense matters outside the partisan political arena have become increasingly difficult over the past several weeks as Senator Goldwater has persistently made defense a partisan political issue. In addition, he has so phrased his attacks as to cast doubt on the credibility of our military power and has thus jeopardized our national security. Let me cite a few examples of the kinds of statements which, if allowed to stand unchallenged, could do great harm to the credibility of our defense posture.

In an article in Life magazine on January 17, 1964, Senator Goldwater stated: "Our present deterrent power was built almost entirely under the Eisenhower administration. There has been no significant addition to it since, and there are no plans for strengthening it. There are, indeed, plans to phase it down."

On the program Issues and Answers on February 9, 1964, Senator Goldwater stated: "* * * I have not questioned the accuracy of these missiles. I know their accuracy and I know that it is wonderful. What I am talking about is, will they go when the button is pushed under actual conditions, and I have not been satisfied that the reliability figures that Secretary McNamara gave us are right * * *."

In a speech at Palomar Junior College, California, on March 20, 1964, Senator Goldwater stated: "I make the flat charge that Secretary of Defense McNamara and the State Department are engaged in unilateral disarmament at the expense of peace and at the expense of freedom * * *."

In a speech at the Economic Club in Detroit on March 25, 1964, Senator Goldwater cited four fatal flaws in our defense posture: "First, we are building a Maginot line of missiles. Second, we are failing to introduce rapid technological advances, sometimes because of false economy, sometimes because of misguided steps toward disarmament. Third, we are permitting our defense policies to disrupt NATO and our other alliances. Fourth, we are downgrading the armed services, ignoring professional military advice and substituting one man's bookkeeping technique for national policy."

In a speech to the Texas Republican Convention in Dallas on June 16, 1964, Senator Goldwater said, "We are in second place and I defy the czar of the Pentagon to dispute that statement."

On June 5, 1964, in response to a question from the Associated Press, Senator Goldwater said, "The defense policies of this administration add up, in effect, to unilateral disarmament. We are lagging behind in weapons technology and in the development of new systems."

In accepting the Republican presidential nomination on July 17, 1964, Senator Goldwater stated, "We are at war in Vietnam—yet the President who is the Commander in Chief of our forces refuses to say whether or not the objective is victory. His Secretary of Defense continues to mislead and misinform the American people. It has been during Democratic years that our strength to deter war has stood still and even gone into a planned decline."

Before the National Association of Counties in the State of Washington on August 11, 1964, Goldwater said, "And what of this, the most perilous statistic of all? Under our present defense leadership, with its utter disregard for new weapons, our deliverable nuclear capacity may be cut down by 90 percent in the next decade. Let me repeat that. The figure is startling, and yet undeniable."

In his forthcoming book, "Where I Stand," reprinted in part in the Washington Post, Senator Goldwater has written: "I charge that the present Secretary of Defense has become the leading advocate—indeed the leading architect—of a so-called defense policy which, by the late 1960's and the early 1970's, will have turned the shield of the Republic into a swiss cheese wall, full of holes; a policy which will have isolated the power of America behind a Maginot line of illusions; a policy which will encourage our enemies to become bolder, to risk the final, fatal step toward nuclear war; a policy which will turn the profession of arms into a second-class craft; a policy which will have so hardened the arteries of our defenses that flexible response to challenges will be impossible, leaving us with the alternatives of only withdrawal or nuclear holocaust. I repeat: The architect of this policy is the present Secretary of Defense. In simplest terms, the defense policies of this administration add up to unilateral disarmament."

I regret that my statement before the Democratic platform committee was given a highly partisan interpretation. I particularly regret that anyone should infer any intention on my part to detract from your efforts on behalf of the national security. I was, rather, trying to emphasize the tremendous organizational and other problems which you and I have encountered—and which I continue to face—in managing the Defense Department. As I said in my article in the April–June 1964 issue of the Civil Service Journal, "When the President first asked that I accept appointment as the Secretary of Defense * * * I called upon my predecessor, the Honorable Thomas S. Gates, Jr. Mr. Gates briefed me thoroughly on his own experience as Secretary of Defense. * * * During his 6 years as Under Secretary and Secretary of the Navy, and thereafter during his 2 years as Deputy Secretary and Secretary of Defense, Mr. Gates had worked to establish the sort of control that Congress has authorized. * * * The sheer magnitude of the task as it unfolded made me question again whether I or anyone could really manage the Department."

Unfortunately, not all my statements before the Democratic platform committee on August 17, 1964, received newspaper coverage. For example, I was asked as a result of the statement in the Republican platform, "We will return the Joint Chiefs of Staff to their lawful status as the President's principal military advisers"; whether there had been "any structural or functional change in the operations by the Joint Chiefs of Staff." In my response, I stated:

"I want to emphasize to you * * * that my predecessor, Tom Gates, initiated a series of meetings with the Joint Chiefs. Until that time, there had been very little regular contact between the Secretaries and the Chiefs on very important matters of the Department, and particularly that was true in the budget."

I think you will agree that we cannot permit partisan attacks and campaign oratory to bring into question the credibility of the military power you and I and many others have worked so hard to assemble. My purpose in responding to these attacks by Senator Goldwater has not been to make the Defense policies and programs of this country a partisan political matter. Rather, my purpose has been to attempt to assure that our allies and our enemies, as well as the American people, retain their confidence and respect for the credibility of the strategic deterrent and conventional military power of this country.

Let me say again that I regret very much that my remarks were interpreted in any way as critical of the outstanding job you did as Secretary of Defense. As you know, I have the highest regard for the contribution you made to the Defense Department and for the assistance you gave me when I became Secretary.

Sincerely,

Robert S. McNamara.

The Peace Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 1, 1964

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, as the Peace Corps launches on its fourth year of activity in foreign lands, it becomes increasingly apparent that this experiment in practical idealism has met with phenomenal success. When President Kennedy signed into law the bill creating it on a permanent basis, on September 22, 1961, the Peace Corps had been operating on a pilot basis since March of that year; but most of that time had been spent in preparatory steps preliminary to service in the field.

In the 3 years that it has been in operation overseas, it has won almost unmitigated praise both abroad and at home. Every country to which it has gone—and the Peace Corps goes only where it is invited by the government of the country—it has been asked to return and expand.

Some of the host countries have set up Peace Corps type projects of their own. Many other countries have begun programs patterned after the U.S. Peace Corps. In this flattering imitation of the American venture, we find fruition of that idea expressed by that man of vision, our beloved President Kennedy, when, in March 1961, he hoped that "our own effort [would be] only one step in a major international effort to increase the welfare of all men and to improve understanding among nations."

At home the Peace Corps has overcome the voices of the skeptics. This is the more remarkable because some of the early criticism of the idea was strong against it. When it was proposed, it was expected that it would be a fiasco. More than one Member of Congress has admitted agreeable surprise at his error in prejudgment. Some of the sternest critics have become the most earnest supporters of the Peace Corps in action.

When, in fact, the Peace Corps volunteers took up their idealistic missions abroad and began the process of helping others to help themselves, it was not long before the words of one favorable prophecy began to come true. When Senator HUMPHREY had been asked what he thought of the proposed program, he had foreseen that "the effect of the Peace Corps would be invaluable. The citizen of an undeveloped country may," he said, "forget a can of American supplies quickly consumed. He may resent a load of American guns turned over to his government. But his memory of working with and sharing the skills of an American citizen will be strong and enduring * * * America's best resource is its people."

When the Peace Corps volunteers—young and old—go to the underdeveloped countries, willing and prepared to adjust their accustomed way of life to the hardships, living conditions, work, recreation, and customs of the natives, the accomplishment of their physical mission is but a small part of the forces which they have set in motion for future accomplishment, for sympathy and understanding, for goodwill, and for mutuality of hope. They, too, have learned; and not a small part of the benefit of a Peace Corps tour of duty is the preparation for service in the various fields of international endeavor which are open and in need of persons of experience and understanding. The U.S. Government and private enterprise, at home and abroad, have welcomed the Peace Corps "graduates" and seek the products of such training.

More than all of the benefits to the recipients of Peace Corps aid, more than all the benefits to the Peace Corps volunteer himself, there are, however, the benefits that rebound to the United States from the sum of that experience. The image of this country abroad has, in some instances, been reversed: from "Yanqui, go home!" to "Yanqui, come back!" In every country where the volunteer has served, there has been appreciation of this different sort of ambassador. More and more countries have asked to have the Peace Corps volunteers come to them.

The Peace Corps has, above all else, succeeded in its fulfillment of that final purpose for which it was created: "to increase through such exchange of knowledge the chances of mutual understanding and of peace on earth." It has earned its name: the Peace Corps.

Los Angeles Custom House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 1, 1964

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, on my last trip to Los Angeles I had the honor of visiting with several of the officers and members of the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce.

These prominent community leaders are strongly of the opinion that the proposed plan to move most of the customs offices now located in downtown Los Angeles to the harbor area should be reconsidered.

In fact, it is my understanding that all major organizations in Los Angeles having any connection with international trade and customs matters are unanimous in agreeing that the principal facilities of the Customs Service at Los Angeles should be maintained in the downtown area, where they have always been located.

These organizations include the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, the Downtown Businessmen's Association, the Foreign Trade Association of Southern California, the Customs Brokers and Freight Forwarders Association, the Licensed Customs Brokers Association of Los Angeles, the Los Angeles Steamship Association, and the Consular Corps.

On behalf of these groups, Miss Marjorie M. Shostak, one of the leading customs attorneys in Los Angeles, and chairman of the Committee on Import Legislation and Customs Problems of the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, has written me a thoughtful and comprehensive letter listing the reasons they believe this proposed move should be reconsidered.

Mr. Speaker, I agree wholeheartedly with the committee on import legislation and customs problems for the reasons which I now wish to outline:

First. Construction of a customhouse in the harbor area to house the principal offices of U.S. Customs in the Los Angeles Customs District would greatly inconvenience the substantial business interests in the downtown area who are the principal users of the customs facilities there. These include the customhouse brokers (over 40 firms), the freight forwarders, the international departments of all the banks, and the steamship companies, now located within 1 mile from the present offices of the customs service in downtown Los Angeles. The importers, exporters, and consular offices are also concentrated in and around the downtown area of Los Angeles, within a radius of 5 or 6 miles of the present downtown customs offices.

Second. Unless adequate facilities are maintained in the downtown area to handle the customs work done there, the service firms, such as the customhouse brokers, freight forwarders, steamship companies, and international departments of the banks would be forced to move their offices from their present convenient downtown locations close to their customers and other Government offices with which they must deal, to the harbor area location 22 miles away.

Third. Maintaining only an entry division to file customs entries and a cashier of customs to receive payment of duties in the downtown area would be totally inadequate, as files must be maintained downtown for inspection by customs brokers, importers, and their attorneys.

Fourth. The plan to move the principal offices of customs from downtown Los Angeles to the harbor location was predicated on acceptance of the plan by the users of customs, 90 percent of whom are located in the downtown area.

See Report of Commissioner of Customs to Secretary of Treasury, dated June 5, 1961, page 12:

> Customs should not agree to locate in a harbor World Trade Center until it is shown that a respectable portion of the users will move, too, if customs does, and do so voluntarily.

See also remarks of Commissioner of Customs at hearing before Subcommittee of Committee on Public Works, U.S. Senate, June 27, 1962, acknowledging that moving customs to the harbor would "gravely inconvenience * * * the users of customs, the importers, and the customhouse brokers," and that 90 percent of the users would use a downtown branch rather than one located at the harbor, at page 23.

Fifth. The Commissioner of Customs, in his testimony before the Senate Subcommittee, indicated that if the plan to house customs in the harbor area and to house the users in a World Trade Center to be constructed in that area, was not accepted and implemented, he would not be in favor of proceeding with the harbor area plan.

Sixth. The users of customs located in the central area of Los Angeles have not accepted the plan, and are as much opposed to moving the customs offices to the harbor area as they were at the time of the hearings at Los Angeles before the Commissioner of Customs in 1961, when the Commissioner acknowledged (in his report of June 5, 1961, page 10), that the 90 percent of users of customs in the downtown area made an overwhelming case against the harbor area site.

Seventh. The 40 customs brokerage firms in the downtown area alone, account for about 500 employees who would be forced to leave the downtown area or seek other employment. Many of the employees have indicated an unwillingness to work in the harbor area. This would cause grave personnel problems to these firms, as these employees require special training and are difficult to replace.

Eighth. Many of these firms feel that it would be necessary for them to maintain offices in the harbor area and downtown, to properly service their customers, which would add substantially to the cost of customs clearance of imported merchandise at the ports in our customs district. Increased costs of customs clearance could well adversely affect the continued growth of international trade through our port.

Ninth. Removal of these firms from the downtown area would result in loss of business by restaurants, department stores, and other establishments now patronized by these firms and their employees.

Tenth. Moving the customshouse to the harbor area would not result in any substantial saving in operating costs to the customs service. Cost of transporting packages for examination to the appraiser's stores is based on handling, not on mileage carried. In any event, examinations are made at the dock in many cases, by personnel already stationed at the docks. However, travel of customs officials to importers' premises would be greatly increased, since importers' premises are located throughout the metropolitan area in a 40-mile radius from the present downtown location of customs.

Eleventh. Customs operates very efficiently from its present location; the cost of administration in the Los Angeles Customs District is only 2.7 cents per dollar of revenue collected, one of the lowest figures shown by any customs district.

Twelfth. Removal of the customs offices from downtown Los Angeles will inconvenience 90 percent of the users and is not required for adequate service to the harbor area, where customs offices have been maintained, since 1911, to handle work arising there. These offices (now in the harbor area) include the entire Marine Division, which handles the entry and clearance of vessels, and enforcement and inspectional personnel required at the harbor area. Export documents can be filed at the harbor or downtown, but the greater number are filed downtown, by far, as indicated in the Commissioner's report, page 9, giving the following statistics for the first 4 months of 1961: 74,381 export declarations filed downtown, and 5,844 at San Pedro.

Thirteen. The customs offices in Los Angeles offer better service to the importing public from their present locations than would be available if the downtown offices were removed to the harbor area. Our complex metropolitan area, served by air, sea, and rail, requires facilities at the harbor, at the airport, and in the downtown area where most of the persons using the customs offices are located. Facilities were established at the International Airport several years ago, to properly process air importations, and will be maintained there; there is no plan to close the airport office in order to consolidate customs offices in the Los Angeles Customs District under one roof.

Fourteen. The proposed plans for a world trade center in the harbor area have not materialized, for construction on Terminal Island, and most of the users in the downtown area do not want to move, even if such facilities were available, because of the many inconveniences of a harbor area location.

Fifteen. The Bureau of Customs recently authorized the collector of customs at Houston to move his offices from the Civic Center area of downtown Houston to another building in downtown Houston closer to the customs brokers and steamship companies. The reason stated was that the move was "in the best interests of the brokers, importers, and other users of customs who will have more ready access to the customs offices with which they deal and that customs will attain better public relations."

This was accomplished through the efforts and assistance of Congressman ALBERT THOMAS, of Houston.

Sixteen. The same objectives should be sought at Los Angeles, as indicated in the letter of Ken Hamanaka, customhouse broker of Los Angeles, in his letter of July 13, 1964, to the Commissioner of Customs, copy attached. Mr. Hamanaka's views are typical of the views of the customs brokers and other users of customs in Los Angeles.

Seventeen. While the reply received by Hamanaka from the Bureau of Customs stated that the situation at Houston was not regarded as comparable to that at Los Angeles, it is apparent that the relocation of the collector of customs office in Houston was for the convenience of the brokers, importers, and other users of customs, and that the facilities were not removed from the downtown area of Houston solely to combine them under one roof in another custom building at the ship channel 15 miles from downtown Houston, where other customs personnel are stationed.

SENATE

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 2, 1964

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. METCALF).

Rev. H. S. Hill, minister, Wesleyan Methodist Church, Herrickville, Pa., offered the following prayer:

Lord, God of our fathers, who under Thy guidance formed this great Nation, we approach Thee with careful thoughts and according to Thy word, in the name of Thy only begotten Son, Jesus Christ, our Lord and Saviour. We humbly confess our sins as a nation, and plead for Thy forgiveness.

We thank Thee for national peace in this trouble-torn world. May our influence, at home and abroad, be for the help and uplift of Thy master creation. Breathe again into our nostrils the breath of life.

Bless Mr. Johnson, our President; help us to hold up his hands in all that is right and correct. Bless each officer and Member of the Senate, the Cabinet, and our Ambassadors who act for us in the nations of this world.

Bless the afterglow of the lives of our great men—George Washington, Abraham Lincoln, Theodore Roosevelt, and others. May their lives, so well lived, assist us as a nation and as individuals. May we not miss the plan Thou hast made for our lives.

We ask these favors in the name of our Lord and Saviour. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request by Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, October 1, 1964, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 1531) to increase the appropriation authorization for the completion of the construction of the irrigation and power systems of the Flathead Indian irrigation project, Montana.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7348) for the relief of Frank B. Rowlett.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 3060) to amend and extend the National Defense Education Act of 1958 and to extend Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress (federally affected areas).

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12633) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MAHON, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. KIRWAN, Mr. WHITTEN, Mr. MULTER, Mr. ROONEY of New York, Mr. FOGARTY, Mr. JENSEN, Mr. HORAN, Mr. BOW, and Mr. LAIRD were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the following concurrent resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 358. Concurrent resolution to provide for the printing of 5,000 additional copies of "Immigration Hearings Before Subcommittee No. 1 of the Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, Parts 1, 2, and 3";

H. Con. Res. 364. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of an additional 1,000 copies of the document entitled "Study of Population and Immigration Problems; Population of the United States"; and

H. Con. Res. 370. Concurrent resolution relating to the enrollment of the bill H.R. 5871.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

On request by Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements during the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request by Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Rules and Administration was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

EIGHTY-SEVENTH BIRTHDAY ANNIVERSARY OF SENATOR HAYDEN

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, at the present time the President pro tempore, as always, is actively engaged in the affairs of the Senate and is presiding over the Appropriations Committee conference and therefore is not in the Chamber.

However, I feel that on this most auspicious occasion I should take this opportunity to invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that the dean of this body, the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], is 87 years old today.

He has the longest term of service of any Member of either House. Until the admission of Hawaii into the Union, he was the only man who came to Washington to represent a State from its inception.

Senator HAYDEN has performed magnificently down through the years. He has always been courteous, kind, tolerant, and considerate to Senators on both sides of the aisle.

On this occasion, I express the hope that, although this is a celebration of his first 87 years, he will still be with us 87 years from now.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am glad to yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, it is an honor for me to join the leader of the majority in the Senate in a brief tribute to one of America's most beloved citizens and the "first Senator."

CARL HAYDEN brings to this legislative Chamber a long lifetime of dedicated and abundant experience in American government, and in inborn and unique ability to legislate and achieve progress.

He is far more than the titular dean of the Senate, far more than simply the senior Senator from Arizona. He is a highly successful Senator for the United States of America, and all her people.

Every man and woman in this Chamber will be eternally indebted to CARL HAYDEN for the unselfish, generous, and constant assistance which he has freely given to each of us on many occasions.

I have often said that my own State of California, over the years, has really had three Senators—for on many occasions CARL HAYDEN has helped his colleagues from California to achieve legislative progress for our people.

California is not unique. CARL HAYDEN has done the same for the State of Montana, and for every other State in the Union.

So, with a heart full of affection and great respect, I am most glad to say to the dean of the Senate "Many happy returns of the day." We pray for him many more constructive, fruitful, and healthful years in the Senate.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I join Senators who are paying tribute to CARL HAYDEN on his 87th birthday anniversary, although I wish he did not have so many of them.

I have always found Senator HAYDEN cooperative and willing to help Senators in need, regardless of the side of the aisle on which they were sitting.

I wish him many more birthdays. I wish we could turn the clock back, but so long as that cannot be done, I sincerely appreciate what he has done for me—and for other Senators.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I am happy to have the opportunity today to join Senators in paying tribute to the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee [Mr. HAYDEN] on his 87th birthday anniversary.

Few people in this world have had an opportunity to achieve so many years on earth; but in addition, few people have had the opportunity to render so much public service in the span of years which the Lord has allotted them.

I have personally had the pleasure of serving on the Appropriations Committee with CARL HAYDEN since 1959. It would be difficult for me to express the deep appreciation I feel for his constant counsel and guidance in this difficult and complex field.

Upon no occasion, when assistance was needed, or when explanation was needed, has he ever spared any effort to see that I and all other members of the committee were completely informed, and that we were kept informed and advised as to the progress of the various programs considered by the Appropriations Committee.

There are few persons who understand Senators the way he does. Few Senators have ever been as continuously kind, courteous, and responsive as the senior Senator from Arizona has been.

For these reasons and many others, I am most happy to join my colleagues today in wishing him a happy birthday and paying tribute to his service to our country.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I submit, for printing in the RECORD, a tribute by the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] to Senator CARL HAYDEN.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR GOLDWATER

I wish to join my colleagues in extending heartfelt best wishes to my close friend and fellow Arizonan, Senator CARL HAYDEN.

For the past 12 years it has been my honor to represent—with him—the people of Arizona. I cherish his friendship. My admiration for him is profound. All our words of tribute to him are indeed deserved. He has the very best wishes of all of us; and on the occasion of his 87th birthday, we wish him many, many more.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business for consideration of nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Adlai E. Stevenson, of Illinois; Russell B. Long, U.S. Senator from the State of Louisiana; Frank Carlson, U.S. Senator from the State of Kansas; William C. Foster, of the District of Columbia; and Francis T. P. Plimpton, of New York; to be Representatives of the United States of America to the 19th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations;

Charles W. Yost, of New York; Franklin H. Williams, of California; Mrs. Gladys A. Tillett, of North Carolina; Richard N. Gardner, of the District of Columbia; and Charles P.

Noyes, of New York; to be Alternate Representatives of the United States of America to the 19th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations;

Mrs. Marietta P. Tree, of New York, to be the Representative of the United States of America on the Trusteeship Council of the United Nations; and

John W. Bowling, of Texas, and sundry other persons, for appointment and promotion in the Foreign Service.

By Mr. HART, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Eugene C. Patterson, of Georgia, to be a member of the Commission on Civil Rights;

James F. Delaney, of Pennsylvania, to be U.S. marshal for the eastern district of Pennsylvania; and

Charlotte Paul Groshell, of Washington, to be a member of the Board of Parole.

By Mr. DIRKSEN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Jon O. Newman, of Connecticut, to be U.S. attorney for the district of Connecticut.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Raul H. Castro, of Arizona, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to El Salvador.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, do I read this name correctly? Is it Raul Castro, to be Ambassador to El Salvador?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, there are many reasons why, before the Senate acts on the nomination of a man named Raul Castro for Ambassador of the United States to El Salvador, we should have a clear and precise description of exactly who this Raul Castro is. I would like to get some assurance from the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs as to this nomination.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I assure the Senator from Wisconsin that Judge Castro, who is the nominee, is not related in any degree whatsoever to the Castros of Cuba.

Judge Castro is a distinguished judge in the State of Arizona. Some years ago, he was a member of the Foreign Service in the State Department. In my opinion, based upon his knowledge of Latin America, he is one of the most able persons that could be selected for an ambassadorship in Latin America. He speaks Spanish fluently. He knows Latin America. Seldom have I been as enthusiastic about the appointment of an Ambassador for Latin America as I am concerning that of Judge Castro.

I assure the Senator from Wisconsin that the country is fortunate in having such an able person selected to represent us in the diplomatic corps in Latin America.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Oregon. It is easy to imagine what could be said about the nomination of a man with such a name unless there were a clear record of this kind made on the floor of the Senate at the time this body confirms him.

I ask the Senator from Oregon whether, when this nomination was reported, a quorum of the committee was present.

Mr. MORSE. I do not believe there was a quorum present at the time that we examined Judge Castro. But, I am satisfied that a quorum passed judgment finally on his nomination.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator.

The reason I make the point is that an appointment to a Federal judgeship in Wisconsin has been pending before the Committee on the Judiciary since September 1963. The judge was nominated by President Kennedy. At President Kennedy's last press conference, in answer to a question, he said that he was in enthusiastic support of David Rabinovitz for circuit judge. Rabinovitz was the nominee to serve as judge in the western district of Wisconsin.

That nomination has not been approved by the Committee on the Judiciary. It was not approved in 1963. President Johnson gave Judge Rabinovitz a recess appointment last January 7th. That recess appointment will expire when we adjourn sine die. Both Senators from Wisconsin have approved this nomination. Two Presidents have nominated him. I am convinced after talks with members of the Judiciary Committee that a majority of the Judiciary Committee favor his nomination.

It is a tragedy for Judge Rabinovitz, a misfortune for our State and a serious injustice that we have a situation in which it is virtually impossible to get a quorum of the Committee on the Judiciary. And without a quorum we simply cannot get action. On the basis of that technicality, this man is disqualified. Both Senators from Wisconsin are in favor of his appointment. And yet he is not going to be approved and take office during this session.

As I understand the technical situation, if the Senate adjourns sine die, Judge Rabinovitz's appointment will automatically end as of that moment.

There has been no action by the Committee on the Judiciary against this nominee. He has the support of all of the interested parties, to the best of my knowledge. But I must concede this is indeed a controversial appointment.

The Library of Congress is unable to show any precedent for turning down a President in his nomination of a judge to serve within a State who has been approved by both Senators from that State. Mr. President, I hope a way—some way—can be found to win Judge Rabinovitz' eventual confirmation.

I withdraw any objection to the nomination of Raul Castro.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

AIR FORCE AND ARMY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Air Force and Army.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, the nominations are confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that the President be notified immediately of the nominations confirmed today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

On motion by Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON CONSTRUCTION OF FACILITIES AT PLUM BROOK STATION, SANDUSKY, OHIO

A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, on the construction of facilities at Plum Brook Station, Sandusky, Ohio; to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

REPORT OF EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON ON GUARANTEES OF CERTAIN TRANSACTIONS

A letter from the Secretary, Export-Import Bank of Washington, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, on the issuance by that Bank on September 22, 1964, of guarantees with respect to certain transactions; to the Committee on Appropriations.

SAVINGS AND LOAN HOLDING COMPANY AMENDMENTS OF 1964

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Home Loan Bank Board, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 408 of the National Housing Act, as amended, to provide for the regulation of savings and loan holding companies and subsidiary companies (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

AMENDMENT OF SUBSECTION (d) OF SECTION 5 OF HOME OWNERS' LOAN ACT OF 1933, AND SECTION 407 OF NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Home Loan Bank Board, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend subsection (d) of section 5 of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, as amended, and section 407 of the National Housing Act, as amended (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORTS OF COMPTROLLER GENERAL

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on unnecessary costs incurred in the procurement of defective torpedo tubes from the Youngstown Welding & Engineering Co., Youngstown, Ohio, Department of the Navy, dated September 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on unnecessary procurement of cargo transporters, Department of the Army, dated September 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on excessive prices negotiated by the defense fuel supply center for storage of petroleum in a commercial facility at Grand Forks, N. Dak., Department of Defense, dated September 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on uneconomical leasing of motor vehicles for use in assembly and checkout operations at Minuteman missile launch sites and avoidance of congressional controls relating to acquisition of motor vehicles, Department of the Air Force, dated September 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on unnecessary costs incurred in the purchase of automatic flight control systems for A–4 series aircraft, Department of the Navy, dated September 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, supervised by the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, year ended June 30, 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Suspension of Deportation of Certain Aliens

Two letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders suspending deportation of certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law pertaining to each alien, and the reasons for ordering such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ENTITLED "JUVENILE DELINQUENCY"—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 1608)

Mr. DODD, from the Committee on the Judiciary, pursuant to Senate resolution 63, 88th Congress, 1st session, submitted a report entitled "Juvenile Delinquency," which was ordered to be printed.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred, as follows:

By Mr. PROXMIRE:

S. 3238. A bill for the relief of Luigi Filippo LoCicero, Michael Anthony LoCicero, and Domenic Louis LoCicero; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HART:

S. 3239. A bill for the relief of Anna Ungvari; and

S. 3240. A bill for the relief of Gabor Siska and family; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS (for Mr. Keating):

S. 3241. A bill for the relief of Vasil Laci; and

S. 3242. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Theresa Gomez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBERTSON (by request):

S. 3243. A bill to amend subsection (d) of section 5 of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, as amended, and section 407 of the National Housing Act, as amended; and

S. 3244. A bill to amend section 408 of the National Housing Act, as amended, to provide for the regulation of savings and loan holding companies and subsidiary companies; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. McCLELLAN:

S. 3245. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to require the furnishing of additional information by tax-exempt labor organizations and to require the disclosure of such information to the members of such organizations and to the public; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 3246. A bill to provide for the inclusion in the charter or bylaws of labor organizations of provisions requiring officers of such organizations to respond to certain questions concerning their qualifications asked in proceedings before tribunals empowered to elicit testimony; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. HART:

S. 3247. A bill for the relief of Samy Antoun Kassab, Geliana Antoun Kassab, Bader Antoun Kassab, Julet Antoun Kassab, and Adel Antoun Kassab; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BREWSTER:

S. 3248. A bill for the relief of Suzanne Mallalieu Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, October 2, 1964, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 1531. An act to increase the appropriation authorization for the completion of the construction of the irrigation and power systems of the Flathead Indian irrigation project, Montana;

S. 1640. An act for the relief of certain employees of the Alaska Railroad;

S. 2180. An act to amend title VII of the Public Health Service Act so as to extend to qualified schools of optometry and students of optometry those provisions thereof relating to student loan programs; and

S. 3174. An act to amend section 5 of the Employment Act of 1946.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

By Mr. MANSFIELD (for Mr. Humphrey):

Statement by Senator Humphrey on need to increase exports, and opportunities for small business in that regard.

By Mr. BIBLE (for Mr. Cannon):

Statement by Senator Cannon on senior citizens voting, and letter from Housing Authority of City of Las Vegas.

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

Excerpt from speech on legislative apportionment, delivered by him at Charlottesville, Va., on August 30, 1960.

OUTSTANDING RECORD OF SENATE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to call attention to the outstanding record of the Senate Committee on Armed Services during the 2d session of the 88th Congress, under the brilliant chairmanship of the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell].

Record of the Senate Committee on Armed Services, 2d Session, 88th Congress

LEGISLATION

Public Law 88–288, authorizing appropriations during fiscal year 1965 for procurement, research, development, test, and evaluation of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for the Armed Forces: Authorizes appropriations for these purposes in the amount of $16,976,620,000.

Public Law 88–390, military construction authorization: Authorizes military construction and provides authorization for housing construction and maintenance in the amount of $1,534,994,000.

Public Law 88–422, military pay increase: Provides a 2½-percent increase in the rates of basic pay for all officers and enlisted members of the uniformed services with over 2 years of service and an 8½-percent increase in the rates of basic pay for all officers with under 2 years of service. The increases total $207,519,000 over a full fiscal year.

Public Law 88–276, increasing cadet strength at Military and Air Force Academies: Increases the authorized cadet strength of the U.S. Military Academy and the U.S. Air Force Academy from 2,529 to 4,417, the strength of the U.S. Naval Academy. Also makes uniform the statutory provisions relating to the nomination and appointment of cadets and midshipmen to the service academies and extends the period of obligated service for academy graduates from 3 to 5 years.

S. 2272, Materials Reserve and Stockpile Act of 1964: Revises and consolidates the laws relating to stockpile management and permits orderly disposal of stockpile excesses.

H.R. 9124, ROTC legislation: Revises laws relating to the ROTC program for the purposes of expanding the junior ROTC program and attracting more applicants for the advanced course of the senior ROTC program.

H.R. 8427, CIA retirement: Provides improved retirement system for certain employees of the Central Intelligence Agency.

Considered and favorably reported 25 other measures on miscellaneous subjects relating to national defense.

NOMINATIONS

Considered 49,258 nominations. Five committee meetings required for consideration of civilian and military officials to statutory offices traditionally involving personal appearances by nominees before committee.

SUBCOMMITTEE ACTIVITIES

Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee: Monitored implementation of nuclear test ban safeguards and prepared two classified reports on this subject, conducted hearings on military situation in South Vietnam, issued report on award of X–22 (VSTOL) development contract, held hearings on explosions of ATLAS–F missiles and conducted staff studies on missile reliability, naval shipyards, Army weapons programs, and air defense facilities.

Central Intelligence Agency Subcommittee: Performed legislative oversight over Central Intelligence Agency and the policies and programs being carried out by that Agency under the National Security Act and the Central Intelligence Act of 1949.

National Stockpile and Naval Petroleum Reserves Subcommittee: Considered and favorably reported S. 2272, which would revise and consolidate the laws relating to stockpile management and would permit orderly disposal of stockpile excesses. Recommended separate bills and resolutions authorizing disposal from national stockpile of excess quantities of zinc, molybdenum, antimony, cadmium, lead, sisal, and tin.

Status of Forces Subcommittee: Conducted hearings and issued report on that part of the NATO Status of Forces Treaty which relates to criminal jurisdiction that is not waived by host countries in which U.S. Forces are stationed.

Officer Grade Limitations Subcommittee: Considered reports submitted by military departments on officer grade distribution.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR METCALF ON WORK DONE ON BEHALF OF ELECTRIC CONSUMERS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the night before last there was held in Bismarck, N. Dak., the conference of Western States Water & Power Consumers Conference.

I hope that I shall not embarrass the present Presiding Officer of the Senate; but, I wish to pay tribute to him. He was highly honored at this conference of the Western States Water & Power Consumers Conference.

I sent to that conference the following message:

September 30, 1964.

Mr. Leonard Kenfield,
Chairman, Western States Water & Power Consumers Conference, Grand Pacific Hotel, Bismarck, N. Dak.:

My heartiest greetings to all attending the Western States Water & Power Consumers Conference this year. Regret that legislative duties in the Senate on the national defense education conference report prevented my being with you. Particularly regret that I will not have an opportunity to hear Senator Lee Metcalf's keynote address. Lee has been doing a tremendous job on behalf of electric consumers in his Senate speeches relating to the propaganda and lobbying activities of the so-called investor-owned utilities and I know he has a message of prime importance for your conference.

Am gratified that you plan to recognize Lee's outstanding contributions by a special award, and that awards will also be presented to Mrs. Nancy Kefauver on behalf of her late husband, the dedicated and courageous Senator Estes Kefauver, and to Jim Patton, veteran friend of the farmer and president of the Farmers Union.

I was proud to count Estes Kefauver among my closest associates in the Senate and we joined together on many occasions in promoting what we believed to be legislation and action in the general public interest. Jim Patton is deserving of great tribute for his constant fight to preserve the family-sized farm and to conserve the natural resources of our Nation.

My Senate colleagues, Federal officials, and all of you who are attending the conference are my longtime friends. We have many common goals. I hope that we may go forward with renewed determination to achieve our objectives of comprehensive and full development of American water and power resources for the benefit of the American people.

My every good wish for a highly successful conference.

Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senator.

Mr. President, I am sure that my colleagues in the Senate join me in extending to the present Presiding Officer of the Senate, the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. Metcalf] our heartiest congratulations for the deserved award that was granted him at this conference of the Western States Water & Power Consumers Conference.

THE 88TH CONGRESS—THE "CONSERVATION CONGRESS"

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, the 88th Congress has been characterized by many as the "Conservation Congress." This plaudit is a sign of greater public concern for conservation projects. The growing awareness of the needs in this field is heartening to those of us on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

While we are thankful for the response to the recent enactments regarding our natural resources, it is important that this interest not be allowed to die on the vine.

For this reason, the remarks of our colleague from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska] upon the occasion of the Fontenelle Forest landmark dedication in Omaha were most welcome. Senator Hruska, in addition to pointing out the accomplishments of this Congress, makes this vital admonition:

> If we fail to protect the dwindling areas of virgin forest and true prairie * * * then there will not be another opportunity.

Mr. President, it has been a source of great personal satisfaction to work with the Senator from Nebraska and my other colleagues in the preservation of our country's beauty.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Congressional Record the text of Senator Hruska's remarks upon the occasion of the Fontenelle Forest landmark dedication.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Remarks of Senator Roman L. Hruska, Fontenelle Forest Landmark Dedication, Omaha, September 13, 1964

Measured against such dramatic achievements as rockets to the moon or television transmissions halfway around the world, it may seem like a small thing we do here today in recognizing Fontenelle Forest as a natural history landmark.

But in a different light, what we do here today is most important. If we fail to reach the moon—as we have—we can try again another day—as we have.

But if we fail to protect the dwindling areas of virgin forest and true prairie, such as this forest, then there will not be another opportunity.

I am pleased to see in Nebraskans a reawakened interest in preserving our historic and scenic sites and areas. For too many years we ignored this part of our heritage. Perhaps it was because we were, by most standards, too young a State.

In recent years, however—and I hope the trend will accelerate as we prepare to observe the Nebraska Centennial 3 years hence—there have been encouraging signs of appreciation of the importance of preserving what otherwise would be lost forever.

Here in the Omaha area, we have the fine work which the Nebraska Historical Society and others have been doing at Fort Atkinson; in Nebraska City, downriver, we have Arbor Lodge, and below that, Brownville.

At Beatrice, we have the Daniel Freeman Homestead, now a national monument. Out west we have Fort Kearney, Willa Cather's home at Red Cloud, Chimney Rock at Bayard, and of course, Scotts Bluff National Monument.

More and more of our local committees are showing an interest in preserving our proud past. I think particularly of the House of Yesterday in Hastings and the Pioneer Village in Minden. There are, of course, many others.

Right now in the Congress we are working to establish still another national monument in Nebraska—the Agate Springs fossil beds north and west of Scottsbluff. We have had the enthusiastic cooperation of the Interior Department, for which we thank Secretary Carver and especially Lem Garrison and other officials of the National Park Service.

So briefly, Mr. Vance, I extend to you and the other members of the Fontenelle Forest Association, my warmest congratulations on this Federal recognition of the natural historical significance of this forest. All of us are in your debt.

Extracts From the Remarks of Senator Roman L. Hruska, Omaha Chamber of Commerce Luncheon, September 13, 1964

It was Victor Hugo who counseled, "Let us, while waiting for new monuments, preserve the ancient monuments."

Today, in the dedication of Fontenelle Forest as a natural historical landmark, we are preserving an ancient monument. It is well that we do, for in our lifetimes there will be no new monuments to replace such natural beauty.

As our minds focus today on our stewardship of the priceless natural resources to which we have fallen heir, I thought you might welcome a report on some of the major conservation legislation enacted by the 88th Congress.

Some are already calling it the "Conservation Congress." This is because it has passed a number of significant bills, some of which have special importance for our State.

On September 1 the Congress sent to the President a bill establishing a land and water conservation fund to permit the States to plan, acquire and develop outdoor recreational facilities and to permit the Federal Government to acquire recreation areas.

The bill is based on a Federal-State partnership in the development of much-needed recreation facilities. Sixty percent of the money to be appropriated by the fund annually is earmarked exclusively for State planning. Participating States will match Federal funds on a 50–50 basis.

This measure will be of considerable assistance in developing some of our State's great outdoor recreation potential. We all know that we have the natural resources in Nebraska. This bill will give us the capital resources necessary to do a first-rate job.

I have had very encouraging correspondence from such groups in Nebraska as the Izaak Walton League. Our experience shows that such recreation areas will be fully used and one of the key provisions of this bill is that user fees will be plowed back into the fund so that it will become self-sustaining.

Another measure which passed the Senate last year, finally won approval in the House on July 31. It is the wilderness bill which establishes a National Wilderness Preservation System. Without this legislation, this country ran a real risk of losing forever to the bulldozer and commercial development areas of irreplaceable scenic beauty.

Also of interest to Nebraska are two bills which grew out of a study by a Senate Select Committee on National Water Supply. This study showed that within a generation, five areas of the country would face a critical shortage of water which would significantly hamper their economic and social progress. One of those areas is the one in which we live, the Upper Missouri Valley.

One of the bills establishes at land-grant colleges across the Nation water resource research centers which can concentrate on research peculiar to their particular areas.

The University of Nebraska is scheduled to be the site of one of these centers, perhaps at its field station at Mead.

The last bill I want to mention calls for the planning and development of basin-wide water plans. We had some difficulty with this one over the question of primacy of the State rights to water uses, but I am happy to say that we prevailed against those who would have given jurisdiction to the Federal Government. This measure has passed the Senate and prospects for action by the House appear good. I was pleased to have been a cosponsor of both the research center bill and the basin planning measure and to have played a part in their approval.

Each of the four bills I have mentioned were landmarks in the conservation field. While there were, of course, some disputes along the way, there was pretty general agreement on the eventual goals; our differences were in how to reach those goals.

Perhaps you are already familiar with a bill I introduced in the Senate to establish a national monument in northwestern Nebraska at the site of the world-famous Agate fossil beds. It is our expectation not only to preserve from destruction an irreplaceable natural scientific deposit of the richest source of fossil bones of extinct mammals on this continent, but also to establish a major tourist attraction.

The National Park Service, which would operate the monument, estimates that between 120,000 and 200,000 visitors annually may be expected, bringing more than half a million dollars a year into the area.

The Agate bill has passed the Senate and we still hope to win approval in the House. Even if we are caught in the adjournment rush, chances for passage next year are very bright.

On the whole, this Congress has measured up well to its responsibilities in the preservation of our resources. We provided adequate funds for soil conservation and reclamation projects, as well as the legislation I have mentioned.

We in the Congress, of course, can concern ourselves only with the broad national picture of conservation. The same kind of job needs to be done at the State and local levels.

By your commitment to Fontenelle Forest, the Omaha chamber shows that it is acutely conscious of its responsibility. You are heeding Hugo's advice to "preserve the ancient monuments."

McNAMARA'S WAR IN SOUTH VIETNAM

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, one of the most important things that is going on in the world at this time is McNamara's war in South Vietnam. For some reason or other, the news media seem fairly well able—speaking of the daily news media—to keep this swept under the rug and out of the view of the consciousness of the American people.

What is going on in South Vietnam today is one of the most serious things that has happened to America in the last 25 years—certainly since World War II.

I have in my hands an article published in the Air Force Space Digest by Mr. Claude Witze, the senior editor of that particular publication.

In the article the author discusses some of the practical facets of McNamara's war which is going on in South Vietnam, and which the American people are apparently being asked to forget about and not to consider. It is one of the greatest dilemmas—and confusions—in American foreign policy that we have ever had. Because of the specific facts and the specific items that Mr. Witze learned while he was in South Vietnam studying the subject, I ask unanimous consent that his article be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

A Crack in the Facade

(By Claude Witze)

Hickam Air Force Base, Hawaii, August 17.—It may be that the turning point in the Vietnamese war was brought about 2 weeks ago when the Communists tried to sink two American destroyers in the Gulf of Tonkin. If the incident did nothing else, it put a big crack in the facade created by U.S. insistence that we observe the terms of the 1954 Geneva accord.

En route home from Saigon, where jets stood on the public airport runway last month even though their presence was officially unacknowledged, this reporter bumped squarely into jet reinforcements en route to Vietnam. There was no blanket of secrecy at Hickam Air Force Base, home of the Pacific Air Forces (PACAF), as interceptors, fighter-bombers, and reconnaissance aircraft were mobilized. The first were RF–101's and RB–57's. Some of them came to Hawaii nonstop from Shaw AFB in South Carolina and were in Vietnam a day later. It was a demonstration of the speedy response that is possible only with airpower, properly used.

At PACAF headquarters there was a sleepless night. The aircraft were on their way on August 4, but the standing order remained that we would never tell the world we were moving modern equipment into the theater. Their arrival would be public knowledge at Hickam and again at places like Guam, the Philippines, and Saigon itself. It was not until the morning of August 5, Washington time, that Defense Secretary Robert McNamara announced the movement, with careful specifics. Interceptors—the F–102—and fighter-bombers were being moved into South Vietnam, fighter-bombers into Thailand, a neighboring haven. Other squadrons were en route to advance bases in the Pacific. The crack in the facade is widening.

Yet, as the alert approaches the 2-week mark, there is no indication that tactical air is being utilized in Vietnam in much more than token fashion. Reports from the front to this date (August 17) indicate that the ground situation continues to deteriorate as it did all during July. The Vietcong Reds continue to be successful in their ambush operations. Experience has shown that these can be curbed most effectively by providing Air Force convoys for movements along highways, railroads, or canals. The Vietcong continue to be elusive. Their intelligence network is excellent; it is estimated that the Communists know within a couple of hours after the decision has been made to rout them from a position. Yet, in one case last week, the defending forces mounted an assault with 96 helicopters and a Vietnamese regiment to go after an encampment of an estimated 2,000 to 3,000 Vietcong.

The concentration of Vietcong had been known for weeks, but there is no record that tactical airpower ever got serious consideration as the ideal tool to wipe it out. The business of massing 96 helicopters at the public Tan Son Nhut airfield must have made it obvious for days that a major assault was planned. According to press reports, both American and Vietnamese soldiers were surprised when the enemy could not be found.

Maj. Gen. Joseph H. Moore, Commander of the 2d Air Division at Saigon, already is quoted as having ruled out the use of the newly arrived jets in the war against the insurgents. His expressed reason is that the Geneva agreement makes this impossible. Another, of course, is that the South Vietnamese Air Force (VNAF) is not prepared to use them and the U.S. Air Force is in that country in an advisory role. Our pilots are teachers, not fighters. It may be that the crack in the facade will grow and that the U.S. Air Force's role will become as honest as that of the U.S. Army. The latter's pilots, attached to the support command under Brig. Gen. Delt M. Oden, are fighting in Vietnam, providing close air support from Army Huey helicopters and Mohawks.

Here at PACAF there is no official complaint about the restrictions on proper exploitation of airpower in Vietnam, but there is no joy, either. The Army's air operations in the theater are described as overt, as opposed to the U.S. Air Force's, which are covert, if and when circumstances force an American pilot to fight back. On the scene in Vietnam, where this reporter just spent 3 sweltering weeks, it is no secret that the U.S. Army has been using its position of dominance in the Military Assistance Command, Vietnam (MACV), to degrade airpower, and there is documentation to prove it. In the press this is put in print from time to time, but always in the frame of a "feud" between the U.S. services. But, at the working level, where the majors and captains are fighting the war in jungle or cockpit, this disagreement does not exist. Army men at this level say they appreciate airpower as much as they did in Korea—and more. When the assault mission is ready to take off, they want tactical air, and lots of it, to work over the perimeter of their designated landing areas. And napalm, which is disliked by the State Department leading to another inhibiting factor for airmen is the weapon that the Army believes most effective.

There are reports that what the newspapers call a "feud" is near its end. If this comes about, it will be a victory for the U.S. Air Force because the practical solution to the practical problem will be a shortening of the lines of communication. When the Vietnamese Corps commander wants air support he wants it quick. There has been a communications stumbling block that will disappear if the Army's key people are equipped with very-high-frequency radio; the shift is under consideration. More important, the request for air support must go through a chain of command involving too many bottlenecks and points where the request may be delayed or rejected. From the forward air controller, the chart shows a path through the air liaison officer for each regiment, division, and corps up to the air support operations center, then to the air operations center. It can take hours—it has taken as much as a full day—for a request to get through this maze. On a trial basis, the U.S. Air Force has been using its own direct communications setup, bypassing most of this predominantly Army machinery, where the requirements can get held up, canceled, or win a substitution—Army aircraft are sent out to do a job the Air Force is better equipped to do. The experiments have been successful.

One cannot come away from the theater without a basic awareness of the handicaps under which the U.S. Air Force operates in that theater. Emphasis is placed on the fact that so many of the artificial restraints on airpower are imposed by political and policy considerations that are entirely unrelated to the field of battle. The Geneva accord and the intellectual maneuverability involved in our alleged adherence to it already have been labored. And so have the State Department's worries about napalm.

There is another quirk: The Air Force cannot carry out a defoliation mission in Vietnam without specific authorization from the Ambassador. First, it should be made clear that defoliation is an important part of USAF's job in this tropical area. The Vietcong strike many of their most telling blows from jungle ambushes alongside highways, railroads, and canals. To help fight this menace, the 315th Troop Carrier Wing (Assault) based at Tan Son Nhut has three C-123 transports equipped with spray devices. These airplanes have suffered more battle damage than any other vehicles in South Vietnam. One of them was hit by machinegun fire 47 times in the month of May alone. At least one reason for this is that when permission for defoliation is given it is with the firm requirements that USAF drop leaflets and use airborne loudspeakers to tell everyone in the area that defoliation will take place and when it will take place. The result is that the Vietcong know when and where to post their machinegunners. The C-123, on this mission, flies over the treetops—500 feet up, at 130 knots. It is an inviting target. The only excuse offered for this perilous procedure is that if the warning were not given the Chicoms (Chinese Communists) would accuse the United States of resorting to germ warfare. The average USAF pilot, clothed in his bulletproof vest and risking his neck over the entire course of his sortie, understandably wishes he were getting a better run for his money. The risks taken in the name of diplomacy are more frustrating than those of open war.

Earlier in the Vietnamese war there were some in our Government who seriously questioned the use of any airpower in this conflict. They feared the multiplicity of border incidents, indiscriminate bombing, the hot pursuit that would lead to violations of the delicate political setup in relation to bordering North Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia. But airpower has done its job within the ground rules. The figures used here at PACAF are almost identical with the ones reported in July from Saigon. Less than 5 percent of the total South Vietnam military force, enlisted in VNAF, is credited with 30 percent of all Vietcong casualties.

At PACAF there is available a tabulation of the air-war record for combined USAF/VNAF operations from January 1962 to January 1964. Here it is:

Combined operational sorties	29,500
Vietcong casualties (killed and wounded)	13,000
Structures damaged or destroyed	32,000
Sampans destroyed	2,800

The sampan item is one that should not be discounted. A sampan, in Indochina, is more than a funny little boat that houses a fisherman and his family. In this war, each one is equivalent to a boxcar loaded with supplies or ammunition.

Another aspect, seen more clearly from Honolulu than from Saigon, is the overall stake we have in southeast Asia and the air threat, such as it is, that the Communists pose. U.S. Army men in Vietnam are the first to admit that their use of this theater to help sell the concept of integral aviation units as part of the ground forces is possible only because there is no air opposition. It may be another USAF handicap in the theater, that there has been no requirement for interceptors and therefore no pressing requirement for early introduction of jet equipment.

But there is always talk, both at PACAF and at Tan Son Nhut, of what the North Vietnamese and the Chicoms may have in mind. Last month there were reports of Chicom air mobilization and even of Soviet helicopters operating just north of the 17th parallel. At Honolulu there is an estimate that the Communist bloc in the Pacific has available more than 5,000 tactical and tactical support aircraft. There are 1,800 in the Soviet Far East, 2,700 in Red China, and 500 in North Korea. The Chicoms put primary reliance on the manned bomber. They have 400 tactical and 300 strategic bombers. The Beagle light jet is based in North Korea and China and from those bases can strike at South Korea, Japan, Okinawa, Taiwan, and southeast Asia—which means Vietnam. The Russians have 300 heavy and medium bombers in the theater. The Bison can hit as far east as Hawaii. The Badger, with inflight refueling, could attack Guam. That they have not, of course, is a tribute to our overall deterrent strength as well as the most recent manifestation of it.

If the war should escalate, it will be PACAF's responsibility, along with the Navy, to meet the threat. If there is a real confrontation it will be traced in the public prints back to late June. That marks the beginning of new Vietcong belligerency and success. It also is when Washington started to make noises about South Vietnam being worth a major war, sharply reversing the long series of optimistic reports brought home from Saigon by Robert McNamara. A North Vietnamese official has been quoted as saying:

"If they fail in the special war which they are testing in South Vietnam, they will also fail elsewhere. That is the international significance of the patriotic struggle of our compatriots in the south with regard to the national liberation struggle in the world."

Well, if we fail in the special war the major responsibility will shift from the Army, which runs MACV, to U.S. Air Force and the Navy, which have minimum representation in the MACV table of organization. U.S. Air Force and the Navy are the major custodians of deterrent power, the same power that reversed a terrifying situation in Cuba, as it did in Lebanon and Berlin.

The taks of winning in Vietnam without invoking deterrent power, particularly airpower, now seems to rest heavily on the shoulders of Maxwell D. Taylor. Ambassador Taylor was an Army general and also the major military adviser to President Kennedy when MACV was created. It is difficult to avoid the observation that when the crack appeared in the facade—starting with the attack on the destroyer *Maddox* on August 2—the name of the Ambassador did not appear in the news. If he was consulted or even notified that the United States was about to retaliate against the North Vietnamese Navy, there was no announcement of this fact. The same can be said for MACV and its Army commander, Lt. Gen. William C. Westmoreland, who only a few weeks earlier had rejected the suggestion that he should have an Air Force officer as his deputy.

Now Ambassador Taylor, who assumed his position barely a month ago, came to Saigon reiterating his 1961 thesis that military victory can be assured only by supporting the Government and building up the economy and society. He is, in short, determined to stir up a spirit of nationalism among the Vietnamese and to guide this spirit to ultimate victory.

A few days ago the Agency for International Development (AID) reiterated this goal, "to help the Vietnamese Government and people resist and defeat the Communist insurgents." And, it continued:

"The role of AID is to help the Vietnamese Government develop effective political, social, and economic programs. These are designed to give the people the incentives to defend their homes and villages."

Then, AID compiled some statistics to show what it, and the Ambassador, have to work with.

About 70 percent of the people in South Vietnam are illiterate. This compares with 25 percent in the Philippines and only 5 percent in Japan.

There is only 1 doctor for each 22,500 persons in South Vietnam. This compares with 1 for each 1,700 in the Philippines and 1 for each 925 in Japan.

The gross national product per capita in South Vietnam is $94. It is $128 in the Philippines and it is $556 per capita in Japan.

The job of creating a sense of nationalism in this kind of a country is a staggering task and one that could consume decades of effort. The idea that Peiping and Hanoi—or Moscow—will give us decades has little merit to the military men who have to help carry out the policy.

The suggestion that the policy now must be changed appears to have at least a root or two in Washington. The attack on North Vietnamese naval bases and our open mobilization of deterrent airpower—the crack in the facade—indicate this is true.

Whether the more basic, and important, policy changes come before the U.S. election or after is of small concern to American fighting men in Vietnam. It is common knowledge in Saigon that the Vietnamese Government's effort to improve its press notices was stepped up sharply about July 1.

It is difficult to see how these press notices will improve to any great degree unless the crack in the facade spreads. The pressure of military force, actual and potential, must be applied less subtly for it is clear that the diplomatic approach has not racked up many points. Within the past few days the Voice of America has been explaining our role in Vietnam with a broadcast by William P. Bundy, Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs. Mr. Bundy has gone to great lengths to protest any implication that we plan to push the war into Communist territory north of the 17th parallel. On the other hand, he has said, "We are determined to use our strength."

The most accurate reading of this is that brinkmanship will be used, and our deterrent power demonstrated, in the case of such provocation as that offered in the Gulf of Tonkin.

It may be that the Reds, if they persist with new incidents, will smash the facade completely and force us to demolish a policy that has not worked. Ironically, it could just happen that way.

PROXMIRE PLEA FOR CHANCE FOR INDEPENDENT TO COMPETE WITH A.T. & T.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Atomic Energy Commission is attempting to slam the door on an independent Wisconsin telephone company's bid to compete with the American Telephone & Telegraph Co.

The Department of Justice has written specifically advising the AEC in this particular case against shutting out independent business.

Justice told the AEC to "scrupulously avoid any action which might prejudice the opportunity of any potential purchaser to obtain the telephone facilities at Los Alamos."

The Small Business Administration also has told me that it disagrees with the AEC decision to exclude the Universal Telephone Co. of Milwaukee from the bid for the telephone facilities at Los Alamos.

The holding of the AEC that the Mountain States Telephone Co., a subsidiary of A.T. & T. is the only company legally authorized to receive and operate these facilities not only contradicts the Department of Justice, the Government's legal expert, but guarantees monopoly.

This is not only an affront to independent business, it burdens the U.S. taxpayer because the Universal Telephone Co. of Milwaukee offered the Government far and away the best bargain for these facilities.

Here is a perfect case study in the massive difficulty of a small business competing with the greatest monopolistic power in America—A.T. & T.

The immense political power of this great financial monopoly has slammed the AEC into line in support of monopoly and against an independent business that deserves a world of credit for competing with and beating the bid of A.T. & T.

Mr. President, Universal Telephone of Milwaukee has done an excellent and responsible job of modernizing and improving telephone facilities in Wisconsin. Its reputation is superlative for responsibility, performance, and efficiency. I ask unanimous consent that letters, articles, and other documents supporting this position be presented in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters and documents were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Initial Letter From Universal Telephone, Inc., to Senator William Proxmire

UNIVERSAL TELEPHONE, INC.,
Milwaukee, Wis., June 30, 1964.

Hon. WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR PROXMIRE: Universal Telephone, Inc., has its administrative offices in Milwaukee and owns operating independent telephone companies in several States, including the State of Wisconsin. I believe we have recently had the opportunity to furnish a number of directories for our Wisconsin exchanges, to you. One of our operations is also in the State of New Mexico.

Two years ago, the Atomic Energy Commission (AEC) advised that they intended to dispose of telephone facilities owned by the Government located at Los Alamos, N. Mex. Since we had operations already in the State, we contacted the AEC as a possible purchaser. At that time, we were advised that Mountain States Telephone & Telegraph Co., a subsidiary of A.T. & T., had been providing service under a maintenance contract with the AEC. At various times, we have subsequently been advised that Mountain States either owns the property or had a right to the property under various legal arguments. In fact, it has always been Mountain States' contention that the property should be given to them without compensation, although since our company entered into the competition for the property, they have indicated some willingness to pay the Government something for the system.

For the past 2 years, we have been having a most difficult time attempting to convince the AEC that they should not give this property to Mountain States and, of course, we have had to expend considerable time and expense competing with Mountain States for the property. Numerous public meetings were held at Los Alamos and frequent conferences held in Washington, D.C., but we have had only token success in denting the power and strength of Mountain States, the Bell System company.

Enclosed is a recent news release from the AEC which was issued after about 15 months of deliberation by the general counsel of the AEC. The release, on its face, sets forth a conflicting story. On one hand, they have stated in paragraph 3 "that Mountain States is the only company at the present time that has legal authority to receive the Government's interest in and to operate the telephone system."

On the other hand, they are stating that they wish to afford all companies an opportunity to acquire the Government's interest in Los Alamos by inviting proposals for its acquisition. Obviously, if Mountain States has the only legal right, in the eyes of the AEC, then the solicitation of proposals will be of questionable value and may only amount to a little window dressing.

Actually, we must admit that, as recently as a few months ago, the AEC appeared to be ready to directly negotiate the sale with Mountain States. At that time, we asked the Small Business Administration (SBA) to look into the matter, since we felt that the disadvantage of our size was becoming fatal to our success. It is our opinion that the only reason there was not direct negotiations with Mountain States is because of the interest that was shown by the SBA and also the Justice Department. AEC, because of our insistence and the interest of the SBA, finally submitted the matter to the SBA on an informal basis. Unfortunately, the whole matter was never submitted to SBA on a formal basis and no formal opinion was requested of the SBA.

It is our further understanding that the SBA objected to the interpretation of New Mexico State law by the General Counsel of AEC, and more importantly, objected to the course that AEC was following in disposing of the property to Mountain States because of the violation of antitrust laws. The end result is that AEC has modified their previous approach in disposing of this property to Mountain States immediately and are now suggesting that independent telephone companies submit proposals for the property, even though their legal opinion states that no one else is entitled to own and operate the same telephone property.

Mr. Joseph Marker, chief, advocatory branch, has spent considerable time and effort investigating this matter. His department has arrived at certain decisions on the problem but has never been consulted formally to present them and it appears that his suggestions have not been followed. We would appreciate if your committee could formally inquire of the SBA concerning the following.

1. What were the actual activities and scope of the SBA's investigation of the Los Alamos telephone disposal matter?
2. What position did the SBA take regarding the disposal?
3. Did the SBA approve or disapprove of the SEC's action and opinion of their General Counsel?

I believe that the SBA would welcome an opportunity to formally express their viewpoints since they have not, to date, had such an opportunity. We certainly would appreciate getting the complete story out in the open. Our legal counsel from New Mexico, Attorney Sterling F. Black and myself have worked on this matter diligently and would be most willing to meet with you and your staff in Washington to further explain the many details that have developed in this matter. Certainly there are pros and cons on both sides, but we are convinced that our program is superior and in the best interest of the U.S. Government. All we ask is that we be given an opportunity to prove ourselves or at least have this property go to some other independent telephone company rather than being swallowed up by the gigantic Bell System which already operates approximately 86 percent of the telephones in the State of New Mexico.

We would sincerely appreciate your comments and any action you may take resulting from this letter.

Yours very truly,
ROLAND G. NEHRING,
Executive Vice President.

Atomic Energy Commission Summary of Opinion Giving A.T. & T. Affiliate Sole Authority To Bid

U.S. ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,
LOS ALAMOS AREA OFFICE,
Los Alamos, N. Mex.

The Atomic Energy Commission announced today that it plans to request proposals from organizations interested in acquiring and operating the Los Alamos, N. Mex., community telephone system.

The Commission has been reviewing the transfer of the community telephone system in connection with the transfer of Government ownership of the Los Alamos community to private and municipal ownership. Statutory authority was granted to the Commission in 1962 to terminate Government ownership of this community which was established during World War II to support the Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory. Transfer of the community to private and municipal ownership and operation will not adversely affect the continuing AEC programs at the Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory.

In its consideration of the community telephone transfer, the Commission obtained the opinion of its General Counsel. The opinion discusses section 73a of the Atomic Energy Community Act of 1955, as amended, which requires that the transferee have the legal authority to receive and operate the system, applicable State law and the operations of the Mountain States Telephone & Telegraph Co. in Los Alamos County, particularly in the White Rock area. The opinion concludes that Mountain States is the only company at the present time that has legal authority to receive the Government's interest in and to operate the telephone system.

The opinion notes, however, that changes may occur in the existing factual situation or in the status of Federal and State law, and that changed circumstances could lead to a different conclusion. In view of this possibility, and in order to afford all companies interested in acquiring the Government's interest in the Los Alamos community telephone system the maximum opportunity to do so consistent with the provision of the Community Act, the Commission intends to invite proposals for its acquisition from all interested companies and to select the transferee under section 73b of the Community Act. Prior to actual transfer, the transferee would be required to submit evidence satisfactory to the Commission that it has the legal authority to receive and operate the system.

Report From the SBA, Dated July 25, and a Copy of Their Formal Recommendation to AEC in Which They Ask That the AEC Modify Its Announcement To Provide That It Will Select the Best Qualified Transferee Without Any Restriction From the Application of the New Mexico Statutes

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., July 28, 1964.

Hon. WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR PROXMIRE: I am happy to reply to your request of July 6, 1964, for a report on the activities of the Small Business Administration in connection with the disposal of the interest of the Atomic Energy

Commission in the Los Alamos telephone system.

Some months ago, after our assistance was requested by Universal Telephone, Inc., Milwaukee, Wis., SBA informally advised the Commission of our interest and our preference for a disposal procedure which would provide an opportunity for possible acquisition by an independent telephone company. In April 1964, we received a copy of the draft opinion of the General Counsel of the AEC which concluded that Mountain States Telephone Co., the Bell System affiliate, was the only legally authorized transferee under certain New Mexico statutes. In informal conferences my staff indicated our disagreement with this legal conclusion. It is our understanding that the Commission made its decision after its members were advised of the informal positions of SBA and the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice. Incidentally, it was only after SBA urged the Antitrust Division to participate that it contacted the AEC in this matter.

We appreciate the acknowledgment by Universal Telephone that SBA was instrumental in modifying AEC's decision so that other companies will be invited to make acquisition proposals and to establish, prior to transfer, their legal authority to receive and operate the Los Alamos system. We recognize, however, that the release of the opinion of the AEC's General Counsel imposes an unequal burden on companies other than Mountain States. Therefore, in an effort to remove this inequality, we are making a formal recommendation to AEC and a copy is enclosed herewith.

I have welcomed this opportunity to inform you of this example of our interagency activities on behalf of independent small business.

Sincerely,

EUGENE P. FOLEY,
Administrator.

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., July 29, 1964.

Hon. GLENN T. SEABORG,
Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Small Business Administration was pleased by the announcement on June 24, 1964, that the Atomic Energy Commission plans to request proposals from any company interested in acquiring the Los Alamos community telephone system. Simultaneously, however, the Commission released and incorporated in its announcement the opinion by its General Counsel that Mountain States Telephone & Telegraph Co. was presently the only legally authorized transferee. We are concerned that the release of this opinion will adversely affect the acquisition opportunity of other telephone companies, especially of independent small business companies. We are not convinced that the legal conclusion in this released opinion was necessary or appropriate.

The conclusion in the released opinion is based upon the no-duplication statutes of New Mexico as interpreted in one opinion by the New Mexico Supreme Court (*Mountain States T. & T. Co.* v. *Suburban Telephone Co.*, 72 N.M. 411, 384 P. 2d 684 (1963)). In that case two telephone companies were competing in extending their lines from different directions, each charged duplication by the other, and each claimed priority. The trial court found that both parties were operating in the same field or territory, part of a county; this finding was affirmed on appeal. We do not believe that these facts are similar or applicable to the disposal of the Los Alamos telephone system by AEC.

We seriously question the applicability of the New Mexico no-duplication statutes to the present situation. We think that the language of these statutes clearly shows the intention to restrict the construction of second plant or equipment which would duplicate existing plant or equipment. There was no telephone plant or equipment in Los Alamos prior to that established by the Government. Mountain States' independent operations in the clearly delimited White Rock area began many years thereafter. The statutes provide a remedy only to the entity which first operated in the field or territory. Therefore, it is our opinion that Mountain States cannot use the no-duplication statutes to prevent a legal transfer by the AEC to any company other than Mountain States.

Even if the no-duplication statutes were applicable, we could not agree with the argument that Mountain States has priority in Los Alamos County because of its providing telephone services in the White Rock area. According to the released opinion the AEC community telephone system serves 4,600 telephones while Mountain States served 230 telephone stations at the end of February 1964.

The Atomic Energy Community Act of 1955 established the policy of Congress for AEC to dispose of its community property to others wherever possible; it was specifically extended to include Los Alamos by the 1962 amendment. Within the spirit of this congressional mandate, the AEC sold, in about 1961, an area know as White Rock within Los Alamos County to private real estate developers. In White Rock the gas, electric, and telephone services are provided by private utilities. Pursuant to the disposal procedures under section 73b of the Atomic Energy Community Act of 1955, as amended, the AEC is transferring the gas and electric utility systems in Los Alamos County to the county government, except for the White Rock area where gas and electricity will continue to be provided by the private utilities. The restriction in the New Mexico statutes is for duplication within the municipality, field, or territory where similar plant or equipment is in operation. Accordingly, if Mountain States is entitled to any priority because of its recent operations in White Rock, we think the field or territory for such priority would be the White Rock area itself and not the surrounding Los Alamos County. We do not believe the Supreme Court of the United States would approve any broader interpretation of the New Mexico statutes which would thereby prevent the AEC from determining the best qualified transferee for the Los Alamos community telephone system within the criteria established by Congress in section 73b of the Community Act.

In view of the foregoing, it is our recommendation that the Commission modify its announcement to provide that it will select the best qualified transferee under section 73b of the Community Act without any restriction from the application of the New Mexico no-duplication statutes. SBA makes this proposal under our statutory responsibility in section 8(c) of the Small Business Act, as amended, to make recommendations to other Federal agencies for the adjustment of their programs to serve the needs of small business. Our act also provides that in order to preserve free competitive enterprise a fair proportion of the total sales of Government property shall be made to small business concerns, and that SBA shall make appropriate recommendations to other Federal agencies; see sections 2(a), 8(b)(11), and 15 of the Small Business Act, as amended.

I appreciate the opportunity afforded to my staff to informally advise your staff of our views after we received a copy of the draft of the opinion prepared by your General Counsel. While our informal representations may have contributed to the announcement that the AEC was inviting acquisition proposals from all interested companies, I think it is appropriate that SBA make this formal representation in an effort to remove the disadvantage to independent telephone companies resulting from the priority status of Mountain States under the announcement released by the Commission.

Sincerely,

EUGENE P. FOLEY,
Administrator.

[Article from the New Mexican of Santa Fe dated Aug. 16, 1964, reporting clash between Los Alamos commissioners and AEC over dispute of telephone facilities]

LOS ALAMOS COMMISSIONERS, AEC MAY CLASH ON TELEPHONE DISPOSAL—FRANCHISING PUT ON NEXT MEETING

LOS ALAMOS.—The Los Alamos County commissioners Saturday set themselves on an apparent crash course with the Atomic Energy Commission over the controversial disposal of the community telephone system here.

Commission Chairman Ellis Stout in letters to both Mountain States Telephone & Telegraph Co. and Universal Telephone Co. informed the two communications utilities that the commission at the next regular meeting, set for September 14, would take under consideration telephone franchising.

The letters came less than a week after the AEC in Washington announced there would be no early decision on disposing of the system. Earlier, the AEC had indicated the system might be sold to private enterprise as early as last spring.

County commissioners at their July meeting took the stand that they alone had the right to franchise a telephone utility in Los Alamos and they were outspoken at the time in declaring they intended that franchise would go to the company that could best serve the needs and the interests of the community.

FAVORS UNIVERSAL

This, on the basis of firm offers made so far, apparently puts Universal out in front as far as the county officials are concerned.

Legal opinion by AEC counsel has so far favored Mountain States and thus the possibility of a bitter dispute has arisen.

Universal has offered the AEC $750,000 for the system, despite the fact that AEC never has completely detailed how much of the system would be turned over to private utility control.

There has been speculation that AEC would possibly retain that part of the system within the technical area—upwards of 4,000 telephones. The entire system is now operated by the AEC with maintenance by Mountain States under contract.

Universal additionally has given the county commission a firm offer of a 4-percent franchise while Mountain States has offered only half that much.

Some county officials privately have expressed concern over delay in the disposal since the sooner the system is sold, the sooner the county, presently suffering from a low total evaluation, would start getting the franchise tax revenue.

ACTION PLANNED

Stout's letter to Earl R. Louthan, vice president and general manager for Mountain States at Albuquerque, indicated the county planned to move ahead fairly fast. Stout asked Mountain States to state in writing features of a franchise agreement that Mountain States would be willing to enter into if the county should grant a franchise in the next 3 months.

Many of the Mountain States' proposals have been verbal offers and Stout's letter stressed that the commissioners wanted them now in writing.

A letter to Roland G. Nehring, executive vice president for Universal, which now operates 12 independent telephone companies, noted that Universal had sent commissioners written proposals and asked Nehring if these franchise offers still held good.

Nehring arrived in Los Alamos Wednesday night on the heels of the AEC notice that there would be no early decision. He conferred with local people with interests in Universal and with county officials before leaving Friday.

Nehring gave commissioners a verbal reassertion of the Universal proposals and told the New Mexican that a letter confirming this would be provided immediately.

Universal officials also have expressed some displeasure with the delays encountered since AEC announced decision to dispose of the utility company.

Universal entered the picture 19 months ago and almost at once became at odds with Mountain States which has asserted it had prior rights.

AEC counsel in June ruled that it was apparent that at the present time Mountain States was the only party that could legally, according to the AEC, acquire the system. But the decision said circumstances might change in the foreseeable future in order to allow Universal to purchase the system.

Most of Universal's holdings are in Wisconsin, Indiana, and Illinois with headquarters in Milwaukee. However, the company does operate a system south of Gallup, at Marvel, Colo., and on portions of the Indian reservations in Arizona.

Nehring said that if Universal is successful in obtaining the franchise that a local company would be formed with stock available and seats on the board of directors available to local people.

Nehring pointed out that the community would also benefit residents of the community since the rates Universal has offered were considerably lower than the proposal by Mountain States.

"We are glad the county commissioners have decided to take action now before their franchise rights completely eroded away," the Universal executive said.

Nehring said his company was willing to take its chances in open competition with any other telephone company. He said the company had stated as far back as April 1, 1963, that the company felt it had a good product to sell, a modern telephone service at the most reasonable rates.

Last year, he said, the county commission submitted a draft of a franchise to the company and "we accepted the draft."

"Our willingness to sign the county franchise remains," Nehring said. "But of course we will be reviewing the matter further to determine if any desirable modifications in light of developments since acceptance of the original draft.

"Overall, we have appreciated the acceptance we have received from the residents of Los Alamos," he declared, "and we would welcome the opportunity to become part of the community and to serve its citizens."

Principal Terms of Franchise Offered by Mountain States, American Telephone & Telegraph Subsidiary, on September 1, 1964

MOUNTAIN STATES TELEPHONE,
Albuquerque, N. Mex., September 1, 1964.

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS,
Los Alamos County, N. Mex.

GENTLEMEN: As requested in your letter of August 13, 1964, the following is an outline of the principal terms of the franchise ordinance which we hope will meet with the approval of the county commissioners.

We have been operating the telephone system in Los Alamos since 1943, and expect to continue to serve this area in the future. Our company would welcome a county franchise granted to us by the board of county commissioners if the franchise payments are comparable with those made elsewhere in New Mexico.

We offer a franchise payment of 2 percent on all local exchange revenues paid by the residents of Los Alamos County. Under this new offer there will now be included revenues, whether paid to the Atomic Energy Commission or our company, and also the revenues paid by the Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory, the Zia Co., and the Atomic Energy Commission.

Contingent upon the acceptance of this offer by January 1, 1965, the initial payment would be made retroactive to January 1, 1964. As a result, the company would begin receiving franchise payments at once of approximately $15,700 per year. This amount is based upon the local revenues from the present telephones at Los Alamos and includes White Rock.

Under this proposal, the county will receive payments in excess of $55,000 between now and the time the actual conversion is made to an exchange operation; namely, July 1, 1967. The first payment would be made for the year 1964 immediately upon the acceptance of a franchise and payments will be made quarterly thereafter on the basis as outlined above.

The supporting structures, consisting of poles and conduit, are now owned by the Government. In the future, they may be transferred to the county for its use in connection with its electric system. The Mountain States Telephone Co. is agreeable to entering into a joint-use agreement with the county in the event the title to these supporting structures is transferred to the county. This, of course, would provide the county with additional revenue in the form of annual pole attachment payments and underground conduit rentals. As an alternative, Mountain States is interested in acquiring the poles and conduit, either from the AEC or the county, or Mountain States would be willing to acquire a part interest in the structures, either with the county or the AEC so that a joint-use agreement could be entered into with each party owning approximately the same amount of plant at the start of the joint-use agreement. In these respects, we are agreeable to any reasonable plan that the AEC or the county may desire. All other telephone facilities; namely, cable, telephone sets, long-distance facilities, switchboards, motor vehicles, furniture, fixtures, and private branch exchange switchboards are now owned and always have been owned solely by the Mountain States Co.

The ad valorem taxes on this property for the year 1963 were $12,780. According to the records of the company, the gross amount of ad valorem taxes paid to the county from the time the county was first established to date, has amounted to $251,472 and our records show that ad valorem taxes have been paid on these facilities since the inception of our operation in Los Alamos in 1943. Unquestionably, there will be a substantial increase in these ad valorem taxes when a new exchange with the new electronic switching service is established.

Under our plans we would furnish extended area service between Los Alamos and Santa Fe. It would enable approximately 27,000 customers in these contiguous areas to share unlimited local calling privileges. The appropriate date to make this change would be coincident with the conversion of the telephone operations in Los Alamos to a standard form of operation.

Last year, in planning for the future telephone growth of Los Alamos, we constructed a microwave system between Los Alamos and Santa Fe. This microwave system will permit Mountain States to add facilities, as required, to adequately handle all long distance, in addition to the extended area service with Santa Fe. We also plan to provide nationwide direct-distance dialing at the time of the conversion to standard operation. The prompt granting of this franchise to Mountain States will allow adequate time to schedule the installation of the latest type of electronic switching equipment. The electronic switching system has many features not now available in the standard dial equipment and such an installation would be one of the first of this ultramodern equipment in the Mountain States territory. The attachment to this letter will give you some understanding of the many conveniences which will be available with an electronic switching office.

We will be glad to meet with you at your convenience in order to work out any details and in order that payments to the county may start without delay.

Very truly yours,
E. E. LOUTHAN,
Vice President and General Manager.

New Service Features Available With ESS—Feature and Availability

(a) Compressed dialing is a feature which will permit the customer to dial any number of commonly called telephones by using an abbreviated number of three or four digits—now.

(b) Add-on conferencing permits adding other people to a conversation by either party dialing a special code and the number of the desired party to be added—now.

(c) Dial conferencing permits the customer to set up a conference call involving three other people, including one on the toll network if desired—now.

(d) Automatic transfer of calls will permit the customer to transfer calls to a predetermined number when he leaves his premises. Upon returning, he clears the calls back to his location by dialing a special code—now.

(e) Call waiting is a feature which processes a low level audible tone on a busy connection to indicate that someone is trying to reach the busy line. It is possible for the party being called to hold the existing connection while he establishes connection with the new caller—about 1967.

(f) Sequence calling—this feature will permit placing a series of calls in a predetermined sequence by dialing a simple code to start the sequence and merely hanging up while the next call is being originated—later.

Principal Terms of Franchise Offered by Universal Telephone, Independent Milwaukee, Wis., Firm on September 17, 1964

SEPTEMBER 14, 1964.

Re franchise proposal of Los Alamos Telephone Co.

Mr. ELLIS STOUT,
Chairman, Board of County Commissioners, Los Alamos County, Los Alamos, N. Mex.

DEAR MR. STOUT: By letter dated August 13, 1964, you requested that we restate our position on franchise matters. We replied by letter of August 26, 1964, to the effect that we remained willing to sign the franchise as drafted by Los Alamos County. In the August 26 letter we did not once again go into the voluminous details of our proposal commitment which had been previously submitted to the county.

Certain conditions have changed in the telephone disposal matter. Firstly, the County of Los Alamos has been awarded the electric and gas utilities. The county will undoubtedly be acquiring the electric poles in the transfer. When this transpires, Los Alamos Telephone Co. will be agreeable to negotiating a joint-use agreement with the county in payment of contact rental at the highest prevailing rate as established in the State of New Mexico. We would also consider any other pole use arrangement that the county might desire, such as payment to the county for part ownership of the electric poles. This contract could be resolved prior to the acquiring by the county of the electric utility, in anticipation of that event.

Secondly, since the submission of our August 26, 1964, letter, we have been advised that the local office of the AEC has decided to withdraw the telephone facilities from the disposal program until July 1967. Realizing that this would jeopardize the revenue program of the Los Alamos County government until 1967, we have decided and are happy to state that we hereby commit to payment of the 4-percent franchise fee immediately, upon issuance of the franchise to us, regardless of our physical possession of the townsite facilities.

The basis of the franchise fee computation will be the gross revenues of $402,098 as set forth in our pro forma statements previously submitted in May of 1963. The result is a franchise fee of $16,084 annually. This fee will be payable immediately to the county of Los Alamos upon granting of the franchise. It is further agreed that an amount of $16,084 would be payable to the county for calendar year 1964. The payment of an identical amount will also be paid for calendar years 1965, 1966, and 1967. Payments will be payable on January 1, 1965, 1966, and 1967 and will increase in amount as we assume operations of the telephone facilities and revenues exceed the sum of $402,098.

Similarly, we acknowldege the fact that the county of Los Alamos has not been responsible for the withdrawal of the technical site from the disposal program and should not be prejudiced because of this revenue producing area being so withdrawn. We hereby also commit ourselves to paying the regular 4-percent franchise fee on the pro forma amount of $461,036 which was also submitted in May 1963. This franchise fee would amount to an additional annual fee of $18,441. Since the disposal of the technical area has now become less definite the $18,441 would not be payable until and if Los Alamos Telephone Co. successfully acquires the technical area facilities. However, we hereby commit to paying the annual amount of $18,441, retroactively to January 1, 1964, and upon the granting of a franchise by Los Alamos County, we would establish an appropriate reserve account under bond, looking forward to the eventuality of disposal of the technical area telephone facilities.

We are willing to commit to the above franchise fee provisions for two reasons. Firstly, we have always stated that we had tailored our program to bring greatest benefit to the county because we recognized its revenue requirements would be great. We are therefore agreeable to making these proceeds available to the county government without any risk to them and we are willing to bear the risk. Secondly, we have always stated that Los Alamos is a highly desirable telephone revenue producing area, and very frankly, we are willing to make this investment to insure that we are succecssful in acquiring the operating opportunities to the area. This commitment will in no way increase the rates that we have already proposed.

We respectfully submit that the board of county commissioners render a favorable decision and grant a franchise at the earliest possible moment in order that we shall have that opportunity to serve the residents of Los Alamos.

Very truly yours,

Roland G. Nehring,
Executive Vice President.

Letter From Department of Justice Dated August 17, 1964, in Which They Strongly Question the Legal Correctness of the AEC Opinion

Department of Justice,
Washington, D.C., August 17, 1964.

Hon. Glenn T. Seaborg,
Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Chairman: This letter pertains to the June 24 announcement by the Atomic Energy Commission concerning the proposed disposal of the telephone facilities which it currently owns and operates at Los Alamos, and the release of an opinion by your General Counsel on the applicability of certain New Mexico laws to the proposed disposal.

Prior to this action by the Commission, personnel of the Antitrust Division had conferred with representatives of the Commission on an informal basis regarding this proposed disposal of facilities, and had been shown a draft of a legal opinion on the latter subject which had been prepared within the Commission. The opinion, which has now been released in substantially the same form as the draft, concludes that Mountain States Telephone & Telegraph Co., a subsidiary of American Telephone & Telegraph Co., is the only "company with present legal authority to operate the telephone system at Los Alamos as a public utility."

In our discussions with AEC representatives we indicated that in our opinion the General Counsel's proposed advice did not necessarily present a correct interpretation of New Mexico law; that there is substantial doubt that the particular statute involved—the New Mexico "no-duplication" law—is applicable under the circumstances present at Los Alamos; and that we hoped that the Commission would scrupulously avoid any action which might prejudice the opportunity of any potential purchaser to obtain the telephone facilities at Los Alamos.

In our last conference on this matter, which was attended by Mr. Hennessey, we outlined a procedure which would be conducive to attainment of the various statutory requirements and governmental policies relating to sales of surplus property. We felt that this suggested procedure would result in full and free competition in the bidding for the facilities and would avoid any prejudgment by the Federal Government as to which firm or firms might ultimately "[have] the legal authority to receive and operate the utility." To meet the requirements of the Community Act we suggested that a provision be included in the invitation for bids which would require the successful bidder to provide prima facie evidence of its "legal authority" at the time of closing of the transaction. In the event of any question of the right under New Mexico law of the successful bidder to operate the facilities, this procedure would permit appropriate proceedings to be instituted by interested parties in the New Mexico courts. This procedure would also have avoided placing the Commission on record with an opinion the legal correctness of which had been strongly questioned by other Federal agencies, and issuance of which might prejudice the rights of any potential purchaser other than Mountain States.

Since Commission representatives expressed the view in our conferences that the Commission is not required to submit the disposal of the Los Alamos telephone facilities to the Attorney General for advice under 40 U.S.C. 488, we observe that, even if this were true, there is nothing in the circumstances here which would warrant the Commission in disposing of these facilities to ignore the general policies of maintaining and strengthening competition which are reflected in both 40 U.S.C. 488 and 42 U.S.C. 2011. Moreover, we feel obliged to inform you that, were the Commission to request our advice under 40 U.S.C. 488 on disposal of these facilities to Mountain States, it is doubtful that favorable antitrust advice could be rendered.

We would be pleased both to discuss this matter further with Commission representatives and to render formal antitrust advice upon request by the Commission.

Sincerely yours,

William H. Orrick, Jr.,
Assistant Attorney General,
Antitrust Division.

Letter From Senator William Proxmire of September 30, 1964, to Chairman Glenn Seaborg of the AEC

September 30, 1964.

Hon. Glenn T. Seaborg,
Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Chairman: I am writing to you in regard to the disposal of the Atomic Energy Commission telephone facilities at Los Alamos, N. Mex. As I understand it, both the Mountain States Telephone Co., a subsidiary of A.T. & T. and the Universal Telephone Co. of Milwaukee, a small business, are interested in bidding on this facility.

I have been advised that the General Counsel of the Commission has issued an opinion on June 24, 1964 stating that the Mountain States Telephone Co. is the only company at the present time which has legal authority to receive and operate these facilities. I have checked with the Small Business Administration and the Department of Justice and both agencies have advised me that they do not concur with the Commission's opinion. In fact, in the Department's letter to you of August 17, they have requested that the Commission "scrupulously avoid any action which might prejudice the opportunity of any potential purchaser to obtain the telephone facilities at Los Alamos."

I strongly feel that these facilities should go to the company which will best serve the needs and interests of the community of Los Alamos and which is willing to take its chances in fair and open competition. In view of the fact that Federal policy dictates that a fair proportion of the total sales of Government property shall be made to small business concerns, that more than 85 percent of the present telephone facilities in New Mexico belong to Mountain States, and that other Federal agencies have strongly questioned the legal correctness of the Commission's opinion, I feel that the Commission should make every effort to remove the disadvantage to independent telephone companies resulting from the priority status of Mountain States under the announcement released by the Commission in June.

I am looking forward to hearing from you on this matter.

Sincerely,

William Proxmire.

TRIFLING WITH TRUTH—SERMON BY DR. RUSSELL C. STROUP

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I have recently been made aware of an interesting sermon delivered here in Washington several weeks ago by a distinguished churchman, Dr. Russell C. Stroup, at the Georgetown Presbyterian Church. Dr. Stroup had read the testimony of the noted writer and essayist, Marya Mannes, delivered quite some time ago before the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee. Her subject was the packaging of products sold in supermarkets, and the many ways in which the consumer is deceived and misled by some manufacturers.

This recalled to my mind the very excellent work done in this area by the Senator from Michigan, **Philip A. Hart**. As chairman of the Antitrust Subcommittee, Senator **Hart** has conducted extensive investigations and hearings into this entire subject, on the basis of which he drew up a bill, S. 387, to set up minimum standards of packaging and labeling to protect the consumer. Senator **Hart** is to be commended for his efforts to spotlight the abuses in the packaging field, and his attempts to correct them by legislation which has received the enthusiastic support of many national organizations representing most of our citizenry, as well as some forward-looking manufacturers. Apparently, there is not enough time remaining in this Congress for action on S. 387, but the chances for passage in the next Congress are excellent.

Because Dr. Stroup's sermon expresses such an interesting point of view on this problem, I ask that it be included in the RECORD. The sermon, entitled, "Trifling With Truth," was delivered by Dr. Russell C. Stroup in the Georgetown Presbyterian Church on August 9, 1964.

There being no objection, the sermon was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRIFLING WITH TRUTH

(Text: Micah 6: 6–16)

The type of sermon which I preach this morning is frowned upon by professors in theological seminaries and by recent graduates of these sacred institutions. It is what they call a topical sermon. A topical sermon is one that deals with war, or peace, or race relations, or automation, or training of children, or use of leisure time—any number of subjects which might be used, and some of which I have used. In theological circles this is contrasted with what is called the Biblical or expository sermon—a sermon in which you take a passage of scripture and try to reveal what is revealed in it, particularly such theological truth or spiritual truth as may be contained in that particular passage. But I have always felt it was odd to make a distinction between the topical and the Biblical. This because I find the Bible a very topical book, dealing with very practical matters relating to life—all of it—and relating to the daily concerns of men and women, of you and me.

This was brought home to me markedly—and the result is the sermon this morning—in reading some very interesting testimony given by Marya Mannes before a congressional committee. It had to do with the very pleblan subject of the packaging of products in supermarkets. Having laid down her book, I was reading in the Bible and I came to that part of the scripture I read to you this morning. It is an excellent example of what I mean when I say that the Bible is a very practical, topical book.

There is in the scripture I read this morning the very high and lofty spiritual concept climaxing in the lovely lines, "He hath shown thee, O man, what is good; and what doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?" But the prophet, unlike a lot of preachers, refuses to leave us soothed by these lovely phrases, these somewhat general statements. Out of the sanctuary he takes us into the supermarkets. God, he says, has a message for the city of commerce where men buy and sell, where goods are consumed and profits are conceived. From speaking of walking humbly with God, loving mercy and doing justly, he spells it out in terms of trade. For the prophet speaks of scant measure, of dishonest scales, of deceitful weights, which are an abomination to God. He condemns those who deceive by false advertising, who cheat consumers by the tricks of the trade. Now it's no good to tell me that God has no place in the supermarket. According to the Scriptures He is there. He is there examining the goods, looking over the shelves. He is concerned as we should be by the facts that He finds. He should discover as we may discover, for example, that a certain applesauce for babies is put out in a container which looks as though it holds as much as it used to hold. But the fact of the matter is that it holds less than it once held. That a package of cereal which once contained a certain number of biscuits now containes one less than it did before. The package looks the same, but the contents are different.

Now of course in ancient Israel there were no laws that compelled the merchant to mark on his package what it contained. We compel the merchants to do that. But one would have to go into the supermarket with a slide rule and a mathematician to discover from the package just what it is that it contains. Like false weights and scant measures, the packages are designed to make you think you are getting the same value in the same package at the same price when actually you are getting less and paying more.

Then there are those deceptive confusions of designations. "Giant" and "Jumbo," whatever that means. What is the difference between a quart and a "full quart," or the "big, big gallon?" Or the term "New," which is loved, or "Improved," or "Activated," or "Super," etc. Someone surely is being taken in, and one suspects that that someone is—me.

Now is all this foolish, unimportant? Am I wasting your time and my time with such seeming trivialities? Few surely are hoodwinked. Surely few care. A penny here and a penny there means millions to someone, but a small loss to us. We are a prosperous and careless people. The money comes and the money goes. Baby gets a little less applesauce, but baby is still healthy. Mom gets a little less for her money, but they still prosper.

Is it important? Well, Marya Mannes says, "It isn't a question of applesauce, it is a question of morality. Little deceptions of single consumers can add up to a mighty deception of a whole people." And so it is. Congress at least has been concerned, and the testimony that I read goes on to say, "Except for the relationship between man and wife, nothing is more intimate than the relationship between the buyer and the seller. And there would be neither marriage nor commerce if the fundamental basis of both were not trust. Without trust a civilized society cannot endure. When the people who are too smart to be good fool the people who are too good to be smart, then society begins to crumble." I would emphasize this last sentence. This is the thing that makes it all important to us and relevant to religion. Good faith is essential in all human relations. Without this, there is a moral and social anarchy. The tragedy of calculated deceit is that we lose our faith as well as our money. We are rich enough to afford the loss of money. We cannot afford the loss of faith. We become cynical and accept dishonesty as a part of life. This is the peril. We no longer expect the truth. We no longer require strict adherence to it. An atmosphere of indifference is created and what we expect of others we may come to accept in ourselves.

How callous we are in this matter I can testify out of my own experience. Many years ago I had a manufacturer in my church come to me. The Government had finally caught up with him, saying he had to change the wording on the package. He said "You know how to use words. I wonder if you could take this and change it so it would say the same thing and yet get by the Government regulation? I'll pay you well for it." That was a job I didn't accept. He was amazed at my reluctance to enter into what he considered a perfectly legitimate business endeavor.

Our manufacturers, merchants, and advertisers have served us well in many ways. They have given us an abundance of goods of acceptable quality, usually, and reasonable prices. We applaud them for their accomplishments. But we have a right to ask, I think, that their honesty match their efficiency. This is true not only in packaging but in advertising as well. The advertiser comes into our homes. No one talks to us as much as they do. They are apt to be more intimate with your children than you are, spend more time with them, say more to them than you do. If this is true, then we have a right to demand that those who come into our homes so intimately do not deceive us and our children with half-truths and doubletalk. I would like to put over every TV set a verse from Ephesians, "Let no man deceive you with vain words." And I would like to send to every TV advertiser another verse from Ephesians, "Let no corrupt communication proceed out of your mouth, but that which is good to the use of edifying that it may minister grace to the hearers." I would suggest that not all advertising does minister grace unto the hearers, nor is it edifying. Paul said that "Evil communications corrupt good manners." They also corrupt good minds. And evil communications have no right in my home or in yours.

Incidentally, I think it is corrupting in a different way to make our children salesmen for soup, soap, and cereal. In a recent survey 94 percent of the mothers interviewed said that their children demanded and got what they were told to ask for. And as someone has remarked, "It is creating a race of demanding, nagging, overindulged, overpampered kids, and a race of beat-down, spineless parents who take their orders." I heard recently of a brave rebellion of a mother in a supermarket who said "I don't care what Howdy Doody says, you can't have it." I applaud this independence.

My deep concern is that in marketing our merchandise we present a false set of values and an unreal concept of life. Of course advertising must deal with the material. It must and should stress consumption. The business of advertising is to get us to buy, and it is a proper business. But in pursuit of this legitimate end is it necessary to appeal to all the baser emotions of man? His vanity, cupidity, envy, fear, stupidity—all these are appealed to. There are better reasons for buying cars than to gain the envy of your neighbor. Love is not lost or gained by reason of your hair tint. And success is not secured through mouthwashes. The world, the real world, is not as advertisers would suggest, made up exclusively of white, middle-class suburban families with the standard two cars, and the just as standard two children. A world of he-men and birdbrained women smoking filter cigarettes, drinking slenderizing beer, suffering chronic indigestion while they worry about telltale gray, bad breath, and 27-percent-fewer cavities.

All of this we know, or think we know. But the advertiser has studied you much more earnestly than you have studied yourself. And he seems to think that if this is not the real world it is the kind of world you would like to have. "The advertiser possesses the power to affect deeply and lastingly the nature, attitudes, and aspirations of 180 million Americans," someone has written. Not simply to buy certain things, but to live, think, aspire in certain ways.

But if we escape this danger, if we are not taken in, if we are too wise to be deceived we are nonetheless in peril. We are either saps or cynics, and both are bad. The exaggerated claim, the doubletalk, the false emphasis, all play havoc with our faith in the written and spoken word. False communications cause us to question all communications. This is disastrous, as all human relations depend on communications. Just as the fabric of our society is held together by faith, so all human relations demand honest communication and a faith in communication, the written and spoken word. And when we tend to reject all as false and phony, the very fabric falls apart. The words of the teacher, the words of the politician, the words of the preacher, may be treated with the same suspicion as the words of the huckster. And often they should be, I may say, because there is a terrible tendency on the part of all of us to become a part of the society of which we are a part, and when everyone is speaking very loudly we raise our voices. When people are using certain methods we tend to use those methods also.

I am not proud of the fact that the Presbyterian Church has pioneered in the broadcasting of catchy little jingles to sell religion as you might sell soap. This we have done, hiring such gentlemen as the one who composed this little gem: "Doesn't it get a little lonely sometime out on a limb without Him?" Now this is done by our church and I presume it is done, alas, by other churches. Someone suggested sardonically certain possible jingles. "Try prayer, it purifies the air." "Take belief for fast, fast, fast relief." "Left in the lurch? No help from Birch? Why not try church?"

How easy it is for all communications to become vulgarized, commercialized, falsified. This is what concerns us. Jesus said, "Let your communications be Yea, Yea, and Nay, Nay." Let them be straightforward and truthful and plain. Paul said, "For we are not like so many peddlers of God's word. But as men of sincerity as commissioned by God, in the sight of God we speak in Christ." God save us from being peddlers of God's word. Let us hold to the simplicity, clarity, sincerity which is in Christ Jesus our Lord. In all of our communications let us be true to the truth.

The peril of our supermarket civilization is first of all that we may lose faith in man. Second that we lose faith in the world. This is no small matter. It matters but little if you lose your money, as I say, in buying goods. It matters much if you lose your faith. And the only way we may regain our respect for truth is to demand of ourselves and others that they be true to the truth.

PRAYER

Our Heavenly Father, we pray that among us who worship Thee there may be the worship of truth. Grant us that integrity, sincerity, and simplicity which is of Christ. We ask it in His name. Amen.

YOUTH OPPORTUNITY CENTERS

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, the junior Senator from California [Mr. Salinger] has made a significant and important statement on youth opportunity centers, which I commend to the attention of all Senators. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Youth Opportunity Centers

(Remarks by Senator Pierre Salinger, of California)

One of the most worthwhile activities in the President's far-reaching war on poverty will be the work of the proposed youth opportunity centers. We in California already know something of what can be done by such centers. In Los Angeles County, the youth opportunity board, a joint powers organization formed by the State, the county of Los Angeles, the city of Los Angeles, the Los Angeles County School Board, and the Los Angeles City School Board, has been doing a vitally important job in serving the disadvantaged youth of the Mexican-American and Negro communities through youth opportunity centers on the East Side and in the south-central areas of Los Angeles. Although underway for only a relatively short time, these centers have already assisted hundreds of young people to secure jobs, to secure job training, or to continue in school. The work which is being done here must be continued and expanded. The State of California and its local governmental units throughout the State are eager and willing to cooperate in this program.

The functions of the centers would be to screen, counsel, and refer youth to appropriate skill development centers to prepare for employment, to search out suitable job opportunities for youth and to place youth in regular employment. One of the universities engaged this past summer in training counselor aids and youth advisers for these centers was our outstanding University of California at Berkeley. It is typical of California to be among those participating in such progressive programs as this.

California wants to help battle the problems of disadvantaged youth, who have little schooling or skills and therefore have little to bring to today's competitive job market. In California we have the brainpower, the will and the resources to work on this problem—to help these youths—and so we hope to continue the work begun with the youth opportunity board in Los Angeles and move on in this important work.

DISCRIMINATORY, UNFAIR IMMIGRATION POLICIES MUST BE CHANGED

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, there are few areas in our laws which more urgently demand reform than our unfair and discriminatory system of selecting immigrants to be allowed to enter our country. No provision of any national law is more distasteful to millions of Americans or to the peoples of many nations of the world than the concept of judging a man's worth for immigration on the basis of his place of birth or the ancestry of his parents.

Five successive Presidents—Franklin D. Roosevelt, Harry S. Truman, Dwight D. Eisenhower, John F. Kennedy, and President Johnson—have all asked for a revision in the present method of choosing immigrants on the basis of their nationality. President Truman said that the idea behind this discrimination was, to put it boldly, that Americans with English or Irish or German names made better citizens than Americans with Italian, Greek, or Polish names. This concept is contrary to our traditions and ideals. As a people we are morally committed to seek a national policy which will make real the simple truth of the words of St. Paul:

> God * * * hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on the face of the earth.

Under the present system, no matter how skilled, or badly needed a man or woman is, if born in the wrong country such person must wait years for admission, if lucky enough to be admitted at all, while others less qualified come almost at will. An Italian scientist or Greek craftsman or Polish engineer may bring more to our country than an unskilled worker from some northern European country. Nevertheless, under existing law the unskilled worker would come first.

Present immigration statutes judge men and women not on the basis of their worth, but on their place of birth—in some cases on the place of birth of their ancestors. It is an affront to millions of Americans and to the people of many countries. Our immigration laws should be such that we ask the question, "What can you do for our country," not, "In what country were you born?"

Although most Presidents since Woodrow Wilson have called upon the Congress to take corrective action, this administration's proposal to abolish the national origins quota system is the first time that a specific bill has been proposed to the Congress by a President. The law he seeks would squarely meet national needs and also be pleasing to foreign nationals. It recognizes that each immigrant has a special worth because of his potential contribution to the total manpower of our country and that he should be judged on his individual ability. The bill will provide flexibility in refugee policy, remove offensive Asiatic restrictions, and increase basic quotas for many new nations.

Over a 5-year period it would eliminate all quotas based on national origin. Each year the old quotas would be diminished by 20 percent. Then, the limit for any one country would be 10 percent of the entire immigration quota for 1 year. The total annual quota would be raised only slightly from the present 154,000 to approximately 164,000.

People would be admitted on the basis of their skills, education, and training. Another governing factor would be the reunification of families now separated by our outmoded immigration laws.

Mr. President, along with many of my colleagues I am cosponsor of the pending legislation proposed to carry out the recommendations of President Kennedy and President Johnson.

I strongly urge that the administration immigration bill be given top priority for consideration when the next Congress convenes. We must right this wrong that stains our national conscience and blurs our image as the greatest democracy in the world. Let us remember at all times, we are the Nation which chiseled on our Statue of Liberty:

> Give me your tired, your poor,
> Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free;
> Send these, the homeless, tempest-tossed to me;
> I lift my lamp beside the golden door.

Mr. President, at the time of his death the late great President, John F. Kennedy, was at work on revising a booklet on immigration which he had published in 1958. He hoped this would further familiarize Americans with the tremendous role that immigrants have played in our Nation's history. We should never lose sight of the fact that all of us are descendants of immigrants who came to these shores seeking freedom and a better way of life.

My grandmother was born in the "old country." She came to this country in 1848, following the revolution in Germany. She had a shawl on her head and a bundle under her arm with her few worldly possessions, but she had the love of liberty in her heart. I do not think that her coming here was bad for the United States.

In his introduction to his brother's book, Robert F. Kennedy made the following statement:

> I know of no cause which President Kennedy championed more warmly than the improvement of our immigration policies. In 1958, while the fight for the 1957 amendments was still fresh, he published a booklet designed to provide those who were unfamiliar with this aspect of our history with an appreciation of the enormous contributions to American life made by immigrants. When President Kennedy sent his historic message to Congress in 1963 calling for a complete revision of the immigration law, he decided it was also time to revise the book for use as a weapon of enlightenment in the coming legislative battle.
>
> He was working on the book at the time of the assassination. It was decided that it should be published posthumously. This legacy should not be denied those committed to the battle for immigration reform.

Mr. President, a part of this posthumous book has been printed in the October 3, 1964, edition of the Saturday Evening Post under the title, "With Clean Hands and a Clear Conscience." John F. Kennedy, the great-grandson of immigrant Americans himself, states posthumously, far more eloquently than I can, the overriding arguments for reform in our immigration laws. I commend this article to my colleagues, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

With Clean Hands and a Clear Conscience

(By John F. Kennedy)

(Note.—At the time of his death President Kennedy was at work on the book from which these pages are taken. It is a plan of action for the American people and a last testament to a cause the late President cherished.)

In 1797 a Member of Congress argued that, while a liberal immigration policy was fine when the country was new and unsettled, now that America had reached its maturity and was fully populated, immigration should stop—an argument which has been repeated at regular intervals throughout American history. A more serious warning of things to come was sounded in 1897 when Congress for the first time provided a literacy test for adult immigrants. President Cleveland vetoed the measure. Presidents Taft and Wilson vetoed similar bills on the ground that literacy was a test only of educational opportunity and not of a person's ability or his potential worth as a citizen. In 1917, with tension high because of the war, Congress overrode President Wilson's veto and the literacy test became law.

The 20-year fight over the literacy test can now be seen as a significant turning point in immigration policy. Indeed, many saw it as such at that time. Finley Peter Dunne, creator of the immoral Dr. Dooley, devoted one of Mr. Dooley's dissertations in 1902 to the subject of the test and immigration. With magnificent irony the Irish bartender says, "As a pilgrim father that missed the first boat, I must raise me claryon voice again' the invasion iv this fair land be th' paupers an' arnychists in Europe. Ye bet I must—because I'm here first * * * In thim days America was th' refuge iv th' oppressed in all th' wurruld * * * But as I tell ye, 'tis diff'rent now. 'Tis time we put our back again' th' open dure an' keep out th' savege horde."

Anti-immigration sentiment was heightened by World War I, and the disillusionment and strong wave of isolationism that marked its aftermath. It was in this climate, in 1921, that Congress passed and the President signed the first major law in our country's history severely limiting new immigration by establishing an emergency quota system. An era in American history had ended; we were committed to a radically new policy toward the peopling of the Nation.

The permanent system, which went into force in 1929, includes essentially all the elements of immigration policy that are in our law today. The immigration statutes now establish a system of annual quotas to govern immigration from each country. Under this system 156,987 quota immigrants are permitted to enter the United States each year. The quotas from each country are based upon the national origins of the population of the United States in 1920.

Because of the composition of our population in 1920, the system is heavily weighted in favor of immigration from northern Europe and severely limits immigration from southern and eastern Europe and from other parts of the world.

To cite some recent examples: Great Britain has an annual quota of 65,361 immigration visas and used 28,291 of them. Germany has a quota of 25,814 and uses about that number, but one-third of these are for wives of servicemen who may enter on a nonquota basis. Ireland's quota is 17,756 and only 6,054 Irish availed themselves of it. On the other hand, Poland is permitted 6,488, and there is a backlog of 61,293 Poles wishing to enter the United States. Italy is permitted 5,666 and has a backlog of 132,435. Greece's quota is 308; her backlog is 96,538. Thus a Greek citizen desiring to emigrate to this country has little chance of coming here. And an American citizen with a Greek father or mother must wait at least 18 months to bring his parents here to join him. A citizen whose married son or daughter, or brother or sister, is Italian cannot obtain a quota number for them for 2 years or more. Meanwhile, many thousands of quota numbers are wasted because they are not wanted or needed by nationals of the countries to which they are assigned.

In short, a qualified person born in England or Ireland who wants to emigrate to the United States can do so at any time. A person born in Italy, Hungary, Poland, or the Baltic States may have to wait many years before his turn is reached. This system is based upon the assumption that there is some reason for keeping the origins of our population in exactly the same proportions as they existed in 1920. Such an idea is at complete variance with the American traditions and principles that the qualifications of an immigrant do not depend upon his country of birth, and violates the spirit expressed in the Declaration of Independence that "all men are created equal."

Furthermore, the national origins quota system has strong overtones of an indefensible racial preference. It is strongly weighted toward so-called Anglo-Saxons, a phrase which one writer calls "a term of art" encompassing almost anyone from northern and western Europe. Sinclair Lewis described his hero, Martin Arrowsmith, this way: "a typical pure-bred-Anglo-Saxon American—which means that he was a union of German, French, Scotch-Irish, perhaps a little Spanish, conceivably of the strains lumped together as Jewish, and a great deal of English, which is itself a combination of primitive Briton, Celt, Phoenician, Roman, German, Dane and Swede."

Yet, however much our present policy may be deplored, it still remains our national policy. As President Truman said when he vetoed the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 (only to have that veto overridden): "The idea behind this discriminatory policy was, to put it boldly, that Americans with English or Irish names were better people and better citizens than Americans with Italian or Greek or Polish names. Such a concept is utterly unworthy of our traditions and our ideals."

Another measure of the inadequacy of the Immigration and Nationality Act has been the huge volume of private immigration bills introduced in Congress. These are bills to deal with individual hardship cases for which the general law fails to provide. In the 87th Congress over 3,500 such bills were introduced. Private immigration bills make up about half of our legislation today.

It is not hard to see why. A poor European college girl was convicted three times for putting slugs in a pay telephone, and 15 years later, married to an American teacher abroad, she was denied entrance to our country because of three separate convictions for a crime involving moral turpitude. Or another case: An Italian immigrant living in Massachusetts with his small children could not bring his wife to the United States because she had been convicted on two counts involving moral turpitude. Her crimes? In 1913 and 1939 she had stolen bundles of sticks to build a fire. It took acts of Congress to reunite both these families.

There is, of course, a legitimate argument for some limitation upon immigration. We no longer need settlers for virgin lands, and our economy is expanding more slowly than in the 19th and early 20th centuries. A superficial analysis of the heated arguments over immigration policy which have taken place since 1952 might give the impression that there was an irreconcilable conflict, as if one side wanted to go back to the policy of our Founding Fathers, of unrestricted immigration, and the other side wanted to stop all further immigration. In fact, there are only a few basic differences between the most liberal bill offered in recent years, sponsored by former Senator Herbert H. Lehman, and the supporters of the status quo. The present law admits 156,700 quota immigrants annually. The Lehman bill (like a bill introduced by Senator Philip A. Hart and cosponsored by over one-third of the Members of the Senate) would admit 250,000.

The clash of opinion arises not over the number of immigrants to be admitted, but over the test for admission—the national origins quota system. Instead of using the discriminatory test of where the immigrant was born, the reform proposals would base admission on the immigrant's possession of skills our country needs and on the humanitarian ground of reuniting families. Such legislation does not seek to make over the face of America. Immigrants would still be given tests for health, intelligence, morality, and security.

It is not only the initial assignment of quota numbers which is arbitrary and unjust; additional inequity results from the failure of the law to permit full utilization of the authorized quota numbers. The tiny principality of Andorra in the Pyrenees Mountains, with 6,500 Spanish-speaking inhabitants, has an American immigration quota of 100, while Spain, with 30 million people, has a quota of only 250. While American citizens wait for years for their relatives to receive a quota, approximately 60,000 numbers are wasted each year because the countries to which they are assigned have far more numbers allocated to them than they have emigrants seeking to move to the United States. There is no way at present in which these numbers can be reassigned to nations where immense backlogs of applicants for admission to the United States have accumulated. This deficiency in the law should be corrected.

A special discriminatory formula is now applied to the immigration of persons who are attributable by their ancestry to an area called the Asia-Pacific triangle. This area embraces all countries from Pakistan to Japan and the Pacific islands north of Australia and New Zealand. Usually, the quota under which a prospective immigrant must enter is determined by his place of birth. However, if as much as one-half of an immigrant's ancestors came from nations in the Asia-Pacific triangle, he must rely upon the small quota assigned to the country of his ancestry, regardless of where he was born. This provision of the law should be repealed.

The Presidential message to Congress of July 23, 1963, recommended that the national origins system be replaced by a formula governing immigration to the United States which takes into account: (1) the skills of the immigrant and their relationships to our needs; (2) the family relationship between immigrants and persons already here, so that the reuniting of families is encouraged; and (3) the priority of registration. Present law grants a preference to immigrants with special skills, education, or training. It also grants a preference to various relatives of U.S. citizens and lawfully resident aliens. But it does so only within a national origins quota. It should be modified so that those with the greatest ability to add to the national welfare, no matter where they are born, are granted the highest priority. The next priority should go to those who seek to be reunited with their relatives. For applicants with equal claims, the earliest registrant should be the first admitted.

In order to remove other existing barriers to the reuniting of families, two additional improvements in the law are needed.

First, parents of American citizens, who now have a preferred quota status, should be accorded nonquota status.

Second, parents of aliens resident in the United States, who now have no preference, should be accorded a preference after skilled specialists and other relatives of citizens and alien residents.

These changes will have little effect on the number of immigrants admitted. They will have a major effect insofar as they relieve the hardship many of our citizens and residents now face in being separated from their parents.

We must avoid what the Irish poet John Boyle O'Reilly once called:

"Organized charity, scrimped and iced,
In the name of a cautious, statistical
Christ."

Immigration policy should be generous; it should be flexible. With such a policy we can turn to the world, and to our own past, with clean hands and a clear conscience. Such a policy would be but a reaffirmation of old principles. It would be an expression of our agreement with George Washington that "The bosom of America is open to receive not only the opulent and respectable stranger, but the oppressed and persecuted of all nations and religions; whom we shall welcome to a participation of all our rights and privileges, if by decency and propriety of conduct they appear to merit the enjoyment."

Mr. HART subsequently said: Mr. President, a few moments ago the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] commented on the leading article in the current issue of the Saturday Evening Post, written by the late beloved John F. Kennedy. The points made in that article and the comment made thereon by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] I believe reflect accurately the good conscience of Americans.

I ask unanimous consent that at this point in the RECORD there be printed the leading editorial in the issue of the Saturday Evening Post for October 3 entitled "Our Immigrant Heritage."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR IMMIGRANT HERITAGE

"We are all immigrants," President Franklin D. Roosevelt once told the lineage-proud Daughters of the American Revolution. That truth is a source of national strength, for in the crossbreeding of a score of strains the phenomenon known as "hybrid vigor" has made the typical American larger than the sum of his parts. He can well say, as in "Ballad for Americans": "Am I an American? I'm just an Irish, Negro, Jewish, Italian, French and English, Spanish, Russian, Chinese, Polish, Scotch, Hungarian, Litvak, Swedish, Finnish, Canadian, Greek, and Turk, and Czech, and double Czech American."

It is fitting that this American should welcome the stranger. Our very survival may well have depended on this hospitality. For we have only luck and the grace of God to thank that the Nazis, who beat us to the jet plane and to the ballistic missile, did not beat us to the nuclear bomb as well. They had the edge, for the very discovery which led to the bomb—the fission of uranium—was performed by Germans Otto Hahn and Lise Meitner on the very eve of the war. It was in Berlin that many of the great scientists who first saw the fearful potentials—Einstein, Szilard, Wigner—met and knew each other. It was our great luck that Hitler's obsession with racial "purity" caused him to drive these brilliant minds into exile, and that Mussolini's Fascist oppression caused Enrico Fermi to flee. The great Dane, Niels Bohr, joined the fugitives. America provided the asylum, the real estate, and the all-essential wealth ($2 billion) which unlocked the atom, but the brilliant men who did it were, for the most part, immigrants and fugitives. Fermi's collaborator's phone call from Chicago to Harvard that the first atomic pile had fissioned had a curious fitness to it: The Italian navigator has reached the "New World" and found the natives "very friendly."

We are put in mind of all this by the article on page 21 taken from third-generation-immigrant John F. Kennedy's posthumous book, "A Nation of Immigrants." It is an eloquent argument for adjusting the inequities of the present quota system, to allow the unused quotas of nations whose people are not particularly eager to emigrate to be used by those nations whose people must now wait for years for a visa. What Kennedy sought is embodied in the administration bill, now pending in committee, to drop nationality quotas, ease immigration for persons whose skills are needed, and allow a modest increase of some 7,000 immigrants next year. Republican Vice-Presidential Candidate WILLIAM E. MILLER has denounced the bill as an attempt to "open the floodgates for virtually any and all who would wish to come and find work in this country," and he used the occasion of Labor Day to tell an audience in South Bend, Ind., that cheap foreign labor would take over their jobs. MILLER, whose immigrant antecedents are German and Irish, and who has found America so mobile that a janitor's son may aspire to the Nation's second highest office, is moved only to echo (without his tongue-in-cheek humor) Mr. Dooley as quoted by Kennedy: "I must raise me claryon voice again' the invasion iv this fair land be th' paupers an' arnychists in Europe. Ye bet I must—because I'm here first." It's a good thing MILLER's brand of immigrants are fairly late arrivals, and weren't around to shut the golden door to the likes of Carl Schurz or Nikola Tesla. Schurz, a German who settled in Wisconsin in 1856, was a pioneer Republican whose famous speech on "true Americanism" cleared the new party of the charge that it was "pro nativism" and helped elect Lincoln President. Tesla, a Croatian who immigrated to these shores in 1884, conceived the principle of the rotary electromagnetic field used in the very Niagara Falls power generators that are so vital to MILLER's home district. We can't risk letting such radicals in again, now that MILLER's here.

SECOND THOUGHTS ABOUT POLITICIANS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, Mr. Frank McGee, a respected and thoughtful commentator, made an excellent statement on September 28, entitled "Second Thoughts About Politicians."

It is so rare that a commentator or journalist displays a sympathetic attitude toward politicians that I think his words should be enshrined in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that the text of his broadcast be made a part of my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SECOND THOUGHTS ABOUT POLITICIANS

(By Frank McGee)

A knowledgeable old lobbyist once told me: "Congress is a collection of very mediocre men a long way from home." Far from being a vicious remarks, this was a sympathetic observation by a man who understood—and liked—politicians.

They are a strange lot, politicians, who understand the voters far better than the voters understand them. I doubt if anyone really understands a politician except another politician.

Who, but a politician, knows and approves the fact that his colleague is pursuing a career, not just serving a term in office? Who, but a politician, knows and approves the fact that concern for his career as much as (and often more than) the merits of a proposition determines the position his colleague will take?

The public does not expect a singer to sing a certain song, or an actor to play a certain part that either knew would damage, or perhaps, end his career. Yet the public does expect this suicidal action from a politician.

The politician understands that the public expects this from him, yet he does not expect the public to understand why he will not do it. Aside from adult members of his own family, there is no one from whom he can expect understanding except another politician.

This gulf between the politician and the public is created at the very beginning of his career. Those entering another profession, say medicine, do so with every intention of making it their life's work and usually with the freely confessed ambition of rising rapidly to the top.

But suppose a young man conducting his first political campaign revealed to the voters that he intended to remain in politics all his life and nourished an ambition to be President of the United States. While the young doctor's attitude is so widely approved that those who deviate from it seem abnormal, the young politician would be ridiculed, scorned and rejected by the voters. From the beginning, hypocrisy is forced upon the politician and he must practice it at every stage of his career, pretending that each successively higher office he seeks is the height of his ambition.

The young doctor, licensed once, never has to return to be licensed again. The politician, on the other hand, must return every 2, 4, or 6 years (depending on the office he holds) to ask that he be licensed again.

Suppose that a doctor specialized in some obscure field of medicine and achieves a significant success. His stature is increased many times over among his colleagues and with the public. But a politician, genuinely expert in all the intricacies of economic, social, and political problems of southeast Asia will be rejected by his constituents if a local defense plant closes or money is not approved for a river-widening project.

And while there are organizations to plead the cause of doctors and every other profession or calling, there is none for politicians and the politician himself never pleads for public understanding of his peculiar problems. He knows the public doesn't care.

A badly mangled metaphor might best illustrate what the public expects of a politician: that he keep his ear to the ground, his nose to the wind, his fingers upon the public pulse and—withal—his eyes upon the stars.

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THE POLISH LEGION OF AMERICAN VETERANS

Mr. HART. Mr. President, last month the Polish Legion of American Veterans held its 17th biannual convention in Milwaukee.

The PLAV is an organization in the great American tradition—an organization which combines service to its own members with a broad concern for the welfare of all Americans and the preservation and expansion of democracy at home and around the world.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions adopted by the Polish Legion of American Veterans be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE POLISH LEGION OF AMERICAN VETERANS IN ITS 17TH BIANNUAL CONVENTION, AT THE HOTEL SCHROEDER, MILWAUKEE, WIS., SEPTEMBER 6, 1964

1. The city of Milwaukee, its public officials and its citizens have spared no efforts to make our convention a tremendous success, and to provide for our physical comfort and spiritual well-being: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the PLAV hereby expresses its sincere gratitude to the citizens and public officials of Milwaukee for their generous hospitality.

POLITICAL CAMPAIGNS

2. We enjoin both candidates for the office of President of the United States to avoid any political promise of a war to liberate Poland from Communist domination, unless the candidate is prepared to commit the United States to full, all-out armed conflict, with Soviet imperialism and to accept the consequences of a nuclear war, which would wipe out Poland and which would probably destroy most of the United States and kill or maim most American citizens.

We urge that the campaign be kept free of false promises, the inspiration of false hopes, and that no group be made a political pawn for the gain of public office.

Poland's future and freedom will be gained at a conference table attended by all major powers.

NUCLEAR WAR

3. The PLAV counts in its ranks veterans of both World Wars and the Korean conflict. Our memory is only too full of the horrors of armed conflict with its great toll in human lives and wanton destruction of property. Our Blue and Gold Star Mothers know equally well the consequences of armed aggression. We are not anxious that our sons wear the Purple Heart or that they receive the Congressional Medal of Honor posthumously.

All of the foregoing considerations lead us to an expression of high praise for those leaders of the United States who succeeded in securing enactment of the nuclear test ban treaty and for their continued efforts to bring about true disarmament.

In the same context our disarmament must not reduce our military posture to a point where we will lay prostrate before the Chinese Communists, or where Soviet imperialists will beat us to death with ax handles. America must always remain strong enough to keep the peace everywhere.

VETERANS' AFFAIRS

4. We urge the Veterans' Administration, our Representatives in Congress, and the President of the United States to use their offices in order that the PLAV becomes a nationally recognized veterans' organization. Denial of this privilege means a denial of adequate representation to the thousands of our members, who because of a language barrier, cannot communicate with VA officers except through a bilingual PLAV service officer.

We also urge that full medical and hospital benefits be extended to veterans of allied forces who are now U.S. citizens.

Whenever available, counterpart funds should be used to care for the graves of Polish soldiers in Italy and other foreign countries. The Communist regimes in Warsaw has neglected the cemeteries of these brave men until they have become shambles.

We do not seek to have veterans set apart as a specially favored group of citizens; but we do insist that the sacrifice we made for the defense of this country be not forgotten. Those captains of industry and finance who oppose any extension of veterans' benefits should be reminded that we kept their empire intact.

PRESIDENT KENNEDY ASSASSINATION

The assassination of John F. Kennedy evoked a termendous emotional demonstration throughout the entire world. It brought tears to eyes of strong men and withered their spines. Therefore, let us pledge ourselves to make his martyrdom an inspiration for us to rededicate ourselves to those principles and ideals for which he lived and died.

These include such ideals as dignity for all men, regardless of race, religion, or national origin; the abolition of poverty and want everywhere; the building of a great America for future generations; and true peace for mankind. These goals can be implemented by our support of the Alliance for Progress, the mutual security program, the food-for-peace program, the Peace Corps, and other similar undertakings.

FIGHT AGAINST COMMUNISM

6. We urge the continuation of strong steps to halt the spread of communism and pledge ourselves to the support of our Government in this field. Diplomacy, rather than armed intervention, removed Red missiles from Cuba. But we must not hesitate to us armed force, as in southeast Asia, to prevent the spread of communism.

We urge continued use of surplus foods as a tool for the spread of democracy. The sale and gift of wheat and other foodstuffs to Poland and other Eastern European countries must be continued; the alternative is to force the citizens of those countries to continuously rely on Communist Russia for their survival. It is because America is the only bright light remaining for these people that we must not let them down in their hour of need. We must continue the foreign aid program.

DOMESTIC PROBLEMS

7. We have expressed ourselves on international matters and foreign policy in the foregoing resolutions. But we must not forget the problems of domestic housekeeping. Therefore, the PLAV resolves to cooperate and implement programs designed to make America a better place to live. We pledge our support for:

1. Job-retraining programs for veterans and nonveterans alike;

2. A reduction in Government spending, with further tax cuts resulting;

3. The use of all of our facilities to curb juvenile delinquency and reduce its incidence.

The PLAV has already instituted a plan of youth activities for this purpose on a State level; this program will be continued with greater emphasis and with more funds.

4. Conservation of natural resources and support of the Wilderness Preservation Program.

5. The enactment of a comprehensive medical care for the aged program, using the best features of both the Social Security Administration and private insurance organizations.

6. The prevention of erosion of our cities by supporting urban renewal and urban conservation programs.

7. The up-grading of all our citizens to end the vast waste of human resources in our country, whether by aids to education, greater social security benefits, or any other means consistent with human decency.

As Veterans of the Armed Forces, of the U.S.A., we pledge ourselves to the principles set forth herein, and as good citizens, we resolve to abide by both the letter and spirit of these resolutions.

UNITED NATIONS

8. We pledge our continued support of the United Nations and urge that its offices be used to pursue the peace everywhere; that it be used as a vehicle to move the Iron Curtain out of Europe; that our Government and the other powers act through the United Nations to foster Democracy in the entire world.

IMMIGRATION

9. We urge that Congress enact a humane immigration policy based on the economic and social needs of our country, and that the archaic quota system be done away with.

VETERANS' AFFAIRS

10. We solicit Congress to reopen the national veterans' life insurance program for those veterans who failed to avail themselves of it upon separation from military service; we urge an expended program of medical and domiciliary care for World War I veterans which will not reduce them to paupers, but rather will give them the decent care which their military service demands. The system of pensions for World War I veterans should be revised in line with the increased cost of living.

POLONIA AFFAIRS

11. All organizations of Americans of Polish descent must cooperate together for the accomplishment of our common objectives. These include the perpetuation of our Polish culture and its dissemination among Americans.

All Americans of Polish descent must work together to restore democracy and freedom to Poland and move out the Communist intruders.

We must combine our efforts to remind the world that this is Poland's millenium; that Poland was a Christian nation 1,000 years ago, and she introduced culture to eastern Europe.

It is recommended that the secretary of this convention distribute copies of these resolutions to:

(a) Local press, radio, and television;

(b) All Polish newspapers and Polish radio programs in the United States;

(c) To the Voice of America and Radio Free Europe;

(d) To the Members of Congress from States having PLAV posts;

(e) To the President of the United States and the Republican and Democratic National Committees;

(f) To the Library of Congress;

(g) Such other persons as the national commander directs.

Respectfully submitted by committee on resolutions.

Judge BENJAMIN C. STANCZYK,
Chairman,
EDWARD L. BIELAGA,
HENRY GROMAK,
MATTHEW ZAMORSKI,
LEONARD J. WOLODZKO,
JOSEPH C. ZALUD.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY MRS. SHYAM KUMARI KHAN, MEMBER OF INDIAN PARLIAMENT

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President I invite the attention of Senators to the fact that we have a very distinguished visitor in the person of Mrs. Shyam Kumari Khan, who is a member of the Council of States, the upper house of the Indian Parliament. Mrs. Khan has devoted her life to the welfare of women and children of India. Among her numerous positions are: General Secretary of the Indian Council of Child Welfare, Vice President of the Indian Village Women's Association, and member of the Planning Commission Working Group for Social Welfare, which is preparing India's fourth 5-year plan. She is a cousin of the distinguished Indian Ambassador, whom we know so well, His Excellency Mr. B. K. Nehru, and of the late beloved Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru.

I take great pleasure in presenting Mrs. Khan to the Senate. [Applause, Senators rising.]

"THE FRUITS OF SOUND TRADE POLICIES"—ADDRESS BEFORE FINNISH-AMERICAN CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in the absence of the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an address entitled, "The Fruits of Sound Trade Policies." The address was delivered by Samuel F. Pryor, vice president of Pan American World Airways.

Senator HUMPHREY has for many years been deeply interested fostering sound Finnish-American relations. This address outlines the many remarkable accomplishments which have been achieved in this area.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FRUITS OF SOUND TRADE POLICIES

(By Samuel F. Pryor)

Mr. President of the Finnish-American Chamber of Commerce, Your Excellency Ambassador Seppala, Mr. Consul General, ladies and gentlemen, when I received your president's invitation to appear here today, I accepted with a great deal of appreciation for three reasons:

The first was personal because Mrs. Pryor and I have been for many years close friends of Ambassador and Mrs. Seppala—two of the finest persons we have ever had the privilege of knowing. Through them we had the honor of meeting President and Mrs. Kekkonen on their visit to the United States in 1961, and the pleasure of arranging the presidential trip across the United States to the 50th State of Hawaii, where I have a home. I shall never forget one moment, in particular. Our party was on the beach at Maui—in the most peaceful surroundings. Suddenly, there came a telephone call from Helsinki. It was to advise the President that a Soviet message had just been delivered to him, asking for military talks with Finland. I told the President that I had a small plane standing by for his use in case of emergency. I shall never forget his quiet reply. He said: "Mr. Pryor, we will continue with the plans you have made. That is why we have Foreign Ministers." His Foreign Minister left for Helsinki, not the President. President Kekkonen's calmness in time of stress made an impression on all of us, aside from all of his other splendid qualities.

The second reason for having my special pleasure in taking part in this meeting is because of the company for which I work. Pan American has had long and cordial ties with Finland. In 1947, American Overseas began flights to and from Finland. In 1961, Pan Am, having acquired American Overseas, inaugurated the first jet service between our two countries. We work closely with the two Finnish airlines—Finnair and Karair. Finnair routes connect with ours at London, Paris, Copenhagen, Oslo, Amsterdam, Hamburg, Frankfurt, and Barcelona. Incidentally, Finnair, one of the world's oldest airlines, started with one 4-passenger hydroplane, flying at 85 miles-per-hour between Helsinki and Stockholm. Today, its fleet consists of 17 aircraft, including the most modern medium-range jets.

In a country which has as many lakes as Finland, air travel and transport are obviously of great importance. The Finnish airlines tie together all cities of that country and most of the towns, including those of the far north. Their air routes reach to nearly all the capitals of free Europe, as well as to Moscow and Leningrad. We in Pan American are proud to work with them as teammates.

Third, I am here as a businessman. Every businessman must be interested in everything that advances trade, especially on the international level.

One need not be an economist or in government to realize that international trade is increasingly vital to all the peoples of the world. Nations now are in the same geographic proximity to one another that towns within a nation formerly were. International trade is on the threshold of an expansion thought impossible less than a decade ago. To prepare for this Pan Am has invested $110 million in all-cargo jet aircraft. Mr. Trippe stated recently that he expects oversea air freight to increase at a more rapid rate than passenger traffic. In a few years air cargo volume will have doubled, leading to the day when revenue from oversea air freight equals revenue from passengers.

The supersonic age is almost here. Think of Helsinki, for example, as the center of a vast circle. When our first supersonic passenger planes go into service in the early 1970's, Finland will be a next-door neighbor. New York will be only 3¼ hours from the Finnish capital. Rome will be only 1½ hours from Helsinki and Sydney, Australia, only 11½ hours away.

I understand that the purpose of today's program is to present information gathered by the U.S. trade mission to Finland last May. From what I have heard so far of the mission's work, it is very impressive—not only for its immediate results but for the vigor with which the U.S. Department of Commerce is now promoting foreign trade. They deserve great praise—even in an election year.

I won't be presumptuous enough to talk here, before so many experts, of the many tangible values of doing business with one another. Enough to say this: Trade has always opened up new worlds since time began. And where trade goes, so go ideas. And, in the realm of ideas lies the future of mankind—for better or for worse. Like our friends from Finland, we in the United States seek the better world.

All human activities are motivated by the desire to satisfy some human need. Where the activity is business, its primary purpose is to provide material goods and physical services. The main motivation obviously is profit. But may I submit that this is not the only goal. For centuries, the trader, in going from region to region, has carried not only merchandise but ideas, techniques, and ideals. He has not only crossed physical boundaries but has broken through mental boundaries, opening new vistas of science and art. The trader has been an instrument of cultural cross-fertilization—an active agent of progress.

This is an aspect of commerce which many businessmen are often too busy to consider. Businessmen, including myself, do not necessarily tend to philosophic speculation about collateral values. But, whether or not the average businessman is actively aware of the nonmaterial byproducts of his work, those byproducts do exist and are most important.

The intellectual, psychological, and political results of commerce and trade, these days, are more effective than ever in the past. The simple reason is that, now, more businessmen have many more accessible points of contact than earlier generations ever dreamed of.

Nonetheless, these byproducts of trade and commerce mark the advance of civilization—of the better way of life for one's children—and for their children. Civilization truly goes hand in hand with trade.

This fact has been true throughout the history of mankind. For example, when the Phoenicians voyaged to the British Isles for tin several centuries before Christ, they brought out only tangible goods to trade, but also new notions of astronomy and of that astonishing tool which they had invented—the alphabet.

Marco Polo brought from the Far East to 13th-century Europe not only such things as coal and spaghetti, but also information about the Great Khan's postal service and of his regime's care for orphans and for the aged. In addition, Marco Polo's written account of his travels became a lasting work of literature from which men today still draw entertainment and instruction.

A century or two later, the growth of trade and the rise of a merchant class were among the liberalizing influences that broke the shackles of feudalism. Still later, the War of American Independence was motivated in no small degree by the colonists' commercial aspirations, on one hand, and, on the other hand, by the restrictive trade regulations of England.

What has changed, beyond the wildest imaginations of our forebears, is our manner of travel—the speed of travel—the present proximity of every land to the other. In effect, today everyone lives next door to everyone else.

Less than a century ago, in 1873, Jules Verne, using the license of fiction, described a world measuring 80 days around. Sixteen years later, Nelly Bly, the American newspaper woman, actually made the circuit in a little over 72 days as an almost incredible journalist stunt. In 1924, the U.S. Air Force performed the first aerial circumnavigation in 14½ days actual flying time. People couldn't believe it. By 1947, Pan Am made the world only 7 days wide. And recently an American businessman, using a regularly scheduled Pan Am flight circled the world in 52 hours.

Today, for example, Pan Am links some 86 lands of the world with jet planes. If one defines distance in terms of time, Boston is nearer to Paris by jet clipper than to Philadelphia by train. San Francisco is only half as far from Honolulu as from Los Angeles by the fastest land travel. If spare U.S.-built machine parts are needed in Finland, they can be jet flown and be made available overnight. Likewise, if a U.S. department store urgently needs to fill its bare shelves with some of Finland's exquisite fashions, they, too, can be supplied within hours for each of our passenger jets carry up to 10 tons of cargo.

The girth of the globe will soon be cut even more by the supersonic aircraft now under construction for Pan Am. When these aircraft go into service, the size of the earth, in actual flying time, will be only 24 hours and 15 minutes.

In these circumstances of a shrinking globe, of expanding international trade, and of the intellectual and political ramifications of international business, is there anything special that should be said of Finland?

Emphatically yes. Finland has displayed exceptional skill in devising successful trade policies and often under conditions of extraordinary difficulty. This relatively small country provides an example which can be instructive to all others. To some, Finland may be a pygmy in size. But, to me, Finland is a giant in what counts most—a giant in honor and a giant in ideas.

There is not a school textbook in the United States nor an encyclopedia which does not carry at least this brief item: "Finland was the only European country to honor its debts to the United States in the years between the two World Wars."

Everyone here knows that—but it cannot be repeated too often.

And we shall never forget that great Finn, Nurmi, who was the true symbol of his people when he emerged as the world's greatest athlete at the Olympic Games. There have been others, as well; President Kekkonen was a Finnish champion.

But let me interpose one other point which the United States and Finland have in common—something of which few people may remember: Prohibition was placed in effect in Finland in 1919. It was repealed in Finland in 1931. They beat us on that repeal by 2 years.

Even though I think deeply and emotionally about all that Finland has gone through over the many years of its history and in more recent years, I do not propose to go into that history. The facts are known to all of us.

Nonetheless, notwithstanding a burden of reparations and tribute that would have forced many a larger and richer nation to its knees, in only 8 years—that is, by 1952—that heavy burden had been discharged. Since then, Finland has been able to enlarge domestic consumption greatly and to engage again in normal foreign trade. Finland's gross national product has nearly tripled—from the equivalent of about $2 billion to nearly $6 billion. It is worth more than casual mention, also, that Finland has never asked for—nor has received Marshall plan or any other foreign aid.

The policies which made possible Finland's dramatic developments are a combination of firm determination, courage, foresight, and political realism.

Our friends, the Finns, have accommodated to all of the realistic facts of life with notable adroitness and skill. By concentrating on high quality of materials and workmanship in manufacture, on excellence of design, both functionally and esthetically, on plain hard work, they have achieved a continuing economic expansion. This has enabled Finland to trade with both East and West while maintaining always its traditional trade with the West. Last year, four-fifths of Finland's foreign trade was with Western nations.

Impressive as are the figures of the rise in Finland's gross national product, her exports and her per capita income, an even more impressive fact is that it is the only nation in Europe, with a common boundary with Soviet Russia, to have avoided political capture.

Despite recurrent pressures, Finland has remained a free republic. Her powerful neighbors, in recent years, have exposed her to the forces of both fascism and communism—to say nothing of some homegrown disciples of both extremes—just as all of us have. But Finland has not fallen victim to either disaster.

Finally, may I say that this achievement has been due basically to her ability to resolve domestic differences by democratic debate; to her integrity in meeting obligations; to what is called, in the Finnish tongue "sisu"—which some Americans might term "rugged individualism" or, perhaps, just plain "guts."

Finland knows that political freedom for her citizens cannot exist without a large measure of economic freedom. She has seen clearly that the business systems of the West are, and have been, the most compatible with the freedom of small countries.

By acting according to these lights, Finland has maintained democracy even on the doorstep of despotism and has built progressively higher standards of living for her people. I know it is the wish of all Americans that she continue to prosper and to live in liberty.

MISMANAGED NEWS

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, the Kennebec Journal of Augusta, Maine, whose editorial excellence is widely acknowledged, in its September 28, 1964, issue has produced another typically penetrating and cogent editorial. It is entitled "Mismanaged News" and I commend it and recommend it as must reading. For that reason, I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Mismanaged News

It is not yet clear if the recent engagement between two destroyers of the U.S. Navy and four unidentified boats in the Gulf of Tonkin was a tactical blunder. But what is clearly evident is that both the White House and the Defense Department are engaged in the tactics of news management again.

It all began with the Secretary of Defense, Robert S. McNamara, who gave out the first sparse information on the incident. The facts were not many, nor did they provide the basis for reaching any conclusion.

The story was simply that four vessels, believed to be PT boats of the North Vietnamese Government, had made threatening maneuvers in the area of the U.S. ships. After they failed to heed warning shots, the destroyers fired upon them with radar guidance.

McNamara's answer to demands for further information was to say that he would answer no more questions. It was a terse rejection.

The next report came from Moscow, alleging that the American destroyers had attacked nonmilitary vessels engaged in peaceful activity and that three of them were sunk.

True or false, the fact is that the President did not order any retaliatory strikes by the Navy—which he did several weeks ago when North Vietnamese PT boats launched a direct shooting attack at two American destroyers.

With this further development, the question was referred to the White House. But here also further news was refused, on the ground that all the known facts had already been disclosed, and, therefore, the President could give out no other information.

If the President had stated that it would be unwise or improper, at this point, to say anything more in the interests of national security, it might be difficult to take issue with him. But his statement that there was no more information is difficult to believe.

First of all, there was such obvious information as the names of the ships involved. How could the Defense Department communicate with the vessels or recall them from patrol if it could not identify them?

More important, U.S. air reconnaissance, as well as the massive intelligence organization maintained in southeast Asia, must have provided further facts. To believe otherwise is to accept an extravagant charge of incompetence against the U.S. military and intelligence establishments.

The need for secrecy seems to provide no support for silence or for efforts to divert further inquiry. By this time, surely, Hanoi must be fully aware of the disposition of U.S. forces in the area, the nature of their own naval involvement, and the casualties suffered, if any.

To tell the American people the facts now would be no gain for the Communists.

The conclusion is inescapable that the only gain the administration hopes to garner from the silence in Washington is to avoid unfavorable news becoming a part of the electoral picture. This hardly justifies withholding from the public information that may be vital in reaching an opinion on one of the most important issues that needs to be decided on November 3.

THE STATE OF HAWAII

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, the State of Hawaii is a most blessed land, cradled in the blue Pacific with the finest climate that nature can bestow.

Many talented people are drawn to this land where the skies are daily arced with rainbows, and many remain forever. One of our most distinguished residents is Mr. Fred Sparks, a freelance writer whose warm and witty articles have graced the pages of many of America's leading magazines.

Fred Sparks candidly explains why he is in love with the 50th State in an article in the October issue of Reader's Digest. Since this will be seen in 14 million American homes, I am confident that Hawaii will soon have more visitors who will come to stay.

If there are no objections, I wish to share Mr. Sparks' romance with Hawaii with my colleagues. I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Record at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I'M IN LOVE WITH THE 50TH STATE—"LET ME TELL YOU WHY"

(By Fred Sparks)

I live in Hawaii at the end of a rainbow. Each day, in the late afternoon, it showers on Diamond Head and then, in an explosion of color, a saucy rainbow dances toward my cottage. Often I invite friends to "come for cocktails at the hour of the rainbow." It never fails.

I found my dream house 7 years ago when I visited Oahu, supposedly for a fortnight. Late one afternoon I walked along the shore past the great hotels, lavish villas and decaying wartime pillboxes, and scaled Black Point, a lava peninsula. On the other side I was transfixed by a sweep of rolling ocean, green to the reef, purple outside.

In the distance, haloed by cotton clouds, towered the twin mountains of Koko Head, like two camel humps. The beach was unsoiled, not a hamburger stand, poster, carton or can was visible. The only sounds were the rustle of coconut palms and the swish of marbled surf washing the white sand. But for a few houses, camouflaged by shrubbery, it would have been a familiar sight to Robinson Crusoe.

Everyone has one moment, I imagine, when he reviews his life and decides what he really wants to do. This moment was mine. I had always dreamt of a tropical island on which to pursue my true pleasures—writing, reading, and the outdoors. I was not a beachcomber, however; I also wanted America's creature comforts, her peoples, her libraries.

But could I now, in my 40's, cast away a journalistic career and economic security for a misty dream and the trials of free-lance writing? Uncertain, I returned to my beach the following morning. Behind a majestic banyan tree, older than the United States, I saw a tiny cottage bearing a "For Rent Furnished" sign. Before the evening rainbow I had taken occupancy and dispatched my resignation. Thank heaven for impulse. I've never regretted mine and I'm still in love with the 50th State. Let me tell you why.

The varied races of the five islands are infected with the aloha spirit, as contagious as laughter. All Hawaii is a welcome wagon. The evening I moved in, my neighbors, as if summoned by a town crier, turned my porch into a fruit stand with greetings from their gardens—artichokes, papayas, mangos, bananas, avocados. They lingered to chat; ukeleles and guitars materialized, and soon a party was roaring. A Japanese neighbor supplied the drinks, a Korean the food, a Chinese the ice. When I asked an officer from Pearl Harbor what I could supply, he said: "You supplied the reason."

My bedroom had become a nursery, with five babies on the bed, two on the chaise lounge, and almond-eyed twins sleeping on a folded bathrobe in the bottom bureau drawer. A stunning Hawaiian lady did a gentle hula, hands and hips swaying light as wisps of smoke. Then, in surprising unity, there commenced a community sing.

What a contrast with the aloof formality of city or suburban living. During 6 years in a New York apartment I had exchanged only nods with the other family on my floor. In Hawaii everyone drops in, and children spill over the neighborhood like a brook at spring thaw. Returning one afternoon, I found a small-fry football game raging on my lawn, my porch a crowded grandstand. A boy said: "It's OK, mister. We live around here." That explained everything.

Nothing ever seems to get lost in the islands, not even children. A couple I know came home one night and found a strange child in their daughter's bedroom. Awakened, their daughter said, "That's Barbara. She lives around here." Barbara identified herself more fully. Anxious to relieve what he was sure were hysterical parents, the man immediately phoned. "Barbara is safe at my house," he said. "I'll bring her right over."

"S'all right," said a sleepy voice. She'll probably come home in the morning."

Neighbors are expected to stick together. One evening a man rang my bell and asked me to vote for his friend for a State office. When I said I supported the opposite party, he asked, "What's that got to do with it? My friend lives around here."

Because the islands are without industrial smoke, they are sootless and smogless. The trade winds sweep away what little dust there is, and my window sills are seldom dirty. Perhaps because they are so pampered by nature, Hawaiians have learned to respect it. There are no outdoor advertisements, and because it's unthinkable for anyone to drop trash, there are no antilittering signs. "Compared to the mainland," said one lady who moved here from Cleveland, "Hawaii is cellophane wrapped."

Hawaii seems to be on a continuous holiday. Besides traditional American holidays, we celebrate Hawaiian, Japanese, Filipino, Chinese, and Korean festivals. One week the streets will shimmy as flower-bedecked maidens hula on the birthday of King Kamehameha, Hawaii's "George Washington." A week later great gongs and somber muffled drums will accompany exotically robed, shaven monks in a Buddhist procession, a living scene from "The King and I."

Our Oriental-American families are very close. For instance, my neighbor doesn't call it just any mechanic when her car breaks down; she calls her brother. If the pipes leak, there's her niece's husband, a plumber. She gets her linens wholesale at an uncle's store. One morning, when I went to the dentist, his anteroom was jammed. When my turn came I joked: "Doctor, you must be getting richer than Rockefeller."

"On the contrary," he replied. "You're my first patient today."

"But all those people outside?"

"Relatives."

Hawaii has none of the mainland's restless, nervous, go-go-go and perhaps the only way to have an ulcer here is bring it with you. A major police problem is to keep traffic moving fast enough, particularly at sunsets and full moons. Everyone crawls along enjoying nature's show. Last May 27 a motorcycle cop caught me making an illegal turn. He studied my license, started to write out a ticket, then changed his mind and tore up the ticket. "I see it's your birthday," he said. "But please don't do it again."

Our motto is: "More better you do it tomorrow." If the tailor promises your suit Thursday, come back Saturday. TV programs occasionally begin on schedule. "Hawaiian time," is 20 minutes late, sometimes more. The night after I had some people in for drinks, a couple knocked. "Sorry we couldn't come yesterday," they said, making themselves comfortable.

One rush hour I was aboard a Honolulu-bound bus when a lady flagged it, handed the driver a tureen and said, "This is for Mrs. Okamoto. She's sick." A few miles later the driver left the bus. When he returned a disturbed tourist cried, "Young man, you've kept us waiting 10 minutes."

"Yes. Mama-san was in bed, so I put the soup on the stove."

In Hawaii, happiness is so easy to catch. You can dine under the stars almost every night, unpestered by hungry insects. Cookouts are so common that recently, for variety, friends invited me to a cook-in. With sea, streams, and mountains a few minutes from every place on this 44-by-30-mile island, the best things in life are free. To enjoy them we live by the sun. I no longer bury my head in a newspaper's global woes at breakfast. Coffee in hand, I watch the sun rise slowly behind Koko Head and listen as chirping mynah birds harry each other in a lush flame tree.

Everyone's astir by 6, and schools and offices open between 7 and 8. By 4:30 p.m. the business district is a ghost town; Hawaii is at play. My neighbor wears quick-drying swim trunks instead of underwear. If things lag at the office, he walks a few blocks to the Ala Maffina Beach, strips down to his suit and dives in. A brief sunbath and he's back refreshed at his desk within minutes.

Radio stations hourly broadcast surf-condition bulletins. If the waves are high, many junior employees claim that beloved relatives have been taken suddenly ill; excused, the boys head for the beach. Surfing here is heaviest when mainland colleges are recessed for the summer. By August a cast is a status symbol in Waikiki, and as many people are in traction as in New Hampshire during the skiing season.

A while back my accountant rejected a Minnesota firm's offer almost doubling his income. The firm asked him what he did want. He responded: "Your figure is generous. Can you also guarantee wild orchids in my garden, golf 365 days a year, and perpetually healthy kids? Hawaii can."

This accountant and his wife, both from Chicago, have a ritual every time they think of returning. They simply open the guest closet and look at their old galoshes.

In Hawaii we are smug about our weather. Our thermometer always says summer, but it always feels like spring. If I'm momentarily distraught, I rise from my worktable on the porch, take exactly 75 steps and purge my depression with the tonic of the Pacific. Or I drive a few miles high up to the top of the Pali and drink in one of the most breathtaking panoramas on this earth. Below are the green plains of Kaneohe, framed by steep gray slopes, palm-fringed beaches, and the endless sea with white fishing boats yawning in the gentle swells. Man's puny problems dissolve before such an eternal vista.

Last year a poll listed Hawaii as the first place most Americans want to visit. Those who do will, I'm sure, remember these as "the happy islands." Certainly I have found happiness in Hawaii, at the end of a rainbow.

CASPER, WYO., NEWSPAPERS ENDORSE SENATOR GOLDWATER

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, among the many States that will be carried by Senator BARRY GOLDWATER this November is the State that this Senator is very proud to represent—the State of Wyoming. Republicans and Democrats may disagree on the percentages and the total votes predicted for this November; but in the candor of their private councils, they agree that Senator GOLDWATER is going to do as well as or better than Richard Nixon, who carried the State by 14,120 votes in 1960.

I am pleased to report to my colleagues and to the gentlemen of the fourth estate that Wyoming's largest newspaper, the Casper Star-Tribune, has endorsed Senator GOLDWATER. Casper is a centrally located city of nearly 40,000 people. Its geographic position makes it what might be called the crossroads of opinion in the Equality State, and its endorsement of a candidate is considered a very favorable index of political thought throughout the State. In a lengthy, dispassionate, and superbly reasoned editorial, it states:

> The Casper Tribune endorses Senator GOLDWATER [for President] not as a Sir Galahad or a St. George, killer of dragons, but as a man whose commonsense approach to the prob-

lems of his country might well put a brake on those trends which submerge the interests of the individual and must ultimately destroy his freedom.

Taking this view, we see the man from Arizona, not as an advocate of extremism, but as a guardian of constitutional government, who can brake the slide to complete federalism, leaving to the States some of the rights originally intended by the founders of our Nation.

The editorial endorsement by the Casper newspapers is made without rancor or vituperation. It is a positive endorsement. With the most objective of criticisms directed toward the present administration, the Casper Star-Tribune notes:

> Peace and prosperity are the central themes; but it is a shaky peace, and the prosperity is so closely linked with a philosophy of deficit spending that it gives rise to grave doubts.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial endorsement of Senator Barry Goldwater by the Casper Star-Tribune of September 27, 1964, be printed in the Congressional Record with my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

To Halt a Trend

In the intense partisanship of a political campaign, the endorsement of one candidate or another quite often carries with it expressions of denunciation of the opposing contender.

As a responsible newspaper, we cannot bring ourselves to go along with the concept that one party is particularly virtuous or the other particularly villainous. In Natrona County in Wyoming, for instance, at this stage of the campaign, there appears to be a rather even division of Republicans and Democrats, with an unknown quantity of several thousand votes to be counted on to decide the issue in the final reckoning. We believe the Nation, like our own community and State, is made up of pretty good people generally and we have no desire to cast aspersions either on their integrity or their intelligence in affairs political.

With an awareness of the right of every citizen to make up his own mind both on the candidates and the issues, we endorse Senator Barry M. Goldwater for President. This decision is made with consideration of all the various arguments involved and it is made also because of a sense of responsibility to Star-Tribune readers who have a right to know where we stand in this important debate. Although the presentation of our views on this question is made with moderation and a due respect for the sincerity and the abilities of the Democratic Party and its standard bearer, it would be a misinterpretation to confuse this moderation with any sense of reluctance.

For several decades now, the American people have been going down the pleasant road to State socialism. If that is the kind of political system the people want, they shall surely have it in the years to come, and they will advance it measurably by the election of Lyndon P. Johnson and Hubert H. Humphrey in November. The Star-Tribune does not believe that this is the goal desired by the majority or that it would be the part of wisdom to continue blindly along that path. Some day there must be a reckoning, and although it may be uncomfortable at any time in our national history, the sooner the realities are faced, the better for the future of America.

When the Republican Party chose Barry Goldwater and William E. Miller as its nominees, it was not without a considerable voice of dissent from those in the party who favored a different approach to the problems of the country. There was, however, no question that the Goldwater nomination was the will of the majority and that it represented the thinking of the party as such. Although there are dissident voices still fighting the battle of the Cow Palace, that is over and done with, and Goldwater is carrying the fight not as an individual but as the standard bearer of his party. The same situation prevails in the Democratic Party, where a number of influential leaders disagree on certain basic principles with President Johnson. Some of these, as already is evident, will bring their influence to bear in favor of a Republican victory, just as certain elements of the Republican Party will work openly or secretively for Mr. Johnson's election. These crosscurrents are not to be ignored, and it is neither unnatural nor dishonest for the benefiting party to take advantage of them. By and large, however, the attention of the voters will be focused on the "mainstream," and that is where the major decision will be made.

In any discussion of the presidential campaign, there are certain fundamental principles involved but these are so often confused with the personalities of the candidates that they are frequently beclouded. Whether Mr. Johnson picks up his beagles by the ears, or turns out the lights in the White House, or whether Mr. Goldwater does not always make his meaning clear and falls into verbal traps that prove embarrassing, or that as a U.S. Senator he has failed to sponsor major legislation, are not paramount. Neither is the relative wealth of the Johnson and Goldwater families or, for that matter, the military records of the two nominees.

Senator Goldwater himself has expounded the basic issues, which he views as fourfold and which he briefly describes as Republican principles "which proclaim that peace in the world is preserved through our strength, that moral leadership is a clear duty of high office, that fiscal soundness is an obligation government owes to the taxpayer, and that our private enterprise system should be encouraged and not impeded."

Mr. Johnson emphasizes national unity and an administration for all the people. As the incumbent President, he is in a favorable position to follow this high-level course, leaving to his running mate and others the gut fighting that is part of any vigorous campaign. Peace and prosperity are the central themes, but it is a shaky peace, and the prosperity is so closely linked with a philosophy of deficit spending that it gives rise to grave doubts.

Senator Goldwater might have added a fifth principle to his basic summary—a principle which is implied but not expressly stated. That is the relationship of the individual to the government and the government to the individual. It is an old axiom that those are governed best who are governed least, and there is no reason to assume that, despite the complexities of modern civilization, this axiom does not hold today. The "creeping socialism" which has caused so much concern can result only in greater and greater interference by government in the personal lives of the citizens. Somewhere along the line, there is a point of no return and when the string has been played out a nation must inevitably wind up either in anarchy or despotism.

We endorse Senator Goldwater not as a Sir Galahad or a St. George, killer of dragons, but as a man whose commonsense approach to the problems of his country might well put a brake on those trends which submerge the interests of the individual and must ultimately destroy his freedom.

Taking this view, we see the man from Arizona not as an advocate of extremism but as a guardian of constitutional government, who can brake the slide to complete federalism, leaving to the States some of the rights originally intended by the founders of our Nation.

EDITORIAL COMMENTS ON SENATOR THURMOND'S SWITCH TO THE REPUBLICAN PARTY

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, on September 16, the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Thurmond] made a courageous and virtually unprecedented decision. In a nationally televised appearance before the people of his home State, Senator Thurmond announced that he was becoming a Republican.

Since that moment, the Senator's office has been flooded with telegrams and phone calls, running, I am told, several hundred to one in endorsing his forthrightness and his courage.

Since coming to the Republican side of the Senate, my longtime friend and neighbor in the New Senate Office Building has been traveling the country, setting the record straight on Republican truth squads and telling the Nation why on the eve of a presidential election he joined the Grand Old Party.

Senator Thurmond is today speaking in Wyoming. At this moment he is in Fremont County addressing a rally in Lander. Later today he moves to Riverton; and later to Natrona County, for a speech before several thousand Wyomingites at Casper.

It is fitting, therefore, that I ask permission to have printed in the Congressional Record a number of editorials from newspapers and radio-TV stations bearing on his switch to the Republican Party or on related events.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Valley Morning Star, Harlingen, Tex., Sept. 24, 1964]

Thurmond Raps Demos as He Moves to GOP

Those who have known and admired Senator Strom Thurmond, of South Carolina, for years are not surprised at the step he took when he announced his departure from the Democratic Party and his support for Barry Goldwater.

Thurmond for years has been a Jeffersonian Democrat, one who has voted consistently against expansion of the Federal Government, and for allowing the people to be self-responsible and not reliant on the bureaucrats.

Mr. Thurmond said he realizes he is taking a political risk by switching from Democrat to Republican in a Southern State and that "my chances for reelection might, because of this step, go down into oblivion." But he says for him, "there is no other course."

Too many politicians think more about retaining a lucrative position than to stand for what they think is right. But Thurmond has stood for what he regarded as right in the face of possible loss of votes and influence. It is interesting that Thurmond has been rated 100-percent conservative by the Conservative Society of America; 90 to 100 percent by the Americans for Constitutional Action, and zero by the big-Government-promoting Americans for Democratic Action. His voting records with those three organizations are a great deal similar to those of Goldwater.

As Senator THURMOND bowed out of the Democratic Party, he gave a bill of particulars—an indictment—against that party. Here is what he told the people of South Carolina:

"I have no choice but to speak openly, frankly, and fully to the people of South Carolina on the crisis that confronts us.

"The Democratic Party has abandoned the people. It has turned its back on the spiritual values and political principles which have brought us the blessings of freedom under God and a bountiful prosperity. It has breached the trust reposed in it by the people. It is leading the evolution of our Nation to a socialistic dictatorship.

"The Democratic Party has forsaken the people to become the party of minority groups, power-hungry union leaders, political bosses, and big businessmen looking for Government contracts and favors.

"The Democratic Party has encouraged lawlessness, civil unrest, and mob actions.

"The Democratic Party has violated its trust by using the power of Government to suppress information on scandals and corruption of its leaders in Government and party offices.

"The Democratic Party has succored and assisted our Communist enemies through trade and aid at the expense of the American people.

"The Democratic Party has established and pursued for our Government a no-win foreign policy of weakness, indecision, accommodation, and appeasement.

"The Democratic Party has demonstrated a callous disregard for sound fiscal policies and practices.

"The Democratic Party, while hiding behind the deceitful gimmick of a darkened White House, has increased deficit spending and squandered, at home and abroad, billions of hard-earned dollars taken from the American people.

"The Democratic Party has utterly disregarded the disastrous effects of the resulting inflation on people with fixed incomes, such as retirees, pensioners, social security beneficiaries, and those who have their savings invested in insurance.

"The Democratic Party has nominated for Vice President a key leader of the Americans for Democratic Action—the most influential socialist group in our Nation.

"The Democratic Party has encouraged, supported, and protected the Supreme Court in a reign of judicial tyranny, and in the Court's effort to wipe out local, self-government, effective law enforcement, internal security, the rights of the people and the States, and even the structure of the State governments."

Some people believe Mr. THURMOND's move may lead to a long predicted realinement of political parties, with conservative Democrats becoming Republicans and liberal Republicans switching to the Democratic Party, giving people a real choice between the parties as well as between candidates. It will be interesting to see.

But regardless of whether that happens, individuals who believe principles are important will salute STROM THURMOND as a courageous man of principle and convictions.

May his tribe increase.

EDITORIAL OPINION FROM WJMX-TRA, SEPT. 17, 1964

At this season an oft-quoted phrase is "There comes a time in the life of every man." Just such a moment of truth came to light yesterday as Senator STROM THURMOND announced his leaving of the Democratic Party and his advocacy of the Senator from Arizona for the Presidency of the United States. In making this move, STROM THURMOND has placed himself in the position of so many South Carolinians who have made the same move or who plan to make such a move. Many have the same feeling—that the Democratic Party today does not, in any way, represent the Democratic Party of our forefathers. There is nothing of the principles of Jefferson, of Jackson left, not even a shred—not an iota, evidenced by the National Democratic Party today. The principles which our grandfathers and great-grandfathers so valiantly supported and stanchly defended in the Democratic Party have long evaporated from the national party which now openly embraces the theories of socialism and it aimlessly wanders down the path—toward the inevitable financial ruin of this country. "Peace and prosperity" offers a wonderful slogan—one hard to improve upon—but when mathematics deny the prosperity to be real—and that "peace" means instead, "accommodation" to the atheistic principle of communism which today threatens every free land in the world, then "peace and prosperity" is a figment of imagination that isn't real, but a bait for votes. This is part of what Senator THURMOND declares that he can no longer support, in his speech of the transition, THURMOND said, "The future of freedom and constitutional government is at stake." And, "to my friends who have conscientiously advised me against this step, I can only say that I fully realize the political risk which may be involved in this step and that my chances for reelection might, because of this step, go down into oblivion." Senator THURMOND continues, "But in the final analysis, I can only follow the course which, in my heart and conscience, I believe to be the best course, I believe to be in the best interest of our State, our country and the freedom of our people. I have chosen this course because I cannot consider any risks in a cause which I am convinced is right." (Senator STROM THURMOND, of South Carolina, as he renounced the Democratic Party to join the Republican Party.)

These then are the words of a man of courage. True, in 1966 that this move might cost him his political office. We cannot believe that the people of South Carolina will be able to ignore this move on the part of Senator STROM THURMOND—and for those who scorn his action for what he believes to be right, surely there are thousands of South Carolinians who will salute this act which THURMOND believes to be in their interest and in the interest of our State of South Carolina. True, he conceivably could be divested of his title of Senator—but because of his action this title can never be taken away from him. "A man of deep conviction—mighty courage—with the interests of his people and his State uppermost in his heart and mind."

Thank you.

[From the Chattanooga News-Free Press, Sept. 17, 1964]

COURAGE OF CONVICTION

We would have a better Congress and a better country if we had more men with the strength of conviction that Senator STROM THURMOND, of South Carolina, has shown.

It is not necessary or desirable that all men have the same convictions—but it is most laudatory when men reach honorable convictions and stand by them, regardless of personal cost.

STROM THURMOND became known nationally in 1948 when his conviction that the Constitution needed a champion led him to a presidential candidacy as a States' Rights Democrat.

A South Carolina Democrat with a record of distinction for many years, STROM THURMOND yesterday declared not only that he is for Senator BARRY GOLDWATER for President but also that he is changing to the Republican Party.

He could easily have supported Senator GOLDWATER and remained in his regular party, and there would have been nothing wrong with that. But he went all the way.

The kind of conviction shown by this great American is in sharp contrast with the opportunistic, Constitution-ignoring, hypocritical, wheeling-dealing, get-elected-at-any-cost leadership that now controls the once honored party that left Senator THURMOND and that Senator THURMOND has now left.

Senator THURMOND's example is a challenge to men of conviction everywhere, though their ideas and convictions may differ. Senator THURMOND has set an example of morality and courage that this Nation should applaud.

[From the Lafayette (Ind.) Leader, Sept. 24, 1964]

THE BIG SWITCH

One of the big stories of the past week was the switch of Senator STROM THURMOND, of South Carolina, from the Democratic to Republican Party. Senator THURMOND has had a long political career as a Democrat and is recognized as a wheelhorse in southern political circles.

Senator THURMOND is one of those southern Democrats who are unhappy with the leadership of their party at the national level. They have demonstrated their displeasure in many ways, but it takes a rugged type of courage for a man of THURMOND's standing to renounce his political affiliation and transfer his party allegiance to the minority party in his State.

The switch will mean that the Senator will lose his legislative seniority in Washington, and since Republicanism is a minority point of view in South Carolina, he will be handicapped accordingly at the polls.

Many and varied have been the opinions expressed at Senator THURMOND's unusual decision. He has been praised and criticized, admired, and castigated. Whatever else may be said of the Senator, he must be admired for his courage and forthrightness. He has probably sacrificed a brilliant political career for a principle—right or wrong.

Senator KEATING, of New York, is a different breed. He is supposed to be a Republican and running as such for reelection to the U.S. Senate. Yet, Senator KEATING will not support the GOP candidate for President because he does not approve of Senator GOLDWATER's views. In our opinion Senator KEATING is a political hypocrite. If he is affiliated with the Republican Party to the extent of holding a high national office through the efforts of the party's membership, then he owes the organization his full support, including support of its presidential candidate.

These two U.S. Senators hold different political viewpoints, and it is quite evident they are made of different stuff. In our opinion STROM THURMOND stands the tallest.

[From the Bluefield (W. Va.) Daily Telegraph, Sept. 19, 1964]

A COURAGEOUS STEP

The real personal and political courage required of Senator J. STROM THURMOND, of South Carolina, in leaving the Democratic and joining the Republican Party will not be comprehended readily by many Americans unfamiliar with the seniority system in the U.S. Congress and the stern political code of the South.

THURMOND, who has been in the Senate since 1954, had built up 10 years of precious seniority on which all Senate privileges, most especially those of committee and subcommittee chairmanships, are based. In becoming a Republican, he loses every shred of these privileges unless the Senate Republican leadership should decide to give him seniority credit for his Democratic service. THUR-

MOND presumably has not asked for any such allowance, but quite possibly he will receive some such reward.

But even more important to THURMOND is the reaction of his constituents in South Carolina, where for nearly 100 years "Republican" has been a term of opprobrium roughly similar to "damyankee." Of course in recent years South Carolinians have been registering Republican opinions at the polls, but State candidates have continued to cling to the Democratic label.

THURMOND has put an end to this hypocrisy. He has recognized that the Democratic Party no longer has any connection with the conservative principles long favored in the South and he has joined the party which does represent these principles.

In so doing, THURMOND has courageously put into action the theory that in our two-party system we must have a clear choice between the conservative and the liberal-socialist approach. We do not have that choice now, because both parties still contain within themselves advocates of both theories.

This confusion could and should be eliminated, and it would be a fine and admirable development if other Southern conservatives would follow THURMOND's lead. At the same time the Republican Party can easily spare the likes of the Messrs. Rockefeller, JAVITS, KEATING, and others who continue to masquerade as Republicans while embracing virtually every Democratic attitude.

If such a massive exchange could be arranged, the whole political picture would be considerably simplified and voters would truly have a choice between two great national parties, each with a sharply differing approach to the problems of this Nation.

Republicans would have nothing to fear from such a confrontation, either. This is a conservative Nation, and President Johnson has recognized that fact by his insistence on clinging to the fiction that he too has conservative leanings. Of course he insists he is "liberal" too, but such political schizophrenia cannot really be tolerated.

The nomination of BARRY GOLDWATER as the Republican presidential nominee was a major step toward bringing the Republican Party back onto the true conservative path. The Democratic Party left that path long ago and its leadership is completely dedicated to the radical socialist approach.

Thoughtful Americans would do well to study the searing indictment of the Democratic Party as it now is constituted which was delivered by ex-member THURMOND. Major excerpts appear in David Lawrence's column on this page today. And those who are conservative Democrats should ponder the question of whether they, like THURMOND, have any business in registering an allegiance to that party.

[From the San Diego Union, Sept. 18, 1964]

NOT IN POLITICS BUT IN COURAGE—THURMOND SPEAKS AS PATRIOT

It was the moment of truth for Senator STROM THURMOND, of South Carolina, when he put a life of party affiliation behind him, and all the prerogatives of congressional seniority, and reregistered as a Republican.

He accused the leadership of the Democratic Party of abandoning constitutional government and taking the country down the road toward a Socialist dictatorship.

So respected is he in the U.S. Senate that he has been spared the usual personal political attacks. In their hearts—as Senator BARRY GOLDWATER himself has said of his own campaign—most of the Senators, on both sides of the political aisle, know that he is right.

But like Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, the Democratic candidate for Vice President, who has dampened his fiery liberalism, not because of a shift in convictions, but out of what he conceived as political necessity, many in Congress feel that the hour is not right for a national political realinement.

They prefer, for the time, to work within the party which has given them position and power.

But there comes a point of no return, when a political leader must at last balance the possibility of some political achievement against conscience.

Senator THURMOND reached that point. And America is the better for it.

He joined Senator GOLDWATER, not only in politics, but in courage. Before the Republican convention, and when his nomination was still a matter of question, Senator GOLDWATER went against the tide of sentiment and the leaders of his own party to vote against the civil rights bill on constitutional grounds.

Here was no surrender to expediency. Here, too, the country was richer by casting up into national life a man who placed his own principles and the Constitution above party and power.

There is a reluctance throughout the land to openly and frankly discuss the profound change that is taking place in American life.

There is a tendency to keep our attention concentrated on each specific issue of Government service and not on their cumulative effect. The war is ignored while we watch the little battles of the fringe of fateful change.

Deeply moved, as a man must be to leave his own party behind him, Senator THURMOND said that it has repudiated the Constitution of the United States, and "has forsaken the people to become a party of minority groups, power-hungry union leaders, political bosses, and big business men looking for Government contracts and favors."

He believes that unless Senator GOLDWATER is elected Americans will "face regulation, control, coercion, intimidation, and subservience to a power elite who shall rule from Washington."

The Democrats want the election to turn on how much more they can do for the people—with their own money, of course.

The Senator Goldwaters and the Senator Thurmonds want to debate the future of America—and the cause of freedom. But the administration has a hundred billion dollars at its disposal—and a cynical willingness to promise everything for everybody.

[From the Augusta Herald, Sept. 18, 1964]

A MAN OF INTEGRITY ACTS

Senator STROM THURMOND's renunciation of the Democratic Party for Goldwater republicanism may prove to be one of the most significant developments of the current presidential campaign.

This possibility lies not so much in the physical fact of THURMOND's having switched allegiances as it does in pointing up the divisive struggle now splitting the Democratic ranks.

After all, Senator THURMOND has been seen for years as, at best, a maverick Democrat. And though having led a splinter party effort in 1948, until now he has stopped short of actually bolting the Democratic camp.

The emergence of Senator BARRY GOLDWATER as the GOP presidential candidate and party head obviously provided the necessary final impetus. In the light of Senator THURMOND's well-known views, it hardly needs arguing that his realinement with the conservative Republicans was a logical move.

More important are the reasons the South Carolina gamecock gave for his belated breach.

The text of his renunciation address, which was reminiscent of the Declaration of Independence, was one of the most articulate and damning indictments of the Democratic Party we have seen.

He made quite clear who he deems to be the deserter, saying that "the Democratic Party has abandoned the people." Adding that it would amount to dereliction of his duty to remain silent, he asserted flatly that the Democratic Party "is leading the evolution of our Nation (toward) a socialistic dictatorship."

He also left no doubt that he sees the candidacy of Senator GOLDWATER as perhaps the last chance for the American people to retain freedom and constitutional government.

He began his departure address by echoing the classic warning that "for evil to triumph, it is only necessary that good men do nothing." Despite the obvious political hazards of his action, he stated with ominous brevity:

"For me, there is no alternative."

There will be those who will deprecate and ridicule Senator THURMOND's decision and who will seek to exact of him a dear price for having listened to his conscience rather than to opportunity.

But from where we sit, win, lose or draw, Senator STROM THURMOND is a credit to South Carolina and the Nation. Most of all, he is a man of rare integrity.

[From the Roanoke World-News, Sept. 18, 1964]

AND NOW IT IS SENATOR THURMOND, REPUBLICAN, OF SOUTH CAROLINA

What the Republican Party could not accomplish in South Carolina, Senator STROM THURMOND accomplished by a single decision Senator THURMOND, a lifelong Democrat, has embraced what he terms the "Goldwater Republican Party." Thus he gives his State a Republican Senator.

The Senator could have announced his support of Senator GOLDWATER for President without leaving his party but he chose to go all the way. Even those of opposite political conviction must admire Senator THURMOND for his forthrightness.

There does not seem to be much question about Senator GOLDWATER's strong support in the South. The Thurmond defection from the Democrats—secession might be a better description—is the most dramatic evidence of Goldwater strength in the States of the Old Confederacy.

This is not Senator THURMOND's first break with the national Democratic Party. It will be recalled that in 1948, when Harry Truman was elected President, THURMOND was the presidential nominee of the States Rights Democrats, carrying Alabama, Louisiana, Mississippi, and South Carolina for a total of 39 electoral votes. But this is the first time Senator THURMOND has broken completely with his party.

It is said that the South Carolina political situation played a part in his decision, that the Democratic Party there has become too moderate to suit him. Governor Russell has permitted desegregation to proceed peacefully in South Carolina. Senator THURMOND and his colleague from South Carolina, Senator OLIN JOHNSTON, both voted against the civil rights bill but the latter was among those seconding the vice-presidential nomination of Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, who helped guide the civil rights act to passage. In addition, there is the possibility South Carolina may go Republican in November.

But we prefer to believe that Senator THURMOND acted on the basis of strong conviction. He is convinced, as are many other southerners, that the Democratic Party has "repudiated the Constitution of the United States," that it "is leading the evolution of our Nation to a socialistic dictatorship," and that it has "become the party of minority groups, power-hungry union leaders, political bosses, and big businessmen looking for Government contracts and favors."

Strong words, those. But there were others. The party, he charged, has disregarded sound fiscal policies and practices and has "encouraged, supported, and protected the Supreme Court in a reign of judicial tyranny." A special barb was reserved for the Humphrey nomination. The Senator pointed out that the vice-presidential nominee is "a key leader of the Americans for Democratic Action—the most influential Socialist group in our Nation."

So Senator Thurmond turns his back, forever, we presume, on the Democratic Party. His action required a great deal of courage. It contrasts sharply with those Democrats of similar bent who prefer to maintain "golden silence" in presidential election campaigns.

[From the Greenville News, Sept. 17, 1964]

Strom Thurmond Takes His Stand

With characteristic forthrightness and courage, Senator Strom Thurmond last night laid his political future on the line in a gesture equally as dramatic as his write-in election to the U.S. Senate as an independent Democrat in 1954.

In a short, hard-hitting address widely broadcast on television, Senator Thurmond denounced the Democratic Party's present leadership and policies in harsh terms. He unreservedly pledged himself to support the presidential candidacy of Senator Barry Goldwater and the policies of the Republican Party as he believes they will be if the Arizonan is elected.

The Senator could hardly have stated his decision and his reasons more strongly.

They boil down to a firm conviction that election of the Johnson-Humphrey ticket in November will establish a line of White House succession that will lead to a socialistic state and the loss of individual freedom; and that the election of Goldwater-Miller ticket is the only hope of avoiding international and domestic disaster to the Nation.

Perhaps it should not have, but Senator Thurmond's action came as a surprise to many of his friends and supporters. Included were some who were in the forefront of the fight to help him get elected in his unprecedented campaign against the State Democratic executive committee's nominee after the death of the late Senator Burnet R. Maybank.

How many of these will follow him, especially in view of how far he has gone, is a matter for conjecture which only future events will settle. He himself stated that he was going against the advice of many friends and he acknowledged a calculated risk to his political future.

The element of surprise, and the cause of some disappointment to persons who have been close to him, is the fact that Senator Thurmond may be going so far as to lose at least part of what has been for the last decade his greatest strength—his position of independence.

While nominally a Democrat, seated as such amid some dissent in 1954 and running in party primaries since, the Senator has not been in any sense of the term a "party liner." He has gone against the party, especially in certain policies and proposed legislation during the last 4 years, as often as he has gone with it, if not more often.

He has taken each policy and each issue as it arose and dealt with it in the light of his own beliefs and those of the basically conservative majority of his constituents. How he has voted in presidential elections is a matter he has kept to himself, just as have many others of his fellow citizens.

This independence has strengthened his hand in the Senate and in national politics generally more often than it has weakened it. It also has been the primary source of his strength among the voters of the State.

His refusal to wear a political label at the cost of sacrificing principle has appealed strongly to South Carolinians during a time of political flux and shifting of partisan lines.

If he is now donning the strict Republican label, after shunning any other all this time, it may diminish his appeal and influence. It may hamper or defeat the obvious purpose of his maneuver, an attempt to help carry South Carolina for Goldwater.

Thurmond did not quite make his intentions on this point clear in his speech. He stated that he had necessarily worked within the framework of the Democratic Party in the past, while maintaining "independence of judgment" in the best interests of South Carolina. "To do this in the future," he said, "I must work within the framework of the Goldwater Republican Party."

Stating that for him, there was no alternative, that freedom and constitutional government were at stake and that he was compelled to work for the election of Senator Goldwater, he said: "This also requires that I join him in his fight, successful as of now, to make the Republican Party a party which supports freedom, justice, and constitutional government."

This, of course, will be enough to cause the Johnson-Humphrey forces in the Senate to attempt to read him out of the Democratic Party and deprive him of his committee positions, a threat already rumored against Senator Eastland, of Mississippi. But anything less than all-out support probably would lead to the same development, if the Democratic ticket wins in November.

At this stage, we can only evaluate Senator Thurmond's action as a gamble involving his own political future and to a large extent the interests of his constituents. Its outcome depends on the vagaries of the fortunes of political war. Strom Thurmond says he has "chosen this course because I cannot consider any risks in a cause which I am convinced is right."

One can only admire a man who risks all for his convictions.

As for us, what a Senator stands for and does on the floor of the U.S. Senate and in its committees still transcends in importance any political label he may wear or personal loyalties he may hold.

[From the Columbia (S.C.) State, Sept. 17, 1964]

Senator Thurmond's Decision

For Strom Thurmond to have supported the program and nominees of the National Democratic Party of 1964 would have required a reversal of principles of which he is incapable.

For the Senator to have stood by in silent, inactive, and politic tolerance of that party's course would have been an insufferable contradiction of the position he has uniformly held.

And it would have violated the very text of his statement of Wednesday: "For evil to triumph, it is only necessary that good men do nothing."

Senator Thurmond, being no hypocrite and being innately a man of action and strong convictions, found it impossible to adapt, to change, to present a false face—or even to stand by passively and impotently in the face of what he construes to be procedures of "evil."

His votes and pronouncements since going to the U.S. Senate, and even before, have been in strict conformity to his principles of government. He is not the accommodationist, the bender to prevailing party policy, the coattail swinger.

This being his nature and record, and the circumstances of the moment being precisely as he has stated them, he had no choice but to associate himself with what he has called the Goldwater Republican Party.

Clearly, the Senator arrived studiously at that designation. The party of today is not the party of the neo-Republicanism of the 1950's, or of those latter-day successors to that dilution of the erstwhile conservatism; it is the party, for the time being at least, conforming largely to the philosophy of Strom Thurmond.

In alining himself with the Republican Party of today, Mr. Thurmond joins with many of his fellow South Carolinians who have done likewise in their protestations of what they conceive to be Democratic error. But as a highly placed elected public officer, he carries the force of leadership which only such an official can bring to such a situation. There is that important and effective distinction between him and the private citizen similarly actuated and acting.

Senator Thurmond has really done nothing more than occupy a new house at the same location, that location being the firm ground where his fundamental precepts have always rested.

Yet the act of occupancy is historymaking and a reflection of unbroken consistency.

[From the Daily Press, Newport News, Va., Sept. 18, 1964]

A Man of Rare Convictions

For the first time in 16 years, a major political figure of the United States has rejected the practical application of his party's principles and has switched his personal allegiance to the opposition.

The action of Senator Strom Thurmond in withdrawing from the Democratic Party in favor of Republican principles calls to mind a similar situation in 1948 when Senator Wayne Morse, a liberal Republican, forsook his ties with the GOP after candidate Eisenhower adopted some of the conservative views of Senator Robert Taft. Morse formally accepted the tenets of the liberal wing of the Democratic Party. There are other older examples of course.

The severance of Senator Thurmond follows by 16 years his acceptance of the candidacy of the States Rights Democratic splinter group for the Presidency, and his leadership of the conservative wing in 1948 resulted in support of more than a million people who respected his personal feelings that there was no choice between the candidates Truman and Dewey.

As Senator Thurmond becomes the lowest Republican in the Senate in terms of seniority, he is discarding for the moment two decades of political effort in his own behalf, yet his action, which is the logical follow-on to his candidacy in 1948, may see him emerge as the catalyst for something the American body politic has been trying to synthesize ever since World War II; the development of a realistic, two-party system polarized toward conservative and liberal elements. For 16 years Senator Thurmond moved within the limits of his own party to achieve his goals, and withal saw the National Democratic Party move further and further toward the left. Now it has passed him by, and as befits a man of rare and honest conviction, he has moved out from under its banner to develop as best he can the conservative doctrines espoused by the Goldwater group within the GOP. He put it this way:

"The Democratic Party has abandoned the people. It has turned its back on the spiritual values and political principles which have brought us the blessings of freedom under God and a bountiful prosperity. It has breached the trust reposed in it by the people. It has repudiated the Constitution of the United States. It is leading the evolution of our Nation to a socialistic dictatorship."

Lest many wonder why other stanch conservatives do not and have not made a similar decision, we would note that men such as Byrd and Robertson have far more responsibilities in the Senate, and are in a far better position than Senator Thurmond to exercise their conservative judgment on matters pending before the Senate; Representative Howard Smith, of Virginia's Eighth, holds similar responsibilities in the House.

Editor James Jackson Kilpatrick, of the Richmond News Leader, found that Woodrow Wilson had once been inclined to explain Mr. Thurmond's action in comfortable words:

"The man who adheres to any party after it has ceased to avow the principles which to him are dear—the man who follows the leading of a party which seems to him to be going wrong—is acting a lie and has lost either his wit or his virtue."

History may record this decision by Senator Thurmond as the beginning of a new and realistic alinement of political philosophies.

[From the Spartanburg (S.C.) Herald, Sept. 17, 1964]

Thurmond's Decision Thoroughly in Tune

Strom Thurmond's momentous decision to go over to the Republican Party is thoroughly in tune with his reputation of political independence and courage.

The Senator is the personification of political transition in the South, more specifically in South Carolina.

This State has traveled from unwavering party-label loyalty, through temporary defections and general independence, to a presently blossoming two-party movement.

Undoubtedly, Thurmond's action—whatever its effect on him personally—will impel the Republican Party forward by a number of years. And this is a force that has been gaining dynamically in South Carolina already.

His forceful statement of Wednesday night might very well bring a chain reaction—perhaps right down to the local level. An untold number of elected South Carolinians are not comfortable within the ranks of the National Democratic Party.

They have been the captives of political transition, not having approached the point of decision. That point has now come to them.

Strom Thurmond's choice has to be out of the deepest kind of personal conviction. He is laying his political future flat on the line—at a time when it was generally considered he was stronger in following than he had ever been.

The Senator has not shrunk from political danger when his principles were put to the test.

In 1940, he took the mantle of States rights leadership—after Hubert Humphrey ("move out of the shadow of States rights into the sunshine of civil rights") had inspired the Democratic National Convention to repudiate the southern position in the party. Not many elected leaders, in this State or any other, were as willing to jeopardize their roles in party affairs for the cause of States rights.

Then in 1954, Strom Thurmond went against the massed power of South Carolina Democrats by refusing to accept the hierarchy's will that Edgar Brown was to be U.S. Senator to succeed the dead Burnet Maybank.

Thurmond took his plea to the people and became the only Member of Congress ever elected on a write-in ballot.

In 1957, southern Senators wished to compromise on the civil rights bill then proposed. Thurmond dissented and put on a one-man filibuster that set a new record. A few weeks later Little Rock erupted and the South Carolinian stood as a lone and eloquent example of forewarning.

In the events of the future there may be argument about whether Strom Thurmond's place in South Carolina is more the result of the political tide, or the wave itself the product of his influence.

But of one thing there cannot be the slightest doubt: His example of personal independence and political courage has inspired a tremendous change in the complexion of South Carolina politics and public affairs.

[From the Chicago Tribune, Sept. 17, 1964]

Act of Courage

Senator Strom Thurmond of South Carolina left the Democratic Party yesterday in order to do everything within his power "to help Barry Goldwater return our Nation to constitutional government through his election to the Presidency." Senator Thurmond's address announcing his decision is printed in its entirety in our news pages. It is a striking, powerful, and truthful account of what has happened to the Democratic Party and is happening to the once-free Federal Republic. We urge every American to read the Senator's words and reflect on them with the greatest gravity.

Senator Thurmond has eloquently stated the difference between the party of Lyndon Johnson and the "power elite" which supports him and the devotion of Barry Goldwater to constitutional government. Under the Democratic Party as it has evolved, the Senator says that "freedom as we have known it in this country is doomed." With Goldwater, the people themselves would "hold the reins of government and rule themselves."

Senator Thurmond has engaged in an act of great courage. He has put his own political career on the line. He will be damned as a segregationist, a right wing extremist, and every other epithet handy to the "liberals." But read what he says. You won't forget it.

[From the Danville (Va.) Register, Sept. 17, 1964]

Thurmond Swaps Parties

It must be said that in changing from his affiliation with the Democratic Party to his affiliation with the Republican Party, Senator Strom Thurmond, of South Carolina, has not changed at all in his political, social, and economic viewpoints. He has been with Senator Goldwater most of the time and against Senator Humphrey nearly all the time.

Thurmond's decision, even so, surely was not an easy one. He has cut many ties and he may have signaled the early end of a career of service to the people of South Carolina and to conservatives in all parts of the land.

By giving up his Democratic status, Senator Thurmond loses all his seniority on the Commerce Committee, where he stood fourth, and the Armed Services Committee, where he stood seventh on the Democratic side. He must now start at the bottom on the Republican side of new committee assignments, having seniority only over any Republicans who may be elected for the first time in November.

The hard choice made by Thurmond is one which has faced and still faces some Republicans and some other Democrats in both the Senate and in the House. Among Republicans who might be expected to jump the political fence at the least prodding, would be both Senators from New York and Senator Kuchel, of California, the acting GOP leader. This trio is mighty unhappy with conservatives in the Republican ranks and the coming to their camp of Senator Thurmond will not cause any one of them to leap with joy or to shout any hosannas. Other southern Democrats are as unhappy with the trend of the national party captured by the ADA ultraliberals and the Negroes but find that they can best combat these influences while remaining within the framework of the party. Like Senator Thurmond has done, they vote their own convictions, usually, rather than follow the commands from the national party spokesmen.

Only current Member of Congress who has made the party swap is Senator Morse, of Oregon, who grew so displeased with moderate Republicans that he quit Eisenhower to support Stevenson, and was reelected to the Senate as a Democrat.

The problem for Senator Thurmond will not be what happens in Washington so much as what happens in South Carolina this year and 2 years hence. He won his seat first by a remarkable write-in campaign. Whether he can win as a Republican has not yet been answered. The risk he has taken is not inconsiderable.

[From the Savannah Evening Press, Sept. 17, 1964]

Strom Thurmond's Deed

Senator Strom Thurmond's harsh repudiation of the national Democratic Party comes as no real surprise. The 61-year-old South Carolinian has cooled to the route his party has taken on numerous occasions in the past.

Probably the most reasoned comment on Senator Thurmond's change of political affiliation comes from Democratic National Committeeman Joe Peeler in Tennessee. The party leader says that "every American is entitled to express his political beliefs every 4 years and Senator Thurmond should not be relegated to a second-class citizenship. He has the same right as every other citizen."

The average voter can switch his party loyalty from election to election with little or no ill effect. The position of the duly elected officeholder is another matter, however. He must weigh the effect that his action will have on his constituency as well as his personal standing as an individual.

Any elected representative would be derelict if he did not conscientiously strive to reflect the will and moods of a majority of those who elect him to office. Apparently, Senator Thurmond has concluded that further association with the Democratic Party would not be in keeping with the spirit of those who sent him to Washington.

There is more at stake than just a campaign endorsement for the candidacy of Senator Barry Goldwater. The matter of changing party principles and party direction obviously were big factors in Senator Thurmond's decision.

In the matter of personal integrity and courage, the South Carolinian has earned a rating in profiles of courage in the same fashion as did the Senator from Arizona. It takes a surplus of guts to stand up and be counted when the stakes are high. Both of these Senators, now both Republicans, are to be commended for this admirable trait.

[From the Fort Lauderdale News, Sept. 18, 1964]

Thurmond's Party Switch a Rare Act of Courage in Political Jungle

(By Jack W. Gore)

Even though many of our professional politicians will tend to characterize Senator Strom Thurmond, of South Carolina, as a "traitor," his decision this week to leave the Democratic ranks and become a Republican is one that took a high degree of intestinal fortitude and unusual political courage.

There are many Democrats, particularly in the South, who share Senator Thurmond's sentiments about the manner in which their party has been taken over by elements completely contemptuous of the traditional principles of Jeffersonian democracy.

But how many of these Democrats are willing to give up what Senator Thurmond gave up this week to avoid sacrificing their principles on the altar of political expediency?

There are not many, to be sure. While there are any number who believe just as strongly as Senator Thurmond that under the present leadership of the Democratic Party the Nation is being taken for a fast ride down the road that leads to a socialistic government, only Senator Thurmond has risked his own political future for what he considers to be the best interests of the people he represents and the Nation as a whole.

Senator Thurmond could just as easily have done what any number of high-ranking southern Democrats are doing today, which is more or less confined to paying lipservice to the conservative policies they espouse while they protect their political positions and their access to the congressional pork barrel.

But Senator Thurmond did not choose to take this hypocritical course. He forthrightly switched his political affiliation, thereby giving up his seniority in the U.S. Senate.

His attitude and his forthright action contrast sharply with any number of his fellow Senators in both parties who sharply disagree with the policies adopted and the candidates nominated at the recent national conventions.

As an example consider the positions of Senators Kuchel, Keating, Javits, and Scott of the Republican Party. These men are all avowed liberals who have nothing whatsoever in common with Senator Barry Goldwater and Representative William Miller, their party candidates in the November presidential election. To all intents and purposes these men are strongly opposed to Senator Goldwater and fear his leadership will wreck their party.

But if these men cannot go along with the direction their party has taken, why don't they do as Senator Thurmond has done and forthrightly join the Democrats where they will feel right at home with the liberal elements which have control of that party? If they had the courage to do this, they would not only be where they really belong, but they would greatly assist in bringing about the party realinement that is needed in this Nation if party labels are to really mean anything.

The same applies to many of our stanch southern Democrats who would certainly find it easier to give their full support to the conservative cause under a different banner than that which is being paraded by President Johnson and Senator Hubert Humphrey.

It has been recognized for quite a few years that today's party labels mean virtually nothing when our present parties are as sharply divided as they are today on conservative and liberal lines. It doesn't make sense that this jumbled situation should continue, but until the liberal and conservative factions in both parties display enough courage to put the political good of the Nation above their own desires to maintain their seniority and their access to the pork barrel, such a party realinement will be almost impossible to achieve.

In this connection we might say that from their past performances many Democratic members of this State's congressional delegation are in a position almost as difficult as that which Senator Thurmond occupied in relation to giving his support and allegiance to the Johnson-Humphrey ticket.

Yet, it should be noted, all of these Democrats have indicated their support of the party ticket even though it means subjugating some of their own principles and beliefs to what they apparently consider to be the more important cause of party unity.

These Congressmen may well feel it is to their own interests and to the best interests of this State that they not jeopardize either their positions of influence or their present ability to secure Federal funds and projects for Florida by refusing to endorse the party ticket.

But when Senator Strom Thurmond declared he was leaving the Democratic Party because he felt it "has forsaken the people to become a party of minority groups, power-hungry union leaders, political bosses, and big businessmen looking for Government contracts and favors," he spoke a truth which is becoming exceedingly difficult for many southern Congressmen to swallow under the guise of maintaining party unity.

Senator Thurmond couldn't swallow his distaste for where the Democratic leaders are taking the country any longer so he left the Democratic Party this week and joined the Goldwater team. His decision may be open to debate, but the integrity behind it cannot be questioned as he displayed the rare type of political courage this country needs if principles are to mean anything in the political jungle that exists today.

[From the Lebanon Daily News, Sept. 21, 1964]

Strom Thurmond, Patriot

The fact that Senator Strom Thurmond, of South Carolina, has changed his party affiliation from Democrat to Republican is a heartwarming example of a man who places country above party and himself.

In taking this action, Senator Thurmond tossed out all his seniority rights which he laboriously built over many years in the U.S. Senate and gave up his important committee assignments.

What Senator Thurmond has done is typical of the man. He is a great patriot. His voice has spoken out boldly time after time against the ever-quickening trend toward a centralizing of all power in Washington. Senator Thurmond is a major general in the U.S. Army Reserves. As such, he led the fight to expose the censorship imposed on the leaders of the U.S. Armed Forces and the no-win policy of the present administration.

Unfortunately a great many Americans lulled to sleep by the present material prosperity and uneducated of the freedoms guaranteed by the Constitution do not understand the dangers that are threatening them, but which Senator Thurmond sees so clearly.

The Republican minority in the Senate has gained a great recruit. It has to be hoped that the Republicans appreciate what they have gained by Senator Thurmond's enlistment.

It is a great and wonderful thing that the United States still possesses leaders who will sacrifice their own careers, if necessary, for the good of the Nation and the safety of all of us.

[From the Atlanta Times]

Thurmond Now; Who's Next?

When men the caliber of Senator Strom Thurmond, of the great State of South Carolina, decide that the party of their choice is the Republican Party, and the candidate of their choice is Senator Goldwater—why, then, look out, Democrats.

The Republican Party today is the party of the people. Already sensing this are the people themselves. It's been coming for years. Now it's here.

Senator Thurmond is the first. There will be others over the months and years ahead. No matter what the consequences in seniority or power in Congress, praise be there still are men who are willing to stand up and vote their convictions, and change parties if necessary.

We have faced the danger of one-party government in this country. It is fitting that Senator Thurmond places his interest in the welfare of the Nation above blind allegiance to party.

For it was on September 19, 1796, that Goerge Washington in his Farewell Address warned against blind allegiance to party or parties, declaring that they are likely "in the course of time and things, to become potent engines by which cunning and ambitious and unprincipled men will be enabled to subvert the power of the people and to usurp for themselves the reins of government.

"Let me," said George Washington, "warn you in the most solemn manner against the baneful effects of the spirit of party generally. This spirit, unfortunately, is inseparable from our nature, having its roots in the strongest passion of the human mind. It exists under different shapes in all governments more or less stifled, controlled, or repressed; but in those of the popular forms it is seen in its greatest rankness and is truly their worst enemy.

"The disorders and miseries which result gradually incline the minds of men to seek security and repose in the absolute power of an individual; and sooner or later the chief of some prevailing faction, more able or more fortunate than his competitors, turns this disposition to the purposes of his own elevation, on the ruins of public liberty."

If George Washington were here today, he would applaud Senator Thurmond and cast a stern eye upon those who seek to elevate themselves upon the ruins of public liberty.

[From the Baptist Bible Tribune, Oct. 2, 1964]

James Strom Thurmond: A Man of Principle

(By Noel Smith)

Senator James Strom Thurmond, of South Carolina, has transferred his political allegiance from the Democratic to the Republican Party. He announced the transfer in a speech to the people of South Carolina on a television broadcast in Columbia. I have read the complete text. The prose is lean, serious, and penetrating. It is a powerful political document. It will be read, studied, and appreciated by serious students of men and government when the hypocritical, artificial federaleze utterances from the characterless lips of manufactured political images are part of the lifeless mass of the political dumpheap.

The supreme consideration of Senator Thurmond's action is not whether the preponderance of political morality and wisdom is with the Democrats or Republicans. The supreme consideration is that here in this babel of smiling mercenaries, there has emerged a man of principle; a man who chooses the pulse and water of enlightened, responsible statesmanship above the meat and wine of Washington flunkeyism; a man who believes that a U.S. Senator has no moral or constitutional right to sacrifice the souls and bodies of future American generations to the pagan bellies of today, a man whose spiritual concepts are not degraded by the lust for money and power.

Senator Thurmond is 61 years old. Son of an Edgefield, S.C., lawyer, he was graduated from Clemson College in 1923. He served as an agriculture teacher and, later, as school superintendent in the Edgefield area. He became a State senator. At 39, Senator Thurmond was on the bench of the South Carolina Circuit Court.

Eighteen years before the Pearl Harbor attack, Senator Thurmond gained a commission in the Reserve officers' training at Clemson College. When the attack came, he resigned his judgeship and volunteered for military service.

On D-Day, Senator Thurmond was in Normandy with the 82d Airborne Division. He came out of the war with 5 battle stars, 18 decorations, and with medals and awards, including the Purple Heart. He is now a major general in the Army Reserves.

Seantor Thurmond was Governor of South Carolina from 1947 to 1951. He discovered laws on the statute books that were not being enforced for obvious reasons. He enforced them. Government appointees no longer held but one office at a time. Horse racing stopped. The slot machines in American Legion clubs stopped operating.

When he was Governor, Senator THURMOND expanded the State's educational system. He placed Negro schoolteachers on an equal pay scale.

He led a successful movement to abolish the poll tax. He increased funds for public health and welfare. When he was Governor, Senator THURMOND ordered the arrest and murder trial of a white man charged with lynching a Negro. That was the first time in the history of the State that such a thing had been done.

While serving as Governor, Senator THURMOND was the presidential candidate of the States' Rights Democratic Party movement. He got 1,169,021 popular votes. He carried 4 States and got 39 electoral votes. A change of 27,000 votes in California and Ohio would have thrown the election into the House of Representatives.

In 1956, Senator THURMOND was elected to the Senate by a write-in vote. He is the only Senator in the history of the country to be so elected. Four years later, he gave the people of his State an opportunity to express their wishes in the regular way at the polls—a thing he was not legally bound to do. He was elected to a full 6-year term without opposition.

When Senator THURMOND became a Senator, he divorced himself of all business connections. The keyhole columnists, who despise him, have despaired of finding even a clue to a skeleton in Senator THURMOND's closet. He is one of the few Senators who lives off his salary.

In his television address to the people of his native State, Senator THURMOND gave a long list of reasons for his decision to leave the Democratic Party. Here is a part of what he said:

"It has been wisely said that 'for evil to triumph it is only necessary that good men do nothing.' Particularly is this true in time of crisis. Seldom before in the history of our Nation have we faced so great a crisis.

"The people of South Carolina have placed me in a position of trust in the National Government. From this position I have observed at close hand the conduct and factors which have brought about this crisis. I would, therefore, be most derelict in my duty were I at this time to remain silent.

"I have no choice but to speak openly, frankly, and fully to the people of South Carolina on the crisis that confronts us.

"The Democratic Party has abandoned the people. It has turned its back on the spiritual values and political principles which have brought us the blessings of freedom under God and a bountiful prosperity. It has breached the trust reposed in it by the people. It has repudiated the Constitution of the United States. It is leading the evolution of our Nation to a socialistic dictatorship.

"The Democratic Party has forsaken the people to become the party of minority groups, power-hungry union leaders, political bosses, and big business men looking for Government contracts and favors.

"The Democratic Party has used the Government as a propaganda machine to distort the truth and deceive the public to the extent that a subcabinet official can publicly defend the administration's 'right to lie' and remain in office, unrebuked.

"The Democratic Party has invaded the private lives of people by using the powers of government for coercion and intimidation of individuals.

"The Democratic Party has rammed through Congress unconstitutional, impractical, unworkable, and oppressive legislation which invades inalienable personal and property rights of the individual.

"The Democratic Party has encouraged lawlessness, civil unrest, and mob actions.

"The Democratic Party has violated its trust by using the power of government to suppress information on scandals and corruption of its leaders in government and party offices."

His friends were concerned about the effect his decision would have on his political future. Immediately, he would forfeit the envied position of influence and power gained through his seniority on the Democratic side. There were many risks. It was a sobering reflection.

Here is what the Senator told them:

"To my friends who have conscientiously advised me against this step, because of a sincere belief that I could best serve the country by following a course designed to keep myself in office, I can only say that I fully realize the political risk involved in this step and that my chances for reelection might, because of this step, go down into oblivion. But in the final analysis, I can only follow the course which, in my heart and conscience, I believe to be in the best interest of our State, our country, and the freedom of our people.

"I have chosen this course because I cannot consider any risks in a cause which I am convinced is right."

"Come give us a taste of your quality," says William Shakespeare's immortal Hamlet.

Senator THURMOND has done it.

Senator THURMOND is a man of principle. Do you know what principle is? It comes from the Latin principium. It means beginning, foundation. It means the essential. It means the abiding, the permanent.

To say that a man is a man of principle, is to say that he takes the position that an automobile must operate by the application of mechanical principles, not by the emotionally lathered notions of fuzzy brained idealists. To say that a U.S. Senator is a Senator of principle, is to say that he believes that the Government of the United States, with all its traditional freedoms and liberty and recognition of personal dignity, is the effect of an adequate cause; and that that cause is the political principles and philosophy with which the Founding Fathers fashioned its foundation. A man of principle knows that the strength and endurance of no structure is out of proportion to the strength and endurance of its foundation. A man of principle refuses to sacrifice the shelter and security of tomorrow to an emotional spree today. A man of principle recognizes that the children of this country are a part of "the people." And he recognizes that when you are speaking of the "interests of the people," you cannot ignore the interests of the children. And in the midst of all the mad talk about "the people" having a right to do anything they wish to do, the man of principle contends that "the people" of voting age have neither the moral nor the constitutional right to ignore the rights of the children. The man of principle scorns the pagan theory that "the people" have the right to mortgage the souls and bodies of their children for generations to come. The man of principle denies that the American people have the right to have the attitude toward their children that the worshipers of Baal had toward theirs.

Being a man of principle, Senator THURMOND tells the people of his State in substance that he must think, and speak, and act in the interests of the foundational concepts of this Republic, not in the interests of his personal fortunes. He tells them that he must think, and speak, and act in the interests of future generations, not in his current and temporary interests as a U.S. Senator.

The truth is, the basic political views of Senator THURMOND are those that Lyndon B. Johnson has enunciated in the U.S. Senate. Take the civil rights bill which Mr. Johnson bulldozed through the Congress. On March 9, 1949, Mr. Johnson was bitterly opposing a much milder "civil rights" bill than the one he pushed through the present Congress. Here is what he told the Senate:

"Such a law would necessitate a system of Federal police officers, such as we have never seen before. It would require the policing of every business institution, every transaction made between an employer and employee, and virtually every hour of an employer's and employee's association while at work. I can only hope sincerely that the Senate will never be called upon to entertain seriously any such proposal again."

Then what is the real difference between Lyndon Johnson and Senator THURMOND?

Lyndon Johnson's record proves that his position is a position, not of political character and principle, but of political expediency. Senator THURMOND's record shows that his position is not a position of political expediency, but of political character and principle. Lyndon Johnson's record proves that he may reverse himself on every principle he has enunciated whenever it is in the interests of his power and money to do it. Senator THURMOND's record shows that power, money, and public recognition are not the stuff from which his political character and principles are fashioned.

And with which of these two positions can the blood and treasure of this country be trusted? Don't the Walter Reuthers know that if a Lyndon Johnson will advocate what is expedient for him to advocate that the time will come (and is coming) in this country when it will be expedient to advocate a Hitler government; and don't these proud and arrogant "liberals" know that the very first classes to become serfs under a dictatorship are the intellectuals and the people of the labor unions?

When Lyndon Johnson was violently opposing a comparatively mild "civil rights" bill in the U.S. Senate, JAMES STROM THURMOND, as Governor of South Carolina, was seeing to it that Negro schoolteachers equally qualified with white teachers, received the same rate of pay as white teachers.

You can trust a STROM THURMOND. You can't trust a Lyndon Johnson. You know what a STROM THURMOND will do in given circumstances 20 years from now. You don't know today what a Lyndon Johnson will do tomorrow.

Lyndon Johnson knows that STROM THURMOND has got something that all the power that Johnson's callous lusts have acquired for him cannot coerce or intimidate. He knows that STROM THURMOND has got something that all the millions Johnson has amassed since he has been on the public payroll cannot buy. And nobody will envy what STROM THURMOND has got more than will Lyndon Johnson—on his deathbed.

Senator STROM THURMOND is a man of principle. The present Washington, D.C., political establishment will never forgive him for it—just as it will never forgive Theodore Roosevelt for saying that "the all-important factor in national greatness is national character."

[From the Lawrence (Mass.) Evening Eagle-Tribune, Sept. 22, 1964]

COURAGE OF HIS CONVICTIONS

The decision of Senator THURMOND, of South Carolina, to leave the Democratic Party and join the Republican Party under the leadership of Senator GOLDWATER was irresistibly logical.

THURMOND ran for the Presidency in 1948 as a States rights candidate and carried four Southern States. His position then was what it is now—in firm opposition to the trend of the American Government under successive Democratic administrations.

"The Democratic Party," he said in announcing his support of GOLDWATER, "has abandoned the people. It has repudiated the Constitution. It is leading the evolution of our Nation to a Socialist dictatorship."

His declaration recalled three pertinent utterances.

One was delivered by a radio personality who, in comment on the closer and more friendly relations between the United States and Russia said that the Communist Russians are becoming more capitalistic and the anti-Communist Americans are becoming more socialistic. Eventually, he concluded, both American and Russian ways of life will be modified until one cannot be distinguished from the other.

Another was uttered by the News-Free Press of Chattanooga, Tenn., on President Johnson's use of the "great society" as the theme of his campaign and as a successor to the themes of New Deal, Fair Deal, and New Frontier. But the great society, in short, said the News-Free Press is the welfare state: "It's socialization, huge taxation, governmental domination, power centralization, individual freedom deterioration. It's the reverse of things that made this Nation great—personal liberty and free enterprise. The great society is a nicer way of saying 'welfare state,' which is a nicer way of describing what could become a slavery state."

The third utterance was delivered by Gus Hall, spokesman of the Communist Party in the United States, in his call to leftwingers to support the Democratic ticket this year as the only means of preventing victory for GOLDWATER whom he described as the Fascist leader of "the most virulent and malignant organized force in our history."

Hall would join the left wing that he represents with the people who push the reforms that Democratic administrations have advanced for 30 years. These are the people, he declares, who because of their experiences will say, "Let's go one step further—a step to socialism."

THURMOND happens to be a man with the courage of his convictions. He could in good conscience not do other than he did. He set an example of courage to the uncounted Americans who share his convictions but have not yet developed the nerve to act in their light.

[From the Palestine (Tex.) Herald Press, Sept. 17, 1964]

TOWARD HIGH AIMS

Americans everywhere who believe in constitutional government should be grateful to Senator STROM THURMOND of South Carolina, a man who risks his personal future in order to stand up for political honesty and the traditions of this free Nation.

THURMOND's breakaway from the Democratic Party, and his endorsement of Republican BARRY GOLDWATER is more than a mere political caprice. For THURMOND himself the move may bring an end to his career in the Senate, for his State is still heavily Democratic. But to other unhappy Democratic conservatives in the Deep South, THURMOND offers leadership away from the cynicism of their recent past.

Without saying so, he points up the falseness of politicians who put expediency ahead of principle and who therefore provide a traitor's leadership to the people who support them. He also gives answer to southern politicians who, disagreeing with the Democratic Party, propose unpledged electors or other moves that merely beg the question. THURMOND therefore makes a stand, long needed, for character which has been lacking in American politics.

Not only Democrats, but Republicans as well, have forgotten principle in a great many cases and a great many areas. A southern conservative running as a Democrat, and pledging unswerving allegiance to whatever candidates and whatever policies the national Democratic Party may choose, has his counterpart in the Republican leftwinger. In the case of both, principles fall victim to political desires.

THURMOND's move, in standing up for principle, does honor to the Constitution of the United States, which he calls on all Americans to cherish. In his advocation of a two-party system in the Southern States, THURMOND may well have been inspired by Constitution Week, which begins today. The Constitution, he may have reflected, was written by honest men for people of honesty.

It would not have occurred to those writers of the Constitution, setting up a structure of government for a free people, that political opportunists some day would put their own ambitions ahead of the Nation itself, or that the American people ever would be gullible enough to accept such false prophets. The men who created a place for statesmanship to flourish, in a world that until then had known little but oppression, could hardly have foreseen the greeds and cynicisms of too many politicians of today, or the fears and the distrusts of today's average voter.

Whether or not any American happens to agree with the principles STROM THURMOND stands for, all should admire him for the fact that he stands up for those principles, even though he may sacrifice his own political future in the process. The same forthright courage by a few other national political leaders across the country—no matter what their particular political philosophies might be—could revive statesmanship and head this country again toward the high aims of its founders.

[From the Passaic (N.J.) Herald News, Sept. 18, 1964]

SENATOR THURMOND JOINS GOP

South Carolina's segregationist, Senator STROM THURMOND, who refuses to support President Johnson in the coming election, has set an example which others who feel they cannot support their party's presidential candidate could well follow. He has left the Democratic Party and announced that he will become a Republican to back Senator GOLDWATER's candidacy.

Senator THURMOND also bolted the Democratic Party back in 1948 when he was Dixiecrat candidate against Harry S. Truman, whom he said he could not support. In so doing, Senator THURMOND put principle above party, which is commendable, regardless of what his convictions are.

No man is bigger than the party to which he belongs and he owes to that party his loyalty. When he finds he can no longer remain loyal, the honorable thing to do is to quit the party and go elsewhere. Theodore Roosevelt did it in 1912, when he left the Republican Party to become a Progressive, and others have done it, too.

Senator THURMOND's forthright action is in sharp contrast to the position taken by some Republicans in high places, including Senator CLIFFORD CASE, of New Jersey, who have refused to endorse Senator GOLDWATER for President, yet remain in the party. Their right to dissent is not questioned. Their place in the party is.

[From the Chicago Tribune, Sept. 22, 1964]

THURMOND'S BOLT OF PARTY A PROTEST

(By Allen-Scott)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Senator STROM THURMOND, of South Carolina, is a man of sincerity and deep spiritual convictions. So it comes as no surprise that he is willing to take a position in politics which could mean risking his seat in the Senate when he comes up for reelection 2 years hence.

Mr. THURMOND—a former Governor of his State, a major general in the U.S. Army Reserves and a lifelong Democrat—has just announced that he is leaving the national Democratic Party to join the Republican Party and work for the election of BARRY GOLDWATER, the Republican presidential nominee.

Even those who disagree with Mr. THURMOND's point of view on public questions cannot but applaud his forthrightness. For he could, like many politicians, easily have maintained a passive attitude toward the Democratic presidential nominee and followed the same course as some of those Republicans who didn't like the Goldwater nomination but who haven't had the temerity to bolt their party and take a position in favor of the candidate of the opposite side, with whose viewpoint their thoughts on current policies more nearly coincide.

Senator THURMOND's televised address to the people of South Carolina announcing his position was not merely an endorsement of Senator GOLDWATER. His 1,500-word speech was an emphatic protest against the trend in the Democratic Party. He says:

"I have no choice but to speak openly, frankly, fully to the people of South Carolina on the crisis that confronts us.

"The Democratic Party has abandoned the people. It has turned its back on the spiritual values and political principles which have brought us the blessings of freedom under God and a bountiful prosperity. It has breached the trust reposed in it by the people. It has repudiated the Constitution of the United States. It is leading the evolution of our Nation to a socialistic dictatorship.

"The Democratic Party has forsaken the people to become the party of minority groups, power-hungry union leaders, political bosses, and big businessmen looking for Government contracts and favors.

"The Democratic Party has encouraged lawlessness, civil unrest, and mob actions.

"The Democratic Party has violated its trust by using the power of Government to suppress information on scandals and corruption of its leaders in Government and party offices.

"The Democratic Party has succored and assisted our Communist enemies through trade and aid at the expense of the American people.

"The Democratic Party has established and pursued for our Government a no-win foreign policy of weakness, indecision, accommodation, and appeasement.

"The Democratic Party has demonstrated a callous disregard for sound fiscal policies and practices.

"The Democratic Party, while hiding behind the deceitful gimmick of a darkened White House, has increased deficit spending and squandered, at home and abroad, billions of hard-earned dollars taken from the American people.

"The Democratic Party has utterly disregarded the disastrous effects of the resulting inflation on people with fixed incomes, such as retirees, pensioners, social security beneficiaries, and those who have their savings invested in insurance.

"The Democratic Party has nominated for Vice President a key leader of the Americans for Democratic Action—the most influential Socialist group in our Nation.

"The Democratic Party has encouraged, supported, and protected the Supreme Court in a reign of judicial tyranny, and in the Court's effort to wipe out local self-government, effective law enforcement, internal security, the rights of the people and the States, and even the structure of the State governments."

The Senator praises Mr. GOLDWATER as a man who "believes in and abides by our Constitution," and says:

"I personally know him to be able and responsible. He is an honest man of courage and conviction, who trusts the American people to hold the reins of government and rule themselves."

Mr. Thurmond pledges himself to work within the framework of what he terms the "Goldwater Republican Party" and says that for him "there is no alternative." He declares that some of his friends have conscientiously advised him against this action, and that he fully realizes "the political risk involved in this step and that my chances for reelection might, because of this step, go down into oblivion."

But Strom Thurmond has concluded that he can follow only the course which in his heart and conscience he believes to be in the best interests of "our State, our country, and the freedom of our people."

One thing seems clear today—both parties are undergoing an upheaval. It is too early to tell how much the "crossover" from one party to the other will be, but there can be no underestimating the fact that both parties are having difficulty holding all of their previous following in the light of the deep differences of opinion which divide their members and which the 1964 campaign has begun to symbolize.

[Editorial from the Jefferson Standard Broadcasting Co., Sept. 18, 1964]

Choosing Up Sides

Senator Strom Thurmond's decision to switch his allegiance from the Democratic to the Republican Party has brought into clear focus the paradox facing many long-term Democrats and Republicans. Especially in this campaign, conservative Democrats and liberal Republicans are finding their party loyalty and their political conscience tested as never before.

This is not the first time that such a move has been made in the Senate. When Senator Wayne Morse, of Oregon, was running for his second term back in 1950, he switched from the Republican to the Democratic Party because he felt more at home there in his political philosophy.

Senator Morse changed because he felt the Republicans were too conservative. Senator Thurmond has changed because he feels the Democrats are too liberal. Both take their politics seriously, and could tolerate living with a philosophy which was alien to them for only so long.

Today the historical spread of philosophy contained in both parties is being narrowed, and it can quite honestly be said that on a national basis the Democrats are now the liberal party and the Republicans the conservative.

With increasing frustration, the traditional southern conservatives have tried to maintain an allegiance to the Democratic Party that began with the years after the Civil War and was strengthened in Franklin D. Roosevelt's era. Senator Thurmond's decision is a reflection of the soul searching which must be taking place throughout the Democratic South, just as soul searching is being done among liberal Republicans elsewhere.

While the conservative southern Democrat is tempted by Republicanism which more closely parallels his thinking, he knows that if sufficient numbers bolt the party, the congressional seniority which results in so many committee chairmanships would vanish, along with the patronage he now enjoys.

Strom Thurmond has been preaching for months now that we ought to do away with party labels. His message has been that there are no longer Republicans and Democrats, just conservatives and liberals, and that they should be recognized as such. His announcement of a change means that he is no longer willing to wait for the new labels. It is not a change of philosophy, but a recognition of existing philosophy that prompted him to put his political career at stake.

Senator Thurmond has been at odds with the Democrats before. In 1948, he was the Presidential candidate of the States Rights Party. Later he was elected Senator on an unusual write-in vote.

"Strom Thurmond, Republican, from South Carolina," has an unfamiliar ring in the ear. But at least it refers to a man who has the courage of his convictions.

[From the Shreveport Journal, Sept. 21, 1964]

Republican Thurmond

Senator Strom Thurmond stunned the people of South Carolina and the South as a whole when he announced that he is switching from the Democratic Party to the Republican and is supporting Senator Barry Goldwater for President.

Thurmond was selected by a write-in vote against the regular Democratic Party nominee in 1954, and reelected with minor opposition as an independent Democrat in 1960. A much-decorated World War II hero, he was Governor of South Carolina after the war and, in 1948, ran as a States Right candidate for President in protest to the nomination of Harry S. Truman.

Goldwater had repeatedly said Thurmond would be welcome in the Republican Party. Both opposed the administration on medical care for the aged, the nuclear test ban treaty and the antipoverty program. As major generals in the Reserve, both were critical of defense measures.

The effect on the two-party system in the South may be considerable. Thurmond received 39 electoral votes for President in 1948, winning the support of citizens in South Carolina, Louisiana, Alabama, and Mississippi. His example could lead to a wide switchover in this year when Goldwater sentiment in the South is high.

[From the Washington Star, Sept. 17, 1964]

Thurmond's Switch to GOP

(By David Lawrence)

Senator Strom Thurmond, of South Carolina, is a man of sincerity and deep spiritual convictions. So it comes as no surprise that he is willing to take a position in politics which could mean risking his seat in the Senate when he comes up for reelection 2 years hence.

Senator Thurmond—a former Governor of his State, a major general in the U.S. Army Reserves and a lifelong Democrat—has just announced that he is leaving the national Democratic Party to join the Republican Party and work for the election of Barry Goldwater, the Republican presidential nominee.

Even those who disagree with Senator Thurmond's point of view on public questions cannot but applaud his forthrightness. For he could, like many politicians, easily have maintained a passive attitude toward the Democratic presidential nominee and followed the same course as some of those Republicans who didn't like the Goldwater nomination but who haven't had the temerity to bolt their party and take a position in favor of the candidate of the opposite side, with whose viewpoint their thoughts on current policies more nearly coincide.

Senator Thurmond's televised address to the people of South Carolina announcing his position was not merely an indorsement of Senator Goldwater. His 1,500-word speech was an emphatic protest against the trend in the Democratic Party. He says:

"I have no choice but to speak openly, frankly, and fully to the people of South Carolina on the crisis that confronts us.

"The Democratic Party has abandoned the people. It has turned its back on the spiritual values and political principles which have brought us the blessings of freedom under God and a bountiful prosperity. It has breached the trust reposed in it by the people. It has repudiated the Constitution of the United States. It is leading the evolution of our Nation to a socialistic dictatorship.

"The Democratic Party has forsaken the people to become the party of minority groups, power-hungry union leaders, political bosses, and big businessmen looking for Government contracts and favors.

"The Democratic Party has encouraged lawlessness, civil unrest, and mob actions.

"The Democratic Party has violated its trust by using the power of Government to suppress information on scandals and corruption of its leaders in Government and party offices.

"The Democratic Party has succored and assisted our Communist enemies through trade and aid at the expense of the American people.

"The Democratic Party has established and pursued for our Government a no-win foreign policy of weakness, indecision, accommodation and appeasement.

"The Democratic Party has demonstrated a callous disregard for sound fiscal policies and practices.

"The Democratic Party has while hiding behind the deceitful gimmick of a darkened White House increased deficit spending and squandered, at home and abroad, billions of hard-earned dollars taken from the American people.

"The Democratic Party has utterly disregarded the disastrous effects of the resulting inflation on people with fixed incomes, such as retirees, pensioners, social security beneficiaries, and those who have their savings invested in insurance.

"The Democratic Party has nominated for Vice President a key leader of the Americans for Democratic Action—the most influential Socialist group in our Nation.

"The Democratic Party has encouraged, supported, and protected the Supreme Court in a reign of judicial tyranny and in the Court's effort to wipe out local self-government, effective law enforcement, internal security, the rights of the people and the States, and even the structure of the State governments."

The Senator praises Senator Goldwater as a man who "believes in and abides by our Constitution," and says:

"I personally know him to be able and responsible. He is an honest man of courage and conviction, who trusts the American people to hold the reins of government and rule themselves."

Senator Thurmond pledges himself to work within the framework of what he terms the "Goldwater Republican Party" and says that for him "there is no alternative." He declares that some of his friends have conscientiously advised him against this action, and that he fully realizes "the political risk involved in this step and that my chances for reelection might, because of this step, go down into oblivion."

But Strom Thurmond has concluded that he can follow only the course which in his heart and conscience he believes to be in the best interests of "our State, our country, and the freedom of our people."

One thing seems clear today—both parties are undergoing an upheaval. It is too early to tell how much the "crossover" from one party to the other will be, but there can be no underestimating the fact that both parties are having difficulty holding all of their previous following in the face of the deep differences of opinion which divide their members and which the 1964 campaign has begun to symbolize.

[From the Manchester Union Leader, Sept. 18, 1964]

Strom Thurmond, Patriot

The fact that 61-year-old Senator Strom Thurmond, of South Carolina, has changed his party affiliation from Democrat to Republican is not only political news but it is a heartwarming example of a man who places country above party and himself. When a man, from his early manhood onward to his middle years, has been a member of the Democratic Party, when he has been Democratic Governor of his State and a Democratic U.S. Senator, considerable courage is needed to give up lifelong association with a political party and, when over 60, start again with another party.

Sometimes a Republican or a Democrat, disliking his party's choice for President, announces that he will not support a candidate. In some cases he also announces that he will support the candidate of the opposition party, but after the election you will generally find these political leaders safely back in their own party, enjoying the seniority they have earned over the years.

Not so with Senator THURMOND. He tossed out all his seniority rights which he has laboriously built up over many years in the U.S. Senate, and gave up his important committee assignments. Unless the Republicans see fit to recognize his years of service in the Senate, he will be in exactly the same position as a freshman Senator just elected, without the important committee assignments that give influence and power in the Senate.

What Senator THURMOND has done is typical of the man. He is a great patriot. His voice, more frequently than any other in the U.S. Senate, has spoken out boldly against the ever-quickening trend toward a dictatorship in the United States, centralizing all power in Washington. Senator THURMOND is a major-general in the Reserve Corps of the U.S. Army. As such, he led the fight to expose the censorship imposed on the military men in the United States and the no-win policy of the present administration.

Senator THURMOND made it very clear, in his ringing declaration by which he announced that he had joined the Republican Party, that there was no other choice than the one he made if we are to preserve freedom and the constitutional government in this country.

Unfortunately a great many Americans, lulled to sleep by the present material prosperity and uneducated from their school days regarding the value of the freedoms guaranteed by the Constitution, do not understand the dangers that are threatening them but which Senator THURMOND sees so clearly.

The Republican minority in the Senate has gained a great recruit, one who is capable of leading them to victory. This newspaper very much hopes that the Republicans appreciate what they have gained by Senator THURMOND's enlistment.

It is a great and wonderful thing that the United States still possesses leaders who will sacrifice their own careers, if necessary, for the good of the Nation and the safety of all of us.

[From the Wyoming State Tribune, Sept. 20, 1964]

I HAVE CHOSEN THIS COURSE

On the night of Wednesday, September 16, 1964, STROM THURMOND, 61 years old, a U.S. Senator from the State of South Carolina, announced: "For me, there is no alternative."

For him, there was no alternative but to renounce his long allegiance to the Democratic Party, and to espouse instead the cause of the Republicans, to seek and work for the election of BARRY GOLDWATER as President of the United States.

"The future of freedom and constitutional government is at stake," said Mr. THURMOND, thrice elected to the Senate from his native State under the aegis of the Democratic Party, "and this requires that I do everything in my power to help BARRY GOLDWATER return our Nation to constitutional government through his election to the Presidency.

"This also requires," said Mr. THURMOND, "that I join him in his fight, successful as of now, to make the Republican Party a party which supports freedom, justice, and constitutional government.

"It will be," said the Senator from South Carolina, a man who may, as he spoke, have recalled his long military service including the Normandy invasion with the 82d Airborne Division, "a long and hard struggle, with many battles to be fought.

"At this time," said Mr. THURMOND, "one objective takes precedence over all others—electing BARRY GOLDWATER President."

What anguish and self-probing involved STROM THURMOND's decision to take this course is anybody's guess, but long associations are not quickly cast aside in the part of the country he comes from—nor are far-reaching decisions such as this arrived at lightly, with a mere wave of the hand.

Particularly in a case such as this where the individual concerned not only has been elected thrice to the Senate under the party's banner he now has cast aside, but also as part of a long political career beginning as a county superintendent of schools, county attorney, State senator, and Governor of his State.

For one should read STROM THURMOND's record while at the same time hearing these words of his speech: "It has been wisely said that 'for evil to triumph, it is only necessary that good men do nothing.'

"Particularly," said he, "is this true in time of crisis. Seldom before in the history of our Nation have we faced so great a crisis."

What is this crisis that the Senator from South Carolina, the former county superintendent of schools, prosecutor, State senator, judge, Governor, soldier, major general in the Army Reserve—what crisis is he considering?

"The Democratic Party has abandoned the people.

"It has turned its back on the spiritual values and political principles which have brought us the blessings of freedom under God and a bountiful prosperity.

"It has breached the trust reposed in it by the people.

"It has repudiated the Constitution of the United States.

"It is leading the evolution of our Nation to a socialistic dictatorship."

Those are stern indictments. But there are others, from the schoolman-prosecutor-legislator-Governor-general, from South Carolina.

"The Democratic Party has forsaken the people to become the party of minority groups, power-hungry union leaders, political bosses, and big businessmen looking for Government contracts and favors."

And on and on: Distorted the truth, allowed a subcabinet official to defend the administration's "right to lie" and remain in office unrebuked, invaded the private lives of individuals by employing coercion and intimidation; rammed through Congress unconstitutional and oppressive legislation; encouraged lawlessness, civil unrest and mob action; "violated its trust by using the power of Government to suppress information on scandals and corruption of its leaders in Government and party offices"; has succored our Communist enemies through trade and aid; has followed a policy of weakness, indecision, and accommodation in dealing with those same Communist enemies.

It has faltered twice at the threshold of victory over the Communist enemy; sent our youth into a war while refusing to call it a war, at the same time asking of this youth that it risk its lives without providing adequate equipment or the will to victory.

"The Democratic Party now worships at the throne of materialism." And so on.

There was one brief glimmer of soul-searching that took place here.

"To my friends" said STROM THURMOND, "who have conscientiously advised me against this step, because of a sincere belief that I could best serve the country by following a course designed to keep myself in office I can only say that I fully realize the political risk involved in this step and that my chances for reelection might, because of this step, go down into oblivion.

"But in the final analysis," said he, "I can only follow the course which, in my heart and conscience, I believe to be in the best interest of our State, our country and the freedom of our people.

"I have chosen this course," concluded the Senator from South Carolina, "because I cannot consider any risks in a cause which I am convinced is right."

THE SUPREME COURT IS DEFYING THE PEOPLE ON APPORTIONMENT

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], recently wrote an article entitled "The Supreme Court Is Defying the People," which was published in a recent issue of the Saturday Evening Post.

This article is a factual and frank discussion of some of the problems confronting the Nation at the present time as a result of the Supreme Court decision.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SUPREME COURT IS DEFYING THE PEOPLE

(By Senator EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN)

(NOTE.—A GOP leader sees legislative chaos and threat of judicial dictatorship in the High Court's rulings on how States must govern themselves.)

Have we reached the point where the preamble to the Constitution, which now reads "We, the people * * * do ordain and establish this Constitution," has been changed to read "We the Supreme Court do hereby decree a new form of government for the people of the United States"? Have we permitted the Court to constitute itself an authority supreme and contrary to the expressed will of the people?

There is a grave danger that we have. On June 15 of this year, six members of the U.S. Supreme Court took what may prove to be the longest step toward creating a judicial dictatorship in this country. They did it by decreeing that the legislatures established by the people in the States of Alabama, Colorado, Delaware, Maryland, New York, and Virginia were null and void, and they dictated the form of legislative government which the people of these States must accept.

The Supreme Court proclaimed that it was acting to enhance democracy and to abolish inequities between the city dweller and his country cousin. Moreover, they have sold us this decision with the alluring slogan of "one man, one vote," a concept which is beautifully democratic in the abstract. But the States of the Nation are not governed abstractly. For 188 years they have been governed by a realistic system of legislative compromise, which recognizes the diverse interests of a diverse people. Now, suddenly, the Supreme Court says it is wrong.

The form of legislature the High Court declared null and void is in effect today in every State in the Union. It is the same form of representation which was adopted by the Thirteen Colonies when they threw off the yoke of the English kings. Basically, it is a legislature composed either of two houses, one house based upon population and another house based upon area, or of one house based upon both population and area. The men and women of the Colonies fought, bled, and died for the right to establish State governments of their choice. This was the choice they made.

Then, a decade later, they met in constitutional convention in Philadelphia. There they forged the provisions of the Federal Constitution on the anvil of experience, hammering out the solutions to the problems of fair representation for all. Even at that time there were rural areas and populous areas, each with diverse and legitimate interests. It was only natural that the sparsely settled and less affluent States should fear the power of the rich and strong. After much debate, this truly vexing problem was solved by a historic compromise. Today we have the handiwork of that solution, the Congress, a legislative body of two Houses, one of which is based on population and the other upon State boundaries.

That was the will of the people in those times, and that has been the will of the people since, as new States have been added to our Union, each one embodying the same principle in its own State constitution. But that is not the will of six men on the Supreme Court. Let us look at how they have ordered the people of this country to refashion their State legislatures.

It all began 2 years ago in the case of *Baker* v. *Carr*, which came to the Supreme Court from Tennessee. For the first time, the Court held it had the final authority over the composition of the State legislatures. Now in the six cases recently decided, the Court used that newly assumed authority in an extraordinary way. The judges decreed that the 14th amendment, which was adopted in 1868, requires both houses of any State legislature to be apportioned on the basis of population alone. Moreover, it directed the lower Federal courts to put this new decree into practice through orders at the State level.

In Colorado, after the *Baker* v. *Carr* decision, the people of that State in 1962 had voted almost 2 to 1 to approve a plan to overhaul their legislature. Yet the Supreme Court refused to accept the plan approved by the people, and Colorado was given only 2 weeks to find a new solution. A specially called general assembly attempted to comply and adopted a new apportionment plan. Then the State Supreme Court of Colorado declared that plan to be unconstitutional. Today the citizens of Colorado do not know what they can do and—in view of all these facts—who can blame them?

In New York the supreme court not only ordered reapportionment but before it was through it had set new terms of office for members of the general assembly. The New York constitution provides for 2-year terms for its legislators, but it has been decreed that those elected this fall shall serve for only 1 year. Then there is to be a second election, and members are to be elected for another year. Then there is to be still a third election, when lawmakers are to be named to a regular term.

An even more appalling situation has been created in Oklahoma. There a three-judge Federal court has taken upon itself the role of reconstituting the State legislature. The court began by declaring invalid a portion of the State constitution and election laws. The State passed a new election law and proposed a constitutional amendment to remedy the defects. Then, in May of this year, the voters of Oklahoma approved the amendment to the State constitution and elected representatives under the new election law. Now the court has declared that amendment and election null and void and ordered new elections based on its own legislative formula—contrary to that approved by the people of Oklahoma.

I learned long ago that the people are the fountainhead of all power in this country. In Colorado and Oklahoma, as well as several other States, the people have acted decisively, but the Federal judges will not accept the result. They say that they represent some higher power to determine the form of our State governing bodies, which is a mistaken and dangerous notion.

Certainly in any representative government there exists a fundamental right in the people to determine how their legislatures shall be constituted. Yet according to the powerful dissenting opinion of Associate Justice John Marshall Harlan, the Supreme Court majority has now declared it to be unconstitutional for a State to give effective consideration to any of the following factors in establishing its legislative districts:

1. History;
2. "Economic or other sorts of group interests";
3. Geographical considerations;
4. Area;
5. A desire "to insure effective representation for sparsely settled areas";
6. "Availability of access of citizens to their representatives";
7. Theories of bicameralism (except those approved by the court);
8. Occupation;
9. "An attempt to balance urban and rural power";
10. The preference of a majority of voters in the State.

In this, the court would blindly disregard the facts of nature as well as the basic principles of representative government. A businessman in Garber, Okla., whose State legislator used to live in nearby Enid, may now have to travel to Oklahoma City to ask for the improvement of a bridge or complain about the condition of a road. A rancher or miner near Duncan, Ariz., could discover that his only representative lives in Tucson, a burgeoning electronics-and-space center with problems completely dissimilar to those at home. In my own home State, voters in sparsely settled southern Illinois may find they must go 150 miles to locate the nearest State legislator.

THE SUPREME COURT

It is a tragic misreading of the history and the temper of our Nation to say that such practical matters have no place in Government. No one appreciated this more than the present Chief Justice of the United States, when he was still the Governor of California. In 1948, commenting on the problem of representation, he stated that:

"The agricultural communities of California are far more important in the life of our State than the relationship their population bears to the entire population of the State. It is for this reason that I never have been in favor of restricting their representation in our State senate to a strictly population basis. It is the same reason that the Founding Fathers of our country gave balanced representation to the States of the Union, equal representation in one house and proportionate representation based upon population in the other."

That was sound doctrine then, and it is sound doctrine now. For the forces of our national life are not brought to bear on public questions solely in proportion to the weight of numbers. If they were, the 6 million citizens of the Chicago area would hold sway in the Illinois Legislature without consideration of the problems of their 4 million fellows who are scattered in 100 other counties. Under the Court's new decree, California could be dominated by Los Angeles and San Francisco; Michigan by Detroit; New York State by the five boroughs of New York City; and Pennsylvania by Philadelphia and Pittsburgh.

Let us look at a specific application of the problem. It is a fundamental rule of government that "the power to tax is the power to destroy." The patriots of Boston recognized this when they rebelled against the ruinous taxes levied by George III. Consequently our forefathers safeguarded the exercise of the taxing power by providing that Congress would control the Federal purse. They provided that all revenue measures must originate in the House of Representatives, where each Member must be elected every 2 years.

At the same time, the rights of each State, large or small, were protected by the requirement that such measures must also win approval in the U.S. Senate.

The Court now proposes to deny similar protection to many of the citizens of the States. In turning control of the State legislatures over to the cities, the Court is giving to the city bosses the power to tax and with it the power to destroy. For it is the city boss who often controls the nomination and election of representatives to the State legislature. The result can be foreseen. Just as all roads led to Rome 2,000 years ago, with tribute and tax revenues flowing to the Eternal City, so today we are confronted with a parallel as a result of the Court's decisions. In place of helmeted soldiers going forth from Rome to collect the tax and bring it to the emporer, we are now to be confronted with political minions surging forth from the controlling city machine to levy, collect and bring back the revenue to be used to perpetuate and further the grandeur and power of that machine.

The city machine will determine where the roads will be built, where the school funds will go, where the police protection will be provided, where the welfare funds will flow. All this and more will be determined and distributed by the city machine. Is this the representative type of government that the Court refers to? Is this really protection of the urban voters?

These are some of the problems which must have been in the mind of Governor Warren in 1948, but strangely they do not have the same impact for Chief Justice Warren. Nevertheless, the viewpoint which he expressed so well in earlier days is now on the lips of many thoughtful citizens. And they wonder what can be done to prevent the damage and disorganization which would inevitably flow from the Supreme Court's latest rulings.

The basic step we must take is a constitutional amendment to make certain that the people themselves, and not the Federal courts, have the final voice in the makeup of their own State legislatures. I have prepared such an amendment, and it has already been cosponsored by about one-quarter of the U.S. Senate. My proposal, which would be the 24th amendment to the Constitution, declares:

First, that the citizens of each State shall have exclusive power to determine the composition of its legislature and the apportionment of the membership thereof.

Second, that this power shall not be infringed or its exercise subject to review in any Federal court.

Third, that at least one house of each legislature must be apportioned on the basis of population as determined by the Federal census, or in the case of a unicameral legislature, that population shall be one of the determining factors of legislature apportionment.

DEBATE IS A LABORATORY

It might take at least 2 years for the adoption of this constitutional amendment. It would be proposed by Congress and must be ratified by three-quarters of the States. Such an amendment would demand careful consideration in every forum. There must be hearings and testimony. The language must be tested in the laboratory of debate.

Thus we have a second problem. We must have immediate action to prevent our State governments from being turned inside out while we are engaged in the slow, thorough process of submitting a constitutional amendment.

Realizing this, I proposed a statute to stay the action of the Federal courts upon the request of a State or its people. A version of this proposal was approved by the Judiciary Committee of the U.S. Senate by a vote of 10 to 2. In order to get action this year, before untold harm is done by judicial rulings, I attached the substance of this legislation to the foreign aid bill as an amendment. I chose that bill because it was the only one remaining on the "must list" to reach the desk of the President for signature before Congress can finally go home.

Some have criticized the choice of the foreign aid bill to carry this emergency amendment, but I believe it is altogether fitting and proper. One of the purposes of our vast aid program is to promote democratic government beyond our shores. My amendment seeks time to preserve it at home. The people of America themselves—not six judges of the Supreme Court—must be permitted to decide this momentous issue of State representation. If the foreign aid bill helps to win us that time, it will have redeemed, in this case, its own democratic promise—but in a manner that none of us could ever have predicted or foreseen.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT OF 1958—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I rise to present a privileged matter.

I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 3060) to amend and extend the National Defense Education Act of 1958 and to extend Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress—federally affected areas. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of October 1, 1964, pp. 23364–23369, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am most pleased——

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. I wonder if the Senator would suggest the absence of a quorum? The Senate is still in the morning hour. I am sure Senators would like to hear my friend's discussion before the conference report is agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. It is satisfactory to me, but I say to the minority whip that I am bringing up the conference report at this time only because the majority leader requested me to bring it up now. I am, however, most willing to wait for the consummation of any morning business Senators may have, but I believe morning business is nearly concluded. I shall be glad to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. President, at the request of the minority whip, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am most pleased to present to the Senate the conference report on S. 3060, titles I through X of which extends, expands, and strengthens the National Defense Education Act of 1958 and title XI of which extends and amends Public Law 815 and Public Law 874, the Federal impact legislation.

Mr. President, at this point in my remarks, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed the report of the committee of conference together with the statement of the managers on the part of the House.

There being no objection, the report of the committee of conference, with the statement of the managers on the part of the House, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 1916)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 3060) to amend and extend the National Defense Education Act of 1958 and to extend Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress (federally affected areas), having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "That this Act may be cited as the 'National Defense Education Act Amendments, 1964.'

"TITLE I—AMENDMENTS OF TITLE I

"Amendment of statement of findings

"SEC. 101. The second sentence of the second paragraph of section 101 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by striking out 'which have led to an insufficient proportion of our population educated in science, mathematics, and modern foreign languages and trained in technology'.

"Schools of nursing

"SEC. 102. The second sentence of section 103(b) of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by striking out 'private' and by striking out '(3),', and by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: ', and includes any school of nursing as defined in subsection (l) of this section'.

"Additional definitions

"SEC. 103. Section 103 of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

" '(l) The term "school of nursing" means a public or other nonprofit collegiate or associate degree school of nursing.

" '(m) The term "collegiate school of nursing" means a department, division, or other administrative unit in a college or university which provides primarily or exclusively an accredited program of education in professional nursing and allied subjects leading to the degree of bachelor of arts, bachelor of science, bachelor of nursing, or to an equivalent degree, or to a graduate degree in nursing.

" '(n) The term "associate degree school of nursing" means a department, division, or other administrative unit in a junior college, community college, college, or university which provides primarily or exclusively an accredited two-year program of education in professional nursing and allied subjects leading to an associate degree in nursing or to an equivalent degree.

" '(o) The term "accredited" when applied to any program of nurse education means a program accredited by a recognized body or bodies approved for such purpose by the Commissioner of Education.'

"TITLE II—AMENDMENTS OF TITLE II

"Appropriations authorized

"SEC. 201. The first sentence of section 201 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by striking out 'and $135,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and such sums for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and each of the next three fiscal years as may be necessary to enable students who have received loans for school years ending prior to July 1, 1965, to continue or complete their education' and inserting in lieu thereof '$163,300,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, $179,300,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, $190,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and $195,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and such sums for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and each of the next three fiscal years as may be necessary to enable students who have received loans for school years ending prior to July 1, 1968, to continue or complete their education'.

"Allotments to States

"SEC. 202. Section 202 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by striking out '1965' wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof '1968'.

"Payment of Federal capital contributions

"SEC. 203. Effective with respect to fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1964, section 203 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is further amended by striking out subsection (b) and by striking out '(a)' after 'SEC. 203.'.

"Conditions of agreements

"SEC. 204. (a) Paragraph (4) of section 204 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended to read as follows:

" '(4) provide that in the selection of students to receive loans from such student loan fund special consideration shall be given to students with a superior academic background; and'.

"(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) of this section shall apply to the selection of students under title II of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 made in or after the second month following the month in which this Act is enacted.

"Terms of loans

"SEC. 205. (a) Subsection (a) of section 205 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended to read as follows:

" '(a) The total of the loans for any academic year or its equivalent, as determined under regulations of the Commissioner, made by institutions of higher education from loan funds established pursuant to agreements under this title may not exceed $2,500 in the case of any graduate or professional student (as defined in regulations of the Commissioner), and may not exceed $1,000 in the case of any other student. The aggregate of the loans for all years from such funds may not exceed $10,000 in the case of any graduate or professional student (as so defined, and including any loans from such funds made to such person before he became a graduate or professional student), or $5,000 in the case of any other student.'

"(b) (1) Paragraph (1) of subsection (b) of such section 205 is amended to read as follows:

"'(1) such a loan shall be made only to a student who (A) is in need of the amount of the loan to pursue a course of study at such institution, and (B) is capable, in the opinion of the institution, of maintaining good standing in such course of study, and (C) has been accepted for enrollment as a student in such institution or, in the case of a student already attending such institution, is in good standing there either as an undergraduate, graduate, or professional student, and (D) is carrying at least one-half the normal full-time academic workload as determined by the institution;'.

"(2) Paragraph (2) of such subsection (b) of such section 205 is amended by striking out 'and (D)' and inserting in lieu thereof the following: '(D) the institution may provide that periodic installments need not be paid during any period or periods, aggregating not in excess of three years, during which the borrower is in part-time attendance at an institution of higher education taking courses which are creditable toward a degree, and may also provide that any such period shall not be included in determining the ten-year period during which the repayment must be completed, but interest shall continue to accrue during any such period, and (E)'.

"(3) Subparagraph (3) of such subsection (b) of such section 205 is amended to read as follows:

"'(3) not to exceed 50 per centum of any such loan (plus interest) shall be canceled for service as a full-time teacher in a public or other nonprofit elementary or secondary school in a State, in an institution of higher education, or in an elementary or secondary school overseas of the Armed Forces of the United States, at the rate of 10 per centum of the amount of such loan plus interest thereon, which was unpaid on the first day of such service for each complete academic year of such service;'.

"(4) Paragraph (4) of subsection (b) of such section 205 is amended by inserting immediately before the semicolon at the end thereof the following: 'in all cases except where the date on which repayment is to begin is suspended by reason of clause (D) of paragraph (2)'.

"(c) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply for purposes of determining the amount of any loans under title II of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 for academic years beginning after the date of enactment of this Act. The amendments made by paragraphs (2) and (4) of subsection (b) shall apply to any loan (under an agreement under title II of the National Defense Education Act of 1958) outstanding on the date of enactment of this Act only with the consent of the institution which made the loan. The amendment made by paragraph (3) of subsection (b) shall apply with respect to service performed during academic years beginning after the enactment of this Act, whether the loan was made before or after such enactment.

"Distribution of assets from student loan funds

"SEC. 206. Section 206 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by striking out '1969' wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof '1972'.

"TITLE III—AMENDMENTS OF TITLE III

"Extension of title

"SEC. 301. Title III of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by striking 'TITLE III—FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR STRENGTHENING SCIENCE, MATHEMATICS, AND MODERN FOREIGN LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION' as it appears as the heading of that title, and inserting in lieu thereof:

"'TITLE III—FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR STRENGTHENING INSTRUCTION IN SCIENCE, MATHEMATICS, MODERN FOREIGN LANGUAGES, AND OTHER CRITICAL SUBJECTS'

"Appropriations authorized

"SEC. 302. Section 301 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended to read as follows:

"'Appropriations authorized

"'SEC. 301. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated $70,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for each of the five succeeding fiscal years, and $90,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for each of the three succeeding fiscal years, for (1) making payments to State educational agencies under this title for the acquisition of equipment and for minor remodeling, described in paragraph (1) of section 303(a), and (2) making loans authorized in section 305. There are also authorized to be appropriated $5,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for each of the five succeeding fiscal years, and $10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for each of the three succeeding fiscal years, for making payments to State educational agencies under this title to carry out the programs described in paragraph (5) of section 303(a).'

"Allotments to States

"SEC. 303. (a) The second sentence of subsection (a)(2) of section 302 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by striking out 'as soon as possible after the enactment of this Act, and again between July 1 and August 31 of 1959' and inserting in lieu thereof 'between July 1 and August 31 of each even-numbered year beginning with calendar year 1964'.

"(b) The third sentence of such subsection is amended to read as follows: 'Each such promulgation shall be conclusive for each of the two fiscal years in the period July 1 next succeeding such promulgation, except that the ratios promulgated in 1959 shall be conclusive for each of the five fiscal years in the period beginning July 1, 1960, and ending June 30, 1965.'

"(c) Effective with respect to allotments under subsection (b) of section 302 of such Act for fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1964, the third sentence of such subsection is amended by striking out '$20,000' wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof '$50,000'.

"State plans

"SEC. 304. (a) Clause (A) of section 303 (a)(1) of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended to read as follows: '(A) acquisition of laboratory and other special equipment (other than supplies consumed in use), including audiovisual materials and equipment, and printed and published materials (other than textbooks), suitable for use in providing education in science, mathematics, history, civics, geography, modern foreign language, English, or reading in public elementary or secondary schools, or both, and of testgrading equipment for such schools and specialized equipment for audiovisual libraries serving such schools, and such equipment may, if there exists a critical need therefor in the judgment of local school authorities, be used when available and suitable in providing education in other subject matter, and'.

"(b) Paragraph (5) of section 303(a) is amended by striking out 'and modern foreign languages' and inserting in lieu thereof 'history, civics, geography, modern foreign languages, English. and reading'.

"Payments to States

"SEC. 305. The second sentence of subsection (b) of section 304 of such Act is amended by striking out 'five' and inserting in lieu thereof 'eight'.

"Interest rates

"SEC. 306. Paragraph (3) of subsection (b) of section 305 of such Act is amended by striking out 'as of the last day of the month' and inserting in lieu thereof the following: 'as computed at the end of the fiscal year next'.

"TITLE IV—FELLOWSHIPS

"SEC. 401. Effective July 1, 1964, section 402(a) of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended to read as follows:

"'Number of fellowships

"'SEC. 402. (a) During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, the Commissioner is authorized to award not to exceed three thousand fellowships to be used for study in graduate programs at institutions of higher education, during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, he is authorized to award not to exceed six thousand such fellowships, and during each of the two succeeding fiscal years, he is authorized to award not to exceed seven thousand five hundred such fellowships. Such fellowships may be awarded for such period of study as the Commissioner may determine, but not in excess of three academic years, except that where a fellowship holder pursues his studies as a regularly enrolled student at the institution during periods outside the regular sessions of the graduate program of the institution, a fellowship may be awarded for a period not in excess of three calendar years.'

"Award of fellowships and approval of institutions

"SEC. 402. (a) The first sentence of subsection (a) of section 403 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended to read as follows: 'Of the total number of fellowships authorized by section 402(a) to be awarded during a fiscal year (1) not less than one thousand five hundred of such fellowships awarded during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and not less than one-third of such fellowships awarded during the three succeeding fiscal years shall be awarded to individuals accepted for study in graduate programs approved by the Commissioner under this section, and (2) the remainder shall be awarded on such bases as he may determine, subject to the provisions of subsection (c).' The second sentence of subsection (a) of such section is amended by striking out ', and' at the end of clause (2) and inserting in lieu thereof a period, and by striking out clause (3) thereof.

"(b) Section 403(b) of such Act is amended by striking out 'under this title' an inserting in lieu thereof 'as described in clause (1) of subsection (a)', and by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: ', and the Commissioner shall give consideration to such objective in determining the number of fellowships awarded under this title for attendance at any one institution of higher education'.

"(c) Section 403 of such Act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"'(c) Recipients of fellowships under this title shall be persons who are interested in teaching, or continuing to teach, in institutions of higher education and are pursuing, or intend to pursue, a course of study leading to a degree of doctor of philosophy or an equivalent degree.

"'(d) No fellowship shall be awarded under this title for study at a school or department of divinity. For the purposes of this subsection, the term 'school or department of divinity' means an institution, or department or branch of an institution, whose program is specifically for the education of students to prepare them to become ministers of religion or to enter upon some other religious vocation or to prepare them to teach theological subjects.'

"(d) The amendments made by this section shall become effective July 1, 1964.

"Fellowship stipends

"SEC. 403. Section 404(a) of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended (1) by striking out 'after the baccalaureate degree,' and (2) by adding at the end thereof the following: 'Where a person awarded a fellowship under this title for study at an institution of higher education pursues his studies as a regularly enrolled student at such institution during periods outside of the regular sessions of the graduate program of the institution, the Commissioner may make appropriate adjustments in his stipends and allowances for dependents.'

"TITLE V—GUIDANCE, COUNSELING, AND TESTING; IDENTIFICATION AND ENCOURAGEMENT OF ABLE STUDENTS

"Appropriations authorized

"SEC. 501. Section 501 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by striking out 'and $17,500,000 each for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and the succeeding fiscal year,' and inserting in lieu thereof '$17,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, $24,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, $24,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and $30,000,000 for each of the two succeeding fiscal years,'.

"State plans

"SEC. 502. Paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 503(a) of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 are amended to read as follows:

" '(1) a program for testing students in the public elementary and secondary schools of such State or in the public junior colleges and technical institutes of such State, and, if authorized by law, in other elementary and secondary schools and in other junior colleges and technical institutes in such State, to identify students with outstanding aptitudes and ability, and the means of testing which will be utilized in carrying out such program; and

" '(2) a program of guidance and counseling at the appropriate levels in the public elementary and secondary schools or public junior colleges and technical institutes of such State (A) to advise students of courses of study best suited to their ability, aptitudes, and skills, (B) to advise students in their decisions as to the type of educational program they should pursue, the vocation they should train for and enter, and the job opportunities in the various fields, and (C) to encourage students with outstanding aptitudes and ability to complete their secondary school education, take the necessary courses for admission to institutions of higher education, and enter such institutions.'

"Payments to States

"SEC. 503. (a) Section 504(a) of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by striking out 'five' and inserting in lieu thereof 'eight'.

"(b) Section 504(b) of such Act is amended by striking out ', who are not below grade 7,', and by striking out 'six' and inserting in lieu thereof 'nine', and by inserting after 'schools' the first time it appears the following: ', or junior colleges or technical institutes,'.

"Junior colleges and technical institutes

"SEC. 504. Title V of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by inserting after section 504 the following new section:

" 'Definitions

" 'SEC. 505. For the purposes of this title, the term "junior colleges or technical institutes" means (1) institutions of higher education which are organized and administered principally to provide a two-year program which is acceptable for full credit toward a bachelor's degree, and (2) institutions which meet the requirements of clauses (1), (2), (4), and (5) of section 103(b) and are organized and administered principally to provide a two-year program in engineering, mathematics, or the physical or biological sciences which is designed to prepare the student to work as a technician and at a semiprofessional level in engineering, scientific, or other technological fields which require the understanding and application of basic engineering, scientific, or mathematical principles or knowledge, and, if a branch of an institution of higher education offering four or more years of higher education, is located in a community different from that in which its parent institution is located.'

"Counseling and guidance training institutes

"SEC. 505. Section 511 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

" 'Authorization

" 'SEC. 511. (a) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated $6,250,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, $7,250,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for each of the eight succeeding fiscal years, to enable the Commissioner to arrange, through grants or contracts, with institutions of higher education for the operation by them of short-term or regular session institutes for advanced study, including study in the use of new materials, to improve the qualification of individuals who are engaged, or are teachers preparing to engage, in counseling and guidance of students in elementary or in secondary schools or in institutions of higher education, including junior colleges and technical institutes as defined in section 505.

" '(b) Each individual who attends an institute operated under the provisions of this part shall be eligible (after application therefor) to receive a stipend at the rate of $75 per week for the period of his attendance at such institute, and each such individual with one or more dependents shall receive an additional stipend at the rate of $15 per week for each such dependent.'

"TITLE VI—LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT

"Extension of title

"SEC. 601. (a) Section 601 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by striking out '1965' wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof '1968'.

"(b) Section 603 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

" 'Appropriations authorized

" 'SEC. 603. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated $8,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, $13,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, $14,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, $16,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and $18,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, to carry out the provisions of this title.'

"Repealer

"SEC. 602. Effective July 1, 1964, title VI of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by striking out the center heading 'Part A—Centers and Research and Studies' and by striking out part B thereof.

"TITLE VII—UTILIZATION OF TELEVISION, RADIO, MOTION PICTURES, AND RELATED MEDIA FOR EDUCATIONAL PURPOSES

"Extension of program

"SEC. 701. Section 763 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by striking out 'six succeeding fiscal years' and inserting in lieu thereof 'nine succeeding fiscal years'.

"TITLE VIII—MISCELLANEOUS

"State administration

"SEC. 801. (a) Subparagraph (2) of section 1004(a) of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by inserting before the semicolon 'and will keep such records and afford such access thereto as the Commissioner may find necessary to assure the correctness and verifications of such reports'.

"(b) Subparagraph (3) of such section 1004(a) is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof '(including such funds paid by the State to the local educational agencies)'.

"Extension of statistical services program

"SEC. 802. Section 1009(a) of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by striking out 'six' and inserting in lieu thereof 'nine'.

"TITLE IX—ADDITIONAL TITLE

"SEC. 901. (a) The National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new title:

" 'TITLE XI—INSTITUTES

" 'Authorization of institutes

" 'SEC. 1101. There are authorized to be appropriated $32,750,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and each of the three succeeding fiscal years, to enable the Commissioner to arrange, through grants or contracts, with institutions of higher education for the operation by them of short-term or regular session institutes for advanced study, including study in the use of new materials, to improve the qualification of individuals—

" '(1) who are engaged in or preparing to engage in the teaching, or supervising or training of teachers, of history, geography, modern foreign languages, reading, or English in elementary or secondary schools,

" '(2) who are engaged in or preparing to engage in the teaching of disadvantaged youth and are, by virtue of their service or future service in elementary or secondary schools enrolling substantial numbers of culturally, economically, socially, and educationally handicapped youth, in need of specialized training; except that no institute may be established under this title for teachers of disadvantaged youth unless such institute will offer a specialized program of instruction designed to assist such teachers in coping with the unique and peculiar problems involved in the teaching of such youth,

" '(3) who are engaged as, or preparing to engage as, library personnel in the elementary or secondary schools, or as supervisors of such personnel, or

" '(4) who are engaged as, or are preparing to engage as, educational media specialists.

" 'Stipends

" 'SEC. 1102. Each individual who attends an institute operated under the provisions of this title shall be eligible (after application therefor) to receive a stipend at the rate of $75 per week for the period of his attendance at such institute, and each such individual with one or more dependents shall receive an additional stipend at the rate of $15 per week for each such dependent.'

"TITLE X—AMENDMENTS OF TABLE OF CONTENTS

"SEC. 1001. The table of contents of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended—

"(1) by striking out

" 'TITLE III—FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR STRENGTHENING SCIENCE, MATHEMATICS, AND MODERN FOREIGN LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION'

and inserting in lieu thereof

" 'TITLE III—FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR STRENGTHENING INSTRUCTION IN SCIENCE, MATHEMATICS, MODERN FOREIGN LANGUAGES, AND OTHER CRITICAL SUBJECTS',

"(2) by inserting after

" 'Sec. 504. Payments to States.'

the following:

" 'Sec. 505. Definitions.';

"(3) by striking out

" 'Part A—Centers and Research and Studies';

"(4) by striking out

" 'Part B—Language Institutes

" 'Sec. 611. Authorization.';

"(5) by inserting at the end thereof the following:

" 'TITLE XI—INSTITUTES

" 'Sec. 1101. Authorization of institutes.

" 'Sec. 1102. Stipends.'

"TITLE XI—FEDERALLY AFFECTED AREAS

"Amendments to Public Law 815

"Sec. 1101. (a) The first sentence of section 3 of the Act of September 23, 1950, as amended (20 U.S.C. 631–645), is amended by striking out '1965' and inserting in lieu thereof '1966'.

"(b) Subsection (b) of section 14 of such Act is amended by striking out '1965' each time it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof '1966'.

"(c) Paragraph (13) of section 15 of such Act is amended by inserting 'the District of Columbia,' after 'Guam,'.

"(d) Paragraph (15) of section 15 of such Act is amended by striking out '1962–1963' and inserting in lieu thereof '1963–1964'.

"Amendments to Public Law 874

"Sec. 1102. (a) Sections 2(a), 3(b), and 4(a) of the Act of September 30, 1950, as amended (20 U.S.C. 236–244), are each amended by striking out '1965' each place where it appears and inserting in lieu thereof '1966'.

"(b) Section 9(8) of such Act is amended by inserting 'the District of Columbia,' after 'Guam,'.

"Comprehensive study

"Sec. 1103. The Commissioner of Education shall submit to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for transmission to the Congress on or before June 30, 1965, a full report of the operation of Public Laws 815 and 874, as extended by this Act, and his recommendations as to what amendments to such laws should be made if they are further extended."

And the House agree to the same.

ADAM C. POWELL,
CARL D. PERKINS,
EDITH GREEN,
JOHN BRADEMAS,
JAMES ROOSEVELT,
CARLTON R. SICKLES,
SAM M. GIBBONS,
JOHN H. DENT,
Managers on the Part of the House.

WAYNE MORSE,
PAT MCNAMARA,
RALPH YARBOROUGH,
JOSEPH S. CLARK,
JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
WINSTON L. PROUTY,
JACOB K. JAVITS,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 3060) to amend and extend the National Defense Education Act of 1958 and to extend Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress (federally affected areas), submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The House amendment strikes out all of the Senate bill after the enacting clause and inserts a substitute. The Senate recedes from its disagreement to the amendment of the House, with an amendment which is a substitute for both the Senate bill and the House amendment.

In most respects the substitute agreed upon in conference is like the House amendment. The differences between the House amendment and the substitute are noted in the following outline, except for incidental changes made necessary by reason of agreements reached by the conferees and minor and clarifying changes.

Extension of National Defense Education Act: The Senate bill extended the programs provided for in the National Defense Education Act of 1958 (hereinafter called the act) for 3 additional years beyond its present expiration date of June 30, 1965. The House amendment extended the act for only 2 additional years. The substitute agreed upon in conference extends the act for 3 additional years.

Extension and amendment of Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress: The Senate bill extended Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, relating to construction and maintenance and operation of schools in federally affected areas, for 2 additional years and made such laws applicable to the District of Columbia. The House amendment extended these laws for 1 additional year. The conference substitute adopts the House position with respect to the extension of the acts, but adopts the Senate provisions with respect to the inclusion of the District of Columbia.

In including the District of Columbia under the Federal impact legislation (Public Laws 815 and 874) the conferees are well aware that Congress authorizes a Federal payment to the District from general revenues each year for governmental purposes in the District Appropriation Act. We also are aware that this payment is justified because of the large federally owned real estate holdings in the District which cannot be taxed for local purposes and because of other financial burdens imposed on the District government due to the fact that it is the location of the Nation's Capital. Nevertheless, we believe the District also should be included under the impact area laws and receive the educational benefits these programs provide. A number of cogent reasons may be given for this inclusion, chief of which is the fact that the District of Columbia is one of the most heavily impacted school districts in the Nation, as judged by the criteria in Public Law 815 and Public Law 874, and should be treated the same as every jurisdiction in the Nation.

It is the intention of the conferees that the Federal impact funds to be received by the District under Public Law 874 be used by the board of education solely for educational purposes, and that they be in addition to the funds made available for education in the District of Columbia budget. It also is the opinion of the conferees that insofar as is consistent with good educational administration, these funds be used to improve the quality and standards of the educational offerings in the underprivileged attendance areas of the city. The superintendent of schools is requested to report to the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and the House Committee on Education and Labor on the ways in which the availability of these funds during the year has improved the educational program for the children in the low income areas.

Amendments of title I: The House bill defines the term "school of nursing" and specifies that these schools will be considered as institutions of higher education for the purposes of the student loan title of the act. The Senate bill contained no similar provision. In retaining this provision in the conference substitute the conferees did not intend to make changes in existing laws. The inclusion of the definition is merely to insure the continuation of existing administrative practice.

Amendments of title II: The Senate bill authorized appropriations of $145,000,000 for the fiscal year 1965, $165,000,000 for the fiscal year 1966, $180,000,000 for the fiscal year 1967, and $195,000,000 for the fiscal year 1968 for carrying out title II of the act (relating to student loan programs).

The House bill authorized the appropriation of $163,300,000 for the fiscal year 1965, $179,300,000 for the fiscal year 1966, and $200,000,000 for the fiscal year 1967 for carrying out title II.

The conference substitute authorizes the appropriation of $163,300,000 for the fiscal year 1965, $179,300,000 for the fiscal year 1966, $190,000,000 for the fiscal year 1967, and $195,000,000 for the fiscal year 1968 for this purpose.

The Senate bill provided for special consideration in getting loans to "(A) students with a superior academic background who express a desire to teach in elementary or secondary schools, and (B) other students with a superior academic background." The House amendment provided for such special consideration for students with superior academic background. The conference substitute is like the House amendment; but in omitting the mention of persons expressing a desire to teach, the conferees do not wish to indicate any belief that the importance of obtaining teachers for the Nation's elementary and secondary schools has in any way lessened.

The Senate bill permitted institutions of higher education to make loans to part-time students who are carrying at least one-half the normal full-time academic load. The House amendment contained no similar provisions. The conference substitute adopts this provision of the Senate bill.

Amendments of title III: The Senate bill authorizes the appropriation of $90,000,000 for each fiscal year for grants to States to assist them to acquire certain equipment. The House amendment authorizes the appropriation of $70,000,000 per fiscal year for this program. The substitute agreed to in conference adopts the authorization in the Senate amendment. The Senate bill also authorizes the appropriation of $10,000,000 annually for State supervisory services and administration. The House authorized $5,000,000 annually for this purpose. The substitute is like the Senate bill.

The present law authorizes grants for the acquisition of equipment suitable for use in providing education in science, mathematics, or modern foreign language. The Senate bill broadened these categories to include history, civics, geography, English, or remedial reading.

The House amendment broadened these existing categories to include reading and English when taught to persons for whom English is a second language, and also authorized grants for the acquisition of wall maps and globes.

The substitute agreed upon in conference adopts the categories in the Senate provision, except that the House category of reading is included instead of the more limited category of remedial reading contained in the Senate bill.

The same differences existed between the Senate amendment and the House bill with respect to the categories in which assistance can be given for supervisory and related services. These differences are resolved in the same manner as the above.

Amendments of title IV: The Senate bill authorized the Commissioner of Education to award 5,000 fellowships for graduate study during the fiscal year 1965, 7,500 during the fiscal year 1966, and 10,000 during the fiscal years 1967 and 1968.

The House amendment authorized the Commissioner to award 3,000 such fellowships during the fiscal year 1965, 5,000 during the fiscal year 1966, and 6,500 during the fiscal year 1967.

The conference substitute authorizes the Commissioner of Education to award 3,000 fellowships for graduate study during 1965, 6,000 during fiscal year 1966, and 7,500 during fiscal years 1967 and 1968.

The Senate bill provides that of the fellowships to be awarded during a fiscal year not less than one-third of those to be awarded in fiscal years 1965 and 1966, and not less than 2,500 for each fiscal year thereafter, shall be awarded to persons who will study in new or expanded graduate programs approved by the Commissioner under section 403(a). The House amendment provides that for fiscal year 1965, 1,500 of the fellowships awarded must be for study in such new or expanded programs, and that thereafter one-third of such fellowships must be for study in such new and expanded programs. The conference substitute adopts the House provision in this instance.

Amendments of part A of title V: The Senate bill authorized the appropriation of $25,000,000 for the fiscal year 1965, $25,500,000 for the fiscal year 1966, $32,500,000 for the fiscal year 1967, and $37,500,000 for the fiscal year 1968 for carrying out part A of title V (relating to grants for State programs of guidance, counseling, and testing).

The House amendment authorized the appropriation of $23,500,000 for the fiscal year 1965 and the fiscal year 1966, and $28,500,000 for the fiscal year 1967 for this purpose.

The conference substitute authorizes the appropriation of $24,000,000 for the fiscal year 1965, $24,500,000 for the fiscal year 1966, and $30,000,000 for the fiscal years 1967 and 1968.

The Senate bill altered the present law to extend Federal assistance for State testing and guidance and counseling programs to all grades of elementary and secondary schools and to junior colleges and technical institutes. The present act allows Federal assistance only for testing and for guidance and counseling in the seventh and succeeding grades in elementary and secondary schools. The only change in the existing law made by the House amendment was to permit Federal assistance for guidance and counseling in all grades of elementary and secondary schools. The conference substitute follows the Senate bill.

The Senate bill also contained a provision, which was not in the House amendment, broadening the type of counseling and guidance which can be assisted to include advising students in their decisions as to the type of educational program they should pursue, the vocation they should train for and enter, and the job opportunities in the various fields. The conference substitute includes this provision.

Amendments of part B of title V: The Senate bill made several changes in part B of title V of the act which relates to counseling and guidance training institutes. The House amendment contained provisions for guidance and counseling institutes which were, with one exception, the same in substance as those contained in the Senate bill. However, the House provisions were included in a new title XI which grouped all types of institutes in one place. The exception is that under the Senate bill the institutes would be for individuals who are engaged, or are teachers preparing to engage in counseling and guidance of students in elementary or secondary schools or in institutions of higher education, including junior colleges and technical institutes. In contrast, the House amendment provided that the institutes would be for individuals who are engaged, or are preparing to engage in elementary or secondary schools as counseling and guidance personnel.

The conference substitute adopts the provisions of the Senate bill, except that where the Senate bill authorized the appropriation of $10,000,000 for each fiscal year, the substitute authorizes the appropriation of $7,250,000.

Amendments of title VI: The sums authorized to be appropriated were the same in the Senate bill and House amendment, except that the House amendment provided no such authorization for the fiscal year 1968 since it did not extend the program into that year. The conference substitute adopts the Senate authorization of $18,000,000 for the fiscal year 1968. For a description of the conference action with respect to part B of this title, see the discussion of the new title XI.

New title XI: The House amendment added a new title to the act which authorized the Commissioner to arrange with institutions of higher education for carrying out institutes for advanced study for persons in a number of specified fields. These fields included the two fields covered by existing law—that is, guidance and counseling and modern foreign language (including English when taught to persons for whom English is a second language). It then adds provisions for institutes for reading, and for teachers of disadvantaged youth in connection with specified types of schools, and librarians (and supervisors) in elementary or secondary schools. Since the guidance and counseling and modern foreign language institutes would be taken care of in this title, the House bill repealed part B of title V and part B of title VI.

The Senate amendment did not create a new title. Instead it provided for the continuation of the guidance and counseling institutes under title V, and broadened the permissible types of institutes in title VI. The new types of institutes were for school librarians and educational media specialists and for persons who engaged in or are preparing to engage in the teaching, or supervising or training of teachers, of history, civics, geography, English, or remedial reading.

The conference substitute, as has been described, retains the guidance and counseling institutes in part B of title V. The remainder of the institutes are authorized in the new title XI. The new title retains all the categories of institutes provided in the House amendment. In addition it includes educational media specialists and the categories of history, English, and geography from the Senate bill. In agreeing to the inclusion of geography, it is the understanding of the managers on the part of the House that that "geography" does not include the field of study known as geopolitics.

ADAM C. POWELL,
CARL D. PERKINS,
EDITH GREEN,
JOHN BRADEMAS,
JAMES ROOSEVELT,
CARLTON R. SICKLES,
SAM M. GIBBONS,
JOHN H. DENT,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, for the purpose of providing the legislative history regarding the conference report, I am under an obligation to, and, in fact, under instructions from, my colleagues on the committee and the House managers to discuss briefly the basis upon which agreement was reached. I shall take the time to do so because the legislative history we make here today may be of utmost importance in the years ahead in administering the act. The report I make today supplements the report of the House managers, our conference practice being that the Senate conferees do not file a written report. Therefore, it is important that we leave no room for doubt as to the meaning of any part of the bill.

Before I do so, however, I should like to express my deepest appreciation to Senators who served with me on the conference committee for the valuable support which they gave to the Senate position on this important legislation.

The President of the United States, in signing legislation that had been passed in the 88th Congress, said that this Congress had passed more educational legislation of greater import than had been enacted by any other Congress in the past 100 years. He referred to the Morrell Act of 1862 as being the last great piece of major legislation on education, other than the National Defense Education Act of 1958, prior to the various bills that have been passed in the 88th Congress.

I make this statement now as a fitting introduction to the tribute and thanks I wish to express to my colleagues on the Senate Subcommittee on Education. I wish particularly to thank the Republican Senators who worked so closely with me and my colleagues on the subcommittee, Senator PROUTY and Senator JAVITS.

The distinguished junior Senator from the State of Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], and the able senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] not only signed the conference report, but were diligent in their attendance and constructive in their suggestions during our conference meetings. Without the assistance of Senator PROUTY and Senator JAVITS, in my judgment we would have had an entirely different and more limited in scope National Defense Education Act bill to consider. We would not have had a bill which follows as closely the Senate provisions of S. 3060 as the one we are proud to report this morning.

I also wish to say of these two Senators that at no time was there the slightest indication of any partisanship entering into their discussion of the problems before the committee. That is the way it should be when we work on a subject matter that is of vital concern to all the people of this country, irrespective of party membership.

This attitude on their part was but a reflection and a continuation of the careful consideration each had given to this legislation. I am proud to acknowledge publicly my gratitude to Senators PROUTY and JAVITS for their constructive assistance. S. 3060 in many of its particulars gives solid evidence of their dedication to the great cause of education.

Mr. President, I would be greatly remiss if I failed to acknowledge the wise counsel given to me by my beloved chairman, the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], who, although he could not be with us physically during the conference sessions, was nevertheless always a tangible presence in our midst.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As a Member on this side of the aisle I believe the conference report on education is a distinct advance in our educational programs. I congratulate the conference committee. I am glad the report has come forth in its present form.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts very much for his comment.

As I indicated to Senator HILL in my report on our activities recently, there are few, if any, subcommittee chairmen who feel more greatly indebted than I do to LISTER HILL for his unfailing tact, courtesy, and support.

The acting chairman of the Labor Committee, the distinguished senior Senator from the State of Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], and the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH]—to each I owe a debt of gratitude for their diligence, for their support, and for their unfailing maintenance of the position of the Senate where it could be fully maintained on the basis of logic and persuasive argument, and for their gracious acceptance of those conscionable compromises which had to be made if agreements were to be secured and if we were to bring forth the strong bill that we are bringing forth in this conference report today.

There were times when materials presented by Senator RANDOLPH on the basis of communications from West Virginia educational leaders helped to resolve our problem. At other points, materials presented with vigor and lucidity by Senator YARBOROUGH carried the day. So also, in a similar manner, the contributions to the conference of Senators MCNAMARA and CLARK have had their effect upon the outcome.

Anyone who has ever served with Senator RANDOLPH in conference is aware of the fact that after he listens and realizes that a proposal is being put forth which would do great damage to the bill before the committee, in his very tactful and courteous manner he makes it clear to the whole conference that if they persist on that road they will lose the vote of the Senator from West Virginia. He did that again in our conference and was of assistance to me by so doing on several important occasions.

All Senators who participated in the conference signed the conference report. Yet, I would be less than candid if I did not indicate to the Senate that had he been able to participate in the conference, it is doubtful, in my judgment, that the distinguished junior Senator from Arizona would have found it possible to accept the agreements which were reached, since he indicated at the time of the committee consideration of S. 3060 that for the reasons given in his individual views to the committee report the basis for his opposition to the Senate bill.

Mr. President, I turn now to a detailed discussion of the bill and the agreements which were reached on each title.

TITLE I—GENERAL PROVISIONS—NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT

Title I of National Defense Education Act contains general provisions covering the act and includes a statement of congressional findings and a declaration of policy, a prohibition of Federal control of education, and the definition of terms contained in the act.

Under the declaration of policy under existing law, there appears the statement:

> We must increase our efforts to identify and educate more of the talent of our Nation. This requires programs that will give assurance that no student of ability will be denied an opportunity for higher education because of financial need; will correct as rapidly as possible the existing imbalances in our educational programs which have led to an insufficient proportion of our population educated in science, mathematics, and modern foreign languages and trained in technology.

The House version of the bill omitted the language which reads "which have led to an insufficient proportion of our population educated in science, mathematics, and modern foreign languages and trained in technology."

Since the Senate amendments to other provisions of the bill in title III and in the institutes title expanded the coverage of the disciplines beyond science, mathematics, modern foreign languages, and technology, it was our view that the change suggested by the House was reasonable. The Senate conferees, therefore, receded on this point.

Under the definitions section of the bill, in the House version there appeared the terms "school of nursing," "collegiate school of nursing," "associate degree school of nursing," and the term "accredited," which were strongly urged upon us by House managers. The Senate conferees resisted the inclusion of this language, basing our resistance upon, first, the position of the American Nurses' Association, and, second, our understanding, based upon conversations with the Office of Education, that the inclusion of the defined terms neither added to, nor detracted from, the rights or benefits conferred upon persons enrolled in schools of nursing under this or any other act.

After much discussion and debate, we were reluctantly persuaded to accept these new definitions on the clear understanding, which is set forth in the statement of the managers on the part of the House, that, in fact, the addition of these terms in the language of the act does not change, in any respect, the authorities under this or any other student loan act, nor will it affect the administration of the various loan programs. It was further agreed—at the insistence, as I recall it, of Senator JAVITS—that in making legislative history on this point of the intention of the conferees it is our view that in no way does the inclusion of these terms relating to a specific profession constitute a precedent for naming, subsequently, other professions or designating preprofessional students.

In view of the discussions which took place on this point and the representations which were made which led to the recession on the part of the Senate, thus permitting the inclusion of these terms, Senators may feel that the following communications on the point may be of enlightening interest. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at this point there be printed in the RECORD a letter addressed to me under date of September 2, 1964, from the American Nurses' Association; my letter of September 25, 1964, to the American Nurses' Association; and their reply dated September 28, 1964.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN NURSES' ASSOCIATION, INC.,
New York, N.Y., September 2, 1964.
Hon. WAYNE L. MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I understand that the Senate conferees are scheduled to meet soon to consider the National Defense Education Act amendments (S. 3060). The American Nurses' Association would like to express its support of the Senate version of the National Defense Education Act. The Senate version does not specifically mention or define nurses or nursing education.

Since the American Nurses' Association has strongly supported other legislation which provides loans to nurses, the specific reference to nurses in the House version of the National Defense Education Act is neither desirable nor necessary.

Sincerely,
Mrs. JUDITH G. WHITAKER, R.N.,
Executive Director.

SEPTEMBER 25, 1964.
Miss JULIA C. THOMPSON, R.N.,
Washington Representative, American Nurses' Association, Inc., Washington, D.C.

DEAR MISS THOMPSON: You will recall that on September 2, 1964, Mrs. Judith G. Whitaker, executive director of the American Nurses' Association, Inc., wrote me with respect to the National Defense Education Act amendment, S. 3060, in which she stated:

"The American Nurses' Association would like to express its support of the Senate version of the National Defense Education Act. The Senate version does not specifically mention or define nurses or nursing education.

"Since the American Nurses' Association has strongly supported other legislation which provides loans to nurses, the specific reference to nurses in the House version of the National Defense Education Act is neither desirable nor necessary."

In accordance with my obligations as a conferee, I in good faith presented this letter to the conference committee. In the discussion which followed, the position of the American Nurses' Association, Inc., with respect to the language of section 103 of the National Defense Education Act as expressed in the September 2 letter, was challenged. The matter was resolved by requesting Representative EDITH GREEN for the conference committee to telephone the American Nurses' Association to verify the position of the organization.

You can understand, I am sure, the embarrassing position in which I found myself when Representative GREEN reported that she had spoken with you and had learned that the September 2 letter had been dispatched during a period in which you were on leave, that the information contained in the September 2 letter was erroneous, and that it had been based upon language of an earlier version of the bill and that the American Nurses' Association therefore did not object to the retention of nursing in the definitions under title I of the National Defense Education Act and asked that its September 2 letter be withdrawn.

Since the position of the American Nurses' Association on this part of the bill was of vital concern to each of the conferees, the receipt of this information from Representative GREEN resulted in a recession on the part of the Senate and adoption of the House position.

I very much regret that the Senate conferees were not apprised of the correct viewpoint of the American Nurses' Association at an earlier date, since, as I have indicated, it would have spared the Senate conferees some embarrassment in misinforming the House in good faith of the true position of the American Nurses' Association.

In order that the matter may be clarified during the legislative history which will be made on the bill when the matter is debated in the Senate, hopefully early next week, I would very much appreciate receiving your comments so that I may make a full report to my colleagues.

With kindest regards,

Sincerely,

WAYNE MORSE,
Chairman, Education Subcommittee.

AMERICAN NURSES' ASSOCIATION, INC.,
New York, N.Y., September 28, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Chairman, Education Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This is in answer to your letter of September 25, 1964, to Miss Julia C. Thompson, Washington representative for the American Nurses' Association.

I would like to reaffirm the context of the letter sent to you and dated September 2, 1964, in which the American Nurses' Association expressed the desire that the specific reference to nurses under title I of the National Defense Education Act be removed.

We very much regret the embarrassing position in which you were placed during the committee conference. The American Nurses' Association is equally embarrassed to learn that a conversation between Miss Thompson and Congresswoman GREEN could have been construed to mean that the information contained in the September 2 letter was erroneous. This was certainly not the intent of any comments made to Mrs. GREEN. Although it is correct that Miss Thompson was on leave when the letter was sent, the letter was properly cleared and approved through my office in New York. It expressed then, as it does now, the feelings of the association.

It is also correct that a statement was sent out preceding action on the House floor concerning several portions of the bill which were unsatisfactory to the American Nurses' Association. All but one of these provisions were removed by amendment on the House floor. This one provision is the specific reference to nurses in the bill. Only in this sense was the letter based upon language of an earlier version of the bill.

I would like to reassure you that had the American Nurses' Association changed its position, you would have been notified in writing prior to the conference. We very much regret that a hasty telephone conversation was misinterpreted and used to refute our letter to you of September 2.

Sincerely yours,

MRS. JUDITH G. WHITAKER, R.N.,
Executive Director.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, it was the view of the Senate conferees that the legislative history that has been made in this respect should preclude this case from being considered a precedent for the future, in the event similar proposals were to be made concerning other fields. It is for that reason that these communications have been printed in the RECORD.

TITLE II—LOANS TO STUDENTS IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Mr. President, the dollar amount of loans to students in institutions of higher education are a compromise between the amounts originally contained in the House and Senate versions of the bill. Briefly, the authorization for this purpose increases the present $135 million authorization for fiscal year 1965 to $163.3 million; to $179.3 million in fiscal year 1966, $190 million in fiscal year 1967, and $195 million in fiscal year 1968.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a State-by-State tabulation of the estimated distribution of these funds, which was prepared by the Office of Education.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Estimated distribution of legislative authorizations, National Defense Education Act of 1958, title II, sec. 202(a), as proposed to be amended by Senate-House conference, Sept. 24, 1964

State	Fiscal year			
	1965	1966	1967	1968
United States and outlying parts	$163,300,000	$179,300,000	$190,000,000	$195,000,000
50 States and District of Columbia	162,176,927	178,066,889	188,693,302	193,658,914
Alabama	2,245,349	2,465,346	2,612,470	2,681,219
Alaska	65,807	72,255	76,567	78,581
Arizona	1,660,469	1,823,161	1,931,961	1,982,802
Arkansas	1,453,648	1,596,075	1,691,323	1,735,832
California	16,936,492	18,595,915	19,705,653	20,224,225
Colorado	2,270,206	2,492,639	2,641,391	2,710,901
Connecticut	2,071,351	2,274,300	2,410,023	2,473,444
Delaware	318,837	350,076	370,968	380,730
Florida	3,709,141	4,072,560	4,315,596	4,429,164
Georgia	2,704,085	2,969,029	3,146,211	3,229,006
Hawaii	568,096	623,757	660,981	678,375
Idaho	641,498	704,351	746,385	766,026
Illinois	8,082,566	8,874,490	9,404,088	9,651,564
Indiana	4,678,718	5,137,135	5,443,701	5,586,956
Iowa	3,103,388	3,407,456	3,610,801	3,705,822
Kansas	2,659,417	2,919,985	3,094,240	3,175,667
Kentucky	2,307,863	2,533,985	2,685,205	2,755,868
Louisiana	2,969,172	3,260,089	3,454,640	3,545,551
Maine	672,622	738,525	782,598	803,192
Maryland	2,298,143	2,523,313	2,673,896	2,744,262
Massachusetts	6,283,631	6,899,296	7,311,022	7,503,418
Michigan	7,057,009	7,748,449	8,210,849	8,426,924
Minnesota	3,954,895	4,342,392	4,601,531	4,722,624
Mississippi	1,931,505	2,120,752	2,247,311	2,306,451
Missouri	4,036,476	4,431,967	4,696,451	4,820,042
Montana	744,378	817,311	866,085	888,877
Nebraska	$1,546,967	$1,698,538	$1,799,901	$1,847,266
Nevada	176,388	193,670	205,228	210,629
New Hampshire	660,512	725,229	768,508	788,732
New Jersey	3,140,674	3,448,394	3,654,182	3,750,345
New Mexico	832,864	914,467	969,039	994,540
New York	13,144,547	14,432,439	15,293,716	15,696,183
North Carolina	4,104,514	4,506,671	4,775,613	4,901,287
North Dakota	786,815	863,906	915,461	939,552
Ohio	7,977,456	8,759,081	9,281,792	9,526,050
Oklahoma	2,636,526	2,894,850	3,067,605	3,148,331
Oregon	2,221,926	2,439,629	2,585,217	2,653,249
Pennsylvania	8,563,875	9,402,957	9,964,093	10,226,306
Rhode Island	861,757	946,192	1,002,657	1,029,043
South Carolina	1,640,605	1,801,350	1,908,849	1,959,082
South Dakota	758,931	833,290	883,018	906,255
Tennessee	3,205,418	3,519,483	3,729,513	3,827,658
Texas	8,943,740	9,820,040	10,406,065	10,679,909
Utah	1,844,824	2,025,579	2,146,458	2,202,944
Vermont	563,741	618,975	655,914	673,175
Virginia	2,706,635	2,971,829	3,149,177	3,232,050
Washington	3,265,223	3,585,147	3,799.097	3,899,073
West Virginia	1,424,223	1,563,767	1,657.088	1,700,695
Wisconsin	3,981,929	4,372,076	4,632,986	4,754,906
Wyoming	339,392	372,645	394,883	405,275
District of Columbia	1.422,683	1,562,076	1,655,295	1,698,856
American Samoa				
Canal Zone	23,157	25,426	26,944	27,653
Guam	16,890	18,545	19,651	20,169
Puerto Rico	1,081,698	1,187,682	1,258,558	1,291,678
Virgin Islands	1,328	1,458	1,545	1,586

NOTE.—Distribution of all amounts estimated on the basis of full-time degree credit enrollment (excluding U.S. service schools), fall 1963.

TITLE III—FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR STRENGTHENING INSTRUCTION IN SCIENCE, MATHEMATICS, MODERN FOREIGN LANGUAGES, AND OTHER CRITICAL SUBJECTS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am pleased to report to the Senate that the conference committee agreed substantially to the amendments to title III of the National Defense Education Act contained in the Senate version of S. 3060.

One difference, the acceptance of the House term "reading" for the Senate term "remedial reading" in section 304(a) of the National Defense Education Act deserves comment. The Senate receded to the House language on this point on the assurance that the term "reading" is a broadly inclusive term which encompasses fully the category of remedial reading, which was in the Senate version of the bill.

Senators will recall that in the Senate committee report, No. 1275, which accompanied S. 3060 to the Senate floor, there appeared on page 11 the following language:

> The committee recognizes that remedial reading is of prime importance. Reading skill is basic to education in all other areas. It has long been recognized that the reading ability of many students is below the level needed for maximum educational achievement. The committee understands remedial reading to mean individual or group instruction aimed at correcting faulty reading habits and/or developing improved reading skill, including efficiency and accuracy. In its deliberations the committee was influenced by the material presented to it by a Vermont physician who in a communication stated, in part—

To the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY]—

"I would like to suggest therefore that you give consideration to further amending the National Defense Education Act so that more help can be provided for more children at as early an age as possible. If a child in kindergarten, or first or second grade, can receive therapy for the specific weaknesses that they so often demonstrate (auditory discrimination problems, memory span difficulties, visual and auditory perceptual disorders, attention problems, etc.) many later-grade repetitions, emotional overlays, and potential dropouts can be prevented."

The term "remedial reading" would also include specialized equipment used in special education classes. For example, this would cover such classes as those for the unusually gifted, the emotionally disturbed, the deaf, or the mentally retarded. The committee has noted that the Commissioner of Education under this title, and under the institute title, is empowered to provide support for training of such children and teachers.

The conference action in accepting the term "reading" in no way changes the emphasis which the Senate report gave to the term "remedial reading." It merely broadens to other categories of reading in our school systems the support previously accorded only to remedial reading.

In this connection also, I want to note for the RECORD the most helpful support I received from the Senator from Vermont and the Senator from West Virginia, both of whom on many occasions in our discussions adverted to the importance of working with children of all age levels to correct and remedy reading deficiencies. It was their view, which I shared and I believe the committee and the Senate shared, that a broad interpretation should be given to the reading authorities to make sure that these youngsters who need help get help. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a table of title III estimated distributions.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Estimated distribution of legislative authorizations, National Defense Education Act of 1958, title III, sec. 302(a), as proposed to be amended by Senate-House conference, Sept. 24, 1964, for each of fiscal years 1965–68

State	Acquisition of equipment for science, mathematics, modern foreign languages, and other critical subjects		State administration and supervision
	Grants for public schools	Loans for nonpublic schools	
United States and outlying parts	$79,200,000	$10,800,000	$10,000,000
50 States and District of Columbia	77,769,460	10,672,056	9,837,327
Alabama	2,089,073	53,059	188,955
Alaska	95,345	3,727	50,000
Arizona	825,045	56,075	82,976
Arkansas	1,096,763	21,472	99,201
California	4,692,896	693,843	849,066
Colorado	866,393	76,660	100,434
Connecticut	707,227	194,312	127,955
Delaware	133,952	33,894	50,000
Florida	2,256,586	154,385	264,126
Georgia	2,513,700	46,138	227,362
Hawaii	274,115	53,946	50,000
Idaho	430,778	15,971	50,000
Illinois	2,836,888	929,856	494,570
Indiana	2,028,256	227,141	245,847
Iowa	1,361,199	171,598	144,386
Kansas	1,025,334	91,211	113,784
Kentucky	1,852,916	155,272	167,595
Louisiana	2,141,299	250,387	193,679
Maine	494,084	62,641	50,525
Maryland	1,306,554	242,402	170,060
Massachusetts	1,528,454	461,379	247,901
Michigan	3,281,426	594,469	436,240
Minnesota	1,730,299	297,944	186,490
Mississippi	1,482,787	33,716	134,117
Missouri	1,684,094	294,573	210,521
Montana	353,453	36,733	50,000
Nebraska	$687,541	$100,261	$73,734
Nevada	96,991	7,098	50,000
New Hampshire	271,085	61,931	50,000
New Jersey	1,681,223	525,262	304,177
New Mexico	667,596	48,090	60,383
New York	4,443,154	1,486,173	803,881
North Carolina	2,915,620	34,426	263,716
North Dakota	397,376	36,378	50,000
Ohio	3,755,845	674,145	524,761
Oklahoma	1,266,671	37,798	124,464
Oregon	799,514	62,109	94,888
Pennsylvania	4,186,466	1,082,466	557,418
Rhode Island	297,661	93,518	50,000
South Carolina	1,621,303	28,038	146,646
South Dakota	441,994	41,347	50,000
Tennessee	2,159,466	55,011	195,322
Texas	5,374,317	266,180	550,229
Utah	616,541	10,825	57,713
Vermont	203,123	31,232	50,000
Virginia	2,262,271	98,487	224,487
Washington	1,235,333	102,213	157,326
West Virginia	1,105,846	30,699	100,023
Wisconsin	1,852,429	454,281	212,369
Wyoming	165,221	6,921	50,000
District of Columbia	175,957	44,363	50,000
American Samoa	50,000	2,307	10,000
Canal Zone	50,000	1,242	10,000
Guam	50,000	8,695	10,000
Puerto Rico	1,230,540	110,199	122,673
Virgin Islands	50,000	5,501	10,000

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Senate conferees dwelt on the "reading" and "remedial reading" points of title III, National Defense Education Act, at some length in conference. We have the assurance of the majority House conferees—in fact, I know of no conferee on either side of the House conferees who would not share the view which I now express for legislative history—that reading, as used in the bill, covers remedial reading.

Let me say to the teachers of America, to the educators of America, that although the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] was of assistance in every part of the bill, this section dealing with reading is a monument to him, because he presented us with the data, the information, and the evidence which left no room for doubt that one of the greatest needs in the American educational system, from the elementary grades right up to college, involves the problem of reading.

The Senator from Vermont was joined by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], who supplemented the evidence which the Senator from Vermont had provided from authorities in West Virginia, backing up everything which the Senator from Vermont brought up.

I close these comments by saying that, in my judgment, one of the major problems confronting us in preventing dropouts in this country from grade school, high school, and college, is the problem of better training in reading. It is not merely a matter of training students to read print. In many instances, it calls for psychological treatment. Many of these problems are psychological problems.

I remember one dramatic example of the type of difficulty with which we are confronted, that a student appearing to be normal in every other respect will see one word the right way up and the next word the wrong side up.

How can we possibly educate that child until we get to the bottom of what causes the reading disturbance? Every dollar we spend to improve reading instruction in the schools of America will pay dividends a thousandfold. If we can correct a reading problem in a child, we make it possible for that child to go on through the educational process, in many instances on to college, and that child can become a great asset to our society.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I am most grateful to the Senator from Oregon for the graciousness with which he has referred to me. It is evident from what he has just said that a single letter from a constituent can sometimes carry great impact upon the course of major legislation.

The Vermont doctor who has been so interested in the difficult problems of finding out what the handicaps were of some youngsters, which makes it so difficult for them to move along in school as rapidly as their other classmates, has been valuable, indeed, to the committee. He pointed out that many of these youngsters have normal or superior intelligence and if we can find out the difficulties which they are experiencing as youngsters, and we can enable them to overcome those handicaps, they will become able, progressive students which will certainly eliminate the probability of dropouts.

While I am on my feet, let me say that those who benefit from the National Defense Education Act legislation—and that includes every citizen of this country—owe a great debt of gratitude to the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse]. His leadership in bringing this measure to its final stages has been outstanding and has reflected the same type of progressive and cooperative outlook on his part which helped make possible enactment of more educational legislation than has been approved by any Congress in the history of the United States.

It has been a pleasure for me to work with the Senator from Oregon. I certainly appreciate his help and cooperation.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I would be less than human if I did not tell the Senator from Vermont that I appreciate very much the comments he has just made. But as I have said before, we did it together. Whatever we have accomplished in this bill, we did it together as committee members. I wish to thank him very much for his kind remarks.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, too often we take for granted the persistent and conscientious efforts which our representatives on conference committees make in resolving differences over important legislation. I commend the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse] for his successful efforts in helping obtain agreement on the extension and improvement of the National Defense Education Act.

His work on the conference committee is of a part with his long and patient efforts as chairman of the Education Subcommittee of our Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to help improve educational facilities and standards for American young people. As one who has served alongside him on the subcommittee and who has watched him bring together divergent views in order to make progress, I feel that he deserves the credit which is now being bestowed upon him.

Today's success is further evidence of his good efforts and, as one who has urged recognition for the 2-year community colleges, I know that in Senator Morse we have a true supporter.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for his most gracious comments. The senior Senator from New Jersey has long been our mentor on the importance of providing support to the junior and community college segment of higher education. He helped to pioneer in this field, and I therefore appreciate all the more his kind comments which I accept only as the symbol of the team of Senators, both on and off the committee, who have labored together to bring this legislation to the point of passage. On that team I count always the Senator from New Jersey. I turn now to the fellowships title of the National Defense Education Act.

TITLE IV—NATIONAL DEFENSE FELLOWSHIPS

Mr. President, the following title of the National Defense Education Act currently provides for 1,500 fellowships annually. The Senate version of S. 3060 expanded this program, which is of major importance if we are to expand our higher educational teaching forces, from the present 1,500 figure to 5,000 fellowships for this fiscal year, 7,500 fellowships for fiscal year 1966, and the Commissioner would have been authorized for the final 2 years to award not to exceed 10,000 fellowships annually.

I can assure the Senate that we attempted to maintain these figures which I personally believe are fully justified by the evidence presented in our hearings. However, as Senators are aware, it is necessary at times to secure agreement to concede items of quantity provided that principles of quality are maintained. In this instance, both House and Senate retreated from the original positions and accepted the program which will provide a doubling of scholarships this year to 3,000, a doubling of that figure for the next fiscal year to 6,000, and an increase thereafter for the final 2 years of the program to 7,500 fellowships annually.

Other modifications to this title which are shown in the summary were largely of a conforming nature dictated by the policy decision on the numbers of fellowships to be established. I regret, however, that we were unable to maintain the increased stipend provisions of the Senate bill.

TITLE V—GUIDANCE, COUNSELING, AND TESTING

This title of the National Defense Education Act consists of two parts. Part A is concerned with programs of guidance, counseling, and testing. I am pleased to report that in this area the Senate version of the bill prevailed. The services under part A will now be available to schoolchildren at all educational levels from the first grade through the junior and community college level. Authorizations for this part of title V were increased from the present $17.5 million to $24 million for the current fiscal year, $24.5 for fiscal year 1966, and $30 million for fiscal years 1967 and 1968.

Title V–B of the National Defense Education Act refers to institutes for the training of teachers who are working or preparing to work in the school systems as counseling and guidance personnel.

It is a disturbing fact that only one out of five teachers and counselors who apply for enrollment in counseling and guidance institutes can be accepted. One of the main reasons for our inability to cope with this demand is the dearth of trained personnel to conduct these institutes. It should be clear that one of the intentions of this legislation is to help fill this hiatus by providing for the training of the trainers of counselors as is the case in the other institutes under title XI. By increasing the number of trainers of counselors, we would remove a major bottleneck now preventing the establishment of institutes in sufficient number to accommodate those who are qualified to enroll and wish to do so.

It should be clear, as well, that counselors in schools should have the benefit of well-trained supervisors to provide assistance in keeping abreast of new developments in this rapidly growing profession.

It is also hoped that ways can be found to administer this legislation to establish more counseling and guidance institutes in States in which it has not previously been possible to have these valuable programs. Qualified individuals who wish to attend these institutes should not be required to undergo the added expenses of long-distance travel to reach colleges or universities offering such programs.

The Commissioner of Education, I am sure, will move with his usual vigor and keen insight to make immediate use of the full range of training of counseling and guidance personnel envisaged by the act—counselors for elementary schools, secondary schools, junior colleges, technical institutes, higher education, and training for supervisors and trainers of counseling and guidance personnel.

Under the House version of S. 3060, the title V–B was repealed and the guidance and counseling institutes were transferred to a new title XI. Under existing law $7,250,000 is currently authorized specifically for guidance and counseling institute programs. Under the House version of the bill this earmarking of funds would have ceased and the funding of institutes under the new title XI of the House version would have been left fully to the discretion of the Commissioner of Education.

The House version of the bill provided for but $35 million for all institutes. The Senate version of S. 3060 would have provided $10 million for guidance and counseling institutes and $30 million for all other institutes.

The conference amendment now before the Senate maintains the guidance and counseling institute program in title V–B of the act but at the $7,250,000 authorization of existing law. The Senate receded to the extent that its conferees accepted the placing in title XI of the currently authorized modern foreign language institutes and the new institutes which were created in a new title XI of the act. These new institutes will be discussed under title XI of the bill.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a table of title V–A estimated distributions.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the Record.

Estimated distribution of legislative authorizations, National Defense Education Act of 1958, title V, pt. A, sec. 501, as proposed to be amended by Senate-House conference, Sept. 24, 1964

State	Fiscal year			
	1965	1966	1967	1968
U.S. and outlying parts	$24,000,000	$24,500,000	$30,000,000	$30,000,000
50 States and District of Columbia	23,616,000	24,108,000	29,520,000	29,520,000
Alabama	465,334	475,091	582,233	582,223
Alaska	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Arizona	204,342	208,627	255,672	255,672
Arkansas	244,301	249,423	305,667	305,667
California	2,090,971	2,134,810	2,616,209	2,616,209
Colorado	247,335	252,521	309,464	309,464
Connecticut	315,112	321,719	392,267	392,267
Delaware	59,684	60,936	74,676	74,676
Florida	650,456	664,094	813,847	813,847
Georgia	559,919	571,658	700,567	700,567
Hawaii	93,067	95,018	116,445	116,445
Idaho	99,136	101,215	124,039	124,039
Illinois	1,217,962	1,243,498	1,523,907	1,523,907
Indiana	605,440	618,134	757,523	757,523
Iowa	355,576	363,031	444,895	444,895
Kansas	280,212	286,087	350,600	350,600
Kentucky	412,731	421,385	516,407	516,407
Louisiana	476,968	486,968	596,779	596,779
Maine	124,426	127,035	155,681	155,681
Maryland	418,801	427,582	524,001	524,001
Massachusetts	610,498	623,298	763,852	763,852
Michigan	1,074,315	1,096,840	1,344,177	1,344,177
Minnesota	459,265	468,894	574,629	574,629
Mississippi	330,286	337,211	413,252	413,252
Missouri	518,443	529,313	648,673	648,673
Montana	95,000	97,084	118,976	118,976
Nebraska	181,582	185,389	227,194	227,914
Nevada	$50,000	$50,000	$52,527	$52,527
New Hampshire	76,376	77,977	95,561	95,561
New Jersey	749,087	764,793	937,253	937,253
New Mexico	148,705	151,822	186,058	186,058
New York	1,979,695	2,021,201	2,476,982	2,476,982
North Carolina	649,445	663,061	812,581	812,581
North Dakota	88,515	90,371	110,749	110,749
Ohio	1,292,314	1,319,410	1,616,936	1,616,936
Oklahoma	306,514	312,940	383,508	383,508
Oregon	233,679	238,578	292,377	292,377
Pennsylvania	1,372,736	1,401,518	1,717,559	1,717,559
Rhode Island	101,665	103,797	127,203	127,203
South Carolina	361,140	368,712	451,856	451,856
South Dakota	98,631	100,699	123,506	123,406
Tennessee	481,014	491,099	601,842	601,842
Texas	1,355,033	1,383,444	1,695,409	1,695,409
Utah	142,129	145,109	177,831	177,831
Vermont	50,074	51,124	62,652	62,652
Virginia	552,837	564,428	691,707	691,707
Washington	387,441	395,565	484,764	484,764
West Virginia	246,324	251,488	308,199	308,199
Wisconsin	522,995	533,961	654,369	654,369
Wyoming	50,000	50,000	56,957	56,957
District of Columbia	78,399	80,042	98,092	98,092
Outlying parts	384,000	392,000	480,000	480,000
American Samoa	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000
Canal Zone	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000
Guam	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000
Puerto Rico	304,000	312,000	400,000	400,000
Virgin Islands	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000

NOTE.—Distribution of all amounts estimated on the basis of school-age (5 to 17) population as of July 1, 1962, for the 50 States, District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico, and as of Apr. 1, 1960, for the other outlying parts.

TITLE VI—LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, two actions were taken by the conference committee on the language development title of the National Defense Education Act.

First, the House conferees accepted the Senate funding provisions of what was formerly part A of the title. The Senate for its part accepted the House version of the bill which placed modern foreign language institutes in the new title XI of the act.

TITLE VII, TITLE VIII, AND TITLE IX OF THE NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT

No items in titles VII, VIII, and IX were in controversy except for the duration of the extension of all titles which will be discussed separately.

TITLE X—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Title X of the act, having to do with the details of the administration of the act, contained language differences between Senate and House versions of the bill. These were discussed in conference and the matter was resolved by accepting in large part the House version of S. 3060. I regret that it was necessary to do this, since in my judgment the Senate language would have enabled the Commissioner, particularly in the improvement of statistical services of the State educational agencies section, to have operated more efficiently.

However, since this is a matter which can be adjusted at a later date through subsequent legislation, if it is pressed by the administration, and since, in effect, the two versions of the language in controversy both originated in the Office of Education at differing times, it was felt that it would be inadvisable to press the matter to the point of jeopardizing conference acceptance of the balance of the agreements reached, and therefore in this instance the Senate conferees receded.

TITLE XI—INSTITUTES

The new title XI of the National Defense Education Act authorizes the expenditure of $32,750,000 to enable the Commissioner to arrange through grants or contracts with institutions of higher education for the operation by them of short-term or regular sessions institutes for advanced study, including study in the use of new materials to improve the qualifications of individuals engaged in or preparing to engage in the teaching, supervising, or training of teachers in the subject matter disciplines of history, geography, modern foreign languages, reading, or English in elementary or secondary schools. Institutes in these subject matters should also be made available to special education teachers such as those engaged in, preparing to engage in, or supervising the teaching of gifted children or handicapped children.

Institutes are also authorized for teachers of disadvantaged youth and for school librarians and educational media specialists.

As I indicated earlier in my statement, the acceptance on the part of the Senate conferees of the new title of National Defense Education Act was a compromise composed of a number of parts.

I have touched upon the retention in title V–B of institutes for guidance and counseling personnel. Basically, the Senate conferees attempted to keep in balance the subject matter disciplines for which equipment is authorized under title III of the act while giving support to services needed by teachers, in which categories fall the library and educational media specialists institutes, and recognizing simultaneously the great difficulty faced by some teachers in coping with young people who come from low-income families, and thus are disadvantaged by comparison to young people from more affluent strata of our society.

The House version, but not the Senate version of S. 3060, provided for the disadvantaged-youth institutes. Since this concept has not been previously subject to much Senate discussion, it will be helpful, I think, to bring to the attention of Senators the committee intent in accepting the House position on this point.

Teachers of disadvantaged youth must bring to the classroom the specialized skills of their profession, abundant enthusiasm, energy, and compassion for young people. In addition, teachers of disadvantaged youth must bring special sociological and psychological insights to the problems of disadvantaged youth; technical skills which bridge the gap between the theory of the university and the reality of the classroom; experience which bridges the gap between their own background and that of the children they teach. Most important of all, they must have developed a genuine attitude of hope for the educability of disadvantaged youth.

Teachers of disadvantaged youth often reflect a value system which differs markedly from that of the children they teach. Though some characteristics of disadvantaged children are shaped by the region in which they reside, there is much about their growth and development which is similar. A better understanding of these common characteristics can often be obtained through an intensive study of the social sciences: sociology, psychology, anthropology, social work, and application of these disciplines to the field education of the disadvantaged. These institutes will also provide teachers with specific and specialized help in the teaching of basic subject areas: reading, mathematics, science, and the arts. The newest methods of teaching and the most advanced technology and materials will be demonstrated and used in first-hand experiences with disadvantaged youth. Institutes of this type should also provide for the training of teachers of children of preschool age. Current research indicates a crucial need for nursery school experience for disadvantaged children in order to cancel out or modify educationally disabling characteristics. There is a critical shortage of competently trained preschool teachers.

I turn now to a short discussion for the record of the educational media specialist institutes.

Over 75 years of research and practical experience with audiovisual materials and other new educational media have indicated that they can make significant contributions to effective instruction of students at all grade levels and in all subject areas. Despite this research evidence, and the effective use being made of such media in some educational institutions, there has been less extensive use of these media than one might anticipate.

It appears that the classroom teacher does not have the sources of special support she needs to make full use of motion pictures, television, audiovisual materials, and programed instruction. If these media are to assist the classroom teacher, they must be readily available, in good operating condition, and closely related to her teaching purposes. The educational media specialist can provide the administrative and supervisory support which the teacher needs in improving instruction with newer media by:

First. Locating relevant instructional media.

Second. Setting up procedures for their critical review and evaluation by teachers and other subject matter specialists.

Third. Assisting teachers in planning effective use of the media.

Fourth. Maintaining the necessary equipment and providing projection and recording services.

Fifth. Informing teachers of new developments in instructional materials and their use.

Sixth. Assisting teachers with the planning and preparation of such media as slides, overhead transparencies, tape recordings which can be locally produced at low cost to meet unique local instructional needs.

The educational media specialist requires a rare combination of administrative, instructional, and librarianship skills. He most frequently comes from the ranks of the classroom teacher, but is on occasion a school principal or school librarian. If his background is one in which there has been strong emphasis on instructional techniques, his training requires the bolstering of his administrative and planning skills, with specialized training relating to the design, production, and use of the newer media. If he is a school librarian, he may need familiarization with the problems of classroom teaching, as well as training for materials design. The technical and administrative skills of the librarian may be translated readily to the responsibilities of the media specialist.

Experience has demonstrated that certain kinds of media responsibilities may be centralized at the school district or county level, whereas other responsibilities are best decentralized to the individual school building. A large number of school districts and institutions of higher education now have audiovisual or instructional media directors. It is rare, however, that every school in a school district have a building coordinator or instructional media. A major emphasis in the proposed institute program should be on the training of persons who can work on a part-time basis as media specialists in the individual school building. Other institutes should stress the upgrading of current district media directors, and provision of specialized training in such areas as local production techniques, selection and evaluation of educational media, and techniques for the in-service training of teachers.

It was our view that a broad construction could and should be given to this authority. We feel that all levels of educational media specialists including supervisory personnel and those who are engaged in closely related work such as those who are concerned with captioned films for the deaf could with propriety participate in the institutes under this title.

PUBLIC LAWS 815 AND 874

The conference report also is concerned with the extension of the impacted areas legislation, Public Laws 815 and 874. As S. 3060 passed the Senate, it provided for a 3-year extension of all titles of National Defense Education Act and a 2-year extension of the impacted areas legislation.

The House version on the other hand, provided for a 2-year extension of all titles of National Defense Education Act and a 1-year extension of Public Laws 815 and 874. However, the Senate version incorporated the District of Columbia under Public Laws 815 and 874, while the House version did not.

Both House and Senate versions of S. 3060 required the Commissioner of Education to submit to the Congress through the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare a report on the operation of these two laws by June 30, 1965, and authorized appropriations for the preparation of the report.

The compromise agreement was to accept the Senate position of a 3-year extension on the National Defense Education Act titles, the House position on the impacted areas legislation, but the Senate position with respect to the inclusion of the District of Columbia. The impacted areas legislation, upon enactment of S. 3060 into statute, will expire on June 30, 1966. This will enable the Congress to give heed to the recommendations contained in the report required by the conference substitute, to address itself to further extension and, I hope, to an expansion of this legislation to remove inequities which many of us feel are now contained in these acts.

Testimony taken in conjunction with other bills this session has indicated to me the strong support on the part of many for modifying further the impact statutes to include larger metropolitan areas presently excluded by virtue of the percentage of impact limitations which are contained in the laws. Further, there appears to be strong support for broadening the definition of Federal impaction, to recognize the Federal interest in other categories of children than than those now presently covered.

For these reasons, it was the feeling among the conferees that we were well advised to accept the solution of the 1-year extension of these statutes.

With respect to title XI of S. 3060, I call to the attention of Senators the paragraph found on page 14 in the section of the conference report containing the statement on the part of the House managers which reads:

> It is the intention of the conferees that the Federal impact funds to be received by the District under Public Law 874 be used by the Board of Education solely for educational purposes, and that they be in addition to the funds made available for education in the District of Columbia budget. It also is the opinion of the conferees that, insofar as is consistent with good educational administration, these funds be used to improve the quality and standards of the educational offerings in the underprivileged attendance areas of the city. The Superintendent of Schools is requested to report to the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and the House Committee on Education and Labor on the ways in which the availability of these funds during the year has improved the educational program for the children in the low-income areas.

The Senate conferees fully endorse and agree to this intent.

Mr. President, S. 3060 is a major statute which fittingly culminates what can only be described as the work of an extraordinarily education-minded Congress. Much attention has been given by the 88th Congress to education and much needed legislation has been placed upon the statute books.

We have not, however, come to grips, as yet, with what I hope will be one of our major concerns in the 89th Congress, the provision of general Federal aid to our public schools. To that goal I repledge and rededicate myself in the years ahead. The work we have done in connection with S. 3060 should not be considered a substitute for what is needed. It is not designed to give specific categorical assistance in meeting specific problems but these additions are necessarily piecemeal. The major job lies yet ahead.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. METCALF. When I served as a Member of the House of Representatives, I was a member of the Committee on Education and Labor. It was my duty and privilege to handle the impacted area program on the floor of the House of Representatives. It was also my privilege to serve on the special committee that handled the National Defense Education Act and to serve on the conference committee that considered that act.

Unfortunately, I am not a member of the Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare of this body.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the junior Senator from Montana permit me to say, however, that we have considered him an ex-officio member of our Subcommittee on Education. As he knows, we have consulted him many times on educational problems, because he is one of the best informed Members of the Senate concerning the educational problems that face the youth of this country.

Mr. METCALF. I thank the Senator from Oregon. I was about to say that I have had a continuing and special interest in this field. I feel that the effective leadership and superb chairmanship of the distinguished Senator from Oregon in the educational field merit the plaudits of all the educators of America.

The Senator from Oregon has achieved in this legislation and in the legislation Congress has passed during the years he has been chairman of the Subcommittee on Education many of the objectives that the late Senator Murray, of Montana, and I tried to achieve in the Murray-Metcalf bill. Many of the benefits for which we fought but failed to achieve in the original National Defense Education Act, including a broadening of the impacted area program, have now been achieved. The boys and girls of America owe much to the senior Senator from Oregon for his effective leadership as chairman of the subcommittee.

I have brought this subject up at this time because the Senator from Oregon is discussing certain compromises that were made with the House. While compromises have been made by both Houses, no compromise on principle has been reached. They were the necessary and effective legislative compromises that all of us must make in order to recognize the legislative positions of those of good will who have different views. But never has the Senator from Oregon, whether as a member of a conference committee or in his position as chairman of the subcommittee, compromised on a basic principle.

As I listen to him discuss this conference report, and look back upon the achievements of the Subcommittee on Education in this Congress, I realize that we have taken long strides forward toward the kind of education that the boys and girls of America are entitled to. Educators owe a great debt to the Senator from Oregon. But, more than that, our talented youth—our boys and girls—who are in unfortunate circumstances and must rely on vocational education and other similar resources owe a great debt to the Senator from Oregon. I compliment him on this great achievement.

Mr. MORSE. I appreciate the compliments of the junior Senator from Montana, and I accept them in behalf of all members of the subcommittee.

The Murray-Metcalf bill did not fail; it merely failed of passage. The Murray-Metcalf bill of some years ago planted the seed. We are only reaping the harvest from that planting, because it takes time in the Senate to pass general welfare legislation. Ordinarily it takes from 8 to 12 years to pass general welfare legislation. Education legislation often takes longer.

It has taken 100 years to try to pass some major legislation at the Federal level. But at least we are working toward the end of making certain that every boy and girl in the United States has an opportunity to develop, to the maximum extent possible, his intellectual potential through the educational process. That is the goal.

The junior Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF] and his predecessor from Montana, Jim Murray, really prepared the seedbed and sowed the seed from which we are now collecting the harvest.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another moment?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. METCALF. The Murray-Metcalf bill may have prepared the seedbed, but it has been the cultivation by the Senator from Oregon and his subcommittee that has made the reaping of the harvest possible.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Montana is very kind. I appreciate his comment.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. I join Senators who are expressing congratulations and commendations to the able senior Senator from Oregon for his handling of not only the National Defense Education Act, but many of the other education legislative programs that have been before us this year.

As has been truly said, the 88th Congress will probably be known as the education Congress. Much of the credit for the accolades which this Congress will receive for the work done on education is deserved by the distinguished Senator from Oregon.

Naturally, we in Florida are deeply concerned about the National Defense Education Act. I do not believe we could get along without it. On behalf of the people of Florida, I join in commending the Senator from Oregon for his able leadership in this field. It will enable the educational level of America to stay at the high standards which it has achieved. Without his leadership, that level could not have been achieved. We are indeed grateful to him. I join all those who are commending him.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Florida; but again, it is the committee and the whole Senate that deserve the credit for the progress that has been made.

The junior Senator from Florida has never failed to provide me with all the assistance I have asked for in trying to have meritorious bills passed by the Senate. He knew how necessary it was to have the Senate set a high standard so that we could come from the conference with a good bill. We have come from conference with a good bill.

While tributes are being paid, I wish to say that the chairman of the conference committee this year, upon my motion, was the Representative from New York, ADAM CLAYTON POWELL. He did a magnificent job of presiding over the conference. His ears and mind were always open to reason. He weighed carefully the proposals that were made. He deserves high credit for our ability to reach a final agreement in conference on the bill now brought before the Senate in the form of the conference report.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, this is an occasion which should be noted in the annals of the Senate.

The distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] has been responsible for more good, educational legislation than anyone, I believe, in the history of the Senate. He has shown his skill not only on the floor in managing the bill and having it reported by his committee, but also by showing his understanding, his tolerance, and his ability to recognize the other man's point of view.

In conference, he has been a stalwart supporter of the position taken so far as the Senate was concerned.

It should be noted that were it not for the extraordinary and effective efforts put forth by the distinguished chairman of the committee, the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], aided and abetted by such outstanding Senators as the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and all the other Senators on that committee, much of this proposed legislation would not have seen the light of day.

I know from personal experience—very personal experience—how difficult the load has been at times for the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

I express to him as majority leader of the Senate my gratitude for the fine work he has done, for the understanding which he has shown, and for the results which he has achieved.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have printed at this point in the RECORD a letter to the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] from the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] under date of October 2, 1964, which covers this subject in part.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE, COMMITTEE ON LABOR
AND PUBLIC WELFARE,
October 2, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR WAYNE: I hope to begin my campaign rather shortly and I want to take this opportunity before I leave to tell you how much I appreciate your public-spirited leadership on National Defense Education Act, S. 3060, and with respect to all of the major education legislation approved by the 88th Congress.

No chairman of the Education Subcommittee has ever compiled a comparable record.

If everything goes well this November I shall be working with you again next year, and I certainly look forward to it.

Please express to Charlie Lee my gratitude for his very able cooperation and counsel.

With kindest personal regards, I am,
Sincerely,
WINSTON L. PROUTY.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I again commend and congratulate the distinguished Senator from Oregon—one of the most effective Members of this body—for the fine work he has done down through the years in the field of educational legislation, among others.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am deeply moved by what the majority leader said. I am about to read the conclusion of my statement, in which I refer to the Senator from Montana.

My committee could not have accomplished the results it did, had we not at all times had the cooperation of the majority leader, the majority whip, the minority leader, and the minority whip in the Senate. We have been able to do this because we have had an understanding and cooperative leadership.

I am particularly indebted to the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] for his never failing willingness to cooperate with me in the presentation of bills at the time when it was most auspicious to present them with the goal of passage in mind.

I thank the majority leader very much. I am tempted, in view of the kind remarks that the Senator from Montana, the Senator from Vermont, and others have made, to extract some of these statements for future reference, and for the political education of the people of my State. I want Senators to know that I appreciate their generosity very much.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

EDUCATION NEEDS OF WEST VIRGINIA AND THE NATION ADVANCED BY PASSAGE OF THE NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1964—SENATOR MORSE LAUDED FOR LEADERSHIP

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, after careful consideration in both Houses of Congress, and lengthy meetings between conferees, the National Defense Education Act Amendments of 1964 have been returned to the Senate for final action.

As a member of the Education Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and as one of the Senate conferees, it has been my responsibility to participate carefully in the development of this vital legislation. In my belief this measure represents a meaningful move forward in our Nation's drive toward increased educational opportunity for all our citizens. It embodies the expansion and improvement of a program which is already proven in effectiveness.

I wholeheartedly congratulate and commend my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] for his energetic and efficient management of this bill. As the diligent and dedicated chairman of the Education Subcommittee, he has labored long, and I am confident that his efforts are being recognized by all Americans who are concerned with the future of our land and the well-being of its younger citizens.

Should the National Defense Education Act Amendments of 1964 achieve final congressional approval today—and I believe they will—important assistance would be made available to citizens and educational institutions in West Virginia and the Appalachian region. Here, where education must become the means for individual and economic reclamation, this measure will be especially significant.

For example, the conference report which we consider carries legislative authorizations which would allocate to West Virginia an estimated $6,345,773 under the student loan provisions of title II. This total would be applied over a 4-year period beginning in fiscal 1965.

Under the provisions of title III, funds will be made available to public and nonpublic schools for the acquisition of equipment for the teaching of science, mathematics, modern foreign languages, and other critical subjects. These legislative authorizations include financial aid for State administration and supervision, and would total nearly $5 million during the next 4 fiscal years.

Guidance, counseling and testing are educational services which are recognized as being especially vital in West Virginia. Under title V of the National Defense Education Act Amendments of 1964, the State would be authorized an estimated $1.1 million to improve and expand these functions.

It is evident, then, that under these three titles alone the National Defense Education Act Amendments of 1964 would be worth an estimated $12.4 million to West Virginia during the next 4 fiscal years.

Mr. President, I am confident that when signed into law by the President, this measure will have far-reaching effect in raising educational standards and broadening educational opportunity in all parts of our Nation. Education is the key to America's future and ultimately, our strongest weapon in the continuing struggle for the freedom and dignity of man. I support without reservation the conference report which is before us, and earnestly urge speedy Senate passage of the National Defense Education Act Amendments of 1964.

Mr. President, I particularly desire to call attention to the matter of the reading provisions which have been emphasized by the diligence of the chairman of the Subcommittee on Education of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. The Senator has been most gracious in referring to my interest in the subject matter, not only in the subcommittee and the committee, but also, and especially, in the conference committee. Merited recognition has also been given to the Senator from Vermont for his intense interest in this subject.

In West Virginia, as was set forth so cogently in a communication from the executive secretary of the West Virginia Education Association, Phares E. Reeder, we need teachers who are proficient and skilled in the teaching of reading to the boys and girls in our State.

A thoughtful and lucidly written letter from Mr. Reeder was especially helpful to the conferees in highlighting aspects of this problem as it exists in West Virginia, and in other States. I request unanimous consent that Mr. Reeder's letter of September 22, addressed to me, be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

SEPTEMBER 22, 1964.

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR RANDOLPH: In the 21 years that I have served as executive secretary of the West Virginia Education Association, I have been vitally concerned with the problem of school dropouts. I believe that our State was about the first in the Nation to make a study of this problem. That was conducted in the late 1940's and has been continued since then. Now this matter has become a major national concern.

As a result of these years of study in relation to the dropout problem, I am convinced that one of the major causes contributing to dropouts is the inability to read. I have discussed this inability to read with hundreds of primary teachers. The conclusion one must draw from this discussion is that at least one-fourth of all boys and girls who enter school will have acute reading problems. It is our belief that the greatest single need in the way of preventiveness lies in the training of special reading teachers who can give adequate time and teaching skill to these boys and girls who are destined to be school dropouts.

This brings me to the purpose of this letter directed to you. It is my understanding that you are a member of the Senate Conference Committee on the National Defense Education Act as carried in S. 3060. As I understand it, the Senate version of Title III expansion adds to mathematics, science, and modern foreign language the subject areas of English, history, geography, and civics. The House version appears to add only reading and English taught as a second language. I would hope that the word reading could be included in the Senate version and the conference committee prevailed upon to accept title III as proposed by S. 3060.

I already have set forth the reason for the inclusion of reading. I would hope that the language of the bill would be of such nature that select elementary teachers could be given assistance for developing themselves into special teachers of reading.

The further extension of title III to include English, history, geography, and civics seems to me to be most vital. Few people are aware of the fact that in our own State the public elementary and secondary schools have responsibility for the total education of more than 85 percent of its children and youth. In other words, fewer than 15 percent enter college. You see, Senator, we have for too long based college entrance upon those who are graduated from high school—being totally unmindful of the great numbers that drop out of school before the completion of high school.

I am convinced that the true defense of America is an internal one. The National Defense Education Act has only begun to get at the very heart of it. If we do not strike and strike hard at these educational deficiencies of our children and youth, we all shall stand guilty of the consequences of the future. A nation can be no stronger than the educational level of its people—an education steeped in the heritage and the moral and spiritual values that have made this country of ours so great.

Extending to you my best personal wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

PHARES E. REEDER,
Executive Secretary.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, remedial reading is important, but there is also a basic reading which we need. What the conference has done in the report—which I am sure will be approved within minutes in the Senate under the leadership of the senior Senator from Oregon—is broad enough. Its scope is sufficient. Its recognition of need is brought to the surface through the use of the word "reading," which covers both basic and remedial reading. I think this was an extremely important contribution of the conferees.

This legislation represents not a handout, but a hand of compassion and understanding extended to citizens of West Virginia and other States. If it is not inappropriate I wish to paraphrase a poem of Ella Wheeler Wilcox. In that poem, she had spoken of the beggar who came and asked for money. It was given to him. Later the beggar returned. The money had been spent, but he was still cold and hungry. Then, a thought was given to that beggar. And, because of the thought, not the gift, he was given the inspiration to succeed in life.

I paraphrase that poem in these words:

> Our country gave to a citizen from its store. He spent the shining ore, and came again and yet again, still needy, as before. We gave a thought, and from that thought he found himself—supreme, divine, better educated, and crowned with blessings manifold. He is poor no more.

That is what the senior Senator from Oregon has done, not in the past few days, weeks, or months, but through the years. He has given of himself in this type of legislation which deals, not with the exploitation of natural resources, but with the conservation and advancement of human resources. I commend him.

I do not wish to indulge in superlatives. It is not necessary. The Senator has indicated that he might make a compilation of the expressions today by Members of the Senate. I feel that not only the citizens of Oregon, but also the citizens of the country recognize the achievements of the Senator. They will not forget the record which the senior Senator from Oregon has been writing for so many fruitful years, especially in the field of education.

To say that the Senator from Oregon is articulate is not enough. His words are clothed with meaning. It is not enough to say that the Senator from Oregon is astute. This is true. But his astuteness brings the leadership which is necessary to conciliate the differences in the approaches to basic legislation such as we are considering today.

It is not even enough for me to say that every Senator is knowledgeable about these matters. This is important because his knowledge causes him to be understanding. How necessary that is, as we think in terms of educational programs.

I remember the recent conference. The Senator from Oregon was constructive in compromise. But he was firm in conviction. He never failed to reflect the thinking of the Senate; and all Senators on both sides of the aisle are appreciative of that fact.

Mr. President, I received a long distance telephone call from the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], who is unavoidably absent today. He is a valued member of the Subcommittee on Education. He wanted to have a part in what was said in commendation of the Senator from Oregon. He asked me to express for him his gratitude for having worked with this subcommittee on this important legislation, but he also wanted to be recorded as one of those who recognized and applauded the continuing service of the Senator from Oregon in the field of education.

I believe that all Senators could in essence join in these words of praise.

We are most grateful. I am very conscious of the privilege which has been accorded me to stand for, with, and perhaps even behind the Senator from Oregon as he has moved the educational programs of this country forward. To have served with him has been a privilege that I shall always cherish.

Mr. MORSE. I say to the Senator from West Virginia, in all humility, that once more I am his beneficiary, greatly enriched by his expression of confidence. But I repeat that we did whatever was done in the bill together, and I think this is a fitting time to say to him and to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] that their insistence on the institute authorizations in the bill, so that we have a very broad institute authorization, will make it possible for many teachers in this country, particularly of both English and reading, to take refresher courses and be brought up to date on the latest techniques that have been developed for the handling of reading problem cases in the schools. The knowledge that the Senator from Virginia and the Senator from Vermont have in regard to this problem is one of the greatest contributions to the bill.

The Senator will remember that there was an attempt to get us to weaken the institute program. That is what I meant when I said earlier in my speech that the Senator from West Virginia has that great ability to sit patiently and respectfully until he hears all sides, and then he makes it very clear that he will not go along, unless the committee is willing to follow where the facts lead. The facts made very clear that the institute programs should be supported. The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] are more responsible than any of the rest of us for getting the institute section in its broad scope into the bill.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The 88th Congress has been one of the greatest Congresses we have ever had. That statement is true certainly in the field of rights, in the field of economics, and in the field of peace. The achievements of this Congress in those fields have been outstanding in American history.

But nowhere have our achievements been more sharp, clear, or obvious than in what I believe must be this most important domestic concern of our Nation. That is in the field of education.

Today the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] is once again shepherding a great education measure on the floor of the Senate—the conference report on the National Defense Education Act.

The conference report, which is excellent in every respect, provides for an extension, an expansion, and an improvement of the National Defense Education Act.

The distinguished Senator from Oregon is a most unusual Senator. I am sure all of us would have to agree that if we were to select any Senator out of the 100 Senators for unusual qualities, we would select the Senator from Oregon perhaps as No. 1. He is unusual because he is superlatively able. I do not know of any man more able than the Senator from Oregon. He is highly articulate, he is very persuasive, and has infinite charm.

At the same time, all of us at one time or another have vigorously disagreed with the Senator from Oregon. As one who has been in a number of liberal fights on the side of the Senator from Oregon, I say that even when we are working together the Senator from Oregon is not the easiest colleague with whom to work. But that is because he is an independent soul, because he has deep convictions, and because he knows when he should not and must not compromise.

At the same time, I do not believe there is a more effective legislative artisan in the Senate than the Senator from Oregon. The reason that the 88th Congress is perhaps the greatest educational Congress in history—certainly, the greatest in 100 years—is not an accident. It is not because the time has come for educational legislation. It is because there is in the Senate a man who is deeply dedicated to education, a man of extraordinary ability, and a man who has been able to produce again and again. The schoolchildren of America, the teachers of America, and the parents of America should be grateful for WAYNE MORSE. They do not have a better friend in the U.S. Senate or a man who has done more for them.

So far as the strength of our country is concerned, our strength depends more than anything else upon the intelligence, the skill, and the ability of the American people. That is our fundamental resource; and the Senator from Oregon has done a magnificent job in contributing to the future strength of America. No man has done more.

Mr. MORSE. My friend from Wisconsin is overly generous. I assure him that on rare occasions when I disagree with my colleagues my attitude is impersonal and highly professional. It has been a great pleasure to stand shoulder to shoulder with the Senator from Wisconsin on many sound liberal causes in this body, because he and I both have sought to carry out what we recognize as our primary obligation—to find out what the facts are and to test them against the question, "Do they support the public interest?" and then vote accordingly. That is our primary obligation.

I say from this desk to the people of Wisconsin today that that is the kind of Senator they have in the United States Senate in the person of Senator William Proxmire. It has been my privilege to count myself as one of his close colleagues in the Senate.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. BIBLE. I would not wish to permit this opportunity to go by without paying my respects and commendation to the senior Senator from Oregon for the landmark work that he has done in this particular field. I recognize him as a leader in many fields, but in the field of education he is probably the foremost leader. I salute him for a task well done.

I wish to comment on one particular phase of the bill which I know from firsthand knowledge is the brainchild of the Senator from Oregon. For the first time there has been written into proposed legislation a provision which would make the impacted provisions of the general law applicable to the District of Columbia. Four or five years ago the Senator from Oregon first stood on the floor of the Senate and made that point very clearly, succinctly, and correctly. I am happy to see that finally that idea has been recognized by the Congress as a whole. As a result the District of Columbia will receive approximately $5 million a year as its share from the impacted area provisions of the general law. As the Senator so correctly pointed out some years ago, there was never any real reason why the District of Columbia should not be considered in exactly the same light as are our 50 States.

For his work in relation to that one item, as well as all items in the bill, I salute the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Senator from Nevada has spoken about leadership. He is my leader. The Senator from Nevada [Mr. Bible] is chairman of the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia of which I have the privilege of being a member. He and I have stood together on the District of Columbia Committee seeking to obtain recognition for the District of Columbia in connection with impacted area benefits. As the Senator from Nevada has pointed out, there has been no logical reason for not including the District of Columbia these many years. We are squeezed between Maryland and Virginia, both States being the beneficiaries of millions of dollars of grants under the impacted areas legislation. We all know that in the District of Columbia there are some schools that particularly need the aid. I have brought out earlier in my statement that we have a commitment from the school authorities in the District that the money will be spent in the poorer schools in the District where it is most sorely needed. It appears that schools in such areas will receive the benefit annually of approximately $4.5 million to $5 million.

But again I say that no one Senator did it alone. I had the support of the District of Columbia Committee, and its able chairman, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. Bible]. I had the support of many Senators on the Education Subcommittee, most of whom either now serve, or have served, on the Senate District Committee. Senator Randolph, as I recall, served, when in the other body, as chairman of the House District Committee.

We happen to be the vehicle for the deliverance of the impacted area legislation. I am very proud that we have righted a wrong, that had existed for too long a time, through this conference report.

Mr. President, once again I wish to express my thanks to my colleagues who have stood shoulder to shoulder with me in this session in working the will of the Senate on educational legislation. On behalf of the Education Subcommittee, I express to our majority leader and to our assistant majority leader our deep thanks for the way in which they have, at every opportunity, smoothed our legislative path and strongly supported the goals of our legislation.

I particularly thank the Senator from Montana [Mr. Mansfield], the majority leader, for his never failing cooperation with our committee for scheduling legislation at the most auspicious times as recommended by the committee.

We are indebted to them and to the many Senators on both sides of the aisle who have supported the position of the committee.

We are grateful, too, for the leadership of the administration from the President, and from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, through every echelon of the Office of Education. I thank them for the counsel and advice we have received. The strong case that has been made for this bill and for the others could not have been made without the factual evidence and policy decisions which were taken downtown. Secretary Celebrezze and Assistant Secretary Wilbur Cohen were always available when they were needed.

As chairman of the subcommittee, I conducted what I jocularly referred to as seminars. I would ask members from the executive departments to attend our seminars as "students." I would assign to them what I called term papers when we called for research into particular subjects. The work would be assigned to them or to their assistants, who would submit reports.

Upon Commissioner Keppel and his staff associates, Dr. Peter Muirhead, and Dr. Samuel Halperin, fell, of course, the burden of providing us with the detailed informational materials which were consistently sought and invariably procured. On behalf of the committee I thank them and ask them to express to each of the departments and divisions of the Office of Education our appreciation for their magnificent and efficient provision of the logical case which was built in support of the legislation.

I wish also to express my deep appreciation, as I have on many other occasions, to the staff members attached to minority on the committee and to the minority staff members of senatorial offices who were unfailingly cooperative.

Mr. Mike Bernstein, minority counsel, and his associates, Mr. John Stringer and Mr. Ray Hurley, while he was with the committee, although fully fulfilling their obligations to the minority were also, on the noncontroversial items, of tremendous help to the majority staff. Mr. Tom Hayes, administrative assistant to Senator Prouty, Mr. Alan Lesser, executive assistant to Senator Javits, and Mr. Norman Halliday, legislative assistant to Senator Jordan, all were most helpful and cooperative in their relationships with the committee staff on this bill.

I do not hesitate to acknowledge my personal indebtedness, upon occasion, for the advice given in response to my requests by Mike Bernstein.

I feel sure also that the subcommittee would wish me to express my appreciation to the majority staff members on the committee, and in particular to our committee counsel, who sits to my right at this moment, who has with deft diligence taken much of the burden from our shoulders in the marshaling of the evidence. I am personally indebted to Jack Forsythe, Charles Lee, who stands at the wall at present, and their associates for their fine staff work on all our educational legislation.

They are, in truth, the brain trust of the chairman of the committee and the members of the subcommittee.

I wish also to thank the girls of the committee office who worked long and hard throughout the course of this Congress in the preparation of our evidence.

I am very appreciative of the help given the subcommittee by Mr. Bob Perrin, Senator McNamara's administrative assistant, Mr. Dick Yarborough, legislative assistant to Senator Yarborough, the legislative assistant to Senator Clark, Mr. Ralph Widner, and by Mr. Dick Royce, who is associated with Senator Randolph.

Mr. President, this completes my presentation. I yield the floor, and I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in my remarks as attachment A, a summary and table relating to the conference bill.

There being no objection, the summary and table were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Attachment A

National Defense Education Act Amendments (S. 3060)

Amendments agreed upon by Senate-House conferees, September 24, 1964.

CONFERENCE REPORT

Three-year extension of entire act.

Title I—General provisions

After reference to imbalances in our educational programs omits the language: "which have led to an insufficient proportion of our population educated in science, mathematics, and modern foreign languages and trained in technology."

Title II—Student loans

Increases authorization to $163.3 million in fiscal year 1965 from present $135 million, $179.3 million in 1966, $190 million in 1967, and $195 million in 1968.

Removes annual institutional ceiling of $800,000.

Extends loan program to accredited postsecondary business schools and technical institutions, public and nonprofit private.

Defines eligible institutions of higher education to make specific reference to public and other nonprofit collegiate and associate degree schools of nursing.

Eliminates special consideration provision for prospective elementary school teachers and for students with superior background in science, mathematics, engineering, and language. Replaces with provision giving priority for the granting of loans to students with "superior academic background."

Increases yearly limit on loans to graduate and professional students from $1,000 to $2,500; increases aggregate limit for such students from $5,000 to $10,000.

Authorizes institutions to extend moratorium on loan repayments (but not on accrual of interest) to part-time students.

Extends "forgiveness" to teachers in nonprofit private elementary and secondary schools and institutions of higher education.

Allows part-time students carrying at least a one-half academic workload to receive loans.

Title III—Financial assistance for strengthening instruction in science, mathematics, modern foreign languages, and other critical subjects

Expands the program for equipment acquisition and State supervision by adding English, reading, history, geography, civics; increases authorization from present $70 million annually to $90 million for acquisition of equipment; from present $5 million annually to $10 million for State supervision and administration.

Provides for promulgation of allotment ratio biennially, and increases the minimum yearly allotment to each State to $50,000.

Authorizes schools to use equipment for other subjects "if there exists a critical need therefor."

Provides for the computation of the rate of interest on loans to nonprofit private schools for each fiscal year rather than for each month.

Title IV—National defense fellowships

Increases maximum number of fellowships to 3,000 in fiscal year 1965; 6,000 in 1966; 7,500 in 1967; and 7,500 in 1968. In fiscal year 1965, one-half of the fellowships, and not less than one-third of the fellowships in fiscal years 1966, 1967, and 1968 must be in "new or expanded" study programs.

In determining number of fellowships to be awarded for study at any one institution, Commissioner must consider national and regional need for facilities.

Limits award to include any person studying for a Ph. D. and intending to teach, or continue to teach, in an institution of higher education.

No awards for study at a "school or department or divinity."

Adjusts fellowship stipends for full calendar year of study and permits awards for any 3 years of graduate study.

Title V—Guidance, counseling, and testing

Increase authorizations to $24 million in fiscal year 1965 from present $17.5 million; $24.5 million in 1966; $30 million in 1967; and $30 million in 1968.

Extends program to all elementary grades, public junior colleges, and public technical institutes.

Authorizes guidance and counseling institutes at not less than the present level of $7.25 million. These institutes are for counseling and guidance personnel in elementary or secondary schools, or in institutions of higher education (including junior colleges and technical institutes). Stipends may be paid to all who attend institutes.

Title VI—Language development

Increases authorization for language development program (VI–A) to $13 million in fiscal year 1965 from present $8 million; $14 million in 1966; $16 million in 1967; and $18 million in 1968.

Modern language institutes (see title XI).

Title X—Administration and improvement of State statistical services

Requires State agency to keep records and afford access thereto.

Requires accounting procedures to assure proper disbursement of Federal funds, "including such funds paid by the State to the local educational agencies."

Title XI—Training institutes

Authorizes $32.75 million each for fiscal years 1965–68 for institutes for teachers or supervisors (or student teachers or supervisors) of modern foreign language, reading, history, geography, English, disadvantaged youth, school library personnel, educational media specialists.

Stipends may be paid to all who attend institutes.

Federally affected areas

Extends the federally impacted areas legislation (Public Laws 815, 874) for 1 year and directs a study of the effects of these laws. Includes District of Columbia in this program.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—OFFICE OF EDUCATION

National Defense Education Amendments, 1964

	1965	1966	1967	1968	1969
NEW OBLIGATIONAL AUTHORITY					
Title I—Amendments to National Defense Education Act of 1958:					
Title II—Student loans	$10,300,000	$120,900,000	$191,900,000	$195,000,000	$101,000,000
Title III—Science, mathematics, modern foreign languages, and other critical subjects	10,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	
Title IV—Graduate fellowships	9,950,000	44,698,500	87,973,000	123,937,500	91,312,500
Title V—Guidance, counseling, and testing:					
Grants to States	3,000,000	24,500,000	30,000,000	30,000,000	
Institutes for counseling personnel		7,250,000	7,250,000	7,250,000	
Title VI—Language development	5,000,000	14,000,000	16,000,000	18,000,000	
Title VII—Educational media research		5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	
Title X—State statistical services		2,750,000	2,750,000	2,750,000	
Title XI—Institutes for critical subjects	22,750,000	32,750,000	32,750,000	32,750,000	
Title II—School assistance in federally affected areas:					
Public Law 815		38,410,000			
Public Law 874	5,000,000	241,145,000			
Subtotal	66,000,000	631,403,500	473,623,000	514,687,500	192,312,500
Administrative expenses:					
Personnel compensation	454,440	840,000	885,000	885,000	477,000
Other	545,560	711,000	750,000	750,000	403,000
Subtotal	1,000,000	1,551,000	1,635,000	1,635,000	880.000
Total new obligational authority	67,000,000	632,954,500	475,258,000	516,322,500	193,192,500
EXPENDITURES					
National Defense Education Act:					
Title II—Student loans	10,300,000	120,900,000	191,900,000	195,000,000	101,000,000
Title III—Science, mathematics, modern foreign languages, and other critical subjects	10,000,000	97,840,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	2,160,000
Title IV—Graduate fellowships		9,950,000	44,698,500	87,973,000	123,937,500
Title V—Guidance, counseling, and testing:					
Grants to States	3,000,000	24,500,000	30,000,000	30,000,000	
Institutes for counseling personnel		2,175,000	7,250,000	7,250,000	5,075,000
Title VI—Language development	800,000	6,440,000	14,320,000	16,320,000	15,120,000
Title VII—Educational media research		1,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	4,000,000
Title X—State statistical services		2,750,000	2,750,000	2,750,000	
Title XI—Institutes for critical subjects	13,650,000	28,750,000	32,750,000	32,750,000	13,100,000
School assistance in federally affected areas:					
Public Law 815		1,921,000	23,046,000	9,602,000	3,841,000
Public Law 874	3,350,000	163,217,000	79,578,000		
Subtotal	41,100,000	459,443,000	531,292,500	486,645,000	268,233,500
Administrative expenses	920,000	1,507,000	1,628,000	1,635,000	941,000
Total expenditures	42,020,000	460,950,000	532,920,500	488,280,000	269,174,500
Number of positions	85	135	135	135	80
Man-years of employment	54	122	131	131	80

Mr. HART. Mr. President, before the Senator yields the floor, may I briefly express some thoughts?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. HART. I have listened to the expressions of appreciation and praise voiced about the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse] by others of my colleagues here. I share in each of those expressions. Some were couched in language I would not be able to master if I had time carefully to write it. But the main thought which underlies the feelings of each of us, I believe, is that Senator Morse, more than any other Member of this body, bears the responsibility for developing legislation which serves the most precious asset which this country possesses. It is its children and its young men and young women.

If America is to succeed in this now very tiny world, it requires the maximum development of the potentials of our young men and young women. If we succeed in this effort, history will find, I think, that we have succeeded as a people because of that. If we fail, history may note the United States as a nation which occupied the center of the stage, as some other nations have, but then became, as other once-leading nations, a footnote in history.

So I think there is no greater responsibility borne by the Senate than that borne by the chairman of the Education Committee. This conference report is a dramatic demonstration of the effectiveness with which he carries that responsibility and the leadership he gives us.

This conference report reflects, if I may be very practical about it, the shrewdness, the astuteness, of the Senator from Oregon as a bargainer.

We ought to look at the figures authorized by the Senate version for the purpose of education and its broad ramifications, then at the figures the House proposed, and then at the figures which the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse] brings before us in the conference report. Rounding out the dollars, we find that the Senator's version proposed the amount of $1,870,000,000. The House version would have limited the figure to $1,180,000,000. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse] presents a conference bill which authorizes $1,800 million.

This is one little rule of thumb by which the people of America may measure the effectiveness of the Senator from Oregon.

I am delighted, of course, to see the substantial sums that will be coming to Michigan under titles 2 and 3. Beyond that, I am grateful that the cause which the Senator from Oregon has undertaken and advocated for some years has been brought closer to fruition. For example, loan forgiveness and institute stipends are now available to teachers in nonpublic as well as public institutions.

I could continue by citing other improvements in the bill, but I want to sum up simply by saying that I am the father of eight children, and I know the excellence of their educational opportunity will be measured in part by what we in the Congress do. Nothing America undertakes, including the race to the moon, has a priority greater than our responsibility for provision for the intellectual and physical welfare of the young men and women of our country who will be coming into adult leadership a few years from now.

Finally, I am glad that we have included all the disciplines, and not merely the mathematicians and linguists, and scientists, because if the mathematicians and scientists develop still more awesome weapons, it requires a citizenry with a balanced sense of history to decide and insure that they shall be prudently used or controlled.

So we come to the close of the session with no more dramatic demonstration of carrying out that responsibility than the proposal which the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse] has before the Senate. I thank him for another significant contribution to America and its people.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I respond by saying first to the people of Michigan that their two Senators have always given complete cooperation to my Subcommittee on Education bills.

They recognize that the greatest resource we have is our youth. Unless we develop to the maximum extent possible the brainpower of our country, we cannot keep ahead of Russia. If we cannot keep ahead of Russia in manpower, we had better see to it that we keep ahead of her in brainpower.

The two Senators from Michigan have recognized the importance of that fact, and they have worked with me with great cooperation throughout the years that they have served in the Senate.

The senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNamara] is necessarily absent at this moment. I wish the junior Senator from Michigan to know that, as a member of the subcommittee and one of the conferees on the bill, the senior Senator from Michigan has been of great assistance in bringing forth a bill which, from the standpoint of meeting some of the needs of education of our country, is the strongest bill that we have ever brought to the floor of the Senate.

Mr. President, the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. Yarborough], who participated extensively in the hearings committee consideration, and who was a stalwart source of strength to me in the conference committee actions which have produced this extension of the National Defense Education Act and the impacted areas school aid, is necessarily absent today.

As I earlier indicated I greatly appreciate his contributions to the successful passage of this bill through the Congress, and I ask unanimous consent that a statement he intended to deliver today be inserted at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR YARBOROUGH

We Americans are children of that phase of intellectual history known as the Enlightenment, a golden age in which men came to believe that a better life was possible through the use of reason and education. The 88th Congress has reaffirmed America's trust in the values of its ancient heritage, by the advances which have been made here in the name of education. This Congress has already passed the Vocational Education Act of 1963, the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act of 1963, the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1963, the Nurse Training Act of 1964, the Library Services and Construction Act of 1964, and the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. Soon we shall take final action on the last of the major education bills of the 88th Congress, the 1964 amendments to the National Defense Education Act and impacted areas legislation.

I should like to pay tribute to my chairman on the Education Subcommittee, the senior Senator from Oregon, Mr. Morse. His knowledge of the educational need of this Nation is unsurpassed. His vigor in pressing the fight for better education is unmatched. Truly no man has done more for American education than has Wayne Morse.

The conference report on the National Defense Education Act extension bears witness to the negotiating skill of our chairman. I believe it is fair to say that the final version is very favorable to the Senate position. The program of loans and matching grants to schools for the purchase of equipment was broadened to include materials for the teaching of English, reading, history, geography, and civics. The institutes for the advanced training of teachers were expanded to include teachers of English, history, and geography. School librarians, education media specialists, and teachers of handicapped children were also added. The authorization for loans for college students was increased by steps to $195 million in 1968. The number of graduate followships was increased by steps to 7,500 in 1967 and 1968.

Aid for education can be justified from many levels—from National, State, and local governments, from foundations, from labor and business, and from individuals. As an elected official from my State, I have worked at the Federal level for programs to aid Texas education. In 1963 the programs authorized by the National Defense Education Act contributed $9.7 million to Texas education. In that same year the Office of Education spent a total of $29.4 million on all its educational programs in Texas. Estimated figures for 1964 are $11.9 million under the National Defense Education Act and $51.4 million for all programs administered by the Office of Education.

I am hopeful that the achievements of the 88th Congress, the "education Congress," will point out the need for devoting more resources to the improvement of education in this country. For although the Federal Government has taken the lead, it cannot and should not bear the burden alone. I look to the future with confidence that the challenge thrown down by the Education Congress will be accepted across the land and that a new era for the cause of education will have come into being these past 2 years.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, S. 3060, the National Defense Education Act amendments bill is a forward-looking measure of considerable significance to Vermont and the Nation.

Vermont's current allotment for student loan money is about $466,000. The bill would raise this allotment gradually over a four fiscal year period to $673,000.

Nonpublic schools in Vermont are currently eligible to receive loans for equipment in the amount of $24,291. This figure will go up to $31,232 for this fiscal year and for each of the following 3 years.

Grants to Vermont for supervisory purposes will go from the present $20,000 to $50,000 annually.

Moreover, Vermont which is now eligible for an allotment of $50,000 for guidance, counseling, and testing will see that allotment gradually increased to $62,652 annually.

On two occasions, the Senate has approved my bill to extend loan forgiveness to teachers in nonprofit, private, and elementary secondary schools, and institutions of higher education. Each time the House failed to act on this measure. However, the loan cancellation provision was inserted in S. 3060 and now anyone who borrows from National Defense Education Act loan funds can get up to 50 percent of his loan canceled if he later teaches at a school or college—whether public or private.

Also embodied in S. 3060 is the language of the Keating-Prouty bill which would allow private schoolteachers to receive the same stipends as public schoolteachers receive when they attend National Defense Education Act institutes.

Recognizing the fact that present law should be broadened, the Labor and Public Welfare Committee is proud to report that our schools may soon purchase, by reason of this pending legislation, teaching equipment for English, reading, history, geography, and civics. In the past, equipment purchases could be made with Federal assistance only in the fields of science, foreign languages, and mathematics.

We have a good bill here—one which will tend to encourage a balanced emphasis on all subject matter. The bill is very necessary because there has been a danger that too much stress might be put on the sciences to the detriment of other areas of study.

In the Senate this has been a bipartisan bill. It was drafted with care and will improve our educational system without an iota of Federal control.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point the estimated authorizations for the State of Vermont under amendments to the National Defense Education Act.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Estimated authorizations for the State of Vermont under amendments to the National Defense Education Act (conference version)

	Current allotment, fiscal year 1965	Authorization			
		1965	1966	1967	1968
Title II student loans	$466,044	$563,741	$618,975	$655,914	$673,175
Title III instructional assistance grants to States for acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling:					
Loans for nonpublic schools	24,291	31,232	31,232	31,232	31,232
Grants for public schools	157,984	203,123	203,123	203,123	203,123
Grants to States for supervision	20,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Grants for guidance, counseling, and testing	50,000	50,074	51,124	62,652	62,652

Mr. PROUTY. Again, Mr. President, I congratulate the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon, and, indeed, all the members of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, and I express my heartfelt thanks to Mr. Charles Lee, Mr. Mike Bernstein, and Mr. Jack Forsythe, whose counsel proved to be invaluable.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I compliment the distinguished Senator from Vermont on the statement he has made. I congratulate him personally for the fine work he has done as the ranking minority member of the subcommittee handling educational matters. Down through the years he has been a stalwart in this field. His contributions have been great, and his understanding of the needs in this particular area have always been to the point, and always nonpartisan.

In addition to what I have had to say about the distinguished ranking minority member of the committee, I feel credit should go also to the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], who is on the floor, and who contributed so much to this accomplishment; also to the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], and the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL].

In addition to the distinguished Senator from Vermont, who now has the floor, I think we also want to recognize the fact that the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] has made many worthwhile contributions, as has also the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], who participated in these meetings and although on occasions he disagreed, he nevertheless did make many contributions.

Finally I believe the committee as a whole is entitled to the thanks of the Congress and the Nation.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I am grateful to the distinguished majority leader for his generous remarks concerning me and other members of the committee. I agree wholeheartedly that every member who served on the Education Subcommittee and on the full committee have participated to a great degree in the interest of a better educational system in this country.

I share the majority leader's view that all members of the subcommittee and the full committee are entitled to a great deal of praise from those who are really interested in and concerned with one of the major problems which we must face as a nation, namely, adequate education for our boys and girls, if we are to maintain the freedoms and the type of government which we have now, and our position in the world tomorrow. I am very grateful to the distinguished majority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. JAVITS. If the Senator from Oregon will help me at the moment—I gather that Senators are discussing the NDEA conference report.

Mr. MORSE. I have explained the conference report. As I said before the Senator entered the Chamber, I am greatly indebted, as is the entire committee, to the Senator from New York for the cooperation and leadership he extended to us in bringing about what I think is one of the major bills on education that this Congress has considered in many decades.

Mr. JAVITS. I believe this Congress will go down as the "Education Congress." We owe a great debt of gratitude to the senior Senator from Oregon. On many matters he often finds himself challenged by a majority of the Senate, as I do, too.

When it comes to education, however, I think he has shown such a delicacy of leadership in terms of exactly what could and could not be done that the whole country should be grateful to him.

This achievement, which has often been effectuated by him, notwithstanding his own deeply held convictions on many occasions to the contrary, because of the vast requirements of American education, makes the adoption of the report a sort of summing up of the accomplishments of this Congress in this field. It should be deeply gratifying to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from New York has stood in my position, a comparable position, so many times that he knows how appreciative I am of those kind words. I want the Senator from New York to know how much I appreciate his strong leadership in the field of education—and on all other fields in the Senate, for that matter. The Senate would not be the great body it is, and that we agree it is, without the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. I feel exactly that way about the Senator from Oregon.

One of the most signal achievements of the bill is to enlarge the horizon of the particular educational disciplines which relate to the national defense, more nearly an approach as to what they really should do, than what they have been under the National Defense Education Act up to now. I consider the addition of history, geography, and civics, along with English and reading, to be at long last an adult recognition of what it means to arm people with education for their own security and their own defense.

I am sure the Senate will approve the conference report; I am delighted that the House has approved it. As the days go by, every person who is being educated in this country, and the parents and friends of those people, as well as the citizens of America, should realize what a monumental achievement and how constructive is this particular bill that we are approving today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, the action of the Senate today in adopting the conference report on the national defense education bill is a further tribute to the effective work of Senator WAYNE MORSE.

As chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Education, the distinguished Senator from Oregon has earned the deep gratitude of all those who are interested in advancing American education.

Many have called the 88th Congress the "Education Congress" because of the many pieces of legislation adopted which have helped to strengthen education.

Certainly this description would not have been possible without the tireless and dedicated efforts of Senator MORSE.

It has been a pleasant and rewarding experience for me to serve with WAYNE MORSE on the Education Subcommittee. I look forward to continuing our efforts in the 89th Congress.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McNAMARA. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I have already, in the absence of the Senator from Michigan, expressed my great appreciation to him, as a member of the Subcommittee on Education, for making the bill possible.

His generosity is very much appreciated. But I repeat that I did not do anything. We all did it together.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from Michigan with respect to the field of education. I only regret that it does not carry over to the field of foreign relations and appropriations for foreign aid.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, while I truly thank the Senator for his comments on education legislation, I hope eventually, as an educator, to educate the former president of the University of Arkansas in the field of foreign relations.

FAILURE OF PASSAGE OF INCREASED SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS BILL AT THIS SESSION

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, it is common knowledge that intervention by the White House with Congress is responsible for killing the bill which would have given from $5 to $7 per month increase to those living on social security pensions.

Apparently the decision has been made by the White House that unless Congress would approve the administration's medicare program the bill providing for these increases in social security benefits was to be pigeonholed.

This decision displays a callous disregard for the plight of the millions of our aged who have been looking forward to this increase in their social security checks to meet their rising living costs.

For the past several weeks administration rubberstamp supporters have been shedding their crocodile tears in an effort to display their great concern for the plight of our elderly citizens.

Yesterday it had appeared that the conferees would be able to agree and approve the increased social security benefits effective immediately and then let the question of medicare go over for the determination of the next Congress. But yesterday morning when the conferees met we were presented with an entirely new 215-page bill which we were told represented the administration's latest version of a medicare proposal and we were given to understand that orders had been given by the White House either to accept this new proposal or to kill the entire bill.

This means that Congress is going home after having voted itself a $7,500 annual salary increase and a $10,000 increase for the Cabinet members while at the same time denying increases for those living on social security pensions.

This action demonstrates the political farce of this administration's claim of an interest in the welfare of our elderly citizens.

INVESTIGATION OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA STADIUM BY COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the majority membership of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration in its approach to the investigation of the Baker-McCloskey charges, are acting like a group of small boys delaying a trip to the woodshed in the pious hope that something will happen to the principal before they get there.

Let us stop dodging around the issue and call the witnesses: Mr. McCloskey, Mr. Baker, Mr. Reynolds, and Mr. Jenkins.

Ask Mr. McCloskey why he paid $109,205.60 for an insurance bond, when the bill, by Mr. McCloskey's own admission, should have been $73,631.28.

Did this $35,000 overpayment represent kick-backs, pay-offs, and political contributions?

Did Mr. McCloskey charge these kickbacks and political contributions off as a normal business expense on his tax returns?

Does this overpayment represent an illegal procedure for making political contributions?

These are the questions that the committee should be asking, and these are the questions which must be answered before the American people will be satisfied.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. SIMPSON. Does not the Senator believe that the name of Walter Jenkins should be added?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Delaware has expired. The Senate is still operating in the morning hour.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for an additional 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. There is no question that Mr. Jenkins should be called, as should many other witnesses whom I did not mention. I have cited only three; but those three should certainly be called at an early stage. We have a right to ask that the committee get down to the meat of the problem and stop the shadowboxing which is currently taking place in the committee.

Mr. SIMPSON. I thank the Senator from Delaware. The people of the Nation are cognizant of the fact that he has done a great service for the Senate and the people of the United States in insisting upon a true and full disclosure of the sleazy business that has been taking place with respect to the Bobby Baker case.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I thank the Senator from Wyoming. Just as in the case of small boys who delay a trip to the woodshed because the principal is there, if this matter is delayed until after November 3, the principal will still be back in the U.S. Senate.

AUTHORIZATION FOR THE COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TO FILE A REPORT OF ITS ACTIVITIES FOR THE SECOND SESSION OF THE 88TH CONGRESS

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the District of Columbia be authorized to have printed in the RECORD, after the adjournment of Congress, a complete report of the committee's activities for the 2d session of the 88th Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TEACHERS SALARY ACT OF 1955—BILL INDEFINITELY POSTPONED

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, at the desk is H.R. 12042, a bill to amend the District of Columbia Teachers Salary Act of 1955. This bill was never referred to the District of Columbia Committee, for the reason that it was merged into an overall salary act. I therefore ask unanimous consent that H.R. 12042 be indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, H.R. 12042 is indefinitely postponed.

RETIREMENT BENEFITS FOR THE JUDGES OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COURTS—CORRECTION OF ENROLLED BILL

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives transmitting to the Senate, House Concurrent Resolution 370.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate, House Concurrent Resolution 370, relating to the enrollment of the bill H.R. 5871.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, the concurrent resolution relates to a technical amendment and is required to correct an error in H.R. 5871, which is a retirement act pertaining to District of Columbia judges. It makes a correction in the act that has been miscited. I ask that the Senate agree to the concurrent resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 370) was agreed to.

THE 88TH CONGRESS AND FISHERIES

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, probably no Congress in the history of the United States has labored as effectively in behalf of the U.S. fisheries as has the one which is now ready to adjourn. I have previously, and on several occasions, called attention to this.

"Significant Fishery Legislation of the 88th Congress" is the title of a speech delivered at Atlantic City on September 22, before the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission, by H. E. Crowther, Deputy Director of the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, of the Department of the Interior. Because it is such an excellent summation, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Crowther's remarks before the Commission be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SIGNIFICANT FISHERY LEGISLATION OF THE 88TH CONGRESS

(Remarks by H. E. Crowther, Deputy Director, Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, 23d annual meeting, Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission, September 22, 1964)

At the close of the 1st session of the 88th Congress the press referred to that session as being the longest during a time of peace with the least accomplished. Now that we can look at both sessions, a generalization of that kind would be incorrect, particularly concerning fishery legislation. The 88th Congress took more significant action concerning fisheries than any Congress since the 84th which took the time and expended the effort necessary to create the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956.

One measure of activity on fishery legislation in this 88th Congress is the number of committee hearings held on proposals that would in some way affect fisheries. During this Congress the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries participated in 37 such hearings. The real measure though is the number and substance of enacted proposals and there are five to which we can point with satisfaction. They are:

S. 1006 (Public Law 88–498), sometimes referred to as the subsidy bill but properly known as the United States Fishing Fleet Improvement Act;

S. 627 (Public Law 88–309), sometimes referred to as the State aid bill or the Federal aid to States bill but properly known as the Commercial Fisheries Research and Development Act of 1964;

S. 1988 (Public Law 88–308), to prohibit fishing by foreign-flag vessels in the territorial waters of the United States;

S. 978 (Public Law 88–424), medical care for fishing vessel owners; and

Public Law 88–205 which amended Public Law 480 to permit domestically produced fishery products to be treated as surplus agriculture commodities under certain conditions for the purposes of titles I and IV of Public Law 480.

UNITED STATES FISHING FLEET IMPROVEMENT ACT

The new law is in the form of an amendment to the fishing vessel construction subsidy law which expired on June 12 1963, to extend the life of that law from its expiration date last year to June 30, 1969. At the same time, the new law makes substantial changes in the earlier program. For example, the maximum subsidy is changed from 33⅓ percent to 50 percent of the cost of the vessel. The requirement for a finding of injury which limited the earlier program to the New England groundfish fishery, is eliminated. A new requirement has been added that the vessel be of advanced design which will enable it to operate in expanded areas and that it be equipped with newly developed gear. There is also a stipulation that the vessel will not operate in a fishery if such operation would cause economic hardship to fishing vessel operators already operating in that fishery. The committee report indicates that by "newly developed gear" the Congress intends that the vessel be equipped with "the most modern gear available."

Under the new law a notice and hearing are required prior to the granting of a subsidy. This procedure will be of great assistance in determining whether or not the granting of a subsidy would cause economic hardship to fishing vessel operators already operating in that fishery.

Another new element in the law is the authority for a subsidized vessel to be transferred to a different fishery after notice and hearing and upon the approval by the Secretary of the Interior of the transfer. Here again the law takes into consideration the protection of the economic interests of those already in a fishery.

Because the law will now have a wider application than it had in the past, it is anticipated that a greater number of applications will be received. The authorization for the annual appropriation of funds was therefore raised from $2½ million to $10 million. The amounts that will actually be appropriated under this authorization will no doubt depend upon the extent to which the industry moves to upgrade our deteriorating fleet by use of this program.

COMMERCIAL FISHERIES RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1964

For some 6 years the Congress has had pending some form of proposal to provide to the individual States assistance from the Federal Government for research in and development of commercial fisheries. Bills in the 86th and 87th Congresses all took the form of a grant-in-aid program to be financed by a transfer of funds from the section 32 funds held by Agriculture. In some cases the proposals would have used our present S–K fund (which comes by transfer from Agriculture) and other proposals would have created a new fund for the purpose that would have been a twin fund to the S–K fund.

In the 88th Congress there were a number of proposals that followed this same pattern, but there was also a new type of proposal which would provide Federal aid to the States from a fund created by direct appropriation. It was this latter type proposal that finally won the approval of the Congress and was enacted as Public Law 88–309. This act authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to cooperate with the States through their respective State agencies which regulates commercial fisheries in carrying out projects designed for the research and development of the commercial fisheries resources of the Nation. Puerto Rico, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and Guam are treated as States. The act contains four different authorizations.

Section 4(a) authorizes the appropriation of $5 million annually for 5 years, which is to be apportioned annually among the States according to a formula based upon the amount of commercial fishery activity in each State. The funds are to be available for expenditure for 2 years and if not used revert to the Treasury of the United States. Projects approved under this subsection will be financed by the Federal Government and by the State government and the share of the Federal Government cannot exceed 75 percent. The apportionment to each State shall be not less than one-half of 1 percent nor more than 6 percent of the amount appropriated annually under this section.

Section 4(b) authorizes the appropriation of $400,000 for each of the first 2 years of the program and $650,000 for each of the last 3 years of the program. This money is to be made available to the States in amounts to be determined by the Secretary for the purposes of the act. The Secretary must give preference to those States in which he determines there is a commercial fishery failure due to a resource disaster arising from natural or undetermined causes. Under this subsection the money may be used for any purpose the Secretary determines to be appropriate to restore the fishery affected by such failure or to prevent a similar failure in the future. Projects approved under this subsection are to be financed entirely from Federal funds and the money appropriated is available until expended.

Section 4(c) authorizes the appropriation of $100,000 annually for 5 years. The funds are to be made available to States in amounts to be determined by the Secretary for developing a new commercial fishery. The funds are available until expended and projects approved under this subsection are to be financed entirely from Federal funds.

The fourth authorization is contained in section 9 of the act and is not related to the preceding authorizations. The section amends section 4 of the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 to permit the fishery loan fund established by that act to be used for loans to Alaska fishermen for charter of fishing vessels for temporary replacement pending the repair or the permanent replacement of vessels damaged or lost in the earthquake disaster of March 27, 1964. The charter loans are to be repaid only from the net profits of the operation of the chartered vessels after deducting a reasonable amount for salary of the fishermen chartering the vessels. This fourth authorization expires June 30, 1966.

PROHIBITION OF FISHING IN U.S. TERRITORIAL WATERS BY FOREIGN-FLAG VESSELS

Foreign-flag vessels have been denied the privilege of fishing in U.S. territorial waters almost since the beginning of the country by an interpretation of the laws which govern the documentation of U.S. vessels. However, in all that time there has been no statutory penalty for violations and the only course of action open to U.S. enforcement vessels has been to request any violator to leave U.S. waters.

This situation was highlighted in 1964 when the Coast Guard apprehended Cuban fishing vessels fishing in our territorial waters off the coast of Florida. There being no Federal law providing penalties, the violators were turned over to the State for prosecution.

Public Law 88–308 provides a clear statement of the prohibition against fishing in U.S. territorial waters by foreign-flag vessels and provides for enforcement of the prohibition and statutory penalties for violations. The law also prohibits foreign-flag vessels from taking any Continental Shelf fishery resource which appertains to the United States. As defined in the act such resources are limited to the sedentary species, that is to say, organisms which, at the harvestable stage, either are immobile on or under the seabed or are unable to move except in constant physical contact with the seabed or the subsoil of the Continental Shelf.

Exceptions are provided for either by international treaty or by specific authority from the Secretary of the Treasury under certain conditions after approval by the Secretaries of State and Interior and the individual State concerned. With the increasing amount of foreign fishing activity off the coasts of the United States, this clarification of U.S. policy concerning its territorial waters and its interests on the Continental Shelf will be extremely helpful in the management of our fisheries by both State and Federal agencies concerned.

MEDICAL CARE FOR FISHING VESSEL OWNERS

Section 322 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 249) provides as follows:

"(a) The following persons shall be entitled, in accordance with regulations, to medical, surgical, and dental treatment and hospitalization without charge at hospitals and other stations of the Service;

"(1) Seamen employed on vessels of the United States, registered, enrolled, and licensed under the maritime laws thereof, other than canal boats engaged in the coasting trade."

This section of the Public Health Service Act then goes on to list six other classes of persons who are eligible for such medical service. Under the terms of the quoted portion of the act, both employed and self-employed U.S. fishermen were provided medical services for many years until 1954 when an administrative ruling interpreted the word "employed" as not covering fishermen who were self-employed. The purpose of Public Law 88–424 is to restore to self-employed fishermen eligibility for the medical care in the section of the act quoted above.

This purpose was accomplished by this new law by adding to the classes of persons eligible for medical care an 8th class as follows:

"(8) Persons who own vessels registered, enrolled, or licensed under the maritime laws of the United States, who are engaged in commercial fishing operations, and who accompany such vessels on such fishing operations, and a substantial part of whose services in connection with such fishing operations are comparable to services performed by seamen employed on such vessel or on vessels engaged in similar operations."

Only vessels of 5 net tons or more are eligible to be registered, enrolled, and licensed under the maritime laws of the United States. In effect, then, crewmembers aboard such vessels will continue to be eligible for the described medical service under section 322(a)(1) and owners of vessels of 5 net tons or more who actually accompany the vessel and whose services are such as to qualify under the language of Public Law 88–424 quoted above will be eligible under section 322(a)(8).

FOOD FOR PEACE

The Foreign Assistance Act of 1963 (Public Law 88–205), enacted in the 1st session of the 88th Congress, contained one section amending section 106 (7 U.S.C. 1706) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended (commonly known as Public Law 480). The amendment provides that for the purposes of titles I and IV of Public Law 480, the term "surplus agricultural commodity" shall include any domestically produced fishery product (not including fish flour until approved by the Food and Drug Administration) if the Secretary of the Interior has determined that such product is at the time of exportation in excess of domestic requirements, adequate carryover, and anticipated exports for dollars. The amendment will not be effective for the purposes of title I until January 1, 1965.

The new law will permit, under the conditions stated, the sale of domestically produced fishery products in the currency of the country of destination under title I of Public Law 480 after January 1, 1965. It also permits the products that qualify to be sold for dollars in foreign countries by means of long-term loans as provided for in title IV of Public Law 480.

These five legislative actions will not, of themselves, solve all the problems that confront the U.S. fishing industry but they will be helpful and they do indicate an increasing awareness on the part of the Congress and the American people to the needs of a historically basic production industry.

SIGNIFICANT FISHERY LEGISLATION OF THE 88TH CONGRESS

(By H. E. Crowther, Deputy Director, Bureau of Commercial Fisheries)

Resolution 1—Concerned with the distribution of shrimp and shrimp products:

"*Resolved,* That seafood, including shrimp and shrimp products should be exempt from being a regulated commodity during shipment, whether or not such seafood shipments are part of loads which include nonexempt or regulated commodities, to insure fast delivery demanded by a scattered market and to avoid delays and excessive costs of shipment."

Bureau of Commerical Fisheries action: The Bureau has testified at hearings and has a continuing policy in support of exemption for fishery products.

We believe the intent of this resolution is to continue the exemption from economic regulation for fishery products. The Bureau agrees with this intention and has taken a positive position in this regard in legislative reports submitted over the years when the matter of regulation of commodities has been before the Congress. In 1963, we testified before a House committee on H.R. 4700 which dealt with seafood and other commodity regulations involving transportation. We also recognize the problem of fishery products being transported in the same truckload with regulated commodities. However, it may be extremely difficult to attain exemption for seafoods in mixed loads in view of all the other requirements that the Interstate Commerce Commission has to recognize in implementing transportation regulation. Nevertheless, the Bureau will continue to follow this situation closely to help insure that fishery products receive and retain exemptions consistent with efficient operation of the industry.

Resolution 3—Extension of United States and States fishery jurisdiction to 12 miles:

"*Resolved,* That the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission go on record as favoring the extension of the U.S. coastal jurisdiction over fisheries to 12 miles and the extension of the jurisdiction of the States to the same extent as the Federal jurisdiction is extended, and direct its officers and staff to present this position as forcefully as possible to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, and the appropriate congressional leaders."

Bureau of Commercial Fisheries action: Action by Bureau of Commercial Fisheries not required.

Resolution 5—Concerning the Atlantic coast offshore lobster stocks and fishery:

"*Resolved,* That the Commercial Fisheries develop and carry out a program to evaluate the offshore populations in relation to other lobster populations of the Atlantic coast, and make recommendations for the most desirable use of the offshore stocks, and further

"*Resolved,* That the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission go on record as supporting an American lobster investigation and assist the Bureau in getting the necessary money to implement the program."

Bureau of Commercial Fisheries action: The 88th Congress added $200,000 to the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries fiscal year 1965 appropriations. A tentative program is being developed which will be discussed soon with an informal steering committee of the States involved. The Bureau's program will be centered at the Boothbay Harbor, Maine, laboratory, and will study the inshore lobster populations of coastal New England and the offshore populations. This latter population has been subjected to a rather intensive fishery by fishermen of the United States. Many fishermen believe this to be the spawning stock for inshore lobsters. In addition, Russian and French vessels have carried out exploratory fishing operations in this area which may indicate an interest in developing an offshore fishery for lobsters at a later date.

Resolution 7—To strengthen fisheries research program in the Middle Atlantic Bight:

"*Resolved,* That the Middle Atlantic section request the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission make the strongest possible representations to the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries to initiate a comprehensive research program of the marine environment and fisheries of the Middle Atlantic Bight, working in cooperation with the adjacent States and qualified private institutions; and further

"*Resolved,* That the Congress be requested to appropriate a minimum of $1 million per year for the next 5 years to carry out this research program."

Bureau of Commercial Fisheries action: Research in the Middle Atlantic Bight area by the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries was increased in fiscal year 1965 through the addition by the 88th Congress of $200,000 for research on the sea clam. This species has been the object of an intensive fishery on the Continental Shelf in the area from New Jersey to Virginia. The fishermen report declining catches and a scarcity of sea clams.

This program will consist of both biological research and exploratory fishing studies.

Biological research will be centered at our Oxford, Md., laboratory. Preliminary studies were begun here during fiscal year 1964 and were financed at about $55,000. The additional funds will allow an expansion of these studies.

A Bureau exploratory fishing program for surf clams was initiated in the Middle Atlantic Bight last fiscal year. As a result of industry concern over the decline of surf clams in the present industry area off New Jersey, a cooperative industry-Bureau program was conducted during the last 18 months. Close cooperation with industry throughout ths program has been maintained with the Eastern Sea Clam Committee of the Oyster Institute of North America.

Two areas of definite commercial potential have been located—one about 30 miles off the Delaware coast and the second approximately 25 miles outside of Chincoteague Bay, Va.

The best catch rate achieved was 10 bushels in a 5-minute drag.

Under the present Bureau program, a systematic survey and evaluation of all potential surf clam producing areas in the Atlantic Bight area and off New England is planned.

RUNAWAY-FLAG OPERATIONS IN THE MARITIME INDUSTRY

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, in the September 18 issue of the Seafarers Log, editorial attention was directed to a problem which should interest all who are interested in strengthening, developing, and restoring our maritime industry.

I found the editorial of such great interest that I ask that it be printed in the RECORD, so that my colleagues and others may have an opportunity to read it.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The problems facing the U.S. maritime industry are legion. They include the steady decline of the domestic shipping industry, the hostile policies of Government agencies, which should be bending their efforts to strengthen U.S. maritime, but have instead adopted policies which are aiding its decline. Waivers of the 50–50 requirements of Government-financed oversea cargoes is another problem crying for solution. On the horizon is the specter of increased mechanization and automation aboard ship.

The SIU and other maritime unions have been attacking these problems with vigor, and although the difficulties are many and varied, they have been making progress toward solving them.

One very basic problem faced by maritime, however, is very little nearer to solution today than it has ever been. The problem of runaway-flag operations is not only one of the biggest difficulties faced by maritime, but is also a major stumbling block in the solution of many of the other problems. It not only has an adverse effect on the maritime industry, but both directly and indirectly is a threat to the security of the entire Nation.

The basic spur to increasing runaway-flag operations is simple greed. U.S. ship operators remove their vessels from American registration and register them under the so-called flags of convenience to avoid the necessity of paying U.S. taxes and to avoid paying the decent wages and maintaining the decent safety and working conditions which have been brought about on U.S.-flag ships only after a long, hard fight by the U.S. maritime unions.

This tax dodging is only one way in which runaway-flag operations undermine the security of the Nation. More directly, it undermines national security because it is problematical whether these vessels, registered under the flags of foreign nations, could be called back for use in the event of a national emergency. The "effective control" principle is a nice theory, but as recent political upheavals in Panama and Honduras have shown, "effective control" may prove to be no control at all. Panama and Honduras of course are two of the major runaway-flag nations.

The U.S. maritime unions were formed to improve seamen's wages and working conditions at a time when they were so bad as to be considered a crime against decency. Runaway-flag operators are now being allowed to turn back the clock on wages and working conditions, undermining the hard-won gains of labor. Seamen's lives are again being endangered by lax safety and maintenance procedures—a laxity which would not be tolerated by the SIU and other maritime unions. After lining their pockets with money saved on taxes and lax safety and maintenance procedures, the runaway-flag operators complete their "silver lining" by cutting seamen's wages to the bone—often back to the bare minimum levels eliminated by the rise of strong maritime unions nearly 30 years ago.

There are solutions to the problem of runaway-flag operations. The SIU and the Maritime Trades Department of the AFL–CIO have pointed out many times to the highest levels of Government that a possible solution to the problem would be to remove the tax loopholes which make runaway-flag operations so lucrative to the shipowner. This is one very promising solution to the problem.

Nothing can be done however, until the Government can be made to act—and up till now it has seemed that no force on earth was capable of moving the supposedly responsible departments of the Government out of their lethargy and indifference. The SIU has maintained and will continue the struggle to get action to end this evil.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR MUSKIE TO ANNUAL CONFERENCE ON METROPOLITAN PROBLEMS

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, at the 13th Annual Commissioners and Governors Conference on Metropolitan Washington Problems, the distinguished junior Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE] delivered a stirring address on the problems confronting our Nation's metropolitan areas.

Senator MUSKIE is a leading authority in this field. His Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee, on which I am proud to serve, has done an outstanding job of realistic study of the problems confronting urban areas and their governments.

I hope that Senators vitally interested in the orderly development of the Washington metropolitan area will read this important speech carefully.

I ask unanimous consent that Senator MUSKIE's address be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE METROPOLITAN CHALLENGE

(Address by Senator EDMUND S. MUSKIE, Democrat, of Maine, before the 13th Annual Commissioners and Governors Conference on Metropolitan Washington Problems, Arlington, Va., October 1, 1964)

By the year 2000, 85 percent of our population will live in urban areas, experts tell us. Here, in our own National Capital region, 3 million new residents will be added by the end of the century.

The pressures of a metropolitan America already pose the greatest threat to our traditional Federal-State-local relations, as well as the greatest challenge to the maintenance of a strong, representative, and flexible Federal system.

There are the physical problems. We face water shortages, transportation snarls, urban blight, and wasteful land use.

There are the social problems. We face increased juvenile delinquency, rising crime rates, and uneasy race relations.

There are the political problems. We face shifting metropolitan boundaries, fragmented local government, and conflict between the central city and the suburbs.

There are the financial problems. We face limited revenue resources and almost limitless expenditure needs; soaring tax rates in the suburbs and falling tax bases in the cities. State and local debts are mounting, while State and local revenue sources fall behind.

Metropolitan areas currently require: $600 million annually for sewage treatment facilities; $400 million annually for pure water; $200 million annually to rebuild each square mile of slums; and $1¼ million dollars annually so commuter railroads can stay in business.

These problems stagger the imagination. They tax our ingenuity as well as our purse.

The metropolitan area is a new type of community, one in which its inhabitants have little or no feeling of community. It is neither a neighborhood, city, State, nor nation. There are no anthems, flags, or mottos. Loyalities are mixed, and problems grow with growth.

While our population has skyrocketed, the land most of us occupy has diminished. In 1940 nearly a quarter of our population lived in rural areas. In 1962 less than 8 percent still lived in the country. The remainder, victims of a technological revolution, moved from farms to urban areas. Mechanized farming, hybrid seeds, better planting methods, and more efficient animal husbandry add to our wealth with continually less human effort. And as this agricultural revolution advances, even more rural Americans will stream into our cities.

What does the new arrival find in our metropolitan centers? Is his environment a liberating influence? Or does he see urban living as a necessary evil, imposed by a technological revolution that has made him an alien in his own land?

The truth lies somewhere between these extremes. Our cities are large and exciting; they house our cultural and educational centers. The standard of living, for most, is higher. On the other side of the ledger, inadequate transportation, excessive noise, dull architecture, and air pollution are strong barriers to safe and sane urban living. We have responded to the economic necessities and this press of population accompanying the transformation of the American landscape, on a haphazard basis. In spite of gallant efforts, we have not rendered our urban areas either beautiful or really habitable.

The press and flux of population made suburban development inevitable. The city—dirty, crowded, and noisy—accelerated this exodus. The city dweller fled in his automobile to find cleaner air, less congestion, and a slower pace of living. For this, however, he ransomed much. As one commentator put it, "he entered the land of 'no.' No storm drainage and no sewers. No curb, no gutter, and no sidewalks. No parks, no playgrounds, and no street lights. No fireplugs, no fire halls, and no firetrucks. No public garbage collection. No modern policing. No zoning and no subdivision control." Look-alike residential housing and gaudy commercial strip development quickly dotted the pastoral landscape the suburbanite sought.

This portrayal is both a historical analysis and a recitation of current events. As President Kennedy put it: "In a few short decades we have passed from a rural to an urban way of life, and in a few short decades more, we shall be a nation of vastly expanded population, living in expanded urban areas and housing that does not now exist, served by community facilities that do not now exist, moving about by means of systems of urban transportation that do not now exist."

How are we going to meet these needs?

The Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, in its report, "Alternative Approaches to Governmental Reorganization of Metropolitan Areas," explores various proposals designed to create a sense of community in metropolitan areas. The commission found there can be no pat solution for easing the problems of political and structural complexity at the local level. One approach called for the merging of outlying districts with the core city, thereby abolishing governmental fragmentation. Another, apparently more feasible, approach called for areawide functions to be performed by a regional government, with each local unit having representation. This federated approach has been adopted by only one metropolitan area in the country.

The establishment of metropolitan councils on a voluntary basis, composed of elected officials; is yet another alternative. Few such bodies exist. You, along with 9 or 10 other agencies, have been pioneers in developing the voluntary regional council as a happy compromise between those who want no change and those calling for the centralization of all metropolitan functions.

The Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments is the institutional recognition of the fact that yours is a regional community. More than 5 million people will live here in another generation. And most of this growth will take place mainly in the suburbs. This staggering increase will require a sharp rise in public facilities. Federal, State, and local funds will all be required to finance independently planned and executed construction programs. Greater coordination, then, is vital. For example, metropolitan water supply and sewage disposal projects demand an areawide attack and a cooperative program. No one level of government alone can handle such regional problems.

Your council understands this need for coordination. You act as a forum where members can meet and discuss common problems. As a study group you make recommendations to member counties, cities, States. But you have never lost sight of the fact that planning is of no value unless it leads to appropriate action. The adoption of the "Year 2000 Plan" and the construction of the Potomac interceptor sewer bear witness to this.

One of the council's most recent and significant accomplishments is receipt of a Federal urban renewal demonstration grant. The purpose of this grant is to assist in bringing together for the first time various local governmental data. This in turn will encourage a greater degree of standardization for metropolitan land use and housing classification. Federal efforts to bring about greater uniformity will also be aided. The project will demonstrate the feasibility of voluntary local cooperation as the basis for regional action. Despite these accomplishments, much work remains to be done.

The final report of the Congressional Joint Committee on Washington Metropolitan Problems, although dated in some respects, is still a fair assessment of the conference's basic difficulty. The report declared, in part, that "despite such welcome steps as the establishment of an operating budget, and the employment of its own executive secretary, the * * * conference has still far to go before it will be dealing effectively with Washington metropolitan problems."

The council has yet to become the authentic voice of the National Capital region. Metropolitan problems cannot be solved unless there are strong advocates able to reach and educate area residents, able to persuade local units that vitally needed action requires joint effort. The council must develop and fight for its own views on issues of areawide concern.

State governments must also bear a responsibility for encouraging regional solutions. Most States have tended to react to the metropolitan challenge in a haphazard fashion. The fiscal, jurisdictional, research, and planning needs of the large urban centers have commonly been ignored or handled on a piecemeal basis.

As a result, cities have turned to the Federal Government. This has alarmed many defenders of States rights. But demands for the preservation of States rights must be matched by an acceptance by the States of their responsibilities toward their major population centers.

The Council of State Governments and the Advisory Commission, the latter of which I am a member, have made several legislative proposals designed to assist State governments in meeting this urban challenge. If the States are to remain viable partners in our Federal system, they must adjust their operations and organization in light of the revolution on the urban frontier. Both groups, therefore, have recommended the establishment of a new agency of State government for metropolitan or local affairs. This new agency would assist the metropolitan areas with respect to the problems of local governmental planning, structure, organization, and finance. Neither Richmond nor Annapolis has such an office, although both provide some of these services. Such a department could also assist the Governor in formulating effective policies to meet metropolitan problems.

The national character of many metropolitan questions makes Federal participation necessary. Several existing Federal programs have already had a significant impact on our metropolitan areas. In addition, three current proposals could make a substantial contribution to orderly urban growth and development.

First, a dimension of the National Capital region's water pollution difficulties is covered in S. 649, which I introduced in the first session of this Congress. It would amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act concerning grants for construction of municipal sewage treatment works. Of special concern to metropolitan areas is the provision that these grants may be increased by 10 percent for a project that is part of a comprehensive regional plan. The Senate, by a vote of 69 to 11, passed this needed legislation. If passed by the House, this measure will do much to strengthen the position of metropolitan planning agencies.

Second, metropolitan area planning would be further assisted by the enactment of S. 855. Senators HUMPHREY, MUNDT, and WILLIAMS joined me in February 1963 in sponsoring this advisory commission proposal. It was considered at length by the Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations and unanimously passed the Senate last January. The bill would require—

1. Establishment of a legally constituted metropolitan agency, charged with the responsibility for areawide planning; and

2. An assessment by this agency of certain Federal grant applications made by local governments before being acted upon by the relevant Federal departments and agencies.

Planning Agency approval of applications is not a prerequisite to Federal assistance under this bill. But the proposal recognizes the role of adequate planning as crucial to achieving metropolitan objectives relating to open-space land projects, airport construction, waste treatment works, urban renewal, public housing, hospital construction, and urban highways. These projects would be viewed as part of a regional plan. The bill would strengthen the concept of a metropolitan community.

It would also establish a frame of reference for all Federal activities affecting an urban area. Programs covered under this measure must be related to each other as well as to local development, if Federal funds are not to be spent on conflicting objectives. Economy, then, also demands this full exchange of information among the political subdivisions within a metropolitan area prior to the allocation of a Federal grant.

And finally, I have supported proposals for the establishment of a Federal Department of Urban Affairs. Until now, the Federal Government's reaction to the emergence of a metropolitan America—like that of the States—has generally been disjointed, sporadic, and unplanned. Such a department is necessary for coordinating the numerous Federal programs that have an impact on metropolitan areas.

These three proposals for congressional action differ in many respects, but all have one feature in common: they seek to establish the foundations for a viable metropolitan community.

A memorable passage from Prof. Kenneth Galbraith's book, "The Affluent Society," portrays our dilemma. He described "the family which takes its * * * air-conditioned, power-steered, and power-braked automobile out for a tour (and) passes through cities that are badly paved, made hideous by litter, blighted buildings, billboards, and posts for wires that should long since have been put underground. They pass on through a countryside that has been rendered largely invisible by commercial art. They picnic on exquisitely packaged food from a portable icebox by a polluted stream and go on to spend the night at a park which is a menace to public health and morals. Just before dozing off on an air mattress, beneath a nylon tent, amid the stench of decaying refuse, they may reflect vaguely on the curious unevenness of their blessings."

Galbraith may exaggerate, but there is indeed an "unevenness" of blessings. Our citizens, and their representatives at all levels of government, are becoming more aware that action in the public sector must be as imaginative and progressive in providing the public service we require as the private sector in providing the luxuries we want.

Joint Federal-State-local cooperation and innovations in government are needed now.

President Kennedy said: "The challenge is great, and the time is short. Shall we begin?"

The council, just by its existence, represents a beginning.

Now, as President Johnson has said, "Let us continue."

U.S. CONTROL OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, in the Washington Evening Star of Thursday, October 1, 1964, there was a full-page statement which labeled nuclear weapons authority a "hypocritical hoax." It was charged that the President of the United States has been totally misrepresenting this Nation's control of atomic bombs—in the words of the ad, "damnable deceit, and flagrant falsification."

Mr. President, this Nation's nuclear weapons policy is an appropriate subject for national discussion and debate. However, one of the most disturbing elements of the present political campaign is the way in which the Republican presidential and vice-presidential candidates are dealing with the question of control of atomic weapons, the conditions under which they should be used, and the question of under whose authority such use should be implemented. The Republican candidate for the Presidency has espoused the concept that small nuclear conventional weapons—whatever that means—should be placed under the jurisdiction of the field commanders, a statement which he later explained as meaning the Commander of NATO.

The public debate thus far seems to have generated more heat than light, because it has failed to define the term conventional. In their public statements, Republican spokesmen use the term "nominal and conventional weapons" in a loose manner, when discussing atomic weapons; and in at least one instance, the "conventional weapons" referred to by the Republican candidate were interpreted to mean systems with a destructive capability equal to the bombs that destroyed Nagasaki and

Hiroshima. When one challenges the Republican spokesman, however, they explain the terms in a way that benefits their arguments in somewhat the way done by Humpty Dumpty, in "Alice in Wonderland."

In a conversation with Humpty Dumpty, Alice was puzzled by his use of the word "glory"; and she said, "I do not know what you mean by 'glory'."

Humpty Dumpty smiled contemptuously and replied: "Of course you don't—'til I tell you. I meant 'there's a nice knockdown argument for you'."

Alice said: "But glory doesn't mean a nice knockdown argument.

"When I use a word," Humpty Dumpty said, in a rather scornful tone, "it means just what I choose it to mean—neither more nor less."

Alice replied: "The question is whether you can make words mean so many different things."

Mr. President, my point is that what matters is not what we Americans think we mean, but is what our allies and our enemies believe we mean.

There now seems to be agreement on at least one point: that the smallest nuclear weapon available is the projectile fired from a Davy Crockett launcher. This weapon is rated as having a yield equivalent to that of 40 tons of TNT, as compared with the 1½ tons of World War II "blockbusters." Therefore, it would seem that the definition of the word "conventional" rests upon the destructive explosive capability of a specific weapon, not upon all of the weapon's characteristics that one should consider. I hope I possess some knowledge of the characteristics of atomic weapons, obtained during 13 years of service on the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy. The Joint Committee has been kept currently and fully informed about the size and the performance characteristics of this Nation's atomic arsenal. Based upon this knowledge, I would take exception to the application of the word "conventional" to atomic weapons of any size.

Let us talk a little about the characteristics of atomic weapons which the Republican candidate for the Presidency has so easily ignored, or perhaps does not understand—in either case, a disservice to the American public. All atomic bursts produce blasts, just as ordinary explosives do. All atomic bursts produce heat, but much greater than that produced by ordinary explosives. All atomic bursts produce nuclear radiation, either as bomb particles or as irradiated natural soil elements, or both. This radiation effect belongs exclusively to atomic explosions.

Consequently, the atomic bomb contains three distinct killing effects in one package. Blast and heat from a nuclear weapon can be used discretely, to avoid damage to the user and to a friendly country in a combat zone. Radiation contamination is a different matter. I am fully aware that the circles of damage from heat, blast, and radiation are concentric. However, heat and blast are transitory in nature; but radiation can contaminate land masses for long periods of time.

The characteristics of this Nation's atomic arsenal and, more specifically, the effects of the use of an atomic weapon are, therefore, greater than merely the damage caused by the explosive force measured by its equivalent in TNT. Forty tons of TNT when detonated would certainly have equal killing power, within certain ranges; whereas, the detonation on the battlefield of a 40-ton Davy Crockett would not only cause devastation by its explosive force, but would bring with it other disturbing characteristics. This is the crux of the problem. An atomic weapon, regardless of size, has the capacity to contaminate land masses and prevent early entry into the general area of the detonation, not only by the enemy forces, but also by friendly troops. Such contaminations would deny for extended periods of time the use of the land to occupants of the country unfortunate enough to be at the scene of such an event. By no stretch of the imagination can I see the wisdom of fighting a war with atomic weapons in friendly countries, as a means of freeing them from occupation or oppression, unless no other alternative is available. Who would set fire to his neighbor's house, if he were sure of starting a conflagration from which both he and his friend would not escape?

The second consequence of the use of atomic weapons is the possibility of escalation which then would result in an all-out atomic war and widespread destruction of both friend and foe, alike. This is not a new issue; no bolt of lightning from Mount Olympus has brought wisdom and insight to a fortunate few. The issue was debated during the Eisenhower administration. It was proposed by certain military leaders during the Korean war, and was rejected by both President Truman and President Eisenhower. The late Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, explored the possibility of the use of such weapons to wipe out supply bases and lines on the mainland of China; and the Eisenhower administration was asked to consider their use when the French were losing Indochina, a decade ago. In each of these previous cases the idea was rejected by both civilian and military leaders, because of the possibility that the use of such weapons would irrevocably lead to the use of larger and larger nuclear systems, and would result in long-term damage to the people we were trying to help. The Republican candidate for the Presidency apparently does not think this is a real concern; but others in positions of authority and responsibility do think so.

The statement that battlefield communications may make it impossible to obtain quick Presidential approval to use such weapons, and the question of whether the NATO commander can, under certain specific conditions, use nuclear weapons on his own decision, cannot, and perhaps should not, be completely and publicly clarified, because of the security involved. I believe it would be wrong for this administration, in order to defend itself on this score, to reveal the instructions to American commanders in the field and the conditions under which they would be authorized to use such weapons without Presidential authority, if, in fact, this be the case. There is reason to doubt that, except during the actual moment of crisis, any President can say with certainty in advance that he would or would not use atomic weapons, or that he would or would not delegate his control to the NATO commander. The situation as of that moment would obviously dictate the necessary measures to be taken. It is interesting to note that for years the Defense Department has wrestled with the question of authority delegated to the field.

The chain of command in connection with calling up or using atomic weapons has been analyzed over a long period of time. All possible ways have been explored to achieve, on the one hand, the use of a nuclear weapon when a worthwhile target of opportunity presented itself, and, at the same time, to assure the necessary precautions, so that the weapon would not be used in an ill-advised manner and precipitate a nuclear war. Personally, I do not want sergeants in the field, however talented and well intentioned, to be in a position to make a mistake which might cost the Nation dearly. In realizing that the circumstances at any given time will require different responses under different conditions, it is much more important to know the character, maturity, and wisdom of those who would have to make that decision, than it is to know the details of the planning for such a decision.

The President of the United States has demonstrated many times the capability to act rationally and prudently in very trying situations; and he is not given to making decisions on the basis of emotion or the desirability of a power play which, if exercised at the wrong time, could bring chaos. He has the capability to stand firm in the face of adversity, and to pass judgment in a cool and calculated manner; and he has the capability and courage to deny the ill-advised use of power. I would advise against insistence upon any ironclad set of rules that would deny the President the flexibility of choice he requires in order to be able to meet unforeseen events.

The possession of great power imposes its own restraint in this nuclear age. Powerful nations, just as powerful men, can afford to be more cautious in the exercise of power than can weak nations or weak men, who must depend upon the element of surprise. To challenge the rationality of weapons management in the presence of the makers of such policy, without regard to the character and personality of those involved, is a disservice. The congressional committees, such as the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy or the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee and others, have repeatedly examined this problem of control, and have accepted the system as it is now constituted, with authority for the use of weapons in the hands of the President. The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has repeatedly examined this problem; and while it may have suggestions for improvement of the control system—indeed, certain of its suggestions have been adopted, in general the system has been acceptable to the committee. One should not lightly set aside the judgment of mature persons who have examined the problem in great detail.

The other disturbing factor is that the Republican presidential candidate, being an active Reservist in the Air Force and a Reserve major general, as well as a member of the Armed Services Committee, could, if he had so wished, have familiarized himself in great detail with the methods and rationale by which weapons were to be made available to the field. But nothing he has said to date gives any indication that he has taken the time to do so. Again I deplore his choice of words, and the fact that he consistently uses the words "yield", in terms of explosive force, as a criterion of whether a weapon is conventional or unconventional. As the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] has stated repeatedly. "There is no such thing as a conventional atomic weapon." An atomic weapon is different from any other weapon known to man, and its careless use would have consequences extremely unpalatable to mankind.

A rebuttal of this statement might be that if this Nation had taken the time and had used the money required in order to develop "clean" nuclear systems—whatever that term means—we could then indiscriminately use atomic weapons in combat safely, and without fear of massive contamination. To this I would reply:

First, bringing the clean systems down to less than 40 tons would be a poor use of fissionable materials in terms of efficiency and cost; and

Second, the mere fact that we were fortunate enough to be able to afford clean systems would not necessarily mean that the enemy would respond in like kind. The burden is upon us to protect our friends from heavy radioactive contamination. Our opponent would have no such compunctions. If he did not have "clean" systems, he would use whatever atomic weapons he had available.

Another charge, sometimes heard, is that the signing of the limited nuclear test ban treaty not only prevents us from testing "clean" systems, but also handicaps the development of devices for peaceful uses of atomic energy.

The truth is that there are presently underway surveys for the construction of a canal between the Atlantic Ocean and the Pacific Ocean; and one of the methods being looked at very carefully is excavation by the use of controlled nuclear explosions. Some say the Russians never would allow the use of atomic energy for this purpose, because it would violate the intent of the limited nuclear test ban treaty.

I ask consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article written by Howard Simons, and published in the Washington Post of September 13, 1964. The facts contained in the article are substantially correct.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of Sept. 13, 1964]

SOVIETS REVERSE OBJECTION TO ATOMIC "DIGGING" IDEA

(By Howard Simons)

The possibility of joint East-West projects using nuclear explosives for mining and excavation was raised by atomic scientists from the Soviet Union and Rumania at the recent Atoms-for-Peace Conference in Geneva.

Though the overtures were made informally on a scientist-to-scientist basis they have aroused considerable interest among administration officials here.

The Soviet overture marks a dramatic reversal in the Russian attitude toward Project Plowshare, the Atomic Energy Commission's program for developing nuclear explosives for peaceful uses. Six years ago at the last Atoms-for-Peace Conference the Soviets accused the United States of using Plowshare as a disguise for continuing atomic weapons development during the moratorium on weapons testing beginning at that time.

The fact that both Rumanian and Russian scientists broached the subject of collaboration this year is significant, too. On a number of occasions American officials have said that the terms of the year-old nuclear test ban treaty inhibit wide use of nuclear explosives for peaceful purposes. The treaty says, in effect, that fallout from underground nuclear tests—which the treaty sanctions—must be confined to the national boundaries of the blast.

In the light of previous Soviet intransigeance American officials were never very optimistic that the treaty could be easily amended to exempt Plowshare detonations from this restriction. The United States had proposed such an exemption and the Soviets vetoed it. Now, however, Soviet interest in Plowshare activities, and more specifically in joint Plowshare efforts makes the prospect for treaty amendment less remote.

The first official U.S. response to the Soviet and Rumanian suggestions was made by AEC Chairman Glenn T. Seaborg at the concluding session of the August 31–September 9 meeting in Geneva. Seaborg said:

"Significant suggestions for methods of international collaboration and participation have been proposed by delegates from a number of nations. It is hoped that through such international support and cooperation nuclear weapons technology can be converted into a valuable research and engineering tool for the benefit of all mankind."

Positive action on international cooperation in Plowshare activities, in which the United States has a technological lead, may come next week when atomic experts gather in Vienna for the Eighth General Conference of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). Seaborg will be at this meeting, as will V. S. Emelyanov, former head of the Soviet civilian atomic program.

It was Emelyanov, the Russian "Mr. Atom," who collared Plowshare expert Gerald Johnson in a corridor at the Geneva meeting and suggested to Johnson the possibility of joint U.S.-Soviet studies of Plowshare projects of mutual interest.

Johnson, an associate director of the AEC's Livermore radiation laboratory, was also recipient of a Rumanian proposal of possible collaborative Plowshare activities under the auspices of the IAEA. Specifically, Johnson said in a telephone interview, the Rumanian suggested that IAEA establish a panel of experts from interested nations to see what could be done in the way of international cooperation.

Officials here are already speculating on some possibilities for such cooperation. The simplest approach would be something akin to the Rumanian notion of gathering experts to review Plowshare progress and possible projects. The Rumanians, for example, mentioned some unspecified needs for nuclear explosives in their mountain regions.

Emelyanov told Johnson of his country's interest in using nuclear explosives for irrigation projects and for moving mountains to expose mineral resources. Tunisia and Egypt have been exploring the use of nuclear explosives to open up canals for commerce to the interiors of those countries. And Australia has had talks with AEC experts on using nuclear explosives.

Johnson, himself, suggested at Geneva that one possibility would be to invite the world's atomic experts to observe a Plowshare experiment in this country, and officials do not dismiss this idea as a future possibility.

Though AEC experts have not yet perfected Plowshare devices to the point where they are relatively free from spewing fallout in intolerable amounts the experts are nonetheless confident that such devices are possible in the near future. Experiments toward this end are continuing in underground test sites in Nevada.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, there is every evidence that there does exist a real possibility of joint East-West development of nuclear devices and techniques for their use in civil engineering projects. Surprisingly, the possibility of such an agreement was raised by the atomic scientists from the Soviet Union and Rumania, at the recent Atom for Peace Conference in Geneva. They made the first overtures for such joint projects to this country. That reaffirms my faith that there is hope that the benefits of the peaceful uses of atomic energy will eventually be made available to all men.

The Kennedy administration decided early—and Congress supported the decision—that only the ability to respond with massive retaliation would not give this Nation a choice. All of the arguments presented for building up our conventional armaments were justified in my opinion. The term "conventional armaments" in wars has always had a specific meaning in the minds of military planners and political leaders. Does it make sense at this time to prostitute that term and to use it so lightly as to include atomic weapons, of whatever size they may be?

Some will say that to state that atomic weapons are different in character, effect, and consequences is merely to echo what has been said in the past about other weapons—from the longbow to the airplane. In "The Art of War," Machiavelli wrote of his concern as to the effects of firearms on warfare, and the need to study realistically how their devastating effects could be minimized.

All those weapons had the capability to destroy men—not man, but could not escalate as easily and quickly into a massive holocaust of destruction. Atomic weapons, regardless of size, can do so.

The Republican presidential candidate states that atomic weapons of small size will be conventional weapons, and will be used as freely as present-day artillery, automatic weapons, and the like. What are "small sizes"? All of mankind's efforts now seem to be avoid the proliferation of atomic weapons of all sizes, because of the fact that these weapons not only inflict damage upon the combatants, but also have certain genetic consequences for men yet unborn. We cannot present two faces to the world. In our attempt to create the image that we, as a nation and as a people, abhor atomic weapons of all kinds, and that we work for the day when they will be abolished from the arsenals of the world, we must not, on the other hand, lightly talk about atomic weapons as conventional weapons to be placed under the control of men, however honorable, whose principal training has been in the art of warfare.

The control of such weapons and such actions must remain in the hands of calm and prudent men who, while concerned about the defense of the Nation, never lose their concern about the effects of nuclear weapons upon mankind. The loss of a tactical advantage, because of denial or delay in the use of atomic weapons in a given situation, might be to our final good, if the consequences of the use of such a weapon might be the destruction of civilization.

The Republican presidential candidate has stated repeatedly that if NATO were given direct command over nuclear forces, trained and ready, no single European nation would attempt to develop its own national nuclear forces as France is now doing. He just does not seem to measure the realities of the world. The mere placing of nuclear systems under the direct control of NATO to be used at its discretion, would not in any way have stopped the French from developing their own nuclear forces. The fact is that France, for her own special reasons, always has felt that, as a nation, she must have her own national nuclear force, to be used as she might determine necessary. What France sought was, not the possession of such systems, but the right to use them as she willed.

The Republican candidate for the Presidency also states that if nuclear arms were not placed directly under the control of field commanders or, as he later qualified it, the Supreme Commander of NATO, and if there were any withdrawal of our nuclear strength from Europe, the result would be that, if localized Communist invasion occurred, no real options, except full-scale intercontinental retaliation or surrender, would be left to the West. He also proposes that a nuclear NATO could meet local invasions on the spot with local tactical nuclear forces. To suggest such a thing as easily as he has done is like suggesting the use of a 75-millimeter cannon to destroy a mouse in one's own living room. We might eliminate the mouse, but we also would eliminate the very thing we were attempting to protect.

The Republican presidential candidate seems to accept the fact that atomic weapons of a certain size are the logical successors for the military roles now performed by correctly defined, conventional weapons. This view can be supported only by a selective use of facts or in ignorance of the facts. I repeat that there is no such thing as a conventional nuclear weapon.

Winston Churchill has said:

> Mankind * * * has got into its hands * * * the tools by which it can unfailingly accomplish its own extermination. That is the point in human destinies to which all the glories and toils of men have at last led them. They would do well to pause and ponder upon their new responsibilities.

Mr. President, I hope the American people will pause and will ponder the implications of nuclear weapons.

KEIFER GRAY—FORTY YEARS OF DISTINGUISHED FEDERAL SERVICE

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, when 1964 comes to a close, it will mark the retirement from Government service of one of its outstanding public servants—Keifer L. Gray, District Director of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, at Anchorage, Alaska.

Mr. Gray's career with the Government covers a span of more than 40 years, and all of those years have been with the one agency.

Four decades ago Mr. Gray accepted his initial post with Immigration as a Patrol Inspector at Marcus, Wash. From this position, promotions came to Mr. Gray at a steady pace. These advancements took him from station to station throughout many States of the Union. He served in New York City, San Pedro, in the Midwest, and in the northwestern part of the country. Alaska assignment first came when Mr. Gray was sent there as Deputy District Director in 1957. In this 2-year tour, Keifer Gray was found by Alaskans to be a dedicated public official; and his reassignment to Omaha, Nebr., in 1959, was viewed with dismay by his friends and associates. Therefore, it was good news to Alaskans when, in 1962, they learned that he was to return, to take charge of the Alaska district.

Those who have worked with Mr. Gray nominate him as tops as a friend, a supervisor, a man of warmth, congeniality, and generosity, and possessed of a splendid sense of humor.

During his two Alaska assignments, Mr. Gray has had opportunity to enjoy some of the magnificent sports-hunting and fishing which Alaska offers. Only last year he came back from a hunting trip with a close-to-record breaking Dall sheep. Those familiar with the habitat of this elusive animal know that return from the hunt with one is, in itself, indicative of the fact the hunter is a man of superb vitality and energy, for these prized animals are found in the rocks and crags of the tallest mountains.

In addition to his love of the outdoors, Mr. Gray is an avid reader. I also understand that he plays an excellent game of pinochle, and is a formidable cribbage opponent.

His working days have been busy and full; but he is never without time to lend a hand to one and all who turn to him for help. In 1952, while stationed in Seattle, Mr. Gray alone handled 1,200 naturalization cases. Understandably, in the 40 years with Immigration he has acquired a multitude of memories; but the one which he avers is most vivid is of the occasion when he traveled to the tiny village of Gambell, on St. Lawrence Island, in Bering Strait, to naturalize six Siberian Eskimos.

I am proud to have this opportunity to pay tribute to this distinguished American. I share the views of his secretary, Mrs. Helen M. Newberry, who says, "we all hate to see him leave, but we know he richly deserves his retirement."

WENDELL WILLKIE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, October 8 will mark the 20th year since the passing of Wendell Willkie, the Republican candidate for the Presidency in 1940, and one of the great Americans of our time. It is fitting that we pay tribute to his memory.

Wendell Willkie was the first world political figure after World War II to call attention to the revolution of colonial peoples for self-determination, and to our common responsibility for freedom everywhere, under the title "One World."

October 8, therefore, is an appropriate time to bring to general public attention the significance of the role Wendell Willkie played and the contribution he made to American unity in behalf of freedom during a difficult time. The President of the United States is, of course, in a better position to do this than is any other man. The late President John F. Kennedy paid tribute to Wendell Willkie in New York City. President Dwight D. Eisenhower paid tribute to Wendell Willkie in Boston, Mass.

The following are quotations from speeches of Wendell Willkie and from his book "One World," and are inscribed in an open book, made of stone, in front of a cross, with a crusader's sword upon a torch emblazoned upon it, at his grave.

ONE WORLD

(By Wendell Willkie)

I believe in America, because in it we are free—free to choose our government, to speak our own minds, to observe our different religions; because we are generous with our freedom, and we share our rights with those who disagree with us; because we hate no people and covet no people's lands; because we are blessed with a natural and varied abundance; because we have great dreams; and because we have the opportunity to make those dreams true. There are no distant points in the world any longer. Our thinking in the future must be worldwide. We must establish, beyond any doubt, the equality of men. The world is awakening at last to the knowledge that the rule of peoples by other peoples is not freedom. Freedom is an indivisible word. We must be prepared to extend it to everyone—whether they are rich or poor, whether they agree with us or not, no matter what their race or the color of their skin. The only soil in which liberty can grow is that of a united people. We must have faith that the welfare of one is the welfare of all. We must acknowledge that all are equal before God and before the law. Only the productive are strong. Only the strong are free. It is inescapably true that to raise the standard of living of any man anywhere in the world is to raise the standard of living, by some slight degree, of every man, everywhere in the world. Whenever we take away the liberties of those whom we hate, we are opening the way to loss of liberty for those we love. The moral losses of expediency always far outweigh the temporary gain. The test of people is their aim, not their color.

STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS AVOID BOND ELECTIONS BY RENTING FACILITIES

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, an excellent article in the Wall Street Journal of September 22 points up a "gimmick" which local governments have been using for some time in attempting to get around the need for voter approval to issue bonds. The "gimmick," described in some detail in the article, is simply to have someone else build the facility—a county courthouse, for example—and then lease it. The "someone else" might be a public employees' pension fund or a nonprofit corporation set up specifically for this purpose. These schemes are symptomatic of a basic difficulty in State-local relations; namely, the shackling of local governments by outmoded State constitutional and statutory restrictions on borrowing.

The technique described in the article is not new. State and local governments hit upon it many years ago, when endeavoring to get around constitutional debt limits. It is a costly device, for the quasi-public corporations that finance the facilities issue revenue bonds which bear an interest rate up to one percentage point higher than that of high-grade general-obligation bonds.

Local government officials, when faced with a compelling need to replace obsolete public structures and to build additional facilities, claim that this device is their only way to meet the needs of their people. Proposed bond issues, often requiring under State law—as in California—approval by as many as two-thirds of the voters, are being turned down by the hundreds; and in many States, local officials are hamstrung by outmoded constitutional debt limits which bear no relationship to present-day governmental needs. Under most State laws, revenue bonds can be issued outside such debt limitations.

Several years ago the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations looked at the local debt problem, and made a number of recommendations which, if followed through by the States, would help the situation. The Commission is a continuing national body. It was set up by Congress in 1959.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] are members of the Commission, which is charged with the responsibility for continuing study and efforts toward improving the effectiveness of our Federal system of government. The rest of its membership is drawn from the Federal executive branch, from State and local governments, and from the general public.

In its report entitled "State Constitutional and Statutory Restrictions on Local Government Debt" the Commission concluded:

> The Commission believes that the present maze of constitutional and statutory restrictions upon local government borrowing constitutes a serious impediment to effective local self-government in the United States. These restrictions handicap self-reliance of local communities and governments, and impel them toward increased financial dependence on State or Federal Government resources. In many States, present provisions have contributed to complexity and deviousness in local debt operations. The Commission believes that State action to remedy this situation is necessary and urgent, and should be designed to relate any State regulation of local debt more realistically to the ability of local governments to service such debt.

In view of the sophisticated administrative tools available to local government officials, the Advisory Commission sees no need for archaic constitutional and statutory provisions limiting local government debt by reference to the local base for property taxation, and recommends that the States consider replacing this traditional shotgun type of debt limitation with a system under which the bond market itself would provide a regulator and a safeguard with respect to local borrowing. Under this system, local bond issues carrying prospective rates substantially above the rate prevailing on high-quality municipal securities would be singled out for further scrutiny by the State government.

The Commission believes that decisions as to the amounts to be borrowed by local governments should be left to their elected governing bodies, subject only to permissive referendums, and that such referendums should be determined by simple majority vote.

In many instances, local bond issues fail because they are poorly prepared and inadequately explained. Many local governments, particularly the smaller ones, do not have sufficient competence to develop the body of technical information needed for a successful bond issue. For this purpose, the States should provide technical and advisory assistance to local governments; and the Commission has recommended that they do so. Only by vigorous action by State governments can the situations described in the Wall Street Journal article be alleviated.

I ask that the article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal of Sept. 22, 1964]

BYPASSING VOTERS: MORE STATES, LOCALITIES, AVOID BOND ELECTIONS, BY RENTING FACILITIES—PENSION FUNDS, OTHER BODIES DO THE BUILDING; ARGUMENT RAGES ON COSTS, LEGALITY—SPEEDY CONSTRUCTION A GAIN

(By Donald A. Moffitt)

SAN FRANCISCO.—On October 6 citizens of Santa Cruz County, Calif., will ballot on a $4 million bond issue to build a new courthouse. But they don't accomplish much if they vote no. County supervisors already have made plans to get the courthouse built anyway—by a method that may well cost taxpayers more than the bond issue would.

The technique they are considering is an old one that's being revived by a growing number of cities, counties, and even States to bypass the voters who have been defeating an increasing number of bond issues lately. It's a two-step procedure:

First, find somebody else to build the courthouse, school, jail, office building, golf course, or whatever it is that's involved. That somebody can be a public employees' pension fund or a nonprofit corporation created for the purpose. It can even be a governmental agency empowered to issue bonds of a type other than the "general-obligation" issues that must be approved by voters.

A CURRENT OBLIGATION

Then, rent the facility under a long-term lease that provides for the government involved to assume ownership when the lease expires; in most cases, this rent can be partially applied to the purchase price of the facility. Legally, rent payments under such a lease usually have been held to be a current government obligation, payable out of general tax revenues, with no special voter approval required. This is true even though the lease usually obliges the government involved to pay rent for quite as many years as it would have to pay interest on a voter-approved bond issue. It's even true if the rent payments go to pay interest and principal on revenue bonds issued by whatever body built the facility, as they often do.

As can well be imagined, this technique has been assailed vehemently by taxpayers, legal writers, and even some judges—though more judges have upheld it when irate taxpayers have brought suit.

Even many governments using the leasing technique profess to dislike it, largely because of its cost. The effective interest rate on leases of government facilities ranges from a fraction to a full percentage point above the very low interest rate on general obligation bonds, which currently averages 3.3 percent.

But leasing arrangements nevertheless have been spreading as government officials have found it increasingly difficult to win bond elections. Santa Cruz County will set no precedent if it leases a courthouse citizens voted not to build. A few localities already have used the leasing technique to, in effect, reverse the results of a bond vote.

BONDS NO—BUT COURTHOUSE YES

When the 56-year-old courthouse at Santa Rosa, Calif., was condemned as unsafe a few years ago, Sonoma County officials went to the people five times in 3 years with proposed bond issues to build a new one; the citizens voted down all five. But workmen nevertheless are now putting finishing touches on a new $4 million courthouse and jail. The county established a nonprofit corporation to borrow money, build the facility, and lease it to the county.

In Los Angeles County, male lawbreakers are hauled off to a $17 million jail, built under a leasing arrangement after voters defeated a bond issue that had been proposed for its construction.

To be sure, such cases are still rare. Far more often, public officials arrange to have facilities built under leasing arrangements without ever putting a bond issue proposal up for a vote.

But many are frank to admit that they are turning to leasing because they fear a bond issue would be defeated. And their fears are far from groundless. Voters did defeat 37 percent of the $5.8 billion in State and municipal bond issues that were put up for approval last year, according to the Daily Bond Buyer, an investors' publication. That's up from a rejection rate of 30 percent in 1962, and only 25 percent in 1958.

"In the Midwest, we broke out with a rash of public rejections of general obligation bonds," says William Ford, executive director of the Illinois Building Authority. "Some means had to be found to provide needed facilities."

REVENUE BONDS ARE DIFFERENT

This building authority was organized by Illinois last year to become that "means." So far it has sold $25 million in revenue bonds. The money is being used, among other things, for buildings and equipment to be leased to State colleges and universities, and for a new penitentiary to be leased to the State prison system.

Revenue bonds are retired from income of the specific facilities built or acquired with bond proceeds. In many cases that income consists only of the rent paid by the government leasing the facilities. Nevertheless, revenue bonds legally are in a different class from general-obligation bonds, which are backed only by the "full faith and credit" of the Government unit issuing them; unlike these bonds, revenue bonds usually don't require voter approval.

"We haven't had a successful bond election for general public buildings since 1940," says John R. Leach, deputy chief administrative officer of Los Angeles County. "The voters will go only for things like hospitals and juvenile wards." General-obligation bond issues in the county must be passed by a two-thirds majority, and officials say the county's urban sprawl makes such a majority exceedingly difficult to get. Voters in one part of the county, they say, won't approve bonds that would go to build a courthouse or golf course in another part of the county that may be 30 or 40 miles away.

So officials have taken advantage of a 1949 state law allowing public employees' retirement funds to invest in real estate sold or leased to governments. In the past 6 years the Los Angeles County Employees Retirement Association has built projects costing $87 million, including the $17 million men's jail and a $1.4 million golf course. It has spent $24.6 million on projects now under construction, including five more golf courses, underground parking lots and a courthouse, and has committed another $25 million for future projects.

All these projects are being or will be leased to the county. Thus they will add to county lease-purchase obligations that taxpayers already are feeling in the pocketbook. It's estimated that rent obligations, plus amounts set aside for eventual purchase of the rented facilities, account for nearly 20 percent of the increase in the county's property tax rate since 1959. The Los Angeles County rate currently is $2.40 per $100 assessed value, up from $2.09 in 1959; of the 31-cent increase, it's estimated, 6 cents was made necessary by lease-purchase commitments.

Some still bigger projects are now being planned for building under lease arrangements. Alameda County and the city of Oakland plan to lease jointly a $25 million sports coliseum being built by prominent local citizens (they include William F. Knowland, **Barry Goldwater's State campaign manager**).

BIG CHICAGO LEASE

Chicago and its surrounding Cook County will lease jointly an $87 million civic center which will house offices of many county and city departments. The center is being erected by Chicago's Public Building Commission, which sold revenue bonds to finance it.

Though no overall measure of the trend is available, Alan V. Barlett, statistician for the Bank of America, estimates that in California alone the State and local governments have incurred substantially more than $200 million in lease-purchase obligations. But he complains that "nobody can find out what the debt is precisely, since most of it is relatively recent and municipalities don't report it as a debt."

The municipalities are within their rights, under a California Supreme Court decision, in taking this view of leasing arrangements. In some other areas, however, there's still a question as to where leases belong in the legal distinction between current obligations of a government and long-term debt.

THE LEGAL PROBLEM

And the question is crucial. Most States prohibit officials of either the State or local governments from incurring debts of more than a year—or, at least, debts that come due after the expiration of the officials' terms in office—without express voter approval. If leases were to be placed in this category, officials would have to arrange elections on leasing arrangements just as they do on general obligation bond issues.

A good many people would like to put leases in this class. As far back as 1868, a Federal judge termed the classification of lease rentals as current obligations "a proposition in legal metaphysics that I cannot comprehend." Several legal writers are attacking it currently on essentially the same basis.

But this view is losing ground. A legal survey, already somewhat outdated, found that leasing of schools had been upheld recently in five States and ruled illegal in only two, while specific leasing arrangements for various other kinds of facilities had been upheld in all five States in which they had been challenged. The survey did find that State building authorities created to lease facilities to State agencies had been held valid in only four States and invalid in six, but the situation in one of the six, Illinois, has changed since the survey was taken. An Illinois building authority established in 1941 was held to be unconstitutional but the authority organized last year was held to be valid under a constitutional 1961 State law.

OTHER CRITICISMS

Legal technicalities aside, critics have other arguments against leasing. One, of course, is what they view as the questionable ethics of bypassing voters. Another, and frequently bitter, argument is based on cost. James M. Wiley, manager of Dean Witter & Co.'s municipal bond department and a resident of California's Alameda County, combines the two in attacking the county's plan to lease the new $25 million sports coliseum jointly with Oakland.

The county, says Mr. Wiley, is "being saddled with substantial nonvoted debt and unnecessarily heavy taxes for years to come." He calculates the proposed 35-year lease on the coliseum will cost county taxpayers 4 percent in yearly interest for a total interest cost of $21,655,000. A 25-year, 3.5-percent issue of general obligation bonds, he says, would cost only $10,237,500 in interest.

The interest rate on lease rentals is calculated in different ways. If the organization building a facility issues revenue bonds, the government leasing the facility pays rent high enough to pay the interest on those bonds. If no bonds are involved, the government and the building organization simply agree on an interest rate in negotiations. When pension funds are involved there may be legal requirements; California law, for instance, specifies that pension funds must receive interest on their investments of at least three-quarters of 1 percentage point more than the going rate on U.S. Government bonds. The State consequently is paying nearly 5 percent interest on some of its leases of public buildings.

FOR THE DEFENSE

Government officials have several arguments for leasing, besides the contention that it is the only way they can get facilities they need greatly but that aren't glamorous enough to appeal to voters. While many concede that leasing is costly, some argue that it isn't as costly as a simple comparison of interest rates would make it appear, and that in some cases leasing actually may save money.

If Alameda County were to hold a bond election for the new sports coliseum it will lease jointly with Oakland, the start of construction would be delayed a year or more, says William E. Davis, assistant county administrator. Since he estimates construction costs are increasing 5 to 8 percent yearly, he contends a speedy start under a leasing arrangement will save enough on building costs to offset part of the extra interest cost—besides which the county will save the several hundred thousand dollars it would cost to hold an election.

Alameda County, says Mr. Davis, already has saved money because of the flexible construction timing that leasing arrangements permit. The construction contract for a welfare building that the county leases from an employees' pension fund, he says, was awarded some years ago when there was a "minor slump in the construction industry. As a result, the low bid was $800,000 below the cost estimated by the architect. This was a very significant saving to the taxpayers."

AVOIDING COMPLICATIONS

Robert W. Christensen, executive director of the Chicago Public Building Commission, says Chicago will lease its new $87 million civic center jointly with Cook County largely because the participation of two government units would make general-obligation bond financing complicated. Obviously the situation would be snarled considerably if Chicago voters approved a bond issue for the city's share of the project while county voters turned down a bond issue for their share, or vice versa. Leasing, he says, not only gets around this but provides a simple method of splitting the costs; county and city each pay rent on the offices they will use in the center.

In some areas, leasing has gained ground because State constitutions severely limit the amount of general-obligation bonds government units can issue even with voter approval. The Pennsylvania constitution limits bonded debt of school districts to 2 percent of their assessed valuation. Harold O. Spiedel, acting deputy superintendent of public instruction, says this is so little that "if some of our school districts had to go to general-obligation bonds, they just wouldn't be able to build anything at all."

Pennsylvania law permits school districts to establish nonprofit, municipality authorities to issue revenue bonds, build schools with the proceeds, and lease the buildings to school districts. A statewide school authority operates in much the same manner, leasing schools to districts that, for one reason or another, don't wish their own authority. Since 1952, just under $2 billion worth of Pennsylvania school construction has been financed through these agencies, nearly two-thirds of it in the past 6 years.

RESOLUTIONS OF BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE NATIONAL FARMERS UNION

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, on October 1 I participated in the Western States Water and Power Consumers Conference at Bismarck, N. Dak.

The previous day the National Farmers Union held a meeting of the board of directors of that organization and adopted the following resolutions which were given to me at Bismarck and which I commend to my colleagues.

I ask unanimous consent that these resolutions be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Resolution of the Board of Directors of the National Farmers Union Adopted Unanimously at Bismarck, N. Dak., September 30, 1964, in Regard to a Missouri Valley Authority

The board of directors of the National Farmers Union believes with the great conservation leaders of our history that America's material resources must serve the human resources of the Nation.

While we recognize the tremendous importance of the hydroelectric projects which have been built in the Missouri River Basin over the past decade, we feel that the economic growth and diversification of the region could be greatly speeded up by comprehensive planning and development.

We are aware of what has been achieved in the Tennessee Valley in flood prevention, low-cost power, improvement of navigation, reforestation, soil erosion control, and conservation of natural resources.

We are also aware that the Missouri Valley development has been hampered by the piecemeal, haphazard approach caused by overlapping jurisdiction and bureaucratic jealousy.

We therefore recommend that Congress consider and approve legislation creating a Missouri Valley Authority, a public corporation, to coordinate, unify, implement, and expand the work of existing agencies so that the administration on a regional basis can move forward more rapidly with comprehensive, multiple-purpose resource development.

Resolution of the Board of Directors of the National Farmers Union Adopted Unanimously at Bismarck, N. Dak., September 30, 1964, in Regard to the Southwest Power Monopoly

The members of the board of the National Farmers Union, taking cognizance of the announced plans of the Western Energy Supply and Transmission Association—a group of nine investor-owned power utilities—to form a $10½ billion generating, transmission and distribution monopoly covering nine southwestern States, are aware that these utilities have extorted from consumers over a period of years many millions of dollars in the form of overcharges.

The overcharges made by just one company alone, the Public Service Co. of Colorado—which is the company headed by the man who will be the president of the new supercombine—have during the period of 1956–60 amounted to more than $20 million.

We take further note that the Western Energy combine has planned to exclude all electric power projects financed wholly or in part by our Federal Government and all rural electric cooperatives.

We note that also besides the nine member firms several additional groups have been invited to participate. These are located in southern California—an area where power groups, public and private, have for many years joined in an attempt to destroy the family farm provision of the reclamation law known as the 160-acre limitation; and that the Imperial Valley Irrigation District is included, which has been receiving water from a federally financed project in violation of Federal law and in defiance of our U.S. Government.

We fear that the supercombine, not content with dominant control of generation and transmission in the southwest, is designed to strangle, emasculate and destroy farmer-owned transmission and distribution cooperatives.

The announced policy, if carried out, will clearly bypass State regulation and be in direct violation of the Federal Power Act, the Sherman Act and possibly other regulatory and antitrust laws.

We therefore hereby resolve:

That the President of the United States direct the Attorney General to study the plans of the proposed supercombine to determine what laws may be violated and to take appropriate steps to enjoin, arrest and bring to a halt the implementation of the plans for formation of power monopoly which would violate law.

That the Federal Power Commission thoroughly investigate the plans of the proposed combine and determine the extent to which the Federal Power Act may be violated.

That the Securities and Exchange Commission investigate in regard to the securities which may be sold and promoted by such a combine.

That the appropriate committees of the Congress take recognition of the monopoly dangers involved in this plan and consider the adoption of new or strengthened legislation to deal with it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

"ISSUES AND ANSWERS"—INTERVIEW WITH SENATOR MANSFIELD ON ABC RADIO AND TELEVISION PROGRAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an interview I had on the ABC radio and television program known as "ABC's Issues and Answers," in which I participated with Bill Downs, ABC news correspondent, and John Scali, ABC State Department correspondent, on Sunday, September 27, 1964, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the interview was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Issues and Answers

The Announcer. Senate Majority Leader Mike Mansfield, here are the issues: Will the Warren report become a political issue? Should we negotiate an end to the war in Vietnam? Do you favor a Johnson-Khrushchev summit conference?

For the answer to the issues, Senator Mike Mansfield, Democrat, of Montana, and majority leader of the U.S. Senate, member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and one of the Senate's most knowledgeable men in foreign affairs. To interview Senator Mansfield, ABC News Correspondent Bill Downs and ABC State Department Correspondent, John Scali.

Mr. Scali. Senator Mansfield, welcome to "Issues and Answers."

In a few hours the Nation will know what the Warren report has to say about the assassination of the late President Kennedy. From what you know about this report, sir, do you see any issue in it which might become a political campaign issue?

Senator Mansfield. No, I do not. I have had a chance to look at it. I agree with the report of the Commission which was set up. I think it was a high-class Commission, men of great integrity and ability. They have gone into this matter thoroughly and I certainly would hope that a report of this nature would not become a political issue in the campaign.

Mr. Downs. Senator, without breaking the release time or any confidences, do you believe that there is anything in the report that Congress should follow up on?

Senator Mansfield. If there are any recommendations, and I do not know, because I didn't get to the end of the report, it would be my belief that the Congress should immediately anticipate the recommendations from the President to follow out any recommendations made by the Warren Commission and I am quite certain that we would stay in session and give those recommendations every consideration possible.

Mr. Scali. Do you think this will interfere or alter the timetable for adjournment of the Congress?

Senator Mansfield. I wouldn't think so, and it needn't be so because if there are recommendations they should be given speedy consideration.

Mr. Downs. When will Congress adjourn?

Senator Mansfield. Optimistically we can adjourn by this coming Saturday, but I have my fingers crossed.

Mr. Scali. Senator, as you know there have been many voices raised abroad who insist that the late President Kennedy was killed as a result of a plot, or conspiracy. From what you know of this report, do you think that the conclusions in it will satisfy these people who see this sort of conspiracy involved?

Senator Mansfield. Possibly not, because there are some people who are trying to gain notoriety and publicity from such a thesis. Among them, of course, the Soviet Union, which I understand has issued its own release on the tragedy. There are others in this country who have made a gimmick out of it, so to speak, and have been giving lectures and making money at the same time.

People read into this report what they want to, but I think because of the great integrity and distinction of this committee that by and large the American public will accept it.

Mr. Downs. Well, Senator, you say Congress is going to adjourn possibly next week. How do you rate the achievements?

Senator Mansfield. I would say that this Congress, this year, would rank with any other year in the history of the Republic. President Johnson sent 51 recommendations down beginning in January of this year. Fifty-one of those recommendations have been passed in the Senate. Forty-five became law. The rest are in conference or—bills like Appalachia which we passed a few days ago, have still to be considered in the House. I don't see how you can do much better, and this, of course, is exclusive of the appropriation bills and there you will find that as usual the Congress has reduced the appropriations of the President considerably.

Mr. Scali. Well, Senator, the big question mark of course is the fate of the medicare bill. How do you see this resolving itself?

Senator Mansfield. That is hard to say. I am hopeful that out of the conference which will resume next Tuesday that some sort of a proposal will emerge because as you know what the Senate did was to pass a health care bill. Not a medicare bill, because the doctors are not involved, but it has to do with hospitals, nursing care, and nursing homes for our citizens who are 65 years of age or over. We have 18 million people in that category and they are increasing at the rate of 1,000 a day. I would hope that if we can't get the original King-Anderson-Gore amendment passed by the Senate we would get the Ribicoff proposal which gives the elder citizens of our country a choice between accepting additional social security payments or coming under a health plan.

Mr. Downs. But you don't see this happening in the next week, do you?

Senator Mansfield. I am hopeful.

Mr. Downs. What would you rate its chances in the House?

Senator Mansfield. That I don't know. That is why I say I am hopeful.

Mr. Scali. Well Senator, is what you are saying that, at least as far as the Senate goes, that all the President's "must" legislation has been approved.

Senator Mansfield. Every single piece of it.

Mr. Scali. And do you know of any parallel for a record such as this?

Senator MANSFIELD. I do not. That is why I say that this year's record will stand up with the record of any year in the history of the Republic.

Mr. DOWNS. In other words, you feel you have a pretty good congressional record to go back home and campaign on?

Senator MANSFIELD. Well, let me make a slight correction, there. This is not a Democratic record, this is a congressional record and the Republicans have time and time again furnished us the difference needed to get some of this legislation through, so I think the credit should go to the Republicans and the Democrats who are Members of the Congress, for the fine record which we have made this year.

Mr. SCALI. Senator, just broadening our horizon, here, a moment, all the political polls that have come up with any conclusions so far show President Johnson way ahead of Senator GOLDWATER. Question No. 1: Do you believe in these polls?

Senator MANSFIELD. No.

Mr. SCALI. Why?

Senator MANSFIELD. Because I just never pay any attention to them. I believe in hard work, handshaking, wearing out shoe leather, meeting with the folks, and that is what counts and not the polls, because, it is just like legislation, you never know how a bill is going to turn out until they count the votes. I am glad they are encouraging. I think it indicates a swing toward Johnson, but I wouldn't place too much credence in them.

Mr. DOWNS. How about the Senate, specifically? I think there are 35 seats up.

Senator MANSFIELD. That is right.

Mr. DOWNS. Would you make any prediction about Democratic gains?

Senator MANSFIELD. I would estimate we would gain, two, three, or four seats as of now.

Mr. DOWNS. Would you want to be specific as to what States?

Senator MANSFIELD. I would prefer not to.

Mr. SCALI. Do you expect the Democrats will gain in the House, too?

Senator MANSFIELD. I would assume if we gain in the Senate, they will gain from 10 to 15 to 20 members in the House.

Mr. SCALI. A personal question, too, in that area Senator: Do you wish to stay on as Senate majority leader?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Well, speaking personally, this is a matter which is always up to the Democratic conference. I didn't seek the position in the first place. The Democrats asked me unanimously, and I agreed. It is up to them.

Mr. SCALI. Well, do you want to?

Senator MANSFIELD. Again, it is up to them, because no one should seek a job of this kind. I don't mind seeking the Senate job that I am seeking, but I have never sought any other political position and it is a little bit unusual in politics to really say you have been drafted for a job, but it is the truth.

Mr. DOWNS. Well then, you wouldn't turn it down as a——

Senator MANSFIELD. No, I wouldn't turn it down because I have found a great deal of satisfaction in working with my Democratic colleagues, in working with the Republicans and being able to achieve reasonable results and doing what we all could do collectively in behalf of the interests of the country as a whole, rather than either political party.

Mr. SCALI. Senator MANSFIELD, one of the Senators who has been mentioned as perhaps worthy of an important role in the Senate is Senator PASTORE. Do you believe that he could be of great assistance to the President in any role in the Senate?

Senator MANSFIELD. Yes, JOHN PASTORE is one of the outstanding Senators, in my opinion. He has ability, integrity, he gets things done, he is a fine, forceful speaker. He represents his people well, and if he happens to be the choice of the Democratic conference, that would be fine, but again, of course, the Democratic conference would have to make that selection.

Mr. DOWNS. In working with the two Presidents of this administration, have you found it easier to work with Lyndon Johnson than you did with John Kennedy?

Senator MANSFIELD. I found it very easy to work with both Presidents. They differ in style. Kennedy was not as out-going as Johnson is but they have both been considerate, they have both been kind and they have both made my path a great deal easier.

Mr. SCALI. Do you think the friendships and the knowledge that President Johnson had from his days in the Senate has been a major factor in the record of Congress in passing the legislation which he thought was so important?

Senator MANSFIELD. Yes, indeed I do.

Mr. DOWNS. But you have not worried about the principle of keeping the legislative branch separate from the executive, he has not been telling you exactly what to do? You could exercise your own judgment, I mean?

Senator MANSFIELD. Oh, yes; absolutely. Neither he nor President Kennedy have tried to tell me what to do because both of them recognized the line between the executive and the legislative. I recognize it and I am very jealous of the prerogatives and the responsibilities of the legislative branch of the Government and as long as I am the majority leader, that line is going to observed.

Mr. SCALI. Well, Senator MANSFIELD, I thank you very much.

In just a moment, we will be back with more issues.

(Announcement.)

Mr. SCALI. Senator MANSFIELD, the Republicans say they are banking on what they call the "silent vote," which has been called many things, "backlash," or anything else you want to call it.

From what you have observed, have you seen any real signs that there is such a "silent vote"?

Senator MANSFIELD. Not in anything that I have observed but I wouldn't gainsay them in that respect. There is a silent vote, there always is a silent vote. How that vote will go is anybody's guess.

Mr. DOWNS. Actually what some people call ballot-box bigotry, I mean they can say one thing but when they get inside that—in the polling booth, they vote, say, their prejudices. They say this is true, that it showed up in the primaries in Wisconsin, Indiana and Maryland, where Governor Wallace did gain a substantial vote. Do you think there is a real sleeper in this election?

Senator MANSFIELD. Perhaps, of sorts, but I think that aspect has been overemphasized, that people are becoming more aware of what the law of the land is and realizing that as far as its application is concerned, that the States in their laws have priority. So there may be something to it, but I think as time goes on that that will dissipate.

Mr. SCALI. Senator MANSFIELD, what do you see as the result of this election, do you expect a landslide win by President Johnson?

Senator MANSFIELD. I never expect a landslide win in any race. Any political race is difficult. Anyone who takes it for granted or who relies on polls I think is in for a rude awakening. It takes hard work and it takes an acceptance of nothing which would indicate that it is going to be easy going. If you are going to win you've got to get out and work and work right up to the last minute, just like for a piece of legislation you have to go out and work for it. You know what the results will be when they count the votes, but only then.

Mr. DOWNS. The Republicans say in connection with this silent vote that there is now going on a political change, that there is a major realinement of our political ideologies. Do you think that is true?

Senator MANSFIELD. No, I wouldn't say that is true, but there is nothing to stop members of either party from going over to the other if they don't agree with the precepts of their own party, but as far as a liberal-conservative party alinement which has been advocated from time to time, I don't see it in the immediate future.

Mr. DOWNS. You see no threat to the two-party system. If there is a Johnson landslide, and the Republicans lose in the Congress, you have strangers, the regular party Republicans out of control, would you say there is a possibility that the Republican Party might disappear?

Senator MANSFIELD. No, and I would deeply regret it. I think this country is strong because it has a good two-party system and I would point out that parties have been down before but they bounced back because the American people as a whole do not like to see too great a disparity between the two parties and it isn't good for the country.

Mr. SCALI. Senator, Mr. GOLDWATER appears to be making an issue out of the fighting in Vietnam where he says both Defense Secretary McNamara and President Johnson are guilty of allegedly lying to the American people about what is going on there.

Do you agree at all with this criticism? Do you think the President and Mr. McNamara have lied about what is happening there?

Senator MANSFIELD. No, I thoroughly disagree. They have been telling the American people the truth. They have been telling the combined leadership, both Republican and Democrat, of the House and Senate what the situation is. President Johnson has had I believe 10 or 11 meetings with the leadership of both houses, and that includes Republicans, this year, to discuss Vietnam mostly, but other matters as well. He has kept the American people informed. He is hiding nothing and I think he is doing the very best he can within the knowledge which he possesses.

Mr. SCALI. Do you object at all to Senator GOLDWATER making a campaign issue out of the fighting in Vietnam?

Senator MANSFIELD. No, not at all. I think any aspect of foreign policy should be discussed, but I hope it would be discussed constructively. Anybody can criticize. Anybody can be negative. But if you do criticize, then I think you ought to come up with an alternative.

Mr. DOWNS. As a matter of fact, Senator, you have been not entirely uncritical of what has been going on out in Vietnam.

Senator MANSFIELD. That is correct.

Mr. DOWNS. And you have put forward suggestions that perhaps we should negotiate an end to that——

Senator MANSFIELD. Just a moment. First, let me say even though I am majority leader of the Senate, I am a Senator from the State of Montana and I have the right to my own independent judgment. I have exercised it and I will continue to exercise it in that capacity.

I have said, speaking of negotiations, that when President de Gaulle made his proposal seeking to bring about a settlement of the situation in all southeast Asia, that it ought to be given consideration. I get a little tired of proposals being made by De Gaulle, for example, and our State Department automatically shrugging them off. Now maybe he's got something, maybe he hasn't, but we have nothing to lose if we look into his proposal because it is a difficult area and we are involved there to a tremendous extent, both in terms of materiel and more important in terms of 18,000 Americans.

Mr. DOWNS. Well, De Gaulle, isn't he talking about neutralization?

Senator MANSFIELD. He has advocated that. If he has got something, let's look at it, but that does not mean that I advocate it.

Mr. SCALI. Well, if we examine the De Gaulle proposal—and I assume the State Department has——

Senator MANSFIELD. I would hope it has, but I am not at all certain it has.

Mr. SCALI. If it has, and it rejects the concept of neutralization as something which would weaken and eliminate whatever chances we have for a military victory, where do we go from here?

Senator MANSFIELD. Well, let me say this: As I see it, our main job in Vietnam is to keep—in South Vietnam—is to keep that country together, to try to give it some stability and some permanence and I think what we ought to do, as long as you have asked the question, is to see if something could not be arrived at by means of which the Cambodians and the South Vietnamese could arrive at an agreement covering their border. I think we ought to step up the defenses against the infiltration of men and materiel along the Ho Chi Minh Trail down through Laos. I think we ought to make sure that we have stiff enough naval patrols to keep the same elements coming down by sea from North Vietnam, but the main job is to try to make that country stable, give those people some hope because they have been in a war of one kind or another since 1939 and that is the No. 1 job, not the idea of interdicting supply places in North Vietnam, not the idea of invading North Vietnam or Communist China.

Mr. SCALI. Well, Senator, how do you persuade the Communists to do this, though? After all, there was an agreement whereby Laos was to be neutral and removed from the cold war. They clearly have violated that agreement and are seeking to overthrow the coalition government of Laos. They are continuing to use the Ho Chi Minh Trail, and indeed some of the areas up north for infiltration. How do you propose that you close off these routes short of sending in more American forces?

Senator MANSFIELD. Not more American forces because you've got a 250,000-man army in South Vietnam. A Vietnamese army. I would put those people up there, take them out of Saigon and other places and make them defend their own country. After all, this is their war. As far as Laos is concerned, it is true you have had North Vietnamese cadres coming in and joining the Pathet Lao. But Prince Souvanna Phouma is still in control, at least on paper he is still the executive head of this government, coalition or otherwise.

Mr. SCALI. If you move them all up to the border areas to seal off whatever routes are available, what happens inside the country where the Vietcong are very strong and where they are capable of taking over control of many of the provinces?

Senator MANSFIELD. Which they have already, but at least you give them an opportunity to bring about a degree of stability in South Vietnam itself.

Mr. DOWNS. How about the charges that the United States is engaged in illegal aggression in that part of the world, that we should admit it and turn the whole problem over to the United Nations?

Senator MANSFIELD. First the United Nations will not take over responsibility in that area. Nobody will do it with us. We are in there now and the idea is not to go north, not to pull out, but to do the best we can to help the Vietnamese help themselves to achieve the stability which they must have if they are to survive.

Mr. SCALI. Well, Senator, if we sought to enter into any negotiations now for some sort of agreement with the Communists, don't you think the present unsatisfactory military position on the Western side would actually invite the Communists to get the better of the negotiations?

Senator MANSFIELD. Of course it would. That is why I would be against negotiations at the present time because if there are ever going to be negotiations, as far as we are concerned we should negotiate from strength.

Mr. SCALI. Well, then, do you favor sending more American military advisers into that area, or in some way doing something in a military fashion that we haven't done up until now?

Senator MANSFIELD. I do not.

Mr. DOWNS. Well, General Taylor, I believe, reported to one of the congressional committees that we are stuck out there for a long, long war of attrition. That there is no military victory possible. That the only way we can arrive at a settlement is to make through attrition the fighting so costly to the Vietcong and the Communists that they will seek an arrangement.

Are we willing to expend that amount of time and money and blood to get this result, which maybe will take years and years?

Senator MANSFIELD. At the present time, Bill, we have no choice, and we will see this thing through.

Mr. SCALI. Do you approve of the instructions that are reported to be guiding American pilots out in that area; namely, that if the North Vietnamese and/or Communist planes try to strike at the American ships in that area, that they should follow them and destroy them, even if it means crossing the North Vietnamese or Chinese Communist borders?

Senator MANSFIELD. I do.

Mr. DOWNS. That is the theory of hot pursuit. In other words, we should be prepared to risk intervention by Peiping—the Chinese Communist government?

Senator MANSFIELD. If anybody attacks us we should retaliate in kind.

Mr. SCALI. Even if it does mean crossing the frontiers?

Senator MANSFIELD. Regardless of the consequences we have to defend our own 7th Fleet and our own ships out there.

Mr. DOWNS. Do you know of any plans for getting SEATO more involved, our allies in that part of the world?

Senator MANSFIELD. It is an utter impossibility. As one of the signatories of SEATO I have never had too much faith in it. I think it is more of a paper treaty than anything else and I think there is no possibility.

Mr. SCALI. Senator, some of the Republicans are hinting rather darkly that once the November elections are over, the Johnson administration will make some sort of deal with the Communists on Vietnam. Do you know of any such deal in the works?

Senator MANSFIELD. Absolutely not, and I certainly would hope that whatever moves we do make in the region of southeast Asia we would let November 3 intervene, because things in this difficult world in which we live have to be faced up to, they can't be delayed, they can't be dodged, they can't be evaded so I would hope that there is nothing political in what we are doing and I am absolutely certain there is not.

Mr. SCALI. Senator, one followup question to that: If the government of Premier Khanh is overthrown again—and they are having a difficult time now—and if a new government takes power—which is on the neutralist hue, and invites us to get out, do you think the U.S. Government should pull out its some 18,000 military advisers and give up this area to——

Senator MANSFIELD. No, you are going too far ahead of me in your crystal gazing. You are raising too many "iffy" questions. Let me answer it in this way: First, I think the biggest mistake made was the assassination of Ngo Dinh Diem, who I think was the only hope to bring stability and peace to South Vietnam and to keep that country free and independent. Now we have had two coups since his assassination last November. We may have other coups, but I think for the present the best thing we can do is to string along with Khanh and see if something cannot be worked out to give—I must emphasize this point—to give, primarily, stability to South Vietnam itself.

Mr. DOWNS. You are not advocating the return of Madam Nhu or anything like that?

Senator MANSFIELD. I am not, because I differentiate between Ngo Dinh Nhu and Madam Nhu on the one hand and Ngo Dinh Diem, the President of the country, on the other.

Mr. SCALI. Well, Senator MANSFIELD, thank you very much. In just a moment we will be back with more issues and answers.

Mr. DOWNS. Well, Senator MANSFIELD, the Republicans say that the Democrats are creating a phony issue when they raise this question of a nuclear trigger, that our military commanders already have the authority to use the nuclear bomb.

Senator MANSFIELD. This is something which should lie within the province of the President entirely. Whether or not there is this sort of arrangement, I do not know. I don't want to know. I don't think the people should know because it is the kind of information which would be of great benefit to the enemy, so I hope we would get away from this and recognize the fact that the President is the man who has to keep his hand on that button.

Mr. DOWNS. Well, then, to get away from it, Senator, what do you think the General Motors strike is going to do to our present prosperity? Is it a threat to the economy, can there be a settlement, will it affect the election?

Senator MANSFIELD. Of course, it is a threat to our economy, but I am very hopeful in view of the fact that the other two in the Big Three in the auto industry have settled with UAW, that this week GM will settle as well, and I am confident the prospects are good.

Mr. SCALI. Do you see any prospect that labor is drifting away from their traditional support of the Democratic Party?

Senator MANSFIELD. No, I would say they are staying with the Democratic Party by and large.

Mr. DOWNS. One final question, Senator. What would happen to the Democratic Party if Senator GOLDWATER wins?

Senator MANSFIELD. Well in this country we make the best of anything that happens and the people make the choice and what the choice of the people is will be all right with me and we will get along very well.

Mr. DOWNS. Well, thank you very much, Senator MANSFIELD, for being with us on "Issues and Answers."

The ANNOUNCER. Our guest has been Senate Majority Leader MIKE MANSFIELD, Democrat, of Montana. He was interviewed by ABC News Correspondent Bill Downs and ABC State Department Correspondent John Scali.

We hope you will join us again next week at this same time for another program of "Issues and Answers."

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 646) to prohibit the location of chanceries and other business offices of foreign governments in any residential area in the District of Columbia.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11380) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12259) to amend the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949 to provide for the determination of the amounts of claims of nationals of the United States against the Government of Cuba.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 1531. An act to increase the appropriation authorization for the completion of the construction of the irrigation and power systems of the Flathead Indian irrigation project, Montana;

S. 1640. An act for the relief of certain employees of the Alaska Railroad; and

S. 3174. An act to amend section 5 of the Employment Act of 1946.

TRIBUTE TO SENATE STAFF—RESIGNATION OF KENNETH TEASDALE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, as Members of this body we are fully aware of the great assistance of staff personnel to us in our work in the Senate even though the public may not be fully cognizant of it. I would like to take a moment, therefore, to say a word of appreciation in public about these men and women who function in our offices, in committee, and on the floor of the Senate. They are as dedicated and devoted and hard working a group as will be found anywhere in the Government. Many of them are outstanding in their professional and other skills and they have made exceptional contributions in connection with the enormous detail which is an essential aspect of the legislative process.

As this session draws to a close, we are about to lose a most valuable member of the Senate staff, Mr. Ken Teasdale, who is general counsel to the majority policy committee. Like his predecessor, Mr. Harry McPherson, whose great ability was recently recognized by the administration in designating him as Assistant Secretary of State, Ken Teasdale has given invaluable help to the majority leadership and to other Members of the Senate, both Democrats and Republicans.

In the 2 years that he has served the majority, Ken Teasdale has served as a brilliant lawyer, as a fine parliamentarian, and as a most responsible aid to the majority and to the Senate as a whole.

I want to take this occasion to wish him well in his new endeavor. As I understand it, he will go into private law practice with his father in St. Louis, Mo. He is an excellent lawyer. I am sure he will serve the people of that city and State with the same extraordinary legal ability that he demonstrated in the Senate. I want to express to him, on behalf of the leadership and the majority, deep appreciation for his dedicated contribution to the work of the Senate and the Government of the United States.

I wish Ken Teasdale well. I express the hope that before too many years have passed he may return to the Senate and occupy one of these seats in the Chamber.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. INOUYE. I wish to associate myself with the eloquent remarks of the majority leader, and to add that Ken Teasdale is one of the finest men I have met along my life's pathway.

I wish him the very best in his future.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. BIBLE. I do not know of any young man more deserving of the tributes just made by the Senator from Montana and the Senator from Hawaii than Ken Teasdale.

I wish him well in his chosen profession when he returns to the great State of Missouri.

Ken Teasdale has served the Senate faithfully and well. He deserves the best.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE 88TH CONGRESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the 2d session of the 88th Congress is drawing to a close. In one way or another, a hiatus of the Senate is imminent. This Senate of the 88th Congress has been the most active, the most productive in my personal memory. It has been, in my judgment, outstanding in the contribution which it has made to the Nation's welfare both at home and in its relations with other nations.

I shall not run through, at this time, a list of its achievements. Most of them are well known to the Members of the Senate.

But I should like to point out that the Senate, operating under procedures that sometimes have been described as cumbersome, has nevertheless dealt decisively with a great number of divisive and deeply rooted issues. Members of this body felt deeply and passionately, even as the American people, on both sides of such issues as equal rights and reapportionment. But operating almost wholly on the basis of consideration, cooperation, and mutual restraint, this institution has given a remarkable demonstration of its capacity to resolve passionately deep human differences on the basis of reason and accommodation. In so doing, it has reaffirmed its vitality and its essentiality in the structure of the Government of the Federal Republic. This sort of achievement is not something which can be conjured up by a majority leader or a minority leader. It is an achievement which derives from the character, the good sense, the ability, and the patriotism of the 100 men and women who compose this body.

The record of this Congress, in short, is the work of all Members of the Senate, of Republicans and Democrats alike, of proponent and opponent. For the majority leadership, I want to say in all frankness, that without the friendly cooperation, the hard work, and the positive contribution of the minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], in particular, my own responsibilities could not have been discharged. I am deeply indebted to him as a thoughtful colleague, as an understanding friend, and a truly great American. To him and to the committee chairmen, and to all Members whose dedication to duty, especially in this election year, entailed personal inconvenience and sacrifice, I want to express an appreciation for myself personally and for the Nation.

Mr. President, since January of this year, President Johnson sent 52 major recommendations to Congress and a total of 129 including appropriations.

So far as the Senate is concerned, those 52 major recommendations have been approved by this body.

In the field of appropriations, it is estimated that Congress has reduced the requests presented by the Budget Bureau at the beginning of this year to somewhere in the vicinity of $4.1 billion. This is a factor which I believe the general public seems to overlook. If we look at the record, going back for more than a decade, we find that every Congress, whether controlled by the Democrats or the Republicans, substantially reduced the requests sent down every year by the administration then in office.

MEASURES FAVORABLY REPORTED TO THE SENATE BY THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY DURING THE 88TH CONGRESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I call to the attention of the Senate a list of measures favorably reported to the Senate by the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry during the 88th Congress, under the able chairmanship of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER].

SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

S. 51, partially retrocedes jurisdiction over the Pole Mountain District of the Medicine Bow National Forest. Approved August 27, 1964—Public Law 88-494.

S. 277, increases number of new counties in which crop insurance may be offered each year from 100 to 150. Approved September 12, 1964—Public Law 88-589.

S. 332, prohibits futures trading in Irish potatoes. Passed Senate July 21, 1964.

S. 400, provides penalties for misuse of feed made available to relieve distress or preserve foundation herds. Approved September 11, 1964—Public Law 88-585.

S. 581, extends for 2 years the authority for leasing tobacco acreage allotments. Approved July 19, 1963—Public Law 88-68.

S. 582, extends for 2 years the exemption of "boiled peanuts" from marketing quotas. Approved July 19, 1963—Public Law 88-76.

S. 623, provides for payments to assist agricultural producers in Alaska to carry out farmland development measures.

Referred to House Committee on Agriculture June 26, 1963.

S. 692, authorizes establishment of an agricultural program for Guam. Approved September 7, 1964—Public Law 88-584.

S. 762, provides for increased 1963 wheat acreage allotments in Tulelake area of California. Approved July 17, 1963—Public Law 88-64.

S. 829, provides for marketing quotas for Irish potatoes. Reported to Senate March 16, 1964.

S. 1253, changes election procedures for county ASC committees. Companion bill, H.R. 9178, was approved August 31, 1964—Public Law 88-534.

S. 1388, extends Cache National Forest to include lands in and near the Pineview Reservoir site, Weber Basin project. Approved August 19, 1963—Public Law 88-99.

S. 1588, authorizes extension of conservation reserve contracts through 1965, and increases annual limit on cropland conversion program to $20 million. Referred to House Committee on Agriculture October 14, 1963.

S. 1604, permits rice producer withdrawing from rice production to transfer his production history for allotment purposes without transferring his land. Approved January 28, 1964—Public Law 88-261.

S. 1605, amends Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act to abolish registration under protest and permit registration number to be shown on label. Approved May 12, 1964—Public Law 88-305.

S. 1703, extends Mexican farm labor program 1 year. Approved December 13, 1963—Public Law 88-203.

S. 1790, provides U.S. contribution to cost of relocating utilities in certain watershed projects. Referred to House Committee on Agriculture June 29, 1964.

S. 1915, makes it clear that Secretary of Agriculture may provide for allotments under milk marketing orders so that instead of receiving a uniform blend price producers will receive a higher return on allotment milk and a lower return on excess milk. Referred to House Committee on Agriculture October 14, 1963.

S. 2218, transfers 360 acres from the Department of Agriculture to the Department of the Interior for the Foothills Parkway. Approved August 10, 1964—Public Law 88-415.

S. 2370, provides for U.S. contribution to maintenance of watershed project dams and works furnishing protection to the Rio Grande Canalization Project. Approved September 18, 1964—Public Law 88-600.

S. 2687, amends and extends Public Law 480, 83d Congress. Conference Report approved by House on September 23 and by Senate on September 24, 1964.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

H.R. 40, provides for grants for the construction of research facilities at State agricultural experiment stations. Approved July 22, 1963—Public Law 88-74.

H.R. 1642, provides for sale of animal quarantine station at Clifton, N.J. Approved September 12, 1964—Public Law 88-592.

H.R. 4242, provides for sale of reserved mineral interests in land in Pender County, N.C. Approved August 31, 1964—Public Law 88-544.

H.R. 4997, extends the 1963 feed grain program through 1965. Approved May 20, 1963—Public Law 88-26.

H.R. 5067, permits limited transfers of 1963 cotton acreage allotments which could not be planted because of natural disasters. (Committee was discharged from further consideration of this bill on the day after the day it was referred to the committee.) Approved April 26, 1963—Public Law 88-12.

H.R. 5860, amends the Packers and Stockyards Act of 1921 to permit deductions for promotion and reserach activities. Approved July 8, 1963—Public Law 88-61.

H.R. 6196, provides for cotton and wheat programs for 1964 and 1965. Approved April 11, 1964—Public Law 88-297.

H.R. 6601, authorizes sale of land in Grand Junction, Colo. Approved September 18, 1964—Public Law 88-603.

H.R. 7588, provides for prompt trial of national forest and grassland rules violation by a U.S. commissioner (at the election of the violator). Approved August 31, 1964—Public Law 88-537.

H.R. 9747, extends Armed Forces milk program for 3 years. Approved August 31, 1964—Public Law 88-529.

H.R. 10069, authorizes Lassen National Forest land exchange. Approved August 31, 1964—Public Law 88-524.

H.R. 10222, provides for a food stamp program. Approved August 31, 1964—Public Law 88-525.

H.R. 10419, provides for payment of part of patronage refunds in cash after a bank for cooperatives becomes subject to Federal income tax. Approved August 31, 1964—Public Law 88-528.

H.R. 11846 permits the Commodity Credit Corporation to purchase processed food grain products for donation and sell grain, instead of having Commodity Credit Corporation grain processed. Approved August 31, 1964, Public Law 88-550.

House Joint Resolution 192 validates certain rice acreage allotments for 1962 and earlier years. Approved October 28, 1963—Public Law 88-160.

House Joint Resolution 403 extended time for filing of leases of 1963 tobacco acreage allotments until 20 days after its enactment. Approved July 30, 1963—Public Law 88-80.

House Joint Resolution 1026 extends time for filing lease of 1964 tobacco acreage allotment with county committee. Approved August 20, 1964—Public Law 88-469.

RADICAL RIGHT TAKES TO THE TELEPHONE—PUTS HATE AND FEAR WITHIN THE REACH OF ALL

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, before Congress adjourns, I invite the attention of the Senate to a manifestation of our national life which I believe deserves the attention of the country. There is an accumulating body of evidence that the American people, who have directed their attention for so long to the radical left—and quite rightly—should turn their attention also to the radical right.

What I am about to state has been foreshadowed by the experiences of other Senators, such as the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] who sometime ago it will be remembered, made a revealing and eloquent speech on the subject.

The American radical right, which in recent years has had virtually a free hand in sowing fear and suspicion through innuendo and lies, is being challenged on several fronts. It has done its work under the guise of anticommunism, but such anticommunism creates rightist totalitarian dangers of its own and is mischievous, deceiving, and self-defeating.

A week ago, a group of 100 distinguished civic, educational, religious, and business leaders organized the National Council for Civic Responsibility to challenge false and misleading right-wing radio broadcasts. This week, two books written by experts in the field of extremist organizations were published to cut through the propaganda and invective and lay bare the tactics and the methods of the major right-wing organizations.

It is about time that the alarm bell on the radical right was sounded, loudly and clearly. For too long the responsible people of this country have watched in silence as the extremists on the right ape the tactics of their opposite numbers on the left in seeking to undermine the American people's confidence in their own leaders and the democratic processes through which they were elected.

It is about time that responsible Americans realized that the fight against extremism—which is always alien to the democratic way—is a two-front war, and that we have been neglecting one front, the extreme right.

The cause of this neglect is not hard to determine. Following World War II, this country learned the hard way about the designs of the international Communist movement, and attention was focused on the extremists of the left who would bury us. Later, after the American people and government became alert to this danger, the radical right continued to label as Communist anyone who opposed them and their dogmatic and totally false view of patriotism and Americanism.

The use of this smear tactic has shielded the radical right far too long. Their continually repeated falsehoods can no longer be treated lightly or ignored as the work of a few isolated members of the lunatic fringe. They do irreparable harm, not because these accusations are true, but because they often remain unchallenged because they seem beneath contempt.

I hope to lay before the Senate the record of one of the smaller, but more insidious of these groups, because I feel that full public scrutiny of ultraright organizations, their spokesmen and their aims, is the only real answer.

That is why the formation last week of the National Council for Civic Responsibility is so important. Arthur

Larson, director of the World Rule by Law Center at Duke University, and spokesmen for the council, said its members would expose the falsity of the allegations made by radical right organizations, especially over the air. He said the group was formed because its members were concerned "about the damage that will be done to the American standards of political discussion and responsible behavior" if the radical right's misstatements on political issues and personalities are allowed to continue.

This group, the National Council for Civic Responsibility—and I hope many others yet to come—will find much material for action in the two books just published: "The Strange Tactics of Extremism" by Harry and Bonara Overstreet, and "Danger on the Right," by Arnold Forster and Benjamin R. Epstein, who are officials of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith.

The Overstreets, who are widely read experts on the nature and designs of communism, write that the radical right does not help us to defend our country against communism or to carry forward the enterprise of freedom.

Their book shows how similar are the tactics of the radical right and the radical left—the doctrinaire approach to all problems, the use of the conspiracy theory of history, and the readiness to use lies or innuendo to undermine confidence in a civic or political leader or an institution.

I hope that the record of the organization I will talk about today will provide one more example of how the radical right is clouding meaningful discussion in the American civic and political arenas with invective and false information.

It should be remembered that professional haters have been with us throughout our history, and have found little difficulty in convincing themselves of treasonable insinuations in the White House, the Supreme Court, or Congress, but have found great difficulty in overcoming the good sense of the American people.

A belief in what they said and wrote was a convenience, but not a necessity, to the haters of earlier times, because most of them were strictly partisan with strictly partisan political motives in mind. But in the last few decades the character and the tempo of smear activity has accelerated, until today we have reached somewhat of an apogee in modern mass libel.

I would like to introduce to you today a nationwide organization not run by professionals but by enthusiastic amateurs and apparently inaugurated and dedicated to bringing hate and fear within the reach of all. The organization called itself Let Freedom Ring, but perhaps it should be called, Let Hate Be Heard. It provides the ultimate in conveniences—a short tape-recorded hate message available at any hour of the day or night, and at the cost of only a phone call.

The group apparently has its national headquarters in Sarasota, Fla., and for the nominal fee of $20 yearly sends to its outlets throughout the country a weekly script, at least 40 of which the local outlets must use if they want to maintain their franchise. This, says the Let Freedom Ring headquarters, allows local outlets some time to present local messages, presumably aimed a local officials.

I first became aware of this organization about 2 months ago and in a very personal manner. Constituents began calling my office with reports that somebody was making tape-recorded messages available, claiming that I had a "100 percent pro-Communist, America-last voting record," among many other things.

Like almost any other person in public life, I decided to ignore this as the work of the local cranks who linger on the edges of society in any community. Then, my office began to get letters and phone calls from concerned citizens in many parts of the country informing me of the attacks and offering assistance. One even went to the trouble of making a tape recording of the message and sending it to me.

These letters, and subsequent research by my staff, indicates that Let Freedom Ring is now plugged into the telephone systems in—and I hope the Senators from these States will take notice—Florida, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Colorado, and California. Most of the scripts sent out by the headquarters in Sarasota are recorded by local people in these communities—using as many different voices as possible—and put on the telephonic broadcasting devices across the Nation simultaneously.

We have learned that Let Freedom Ring has been organized nationally for about 20 months. We have been able to collect a representative sample of the scripts it has distributed, and have listened in on some of their telephonic hate messages in several locations around New York City, in Philadelphia, and in Boulder, Colo.

We have learned that in this relatively short period of time Let Freedom Ring has attacked with innuendo and outright lies and in the most irresponsible, personal, and vicious manner, Presidents Kennedy and Eisenhower, Chief Justice Earl Warren, U.N. Ambassador Adlai Stevenson, the late Eleanor Roosevelt, and many other prominent and loyal Americans.

It has used half-truths and lies to indicate that the higher echelons of our Defense Establishment are working to deliver the country into the hands of the enemy. It has alleged that American aid to Yugoslavia goes directly to the Soviet Union, that our Government would aid in the execution of former Venezuelan Dictator Perez Jiminez, and that the United Nations Children's Emergency Fund—which feeds thousands of hungry youngsters throughout the world—"is one of the best examples of subversion."

In short it has done everything possible to cast the cloud of suspicion over the loyalty of elected officials and doubt over the capability of our form of government to defend us from communism.

The Sarasota headquarters, for example, in telling its story to potential affiliates, brags about even this petty a triumph:

> You will be amazed at the influence that you can have on public opinion almost immediately. Last year, for instance, we were given credit for having killed the UNICEF Christmas card drive locally—an accomplishment of which we are very proud.

I feel it is important to bring this radical and extremist organization to the attention of the Senate and the Nation for three reasons:

First. The method used by Let Freedom Ring makes it faceless, and anonymous. A voice on the telephone. Not even the written word where the inaccuracies and innuendoes can at least become apparent to reasonable people on considered reading. No, just the short message over the phone, which leaves you asking what exactly was said, but with just enough of the message to cause suspicion and doubt.

Telephone officials in many parts of the country agree that there is absolutely nothing they can do to regulate the use of their equipment, except in cases of overt criminal activity. It is almost impossible, however, for the individual telephone customer to find out from his local company just who rents the equipment for Let Freedom Ring broadcasts. On occasions it has even taken the press months to find out who is responsible for these messages, as was the case with reporters for the Sarasota Herald Tribune. In September 1962, however, the operator of a Let Freedom Ring device in Berkeley, Calif., which was broadcasting vicious, anti-Semitic messages, was exposed by the Anti-Defamation League as a man who a year earlier had written ADL to say that "(Adolf) Eichmann had the right idea." But reporters in New York and New Jersey have encountered great difficulty discovering who is actually recording the messages, and apparently this is just the way the Let Freedom Ring people want it.

Second. When made the subject of this kind of smear, most of us in public life tend to ignore it, as I originally did, because we feel that whatever protest we raise will give such organizations and their wild charges even more of the publicity and notoriety they crave. And we are right. The bulletin produced by Let Freedom Ring in search for new outlets carries this paragraph:

> The initial broadcast we send you will be especially "strong" (but factual), in order to get as much free advertising as possible from the newspapers and by word of mouth.

And in the same bulletin:

> No matter how beautiful the screams of pain from the left wing press (resulting in hundreds of dollars of free advertising), you will have to put the name constantly before the public after the initial flurry of interest dies down.

But the spotlight of public scrutiny thrown on organizations such as this does alert the people and bring about a vigilance which can warn the otherwise unsuspecting in advance.

Third. The American people have long consigned to oblivion these merchants of hate, but the pushbutton approach to mass libel shown in the activities I am here disclosing and which operates simultaneously in all parts of the Nation contributes to a serious erosion of truth and the growth of unwarranted suspicion concerning our national institutions and policies and our national leaders.

I call attention to the fact that Presidents have been uniformly smeared, going back to George Washington's day. Benjamin Bache and his cohorts who continually smeared President Washington in the mid-1790's in search of some treasonous sellout of the principles of democracy, reached comparably few people. Neither could the haters of Jefferson or Jackson, or Lincoln or Andrew Johnson, or Franklin D. Roosevelt or Harry Truman.

Let us remember that in all cases—and the American people should ponder this point well—those smears were by self-styled "patriots" who always found evidence of treason in the Executive Office or in some high level of government.

But, Mr. President, how many more people were reached with this rather startling example from "Let Freedom Ring" headquarters which was put on the telephone devices in February 1964:

> Although the U.S. Congress has not authorized our disarmament, this is rapidly taking place illegally. Our bomber fleet is being junked, our military bases are being closed down at home and abroad, and Representative FOREMAN, of Texas, reports that 17 of our long-range radar stations have been dismantled and shipped to pro-Communist India.
>
> Our military forces are becoming demoralized and resignations by officers were up 100 percent in 1963 as compared to 1962. We are told by a military officer, who must remain unnamed, that our atomic stockpiles are being dumped into the sea on the west coast of the United States.
>
> At the University of Michigan a plan is being developed for the systematic house-to-house search of the entire United States for arms of any kind. The search is to be made by the U.S. Army by blocking off five States at a time, beginning in the western part of the country. The entire civilian population is to be completely disarmed by the end of 1965.
>
> From the Herald of Freedom we quote: "The plans for the takeover of a country by the Communists provide for the immobilization of the Armed Forces, the demoralization of the police, and disarmament of the populace. Those who think it can't happen here should remember that every country, including Cuba, had an army and a navy and yet they were taken over with no difficulty."
>
> Let freedom ring.

I took the trouble to send this scurrilous, dangerous, and perhaps seditious text to the Department of Defense for comment. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the Defense Department's detailed answer to these unbelievably wild charges.

There being no objection, the text was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEFENSE DEPARTMENT'S ANSWER

Charge: Although the U.S. Congress has not authorized our disarmament, this is rapidly taking place illegally.

Answer: The United States is maintaining and will always continue to maintain all the military power necessary to our defense and our part in the defense of the free world. Although always prepared to discuss any honest proposals which might hold real promise of increasing the possibilities for peace, whether those proposals deal with foolproof plans for world disarmament or with plans for increased free world defense strength, the United States not only is not disarming itself, but, quite the contrary, in every area of national strength, America today is stronger than it has ever been before. The U.S. military force is stronger than any adversary or combination of adversaries in the world.

To appreciate the full extent of this force, we can contrast it to that of our principal adversary. By such a test, our strategic superiority is incontestable.

Our Strategic Alert Forces now have 1,100 bombers, including 550 on 15-minute alert, equipped with decoy missiles and other penetration aids to assure that they will reach their targets. The Soviet Union could, with difficulty, place over this country on two-way missions slightly more than 100 heavy bombers, plus 150 medium bombers capable of striking only Canada and the northwestern corner of the United States.

We now have more than 800 fully armed, dependable ICBM's deployed on launchers, almost all in hardened and dispersed silos. This number will be increased to over 1,000 by 1970.

Our Navy now has 256 Polaris missiles deployed in 16 submarines; 25 more Polaris submarines are under contruction. By 1970 we will have 656 Polaris missiles in 41 submarines. The Soviet Union's submarine-launched ballistic missile fleet is, by comparison, small and ineffective. Most of its submarines are not nuclear powered, their missiles cannot be launched from beneath the surface, and the range of these missiles is only a third of the range of our Polaris missiles.

The power of these forces will soon be further increased by the addition of the new Polaris A–3 missile and the new Minuteman II. The Minuteman II is as great an improvement over the Minuteman I as the B–52 was over the B–47. It will be more than eight times as effective against the best protected military targets as its predecessor.

Moreover, in the field of military research and development, the United States has initiated or carried to completion more than 200 new projects and new weapons systems in the last several years. Among these projects are:

The SR–71, a long-range, manned, supersonic strategic military reconnaissance aircraft, which employs the most advanced observation equipment in the world and flies at over 2,000 miles per hour and at an altitude of over 80,000 feet.

The new Nike X, which will give us the option to deploy—if the national security requires it—the most advanced antiballistic missile yet conceived by any nation.

The new A7A aircraft, which will give the Navy superior attack capability at more than double the range of the A4E that it will replace.

The EX–10, a heavy, new type of torpedo for use against deep-diving, fast, nuclear submarines.

The new Main Battle Tank, which will give our ground forces armor superiority throughout the 1970's.

The revolutionary variable-sweep winged F–111 fighter-bomber, a supersonic aircraft which has double the range and several times the payload of any previous fighter-bomber.

Finally, and conclusively, the tempo of our great, bipartisan national defense effort has consistently increased in recent years. The total national defense budget has increased from $40.7 billion in fiscal year 1955 to $47.5 billion in fiscal year 1961 (the last Eisenhower budget) to $53.9 billion in fiscal year 1965, and reached a post-World War II peak of $55.3 billion in fiscal year 1964, during the years in which the United States bought much of the missile hardware which now gives us such a decisive advantage over any possible adversary or combination of adversaries.

This Nation now has, and will continue to have throughout the future, such overwhelming deterrent power that the leaders of the Communist world know that an attack on the free world would surely be followed by their own complete destruction.

Charge: Our bomber fleet is being junked.

Answer: No part of our bomber fleet is "being junked." Our bomber fleet has been assigned a significant role in the Nation's defense and will continue to have such a role as long as national security requires it.

Today we have over 1,100 strategic bombers, a 4 to 1 superiority over the Soviets. The combat effectiveness of our bombers is increasing through the installation of the latest air-to-surface and decoy missiles to help them reach their targets in the event of a surprise enemy attack.

We expect to spend about $300 million a year in improving the overall capabilities of our B–52 force. We have already spent about $1.6 billion.

In accordance with a decision made several years ago, the older B–47 medium bomber is gradually being phased out of the active inventory, since the large measure of national defense our missile forces and newer B–52's and B–58's supply has supplanted the need for the older medium-range B–47 aircraft.

Our forward defense plans now go through fiscal year 1972. These plans include large numbers of strategic bombers at every stage.

No decision has been made about our needs beyond 1972, but we are making ample advance provision for (1) possible extension of the life of the B–52, (2) research on new manned systems, and (3) possible strategic uses of manned systems (such as the F–111) now in production.

Charge: Our military bases are being closed down at home and abroad.

Answer: This charge confuses our carefully phased program to terminate activities at military bases whose activities are no longer required for the defense effort with an unfounded and totally false notion of unilateral disarmament.

The facts are that today the Department of Defense has over 1,000 military bases, throughout the world, providing this Nation and its allies with a strength second to none.

About 3 years ago, the Department of Defense embarked on a program to identify those installations which could be consolidated, reduced in scope, or closed without any adverse effect whatsoever on our military effectiveness. As of June 30, 1964, 144 bases were affected by this program, with these significant results: $570 million annually in operating costs will be saved; over 1 million acres of land will be turned back to the private sector of our economy. Land which was once tax consuming can now become tax producing. The short answer here is that the program to terminate unnecessary operations was designed to, and is in fact, increasing our military preparedness, not reducing it.

Charge: Seventeen of our long-range radar stations have been dismantled and shipped to pro-Communist India.

Answer: On April 26, 1963, the Department of Defense announced to congressional leaders and the public plans to eliminate a number of radar installations no longer needed, and subsequently 17 long-range radar installations were closed. The appropriate responsible congressional committees have been kept fully informed of these developments.

The 17 radars in question were originally assigned as a part of our system of defense against manned bomber attack. Each was selected by the Air Force for closing after careful consideration of whether it made a useful contribution to the defense system. These 17 were no longer needed for our defense, and their elimination was achieved without any practical weakening of the air defense we do need. At the same time the taxpayers were necessarily saved millions of dollars and the Air Force was able to reassign to useful missions the men committed to the maintenance and manning of the installations.

The radar equipment has now been removed from most of these 17 installations. Under normal disposal procedures, some of these excess radar units were rehabilitated and channeled into the U.S. military assistance program and, thereafter, were made available to a number of friendly foreign countries to aid in their air defense.

Since the Communist Chinese invasion of India posed a serious air threat to that country, some of these radars were programed for India under the military assistance program to assist that country in defending against the Chinese Communist threat.

Charge: Our military forces are becoming demoralized and resignations by officers were up 100 percent in 1963 as compared to 1962.

Answer: This statement is a gross distortion of the truth.

The facts are that only a relatively small percentage of regular officers leave the services through resignation. In the last several years, only about 1 regular officer resigned for each 100 regular officers in the force. While the percentage of resignations increased from 0.6 percent in fiscal year 1962 to 1.4 percent in fiscal year 1963, the operative factor was a freeze imposed on resignations during most of fiscal year 1962 due to the Berlin crisis. The net effect of this freeze was to force the postponement of many resignations from fiscal year 1962 to fiscal year 1963. As a result, the fiscal year 1962 resignation figures are artificially low.

Charge: We are told by a military officer, who must remain unnamed, that our atomic stockpiles are being dumped into the sea on the west coast of the United States.

Answer: This charge is totally false.

The facts are that our atomic stockpiles are not being dumped into the sea or anywhere else. The size and mix of our stockpile is reviewed annually by our top military and civilian leaders. It contains enough weapons and megatonnage to insure today, and in the future, the complete destruction of both the Soviet Union and Communist China, under the worst imaginable circumstances accompanying the outbreak of war. There should be no doubt of this in the minds of any American. There is none in the minds of our enemies.

Over the last 4 years, for example, there has been a 150-percent increase in the number of nuclear warheads and a 200-percent increase in the total megatonnage in our strategic alert forces.

The "unnamed" informer is badly confused. Quite obviously, he is yet to discover the fundamental difference between the atomic stockpile, on the one hand, and certain radioactive wastes that result in the production of stockpile materials on the other. Some of these wastes contain radioactivity at levels which require their careful and safe disposal. With internationally accepted health standards fully observed, some of this waste has been disposed of at sea, in specially designed waterproof containers.

Charge: At the University of Michigan a plan is being developed for the systematic house-to-house search of the entire United States for arms of any kind. The search is to be made by the U.S. Army by blocking off five States at a time, beginning in the western part of the country. The entire civilian population is to be completely disarmed by the end of 1965.

Answer: This charge is absurd, completely false, and reflects the hallucinations of an aberrated mind.

The Department of Defense has no knowledge of any plan or study at the University of Michigan or anywhere else even remotely bearing any semblance to the one alleged in this charge.

The right of citizens to be secure in their homes and persons from unreasonable searches and seizures and their right to keep and bear arms are both guaranteed by the U.S. Constitution. These constitutional rights always have been and always will be jealously guarded by the U.S. Government and are among the blessings which our Armed Forces have fought and died to protect in three wars in the last 50 years.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, of course not a word of that was true. The Pentagon's analysis makes it clear how propagandists such as those writing the LFR scripts make full use of half-truths as well as outright falsehoods to give their message the appearance of credibility. For example, it is true that resignations of Regular military officers increased 100 percent between fiscal year 1962 and 1963. What isn't reported is the reason for such an increase—the freeze on all resignations during most of 1962 because of the Berlin crisis. This type of message is a gross imposition upon the American people and is done in such an underhanded way that it needed to be spread upon the RECORD.

Also, in the tradition of irresponsible propagandists—using other irresponsible propagandists in an attempt to document their line—the house-to-house search for arms idea appears to have been taken directly from the October 1963 issue of "On Target," the magazine of the Minutemen. The Department of Defense calls this charge "absurd" but the "Let Freedom Ring" writers apparently swallowed whole this article by the Minutemen, a supersecret group specializing in guerrilla warfare training on the theory that the Communists will take over the United States and they will take to the woods in order to defend the freedom of the country.

Mr. President, the insinuations of "Let Freedom Ring," are beneath our contempt and unworthy of our notice, but the public must be made aware that this sort of message is being distributed and used nationwide and simultaneously or it may mistake Let Freedom Ring as the work of purely local crackpots.

And unless the public understands that this sort of message depends on the use of innuendo, half-truths and invective to leave a nagging, if illogical, suspicion in the minds of the listener, it may underestimate the effectiveness of this sort of propaganda. Both the Communists and the Nazis understood only too well that the constant repetition of half-truths and outright lies over a long enough period could make suspicion of lawful, democratic authority commonplace.

The operations of Let Freedom Ring show how an infinitesimal segment of our society, using modern techniques, can implant these suspicions and these doubts throughout the Nation. This is why I feel that the formation of the National Council of Civic Responsibility and the renewed interest in the radical right among leading authors and publishers is so important.

We are quite well armed in our anti-Communist struggle with the organizations that are in being, with the awareness of our people, and with the constant activity in the Congress and outside the Congress to alert the country to the Communist danger. I thoroughly agree with those alerts. I am a party to them. I shall continue to be. But we have left our flank exposed. There is a certain amount of naivete on the part of the American people with respect to the ultrarightists. It is felt that they are in a different class, that they are just misguided patriots. The material that I have just described—and much more has been given by others—is as dangerous and as undermining and possibly as seditious as communism. One would be as much enslaved if he had a black or brown collar around his neck as he would be with a red collar. We want neither.

I believe it is high time that the American people become alert to the danger and cease accepting these extremists on the right as crackpots who have to be forgiven because they are really very patriotic even if they go overboard a bit. We should recognize them for what they are—people who are dangerous to the security and future of the Nation; just as dangerous as those on the extreme left. We should be just as vigorous and strong and vigilant against one extreme as we are against the other. This should be reflected in the activities in our committees in the Congress, both in the House and in the Senate. It should be reflected in the expression of candidates, including presidential candidates, who somehow or other refuse to recognize or just cannot bring themselves to recognize that the greatest danger of the extreme right equates with the grave dangers of the extreme left. They both must be fought with equal vigor, intensity, awareness, and alertness, as we know the greatest weapon in our country is the spotlight of public attention.

Mr. President, I believe that the American people are sophisticated and discerning enough to know a patriot when they see one, even though they do not agree with him.

I believe they are sophisticated and alert enough to know sedition when they see it, whether it comes under the symbol of communism or whether it comes under the labels of the radical right.

This is why I hope that the alarm now raised will be heeded by responsible citizens and groups throughout the country and our people will not only be made aware that we are engaged in a two-front war, but will join a counterattack against the forces of hate, fear, and irresponsibility on the extreme right as well as on the extreme left.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that the conference report on the foreign aid authorization bill be laid before the Senate for consideration.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** laid before the Senate the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11380) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of today.)

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is my understanding that this conference report has been signed by all the conferees; and I ask for its adoption.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of either the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] or the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], as to what disposition was finally made of the so-called Mundt-Lausche amendment, to establish legitimate rates of interest and establish amortization repayment tables for what are euphemistically referred to as "loans" in the foreign aid program; whether a distinction has been retained between loans which bear interest and have a repayment schedule and "loans" which obviously we do not intend to recapture since in reality they are actually gifts.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Do I correctly understand the Senator's inquiry to be what happened to it?

Mr. MUNDT. Yes. I saw newspaper reports about it, which presumably are accurate, but inadequate.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The law was left unchanged as it now stands with the exception that, whereas the law now provides that the interest rate which will be paid during the 10-year grace period, prior to the beginning of the payment of principal, is three-quarters of 1 percent, the interest for that part of the grace period was raised to 1 percent a year.

I am trying to get this information straight. It is rather complicated.

The interest rate after the 10-year grace period goes from the present 2 percent to 2½ percent per annum.

The grace period was left at 10 years, as it is in present law. It is not as set out in the Senator's amendment, which I believe provided for 5 years.

There were discussions about reducing that period to 7 years, rather than the 10 years now provided. Finally it was left at the 10-year figure.

Would the Senator like to have me discuss some of the arguments that were made?

Mr. MUNDT. I would.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Arguments were made that other countries are now coming up to this particular system of terms. In other words, I think Canada has now come up to a 10-year grace period.

I am sorry the chairman of the committee is not present.

At any rate, Canada has come up to a longer grace period. Some of her payment periods run for as long as 50 years. Other countries are coming nearer to the standards which we have.

The argument was made that if we begin to lower the grace period, we shall be defeating the very purpose of getting other countries to join in soft loans on easier terms.

There was violent opposition by the State Department to the Senator's amendment. On many occasions when the State Department raises violent opposition, it seems to have quite an influential effect on certain Members of Congress.

Mr. MUNDT. May I inquire whether the House conferees as a unit were adamantly opposed to our amendment, or whether there was some breaking of the ranks that may give us hope for future reformation?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I am not at liberty to tell which members of the conference were committed to what. The House conferees agreed to the final result, and the Senate conferees agreed to it, in the majority. I do not believe there was a record vote on either side. I had some reservations, for my purposes; but the Senate conferees agreed to this result, as did the House conferees. The House Members will have to speak for themselves.

Mr. MUNDT. Were any stipulations made with respect to the time after the 10-year grace period? Ten years represents a decade. Ten years into the future, in the kind of life we live, with changes occurring as fast as they do, almost extends into perpetuity so far as some of these newly developing nations are concerned. Are there any stipulations, after the expiration of the 10-year grace period, as to the kind of amortization payments that are to be made?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The present law stands unchanged with the exception of the two interest-rate provisions. So whatever is in the present law remains in. Under the present law there is no legal termination period for these loans. The legal termination period or due date is fixed in the contract of loan made between AID and the recipient countries or groups that receive the loans. Many of those loans will have interest rates of 3 or 4 percent. They do not adhere to the minimum stipulations in the contracts. As I understand, some of the loans will go for 5 years, some for 10, some for 20. I do not know of any that go for much longer than that.

Mr. MUNDT. Some go for 40 years.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I was about to say that I am informed by the staff that one or two—perhaps three or four—loans will go for as long as 40 years. But that period is set in the contract upon which the loan is made.

Mr. MUNDT. Did anything come out of the conference which would prevent, for example, after the grace period—which would leave 30 years—a deferment of the repayment of the loan until the 30 years are over, in the case of a 40-year loan, or, in the case of 30 years, beyond the expiration of the grace period? Is there any provision that there must be annual repayments?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. No; these are a part of the terms and conditions of the contract of loan or the specifications upon which the loan is based. Those terms and conditions are set out in the contract.

Mr. MUNDT. Let me put it this way, so that our constituents will know exactly what we have done, or, to put it better, what we have failed to do to protect the interests of the taxpayer.

Is it correct to say, so far as the present law is concerned, that it would be possible for a borrowing country to obtain the money and pay 1-percent interest on it for the first 10 years and 2½-percent interest on it for the next 30 years, and make no repayment of principal of any kind until the end of the 40th year from the time when the loan had been negotiated?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I presume it could be done, but the whole connotation of the law is that, as the law stands now and as it will stand if this proposal is adopted, there will begin to be an amortization after 10 years, because the law refers to the 10-year grace period. However, it is still a matter of contract between AID and the borrowing country or the entity that borrows this money.

Technically, it could be possible. There are no open end loans. I am not aware of any loans that have been extended beyond the original contract period. There may be some, but if there are any, I do not know of them. I believe that most of the loans that have been made are on much more stringent terms.

Mr. MUNDT. We have been in this global bucket shop business for only 17 years. Some of the loans were made for 30 or 40 years, and the question of extendability has not necessarily been raised as yet.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. So far as I know, the question of extendability has not been raised. It would be technically possible for the lending agency to renegotiate a loan contract and make some extensions. At the present time that is not the fact.

Mr. MUNDT. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I assure the Senator from South Dakota that the bulk of the loans have been made on tougher terms than the minimum set out even in the present law.

Mr. MUNDT. I appreciate the Senator's report. I do not wish to interrogate him further. I realize that he is a reluctant witness to a murder, that took place at midnight, of the Mundt-Lausche proposal, and that he did not participate in the assassination. I wanted to get from him as close an eyewitness account as I could.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I thank the Senator for his generous remarks. However, as a member of the conference I must share whatever responsibility falls upon the conferees. I was a member of the conference. A number of things went on in the conference of which I did not personally approve. However, we cannot always get our way in everything in conference. We have to do the best we can to reach an agreement on something that we hope will be acceptable to both Houses. In this case, this seemed to be the only possible solution.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator from South Dakota has been a member of conference committees ad infinitum, ad nauseam. I appreciate the problems involved, especially when we are up against an adjournment date, which has been tardily arrived at. In such a case there are a great many pressures besides economics and logic.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. There is the little element of a majority vote, too.

Mr. MUNDT. Yes. Too frequently we of the minority cannot get everything we would like to get. Under normal legislative procedures, I would suggest a motion to reaffirm the position which the Senate took by an overwhelming majority on a yea-and-nay vote, when we said that from now on to allude to foreign loans means a classification on an honest, responsible, and forthright basis, that it means a legitimate interest rate, that it means a shorter period of grace, and that it certainly means a schedule of repayment which is in conformity with economic and banking practices.

However, I shall not make a motion of that kind today, and thereby try to hold the Senate in session any longer, at a time when I doubt very much whether a quorum of Senators is within 100 miles of Washington. Probably it would not be possible to obtain a quorum in the House until the end of next week. I see no purpose to be served in trying to do that under the circumstances.

However, I serve notice now, that we will renew this fight next year. While I do not see the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] on the floor at the moment, I know that he shares in these sentiments. I note the presence of the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and I know he also shares those sentiments.

Mr. MORSE. I think a little fighting should be done now. I think there should be a yea-and-nay vote. I want Senators to go on record on this conference report. In my judgment, this conference report is the most unconscionable conference report that I have seen come to the floor of the Senate in my 20 years in this body.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator from South Dakota is not very happy about it either, and he would vote against the conference report if a yea-and-nay vote were held. I doubt however that anything worthwhile could be accomplished at this late hour. Too many Senators are absent; too many of those still present are eager to adjourn and leave Washington. At least we will renew this fight next year to try to do something in the interest of the American taxpayers.

The time is long past when we should stop flimflamming the public by saying we are engaging in a program of economic loans when those loans are only thinly disguised grants, with 10-year periods of grace, and with the interest rate so low that every time the interest is paid we must subsidize every dollar of it because we pay much more for our own money.

I serve notice on the AID representatives and on the State Department that I shall ask for a record of achievement, not merely the arguments that are made in committee, and a statement on how many other countries are making money available on the same low terms that we are making in this great AID program, and whether we are making the kind of progress that they hopefully envision in this area.

This program is old and now has a well developed beard, and walks with halting step, after 17 years. We are no longer justified in the deception of calling something a loan that is really a grant. I should take this occasion to announce that I have been working with others for several months on a reappraisal of our entire economic oversea aid program, which I intend to introduce in legislative form at the next session, either as a separate bill or as an amendment, which will get away from the entire concept of using hard earned dollars of American taxpayers, derived from individual, privately owned enterprises, to subsidize socialism all around the world. That is basically wrong. We are taking American dollars, derived from private enterprise, and virtually giving them away in the guise of loans, sometimes directly as gifts, to subsidize nationalization and socialistic enterprises in countries where we know they cannot succeed, and when we could not make this kind of enterprise successful in our own country with the kind of sophisticated political development which we have in the United States.

I propose to offer a new approach to this subject, based on our gratifying experience with the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in America. I propose to replace the subsidizing of foreign governments with foreign politicians channeling our funds through political hands into socialistic enterprises, with another concept which we could describe as an International Reconstruction Finance Corporation, to lend money on economic terms softer than we would normally charge, but sufficiently high to recapture the loan rate which America has to put into its dollars; a Reconstruction Finance Corporation operation overseas which would be jointly under the direction of American directors and directors from the recipient countries; a corporation which would lend its funds to establish private entrepreneurs, private enterprises, and prospective taxpaying operations, so that we could create some basis for solvency overseas, some basis for the projection of the concepts, values, virtues, and rewards of private enterprise, some basis for a broad enough tax base so that little countries could have some degree of solvency and some degree of security. It should be a wholly different approach to a program which is beginning to fail notoriously, primarily because those without realism are administering it in such a way that there can never be a distinction between a gift and a loan; and in the second place, because those who are administering it are seeking to impose upon little, underdeveloped countries, and some large ones, socialistic schemes which cannot work there, because they could not work here, instead of helping them to develop the private enterprise that is so essential to stability and solvency around the world.

I am bitterly disappointed at the abject surrender which the Senate conferees felt compelled to make. I can understand their reasons. There was pressure for adjournment. The hour is late. The House has disappeared. Senators are far asunder. This is not a good atmosphere in which to try to correct what I believe was an unfortunate failure to stand up and bring back this important reform, which to my personal knowledge, has taken more than 7 years to produce.

I started working on it with the late Senator Styles Bridges at least that long ago in the Senate Committee on Appropriations. It has been moved from where it was, from the point where a loan did not bear any interest rate at all, to at least 2½ percent. I suppose that can be considered progress in 7 years. It is a little over one-quarter of 1 percent a year, if I calculate it correctly, or in that area. We have also moved it from where it was—no interest at all—to 1 percent for the first 10 years.

Mr. President, you know, I know, and every other Senator knows, and every foreign country knows that by the end of 10 years some of the recipient countries will have disappeared. Something will have happened to them in this fast-changing world. That money is gone. There will have been not even a single repayment, to begin with. Those remaining will have developed no methodical habits of repayment, no fiscal policies, no bookkeeping procedures.

In some countries, a new great "I Am" will have replaced the leader who is at present in charge. When the new dictator or premier or president or potentate or king walks in and looks at the record, he will say, "Am I supposed to pay Uncle Sam back all this money and all this accrued interest? I had nothing to do with borrowing it or spending it; I will do the old political Pontius Pilate act. I wash my hands. It is too bad it has happened, but do not expect me to pay these debts incurred by my predecessors whom I have removed from office. The other fellow did this. I am having troubles enough of my own."

So gone down the drain, through carelessness, indifference, bad judgment, and faulty administration will be unknown hundreds of millions of American dollars.

This Congress has failed to take the salutary step which we earlier obligated ourselves, in a yea-and-nay vote, to take.

If the troops are gone and we cannot fight the battle now, we shall have to renew the contest with increase vigor next January.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I seem to be the unchallenged winner of the booby prize in the game of foreign aid which we have been playing with the House conferees. To the best of my knowledge, I did not win enough points even to bother to count them. I did however sign the conference report and recommend that it be approved by the Senate. As a matter of fact, I have been somewhat in a state of shock in the past few days. Perhaps I owe the Senate an explanation.

It began a few weeks ago, when the Senate had the poverty bill under consideration. It may be recalled that an amendment was offered or a proposal was made to concur in a House amendment—I have forgotten which—to require every recipient who benefits from the poverty program to take a pledge of loyalty to the Government of the United States. It may be recalled that the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] made a strong argument against singling out these people as those who should be suspect enough to be required to take the loyalty pledge. As I recall, I chimed in and asked the Senator from New York if he knew why anyone earning less than $1,000 a year should be automatically suspect, while anyone who received more than $1 million a year from the Government should be above suspicion.

Perhaps that was not a nice thing to say, but I said it, and it began to work on me.

Then, when the foreign aid bill came up, I thought, "If little Maria Gonzales and Timmy Sullivan, who could be getting some assistance under the poverty bill, are required to take an oath of loyalty to the Government, why should not the contractors who get millions of dollars out of the AID program, the munitions manufacturers who get more millions of dollars out of the AID program, and the bankers, who have their loans guaranteed by the Federal Government, also take the loyalty oath?"

That is why I offered the amendment to the foreign aid bill to require that all beneficiaries of the foreign aid program be required to take a loyalty oath, the same as Maria Gonzales and Timmy Sullivan would have to do in order to get benefits from the poverty program.

The Senate accepted the proposal with, I believe, only two voice votes in opposition. Then I waited for results. I thought that I would almost immediately get protests from international bankers, international contractors, and international munitions manufacturers. But lo and behold! I have not heard one of them protest the taking of the loyalty oath.

But this is where the shock took place: the intellectual community, the self-styled intellects of our great Nation, immediately began to protest. They said, "What? We take an oath of loyalty to the United States? We should say not. That is an insult. It interferes with our academic freedom"—or something like that.

The presidents of some of the big colleges in the United States said they could not take any more business from the Federal Government if they had to pledge allegiance to the United States and say that they and their institutions would not support the overthrow of the U.S. Government by force.

I really was surprised. Their organizations came in, too, and said, "No, not us." They had not protested against anyone else taking the loyalty oath; it was only themselves.

So in committee I offered a modification of the amendment to exempt institutions of higher learning and their officials from taking the loyalty oath, and the committee did not think much of that, either. I suppose they were right because, after all, I believe that 98 percent of the teachers of the country would not object to standing up and saying, "We are loyal to the United States through thick and thin." And it would not reflect upon them in any way.

So that is where we are. As of now, members of the Peace Corps must pledge allegiance to the United States. These same college people did not object when members of the Peace Corps were required to take the loyalty oath. All members of the Job Corps will have to take the loyalty oath. The Department of Justice sent us a letter, Senators will recall, when the poverty bill was before the Senate, stating that they supposed it was all right to make these people take the loyalty oath, that it would not affect them much anyway. The majority whip, it will be remembered, also said that he guessed it was all right to approve that, too; so it was approved.

Now we have members of the Peace Corps who have to take an oath of allegiance, and the Job Corps beneficiaries from the poverty program will have to take the oath of allegiance. Consultants, if they are on their own, will have to take the oath of allegiance. If they are connected with an institution or an organization of higher learning, they will not have to do so. Farmers who receive direct payments will have to take an oath of allegiance.

Of course, we all know that Members of Congress, as well as members of the Armed Forces, take an oath of allegiance to the United States. Thus, we have only this protest coming from college presidents and their association and no one else. I have just had the Peace Corps affidavit handed to me. A member of the Peace Corps takes this oath in this affidavit, which he has to sign:

> I am not a Communist or Fascist. I do not advocate, nor am I knowingly a member of any organization that advocates the overthrow of the constitutional form of the Government of the United States, or which seeks by force or violence to deny other persons their rights under the Constitution of the United States.
>
> I do further swear (or affirm) that I will not so advocate, nor will I knowingly become a member of such organization during the period that I am an employee of the Federal Government or any agency thereof.

I have not received a single protest from a member of the Peace Corps taking this oath. I do not know how it could be written any stronger. I have received no protests from any other class of people doing business with the U.S. Government against taking an oath of loyalty to the United States.

Mr. President, that is why I am somewhat shocked today. I have been in the Senate for 24 years, and to the best of my recollection I have voted for every single proposal for Federal aid to education in all grades, from elementary through the graduate schools. To the best of my recollection, I have voted for every single appropriation to carry on those programs to the fullest degree.

Then, when those people representing the benefitting institutions say to us that while it is all right for everyone else, including the poverty program beneficiaries and Peace Corps members, to take an oath of allegiance to the United States, but not for them, it puts me in a state of shock and disillusionment.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I shall speak briefly because I know that the Senator from Oregon wishes to obtain the floor. He is most gracious to allow me to proceed.

I protest strongly in respect to the conference report against the excision of the amendment on the persecution of Jews in the Soviet Union.

It is the great tradition of our country, going back to the middle of the previous century, that such persecutions have been protested. The Senate, after much deliberation, adopted the amendment. It is my deep conviction that it would have been adopted in the House of Representatives—if submitted to a vote—as overwhelmingly as it was in the Senate where, I believe, the vote was unanimous except for one dissenting vote.

Nonetheless, it has been excised, and the language which has now been put into the conference report is, really—and I say this with all respect—not language which relates to the particular problem. Moreover, it does take the finger of blame for persecution of Jews off the Soviet Union where it belongs.

With respect to the language used in the conference report, I would not wish to say it is meaningless. I would never say that about language which asserts that the American people are against infringement of the right of freedom of worship or to condemn persecution, even in most general terms.

However, it is fair to say that this really has nothing to do with the amendment, which is in accord with and germane to the issue with the specific and precise case made on the floor of the Senate about the persecution of Jews in the Soviet Union, carried on by the Soviet Union as a matter of government policy in terms of many anti-Jewish acts, repression of the Jewish religion and of Jewish culture, all of which was specified in great detail when the question was debated in the Senate.

This situation is very much to be deplored. Moreover, it is a situation which should be protested.

It is a fact that it defies the tradition of more than a century in this country of protesting exactly this kind of act in exactly the same country. We protested anti-Jewish acts when the czars were in power, and now we have an opportunity to protest them to the Soviet Union.

One final thought appeals to me very deeply—that we justify a vast part of the struggle in respect to foreign aid, in respect to the defense machinery of the United States, in terms of the struggle against communism, to prevent communism from taking over the world by infiltration, subversion, or persuasion; yet, when we have one of the most meaningful, most appealing, and most sympathetically compelling issues with the Communists—namely, the issue of freedom to practice one's religion, the issue of persecution on the grounds of faith, we forgo it for some doctrinaire idea that it should not go into this law, but somewhere else.

What more appropriate place could there be than a law which implements policy upon which all American foreign policy is based, and our determination that communism shall not take over on earth?

The one thing that Communists are trying to sell mankind on is its liberalism in terms of accommodation to the rights of man. It is the one issue they defy with the greatest of cynicism. The fact that anti-Semitism is a crime is written into the basic law of the Soviet Union; yet the Government of the Soviet Union practices anti-Jewish acts which many of us feel are tantamount to the very thing its basic Constitution asserts to be a crime. Yet, given the opportunity by a well-nigh unanimous vote in the Senate to affirm our principles in the foreign aid bill, we take it out upon the doctrinaire ground that it does not belong in this piece of legislation—which is exactly where it does belong.

For the life of me, I cannot understand where else it should go. It is a "sense of Congress" resolution. I am deeply convinced that it is the sense of the country. I believe that the excision of the resolution is shameful and unfortunate. I protest deeply that it was stricken from the bill and referred to only in the broadest and most general of terms, terms to which I could not object and would never protest against. It is right. However, it is not germane to the issue with which the Senate is dealing when it adopted the resolution by such an overwhelming majority of Senators.

Mr. SIMPSON and Mr. MORSE addressed the Chair.

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I join the Senator from New York in the statement he has just made in regard to elimination in conference of the Senate resolution which sought to make clear our disapproval of Communist Russia's persecution of Jews.

There is all the difference in the world between the issue which was raised by that resolution and the language brought out by the conferees in regard to discrimination with respect to religious faith.

We are dealing here with a group of people known as Jews. Everyone knows what anti-Semitism is. We know what a plague of horror it has been to mankind for many centuries.

I shall speak on this subject at greater length later this afternoon, or at a later time, but I wish the RECORD to show that I join the Senator from New York in regard to his observations.

I wish to be cooperative with the leadership, but I find myself in a difficult position procedurally at the present moment.

I am perfectly willing to enter into any agreement with the leadership for a vote at a time certain in regard to the foreign aid conference report. I have been one of the leaders in the Senate against the foreign aid bill, as presently envisioned, and as it has been brought back from the conference, with most of the recommendations of the Senate stripped from the conference report. I believe we have an obligation to get a rollcall vote in the Senate.

At the same time, I want to cooperate with the leadership. I am willing to enter into an agreement to vote at a time certain—any time that the leadership wants to propose. But we ought to have a record vote on a matter that splits the Senate as this conference report does.

I want the leader to know that I am not trying to be stubborn about it. But I feel so deeply about it that I do not believe this conference report should be agreed to in this body with merely a dozen Senators on the floor.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I thank the senior Senator from Oregon very much for his extremely helpful intervention.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT REQUEST

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a vote on the conference report on the foreign aid authorization bill at 2:45.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I shall be very brief. May I ask a question of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] who has just come into the Chamber? I am told by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] that he would rather have the Senator from Arkansas answer the question. I have just protested vigorously against the excision of the provision with respect to the persecution of Jews in the Soviet Union from the foreign aid bill.

Can the Senator from Arkansas—and his views prevailed in the conference—give us the rationale with respect to this excision? Why was this done by the conferees? Was there any view on their part that this was not true?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The House conferees had no feeling about it in any way. There was nothing in their version of the bill that was similar to it. They thought that it was inappropriate to use this bill as a vehicle for a policy of this kind. They wanted to take the whole thing out. I thought we were obligated to retain it. We had a vote here. I thought it should stay in. This was the compromise that they were willing to make. There was a difference between the two versions. There was no effort on their part to deny the facts. They thought such a provision would be inappropriate in this bill.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I repeat my deep sense of protest against this excision. I believe the correctness of my position would be demonstrated by a vote in the House—which I am confident would be unanimously in favor of such a resolution. If the matter had been returned to the House, it would have been favorably voted on as decisively as it was in the Senate.

I yield the floor.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I have witnessed many times in this Chamber the addition or deletion of items from bills that have come before our august body, on which we voted favorably, but in which items were added or deleted in conference.

The foreign aid conference committee undoubtedly had what it considers good reasons to strike the reapportionment provision and the Tower amendment on aid to Indonesia from the foreign aid authorization bill, but I cannot but think that such reasons were more specious than laudable. I voted against the innocuous reapportionment resolution because I felt that in its defeat the Senate might take it upon itself to put something with a little more starch into the reapportionment issue. However, innocuous though it was, the sense of Congress resolution was at least a means by which the Senate could take official cognizance of the reapportionment dilemma. It is unconscionable to me that the majority of conferees could delete this language.

The resolution as passed by the Senate would have made no requirements of the Supreme Court. That august body would have been free to trip the light fantastic through the laws of the land, the legislatures of the States, and the Halls of the Congress. The resolution simply importuned the gentlemen of the High Court to act with restraint and moderation—two words which this administration purports to favor in its political discourse—but obviously even this language did not please the conferees. It is tragic, Mr. President, that this is so, for now the States have no recourse, and they are at the mercy of Federal courts which have thus far been disinclined to show either moderation or restraint in reapportionment.

Now, Mr. President, regarding Indonesia, certainly, there is no doubt that this Nation's foreign aid funds—that is, the taxpayers' funds—have been misspent in many different ways.

I feel, however, that in the field of foreign aid, our very worst fault is the continuing failure to make a distinction between friends and enemies.

I was pleased that the Senate saw the distinction this year in one such case. I regret that the majority of foreign aid conferees apparently did not.

I refer, Mr. President, to Sukarno. On August 13, this body very clearly saw fit to prohibit further aid to one of our country's enemies, Sukarno. The vote on the prohibitive amendment was 62 to 28.

At this juncture in my remarks I digress to say that I agree wholeheartedly with the attitude of the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] concerning the action of the conferees in respect to the resolution which would have censured Soviet Russia for its persecution of the Jews in that land. I endorse everything that the Senator from New York said in that connection.

The Senate faced the fact that Mr. Sukarno is no friend of the United States. I regret the majority of conferees did not.

The conference report says nothing that the Senate did not know when it voted 62 to 28 to prohibit such aid. The conference report stated that we still have discretion to cut off aid. If the administration discretion were being wisely used, the amendment would not have been necessary in the first place. But, this discretionary power is not being used.

Where is Sukarno today?

I read from yesterday's issue of the New York Times from an article entitled "More Soviet Arms Promised Sukarno," as follows:

> The Soviet Union agreed today to supply more arms to Indonesia. However, no formal agreement has been signed by Premier Khrushchev and President Sukarno, who arrived here (Moscow) yesterday and will leave tomorrow on his way to Cairo for a meeting of the leaders of nonalined nations.
>
> Under a previous agreement on military aid, signed by Foreign Minister Subandrio in July, the Soviet Union supplied transport planes, helicopters, and other equipment for Indonesia's military struggle against Malaysia.

Premier Khrushchev met Mr. Sukarno for the second time in 2 days this morning. Their talks covered the further development of friendly Soviet-Indonesian relations and the international problems of mutual interest. I might also add that on the floor of the Senate, Sukarno was quoted as having said to the United States of America, "To hell with its aid."

Let me review briefly the facts. We now spend money to train Indonesian military and police personnel. Indonesia is at this time waging war against our British and Malaysian allies.

Sukarno continues to remark publicly he will "crush" Malaysia. Sukarno is a friend of the Communists. There can be no doubt of this. Two prominent Communist Party leaders in his country hold the rank of Minister.

As of late April there were 187 Indonesian armed forces personnel training in the United States, plus 38 police personnel, a total of 225.

Here is a breakdown of the U.S. folly:

Under the Army, 94 Indonesian trainees are at work. Sixty-one of them are scattered among such regular military career courses as engineering, adjutant general, finance, ordnance, armor, signal, medical, infantry, women's army corps, military police, chaplain, supply, quartermaster, transport, artillery, and the U.S. Command and General Staff School. Thirty-three others are in what our State Department calls civic action courses, which somehow include infantry training.

Until this year Indonesian trainees here were given guerrilla and counterinsurgency courses.

Under the supervision of our Navy, 68 Indonesian trainees are assigned to various U.S. military schools in such career courses as naval aviation, oceanography, supply, electronics, engineering, motor transport, and the Navy Command Course. Another seven are in those elusive civic action courses.

Under the Air Force, there are 18 Indonesian trainees; 10 in Air Force career courses, and 8 in civic action.

In addition 38 Indonesian police are training in this Nation. Thirteen are taking police management and internal security courses at AID's International Police Academy right here in Washington. They get special instruction in traffic, patrolling, and railroad security—all handy things to know in a dictatorship.

Eighteen more Indonesian policemen are at U.S. military schools working in telecommunications maintenance, weapons and ammunition repair, Coast Guard organizations, maintenance and operation, search, rescue, maritime law enforcement, and military police organization and operations.

Three others are studying at private institutions in the field of telecommunications. One is studying police administration at the University of Southern California; three are taking courses here in Washington under that catchall "civic action" heading.

While this U.S.-financed training goes on, our ally Malaysia is being invaded and British troops in the area killed by Indonesian military forces.

This would seem a good place for the Johnson administration to make a start at getting our foreign assistance programs out of the realm of the ridiculous and back to the realm of reason.

Of particular interest is the police training program administered by the Agency for International Development since 1954 and upon which, to date, American taxpayers have spent more than $16 million.

AID blithely admits that the training is designed to increase the competence of the 110,000-man national police of Leftist-Dictator Sukarno. We are to help train the police officers, modernize their radio communications, update their transport facilities, and improve their supply system.

American taxpayers are footing the bill for this so that Sukarno will not lose control of his island nation. That is a priority set by our foreign assistance program. It could use some prompt rethinking.

Among the major items of equipment we have sent to this "peaceful, friendly, democratic" nation are 1,800 vehicles of all types, 53 small patrol craft for sea police, 5 small aircraft for air police, laboratory equipment in the amount of $206,000, records and identification equipment in the amount of $130,000, and investigative equipment to the tune of $25,000.

Approximately $2 million has been expended to provide a radio, teletype, and telephone communication network giving Sukarno's police comprehensive coverage throughout the widespread nation.

Mr. President, I request unanimous consent that a New York Times article dated October 1 and entitled "More Soviet Arms Promised to Sukarno" be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MORE SOVIET ARMS PROMISED SUKARNO

> MOSCOW, September 30.—The Soviet Union agreed today to supply more arms to Indonesia.
>
> However, no formal agreement has been signed by Premier Khrushchev and President Sukarno, who arrived here yesterday and will leave tomorrow on his way to Cairo for a meeting of the leaders of nonalined nations.
>
> Under a previous agreement on military aid, signed by Foreign Minister Subandrio in July, the Soviet Union supplied transport planes, helicopters, and other equipment for Indonesia's military struggle against Malaysia.
>
> Premier Khrushchev met Mr. Sukarno for the second time in 2 days this morning. Their talks covered "the further development of friendly Soviet-Indonesian relations and international problems of mutual interest," according to Tass, the Soviet press agency.
>
> High military, economic, and diplomatic officials were present on both sides.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, in his remarks during debate on this very amendment, the distinguished Senator from Illinois noted, as shown on page 19427 of the RECORD of August 13:

> It is now roughly 2 months since the distinguished leader in Indonesia, Mr. Sukarno, stated publicly to all the world—and it was carried by every wire service—that "The United States can go to hell with its aid."

I might note parenthetically, Mr. President, that the United States might as well go there as it has nearly exhausted its supply of earthly coffers in which to plunk American tax dollars.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the conference report on the foreign aid authorization bill is characteristic of the difficulty Congress faces in trying to reduce foreign aid expenditures and make all aid expenditures more effective in promoting national objectives.

The conference report demonstrates once again that only when both bodies act in concert on the floor are the aid agencies stopped from writing their own foreign aid legislation. Year after year we have seen the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate and the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House march right straight down the line laid down by the State Department, the Defense Department, and AID on foreign aid policy. This conference report is evidence that the same thing has happened again this year. It only means that next year, the House floor and the Senate floor will have to see adamant and coordinated efforts made to redraft foreign aid legislation that will advance the national interests of the United States.

This conference report is largely a recital of the amendments added on the Senate floor from which the Senate conferees receded.

I ask Senators to examine their copies of the conference report. Look at the first page. The report shows that the Senate receded from its amendments numbered 1, 3, 4, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 16, 18, 19, 21, 22, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 34, 36, 37, 38, 41, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, and 60.

The record also shows that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 6, 7, 33, 44, and 52 and agree to the same.

That is the most unsatisfactory conference report that has ever come to the floor of this body in my 20 years in the Senate. There is no match for it in walking out on the commitments made here on the floor of the Senate by the vote of the full Senate. That is why the senior Senator from Oregon has taken the position that Senators today should stand up and be counted on the conference report by a yea and nay vote, and when they do, they will only be beginning to fight in the next few years until we bring to an end the shocking betrayal of the taxpayers of this country as found in the foreign aid program. Hundreds of millions of dollars are being wasted. Hundreds of millions of dollars are being used to foster corruption abroad in one kept government after another.

The most important items on which the Senate conferees receded were those designed to tighten the policy directives governing foreign aid. The net result is once again to accommodate administrative desires to have a free hand in the distribution of foreign aid.

I am extremely disappointed that the ban on aid to Indonesia, just discussed by the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] was stricken out. Congress is literally abdicating its responsibility for the foreign aid program when it permits aid to Indonesia, headed by that irresponsible man known as Sukarno, to continue.

And it continues only on the hypothetical, vague, and desperate assumption that if we train a few military personnel in that country, they eventually will rise to positions of leadership and will follow American designs and objectives in that part of the world.

That is a part of the propaganda of the Pentagon. There is a clique in the Pentagon that is trying to exercise more and more military influence in this American democracy. Around the world they are trying to build up military oligarchies and use American taxpayer dollars to strengthen those oligarchies. I say to the American people that between now and next year we have a responsibility of citizen statesmanship to make clear to Members of the Congress that we want no more of it, and that next year we want the foreign aid bill drastically revised.

Mr. President, I do not know of a more fatuous assumption that could be devised as a basis for spending American money. The notion that we can guide and control countries by remote control is proving utterly fallacious even in South Vietnam, where we have invested more like $3 billion since the French withdrawal and we still have been unable to control events.

We continue to put this money into Indonesia as a means of influencing its military leaders, and as the Senator from Wyoming has pointed out, we get in return insult after insult from Sukarno. We get a violation of the United Nations Charter by Sukarno on event after event. We are making war in that part of the world, and the United States proposes to continue to pour more money into the assistance of that tyrant.

We think we are protecting American military interests in south Asia by so doing. But I say we are only training Indonesians who will carry out their own objectives in that part of the world, and they will not be American objectives.

If anything, more fundamental reasons for the continuation of our aid program in Indonesia are the investments of American oil companies there. American companies have invested nearly half a billion dollars in Indonesia, and the Shell Oil Co., an international company, has investments estimated at around $650 million.

Indonesia has for years made threatening noises about nationalizing all foreign oil operations, and every time Sukarno uses that blackmail threat, the American oil companies tremble, and the pressure is put on for more American aid to Indonesia.

Last year an arrangement was agreed to that permits the oil companies to continue the management and control of their holdings for another 20 years. Their exports from Indonesia amount to a quarter of a billion dollars a year in value, and while 60 percent of the profits go to Indonesia, it is obvious that in protection of their share, the companies are quite willing to have American taxpayers shell out a little "protection money" to Sukarno.

The domestic distribution facilities in Indonesia are expected to be nationalized; but the real value of the investments is in the exporting of Indonesian oil.

As they are in the Middle East, the American taxpayers are being billed—and I should say bilked—for the privilege of having American oil companies earn huge profits in foreign oil. We are constantly lulled with the theory that we have to preempt all the oil fields in the world to keep them from falling into Communist hands. I tell the American people that is a lot of baloney. The world is nearly drowning in oil. What we are really trying to do is to extend our control over as much of the supply as possible in order to maintain an artificially high price for oil on the world market. The "keep it away from Communists" line is only an excuse for the money our taxpayers are taxed to pay the local governments for the privileges they grant our investors.

This is a measure of how far foreign aid has gotten away from the theoretical objectives used to justify it. The kind of aid we are furnishing to Sukarno has nothing in the world to do with helping the people of Indonesia live better. It has nothing at all to do with raising living standards or reaching the masses of the people in any way at all.

It is strictly and purely a political gesture, from which we hope to gain privilege for American business and to forestall threats to what we consider our security interests in the Indian Ocean and the South China Sea.

Aid furnished on that basis has been a failure in country after country; it will be a failure in Indonesia, too.

Next year the House of Representatives must start with a ban on aid to Indonesia written into the foreign aid bill on the floor, and the Senate must follow suit. That is the only way this disreputable aid program to Sukarno will ever be ended.

The Senate conferees invited floor action next year, too, by compromising the Senate amendment on interest rates. The conference report states:

> The committee of conference weighed the appeal for stiffer loan terms against the more important consideration that borrowing countries not be encouraged to pursue irresponsible debt practices. Prudence requires that such nations not be burdened with unduly high loan costs until their development is sufficient to finance their debts. Any severe increase in the costs of loans would only increase the possibilities of default which would have serious consequences not only for foreign governments and international financial institutions that had loaned the money, but also for private investors, many of whom are U.S. citizens.

That is clear enough. The American taxpayers are being told more plainly than usual that they will have to continue subsidizing American private investors abroad and continue subsidizing the foreign countries that lend to underdeveloped nations at commercial interest rates and many of them do. "After all, Mr. Taxpayer, if you did not give low-interest loans to these countries they might not be able to pay off foreign creditors and private American investors." That is the message of the conference report.

Once again, action will have to start in the House next year to write a reasonable interest rate section into the bill on the House floor that the Senate can endorse when the bill reaches the Senate floor.

The money amendments made by the Senate were also quickly "ditched" in conference. The total sum authorized by the conference committee is $3.506 billion, only $10 million under the executive request. The Senate cut that request by $250 million or $266 million. Then we added an amount of $50 million for the beef amendment. So we cut it about $200 million or $225 million.

When the Senate sent it to conference, it authorized $3.290 billion. Of these reductions, only the small one in technical cooperation and development grants was retained by the conferees.

Here again, it is going to take floor action in both Houses to bring the sums spent down to reasonable levels.

The alibi that is being given in the cloakrooms this afternoon is, "Let it go through, because we have already passed an appropriation bill of only $3.250 billion."

Mr. President, this is an authorization bill, authorizing policy; and it is the policy in the report that the senior Senator from Oregon objects to, as I have done for many months past and the last 2 years. Any time it is desired to reform policies in foreign aid, such an effort will have the support of the senior Senator from Oregon, and he will be supporting the foreign aid program. But until corruption, inefficiency, and waste are taken out of our foreign aid program abroad, I will continue to vote against it.

I am satisfied that the American people, by increasing millions, are supporting the position the Senator from Oregon is taking. Come next year, I pledge today an all-out fight against the foreign aid bill that will make my past fights appear to be mere skirmishes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Is the Senate to vote at 2:45 p.m.?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. At 8:45 p.m., pursuant to a prior unanimous-consent agreement, the Senate will vote.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, it is not necessary for me to make these remarks, but I think, in view of the deep feelings of the Senator from Oregon and the very powerful argument he has made, it would be appropriate to say a few words about the aid program.

Like all other programs—either foreign or domestic, in my opinion—this program has had its failures. It has also had its successes. On balance, I think its successes far outweigh its failures.

I do not believe that the Senator from Oregon would deny that the initial effort in this field, the Marshall plan was a very great success. It went along well. Of course, the conditions then were much easier to deal with than the ones that confront us now in places like Asia, Africa, and Latin America. But, on balance, I think the program has been beneficial.

One way to get a little perspective about this matter—and I think it deserves some credit—is to compare conditions in the world today with those after World War I. World War I, up to that time, was the worst, the most destructive conflict the Western World had ever experienced. Twenty years after World War I, we were on the verge of World War II. After World War I we did not engage in the League of Nations. We refused to participate in that activity. We did not assume any responsibility for the development of underdeveloped countries. We made no effort to try to bring stability and peace into any area. We had an official policy of isolation.

Subsequent to World War II we have had the opposite overall policy both with regard to the United Nations, as compared with the League of Nations, and also in the field of aid, engaging in those activities, and trying to influence the course of events. While I do not pretend that aid alone has made the difference, still I think it is true that at present, in spite of difficulties in South Vietnam and some other difficult areas, the world is not in anything like the unstable and dangerous situation in which it was in 1938 and 1939.

If the American people will judge the situation and compare the situation carefully with what happened as a result of our policy after the First World War, and assess the role and influence the aid program has had since World War II, they will agree that it has been a bargain.

It is true that it has cost much more money than other activities, short of all-out war; but, on the other hand, when we compare the total cost of the aid program with the cost of waging war, we get a little different idea and a little different view as to whether or not an investment of this kind, compared with the outbreak of a conflict, is a good investment—aside from the cost of lives, but only in terms of dollars and cents.

The cost of World War II was infinitely greater to this country, as well as to other countries, than the cost of the aid program. It is not a perfect program. I would not challenge the statement of the Senator from Oregon and say there have been no mistakes. I am well aware that there have been. One could say that of practically every other kind of program, even domestic programs such as programs for relief of unemployment or other relief programs, which we all support. From time to time we encounter abuses, because, human nature being what it is, there is no way to prevent them.

I do not believe that the allegations of malfeasance and gross corruption, and so on, which have been made about AID, are sound. Some mistakes have been made. I have found very few, if any, instances of deliberate corruption on the part of any employees of AID. I do not think it is subject to that kind of criticism. It is a thankless job. I suppose this agency has had more directors in a shorter time than any other major activity of Government. No one cares to serve as director of this administration, partly because of the attacks that are made on it, partly because of the extreme difficulty that the administration has had in areas with which we are not very familiar and where we have had little experience in the past, and partly because Congress has put so many inhibitions upon the administration, which makes the job much more difficult than if we were to adopt only broad policies and leave the administration up to the executive department and merely review their activities after they had performed their work.

I cite one example. In the present bill I did my best, as many of my colleagues did, to keep in the bill the provision regarding giving the AID Administrator the power to upgrade the quality of his personnel. However, the House conferees absolutely refused to accept that provision. We were in a deadlock practically all day yesterday on two points—the one I have mentioned, and the other on the Sabbatino amendment. We could not make any progress, and we had to give way in order to get any report at all.

I regret that very much. Mr. Bell is a very conscientious public servant, and he would like to have the opportunity to improve the quality of his top employees, but we did not get that provision. I hope next year the Senate and the House will review that aspect of the bill.

On the whole, while I cannot say that this is a perfect program, I believe it is certainly worth while.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall take only 1 minute.

Time does not permit me to reply in detail, although the facts warrant a reply in detail.

All through the argument of the Senator from Arkansas runs the fallacy that the aid proponents have used time and time again, namely, that aid prevents war. The sad fact is that the way we are operating aid it induces war. Consider the way we are building up the war machines throughout the world. Consider what we are doing in Pakistan and India. We are supporting them with a military aid program of millions of dollars, not one dollar of which should have been granted to either country. They are building themselves up so that they can go to war with each other over Kashmir. If they go to war over Kashmir, they will be practically 100-percent equipped with American military aid.

Take the case of Greece and Turkey. In Turkey, we have thrown down the drain hundreds of millions of dollars of taxpayer money to build up a military oligarchy; a tyranny, not a democracy—a tyranny operating state industries and using moral corruption throughout their manpower program.

In southeast Asia our military aid is seriously endangering peace in that part of the world. In Africa, it is sucking the United States deeper and deeper into the affairs of African countries, and I predict that if Congress does not stop it, U.S. aid programs will produce another Vietnam involvement in Africa.

It is a fallacious argument to argue that foreign aid prevents war. If we wish to prevent war, let us go in for economic aid project by project.

In preparing people for economic freedom in the underdeveloped areas, we are bringing them free government and reducing the possibility of war.

Military aid is causative of war, not productive of peace.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I ask for the yeas and nays on the conference report.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time is now 2:45 p.m. Pursuant to the unanimous-consent agreement previously entered, the Senate will now vote on the adoption of the conference report on H.R. 11380. The yeas and nays having been ordered, the clerk will call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. As I understand, a vote in favor of the conference report is a vote of "yea."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from Nevada [Mr.

CANNON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] are absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MCGOVERN], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], the Senator from California [Mr. SALINGER], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] is paired with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN].

If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "yea" and the Senator from North Carolina would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from California [Mr. SALINGER] is paired with the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING].

If present and voting, the Senator from California would vote "yea" and the Senator from Alaska would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] is paired with the Senator from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN].

If present and voting, the Senator from New Jersey would vote "yea" and the Senator from Idaho would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] is paired with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MECHEM].

If present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "yea" and the Senator from New Mexico would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], the Senators from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS and Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MECHEM], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are necessarily absent.

The pair of the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] has been previously announced.

On this vote, the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS] is paired with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

If present and voting, the Senator from Delaware would vote "yea" and the Senator from Nebraska would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] is paired with the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT].

If present and voting, the Senator from New York would vote "yea" and the Senator from Utah would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] is paired with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND].

If present and voting, the Senator from Iowa would vote "yea" and the Senator from South Carolina would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] is paired with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK].

If present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky would vote "yea" and the Senator from Colorado would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN] is paired with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS].

If present and voting, the Senator from Idaho would vote "nay," and the Senator from New Jersey would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] is paired with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA].

If present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "yea" and the Senator from Nebraska would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MECHEM] is paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK].

If present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico would vote "nay" and the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "yea."

Mr. DIRKSEN (after having voted in the affirmative). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." Therefore, I withhold my vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALTERS in the chair). On this vote, the result is—yeas, 35, nays 15, and one live pair. This constitutes a quorum.

The yeas and nays were announced as follows:

[No. 592 Leg.]

YEAS—35

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Bartlett
Byrd, W. Va.
Case
Church
Cooper
Dodd
Douglas
Fong
Fulbright
Hart
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Holland
Inouye
Javits
Kuchel
Mansfield
McIntyre
McNamara
Metcalf
Monroney
Nelson
Pearson
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Saltonstall
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Walters
Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—15

Bible
Byrd, Va.
Ellender
Jordan, N.C.
Lausche
Long, La.
McClellan
Morse
Mundt
Robertson
Russell
Simpson
Stennis
Williams, Del.
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—50

Bayh
Beall
Bennett
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Cannon
Carlson
Clark
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Eastland
Edmondson
Ervin
Goldwater
Gore
Gruening
Hartke
Hill
Hruska
Humphrey
Jackson
Johnston
Jordan, Idaho
Keating
Kennedy
Long, Mo.
Magnuson
McCarthy
McGee
McGovern
Mechem
Miller
Morton
Moss
Muskie
Neuberger
Pastore
Randolph
Ribicoff
Salinger
Scott
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough

So the report was agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon will state it.

Mr. MORSE. For future reference, so that the record may be kept straight, do I correctly understand that the announcement of the Chair on the last vote was that the yeas were 35 and the nays were 15, with one pair?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MORSE. Do I correctly understand that under the precedents of the Senate, when there is less than a physical quorum present, a quorum can be created by certain Senators giving live pairs with absent Senators, and that that amounts in effect to the creation of a quorum?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Parliamentarian advises the Chair that a quorum must be physically present. On the last vote there were 35 yeas, 15 nays, and one live pair, which made 51 Senators present, a quorum.

Mr. MORSE. Then the live pair would constitute the first 50?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. With the live pair, 51 Senators were present, a quorum.

Mr. MORSE. Fifty-one.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty-one Senators were physically present, which constitutes a quorum.

Mr. MORSE. So the total number of senatorial bodies on the floor was 51?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Chair.

LOCATION OF CHANCERIES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 646) to prohibit the location of chanceries and other business offices of foreign governments in any residential area in the District of Columbia. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALTERS in the chair). The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of today.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, the bill, S. 646, which was reported by the conferees is, in my opinion, a fair and reasonable resolution of the problem which has confronted the residents of the District of Columbia, the U.S. Government, and the governments of foreign nations seeking locations in the District of Columbia for chancery buildings.

The bill which the conferees have reported clearly spells out the requirements which foreign governments must meet in order to locate chanceries in the District.

With certain specified exceptions, no new chancery locations may be established in residential zones. The Senate conferees adopted provisions of the House bill which would allow chanceries to be located in medium high density and high density apartment zones, subject to explicit standards of available off-street parking space, building height, and architectural design. Chanceries will be allowed to locate in all other zones, including special purpose, commercial, and industrial zones.

The House bill had included a provision allowing small chanceries employing less than seven persons to locate in all residential zones. The House receded from this position in the face of the argument so ably presented by the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] that such a provision might well turn out to be virtually unenforcible.

Sections 2 and 4 of the bill approved by the conferees represent a strengthening of the provision included in the original Senate bill designed to protect the rights of owners of buildings now legally used as chanceries.

Section 4 was intended to meet the specific case of a building in any residential zone when the most recent legal use of that building has been as a chancery by a foreign government. Section 4 would allow that building to be used as a chancery by another foreign government in the future. Thus, the owners of the building, who may have expended considerable sums of money in altering their building to make it suitable for chancery use, will not have to lose their investment solely because their present tenants move out. Of course, as the House report pointed out, the right to use a building as a chancery in the future "could be specifically abandoned by the owner of such property or by demonstration that, as a matter of fact, the use had been otherwise abandoned."

The conferees were unanimous in feeling that the present bill represents a fair solution to the chancery problem in Washington, for the time being. Hope was expressed that it might be possible, at a later date, to consider a more long-term solution to the problem, possibly in the nature of a special chancery area, or precinct.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. McINTYRE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. I should like to make some legislative history. Let us assume that Black Acre in the city of Washington constitutes present nonconforming use. Do I correctly understand that there is nothing in the bill which would affect the rights of the owners of Black Acre to continue that nonconforming use so long as the nonconforming use remains the same, regardless of tenants?

Mr. McINTYRE. The Senator from California is correct. The bill goes out of its way to protect existing vested rights in the Black Acre situation. If the Black Acre owners have a nonconforming use they are entitled to certain vested rights that would not be affected by the bill.

Mr. KUCHEL. Even though the tenants hasten to change, if the nonconforming use is set aside for another government?

Mr. McINTYRE. The Senator is correct. My admonition to him is that a nonconforming use is a right with its own legal standing. The owners of Black Acre cannot expand upon the use. By the same token, it could very well be legally abandoned.

Mr. KUCHEL. Could be?

Mr. McINTYRE. Could be; but at the discretion of the owners.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a copy of my letter to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. McINTYRE] on this subject.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEPTEMBER 29, 1964.

Hon. THOMAS J. McINTYRE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR TOM: As you know, I have had a longstanding interest in S. 646 dealing with foreign chanceries located in the District of Columbia. One of my California constituents owns the building which is now leased to the Jamaican Government as a chancery. This building has always been used as a chancery and, although in a residential district, indeed, the sister-in-law of my constituent lives next door, it is not suitable because of its size for use as a private residence. I deeply appreciated your entering into a colloquy with me on this matter when S. 646 passed the Senate.

I have studied both the House and the Senate reports on this legislation and I feel that the provisions with regard to the right of an individual to continue a long established nonconforming use, such as is true in the case of a grocery located in a residential neighborhood prior to the establishment of a zoning law or regulation, is not clear with reference to the type of situation in which my constituent finds himself. I therefore wonder if it might be possible for you to raise this question when the conferees meet and see if some agreement could be reached in principle on this matter so that the appropriate legislative language might be drafted. I think the principle here is that a person using a building on the date of the adoption of the zoning regulations, say May 12, 1958, should be permitted to continue to use that property to the same extent and in the same manner as it was being used at that time and during the period which ends with the enactment of the bill now before the conferees. I would hope that such a continued use, as a chancery in this case, would not be subject to new provisions which would restrict the reasonable use of that property in residential areas.

With kindest regards.

Sincerely yours,
THOMAS H. KUCHEL.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. FULBRIGHT subsequently said: Mr. President, a moment ago, when the chancery bill conference report was acted on, I wished to say a word of commendation for the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. McINTYRE] for the fine work he did in bringing to final passage the chancery legislation, and to express my appreciation to the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] for the contribution he made in working out what I believe to be a very sound procedure for the location of foreign chanceries in the city of Washington.

It has been a troublesome problem for many years. It has caused a great deal of ill feeling between our country and foreign countries. I believe the formula which the bill has adopted is a sound formula and one that we can live with. It will go far toward settling this troublesome problem.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I join the Senator from Arkansas in expressing my appreciation to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. McINTYRE] for working out what I think is a very sound principle to govern the location of chanceries in the District of Columbia.

It was my privilege to work with the Senator from New Hampshire as one of the conferees. I want the record to show that credit for that fine conference report should go to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. McINTYRE]. Every suggestion he made I thought was a very sound one and I was very glad to go into conference supporting his hand in those recommendations.

TRIBUTES TO SENATOR WALTERS OF TENNESSEE

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, it now appears that the 88th Congress will adjourn sometime this evening, and before Senators leave I wish to make a brief statement.

I desire to say a few words with respect to the distinguished occupant of the chair, the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. WALTERS] and his brief period of service in this body.

It has been a high privilege for me to know the Senator and to enjoy his friendship. Not in the time that I have served in the Senate has any man entered this body and gained the respect, esteem, and affection of the Members of the Senate in a similar period of time to a greater extent than has the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. WALTERS]. The Senator from Tennessee has been a very valuable Member of this body. He has indicated that very rare characteristic of commonsense. Down in my home State of Georgia, we call it horsesense. It enables him to analyze legislation and to vote for sound governmental practices.

I regret very much to see the Senator from Tennessee leave this body this evening after it adjourns sine die. He has made very many valuable contributions during the period he has been here. I assure the Senator that he takes with him the affection and esteem of his colleagues.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, just over 1 year ago the Senate was bereaved by the death of one of its most prominent Members, Senator Estes Kefauver, of Tennessee. We were fortunate, however, in having the able and capable HERBERT S. WALTERS join our ranks to represent the State of Tennessee. Long prominent in the Democratic Party on the State and National levels, HERBERT WALTERS took his seat on the floor of the Senate particularly well suited to represent the people of his State and to carry on in the fine tradition set by his predecessors throughout our history and by the present senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE].

Senator WALTERS brought with him a rare and mature insight into the needs of Tennessee and the United States along with a keen and understanding mind. We have found him to be kind and unassuming and the possessor of a spirit of cooperativeness rarely exceeded, but with deep convictions to which he holds tenaciously.

Mr. President, we bid farewell to HERBERT WALTERS with regret. We know that he will continue to find ways to serve the people of Tennessee and the Democratic Party as he has done for more than 30 years.

I am honored and happy to join the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] in making my feelings known concerning the present occupant of the chair.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I welcome this opportunity to associate myself with the views expressed by the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia.

I wish to say publicly what I have privately said to the Senator from Tennessee. "I hate to see you go."

The Senator from Tennessee is beloved in this body, not only for his judgment and fine ability, but also for his sterling qualities of character. His service here was of peculiar interest to me. His lovely wife came from Staunton, Va., which is 36 miles north of my home in Lexington. We in Virginia have looked upon him as our third Senator in this body. We do not like to see him go.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I am happy to say that I think "HUB" WALTERS has made a great contribution to the Senate since he came here. He is always able to see the sunny side—sometimes when it does not appear that there is any sunny or humorous side.

I, for one, have enjoyed his company very much.

As he goes back to Tennessee, I know he has had an experience to take back to his State. I believe that he has voted right most of the time—perhaps not every time. But he has been a credit to his State. I would like to have the people of his State know that we appreciate the fact that "HUB" WALTERS has made a real contribution during the time he has been here.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I wish to express my thanks to the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] for raising this question.

It was my great privilege to serve with the Senator from Tennessee on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. We have had a large amount of work in that committee. I have watched him work. I was agreeably surprised to find that from his rich background he had drawn knowledge that is ordinarily available only to legislators who have served over a long period of time.

He is a good man and a fine gentleman. I have appreciated my service with him in the Senate.

The Senator from Georgia has done a fine thing in calling attention to the fact that the Senator from Tennessee will not be with us next year. The Senator from Tennessee has made a fine contribution to the membership of this body. He has been a very fine Senator. We shall miss him. We all wish him a very long and profitable life.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, in the short period that the distinguished Senator now presiding over the Senate has been in this body, I have been in rather close contact with him, from the first day that I met him. On every day thereafter, my admiration of his character and his work increased.

I had the privilege of being with him about once a week at meetings which were devoid of political ramifications, but during which meetings revelations of character were constantly made.

As I have stated, while I respected him shortly after my first meeting with him, that respect has grown in the days that I have been with him. He has been frequent in attendance. He has been stable in his judgment. He has been affable in his relationships with his colleagues. He has been a good servant of the people.

I shall miss him very much. My hopes are that intermittently he will return so that we may again have the benefit of association with him.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, it is always a sad day when the occasion arises that we must pay tribute and, in effect, say goodby to those with whom we have associated in the Senate, and whom we have come to love and respect.

I believe that it is particularly sad to say goodby to a man who made it known soon after he arrived that he had no intention of attempting to run for office this year and thus to keep the seat which he now occupies, and which he has occupied so well.

It is sad that we are required to say goodby to a man—at least so far as his participation in the Senate is concerned—who, knowing that he was not going to remain here, has devoted himself to his work in the Senate with such earnestness that perhaps many others might well take an example from his actions.

It has been my pleasure to serve with "HUB" WALTERS on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. Even though he knew that his term would be relatively short because of his own choice, there are few, and there have been a few on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs who have attended so regularly, who have done their homework so well, and who have been an inspiration to the entire committee, as has the Senator from Tennessee.

I express my own personal thanks for the clarity of vision, fairness, and integrity with which the Senator from Tennessee has approached all of these problems, as well as the problems that he has had on the floor of the Senate. The senior Senator from Colorado and the junior Senator from Colorado—who is temporarily absent—extend the Senator our very best wishes. We hope the Senator will remember to return and say hello to us.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I thank my friend for yielding to me. I thank him even more for his kindness and courtesy in bringing up this particular item of business.

I have had the very great pleasure of being in the circle of warm friends of Senator WALTERS while he has been a Member of the Senate.

I shall always count that as a delightful experience.

Incidentally, early in his stay here he found out that among my many interests was a love of collecting books, and particularly books about the Southland. He proceeded very quietly and, without giving me any formal notice of it, found a long out-of-print book written by another distinguished Senator from Tennessee, Senator McKellar, our late friend, about all the Senators who have served in the U.S. Senate representing the great State which has been so well represented by Senator WALTERS during his stay here.

Aside from the question of personal friendship and my regret that he is leaving to go to an area where we shall not be able to see him so often, I wish to say that he has been exceedingly faithful in his attendance upon the Senate and in the discharge of his duties. He has been exceedingly sound in the expression of his judgment upon the many diverse items on which he has voted. He has been completely fearless in the expression of his opinions and his judgment as shown by his votes.

We shall miss him greatly. We shall not miss him, however, from our circle of friends, and we hope that he will come back frequently. I know that he will find continuous ways to serve his great State—the Volunteer State—and the great Nation which we all love so much.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the distinguished Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. I know that I express the views of my colleague [Mr. KEATING], who is unavoidably absent, and myself, in wishing a happy and long life to a most gracious and generous Senator.

We come to know people around here very well, and the intimacy of our contact and the fact that this is a hard place to get to, as JOE MARTIN once told me when I first came, only makes our experience here the more interesting and important in our lives. I know it is in the life of the Presiding Officer, Senator WALTERS, who will not be with us in the next session.

I wish to express to him the pleasure and satisfaction which we have derived from our association with him. We have observed his unfailing courtesy, sweet disposition, and lovable character. We shall miss him as a friend and a colleague. We hope that he will come to see us often. I know that I speak for Senator KEATING again, and, speaking for him and myself, we hope for Senator WALTERS a healthful life and fruitful service, as has just been said by the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], in the service of his State and Nation.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. I am delighted to have an opportunity to express my sentiments regarding the Senator from Tennessee.

I greatly regret that the day is approaching when he will end his tenure here. During my service in the Senate no one has come along who has made a finer impression or contributed more in such a short time as a Member of the Senate. Senator WALTERS has affected legislation and he has affected policy—always in a constructive way. He has made friends among Senators. Each Member of this body feels that he is a personal friend.

On Wednesday I heard the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] mention the attendance of Senator WALTERS in meetings of the Senate. I do not think he has missed a single one if he was in the city during the time that he has been a Senator. I have always found the Senator from Tennessee to be sincere and dedicated. When it comes to qualities of character, honor, and principle, as well as intelligence, he is superb.

I know that my colleague [Mr. EASTLAND], who happens to be absent from the Chamber at the present moment, joins wholeheartedly with me in my expression of those sentiments. I have heard him express them many times.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I join with Senators in paying tribute to the distinguished occupant of the chair at the present time.

I came to know Senator WALTERS many years ago, long before he came to the Senate. I admired him as a man and as a friend then. I was pleased when I heard that he had been appointed to fill the vacancy created by the passing of our late colleague Estes Kefauver in the Senate. From the time that Senator WALTERS made his decision not to run again, I have regretted to see the day come when he would take his departure from the Senate. I believe that no man—certainly no man during the time that I have served in the Senate—has made a finer impression on his colleagues within the short time that he has been here. HERB WALTERS is a good Senator and an able Senator. He is a good citizen and a fine friend.

I regret that my colleague is not able to be present today. I suppose all Senators know that my colleague [Mr. HILL] has had surgery. He has gone home. While he is out of the hospital and back in his home in Alabama, he is resting and recuperating. Many times LISTER HILL and I have talked about what a fine Senator HERBERT WALTERS is. I know that if my colleague were here today, he would pay sterling tribute to the fine traits that characterize this man from Tennessee. I join in expressing the hope that has been expressed by so many other Senators that when Senator WALTERS goes away from here he will not forget us and he will come back and visit us often. I know it will always be a pleasure and a delight for us to welcome him back.

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. McINTYRE. I should like to associate myself with the remarks of my fellow Senators in tribute to Senator WALTERS. As a freshman Senator I have been most appreciative of his cooperation and helpfulness to those of us who assist in the duties of presiding. He assisted many times in that duty. I happen to know that to date Senator WALTERS has presided 133½ hours, which I believe leads the pack of the junior Senators who share that duty.

Even more than that, I can yield to no other Member of this body in my respect and affection for the late Senator Estes Kefauver. I think Senator Kefauver himself would have been proud of the fact that Senator WALTERS, in coming here, has been the type of individual with whom it has been so easy to work. He is friendly in his manner and he has been of real and considerate value to the Senate in all of its deliberations.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wish to join the Senator from Georgia and other Senators in paying tribute to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. WALTERS]. He has not been in the Senate as long as some of us. However, he has exhibited very good sense and discretion. I know that all of us regret his leaving the Senate.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to say to the present Presiding Officer, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. WALTERS], that I feel I have been greatly enriched this year as a result of the friendship which has developed between the two of us.

He has been a fine addition to the Senate. I shall always appreciate the opportunity I have had to associate with him on a very personal basis. I shall look forward to a continuation of that friendship, even though the Senator from Tennessee will not be an official Member of this body. I trust he will come back to see us frequently. I shall never miss an opportunity, when I am in Tennessee, to try to see him.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I am sure that my colleague, who is necessarily absent today, would like to be associated with the things that have been said about Senator WALTERS. I know that others who are not in the Chamber at this time hold him in the same affection and esteem. On their behalf, as well as my own, I salute you, sir, as an outstanding Tennessean and a great American, and express the hope that you will return frequently to visit us in these Halls.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I rise to pay tribute to a stanch friend who is also an admired and respected colleague. The gentleman from Tennessee is one of the most tolerant and understanding men in the U.S. Senate. He is uncompromising in matters of principle. He is a compassionate man, a true and loyal friend. He has endeared himself to his colleagues on both sides of the aisle because of his fairness and magnanimity. He is indeed one of nature's noblemen.

He has served the people of Tennessee with dedication, devotion, and with distinction. He has shown himself to be concerned with the needs of the people of Tennessee as well as of the entire Nation. By his statesmanlike service in the U.S. Senate, he has added luster to the glorious history and contribution which has made Tennessee and our Nation great. We came into this illustrious body as comparative newcomers together. We both share the pride which comes when a man has served for many years in public office in his home State and then is privileged to continue that service on the national scene. Our beloved colleague has established himself as an able Senator, making an enviable record, and presenting a challenge to whomever follows him.

My dear wife and I shall always cherish the warm, close, and affectionate association with our confrere and his lovely wife. This association has been harmonious and congenial and very meaningful to us.

Tennessee can well be proud of this fine son in his all-too-short service in the U.S. Senate, because, to all who know him, the name HERBERT S. WALTERS stands for the highest type of manhood, integrity, and loyalty to worthy ideals. We shall miss you, my good friend.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I am very sorry indeed to know that Senator HERBERT WALTERS will not be with us during the coming year. Both as a seatmate and a colleague, I have found him a wise, thoughtful, and most enjoyable friend. I remember, too, his excellent work as a Democratic national committeeman for Tennessee.

During the next Congress, I, for one, shall miss having his advice, counsel, thought, and help. I take this occasion to wish him and his wife the very best of happiness and joy in the future.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, this past summer one of the most amazing and remarkable achievements in the annals of sports happened—not just American sports but world sports as well. And the very leader of the group making this unbelievable achievement came from the U.S. Senate—from one of our very own.

I am, indeed, proud of this remarkable person not only because he is a fellow Senator, not only because he is a fellow New Englander, not only because I serve on the same committees with him, but also because of what he is himself as an individual and as a human being. I am sure that every Member of the Senate shares my pride of him and the great credit that he has reflected on the U.S. Senate.

I speak of the senior Senator from Massachusetts, the Honorable LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, for whom there is so much respect, admiration, and affection. On July 4, 1914, young LEVERETT SALTONSTALL led the Harvard crew to victory in the world's foremost rowing contest—the Grand Challenge at Henley-on-Thames of the Henley Royal Regatta in Great Britain.

The Harvard crew that was captained by LEVERETT SALTONSTALL on that July 4, 1914, won the Grand Challenge Cup for the United States and Harvard University for the first time—the first American team to do it. Rowing enthusiasts regard this as the world series of international rowing. It is easily the most coveted cup in rowing competition.

Fifty years later, on July 4, 1964, "LEV'S" crew returned full strength to the scene of their great victory of 50 years past. Every member of that great and illustrious crew was present. And they stroked a half mile down the course and back again.

The people of Great Britain were delighted. Their Mother Queen presented each of the crew a specially struck gold commemorative medal marking the 1914 Harvard victory. Of this achievement, the London Times said:

> This is an achievement unique in the annals of Henley, and perhaps of any other team sport, and its celebration is to be unique also. The Grand Challenge Cup is the oldest, indeed the original, Henley trophy. Every oarsman aspires to win, and those who have done so know that there is nothing quite like it.

Mr. President, as the saying goes, "This is the kind of stuff of which dreams are made." That saying was never so dramatically appropriate as in describing this remarkable reunion.

Mr. President, this is the kind of rare thrill that makes your spine tingle—that makes you warm inside—that gives you inspiring courage—and gives you a truly deep feeling of friendship for your fellowman.

I salute Captain "LEV" and the members of his historic crew on what they did on July 4, 1914, and 50 years later on July 4, 1964, not only for the United States but literally for every human being in the world in the great hope that their magnificent achievement inspires.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mrs. SMITH. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. I suppose we could expect it, and we do expect it, from the distinguished senior Senator from Maine that she would think of such a thing as this and be so gracious as to pay tribute to "LEV" SALTONSTALL for what was really a marvelous achievement.

As the London Times said, the Henley Regatta is everything in the rowing world. There may be many other races, but everyone wants to win the Henley.

This example of victory of a crew which was led by our distinguished colleague, Senator SALTONSTALL is, I think, unparalleled, so far as I know from following sports, in which the same team that won a major sporting event in 1914 were able, together with the same coxswain, to get back into a shell 50 years later and row on the Thames. It was indeed a tribute to the courage, faith, and friendship of these men, but it is also a spirit which our British friends particularly and greatly admire. I know from my own contacts and what I have heard that they appreciated the effort these gentlemen made in returning there 50 years later.

I pay my respect to Senator SALTONSTALL. I particularly express my appreciation to the senior Senator from Maine for being so thoughtful as to make these expressions possible today.

Mrs. SMITH. I thank my distinguished colleague for his generous words.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mrs. SMITH. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I think we are all proud of the senior Senator from Massachusetts, and also envious of him for what he has done in repeating his triumphal performance of 50 years ago. Naturally, he is a source of great pride to all Americans. I appreciate the thoughtfulness of the Senator from Maine in giving the Senator from Massachusetts this well deserved recognition. I still think the Senator from Maine would have made a good President.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mrs. SMITH. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I was not among that sizable number of Senators who had the pleasure of being sons of old John Harvard, but my observation has been that they are generally very fine citizens and great Americans. I know of none of them who stands out more in those qualities that LEVERETT SALTONSTALL.

When he was Governor of his State and I had the honor to serve in a similar capacity in my own State, he entertained us in order to make us feel at home at Harvard. He put us up in Elliott Hall. So to that extent I have been close to that institution of learning.

I have known of no finer person in my public life, no gentler person, no firmer person when he had a conviction.

I am not surprised that he led his crew to the original victory, nor am I surprised that he was on hand to lead the crew to victory again in their triumphal trial run 50 years later.

I congratulate the Senator from Massachusetts, the university which produced him, and the Senator from Maine for having said these kind words today.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maine yield?

Mrs. SMITH. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I think there is entirely too much emphasis placed on Harvard University, because the universities of Montana, Colorado, Maine, Florida, Alabama, Tennessee, Arkansas, and many others are just as good, but those universities are not endowed with age and the traditions and prestige which is Harvard's, and rightly so. We are all one in honoring a son of that great institution. Whether in the field of athletics or in the Halls of Congress, when there is a job to be done, LEVERETT SALTONSTALL is one to do it.

I am delighted to have this opportunity and privilege to pay homage to a great man, a man who is an inspiration to us and the Nation, the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts.

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, I thank my distinguished colleagues for joining me in what I consider to be a great accomplishment. When we speak of physical fitness, I know of no greater example of it than the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts.

WHERE WERE THEY WHEN NEEDED?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I have noted with interest and approval an editorial entitled "Where Were They When Needed?" which appeared recently in the Suwannee Democrat at Live Oak, Fla., and was reprinted in the Tallahassee Democrat. Much of the fine little north Florida city of Live Oak was under several feet of water for days, as a result of heavy rainfall that accompanied the recent Hurricane Dora.

This editorial reflects so truthfully the kindly relationship between our white and colored citizens in Florida that I desire to share it with my colleagues. I ask unanimous consent to have this editorial printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Tallahassee (Fla.) Democrat, Sept. 20, 1964]

WHERE WERE THEY WHEN NEEDED?

Where were they?

As every person in Suwannee County knows, this community has been the victim of unwarranted, unthinking, and unfeeling tension between the races during recent months.

We have seen agitators come into our community to insult and inflame. Several unfortunate instances have seen violence averted only by cool heads on the part of the law officials and the good people of both races of Live Oak.

Daily from the papers we read of the agitators pouring into our cities, engineering strife where there is none. Ignorant and totally imbecilic trained agitators prey upon the colored people and seek to threaten officials and the people.

In a land of law, we have a group that believes that law is only for one side. The laws they agree with must be abided by all of the people, but those they disagree with, on whatever pretext, are to be violated with riots, violence, or any other means.

And they do this because the colored people are supposedly persecuted in the South. And so in Live Oak we have had our problems with characters similar to those of Greenwich Village, where otherwise they would be cursing and defiling free enterprise, religion, capitalism, labor, management, and everyone else—while learning to be first-class dope addicts and strumming obscene tunes on a uke.

And there are the other misguided souls coming into our land like the mother of the Governor of Massachusetts. What possible business she had in St. Augustine is beyond us. We would resent bitterly the family members of Florida's Governor going to that State to cause strife and turmoil.

But they do this in the name that they are helping.

Well the big question in Live Oak today is: Where are they?

Today a large part of the colored population of this city is homeless, hungry, poorly clothed, miserable, and flooded out by the terrible storm of the past week.

Where is the NAACP, where is CORE, the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee, the Urban League, SNICK, and the multitude of other organizations that infest this land?

We can't find them.

And who did the colored people of Suwannee County turn to? As in all times past, they turned to their fellow citizens, both black and white.

And we aided each other.

Had it not been for immediate assistance from the Red Cross and Salvation Army, the people of Live Oak would have shared what little was left.

There was no racial strife and unrest here this week. Just folks who have for years lived and worked in harmony determined to let their faith in God, sympathy, and understanding guide their efforts to bring peace, safety, and normalcy to a battered and flooded community.

But CORE and the NAACP have aided neither. They are not to be found. Their leaders are doing nothing. They do not seemingly find it to their liking to help out their colored brethren when a disaster like this strikes. They would rather spend their time ranting and raving, rioting and looting, agitating and causing strife and turmoil.

They'll be back. On this you can bet.

We would hope that when they do, the colored people of this community will ask them a simple question: Where were you when you were needed?

SUMMARY OF ACTIVITIES OF THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS, 88TH CONGRESS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, in faithful observance of the annual rites of the Congress, I submit for the RECORD a summary of accomplishments of the Committee on Foreign Relations during the 88th Congress. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed following my brief statement.

The committee has enjoyed a businesslike and profitable 2 years and I want to thank my colleagues on the committee for making this possible. As usual, high honors go to the ranking majority and minority members, the junior Senator from Alabama and the senior Senator from Iowa, but many others have been faithful in attendance and diligent in the work of the committee.

I believe it can be fairly stated that the highlights of the 88th Congress in the foreign relations field were the approval of the limited nuclear test ban treaty and the joint resolution promoting the maintenance of international peace and security in southeast Asia. Of continuing importance, of course, were the Foreign Assistance Acts of 1963 and 1964, which were subjected to the most careful and searching scrutiny by Congress in many years. International financial institutions were strengthened by approving increases in the resources of the International Development Association and the Inter-American Development Bank. Relations with our good neighbors, Mexico and Canada, were improved by approval of the Chamizal Treaty and implementing legislation, of lower Colorado River flood control programs, by the presentation of a statute to Mexico, by the establishment of the Roosevelt Campobello International Park, and by planning the participation in the Canadian Universal and International Exhibition.

The committee's study of the effectiveness of the Foreign Agents Registration Act was completed and a bill making improvements in the law passed the Senate July 6, 1964. I expect that this bill will be finally enacted in the next Congress.

All in all, the committee ended the Congress with a clean calendar.

TREATIES ACTED ON

First. Convention on extradition between the United States of America and Sweden, together with a related protocol, signed at Washington on October 24, 1961. Approved October 22, 1963, by a vote of 74 to 0.

Second. Additional protocol to the treaty of extradition of January 13, 1961, between the United States of America and the United States of Brazil, which additional protocol was signed at Rio de Janeiro on June 18, 1962. Approved October 22, 1963, by a vote of 74 to 0.

Third. The International Coffee Agreement, 1962, which was opened for signature in New York on September 28, 1962, in the English, French, Russian, Spanish, and Portuguese languages, and was signed on that date in behalf of the United States of America and a number of other countries. Approved May 21, 1963, by a vote of 69 to 20.

Fourth. Consular convention between the United States of America and Korea signed at Seoul on January 8, 1963. Approved October 22, 1963, by a vote of 74 to 0.

Fifth. Protocol dated at Rome September 15, 1962, to amend the Convention on International Civil Aviation done at Chicago on December 7, 1944. Approved October 22, 1963, by a vote of 74 to 0.

Sixth. Convention on extradition between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the State of Israel, signed at Washington, December 10, 1962. Approved October 22, 1963, by a vote of 74 to 0.

Seventh. Consular convention between the United States of America and Japan, together with a protocol relating thereto, signed at Tokyo on March 22, 1963. Approved October 22, 1963, by a vote of 74 to 0.

Eighth. Treaty banning nuclear weapon tests in the atmosphere, in outer space, and under water, signed at Moscow on August 5, 1963, on behalf of the United States of America, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Approved September 24, 1963, by a vote of 80 to 19.

Ninth. Convention between the United States of America and the United Mexican States for the solution of the problem of Chamizal, signed at Mexico City on August 29, 1963. Approved December 17, 1963, by a vote of 79 to 1.

Tenth. Agreement between the United States of America and the Republic of Austria regarding the return of Austrian property, rights, and interests, signed at Washington on January 30, 1959. Approved February 25, 1964, by a vote of 66 to 24.

Eleventh. Protocol modifying and supplementing the convention between the United States of America and Japan for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on income, signed at Tokyo, on May 7, 1960, supplementing the protocol signed at Washington on April 16, 1964. Approved July 29, 1964, by a vote of 84 to 0.

Twelfth. Protocol between the United States and Japan, signed at Tokyo on August 14, 1962, modifying and supplementing the convention for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on income signed at Washington on April 16, 1964, as supplemented by the protocol signed at Tokyo on March 23, 1957, and as modified and supplemented by the protocol signed at Tokyo on May 7, 1960. Approved July 29, 1964, by a vote of 84 to 0.

Thirteenth. Convention between the United States of America and the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg for the avoidance of double taxation of income, the prevention of fiscal evasion, and the promotion of trade and investment, signed at Washington on December 18, 1962. Approved July 29, 1964, by a vote of 84 to 0.

Fourteenth. Text of amendments of the International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution of the Sea by Oil, 1954, adopted by a Conference of Contracting Governments convened at London on April 11, 1962. Approved February 25, 1964, by a vote of 88 to 0.

Fifteenth. International agreement regarding the maintenance of certain lights in the Red Sea. Approved February 25, 1964, by a vote of 88 to 0.

Sixteenth. Protocol amending the interim convention on conservation of North Pacific fur seals, signed at Washington on February 9, 1957, which protocol was signed at Washington on October 8, 1963, on behalf of the Governments of Canada, Japan, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and the United States of America. Approved January 30, 1964, by a vote of 80 to 0.

Seventeenth. Protocol, signed at The Hague on October 23, 1963, modifying and supplementing the extension to the Netherlands Antilles of the convention between the United States of America and the Kingdom of the Netherlands for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on income and certain other taxes. Approved on July 29, 1964, by a vote of 84 to 0.

Eighteenth. Supplementary convention between the United States of America and the Kingdom of Sweden relating to income and other taxes signed at Stockholm on October 22, 1963, modifying and supplementing the convention and accompanying protocol for the avoidance of double taxation and the establishment of rules of reciprocal administrative assistance in the case of income and other taxes, signed at Washington on March 23, 1939. Approved July 29, 1964, by a vote of 84 to 0.

Nineteenth. Protocol of the Prolongation of the International Sugar Agreement of 1958, dated at London, August 1, 1963. Approved January 30, 1964, by a vote of 80 to 0.

Twentieth. Partial Revision of Radio Regulations, Geneva, 1959, and the Additional Protocol signed at Geneva on November 8, 1963, by delegates of the United States of America and other countries represented at the Extraordinary Administrative Radio Conference held at Geneva October 7 through November 8, 1963. Approved February 25, 1964, by a vote of 88 to 0.

Twenty-first. Protocol between the United States of America and Greece, signed at Athens on Februray 12, 1964, modifying and supplementing the convention of February 20, 1950, for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on the estates of deceased persons. Approved June 23, 1964, by a vote of 83 to 0.

Twenty-second. Protocol to the International Convention for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries, signed at Washington under date of February 8, 1949, which protocol relates to harp and hood seals. The protocol was signed at Washington under date of July 15, 1963, for the United States of America and 11 other governments. Approved June 23, 1964, by a vote of 83 to 0.

Twenty-third. Supplementary convention to the extradition convention of October 26, 1901, and the supplementary convention of June 20, 1935, between the United States of America and Belgium, which supplementary convention was signed at Brussels on November 14, 1963. Approved August 6, 1964, by a vote of 91 to 0.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

First. S. 284, for the relief of Ethel R. Loop, the widow of Carl R. Loop. Private Law 88-297. Approved August 30, 1964.

Second. S. 745, to provide for adjustments in annuities under the Foreign Service retirement and disability system. Conference report agreed to by House September 30, 1964.

Third. S. 777, to amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act in order to increase the authorization for appropriations and to modify the personnel security procedures for contractor employees. Authorizes $20 million for 2 years. Public Law 88-186. Approved November 26, 1963.

Fourth. S. 944, to provide for the presentation by the United States to the people of Mexico of a monument commemorating the independence of Mexico, and for other purposes. Public Law 88-399. Approved August 4, 1964.

Fifth. S. 949, to amend the United Nations Participation Act, as amended—63 Stat. 734–736. Amended and passed Senate December 6, 1963.

Sixth. S. 1512, to authorize one additional Assistant Secretary of State, and for other purposes. Passed Senate July 16, 1963.

Seventh. S. 1627, to enable the United States to contribute its share of the expenses of the International Commission for Supervision and Control of Laos—ICC—as provided in article 18 of the Protocol to the Declaration on the Neutrality of Laos. Public Law 88-468. Approved on August 20, 1964.

Eighth. S. 1917, to provide authority to protect heads of foreign states and other designated officials. Public Law 88-493. Approved August 27, 1964.

Ninth. S. 2136, to amend the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended. Amended and passed Senate July 6, 1964.

Tenth. S. 2213, to provide certain basic authority for the U.S. Information Agency. Amended and passed Senate, December 6, 1963.

Eleventh. S. 2214, to amend the International Development Association Act to authorize the United States to participate in an increase in the resources of the International Development Association. Public Law 88-310. Approved May 28, 1964.

Twelfth. S. 2394, to facilitate compliance with the Convention between the United States of America and the United Mexican States, signed August 29, 1963, and for other purposes. Public Law 88-300. Approved April 29, 1964.

Thirteenth. S. 2455, to amend further the Peace Corps Act (75 Stat. 612), as amended. Public Law 88-285. Approved March 17, 1964.

Fourteenth. S. 2464, to establish the Roosevelt Campobello International Park, and for other purposes. Public Law 88-363. Approved July 7, 1964.

Fifteenth. S. 2905, to provide for the appointment of a Commissioner General for U.S. participation in the Canadian Universal and International Exhibition, and for other purposes. Public Law 88-586. Approved September 11, 1964.

Sixteenth. S. 3074, to give the consent of Congress to the construction of certain international bridges. Passed Senate August 5, 1964.

Seventeenth. H.R. 5207, to amend the Foreign Service Buildings Act of 1926, to authorize additional appropriations, and for other purposes and to amend the Philippine War Damage Claims Act of 1962. Public Law 88-94. Approved August 12, 1963.

Eighteenth. H.R. 7044, to amend Public Law 193, 83d Congress, relating to the Corregidor-Bataan Memorial Commission. Public Law 88-240. Approved December 23, 1963.

Nineteenth. H.R. 7405, to amend the Bretton Woods Agreements Act to authorize the U.S. Governor of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development to vote for an increase in the Bank's authorized capital stock. Public Law 88-178. Approved November 13, 1963.

Twentieth. H.R. 7406, to provide for increased participation by the United States in the Inter-American Development Bank, and for other purposes. Public Law 88-259. Approved January 22, 1964.

Twenty-first. H.R. 7419, to authorize the conclusion of agreements with Mexico for joint construction, operation, and maintenance of emergency flood control works on the lower Colorado River, in accordance with the provisions of article 13 of the 1944 Water Treaty with Mexico, and for other purposes. Public Law 88-411. Approved August 10, 1964.

Twenty-second. H.R. 7885, to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended and for other purposes. Authorizes $3.6 billion for fiscal year 1964. Public Law 88-205. Approved December 16, 1963.

Twenty-third. H.R. 9009, to amend further the Peace Corps Act, as amended. Authorizes $102 million for fiscal year 1964. Public Law 88-200. Approved December 13, 1963.

Twenty-fourth. H.R. 11380, to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes. Conference report agreed to, October 2, 1964.

Twenty-fifth. H.R. 11754, to amend the Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1926, to authorize additional appropriations, and for other purposes. Public Law 88-414. Approved August 10, 1964.

Twenty-sixth. H.R. 12259, to amend the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949 to provide for the determination of the amounts of claims of nationals of the United States against the Government of Cuba. Amended and passed Senate September 8, 1964.

Twenty-seventh. H.R. 12342, to authorize certain retired and other personnel of the U.S. Government to accept and wear decorations, presents, and other things tendered them by certain foreign countries. Amended and passed Senate September 2, 1964.

Twenty-eighth. Senate Joint Resolution 60, providing for acceptance by the United States of America of an instrument for the amendment of the constitution of the International Labor Organization. Public Law 88-65. Approved July 17, 1963.

Twenty-ninth. Senate Joint Resolution 72, favoring the holding of the Olympic games in America in 1968. Public Law 88-124. Approved September 16, 1963.

Thirtieth. Senate Joint Resolution 120, providing for the recognition and endorsement of the 17th International Publishers Congress. Public Law 88-298. Approved April 17, 1964.

Thirty-first. Senate Joint Resolution 162, extending recognition to the International Exposition for Southern California in the year 1968 and authorizing the President to issue a proclamation calling upon the several States of the Union and foreign countries to take part in the Exposition. Public Law 88-496. Approved August 27, 1964.

Thirty-second. House Joint Resolution 324, extending an invitation to the International Olympic Committee to hold the 1968 winter Olympic games in the United States. Public Law 88-95. Approved August 12, 1963.

Thirty-third. House Joint Resolution 405, to amend the joint resolution providing for U.S. participation in the International Bureau for the Protection of Industrial Property. Public Law 88-69. Approved July 19, 1963.

Thirty-fourth. House Joint Resolution 778, to provide for participation by the Government of the United States in The Hague Conference on Private International Law and the International—Rome—Institute for the Unification of Private Law, and authorizing appropriations therefor. Public Law 88-244. Approved December 30, 1963.

Thirty-fifth. House Joint Resolution 779, to amend the joint resolution of January 28, 1948, relating to membership and participation by the United States in the South Pacific Commission, so as to authorize certain appropriations thereunder for the fiscal years 1964 and 1965. Public Law 88-263. Approved January 31, 1964.

Thirty-sixth. House Joint Resolution 1145, to promote the maintenance of international peace and security in southeast Asia. Public Law 88-408. Approved August 10, 1964.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS

First. Senate Concurrent Resolution 58, to print 5,000 additional copies of hearings on Executive M, 88th Congress, 1st session. House amendment agreed to by Senate October 28, 1963.

Second. House Concurrent Resolution 343, expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the enforcement of the provisions of article 19 of the United Nations Charter. Passed Senate on August 20, 1964.

SENATE RESOLUTIONS

First. Senate Resolution 25, authorizing the Committee on Foreign Relations to examine, investigate, and make studies of matters pertaining to the foreign policies of the United States and their administration. Agreed to March 14, 1963.

Second. Senate Resolution 26, authorizing the Committee on Foreign Relations to continue its study of the activities of nondiplomatic representatives of foreign principals. Agreed to March 14, 1963.

Third. Senate Resolution 152, to print as a Senate document the study entitled, "Problems and Trends in Atlantic Partnership—II." Agreed to June 17, 1963.

Fourth. Senate Resolution 168, accepting an invitation to attend the next general meeting of the Commonwealth Association to be held in Kuala Lumpur, Malaya. Agreed to July 11, 1963.

Fifth. Senate Resolution 240, to print as a Senate document, with additional copies, the second annual report to the Congress on the implementation of the Humphrey amendment. Agreed to April 16, 1964.

Sixth. Senate Resolution 277, authorizing the Committee on Foreign Relations to examine and study the foreign policies of the United States. Agreed to February 10, 1964.

Seventh. Senate Resolution 339, authorizing the sending of observers from the U.S. Senate to the next general meeting of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association in Jamaica. Agreed to July 23, 1964.

Eighth. Senate Resolution 369, to print additional copies of a committee print entitled "East-West Trade—A Compilation of Views of Businessmen, Bankers, and Academic Experts." Agreed to September 25, 1964.

Ninth. Senate Resolution 371, to print as a Senate document a report on the implementation of the Humphrey amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act. Agreed to September 25, 1964.

CONFIRMATION OF NOMINATIONS

As of October 1, 128 nominations for appointments as Ambassadors, officials in the State Department, and so forth, had been confirmed as well as 3,863 nominations in the Foreign Service.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, from the Committee on Foreign Relations sundry nominations have been favorably reported. I ask for their immediate consideration, and move that the Senate go into executive session.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

REPRESENTATIVES AND ALTERNATE REPRESENTATIVES OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE 19TH SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED NATIONS

The Chief Clerk read the following nominations to the 19th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations:

Representatives: Adlai E. Stevenson, of Illinois; Russell B. Long, U.S. Senator from the State of Louisiana; Frank Carlson, U.S. Senator from the State of Kansas; William C. Foster, of the District of Columbia; Francis T. P. Plimpton, of New York.

Alternate Representatives: Charles W. Yost, of New York; Franklin H. Williams, of California; Mrs. Gladys A. Tillett, of North Carolina; Richard N. Gardner, of the District of Columbia; Charles P. Noyes, of New York.

Mrs. Marietta P. Tree, of New York, to be the Representative of the United States of America on the Trusteeship Council of the United Nations, vice Sydney R. Yates, resigned.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed.

THE FOREIGN SERVICE

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Foreign Service.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objections, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

CONSULS GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

The Chief Clerk read the nominations of John W. Bowling, Robert A. Hurwitch, John A. Lacey, and Walter J. Mueller to be Consuls General of the United States of America.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed.

FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS OF CLASS 3, CONSULS, AND SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

The Chief Clerk read the nominations of Robert L. Walkinshaw, Thomas E. Walsh, and John C. Weisert to be Foreign Service officers of class 3, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed.

FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER OF CLASS 4

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Robert L. Dowell, Jr., to be a Foreign Service officer of class 4, a consul, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Richard Noyes Viets for appointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 6, a vice consul of career, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry other nominations in the Foreign Service.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered and confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

FOREIGN SERVICE RESERVE OFFICERS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Foreign Service Reserve.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered and confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

FOREIGN SERVICE STAFF OFFICER

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of George J. Stanger, a Foreign Service staff officer, to be a consul of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Without objection, the President will be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nominations.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. I move that the Senate return to legislative session.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

TRIBUTE TO THE MAJORITY LEADER

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I would not want to have the Senate adjourn sine die without expressing my very sincere thanks to the people of Montana. I believe everyone in this body is greatly indebted to the people of Montana for sending to us the senior Senator from Montana, our majority leader [Mr. Mansfield].

I am looking forward to continuing my service in the Senate next January under the leadership of our majority leader, Mike Mansfield.

It is quite appropriate to use as a descriptive term when one speaks of Mike Mansfield the word "noble." I consider him to be a noble man in the true sense of the meaning of that term.

I have a right to speak about the Senator from Montana, because undoubtedly I am one of those in the Senate who from time to time present to him some problems of leadership. This is always true when a leader must deal with someone who frequently finds himself supporting or advancing a minority point of view.

The graciousness of the majority leader, the complete fairness and impartiality, and his insistence that minority views be given the same fair treatment in the Senate as majority views has endeared him to all of us.

I want the majority leader to know that as we adjourn sine die tonight he will be leaving Washington to take up his campaign for reelection in Montana. I know that will not be too difficult a task. He will do it with the heartfelt appreciation and best wishes of every Member of this body.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, no longer is there any doubt that this Congress has been one of the most productive in the history of our Nation. In my opinion, this Congress has been the most productive of this century—certainly of this generation. It has variously been called the Education Congress, the Conservation Congress, and the Accomplishment Congress. It has been most definitely an Accomplishment Congress, even if in these closing days of the session Congress finds it difficult to accomplish its own adjournment.

Mr. President, if any single person can properly be called the architect of this achievement record, it is the able, distinguished, and beloved majority leader, Mike Mansfield. His unfailing patience, his indomitable good humor, and his quiet persistence have served all of us, and have been the blueprint for the fine record of this Congress. Thanks to his design, a "can-do" Congress has emerged as a "did-do" Congress.

Mr. President, it is with complete sincerity that I voice my respect and my admiration for the majority leader. I extend to him my sincere congratulations. He has earned the praise of all us; he certainly deserves it. Every one of us is richer for his efforts, and so is the Nation.

McNAMARA'S WAR

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have permission to insert in the Record certain material in the form of newspaper editorials and usual material, including a sampling of the correspondence that I have received in support of my position against McNamara's war in South Vietnam and in support of my position in opposition to foreign aid.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Oct. 2, 1964]

What Are Our War Aims in South Vietnam?

(By James Reston)

Washington, October 1.—The Johnson administration is once more reviewing its policy in Vietnam and once again it is deeply divided about how to proceed.

There is general agreement at all levels of the Government that the political instability in South Vietnam is increasing. The division is between those Johnson aids who want to expand the war into Communist North Vietnam with the direct participation of U.S. troops, and those who believe the risks of such a policy outweigh the advantages.

It is easy to understand why this division runs so deep. What is not so easy to understand is why the administration is pressing a review of the policy at this time. While the political situation in Saigon is said officially to be deteriorating, the administration insists that there is no danger of collapse there in the foreseeable future, and Ambassador Maxwell Taylor has stated this week that the Communist military assault on South Vietnam is further from success now than ever before.

PROVOKING AN INCIDENT?

If this is true, it is difficult to understand why some prominent officials, a few weeks before a national election, should be talking so openly about expanding the war, and not only advocating but almost lobbying for such a course of action.

It is even possible now to hear officials of this Government talking casually about how easy it would be to "provoke an incident" in the Gulf of Tonkin that would justify an attack on North Vietnam, and thus, according to this thesis, enable the United States to bring strong military pressure on the Communists there to let up on their pressure on South Vietnam.

President Johnson himself is not engaging in any such blithe conversation on the subject. On the contrary, he has been emphasizing that the United States is merely there to assist the South Vietnamese to preserve their own freedom.

"We don't want our American boys to do the fighting for Asian boys," he said this week. "We don't want to get involved in a nation with 700 million people (Communist China), and get tied down in a land war in Asia.

"So what are we doing? We are staying there and supplying the South Vietnamese with some of the things that we have. We have 20,000 men out there advising and helping them but we are not about to start another war and we're not about to run away from where we are."

At the same time, the Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs, William P. Bundy, put the emphasis another way this week in Tokyo.

"Expansion of the war outside South Vietnam, while not a course we want or seek," he said, "could be forced upon us by the increased external pressures of the Communists, including a rising scale of infiltration."

These two statements, both reflecting official attitudes often expressed here, illustrate the ambiguity of U.S. policy in that peninsula. For months and even years, this Government insisted that American troops and material were in Vietnam merely to help that government help itself. It was emphasized that the war was their war and that everything depended on South Vietnam's ability to unify itself and use American help effectively.

As South Vietnamese unity and military efficiency have declined, however, the United States has gradually begun to restate its aims and to emphasize that "the United States regards as vital to its national interest and to world peace, the maintenance of international peace and security in southeast Asia."

In short, what started as a limited commitment to play a subsidiary role, has gradually become a U.S. commitment not only to maintain the peace and security of South Vietnam, but of the whole of southeast Asia.

This larger commitment has been endorsed by a congressional resolution, and it has encouraged not only those who want to expand the war into the north but those here who think they see a clever way of doing this by "provoking an incident."

There is, of course, always a lot of casual talk here while major policies are in dispute, but this is an odd time and an odd way to proceed on anything so important as risking a war with China.

It clouds an already complicated and devilish dilemma with suspicion. Last week we were told by unidentified officials that U.S. pilots were authorized to chase any attackers into North Vietnam or even into China. Today, for the first time, the U.S. destroyers involved in the last Gulf of Tonkin incident were identified, not by the Government, but by a letter from an Iowa sailor aboard one of the ships to his parents back home in Dubuque.

Nobody can be very dogmatic about what should be done about the agony of Vietnam, but the Nation is entitled to a clearer definition of our war aims there and specifically to an assurance that our ships are in the Gulf of Tonkin to end the war and not to "provoke an incident," that might expand the war.

SEPTEMBER 27, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Here are my efforts to thank you and to let you know that you are appreciated for the honest and courageous stand on Vietnam and the part the United States is playing there.

Last week a mother told us, several of us, how worried she was because her son was a soldier, a plain soldier in Vietnam and she had not heard from him for 2 weeks whereas he usually wrote every week. But Vietnam was the most terrible place for him to be and she felt so helpless. We told her to write to President Johnson and our Washington Senators.

It will soon be United Nations Day. So I hope more will admit the sense of your position and the need for the U.N. to take over.

The fact that we are so senseless about China, the real China doesn't help matters.

Thank you and may you have the strength and courage to continue in your good work.

Sincerely,

MRS. PAULINE SWANSON.

SEATTLE, WASH.

MESS IN VIETNAM

The deepening frustration of the U.S. position in South Vietnam calls for a more penetrating analysis and report than those given by Ambassador Maxwell Taylor in Washington last week.

Although Gen. Nguyen Khanh remains as Premier after the bloodless military coup and countercoup, and the State Department boldly asserts its confidence in him, it is obvious that his power was weakened, if not destroyed.

The student and Buddhist riots which forced Khanh to give up the dictatorial powers he proclaimed for himself and to promise a new constitution and free election of a civilian government revealed the basic instability of his rule.

The army revolt which forced him to flee Saigon confirmed his lack of authority in the armed forces. Although the army generals backed down and withdrew their troops because air force generals insisted on restoring Khanh to his seat, this left Khanh little better off. Now it is the air force that has Khanh under control. Reportedly, eight younger generals demand widespread civilian government and military reforms.

What makes Ambassador Taylor and the Washington playcallers look so ineffective is that the army action against Khanh over the weekend apparently came as a complete surprise. While General Taylor was reassuring the administration and congressional leaders that the Vietnam situation was improving, Malcolm Browne, of the Associated Press, was reporting strong hints of another coup, which occurred on schedule.

If rioting in the streets or a splinter movement of troops and tanks can send Khanh and the other members of the ruling triumvirate scuttling into hiding, there is obviously no leadership on which the United States can depend for prosecution of the war against the Vietcong Communists.

Former Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge reported limited success in interesting friendly Western nations in making at least a token contribution to the anticommunism fight in Vietnam. Such support is unlikely to be provided after the events of the past weekend.

The failure of U.S. policy to achieve noteworthy progress against the Vietcong forces and the instability of the South Vietnam Government are an embarrassment to President Johnson as the election approaches. His Republican opponent, Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, has not, however, offered any reasonable plan to improve the situation. It's a mess and no one seems to know the way out.

LEMONT, ILL.,
September 30, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Hardly a day goes by but that I read an excellent quote from your speeches against continuation of the Vietnamese war in some newspaper or magazine. I am so grateful to and for you and Senator GRUENING.

I am grateful, too, that you considered my support for your stand on this Vietnam issue to be of sufficient weight to share one of my letters with your fellow Senators. I do hope it helped to strengthen your own stand. It has just come to my attention that you included my letter in your August 21 speech in the Senate. If you have any extra copies of the speech, I would appreciate very much having three or four of them.

Perhaps you will be interested in the enclosed copies of my letters (1) to President Johnson, and (2) to the Washington Post editor.

My very best wishes for your good health to enable you to continue your humane and principled stand for a peaceful settlement now of the South Vietnamese war.

Very sincerely yours,

MARY PHILLIPS.

LEMONT, ILL.,
September 30, 1964.

President LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Each day the war continues in Vietnam, innocent people die, and danger of escalation of the war grows.

The latest news re "hot pursuit" into the airspace and waters of China and other nations bordering Vietnam is disturbing indeed.

Please listen to learned, reasonable, experienced, and responsible leaders like Senators MORSE, of Oregon, and GRUENING, of Alaska, and start immediately to negotiate a settlement in Vietnam.

I realize you are too busy campaigning to read letters, but I hope some of your aids will have a moment to read the enclosed copy of my letter to the Chicago Daily News and report to you that many people expect you to ignore the "soft on communism" accusation of Senator GOLDWATER and to settle the Vietnamese war peacefully and now.

I am campaigning in my humble way for you, but I could put more enthusiasm into it if you would stop the slaughter of innocents in Vietnam. I think I am not alone in this feeling.

Very sincerely yours,

MARY PHILLIPS.

LEMONT, ILL., *September 29, 1964.*

EDITOR, WASHINGTON POST,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: Recently, WILLIAM MILLER, Republican candidate for Vice President, was asked: "If elected, what will the Republicans do about the war in Vietnam?"

Mr. MILLER replied that after conferring with the Pentagon, State Department, military advisers in South Vietnam, and the South Vietnamese Government, they would conclude the war.

His reply is ambiguous. Just what does he mean by "conclude the war"? How? He did not say he would confer with the leaders of the National Liberation Front in South Vietnam, nor the governments of North Vietnam, Cambodia, Laos, nor any of the 14 nations which negotiated a settlement with France in 1954. Does he mean he would decline to confer with them? Was any war ever concluded without conferences with the other side? Or does Mr. MILLER foresee only a military solution?

If so, it would be appropriate for him to look back 10 years: France had spent 7 years and 7 months fighting the dirty war in Vietnam. She had lost 100,000 of her sons killed or missing, with another 140,000 wounded. She had spent $5 billion (of which the United States contributed 2 billions). Yet she recognized there was no military solution. She met with representatives of 14 nations at a conference in Geneva and negotiated a settlement.

It is time for Mr. MILLER—and President Johnson and Senators HUMPHREY and GOLDWATER—to recognize, as France's President De Gaulle did, that there is no military solution. It is past time to begin preparations to reconvene the 14-nation conference, or to call on the United Nations to negotiate a conclusion of the war in South Vietnam.

Very sincerely yours,

MARY PHILLIPS.

BERKELEY, CALIF.,
September 27, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MORSE: We sincerely appreciate your recent remarks concerning U.S. foreign policy, particularly in Vietnam.

Yours truly,

Mr. and Mrs. JOHN HENNINGS.

SEPTEMBER 27, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This morning's news accounts of the President's alleged post-Tonkin "hot pursuit" orders only indicate how close to war we are. They reflect a decade in Indochina of ineptitude, shortsightedness, tomfoolery, and illegality, on our part. We, the people, have been for 10 years insulted by the lack of straight talking about the realities of life and death in southeast Asia. We must have a political settlement and we must bring China into the U.N. and the conference table before it is too late.

Respectfully,

ALBERT LEVY, M.D.

SEPTEMBER 28, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Not too long ago, my husband and I read portions of your speech that was made to the Congress regarding Vietnam. Sir, it is with heartfelt thanks that I write this letter to you. As never before have we ever read or heard the true facts before. We regret that this speech was buried in the back pages of the daily newspaper and not on the front page where it belonged. It is truly disheartening to know that out of the many political representatives in our Government, you are the only one that will and do present the truth about U.S. activities in Vietnam. Your knowledge and intelligence regarding this subject, sir, are second to none. To us, Senator, you are 10 feet tall.

My husband and I only wish that you were our Senator, so that we could cast a vote for you to say thank you.

Sincerely,

MRS. ARTHUR LIVIERI.

FORT LAUDERDALE, FLA.

THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN,
Milwaukee, Wis., September 23, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Please add my letter published in the local paper to the impressive outpouring of support and tribute testimonials of which have filled many pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Yours was the one small voice of conscience—with GRUENING—that I am sure a later generation of wiser Americans will treasure and honor. The reactionary right is on the warpath in American and on foreign policy it is difficult to express publicly prudent judgments. My wife and friends have questioned the wisdom of my exposing myself in such a sensitive issue but I told them: I must follow Senator MORSE, who has done an infinitely braver thing than I, we have only to follow in his path. All honor for leading the way.

Yours,

MANUEL GOTTLIEB,
Professor of Economics.

[From the Milwaukee Sentinel, Aug. 14, 1964]

AUGUST 10, 1964.

DEAR EDITOR: Bravo for Senator MORSE for his trenchant criticism of American conduct in the Tonkin Bay crisis. We risked nuclear holocaust to force the removal of Soviet missiles placed 90 miles away from our shores. Has not America given equal affront in patrolling with hostile military craft waters used extensively for coastal, fishing, and island shipping in a bay fronted entirely by unfriendly nations whom we do not recognize. The movement in such waters of hostile military craft hazards the risk of incidents as the history of international politics abundantly shows. In any incident military craft must always defend themselves when attacked or obstructed. Ours are reported to have so done with wide disparity between damage suffered and inflicted. When such incidents recur the powers involved are obligated to seek to assess the situation and intentions of the other side through direct negotiations. If such negotiations are unavailing, then our obligations under the U.N. Charter requires that before undertaking direct military action that complaint in the United Nations be made of the offending behavior so that the appropriate investigation and factfinding can be made and remedies devised. We are not without friends in the U.N. and our cause there would not have been a forlorn one. Incidents need to be investigated carefully since the history of diplomacy shows how frequently governments will stretch the bounds of truth or will devise what in candor we once described as "coverup" stories when incidents are reported or interpreted.

But even before a U.N. investigation was commenced under cover of darkness and while labeling North Vietnam the "aggressor," we launched a devastating air attack. Neutral investigation is now hampered because some or all of the evidence on the North Vietnam side has been destroyed. Let us hope that the destruction of the North Vietnam PT boats, which could badly hurt an invasion fleet, will not be the precursor of an Inchon-style invasion just as the unannounced attack on Castro's air fields was the precursor of the ill-fated Bay of Pigs invasion.

MANUEL GOTTLIEB.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
September 27, 1964.

SENATOR MORSE: At the time of the first Gulf of Tonkin crisis, and the passage of the joint resolution endorsing American attacks on North Vietnam, I was serving in the Army and did not feel it proper and in keeping with my position and its function to express open opposition to the policies of the President. Having, however, finished my period of military service, I want to thank you, Senator, for voting and speaking against that resolution. I also hope that you will continue to speak against the ever-growing war in Vietnam. Since you are, so clearly, a courageous and honest man (and there seem to be so few), I am sure you will, and I only regret that I cannot help in returning you to the Senate again and again.

I enclose a letter I have written to Senator FULBRIGHT, which I believe expresses some of my feelings with regard to the joint resolution and the Vietnam war.

Once more, sir, I want to thank you for the difficult position that you have taken in the Senate, and express my regret that I am unable to help you.

Yours,

AIVARS I. TRUSIS.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
September 27, 1964.

Senator FULBRIGHT:

For many years it has been my hope that the first time I feel it necessary to write to a U.S. Senator it should be to express my approval. Therefore, it is with a measure of sadness as well as alarm that I write to you, Senator, with regard to our war in Vietnam.

One is, I think, justified in asking: Will the war in Vietnam be still further expanded after November? If the answer is Yes—and there is little to indicate that such is not the intention—I wish to register my protest. It may perhaps be pointed out that such a protest is more properly expressed through the ballot, but since we—in the fashion of the Roman Republic—have come to endow certain members of our Government with what appear to be virtually dictatorial powers, I find no choice but to register my protest outside the more normal democratic process. I am sure you will grant me, Senator, that if the power to make war at some future time is conferred on a man by acclamation—be that man a President of the United States, or be he a Cuban Premier—voting becomes a puerile business. Has it perhaps been claimed that such an acclamation was justified by extraordinary circumstances? May democracy be suspended at a time of crisis? If such a justification is offered, and it has been offered, one may well ask: when, in the last 25 years, has there not been a crisis? If the suspension of democracy is justified by extraordinary circumstances, then let me point out that democracy is quite damned, because it is itself an extraordinary circumstance. Need anyone be reminded of that? Amazingly: it appears, Yes. What justification, Senator, do you offer for the U.S. Senate rendering its constitutional power to declare war a vacuous formality, a trivial matter to be dispensed quickly and lightly? Someone else will declare war for you, under circumstances that are still in the future; what an amazing sense of responsibility of an august and responsible institution. Perhaps something will be said about the need for unity, or for a show of unity. But since when, sir, has unity in error, folly, and cowardice been honorable and necessary? The categories of my questions must be out of fashion; I must surely have missed some momentous turn of the world.

The questions that I have asked lead me directly to others with regard to our friends in South Vietnam. Given the dictatorships—military and civilian—that flourish in that area, that we tend with a care that would melt a gardener's heart, could you explain, sir, through what distortion of the common meaning of words may it be said that we and our assorted friends are engaged in fighting for freedom? I do not understand. Does the explanation lie in the fact that we are fighting Communists? I would be quite satisfied if communism, and only communism, were slavery, but slavery is both older and younger than communism. Since I was born in a country which was occupied, and reoccupied, both by Nazi Germany and by Soviet Russia, I no more than you, Senator, need be reminded that anticommunism does not necessarily indicate a love of freedom. Do you feel, as does Senator GOLDWATER, that if it takes "a dictator in order to keep communism out, then I don't think we can object to that"? It is sometimes said: If we do not stop communism in Asia, where will we stop it? I ask you, Senator: If we do not object to a dictator in Vietnam, where will we object to having one? France suffered corruption through the methods it employed in Indochina and in Algeria. Why are we not subject to a similar corruption? What justifies us in aiding one dictatorship rather than the other, one slavery rather than another? That a nation which claims to have dedicated itself to establishing a free world should, nevertheless, aid a ruthless series of dictatorships is a spectacle that surely deserves a great and extraordinary explanation. But except for the courageous protests of a few Senators, I hear nothing but acclamations and observe nothing but a herd instinct. The spectacle is too pathetic to even sustain anger.

And finally, sir, I am amazed that you, who so often has shown both courage and intelligence, have not opposed (instead of guided) the acclamations, and have not daily called for an end to the disgraceful war in Vietnam.

Surely, sir, surely that war cannot be in the interest of this Nation.

Yours,

——— ———.

NEW ZEALAND,
September 25, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C., U.S.A.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to express my appreciation for the outstanding work you have been doing in the field of foreign affairs and defense policy.

You seem to be an anomaly—an honest man in a sea of corruption and sold-out men. Thank God there is at least one left—Senator MORSE who is not afraid to name a Nazi in NATO or a U.S. escalation as such, in the Gulf of Tonkin.

Please consider me your South Sea constituent—loyal to the democratic ideal as you alone seem to have been proclaiming it, and to the general principles of reason, truth, honesty and American traditions, in international relations.

As I see it, certain forces within the United States of America have preserved the German General Staff—the whole apparatus of Nazi-ism—now whitewashed as "a good and reformed ally of the United States of America." Hogwash. As is well documented in Heusinger and the Fourth Reich, and The Old Nazi and the New Germany, the same old Hitler crowd are calling the shots in West Germany, and perhaps, have U.S.A. unsophisticated generals under their tutelage. Heusinger and his staff did get into NATO and presumably know most U.S.A. defense secrets. Thus they may be in the position of being able to use or abuse the entire apparatus from the top down.

Having studied the ideology of the German General Staff and its modus operandi, I would say their strategy would be to get the United States of America into a limited nuclear war in the Asia-Pacific theater. This would serve to make the United States of America hated for 500 years as you say, and would also clear the way for an overt takeover by the German General Staff of the West German political apparatus. In the anarchy, the General Staff would take the calculated risk of moving into East Germany, on the grounds that neither the United States of America or U.S.S.R. would dare risk striking each other for fear of bringing on mutual annihilation.

However, the United States of America in devastating China with nuclear bombs, would make itself a pariah among nations—thus serving two other powers: The Soviet Union and Germany. Every other nation will look good in comparison to the United States of America after it does its job on China.

In anticipation, West Germany is establishing various relations with Red China—to better serve its purpose as an "innocent" ready to pick up the pieces and the resources of the area. What perfidy.

The general Nazi influence has established a snowball of anti-Communist hysteria in the United States of America which now seems to be self-perpetuating, and will fulfill the destiny planned for the United States of America by the German General Staff. The captivation of the American mind by the anti-Communist credo cannot be overestimated, as it is by this tactic alone, by which the Germans can direct the United States of America to achieve its objectives. The Germans have a traditional genius for warfare—and as you well know, anything goes to achieve the desired objectives.

Thus if Heusinger and his kind can use the United States of America to serve their ends—wonderful—the Fourth Reich may yet come to be.

Another tactic might be to precipitate United States–U.S.S.R. mutual incineration (perhaps through sneak attack on one or the other nation), leaving Europe relatively untouched. This would allow the Germans to pick up the pieces in the aftermath—play the benevolent big brother to both powers, and secure the German dream of world domination.

I would say that so long as the United States of America can be agitated to pray at the anti-Communist altar, they will inadvertently serve the German purposes. You can't preserve nazism intact, and expect it to serve anything other than itself. That is the major flaw in U.S. strategy since World War II, when it preserved Hitler's intelligence and general staff apparatus. They must have started laughing in the late 1940's.

However, what we probably have now is a thorough infiltration of the American power elite by those serving the German purpose—those so conditioned to the anti-Communist religion, that they are willing to destroy every good thing America ever stood for in the world. Democracy, free speech, civil liberties, free thought, all of this must go to defeat the enemy. So long as outside agents direct (and pay) these cynical and opportunist "defenders" of the free world, America will continue on its self-defeating course—creating or paying off foreign dictators and waging wars against the disenfranchised. One might well ask, How many U.S. dollars given to Chiang Kai-shek, have found their way back into the right pockets to make U.S. policy? The same goes for Trujillo and Franco and Batista in their day. As Walt Rostow says in his new book of nonsense it is the stability and anti-Communist qualities of dictatorial regimes which make their freedom and democracy so attractive to the United States.

What I believe is that the United States must become sane and develop its policy before it gets caught in the trap of committing a strategic limited nuclear war in the Asia-Pacific theater. It must come to see that winning the cold war and the cause of humanity so far as communism is concerned is to democratize Communist regimes by contacts and trade and cultural relations. If they can only become prosperous, the totalitarian nature of the Communist regimes will disintegrate as their people move toward self-expression. This kind of thing is impossible under dictatorship of any kind including nazism, which the German general staff will reimpose (under another name) if they can.

Given the technological explosion—cybernetics—automation et al., humanity in total, could easily build a very viable world, once it managed to break through in the human and national relations sector.

How can the United States be persuaded of this before it is too late?

How can the United States be got off the anti-Communist kick and onto the real issues and problems—giving help to the oppressed rather than arms to their oppressors and dictators. That is the question—the major question which the United States must not confront at all costs if it is to continue to serve the ultimate interests of resurgent nazism.

Things are very confused now in international relations. Too many in the United States of America feel they are serving freedom and democracy by serving people like Chiang Kai-shek, Franco, Salazar, Heusinger and the like. Then there is Diem and Khanh in South Vietnam. This is pure scandal and inexcusable.

Sometimes I wonder if the Nazis have taken over the whole U.S. State Department, FBI, CIA, and Pentagon. What is the real reason that Hoover was given an extension of office in the FBI? I shudder at the guesses that occur to me.

And the Kennedy assassination and its mysteries, what a colossal act of criminality, that seems to be getting buckets of whitewash thrown on it—but never enough to account for the outstanding unanswered questions, and contradictions.

I write to you in this vein because I believe in your integrity. To me you represent all that is good in American traditions and I shudder to think that America may soon be converted into almost an exact opposite of what it stands for—to better serve the foreign dictatorial masters and domestic lackeys which serve them, and the brainless military-industrial-political combine feeding aimlessly on the arms industry.

I was born in Yonkers, N.Y., and spent the first 8 years of my life in the United States of America before my family went to Toronto, Canada. My great-grandmother used to converse with Emerson, and somewhere back there I was related to the Adams family. Not that that gives me any particular merit—but only to show that in terms of forebears, I have a right to proclaim my definitions of what America should stand for and where it is going wrong today.

Given the present situation the only thing I can do here is to publicize your views, in hopes that allied Governments may apply the brake on U.S. war policies, rather than collaborate in the doom of both the United States of America and themselves. I've been doing this. I am reproducing your article in the recent issue of Progressive magazine, "Humpty Dumpty in South Vietnam," and will distribute it. Certain political cretins in New Zealand call you an irresponsible maverick, because you are trying to prevent America from committing genocide in Asia. They have fluid on the brain and acid in their bowels and I am opposing them.

I would appreciate it if you could help this effort by having your speeches sent to me airmail. I will see that relevant material is disseminated in both New Zealand and Australia. It is true enough that I am dealing here with a political wasteland so far as international affairs is concerned. Nevertheless it is my philosophy that one must go on trying right up to the end—having faith that reason and self-interest will prevail over propaganda.

Yours very sincerely,

Lawrence F. J. Ross.

September 24, 1964.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: A little time has elapsed since the Gulf of Tonkin episode transpired, yet our spirits remain grim and a heavy sense of total disenchantment weighs on our minds—all because of the dangerous course of hostilities our administration chose to follow regarding the Vietnamese policy.

We, in our circle of peace-loving kith and kin, brand Goldwater the unbridled jingoist. Now we find ourselves disenfranchised votewise. Where is our peace champion?

It seems that outside of a handful of other Senators your voice, Senator Morse, is the only voice of sanity, soundness, sincerity, and truth in Washington. All else from our point of view is sheer madness.

While we love our Nation with a passion, we will voice dissent with policies which are mendacious, which humiliate us in the eyes of the intellectual world, and which do violence to our hearts and minds. I assure you the compassionate, humane and goodhearted Americans will not close ranks and rally 'round the flagpole simply because the McNamaras, the General Taylors, the Rusks, the Goldwaters—and, yes, the Johnsons, say so.

We are dismayed beyond words and certainly wonder why Americans are fighting and dying in far away Vietnam. Why have billions been poured in and millions more being apportioned to the contemptible dictators from Bao Dai, Diem and Khanh? Is the lot of poor wretched humans there bettered one iota—or only embittered beyond endurance? We're preserving no freedoms for anyone. There isn't a principle to die for. There is nothing but sham. Mr. Johnson's appealing, sober and heartening remarks of March 23, 1964—"The people of the world, I think, prefer reasoned agreement to ready attack * * *" now have a sick and hollow ring.

More from his speech—"And this is our objective—the quest for peace and not the quarrels of war. * * *" I wonder if that is why our "lily-white ships of peace" bullied their way to the waters of Tonkin? Senator Morse, your explanation of that incident had the ring of truth.

"In every trouble spot in the world this hope of reasoned agreement instead of rash retaliation can bear fruit." (L.B.J.) Preserve us from the poison we're reaching for.

I would say to the President that war is not unknown to me. I have partasted of the bitter fruits of battle for 4 years. I know firsthand of the bestiality, lunacy, and grisliness of murdering one another, for I fought as a paratrooper in World War II with the 11th Airborne Division. I am sickened as to what it does to men. I have a great real fear that we Americans are rapidly becoming as calloused and hardened to wholesale slaughter as were the Germans when Hitler and his insane Nazi gang were bullying the world. No informed American can say, as do the (German) simians of today: "truly, we saw no evil, we heard no evil, and we spoke no evil under Hitler."

Senator Morse, we toss you verbal bouquets and encomiums for your courage in resisting the jingoes.

We appeal to you to do all you can to turn the Vietnamese war problem into one of peace.

With warmest handclasps, we are,

Cordially yours,

Milton Thor.
Irene Thor.

Los Angeles, Calif.

SEPTEMBER 22, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: You will be interested in the enclosed "nomination" of yourself for President, appearing in the contributions column of the September 17th issue of the San Jose Mercury.

Sincerely yours,

HERBERT C. JONES.

Editor: After finally acquiring a copy of our current bestseller, "The Invisible Government," and applying the knowledge gained therein to the month-old Gulf of Tonkin episode, a more clear picture begins to unfold.

The second attack upon our destroyers was a well organized, even if "spur of the moment," operation of the CIA to make an excuse to involve our more active support of the South Vietnamese commando raids against North Vietnam. Very likely the operation had the full knowledge of President Johnson for he is briefed daily on CIA operations and situation analysis. The retaliation measure to Congress was probably planned in advance also. It is of everlasting credit to Senators MORSE and GRUENING that they smelled a very old and rotten herring in the whole episode and selflessly fought and voted against the blank-check retaliation measure. * * *

In the meantime, it is my sincere conviction that Senators MORSE and GRUENING are the only two public citizens of our Nation who are morally qualified to become President and Vice President of these United States.

ELTON R. MAAS.

SEPTEMBER 24, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Just a few lines Mr. MORSE to let you know how strongly my family and friends support your brave stand against America's role in South Vietnam. We endorse all your statements. Please keep up the work of bringing our Nation back to some kind of sane foreign policy.

For your information, although you may know this, shipments of a chemical named "Vacate" have been leaving the bay area recently for the American Ambassador in Saigon. As a longshoreman I see this. Besides a warning of what the chemical can do to animals and people, the label on the container said: "a nonselective herbicide * * * toxic to all types of vegetation and may render the entire treated area totally or partially unproductive for one or more years. * * * Diamond Alkali Co., Cleveland Ohio."

This is the way we fight this war. (I assume this is some of the chemical used to strip foliage.) We kill the vegetation and make the soil useless. We are certainly on the same level as the British and French imperialists of other days.

Please keep trying to bring these facts across to the American people.

Best wishes.

Sincerely,

DICK SCHAEFER.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.

AUSTRALIA,
September 17, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C., U.S.A.

DEAR SIR: My husband and I would like to congratulate you on your lone courageous stand over the recent Vietnam crisis. Your compassionate and farsighted views were shared by many thousands of Australians.

As the elections are now very close I know you must be very busy but as your name is now known in Australia could you possibly write a letter to the editor of "The Sydney Morning Herald," one of our main newspapers about peace and cooperation.

Next month in Sydney the Australian Congress for International Cooperation and Disarmament is being held from October 25–30, sponsored and being worked for by intelligent, loving, concerned people who want a future for their children not chaos. The newspapers are doing everything possible to kill it before it begins by the usual ways.

Greetings from my family to yours.

Yours sincerely,

Mrs. JUNE MASON.

BERKELEY, CALIF.,
September 21, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I would like to thank you for your brave stand on the congressional resolution on Vietnam. Indeed, the present general strike in South Vietnam shows the wisdom of your position on Vietnam.

In the next Congress I sincerely hope that you will continue the struggle against American intervention in the Vietnamese civil war and that you will work for the repeal of the draft which threatens all students like myself.

Yours in peace,

STANYAN VUKOVICH,

P.S.—Please send me any literature which you have on file on Vietnam.

LOUISVILLE, KY.,
September 23, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

SIR: Tonight I heard your interview on radio, ABC's program "From the Capital." It was certainly a worthwhile experience. It is good to know we have Senators with your courage and zeal and one who truly works for peace. I regret I cannot vote for you and hope to hear you again.

Miss RUTH HUNT.

LINCOLN PARK, MICH.,
September 26, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We heartily congratulate you on your stand on Vietnam.

Last night I bought a copy of your August speech (reprint from CONGRESSIONAL RECORD) and it was lost before I read it.

Please send me a copy if you have any left.

Sincerely,

D. SPEIR.

LOS ANGELES,
September 19, 1964.

The gratitude of the American people and the world should be given to you, Messrs. WAYNE MORSE and ERNEST GRUENING, the "Castor and Pollux" of the American Senate.

ANNAMARIA BERGMAN.

ALEXANDRIA, VA.,
September 24, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: When I first came to Washington over 10 years ago I heard you speak at the Quaker meetinghouse, and I still recall how impressed I was by the force of your intelligence.

During the past several months I have been following your discussion, as reported in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, of the vital issues of foreign and domestic policy that face us today. A few moments ago I read your well-reasoned attack on those who would undermine our liberties by sapping the power of the Supreme Court. I write merely to say that the country is fortunate to have a man of your courage, intellect, and experience in the Senate.

Your place in history will far overshadow that of the Goldwaters who have temporarily risen to the surface of American life.

Sincerely,

TIMOTHY J. LARKIN.

BIG SPRING, TEX.,
September 21, 1964.

DEAR SIR: I listened to a radio interview this evening in which you spoke. I wish you to know, for what it is worth, that when you speak with such candor and conviction on matters of foreign policy and United Nations membership, there is someone in this part of the country for whom you speak. The ideas you express and your willingness to express them provide a renewed measure of optimism and hope for our society. I am far from your bailiwick, but I trust that your constituency will perpetuate the voice which you provide in our Government.

Again, thanks for speaking out from what seems to be a publicly unsupported viewpoint for us whose voices don't carry as far or as clearly. I wish that I had your opportunities; and if your efforts and those of your colleagues who seem to have some hope and respect for all humanity can keep the world livable for a while longer, then perhaps I shall.

Sincerely,

JOSEPH DAWES.

MORRISTOWN, N.J.,
September 24, 1964.

Senator MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I would like to commend you for the position you have taken in regard to the war in South Vietnam. It is not a popular position you have taken, but one which reflects your intelligence, ethics, and love for democracy.

I am in complete agreement with you in wanting our Government to call for a reconvened Geneva Conference, to negotiate a settlement with appropriate international guarantees and under U.N. peacekeeping supervision.

Sincerely,

Mrs. PEARL SWANGER.

SEPTEMBER 23, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Your State of Oregon should be proud of having the only Senator who voted against the Johnson Vietnam resolution. You are so right to fight this act of brinkmanship which carried us periolously close to full-scale war in southeast Asia. Of course, North Vietnam concluded that there was a relationship between the American patrol boats and the South Vietnamese boats bombarding their islands. As you said, it was the only conclusion they could draw.

Please know that you have admirers of your courageous stand against "crisis" maneuvering. You are the only real statesman, and I wish you could be President.

Sincerely,

Dr. and Mrs. RODNEY T. HOOD,
Franklin, Ind.

P.S.—I hope you will read page 3 of the September issue of Progressive magazine. (L. B. Johnson has many good ideas, but in foreign affairs he needs much more expert help.)

September 23, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE SIR: While I am writing belatedly on your excellent and courageous statement on Vietnam, I would like you to know I have spoken about it repeatedly.

It is for this reason I write today. I was most alarmed to read Secretary Rusk's warning about the Gulf of Tonkin. The sheer arrogance is most dismaying.

What would have happened if the situation were reversed?

I appeal to you as a Democrat to convey this alarm to the President and the Secretary of State.

I have been campaigning for President Johnson and Senator Humphrey. It is most difficult to answer "Who is warmongering?" Who is rattling the sword when we strut and shoot in the Gulf of Tonkin?

Must we concede to Goldwaterism and lay the basis for the war the Democrats say they are avoiding?

I have a deep respect for your leadership. I understand the need to play down some aspects of the situation because of the campaign but elections are not held in vacuums.

Please carry on.

Respectfully yours,

Tobey Schein.

Hoboken, N.J.,
September 15, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: I recently read, in someone's home, a little of one of your speeches to Congress on Vietnam and would like very much to have two copies of this—one to study and one to pass on to friends.

This was a reprint of Congressional Record, August 5, 1964, volume 110, No. 151.

Many of us are very much concerned over U.S. foreign entanglements. Personally, I must say reading "The Invisible Government" (CIA) hasn't helped a bit to palliate uneasiness.

Thanking you, I am,

Very truly yours,

Barbara Tompkins.

Cincinnati, Ohio,
September 7, 1964.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

My Dear Senator: I wish to congratulate you on the brave stand you have taken in reference to our position in Vietnam. I hope and pray you will continue until others begin to see the course we are taking.

May I ask you to send me copies of your speeches in Congress on Vietnam and our position in the Far East?

Thanking you for your trouble, I remain,

Very sincerely yours,

Beulah K. Arndt.

September 21, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: Thank you for responding to our request concerning your Senate speeches on the Vietnam issue. The material proved very useful in our meeting with the managing editor of the Evening Bulletin here.

You might care to know that the editor admitted his Washington bureau had erred in not covering your floor speeches and said he would have the situation corrected. We will be keeping an eye on the paper when you take to the floor again.

Meanwhile, we are now investigating the performance of the Inquirer, which is even less likely to give coverage to proposals to avoid war. Can you furnish us with the dates of your speeches following August 13, the last date on the list you previously provided us with? You will recall that the list gave the speech dates and Congressional Record page references.

Again, thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

William H. Wingell, Jr.

Portland, Oreg.,
September 21, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: We wish to assure you of our support in regard to your stand on U.S. policy in Vietnam. We admire your courage and appreciate your repeated efforts to bring the facts to the American people.

Sincerely,

Louise Engel.

September 21, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: Please keep on working for negotiated peace in Vietnam. I am sure that thousands, who do not bother to write you, feel as I do about this and wish to thank you for your fight for it.

Courage and success.

Yours truly,

Genevieve Hamlin.

August 16, 1964.

Dear Senator W. Morse: We thank you for your speaking up on our role in Vietnam. I and many Americans agree with you. Please continue to fight, and the President shall stop the war, and bring our boys back.

Respectfully yours,

Mr. and Mrs. E. Altman.

September 21, 1964.

Dear Sir: We recently heard about the stand you took in the Vietnam crisis. We would like you to know we admire you very much. It is a remarkable thing today when anyone dares to stand up for his convictions.

Mrs. Doris Cooley.

Germantown, Ohio.

San Francisco, Calif.,
September 18, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: Thank you very much for sending me the printed form of your speech, concerning the congressional resolution to support our President's actions in the Tonkin Gulf incidents. It was with great interest that I read your comments on this matter, for I too have had grave misgivings about our Government's policies in southeast Asia.

You, Senator Morse, are serving as the conscience of the U.S. Senate. Both Senator Gruening and you, are to be commended for standing up against great odds in renouncing the use of forces in Vietnam. It is my only hope that others in Congress will also decide that it is time to alter our futile and dangerous policy of backing unpopular governments—a policy in the name of "fighting communism" that actually promotes communism. Perhaps, after the election, the administration will find the courage to work for a realistic solution to the problems of Vietnam.

You are performing a great service for all mankind, for the crises in southeast Asia endangers the peace of the entire world.

My very best wishes to you,

Don Beck.

Germantown, N.Y.,
September 15, 1964.

Dear Senator Morse: As we see more clearly each day how little the group in power in Vietnam represents the people there, and how anxious the generals were to escalate the war before the opposition to them became as open as it now is. Truly we must thank you again for helping to keep the country from going even further than we did during that shameful action at the Bay of Tonkin.

I hope you will be in a position to make a further speech using the present developments there to show the need for a negotiated peace. If such a speech is in the offing can I order 100 copies in advance to mail out to a group of people here. If not could I still have that many of the speech you made during the Bay of Tonkin bombings. There is a growing sentiment for a negotiated peace here, shown even in newspaper editorials and letters to the editors. We hope to enlarge that and make it more vocal by getting a Quaker speaker out who knows the area—and by circulating as much information as we can on the matter.

With sincere thanks for the service you have done the Nation and the world on this vital matter.

Yours truly,

Vivian Rosenberg.

September 14, 1964.

Hon. Senator Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: Having just finished reading the transcript of your speech of August 5 before the Senate, I wish to express my feelings of complete agreement with the views you have so courageously stated in said historic speech, which our newspapers and magazines have practically ignored or merely mentioned in a single paragraph.

It so happened that my reading of your speech coincided with the happenings in Vietnam over the weekend and which merely have confirmed once again the utter futility of our intervention in that country and our support of the shaky regime now trying to rule South Vietnam.

Permit me to extend to you, dear Senator Morse, my best wishes and my feelings of genuine admiration for your courage in keeping alive the fight for a review of our policy of unilateral intervention in southeast Asia.

Respectfully,

D. A. Vonk.

Virginia, Minn.,
September 12, 1964.

Senator Ernest Gruening,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator: I wish to express my agreement with the statement of Helen Mears in the first letter in the Nation, September 4, 1964: "All honor to Senators Wayne Morse and Ernest Gruening for voting against the joint congressional resolution that, in effect, endorses our Government's past and continuing intervention in southeast Asia." You show that the voice of sanity and humanity is not completely stilled.

Truly yours,

Truman Griffin.

September 12, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senator Gruening,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Gentlemen: We wish to let you know how completely we agree with the stand you gentlemen have taken on the Vietnam situation. Keep up the good fight and let us know what we may be able to do to help.

Sincerely,

Mary and Tom Lasater.

September 23, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

My heartfelt thanks, congratulations to you for your stand against Vietnam war and reapportionment foes. You do credit to our Nation. A long life to you.

My best wishes.

D. C. Shoultz.

Sunnyvale, Calif.

Long Beach, Calif.,
September 28, 1964.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: We desire to commend you for your intelligence shown in your analysis of the U.S. aggression in both North and South Vietnam.

We definitely oppose having our American Armed Forces in southeast Asia and hope that you will continue your fight against the hopeless situation in that area.

Very sincerely yours,
Mr. and Mrs. Francis D. Reider.

San Jose, Calif.,
September 19, 1964.

Dear Senator Morse: I wish to say again how much I appreciate your courage and vision in opposing our worse than useless activities in South Vietnam. And as long as our war vessels are in the Gulf of Tonkin, perhaps helping in the South Vietnam raids, dangerous incidents will develop.

More power to you.

Sincerely,
George L. Collins.

Los Angeles, Calif.,
September 9, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: We have been listening to your views about the war in Vietnam for some time and have just read excerpts from your recent talk in Los Angeles on this subject. We want you to know that we, in this household, strongly favor the idea of placing the matter before the United Nations. It does not look as though we can ever work a miracle to inspire the people of Vietnam to pursue their war to a successful finish.

Another suggestion was put forth in a recent editorial in the Christian Science Monitor. It was to the effect that we send political experts rather than military ones to that country to help the people set up a stable government.

You have our support in anything you can do or say to convince the administration that you are right about Vietnam.

Very truly yours,
Patricia R. Williams
Mrs. C. D. Williams.

Redwood City, Calif.,
September 3, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
U.S. Congress,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: I have just finished reading your statement on the "Gulf of Tonkin Incident" which your office was kind enough to send me. I must admit that I had come to rather similar conclusions as regards our policy in southeast Asia, however, I have been unable to firm these up due to lack of information and poor newspaper reporting. It is my intention to send your statement along to the Christian Science Monitor to which I subscribe, and which I think was remiss in not printing one sentence of your statement.

It is very encouraging to me that we have men in our Senate who will speak out with a firm voice on such an unpopular issue. This is not easy and I am sure that you must be bearing the brunt of your courage right now. However, it served to convince me that some of the sparks our Founding Fathers invested into our Nation are still alive.

Yours very truly,
Helen J. Burke
Mrs. Richard J. Burke.

Auckland, New Zealand,
September 7, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse.

Dear Sir: I wish to record my admiration of your consistent opposition to the tragic American policy in southeast Asia. A policy which is dragging the world steadily toward a nuclear war. As far as I can tell, yours is the only sane voice to be heard speaking on Vietnam, in America at present. This is, of course, bearing in mind that our "free" New Zealand press has not seen fit to publish any more than a brief synopsis of your opinions and nothing of your speeches in the Senate.

Please accept my best wishes for success if you are involved in the forthcoming elections. Perhaps a resounding Democrat victory will inject some reason into American foreign policy.

Yours faithfully,
W. S. Hughes,
The University of Auckland.

Asheville, N.C.,
September 4, 1964.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: I would like to express my appreciation for your fight to save the United States and to try to inform the people. I know it's a thankless task and pretty lonesome up there with only Senator Gruening and possibly a couple of others to scotch for you.

I'm sorry that all we of North Carolina have done is send a couple of "gutless wonders" to the Senate.

I hope you and Senator Gruening will continue in the Senate for many more years.

Again thanks for your stand on Vietnam and all other business of the Senate.

Yours sincerely,
Mr. and Mrs. J. R. Still.

San Jose, Calif.,
September 16, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: In William Winters Comments of September 7, 1964, he wrote of you speaking in Los Angeles to the "Californians for Liberal Representation," about the U.S. involvement in Vietnam, and reading the excerpts in quoting you, and also hearing your views on radio.

And your admirable stand, with only one other, Senator Gruening, of Alaska, against all the Senators and Representatives in regards to southeast Asia.

We, my husband and I, feel that perhaps some of your most timely articles would be printed in the magazine Frontier, 1434 Westwood Blvd., Los Angeles 24, Calif. They are much in accord with the people that are concerned with all the "glossing over" of almost every worthwhile phase of our present-day truths, and dressing up deceits of all kinds.

We stand up for your honest appraisals, and trust that more people will seriously consider them.

With our sincere best wishes,
Mr. and Mrs. Wayne S. Huff.

San Francisco, Calif.,
September 15, 1964.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: The ILWU Joint Legislative Committee is proud that your voice was heard in the Congress on the position of the United States in Vietnam. We commend your courageous stand against the escalation and extension of the war.

Even Ambassador Taylor has indicated that there will be no military solution to the situation and that only a political solution is possible.

We feel sure you will continue to be the spokesman for a peaceful solution to the situation in Vietnam.

Sincerely yours,
William Chester.
Keith Eickman.

Blanchard, Mich.,
September 18, 1964.

Dear Senator Morse: I must tell you how I admire you for voting against our intervention in southeast Asia. I wish I could be as proud of our Michigan Senators.

Sincerely,
Mrs. Helen Decker.

West Newbury, Mass.,
September 19, 1964.

Dear Senator Morse: Put this on the "Yes" pile of your letters re your communication to the Washington Post on Wednesday (or was it Thursday?). Robert Trumbull in his recent "The Scrutable East" wonders whether high officials of the U.S. Government really believe the nonsense they try to sell to the public. I am not particularly surprised that Dean Rusk finds it possible to voice pronouncements which he cannot possibly believe, but I am deeply distressed at Adlai Stevenson's deterioration over these last few years. Twelve years ago I was arguing that he would bring a new dimension in character and maturity to the Presidency. I dislike being wrong.

Of course, we must negotiate about Vietnam, and presumably through the United Nations. But negotiations will be quite useless if we enter them in any spirit other than one of wanting to redress the disgraceful injustice which we have wrought over these past two decades. Perhaps, ignorance has played a larger part in it than malevolence, but the result was the same.

I am unwilling to believe that most Americans would not agree with you if they were not hopelessly ignorant about Vietnam—as indeed about Asia and many other modern problem areas, geographical and other. There has been a failure in our education, not so much in our schools and colleges as in the postclassroom media of education, which have not kept up with our dynamic world. We need right now a national educational effort at this level, utilizing all the possible media. This is the problem that educational thinkers ought to be directing their attention to, not only to crowding more and more of personnel and subject matter into classrooms. Only with something of this kind are we going to have any hope of reaching national decisions in a democratic manner.

Please don't lose hope; keep at it and keep it up.

Sincerely yours,
Mortimer Graves.

September 15, 1964.

U.S. Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Honorable Sir: Please accept our thanks and congratulations for your courageous and forthright stand on the dangers of our involvement in Vietnam.

Your words are words which need to be said, and lend courage to others who feel the same way.

Please do not feel discouraged. In time (we hope it will be "in time") the majority of the American people will recognize the validity of what you say and will rally 'round.

Sincerely,
Francis G. Fink.
Vivian I. Fink.
Chris Fink.
San Jose, Calif.

SAN JOSE, CALIF., *September 16, 1964.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Although it is very belated, I wish to applaud your stand on the Vietnam situation and your negative vote on President Johnson's "predated declaration of war."

It is such a crying waste of manpower, money, and as you pointed out, we have no business there.

Once again, you seem to be the only man in the Senate representing my viewpoint. Thank you.

Sincerely,

MOLLY OBERBILLIG.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
September 18, 1964.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Your continued bravery on Vietnam issue will earn you a purple heart from the people someday—we will have peace there before long if we all keep up the hard work that you, GRUENING, MANSFIELD (at times), have done. But now we have a more serious problem, that of GOLDWATER which should involve our strenuous campaign activities. For without large moves by the Senators to defeat him we will be faced with a McCarthy era. We should go back to our communities and speak opposing him, uncovering the San Francisco arrests, scare tactics, etc.

How can the public vote with authority when they do not have facts about 'Frisco, about Vietnam or about Kennedy's death. We must lift the curtain of untruth—reminds me much of "1984."

Your example of switching party affiliation should be followed widely now that THURMOND has done it (we got rid of him, thank God). I have asked Rocky and JAVITS to consider it.

Please keep up vigorous campaign with colleagues when session ends.

With hope, faith, respect,

ROLAND A. HIRSCH.

SEPTEMBER 16, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I have just read your speech opposing the joint resolution on Vietnam, and should like to offer my congratulations on your stand. I was able to learn of your speech only through copies of the August 5 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which are being distributed by Students for a Democratic Society. Again, I admire your actions very much, and am generally in accord with them.

Yours,

BARRY TANNER.

DETROIT, MICH.

September 2, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Though I am never likely to have an opportunity to vote for you, I am one of those for whom you have provided representation. Surely, I am one of many who live outside your State of whom this is true.

As a mother of two children, I look with despair at the photographs of peasant Vietnamese women carrying their bandaged children—casualities at the hands of their own countrymen and ours in this grim "defense of the free world." I hope you will continue your lonely struggle against this misguided and futile war.

I also applaud you for your remarks regarding the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party. I consider your position a true defense of the free world.

Yours truly,

MARY J. DEWEAVER.

OTTER LAKE, MICH.,
September 7, 1964.

DEAR SIR: So very late I write to thank you for your remarks on Vietnam—May 18. Especially remarks re U.N.

I wish to say I agreed then, and I agree now, with what you said. I deeply regret that so few of our elected officials respect their constitutional responsibilities, and so few, and so late, do constituents appreciate and respond. Thanks.

ARTHUR E. SPENCER.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
September 14, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I would like to commend you and encourage by support, your stand on the Vietnamese war. I am ashamed to have to read in the local Philippine press that our Ambassador to Vietnam feels it imperative for the United States to sustain its military presence in Vietnam, because if we "lose" Vietnam we might be pushed back to Hawaii; and furthermore if we lose this war we are conceding to the Communists the victory of a war of "liberation." This imperialistic cant is horrifying to all American ethical standards. It is a disgrace to be identified with a country whose actions so blatantly oppose its beliefs. I do not want to believe that our country has sunk so low, or that we have become so narrowminded and bigoted in the pursuit of our beliefs. The easy military answers of our strong country do not serve as useful models for an emerging Asian nation.

Living on a military base which sends men daily to the war in Vietnam, I am overcome with the tragedy of this absurd mission. The boys admit that they do not understand, but they are trained to obey. In personal conversations they have spoken of the joy of combat, and at the same time readily conceded their ignorance as to who it was they were killing. The Vietnamese, they say, all look alike to them, and anyone makes a good target. These senseless killings must not go on—neither for the joy of sport nor to save face for a nation strong enough to admit a mistake. It must by now be blatant to a fool that the succession of military dictatorships do not represent the people.

So I add another voice to the clamor for political and legitimate settlement, realizing full well that perfection is not the reasonable goal for a newly born and torn nation.

Respectfully and sincerely yours,

ANNE LABOUISSE FARNSWORTH.

MOUNTAIN LAKES, N.J.,
September 18, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on your letter to Washington Post concerning Vietnam policy. Keep up the good work.

PAULINE MAAS.

SOUTH PASADENA, CALIF.,
September 16, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Yesterday you were quoted as asking what the Johnson-McNamara policy is regarding Vietnam.

Obviously, it is very simple. McNamara's policy has always been "Spend all the American dollars you want to, kill all the American boys that are over there, but don't under any circumstances harm one of my computers."

And after every setback McNamara is willing to hold a press conference and display charts which show, he says, how the South Vietnamese are really winning. These, of course, are the same charts he used many, many months ago to demonstrate that the war in Vietnam was practically won and the American boys would be coming home soon. What he neglected to point out then was that the American boys would be returned gradually, in coffins.

Remember when McNamara used these same charts to show Ford stockholders that the Edsel had swept all competition from the highways?

REID BYRON.

BERKELEY, CALIF,
August 30, 1964.

DEAR SIR: Though I am not a member of your constituency I feel your pronouncements on foreign policy have been speaking for me.

Thank you for your forthright and courageous views.

Yours truly,

JERARD P. REILLY.

ELLENSBURG, WASH.,
September 15, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MORSE: Just a word to commend you for your stand on the Vietnam mess. Most of us don't believe the reports given us by those in Washington. I always have a sneaking notion, that the young men we were told were sent to Korea lately weren't sent there at all, some of mine were sent and I don't like it.

Today is our primary election, maybe we can do something about things we don't like.

I am enclosing a cartoon on foreign aid. I surely laughed at it, but it is pretty costly laughing to us taxpayers. Thank you.

MRS. OLGA JOHNSON.

OTTAWA, ONTARIO, CANADA.
September 15, 1964.

Senator W. MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: The conflict in South Vietnam has been, to me, the cause of a great deal of anxiety. I regret the suffering visited upon the people; I fear that the enemies of our various ways of life have gained by exploiting the terror and cruelty that is taking place; and I wonder whether the existence of the problem may help GOLDWATER and other extremists shortly.

The fact that Canada was appointed "policeman" in Geneva in 1954 but has not fulfilled this obligation is a source of some humiliation to me.

If you would have someone in your office send me any informative material you have available, I would be most thankful. I would also appreciate prices and sources of published matter. Thank you.

Yours truly,

JOHN KARL.

SEPTEMBER 11, 1964.

Senator MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: There is nothing more important to our way of thinking than the elimination of this chicken-manure monkey business in Vietnam.

In the National Guardian of August 15, 1964, we read a report of your statement in the Senate against the resolution granting the President advance approval on all steps he deemed necessary to repel any attack on U.S. forces in southeast Asia.

If it wasn't so serious, it would be funny; these great, big PT boats coming down the coast to attack our teensy, weensy destroyers and aircraft carriers.

You have the advantage of being permitted to address the Senate in protest regarding this and many other stupid acts that are being forced on the people by a process which refuses them any voice in the matter whatsoever. The voices of the small group of the American public, who are informed well enough to know what is going on, has no medium of expression.

There are many phases of Government I would like to discuss—the foreign aid, civil rights, unemployment, social security, etc., but I feel one point will help to settle most of the problems of the above subjects, and that is, that the Congress of the United States should take up its option to buy back the Federal Reserve System for $148 million dollars and thus eliminate more than $10 billion in interest per year on 1¼ trillion dollars of debt.

There are many Americans informed well enough to know that Oswald did not kill Kennedy. The Lane and other reports make this quite clear, regardless of what the Warren's committee report is going to be.

There is no good reason why the churches should be permitted to enter the various fields of business and still be exempt of taxation. It is quite obvious that millions of people, who do not support any church, are being forced to pay a higher tax, because church property is exempt.

Although we do not pay an income tax, we are forced to pay every other tax, and our total income is a social security check of $76.60.

The Cuban refugees in Florida receive more than this. and they haven't contributed a dime. Frankly, my wife and I are losing our patience with this so-called land of the free and home of the brave, where the Congressmen can vote themselves a bigger raise than we get—take it out of our taxes, and we have no right to decide one way or the other.

We are heartily in support of your stand regarding every phase of Government, as far as we know what is. You make more sense than any other Senator we know.

Sincerely yours,
Mr. and Mrs. J. M. GROSS.
MENDOCINO, CALIF.

ST. LOUIS, MO.,
September 7, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: As a leader of national standing I direct this observation to you.

Recent events in South Korea and Vietnam suggest that the spirit of dictatorship still prevails over democracy. These two examples of American intervention afford us no indication of the real purpose of America foreign policy.

We are against something, presumably communism, but what are we for? We say we oppose all forms of totalitarianism including fascism. Yet we support outright dictatorship in Spain and countenance it elsewhere. In considering the American image, in a world in which we wish to remain prestigious what really is our policy? Do we have any means of expressing the positive, democratic idiom? Can the Peace Corps serve this purpose?

Respectfully,
MAX G. FRANKEL.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: It is with the greatest concern and urgency that I write you concerning the situation in Vietnam. This is a civil war, probably more nationalist than Communist inspired. Military intervention will not stop communism which has fed on war. There must be a political solution, difficult as it may be, because a satisfactory military solution is impossible.

Will you please do all in your power to initiate a reconvening of the 14 Nation Geneva Conference to decide the issue of Vietnam? You are aware, as your actions indicate, that this hot spot could erupt into a thermonuclear war, and that must not happen after we have made the splendid progress of at least the limited test ban treaty.

Thank you for your efforts in this direction—I am aware of your endeavors toward negotiation rather than force.

Many thanks.

Respectfully yours,
EVELYN WALTERS.

HILTS, CALIF.,
August 8, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR: I want you to know I've always admired you, but after hearing you on "Face the Nation," and discuss the controversial, ticklish problem of South Vietnam, I admire you even more, because you showed courage and I believe you are correct.

It is funny how people often refuse to accept the truth, believing only what is tasteful to them.

Keep hammering away at the public, and to those in Washington, because although you are facing many obstacles, it is important that you carry your message to the people.

I believe in the United Nations, and we have to work within its framework, we have to set an example, and live up to our own principles and ideals.

We can't for example, pick up our "marbles and go home, because they ain't all our marbles." The United Nations wasn't intended as a tool just for example, the United States, but now is a good time to use world opinion in our favor, if we just use it.

Red China must be admitted as soon as possible. To refuse her, to ignore her, is to court disaster.

Being a proud American first, a proud Oregonian second, I am proud to have a strong voice representing our great and most beautiful State, such as that of U.S. Senator WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon.

Keep up your good work.

Respectfully yours,
EUGENE L. NELSON.

ERWIN, TENN.,
August 4, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Regarding your talk last night on Washington cloakroom about our foreign policy in South Vietnam, I wish to applaud you for your marvelous courage and forthrightness. It is almost unbelievable to hear any politician speak out so bravely, in this age of conformism and fear and misinformation from the publicity media.

Your ideas on this subject are, as Mark Twain used to say: "The truth with the bark on." I greatly envy Oregon State for having such a courageous Senator and also the State of Alaska for their Senator GRUENING. Please keep up your unequal fight.

Very sincerely,
ELIZABETH SEEMAN.

DAVENPORT, IOWA,
September 5, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I listened to the interview with you over CBS radio via WJR, Detroit, on September 3.

Your idea of giving the United Nations responsibility for the situation in Vietnam seems eminently sensible to me, and I hope you will succeed in getting the administration to consider it.

I also agree with your view as to the proper role of a congressional investigating committee in cases like the Baker case, namely, that violations of statutes should properly be handled by the criminal courts.

With best wishes,
WILLIAM T. EVANS.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
September 6, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: It is all too seldom that Americans are privileged to hear a great statesman on TV and my one regret is that "Youth Wants To Know," coming as it does on Sunday afternoon, may not have had enough exposure. Would that this program could be repeated at a prime evening time.

I have long been convinced that our program in Vietnam is indefensible. Your lonely fight—and that of the Senator from Alaska, is a sorry commentary on the caliber of the men in Congress who so basically misrepresent us in Congress. The abolition of the mouthing of the Lord's Prayer by children in our public schools can stir them to frenzied action but alas they are never so stirred by the moral teachings of the Lord they profess to serve.

I have always admired you for your courageous and often lonesome stand on many important issues. Most of all I am thankful for your perception, your brilliance, and your unswering dedication to fighting for the things that you—and unfortunately so few of us on the outside, know to be just and to be right.

Thank you again Senator MORSE.

Sincerely and respectfully,
ILYANA B. BROMBERG.

NEW YORK, N.Y.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Though I am not of your State, I wish to congratulate you on the first truly clear picture of the Vietnam situation I've read. I'm referring to your article in Progressive.

Normally, I do not write letters but I have sent several on this matter to the Senators of our State and others. This is merely a note to support you.

I simply do not understand why we are there?

Most sincerely,
MARILYN P. KLUGE.

FORT LEE, N.J.,
September 2, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I would like to congratulate you on your courageous, rational stand against current U.S. policy in regard to Vietnam. I particularly enjoyed your article on the subject in last month's Progressive.

Sincerely,
FRED FLAXMAN.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.,
September 4, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE SIR: I have just read reports of your speech of August 5 regarding U.S. involvement in Vietnam. The local papers that I read on vacation gave no indication of your position which I heartily endorse. I particularly feel that the questions you raised should be answered by the executive and legislative branches of our Government and the newspapers and their columnists.

If still available I would appreciate one or more copies of your speech criticizing a predated declaration of war.

Please accept my deepest thanks for acting in our country's best interests.

Sincerely yours,
SIDNEY LEVY.

September 2, 1964.

Senator Morse:

I am writing this letter in appreciation of your fine work in the Senate recently. In particular I would like to encourage your further actions and debates upon our action in Vietnam.

Your arguments in defense of a different foreign policy—I hope an effort and emphasis on social and economic aid to worthwhile people—are wholeheartedly encouraged by me.

Thank you.

Laurence Raphael.

Seattle, Wash.,
September 2, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: We wish to commend you on your position on Vietnam and strongly endorse it as the only position in keeping with morality and with reality.

We are recommending that position to our Senators, and to the President.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. John J. Runnings.

Monterey, Calif.,
September 2, 1964.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: Thank you for being Senator Morse. We consider you our representative, as do, we are sure, people in many other States. We are proud and grateful that you are willing to represent us.

Your article on Vietnam which appeared in the Progressive impressed us with its concisely reasoned approach to the problem and provided excellent material for discussions. Newspaper coverage of your stand has been scant.

We were heartened last week by a half-page ad appearing in the San Francisco Chronicle, sponsored by a group of Bay Area citizens. Their ad quoted your statements on Vietnam extensively and endorsed them fully. We are of course contributing our small bit financially, and writing to the President and our California Senators.

We feel certain that there are human beings everywhere who are applauding your efforts as do we.

Sincerely,

Fred S. McFarland,
Elizabeth J. McFarland.

Roslyn Heights, Long Island, N.Y.,
September 8, 1964.

Dear Senator Morse: I am writing this note to let you know that I am in full accord with you in your views toward Vietnam. I believe that you are the only Senator who realizes the only way of securing peace in Vietnam, and I would just like you to know that you have my support.

Yours very truly,

James Alan Paley.

Poland, Ohio,
September 6, 1964.

Hon. Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator: I just heard you speak on Meet the Capitol Press, and I compliment you on your outspoken opinions of what we should do about our foreign policy and on Red China. I agree with you. Something should be done now. And to keep Red China out of the United Nations is only throwing oil on the fire.

Keep up the good work.

Understand I am not upholding for communism. I want no part of it. But for the white man to think he can control all of Asia is absurd. I am white, also. My forefathers came over over 200 years ago.

Trust the Lord to lead you in your very responsible work.

Thanks.

W. L. Bentur.

August 30, 1964.

Dear Senator Morse: Having heard the news on radio last night and nothing since of your charges that the *Maddox* was in North Vietnam territorial waters also that it was the first to fire has prodded me to write and ask you to please pursue this to the fullest capacity it would take to bring this ship back to the States. As a wife of a member of the crew I feel that this ship is being used now in a capacity that is highly smelling of politics. How can we expect the respect and trust of other nations if we cannot own up to taking the responsibility of our own actions. We cannot base our future on the hopes that other nations will commend us for being strong and powerful when we let a false pride rule our Nation. Myself and other wives of crewmembers have been of course anxious and in trying to find a logical answer for being kept without information as is routine in circumstances such as this. Your charges were the suspicions we had been trying to suppress. If this ship is being detained for any reason except for the legitimate cause of the good of our Nation, certainly a second thought should be given. Hoping that you will be making a sincere effort to clarify this I'll close.

Sincerely,

Mrs. R. E. La Londe.

Scarborough, N.Y.,
August 31, 1964.

Dear Senator Morse: We have been wanting to thank you for your valiant and lone fight for a more sane and moral intelligent policy toward Vietnam. As Democrats and Democrats who profoundly wish a Johnson-Humphrey victory in November, we are greatly disturbed and cannot see how our Vietnam policy can be defended or changed without backtracking on so much that we have said.

You have been one and I guess the only one, beside Senator Gruening who supported you who has dared to state the facts, and who has had the intelligence to see the situation.

Since every paper, including the New York Times, blanketed out your speech in the Senate, could you send me several copies. I would like two for our local libraries and one for our Friends meeting and two for our mother and son who support you warmly and would vote for you any time anywhere if we all had the chance. Ten copies if they are available.

Bless you for your courage and statesmanship. Can you help to get us back on the right track?

Very sincerely,

Leslie and Alice Balassa.

September 7, 1964.

Dear Senator Morse: Thank God for a man like you. We need more. Your talk on South Vietnam that the United States has no business in South Vietnam is so right.

It must be hard to hold onto solid beliefs amongst an almost solid wall of auctioneers and back scrubbers.

I'm for you 100 percent. Maybe even if there is only one intelligent voice—the people will hear and respond.

Talk about the Iron Curtain, what about the darkness of news kept from the American people.

Here we call ourselves a free people—but we are not permitted to know what is really going on. Also medicare in other small poor countries—but not for the so-called free people in the United States. We are told medicare is socialism—Hogwash.

Sincerely,

Peggy Klempner.

September 7, 1964.

Dear Senator Morse: I wish to take the time to congratulate you on your magnificent and almost lonely stand on South Vietnam.

You are one of the few courageous Americans who is saying the correct and honest thing, as time will pass the country will know how right you are. We need this piece of real estate with its one million and a half per day like a hole in the head.

It could be the start of another stupid Korea.

At any rate keep up the good work. God knows I appreciate it. I know other people do even though they do not take time to write (and they should). I wish to God more people like you were in Congress representing us.

God bless and keep you—

Sincerely,

Frank Peronne.

South Yarmouth, Mass.,
September 1, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: The Yarmouth Meeting of Friends (Quakers) commends the caution and concern about the possible expansion of the war in South Vietnam shown in your courageous vote against the resolution approving U.S. attacks on North Vietnamese bases. We hope that you will continue to insist that our Government seek constructive, nonmilitary solutions to the admittedly complex problems of southeast Asia.

For and behalf of the Yarmouth Meeting of Friends.

David W. Douglas.

St. Paul, Minn.,
September 1, 1964.

The Honorable Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: I would like to commend you and Senator Greuning on your negative vote on the congressional resolution giving the President a free hand in military operations in southeast Asia.

Sincerely yours,

Morton Berland.

Berkeley, Calif.,
August 29, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: I am writing not only for myself, but for many others who feel the way I do and who want to congratulate you for the stand which you are taking on the issue of South Vietnam. Please keep up the fight to try to bring some sort of reason to other Senators and Representatives.

Because I am terribly concerned over what is happening in South Vietnam and the danger that the war may escalate into World War III, I have written to my Senator, and to McNamara, Rusk, and President Johnson urging them to begin a negotiated settlement in South Vietnam. If you have any suggestions for further action which I as a citizen can do, I would be very pleased to hear from you.

Thank you from the bottom of my heart for speaking out against this preposterous position in which we have placed ourselves.

Keep up the good work.

Carol C. Panny,
(*Mother and Teacher*).

Downey, Calif.,
August 30, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: Your view of U.S. activity in Vietnam, as reported in the Los Angeles Herald-Examiner of today's date, seems to me deserving of commendation. This has long been my opinion, also, and I am most pleased to find that someone is speaking out against the policies of the Dulles brothers and the Pentagon, which, in my opinion, can lead to no good.

You are doing a good job. We are sorry not to be constituents.

Sincerely yours,
John N. vonRaaphorst.

Los Angeles, Calif.,
September 8, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: I was one of the fortunate people who attended the meeting at the Ambassador Hotel, in Los Angeles, at which you spoke.

I admire your honest, outspoken analysis of the Vietnamese situation, and agree that our country should pull out of that country.

Please continue your admirable work in and out of the Senate.

Yours sincerely,
Eleanor Pitt.

The Malibu Discussion and
Action Group,
Malibu, Calif., September 7, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: The Malibu Discussion and Action Group's topic for discussion in the month of August was Vietnam. After a brief account of Vietnam's history from 938 A.D. to the present, and a discussion of current conditions in Vietnam, handicapped by the general shortage of unbiased information on the subject, we turned to the problem of the alleged attack on the U.S.S. *Maddox* and the United States bombing of North Vietnamese territory.

After considerable dialog we reached a consensus of opinion and decided that our "action" for the month would be to write to you and our other representatives as well as the President concerning the following points:

1. We oppose escalation of the war into North Vietnam.

2. We feel that Vietnam should be neutralized and free elections should be held in North and South Vietnam under U.N. supervision. We should not rely upon military means to settle social and economic problems.

3. We feel that the response of the United States to the alleged attacks upon our fleet in the Tonkin Gulf was out of proportion to the alleged attacks and was dangerous to world peace.

Sincerely,
Sarah Hughes Dixon,
Secretary.

Brooklyn, N.Y.

Senator Morse: There are many questions in my mind concerning the position of the United States in southeast Asia which I hope you can clear up.

First. Why did the United States get so deeply and financially involved in the war between the French and the Indochinese when it was clearly a war for independence?

At the end of this war when the French were defeated they agreed to sign the Geneva Accords of 1954. Why did the United States object to signing this agreement?

If I am correct, some of the stipulations of this agreement were the withdrawal of foreign troops, an election by the people 2 years after the signing of the agreement and the eventual reunification of the two Vietnams. Why weren't these conditions carried out and why, instead, did our Government support the Diem regime and each succeeding government, and allow them to seize almost complete dictatorial powers, while we were presumably "defending the freedom" of these people?

Albert Gore, Senator from Tennessee, stated on the "Today" show that we have three choices in Vietnam:

(1) To start a major war.

(2) To pull out completely.

(3) To support the present government and try to stabilize it while rallying the people behind it.

Do you feel we are truly following the third course? If so do you feel we will ever have the support of a people who have been aiding the success of the guerrillas and even overwhelmingly supporting and joining them? If these guerrillas are the enemies of these people why are they able to get such great support from the people?

Finally, is the military strategic position of Vietnam so important as to warrant the spending of $2 million a day which we are pouring into the war effort and the many men we have been losing there, not to mention the death and destruction the war has been causing the Vietnamese people.

If this position is so crucially important, do you see any chance of our being able to defeat the guerrillas? If so, how, outside of a complete war and a possible world war III?

I would appreciate answers to these questions.

Thank you.

Julie Gross.

Redwood City, Calif.,
September 9, 1964.

Wayne Morse, Senator,
Senate Office Building
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: I just heard that you were one of only two Senators who voted against the recent North Vietnam resolution, August 6. It is very comforting to know that some of you will hold out for what you think is right even against such a great majority and in an issue of this kind, where voting against might seem to cast shadows on your "Americanism" even. It is truly comforting to us down on this level who feel powerless in these issues.

I am curious to know why you voted against this particular matter. I know why I would vote against it and I hope that I might not sound too longwinded that you might be able to wade through it in view of your very busy days.

1. If we believe, as the President said recently, that all nations should be allowed to set their own course, then why don't we allow it in the Vietnam area?

2. Why should we send millions to South Vietnam (which caused the problem at hand, in North Vietnam) when we need the money here at home to "fight poverty"?

3. Then about our destroyers getting into trouble 10,000 miles from home—well, if my children had rocks thrown at them by bullies on the next block, I hope I have instilled in them the sense to come home—not attack and get into more trouble.

4. The French failed to settle problems in Vietnam—do we think we can succeed in that area (whatever "succeed" means)?

5. It is really a Communist versus free-world fight? Or is it a case of some diverse peoples, struggling through adolescence and wanting to avoid some of the pitfalls or mistakes of the not completely perfect Western World society?

6. Are governments such as that of Diem and now the present one so "democratic" that they are worth so much effort, sweat and blood—American and native?

7. Were our ships really in international waters and if so were they not menacing a sovereign nation?

Why go on. There are so many more reasons I would want to give. I would like to know what your reasons were for taking such a lone stand in this matter. I think maybe I can find a copy of your early August speech in the Congressional Record and it should contain most of them. Further, I hope you will tell me that many other Congressmen feel the same way you do, even if they did not have the strength to stand as you did. I would be really worried if you are practically the only one in Washington who takes such a view. You see, I take it upon myself to write to any Congressman who makes some statement that I call constructive, to commend him on such action. I feel like this is exercising as much democratic action as a citizen can in such a large complex society. We cannot all get together to decide on issues as they might have done in an early Greek society. Of course if the Greeks did get together, democratically, over 50 percent of the population was excluded even then—the slaves.

When is all this madness going to end? When are we going to stop saying we want peace as we continue to clobber, figuratively (Cuba) and actually (North Vietnam and a large portion of the people of South Vietnam) small defenseless countries?

I'm glad there is one Senator Wayne Morse but we need more.

Sincerely,
Jack L. Selk.

Lewiston, Idaho,
September 15, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: I would like to offer a few words of thanks for your stand, stated in the press recently, in favor of some measure of international law to replace the jungle of power politics.

In his inaugural speech, President Kennedy referred rather eloquently to an American effort to establish world law. Later, however, there was the Bay of Pigs spectacle and events in Vietnam and elsewhere tended to overshadow any effort to establish law and order and our foreign policy slipped again into the ugly world of power politics.

I would like to have copies of your speeches on the subject of world affairs if these are available.

Very truly yours,
Morton R. Brigham.

Brooklyn, N.Y.,
September 16, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: I have been wanting to write to you for many months now to let you know how much I admire you, but I could never seem to find the time. Now that I have a cold I have the time. In my opinion you are one of our most honorable and courageous Senators, if not the most courageous. Even though I do not always agree with you, I always respect you. I hope you will spend many more years in the U.S. Senate. The country certainly needs you.

Since I am a New Yorker and may never get a chance to cast a ballot for you, I think it's only right that I send this letter.

Sincerely yours,
Sheldon Helfand.

WATERFORD, CALIF.,
September 15, 1964.

WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I would like to commend you for your lonely vote on the resolution supporting our violent action in North Vietnam.

Intellectually, I have supported you in your efforts to change our emphasis in southeast Asia.

Why we have to repeat the blunders of the French I do not know but I do know you cannot stop communism by brute force as we seem to feel.

It is appalling to countenance this wastage in southeast Asia when one-third of our citizens are in serious need and our best efforts should go toward building the U.S.A. into a working democracy where all can feel that they have a stake and a function in our society.

Sincerely,

SAMUEL R. TYSON.

ATLANTIC CITY, N.J.,
September 3, 1964.

Hon. SENATOR MORSE:

DEAR SENATOR: I just received your No. 8 report and as I have become disgusted with the handling of Vietnam mess your letter only convinced me of how wrong we are to continue sending men and money when we simply do not understand the people.

Last year we were told dreadful things that the late Diem was supposed to have permitted. The good accomplishments, and there were many such as increasing rice production and increased rubber output and established a manufacturing base or was about to do so.

Hospital beds were established in nearly 4,000 rural health centers, primary schools were doubled, and university scholars were increased from 2,900 to 17,000.

This was done by the man our Nation was willing to have removed and what a disgrace.

His widow was treated shamefully by our press, radio, etc. Here was a woman who well knew the enemies of her husband and her country.

Yet a man like Lodge was too dumb to know what was going on right under his nose—and imagine running him for President. How dumb can we get?

I have been a Democrat ever since women got the vote but this year I am voting Republican and my entire neighborhood is doing likewise.

If this administration is proud of its accomplishments, that is more than I am, and GOLDWATER may give them more than they would believe.

I do not know if you ever bother to read mail from the likes of me but I feel I know you and I have always enjoyed the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD you send me as well as the newsy articles.

At present I am reading "The 480" by Eugene Burdick. It is a novel of politics and many of our Government men are mentioned in it.

Mr. Burdick should be quite an authority as his background of world traveler, lecturer, and professor of political science makes his stories sound possible.

I want you to know I appreciate your taking the stand you do on Vietnam. I wish more statesmen were like you.

Again thanking you I am,

Sincerely yours,

COLUMBIA CONOVER.

SAN JOSE, COSTA RICA,
September 7, 1964.

President LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR PRESIDENT JOHNSON: Senator WAYNE MORSE' forceful article about Vietnam in the August Progressive impels me to tell you of my disapproval of U.S. policy in Vietnam. The article, together with disturbing reports of political and social unrest in South Vietnam (Buddhist and Catholic fights; the unseating of the Government's leader, Khanh, by student riots) strongly suggest that American policy has been misguided in Vietnam and that it should be rethought and realmed now.

Our military involvement in South Vietnam violates the U.N. Charter of which we are signers, and the spirit of the Geneva agreement which we did not deign to sign. We are, then, working against the very world order which you proclaimed as the ultimate aim of U.S. policy before the bar association in New York in your recent speech. To the Vietnamese, apparently, and to the other inhabitants of southeast Asia we appear as the imperialists, having taken over the power and the prerogatives of the French when their position in Vietnam became untenable.

A report in today's paper written by Ray Cromley tells of this newspaperman's conversation with a group of friendly Vietnamese in Saigon. When asked their opinion of the U.S. shelling of the North Vietnamese boats, these Vietnamese lawyers, engineers, and architectural students did not answer directly, but in turn asked newspaperman Cromley their own questions: "It all depends on why the North Americans bombed North Vietnam ships. Did you do it to help us, or because of your own domestic political needs? Are you here in order to help us, or in order to pursue your own purposes and ends?"

I urge you to reassess and redirect our policy in southeast Asia to make it an expression of our most valued ideals. Freedom—which we Americans do cherish—for the people of southeast Asia must mean that they direct their own destiny with aid and assistance neither from us nor from anyone else unless it were disinterested help from an impersonal international body. Let us give a boost to world law and to the deepest meaning of freedom by a new policy for Vietnam and southeast Asia.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. CHESTER M. PATTERSON, Jr.

PALO ALTO, CALIF.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to tell you how important a figure you have been in my life. I have been terribly bitter and disillusioned with American foreign policy. Your voice alone, along with a few other brave and moral men in our Government, let me believe that all is not corrupt, ignorant, or naive in America's thinking.

I admire you greatly, sir, on your Vietnam stand. This cannot, in any way, erase the guilt I feel as an American, for the murder of innocent Vietnamese citizens and the useless slaughter of misinformed American servicemen.

I pray more Americans hear your sane pleas.

Personally, I wish you good health and a long life. You are the hope of America and the world for peace.

My humblest good wishes,

BRENDA SIEGEL.

GREATER NORTH HOLLYWOOD
DEMOCRATIC CLUB,
September 10, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: We of the Greater North Hollywood Democratic Club consisting of 95 members, have unanimously passed a resolution to endorse your position in the Senate resisting the dangerous policy of putting unprecedented war power in the hands of a single person.

We particularly compliment you in your resistance of the overwhelming pressure.

We want you to know that there are many people who feel as we do who have not yet expressed themselves as yet.

We are certain that the ground swell of those with the same sentiment as yours and ours will begin to appear in the near future. It is not the nature of the American people to want to push their weight around.

Our Democratic fairplay heritage will surely come to the fore soon and we are certain you will not be so lonely in your position in the future.

Hoping to hear more from you in the Senate,

Best regards,

Sincerely,

GEORGE ANTON,
President.
SABINA H. MARFIAN,
Corresponding Secretary.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
July 15, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I want to thank you and commend you for your wonderful speech at the City Club yesterday. I am encouraged to see quite a good report of it on page 1 of today's Oregonian. To some extent this Oregonian report breaks the news blackout which they have maintained on what is being done in the name of freedom in South Vietnam.

Since we met you at the airport on Friday, July 10, I have talked with several people about finding ways to get the facts of the southeast Asia problem to the people of Oregon. Retired Reed College Professor Charles McKinley, who is active in the Council for a Livable World, believes that you, with other Senators, could write letters or guest editorials to some of the liberal newspapers outside of Portland. He suggested: the East Oregonian at Pendleton, the Medford Tribune, the Eugene Registrar Guard, and the Oregon Statesman at Salem.

I believe the Portland Reporter would print a letter from you. And after yesterday's speech I think they might be happy to print a guest editorial from you.

Not many people belong to the City Club, but large groups read the Reporter, especially the letters. The speech was broadcast at 10:25 p.m., so many people missed hearing it. I would like to have your opinion on the above suggestions.

Sincerely yours,

IONA B. TANNER.

SYRACUSE, N.Y.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Many thanks on your contribution of thoughts on the war in South Vietnam. Please keep your voice loud on this undeclared war and denote efforts to its end through U.N. effort.

Thanks.

Mrs. JAMES D. HUNT.

LEWIS COLLEGE,
Lockport, Ill., September 2, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I want to take this opportunity to praise your criticism of our policies in Vietnam, especially the issue of our bombing raids over North Vietnam. In an article in this week's New York Times, you stated our destroyers were operating 3 miles off the coast. Were you quoted correctly? Most of my friends, nearly all in fact, disagree with me over the morality of the bombing raids. I am sorry to say that your and my feelings on this issue are in a distinct minority; only one other faculty member here that I have talked to has indicated agreement with your stand. This is why I am taking this opportunity to indicate my support and to urge you to keep up your distinguished criticism.

I would appreciate any additional information you find important, if you have the time.

Thank you for your consideration, and keep up good work.

Sincerely,

JOSEPH M. MCFADDEN,
Assistant Professor, History Department, Lewis College.

OMAHA, NEBR.,
September 5, 1964.

Hon. Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: From the enclosures you may readily gather why I have the highest regard for you as a public servant, why I consider you one of the most courageous statesmen, and not mere politician, of our fair land, and why I am asking of you as many copies or reprints of the interview of Capital Room of recent days as you can spare or you can hustle up for me for local distribution. Also at least one copy of some of your latest speeches on U.S. foreign policy and particularly its position in South Vietnam.

Thanking you in advance, I remain,

Sincerely and civically indebted,

HARRY G. MENDELSON.

LA JOLLA, CALIF.,
September 21, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I want to express my agreement with your speeches on Vietnam. If you have a mailing list for copies of these speeches I would appreciate being added to it. The details in the press are very sparse.

Sincerely yours,

FRANCIS R. HALPERN.

BALTIMORE, MD.,
September 23, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Your excellent speech of August 5, explaining your position on our involvement in South Vietnam has just come to my attention. You have explained the situation so clearly and in such detail that I wonder how the State Department can continue to maintain its rigid policy of "no negotiation at the present time." That such is the official policy is made clear in a letter I received within the week in answer to one I had sent to the President urging negotiations of some kind.

The only hope seems to be in a wiser public, not only aware of the dangers but willing to speak up. I hope you still have copies of your speech. If you have I should greatly appreciate your sending me about 50. I could easily distribute that number to friends in the Baltimore branch of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, and to others less concerned.

We are grateful for your voice in the Congress.

Yours sincerely,

E. LUCILE BURNS.

CHEVY CHASE, MD.,
September 25, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have watched with leaping dismay the ignoring of a life-and-death issue in the present campaign; namely, the maneuverings of our forces in the Tonkin Gulf. You are the only public figure who, to my recall, has had the decency and intelligence to speak out on the provocative acts performed in our name.

The Goldwater approach to these matters is, of course, impossible, but the behavior of the administration certainly leaves much to be desired, especially in the most recent mystery fusillade of our destroyers. There appears to be an attempt by the administration to sweep it all under a rug.

A few days ago I attended a political meeting at which were present both party candidates for Senate and Sixth District of Maryland. Not a single office seeker challenged or even mentioned in his prepared remarks the posture of the United States in the Tonkin Gulf. When questioned about this, the Democratic candidate for Senator replied in effect, that what we were doing there was justified by the supposition that we were preventing India from falling into Red hands, and that we really showed them when the ships were attacked (applause, etc.).

To me it is deplorable that administration candidates feel so politically sleek that they can appeal to jingoist sentiments—exhibiting an attitude that is just as trigger happy as many of the notions of GOLDWATER.

This election ought not to go by default to an administration which pours an anodyne on questions of foreign policy. I strongly support your attempts to raise life-and-death issues, and I beseech you to continue these efforts to, in effect, prevent the ultimate calamity.

Thank you for your kind attention,

ELLIOTT SCHIFFMANN.

BRONX, N.Y.,
September 6, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senator from Oregon,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I want to congratulate you on the stand you took today before the panel of youngsters on the WABC network with regard to our actions in South Vietnam.

I have always felt about this matter as you expressed it, but the public and the newspapers do not seem to be aware of it. If only the taxpayers in our Government could be informed of this waste they might rise up against these unnecessary expenditures.

The whole trouble with all these things is apathy and ignorance. Thanks that we have one Senator who has the courage and principle to expose these failures.

Wishing you success in your fight for the right, I am,

Yours very truly,

SAMUEL DANZIGER.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
August 21, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am tremendously impressed with the wisdom of your statements, your opposition to our intervention in Vietnam. This note to you is a trifle belated.

However, I wanted to express my commendation to you for your courage to maintain your convictions. Enclosed is a note I have written to the President.

Sincerely yours,

(Mrs.) ANN ADAMS.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
August 22, 1964.

President LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Today the news discloses that students are demonstrating in South Vietnam against the dictatorship. This reaffirms my understanding that great numbers of South Vietnamese are not interested in fighting the North—for their own government is oppressive and their living conditions unsatisfactory.

For the United States to risk large-scale war by our continuous intervention in that area appears to be entirely in error. We spend a million dollars daily and involve the lives of American boys uselessly.

I truly believe that the issue is between the haves and have-nots. If hunger and want were eliminated in the world, communism could be no threat.

I was deeply impressed with Senator MORSE's lone, courageous stand and in his public utterances regarding the Vietnam fiasco.

Sincerely yours,

(Mrs.) ANN ADAMS.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.,
August 20, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am writing to thank you for the thoughful, statesmanlike speech you made on the floor of the Senate on August 5, 1964, in relation to the situation in Vietnam.

As you are probably aware, my newspaper, Philadelphia Bulletin, along with most other newspapers only printed small excerpts of your speech. Only yesterday, I had the opportunity of reading a major excerpt of your presentation. It is very frightening to me that in a body like the U.S. Senate, there should have been only two voices, yours and Senator GRUENING, speaking in opposition to the U.S. resolution to advance the war in Vietnam.

Please do not lose heart at your apparent lack of support in the Senate. I feel convinced that if the majority of the American people had the opportunity to read and think about the points raised in your speech they would be completely behind you.

I thank you as a U.S. citizen and as a mother, for trying to protect our land and our children and trying to make us face reality in a nuclear world.

Very sincerely yours,

Mrs. LILLIAN MILLMAN.

P.S.—I would appreciate a few copies of your entire speech which I plan to mail to responsible leaders in my community.

PULLMAN, WASH.,
August 18, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Never since the days of Altgeld, Norris, and Marcantonio have the American people been treated to the courage displayed by you in your struggle to inform them of the facts concerning Vietnam.

Only one newspaper carried the major portion of your text regarding President Johnson's request for a predated declaration of war in southeast Asia: That was the National Guardian. The Guardian has carried your speeches, as well as those of Senator GRUENING. In fact, Senator GRUENING was even moved to write a letter thanking the Guardian for carrying his speeches, which were ignored by the New York Times.

Since the Guardian is a weekly, I have missed some of your speeches. Would it be possible, therefore, to send me copies of those concerning Vietnam. What would be the possibility of receiving bulk copies? If this is not possible, may I please have two copies of each?

Finally, sir, excuse my presumption, but have you considered using your franking privileges to inform the American people of the disastrous and futile road we are traveling in Vietnam. Normally our mass media carries the voice of dissent so the people may make up their minds. However, in this case the mass media have abdicated their responsibility. Some of us here at the university have even considered putting some of your speeches in the papers by buying the space. This cost is, as I am sure you realize, quite high. Again please excuse the presumption, but have you considered personal appeals to the papers by you and/or Senator Gruening to print your texts.

I have ultimate confidence in a well-informed electorate. However, the task of informing them can be, as I am sure you've known for quite a while, quite formidable.

Very sincerely yours,

Joseph E. Morrow.

Stromness, Orkney, Scotland,
August 18, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
The Capitol,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator: Allow me to congratulate you on your courageous stand on peace in Vietnam.

It is tremendously inspiring to us in Britain that a voice of sanity is heard in a country which we think is engaging in a hopeless and quite illegal campaign in a foreign country, far removed from any direct threat to the security of the United States.

Far from containing communism, U.S. activities foster it, as was amply proved in China. History will also prove that the single opponent in the Senate, of present-day policy, was right and all the others tragically wrong.

Surely you speak for millions of, at present, inarticulate Americans who are beginning to think along similar lines, and these are the hope of humanity. May their united voices halt this madness before it is too late.

But what a welter of blood and tears must the world endure before the truth dawns.

Yours sincerely,

G. S. Robertson, Jr.

Bellevue, Wash.,
August 31, 1964.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: I would appreciate a copy of your Vietnam speech, if you are able to supply me with same. From the few quotes I have seen, it seems to be very good.

Thank you.

Very truly yours,

Betsy Hay,
Mrs. D. E. Hay.

February 9, 1964.

Dear Senator Morse: I should just like to extend my congratulations on the stand you have taken on U.S. policy and actions in Vietnam. The facts clearly indicate that the United States should be blamed more than any other country and now seems to be prepared to plunge the world into nuclear war if this is necessary to retain in power, dictators who have little to recommend them beyond an attitude of anticommunism.

Communism can be contained only if a constructive policy is formulated to appeal to the people of Vietnam. After Chiang Kai-shek, Syngman Rhee, and Ngo Dinh Diem we would hope that America might look at the facts as they are rather than as one would desire them to be. Intervention in a civil war, using leaders at least as responsible as the Communists, can solve nothing and can lead only to disaster and to the triumph of communism.

Despite the Australian Government policy of support for the U.S. actions, many people here are bitterly opposed to America's actions on the grounds of morality, risk, and indeed commonsense. Neutralization offers the only way for the United States to withdraw with honor from Vietnam; it also could provide a means of insuring that Communist expansion might be checked.

We feel that the United States can always go home from southeast Asia; Australians have no option but to remain in the area. By allying itself with the U.S. policy, the Australian Government shares the guilt—but not all of us agree with the Government.

I do hope you do not mind my writing to you but I wanted to express my congratulations and extend my best wishes to you in what must be a difficult time.

Kindest regards.

Yours sincerely,

G. J. Morrow.

Burbank, Calif.,
August 25, 1964.

Dear Senator Wayne Morse: Congratulations on your refusal to give the President a blank check for the Vietnam crisis.

Why are we Americans forced to dig and probe in the dark to show us the light on the truth regarding our foreign policy and many other major issues?

We totally disapprove of a nation within our Nation using the U.S. governmental machinery in pursuit of its own ends.

Our concern about Otto Otepka is deep. We are wondering why his statements are not checked out.

Sir, the Communists have seen the Americans as fun loving—easy-going people, that will give the devil himself the benefit of a doubt. They have seen us being pushed and shoved around and take it. But they haven't seen our tempers when our spirits are riled up and Heaven help them if they ever do. We do not like the idea of them forcing us to war to gain them more strength, but we will not stand idly by if they try to take over our Nation.

In the Senate, Mr. Fulbright, on August 20, 1964, read an article written by Walter Lippmann called "Why Not Victory." We believe it to be a most unintelligent article.

Quote: The only way to defeat the guerrilla is to put much larger numbers of men on the ground, in the jungles and in the swamps and on the plains, and in the mountains. As against Africans and Asians, white men cannot win such wars. What is more, white men including the Russians, will not mobilize the large enough masses of men required for this kind of warfare. Unquote.

How does Mr. Lippmann think the Indians fought?

I'm sure our generals are intelligent enough to handle their business. Mr. Lippmann should keep his nose out of it.

Why does Mr. Lippmann include the Russians? Everyone knows the Communists hold Russians captive, they wouldn't care to fight for Khrushchev, and the Communists haven't got the guts to stand up in an even fight, that's why they crawl in on their bellies like slimy, sneaking snakes and rob people of their country by the lowest forms known to man. Their cowardly fear causes them to murder people by the millions in countries they hold captive. They are so cowardly they will not even admit they are Communists.

They serve well the cause of their father the Devil. They cannot confess to follow the way of God; they are taught there is no God, only materialism.

There is only God or the Devil to follow.

If our Government would stop pouring billions into the pockets of criminal leaders whom all countries hate, then there would be no need of us going to war. Let them have their revolution among themselves.

God bless you.

Sincerely,

Margaret McLeod.

P.S.—How can they start a war when they don't have enough wheat to feed themselves?

Glendale, Calif.,
September 24, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

My Dear Senator: I frequently read in our papers where you are exhorting the administration to get out of Vietnam and stop the tremendous outlay in men and materials.

Red China is reported to say that as we send in men and supplies to Vietnam and its neighbors she will continue to block any progress we make.

The thing that amazes me is that our so-called leaders think we can prevail against the Communists who apparently are able to supply large numbers of troops to fight a war that our citizens do not want and who did not vote for the project.

My best wishes in your efforts.

Sincerely yours,

Fred D. Gibbs.

Buffalo, N.Y.,
September 24, 1964.

My Dear Senator: We wonder if those boys who are now dying in South Vietnam deserve more than some of our politicians who are going about our country telling folks, "You never had it so good." This slogan is a mockery, a travesty, to those boys who are in that war way up to their necks. The Vietnamese Government has no stability and this administration is making the same mistake France made in Indochina. Your position in reference to it is to be admired and encouraged.

Most respectfully yours,

W. S. Buchart.

Tacoma, Wash.,
September 22, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: I wish to commend your actions in support of the Supreme Court decision on legislative reapportionment.

I also wish to express support of your little publicized statements on Vietnam and the improper involvement in that country.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. Naomi Ellison.

September 15, 1964.

Thank you for speaking out about the deplorable situation in Vietnam. I too believe the people should be informed.

Your courage is appreciated by many.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Constance Justesn.

Bakersfield, Calif.

U.S. Vietnam Policy Attacked

The 1954 Geneva agreement ended the long French colonial regime in Indochina, and theoretically brought peace and stability to the area on the basis of the establishment of three neutral independent nations: Laos, Cambodia, and Vietnam. Every major country, including the United States and Communist China, signed or otherwise indicated acceptance of the Geneva agreement. The agreement provided for withdrawal of all foreign military troops and aid, as well as national elections throughout Vietnam by 1956. The United States put Diem in as ruler of South Vietnam and did not permit these elections.

The agreement failed in its purpose. It is an unfortunate truth that the United States bears the major responsibility for the failure of the Geneva agreement in Vietnam, for our own Government has been and still is spending billions on military aid in South Vietnam and many millions more to support U.S. troops fighting in South Vietnam. We then and now militantly oppose any and all proposals for neutralization of Vietnam. Our policy in South Vietnam is a unilateral violation of an international agreement which we agreed to uphold. This alone is sufficient reason to reconsider our policy. But there are still other important reasons why this country should end its military involvement in Vietnam.

1. The military involvement has led to a real danger of a general war in Asia and possibly to a nuclear war.

2. It is a policy that cannot lead to a meaningful victory.

3. It is a policy that wastes lives and drains the resources of the American people in a cause that is not in the best interests of our people.

The facts are that we are not fighting for freedom in South Vietnam, and South Vietnam is not threatened by outside Communist aggression. The facts are that we have intervened in a civil war on the side of the reactionary clique that controls the Government of South Vietnam, a clique that included Diem and now includes Khanh.

The governments we have sponsored in South Vietnam, first under Diem and now under Khanh, are led by people who worked for the French colonial administration or who remained aloof from the struggle against it.

This should help explain why 30,000 (according to AP reports) poorly armed guerrillas in South Vietnam now control 60 percent of the country and why they are consistently able to defeat the modern well-armed 400,000-man South Vietnamese army and its supporting group of 17,000 highly trained U.S. military "advisers." Commonsense says that this couldn't have been done unless the Vietcong had a large degree of popular support.

What is U.S. policy in this situation? Our Government insists that North Vietnam and Red China can call off the Vietcong, despite the fact that it is not Chinese troops or North Vietnamese troops that compose the Vietcong. Neither is the Vietcong dependent upon supplies from North Vietnam and China—not when it is in control of most of the countryside and when 90 percent of its weapons come from captured U.S. stock by our own admission. Talk of extending the war to North Vietnam and China is dangerous and foolish. It would mean a war that we could win only at immense cost, and, if we won the war, we would still be no closer to our objective of building a stable non-Communist government for South Vietnam.

What we need in South Vietnam is a program that can win popular support for the Saigon Government. There is no guarantee that this can be done, but before it possibly can, one all-important first step must be taken. The civil war must be ended. There is a kind of arrogance in stating over and over that we will fight forever—make any sacrifices—to crush the Vietcong. It is the people of South Vietnam who will be making the sacrifice, and they are tired of war. Their land has been constantly ravaged by war for a quarter of a century, and their allegiance will go to the party of peace. United States policy in South Vietnam is now self-defeating because it offers nothing but war on into the indefinite future.

The stock answer to critics of this Nation's role in Vietnam is to imply that we would give the area to the Communists. The fact is that our present policy, if it doesn't kill us all, is bound to do just that. In the words of Senator Morse regarding Vietnam, "we should never have gotten in, we shouldn't have stayed in, we should get out now."

Let us look at the issue of South Vietnam from a different perspective. We should see it as a deadend, as a diversion of this country's energies from the real problems. How do we best promote freedom: By building "strategic hamlets" in South Vietnam or by ending racism in Mississippi? How do we promote prosperity: By using chemical defoliants and napalm in South Vietnam or by attacking poverty in Appalachia? How do we promote our security: By attacking North Vietnam and China or by bringing automation under social control?

It is in this context that we look at Vietnam and see this country spending $2 million every day to maintain General Khanh and his crew while programs to uproot racism, to eliminate poverty, and to secure a better life in this country go begging. Let's put the important things first, and let's begin by taking the Vietnam question to the United Nations and withdrawing our military aid in South Vietnam.

Joe Uris,
Ron Subotnick,
and others of the W.E.B. DuBois Club.

August 19, 1964.

Dear Senator Morse: Thank you for your forthright stand on Vietnam, and your honesty in oppposing President Johnson's resolution. Many of us here in New York agree with your position on this matter.

Unfortunately, the newspapers did not reprint the text of your speech. I came across excerpts in the National Guardian—a complete page.

Would it be possible to get a copy of the Congressional Record of your speech? Arguments fly back and forth here and it is important to have facts to back them up.

Your position and Senator Gruening's are like a breath of sanity in a mad world. The hypocrisy and self-deception of our country over Vietnam shocks and saddens me. It also frighten me—as a nonbeliever in brinkmanship.

Thanks again. We need your courage and objectivity.

Sincerely,

Julia Yarrow.

August 17, 1964.

Sir: I have seen excerpts of your remarks of August 5, 1964, on the resolution granting the President extraordinary powers relative to southeast Asia. There is an overwhelming merit in the essence of your remarks and I should appreciate copies of them, if possible. Please send 1 copy to W. Jones, Brooklyn, N.Y.; and 10 copies to W. Jones, Bakers Local No. 3, Long Island City, N.Y.

Thanking you in advance,

Fraternally,

Bill Jones.

August 15, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: I have read a few statements made by you recently and your views interest me. They seem to come close to my own feelings and thoughts on world affairs, human rights, etc. Although I am not part of your constituency, I would like very much to know more about you.

Would you send me whatever material you may have available, including reprints of any recent speeches, so that I may learn where you stand on major issues facing our country and, more importantly, our world.

Before writing directly to you, I requested this information from the League of Women Voters who referred me to an organization called "Americans for Constitutional Action" in Washington. I wrote to them requesting the above information, but the only thing they sent me was rather reactionary material. So, I must make the request of you.

Thank you for whatever information you may send.

Sincerely yours,

Muriel Berger.

August 13, 1964.

Hon. Senator Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: Congratulations on the stand you took with regard to our intervention in North Vietnam. I would appreciate your sending me as many copies of your speeches you made in recent months, as possible. I would like to distribute them among our friends, and also to neighbors up and down the block. People are interested to keep the peace in southeast Asia, but unfortunately don't take the time to write to their representatives in Washington. Maybe getting acquainted with your speeches will help.

Thank you.

Respectfully,

Sylvia R. Primack.

New York, N.Y.
September 14, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.:

Not one more American boy should die. Vietnam policy incredulous, inconsistent, indefensible. Negotiate United Nations.

Carlton N. Hendrickson.

September 8, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
417 Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: Please be assured that your stand on Vietnam is right and that there are (there must be) many who agree with you besides me. The Holy Roman Empire ruled the world and ultimately went down to its doom. It was too big a job and history says they decayed. The British Empire ruled the seas and the sun never set on her possessions. It was too big a job for her. In all history where might alone was accepted for right that country (nation) was doomed.

Senator Fulbright's statement to the Nation, after the U-2 incident, covers it completely. There's no evil which a nation will not embrace to fulfill its ambition, and thereby dig its own grave.

For a long time we have had a double standard of national morality—one for ourselves and the opposite for others (examples: (1) the Suez affair and England, France, and Israel; (2) Quemoy, the islands off China coast and Formosa versus China; (3) Cuba).

We spread the umbrella of our protection around the robots we appoint in lands thousands of miles away, if our national business interest pocket nerve is affected; and we care little whether we support dictators and bloody, self-seeking despots, all in the fantastically hypocritical name of freedom. This especially applies to the Koreans and now to Vietnamese.

I love my country too much to stand by watching and hurting while our reputation for truthfulness and for moral strength is so easily recognized by the intelligent in all lands, as a fraud.

Tragically it seems it never is so bad it can't be worse, which is the only reason I am for Johnson and Humphrey.

Even if I don't write you daily, and if the great New York Times doesn't seem to believe your news is fit to print, believe me I am greatly indebted to you.

Respectfully,

Rev. Morley Wolfe.

Ossining, N.Y.

Philadelphia, Pa.,
September 9, 1964.

Dear Senator Morse: It was with sincere pleasure and great admiration that I read your speech concerning your stand against U.S. intervention in the internal affairs of southeast Asia.

It is a great relief to know that there are at least two courageous, outspoken, thinking men in the Senate of the United States.

To you, sir, and to Senator Gruening—thank you.

Sincerely,

Elin M. Belsky.

Upland, Calif.,
September 8, 1964.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senate Offices,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator: I have long been an admirer of your forthright position in major issues, never more so than now, your courageous statement on Vietnam is a service not only to our country, but to all mankind. If politics is the art of the possible, then statesmanship does the impossible. Your fine work is real statesmanship.

Please accept my heartfelt support and sincere best wishes for the widespread knowledge of your position by all thinking citizens. I trust more of our lawmakers and Government officials will understand and favor it.

Blessings,

PAUL S. DELP,
Professor of Philosophy.

ST. LOUIS, MO.,
September 2, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I extend gracious thanks for the hearings you sent me concerning the foreign aid bill. Since the bill is currently shelved, it will probably return to the floor fairly soon, when it does, I hope you succeed in any attempts to cut the appropriations.

Concerning the Vietnam situation, I am slowly realizing that your position, which I formally scorned, now seems to be the correct one. I consider myself an "all or nuthin" man on foreign policy. Since we cannot obtain all, we had better settle for "nuthin."

In addition, I send congratulations on a dedicated and devoted job in the Senate. Since I am fairly conservative, and seem to consider you a leftwinger, I find it difficult to compliment you. However, a Senator who excels himself beyond the ordinary solution to problems, and a Senator who inserts articles in the RECORD which criticize him, and a Senator who red rosingly engages in a filibuster, only to delay, not to thwart voting, can't be all bad. I hope you continue your successful work in the Senate, we need you.

Since I always enjoy reading any speeches or articles of the senior Oregonian, I would be honored and delighted if you could possibly send me your newsletter. Surely anyone who passes over the writings of Senator MORSE, misses the foremost work of art of America's most distinguished Senator. Please include my name on your mailing list.

Faithfully yours,

GEORGE OTTE.

BAKERSFIELD, CALIF.,
September 4, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This letter is long overdue; like many who are "for" you, I have put off writing while those "agin" are busy. Your record as a person and as a Senator, your objectivity in evaluating the American foreign policy and its position in the Far East, command the respect of all thinking persons. You deserve the full support of every citizen, not just that of your constituents. We are indebted to you for your stanch and almost singlehanded opposition to events of the past few weeks.

It is my great hope that you, and others like you, will be able to continue speaking out for commonsense.

Sincerely,

DAVID D. HEWES.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
September 4, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have read with great interest your statements regarding American foreign policy. I am particularly concerned about our position in Vietnam. It is my belief that we should withdraw from Vietnam, and let this entire problem be referred to the United Nations.

Very truly yours,

MRS. KATHERINE G. FLYNN.

OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLA.,
September 8, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

My heartfelt thanks for your courageous stand against our involvement in southeast Asia. Please hold firmly to your convictions because you are right. Our involvement is a form of imperialism backed by powerful minority groups of financial and industrial oligarchy whose only aim is profit and no responsibility toward making our world better for all mankind.

W. G. ROMINGER.

JULY 12, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am writing to praise and give you some small encouragement on the courageous stand you have been taking on the southeast Asian situation. Men like yourself and Senator GRUENING offer some hope to the growing number of us who are appalled and sickened by U.S. policy in this area. Perhaps the final straw for many was the realization that this country was aiding and abetting a government (the South Vietnamese) which systematically traffics in the most brutal torture. It reveals only the deepest moral nihilism to attempt to excuse ourselves by saying that that is the way things are done there. It is impossible to believe that a government which is so dependent upon our strategic and tactical support could not be forced to discontinue this practice if pressure were applied.

I am a student at the University of Michigan. I do not belong to any political party nor am I a "professional" anti-American, or ultraleftist. I do think it is worthwhile for Members of the Congress and the administration to know that many younger people are beginning to find their Government's acts immoral and abominable. Almost against my will, I am becoming quite cynical about American policies and motives. It is difficult not to though, when Members of Congress and the President continue to insist that we are defending the free world at the same time our largest selling national picture magazine is running color photographs of favorite torture techniques of the South Vietnamese troops while our "advisers" look calmly on.

I do not believe that my thoughts on this situation are foolishly idealistic, emotional or naive. It is no doubt true that atrocities are the byproduct of every war, though one could argue that there is something particularly repulsive about a government which engages in the torture of the women and children of its own civilian population in order to sustain itself. What many members of our Government do not seem to realize is many many people are beginning to be rather certain that we stand for nothing better, and perhaps something worse than the Communists. We become what we do. If we are willing to blithely accept the formula of the end justifying the means, we have made a dangerous and perhaps fatal step. Good luck to you and thank you for the small glimmer of hope.

Yours truly,

PATRICK CONNOR.

ONTARIO, CALIF.,
August 22, 1964.

President LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We the undersigned registered Democrats of southern California wish to protest the foreign policy of our Government in southeast Asia, and specifically our present policy in South Vietnam.

We agree wholeheartedly with that great statesman, Senator WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon, when he says, as he has time and time again on the floor of the U.S. Senate, "We should not have got in, not have stayed, and should get out now." We also agree with the Senator from Alaska, ERNEST GRUENING, who says, "The time has come to cease the useless and senseless loss of American lives in an area not essential to the security of the United States."

Let us stop a $2 million-a-day war that nobody wants. We urge you, President Johnson, along with the State Department, to call a halt to this dirty war in South Vietnam. A continuation of our present policy in Vietnam could lead to a devastating nuclear war that no one could win.

Let's not make Vietnam another Hiroshima.

Sincerely yours,

M. D. ALLEN.

LOS ALTOS, CALIF.,
September 2, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Perhaps because I am not a constituent of yours, I have never been moved to write you a letter, though I have been an admirer of your many courageous political acts over the years of your service in the Senate. But it would be criminal for me to delay longer in writing to tell you how much I appreciate your attempts to keep a flicker of intelligence alive in our dealing with the situation in Vietnam.

If anything is true, I am afraid that it is the terrible fact that our involvement in Vietnam is even less honorable than the picture you have detailed for the American people. I can understand the reasons of political expediency that have led a consummate politician like Lyndon Johnson to his present position concerning Vietnam. What alarms, saddens, and disgusts me is the failure of so many of your colleagues to join you on this issue—men who for the most part do not have President Johnson's excuses for their actions. I can only hope that you represent the voice of conscience and good judgment that is only temporarily stilled in men such as Senators FULBRIGHT, MCGOVERN, and other (dare I add HUMPHREY?).

I hope that you will eventually see your views vindicated against the current conformity and in spite of the fairly uniform press suppression of your damaging criticism of our war in Vietnam.

Sincerely,

R. D. LAKIN.

FRANKLIN, OHIO,
September 15, 1964.

SENATOR WAYNE MORSE: Some weeks ago I understand you took a stand against the action the President took on the Vietnam crisis. I think you were right in doing so and I wish to commend you for doing so and to thank you for doing so.

Yours very truly,

DOROTHY SILVERS.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I cannot express how greatly you should be commended for your stand on Vietnam.

May we please also urge that you introduce in the Senate the concurrent resolution introduced in the House that opposes M.L.F. We know you must also be opposed.

Thank you.

Mr. and Mrs. V. K. ULMER.

SEPTEMBER 16, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR: I would like to commend you for your forthright statements about American participation in the war in Vietnam. When intelligence and honesty about our role are so rare, your voice is particularly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Elaine Edgell.

Dear Senator Morse: This card is to let you know how much I appreciate your stand on Vietnam and to congratulate you on taking this stand.

Please take a similar stand on the resolution in the House at this time opposing M.L.F. I feel that you also must oppose this.

Mrs. Leon Jackson.

Los Angeles, Calif.,
September 18, 1964.

Dear Sir: Hope your speeches on involvement in South Vietnam are being published in the newspapers.

Please send me your speech of Monday, September 16, 1964, where you point out the withholding of the "facts about the war."

Thank you very much.

The American people should be proud of your voice in the Senate for warning that this path might lead to a third world war.

Thank you again.

Joseph Siegel.

San Jose, Calif.,
September 17, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: This is to commend you and thank you most sincerely for your courageous and honest stand against our participation in the civil war in Vietnam. You are right. I hope that you will have more colleagues joining you, if they too can find the courage.

Sincerely,

Susan Adams.

Mosman, Sydney, N.S.W., Australia,
September 1, 1964.

Dear Senator Morse: I would like to hail you, as history certainly will do so, as a brave and honest man for your stand on Vietnam. Nor can it have been any easy thing to do, your Government having the attitude it has on this question.

What you do is doubly important. Too often a country is judged by the actions of the government in power at the time and other peoples tend to forget that what is done is often against the wishes of many. It is a good thing to be reminded that there are people of good will everywhere and if we band together and fight for justice surely justice will prevail in the end.

We in Australia are very concerned about the question of unhappy Vietnam, not only are they among our neighbors but our present Government slavishly follows what yours decrees, which makes statements like yours so very important.

Thanking you and wishing you every success in your courageous stand.

Yours very sincerely,

Dora Armytage.

Marysville, Wash.,
September 2, 1964.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

My Dear Senator Morse: I want to applaud long and loud for the stand you took in regard to Vietnam.

Very sincerely,

Mrs. Clair Kuhnle.

Bar Harbor, Maine,
August 31, 1964.

Hon. Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: I am writing to express my thanks to you for your perseverence and fortitude in the defense of your stand on recent world problems, particularly the festering Vietnam issue. My respect for you is furthered by the fact that you belong to a very small minority in the most influential Government body, the Senate.

I find myself a voice in the dark and subject to much criticism aimed at my defense of my own ideals, as I'm sure you must. But still, I strive to convince people through discussion of what I believe to be the truth, though whether I accomplish anything or not is a question. This, then, is the reason that I wish to urge you, as a person honored and respected by many, to continue on your present course, advocating a reversal in a policy which will inevitably reach a dead end.

Sincerely yours,

W. Edwin Kaliss.

P.S.—I am 16 years old, and am entering the 11th grade.

Pittsburgh, Pa.,
September 1, 1964.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senator from Oregon,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: If you have made a Senate speech on the recent Saigon riots and the collapse of the Khanh regime, or if you intend to make such a speech presently, I would appreciate a copy.

I would think that the complete failure of U.S. policy in Vietnam must be evident to many of your colleagues by now. Can you perhaps convince Fulbright that we are not successfully stabilizing the situation, and that those requirements of strength which he thought ought to precede involvement of the United Nations are never going to be fulfilled? That, in fact, in his discussion with Senator Church (Congressional Record, June 23, 1964) his claim to a practical point of view has hardly stood the test of time.

The chief hazard now will be the tendency to send U.S. ground forces into action. Is it possible to get large chunks of the Ridgway report on Indochina (1954) into the Congressional Record? Much of it must apply as well now as it did then.

Best wishes,

R. D. Campbell.

Wayne, N.J.

Dear Senator Morse: After the news tonight on TV, I have sent the following night letter to President Johnson:

Why should there be U.S. bombers over North Vietnam? Do we or don't we believe in the United Nations? What democracy are we supposed to be protecting in South Vietnam? With a son in the Air Force, I have more than average concern. For a long time, I've read several papers daily, searching for reasons to support our policies and the only reasons I can find do not do us credit.

Thank you for your forceful TV appearance this week.

Sincerely,

Frances Zang.

New York, N.Y.,
September 6, 1964.

Dear Senator Morse: I have just heard your interrogation by certain youth on TV.

I have strongly favored your and Senator Gruening's fights over the last 6 months on our (the United States, that is) role in South Vietnam.

I am in general agreement with what you said today.

But I was disturbed by your suggestion that we remain in South Vietnam if we have SEATO members' troops alongside "us."

SEATO is fortunately dead, so there is little likelihood of your suggestion being realized.

I am disturbed by your implication that our presence, in our present role in South Vietnam would be tolerable, even desirable, if we were only one of many interveners.

For we are interveners in a civil war in which S. Vietnamese who want South Vietnam to be run by Vietnamese are rebelling against a puppet government.

I had thought that your objection to our involvements there was based largely on this fact.

Your insistence upon bringing the U.N. into this could easily produce another Korean sham operation, although it is true that U Thant is a different man from Trygve Lie.

Nor it is apt to cite the U.N.'s and our role in the Congo, which has brought Tshombe back.

Let us put South Vietnam back into the hands of the original international committee of 1954, although the United States did not sign.

But, let us get out.

Respectfully yours,

Robert Melton.

Red Bank, N.J.,
September 7, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: As an 18 year old who is subject to be drafted into the Vietnam war should it get worse, I applaud your efforts to end our involvement there. I see no reason why American boys should die in support of a bloody dictator. If the people of South Vietnam don't want to fight the Vietcong, why should American boys? I agree with you that the U.N. should be sent there as a peacekeeping force.

It is certainly pitiful that only two U.S. Senators stood up to protest our bloody role in Vietnam. It is also pitiful and shameful that the American people seem to be willing to go to war over Vietnam. Don't let your critics bother you Senator Morse. A large number of people are behind you. Keep up the good work.

Sincerely,

Mr. Dennis Bentham.

North Manchester, Ind.,
September 11, 1964.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator: Enclosed you will find a copy of "Memo on Vietnam" by David McReynolds and A. J. Muste, which we regard as a most vital presentation of little known facts on this distressing situation. We hope you will be concerned enough to read this leaflet.

We also call your attention to the testimony given in recent symposium on Vietnam by such qualified persons as Stanley Millet, professor of political science, who taught for 2 years at the University of Saigon; Robert Browne, economist, who spent 6 years with the U.S. aid program in South Vietnam and Cambodia; Arthur Dommen, UPI correspondent in Vietnam for 2 years; also published reports by Dr. David Arnold of Princeton University who served 14 months with the USIA in Saigon.

It seems to us that the Pentagon and the CIA are too often taking critical situations out of the hands of the State Department. We regard this as a serious threat to democracy and world peace. It is likewise "un-American" in the truest sense. We feel that under no circumstances should war be extended into North Vietnam. Red China obviously has legitimate interests which we must not fail to recognize.

Earnest consideration should be given the neutralization of the whole Indochina area under international supervision. Present times give ample indication that we can no longer deal with independent nation-states but must resolve our conflicts in relation to the total community bound together by mutual dangers as well as mutual hopeful possibilities.

We appreciate the responsible conduct of foreign affairs which has in many instances characterized the Kennedy-Johnson administration supported by moderate and liberal members of both parties. We admire the forthright position taken by Senator WAYNE MORSE on the Vietnam involvement. We are aware that irresponsible jibes and needling of the Goldwater team increase the pressures on the present administration to extend this shameful war. However, we urge you to use your influence to firmly support responsible statesmanship and to keep this from becoming a political issue.

Most sincerely yours,

HARVEY M. LANDIS.
LOIS L. LANDIS.

MEMO ON VIETNAM

(By David McReynolds and A. J. Muste)

The situation in the states that formerly composed French Indochina (Laos, Cambodia, North Vietnam, South Vietnam) would be confusing enough without the help of the U.S. Government in consistently misrepresenting the facts. The United States officially holds that it is in South Vietnam solely to protect the independence and freedom of that nation—one troubled by a Communist insurrection physically supplied by and politically directed from North Vietnam and, more basically, under the domination of the Chinese Communists. Regarding Laos, we take the position that all would be well if the Pathet Lao—the pro-Communist forces—did not continually violate the political agreements regarding the neutrality of Laos. Finally, we express pained surprise that Cambodia accuses not only South Vietnam but also the United States of aggressive acts.

THE BACKGROUND

These American-made pictures are seriously misleading. To understand the current situation one must go back to the U.S. theory of "containing" the Chinese revolution by building around it a ring of military bases and alliances. In part this had been achieved through treaties with Pakistan, the Philippines, South Korea, and Japan, and through support of Chiang on Taiwan and the retention of Okinawa as a U.S. military base. But India and Burma remained "weak spots" in this "chain of iron." It was for this reason that the India-China border dispute provoked the keen anticipation in some areas of American opinion that it would push India into open military alliance with the West. An attempt was made to "plug the Burmese gap" by maintaining for some time a band of Chinese Nationalist troops on Burmese soil along its Chinese border. (This was entirely a CIA operation of which most Americans are still not aware. After extremely sharp protests by the Burmese Government, the CIA finally abandoned the airlift of supplies to these troops who had, in any event, taken to growing opium for the narcotics trade and were embarrassing the CIA.)

In this context of "containing" China, the French withdrawal from Indochina in 1954, following defeat by the Communist-led Viet Minh under the leadership of Ho Chi Minh, meant that a huge "hole" had suddenly appeared through which Chinese influence might flow into southeast Asia. The United States became involved almost immediately. We had previously supplied some $3 billion of military aid to the French for their Indochina war, and Richard Nixon had urged direct U.S. involvement to prevent the triumph of the Viet Minh (an idea vetoed by Eisenhower). With the French out, Cardinal Spellman and others prevailed upon Ngo Dinh Diem, a devout Catholic living in the United States, to return to South Vietnam to head the Government. In October 1955, he took control from the discredited Bao Dai and the war ended with the signing of the Geneva accords. Under these there were to be internationally supervised free elections in both South and North Vietnam by July 1956, leading to a unified all-Vietnamese Government.

The United States did not sign the Geneva accords but had pledged not to violate them. Urged on by the United States, however, Diem flatly refused to arrange for the free elections: everyone close to Vietnamese affairs knew that Ho Chi Minh, a national hero, would easily win in both North and South Vietnam.

Initially Diem had some success in establishing control over South Vietnam. There were significant land reforms and he achieved at least some popular support. But increasing repression of the Buddhists, growing corruption in Government, refusal of Diem to conduct the free elections, all led to a resurgence of guerrilla war by what we know as the Vietcong. Like the Viet Minh before, it is not simply a Communist force, as Americans have been told, but the organizational focus for most of the resistance groups. The Communists are active within the Vietcong and give it its political direction, but they are a minority.

Against this armed rebellion, and in direct violation of the Geneva accords, the United States began a vigorous military support of the Diem regime. For a time the violation was thinly disguised by calling the troops advisers and claiming that the military supplies were merely permitted "replacements" for existing supplies. But the fiction has long since worn off. Despite the repeated American assertions that "masses" of war material are "pouring in" from North Vietman, the hard fact remains that the only power which has intervened in any significant way in South Vietnam is the United States. On March 6 of this year, Pulitzer Prize winning reporter, David Halberstam, of the New York Times reported, "The war is largely a conflict of southerners fought on southern land. No capture of North Vietnamese in the south has come to light and it is generally believed that most Vietcong weapons have been seized from the South Vietnamese forces." A later report in the Times by a member of the U.S. military force there indicated that 75 percent of all weapons seized are of American manufacture, and clearly had been captured earlier by the Vietcong from Government troops. The remaining 25 percent of captured weapons were largely homemade rifles. We are in the ironic situation where we both violate solemn international agreements by supplying weapons to the South Vietnamese Government, and are the major source of supply, albeit indirectly, to the Vietcong itself.

The Diem regime fell in 1963 and was replaced first by one military junta and then by another, the current one headed by General Khanh. There has never been a free election, nor is any planned: the present Government does not have the support of its people. Walter Lippmann wrote in the Washington Post on April 21, 1964: "The truth, which is being obscured for the American people, is that the Saigon government has the allegiance of probably no more than 30 percent of the people and controls (even in daylight) not much more than a quarter of the territory." Even the U.S. "military advisers" come very close to admitting this. The Observer, official U.S. Military Adviser Group newspaper in Saigon, reported on January 25 of this year that a ranking spokesman for the American mission "conceded that some 4 to 5 million people support the NLF (National Liberation Front, the political arm of the Vietcong) in varying degrees, though not necessarily through choice or sympathy, but rather by fear and coercion."

Thus, far from confronting a massive intervention of Communist troops and supplies from North Vietnam or China bent on overthrowing a popularly based democratic government in the south, the United States is engaged in a unilateral intervention on behalf of an undemocratic and unpopular government which cannot even attract support of its own people. An indication of this is that the Vietcong, with an army of only 25,000 regulars and 60,000 to 80,000 irregulars, has been able to take control of three-fourths of the territory of South Vietnam despite a government army of 500,000 men, backed by complete control of the air and equipped with the latest materials.

LAOS

All contending forces in Laos are discouraged by the unwillingness of the people to do any serious fighting despite all the equipment they have been given. Clearly, CIA and American policy have been as fully "aggressive" as the Pathet Lao. Over a year ago the CIA, unsatisfied with a neutral government, proceeded to overthrow it in an effort to set up a rightwing regime, but the Pathet Lao quickly won so many military victories that the United States retreated and managed to reestablish a neutral government. Within the past 3 months the rightwing generals, either instructed by the CIA or, at best, thinking they were doing something the Americans would approve of, again overthrew the Government, and again the Pathet Lao struck back and won much territory.

There should be some sense of realism about Laos. First, none of the native factions like fighting nor are they disposed toward brutal solutions of any kind. They are simply not properly "civilized." Laos is a mountainous area, with little economy of any kind, in which no one (except Americans, Chinese, and Russians) wants to fight. (One American economist returned from Laos to say, "It's fantastic, really quite impossible, but the Laotians simply don't have an economy. I've never seen anything like it.") Further, from a military standpoint it doesn't really matter who controls Laos. It is not geographically the military "key' to anything. No one is going to launch a major military action in any direction through Laos itself. With a situation where the people are gentle, the economy nonexistent, and the terrain impossible, and where all three Laotian factions would probably make peace among themselves very quickly if the Americans, Chinese, and Russians would simply get out, we ought to realize that in terms of a world power struggle Laos simply isn't a factor, no matter who "controls" it.

CAMBODIA

The Cambodian situation is more complex. Unlike Laos and North and South Vietnam, there has been no guerrilla movement in Cambodia. The Government is stable and popular with the people, and the leader, Norodom Sihanouk, seems from all accounts to govern wisely. Sensing that the United States is finished in South Vietnam, he has cut his ties to the United States and begun to orient his policy toward what he considers the new political reality in the area—China. He insists the United States is seeking his overthrow and, while the United States has elaborately denied this, one must conclude from a survey of the CIA record that very possibly secret agents are searching for (1) an assassin and (2) a replacement for Sihanouk. Whether or not this is the case, it it clear that South Vietnam has repeatedly violated Cambodian territory—one such incursion, with an American "adviser" present, bombing a village and killing a number of civilians. The United States and South Vietnam have both charged Vietcong use of Cambodia as a major supply base—in the face of Cambodian denials and the lack of evidence. But there is overwhelming evidence that South Vietnam has violated the borders of Cambodia. The tragedy is that, given a stable and popular government in

Cambodia, the United States continues to attempt to coerce it into an open or overt alliance with the West in violation of the Geneva accords, and at great peril to the stability of Cambodia itself. The goal of military containment of China blinds the United States despite experience in Laos and South Vietnam, to the enormous value from any standpoint of a stable neutralist government in Indochina.

THE NATURE OF THE WAR

Because this paper aims at political analysis as distinct from moral denunciation, we will avoid documenting at length the outrageous nature of the American war in Vietnam. But it is important for Americans not to lose sight of this aspect which is central to any discussion of Vietnam. The documentary evidence from non-Communist sources, including the New York Times, the New York Herald Tribune, the Washington Post, etc., is overwhelmingly clear. We have either used or caused to be used torture on prisoners, both military and civilian; napalm bombing and machinegunning and artillery shelling of villages on the chance they might contain elements of the Vietcong; and mass detention of the peasantry in the "strategic hamlets" which amount to little more than concentration camps, complete with guards and barbed wire and even special moats. (Here, too, there is irony. In a number of instances the Vietcong had willingly sent women, children, and the elderly into the "strategic hamlets" where, despite the lack of freedom, they would at least be safe from Government napalm bombing and would have enough to eat. This has freed the men of the Vietcong for greater concentration on the war. As one U.S. military adviser bitterly commented after this tactic had become obvious, "all we are doing is babysitting for the Vietcong.")

The American Government had for long denied that it was engaged in napalm bombing and strafing of the villages. The degree of "governmental lying" on this and a host of other matters finally provoked so moderate a journalist as James Reston of the New York Times to complain that the Government, by its suppression of the facts and by its contradictory statements, was making it impossible for the American public to know what was going on. When the Pentagon finally admitted napalm bombing, Reston praised the disclosure, commenting that, after all, everyone knew such weapons were in use and previous denials only made the Government look silly. It is worth quoting from an editorial in the Saigon Post on January 10, 1964. This journal is not an organ of the "left" since no "left" is permitted to exist in South Vietnam, and all papers, in any event, are under tight Government censorship. With these two facts in mind, the following is even stronger than it appears to be: "In many instances peasant grievances are the result of tactical errors committed by well-meaning commanders. Cases have been reported of wanton bombing or shelling of entire villages where, it was later learned, only a handful of Vietcong had been detected. Sometimes these grievances are explained away as the consequences of war. The merciless destruction of unharvested ricefields under a column of armored personnel carriers, or the scorched earth of napalm bombing are examples of this type of grievance."

THE MIRAGE OF MILITARY VICTORY

We are trapped in a situation where no traditional military victory can be won in South Vietnam regardless of how many more troops and how much more equipment is poured in. The Vietcong have now begun to engage in open attacks along more normal lines of warfare instead of limiting themselves to hit-and-run tactics, indicating increased military power and organization. Americans should keep in mind that the French put 400,000 well-trained and determined men into French Indochina, that these men were backed by some $3 billion of U.S. aid, that French casualties finally reached the appalling figure of 172,000 (with at least one-quarter-million Vietminh casualties), and that at the end the French had to sue for peace. It is incredibly naive for Americans to think that with a force of 15,000 "advisers," plus money, plus a demoralized and disheartened government army, success can be achieved where the French had failed. After 10 years of the current war and the killing of countless rebels, the Saigon government has lost control of most of South Vietnam.

A look at Algeria will further indicate the hopelessness of the U.S. position. There the French had excellent supply lines, overwhelming military superiority, and a large and long established French population. They had an army of 760,000 in the field and these were backed with $12 billion during 8 years of war. The top strength of 60,000 FLN men was cut down to 7,000 by the time of ceasefire. The French even built a half-million-dollar electronic fence to keep FLN forces from crossing into Tunisia for sanctuary. Despite all this, the French were fiinally forced to withdraw.

In contrast, the United States must ship its men and supplies some 8,000 miles and fight in a jungle where the enemy can melt away even when completely surrounded. This is a war where vast seapower is meaningless, where total air superiority can be used only to bomb civilians because the Vietcong cannot be spotted. Any hope for a U.S. victory is the closest thing yet to a military impossibility.

EXPANSION OF THE WAR

The frustration of trying to win a war incapable of being won, the Government's distribution of deceitful information, and an adolescent faith in being able to "lick anybody" make it easy for the ignorant and irrational to talk of expanding the war to North Vietnam or even to China. We would, of course, oppose such extension on pacifist grounds. But from a military viewpoint such extension would make sense only if the Vietcong were indeed being trained and equipped by the North Vietnamese and the Chinese. Despite statements by Government officials to this effect, this is simply not the case. North Vietnam and China could be totally destroyed without any marked effect on the struggle in South Vietnam because a major source of Vietcong military supplies are captured from Government troops. In Korea there was a certain logic, in a military sense, in MacArthur's desire to bomb north of the Yalu River because of engagement with masses of Chinese troops and fighting aircraft from across the Yalu. But there is no fighting with Chinese or North Vietnamese troops in South Vietnam, and enemy airpower does not exist. The strongest single area of Vietcong control is, in fact, in the southern tip of South Vietnam, in the Mekong Delta, where the Vietcong are completely cutoff, geographically, from any contact with Laos and North Vietnam. Under these circumstances, to call for extension of the war is to reveal the prompting of frantic desperation rather than the workings of a calm and objective mind.

In view of such talk it should be noted that, in fact, the war had been extended into the north some time ago. It made no headway. C. L. Sulzberger (who supports increased U.S. intervention) reported in the New York Times, June 27, of this year: "In 1961 a South Vietnam 'First Operation Group' was established under U.S. direction to fight secret operations in North Vietnam. Now, as we have shown in Laos, we contemplate backing this kind of action with air support. * * *" The problem is that the so-called counterinsurgency forces which penetrated North Vietnam were unable to establish any base. They had no support from the local population, were quickly reported to the military authorities, and were wiped out. (This should cast doubt on the relative conditions in North and South Vietnam as reported. We are told that North Vietnam is a terror-ridden Communist state, waiting for liberation, while South Vietnam is a popularly supported free state. Yet American forces find no welcome in the north, but are reported to the Government. In the south the Vietcong is given food and shelter by the native population.)

And yet there is talk of further expansion of the war. Premier Khanh has publicly stated on at least two recent occasions that he would move north to liberate all Vietnam as soon as the situation in the South was secure. To the best of our knowledge, Khanh's statements have not been repudiated by any U.S. spokesman. Is it possible that the United States, which knows it cannot win a free election in Vietnam, is now seeking to unify that area through direct military action?

HISTORICAL AND POLITICAL PERSPECTIVES

Southeast Asian history did not begin with the arrival of the first U.S. "military adviser" in Saigon, but goes back several thousand years. China has, on at least three occasions, ruled Indochina, one time for a thousand years. Chinese attempts to penetrate Indochina are thus a new expression of a 5,000-year-old dream of Chinese imperialism within Asia: evil, yes, but vastly different from that dire "World Communist Conspiracy" which Washington insists on seeing. It is the imperialism of Chiang Kai-shek as much as of Mao Tse-Tung. Years before his forced retreat to Taiwan, Chiang claimed that island as an intrinsic part of China (just as Mao does today) when, in fact, historically it is not. Chiang long meddled in the affairs of Tibet and insisted upon Chinese sovereignty over it. Had Chiang won the civil war there is every reason to assume he would now be engaged in border disputes with the Soviet Union and with India, and would be trying to extend his influence into Indochina. Everyone's imperialism, whether military or more subtle, is evil, but it is part of an old pattern and should not lead Americans into the sort of paranoid reactions we have been having, as if Chinese influence in Indochina today means the fall of Australia tomorrow.

The second point to be derived from this history is that the people of Indochina, while they have been repeatedly subjected to Chinese rule, are not Chinese and do not wish to become part of any new Chinese Empire. The feeling is strongly held by all factions in the Indochinese states, both Communists and anti-Communists. There is sharp awareness of the dangers of Chinese influence precisely because it has been threatening for so long. There has been, at least until recently, a strong pro-Moscow faction within the ruling party in North Vietnam.

Americans assume a Vietcong victory would mean not only communism but an immediate extension of Chinese Communist influence into southeast Asia. This would certainly be to China's liking, but more probably the regime of North and South Vietnam would take a cautious policy toward China. There is good reason to believe Vietnam could become the "Asian Yugoslavia." Every Communist state that has made its own revolution so far has pursued a distinctive nationalist line. This was first true with Russia which has always treated the world Communist movement as subsidiary to Russian needs and interests. It was true in Yugoslavia and again in China. It is proving true in Cuba which plays Russia against China in order to pursue an essentially Cuban course. Yugoslavia, China, and Cuba all won their revolutionary struggles with little more than moral help from the Russians—which is about all the Chinese have given their Indo-Chinese partisans. But if the war continues, North Vietnam, historically dependent on southern rice, will have to get supplies from China. And increased U.S. military action in South Vietnam would mean the Vietcong would have to turn to North Vietnam for more than the present trickle of physical help. Chinese help would become essential and with her volunteers would come a dominating Chinese influence. The question—the only serious question—is what situation would exist following American withdrawal.

The likelihood is that the sooner peace comes to South Vietnam the sooner will she, in cooperation or direct union with North Vietnam, be able to follow an independent policy, thus acting as a check on Chinese penetration into southeast Asia. In Europe the defection of Yugoslavia from the Soviet bloc meant the immediate end of the civil war in Greece. Just as Yugoslavia, Albania, and now Rumania can now pursue fairly independent policies toward Russia (and nonaggressive policies toward their non-Communist neighbors), there is good reason to suppose the Indochinese states could do the same in regard to China. Chinese domination over Indochina is not inevitable, but it is made more certain by the intransigence of current American policy. China will accept neutral or independent Communist states to her south, but she will not tolerate an American base on her borders, as she demonstrated at great cost to everyone in Korea.

PRESENT ALTERNATIVES

American policy in South Vietnam is at a dead end. If war is continued on its present scale, the losses will continue and increase. If American forces are increased substantially, either North Vietnam and/or China will send volunteers and equipment to offset such increases. At this point the choice may well be between evacuation and open—ultimately nuclear—war against China. On the other hand, to withdraw now might well permit South Vietnam to follow a course relatively free from Chinese influence. But as such withdrawal is postponed, Chinese influence will become more pervasive.

It has been suggested that the United States seek a convening of the 14 nation conference which drew up the Geneva accords in order to achieve a guaranteed neutralization of Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia. Others suggest that the entire problem be laid before the United Nations. We believe that the matter was most precisely stated by the Socialist Party in recently demanding "* * * that our Government should use every effort by negotiation to bring about neutralization of Vietnam and to maintain a genuine neutralization of Laos and Cambodia, but under no circumstances to continue its investment of men and money in war in southeast Asia."

This means that we must not fall into the trap of supporting the U.S. Government "pending" an agreement on neutralization, U.S. policy should be totally opposed as a bumbling fraud, and the withdrawal of U.S. troops and arms urged as a first step. This should be done at the same time that we support plans toward the neutralization and independence of the Indochinese states, ending all attempts to draw them into our pattern of military alliances.

Finally, no settlement of the problem of Indochina is possible as long as the United States refuses to face the reality of China. In long-range political terms, American power in Asia is extremely limited relative to the enormous Chinese power and therefore cannot hope to affect events except in the negative sense of destroying these areas through war. It is thus the height of political folly for the United States to continue denying the existence of the Chinese Government, let alone the refusal to enter into serious negotiations with that Government. But beyond diplomatic recognition and permitting entry of China into the United Nations, realism dictates realization that China has legitimate interests, particularly in the Far East. Such realization would make clear that negotiations cannot be conducted as long as the United States retains the island of Okinawa as a military base; subsidizes Chiang Kai-shek on Taiwan and even on the islands of Quemoy and Matsu (indisputably Chinese territory); permits Chiang to raid the mainland coast; and regularly sends spy planes over Chinese territory. All this is in addition to this Government's direct military intervention in the affairs of the Indochinese states in flagrant violation of international agreements.

We do not believe the public would approve the reasons for this war or the way in which it is being fought. We do not believe that most Americans want the war extended, and certainly not to the point of open conflict with China—one in which tens or hundreds of thousands of Americans as well as Chinese would have to die to cover up the blunders of the CIA and the general incompetence of the State Department. And certainly no one, except for the extreme right, really wants to risk a nuclear war on the issue of whether or not we shall continue to defend an oppressive and undemocratic minority government in South Vietnam.

The full story of the war in South Vietnam must be brought to the American public, particularly to those community leaders in the church, the trade unions, the schools and universities, who can help to effect a change of policy.

The issue of Vietnam must be brought into the coming political debate. Barry Goldwater is entirely correct in saying that this is a campaign issue—but it must be made an issue quite different from the one he intends. Every congressional candidate must be confronted with it and support should be rallied behind those who, like Senator Wayne Morse, have spoken out uncompromisingly for an immediate end to U.S. intervention in South Vietnam.

The peace movement must show greater vigor on this issue than it has in the past. All peace and liberal organizations should be encouraged to speak out, now, for the immediate end of the war. In our approach to the public and to opinion leaders it is not enough to express our sense of moral outrage. We must also communicate the utter folly of U.S. policy in southeast Asia in political and military terms. If we fail to do so—vigorously, now, everywhere—then we shall continue to drift toward a general war in Asia.

Passaic, N.J.,
September 6, 1964.

Dear Senator: Today I got final proof that the fourth estate is a party girl and should be running around a pool, instead of filling us with the quarter truths they do; as when they report what you say. I am sorry you won't be able to stack me up with your VIP mail because I am not a professor.

You were splendid on "Youth Wants To Know" and I got your message, as they did. You could see them percolating with the truth you speak and I think you should talk more to young people. The fact that I understood you so pellucidly means I must be in my second childhood. But I understood you when you were in Passaic almost 20 years ago, I guess, at a United Jewish Appeal dinner and I sent up a note asking would you please run for President and you said, Oh, no, not I. It's around here someplace but it would take all day to find it, as I put away the things I treasure very carefully.

It may have been at the time of pinhead's first run, that grinning vacuum who now makes Humphrey seem unconscionably wordy, for surely the general was the most inarticulate President we ever had.

I was right, though. You should have run for President and we would not have had Foster's brinkmanship and 8 long years of Eisenhower's golf and Mamie's trip to the beauty parlor. The world hates an I-told-you-soer, but I did tell you and I think I was pretty smart. But you would have none of it. What a campaigner you would have made. That year is gone and there is no use thinking on it. Take care of yourself, we need you; and don't let the reporters malign you with half quotes. Bye.

Yours,

Celia Salkin.

P.S.—I am not disagreeing with you but as a member of the youth panel did not bring it up, didn't the U.N. ask North Vietnam to discuss the mess there and didn't they agree, if they would be addressed as the Democratic Republic of North Vietnam? Didn't South Vietnam then want to be addressed as the Republic of South Vietnam or else neither would come to discuss Malaysia? This is Gilbert and Sullivan stuff to me and proves again that Peiping should be in the U.N., no matter what we think of the regime. How can you call anyone to book who isn't in the book?

I have written many times to the local paper (an offshoot of the Chicagon Sun, politically) and have been called a Communist because I thought Red China, not Chiang, should be in the U.N. Why is the U.N. so leaden in its worship of protocol and why does it walk as if only eggs are underfoot and none must be cracked? When Makarios, whose only claim to religion is the beard, asked Nasser for support and then Nasser announces that there should be no interference in the internal affairs of nation by nation, why didn't the U.N. blast him with a simple question like, What are you doing, then, in the Cyprus dispute? No striped pants, no rap of the gavel, no international channeling. Just the question. The U.N. is smothered in polite windbagging. U Thant seems all right, but there was only one Trygve Lie. There should be a U.N. spokesman who is empowered to speak up loudly, and fast, in certain situations.

That's a postscript. But I can't stand the sight of wasted paper. Do take care of yourself.

August 17, 1964.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator: May I have a copy of your August 5 speech on the resolution with regard to military action in Vietnam. I thank you in advance.

Yours truly,

Nathan Newman.

Jackson Heights, N.Y.

P.S Take continued courage to speak the truth openly.

New York, N.Y.,
August 14, 1964.

Dear Senator Morse: Thank you for sending your message last Thursday (Aug. 6), to those of us gathered in Washington Square to commemorate the atomic bombing of Hiroshima and to plea for an end to the war in Vietnam. It is good to know that there is at least one person in the Senate who feels as we do. I hope it is comforting for you in your lonely stand to know that there are those of us who support your stand.

If it would not be to presumptuous of me I would like to ask if you could send me a brief list of good material on Vietnam. I am afraid most of my knowledge on the subject comes from newspapers and liberal publication and I wholly trust the objectivity of neither. I am interested in both the background and the present situation. Thank you for whatever you can do.

Sincerely yours,

ANTHONY BARRON.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.,
August 10, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We wish to express our deep appreciation for the courageous stand you took regarding the Vietnam crisis. We only wish that there were more responsible men like you in our Senate to represent us.

As long as we have a few men like you, who have the courage to speak the truth, we can still have hope for the future of our country.

We would appreciate it, if we could receive any newsletters which might be issued from your office.

With much admiration,

JOSEPH and MARY RUSSO.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
August 12, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SIR: Please accept this letter as a vote of confidence in the brave stand which you have been taking against our policy in southeast Asia. In a time when the use of simple answers to complex international problems and in an era when the greatest country on earth feels compelled to resort to force and violence rather than reason and the following of international law to inflict its will upon the weak and undeveloped nations of the world, it is encouraging to see on the floor of the Senate a man strong enough to speak the truth no matter how unpopular the truth may be. And I am also extremely disappointed to learn that other men in Congress who surely are intelligent and informed enough to know better have, for the sake of political expedience, gone along with the resolution to support the President in his present agggressive and unlawful course of action in Vietnam.

Since a great deal of the factual material which you have presented in the Senate has not been reported in the press, I as well as, I believe, the great majority of the population have been remaining in ignorance of much vital information on our involvment in Vietnam. If you have on hand any such information I would appreciate receiving it.

Sincerely,

DONALD R. WASKEY.

RHINEBECK, N.Y.,
August 15, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Three cheers for your opposition to the rubberstamp resolution giving a blank check to the administration to do what it likes in southeast Asia. Any day now I expect to hear that an electronic device has been installed in Congress so that our elected representatives won't have to bother to appear in person meekly to vote "yea" on another involving a military action. Your opposition and that of Senator GRUENING to this whole insane Vietnamese muddle is one of the bright spots in the picture.

The news media, at least 99 percent devoted to brainwashing the public with whatever the official Government stand is on any issue, has, of course, not published your speech in opposition. In only one paper, the National Guardian, was I able to read much of what you said. That is a pity, for the excerpts given there should make even the most conformist American sheep sit up and think there is more than one viewpoint on this vital issue.

I was one of those persons participating in the silent vigil held in Times Square commemorating the bombing of Hiroshima and held a placard demanding peace in Vietnam. I also attended the rally following the end of the vigil, at which well-known members of various peace groups spoke, among them I. F. Stone, Norman Thomas, a Japanese survivor of the bombing, who had been a child at the time, and reported that people are still dying today as a result of that bomb which is as a ping pong ball compared in size to a basketball as to its destructiveness. The H-bombs which we have stockpiled today are enough to eliminate all life on earth many times over.

Bayard Rustin made what seemed to me the most effective point of the evening when he said that what we should do instead of sending our troops to Vietnam to establish democracy there was to pull them out and try establishing it in Mississippi. I heartily second the motion.

May I have, if possible, a copy of your speech to put in the Peace Center that Dutches County Women for Peace operate in the city of Poughkeepsie? On second thought, if you can spare them, I'd like to send five other copies to my relatives in Kansas and Texas. They need them.

Thank you for everything. I wish you were my Senator so I could vote for you. Keep up the good work.

With gratitude and best wishes,

Mrs. HELEN ROHR.

CHICAGO, ILL.,
August 14, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate Offices,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We wish to commend you for your courage in speaking out against the military actions of our Government in South Vietnam. Both of us have been active in COPE and are very interested in obtaining copies of your pertinent remarks on foreign policy, particularly those dealing with the situation in Vietnam and on foreign aid.

Since the press coverage of your remarks has been scanty, would you be so kind as to send us this material at your earliest convenience.

Thank you.

Yours very truly,

Mr. and Mrs. ELMER JOHNSON.

LOS ALTOS, CALIF.,
August 11, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am unaccustomed to letter writing, but the nature of the times and your superb performance in the Senate recently in regard to our foreign policy in general and our unjustified, illegal position in South Vietnam in particular, have moved me into action. I wholeheartedly support the courageous stand you have taken to use the Senate as a sounding board to alert the people to the fact that there is another side to the Vietnam story which is not being presented to us in the mass news media. I hope that your pleas for logic and reasoning in this situation do not fall on deaf ears. This country's future as the land of the free may well depend on a few voices such as yours which can alert the press to its responsibility to get all the viewpoints presented to the people, whether these viewpoints are to our liking or not. If there is no public response to your efforts then these are indeed foreboding times.

Your position regarding our foreign aid commitments is also commendable. Foreign aid to the needy and specific projects benefiting the common people of a country is one thing and should be continued, but foreign aid to support corruption, dictatorship, and enslavement is quite another and needs to be stopped.

If copies of your recent speeches on these subjects are available, I would like to get them.

Your truly,

EARL C. WATSON.

BERKELEY, CALIF.,
August 12, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: This is to express admiration for your stand on Vietnam, as glimpsed briefly on CBS television. We would greatly appreciate copies of your Senate speeches on the matter.

Yours respectfully,

ESTELLE BAER.
R. M. BAER.

STEWARTVILLE, MINN.,
August 13, 1964.

Mr. WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SENATOR: We noticed you were cutoff of "N.B.C. News" during the giving of your statement to reporters on the affairs in the Gulf of Tonkin.

Would you send us a copy of that statement in full? We would like to have it for a Farmers Union meeting August 20. We are not at all satisfied with the news as given out on this matter. There seems to be something that is not being told, perhaps you can tell us what it is.

Perhaps history will record that this Congress had two statesmen and a few hundred that were something else. Your courage was noble.

Yours sincerely,

STUART AYSHFORD.

JUNE 16, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I would very much like to receive a copy of your speech on Vietnam.

Also, if you still have any copies of your speeches on "Communication Satellite" episode—I will appreciate that.

Sincerely,

Mrs. PEGGY KAZARIAN.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.,
August 14, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I read your wonderful speech delivered to the Senate in opposition to the resolution which, in your words, is a predated declaration of war. In its complete honesty and concern for the fate of this world, it is a most moving and valuable document. It was not published in its entirety, and I should very much appreciate receiving a copy of it. I wish to circulate it among my friends.

What a tragedy for our country and for the world that only two voices were raised in behalf of sanity. The remaining Members of Congress either could not or would not recognize the danger that confronts us.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. IDA G. KLINGSBERG.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
August 7, 1964.

President LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR PRESIDENT JOHNSON: I do not support our aggressive policy in Vietnam. Rather, I support Senator WAYNE MORSE who so eloquently and courageously stated that he would not support our predated declaration of war in southeast Asia.

As Senator MORSE has indicated, the United States has been making covert war in southeast Asia for some time now. He is correct when he states that the recent events in Vietnam are as much the doing of the United States as the doing of North Vietnam.

The primary issue in southeast Asia, that of peace, will not be solved by the type of aggression in which we are now engaged. Rather, peace will only be brought about by taking the issues to the United Nations.

I wholeheartedly support Senator Morse in his brave, fearless, and forthright decision. It is a pity that our Nation does not have more statesmen of his integrity and foresight, for it is the lack of such qualities which will lead us to war.

I hope that you will exhibit these qualities in your choice of alternative solutions to that which can only lead to destruction. The decision, and the qualities which it takes to make it, will come from you.

Therefore, we look forward to a decision which is consistent with the realities Senator Morse has presented.

Very sincerely yours,

Douglas E. Ferguson.

August 8, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: Congratulations for your forthright and courageous stand on the Vietnam war.

I would be grateful if you could send a full copy of your speech, because, as you must know, the newspapers are giving your stand very little coverage. I am sure you also realize that there are many people who are heartened by your stand but who find no way of expressing their feelings, and I hope you will be able to continue to speak out on this issue, and to find additional support among your congressional colleagues.

Sincerely yours,

Carl Moos.

P.S.—We've wired Keating and Javits, and urged others to do likewise, but I doubt if there is much hope of support for you from that quarter.

Newark, N.J.,
August 25, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: Thank you for the courageous speech that you delivered in the Senate recently against the ridiculous attitude of our American Government in continuing hostilities in South Vietnam.

Good health and continued strength to you in your lonely position in the U.S. Senate. We would hope that in time you will be joined by others who will recognize the decency in our avoiding such unnecessary expenditure of money and life.

Very truly yours,

Seymour Charles, M.D.

San Bernardino City Schools,
San Bernardino, Calif., August 25, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse.

Dear Sir: May a teacher in a faraway town express personal appreciation for your stand in trying to reduce the method of war in resolving problems. Your wonderful, yet unpopular, insight on our problems in Vietnam place you way above political advantages.

I worry often why we are so eager to use the same methods to achieve our goals which we have so vehemently condemned when they are used by our adversaries.

I believe you might agree with Thomas Paine when he wrote, "That there are men in all countries who get their living by war, and by keeping up the quarrels of nations, is as shocking as it is true; but when those who are concerned in the government of a country make it their study to sow discord, and cultivate prejudices between nations, it becomes the more unpardonable."

The best of luck to you and your views. My choice for President—Senator Wayne Morse.

Respectfully,

John Ragsdale.

Dublin, Calif.,
August 12, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: I heard from a radio newscast last week that you accused the United States of being the provacateurs of the North Vietnam gunboat attack. Also the newscast stated that you said that we the United States have been breaking the U.N. charter in respect to the Vietnam crisis. Due to the fact that our local newspaper (San Francisco Chronicle) failed to mention your above statements, will you please elaborate further?

Yours truly,

Loren D. Ward.

August 14, 1964.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: I should greatly appreciate having copies of your remarks of August 5 regarding the situation, and our involvements, in Vietnam, of which I have seen brief excerpts.

My wife and I agree with you that our present course enhances the danger of nuclear war, and that the resolution of the military part of the conflict, at least, must be accomplished through the United Nations.

With sincerest best wishes.

Very truly yours,

Sam Zaslavsky.

New York, N.Y.

August 13, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: Our Chicago South Side Branch, Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, wishes to commend you for your courageous stand and vote against the resolution empowering President Johnson to take any military action he deems advisable in southeast Asia.

We would appreciate receiving a copy of your remarks in the debate on this question.

Enclosed is a copy of a recently passed resolution of our branch, for your information.

Sincerely yours,

Lois Romero.

Chicago, Ill.

Pasadena, Calif.,
August 11, 1964.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: It is a great satisfaction to me that you are a Member of the Senate with courage to speak out against the war in South Vietnam and to voice opposition to whatever you feel isn't right.

I'm sure you are not against all foreign aid, but only against its wrong place or use.

I have written the President and our Senators from California to have a negotiated settlement of the war in South Vietnam, and to the Pasadena newspaper (Independent-Star-News) which printed it in "The Forum."

I wish I could vote for you.

Sincerely yours,

(Mrs. J. F.) Margaret C. Joyce.

August 20, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: I want to congratulate you and Senator Gruening for your most courageous criticism of the U.S. bombing of the North Vietnamese bases, and I agree with you completely.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Freda Priwer.

Dear Senator Morse: I give my full support on your views on the southeast Asian crisis. Also I hope that in the long run your views will prove to be predominant.

Sincerely,

Susan Alpert.

Dear Senator Morse: I would like you to know that I am in support of your views regarding the southeast Asian crisis.

Yours truly,

Ronald J. Putirka.

Dear Senator Morse: I am glad to hear you are one of the few not in favor of the President's aggressive action in Vietnam. Also that you feel that a more peaceful way can be found to settle differences.

Sincerely,

Joyce Zack.

El Paso, Tex.,
August 9, 1964.

Sen. Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: I would appreciate a copy of your recent comments regarding Vietnam.

Yours truly,

(Miss) Nathalie Gross.

San Diego, Calif.,
August 8, 1964.

My Dear Senator Morse: It has been unbelievable that such venomous criticism should be thrown your way because you had the courage to vote against giving the President full war power to carry out our "advisory" capacity in the Vietnam affair. The attached clip is all that was reported on your stand—I am hoping your speech has been reprinted so that I may receive a copy to read in its entirety. Believe me, as a complete nonconforming independent, I have not agreed with you often, but in this count me on your side.

We have paid a disproportionate share in keeping the U.N. alive—but we are afraid to use it, and with good cause. But in this instance, when we carry a chip on our shoulder 10,000 miles from our shores, and start bellicose noises when confronted by someone willing to try to knock it off—it is time we sat back and took a long serious look at our stance. For once let the U.N. make a decision—and let us get out of where we are not getting results. We cannot afford the loss of face again we got in Korea. The U.N. would let us withdraw without losing the little prestige we have left in Asia. Does Johnson really believe we can take on all of Asia? Who over there would stand with us?

I agree with Goldwater in being firm—when the integrity of the country is involved; but this is simply "involvement" with neither victory nor peace to be hoped for.

Sincerely,

Herslea C. Conway.

Fort Bragg, N.C.,
August 7, 1964.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senator of the United States,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: I was very interested in the Greensboro Record's report of August 6 on your remarks regarding the joint, bipartisan resolution supporting President Johnson's retaliatory attack on North Vietnam. According to the article, you felt you could not support the resolution as a "predated declaration of war" and also stated that the U.S. Navy had escorted South Vietnamese naval attacks on North Vietnam, at a date prior to the incidents this week.

Although I am not one of your constituents, I would greatly appreciate it if you could send me a full text of your comments on the above matter, and any other comments that you have made on recent foreign policy, both in Vietnam and elsewhere.

After careful reflection, I cannot help but feel that there is a slight odor emanating from the administration's handling of the naval incidents of this week.

Yours truly,

MELVIN ROSENBERG.

P.S.—I am a registered Democrat.

NORTH HOLLYWOOD, CALIF.,
August 21, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We wish to to commend you again for your positive position on South Vietnam and on U.S. foreign policy in general, as expressed in your statements supporting your recommendations to cut U.S. foreign aid programs. It is our opinion that your voice is one of the all to few sane, progressive, and independent ones in our National Government today. It is also our opinion that our domestic policy is tied inseparably to our foreign policy. The present course of these foreign policies cannot help but lead to internal repression under the guise of the need for national unity in support of a bellicose foreign policy.

It is clear that today "national unity" is the objective of both national parties since there is not the slightest difference in their foreign policies: witness President Johnson's attack on South Vietnam a la Senator GOLDWATER. We believe that this "national unity" is most dramatically expressed internally by the agreement of the candidates not to discuss civil rights as a campaign issue. This agreement is essentially repressive.

In short, we feel that the American people are not being offered a significant choice in the forthcoming election. It is in this connection that we are writing to you. We want to suggest that you become a write-in candidate for the office of President of the United States.

It may be presumptuous on our part to suggest that you become a candidate for the Presidency; but this is a critical time in the history of our country, and indeed, in the history of the world. We sincerely believe that on the American scene today you are the most capable leader, the one most able to rally our people around a courageously peaceful foreign policy, and progressive domestic policies worthy of an open and free society.

We recognize that it would be the height of political naivete to expect that under the present circumstances and at this late date such a campaign as herein suggested could result in your victory for the Presidency. But we do know that your candidacy would give the people of our country a positive choice: a choice which tens of thousands would make, and a choice the importance of which could not be ignored by whomever attains the Presidency in 1964.

With some realization of the personal and political perils which you would face, but with a knowledge of our Nation's perils, we urge that you become a write-in candidate for the President of the United States.

We do not have the political power or knowledge to put such a program into effect. But we are confident that if you choose to become a candidate the means are available to you, that you have the knowledge, and that you will be able to secure thousands of willing and able workers.

With sincerest best wishes we are

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS JACOBS.
DEBBY JACOBS.

SAN DIEGO, CALIF.,
August 15, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: On behalf of the board of directors of the San Diego Peace Information Center may I congratulate you on your critical statements of our Government's policies in Vietnam? Yours is truly a "voice in the wilderness" that we hope can be echoed and reechoed throughout our country in order that our lives and liberty may prevail.

San Diego, with its single, very conservative newspaper and pitiably naive citizenry, is especially in need of having the facts brought squarely before it. We in the peace center have tried to urge San Diegans to call for an end to the unilateral action our Government has been taking in Vietnam. Our success has, of course, been more than extremely limited because of our very small resources. For this reason it has occurred to us that we might write you on the sheer chance that you might consider coming to San Diego to give San Diegans the benefit of your own great personal conviction in this very serious time. Naturally, because our own resources are so limited, we would have to call on others in the community to share the responsibility of your coming. Before doing so, however, we need to know if it would actually be possible for you to come here and how much money you would expect to receive for your visit.

If such a visit is not possible at this time, you may be assured that we will continue to do whatever we can to urge San Diegans to heed your words and follow through by communicating with President Johnson and Members of Congress. Perhaps our small effort will help insure that sanity will prevail before it is too late.

In closing may I say, for myself and my friends in the peace center, thank you, sir, for speaking out as few American statesmen have, but as every American should.

Very sincerely yours,

MRS. JEAN SWERDLOW.

JACKSONVILLE, FLA.,
August 14, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR: You made some statements before the Senate about the U.S. policy in Vietnam.

Also you voted against the resolution backing the raid of U.S. planes on Communist PT boats.

The paper quoted you as saying that you advised some time ago that our policy in Vietnam could only lead to a shooting war.

What is so outstanding about the news of what's going on in Asia is the "lack of news as to what is going on there" as presented to the American public.

Would you please elaborate for me on what's wrong with our Far Eastern policy and what should our policy be. I would consider any information on the subject a great favor. Since I could better fulfill my duties as a civic-minded citizen in helping to keep others informed so that they too can more intelligently perform their duties as American citizens.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN WINGATE.

AUGUST 13, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Few newspapers in the country mentioned your vote against Johnson's Vietnam resolution, or that of Senator GRUENING, fewer printed even a line or so of your honest and brave speech. Once again, a press biased and manipulated has seen fit—and effectively—to censor the dissenting view. I offer you my sincere congratulations.

Is there any difference between Johnson and GOLDWATER now?

Would you be so kind as to send me a complete copy of your speech?

Thank you.

Sincerely,

MIKE DISEND.

NEWARK, N.J.

AUGUST 13, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have recently been told that you have made a series of excellent speeches in the Senate on the subject of Vietnam in its relationship to U.S. foreign policy.

If it is possible, I would greatly appreciate receiving copies of these speeches. Thank you.

Sincerely,

MRS. DONALD E. OMAN.

MILL VALLEY, CALIF.

PAWTUCKET, R.I.,
August 12, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I was much interested in reading your speech to the Senate last Friday on the South Vietnam situation, but have been unable to find a transcript or even a summary in the Providence or New York papers. If it is convenient, could you arrange, please, to send me one or two copies of your remarks.

I am anxious to read what I know will be your own independent opinion on this involved situation.

Not all the press are uncritical. Here are two current editorials from the Providence Journal on the recent Tonkin incidents.

Although the only time I have had the privilege of meeting you personally was at a meeting some years ago in the Narragansett Hotel, Providence, sponsored by the Rhode Island, AFL-CIO, I have tried to follow your important statements closely.

My best wishes for your good health and continued independence of spirit and expression.

Sincerely,

IRVING JAY FAIN.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
August 12, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have heard of the speech you delivered recently in the Senate regarding our position in Vietnam and southeast Asia in general, and I would very much appreciate obtaining a complete text of it.

In the past, I have requested information on southeast Asia from Senator THOMAS KUCHEL, the Senator of my State. Allow me to say that I have the greatest respect and admiration for Senator KUCHEL and do not intend this as a criticism in any way. But, the information I received was official releases from "the Foreign Policy Department," "the Department of Defense," etc. Needless to say, these official releases were not overly informative, and do not support the general position of your speech, as I understand it. If there is another or additional material available, I have not the words to express how very much I would appreciate receiving it. Could you tell me upon what information you have drawn your conclusions?

What I have heard of your opinions regarding foreign aid, I most heartily endorse. Again, I would appreciate any information in this area as well.

Thank you very much for your time and attention.

Sincerely,

Ruth Hefner.

P.S.—What happens to obsolete atom bombs?

August 31, 1964.

Dear Senator Morse: We are fortunate to have a man like you in the Senate, who understands what our Government is doing in Vietnam and has the moral courage to stand up and let the world know how you feel about it and what it may lead to.

I feel like you do, that we have no business there, and that we should get out. I am including a letter I wrote to the Chicago papers a few days ago. I would like to get a copy of your Senate speech of August 5, 1964. Would you please send me a copy.

Thank you.

Edwin Johnson.

Waban, Mass.,
August 6, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: I appreciate your calling to the attention of the people of the United States the dangerous nature of the recent action of the United States in North Vietnam. I support you in your stand as reported in the Daily Press. More power to you for your courage and sobriety.

I would appreciate receiving a copy of the speech which you delivered before the Senate on August 5.

Very truly yours,

Jerome Grossman.

Santa Barbara, Calif.,
August 7, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: Congratulations on your position on U.S. policy in Vietnam and particularly on your outspoken opposition to the congressional resolution backing and encouraging the White House in its latest military adventure there.

I would be grateful if you would provide me with copies of the Congressional Record which include your statements this week on the new Vietnam crisis.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Robert H. Sollen.

Binghamton, N.Y.,
August 7, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
State of Oregon,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: I am writing to thank you for your vote in the Senate yesterday. I have watched with great admiration your fight to expose the truth about the United States and its relations with South Vietnam. The press bombards us with statements about "all America uniting behind our policy in southeast Asia" constantly. Yours is one of the few sane voices in the Government today.

I would appreciate it if you would send me your more recent speeches on this issue.

Sincerely,

David J. Martin.

August 9, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: I read small excerpts from your address to the Senate regarding the U.S. position in Vietnam. I am greatly interested to learn more about the reasoning of those who oppose our continued intervention in Vietnam.

It seems to me shameful that the press did not give your speech adequate coverage: right or wrong, your views are deserving of consideration by the people through newspaper coverage.

I would be most grateful if you would send me a copy of the Congressional Record reprint of your address on our position in Vietnam, and any further information you may have available that would elaborate on your stand on this matter.

Very respectfully,

Emanuel H. Rosen.

Silver Spring, Md.,
August 7, 1964.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: I think your vote today on the Vietnam resolution was legally and morally correct. I am very discouraged at the way things are going in southeast Asia, but at least it is good that you and Senator Gruening see the issue clearly and are pointing out the course that we should follow. Congratulations. I would appreciate it very much if you would send me a copy of your speech in the Senate today.

Sincerely,

James H. Inglis.

Los Angeles, Calif.,
August 7, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: This letter is written in support of your position concerning U.S. involvement in Vietnam. I want to extend to you my respect and admiration for your extraordinarily forthright and courageous statements on our position in this southeast Asian crisis.

I definitely agree with you that the recent incidents are as much the doing of the United States as the doing of North Vietnam. Indeed, as you point out, the United States has been making covert war in southeast Asia for some time now. I wholeheartedly support you in your brave and fearless decision not to support our predated declaration of war in that part of the world. It is truly a pity that our Nation does not have more statesmen of your integrity.

The primary issue in southeast Asia, that of peace, will not be solved by acts of aggression. Rather, peace will only be brought about, as you have said, by taking the issues involved in the present crisis to the United Nations or some other international body.

I would appreciate copies of your statements made in the Senate on the recent troubles in Vietnam. And, again, my support and respect are extended to you.

Very sincerely yours,

Douglas E. Ferguson.

New York, N.Y.,
August 7, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: I was favorably impressed with the remarks you made on the Senate floor on Wednesday, August 6. I have heard similar statements made concerning our involvement in the Vietnam war but I do not fully understand the allegation in regard to our violation of the Geneva agreements of 1954.

Because of my interest in this situation and what I feel to be the need for reflection and hard thinking, I request some further information in amplification of your reported remarks. I am especially interested in the alleged violations by the United States of the Geneva agreements and also in the apparent fabrication by the Departments of Defense and State of the facts surrounding the encounter with North Vietnam forces.

I'd like to close by stating my admiration for your willingness to dissent in a time when little such thinking is going on and the "unity" theme seems to be covering up any dialogue on this topic.

Thank you for your prompt attention to this request.

Very truly yours,

Joseph S. August.

Penfield, N.Y.,
August 6, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: I would like to have all reprints of speeches you may have regarding your current views on the Vietnam situation.

On request I received a copy of the May 27, 1964, Congressional Record containing one of your speeches with the script of your "Meet the Press" interview in the Appendix.

Please send any more similar material you have. I am much in support of your views.

Sincerely yours,

W. Eugene Notz, M.D.

Corvallis, Oreg.,
August 17, 1964.

The Honorable Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Wayne: This is merely a note to let you know I support you completely in your stand in the Far East. Your position is exactly correct in our stand that this is properly a United Nations problem first and a SEATO action second. We act as if we must rush in as a nation.

In my estimation you have a lot of silent support among parents of our young people.

You may be assured of my continued support. I had another meeting which I could not evade the night you talked in Corvallis, so had to miss saying, "Hello."

Sincerely,

Maurice L. Bullard,
Director of Guidance.

Cambridge, Mass.,
August 6, 1964.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: I have followed with interest your dissent to U.S. policy in southeast Asia, or rather as much of it as has been available in the press. I would appreciate receiving a fuller account of your views, as well as some of the factual material on which you base them.

Thank you,

Sincerely yours,

David Ziegler,
Teaching Fellow in Government,
Harvard University.

Dear Senator: I am very confused as to the facts about our role in southeast Asia. Can we win in Vietnam and should we try? Are we really blameless and innocent of all charges of aggression? Do we have any control over the Government of South Vietnam? Do all our advisers simply advise? We support the U.N. but have only gone to that body in the present crisis, I believe. Why?

Would you please write and tell me of your beliefs concerning my questions and tell me what you believe should be done. Could you please also explain your views as expressed in the enclosed clipping.

I admire the intelligence of your argument. I also deeply admire your courage in dissenting. Please continue your fight for what you believe in. Thank you.

Yours truly,

WILLIAM DEAN, Jr.

"MORSE immediately launched into his criticism in which he said the incident that inspired the resolution was 'as much the doing of the United States as it is the doing of North Vietnam.' Among other things, he charged that a forerunner to the attacks was a bombardment by South Vietnamese naval vessels of 'two North Vietnamese islands within 3 to 5 or 6 miles of the main coast of North Vietnam.' He said the implications were that the U.S. Navy stood guard during this attack."

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
August 8, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I have always considered you one of the great recondite Members of the Senate. Your able opposition to the Johnson resolution is noteworthy for an impartial study of the Vietnam crisis.

In order that I may be fully informed, kindly mail to me copies of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD wherein your speeches are contained; and detailed information of your opposition for historical material.

Thank you kindly for your information.

Very truly yours,

CLIFFORD MORGAN.

PITTSFIELD, MASS.,
August 8, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: It is extremely heartening to read of your efforts in the Senate to present a rational point of view in the present crisis. May I also endorse your action in voting against the recent bipartisan resolution concerning southeast Asia.

Information seems to be one of the major problems in evaluating the present situation. If there are any printed copies available of speeches that you have given in the Senate on the subject of Vietnam, I should like to get them.

Respectfully,

ALBERT ROWE.

AUGUST 8, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: You are to be commended for your courageous opposition to the Vietnam resolution and expressing the truth.

More power to you.

SCHRIVER.

P.S.—Please send me copies (10, if possible) of your magnificent Senate speech against the resolution for distribution to friends.

Thank you.

AUGUST 19, 1964.

Senator W. MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I have read your complete statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that followed the joint resolution to give the President power in the Vietnam war. I am shocked that only you, apparently, stood against this resolution. I agree in particular with you on the following: we have no business upholding General Khanh; the struggle cannot be settled by war; we should turn to the United Nations; and we should begin immediately to live up to our obligations as a member of the United Nations.

It is a tragic mistake that much information contained in your speech never reaches the daily paper. Although I would prefer President Johnson over the present Republican nominee for President, I cannot understand the President's actions nor his words. When he speaks of going to war to preserve the peace, I shudder. But I shudder more when I hear Mr. GOLDWATER wanting to atom-bomb the "trees" in North Vietnam.

A little over 100 years ago, Mr. Lincoln stood almost alone in the House to challenge the President to prove Mexico provoked the war between the United States and Mexico, and to call on Congress to reassert their prerogative to declare war that had been usurped by the President. We have changed but little, have we not? I sincerely hope that you are successful in shocking some of your colleagues into using their good senses, and that the President of the United States is influenced by your very excellent advice.

Sincerely,

E. L. ARMSTRONG.

AUGUST 6, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We wish to express our gratitude for your courageous stand these last few months on the war in Vietnam and particularly your statement in the Senate yesterday. The bland assumption of "responsibility" by our Government, together with such reckless acts, much indeed be opposed and we applaud you and support you for doing so.

Would you be good enough to send us the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD containing the full text of your remarks?

Sincerely yours,

Dr. and Mrs. A. FREEDMAN.

AUGUST 14, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR: Your stand on the Vietnam issue interests me as a high school teacher of American history. Would you please send me some of the facts upon which you based your position? I have long been an admirer of your liberal, independent positions. Thank you.

Sincerely,

JOSEPH A. BOCCHINO.

YONKERS, N.Y.

JAMAICA, N.Y.,
August 28, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: For quite some time I have supported your actions, with regard to U.S. foreign policy in South Vietnam. It is unfortunate that there are only a few people like you who show such a keen understanding of the situation there. I hope that you will continue your opposition to the present disastrous American policy. I beg you to continue your, almost single handed, fight for a realistic foreign policy. I beg you to continue your voice of sanity amidst a chaotic opposition. Your voice must be heard, for you are perhaps the best hope for a realistic American foreign policy.

I would now ask of you a favor. Could I please, if it is not too much trouble, have some copies of the statements you have made on our policy in southeast Asia? I would deeply appreciate this. Thank you very much, and may God bless you.

Sincerely yours,

ALVIN VERTER.

HAP MUSIC, INC.,
New York, N.Y., August 27, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: May I express to you and Senator GRUENING my profound appreciation for your courageous stand against escalation (for political purposes preponderantly) in Vietnam and the rest of that area.

Also the thanks of many of us in the front line of our protest August 25 in front of the Convention Hall at Atlantic City. The fact that you veered left and walked past us, then veered right to enter the hall, was a silent gesture of support which enabled us to smile inwardly at the usual flurry of name calling that came our way. And it meant that you appreciate the basic issues involved in this flagrant policy supporting a series of dictators. Only this morning South Vietnam police "carbined" the protesting youth of Vietnam killing two.

A group of us would appreciate having, if possible, three copies of your analyses of the South Vietnam policy, and also Senator GRUENING'S. It is truly frightening that the press has suppressed almost fully the reality and your comments.

I hope and pray that your antiwar stand and solid logic will find new impetus with Senator HUMPHREY'S nomination and election. If not, hell in that area—and maybe the whole world—is sure to break loose.

Most sincerely yours,

HOWARD PLUMMER.

AUGUST 8, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: My morning newspaper, the San Francisco Chronicle, informs me today that you spoke for an hour and 40 minutes against the congressional joint resolution granting President Lyndon B. Johnson sweeping powers to conduct military operations in the southeast Asia theater, then favors me with but a single sentence which it seems to think gives an adequate summary of your views.

I suspect that you had more to say than the Chronicle reports, or else would have taken less time to say it. If your speech is issued as a reprint, or if not, when it is printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, would you be so good as to send me a copy of it?

And if it is available, I should also like to receive the pamphlet of your statement on H.R. 11380, the Foreign Assistance Act, mentioned in the Nation of August 10, which I also happened to have read today.

I am one of many Americans who have grave doubts and concern about our Government's foreign policy, and I am deeply grateful that there is at least one person like yourself who dares to question and challenge what seems to be a return to the perilous policies of "brinkmanship."

Yours sincerely,

HAROLD ROSSMAN.

FAIRFAX, CALIF.

RALPH J. APPLETON PIANO SERVICE,
August 8, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SIR: If there is going to be a transcript of your speech in the Senate on the Vietnam resolution I would like a copy plus other of your comments on the subject.

Oblige.

R. APPLETON.

SAN ANSELMO, CALIF.,
August 10, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I should greatly appreciate receiving a copy of your address of last week in the Senate concerning the Vietnam crisis.

In my opinion, often stated, we should never have intruded ourselves into this matter, and the sooner we wash our hands of it the better. I agree with you that our country has made a great mistake in becoming involved in a matter of this nature.

Sincerely yours,

EVERETT C. MCKEAGE.

New York,
August 10, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: A portion of your recent speech to Congress was shown on television. However, I note no paper in the New York area had any excerpt or the printing of your entire speech, and this includes the New York Times.

Would it be possible to send me a copy of the two speeches you made to Congress, the first following the President's order of retaliation, and the second before the Congress when it approved or empowered freedom of action to the President?

Very sincerely,
Joseph Strum.

Lausanne, *August 21, 1964.*

Dear Senator Morse: It was with great pleasure to see the Zurcher Woche give prominently your views on Vietnam (clipping enclosed) which should be heard widely. Elsewhere in the newspaper is a story in which it says that China is not anxious to take steps at this time because any American action, including with atom weapons, will turn all of Asia against the United States. I studied also German newspapers and found that there is little belief in the U.S. version of the *Maddox* affair. The *Maddox* was obviously looking for trouble. Also, that little North Vietnam could scare big Uncle Sam doesn't look creditable to Germans. People feel that Khrushchev has been put on the spot. He doesn't want to spoil Johnson's chances for election, yet had promised solidarity in case North Vietnam would be attacked by the United States. Germans are self-conscious when it comes to the discussion of U.S. policies. First they got beaten, then they wanted to build up without becoming involved in militarism, and finally they have to push NATO and join militaristic policies which help the revenge mongers (a very vocal bunch). Mostly, people are afraid that the United States with all its international power politics will involve Europe into a war which will destroy what is left of Germany. Although people are little interested in political communism, despise Ulbricht, and oppose Russia's methods, there is no fear of Russia as there is of U.S. brinkmanship. Khrushchev's desire for peace is considered genuine, and it is often believed that China would like to pursue friendlier tones if it could feel more secure and find better recognition. In any event, there is little understanding why the United States should feel in a defensive position while she is able to build a superior arsenal, send troops and weapons everywhere, bomb other countries, and scare the wits out of any opponent. Your criticism of not using the U.N. to settle conflicts is well taken because it helps to show people of the world that we do have leaders who believe in democratic principles and procedures on an international plane.

We've had a most rewarding trip through parts of Europe thus far and are looking forward to still another 2 weeks in Switzerland, Italy, and Greece before arriving in Israel for the working session. We just saw the spectacular Swiss Exposition in Lausanne at Lake Geneva. Except for a bad mishap in Munich where we suffered losses from a break into our rented car, parked at the U.S. Consulate, we had a good time and saw a lot. German cities were altogether new to us except for some old street names with little to be nostalgic about. There is some good new architecture, and I was glad to see that some of the architectural pioneer work of the twenties and early thirties is still there. We saw also our former house in East Berlin which was my first executed independent design. My reception by the architects of East Berlin was extraordinary and most friendly. There is a great hunger for exchange of news and ideas.

Enclosed is a copy of my interview with a spokesman of West Berlin's Information Center which may interest you. Although there is an intense effort made to stabilize West Berlin's position and nurse hopes for better relations with the East in the future, some of thinking is muddled and some of the conditions seem untenable. Some compromises will have to be found, and every compromise rests on give as well as take. The rigidity may not work to our advantage.

With kind regards, also to Mrs. Morse, from Mrs. W., and

Yours sincerely,
A. A. Waesteter.

Pomona, Calif.,
August 18, 1964.

Senator Thomas Kuchel,
Senator from California,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Kuchel: In all the discouraging news and commentary I have heard in the past few weeks concerning the situation in South Vietnam, the words of one individual alone have struck a note of reason and of possible solution.

Those are the words of Senator Wayne Morse, of Oregon, whose stand that the present position of the United States in South Vietnam is untenable and indefensible seems, to me, to most accurately express my own point of view.

I write to request that you support Senator Morse's stand to the greatest extent possible.

Respectfully yours,
Miss Laura O. Duclos.

North Newton, Kans.,
August 22, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: I am writing you this rather informal note from a vacation cabin in Colorado to thank you for your recent courageous votes and statements on our policy in Vietnam and southeast Asia. Bipartisanship is no guarantee in itself that a policy is feasible or consistent with best long-run interests of the country, let alone morally defensible. I hope that you can continue to furnish us with analyses such as your recent statement in the August 1964 Progressive magazine.

With every good wish.

Sincerely,
J. Lloyd Spaulding.

San Francisco, Calif.,
August 6, 1964.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
U.S. States Senate,
Washington, D.C.

My Dear Senator Morse: Please accept the thanks of at least one citizen for your speech on the floor of the Senate yesterday and your dissenting vote today in committee on the proposed resolution, which expresses support for even more ridiculous actions in southeast Asia on the part of the United States.

As a reporter, I have had occasion to follow with some care the reports of the New York Times and those coming over the Associated Press wire on the situation in southeast Asia. With minor exceptions, I find myself in agreement with the views which you have expressed in your speeches on the floor of the Senate during the last 6 months. I cannot but deplore the scanty attention which those speeches have received in the press, but this coverage has unfortunately been quite consistent with the general press coverage of the southeast Asian situation. You may be interested to know that KPFA in Berkeley, Calif., with which I am connected, has broadcast significant portions of your speeches on this subject. If there are any reprints of those speeches available, I would appreciate receiving copies at the address below.

It is not necessary to be naive concerning the actions of the Communists in southeast Asia to realize that our own actions have contributed as much to the deterioration of the situation there as those of the Communists have. Even from the point of view of Realpolitik, our southeast Asian policy has been dangerously foolish and shortsighted. I hope that you will continue to support a modicum of sanity in that policy.

Yours truly,
Raymond Bridge.

San Francisco, Calif.,
August 6, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator: Bless your heart.

Sincerely,
Duncan and Esther Johnston.

Los Angeles, Calif.,
August 24, 1964.

Dear Senator Morse: First of all I would like to compliment you on your stand on Vietnam. U.S. involvement in that country is totally uncalled for and certainly does not help the cause for peace in the world. Unless this whole administration begins to act with honesty in this and many other situations we now are involved in, we will further endanger the lives of the people of this earth. The least we have is the responsibility to act with that honesty and a compassion for human life.

Would you please be kind enough to send me reprints of your major speeches on Vietnam (and the rest of southeast Asia). I wish to learn more about this situation.

With my best wishes,
Dan Appelman.

San Francisco, Calif.,
August 26, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: I recently read excerpts of the excellent speech you delivered on the situation in Vietnam.

At your convenience, I should very much like to receive a copy of the full text of your speech.

Thank you for the consideration of my request.

Very truly yours,
Miss E. Greenfield.

August 29, 1964.

Dear Senator Morse: I would like to have a copy of the Senate speech in which you attacked the resolution giving President Johnson advance approval of whatever steps he deemed necessary in Vietnam and called it "a predated declaration of war."

The approval of this resolution by the great majority of the Congress only goes to point up the truth in G. B. Shaw's famous aphorism that "Fifty Million Frenchmen Can't Possibly Be Right."

My only regret is that I don't live in Oregon and hence cannot cast my vote for you.

Sincerely,
George A. Tompkins, Jr.

August 14, 1964.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: I want you to know how very much I agree with your stand on Vietnam and your votes on this issue.

I read with great interest your article in the August issue of the Progressive on Vietnam. It is one of the most informative articles I have read. It is to be regretted that every adult in the United States can't read what you have to say. Perhaps there would be more dissent. One wonders what has happened to us. When Mr. Dulles tried to convince the people that we should send troops to help the French, they objected so vigorously that he had to abandon the idea. Now we have so-called advisers (over 15,000 of them) on Vietnam soil, have lost over 200 killed and many wounded, and only a comparatively few raise their voice in protest.

Mr. McNamara says we must protect our vital interests in southeast Asia. He doesn't say what these "vital interests" are 8,000 miles from our shores. It seems to me that Australia, etc., in that area should be more concerned about what really are vital interests, that any communistic takeover would affect them quicker and more drastically (should there be a communist takeover). Yet they are smart enough to keep out of it.

In the last copy of Fellowship (Fellowship of Reconciliation), under "Peace in Southeast Asia in an Election Year?" and what can and should be done, they say: "Testify for a neutralized southeast Asia before the Democratic platform committee. (It is understood the administration would turn to escalation of the war if events got out of hand before election day.)" It is difficult to believe Fellowship would make such a statement without some basis. If it has a basis, it is most depressing. Do you think Mr. Johnson and his advisers would really take such a step?

If available, I would like to have copies of your speeches before the Congress on Vietnam. Also on the foreign aid bill. I think you are in the right here also. Do you favor, in full, the antipoverty bill?

Thanking you in advance, and again assuring you of my support of your stand on Vietnam, I am

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. John T. Scanlan.

Chicago, Ill.,
August 22, 1964.

Chicago Sun-Times,
Chicago, Ill.
Letters to the Editor.

Dear Sir: In perspective our brief war with North Vietnam looks very much like a put-up job, a provocation by our puppet South Vietnam. Consider the following facts: Our Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNamara, at his August 6 news conference confirmed that a large force of South Vietnam armed junks and gunboats were present in the Gulf of Tonkin and "* * * is very active in that area." He also refused "* * * to confirm or deny" that two offshore islands had been shelled 48 hours before the first attack. Then when the PT boats came to investigate what was going on, they ran into our destroyer waiting for them and the fight was on.

If we had let it go at that everybody would have forgotten about it. But someone somewhere thought this is an election year and we got to outdo Goldwater, so another fight had to be staged. North Vietnam admitted the first encounter but has categorically denied the second one and facts seem to back them up. The second encounter was during a dark and stormy night; it started 65 miles out at sea and the two destroyers were headed out of the gulf and into the Pacific Ocean. It would have been the utmost in stupidity for North Vietnam to invite retaliation by attacking our destroyers; far from their own coast and when they were going away and headed out to sea.

This fight lasted from 10:30 p.m. until 1:30 a.m., 3 hours of fighting and not a hit or even a near miss, from an "undetermined number of attackers, which means more than could be counted on the radar screens. Mr. McNamara says North Vietnam has little more than 25 PT boats (Jane's Fighting Ships records only 16) while South Vietnam's Navy, he says has "about 500 junks and some other craft." Our destroyers did not identify the attackers. If they were North Vietnam PT boats they would have had to race home some 150 miles to be there in time for our airplanes to blast them to bits a few hours later.

Does all this sound logical to you? To me it looks very much like a pretended attack by a lot of these South Vietnam junks, to give our side an excuse for a devastating counterblow to appease Mr. Goldwater.

We should ask ourselves if the greatest power in the world can afford to act like a street corner bully that will resort to violence at the drop of a hat? It takes no brains to act like a bully. But it takes brains to act for peace.

I want to end by quoting Senator Wayne Morse, speaking in the Senate on August 5: "For 10 years the United States has violated the Geneva Agreement of 1954." It has "* * * sought to impose a military solution on a political and economic problem. The rule has been that of a provocateur. I have been briefed many times and witness after witness from the State Department and from the Pentagon have admitted under examination that they had no evidence of any foreign troops in South Vietnam; from North Vietnam, Red China, Cambodia, or anywhere else. The only foreign troops there have been * * * Americans."

I hope our Government will take the initiative in calling the original Geneva conferees that negotiated the 1954 Indochina settlement into a new conference to settle the present hassle peacefully before it is too late.

Sincerely,

Edwin Johnson.

Senator Wayne Morse.

Dear Sir: Only you and Senator Gruening had the courage and honesty to vote against the escalation of the war in southeast Asia and the coming holocaust we face if we pursue the tragic course we are taking.

Please keep up your struggle for peace and sanity.

Would you send me 5 copies of your Senate speech opposing the extension of power to the President.

Sincerely,

Tom Siegel.

Paterson, N.J.,
August 6, 1964.

Hon. Wayne B. Morse,
U.S. Senator from Oregon,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: Please accept my support and congratulations for your stand in opposition to our role in southeast Asia and specifically on the latest incidents.

Since the press ignores your speeches and remarks, I am requesting copies of your speeches on June 5 and 6, 1964. Also, if possible, any other copies of previous remarks available. I would like to have them not only for my own personal understanding but also to show them to friends in an effort to muster support for your courageous stand for peace.

Thank you.

Respectfully,

George Sheldrick.

August 16, 1964.

Dear Senator Morse: Apropos our costly involvement in Vietnam, it was you who did "keep your head when all about you were losing theirs." Millions of frightened and anguished Americans feel as you do. More power to you.

Respectfully yours,

Nathan Berman.

Brooklyn, N.Y.,
August 21, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator: I read the speech you made in the Senate on August 5 against our policy in Vietnam. History will prove you and Senator Gruening brave fighters for peace and the policy of no interference in the internal affairs of any state.

Am sure you have the thanks of all peace-loving and fair-minded Americans.

Keep up the good fight.

Yours very truly,

Frances G. Berlin.

Beverly Hills, Calif.,
August 21, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: My husband and I both wish to tell you of our admiration for your courageous stand against the war in Vietnam, and the action in (of) Congress.

We have followed the continuous and prolonged battle you have waged to open the eyes of the American people, and I am sure that many are inspired by your efforts. We hope that you will continue your fine work.

Can you suggest how ordinary citizens can make their attitudes felt most effectively.

We hope to attend the dinner which will be given in your honor here in September.

Sincerely yours,

Evelyn L. Pritcher.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: Your bold and courageous stand in your TV appearance last week, your sincere opinions expressing grave concern over our country's involvement in the South Vietnam war and the warning that this participation may bring about a major war in east Asia, was most heartening and found a deeply felt response in the hearts and minds of the American people. Especially, in the hearts of our mothers, who do not want to see their sons killed in a senseless war in Vietnam.

Senator Ernest Gruening from Alaska was so right when he said, and we quote "all Vietnam is not worth the life of one American."

We, the listeners were most proud of you Senator, as well as of Senator Gruening, and we wish to commend you on your stand in protesting the unjust slaughter of human beings.

Let us hear your voice raised in strong protest, again. You are not alone, in this fight. Thousands of Americans are with you. We hope, that with the help of people like you, peace will be achieved.

Most sincerely yours,

Mrs. J. Dobson.

Sir: I am so in accord with you about this South Vietnam situation. I do not have one drop of Alabama Davis blood to leave in southeast Asia, and the way we are being villified I would not think the country would want it. Why not send these do gooders down there stirring up the Negroes, they want to fight. I have a 22-year-old grandson just made a first lieutenant Army helicopter pilot, slated to go over there. How did we become so well acquainted with those folk anyway that we should fight their battles? I gloried in your vote against it and the raising of your voice, I could bellow and it would do no good.

Sincerely,

Bernice Davis.

Pjai, Calif.,
August 17, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: This letter is to let you know that I support your outspoken stand on the Vietnam issue. I am one of many southern Californians who thinks that the United States should find another means other than subsidizing war to end the fighting and American involvement in southeast Asia.

First we should make fuller use of the United Nations to settle disputes between countries. Secondly we must practice the late President Kennedy's statement, "Let us never negotiate out of fear but let us never fear to negotiate."

Our leaders must come to realize that their efforts must be concentrated on establishing a binding and honorable peace in world. They must stop playing with fire and rattling their swords in this nuclear age because if they don't mankind may perish.

You clearly see the danger we face and if you keep on reminding your colleagues about it enough times I think you will reach many of them. Keep up the good work.

Sincerely,

Ned Moore.

New York, N.Y.,
August 21, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: Ever since I read of it in the newspaper, I have been wanting to congratulate you on your courageous stand on Vietnam. I hope you will continue in this effort.

With my best wishes.

Cordially,

George Braziller.

Tewksbury, Mass.,
August 24, 1964.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Sir: I understand that certain British newspapers and certain elements of the leftwing press in the United States are suggesting that the second incident in the Gulf of Tonkin may have been a fake attack staged by General Khanh's navy to get us to retaliate against North Vietnam. Do you have any information which could either confirm or deny this possibility?

By the way, you are my favorite Senator, keep up the good work.

Sincerely,

John A. Ball.

Chicago, Ill.
August 19, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: Thank you for taking the position you have on the southeast Asia conflict. I read your address to Congress and I support you 100 percent. War is unthinkable and our policy seems to be leading right into it. Please, please keep up the good work. We need some sanity interjected.

Sincerely yours,

Dr. N. Welcher.

Situation Serious

There was no indication of new Communist buildups in the Far East yesterday, but the State Department warned that the situation is "intensely serious."

Department spokesman Robert McCloskey disclosed that South Vietnamese Premier Nguyen Khanh had discussed his general mobilization order with U.S. officials before placing it in effect. Khanh had warned of stepped-up Red attacks on his country and he called the next few weeks decisive.

The major opposition to the congressional resolution backing Mr. Johnson came from Senator Morse.

BLANKET AUTHORITY

The Oregon Democrat charged that the President was asking "blanket authority to wage war."

"No matter who the President is nor how good his intentions, unsanctioned acts of war can lead to all-out nuclear war and the end of this Republic.

"The President does not have the power to make war without a declaration of war by Congress."

Gruening charged that "all of Vietnam was not worth the blood of one American boy."

Brooklyn, N.Y., *August 10, 1964.*

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: Congratulations for your lone stand against the dangerous administration policy in Vietnam. You have my support.

I looked in the New York Times in vain for the text of your speech against the Vietnam resolution. I would appreciate a copy.

Sincerely,

Marion Kronheim.

Ossining, N.Y.,
August 10, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: Congratulations on your forthright and courageous attack on President Johnson's actions in Vietnam, and on our policy there all along.

Is there any chance of getting a text of your address to the Senate, as I missed hearing it and the press almost missed covering it. I consider the poor coverage flagrantly unfair to the lone voice of criticism you so properly raised.

With best wishes for your continuing vigor and wisdom.

Sincerely,

Maisie Foreman.

Berkeley, Calif.,
August 8, 1964.

Sir: You and Senator Gruening are to be commended for your votes against the resolution to sanctify aggression against Vietnam. That war is the act of a greedy bully, and your denunciation of it will read better in history than the bellicose excuses for it.

Unfortunately, the commercial newspapers here are silent on what you have been saying. I may have to subscribe to the Congressional Record.

Sincerely,

Lee Coe.

Redwood City, Calif.,
August 7, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: To date I have been unable to obtain a copy of your address with reference to the Vietnamese situation. I would be most appreciative if your office could send me a copy of this speech. Also any additional references which pertain to this topic which are unlikely to appear in the newspapers would be most appreciated.

Thank you for your consideration.

Yours very truly,

Mrs. Richard J. Burke.

Truro, Mass.,
August 12, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Chambers,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: We wish to thank you and Senator Gruening for the courageous battle that you have been waging against our intervention in the Vietnam situation. Such military policy as our country has been carrying out in Vietnam may very well lead to a nuclear holocaust. We urge you to continue your brilliant and courageous fight against intervention. We are sure that the American people would be completely behind you if they could be apprised of the actual facts.

We would appreciate it if you would kindly send us a copy of your speech in the Senate Chamber. Thank you. We will do all in our power to inform as many people as possible of its contents. Unfortunately the press, television and radio has given your speech poor coverage.

Yours respectfully,

Eugene and Ella Jackson.

Plainfield, N.J.

Dear Senator Morse: During the recent Vietnam crisis the New York Times carried some information concerning your refusal to support President Johnson's request for a congressional resolution about southeast Asia. Since the coverage of your position was poor I wonder if you can send me a copy of a speech you've made on the subject or a reference which will explain your position.

Sincerely yours,

Arthur S. Watnick, Ph. D.

Glendale, Calif.,
August 8, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse.
Representative from Oregon.

Dear Sir: I, and my family, always listen respectfully when you speak, and we have heard you whenever you were on TV. We have come to the conclusion that you are the only honest man in government today, and we want you to know how much we appreciate what you have done and are doing. I consider you a patriot, and this is a word I use thoughtfully and lovingly.

I would like very much to have a copy of your speech before the House against the war in Vietnam. It was the only voice in this country raised for truth and humanity.

The people who turned their backs on you and walked away have walked into the arms of fascism.

If you can advise me on how to secure a copy of your speech to the House, I shall be very grateful, or, if your office could send me a copy I would reimburse them immediately.

Thank you.

Respectfully,

Margaret M. Dornhauser.

P.S.—The particular speech I want is the one against the resolution of the President for carte blanche in North Vietnam.

M.D.

Seattle, Wash.,
August 9, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: Your solitary stand in Congress with Senator Gruening offered a little optimism to the day in seeing that my views on the Vietnam situation are represented in that august institution. My opinions of official U.S. policy in Vietnam are essentially a mirror image of your own; your having the courage to stand up for what you believe to be right has added some steady ground under my own shaky questioning. Though when judging what I know of the problem, gained through the incomplete and insufficiency commentary and published sources, tainted with emotionality, conflicting facts, and nonsense, as they are, one cannot help it but feel pessimistic about the future and impotent to do anything about it.

I first became aware of your stand through a derogatory and superficial editorial in the Seattle Times about a month ago and through William Mandel, a radio commentator. The Seattle Times is best known for its ability to hold those attitudes that are most acceptable, and not for its insight or depth of reporting. In such a capacity they came out with many irresponsible statements, which was of course what they thought to be the proper thing to do.

The opposition you are encountering to your ideas is undoubtedly very intense, but still there are many people who see them as the answer to peace, at least for the immediate future. This group of course comprises a small minority of the population, but you do not stand unsupported.

Here in Seattle a few months ago last spring over 150 students and other interested persons (myself included) staged a demonstration favoring the movement of troops out of Vietnam, at a time when such a move might have been conceivable. The ill-received demonstration consisted of a march of several miles, ending in the center of the business district with a vigil. There was no mention of it in the papers or on the radio.

The similarities between the events so far taken place in Vietnam and those of the incipient stages of other wars in history are a fearful prognostication. It seems strange that 7,000 years of civilization have not taught man that the use of weapons and the waging of war on one's fellow man is not the answer to any problem. Please continue to support a peaceful solution to the Vietnam crisis, either by means of the U.N. or by any other rational means.

Sincerely,

Ronald R. Ringdahl.

(If it is at all possible, could you send me a copy of your speech explaining your position delivered before the Senate on the occasion of congressional support of the President's actions in Vietnam last week?)

Berkeley, Calif.,
August 10, 1964.

Senator Morse: Your principaled stand against the war in Vietnam and any extension of it is an extremely significant event in U.S. history. I urge you to stand firm at all costs.

Please send me copies of your Senate speech of the week of August 3.

Yours truly,

Stephen Saloff.

Power, Mont.,
August 18, 1964.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: We want to thank you and Senator Ernest Gruening for the courageous and honorable stand you took on August 5 on a resolution introduced in the U.S. Senate to grant the President advance approval on all steps he deems necessary in southeast Asia.

The war in southeast Asia (Vietnam) could escalate into a third world war if carried into North Vietnam and this is a very dangerous game we are playing. We ask that the President and the Congress consider the following points for a peaceful solution in southeast Asia:

1. The U.S. Government should be in favor of calling, or rather, reconvening the 1954 Geneva Conference of 14 nations and abiding by their recommendations, or:

2. The U.S. Government should work through the proper agencies of the United Nations to obtain a settlement satisfactory to all parties concerned. The United Nations is the only proper organ through which such controversies should be handled. If a powerful nation like the United States does not respect the United Nations, then we cannot expect smaller nations to respect its decisions and one another.

Sincerely yours,

Mr. and Mrs. Harold Woodhouse,
Mr. and Mrs. Matt Mayer,
Mr. and Mrs. Nilo Antila.

Brooklyn, N.Y.,
August 10, 1964.

Dear Senator Morse: As a veteran of World War II, and as a father, I want to express my gratitude to you for your forthright and courageous voice for peace and against the abuse of Executive power. If only we in New York State had someone of your caliber to run for the Senate.

Please send me a copy of your statement regarding events in Vietnam and the "advance declaration of war."

Sincerely yours,

Sol Gorelick.

Los Angeles, Calif.,
August 9, 1964.

Dear Mr. Senator: Please accept my thanks for your vote against the joint resolution on southeast Asia. The size of the approving majority give reason for much misgiving.

Beginning with our refusal to sign the Geneva Pact of 1954 and ending with our provocative acts in the Bay of Tonkin, our Government's policies in that part of the world could not have been better designed not to win friends and not to secure a peace by compromise.

Twice this year I have written the President on the subject; once, I received a State Department "handout" and the second time my letter was not acknowleged. Early in the year I referred to the danger of actions being prompted by political considerations, a fear which I think was well founded.

I hope you will continue your efforts to introduce a sense of reality into the debates and to remind the Nation of the dangers. The United States' actions in southeast Asia remind me of the young man who is sure he will manage to dominate the marriage which he enters into with an older woman who has already had a half dozen husbands.

Yours sincerely,

S. M. Rabson.

P.S.—May I have a copy of your remarks of August 7.

S. M. R.

Easton, Md.,
September 16, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: I am very pleased indeed that you are promoting a more forward looking approach to problems in Vietnam. Do continue the good work. The following is more or less what I mailed to my Congressman and the Maryland Senators.

1. Apparently South Vietnam is an excellent area for raising food, so we should do all we can to encourage and help the local population to improve their farming in order to increase their production. That might best be done through agencies of the United Nations, such as Food and Agriculture Organization, with all the support they need from the United States, so that people who are now opposed to our being in Vietnam will not have grounds for objecting.

2. Since there is lack of food in North Vietnam, negotiations should be started now for trade between North and South, the southerners sending food north in exchange for products from northern factories. This might discourage the North Vietnamese from feeling that they must have political control of South Vietnam.

3. Eventually South Vietnam might increase its food production sufficiently to trade with hungry people in southern China, Indonesia, India, and elsewhere in order to help stabilize southeast Asia.

4. The longer war is carried on in Vietnam the more chance there is for further involvement of mainland China in that peninsula. Very probably the Vietnamese people, either North or South, do not want control from China, and would be glad to start negotiations toward stopping the fighting.

5. Communists have been offering solutions to problems to Vietnamese people for several years now. We should not be simply anti-Communist, but we should be helping people learn about and practice democracy. This development of democracy may have to be helped by agencies of the United Nations, such as technical assistance.

6. Many other nations that are hesitating to help us in Vietnam today may be glad to join in these projects. In the process of building democracy we may find many Vietnamese people will work with us, who are now fighting against us, since they think we are not now bringing constructive aid to their land. All of this will be difficult, but will be in the right directions, as opposed to continuing the warfare.

I received a reply from Senator Daniel Brewster apparently sympathetic to my ideas.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. Caroline L. Forman.

Chittenden, Vt.,
August 21, 1964.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: Although I am not one of your constituents, I cannot forbear writing a short note congratulating you and, at the same time, expressing my gratitude to you for your strong position over the past months with regard to the Vietnam situation. Especially do I admire your vote against the President's policy pertaining thereto. Courageous men of integrity and uncompromising belief in what we hope is the peaceful democratic ideal are always few and far between; the fact that your vote was one of only two cast in the whole Congress is a measure not only of this fact but also of your integrity in the face of overwhelming odds. I can only say that I wish you were representing my State and, failing that, that there were some way in which I could support you in your continuing fight to maintain the ideals for which our country is supposed to stand in a world growing ever darker under the threat of militarism, war, and nuclear destruction.

Sincerely yours,

Richard A. Clark.

Goleta, Calif.

Dear Senator: My parents have been receiving your "Senator Morse Reports." I would greatly appreciate being added to your mailing list.

I am a student at the University of California, who is greatly aware of his responsibilities in this democratic society of ours. I support your stand on the Vietnam question, because of the possibility of a Goldwater in the Presidency with this great increase in power to wage war.

I would like to commend you for your reports and would greatly appreciate receiving them.

Sincerely,

Pete Relis.

Houston, Minn.,
August 28, 1964.

Mr. Wayne Morse,
Senator,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: Would that words could express the profound respect, admiration, and love we have for you and Senator Gruening, the only two who spoke up against our country's cruel meddling in Asia, all contrary to international law and treaties. Your speech on the Senate floor June 23, 1964, shows the highest courage in voicing opposition to the "powers that be." From now on you can live at peace with your conscience. You have voiced what so many ordinary people think and feel, but lack courage to express for reasons too well understood. But, as you rightly say to the American people, "that a war in Asia will be stopped only if the people of the United States stop it." If the bulk of the populace survive the era of "fear and smear," in time, maybe there will be hope for redemption of our folly and insanity.

All we can say is God bless you and all your kind. May you be sustained throughout your difficult dedicated service—the price is high, as the Linus Paulings, John Haynes Holmes (recently deceased at 85), Norman Thomas, Muste, Martin Luther King, and many others have found but such souls will go down in history as saviors of humanity when the others will be forgotten in ignominy.

We are grateful to you for your noble service to our country.

Very sincely yours,
Mr. and Mrs. John C. Refsland.

Post Office Box 218,
North Sydney, N.S.W., Australia,
August 9.

Dear Senator: Would you be kind enough to mail me copies of your recent statements and speeches on the Vietnam situation? A little in the form of very cut quotes have trickled through a fivefold censorship to appear in the local press. The British Broadcasting Co. has also quoted you at times. Evidently yours is the only sane voice these days to be heard in Washington, D.C. You seem to be surrounded by packs of murderous boobs bent upon war and only too eager to scuttle what remains of constitutional government.

When I left the United States 3 years ago I was distressed at the growing U.S. militarism of the worst junker type. It now alarms me to read of a near military dictatorship in the present concepts of establishing and implementing foreign policy. If this keeps up how long before domestic matters take on the form of a garrison state?

Senator, has it occurred to anyone that the psychological climate in the United States today is very close to that which prevailed in Nazi Germany of about 1939 before the war? Believe me, the image of the United States abroad is now closer to that of a war-mad bully than many of us Americans like to think. It's been a real eyeopener to travel out of our country. And not very pleasant or flattering either. Frankly, I find it more comfortable at times to be mistaken for a Canadian than a bloody Yank and this is one of the most friendly countries to things American. Or once was.

There is something drastically wrong with the United States what with riots and violence at home, gun running to this and that country abroad, military provocations all over the globe, the big lie techniques in much of what comes out of State. The sheer dirtiness of our warmaking in southeast Asia is worthy of anything the Nazis did and hung for. And just how does the United States now wage war of any kind without congressional declaration according to the Constitution? Sounds like our republican form of government is over.

On the basis of those brief news items about your own efforts, let me say that you have our (mine and other Americans here) sincere thanks for your efforts to avert our national suicide. I, for one, hope you succeed and we all convey our best wishes to you.

Sincerely,
L. A. Benedict.

Hayward, Calif.,
August 19, 1964.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Wayne: I have read your speech recently given on the South Vietnam issue.

Yours is a courageous, clear, and telling indictment of the wrong-headed policy now being pursued by this Government.

Thank you for your leadership in the cause of peace.

Last March I was in Washington and called at your office but you were not in.

Keep up the good fight.

Cordially,
Ed.

Venice, Calif.,
August 18, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Foreign Relations Committee,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: "A clear voice in the senatorial wasteland."

We are humbly grateful for your lone clear voice that spoke out against the resolution introduced in the U.S. Senate on August 5, 1964, to grant the President advance approval on all steps he deemed necessary to "repel any attack on U.S. forces in southeast Asia." Many thanks also to Senator Gruening, Democrat, of Alaska, who also voted against the resolution.

Enlightened citizens who understand the dangerous implications of this resolution are saddened along with you, especially so because the press, radio, and T.V. have been practically silent about the issues, so they are ignorant of the threats of war confronting us.

It is clearly evident, as you so wisely state, "that a continuation of the U.S. unilateral military action in southeast Asia, which has now taken on the aspects of open aggressive fighting, endangers the peace of the world."

It is imperative that the American people make themselves heard on U.S. policy in Asia and to urge the Government to send our boys home.

Thank you again, Senator Morse, for being such a true representative of the American people.

Most sincerely,
Helen Ross.

Sydney, Australia,
August 19, 1964.

Dear Senator Morse: On behalf of my wife and family, I wish to thank you for your sane approach to the southeast Asia crisis.

I am sure peace-loving peoples throughout the world agree with you.

The impression your beloved country creates to my family and I is aggressive, and is typically "do as I say, not as I do."

Senator Morse, you seem to be surrounded by madmen and I do admire your courage and tenacity. Sir, you have millions of unseen friends all over this world of ours. Let us hope and trust that men of the caliber such as yourself eventually make all men see reason and the utter futility of foreign aggression and war.

Yours faithfully,
George C. Wells.

Minneapolis, Minn.,
August 6, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: I applaud your forthright comments on the Vietnam situation. By bombing ports and bases in North Vietnam, we are the ones who are becoming provocative. We were justified only in firing on the ships which fired on us.

You are also right in not giving President Johnson a free hand in decisions relevant to the military situation in that area.

I plan to write to my Senators and to McNamara and Rusk to oppose an extension of the conflict.

Sincerely,
Stanley A. Nesheim.

P.S.—Please send me a copy of your statement of August 5, 1964. Thank you.

Kingston, N.Y.,
August 8, 1964.

Dear Senator Morse: My wife and I were very pleased that you voted against the Vietnam resolution in the Senate.

We know, through I. F. Stone's Weekly, that you have made several important speeches on our southeast Asian policy, but there has been almost no mention of them in the press that we could find. How is it possible that such speeches are not reported? We cannot believe that there is a conspiracy against you. Is the press so sure that your speeches won't sell papers that it doesn't print them? Is the press so biased that they all refuse to report a Senator's views?

We would like to have an answer to these questions that is not merely speculative but one that can be substantiated.

If it is possible to obtain your speeches please tell us how to get them.

Sincerely,
Edward W. Averill.
Joanne Averill.

Albany, Calif.,
August 12, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator: Please be assured of my heartiest support of your position on the Vietnam crisis and my admiration of your demonstration of courage in standing up for your convictions. I would be happy to support you as a candidate for the Presidency, but I suppose at this time that the bulk of the American people are not yet ready to face the truth about our conduct of foreign affairs, and a truthful statesman might come out second best in a contest with a double-talking politician.

I would appreciate it if you could send me about 10 reprints of your speech on the Vietnam crisis, and will distribute them to friends and acquaintances.

Yours respectfully,
G. W. Sorenson.

Boston, Mass.,
August 13, 1964.

The Honorable Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: I wish to commend you heartily for having the courage to stand in a minority of two and vote your convictions on the recent resolution on our involvement in southeast Asia. Circumspect and responsible dissent is a vital part of our American system.

I myself have some qualms about our current involvement in southeast Asia, but do not have sufficient information to be sure that I agree fully with you. I would greatly appreciate receiving a copy of your remarks on the resolution and any other pertinent material you may have on hand.

Sincerely,
Gordon D. Gibson.

New York, N.Y.,
August 11, 1964.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: Permit me to offer you my appreciation for your courage in face of the recent Vietnam crisis; it was in the tradition of Senators Borah and Norris. There was a disgraceful editorial in our local paper, "The New York Daily News" in which they questioned your patriotism. I hope that you will find time to answer this vicious attack, as many New Yorkers regard this yellow journalism sheet as the truth.

As a former GI who served in the Philippines in the last war, I sometimes wonder what the hell are we doing in Vietnam, especially since it seems to me that since the war, most of the leaders of these so-called

Asian democracies are of the ilk of the Diems, Sukarno, etc., who seem interested in milking the U.S.A. for their own selfish motives, and we should stop risking lives of American boys unless BARRY GOLDWATER is interested in defoliating the area in his own plane with the Birch society as back-up troops.

Would appreciate it very much if you would send me the portion of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that contains your views on Vietnam.

Wishing you many years of healthy service to our Nation,

Sincerely,

A. D. TINKEL.

SAN PEDRO, CALIF.,
August 8, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: You have my admiration for your independent and objective stand on our South Vietnamese and South Asian involvements.

It is a sad commentary that only Senators MANSFIELD and SALINGER (as presiding officer) were present when you made your address. Also, that only Senator GRUENING joined you overtly.

George Washington, if he were still around, I am sure would be in your corner.

Did anybody make an attempt yet, to survey and evaluate our foreign involvements of several decades? It is certain that not everything that we did was bad, but neither was everything good. I wonder is there any such move on the horizon?

I appreciate that you possibly can't answer me personally. But if you know of anything that appeared in print, won't you please send me the bibliography?

By all means, please send me the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which carries your last address, and possibly also those with your previous addresses on the subject at hand.

More power to you, Mr. Senator; history will prove that the Senate and the Nation should have paid more attention to you.

Respectfully and sincerely,

ADOLPH WEINBERGER.

THE BERLIN GOVERNMENT SEES ITS PROBLEMS

(Exclusive interview for the Eugene Register-Guard)

Berlin continues to be a pivotal point on the world's map. When fighting is going on in Vietnam or in the Congo we should perhaps keep in mind that the frightening struggles for power are being played simultaneously on the entire political keyboard of the world. At the moment both Berlins appear to be calm places if divided. Who knows, however, how to analyze the situation as to possible future changes in emphasis on political pressures? Germans, who generally look with apprehension at any kind of brinkmanship, no matter where their personal sympathies happen to be, usually express their feeling with caution unless when talking privately. They feel that they may become victims of outside forces who are able to make Germany the battleground of conflicts which are beyond their control.

Because Berlin's vigorous mayor, Willy Brandt, was still in the hospital after surgery, we were unable to renew our acquaintance which we made when both of us were refugees in Sweden some 25 years ago.

However, Herr Werner Steltzer of the Berlin Information Center was kind enough to answer, as Mayor Brandt's spokesman, the questions which I present. Particularly welcome was his analysis of the Berlin situation and the government's basic position.

At first, I made reference to President Johnson's recent talks with Chancellor Erhard and his renewed interest in German unification, and asked whether such ideas might be based on realistic plans.

Mr. Steltzer answered that "the unification of Germany is a necessity, not because the Germans always want it, but because we won't have peace in this part of the world on the basis of a permanently divided Germany." He pointed out further that at present Germany is in a historical phase before a peace treaty with the victorious powers of the Second World War. "The declared basis is unconditional surrender," said Mr. Steltzer. Therefore, the victorious powers could decide on whether there should be one or two Germanies. However, the individual powers have interests of their own and they will try to swing matters in their own favor. As long as the cold war exists there will be no unification despite the fact that unification will be necessary for the development of a stable situation, according to Berlin's spokesman.

On the other hand, Mr. Steltzer said, the Soviet Union cannot agree at present to a unification of Germany because it would mean that the western border of communism would have to recede a couple of hundred miles to the east. In the field of economics this would mean a tremendous loss to the Eastern powers. The Soviet occupational zone represents perhaps the greatest industrial force next to the Soviet Union itself.

"Consequently, our interest is to bring about a situation in which Mr. Khrushchev can place his signature on a treaty which has the headline—Unification," continued Mr. Steltzer. Berlin's interest is with a policy of "detente," with a decrease of tension. Only many very small steps will lead to a solution and many of these will have to go through quite a few changes as progress is being made, Mr. Steltzer said.

My second question referred to possible contradictions developing out of policies toward unification of the two Germanies on the one hand and toward integration with France on the other.

Mr. Steltzer was emphatic about the point that all solutions for an integrated and united Europe, which would be rejected as possibilities from any German point of view. To emphasize the point that France would not resist unification with East Germany, Mr. Steltzer quoted the former French premier Mendes France, who was not exactly a friend of Germany, as saying: "Well, let Germany have unification and they will have so many domestic troubles that they won't bother us much." We are convinced that the necessity of the unification of Germany cannot hinder or postpone the integration of Europe, said Mr. Steltzer.

I was then interested in the question of how the unification of Germany and European integration could take place in view of the seeming incompatibility of the capitalistic and communistic systems.

In his answer it appears that, according to Mr. Steltzer, the Berlin government is sharing a theory which has been advanced also in the United States. "I think it is a commonplace already that, seen from a worldwide point of view, the two systems are approaching each other. Ultimately, the only difference will be in the ownership. A large tractor factory in Stalingrad is owned by the state but run according to the principles of General Motors," said Mr. Steltzer. He emphasized, however, that these similarities exist only with respect to economics. The Russians, he pointed out, have changed completely from the earlier method where price and productivity didn't matter, but just the order to fill a demand regardless of what the cost would be. They have now introduced the following factors: (a) the market price and (b) the production costs. Therefore, the manager of the plant in Leipzig cannot differ very much in his working mentality from a manager in Dusseldorf, said Mr. Steltzer.

As a point of interest he added that the big business managers of West Germany, while belonging themselves to the governing Christian-Social Party, did not support their Government when it came to a steel pipe embargo against the communistic East. The German pipe manufacturers protested this embargo although it could mean the prevention of piping oil from the Tiflis fields to a potential western front. The western managers explained that they have to look after their own productivity. To Mr. Steltzer this explained that, although the western managers belong to the same party as their Government and have the same general mentality, they nevertheless have to oppose their political leaders when the demands of their own production are clashing with the demands of international policy. As a consequence, if the Government insists on its policy, it has to step into the production cycle and has to support industry, including the assumption of business risks. In this manner the Government obtains influence on production and in an almost involuntary way will end up with a production mode which industry and government are actually trying to fight, said Mr. Steltzer. He apparently is taking this development, which one might call "cold socialization" as an inevitable and permanent byproduct of the cold war.

A further question was: "You said that immediate unification as a whole would be unacceptable to the East because it would be a loss to them. Therefore, you said, it would have to take place in small steps. Could you give some examples of what these small steps could consist of?"

Mr. Steltzer: "Yes, for instance, we should have an increase in technical contacts which we already have with each other. We have a general construction plan for Berlin. The area around the Potsdamer Platz shall again be the hub of the city. All our construction plans for Berlin provide for this future development. Then, for the city Autobahn, a circumferential road, of which we have charge halfway around the circle, we hope to work together with the East Berlin authorities who are in charge of the other half. There is one service where we do work together. While water and electricity are divided, the sewage system could not be divided and engineers on both sides have to cooperate. If we could achieve slowly small steps in the unification of communications as for instance of the telephone service and, as Willy Brandt has recommended for a long time, of the public transportation system, then personal contacts will be possible again, and that demands cooperation."

I asked as a final question what one should think about the German remilitarization, which gave Germany a key position in NATO, which of course angers General de Gaulle and makes Russia afraid.

Mr. Steltzer said, "of course, the Russians are afraid because of what they have suffered from the German Army. This certainly is not just propaganda what Mr. Khrushchev says about it. There is a genuine fear of what might happen.

"It was more by demand of the Western Allies than by German initiative that we are making a direct military contribution to the security of Europe," continued Mr. Steltzer, "Germany is supposed to be part of the decisive command post which has a finger on the trigger, and this is a very, very dangerous situation. It should be overcome by diplomatic and political activity in the international field as soon as possible."

Mr. Steltzer concluded the interview with a quote from Mayor Brandt that Berlin is not a source of danger but a thermometer of danger, of tensions and of difficulties that exist in the world. One cannot cure a disease, Mayor Brandt said, by throwing away the thermometer. For the time being there is no particular pressure on Berlin, "but we do not know whether tomorrow perhaps someone will decide to put the pressure on this area again," said Mr. Steltzer.

World politics can be well studied in the mirror of Berlin. My thanks went to Mr. Steltzer in Berlin's Information Center, a fine modern building near the Zoo station in West Berlin's business center.

H. H. Waechter.

Knoxville, Tenn.,
August 21, 1964.

Sen. Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator: I want to thank you for your vote on the Vietnam resolution. I wish that our own Senator Gore could have had the judgment and wisdom to vote as you did. As I am sure you agree, we have no legal nor moral right in this pathetic country.

It would seem that we are now rapidly becoming involved in the Congo and wherever else we believe our benevolent presence is required—or allowed. We read in the press that a committee is being sent to Malaysia to ascertain what "military aid" these people need. Do you not agree that we seem to be fast losing our minds in our country?

We hope that you will do everything you can to prevent our further involvement in these countries. In most of them, we are not only not wanted but are hated and despised.

Sincerely yours,
Mrs. Franklin Pitcher.

Tucson, Ariz.,
August 20, 1964.

Sen. Wayne Morse,
The Senate,

Dear Senator Morse: Please accept my hearty endorsement regarding your position urging negotiation in the Vietnamese struggle.

Apart from the constant threat of wider military involvement, we are missing an opportunity to set an example in the peaceful resolution of conflict. As a leader among nations, this seems to me an important obligation resting on the United States. Our proclaimed intentions of bringing "freedom" and "democracy" to South Vietnam at the expense of their lives and liberty makes a hollow mockery of all that we claim to represent.

Again, therefore, may I add my modest encouragement to you in your efforts to bring this problem to the conference table.

Respectfully,
Ralph C. Kauffman.

Los Angeles, Calif.,
August 19, 1964.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: Thank you for the brave speech you made in the Senate on August 5, which I have just read.

Like many other Americans, I had hoped that the President could and would find a way to settle the situation in Vietnam through negotiation by all the groups concerned either in accordance with the Geneva Agreement or under the control of the United Nations and so end this unilateral action on our part, which is so completely at variance with all our two centuries of traditional American principles—principles which have made our country great, and of which we have been so proud. One can depend on the good sense and clear thinking of the American people if they are given the facts; but, unfortunately, they have not been given the facts during the past 20 years.

The resolution against which you spoke only entangles this country more deeply in a situation where we did not and do not belong and makes it much more difficult to withdraw with honor; it is as if this country had been caught in quicksand.

It seems incomprehensible that you and Senator Gruening of Alaska were the only Senators to cast your votes against the resolution. Can it be that Senator Goldwater is already directing American foreign affairs? Heaven help our beloved country if he is. What has happened to the thinking of all the other Senators? Are they blind to the precipice which lies at the end of the road they are now taking?

Sincerely yours,
E. J. Spencer.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: Your bold and courageous stand in your TV appearance last week, your sincere opinions expressing grave concern over our country's involvement in the South Vietnam war and the warning that this participation may bring about a major war in east Asia, was most heartening and found a deeply felt response in the hearts and minds of the American people. Especially, in the hearts of our mothers, who do not want to see their sons killed in a senseless war in Vietnam.

Senator Ernest Gruening from Alaska was so right when he said, and we quote, "all Vietnam is not worth the life of one American."

We, the listeners were most proud of you Senator, as well as of Senator Gruening, and we wish to commend you on your stand in protesting the unjust slaughter of human beings.

Let us hear your voice raised in strong protest again. You are not alone in this fight. Thousands of Americans are with you. We hope, that with the help of people like you, peace will be achieved.

Most sincerely yours,
Matty Saltzman.
Los Angeles, Calif.

Delmar, N.Y.,
August 9, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: You are to be highly commended for your efforts to raise your reasonable voice above the raucous hue and cry which bursts forth on the topic of southeast Asia.

Please continue your efforts to present your side of this vital issue.

I would like to have copies of your remarks to the Senate regarding the resolution approving the U.S. Navy attack on the North Vietnam naval bases.

Sincerely,
James C. Mancuso.

Trenton, N.J.

Dear Senator Morse: I am writing to congratulate you and thank you for the stand you have consistently taken on the war in Vietnam. It took real courage for you and Senator Gruening to vote against the President's resolution.

Could you send me the texts of some of your Senate speeches on Vietnam?

Sincerely,
Richard Parker.

Miami Beach, Fla.,
August 8, 1964.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator: As a citizen of this great land, naturally I am very much interested in the doings of our legislators. I always had a warm appreciation of what the Oregon delegation so heroically had done.

I want to know more.

Can you, dear friend, send me some of your speeches, and what others said on the great topic before us today?

Good fortune be with you.

Most sincerely,
Meyer Chariff.

Lakeside, Oreg.,
August 9, 1964.

To the Editor,
The Oregonian,
Portland, Oreg.

Dear Sir: Your current castigation of Senator Morse because of his stand and his vote on the southeast Asia hassle calls to my mind the time the writer attended a testimonial dinner in a distant city honoring a gentleman who had just been reelected by the largest vote ever given a candidate for a high office in his State. When the guest of honor arose to respond to the several toasts he did so in words and in substance as follows: "As I sat here listening to the kind things you friends have had to say about me my memory took me back to that early morning hour in April 1917, when the question was put in the House of Representatives, Shall we declare war on Germany? I was one of the five who voted in the negative. Before sundown I had been fired from my only appointed office, a member of the library board here in my home town, and of course the voters fired me from my congressional job at the next election. How sweet it is to be back on top again surrounded by such good friends. I cannot pass up this opportunity to have the last word and say that if that emotion-packed hour should be reenacted today that I would not change my vote for I voted right the first time."

When the writer was a kid I shovelled coal after school into the basements of the neighbors to earn the price of admission on Saturday night to the Des Moines auditorium to watch the would-be champs of the world try to pin Frank Gotch, the champ. No one was ever able to do it but it was worth the price of admission to see them try. Today it is a treat to pick up my morning paper and observe you attempt to rope and hogtie Senator Morse. I am like the tourist down in Bombay who put up four bits to watch the native do the Indian rope trick. I do not think you can do it but it is worth a nickel a day to watch your efforts. If bets are in order I will play the percentage and string along with the champ.

Yours very truly,
Forrest E. Cooper.

Dear Wayne: You voted right the first time.

F.E.C.

Oakland, Calif.,
August 28, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,

Dear Senator Morse: I am writing to some others and thought I might as well begin with the most courageous Senator of them all. I know your advice about our withdrawing from Vietnam goes unheeded but perhaps not quite. Two million dollars per day for killing human beings who don't want us in their homeland. I can't read all the cruelties perpetrated. One has enough trouble sleeping in these unresponsible times. Have we become callous to what destruction of men, women, and children means? Along with all possible chance for them to raise their own food. It is so barbarous and why should our young men we have nurtured and taught to want an education and a future be sent out as victims, killing those they don't want to kill? This just by way of letting you know that I am grateful to you for speaking some terrible truths that need to be uttered. I wish you and Gruening were in the Johnson-Humphrey driver's seat. One wonders and hopes about our new civil rights law. Who will supplant Bobby (and how glad I am that he is being supplanted) and will the laws really be enforced? When shall we ever have a lynch law? I have my own opinions about a number of matters re how our Government has avoided helping those heroic youngsters in Mississippi. I share some of Dick Gregory's opinions about who helps whom. The situation in which we are willing to let the noble be slaughtered must come to an end if we are really to have life more abundant.

Thanks for being the heroic Senator. Senator Clark, from my native Pennsylvania, is good on so many matters but not on the foreign situation.

Very appreciatively yours,

Anna C. Dart.

San Francisco, Calif.,
August 26, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: I have written you many times commending your courage and agreeing with what you say about our foreign policy, especially our current brinkmanship in Vietnam. It seems that wherever there's trouble, our CIA is behind it.

Your radio comments on Tuesday, August 25, were very timely. It's about time someone in our Congress came out with the truth.

I enclose an expression of opinion from my neighbor, Mr. A. Fried.

You deserve the thanks of all the American people. Carry on.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Sally Cooper.

Claremont, Calif.,
August 21, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Old Senate Office Building,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: I regret very much that I will be out of town on August 29 when you are in Los Angeles, and thus will be unable to be at the dinner where you are speaking. I am especially sorry because this will prevent me from telling you in person how very much I value your splendid performance in the Senate on South Vietnam and all foreign aid, to say nothing of a host of other things. If by any chance, however, it should be possible for you to be in southern California after August 30, I would appreciate very much the opportunity to see you and would be delighted to invite you out to the Claremont Colleges.

Yours sincerely,

Fred Warner Neal.

P.S.—I enclose a recent effusion of my own, which you may find of interest.

AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY, THE NEW ISOLATIONISM AND THE 1964 REPUBLICAN PLATFORM

(By Fred Warner Neal[1])

Any foreign policy is likely to challenge rationality. I am inclined to think that foreign policies generally can best be understood if one keeps in mind two guiding principles: First, foreign policies tend to be irrational. Second, the more irrational the policy, the more tenaciously it is pursued. By irrational here I mean based on unreal or factually inaccurate premises, faulty perception of reality, producing unreasonable goals and/or action demonstrably leading elsewhere than to the goal sought.

This results essentially from what Sartre would call the human condition. There is a human propensity, in the best of circumstances, to self-delusion. The arena of international politics is by no means the best of circumstances, because it requires judgments about unfamiliar terrain in a milieu of nationalism, which itself exudes irrationalism. All this, of course, is, in the existentialist sense, inescapable. It cannot be eliminated, only coped with. In the good old days, say pre-1954, this irrationality in foreign policies was not so bad, comparatively. At best it could produce short-run benefits. At worst it could only result in loss of a few billion dollars and a few million lives. Today, in the thermonuclear age, it can no longer produce even short-run benefits, and the potential destruction of lives and property, if not total, is beyond human reckoning. What international politics in the thermonuclear age is about, essentially, is how to live in a world of human and institutional irrationality and still avoid this result.

Elements of irrationality in American foreign attitudes are not hard to find, starting, perhaps, with the time soon after the Union was formed when, unarmed and at war's edge with England, there was a great popular urge—fortunately resisted by a wise leadership—to go to war with our chief ally, France. Examples in other epochs vie with each other. But, if only because the United States did not participate actively in international affairs, the period after World War II has seen more, and more obvious, examples. With the United States at the height of its military power after the war, and the Soviet Union at its lowest ebb, we developed an almost paranoiac fear of Soviet military aggression. With Stalin, for his own purposes, opposed to Communist expansion, we based our whole foreign policy on its imminence. We focused our European policy on a NATO conventional armed force when it was clear that any war in Europe would be nuclear. In an age of nationalism and revolution, we have managed to be on bad terms with nearly almost every national revolutionary movement that has come along. Urging the Soviet Union to accept the status quo, we oppose it in Central Europe. With a rising fear of Soviet aggression in Europe, we poured money, via France, into Indochina and considered going to war to help a lost French cause. We opposed the Geneva settlement, refused to sign it when it was negotiated, intervened to aid those opposed to it, and now are involved in military combat to uphold it. When the Chinese Communists, who for years had been developing power in China for all to see, defeated the Nationalist Government and set up shop, we blamed it on to the Russians and/or Communists in the State Department. We declared South Korea to be outside our defense zone and then promptly went to war when the North Koreans invaded. When our forces approaching the Yalu River clearly threatened Chinese National interests, we were completely unprepared for Chinese intervention, despite the fact Peiping had warned us about it as well as it could warn a country which did not recognize its existence. When the Chinese came in, to a war on their very borders and 10,000 miles away from ours, we denounced China as an aggressor. We have continued to support the Formosa regime, which wants to overthrow the mainland government, and denied the Communist regime control over islands only 5 miles off its shores, and then say the Chinese will have to stop being hostile to us before we will treat with them.

The illusion that we can refuse to treat with China while ourselves meddling in the Far East and still have stability there is perhaps the penultimate irrationality. The ultimate one, of course, is the idea that in the thermonuclear age there is security in an overkill capacity. As with other irrationalities, the trouble with it is that it not only does not serve American interests, but actually works against them.

The United States is not alone in the irrationality of its foreign policy. These odd peccadilloes of ours are, in fact, all the more dangerous because of foreign policy irrationalities of other nations. But in this area, the desire of the Americans always to be foremost does seem to have been fulfilled.

How can one explain it? Here is the United States, with its scientific skill and pragmatism, its revolutionary ideas of political freedom for all, lack of binding class feeling, social mobility, and unlimited opportunities for education. A nation so richly and uniquely endowed, impelled by neither need nor desire for conquest, uninhibited by ideology, caste, or precedent, should be able to see the world calmly, objectively, and in perspective.

That too often we have not done so is explainable, I think, by the fact that the United States is essentially an isolationist nation. There is no question, of course, that we have abandoned the formal isolationism of the interwar period. But isolationism does not mean merely not participating actively in international affairs. Isolationism, in a sense meaningful for international politics, is fundamentally a state of mind; it is ignorance of the rest of the world and its main currents. A nonparticipating nation tends to be isolationist in other ways too, but not always, as witness the case of Switzerland. The slightest eddy in world affairs is recorded and usually understood in Bern, for example, despite the fact that the Swiss participate politically in nothing, not even the United Nations; while on the other hand there are nations that participate in everything and intervene everywhere which do not really have a grasp of what they themselves, let alone other nations, are doing. An isolationist nation in this latter sense tends to reject the unpleasant truth that the world is a very plural place, that other nations and peoples neither do, nor have to, see the world the way it sees it.

Such an isolationist nation tends to see the world in terms of its own moral superiority, and opposition to it as evil. Since to compromise with evil is evil, it tends to become rigid in its positions, rejecting compromise of any kind as appeasement of evil. Such an isolationist nation tends to see disagreement as hostility, hostility as threatening military conflict, and military conflict as Armageddon. It finds it difficult if not impossible—often despite the best of intentions—to conduct its foreign relations according to the fundamental principle that international politics is a two-way street. It may be genuinely peace loving—most nations are, on their own terms—but since it ignores, grossly misconceives, or denies altogether the interests of other nations where they differ from its own, it has difficulty in practicing restraint; and the lack of restraint itself produces a propensity to conflict. But, incapable of introspection and self-criticism because of its conviction of its own righteousness, the isolationist-minded nation sees the lack of peace resulting only because of the intransigence, or aggressiveness, of other nations; and the next step is trying to achieve peace by making war. Slowly, then rapidly, reality eludes it to the point of irretrievability.

Now, despite the irrationalities of our foreign policy I have cited, I do not mean this as a description of the United States. We have thus far escaped many of these pitfalls. But surely the syndromes of the isolationist-minded nation are apparent in too many of our foreign policy attitudes. Particularly has there been a tendency to ignore the principles of international politics that were so well understood by our Founding Fathers. These were well expressed in the Monroe Doctrine. The Monroe Doctrine was firmly based on the concept of reciprocity inherent in international political principles and was tied to the fundamental principle of core interests and their relation to geography. That is, the truth that some nations have interests which are more important to them than others, and that these interests begin with geographical proximity. The Monroe Doctrine has been so vulgarized and misrepresented of late that perhaps it is necessary to recall it to you as it was conceived by that wise and prudent statesman, John Quincy Adams. There were two parts to the doctrine. One part asserted the priority of American interests in this hemisphere. And the other part asserted, as a quid pro quo, that the United States would not interfere in areas which were the priority of other nations, that is, affairs of Europe. As such, the Monroe Doctrine was a balanced and reasonable assertion of American interests and American restraint. It is a typical syndrome of the isolationist-minded nation that we have ignored, violated and now forgotten the second part of the doctrine while continuing to assert the first. The Monroe Doctrine may not be dead, but if it is in an exceedingly critical condition we have only ourselves to thank. Cuba was only the chickens coming home to roost.

---

[1] Professor of international relations and government, Claremont (Calif.) Graduate School. Lecture delivered at convocation of Claremont College's summer session, July 23, 1964.

To a considerable extent, the development of the United States as an isolationist-minded nation was probably unavoidable. Young, we lacked historical perspective. Protected by the God-given oceans, to say nothing of the British fleet, we could concentrate on our internal development without fear of attack. We could expand westward without encountering other nation-states. Our puritan background of self-righteousness was unchallenged by the give and take of normal international relations. Our Calvinist background led us to equate our great material successes with divine will. International war was an evil other nations constantly engaged in, because they lacked our moral base. The Indians, against whom we warred constantly, challenged neither our moral self-satisfaction nor our growing sense of omnipotence. The United States never had, aside from infrequent wartime, a real meaningful opponent in the world, which challenged its policies, its methods of social organizations, its moral standards, and its way of life. For all of our history, up to World War I, the world stood firm and solid, comfortably controlled by the Western Europeans, from whom we sprung; and where the Western Europeans faltered, as was the case with Spain in the Philippines, we stood ready to pick up the pieces and plug the dike.

When we finally did get involved in the whirlpool of the immoral world in 1917, we resolved to set things right according to proper moral and democratic standards. And if our high-minded war aims did not win over our victorious allies, they made a lasting impression on much of the American intellectual community. This group was shocked at the American rejection of the league and our subsequent withdrawal back to our own bastion. From the shock developed the fixation on the need to participate actively in the world, come what may, and the subsequent confusion between isolationism and nonparticipationism. Responsible for ideas and education, this internationalist-minded intellectual community, in effect, proceeded to sell their concepts to the American elite. When the formal isolation of the interwar period proved calamitous, they were in business, as it were. A whole generation of Americans had had it drummed into them that the thing to do above all else was to participate actively in world affairs—never mind on what base, never mind with what knowledge—participate and this time, for sure, set the world aright. Even as we set forth, we were misconceiving the nature of international reality. Engaged in a war for freedom and democracy, we were convinced all our allies saw things much as we did. Again there was shock when it turned out otherwise. But this time there was no retreating back into our shell. We set out to do what we thought we should have done after World War I. We were now going to participate. We were going to intervene. But the old isolationist base, the old ignorance of the main currents of the world, was still there. Isolationism in this sense remained, but was now joined by participationism. This time, however, the familiar, comfortable world of a strong Western Europe and solid British Empire had collapsed. Even the oceans had suddenly shrunk. The old sign posts were missing, and the specter of atomic weapons turned the path into a veritable nightmare. And, in addition, there was an erstwhile ally—motivated by an unrealistic fervor of its own—demanding its right to be heard, its right to put the world in order the way it saw things—which was not our way at all. The United States now, like other great nations before, had a powerful opponent, and our reaction was one of indignation to the very idea of it.

Thus emerging suddenly, full-blown like Athena, after decades of isolation and with strength unimagined in any other time or place, it is not surprising that the isolationist background of the United States produced irrationalities in our efforts to cope with this unfamiliar and hostile world. In some ways, it is surprising that we did as well as we have done. For there were limits on our irrationality, which, after all, was not much greater than anybody else's. Maybe we saw reality dimly, but we were not altogether out of touch with it. Maybe we had illusions of near-omnipotence, but they were not of absolute omnipotence. Maybe we suffered confusion about idealism and realism, but not complete confusion. Maybe domestic politics took us into irresponsible foreign policy positions, but they were not totally irresponsible. On all sides, and in all political parties there were leaders who, if they did not clearly perceive the path, at least perceived the awful pitfalls; who, if they did not stand for enough restraint, at least stood for some. And as the harsh impact of the real world crowded down on us, we began, however slowly, to make progress in our adjustment to it.

Today, however, the limits on our irrationality have been challenged. Isolationism has been joined, not only by unrestrained participationism-interventionism but also by total irresponsibility. There has been a return to the know-nothings of more than a century ago, but this time concentrating on foreign policy. What we are now faced with is the danger not only of isolationism-participationism but isolationism-participationism-know-nothingism. I refer, of course, to the platform of the 1964 Republican Party adopted in San Francisco. Up until now, the irrationalities of our foreign policy have not been a fundamental issue of domestic politics. Neither party has had a monopoly on irrationality, nor has either party had a monopoly on those elements of wisdom, commonsense, and restraint that from time to time have found their way into American foreign policy. Indeed, despite the dangerous peccadilloes of John Foster Dulles, an objective analyst might find more of these elements in the Eisenhower years than in the years immediately preceding or following.

The recent Republican convention changed all that. With the takeover by the know-nothings, the proposed Republican foreign policy is a nightmarish parody of a foreign policy based on ignorance, wild emotion, and unrestrained arrogance. I am sympathetic with many of the aims of this platform. But as written, almost every foreign policy plank in it constitutes a rejection of fact and reality or a violation of the most elementary principles of international politics, and a good many manage to do both at the same time. It is a document so incredible that one could not take it seriously were it not so dangerous. And when seen in the context of foreign policy utterances of the party's new standard bearer, it is even more dangerous.

Now I earnestly hope that my remarks about the Republican platform will not be misunderstood in any narrow partisan sense. This is not a political speech. It is with considerable reluctance that I use harsh adjectives about the platform of one of the major parties of the United States. But I could not be true to myself as a scholar, or as a citizen, if I permitted the ideas formulated at San Francisco to go undescribed for what they are just because they are in a party platform. The Republican platform is far more than a partisan matter, and most assuredly I do not speak about it from the standpoint of partisan politics, any more than do the increasing number of Republican leaders who do not go along with it. This platform is of the greatest national concern, and to every citizen. For almost every plank of it could jeopardize the interests of the United States—no matter how you conceive them—and jeopardize the rest of the world as well. If it be part of Communist strategy to extend its influence and isolate the United States, then the foreign policy parts of the Republican platform would constitute the greatest boon to communism since the Russian revolution. Even on its own wild premises, the platform does not stand up. Far from rallying the nations of the world to a crusade for freedom or anything else, it is a recipe for isolation in its worst sense—unilateral American military intervention all over the globe, without allies. It would undo all the slight advances that have been made toward getting out of the dangerous cold war morass, and then proceed to take us closer and closer down the path to thermonuclear war and destruction.

Now in making this strong condemnation of the Republican platform, I do not wish to question the motives of the men who made it. That they are ignorant is obvious, but, as I said earlier, ignorance is no monopoly of the Republicans. Essentially they, those who made the platform, are extreme products of irrationalities and frustrations produced by our past policies, both Republican and Democratic alike. Both Democrats and Republicans are responsible for the anti-Communist hysteria which has left deep marks on our thinking. Both are responsible for the deep misunderstandings of the nature of Soviet communism under which we labor. Both are responsible for our tendency to treat communism as a passing phenomenon over which right combined with might can triumph, rather than a lasting phenomenon that must be coped with. Both are responsible for our hopes of "winning" the cold war. Both are responsible for the unrealities of our Far Eastern policy. Both are responsible for our confusion between compromise and appeasement. Both are responsible for our fixation with security through thermonuclear overkill capacity. And it is out of these irrationalities that the frustrated know-nothings of San Francisco, in the name of victory and democracy, produced their incredible recipe for the defeat of freedom and democracy and their destruction.

It would be bad enough if all this were simply deceit, to fool the people, to get votes, to outbid the Democrats in the American game of "I'm more anti-Communist than you are." But worse still, I fear, is the fact: all indications are that the standard bearer of the Republican Party and his henchmen who wrote the platform are sincere. I do not even doubt their sincerity when they engage in what seems to be pure doubletalk, such as urging an increase in our military apparatus, preparing for war, reducing Government expenses and decentralizing Government, all at the same time.

Nor when they boast on the one hand that they will never surrender any American interests to the United Nations and then—in the same breath, as it were—call for a method of voting in the General Assembly based on population. Can they, one wonders, be oblivious of the fact that—despite their opposition—Communist China is certain to come into the U.N., sooner or later, and that even without China it would be easily possible to muster a far greater population aggregate against us than for us? The answer is yes, they can be oblivious to it; for those who could, with sincerity, draft the rest of the foreign policy planks in the platform, are capable of any other inanities as well.

Then there is this repetitive use of the word "freedom" in the platform. What does it mean? Does it have a single meaning? Does it mean the same to an American, to a Chinese, to a Vietnamese, to an African? I well remember when Senator GOLDWATER was here in Claremont a short 3 years ago. He talked then a great deal about freedom. The Algerian war was then in progress, and the Senator, like some French extremists, apparently saw in it a Communist plot. He rejected any sympathy, let alone help, for the Algerian nationalists in these words: "What we must be for is freedom. The interest of freedom must always be first. If the Algerians have to wait for independence in the interests of freedom, this is too bad but freedom comes first." Nobody thought to ask Senator GOLDWATER freedom for whom and from what, and apparently then, as in San Francisco, the question didn't occur to him either.

It is for this nameless and amorphous freedom, it seems, that Senator GOLDWATER and his fellow know-nothings think they must be faced with Armageddon. There is no question to them that they will be fighting a holy war. "The struggle today," Senator GOLDWATER told a reporter for the German magazine Der Spiegel, "is a struggle between Godless people and the people of God, and if you want to put it in its basic form, it's between slavery and freedom. It's now worldwide. I claim that one cannot live with these two philosophies forever. Sometime there'll be only one."

One institution that has had a good deal of experience with holy wars is the Vatican, and if there were, in fact, a struggle between "Godless people and the people of God," one would think the Pope would know about it. Yet if one seeks an absolute contrast to the views of the Republican platform and its standard bearer, let him examine the measured plea for coexistence made by that great ecclesiastical statesman, Pope John XXIII, in his Encyclical, Pacem in Terris. "All political communities are of equal natural dignity," wrote Pope John, "since they are bodies whose membership is made up of these same human beings." And then he urged: "Spare no labor in order to ensure that world events follow a reasonable and human course. In the highest and most authoritative assemblies, let men give serious thought to the problem of a peaceful adjustment of relations between political communities on a world level * * *."

Now the basic, fundamental and indisputable fact of international politics in 1964 is—as Pope John knew—if either the Soviet system or ours wants to exist, they must, for the long-run future, coexist. They must either achieve a detente and make progress toward disarmament, or the dangers of their mutual destruction will increase by arithmetic if not geometric proportion. The interest of the United States simply cannot be served in any real and ultimate sense unless we are able to reach the necessary understandings with Moscow. This does not mean that we have to give up any basic interests fundamental to our security or that they do. There is every reason to believe that such an arrangement is possible. The Soviet leaders have adapted themselves to the realities of the thermonuclear world. They clearly seek a detente. We are not obligated to accept their terms for it, but we are obligated—if we want our Nation and its ideals to survive, let alone flourish—to make compromises in areas that are not basic to our interests. President Kennedy came to realize this, and the great tragedy of his assassination, apart from the poignant personal part, was that he appeared to be on the verge of doing something about it. President Johnson realizes it, and there has been reason to hope that, once the need for politicking is behind him, he too, will try to do something about it. Many Republican leaders have recognized it also, this truth that we must live with the Russians or not live at all. One can argue about methods, and it is proper that we should—about how we should get on with it, where we should stand firm, where we should compromise, how far we should go toward disarming and when. But the Republican platform rejects, flatly and absolutely, the idea itself.

The platform calls for the military assertion of global American interests including, indeed, dismemberment of the Soviet Union itself and elimination of whatever influence the U.S.S.R. might have outside of whatever borders Senator GOLDWATER might see fit to leave it. Such a policy would be morally indefensible even if we had the power to make it meaningful. The United States has no God-given right to police the world or to determine what kinds of social and political systems other people shall have. It is dubious that attempts to do so could in fact promote our ideals: certainly some of our efforts to date have been less than edifying. Even more clearly it would not serve the interests of the United States. But the indisputable fact is, in any event that we do not have the power to do it even if it were desirable. To say this is not defeatism—we can well take care of ourselves and our own—but it is simply a recognition of the hard, cold facts of thermonuclear life and death. To assert the contrary, as does the San Francisco platform is worse than know-nothingism; it is megalomania run riot.

Those who wrote the platform call for the United States to reassert its leadership by repairing NATO and other alliances, and then they set forth a policy that could not better guarantee the desertion of our allies were it designed specifically for that purpose. No matter how much our allies may join us in opposing communism, not a single one of them would be willing to risk its fate—and the world's—in a global crusade led by an atomic juvenile delinquent.

One cannot quarrel with the desire to take the initiative in the cold war, but the initiative called for in the Republican platform is the initiative of lemmings, intent on their own mass destruction.

The very assertion by a major American political party of foreign policy goals demanding dismemberment of the Soviet Union is a fundamental disservice to the interests of the United States. One of the great hopes we have is in the revision in Soviet Communist doctrine about war and peace made by Khrushchev. Fortunately, the Russians have in the last few years acquired some sophistication about American politics, but even so, it would not be surprising now, in light of the San Francisco platform if Khrushchev has a few second thoughts about how much the American people do support a policy of detente. After all, the Republicans came within a few votes of victory in 1960. Khrushchev's approach to the matter of coexistence is bitterly opposed by the Chinese, and they have supporters throughout the Communist movement including, doubtless, in the U.S.S.R. Khrushchev's inability to reach substantive agreements with the United States, even given our present policy, has strengthened his hard-line Communist opponents. Can there be any doubt that if Senator GOLDWATER were elected on the San Francisco platform, they would be so strengthened as to threaten seriously the present Soviet policy of accommodation? The platform says, rightly, I think, that we should not take sides in the Soviet-Chinese dispute, but its whole foreign policy could not give a better assist to the Chinese if it had been written in Peiping.

Of course, all these matters are complicated, while the world of the San Francisco platform is foursquare and simple. What does not fit it is simply rejected. One of the most significant developments in the last 10 years has been the breakup of Communist monolithism, the rise of Communist nationalism and the appearance of important differences among the various Communist countries. The Republican platform not only ignores but at the same time denies this development altogether. Communism there, is an even more amorphous concept than freedom. The platform's treatment of communism would have been wrong enough 10 years ago; today it is simply ridiculous.

Now none of this discussion anticipates much close cooperation and friendship between the United States and the Soviet Union, in any event. Come what may, we are adversaries in a grand competition, nor is there anything so unusual about this. It is a competition that we can't win, in any absolute sense of doing something so that, suddenly, there won't be any communism any more, but it is a competition that we don't have to lose either, if we act on the basis of wisdom, reality, perseverance, and restraint. Indeed, our strength in this competition is great, up to now so great that I see only two ways in which we can lose. One would be thermonuclear war. The other would be the enactment into policy of the Republican Party platform, and the two dangers may well be intimately related. I do not consider the Soviet Union a danger in a military sense, but communism, as a philosophy and as a method of organization, could endanger us if it were to sweep the world. I should say, however, that at the moment this is a danger far less acute than that posed by the Republican platform.

I hope I have made it clear that I would consider it a catastrophe of the first magnitude for the United States—and for human progress—were this know-nothing-isolationist-extremist platform ever to be implemented. There probably is not much likelihood that it will be. One cannot have even a little faith in the American people and say anything else. On the other hand, we must face the fact that the Republican platform was produced out of the isolationist-participationist climate of American life, and one can't conclude, therefore, that it will have no support.

Again, I want to emphasize that I am not in anyway speaking from the standpoint of partisan politics. I am not totally out of sympathy with Senator GOLDWATER's desires for economy, private enterprise, and restricted Government power. I can well appreciate his yearning to escape from the hard world of the 1960's. How pleasant it would be if only we could return to the 1890's, and I do not say this sarcastically. But alas, barring a time machine, it can't be done. Were it not for the Republican platform's extreme positions on foreign policy, I would not dream of speaking out here against it in this manner, regardless of my private views. I hold no brief for the policies of the Democratic Party, and I have repeatedly criticized many of them, sometimes from this very podium. I cannot conceive that the Democratic platform will prove to be any paragon of political virtue or wisdom, and should it degenerate to anything like the Republican platform, I shall attack it likewise.

Ordinarily in an election, the intelligent, conscientious voter, regardless of party, will weigh the candidates and their platforms before making a choice. But I would be less than honest if I did not say that I can imagine no intelligent, conscientious American, whatever his political affiliation, who will not oppose utterly anything like the San Francisco platform and those who support it, irrespective of party. We shall soon have a test, and the results will show us, and the world, how many such Americans there are, and how strong the know-nothing extremists are. In a very real way, the test may be that of the viability of the American political system itself.

C. L. Sulzberger, writing of the Republican Convention the other day in the New York Times, quoted Karl Marx as saying: "History repeats itself first as a tragedy, then as a farce." And Sulzberger commented: "Here we have the farce first." One can only add: May God spare us the tragedy.

San Francisco, Calif.,
August 26, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: I wish to take this opportunity to thank you for your comments on CBS radio, Tuesday, August 25. We commend your courage in coming out with the truth. It's too bad you are in the minority in our Congress. This country is badly in need of courageous commentary so that the public which is uninformed and badly informed by the press should somehow get to know the truth about our immoral foreign policy.

Thanks again and keep up the good work. There are many who agree with you—you are not alone.

Very truly yours,
Adolph Fried.

Marlith, Mich.,
August 10, 1964.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: Please send me a copy of your recent speech concerning the American attack on the North Vietnamese.

I would also appreciate any other material you have which gives your position on America's involvement in southeast Asia.

Thank you very much.

Sincerely yours,
(Rev.) Edwin L. Knopf.

P.S.—I admire your independence and your willingness to speak your mind on these matters.

The Riley Rock Shop, Inc.,
Springfield, Ohio, August 10, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: I have long had an admiration for you for being one lawmaker that had the courage to speak out for what you thought was right. You have now voiced the same doubt I had in my mind, and that is that there is a very good chance that the United States had been the provocateur in the recent North Vietnam situation. In fact, I had been looking for just this thing to happen, for a nephew of mine, a West Point graduate, had been ordered into intensive training several months ago. He is now in South Vietnam. Of course, he is not an isolated case, for they don't train just one man at a time.

May I have a copy of the speech you made in the Senate in opposition to granting the President power to intervene at his discretion? What is the point? What are we doing over there anyhow, mixing into the affairs of other people? We're not saving the world from communism. It is steadily advancing. Some more positive measures will have to be taken than allowing them to take two steps forward, then stepping back one.

Thanking you in advance, I am
Yours truly,
Mrs. James W. Riley.

Elkins Park, Pa.,
August 8, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: Although I previously understood that the United States of America was fighting this current war in Vietnam for the preservation of freedom and to withstand the further enslavement of the peoples of the world by the Communist threat, recent statements which you made have forced me to reconsider the role of the United States in the East.

To end this confusion that has resulted from utterly contradicting statements, I would greatly appreciate any factual information which you would be so kind to send me or any other reliable sources of information to which you might direct me, concerning this most grave situation.

I have the honor to remain,
Yours very truly,
Steven L. Keroes.

Portland, Oreg.,
August 7, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: Recently I heard your talk before the City Club. I find that I agree with your views on the Vietnam situation, at least those I heard in your speech and based on the facts you presented.

It seems to me that, under the present circumstances, we have no business there alone.

It also appears that the administration or at least some of its representatives are trying to whip up enthusiasm for an invasion of North Vietnam. The same kind of publicity campaign was staged prior to the First World War by those who wanted the American people to accept the United States entering the war.

If we got our ships out of the places where they have no business at this time and stop beating the tom-toms we will have no occasion to retaliate for a PT boat attack.

The purpose of this letter was not to tell you things you already know, but to tell you that a Republican supports your position and to give you encouragement.

Yours very truly,
Peter Voorhies.

Campbell, Calif.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senator of Oregon,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator: Although I am not one of your constituents, nevertheless I would like to commend you on the stand you and Senator Gruening have taken opposing the extraordinary powers given to our President L. B. Johnson.

I wish the Senators of our State would have the same intestinal fortitude you have shown.

Sincerely yours,
Anna B. Kriesfeld.

Point Pleasant, Pa.,
August 29, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senator From the State of Oregon,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: I am greatly impressed by many of the ideas which you express so clearly and fearlessly. I am indebted to you for your article, "Humpty Dumpty in Vietnam," from the Progressive (to which I subscribe). In a situation where news is edited to favor status quo decisions, every breach in the wall of silence is precious to us all.

There are three people here who discuss your expressions with deep concern and belief in their immediacy and relevance. We would greatly appreciate it if you could send us any sampling of your thoughts that may be printed up for distribution by your office.

Thank you very much.

Sincerely,
Val Sigstedt.

San Francisco, Calif.,
August 31, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: I've wanted to write to express my admiration for you and the courage you've shown in shedding light on the sordid—and sadly obscured—truth about the ghastly situation we've been embroiled in in Vietnam. It means a very great deal to know that there is a voice to affirm the truth, the reality about the corruption we've been supporting with enormous funds and now ever more lives in that antithesis of democracy, South Vietnam.

Many thanks for your affirmation of a—of late—badly befuddled ideal; yours is the true Americanism.

Sincerely yours,
(Mrs.) Sandra Wallace.

New York, N.Y.,
August 28, 1964.

The New York Times,
229 West 43d Street,
New York, N.Y.

Gentlemen: I was astonished to read at the conclusion of one of your articles on the demonstrations in South Vietnam (Danang Rioters Hit U.S.-Run Hospital, Aug. 27, 1964) that "Authorities made an effort to calm the mobs last night by simulating a North Vietnamese air raid. The bands thinned out but reformed this morning."

Since no Communist air power has yet been used over South Vietnam, either by the Vietcong, the Chinese, or the North Vietnamese, one wants to know in more detail exactly how the authorities "simulated" a North Vietnamese air raid. Did they drop bombs and strafe their own people? Did they paint North Vietnamese insignia on South Vietnamese planes?

Which authorities were responsible?

Finally, if North Vietnamese air raids have been simulated to calm South Vietnamese mobs, will they also be simulated to justify "retaliation" by U.S. planes against North Vietnam? Is it beyond doubt that North Vietnamese torpedo boat attacks were simulated for just that purpose?

The Times and the "authorities" owe us a more detailed explanation.

Yours truly,
Steve Seltzer.

San Francisco, Calif.,
August 27, 1964.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Sir: Your statements in the Senate and in the Progressive (August 1964) have shed new light for me on our present involvement in Vietnam. In them I believe you have irrefutably demonstrated the fallacy of our policy in South Vietnam by pointing to the disparity between this policy and our fundamental commitment to the right of self-determination for all nations.

I extend my sincere respect and admiration for your courage to give voice to unpopular beliefs in these troubled times.

Sincerely,
Richard F. Conrat.

BRIGHTON, MASS.,
August 28, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Once again I feel compelled to write a letter of congratulations to you on your vote on the Vietnam statement by the President. I agree with you that a peaceful settlement of some sort must be reached. The current civilian unrest there proves your recent statements. I feel happy that there are at least two Members of Congress with courage.

I would be interested in hearing your views on the NATO nuclear force which we propose. I am against it as it seems only to spiral the arms buildup in Europe. It also brings the nuclear weapons that much closer to Germany which I fear greatly as a military power.

Sincerely,
ROBERT S. TARPEY.

AUGUST 7, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: May we congratulate you for your sane and forthright stand on Vietnam. We have long been dismayed over U.S. foreign policy in southeast Asia. We heartily endorse your refusal to go along with the joint resolution supporting Johnson's moves against North Vietnam. You might be interested to hear that at a June meeting of academicians at Lewis and Clark College ("The First Northwest Faculty Seminar on Problems of War and Peace") the members unanimously rejected U.S. policy in South Vietnam as unsound politically, legally, militarily, and morally.

May we also compliment you on your trenchant article in the August issue of the Progressive and on your views on the Foreign Assistance Act of 1964, especially those pertaining to military assistance.

We will reproduce portions of the Progressive article and distribute it throughout our town. Thank you again.

Respectfully yours,
BRUCE ANAWALT.
LORETTA ANAWALT.

P.S.—Please pass on to Nancy my very best wishes and let her know that I have been teaching at Washington State University for 4 years now. I have heard some news of her and am pleased she is doing well. Thank you.

B. A.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
July 3, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Democratic Convention Headquarters,
Courtel Motel, Coos Bay, Oreg.:

Support you on your position on Vietnam. Hope that State Democratic convention does likewise.

RUSS FARRELL.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
July 3, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
State Democratic Convention,
Coos Bay, Oreg.:

We urge you to pass a resolution condemning the shameful war in Vietnam.

Mr. and Mrs. LARRY E. MEDINGER.

GRESHAM, OREG.,
July 3, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Courtel Motel,
Coos Bay, Oreg.:

DEAR SENATOR: We beg you to continue your courageous fight to bring U.S. military home from southeast Asia.

MARK and CORINNE CHAMBERLIN.

GRESHAM, OREG.,
July 3, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Courtel Motel,
Coos Bay, Oreg.:

Congratulations on growing support for your good stand against our involvement Vietnam.

CLARENCE BERGQUIST,
Chairman, Methodist Federation,
Gresham.

MORSE PRAISED

TO THE EDITOR: Senator WAYNE MORSE is performing a valuable service for the American people. He appears to be the only U.S. Senator who has not succumbed to the hysteria carefully cultivated by the Johnson administration during the recent Gulf of Tonkin incident.

His role in the present southeast Asia crisis is similar to the role performed by Senator Robert M. LaFollette, of Wisconsin, during the hysteria that dragged the United States into a war that was supposed to "make the world safe for democracy" in 1917. It should be pointed out that Senator MORSE is a native of Wisconsin and was raised in the fighting liberal tradition of old Bob LaFollette.

Senator MORSE is absolutely correct in his assertion that the U.S. Government is indeed seeking a predated declaration of war. The congressional resolution desired by the Johnson administration would be a carte blanche for any future fait accompli that the State Department and the Pentagon might present to the American people in the future.

Apparently we are now entering a new era of international anarchy where governments will first act against each other without exhausting peaceful remedies for the resolution of disputes. It is an unpleasant truth to contemplate but the United States has now decided that a Pearl Harbor approach to the resolution of international disputes is sometimes justified.

Senator MORSE deserves the gratitude of the American people for his fight against the Pearl Harbor approach. He is a man among sheep.

ROBERT E. NORDLANDER,
Menasha, Wis.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
August 6, 1964.

Hon. Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I commend you with all my heart for your courageous stand on the Vietnam situation. I only hope other elected representatives will follow your lead.

I agree with your view that there is a civil war going on in South Vietnam and we are interfering in the internal affairs of that country.

I've sent telegrams protesting the involvement of American troops in Vietnam to President Johnson, California Representatives James Roosevelt and Charles H. Wilson, also Senator Thomas H. Kuchel.

My personal opinion is that President Johnson will commit political suicide and not only lose the election but the respect of the American people if he follows the Goldwater line, which is to escalate this so-called war further north. His alternative is to be honest with himself and the American people and present this entire dispute before the United Nations or to use the methods you recommended for solution to the southeast Asian problem.

The local newspapers do not always print what you say on Vietnam so would appreciate copies of your speeches regarding this subject so I may publicize your stand and get my friends and others to see the light and spur them into action.

Respectfully yours,
MRS. MAE LEVIN.

RIDGEFIELD, N.J.,
August 26, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SENATOR: I thought I would take this opportunity to congratulate you on the fine stand you have taken on so many issues, and especially on the speech you gave condemning our meddling in Vietnam. I feel that you are the conscience of Congress and I regret that a man of your integrity should not now be acclaimed our next President. I have followed your course in Congress for many years, and you echoed what I felt I would have done if I were in your place. May the sanity evinced by you spread to other responsible Members that they may return our Government to pathways consistent with Christianity.

Sincerely,
CHARLES WOODROW LAUBER.

MODESTO, CALIF.,
August 27, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Want to express my appreciation for your forthright stand in regard to our involvement in southeast Asia. There must be many more among your colleagues who agree with you but are afraid of political lightning.

I would like to know how much, in the estimation of our military or the CIA, support has General Khanh among the South Vietnamese. From what little information available here it is exceedingly small. Would also like to know if Secretary McNamara is sure that the attack on the *Maddox* and *C. Turner Joy* on the night of August 4 was not perpetrated by General Khanh's gunboats in order to involve us deeper and thereby make his own position more secure. It would not surprise me if he should use such shenanigans.

It is very disconcerting to reflect on what kind of regimes we are keeping in power by our foreign aid. It seems to me that we would be better off in every way if we used that money for slum clearance in Harlem and other cities. There is so much that needs to be done in order to alleviate those pressing problems here at home.

Hoping that you will send the information requested in the second paragraph above. With the very best of wishes, I am,

Yours for more sanity,
STEFAN C. CHARNESKI.

ASHBY, MASS.,
August 23, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I was glad to learn that two U.S. Senators had the courage of their convictions and voted against endorsement of President Johnson's orders to the Navy in the recent Tonkin Bay affair.

I do not like what we are doing in South Vietnam. I cannot believe that our policy there is helping to preserve peace or build democracy there.

The common people, as usual, are the sufferers.

Why are we not giving some consideration to President de Gaulle's suggestion that efforts be made to establish a neutral region in southeast Asia? Or are we? How can we begin to support the ordinary peasants rather than the elite ruling class? How can the shooting be stopped?

Sincerely,
DOROTHY T. WILDER.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
August 22, 1964.

SENATOR MORSE,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to commend you for your steadfast opposition to the undeclared war in Vietnam.

It is unfortunate that in the U.S. Senate there are only two courageous Senators that have the courage of their conviction to speak out against a war that we have no business to be in, and it is the best interest of the American people and the world to pull out of it.

In this nuclear age the only way to resolve differences is by negotiations and we surely have the instruments to do just that. Keep up your humanitarian fight for a world of peace and brotherhood.

Very truly,

ESTHER BECKER.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
August 24, 1964.

Senator MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I approve and endorse your position regarding the war in South Vietnam.

STEVE WILK.

WALLED LAKE, MICH.,
July 31, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: All praise for your valiant fight against flagrant U.S. aggression in Vietnam. Keep up the good work. The reason you don't hear from me oftener is I'm so busy bombarding the L.B.J.-Rusk-McNamara war machine with protests I can't find the time. (Copies to Michigan Senators and Representatives.)

Senator GRUENING has sent me his speeches on the subject from March 10 to July 2, 1964—the fullest review I've read, though I've been a steady reader of the National Guardian since its beginning, and am also an earnest reader of Monthly Review, New World Review, and the Minority of One, which do their best to dispel the blackout of the representative press.

I would appreciate receiving all of your speeches on the subject, past and future, you will send. I read it all most studiously.

Can't you and Senator GRUENING and other valiant soldiers for peace and conversion to a U.S. economy to nonmilitary production, get a new party going with this long overdue objective?

Respectfully yours,

R. P. BREDE.

Names of others who would value copies of CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with your Vietnam speeches:

Rev. Colin D. Keys, Shanton, Iowa; Mrs. Sylvia Trulin, Howell, Mich.; Dr. and Mrs. E. C. Bancroft, Hamilton, N.Y.; Miss Judith Bancroft, Arlington, Va.; Mr. Alexander Brede III, East Lansing, Mich.; Dr. Robert Peebles, Oberlin, Ohio; Mr. and Mrs. Alec Krater, Independence, Calif.

JOURNAL SUPPORTS MORSE

To the EDITOR:

As Friends, we wish to express our grave concern regarding the situation in South Vietnam—a situation particularly tragic to the Vietnamese people.

We urge the placing of the entire Vietnam situation before the United Nations and the withdrawal of U.S. military forces from this area of southeast Asia as soon as United Nations personnel can be assigned.

We strongly support and commend Oregon's Senator WAYNE MORSE for his forthright stand and his outspoken desire to correct this phase of U.S. foreign policy.

Likewise, the Oregon State Democratic Platform Committee is to be commended for supporting the position of Senator MORSE.

As events of the recent weeks have demonstrated, we are fast approaching a point of no return. Immediate steps must be taken to neutralize this area of conflict.

ESTHER RICHARDS, *Clerk.*
ROBERT MORRIS SMITH,
Chairman, Peace and Social Service Committee, Religious Society of Friends.

CHALLENGE TO PRESS

To the EDITOR:

It has been an open secret now for several months that our Government was seriously considering an extension of the war in South Vietnam into the north. At the same time the American people have been kept unaware of the day-by-day progress of U.S. involvement of Vietnam and of the most recent policy decisions of the Government. Now a resolution is demanded of Congress, on the basis of the "Tonkin incidents," delegating the power to make war in that area for an indefinite period of time to this same administration.

To this point, only Senator MORSE has opposed this unnecessary and, in my judgment, indefensible policy. There has been no investigation of the supposed "aggression" of North Vietnam, nor of the ulterior designs of the administration, in seeking this grant of extraordinary power. There is plenty of reason to doubt that the administration is telling the full truth about these "attacks." In particular, the American people do not know the prelude to the incident and the role of these same ships in aiding and abetting South Vietnam attacks on the coast and islands of the north.

Since it is not likely that Congress is going to question the policy of the administration and entirely unlikely that the Republican Party is going to give us a choice by making the Government give the full facts of the incident, that responsibility falls on the press.

It is incumbent on the press to demand the full facts, to present them to the American people and to reserve approval of this dangerous and covert policy until it has been discussed openly and fully.

In my opinion, the press has not given the American people the critical examination of this policy which it so badly needs.

J. L. TOBEY,
Tolovana Park.

TOO MUCH POWER

TO THE EDITOR: In your August 18 issue, Mr. Dearborn of Minneapolis made a broad-brush smear of our U.S. Senators. An answer to part of this attack is in order.

I support Senator MORSE in his opposition to the handling of the Vietnam crisis. There is a sound constitutional basis for this. The right to declare war or initiate acts of war is reserved to the Congress.

The right of our naval force to defend themselves against attack in international waters is unquestioned. When we go beyond this and launch an attack on another nation, then this should be authorized by the Congress. The hasty and unauthorized retaliation by the executive department was not warranted by the circumstances.

Time was available for our clear warning to North Vietnam by authorizing attacks on their supporting facilities in the event of a repeated attack. This would undoubtedly have discouraged further action on their part and dispelled the charges of "paper tiger" in Asia.

Unfortunately, congressional action came after our attack and goes too far. It yields to the President the power to engage in acts of war throughout all of southeast Asia. This resolution is a complete abdication of congressional responsibility in these matters and places no limitations on the President as to time, place, means or provocation. How will our President in 1984 use this power?

FRANK J. MIEHE,
Lake Oswego.

ST. LOUIS, MO.,
August 27, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Congratulations on your stand on Vietnam. While you stand almost alone in the Senate, you have helped keep alive the possibilities for a further examination of our policy in southeast Asia.

Sincerely,

F. RICHARD SINGER, III.

WHITTIER, CALIF.,
August 25, 1964.

The Honorable WAYNE L. MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This is my opportunity to compliment you for what I consider a very courageous stand, in your recent criticism of the resolution which supported President Johnson and our provocative action in the Gulf of Tonkin. You were obviously in the minority, so far as the vote in the Senate was concerned but, so far as popular support from "the people," I am sure you had many, many supporters.

I personally am very much concerned with the trend of our present foreign policy. The United States seems bent on lending our support everywhere—whether or not it is requested.

It is my hope that our representatives in Washington, D.C., begin to realize that their actions involve the lives of human beings. It is admirable to be a fervent patriot and support our elected leaders, provided these leaders are realists as well as patriots.

Your position in the Senate has been unique and I personally have great admiration and respect for your stand on international problems. Keep up the good work. Although I can't vote for you personally as I am a resident of California, I support you whenever and wherever I can.

Sincerely yours,

R. W. SMEDUL.

SEVEN VALLEYS, PA.,
August 29, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I just discovered yesterday that my letter to you of August 7 was in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and found this most heartening—I hope it will do some good there. I have not given up yet on our policy in Vietnam. Last Saturday I participated in a demonstration on Vietnam locally and Tuesday I was in the Vietnam demonstration in Atlantic City. I am also enclosing a carbon of a letter I have just written to Senator CLARK.

During our local demonstration we handed out one-page sheets quoting you and Senator GRUENING and urging people to wire or write the President, Senators, Congressmen. You may have seen the sheets handed out in Atlantic City—attempting to present the facts that too many are unaware of. Unfortunately too often the response is like that of one man in Atlantic City who saw the large type at the top of the page, crumpled it up without reading it, and told me I was a Communist. He didn't want the facts and was darned if he was going to let anyone tell him the facts. But it was heartening too to have many people say warmly "I agree with you." Often these were people unlikely to write to their Senators or Congressmen, but who knew that war is not the way to change men's minds.

So—let's keep trying.

Best wishes,

LINDA SMITH.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Your bold and courageous stand in your TV appearance last week, your sincere opinions expressing grave concern over our country's involvement in the South Vietnam war and the warning that this participation may bring about a major war in east Asia, was most heartening and found a deeply felt response in the hearts and minds of the American people. Especially, in the hearts of our mothers, who do not want to see their sons killed in a senseless war in Vietnam.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING from Alaska was so right when he said, and we quote, "all Vietnam is not worth the life of one American."

We, the listeners, were most proud of you, Senator, as well as of Senator GRUENING, and we wish to commend you on your stand in protesting the unjust slaughter of human beings.

Let us hear your voice raised in strong protest, again. You are not alone in this fight. Thousands of Americans are with you. We hope, that with the help of people like you, peace will be achieved.

Most sincerely yours,
HYMAN MOSKOWITZ.

CORTLAND, N.Y.,
August 21, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: As an American citizen I would like to thank you for the independent position that you and Senator GRUENING have taken on the war in Vietnam. If the press reports that I have seen accurately reflect your views, I am 100 percent in agreement with the position you have taken. I would appreciate it very much if your secretary could send me some material from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in regard to the southeast Asian problem and in regard to your position on foreign aid.

Let us hope that in the very near future that peace can be restored in this wartorn area.

Sincerely,
JAMES P. BARKER.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
August 22, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Your bold and courageous stand in your TV appearance last week, your sincere opinions expressing grave concern over our country's involvement in the South Vietnam war and the warning that this participation may bring about a major war in east Asia, was most heartening and found a deeply felt response in the hearts and minds of the American people. Especially, in the hearts of our mothers, who do not want to see their sons killed in a senseless war in Vietnam.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING, from Alaska, was so right when he said, and we quote, "all Vietnam is not worth the life of one American."

We, the listeners, were most proud of you Senator, as well as of Senator GRUENING, and we wish to commend you on your stand in protesting the unjust slaughter of human beings.

Let us hear your voice raised in strong protest, again. You are not alone in this fight. Thousands of Americans are with you. We hope, that with the help of people like you, peace will be achieved.

Most sincerely yours,
M. GINSTOSS.

NANUET, N.Y.,
September 2, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: From time to time, I read small excerpts in the New York Times, from your speeches, which I find exceedingly interesting. Likewise, I read some excerpts of your address on August 5, with reference to South Vietnam, which I found very informative and an analysis one doesn't get in the daily press, radio, or TV. I would, therefore, appreciate so very, very much, a copy of your entire talk. And so would some of my friends who likewise have been saddened by our young men, who have bravely given their lives, and have questioned "why?"

I am therefore enclosing a list of their names and addresses, who likewise, like Diogenes are seeking the truth. Will you please put us on your mailing list and send us a copy of your entire address of August 5, referred to above? I notice that Senator GRUENING of Alaska, likewise voted against the resolution, and I am therefore mailing him a copy of this letter.

Thank you, and with every good wish, believe me.

Very sincerely,
(Mrs.) ROSE PORTAL.

J. Herbert Allatt, Nanuet, N.Y.; M. Ackman, New York City; P. Campoli, Nanuet, N.Y.; P. D'Addeo, Monsey, N.Y.; M. Dickstein, Nanuet, N.Y.; Dr. and Mrs. Edelstein, Nanuet, N.Y.; V. Eismont, Spring Valley, N.Y.; Dr. N. C. Fine, Nanuet, N.Y.; Dr. E. Garbus, Spring Valley, N.Y.; J. Garfinkel, Bronx, New York City; Dr. H. Grushkin, Nanuet, N.Y.; Mr. and Mrs. S. Gurlitz, W. Nyack, N.Y.; F. R. Horn, Pearl River, N.Y.; Mr. and Mrs. A. C. Kapelner, Brooklyn, N.Y.; Alex Kelter, Hastings-on-Hudson, N.Y.; Dr. and Mrs. H. W. Lubetsky, Pamona, N.Y.; Mr. Lance Malkind, Pearl River, N.Y.; Mrs. Helen Lucas, Radburn, N.J.; Dr. and Mrs. G. Morlan, Pearl River, N.Y.; Dr. and Mrs. H. L. Sperling, Suffern, N.Y.; Mr. Thomas Theise, Pearl River, N.Y.; Mr. and Mrs. J. B. Wiggenhorn, Valley Cottage, N.Y.

YAKIMA, WASH.,
August 18, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE L. MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: It is hard to put into words our appreciation for your dissenting vote when President Johnson asked for the resolution to step up the Vietnam war.

Thank God for you and Senator GRUENING who stood on conscience. It seems as if the rest of Congress is like a flock of sheep.

My husband is away on business at the present, and I have been ill is the reason for neglecting to get this note of thanks to you. He and I have been alarmed at our policy in Vietnam and admired your stand.

Respectfully yours,
Mrs. M. E. HERR.

RIDLEY PARK, PA.,
August 22, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I have already congratulated you on your wonderful stand in opposition to the official Vietnam policy. However in talking to my friends I find that most of them are very ignorant of the most elementary facts of the situation. Would it be possible for your office to send me about 50 copies of your speech in opposition to President Johnson's resolution.

As a member of the Philadelphia Orchestra I travel a great deal and am anxious to distribute your speech to many people.

Wishing you continued strength and increased success I remain;

Very sincerely yours,
FRED BATCHELDER.

MADISON, WIS.,
August 25, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I would like to heartily commend your vote against the Vietnamese resolution and your consistent stand against U.S. presence in southeast Asia. The questions you raise and the reasoning you present need the greatest support—I admire your sanity and courage.

Very sincerely,
Mrs. PETER WEISS.

ELSINORE, CALIF.,
August 24, 1964.

Sen. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Please accept our commendation of your speech on the Senate floor on August 5, 1964.

We agree with you wholeheartedly, and hereby express our thanks for your courageous stand on behalf of peace.

Respectfully yours,
ELSINORE JEWISH WOMEN'S READING CIRCLE.

Aida Beldner, Corresponding Secretary; Bertha Sideman, President; Dr. Rosa S. Warben, Mary Magnus, Anna Schultz, Mary Hafer, Bessie Zaretsky, Baina Rival, Zena Goldsmith, Rose Shapiro.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.,
August 22, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I cannot understand why so few people care about the truth in Vietnam. I am grateful for your constant efforts to bring it to light and urge a realistic, nonwarlike policy—but I am terribly frightened as we become more and more aggressive, and no one seems to care.

Thank you for your efforts—I hope for my children's sake others will see and act by your light.

Sincerely,
Mrs. K. J. ACKERMAN.

WORCESTER, MASS.,
August 25, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I want to express my appreciation of your position and that of Senator GRUENING, on the Vietnam situation.

I wish that our Massachusetts Senators shared your views about our policy there, which is so disgraceful and dangerous to our country.

Respectfully,
THURSTON TAYLOR.

SEATTLE, WASH.,
August 10, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Just a note to let you know that you have my support in your stand on our involvement in South Vietnam.

I lost a brother in Korea who died in support of a dictator, and the area is still under a dictatorship.

In South Vietnam the government is a military dictatorship. Up north the Communists have a dictatorship. So what choice is there. Is our side better than the Communists? I am 100 percent for pulling out of Vietnam. If the present government can't stay in power now, after several billions of dollars of our military aid, then it deserves to fall.

Sincerely,

WALTER F. MANDICH.

LONG BEACH, CALIF.,
August 25, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you for never disappointing me, in all these years of your senatorial record.

Your stand on Vietnam was heroic—and I approve—and applaud your vast courage in speaking out.

I'm a 47-year-old cynical citizen. My faith in the legislative process we have currently is sorely tried. Then you speak, and I feel if there is one Senator—you are the one.

Sounds a bit like a fan letter to the Beatles, but I do want you to know how sincerely I admire your bravery and clear-mindedness.

Currently, politics so sickens me that hearing you speak your mind is truly an oxygen treatment.

Thank you for just being you.

Sincerely,

HELEN BRIDGET TETLEU.

BALTIMORE, MD.,
September 5, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: The enclosed letter to the editor I sent to the Evening Sun, and as you can see it was published in its entirety.

I am sending it to you to encourage you to keep up the good fight. So many of us are behind you.

I was recently a Republican candidate for the U.S. Congress from Maryland's Seventh District. I lost in the primary to a saber-rattling Goldwater Republican. Even though a Republican, I am supporting President Johnson in his campaign.

I sent a copy of this letter to the President also.

With all good wishes,

Sincerely,

SYLVAN M. SHANE.

WINTHROP, MASS.,
August 27, 1964.

MY DEAR MR. MORSE: Just a note to express my sincere appreciation of your stand on Vietnam. Yours seems to be the only voice raised in opposition to our big-bully policy there and I feel heartened each time you raise it. I don't know how we got ourselves into that mess, but I do know that more military force is not the way out of it. Can't vote for you—alas—living in Massachusetts, but I surely can send up many prayers for your support. Do what you can to dispel our vast misinformation about things, as it is now, and may heaven help you.

Most gratefully,

Mrs. FAITH B. WHITMAN.

BUENA PARK, CALIF.,
August 25, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Good for you. Are you the only man in the Senate with any sense? Or the only one with any courage? Or both? Whatever the case, I feel a moral obligation to let you know that I applaud and support your position on Vietnam.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. CONSTANCE D. HADDAD.

PERKINS, OKLA.,
August 26, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I want to congratulate you upon your stand on the Vietnam question. You are so right.

I thank you for your courage in standing against the idiotic reaction of other supposedly peace-loving officials.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. C. B. STOUT.

GRANVILLE, MASS.,
July 7, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: No words can express my pride in knowing you and my thorough endorsement of your logic, historical data, your international law, and your practical and sane diplomacy.

Thank you for taking the open stand and the vote recording that you did. Please convey to Senator GRUENING my appreciation of his stand by word and vote.

Even if you speak to an empty house you have some who will hear you on the outside and many more who, in days yet to come, will learn of and commend your stand.

I have written my humble contribution to newspapers and to several Senators as well as to Ambassador Stevenson.

May I receive copies of your speeches if available and convenient?

Is there a grouping of opinions by competent lawyers and eminent citizens backing your arguments which it is possible for me to obtain and circulate? I will try to be responsible for circulation in my own town to the extent of 100 at $5 per mailing.

If that $5 can be used to better advantage otherwise, please command me.

Cordially,

HERMANN G. PATT.

SALT LAKE, UTAH,
August 7, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

MY GOOD BROTHER AND HONORED SIR: If, as the Good Book says, "being thy brothers keeper" be honorable, conscientious, and considerate of your fellowman then I hereby christen you "All-American of the U.S. Senate today." Were I in your shoes today I would oppose McNamara's war, and his "yes-men Senators" as do you; and I thank you for defending my sons, and other sons, against the danger of fertilizing Asiatic soil by their blood being spilled there.

From my humble position, I feel the U.S. Navy attempts to convert all of the Pacific into a yankee lake, to aline the crumbled British and French empires into U.S. colonies, of pouring billions of dollars into the Vietnam and forcing a war on China and Russia is only another Korean rathole that John Dulles engineered; and gives growing international evidence of the United States being the breeding ground of the worldwide wars, oppressors of the backward peoples, and wreckers of world peace; and very clearly outlines the bankrupt state of U.S. leadership and diplomacy.

Can one fail to see why "anti-yankee" agitators make such staggering gains in successfully maligning the United States and activating crowds (mobs?) to spit on Mr. Nixon in Caracas, or keep Mr. Eisenhower out of Japan?

Expanding war in Vietnam under a smoke screen of "stopping communism" only exposes the truth, the real truth, of U.S. design, debunks our boasts as "defenders of the free world (?)," and will make China the protector of Asia from the "Godly" (?) western (Christian ?) United States.

As we sow, we shall reap. Henry A. Wallace said "don't send tanks, guns, and planes to the prostrated nations—but send seed, plows, and food to them." Voice of sanity. Today, with two-thirds of humanity "anti-yankee" and many others leaning that way, we face the necessity of nuclear incineration for our opponents—or cease the "fire and death" prescription of "Dr. McNamara" and his coterie of collaborators—Which will others of the NATO choose? Certainly not war.

One more Hiroshima and U.S. prestige is in irreparable discard, the vaunted leadership is repudiated and U.S. "sphere of influence" shrinks to our shoreline.

To one of your grasp of facts, I can only falter in your shadow, but may I implore God to give you the wisdom of the ages and fortitude of Atlas, that your good efforts prevail to turn the Senate from war, to a humble appreciation of, and application to, our social needs.

I will appreciate 20 copies of your last statements in the Senate against the naval and military acts in Asia.

Thanking you, I am always,

Yours in respect,

JOE BIRD.

DUNREITH, IND.,
August 23, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: A belated thank you for the stand you took, almost alone, on the Vietnam actions.

You have probably experienced a lot of hateful opposition on this account, and I want to add my encouragement and thanks for the service you are rendering by speaking what you consider to be the truth.

Sincerely,

PETER N. KIGER.

NEW WINDSOR, MD.,
August 22, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I was much interested in your article in the August issue of Progressive "Humpty Dumpty in Vietnam." I guess I was not quite sure of the logic of your position from the newspaper accounts but this article is very informative. I would be interested in receiving any copies of speeches you might have made on the subject, if any are available. I have always respected your integrity ever since I remember seeing your billboards out in Oregon when you ran for the Senate back in 1944. Keep up the good work.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM P. NYCE.

STOCKTON, CALIF.,
August 30, 1964.

DEAR MR. MORSE: I don't feel as though my letter is going to have any bearing on the subject one way or another, but I do feel like I have the right as a voting citizen of the United States, to voice my opinion.

I do not feel like I am only speaking for myself, but thousands of other Americans

My topic is Vietnam.

I work in a large department store and talk with people, 5 days a week, from all walks of life, and I have yet to find one person who is in accord with our military being in Vietnam.

Aren't we doing just the opposite of what we said we would at the Geneva Conference?

Conditions in Vietnam have shown no improvement in the 5 years we have been over there. I feel like thousands of other Americans, that we are only a source of irritation by having our military dictating over there. I am sure that the Government of Vietnam could be more easily stabilized if we would pull our military out of there and deal with them on a roundtable discussion basis and helping them to achieve better and more peaceful living standards. Better schools, hospitals, various types of enterprises to create employment, better knowledge of agriculture and last but far from least to have unity and love for one another. This cannot be done with rifles and handgrenades.

Our military men are a source of rebellious contention with those people and they will resent that form of aggression as long as there is a Vietnam. I do not feel like we are exploiting ourselves as Christian Democrats in the methods we are using.

There is only one way to defeat communism and that is to show and prove to those people that there is a better and healthier way to live and again that cannot be done with the "Do as I say plan or we will kill you."

Maybe my whole understanding of this situation is wrong but that is the way thousands of Americans feel.

Why must we sacrifice any more of our sons, husbands, and brothers over there when nothing is to be accomplished by their sacrifices.

Please, Mr. MORSE, fight just a little harder and try and get our leaders to see and admit that they are making a costly mistake. There is no disgrace when you admit you are wrong but it is a disgrace to take any more lives of our American men. A Purple Heart or a citation of one kind or another is no reward to the loved ones of these men who gave their lives—for what?

Respectfully,

MRS. MOLLY MCGUIRE.

GOLETA, CALIF.,
August 21, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE: This little letter is written to remind you that those all-too-few Americans fortunate enough to be exposed to an undiluted portion of your political views steadfastly support your unswerving dedication to a peaceful world, as admirably seen in your Senate speech on the southeast Asia declaration.

Your example is a fitting addition to another chapter in profiles in courage.

We thank you,

BILL WILDE,
JACOB DEKKEN.

AUGUST 23, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I write to thank you for the incredibly courageous efforts you have been making to bring an open discussion of U.S. policy in southeast Asia (and elsewhere) to the Senate floor.

You stand as the greatest inspiration to those of us who are optimistic that the confrontation with communism will not produce world war III.

May I suggest that the Willard Matthias of CIA suggestion for negotiations may be an important opening in the direction of peace.

Thank you,

ROBERT O. DOYLE.

HONOLULU, HAWAII,
September 2, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Just a note of encouragement in line with your stand on the South Vietnam situation.

Sincerely,

WM. A. MYERS, M.D.

UNITED STATES DUTY BOUND TO TAKE VIETNAM ISSUE TO UNITED NATIONS, SAYS WAYNE MORSE

"I will repeat and repeat in the months to come," vowed Senator WAYNE MORSE, "that the United States cannot justify sending an American boy to his death on a battlefield in the absence of a declaration of war and without seeking first to settle the dispute in the United Nations.

"What is happening in South Vietnam is a threat to the peace of the world. That puts it under the jurisdiction of the United Nations. It is the clear duty of the United States to file a complaint before the United Nations in respect to the violation of the Geneva accords, and not to take unilateral military action, which action has intensified the threat to the peace of the world, flowing from the violation of the accords."

The above remarks of WAYNE MORSE are to be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 21, 1964.

AUGUST 22, 1964.

To the Honorable SENATOR MORSE.

DEAR SENATOR: I read your speech defending the right for the South Vietnam people. They have the right to live without the United States to interfere aggressively.

And I wish to congratulate you with all my heart.

All the people with brains say we will lose and the goofy generals don't see it.

My best wishes to you, Senator, for your health so you can be able to tell the goofy ones.

Yours truly,

S. A. DROPOLL.

MICKLETON, N.J.,
August 23, 1964.

Senator CLIFFORD CASE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CASE: The situation in Vietnam, and therefore in all of Asia, looks more and more dangerous to the peace of the world, and the standing of the United States among the nations.

I am particularly disturbed by the recent vote in the Senate when you and all but two Senators voted to support a military dictator who very evidently has little support among his own people. I can understand the pressures upon you, but regret that you did not back Senator MORSE after his very able speech on Vietnam.

The idea that arms will defeat communism is the theme of the narrow nationalists who threaten to precipitate a war to end civilization. I believe that any such armed victory would only prolong the reign of communism, and that the field of action must be changed to that of the minds and welfare of the people of Vietnam. Our own example is the most effective weapon that we have, and it has been contradictory and inconsistent in many ways. I am convinced that our troops have no more business in Asia than Russia's have in Cuba or Hungary.

Hoping that you will study this question more carefully, I am

Sincerely yours,

HENRY W. RIDGWAY.

MADISON, WIS.,
August 19, 1964.

To Senator WAYNE MORSE: Congratulations on your integrity and commendable stand on the Vietnamese resolution, and your consistent stand against the presence of United States in the southeast of Asia. More strength to you.

Sincerely,

MRS. DENISE NOBLE.

AUGUST 22, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank God, you have the courage to stand fast in opposition to the insanity of expanding the war in Asia.

Continue your efforts for peace.

CHESTER KINSY.

OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLA.,
August 18, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senator from Oregon.

OUR DEAR SENATOR: I feel that in raising the question of what our country's business is in South Vietnam, and what cost to us ensues in the close-working alliance between our Government and that of a succession of dictators in South Vietnam you are rendering, as Senator GRUENING is also, a valuable service to the American people.

As Senator FULBRIGHT has on occasions remarked, or wrote, "to think on the unthinkable" is a salutary exercise of reason for anyone in Government, or for any citizen for that matter.

I suspect the major portion of the South Vietnamese people has come to look upon the 21,000 American "advisers" as intruders and heartily wish that they would clear out.

There is the appearance that local dictators are holding the populace in thralldom, and that a few amongst the higher echelon of thousands of American "advisers" have established, and are in the process of establishing an ever-tighter dictatorship over the Vietnamese military Khanh and for the Khanhinate.

Our local press only published an excerpt from your recent speech on this "graveside" matter. This appears to me as being censorship, which I think does not befit a democrary; neither does it seem emulous of an honest way of life, which thought leads on to another, that being the question: how can "free" world become much free without constructing a great society based and buttressed on honesty in government and in life?

If available I would appreciate receiving reprints of each of your two speeches recently made dealing with this acute problem.

Sincerely,

CONNER MCGEE.

SWITZERLAND, *August 21, 1964.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: While in England I read a brief mention of your stand in declining to give anybody a "predated check for a declaration of war" in southeast Asia. The press once again failed to report your views and facts of value to the public but that one man had the courage to stand by his convictions—and the awesome truth—was important to history.

Events since that moment of hysteria seem to have vindicated your assertions that the United States was at least as much to blame as North Vietnam for any incident which occurred there. It appears that the Vietnamese mosquito boats may have had good reason to believe that the *Maddox* was the same vessel that had repeatedly attacked some of their islands—a case of mistaken identity, apparently. The vessel or vessels that attacked the islands may have been merely ships furnished to the South Vietnamese by the U.S. Navy and possibly escorted to the scene of the attack by the same patron.

May I have a copy of your remarks made in opposition to the granting of that "predated check"? I have a notion that they will be important to add the historical record.

Enclosed is a brief comment of my own on the direction of U.S. policy in southeast Asia in which I took the liberty of quoting you—I hope, acceptably. French and British editors were and remain much concerned that some trigger-happy believers in the omnipotence of airpower may involve us in some more tragic episode before the elections are over and I hope that I am correct in assuring them that such is not the intention, at least, of responsible leaders of the administration. All the same, it appears evident that Hanoi's restraint or caution or discretion—or more sanity than most of us are prepared to concede the Asian opposition—prevented the enlargement of that Tonkin incident into a general holocaust. Men with that much sense of responsibility might be worth talking to before shooting up. I would say that a more effective response to a few harmless shots from the mosquito boats of Tonkin would have been a bombardment of those ports with bags of gift rice instead of explosives, accompanied by a warning to them and the world that the next time might be more lethal.

Sincerely,

EDGAR SNOW.

SAN JOSE, CALIF.,
August 20, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: This afternoon I read the major excerpts of your speech of August 5 in opposition to President Johnson's policy on Vietnam. It was published in a small weekly newspaper published in New York.

Enclosed is a copy of a letter I wrote to the local San Jose paper. I would appreciate it if you would mail them a copy of your speech and mail to me five copies of your speech.

Thanking you from the bottom of my heart for your courage and strength, I am

Very truly yours,

DONALD H. CLARK.

SAN JOSE, CALIF.,
August 20, 1964.

EDITOR,
San Jose Mercury,
San Jose, Calif.

DEAR SIR: According to today's (August 20, 1964) "Inquiring Reporter" all seven of the people interviewed on the "U.S. Stand in Vietnam" voted approval of our present policy. This is understandable when you consider what they have read so far about what has happened.

In all fairness to the truth I would urge you to print the major excerpts of Senator WAYNE MORSE's speech of August 5, in opposition to the resolution in support of President Johnson's action. I would further urge the Inquiring Reporter to make another interview after the speech is printed to gage public opinion on the issue.

Very truly yours,

DONALD H. CLARK.

[From the San Jose (Calif.) Mercury, Aug. 8, 1964]

INQUIRING REPORTER: FAVOR U.S. STAND IN VIETNAM?

Danny Moyers, food clerk, San Jose: "So far, so good. As long as we stay firm with it right now. If I had my way I'd just draw the line and say, 'This is it.' I'd agree up to a point with GOLDWATER who wants to go in and cut out the supply lines. Either get in or get out. No sense wasting dollars and men. It won't be a campaign issue now. Johnson took the bite out of it."

Mrs. Donald Tewalt, housewife-school employee, San Jose: "Yes, I do. I'm in agreement with his returning the fire, if you can call it that. He sort of showed them he wasn't afraid. I think it would be a good policy for the future. I don't agree with GOLDWATER even though I'm a Republican. The theory of retaliation with limited force will accomplish its mission. I don't think Vietnam will be much of a campaign issue now that GOLDWATER has agreed with Johnson."

M. D. Stewart, college teacher, Santa Clara: "I think the action Johnson took is consistent with our policy: a reluctance to get into war, but an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth. I'm for it under the present circumstances. If they made a major change I hope our Government would take similar steps. Right now we should be content to cope with Russia and their bluff. The attack was a decided advantage for the Democrats, as Johnson has taken a strong and decisive position."

The Rev. Joseph Green, pastor, San Jose: "Yes, I do. We've been long overdue in standing up to the Red forces. We've been backing down more or less since Korea. It's time we showed our colors. Sooner or later we'll have to resolve the Vietnam problem. But let them be the aggressor when it happens and we can defend ourselves. I sort of go along with GOLDWATER. 'Peace through preparedness.'"

Becky Lira, high school student, San Jose: "We just couldn't let it go at that. If we did let it go, even though they were just little P.T. boats, they may come back with something bigger. I think Kennedy would have probably done the same thing. I don't think we should take over Vietnam. I wouldn't want anyone to take over our country. And I wouldn't favor the use of atomic weapons. If I had my way we would go back to using pistols.

Mrs. Zella Galletti, housewife, San Jose: I don't think Johnson was correct in ordering the recent attack. He's definitely just trying to carry out Kennedy's policy down the line. To me this is good, if we can do it, as I was behind Kennedy all the way. And I'm sorry Johnson eliminated Bobby Kennedy. As a result, I don't think Johnson has a very good chance now. As for others, I don't think anybody should comment on Mr. GOLDWATER's comments on Vietnam or otherwise. Just ignore him."

Jack Vitale, cement plant worker, Los Gatos: "I guess so, I guess Johnson did the right thing. The Russians are just waiting and waiting. They could step in any time if we didn't stay right after them. Johnson is really trying. He's holding his head up like anybody else would, I guess. Cuba is pretty quiet right now compared to what it once was. Maybe Vietnam will turn out the same way if we don't let them get ahead of us."

DAYTON, OHIO,
August 26, 1964.

To the Honorable Senator Morse.

DEAR SIR: I wish to thank you for standing up to your beliefs, even in spite of so much opposition. God bless you always.

I will be praying for you and other leaders of our country.

Sincerely,

MRS. BETTY DE LONG.

YORK, PA.,
August 24, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I cannot express deeply enough to you my thanks and appreciation for the courage and integrity you have long shown in the Senate, but especially in regard to the war in Vietnam. It is so difficult for us to really get the truth, but I'm sure many Americans feel the U.S. role in southeast Asia is unjustified. It seems as if we deliberately are looking for a major war in that area.

I am certain that you must feel a sense of tremendous frustration standing almost alone in your attempt to reverse the trend toward war. Many of us share this feeling and wonder what, if anything, we can do. Quite a few months ago I wrote President Johnson about seeking a negotiated settlement in Vietnam. My reply came from the State Department stating firm opposition to this point of view and including an historical sketch of the Vietnamese situation from about 1954 on. This did not seem to fit with information I have read elsewhere. It almost seems that we ordinary citizens are being told what the Government wants us to believe. This is exactly what we have criticized so strongly in Russia and other totalitarian states.

This trend toward almost a party line, the activity of the CIA, the strong pull to the right which the nomination of GOLDWATER seems to presage, and the almost required pose of being tuff that politicians exhibit makes me very doubtful that a world of peace can ever be achieved. Isn't there something that can be done? Perhaps if the profits could be removed from war preparations, the strength of the military-industrial complex in foreign affairs would be minimized.

Thank you for your lone strong voice. If you have any advice to peace oriented people, please let me know. I plan to join the protest vigil in Atlantic City on August 25.

Sincerely,

MARGERY H. DAHN.

DETROIT, MICH.,
August 21, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to commend you for your courage and commonsense in speaking out against the war in Vietnam, which you have rightly called illegal and unconstitutional. Please continue to work for a negotiated settlement. My prayers and good wishes are with you.

Sincerely yours,

ROSEMARY LAMBERT.

MENLO PARK, CALIF.,
August 18, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SENATOR: During the past several months, or even 2 years I have written dozens of letters of protest on our military exploits in Vietnam. The greater number of these protests were inspired by the lucidity of your reasoning and often by Senator GRUENING as well.

As you say, "our leaders counted on bluffing Communist China; but she was not bluffed in Korea when the whole U.N. was with us, and this time we have not one single ally." (Aug. 5, in the Senate. Quoted at length in the National Guardian Weekly, Aug. 15, 1964.)

I am appalled that not more Senators, especially Senator BARTLETT, did not join you and Senator GRUENING on this matter. I shall write also to the Senators from California, though perhaps Senator SALINGER was not yet a Member.

Very sincerely and gratefully,

MISS INGEGERD UPPMAN.

P.S.—Another article by you, in the August Progressive, we have Xeroxed and we are distributing copies.

BERKELEY, CALIF.,
August 21, 1964.

Hon. Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We have held an election in our house and elected you our honorary Senator. This citation comes about mainly for your courageous efforts in the Vietnam crisis some 2 weeks ago which I have avidly followed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. But it also takes into account your past and present efforts in the fields of foreign aid, natural gas, space satellite, left and right dictatorships, and public power. Incidentally, I have not yet informed my family of this vote, but since we vote by weight and I weigh more than my wife and two daughters, I'm sure of the outcome. I'm positive that they will move to make it unanimous. This seems as reasonable a voting procedure as anything the anti "one-man one-vote" people (DIRKSEN et al.) are talking about. It is certainly better than "one-acre one-vote" or "one-cow one-vote." This way, the more you have at stake (pounds), the more your voting power is.

In Wednesday's New York Times (August 19), the headline was "Two Hundred and Eighty Reds Reported Slain in Biggest Saigon Victory." This headline was repeated in all the local papers I've seen. When you read the story, you find out that about 500 Vietcong took part in the engagement, 280 Vietcong were killed but only 10 bodies were found. That is, 270 Vietcong (dead) were carried off through the jungle by the 220 live Vietcong, fighting as they went. This story seems to be a lie, a victory of press relations, not of battle. If you read the last paragraph of the story in the Times (which was cut out by all the local papers) you find that "First reports from the battle scene indicated that the Vietcong had come out the victor while losing about 40 men. However, Americans said today that the Communist death toll had been seven times greater." The "first reports" sound more like the truth, but very, very few Americans will ever realize this. Chalk up another victory for "public relations." Reporting like this is the reason that the overwhelming majority of Americans are against you and Senator GRUENING in your fight to bring some intelligence into this dispute. You must cite hard facts in your public appearances, not generalities, if you are to make any impression on the American public. Such facts as the admitted violations of North Vietnam (12-mile) waters by U.S. warships (Admiral Moore in the New York Times), the violations by the United States of the Geneva accords (no free elections, introduction of new military equipment, etc.) must be publicized if the U.S. people are ever to understand the position of the Communists. The American people must realize that the Vietcong are mostly South Vietnamese fighting with captured American weapons. This can be documented in the American press but it is usually buried way down in newspaper on page 32 or 50. These are the facts you must publicize if we ever are to get away from the battlefield and to the conference table.

I must admire your courage and honesty in speaking up as you have. Please keep it up. If the rule of law is not triumphant, the rule of death will be.

Yours truly,

GEORGE E. GOLDMAN.

MADISON, WIS.,
August 24, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MORSE: I should like to express my appreciation to you for the moral courage and clear thinking expressed in your consistent stand against the presence of U.S. forces in southeast Asia and in particular for your vote against the recent Vietnamese resolution. Please continue your good work for the welfare of our country and the world.

Sincerely,

VIOLA J. GRAHAM.

MILWAUKEE, WIS.,
August 22, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: As I believe I've told you before, I respect your record of individualism in the Senate. You and Senator GRUENING, among public figures, are the only two I should trust as President and Vice President of our country. I particularly admire your vote against giving Johnson power to extend the war in southeast Asia.

How I wish I could tell you my hopes for this country, my sadness at the way things are going. But you know my views already. Essentially they are your own. And to do unto others.

My husband is a newspaperman; I am a writer-editor. Please let us know when we can do something to help you, personally, or anyone who loves life enough to know we must not ruin it for ourselves or others through ignorance or false pride.

What can we do now? Shall we join the Democratic Party and work from within? Milwaukee, this truly charming city, is too comfortable and insular to have any effective peace groups. Tell me to whom we should write.

One last thing. A candidate for State assemblyman in our district (third) is the only one who ever said in his public words and meant it, the dirty word "peace," and no CD, and civil rights, and that a politician should declare his sources of income. His name is Bob Robinson. I'm telling you because I hope someday he meets you in the Senate. It's one spark of hope—then you'll have three votes.

Sincerely,

JEAN CLARRIDGE PELLETIERE.

BURBANK, CALIF.,
August 22, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Keep saying "it" and saying "it" and saying "it"—the truth about Vietnam and southeast Asia. Why are you and Senator GRUENING alone in your stand for a just, rational, humane settlement of U.S. involvement?

Many, many are sick and cynical and disillusioned by the provocations, arrogance, and indefensible U.S. involvement.

Do "keep saying it," and never stop talking.

Thank you for representing so many who cannot speak for ourselves.

Most respectfully,

Mrs. HARRY L. BLACK.

ST. IVES, AUSTRALIA, N.S.W.,
August 18, 1964.

Senator WAYNE L. MORSE,
Senate House, Washington.

DEAR SIR: May I please add my congratulations and support to the many you must have already received for your courageous and sensible protest against America's attack on North Vietnam. Many of us in Australia do not support our own Government's foreign policy which seems to be merely an echo of Washington no matter what occurs. We would all wish to see America as leader of the Western World but fear that she will lose this position if further happenings of this kind take place again.

However we are well aware that even in America there is widespread dismay at the idea of any extension of war in southeast Asia and it gives us a great deal of comfort to know that there is someone like yourself in the vanguard of the struggle for sanity, genuine democracy and the peaceful settlement of disputes. Please continue this struggle, and I can assure you that you have the wholehearted admiration of all Australians whether they agree with you or not. Your leadership has given great encouragement to all sane and sensible people everywhere and we feel sure that in time the American administration will be influenced to feel the same humanity and commonsense.

Again my thanks and congratulations on your stand.

Yours faithfully,

Mrs. MILLICENT L. CHRISTIAN.

CORVALLIS, OREG.,
September 7, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: The enclosed clipping will help to correct my present address.

I am anxious to encourage you in your positions on southeast Asia, foreign aid cuts, and civil rights. I respect your courage in the stands you take and I admire your wisdom in arriving at those stands.

Thank you for the things you send in the mail.

Yours truly,

BOBB F. BROWN.

PORT ORFORD, OREG.,
August 29, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR: Your stand on the Vietnam war strikes me as about the only intelligent one expressed in high circles. I have wondered about our right to be there, regardless of patriotic cliches and thunderings about freedom. I think I fear our Nation's possibly well-meaning stupidity about as much as I fear the enemy.

Please change my address on your mailing list to the above. Formerly, it was: 9198 SW. West Haven, Portland, Oreg. I have now become a rural schoolteacher.

Your truly,

DIANE E. ABBOTT.

P.S.—Even if the tennis-shod (shoed?) little old ladies are damning you, I still prefer your kind of foreign policy.

BLUE RIVER, OREG.,
August 28, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR FRIEND: The enclosed article was taken out of the San Francisco Chronicle this morning. Your courage in making an issue of the Vietnam war is wonderful. Your true friends are mighty proud of you. Keep up the good work.

More and more people are coming around to the view that we have no right being over there.

I felt that you would like to see the enclosed article.

Your sincere friend,

ART DUSTAN.

TALINT, OREG.,
August 19, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: As requested in your news letter of August 12, I am sending you our change of address. We would be sorry to miss a copy of the letter for any reason.

We are proud of your stand on the Vietnam issue, and applaud the courage you showed in voting against the recent resolution.

We hope you will represent Oregon for many more years in the Senate.

Yours sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. JOHN BEAGLE.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
August 18, 1964.

The Honorable Senator WAYNE MORSE,
417 Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I don't find many areas where I am in agreement with you, as I am a registered Republican and believe more in the Republican principles than I do of the Democratic principals. However, on the issue of Vietnam, I strongly support your position, and certainly admire your courage in facing up to overwhelming opposition. I can't help but feel you are right on this issue.

Yours truly,

R. M. JOHNSON.

PARKDALE, OREG.,
August 15, 1964.

Senator WAYNE L. MORSE,
417 Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Allow me to express satisfaction with and approval of the stand taken by yourself and Senator GRUENING of Alaska with regard to spreading the war in Vietnam, and to bestowing on our Presidency the blanket approval to wage war. As reported in the Portland Oregonian, although presumably of a small minority (in my way of thinking), I very much admire and applaud our esteemed Senators for standing up for what is right (but unpopular).

A group of Christians whom I know have been praying for the leaders of our Nation that they may receive divine guidance in directing the complex, and oftentimes vexing, problems and affairs of this great country.

While I am at it, I want to thank you and the Senators associated with you for the successful effort you have made to get foreign aid onto a more realistic basis. I am with you 100 percent.

Very truly yours,

Eric S. Nance.

August 31, 1964.

My Dear Senator: This copy will show that you have my backing. It is of small consequence, I know, but for whatever it's worth, you have it.

Thanks for the Record.

R.F.S., Sr.

[Copy]

Compton, Calif.,
August 27, 1964.

His Excellency, the President of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

Mr. President: I feel constrained to write you, giving my view in reference to the participation of this country in the military struggle now in progress in southeast Asia. It is my conviction that our engagement in this struggle cannot be justified on any grounds.

Having listened to the oratory at the convention at Atlantic City—most of it beautiful, interesting, and inspiring—I note that nearly every speaker has emphasized the necessity for peace on this planet and the importance of this Nation in the quest for it. I hasten to admit, sir, that the power and influence of this Nation is an important, probably the most important, factor in the effort toward universal peace in the world today.

But let me ask you, Mr. President, in all respect and yet candidly, in the pursuit of peace is it necessary to sacrifice American lives? Again, may I ask with equal respect and candor, what person is willing to acknowledge individual responsibility for the lives of Americans thus sacrificed?

As I have been taught to understand, by the law laid down by the great lawgiver, Moses, and supplemented by an additional commandment elucidated by Jesus Christ, we are admonished not to kill our fellow men.

Force, Mr. President, is not—cannot be, the answer in South Vietnam, or anywhere. The pretension that our part in this conflict is in pursuit of freedom does not stand up when exposed to the light of reason, right, and commonsense.

Please, Mr. President, please let us find some other way. The lives of Americans are too precious to be offered to the god of war in such a useless and senseless manner. Thanking you for your kind consideration to this appeal, I beg to remain,

Sincerely yours,

R. F. Smalley, Sr.

Phoenix, Ariz.,
August 27, 1964.

Dear Senator Morse: Having written to the Senator of my own State (the first time I ever followed that advice "write to your Congressman"), now I write to you. He was kind enough to answer my letter, but all I found out was that the President knows more about the situation than anyone else and is giving it his most serious consideration. Now, how do we, the little people, make our wants and wishes known? How do we fit in, besides footing the bill? I am speaking of that "unspeakable" situation Vietnam. What I want to know is this, What is the reason for allowing even one known Communist in this country, when our husbands and our sons have been sent 10,000 miles away to that miserable place, supposedly to fight communism and rescue those unfortunate people from its clutches? I am not very learned but I have followed the situation closely enough to know that the biggest majority of those people do not want to be rescued, actually hate us, and are stabbing us in the back. The only ones who do not seem to have lost the will to fight are the ones opposing us. Still we insist on staying in there. Is it that we would rather lose lives than lose a little "face"? You can bet that the lives of the ones who think that way are not being risked and it is not the lives of their sons.

My husband and I are aware that we have footed a part of this bill with our tax money. We are not complaining so much about that, although it represents a lot of hard work and was money poured down a rathole. What we are complaining about (grieving is a better word) is that our son has been sent there, as well. He is our only child and only 19. He made the mistake of enlisting, against our advice. He did not know that he was going to go to the other side of the world to fight something that needs fighting right here under our own noses. Unless I am badly mistaken, Communists are lecturing in colleges, are given the privilege of running for office, and are behind a large part of our racial trouble. Why? Why? Why? We know they are here. I am more than disgusted—I am outraged. The nearly 200 Americans who have laid down their lives over there have died for nothing. Their deaths have served no more purpose than the untimely death of President Kennedy. It's just that not as much is said about it. As my son once wrote me, "I guess that back home, this is just something people read about and turn over to the next page." He is not one to complain. He has no idea that I am writing this. I would like my name as the writer of this letter to be kept confidential. I am not ashamed of writing it but I do not want anything worse to happen to him. He is doing the best he can in an impossible situation and I do not write and tell him how his father and I feel. I tell him that the time will pass quickly and we are sure that he will be all right. This is a lie, for every day is an eternity to us, as it surely is to him, and we are torn with anxiety. If it were for something logical and he were defending us from an attack here at home I would be proud, but this is not so. I do not feel "yellow." I know, as I said before, that the ones who want communism stopped over there before it gets over here are not the ones who stand to lose their loved ones there. If they would open their minds and their eyes they would see that it is here right now.

I doubt very much if our sending a bunch of bright, shiny bugles to Vietnam is going to raise the morale of our boys. We had better send them so real help or bring them home while there are still some of them to bring home. I know that you have had the courage to state your views though they differed from what nearly all the others have expressed. Would that there were more like you. Perhaps you and Senator Dirksen can work for us.

Respectfully,

Mrs. J. W. Jackson.

San Francisco, Calif.,
August 22, 1964.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Sir: This is to commend you on your courageous stand against the Joint Congressional Resolution Supporting Government Intervention in Vietnam.

Many American citizens entertain grave doubts as to the wisdom, moral and practical, of the Vietnam effort. As one of them, I am grateful to your uncompromising honesty in speaking up for me.

Yours Very truly,

Mrs. Anne Frisbie O'Neill.

Brooklyn, N.Y.,
August 8, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Morse: I applaud your stand on the Vietnamese war. I hope you will continue your efforts to prevent the cry of "remember the *Maddox*" from leading to an immense and destructive war. It is much to my regret that I cannot vote for your reelection.

Sincerely,

Franklin E. Mirer.

New York, N.Y.,
August 27, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: Although belatedly, I wish to congratulate you on your stand with regard to U.S. intervention in South Vietnam. I and many people to whom I have spoken agree that the Vietnamese people should be left to their own devices, to settle their own problems without any intervention on the part of any foreign power. Perhaps there would be no more war there today if the United States had not given such support to the old reactionary regime nor to its successor.

I wish also to declare our support of you in your stand on civil rights and other advanced and progressive legislation.

Keep up the good work, Senator Morse; the majority of the American people and all peaceful, freedom-loving people are behind you.

Thank you.

Respectfully yours,

S. Bernstein.

Bethesda, Md.,
August 25, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: Congratulations on your stand against U.S. military action in Vietnam. U.S. intervention in Vietnam is causing war, not peace; supporting force and violence, not freedom. The Communists are right when they call us "imperialist aggressors" in Vietnam.

An international conference should settle the issues involved, and not the United States.

Sincerely,

Gladys H. Swift.

Fort Washington, Pa.,
August 25, 1964.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senator, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator: Regarding your views of stopping the shipment of American boys to fight in Vietnam and many other places expresses my sentiments also, and I am with you 100 percent.

I admire a man with courage who speaks his own mind.

Respectfully yours,

Louis Stefan,
Veteran, World War I, 315th Inf.

Great Neck, N.Y.,
August 22, 1964.

Dear Senator Morse: I wish to congratulate you on your speech on Vietnam and foreign policy. I wanted to write sooner but couldn't manage it. Would it be possible for me to get one or more copies of your speech, so that I could give it to friends to read? I wish many more people were aware of the points you emphasized.

Yours most cordially,

Dr. Leonard Frank.

Wyandotte, Mich.,
August 21, 1964.

Senator Wayne L. Morse,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator: Newspaper accounts and radio and television news broadcasts have, frankly, confused me over American intervention in South Vietnam.

Having read earlier this year of your concern over American policy in southeast Asia, I, as both interested citizen and prospective newspaper reporter, would appreciate having on file your views on this troubled area.

Perhaps by sending the Congressional Record or other source material you can meet my request.

Thank you very much. I am

Sincerely yours,

Michael L. Skinner.

August 18, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: We support your stand taken in the U.S. Senate on August 5, 1964, against the resolution to grant the President approval on all steps he deemed necessary "to repel any attack on U.S. forces in southeast Asia."

We urge no escalation of war—urge immediate negotiations in southeast Asia. We have no business in Asia—this is a matter for the people of South Vietnam to settle without our men, money and military equipment.

Get out of South Vietnam now, out of southeast Asia now!

Very truly yours,

Mr. and Mrs. Harold Stocker.

Pomona, Calif.

Ann Arbor, Mich.,
August 19, 1964.

The Honorable Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: I am writing to commend you for your lonely struggle against the horrors and imbecilities of America's current military program in Vietnam. It is indeed a lamentable fact that men in your position must deal with a public opinion that, for the most part, is dreadfully mal-, mis-, and downright uninformed about the events and issues in question. Following its present course, this American military program seems inexorably destined to result in another unfortunate (and eventually highly unpopular) war with China. If that should happen, your present stand will, of course, be vindicated, and this same public opinion will (just as monolithically, no doubt) howl for an end to the slaughter. Even if you happen to be "wrong" in regard to Vietnam, and this does not appear to be the case, I salute you for your courage.

Very truly yours,

T. G. Powell.

Tacoma, Wash.,
August 18, 1964.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: We wish to commend you on the position you have taken in regard to the recent Vietnam crisis and for your courage in standing up against such odds when everyone else seemed to be climbing on the bandwagon.

People we contact daily were strangely silent about "the action" or seemed reluctant to discuss it. This we believe must be due to the tremendous news buildup and selling job, "brainwashing" U.S. style.

It is difficult to get the truth about our foreign affairs. When we do, months or years have passed by. Then it is too late to get a proper public reaction. Members of the State Department have admitted that, when they thought it was expedient to do so, they would lie.

One thing we are sure of: This Nation seems to have become a self-appointed police force, under the guise of protecting freedom around the world. We are pushing in with a chip on our shoulder everywhere, propagandizing, becoming involved militarily, using economic pressure, financing revolutions and propping up questionable governments, outdoing the Communists at intrigue. This we are doing eslewhere while, here at home, we are doing such a dismal job of protecting and winning some of those same freedoms. It seems as though there is an unseen hand operating within the Government which is continually involving us in international situations which the people really do not approve. This is probably what President Eisenhower was referring to in his parting address when he warned the Nation about the threat of a military-industrial combine taking over.

We should look to our own internal security, take care of our own shortcomings, live by example and lead by example in order to sell the rest of the world on what we believe we have to sell. This is the only way we can succeed in outstriding dictatorships, right or left.

We trust you will continue to carry on the fight for truth, freedom and decency.

Sincerely,

Wm. and Ivy McCullough.

Lombard, Ill.,
August 20, 1964.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

My Dear Senator Morse: Many thanks for your August report and your reprint of your "individual views" which I read with great interest.

You are so right in appraising the terrible implications of the resolution giving the President the power to initiate war. The press has given scant report of your protest. I found a sympathetic account of it in I.F. Stone's weekly and a substantial excerpt of it in the National Guardian. I wish I could read the entire speech.

We are still clinging to the inglorious and dangerous Dulles policy. It was Churchill who propagated the cold war and it was Kennan who fathered the containment policy. Subsequently Churchill came out for coexistence and Kennan repudiated his own policy of containment. Both were great to acknowldege an error.

We did not sign the Geneva Treaty but we are acting as if we had a mandate from the world to stop communism. We are still bucking a revolution instead of backing it. We are throwing our weight. If we want to stop communism we should try to improve the standard of living of all peoples. People who are well off do not care for communism. We have all the ingredients to do this; surplus of food, knowledge we can share, and capital we can employ. President de Gaulle, in spite of his hauteur, offers a face saving solution out of this situation but of course nothing can be done until after the election, lest this modern Alcibiades of the Republican Party charges the administration with Communist conspiracy.

If our policy is faulty in east Asia it is equally so in Cuba. As long as we talk of crushing Castro the Progress of Alliance has no chance. The money we are pouring into Latin America is used to support the economic and military groups who are sitting on the peoples' necks. The United States should settle its differences with Cuba—as we did with Mexico—and help to finish the revolution against Batista. This would detach Cuba from Moscow and put the fear of God and revolution into the hearts of the ruling classes. Incidentally it might create one quarter million jobs. We have put the cart before the horse and no amount of beating the cart will make the horse go forward. We ought to do on a gigantic scale what we now do with the Peace Corp.

As a man who has such clear perspective you must have moments of frustration about the way events are shaping up and this is one more reason that I admire so much your consistent efforts to make this a better world for all people.

Most respectfully yours,

D. D. Barta.

Watertown, Wis.,
August 20, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.

Senator Morse: According to the voting record you are an independent, not a conformist. What United States needs is more guided men and less guided missiles, men with guts enough to defy the banker-military combine and return our money system to a sane constitutional base.

The administration in Washington claims they are dedicated to peace, but talk and act more like a dictator seeking to scrap portions of the Constitution. Why does the administration permit and support so many provocative incidents; in Germany, Berlin, Congo, Latin America, Panama, southeast Asia by U.S. military forces. It is quite evident there are some triggerhappy personnel in and out of the military to fabricate false reports. The Spanish American was sparked by a false report. The bombing of Japanese cities in World War II was the result of a false report. (Not in the history books.)

Since when has the President the right to start a war? President John F. Kennedy started a war in southeast Asia by dispatching U.S. troops to support a ruthless regime in South Vietnam that the Vietnamese people disapproved of. A religious war? President Lyndon B. Johnson is following in the footsteps of his predecessor (spreading the conflict) by sending troops to the Congo. Was Congress consulted?

If the people of the United States want peace it is imperative that we prepare for peace. Creativity, reasoning, virtue (will to to good) are the only road to peace there is.

Thoughts of war are commodities of no value. United States cannot afford to practice any destructive action.

That is the way it appears from here.

H. B. Schauer.

P.S.—Do you have a newsletter to explain your viewpoint?

NATIONAL UNITY, BUT AT WHAT COST?

(By Robert M. Hutchins)

National unity is a splendid thing, but it can be purchased at too high a price. When misrepresentation and self-righteousness are the foundation of national unity, it becomes unattractive and seems unlikely to last.

Our record in Vietnam is a sorry one. We had no business there in the first place. We have none now. We must eventually withdraw. The French tried to hold onto Indochina with 400,000 men. They were driven out after suffering 172,000 casualties.

On April 21, Walter Lippmann wrote: "The truth, which is being obscured for the American people, is that the Saigon Government has the allegiance of no more than 30 percent of the people and controls (even in daylight) not much more than a quarter of the territory."

The situation has deteriorated since April. Walter Lippmann now says we are in Vietnam in order to be a great power in the South Pacific.

The only beneficiary of the extension of the war will be the oppressive and undemocratic regime of President Khanh. He has been screaming for an invasion of North Vietnam. This is not because North Vietinam has been deeply engaged against him.

President Khanh's object has been to bolster his tottering government by involving the United States in a full-scale war on his behalf.

To gratify President Khanh we moved units of the 7th Fleet into the Gulf of

Tonkin in the last month. The land around this gulf is that of Vietnam and Red China.

According to our version, our ships were attacked in international waters 30 to 65 miles from shore. If our version is correct, the attack cannot be excused, though perhaps it may be explained by a certain jumpiness or trigger happiness induced by seeing unfriendly warships so close to shore.

According to our version, the attacks on our ships failed. In the exercise of the right of self-defense, we sank four or five of the enemy. We then proceeded, in the exercise of the "right" of retaliation, to carry the war against the ports—and the people—of North Vietnam.

Since when has there been a right of retaliation? You may defend yourself if attacked, but nothing in domestic or international law permits you to go around the next day and burn down your attacker's house, saying as you do so, "This is a limited and measured response." That is an act of war.

We are constantly proclaiming that our mission is peace. We are devotees of the rule of law. When other nations are involved in a dispute, we insist on negotiation and resort to the United Nations. We disowned our friends the British, French, and Israelis when they tried to seize the Suez Canal.

On the very day on which Ambassador Adlai Stevenson made his belated statement to the U.N. on Vietnam, our schizophrenic State Department announced an agreement among Britain, Russia, and the United States that said, "We declare our intention to do everything possible for the solution through negotiation of unresolved international problems in order to strengthen the general peace, the benefits of which would be enjoyed by all states, big and small, and by all people."

This is the spirit in which we must act if we expect to be taken seriously as missionaries of peace. The Gulf of Tonkin may turn out to be a sadder page in American history than the Bay of Pigs.

CUPERTINO, CALIF.,
August 18, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE of Oregon.

DEAR SIR: Congratulations on your vote, one of only two, against the blank check endorsement of Johnson's retaliation measure. My limited analysis and proposals are enclosed herein. In case I didn't elaborate upon my background in my previous letter, I have never been a member of the noted (or notorious) Communist Party. Rather I spent 6 years in Technocracy Inc. from 1942 through 1948, and as we used to say "Once a technocrat, always a technocrat." My training in analyzing current events came from there.

I intend to pursue the issue noted herein throughout the next 3 months. I hope you are agreeable to the proposition.

I wrote a manuscript of 195 pages single-spaced typewritten, entitled "The End of an Age." DON EDWARDS, Congressman from our Ninth District nearby, has a copy of it and you can get a better idea of my background, analysis, activities, reasoning, etc. from there if you can talk him out of it. Chief Justice Earl Warren received about the first copy, for it deals with the Kennedy assassination and its implications. This is basically why events are at such a late point that what I propose herein—including my suggested name for the party—must be considered seriously and speedily.

Hoping to hear from you about the first of September—affirmatively—I am

Sincerely yours

ELTON R. MAAS.

MANISTEE, MICH.,
August 19, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: You will find the enclosure very interesting.

While Burchett is by no means impartial he has been right far too often in the past to disregard what he has to say.

Your fellow Senators need to read this more than you do. Perhaps some will.

Yours,

JOHN W. HARVEY.

GLENDALE, CALIF.,
August 11, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

SENATOR MORSE: I read with much interest your recent article in the Progressive concerning the U.S. position in southeast Asia. When the current crisis and Presidential resolution occurred only a week after I had read your remarks in the magazine, I waited anxiously to see your comments and vote on the President's resolution; your bold position reflected the courage you have always used in the Senate.

If at all possible, I would very much like an outline of your lengthy debate on the resolution before it was passed last week. Or, better yet, I would enjoy a congressional digest reprint of your comments if you are making them available in this form.

Thank you for any cooperation you can give.

Sincerely,

JACK MCCREARY.

NORTH CUMBERLAND, R.I.,
August 13, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senator from Oregon,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Let me commend you for your heroic and honorable stand respecting the resolution adopted last week by the Senate apropos the Tonkin Bay ruckus.

I encourage you to be even more picturesque in your sense of indignation, in your matching words to the crime, if indeed you have proof of the 7th Fleet protective role or actual provocation of South Vietnam attack against Vietcong coastal installations. I remind you of words spoken in 1846 by President Polk, and in a sense echoed by Johnson in the present instance, and which inspired Lincoln to (in effect) call Polk a liar following the latter's allegations about American blood being spilled on "American" soil, way down there at Matamoras. This was another of those fateful moments which opened a Pandora's box of woe, specifically posing the comic ironies of face-saving at the moment in order to win friends in Latin America, an enormous historic "blunder" from which we still haven't grasped the retributive payoff dictated by history, the main ingredient of which is still of Hammurabic origin.

How poverty stricken is our leaders' sense of history. We have culturally and exclusively been geared to a sense of the immediate, to what momentarily is to be gained, when the chips are really down, at the price of what multiplicity of ironies remotely ensue. What beggarly comfort; e.g., we are at the moment expected to extract from the impoverished and universal headline which aims to ease our fluctuations of nail-biting and overwrought tenterhooks with its feeble assurances that "maybe China will not intervene." As though China has not tucked this "episode" in the back of its scheming noodle. As though any halfwit doesn't know China bides a more propitious time for some grandiose dole of historic comeuppance aimed at flushing this incidental arrogance of this chief bastion of the "Christian" dispensation down the privy of history. What a dossier of our lost opportunities could be compiled, as you yourself truly stated in your TV press interview of a few days ago.

Yours is the long view, Senator, and on that basis alone you qualify for the right to enjoy a far greater degree of influence in the highest councils of Government, as countless of your contemporaries ardently wish you did, but who instead are perforce compelled to gape upon the collective mass of rubber stamps who play their role in this stupid focus upon the immediate, via their primacy of concern with momentary political fortunes.

May I have a copy (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD) of your extended remarks in the Senate on this U.S. naval involvement with the North Vietnamese?

Respectfully yours,

JAMES A. HABERSHAW.

ST. LOUIS, MO.,
August 19, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Ever since you made your splendid stand in the Senate on Vietnam I have wanted to express to you my personal thanks and admiration and to pledge to you all the support I can muster in trying to change our national policy in southeast Asia. As a member of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, I participated in the national convention in Indianapolis from which we sent a strong resolution to the President on the need to reconvene the 14-nation Geneva Conference and neutralize this area before the United States is dragged by the course of events into ever-increasing expenditures of men and money and, possibly, into fullscale war.

My husband and I have written strong letters to our Missouri Senators expressing regret that they did not join you and Senator GRUENING in your courageous and sensible stand.

By an ironic coincidence, the St. Louis Post Dispatch has been printing chapters from "The Invisible Government" on the CIA's role in the Cuban crisis during its reporting on the Vietnam crisis, and some of its editorials on Vietnam might lead one to more than suspect that the "coincidence" was intentional.

If ever you should be tempted to waver from denouncing our Government's military intervention and its bypassing of the commitments it has made in the United Nations to resort only to peaceful means of settling international disputes, please think of all of us who have no voice but yours to express our views in Congress and never feel that you are just 2 against 100 or 435. You speak for the thousands, and hopefully millions who sincerely want war prevented at any cost, and who are not being correctly represented by their own representatives on American intervention in Vietnam.

Very sincerely,

ELDORA SPIEGELBERG.

DAYTON, OHIO,
August 31, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Foreign Relations Committee,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Permit me to congratulate you on your memorial speech of August 15. You should be commended for continuously raising your voice to demand that United States withdraws its forces from South Vietnam and agree to negotiations for a true peace in Vietnam and southeast Asia.

I was deeply impressed by the masterly and moving expressions of your speech. Your courageous convictions that peace should be fundamental in our relations with southeast Asia should be a flaming torch to guide us all. In my opinion, you are one of America's great men in our generation.

Respectfully yours,

HENRY H. METZGER.

BRONX, N.Y.,
September 2, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Please pardon the informality of my request for information. I would appreciate your sending to me whatever documentation you have available concerning your position with regard to U.S. policy in South Vietnam.

A friend and admirer of your courage.

JAC RADOFF.

OLYMPIA, WASH.,
September 7, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Your cloakroom comments on Vietnam unassailably lucid, reasonable, and of high moral statesmanship. Too bad we don't have 51 like you in Senate.

HELEN and CARL WEST.

VANCOUVER, WASH.,
August 22, 1964.

Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the United States,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. JOHNSON: Since I have written on the Vietnam situation, I hesitate to do it again. But I have spent more than half of my adult life in the orient and hence am deeply concerned with what happens there. I understand that, especially in an election year, you are pushed by many in your party to take stands in Vietnam which they think will "save our face" as we say in the orient. It seems to me that we are doing just the opposite.

I keep asking, Why are we in Vietnam in a military role? Are we not aggressors in that area rather than the North Vietnamese? It seems to me that their actions are more in self-defense than are ours. We surely felt that way in the case of Russian aid to Cuba?

May I quote from the Oregonian of May 29, 1964, a statement by Walter Lippmann? "Our cardinal mistake in southeast Asia was the decision of Secretary Dulles to treat South Vietnam * * * as an American protectorate * * * we must look for solutions, not by expanding the war, but by taking it to the conference table, whether to a reconvened Geneva Conference or the United Nations or both." I agree. I realize that this is a situation which you inherited, but I hope you will have the courage and vision to change the trend.

I hate to see communism make gains, but when we make our major action military rather than social and economic, I believe that we are helping rather than hurting the Communist cause. As I have said in earlier letters and wires, I feel that, for the peace of the world as well as for our own democratic heritage, we should withdraw from military action in that area, especially as we are not supporting democracy in the regimes we favor there, any more than communism does.

I pray God that my beloved Nation may not be taking action which will destroy all that we really believe in.

Very sincerely yours,

EDITH S. ROEDER.

P.S.—Thanks for the strong stand you have taken on this issue. I want you to know that I support you.

E.S.R.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
August 13, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We of Students for a Democratic Society were heartened by your August 5 speech in opposition to "a predated declaration of war," in your words.

We feel your speech of such vital concern to students that we would like to obtain reprints if possible. If you have reprints available, we should very much like to mail them to 150 key members of SDS around the country.

Thanking you for your attention,

Yours most sincerely,

DOUGLAS IRELAND,
National Staff, SDS.

ASHLAND, OREG.,
September 5, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Please put me on your mailing list for Senator MORSE reports. I am a relatively new resident of the State—2½ years—and am looking forward to a long residency.

You have my support on Vietnam. I feel we do not belong there, and I would be very happy if we could get out.

Sincerely,

SANFORD GOODMAN.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
August 26, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Your recently expressed convictions on the "tragedy of Vietnam," are worthy of highest commendation. Subsequent events confirm my deep personal feeling that citizens of that war-torn land are tired of the strife and divisiveness which confront them daily. I hope you and all of us will keep proclaiming that there is a better way than the one we now support.

Warm personal regards,

Cordially yours,

A. RAYMOND GRANT.

ALBANY, OREG.,
August 31, 1964.

We agree with your stand on pulling out of South Vietnam.

DON STOOPS, *Republican.*
NANCY STOOPS, *Democrat.*

PORTLAND, OREG.,
August 26, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I have talked to dozens of my friends, and many other people, and their universal opinion is that in the matter of war with Vietnam you are doing a fine job in opposing it.

It is a wonder that the action and provocation of Ike, Dulles, and the great engineer, Hoover, has not had us bombed off the face of the earth. There are some people, I suppose, who don't agree with you, but my contacts with people give me 98 percent who think that you are doing a fine job.

ALLEN F. WILKINSON.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
August 22, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

DEAR SIR: I wish to express my support of your stand on South Vietnam.

It seems there is no solution the way things are going. I am 75 years of age and can look back and see where often the popular view was 100 percent wrong.

The military is too powerful and wasteful and should be controlled.

Best wishes,

ROBERT LONTHOLD.

EUGENE, OREG,
August 19, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I want to take this opportunity to commend you for your stand on the Vietnam affair. I wholeheartedly agree with you and your colleague from Alaska. You are doing outstanding work and are not afraid to say what you believe regardless of political consequences. You are to be admired for this. Even if I didn't agree with you, you have brought situations into the open so that I can closely examine the facts.

This is my first letter to a political figure. I was not a registered voter until you were defeated by Kennedy in the Oregon primary. I didn't think he could do it. When he did, I figured it was time to register.

My main purpose in writing to you is to show my old address which was 1895 City View Street, Eugene, Oreg., and my new address which is 2961 Allane Street, Eugene, Oreg. Please keep sending me the "Senator MORSE Reports" so that I may be better informed. Keep up your outstanding work.

Sincerely,

LLOYD LANDERS.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
August 17, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR WAYNE: Just time for a few lines between coaches' meeting and summer job.

I've been meaning to write for the last week and a half, and your newsletter today served to jog my inattention. I imagine you are receiving some pretty hot replies to your Vietnam stand; I hope I can in some way alleviate at least one of these by saying sincerely that I believe your position is not only extremely well taken, but also courageously maintained in the face of "gung ho" emotionalism.

Keep up the fine representation. I might add, for your possible benefit, that the most difficult bastion of ignorance I have encountered in the whole matter is that of the war status; i.e., that the United States committed an act of war when it attacked the North Vietnam mainland. Stress this, it's important.

Thank you, Senator.

DONN C. BECK.

ST. LOUIS, MO.,
August 19, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I finally succeeded in seeing the full text of your speech in the Senate on August 7, of which our press gave us only a brief and entirely inadequate account. All the more can I now tell you of my admiration for your clearsightedness and courage in speaking up on an occasion when too many of your colleagues, even those who claim to be ready for "unthinkable thoughts," lost all sense of proportion.

Ten years ago, as a research scholar in Paris, I got my first taste of the senselessness of attacking the Vietnamese problem as a military attempt to contain communism and promote democracy. Ever since France pulled out, I have been worried lest our blind anticommunism at any price would suck us into France's position, with even less understanding and ability to solve the real problem. It is a relief to hear at least two Senators acknowledge it.

Why is it that in the United States it takes so long before we can read the full text of what our Representatives say in Congress, compared with, e.g., England, where the press reports on it on the next day in full?

Sincerely yours,

HERBERT SPIEGELBERG,
Washington University.

P.S.—I would appreciate receiving at least two copies of the text of your and Senator GRUENING's speeches.

GRESHAM, OREG.,
August 25, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Over 20 years ago, I left Wisconsin with my family to make a new home in Oregon. Every year since, I have received increasing pleasure and satisfaction as a citizen of this great State.

But the other day when the senior Senator from Oregon took his stand against further involvement of our Nation in the Far East, I received the greatest satisfaction of all in being a citizen of this, my adopted State.

Leaving seminary in 1925, I chose Wisconsin as my field of ministry because of the heritage of the great statesman who had left his mark so indelibly impressed on the whole of our Nation. I refer to Senator Bob La Follette. Would that his followers and those who came after him in Wisconsin had had the same vision and the same dedication. He was concerned, I felt, about men and women; about human lives and human values—about the enrichment of all men. He was one of America's great statesmen.

And now in the senior Senator from Oregon, I find one who stands head and shoulders above all others in the U.S. Senate in that he is concerned for the real values in national and international life.

The stand you have taken on the southeast Asian crisis, Senator, your clear and forceful logic, your great sense of justice and above all, your dedication to those high and holy values necessary for the building of a world of peace and brotherhood may not today pierce this fog of national pride and prejudice, but it will one day receive a resounding vindication.

It was a great moment in history when the senior Senator from Oregon stood on his two feet, facing the massive opposition of Congress in his forthright declaration on our involvement in Vietnam.

Mrs. Chamberlin says, "amen," and joins me in saluting you as our one truly great statesman in this day of world crises. Words cannot convey to you, Senator MORSE, our admiration as you stand, one man against a great tidal wave that will engulf the whole world unless enough people in other countries and in our own arise to stop it. It may be that foreign opposition, particularly from our allies, will help stay the hand of this administration and help bring this Nation to its senses.

I've heard it said that God and one are a majority. May the good Lord keep your fires burning.

Cordially,

MARK A. CHAMBERLIN.

ST. HELENS, OREG.,
August 17, 1694.

Senator MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I agree with you 100 percent on your stand on Vietnam and commend you on your courage to voice your opinion and the opinion of many people.

Yours sincerely,

CHARLES W. LANCASTER.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: In case your mail is running too heavily against your stand on the southeast Asia crisis, you can count me in as a supporter of your position.

Sincerely,

BERTHA H. KNUDSON.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
August 22, 1964.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I heartily agree with your views on Vietnam.

We have no business getting into war with Asiatics.

We shelled out billions of dollars and killed 27,704 GI's in the Korean war.

We were not permitted to win that war, nor attack China, and yet, all wars in Asia involve the Chinese.

If we are not permitted to attack and destroy Chinese bases and supply depots, we shouldn't go to war at all.

The only people who profit from these wars are the private bankers, to whom we owe $288 billion.

Our next war should be on private bankers.

Thank you.

Sincerely yours,

V. L. SHIPLEY.

AVIANO AIRBASE, ITALY,
August 27, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I appreciate receiving your report, and hope to continue to receive it. You help me to keep up with a little of what's going on in Washington.

Being overseas here in Italy, we don't have access to much stateside news, and the Stars and Stripes newspaper, which is printed overseas is good but quite limited.

I have clipped the address and added my zip code number, as you requested. Keep up the good work and just a note of thanks from a serviceman; I sincerely believe the way you do about South Vietnam.

Best regards,

JOHN E. WILLIAMS.

CALIMESA, CALIF.,
August 22, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you for sending me your very informative newsletter these past years.

I have recently moved to California, but I still wish to receive your newsletter. Enclosed is the mailing stamp with my old address as per your directions in your last newsletter.

I wish to commend you, Senator MORSE, for your efforts to keep the resolution concerning the Vietnam crisis from being passed.

Sincerely yours,

BRUCE D. HAHN.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
August 22, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Thanks for the monthly MORSE Reports.

Your comments in the last one on South Vietnam are certainly more realistic than the policy being pursued.

I have felt for many a long year that a thorough housecleaning of the State Department has been overdue.

Yours very truly,

H. CHAS. DETLOFF.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
August 17, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am in receipt of your report of August 12. I agree with your analysis of our position in Vietnam. I compliment you for having the courage to speak so frankly upon this highly emotional subject and hope that you continue to inform the country of your views.

My mailing address should be changed on your records from 3323 Southwest Harbor Drive to 1432 Southwest Sixth Avenue, Portland, Oreg.

Thank you.

Very truly yours,

WM. W. MCGEORGE.

EUGENE, OREG.,
August 24, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you so very much for your last Report which I received, dated August 12, in which you give an extensive statement of your particular position with regard to activities in South Vietnam.

While I'm not as well informed about these facts and events as you are, by any means, I am inclined very strongly to agree wholeheartedly with your position. I know that for you to make these statements, almost by yourself, does not increase popularity under the present circumstances. Nevertheless, I think we have done some very unwise things in that part of the world. I wish somehow we could take the necessary steps to get the United Nations involved in this instead of ourselves.

In any event, I wanted you to know that I agree with the position you have taken so far as I understand the problem.

Respectfully yours,

E. J. ASCHENBRENNER.

BEND, OREG.,
August 18, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
417 Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I appreciate your stand on the North Vietnam situation. It takes a brave man to express the feelings of the people in the face of organized law violation, whether expressed by the Texas millionaire group or the ill-disguised fascism of Generals GOLDWATER and Eisenhower shown by their antagonism to press and TV reporting.

You are a credit to Oregon.

Sincerely,

CECIL C. MOORE.

SEATTLE WASH.,
August 20, 1964.

The Honorable LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President, The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR PRESIDENT JOHNSON: I am deeply concerned about the war in South Vietnam and urge that the Geneva Conference reconvene in an effort to arrive at a settlement, with appropriate international guarantees under U.N. peacekeeping supervision. I never could understand why the United States is going it alone in South Vietnam. I believe in making use of the U.N. whenever and wherever we become involved in foreign problems.

In the case of South Vietnam it appears that the United States is trying to weaken the U.N. and I don't like this one bit. We are no better than the Russians when we ignore the U.N. as we have in South Vietnam. Also, why has not the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization conferred on this very grave problem?

The Laotian situation should be taken up at the same time the matter of South Vietnam is negotiated, being a southeast Asian trouble spot. The introduction of foreign military personnel in Laos is in violation of the Laos declaration signed by the United States. We are guilty of breaking too many agreements when it serves our purpose to do so.

Another point I want clarified is—why has there not been a free election in South Vietnam? We hear about free elections, but again, when it serves our purpose we let the military or some dictator take over. Our deeds belie our words.

If the United States is really working for peace as it proclaims to all the world, there should be no delay in gathering around the conference table in a supreme effort to end the very grave situation we face in southeast Asia.

Let's not tempt fanatics to the explosive point.

It would be a joyous feeling for all mankind, Mr. President, if you in your capacity would show the world we mean what we say and truly want peace. This being an election year, I beg of you to use your good efforts to accomplish an end to the strife in southeast Asia.

Respectfully,

MARY O'NEILL HAYES.

HARPERS FERRY, W. VA.,
August 21, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: It is encouraging to know that you have spoken against the war in Vietnam. I congratulate you on your courage in speaking for an unpopular point of view. I strongly approve the idea of using the United Nations to settle the conflict. Whenever possible, the United Nations should be given a chance to operate, for each time it succeeds in negotiation it becomes stronger as an international arbiter.

Thank you for the continued service you give not only to your country but to the cause of world peace.

Sincerely yours,
MRS. BYRON WEBB.

HONOLULU, HAWAII,
August 26, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you for your efforts to stop the ill-advised war in Vietnam, and for sending me reports of your speeches. Also for sending Senator NELSON's speech on ending the draft. I have kept them in my peace information file, for future reference, and will appreciate such information in the future.

Yours respectfully,
RUTH L. SNYDER.

GREAT NECK, N.Y.,
August 25, 1964.

Hon. Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senator from Oregon,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have been reading about your position in regard to the Vietnam situation.

I can appreciate that yours is just a "voice in the wilderness," but I think it is most important that you stand by your convictions. Our country is the gainer when we have men like you in the Senate.

Respectfully yours,
MAX KOVNER.

PAWLING, N.Y.,
August 24, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: In view of your pronounced opposition to the administration's policy in southeast Asia, with which I fully agree, I enclose herewith a copy of a letter I recently wrote the New York Times on the subject.

The Times did not see fit to publish this letter, pleading the familiar excuse of "pressure of space," which is hogwash as they have published much longer letters of mine in the past. I regret this because probable destiny is a factor that should play an important part in our calculations of the future, a factor, however, that is too often overlooked.

The significance to be attached to my letter to the Times, as I look at it, lies in the fact that even though we were to gain our objective, whatever that may be, and however it is to be determined, the odds, over the years, will remain the same: South Vietnam is unlikely to be any stronger militarily, and its political position to remain unstable and uncertain as now, while there will still be a North Vietnam, and more important, a China with a population of three-quarters of a billion people, sooner or later armed with atomic weapons, making Judge Egerton's remarks tragically pertinent. It is the future probabilities, it seems to me, about which we must think, not the present.

Respectfully yours,
EMERSON C. IVES.

AUGUST 9, 1964.

To the Editor of the New York Times:

I wholly agree with and commend the letter of Judge Henry W. Edgerton respecting our Vietnam policy appearing in today's Sunday Times.

I would particularly call attention to his comment that "When, if not before, Communist China has atomic weapons, it will no more tolerate American military action in southeast Asia than we would tolerate Russian military action in Cuba."

I would like to reiterate a comment I made in a recent letter to the Times to underscore his and Senators GRUENING's and MORSE's assertions "that we have no business in southeast Asia."

"What we and our Government officials seem unable to comprehend is the fact that these millions of people are permanent inhabitants of Asia, and that what we do there can be but of a temporary nature, and cannot alter the ultimate destiny that inevitably must rest in the hands of the people living in that part of the world."

Destiny is not a matter of the few years we may choose to concern ourselves in the affairs of southeast Asia, it is a matter that involves decades in time, and it is shortsighted and futile for us to think we can change the ultimate interrelationships of nations that inevitably must be resolved by the hundreds of millions of people permanently living contiguous to one another, and that thousands of miles from our shores on the opposite side of the world.

EMERSON C. IVES.

LONDON, ENGLAND,
September 1, 1964.

DEAR SIR: I am 22 years old and studying to be a lawyer in England; and I hope you will not think it presumptuous of me to write to you about Vietnam.

I read in Newsweek of August 17 that you voted against the resolution supporting the recent action taken by the United States in the Gulf of Tonkin, and that you think the United States should leave Vietnam. I wish to write to you to say that I admire your courageous attitude, and that I think that this policy is the only sensible one for America to adopt. I may add that I am not a Communist or a Socialist, but that I think countries should develop naturally and adopt the political structure that suits them best. The idea so many Americans seem to have, that their Constitution and "way of life" are superior to any other, is quite fatuous. It is merely a system that happens to work reasonably well in the United States.

It seems that many people imagine they are applying the lesson of Munich while "resisting aggression" today. This attitude is apparent in President Johnson's remark about "aggression unchecked being aggression unleashed." But so far from having learned the lesson of Munich, they are surely making exactly the same mistake. Those responsible for that episode no doubt had the First World War at the back of their minds, a pointless war that virtually nobody wanted, and which could probably have been averted if the leaders of the countries concerned had had time to negotiate about the situation. They were determined not to make the same mistake, and to work out a suitable peaceful solution.

People today are looking backward in exactly the same way, and thinking that so long as they pursue exactly opposite policies to those that turned out so badly in the past, then they must be doing the right thing.

In fact, of course, the way to deal with any problem is to look at it as it really is. The differences between Mao's China and Hitler's Germany in terms of, e.g., geographical position, economic power, and degree of madness of the two leaders, are obvious. It is clear that the most urgent problem in the East today is that of rising population and food shortage. It is also clear that the problem is insoluble, since any increase in living standards is automatically nullified by a fresh rise in population. It therefore appears that war is inevitable in the East; and this being so, it is in the interests of the United States to clear out and not become involved. The security of the United States can only be jeopardized if China acquires a nuclear bomb; and if this does occur, then the United States would be much better off to be on good terms with China, and to have allowed South Vietnam to go Communist, than vice versa.

I hope you do not mind my writing to you and expressing these far from original views.

Yours sincerely,
CHARLES ROSSETTI.

OAKLAND, CALIF.

DEAR SIR: Congratulations on your attack on the stupid Vietnam policy of the administration. Keep it up.

J. DUTULTGEN.

ST. LOUIS, MO.,
August 24, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: May I, belatedly, congratulate you on your stand against extension of the war in Vietnam? In both your vote (on the granting of presidential powers) and in your speeches you have represented what is to me the only sensible approach to achieving a settlement in southeast Asia—neutralized, independent states whose territorial integrity must be guaranteed by all the great powers, including China. Without your courage in bringing the facts to light, it would have been difficult for me to understand what had happened during the events in the Bay of Tonkin. It is a pity that President Johnson took the easy way out—of reprisal and of accommodation of the provocative maneuvers of the Khanh regime. I believe that your stand for a sane approach in this area will act as a rallying point for those of us who disagree with Khanh and with China—but who think an intermediate course, with peace and honor, can be achieved. Again, my admiration and congratulations—and please put me on your mailing list.

Sincerely yours,
D. S. BOLEF,
Professor of Physics.

LA JOLLA, CALIF.,
August 24, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am so glad that you are in the strategic position of power in regard to the situation in Vietnam; I have confidence in your judgment. Of course, you realize that what you and your committee say and do now may affect the history of the world. May you be led aright so that we may see the beginning of an era of world peace instead of world war.

We in our homes can do little but to lay awake nights and pray for you. I hope you are to be our next Vice President. I have watched you in action, approvingly, for many years.

Very sincerely yours,
ELLA LEE COWGILL.

SEVEN VALLEYS, PA.,
August 29, 1964.

Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CLARK: I have just received your letter of August 24. I find here, as I have sometimes found in communicating with other people, that the facts you see and the facts I see are quite different ones. Though I believe the large majority of the American people agree with me, for one reason or another, there are certainly too many who have been hearing and seeing what you have evidently been hearing and seeing.

It seems open to question even just what did happen in the Gulf of Tonkin. Were there really two attacks or only one? Did the North Vietnamese intend to attack a U.S. ship or was it an error, since the South Vietnamese were attacking the North Vietnamese in this area prior to this with U.S. arms? There is no doubt our men did shoot back and inflict more injury than was inflicted upon them; that is enough to make our air raids on North Vietnam beyond the bounds of moderate retaliation and self-protection.

South Vietnam is a military dictatorship. I fail to see how democracy is advanced by the support of a military dictatorship. Furthermore, the vast majority of Vietnamese are not for the government they now have and arms will not make them for it.

Using napalm bombs on civilian populations is not a way to make friends and allies.

It is very easy to blame the Communists for everything that is wrong in the world here and abroad. But let us examine our own behavior before we decide the other guy is all wrong and we are all right. We violated the 1962 Geneva Convention first. We shipped arms into South Vietnam against this international agreement. Has a single Communist Chinaman been found in South Vietnam? No. But South Vietnamese trained by Americans have been found in North Vietnam. The South Vietnamese are fighting largely with homemade weapons and weapons stolen from American supplies. Were our foreign aid program economic rather than military, the arms would simply not be there, and many now dead would be alive.

Why has the United States refused to have the U.N. handle the situation? Why have we refused the reconvening of the 1962 Geneva Conference?

In Cyprus both sides fight with American arms. Doesn't that indicate something drastically wrong with American foreign policy?

I think we drive people who might be our friends to the Communists. We ship arms to dictators when the people are starving and the Communists promise them food. I agree with your comment about "shooting from the hip" and am certainly glad that Senator GOLDWATER was not handling the situation or we would not be able to argue about it, most probably, but that does not mean that President Johnson took the wisest course.

I frankly think that the South Vietnamese are rebelling, and that we would do well to recall that our own country was founded by revolution and rebellion. I think every day that passes and we fail to take cognizance of the revolutionary world we live in, the worse we make the situation for ourselves. Must we continue a stupid policy because we have begun it? It would seem so, because we certainly cannot win a war in southeast Asia, yet we waste more money, arms, lives futilely. I should like to see that money and those lives go into the war on poverty, into the proposals outlined in your subcommittee's report, instead of the mere drop in a bucket that has been voted.

A letter which I wrote to Senator MORSE on August 7 was in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 21—applauding his stand. I believe Senator MORSE and Senator GRUENING could give you much better arguments against our present policy in southeast Asia than I can, so I will leave you to talk with them although I am certainly available if you wish to argue with me in person at any time. If we are to back up our words with deeds, let us have the U.N. take over in Vietnam, let us examine our own behavior carefully and critically, let us not ship arms and men to back up military dictatorships.

Sincerely,

LINDA SMITH.

GREAT NECK, N.Y.,
August 22, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I would, very much, appreciate receiving a copy of your recent speech on the subject of our destroyers patrolling the Gulf of Tonkin.

Please also place my name on your mailing list for future speeches. Yours is a voice that makes it possible for me to point out to some cynics here that our is not a "Yeh" Congress.

Sincerely,

NAT. H. SAUBERMAN.

SCHOFIELD, WIS.,
August 24, 1964.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We feel compelled to commend you for the excellent article in the August issue of the Progressive magazine entitled "Humpty Dumpty in Vietnam."

We are glad that there are informed, concerned men like you in the Senate who will courageously speak for the moral, humane solution to our problems.

We are wondering what the economic stakes are in the southeast Asian area that are worth the risk of war? Is it an area of great undeveloped riches that might be opened for investment? Or are there already "great" interests to be "protected"? Can you enlighten us?

Best wishes for your continued, splendid influence where it counts.

Sincerely,

ESTHER DIDDAMS.

SALEM, OREG.,
September 3, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have been reading with interest the letters with which you have been filling the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I wonder if you are going to put this one in—probably not as I do not agree with you on your stand on Vietnam. I do believe we are putting out too much in foreign aid to the wrong places and people but I am sure my reason for opposing foreign aid and yours are two entirely different reasons.

I would like to mention that if someone from the John Birch Society had said just one tiny bit as much against the President or any of his policies that you have said, you and your so-called liberal friends would have been screeching to high heaven about them being extremists and radicals, etc.—smear, smear and so on. (I am not a J.B. member).

I have no love for President Johnson and his policies but once in a while he stumbles onto doing the right thing and in this case I agree with him.

You disagreed with the Republicans and left the party (fortunately for the Republicans) and joined the Democrats—now it appears you are heading for leaving the Democrats—where to now—the Wayne Morse Party?

I know this letter will have no effect whatsoever on your policy and statements or any other way but thought I would let you know what I think anyway.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. MARY L. HINTZ.

FRAMINGHAM, MASS.,
August 23, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to congratulate and commend you most warmly for your realistic and helpful position on the war in Vietnam.

Yours sincerely,

PENELOPE TARTON.

MILWAUKEE, WIS.,
August 22, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I commend your courageous stand on the Vietnam situation. Events of the last few days confirm the fact that the trouble is political and economic, and a military solution is impossible. The present government smacks of dictatorship and will probably fall, as the past ones have because it has no popular base.

Another item—please, no nuclear force for NATO. It would only increase world tension. The Russians genuinely fear the Germans, and any spread of nuclear weapons is bad.

Sincerely,

EVELYN C. KNAPP.

[From the Baltimore Evening Sun, Sept. 2, 1964]

NEUTRALIZATION ASKED FOR VIETNAM

SIR. In the Forum of August 14 I urged neutralization and withdrawal of our troops from South Vietnam and quoted Senator GRUENING who said: "South Vietnam is not worth the life of a single American boy." Three letters to the Forum have since taken issue with me. They were written by L. W. Metzger, K. J. Rothe, and D. E Zevitas, each of whom claimed that both Senator GRUENING and I were wrong and urged that we continue the war in South Veitnam in the interests of freedom This issue requires clarification.

The majority of the South Vietnamese guerrilla fighters, known as the Vietcong, are not Communists. They are citizens of South Vietnam, not unlike the early American colonists who took up arms against their British overlords who imposed upon them oppressive taxes and curtailed their freedom. The majority of the citizens of South Vietnam were opposed to the military dictatorship of both the Diem and the Khanh regimes, and the present one is no different from the other two. In addition, the people are deadly opposed to the presence of American "advisers" who are aiding and abetting the oppressive totalitarian dictatorship of the present Vietnamese Government.

Senator MORSE spoke the following words in the U.S. Senate:

"For the past 10 years the United States in South Vietnam has violated the Geneva agreements of 1954. For 10 years we have tried to impose a military solution upon a political and economic problem. Our extensive military aid to South Vietnam was a violation of the Geneva accords. Our sending of troops into South Vietnam, even under the camouflage of military advisers, was not only a violation of the Geneva accords but of the spirit and intent of the peaceful purposes of the United Nations Charter itself."

It has been estimated that 70 percent of the citizens of South Vietnam were opposed to the military dictatorship of both Diem and Khanh. And every Senator and Congressman in Washington knows that South Vietnames dictators remain in power only by grace of the Pentagon in Washington. We are helping communism when we demonstrate that our interests lie not with the majority of the people of South Vietnam, but with totalitarian puppets, answerable only to Secretary McNamara and the Defense Department. By ignoring the true wishes of the people of South Vietnam who want only peace, who desperately desire neutrality and an end to the war, we are looked upon as warmongers.

Over 5,000 professors in universities throughout America as well as hundreds of our religious leaders of all faiths have urged President Johnson to seek a negotiated settlement by supporting a neutralized North and South Vietnam. But Mr. GOLDWATER and Secretary McNamara both remain adamant and trigger happy regarding this unfortunate land. Our failure to heed the voices of our educational and religious leaders will serve only to benefit the Communist cause and to endanger the peace of the world.

President Eisenhower fulfilled the deepest wishes of the American people for peace when he promised, on the eve of his election, to go to Korea to seek an end to the Korean war. I am confident that a move in this same direction of ending the war in South Vietnam by President Johnson would satisfy the deepest yearnings of the American people and guarantee his reelection.

Sylvan M. Shane.

Baltimore, *August 29.*

New Berlin, Wis.,
August 25, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Morse: We commend you heartily for the forthright stand you continue to take on the Senate floor in the debate on Vietnam. We agree with you that our Government is on very shaky ground in our warfare over there. Let the dispute be put in the hands of the Geneva conference—and let the U.N. peacekeeping machinery be used there. We trust that more Senators will join with you on this stand.

Sincerely,
Richard and Maxine Franz.

Detroit, Mich.,
August 25, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: We want to congratulate you for your courage and insight in protesting U.S. military involvement in Vietnam. We see this involvement as indefensible in view of our professed interest in furthering international peace through negotiation and arbitration. You are, we hope, not as alone as you may feel at this time. There in an immense national apathy regarding Vietnam, as people avoid thinking of painful circumstances which seem far away and beyond their control. Also, national solidarity is deemed in the national interest where wars are concerned, so that many people who have doubts about the propriety of U.S. actions repress their doubts under the pressure of events.

You deserve great commendation for your efforts.

Sincerely,
Mr. and Mrs. Carl R. Andreas.

New York, N.Y.,
August 25, 1964.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Morse: Permit me to congratulate you, belatedly, on your courageous and lone stand on the Vietnam question. This is but another fine act to add to your magnificent record in the Senate.

I would be proud, Mr. Morse, to be a member of your constituency.

Respectfully yours,
Mrs. Florence Jonas.

Kenwood, Calif.,
August 26, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: It is with a feeling of profound respect that this note is sent to you in an attempt to express gratitude and appreciation for your integrity and insight in speaking on Vietnam and the Tonkin Gulf.

Associated with this is something approaching despair for it is only you and Senator Gruening who have had the courage and dedication to express a reasoned, objective, and honest evaluation.

Faithfully yours,
H. D. Tibbits.

September 1, 1964.

Hon. Wayne Morris:

Send this on to our beloved and distinguished President (L.B.J.).

Geo.

President Lyndon B. Johnson,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.:

I listened to and approved of what you said (acceptance) last night. That goes for Hubert Humphrey too.

But what about Vietnam?

Better save our "neck." Our face won't even show without a neck. The American eagle has too many arrows already. And you have no mandate I know of to defoliate the olive branch further.

The letters that Wayne Morse has been getting (and putting in the Congressional Record) are not from screwballs or crackpots. That so many average Americans take the time and effort to alert us to the dangers of our senseless meddling—highly provocative too—ought persuade you—as Commander in Chief.

It is possible you have certain "undisclosed" information, hidden—for security or other—reasons for this bold and daring brinkmanship.

One occurs to me. Khrushchev was forced to take a position. And did. He said if in fact we (U.S.A.) were attacked without provocation (and the full factfinding so revealed) he'd go along with what we did. He's still gathering the facts.

The day Lodge got back from Vietnam I was in the District of Columbia. He told the newsmen the only reason to have military in Vietnam was so you could "sleep." Protection from ambush was the inference. The victory, he made clear, was political. Winning the Vietnamese "by persuasion."

The teacher I talked to July 6 at the ski-lodge on Plotcan Rosa (Swiss-Italian border) was an officer in the French Army the last 2 years they were in Vietnam. He'd been in Russia (school) a year, Siberia, Peiping, etc. He made it clear to me the Vietnamese "don't want war." They don't want foreign-military personnel of any kind. Needless to say they "hate" colonialism of any brand.

Why not dispatch some of our best Peace Corpsmen (whose skin is very much the color of theirs) to Vietnam. On invitation, of course. I've lately read most of Shriver's article in the September Geographic. If I thought it would do any good (for them and us) my wife and I would go there. Turn the lock on our business for 2 years).

Yesterday in the mail the passport office turned down my bid to go to Cuba. No reason given. I ask a reconsideration to me, it is un-American to curtail travel. I'd take my own chances. Ask no protection. But I'd behave there like a guest ought to. And try my best by example to better understand their thinking.

I went to Cuba regularly until the passport ban. I've been on both sides of the Berlin wall and the "no-man's land" in Jerusalem (the invisible wall). Was guest in an average home in Novohuzretgh, Siberia, a year ago. Got my own visa right there in Moscow and did it myself. No help. I didn't even ask the (our) Embassy. Nobody pays me a dime to go there (or elsewhere). Where do the dollars come from? I've had no new car since 1938. Gave up tobacco in 1934, never did drink. So (at 56—years old) I never felt better, ain't mad at nobody. I build homes for poor folks, run a small travel agency, and practice law. Been reading the Congressional Record since 1934—more and more each year. McMillan (S.C.) first sent it to me through my Vanderbilt Law School roommate whose associate (there in Nashville) was a close relative. Yes, Pat Harrison, Joe Robinson, Wm. Borath, "Cotton Ed" (I was personal guest in his office in 1941—June). Yes even Carter Glass who led the fight against the court-packing scheme—all of them I recall.

But—back to the point—Morse is right. Vietnamese must settle their own domestic squabble. We've no right to impose our will or "ism" on them.

Negotiate. Use the U.N. As for the 600 million Chinese, they are traditionally our friends. So are the Cubans. Canadians trade with both. Why don't we? How can we tail up puppets like Chiang Kai-shek and Khanh? Claim they're the respected heads of government.

I want to help, not hinder. But you are no servant. And intend to support you. But I'm not going to rubberstamp your policies. That ain't American.

Faithfully,
George W. Kunkle.

Chilmark, Mass.,
August 23, 1964.

Dear Senator: I am on your mailing list and read all you send your friends. You are a refreshing spirit in a maze of conformity. I share your views that unilateral military action offers no solutions to communism and that aid to friendly dictators is no service to democracy. Those are the points that occasion this expression of my general admiration.

Sincerely,
Roger Baldwin.

Schodack Landing, N.Y.,
August 23, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
The Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Morse: I want to congratulate you for voting against the recent resolution giving the President further powers to intensify the war in Vietnam.

I have written to President Johnson telling him of my support for the silent vigil for ending war in Vietnam, at the Democratic convention.

Yours truly,
Betty E. Lares.

Newberg, Oreg.,
September 3, 1964.

Our Dear Senator Morse: I have wanted to write you concerning your stand on the Vietnam question, about our policy in Asia, and to assure you that I know you are admired for such a stand. Thank the good Lord we have one man, a statesman Senator who is not a yes man. I have yet to find one when talking about your position who will challenge it upon the premise you have stated.

Of course, these two Portland papers—with their yellow journalism will weave in their lies and walk around the truth and inject that which you never said or meant. Like in their editorial (the Oregonian of Sept. 2, 1964) trying to put across the idea that you are all out against the President and the administration.

I notice that they will not come out and say whether they are opposed to war in Asia and the killing of our boys in an undeclared war and for what—to bolster a government of people who have no desire to even fight for their own freedom. Then as you have stated, where are our allies and what part are they taking? I surely hope that China will not open up and come across like they did in Korea, for as you say we have no business in a land war with that nation with its millions who will fight and die for a bowl of rice.

No doubt there are many who have written to you about this and have stated like I am now that we think you all-out right and if many in Congress were as courageous as you they would stand up and be counted—like the Senator from Alaska (I think) bless him.

Wish you had time to write a book of said doings—about national policy the down to earth truth—perhaps you will some day—I really believe it would be a best seller.

Sincerely yours,
Miller H. Porter.

Pasadena, Calif.,
August 19, 1964.

Hon. Senator Wayne Morse:

The stories of Lot and the history of Rienzi come to mind when I think of your lone voice on August 5. One lone, brave voice for the mercy of rationality. But you had one to vote with you. Where was Senator McGovern, of South Dakota, on that day?

Please send me the congressional report on that day.

The Peace and Social Action Committee of the center where I worship sent you a telegram of support. I send you my continuous, earnest, honest thoughts of prayerful appreciation for your clear-minded, heartening action.

Sincerely,

Roberta Walen.

P.S.—We are in a colossal effort to get a million letters to our officials in Washington before U.N. Day.

R. W.

Asheville, N.C.,
September 3, 1964.

Dear Senator Morse: My wife and I have not written you to extend our congratulations for your splendid speech opposing the President's blank check for making work as he chooses, but we do want you to know we have been working around the clock telling others about it, and soliciting them to write you and Senator Gruening for voting against that insanity.

Fred Stoner, editor and publisher, U.S. Farm News, was very happy that you inserted my article on Vietnam in the Congressional Record, August 20, and, of course, I am also. Would you be good enough to have one of your assistant mail me a copy of it for my files?

With admiration and warm regards,

Cordially,

Henry B. Hanes.

San Diego, Calif.,
September 4, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

How can we express ourselves adequately to give support to your view? My wife and I heard your speech on KPFK–FM tonight and I want you to call on us as your supporters to tell us how we can help. I would like to order 100 copies of your speech to mail out.

Thomas F. Wrigley.

Montagnola-ti. (Schweiz),
August 25, 1964.

Senator Ernest Gruening and Senator Wayne Morse, *Washington, D.C.*

Gentlemen: Kindly add my name to those of other American citizens who are for a policy of peace.

I deeply admire the courage it must have taken for you to vote against the resolution. I trust that no insults you may have received will detract you from a "hot pursuit" of the course which you consider necessary in the interest of the American people. It happens also to be in the interest of the entire human race which inhabits this tiny planet in the universe.

If I had been a Senator in that vote, I would probably not have dared to vote "no," for fear that my vote might give comfort and aid to the Eastern powers, so that I would have probably answered only "present." But today I realize that your clear no votes have helped the American people a thousand times as much as any help which they might have given, unavoidably, to the Eastern powers.

As a small token of my esteem I intend to mail you, in October, on return from a trip, a few antique maps from my collection of antique maps; namely, maps over 100 years old of Alaska, Oregon, and Arkansas, the latter for Senator Fulbright, as I resided in his State from 1951 to 1961 and admire also his work.

Let no threats from the Birch Society or from the new Burch society push you from your work to settle post-Hiroshima problems not by pre-Hiroshima, stone age methods, but by methods which will permit survival.

Respectfully and cordially yours,

Kurt Kauffmann,
Ph. D. (*Economics*).

P.S.—So that you can evaluate my vote of confidence: born 1900 in Hamburg, Germany—from 1937 to 1961 in the United States—since 1945 a citizen—never a member of any Communist or Communist-front organization—non-Communist liberal subscribing to Fulbright's choice of coexistence or mutual annihilation. Traveled in 39 non-Communist countries in 4 continents. I fear that President Johnson will lose at least 100,000 votes of Americans residing outside of the United States because of the archaic system of obtaining absentee ballots, instead of letting a passport be stamped in the nearest U.S. consulate.

Brooklyn, N.Y.,
September 5, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: At last a voice cried out this afternoon for morality and justice. In discussions with friends, it was ever the conclusion that our part being played in Vietnam would never bring peace to that country.

In speaking of morality, how can we dare to lend American planes to ferry mercenaries to assist Mr. Tshombe?

My husband and I fully concur with you. Help the underprivileged by teaching them self-help, and in the interim supply food and machinery where necessary toward this end, else we shall be confounded; and by this I mean, new alliances will emerge antithetical to our freedom and security.

Thank you so much for being so brave—it is a lonely position, but I feel so correct.

Respectfully yours,

Mrs. Rosanne Rozin.

Los Angeles, Calif.,
August 27, 1964.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

My Dear Senator: I was happily surprised about your courage to dissent the U.S. current foreign policy on the floor of the Senate. I wonder if you could please send me or direct me where I may obtain some of the speeches you made about our presence in South Vietnam. I thank you for your anticipated aid.

Sincerely,

Frank Landsmann.

Tucson, Ariz.,
August 20, 1964.

Dear Senator Morse: Your keenly perceptive analysis of, and forthright position on the war in Vietnam are heartening to me. We must be made to recognize the ambiguity in our foreign policy, and face the discrepancy between our professed moral principles and our practice.

Our continuing resort to expediency, rationalized as a necessary response in kind to Communist tactics, carries us, with accelerating speed, toward chaos. Fear has atrophied our minds and destroyed our moral sensitivities. Even the Pentagon knows that the concept of "absolute sovereignty" dissolved when all national borders became permeable, but the State Department goes on operating right out of Bismarck, and or the early texts of Hans Morgenthau.

Full use and constant strengthening of the United Nations is not an option, but a mandatory requirement in the atomic age. The choice is simple, however difficult the implementation; we go backward toward intensified nationalism, or forward through the U.N. toward a governed world.

Would you be kind enough to send me copies of your proposals to the Senate or other statements of your position on Vietnam?

With sincere regard,

Eleanor Backus.

Fort Benning, Ga.,
August 25, 1964.

Hon. Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: In the midst of emotional saber rattling, the cool voice of reason manifested itself in your person.

The incidents which occurred in the Gulf of Tonkin were totally unnecessary, and would have been ludicrous if the gravity of the situation were not so great. Our policy in the Far East, particularly southeast Asia, is about as confused and equivocal as our policy anywhere else in the world.

Senator, I congratulate you on your display of courage by denouncing the policy of the United States during those days of abhorrence. And as a testimonial to you, Senator Morse, may I kindly have a copy of the speech you delivered on the Senate floor castigating our seal action in Vietnam? A copy of your speech will greatly facilitate and enhance my ability to engage in educational debate with those who differ with me on this subject.

Thanking you for your usual courtesy and cooperation, I am,

Sincerely yours,

Joseph A. Fusaro.

Union of Australian Women,
Western Australia,
Perth, August 19, 1964.

Dear Senator Wayne Morse: We write to congratulate and thank you for your timely criticism of U.S. policy in South Vietnam.

We know that millions of other women throughout the world think the same.

We are emphatic that this war must be brought to an end. The women and children of Vietnam have suffered enough, the threat it presents to whole world is too grave. A peaceful solution must be found.

We had an interview with the counsul for the United States in this city a few days ago. He said emphatically that America was going to stay in Vietnam. We got the impression that there were no plans to explore a negotiated settlement. It seems to us there is no other way out of the difficulty, and a government and a country of the might of the United States should be big enough to do this.

We and many other women disagree with our own Government's actions in sending men, materials, and weapons to South Vietnam. We have organized many messages to this effect to the Parliament which is now sitting.

Thank you for showing us another America, one we feel we could be real friends with.

Your sincerely,

Hon. Secretary.

August 16, 1964.

To Whom It May Concern:

On Sunday, August 2, 1964, about 2:40 p.m., 3 torpedo boats, allegedly of North Vietnam, attacked the U.S. destroyer *Maddox* that was patrolling along the coast of North Vietnam about 30 miles from shore and moving in a south-southeasterly direction at a speed of 15 knots.

On Tuesday at 9:30 p.m. "several" fast surface vessels began approaching from the south and the west in separate groups, and attacked this time during darkness, using searchlights to spot the destroyers *Maddox* (and *Joy,* which had joined the *Maddox* Monday morning). The attack continued for nearly 4 hours. In the meantime, after the first attack, our President had sent an ultimatum, through channels, to North Vietnam, warning against any further such attacks against our 7th Fleet vessels on the high seas, or else. News reports that I heard indicated that the official message of warning was not received in North Vietnam by the time the second attack took place. Our destroyers were neither one damaged to any mentionable extent, nor were any of the crews injured, according to reports that I have found to read on the two attacks. Even so, our President ordered retaliation of a major magnitude against the PT-boat bases of North Vietnam which the attackers might have ventured from, or which they might venture from at any future time, which was carried out.

On face value, one could readily agree that the retaliation was justified, at least to some extent, if—(1) the attacks were entirely unprovoked; (2) one supposed that North Vietnam had been properly warned; (3) the second did in fact originate from North Vietnam (which they categorically denied according to one initial report); and, if (1) and (3) above were true, (4) even without warning if serious damage or loss of life had occurred to our 7th Fleet vessels and personnel. But let us carefully examine the facts and logic of it all.

One would suppose from the reports that the destroyers had continued in a generally southeasterly direction during those 2⅓ days between attacks, yet the entire coast of North Vietnam is only 150 miles long in that direction, considering the course during the initial attack. That distance could have been covered in 10 hours, or less, at 15 knots, the alleged patrol speed, yet some 56 hours had elapsed. One could thus assume that the destroyers were off South Vietnam before the second attack took place, or had time to make several more patrols up and down the coast of North Vietnam by Tuesday night. And if the second supposition is true, what are we doing patrolling so close to the shores of North Vietnam and Red China day after day and week after week. How would we feel if Russian destroyers and carriers were cruising back and forth, up and down the coast about the same distance out, between Baja California and Santa Barbara, Calif.

North Vietnam denied the second attack, and indeed, some of the PT-boats approached from the south, and none came from the pack of PT-boats that the destroyers had been observing on their radar screens for several hours throughout the afternoon and evening. The quantity of boats in this second attack is not given in the Navy intelligence summary in Life magazine for August 14, even though radar should have been able to count them easily, nor is the position of the action indicated in this report, or any other report in the news or on television that I have come across.

The rebellion against the Saigon regime in South Vietnam has been and is a peoples rebellion—even more so than our own war of independence of 1776. Some 75 to 85 percent of the people are against the current regime. General Khanh has been talking strongly of attacking North Vietnam, and in fact has claimed repeated commando raids into North Vietnam over the past several months, and with only some 2½ million loyal supporters at the most in his country, out of 9 million (1954) population total, who does he expect to use against the 13 million North Vietnamese population (and 700 million Chinese). It is only logical that Khanh would be looking for an excuse or means of involving the active might of the United States behind his goals, in addition to the advisory and material help the south has been receiving for 10 years, and which the French received in material and money to the tune of 78 percent of the effort from our Nation between the years of 1946 and 1954.

Also, in view of the Republican presidential candidate's intense interest in Vietnam as a prime campaign issue, it is entirely within the realm of probability that political motivations were involved in the entire mess—political motivations from within our own country and in direct relation to the November presidential contest. Of course, these are mere suppositions, and anyone who feels that our Nation can do no wrong, that we are entirely interested in peace, that we are really interested in the freedom of the nations and peoples we have become involved with, and that we are above all question as to our integrity—these people will instantly reject my insinuations, and rightly so if their faith in the goals of our Nation and its leadership is well founded. But we are that angelic?

I happen to remember the conflicting Presidential announcements during and following the Bay of Pigs invasion and the U–2 incident. I remember in 1959 how the stock market fell many billions of dollars when good news on disarmament came out of Geneva—and how in a few days the news changed for the worse and the stock market regained all of its losses and more. I remember well how our feelings toward the Soviet Union were changed almost over night at the end of World War II, and completely contrary to several wartime agreements between the three major powers in relation to close postwar cooperation to prevent there ever being another major conflict, and this began taking place within 11 days after F.D.R. passed on. Perhaps the words of Harry S. Truman on June 23, 1941 (the day after Germany attacked Russia) are a livid clue as to why these past 20 years of events have taken place and the solemn wartime vows have been slithered out from under. To quote the then Senator from Missouri, "If we see that Germany is winning the war we ought to help Russia, and if Russia is winning we ought to help Germany, and in that way let them kill as many as possible." (The New York Times, July 24, 1941—as requoted in "The Cold War and Its Origins.")

Our Nation, through its CIA, organized the Bay of Pigs invasion of Castro's Cuba, and as a result of that escapade The Nation magazine asked Fred J. Cook to do a complete report on the CIA (based only on known and published facts), the organization that is responsible to no one but the holder of the highest office of our land, the President of these United States—and which reports to him every morning the world situation and its activities at that moment. The article took up 44 pages of a special issue of the magazine dated June 24, 1961. You may borrow a copy from your local library, or request one from The Nation, 333 Sixth Avenue, New York, N.Y. The article goes into detail on the connections between the German industralists who promoted Hitler into power on the one hand, and Allen and John Foster Dulles on the other hand. It lists many military coups that the CIA was intimately involved in the organization and promotion of: Iran in 1953, Guatemala in 1954, the attempt in East Germany in 1953, and the same in Hungary and Poland in 1956, Egypt in 1952, and many attacks of a commando nature against Red China from Quemoy and Matsu during the 1950's that at least twice brought us to the very brink of war in that area. There are several others of lesser importance as well; and since that article was written, of course, there have been others including the military takeovers of Honduras last fall (when several hundred guards protecting the office of the liberal president were mowed down before they could have breakfast one morning), the Dominican Republic just a few days earlier, and Brazil early this spring; all of which set up right-wing military dictatorships, which our current President recognized as soon as the opportunity presented itself. This was as soon as he took office and got settled in the instance of the first two, and almost immediately in the case of Brazil.

In addition to the above, during April we read in our news of the house arrest of one Prince Souvanna Phouma, the neutralist premier of Laos, by the right-wing elements of the coalition government there. Subsequent to that event we read reports of merging of the right-wing and neutralist elements in Laos, and within 3 weeks renewed military moves on the part of either the Pathet Lao forces—or certain neutralist elements that did not approve of succumbing to the right-wing takeover. And then we began sending numerous air strikes against the dissident elements there and against the Pathet Lao positions. And subsequent yet, we began reading reports of commando raids into North Vietnam, and plans for invasion of the north. And as General Khanh remarked after he was elected president by a 50-to-8 vote of the military junta, "Everything we do is done in close cooperation with American authorities."

It is also significant that many of the regimes that we have been supporting, and those which the CIA helped to set up in power, have been and are still (in most cases) vicious, dictatorial, corrupt, wealth oriented, and generally indifferent to the needs of the people of their respective domains. This was true of South Korea under Rhee, China and Formosa under Chiang Kai-shek, South Vietnam under the Diems, Batista's Cuba, Iran, and many others.

It must be remembered that both political parties in our country have been deeply involved in the French Indochina area since 1946 when the rebellion against the French first began. Truman saw to it that some three-fourths of the effort to suppress the people's revolt was financed by America. Ike and John Foster Dulles saw to it that Vietnam would not be reunited by popular vote (as called for by the Geneva agreements), by building up and supporting the Diem regime and by organizing and creating the SEATO organization. And don't forget that we have sent a great deal of help and military equipment to Franco's Spain (which came into being as a result of Franco's military conquest of the duly elected loyalist government there and which was a proving ground for the war machines of Hitler and Mussolini prior to their initiating World War II), and which we invited to become a member of NATO.

And so I could go on, and on. I am convinced that the general overall events of the past 18 or 20 years, including the commando strikes against North Vietnam (undoubtedly at the direction of our military mission in South Vietnam), and the specific event of ordering 64 air sorties against North Vietnam PT boat bases and oil storage—in an almost infinitely stepped up retaliation compared to damage received by our destroyer patrol—heavily qualifies our President Lyndon B. Johnson as a war criminal, and Senator GOLDWATER right along with him for persistently encouraging such action or worse, and in fact sanctioning beforehand this particular action. On the other hand, these are not alone in their vast responsibility—Truman, Ike, and Kennedy are likewise as responsible, and the majority of Congress as well. Unless, of course, there is some other ethical or moral reason that transcends all else—some other reason why Communists should be treated as if they were less than human beings—human beings that are making a sincere and sustained effort on the world scene to uplift the lot of the people in the most efficient way that has appeared in all the history of man—and which has proved quite successful for the most part, isolated cases of somewhat serious mistakes (which our politicians, businessmen and the press play up out of all reasonable proportion), notwithstanding.

And now, in view of the above outlined facts and the voluminous evidence that exists to back them up, in view of the imminence of a crucial presidential election just a few short months away, and in view of the only current choice for myself and my fellow countrymen to pick from—a war criminal, or a liar and potentially worse war criminal—I deem it advisable that a third choice be immediately made available and vigorously promoted.

In view of the evidence thus far, and the vote that was taken on the retaliation sanction, there are only two men of sufficient public stature and moral integrity to qualify them for the highest offices of our land. These men, in spite of the nearly overwhelming pressures which were brought to bear upon them to unanimously support the President's retaliation policy (and future acts of a like nature), were the only two, out of nearly 535 Congressmen and Senators, who saw the issue somewhat clearly and maintained a sufficient moral stamina to vote against the retaliation measure. They are Senator WAYNE MORSE, of the State of Oregon, and Senator ERNEST GRUENING, of the State of Alaska, who have consistently stuck to their principles—and to the avowed highest principles of good on which our Nation was originally founded. It is perhaps fortunate that there were only two for this leaves no doubt as to who should be chosen and receive the full support of the American people of good will.

I further propose that a new political party be immediately formed to most properly carry out the purposes and goals of the truly liberal people of our Nation. And in the interests of truth and honesty, and to most accurately portray the principles of good that are embodied in the Golden Rule and Second Great Law of God which emphasizes the twin goals of "Peace on Earth and Good Will to All Men", and likewise the initial example shown by the earliest followers of Christ, Acts 2:44–45, "And all that believed were together, and had all things common; And sold their possessions and goods, and parted them to all men, as every man had need."—in view of these highest of ideals, I propose that this new party be called the "Christian Communist Party." Those who sign their names to the major tenets of the above declaration, but who nevertheless hold reservations as to the above name for our party, may indicate their reservations by appending an asterisk at the end of the line on which their name appears and initialing same.

Reference sources for the above analysis: "Thunder out of China" by Annalee Jacoby and Theodore H. White, 1946; "A Nation of Sheep" by William J. Lederer, 1961; "The Tragedy of Vietnam" by Helen B. Lamb, at peace centers, 1964; "The Warfare State" by Fred J. Cook, Macmillan Co., 1962; "The Cold War and its Origins" by D. F. Fleming, Doubleday & Co., 1961; "The C.I.A." in the Nation by Fred J. Cook, June 24, 1961; Worldbook Encyclopedia Annuals, 1955 through 1964; World Almanacs and Books of Facts, 1958 through 1964; Encyclopedia Americana, 1949 edition, including items "U.S.S.R.", "Social Reform Movements Since World War I", "World War II", "Pacts and Conferences", "Hungary"; "Looking Backward—2000 A.D. to 1887 A.D." by Edward Bellamy, 1888; and last but not least, The Bible, King James version. Duplication encouraged, or additional copies available from Elton R. Maas, 10696 Tantaw Avenue, Cupertino, Calif., Technocrat.

MANISTEE, MICH.,
August 19, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: You will find the enclosure very interesting.

While Burchett is by no means impartial he has been right far too often in the past to disregard what he has to say.

Your fellow Senators need to read this more than you do. Perhaps some will.

Yours,

JOHN W. HARVEY.

WITH SOUTH VIETNAM'S GUERRILLAS

(By Wilfred Burchett)

I was musing over the image of a nearly full moon repeatedly shattered by our little sampan into a million stars only to reform into a shimmering, golden orb within seconds of our passing. Framed in the delicate profile of bamboo leaves glinting in the dark where the moonlight touched them, everything looked polished and gleaming like a Vietnamese lacquer painting. Suddenly there was a warning signal from our guide; the outboard motor was cut and we veered sharply toward a bamboo thicket on the riverbank. There was the sound of many more outboard motors coming from the direction in which we are heading, and this was disquieting. We were supposed to be in safe territory. Cigarettes were doused, conversation reduced to whispers. Within a few minutes the first couple of a double line of sampans rounded a bend about 500 meters distant, followed by more and more. They were still rounding the bend when the first couple was only 20 or 30 meters from our hiding spot. But long before that, we had heard the sound of women's voices and as they grew nearer we caught glimpses through the leaves of sampans filled to the waterline with women and girls. Each was holding a stick with a papered-over frame on which slogans had been scrawled in big letters and in every sampan there were a few cloth banners with boldly printed slogans, stretched between two sticks.

Our sampan slid out again into midstream and jocular greetings were exchanged as our motor started up again and we moved on downstream past the convoy. By the way the sallies were shouted back and forth and the bursts of laughter that followed some of them, it was clear we were really in safe territory.

"They're off to the district center for a demonstration," said Huynh, my very knowledgeable journalist-interpreter. "There are about half a dozen villages represented here, but there are other convoys moving in by road and river by other directions. The enemy's going to get a nice surprise in the morning." I looked at my watch and it was just after midnight.

"They have to travel by night to avoid planes," said Huynh. "They like to be in town well before dawn before the authorities are around to give orders."

I asked what the demonstration was about, and after a few more exchanges with the boats, he explained that a village in the district had been bombed a few days previously and a new school and library had been wiped out, as well as half a dozen houses. No one had been killed, but they were going to protest about destruction of public property, as the school and library had been built by the villagers themselves. The others were coming "out of solidarity" and to protest against bombings in general. Huynh translated some of the slogans. Apart from those demanding an end to bombings, an end to the destruction of "government" and "public property" and compensation for the damage done, there were others, such as: "Higher pay for our sons in the army," "Regular leave for army men," "Pensions for wounded soldiers," "Compensation for wives and mothers of army men killed and wounded in action," "An end to beatings in the army."

"Which army?" I asked.

"The puppet army, of course," he replied.

"But the people are from the Liberation Front areas?"

"Almost all of them are."

"And they are demanding higher pay for the soldiers that come and shoot them down and burn their villages?"

"It's a correct tactic," replied Huynh. "First of all the population never admit to being 'Vietcong.' They all claim to be loyal subjects of Saigon with the right to 'protection' from the Saigon government. If there are Vietcong around it is only because the 'legal' government has run away, but this is not a reason to bomb their villages. Secondly, being themselves on a strictly legal position, they can claim the Saigon army is 'their' army and should protect them. Also it conforms to the general Front policy of winning the sympathy of the puppet troops. Such slogans give the troops the idea that they are being badly treated and adds to their discontent. But as a tactic for the actual demonstration it is also very effective. Troops find it difficult to repress demonstrators when they are demanding better conditions for the troops themselves. But it is much more than just a temporary expedient. The Front has a whole policy for such things," he said, lighting a cigarette up as extra confirmation that we were deep in Front-controlled territory.

"In cases where there are families in our areas whose sons or husbands have been killed or incapacitated while serving with the enemy forces, we give them material help. We give less than we do to families of our own troops, but we do help them.

We have a special organization that visits bereaved families—including those of puppet troops—to explain front policy and check up on their material needs. They report back and help is allotted accordingly. It may be in the form of money or food, or help with manpower. In the cases where tyrants are executed, or punished by having their properties confiscated—usually their wealth was amassed by plundering their victims, we leave enough for the family to live on. We do not want to alienate a single person unnecessarily and we want to gain the maximum possible to our cause. All that is part of the political aspect of our struggle, to which our leaders pay as much, or more, importance as the military side of things.

We had left the last of the sampans behind by that time and had the river and the moon to ourselves again. I probed Huynh about further illustrations of political strategies and tactics and the nature of politico-military struggle.

"You've already seen for yourself," he continued, "that in many areas there are posts that we could easily wipe out. But if the garrisons are quiet; if they lay off shooting and plundering and listen to the explanations given by the population, we don't shoot. If they shoot—we shoot and we win. They know that. But it is useful for us to keep them there as a target for the explanations. Almost the whole population—except for our armed forces—takes part in this. It goes on day and night. In theory the Saigon troops are forbidden to have any contact with the local population, even their closest relatives. In practice there is contact all the time. But for the past couple of years, the top brass is so worried by the disaffection rate that the garrisons are rotated every 3 months. But our people can do a lot with them in 3 months and, in any case, in the area to which they are transferred, there are others to carry on the good work. Our people live among the enemy or, more exactly, they live among us. Land reform has been carried out and our peasants, by, and large, work for themselves.

The puppet troops are peasant conscripts. When they see this free life going on around them; the landlords and tax collectors either nonexistent or under control—you think this doesn't have an effect? Compared to life in Saigon-controlled areas where the peasants are regimented and ground down like slaves? Especially when the difference is drummed into them day and night by fellow peasants working their own fields right up to the walls of their posts.

"Our liberated areas sometimes reach within a hundred or so meters of a post and the garrison has to depend on airdropped supplies, because we will shoot down helicopters if they try to land and we've destroyed the roads. We could starve them out if we wanted, cut off their supplies altogether. But we allow two or three—no more—to come out and pick up the supplies. We take the parachutes because we need the cloth. But food supplies we let them have. The troops appreciate this attitude. We always make it clear we are against Vietnamese killing Vietnamese and so they are glad to adopt our live-and-let-live attitude.

"Our leaders take the view that these are conscripts who practically have no choice but to serve Saigon, but who also don't want to die by being forced into combat with us. When there are holidays, the villagers go and visit the garrison troops. They are not too cordial toward them, but courteous. They might even bring small gifts, fruit and cakes, and mix them up with their explanations. They advise them politely to stick to the 'traffic lanes' if they come to the village and that if they come without shooting or plundering—all will be well. They will be invited into homes and given tea. But if they leave the main tracks and start uninvited toward the houses or the pigsties, poultry sheds, fruit trees, etc., they will be in for trouble with traps immediately. And if they start shooting they will be in for far worse trouble—if not on that occasion, then the next time they move out of the post. The troops know by bitter experience—their own or those of others—that this is true.

"The population is well educated by the front not to stick their necks out," Huynh continued, "always to be tactful and nonprovocative. For instance, the garrison chief often knows who are the front 'activists' in any village. The posts are built on elevations, the garrison chief has his binoculars. He can see people sticking up posters, writing slogans on the walls, addressing meetings and so on. If it is an area where he can move out and take a patrol into the village to question people, they will reply: 'Sure—there are some Vietcong here. Come and arrest them if you like. But in fact they do no harm. And if bullets start flying innocent people may get hurt. You might get hurt too because it seems they have good military training; know how to handle their weapons.' If troops do come and kill someone, the body will be carried to the post and the whole village will turn out in a protest demonstration. They will let the troops know they are in for a bad time if they set their foot outside their post again.

"Another example. The villagers contribute rice to the front—the garrison chief can see the porters carrying it away, or he will hear about it at least. But for any contribution to the front, a receipt is given. The villager will take these receipts and show them to the soldiers in the post. 'You see,' they will say, 'the Viet Cong made a levy last night. They made us hand over some rice. They say it was necessary for the liberation of the country—to get the Americans out and end the war. We had to pay up—we couldn't help ourselves.' In this way they cover up for themselves and drive another little arrow home at the same time."

Huynh who is famed as a skilled propagandist himself, and a veteran of the war against the French, explained that such tactics were only necessary and possible because, although the people opposed the administrative, political, and ideological positions of Saigon, they still technically were in Saigon-controlled territory and they had to maintain a correct legal status to remain alive.

"So we encourage them to tell the officers at the post all sorts of things," he continued. "A garrison commander may ask if there are guerrillas in the village. 'Yes,' someone will reply. 'We have guerrillas here. My son is a guerrilla. My husband is a guerrilla. Yes—they have guns.' But when they are asked what is the strength of the unit, where the guns are hidden—this they don't know. We encourage the villagers to pass on certain facts that formerly the torture squads could never have wrung out of them. With the changed relations of strength, such facts make good propaganda today. But they never reveal the strength of units or location of weapons.

"When the armed resistance first started," Huynh continued, "parents encouraged their sons to escape from the villages and join the guerrillas. The enemy started shooting fathers of those who had disappeared. The people countered this by protests, claiming the Diemists themselves had killed or kidnapped their sons. A mother would sit up half the night preparing her lad's clothes and food for a few days' journey into the mountains; pack him off in the small hours of the morning and a few hours later, when he was well away, would lead a delegation of wailing women to the district chief, demanding the return of her son who must have been 'arrested.' Or the delegation would complain about the lack of security in the village when the Viet Cong could come and 'kidnap' their lads. The people's initiative and ingenuity in such matters has no limits," Huynh said and went on to explain that in virtually every village, including the Saigon-controlled ones, there were special propaganda teams and exchanges of experience.

"The enemy know, for instance," he continued, as we lay stretched out on the bottom of the sampan under the white brilliance of the stars, the water rippling by, and the outboard motor softly puttering away, "that virtually everybody in every village takes part in making spikes for traps.

"If they are accused of this, they will speak up: 'Yes, the Vietcong make us do this. We have to obey them. You are not here to protect us—what can we do?'

"If they are asked where the spikes are kept, they will show one or two, but not the real stock. 'These are rejects,' they will say, 'the Vietcong refused to pay for these—all the good ones they have taken away.'

"They can reply like this now only because of our strength. The real breakthrough came, however, only when the people themselves started punishing the worst of the bullies." Our sampan headed into a little cove and we started reaching for our knapsacks. Huynh continued his story. "This political work never lets up," he stressed, "and it helps to compensate a lot for the enemy's superiority in arms."

He recalled that before the armed resistance had become generalized, he had worked for a time in the coastal plain areas of central Vietnam.

"At that time, we in the plains had no arms at all, but we knew the tribesmen in the hills had started to defend themselves. Punitive expeditions used to pass through our areas on the way to the mountains and our people used to work on the troops warning them in the most tactful way not to start massacring the tribespeople. It was the only sort of help we could give them at that time. 'We know the tribespeople,' one old man would say. 'They are proud, courageous people—if you do anything wrong, they are certain to kill you. They have terrible traps full of spikes and poison arrows that make you suffer terribly for a few minutes before you die. A pity for fine young chaps like you. We only give you a friendly warning because we are Vietnamese like you.'

"And when they came back again after a few days, carrying their wounded—and plenty not coming back at all—our people would be full of sympathy, would give them tea with remarks like: 'What did we tell you? Keep away from their villages or you'll all be killed.'"

Listening to Huynh, I realized that the South Vietnamese were displaying real ingenuity in the part of guerrilla warfare.

During an earlier rest period, I had been talking with some tribespeople about their various hunting methods. Kpy Plui, a Jarai tribesman who once served in the French Army and is now a famous hunter from Kontum Province, after giving me an exciting account of how his people hunted tigers and wild pigs, came down to the less dangerous business of the monkey hunt. They pick half a thousand to a thousand and more at a time.

I asked what they did with such a quantity of monkeys.

"We keep them in cages and eat them as needed. The bones are boiled down for medicine. But the very big ones, we keep for propaganda teams.

"And what about the propaganda aspect?" I asked.

"We choose the biggest ones—about 15 to 20 kilograms. We dress them up in black pants and shirts, make up their faces a bit to look like Diem—in his time—and Harkins or Nguyen Khanh now. We draw caricatures on the back of their shirts, tie streamers with slogans to their legs and smuggle them into Saigon and provincial capitals. We turn them loose around the marketplace early in the mornings, or in main thoroughfares just as people are going to work. The monkeys are a bit puzzled at first, but then they start leaping around with the slogans streaming out. People are delighted as they always are with monkeys. The police don't know what to do. It is awkward shooting at them, like shooting at the leaders themselves. Anyway they would cover themselves with ridicule trying to shoot them. So they start chasing around trying to catch them and rip off the streamers. The more they chase them and leap around, the more the people enjoy the spectacle. It is a very effective form of propaganda but it is useful for other things too. No more than three people can gather together in the streets, even in the market. The police will arrest them—even if they have only gathered because of an argument or some market bargaining. But when the monkeys and the police are chasing each other around, people can get together and our propagandists can get in some quick work."

Even lowlier creatures than monkeys figure in the fantastic arsenal of weapons the South Vietnamese people are using—and not only for propaganda. There are front-controlled villages—in Mo Cay District of Ben Tre Province, for instance—the defense of which is primarily entrusted to bees. Chi Nguyet (Sister Moonlight), another of those jewels of girls from Ben Tre, a madonna-faced beauty with a mischievous smile, told me of how from 1960 on the Diemists tried to convert her village into a strategic hamlet.

"A lot of us girls went in protest to the Provincial capital, but they arrested us all and beat us up," she said. "Then all the women of the village came to Ben Tre with their children and demanded our release. They kicked up such a row and started organizing so many other women from Ben Tre to support them, that the governor was glad to get rid of us. But then the Diemist troops had it in for our village. They kept coming, stealing pigs and chickens and always trying to force us to build fences and dig moats and wall our village in. But we refused. In our area, as in many other parts of South Vietnam," she continued, "there is a specially big and ferocious type of bee. They don't store honey, but their sting is terribly painful; half a dozen of them can kill a fully grown man. We studied the habits of these bees very carefully. Among other things they have four sentries on permanent duty in daylight hours. If they see something they don't like, they call out the whole hive and they will attack whatever disturbs them. We learned to handle them very carefully; by pasting sticky paper over the hive entrance we could move the nests about.

"One day we had word that an enemy platoon was heading our way, so we set some hives in trees near which they had to pass; dug some traps in the road and attached strings to these, leading to the hives. The patrol came along and sure enough one fell into the trap and tore the paper off the hive. The bees attacked immediately and the troops ran like mad buffalo, some stung by the bees, other falling into our spiked traps. We were sure they would send for help, so we set up some more hives. Sure enough a company of troops started out by road and some more landed near the village by helicopter. They could not come too close because fields just around the village were spiked with poles. When the enemy troops came near, they saw piles of earth as if from freshly dug traps. The officer in charge must have ordered the earth cleared away to uncover the traps—which is what we had expected. The hives were hidden in the earth and were actually broken up by the troops. There was a terrible commotion when they were disturbed in such a rough way. They attacked like dive bombers, many hundreds of them. In no time at all, the troops were racing back toward the helicopters, the bees after them until they had taken enough revenge, I suppose," she said with her charming mischievous smile.

"We were very encouraged by this victory and started to rear the bees especially for our defenses and for those of neighboring villages. When I left," she concluded, "we had over 200 hives set up and the enemy had not dared to come near us for a long time."

When I met Sister Moonlight, she was far from her native village, taking part in a regional conference where experiences of such unusual types of warfare were being exchanged for application in other areas.

The use of money, propagandists and garrisons of bees are further illustration of what a people's war means even in the nuclear era. I doubt that any general staff in the world could plan from on top the use of such weapons. It is the grassroots nature of the struggle in South Vietnam that produces them. When people are defending their own homes and hamlets their resources are without limit.

Successive garrisons to Sister Moonlight's village were, of course, politely warned by the villagers of the ferocious nature of the bees in the area and that if they were coming on a friendly visit, it was better to have some of the locals steer them past the hives of bees that had invaded the area and also never to fire guns near the village because this enraged the bees terribly and "everyone will suffer."

Writers, theater workers, and journalists, I found, engage in almost simultaneous politico-military activities.

Tran Huu Trang, the well-known Saigon writer and dramatist who is president of the Writers & Theater Workers Association—also of the NFL central committee, told me that members of the association, arms in hand, took part in all major attacks.

Journalists also collect their stories of military operations while actually taking part themselves and work almost literally "with a pen in one hand and a rifle in another."

A pigtailed girl who was introduced to me as Sister Thien—not her real name because her family is still in Saigon and she goes in herself from time to time—told me something of the difficulties she and her colleagues have in producing a student paper for the Saigon-Gai-Dinh area.

"For a long time we printed secretly right in the center of Saigon itself," she said, "actually in Diemist printing shops. But things got too hot, so we bought a printing plant of our own and smuggled it out of Saigon to set up here in the jungle."

"Smuggled it out of Saigon?" I asked, knowing that Saigon is probably the most tightly controlled city in the world.

"Yes," she said with a cheery smile. "We took the whole thing to pieces. The print was taken out in the carrying baskets of scores of 'market women'—actually us girl students—the baskets topped off with unsold fruit and vegetables. The rollers and cog wheels and things were a bit of a problem, but we greased them well and attached them to the bottom of the sampans. They had a long ride in the water, but cleaned up all right later. We shipped the whole lot out in a couple of nights—right under the noses of the Diemist flics. Our problem was to print in Saigon and smuggle copies out into the countryside and other provincial capitals. Now its the opposite. We print outside and smuggle the copies into the capital. We publish 5,000 copies for Saigon and once they get down to our 'letter-boxes'—our liaison agents, they are quickly distributed and pass from hand to hand until virtually every student gets to read them. It is a very popular paper and our main correspondents are the students themselves, smuggling their articles out by the same network we use to smuggle them in. Of course we keep changing our communication channels to fool the police. So far we have had no mishaps."

And so it goes on. A ceaseless, relentless battle of the minds of everyone, from students to soldiers; from peasants to government officials and high-ranking army officers, with never a trick left unplayed. This battle is being won hands down by the Liberation Front. The Saigon regime—despite the U.S. experts on psychological warfare—has little to offer in return and no real means of counterattack.

August 31, 1964.

Dear Sir: First, I want to thank you for your protest of the Gulf of Tonkin raids. Since your speech was not in any of the Chicago papers I just got it (excerpts rather) from another source.

Have been writing letters to the papers for a year about Vietnam and my luck is no better than yours. Not one has been published although other letters have. My last effort was an open letter to my Congressmen and Senators.

If you have any copies of that speech I would very much like some. Perhaps I can raise a little indignation among a few of my friends.

Thank you.

Yours for a better world,

Myron R. Brundage.

San Pedro, Calif.,
September 1, 1964.

Dear Senator Morse: My appreciation for your recent stand on the war in Vietnam and bless the people of Oregon for keeping you in the Senate.

B. J. McMullan.

Vista, Calif.,
August 25, 1964.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Washington, D.C.

Honorable Sir: I agree with your views regarding our policy in Vietnam and wish to commend you for your opposition—I believe our reprisal attack was unwarranted. In fact, I am not sure the attack on our destroyers was not provoked.

Sincerely,

Miss Florence Jamieson.

San Jose, Calif.

Congratulations Senator Morse: You are the voice in the wilderness—your courageous statements on Vietnam give those of us who agree renewed courage and faith in our own sanity. I am constantly reminded of Lincoln's rejection of the war with Mexico.

Mrs. Marie Erdman

St. Paul, Minn.,
August 26, 1964.

Dear Senator Morse: Congratulations on your great fight to bring peace to South Vietnam.

Now that Senator Humphrey is choice for Vice President why not suggest he go to South Vietnam as peacemaker.

Maybe he can help settle this senseless war. (It's obvious our military is going from bad to worse.)

Keep up your great work for peace. It is appreciated by everyone I know, but they just don't take the time to tell you.

J. F. McEvoy.

Schenectady, N.Y.,
August 25, 1964.

Dear Senator: The news from South Vietnam lately is getting so lopsided that my imagination cannot keep up with it. I thought we just got finished distributing $300 million and a lot of halos. And now the people in South Vietnam are throwing rocks at our boys and demanding that their leaders turn in their halos.

B. Coppola.

August 27, 1964.

Dear Senator: Could you please send me two copies of your remarks in the Senate against passage of the Vietnam resolution, the "predated declaration of war." Also, do you have a digest of the legislation you have been instrumental in getting passed, or blocked, in the last few years? I wish whatever you have were contagious down there in Washington. Did you get my wire?

Sincerely yours,

Samuel Z. Wintroub.

August 19, 1964.

Dear Senator Morse: We wish to congratulate you, along with Senator Gruening, for voting against the resolution to grant advance approval of the President's decisions regarding military steps in Vietnam war. Very little coverage was given your courageous speech in our newspapers but the full text was printed in August 15 edition of National Guardian.

We would like to send copies of your speech to a number of friends and would much appreciate several copies if you have them available for mailing.

Thank you.

Mrs. Lee C. Poole.

Brockton, Mass.,
August 17, 1964.

Dear Senator Morse: I feel you are owed a debt of gratitude for your perseverence in your stand in regard to the war in Vietnam. I hope we have a political settlement of the struggle there.

Cordially yours,

Lois Baker.

Fargo, N. Dak.,
August 24, 1964.

Dear Senator Morse: You are to be commended for your stand in South Vietnam. It is a pity that your colleagues cannot perceive the situation there as you and Senator Gruening of Alaska see it. While there are a few of us, professors of the arts, history, and humanities, who agree wholeheartedly with your stand, the majority I talk to advocate the get tough policy. It is a shame that the press and TV cannot enlighten people more to the issues of the day.

Sincerely,

Phyllis Lahti.

Northampton, Mass.,
August 22, 1964.

Dear Senator Morse: I applaud the courageous commonsense you have displayed with respect to the Vietnam crisis.

There has been a disturbing lack of realism about Vietnam in American policy.

Keep talking.

Sincerely,

David C. Huntington.

Philadelphia, Pa.,
August 17, 1964.

Dear Senator: History will vindicate you and Senator Gruening for your stand against U.S. aggression in southeast Asia.

Thank you again.

N. Dubina.

August 18, 1964.

Sir: Most heartily agree on your stand that we should get out of southeast Asia and stop killing. Please do send me your speeches on these events.

Sincerely,

Joe Castro.

Slaterville Springs, N.Y.,
August 19, 1964.

Dear Senator Morse: We are so proud of you for your courage in speaking out against our participation in the illegal war now being stepped up in Vietnam. It took real character and gumption to vote against the congressional resolution giving President Johnson "a free hand" in further involving our men, our money to support (once more) an unpopular military dictator in a suffering country. Senator Gruening also voted against this vast expenditure in human life and resources. Bless you both.

Sincerely,

Hazel Root Brill.

Norwalk, Conn.,
August 19, 1964.

Dear Senator Morse: Thank you for your stand in relation to South Vietnam based on your recognition of our Government's violation of the U.N. Charter and your insistence that the U.N. procedures be used.

Yours is a welcome voice in the wilderness.

Helen C. Hubbell.

SOCIAL SECURITY FINANCED HOSPITAL INSURANCE FOR THE ELDERLY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a short time ago, the Senate voted its approval of legislation which included social security financed hospital insurance for the elderly.

We approved that program because the overwhelming mass of evidence indicated the need of older Americans for a dignified means of meeting the high costs of necessary health care. The facts are inescapable that the existing means of financing hospital and related care—Kerr-Mills and private health insurance are either inadequate, inappropriate, or both.

I am proud that the Subcommittee on Health of the Elderly of the Special Committee on Aging, through its well-documented reports, was able to bring to the attention of the Senate the best available information concerning Kerr-Mills and private health insurance. Every effort was made to insure that those reports were complete, accurate, and objective.

No attempt was made to gloss over the positive aspects of the Kerr-Mills program of Medical Assistance for the Aged of private health insurance coverage. Both function effectively in some places, for some older people, at some time. But, based on the facts certain conclusions were unavoidable.

In sum, it was quite obvious that what was being done, and what was available to do the job, were inadequate to the task. Kerr-Mills MAA is an uneven, erratic, and often inequitable program. It is a public relief program which requires that the elderly, through redtape, interview and investigation, confess that they are unable to meet their needs.

While it has some value as a "last ditch" form of help, Kerr-Mills MAA cannot possibly be justified as the basic Federal answer to the health care financing needs of our elderly.

With regard to Blue Cross and other private health insurance, we found that only one in four of our elderly hold hospital insurance meeting the standard of adequacy established by the American Hospital Association. More importantly, we found that private hospital insurance coverage for the aged, under the pressure of rising costs of care and competition, is rapidly becoming even less adequate at the same time it becomes more expensive.

Our report on private coverage entitled "Blue Cross and Private Health Insurance Coverage of Older Americans," was released in July of this year. It was unanimously endorsed by the eight majority members of the subcommittee.

The report, I believe, is informative, authoritative, and revealing. Spades are called spades in forthright fashion. Needless to say, revelation and exposure usually draw criticism. Our report was no exception.

I respect the health insurance industry, which in most cases has done the best it could to offer some coverage to the aged. Unfortunately, the peculiar economic and health circumstances of the elderly create needs beyond the capacity of the commercial insurance industry. I must say that I have substantially less respect for the organization which purports to speak for most of the large health insurers—the Health Insurance Association of America.

The Health Insurance Association of America is registered with the Congress as a lobbyist. It has been in the forefront of those opposed to medicare. While it poses as an objective source of information on health insurance, it has functioned as a source and propagandizer of doctored data—designed to put medicare in a bad light.

Our report details a series of techniques employed by the Health Insurance Association which substantially distorted the facts concerning the number of older people covered by private health insurance. The sad thing about all this is that many people accepted and used this data as accurate. Many Members of the Congress have, in good faith, relied upon the misleading misinformation produced by the Health Insurance Association of America.

During the course of hearings on hospital insurance proposals before the Senate Finance Committee, the Health Insurance Association made a vitriolic, self-serving attack on the report issued by our subcommittee.

The evasive tactics employed by the Health Insurance Association in seeking to discredit our findings serve only to strengthen our conviction that our original conclusions are valid.

The first tactic used by the HIAA is their statement that our report "questions the integrity of the private insurance business." This is of course nonsense. What our report questioned, was the accuracy of the information supplied by the Health Insurance Association of America. The effort of the HIAA to paint all criticism of its activities as criticism of the whole health insurance industry is deplorable. The Health Insurance Association of America does a serious unjustice to an important industry in equating its questionable activities with the entire health insurance business.

Reputable elements within the health insurance industry did not demonstrate the same sense of panic exhibited by the HIAA upon publication of our report. For example, an editorial in the highly respected trade publication "Insurance," referred to the report as a "sobering document" pointing "to the urgency of a long, deep, searching look at the current status of the business."

The editorial went on to say that "There are many policies offered that are totally inadequate," and suggested that the industry consider establishing minimum standards of benefits. Now this is what I call a constructive and responsible comment by an important voice of the insurance industry.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the magazine "Insurance" be inserted in the Record at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Facts and Figures

The McNamara report to the Senate, concerning the role of insurance in meeting the health costs of those over 65, is a sobering document.

A report published last week of the relative merits of the various hospitalization and medical expense policies of 100 insurers—and editorially lauded by the New York Times—is likewise a sobering document.

These both give evidence of a congealing public interest and concern about the availability and adequacy of health insurance for the Nation's older population.

Two basic elements comprise the basis of both these reports. One is the nature of the contractual coverage offered; the other is the matter of statistical authenticity of the comment on this whole matter of health insurance.

It certainly points to the urgency of a long, deep, searching look at the current status of the business.

Are the statistics on which public comment is based adequate?

Are the many and varied policies offered to the public adequate?

Whatever the cost involved, an immediate effort should be made by the industry to establish a minimum standard, for the measurement of a covered risk, for the coverage included in a policy, and for the material reported.

It is common acceptance that there are many policies offered that are totally inadequate. The $5 and the $10 policies are clearly inadequate. Many of the very low premium contracts with somewhat broader coverage are inadequate because of limitations.

It might be warrantable for the industry to draw up a minimum standard for a policy contract for hospitalization and surgical expense. This would not be telling any company what it would have to include above that minimum. But it would set a floor below which no one could call it an adequate policy for these coverages. It might as well be faced. Others are going to do this, if the business does not—in fact, they are doing it now. And it would do much to clear the air and guide the public.

Such a move would be worth a tremendous amount of time and money on the part of the health insurance companies.

Private health insurance has written a great history and has a powerful story to tell.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the second tactic employed by the Health Insurance Association was an accusation to the effect that our report "totally" omitted any mention of the "dramatic growth" in health insurance coverage of the aged.

Again, I say "nonsense." Obviously, a substantially higher percentage of the elderly hold policies today than were covered 15 years ago. The point is that there has been a very sharp decline in the rate of growth in coverage of older persons in recent years. This has been coupled with a decreasing ability on the part of those who now have coverage to pay the increasing costs of policies which become less and less adequate to their needs.

Our report quoted a portion of the HIAA testimony before the Ways and Means Committee in which the Health Association claimed a 28-percent increase between July 1961, and December 1962, in the number of aged holding health insurance. If true, this certainly would have been evidence of "dramatic growth."

But the subcommittee's report thoroughly demonstrated that the "growth" reported by the HIAA was in need of very drastic pruning. Their figures were grossly inflated and exaggerated.

In our report, we characterized as inaccurate and misleading, HIAA testimony before the Ways and Means Committee which stated in part:

> Today the aged have available coverage through (1) individual company mass enrollment programs, first introduced about 5 years ago and affording coverage irrespective of condition of health, which have already enrolled over 2 million senior citizens.

We pointed out that the three companies offering such coverage had reported to the subcommittee that they had, under the most liberal interpretation, no more than 750,000 different older people covered under such policies at the end of 1963. By "different older people" we mean, of course, individuals holding one or more policies. In fact, however, probably not more than 600,000 different persons are so covered. Certainly this is a far cry from the "over 2 million" claimed by the Health Insurance Association.

The source cited by the HIAA in support of its now-discredited claim was one of its own documents which stated:

> Through a development of the last 4 years, a mass enrollment approach whereby all persons 65 years of age and older in a given State can be insured regardless of present or past condition of health, well over 1 million aged persons have become insured.

The Health Insurance Association of America spokesmen now maintain that they were misunderstood by the subcommittee—that their testimony was designed only to indicate that over the years more than 2 million people had signed up at one time or another for coverage—not that 2 million were covered at the time of their testimony.

The patent falsity of the HIAA's explanation is demonstrable, apart from the fact that phrases such as "have already enrolled," and "have become insured" indicate current coverage.

First, to take their explanation at face value would indicate the existence of a problem of enormous dimensions. Most of the policies issued by the three companies offering the type of insurance involved here were issued during the last 3 years.

What the HIAA is now saying is that of the more than 2 million people who took out those policies during those few years only 600,000 still have protection.

Even allowing for terminations because of death, their explanation, again at face value, indicates that the overwhelming majority of older people who took out these insurance policies were unable to hold on to them.

Without wishing to do so, the HIAA makes a very strong case here for enactment of a Federal program of hospital insurance for the aged.

Second, all available data indicates that not more than 1 million different people were ever insured under these three programs since their inception. No data has been offered to dispute this conclusion.

The HIAA appeared before the Senate Committee on Finance to testify in opposition to the several hospital insurance proposals under consideration. Included in their testimony were cost estimates for the Gore amendment purporting to show that the cost figures of the Social Security Administration were grossly underestimated.

Included in their supporting data was a reference to a 1960 study made by the New York State Department of Insurance which indicated high utilization of hospital services by insured older persons. The citation appears on page 591 of the transcript of the recent Finance Committee hearings.

The figures cited are described as "NYS Insurance Department studies—1960 study, mass enrollment 31-day maximum." The clear inference here is that the New York State Insurance Department made this conclusion from data it had developed. But this was not the case.

The State of New York collected hospital utilization information on 19 different insurance plans plus Blue Cross programs in order to develop a composite rate which could be used by insurers in offering coverage to aged persons who converted group insurance to individual policies upon retirement.

The type of insurance plans reported to the insurance department covered four kinds of group conversion policies—offered by six reporting companies—two types of group policies—reported by five companies—one type of individual mass enrollment policy—one company reporting—four types of individual policies—seven reporting companies; and several Blue Cross types of coverage.

Among all these different plans of insurance and the many tables developed by the State insurance department, the Health Insurance Association selected the data of one company—reporting on a mass enrollment plan.

It follows, of course, that the particular program selected indicated the highest rate of hospital utilization of the many plans reported to the insurance department. That same plan offered data on utilization for males and females and for both sexes. The HIAA included in its testimony only the utilization rate for males—again, the highest possible figure.

Thus, in testimony before the Finance Committee, the Health Insurance Association of America described this one insurance policy as though it were an official State estimate of composite hospital utilization rates. They reported only the highest utilization rates reported by any company for any plan, and then reported only the utilization rate for the higher of the two sexes.

This selective distortion was not, of course, mentioned in their testimony.

Mr. President, there are those who advocate that the Federal Government must pay greater attention to the activities of the insurance industry. I think they have a point. Activities such as those of HIAA certainly warrant further review of the Federal role in the insurance picture.

The Congress has a right to expect that witnesses before it will testify fully and forthrightly. Anything less than that—and the HIAA has given us less than that—trifles with the legislative process of the Congress.

NEEDED: A DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, this 88th Congress has made some of the greatest substantive gains for the conservation and development of the Nation's resources in our history. Wilderness areas have been reserved. The land and water conservation fund will develop Federal and State recreation areas. The Water Resources Research Act will assist the States to establish water research centers at our great land-grant universities. The States will be helped to foster commercial fishing. Significant protection has been given the Nation's fishery resources by the Territorial Seas Enforcement Act. The Job Corps will do again for our young people and for our forests and lands what the Civilian Conservation Corps did in the 1930's. New national parks, monuments, and seashores have been authorized. The Pacific coast inter-regional, extra-high-voltage, electric intertie has been made possible by congressional definition of the basis for inter-regional exchanges of surplus power. A Public Land Law Review Commission has been established and interim legislation enacted to assure the orderly management of the public domain pending modernization of the land laws. Much minor legislation also has been accomplished.

Surely, this is a record of which every Member of the Congress can be justly proud—a record which fully justifies the title "The Conservation Congress."

Yet, in our justifiable concern for substantive progress, we have largely ignored procedural modernization of the management of the Nation's resources. Only the proposed Water Resources Planning Act addresses itself to the way we manage our resources and it offers no fundamental solution to the problems we have created for ourselves.

Essentially, we have permitted ourselves to drift into the morass of government by committee. Between 1775 and 1787 this Nation learned the basic lesson about committees. Committees are useful, nay probably essential, to reach concensus. Committees can represent different points of view, provide a forum for the exchange and reconciliation of ideas, and agree upon a common course of action. In short, they are appropriate for legislating but committees are not suited to carry out decisions. Administration must be assigned to a responsible official who is given the power and the resources to carry out the decision reached by the responsible legislative authority.

This lesson is fundamental. The Founding Fathers demonstrated their thorough comprehension of it by establishing the Congress to reach concensus through discussion and deliberation and by assigning all executive authority to one man—the President.

In the management of our natural resources, we have permitted the erosion of this basic principle until today we have Government by administrative committees—which means that we simply have a bureaucratic system for dividing up the work to keep everyone busy and to hide responsibility—a system which itself consumes a vast amount of our top administrative talent.

Congress itself has brought on this administrative chaos by the simple process of distributing responsibility for natural resources among too many different agencies in too many departments. Consider the facts: Primary responsibility for water resources is fractured into four major departments and two independent agencies. The Department of the Interior contains the Bureau of Reclamation, the Office of Saline Water, the Office of Water Resources Research, and the Geological Survey which measures streamflow and conducts certain other water research activities. Interior has an Assistant Secretary for Water and Power and with a staff which specializes in this field. Water is a major responsibility at Interior. The bulk of water resources construction and management, however, is assigned the Civil Works Branch of the Corps of Engineers of the Department of the Army in the Department of Defense. There it is strictly a sideline inherited from the early 19th century when the corps was the only effective engineering organization of the U.S. Government. Although Army officers hold key command positions, the bulk of the civil works activity is handled by regular civilian civil servants, just as in the Bureau of Reclamation.

Two other agencies have important water construction and control responsibilities. The Soil Conservation Service in the Department of Agriculture has a small watersheds program which involves the construction of significant impoundments on the upstream reaches of many rivers. Effective use of these dams requires coordinated programing with other river regulation agencies.

The Tennessee Valley Authority, an independent agency, builds and operates all water regulation installations on the Tennessee River. Since the Tennessee is a tributary of the Mississippi, its work must be coordinated with the Corps of Engineers, Bureau of Reclamation, and Soil Conservation Service.

Water pollution has become a major national problem, however, and we have assigned responsibility for pollution control and river basin planning to prevent pollution to the Public Health Service, which is in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

To complicate matters still further, the Federal Power Commission is authorized to grant licenses for the construction of hydroelectric dams on rivers. Because of the requirement that such dams must be consistent with comprehensive development plans the Federal Power Commission also views itself as empowered to develop and promulgate comprehensive river basin plans, thus duplicating the planning work of the construction agencies. In several instances the Commission has flagrantly gone its own way despite the clear-cut recommendations of other Federal water development agencies and even in the face of contrary Congressional action. The Hells Canyon and Mountain sheep license cases are only two examples. It also has been subverting the intent of Congress in the Federal Water Planning Act by granting 50-year extensions of hydroelectric licenses on flimsy amendments to existing licenses.

Threats of additional valley authorities 15 years ago to end this bureaucratic jungle, led to the development of an elaborate system of interagency committees for each river basin and even to a National Interagency Water Resources Committee. Lately, pending the passage of the Water Resources Planning Act, an ad hoc Interdepartmental Committee on Water Resources has been set up. It has produced much good work in the setting of standards for project evaluation, but most of this has been done with great labor by a staff committee composed of highly competent civil servants, each representing his own department. Unavoidably the result has become the lowest common denominator upon which negotiated agreement could be reached.

Budgetwise, Congress insists upon better unity. We consider the budget for the civil works activities of the Corps of Engineers in the same budget bill with the Bureau of Reclamation, the water research offices, and the power marketing agencies of the Department of the Interior.

Similar diffusion marks outdoor recreation, despite our efforts to bring order by the establishment of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation. The bureaucratic division of labor is already plunging ahead. This is what we find:

The bulk of recreational responsibility is in the Department of the Interior, under the Assistant Secretary for Public Land Management. The National Park Service is responsible for more than 200 areas, including the recreational features of the major storage reservoirs of the Bureau of Reclamation. The Bureau of Outdoor Recreation is responsible for the coordination of Federal recreational activities, working through an interdepartmental council composed of Cabinet officers. It also is developing a national and regional outdoor recreation plan and will administer the land and water conservation fund to provide grants-in-aid for State and local recreational development and to assist Federal agencies to develop the recreation potential of lands they manage. The Bureau of Land Management operates recreational facilities on the public domain which are compatible with other multiple-purpose use and makes public land available to States and local governments for recreational use at special low rates. The Bureau of Indian Affairs fosters recreational development of tribal reservation lands, both to provide recreational opportunities for the Indian people and other American citizens and to improve the economic conditions of the Indian tribes.

Hunting and fishing are also in the Department of the Interior under the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, which reports to the Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife. The Bureau provides other recreational opportunities such as hiking and picnicking which are compatible with wildlife refuge purposes. Although these programs are directed between two Assistant Secretaries, the Secretary of the Interior at least has responsibility for all and can insure their consistency and their balance.

Three other agencies, however, maintain major, separate outdoor recreation facilities: The Forest Service in the Department of Agriculture; the Corps of Engineers in the Department of the Army in the Department of Defense; and the Tennessee Valley Authority, which has turned over much recreational management to State and local governments in its service area. Both the Forest Service and the Corps of Engineers serve more visitors each year than the National Park Service.

Still other agencies are involved in outdoor recreation in some way. The Urban Renewal Administration of the Housing and Home Finance Agency has an open spaces program which enables metropolitan local governments to purchase lands for recreation, esthetic and related purchases. The Soil Conservation Service's small watershed dams have recreational value for swimming, boating, fishing, and other water-related activities. Federal Power Commission licensees protect migrating fish and open impoundments for public recreation. The Area Redevelopment Administration has made numerous loans to foster recreational development where that activity offers the best hope for permanent economic support to a community. One count cites 27 Federal agencies which have responsibility for some phase of outdoor recreation in the United States.

A third type of confusion stems from the separation of our two principal land management agencies in the first decade of this century. When the Bureau of Land Management was still dedicated to the philosophy of disposing of the public lands as rapidly as possible, the setting aside of our precious forests in a separate agency, the Forest Service, dedicated to the philosophy of permanent sustained-yield management in the public interest, was essential. The politics of the Theodore Roosevelt administration led to the establishment of the Forest Service in the Department of Agriculture rather than as a sister bureau in the Department of the Interior.

This arrangement has made no sense for a generation or more. The Forest Service is a land management agency, not a rural service agency. It has few, if any, vital coordination relationships with other bureaus in Agriculture. It has many and continuous coordination relationships with its sister land management bureaus, all in the Department of the Interior: the Bureau of Land Management, the National Park Service, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife. Congress has long recognized these facts of life and handles the Forest Service budget along with the regular Interior budget, separately from the Department of Agriculture budget. Separating the Forest Service budget from the Department of Agriculture budget greatly weakened the ability of the Secretary of Agriculture and the chief executive to exercise the constitutional authority of the President over this agency.

Recently we have seen choice examples of what happens when one conservation agency is alone in a different department from the bulk of its sister agencies. Both in the Accelerated Public Works Program and in the Job Corps, the Forest Service, solely because it is located apart in the Department of Agriculture, has been treated as the equal of all the other land management agencies combined. The four Interior agencies manage more than 600 million acres of public domain, three times the Forest Service total; serve more annual vacation visitors; provide special services to the Indian people, which has no parallel in the Forest Service; and have a combined annual budget about twice that of the Forest Service. Yet the Accelerated Public Works program allocated $64 million to eight Interior agencies of which the Bureau of Indian Affairs received $21 million; the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, $21 million; National Park Service, $11 million; the Bureau of Land Management, $11 million; and $63 million to Agriculture, virtually all to the Forest Service. The Job Corps is dividing its camps 50–50 between Interior and Agriculture. Five bureaus, including the Bureau of Reclamation, are participating at Interior; only the Forest Service is involved at Agriculture. Is this a rational decision or a rational allocation of the taxpayers' money, or is it the result of encrusted bureaucratic powers immune to rational executive direction dividing the spoils?

It is time to end such administrative confusion and the multiplication of such administration expedients. Two kinds of constructive action are needed to modernize natural resources management. First, basic tools of sound management need to be systematically put into practice; secondly, basic administrative reorganization should unify responsibility and make the new tools effective.

Two new tools are especially needed for effective management of the Nation's resources: long-range planning and capital budgeting. Other tools are closely related.

Capital budgeting, based upon sound economic analysis, is long overdue. We have been treating Federal expenditures for natural resources as though they were comparable to normal expenditure programs for other Government services, such as law enforcement, operation of the courts, collection of taxes, maintenance of the Armed Forces, and representation of the Nation in other countries. They are not comparable at all.

Natural resources are a basic source of wealth. Money expended for construction of a hydroelectric dam or for the replanting of a forest is not simply expended for a necessary service. It is invested in a permanent asset which thereafter will produce wealth for the Nation far exceeding the initial expenditure.

All businessmen, indeed all of us in our private lives, make a distinction between operating expenditures and capital investments. None of us would think of regarding the cost of a new home as a sum to be paid out of one year's salary. Debt service and mortgage retirement are the costs we calculate in our personal annual budgets. Personal or business liabilities, such as mortgages, are offset in our personal and business ledgers by the capital assets we have acquired. A business, or an individual, is solvent if his assets exceed his liabilities.

Not so the Government. When it builds a major electric transmission line, for example, it treats the expenditure as though it were for paper clips and reams of paper—money which goes for necessary operating expenses. True, the expenditure for the line is recovered through charges to the users, but for budget purposes, and in debt analysis, it is treated as an operating expense.

Our national debt is treated as though the Nation had no marketable assets. Decisions to invest or not to invest are made, in the last analysis, not on the proper basis of whether the investments are sound and in the public interest, but on whether such investments will raise the total dollar expenditures above the total dollar income of the Nation for the next budget year. We thus force capital investment to compete with necessary operating costs in shaping the annual budget, and because it is easier to put off building a new dam or reforesting a denuded hillside than to curtail going services, we hamstring needed new capital investment in natural resources.

This is nonsense reckoning. If the Nation's capital assets are increased more than the debt is increased by a capital investment and if the investment can be recovered together with the costs of operating, maintaining, and servicing it, then the investment should be made. It is a sound, prudent move. Every businessman in the Nation, faced with such an opportunity to borrow money to make a profitable investment, would seize it instantly. The principal restraining consideration for economically justified Government investments should be whether the investment can be undertaken without needlessly inflating prices; not whether it will raise the annual expenditures above the annual income during the construction period.

The obvious solution is to treat sound capital investments under an entirely separate budgetary concept. Proposed capital expenditures should be balanced against the capital assets they will create. The national debt should be balanced against the Nation's present capital assets. Where it is feasible, as in the construction of electric transmission lines, we should also give serious consideration to authorizing self-financing powers to the responsible Federal agencies so that revenue bonds rather than general obligation bonds may be used to obtain the necessary investment capital. The TVA self-financing system is an existing successful application of this principle.

Long-range planning is a second needed tool. Despite much noise about long-range planning, little has actually been done in the Government. Much of what has been put out as long-range planning is merely promotional literature for bigger and better bureaucratic activities.

Well designed long-range plans should oblige each agency to set forth clearly and precisely what its goals are or what the agency believes they ought to be. Each goal should be justified by public need, present or demonstrably forthcoming, based upon sound inspections of national population and economic change, and by economic and other analyses which prove that the achievements or services to be expected are worth the costs to be incurred.

The accomplishment of the goals should then be scheduled by the specifying of objectives or targets which can be stated in measurable terms and scheduled for accomplishment by set times through specific programs of action. Manpower, costs, and time schedules should be prescribed.

Once a long-range plan is laid down, an agency should be held to it, with changes being reviewed and approved as often as circumstances require.

Such a system permits orderly budgeting from year to year to accomplish the plan; fosters coordination of activities among agencies to accomplish related objectives; and enables responsible policy-level officials to make coherent choices to alter agency directions, to speed or slow programs, or to change relationships among them. Robert McNamara has introduced such a long-range planning system at the Department of Defense. It is paying handsome dividends, not only in immediate cash savings in our defense effort, but in enabling the Nation, through its Secretary of Defense, to make rational choices among alternative courses of action to optimize the Nation's effective defenses within the resources which the Congress feels it can afford to allocate to defense. Had we comparable systems for the rest of the Government, the President should be able to make similar choices among very diverse programs. And it is believed he would quickly find that we have grossly neglected to invest in the underpinnings of our wealth—the Nation's natural resources.

Lacking such a system we will continue to allocate resources by interagency peace treaties negotiated by interagency committees composed of top level career civil servants.

Retooling, then, will not be enough. Drastic reorganization of natural resources administration must be undertaken if we are to end government by committee and the bureaucratic game of dividing the spoils. Halfway measures will not suffice. A bold and sweeping reorganization is required if we are to regain effective policy direction of the Nation's basic wealth.

All Federal programs primarily intended for the management of the Nation's natural resources should be brought together in a single Department of Natural Resources. I do not propose to change programs, like those of the Small Business Administration, which may affect the management of natural resources as an incidental part of their general activity. I do intend that all agencies having major responsibility for the management of federally owned resources should be united under one Cabinet officer.

Specifically this requires four major changes:

First, all the land management agencies save the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, should be under one Assistant Secretary for Public Land Management. This means that the Forest Service, the Bureau of Land Management, the National Park Service, and the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation should be responsible to the same Assistant Secretary of the Department of Natural Resources. This will fix responsibility both with land and outdoor recreation.

Second, all water resources management should be under one Assistant Secretary for Water Resources. This means specifically that the civil works functions now assigned the Corps of Engineers, the pollution control functions now assigned the Public Health Service, the small watershed program now assigned the Soil Conservation Service, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Office of Saline Water, the Office of Water Resources Research, the water data gathering and analysis services of the Geological Survey, the hydroelectric licensing functions now assigned the Federal Power Commission and the Tennessee Valley Authority intact, except for its power functions, should be responsible to the same Assistant Secretary of the Department of Natural Resources.

Third, power marketing responsibility should be assigned an Assistant Secretary for Power who would be responsible for the power generating and transmitting functions of the Bureau of Reclamation, the Bonneville Power Administration, the Southeastern Power Administration, the Southwestern Power Administration, and the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the remaining regulatory duties of the Federal Power Commission which should be transferred intact. He could then systematically go about planning, fostering, constructing, and managing a national power supply system in cooperation with the various generating and distributing agencies, public, cooperative, and private, to insure the Nation a boundless supply of low cost power.

Fourth, although the Bureau of Indian Affairs has many land management responsibilities, its primary duties now are in the education, adult vocational training, industrial development, social welfare and related fields of human services. Only a minor fraction of its budget goes for land management functions. The same is true of the Office of Territories. These agencies have no proper place in a Department of Natural Resources and probably should be transferred to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Such a reorganization should permit us to eliminate all of the elaborate interdepartmental river basin committees which have been engaged in the business of carving up the rivers to keep each of their member agencies busy. It should permit elimination of the elaborate Inter-Departmental Outdoor Recreation Council and permit real recreation planning leadership through the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation. It should facilitate the systematic assignment of all Federal forest lands to the Forest Service and the blocking up for permanent multiple-use management of the bulk of federally owned rangelands by the Bureau of Land Management. It should facilitate common arrangements for fire control, road construction, and law enforcement among Federal agencies which administer adjoining lands. It should allow for the rational assignment to the National Park Service of all important areas to be managed primarily for recreation by the Federal Government. Instead of a bureaucratic jungle of interagency committees, the Nation should behold an orderly, rational administrative structure, properly responsible directly to officers appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate who are in a position to give effective coordinated policy direction to the Nation's resources programs.

We should then be able to act intelligently to introduce long-range planning, capital budgeting, modern machine records systems, and other tools of efficiency to the end that our Nation's resources may serve us, and our children, and their children and beyond, with all of the necessary materials for the good life.

In effect I am suggesting that we modernize our national resource agency function by adopting the long overdue recommendations of the first Hoover Commission and establish a Department of National Resources.

CONTRIBUTIONS OF PUBLIC POWER TO U.S. ECONOMY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, before this Congress adjourns sine die, I wish to make a brief speech on some of the contributions that the public power program has made to the economic progress of our Nation within the last 21 years.

CRUCIAL ISSUES FACED OVER TWO DECADES

All of us can be proud of what was achieved through the work of the American Public Power Association and the cooperation of those of us in the Congress who worked with public power groups in developing, not only for our generation but for future Americans, a strong and lasting public power program with its yardstick protection of rates paid by power consumers.

The years that have passed since the first convention of the American Public Power Association 21 years ago have produced significant events. I recall distinctly and with satisfaction our success in obtaining congressional approval of TVA's New Johnsonville steamplant in 1948, the dramatic revealing of the ugly facts of the Dixon-Yates deal back in 1954, and our success in obtaining passage of self-financing legislation.

It gives me satisfaction to recall that I have been a part of the group of legislators who worked for adequate appropriations for Federal power marketing agencies in the Southeast, Southwest, and the Pacific Northwest, and who backed public power development at Niagara and St. Lawrence.

In 1954 a group of us vigorously opposed the atomic energy giveaway program which former Senator Knowland of California sought to steamroller through the Senate; in 1956 many of us supported efforts to secure public participation and control in the field of nuclear power, and in 1957 we fought attempts to restrict the small reactor program which benefits consumer-owned electric systems.

It was my bill for a high Hells Canyon Dam, which public power groups supported magnificently, as did a majority of the Members of the Senate, that provoked the historic congressional fight for comprehensive development on the Snake River. We worked for authorization of the Hanford nuclear powerplant, which will be the world's largest atomic station. We fought the "no new starts" policy and supported an all-Federal transmission grid for the Colorado River storage project.

NEED FOR CONSTRUCTIVE CONTROVERSY

There is a great dearth of constructive controversy in this country today. The prevailing tendency is to wrap potential public disputes in platitudes and hope that the problem will go away. When answers are required and the facts get in the way, they are frequently reshaped to fit preconceived solutions. Politicians are prone to procrastination, as a natural defense against antagonizing voters, and there are plenty of special interests to whisper in any available Congressional ear that retention of the status quo is essential to the American way of life.

But the fact of the matter is that the American way of life has been built on the byproducts of great debates which have raised issues to peaks of principle, visible to all citizens to agree with or attack. This country was born as the result of a revolution, developed its Constitution in a classic controversy over the elements of democracy, determined to preserve the Union in a bitter struggle which divided the Nation into two armies.

Today in this country we live in an aura of affluence. It is true that 5.4 percent of our total labor force—some 4.3 million workers—are unemployed, and that one-fifth of American families—representing an estimated 35 million people—have average annual incomes of less than $3,000. But these hard facts seldom touch the lives of most of us. Thirty years ago it was different. We were in the midst of a deep depression. Unemployment touched nearly every family in some fashion. Your family was considered extremely lucky if it possessed a $3,000 annual income, or even half that amount.

With affluence comes complacency. If times are good, why rock the boat? Apathy relinquishes the reins of leadership to those who seek to perpetuate or expand their own power, whatever the cost to the public interest. If you are fed a few false "facts" in the newspapers or find you have been fleeced by a few cents or a few dollars in a business transaction, apathy tells you that you can shrug your shoulders because it does not hurt much.

PRIVATE COMPANIES SECURE SUBSIDIES

What hurts you a little can help someone else a lot. Private power companies know this. Based on a 6-percent rate of return—normally considered reasonable for electric utilities—200 private power companies overcharged their customers by almost half a billion dollars in 1961, according to a study by the Federal Power Commission. Some 47 million consumers each contributed an average of $10.55 to this utility windfall.

Instead of seeking ways of correcting this abuse, the U.S. Congress this year rewarded private power companies by prohibiting the Federal Power Commission from requiring them to pass on to consumers immediately a totally unwarranted 3-percent tax credit—a reduction in utility costs which will put millions in the pockets of these companies. This is only the most recent of a long string of tax favors, including fast tax writeoffs, liberalized depreciation, and tax-free dividends which have been handed out to these companies over the last decade. Today the private power companies continue to collect taxes from consumers which the companies do not pay to the Federal Government but hold for their own use. At the end of 1962, accumulated "phantom taxes" amounted to $1.6 billion.

FPC statistics for 1962 show that net profits for the Nation's private power companies were up 9.5-percent over 1961, compared with a 5.8-percent increase in net profits for all industries, and a 3.1-percent increase in net profits for manufacturing industries. Private power companies netted 15.3 cents out of each revenue dollar in 1962, while the comparable figure for all industries was 3 cents, and 3.1 cents for manufacturing industries. Preliminary figures for 1963 show that the private power companies enjoyed another 6.3-percent boost in profits for a new record of $2.2 billion.

These companies tell you in expensive advertisements in national magazines that they are the quintessence of "free enterprise." But I tell you that they are subsidized monopolies, sheltered against risk, provided with a guaranteed rate of return on their investment after taxes, and granted special powers by Government. They are in business to perform a function affected with the public interest, and their response to this responsibility has been to attempt a "snow" job on the American people.

UTILITIES SEEK TO CRIPPLE REGULATION

Hundreds and thousands of dollars are annually siphoned off from monthly electric bills to finance the massive propaganda and public relations campaign of the private power companies. They are heavily engaged in political activity to promote the interests of management and shareholders—at the expense of their customers. I have run for public office in the face of their financing efforts, and I know. It is difficult to recall a Federal hydroelectric project that they have not opposed, although when the dam is constructed they are usually eager to purchase power—at dump rates. They have fought the antimonopoly preference clause for years.

The companies like to claim that they are regulated in the public interest. Even the casual observer is aware of the fact that State commissioners have never effectively controlled the rates of private power companies. And when the Federal Power Commission started to get tough, the companies' answer was to launch an effort to destroy effective regulation by legislation and political pressure.

Legislation has been introduced in the House of Representatives which would reverse the recent unanimous decision of the Supreme Court in the Colton case upholding the authority of the Federal Power Commission to effectively regulate sales of electric energy at wholesale in interstate commerce. It would cut the heart out of part II of the Federal Power Act, a portion of the statute which is of vast importance to local public power agencies who may seek relief from unfair or discriminatory power purchase contract provisions imposed by private power companies. It would eliminate meaningful regulation of increasingly large and integrated power companies. This proposed amendment of the Federal Power Act will be pushed by powerful forces who oppose any effective curb on their activities. FPC Chairman Swidler has declared that passage of this bill would take us "back to the Insull days as far as Federal regulation is concerned." You and others must help bring to public attention the reasons why this bill should not be enacted into law.

Wrapping themselves in the flag is a favorite power company tactic. To hear their story, they are more American than Betsy Ross. Shrouded in the stars and bars, shouting accusations of oppression by government fiat, they raise the cry of "freedom." And for once, at least, they are right. The issue is freedom—freedom of choice by any community to determine for itself how it will provide itself with electric service.

The history of the private electric power industry in this country reveals one stark fact: Competition by example is the only truly efficient way of regulating electric rates. The "yardstick" function of local public power systems is a major bulwark against excessive charges. Your organization is dedicated to the concept of more power at lower cost for greater numbers of Americans. Fulfillment of this goal benefits your local community, but it also advances the economic interests of electric consumers throughout the United States. I urge that you press forward to implement this goal.

The private power companies fear the competition you provide. Even though they control 80 percent of the industry, they attempt to brainwash the American public into believing that the public sector constitutes an active, aggressive threat to their existence. If they do not clean up their own house, perhaps this is true. But the remedy lies in their own hands. They cannot solve the problem by blustering about "socialism," beating their breasts over patriotism, or resorting to "guilt by association" tactics. The answer is to compete and provide—as the companies say they are "ready, willing and abe" to do—better service at lower cost.

Electric rates in the Pacific Northwest are the lowest in the Nation. We are fortunate in possessing strong municipal systems, public utility districts, and rural electric cooperatives. Twenty Federal dams on the Columbia River system supply low-cost power and energy, marketed by the Bonneville Power Administration under the preference clause. Here are all the elements that the private power companies constantly criticize.

Yet the public power programs of the Pacific Northwest have helped, not hindered, the growth of privately owned utilities. In 1937, the year the Bonneville Project Act was signed into law, the major private power companies in the Pacific Northwest realized net profits of $6,900,000. In 1962, their net profits were $45 million—a 559 percent increase. The gain for the total U.S. private power industry during this same period was only 320 percent. While dividends paid stockholders by the Pacific Northwest companies boomed by 1,660 percent, the average for all U.S. private companies was 333 percent.

PUBLIC POWER DISTINGUISHED BY DEMOCRATIC CONTROL

These facts about the Pacific Northwest make mockery of the elaborate and erroneous logic of the companies about unfair competition. They may claim that the "yardstick" concept is meaningless, but as far as the consumer is concerned, it has one overriding merit: It works. And as long as we have available active, vital consumer-owned utilities, distinguished by local, democratic control, it will continue to work. In your systems there is no conflict of interest between the consumer and the stockholder, because they are one and the same. You can devote your system to good service and low rates, and your community and its citizens will be the beneficiaries.

We in the Pacific Northwest know the benefits you can provide. Twenty-five years ago, few of our farms had electricity, but today 99 percent of our rural areas have the advantage of light and power. Pacific Northwest families use 10 times as much electricity as they did in 1940, and 2½ times as much as the national average.

The private power companies like to rant and rave about the taxes they "pay" to aid local economies. But they know as well as you that they are only tax collectors. Listen to Edwin Vennard, managing director of the Edison Electric Institute, in his book "The Electric Power Business" published by McGraw-Hill in 1962: "Taxes, like labor and fuel, are an expense and, like other costs, are included in the price of the commodity. Thus, in effect it is the customers who pay the company's taxes." And the companies deliberately ignore taxes, payments in lieu of taxes, and services provided at cost which local public power agencies contribute to their community.

TECHNOLOGY MUST BENEFIT CONSUMERS

Undoubtedly all of you have studied statistics predicting the fantastic future growth of the electric power industry. By 1980, power requirements of the American people are projected as three to four times greater than today. The enormous savings possible in relatively small reductions in cost of electricity are staggering when we consider these demands. A reduction of only one-tenth of a cent per kilowatt-hour can mean $3 to $4 billion more in the pockets of consumers two decades from now.

Will consumers realize the huge economic benefits which can accrue from technical advances such as large generation units and extra-high-voltage transmission which the experts say will set new standards for electric production in 20 years? I think the answer here will largely depend on you.

There is an ever-increasing concentration of power in the private sector of the electric industry. While in 1917 there existed more than 4,000 private utility generating systems, in 1962 the figure was less than 400. These remaining companies have intensified their attacks on you and related programs. With mammoth assets—12 percent of all capital invested in business in this country—they are prepared to buy their way into a monopoly position by purchasing your systems wherever they can.

I believe it is essential to the cause of low-cost power that public power systems not only survive, but prosper. I believe that a major policy of the Federal Government should be to insure that the competitive influence that public power systems represent will continue to be felt in all parts of the Nation.

To accomplish this, the American people must be assured a source of low-cost wholesale power, created either by public power generation or purchased from a friendly supplier. The Federal power program and the preference clause remain a principal protection for our power systems in many parts of the country.

DEVELOPMENT OF HYDROELECTRIC RESOURCES REQUIRED

We have developed only 25 percent of our potential hydroelectric power. Many useful multiple-purpose projects remain for authorization and construction as part of our comprehensive river basin development program. We cannot—and should not—leave to private parties the development of multiple-purpose sites. Let them develop low-head dams.

Availability of public development is the only method we have available to insure full comprehensive use of our limited water resources. The failure of the House to pass my Hells Canyon bill is only one example of the economic waste which results from neglecting to fulfill this conservation duty. Public development is essential where power revenues are required to finance other purposes, such as irrigation. Nor can a private corporation be expected to invest heavily in non-revenue-producing features such as flood control, navigation, and wildlife enhancement. Some projects, such as proposed giant dual purpose nuclear desalinization and powerplants, are of a size and importance that public control is necessary and desirable.

Public development can create the economic lever of competition and apply it to reduce costs of electricity in an industry which is monopolistic in nature and insulated from the normal forces of "free enterprise." It permits taxpayers to obtain directly the full monetary benefits of water resource projects. Only with public development can we successfully advance the philosophy of more power at lower cost through promotional rates which encourage use and production.

Viewed in the perspective of total Federal expenditures, amounts invested annually in land and water resources development are small—always less than 2 percent of the total Federal budget. Since 1900, the United States has spent $21.5 billion on programs of the Corps of Engineers, Bureau of Reclamation, and TVA combined—less than one-third the amount budgeted for defense today in a single year.

Specific power policy issues face Congress today. The advice and action of public power groups can play an important part in determining whether or not these issues are resolved in the public interest.

INTERTIES MUST SERVE PUBLIC INTEREST

On the Pacific coast, the Congress has just approved the construction of an extra-high-voltage interconnection linking the electric systems of the Northwest and Southwest to permit sale and exchange of surplus power and energy for the mutual benefit of all parties—public and private—in the two regions. Benefit-cost ratio of such an intertie is estimated at 4 to 1. It is a lucrative proposition, and many are eager to exploit it.

This facility should be a common carrier, available to all on equal terms, and fully responsive to public needs. Special interests who seek profit at public expense or organizations who seek to satisfy their own needs without proper protection of the rights and requirements of others should not be allowed to dominate this transmission system.

Recently a top private power company executive in the Northwest was candidly quoted in the Wall Street Journal as saying, "Who controls transmission controls the works." He is right. It is for this very reason that I say that Congress and the administration has a clear and compelling responsibility to guarantee that interregional interconnections such as those proposed between the Northwest and Southwest do not become instruments of monopoly.

We need other high-capacity interties in this country. Advances in transmission technology can provide great advantages to consumers in terms of cost—but not if we allow the uninhibited construction of "transmission tollgates."

This is not just a matter of applying advanced technology. Hand-in-hand with full scale power pooling on a nationwide basis must go means to insure that consumers share the benefits and that economies are not promoted solely for profit. Supertransmission on a regional scale adds a new element to the electric power business—which is a public business no matter who owns or operates it. Electricity is an essential of everyday life and we must guarantee that giant powerlines do not create a new form of monopoly which will allow a few men to control both the current and the cash register.

FEDERAL LINES NECESSARY FOR PROPER PROTECTION

I believe that the utilities which seek to build major transmission across State lines should be required to go before the Federal Power Commission and prove that their plans are in the public interest. I support regulations adopted by the Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture which require that when a private electric power transmission right-of-way is granted across Federal lands, excess capacity be made available to Federal power systems for transmitting power to preference customers; it makes sense to avoid wasteful duplication of facilities and destruction of useful land. But neither of these policies is enough by themselves. We need publicly owned lines to provide a standard of cost competition.

Congress last year approved appropriations for construction of two large Federal lines to interconnect the Northwest and Southwest, subject to passage of regional protective legislation and good faith negotiations on other proposals to do this job. Nine non-Federal entities have offered to build all or part of such a system, but the Secretary has found their proposals are not fully responsive to criteria issued by the Department. These proposals should be rejected if they do not provide maximum benefits, for the foreseeable future, to the largest number of people at the lowest possible cost—and without creation of monopolistic control by a particular State or utility. Experience has indicated that only when Federal transmission lines are activated or easily accessible are preference customers and the Federal Government—which owns and operates power projects in both the affected regions—assured a fair deal.

BUDGETING PERSPECTIVE DEMANDS CAPITAL BUDGET

There are other issues which Congress should face, but which it has avoided. One is the capital budget. We need a capital budget to put the Federal power program in proper perspective. Investment in hydroelectric projects represents creation of an asset which will pay back its full cost plus interest. Power is a "paying partner" in multiple-purpose projects. In the last decade, taxpayers realized better than $1 billion from sale of electricity from Federal projects.

But today we lump self-liquidating costs for power together with governmental operating expenses such as typewriter ribbons and carbon paper. Establishment of a capital budget would be a basic fiscal reform, permitting a meaningful distinction between current and capital outlay, and I have pressed for such a budget since 1947. A capital budget represents a sound business principle. It should be pushed by your organizations, and all Americans interested in accurate examination of national expenditures.

There are issues which will be tested in the courts. One is the erroneous decision of the majority of the Federal Power Commission awarding a hydroelectric project license to a group of private power companies for development of the middle Snake River—even though the Federal Power Act clearly specifies that in this case preference must be given to the competing application of public agencies. This ruling by three members of the Federal Power Commission is wrong on the law, it is injurious to the economic interests of the Northwest and the Nation, and it should be reversed.

Federal power programs and the preference clause are no panacea for the preservation of competition in the electric industry. You will have to take action—individually or in cooperation with each other—to develop fossil-fuel or nuclear steamplants to meet your needs. There are many difficulties in the way of joint endeavors, and no general solution to these problems. But you already have examples of projects of this type, and many of your meetings here are devoted to discussion of the manner and method of extending this approach.

This I do know. Those of us in Congress who believe in the case for competition in the electric industry look to you for aid in supplying answers to increasingly complicated questions of public policy in this field. I hope that you will attempt to supply them.

I am suggesting that public power groups should spark the constructive controversy that is required in this area. The private power companies seek primarily to perfect their claim to a divine right to sell electricity. Regulatory commissions have proven incapable of resisting external or internal pressures applied by the power companies. Users of electricity are largely unorganized and inarticulate. That leaves consumer-owned electric systems to advance the new ideas which may be required to deal with bigness in the electric business.

Few people enjoy engineering arguments or picking a fight. Our society makes it tough on the individual or group that wants to change the system and shake up vested interests. I have been subjected to harsh criticism on a number of occasions, and I have had the treatment. That is part of the job of any U.S. Senator who is worth his salt. All of us have a responsibility to work for what we think is right. The case for competition is right. It is verified by experience. And it is well worth fighting to maintain.

As the Congress adjourns sine die tonight, I wish to give assurance to my friends and supporters that I shall continue in the next session of Congress to serve as one of the watchdogs of the Senate seeking to guard and protect the public's economic interest in maintaining and strengthening the public power yardstick in connection with hydroelectric power development throughout the United States.

For 20 years, I have sought to carry out the trust that liberals before me such as Robert M. LaFollette, Sr., Robert M. LaFollette, Jr., George Norris, Hiram Johnson, Clarence Dill, Burton K. Wheeler, William Borah, and Charles McNary, left as a legacy of obligation to those of us who have followed them here in the Senate in respect to protecting the rights of all the American people in their natural resources, including in particular the potential electric power resources of the rivers of America.

It is easy for many people to forget that each generation is, in fact, a trustee of God's gifts of natural resources to the people of our country. Each generation has a great obligation of seeing to it that they leave our natural resources in a better position than that in which they found them. Members of the Congress have a solemn duty to help develop the natural resources of the country for the benefit of all the people rather than for the benefit of the selfish economic interests of exploiters and profiteering ravagers. If the liberals in the Congress of each generation ever fail to carry out the trust that we have inherited as a legacy of legislative obligation from those liberals who have preceded us in the Congress, we will fail in our obligations to both man and God.

Earlier today, I spoke of the great record that the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. LEE METCALF], has made in this session of the Congress in a series of notable speeches in which he has called attention to the false propaganda and misleading statements and unsound claims and programs of some of the private utilities of the country. It is important that friends of sound conservation of our natural resources and the many members of public power groups who have come to learn the importance to our economy of the preservation of the public power yardstick in the development of hydroelectric power see to it that Senator METCALF and others in the Congress who stand with him do not stand alone but are backed up by strong public opinion support in the local communities of America which are served by hydroelectric power.

In closing this speech, I want to make it perfectly clear that in the next session of Congress we shall continue to do everything we can to protect and develop the legitimate rights of public power programs and at the same time, give assurance to the private utility companies that we recognize that they, too, have a legitimate contribution to make to the maximum development of the electric power resources of the Nation.

I never have favored the elimination of private power companies. In fact, I have always favored supporting a power-pooling program that would assure to the private power companies their fair share of the power resources of our streams for development at low head dams.

What I have fought is the selfish programs of private power companies based upon the objective of eliminating all public power systems and requiring that all power developed at multiple-purpose hydroelectric dams must be transmitted over the lines of private power companies. We all know that if the private power companies ever obtain monopoly control over transmission of power in this country, there will be no more public power yardstick, and the consumers of electric power will pay through their economic nose. A monopoly of power transmission in the hands of private power companies means exorbitantly high rates for both the private home consumer, the businessman, and the manufacturer.

The Northwest intertie program which was just authorized by the Congress of the United States represents a great step forward in providing legal instrumentality for private utility companies and public power groups to work together for the common good and at the same time, to the economic advantage and prosperity of each group.

SUMMARY OF ACTIVITIES OF COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE, 2D SESSION, 88TH CONGRESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], and a summary on the activities of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service during this session of Congress.

There being no objection, the statement and summary were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement by Senator Johnston

I herewith submit a summary of activities of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service reflecting the accomplishments of the committee during the 2d session of the 88th Congress.

I congratulate all the members of our committee for their fine efforts in behalf of the committee, the Congress, the agencies of Government under our jurisdiction, and particularly the nearly 2 million Federal employees whose lives and well-being are affected by our work. I am also deeply appreciative of the fine work of the committee staff. All the staff have done their jobs well. I think it a singular achievement that all of the bills we reported received the unanimous support of both the majority and minority of our committee. Without their cooperation and assistance, our job would have been more difficult, and perhaps could not have been accomplished at all. I thank them very sincerely.

Summary of Activities of Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, 2d Session, 88th Congress

During the 2d session of the 88th Congress, nine Senate bills, four Senate resolutions, one Senate Joint Resolution, two commemorative stamp bills, and eight House bills were referred to the committee for consideration. The committee (or subcommittee thereof) held 13 days of public hearings on seven Senate bills and five House bills, 2 days of hearings on three executive nominations, and 2 days of hearings on postmaster nominations subject to rule 8 of the committee. The committee met in executive session on 20 occasions.

The committee received 1,278 postmaster nominations, of which 1,085 were favorably reported to the Senate and subsequently confirmed; 11 were withdrawn by the President, and only 182 were pending at the conclusion of the 2d session of the Congress.

LEGISLATIVE RECORD

The outstanding accomplishment of the committee in 1964 was the Government Employees Salary Reform Act. The committee began its work on this bill shortly after it was introduced in the House in June 1963. Our first hearing was in September 1963 and the committee continued its consideration of this bill until it was referred to this body on April 28, 1964. I recall no measure which has received more careful study than H.R 11049. There has never been such a comprehensive bill for Federal salary legislation. It fulfills the promise enacted in the Federal Salary Reform Act of 1962. It provides increases for all employees and executives of the Government. It establishes new methods for classifying post offices throughout the Nation. It is truly a landmark. The committee held 8 days of hearings on this bill and met in executive session in the early morning and late evening. After 15 executive sessions this bill was unanimously reported to the Senate. It was signed into law by President Johnson on August 14, 1964, and today stands as one of the five most significant accomplishments of this Congress and the Kennedy-Johnson administration. We of the committee are deeply proud to have played a roll in its enactment.

A second major law considered and reported by the committee was the Dual Compensation Act. This bill consolidated and modernized all of the laws regarding the employment of retired military personnel in the Federal civilian service. In repealing more than 50 different statutes—some of which were enacted in the 19th century—the law established a simple and easily administered policy for employing former military persons. It is the product of almost 10 years work and represents a fine example of executive and legislative cooperation in developing a new statute.

H.R. 5932 extends health and life insurance to certain teachers temporarily employed in the public schools in the District of Columbia. It also provides retroactive pay increases to certain Federal employees not compensated under one of the major salary schedules. This bill is presently awaiting the President's signature.

The committee favorably reported the following bills each of which has been signed into law by the President:

H.R. 5377, extending legislative retirement computation benefits to the Architect of the Capitol and his employees.

H.R. 7235, changing the method of paying employees of the Clerk of the Supreme Court so that fees collected by the Clerk shall be paid to the Treasury and salaries of the Clerk and his employees shall be paid out of appropriated funds.

H.R. 4818, H.R. 3545, and H.R. 9425, all of which relate to the nature of duties and employment of employees of the Bureau of the Census. The purpose of these bills is to simplify and modernize census taking methods and reduce the expenses of taking the decennial census.

H.R. 5708, to extend health and life insurance to certain U.S. Commissioners who perform full-time duties.

The committee considered and favorably reported the following bills which were passed by the Senate and referred to the House of Representatives:

S. 1974, correcting a technical deficiency in the language of the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act regarding the designation of a beneficiary.

S. 564, extending second- and third-class mailing rates to volunteer fire companies.

PARTNERS OF THE ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I wish to direct the attention of the Senate to a little publicized but highly constructive contribution of American private citizens and groups to our Alliance for Progress with Latin America. Through a program known as "Partners of the Alliance" various clubs and private associations on the State and local level undertake to work directly with the people of communities in Latin American countries for the completion of various development and civil improvement projects. Among the participants in the program are American civic clubs, business and professional organizations, trade unions, and private individuals.

In the case of each project the cooperating group in the United States provides assistance, either in the form of money or technical assistance, goods, for the implementation of a local self-help project in Latin America. The contributions are private and voluntary, involving no public expenditures by the U.S. Government. The Partners of the Alliance program is thus geared to personal involvement and responsibility on both sides in striving for the long-term success of the Alliance for Progress. The contributions of the Partners of the Alliance are necessarily small in amount and scope but the psychological importance of the program is very considerable because of its encouragement of the spirit of self-help, which is probably the most important single requirement for the long-term success of the Alliance for Progress.

The Partners of the Alliance program is sponsored by the Agency for International Development but implemented by American civic groups and other private organizations all over the country. In my own State of Alabama, for example, the Partners of the Alliance program was initiated last spring by the Mobile Junior Chamber of Commerce, which has launched a people-to-people program with Guatemala.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the Record at this point two documents—a speech given last July 15 by Mr. James Boren, Director of the Partners of the Alliance, and a list of projects implemented through the Partners of the Alliance programs.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Speech by Jim Boren, Director, Partners of the Alliance, FFA Convention, Texas, July 15, 1964

The Partners of the Alliance is a State and local level program through which civic clubs, business and professional groups, trade unions, trade associations, and individuals can work directly with the people of an Andean village, a jungle colony, a valley community, or a slum improvement association. It is a program in which any person or group who has a sincere interest in helping our neighbors in the other Republics of the Americas can participate.

Our experience in Peru has demonstrated that the Partners of the Alliance concept is a sound and workable one. There were villages in Peru, where I worked for 2 years, in which the people had built schools but lacked the materials for the roofs, the doors, and the windows. We found that $150 to $350 would provide such materials for most of these schools. Other villages were conducting night literacy classes for adults—classes in which the adults, after long hard days of difficult work, were sharing stubs of pencils and straining their eyes to see the small blackboard which was lighted by candles or perhaps a kerosene lamp. In some instances, where the altitude of the Andes would permit safe operation, we helped the villages obtain pressure lanterns. In most instances we helped them with a small generator—an electric generator which runs for 5 hours on a gallon of gasoline and lights seven 50-watt bulbs. This was the Alliance for Progress for the people of these villages. This lantern or generator was not given to the village; it was a part of an alliance effort. They had to do something as their part of the partnership program such as building a larger blackboard across the front of the room or building a latrine by the school or rerouting a sewage ditch or building or improving a footbridge across a river.

The people of the village of Cuyochico near Cuzco were digging an irrigation ditch through the rock of a mountain. Their tools: picks and iron bars. We helped by providing a jackhammer unit. Later, when the Communist march was made through the streets of Cuzco, the entire Cuyochico area did not have a single participant in the march. The important aspect of this project was that it was a response to self-help on the part of the villagers.

Possibilities for direct partnerships are limitless. When a village has built its own community center and dug a well for a pure water supply $285 can provide a pump to help lift the water to the village. When a barricade (slum) improvement association has a self-help project under which it is building community buildings such as schools for medical posts, the provision of a cement mixer and a few wheelbarrows can make significant contribution to the peoples' efforts to help themselves. I could go on and on * * * hand tools, equipment for small medical posts, small collections of books in Spanish for community or barriada libraries, and first aid kits for villages. These are not pretty little stories pulled out of the air * * * these are specific illustrations of what has been done in Peru.

This direct partnership alliance of a club in the United States with a village or other group is not an adoption program in which a city or a State patronizingly adopts a Latin American state or city. It is a partnership program that has as its base the direct assistance to help people help themselves. It is not an old clothes charity program * * * it is a direct alliance between a U.S. group and a Latin American group to work toward the establishment of a lasting and constructive relationship. This is not a program in which mayors merely exchange keys to the cities and establish pen pal committees. This is rather a program through which mayors and groups and individuals can do something constructive as working members of a direct alliance.

As of this date there are 11 programs in motion. Utah is now beginning to implement a 23-point program with Bolivia; the Idaho Partners of the Alliance are moving forward with a program with Ecuador which will include assistance with a town plan program; Oakland County (Mich.) Partners of the Alliance now have a permanent representative in the Valle del Cauca of Colombia and the program is moving forward; 15 school districts in Oregon have developed a program through which 15 educators from Costa Rica will spend their summer vacation working with schools in Oregon as resource people for Spanish and social studies classes and in return they receive inservice training in methods and teaching aids; Alabama is organizing to work with Guatemala; the Tucson-southern Arizona partnership team is preparing a report for southern Arizona groups concerning a program with El Salvador; Texas has organized its Partners of the Alliance group and is initiating its program with Peru; Ohio will soon send a team to Parana in Brazil; Illinois is moving in the first stages of an alliance with the state of Rio Grande de Sul in Brazil; the Colorado Society of Engineers has adopted a resolution indicating its interest in fostering a partnership program with the state of Minas Gerais in Brazil. Other groups are working in Wisconsin, Massachusetts, Indiana, Florida, Nevada, and California.

From time to time I am asked, "Why isn't the government-to-government program taking care of these needs? Why are we as taxpayers now asked to do more?" There are several answers to these questions. From the standpoint of the basic concept, the Alliance for Progress is an alliance of all of the peoples of the free world. It is an alliance which is only partially articulated through the government-to-government programs. From the standpoint of operations, the identification of people with people in a direct alliance is important. If the Alliance for Progress is to succeed and if economic, political, and social stability is to become a reality in this hemisphere, the private sector will be a major factor in that success.

In our official government-to-government programs, we are working with our sister republics to help them build their own institutional capabilities to resolve their own problems. It takes time, however, to build institutions and we should reflect upon the history of our own country in this respect. It takes time, for example, to develop an agricultural extension service that can meet the needs of the great rural areas; it takes time to build a savings and loan system to the point that it can foster a private enterprise housing program; it takes time to develop credit institutions which can meet the needs of small business and agricultural supervised credit; it takes time to establish cooperative institutions that are effective tools for problem solving. In short, it takes time to help build institutions to the point that they have impact upon the people. The Partners of the Alliance program can help buy the time to carry out this vital but longer range economic development program.

The funds appropriated for our programs must go to this basic business of building institutions and infrastructure. If we were to spend the limited funds available to us for the type of impact projects which I have described as being the core of partnership activities, we would be building for failure because without effective institutions there can be no economic or political stability. On the other hand, if we only concern ourselves with the more impersonal business of institutional development, we may be building for failure in that there may not be time available to us to carry out the basic program of the alliance.

The Partners of the Alliance is a program which recognizes that the greatest asset of a nation are its human resources. The history of our own Nation is replete with the deeds of men who built a nation from a wilderness, a wilderness of the physical elements and a wilderness of societal disorder. The recognition of the role of the people was reflected by the present President of Peru, Fernando Blaunde Terry, when he spoke of 1956. He said.

"Cada vez que observo de alguna altura. Every time I look from some height upon a Peruvian village I ask the same question and I get the same inspiring answer.

"As I look at the humble town with its colorful bell tower, I inquire of my guide: Who built the church? and the guide replies: 'The people built it.' Again I ask: Who built the school?, and he answers again, 'The people built it.'

"And following the winding dirt road amongst the mountains I ask once more: 'Who made this road? and again, resounding now in my ears like a triumphal march I hear in these eloquent words the history of all of Peru's yesterdays, its present, and the prophesy of its future: 'The people built it.'

"The people built the road, the church and the schools.

"The people raised the terraces and dammed the torrent.

"Once there was an earthquake and they recovered their debris and rebuilt their homes.

"And when it was required of them they gave of their sons to the army; and they suffered the nation's indifference without complaint.

"They were denied their ancestral rights of freedom to choose their own leaders and goals. Rulers were imposed upon them. Their properties and income were taken from them. But they could not be deprived of their traditions.

"And the people went on building roads, schools, and churches. Because, fortunately, though Peru's small villages have been forgotten villages, they have not forgotten their own heritages."

And, it is the people who shall determine the success or failure of the Partners of the Alliance, and I am asking for your help in this vital endeavor. To those who express concern about the problems of communism in this hemisphere, I say that the opportunity is at hand to translate words into action. To those who wish to help people help themselves and to help give meaning to hope, I say that the way is open through the Partners of the Alliance.

Projects implemented through Partners of the Alliance programs

Country	Project	Assistance requested	Implemented by—
Colombia	Villa Restrepo (Tolima) (sewing cooperative)	Materials: Buttons and thread for producing household maids' apparel.	Pan American Assembly, Chicago (M. Larson).
	Hospital Infantil (Bogotá)	Antibiotics and hospital equipment	Direct Relief Foundation, Santa Barbara, Calif.
	Valle del Cauca and city of Cali	Technical assistance in municipal budgeting and planning.	Oakland County (Mich.) Partners of the Alliance. John Madole sent to Valle del Cauca as permanent representative.
	Valle del Cauca	Exchange of 2 university students from each of 2 partners' areas.	2 Oakland County students are presently enrolled in the Universidad del Valle, and 2 Valle students are studying at Oakland University. Scholarships provided by each institution.
	Trade school (Cali)	Supplemental equipment for mechanics training program; the trade school was constructed by the barrio residents (with assistance of Peace Corps volunteers).	Oakland Committee Partners.
Peru	Arequipa Rural School	School materials: blackboards, etc	West End School, San Rafael, Calif.
	Ayacucho Industrial Art School	(2) Dyepots (for wool dyeing)	Sunset High School, Dallas, Tex.
	Braille watches (40)		By Zale Jewelry Co., Dallas, Tex.
	Camisea Community (literacy programs)	(2) Coleman lanterns	Pan American student forum, Navasota High School, Navasota, Tex.
	"A Little Library" for an Indian village		Texas Partners Committee.
	"A Little Library" for (Lima) barriada		Do.
	Portable generator	1 portable generator	Woman's Democratic Club, 10th Congressional District, Virginia.
	do	do	Pedernales Electric Cooperative, Inc., Austin, Tex.
	do	do	Vocational Agriculture Teachers Association, Texas.
	do	do	AmpChamp, J. T. Rutherford, Washington, D.C.
	Scholarship for a young farmer leader at Institute of Rural Education.	4 months training	Circle K Club, Baylor University, Waco, Tex.
	Yungay Community (Callejon de Huaylas)	Roof for school for orphans of the 1962 avalanche	Cmdr. Roy Powell, Washington, D.C.

Projects implemented through Partners of the Alliance programs—Continued

Country	Project	Assistance requested	Implemented by—
	Rehabilitation Institute (Lima)	Shop equipment	Texas Rehabilitation Association (Dr. David Wade).
	Yuncay Community (Urabamba)	Materials for construction of 2 bathhouses (roofing materials, cement, pipes, showerheads, etc.).	Justin F. Kimball High School, Dallas, Tex.
	Huancabamba generators (literacy programs)	Generator for night literacy classes	Alton Marshall, Albany, N.Y.
	Huaura Institute of Rural Education	For local purchase of handtools and cloth, "seed stock" for cooperative store.	Mount Vernon High School, Alexandria, Va.
	Navan community (farm-to-market road construction self-help project).	Wheelbarrows and picks for construction	Texas AFL-CIO.
	Chain saw for La Convencion Lares project	Gas-operated chain saw to help expedite efforts in La Convencion Lares project.	Funds sent by Pan American student forum clubs and Midwestern University of Wichita Falls, Tex.
	Pucara (Junin) cooperative chicken project	$395 to purchase materials to establish a cooperative chicken project.	Funds sent by Pan American student forum clubs and Midwestern University of Wichita Falls, Tex.
	La Convencion Lares (Cuzco) water project for 5 communities.	$535 for the purchase of materials and cement mixer for the construction of 5 water tanks.	Through funds for special projects USAID/Peru.
	Pampa de Comas (knitting cooperative)	2 knitting machines	Pan American Development Foundation, Washington, D.C.
	Picha community (Michiguenga) (literacy programs).	3 Coleman lanterns	Texas Good Neighbors, Travis High School, Austin, Tex.
Ecuador	Conocoto Hogar Indigena	4 sewing machines; 1 typewriter	Boise Valley Idaho Jaycees.
	Pelileo (metal and carpentry shop for high school)	$100 for purchase of materials and tools for construction of benches and stands.	Idaho Partners of the Alliance.
	Gonzalez Suarez, "Cooperativa Forestal" (reforestation project), at altitudes of 10,000 feet in desolated Andean highlands.	4 tents and sleeping bags	Boise Cascade Corp., Boise, Idaho.
	Cumbaya and Quito, needles and syringes (requested by Mrs. Kokabatsi, president, Woman's Federation of the World in Ecuador).	2,000 disposable needles and syringes to inoculate the children for diphtheria, typhoid, and typhus.	Dr. Hal Reynolds, Caldwell, Idaho.
Costa Rica	San Jose streetsweeper (vacuum type)	To help clean city of volcanic ashes	Excess equipment reconditioned by city of San Jose, Calif. Shipping financed by Partners of the Alliance.
	Educational training	Inservice training for 15 Costa Rican educators who will also serve as half-time resource teachers (Spanish and social studies) in 15 Oregon school districts.	15 Oregon school districts (arranged and coordinated by Superintendent E. Cooper of Eugene, Oreg.), half of the transportation through AID.
Bolivia	Santa Cruz, Gabriel Moreno University Library	Shipment and packing of books from Massachusetts to Bolivia (paid by Partners of the Alliance).	By Massachusetts Rotary International (District No. 793).
	(23) Braille watches	Supply pooled with amount given to PAU/OAS	Zale Jewelry Co., Dallas, Tex.
	Design plans for simple cooking stove	4-S Clubs of Bolivia	4-H Club of Utah.
Chile	San Gregorio Cripple Children Home (Santiago)	Materials to construct furniture	Evelyn Mayer, Colorado Springs, Colo.
Nicaragua	Hospital equipment (Managua)	Hospital equipment and supplies	By Mercy Hospital, Fort Dodge, Iowa.

AWARD OF THE ELOY ALFARO GRAND CROSS AND DIPLOMA TO DR. EDMUND G. GESSMANN

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the remarks by the distinguished junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] on the occasion of the award of the Eloy Alfaro Grand Cross and Diploma.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AWARD OF THE ELOY ALFARO GRAND CROSS AND DIPLOMA TO DR. EDMUND G. GESSMANN

Dr. Edmund G. Gessmann received the Eloy Alfaro Grand Cross and Diploma on September 4, 1963, in the Masonic Club of New York and in the presence of an assemblage of dignitaries and friends.

Dr. Gessmann was decorated by Stanley W. Wakefield, right eminent past grand commander of the grand commandery of Knights Templar of the State of New York and American deputy provost of the EAIF.

Dr. L. Lester Beacher, American deputy provost of the EAIF, was master of ceremonies, and the invocation and benediction were offered by the Reverend John Brett Langstaff, B. Litt., and past grand prelate of the Grand Commandery of Knights Templar of New York. Austrian Consul General, Dr. Johannes G. Wilfort, representing his Government, delivered an eloquent address calling attention to the great opportunities which the United States offers its citizens.

Dr. John Maurice Keesing, international provost of the EAIF, also paid tribute to Dr. Gessmann. Dr. Herman A. Bayern, American provost of the EAIF, in a brief speech outlined the aims and purposes of the foundation and said that Dr. Gessmann was unanimously voted this high honor in recognition of his efforts in behalf of crime prevention, prison reform, and juvenile delinquency, his radio programs and his lectures, and because his achievements and accomplishments comes within the framework of the aims and purposes of the foundation.

Thank you very much R. W. Dr. Lester L. Beacher, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, who are gathered here this evening for the sole purpose of honoring Dr. Edmund G. Gessmann in recognition of his outstanding public and private services to mankind. You know, my dear Dr. Gessmann joins a goodly company of distinguished Americans who have been decorated and similarly honored in the past. They include President John F. Kennedy, past Presidents Dwight D. Eisenhower, Harry S. Truman, Herbert Hoover. Other dignitaries include Dr. Milton S. Eisenhower, Gen. Douglas MacArthur, Commissioner Robert Moses, who is now running the World's Fair, also J. Edgar Hoover, who typify the caliber of men who have received this high honor. Of course, many would like to know just what this foundation represents and who Gen. Eloy Alfaro was. The foundation was authorized by the official decree of the then President of Panama in 1949 in order to perpetuate the memory of Gen. Eloy Alfaro, who was President of Ecuador at the turn of the century, and the type of dynamic leader who settled all the problems of South America during the period when he was active. Indeed, if we had another Gen. Eloy Alfaro today there would not be any crisis in Cuba, Venezuela, or other South American country. This is the type of man who is needed in South America today in order to stop the Soviet Union in its ruthless path of aggression.

We in the United States are actuated by the best motives, but in a final analysis it will require another Martines, a Bolivar or Alfaro to bring about peace in this world. The aim and purpose was to perpetuate the memory of this leader and the foundation has devoted itself to the task of encouraging the liberal ideals and principles for which this great Ecuadoran laid down his life almost a century ago. He expanded and fostered the public educational institutions of his country, increasing the commerce, industry, and trade in general. If he were alive today, I am sure that he would be in the forefront of the fight to preserve the Western Hemisphere and Pan American unity, which would constitute a perpetual bulwark against the attempt of any form of foreign despotism to plant tyrants heels on even the tiniest portion of the soil of the Americas, as the Soviet Union and Castro with his fellow Communists have actually done in Cuba, 90 short miles from the coast of Florida. General Alfaro was a rebel and a conspirator, but his rebellion was directed against hatred, injustice, discord, and tyranny. He was the leader of a generation fired with the hope and desire that responsible united political action would enhance the prosperity of their country and the welfare of the people. His work was one of the greatest contributions to the good will, the mutual understanding, and the love of liberty, the democracy, and the peace between the people of the world.

The philosophy of this great patriot General Alfaro, known and recognized as the Abraham Lincoln of Latin America was based principally on his service to his fellow human beings, and to the cause of international peace. He translated these ideals and principles of Masonry in action. As a matter of fact, General Alfaro was one of the founders of Masonry in South America. He was an honorary 33d degree. His son, the late Ambassador Alfaro, also was a Mason, a Shriner, and an honorary 33d degree, also a graduate of West Point, as were likewise the three grandsons of the General Alfaro, who are now the officers of this foundation.

The public and private activities of our guest of honor, Dr. Gessmann, come within the framework of this type of service to humanity. In recognition of this fact, the foundation unanimously voted him this highest honor, the Eloy Alfaro Grand Cross and Diploma. I believe, that I am safe in stating that of all the former distinguished recipients heretofore mentioned by our master of ceremonies and those that I have mentioned and many other distinguished personalities from all over the world if they were here they would congratulate and welcome

Dr. Gessmann to this highly selected group of distinguished Americans who have been approved to carry out the aims and purposes of the foundation.

ANNUAL REPORT INTRODUCTION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, it has been my custom throughout my congressional career to report to my constituents in New York State on each session of Congress and on my own activities during the past year.

This is my 16th such report, and it is one of the most gratifying, for the year 1964 was a year of historic legislative performance on a number of issues of national concern to which I have been devoted during my terms in the House and Senate.

The principal achievement, a historic milestone, was enactment of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the most comprehensive civil rights legislation in history. This triumph was preceded and made possible by another historic vote—the vote to invoke cloture, thus cutting off a Senate filibuster for the first time in history on a civil rights bill. Justice and bipartisanship determined the issue, and it was the culmination of years of effort, in which I am proud to have played a hard-working role.

The votes on cloture and on the civil rights bill represented the Senate's finest hours. No votes could have done more to revive the Nation's faith in the Senate and in the Congress, for it was evidence that, at long last, we were prepared to do justice in our Nation after decades-old wrongs of racial segregation and discrimination had gone unabated—and that we were master in our own legislative house.

Among the other major achievements in which I was particularly active during the past year were:

A $11.5 billion tax cut—the biggest such tax reduction in history—which was long overdue to revitalize our domestic economy; a Federal program of aid to urban mass transit systems, which though modest was the first recognition by a normally rural-oriented Congress of the urban mass transportation crisis; an extensive housing bill; an antipoverty program to deal with the appalling discrepancy between our national image of prosperity and the national reality of our poor and underprivileged; creation of a National Commission on Automation and Technology, to deal with the impact of technological change upon production and employment.

Of special satisfaction to me was the enactment of a bill providing for a National Council on the Arts, a program which I have been sponsoring for the past 16 years; and the establishment of a Fire Island National Seashore, creating New York's first national park.

Other important measures enacted were: a Mental Health Facilities Act and Mental Health Retardation-Child Health Act, both firsts in a neglected field of Federal action; a heretofore stymied National Wilderness Act, which preserved 35 million acres of federally owned land from commercial use; and measures to strengthen control over pesticides.

In all, 23 measures which I sponsored and 24 others which I cosponsored were enacted into law during the 88th Congress. An additional 25 measures which I either sponsored or cosponsored were passed by the Senate, as were 3 of my "private bills."

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

The performance of the 88th Congress, which in 1963 had gotten off to a dawdling and dreary start, was on the whole impressive. But there were also some major failures, and a great deal of unfinished business remains.

Most distressing of all was the failure to enact a program of health care for the aging, which I had coauthored and which passed the Senate and went on to fail in conference. Also disturbing, especially in view of the tragic assassination of President Kennedy, was the failure of the House to concur with a constitutional amendment which I cosponsored and which passed the Senate, to improve the procedures for presidential succession and to provide for vacancies in the Vice Presidency. The Warren Commission report, while laying to rest the conspiracy theories concerning the assassination, made recommendations for the protection of Presidents in the future, and Congress must act on them early in the new session.

Other programs which must be dealt with as we move into 1965 and in which I am especially concerned are proposals to eliminate the discriminatory national origins quota system from the U.S. immigration laws; to establish a code of ethics for Congress with provision for disclosure of financial interests; to solve endemic unemployment and spur U.S. economic growth; to update our archaic antitrust laws; to begin to treat addiction as a disease not solely as a crime and to promote narcotics research; to develop a unified export-expansion policy; to devise a better international monetary system; to permit the televising of Senate sessions; and to provide a uniform closing time for polling places throughout the Nation in presidential elections.

The foregoing represents the highlights of the past year. I will now go into the details of the 2d session of the 88th Congress:

NEW YORK STATE AFFAIRS

Legislation to establish a Fire Island National Seashore, which I cosponsored with Senator KEATING, was signed into law creating New York's first national park to provide recreation opportunities for millions. Also enacted was legislation, for which I worked long and hard, to compensate the Seneca Nation of Indians in western New York for the loss of their homes by Federal construction of the Kinzua Dam.

A monumental effort to insure that New York receives a fair share of Federal programing was made on several fronts. A steady 10-year decline in the value of prime defense contracts awarded in the State was halted, although individual defense firms were adversely affected by an overall cutback in defense spending. New York's share of the Nation's defense contracts increased from 9.9 percent in the 1963 fiscal year to 10.2 percent in fiscal year 1964.

During hearings on military procurement by the Joint Economic Committee, of which I am a member, I told Secretary McNamara that if the administration wanted to claim credit for cuts in defense spending it must accept and discharge the responsibility in alleviating economic dislocation caused by such cuts in communities heavily dependent on defense plant employment.

In order to encourage full use of the resources available under existing Federal programs, I cosponsored, along with Senator KEATING and the steering committee of the New York Congressional Delegation, a conference attended by approximately 400 local New York officials at which useful Federal programs were explained. I have urged community, business, and labor leaders to form regional committees to make plans to counter the effects of further cutbacks or shifts in defense spending. To further assist the development of the State, I helped present a case to NASA for location of the electronics research center in New York and worked to obtain new Air Force facilities in the State. I cosponsored legislation for the construction of a Federal mint in New York.

The Defense Department's plan to close military installations throughout the country included the phaseout of Rome (N.Y.) Air Materiel Area facilities—ROAMA—and significant employment cutbacks at the Brooklyn Navy Yard. The burden of proof that these actions would provide meaningful economies and would not adversely affect our national defense efforts must be met by the agencies proposing them. Congressman PIRNIE, of the Rome area, Senator KEATING, and I requested a detailed analysis of the claimed savings by the Comptroller General, who concluded that part of the estimated savings was not attributable to the proposed closing and the remainder could not be identified because the Air Force had destroyed detailed supporting papers. Despite this information, the decision to phase out ROAMA has not been altered.

I also cosponsored amendments to the military construction bills to prevent use of Federal funds for construction of new facilities to replace facilities ordered closed. I was assured that the Preparedness Subcommittee would examine carefully any request for expenditures of this type.

Together with the New York congressional delegation I worked to get a fair share of work for the Brooklyn Navy Yard. I introduced legislation to authorize the Armed Services Committee to conduct a comprehensive study of the defense role of naval and private shipyards and to examine the impact upon local communities of curtailment of shipyard operations. Joined by seven other Senators, I introduced an amendment to the defense appropriation bill requiring the Defense Department to prove the need and to allow consideration by congressional committees before any Navy yard could be shut down. I cosponsored a second amendment to this bill to require that an equal percentage of new ship construction be assigned to Navy yards to remedy the imbalance of new construction now being assigned to private yards. I shall continue to do all I can to improve the work and employment situation at the Brooklyn Navy Yard and to keep it open and functioning as an indispensable element of national security.

I worked to insure that flight safety standards would not be compromised at the Elmira, Poughkeepsie, and Utica airports despite FAA plans to consolidate flight service stations there. In addition, I supported legislation to provide funds for development of a number of New York ports and waterway facilities.

Congress passed my resolution extending an official welcome to out-of-State and foreign visitors to the World's Fair. Some 43 Senators also joined me in introducing a bill to establish the annual celebration of American Indian Day.

CIVIL RIGHTS

This will undoubtedly be remembered as a landmark year in the struggle for equal opportunity for all because the first truly meaningful Civil Rights Act in a century was enacted after a record-setting, 2-month filibuster in the Senate was shut off. I am deeply gratified to report that I played a full role in the successful struggle. The fact that cloture was finally achieved—for the first time in history on a civil rights bill—was a triumph of bipartisanship. In the House, 78 percent of the total membership, including 81 percent of the Republicans and 59 percent of the Democrats, voted for the measure on February 10; and on June 10, 71 Senators voted for cloture, including 81 percent of the Republicans and 65 percent of the Democrats.

After a decade of seeking meaningful Federal legislation, our success this year was the result of a most heartening, nationwide interfaith effort to awaken the white majority to the deep moral issue involved in the Negro struggle for equal opportunity. Another important factor was the effective organization of civil rights proponents during the Senate's long stalemate on the bill, with teams of bipartisan captains made responsible for each of its major segments.

I was Republican captain for what I consider to be the historic hub of civil rights legislation, titles III and IX, authorizing the Attorney General to participate in civil injunction suits to insure equal protection of the laws to all against excessive police action and efforts to stop lawful demonstrations. Along with others I repeatedly engaged in debate with the filibustering opponents of the bill to set the record straight on what it provided, and to answer a mail and advertising campaign—financed in part by the tax moneys of a Southern State—which greatly distorted the issues. I sought especially to clarify the provisions of the bill, which I have long advocated, authorizing withdrawal of Federal funds from State and local programs which discriminate on account of color, and to support the constitutionality of every provision especially that guaranteeing nondiscrimination in public accommodations.

I participated fully in the negotiations which led to the so-called Dirksen amendment, which was substituted for the House-passed bill. The amendment retained the fundamental structure of the measure—in some respects strengthening it—and helped to amass the two-thirds vote needed for cloture. During the consideration of more than 100 additional proposed amendments, I fought to keep the provisions true to the bill's initial promise.

The act, in my judgment, fulfilled that promise although in many respects it could have been considerably stronger if compared to the 1960 platforms of both parties, the unanimous recommendations of the Commission on Civil Rights, and the bills long introduced by me and by other Members of Congress. Its major significance is its recognition of Federal responsibility and authority in every important field of civil rights: voting, public accommodations, publicly owned facilities, public school desegregation, nondiscriminatory use of Federal funds in State and local programs, equal employment practices, and participation by the Attorney General in equal protection of the law suits.

The enormous need in certain areas of the Nation for a Federal presence was tragically demonstrated by the murder of three young civil rights workers—Michael Schwerner, James Chaney, and Andrew Goodman—who had been participating in a Negro voter registration drive in Mississippi. The Mississippi project was courageously continued, but in some locations violence and intimidation have followed the scheduled departure of the student workers. I am making every effort to get the Justice Department to use its full authority—greatly enlarged by enactment of the Civil Rights Act of 1964—to give adequate Federal protection to civil rights advocates in southern areas, to insure the right of every American to travel in any State, and to get the authority of the President to back this effort.

That the civil rights problem is a national and not a regional one was made apparent by an outbreak of riots in New York City, Rochester, and other major cities. I supported the steps taken by responsible civil rights leaders to prevent such acts by anyone, no matter how deeply we may feel about the frustrations brought on by discrimination. Anarchy will surely destroy everyone's liberty and opportunity and undermine the very law just enacted.

At the same time there must be a determined effort to eradicate the causes of so much discontent and resentment in large segments of the Negro community. There is an increasingly greater need for training and education to catch up with the accelerating pace of automation, and I have urged business and industry to join fully in this effort with educational institutions and Federal and State agencies.

The yearlong dispute over the New York City schools did not involve segregation in violation of the Constitution, but racial imbalance in only 19 percent of the city's 860 schools. I supported city and State educational authorities in their development of an affirmative plan to achieve better racial balance in the 19 percent beginning with the pairing of 8 elementary schools along the lines of the so-called Princeton plan.

DOMESTIC ECONOMY

The major economic measure enacted in the 88th Congress was the $11.5 billion tax rate reduction, which I had been among the first to support in 1962 as a vital first step to spur growth of our lagging economy. The bill reduced the rate scale for individuals from 20–91 percent to 14–70 percent and for corporations from 52 to 48 percent in two steps. It also made the tax structure more equitable in a number of ways, including a provision I had long sponsored for income averaging for taxpayers such as artists and proprietors of small businesses, whose incomes fluctuate widely from year to year.

As I have in the past, I voted against repeal of the 4-percent credit for dividend income in excess of $50, which along with the present $50 exclusion of dividend income, I believe is a sound partial effort to ease the impact of double taxation upon such income.

I supported amendments which would have repealed wartime created excise taxes on cosmetics and luggage, including ladies' handbags, and on jewelry and fur purchases up to $100 because I feel these items cannot be considered "luxuries." I offered an amendment, which was rejected, to repeal the 10-percent excise tax on admission to live theater and musical performances, and voted, as I always have, to reduce the oil and gas depletion allowances. I supported an amendment, modified at my suggestion, which would have permitted working students to deduct from their taxable income their own expenditures for tuition, room and board.

I believe that the tax cut alone, important as it is, will not cure endemic unemployment which continues to hover above 5 percent in a period of unprecedented prosperity. Revision of our antitrust laws, stimulation of profit sharing and stockownership, expansion of exports, and machinery to avoid crippling national emergency strikes are also necessary as incentives to expand investment and create new jobs. I was most gratified that a measure establishing a Presidential Commission on Automation, which I had long proposed, was finally enacted into law. At hearings called at my request, I pressed for revision of antitrust laws which inhibit international trade.

A bill which I had long cosponsored was enacted amending the Davis-Bacon Act to include fringe benefits within prevailing wage determinations under Government contracts. I cosponsored another successful measure which required registration of contractors in order to aid migratory farmworkers.

I supported enactment of the bill authorizing the continued use of the date 1964 on newly minted coins until the current acute coin shortage is alleviated. And I participated actively in committee consideration of a measure which would require the disclosure of certain information needed by consumers in credit transactions.

In his budget message, President Johnson estimated spending at $122.7 billion and revenues at $119.7 billion. To me, the budget demonstrates the size of our responsibilities in the world, but it also requires careful scrutiny to minimize the deficit and guard against national waste and inefficiency. When I was not convinced that the need for expenditures had been demonstrated adequately, I voted for reductions, as in the case of certain aspects of the Interior appropriations and National Aeronautics and Space Administration bills.

I sponsored a measure to establish a bipartisan commission on Federal expenditure policy to assist the executive branch in modernizing and streamlining the budget. And a bill which I cosponsored was passed by the Senate requiring periodic review of Federal grant-in-aid programs.

URBAN AFFAIRS

The Housing Act of 1964 extended basic housing programs, such as urban renewal, low-rent housing, and housing for the elderly, but also contained a number of important innovations. My amendment was accepted to include in urban renewal the development of air rights sites for low- and middle-income housing in crowded urban centers. Additional relocation assistance which I sponsored was provided for small businesses and individuals forced to move because of urban renewal. Another provision I sponsored required effective enforcement of housing codes instead of demolishing structures which can be made safe and sanitary. I also supported the new program, proposed by House Republicans, providing rehabilitation loans in urban renewal areas to achieve the same goal, and I fought for the appropriation to begin this needed program. A provision which I offered made the increasingly urbanized larger counties eligible for urban planning aid for the first time. My proposal to permit the FHA to correct structural defects in homes with FHA-insured mortgages, when relief cannot be obtained from the builder, was also included in the bill.

The mass transit bill, vital to our traffic-jammed urban areas and long a program I have cosponsored, finally became law, and I fought for the first appropriation to begin its implementation.

Enacted was a measure I have long sought providing legal assistance to indigent persons accused of crime in the Federal courts. But no action was taken on my proposal to begin to meet the grave national problem of drug addiction as an illness rather than as a crime, despite support from the President's Advisory Commission on Narcotic and Drug Abuse and from various legal and medical experts in hearings held by the Senate Permanent Investigations Subcommittee, in which I participated as a member.

ASSAULT ON POVERTY

The Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 had my active support, after adoption of my amendments strengthening local coordination of programs. Called the Antipoverty Act, this measure provides for a Job Corps and a work-training program for unemployed youth, a work-study program for college students, an adult education program, a domestic Peace Corps called VISTA, and loan programs for small businesses and small farms.

Based on conclusions drawn in a seminar on poverty called by New York University at my suggestion last May, I proposed amendments integrating State camp programs with the Federal program and requiring that unemployment compensation should not be considered as income for those participating in the program. I also received a written commitment from the Director that the Small Business Administration would administer the small business provisions of the act, and the Farmers Home Administration the farm provisions.

My proposal to give Governors the authority to accept responsibility for and administer Federal antipoverty programs in their States was not accepted, but the Senate passed a more stringent amendment permitting Governors to veto private projects. The House deleted my unemployment provision, broadened the Governor's veto power, and attached a loyalty oath amendment that endangered final passage of the bill. I strongly opposed the loyalty oath, but at my request the Justice Department ruled that the provision would affect only Job Corps enrollees and others directly receiving Federal funds, not recipients of loans or those taking the training programs.

My amendment allowing State officials to have a voice but not a veto in shaping programs under the Appalachia bill was the only one accepted by the Senate before it approved this measure to provide public works and economic programs over a 5-year period to assist the development of the 10-State region. I voted for the full 1965 authorization of $15 million for the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offense Control Act, which was adopted, and worked to obtain more adequate appropriations for the child day-care program which provides assistance to working mothers.

EDUCATION

As a member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare I helped to shape and enact into law a number of urgently important education bills. The extension of the National Defense Education Act for 3 years gave a necessary measure of stability to this vital program. The loan program for college students was substantially increased and its scope broadened to allow additional thousands to complete their college education. My proposal to extend loans to part-time students to help those working their way through college was accepted. I supported a substantial increase in the number of National Defense fellowships and the inclusion of English, reading, history, geography, and civics in the program.

The Nurse Training Act, which I actively supported, authorized a $287.6 million, 5-year program for construction, rehabilitation, and improvement of nurse training schools and included an $85 million student loan program with a 50-percent forgiveness provision for those who work 5 years in a public or private nonprofit hospital or institution. I also supported the Public Health Training bill which authorized grants for traineeships in public health nursing and engineering.

Scholarship aid for higher education students is urgently needed. Since the House opposes undergraduate scholarships, I have sought to substitute for this an undergraduate loan program under which students could obtain 50-percent forgiveness by becoming teachers and another 50 percent by maintaining scholarship standards set by the States.

HEALTH AND MEDICARE

A Federal program of medical care for the aged passed the Senate in the form of the Gore-Anderson-Javits amendment to the social security amendments bill, only to fail in the House-Senate conference. The amendment, put together during Senate debate, was similar to a bill I introduced in January based on the recommendations of the National Committee on Health Care for the Aged, which had been formed at my suggestion. It would have established a hospitalization and nursing care program under social security financing and a private medical and surgical insurance plan made available nationally for about $2 per person a week.

The amendment included principles I have been advocating for years: The incorporation of private enterprise into the program to act as a governor on the expansion of governmental activity in this field; the inclusion of everybody over 65 years old; and the establishment of a separate social security trust fund for the health care program. I will continue to work for a meaningful program of health care for the aged because I am convinced it is essential for the dignity and the security of our older citizens. I am confident we will soon succeed.

I voted for the social security amendments bill which provided for a $7-across-the-board increase in benefits and other improvements, including an increase from 18 to 22 in the maximum age of students who can receive benefits, which I have worked for and sponsored for years. I opposed the deletion in committee of a provision to extend coverage to self-employed doctors, the only group of significant size now excluded.

The continuation and expansion of the Hill-Burton Act was enacted, including $202 million for modernizing and improving older hospital facilities and for diagnostic and treatment centers, as well as for new hospital construction. I actively supported this measure.

I helped refine the definition of psychotoxic drugs in a Senate bill which strengthened Federal controls over barbiturates and amphetamines—the so-called pep pills—and supported the bill which provides 4,000 additional nursing care beds for veterans. I am giving careful attention to developments in connection with the Surgeon General's report on smoking and health.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Vietnam was the key cold war battlefront as the congressional session neared an end, even while we continued to face difficulties in the Congo, Cyprus, and the Middle East. I have stood firmly behind a no-back-down position on Vietnam, which is the key to all southeast Asia.

I voted for the resolution backing the President in his retaliatory action following North Vietnamese torpedo boat attacks on the U.S.S. *Maddox* in international waters in the Gulf of Tonkin. I have also continually supported basic U.S. objectives: to enable South Vietnam to resist Communist infiltration and to secure peace and stability under a freely elected government. In Senate speeches I have made it clear that I am for continued U.S. help in the Vietnamese struggle for freedom because there is no other realistic choice, but I have opposed extending the U.S. role in the struggle.

Also, I have urged that our allies in the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty Organization be invited to take an active part in support of the resolution to maintain international peace in southeast Asia, since their interests in this region are as great as ours. I got assurances that the United States will continue to press for the maximum contribution of the SEATO nations. If the situation in southeast Asia could be stabilized and if North Vietnam, Communist China, and the Soviet Union gave real assurances actually to keep hands off Laos and South Vietnam, the United Nations would then have a reasonable chance for a successful overall settlement of the regional problem.

In the Senate I answered the now famous speech of Senator FULBRIGHT in which he charged that U.S. diplomacy is to a large degree based on myths, not reality, and I reaffirmed the validity of the basic direction of our bipartisan foreign policy as sustained by four administrations since World War II. I urged that the present lull in the cold war be used to strengthen Western unity and to accelerate the economic development of nonindustrial nations rather than placing our primary effort on negotiating with Communist nations.

In a speech in Santiago, Chile, I proposed the formation of a Latin American Common Market combined with a broader Western Hemisphere Free Trade Area to integrate and accelerate economic development in Latin America. This concept is getting much attention as the most helpful to Latin American economic development.

Civil conflict in Cyprus created a series of crises in which war between Greece and Turkey, both NATO allies, seemed imminent. I supported U.S. policy which would agree to any final solution that would contribute to the peace and welfare of the entire Cypriot population, both Greek and Turkish, through self-determination and safeguard the rights of the individual to equal justice and civil liberties. We have a major interest in maintaining peace in the eastern Mediterranean, and must do all we can, directly and through the United Nations, to assure that objective.

Concern over the Middle East was heightened by United Arab Republic President Nasser who continued to maintain more than 30,000 troops in the Yemen war zone in spite of his pledge to the United States to withdraw, by his threats against Israel and by his continued use of former Nazi scientists to develop warplanes, missiles, and other offensive weapons. With my colleagues, I urged the President to offer Israel a collective defense treaty or military assistance to counter the effect of the United Arab Republic designs on the peace of the area.

I warned that Congress was approaching a showdown on U.S. policy toward President Nasser, and pointed to a long list of congressional actions since 1955 that sought to restrain the executive branch in persisting to give aid to the United Arab Republic without conditions. I also protested the International Monetary Fund loan to Egypt pushed through at U.S. insistence—as not being in accord with sound banking principles or international policy under which the Bank operates.

I denounced persecution of Jews in the U.S.S.R. and called for a great "wave of indignation" to rise up protesting the Soviet Union's oppressive acts and failure to permit Jews to practice their religion in their own way, to be free of discrimination and to rejoin their families in other lands. This denunciation of anti-Jewish acts by the U.S.S.R. included protest over an anti-Semitic book published by the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences; while similar protests from many parts of the world eventually persuaded the Soviet Union to disavow and ban. I also testified before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in support of a Senate resolution denouncing Soviet discrimination against Jews, and cosponsored the amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act which denounce such persecution. I will continue to protest Soviet anti-Jewish policy.

I fought against—and came within seven votes of defeating—Senate ratification of an ill-advised international agreement with Austria for return of property, seized during World War II, to 52 Austrians whose claims had already been dismissed by the Justice Department on the ground that they were either Nazis or applicants for Nazi party membership.

In the Senate, I urged continued support for the United Nations, supported the development of a U.N. force for peace-keeping purposes and called for cooperation in solving the U.N.'s financial crisis brought about by the refusal of the Soviet Union, France, and other states to pay their fair share of U.N. peace-keeping costs, notwithstanding the World Court's decision upholding their legitimacy.

AID AND TRADE

I supported the Foreign Assistance Act of 1964 for which $3.25 billion was appropriated. I believe that much larger sums are necessary to do the job adequately, especially in Latin America where we should concentrate assistance in countries that are able and willing to make the greatest use of it. I also believe that a country that does not carry out social reforms should not receive aid and that our aim should be to give the developing countries a feeling that their greatest hope is with the United States and the free world.

The Advisory Committee on Private Enterprise in Foreign Aid, which I proposed and Congress adopted as part of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1963, was appointed in May and began to explore methods of bringing the vitality of the private enterprise system into the foreign aid effort.

The committee is Chaired by Arthur K. Watson, president of the IBM World Trade Corp., and includes distinguished representatives of our universities, foundations, labor unions, and the professions.

The Atlantic Community Development Group for Latin America—ADELA—which grew out of the Economic Committee of the NATO Parliamentarian's Conference, of which I am chairman, became fully operational in September. ADELA seeks the greater participation of West European, Canadian, Japanese, and American private investment capital in Latin American development through a multinational investment company. In June, Adela made its first joint investment, in a Colombian steel forging plant, with the International Finance Corporation, an affiliate of the World Bank.

I cosponsored a bill to establish a Peace by Investment Corporation which would make capital, raised by the sale of stock to millions of small investors, available to businesses and development projects in underdeveloped countries. The bill is based on the work of my brother, Benjamin A. Javits, and Leon Keyserling, a former chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers. I also helped to initiate and sponsor the Executive Service Corps which has been formed by the private sector with the cooperation of AID and which is now beginning to make managerial personnel available to countries needing special skills to advance their economic growth.

I fought hard to sustain the principles and objectives of the Trade Expansion Act in the face of rising protectionist sentiment in the Congress. I believe the reciprocal reduction of trade barriers benefits American business and labor and strengthens our economic bonds with the free world nations. I believe enactment of the strict buy-American provisions of the Mass Transit and the expanded Food Stamp Acts and quotas on the importation of meats will have serious consequences on the forthcoming Kennedy round of trade negotiations and on Western unity. I will continue to oppose bills restricting our international trade.

Despite basic improvements in our balance-of-payments position, the administration persuaded Congress to enact an interest equalization tax on foreign security issues sold to Americans. I opposed this measure as a major departure from our policy of encouraging the free international flow of private capital and because it would not be able to meet its objectives. I offered an amendment which would have exempted from the tax new foreign security issues if not more than a given percentage—to be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury—were sold to U.S. citizens. I also offered a substitute bill which would have given the President standby authority to establish a voluntary capital issues committee to limit the sale of new foreign security issues if a balance-of-payments emergency arose.

I supported U.S. adherence to the International Coffee Agreement in the belief it was vitally important to the economic development and political stability of Latin America. The Senate accepted my amendment to the food-for-peace bill authorizing the President to use the program to help friendly nations in becoming independent of trade with Communist China.

With colleagues from other east coast States, I fought to eliminate controls on the importation of residual fuel oil which is essential for schools, hospitals, and other large consumers. We succeeded in gaining an 11-percent increase in the imports allowed during the quota year, temporarily alleviating a supply problem on the east coast.

IMMIGRATION

I continued to press for substantial revision of our outmoded immigration national quota system and participated in hearings on the many pending bills including my own and an administration measure which I cosponsored. When no further action was taken, I introduced a further measure which would have utilized the more than 175,000 existing unused quota preference numbers for skilled technicians and relatives of U.S. citizens in addition to some 51,000 other quota numbers left unused in the last fiscal year. Failure to act on even this urgently necessary stopgap device was a tragic mistake.

GOVERNMENT ORGANIZATION

Concerned about the fact that the Nation for the second time in 20 years is without a Vice President—an officer whose function has grown in importance so greatly—I joined in sponsoring a constitutional amendment, which the Senate passed, and which differed from my own proposal by authorizing the President to nominate a Vice President in such circumstances, subject to ratification by both Houses of Congress. The proposal sent to the House also included a much-needed constitutional procedure in the case of presidential disability.

Controversy over the Supreme Court's ordering of reapportionment of State legislatures tied up the Senate for a month at the end of the session. I have long believed that there is need for fairer representation for many of our urban and suburban areas, which have often been disadvantaged by apportionment established when the country was less centralized in urban areas. Also, there may be a case for a constitutional amendment limited only to permitting the people of any State, if they wish, to choose by referendum to have one house of their legislature apportioned, like the U.S. Senate, with reference to a factor other than population, and I introduced such a proposal. There was much concern that lower Federal courts may be pressing State legislative reapportionment too rapidly in the light of some States' electoral procedures. I do not believe, however, that the Congress may constitutionally impose a rule of decision upon the Federal courts, particularly in cases involving constitutional rights already pending before them. I accordingly proposed that the Congress instead express its request to the Supreme Court, through a "sense of Congress" resolution, that adequate time be given to comply with the Supreme Court decision consistent with each State's electoral processes. A similar proposal was finally adopted by the Senate, breaking the deadlock, but was later rejected in the Senate-House conference.

I introduced a bill, which received important network support, to meet the vexing problem of widely broadcast computer projections based on early voting returns by establishing a uniform closing time for polling places in presidential elections, taking into account the variations in time zones across the Nation. I supported the bill, passed by both Houses, which would have suspended the "equal time" law and permitted television debates between the major party presidential candidates as in 1960, but it was blocked.

I testified before the Rules Committee investigating the conflict-of-interest scandal surrounding the resignation of Senate Majority Secretary Robert Baker and urged adoption of measures which I have repeatedly introduced and which, if adopted, might well have prevented such cases. When the Senate considered a proposed code of ethics, I voted to make it effective without further delay, to require full financial disclosure by Senators and staff, and to establish a permanent Senate investigating committee to enforce the code. I also sought to give the new committee the power to give advisory opinions. When further evidence about the Baker case was revealed, I voted to reopen the investigation and to have it conducted by the new committee.

I continued to press for a general overhaul of congressional procedure, the need for which was so apparent in the 2-month civil rights filibuster, but the Senate adopted only two minor rules changes, one calling for germaneness of debate during at least 3 hours each day, and another permitting committees to meet during a small part of the Senate session each day.

GOVERNMENT SERVICE

Concerted efforts by Congress resulted in passage of the $557 million pay raise bill for 1.7 million Federal civil service and postal employees, as well as for Cabinet members, Federal judges, Congressmen, and Senators. These increases will help the Government retain well-qualified people, and are an important step in recognizing the need to pay Government employees at a rate comparable to that of private industry.

Federal Government retirees are experiencing difficulty in sustaining themselves, and the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee has held hearings on legislation to grant them graduated scale increases of 3 to 9 percent.

I also supported a significant pay raise for military personnel which was signed into law; and cosponsored legislation requiring a review of the inadequacies of the present draft law which hinders the careers of so many of our young people. The President later acted on this proposal by requesting the Secretary of Defense to conduct such a study.

I consulted often with the Postmaster General to make sure his economy plans would not curtail vital mail services. Improvements recently authorized included extension of window services in some cities, opening of courtesy windows for emergency mailings until midnight and the resumption of financial services on Saturdays. The Post Office Department agreed to make further adjustments in the future, if needed.

AGRICULTURE

The Senate Agriculture Committee tied programs for wheat and cotton together in a bill I was forced to oppose because I felt the wheat program was contrary to the best interests of New York farmers. Although I also had grave doubts about the desirability of the multisubsidy cotton provision of the bill, I believe it was the only available way to keep foreign producers from having a cost advantage over U.S. textile manufactures in buying raw cotton. The wheat certificate plan in the bill was similar to the one rejected by our Nation's wheat farmers—and two-thirds of New York's wheat producers—in a referendum last year. I joined in introducing an amendment to allow separate consideration of these two programs by striking the unsound wheat provision. It was defeated by a narrow margin.

I introduced another amendment to the wheat-cotton bill to establish a commission to examine the adequacy of our agricultural policies and goals, and received assurances during Senate debate that hearings would be held. Congress enacted legislation to establish a National Commission on Food Marketing to examine problems of pricing, marketing, and competitive practices in the food industry.

Also passed was the food stamp program, which I supported, to allow needy people to increase basic food purchases through regular commercial channels. Legislation to improve pesticide registration and labeling procedures, which I cosponsored, was also enacted. In addition, I strongly supported the increase in funds for the special milk program, and the important soil conservation and food for peace programs.

Following meetings by major milk producer organizations to discuss serious drought conditions in upstate New York I urged the Secretary of Agriculture to supplement emergency loan aid and extension of grazing privileges on land diverted from production with much-needed additional assistance including the offering of grain at reduced prices. This assistance was granted to farmers in a large number of the counties affected.

FACTUAL INFORMATION ON THE COUNCIL FOR A LIVABLE WORLD

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I ask that as a part of my remarks a timely and factual report on the Council for a Livable World—prepared by a group of Senators and their staffs—be inserted in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT OF THE COUNCIL FOR A LIVABLE WORLD

INTRODUCTION

The Council for a Livable World is a secret political organization with a satchel full of money. It will probably be operating in your State, attempting to select your U.S. Senators and Representatives this fall.

The council has money; money counted in the millions of dollars. And it has demonstrated in the past it is willing to spend as much as is needed to elect the kind of Senators and Representatives it describes as "thoughtful" men. By "thoughtful" the Council for a Livable World means men who agree with its position and will work to achieve its aims.

What are these goals?

Briefly, they include unilateral disarmament, stripping the United States of its muscle, turning this country into a fourth-rate power at the mercy of the international wolfpack.

The organization is practically unknown; its founders and supporters would like to keep it that way. Council membership lists are secret. Even members don't know for sure who their fellow members are.

The Council for a Livable World collects large chunks of cash from these members—some estimate it at $1,400 to $1,500 daily—and disburses it to "thoughtful" candidates.

The council is dedicated to becoming a potent political force in the United States, if not the dominant political force. It claims to have tipped the balance in the election of one U.S. Senator before it was 6 months old.

It openly boasts it is collecting money for other Senators or senatorial candidates. These contributions range from a few hundred to $22,000.

As early as 1962 council founder and president, Leo Szilard, claimed a devoted membership of 2,500, each contributing 2 percent of gross earnings for political action. Figured on a conservative average salary basis of $10,000 this amounted to $500,000 annually in the slush fund.

Dr. Szilard's goal then became a 2-percent contributing membership of 150,000 with an annual take of $20 million—$40 million for each congressional campaign year, or $80 million for a presidential campaign.

Since then, the council's goal has been scaled down to what its board of directors considers more realistic, a contributing membership of 20,000 with an annual kitty of $4 million.

Even by modern political spending standards $4 million judiciously disbursed will make a large difference in any election.

And the council attempts to use judgment. Money is not to be profusely donated in the big-population States where campaigning is more expensive; it is spent in the smaller States of the Midwest and West where a political buck packs a bigger punch.

The council, in short, is a secret, well-financed political organization with money burning in its pockets and with shrewd spending habits.

HISTORY

Council for a Livable World is the fusion of two brainchildren of the late Dr. Leo Szilard, physicist turned politician.

The council was born in June 1962 when two previous organizations, the Council for Abolishing War and the Lobby for Abolishing War, were dissolved and their membership transferred to the new organization at a meeting in a Washington, D.C., hotel.

Scientists who had worked on the political perimeter from the end of World War II until 1961 suddenly found they had new status, new power under the present administration. Many of these men, including Dr. Szilard, had actively opposed use of the atomic bomb in Japan, opposed development of the hydrogen bomb, and opposed creation of a nuclear deterrent force by the United States under the Eisenhower administration.

These same men strongly supported free interchange of secret information with the Soviet Union and other Communist countries and advocated limited or total disarmament, internationally controlled or unilateral.

In 1960, former Secretary of State Christian Herter, by departmental order, created the Disarmament Agency within the Department of State. The scientist-politicians approved the move but soon discovered it was not enough for their purposes.

With the Disarmament Agency relegated to a secondary position in State the scientist-politicians found it difficult to operate freely. They determined it must get at least semi-independent status with more direct control from the White House where they felt more at home, more comfortable.

Their first intensive effort was in this direction and they were successful. Almost at once the White House took command, drafted legislation, and submitted it to Congress for approval. The scientist-politicians had succeeded so far.

However, there was still a drawback—Congress.

This new breed, the scientist-politicians found the atmosphere in Congress not to their liking. They found they had little in common with the men in Congress and little rapport with a majority of them.

To offset this, Dr. Szilard in late 1961 formed his Council for Abolishing War. It immediately attracted others in the academic world who felt as he did, who had the same views on diminishing defense. Purpose of the organization and its sister organ, the Lobby for Abolishing War, was twofold: to inform Congress and to elect Congressmen.

The twin organizations did not accomplish their purpose fully and in June 1962 the Council for a Livable World was created.

Success, according to the Council for a Livable World, was immediate. By campaign time Dr. Szilard was able to state the council had a membership of 2,500. Council for a Livable World has since stated this membership poured $22,000 into the campaign of Senator GEORGE MCGOVERN, Democrat, of South Dakota, and maintains this money made the difference between victory and defeat for Senator MCGOVERN.

In an undated memorandum on Council for a Livable World stationery from Bernard T. Feld, president, and H. Ashton Crosby, executive director, the following paragraph appears:

"This organization—the Council for a Livable World—was formed in June 1962, and participated in the November 1962 congressional elections with impressive results. The most outstanding example was GEORGE MCGOVERN, who received from supporters of the council over $20,000, representing about one-fifth of his total campaign expenditures. MCGOVERN was elected to the Senate by a margin of less than 600 votes—the first Democratic Senator from South Dakota in 26 years."

ORGANIZATION

Council membership is largely drawn from the academic world. However, scientists and technicians, engineers, and professional men in private industry also have been solicited for membership and many have joined the ranks.

Exact membership of the group is not known. The only known statement of membership is that made by Dr. Szilard in 1962 when he claimed 2,500. Indications are, however, the membership and contributors' lists have grown dramatically since that time.

Membership is not confined to the United States. At least one resident of Geneva, Switzerland, is listed openly as a contributor in 1962.

A majority of the board of directors are scientists or scholars drawn from the academic world. One of the cochairmen, with Dr. Szilard, was William Doering, professor of chemistry, director, division of sciences, Yale University. Dr. Bernard T. Feld, president, is professor of physics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

A notable exception to this academic approach is James G. Patton, president of the Farmers Union, who is also listed as a member of the board of directors.

Working with the board is a committee of scientific advisers. This list contains many outstanding names of the scientific world. The scientists' committee works closely with the board and, together, they might well be described as the apex of the scientific-political effort in the United States.

It is believed a number of other professional and political organizations including SANE, S.O.S., and at least one group dedicated to advancement of socialism are contributing substantial amounts of money to Council for a Livable World. In this area fact is hard to separate from "report" because the council keeps its financial records as secret as its membership rolls.

LEO SZILARD

To appreciate fully the motivation of the Council for a Livable World it is essential to understand the man who created it and who hand-picked the people carrying on its work—Dr. Leo Szilard.

Until his death this year Leo Szilard was the council. It was his brainchild; it was his project from the beginning. It was Leo Szilard who outlined its program, who developed its political techniques and who contributed its political philosophy.

Dr. Leo Szilard was born in Hungary and received his early education in physics there. He took graduate work at the University of Berlin but fled under the Nazi pogroms of the 1930's to England and then to the United States.

In this country Dr. Szilard taught physics and became closely associated with Enrico Fermi in the development of nuclear science. In the late thirties, fearing Nazi scientists were making real progress in the development of a nuclear explosive, Dr. Szilard became one of the leaders, along with Dr. Fermi, in the movement to cloak U.S. work in the field in secrecy.

At the same time he and Fermi led the drive to get the United States into the nuclear race. They took their proposals to Dr. Albert Einstein and urged him personally to contact Franklin D. Roosevelt with the idea. They convinced Einstein and he presented what basically was the Szilard approach to development of the bomb to the President.

During World War II Szilard and Fermi teamed up at the University of Chicago to do the basic research job which led eventually to Hiroshima.

Having developed the bomb, Szilard suddenly cooled to the idea of using it. He led the small group of American scientists who protested to President Truman against making use of the bomb against Japan. It was his contention the Japanese people should be warned of its existence and be given a chance to quit the war.

President Truman's refusal to accept the Szilard proposal apparently pushed the scientist all the way over to the left. He devoted the next few years first, to opposing further nuclear armament, then to opposing development of the hydrogen bomb and to supporting Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer in his clearance case before the Atomic Energy Commission.

It was also during this period that Szilard began his long correspondence with leaders of the Soviet Union. First he wrote, over State Department protests, to Stalin and Molotov, later to Khrushchev. This latter correspondence culminated in a tete-a-tete with Khrushchev in New York. Khrushchev was in New York for the U.N. meeting. It was at this time that he made a mockery of international procedure with his shoddy, shoe-pounding appearance before the world body. The performance didn't appear to bother Szilard, however.

His appointment with the Kremlin dictator started out as a 15-minute interview, ended up as a 2-hour conference. Neither party ever revealed fully the extent of their talk.

Meanwhile, Szilard had teamed with Lord Bertrand Russell of England and Cyrus Eaton—American bankroller of leftist causes—in an extragovernmental series of talks with Communist scientists. Szilard, along with Russell and Eaton, helped create the first international conference of scientists which became known as the Pugwash Conferences, named for Eaton's plush hideaway at Pugwash, Nova Scotia. Szilard was a regular at succeeding conferences.

With the change of administrations in 1961 Szilard suddenly found he had comparatively free access to the White House, to the Disarmament Agency and to high-level Government circles. But there were stumbling blocks to achieving his goals—mostly in Congress.

It was at this time he and other scientists began working on the activist program which evolved into the Council for a Livable World. Szilard was its early money-raiser, appearing at dozens of campus gatherings across the country, addressing hundreds of meetings of faculty and students urging his program and outlining his proposals for political action.

He had sprung full blown into politics.

TROIKA

To achieve its goal—a totally defenseless United States—the council has adopted a troika approach:

1. Infiltration of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.
2. Extragovernmental conferences with Red scientists.
3. Buying U.S. elections.

The Arms Control and Disarmament Agency came to life through a departmental order by Secretary of State Christian Herter in 1960. A year later, in September of 1961, the Agency was given congressional approval. William C. Foster was appointed its first Director and Adrian Fisher his deputy.

The Agency has sponsored a number of research projects, contracting them out to universities and private, nonprofit corporations. In turn, these contracts are sublet to individual scientists, scholars and lawyers.

A number of these contracts can be traced back to Council for a Livable World members or its financial contributors. Council for a Livable World thus had found a new source of income: the tax dollar. Samples:

Contract No. ACDA/ST-5, "Inspection and Control in Disarmament Agreements," prime contractor: Institute for Defense Analysis; one of the major contributors: Donald Glaser, professor of physics, University of California, Berkeley, Calif., a member of the scientists for a livable world committee of the council.

ACDA/GC-33, "Quis Custodiat? Controlling the Police in a Disarmed World," by Roger Fisher, Harvard Law School, representative of Council for a Livable World at hearings before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, April 10, 1962. Fisher also participated in contracts numbered ACDA/IR-8, ACDA/ST-5, ACDA/IR-7.

ACDA/DAS-25, "Factors Affecting Soviet attitudes on Disarmament," Matthew Maselsom, a Council for a Livable World member.

Freeman J. Dyson, listed as an adviser to Council for a Livable World, also served as a scientific consultant to ACDA for 35 days during the period January 1 to August 30, 1963.

Richard Barnet, an adviser to Council for a Livable World, codirector of Institute for Policy Studies, listed by institute as deputy director of political research, ACDA. (ACDA lists him only as a consultant.)

ACDA/IR-8, "Political Control of an International Police Force," by Hans Morgenthau, an adviser to Council for a Livable World under contract to the Institute for Defense Analysis.

ACDA/WEG-9, "Factors on Arms Inspection and Reassurance," by Bernard Feld, president of Council for a Livable World. Dr. Feld also took part in contract ACDA/WEC-2, as a subcontractor for the Raytheon Corp.

Council for a Livable World lists as a member of its science committee a Hudson Hoagland. One John H. Hoagland, perhaps not related, took part in no fewer than five ACDA contracts.

University of Chicago Professor Robert Gomer, a member of Council for a Livable World, participated as a subcontractor in at least one ACDA contract.

The list is impressive enough to indicate heavy participation in the research operations of the Disarmament Agency by Council for a Livable World, espousing its cause of a disarmed, helpless America in a world of continued tensions, continued armaments.

This activity is made all the more frustrating since taxpayers find themselves paying for this Council for a Livable World adventure in politics whether they approve it or not.

Origin of some of Council for a Livable World's ideas and tactics becomes eminently clear when members' close ties with Communist colleagues—well tutored in the art and skills of power politics—are examined. At least eight leading figures of Council for a Livable World have attended one or more of the Pugwash Conferences where Americans gathered in secret with scientists from Russia, Poland, and other Red nations to exchange information.

The Senate Internal Security Subcommittee has examined the Pugwash meetings carefully and issued a staff analysis during the 87th Congress, 1st session.

Said the report:

"In most of the contacts that have thus far taken place, the free world scientists, although they have sometimes argued strongly, have not been able to compete with their Communist counterparts. The extensive use which the Communist propaganda apparatus has made of the Pugwash Conferences is proof enough of this.

"The free world scientists have no central guiding political ideology. The Communist scientists have such an ideology.

"The free world scientists are under no discipline. The scientists from the Communist bloc countries, when they attend international conferences, do so under the discipline of the Communist Party.

"The free world scientist, brought up in the tradition of freedom of criticism, is frequently critical, and sometimes overcritical of his own government. The Soviet scientist—especially the Soviet scientist who represents his Government abroad in any capacity—has been conditioned to blind obedience to government policy.

"The free world scientist has been accustomed to an exchange of views with fellow scientists based on a common regard for the truth and scientific objectivity. The Soviet scientist knows from his own sad experience, that, whenever there is a conflict between a scientific objectivity and Communist dogma, it is scientific objectivity that must yield.

"The free world scientist comes to his meeting with Soviet scientists with an open mind, full of trust and a desire to communicate and cooperate. The Communist scientist comes to these conferences with carefully defined political directives. It is his duty to attempt to shape and exploit the conference in a manner which will best serve the ends of Soviet imperialism."

Internal Security Subcommittee investigators identify the following Americans (all members of Council for a Livable World or its predecessors) as having attended Pugwash Conferences:

First Pugwash Conference, July 6 to 11, 1957: Leo Szilard, Herman J. Mueller, John Edsall.

Second Pugwash Conference, March 31 to April 11, 1958; Morton Grodzins, Leo Szilard.

Third Pugwash Conference, September 14 to 20, 1958: Charles Coryell, Bernard Feld, Morton Grodzins, Herman J. Mueller, Leo Szilard, Victor Weisskopf.

Report from Moscow on Disarmament and World Security (roundtable discussion of sixth conference impressions): Alexander Rich.

Moscow conference, November 27 to December 5, 1960: John Edsall, Bernard Feld, Morton Grodzins, Leo Szilard, Alexander Rich.

"The Pugwash Conferences," staff analysis prepared for the Subcommittee To Investigate the Administration of the Internal Security Act and Other Internal Security Laws of the Committee of the Judiciary, U.S. Senate, 87th Congress, 1st session, GPO Washington, 1961.

Having meshed its international and Disarmament Agency gears, Council for a Livable World found itself blocked in only one direction—the U.S. Congress. Having learned realism, the council set about changing this realistically—by spending huge sums of money to elect Members of House and Senate who believe as they do.

The council's method of spreading this political largesse is ingenious. Council for a Livable World itself doesn't like to write large checks made out to individuals or to campaign committees. Instead it instructs its members (and being scientists the instructions are a neat formula) on how to do it as individuals.

Having first evaluated candidates, Council for a Livable World on November 15, 1963, outlined its program in a letter to supporters:

"You will remember that last spring we asked council members to consider making the second half of their 1963 contributions to a senatorial candidate who would be up for reelection in 1964 and that we suggested that these candidates would be chosen from the following list: Quentin N. Burdick, North Dakota; Albert Gore, Tennessee; Philip A. Hart, Michigan; Frank E. Moss, Utah; Gale W. McGee, Wyoming; Edmund S. Muskie, Maine; Eugene J. McCarthy, Minnesota.

"All of these candidates are worthy of support, but on the basis of their relative need for support, the council recommends that priority now be given to Senators Burdick [sic], Moss, and McGee."

How was this "priority" support to be given? The following form to be filled out by contributors was enclosed:

Council For a Livable World,
Washington, D.C.

I enclose my contribution in the amount of $——— for the second half of 1963 to the

Council for a Livable World to be used as follows:

☐ I would like to contribute to the general funds of the Council for a Livable World for political or other purposes. (Make checks payable to "The Council for a Livable World.")

☐ I would like to contribute to the campaign fund of a senatorial candidate in the 1964 elections. (All checks should be made out directly to the candidate, but sent to the council for transmittal.) The following are recommended as guidelines for those who otherwise have no strong personal preference:

— If your last name begins with letters A–K, contribute to the campaign of Senator Quentin N. Burdick.

— If your last name begins with letters L–R, contribute to the campaign of Senator Frank E. Moss.

— If your last name begins with letters S–Z, contribute to the campaign of Senator Gale W. McGee.

Other senatorial candidates:

— Albert Gore.
— Philip Hart.
— Eugene J. McCarthy.
— Edmund S. Muskie.

Name --
Address -------------------------------------
City---------- State---------- ZIP code --

These oblique instructions are cunning in the extreme and demonstrate a shrewd and devious political brain behind the movement. They contain two safeguards, one for the council and the other for the candidate involved. Note the instructions accompanying box No. 2: "(All checks should be made out directly to the candidate, but sent to the council for transmittal.)"

By following these instructions the candidate would receive a batch of checks from individual citizens and would not have to identify the money as having come from a secret political organization which selected him for support. Few sharp-eyed observers would question a contributors' list containing merely individual names; many might question a large, lump-sum check from Council for a Livable World.

This system also places the council beyond having to comply with the reporting law in Washington, D.C. As a political organization it had not, itself, contributed directly to any candidate; it had merely recommended candidates for others to contribute to as they saw fit.

A third point: by transmitting the checks CLW would be able to keep tabs on who got the money, how much, and from whom.

The contribution formula was also contained in the instructions. If your last name began with the letters A–K, contributions should go to Senator Burdick; L–R, to Senator Moss; S–Z, to Senator McGee.

Scientific, no?

Also devious.

Six months later, May 5, 1964, the council had expanded the list of those in whom it was interested by adding the names of two incumbent Members of the House, Representatives Joseph M. Montoya, Democrat, of New Mexico, and Ralph R. Harding, Democrat, of Idaho. By May 5, Representative Montoya had announced his intentions of running against Senator E. L. Mechem this fall.

This time the contributions formula had changed slightly and contributors were urged "* * * unless you have special desires relating to the support of some particular candidate * * * that contributions now be given to the following priority candidates according to the following recommended alphabetical apportionment: Montoya, A–D; McGee, E–K; Muskie, L–P; Moss, O–S; Harding, T–Z."

The council felt impelled to make an explanation of its support for Congressman Harding:

"You will note that with its recommendation of Congressman Harding for support, the council is departing from its precedent of soliciting support only for candidates for the Senate. However, we feel that in this case, the reelection of Mr. Harding is the first step toward our support of this outstanding young legislator for election to the Senate in 1966."

The council is not only realistic in an immediate sense, it looks to the future.

The Council for a Livable World has made other departures. Evidence has come to light it is attemping now to swing primary as well as general elections. An indication of this broadened interest came in a news dispatch from Harrisburg, Pa. It detailed contributions received by Genevieve Blatt, a Democratic contender for the senatorial nomination. In her filed statement with the Secretary of State she listed $1,000 contributed to her campaign by the Council for a Livable World. When the council filed its lobbying expense statement with the Secretary of the Senate for the second quarter of 1964 an interesting "lobbying" expense item appeared: "Genevieve Blatt, Philadelphia, $1,000." Miss Blatt, after a closely contested primary battle, was finally declared a winner. The Council's contribution, according to the second story of her filing with the Pennsylvania secretary of state was the second biggest to the Blatt primary campaign fund.

Its tenacles spread out.

The council's success in getting members to contribute to political campaigns can be demonstrated by the following tabulation accompanying its May 5, 1964, letter soliciting funds: Council for a Livable World, 1346 Connecticut Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C. Political contributions—1963–64.

Letter and questionnaire to the Council for a Living World supporters, November 15, 1963 (copy attached).

	Through 1963	From Jan. 1, 1964	Total 1963–64
Senator Burdick [1]	$10,171.50	$4,180.34	$14,351.84
Senator Moss	6,003.00	1,986.33	7,989.33
Senator McGee	5,769.00	2,689.83	8,458.83
Senator Gore	115.00	15.00	130.00
Senator Hart	100.00	60.00	160.00
Senator McCarthy	330.00	1,766.00	2,096.00
Senator Muskie	252.30	120.00	372.30
Congressman Donald Fraser	------------	20.00	20.00
Jerome Ziegler	------------	25.00	25.00
Total	22,740.80	10,862.50	33,603.30

[1] Senator Burdick, after receiving funds from CLW members, claims to have returned every cent of it.

$530 currently on hand of unallocated political funds transmitted to CLW by supporters but unspecified as to candidates.

RACE AND IMMIGRATION

Mr. HART. Mr. President, Harry Golden discusses the subjects of race and immigration in the interesting perceptive fashion which is his and which has influenced, for good, many of the public debates and decisions in this country. He treats the subject in a most unusual but penetrating way.

I am especially pleased that this address by Mr. Golden was delivered at a meeting held at Michigan State University on August 20, 1964, at the conference of Cursillos in Christianity. The Cursillo movement is a magnificent, developing one in this country and has helped many of us to understand better our reasons for helping to recognize in one another the Creator of all of us.

This combination of a distinguished American Jew speaking as a guest and lecturer to the Roman Catholic Session of Prayer and Dialog is one that I hope will receive the widest attention. I ask unanimous consent that the address by Mr. Golden be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

It is a great honor for me, a Jew, to participate in this Cursillos in Christianity, a Roman Catholic session of solemn prayer and dialog.

When the late Pope John XXIII announced his intention to write a new social encyclical some of his closest collaborators suggested that it might not be necessary to treat themes which had already been explored by his predecessors. They made specific reference to the Rerum Novarum of Leo XIII, and Quadrigesimo Anno, of Pius XI:

"No," said John, "the world travels faster than we do. We must adapt daily and totally so that we do not limp along behind. Otherwise we will be outrun. By whom? I leave that to you to figure out."

Pope John's call for total awareness and total involvement in the area of social justice, has had a phenomenal result. I believe it was the first time in modern history that the reign of a Pope was as exciting to millions of Protestants, Jews, Moslems, and indeed to Free Thinkers too, as it was to the Roman Catholics themselves.

I would like to discuss two problems which I believe are involved in this need for total awareness, and total involvement. Race and immigration, and how we resolve these problems may very well be the key to America's victory in the struggle for the moral leadership of the free world.

We hear of the "white backlash" and are told we must fear it. We hear this at the very moment we hear America is the leader of the free world. Hearing both we know nevertheless we can believe only one.

If indeed America is the leader of the free world, then we must fear nothing. Leading the free world is not a position easily come by nor easily held. It takes sacrifice and blood. And more. We are the leaders of the free world because America is more than just a people. America is a moral idea, the idea of liberty and justice for all.

I believe it is shameful of us to suspect that Americans will vote against their own interests out of some secret fear. It is more than shameful for any of us to believe that Americans want to deny the blessings and benefits of America to 19 million other Americans.

I cannot believe this. It isn't true.

I believe a good one-word description of the American dream is mobility. The opportunity to move about as free men without special permission or registration card. The opportunity to move from one place to another place, from one income level to another income level, from one station in life to another station in life. And yet for nearly 100 years we have tolerated the very negation of the American dream as it involves our neighbors of the Negro race.

Let us examine the challenge. We have all heard people say, the Irish immigrants did not need FEPC to make their way in America, the immigrant Jews who couldn't even speak the language, did not need any freedom rides or sit-ins to make their way, and so on with the Poles, Italians, and others. I'll come back to this challenge presently.

America's welcome for the immigrant was often less than enthusiastic. We have had

9 or 10 nativist movements during the last century. Yet despite these nativist movements it must be said that the sense of America as a refuge for the oppressed was never really far from the consciousness of the people of this country.

What therefore is at the core of the problem of the Negro in relation to the millions of foreigners who have entered the open society of America? It is not necessarily that the Negroes are poor, that they live in substandard housing. When novelist James Baldwin states the problem in terms of his own terribly deprived childhood in Harlem, I am not deeply impressed. I saw poverty just as great as Baldwin experienced, among the Jews and Poles on the Lower East Side of New York, among the Italians in Little Italy, among the Irish in the Hell's Kitchen district of New York's west side. The important thing to remember about these immigrants is that they could get out. We knew almost by instinct that if we studied, learned, worked, strived, and sacrificed, the open society of America was waiting for us. Oh, there may have been pinpricks at the social level, but they were of little consequence really. America beckoned to us, come and join us as part of the corporate whole, there's room for all, in America there are no superfluous men.

It is not therefore that the Negro has been poor and has lived in substandard housing, but that we have long since established the political, the economic, and the social compulsions which have kept him securely locked in—locked in his ghettoes in the North and cut off entirely from the center of life in the South. Unlike the rest of us strangers he could not get out. And we should remind ourselves that we kept him locked in during the years of the greatest industrial-urban expansion and wealth accumulation in the history of the world.

And let us not be overly proud that so many of us did achieve this passage into the open society without FEPC, or like they say, pulling ourselves up by the bootstraps while the Negro remained in his ghetto.

The best answer to this has come from a young Boston Irishman, the late John F. Kennedy. In an interview he granted me in June of 1963, he addressed himself to this idea. It was a brilliant insight, and I was permitted to quote him as follows:

"The Negro has no hope of subterfuge or pretense, he cannot change his name to alter his origins, nor can he change his religion, nor can he move from cities to isolated areas, the Negro needs legislation every step of the way and I hope to be able to give it to him."

These words coming from a young man, even though he was President of the United States, were tremendously impressive, they confirmed a truth which has come to many of us after 20 years of study.

The Negro must have legislation "every step of the way" because he is born not only into a desperate economic and social complex, but he must struggle against a psychological complex which demeans every American, white and Negro. We cannot help recognize the black man, and there are many whose recognition triggers terror, or contempt, or condescension, or paternalism, or fear. This is a conditioned psychological response that only reason dissipates, but there are many who are unreasoning. And do not let anyone tell you that law cannot do the job. There are Negroes working today in the carding rooms of the textile plants of my State, for the first time in history. This did not come about because the white mill workers were suddenly possessed of an overpowering love. It has come about because of Mr. Kennedy's equal employment directive. If you discriminate in employment you lose your Government contract.

And behind all of this are a few simple facts which in themselves are amazing in that they have so rarely been explored and yet they involve not only human dignity but human life itself. Because behind all of this law and sociology is the simple fact that in 1960, four Negro women died in childbirth for each white woman who died in childbirth; that Negro infant mortality was five times greater than white infant mortality; that tuberculosis which is twelfth as the cause of death among whites is second as the cause of death among Negroes, and these simple facts tell us the story of the locked-in Negro community within a civilization which is the most opulent on earth and which also considers itself the most Christian of all countries on earth.

I referred to race and immigration, but their relationship is close and we may reasonably consider both problems as central to the perpetuation of the American dream.

The McCarran-Walter Immigration Act, still on the books, admits 154,647 immigrants a year, under quotas based on the 1920 ratio of foreign born in the Nation's population. President Truman declared it discriminatory and inadequate for national needs, saying some deportation provisions were so vague as to allow "thought control."

When President Eisenhower urged revision of the restrictive measures of the act, the late Congressman Walter successfully guarded provisions allowing almost free access to the United States of immigrants from the Nordic and Anglo-Saxon countries and restricting the number from the Mediterranean, Middle Eastern, Balkan, Eastern European, and Asian countries.

Thus the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act permits those to come who are likely not to want to, and restricts those who do want to.

The restrictive features of the McCarran-Walter Act strikes me as paradoxical in a civilization professing Christianity. While we have no state church, one can say nevertheless, Christianity is an important factor in the life of most Americans.

Certainly what helped make Christianity a universal religion was that the early church recognized the value of the foreigner.

Pope Hildebrand believed the Gospel would be spread most effectively by missionaries as dissimilar to the people to whom they preach as possible. It was this Pope's deep understanding of the foreigner's vitality which led to establishing celibacy among the clergy around 1070. The clergy were thus made "strangers" in their surroundings and in its way the prohibition against marriage helped the church seal its tremendous political success.

More to the point is that we can relate the success of Christianity as a universal religion to the success of the United States as leader of the free world.

Christianity came at a time when travelers could go from Babylon to York without a passport. Think how this helped to spread an idea.

In the second and third centuries, the highways of Europe and Britain were filled with monks in black robes bearing crosses. By the time of St. Augustine, there already was a "McCarran-Walter Act" all over Europe but the missionary work had been sufficiently accomplished and Augustine was able to consolidate the great victory by "marrying" Christianity to the arts. Had there been no free movement, however, we have the right to conjecture that the people of the northern forests of Europe might have held on much longer to Wotan, the Anglo-Saxons might have taken Mithra to their hearts, the god they had borrowed for a time from the Roman legionnaires, and other peoples might have held on much longer to their gods who lived on mountain tops, in the trees, and in the oceans, rivers, and streams.

Christianity was quick to grasp the significance of the classical stranger in world history. Jesus was born in Bethlehem, a little town the great Greeks and the equally great Romans had never even heard of. And a mere handful of "strangers," Jews from Judea (St. Paul among them) were able to "conquer" the great Roman Empire with all its vast works and all its far-reaching institutions. They did it with an idea, but they also did it because they were "strangers."

In the United States as late as 1900, fewer than one-third of our people could trace their ancestry further than a native-born grandfather. Essentially we were all foreigners. Indeed, based on European standards, all Americans even today, in 1964, are foreigners, except the American Indian. What the freedom of movement in the first two centuries did for Christianity, the free access to the United States from its earliest beginnings to 1920 did for America—it made us.

When the Congress passed the first of its anti-immigration bills, one of the arguments to which it harkened was that the Italians came to America and worked here for 10 or 15 years, saved every nickel, and departed then for home. Congressmen even gave President Woodrow Wilson a carefully documented survey of how many millions of dollars this cost America, money which left here and entered Italy. President Wilson read this document, then vetoed the bill, saying, "Yes, but they left us the subways they built, didn't they"?

The immigrants, particularly the immigrants after the Civil War, gave America its gulf stream of vitality.

Why should this be? Is the "foreigner" better than the native? Of course not. In fact the foreigner or the stranger does not think himself as good as the native and it is this sense of inferiority, this hope to be like the native, that has given him this vitality through all history.

Just as the three great monastic orders in France were founded by a German, a Hungarian, and an Englishman, and Christianity was established in the Anglo-Saxon world by Italians and Spaniards, so were the great industrial, intellectual, and scientific institutions in America founded by foreigners from Scandinavia, Germany, Ireland, Britain, Italy, Poland, Russia, Hungary, Rumania, Austria, and all the other lands in the world, 43 million immigrants in 100 years from 70 different countries.

It is a vitality we may have lost since the first law restricting immigration passed over the veto of President Wilson in 1920. When we become comfortable in our environment and there are few challenges we lose some of our drive.

Another 50 years of "racial" and "ethnic" restrictions and we will all look like Davy Crockett. Not that Davy Crockett was bad looking, but he didn't look like the Swedish farmer in the Midwest or the Irish laborer laying the railroad ties or the Jewish medical student or the Polish ironworker or the Chinese merchant in San Francisco or the Italian restaurateur in Connecticut or for that matter, the Mohawk Indian who works in high steel.

Realistically, the "open door" policy is out of the question. But there are reasonable and providential revisions possible. And they are American. I refer to the proposals made by Senator PHILIP A. HART of Michigan. He asks for the total number of admissible immigrants to be one-seventh of 1 percent of the total population instead of one-sixth of 1 percent of the white population according to the 1920 census. He would revise the "national origins" quota system by a formula based on the relative population of the countries of the world.

The section of our country which is only now entering the industrial age is the old Confederate South; significantly, this is the one section that had no immigrants, no foreigners, no strangers. There was great comfort in the homogeneous society, yet today when the physicist and scientist appear before the Senate committee to discuss the matters which concern the welfare, security, and survival of the United States, some of them talk with a heavy accent. One or two even need an interpreter.

Lysander, Sparta's great man, was not a Spartan at all, nor was William who started Britain on her road to glory a Briton, nor was Disraeli who made Victoria Empress of India an Englishman. A man is no prophet in his own country. Every land in this world sends its preachers to its neighbor, and receives preachers in return. The millions of immigrants who came to America were "preachers" with a gospel, seeking what the Greeks called "the good life."

It is the immigrant, who, finding freedom and opportunity in America, tells us what it is.

Once we had a "peace corps" that cost us nothing. It was composed of foreigners who wrote "home" about America and linked us to every country, city, town, hamlet, and farmhouse in the world. Who else better extolled the American way of life, who praised liberty and proved the pursuit of happiness better than the "foreigner" who described to the folks behind his new job in Detroit or his butcher shop in Milwaukee?

The McCarran-Walter Act robbed us of this. But God is good to us. America's new vitality will now come from the Negro, who, striving to be like others, will make others define what it is they are, what it is they ought to be. This is America's good fortune to have always the marginal man struggling to get "in," struggling to prove himself, struggling to enter the open society and "become" like everyone else—as quickly as possible. By his use of Christianity as a weapon in his struggle for civil rights, the American Negro may have saved Christianity, or at least redeemed it for those religious fellowships, particularly in the South, who backed away from a moral issue. But the contribution of the American Negro will be equally great in providing the American civilization with the vitality which the classical "stranger" has always provided in his struggle to become part of the corporate whole.

Thank you for your invitation. I shall cherish the honor for the rest of my life.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 12318) to provide an equitable system for the classification of certain positions under the House of Representatives, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H.R. 2772. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Harley Brewer;

H.R. 6218. An act to amend the act of June 29, 1960, to authorize additional extensions of time for final proof by certain entrymen under the desert land laws and to make such additional extensions available to the successors in interest of such entrymen; and

H.R. 9124. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to vitalize the Reserve Officers' Training Corps programs of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, and for other purposes.

EQUITABLE SYSTEM FOR CLASSIFICATION OF CERTAIN POSITIONS UNDER THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the bill H.R. 12318, and I ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALTERS in the chair) laid before the Senate the bill (H.R. 12318) to provide an equitable system for the classification of certain positions under the House of Representatives, and for other purposes, which was read twice by its title.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill (H.R. 12318) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

NATIONAL AVIATION SYSTEM SYMPOSIUM

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, a unique symposium on our national aviation system took place on Wednesday and Thursday of this week at the Federal Aviation Agency here in Washington. This was the first time such a symposium has been held. The purpose of this meeting was to present what the FAA has been doing and what it plans to do for the future in the development of our national air space system. The meeting was attended by some of our Nation's leading figures in aviation. Presidents of our largest international and domestic airlines, president of our largest aircraft manufacturers and high officials in such Government agencies as NASA and the Department of Defense.

Mr. Halaby appropriately called this the "shareholders" meeting, because everyone in attendance is an active participant in our national air space system. Mr. Halaby is to be congratulated for his foresight in getting together this distinguished group of approximately 150 leaders in aviation. I am sure they have all profited from the 2 days they spent at the FAA and the FAA has undoubtedly gained from their comments which were offered at these meetings.

I believe the remarks which Mr. Halaby made at the symposium on our current national air space system and the future of aviation in 1965 will be of interest to all Members of Congress. I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Halaby's remarks printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF N. E. HALABY

It is a rare and stimulating pleasure for the FAA to host the leadership of the aviation community for the next 2 days. The 200 people in this room have great responsibility and great authority for maintaining and advancing aviation in the world of the sixties and seventies.

This shareholders meeting, which I hope will become an annual event with the FAA reporting on the problems and progress of the previous fiscal year and the prospects for the forthcoming fiscal year, was suggested by my recent reading of several of your annual reports. It seemed to me that in a very real sense all of you and those whom you represent and employ are truly shareholders in the American airspace. Each of you holds stock in the national aviation system. Therefore, I feel, we will find it helpful to meet together over both problems and prospects.

This is the 6th year of the jet age; it is also the 6th year of the Federal Aviation Agency and the 26th year of the Civil Aeronautics Act. In this relatively short period we have come a long way in our pursuit of aviation improvements. Usually industry, labor, and Government have been together. Only infrequently has there been diversity and controversy—fortunately.

Our purposes today and tomorrow are these: First, to review very briefly the lessons of the past 6 years with particular reference to last year. Second, to look ahead to next year and, using that as a backdrop, to attempt to preview as far as 1975.

Today we will talk about the recent past and the present. Tomorrow the future. Thursday night we would like to feel that you will go back to your offices and homes feeling that for the first time all of the diverse and competing, yet mutually related factors in the national aviation system have been discussed. In other words, that you have met and you have been consulted over your airspace.

We also hope that, as the principal users of the Government services which the FAA provides, you will have a better understanding of what the Agency is and isn't, and what its programs can and cannot do for you and your members and customers.

Finally, we feel that this is a unique opportunity for you to pause for 48 hours and take a 360° look at aviation's horizon. If you are an airline dispatcher, you see one segment of this broad, many-dimensioned airspace. If you are a pilot, another, a mechanic, still another. If you are a manager, you look at it more broadly perhaps, but not the same as the military pilot or commander. If you are a private pilot and your whole fleet is one airplane and your entire route system is from grass strip into town, you have quite a different view from that of the airline or military pilot.

We in the FAA are required by law to look at the whole, to see the broad public interest, and in doing so not only to regulate but to promote aviation. This is not easy. But I have tried, in my own way, to seek and maintain a proper but dynamic balance of interests.

For these two days, I hope we can confer not just as regulators and regulated but as searchers for answers to mutual problems. My conclusion, after almost 4 years, is that if we look at aviation from the point of view of the traveler and the neighbor of the airplane, we come closer to that elusive standard we pursue, the "public interest."

Of course the many diverse and competing views which propel this system, and sometimes bedevil it, are held by the most individualistic and dedicated hard-driving group of men and women in any industry in the world. This driving spirit of competition exists not only between companies but between individuals. And this, of course, accounts for the rapid growth of the aviation industry as well as the controversies among its leaders.

I have accounted for the varied interests and views of the public we serve. But we in FAA also serve, and are served by, our board of directors—the Congress of the United States, 535 strong.

We see the general public, the taxpayers, as well as the aviation community which you represent, as our shareholders. And, we feel that we are the executive management—the hired hands of the airspace, if you will. On the other hand, the Government segment of the aviation community must not only share responsibility with you but there is certain authority which we must at times exercise against you. In other words, in its wisdom the Congress has decreed that the marketplace does not provide the sole regulation. The people, through the Congress, state that they want Government as well as competition to control aviation. As Government we must wield authority and responsibility and we do, and we will continue to do so to the best of our abilities. But in doing so, we not only desire to consort with you, but have learned that we can enjoy it without relinquishing any of the authority vested in us by the people of the United States.

Let us now look at the system and describe the environment in which we fly.

You see on this chart the three general categories of flying. The military operate some 25,000 aircraft from mach 3 down to zero speed and from 85,000 feet down to the surface of the water. There were 18.8 million military flight operations last year—IFR, VFR, night and day, domestic and international.

The second category is air carrier aviation with approximately 2,100 airliners carrying 50 billion passenger miles and conducting about 7.7 million operations per year.

The third category is general aviation, involving some 85,000 aircraft flying some 46.9 million operations.

Within this national aviation system there are some 350,000 or 400,000 pilots—roughly 15–20,000 air carrier pilots, 300,000 general aviation pilots and perhaps 50–60,000 military pilots. Not all of these pilots are active and fortunately not all of them are active at any one time. They fly a variety of missions, all the way from very high speed test runs at mach 3 to the student acrobatic flights in very congested areas of Florida and Texas.

There are some 8,000 airports in the United States, only 600 of them receive air carrier service and about 70 are jetports. There are numerous military bases and thousands of small airstrips.

Let me describe the plant—the environment which contains all of this activity.

The FAA operates 168,000 thousand miles of airways with 19,000 traffic controllers supported by about 15,000 systems maintenance people. They operate the national airspace system. We believe it has a capacity of handling about 4,000 aircraft at any one time. Last year our towers, 278 of them, handled nearly 33 million operations. We estimate about 36,500,000 this year and 38 million in fiscal 1966.

As shareholders and as taxpayers I think you would be interested in the nature of your investment. It is about $1,150 million and the unit costs are spread in the following way. The 21 air route traffic control centers cost $105 million. The 191 radars in our system cost $335 million. The 278 towers cost $90 million. And, the 330 flight service stations cost $110 million.

In terms of the use of the airspace, the military use about 30 percent of the airspace services we provide and the civil account for about 70 percent.

As you know, the facilities provided have greatly increased so that, since 1958, the primary air navigation facilities for navigation and communications have increased by almost 3,100 units or 67 percent. Just since I came into office we have added 57 towers, 37 long-range radars, 76 new approach light systems, 73 new instrument landing systems, and 111 more VOR and VORTAC navigation aids.

The number of airports which have been added new in the past 5 years is 176 and 134 more are now under construction. The number improved is 888. So, we have a plant worth approximately a billion and a quarter.

Now, each of you knows about his own organization and I think a word about the one of which I am currently chief executive officer is appropriate at this point. Not that we wish to make a budget pitch to you because we do not.

However, I would like to point out what this organization has been and what it is.

When I took over in the spring of 1961, the Agency was highly centralized, operating 545 field installations from 8 line bureaus here in Washington. It was deployed in approximately 13 different buildings within this city and such operating decisions as authorizing an obstruction at the Los Angeles Airport, made their way here for decision. The thing that disturbed me most was that the key staff had projected an increase from approximately 44,000 employees to 57,000 employees by 1965. I recognized that the population had trebled in the CAA/FAA since 1954 but I could not believe that this Agency should be expanded to 57,000 people. The spending in 1961 too was projected at nearly a billion dollars or $902 million for 1965.

I immediately moved to reduce the projections by decentralizing the operation—in other words, reducing overhead—and by demanding a high rate of increase in employee productivity each year, reasoning that as our new employees gained in experience we could expect more work from them.

As a result, the rate of growth has been completely arrested and we are now, for the first time, leveled off at about 45,800 positions. In the decentralization we also reduced the Washington staff from 3,700 to the present 3,200 and made employment reductions in research and development and other areas.

To my great pleasure and pride, I can tell you that we have some very, very fine people in FAA. We have tried hard to put our most competent people in the positions of greatest responsibility, and we have here today, the first team. About 19 of these key men were brought in by me, a fourth by General Quesada and 17 are career men. I have delegated—as many of you have done to division managers—very important responsibility and authority to the regional directors in New York, Atlanta, Fort Worth, Los Angeles, Honolulu, Anchorage, Kansas City and London.

We also have two major field centers. One is the aeronautical center at Oklahoma City where we have our supply depot, training academy and medical research institute. We have 4,500 people there. Our research and development center is located in Atlantic City and we have about 1,000 employees there.

FAA employees are productive people. They are experienced people. One reason is that the turnover is the lowest in Government, for any major agency, as low as 3½ percent among our controllers. The increase of productivity per year among controllers is now almost 5 percent. For systems maintenance technicians, it exceeds 5 percent. This is a record which I would challenge any corporation to match in similar categories of operations.

I would like to touch on appropriations very briefly. This past year, for the first time in the history of the FAA, the Agency requested less money than in previous years. Despite this, as you know, we got a whacking cut of $30 million for our efforts to present the tightest budget yet.

Well, we have covered considerable ground here and I would just like to mention one rather sour note. I doubt you would like any more than I presiding over an organization whose annual expenses are three quarters of a billion dollars and whose annual revenues are only about $150 million derived from the 5 percent airline ticket tax and the 2 cents tax per gallon of aviation gasoline. Any outfit that collects only 20 percent of its costs is bound to be in trouble. Fortunately, the profit and loss statements for a Government agency is not this rigorous, and, of course, we must attribute a large share of this cost to national security for facilitating military operations, I would say roughly one-third and a large share of public protection in general.

It costs us $450 million to operate the national airspace system, and we take in only $150 million from the aircraft using the system. We have recovered one-third of our costs in tax revenue. Thus, if we are recovering only $150 million out of an annual operation and maintenance cost of $450 million, we have $300 million uncovered. I think it is fair to attribute approximately $200 million of this to national security and public protection, just as we build our defenses and as we build dams, dredge rivers for flood control and other public protective purposes. That still leaves $100 million that easily can be attributed to the users and month after month, budget after budget, I must explain to the Budget Director and a number of very thoughtful and dedicated men in the Congress why the aviation industry should be so favored.

Just to compound my felony, I am told that to this FAA cost should be added the $90 million of CAB costs and $25 million of NASA costs to bring the total "subsidy" to the national aviation system to about a billion dollars, only $150 million of which is recovered directly in fuel taxes. And even through corporate income taxes on aviation are very substantial they are no different from those paid by other industries with no such substantial subsidy.

Now gentlemen, I think we have a problem, and the sooner we face it and solve it rather than fight it year after year, I think the better off we will all be, and I think the healthier we'll all feel, as well.

In winding up this introduction, I should tell you that I think we have come a long way but we've got some very serious additional problems facing us. First is the flight safety record. It's good, but not good enough. Second is the problem of noise and public anxiety. Then, airport accessibility. As urbanization of population expands around the airport, it's less and less desirable to go by air, from one metropolitan area to another metropolitan area, unless the flight time saving is very substantial. Next, I think we have very serious problems coming up in aircraft development: the short-haul transport, the metropolitan plane, probably VSTOL, as well as the supersonic transport. Finally, I think you men who have been dependent upon MATS contracts have a very serious shifting of gears to do as the C–141 fleet builds up and perhaps added to that, the CX–HLS, capable of carrying 600 seats.

I guess all of our problems could be summed up in this fashion. Minimize fears and fares, and maximize public service with economy.

In the last 4 years, I feel this industry has had an impressive era of growth. There has been good cooperation between industry, labor, and Government. The number of man-years lost, by the way, due to strikes, is unbelievably low. In fact, last year I believe it was less than 10 days.

Most dramatic, of course, was the air carrier economic recovery, zooming from the worst deficit in its history to the highest profit levels.

Also for these 4 years we have had the best consecutive string of annual safety records in the history of civil aviation. The carriers and general aviation flew more miles last year than at any time in history and they were about the safest miles. The U.S. commercial safety record is at least three times as good as the ICAO world average record.

All of you contributed to this great record for which we can take some encouragement but not any complacent satisfaction.

AVIATION IN 1975

During the past 6 months, we in the FAA have been involved in what I consider to be one of our most important projects—articulating the policies and goals which will guide the Agency through 1975. In these aviation goals, we are trying to achieve a balance between the Nation's needs and the Nation's capability for meeting those needs. We are also developing a long-range planning process to help insure that we achieve our goals.

This means that we shall have a document which sets out in comprehensive form the policies which guide the FAA in the accomplishment of its missions and its relationships with you, its shareholders of the airspace. Not only will such a policy statement serve as a guide in decisionmaking and help insure consistency within the Agency, but it will provide those with whom the FAA deals a better understanding of the philosophy behind our actions and our regulations.

Such an understanding is particularly significant for a regulatory agency such as the FAA, which must achieve compliance with its regulations by primary reliance upon a force of enlightened self-interest and a sense of public responsibility, and by secondary reliance upon an enforcement program which is fair, fast, consistent, and effective.

It is equally important that you, the shareholders, be aware of the goals the Agency is seeking to achieve. These goals will determine the programs we undertake and, in turn, will determine both the kind of service and the level of service which we offer the public and the aviation community.

We are proud of the fact that the United States is the world leader in aviation—that aircraft of U.S. manufacture set the standards of safety, reliability and economy throughout the world; that American-made avionics equipment is unsurpassed; that we have a domestic and international air transportation system second to none in the world; that our system of air traffic control and navigation is unequalled; and most important of all that the air traveler on U.S. air carriers is the safest air traveler in the world.

Our position of leadership is the product of dedication and hard work on the part of people like you. We, in the FAA, intend to do everything we can to guarantee that the United States remains the world leader.

Our policies and our goals must recognize this responsibility. In setting our goals, it has been necessary to identify the most important problems we will be facing in the future. Undoubtedly, the most serious problem confronting the world for the remainder of this century, aside from maintaining world peace, is the population explosion. The present world population is 3.2 billion. In ten years it will be over 4 billion, and by the year 2000 there will be 7 billion. The United States will feel the press of population growth, but to a somewhat lesser extent than the rest of the world.

The two other most serious problems confronting the United States in the years ahead are automation and the existence of the industrial-military complex.

Automation will increase productivity immeasurably, making many things possible which had heretofore been beyond the realm of man's capability and even his imagination, and remove the drudgery and the time-consuming human effort required to perform many necessary tasks. At the same time, automation poses a serious threat to our society unless we are able to make the necessary changes in our social, economic and political institutions to cope with the fact of man's changing role in his society. As a Nation, we must demonstrate the wisdom and the imagination necessary to utilize the benefits of automation without becoming engulfed in a sea of unemployment.

The requirements of national security have led to the development of a system which draws to it the best of the Nation's research talent as well as the best of its managerial capabilities. The demands of wars and cold wars, the tremendous quantities of money involved in military programs, the magnitude of our efforts in space all have combined to produce a military-industrial complex whose growth and direction have been determined not by market forces but by demands of national defense and national prestige. This has lead to an increasing dependence of the civilian sector of our economy on the technological fall-out of military and space programs. In many cases, the result has been a far different allocation of resources than would otherwise have taken place with much more rapid rates of growth and development in those sectors of the civilian economy which have been able to utilize directly or indirectly the benefits of our vast defense expenditures.

In the coming years there will be a strong temptation to use more and more governmental actions to insure the rapid introduction of technological advances. Clearly, there is an important role for Government in research and development and, of course, we must find ways to make the benefits of technology available rapidly. However, we must be very stringent in our demands that there be ample justification for any departure from the normal market mechanism. We must be sure that governmental activity is confined to those areas where there is not an adequate private substitute.

These problems—the population explosion, automation and the existence of the industrial-military complex—will be with us for the indefinite future. Certainly the first two can be expected to become progressively more serious. A failure to cope with any one of the three adequately may well prove disastrous.

Aviation is closely related to each of these problems. Each of the three will increase the demands which are already being made on the aviation industry but at the same time, the proper use of aviation technology can contribute significantly to our ability to meet the challenges ahead.

For many problems, air transportation offers a sound hope for building a social, economic and political system that can begin to both keep pace with population growth and support the demands of economic growth and development. Aviation also offers new ways of meeting traditional problems which will exist on a much larger scale with considerably less total investment than would be required by traditional means.

The rapidly advancing technology of aviation holds out great promise of bringing to the unparalleled speed and flexibility of aviation a remarkable element of operating economy; $100 fares from New York to Paris and 5 cents per-ton-mile cargo rates will come in relatively few years. There is no doubt of that.

What is far more important in terms of the problems of the United States and of the world, however, is the fact that aviation technology is just now on the threshold of developments which will provide capabilities greatly in excess of these. Innovations in aerodynamics, improved propulsion systems and fuel properties, and the development of new metals and other materials will produce performance characteristics and operating economies which will allow aviation solutions to entire ranges or problems where aviation has never been a factor before.

The implications of advanced aviation technology are vitally important to the less-developed countries of the world. Air transportation can, in effect, solve problems of mountain ranges, impenetrable jungles, deserts, and unbridgeable river complexes. We have already seen examples of this in Latin America, Asia, and the Near East.

But the less-developed countries are by no means the only ones that stand to benefit from the coming revolution in aviation technology. In the United States, for example, it may well be that the only possible solution to the urban transportation problem will be an aviation solution. There will be great strides in normal intercity operations and in city-center to city-center air transport.

Automation will provide greater reliability at lower cost in many aspects of aviation. Advanced navigation equipment, all-weather landing systems, and better aircraft themselves are just a few illustrations of the benefits we can expect.

Automation will also mean more free time for larger numbers of people. The availability of safe, low-cost air transportation will broaden the choices available to the population in general and allow them to make more profitable and more enjoyable use of their leisure. Aviation will also make a wider range of products available in markets throughout the world at greatly reduced prices, improving the choices available to the individual in his role as a consumer. Just as the emerging nations will need expanded markets for their products, the developed countries will have to find markets for their greater productive capacity generated by automation.

If we are to solve the problems of the future and use our knowledge to improve the lot of mankind, we cannot approach them with what Kingman Brewster, the president of Yale, has characterized as "the needlepoint mentality of a bond house lawyer." We must approach them boldly—with imagination—with enthusiasm—and with a deep and sincere feeling for the human values involved.

In more specific terms, we must consider the general economic environment in the United States and the population problem in terms of size, distribution, and the important sociological factors. Looking at the United States, we see a population of 226 million by 1975. The steady trend toward urbanization will continue and by 1975 over 75 percent of our people will live in urban areas. There will be 30 metropolitan areas with a population of 1 million or more. Many of these large metropolitan areas will gradually join to form megalopoli.

The gross national product will increase from $600 billion to well over $900 billion by 1975. Increased productivity will mean higher family incomes and a generally rising standard of living. Per capita disposable income is expected to increase by at least 30 percent and shorter workweeks and extended vacations will mean more leisure time for large segments of the population.

In the light of this, we must consider what the needs of air transportation will be in the decade ahead and what should be the role of the aviation's community in meeting these needs.

It is immediately obvious that an increased number of vehicles, diversified in type and in deployment, will be needed to solve our air transportation problem. The Nation must look first to its aviation industry to see that new technology is used in supplying vehicles matched to our changing requirements. The FAA must have a thorough understanding of the Nation's air transport problems in light of our total transportation system. In those cases where private industry alone is unwilling or unable to use the technology to produce the needed vehicles, the Government must be prepared to act—but only to the extent necessary to see that the Nation's requirements are met.

In speaking of vehicles, I refer to the entire spectrum, from SST's to V/STOL's and, I include both general aviation and the air carriers.

In our developing complex of urban communities, new air vehicles will not serve to provide effective air transportation without an appropriate system of airports. The FAA is developing a national plan for a system of airports to meet these future needs. The problem of access to these airports from the communities they service will depend on better solutions to urban ground transportation problems. It is an established fact that the technology of air transportation is far more advanced than the technology of other modes. While all of us in aviation should be proud of our progress, we can not afford to sit back and watch the effectiveness of our air transportation system being strangled by inadequate airport access.

We anticipate at least a 40-percent increase in flight activity by 1975. To support this increase in traffic with its new vehicles and its system of airports, we must have a National Airspace System to move the vehicles safely and efficiently.

As of today we have introduced only a small amount of automation into a system that remains basically manual. Now we are at the threshold of a major program to automate our air route traffic control centers. Before 1975, we expect to see automation not only of the entire en route system but also of all significant terminal areas. This will include automatic processing and distribution of flight plans, automatic radar and radar beacon tracking, the automatic association of these tracks with flight plans, and automatic coordination of flight information by the controllers within a facility and between facilities.

The aviation weather subsystem will be developed to a point where it can truly meet the needs of all aviation users and will be fully automated. Terminal area operations will benefit significantly from complete all-weather landing, and airport capacity will be increased through automated sequencing and control of each aircraft.

Through these applications, we can expect significant improvement in safety along with greater dependability in air transportation.

The future of our air transportation depends upon the combined efforts of all the aviation shareholders. I would like to discuss some aviation goals which can be achieved only by the support and impetus of the entire aviation community.

It is in the national interest to see the products of our entire aviation industry sold to the other nations of the world. But we are not interested in just selling hardware. Our responsibility as a world leader, our national prestige, and indeed our national security require us to promote the use of our concepts, techniques and procedures of managing an airspace and an airport system. While there has been some progress toward this goal in the past, I do not feel that the United States is as far along this path as our changing world requires.

In my opinion, our most important domestic goal is the establishment of a truly effective air transportation system. In terms that the traveling public can understand, this means the connection of any two population centers within the United States by a door-to-door travel time of not more than 8 hours. Obviously, such a system will require the dedicated efforts not only of the entire aviation community but also of those who are developing an integrated ground transportation system.

Finally, there is an overriding goal which must be uppermost in the minds of everyone. None of the accomplishments I have already discussed will be possible if they are not accompanied by improvements in air safety and, here, primary reliance must be on the aviation community itself. The greatest strides in aviation safety will always be the result of voluntary actions on the part of manufacturers, carriers, pilots and mechanics and airport operators. The Government's role must be one of guiding, assisting and monitoring. Only in the last analysis should it take direct enforcement actions. Only through an acceptance of this responsibility by all members of the aviation community will we be able to achieve and maintain the level of safety which the public has every right to expect from aviation.

It is important that we all understand where aviation is going in the future. But understanding alone is not enough. No one segment of the aviation community, neither in the Government nor in the private sector, has the resources, the capability or the authority to achieve these goals unaided. It is only through the combined and concerted efforts of all shareholders that our goals for air transportation will be realized in the decade ahead.

RECESS UNTIL 5 O'CLOCK THIS AFTERNOON

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess until 5 o'clock this afternoon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(At 3 o'clock and 55 minutes p.m., the Senate took a recess until 5 o'clock p.m. today.)

At 5 o'clock p.m., the Senate reassembled, and was called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. AIKEN in the chair).

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR EDMONDSON, OF OKLAHOMA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is with regret that we bid goodbye to Senator J. HOWARD EDMONDSON, of Oklahoma, who joined our ranks less than a year ago. Senator EDMONDSON served as Oklahoma's youngest chief executive before coming to the Senate and was notably well prepared to fill the place left by his predecessor, the late Senator Robert Kerr. He has served admirably and with distinction.

Those who have served on the Agriculture and Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committees with Senator EDMONDSON can attest to his abilities and his insights. He has been one of the hardest working young Senators and has earned a special place in the hearts of his colleagues.

I wish him well. We know that his service to the people of Oklahoma and the United States is not over, but that he will continue to give of his great capacity with the same sincerity and dedication that has marked his career in public service since its inception in 1953.

RECESS SUBJECT TO CALL OF THE CHAIR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

At 5 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m. the Senate took a recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

At 5 o'clock and 21 minutes p.m. the Senate reconvened and was called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. MCINTYRE in the Chair).

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business for the consideration of a number of nominations which have been reported by the Committee on the Judiciary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Eugene C. Patterson, of Georgia, to be a member of the Commission on Civil Rights.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

U.S. MARSHAL

The legislative clerk read the nomination of James F. Delaney, of Pennsylvania, to be a U.S. Marshal for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania for the term of 4 years.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

BOARD OF PAROLE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Charlotte Paul Groshell, of Washington, to be a member of the Board of Parole.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

U.S. ATTORNEY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Jon O. Newman, of Connecticut, to be a U.S. Attorney for the District of Connecticut for the term of 4 years.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

THE ECONOMIC SITUATION IN BRAZIL

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, before the Senate adjourns sine die, I wish to make a few brief remarks on Brazil. I make them in my capacity as chairman of the Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and I make them also because at the beginning of the present regime in Brazil I expressed on the floor of the Senate some skeptical views as to whether or not the new administration in Brazil would follow constitutional processes. I said at the time that I hoped it would. I was critical of the fact that it exercised a power which, of course, would not be tolerated in the United States, namely, denying continuation in office of people freely elected to that office, even though the party in power might not be sympathetic with the views of those officeholders.

However, it is always a mistake for us to insist that exactly the same procedures of the democratic process must exist everywhere else in the world in order to have us view with approval the accomplishments of a given administration. I have watched the Brazilian situation very carefully, and I am satisfied that the Brazilian administration at the present time is characterized to a remarkable degree by democratic process in keeping with the constitutional powers granted to any administration in Brazil. It is also making an attempt to check the inflationary spiral in that country. The leaders of that Government, I am sure, would be the first to say that they still have a long way to go.

One of the first steps taken by the new Brazilian Government to cope with the deteriorating economic situation, which it inherited, was to reestablish negotiations with the major creditor governments of the country to obtain help in alleviating severe balance of payments difficulties. As a consequence of arrangements worked out with the creditors, Brazil obtained substantial foreign debt relief in 1964 and 1965 of approximately $300 million.

Of course, the United States and its taxpayers are foremost among the creditors to whom payment was postponed.

The growing Federal budget deficit was quickly identified as one of the prime causes of rapidly increasing inflation and the new Government has taken concrete measures to cut back sharply Federal expenditures and to increase revenues. As a consequence of these measures, in addition to eliminating costly import subsidies on wheat and petroleum, the government estimates that it will be able to reduce the 1964 budget deficit to approximately Cr$750 billion, compared to a deficit of roughly Cr$1.3 trillion which would have arisen under the budget inherited from the previous administration had the new Government not moved rapidly. The authorities are fully aware of the continued need to make further reductions in spending both during the current and coming years. In real terms, the budget deficits presently forecast for 1964 and 1965 are expected to be less than in 1963. Furthermore, the entire format of the budget is being recast along the lines employed in many other countries; this is expected to permit a clearer definition in future of the uses of available resources and in overall economic planning.

One of the primary goals of the Government is to attract greater foreign private investment and to that end legislation to amend the highly restrictive profits remittance law, which had resulted in a sharp decline in foreign investment since 1962, was submitted to the Congress. It was signed into law by the President on August 31, thereby removing one of the principal deterrents to foreign private investment. The new law has been generally welcomed by investors abroad.

During the past few years, Brazil has handicapped its exports by highly unrealistic, overvalued foreign exchange rates. On September 2, it was announced that the exchange rate would be permitted to fluctuate freely, which resulted in an immediate de facto devaluation which will have a significant effect in stimulating exports and increasing foreign exchange earnings.

During the brief period since the establishment of the Government, strenuous efforts have been directed toward the preparation of a comprehensive economic action program for 1964–66, to achieve the triple goals of stabilization, development and reform. A preliminary program has now been completed which envisages the acceleration of economic growth, social welfare, agrarian reform, correction of chronic budget deficits, creation of new jobs, gradual containment of inflation, encouragement of foreign investment and numerous other highly constructive measures, which represent real progress in the efforts of the authorities to come to grips with their extremely difficult economic and financial problems.

I cannot begin to express the extent of my high commendation for this program of domestic reform in Brazil.

As I have said before, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] and I at the Conference at Bogotá and later at the Punta del Este Conference, sought to point out to the delegates that the Alliance for Progress had no hope for success unless the Latin American countries had a cooperative program, rather than depending on a program of unilateral aid from the United States to Latin America.

At the recent Conference of the Organization of American States in Washington, D.C., I was greatly encouraged by the position taken by the Foreign Minister of Brazil, and the information I obtained from the Brazilian delegation, as to the great strides forward they are making in the whole field of economic reform in Brazil. I think it augurs very well for the future of Brazil.

In order to meet the existing housing shortage, a housing bill has been submitted to, and approved by, Congress. In essence, the bill establishes a National Housing Bank and provides for a mechanism to make available resources for low-cost housing construction.

I think they are well on their way to implementing the principles of a building and loan association approach, which, under the Alliance for Progress program, is going along with great, successful strides in such countries as Chile, Venezuela, Colombia, and Peru. We see great hopes for its development also in Bolivia. Now we have this additional evidence of the strides that are being made for the improvement of housing conditions in Brazil by making available to low-income people an opportunity to own the roofs over their heads through the program of a National Housing Bank to which I have just referred.

Brazil's independent and constructive posture in the field of international relations has recently been clearly manifested in international forums and was referred to by the President of Brazil in a foreign policy speech which he delivered to the graduating students of Brazil's foreign service school. He referred to the many common interests and ties between the United States and Brazil and to Brazil's commitment to the Western democratic system. He also spoke of free enterprise and the orderly encouragement of private capital, its tradition of inter-American solidarity, his confidence that our two nations "can join their economic and commercial interests on a plane of honorable policy and friendly reciprocity." His fundamental observation that interdependence is essential to the preservation of independence applies equally today to the United States or to any country which seeks to achieve for its citizens a free and prosperous way of life.

I highly commend the Government of Brazil for the progress it has been making on the several fronts I have mentioned in this brief speech, but we should keep in mind the fact that we have obligations to perform, too, if we are to maintain good faith as a partner in implementing the Alliance for Progress program.

It is a matter of great disappointment to me that the Congress has not faced the importance of seeing that the coffee agreement was approved before adjournment. We must face the fact that some of our Latin American allies are dependent for economic stability in large measure upon the exportation of one or two commodities. Those are so-called raw material commodities. They are not manufactured goods.

It pains me to listen to Members of Congress seek to take political advantage of our neighbors to the south of us by opposing a coffee agreement which we solemnly entered into, which we urged others to enter into, for the purpose of stabilizing the price of coffee.

Unless one or two or three commodity products of our Latin American allies can be stabilized, so far as export prices are concerned, we are only wasting our money in foreign aid to Latin America. We can pour millions of dollars into Latin America through the Alliance for Progress program, and by a few cents' change in the price structure of some commodity on which the economy of a country is largely dependent, as in the case of Brazil, whose economy is in large measure dependent upon the export price of coffee, we shall have wasted the taxpayers' money made available under the Alliance for Progress program.

Through the coffee agreement, we were seeking to stabilize the price of coffee, to at least build a floor under which the price of coffee could not go. Such stabilization is necessary for the economic stability of a country such as Brazil, and some 14 other Latin American countries whose economies are dependent in no small part upon coffee prices.

It pains me to hear politicians in our country wring their hands over a possible increase of a few cents a pound in the price of coffee and make their plea to the housewives of America. That may be good vote-getting technique, but let me say, quite frankly, that the housewives of America have some responsibility of citizen statesmanship in these troublous times.

Although it does not follow that the coffee agreement would result in a substantial increase in the price of coffee in this country, I am perfectly willing to say on the floor that I would not be greatly concerned if it resulted in a slight increase in the cost of coffee of 2 or 3 or 4 cents a pound. That is not going to break the housewives of America. Most of those wives pay more than that increase for lipstick. Important as that is, they buy a good many items on which they might save. That is true—and I submit it is true—if the stabilization of so-called raw material production would, in the long run, mean hundreds of millions of dollars to the economy of the United States.

Certainly, I prefer it to the continual advance of money we are sending to Brazil under foreign aid, even as we reschedule old debt she cannot repay.

Do not forget that this country exports a great deal to Latin America. Do not forget that we export finished products, manufactured goods. Do not forget that the prices of American goods shipped into Latin America during the past 10 years have increased manifold over the increase in the price of any natural raw material product Latin America ships into the United States.

When we attend international conferences in Latin America, that fact is made very clear to us, and right into our teeth. It is pointed out that we are in no position to be complaining about whatever increase in price a stabilization program such as represented by the coffee agreement might result in, in connection with their raw materials. Do not forget that we are the beneficiaries of the increased prices of finished products that the United States ships into Latin America. We cannot have it both ways and maintain friendly relations with Latin America.

It has been very interesting to hear some concern expressed today as to whether or not some Latin American countries will turn, to a greater degree, to trade with France. Those comments have been made in connection with General de Gaulle's visit to Latin America. It can be put down for a certainty that that is where they are going to turn if we continue to exploit their raw materials by insisting that they come into this country at prices so low that the results will be to cause depressions and unemployment and low income for their people.

For some years on the floor of the Senate the senior Senator from Oregon has supported what is a very unpopular cause, but we will come to it. It is only a matter of time. Eventually, if we are to maintain trade relations with Latin America, we shall have to develop a common market, or else we shall lose Latin America, and Latin America will turn toward Europe.

I hope that in the next session of Congress we shall come to grips with the type of economic problem that is raised by such proposals as the coffee agreement. That is not the only agreement we ought to be working out to stabilize prices. We shall not be able to go into international conferences through the Organization of American States and expect to receive the good will of Latin American countries, as we seek to solve mutual problems, if we continue to supply the evidence that they are accumulating of a policy that is, in fact, economic discrimination against Latin America.

I hope we shall take advantage of the present favorable climate which exists between the United States and Latin American countries, created in no small measure by two past great Presidents of the United States. Franklin D. Roosevelt inaugurated his good-neighbor policy. Many of the points that I made this afternoon were embodied in the good-neighbor policy of Franklin D. Roosevelt. He recognized that we must work out a broad understanding with our Latin American friends in connection with the raw material goods that we buy from Latin America at low prices when we expect them to buy our manufactured goods at high prices. We shall not be able to work that game much longer and have economic allies to the south of us.

The late beloved Jack Kennedy envisioned and promulgated the Alliance for Progress program. That program is based not only on cooperation, and not only on a program of self-help, which Senator HICKENLOOPER and I proposed to our Latin American allies at the Bogotá Conference, when we pointed out to them in that Conference that there could be congressional support for the development of a mutual program of economic reciprocity provided they would be cooperating partners engaged in self help, and expressed it further at Punta del Este. President Kennedy, in promulgating his Alliance for Progress program, also made it clear that a principle of mutuality and reciprocity was involved in the matter of developing trade relations between the United States and Latin America.

I know the powerful lobbies that exist whenever an attempt is made to seek to arrive at a trade agreement with Latin America that will make it possible for those countries to develop a system of economic self-reliance, or to develop a system of economic security. The United States will have to be willing to pay more for the raw materials that we import from Latin America.

I note that the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] has just entered the Chamber. I should like to close my comments on the economic problems with regard to Latin America by pointing out that his program, which he and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] have been pressing on the Senate for the past 2 years, and of which I have been in support, is designed to strengthen the economy of Latin America. We must encourage the Latin Americans and welcome, by way of cooperative effort, American investment in their economic resources—the development of the technology, and technical know-how, so that they can manufacture a substantial amount of the goods they must export in trade, so they can develop some of their own raw materials into manufactured goods. That will not result in the loss of jobs in the United States.

As the Senator from New York and the Senator from Minnesota pointed out time and time again, it will create a healthy economic climate in Latin America. A healthy economic climate there will create a demand for goods, because in that way there will be built up purchasing power, and that purchasing power will create a market for our own goods far in excess of anything that most people have imagined thus far.

That is another reason why Senators have heard the senior Senator from Oregon urge favorable consideration of a Common Market approach to the economic relations between the United States and Latin America.

Before Congress adjourns, I wished to speak these words of commendation to the present administration in Brazil, so far as its economic effort is concerned, and to wish it well, and to express the hope that my own country, come January, will be more cooperative than it has been to date in respect to a coffee agreement.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I have listened with great interest to the Senator from Oregon. I have heard him before on this subject. It is interesting and exciting to me that the Senator, who has a very interesting and sympathetic relationship to the great Senators who have served in this Chamber, and who has a real sense of identification with those who fought against predatory interests, to the point that it is almost a Populist tradition which the Senator carries in his character, especially coming from where he does, and a person like myself, who has had big business experience, who has a certain sense of the industrial processes, the banking processes, and the credit processes, and knows how they work, and who sees how the fundamental thrust of business in the public interest as the hope of mankind can best be realized through the stock corporation, and multiple ownership, which it makes possible. We have come almost unconsciously to that kind of consensus. This is to me one of the exciting aspects of my service in the Senate. I wanted the Senator from Oregon to know how good I felt about it.

Mr. MORSE. I appreciate very much the position the Senator has taken. It has been unanswerable. We cannot fly in in the face of facts. The Senator from New York has presented to this body time and time again economic facts that confront us with regard to our problems in Latin America that we cannot run away from. Some of our colleagues have tried to run away from them, because they are taking a provincial attitude.

If we are to beat communism in Latin America—and the battle is nip and tuck—we must build up institutions of economic freedom. Those institutions are related to individuals. Without individuals, it is worthless. We must do what we can, through the type of program the Senator from New York and the Senator from Minnesota have been emphasizing, to help Latin America set up what I am perfectly willing to call a system of private enterprise in Latin America. I keep referring to it as a system of economic freedom. That is what private enterprise is.

Unless people first can be economically free, they can never be politically free. So long as we permit a situation in Latin America that maintains millions of people in economic serfdom, we have victimized them with the danger of communism. That is why I am protesting on this little segment today. I am protesting the failure on our part to end this session with the coffee agreement an accomplished fact. I am protesting our failure to implement to a greater degree than we have this feature of the Alliance for Progress program.

My colleagues on the Committee on Foreign Relations know that they could have had an enthusiastic ally if they had cut out the millions of dollars of waste in military aid in the foreign aid bill and placed those millions of dollars in economic aid, for investment in specific projects that would have helped the masses of people living in the economic environment of those projects. I was willing at one point in the foreign aid discussions in the Committee on Foreign Relations to agree to have every dollar that was cut from military aid added to economic aid. Much of the military aid that is being given is worthless, so far as bringing freedom to the people of Latin America is concerned. The sad part is that so much of our military aid reduces the amount of freedom because it builds up a powerful military oligarchy that has no interest in democratic processes or in economic freedom.

So long as I serve in this body, I shall continue to try to carry out what I know were the objectives of President Kennedy in regard to the Alliance for Progress program, because that program came out of our subcommittee when Jack Kennedy of Massachusetts was a member of the committee. The recommendations from the experts with whom we entered into contracts to do that research are the recommendations that John Kennedy adopted when he went into the White House. That is where the whole program came from. I shall continue to keep faith with that program.

THE MALLORY RULE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article entitled "The Mallory Rule: Myth and Reality," written by Alan Barth, and published in the Washington Post of September 22, 1964, and also the excellent testimony on this subject by Mr. Sidney Zagri, which was submitted to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

There being no objection, the article and testimony were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MALLORY RULE: MYTH AND REALITY

(By Alan Barth)

The Mallory rule is up for flagellation again—this time in the political arena. Observing that "the Nation's Capital is being consumed by crime," and ascribing this situation to "obsessive concern for the rights of the criminal defendant," Senator BARRY GOLDWATER defined the Mallory rule a week ago as holding "that any statement made by a defendant to police officers is inadmissible if arraignment is delayed."

It would be hard to compress more misconception and misinformation into any assertion of comparable length but District Police Chief Robert Murray promptly showed that it could be done. The Mallory rule, he said, commenting on the Senator's speech, has had "a great deal to do" with the rise in the crime rate here.

The Mallory rule does not forbid the use of statements made to police officers prior to arrest; it does not forbid the use of so-called "threshold" statements made to police officers immediately after arrest; it does not forbid the use of statements made to police officers after arraignment. It excludes from Federal courts only confessions obtained by the police during an unlawful detention of a defendant, or statements derived from such confessions.

As for Chief Murray's contention, the Mallory rule may conceivably affect prosecution of defendants but it cannot reasonably be said to affect the crime rate. U.S. Attorney David Acheson pointed out that crime has increased in the Maryland and Virginia suburbs, where the Mallory rule is not operative, at about the same rate as in the District.

The history and purpose of the Mallory rule deserve to be recalled as an aid to understanding it. After the famous Wickersham Commission report on "Lawlessness in Law Enforcement" was issued in 1931—it revealed that brutal third-degree methods were used to elicit statements from suspects held in police stations all over the land—virtually every State in the Union, Arizona included, enacted laws requiring that arrested persons should be brought promptly before a judicial officer who would determine whether they should be detained. Congress enacted just such a law to govern Federal officers.

In 1943, the Supreme Court, in the McNabb case, upset the conviction of three Tennessee moonshiners convicted of killing a Federal revenue officer—because the conviction was based on a confession obtained through violation of this law. The Court noted that the law was intended to check "resort to those reprehensible practices known as the 'third degree.'"

Following the McNabb decision, the Supreme Court appointed an advisory committee of distinguished lawyers which deliberated on the problems involved in arrests and confessions and drafted the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure. These were promulgated by the Supreme Court in 1946 and were expressly approved by Congress in 1948 when it reenacted title 18 of the United States Code into law.

Among these was rule 5(a) providing that "an officer making an arrest * * * shall take the arrested person without unnecessary delay before the nearest available commissioner or before any other nearby officer empowered to commit persons charged with offenses against the laws of the United States."

In 1957, the Supreme Court applied rule 5(a) in the case of Andrew Mallory, convicted of rape on the basis of a confession obtained after prolonged detention in a police station—and without ever being told of his right to counsel or to a preliminary examination before a magistrate or his right to remain silent. The Court unanimously decided that the confession was inadmissible because it resulted from police lawlessness—from flagrant defiance of an act of Congress.

It seems plain from this that the rule requiring the police to take an arrested person promptly before a judge or a commissioner is a rule framed by Congress, while the Mallory rule or the McNabb rule (they are the same thing) is simply a judicial device for enforcing the rule which Congress enacted into law.

Moreover, taken together they protect some pretty basic constitutional rights. They protect the right to be free from arbitrary arrest; they protect the right to the assistance of counsel; they protect the right to refrain from self-incrimination; they protect the right to be released on bail pending trial; they protect the right of habeas corpus. And they provide protection against the evil they were designed to correct—the evil of third degree tactics by overzealous policemen.

STATEMENT OF SIDNEY ZAGRI, LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL, INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF TEAMSTERS

The CHAIRMAN. Good morning, Mr. Zagri.

Mr. ZAGRI. Good morning, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman and members of the Senate District Committee, although I am appearing specifically on title I and title III, of H.R. 7525, as well as on H.R. 5726, I would not like to have this opportunity escape me to say that the testimony by the preceding witness, Mr. Bennett, Director of the Bureau of Prisons, his comments on the meat-ax approach of this bill, its drastic approach in finding solutions to crime, illustrates the approach of the bill in title I and title III as well.

And we are here specifically in opposition to H.R. 7525, particularly title I and title III, as well as H.R. 5726, which has been offered by U.S. Attorney Acheson and Deputy Attorney General Katzenbach as a compromise solution.

I note in today's paper that the committee is thinking in terms of a compromise solution on the Mallory rule. I trust it has not reached that because I am going to direct much of my testimony here this morning to point out that this so-called compromise——

The Chairman. The committee has reached no determination on this bill. They have not met in executive session and there will be no determination until they have met in executive session.

The indication was where there were possible avenues of working this out.

Mr. Zagri. Because let me say that there can be no compromise with the techniques of the police state or with the essentials of personal liberty. There can be no compromise with "secret investigative" arrests, whether they be by Castro's secret police, the Soviet Committee for State Security, or by the Metropolitan Police of the District of Columbia.

There can be no compromise with fundamental constitutional guarantees. H.R. 7525 openly flouts the Constitution; whereas, H.R. 5726 hems and haws, advances and retreats between constitutional safeguards and arbitrary police action. What it gives with one hand, it takes away with another.

H.R. 5726: I consider H.R. 5726 the more dangerous of the two bills because it is the more plausible. It appears to afford constitutional safeguards without assuring them. It is an attempt to reconcile "the exigencies of criminal prosecution with the imperatives of constitutional liberty." In reality, it ends in whittling away dangerously at vital constitutional safeguards.

Its principal proponents—such as Deputy Attorney General Katzenbach—start out with the major premise that the Mallory rule is a good one—but not for the District of Columbia.

In defense of the Mallory rule, he states:

"The district court made clear its intention to prevent law enforcement officers from delaying hearings for the purpose of eliciting confessions. This is as it should be."

He then states:

"The problem which gives rise to the legislative proposal before the committee not with the Mallory rule but with its application in the District of Columbia."

He makes the rather remarkable proposal that Federal rule 5(a), requiring preliminary hearing without unnecessary delay, which is effective in all of the courts of the 10 judicial districts of the Federal court system, and with all the States having similar enactments, be repealed in its application in the District of Columbia.

Rule 5(a) is aimed at preserving constitutional rights and, in particular, procedural due process of law. It provides for the treatment of accused persons on an equal basis—the innocent as well as the guilty. It offers protection to the impoverished, uneducated, or youthful suspect. The hardened, well-heeled criminal does not need a city magistrate to advise him of his rights. He knows those rights. He has highly paid attorneys to advise him in advance.

On what basis can he justify that the lowly, the illiterate, the impoverished of the District of Columbia be detained by the police up to 6 hours without probable cause to believe that the accused has committed a crime, and afford the right of prompt arraignment in all other jurisdictions?

Deputy Attorney General Katzenbach seeks to justify a double standard of constitutional safeguards on the basis that—

"Only in the District of Columbia do the Federal courts have broad jurisdiction over crimes of violence which characteristically lack eyewitnesses and independent evidence."

By contrast, he points out—

"Most Federal criminal cases in other jurisdictions involve frauds, mail thefts, narcotic violations and the like, where there is substantial evidence apart from a confession; i.e., controlled property, financial records, tax returns, et cetera."

He then concludes that—

"It is reasonable to consider the problems in the District of Columbia as being rather unique with respect to the Mallory rule and deserving of congressional consideration in legislation limited in its application to the District of Columbia."

While it may be true that such a distinction may exist between the District of Columbia and other Federal jurisdictions, it is not true with reference to the State jurisdictions where the Mallory rule has been applied. As recently as last week, in *People* v. *Donovan*, 326 W 2A1, the court of appeals in the State of New York, where crimes of violence are as great as in the District of Columbia, applied the Mallory rule.

And I quote from that citation:

"Quite apart from the due process clause of the 14th amendment, New York's constitutional statutory provisions, pertaining to the privilege of self-incrimination and the right to counsel, not to mention the State's guarantee of due process, require its exclusion."

In this case the court excluded a confession solely on the grounds that it was taken during a period of unnecessary delay prior to arraignment. And I think that it is especially significant at this time that a State like New York, which includes, of course, New York City where crimes of violence are certainly as many in number or probably much higher in number, and almost as great in frequency, as they are in the District of Columbia, that the New York Court of Appeals applied the Mallory rule.

The Supreme Court has enforced the Mallory-McNabb rule in the States under the 14th amendment.

The rule in the Mallory case is in full force and effect in the city of Buffalo, N.Y. This is in accordance with section 165 of New York State Code of Criminal Procedures, which provides:

"The defendant must in all cases be taken before the magistrate without unnecessary delay and he may be given bail at any time of the day or night."

An examination of crime statistics of cities with half a million to 1 million persons establishes Washington, D.C., as No. 1 in two major crime categories of violence, and Buffalo, N.Y., is recorded as 16th in these same two crime categories. A check with Lieutenant Phelps of the Buffalo police force indicates that:

"We do not arrest a man unless we are ready and prepared to go to court."

The Mallory rule did not impede effective police practices in Buffalo. Operating under the New York State Code, the police are required to use brains rather than brawn.

In Great Britain the suspect cannot be questioned, with the exception of clearing up ambiguities, once he is placed under arrest. Yet we find according to the criminal statistics of England and Wales in 1962, an unusually high percentage of crime solutions, particularly in acts of violence without the aid of the confession. Although crime is on the upgrade in England, felonies increasing from 283,220 in 1938 to 896,424 in 1962, we find that in 1962, there were 37,958 offenses charging acts of violence with 32,027 cases cleared during the same year.

It is clear from these figures that adherence to a strict code of police behavior is not a handicap to police efficiency. On the other hand, slack and unimaginative police work cannot occur where recourse to extra legal action is not available in the solution of crime.

It should be pointed out that the Mallory rule does not prohibit questioning of a suspect. It simply requires arraignment without unnecessary delay.

The crucial period during which mental or physical coercion may be applied is between the time of detention and arraignment. The investigation into lawless enforcement of law conducted by the Wickersham Commission showed that out of 106 cases reported between 1920 and 1930 in appellate courts where use of the third degree was charged, there were only 7 cases where the prisoner declared that the third degree was used after he had been brought before a city magistrate.

Coercion itself is always hard to prove because the questioning takes place in secret. It is true that H.R. 5726 provides that—

"Such questioning and the warning and advice required by subsections (a) and (b) of this section were, whenever reasonably possible, witnessed by a responsible person who is not a law enforcement officer or transcribed verbatim or recorded by a wire, tape, or other sound recording or conducted subject to other comparable means of verification."

This provision simply provides for verification of the accuracy of the warnings and advice with reference to self-incrimination, also to notify a relative or friend and consult with counsel. This does not provide for verification of the actual questioning, and it is well established that mere questioning, in and of itself, can be coercive under certain circumstances.

Section 3 of H.R. 5726 establishes a 6-hour period for detention between the time of arrest and completion of the confession, statement, or admission. Could not this result in establishing the norm for investigative arrests?

Deputy Attorney General Katzenbach conceded this as a possibility in his questioning by Senator Dominick in his appearance before this committee yesterday. This establishes an arbitrary standard in which questioning which, in fact, was coercive could take place and confessions so acquired would be admissible. Deputy Attorney General Katzenbach seeks to justify the 6-hour rule on the basis that recent decisions of the District Court of Appeals have reversed convictions based upon confessions given 2 or 3 hours after arrest. He states:

"Thus 'without unnecessary delay' has come to mean 'without any delay.'"

On cross-examination, Deputy Attorney General Katzenbach, concedes that while confessions were obtained within 2 or 3 hours or less after arrest, arraignment in some instances did not take place until the following day. The Mallory rule simply requires the court to find that under a particular set of circumstances, delay was unnecessary. It may be that in each of the instances cited by Deputy Attorney General Katzenbach, the court had good reason to find that the delay was unnecessary. It does not follow that because a confession was obtained within a short time after arrest, that the surrounding circumstances did not indicate the existence of unnecessary delay.

The 6-hour detention period repeals the present rule banning investigative arrest in the District of Columbia, which was enacted by the Commissioners as a result of the Horsky report, which found that there had been great abuse of police authority in arresting individuals on grounds of suspicion. There is no law called suspicion.

Under the fourth amendment, the person may not be arrested unless there is probable cause before the arrest may be made. This probable cause may not be ascertained by an unnecessary delay through the media of the secret investigative arrest. The fact that there is a 6-hour limitation on the investigative arrest does not make it less a violation of a fourth amendment right.

Despite all the constitutional window dressing of section 3, the fact remains that the suspect is informed of his rights against self-incrimination, right to counsel, right to remain mute—not by a magistrate, not by a commissioner, but by the police. This bill substitutes the zealousness of police action for time-honored checks on the police through judicial machinery.

The legislative policy behind the requirement that an officer making an arrest take the arrested person without unnecessary delay before the nearest available commissioner is spelled out by the U.S. Supreme Court in *McNabb* v. *United States* (318 U.S. 332, 343, 344, p. 1582):

"The purpose of this impressively pervasive requirement of criminal procedure is plain. * * * The awful instruments of the criminal law cannot be entrusted to a single functionary. The complicated process of criminal justice is therefore divided into different parts, responsibility for which is separately vested in the various participants upon whom the criminal law relies for its vindication."

I wish to point out that the Katzenbach proposal does not divide this function. He vested all in the police authorities.

"Legislation such as this, requiring that the police must with reasonable promptness show legal cause for detaining arrested persons, constitutes an important safeguard—not only in assuring protection for the innocent but also in securing conviction of the guilty by methods that commend themselves to a progressive and self-confident society. For this procedural requirement checks resort to those reprehensible practices known as the third degree which, though universally rejected as indefensible, still find their way (354 U.S. 453) into use. It aims to avoid all the evil implications of secret interrogation of persons accused of crime."

I must agree with the Washington Post editorial:

"It is a sound principle of law that arrested persons should be taken before a judicial officer without unnecessary delay, that they should be advised of their rights by a judicial officer and that they should be subject to detention only upon the authorization of a judicial officer. The only effective way we can think of to make the police observe this principle of law is to forbid the use of any evidence, including confessions, obtained in violation of it."

I must agree with Senator MORSE's evaluation of this bill:

"The Acheson bill is a most unacceptable compromise. When one concludes the reading of the Acheson bill he discovers he has nothing but a meaningless hodgepodge left."

I must agree with the overwhelming majority of the 900-odd lawyers of the District bar who voted against all three bills (including the Acheson bill) aimed at a revision of the Mallory rule and permitting easy interrogation of suspects by policemen.

H.R. 7525, title I: Repeals the McNabb-Mallory rule and nullifies section 5(a) of the Federal rules. While the Mallory rule is an exclusionary rule of evidence, its repeal will interfere with certain basic constitutional safeguards. It opens the door for prolonged detention for an unlimited period of time. Imprisonment incommunicado interferes with the right of habeas corpus, which is guaranteed by article I, section 9, of the Constitution itself. If the prisoner's family or friends or lawyers knew where he was, they could at once obtain habeas corpus and compel the immediate production of the prisoner before a magistrate.

No expediency would supersede the rule of immediacy—no court would permit custody without committal to be continued an instant because of the desirability of interrogation or the inadvisability of warning confederates. The suspension of habeas corpus by policemen should be condemned.

Unlawful detention takes away the right to bail guaranteed by the eighth amendment of the Constitution to insure personal freedom. Even after a lawful arrest only a magistrate can grant a person bail. Those who keep him from the magistrate are denying him the right to bail.

Unlawful and secret detention deprives the accused to have the assistance of counsel for his defense; which is guaranteed by the sixth amendment. The Supreme Court through Justice Sutherland and Justice Black has declared that a person requires the guiding hand of counsel in every step in the proceeding against him.

The constitutional right to counsel commences from the moment of the arrest of the prisoner to assist him in securing his discharge if the evidence is insufficient, to advise him about his statement during preliminary examination before the magistrate, to arrange his bail, and to protect him from abuses during confinement.

Finally, unlawful detention tends to impair the right of the accused under the fifth amendment not to be "compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself." This does not preclude proper questioning, but it is obvious that the line between proper and improper questions may easily be passed. Nothing but the conscience of the police officer can protect a prisoner from milder or drastic forms of the third degree so long as he is in their uncontrolled custody removed from systematic prison regulations and isolated from the outside world.

Title III: Title III seeks to accomplish indirectly what title I would do directly. It is, to quote the minority report of the House District Committee, "a legislative sheep in wolf's clothing."

Although it is extensively designed to detain a material witness, it does not provide that the material witness be in connection with a pending case. The Federal rules already provide for the detention of material witnesses under those circumstances. Actually under this title, any investigative arrest or any confession obtained could be used for the purpose of obtaining an arrest of a person detained.

The proponents of title I will do more than to "qualify and amend" the Supreme Court's decision in *Mallory* v. *United States* (354 U.S. 449); it will, in fact, overrule many court decisions and a long well-established judiciary policy of protecting persons against unlawful arrest and secret prolonged interrogation.

It has been argued that the Mallory rule hampers effective law enforcement in that it is often difficult to show "probable cause" unless and until a confession has been secured. I have already pointed out that efficient police work does not depend upon obtaining confessions by unlawful detention, in fact the contrary is true.

Reliance upon extra-legal methods for obtaining evidence results in sloppy police work; it results in disrespect for law because of the use of unlawful means by law enforcement officers.

Earlier in our discussion, I referred to Buffalo as an example of the best behaved city in America where the Mallory rule was enforced.

I suggest that there is a more basic reason for the crime rates in the two cities; this is, Buffalo and Washington.

Let us compare the situation of a man, able bodied, unemployed, and penniless with a family to support in Washington and in Buffalo. I do not suggest the gentleman has two families to support. I ask you to envisage him in the same family situation in Washington or in Buffalo. In Washington, he could not be given relief, desperately though he, his wife, and his children may need it. In Buffalo he would be entitled to relief. This relief would be supplied, in part, by Federal matching funds under the aid-to-dependent-children law, as amended in 1961. If he were a single able-bodied man in Buffalo he would get relief from the city general assistance fund. In Washington, he would get no relief.

The exclusion of a man from relief because he is able bodied, when he has a family to support and cannot find work, is inhuman. It arouses in the man desperation, bitterness, and enormous envy. This is a tough society in which to be poor. The bitterness of the dispossessed is reflected in the crime statistics of this city and in the type of crime committed.

Washington is the highest city in the Nation in incidence of aggravated assault and second to highest in the incidence of robbery. Out of 16 cities, Buffalo is 15th in the incidence of both aggravated assault and robbery.

What is a penniless father of a family to do in Washington when his children cry for food or for more warmth on a winter's night? For many of us of low skills there is no work and no prospect of work. He must either beg or he must steal. Until we, too, have been faced with that choice I do not think we should feel sure of what we would do.

In Buffalo, the same man has an additional choice. He can apply for relief. It is better than begging or stealing.

I criticized the Murray thesis for simplicity. Am I opening myself to the same criticism here? My argument is a simple one. Many crimes in Washington are committed, on impulses, by desperately poor men denied help by the society which has rejected them as wage earners.

I am not suggesting that this is the only or even the major cause of crime in this city. What I do suggest is that it is one of the major causes. I believe there is a positive correlation between the humane welfare regulations of the city of Buffalo and the low crime rate there.

Scrupulous police work and a human approach to welfare problems spells Buffalo, America's best behaved big city.

A police force encouraged openly by its chief to demand extra-legal rights in "fighting" crime and an inhuman welfare program directed by Members of the Congress who oppose advance in the area of civil rights spells Washington, D.C., where one's chances of being assaulted and robbed are higher than anywhere else in the Nation.

May I urge upon members of this committee to call upon their colleagues on the full Senate Appropriations Committee this week to replace the aid-to-dependent-children program in the new District of Columbia budget. Let us give it a try for 1 year. Let us see what demoralizing results will flow from helping a poor unemployed and able-bodied man to feed his wife and little ones. Let us see what effect this innovation might have upon the crime rate.

CONCLUSION

It should be noted that the Ford Foundation has made a grant of $215,000 to the American Law Institute for the purpose of conducting an objective study of the rule in the Mallory case and related problems raised by that case.

I completely agree with Senator WAYNE MORSE that the Congress should put off making any decision in this matter until the American Law Institute has completed its study.

In the meantime, let us not be stampeded into any drastic departure eliminating basic constitutional safeguards. Let us remember that the basic separation of functions does not permit the police to pass judgment on the validity of their own arrests. Let us face up to the problem of the increasing crime rate in the District by improving the efficiency of the police, increasing the size of the force, raising the minimum educational standards and training program.

For example, the Buffalo Police Department requires high school graduates; the District police have many school dropouts on the force.

And, finally, let us remember the problem of crime in the District is far too complex to find solutions through any single panacea. Remember that the concentration of crime here is in the central city which economy is a disaster area. The average unemployment rate in this area, calculated from 1960 census figures, is 10.4 percent of the male work force.

And this figure does not really tell the full story because we find that when the average national unemployment is around 6 percent, that the Negro unemployment in the country borders nearly 20 percent.

They are the first to be laid off and the last to be returned to work.

Let us remember the warning of Judge Lehman, New York Court of Appeals in the Doran case.

"Suggestions that courts should not hamper police by restricting them to the use of lawful methods seem to many of our citizens in accord with commonsense. Our boasted guarantees of liberty—it would seem—are so precious that they must be kept for special occasions and not be subjected to the wear and tear of daily use. Not so may the court treat these guarantees. In a court of law no argument of expediency can ever justify a lawless invasion of a legal right."

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Mr. Zagri. I appreciate your views.

You made constant reference to Buffalo. Approximately how large a city is Buffalo?

Mr. ZAGRI. It is over 500,000.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you have any knowledge as to the size of its police force? Do you know how many police they have there?

Mr. ZAGRI. I can get that information for you.

(The information referred to follows:)

INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF TEAMSTERS, CHAUFFEURS, WAREHOUSEMEN & HELPERS OF AMERICA,
Detroit, Mich., December 16, 1963.

In re H.R. 7525, H.R. 5726.

Hon. ALAN BIBLE,
Chairman, U.S. Senate, Committee on the District of Columbia, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BIBLE: When I testified before the Senate District Committee on November 6, 1963, on the subject of the Mallory rule, I was asked to supply figures for the populations and police strengths of Buffalo and the District of Columbia.

The figures are appended below.

	District of Columbia	*Buffalo*
Population (1960)	763, 956	532, 759
Present police strength	2, 920	1, 346

This means there is a policeman for each 261 persons in the District of Columbia and 1 for each 395 persons in Buffalo. Yet it is the District of Columbia police who call for additional police powers.

If I can be of any further assistance, please let me know.

Cordially yours,

SIDNEY ZAGRI,
Legislative Counsel.

The CHAIRMAN. I think it would be helpful to furnish it for the record because it apparently is a city of somewhat comparable size.

It is a little smaller, but it is not surrounded by as large a metropolitan area as we have, but comparisons of that kind, I think, are very helpful.

The Senator from New Hampshire?

Senator McINTYRE. I just want to compliment Mr. Zagri for a very fine statement and to assure him that the views that he has expressed here will be given every consideration by this committee.

Mr. ZAGRI. Thank you.

Senator McINTYRE. In view of the time situation here, I do not think I will ask any questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Mr. Zagri. We certainly appreciate your coming here this morning.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, this is the best article, the best analysis in language understandable by laymen, that I have yet read on the Mallory rule. I have placed it in the RECORD because I want it to be easily available to people who are raising questions about the Mallory rule.

I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the text of a speech I made last Monday at the National Convention of City Attorneys, held in Portland, Oreg., in the course of which I discussed the Mallory rule and answered some of the arguments that are being made by the Republican candidate for President in connection with his so-called crime program.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF SENATOR WAYNE MORSE, NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF MUNICIPAL LAW OFFICERS, PORTLAND, OREG., SEPTEMBER 28, 1964

There are few men in contemporary America who have contributed more to the application of legal principles than has your general counsel and my long-time friend, Charles Rhyne. Over the decades he has, probably more than any other representative of the legal profession, stood for the practice, and not just the theory, of the rule of law in human affairs.

It is unfortunately easy to forget that our devotion to a system of government of laws rather than government by men is sometimes characterized by lipservice and not by practice. The U.S. Senate has just concluded a long wrangle over just such an issue.

The substantive question was that of the reapportionment decisions of the Federal courts. I need not describe to you the controversy that these decisions have aroused, not only in the some 30 States where the apportionment of legislatures is under challenge in the Federal courts, but everywhere in the country.

In State after State, legislatures have for decades violated their own constitutions by failing to keep their legislative apportionment in line with their own constitutions. This was true in Oregon from the turn of the century until 1952, when the people of this State finally took matters into their own hands and reapportioned the legislature directly, by their own hand, through the use of the initiative.

But in States where the initiative is not available to the general public the disproportionate voice of rural and small town districts was causing the State government to lose contact with a growing bulk of its people. In Oklahoma, for example, which is one of the States now holding elections to its legislature under court order, its own State supreme court found 20 years ago that the legislature was in violation of the districting provisions of the Oklahoma constitution. But it did not believe there was any judicial remedy. So the rule of law became an exercise in lipservice. The rule of law in the composition of these State legislatures disappeared. In State after State, as districting requirements were ignored by session after session of the legislatures, we had a government of men and not of laws.

The real contribution of the Supreme Court in these cases was not so much the finding that the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment requires representation according to population, but the finding that there was indeed a judicial remedy for malapportionment.

Under guidelines laid down by the Supreme Court, the Federal district courts have been directing the responsible State agencies to formulate redistricting plans, and where no plans have been forthcoming, the courts have formulated their own plans. They have begun ordering special elections to carry out these new apportionments. Despite all the political howling heard across the land in recent months, these elections are proceeding with remarkable public acceptance and equanimity. It is not the public weal that is disrupted, so much as it is the political organizations that were based on an illegal control of the legislatures that are disrupted.

No matter what the Federal courts do in this matter, it will always be possible for the American people to exempt the State legislatures from the 14th amendment, if that is their desire. The people may reach the conclusion that area rather than population representation is desirable at the State level, and they may change their Federal Constitution to so provide. But I am certain that whatever are the constitutional requirements for apportionment, never again will State legislatures be allowed to flout those requirements for lack of a judicial remedy.

The rule of law, and not of men, has been extended to State legislatures. The right of people to be protected equally by the laws and constitutions of their States has been made a reality, and not a theory only. A majority of the U.S. Senate felt it had to throw a sop to the political machines by passing its own judgment on how the cases should be handled.

It did so despite the lack of any legal right whatever to advise the courts on the handling of certain cases. There was no rule of law in the Senate last Thursday when it extended its extra-legal, gratuitous opinion to the courts on how equity should be defined in reapportionment cases.

The Congress does have the constitutional power to enforce the 14th amendment. I hope that some day the Congress will remove the blot of this illegal resolution by adopting legislation that will set forth a statutory procedure for reapportionment in line with the 14th amendment.

Insofar as the apportionment issue alone is concerned, I believe that the court orders are the best thing that has happened to our States in a long time. I need not tell municipal officials that many of your problems have been brought to Washington for attention and solution because it has been impossible to have them adequately considered and solved at the State level. If there has been any so-called invasion of States rights by the Federal Government, it has not been so much an invasion as it has been the filling of a vacuum.

The needs of the American people are going to be met, and if they are not met at the State or local level, they will be met at the Federal level. These domestic problems are increasingly those that relate to urbanization and suburbanization.

From my 10 years of service on the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia, I have achieved some familiarity with those problems. The District of Columbia is typical of many large cities in that it is losing population to outlying areas, yet those outlying "bedroom" counties are in two different States, Maryland and Virginia. Metropolitan Washington therefore consists of two State jurisdictions, one Federal jurisdiction, and a great variety of subdivisions within those jurisdictions.

It is probably inevitable that the municipal problems of the District come in for political treatment at campaign time. Currently we are hearing about crime in the Nation's Capital, for which the Johnson administration and the U.S. Supreme Court are made to sound personally responsible. But for many years past, any time a street crime occurs in the District that involves a tourist, or an employee of a Member of Congress, the news has been treated as national news rather than as local news.

I do not dispute this practice, but I do not think it has really been developed far enough. The crime that is under discussion in this year's election campaign is not the organized rackets that have existed for decades in city after city in this country, but almost entirely street crime. And it is a rising rate of street crime that is plaguing virtually all urban communities of the country.

You are hearing it said that crime in the District of Columbia is in large part due to the existence of a provision in the Federal criminal code that requires an arrested person to be taken before a committing magistrate without unnecessary delay. The Supreme Court has interpreted this rule in cases where it has thrown out convictions resulting from confessions obtained during arrests where the individual was held more than 8 hours without being committed. These interpretations have come to be known as the Mallory rule.

The Mallory rule today is only a court interpretation of a Federal statute. It applies to all cases of Federal criminal prosecution. Not only the District of Columbia police, but the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Treasury Department agents, and all other Federal law enforcement officers are bound by it.

Yet despite all the charges and allegations that the Mallory rule is promoting crime in Washington, D.C., there is not one single hint of evidence that crime in Washington is any greater or increasing any faster than in areas where there is no Mallory rule. It has already been brought to the attention of the American people for the first time, though not by the people who raised the issue in the first place, that the rate of crime per 1,000 inhabitants is higher in Phoenix, Ariz., where there is no Mallory rule than in the District of Columbia, where there is.

I think that is progress. I think there is some chance of bringing out the facts about the conditions of life in a community that result in lawless acts and assaults against person and property not to take possession of a small fortune, but for pennies and nickles, or for "kicks."

In fact, we are beginning to appreciate that increasing crime is not peculiar even to economic deprivation and lack of opportunity alone, although that is one of its important sources. We are seeing crime that takes the form of thrill seeking and vandalism increases even in well-to-do neighborhoods.

There are those who believe that as in international relations, the way to encourage respect for authority is to have to use overpowering force.

One manifestation of that theory has been the age-old practice of arrest for investigation. Surprisingly enough, arrest for investigation was practiced in the District of Columbia for many years after the Mallory rule. It was possible for it to continue because persons were able to invoke the Mallory rule only if they were brought to trial and a confession obtained during their detention were used as evidence against them.

The result was that the Mallory rule did nothing to protect the thousands of persons who continued to be arrested in the District of Columbia, held for as many hours as the police chose to hold them, and then released. In nearly all these instances, the persons detained were not of the economic or social background where a lawsuit was likely to be instigated against the local police.

Today, there is no longer in effect in Washington the practice of arrest for investigation, a condition that continues, however, in virtually every other police jurisdiction in the country. It was abolished in Washington by administrative order of the District Commissioners. But again, the return to the rule of law has not set loose more crime in the city than exists in comparable cities elsewhere.

We have been hearing these legal rules derided as giving criminals a sporting chance to evade the law. But who knows who the criminals are until the full process of the law has been run?

The Anglo-American system of jurisprudence itself gives the accused person far more than a sporting chance. It demands that he be regarded as innocent until proved guilty. That is not a legal doctrine invented by the Warren court, nor the Johnson administration, nor WAYNE MORSE, nor Americans for Democratic Action.

These attempts to blame rising crime rates upon legal procedures long established as basic to due process of law is an easy "out" for those who find it embarrassing and disturbing to consider any other possible causes for those crime rates. Social conditions and attitudes, lack of opportunity due to racial discrimination or lack of education, poor motivation, a glorification of violence in all our entertainment media, a national pride in the most monstrous and destructive war machine ever assembled—all these factors also contribute to the ease with which many American youths find it simpler and more convenient to snatch a pocketbook from an old lady than to earn $20 on a job.

The use of force or stealth to gain what you want from others is not a practice nor an attitude that can be cultivated at the international level of activity and then easily and readily repudiated as a standard of behavior on the individual level. Nor can respect for the law be advanced by methods that flout and disregard the law.

We excuse the first by saying that there is no rule of law among nations that can be enforced today over all nations equally. But we cannot excuse the second at all.

We do have a national crime problem that relates to rising street crime as distinct from organized crime. But we will never solve it or curb it by illegal methods.

Whatever the outcome of the current political campaign in which this issue is being used, I very much hope that the discussion of the issue itself will continue. I hope that more Americans will familiarize themselves with such matters as the Mallory rule, and with relative crime statistics in various cities and parts of the country. I hope there will be a long-term study of the mental and emotional attitudes that lead young men and women of such a variety of social and economic backgrounds to accept violence as a means to an end, and sometimes as an end in itself.

We live in a country that is changing as fast as any society has changed in the history of the world. We really understand very little about it. Neighborhoods form and disappear almost overnight; a community pattern of 10 years ago is gone today; a family thinks little of moving every 2 or 3 years and from one section of the country to another. A racial system over 200 years old is breaking up. The speed and fluidity of our society and the new aspirations it is creating among our people are developing new problems and standards of their own. Until we understand more of what they are, we are going to find it impossible to beat down crime rates with the use of force and illegal police methods.

I submit that this is not a sociological theory; it is a fact of history. We experienced the greatest social dislocation of our history in the South after the Civil War. The immediate response was to try to cure it with the massive application of force in the form of military armies of occupation.

Their only legacy is one of having made a bad situation worse. The force they applied was not so much in enforcement of the laws and Constitution as in violation of them.

Municipalities have a more immediate interest in all the ramifications of crime rates than any other level of government. But one contribution the Federal Government could make is the one that has been applied successfully to many other social problems—the White House conference. We need a nationwide study of crime rates that will pinpoint not only the types of crimes being committed, but more important, will pinpoint their motivation. Not until we know the "why" of crimes of this kind, will we know how to deal with them.

That is what I hope will come out of this campaign. I am satisfied that derision for the basic principles of the rule of law is not the answer. The American people will also recognize, in time, that it is not the answer. But we could use a White House conference to help us find the answer.

That is a real contribution the Federal level of government can make to our municipalities, along with its example of devotion to preservation of constitutionalism through such institutions as the Mallory rule.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I pointed out in the speech that there is a higher rate of crime in Phoenix, Ariz., than in Washington, D.C. Phoenix, Ariz., does not have a Mallory rule. The Republican candidate is seeking to mislead the American people into believing that the Mallory rule has something to do with the crime rate. He cannot supply any authority in the field of criminal law that will support him.

The District of Columbia has a police chief who should have been fired years ago. He has tried to spread that falsehood to the people of this area.

Baltimore does not have a Mallory rule. The cities of Virginia do not have a Mallory rule. But their crime rate is comparable with and in some instances higher than that of Washington, D.C.

There are many serious reasons why a high crime rate exists in Washington, D.C., but the presence of the Mallory rule has nothing to do with them. As this magnificent article by Mr. Barth points out, the Mallory rule applies to a small number of cases in which a confession has been extracted from a person arrested who has never had the opportunity and guarantee of being arraigned until he has been subjected, first, to shocking third-degree, police state tactics.

The Senate is about to adjourn sine die. This is the fourth or fifth time that the Senate will have adjourned sine die without Congress adopting a "court-busting" bill that seeks to repeal the Mallory rule. I shall offer no apologies to the Senate or the country for the part I have played those four or five times in doing what I could to block such a "court-busting" bill. I shall be back at the same fort next January.

I shall continue to do everything I can to continue to guarantee to the American people that, so far as Federal officers are concerned, when the hand of a Federal arresting officer is put on a person's shoulder, that officer shall take him forthwith to a committing magistrate. That is what the Mallory rule requires. If the officer has probable cause for arresting a person, he does not have to worry about his being committed. But if he does not have probable cause for arresting, he has no right to take the person into a police jail and abuse him, interrogate him, and third-degree him for as many hours as it may take to get certain types of people to break down and confess things they did or did not do and violate the precious constitutional guarantee of the presumption of innocence. That presumption of innocence is as much a procedural right of the guilty as it is of the innocent, because that presumption places the burden upon the State to prove guilt, not the burden upon the arrested to prove innocence.

So I am highly pleased that, once more, Congress is about to adjourn sine die with the unanimous decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the Mallory case still protected. I renew my prediction, as I close my comment on the Mallory rule, by saying that it is my view that in due course of time a set of facts will be so presented to the Supreme Court of the United States that no other decision can emanate from that body, because I believe that arresting a person and not arraigning him forthwith is unconstitutional and constitutes a violation of due process. That question has not been directly passed upon yet by the Supreme Court. In my judgment, eventually that issue will be raised. In my opinion, if it is raised, only one decision can emanate, because a person is entitled, as a freeman or a freewoman, when arrested, to have a judicial officer, not a policeman, determine whether he or she is to be interned. One is entitled to arraignment without delay.

It is interesting to note how prosecuting officers are slowly but surely coming to recognize the soundness of the position of the senior Senator from Oregon. I was gratified at the number of city attorneys from all over the country, North and South, East and West, who attended the meeting in Portland, and who came to me following my lecture the other noon and said, "It is very difficult for us to come to this point of view because of the practicalities and the kind of people involved we deal with. But we cannot deny the major premise that arrested persons are entitled to the kind of procedural protections afforded them under the Mallory rule."

Mr. HART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield at that point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McINTYRE in the chair). Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. MORSE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HART. It is my good fortune to be in the Chamber when the Senator from Oregon reminds us of the role he has always played in the effort to "hold the fort" against those who would set aside the Mallory rule.

I am sure the Senator has been struck, as I have been struck, by an almost consistent and predictable pattern, that those who react vigorously against the evils of the police state and caution that we do not have enough policemen—uniformed and plainclothes men—to secure us against efforts to bring about a police state, are in the front ranks of those who argue that the Mallory rule is wrong.

I believe it is a good a rule of thumb that the distinction between a free society and a police state is precisely the right which the Mallory rule insists shall be accorded to all persons.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Michigan is so right. There is no question about it. The proponents of abolishing the Mallory rule forget one of the major causes of the American Revolution. Our forefathers fought against the police state methods of the British Crown, the kangaroo court system of the British Crown, the arbitrary power given to an arresting officer under the British Crown. How easy it is for them to forget that.

Yet, when we are fighting to preserve the Mallory rule, we are fighting to preserve one of the great guarantees over which our constitutional forefathers fought a revolution in order to maintain and preserve it for us.

Mr. HART. I am grateful that the Senator from Oregon has placed another lecture on this subject in the RECORD. I plead guilty to having stolen sections from his earlier lectures for my own use. I know that in the months which remain I shall probably be stealing some sections from this latest lecture with good effect.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Michigan never steals anything from me. If I ever make a comment which he believes is useful to him, I am the one who is complimented and honored by his use of it.

LAW DEANS CRITICIZE SENATOR GOLDWATER'S STAND ON SUPREME COURT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article published in the Washington Post for September 17, entitled "Law Deans Rap BARRY on Court."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> ### LAW DEANS RAP BARRY ON COURT
>
> Five law school deans have termed Senator BARRY GOLDWATER's criticism of the Supreme Court "ill-informed and dangerous," the Democratic National Committee said yesterday.
>
> The five deans, in a statement made public by the committee, said the charges by the Republican presidential candidate "being either careless or uninformed, irresponsibly obscure the real issue."
>
> Such attacks, the statement said, "do serious disservice to law and order in a time when both depend largely upon voluntary respect for judicial decisions. Those attacks seem to us ill-informed and dangerous * * *.
>
> "We are deeply disturbed not only by the particular attacks but about the manner in which Senator GOLDWATER apparently seeks to make a political issue of the very independence of the Supreme Court. The Court is defenseless since it must, quite properly, stay outside the arena of political controversy. It is therefore an inviting target for irresponsible criticism, but a most inappropriate one."
>
> The Democratic National Committee said the law school deans making the statement were Jefferson B. Fordham, University of Pennsylvania; Richard C. Maxwell, University of California at Los Angeles; Vernon X. Miller, Catholic University; Eugene V. Rostow, Yale University, and Henry Brandis, Jr., dean emeritus of the University of North Carolina School of Law.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, one of the great justices in the Washington area in recent years, and now retired, is Judge Henry W. Edgerton. He has been a source of inspiration to me. His opinions over the years have been brilliant and scholarly.

Recently, he sent a letter to the Washington Post, the opening sentence of which I read:

> I have retired from regular active service as a circuit judge of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia circuit and am interested in apportionment only as a citizen.

Judge Edgerton proceeds to give a concise account of his views on the recent apportionment issue which plagued the Senate for several weeks. He has set forth in his letter the major arguments that I sought to present in my legal arguments on the floor of the Senate in opposition not only to the Dirksen amendment, but also to the substitutes for the Dirksen amendment. As Senators know, there was not a substitute offered that did not seek to invade the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court and the lower Federal courts. I thought one of the most amusing arguments in support of the substitute was that the last substitute could not be considered as an attack on the Supreme Court because it really constituted only instructions to the lower Federal courts.

Of course, the lower Federal courts are part and parcel of the Federal judicial system, at the head of which happens to be the Chief Justice of the United States. So when we seek to weaken the lower Federal courts we automatically also strike a blow at the Supreme Court itself.

So although some of my friends are unhappy about the fact that I opposed their substitutes, although they were delighted to have me with them in opposition to the Dirksen amendment itself, I am glad to have such sound judicial support—in verification of my position in this historical debate—as Judge Henry W. Edgerton, in which he sets forth in his letter the arguments which I highly endorse.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this letter printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APPORTIONMENT TANGLE

I have retired from regular active service as a circuit judge of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit and am interested in apportionment only as a citizen.

The Constitution says "The judicial power of the United States shall be vested in one Supreme Court, and in such inferior courts as the Congress may from time to time ordain and establish." And "The judicial power shall extend to all cases, in law and equity, arising under this Constitution, the laws of the United States," etc. In cases "arising under" the clause of the Constitution that forbids a State to deny to any person the equal protection of the laws, the Supreme Court has decided that both houses of a State legislature must be apportioned on a population basis so that each person's vote shall have equal weight with every other person's.

The House of Representatives has passed a bill that would nullify these Supreme Court decisions by (1) forbidding the Supreme Court to review cases concerning apportionment of State legislatures and (2) forbidding U.S. district courts to decide such cases in the first place. If this bill were to become law and were observed, it would remove such cases from the "judicial power of the United States." Because these are cases "arising under this Constitution," Congress has no power to do so. For the same reason, Congress has no power to require delay in such cases, as a different bill now pending in the Senate proposes to do.

The Constitution says "The Supreme Court shall have appellate jurisdiction, both as to law and fact, with such exceptions, and under such regulations as the Congress shall make." And Congress may "ordain and establish" inferior courts. But these constitutional provisions no more authorize Congress to prevent the judicial power of the United States from enforcing the right to equal protection of the laws than the same provisions authorize Congress to prevent the judicial power from enforcing the right to freedom of speech, or trial by jury, or any other constitutional right.

Congress cannot nullify constitutional rights by the simple device of forbidding U.S. courts to decide cases in which these rights are involved. Congress may redistribute among U.S. courts the judicial power to enforce constitutional rights, but Congress cannot eliminate or reduce that power. The Constitution, like other documents must be read as a whole.

The constitutional grant to U.S. courts of the judicial power to decide all cases "arising under this Constitution" is not subject to any implicit proviso to the effect: provided Congress is willing. The constitutional grant to Congress of the legislative power to determine what questions may be decided by what courts is subject to an implicit proviso to the effect: provided, that the judicial power conferred by the Constitution upon U.S. courts may not be abridged."

HENRY W. EDGERTON.

WASHINGTON.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me before he leaves that subject?

Mr. MORSE. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. HART. Not to comment on the prudence or tactics employed to defeat the efforts to instruct mildly or directly the structures of the Federal judiciary or just the district courts, but parenthetically, I believe that the tactics used prove that we were not imprudent in the course we took. So long as we are going to end this session with comments on what we have not done in the Senate, would not the Senator agree that we could take pride—and I believe proper pride—in being conscious that the emotional reaction to the so-called prayer cases has not caused Congress to panic to the point that some had led us to believe would happen.

Mr. MORSE. I am delighted at everything we have done to prevent the passage of any "court-busting" bill. I am only sorry that we did not lay the Dirksen amendment on the table. I shall never be convinced that we could not have done so if my good, liberal friends had only rallied in support of the motion, because I believe that it could have been passed—it might have taken another day or two—but it would have been worth it. It would have made pleasant reading for the legal research student in some law school writing a term paper on the reapportionment issue in this session of Congress when he went through the record on the substitute proposal.

THE WASHINGTON, D.C., POLICE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial recently published in Roll Call, entitled "The Washington Police—A Matter of Personal Privilege."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WASHINGTON POLICE—A MATTER OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

(By Sidney Yudian)

This newspaper has won testimonials throughout the Nation for calling attention to Washington's growing crime wave long before it became fashionable.

After discussing the matter with Police Chief Murray and others, we editorialized for changes in existing laws which, according to the police, hampered their efforts to combat crime in the District.

It seemed to us that criminals were afforded too great an advantage over the police under restricting regulations. Senator WAYNE MORSE and many outstanding lawyers disagreed with us. We contend that, in theory, their advocacy of more protection for the accused was fine, but that in practice it led to a perpetuation of crime.

It is amazing how personal experience can produce the facts to change one's convictions where millions of words have failed.

From personal experience with the Metropolitan Police Department, I am now convinced that more—not less—protection is needed for the District citizen against mishandling by some of the police.

I have always respected the police in my hometown (Connecticut) and in the various places I have lived and worked as a newspaperman. I am not a criminal or a lawbreaker, and the respect has been mutual.

After 15 years in the District I have good reason to believe that elements of the Metropolitan Police engage in punitive activity, harassment, and degradation as well as downright illegal practices.

In the 15 years I have been here as an assistant to a Congressman and editor-publisher of the congressional newspaper, I have never appeared at police headquarters for anything more than paying parking tickets. I have never had a moving violation or anything more serious than parking in an alley.

Because my auto has been rifled so many times, I developed the habit of parking on a corner in front of my apartment window. There I can keep an eye on it throughout the night, since, under police protection I have lost four brand new tires, two hubcaps, all of my sister's summer clothing, several suits, myriad shirts, two radio aerials, and various other articles I cannot recall. Another good reason for parking close to my apartment, is the fear of treading the streets at night. Since I work late several nights during the week, the chances of being mugged, stabbed, or robbed are minimized by reducing the space I have to cover before entering the safety of my home.

Since my articles on District crime (actually written to aid the police) I have been attracting parking tickets whenever there was the slightest excuse. Over the years, I would guess I have received between 50 and 75 tickets for parking. Many have been paid, some have been "fixed," at least $300 has been added to the District coffers for little or no reason.

Hints had been dropped that the police were "out to get me."

This week, my experiences with the Metropolitan Police confirmed that rumor. For the first time in my life I am in fear of the police. Suppose I should have an accident, or happen to be on the scene of a crime? What protection would I have against the authority of an officer or officers breathing the fire of vendetta?

Last Tuesday afternoon I left my office for a business luncheon. I walked to my apartment to pick up my car. It was parked in front of my apartment, legally within the white line denoting 40 feet from the corner. There was a car parked in back of it. I decided to leave it and take a taxi.

That evening, after working in the office, I walked home for dinner. I saw a motorcycle policeman sitting in the space behind my car. Watching from my apartment window, I saw a Metropolitan Police tow truck arrive on the scene. The officer directed him to my car. The tow truck pushed my car back, far over the white line. I saw the officer go to the front of my car and examine the fender. Then, just before the car was towed away, he placed a ticket on the car.

With the pressures of deadline and the Labor Day weekend, I did not get to the police headquarters until the following week. There I was told that I had six parking tickets outstanding, and the most current one made it seven.

District regulations forbid the impounding of a car for traffic violation unless the auto is, at the time of impounding, parked illegally. Mine was not, but the officer made sure it was. Besides, I was given a ticket for it.

After paying $10 per ticket, I asked where my car was located. After more than an hour of going from one office to another, one officer said it was downstairs in the lot. It was not there. Back at headquarters, after another hour, someone told me it had been towed to the city car dump at Blue Plains, Md.

Arriving there, we noticed what looked like acres of discarded autos, minus wheels, fenders, hoods and tops. Only one auto in decent repair was in the assortment—mine.

The attendant told me it had arrived on Thursday—apparently towed miles away while I was negotiating for its release.

Examining the front fender, which had been thoroughly repaired and repainted that week, I found a deep gash where the tow truck had banged into it. On the windshield someone had painted a series of large numbers, impossible to rub off.

To tell this story is why I have used this space for a point of personal privilege. I am a citizen endowed with a good reputation and a responsible job. If this can happen to me, what must persons with less recourse be subjected to if for some reason the Metropolitan Police are "out to get him?"

I sincerely hope the Congress will strongly reconsider removing any regulations guaranteeing protection for District citizens. I join Senator Morse in asking for an accounting from the Metropolitan Police in regards to their treatment of all citizens.

While this article is concerned with the Traffic Division of the Metropolitan Police solely, I believe that those charged with its supervision cannot thoroughly be absolved.

EARLY RETIREMENT FOR AMERICAN WORKERS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a former legislative assistant of mine, Mr. Merton C. Bernstein, now a member of the faculty of Yale University Law School, and in my judgment one of the brilliant young legal scholars of this country, has recently written a book on the subject of union pensions and welfare funds. It is one of the most scholarly and sound analyses of this whole field of pension retirement and welfare funds which has been written to date.

In the New Republic of recent date, an article was written by Mr. Merton C. Bernstein, which reflects creditably upon his scholarship, entitled, "The Push for Early Retirement."

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Record, together with another one written by him, published in The Nation for June 15, 1964, entitled, "The Pension Mirage."

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New Republic, Aug. 22, 1964]

THE PUSH FOR EARLY RETIREMENT

(By Merton C. Bernstein)

The UAW this summer will ask the auto companies for optional "early retirement" with full benefits at age 60, and compulsory retirement at age 65 instead of the present 68. Other unions are following the leader. Demands to lower the social security retirement age to 60 are growing more insistent. Optional earlier retirement often in practice is forced on older workers by younger workers; since retirement at age 62, with reduced benefits, became available under social security, many men between 62 and 65 have found such pressure irresistible.

This drive to push out the elderly to protect jobs for the young (really those in their middle years) comes from the rank and file. Yet it is questionable that for every forced retirement a job will open up for younger workers. Some employers are willing to defer an employee's separation until he reaches retirement; when he leaves, the job is blanked. One utility company reports that it filled only one out of eight jobs vacated by retirees: it introduced new devices to coincide with retirements.

The supply of workers in their prime working years—between 30 and 45—will grow proportionally smaller over the next several years, because of the lower birth rates of the depression years. Therefore these people should be in greater demand by employers.

The cost of benefits for early retirees is high. The same money could be better spent to promote more adequate retirement protection and greater job security. The cost for private pension plans would vary considerably, depending upon the age distribution of the employees. For one group analyzed by me, normal retirement age of 65 would be about 25 percent more expensive than age 68. According to one union estimate, reducing retirement age to 60 from 65 would increase plan costs 50 percent. For some plans the differential would be even greater. And a reduction of retirement age to 60 under social security might require a payroll tax increase of 1 full percent of covered payroll, in addition to the present 9¼ percent which is equally shared by employer and employee, i.e., a boost of better than 10 percent.

Exiling the elderly from their work while they still are able and willing to do their jobs inflicts a great psychological wound as well as hurting them financially. This may explain why a high proportion of older workers declare that they want to keep working past 65, but that most of those out of work after 65 tell interviewers that they are not well enough to work. Not only is status destroyed, but the whole pattern of social life is disrupted with loss of a job, because the work place also provides a man's closest companions and many of his leisure activities.

Exile from the job also results in financial demotion; economic want becomes more severe as the years go by. We have yet to realize the need in which most retirees live. Just consider that the average retiree's social security benefit is $80 for men and $120 for couples—which means that perhaps half of the 13 million retirees and their survivors over 65 draw less. Nor do private pensions help many of them. Moreover, private plan benefits generally are quite modest. Even the relatively opulent steelworker and autoworker plans provide (with social security benefits) less than half the retiree's former earnings. Who wants to try to live on less than half his current income? Little wonder that about two out of three elderly persons live below the poverty level—as compared with one one out of five in the population at large.

The earlier we retire people the sooner they will fall below the poverty level because their fixed benefits are eroded by inflation, their earning power is diminished by age, and the benefits themselves must be smaller than they would be if retirement age was higher. This is obviously so because most plans pay in proportion to length of service, therefore any amount of money available for retirement income will provide smaller benefits for each year, if these must be paid out for more years. Moreover, under private plans, where earnings on pension fund principal often generate a large portion of the benefit, the earlier the benefit is drawn the shorter is its period of earning. Not only will most of the unemployed aged live miserably, many will be financial burdens to their children or their communities. Pretty clearly, their consumer purchasing power will be weak at a time when the economy needs all the effective consumers it can get.

Older jobseekers, who according to the Department of Labor already account for a disproportionately high amount of chronic unemployment among displaced men, will be given yet another handicap. Employing them will be yet more expensive if they must be retired earlier, because of the increased pension costs. Moreover, retraining them will be even less worth while because the costs, often high, will be amortized over a shorter period of work.

Better use can be made of whatever amounts are won for retirement programs in collective bargaining and from Congress.

Underlying the proposal for earlier retirement is the notion that it is better to unemploy an older worker with a regular source of income (social security and perhaps pension as well) rather than a younger worker with larger family responsibilities and without the substitute income source. This overestimates the income available to the older jobless person. In more and more States, he does not receive unemployment compensation benefits if getting a private pension benefit. Also younger workers usually will have unemployment compensation benefits, which usually will exceed the combined social security and private pension benefits of a comparable retiree, though unemployment compensation runs out after a specified number of weeks, usually 26.

The younger unemployed person is more employable than the older. He is more retrainable because of generally superior education and often superior learning power. For those now in their fifties and sixties a full high school education was a rarity; for younger workers it was a commonplace. The costs of training younger workers represent a better investment because they can be at their new work for longer.

WHILE THE GETTING IS GOOD

In contrast, where employment opportunities are shrinking and earlier retirement permits younger workers to stay on their present but tenuous jobs longer, many may last only long enough to reach the age at which reemployment and retraining opportunities are less promising—a category which today sets in at age 45 or even lower. In other words, what I suggest is that younger employees should get out of unpromising job situations while the getting is good.

Rather than unemploy the (not-so) elderly workers, our efforts should be upon retraining the young, possibly even before they become unemployed, in the many new skills for which there is a demand. Retraining subsistence allowances under the Manpower Development and Training Act are limited to the State's average unemployment compensation benefits, which are pretty low especially when compared to the regular wages of those with good jobs—the kind of worker being talked about here. Special retraining allowances attractive enough to prevent loss of earnings would be necessary to persuade younger workers to leave well-paying jobs to undertake training for new skills. Of course, some such employees might be on layoff. Even with many of them, training allowances would have to be far more substantial than they are today for them to decide to train for a different job and, in effect, concede that their chances of recall to the old were gone; understandably, workers do this very reluctantly.

There are supposed to be several hundred thousand highly skilled jobs going begging; it is difficult to train the unskilled and semiskilled for many of these tasks, but many highly skilled employees would fit the bill. If we were to enable and induce promising younger people, both unemployed and employed, to train for those jobs, we would achieve more production of goods and services which are in demand (that's why the jobs are open); greater status and financial security for older employees; and well-paying jobs which are relatively secure for younger workers.

Such an arrangement assumes that some of the quite prodigious amounts required for earlier retirement (both under private plans and social security) would be devoted to higher retraining benefits and, in some cases, more expensive and longer training for the younger transferring workers. That should leave a substantial surplus for making improvements in the benefits and protection afforded to those who retire at the older ages. There, the first order of business is to boost social security benefits above their prevailing below-subsistence levels, especially for widows—many quite aged—for whom the average benefit is less than $60 a month.

Our private pension system also stands in need of basic improvement, indeed some profound redesigning. Obviously widows—especially older ones—are in urgent need of a supplement to their social security benefit—only a bare handful of plans provide one. Most plans provide paltry death benefits for survivors of those workers who die before reaching retirement age. Benefits for such younger widows (many not eligible for any social security benefits) and children should also receive high priority.

Under the typical private pension plans most employees separated from their jobs lose the entire value of their pension credits—they might just as well have never been under a plan. This stems from the fact that eligibility depends upon retiring while still employed by the company or, if separated before that, having had service with that company of 10 or 15 years and reaching age 45 or 40; conditions not met by most who leave or are put out of their jobs. Plans should enable most separated employees to take with them at least some of the value represented by their earned credits—the more the better—so that when they reach retirement their resources will be more adequate to provide a standard of living of decency. (Such arrangements, known as "vesting," could be facilitated by a national private pension clearinghouse, a proposal to which I devote a substantial part of my book.)

[From the Nation, June 15, 1964]

THE PENSION MIRAGE

(By Merton C. Bernstein)

In the war that has been declared on poverty, scant attention is being paid to the economy's veterans—the retirees and those about to be mustered out of the ranks of the employed. We had better look to their problems soon because, behind the crisis of unemployment, another crisis is building. Whenever automation displaces workers, whenever a plant lays off hordes of workers or a whole company shuts down, the workers not only lose their jobs, but a high proportion of them also see their expected retirement savings wiped out. This happens because private pension plans are out of phase with changing patterns of employment.

For example, when Studebaker, after 40 years of operation, closed its last plant in the United States, the sudden unemployment of its several thousand workers made headlines across the country. Unreported was the second tragedy: the disappearance of the expected retirement savings of more than five out of six employees still on the payroll. Simply stated, the Studebaker pension fund, limited to this one company, had insufficient money to meet the valid claims built up over decades of service. Luckily, there was enough in the account for those already retired and for another 1,100 who were beyond 60 and immediately eligible for retirement. Of the remaining 5,700 employees, the bulk—3,900—were older than 40 and had worked more than 10 years for Studebaker. This group was entitled under the terms of the plan to the "vesting" of their credits; that is, a legally binding promise to pay a man, at 65, benefits in accordance with his term of service. Vesting is intended to protect those who, having earned substantial credits in a retirement plan, may leave the company or be dismissed before reaching retirement age. Unfortunately, at Studebaker, as is common, the obligation was limited to the resources of the fund, which ran dry meeting the claims of retirees. Hence the other long-service employees lost both job and expected pension savings; and, of course, so did the other 1,800 workers who were not yet 40.

This is story is being repeated across the Nation when plants close or lay off their workers because of rapidly changing technology, defense emphasis, export markets and consumer patterns. Sometimes pension credits mean nothing because the cupboard is bare—as with the Packard shutdown in Detroit a few years ago. More often, displaced workers lose pension credits because their plans do not contain vesting provisions or because the qualifying conditions are too stringent.

We have yet to awaken to the full dimensions of the financial pickle of the elderly—who are becoming more numerous and constitute an ever larger portion of the population. At present, more than 17 million Americans have reached 65, the arbitrary age at which our social security system and most private pension plans permit retirement with full benefits. Ever since World War I, the working life of the average American has been getting shorter, while the average lifespan has been lengthening. Pension plans have established a retirement age for many enterprises, and often it is compulsory. So fewer and fewer of the aged will have jobs; yet they will be living longer than people have in the past.

On what will they live? The mainstay of most retirees and their widows is social security, as the old-age and survivors' insurance program has come to be known. Despite a series of major improvements that began in 1950, social security benefits, if not supplemented, maintain people in a style to which none of us wishes to become accustomed. Retired workers receive from OASI an average of about $76 a month ($80 for men and $60 for women); couples average $125 (a husband and wife over 65 receive 1.5 times the husband's primary benefit). Alas, widows average but $58 a month—or a not so grand total of $696 a year.

Because social security benefits in the 1940's were so inadequate—far below even today's modest scale—unions began to bargain hard for employer-financed pension plans as part of the wage- and working-condition package. Starting in World War II, and more markedly since the onset of the Korean conflict, the plans have multiplied. They were facilitated for employers by favorable tax treatment and the phenomenal increases in value and earnings of the stock in which more and more of the pension funds became invested. So today, it is estimated—unfortunately no one really knows—that something more than 43,000 plans with assets greater than $66 billion "cover" perhaps 23 million working people. (Of course, that's a good deal less than the 43 million nonfarm employees who work full time, and the figure rises to 80 million if seasonal workers are included.)

But being covered carries no assurance of receiving a pension. Approximately 85 percent of the employees covered are in single-employer plans which condition pension eligibility upon retirement at 65 after long service with the company, alternatively, vesting is available to employees separated from a job if they are over age 40 or 45, and if they have worked continuously for that one company for 10 or 15 years. The catch is that the ups and downs of the economy keep people moving in and out of jobs by the millions. Nor is the seniority enjoyed by many older workers a sure defense against displacement; the category of work to which their seniority attaches may be wiped out.

Rapid shifts in defense production are probably the most dramatic job destroyers. A congressional decision to discontinue a plane or missile can cost tens of thousands of jobs in a matter of months. Scrapping the Skybolt missile caused one company to lay off 1,700 workers within days; 2,000 to 3,000 were dropped thereafter. One subcontractor alone separated 3,200 employees. In the aggregate, these changes are enormous. From a postwar high of 928,000 in 1957, aircraft employment dropped to 640,000 in 1960.

Technological change—of which, I suggest, we've seen only the beginning—eats up jobs by the hundreds of thousands. A short time back, some evangelists of automation declared that jobs would be made, not lost, as it advanced. Even if that should prove to be true, new devices displace workers, and not only from factory jobs but from service and white-collar positions.

Competition from overseas, shifts in domestic tastes, shifts in the population profile (more babies, more oldsters, fewer people in their middle years), changes in demand for goods and services all mean a shifting pattern of consumption; that in turn means a high job turnover—and many lost pension credits. Technological developments often make it advantageous for a company to shut down an old plant and build a new one nearer markets or sources of supply. Such shifts are facilitated when new techniques free the employer from dependence on a skilled labor supply.

Some companies, usually under union pressure, consent to partial benefits for separated employees, but the law has yet to compel such payments. Without exception, the courts turn down employee pleas to preserve pension credits earned before a merger, mass layoff, or other organization switch. The judges usually do not look beyond the precise terms of the plans themselves, which rarely provide for plant or unit shutdowns, mergers, and the like. Courts overlook the fact that employer contributions to pension plans have come to be regarded and dealt with by both companies and unions—and, indeed, by Congress in several major pieces of legislation—as a form of compensation. In effect, the employees are denied part of their pay.

In one such shutdown which went into litigation, some 10,000 jobs were lost and with them all pension credits; even employees who would have reached retirement age during the span of the current collective-bargaining agreement (some with 20 and more years of service) lost all the potential value of pension credits. In another plant shutdown case, employees within a few weeks of age 65 were fired, and thereby lost all their retirement benefits. On occasion, an employer who shuts down recaptures the use of the funds that had been set aside for pensions.

Obviously, most existing pension plans do not fit rapidly changing employment patterns; the courts are unimaginative and wooden, and the Treasury Department has been doing too little too late. Other remedies are required.

The prescriptions usually offered for improvement are vesting—for long-term, older employees—and multiemployer plans. The trouble is that large groups of employees, caught in mass layoffs, do not have sufficient service (10, 15 or even 20 years) and the requisite age (typically 40, 45 or even 50 and 55) to meet vesting conditions. Moreover, vesting as now practiced, means high administrative cost and low benefits subject to erosion by inflation. And while multiemployer plans are some improvement, because an employee who spends his working life in one industry can carry his credits from one employer to another, they are no help at all when the industry is declining, as the plight of the mineworkers so pathetically attests.

Private employment-based pension plans were called into being to supplement a sadly inadequate social security retirement program. Since 1950, OASI has only just kept pace with inflation. Hence, private-plan supplements are still needed and will continue to be. Hence, also, they clearly require some basic redesigning. What we need, in essence, is a pension system which allows an employee to obtain at least some of the value implicit in every year of pension credits he earns, and to carry it with him to any future job. Although there have been timid calls for "portable pensions," all such proposals are based upon the kind of vesting described, with shortcomings even beyond those sketched.

What I urge is a national clearinghouse to facilitate the transfer of pension credits as employees move from job to job throughout their career. The clearinghouse could be operated as an all-public or an all-private affair, or under one of several public-private arrangements. It should offer a master group plan for small companies, which find it burdensome and costly to cover their employees—and rarely do so. This will become a matter of growing importance as the service trades, in which small firms are common, account for an ever larger portion of the work force.

The details of a national scheme are complex, the problems many—but they are all manageable. To get started, we need awareness of the problem and sufficient concern to seek solutions. We have lacked both.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am sure that the Labor and Welfare Committee of the Senate will be confronted next year with several issues, particularly in connection with the job losses caused by automation, which will bring us face to face with problems of welfare funds, pensions and retirement funds. I am sure that we shall all be grateful to Mr. Bernstein because he has already done much of the research work for us.

I believe that all we need to do will be to take the mass of material found in Mr. Bernstein's book and use it as the basis to implement whatever proposed legislation we wish to enact.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 1147. An act to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to construct and maintain an adequate system of roads and trails for the national forests, and for other purposes;

S. 1593. An act to amend section 14 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1954 concerning the interstate planning and coordination of the Great River Road;

S. 2460. An act to amend the act of July 13, 1959, so as to extend the period of time within which certain construction may be undertaken by the State of Missouri on lands conveyed to such State by the United States;

S. 2649. An act to designate as the Graham Burke Pumping Plant the pumping plant being constructed in the State of Arkansas as part of the White River backwater unit of the lower Mississippi River flood control project;

S. 2654. An act to change the name of the canal known as the Bay Head-Manasquan Canal and as the Manasquan River-Barnegat Bay Canal, to Point Pleasant Canal;

S. 2968. An act to amend subsection 120(f) of title 23, United States Code; and

S. 3143. An act to designate as Clair Engle Lake the reservoir created by the Trinity Dam, Central Valley project, California.

The message also announced that the House had severally agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the following bills of the House:

H.R. 9393. An act to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide full retroactivity for disability determinations, to extend the period within which ministers may elect coverage, and to validate wages erroneously reported for certain engineering aids employed by soil and water conservation districts in Oklahoma;

H.R. 10473. An act to extend the period during which Federal payments may be made for foster care in child-care institutions under the program of aid to families with dependent children under title IV of the Social Security Act; and

H.R. 11812. An act making appropriations for foreign assistance and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes.

RECESS SUBJECT TO CALL OF THE CHAIR

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Michigan.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 10 minutes, p.m., the Senate took a recess subject to the call of the Chair.)

At 8 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m., the Senate reassembled, and was called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair).

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF "IMMIGRATION HEARINGS BEFORE SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 1 OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, PARTS 1, 2, AND 3"

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I submit a concurrent resolution, which I send to the desk. I ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be read.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 358) was read, as follows:

H. Con. Res. 358. Concurrent resolution to provide for the printing of 5,000 additional copies of "Immigration Hearings Before Subcommittee No. 1 of the Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, parts 1, 2, and 3."

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, five thousand additional copies of part 1, "Immigration Hearings Before Subcommittee No. 1 of the Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives"; and five thousand additional copies, each, of parts 2 and 3 to be printed concurrently with the publications entitled "Immigration Hearings Before Subcommittee No. 1 of the Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives", Eighty-eighth Congress, second session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALTERS in the chair). Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (H. Con. Res. 538) was considered and agreed to.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF DOCUMENT ENTITLED "STUDY OF POPULATION AND IMMIGRATION PROBLEMS; POPULATION OF THE UNITED STATES"

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I submit a concurrent resolution, which I send to the desk. I ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be read.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 364) was read, as follows:

H. Con. Res. 364. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of an additional 1,000 copies of the document entitled "Study of Population and Immigration Problems; Population of the United States."

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there shall be printed one thousand additional copies of the documents entitled "Study of Population and Immigration Problems; Population of the United States", with illustrations and maps, special series 1 through 16, inclusive, for the use of the House Committee on the Judiciary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 364) was considered and agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12633) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 10, 11, 12, 31, 39, 45, 51, and 63 to the bill and concurred therein, and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 38, 40, 43, and 60 to the bill and concurred therein, severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1965—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12633) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of today.)

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

FOOD STAMP PROGRAM

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I wish to address my remarks briefly to that portion of the conference report which relates to the financing of the permanent food stamp program that follows the enactment of the permanent authorization law at this session.

I regret that in the conference meeting between the Senate and the House conferees in connection with the supplemental appropriations bill, H.R. 12633, the Senate conferees were unable to prevail upon the provision inserted under this head in the appropriations bill, which reads as follows:

> *Provided*, That hereafter appropriations under this head shall be made in accordance with the provisions of Public Law 88–525.

That amendment was in accord with the authorization law passed by the Congress at the present session, when it enacted a permanent food stamp program.

As one member of the Agricultural Subcommittee on Appropriations, I wish to make it abundantly clear that, so far as I am concerned, any future requests in a budget estimate to use section 32 funds for financing the food stamp program will be vigorously opposed.

The statement of the managers of the bill in the House of Representatives in connection with the conference report reads as follows:

> While Senate language prohibiting the use of section 32 for this purpose has been eliminated, the conferees concur with the intent of such language.

Mr. President, I interpret that language to mean that the House agrees with us that under the provisions of the authorizing legislation, section 32 funds should not be used for this purpose, which is a welfare purpose, but that, instead, general revenue funds should be so used.

I believe that this agreement of the conferees in connection with the supplemental appropriations bill should be directive enough to the Department and to budget-making officials outside the Department of Agriculture to preclude any recurrence of unwarranted and unauthorized proposals to transfer section 32 funds for other purposes not directly related to its original intent.

If there is to be any clear record available for Members of Congress, or anyone else, as to the expenses in connection with any governmental program, it is my view that the financing thereof should be by direct appropriation, out of the general revenues of the Treasury, rather than by attempts to camouflage the cost of programs through transfer from permanent appropriation funds, such as section 32.

Mr. President, I ask that there be printed in the RECORD at this point the pertinent provisions of section 16 of Public Law 88–525, the authorizing legislation.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> SEC. 16. (a) To carry out the provisions of this Act, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated not in excess of $75,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965; not in excess of $100,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966; and not in excess of $200,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967; and not in excess of such sum as may hereafter be authorized by Congress for any subsequent fiscal year. Such portion of any such appropriation as may be required to pay for the value of the coupon allotments issued to eligible households which is in excess of the charges paid by such households for such allotments shall be transferred to and made a part of the separate account created under section 7(d) of this Act.
>
> (d) Amounts expended under the authority of this Act shall not be considered amounts expended for the purpose of carrying out the agricultural price support program and appropriations for the purposes of this Act shall be considered, for the purpose of budget presentations, to relate to the functions of the Government concerned with welfare.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, section 16(a) of the Food Stamp Act of 1964 authorizes that the financing be by regular appropriations, and specifies the limitations through fiscal 1967.

Second, section 16(d) makes it very clear that the costs of the food stamp program are not considered price-support programs operations, and appropriations made for the purposes of carrying out the Food Stamp Act are to be considered for the purpose of budget presentations to relate to the functions concerned with welfare and not with agricultural support programs.

The action by the conference committee provides $60 million for expenses of the new program for the fiscal year 1965, and for the continuation of the pilot program during the current fiscal year.

Mr. President, the wording of the authorizing statute could not be clearer, and I believe that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and the members of the Subcommittee on Agriculture of the Committee on Appropriations will be extremely insistent from this time forward that the food stamp program shall be regarded as a welfare program and shall be financed as directed by the authorization act out of general revenue rather than out of section 32 funds. I thank the Presiding Officer.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 12633, which was read, as follows:

> *Resolved,* That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 10, 11, 12, 31, 39, 45, 51, and 63 to the bill (H.R. 12633) entitled "An Act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes", and concur therein.
>
> *Resolved,* That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following:
>
> "For an additional amount for 'defense educational activities,' $60,750,000, of which $10,300,000 shall be for capital contributions to student loan funds and loans for non-Federal capital contributions (not to exceed $300,000) to student loan funds, $10,000,000 shall be for grants to States for equipment and minor remodeling of facilities for the purposes included in section 301 of Public Law 85–864, as amended, and for supervisory and other services, and $3,000,000 shall be for grants to States for testing, guidance, and counseling: *Provided*, That, in lieu of amounts heretofore specified, allotments for grants to States under sections 302(a) and 305 for acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling shall be made on the basis of $70,400,000, allotments for loans to private nonprofit schools shall be made on the basis of $9,600,000, and allotments under section 302(b) for supervisory and other services shall be made on the basis of $6,000,000: *Provided further,* That this appropriation shall be available only upon enactment of S. 3060, Eighty-eighth Congress, or similar legislation, amending the National Defense Education Act of 1958: *Provided further,* That none of the funds available for "Payments to school districts" shall be paid to the District of Columbia or any agency thereof as a result of Federal impact on the schools of the District of Columbia during fiscal year 1965."
>
> *Resolved,* That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:
>
> "For an additional amount for "Community Health Practice and Research", $5,000,000 to be derived by transfer from the appropriations for the Economic Opportunity Program, Office of Economic Opportunity: *Provided*, That the appropriation under this head in the Department of Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act, 1965 (Public Law 88–605) shall be available to carry out section 306 of the Public Health Service Act."
>
> *Resolved,* That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 43, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:
>
> "*Provided, further,* That not to exceed $2,000,000 of this appropriation may be transferred to "Grants to States for public assistance" to carry out existing projects authorized by section 1115 of the Social Security Act, as amended."
>
> *Resolved,* That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 60, and concur therein with

an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert the following:

"APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION

"*Salaries and expenses*

"For necessary expenses of the Federal representative and his alternate on the Appalachian Regional Commission and for payment of the administrative expenses of the Commission, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), and hire of passenger motor vehicles, $800,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall become effective upon enactment into law of authorizing legislation."

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 40, 43, and 60.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. What is the status of the conference report at the present time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate has agreed to the only amendment that was in question. The bill will be transmitted to the House for the House to act on the last amendment of the Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Chair.

PRINTING AS SENATE DOCUMENT OF ANNUAL REPORT OF JOINT SENATE-HOUSE REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, it has been customary in all other years for the annual report of the Joint Senate-House Republican leadership to be published as a Senate document. I see no necessity for having it published in the Record, but I ask unanimous consent that there be printed as a Senate document the annual report of the Joint Senate-House Republican leadership.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SENATOR GOLDWATER'S VIEWS—REMARKS BY CICERO

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, in the September 19, 1964, issue of America magazine there appears a letter to the editors written by Miss Taylor Caldwell, of Buffalo, N.Y. Her letter deals with remarks made by Cicero in defense of Rome. I believe the letter to be timely and appropriate, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Editor: A considerable time ago—long before he was even considered as the Republican nominee—I wrote Barry Goldwater and quoted a saying of Marcus Tullius Cicero's, in connection with Cicero's defense of Rome against the evil and violent patrician, Lucius Sergius Catilina. The quotation is from the Vatican archives, which I read and translated for use: "I must remind you, lords, Senators, that extreme patriotism in the defense of freedom is no crime. And let me respectfully remind you that pusillanimity in the pursuit of justice is no virtue in a Roman."

Whether that quotation of Cicero's remained in Barry's mind, I do not know. It is still true today, when America is in exactly the same position as Rome was when Cicero was consul—an office similar to that of the President of the United States. Barry meant just what Cicero meant, and under the same circumstances, and the liberals know it only too well.

Rome had declined, as Aristotle had said, centuries before the event, from a republic into a democracy, and, as Aristotle said, "democracies degenerate into despotisms." Catilina's speech to the murky underworld of Rome—composed of criminals, unemployed freemen, songsters, dancers, "intellectuals," the disaffected and the traitors—could be used by any "liberal" politician today, word for word. And Cicero's orations against Catilina could be used by Barry today, in toto, and would be just as valid.

We have several Catilinas in American public life today. Fortunately, we have a Cicero in Barry Goldwater.

Miss Taylor Caldwell.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I shall refer to one paragraph of the letter, because it is so timely. It indicates that in any age or generation, the mind of man contrives the same thing. Here is Cicero's statement; it is from the Vatican Archives:

> I must remind you, lords, Senators, that extreme patriotism in the defense of freedom is no crime. And let me respectfully remind you that pusillanimity in the pursuit of justice is no virtue in a Roman.

That sounds almost word for word like Barry Goldwater and it was uttered a long time ago in the dignity of the Roman Senate.

THE BIG ROCK CANDY MOUNTAINS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, for a long time I have been searching for a definition of "the great society." I started with the New Deal, and then the Fair Deal, and then the New Frontier, and then the great society; and I wondered how one would adequately define it. I discovered a definition. It is a song. Perhaps I shall sing it tomorrow for the edification of the Senate. The title is "The Big Rock Candy Mountains."

I will read the introduction and then the chorus:

THE BIG ROCK CANDY MOUNTAINS

Introduction

On a summer's day in the month of May,
  A burly little bum come a-hiking,
Travelling down that lonesome road
  A-looking for his liking.
He was headed for a land that was far away,
  Beside the crystal fountain—
"I'll see you all this coming fall
  In the Big Rock Candy Mountain."

1.

In the Big Rock Candy Mountains
  You never change your socks,
And little streams of alcohol
  Come a-trickling down the rocks.
The boxcars are all empty
And the railroad bulls are blind,
  There's a lake of stew and whiskey, too,
  You can paddle all around 'em in a big canoe
In the Big Rock Candy Mountains.

Chorus

O—the buzzing of the bees
In the cigarette trees
  Round the soda-water fountain,
Where the lemonade springs
And the bluebird sings
  In the Big Rock Candy Mountains.

2.

In the Big Rock Candy Mountains,
  There's a land that's fair and bright,
Where the handouts grow on bushes
  And you sleep out every night,
Where the boxcars are all empty
And the sun shines every day,
  O I'm bound to go, where there ain't no snow,
  Where the rain don't fall and the wind don't blow
In the Big Rock Candy Mountains.

3.

In the Big Rock Candy Mountains
  The jails are made of tin
And you can bust right out again
  As soon as they put you in;
The farmer's trees are full of fruit,
  The barns are full of hay,
  I'm going to stay where you sleep all day,
Where they boiled in oil the inventor of toil
In the Big Rock Candy Mountains.

Mr. President, I think that must be the great society.

THE MINORITY LEADER'S REPORT

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, it is also customary at this season of the year to place in the Record an account of the activities of Congress for the past 2 years; and I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted at this point in the Record and to be printed as a Senate document, the minority leader's report, together with some attached data.

There being no objection, the report and attachments were ordered to be printed in the Record, and to be printed as a Senate document, as follows:

THE MINORITY LEADER'S REPORT

The 2d session of the 88th Congress is now history. Like all institutions serving the people, it will be appraised in various ways.

One favorite inquiry is to ask, "Who got what?" and then proceed to list what was or was not done for labor, business, agriculture, relief, the aged, and other social and economic groups.

Still another assessment—as I have pointed out before—is the volume approach; namely, days in session, pages filled in the Congressional Record, the number of bills enacted, the number of recorded votes, the number of bills on which no action was taken, the number of nominations submitted and approved, and other items. All this I leave to the statistical bonepickers.

The principal achievements of the session are conceded to be the tax reduction bill and the civil rights bill. Other measures are included with this report.

I make especial mention of two measures. The first is the Antipoverty Act, officially styled the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. This proposal burst upon the Congress and the country with a flourish of trumpets and the great battle cry "War on Poverty." The slogan is mainly political. The report of the Committee on Labor and Education of the House of Representatives on this measure indicates that we already have 43 individual programs dealing with the cause, prevention, and cure of poverty. This new program duplicates much of what is already being done and its purpose and scope are anything but new.

The act provides for a Job Corps, a work training program, a work study program, urban and rural community act programs, special programs to combat poverty in rural areas, employment and investment incentive programs, pilot programs, and small business loans. To this one should add the authority of the Director to enlist an unlimited number of "volunteers for America." It is quite a package. By means of camps and centers, study classes and incidental work, community projects and land development, loans and grants, a half million persons will actually be added to the Federal payroll without full payroll status. All this is to cost about $1 billion the first year.

It is but the first installment. Unless this program departs from the historic pattern, it will be here a long time and grow and grow and grow. If there were the slightest chance that the durable results to be expected from this program justified such an outlay, it might be accepted as at least a fair gamble.

But the justifications which were submitted were weak and conjectural. The cost per enrollee in the Job Corps, for example, is admittedly sky high—$5,000 per year (a year in Harvard costs only $3,800). And the type of training will fall far short of the needs and requirements of an expanding industrial economy.

The second measure which merits some comment is the so-called Appalachia project, named for an area of 11 States from Pennsylvania to Alabama which cluster about or near the Appalachian Range and embrace 355 counties. The overall cost on a 5-year basis would also be a billion dollars to be jointly financed by the Federal and State Governments. More than $8 out of every $10 provided by the program would go to highways. The balance would be scattered among schools, hospitals, health facilities, the restoration of mining areas, etc. To be sure, the very construction of such facilities would provide temporary jobs. But a durable, lasting job is one which must be geared to the production and servicing of goods and commodities.

Coal and timber are the basic resources of this area. What is going to be done to retrieve markets for the dwindling coal mines? Where is the program for developing markets for the timber industry? What hope is there for an impoverished area unless its development is strongly geared to the production of goods and services and not merely to the building of city halls, sewage disposal plants, and highways?

The House of Representatives failed to act on this measure during the 88th Congress.

The area redevelopment program is subject to much of the same criticism. So many of its frills have already been exposed. It has now been provided with another $355 million for the fiscal year 1965. If anyone wishes to examine a classical account of the incredible and fantastic operations of ARA, an article should be read which appears on page 197 of the September issue of Reader's Digest under the title, "When the Bubble Burst in Crockett, Texas." By permission, the article is appended at the end of this statement. It requires no amplification from me.

These are some of the things which the Republican minority has sought to bring to light in connection with these and other measures. With a public debt of $314 billion, a deficit between income and outgo of $8.3 billion, an increase of 13 percent in the Federal debt since World War II, an increase of 448 percent in the State and local debt in that same period, an increase of Federal aid to the States from $885 million to $7 billion since 1946, how long can this squandermania continue before we are in deep trouble?

Already signs of fiscal desperation, inflation, and difficulty are appearing elsewhere as in the case of Italy. Other countries are moving in that direction. Can we hope to avoid this contagion if our fiscal house is not in order? One can only look to the lamps of the past and take note that we did not escape it before.

At this point I must take a departure from the pattern of these annual reports. It concerns not the performance of Congress, but the future of Congress as an institution. It, in plain English, amounts to a constitutional crisis and should be understood by every American.

This 88th Congress comes to an end as we observe the 187th anniversary of the formulation of the Federal Constitution. That document created Congress. It made it article I, ahead of the other branches. From time to time, we should refresh ourselves on the first section under that article. It is clear and all inclusive. It recites that, "The legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives." That is the whole of it.

Speaking of the powers given to Congress by the Constitution, President Monroe was led to observe that, "The whole system of the National Government may be said to rest essentially on the powers granted to this branch."

But today, it is beset with reformers who believe it is too slow, too clumsy, and too inefficient. It is beset with reorganizers who would like to change its structure, its rules, its committees. It is beset by pressure groups without number who know full well that only through the Congress can they secure the laws and the authority which are to their liking and which serves their own particular economic and social purposes.

As an institution, the Congress has been castigated from within and from without. It has been lampooned and cartooned. It has been reviled and calumniated.

In other days this attitude toward Congress was not to be taken too seriously because it was sporadic and diffused. But today, it is quite another thing. The effort to demean and denigrate the Congress appears to be organized. It embraces Congressmen, Senators, professors, some of the press, pressure groups, some columnists, and a few commentators. Not the least of the forces at work to downgrade the Congress resides in the executive branch of Government itself. This is no new phenomenon. It takes the form of flouting the will of Congress, of withholding information, of ignoring the intent of the legislative branch. Some years ago, I listened to the late distinguished Senator from Georgia, Walter George, as he addressed the Senate and uttered the conviction that one of the great and disturbing weaknesses in our Government today was to get those who are charged with executing the laws enacted by the Congress to carry out its expressed will and intent. Whenever the Congress and the people become both complacent and reconciled to such a state of affairs, then indeed will the most important branch of the Government become demeaned and downgraded in its own eyes and in the eyes of the people.

Now there is a new threat. We are confronted with still another invasion of the legislative power. It comes from the third branch of our Government—the judiciary.

Justice Felix Frankfurter while on the Supreme Court had occasion to comment on the trend during his judicial service. Justice Learned Hand once referred to the tendency of the Supreme Court to become "a third legislative chamber" and Prof. Edward Corwin, of Princeton, remarked upon "the aggression of the Court." Now the aggression has become a full reality.

The action of the Supreme Court in the so-called apportionment cases is an affront to both the legislative process and the Constitution itself. The Court's interpretation of the 14th amendment in these decisions is such that the powers of the States to deal with the composition of their own legislatures is jeopardized and the power of the Congress to deal with the problem through the amendatory process to the Constitution is cavalierly dismissed as an arbitrary and capricious effort to tyrannize the High Court. In recent weeks, there has been a veritable rash of articles, editorials, and comments on this matter and especially from the cloistered deans and professors of our law schools. What this melange adds up to is complete confusion of the issue.

First, it is essential to grasp what the Court has done.

When our great Constitution was being written the primary concern of the Founding Fathers was the protection of the rights and interests of all the people—not just those of the majority, but of the minority, not just the great, but the small, not just the rich, but the poor, not just those in the densely populated urban centers, but those in the sparsely populated areas.

The backbone of this concern was expressed in the establishment of a Federal system of States under a tripartite National Government of carefully limited powers, with all other authority residing in the States. One of the National Government's delicate balances was the establishment of a U.S. Senate based on geographic representation, and a House of Representatives based on population. It was based on the constitutional practice of certain of the original 13 States themselves.

Last June, the Supreme Court by a 6-to-3 decision, without clear constitutional language nor precedents to guide it, upset 175 years of legislative tradition rooted firmly, as we have seen, in the very birth of the Constitution itself. In a decision by Chief Justice Warren, the Court held:

"With respect to the allocation of legislative representation, all voters, as citizens of a State, stand in the same relation regardless of where they live. Any suggested criteria for the differentiation of citizens are insufficient to justify any discrimination, as to the weight of their vote, unless relevant to the permissible purposes of legislative apportionment. Since the achieving of fair and effective representation for all citizens is concededly the basic aim of legislative apportionment, we conclude that the equal protection clause guarantees the opportunity for equal participation by all voters in the election of State legislators * * *.

"We hold that, as a basic constitutional standard, the equal protection clause requires that the seats in both houses of a bicameral State legislature must be apportioned on a population basis. Simply stated, an individual's right to vote for State legislators is unconstitutionally impaired when its weight is in a substantial fashion diluted when compared with votes of citizens living in other parts of the State."

Justices Stewart, Clark, and Harlan dissented in the sharpest tones. Said Justice Stewart in part:

"The Court's draconian pronouncement, which makes unconstitutional the legislatures of most of the 50 States, finds no support in the words of the Constitution, in any prior decision of this Court, or in the 175-year political history of our Federal Union.

"With all respect, I am convinced these decisions mark a long step backward into that unhappy era when a majority of the members of this Court were thought by many to have convinced themselves and each other that the demands of the Constitution were to be measured not by what it says, but by their own notion of wise political theory.

"The rule announced today is at odds with long-established principles of constitutional adjudication under the equal-protection clause, and it stifles values of local individuality and initiative vital to the character of the Federal Union which it was the genius of our Constitution to create * * *.

"What the Court has done is to convey a particular political philosophy into a constitutional rule, binding upon each of the 50 States * * * without regard and without respect for the many individualized and differentiated characteristics of each State * * * stemming from distinct history, distinct geography, distinct distribution of population and distinct political heritage."

Justice Clark remarked in part: "I cannot agree to the arbitrary application of the one man, one vote principle for both houses of a State legislature. In my view, if one house is fairly apportioned by population * * * then the people should have some latitude in providing, on a rational basis, for representation in the other house."

In his scholarly and exhaustive dissent, Justice Harlan literally dissected the majority opinion. He summed up his dissent in these historic words:

"What is done today deepens my conviction that judicial entry into this realm is profoundly ill advised and constitutionally impermissible. As I have said before * * * I believe that the vitality of our political system, on which in the last analysis all else depends, is weakened by reliance on the judiciary for political reform; in time a complacent body politic may result.

"These decisions also cut deeply into the fabric of our federalism. What must follow from them may eventually appear to be the product of State legislatures. Nevertheless, no thinking person can fail to recognize that the aftermath of these cases, however desirable it may be thought in itself, will have been achieved at the cost of a radical alteration in the relationship between the States and the Federal Government, more particularly the Federal judiciary. Only one who has an overbearing impatience with the Federal system and its political processes will believe that that cost was not too high or was inevitable * * *.

"Finally, these decisions give support to a current mistaken view of the Constitution and the constitutional function of this Court This view, in a nutshell, is that every major social ill in this country can find its cure in some constitutional 'principle' and that this Court should 'take the lead' in promoting reform when other branches of Government fail to act. The Constitution is not a panacea for every blot upon the public welfare, nor should this Court, ordained as a judicial body, be thought of as a general haven for reform movements.

"The Constitution is an instrument of Government, fundamental to which is the premise that in a diffusion of governmental authority lies the greatest promise that this Nation will realize liberty for all its citizens.

"This Court, limited in function in accordance with that premise, does not serve its high purpose when it exceeds its authority, even to satisfy judicial impatience with the slow workings of the political process. For when, in the name of constitutional interpretation, the Court adds something to the Constitution that was deliberately excluded from it, the Court in reality substitutes its view of what should be so for the amending process."

There is the essence of the Supreme Court's decision, and of the dissenting opinions by the Justices who disagreed.

What is next? A whole ocean of uncharted waters confronts the American people as a result of the Court's action.

When the Court employs the brand of logic found in this decision the entire historic Federal-State relationship comes into question, segments of the Federal system itself appear in jeopardy, and the very foundation of municipal and county government is potentially challenged.

It is, for example, clear that approximately 44 of the 50 States must revise their legislative apportionment—historically divided on a population and a geographic basis—so that it rests solely on population. This overturn of 175 years of legislative tradition, with neither clear constitutional language nor precedents to sustain it, raises the serious question as to what next is on the docket to further invade rights unmistakably vested by the Constitution in the States. How far can the 14th or equal protection amendment be stretched? What other constitutional amendments have been adopted for one purpose, one intent, which can now be interpreted by the Court to rewrite the Constitution in a manner never intended by the original authors?

Who can say? Will the U.S. Senate—where today 26 States having only 16 percent of the population could exercise a 52 to 48 majority—be next? Or will it be the electoral college system under which one New York City precinct could nullify the electoral vote of 12 States for President of the United States?

Or will it be the governmental instruments of the 3,072 counties in the United States, the 34 independent cities, and the 24 election districts in Alaska? Or the 91,185 other types of local government which include 34,678 school districts, 17,997 municipalities, and 17,144 townships? Far fetched?

Not at all. A Michigan court has already ruled, on the basis of the Supreme Court decision, that the Kent County Board of Supervisors must be reapportioned on a population-only basis.

Clearly, the apportionment decision of the Supreme Court has far-reaching implications. To correct imbalances in representation in certain areas where the legislatures themselves had refused to act—rightly or wrongly—a whole new philosophy of judicial interpretation of the Constitution has been evolved.

We are, whether we yet fully realize it or not, in a constitutional crisis. We must look profoundly at this page in our history and decide if we want to erase it. If we don't we may find the pages have only begun to turn.

AGRICULTURE

Republicans have always believed the farmer exemplifies the free way of life. We believe that free farmers are the Nation's greatest asset for they not only provide food for our own people but for others. That the free farmer who has produced in such abundance is our greatest asset is proved by the fact that Soviet Russia has had to call upon our farmers as well as farmers of other free countries to supply their need for wheat for bread to fill the mouths of their own children.

However, the Democrat administrations have always looked upon this abundance and surplus of agricultural commodities as a sword of Damocles hanging over our heads. The only answer they have had for this problem is more and more stringent controls over the farmers' freedom, instead of pushing for more utilization research, to find new and industrial uses for agricultural commodities. The Department of Agriculture requested that no additional funds for this purpose be included in the 1965 agriculture appropriations.

Here, in the approach to this important problem, the Democrat administrations have differed extensively from the Republican viewpoint.

In the first session of this Congress, the Democrat administration offered the farmers a generous subsidy in return for accepting Federal aid. What they failed to stress was that in accepting this subsidy they were placing the chains of most severe controls on the farmers.

The extension of the Feed Grains Act as sponsored by the Democrat administration contained many changes from the original act, and retained many of the same shackles with a demand for speedy action on the ground that it was urgent. It was indeed urgent from the Democrat viewpoint, for looming up was the wheat referendum on which the farmers were to vote whether or not they would accept Federal payments which would limit their freedom of action.

But what happened? Despite heavy pressure, the farmers chose to retain their freedom even though a frantic pressure campaign was waged all over the Nation by the administration and its bureaucratic personnel. In fact, these political activities became so flagrant that a section was written into the 1964 agricultural appropriations bill, forbidding funds to be used by the Agriculture Department for influencing the vote in any referendum or to influence agriculture legislation by county agents or for engaging in any activities other than advisory and supervisory duties, other than those prescribed in administrative regulations. The end result was that the program could not command so much as a simple majority of those who voted, let alone the necessary two-thirds vote required.

With this setback in its agriculture program, the Democrat administration then set out to produce a voluntary wheat program which follows in a general way the compulsory provisions rejected overwhelmingly last year.

The bill provides 1964 price supports at $2 a bushel on grain for domestic food use and $1.55 a bushel on export wheat. Only those farmers who voluntarily limit production would receive price supports.

Coupled with the wheat program is the cotton program which was designed to meet the textile industry's complaint that domestic mills must pay more for American cotton than foreign competitors. Under the cotton legislation, cotton mills would buy cotton from the farmers at the supported price of 32.5 cents a pound. However, they would receive a subsidy of 8 cents in the form of certificates redeemable for Government surplus cotton. This, in turn, would bring their cost down to the world price of 24.5 cents a pound.

As an inducement to reduce cotton planting the legislation provides a bonus price-support payment of 3.5 cents a pound to farmers who cut their acreage about one-third. Farmers could, however, grow some cotton above their allotments for export at world prices. Although the request was for a 4-year cotton program, the duration was cut in half to 2 years.

It is interesting to note that in the 1960 Democrat platform it was stated: "All these goals demand the leadership of a Secretary of Agriculture who is conversant with the technological and economic aspects of farm problems."

And what happened? In trying to carry out this program, the Secretary of Agriculture upset the cotton program as it was intended by the 1958 law. He almost ruined the dairy program through Federal controls and national allotments and then tried to force down the throats of the farmers a wheat program that the farmers did not want and which they voted against in no uncertain manner.

And as for the promise of commodity supports at not less than 90 percent of parity—it went down the drain as did so many of the other Democrat promises.

Truly, the American farmer is the forgotten man as far as this administration is concerned. His innate spirit of independence, his love of freedom as expressed in the wheat referendum in May 1963, have only subjected the farmer to reprisals.

Republicans introduced legislation to give the wheat farmer a voluntary program that made sense. Then President Johnson jumped in and started his highly publicized war on poverty March 6 this year by supporting and praising the administration's wheat and cotton bill.

Basic to this problem is the fact that the CCC operated farm program had in 30 years cost the taxpayers nearly $38 billion. Of this cost, this Democrat administration has been responsible for more than $11 billion of the total in the 3 years it has been in office.

If you will recall, when this administration took office it was with a promise of "full parity of income," but in the past year the farm parity level, as a matter of fact, stood at 74 percent on September 1, 1964—the lowest since 1939. This present administration promised to control inflation, yet the current prices the farmers are paying for items used in living and production are the highest in history. This administration promised lower interest, but the farmers are paying higher interest and farm debt has increased over $7 billion in the last 3 years.

It is not enough that the farmer has been regulated and harassed, but the ill-combined wheat-cotton program fails to come to grips with the real problems which are punishing American agriculture.

Congress, in 1958, passed adequate cotton legislation and during the time congressional intent was followed the program worked satisfactorily. However, in 1961, the Secretary of Agriculture increased the support level, thus increasing the export subsidy. This upset the applecart because it caused us to lose our competitive position in the world market.

Although the cottongrower was in much more trouble than the cotton manufacturer, in the public mind the cost of the cotton provisions is to be charged to agriculture.

What this cotton program did is to revive the old discredited Brannan-type plan of direct payment to farmers.

As far as the wheat program is concerned, it is substantially the same program which was rejected last year by the farmers' referendum despite the efforts of the administration to force it upon them by threatening that it was this program or none at all.

The farmers want uncomplicated and workable legislation in the direction of less, not more, control. They want to move away from restrictive Government programs and assume greater responsibility for the production and marketing of their commodities.

Senate Republicans, realizing the farmers' desires in this direction, voted almost solidly against this poorly conceived, mismatched cotton-wheat program. When the bill went over to the House side, Republicans again voted overwhelmingly against it and it was only approved by a cliffside vote of 211 to 203 after a night session followed by a very unusual recess of 2½ hours called by the Speaker.

The farm bill was further complicated by a trade-off idea on the passage of a food stamp for the needy bill which is part of the President's so-called war on poverty program. The program, which permits needy people to buy discount stamps which may be redeemed at full face value at food stores, would not, according to many Republicans, help to dispose of surplus commodities. The stamps may be used to buy almost any type of food and would, in their estimation, mushroom into a multimillion-dollar welfare program. Therefore the problem not only remains unsolved but could grow into another costly and unneeded Government bureaucratic activity.

In the final analysis, the farmers are again the forgotton stepchild, remembered only in false promises by the Democrat administration in election years.

CIVIL RIGHTS

In the history of mankind there is an inexorable moral force that carries a nation forward. Such a force had its culmination this year in the Civil Rights Act.

Every generation must march up to the unfinished tasks of the generation that has gone before. There probably will be greater unfinished tasks and every generation will have to confront them. They will also be found in the domain of freedom.

Equality of oportunity must prevail if we are to complete the covenant made with the people.

And thus it was on June 19, 1964, the Senate, after 83 days of debate, passed the most comprehensive civil rights bill in the history of the country by a rollcall vote of 73 to 27, following the longest debate on any legislation ever considered by the Senate. This vote came after a historic vote on cloture, the fifth time cloture has been invoked in the Senate, and the first time cloture was ever invoked on a civil rights measure.

This historic vote occurred 1 year to the day from the time that an Executive message and accompanying legislation dealing with civil rights was sent to the Congress for consideration; a message delayed 2 years after the Democrat administration had promised action.

As early as June 5, 1963, 2 weeks before the late President Kennedy sent his civil rights message to Congress, the Senate Republican Conference issued a statement which read as follows:

"It is the consensus of the Senate Republican Conference that:

"The Federal Government, including the legislative, executive, and judicial branches, has a solemn duty to preserve the rights, privileges, and immunities of citizens of the United States in conformity with the Constitution which makes every native born and naturalized person a citizen of the United States as well as of the State in which he resides.

"Equality of rights and opportunities has not been fully achieved in the long period since the 14th and 15th amendments to the Constitution were adopted and this inequality and lack of opportunity and the racial tensions which they engender are out of character with the spirit of a nation pledged to freedom and justice.

"Since the days of Abraham Lincoln, the first Republican President, the God-given rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness have been cardinal principles of the Republican faith, and the equal opportunity to obtain these rights has consistently and uninterruptedly been reaffirmed in the platforms of the Republican Party.

"For the first time in more than four score years civil rights legislation of a meaningful character and purpose was placed on the Federal statute books as a result of the initiative of Republican leadership in Congress and President Eisenhower.

"Republican Members of the U.S. Senate in this the 88th Congress reaffirm and reassert the basic principles of the party with respect to civil rights and further affirm that the President, with the support of the Congress, consistent with his duties as defined in the Constitution, must protect the rights of all U.S. citizens, regardless of race, creed, color, or national origin.

"We deem it the President's duty as provided in the Constitution to enforce the laws insuring the rights of citizens of the United States and preserving domestic tranquillity as basic objectives of constitutional government.

"In pursuance of these objectives, we as Republican Members of the Senate will support further appropriate legislation required to help solve the problems of our Nation in the field of civil rights."

The Republican Party—the party of Abraham Lincoln—has from its beginning striven to make the promise of civil rights for all a reality. We also recognize that discrimination is not a localized problem, but rather a problem to be faced by North and South alike. The Republican Party is proud of its civil rights record. During the 8 years of the Republican administration from 1953 to 1961, more progress was made than in the preceding 80 years.

As we considered this legislation, some Republicans felt there were provisions in the act that were meritorious dealing with genuine civil rights, but they felt compelled to oppose the bill on grounds of constitutionality, particularly in titles II and VII. They were genuinely concerned over Government regulatory action in the field of private enterprise. They felt this should be brought before the people in the form of a constitutional amendment and so they opposed the enactment of the bill.

Now that the Civil Rights Act of 1964 has become the law of the land, overwhelmingly approved by both Houses of Congress and by members of both parties, it should be accepted in good grace and with full cooperation of all our citizens.

It will not be an easy path to tread. There will be many thorns and brambles. I have great faith in the American people. They have always risen to their greatest stature when there have been crises, and, with good faith on both sides and a determination to abide by the laws, we can go forward to even greater heights.

CIVILIAN SPACE PROGRAM

Among the most controversial and expensive programs submitted by the present administration has been the civilian space adventure known as Project Apollo—the manned lunar landing project. No one has ever given Congress a definitive estimate of the cost of this program. We have cost estimates by experts ranging from $20 billion to $40 billion.

Republican concern over the program is engendered by the belief that far too much of our national technical talent and scientific intellect is devoted to this one project while other, more needed and worthy programs are permitted to flounder for lack of competent, imaginative direction.

We have the President stating that we cannot afford and will not permit Russia to be first with a man on the moon.

Let us look at this space project more closely.

It is not a question of being second in space ventures. We have already proved our superiority in sophisticated instrumentality in this field. Our moon shot with its thousands of pictures of the moon's surface proved our superiority.

Psychologically, to put a man or men on the moon first may give us great satisfaction. But scientifically, according to the testimony before the Senate Appropriations Commmittee for fiscal year 1965, it was admitted that some of the severest criticism of this manned attempt comes from the scientific community. Some scientists contend that far more scientific data could be obtained by instruments than through a manned vehicle.

The testimony also brought out that we are spending about one-twentieth of our national budget on space.

Mr. James E. Webb, Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, said that if unmanned, fully instrumented space vehicles were used, there would be a savings of $2 billion on the cost of the manned capsule.

Space exploration must and will come. But what priority should be applied to it within the total national effort?

In 1963, in a study on space exploration by the Senate Republican Policy Committee staff, titled "A Matter of Priority," it was stated that no fruitful discussion could be held unless the emotional trappings, the verbal excesses, were removed. It was stated that a cold, careful examination was past due.

The questions were asked: Was it more important to have a man on the moon than to conquer cancer; a lunar exploration more important than conquering mental illness; lunar dust more important than the 17 million Americans we are told go to bed hungry each night; a path to the moon more important than a highway system free from the slaughter of thousands of Americans each year; or more important than seeing our children free of leukemia; or insuring an adequate water source for our great metropolitan centers; or making use of our stored natural resources?

The controversy resolves itself then to this—not whether man will ultimately reach the moon and beyond, but rather, how shall it be done, and whether other aspects of human needs should be bypassed or overlooked in the one spasmodic effort to achieve a lunar landing at once.

And what after that? Are we to reach further and further into space with manned shots so that there is no end to these astronomical costs beyond the period of 1970?

The 88th Congress has not mistaken glamor for sound, scientific inquiry. In both sessions the House and Senate have taken long, hard looks at the project, the result being a substantial trimming of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration budgets. Fiscal 1964's NASA budget was trimmed from $7.5 billion, as requested by the Administration, to $5.3 billion. The fiscal 1965 budget was further trimmed to $5,246,293,250.

It is still a question of priority. When we are spending one-twentieth of the total national budget for political and psychological reasons, it is time to stop, look, and listen as to what the end result will be.

ATOMIC ENERGY

This year the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, for the first time, reviewed the entire AEC budget, including both operating and construction funds. The hearings were extensive, lasting over a period of 6 weeks. The bill was reported by the Joint Committee without dissent and approved by a voice vote in the Senate. The House approved the bill by a vote of 340 to 3.

In general, the bill authorizes a total of $2.6 billion for operating expenses and plant and equipment for the fiscal year 1965 atomic energy program. This amount is $28 million less than that requested by AEC. The bill sets a ceiling on appropriations of approximately $60 million less than the appropriation for fiscal year 1964.

Approximately $2.3 billion is authorized for operating expenses under the AEC's 13 major programs, including a cooperative program with Canada in the development of heavy water reactors; the merchant ship reactors program; a flight test for the SNAP 10–A reactor; the physical research program; plant and capital equipment; and a commission with special authority to enter into arrangements with industry for the construction of isotope production and packaging facility.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT OF 1964

Under the euphonious name of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, more commonly known as the antipoverty program, the Congress gave a green light for the spending of almost a billion dollars the first year to alleviate poverty in this country. As is the case in many other Democrat programs, this first year cost will not reflect future costs. It is anticipated by some that the cost of this program may easily reach many more billions a year.

In testifying in favor of this program, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare stated the Government already has 43 programs which have "a direct application to poverty." If these 43 programs cannot take care of this problem then how can these additional costly programs—some of which duplicate existing programs—do any more? Why not make the present programs more effective was a question that was not answered. It is also interesting to note that the amount devoted in the first year to the "war on poverty" amounts to two-thirds of the cut in the Defense Department's procurement expenditures in the 1965 budget.

This law contains seven titles. There is a series of youth programs to establish a Job Corps, a work training program, and a work study program. Cost: $412.5 million. All of these are worthy causes but it remains in doubt that some of the training suggested will do much to prepare youths for jobs in this skilled market.

Then there are the community action programs on which $340 million will be spent. This presupposes that communities have not been doing their best to attract industries and jobs.

Next, there are programs for rural areas, including loans up to $2,500 to low-income families to help bring them above the poverty level. I am constrained to ask that if these people are now in such straits how are they going to be able to repay these loans? Thus there would be added another burden on their backs. And in connection with these loans there are loans of $2,500 to finance nonfarm, income-producing enterprises.

There are employment and investment incentives in the form of loans to small businesses up to $25,000 limit on more liberal terms than now possible under the Small Business Administration. It is cause for concern as to the wisdom of this since loans under the SBA are quite liberal in terms.

Then there are the work experience programs for experimental projects designed to stimulate States to introduce training programs for unemployed fathers and other unemployed persons. Here, too, unless good judgment is used these experimental programs could end up without actual usable work training given.

This whole program is headed up by an antipoverty czar under whom the administration and coordination of the program is placed. Since the program cuts across many Government agencies with already existing programs in the antipoverty field this could become quite a maze.

Then there is the policy declaration that an individual's opportunity to participate in the programs is not to be jeopardized by his or her receipt of unemployment compensation or public assistance.

The object of this law is to be commended. It is doubtful, however, that, under the circumstances, its object can be obtained. It would not be surprising to have a request before Congress next year for many additional billions to carry on this program with an ever-expanding Government bureaucracy. Already there are rumblings from various State Governors that they do not wish some of these programs in their States. Its success is to be hoped for and remains for the future to decide. And it is also hoped that the administration would make the existing programs more effective.

FOREIGN POLICY

One of the responsibilities of the party out of power in the United States is to lend its support to bipartisan foreign policy wherever mutual accord makes this possible.

The history of this Nation shows that when the party in power pursues a strong foreign policy there is strong bipartisan support for that policy.

Examples of this bipartisan policy are the Truman Greek-Turkish policy which the Republican 80th Congress supported wholeheartedly and the Eisenhower policies on Formosa, the Suez, and Lebanon which were supported by the Democrat Congresses.

However, on several occasions during the last 3 years we Republicans have been compelled to assert our mystification as to what policy we were being asked to support, whether, indeed, there was any policy at all. And since Mr. Johnson assumed the Presidency, the mystery has deepened.

The United States has drifted in its foreign relations and has suffered one setback after another. Instead of acting in the field of foreign policy under a firm program, we have been reacting to each crisis, improvising as we have gone along, the consequence of which has been a steadily deteriorating position all over the world.

I need only mention the disarray of our relations with our allies in NATO, in SEATO, and CENTO. We have raised suspicions in the minds of our NATO allies by our unilateral trade with and concessions to Soviet Russia, then have demanded their cessation of trade with Communist Cuba.

Although the President has stated that we are beloved and respected all over the world, events seem to indicate otherwise. I might cite Cambodia which kicked out the American diplomatic mission and rejected further American aid in favor of Red China; Pakistan, cooling relations with the United States and conversely warming relations with Red China; Japan, with its increasing interest in closer ties with Red China; France, and its recognition of Red China; Panama, where Castroites helped to organize anti-American rioting; Peru where Communist-led tin miners kidnaped American officials and held them for ransom in the form of concessions to that country; Zanzibar, where Communists have seized power and endangered our satellite tracking station; Libya, which announced cancellation of American rights to airbases; the Dominican Republic, where U.S. property was set afire; Martinique, where U.S. property was smeared with black paint; Cyprus, where two bombs exploded against our Embassy; Ghana, where mobs tried to seize and destroy our flag. U.S. property suffered thousands of dollars in damages in Caracas, Venezuela, and money was stolen. Windows of our buildings have been smashed in London, East Pakistan, Brussels, Bulgaria, Somalia, and in dozens of other countries.

If our foreign policy cannot cope with problems of these dimensions, what happens when greater issues develop?

We, in Congress, do not contest the right of the executive department in the conduct of foreign affairs. Our Constitution gives that awesome responsibility to the President. But the Constitution also gives to the Senate the obligation to ratify treaties as proposed by the President.

Republicans have in the past and will in the future support the foreign policy of our

Nation—but, first, we must know what that policy is.

Since Congress must be called upon to appropriate the necessary funds to carry out all important aspects of our Nation's foreign policy, it must look carefully into the grants and aid through which this policy is carried out.

When we see this administration collaborating with Socialist and neo-Communist governments to the disadvantage of our allies, when we see American pilots shot down and American property expropriated or destroyed, when we see the administration publicly announcing that it limits our participation in the face of Communist threats and aggression, when we see the weakness of our leadership in the United Nations and unilateral agreements made with Soviet Russia, when this administration fails to gain concessions from Soviet Russia in return for such things as the wheat deal and then even subsidizes the prices of that commodity and gives long-term credits for it, then the charge of a weak and vacillating foreign policy can be sustained.

Now we are not only involved in Vietnam with the loss of almost 300 American lives through combat but are getting more and more deeply involved in Laos by refusing to stand firm in the face of Communist violations of the Geneva agreements. Permitting them to continue this practice merely gives them the go-ahead to further Communist penetration in Southeast Asia. We are confronted with the lack of a firm policy and confusion of opposing statements by the State Department and various officials of the Defense Department as to whether we are in for a long, drawn-out form of guerrilla warfare or are going to be able to withdraw our forces within a year or two. All is indecision and confusion.

It is hoped that a step forward was achieved in the lessening of tension by the signing of the partial nuclear test-ban treaty last year, which was designed to end nuclear testing in the atmosphere, in space, and underwater areas.

The long negotiations which brought even this small step were instituted under the Republican administration by President Dwight D. Eisenhower and his Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles. This treaty cannot wholly prevent the spread of nuclear arms to nations not now possessing them, as witness France's nuclear arms program, but it does prohibit assistance by signatories to nonsignatories. A limited test ban treaty was first proposed by President Eisenhower in 1959, when the relative nuclear strength of Soviet Russia and the United States made a limited test ban desirable. However, the relative strength of the world powers had changed between the time of the Eisenhower proposal and the signing of the test-ban treaty causing some doubts to be raised about its ratification. The Eisenhower proposal did not envision a Soviet Union veto of every proposal by the United States for the peaceful application of atomic energy for such worthy purposes as diverting hurricanes, digging shipping channels and canals, and other so-called plowshare programs. The 1963 treaty does limit uses for peaceful purposes if the resultant radioactive debris would extend beyond national borders. Because of this limitation it makes it impossible to use atomic power to dig a new canal anywhere within Central America.

This treaty, although a small step in the right direction for easing tensions, does not mean the elimination of the hateful Berlin wall, the elimination of the Communist cancer in Cuba, the free unification of Korea, the cessation of armed conflict in Vietnam and Laos, nor the threat of Red China to India, Formosa, or Southeast Asia.

The citizens of the United States since World War II have provided over $100 billion from the public purse to assist nations all over the world to develop healthy, free societies. Hearings have brought out that too many of these funds were channeled either into the pockets of some of the ruling classes or put to frivolous uses. Because of this situation, Congress has looked very thoroughly into some of the grants and loans and has pared down many requests. To make sure that the world would know that all these funds come from the taxes of the American people or from funds borrowed on their credit, I proposed an amendment to the foreign aid bill to this effect and the amendment was accepted. In addition, Congress encouraged the investment of private funds for use in newly developing nations where the know-how of American enterprise would prove helpful in developing their own economies.

The Senate also consented to an amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1963 expressing the sense of Congress that full investment guarantees under the act by those countries receiving aid would be regarded "as a significant measure of self-help by such countries improving the climate for private investment both domestic and foreign." It is hoped by such action the expropriation of American properties will cease.

Last year, in December, the Senate agreed to the conference report which set the foreign aid authorization at $3.6 billion.

This year, for fiscal year 1965, the President proposed a $3.5 billion foreign aid budget and it was approved substantially in that amount after attempts to whittle down the funds. The American people are becoming loath to use their tax money and credit to support nations who are now amply able to support themselves, or who accept our aid and then consort with the Communists to our disadvantage.

Because of the deterioration of our position in foreign affairs, Republicans think the time is here for a reassessment of American foreign policy. We cannot be expected to support an enigma. We cannot be expected to support an unknown program.

Republicans support a policy of strength—a clearly enunciated policy—and the sooner this Nation returns to such a policy the better will be our relations in the world.

GOVERNMENT FINANCE AND TAXATION

There is one record this present Democrat administration has made which has never been equaled by any Republican administration—and that is the size of the debt limit today.

When Treasury Secretary Douglas Dillon asked Congress on May 25 to raise the Federal debt ceiling again, after setting another record in 1962 when two raises were approved by this Democrat-controlled Congress, our national debt reached an alltime high. Traditionally, Congress grants only one debt ceiling increase per year. However, under this Democrat-controlled Congress, there have been three increases in the debt ceiling within a period of a little over a year. As of April 30, 1963, the public debt was $303 billion. As of April 30, 1964, it was $308 billion. The Democrats have raised the temporary debt ceiling to $324 billion.

Although this present Democrat administration increased the debt limit by $39 billion since it has been in office, it is constantly reminding the public that it is an economy-minded administration.

It is of interest to call attention to the following comparison of the expenditures by Federal agencies under the fiscal year 1960, during the Eisenhower Republican administration, with the estimated expenditures for fiscal year 1965, under the Johnson Democrat administration, as compiled by the U.S. Treasury:

A comparison of expenditures by Federal agencies under Eisenhower (1960) and Johnson (1965)

[In billions]

	Fiscal year 1960	Fiscal year 1965 (estimated)
Legislative branch	$0.126	$0.179
Judiciary	.049	.072
Executive Office of the President	.056	.028
Funds appropriated to the President	1.764	2.533
Agriculture Department	5.419	5.815
Commerce Department	.539	.833
Defense Department, Military	42.824	51.200
Defense Department, Civil Functions	.902	1.192
Health, Education, and Welfare Department	3.403	5.853
Interior Department	.690	1.148
Justice Department	.258	.343
Labor Department	.549	.667
Post Office Department	.525	.475
State Department	.247	.382
Treasury Department:		
Interest:		
On public debt	9.180	11.000
On refunds of taxes	.076	.090
Other	.875	1.246
Atomic Energy Commission	2.623	2.735
Federal Aviation Agency	.508	.829
General Services Administration	.408	.578
Housing and Home Finance Agency	.309	.149
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	.401	4.990
Veterans' Administration	5.250	5.066
Other independent agencies	.224	.085
District of Columbia	.028	.088
Total by agencies	77.233	98.500
Less: Interfund transactions	.694	.600
Total budget expenditures	76.539	[1] 97.900

[1] Total includes nonagency expenditures.

Source: Treasury Bulletin, April 1964 (U.S. Treasury Department, Office of the Secretary), p. 5.

But that does not tell the whole story of fiscal and financial gimmicks. Total Federal outlays or gross expenditures in fiscal year 1965 will probably approach $150 billion. This total includes the spending of 76 public enterprise funds which appear in the administrative (or "regular") budget only on a net basis—and 314 trust funds.

These so-called public enterprise funds include such familiar enterprises as farm supports, certain Federal housing activities, and the postal service. Federal old-age and survivors insurance, the disability insurance trust fund, highway trust fund, and others are usually completely outside the administrative budget, but are included in consolidated cash budget totals. Thus the estimated $150 billion in gross Federal expenditures for fiscal year 1965 compares with an estimated $97.9 billion in expenditures in the administrative budget alone.

And there is another gimmick being used to bolster the posture of the Johnson administration and that is to tack on to the late President Kennedy's budget year, which ended June 30, 1964, large sums which would normally show up in later months. In other words, the deficit in President Kennedy's budget was obviously increased by the amount of President Johnson's budget cuts.

It is a certainty that the Bureau of the Budget has never been through a more trying period in the preparation of a budget than in adjusting from the requirements of the late President Kennedy to fit the demands of President Johnson when he took office.

In the normal course of events we receive the large budget document and the summary at the same time. This year the detailed budget was delayed by about 2 weeks in order to make the justifications tally with the budget summary as adjusted by President Johnson. It was clear that he sought to enforce economies in some areas, particularly military procurement, in order to permit expansion of other programs, such as the antipoverty effort, without making the total dollars in the budget appear to be out of line. Specifically $1.2 billion was cut from military procurement, which bears a striking resemblance to the first year cost of antipoverty.

Many other adjustments have been made to absorb 1965 projects with money contained in the 1964 budget, and indeed many programs were deferred to fiscal year 1966 when there will not be an election-year scrutiny on the overall budget.

Ever since he took office, President Johnson has outspent President Kennedy. In every month, since December 1963, expenditures under the Johnson administration have been larger than those of identical months under President Kennedy.

The record shows that for December 1963 there was an increase of $717 million over December 1962. For January 1964 the increase over January 1963 was $479 million. For February 1964 the increase over February 1963 was $758 million; March 1964 over March 1963 an increase of $74 million; April 1964 shot up again over April 1963 with an increase of $340 million. In May 1964 expenditures of the Johnson administration under the administrative budget were $7.511 billion compared with $7.470 billion in May 1963, an increase of $41 million. Altogether there was a total expenditure increase of $2.4 billion in 6 months—or at an annual rate of around $5 billion.

In addition, the cost of new programs which are spread over other years must be remembered.

Over 95 percent of our national debt today was created under the 30 years of Democrat control of the National Government. It is admitted that much of this debt can be attributed to the cost of wars. However, the Democrat administration boasts of its planned deficit even in peacetime.

We needed a debt limit of only $300 billion to finance World War II. When the war was over this debt was reduced to $252 billion. Now the Secretary of the Treasury foresees not the present "temporary" ceiling of $324 billion but an actual debt of $325 billion within the next 2 years. And, this at a time when the Democrat administration boasts of the highest peacetime prosperity in history.

In the past 15 years there have been 11 Federal deficits. During this period the interest on the Federal debt has doubled so that that interest alone is now costing the taxpayers of this Nation $11 billion a year or the equivalent of more than 12 cents out of every dollar of taxes paid the Federal Government.

With a Presidential pledge for "prudence and economy" we find there was a deficit of $8.3 billion in fiscal 1964. Next year, there is a planned deficit of approximately $6 billion. Next, we find a planned debt approaching $325 billion in 2 years.

And there are no plans for either a balanced budget or a debt reduction.

Turning off a few bulbs in the White House is not going to put a fraction of a dent in this huge spending program.

The state of the national finances, despite present prosperity, is deplorable.

Taxes

The late President Kennedy sent to Congress a request for a tax reduction and tax reform law. For around 8 months the House worked diligently on this most complicated piece of legislation.

Finally, the bill, with more tax reduction than tax reform, was received by the Finance Committee of the Senate in the late fall. Great pressure was placed upon this committee to get the bill before the Senate so that its passage would make it possible for tax reductions to take place by January of this year.

The Finance Committee set right to work and had a bill prepared for Senate consideration in the first month of the second session of this Congress so that one of the first major bills to be considered would be the tax bill.

Then some wonderous things began to happen. Our Democrat friends have made a great issue of being the party of the common man. However, when it came to aiding the common man, they were noticeable by the absence of their votes.

First of all, there was the matter of education. All of us know that in this age education is a must. Every effort is being made to induce our young people to stay in school—to obtain as much education as they can—in order to become skilled in the field of their choice.

Everyone knows, too, that higher education today is four or five times as expensive as it was 20 years ago. Many families, particularly those with more than one child to educate, cannot afford higher education and if the child is to receive this education he must find a job somewhere to send himself through college.

A Republican amendment was offered to the tax bill to permit those boys and girls who are working to send themselves through school to take a tax reduction on their earned income up to $1,200 a year in exemptions in the case of undergraduates and $1,500 a year for graduate students as long as they are in college.

This amendment was defeated—not by the Republicans, every one of whom voted for the amendment—but by the Democrats who voted against it. Thus the student who wants an education to such a degree that he is willing to work and earn the money while he is going to a college or university is penalized and, if his parents cannot help him out, he is taxed on his earnings without the extra financial aid he needs at the time.

Excise taxes

There is no greater truism than that a tax once placed upon the people is almost impossible to repeal. The excise taxes are a case in point.

Many of these taxes, placed upon the people during World War II and extended year after year, are still with us. Not only are they visible taxes paid when the article is bought, but they contain taxes paid by the manufacturer at the source and added to the price of the article.

Republicans made an attempt to repeal a few of these more onerous taxes. In fact, every Republican present voted for an amendment proposed by me to repeal the excise taxes on luggage and cosmetics, and, in addition, to make tax free jewelry and furs costing less than $100.

The Senate finally adopted an amendment accomplishing this purpose and also cut taxes on cabaret admissions; reduced theater admission taxes; and partially repealed the tax on musical instruments used in school bands; and also removed the taxes on lacrosse, tennis, and ping pong equipment.

However, in conference the House was adamant against repealing or reducing these taxes and, with the deadline of July 1 around the corner when all excise taxes would have expired, the Senate agreed with the House. The only amendment agreed upon was that which provides retroactively for the deduction of nonbusiness losses arising from the confiscation of property by Communist Cuba.

A study is being made now in the House on the question of excise taxes. It is hoped next year that many of these onerous so-called wartime taxes will be repealed or reduced.

HOUSING

Once again Congress approved an omnibus housing bill, continuing until October 1, 1965, not only such housing programs as urban renewal, public housing, direct loans for farm housing, the Federal mortgage insurance programs, the open space program, community facilities, and housing for the elderly, but some more controversial programs. The cost of the housing programs for 14 months is $1.2 billion.

A substitute was proposed which, in effect, would provide a simple extension of the existing programs, for it was the opinion of many sincere advocates of housing programs that it would be wiser to continue the existing programs this year. A number of studies were underway in both Houses which would give better guidelines to the housing programs in the future.

It was felt by some that many controversial and new programs needed further study. For instance, it was felt that the committee took only halfhearted action on city building code enforcement requirements whereas a thorough study should have been ordered so that effective action could be taken in 1965.

It is true that many families displaced by urban renewal programs have suffered in trying to find decent and adequate housing, but in many instances this has been due to poor planning and administration on the part of the Housing Administration and the municipalities which have shown more interest in commercial activities. Spending more money will not alleviate this problem, but more consideration to the housing needs of displaced persons would go far toward meeting these needs.

Another controversial feature is the advance acquisition of land for community facilities. This could provide windfalls for those with inside information. It could also mean that land acquired for such purposes could no longer be desirable for future public works because of rapidly changing community needs. And it was felt that the provision for financial grants for urban studies could be postponed until there was more information available as to the need for this program.

Despite the need for housing legislation, over the course of the years it has become a kind of catchall and badly needs overhauling. It is hoped that when housing legislation again is before the Congress it will be looked into thoroughly; be made to do what it was first intended to do instead of trying to rebuild badly planned cities, building new towns, financing transportation, and granting "vacation allowances" for businessmen who are displaced by an urban renewal project. All of this is a far cry from providing housing for those needy and worthy people.

INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION

The International Development Association came back to Congress for an increased authorization of $104 million in each successive year beginning with fiscal 1965—a total of $312 million from the United States, with other countries putting up the remainder of the $750 million in capital requested by the Association.

This money is lent to soft currency countries which cannot obtain credit through regular channels.

I feel it should be noted not only by the American people but by those who do the borrowing that the American taxpayer is paying for these loans.

With this in mind I evolved the so-called Dirksen formula which reads as follows—after the word "appropriate"; "out of funds supplied by the Nation's taxpayers or out of funds borrowed on their credit." This phrase was adopted by Congress and is contained in the act.

This bill was approved by the Senate early in the session. The House, on February 26, sent the bill back to the Banking and Currency Committee by a vote of 208 to 187 after critics charged that some of these funds might be funneled into Cuba or other Communist countries.

Finally, under White House prodding, the House was prevailed upon to act once more and on May 14 approved the bill by a voice vote although some Members complained that other IDA member countries were not bearing their share of responsibility in providing funds.

The bill is now law and it is hoped that it will serve its purpose and not be another futile, costly program to the American taxpayer.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

Republicans have always stood for a sound defense in the belief that a strong defense is the surest means of keeping the peace and a sure deterrent against aggression by any nation or combination of nations.

There is little doubt the cold war which followed the hot war of the 1940's has been kept in its cold state because of our retaliatory capabilities.

It was during the Eisenhower Republican administration that the program of a strong defense was built up and accelerated. The so-called missile gap issue of the 1960 campaign turned out to be just what it was—a phony with no basis in fact.

It has been forgotten, perhaps, that under the Eisenhower Republican administration the concept of the intercontinental ballistic missile was developed—that the Atlas, Titan, Minuteman, and Polaris were developed.

Many of today's advanced strategic weapons systems are realities due to the foresight and imagination of the Republican defense team. Among them is the A–11 interceptor, a plane that can fly at approximately three times the speed of sound and can climb to an altitude of more than 70,000 feet.

But what has happened to our defense posture in the last 3 years? The Secretary of Defense testified before the Joint Atomic Energy Committee in November of last year that during the Cuban crisis the United States was caught terribly short of fighter and transport planes.

He also stated that there were not enough patrol craft and escort vessels and that we were also short of Navy and Air Force planes to track Soviet ships moving into the Western Hemisphere.

We have witnessed a difference of opinion between the Defense Secretary and the Air Chief of Staff over the reliability of missiles in replacing bombing planes. There has been an air of secrecy in regard to our defense needs.

Then there has been the controversy over the TFX fighter plane for both the Air Force and the Navy in which the Defense Secretary overruled his military advisers. The conflict-of-interest charges have not been clarified.

Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, Air Force Chief of Staff, in appearing before a House Appropriations Military Subcommittee, warned that Russia is catching up with the United States in military strength and urged immediate steps to develop a new manned strategic aircraft for use in the 1970's to provide a flexible response to attack. He also cautioned against overreliance on what he testified was a "muscle bound" defense system dependent entirely on intercontinental missiles.

The Democrat administration's claim that in the 3 years of the Kennedy-Johnson administration development of new weapons systems had averaged well over 50 percent higher than in the 4 preceding years is not supported by the record. When compared with the two Eisenhower terms with a total of 47 new starts, the Kennedy-Johnson record shows only 7 new programs, all of which were nonstrategic systems. In his report, Secretary of Defense McNamara used the Nike X, which is a follow-on of the Nike-Zeus, as a new system. This is similar to claiming a brand new weapons system every time the model numbers are changed.

The President, on a "nonpolitical" tour to the West, announced in Sacramento, Calif., that new antisatellite and radar systems had been developed. He stated that the systems were operational. The antisatellite system would, the President stated, knock out any hostile satellite sent in our direction. The radar system now, according to the President's statement, has overcome the horizon-limit and is now capable of detecting any missile launching wherever it might occur.

The President stressed the time limit, stating the new weapons were developed "in 1962 and 1963."

Defense Secretary McNamara, on September 18, made a particularly remarkable statement as to the cost figures on these two projects. He stated that the cost for the one Army and one Air Force operational antisatellite installations was $80 million. Then Mr. McNamara went on to state that the cost for a "whole family" of over-the-horizon early warning radar outposts was $50 million.

To go into this incredible assertion further, Mr. McNamara acknowledged that the Army antisatellite program is a "derivative" of the Nike-Zeus antimissile missile system that has been under development since 1957 at a cumulative cost so far of nearly $2 billion.

The space tracking system has been in place for a number of years, one part being the Vanguard program in 1957. "Spadats," the basic satellite detection network in use today, and the control system in Colorado which it serves, both date back to the Eisenhower administration. Therefore, the claim of this Democrat administration that the development of new weapons systems averaged 50 percent more than under the Eisenhower Republican administration does not jibe with the facts.

A study was made by Senator LEN B. JORDAN in which it was brought out that the United States will not be able to verify the ability of its hardened underground missile systems to survive close-in, high-yield nuclear explosions.

The study also revealed that Secretary McNamara stated that the Soviet Union has conducted tests with much bigger bombs than those tested in the United States and that "their technology is further advanced than ours in this very high-yield field." We do not know what the Russians did or did not learn from their high megaton tests and we know practically nothing about possible impairment of our system from the detonation of a large yield weapon.

According to U.S. Air Force records, the rates of successful firings of three major missiles are: Atlas, 68.8 percent; Titan, 72.2 percent; and Minuteman, 68.8 percent. Gen. Thomas S. Power, Commander of the Strategic Air Command, was quoted as saying that, "We have not tested any of the operational warheads in our inventory" and "unless you test the very thing that is in your arsenal, you are never certain."

All these are matters of concern to the Republican minority. If our defenses are being maintained adequately, then the Nation should know. There should be no paper curtain of secrecy and evasion. If we need further weapons of any kind to maintain our defense superiority, then every American, whether Republican or Democrat, stands ready to back up any program.

It is no time to subordinate our national security to political purposes. Our peace and security are not playthings in the hands of political experts. A candid statement of facts within the realm of security would do much to alleviate the uncertainty which now prevails as to our defense readiness in a world which sees brush fire wars all over the globe—wars which could accelerate into large conflagrations.

SOCIAL SECURITY AND MEDICARE

The welfare of all our citizens has never been the prerogative of any political party. The difference lies in the approach to the problem.

When the original social security act was reported out of the House Ways and Means Committee in 1935, during a Democratic administration, it is significant that the minority report concluded with these views: "The minority membership (Republican) of the Ways and Means Committee has at no time offered any political or partisan opposition to the progress of this measure, but on the contrary, have labored faithfully in an effort to produce a measure which would be constitutional and that would insure to the general welfare of all the people."

In its approach to the general welfare of our elder citizens, the Republican Party has endeavored not only to increase the benefits and coverage, but to place social security on a sound actuarial basis. The aim has been to preserve the trust fund and to insure that the funds are more than sufficient to meet future obligations. This is still our guiding principle.

At the time the act was adopted, social security benefits, it was agreed, would not constitute a pension but would provide a floor on which private savings could be built.

As time has gone on, the various Congresses and administrations, both Republican and Democrat, have not only increased these benefits but have brought under the system many more millions of our citizens.

Then came the question of the ills of old age. Proposals to extend hospital insurance benefits to all persons covered by social security began to be made as far back as 1942. Periodically such bills have been introduced, specifically in 1942, 1945, 1950, 1952, 1954, 1957, 1959, 1961, and 1963.

Answering these needs, but still keeping medical care in the hands of the States which are nearer to the needs of the people, there was enacted into law on September 13, 1960, amendments to the act. The so-called Kerr-Mills program provided, among other things, grants to States for medical care for the aged individuals of low income—those who needed it the most. In all except 12 States, some type of coverage is provided.

It is a true medical care program for it provides that those States which participate may include not only hospital expenses but physicians' services, skilled nursing, and private duty nursing services; dental, laboratory, and X-ray services; prescribed drugs, eyeglasses, dentures, and prosthetic devices; diagnostic, screening, and preventive services, among other things. There are no dollar limits on matching funds by the Federal Government.

It is no secret that the Democrat administration has not pushed or publicized this program. Instead it has consistently pushed its socialized medicine plan, misnamed medicare. In reality this medicare program is a limited hospitalization plan with a deductible provision which would result in expense to the patients. It provides no medical expenses outside of routine medical care in the hospital itself. Physicians and surgeons bills must be paid for by the individual.

Despite these drawbacks, when the improved social security amendments came over to the Senate from the House, the so-called medicare program was added to it.

To take care of the additional cost of such a program, it was necessary to increase the social security payments by both employee and employer and also for those self-employed. Not only was the rate increased to 4.2 percent of earning but the ceiling was raised from $4,800 yearly earnings to $5,400 in the House bill or to 5.20 percent by 1971 on $5,600 yearly earnings in the Senate bill. This constituted a maximum of $252.20 yearly on each individual. The rate on self-employed increased to 6.3 percent on the maximum of $5,600.

It was anticipated that the total cost of the program would be about $2 billion the first year.

Then the bill went back to the House. Realizing it did not have the votes to pass this so-called medicare program, the House sent the bill to conference.

The conferences finally could come to no agreement, therefore no action was taken on either increased social security payments or the so-called medicare program in the 88th Congress.

Thus those under the social security program were denied increased benefits due to President Johnson's insistence on including so-called medicare in the bill.

URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION

After a tortuous journey of 4 years, the urban mass transportation bill was approved by Congress despite the objections of the majority of Republicans who felt that this was a problem more ably solved by the urban centers themselves. In the opinion of many, this was one more intrusion of the Federal Government into local affairs and the spending of unneeded funds in this time of huge Federal deficits.

Evidence that the Congress was reluctant to pass the bill is the history of this legislation. The first mass transit bill was passed in the Senate in 1960. No action was taken by the House. Again, in 1961, the Senate approved mass transit legislation as part of the housing bill. That legislation authorized mass transit only on a temporary basis and was concurred in by the House. Studies of experimental projects were made with Federal loans and demonstration grants throughout the Nation.

In 1962, a comprehensive mass transit bill was reported to the Senate; but Congress took no action on that bill, merely extending the temporary program for another year.

In April 1963, the Senate approved mass transportation legislation. It was not until the latter part of June 1964 that the House passed a slightly different version of the bill which was accepted by the Senate.

Now we have a mass transportation law despite the fact that last year the New York City Planning Commission proposed a municipal $547 million mass transportation program while a year earlier San Francisco approved a similar $792 million bond issue, and Los Angeles, Philadelphia, and other large urban centers have either approved multimillion-dollar bond issues or drafted their own plans for mass transit.

Although this new law authorized Federal grants in the sum of $375 million for mass transit over the next 3 years at the rate of $75 million for fiscal 1965, $150 million for fiscal 1966, and $150 million for fiscal 1967 for the purpose of helping to pay for building transportation systems and to buy equipment for such systems, only $60 million was appropriated for 1965, and nothing was appropriated for 1966 or 1967.

These Federal grants could cover up to two-thirds of that part of the cost of improved systems which is not financed by fares charged to passengers. Local communities would have to provide the remainder of the funds.

It is true that our urban communities have great need for improved mass transit systems but it is true also that our major metropolitan centers are the wealthiest in the country.

The money provided in this bill is only a starter. It may open the door to an ultimate expenditure by the Federal Government of $10 billion or more.

Economy in Government seems to be a forgotten word.

WILDERNESS

Legislation was enacted on September 3, 1964, to establish a wilderness preservation system which embraces 54 areas totaling 9.1 million acres. In the future, commercial development or exploitation of mineral resources will be forbidden on these acres. Another 34 primitive areas, totaling 5.5 million acres remain under Forest Service jurisdiction. Thereafter Congress can decide over a 10-year period whether these areas should be included in the wilderness preservation system.

The mining and mineral leasing laws were extended to these areas through December 31, 1983. As of January 1, 1984, minerals in the system would be withdrawn from development under the mining laws except for valid existing rights.

Land and water conservation

The Congress approved a measure establishing a Land and Water Conservation Fund to be used for improvement or acquisition of outdoor recreation facilities. The funds would come from Federal taxes on motorboat fuel, Federal fees at certain recreation areas, and proceeds from the sale of Federal surplus real property. It is estimated that $140 million a year would go into the fund for the next 10 years.

When the Bubble Burst in Crockett, Tex.: The Illuminating Story of a Small Town That Believed the Promises of the Federal Government—and Woke Up Both Sadder and Wiser

(By Charles Stevenson)

Crockett is a town of some 5,350 people in Houston County, Tex. What happened there recently shows not only what can come about when Washington pours hundreds of millions of dollars into hastily contrived business ventures; it also illustrates how official secrecy is used to cloak official mistakes. The Crockett story is one of the most remarkable in the brief history of the Federal Government's Area Redevelopment Administration.

ARA was set up in 1961 to help depressed areas create new industries and jobs. Since then it has ballooned into a free-wheeling arm of government, ladling out lavish gifts and loans, and establishing a new order of politically entangled businesses. Frequently these Government-subsidized establishments make things very tough indeed for competing businesses which operate under our traditional free enterprise system. All this is done under ARA's broad authority, granted by Congress in an incredibly rubbery statute, to boost employment and prosperity. Here's how the program worked in Crockett.

WONDROUS INVENTIONS

Late in 1962, ARA introduced to the leading citizens of the town the president of a firm called Audio Electronics, Inc. His name was J. Paul Dawson, and he—with ARA's sponsorship—proposed to build a plant to manufacture, among other things, a wondrous new tape-playing, picture-projecting invention. Not only would the new industry create jobs and aid the town's limping economy; also, the people were to be allowed to buy stock in Audio Electronics.

On the morning of March 1, 1963, some 35 persons assembled at Crockett's County telephone building to hear the official announcement that ARA had approved Dawson's proposal. Among those present were members of the county's Democratic executive committee, local officials, and Benton Musselwhite, a lawyer from nearby Lufkin, who, as a member of ARA's National Advisory Committee, was lending his prestige to the project.

Presently, out of a loudspeaker-telephone hookup from Washington boomed the voice of RALPH W. YARBOROUGH, senior U.S. Senator from Texas, who had been one of the sponsors of the legislation establishing ARA. After complimenting Musselwhite for his efforts and congratulating the Democratic committee members for their participation, he said, "It is highly pleasing to me to be authorized from the White House to announce to my friends in Houston County that you are going to gain a fine new industry—one that will provide new jobs for 180 people, add new strength to your area."

The Senator outlined the terms: ARA had approved a loan of $382,649 to Audio Electronics to build its factory—a loan that would run for 25 years at 4 percent (a better deal than businessmen can get commercially). The firm itself would put in $147,173 in equity." And, finally, the people of Crockett would raise a public purse of $58,869 to pay for the plant site and provide the required show of local interest.

Inspired by the Government ballyhoo and Senator YARBOROUGH's loudspeakered assurances that the deal would "help spark a whole industrial revolution," the residents of Crockett eagerly set to work. Quickly they raised their share of the Audio Electronics kitty—some $60,000 in cash. Drawings of Audio's proposed factory of aluminum and tinted glass were exhibited at both Crockett banks. A banker and officials of the local development organization inserted in the weekly Courier an announcement that "Audio Electronics, Inc., is offering 1,300,000 shares of stock to Houston Countians at 50 cents per share." A separate column urged prospective investors to "hurry up," because there was a 5-day time linit.

DISAPPEARING SHOVELS

The construction contract for the plant was awarded, and Houston County Development Foundation Day was proclaimed for the ground-breaking on May 25, 1963. A crowd of 3,500 assembled. Senator YARBOROUGH and Audio officials flew in. Everyone seemed impressed with two large signboards on the factory site, a 40-acre tract bought with part of Crockett's public contribution. One sign, which carried the signature of the President of the United States, proclaimed: "We're creating more jobs for America." On the other was a painting of a vast, shiny factory.

Dignitaries took turns breaking the earth with six gold-plated shovels—four of which somehow disappeared after the ceremony. Then everyone adjourned to the city park for a free barbecue and speeches. Dawson feelingly gave credit to Senator YARBOROUGH as "the individual who more than any other man made the day possible." And, in his address, Senator YARBOROUGH said, "You have brought in a new industry, a new plant, new vision, new payrolls, new jobs, and opportunities for youth. Under the wise and beneficent provisions of the Area Redevelopment Act you are building for the present and the future."

Construction work was scheduled to begin 2 days after the groundbreaking. The day came—and nothing happened. At least 300 people who had been exhorted over the radio to come out for jobs milled around the site in disbelief. Next day, many returned. Still nothing happened. Days became weeks.

On June 28, State ARA Coordinator Ray Morrison got together with worried members of the county development organization at a meeting to which reporters were not invited. Afterward everybody was told that the project "is still in sound position" and that there was only a "temporary delay."

But nothing ever did happen. Although more than a year has elapsed since the ground-breaking, the costly site provided by the people of Crockett is still bare of any ARA building. Up to now, nobody in Texas has been able to get a full explanation of the mysterious collapse of the much-heralded project.

STOCK FRAUD

The facts are that, even as the ground-breaking ceremony was taking place, the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission was conducting a stock-fraud investigation involving Visutronics Corp. of America and the arrangements whereby Audio Electronics was to manufacture Visutronics inventions. Two months later, the SEC asked a U.S. District Court to restrain Visutronics and "all acting in concert" from fraudulently representing that its inventions and patents were worth $1,500,000 to $2 million—and also from representing that the Audio products would be sold to the Armed Forces.

Subsequently, Federal Judge Roger D. Foley issued an injunction to halt the whole scheme. Yet for months after this court order, and long after collapse of the whole bubble, ARA continued to list the Audio Electronics loan as one of its approved projects and to claim that it was bringing 180 jobs to Crockett. The project was dropped from the ARA directory only after I personally asked why it was still listed.

The most mysterious facet of the whole affair is how and why ARA permitted the full prestige of the U.S. Government—including the White House and a U.S. Senator—to be placed behind a man like J. Paul Dawson. The simplest investigation would have revealed that he had a long record of legal difficulties. Moreover, throughout the time that he was negotiating with ARA for the Audio loan, there was pending against him in the U.S. District Court of Montana a $21,000 suit for stock fraud under the Securities and Exchange Act. (Last May, a judgment was entered against Dawson and a salesman-colleague for the full amount plus interest—in favor of a group of Montana and Idaho physicians and dentists whose funds had been accepted for help in manufacture of an electronic painkilling device.)

At the time of the ARA announcement and the festivities in Crockett, Audio Electronics shared quarters with another company in a small, one-story building on an outlying side street of Houston. It could scarcely meet its day-to-day cash requirements. A principal asset was believed to be its licenses for the Visutronics inventions. Yet if ARA had checked, the agency would have learned that the Visutronics president, billed as a scientific genius, had never gone beyond grade school and had been involved in bogus security deals in California. Moreover, it turned out that Audio did not have the necessary legal right to manufacture the Visutronics inventions.

VANISHED DREAM

Not only has Crockett's dream of a fine Audio factory vanished like the morning mist, but a number of citizens have been hurt financially. Because people believed that their Senator's "White House announcement" of the ARA loan to Audio guaranteed the firm's soundness, several Texans invested in it and lost all. One man dropped $40,000. A retired Air Force officer plowed in $7,000. On the day that the Houston Post carried a report that Audio "has received" a $382,649 loan from ARA, Dawson was able to persuade a trusting employee, a former Salvation Army captain, to turn over his life savings of $4,000 to "provide needed capital." He even induced a woman to lend $2,000 borrowed from a relative. "We assumed that our Government had investigated and everything was all right," the incensed woman says. "Wouldn't you?"

Which raises the obvious questions: Didn't ARA conduct any investigation at all? How was it possible for this agency to announce that Audio Electronics would post $147,173 as its "equity" to justify the big Government loan?

When I asked ARA for the answers, Donald W. Stull, special assistant for public affairs, wrote me: "Our attorneys advise us that title 18, United States Code, makes it a crime to disclose confidential information on an applicant's financial status." How about information that isn't confidential? "Our legal department advises us that it would be mechanically impossible to separate the confidential material from these reports, and that this would have to be done in order for us to stay within the law and protect the privacy of the applicant's business," replied ARA Deputy Administrator Harold W. Williams.

Indeed, the only explanation that I could get from Williams for the collapse of the Crockett project was that "the president of the applicant firm requested withdrawal of the application" for his loan because "he had been unable to obtain patent rights for products he intended to manufacture"—a withdrawal which in truth was suggested by certain Federal officials after I had begun to ask them questions.

Apparently the official ARA philosophy is that we taxpayers, who supply the money for this phase of the administration's war against poverty, will be happier if we are not exposed to the full truth.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I also ask unanimous consent that the major laws digest be placed in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at a later date and that the customary number be printed as a separate Senate document.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR MIKE MANSFIELD, THE MAJORITY LEADER

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, since we are on the eve of adjournment, I wish to say a particular word about my friend from Montana. There may be gentler people in the world, there may be humbler people, and there may be abler people, but if there are I have never seen in one man such an acme of these qualities as in the majority leader, MIKE MANSFIELD.

In the years that he has sat in the seat of the majority leader and I have sat in my seat I have developed a deep and abiding affection for him. I know the burdens that he has carried, and I presume on occasion the minority leader has added to those burdens, not wittingly, but only in pursuit of duty as he saw it.

I salute him for the excellent service he has rendered in the 88th Congress. I hope time will deal gently with him and give him health and strength and shower him with all of life's richest blessings.

Then, Mr. President, I commit the supreme political heresy—and perhaps it ought not to be done—but I hope, if it is the desire and the design of destiny that he pursue his responsibilities in this body, that he will be back.

On occasions people have sought to entice me to come to the State of Montana to campaign. Mr. President, I am a rather rough character, and I have gone almost everywhere to campaign, and I suppose, in the manner of these new technological developments, I will be aboard one of the orbit schooners, if there is a constituency on the moon, to see whether we can get a Republican up there.

There may be other places in the universe that may some day be represented in the U.S. Senate. If there are, and if it is given to me as an assignment to go there and campaign for a Republican, I shall do it. But there are times when the heart speaks, and nothing else counts. So I wish him well, and I leave it there, because he has been a great leader.

There are all kinds of leaders. There is the imperious, arrogant kind who drives things through. Then there is another type, the humble type, like the Leader who walked along the shores of the blue waters of the Sea of Galilee a long time ago. That kind of leader leads through the sheer force of character and gentility. That is the kind of leader he has been. MIKE, I wish you well.

Mr. President, tomorrow, when we adjourn sine die, I may have many more things to say that may be pertinent, as we take leave of each other, because I am so hopeful that perhaps in the 89th Congress I can gain a few recruits.

I should not say this. I should not say that a Member is or is not on the floor, but I should like, as a great mark of respect, refer to our newest Member, from California, PIERRE SALINGER. I shall have my ear cocked on election night, because that will be a great contest in the State of my friend from California [Mr. KUCHEL]. I thought up what I believe to be a suitable sentiment.

I can only hope that on that night, as the votes are counted, George Murphy will be elected to the Senate, the band will strike up in Sacramento or Los Angeles or San Francisco, and that PIERRE will be there, and that the band will play, "Carry Me Back to Old Virginny."

There will be a contest in the great State of Indiana. I love our friend from Indiana, who is a Member of this body, but I would be a little entranced if on election night I should hear the sweet cadences of a Hoosier quartet sing "Back Home Again in Indiana."

There is a distinguished Member of this body from the State of Michigan. I love him like a brother. He is my chairman. But, I suppose whatever agreeable evil sometimes creeps into this feeble mind of mine might find some joy when our friend PHIL HART will be singing "That Is Why I Wish Again That I Was in Michigan, Down on the Farm."

Then there is our distinguished friend who sits in the rear row. I love him too. He is BILL PROXMIRE. His father and mother saw the light earlier. They are Republicans. They live in Illinois, I believe, and they vote for me. Would it not be wonderful, as we try to recruit on our side, if suddenly a great swelling chorus should move into a crescendo and sing on election night "On, Wisconsin."

Would that not be wonderful? "And stay right there."

I do not want to make an adjournment speech tonight. I really wished to pay tribute to my great friend from Montana, and also to express the hope that perhaps a kind destiny and some kind of genie will look with favor upon our friend. I hope that on the 3d day of January, when we reassemble here, we shall look around and see, in addition to all the old faces, a few new faces.

I say to you, Mr. President (Mr. WALTERS in the chair), that you will be the one voluntary retiree from this body, so far as I know. I paid testimony to you the other day because I have known you a long time. You have been a gracious citizen. You have been gracious to a part of my family and my grandchildren. You know them. They are in the land of "Estes the Bestest." So I come down there frequently, and you have been very kind. You deserve every choice blessing that a good destiny can shower upon you. You are a good person. All Tennessee knows it. I have heard about you many times in the years that I have gone down to the Volunteer State. I have always thought of that man from Arimathea, who claimed the body of the Great Redeemer. I have looked for a description of him, and all I found was "He was a good man, and just."

Mr. President, you have been a good man for Tennessee, for your friends, and for your country. Mrs. Walters has been good for them, too. So, as you leave this body and resume your business in that great State, everyone here will wish you well.

I shall probably conclude these remarks tomorrow.

So with that we can go on with the business of the Senate, if there be any business.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am deeply grateful to the distinguished minority leader for the kind words he spoke about me. However, in all honesty I should point out that the record of this Congress is not the property of either the minority leader or of myself but is, in effect, the result of the joint efforts by all Senators on both sides of the aisle.

Unlike my distinguished friend, I look forward with pleasure to watching the return of Senators SALINGER, HART, HARTKE, PROXMIRE, and perhaps a few new Democrats. But only time will tell in that respect.

I do want the distinguished minority leader, my warm friend, my close friend, to know how much I appreciate what he has said.

THE PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION CAMPAIGN—EDITORIAL IN THE SATURDAY EVENING POST

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the spectacle of normally Republican newspapers and magazines announcing their support for Lyndon Johnson has become commonplace. Yet, nothing could have prepared us for the September 19 editorial of the Saturday Evening Post, a venerable magazine which throughout its long and colorful history has never before supported a Democrat. Its editorial, entitled "Why Lyndon Johnson Must Be Elected," must surely rank as one of the most incisive and pungent political statements of the year.

The distinguished elder statesman of journalism, Walter Lippmann, has amplified upon two aspects of the Post editorial, and the campaign in general, in two valuable articles. In one, he wrote of the contradiction in the Goldwater belief that a smaller, less powerful Government can sweep crime and violence from the streets, and all our obstinate foes from land and sea. In the other, he wrote about the Senator's foreign policy: "His idea of diplomacy is to deliver an ultimatum."

The editorial and the articles are well worth the time of anyone still in doubt about where his vote should go. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial and the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY LYNDON JOHNSON MUST BE ELECTED

A healthy, vigorous two-party system is absolutely indispensable to the survival of American democracy. Its proper functioning requires each of the major parties to put forth a man who is unmistakably and unquestionably qualified to be trusted with the incalculably grave and terrible powers of the Presidency.

In the presidential election of 1964, the two-party system has been seriously endangered. One of the great parties, the Democratic, has fulfilled its duty by putting forth a man, Lyndon B. Johnson, who has many flaws and leaves much to be desired, but who is unquestionably as well qualified to be President as any tried and tested leader the Democrat Party now affords.

The other great party, the Republican, has shirked and betrayed its duty by putting forth a man, BARRY GOLDWATER, who is manifestly unqualified to be President and whose unsuitability for this awesome responsibility becomes clearer with every passing day and with every feckless word he utters.

The two-party system has thus been endangered because this misfeasance on the part of the Republican Party has left the enlightened, the rational, the prudent, the responsible American voter no acceptable other choice in this election. He is not even given the option of an echo. He is given only the option of a question mark, of a man who is seemingly congenitally unable to say what he means or even know what he says, to say anything clearly or to hold the same conviction 2 days in a row. BARRY GOLDWATER's tongue is like quicksilver; his mind is like quicksand.

The Post therefore urges the election of Lyndon B. Johnson as President.

It urges, even more strongly, the defeat of BARRY GOLDWATER.

We are confident that Johnson will make a good President because he already is a good President. In the 10 brief months he has held the highest office, he has shown an ability unmatched in this century to bring all the diverse and warring factions of Congress behind the enactment of positive, progressive, and needful legislative programs. In his greatest test as Commander in Chief—the attack on our Navy in the Gulf of Tonkin—he has acted with both the forcefulness and restraint which is required in the man who alone controls the ultimate weapon and bears all the fearful responsibility which that entails.

We are equally confident that GOLDWATER would not make a good President. He has not even made a good Senator. He has been in the Senate 11 years and not one piece of memorable legislation attaches to his name. He has been in its councils through the most momentous and revolutionary decade in the history of this Republic as we have strained every seam and fabric of our traditional habits and thinking to keep abreast of an age when all the supposed boundaries of man's environment are being broken, gravity defied, space penetrated, the moon reached, the riddle of the human cell being unraveled. Merely to understand, much less to master, this surge and change, heavy with unguessed new treasures of technology to increase man's wealth, has required and will require Government entry into areas never before imagined. But BARRY GOLDWATER has managed to live through this whole tremendous epoch with his face turned squarely to the past, his eyes closed, and his mind preoccupied with one—and only one—idea; somehow to shrink the Government back into the familiar and comfortably small proportions of his Arizona youth. BARRY GOLDWATER has left no mark in the Senate because, as he has truthfully declared, he sought to erase marks rather than to make them: "I have little interest in streamlining Government or in making it more efficient, for I mean to reduce its size. I do not undertake to promote welfare, for I propose to extend freedom. My aim is not to pass laws, but to repeal them. It is not to inaugurate new programs, but to cancel old ones. * * *" He is like the Cincinnati kettlemaker who, when first hearing of Kentucky Ironmaker William Kelly's use of air to make steel, exclaimed, "I want my iron made in the old way or not at all." His mind is surely not in phase with today's world.

GOLDWATER changes his "convictions" almost as often as his shirt. One day he is for abolishing social security, the next day for strengthening it, one day for giving field commanders control over nuclear weapons, the next day for restricting control to the NATO supreme commander. Many of his statements are inherently contradictory nonsense—e.g., to cut all Government expenditures, while expanding defense (which already takes more than half of every tax dollar spent)—like advertising a car that is bigger on the inside but smaller on the outside. Some of his statements, if they have any meaning at all, are rather frightening in the subconscious thoughts which seem to lie behind them, particularly those concerning his strange love affair with German prowess: "With all due respect to American military leaders, Germany would have won both world wars if she had not been badly led." "I think it was the Germans who originated the modern concept of peace through strength." This last remark prompted Hamilton Fish Armstrong, editor of Foreign Affairs, to ask the New York Times to clarify whether it was Hitler's or the Kaiser's "peace through strength" that GOLDWATER had in mind. However, it is always possible that he really had nothing in mind, as when he told reporters who briefly boarded his cruising *Sundance*, "I've thought for some time that talks with the Red Chinese might be profitable." He later radioed ashore that what he really meant was that the United States should be ready to threaten the Chinese, telling them that "if they didn't stop, then you would blow up a bridge or some other sort of force." He finally cleared everything up by adding, "I'm not really recommending this, but it might not be an impossible idea."

GOLDWATER is a grotesque burlesque of the conservative he pretends to be. He is a wild man, a stray, an unprincipled and ruthless political jujitsu artist like Joe McCarthy, whose last-ditch defender he remained even when three-fourths of the Senate had voted to condemn their Red-hunting colleague. He still defends McCarthy, well knowing that he imputed treason to General Marshall and to President Eisenhower. He will not condemn the John Birch Society, though knowing that its leader, Robert Welch, has called Eisenhower a Communist agent. Yet, in order to get Eisenhower's vacuous blessing, GOLDWATER was capable of a tongue-in-cheek erasure of his infamous "extremism" slogan, a statement that was not written in haste but with extreme care, and gone over time and again by GOLDWATER before he uttered it. These words can, and should, forever symbolize the total fraudulence of his claim to be a true conservative: "Extremism in the defense of liberty is no vice, and * * * moderation in the pursuit of justice is no virtue." That statement deserves to be the "rum, romanism, and rebellion" of this election, and BARRY GOLDWATER deserves to be defeated for it alone, no matter how much he tries to clown it away. He knew what he meant by it, and so does every John Birch fanatic and Ku Klux vigilante.

For the good of the Republican Party, which his candidacy disgraces, we hope that GOLDWATER is crushingly defeated. It was clear, from poll after poll, that the rank and file of Republican voters overwhelmingly preferred other leaders to GOLDWATER. It was equally clear that the fanatical GOLDWATER bias of a majority of convention delegates revealed the capture of the Republican Party by a new breed of so-called leaders whose selection had been steamrollered by extremist, well-heeled types. The men who have most deserved to lead the Republican Party, by virtue of their long, distinguished, and responsible service in it, and to the country, have been made to feel unwelcome, hissed and hated in it, as they were repudiated by it. A crushing defeat for GOLDWATER will drive the fanatic saboteurs of the Republican Party back into the woodwork whence they came. It will provide the opportunity for the party's true leaders to build anew from the wreckage that these heedless, reckless, ill-mannered and arrogant men are sure to leave. Then the two-party system can be restored, and the voter will again have a choice, not a calamity.

THE HALLMARK OF GOLDWATERISM

(By Walter Lippmann)

Senator GOLDWATER has been telling the country that the President has become much too powerful and that this very powerful President has been much too weak to win the cold war and stamp out crimes of violence in our city streets. The Senator has based his campaign on the thesis that the powers of the Presidency must be reduced and that then a smaller and weaker President can and should do away with the most troublesome problems at home and abroad.

This central contradiction is the hallmark of Goldwaterism. The Senator finds it easy to believe that a smaller, shrunken, much less costly government can overawe the Communist nations jointly and severally, can command the Western alliance, and can put Latin America in order. In BARRY GOLDWATER's mind a cheaper government could act more strongly, a weaker government could see that the cities are successfully policed.

How, one must ask, can we run the world and yet pay less? The fact, to be sure, is that to do what Senator GOLDWATER wants to have done demands a much more powerful government than we have today. Why does he think it doesn't? The plain truth, I submit, is that he is a dreamer, that when BARRY GOLDWATER talks about public affairs, he lives in a world of fantasy. He dreams that all things are possible. For it is only in the world of dreams that weaker Presidents can do gigantic things, that great results can be achieved at little cost.

This unworldliness is a part of his personal attractiveness. In his world everything becomes possible when you have said that it should happen. There is no clash between the theories and the facts. The hard realities do not really exist. It was this boy who has never grown up fully who said the other day that when he was President he would install his ham radio set in the White House and would then be able to talk to a number of heads of state.

This unworldly divorce from reality is not always charming. Many dreams can be quite cruel, and when Senator GOLDWATER talks about the poor he can be very cruel. He has been making much of our common worries about the increase of crime and, exploiting this worry for political purposes, he has been claiming that he, BARRY GOLDWATER, can stop the crime which Lyndon Johnson is, so says GOLDWATER, promoting.

How is President Johnson promoting crime? By backing the Civil Rights Act and by sponsoring social security and welfare measures. These, according to Senator GOLDWATER's Minneapolis speech, are causing "a breakdown in private responsibility" and in "respect for law and order." The Senator asks that "if it is entirely proper for Government to take from some to give to others, then won't some men be led to believe that they can rightfully take from anyone who has more than they?"

This must be about the first time in 200 years that any public man has argued that charity corrupts the characters of the poor.

It is not only charity that is corrupting the poor. The search for justice is also corrupting the poor. The Goldwater theory about civil rights for Negroes is that by enacting laws about these rights the Negroes have been incited to demand these rights. According to one of his leading supporters, perhaps the most distinguished intellectual in the Goldwater camp, Prof. Milton Friedman, of Chicago University, the Civil Rights Act "has directed Negro resentment against whites."

Thus, it is not the grievances that incite the Negroes; it is the effort to redress the grievances.

The campaign has been underway only for about 2 weeks and it begins to look as if the real issue to be decided is not whether this or that policy or this or that piece of legislation is sound but whether BARRY GOLDWATER is fit to be President in the hard world of reality.

ON WARMONGERING

(By Walter Lippmann)

General Eisenhower says it is "tommyrot" to think that Senator GOLDWATER is a "warmonger"—that is to say, a man who wants to start a war. But does anybody say that BARRY GOLDWATER wants a war? I know of no one who says it, or thinks it. What is being said is that he is the kind of man who would be much more likely than President Johnson to get us into a big war.

This charge, which is affecting the campaign profoundly, is that Senator GOLDWATER's admiration of brinkmanship, his impulsive willingness to threaten nuclear war, could put this country in the position where the only choice left was between surrender and nuclear war. It is not that BARRY GOLDWATER wants to have a war; it is that he denounces every alternative to war as surrender, appeasement, or cowardice.

The crucial fallacy of his military thinking and of his ideas about foreign policy is the assumption that the United States must be and will be obeyed by all the rest of the world, by its adversaries, its rivals, its allies. Here again is that unreason of the dreamer: the illusion of superman that all opponents can be commanded to disappear. Of course, the Senator does not want a war. But he is suffering from that most dangerous of all the illusions of a statesman, the illusion of omnipotence.

Thus, if one studies his remarks on foreign policy, one finds that his idea of diplomacy is to deliver an ultimatum. If what he means is what he says, he would solve all our difficult problems by issuing an ultimatum to somebody. He would solve the Vietnamese conflict by an ultimatum to Hanoi and an ultimatum to Peiping. He would get rid of the nuisance in Cuba by an ultimatum to Castro. He would remove the Berlin wall by an ultimatum to the Soviet Government.

He is at pains to deny that he is "trigger-happy," and General Eisenhower is now testifying that no one who has seen a war could want a war. But BARRY GOLDWATER is undeniably ultimatum-happy. And this makes him a very dangerous man. For there are powerful, brave, and proud nations which oppose us on various issues. A President who would conduct foreign policy by ultimatum is failing to realize that other people are like Americans in that, driven to it, they will fight rather than surrender.

This is the specific danger of Goldwaterism in foreign affairs: an instinctive and impulsive preference for the ultimatum rather than for negotiation. That is why, without intending to have a war, he would prove to be a precipitator of warlike crises and perhaps of the ultimate crisis of a war of annihilation. For him the outer world does not really exist: the foreigners who live beyond the seas are not other men with whom we must live on this planet but abstractions who will vanish if the President barks at them.

There has been no serious discussion about foreign affairs in this campaign. There is not likely to be. For the President lives in the daylight world and there he deals with Russians and Chinese and Germans and South Americans and Vietnamese and Cypriots, all of whom are very different and most of whom are very ornery. They all have certain things in common. In the daylight world the President knows that he did not create them. He knows that he does not own them. And he knows that he cannot command them.

But BARRY GOLDWATER does not live in the daylight world and he does not deal with real people, only with the good guys and the bad guys of superman's imagining.

REASONS FOR SUPPORT OF PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S CANDIDACY

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, with the economy expanding at a rate nearly double that of 4 years ago, gross national product up more than $100 billion in that period, profits at an alltime high, and unemployment down from that of 4 years ago, is it any wonder that businessmen in unprecedented numbers support the candidacy of Lyndon Johnson? The exodus of Republicans to the standard of Lyndon Johnson has been so great that one writer stated that Republicans felt themselves duty-bound, as loyal friends of the free-enterprise system, to vote Democratic this year.

To students of finance, this comes as no surprise. One of the most respected of these observers is Sylvia Porter, whose articles are widely published. In her article which was published on September 11 in the Idaho Falls Post-Register, she listed six major reasons why President Johnson is winning such widespread support from business.

Mr. President, I am sure that Senators and others in this country who are concerned with our economic health will be interested in what Sylvia Porter wrote; therefore, I ask unanimous consent that her article entitled "Free Enterpriser" be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Post-Register, Sept. 11, 1964]

FREE ENTERPRISER

(By Sylvia Porter)

The mass defection of business and financial leaders who have been lifelong Republicans to the Democratic presidential nominee in 1964 is without precedent in modern politics. Why?

At the heart of the phenomenon is not just the commonplace answer that these Americans fear what Senator GOLDWATER policies might mean. At the heart of the phenomenon is the fact that these men and women accept Johnson as a true conservative, a sincere defender of our country's version of free enterprise, a man who understands the crucial roles business confidence and adequate profits play in a prosperous economy. They are far more pro-Johnson than anti-GOLDWATER—a complex point demanding objective analysis.

Toward Kennedy's policies businessmen generally were suspicious, even hostile, for they distrusted Kennedy as a strong-willed, young intellectual adventurer. Toward the same policies under Johnson they are openly sympathetic, for they trust Johnson as a mature man of action you can do business with.

A profoundly significant fact inherent in business support of Johnson is that the Democratic administration of Kennedy-Johnson has done more for business than any other in memory.

In his book "The Free Enterprisers: Kennedy, Johnson, and the Business Establishment," published today by G. P. Putnam's Sons, Hobart Rowens pulls together the positive moves made in Kennedy's term. This partial list well may stun those who think Kennedy deserved his antibusiness reputation. Specifically:

1. A new investment tax credit and liberalized depreciation guidelines—both extremely valuable concessions to business which are giving multimillion-dollar relief each year to businessmen investing in plants and equipment.

2. A private corporation to operate the communications satellites—a step Rowen calls an extraordinary transfer to private hands of infinite wealth and power that might have been, properly, a public trust and evidence that the Kennedy administration was not trying to affect the basic division of economic power between Government and the private sector.

3. A reduction in transportation taxes and a program to reduce regulations on transportation—just two indications that the "essence of Kennedy's philosophy" was a free market economy.

4. The Trade Expansion Act—designed to help U.S. business expand exports to prospering European nations.

5. The biggest personal and corporation income tax cuts in history—along with stated agreement that if this fiscal policy restimulated inflation, the Federal Reserve System would be free to use monetary policy to put the brakes on credit and raise interest rates.

6. A long series of orthodox financial measures to protect the U.S. dollar, curb the outflow of gold—and reassure the central bankers of the free world that our financial policies were sound.

Since Johnson took over, he has added aggressive programs to control Federal spending, a crucial factor in business approval; unprecedented efforts to bring businessmen to the White House to help "in actually determining the economic future of the country"; pledges for future tax cuts, particularly excise tax cuts.

Rowen, an editor of "Newsweek," is a nationally respected journalist who has been reporting business news from Washington for two decades. He began this book almost 2 years ago and it's no political quickie. In fact, Rowen's intention was not to defend Kennedy's conservatism but rather to prod the late President into being bolder in fighting for his original goals of a new economic era.

But the man Rowen "wanted most to read it is no longer with us." Johnson has fully taken over, is inspiring widespread business confidence even while he strives for policies which will maintain this Nation's remarkably prolonged prosperity, curb poverty, and make a "great society."

Rowen did not write this book to praise the probusiness policies of Kennedy-Johnson. Yet the record he submits gives businessmen-for-Johnson one of their most powerful election weapons.

ANGUISH AMONG NATO ALLIES ABOUT GOLDWATER CANDIDACY

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, at first glance, it may seem strange that the nomination of Senator GOLDWATER, a man who often praises the NATO Alliance, has done more to disrupt this alliance than any event in recent years has done.

Yet, having just returned from Vienna, where I served as a Senate observer at the eighth regular session of the International Atomic Energy Agency General Conference, I can testify personally that this is the case. The Goldwater candidacy is everywhere regarded with derision and dismay. The fear which has been aroused in Western Europe is understandable, when one considers that the NATO Alliance survives only because our partners have put their trust in the prudence and perseverance of the U.S. Government and of its head of state; the American President has ultimate power over the lives and defense of the citizens of the NATO countries. Our allies cannot be expected to trust a presidential candidate who in the past has so often announced for reckless foreign ventures.

Max Freedman has written for the the Washington Star two thoughtful articles which set forth some of the reasons for the anguish among our NATO allies about the Goldwater candidacy. As Mr. Freedman has correctly pointed out:

> Senator GOLDWATER has found the fatal formula for dismembering NATO and destroying it. Europe's fears about Senator GOLDWATER are neither panicky nor unjustified. They are prophetic and right.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Freedman's articles be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOLDWATER'S POSITION ON NATO

(By Max Freedman)

Senator BARRY GOLDWATER has always praised NATO as the primary instrument of Western security. He has promised to work for its greater unity and strength. Yet the people of Western Europe, who would benefit from his cooperation, are the first to regard his possible election as a calamity to peace. How does one explain this paradox?

The explanation can be found in his concept of the alliance. His views on NATO are shared neither by the United States nor by our European allies.

He thinks of NATO almost exclusively in military terms. Even when he talks of an Atlantic partnership as he did in his acceptance speech at San Francisco, he is still thinking of Western strength organized in opposition to communism. He does not allow himself to think of NATO as an organization capable of growth and expansion regardless of what is done by Moscow.

After all his brave words about partnership, it is distressing to find him so grudging and cautious in his attitude to the current trade negotiations with Western Europe. Without economic cooperation there can be no hope of political unity in the alliance. Yet Senator GOLDWATER, when it comes down to hard bargaining, is more eager to be the guardian of American economic interests than he is to be the architect of Atlantic unity.

There is nothing wrong with seeking to protect American interests. Everything is wrong however with a policy which makes very little effort to reconcile these interests with the needs of the Atlantic alliance, especially when Senator GOLDWATER has spoken with such glowing emphasis of the importance of moving from an alliance to a partnership.

Our allies, looking at Senator GOLDWATER's words and record, believe they are right in thinking he wants Western Europe not as a partner in freedom but primarily as an ally in the struggle with Russia.

This disquiet becomes more acute as they realize that he wants that struggle to continue and to grow still more menacing. He completely rejects the possibility of a truce in the rivalry with Russia, even though a final settlement may be reserved for a distant age. In fact, he wants us to renew and intensify the cold war.

He has suggested that the model for our relations with Russia should be our policy towards Cuba. Presumably we should isolate Russia diplomatically, organize a massive and pitiless boycott of Russian goods, cut off all personal relations with the Russian people, and work for the overthrow and destruction of the Communist government in Moscow. He has left us in no doubt that he would encourage every rebellious tendency in Eastern Europe against Russia.

Three things must be said about this strange policy.

In the first place, Senator GOLDWATER assumes, without evidence and in defiance of all experience, that Russia should submit meekly and docilely to this hostile American policy. If Senator GOLDWATER should ever become President and try to organize such pressures against Russia, we would at once move into a dangerous area of world affairs, with peace in the balance. For the tentative truce would be replaced by massive retaliation that would bring the greatest threat to peace since the end of the Second World War. It is a measure of Senator GOLDWATER's understanding that he thinks he can treat Russia as if it were Cuba and get away with it.

Secondly, Senator GOLDWATER utterly fails to realize that the growing sense of freedom and security in eastern Europe is the direct result of the relaxed tensions with the Soviet Union. If the United States is to heat up the cold war, as he wants us to do, the first result of the new policy would be savage repressions by Russia in eastern Europe. And if he were to persist in encouraging the Poles and Hungarians and Czechs to revolt, he would be leading them into a tragic martyrdom without parallel in modern times.

Finally, there is absolutely no evidence that a single European member of NATO wants such a policy or would be willing to support it. Senator GOLDWATER has found the fatal formula for dismembering NATO and destroying it. Europe's fears about Senator GOLDWATER are neither panicky nor unjustified. They are prophetic and right. Senator GOLDWATER, with the alliance in ruins, would then proceed to goad and torment Russia into acts of desperation. This policy can hardly commend itself to responsible voters.

[From the Washington Evening Star]

GOLDWATER IMPUGNS U.S. MOTIVES

(By Max Freedman)

In his new book, "Where I Stand," Senator BARRY GOLDWATER has laid it down as the first rule of his foreign policy that the United States must always act within the restraints and unities of NATO.

"The crux of the problem," he said, "is our tendency, even our eagerness to negotiate unilaterally with the Soviet Union." And again he urged the United States to give "a pledge not to engage in bilateral negotiations with the Soviet Union on matters that directly involve the interests or security of our NATO partners." What, if anything, do these words mean?

The NATO treaty was signed in April 1949. In the last 15 years there has not been one instance in which the United States negotiated with Russia behind the back of its allies, or bartered away their interests without consultation, or displayed any eagerness for unilateral negotiations and concessions that would compromise the position of Western Europe. Ignoring this record, arguing without proof, and making his own prejudice his guide and oracle, Senator GOLDWATER proceeds to attack the motives and good faith of American policy.

He has not condemned a specific policy. He has impeached the purpose and character and reliability of that policy. If Senator GOLDWATER is right, the United States, thinking eagerly of its own interests and setting them ahead of the interests of its allies, is unworthy of being the leader of the grand alliance. It is also incapable of being a good member of NATO.

A presidential candidate should have shown less eagerness to traduce his own Government by accusing it of being willing to betray its partners. When did President Truman or President Eisenhower or President Kennedy or President Johnson do anything that justifies this attack and vindicates this censure?

The most direct negotiations between Moscow and Washington concerned the nuclear test ban treaty, which Senator GOLDWATER opposed. Those negotiations had of necessity to be limited to the nuclear powers. France chose to remain aloof, but none could have been more enthusiastic about them than Great Britain. The other members of NATO shared Britain's enthusiasm and rejoiced to ratify the treaty. What is Senator GOLDWATER talking about? On general questions of disarmament, the United States, at Geneva and the United Nations, has always worked closely with its NATO partners. It has remained for Senator GOLDWATER to accuse the United States of bad faith.

Apparently everyone except Senator GOLDWATER has regarded the Cuban missile crisis of 1962 as a special case because of the need for secrecy and the compulsion to seek a swift solution. Yet even here the allies were informed at the first opportunity. Livingston Merchant went on a special mission to Canada. Dean Acheson reported to General de Gaulle. Ambassador David Bruce in London took a memorable initiative to win British support. West Germany was resolute and unfaltering in her admiration of President Kennedy's conduct of the negotiations.

The NATO council regarded the negotiations not as a betrayal of the alliance, nor as an assertion of America's eagerness to seek an accommodation with Russia, but as a defense of all free nations amid circumstances of unprecedented peril. Why does Senator GOLDWATER falsify this record and stoop to slapdash accusations against his own country?

The United States has neither coveted nor negotiated any special trading advantages for itself with Russia. That trade is negligible. The sale of wheat was a special case and NATO, unlike Senator GOLDWATER, welcomed it. The United States has persuaded its allies to have a more stringent list of strategic items of trade than they would have preferred. American influence has been persuasive in the alliance in preventing a general rush to provide long-term credits to Russia. Where in this record can Senator GOLDWATER find any proof that America has been going it alone or being a bad member of the alliance in seeking special favors for itself?

The security of Berlin is a matter so vital to the whole alliance that any threat to that city immediately produces a major crisis with full cooperation among all the NATO countries the urgent order of the day. Britain, France, West Germany and the United States are in frequent consultation on Berlin and the whole German problem. The NATO council has dealt with these matters on many occasions. Does this sound like a sneaky American policy?

Many of our NATO partners have a larger cultural exchange program with Russia than has the United States and they have had it for a longer time.

Genuine problems and urgent division now trouble NATO and they deserve careful scrutiny. But NATO is not helped in any way by this clumsy and cheapjack attack on the motives of American policy. Senator GOLDWATER's criticism outrages the facts and insults the United States.

THE BALTIC NATIONS

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, the plight of the Baltic nations arouses the deepest sympathy and compassion in all of us. These small, defenseless states have been absorbed by a huge and ruthless neighbor, without regard to legal principles and without recourse to popular sentiment. Their continued subjugation by the Soviet Union is properly a burden on the conscience of freemen everywhere.

The Baltic States, like all of the satellite and subjugated nations around the world, will surely have their day of reckoning, simply because tyranny invites its own dissolution. In the context of the nuclear age, the dissolution may be more evolutionary than revolutionary, as events in Eastern Europe in recent months have seemed to suggest. But come it will, and we in the West must do what we can to speed it along.

One suggestion as to how this could be accomplished is incorporated in a draft resolution sent to me by Rev. Vaclovas Martinkus, of St. Casimir's Rectory, in Providence, R.I. Reverend Martinkus' resolution would use the great forum of the United Nations in an attempt to secure relief for the Baltic nations. His suggested approach might well be applied at some point in the future, and it certainly merits consideration. I do not propose to submit it at this late point in the session; but I ask unanimous consent that it be printed as an exhibit at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DRAFT RESOLUTION BY REV. VACLOVAS MARTINKUS

Whereas the Communist regime did not come to power in Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia by legal or democratic processes; and

Whereas the Soviet Union took over Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia by force of arms; and

Whereas the select committee of the House of Representatives created by House Resolution 346, 83d Congress, to investigate the incorporation of the Baltic States into the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics found that the incorporation of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia was contrary to established principles of international law; and

Whereas the United States of America has never recognized the incorporation of the Baltic States into the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and continues to maintain diplomatic relations with representatives of the former free governments of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia; and

Whereas there exists a strong and undivided world opinion to eliminate all remnants of imperialism and colonialism; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America request the President of the United States to bring up the Baltic States question before the United Nations and ask the United Nations request the Soviets:

(1) To withdraw all Soviet troops, agents, colonists and controls from Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia.

(2) To return all Baltic exiles from Siberia, prisons and slave-labor camps in the Soviet Union; and be it further

Resolved, that the United Nations conduct free elections in Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia under its supervision and punish all Soviet Communists who are guilty of crimes against the people of the Baltic States.

TENTH ANNIVERSARY OF ASSEMBLY OF CAPTIVE EUROPEAN NATIONS

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, the Assembly of Captive European Nations recently observed the 10th anniversary of its founding, at a meeting held at the Carnegie Endowment International Center, in New York City.

As Mr. Aleksander Kutt, chairman of the assembly, explained, that occasion, while not a joyous one, afforded "an opportunity to call the attention of the peoples and governments of the free world to the freedom aspirations of the captive peoples and to their stanch resistance to Communist dictatorships that subjugate them."

These aspirations for freedom are worthy of profound admiration. Indeed, self-determination for the nations of east-central Europe is a goal fundamental to all who believe in the principles of a free world.

The assembly represents the following countries: Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, and Rumania. To all those who yearn for freedom in these nations, tragically deprived of their liberties by Communist tyranny and dictatorship, I express my own admiration and my highest regard. May their wishes, which so coincide with our own hopes, become a reality.

THE COUNSELOR ADVISER UNIVERSITY SUMMER EDUCATION PROGRAM

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, during the past summer, approximately 2,000 persons from 50 States participated in the counselor adviser university summer education—CAUSE—program conducted by the Department of Labor under a Manpower Development and Training Act grant. In 27 colleges and universities throughout the country, training was carried on to develop a trained pool of individuals versed in the cultural background, needs, and problems of disadvantaged youth throughout our Nation.

I am pleased to note that 17 Rhode Islanders completed the training, and are now prepared to enter careers of service to the less advantaged, by working in the various State employment services, the functions of which are being expanded to aid the many young people who are out of school, out of work, out of hope. These expanded services will take the form of youth opportunity centers throughout the country specifically designed to reach and help these youths.

In a sense, the CAUSEists manning these centers could be termed the first front in the war on poverty. They will be an integral part of the Economic Opportunity Act program, and it is hoped that they will be a part of a coordinated effort to reach our less advantaged youngsters.

I commend those who have joined in this effort. Two thousand trained counselors are not many, in a nation of over 190 million people; but the youth opportunity center program is a welcome step forward.

I have stated many times that we in the United States need to develop a national youth policy, for a program of carefully coordinated and effective programs to deal with all our youth. We should be equally concerned with young people who have no particular problems, as well as with the problem-plagued. Our vision should be directed toward the development of greater challenges and the building of wider opportunities, so that we may get the very best from our young people, and may offer them the most.

CAUSE and the youth opportunity centers, as the program expands, will do much toward the implementation of a national youth policy. We in Congress have passed the Economic Opportunity Act. We must now encourage efforts such as those of CAUSE, to insure its success.

APPROPRIATION FOR NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE ARTS

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I express my very real disappointment that the funds for the National Council on the Arts, established by Public Law 88-579, have been curtailed in the supplemental appropriation bill and in the conference from $100,000 to $50,000.

In my best judgment, the $100,000 figure was too low for the proper implementation of the Council's work. The estimate presented to the Senate Committee on Appropriations by the Bureau of the Budget and Mr. Roger Stevens, the President's special assistant on the arts, was $125,000.

It would seem that the $50,000 now proposed would threaten to curtail most seriously the important work to be undertaken by the Council, on behalf of our Nation's cultural welfare.

Last December 20, the Senate passed the bill to provide for both a National Council on the Arts and a National Arts Foundation. The bill was made less comprehensive by the House of Representatives, which acted only on the concept of a National Council on the Arts, and eliminated the provisions dealing with the Foundation.

In supporting the acceptance by the Senate on August 21 of this year, of the House version of House bill 9586 as the best possible legislation in this area which we could hope to achieve during this session of Congress, I expressed my regret that the House had not seen fit to endorse the full contents of Senate bill 2379, which combined the Council and the Foundation.

I believe that the funds provided by the supplemental appropriation bill are wholly insufficient.

I urge the Members of the Senate, who, through this legislation, have taken the lead in seeking the betterment of our cultural welfare, to join me in supporting the concept that a further supplemental appropriation during this fiscal year for the National Council on the Arts be given every consideration at the earliest possible time.

Many of us have worked over the years in behalf of the provision of proper governmental recognition to the arts in this country, and in behalf of a Federal cultural establishment. Indeed, the concepts for the legislation I am discussing have been before Congress for some 87 years. It would be tragic if, because of a lack of appropriations, the Council should be given so little scope for its work and its efforts.

NOMINATIONS OF POSTMASTERS

As in executive session.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], I send to the desk the nominations of nine postmasters that have been reported by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and I ask for their immediate consideration. The nominations have been cleared with the minority leadership.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nominations will be stated.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business this evening, it adjourn until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1965

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, yesterday the Senate passed the foreign assistance and related agencies appropriation bill for fiscal year 1965, after accepting the amendments of the committee en bloc and adopting two subsequent amendments.

One amendment was offered by the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] which reduced the limitation on the use of aid funds for research purposes from $15 million recommended by the committee to $12 million.

The other amendment adopted by the Senate was proposed by the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and provided for a reduction of $50 million in the contingency fund.

Final Senate action provided for $3,250 million for title I of the bill, the Foreign Aid portion, a reduction of $50 million from the amount recommended by the committee, and $412,077,000 for title II, the related agencies portion.

The Senate was recently informed that the bill that passed the Senate has now been approved by the House, thus obviating the necessity for a conference on the bill.

So that the record may reflect this action, I ask unanimous consent that a table which shows the appropriations for fiscal year 1964, budget estimates for fiscal year 1965, the bill as passed by the House, and as passed by the Senate, which now becomes the final action on the bill, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Comparative statement of appropriations for 1964, and estimates and amounts recommended in bill for 1965

TITLE I—FOREIGN ASSISTANCE

H. Doc. No.	Item	Appropriations, 1964	Budget estimates, 1965 [1]	Recommended in House bill for 1965	Recommended in Senate bill for 1965
	FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT				
	ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE				
240	Development grants	$155,000,000	$224,600,000	$204,600,000	$204,600,000
285	American schools and hospitals abroad	14,300,000	18,000,000	18,000,000	16,800,000
	American hospitals abroad (special foreign currency program)	4,700,000	------	------	0
	Surveys of investment opportunities	------	2,100,000	2,100,000	1,600,000
285	International organizations and programs	116,000,000	134,400,000	134,272,400	134,272,400
305	Supporting assistance	330,000,000	405,000,000	405,000,000	401,000,000
	Contingency fund	50,000,000	150,000,000	150,000,000	99,200,000
	Inter-American social and economic cooperation program	135,000,000	------	------	------
	Alliance for Progress:				
	Development grants	80,000,000	85,000,000	85,000,000	84,700,000
	Development loans	375,000,000	465,000,000	425,000,000	425,000,000
285	Development loans	687,300,000	922,200,000	782,200,000	773,727,600
285	Administrative expenses, AID	50,000,000	52,500,000	52,500,000	51,200,000
	Administrative expenses, State	2,700,000	2,900,000	2,900,000	2,900,000
	Subtotal, economic assistance	2,000,000,000	2,461,700,000	2,261,572,400	2,245,000,000
	MILITARY ASSISTANCE				
285 and 305	Military assistance	1,000,000,000	1,055,000,000	1,055,000,000	1,055,000,000
	Limitation on administrative expenses	(24,000,000)	(23,500,000)	(23,500,000)	(23,500,000)
	Total, title I, foreign assistance	3,000,000,000	3,516,700,000	3,316,572,400	3,250,000,000
	TITLE II—FOREIGN ASSISTANCE (OTHER)				
	FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT				
240 and 306	Peace Corps	$92,100,000	$106,100,000	$87,100,000	$87,100,000
	Reappropriation	------	------	(17,000,000)	(17,000,000)
	DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY—CIVIL FUNCTIONS				
	Ryukyu Islands, Army, administration	10,000,000	14,441,000	14,441,000	14,441,000
	DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE				
	Assistance to refugees in the United States	39,717,137	45,400,000	45,400,000	34,800,000
	Reappropriation	------	------	------	(7,600,000)
	DEPARTMENT OF STATE				
	Migrants and refugees	10,550,000	8,200,000	8,200,000	8,200,000
	FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT				
	Inter-American Development Bank	50,000,000	205,880,000	205,880,000	205,880,000
	International Development Association	61,656,000	61,656,000	61,656,000	61,656,000
	Total, title II, foreign assistance (other)	264,023,137	441,677,000	422,677,000	412,077,000
	TITLE III—EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON				
	Limitation on operating expenses	($1,314,366,000)	($1,350,060,000)	($1,350,060,000)	($1,350,060,000)
240	Limitation on administrative expenses	(3,500,000)	(3,781,000)	(3,781,000)	(3,781,000)
	Total, title III, Export-Import Bank	(1,317,866.000)	(1,353,841,000)	(1,353,841,000)	(1,353,841,000)
	Grand total, all titles	3,264,023,137	3,958,377,000	3,739,249,400	3,662,077,000

[1] H. Doc. 266, dated Jan. 21, 1964, unless otherwise indicated.

THE NEED FOR SEASONAL FARM LABOR IN CALIFORNIA

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, many of the farmers of California are confronted with a crucial and tragic problem: how to secure sufficient temporary farm labor to harvest their crops during the peak harvesting season. I am well aware that Congress has heard many of these arguments before and that the present administration and Congress have seen fit to permit the expiration of Public Law 78, the so-called Mexican labor program. This law will expire on December 31, 1964. Its expiration will work grave hardship not only on the farmers of my State but also on those in many other States of the West and the South. Its expiration will not stop the importation of foreign labor; it will only make such importation more chaotic with inadequate standards. Its expiration will be a blow to Mexican-American relations.

The uncertainties which its expiration will bring to the average farmer who needs a few workers to help him during peak harvest periods will mean a cutback in planting which will have a great effect not only on the agricultural economy of my State and other States but on industries related to that economy such as transportation, food packaging, and food distribution.

With the impending elimination of this law, California growers have intensified their recruitment efforts of domestic workers from other States. In cooperation with the University of California and a number of private manufacturing firms, the growers are also engaged in an all-out mechanization program for the major labor-using crops.

The crops which demand peak seasonal labor and which have employed the major portion of Mexican nationals include tomatoes, strawberries, lettuce, lemons, asparagus, snap beans, melons, sugarbeets, grapes, cotton, oranges, and celery.

Mr. President, I wish to analyze very carefully the needs of California agriculture for seasonal farm labor, the progress of efforts that have been made in mechanization and what remains to be done, the extent of California farm labor protective legislation, and the need for additional legislation at the Federal level to bring the Nation up to California standards so that we can attempt to make a judgment as to whether or not there is a need for extension of the Mexican labor program.

THE SCOPE OF CALIFORNIA AGRICULTURE

Mr. President, although California is the most urbanized State in America, it is also first in agricultural production. In 1963, the cash receipts received by California farmers for the marketing of their produce totaled $3,495,900,000. Of this, Government payments represented only $32,200,000. Farm production expenses totaled $2,692,200,000. Thus, net farm income totaled $940,700,000. While cash receipts for farm marketing were more than in 1962, an increase of more than $48 million in farm production expenses resulted in less net farm income for California farmers in 1963 over the previous year.

In 1963, the wages paid to all workers employed on California farms and in food packing and processing plants totaled $2.07 billion. Wages paid to domestic workers accounted for $1.99 billion of that total. Noting the earnings of all workers who were employed on farms in California during 1963, we find that they were paid approximately $644 million. Of that sum, foreign contract workers, primarily from Mexico, the so-called braceros, received about $73 million of that sum. This represents 3.5 percent of the earnings of all workers both on farms and in food packing and processing plants and 11.3 percent of the wages paid for on-farm work. Workers who come in under Public Law 78, the Mexican labor program, represent a small proportion of the total farmwork force, even in months of high labor need, which are May through October. But this comparison does not show the relative importance of the Mexican labor program to particular communities and for particular crops. A good example of the crucial importance of this program exists in the Salinas Valley. The Salinas Valley is centered in Monterey County. It is probably the lettuce center of the world. Agriculture is responsible for almost one-third of that county's adjusted gross income or $146 million in 1963. Crops requiring a high labor input, however, produced $115 million of this income.

Here, Mexican nationals make up about 40 percent of the total farm labor force, especially between May and October. During these months there is a peak demand for fieldworkers to harvest lettuce, strawberries, tomatoes, celery, and broccoli, among other crops. Thus while the use of Mexican nationals is a relatively small portion of the farm labor force for the State as a whole where much of the peak season need is met by hiring domestic farmworkers as the occasion arises, in the Salinas Valley this is clearly not the case.

The termination of the Mexican labor program will mean that Monterey County will have to somehow secure in terms of human or mechanical resources, a replacement for two-fifths of its labor force if it is to maintain its present level of farm production. This replacement is not a year-round requirement. This replacement is needed only for the period extending from May through October since there is no need for additional farm labor from November through April. Throughout the year, 2,000 of those who work in agriculture in Monterey County are the farmers themselves and unpaid family workers. Between 5,000 and 8,000 are hired domestic farmworkers depending on seasonal demand and the availability of students who are on vacation from school. The Mexican nationals vary between none in February to in excess of 11,000 in May and September.

I have dealt extensively with the situation in Monterey County because it illustrates vividly, I think, the degree to which the termination of the bracero program without an adequate substitute for this lost labor will affect some parts of the California agricultural economy.

Most of us know that whether it be in the Nation as a whole or California there is not one farm problem. There are many farm problems. This is true whether you are discussing the problems of farm commodity production or those relating to farm labor requirements.

Foreign contract labor in California is primarily employed in so-called stoop labor tasks. The need for this hand labor depends on the type of crop and the extent of mechanization in thinning and harvesting that crop. There are 12 crops which have been almost constant in their need for foreign workers. Between the years 1959 and 1963, according to the California Department of Employment, over 1,000 or more Mexican nationals were employed in each of these crops.

Mr. President, I ask consent that a table showing the number of Mexican nationals employed at peak activity, for these 12 crops, in California, in 1959 and 1963 be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Crops employing 1,000 or more Mexican nationals at peak activity, California, 1959 and 1963

Crop	Number of workers employed at peak activity	
	1963	1959
Tomatoes	38,100	37,140
Strawberries	10,500	8,750
Lettuce	6,140	6,880
Lemons	3,530	7,240
Asparagus	4,890	5,780
Beans, snap	2,350	2,040
Melons, all types	3,720	2,370
Sugarbeets (thin)	2,670	4,120
Grapes	2,850	2,720
Cotton (chop)	1,700	2,900
Oranges, Valencia	2,880	3,400
Celery	1,610	1,610

Source: California Department of Employment.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, some have said in the Senate that if the Mexican labor program were only terminated, then employment opportunities would exist for domestic workers who are now unemployed. Superficially, this is a very appealing argument. I am sure those who make it mean well. But such an argument makes as much sense as adding two apples and four oranges and saying you have six apples. Those who make such an argument are totally unfamiliar with the real needs of California agriculture or, indeed, the agriculture of any State where there is a great demand for field labor during the peak harvesting season.

An unemployed coal miner in eastern Kentucky does not want to move to California to work in a lettuce field as stoop labor. Neither does the unemployed automobile worker in Detroit, Mich. For that matter, the unemployed aircraft worker in Los Angeles does not want to move 350 miles north to Monterey County. Nor should they. Our Nation must face up to the need for expanded job opportunities in the industrial sector of our economy, not by relocating people all over America so that they might do seasonal farm labor, but by expanding the economic opportunities within the industrial and service sectors of our economy so that they might have year-round work. Let us not take fellow human beings and offer them only a few months work each year in the fields of California. What is to happen to them during the remainder of the year? Are they to become welfare burdens on the property taxpayers of my State? Does it make sense to encourage a nomadic way of life for even domestic farmworkers and having them roam the various States of the Union seeking employment with all the hardships that such instability and constant uprooting means to their families and especially their children, not to mention themselves? About the only people getting ahead in that type of operation are the ones who sell the migrant farmworker the gasoline for his car as he moves from town to town seeking a few weeks employment here and there.

MECHANIZATION

One possible replacement for the tremendous loss of field labor which will result from the termination of the Mexican labor program is increased and expanded mechanization. Mechanization in agriculture as it concerns thinning and harvesting—the two processes demanding great amounts of labor for short periods of time—is not merely a matter of building a machine to do the job. Mechanization in this sense often means a redesigning of the crop itself.

Using machines to pick cotton and harvest field grains was not a difficult problem. Engineers could construct mechanical devices to do the same tasks that were performed by hand labor. But with the attempt to mechanically harvest fruits and vegetables, a whole new set of problems arises. Often, the type of plant, fruit, or vegetable must be changed before a particular machine becomes practicable. This requires time and a great investment of research effort, not by individual farmers, who do not have the time or funds to finance such a large-scale undertaking, but primarily by the U.S. Department of Agriculture and the great land-grant colleges and universities, such as the

University of California and especially its Davis campus.

Mr. President, the Division of Agricultural Services of the University of California has just published a detailed analytical study entitled "California Agricultural Labor Requirements and Adjustments." This report, prepared by Eric Thor and John W. Mamer, discusses at length the extent of mechanization in California agriculture. I should like to summarize some of this information for the education of my colleagues on a crop by crop basis.

TOMATOES

Tomato growers will be the most crucially affected by the ending of Public Law 78. They are the largest users of foreign labor in my State. Approximately 38,100 foreign workers were employed to harvest tomatoes during the 1963 peak period. This represented 85 percent of the total workers engaged in the tomato harvest. The on-farm value of this crop was $110 million.

Mechanical harvesting of tomatoes is feasible, according to the experts at the University of California, from both an engineering and an economic standpoint. Together, engineers and plant breeders in my State have been working for several years to develop a mechanical tomato harvester and, equally important, a variety of tomatoes that can be harvested by the machine.

A prototype was completed in 1960. In 1961, four machines were built and in operation. After further development, including changes in cultural practices, 25 tomato harvesters were in operation by 1963. In that year 5 percent of the canning tomatoes were harvested by machine. This year, it is estimated that 125 machines may be in operation. In addition to the University of California machine, two commercial harvesters are also under development. The university machine does not completely do away with the need for labor, but one person on the machine replaces about five in the field. The machine sells for $18,000. It is estimated that the cost to those who use the machine will not be greatly different from the cost of harvesting by hand. By 1969, these University of California experts believe that a large proportion of the California canning tomato crop will be harvested by machine. But 1969 is still 5 years away. Besides there is no machine in use or under development which will harvest the tomatoes which are sold in the fresh market.

STRAWBERRIES

The second largest number of foreign workers is used in strawberries. In 1963, 10,500 Mexican nationals were employed during the peak week in May. This meant that almost 70 percent of those who were employed in strawberries that week came in under Public Law 78.

While the acreage in strawberries has been declining, the yields per acre have been increasing. The only mechanization in strawberries has been limited to a machine which will transport workers down the row while they are picking the berries. The University of California experts believe that there "does not appear to be any possibility of developing a machine to harvest the present strawberry varieties grown in California." While noting that engineering investigation and research continue and plant breeders are trying to develop a strawberry plant which will subject itself to mechanization, the university experts conclude that "it is doubtful that we will see the harvesting of strawberries mechanized for many years."

LETTUCE

The third largest number of foreign workers is used in lettuce. In 1963, approximately 6,140 Mexican nationals were employed during the peak week in October. This meant that almost 80 percent of the total work force employed in the lettuce harvest during the peak period consisted of workers brought in under Public Law 78.

The on-farm value of the California lettuce crop in 1963 was $85 million. Almost 120,400 acres of lettuce were harvested that year.

In 1962, the University of California began its research effort to develop a mechanical lettuce harvester. An experimental machine has now been developed. As yet, the machine does not trim the head of lettuce but it will select, cut, and convey it in the field. Commercial testing of this experimental model will take place next year. It will probably cost $10,000 per machine. According to the university experts, if the harvest rate is 200 cartons per acre, the cost per carton of lettuce will be about 9 cents. The present labor cost to select and cut is about 7 cents per carton.

While the cost would be more expensive, the machine would replace about 10 men. This factor is, of course, important with the termination of Public Law 78. The basic problem, however, is one of time. It might well be another 5 years or even a decade before this machine is perfected and in the fields of my State and other States. In the meantime, how do we harvest the crop?

ASPARAGUS AND MELONS

This story can be repeated with the other crops which are heavy users of field labor. In 1963, 4,890 Mexican nationals were employed in the asparagus harvest during the peak week. The value of the crop in 1963 was almost $30 million. While some mechanized harvesting is possible here, the problem of separating the green and the white asparagus has not been resolved. Thus, effective mechanical harvesting is still many years off.

Approximately 3,720 Mexican nationals—about 44 percent of the work force—were employed in harvesting melons during the 1963 peak week. There was a $45 million crop that year. A melon harvester is under development but due to the difficulties involved and the necessity for the development of new varieties which can be harvested mechanically, it will be unlikely that such a harvester is commercially feasible before the 1970's.

CITRUS

There are three orange-growing areas in California. Only the southern California area employs Mexican nationals to harvest oranges. In 1963, 2,880 foreign workers were employed in the peak week. Great effort has been made to develop a mechanical orange harvester, yet still unsolved is the problem of removing the fruit from the tree without breaking the peel.

The same problem exists with regard to lemons. A total of 3,530 Mexican nationals were employed during the 1963 peak week of the lemon harvest. This represented 70 percent of the workers employed. It was a $47 million crop.

The university experts conclude that "it is highly doubtful that any mechanical equipment will soon be developed to harvest citrus fruits sold for fresh consumption."

GRAPES

Grape growers utilized 2,850 Mexican nationals during the 1963 peak week. The on-farm value of the 1963 grape crop in California was almost $158 million. With regard to grapes used for raisins and wine, some mechanization has been accomplished, but it is still in the experimental stage. Even when these machines are fully developed, they will not result in the elimination of seasonal labor. They might reduce it a little and a shift in the seasonal pattern will occur. At present the only solution to mechanical harvesting of table grapes will probably be the development of new varieties. Thus, mechanical harvesting of table grapes is many years away, while mechanization of wine and raisin grapes will probably not be accomplished to any great extent before 1970. In the meantime, who will harvest the crop?

SUGARBEETS

Sugarbeet thinning employed 2,670 Mexican nationals during the 1963 peak week. There has been a decline in the use of foreign labor for sugarbeet thinning since 1958 when more than 4,000 braceros were employed. The acres harvested during that period have increased by more than 50 percent. The 1963 on-farm value of California sugarbeets was $75 million. Mechanical beet thinning machines are available; however, they have not been widely accepted by the growers since there is a greater loss in yield per acre because of the imperfections which exist in mechanical thinning. A new approach is now being taken to resolve this problem and that is to develop a precision planter.

SNAP BEANS AND CELERY

Approximately 2,350 Mexican nationals were employed to harvest snap beans during the 1963 peak week. No harvester has been successfully developed to harvest pole beans. In New York, Wisconsin, and Oregon much work has been done on mechanical harvesting of a snap type of bush bean. California, however, has not shifted from the pole to the bush variety of snap beans because bush varieties are not of as high a quality as the pole variety. Yields are also lower with the bush varieties and the area in which pole beans are grown is not particularly suitable for growing the bush variety. Work is underway to develop bush beans that have the same quality and yield per acre as the pole bean varieties.

The celery crop in California had an on-farm value of almost $27 million in 1963. It is a year-round crop and thus field labor to harvest it is required in some part of our State each month. In 1963, 1,610 Mexican nationals were employed during the peak week. While mechanical harvesting is available, such cutting lacks the flexibility of hand cutting and results in higher costs to the grower than does the hand method of cutting.

All of this will take time. In the meantime, who will harvest the crop?

COTTON: A DRAMATIC STORY OF MECHANIZATION

Cotton, in dollar value, is still California's leading farm crop. There were 732,000 acres of cotton harvested in 1963 for a total value of over $301 million. The story of mechanization in cotton is a dramatic one. In the last 13 years, California cotton acreage has increased from 581,000 acres to 732,000 acres, yet we now use 60,000 fewer workers during the peak period. A large number of workers are still employed in harvesting cotton. Hand picking, however, has almost been eliminated. The principal tasks requiring hand labor are thinning and weeding. Of the 17,660 workers employed in cotton during the peak week in June, about 1,700 were Mexican nationals. By the end of the decade much of this hand labor will be eliminated with the development of a precision planter and chemical control of weeds.

Mr. President, the story of mechanization of cotton is impressive, but it took many years of development. The development of mechanical harvesting equipment and practices takes time. Before a completely mechanized sugarbeet harvest was possible there came two decades of experimentation and development. The work on the tomato harvester—the crop demanding the most foreign labor—has been underway for some 15 years. The question still remains: In the meantime, who will harvest these crops?

Mr. President, there is no question that work in agriculture, especially field work, is hard work. The sun is hot. There is much bending and stooping. There is always a great deal to be done in a short period of time.

California has, by and large, faced up to the legislation which is needed to provide comparable protection for those who work on its farms similar to that available in the industrial sector of our economy. I would like to review the record of my State in this respect. I think more needs to be done. That will always be so as times and conditions change. I would also like to review what the Federal Government has and has not done to protect the farmworker. Much more needs to be done here, too. Perhaps then, we will secure an understanding of the actual conditions under which both domestic and foreign laborers work in California fields and we will be on the way toward deciding whether or not additional supplemental labor is required during peak harvest periods.

CALIFORNIA PROTECTIVE FARM LABOR LAWS

Farmworkers in California are covered by minimum wages for women and minors, by child labor laws, by wage payment and wage collection laws, by workmen's compensation, by temporary disability insurance, and by farm labor camp and contractor standards. Historically, State labor laws were promulgated to regulate the working conditions of employees in industry and trade. Originally, these laws were usually limited to specific types of places of employment or to enumerated industries. Many labor laws are still limited in this manner. More and more, these laws have been extended to cover general employment. All too often, however, these more general laws have excluded agricultural employment. Even where there is no specific exclusion and the laws are broad enough so that they could include agricultural labor, they may, in their implementation, simply not be applied to agricultural workers.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a table, prepared by the Bureau of Labor Standards of the U.S. Department of Labor, showing the coverage of agricultural workers under 10 major labor laws on a State-by-State basis be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Coverage of agricultural workers under 10 major labor laws

State	Farm labor camp regulation	Farm labor contractor regulation	Transportation regulation	Minimum wage law	Child labor law	Wage payment law	Wage collection law	Workmen's compensation law	Temporary disability insurance law	Unemployment insurance law	Total number of laws in each State	State migratory labor committees
Alabama											0	
Alaska					X			X			2	
Arizona	X							X			2	X
Arkansas											0	X
California	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		9	
Colorado	X	X	X		X	X					5	X
Connecticut	X		X		X			X			4	X
Delaware	X										1	X
District of Columbia					X					X	2	
Florida	X				X						2	X
Georgia											0	
Hawaii	X			X	X			X		X	5	
Idaho	X										1	X
Illinois	X				X						2	X
Indiana	(1)				X						1	X
Iowa	X										1	
Kansas	(2)										0	
Kentucky								X			1	
Louisiana								X			1	
Maine											0	
Maryland	X				X						2	X
Massachusetts	X				X	X		X			4	X
Michigan	(2)										0	
Minnesota	X					X		X			3	X
Mississippi											0	
Missouri					X						1	
Montana	X										1	
Nebraska	(2)										0	X
Nevada	X	X									2	
New Hampshire	X					X	X				3	
New Jersey	X	X			X			X			4	X
New Mexico	X										1	
New York	X	X	X		X			X			5	X
North Carolina	X		X								2	X
North Dakota	(1)										0	X
Ohio	X				X			X			3	X
Oklahoma	X										1	
Oregon	X	X	X								3	X
Pennsylvania	X	X	X		X	X	X				6	X
Puerto Rico		X		X	X			X		X	5	
Rhode Island	X										1	
South Carolina											0	X
South Dakota								X			1	
Tennessee											0	X
Texas		(3)									0	X
Utah	(1)				X						1	
Vermont								X			1	
Virginia	X				X						2	X
Washington	X	X									2	X

See footnotes at end of table.

Coverage of agricultural workers under 10 major labor laws—Continued

State	Farm labor camp regulation	Farm labor contractor regulation	Transportation regulation	Minimum wage law	Child labor law	Wage payment law	Wage collection law	Workmen's compensation law	Temporary disability insurance law	Unemployment insurance law	Total number of laws in each State	State migratory labor committees
West Virginia	X		X								2	X
Wisconsin	X			X	X			X			4	X
Wyoming	X							X			2	
Total laws:												
Agricultural workers	30	9	8	4	20	6	3	17	1	3		27
Other workers	(4)	(4)	(4)	35	52	49	21	52	4	52		

---

[1] Advisory standards.
[2] Mandatory standards for certain growers.
[3] Limited coverage.
[4] Not applicable.

Source: U.S. Department of Labor.

Mr. **KUCHEL**. Mr. President, on the basis of this compilation the State of California is batting 90 percent with regard to protective legislation for our farmworkers. Only one other State, Pennsylvania, comes close to the California record. Pennsylvania has passed laws in 6 of these 10 areas. But let us examine the scope of these laws in more detail.

California and 29 other States have mandatory laws or regulations which apply to all labor camps or specifically to camps for migrant farmworkers. A 1963 California law declares that there is a need for farm labor centers to help assure a supply of agricultural workers when they are needed and gives local housing authorities the power to acquire and operate farm labor centers for housing persons engaged in agricultural work. Workers whose principal source of income is from farm work are eligible to rent housing in these centers.

California and eight other States have regulations applying specifically to farm labor contractors or crew leaders. California and four of these States expressly cover labor contractors, who for a fee recruit farmworkers. Under these laws the farm labor contractor is required to obtain a license, comply with certain records requirements, refrain from engaging in certain undesirable practices, and required to file bond.

California and seven other States have laws or regulations establishing safety standards for vehicles used in the transportation of farmworkers, and for the operation of such vehicles. Under the Eisenhower administration a Federal law was passed, as you will recall, which provides for the regulation of the interstate transportation of migratory farmworkers. The Interstate Commerce Commission is authorized to establish reasonable requirements with respect to the comfort of passengers, qualifications of operators of the vehicles, and safety of operation and equipment. These requirements apply to carriers who transport migratory workers for a distance of more than 75 miles and cross an interstate boundary line. The regulations issued under this law relate to protection of passengers from cold and the provision of meal and rest stops.

California and nine other States provide a minimum age for employment of children in agriculture outside school hours. In California the age limit is 12 during vacations and 14 outside of school hours on school days. California and 16 States have a minimum age for farmwork during school hours. In California the minimum is 15, except 14 under certain conditions. In addition to the State laws that exist, two Federal laws affect the employment of children in farmwork. Under the Federal Fair Labor Standards Act, a 16-year minimum age during school hours is established for those working on farms whose produce is in interstate or foreign commerce. Under the Sugar Act, if a producer is to obtain maximum benefits, he may not employ children under 14 or permit those of 14 and 15 to work more than 8 hours a day in cultivating or harvesting sugarbeets or sugarcane.

California and only three other States cover all farm employment under workmen's compensation. Thirteen States have some workmen's compensation coverage for farmworkers, but exceptions as to coverage in terms of total employees and types of work are granted.

Only Hawaii has a minimum wage law which applies specifically to all agricultural workers including men, women, and minors. Hawaii sets a $1.25 an hour minimum. However, Hawaii only covers agricultural work in any workweek in which the employer has 20 or more employees. A 1964 Michigan statute provides that if an employer has four or more nonseasonal farmworkers, he cannot employ them for more than 13 weeks in any four consecutive 3-month periods at less than $1 an hour beginning on January 1, 1965. This would increase to $1.15 on January 1, 1966, and to $1.25 on January 1, 1967.

California and seven other States have minimum wage laws which are broad enough to cover agriculture, but these laws cover women and minors only. The rates are set by administrative order. The California wage order sets a minimum of $1 an hour for women and minors who are 16 and over, employed in agricultural occupations.

California and two other States have wage payment and wage collection laws which specifically apply to all farmworkers. In California, this means a semimonthly payday, unless the employee is boarded and lodged by the employer in which case he may be paid monthly. The employee must be paid promptly if he is discharged or quits. California also provides for the use of legal procedures by the State to collect back wages for employees in agriculture.

Only Hawaii specifically covers agricultural workers under their unemployment insurance laws, provided the employer has 20 or more employees in 20 weeks in the current or preceding calendar year.

Mr. President, in 1962, Congress passed the Migrant Health Act to improve the health care and health conditions for domestic migratory farmworkers and their families. I supported this measure in the Senate and in the Appropriations Committee. California has had an extensive program in this area to better the lot of our migrant farmworkers.

In the first year of the Migrant Health Act, Congress appropriated $750,000 for grant support under this act. In the second year, Congress appropriated $1.5 million of grant support. During the current fiscal year, Congress has authorized $2.5 million in grant support.

California began its migrant health program with State funds prior to the passage of the Federal program. Thus, in the second year of the Federal program, California received $483,004 in support and during the current fiscal year, California is receiving $536,911 in Federal support. To this, the State and counties are adding $336,638 of their own funds. The result has been an extensive and an excellent program. A State staff consisting of a full-time physician, pediatrician, medical social worker, sanitarian, nursing specialist, health education specialist, and research consultant actively aids the various county programs. In volume and quality, all responsible observers agree that California is first in this area.

In Fresno County, for example, the emphasis is on family health service clinics. Not only are sick people treated there, but immunization programs are undertaken as well. Nursing services are provided to the farm labor camps. A sanitation program is underway to educate both the growers and the farmworkers. A health program has been developed.

Other counties which have a similar program in varying degrees include Butte, Colusa, Kern, Merced, Monterey, San Luis Obispo, Santa Barbara, and Santa Cruz, as well as the city of San Jose. Sutter and Yuba Counties are just beginning this program. In addition, there are four counties conducting migrant health programs solely from State funds. They are Contra Costa, San Bernardino, San Joaquin, and Santa Clara.

I have recited this rather lengthy summary of the laws which my State has passed to protect our farmworkers and their families to show that we have not been laggard in this regard. Indeed, Mr. President, I think it is safe to say that California has led the Nation in establishing protective legislation beneficial to those who work on our farms.

A NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL MINIMUM WAGE

What remains to be done is largely in other States of the Union and by the Federal Government. I have long advocated that a national agricultural minimum wage be established. I think it is unconscionable that those who work on the farms of America should be excluded from the protection of the Fair Labor Standards Act. Congress, by law, has established that in the industrial sector of our economy there shall be a minimum wage for those who work in interstate commerce. Under the law we approved early in 1961, that minimum for all covered industrial and service workers will be $1.25 an hour by September 3, 1965. Yet, farmworkers will not have this protection. They should have such protection.

Let us look at the record. The three Pacific Coast States of California, Oregon, and Washington now pay, according to the farm wage rate statistics issued by the U.S. Department of Agriculture on July 1, 1964, an average of $1.36 an hour without board or room to farmworkers. The six New England States are next with an average of $1.30 an hour; then come the three Mid-Atlantic States with an average of $1.20 an hour; next are the West North Central States and the Mountain States with an average of $1.18 an hour, then the East North Central States with an average of $1.17 an hour. However, three areas of the Nation average below $1 an hour, although some States within these areas have an average above $1 an hour.

Mr. President, I ask consent that a table showing the per hour, without board or room, farm wage rate as of July 1, 1964, as reported by the U.S. Department of Agriculture be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Farm wage rates, July 1, 1964

State and region	Per hour without board or room
Maine	$1.21
New Hampshire	1.25
Vermont	1.24
Massachusetts	1.33
Rhode Island	1.40
Connecticut	1.40
New England States	1.30
New York	1.22
New Jersey	1.26
Pennsylvania	1.12
Middle Atlantic States	1.20
Ohio	1.14
Indiana	1.14
Illinois	1.21
Michigan	$1.12
Wisconsin	1.25
East North Central States	1.17
Minnesota	1.19
Iowa	1.25
Missouri	1.08
North Dakota	1.13
South Dakota	1.13
Nebraska	1.20
Kansas	1.24
West North Central States	1.18
Delaware	1.07
Maryland	1.09
Virginia	.88
West Virginia	.83
North Carolina	.80
South Carolina	.59
Georgia	.72
Florida	.95
South Atlantic States	.81
Kentucky	.87
Tennessee	.73
Alabama	.67
Mississippi	.62
East South Central States	.74
Arkansas	.80
Louisiana	.74
Oklahoma	1.07
Texas	.88
West South Central States	.85
Montana	1.20
Idaho	1.31
Wyoming	1.21
Colorado	1.19
New Mexico	.92
Arizona	1.03
Utah	1.33
Nevada	1.36
Mountain States	1.18
Washington	1.40
Oregon	1.31
California	1.35
Pacific States	1.36
United States	1.13

Source: Crop Reporting Board, U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I am concerned not merely as a Californian whose farmers must compete with produce from other States in eastern markets, but also as an American. The average farm wage rate per hour in California is more than twice the average farm wage rate per hour in South Carolina, Alabama, and Mississippi. It is a third or more higher than the average farm wage paid in Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, Georgia, Kentucky, Tennessee, Arkansas, Louisiana, and Texas.

This is not right. It is an issue which the next administration and the next Congress and all of us must face up to if we are to bring some minimum level of economic support to those who work on our farms.

OTHER FEDERAL LEGISLATION

I mentioned earlier the passage of the Migrant Health Act. This was a great step forward by Congress. California, through its own prior efforts, was in a unique position to utilize this program and has done so.

I regret that the record of this Congress in other areas of farm labor protective legislation, beginning with the national agricultural minimum wage which I have already discussed, has not been as good.

I supported in 1963, as I did previously, legislation reported by the Senate Subcommittee on Migratory Labor designed to improve the hard lot of what former Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell correctly described as "the excluded American"—the domestic migrant farmworker. These measures included S. 521, the proposed Migrant Agricultural Employees and Children Educational Assistance Act; S. 522, providing for daycare services for the children of migrant agricultural workers; S. 523, dealing with agricultural child labor; S. 524, the proposed Farm Labor Contractor Registration Act; S. 525, which would establish a National Advisory Council on Migratory Labor; and S. 526, which would amend the Public Health Service Act to establish a program to assist farmers in providing and constructing adequate sanitation facilities for migratory farm laborers.

These measures passed the Senate on June 10 and 11, 1963. They were referred to the responsible committee of the House of Representatives. S. 524, providing for registration of migrant worker labor contractors, which had originally been recommended by the Eisenhower administration, was approved on September 7, 1964, and became Public Law 88-582.

In the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, the so-called antipoverty bill, the Senate authorized the Director of the program to develop programs to assist State and local agencies, institutions, farm associations or individuals in aiding migrant workers and their families in housing, sanitation, education, and daycare of children. Private institutions and individuals could receive only loans, not grants. In the House of Representatives, these provisions were extended to cover other "seasonally employed" farmworkers.

In addition, in the Housing Act of 1964, the Senate authorized a new $10 million grant program to pay up to two-thirds of the development cost of low-rent housing for domestic farm laborers. Applicants under this program were required not to charge rentals exceeding amounts approved by the Secretary of Agriculture and to maintain the housing in good condition. This is now part of Public Law 88-560.

The provisions of S. 523 which would extend the Fair Labor Standards Act to agricultural child labor and S. 525 which would establish a National Advisory Council on Migratory Labor still remain to be considered and acted upon.

Thus, while the problem of improving the living, working, and health conditions of our farmworkers has been nibbled at, the basic unfinished business still remains; that of the farm worker's level of wages. Only a national agricultural minimum wage will be effective here. Again, I hope that Congress and the administration will face up to this issue.

CONCLUSION

Mr. President, I have reviewed at length the scope of California agriculture, the particular needs of some crops for large amounts of supplemental labor for short periods of time, the extent of mechanization as an alternative to this supplemental labor, and the protective legislation for farmworkers at the National and State levels. What conclusions can be drawn from this?

In the first place, with present statewide trends in crop acreage and production, seasonal labor requirements at the peak of the season will increase, rather than decrease, in the years immediately ahead. With the exception of the canning tomato harvest, mechanization will not replace the need for temporary farm labor to meet this seasonal need during the next 5 years. The loss of seasonal labor will be particularly hard felt in such areas as the Salinas Valley where there is extensive lettuce and vegetable production.

The problem for the domestic farmworker is increasing. It is more difficult for such temporary farmworkers to obtain year-round employment in rural communities. With intensive cultivation the periods of peak employment are shortening and job opportunities during the off season are diminishing.

Earlier I noted the proposals of some who would import the unemployed from other parts of America to solve the California farm labor problem. This does not solve the problem. It does not end the unemployment of the individual concerned since he will not have year-round work in California. It does not guarantee the California farmer that he will be able to meet his labor requirements in advance since after paying for an unemployed person's trip to California, there is no way to require that individual to work a specified period on a farm.

What it would mean is encouragement for a nomadic way of life for some Americans. I do not believe this is wise public policy with all that such constant migration means to one's family and the children in particular. It will mean that young people largely go uneducated. It will mean that the property taxpayers of California would in all likelihood be required to support these seasonal farm families during the remainder of the year with welfare assistance. Those who have studied employment trends and patterns find that historically those that have come to California to work in agriculture work there only a short time and then migrate to the urban areas to seek nonfarm employment there. This would mean that California farmers would have to import new domestic farmworkers from outside the State each year. At the end of the harvest period, these workers would add to the unemployment problems which already confront us in our metropolitan areas.

In July, the unadjusted unemployment rate for the Nation was 5.0 percent. For California it was 5.9 percent. In the San Diego area it was 7.5 percent.

In farm communities, youth on vacation will not solve the grower's labor needs for the simple reason that much seasonal farmwork must be done at a time when most young people are in school. Strawberries and tomatoes, for example, are two important crops whose harvests are at a peak when school is in session. In brief, for these and other reasons, such as the distance of urban youth from the farm areas, it is doubtful that domestic recruitment of farm labor can be expected to replace fully the present need for foreign workers.

We have reviewed the extensive protection which California law provides for its farmworkers in relation to that provided for the farmworkers of other States. Only one State, Hawaii, provides unemployment compensation for farmworkers. The University of California experts have concluded in the study which I cited earlier that:

> Temporary farm labor has not, as a rule, been economically attractive to nonfarmworkers drawing unemployment insurance or receiving welfare payments. For example, a family of a man and wife and three children, in which the man is unemployed, may receive welfare payment of about $250 a month in the large urban counties. The worker may be discouraged as well by the possibility of delay in return to the welfare rolls once farm employment ends.
>
> * * * * *
>
> Workers in industries covered by unemployment compensation can receive a maximum payment of $55 per week. The State average unemployment payment in mid-1964 was $44 per week. For an unemployed worker from such an industry receiving the State average compensation, the cost of traveling to a farm job may very well wipe out the additional income from farm employment. In addition, while working on the farm, it is difficult for him to seek work in his particular trade or skill.

These experts conclude that it is not possible to predict the wage rate which would be necessary to attract workers from the nonfarm industries and from the welfare and unemployment rolls. Farm wage rates, just as prices received by the farmers for their products have tended to move upward at a much slower rate than nonfarm wage rates and the prices farmers pay for nonagricultural products.

Mr. President, on September 30, 1964, the Washington Evening Star carried a story of the action of the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors announcing that those who were able bodied and on the local relief program would have a choice of working on the farms or getting off of relief once Public Law 78 expires. The supervisors provided that the minimum wage for such work would be at least $1.25 an hour and that adequate sanitary facilities and other acceptable employment conditions be provided. I ask consent that this article be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW LOS ANGELES EDICT: WORK OR GET OFF RELIEF

LOS ANGELES.—The Los Angeles County relief program has been ordered changed to include this proviso:

"Work—or get off relief."

The county board of supervisors, which ordered the welfare changes yesterday, even has a type of work in mind: field hand labor.

Such work on California farms is now done mostly by Mexican nationals imported for the purpose under the State's bracero program.

Efforts to persuade unemployed persons to take over the work, at $1 to $1.25 an hour, have failed. The bracero program ends December 31.

Supervisor Ernest E. Debs said yesterday: "We have a lot of able-bodied boys on the relief program. They will not go to school or learn a trade. It seems about time to say:

" 'Either work or you will not get food.' "

The supervisors enacted a five-point program which one State official said sounded legal. A labor spokesman expressed doubts.

Supervisor Kenneth Hahn estimated the county will have 30,000 unemployed youths available to take over the bracero jobs when the labor-importation plan expires December 31.

The new regulations would make these requirements of employers hiring from relief rolls:

1. That adequate sanitary facilities and other acceptable employment conditions be provided.
2. That the minimum wage be at least $1.25.
3. That, if possible, steady employment should be provided.
4. Adequate transportation shall be provided to the farms.
5. Recipients of public assistance will not be required to work under unusual circumstances, such as illness or other difficult conditions in their families.

William Gilbert, director of the AFL-CIO Organizing Committee for Los Angeles and Orange Counties, demanded that the workers get "decent, guaranteed, minimum hourly, daily, and weekly wages."

He said that under present systems workers get $1 an hour and must pay $1.75 daily for board in places too distant for daily commuting.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the University of California experts have concluded that it is not possible to measure what effect higher wages would have in securing additional domestic workers to perform seasonal farmwork. If wages were raised in one area and not in another, one possibility is that farmworkers would be attracted away from areas where they are also needed. Thus, any increase in wage rates would have to be done on a statewide basis. Yet California is already paying at an average of $1.35 an hour, the second highest farm labor wage rates in America. The average for the State of Washington is $1.40 an hour. Thus, we return to the need for a national agricultural minimum wage.

The farmer is in pure competition. Hundreds and thousands of individual farmers, making decisions independently, cannot maintain high prices for their goods and pass their increased cost of production on to the consumers as can most of the larger corporations of America. In our industrial economy, a few major producers set the pace for the industry. It is true that where the major share of a crop is produced in California, cutbacks in our farm production might make possible higher prices. But, this will not help our farmers, or our country in the long run, since such an action would only encourage other States and foreign countries to expand their own production of that product. Once we have lost our share of the market, it would be difficult to regain it. It does little good in looking at our agricultural production as a whole to advocate California farmers raising their wage rates, while other States and foreign countries do not, when we already pay the high level that we do.

As I said earlier, the shift in our State from agriculture requiring a seasonal labor force does not merely mean that our farmers will suffer, but it means that those workers in transportation, food processing, packing, and distribution, as well as many domestic and foreign consumers will also suffer.

The case of tomatoes is a good one. It is the crop which requires the greatest number of Mexican nationals since the harvest occurs primarily after our young people have returned to the classroom. I noted earlier that the on-farm value of the California tomato crop in 1963 was $110 million. Tomato growers spent $16 million just to grow tomatoes: for insecticides, for fertilizer, for fuel and equipment, for seeds and plants. This does not include their cost of labor.

Processors of the tomato crop, however, spent $70 million for the metal containers, $11 million for the glass containers, $1.8 million for the caps and lids, $12 million for the cartons, and $6 million for the labels needed to handle the 1963 crop. In addition, almost $22 million went to truckers to haul the tomatoes to packing plants and $32 million was spent on the transportation to get the packed product to its market.

There were 50,000 people employed by the tomato canners to process the crop. These are all Americans. No Mexican workers were involved. These employees received $45 million during the season for their work.

The total result was almost a $216 million direct contribution to the nonagricultural economy. Besides that the growers were paid about $88 million, which in turn went for farm labor, interest, taxes, and other products.

Thus, in California, the canning tomato industry amounts to a $300 million segment of our economy. This is what can be lost because an adequate substitute cannot be found for the seasonal labor which is now needed to harvest this crop.

Mr. President, our growers, in cooperation with the California Department of Employment are continuing their attempt to secure needed domestic farmworkers. But the extension of Public Law 78 is still justified. The director of the California Department of Agriculture, Mr. Charles A. Paul, in 1963, before the House Committee on Agriculture during hearings on the extension of Public Law 78, testified in support of such an extension.

I have reviewed the extent of mechanization and the problems of attracting domestic farmworkers. I now ask: In the meantime, who will harvest the crops?

In my judgment, Mr. President, I believe that there will continue to be a need for some foreign supplemental labor until almost total mechanization of fieldwork occurs. We have had the Mexican labor program under Public Law 78. I believe it has been a good one.

There has been a substantial reduction in the need for foreign labor based on the new methods which have been introduced to harvest such crops as cotton. When, with others, I successfully urged extension of Public Law 78 in the U.S. Senate on several occasions, I noted that I did not believe a single foreign worker should be imported into this country if it would adversely affect our domestic work force. I still believe that. That was the clear and expressed desire of Congress and the Migrant Labor Agreement of 1951 between our Government and the Government of Mexico. Under Public Law 78 and that agreement we intended to regularize the use of foreign labor and avoid a "wetback" situation, as well as establish reasonable protection for those workers who came into our country as to prevailing wages, housing, sanitation, transportation, and other working conditions.

Before a Mexican national could be admitted, the Department of Labor, which is the agency responsible for administering this program, had to ascertain that there was no adverse effect on domestic workers. Some in this Chamber, without foundation I believe, have charged that Public Law 78 did affect domestic employment. If there was something wrong with the program it was not the fault of the Congress or the growers, it was the fault of the Department of Labor in administering that program.

Mr. President, the Mexican Government favors the continuation of the Mexican labor program. On March 20, 1963, I had the honor to serve as reporter for Committee III of the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Meeting at Guanajuato, Mexico. There, several of us in the Senate and the House of Representatives sat down with our colleagues in the Mexican Congress and exchanged views on the problems of tourism, border trade, cultural exchange, and migratory farmworkers which confronts our two countries. All who were there assembled were unanimous in their support of the Mexican labor program.

We concluded:

> Where American argiculture has been unable to obtain sufficient assistance in harvesting its crops from American citizens, Mexico, by agreement, has provided American farmers with Mexican nationals for temporary periods of time. We believe this is a good program, to the mutual help of both countries. Many of the problems involved have been solved. Others remain. There was unanimous agreement that the program should continue.
>
> Illegal entry into either country ought to be prohibited by vigorous law enforcement. The problem of permanent visas was discussed. In its immigration laws the United States of America does not impose quota restrictions on Mexico, nor on the nations of the Western Hemisphere. While there were divergencies of view as to what action should be taken on the question of when permanent visas are for strictly permanent work, there was agreement that the matter should be studied.

Mr. President, the irony is that with the expiration of Public Law 78, foreign workers can still come into this country as a regular nonquota immigrant, under Public Law 414 which authorizes the granting of a permanent visa.

The Mexican Government has long been worried about this procedure, known as the green card program. Under it, Mexican farmworkers can emigrate to the United States to become permanent residents. These immigrants are admitted to our country on a permanent basis, when an American grower files a letter with our Immigration Service offering permanent employment to the Mexican worker and the Department of Labor certifies that domestic labor is not available.

There is, of course, no guarantee that the green card workers will stay on the farm. They are free to change employment once they establish residence here. All too frequently they move on to a metropolitan area and seek a job opportunity there, thus adding to the unemployment problems of our cities. The green card worker has no protection such as the bracero does who has a contract with his employer or the employer's association establishing wages and working conditions. In fiscal year 1962, 54,952 U.S. immigration visas were granted to Mexican citizens to enter the United States. It is estimated that at least 80 percent of these were former braceros who were now coming to America as green card agricultural workers. But, the green card worker cannot solve the grower's demand for labor needed only for a short period.

Mr. President, on September 24, 1964, the McClatchy newspapers located in Sacramento, Fresno, and Modesto, California, editorially noted that "California Agriculture Confronts Urgent Crisis." They urged continuation of Public Law 78 until a complete study could be made to separate fact from fiction as espoused by many groups who have a vested interest in opposing or supporting this program. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CALIFORNIA AGRICULTURE CONFRONTS URGENT CRISIS

Signs multiply that California agriculture confronts a real crisis as a result of the impending lapsing of the law which permits the importation of Mexican workers to help harvest this State's $3.4 billion crops.

The Wall Street Journal in an excellent summary of this crisis shows the issue is moving toward possibly disastrous effects on the entire economy of California.

Agricultural leaders are concerned over the possibility that a reduction in crops may be the only answer to the farm labor bind. During the peak harvest month last year the braceros, the Mexican workers, numbered 61,000 of the 368,000 farmhands in the field.

J. J. Miller, manager of the Agricultural Producers Labor Committee, has noted that such big U.S. food concerns as the Campbell Soup Co., the H. J. Heinz Co., and the California Packing Corp. recently have built large plants in Mexico. While the companies generally say these plants are designed to serve Latin America, the fear persists that industry is going to Mexican labor if Mexican labor cannot come into the United States.

Certainly if a lack of stoop farm labor causes a curtailment of California crop production the economy of the whole State will be adversely affected. The jobs of workers in the food processing industry will be directly threatened.

Labor unions and some welfare agencies oppose the bracero program. It is argued it takes jobs from American farm laborers and acts to depress the wages of these native workers.

The agricultural industry retorts it cannot pay the wages sought by the unions. It cites many failures of recruitment plans within America.

Despite the many studies of the bracero program one more should be made and the law should be extended until the study is completed.

This study, made in the chastening atmosphere of a real emergency, should determine what the area of compromise is between farm producers and the unions. These compromises should be weighed against curtailed crops, the removal of industrial payrolls, and other blows to workers and capital which would follow the shrinking of California agriculture.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I believe, on the basis of the evidence that I have reviewed at length, that there is a real and urgent need for the continuation of this program. I believe that Congress and the administration have done a real disservice not only to the farmers and related industrial workers of my own State but of other States as well by permitting this program to expire on December 31, 1964. I hope that once the national election fervor has subsided that we can then deal calmly and rationally with the very substantial issues which confront us in the farm labor area as we seek adequate seasonal labor to harvest our crops. This problem should be high on the agenda of the next Congress and administration.

Mr. President, I ask consent that various editorials and articles from California newspapers relating to the impact of the Mexican labor program on our economy be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorials and articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Los Angeles Times, Aug. 11, 1964]

CALIFORNIA'S CROPS WON'T WAIT

In spite of Governor Brown's optimistic assurances that there will be sufficient labor to harvest all crops in the State next year, California growers are becoming increasingly anxious.

Public Law 78, which authorized importation of Mexican bracero farmworkers, will expire December 31 with virtually no chance of congressional extension. And with the end of this program the future of half a billion dollars in crops, annually harvested by the braceros, is placed in serious jeopardy.

The Governor, therefore, must not wait until the end of the year to take positive action to protect not only those crops but the tens of thousands of jobs directly and indirectly dependent upon them.

Some crops will be ready for picking in January, and a number of growers are already talking of cutting back on planting that must be done within the next month or two. Precious little time is left for the necessary preparation of the ground, ordering of seedlings and arrangements for bank credit.

Although Brown this week reiterated his promise of adequate farm labor, he still hasn't clarified how that goal will be achieved.

The Governor surely knows that the stepped-up efforts of growers and State employment officials to recruit more domestic workers have been largely unavailing. Labor union officials contend higher wages are the answer. But the evidence indicates that whatever wage growers could pay within reason would not make this difficult "stoop labor" any more attractive.

The only short-term answer—and the words "short term" must be emphasized—is the importation of supplementary foreign labor through existing Public Law 414. Provisions of the law now allow the use of West Indians in Florida and this could be applied to the California manpower crisis if State and Federal agencies approve.

The climate in Washington already seems favorable for such action. But the Governor must take the initiative. The alternative would be a major disaster to California agriculture, the State's biggest business.

[From the San Francisco Examiner, Aug. 23, 1964]

LABOR GUARANTEE NEEDED BY STATE FARMERS

California's multi-million dollar agricultural industry is in trouble. Its future is threatened by: Labor problems, tax problems, foreign competition.

Failure to find fast and adequate solutions to these challenges can eventually result in:

Higher food prices for the consumer.

The conversion of some of the world's richest and most precious farmlands to tract homes and industrial development.

Here's the background. California's agricultural leadership is not based on strength in a single crop. It is represented in thousands of farms producing a wide variety of specialty crops.

Many of the crops are highly perishable and must be harvested and marketed on a timeclock schedule.

At the present time, most of the crops do not lend themselves to harvesting machinery. They require manual labor. Most are hand harvested.

While our Nation has more than 4 million unemployed persons, it does not have men and women who will do the kind of "stoop labor" required in our fields.

Repeated attempts to recruit satisfactory domestic labor have proved unsuccessful.

During the Korean war the Federal Government was petitioned to permit the importation of itinerant field labor from Mexico. Each year since then tens of thousands of the migrant workers have poured across the Mexican border.

After harvesting our valuable crops, these braceros—as they are called—have returned to their homes, richer in money and richer in experience.

Officials of this country, as well as those of our neighbor to the south have hailed the bracero plan as a good neighbor program of importance to both nations.

However, some union labor groups have consistently opposed the program. They have contended that American labor should be used for American crops.

Largely due to this pressure, the bracero program will be discontinued at the end of 1964. Federal laws must be changed to permit its continuation.

As a result, at this point, there is no labor supply on the horizon that will handle the California crop harvest in 1965.

Some of our own agriculturists—as well as Mexican landowners—have recognized the imminent threat to California agriculture and have developed vast farm areas just south of the Mexican border.

Mexican crops are now pouring into California. Sometimes at prices that depress local markets.

As this pressure develops, farmers are also faced with higher taxes that some claim are "confiscatory."

Appraisals—on which taxes are levied—are frequently boosted because of the adjacency to high-priced subdivisions and tract developments.

As a result, some owners are taking the position that they are being taxed at the same rate as real estate promoters and might be forced, therefore, to turn their rich soil over to bulldozers.

The picture is dismal. There is no easy solution. But—there is need for sensible action. And soon.

The tax problem should be carefully and thoughtfully researched. Some proper form of relief should be given those who maintain our farm lands and keep our California agriculture strong and vital.

The Federal Government should extend or reinstate the bracero program. We petition the Congress, the Governor, our Senators, and our Represenatives to move on this problem without delay.

The foreign competition can be beneficial. It can be destructive only if we aggravate the tax and labor problems of our own growers to the point that they are priced out of their own markets.

Action on points one and two is needed at once. Delay, and in the years ahead, California's agricultural strength will weaken and, perhaps, eventually die.

[From the Los Angeles Times, Aug. 16, 1964]

BRACERO LOSS PERILS STATE'S BILLION DOLLAR FARM INDUSTRY—NEARLY ALL CALIFORNIA COULD BE SEVERELY AFFECTED NEXT YEAR

(By Gene Blake)

California's $3.43 billion farm industry—and related business valued at $10 billion—is facing a crisis which could severely affect nearly every man, woman, and child in the State.

It will come next year if enough farmworkers are not found to harvest crops now picked by nearly 62,000 Mexican braceros at the peaks of the seasons.

Public Law 78, under which Mexican nationals have been recruited for temporary farmwork on this side of the border, ends December 31. There is no chance for another extension at the end of this year.

Growers say they cannot recruit American domestic workers for the "stoop" labor. They say they've tried, with the help of State employment departments here and across the Nation, but failed.

UNIONS DISPUTE GROWERS' CLAIMS

The growers' claims are disputed by some church, social welfare, and labor union groups, who argue that a domestic force could be obtained if better pay and working conditions were provided.

While the charges and countercharges and alternative proposals are bandied about, officials close to the situation are growing concerned.

One thing that worries them is that most Californians just don't care—because they are unaware how much their livelihood and California's entire economy depend on the State's farm industry.

For example, the Council of California Growers points out that one of every three jobs in the State rests directly or indirectly on agriculture.

SWELL TO MORE THAN $14 BILLION

California's record $3.43 billion worth of farm commodities in 1963—highest in the Nation—was three times the value of oil and natural gas production in the State.

As the farm commodities flow through the channels of trade, commerce, and industry, it is estimated by economists that the monetary effects swell to more than $14 billion.

Services of 312,900 workers, rising to a total of 406,300 at peak harvest, are utilized by farming itself.

But for every 100 employed in agriculture, another 263 are working in such closely related industries as canning, preserving, packaging, transporting, storing, and selling.

STEEL INDUSTRY INVOLVED

And there's more, when the chain reactions created by the farm industry needs are considered:

The steel industry annually sells 600,000 tons of tinplate for metal containers to California canneries. Glassmakers each year sell 1.3 billion jars, with a value of $54 million, to California food processors.

Thirty million pounds of low-density polyethylene are supplied annually by the plastics industry for use by California agriculture in items such as food packaging.

Paper products manufacturers provide 400 million fiber-box containers. About 40 million wooden containers, with a value of more than $15 million, are supplied for packing produce.

A million miles of printed labels are used by the State's food canners and packers each year. Food advertising in California amounts to over $125 million annually.

California farmers each year buy an estimated $2.2 billion worth of goods and services—labor, machines, petroleum products, transportation. California lending institutions provided California farmers with $734 million in loans in a recent year.

The estimated annual payroll in 1962 of agriculture-related business and industry in the Los Angeles-Orange County metropolitan area alone was well over $1 billion.

Thus it can be seen that nearly every Californian has a big stake in California agriculture—and ample reason to be concerned lest the crops wither and die for want of pickers.

Of course, not all the enumerated industries and jobs and income will vanish if there is no one to replace the braceros, for their numbers average annually less than 10 percent of the California farmworkers.

RATIO HAS DROPPED

The ratio has dropped from a peak of 15 percent in 1957, largely due to mechanization, growers say.

Major crops for which braceros are employed are tomatoes, strawberries, asparagus, lemons, lettuce, melons, sugarbeets, and celery.

Aggregate value of these crops in 1962 was $435 million, and it is estimated they gave a $1.74 billion boost to the State's total economy.

Western Growers Association estimates that more than 60 percent of the workers harvesting California's fresh vegetables and melons are braceros.

That industry annually accounts for 117,000 railway carlot shipments, 137,000 carload equivalents of truck transportation, 820,000 tons of ice at points of shipment alone, $10 million worth of petroleum products, $6.5 million in seeds, 156 million containers and 93 million pounds of fertilizers.

Investments of the fresh vegetable and melon industry include $34 million in packinghouses and equipment, $6 million in special harvest machinery, 17,500 trucks and 16,800 tractors.

TOMATOES CHIEF CROP

Tomatoes are the chief crop harvested by braceros, accounting for a $130 million product in 1962. Of the 43,700 workers in the tomato fields at peak harvest that year, 80 percent were braceros.

Without a sufficient force to harvest the tomatoes when they ripen, they would rot away under the blazing sun within days and the entire crop would be lost. Consider what the impact would be.

The California Tomato Growers Association reports that about 50,000 persons are employed in tomato canneries during the season.

Annual expenditures of the tomato growers, the association says, include $4 million for fuel and machinery repair service, $3.5 million for fertilizers, $3 million for insecticides and their application, $5.5 million for seeds and plants.

In 1962, tomato processors spent $70 million for metal containers, $11 million for glass containers, $1.8 million for caps and lids, $12 million for cartons, $6 million for labels, $12.8 million for trucks hauling raw tomatoes to plants, $32 million for shipping finished products to market and $45 million for cannery employees.

HUNT PLANT EXAMPLE

A lot of dry statistics? Maybe. But they mean food and clothing and shelter and perhaps even a few modest luxuries for thousands of human beings.

One example of a processing plant is the Hunt Foods & Industries, Inc., a $10 million complex in Fullerton.

It provides jobs for a permanent force of 1,400 persons, plus another 1,200 during peak production months. Its payroll averages nearly $500,000 a month.

The St. Regis Paper Co. in Fullerton devotes 85 percent of its production to agricultural needs, mostly for growers employing braceros. It utilizes $5 million worth of products annually, has an average annual payroll of $750,000, pays $300,000 for services and $80,000 in local taxes.

These are but a few examples of the industries that might be hit—with a resultant blow to the economy—should their raw materials or markets be cut off by a farm labor shortage.

Growers are working desperately on mechanization as one solution. But Dr. George B. Alcorn, director of the agricultural extension service at the University of California, says machines will not replace men for many years in most California crops now picked by hand.

The tomato harvesting machine is farthest along the development route and by next year might handle half the crop, Dr. Alcorn says.

It has taken 17 years to develop a modified tomato that can be harvested mechanically, due to the necessity of having at least 90 percent of the fruit ripen on the vine at one time. Each machine capable of harvesting about 100 acres a season is expected to cost at least $25,000.

MANY YEARS DISTANT

The citrus industry is spending $1 million on research in the next few years, but mechanical harvesting for citrus is many years distant. Mechanical harvesting of strawberries, asparagus, and celery appears to be about as far off.

Other prospects are 1967 for lettuce, the late 1960's for grapes, and 1970 for cantaloupes.

Meanwhile, California growers' fears of competition from Mexico and other States are mounting.

Mexico has doubled its irrigated acreage since 1950, from 6 million to 12 million acres. Since 1952, its exports of agricultural products into this country have increased 65 percent, from about $164 million to $271 million.

In Mexico, farm labor is plentiful and cheap—equivalent to about $1.50 a day compared with the average of $1.33 an hour in California.

California growers also are feeling the pinch of competition from other States, chiefly Texas, where the hourly rate is 84 cents. The national average is less than 95 cents.

WON'T BOTHER CONSUMER

The Council of California Growers has made no study of what might happen to consumer prices here if a shortage of farm labor develops.

"If Mexico fills the market vacuum, and apparently she has the capacity to do so, it may make little difference to the consumer," says O. W. Fillerup, executive vice president of the council.

"But it will make a big difference to the many thousands of workers employed in our agriculture-related industries—the packing sheds, the ice plants, the canneries, freeze plants, dehydrators, and truck and rail lines."

The Agricultural Producers Labor Committee, created by the citrus and avocado growers of California and Arizona, last fall set up the Farmers Harvest Association to recruit domestic workers.

During a 6-week period, with the help of the State department of employment, FHA recruited unemployed men in the Los Angeles area. They were assembled downtown each Monday and were taken by bus to grower association camps in the San Gabriel Valley and the Ventura area.

The most recruited in any 1 week was 39, and only 16 were still working at the end of the week, reported Dick Daniels, manager of FHA.

ABANDON PROGRAM

Thereafter, the number declined to such a point that the FHA and Department of Employment agreed to discontinue the program as being uneconomical.

In a nationwide search, 1,200 unemployed farmworkers were obtained from Texas, but less than 15 percent stayed through the harvest.

"They just came for the ride," one official says.

In all, during the first 6 months of the year, FHA recruited 1,879 domestic workers. Each worked an average of 70.9 hours, for a total of 133,280 man-hours.

But the number of working hours available for that type of labor totaled 8,389,440.

SEEK OTHER SOLUTIONS

And so, the growers are seeking other possible solutions. One may be a Senate bill which in effect would create an American bracero force. Another is a provision of the Immigration Act, which permits individual growers to contract for temporary or permanent foreign workers.

A section of President Johnson's $948 million antipoverty program approved by Congress last week may be of some help. It sets aside $15 million for attention to the problems of education, sanitation, child care and housing for migrant farmworkers.

Perhaps needed most at this point, however, is general public awareness of the crisis and its widespread impact.

[From the Los Angeles Times, Aug. 27, 1964]

"Stoop Labor" Means Labor on the Farm

(By Jerry Gillam)

Are you tired of your present job? Do you long to work outside in the fresh air instead of indoors? Would you like to go out on a California farm and pick cantaloups for a change of pace?

If the answer to those three questions is yes, you may be in big demand by the 1965 harvest season.

But don't get in line to pick cantaloups if you don't know what the job entails. It might kill you.

A cantaloup grower can lose his shirt overnight if enough good pickers aren't available when his crop ripens because the melons rot quickly if left in the field too long.

For this reason it is essential that the grower know beforehand that he can find pickers, that there will be plenty of them, and that they will work hard to beat the time element.

The Mexican bracero is at his best when it comes to picking crops like cantaloups.

This is so-called stoop labor. Its hard work, but the bracero doesn't seem to mind it, despite dust and heat.

The Western Growers Association estimates more than 60 percent of the workers harvesting California's fresh vegetables and melons are braceros.

A Federal law which permits importation of braceros to work in California fields, however, is scheduled to expire December 31.

This means that there will be a farm labor shortage that must be filled from other sources.

The braceros arrive at the cantaloup field about dawn in open trucks.

They fan out, long sacks slung from their shoulders, and start down the row behind moving trucks that drag long 2 by 12 boards from the rear on each side of the truck bed.

Scurrying along in a bent-over position like crabs, the braceros tell by color and feel which cantaloups are ripe and should be deposited in their sacks.

When a sack is loaded to weigh about 50 pounds, the bracero runs up the board on the left side, dumps the cantaloups, and runs down the board on the right side to start filling his sack again.

All this is repeated in continuous motion over and over again. The trucks don't stop except to turn down another row.

The crew boss sits atop the cab yelling at any slowpokes to go faster in Spanish.

For his work the bracero is paid by piece rate, but in no case less than $1 an hour. An average cantaloup picker can earn $200 a month.

He also is provided with free lodging and free round trip transportation from Mexico, and pays no more than $1.75 a day for meals.

The law specifies that the bracero must be guaranteed these things, plus protection by the Federal and State Government.

It also requires that the growers must exhaust the supply of local domestic farm help before they can turn to braceros.

Although the bracero accounts for only 10 percent of the annual total State farm work force, he is particularly active in stoop labor harvesting of highly perishable crops like cantaloups and tomatoes. Growers of this type of crop insist the scheduled demise of the Federal importation law will work a severe hardship on them because domestics will not do that kind of work.

Organized labor, a vigorous foe of the bracero program since it started, disagrees with this thinking.

It claims domestics can and will do the job if wages paid are high enough and working conditions are improved.

In the meantime, Governor Brown and State Employment Director Albert Tieburg have a knotty problem to solve before the 1965 harvest season rolls around.

The Governor recently promised the growers there will be enough labor, domestic or otherwise, to harvest the crops, without braceros.

But, at the same time, Brown admits, and Tieburg agrees, that the source from which this substitute labor will come is not clear, at present.

A section of the immigration law that permits individual growers to contract for temporary or permanent foreign workers may be the ultimate answer.

[From the Los Angeles Times, Aug. 31, 1964]

FEWER GROWERS HIRING BRACEROS, LABOR DEPARTMENT REPORTS INDICATE

(By Ruben Salazar)

There is a significant drop in the number of California growers who use braceros as supplemental farm labor, according to a report released today by the U.S. Department of Labor.

The Federal agency's 1963 report on foreign agricultural labor shows that only 6,122 California growers hired braceros in 1963, compared to almost 8,000 in 1962.

California Department of Employment figures list 35,000 to 40,000 California employers of farm labor.

The 6,122 employers of braceros hired 120,412 braceros in 1963 with 10,000 of them signing new contracts after their original ones expired, the Labor Department report said.

In 1962, California used 132,503 braceros and 10,000 also were recontracted.

The drop in the number of bracero users in California is mostly among those who use a small number of these Mexican nationals as farmhands, the Labor Department report said.

These were able to get domestic farmworkers during 1963, the report said.

The 6,122 California growers who used braceros in 1963 were mostly large operators in such crops as lettuce, tomatoes, strawberries and melons.

These large growers contend that the end of the bracero program December 31 will cause a critical labor shortage which could affect the State's economy greatly.

They say they have tried to recruit domestic workers without success, even though California pays a higher hourly wage than most States.

The Council of California Growers said mechanization is the chief reason for the hiring of fewer braceros in the last 5 to 10 years.

"It is obvious, therefore, that mechanization is already phasing out the bracero program on a gradual basis," council spokesman Cliff Schlegel said. "And many of our agricultural leaders believe that mechanization would, eventually, almost completely phase out this program.

"If allowed to proceed in this manner, they point out that it would be far less of a shock to agriculture and its related industries than a suddent termination."

The council also took exception to the assumption that the decline in the use of braceros in California is attributable only to smaller employers. What is happening, the council stated, is that many of the smaller operators, such as those with 2 to 5 acres in citrus, are selling out to the larger growers.

The U.S. Departments of Labor and Agriculture report that the July 1964 national composite hourly farm wage rate without board or room was $1.13.

California, with $1.35, was just below Washington, Connecticut, and Rhode Island, which paid $1.40 an hour in July.

LOWEST IN JULY

South Carolina with 59 cents an hour without room or board was the lowest for July.

The bracero program, which brings Mexican farmhands here under an international agreement and Public Law 78, is scheduled to end December 31 with no predicted chance of an extension.

One reason given by those opposing a foreign farm labor program is the high rate of unemployment among domestic farmworkers.

Users of braceros, however, say domestics will not perform "stoop" labor, no matter what the pay is.

The Rev. Richard Sample of the California Migrant Ministry, who for the last 4 years has been working with domestic farm laborers in the Fresno area, said Sunday:

"The basic issue is wages and working conditions. I see no evidence in our area that either the growers—whose main responsibility it is—or the Farm Placement Service, which needs to help the process, is doing anything to deal with these basic issues of just wages and reasonable working conditions.

"I know that domestic workers are there, ready and willing to work if they are given incentive. My own opinion is that the growers are consciously doing the very opposite thing—setting out to prove that domestics are unreliable, that domestics won't and can't do the work. This just isn't true."

The U.S. Department of Labor in its July report points out that June 1964, marked the 41st month in the strongest economic advance of the four postwar business cycles, but adds that "figures indicate that farmworkers are not sharing in the recent prosperity."

"While unemployment rates for all workers have been lower than a year earlier in every month of 1964, those for agricultural wage and salary workers (throughout the United States) have been higher in every month except February," the U.S. Department of Labor said.

IN 1956 119,600

Peak employment of Mexican braceros in 1963 was 74,800 compared to 79,400 in 1962. The highest peak reached during the present bracero program was in 1956 with 119,600

The Labor Department reported that among the largest employers of braceros in California during 1963 were:

Imperial Valley Farmers Association, 12,983 contracts in effect with individual braceros during 1962, Growers Farm Labor Association (Central Coast), 20,202; San Joaquin Farm Production Association, 20,900, and Ventura County Citrus Growers Committee, 7,105.

[From the Los Angeles Times, Sept. 13, 1964]

OFFICIALS DOUBT IF CITY WORKERS WILL AID FARMS

(By Harry Bernstein)

A new move to get unemployed workers out of the cities and onto California farms is underway, but everyone involved is dubious of its success under present conditions.

The latest experiment began last week with a series of farm area tours by groups of social workers, job placement counselors and others who deal with unemployed citizens.

The idea was to acquaint these officials with farm job prospects. They, in turn, are supposed to use this knowledge to help encourage city jobless workers to move to farm jobs.

Consensus of the group was that they will do so only with extreme reluctance, if at all, because of a host of complex psychological and emotional reasons, in addition to the historic economic reasons.

And growers who want the American workers instead of Mexican nationals agreed there is little chance that farm wages and working conditions can realistically be made much more attractive than they are now.

The result was a conclusion by all sides: don't expect any rush of jobless workers out of the city and back to the farms.

The doubts are rooted in essentially the same arguments which have been continuing angrily for nearly three decades.

LESS THAN BENEFITS

Growers insist farm jobs in California are already paying among the top wages in the Nation, with an average hourly rate of $1.35 and that they are making the at times unattractive farm jobs as good as possible within the present economic structure of agriculture, California's biggest single industry.

And, the growers said, despite all the efforts to recruit American workers, foreign workers are still needed because Americans cannot or will not do the work.

Unions, church groups, and most of the social workers on the tours last week insist with equal vigor it is unreasonable to expect jobless city workers to take farm jobs which at times pay less than unemployment or relief benefits paid in the cities.

CHEAP LABOR WANTED

And as long as the growers are able to get cheap foreign labor accustomed to Mexico's lower standard of living, they will not be forced by normal supply and demand pressures to raise wages and improve conditions enough to get many Americans back to the farms, they argue.

The back-to-the-farm project last week was started by the State department of employment in cooperation with the Los Angeles County Bureau of Public Assistance, the Greater Los Angeles Youth Opportunities Board, and Milton Natapoff, member of the State board of agriculture.

Natapoff, undismayed by the reaction of the city visitors, insists the city-to-farm shift can be made if some changes are made by growers and if some ideas held by job placement counselors and social workers also are changed.

PILOT PROJECTS URGED

He first wants to start some pilot projects which bring young unemployed workers in small groups to work together on carefully planned, well-programed farm jobs.

"You can't just send a boy or two out to a farm away from his city friends, family and his home, bad as it may be, and expect him to quickly fit into a farm job where there are often no sanitary facilities, and no encouragement for prospects of advancement," Natapoff said.

"While the growers have to help on these problems, however, the job placement people have to start upgrading the status of farm jobs in psychological terms—farm work can be healthy, out of the asphalt jungles of the city," he said.

But the growers say that while they are anxious to get Americans to do the work for them, they don't want to encourage employment of persons who cannot physically or emotionally do the job.

William Tolbert, manager of the Ventura County Citrus Growers Association, told the city visitors, "We don't want to merely transfer the relief problems of Los Angeles to Ventura."

As if to emphasize the emotional aspect of the problem, one YOB social worker, asked if she will encourage youngsters to take farm jobs, said:

"Many of our boys are Mexican-Americans. Some of their families had lived as dirt farmers or peons for centuries. They come to our agency to get help in adjusting to city living, and to get jobs which have some sort of future.

SENSE OF ESCAPE

"I cannot in good conscience urge them to take a farm job as a picker at $1 an hour in the dusty fields from which they feel, perhaps subconsciously, they have finally escaped."

Frank M. Vujovich, a grower with large acreage in the Oxnard area, said he is one of the few there who manage to do without Mexican braceros.

"But if all tried as hard as I do to use domestics only, there wouldn't be enough to go around," he said.

"The problem of raising wages high enough to get Americans is not only that we don't know how high 'high enough' is, but because the way the farm economy works, a grower cannot pass on his payroll cost increases as manufacturers do.

WORK TO BE DONE

"I'm interested in psychology, but I've got field work to get done."

The debate has been revived publicly primarily because Congress has decided to let Public Law 78 expire December 31. This means Mexican nationals (about 120,000 were hired in California alone last year) will not come into this country for the farm jobs under the law first passed in 1951.

It is known that the Government is expected to permit immigration of Mexican nationals on a temporary basis under regular immigration laws (Public Law 414), but this plan provides none of the guarantees given to the Mexicans by the bracero law.

From the viewpoint of the unions, it is worse than the bracero program which they fought so long.

PROMPTED NEW EFFORT

The temporary immigration is expected only on condition that the growers exert even more efforts to hire Americans where possible.

This prospect largely prompted the new moves to get jobless city workers onto the farms.

The first tour by the city and county officials was in Ventura County—on a school bus. The Sunkist Lemon Packing Co. plants were the first stop.

There the lemons brought in from the fields (2.8 million boxes of them a year) are graded, cleaned, and packed for shipment in what is almost a year-round operation.

Sorters, mostly women, earn $1.50 an hour for standing by endless conveyor belts picking out bad lemons as they roll by.

Nearly 90 percent of the citrus fruit field work is done by braceros in Ventura County, with rates based on the number of boxes the men can pick in a day.

The minimum wage is $1 an hour, but Jack A. Lewis, State farm placement supervisor, said in a very few cases the minimum can be waived by the worker.

One who did so was John Kursten, 17, of Oxnard, a tall youngster whom his friends dubbed "the Green Giant."

"I make about $3 to $5 a day for my 8 hours, but I signed a waiver that they'd keep me on since I wasn't picking as much as the others," Kursten said.

ONE DOLLAR AND FIFTY CENTS ON AVERAGE

Growers are not expected to continue employing those who don't pick enough lemons to make up on a piece rate basis the $1 an hour minimum being offered.

"I guess I just ain't cut out for it," the youngster said.

S. C. Cook, ranch foreman who earns $325 a month plus his house on the ranch, said most pickers earn about $1.50 an hour on the piece rate system.

Pedro Gonzales, 40, of Juanito, Mexico, a bracero, said through an interpreter as he ate lunch with 15-year-old John Olvires, of Oxnard, an American, that he has been making about $45 a week but his young friend, a "local," was not doing as well.

The city visitors were concerned, they said, because of a lack of sanitary facilities or places to eat, in addition to the question of wages.

Natapoff, asked about such problems, promised he would "certainly recommend that any pilot project set up include such essentials as sanitary facilities and some benches to eat on instead of crates."

DIFFERENCE IN HABITS

Spokesmen for the growers emphasized to the group that there are basic differences between farm and city habits, and one noted that California farm workers have more protective legislation than any other State.

Farmworkers in California are covered by workmen's compensation, temporary disability insurance, farm labor camp standards, and minimum wages for women and minors.

But others note the work is irregular, and the average includes higher paid workers too.

Herb Lee, head of the California-Arizona Farm Labor Association, said the prices "farmers receive are relatively unchanged from 20 years ago, yet wages, benefits, and competition have increased steadily.

"It is an indication of the progressiveness of the California farmers that they have managed to remain competitive with growers in other States despite these economic disadvantages."

A young unemployed Los Angeles man was along on the tour to decide for himself what he thought of farmwork.

"It's not for me. They don't pay anything, and it's plain dirty."

"We are getting Government money to help young, jobless Americans who are not in school to get a good job, steady work, and to become good citizens," said Mrs. Atara Mont, of the Youth Opportunities Board.

"From what we have seen, a job as a fieldworker doesn't fit these criteria."

The group ate at the growers' association messhall where workers are fed for $1.75 a day. The Mexican-style food was tasty and plentiful, and the rooms for single workers were clean, with nine men to a fairly large barrack-style room.

OTHER ARGUMENTS

This visit raised the issue of family housing, and Tolbert said Ventura growers now have room for 600 people in their family housing facilities, "but we can't find any takers."

The visitors did not get a chance because of time limitations to watch recruiting efforts, but the arguments continued on this score, too.

Growers insist they try, hard, to get Americans for the jobs before they ask the Government to bring in Mexican nationals.

This view was countered, however, by complaints that not only are the wages and working conditions insufficient to make recruiting programs realistic, but even the programs themselves are really halfhearted.

As one county social worker put it, they are conducted "with more of an eye on the newspapers and radio than on the potential farmworker."

The tour ended with arguments and discussions over morals, psychology, and economics going on until the last of the stragglers left the bus late in the evening after a day on California's farms.

[From the Los Angeles Times, Aug. 19, 1964]

BROWN SEES NO LACK OF FARM LABOR—SAYS STATE CROPS WILL BE HARVESTED WITHOUT BRACEROS

(By Jerry Gillam)

SACRAMENTO.—Governor Brown, Tuesday, flatly declared there will be enough labor to harvest California's farm crops next year in spite of the cutback in Mexican national labor.

He said he did not know yet where it will come from and that "it may be hard" but added:

"I assure you that there'll be enough labor, domestic or otherwise, to produce the crops of California next fall."

AGAINST EXTENSION

Brown made his remarks at his weekly press conference in response to a query as to whether he would support a continuation of the so-called Bracero Act which has allowed California farmers and ranchers to import help from Mexico, most of it stoop labor. He said he didn't think an extension of the act would help for two reasons:

1. There is no inclination to extend the bracero law on the part of congressional leaders, growers, or labor leaders.

2. Farm labor will be available if ranchers and farmers are willing to pay "a little higher wage."

However, he did not go on record as favoring a minimum wage for agricultural workers—a topic that has got him in hot water in the past.

HOPE IN MACHINERY

In the long run, he indicated, he hopes that automation may take up some of the slack, although admitting at the same time this could add to California's unemployment problem.

Meanwhile, he reported, he is conferring with his director of employment, Albert B. Tieburg; Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman; Undersecretary of Labor John F.

Henning, growers and labor leaders in seeking a solution to the problem.

Agriculture, a $3 billion-a-year business in California, last year imported some 63,000 Mexican nationals for farm help under the bracero program—Public Law 78.

The controversial 12-year-old program has been under heavy fire from California organized labor since it started.

Labor leaders claim enough domestic workers are available—if wages are high enough and working conditions are improved.

Using domestics instead of braceros, they say, would help reduce the State's unemployment rate.

The farmers argue there aren't enough suitable domestics and prefer the braceros because they work hard and don't object to stoop labor.

EXTENDED IN 1963

Public Law 78 was extended for 1 year in 1963 following a bitter battle in Congress with assurances given it would be the last time needed to obtain approval.

The Council of California Growers announced last February it would not seek further extension of the bracero program after seeing the handwriting on the wall in Washington.

In a policy statement, the council encouraged the State to fill the gap by recruitment of domestic workers in California and from other States if necessary to keep the crops from rotting in the fields.

"I am completely committed," Brown told newsmen, "to getting sufficient labor from whatever source I can to harvest the crops next year."

He added, however, that Tieburg has reported the search for other adequate domestic sources so far has been unsuccessful.

"We may have to import some labor," Brown said. "If so, I would support it, but I'm not ready to concede that today."

The Governor noted there is a section of the Immigration Act which permits individual growers to contract for temporary or permanent foreign workers.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I understand that before the Senate concludes its deliberations this evening, the distinguished junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] desires to speak. Therefore, I have the honor to suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INTRODUCTION OF SIMPLIFIED TAX SYSTEM

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, on October 16 of last year I offered as an amendment to the then pending tax-reduction bill, which became the Revenue Act of 1964, a plan for an optional simplified tax system. It was a distinct honor and experience for the junior Senator from Louisiana to be the floor manager of that bill. As the manager of the bill, I did not feel privileged to offer any amendments in my own right, pursuing the theory that the spokesman for the committee should support the committee bill as reported.

Nevertheless, the proposal that was made for a simplified tax system appeared to me to have great prospects for bringing equity and uniformity to our present tax system.

That amendment would have substantially simplified the tax rules and would have tended to equalize the tax treatment for high-income taxpayers with differing sources of income and types of expenses. I now propose to introduce a bill which would propose a still simpler tax system, one which would extend to middle-income taxpayers as well as upper income taxpayers and would dovetail with the simplification now available to lower bracket taxpayers through the standard deduction. In addition to simplifying the tax system for middle and lower income taxpayers, my bill would raise the limitation on the standard deduction and increase the amount of the minimum standard deduction.

I am introducing this system at this time so that it may be studied fully by the members of the Finance Committee and by other interested Senators and Members of Congress, by the Treasury, by the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, and by other distinguished students of the tax laws. I hope to reintroduce this bill in the next Congress and seek action on it at that time.

Subsequent to the action on the Revenue Act of 1964, the junior Senator from Louisiana was much flattered to observe that Mr. Mortimer Caplan, who served during the years of the Kennedy administration as Commissioner of Internal Revenue, declared that the proposed simplified tax system was the most hopeful thing he had seen in some time for bringing about fair, equitable, uniform tax treatment for all American taxpayers.

There is a great amount of enthusiasm for this type of tax reform from such students of the tax system as Secretary of the Treasury Douglas Dillon, Stanley B. Surrey, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, and a number of other outstanding persons in the Treasury Department.

Last year, when I introduced my proposal for a simplified tax system, I stated my concern about the inequity and complexity of our tax structure, particularly with regard to individuals in the upper-income brackets. I pointed out that a study of tax returns of individuals in high-income brackets showed two things: Some taxpayers do not pay nearly enough; others pay too much. While it is true that our tax rates on personal income are steeply graduated on the first $100,000 and reach a rate of 70 percent for 1965 and subsequent years under the Revenue Act of 1964, most high-income taxpayers are able either to make their income in ways that are not taxable or to benefit from a number of ways of deducting large amounts. Consequently, most high-bracket taxpayers, with the help of tax lawyers and accountants, are able to keep their taxes well below 50 percent of their gross income.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a table which shows the effective tax rates paid by taxpayers with adjusted gross incomes over $500,000. This table shows that over 26 percent of taxpayers with incomes over $5 million pay no Federal income tax whatsoever. It also shows that large percentages of high-income taxpayers pay very low rates of tax.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Percentage distribution of effective tax rates based on adjusted gross income by income classes; all returns with adjusted gross income of $500,000 or more, 1959

[In percent]

Adjusted gross income	Median	Total	Effective tax rate (percent)									
			0	0.1 to 9.9	10 to 10.9	20 to 29.9	30 to 39.9	40 to 49.9	50 to 59.9	60 to 69.9	70 to 79.9	80 to 84.9
$500,000 to $749,999	46.0	100	0.6	0.8	1.1	6.4	17.0	45.6	13.8	8.8	5.1	0.8
$750,000 to $999,999	47.5	100	1.0	1.6	1.6	4.7	11.9	46.6	18.7	8.3	4.6	1.0
$1,000,000 to $1,999,999	48.8	100	4.0	.5	.5	4.1	11.2	47.2	17.3	8.6	6.1	.5
$2,000,000 to $4,999,999	47.3	100	3.1			6.3	9.4	48.4	14.1	9.4	7.8	1.5
$5,000,000 and over	46.8	100	26.3				5.3	31.6	15.8	15.8	5.2	
All returns	46.6	100	2.0	.8	1.0	5.4	14.2	46.0	16.5	8.0	5.4	.8

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, it is an amazing fact, to find out that while we contend we have a graduated income tax, based on ability to pay, one-quarter of those with incomes over $5 million do not pay any Federal income tax. They succeed in avoiding paying it by taking full advantage of all the deductions and various provisions in the law which can be exploited for them by good lawyers and good tax accountants.

Some of the methods by which tax liabilities have been kept low have been the receipt of income from State and municipal bonds which is not taxable, the deduction of contributions to charities and private foundations, and the diverting of large sums of money into types of assets which receive the much lower capital gains tax treatment. Particularly is this true in cases where the capital gains income is offset by a large interest deduction to cover the cost of financing the transaction. The use of pension plans and profit-sharing plans by owner-managers of small, closely held corporations, percentage depletion, intangible drilling costs and stock options have all been subject to severe criticism by students of our tax system.

Nevertheless, there are still cases where individuals are actually paying much more than 50 percent of their income to the U.S. Government. It makes little or no sense for this Nation to have a tax system which crucifies one taxpayer by depriving him of most of his income, while it accords to another the privilege of retaining within his ownership and control 100 percent of his earnings, without any income tax liability whatever.

For this reason, Mr. President, I proposed last year an alternate method for computing Federal income taxes. It was my proposal that a taxpayer should have the right to elect to pay his taxes—at lower tax rates—without the benefit of the various "gimmicks" and tax-avoidance schemes which are most frequently employed by high-bracket taxpayers. The taxpayer would elect to pay taxes on interest derived from State and municipal bonds. He would pay taxes on amounts contributed in his behalf to profit-sharing plans and pension plans. He would be required to capitalize his intangible drilling cost, and would be permitted only cost depletion on mineral properties. The taxpayer would be denied deductions for contributions to all sorts of charities and foundations.

Although my proposal of last year received favorable consideration by many serious students of tax laws, it was not adopted. Some persons pointed out that it would benefit only a handful of high-income taxpayers, and I recognized its limited applicability. When I proposed the simplified tax system last year, I expressed my hope that it would, in time, become so popular that there would be a demand to extend this type of treatment to other taxpayers with smaller incomes, perhaps soon to those with incomes exceeding $10,000. However, I stated that it would be impractical at that time to extend the simplified tax system to taxpayers with incomes down to $10,000 because of the possible large revenue losses that might result. In the past year, however, I have devoted additional study to the problem—and the Treasury Department has helped me—and the revenue effects have been calculated more precisely. Extension of the simplified tax system to a broad range of middle-income taxpayers now appears to me to be feasible.

Therefore, I now propose a bill embodying a revised simplified tax system which would extend to all taxpayers with incomes over $10,000, who so elect, the advantages of equity and simplicity that would have been available only to high-income taxpayers under my proposal of last year. Like my proposal of last year, taxpayers who elect to give up the advantages of special tax treatment for certain types of income and deductions for certain expenses would be entitled to special lower tax rates. The tax rates I now propose would be, in the case of married taxpayers filing joint returns, 20 percent on the first $20,000, 25 percent on the next $8,000, and so on rising up to 50 percent on income over $100,000. In the case of a single individual, the rates would be 20 percent of the first $10,000, 25 percent of the next $4,000, and so on up to 50 percent on income in excess of $50,000.

At the conclusion of this speech, I shall place in the RECORD table 1 which shows the complete tax rate schedule that I propose as well as the schedule of rates effective in 1965 under present law. If it is believed that rates in this table are too high generally, or that the top rate of 50 percent is too high, then Congress could consider reducing the rates to figures that it deems more appropriate. Similarly, if the provisions of the bill I am introducing appear too severe, either in the deductions disallowed or the inclusions in the tax base, consideration could be given to modification.

In any event, I should like to emphasize that this method is optional and that taxpayers could continue under the rates and other provisions of present law. In fact, most taxpayers would not make the election. Once the optional method is elected by a taxpayer, his election would generally be irrevocable for 5 years, at which time it could be renewed for successive 5-year periods. Some have objected that the 5-year binding election is too harsh, particularly in cases where the taxpayer has suffered unexpected financial reverses. My revised bill should eliminate this objection. It would provide—in addition to several specific relief provisions—that the taxpayer could revoke his election at any time he desired, but he would have to recompute his income and tax for all years covered by that election as if he had not made the election. Moreover, he would have to pay an additional tax of 5 percent of the recomputed tax plus interest on any deficiency. However, in appropriate cases he could obtain a refund.

In addition to its extension to middle-income taxpayers, the system I now propose differs from my proposal of last year in several important respects. Under present law, long-term capital gains are given specially favorable tax treatment. Only half of such gains are included in income and the tax on such gains may not exceed 25 percent. This is perhaps the most widely utilized provision for specially favorable treatment of a particular type of income. My proposal of last year provided that taxpayers who elect the simplified tax method would be required to include in income their full capital gains but could pay tax at the 25-percent rate with respect to some, but not all, types of long-term capital gains. After considerable study over this past year, I am convinced that taxpayers who desire the low rates and the simplicity of the simplified tax method should be required to treat all income, including all capital gains income, in the same manner. Much of the complexity of the present tax law results from the necessity of distinguishing between capital gains and ordinary income, and many of the "gimmicks" and tax-saving schemes are designed to secure the benefit of capital gains treatment rather than ordinary income treatment. There are many valid arguments for special treatment of capital-gain income, but real simplicity, lower rates, and tax equity cannot be achieved until capital-gain income is treated like other income. Since the system I propose is entirely optional, no taxpayer would be harmed by the suggested treatment of capital gains. Tables 2 and 3, which I propose to place in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks, show respectively that capital gains are concentrated in the hands of high-income taxpayers and that, among high-income taxpayers, those with a high proportion of capital gains have much lower effective tax rates than other high-income taxpayers.

In my proposal today, I am coupling with my suggestion for an optional simplified tax system a suggestion for an increase in the limitation on the standard deduction from $1,000 to $2,000 and for a $100 increase in the minimum are necessary if we are to extend to taxpayers in all income brackets a realistic standard deduction. These increases opportunity of utilizing a simplified tax system and if we are to treat more equitably middle and lower income taxpayers.

Under present law, taxpayers with incomes up to $10,000 are entitled to a standard deduction of 10 percent of income if they elect to forego itemized deductions for otherwise deductible personal expenses. Last year's tax law added another alternative to itemization of deductions or claiming the 10-percent standard deduction. Taxpayers may now claim a minimum standard deduction of $300 for a single person, $400 for a married couple, and an additional $100 for each dependent. Individuals who are 65 or over, or individuals who are blind, are allowed an additional $100 or minimum standard deduction for age or for blindness. Taxpayers with incomes up to $10,000 derive almost all their income from wages, salaries, interest, and dividends, all of which receive ordinary income treatment. Consequently, such taxpayers who elect the 10-percent standard deduction, or the minimum standard deduction, already have a relatively simple tax system. The simplified tax method that I am proposing would extend to upper income taxpayers a similar opportunity to avail themselves of a relatively simple tax system under which all income is treated alike and there are no complicated personal deductions.

However, studies have shown that very few taxpayers with incomes between $10,000 and $20,000 would find it advantageous to elect the simplified tax system unless the rates thereunder were reduced to a point where there would be a prohibitively large revenue loss to the Government. In addition, about 3 out of 4 persons with incomes of between $10,000 and $20,000 find that they have deductible expenses under present law well in excess of the present $1,000 limit of the standard deduction. Thus, they must itemize their deductions in order to minimize their tax. Therefore, in order to afford to such middle-income taxpayers the opportunity—that is presently available to low-income taxpayers and that would become available to high-income taxpayers—to use a simplified tax system, I have proposed that the limit of the standard deduction be raised to $2,000.

Let me again emphasize that, like my proposed simplified tax method, the standard deduction is optional. Thus, taxpayers who desire to itemize their deductions for charitable contributions, medical expenses, State and local taxes, interest, and so forth, could continue to do so. However, all taxpayers who desire to forego the difficulties of recordkeeping, accounting, and reporting such expenses would have a reasonable alternative.

In the case of our lowest income taxpayers, many have found that they must itemize their deductions because, as low as they are, they nevertheless exceed 10 percent of their incomes. The minimum standard deduction enacted last year was a great help in allowing many of these low-income taxpayers to switch to a simplified tax system. However, I believe that more should be done to make simplification available to such low-income taxpayers. I am, therefore, proposing that the minimum standard deduction be increased by $100, from $300 to $400 for the single person, and from $400 to $500 for the married couple. The minimum standard deduction of $100 for each dependent, for age, or for blindness, would remain unchanged. In the case of a married couple filing separately, the minimum standard deduction for each spouse would be increased from $200 to $250. It should be noted that this increase in the minimum standard deduction would mean that taxpayers with incomes up to $1,000—surely well within the poverty area, however it may be defined—would not have any Federal income tax to pay.

Mr. President, objections to my proposal will come from several sources. One group will feel that tax reduction for upper-income taxpayers should be available only when those persons as a group have been denied the benefit of favorable tax treatment which they have enjoyed in the past. To those reformers, I would respond that they have been trying to prevail in their views for many years and that these corrections come slowly. Meanwhile, those taxpayers who have not enjoyed the benefit of favorable tax treatment have suffered under a system which, as applied to them, has been little short of confiscatory. Relief for those who have paid taxes on virtually all of their income should not be forever denied while one seeks to correct a system which contains many inequities and inconsistencies.

A second group will say that this amendment would do too much for persons making a large income. As I have pointed out, most persons making big money pay taxes at an effective rate of less than one-third of their gross income. It is unfair in my judgment to deny fair tax treatment to persons paying an effective rate above 50 percent so long as the favored tax treatment exists for the overwhelming majority of persons with similar incomes.

Finally, other groups will object to particular aspects of my plan. To critics of any of the details of the optional tax plan, let me say that I am not wedded to the specifics of the plan I am today introducing. I am not opposed to changes designed to ease any unintended harsh effects. But I will not compromise on the principles of my program—which are simplicity and equity.

Mr. President, I am critical of the current system of taxation in the United States whereby we are at cross purposes. We have a steep, progressive system of tax rates intended to make each person pay his fair share of the tax burden. But then there are so many exceptions to the rule that we find few taxpayers paying the share that was originally intended.

The plan I offer today is more realistic. It is a beginning in the direction of a tax system simpler and easier for everyone to understand, and a system with greater fairness and justice for every taxpayer.

It is time we began to reduce the premium enjoyed by the taxpayer who has tax lawyers and accountants to show him ways to avoid paying taxes to his Federal Government. It is time we make this first step toward encouraging taxpayers to report and pay on a fair and equitable basis those taxes which are properly due the Government.

Furthermore, it is time we do something to relieve the tremendous pressure that is constantly upon the Congress and its committees dealing with taxes to write more gimmicks and more special interest provisions into the laws, favoring some groups while ignoring others. If a provision such as that which I am recommending should become law, it would be my purpose to resist with all of my energy and ability any effort to make the system the subject of loopholes for the benefit of favored taxpayers. If this system should become law, it would be my purpose to seek steadily to improve upon it until a high percentage of taxpayers would prefer it to the complicated, unfair, and inequitable system that presently exists.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement indicating the number of taxpayers likely to be affected by different features of my bill together with the probable effect of these features on the revenues. Also I ask unanimous consent that there be included in the RECORD the text of the bill, a statement of some additional reasons for my optional proposal and a technical explanation of certain aspects of it, and tables 1 through 13.

Mr. President, I hope that the clerks and our able reporters of debates will seek to be a little generous in the space that they allot to these tables so that a person can read them intelligently and comprehensively—even though a little blank space might be left on the page.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD, together with the explanatory statement and explanation.

The bill (S. 3250) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an optional simplified tax method, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. LONG of Louisiana, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SEC. 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as "The Simplified Tax Method Act of 1964."

SEC. 2. SIMPLIFIED TAX METHOD FOR ELECTING INDIVIDUALS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 1 (relating to normal taxes and surtaxes) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subchapter:

"Subchapter U—Election of Simplified Tax Method

"Sec. 1391. Election of simplified tax.
"Sec. 1392. Simplified tax imposed.
"Sec. 1393. Simplified taxable income defined.
"Sec. 1394. Special rules.

"SEC. 1391. ELECTION OF SIMPLIFIED TAX

"(a) GENERAL RULE.—Except as provided in this subsection and subsection (f), an individual may, for any taxable year, elect to be subject to the simplified tax imposed by section 1392 in lieu of the tax imposed by section 1 or section 1201. An election under this section may not be made by—

"(1) an estate or trust,

"(2) a nonresident alien individual, or

"(3) a married individual, unless his spouse also makes an election under this section, or has made an election, which is in effect for such taxable year, and unless such individual and his spouse have the same taxable year.

"(b) ELECTION.—

"(1) WHEN MADE.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), an election under this section for any taxable year shall be made within the time prescribed by law (not including extensions thereof) for filing the return for such taxable year.

"(2) YEARS PRIOR TO ISSUANCE OF REGULATIONS.—An election under this section for any taxable year ending prior to the date of the first publication of regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate under section 1394 may be made within ninety days after such date.

"(3) MANNER.—An election under this section shall be made in such manner as the Secretary or his delegate shall by regulations prescribe.

"(c) YEARS FOR WHICH EFFECTIVE.—An election under this section shall be effective for the taxable year for which it is made and for each of the four taxable years immediately succeeding such taxable year, unless, with respect to any such taxable year, it is revoked under subsection (d) or (e) or terminated under subsection (f).

"(d) REVOCATION OF ELECTION.—An election under this section may be revoked (at such time and in such manner as the Secretary or his delegate shall by regulations prescribe) by the taxpayer for any taxable year with respect to which—

"(1) amendments (made after the date of such election) to this subtitle or to the regulations prescribed thereunder become effective, and the Secretary or his delegate determines that a major portion of the difference (computed without regard to such amendments) between

"(A) the tax liability of electing taxpayers as a class under this subchapter, and

"(B) the tax liability of electing taxpayers as a class which would exist under this chapter but for this subchapter

is eliminated by reason of such amendments; or

"(2) the taxpayer—

"(A) becomes disabled (within the meaning of section 213(g)(3)) and at least 50 percent of his gross income for the five taxable years immediately preceding such taxable year consisted of earned income (as defined in section 911(b)); or

"(B) is discharged in bankruptcy.

A revocation under this subsection shall be effective for the taxable year for which made and for all succeeding taxable years.

"(e) Retroactive Revocation of Election.—

"(1) Retroactive revocation.—An election under this section may be revoked (at such time and in such manner as the Secretary or his delegate shall by regulations prescribe) by the taxpayer for any taxable year.

"(2) Effect of retroactive revocation.—In the case of a revocation, under this subsection, of an election, except as provided in paragraphs (3) and (4), the taxpayer shall be treated (under regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate) as if he had never made such election.

"(3) Additional tax.—In the case of a revocation of an election under this subsection, in addition to the tax imposed by section 1 or section 1201, there is imposed for each year for which the election so revoked would have been effective, a tax equal to 5 percent of the tax imposed by section 1 or section 1201.

"(4) Statute of limitations.—Notwithstanding any law or rule of law—

"(A) any deficiency attributable to a revocation under this subsection may be assessed and

"(B) any claim for refund or credit relating to an overpayment attributable to a revocation under this section may be filed at any time within 3 years of the date on which the revocation is made.

"(f) Termination of Election.—In the case of a married individual, an election under this section shall terminate commencing with any taxable year for which an election under this section is not in effect for his spouse.

"(g) Election After Expiration, Revocation, or Termination of Prior Election.—

"(1) In general.—If a taxpayer has made an election under this section which has expired in accordance with subsection (c), has been revoked under subsection (d) or (e), or has terminated under subsection (f), such taxpayer may not, except as provided in paragraph (2), make an election under this section for any of the 5 taxable years following the last taxable year for which his prior election was in effect.

"(2) Exceptions.—Notwithstanding paragraph (1)—

"(A) in the case of an election which has expired in accordance with subsection (c), an election under this section may be made for the first taxable year following the last taxable year for which the prior election was in effect; and

"(B) an election under this section may be made for any taxable year if the Secretary or his delegate consents to such election.

"(h) Rules for Determining Marital Status, Etc.—For purposes of this subchapter—

"(1) Marital status.—Section 143 (relating to determination of marital status) shall apply in determining whether an individual is married for any taxable year.

"(2) Taxable years of husband and wife.—If the taxable years of a husband and wife begin on the same day and end on different days because of the death of either or both, they shall be treated as having the same taxable year. The preceding sentence shall not apply with respect to the surviving spouse if he remarries before the close of his taxable year.

"Sec. 1392. Simplified Tax Imposed

"(a) Rates of Tax.—A tax is hereby imposed for each taxable year for which an election under section 1391 is in effect, as follows:

"(1) Individuals.—In the case of an individual other than an individual to whom paragraph (2) or (3) applies, the lesser of—

"(A) the tax determined in accordance with the following table:

If the taxable income is:	The tax is:
Not over $10,000	20 percent of the simplified taxable income
Over $10,000 but not over $14,000	$2,000 plus 25 percent of the excess over $10,000
Over $14,000 but not over $18,000	$3,000 plus 30 percent of the excess over $14,000
Over $18,000 but not over $32,000	$4,200 plus 35 percent of the excess over $18,000
Over $32,000 but not over $50,000	$9,000 plus 40 percent of the excess over $32,000
Over $50,000	$16,300 plus 50 percent of the excess over $50,000

; or

"(B) a tax on simplified taxable income computed at the rates provided by section 1(a) (relating to rates of tax on individuals).

"(2) Heads of households.—In the case of a head of a household (as defined in section 1(b)(2)) the lesser of—

"(A) the tax determined in accordance with the following table:

If the taxable income is:	The tax is:
Not over $10,000	20 percent of the simplified taxable income
Over $10,000 but not over $14,000	$2,000 plus 22.5 percent of the excess over $10,000
Over $14,000 but not over $18,000	$2,900 plus 25.0 percent of the excess over $14,000
Over $18,000 but not over $20,000	$3,900 plus 27.5 percent of the excess over $18,000
Over $20,000 but not over $28,000	$4,450 plus 30.0 percent of the excess over $20,000
Over $28,000 but not over $32,000	$6,850 plus 32.5 percent of the excess over $28,000
Over $32,000 but not over $36,000	$8,150 plus 35.0 percent of the excess over $32,000
Over $36,000 but not over $50,000	$9,550 plus 37.5 percent of the excess over $36,000
Over $50,000 but not over $64,000	$14,800 plus 42.5 percent of the excess over $50,000
Over $64,000 but not over $100,000	$20,750 plus 45.0 percent of the excess over $64,000
Over $100,000 but not over $150,000	$36,950 plus 50.0 percent of the excess over $100,000

; or

"(B) a tax on simplified taxable income computed at the rates provided by section 1(b) (relating to rates of tax on heads of households).

"(3) Married individuals who file joint returns and surviving spouses.—In the case of a husband and wife who file a joint return under section 6013 and in the case of a surviving spouse (as defined in section 2(b)), the lesser of—

"(A) the tax determined in accordance with the following table:

If the taxable income is:	The tax is:
Not over $20,000	20 percent of the simplified taxable income
Over $20,000 but not over $28,000	$4,000 plus 25 percent of the excess over $20,000
Over $28,000 but not over $36,000	$6,000 plus 30 percent of the excess over $28,000
Over $36,000 but not over $64,000	$8,400 plus 35 percent of the excess over $36,000
Over $64,000 but not over $100,000	$18,200 plus 40 percent of the excess over $64,000
Over $100,000	$32,600 plus 50 percent of the excess over $100,000

; or

"(B) a tax on simplified taxable income computed under section 2 (relating to tax in case of joint return or return of surviving spouse).

"(b) Credits Against Simplified Tax.—For any taxable year with respect to which an election under section 1391 is in effect, no credit against tax shall be allowed under section 35 (relating to partially tax-exempt interest received by individuals) or 37 (relating to retirement income).

"Sec. 1393. Simplified Taxable Income Defined

"(a) In General.—For purposes of this subtitle, the term 'simplified taxable income' means adjusted gross income (as defined in section 62), increased as provided by subsections (b) and (c), and reduced as provided in subsection (d).

"(b) Additions to Adjusted Gross Income.—For purposes of subsection (a), adjusted gross income shall be increased by—

"(1) Amounts otherwise excluded.—Amounts excluded from gross income under part III of subchapter B of chapter 1 (relating to items specifically excluded from gross income), except amounts described in—

"(A) subsections (a) and (d) of section 101 (relating to proceeds of life insurance contracts),

"(B) section 102 (relating to gifts and inheritances),

"(C) section 108 (relating to income from discharge of indebtedness), and

"(D) section 111 (relating to recovery of bad debts, prior taxes, and delinquency amounts).

"(2) Income from sources outside the united states, etc.—Amounts excluded from gross income under—

"(A) sections 893 (relating to compensation of employees of foreign governments), 911 (relating to earned income from sources without the United States), 912 (relating to exemption for certain allowances received from the United States), 931 (relating to income from sources within possessions of the United States), and 943 (relating to exclusion of dividends to residents of Formosa or Hong Kong), and

"(B) any treaty of the United States (notwithstanding section 894, relating to income exempt under treaty).

"(3) Social security and railroad retirement benefits.—Two-thirds of all amounts received as a pension or annuity under title II of the Social Security Act or under the Railroad Retirement Acts of 1935 or 1937.

"(4) Unemployment benefits.—Amounts received from a State or a political subdivision thereof, or from the United States, on account of unemployment.

"(5) Contributions to employees' trusts, etc.—Contributions, described in sections 403(b) (relating to taxability of beneficiaries under certain annuities), 404(a) (relating to general rule for deduction for contributions of an employer to an employees' trust, etc.), 404(b) (relating to method of contribution, etc., having the effect of a plan), and 405(c) (relating to deduction for contributions to bond purchase plans), made on behalf of the taxpayer and not otherwise included in gross income, but only to the extent that the taxpayer's rights to or derived from such contributions are nonforfeitable during his taxable year. For purposes of this paragraph, the Secretary or his delegate may by regulations prescribe that contingencies which are not substantial shall not be taken into account in determining whether an employee's rights are nonforfeitable. This paragraph shall not apply to contributions made on behalf of a taxpayer who is an employee within the meaning of section 401(e)(1) (relating to self-employed individuals).

"(6) SECURTIES OF THE EMPLOYER CORPORATION.—Amounts excluded from income under the second sentence of section 402(a)(1) (relating to general rule for taxability of beneficiary of exempt trust) or the second sentence of section 402(a)(2) (relating to capital gains treatment for certain distributions).

"(7) EXERCISE OF CERTAIN STOCK OPTIONS.—In the case of the transfer of a share of stock to a taxpayer pursuant to his exercise, during the taxable year, of an option which meets the requirements of section 422(a) (relating to general rule for qualified stock options), 423(a) (relating to general rule for employee stock purchase plans), or 424(a) (relating to general rule for restricted stock options), an amount equal to the excess of the fair market value of the share so transferred over the price paid under such option for such share.

"(8) GROUP-TERM LIFE INSURANCE.—Amounts equal to the cost (determined on the basis of uniform premiums, computed on the basis of 5-year age brackets, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate) of group-term life insurance on the life of the taxpayer provided for part or all of the taxable year under a policy (or policies) carried directly or indirectly by the taxpayer's employer (or employers).

"(c) DEDUCTIONS DENIED.—For purposes of subsection (a), adjusted gross income shall be increased by an amount equal to the deductions allowed under—

"(1) TAXES ON OR MEASURED BY NET INCOME.—Sections 162 (relating to trade or business expenses), 164 (relating to a deduction for taxes), and 212 (relating to expenses for the production of income), for any State, local, or foreign tax on or measured by net income.

"(2) CIRCULATION EXPENDITURES.—Section 173 (relating to circulation expenditures).

"(3) AGRICULTURAL EXPENDITURES.—Sections 175 (relating to soil and water conservation expenditures), 180 (relating to expenditures by farmers for fertilizer, etc.), and 182 (relating to expenditures by farmers for clearing land).

"(4) NATURAL RESOURCES.—Sections 263(c) (relating to intangible drilling and development costs in the case of oil and gas wells), 613 (relating to percentage depletion), 615 (relating to exploration expenditures), and 616 (relating to development expenditures).

"(5) SELF-EMPLOYED INDIVIDUALS.—Sections 404 (relating to deduction for contributions of an employer to an employees' trust, etc.), and 405(c) (relating to deduction for contributions to bond purchase plans), to the extent attributable to contributions made on behalf of an individual who is an employee within the meaning of section 401(c)(1) (relating to self-employed individuals).

"(6) CAPITAL GAINS.—Section 1202 (relating to deduction for capital gains).

"(d) DEDUCTIONS ALLOWED.—For purposes of subsection (a), adjusted gross income shall (except as otherwise provided in subsection (c)) be reduced by an amount equal to—

"(1) PERSONAL EXEMPTIONS.—The deductions allowed by section 151 (relating to allowance of deductions for personal exemptions), other than the additional deductions for age and blindness allowed by subsections (c) and (d) of such section.

"(2) TRADE AND BUSINESS EXPENSES OF EMPLOYEES.—The deductions allowed by this chapter (other then by part VII of subchapter B, relating to additional itemized deductions for individuals) which are attributable to a trade or business which consists of the performance of services by the taxpayer as an employee.

"(3) EXPENSES FOR PRODUCTION OF INCOME.—The deductions allowed by section 212 (relating to expenses for production of income).

"(4) ALIMONY, ETC., PAYMENTS.—The deductions allowed by section 215 (relating to alimony, etc., payments).

"(5) DEDUCTIONS ALLOCABLE TO ITEMS REQUIRED TO BE INCLUDED IN GROSS INCOME.—The deductions allocable to items required to be added to adjusted gross income under subsection (b), to the extent that such amounts would be allowed as deductions but for the fact that such items were not otherwise included in gross income.

"(e) ITEMS NOT TO BE TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT MORE THAN ONCE.—Nothing in this section shall permit the same item to be deducted more than once or included in income more than once.

"(f) CROSS-REFERENCES.—

"(1) For special provisions relating to contributions to employees' trusts, etc., see section 407.

"(2) For special provisions relating to stock options, see section 425(1).

"(3) For special provisions relating to trusts, see section 679.

"SEC. 1394. SPECIAL RULES.

"(a) REGULATIONS TO PREVENT AVOIDANCE OF TAX.—The Secretary or his delegate shall prescribe such regulations as he may deem necessary in order that the income tax liability of any taxpayer who makes an election under section 1391, before, during, and after the period for which the election is effective, may be returned, determined, computed, assessed, collected, and adjusted, in such manner as clearly to reflect the income tax liability of such taxpayer and the various factors necessary for the determination of such liability, and in order to prevent avoidance of such tax liability. Such regulations may provide for the distribution, apportionment, or allocation of gross income, exclusions, deductions, credits, allowances, and items described in section 1393 between or among a taxpayer who has made an election under this section and any other person or persons. A taxpayer who makes an election under section 1391 shall be considered to have consented to the regulations under this section which are in effect on the date of such election.

"(b) CERTAIN PROVISIONS INAPPLICABLE.—For any taxable year, for which an election under section 1391 is in effect, the following provisions shall not apply:

"(1) Section 72(n)(2) (relating to limitation of tax in case of certain distributions with respect to contributions by self-employed individuals).

"(2) Section 170(b)(5) (relating to carryover of certain excess charitable contributions).

"(3) Section 632 (relating to sale of oil or gas properties).

"(4) Section 673(b) (relating to exception where trust income is payable to charitable beneficiaries).

"(5) Section 1111 (relating to distribution of stock pursuant to order enforcing the antitrust laws).

"(6) Section 1201(b) (relating to alternative tax on capital gains).

"(7) Section 1347 (relating to claims against the United States, etc.).

"(c) ADJUSTMENTS TO BASIS.—Notwithstanding any provision of section 1016 (relating to adjustments to basis) and notwithstanding any election made under this title, proper adjustment in respect of property shall, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate, be made with respect to amounts described in section 1393.

"(d) PENALTIES APPLICABLE TO CERTAIN DISTRIBUTIONS.—Section 72(m)(5) (relating to penalties applicable to certain amounts received by owner-employees) shall be applied as if this subchapter had not been enacted.

"(e) TAXABLE INCOME.—With respect to any taxable year for which an election under section 1391 is in effect, the term 'taxable income' wherever used in this title shall be read as 'simplified taxable income', unless the context otherwise requires.

"(f) CERTAIN TRUSTS.—With respect to any taxable year for which an election under section 1391 is in effect—

"(1) paragraphs (1), (2), (3), and (4) of section 665(b) (relating to accumulation distributions of trusts, etc.) shall not apply,

"(2) section 666(a) (relating to amount allocated in the case of accumulation distribution) shall apply to the preceding taxable years of a trust described in section 666(a) without regard to any provision of such section which would (but for this paragraph) limit its application to the 5 preceding taxable years, and

"(3) the next to the last sentence of section 668(a) (relating to amounts treated as received in prior taxable years) shall not apply.

"(g) INCOME AVERAGING.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The tax imposed by section 1302 shall, in the case of a taxpayer who so chooses, be limited to an amount determined in accordance with the principles of Part I (relating to income averaging) of Subchapter Q, provided that—

"(A) The income of a year for which an election under section 1391 is in effect shall not be averaged with the income of a year for which such an election is not in effect;

"(B) Notwithstanding section 1302(e)(2) (relating to the definition of base period), if an election under section 1391 is in effect for the computation year, the base period shall be the immediately preceding taxable years (not in excess of four) for which an election under section 1391 was in effect; and

"(C) The Secretary or his delegate shall prescribe such regulations as he may deem necessary to carry out the purposes of this section.

"(2) ELIGIBLE INDIVIDUALS.—For any taxable year for which an election under section 1391 is in effect and for the four immediately succeeding taxable years, a taxpayer shall not be an eligible individual within the meaning of section 1303 (relating to individuals eligible for income averaging) unless he consents, at the time and in the manner prescribed by regulations, to the regulations under paragraph (1)(C) of this subsection.

"(h) CROSS REFERENCE.—For extension of statute of limitations in certain cases, see sections 6501(k) and 6511(d)(5)."

(b) CONTRIBUTIONS TO EMPLOYEES' TRUSTS, ETC.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Part I of subchapter D of chapter 1 (relating to pension, profit-sharing, stock bonus plans, etc.) is amended by adding after section 407 the following new section:

"SEC. 408. SPECIAL RULE RELATING TO CONTRIBUTIONS FOR EMPLOYEES WHO HAVE ELECTED SIMPLIFIED TAX METHOD

"(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this part, an employee shall include (under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate) in his gross income for the taxable year contributions which are—

"(1) described in sections 403(b), 404(a), 404(b), and 405(c),

"(2) made on his behalf in any taxable year for which an election made by him under section 1391 (relating to election of simplified tax) is in effect, and

"(3) not previously included in his gross income, but only to the extent that his rights to or derived from such contributions become nonforfeitable during the taxable year. For purposes of this section, the Secretary or his delegate may by regulations, prescribe that contingencies which are not substantial shall not be taken into account in determining whether an employee's rights are or become nonforeitable during the taxable year.

"(b) CROSS REFERENCE.—

"For treatment of contributions nonforfeitable when made, see section 1393(b)(5)."

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for part I of subchapter D of chapter I is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"SEC. 408. SPECIAL RULE RELATING TO CONTRIBUTIONS FOR EMPLOYEES WHO HAVE ELECTED SIMPLIFIED TAX METHOD."

(c) CERTAIN STOCK OPTIONS.—Section 425 (relating to definitions and special rules) is amended by redesignating subsection (j) as subsection (k) and inserting after subsection(i) the following new subsection:

"(j) SPECIAL RULE FOR EMPLOYEES WHO HAVE ELECTED UNDER SECTION 1391.—Section 421(a)(1) shall not apply to any option granted to the taxpayer during a taxable year for which an election by him under section 1391 (relating to election of simplified tax) is in effect."

(d) ACCUMULATING TRUSTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subpart E of part I of subchapter J of chapter 1 (relating to grantors and others treated as substantial owners) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 679. INDIVIDUAL ELECTING SIMPLIFIED TAX METHOD TREATED AS SUBSTANTIAL OWNER.

"(a) GENERAL RULE.—An individual for whom an election under section 1391 (relating to election of simplified tax) is in effect for the taxable year shall be treated as the owner of any portion of a trust in respect of which, for such taxable year, there may be accumulated any item of gross income or any item required to be added to adjusted gross income under section 1993(b) (relating to additions to adjusted gross income), if such accumulated item may ultimately vest in such individual or his estate and must ultimately vest in such individual, his estate, or his appointees.

"(b) SPECIAL RULES.—For purposes of subsection (a)—

"(1) The term 'appointees' includes beneficiaries designated in the trust instrument, legatees, persons appointed by will, and persons who take in default of an appointment.

"(2) The Secretary or his delegate may provide by regulations that contingencies which are not substantial shall not be taken into account.

"(c) EXCEPTION WHERE GRANTOR OR PERSON OTHER THAN GRANTOR IS TAXABLE.—Subsection (a) shall not apply if the grantor of the trust is otherwise treated as the owner under sections 671 to 677, inclusive, or if a person other than the grantor is otherwise treated as the owner under section 678."

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for subpart E of part I of subchapter J of chapter 1 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"Sec. 679. Individual electing simplified tax method treated as substantial owner."

(e) INCOME FROM AN EMPLOYMENT.—Paragraph (2) of section 232(g) (relating to income from employment) of the Revenue Act of 1964 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "A taxpayer may not elect under this paragraph for any taxable year for which an election by him under section 1391 (relating to election of simplified tax) is in effect."

(f) STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS EXTENDED.—

(1) LIMITATIONS ON ASSESSMENT.—Section 6501 (relating to limitations on assessment and collection) is amended by redesignating subsection (k) as subsection (l) and by inserting after subsection (j) the following new subsection:

"(k) TAXPAYERS ELECTING UNDER SECTION 1391.—In the case of a deficiency attributable to the applicaiton of regulations under section 1394(a) (relating to regulations to prevent avoidance of tax, etc.), such deficiency may be assessed at any time before the expiration of the period within which a deficiency for the last taxable year for which the election by the taxpayer under section 1391 (relating to election of simplified tax) is in effect may be assessed."

(2) LIMITATIONS ON CREDIT OR REFUND.—Section 6511(d) (relating to special rules applicable to income taxes) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(5) SPECIAL PERIOD OF LIMITATIONS WITH RESPECT TO TAXPAYERS ELECTING UNDER SECTION 1391.—If the claim for credit or refund relates to an overpayment attributable to the application of regulations under section 1394(a) (relating to regulations to prevent avoidance of tax), in lieu of the 3-year period of limitations prescribed in subsection (a), the period shall be that period which ends with the expiration of the 15th day of the 40th month following the end of last taxable year for which the election by the taxpayer under section 1391 (relating to election of simplified tax) is in effect."

(g) NONSEPARABILITY OF PROVISIONS.—Notwithstanding section 7852(a) (relating to separability clause), if any provision of the amendments made by this section, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance, is held invalid on constitutional grounds by the Supreme Court of the United States, the amendments made by this section shall have no force or effect, and the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 shall apply as if this section had not been enacted.

(h) TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.

(1) The table of subchapters for chapter 1 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"Subchapter U. Election of Simplified Tax Method."

(2) Section 891 (relating to doubling of rates of tax on citizens and corporations of certain foreign countries) is amended by striking out "and 881" and inserting in lieu thereof "881, and 1392".

SEC. 3. INCREASE OF LIMITATION ON STANDARD DEDUCTION.

The second sentence of section 141(a) (relating to standard deduction) is amended to read as follows:

"The standard deduction shall not exceed $2,000, except that in the case of a separate return by a married individual the standard deduction shall not exceed $1,000."

SEC. 4. MINIMUM STANDARD DEDUCTION.

Paragraph (2) of section 141(c) (relating to minimum standard deduction) is amended to read as follows:

"(2)(A) $300, in the case of a joint return of a husband and wife under section 6013,

"(B) $300, in the case of a return of an individual who is not married, or

"(C) $150, in the case of a separate return by a married individual."

SEC. 5. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendments made by this Act shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1964.

The statement and explanation submitted by Mr. LONG of Louisiana are as follows:

NUMBER OF TAXPAYERS LIKELY TO BE AFFECTED BY DIFFERENT FEATURES OF LONG BILL TOGETHER WITH PROBABLE EFFECT OF THESE FEATURES ON REVENUES

The simplified tax system I proposed last year would have been elected, it was estimated, by only 14,000 taxpayers. It is now estimated that over 300,000 taxpayers would elect the optional rate system I am proposing and that their tax burden would be reduced by about $225 million. In addition, it is estimated that about 2.5 million taxpayers would benefit from the proposed increase of the standard deduction ceiling alone and that the revenue loss attributable to the increase in the standard deduction would be $210 million. Finally it is estimated that 11 million taxpayers would benefit from the increase of the minimum standard deduction and that the revenue cost would be $270 million. When all three features of my proposal are combined, the total tax reduction is estimated to be about $700 million and it is estimated that about 13.8 million taxpayers—28 percent of all the taxpayers—would benefit directly. (These estimates are shown in detail in tables 4 through 7.)

These estimates of losses of revenue due to the Long simplified tax plan as compiled for me by the Treasury Department are necessarily very much on the high side because Treasury officials have not taken into account the increased flow of revenue to the Government as a result of the fact that a considerable number of taxpayers who will elect the simplified tax plan will spend more time earning money and less time concocting tax avoidance arrangements, some of which are uneconomical and contrary to public policy, and all of which cause substantial losses in Government revenue.

Thus it is estimated that about one out of every four taxpayers with adjusted gross incomes of $20,000 or more would elect the simplified optional rate system—about 300,000 taxpayers in all. An additional 114,000 taxpayers with these same incomes would elect to switch to the standard deduction because of the higher ceiling in lieu of itemizing their deductions (see table 6).

Among the middle-income group—those with incomes from $10,000 to $20,000—the optional rate system would benefit very few (only about 10,000 taxpayers), but the proposed increase in the limitation on the standard deduction would aid almost 550,000 taxpayers, or 11 percent of those in that income range who now itemize their deductions, to switch to the simple standard deduction.

Taxpayers with incomes below $10,000 would not benefit from the optional-rate system or the increase in the $1,000 limitation on the standard deduction but as a result of the proposed $100 increase in the minimum standard deduction, about 1 million of such taxpayers would get the benefit of simplification—about 300,000 would switch from itemization to the increased minimum standard deduction and 700,000 others would become nontaxable as a result of the increase in the minimum standard deduction.

In total, about 2 million taxpayers would benefit from simplification by giving up itemization or becoming nontaxable. Moreover, these same 2 million taxpayers and an additional 11.8 million would gain in terms of fairer tax treatment. The latter group includes mostly taxpayers whose income is well below $10,000 and who now claim the minimum standard deduction or the 10-percent standard deduction. It also includes 1.8 million taxpayers most of whose incomes are between $10,000 and $20,000 and who now use the standard deduction. This is the group that is now limited by the $1,000 ceiling on the standard deduction and does not therefore have the opportunity of deducting the full 10 percent of income by electing the standard deduction. In contrast, taxpayers with incomes below $10,000 who claim the standard deduction can deduct the full 10 percent of their income. My proposal would alleviate this restriction and allow all taxpayers with incomes up to $20,000 the full benefit of the 10 percent standard deduction. Those with incomes over $20,000 will generally find the simplified tax system to be a reasonable alternative. Thus, all taxpayers, whatever their income, will be offered a reasonable option to elect a relatively simple tax system.

In addition to those benefited directly by my proposal, it is my belief that all taxpayers will benefit from a sounder, fairer, and simpler tax system and that my proposal represents an important step in that direction. As a student of our tax system, I have become increasingly impressed by the inequity and the complexity of our tax structure, particularly with regard to individuals in upper-income brackets. The difference between high-income taxpayers who do and those who do not pay high effective rates of tax is illustrated in table 8, which compares the type of high-income taxpayer who would not elect the simplified tax method with the type that would. Tables 9 through 11 illustrate the cases of taxpayers with large incomes who have succeeded in keeping their tax liability very low. In some cases, these taxpayers have paid less than 1 percent of their income in Federal taxes. In fact, there are taxpayers who have legally avoided paying any taxes at all, even though their gross income exceeded a million dollars. Tables 9 through 11 also show the situation of other taxpayers with similar amounts of income who pay more than 50 percent of their income in taxes and how this latter group of taxpayers would benefit from my proposal.

Under the simplified tax system I am proposing today, the maximum rate would be 50 percent, and lower rates would be applicable to the first $100,000 of income in the case of a married taxpayer. Nevertheless, it is estimated that about 75 percent of all taxpayers with incomes over $20,000 would not find the simplified system advantageous despite its lower rates. In fact almost 60 percent of taxpayers with incomes over $50,000 would find the present system more advantageous and would not elect the simplified system. (See table 6.) These figures point up clearly, I believe, that most high-income taxpayers find ways to avoid the impact of the present high tax rates. The difference between such high-income taxpayers and those who do pay high effective rates of tax is illustrated in table 13, which compares the type of high-income taxpayer who would not elect the simplified tax method with the type that would.

Additional Reasons for Optional Proposal and Technical Explanation of Certain Aspects

SIMPLIFICATION AND EQUITY

One principal reason for my proposal is that it would greatly simplify the tax law. I recognize, of course, that my amendment will not mean immediate simplification for many taxpayers. However, if it proves successful with respect to the group to which it applies, we will be able to extend its principles to even more taxpayers. In any event, it would reverse the trend to an ever-increasing complexity and show our determination to achieve simplification. It may be objected that, even for the group affected, the program is not a simplification because taxpayers would have to compare their tax under the present system with the tax under the optional program before deciding whether to elect. Thus two computations of tax would be required where one suffices today. This reasoning overlooks the fact that the election is irrevocable for 5 years. Once the election were made, the taxpayer would follow the simple system for the next 4 years without any need for alternative computations.

Everyone is agreed that the standard deduction, introduced in the early 1940's, simplifies the tax system for more than 25 million taxpayers; yet it, too, is elective so that the taxpayer each year must make two computations before he can decide upon his election. Nevertheless, no one would argue that because of this theoretical double computation we should discard the standard deduction.

It should be noted, however, that the standard deduction is effective only for lower income taxpayers because of the $1,000 ceiling. Almost every high-income taxpayer has deductible expenses in excess of $1,000. Thus, the standard deduction is rarely elected by high-income taxpayers. The optional method suggested herein would give high-income taxpayers an option somewhat similar to the standard deduction.

Those who now elect the standard deduction must forego only itemized deductions. Since the optional method would extend relatively greater advantages to high-income taxpayers, they would be required to forego not only itemized deductions but the other tax advantages detailed above.

IMPROVEMENT OF TAXPAYER MORALE

The present high rates, combined with the use of tax-avoidance devices by many very wealthy taxpayers, have led many taxpayers to the conclusion that the tax system is confiscatory and unfair. Others, seeing the preferential treatment accorded certain types of income, have deluged Congress with pleas for special treatment in their own situation. In the light of the present high rates and the unequal treatment of taxpayers with similar amounts of income pointed out above, these pleas have been hard to resist, and the categories of income given favored treatment have expanded. Still other taxpayers, in a silent protest against what they conceive to be an unfair system, have resorted to sharp practices and tax evasion.

The reduction of rates in the Revenue Act of 1964 will do much to alleviate these problems, but we can and should do more. My proposal would make it clear that in no case need a taxpayer pay as much as 50 percent of his income in Federal income taxes. Thus, claims that the Federal Government is a senior partner or that the tax-rate schedule is confiscatory would be stifled and their effect on taxpayers' morale eliminated. Perhaps more importantly, the reduction in the use of tax-avoidance devices, discussed above, would reduce the feeling among many taxpayers that the tax system is inequitable and would minimize the need for, and consequently the incidence of, pleas to extend preferential treatment to new categories of income.

THE 5-YEAR ELECTION

An election to pay tax under the optional program will generally be irrevocable for 5 years. If the election could be changed every year without penalty, it could be abused by taxpayers electing in alternate years and bunching their deductions, tax-exempt interest, and so forth, in years when they do not elect. Thus, they would get the benefit both of the present tax system with its provisions favoring certain types of income and expenditures and the optional method with its low, effective rates. On the other hand, if the election were made effective for all time or for a very long period of time, very few taxpayers would elect because they would be unwilling to commit themselves for so long into the future when their circumstances might very well change. A 5-year election, however, should be long enough to prevent manipulation and yet short enough so that at least some taxpayers would be willing to commit themselves to get the benefit of favorable rates.

In certain limited circumstances the election could terminate in less than 5 years. Thus the election would terminate if the taxpayer married a person who had not elected, if the law were changed so that the optional method became substantially less favorable to electing taxpayers as a group, or if the taxpayer went into bankruptcy or became disabled, so that he no longer received earned income. Moreover, the taxpayer could revoke the election if he found it desirable, provided he recomputed his tax for all prior years covered by that election (i.e., not more than 5 years) as if he had not made the election and provided he paid such recomputed tax plus an additional tax of 5 percent thereof and interest on any deficiency. In such case he would be given credit for any tax paid under the election and therefore might receive a refund.

TAX-EXEMPT INTEREST

A taxpayer who elects the optional program will be required to agree to include in income presently tax-exempt interest on State and local bonds. Taxpayers who do not desire to pay tax on such interest would, of course, not elect the optional program. In view of the number of taxpayers involved, the program should not have a significant impact on the municipal bond market.

MINERAL INCOME

A taxpayer electing under the optional program would be allowed cost depletion but not percentage depletion on mineral income. Thus, he could recover his cost in the mineral property but not anything in excess thereof. In addition, taxpayers who elect would be required to capitalize their intangible drilling costs rather than deduct them as they may do today, in many cases against other ordinary income.

PENSION AND PROFIT-SHARING PLAN CONTRIBUTIONS

Under present law an employee is not taxable when his employer makes contributions on his behalf under a qualified pension or profit-sharing plan. The employee is taxed, however, when the plan distributes his benefits to him. An employee who elects the optional method would be required to include such contributions in income when made—provided his rights under the plan are then nonforfeitable—but he would not be taxable on distributions from the plan to the extent of contributions previously included in his income.

In the case of a self-employed individual who elects the optional method, no deduction would be allowed for contributions for his own benefit under an H.R. 10 pension plan, and, to that extent, he would not be taxable on distributions by the plan.

DEDUCTIONS

Under present law taxpayers are allowed two different types of deductions.

First, adjusted gross income deductions. In computing adjusted gross income, all taxpayers may deduct trade and business expenses, 50 percent of net long-term capital gains, up to $1,000 of net capital losses, expenses attributable to rental property, depreciation and depletion in the case of trust beneficiaries, and contributions to self-employed individuals' pension plans—H.R. 10. In the case of employees only reimbursed expenses and expenses for transportation and travel away from home may be deducted from gross income as business expenses.

Second, taxable income deductions. In computing taxable income, taxpayers may deduct from adjusted gross income personal exemptions and may elect to deduct either the standard deduction or the itemized deductions allowed by the code for expenses which are not deductible in computing adjusted gross income—principally, State and local taxes, interest paid, charitable contributions, medical expenses, casualty losses, alimony, investment expenses, and employee business expenses.

Taxpayers electing the optional method would be allowed only the adjusted gross income deductions, with modifications discussed below. They would not be allowed any taxable income deductions, either itemized deductions or the standard deduction.

In addition to adjusted gross income deductions, taxpayers who elect the simplified tax method would be allowed to deduct all investment expenses, expenses for the production of income, employee business expenses, and alimony. They would also be allowed the deduction for personal exemptions—except the additional personal exemptions for old age and blindness. Electing taxpayers would not, however, be allowed deductions with respect to net long-term capital gains, percentage depletion, intangible drilling expenses, or H.R. 10 pension contributions.

MISCELLANEOUS ADJUSTMENTS

Taxpayers who elect the optional method would be required to include in income some other presently tax-free types of income, such as two-thirds of social security and railroad retirement benefits. (The remaining third of these benefits will continue to be taxfree so that taxpayers may recover their already taxed contributions to the benefit systems.) In addition, there would be included in the income of electing taxpayers the first $200 of dividends now excluded, presently exempt foreign-source income, sick pay, and trust income accumulated for their benefit—or for the benefit of themselves, their heirs, or their appointees. Such taxpayers would not be allowed to take advantage of the dividend credit (eliminated for 1965 and subsequent years by the Revenue Act of 1964) or the retirement income credit. Electing taxpayers would be allowed the benefits of the income-averaging provisions, but these pro- years during which an election is in effect visions would be modified so that income for could not be averaged with income for other years.

TABLE 1.—*Optional rate schedules under the Long proposal and 1965 rate schedules under present law*

Schedule I. Long Proposal: (A) Single Taxpayers Who Do Not Qualify for Rates in Schedules II and III and (B) Married Persons Filing Separate Returns

If the amount of simplified taxable income[1] is—	Then as tax before credit—
Over 0 but over $10,000	Enter 0 plus 20 percent of excess over 0.
Over $10,000 but not over $14,000	Enter $2,000 plus 25 percent of excess over $10,000.
Over $14,000 but not over $18,000	Enter $3,000 plus 30 percent of excess over $14,000.
Over $18,000 but not over $32,000	Enter $4,200 plus 35 percent of excess over $18,000.
Over $32,000 but not over $50,000	Enter $9,100 plus 40 percent of excess over $32,000.
Over $50,000	Enter $16,300 plus 50 percent of excess over $50,000.

Schedule II. Long proposal: (A) Married Taxpayers Filing Joint Returns and (B) Certain Widows and Widowers

If the amount of simplified taxable income[1] is—	Then as tax before credit—
Over 0 but not over $20,000	Enter 0 plus 20 percent of excess over 0.
Over $20,000 but not over $28,000	Enter $4,000 plus 25 percent of excess over $20,000.
Over $28,000 but not over $36,000	Enter $6,000 plus 30 percent of excess over $28,000.
Over $36,000 but not over $64,000	Enter $8,400 plus 35 percent of excess over $36,000.
Over $64,000 but not over $100,000	Enter $18,200 plus 40 percent of excess over $64,000.
Over $100,000	Enter $32,600 plus 50 percent of excess over $100,000.

Schedule III. Long Proposal: Unmarried (or Legally Separated) Taxpayers Who Qualify as Head of Household

If the amount of simplified taxable income[1] is—	Then as tax before credit—
Over 0 but not over $10,000	Enter 0 plus 20 percent of excess over 0.
Over $10,000 but not over $14,000	Enter $2,000 plus 22.5 percent of excess over $10,000.
Over $14,000 but not over $18,000	Enter $2,900 plus 25 percent of excess over $14,000.
Over $18,000 but not over $20,000	Enter $3,900 plus 27.5 percent of excess over $18,000.
Over $20,000 but not over $28,000	Enter $4,450 plus 30 percent of excess over $20,000.
Over $28,000 but not over $32,000	Enter $6,850 plus 32.5 percent of excess over $28,000.
Over $32,000 but not over $36,000	Enter $8,150 plus 35 percent of excess over $32,000.
Over $36,000 but not over $50,000	Enter $9,550 plus 37.5 percent of excess over $36,000.
Over $50,000 but not over $64,000	Enter $14,800 plus 42.5 percent of excess over $50,000.
Over $64,000 but not over $100,000	Enter $20,750 plus 45 percent of excess over $64,000.
Over $100,000 but not over $150,000	Enter $36,950 plus 50 percent of excess over $100,000.

Schedule IV. 1965 Rates Under Present Law: (A) Single Taxpayers Who Do Not Qualify for Rates in Schedules V and VI and (B) Married Persons Filing Separate Returns

If the amount of taxable income[1] is—	Then as tax before credit—
Over 0 but not over $500	Enter 0 plus 14 percent of excess over 0.
Over $500 but not over $1,000	Enter $70 plus 15 percent of excess over $500.
Over $1,000 but not over $1,500	Enter $145 plus 16 percent of excess over $1,000.
Over $1,500 but not over $2,000	Enter $225 plus 17 percent of excess over $1,500.
Over $2,000 but not over $4,000	Enter $310 plus 19 percent of excess over $2,000.
Over $4,000 but not over $6,000	Enter $690 plus 22 percent of excess over $4,000.
Over $6,000 but not over $8,000	Enter $1,130 plus 25 percent of excess over $6,000.
Over $8,000 but not over $10,000	Enter $1,630 plus 28 percent of excess over $8,000.
Over $10,000 but not over $12,000	Enter $2,190 plus 32 percent of excess over $10,000.
Over $12,000 but not over $14,000	Enter $2,830 plus 36 percent of excess over $12,000.
Over $14,000 but not over $16,000	Enter $3,550 plus 39 percent of excess over $14,000.
Over $16,000 but not over $18,000	Enter $4,330 plus 42 percent of excess over $16,000.
Over $18,000 but not over $20,000	Enter $5,170 plus 45 percent of excess over $18,000.
Over $20,000 but not over $22,000	Enter $6,070 plus 48 percent of excess over $20,000.
Over $22,000 but not over $26,000	Enter $7,030 plus 50 percent of excess over $22,000.
Over $26,000 but not over $32,000	Enter $9,030 plus 53 percent of excess over $26,000.
Over $32,000 but not over $38,000	Enter $12,210, plus 55 percent of excess over $32,000.
Over $38,000 but not over $44,000	Enter $15,510, plus 58 percent of excess over $38,000.
Over $44,000 but not over $50,000	Enter $18,990, plus 60 percent of excess over $44,000.
Over $50,000 but not over $60,000	Enter $22,590, plus 62 percent of excess over $50,000.
Over $60,000 but not over $70,000	Enter $28,790, plus 64 percent of excess over $60,000.
Over $70,000 but not over $80,000	Enter $35,190, plus 66 percent of excess over $70,000.
Over $80,000 but not over $90,000	Enter $41,790, plus 68 percent of excess over $80,000.
Over $90,000 but not over $100,000	Enter $48,590, plus 69 percent of excess over $90,000.
Over $100,000	Enter $55,490, plus 70 percent of excess over $100,000.

Footnote at end of table.

TABLE 1.—*Optional rate schedules under the Long proposal and 1965 rate schedules under present law*—Continued

Schedule V. 1965 Rates Under Present Law: (A) Married Taxpayers Filing Joint Returns and (B) Certain Widows and Widowers

If the amount of taxable income [1] is—	Then as tax before credit—
Over 0 but not over $1,000	Enter 0 plus 14 percent of excess over 0.
Over $1,000 but not over $2,000	Enter $140 plus 15 percent of excess over $1,000.
Over $2,000 but not over $3,000	Enter $290 plus 16 percent of excess over $2,000.
Over $3,000 but not over $4,000	Enter $450 plus 17 percent of excess over $3,000.
Over $4,000 but not over $8,000	Enter $620, plus 19 percent of excess over $4,000.
Over $8,000 but not over $12,000	Enter $1,380 plus 22 percent of excess over $8,000.
Over $12,000 but not over $16,000	Enter $2,260 plus 25 percent of excess over $12,000.
Over $16,000 but not over $20,000	Enter $3,260 plus 28 percent of excess over $16,000.
Over $20,000 but not over $24,000	Enter $4,380 plus 32 percent of excess over $20,000.
Over $24,000 but not over $28,000	Enter $5,660 plus 36 percent of excess over $24,000.
Over $28,000 but not over $32,000	Enter $7,100 plus 39 percent of excess over $28,000.
Over $32,000 but not over $36,000	Enter $8,660 plus 42 percent of excess over $32,000.
Over $36,000 but not over $40,000	Enter $10,340 plus 45 percent of excess over $36,000.
Over $40,000 but not over $44,000	Enter $12,140 plus 48 percent of excess over $40,000.
Over $44,000 but not over $52,000	Enter $14,060 plus 50 percent of excess over $44,000.
Over $52,000 but not over $64,000	Enter $18,060 plus 53 percent of excess over $52,000.
Over $64,000 but not over $76,000	Enter $24,420 plus 55 percent of excess over $64,000.
Over $76,000 but not over $88,000	Enter $31,020 plus 58 percent of excess over $76,000.
Over $88,000 but not over $100,000	Enter $37,980 plus 60 percent of excess over $88,000.
Over $100,000 but not over $120,000	Enter $45,180 plus 62 percent of excess over $100,000.
Over $120,000 but not over $140,000	Enter $57,580 plus 64 percent of excess over $120,000.
Over $140,000 but not over $160,000	Enter $70,380 plus 66 percent of excess over $140,000.
Over $160,000 but not over $180,000	Enter $83,580 plus 68 percent of excess over $160,000.
Over $180,000 but not over $200,000	Enter $97,180 plus 69 percent of excess over $180,000.
Over $200,000	Enter $110,980 plus 70 percent of excess over $200,000.

Schedule VI. 1965 Rates Under Present Law: Unmarried (or Legally Separated) Taxpayers Who Qualify as Head of Household

If the amount of taxable income [1] is—	Then as tax before credit—
Over 0 but not over $1,000	Enter 0 plus 14 percent of excess over 0.
Over $1,000 but not over $2,000	Enter $140 plus 16 percent of excess over $1,000.
Over $2,000 but not over $4,000	Enter $300 plus 18 percent of excess over $2,000.
Over $4,000 but not over $6,000	Enter $660 plus 20 percent of excess over $4,000.
Over $6,000 but not over $8,000	Enter $1,060 plus 22 percent of excess over $6,000.
Over $8,000 but not over $10,000	Enter $1,500 plus 25 percent of excess over $8,000.
Over $10,000 but not over $12,000	Enter $2,000 plus 27 percent of excess over $10,000.
Over $12,000 but not over $14,000	Enter $2,540 plus 31 percent of excess over $12,000.
Over $14,000 but not over $16,000	Enter $3,160 plus 32 percent of excess over $14,000.
Over $16,000 but not over $18,000	Enter $3,800 plus 35 percent of excess over $16,000.
Over $18,000 but not over $20,000	Enter $4,500 plus 36 percent of excess over $18,000.
Over $20,000 but not over $22,000	Enter $5,220 plus 40 percent of excess over $20,000.
Over $22,000 but not over $24,000	Enter $6,020 plus 41 percent of excess over $22,000.
Over $24,000 but not over $26,000	Enter $6,840 plus 43 percent of excess over $24,000.
Over $26,000 but not over $28,000	Enter $7,700 plus 45 percent of excess over $26,000.
Over $28,000 but not over $32,000	Enter $8,600 plus 46 percent of excess over $28,000.
Over $32,000 but not over $36,000	Enter $10,440 plus 48 percent of excess over $32,000.
Over $36,000 but not over $38,000	Enter $12,360 plus 50 percent of excess over $36,000.
Over $38,000 but not over $40,000	Enter $13,360 plus 52 percent of excess over $38,000.
Over $40,000 but not over $44,000	Enter $14,400 plus 53 percent of excess over $40,000.
Over $44,000 but not over $50,000	Enter $16,520 plus 55 percent of excess over $44,000.
Over $50,000 but not over $52,000	Enter $19,820 plus 56 percent of excess over $50,000.
Over $52,000 but not over $64,000	Enter $20,940 plus 58 percent of excess over $52,000.
Over $64,000 but not over $70,000	Enter $27,900 plus 59 percent of excess over $64,000.
Over $70,000 but not over $76,000	Enter $31,440 plus 61 percent of excess over $70,000.
Over $76,000 but not over $80,000	Enter $35,100 plus 62 percent of excess over $76,000.
Over $80,000 but not over $88,000	Enter $37,580 plus 63 percent of excess over $80,000.
Over $88,000 but not over $100,000	Enter $42,620 plus 64 percent of excess over $88,000.
Over $100,000 but not over $120,000	Enter $50,300 plus 66 percent of excess over $100,000.
Over $120,000 but not over $140,000	Enter $63,500 plus 67 percent of excess over $120,000.
Over $140,000 but not over $160,000	Enter $76,900 plus 68 percent of excess over $140,000.
Over $160,000 but not over $180,000	Enter $90,500 plus 69 percent of excess over $160,000.
Over $180,000	Enter $104,300 plus 70 percent of excess over $180,000.

[1] Under the Long proposal tax is computed on "simplified taxable income" rather than "taxable income" as under present law. Simplified taxable income includes certain types of income not taxable under present law and is computed without any deduction for personal expenses (interest, taxes, contributions, etc.) and certain other items.

TABLE 2.—*Capital gains, by income levels*

Returns with adjusted gross income of—	Comprise this percentage of all taxpayers—	But receive this percentage of all capital gains
$200,000 and over	0.0096 of 1 percent	16
$100,000 and over	0.04 of 1 percent	24
$50,000 and over	0.2 of 1 percent	35
$10,000 and over	8.7 percent	69
Less than $5,000	57.8 percent	17

Published in Senate Finance Committee's Report on the Revenue Act of 1964, Jan. 28, 1964, p. 162.

TABLE 3.—*Effective tax rates under present law (1965 rates) for high-income taxpayers with low, medium, and high proportions of capital gains*

Adjusted gross income	Tax as percent of total income [1]
High proportion of capital gains:	
$120,000	25.9
$170,000	24.5
$300,000	22.3
$700,000	21.0
$2,000,000	21.4
Medium proportion of capital gains:	
$120,000	29.1
$170,000	29.2
$300,000	28.7
Medium proportion of capital gains—Continued	
$700,000	25.4
$2,000,000	28.0
Low proportion of capital gains:	
$120,000	34.9
$170,000	37.2
$300,000	41.6
$700,000	40.6
$2,000,000	46.4

[1] Total income is adjusted gross income plus capital gains excludable from adjusted gross income.

Table 4.—*Revenue effect of Long proposal*[1]

AGI class	Present law tax	Tax change
Under $10,000	$18,355,000,000	−$270,000,000
$10,000 to $20,000	10,550,000,000	−140,000,000
$20,000 to $50,000	5,785,000,000	−150,000,000
$50,000 and over	4,730,000,000	−145,000,000
Total	39,420,000,000	−705,000,000

[1] Proposal would provide an optional rate schedule, extend the standard deduction ceiling to $2,000, and raise the minimum standard deduction to $400 and $100 for spouse and each dependent.

Table 5.—*Number of tax returns benefiting and revenue loss from the increased standard deduction ceiling of $2,000, increased minimum standard deduction, or optional feature of the Long proposal*

[Number of returns in thousands and dollar amount in millions]

AGI class	Increased ceiling		Increased minimum standard deduction		Option		Long proposal	
	Number of returns[1]	Revenue loss	Number of returns[2]	Revenue loss	Number of returns	Revenue loss	Number of returns	Revenue loss
0 to $10,000	27	(3)	11,000	$270			11,027	$270
$10,000 to $20,000	2,305	$140			10	(3)	2,315	140
$20,000 to $50,000	152	65			240	$85	392	150
$50,000 to $100,000	1	5			55	85	56	90
$100,000 and over	(4)	(3)			8	55	8	55
Total	2,485	210	11,000	270	313	225	13,798	705

[1] Benefiting only from the increased standard deduction ceiling of $2,000.
[2] Benefiting only from raising minimum standard deduction to $400 and $100 for spouse and each dependent. About 700,000 returns would become nontaxable.
[3] Less than $2,500,000.
[4] Less than 500.

Table 6.—*Number of returns benefiting from the increased standard deduction ceiling of $2,000, increased minimum standard deduction or optional feature of the Long proposal*

[Number in thousands]

Adjusted gross income class (thousand)	Number of taxable returns[1] present law	Number benefiting only from ceiling increase		Number benefiting only from increased minimum standard deduction[2]		Number choosing the option		Total Long proposal	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
All returns:									
Under $10	41,621	27	0.1	11,000	26.4			11,027	26.5
$10 to $20	6,709	2,305	34.4			10	0.1	2,315	34.5
$20 to $50	1,042	152	14.6			240	23.0	392	37.6
$50 and over	152	1	.7			63	41.4	64	42.1
Total	49,524	2,485	5.0	11,000	22.2	313	.6	13,798	27.9
Standard deduction:									
Under $10	23,327	25	.1	10,700	45.9			10,725	46.0
$10 to $20	1,762	1,757	99.7			5	.3	1,762	100.0
$20 to $50	98	38	38.8			60	61.2	98	100.0
$50 and over	4	1	25.0			3	75.0	4	100.0
Total	25,191	1,821	7.2	10,700	42.5	68	.3	12,589	50.0
Itemized deductions:									
Under $10	18,294	2	(3)	300	1.6			302	1.7
$10 to $20	4,947	548	11.1			5	.1	553	11.2
$20 to $50	944	114	12.1			180	19.1	294	31.1
$50 and over	148	(4)				60	40.5	60	40.5
Total	24,333	664	2.7	300	1.2	245	1.0	1,209	5.0

[1] At calendar year 1963 levels of income.
[2] Includes 700,000 returns which would become nontaxable.
[3] Less than 0.05 percent.
[4] Less than 500.

Table 7.—*Number of returns benefiting from simplification*

[Number in thousands]

Adjusted gross income class	Number of taxable returns, present law[1]	Number benefiting from ceiling increase		Number benefiting from increased minimum standard deduction[2]		Number benefiting from option		Total, Long proposal	
		Number	Percent of class	Number	Percent of class	Number	Percent of class	Number	Percent of class
Under 10,000	41,621	2	(3)	[2] 300	0.7			[2] 302	0.7
10,000 to 20,000	6,709	548	8.2			10	0.1	558	8.3
20,000 to 50,000	1,042	114	10.9			240	23.0	354	34.0
50,000 and over	152	(4)				63	41.4	63	41.4
Total	49,524	664	1.3	[2] 300	.6	313	.6	[2] 1,277	2.6

[1] At calendar year 1963 levels of income.
[2] Also 700,000 would become nontaxable.
[3] Less than 0.05 percent.
[4] Less than 500.

TABLE 8.—*Example of tax disparity of actual taxpayers and effect of Long proposal*

Item	Present law (1965 rates)		Case B using Long option
	Case A	Case B	
Wages and salaries	$17,708	$201,436	$201,436
Dividends	258,089	30,612	30,612
Interest	69,394		
Capital gains (100 percent) [1]	561,995	4,728	4,728
Other income (net)	28,595	117,548	117,548
Income	935,781	354,324	354,324
Wages and salaries	17,708	201,436	
Dividends less exclusion	257,889	30,512	
Interest	69,394		
Capital gains (50 percent)	286,287	2,364	
Other income (net)	28,595	117,548	
Adjusted gross income	659,873	351,860	

Item	Present law (1965 rates)		Case B using Long option
	Case A	Case B	
Exemptions	$2,400	$3,000	$3,000
Deductions	396,108	23,665	
Contributions	120,330	5,299	
Interest	247,809	937	
Taxes	14,629	13,025	
Medical			
Other	13,340	4,404	
Tax	137,854	198,144	158,262
Tax as percent of income	14.7	55.9	44.7

[1] Includes net short-term gain of $10,579.

TABLE 9.—*Example of tax disparity of actual taxpayers and effect of Long proposal*

Item	Present law (1965 rates)		Case B using Long option
	Case A	Case B	
Wages and salaries		$79,802	$79,802
Dividends	$178,334	302,903	302,903
Interest	80,232		
Capital gains (100 percent)	68,229	418	418
Other income (net)	503		
Income	327,298	383,123	383,123
Wages and salaries		79,802	
Dividends less exclusion	178,184	302,803	
Interest	80,232		
Capital gains (50 percent)	34,906	209	
Other income (net)	503		
Adjusted gross income	293,825	382,814	

Item	Present law (1965 rates)		Case B using Long option
	Case A	Case B	
Exemptions	$600	$3,600	$3,600
Deductions	259,959	6,199	
Contributions	2,338	2,012	
Interest	2,758	326	
Taxes	[1] 233,530	2,660	
Medical			
Other	21,331	1,201	
Tax	12,906	232,048	172,361
Tax as percent of income	3.9	60.6	45

[1] Includes a large amount of State income tax attributable to capital gains in previous year.

TABLE 10.—*Example of tax disparity of actual taxpayers and effect of Long proposal*

Item	Present law (1965 rates)		Case B using Long option
	Case A	Case B	
Wages and salaries	$20,000	$201,916	$201,916
Dividends	76,318	34,994	34,994
Interest	206	1,174	1,174
Capital gains (100 percent)	1,210,426	−4,491	−1,000
Other income (net)	−22,283	345,275	345,275
Income	1,284,667	578,868	582,359
Wages and salaries	20,000	201,916	
Dividends less exclusion	76,218	34,894	
Interest	206	1,174	
Capital gains (50 percent)	605,213	−1,000	
Other income (net)	−22,283	345,275	
Adjusted gross income	679,354	582,259	

Item	Present law (1965 rates)		Case B using Long option
	Case A	Case B	
Exemptions	$1,200	$1,800	$1,800
Deductions	676,419	62,403	
Contributions	463	43,155	
Interest	587,693	3,168	
Taxes	85,401	11,072	
Medical	2,500		
Other	362	5,008	
Tax	265	333,619	272,880
Tax as percent of income	.02	57.6	47

TABLE 11.—*Example of tax disparity of actual taxpayers and effect of Long proposal*

Item	Present law (1965 rates)		Case B using Long option
	Case A	Case B	
Wages and salaries	$28,580	$198,243	$198,243
Dividends	115,675		
Interest	13,367	4,455	4,455
Capital gains (100 percent)	27,584		
Other income (net)	45,703	−4,619	−4,619
Income	230,909	198,079	198,079
Wages and salaries	28,580	198,243	
Dividends less exclusion	115,475		
Interest	13,367	4,455	
Capital gains (50 percent)	13,792		
Other income (net)	45,703	−4,619	
Adjusted gross income	216,917	198,079	

Item	Present law (1965 rates)		Case B using Long option
	Case A	Case B	
Exemptions	$2,400	$600	$600
Deductions	149,820	12,912	
Contributions	63,105	6,050	
Interest	37,237	3,097	
Taxes	17,566	3,764	
Medical	4,207		
Other	27,705		
Tax	24,408	114,687	90,040
Tax as percent of income	10.6	57.9	45.5

TABLE 12

A. Number of returns by effective tax rates based on adjusted gross income by income classes; all returns with adjusted gross income of $500,000 or more, 1959

Adjusted gross income	Total	Effective tax rate (percent)									
		0	0.1 to 9.9	10 to 19.9	20 to 29.9	30 to 39.9	40 to 49.9	50 to 59.9	60 to 69.9	70 to 79.9	80 to 84.9
$500,000 to $749,999	529	3	4	6	34	90	241	73	47	27	4
$750,000 to $999,999	193	2	3	3	9	23	90	36	16	9	2
$1,000,000 to $1,999,999	197	8	1	1	8	22	93	34	17	12	1
$2,000,000 to $4,999,999	64	2			4	6	31	9	6	5	1
$5,000,000 and over	19	5				1	6	3	3	1	
All returns	1,002	20	8	10	55	142	461	155	89	54	8

B. Percentage distribution of effective tax rates based on adjusted gross income by income classes; all returns with adjusted gross income of $500,000 or more, 1959

[In percent]

Adjusted gross income	Median	Total	Effective tax rate (percent)									
			0	0.1 to 9.9	10 to 19.9	20 to 29.9	30 to 39.9	40 to 49.9	50 to 59.9	60 to 69.9	70 to 79.9	80 to 84.9
$500,000 to $749,999	46.0	100	0.6	0.8	1.1	6.4	17.0	45.6	13.8	8.8	5.1	0.8
$750,000 to $999,999	47.5	100	1.0	1.6	1.6	4.7	11.9	46.6	18.7	8.3	4.6	1.0
$1,000,000 to $1,999,999	48.8	100	4.0	.5	.5	4.1	11.2	47.2	17.3	8.6	6.1	.5
$2,000,000 to $4,999,999	47.3	100	3.1			6.3	9.4	48.4	14.1	9.4	7.8	1.5
$5,000,000 and over	46.8	100	26.3				5.3	31.6	15.8	15.8	5.2	
All returns	46.6	100	2.0	.8	1.0	5.4	14.2	46.0	15.5	8.9	5.4	.8

C. Number of returns by effective tax rates based on amended gross income by income classes; all returns with adjusted gross income of $500,000 or more, 1959

Amended gross income [1]	Total	Effective tax rate (percent)									
		0	0.1 to 9.9	10 to 19.9	20 to 29.9	30 to 39.9	40 to 49.9	50 to 59.9	60 to 69.9	70 to 79.9	80 to 84.9
No amended gross income	1	1									
$250,000 to $499,999	4		1		1	1		1			
$500,000 to $749,999	190	1	3	1	17	24	32	50	35	24	3
$750,000 to $999,999	239	1	2	28	100	29	27	22	19	8	3
$1,000,000 to $1,999,999	401	9	3	21	261	27	23	28	16	12	1
$2,000,000 to $4,999,999	130	2	1	8	90	5	7	5	8	4	
$5,000,000 or over	37	6		1	22		2	2	3	1	
All returns	1,002	20	10	59	491	86	91	108	81	49	7

[1] Adjusted gross income amended for each return to include in full capital gains and losses realized in 1959 and exclude capital loss carryover from the preceding 5 years.

D. Percentage distribution of effective tax rates based on amended gross income by income classes; all returns with adjusted gross income of $500,000 or more, 1959

[In percent]

Amended gross income [1]	Median	Total	Effective tax rate (percent)									
			0	0.1 to 9.9	10 to 19.9	20 to 29.9	30 to 39.9	40 to 49.9	50 to 59.9	60 to 69.9	70 to 79.9	80 to 84.9
No amended gross income		100	100.0									
$250,000 to $499,999	32.4	100		25.0		25.0	25.0		25.0			
$500,000 to $749,999	53.0	100	.5	1.5	0.5	8.9	12.6	16.9	26.4	18 4	12.7	1.6
$750,000 to $999,999	28.6	100	.4	.8	11.7	41.9	12.2	11.3	9.2	7.9	3.3	1.3
$1,000,000 to $1,999,999	23.8	100	2.3	.8	5.3	65.1	6.7	5.7	6.9	4.0	2.9	.3
$2,000,000 to $4,999,999	24.6	100	1.5	.8	6.2	69.2	3.9	5.4	3.8	6.1	3.1	
$5,000,000 or over	23.7	100	16.2		2.8	59.4		5.4	5.4	8.1	2.7	
All returns	27.6	100	2.0	.9	5.9	49.0	8.6	9.1	10.8	8.1	4.9	.7

[1] Adjusted gross income amended for each return to include in full capital gains and losses realized in 1959 and exclude capital loss carryover from the preceding 5 years.

Source, table 12: Published in Senate Finance Committee hearings (October 1963), Revenue Act of 1963, pt. 1, pp. 280–281.

TABLE 13.—*Example of tax disparity of illustrative taxpayers with $1,000,000 of income and effect of Long proposal*

	Present law (1965 rates)		Case A using Long option	Case B using Long option
	Case A	Case B		
Wages and salaries	$90,000	$50,000	$90,000	$50,000
Dividends	50,000	150,000	50,000	150,000
Interest (tax exempt)	150,000		150,000	
Capital gains (100 percent)	700,000	100,000	700,000	100,000
Other income (net)	10,000	[1] 700,000	10,000	700,000
Income	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Wages and salaries	90,000	50,000		
Dividends less exclusion	49,800	149,800		
Interest (tax exempt)				
Capital gains (50 percent)	350,000	50,000		
Other income (net)	10,000	700,000		
Adjusted gross income	499,800	949,800		

	Present law (1965 rates)		Case A using Long option	Case B using Long option
	Case A	Case B		
Exemptions	$2,400	$2,400	$2,400	$2,400
Deductions	300,000	30,000		
Contributions	10,000	5,000		
Interest	200,000	2,000		
Taxes	80,000	20,000		
Medical	5,000	2,000		
Other	5,000	1,000		
Tax	[2] 175,000	603,160	481,400	481,400
Tax as percent of income	17.5	60.3	48.1	48.1

[1] Partnership income.

[2] Alternative capital gains tax of 25 percent only.

PRIVATE BILLS AFFECTING TAX POLICY

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, recent events compel me to express my concern that the enactment of certain private legislation may be undermining the integrity of our Federal tax law. This is a matter which I approach with great reluctance, because it involves the responsibility of Congress and congressional committees for assuring even handed treatment for all taxpayers similarly situated.

Several private bills which have recently passed the Congress have had the effect of changing substantive Federal tax rules of general application for the benefit of particular taxpayers. I recognize that private legislation has traditionally provided a means for the redress of grievances growing out of governmental act or omissions for which there is no legal remedy. But in the area of Federal taxes this type of private legislation generally has been restricted to bills which modify procedural requirements of the tax law, such as the statute of limitations, to allow a taxpayer who has made a mistake to correctly compute his tax liability where exceptional extenuating circumstances exist. This is quite different from the recent private bills which establish unique substantive tax rules to which only particular taxpayers are entitled.

It is one thing, for example, to allow a taxpayer to file a claim for refund a few days late because of his serious illness. It would be quite another thing, however, to allow one particular 50-year-old taxpayer to claim all of his medical expenses as a deduction when all other taxpayers under the age of 65 can deduct medical expenses only to the extent they exceed 3 percent of their adjusted gross income.

One recent bill, H.R. 4766, overturned, for the benefit of one particular taxpayer, recent legislation formulated by the Ways and Means Committee and the Finance Committee to solve a difficult problem relating to the computation of percentage depletion in the brick and tile clay industry. Another bill, H.R. 5759, would grant, apparently because of compassionate considerations, a refund of excise taxes on distilled spirits which were destroyed under circumstances which did not qualify for a refund under the general substantive tax rules. A third bill, H.R. 1851, would relieve a taxpayer of his obligation to pay interest at 6 percent per annum on delinquent payments of income tax.

I am not expressing an opinion as to these specific bills. However, I am concerned that at least some of these bills did not receive sufficient consideration from the viewpoint of the tax policy embodied in the substantive tax rules which they overturned.

Until last Wednesday I had not raised objections to any such private legislation. On Wednesday, however, I offered an amendment, which was accepted, to provide capital gain treatment rather than complete tax exemption for a payment for a transfer of all substantial rights to a patent. I did this because it was consistent with general substantive tax rules.

In the future, I hope that it will be possible to have private legislation which has the effect of changing substantive tax rules for particular taxpayers, in addition to being referred to the Judiciary Committee, also referred to the Senate Committee on Finance for its consideration from the standpoint of tax policy.

Relatively few of the total number of taxpayers fail to comply with procedural requirements, but many taxpayers complain of general substantive tax rules as they apply to their particular cases. If one taxpayer is relieved of his obligation to pay interest because his late payments of income tax are due to reasonable cause, why should not all taxpayers who have reasonable cause for their late payments receive similar relief?

If compassionate considerations alone are to justify changing general substantive tax rules for particular taxpayers, our Federal tax law will become riddled with special exceptions based on the particular financial or other circumstances of selected taxpayers, thus resulting in discriminatory tax preferences rather than equity among taxpayers.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of section 3, Public Law 88-606, the Speaker had appointed Mr. ASPINALL, Mr. O'BRIEN of New York, Mr. WHITE, Mr. SAYLOR, Mr. KYL, and Mr. BURTON of Utah as members of the Public Land Law Review Commission on the part of the House.

The message announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H.J. Res. 1192) fixing the time of assembly of the 89th Congress, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 371) establishing that when the two Houses of Congress adjourn on Saturday, October 3, 1964, they stand adjourned sine die, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills:

H.R. 1096. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to cooperate with the State of Wisconsin in the designation and administration of the Ice Age National Scientific Reserve in the State of Wisconsin, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 7348. An act for the relief of Frank B. Rowlett.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF THE SIGNING OF CONFERENCE REPORT ON VETERANS NATIONAL LIFE INSURANCE BILL

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I announce that the conferees have signed the conference report on the veterans' bill, so that there will be a Veterans' Pension Act. The House would expect to act on the report tomorrow. A unanimous consent agreement has been entered into in the House so that the conference report will not have to lie over. I am happy to say that the conference report will make it possible, in view of the very fine provisions enacted by the House and, I believe, improved by the Senate, for 8 million veterans to obtain their national life insurance.

Mr. MORSE. I am delighted to hear the report.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION CONFERENCE REPORT—FUNDS FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SCHOOLS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I rise to make a brief plea for legislative justice—a plea for legislative justice for several thousand little boys and girls in the District of Columbia and for seven thousand young men and women in the District of Columbia; those boys and girls and young men and women attending the elementary and secondary schools in the District of Columbia.

In the haste and under the pressure of seeking to adjourn the Congress, I wish to believe that unwittingly, and without full consideration, this injustice is pending and it is a question now as to whether the Congress of the United States in its wisdom tomorrow will prevent it from becoming a reality. I am making these few brief remarks by way of a plea for legislative justice tonight so that they can be in the RECORD for my friends in the House of Representatives to read tomorrow before they make their final decision in regard to a very serious injustice that would have been involved had we permitted the supplemental appropriation bill as reported to us from the House to be adopted by the Senate tonight.

I would have my friends in the House know the history of the action that was taken by the conference committee of the two Houses on the national education bill—a conference report that was approved by an overwhelming vote in both Houses of the Congress. Only yesterday in the House a motion was made to recommit that conference report and that motion was defeated in the House by a vote of 107 yeas to 236 nays, 87 not voting.

Then a motion was made to approve the conference report on the national defense education bill in the House, and it was passed by a vote of 320 yeas, 20 nays, 2 voting present, and 88 not voting. That conference report included a provision for including the District of Columbia in the impacted area program enjoyed in every State in this Union.

The record of today's discussion on the floor of the Senate on that conference will speak for itself, for speaker after speaker in the Senate praised that conference report.

Mr. President, my distinguished colleague from the State of Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the chairman of the Senate District of Columbia Committee, particularly praised the provision in the report that provided at long last for the inclusion of the District of Columbia in the impacted area program.

But when the supplemental appropriation bill came to the floor of the Senate tonight from the House of Representatives, the senior Senator from Oregon was advised that an exceptionally extraordinary legislative procedure had been followed in the House. The supplemental appropriation bill had been taken back to the floor of the House, and the House had added an amendment on the floor of the House to the supplemental appropriation bill that had the effect of excluding the District of Columbia from any funds to be spent in connection with any impacted area program for the benefit of District of Columbia schools.

That is most unjust. It is very unfair to thousands of boys and girls and young men and women in the District of Columbia to whom we owe the same obligations and responsibilities of making available to them the best education possible that we seek to do, by making available impacted area funds, in every State of the Union.

Go a few miles away to Baltimore, where there are many Federal employee civil servants, just as there are Federal employee civil servants in the State Department, the Labor Department, the Agriculture Department, and every other department of the Federal Government in Washington. Federal employees in Baltimore, Md., are included in the determination of the eligibility of Maryland and that part of Maryland for impacted area funds. One might say, "O Justice, where is thy sting?" If that is justice, then I know not what justice is.

We can go across the Potomac into the State of Virginia, where there are thousands and thousands of Federal employees—office employees—and they are accounted for in the formulation of the formula for funds allowable under the impacted area program for Virginia and those areas of Virginia in which school districts qualify for impacted area funds.

Mr. President, I could take you to State after State—for example, California, with Los Angeles and San Francisco, and other areas in that State—where there are thousands of Federal civil service employees, just as there are in the buildings in Washington, D.C., but those employees are taken account of in determining the impacted area formula that will benefit the boys and girls of California. In my own State and every other State the same situation prevails.

I understand that one of the arguments used for the extraordinary legislative course of action by the House of Representatives tonight was that funds for the school budget for the District of Columbia have already been appropriated.

Mr. President, school district after school district in city after city is waiting tonight for the providing of impacted area funds. They have appropriated their local funds, but they are hoping for and counting upon the availability of impacted area funds.

For some years now, as the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the chairman of the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia, would say if he were standing here with me tonight, he and I and the other members of the District of Columbia Committee have pleaded with the Congress to be fair with the District of Columbia, to stop its discrimination against the schools of the District of Columbia, denying to the District of Columbia the right to participate in the impacted area program.

The argument has always been, "Congress appropriates a budget for the District of Columbia and appropriates funds for the school districts, and that ought to be considered sufficient and final."

Mr. President, that is no justification for denying those little boys and girls and young men and women the same opportunity and advantages, by way of support for their schools, that the boys and girls and young men and women in other parts of the country enjoy.

Let us be frank about it. We always have a very difficult time obtaining a budget and an appropriation for the District of Columbia. As chairman of the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia that has jurisdiction over the schools, I testify here tonight with my right hand raised—and I would be glad to put my left hand on a Bible if one were in front of me—that the Congress has been unfair to the District of Columbia time and time again, year after year, in regard to the amount of money it appropriates for all of the functions of the District of Columbia. Because of its parsimony, the sad fact is that the schools in particular have been denied funds they ought to have had.

I am satisfied, without fear of successful contradiction, the District of Columbia has been denied funds in considerable amounts for purposes for which schools in cities of the same size, under State and city and local school district jurisdiction, have been receiving money. I know of no principle of fair play toward the boys and girls and young men and women of this District that can justify the blow that was struck against them tonight.

If I could get Members of the House and Senate to come with me, as I have gone time and time again, into some of the deplorable, overcrowded, congested schoolrooms in this District, and watch the educational process try to work, I have no doubt that there would be a quick reversal of the action in the House.

Do not forget that these thousands of little boys and girls and young men and women for whose just rights I am pleading tonight are going to be adult citizens tomorrow. What kind of citizens, Mr. President? There is much being said these days about various social and sociological problems in the District of Columbia. We have only ourselves to blame.

Mr. President, we cannot maintain the type of educational facility in the poorer schools of the District of Columbia which the money we included in the National Defense Education Act would have been spent to alleviate and develop good citizens. We cannot have good citizens when in childhood they are put through the inadequate educational processes that little boys and girls in the District of Columbia are being subjected to. We sought to bring some relief in our Education Subcommittee, and provided that relief in the National Defense Education Act.

For the benefit of my friends in the House I wish to tell them the procedure that was followed in the conference that resulted in the House conferees accepting that section in the Senate bill which included the District of Columbia in the Federal impacted area program.

It does not happen to be the case that those of us on the Senate side in the conference are responsible for the final arrangement that was arrived at on this section of the bill.

As I have done before, I again give full credit to the farsightedness of House conferees who had reached the same conclusion that we had reached on the Senate side. Simple justice, fair play, and sound public policy called for the inclusion of the District of Columbia in the Federal impacted area program.

Mr. President, in the years past, one of the most effective opponents of including the District of Columbia in the Federal impacted area program was the distinguished and able Representative, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT]. Let the RECORD be perfectly clear that Representative DENT, more than any other person, deserves credit for proposing in our conference committee that the House recede and accept the Senate's proposal for the inclusion of the District of Columbia in the Federal impacted area program. Representative DENT did not do that on the spur of the moment in the conference room. He had studied this subject for some days before the conference ever started. He told us the story. It is a dramatic story, and the kind of story that should give the American people great respect for, and great confidence in, those who serve them in Congress, who are willing to follow where the facts lead.

Representative DENT studied the educational situation in the District of Columbia and became convinced that what the senior Senator from Oregon has said about the deplorable situation in our poorer schools in the District of Columbia is verified by the facts. Representative DENT then went to the Superintendent of Schools of the District of Columbia, Dr. Hansen, one of the most dedicated school administrators I have ever known. He talked the situation over with the Superintendent of Schools in the District of Columbia. As is pointed out in the conference report filed with the Congress by the House managers of the bill, he arrived at an understanding with Dr. Hansen that the money that would accrue to the school system of the District of Columbia, as the result of being included in the Federal impacted area program, would be spent on the so-called underprivileged schools of the District of Columbia; and he had the assurance that the money would not be going to so-called noneducational expenses, but that the money would be spent for the benefit of these little boys and girls and young men and women who, as I speak here, are enrolled in a school system that makes it necessary for them to go to substandard schools within the boundary of the Capital City of the Nation.

Mr. President, I wish to say to his credit that when Representative DENT made that report in conference, the overwhelming majority of the House conferees agreed to recede and accept the section of the Senate bill that included the impacted area benefits for the District of Columbia.

Mr. President, that was an issue, as the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will show, in the House yesterday when the national defense education bill was passed by the overwhelming vote of 320 to 20, with 2 voting "present," and 88 not voting. That section was in the conference report in the Senate today when it was adopted, following a long discussion, with one favorable speech after another in support of the conference report, and on a voice vote not a dissenting "no" was uttered. The parliamentary situation we find ourselves in is difficult. I do not know how many of the 320 Members of the House who voted for the conference report yesterday were absent today. I am aware that there is a terrific pressure for adjournment. I want to see Congress adjourn. I do not want to see Congress adjourn on the basis of its last act being the committing of a great wrong against thousands of little boys and girls and young men and women. I have a trust, too. I have a trust as a Senator. I have a trust to my colleagues in the Senate, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Education.

I have sought to dedicate myself to that trust over the years. I have no intention of walking out on that trust in the dying hours of this session of Congress because of the great pressure drive to adjourn and go home. I could never live with myself if I yielded to the suggestions that were made to me by some tonight: "Let it go, WAYNE; let it go; we will see what we can do next year."

Next year does not include the benefits of the impacted area program for the assistance of thousands of little boys and girls and young men and women of the District of Columbia for this year.

Mr. President, great intangible values are involved. Precious human values are involved, on which no dollar sign can be placed.

There is also, according to my sights, a great responsibility for doing everything we can to try to get our friends in the House to reconsider its precipitate action and not use an appropriation bill as a vehicle for this type of legislative action, although I have no doubt that, technically, the House is within its legislative rights because this amendment was added on the floor. I am advised that, undoubtedly, it was added on the floor because, had an attempt been made to add it in committee, it would have been subject to a point of order, for it would have been legislation on an appropriation bill, proposed by a committee, not by either body of Congress.

But formalities and technicalities cannot make a wrong right. Legislative formalities and technicalities cannot right an injustice when the major premise is wrong; and the major premise on which, apparently, the House acted is, in my judgment, wrong, for it wrongs human beings; it wrongs human values; it wrongs a group of underprivileged little boys and girls and young men and women for whom we ought to be doing everything we can to help, not harm, not keep down.

Is it a case of our inability to see the human diamonds in our own backyard when in the Senate we vote millions of dollars for educational purposes in one so-called underdeveloped country after another around the world? Although I am one of the opponents of the foreign aid bill on the basis of its present structure, no member of the Committee on Foreign Relations or no Member of the Senate has ever heard the senior Senator from Oregon object to the expenditure of aid funds to help human values abroad; to help educational processes abroad among the underprivileged people of the world, whose minds we are trying to develop and win over to the cause of freedom in order to prevent their being subjected to the slavery of communism.

But should we do less for our own underprivileged? Should we do less for our own underprivileged in the District of Columbia than we are willing to do for little boys and girls and young men and women in the slums and ghettos of Latin America, India, Pakistan, Africa, and southeast Asia? I am at a loss—I have always been at a loss—to understand the attitude of those who think it is fair and right and just to set the District of Columbia aside and say that the wonderful impacted area program for the benefit of children in the areas that qualify under the formula shall be denied to our boys and girls in the District of Columbia, a program made available to boys and girls across the District line in Maryland and Virginia and in every other State.

I do not think the House upon reflection should want its action of tonight to stand. I plead with the House not to let it stand. I plead with the House to give the benefit of the doubt, if there is a doubt—and I am at a loss to understand that doubt—to the little boys and girls and young men and women for whom I have pleaded tonight, for whom we of Congress are solely responsible for sending to poor, inadequate schools in the District of Columbia.

Let Members of the House speak with the Superintendent of Schools in the District of Columbia. Let them hear from Dr. Hansen his plea for the benefit of impacted area funds for those low-standard schools in the District of Columbia as to which he has made the commitment that he will spend the money for educational benefits to the boys and girls and young men and women in those schools.

Let the Members of the House who have any doubts visit those schools and then answer to their own consciences as to whether or not they think they ought to continue to deprive those boys and girls of the opportunities for the better education that would accrue to them if the District of Columbia were brought within the impacted area program.

I make a plea also to the leadership of the House to bring back its membership—not merely a quorum. The people of America are entitled to have the membership of the House pass on the question of protecting human values. I make a plea to the leadership in the Senate to bring back the Senate—not merely a quorum, not merely a bare 51, such as we had this afternoon. We now have a question of human values that transcends the interests of Members of Congress in either going home or staying home.

We have had raised by this parliamentary maneuver the great question of fulfilling our legislative trust, not by a bare quorum of the two Houses, but by the full membership of both Houses. I feel very deeply on this question. I know the situation in regard to the educational need in the District for the thousands of little boys and girls and the young men and women for whose educational interests I have pleaded tonight. I shall do my very best tomorrow to try to bring about a full attendance of Senators, if that becomes necessary, for final action on this question of human need.

TRANSACTION OF ADDITIONAL ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following additional routine business was transacted:

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. MANSFIELD (for Mr. JOHNSTON), from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service: Nine postmaster nominations.

(NOTE.—The confirmation of the above nominations appears under a separate heading.)

ADDITIONAL BILLS INTRODUCED

Additional bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CHURCH (for himself and Mr. JORDAN of Idaho):

S. 3249. A bill to require fresh potatoes purchased or sold in interstate commerce to be labeled according to the State in which such potatoes were grown; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana:

S. 3250. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an optional simplified tax method, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. LONG of Louisiana when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move, pursuant to the order previously entered, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 10 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.) the Senate, under the order previously entered, adjourned until tomorrow, Saturday, October 3, 1964, at 11 o'clock a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate October 2, 1964:

United Nations

Mrs. Marietta P. Tree, of New York, to be the Representative of the United States of America on the Trusteeship Council of the United Nations, vice Sidney R. Yates resigned.

The following-named persons to be Representatives and Alternate Representatives of the United States of America to the 19th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations:

To be representatives

Adlai E. Stevenson, of Illinois.

Russell B. Long, U.S. Senator from the State of Louisiana.

Frank Carlson, U.S. Senator from the State of Kansas.

William C. Foster, of the District of Columbia.

Francis T. P. Plimpton, of New York.

To be alternate representatives

Charles W. Yost, of New York.

Franklin H. Williams, of California.

Mrs. Gladys A. Tillett, of North Carolina.

Richard N. Gardner, of the District of Columbia.

Charles F. Noyes, of New York.

Diplomatic and Foreign Service

The following-named persons, now Foreign Service officers of class 2 and secretaries in the diplomatic service, to be also consuls general of the United States of America:

John W. Bowling, of Texas.

Robert A. Hurwitch, of Illinois.

John A. Lacey, of Ohio.

Walter J. Mueller, of Connecticut.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 3, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Robert L. Walkinshaw, of Connecticut.

Thomas E. Walsh, of Rhode Island.

John C. Weisert, of Illinois.

Robert L. Dowell, Jr., of Florida, for appointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 4, a consul, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

Richard Noyes Viets, of Texas, for appointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 6, a vice consul of career, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 7, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

G. Paul Balabanis, of California.

Frank B. Crump, of New York.

Michael A. Davila, of Texas.

Robert W. DuBose, Jr., of California.

James J. Gormley, of New York.

Allen S. Greenberg, of the District of Columbia.

Richard A. Hollowaty, of California.

Coleman J. Nee, of Massachusetts.

Arnold P. Schifferdecker, of Missouri.

William Seth Shepard, of New Hampshire.

Theodore L. Smith, of New York.

Donald E. J. Stewart, of the District of Columbia.

Peter O. Suchman, of New York.

Walter Frederick Weiss, of California.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 8, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

James A. Allitto, of California.

Miss Elizabeth A. Bean, of Connecticut.

Joseph F. Becelia, of New York.

Miss Mary Rose Brandt, of Oregon.

David G. Brown, of Pennsylvania.

Donald E. Crafts, of Georgia.

Miss Mary A. Hartl, of Minnesota.

Frederick H. Hassett, of Missouri.

H. Kenneth Hill, of California.

Stuart H. Lippe, of Michigan.

James E. McGee, of California.

James Hamilton McNaughton, of New York.

Wilson A. Riley, Jr., of Connecticut.

Peter G. Smith, of Michigan.

Robert F. Starzel, of Vermont.

James Tarrant, of California.

The following-named Foreign Service Reserve officers to be consuls of the United States of America:

Heath Bowman, of Florida.

Marvin E. Brenner, of Pennsylvania.

Louis V. Ebert III, of Illinois.

Paul I. Loeb, of the District of Columbia.

James E. Markey, Jr., of Illinois.

Gordon W. Murchie, of California.

Frank Rettenberg, of New York.

Samuel R. Sanders, Jr., of Virginia.

Cecil L. Sanford, Jr., of North Carolina.

Charles G. Simmons, of Virginia.

Justin Sloane, of California.

G. Scott Sugden, of Maine.

The following-named Foreign Service Reserve officers to be vice consuls of the United States of America:

Kent B. Crane, of Virginia.

Miss Joan Edmonds, of California.

Belmont F. Haydel, Jr., of Louisiana.

Calvin L. Thomas, Jr., of Virginia.

The following-named Foreign Service Reserve officers to be vice consuls and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

James M. Fernald, of New Jersey.

John D. Folger, of the District of Columbia.

Paul G. Nyhus, of the District of Columbia.

The following-named Foreign Service Reserve officers to be secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Alexander Akalovsky, of Maryland.

Stephen W. Baldanza, New Jersey.

David Chavchavadze, of Massachusetts.

Earl Norbert Garrett III, of Virginia.

Francis J. Hazard, of Tennessee.

Henry K. Heuser, of Maryland.

Adolf J. Lium, of the District of Columbia.

Keith L. MacPhee, of Virginia.

Timothy A. Pfeiffer, of Maine.

Thomas E. Sawyer, of Virginia.

F. William Small, of California.

Michael Tanes, of Massachusetts.

George J. Stanger, of New York, a Foreign Service Staff officer, to be a consul of the United States of America.

Postmasters

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ARKANSAS

Dee R. Robbins, Norman, Ark., in place of N. W. Smith, retired.

CALIFORNIA

Maurice E. Ball, Fillmore, Calif., in place of J. K. Schwartz, retired.

Robert S. Gleason, Oceanside, Calif., in place of F. H. Lauraine, retired.

COLORADO

Barbara M. Spencer, Ouray, Colo., in place of M. H. McCullough, retired.

FLORIDA

Wilton P. Banks, Pompano Beach, Fla., in place of W. W. Parrish, deceased.

GEORGIA

Lowell D. Morgan, Springfield, Ga., in place of R. R. Beckwith, retired.

ILLINOIS

Martha K. Webster, Palatine, Ill., in place of C. J. O'Hara, resigned.

INDIANA

Howard Schwartz, Craigville, Ind., in place of J. L. Wasson, retired.

KANSAS

Roger K. Perry, Saint Marys, Kans., in place of Jeannette Byrnes, retired.

MISSISSIPPI

Mahala Avis Ferriss, Bentonia, Miss., in place of M. H. Martin, transferred.

John D. Rosamond, Gholson, Miss., in place of L. C. Skipper, Jr., declined.

Hayden L. Martin, Pittsboro, Miss., in place of L. R. Beckett, retired.

MISSOURI

William J. Blanton, Norwood, Mo., in place of J. H. Richardson, retired.

NEBRASKA

Robert D. Nealon, Wolbach, Nebr., in place of H. E. Berney, retired.

NEW JERSEY

Helen B. Milne, Elwood, N.J., in place of E. F. Bozarth, retired.

NEW YORK

William M. Fleckenstein, Colden, N.Y., in place of G. W. Miller, retired.

Lachlan Thomson, Pawling, N.Y., in place of F. J. Clum, retired.

Earl E. Gordon, Pomona, N.Y., in place of M. N. Lynch, retired.

Willard H. Aubrey, Rouses Point, N.Y., in place of H. D. Ashline, retired.

OHIO

Frank Dobrozsi, Middletown, Ohio, in place of L. M. Taylor, resigned.

H. W. Kinney, Richmond, Ohio, in place of E. L. Clare, resigned.

OKLAHOMA

William W. Tripp, Blair, Okla., in place of F. H. Hawkins, retired.

Cecil L. Brandly, Oakwood, Okla., in place of C. A. Shaw, retired.

Beatrice H. Jones, Porter, Okla., in place of Evah Kirksey, retired.

VERMONT

James D. O'Brien, Shelburne, Vt., in place of E. T. Sevee, deceased.

In the Coast Guard

The following officers of the Coast Guard for promotion to the grade of lieutenant (junior grade):

Thomas P. McCann
Gerald F. Woolever
David R. Zwick
Nelson H. Keeler, Jr.
James L. Webster
Harry T. Suzuki
Kevin T. Clancy
Robert A. Major
Carl R. Mockler
Warren D. Snider
Robert L. Vance, Jr.
Gill R. Goodman
Howard B. Gehring
Richard L. De Vries
Thomas D. Fisher
James W. Fry, Jr.
Nelson W. Koscheski, Jr.
George J. Buffleben, Jr.
Robert P. Dickenson
Billy W. Richardson
Robert E. Leggett
David J. Connolly
Robert L. Kuhnle
Virgil F. Keith, Jr.
Harry D. Nelson
Karl L. Reichelt
Richard A. Walsh
William B. Waff
John E. Lindark
Robert W. Burchell
Arthur E. Katz
Harvey F. Orr
John R. Yetke, Jr.
Andrew F. Durkee, Jr.
Wayne K. Hodsen
Stephen T. Ulmer
David A. Young
James J. Lantry
Dan A. Nauman
Kent M. Ballantyne
Philip R. North
Raymond H. Canada, Jr.
Charles B. Mosher
George K. Brown III
John W. Gresson
Kurt L. Elste
Dennis J. Brady
Ray A. Heller
Robert G. Bates
Rudy K. Paschel
James F. Dewey
Robert E. Fenton
Michael J. Jacobs
William M. Baxley
Jerome P. Mullins
William A. Caster
Arthur E. Shepard
Peter C. Busick

Ronald O. MacFee
William D. Bechtel
David T. Machmer
Daniel K. Shorey
Jeffrey D. Hartman
Ernst M. Cummings
James A. Murray, Jr.
Denis J. Bluett
Robert M. Pockman
Edward E. DeMuzzio
John D. Adams
Jan F. Smith
Michael Burdian
Michael P. Studley
Michael E. Greene
David C. Brostrom
Charles E. Haas
Stephen J. Ratey, Jr.
James D. Boyce
Danna W. Starkweather
Roger W. Hassard
David L. Andrews
James F. McCahill, Jr.
Barham F. Thomson III
Murray J. Towle
Nicholas H. Allen
Richard J. Heym
Anthony R. Adams
William A. Monson
Roger L. Beving
James C. Haldeman
Karl W. Mirmak
Forrest F. Fursus, Jr.
Norman J. Cross
James L. Mapel
Gerald "D" Mills
Lyman B. Norton
Lynn M. Brown
Phillip J. Kies
Monette B. J. Ratcliff
Virgil J. O'Grady
Edwin F. Chase, Jr.
Dale W. Johnson
Charles L. Gomez
Jacob P. Aucoin, Sr.
John McDonald
Howard H. Lindsay
Thomas E. Brown

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States to the grades indicated under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284, 3306, and 3307:

To be major generals, Medical Corps

Maj. Gen. George Merle Powell, O19340, Army of the United States (brigadier general, Medical Corps, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Henry Schuldt Murphey, O19338, Medical Corps, U.S. Army.

To be brigadier generals, Medical Corps

Brig. Gen. William Donald Graham, O20067, Army of the United States (colonel, Medical Corps, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Douglas Blair Kendrick, Jr., O20511, Army of the United States (colonel, Medical Corps, U.S. Army).

Col. Norman Everett Peatfield, O21027, Medical Corps, U.S. Army.

To be brigadier general, Veterinary Corps

Col. Stephen Greive Asbill, O21471, Veterinary Corps, U.S. Army.

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States to the grades indicated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3442 and 3447:

To be major generals, Medical Corps

Brig. Gen. Henry Schuldt Murphey, O19338, Medical Corps, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. Byron Ludwig Steger, O19661, Medical Corps, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. James Thomas McGibony, O20406, Army of the United States (colonel, Medical Corps, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Conn Lewis Milburn, Jr., O20405, Army of the United States (colonel, Medical Corps, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Laurence Addison Potter, O22294, Army of the United States (colonel, Medical Corps, U.S. Army).

To be brigadier generals, Medical Corps

Col. Frederic John Hughes, Jr., O26370, Medical Corps, U.S. Army.

Col. Philip Wallace Mallory, O20916, Medical Corps, U.S. Army.

Col. Oscar Elliott Ursin, O21687, Medical Corps, U.S. Army.

Col. Richard Irving Crone, O21727, Medical Corps, U.S. Army.

Col. Glenn Jesse Collins, O22687, Medical Corps, U.S. Army.

Col. Colin Francis Vorder Bruegge, O26958, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, Medical Corps, U.S. Army).

Col. George Joseph Hayes, O57388, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U.S. Army).

IN THE NAVY

The following-named officers of the U.S. Navy for temporary promotion to the grade of commander, in the line, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Ackerman, Eugene B.
Ackley, Richard T.
Agnew, Richard S.
Allen, Richard P.
Allison, Paul
Allmann, Richard R.
Ambrose, John E.
Anderson, Robert G.
Andresen, Ronald N.
Andrews, Jack B.
Andry, Walter G.
Angleman, Cornell C.
Anthony, John D., Jr.
Archer, Martin D.
Armstrong, Robert P.
Arnold, Henry D.
Arnold, William S. M.
Ashworth, Albert R., Jr.
Aslund, Roland E.
Aumack, Robert F.
Austin, Fuller A.
Awalt, Thomas Y., Jr.
Axell, Charles L.
Ayres, William H., Jr.
Baarstad, David E.
Bacheller, Frank E.
Backstrom, Robert I.
Bading, Herman M.
Baggett, Lee, Jr.
Bailey, Henry G.
Bailey, Richard T.
Bailey, William C.
Baker, Norman K.
Bare, Keith R.
Barkalow, Gerald H.
Barker, Franklin H.
Barker, Raymond H.
Barnard, Robert W.
Barnette, Curtis L.
Barrineau, Edwin
Barron, Joseph M.
Bates, George M.
Baty, Edward M.
Bauerlein, Leo P.
Bauernfeind, Joseph H.
Baysinger, Reaves H., Jr.
Beatty, William F.
Beck, Frederick E., Jr.
Beeler, James W.
Beesley, David L.
Beesley, Howard L.
Bell, James R.
Bellar, Fred J., Jr.
Belter, Robert H.
Benn, Joseph W., Jr.
Bennett, Robert E.
Bennie, Ralph F.
Berglund, Rex R.
Bergstrom, James H.
Berthier, Neil E.
Bigley, Thomas J.
Billings, Randall K.
Bircher, William B.
Blaha, Albert J.
Blalock, David H., Jr.
Block, Peter F.
Bloomfield, Rollin W.
Boeing, Charles E.
Bogart, Tudor M.
Boggs, Gilbert A.
Borlaug, Paul V.
Born, Waldo L.
Bortner, James A.
Boston, Leo
Boyd, David S.
Bradfield, James
Bradford, John W., Jr.
Bramley, Leslie G.
Branch, Alvin D.
Brand, Alvin
Brandenburg, Delbert E.
Branson, John J., Jr.
Brick, John H.
Bristol, Edward R., Jr.
Brook, William N., Jr.
Brown, Charles O.
Brown, Charles D.
Brown, James B.
Brown, James W.
Bruce, Forrest T.
Bruck, Thomas J.
Brumbach, Lawrence E.
Bryan, Paul E., Jr.
Buck, Roger L.
Burden, James D.
Burnett, James C.
Burt, Alexander R., Jr.
Bustard, Francis W.
Buteau, Bernard L.
Byron, Herbert I.
Byron, John B.
Cady, John P., Jr.
Caglione, Joseph, Jr.
Cahill, John W., Jr.
Caldwell, Ronald H.
Cameron, Allan K., Jr.
Campbell, James S.
Campbell, Richard B.
Canaan, Gerald C.
Carberry, James P., Jr.
Cariker, Jess L., Jr.
Carius, Robert W.
Carlton, George A.
Carpenter, Malcolm S.
Carr, William K.
Carroll, John H., Jr.
Carter, Earl L.
Carter, Frank R.
Casey, Edward J., Jr.
Cassilly, Frank R.
Catterlin, Samuel F.
Cawley, Thomas J.
Cedarburg, Owen L.
Chadwick, Daniel
Chambers, John J.
Chanaud, Henry L.
Chapman, George T., Jr.
Choyce, Charles V.
Christensen, Charles S., Jr.
Church, Clifford E., Jr.
Clark, Fred P., Jr.
Clark, Willard H., Jr.
Clarkson, Charlie J., Jr.
Clemens, Porter E.
Cochran, James A.
Coffman, Walter W.
Cogdell, John B.
Cole, Charles W.
Coleman, Frank S.
Coleman, Gerard G.
Colleary, John E., Jr.
Colvin, Robert D.
Comstock, George F., Jr.
Conkey, Carlton G.
Connolly, Robert D.
Cook, Richard M.
Coontz, Robert J.
Cooper, David L.
Cooper, Stanley G.
Cordray, Richard P.
Cornett, Francis E.
Cossaboom, William M., II
Costello, Daniel J.
Costello, Peter M., Jr.
Coughlin, John T.
Covington, Gerald E.
Cowhill, William J.
Cowperthwaite, John K.
Cramblet, Frank
Crangle, Richard H.
Crawford, Donald H.
Crosby, Howard S.
Crow, Edwin M.
Crowl, Otho W.
Cruse, Donald A.
Cunningham, Russell P., Jr.
Dauber, Robert A.
Daum, Theodore E.
Davey, Richard B.
Davidson, Harrison W., Jr.
Davidson, Richard S.
Davis, Allen B.
Davis, Jack W.
Davis, Thomas E.
Day, Lawrence C.
Debold, Joseph F.
Dellinger, Chesley Y., Jr.
Delozier, Richard G.
Demers, William H., II
Denmark, George T.
Dennis, Edwin L., Jr.
Dewey, William E.
Dickins, Richard A.
Diehl, William F.
Doak, Samuel L.
Doan, Richard C.
Draddy, John M.
Dreesen, Robert F.
Driscoll, Jerome M.
Driscoll, William T., Jr.
Dufort, Emile J., Jr.
Duggan, Frederick F., Jr.
Duggan, Richard W., II
Duncan, Richard D.
Dunnan, Neville D.
Dunning, Frederick S., Jr.
Eagye, Thomas R., II
East, George W.
Eckerd, George E.
Eckert, Earl J., Jr.
Edwards, Frederick A., Jr.
Elliott, James D.
Ellison, Leroy S.
Ellsworth, William A.
Emerson, David F.
Emlet, Harold B.
Engel, Paul H.
Engle, Raymond E.
Epps, Charles W.
Erikson, Warren W.
Estes, Windom L.
Fahland, Frank R.
Falkenstein, Rudolph F.
Farrell, John B.
Farrell, John R.
Farris, Frederick A.
Faulkenberry, Virgil T.
Feagin, Frederick K.
Fears, Donald C.
Featherston, Frank H.
Feeney, Harold
Fenno, Eric N.
Ferrucci, David E.
Finley, Alden G.
Finley, Hugh D.
Fleming, Francis L., Jr.
Fletcher, James L.
Flynn, Richard E.
Foley, Sylvester R., Jr.
Forbes, Donald K.
Forster, William G.
Foster, James R.
Foster, Raymond H.
Foucht, Richard A.
Fox, Albert D.
Fox, Richard T.
Frassa, Donald G.
French, Robert D.
Freytag, David R.
Friesen, Edwin J.
Frosio, Robert C.
Frudden, Mark P.
Gaddis, George E.
Garland, Earl E.
Garland, John C.
Gates, David E.
Geist, Richard A.
Geitz, Kenneth L.
Gercken, Otto E.
Gibbons, Paul C., Jr.
Giles, Claude F.
Gilpin, Burton H.
Gire, Larold W.
Gobble, George F.
Goewey, William I.
Goldbeck, Lewis H., Jr.
Goldman, Howard A.
Goode, Martin
Gooding, Niles R., Jr.
Goodwin, Edmund E.
Greer, James C.
Gregory, George T.
Grigg, William H.
Grimm, William F.
Groff, Bruce F.
Grosvenor, Alexander G. B.
Grunwald, Edward A.
Gureck, William A.
Hage, Lealand P.
Hall, Berkeley W.
Halleland, Henry L.
Hamer, Robert R., Jr.
Hamill, Jerome E.
Hamilton, Donald C.
Hamm, Warren C., Jr.
Hanlon, Kevin
Hanson, Carl T.
Hardgrave, James B.
Hardy, Martin E.
Harkness, Vinton O., Jr.
Harris, John
Harris, Richard D.
Harris, Robert D., Jr.
Hart, George L.
Hartshorn, David L.
Harty, Thomas G.
Haselton, Waring B., Jr.
Hawkins, Larry L.
Hawkins, William H.
Hayes, Stanley M.
Hays, Ronald J.
Heerwagen, David D.
Hegrat, Donald M.
Heininger, Howard G., Jr.
Hemann, John W.
Henderson, Stanley W.
Henry, Martin H.
Hickey, Charles F.
Hicks, Lawrence F.
Highberg, Roy W.
Hill, Allen E.
Hilscher, Carl C.
Hirstein, Robert V.
Hoare, Robert E.
Hofer, Frank N., Jr.
Hoffman, Robert D.
Hofford, John L.
Hofstra, Edward J.
Hofto, Leslie C.
Hohn, Henry E.
Holman, Rockwell
Holmes, John S.
Hoover, Matthew V.
Hopkins, Clifford D.
Hopkins, Mark, Jr.
Horan, John E., Jr.
Hornbeck, Donald R.
Hosemann, Leland J.
Hotes, John L.
Howell, Joe P., Jr.
Hower, Floyd E., Jr.
Hubbard, Donald
Huff, Mahlon S.
Hughes, Frank W., Jr.
Hughes, Ray S.
Hughes, Wayne L.
Hugo, William P.
Hunsley, Lindel A., II
Hussmann, Harry L., III

Huth, Ralph L.
Iredale, John P.
Jacobssen, George E., Jr.
Jarrell, Donald L.
Jeffries, Claude E., Jr.
Jenista, James F., Jr.
Jensen, Arlo J.
Jensen, Donald L.
Jensen, Wayne L.
Jepson, John A.
Johnson, Daniel C.
Johnson, Homer R.
Johnson, Ian J.
Johnson, Merlin L.
Johnson, Neal J.
Johnson, Phillip T.
Johnson, Robert W.
Johnson, Willard E.
Johnston, Richard C.
Jones, Cecil B., Jr.
Jones, John P.
Jones, Ray P.
Jones, Stanley W.
Jordan, Watt W., Jr.
Kaiser, Robert D.
Kamrad, Joseph G.
Kaufman, Norman L.
Kaufman, Richard F.
Kaune, James E.
Kay, Howard N.
Kays, Jack C.
Kearney, John R.
Keller, Robert G.
Kelly, Ronald T.
Kelly, William P., Jr.
Kempf, Cecil J.
Kennedy, James R., Jr.
Kernan, William H.
Ketchmark, Giles J.
Kidd, Owen A.
Kiehl, William A.
Kiker, Herbert W., Jr.
King, Robert A.
Kingsbury, Ben P.
Kirkhorn, Robert L.
Kirkpatrick, Darrell F.
Kivlen, Alexander L.
Kjeldgaard, Peter D.
Klemm, Wilbur C.
Kluga, Norbert R.
Knoizen, Arthur K.
Kolstad, Tom I.
Kost, John D., Jr.
Kozman, Robert J.
Kremer, George
Krantzman, Harry M.
Kraus, Rudolf L.
Kreinberg, Alfred G.
Kremer, John L.
Kretchman, Frank C.
Krohn, Stanley W.
Laney, Edward V., Jr.
Lasell, Max H.
Lasley, William W.
Lassen, William V.
Lassiter, Will E.
Lawrence, Gregory E., Jr.
Lawrence, John V., Jr.
Lawrence, William P.
Leary, Ramon W.
Ledew, Thomas A.
Lee, Byron A.
Lehman, Donald A.
Lemon, Robert T.
Leser, John R.
Lester, Louis R., Jr.
Leue, David E.
Lewis, Daniel A.
Linder, James B.
Lintner, Richard W.
Lisanby, James W.
Lockwood, Harold R.
Lofton, Edgar K., Jr.
Lombard, Richard L.
Long, Charles R.
Longino, Hugh E., Jr.
Loomis, Aubrey K.
Lorfano, Joseph J., Jr.
Loux, Raymond E.
Lovata, Albert F.
Lovelace, Robert H.
Lovell, James A., Jr.
Lund, John D.
Lynam, Donald M.
Lyne, George C.
Lytle, James H.
MacDowell, Charles R.
MacKell, Richard A.
Mackenzie, John D.
Mackey, Robert R.
Madera, Harry P.
Madison, Douglas W.
Magee, Jack E.
Mahon, Richard B.
Maier, Charles W., Jr.
Maire, Rex E.
Majesky, John E.
Malloy, John E.
Mandeville, Robert C., Jr.
Mann, Earl
Manning, Richard T.
Mantz, Roy T.
Marcellus, Russell A.
Marlin, Hubert A.
Martin, Richard W.
Massa, Emiddio
Mathis, Paul J.
Matson, Willis A., II
Mauney, Thomas C.
Mayer, Donald R.
Mayer, Joseph C.
Mayo, William H.
McAnulty, Robert M., Jr.
McArthur, John C.
McArthy, Richard L.
McAvenia, James F., Jr.
McClain, Kirby L., III
McClaran, Stephen W.
McClure, James R.
McCoy, Joseph C., Jr.
McDonald, Robert P.
McFall, Albert D.
McGarrah, William E., Jr.
McGinnis, Ted R.
McGlaughlin, Thomas H.
McIntyre, Andrew
McJunkin, Russel E., Jr.
McKay, Robert B.
McKnight, Jesse E., Jr.
McLoughlin, Howard T.
McNabb, Joseph M.
McNally, John J., Jr.
McNulty, Gerald
McQuiston, Edward I., Jr.
McVoy, James L.
Mealy, Daniel N.
Meek, Donald B.
Messner, James R.
Michaud, Robert A.
Miguel, Theodore, Jr.
Miller, Adair
Miller, Raymond L.
Miller, Richard A.
Miller, William A.
Mills, Joseph E.
Minkkinen, Erkki O.
Minnis, Marion L., Jr.
Moberly, Arthur L.
Moberly, Richard O., Jr.
Modeen, Donald O.
Mohr, Charles H.
Molzan, Edward W.
Montague, Lloyd L.
Moore, Lundi A.
Moore, Roderick B.
Moore, William F.
Moors, Donald E.
Morin, Gene D.
Morrison, Lewis E.
Morrissey, John N.
Muck, Floyd R.
Mull, Charles L., II
Mulligan, James A., Jr.
Murphy, Frank M., Jr.
Myatt, Bert, Jr.
Myer, George W.
Neander, Stanley B.
Neiger, Ralph E.
Nelson, George G.
Nelson, Marvin D., Jr.
Nelson, Robert L.
Netro, Robert J.
Newark, Theodore E.
Newman, Fred S.
Newman, James F.
Nicholson, Richard E.
Nicholson, Jerome E.
Noble, Robert E.
Noble, Thomas I.
Nordan, Emile E.
Norton, Curtis R., Jr.
Notz, Robert C.
Nussbaumer, John J.
Nutt, Thomas O., Jr.
Oakes, Raymond H.
O'Brien, John W.
O'Brien, Charles J., Jr.
O'Connor, Francis E.
O'Donnell, George J., Jr.
O'Drain, John E.
Odrobina, Stephen R.
Ohlrich, Walter E., Jr.
O'Neill, Thomas F., Jr.
Orem, Charles A.
Otten, Henry E.
Ottensmeyer, Robert M.
Page, George L.
Palmer, Gary H.
Palmquist, John R.
Parce, James R.
Parode, Harlan D.
Parrish, William I.
Pausner, Joseph J., Jr.
Pearson, George R. M.
Pelton, Eugene A.
Pelton, Robert L.
Pennington, Otis C.
Pester, Fred J.
Peters, Ralph C., Jr.
Petersen, Donald E.
Pettit, Royce E., Jr.
Pezzei, Engelbert G.
Pfeiffer, King W.
Phillips, Charles T.
Phillips, Edward G.
Phillips, Lawrence E.
Pickering, Richard C.
Pinzel, Lawrence E.
Platte, William A.
Platzek, Eugene H.
Polgar, Paul S.
Portnoy, Howard R.
Potts, Bobby L.
Pouliot, Jean R.
Powell, James R., Jr.
Preston, Frank W.
Preston, Joseph M., Jr.
Price, Byron
Pride, Alfred M.
Profilet, Leo T.
Pullar, Andrew, Jr.
Purdy, Harlan R.
Putnam, Charles L.
Quaid, Marvin M., Jr.
Quigley, Donovan B.
Quinn, Jack Q.
Radcliffe, Roderick T.
Ralston, John, Jr.
Rasmussen, James P., Jr.
Rau, William F.
Reavis, Jackson B.
Redmond, John G.
Reed, Robert K.
Reed, Sherman C.
Reichl, Charles J.
Resek, Lawrence H.
Reynolds, Kenneth C.
Richards, William L., Jr.
Ripley, Robert K.
Risser, James B.
Roberts, Gerald G.
Robertson, John W.
Robisch, Herbert E.
Rockwell, Frank A.
Rogers, Thomas S., Jr.
Rosendahl, Edmund I.
Rosenquist, Donald E.
Ross, Thomas H.
Roth, Franklin H.
Rowe, John D.
Rubey, Ervin B., Jr.
Ruble, Byron C.
Rulis, Robert A.
Rumble, Maurice W.
Rutledge, Howard E.
Ryan, John J., Jr.
Ryan, Philip J.
Saari, Aimo M.
Sabalos, Nicholas
Sample, Richard J.
Sample, Robert J.
Sampson, Jesse E.
Sands, James W.
Sandsberry, Jack C.
Sargent, Herbert A.
Sattler, Donald C.
Saunders, Stephen I., Jr.
Schaub, Robert L.
Schenker, Marvin L.
Schied, Charles F.
Schneider, Arthur F.
Schoelen, Lawrence A.
Scholl, Kenneth C.
Schroeder, Robert A.
Schultz, Jesse Z.
Schultz, Milton J., Jr.
Schwab, Robert W.
Scott, James H.
Scott, Melvin L.
Scoville, Jack
Scribner, Henry I., Jr.
Scully, Donald G.
Sebenius, Carl H., Jr.
Selby, Donald E.
Shafer, Walter R.
Shaffran, William S.
Shannon, Rickard W.
Shartel, Edward A.
Shaw, Fletcher H.
Sheridan, William R.
Sherman, Thomas H., Jr.
Shields, William B.
Shipman, Junious E.
Shultz, Robert T.
Siergiej, Edward S.
Sims, Harvey K.
Singer, Arnold N.
Skalla, Derald Z.
Skinner, Clifford A., Jr.
Skinner, Glenn E., Jr.
Skirm, George L., Jr.
Slankard, Max L.
Sleeper, Sherwin J.
Smith, Jerome W.
Smith, Maurice E.
Smith, Robert F., Jr.
Smith, Thomas M.
Smith, William D.
Smolinski, Joseph P., Jr.
Snodgrass, Cornelius S., Jr.
Snyder, Carl S., Jr.
Snyder, Francis M.
Snyder, John C.
Snyder, Roy D., Jr.
Solomon, Jerome E., Jr.
Sorg, George A.
Southall, Walter E., Jr.
Space, David J.
Sparks, Harold A., Jr.
Spayde, Keith C., Jr.
Speer, Paul H.
Speiser, Jack E.
Spence, Benjamin E.
Spencer, Ralph G.
Spiller, John H., Jr.
Springer, Roy M., Jr.
Stack, Richard A.
Stapp, Aron L.
Steentofte, Eric H.
Stephan, Charles R.
St. John, Alvin P.
St. Louis, Norman E.
Stoddard, Clarence W., Jr.
Stollenwerck, William M.
Stolpe, Richarp H.
Stone, Bruce G.
Storey, Joseph D.
Streich, Paul R.
Strobel, James W.
Stull, Donald
Sudhoff, Herbert A.
Sullivan, Don M.
Summers, Gilbert L.
Sundt, Wilbur A.
Sutherland, Donald C.
Swadener, John R.
Swanson, Charles A. L.
Switzer, James R.
Taylor, Leslie A., Jr.
Tebo, Ballard W.
Terrell, Fred W., Jr.
Thom, Norman R.
Thomas, Earle V.
Thomas, Robert L.
Thomas, Walter R.
Thompson, James J.
Thompson, Robert C.
Thompson, William B., Jr.
Thorndike, Robert F.
Thorp, John H.
Thurston, Dick W.
Tipton, Harold F., Jr.
Todd, Troy E.
Todd, William E.
Tolbert, Robert R.
Tollgaard, Elmer M.
Touch, Ralph J.
Toy, Frank E.
Traynor, Lawrence E.
Tregurtha, James D., Jr.
Trimble, Dan M.
Trost, Carlisle A. H.
Tuomela, Clyde H.
Tvede, Ralph M., Jr.
Twite, Martin J., Jr.
Tyson, James J., Jr.
Underwood, Leland J.
Valentine, Robert F.
Vankleeck, Justin L.
Varner, Byron D.
Varner, Eldon P., Jr.
Vaughn, Robert E.
Veit, William H.
Vines, Thomas E.
Vogel, Oscar J., Jr.
Vollmer, Robert J.
Vosseler, Warren P.
Wagner, Eugene R.
Wagner, Robert H.
Wallace, David T.
Wallace, Edwin S., Jr.
Wallace, Kenneth R.
Waller, Alexander E., Jr.
Warwick, William B.
Wasniewski, Emil F.
Weatherly, Robert T.
Webb, William H.
Weeks, Grady A.
Weymouth, Burton R.
Whaley, William S.
Wheat, Newton L.
White, Grover C., Jr.
White, James A.
White, Wendell A.
Whitehead, Richard T.
Whitley, Walter J.
Whitlock, Richard T.
Whitman, Donald L.
Wholey, Lloyd C.
Wikeen, Donald B.
Wilbur, Harley D.
Wilder, Fred W.
Wilgus, Carlton L.
Wilhite, Alan S.
Wilkins, James R., Jr.
Wilkinson, Donald W.
Wille, James E.
Willi, Thomas A.
Williams, William A., III
Willingham, William E., Jr.
Wilson, Alexander B.
Wilson, Joseph W.
Winton, John R., Jr.
Wise, Gerald W.
Wiseman, Richard F.
Wisenbaker, Eugene M.
Wood, Peter W.
Woodruff, Richard F.
Woodworth, Charles M.
Woolcock, Thomas E.
Wooldridge, Edmund T., Jr.
Worchesek, Robert R.
Wright, William B.
Wuest, Carl I.
Wuethrich, Don L.
Wunderlich, Robert
Wurzbacher, Robert T.
Yowell, Grover M.
Ziarnik, Walter P.
Zink, Stewart T.
Zwolinski, Frank J.

Lt. Comdrs. Lucy B. Caskey and Muriel J. Lewis for permanent promotion to the grade of commander in the line subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate October 2, 1964:

Department of State

Raul H. Castro, of Arizona, to be Ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary of the United States of America to El Salvador.

In the Air Force

The nominations beginning Robert W. Goodnow to be major, and ending Humphrey K. Hastings, Jr., to be second lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 24, 1964.

IN THE ARMY

The nominations beginning Robert Abraham to be colonel, and ending Sumner Willard to be professor of foreign languages, U.S. Military Academy, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on September 21, 1964.

UNITED NATIONS

The following-named persons to be representatives and alternate representatives of the United States of America to the 19th Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations:

To be representatives

Adlai E. Stevenson, of Illinois.

RUSSELL B. LONG, U.S. Senator from the State of Louisiana.

FRANK CARLSON, U.S. Senator from the State of Kansas.

William C. Foster, of the District of Columbia.

Francis T. P. Plimpton, of New York.

To be alternate representatives

Charles W. Yost, of New York.

Franklin H. Williams, of California.

Mrs. Gladys A. Tillett, of North Carolina.

Richard N. Gardner, of the District of Columbia.

Charles P. Noyes, of New York.

Mrs. Marietta P. Tree, of New York, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Trusteeship Council of the United Nations, vice Sydney R. Yates, resigned.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The following-named persons, now Foreign Service officers of class 2 and secretaries in the diplomatic service, to be also Consuls General of the United States of America:

John W. Bowling, of Texas.
Robert A. Hurwitch, of Illinois.
John A. Lacey, of Ohio.
Walter J. Mueller, of Connecticut.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 3, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Robert L. Walkinshaw, of Connecticut.
Thomas E. Walsh, of Rhode Island.
John C. Weisert, of Illinois.

Robert L. Dowell, Jr., of Florida, for appointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 4, a consul, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

Richard Noyes Viets, of Texas, for appointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 6, a vice consul of career, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 7, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

G. Paul Balabanis, of California.
Frank B. Crump, of New York.
Michael A. Davila, of Texas.
Robert W. DuBose, Jr., of California.
James J. Gormley, of New York.
Allen S. Greenberg, of the District of Columbia.
Richard A. Hollowaty, of California.
Coleman J. Nee, of Massachusetts.
Arnold P. Schifferdecker, of Missouri.
William Seth Shepard, of New Hampshire.
Theodore L. Smith, of New York.
Donald E. J. Stewart, of the District of Columbia.
Peter O. Suchman, of New York.
Walter Frederick Weiss, of California.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 8, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

James A. Allitto, of California.
Miss Elizabeth A. Bean, of Connecticut.
Joseph F. Becelia, of New York.
Miss Mary Rose Brandt, of Oregon.
David G. Brown, of Pennsylvania.
Donald E. Crafts, of Georgia.
Miss Mary A. Hartl, of Minnesota.
Frederick H. Hassett, of Missouri.
H. Kenneth Hill, of California.
Stuart H. Lippe, of Michigan.
James E. McGee, of California.
James Hamilton McNaughton, of New York.
Wilson A. Riley, Jr., of Connecticut.
Peter G. Smith, of Michigan.
Robert F. Starzel, of Vermont.
James Tarrant, of California.

The following-named Foreign Service Reserve officers to be consuls of the United States of America:

Heath Bowman, of Florida.
Marvin E. Brenner, of Pennsylvania.
Louis V. Ebert III, of Illinois.
Paul I. Loeb, of the District of Columbia.
James E. Markey, Jr., of Illinois.
Gordon W. Murchie, of California.
Frank Rettenberg, of New York.
Samuel R. Sanders, Jr., of Virginia.
Cecil L. Sanford, Jr., of North Carolina.
Charles G. Simmons, of Virginia.
Justin Sloane, of California.
G. Scott Sugden, of Maine.

The following-named Foreign Service Reserve officers to be vice consuls of the United States of America:

Kent B. Crane, of Virginia.
Miss Joan Edmonds, of California.
Belmont F. Haydel, Jr., of Louisiana.
Calvin L. Thomas, Jr., of Virginia.

The following-named Foreign Service Reserve officers to be vice consuls and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

James M. Fernald, of New Jersey.
John D. Folger, of the District of Columbia.
Paul G. Nyhus, of the District of Columbia.

The following-named Foreign Service Reserve officers to be secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Alexander Akalovsky, of Maryland.
Stephen W. Baldanza, of New Jersey.
David Chavchavadze, of Massachusetts.
Earl Norbert Garrett III, of Virginia.
Francis J. Hazard, of Tennessee.
Henry K. Heuser, of Maryland.
Adolf J. Lium, of the District of Columbia.
Keith L. MacPhee, of Virginia.
Timothy A. Pfeiffer, of Maine.
Thomas E. Sawyer, of Virginia.
F. William Small, of California.
Michael Tanes, of Massachusetts.

George J. Stanger, of New York, a Foreign Service staff officer, to be a consul of the United States of America.

COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

Eugene C. Patterson, of Georgia, to be a member of the Commission on Civil Rights, vice Robert G. Storey, resigned.

U.S. MARSHAL

James F. Delaney, of Pennsylvania, to be U.S. marshal for the eastern district of Pennsylvania for the term of 4 years, vice James V. Ryan, resigned.

BOARD OF PAROLE

Charlotte Paul Groshell, of Washington, to be a member of the Board of Parole for the term expiring September 30, 1970.

U.S. ATTORNEY

Jon O. Newman, of Connecticut, to be U.S. attorney for the district of Connecticut for the term of 4 years, vice Robert C. Zampano, resigned.

POSTMASTERS

MICHIGAN

Joseph J. Lozeau, Bridgman.

MINNESOTA

Thomas E. Torgeson, Kensington.
Edward C. Ricke, Morgan.

MONTANA

John R. McCormick, Kremlin.

NEBRASKA

Virgil C. Penny, Oxford.

PENNSYLVANIA

Victor N. Deane, Kane.
John P. Vensel, West Alexander.

WISCONSIN

Andrew G. Bernoski, Fifield.
Donovan E. Ireland, Lodi.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 2, 1964

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Galatians 6: 10: *As we have therefore opportunity, let us do good unto all men.*

Almighty God, may our minds and hearts this day be resident and regnant with the spirit of the Man of Galilee, who went about doing good.

We penitently confess that we are guilty of making so little of the many opportunities which we daily have of helping to build a better world.

May we never be content to sing the praises and place the stamp of approval upon the good deeds of others while we ourselves are standing idly by.

Inspire us with a passion to make a worthy contribution to the higher welfare of our beloved country and all mankind.

Grant that we may be the champions of those values in life which are abiding and enduring.

Help us then to meet and minister to the moral and spiritual needs and demands of humanity, for man cannot live by bread alone.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 1096. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to cooperate with the State of Wisconsin in the designation and administration of the Ice Age National Scientific Reserve in the State of Wisconsin, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1640. An act for the relief of certain employees of the Alaska Railroad.

The message also announced that the Presiding Officer of the Senate, pursuant to Public Law 115, 78th Congress, entitled "An act to provide for the disposal of certain records of the U.S. Government," appointed Mr. JOHNSTON and Mr. CARLSON members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 65–6.

ISSUANCE OF PRESS RELEASE

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as I was not allowed to conclude my remarks last night, I should like to announce that within the next hour I am issuing a full press release containing selected sections of my remarks, and I commend this to your attention.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, because I wish to discuss the question of conflict of interest, I have earlier today sent notice of my intention to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MILLER]. On June 11, 1964, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MILLER] introduced House Resolution 770—setting up an investigation of "any financial or business interests or activities" of any Member of the House, "for the purpose of ascertaining whether any such interests or activities have involved conflict of interest." In a special order on this and identical resolutions introduced by other minority members on June 15, the sponsors of the resolution pointed out that "this is not a partisan matter," and that they welcome "the wholehearted cooperation and support of Members on both sides of the aisle to the end that we may repair the damage that has been done to the reputation of the House of Representatives."

I welcome the invitation. Nothing could be more useful than to have the gentleman from New York [Mr. MILLER] have his immediate investigation of conflicts of interest on the part of Members. Mr. Speaker, I cannot think of a Member of this body with a more comprehensive grasp of the subject matter.

Mr. BOGGS. I would like to subscribe to what the gentleman is saying. I would hope that we could pass such legislation and I am sure the gentleman from New York would be for it. We could look into all these matters.

Mr. REUSS. I appreciate the gentleman's remarks. I think we could get a lot of bipartisan support.

SENATOR GOLDWATER

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday night people of Toledo and northwestern Ohio were privileged to have as their guest the Republican presidential nominee, Senator BARRY GOLDWATER.

In his speech at the University of Toledo fieldhouse, Mr. GOLDWATER said that freedom is the basic issue of this whole campaign—and there is reason to believe that he is quite right. The Republican standardbearer neglected to give his definition of freedom but he did say that it would be preserved only if governing power emanates from our towns, cities, and States, rather than from Washington.

Perhaps we get a better idea of what Senator GOLDWATER intends by freedom when we look closely at his State of Arizona to see what this might mean. We find that:

Arizona ranks fifth from the bottom of all States in unemployment compensation—ratio of maximum weekly payments to average weekly wages in jobs covered.

Arizona has one of the highest bankruptcy rates in the country—about twice as high as other States in the Rocky Mountain region.

Arizona ranks 30th among the States in per capita income—well below the average.

Arizona is providing jobs for only one out of every four wage earners who migrate there.

Arizona has no civil rights laws except one prohibiting discrimination in public employment.

Arizona's capital city, Phoenix, has a higher crime rate than any other city of its size in the country and, according to author Cleveland Amory, among the most shocking slums in the United States.

Perhaps another indication of Goldwater freedom is to be found in his attack on the "impulsive, massive, politically motivated tax cut gimmickry" contained in the $11.5 billion tax cut which was enacted this year by Congress with the support of a substantial majority of House and Senate Republicans. Presumably a greater freedom would be achieved through his 5 percent a year, 5-year tax cut plan for corporations and individuals which obviously is designed to give far greater benefits to the big than the little.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, we get a glimpse of Goldwater freedom from the fact that the radio broadcast of his Toledo appearance last Wednesday was sponsored by an organization which calls itself Conservatives for Goldwater Book Store, located on Madison Avenue in Toledo. This recently formed group is making available such literary masterpieces as "None Dare Call it Treason," a concise volume in which the author—the president of the Young Republicans of Missouri—blames every President since Hoover for losses to communism and weaves leftist conspiracy through hundreds of authentic looking footnotes. Also being offered, perhaps for children, is "A Texan Looks at Lyndon, a Study in Illegitimate Power." This treatise is from the pen of one Javetts Haley, head of the Far-Right Texans for America, who achieved distinction in 1962 by urging that Chief Justice Warren be not impeached but hanged—according to Newsweek—or lynched—according to Time.

Mr. Speaker, we in Toledo gained a clearer insight into Goldwater freedom from his visit to our city. I can only hope that he continues traveling extensively between now and November 3.

THE HAPPY WARRIOR: HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, few men in our generation have worked as hard, exhibited as much depth and versatility in their knowledge of so many issues, or developed into more articulate spokesmen for democracy than Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY. An article by Mary McGrory in the October 1 Washington Evening Star so well captures the spirit of Senator HUMPHREY's vibrant campaign that under unanimous consent I include this article with my remarks:

HUMPHREY SPIRIT RUNS HIGH

(By Mary McGrory)

WITH SENATOR HUMPHREY IN THE WEST.—Any other campaigner, in the gloaming of a day that began at dawn, might feel imposed upon if forced to suffer through the introduction of the local candidates for coroner, auditor, county reporter and circuit clerk.

But not Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY.

A national candidate who is told by everyone in his entourage from the campaign director down to the mimeograph operator that his speeches are too long, might feel resentful or aggrieved.

But not HUBERT HUMPHREY.

A vice-presidential hopeful whose aid unceremoniously pokes him when he lingers over-long with a middling airport crowd, might either ignore the signal or stop talking.

But not HUBERT HUMPHREY.

At the Des Moines airport last night, the Senator, in a rare burst of querulousness said: "They're tapping me on the leg every 2 minutes here to wind up this speech, but you're here to see me, and I want to meet you."

ENJOYS THE PRIVILEGE

The reason HUMPHREY is not subject to the irritations and fatigues of other politicians is perfectly simple. He sooner or later confides everything to his beloved public, and yesterday he came out with it at the Moline (Ill.) airport.

"It has been a joy to me," he said feelingly, "to be chosen as your vice-presidential nominee. What greater privilege can there be than to be on the national ticket of a great political party, great man?"

HUMPHREY's campaign, like his career, is testimony to the power of positive thinking.

The Bible says: "Hope deferred maketh the heart sick." But not, obviously, HUBERT HUMPHREY's.

The boy from Huron, S. Dak., who never thought he would make the big time is loving every moment of his success.

CRUSHING SETBACKS

No one could begrudge him his joy. He is the Robert Bruce of American politics. He has been hankering to be a national figure since 1956 and has suffered setbacks that would have crushed another man. But in 1956, having lost the vice presidency, he went to work to court the Senate establishment and to erase the image of the brash young liberal who did not know his place.

Again in 1960, having been, as he says "trimmed" by a handsome, wealthy Eastern Harvardian who personified everything beyond the grasp of a poor plainsman, he gamely went to work as John F. Kennedy's lieutenant in the Senate.

And beginning this spring he was put through a series of ordeals by that inexorable taskmaster in the White House. They stopped just short of requiring him to walk over the waves at Atlantic City before he finally won the prize.

Today he is the most radiantly grateful vice-presidential candidate since Alben Barkley. In his campaign plane, "The Happy Warrior," the climate is always summer, the mood seldom falls below euphoria. Sometime HUMPHREY, his abused voice cracking with sincerity, speaks of "the public happiness" in America under a Democratic administration. It is, however, not a patch on his private happiness.

He welcomes each fresh attack from Senator BARRY GOLDWATER and Representative WILLIAM MILLER. Every meeting is "splendid," every crowd is "wonderful."

In his speeches he cannot contain himself. His campaign director, Bill Connell, holds a stopwatch, makes throatcutting gestures as the appointed end is near. HUMPHREY plunges from climax to climax, his thin voice breaks, his prominent eyes water with the effort of wringing from his public one more indication that they share his love of a benevolent Federal Government, his admiration of a great President, his devotion to the Democratic party. One night in Fort Wayne, he went on for 52 minutes.

The quality of his hearers makes no difference. Enemies, as in southern Georgia, have to be won over, or at least worn out. Friends have to be given their money's worth. One audience, alone, daunted him.

Speaking before the frosty, uniformed members of the National Guard Association in Detroit on the uncongenital subject of our nuclear defenses, the advocate of the test ban treaty faltered. For once, he stuck almost word for word to his prepared text. He waited for applause that never came from part-time soldiers who feel GOLDWATER is their true friend. They were apathetic. Other politicians understand apathy, they even experience it themselves occasionally.

But not HUBERT HUMPHREY.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, before I discuss the topic I had in mind I wish to say to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS] that I believe many of us would join in the investigation and elucidation of conflict of interest, but I have noted a peculiar lack of desire on the part of the gentleman and his party leaders to really get into the real issue of conflict of interest, which happens to involve the President of the United States. Let us get into the whole issue if we are going to do so. I am all for it.

UNEMPLOYMENT STATISTICS: UP FROM 5.1 TO 5.2 PERCENT

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the unemployment rate has increased in the past month from 5.1 to 5.2 percent.

On August 11 I suggested that the administration had juggled the employment statistics when it hailed a decline in the unemployment rate to 4.9 percent. I said this did not sound logical. See pages 18981–18983 of the RECORD.

Interestingly enough, with the unemployment rate going up, the news media practically buried the story, the same news media which front-paged the questionable 4.9-percent figure 2 months ago.

We badly need fair reporting. Monthly economic statistics should be reported the same way each month, regardless of what they are, in the same part of the paper, with the same type headlines to let the people draw their own conclusion. The Labor Department and the press should not play politics with economic statistics.

For the purpose of future reference, I point out that the Washington Star carried an Associated Press story of the increase in unemployment in its stock final edition and then under this deceptive headline: "Employment, Jobless Total Both Decline." Instead of a straight news story the Associated Press account was interspersed with self-serving interpretative remarks attributed to the Department of Labor.

The story in the Washington Post was buried on page C6, quite a contrast to the treatment given the August "good news." It, too, appeared under a deceptive headline, "Jobless Rate Improvement Gets Setback." The whole issue has been, has there truly been a jobless rate improvement? This account quoted the Labor Department as saying the 0.1-percent increase is not statistically significant. Neither was the 4.9-percent August figure significant. All the recent figures show that the unemployment ratio is still unacceptably high in a period of high economic upturn. This is significant.

CHILE-CALIFORNIA PROGRAM

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, in San Francisco recently I had the pleasure of attending the first meeting of the advisory committee to the Chile-California program, a project supported by the Agency for International Development.

As a member of the advisory committee, I should like to report on the progress of our program because I know many of my colleagues support similar programs of cooperation in their own States.

During the 5 months since the Chile-California program was initiated, California advisers in Chile have been assisting their Latin American counterparts in planning public sector investment and improving Chile's educational system. Californians have also been instrumental in furthering the Maule River Basin regional development project which would use a principal Chilean water resource to raise the economic and social levels of a part of that nation.

In addition, transportation problems are being studied with a view toward their alleviation through future construction projects. University of California faculty members will soon be traveling to Chile to meet with their opposite numbers in the Republic.

The cooperation between California and Chile includes the private as well as the public sector of our economies. A computer system valued at more than a quarter of a million dollars has been given by a California firm to the Chilean Technical University of the State. Two of our largest private industrial organizations, Kaiser Industries and the Crown-Zellerbach Corp., have made substantial investments in Chile. Information is being exchanged between our poultry, wine, fishing, and fruit and vegetable growing industries. One of our large California banks plans to establish a Chilean branch in the near future.

On still another level, many Californians have enthusiastically joined in people-to-people projects; California schoolchildren have given contributions to schoolchildren in Chile, and, of course, Californians are among the Peace Corps volunteers presently serving in that country.

California and Chile have long borne a strong resemblance to each other in their natural endowments. With the AID-sponsored Chile-California program, the people of my State are now enjoying new and meaningful relationships with their neighbors to the south.

SUPREME COURT PRAYER DECISIONS

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court's prayer decisions led me to seek the root cause of such constitutional misinterpretation.

As the culmination of that research, today I have introduced a constitutional amendment which I believe is mandatory if the Congress is to restore the integrity of the Constitution and the Bill of Rights which have been violated by the Court for a quarter century.

The Court has perpetrated an unheralded, unrecognized, legal revolution, and has gotten away with it. If we in the Congress fail to act soon, this Court, if it continues in its present pattern, may well take away all the religious freedoms our people treasure.

I do not speak lightly. The issue is the Bill of Rights.

The key to the Court's revolution is its proposition that the 14th amendment absorbed the 1st amendment. That fiat of the Court turned upside down the original purpose of the Founding Fathers, that all authority in the area of religion would be left to the States. By the Court's license, the Federal Government is toppling the barrier erected against its power by the Bill of Rights.

A constitutional amendment is mandatory to end this dangerous onslaught by the Supreme Court, which has already cut down one of the unalienable rights of the people.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE], I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs may have until midnight, October 2, 1964, to file reports on H.R. 1927 and H.R. 2434.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1964

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 11380) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 1925)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11380) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 1, 3, 4, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 16, 18, 19, 21, 22, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 34, 36, 37, 38, 41, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, and 60.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 6, 7, 33, 44, and 52, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"TITLE I—DEVELOPMENT LOAN FUND

"SEC. 101. Section 201(d) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to the Development Loan Fund, is amended as follows:

"(a) Strike out 'Foreign Assistance Act of 1963' and substitute 'Foreign Assistance Act of 1964'.

"(b) Strike out '2 per centum' and substitute '2½ per centum'.

"(c) Strike out 'three-fourths of 1 per centum' and substitute '1 per centum'."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out the matter proposed to be stricken out and in lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "102"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out the matter proposed to be stricken out and in lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "103"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out the matter proposed to be stricken out and in lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "104"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out the matter proposed to be stricken out and in lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "105"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out the matter proposed to be stricken out and in lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "106"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Strike out the matter proposed to be stricken out and in lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "108"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Strike out the matter proposed to be stricken out and in lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "108"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 32: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and agree to the same with amendments as follows:

On page 8, line 2, of the Senate engrossed amendments strike out "(e)" and insert: "(g)"

On page 8, line 5, of the Senate engrossed amendments strike out "articles" and insert: "article having a value in excess of $100,000"

On page 8, line 16, of the Senate engrossed amendments strike out "articles" and insert: "article"

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 35: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: On page 10, line 2, of the Senate engrossed amendments strike out "(b)" and insert: "(a)"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 39: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"(d) Amend subsection 620(e), relating to expropriations and other similar matters, as follows:

"(1) After '(e)' insert '(1)'.

"(2) Redesignate subparagraphs (1), (2), and (3) of the first paragraph as subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C), respectively.

"(3) Strike out 'paragraphs (1), (2), or (3)' and substitute 'subparagraphs (A), (B), or (C) of paragraph (1)'.

"(4) At the end of such subsection add the following new paragraph (2):

"(2) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no court in the United States shall decline on the ground of the Federal act of state doctrine to make a determination on the merits giving effect to the principles of international law in a case in which a claim of title or other right is asserted by any party including a foreign state (or a party claiming through such state) based upon (or traced through) a confiscation or other taking after January 1, 1959, by an act of that state in violation of the principles of international law, including the principles of compensation and the other standards set out in this subsection: *Provided*, That this subparagraph shall not be applicable (1) in any case in which an act of a foreign state is not contrary to international law or with respect to a claim of title or other right acquired pursuant to an irrevocable letter of credit of not more than 180 days' duration issued in good faith prior to the time of the confiscation or other taking, or (2) in any case with respect to which the President determines that application of the act of state doctrine is required in that particular case by the foreign policy interests of the United States and a suggestion to this effect is filed on his behalf in that case with the court, or (3) in any case in which the proceedings are commenced after January 1, 1966."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 40: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out the matter proposed to be stricken out and in lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "(e)"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 42: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out the matter proposed to be stricken out and in lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "(f)"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 43: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 43, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out the matter proposed to be stricken out and in lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "(g)"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 59: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 59, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: On page 17, line 19, of the Senate engrossed amendments immediately after "President," insert the following: "and any other local currencies owned by the United States in amounts not to exceed the equivalent of $50 per day per person exclusive of the actual cost of transportation"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 61: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 61, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"PART V—RELIGIOUS PERSECUTION

"SEC. 501. It is the sense of the Congress that the United States deeply believes in the freedom of religion for all people and is opposed to infringement of this freedom anywhere in the world. The Congress condemns the persecution of any persons because of their religion. It is further the sense of Congress that all persons should be permitted the free exercise of religion and the pursuit of their culture."

And the Senate agree to the same.

THOMAS E. MORGAN,
CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI,
EDNA F. KELLY,
WAYNE L. HAYS,
W. S. MAILLIARD,
PETER H. B. FRELINGHUYSEN,
Managers on the Part of the House.
J. W. FULBRIGHT,
JOHN SPARKMAN,
MIKE MANSFIELD,
Per J. W. F.
BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER,
GEORGE D. AIKEN,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11380) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

I. TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS

The following Senate amendments made technical, clerical, clarifying, or conforming changes: 5, 8, 10, 11, 12, 15, 17, 20, 23, 25, 28, 30, 31, 38, 40, 42, 43, 49, 50, 51, 53, 56, and 57. With respect to these amendments (1) the House either recedes or recedes with amendments which are technical, clerical, clarifying, or conforming in nature; or (2) the Senate recedes in order to conform to other action agreed upon by the committee of conference.

II. AUTHORIZATION OF FUNDS

The House bill authorized the appropriation of $2,126,472,400 while the Senate amendment authorized $2,076,600,000, a reduction of $49,872,000. In addition to these new authorizations of funds, there is authorization in the law for funds for development loans, for Alliance for Progress loans, and for Department of State expenses in connection with the administration of the program.

The following amendments pertaining to the authorization of funds were in disagreement between the two Houses.

Amendment No. 6, technical cooperation: The House bill authorized $224,600,000; the Senate amendment, $215,000,000. The committee of conference recommends $215,000,000.

Amendments Nos. 13 and 14, surveys of investment opportunities: The House bill authorized $2,100,000; the Senate amendment, $2,000,000. The committee of conference recommends $2,100,000.

Amendment No. 18, international organizations and programs: The House bill authorized $134,272,400; the Senate amendment, $134,400,000. The committee of conference recommends $134,272,400.

Amendment No. 21, supporting assistance: The House bill authorized $405,000,000; the Senate amendment, $374,700,000. The committee of conference recommends $405,000,000.

Amendment No. 26, military assistance: The House bill authorizes $1,055,000,000; the Senate amendment, $1,045,000,000. The committee of conference recommends $1,055,000,000.

Amendment No. 45, limitation on aggregate authorization for use in fiscal year 1965: The Senate amendment added a new section 620A to the act limiting to $3,250,000,000 the aggregate of the total amounts authorized to be appropriated for use in fiscal year 1965 for furnishing assistance and for administrative expenses under the act. The Senate amendment also contained a proviso authorizing an additional appropriation of $50,000,000 to be used to donate domestically produced meat and other protein foods to school lunch programs abroad.

The Senate recedes.

The following table shows the differences between the House bill and the Senate amendment, the sums agreed to by the committee of conference, and the administration appropriation request for programs authorized in this bill and in existing law.

	Executive appropriation request (1)	House bill (2)	Senate amendment (3)	Conference agreement (4)
Part I: Economic:				
Chapter 2: Development assistance:				
Title I: Development loans	$922,200,000	(1)	(1)	(1)
Title II:				
Technical cooperation, development grants	224,600,000	$224,600,000	$215,000,000	$215,000,000
American schools and hospitals	18,000,000	18,000,000	18,000,000	18,000,000
Title IV: Surveys of investment opportunities	2,100,000	2,100,000	2,000,000	2,100,000
Title VI:				
Alliance for Progress loans	465,000,000	(1)	(1)	(1)
Alliance for Progress grants	85,000,000	85,000,000	85,000,000	85,000,000
Chapter 3: International organizations	134,400,000	134,272,400	134,400,000	134,272,400
Chapter 4: Supporting assistance	405,000,000	405,000,000	374,700,000	405,000,000
Chapter 5: Contingency fund	150,000,000	150,000,000	150,000,000	150,000,000
Part II: Military	1,055,000,000	1,055,000,000	1,045,000,000	1,055,000,000
Part III:				
Administrative expenses, AID	52,500,000	52,500,000	52,500,000	52,500,000
State Department	2,900,000	(1)	(1)	(1)
Total	3,516,700,000	2,126,472,400 [3] (3,516,572,400)	[2] 2,076,600,000 [3] (3,466,700,000)	2,116,872,400 [3] (3,506,972,400)

[1] Previously authorized.

[2] The Senate amendment added a new section 620A to the act which limited the total authorization for appropriations to $3,250,000,000. An additional $50,000,000 was authorized to be appropriated for the purchase of meat and related products.

[3] This total includes sums for programs previously authorized that are included in the total for col. 1. This figure is shown for purposes of comparability.

III. AMENDMENTS FROM WHICH THE SENATE RECEDED

Amendment No. 1: Statement of policy

The Senate amendment included a new paragraph to be added to the statement of policy of the act. The added language states that it is the policy of the United States to encourage the efforts of American institutions of higher learning in programs of development and research in the less developed friendly countries and to strengthen the partnership between the U.S. Government and these institutions by all available means including increasing and facilitating interchange of personnel.

The House bill did not contain this provision.

The Senate recedes.

Amendments No. 3 and No. 16: Appropriation of loan receipts

The Senate amendments amended sections 203 and 253 of the act to subject the authority of the President to relend receipts from development loan funds and from Alliance for Progress loans to the annual appropriation of such receipts.

The House bill did not contain similar provisions.

The managers on the part of the Senate accepted the argument in opposition that section 117 of the Foreign Aid and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1964, already subjects development loan receipts, and receipts from Alliance for Progress loans to the appropriation requirement. Section 117 is a permanent provision of law, the continued validity of which is not dependent upon annual reenactment.

The Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 4: International Development Association

The Senate amendment repealed section 205 of the act, which authorizes the President to lend up to 10 percent of development loan funds to the International Development Association (IDA) for use by the IDA pursuant to the International Development Association Act (Public Law 86–565) and the IDA articles of agreement if the President determines that such action would more effectively serve the purposes of the Development Loan Fund.

The House bill contained no comparable provision.

The Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 9: Exclusions from loss covered by extended risk guarantee

The Senate amendment amended section 221(b)(2) of the act to exclude from the kinds of loss covered by extended risk guarantees, losses attributable to an "action not meeting a standard of reasonable business prudence for which the investor is responsible."

The House bill did not contain a similar provision.

The committee of conference noted that section 221(b)(2) already excludes losses "arising out of fraud or misconduct for which the investor is responsible." The difficulty inherent in drafting a statutory definition of "a standard of reasonable business prudence" was also recognized. It was the opinion of the committee of conference that this matter should be dealt with by administrative action and that the factor of reasonable business prudence should be taken into consideration by the executive branch in administering the investment guarantee program.

The Senate recedes.

Amendments Nos. 18 and 19: Contributions to international organizations for use for voluntary service programs

The House bill added to section 302 of the act a provision that none of the funds available to carry out chapter 3 of part I of the act may be contributed to an international organization or a foreign government or agency thereof to pay the costs of operating or developing any volunteer programs which are related to the selection, training, and programing of volunteer manpower. The House bill also reduced chapter 3 authorization by $127,600 for the purpose of limiting the U.S. contribution to the International Secretariat for Volunteer Service to $22,400, an amount sufficient to finance, on a 40-percent matching basis, the information clearinghouse functions of the Secretariat.

Senate amendment No. 19 struck out the House language and substituted therefor a provision that none of the funds available to carry out chapter 3 may be used for contributions (1) to the International Secretariat for Volunteer Service or any similar international organization for use by it to pay the costs of developing or operating any volunteer service or other Peace Corps-type program of any foreign government or agency thereof, or (2) to any volunteer service or other Peace Corps-type program administered by such international organization. Senate amendment No. 18 also authorized the full amount requested by the executive branch for chapter 3, thereby making possible a U.S. contribution to the International Secretariat for Volunteer Service of $150,000.

The Senate recedes in both instances.

The committee of conference is of the opinion that the U.S. contribution to the International Secretariat for Volunteer Service should be limited to $22,400, on a 40-percent matching basis. Such a contribution should enable the International Secretariat to perform its information clearinghouse function. At the same time, the agreed language would not authorize contributions to the Secretariat for technical assistance to Peace Corps-type programs of any international organization or foreign government.

Amendment No. 22: Earmarking of supporting assistance funds for Vietnam

The House bill added a new sentence at the end of section 402 of the act, providing that not less than $200 million of the supporting assistance funds for fiscal year 1965 may be available solely for use in Vietnam, unless the President determines otherwise and promptly reports his determination to the Congress.

The Senate amendment struck out this provision.

The Senate recedes.

The committee of conference agreed that while the earmarking of foreign assistance funds for particular countries generally is undesirable, the special circumstances of Vietnam warrant an exception in this case. There is little likelihood that the United States will furnish less than $200 million of supporting assistance to Vietnam in fiscal year 1965. Further, the language of the House bill, while according special recognition to the U.S. effort in Vietnam, allows the President adequate flexibility. The committee of conference wants to go on record, however, that this action should not be construed as establishing a precedent for the earmarking of foreign aid funds in the future.

Amendments Nos. 24 and 29: Military credit sales guarantees

The House bill amended chapter 2 of part II of the act, which relates to military assistance, in two respects:

First, it added a new subsection (e) to section 503 of the act authorizing the President to guarantee individuals and firms doing business in the United States against political and credit risks of nonpayment arising in connection with credit sales of defense articles and services which they finance to friendly foreign countries and international organizations; and

Second, it added a new subsection (b) to section 509 of the act, authorizing the President to employ the services of private firms in connection with the issuance and servicing of such guarantees, and the adjustment of claims arising under them. The proposed subsection (b) further provided that guarantees issued pursuant to part II of the act would be considered contingent obligations backed by the full faith and credit of the United States, that obligations were to be recorded against funds available for credit sales under part II of the act in an amount equivalent to 25 percent of contractual liability related to such guarantees, and that the funds so obligated, together with fees and premiums directed to be charged in conjunction with the issuance of such guarantees, would constitute a single reserve for the payment of claims.

Senate amendments No. 24 and No. 29 struck out both of the above-described provisions of the House bill.

The Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 27: Earmarking of military assistance funds for Vietnam

The House bill added a new sentence at the end of section 504(a) of the act providing that not less than $200 million of the military assistance funds for fiscal year 1965 may be available solely for use in Vietnam, unless the President determines otherwise and promptly reports his determination to the Congress.

The Senate amendment struck out this provision.

The Senate recedes.

The views of the committee of conference on Senate amendment No. 22 apply also with respect to this amendment.

Amendment No. 34: Study of incentives to private enterprise

The Senate amendment added a new subsection 601(b)(7) to the act, directing the President to study the feasibility of establishing tax and other incentives for private enterprise to help develop the economic resources and productive capacities of less developed countries.

The House bill did not contain a comparable provision.

The Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 36: Encouragement of utilization of U.S. engineering and professional firms

The House bill added a new subsection (d) to section 601 of the act, relating to encouragement of free enterprise and private participation. The new subsection expressed the sense of the Congress that the Agency for International Development should continue to encourage the use of engineering and professional services of U.S. firms or their affiliates in financing capital projects.

The Senate amendment struck out this provision of the House bill.

The Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 37: Special price test for petroleum products financed under the foreign assistance program and barter agents' commissions

The Senate amendment added a new proviso to section 604(b) of the act, establishing a new price test for petroleum products financed under the foreign assistance program. It would preclude the supplier of petroleum products from charging a price in excess of the price he charges in comparable export sales from the source country at the time of sale. The comparable export sales price test would not apply to purchases under formal competitive bids or to commodities traded on exchanges. In determining the supplier's "comparable export sales price," sales to affiliates would be excluded.

The Senate amendment also added a new subsection (e) to section 604 of the act, providing that no funds available under the act shall be used to pay a barter agent's commission or other servicing charge or disposal fee when commodities furnished to an aid recipient country are procured through barter arrangements. Any such commission, charge, or fee would have to be paid by the supplier of the commodities so procured or by the recipient country.

The House bill did not contain comparable provisions.

The Senate recedes.

The committee of conference took note of the fact that no hearings have been held before the Committee on Foreign Relations or the Committee on Foreign Affairs on the proposals embodied in the amendment. Further, the committee of conference was informed by the executive branch that the amendment is based on assumptions which are incorrect and that it would not result in economies in the administration of foreign aid. Because of the complexity of issues involved, and the potentially far-reaching effects of the amendment on the administrative burden on AID, the committee of conference believes that the proposed changes should receive thorough study by the appropriate authorizing committees of the Congress.

Amendment No. 41: Aid to Indonesia

The Senate amendment amended section 620(j) of the act to provide that no further U.S. assistance shall be furnished to Indonesia under the act or any other provision of law and that all Indonesian military or police trainees now in the United States shall be notified of the immediate termination of such training and no other training of Indonesian nationals initiated.

The House bill did not contain a similar provision.

The committee of conference took note of the fact that section 620(j) of the act already prohibits aid to Indonesia unless the President determines that the furnishing of such assistance is essential to the national interest of the United States. The act also requires the President to report fully and currently to both Houses of the Congress on any assistance furnished to Indonesia. The committee of conference agreed that because of the fluid situation in southeast Asia and the Pacific, and in order to assure most effective use of foreign aid to serve U.S. foreign policy and security interests, the President should be allowed to retain this minimum degree of flexibility.

The Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 46: Initial assignment of foreign service personnel to Washington positions

The House bill amended section 625(d)(2) of the act to authorize the initial assignment of up to 20 AID foreign service personnel to Washington positions at any one time prior to assignment overseas.

The Senate amendment increased that number to 30.

The Senate recedes.

Amendments Nos. 47 and 48: Selection-out and separation authorities

Senate amendment (No. 47) amended subsection (e) of section 625 of the act to extend to other AID personnel the existing selection-out authority which is presently applicable only to AID foreign service personnel. Certain specified categories of personnel were excepted.

Senate amendment (No. 48) added a new subsection (j) to section 620 of the act authorizing the President to separate, notwithstanding any other provision of the law, a maximum of 100 employees of AID in the upper grades during each of the 2 years commencing with the effective date of the bill.

The House did not contain comparable provisions.

The Senate recedes. The committee of conference recognizes that there is need to strengthen the personnel structure and personnel policies of AID. On the other hand, the Senate version proposed a remedy that for the present was regarded as far reaching. The burden rests with AID to improve its personnel practices through the more rigorous and thorough application of existing laws and regulations. The problem should be kept under close and continuing review by the Congress.

Amendment No. 54: Compensation of experts and consultants

The House bill amended section 626(a) of the act to increase the maximum compensation that may be paid experts and consultants performing functions under the act from $75 per day to $100 per day.

The Senate amendment struck out this provision.

The Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 55: Loyalty affidavits

The Senate amendment added a new section 639 to the act stipulating that no funds under that act shall be used to make payments under any contract between the United States or any aid recipient and any individual U.S. citizen, U.S. corporation, or foreign corporation owned by U.S. citizens, unless such individual or the principal officers of the corporation file an affidavit that they do not believe in and are not members of or support any organization that believes in the violent overthrow of the U.S. Government.

The House bill contained no comparable provision.

The committee of conference noted that with respect to contracts involving the service of U.S. citizens overseas, full protection of U.S. interests is given by section 111 of the Foreign Aid and Related Agencies Appropriation Act and by AID's own regulations. Section 111 of the appropriation act provides that none of the funds available under the act shall be used to make payments with respect to any contract for the performance of services outside the United States by citizens who have not been investigated for loyalty and security in the same manner as if they were regularly employed by the United States. AID regulations go beyond this to require that all domestic nongovernment personnel must be cleared if their positions are sensitive, even if they do not have access to classified information.

The Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 58: The Powazki Cemetery in Warsaw, Poland

The Senate amendment added a new subsection (sec. 648(b)) authorizing the President, as a demonstration of good will on the part of the people of the United States for the Polish people, to use foreign currencies that have accrued to the U.S. Government under the Foreign Assistance Act or any other act, for assistance in the repair, rehabilitation, improvement, and maintenance of the Powazki Cemetery in Warsaw, which serves as a burial place for thousands of Polish resistance fighters who fell in the Warsaw uprising of 1944. The exercise of this authority was made subject to the provisions of section 1415 of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1953.

The House bill did not contain this provision.

The Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 60: Sense of Congress on proceedings for reapportionment of State legislatures

The Senate amendment added a new section to the bill (sec. 403) which expresses the sense of Congress that, in any case where a district court of the United States has ordered reapportionment of either house of a State legislature to conform with constitutional requirements regarding representation, such State legislature should be allowed the length of time of a regular legislative session plus 30 days, but not to exceed 6 months, to comply. The section also expresses the sense of Congress that in such cases the next election of members of the State legislature should be conducted in accordance with the laws of such State in effect September 20, 1964. If such a State fails to apportion representation within such time limitation, it is declared to be the sense of Congress that the district court having jurisdiction shall apportion representation in such legislature among appropriate districts so as to conform to the constitution and laws of such State insofar as is possible consistent with the requirements of the Constitution of the United States.

The House bill did not contain a comparable provision.

The Senate recedes.

IV. AMENDMENTS FROM WHICH THE HOUSE RECEDED

Amendment No. 2: Interest rates on loans

The Senate version added to the act a requirement that, except for loans already authorized or committed, no development loans may be made (1) in the case of commercial loans at an interest rate of less than one-fourth of 1 percent above the average annual interest rate on U.S. interest-bearing obligations as of the end of the fiscal year preceding the year in which the loan application is filed (i.e., as of June 30, 1964, approximately 3⅝ percent), or (2) in the case of noncommercial loans at an interest rate of less than 2½ percent per year. In addition, the Senate version required that with respect to commercial loans principal payments may only be deferred until the productive enterprise or facility which is the subject of the loan commences operation or becomes available for operation. Thereafter principal payments shall become due at annual intervals and full payment must be made in no less than 25 years. Noncommercial loans must be paid in "regular installments" within 25 years. The amendment defines "commercial loans" as loans made for the development of productive enterprises or for facilities directly used in productive enterprise, such as equipment, machinery, supplies, materials, or land. "Noncommercial loans" are all other loans. By reason of section 251(b) of the act the Senate version would also apply to Alliance for Progress loans.

The House bill contained no comparable provision.

The House recedes with an amendment that raises the interest rate on loans during the 10-year grace period from three-fourths percent per annum to 1 percent per annum and raises the minimum interest rate for the life of the loan following the grace period from 2 percent to 2½ percent per annum. Such rates would not be effective on funds authorized or committed to be loans prior to the effective date of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1964. These terms will also apply to Alliance for Progress loans.

The committee of conference weighed the appeal for stiffer loan terms against the more important consideration that borrowing countries not be encouraged to pursue irresponsible debt practices. Prudence requires that such nations not be burdened with unduly high loan costs until their development is sufficient to finance their debts. Any severe increase in the costs of loans would only increase the possibilities of default which would have serious consequences not only for foreign governments and international financial institutions that had loaned the money but also for private investors, many of whom are U.S. citizens.

At the same time the committee of conference noted the trend by other foreign leaders to lower their interest terms and extend the maturities and grace periods. The amendment agreed to by the committee of conference brings U.S. terms closer to those of such lenders. The language in existing law and that in the amended language accepted by the committee of conference sets minimum loan terms. It was noted that the United States has set terms for its loans above the minimum wherever the capacity of the borrower permits.

The conferees agreed that some hardening of minimum loan terms is appropriate. Further, the conferees urge AID to require interest rates above the minimum whenever possible in view of the balance-of-payments position of the borrowing country.

AID is launching a study of the relationship of U.S. lending terms to the development efforts in various countries, to the lending policies of other donor countries, and to the very serious problem of rapidly mounting debt service burdens. The Congress will have an opportunity early next year to consider the full implication of this study.

Amendment No. 7: Feasibility study of used equipment program

The Senate amendment added a new section (sec. 217) authorizing the President to use technical cooperation/development grant funds to study the feasibility of establishing a program for furnishing less developed friendly countries with used tools, machinery, and other equipment to be donated by private enterprises or acquired through normal channels of trade. The purpose would be to determine how such programs may be utilized by and contribute to the economic development of the receiving country. The President is required to report to the Congress at the earliest practicable date on the results of such study, together with recommendations.

The House recedes.

The managers on the part of the House were concerned that the use of old equipment, unless fully and carefully rehabilitated, could result in costly and unnecessary delays, but agreed to the Senate language authorizing a study and investigation to determine the feasibility of such programs. Such a study should involve neither expense nor excessive time because of reviews which have already been conducted by the Agency for International Development over the past several years.

Amendment No. 32: Special certification for military assistance

The Senate amendment added a new section 513 to the act to require either (a) that the appropriate chief of U.S. Military Advisory Group, or a corresponding officer, certify in writing at least 6 months prior to delivery that a recipient country or international organization has the capability to utilize effectively any defense articles which the United States proposes to furnish, or (b) that the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, or certain designees, determine with respect to defense articles in approved programs that it is necessary to furnish the defense articles in the absence of such certification and specifically give advance approval to the furnishing of the defense articles. In addition, the Secretary of State would be required to make a complete report of each such determination and approval and the reasons therefor to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to the Senate Committees on Foreign Relations and Appropriations. The section would not apply to military sales under section 507 of the act.

The House bill contained no comparable provision.

The House recedes with amendments which limit the application of this section to any single defense article having a value in excess of $100,000. The purpose of this new section is to discourage the furnishing of military equipment to countries where it cannot be used effectively. Numerous instances were reported where sophisticated and costly equipment was incapable of use either because related and necessary component parts were not provided, requirements had changed in the interval between approval of the program and the delivery date, or the recipient country itself lacked the skill or organization to use the equipment. While the managers on the part of the House recognized the persuasiveness of these arguments, they were reluctant to increase the paperwork and man-hours devoted to clearing hundreds of small items. The act already includes a definition of value. For example, rifles and trucks would not require a certification whereas aircraft and costly electronic equipment, if it has a unit value of more than $100,000, would be covered by the language in this section.

Amendments Nos. 33 and 35: Advisory Committee on Private Enterprise in Foreign Aid

The House bill amended section 601(c)(5) of the act to raise from $50,000 to $100,000 the authority to use funds otherwise available under the act for the expenses of the Advisory Committee on Private Enterprise in Foreign Aid.

The Senate amendments struck the House language raising the limitation on expenses of the Committee to $100,000 (No. 33), but retained the termination date of June 30, 1965, contained in the House bill (No. 35).

The House recedes.

The legislative history of this provision makes clear that only the direct costs of the members of the Committee are to be charged to the statutory ceiling. Such costs of backstopping the Committee operations as may be incurred by AID are not charged against the ceiling. The limitation of $50,000 is adequate for the work of the Committee.

Amendment No. 39: Expropriations by foreign states

The Senate amendment added a new paragraph (2) to subsection 620(e) of the act, providing that no U.S. court shall refuse, on the ground of the "act of state" doctrine, to examine the validity of acts of foreign states occurring after January 1, 1959, which are alleged to be contrary to international law, unless the President determines and notifies the court that application of the "act of state" doctrine is required by U.S. foreign policy interests.

The House bill did not contain a comparable provision.

The House recedes with an amendment.

The managers on the part of the House regretted that there had not been an opportunity for thorough study and full hearings on the subject. The committee of conference amended the Senate language to pinpoint its precise effect, making it clear that it does not apply if no violation of international law principles is found, or if the case involves a short-term irrevocable letter of credit issued in good faith prior to the taking of property by a foreign state. The exception in those individual cases in which the President determines that judicial review of the foreign government's action is not in the U.S. foreign policy interests is preserved. An additional change was added to limit the application of the amendment to cases in which the proceedings are commenced before January 1, 1966. This limitation was approved with the understanding that the congressional committees concerned will make a full review and study of the matter during the next Congress and make a determination on the need for permanent legislation.

Amendment No. 44: Productive enterprise

The House bill added a new subsection (n) to section 620 of the act providing that no assistance should be furnished for the construction or operation of any productive enterprise abroad unless the President determined that similar productive enterprises in the United States were operating at a substantial portion of their capacity and such assistance would not result in depriving such U.S. enterprises of their reasonable share of world markets.

The Senate amendment deleted this provision of the House bill.

The House recedes.

The managers on the part of the House accepted the Senate amendment after full consideration of the argument advanced in opposition that section 620(d) of the act already provides adequately for the protection of U.S. industry by requiring the administrators of the foreign assistance program to make arrangements with countries where U.S. assistance is provided for the construction or operation of productive enterprises to limit competition of such enterprises with U.S. industry.

Amendment No. 52: U.S. representative to the Inter-American Committee on the Alliance for Progress

The House bill added a new subsection (k) to section 625 of the act, relating to the employment of personnel. The new language would authorize the President to appoint or assign a U.S. citizen to be the U.S. representative to the Inter-American Economic and Social Council (IA–ECOSOC) and to be the U.S. representative to the Inter-American Committee on the Alliance for Progress. Provision for compensation for such officer was also included.

The Senate amendment deleted the reference to the IA–ECOSOC, thus authorizing the President to appoint or assign a representative only to the Inter-American Committee on the Alliance for Progress under the authority of the new section.

The House recedes.

When the House had the bill under consideration, the executive contemplated that one individual would serve as U.S. representative to both organizations. Subsequently, the executive changed its request to provide the special authority only for the U.S. representative to the Inter-American Committee on the Alliance for Progress.

Amendment No. 59: availability of foreign currencies

The Senate amendment added to section 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, a provision which would restrict the use of foreign currencies by appropriate committees of the Congress engaged in carrying out their duties under section 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act to those currencies "which are in excess of the amounts reserved under section 612(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and of the requirements of the United States Government in payment of its obligations outside the United States, as such requirements may be determined from time to time by the President."

The House bill contained no comparable provision.

The House recedes with an amendment, which, while retaining the Senate language, places a limitation on the use by appropriate committees of the Congress of local currencies not covered by the Senate language.

Amendment No. 61: Religious persecution

The Senate amendment added a new section to the bill (sec. 501) which expresses the sense of the Congress that the United States deeply believes in freedom of religion for all people and is opposed to infringement of this freedom anywhere in the world. The Senate amendment further declares that there is evidence that the Government of the Soviet Union is persecuting Jewish citizens by singling them out for extreme punishment for alleged economic offenses and by infringement of their freedom of religious observance, and that the Soviet Union has a responsibility to the nations of the world to match its constitutional guarantees of freedom of religion with specific action. Finally, the amendment expresses the sense of the Congress that religious persecution in the Soviet Union be condemned and that the Soviet Union in the name of decency and humanity cease the enumerated acts of persecution.

The House bill did not contain any comparable provision.

The House recedes with an amendment which expresses the consensus of the committee of conference that the religious persecution of peoples of all faiths, and the infringement of their freedom of religious observance, is repugnant and to be condemned.

Thomas E. Morgan,
Clement J. Zablocki,
Edna F. Kelly,
Wayne L. Hays,
William S. Mailliard,
Peter H. B. Frelinghuysen,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. MORGAN (interrupting the reading of the statement). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the statement of the managers be dispensed with. This was printed in the Record, and I am sure every Member read the Record this morning, so we can dispense with its reading now.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this conference report on the foreign aid authorization bill was filed last night, only a few hours after the House had officially sent the measure to conference. This does not mean, however, that the agreements contained in the report are the result of hasty or ill-considered action. Far from it. There were some delays in getting the House conferees named. When we were finally appointed yesterday we went to conference after having had the benefit of a number of informal preconference consultations with the Senate conferees.

That is how we were able to reach final agreement last night on the 61 differences between the House and Senate versions of the foreign aid bill. Of these, 23 involved minor technical and conforming changes that presented no problems. The remaining 38, however, ranged from minor to major substantive changes on a wide range of subjects, some of them not even related to foreign aid. Of these, the Senate receded on 28, the House receded on 5, and the committee of conference compromised on 5. I think this is a pretty good indication that we did our best to maintain the position of the House as far as possible.

As passed by the House, the bill authorized appropriations totaling $2,126,472,400. The Senate bill authorized $2,076,600,000, a reduction of $49,872,000. The conference agreement is for $2,116,872,400, a difference below the House figure of only $9,600,000. In the compromise, the Senate conferees agreed to restore the House figures for surveys of investment opportunities, international organizations and programs, supporting assistance and military assistance. In turn, the House conferees agreed to the lower Senate figure on technical cooperation, $215 million as against the House figure of $224,600,000.

One of the most controversial features of the bill, as amended by the Senate, was a provision, included in amendments 47 and 48, which authorized the AID Administrator to separate certain employees without regard to the civil service and veterans' preference laws. This provision had been rejected by the Foreign Affairs Committee by a vote of 16 to 6, including my own. Yesterday, when a motion to instruct the conferees appeared imminent, I pledged my best efforts to maintain the House position and asked that the motion not be made. When the motion was withheld, I appreciated the compliment and the confidence shown in the House conferees by those who sincerely feared this provision as a threat to the civil service merit system and who were concerned that in the necessary "give-and-take" of a conference that we might have to yield. I am happy to report that although it proved necessary to devote a great deal of time to it, this provision has been stricken in the conference agreement.

Mr. Speaker, when the rule was debated yesterday which sent the foreign aid bill to conference, much was said about an ungermane and unrelated matter which had been added to the bill in the Senate. This was amendment No. 60, which related to the Supreme Court decision on the question of reapportionment of State legislatures. During the earlier hearing by the Rules Committee I had expressed my own disapproval of this so-called Mansfield compromise on reapportionment. The House conferees were firm on this and in the conference agreement this provision has also been stricken.

We have brought back to the House a conference report which I believe merits approval by this body. I wish to express my appreciation to all the members of the committee of conference, both House and Senate, for the long hours devoted to seeking and working out acceptable solutions to the differences in the two versions of the bill. In some respects, the conference agreement is better than the form in which the bill passed either House or Senate. I urge the adoption of the report as a compromise which is both reasonable and fair.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I listened to the gentleman's explanation with a great deal of interest and appreciated it very much. I think the conferees did a very good job under the rather difficult circumstances that confronted them. But if I read the press correctly this morning, the conference report which brings in a compromise bill does carry a provision that will permit American aid to be sent to Sukarno, of Indonesia, something that was prohibited, as I understood it, under the provisions of the bill brought out by the committee and adopted by the House; is that correct?

Mr. MORGAN. That is not quite correct. The House last year wrote in its own Indonesia provision prohibiting all aid to Indonesia unless a determination was made by the President that to do so was essential to the national interest of the United States. That is retained in the Foreign Assistance Act. The Senate during debate in that body adopted a separate Indonesia provision that removed the President's discretion, and eliminated the only aid Indonesia is now receiving, which consists only of the training of some military personnel in this country.

As the gentleman is aware, we have been giving no aid to Indonesia except for the training of these military personnel. The act still provides that the President may do this only if he makes a special determination that it is essential to the national interest of the United States.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Is that provision the same as was contained in the bill when it cleared the House?

Mr. MORGAN. The House bill left the restrictions intact. It did not change the limitation we adopted last year.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, may I ask one other question? What about American aid to Yugoslavia and other Communist countries?

Were there any restrictions that were voted in the House eliminated or eased by the action of the conference committee?

Mr. MORGAN. The original Foreign Aid Act of 1961 has restrictions in it against all Communist countries. It has a separate section in it on Yugoslavia and other Communist countries but, of course, again it leaves the final determination up to the President of the United States who must find that the country is not controlled by the international Communist conspiracy; that assistance would promote the independence of the country from international communism and, most important of all, that such assistance is vital to U.S. security. The only aid now provided for Yugoslavia is under provisions of Public Law 480.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, what about the continued aid to Yugoslavia and other pro-Communist nations? Will that aid be continued under the present program?

Mr. MORGAN. Well, it could be, but there has to be a Presidential determination that such aid would be in the interest of our national security.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The reason why I ask that question is this: As the gentleman well knows, there are many Members of the House, including myself, who have been rather opposed in the past to some of our rather peculiar generosity to Communist nations and dictators as well as Communist people all over the world, at the expense of the American taxpayer.

We are anxious to know whether or not there has been any tightening of those restrictions or any loosening of those restrictions.

Mr. MORGAN. I am sure the gentleman is familiar with the bill extending the provisions of Public Law 480 which passed this body last week and which then went to conference. There is a further tightening of these restrictions in that bill.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I realize that.

Mr. MORGAN. That is, with regard to aid to Yugoslavia.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Of course, I am asking the gentleman about this particular piece of legislation today.

Mr. MORGAN. The ban against aid to Yugoslavia is still in the original act of 1961.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. If the gentleman will yield further, I do appreciate the frankness with which the gentleman from Pennsylvania has discussed these matters, and I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I wish to commend the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN] and the managers on the part of the House for having eliminated Senate amendments 47 and 48 dealing with "select out" procedures as well as having brought about the striking of the ungermane milk and water Senate amendment reference to reapportionment.

However, permit me to say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that what I have said in nowise changes my attitude toward the foreign handout program. I am still opposed to it and I believe there is far too much money authorized in this bill. But I do want to commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania and the conferees on the part of the House for what I believe was a worthwhile piece of work at this conference.

Mr. MORGAN. I want to thank the gentleman from Iowa for his comments and I want to assure the gentleman that the hard work which the chairman of the House conferees went through during the last week left him with no illusions and no intention to ever try to change the mind of the gentleman from Iowa as to his position on foreign aid.

Mr. GROSS. If the chairman will yield further, I would like to ask the gentleman what interest rates are provided? Will the gentleman briefly explain what transpired with respect to interest rates?

Mr. MORGAN. As I am sure the gentleman is aware, the Senate adopted the so-called Mundt amendment which provided two formulas for interest rates, one for commercial loans and another for noncommercial loans.

This so-called hardening of the loan process was a very difficult and complex item. It was one of the amendments which required prolonged discussion and consideration by the conferees.

The House conferees were convinced that the Mundt amendment was too severe and would absolutely ruin the development loan section of the bill.

We finally worked out a compromise whereby the so-called service charge or the interest rate during the grace period was increased from three-quarters of 1 percent to 1 percent. Then after the grace period we increased the interest rate from 2 percent to 2½ percent. This represented a compromise agreed to by both the House and the Senate conferees.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, after the 10-year grace period the interest rate will go up to 2½ percent?

Mr. MORGAN. Two and a half percent; that is correct.

Mr. GROSS. I see.

Aside from one or two other amendments—at least one that I note in the report—there are no ungermane amendments of any real import, would the gentleman say?

Mr. MORGAN. I will say that in my opinion there is still one nongermane amendment in this bill. This is the so-called Sabbatino amendment relating to the act of state doctrine. The House conferees were not able to secure its removal, but we did succeed in modifying it by inserting a termination date. This amendment will expire on January 1, 1966. We were successful in securing deletion of practically all the other nongermane amendments.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ADAIR. In line with inquiries made by the gentleman from Iowa concerning interest rates and the response made thereto, I think it should be pointed out that those figures are a minimum, and that there are in fact outstanding loans bearing higher rates of interest.

Mr. MORGAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I should like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Iowa in commendation of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House and the other conferees of the House in striking these nongermane amendments that the other body placed in there, particularly the one with reference to reapportionment.

I think it would have been a great mistake, particularly the one with reference to reapportionment. I think it would have been a great mistake, particularly from the point of view of those of us who think that the Supreme Court went beyond its provinces in legislating reapportionment in that decision and other decisions of similar nature. I particularly objected to the language placed by the other body with reference to apportionment wherein it in effect approved of the action of the Court in this reapportionment matter and where affirmatively they went on record as saying that the Court had jurisdiction in that matter, and in that many of us feel it is not true and it is not so; that it is unconstitutional and that the Court went far beyond its jurisdiction in assuming to legislate in this field.

I hope that this Congress will do something about that matter at an early date.

Mr. MORGAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Adair].

Mr. ADAIR. I should like to join those who have commended the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs for his work. Included in that, to judge from the results which were obtained, should also be all of the House conferees.

A reading of the conference report will indicate clearly the fact that with respect to the other body the House has done exceedingly well. I did not sign the conference report. This does not indicate that I have any lack of appreciation for what has been done. It indicates, rather, a continuation of my longstanding personal objection to the foreign aid program as presently constituted.

I think there are one or two points that can be properly further stressed. There were two items in the bill that had particular reference to the U.S. Supreme Court. One was the section relating to reapportionment, the other was the section relating to the Sabbatino case. Our action in these instances, in my opinion, has indicated that the House very clearly feels that restraint needs to be placed upon the authority of the Supreme Court with respect to certain lines of decisions.

It has been pointed out here earlier that the section with respect to reapportionment was completely stricken. This must not be taken to indicate that the conferees thought that the Court should have complete and unlimited power, as some seem to think, in the matter of requiring redistricting of the several States. We certainly do not believe that to be true. That section was stricken because there was language in it which might have been thought to indicate that we did approve of the intrusion of the Court into these areas of reapportionment. So by cutting it out, it is my opinion that we have said to the Court that "We do not want you intruding into the area of State reapportionment."

The other matter which touches particularly the Court was the Sabbatino case. Members are familiar with that decision. That is the case in which the proceeds from the sale of sugar expropriated by Castro from American owners were involved. The agent of Castro in this country brought an action in our courts to obtain these proceeds. The lower courts ruled in favor of the American owners on the ground that the Castro taking was in violation of international law. The Supreme Court reversed, ruling against the American owners on the basis of a strict new interpretation of the act of state doctrine.

In our conference report we have said that Federal and State courts are to be free in cases before them involving acts of foreign states to enforce principles of international law.

These principles as applied by our courts are to include the requirement for prompt, adequate, and effective compensation in cases of expropriation spelled out in the first part of section 620(e). The new language, like the rest of section 620(e), is important to the protection of investment abroad. It insures that, however the case may arise or the act of state doctrine be invoked, a party who has suffered an expropriation in violation of these principles may bring suit to assert his claim to the expropriated property if there is an attempt to market it in the United States or can resist a suit by the expropriating government to seize the property.

The January 1, 1966, cutoff date we inserted in the amendment will give our committee an opportunity to have hearings next year on how the amendment works in practice during its annual hearings on the Foreign Aid Act. Our adoption of the amendment now requires the State Department, which opposed it, to give the amendment a fair chance to operate in practice, and puts the burden on them in our hearings next year of showing how the amendment's Presidential waiver provision does not amply meet any problems that may arise in the actual conduct of foreign affairs.

Although it may seem somewhat strange to Members to be discussing decisions of the courts in a foreign aid bill, yet as matters turned out that was one of the most significant aspects of the bill. Our modification of the act of state rule in the Sabbatino decision is very important to the security of our private investments abroad.

I close as I began, by saying that the conferees represented the House of Representatives very well. It has hardly been necessary to comment on the dollar items of this conference report because they are extremely close to the dollar values which were in the bill as it passed the House.

The dollars are minimal, and in the context of the $3.5 million overall are not of very great consequence.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. Frances P. Bolton] 2 minutes.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to express my very real appreciation of the work done by all of the members of the conference committee. I particularly wanted to have a Member from the Republican side who does not agree with the way we have been doing foreign aid and I wanted him to express the many things that he is quite equal to expressing with such justice and such fairness. I think the conferees need always to have a Member who objects. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Adair] has always been against the way the foreign aid has been managed and has so voted. But he is so fair, so just that he is a tremendous asset to us all.

I also want to say that the gentleman from California [Mr. Mailliard] and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Frelinghuysen] have contributed a very great deal and as to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Frelinghuysen], in spite of the fact that he has had to be in two places at once. He is exceedingly valuable in both places.

To my chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Morgan], I express the greatest possible appreciation. To the members of the conference committee from this side he has always been fair. Oh, sometimes we like to put a little hot coal under him or something, but we will forgive him all these things because we do appreciate the fineness of his service.

Mr. Speaker, to me this conference report is really a tour de force and a very wonderful report. I anticipate its passage.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MAILLIARD].

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, I think the content of the conference report has been sufficiently explained by prior speakers so I see no reason to unduly consume the time of the House.

May I add my voice to that of the others of my colleagues in expressing my own appreciation of the way in which our chairman and the other conferees conducted themselves.

I think the statistics of the conference report, showing that the other body receded in 40 instances and the House in 5 instances is fairly good evidence of the diligence with which we attempted to maintain the position of the House.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER].

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, as one who is not a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs I want to add my voice of commendation to that of my colleagues for the fine work that has been done by the distinguished chairman of this committee and by each of the conferees including even those Members who might still be in disagreement with the final result.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take a moment to point out something which I think has not heretofore occurred in any foreign aid bill. The reference to religious persecution in this bill is most salutary. I think the conferees are to be commended especially for this significant addition to this bill. While the Senate version did point the finger directly at Soviet Russia, and the version as finally adopted does not, I think the former is the better one.

This particular provision was brought about at this time because of the religious persecutions that are going on primarily in Soviet Russia. It would have been much better, I believe, not only to point the finger at the culprit now before the bar of world public opinion where it is being so severely condemned, but also that this Congress go on record, as it is doing now, against religious persecution wherever it may raise its ugly head.

That this is the least we should do now, I am sure is the unanimous opinion of both Houses of Congress. With more time for consideration of the problem, we can and we will go further.

The conferees are to be complimented for having put this language in in such a forceful way and with such wide application.

We now say to the world that we not only practice freedom of religion here, but espouse it for all people everywhere. More than that we say we abhor religious persecution and urge its end.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN].

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, at this stage of the session perhaps it is unusual that we should find ourselves in a mood of self-congratulation. We can be glad that this is so. I, too, should like to commend the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs for a job well done. To him, real credit is due.

The conference report which has been agreed upon is a significant one, and one on which we can reach general agreement. Individually, perhaps, we may be disappointed about some aspect of the many amendments which we had to consider, and the agreements arrived at. However, I do believe that we have in very large measure successfully defended the House position. It would, indeed, be possible for the other body to argue that we had won too much in defense of our own point of view.

The gentlewoman from Ohio just now in her kind remarks about the House conferees indicated that I have been serving in more than one capacity. It happens that in the past few weeks I served in two conferences with the Senate. I served as a House conferee with respect to the amendments to the National Defense Education Act. The conference report on that subject was under consideration yesterday when I was scheduled to be meeting as a conferee on this foreign aid authorization bill.

The contrast between the procedures in these two conferences was very marked. With respect to the National Defense Education Act, the House conferees capitulated on almost every significant point of difference between our bill and the bill passed by the other body. However, in the foreign aid conference we succeeded in eliminating almost all the nongermane amendments and in maintaining the House position on the important differences between the House and the Senate. I was personally gratified that my amendments to earmark funds specifically for South Vietnam should have been retained.

My only regret is that it took us so long to reach this point of time. I should like to call attention to the fact that the House passed the authorization bill on which we have been conferring on the 10th of June, almost 4 months ago. It was not until the 24th of September that the other body took action on this authorization bill. This delay accounts for the fact that Congress is still in session at this late date. As we all know, the time consumed was largely over the so-called Mansfield amendment, or comparable amendments to that amendment, with respect to legislative reapportionment. The Mansfield amendment, as has been noted, has been eliminated in conference.

In closing, let me say once again that it has been a pleasure to work with the House conferees, and also with the Senate conferees. All concerned have shown real understanding of the complexity of the problems which are incorporated in these amendments, and all have shown a high degree of commonsense, and a desire for conciliation in reaching the necessary compromises.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. MATHIAS. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I should like to congratulate the conferees on the decisions they have reached. I personally was particularly pleased that they eliminated the principle of selection out in the AID employees section. This is particularly important in the long continuing history of Government service.

Mr. Speaker, since there may be another attempt to attain the objective of the amendment adopted by the other body, I should like to briefly outline my position on the subject.

The proposed subsection which would grant the Administrator of the Agency for International Development authority to dismiss employees summarily, in my opinion, constitutes one of the greatest threats to the merit system in recent years. It would gravely endanger that system which has proved to be one of the bulwarks of a democratic government.

The further proposal to permit the selection out of regular civil service employees in the departmental service of the Agency, was no less menacing in its implications for undermining the career service of the Federal Government.

Either eventuality would in effect be unmistakably a step toward weakening the merit system and withdrawing from civil service employees those protections in law which have been provided first in the Civil Service Act 81 years ago and strengthened 31 years later by the Lloyd-LaFollette Act of 1912 and the Veterans Preference Act of 1944, as well as by the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 in its present form.

There were and are some sound objections to these two proposals and I would like to dwell briefly on several of the more significant. The disturbing aspect of both proposed changes in the Foreign Assistance Act in its present form is that the authority requested is to be exercised "notwithstanding any other provision of this or any other law." In effect, the Administrator would be a law unto himself.

Such proposals would open the door to dismissals on grounds other than merit or demerit, and they could well be used for partisan political purposes as well as internal politics within the Department of State. I would hope that these fears are groundless, but from experience it seems the part of wisdom to investigate such proposals carefully and to consider above all their adverse implications for the employees of AID.

The summary firing authority would have been almost certain to damage the morale of virtually all the employees of the Agency, for no one could be certain that at some future time his number would be up, so to speak, because of the stand he took on some particular policy or a change in administrative personnel. Anyone who has had experience in any organization as large as AID knows that internal office politics poses hazards at times which are beyond those that might be encountered in some far-off land.

Many of my constituents would have been affected by this bill under consideration, and they have told me of its many undesirable effects. I have learned of the adverse effect which already has resulted from the arbitrary power vested by Congress in the administrator of agencies that preceded AID in 1953 and in 1961. Those earlier grants of power only harmed those agencies. Many capable employees left because they could not work under such unsettling conditions. It should be obvious that those earlier actions did not fulfill their purpose, or Congress would not now be asked for an extension of that authority. Such an extension would only do more damage to an agency which is badly in need of the dedication and intelligent effort of every one of its experienced and capable employees.

I am amazed that our colleagues in the other body were misled in the belief that summary dismissals could produce any desired results. It is utterly impossible to effect administrative improvements when employees are working in constant fear of reprisal or punishment. Limitation of this summary authority to no more than 100 employees in each of 2 years only questions further the wisdom of making it available. Why select any number as a maximum? And if there is such a segment of the total work force that is delinquent or incompetent, it is strange indeed that courageous and enlightened administration could not utilize the means already at hand to eliminate them from the service. The request for this authority seems to be more an admission of weakness than an indication of administrative competence.

The proposed amendment to subsection 625(e) of the Foreign Assistance Act, for the purpose of extending the selection out procedure now applied in the AID foreign service, is no more palatable than the summary dismissal action which was also requested. It is not lessened in its potentiality for discrimination or reprisal by the promise of administrative standards or the right of appeal to the same Agency officials that had a part in the original action. It is not being overimaginative to suspect that other agencies of Government would seek the same authority. It provides a convenient way for getting rid of people you do not like for some reason or other, and when you can have a part in preparing a case against the individual involved, it is all the more appealing as a method which requires no real explanation.

Under the circumstances, I heartily applaud the corrective action of the conferees and thank the House members of the conference committee for sticking to their guns.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Thomson].

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I probably will not need that amount of time.

I do not wish to strike a discordant note in this mutual admiration society which has taken place today. I do not intend to raise a point of order that a quorum is not present, though obviously a quorum is not present.

However, I did not want the vote to be taken with anyone feeling that I was supporting this conference report. As the chairman of the committee knows, I have been trying to get information for 3 months on the unbelievable squandering of American taxpayers' money in a market in Athens, Greece. The AID people do not even have a record of more than $3 million being spent there. The records are all kept in Athens, because it involves Public Law 480 money, counterpart funds. We do not keep records in America unless it involves dollars.

Since I have been making this inquiry—and the Chairman has been assisting me in it—the Inspector General has started to work on the problem, the State Department has started to work on the problem, the Comptroller General has started to work on it, and everybody interested in the foreign aid program is beginning to look into it. But since the 25th of June—and here it is the 2d day of October—I have been unable to find out what happened to the American money in Athens, Greece. That is only one drop in the bucket where millions of dollars are being wasted. If our committee would turn its attention to the July 1964 report of the General Accounting Office and their revelations with regard to the waste of American money in Vietnam, they would see where we cashed a check for $10 million and converted it into the currency of South Vietnam, and we cannot find out where the money has gone or who it was who got away with it.

I think before we vote additional billions of dollars that we will pour into this program we must tighten up the laws and procedures and methods being followed in the passing out of American millions.

I thank the chairman very much for yielding me this time.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I would like the record to clearly show that I opposed the Dirksen amendment on reapportionment. I approve, therefore, the action of the managers on the part of the House on the foreign aid conference in eliminating this amendment. Had such a matter come before the House, I would have voted against including this amendment in the bill. Not only did I disapprove of the language of the amendment, but also I have disapproved of any delay in redistricting, and especially in my own State of Washington. Our Governor has failed to call a special session for this purpose. Consequently our legislature, under an edict of a panel of Federal judges, faces a system of weighted voting.

However, Mr. Speaker, at least now the Dirksen amendment is killed.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the conference report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS OF SELECT COMMITTEE TO CONDUCT A STUDY AND INVESTIGATION RELATING TO GENERAL WELFARE AND EDUCATION OF CONGRESSIONAL PAGES

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 847, 88th Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Select Committee to conduct a study and investigation of all factors relating to the general welfare and education of congressional pages the following Members on the part of the House: Mrs. Green of Oregon, chairman; Mr. Gibbons, of Florida; Mr. Charles H. Wilson, of California; Mr. Broomfield, of Michigan; and Mr. Curtin, of Pennsylvania.

INTERNATIONAL CLAIMS SETTLEMENT ACT OF 1949

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the Senate amendments to H.R. 12259 to amend the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949 to provide for the determination of the amounts of claims of nationals of the United States against the Government of Cuba.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, line 1 after "Cuba" insert "which have arisen out of debts for merchandise furnished or services rendered by nationals of the United States without regard to the date on which such merchandise was furnished or services were rendered or".

Page 2, line 9, after "States." insert "This title shall not be construed as authorizing an appropriation or as any intention to authorize an appropriation for the purpose of paying such claims."

Page 3, line 13, after "Cuba" insert "arising out of debts for merchandise furnished or services rendered by nationals of the United States without regard to the date on which such merchandise was furnished or services were rendered or

Page 4, line 24, strike out "unless" and insert "if considered shall be considered only to the extent".

Page 5, strike out lines 3 to 7, inclusive, and insert:

"'(b) A claim for disability under section 503(b) may be considered if it is filed by the disabled person or by his successors in interest; and a claim for death under section 503(b) may be considered if filed by the personal representative of decedent's estate or by a person or persons for pecuniary losses and damage sustained on account of such death. A claim shall not be considered under this section unless the disabled or deceased person was a national of the United States at the time of injury or death and if considered, shall be considered only to the extent the claim has been held by a national or nationals of the United States continuously until the date of filing with the Commission.

Page 6, line 12, after "losses" insert ": *Provided*, That the deduction of such amounts shall not be construed as divesting the United States of any rights against the Government of Cuba for the amounts so deducted".

Page 6, line 14, strike out "507." and insert "507. (a)".

Page 6, line 19, after "amount" the second time it appears insert ", together with a statement of the evidence relied upon and the reasoning employed in reaching its decision".

Page 6, after line 19, insert:

"'(b) The amount determined to be due on any claim of an assignee who acquires the same by purchase shall not exceed (or, in the case of any such acquisition subsequent to the date of the determination, shall not be deemed to have exceeded) the amount of the actual consideration paid by such assignee, or in case of successive assignments of a claim by any assignee."

Page 7, line 18, strike out "'APPROPRIATIONS" and insert:

"'APPROPRIATIONS AND VESTING AND LIQUIDATION OF CUBAN PROPERTY"

Page 7, line 19, strike out "511." and insert "511. (a)".

Page 7, line 20, strike out "$750,000" and insert "the aggregate amount of the net proceeds realized from the sale or liquidation of the property of the Government of Cuba pursuant to subsection (b) of this section".

Page 7, line 21, after "Commission" insert "and the Treasury Department".

Page 7, line 21, strike out "its".

Page 7, line 22, strike out "its" and insert "their".

Page 7, after line 23, insert:

"'(b) Any property of the Government of Cuba which was blocked in accordance with the Cuban assets control regulations, July 8, 1963 (31 C.F.R., part 515, et seq.), and which remains so blocked six months following the date of enactment of this title shall vest in such offiecr or agency as the President may from time to time designate upon such terms as the President or his designee shall direct. Such property shall be sold or otherwise liquidated as expeditiously as possible after vesting under such rules and regulations as the President or his designee may prescribe. So much of the net proceeds remaining upon completion of the liquidation thereof as may be necessary shall be used to reimburse the Government of the United States for expenses incurred by the Commission and by the Treasury Department in the administration of this title. Any proceeds remaining thereafter shall be covered into the Treasury to the credit of miscellaneous receipts.

Page 7, after line 23, insert:

"'FEES FOR SERVICES

"'SEC. 512. No remuneration on account of any services rendered on behalf of any claimant in connection with any claim filed with the Commission under this title shall exceed 10 per centum of so much of the total amount of such claim, as determined under this title, as does not exceed $20,000, plus 5 per centum of so much of such amount, if any, as exceeds $20,000. Any agreement to the contrary shall be unlawful and void. Whoever, in the United States or elsewhere, demands or receives on account of services so rendered, any remuneration in excess of the maximum permitted by this section shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than twelve months, or both."

Page 8, line 2, strike out "512" and insert "513".

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. speaker, reserving the right to object, would the gentleman from Florida be kind enough to explain the significance of the Senate amendments so that we can understand them?

Mr. FASCELL. I will be very happy to, Mr. Speaker.

You will recall that this bill passed the House unanimously and came out of the Committee on Foreign Affairs unanimously. The bill also came out of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee unanimously with certain amendments which are now before us. The bill provides a procedure whereby American claimants against the Government of Cuba would be able to place and prove a claim before the U.S. Foreign Claims Settlement Commission. The Senate wrote a provision with respect to attorneys' fees, which is one of the amendments involved here. Claims of U.S. nationals against the Government of Cuba vary in amounts ranging from a few hundred dollars to many millions of dollars. It was thought that it might be more difficult for persons having small claims to obtain competent legal assistance in the preparation and presentation of claims. It was decided to permit attorneys to receive up to 10 percent of their fees on the first $20,000 of any claim. However, on the other hand, recognizing that there are many large claimants, the committee felt it would be desirable to permit an attorney to receive up to 5 percent for his services on that portion of any claim in excess of $20,000. This was a restriction put in by the Senate, to which we are asking agreement.

The other major substantive amendment inserted by the Senate went back to the original version of the House bill; and that was to take the blocked assets of the Cuban Government here in the United States and apply them toward the administrative costs for carrying out the purpose of this bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield so that I may ask a question of the gentleman from Florida?

Mr. MAILLIARD. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. But you in no way went back to the provisions in the original bill which provided for certain incentives for investment in foreign countries?

Mr. FASCELL. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, in proposing acceptance of the Senate amendments to the Cuban claims bill we authored, I would like to reassure my colleagues as to the effect of some of these amendments. I will, therefore, state our understanding on these aspects of the Senate amendments on the basis of which I recommend the bill to you:

First. There are certain erroneous statements and assumptions made in the Senate report with reference to the Senate amendment to section 506 about the tax treatment of Cuban losses. These statements are not necessary to the proper construction of section 506 since there is no ambiguity in its language. It is our intention that section 506 not refer to any amounts not actually paid to a claimant and that it therefore not change the present provisions of the Internal Revenue Code dealing with tax deductions for expropriation losses and the subsequent imposition of taxes on any recovery.

Second. At the request of the State Department the Senate added a provision to section 507(a) requiring that the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission in its adjudications furnish a statement of the evidence relied upon and the reasoning employed in reaching its decision. We take this to mean that the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, as it has in the past, should exercise its judgment as to the evidence and reasoning set out in its adjudications and that if it follows its practice under its present able chairman, Dr. Re, this requirement will be satisfied.

Third. We construe the Senate amendment to section 507(b) dealing with the valuation of claims that had been assigned to apply to those claims that have been actually transferred in arm's length transactions between unrelated parties. I am informed that a number of corporations have consolidated the claims held by their various subsidiaries and affiliates. The Senate provision would not apply to such transfers.

Fourth. In section 511, the Senate has authorized administrative expenses for this program in the amount to be realized from the disposition of Cuban Government assets blocked in the United States. We understand this provision to permit an immediate appropriation of an amount sufficient to initiate the claims adjudication process, provided it is within the estimate of what is ultimately to be realized from these assets.

We construe this authorization to cover the administrative expenses of whatever agency is ultimately designated by the President to carry out the vesting and liquidation of such assets. We construe the reference to "property of the Government of Cuba" not to include property that Castro claims title to by virtue of expropriations he has effected since January 1, 1959. Otherwise, we would be giving broader effect to the very expropriation decrees we reject as invalid and increasing the loss of the U.S. claimants beyond what Castro has been able to accomplish.

Mr. Speaker, since Castro came to power on January 1, 1959, the Cuban Government has expropriated and nationalized all properties in Cuba owned by nationals of the United States. In violation of principles of international law, no effective compensation has been paid. Current estimates of the total amount of claims of U.S. nationals against the Government of Cuba are in the neighborhood of $1.5 billion. There are many claimants, large and small, in all parts of our country.

More than 5 years have passed since the Castro government began confiscating the property of American nationals and it is obvious that the early adjudication of claims would be in the best interest of all concerned. This bill provides the necessary authority to set the machinery in motion for an orderly determination of the amount and validity of claims of U.S. nationals against the Government of Cuba while the means of documenting and supporting such claims are still available. If this matter is delayed any longer, witnesses and claimants may die and records may be lost, thus making it increasingly difficult to substantiate claims. Moreover, the promp receipt and determination of the amounts and validity of the claims will provide the Department of State with an accurate record for use in any future negotiations.

I wish to emphasize that the payment of such claims is not the responsibility of the U.S. Government—it is the responsibility of the Cuban Government and this legislation does not contemplate that claimants will be paid out of U.S. funds. But it is necessary and important to receive the claims of Americans and to have the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission in a prompt and orderly fashion determine their amount and validity. This bill makes that possible and I am grateful that it has had the unanimous support of both this House and the other body.

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman; and I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House concur in the Senate amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REGULATING THE LOCATION OF CHANCERIES IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 646) to prohibit the location of chanceries and other business offices of foreign governments in any residential area in the District of Columbia, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I hope it will not be necessary for me to object—will the gentleman briefly explain this bill.

Mr. MULTER. I shall be very happy to.

Mr. Speaker, this bill deals with the location of chanceries and other business offices of foreign governments in residential areas in the District of Columbia.

In order better to understand the subject matter I should say that an embassy is the residence of the head of the diplomatic mission of a foreign government, such as the ambassador, charge d'affaires or the minister; that is, the ranking head. The chancery is the business office of the mission or of the embassy as the case may be. Many times, in the case of smaller countries, the chancery or business office will be combined with the embassy residence. In the larger countries where they have extensive business here, the chancery will be a separate office in an office building or in a separate building which houses the business offices of the foreign country.

The bill came to us from the other body with an absolute prohibition against any chancery either as part of an embassy or separate from the embassy being located in any residential area anywhere in this area. When the bill got to the Committee on the District of Columbia we made some important changes. Both the subcommittee and the full committee acted unanimously. We reported the bill with an amendment which instead of excluding chanceries entirely and completely from all residential areas, we did so with some very severe limitations. For instance, in a strictly residential area which consisted only of one-family homes, we provided that the embassy and chancery combined in the residence, if it had less than six employees, could locate there if it otherwise met the criteria for the surrounding area, as to size and design, parking facilities and the like.

We also provided that under these same conditions where they met all the surrounding requirements as to height of building and parking facilities and the like they could go into other residential areas. They can go into any commercial area and into special-purpose areas, whether it is a combination of chancery and embassy or merely the chancery alone. That is the way, incidentally, that the bill passed the House after it was reported by the House committee, and without any objection, with these limitations permitting them to go into the strictly residential areas if there were less than seven employees.

When we got to conference the representatives of the other body suggested that it would recede if we would accept an amendment which would exclude from the strictly residential areas the combination chancery and embassy, or the chancery alone. We felt this was reasonable and agreed thereto.

Therefore, as the bill now comes before the House by this conference report, we restrict the embassy-chancery combination or the chancery alone from going into the strictly residential areas. They cannot go in there under this bill under any circumstances, no matter how few employees they have. But we do permit them to go into the high-density and middle-density apartment house areas. This is what is known as the "R–5C" and "R–5D" residential areas.

We let them go into commercial areas as such. We do not restrict them in that regard. We let them go into the special-purpose areas, provided they meet the zoning requirements. We let them go into the middle-density and high-density apartment areas, if they otherwise comply with all of the zoning requirements and also meet the parking facilities requirement we set forth in this bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman say that this report reasonably meets the protests of certain citizens groups, or does he have that information?

Mr. MULTER. I believe I can inform the gentleman from Iowa that practically all of the objections which we received against the location of chanceries in residential areas have been met. This was stirred up primarily by the attempt of the Soviet Government to move into a very highly restricted residential area and build a chancery office building there. That cannot be done under this bill.

There are other countries which also sought to go into these highly residential areas with offices and chanceries rather than just residences. We do not restrict them as to an embassy. This, we believe, belongs in the residential areas and there was no objection raised about that. But the objections by the residents of these very strictly residential areas were against these chanceries coming in there. Those objections are now met by this bill.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for his explanation.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 1924)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 646) to prohibit the location of chanceries and other business offices of foreign governments in any residential area in the District of Columbia, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the text of the bill and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

"That section 6 of the Act entitled 'An Act providing for the zoning of the District of Columbia and the regulation of the location, height, bulk, and uses of buildings and other structures and the uses of land in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes', approved June 20, 1938, as amended (D.C. Code, sec. 5–418), is amended by inserting '(a)' after 'SEC. 6.' and by adding at the end of such section the following new subsections:

"'(b) After the date of enactment of this subsection a foreign government shall be permitted to construct, alter, repair, convert, or occupy a building anywhere in the District of Columbia, other than a district or zone restricted in accordance with this Act to use for industrial purposes, for use by such government as an embassy.

"'(c) After the date of enactment of this subsection, except as otherwise provided in subsection (d) of this section, no foreign government shall be permitted to construct, alter, repair, convert, or occupy a building for use as a chancery where official business of such government is to be conducted on any land, regardless of the date such land was acquired, within any district or zone restricted in accordance with this Act to use for residential purposes.

"'(d) After the date of enactment of this subsection a foreign government shall be permitted to construct, alter, repair, convert, or occupy a building for use as a chancery within any district or zone restricted in accordance with this Act to use for medium-high density apartments or high density apartments if the Board of Zoning Adjustment shall determine after a public hearing that the proposed use and the building in which the use is to be conducted are compatible with the present and proposed development of the neighborhood. In determining compatibility the Board of Zoning Adjustment must find that—

"'(1) in districts or zones restricted in accordance with this Act to use for medium-high density apartments, that off-set parking spaces will be provided at a ratio of not less than one such space for each twelve hundred square feet of gross floor area; and

"'(2) in districts or zones restricted in accordance with this Act to use for high density apartments, that off-street parking spaces will be provided at a ratio of not less than one such space for each one thousand eight hundred square feet of gross floor area; and

"'(3) the height of the building does not exceed the maximum permitted in the district or zone in which it is located; and

"'(4) the architectural design and the arrangement of all structures and off-street parking spaces are in keeping with the character of the neighborhood.

"'(e) As used in this section, the term—

"'(1) "embassy" means a building used as the official residence of the chief of a diplomatic mission of a foreign government.

"'(2) "chancery" means a building containing business offices of the chief of a diplomatic mission of a foreign government where official business of such government is conducted, and such term shall include any chancery annex, and the business offices of attachés of a foreign government who are under the personal direction and superintendence of the chief of mission of such government. Such term shall not include business offices of nondiplomatic missions of foreign governments such as purchasing, financial, educational, or other missions of comparable nondiplomatic nature.

"'(3) "person" means any individual who is subject to direction by the chief of mission of a foreign government and is engaged in diplomatic activities recognized as such by the Secretary of State.'

"SEC. 2. Nothing in the amendments made by the first section of this Act shall prohibit—

"(1) the future or continued use of a building as a chancery or the making of ordinary repairs to any such building for which lawful use as a chancery existed on the date of enactment of this Act, or

"(2) the construction, reconstruction, expansion, or alteration in accordance with any permit issued by the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia on or before February 18, 1964, of any building used or to be used as a chancery.

"SEC. 3. The amendments made by the first section of this Act shall apply only to applications for special exemptions to the zoning regulations filed with the Board of Zoning Adjustment after May 1, 1964.

"SEC. 4. After the date of enactment of this Act, no building or chancery being used by a foreign government in the District of Columbia shall be transferred to or used by another foreign government unless such use is in accordance with section 6 of the Act of June 20, 1938, as amended (D.C. Code, sec. 5-418), or unless such use was in accordance with applicable law at the time of this enactment.

"SEC. 5. This Act and the amendments made thereby shall not be administered in such a way as to discriminate against any foreign government on the basis of the race, color, or creed of any of its citizens."

And the House agree to the same.

Amendment to title: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the title of the bill, and agree to the same.

ABRAHAM J. MULTER,
T. G. ABERNETHY,
GEORGE HUDDLESTON, Jr.,
WILLIAM L. SPRINGER,
FRANK HORTON,
Managers on the Part of the House.
TOM MCINTYRE,
WAYNE MORSE,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 646) to prohibit the location of chanceries and other business offices of foreign governments in any residential area in the District of Columbia, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The House amendment struck out all of the Senate bill after the enacting clause and inserted a substitute. The Senate recedes from its disagreement to the amendment of the House, with an amendment which is a substitute for both the Senate bill and the House amendment. The conference substitute is in large part the same as the House amendment. The differences between the House amendment and the substitute agreed to in conference are noted below except for minor technical and clarifying changes made necessary by reason of the conference agreement.

The House amendment made a distinction between those chanceries having more than six persons conducting the official business of a foreign government and those having less than seven persons. The House amendment permitted the smaller chanceries (those having less than seven persons) and the combination embassy/chancery (an official residence of an ambassador where official business is also conducted by less than seven persons) to locate in certain residential areas closed to the larger chanceries.

The proposed conference substitute makes no distinction between the large chancery and the small chancery or the combination embassy/chancery so that the statute will apply equally to both large and small chanceries.

The House amendment provided that a foreign government could locate any size chancery in an area zoned for medium-high density apartments or high density apartments and, in the case of a small chancery (one having less than seven persons), in any other area zoned for residential purposes, if the Board of Zoning Adjustment determined, after a public hearing, that the proposed use as a chancery was compatible with the development of the neighborhood.

The proposed conference substitute deletes the provision in the House amendment which permits the location of a small chancery in an area zoned for residential purposes (other than an area zoned for medium-high density apartments or high density apartments) and prohibits the location of any chancery in such an area.

ABRAHAM J. MULTER,
T. G. ABERNETHY,
GEORGE HUDDLESTON, Jr.,
WILLIAM L. SPRINGER,
FRANK HORTON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in explanation of the conference report and ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the conference report just adopted.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 270]

Alger
Aspinall
Avery
Ayres
Bass
Belcher
Berry
Brooks
Buckley
Burton, Calif.
Casey
Celler
Clark
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Diggs
Dorn
Edmondson
Ellsworth
Evins
Finnegan
Fino
Fisher
Flynt
Forrester
Giaimo
Gill
Grant
Hanna
Healey
Hébert
Hoffman
Holland
Hull
Jones, Ala.
Kee
Keogh
Knox
Landrum
Lankford
Leggett
Lesinski
McIntire
Mailliard
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Matsunaga
Michel
Miller, Calif.
Miller, N.Y.
Montoya
Morris
Morrison
Morton
Nix
Pilcher
Pool
Powell
Purcell
Rains
Reid, Ill.
Reifel
Rivers, Alaska
Rogers, Tex.
Rostenkowski
St. George
Schwengel
Scott
Selden
Senner
Sheppard
Sikes
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Springer
Stafford
Sullivan
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, La.
Thompson, Tex.
Toll
Tupper
Weltner
Younger

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). On this rollcall 341 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

CLASSIFICATION OF CERTAIN POSITIONS UNDER HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I call up House Resolution 894 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 12318) to provide an equitable system for the classification of certain positions under the House of Representatives, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on House Administration, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] and pending that I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 894 provides for consideration of H.R. 12318, a bill to provide an equitable system for the classification of certain positions under the House of Representatives, and for other purposes. The resolution provides an open rule with 1 hour of general debate.

The general purposes of H.R. 12318 are:

First. To adjust salaries of employees in the four departments of the House of Representatives, namely, the Clerk, the Sergeant at Arms, the Doorkeeper, and the Postmaster, in accordance with the principle of equal pay for substantially equal work;

Second. To compensate employees and establish a logical and appropriate relationship between certain House positions on the basis of differences in the difficulty, responsibility, and qualification requirements of the work performed;

Third. To establish a system wherein longevity or tenure in a job may be recognized; and

Fourth. To establish tables of organization to reflect staffing, functions, and program responsibilities.

It is believed that enactment of the legislation will eliminate a number of time-consuming and inefficient practices in the pay area but also will inaugurate improvements in salary administration and in the management of personnel.

It is not a pay increase bill.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 894.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Speaker, I join with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. YOUNG], in support of this resolution which will make in order consideration of the bill H.R. 12318 that, in my opinion, will deal very effectively with an employment problem here in the House of Representatives—and only in the House of Representatives—which has plagued us for a good many years.

Under the provisions of this bill you will have a basis or base upon which under the standards of the Civil Service Act, minor employees of the House will be placed on an equal basis. It will bring an end to the long-established custom of too often putting in a minor resolution or offering a resolution at the end of the day by some particular Member, perhaps with some influence in the House, to increase the pay of some favored employee without regard to the services rendered, as far as the same type of work and the same kind of service rendered by some other employee.

It will straighten out and adjust for the first time the differences that now exist in the House. It will eliminate this practice of special resolutions, as I have said. It will place these employees under the provisions of the Classified Civil Service Act, that is, as far as the qualifications they must have to fill their positions. It will also, of course, provide for an equitable way to handle all of the employment in the minor positions of the House. There will be 1 hour of general debate, under an open rule where amendments may be offered. I have been told one amendment to be offered by the House Committee on Administration will be purely to correct a typographical error in the bill. There may be another amendment offered for the purpose of eliminating certain positions in the Press Gallery which should not come under the provisions of the law. This matter was called to the attention of the committee and, as I understand it, the committee has agreed since the bill was reported to offer an amendment to correct that particular provision of the bill.

I know of no opposition to the rule. I hope it will be adopted, and that we may proceed to the consideration of this legislation which, as I said in the beginning, is purely a House of Representative housekeeping bill to straighten out some of our many problems here at home. We have been legislating all year on matters affecting the whole Nation. Let us clean up a situation in our own back yard, or front yard, so that at least when we start a new Congress next January we may have a sounder, saner basis upon which to compensate and to evaluate the services of our minor House employees.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 12318) to provide an equitable system for the classification of certain positions under the House of Representatives, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 12318, with Mr. JOHNSON of California in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON].

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, this measure is a bit complex and it may appear that way to you, yet with some of the explanations available I believe you will agree to this matter we are presenting. What it actually does is to give us a system in the operation of the House of Representatives which we do not now have and have never had. Almost everything has become complicated, bigger, with more employees, more cost, and so forth.

First, I want to pay particular tribute to my friend, the able gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FRIEDEL], who has diligently worked on this measure for 10 months. He has had the help of experts from the General Accounting Office and from the Civil Service Commission. They have devoted 5 straight months to a study of the mechanics of this thing, as to how it will work in theory and in practice. I hope it will give us a system which will do away with some of the haphazard handling of the things which I think all of us know exist here in our own operation.

We are inclined to criticize the executive departments and the bureaus, and so forth, and at times I have been a party to it. It is easy to give the bureaucrats a bad time about the way they run things, but actually, just between us, I would not be surprised if an objective appraisement were made we are not just about the greatest offenders in all Government because of the way we handle our own affairs. I venture to say there is not a week that passes that some of you will not be coming to us asking about the treatment of a certain employee.

This covers only the employees of the four elective offices of the House of Representatives. Please bear that in mind as we go along. That is, the Clerk, the Sergeant at Arms, the Doorkeeper, and the Postmaster. It involves about 435 employees.

We say this is not a salary increase bill. I will contradict myself first and say that it is estimated to raise the first-year cost by $130,000. The reason we say it is not an increase bill is that we say it is a salary adjustment bill. By attrition by retirement, deaths, resignations, and so forth, the higher salary the employee is receiving will not go to his replacement. The person filling such a position will drop back to the starting salary for that position. There are supervisors, there are men and women in responsible positions who actually draw less salary than people who work for them, and that is hardly conducive to the best morale. We are trying to adjust that.

There is some theory involved in this thing. It may not be perfect; at least, I would not contend it to be perfect. But we hope that if we go along with some trial and error, and there is going to be some error, there is no question about that, we can put people in the proper slots, so that, considering their work along with their responsibility, they will get commensurate pay. In other words it is a job which we believe, Mr. Chairman, can be properly described as equal pay for equal work. We ought to make the pay commensurate with that job and the responsibilities of that job. That is really the whole thing involved here. I repeat I do not know that we are doing this in all instances but at least that is what we are trying to do. If you will support us on this bill we will have a system that will be of great help to us and of course it will be up to us to try to make that system work.

There is a great deal of responsibility which goes with this bill and while I might say that so far as I am concerned I do not invite that responsibility, it does place quite an obligation on the Committee on House Administration to see that this system does work. This will require that we have someone who is really expert in this field. If we do this, and of course we will make every effort to do so, then we will have something that we hope will be comparable to the operations of government in other areas regarding the 455 employees involved in this proposed change.

This does not disturb the patronage system. That question has been asked and perhaps it should be. But I repeat it does not disturb the patronage system; and I am not critical of that at all. But I understand that the patronage committee agrees to this action and so far as I know the leadership on both sides are in agreement that some system be established with reference to these matters. Let us try this and we will try to put into operation an orderly procedure so that we will know exactly what the situation is.

Incidentally, we are putting this thing on a flat salary basis so that one can tell what the salary of an employee is. We are doing away with this so-called base salary business, which I think should be eliminated in all employment. At least this will be a step in that direction through the adoption of this bill.

If a person draws $5,000 or $10,000 or $15,000 or whatever the salary is, then that is the gross salary and does away with the system of base pay as we now have it.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KYL. The gentleman has said that we do not disturb the patronage system by this bill and he is correct. However this system that is proposed in this bill would prevent putting someone in an office at let us say a figure of $17,000 simply because he is a favored person while other people in that office who are actually on a scale above this individual would draw far less money. Is that not correct?

Mr. BURLESON. That is correct. And that has caused quite a disturbance in some instances.

Mr. KYL. There is one other point that the gentleman has made which should be elaborated on so that all Members do understand what a complicated and foolish proposition the present system of salary scales is. We actually have people on the Hill who do not want promotions because a promotion would mean that they would get less money.

Mr. BURLESON. Yes, that has happened.

Mr. KYL. That has happened because the title that would go with the promotion actually means less income for the individual.

Mr. BURLESON. Exactly. As the gentleman knows, we have tried to identify the job so that it is in black and white and you can know what the employee is supposed to be doing. In other words his work will be that for which he is hired. An employee on the payroll as a janitor should not be the chief adviser on nuclear energy. I am being facetious of course, but some things which occasionally come to notice is almost this ridiculous and misleading. Some of this sort of thing is not always by design, but over a period of time develops this way. We hope to keep a correct job description to determine responsibility, pay, et cetera.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, as has been well explained by both the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. YOUNG] and the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], of the Committee on Rules, and our colleague the chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON], this bill, H.R. 12318, has been worked on for many months and has received most thorough consideration. It provides for an equitable system for the classification of certain positions in the House of Representatives in the four departments mentioned by the chairman; namely, the Clerk of the House, the Sergeant at Arms, the Doorkeeper and the Postmaster. It does not apply in any way to Members of the House of Representatives, to the employees on their staffs, the staffs of committees or the officials of the House which are proposed by the leadership of the majority and minority and subsequently by the House.

This measure now before us provides for an orderly procedure and brings such orderly procedure out of a previously chaotic condition. This present chaotic situation has been created by the adoption, from time to time, of resolutions which have sometimes been ill considered and quickly considered and have been brought up without much advance notice.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following statement of the purpose and objectives of the bill:

H.R. 12318

PURPOSE

To provide an equitable system for the classification of certain positions in the House of Representatives, as follows: Office of the Clerk of the House, office of the Sergeant at Arms, office of the Doorkeeper, and office of the Postmaster.

Inasmuch as the police force—office of the Sergeant at Arms—and the telephone operator—office of the Clerk of the House—function under the joint jurisdiction of the Senate and House of Representatives, they are excluded from the bill.

The bill does not apply to Members of the House of Representatives, nor to employees in their offices.

The bill does not apply to the office of the Speaker, Parliamentarian, Chaplain, coordinator of information, legislative counsel, or committee staffs.

OBJECTIVES

To establish an orderly and businesslike system of personnel operation.

To recognize longevity or tenure in all positions.

To adjust salaries in accordance with the principle of equal pay for substantially equal work.

To aline positions properly in order to establish a relationship based on differences in the difficulty and responsibility of the work performed.

CONCLUSIONS

The bill will not alter or affect in any way the existing patronage system of the House of Representatives.

It will not affect the authority of House officers to make assignments, or to detail or transfer employees to other positions as the need arises.

No employee will receive a reduction in salary because of the adoption of the pending bill.

It will not be possible for supervisors to receive less salary than employees working under them.

There will no longer be a designation of "basic salary" for the positions covered by the bill.

The House of Representatives will be relieved of consideration of individual or piecemeal pay resolutions.

ADMINISTRATION

As a result of over a year's work on the part of the Committee on House Administration, the committee now has a job description for each position, a personnel record of each employee, and an evaluation of each position based on information applicable to other positions in the Congress and in the executive departments.

Uniform standards will be maintained, and job descriptions will be kept current.

Deadend jobs will be eliminated by the proposed longevity system of automatic pay increases.

Under H.R. 12318 the Committee on House Administration is authorized to establish new positions on either a temporary or a permanent basis whenever the committee determines that such positions are warranted in the interest of the efficient operation of the House of Representatives.

Pay schedules have been established, and may be changed from time to time upon administrative authority of the committee.

The bill authorizes the Committee on House Administration to establish and maintain a system of automatic advancement by successive step increases in compensation for those employees within the scope of the legislation. The committee may revise such steps from time to time as it deems appropriate.

COSTS

Present annual gross salaries of personnel covered by H.R. 12318, including the recent pay increase, total $3,024,839.

The initial cost of $130,000, which we expect to recapture over the next 5 years, is less than 4 percent of the payroll.

I would urge the adoption of this measure. I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEED].

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, as chairman of the Legislative Appropriations Subcommittee, we have more than a passing interest in this proposed legislation because year after year the inequities which exist, with which this bill seeks to deal, have created numerous problems for the subcommittee.

As Members know, there is a restriction against legislating on an appropriation bill. We have been quite limited in the opportunities we have had to try to iron out some of the inequities, but there has never been a bill with which I have had anything to do which has not had some serious difficulties because legislation such as is proposed today did not exist.

I believe this is a very good bill. I believe it is badly needed. I feel certain any Member who has tried to acquaint himself with our housekeeping problems here realizes it is long overdue.

I know this is a detailed and technical matter with which we are dealing, which has some angles to it hard to cope with. For that reason I wanted to take a moment to express my personal appreciation to the committee for the long work it has done and for what I believe to be the good job it has done in bringing this legislation before the House today.

I certainly hope the House will approve this legislation. If it does, I assure the Members that the work of the Legislative Appropriations Subcommittee in the new Congress will be made a great deal easier and a great deal more proper.

I believe this involves an important morale factor for our employees on "the Hill." At this time I know of three or four matters which have been of some interest to some Members and some employees, and there is authority in this legislation to cope with those matters. At the present time there is no way to cope with them.

These things will continue to come up, because we have a large and varied activity here. I cannot urge too strongly the favorable consideration of the bill before the House today.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Chairman, I should like to express my own personal appreciation to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FRIEDEL], and to the other Members both on the majority and minority sides for the excellent job they have done on this measure.

I should also like to express my personal appreciation and thanks to the General Accounting Office and the Civil Service Commission for the very able assistance they have rendered to our committee in developing the schedules which have been developed, which I feel certain are completely equitable.

Again I urge the adoption of this bill.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHENCK. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. Due to the manner in which the bill has been brought up, there are a couple of questions I should like to ask the gentleman. As I understand the situation, we shall be acting on this matter in only a few moments.

Could I ask the gentleman what the procedure will be as it relates to hiring and firing of these employees, under this equitable system of classification?

Mr. SCHENCK. In reply to my friend the gentleman from Florida may I say there is no change at all in the procedures. The various elected officials of the House will still have complete control of their own individual departments.

They will have complete authority to make assignments that entail transfer or to detail the work of employees or to transfer employees to other work. It has no bearing at all upon the system that is in operation. It is not in any sense a civil service bill, but it is merely patterned along those lines in order to bring about the proper order. But it does not in any way affect the authority of any of the elected officers of the House in hiring, assigning, or firing their own employees.

Mr. CRAMER. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SCHENCK. I am glad to yield.

Mr. CRAMER. Do I understand, then, that with respect to the hiring and firing practices or procedures it is not intended that a civil service type procedure will be established relating to that, but it will be handled through the Democratic leadership as relates to the majority employees and through the Republican leadership as relates to the minority employees. Is that correct?

Mr. SCHENCK. The gentleman is absolutely correct. It is exactly that way. And for that reason, this matter was very carefully discussed with the leadership on both the majority and minority sides and the leadership on both sides are in complete agreement as to the value and workability of this measure, this was brought out.

Mr. CRAMER. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SCHENCK. I am glad to.

Mr. CRAMER. There are a number of minority employees in addition to that specifically set out on pages 2 and 3; namely, the position of minority pair clerk, which is set out on page 2, line 25. It is true, of course, is it not, that there are a number of other minority employee positions, so could the gentleman indicate as to why the minority pair clerk was included under this classification but no other minority employees were specifically included?

Mr. SCHENCK. I should like to explain to my friend from Florida, there have been some inequities arising throughout the years due to the haphazard way in which some of these positions and salaries have been handled. The committee has gone on the theory that equal pay for equal work should be the general underlying philosophy. Therefore, there are some changes in this measure, as the chairman of our committee, the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON] referred to, which would correct some existing inequities. For that reason that position is specifically set out here.

Mr. CRAMER. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SCHENCK. Yes.

Mr. CRAMER. Do I understand, then, that the effect of this resolution so far as minority employees are concerned is that it affects only the minority pair clerk? All other minority employees are outside of the Classification Act?

Mr. SCHENCK. No. It affects all minority employees and all majority employees and is subject entirely to both the minority and majority leadership on each side of the House.

Mr. CRAMER. Could the gentleman tell me, then, why the minority pair clerk is specifically set out but no other minority employees are included and specifically set out?

Mr. SCHENCK. As I understand it, that was the greatest inequity under this present situation.

Mr. CRAMER. Then, why was it necessary to set it out at all if they are all covered?

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHENCK. Yes. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KYL. There is a technical difference in this case, because this is the one employee who is actually a minority employee rather than an employee of one of these four officers covered in the bill.

Mr. CRAMER. Is it my understanding, then, that all persons employed as minority employees, by practice, as a result of the understanding between the majority and minority leadership, are not designated as "minority" employees, but they will be covered under the definitions of section 3, paragraph (1)?

Mr. KYL. The gentleman is correct. And, further to ease his mind, I would say that each of these matters has been cleared both with the leadership of the minority and the majority sides of the aisle.

Mr. CRAMER. I appreciate that. And the reason I am asking some of these questions is I am sure both gentlemen realize the question of minority employees is one that is traditionally determined in the Republican House conference at the beginning of each session and handled by the leadership and the conference throughout the session so far as minority employees are concerned.

As vice chairman of that conference, having discussed it with the chairman of the conference, the distinguished gentlemen from Michigan [Mr. FORD], I felt it was essential that these matters be clarified so that the minority as well as the majority in the future will know what are the responsibilities and rights as they relate to minority employees. So, may I ask a couple more questions of the gentleman?

Mr. SCHENCK. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. On page 13, section 10 provides, relating to appointments:

> SEC. 10. Except as otherwise provided by this Act, each individual appointed to a position subject to the House Employees Schedule (HS) or the House Wage Schedule (HWS) shall be placed in the minimum step of the appropriate compensation level (HS level or HWS level) of such schedule.

Does that mean that a new employee in a new schedule being appointed to a given schedule must start at the bottom of that schedule?

Mr. SCHENCK. I would say to my friend from Florida it means this, that if an employee retires after having served a long time in the House of Representatives for either the majority or the minority, and has reached a top level of compensation, when his replacement is made by either the majority or the minority, he will be placed in the proper slot and position in the new schedule and will then gain longevity increases as his service continues.

Mr. CRAMER. Will the gentleman answer a further question? Suppose there is a transfer between schedules. Suppose the minority leadership or the majority leadership should decide that Mr. X who has a high level in one classification is qualified to be transferred to a similarly high or even higher level in another classification—I think we had a recent example of such action without classication on the minority side of a recent date—will that present discretion presently existing both in the minority and the majority remain or will a person being transferred and well qualified from one classification to another—would it be possible to make those transfers because of his having discarded the lower classification level?

Mr. SCHENCK. May I say to my friend that there is nothing whatever in this legislation which removes any discretion that either the majority or the minority has had in the past; neither does it give any additional discretion. It is in a condition of status quo. In other words, if the leadership on either side decides to change an employee from one position to another, that is entirely within the discretion of the Members on that particular side.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Ohio yield to me?

Mr. SCHENCK. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I gather from the gentleman's last statement that any of the employees on the minority side—some 26, as I recall, who are assumed to be minority appointees—if any were to be transferred or let go, the prerogatives in that case would be the same in the future as they are today?

Mr. SCHENCK. The gentleman is exactly correct.

Mr. FORD. The House conference or the minority leader or any other individual or group that had that responsibility today would have the same responsibility if this resolution is passed?

Mr. SCHENCK. The gentleman is exactly correct.

Mr. FORD. May I ask one other question? Section 11 on page 13, "Establishment of Positions" states:

> The committee may authorize the establishment of additional positions of the kind to which this Act applies, on a permanent basis or on a temporary basis of not to exceed six months' duration, whenever, in the judgment of the committee, such action is warranted in the interests of the orderly and efficient operation of the House of Representatives.

Could the gentleman tell us what the members of the committee had in mind when this provision was included?

Mr. SCHENCK. I would like to say to my friend, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD], who is the chairman of our Republican conference, that the committee felt there should be a certain amount of freedom existing so that if there is a need for a temporary employee, the leadership on the majority or minority side might have the complete freedom to establish that position without having to go through a long authorization procedure.

Mr. FORD. In other words, that provision would work as other positions or availability of positions has worked in the past?

Mr. SCHENCK. Exactly.

Mr. FORD. In other words, if a position were to be made available for either the majority or minority then the availability of that position would be cleared with the leadership on the side so affected.

Mr. SCHENCK. The gentleman is exactly correct.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHENCK. I shall be glad to yield to the chairman of our Committee on House Administration.

Mr. BURLESON. A case in point can be found over in the folding room where they employ more than 100 or so temporary employees. As everyone knows, there is nothing more permanent than "temporary" in the Government in a lot of its undertakings. However, these people have been there for a number of years working on an hourly basis as temporary employees but have received no longevity, they have received no retirement benefits and they have received none of the fringe benefits which accrue to others. In this instance we do away with that particular procedure, except there remains some latitude of 6 months during which temporary employees can be hired in the case of a real emergency. That is the purpose for this section.

Mr. FORD. If the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHENCK] will yield further, in the hiring of such people on a temporary basis, the traditional method of appointment that has existed in the House would continue?

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Ohio yield further to me at this point?

Mr. SCHENCK. I yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. BURLESON. The same method will be employed as has been followed heretofore. However, we are trying to bring these people in who are not presently treated properly who perform the same type of work and who receive the fringe benefits. However, it will not interfere with the present practice of the appointment of employees.

Mr. SCHENCK. May I assure the gentleman that there will be no change, with the exception of this limitation, as to a temporary nature.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHENCK. I shall be glad to yield to my colleague and member of the committee, the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. KYL].

Mr. KYL. There will be less latitude, too, in the salary that can be paid with reference to these positions. That salary will be set.

Mr. FORD. The salary will be set through the use of a regular schedule that is included in the legislation?

Mr. KYL. That is correct.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Ohio yield further?

Mr. SCHENCK. Yes.

Mr. CRAMER. As I understand the answer to my question of the gentleman from Ohio, as it relates to transfers between different classifications, the present authority of both the minority and majority leadership to transfer a person from, say the clerk's office to the postmaster's office, is not infringed upon and he would not have to start, if he were near the top in the clerk's classification of positions, at the bottom of the classification of postmaster's positions? Is that right or wrong?

Mr. SCHENCK. The gentleman is correct, based upon the qualifications of the person so transferred and the position that happens to be open.

Mr. CRAMER. I would say respectfully to the gentleman that as I read section 10 it appears that the intent and purpose is that a person transferring to a new classification must go to the bottom of that classification.

Then, also, a person, regardless of how well he proves his qualifications or what his past experience may have been, under the section dealing with promotions, which is section 7, the step increases, that person, even though he may be well qualified, cannot jump any of the steps stated in section 7, the step increases, without having conformed to 30 months in 2, 3, and 4, and 30 months in 5, 6, and 7, and so forth.

Mr. SCHENCK. May I say to the gentleman from Florida that the purpose of this—and we are here trying to set up the legislative history—is to control the positions and the wages and the place upon the schedule for new employees, and not existing employees who may be transferred. There is no change at all in this legislation which would in any way adversely affect the prerogatives, rights, and privileges of the leadership on either side of the House in making such transfers as they may decide to make.

Mr. CRAMER. I appreciate the gentleman's suggestion and the committee's suggestion in the broad statement that this will not interfere with the prerogatives. Let me say at the outset the classification of jobs and the description of jobs, in an effort to get qualified people in them, is laudable. I would not like to have any questions I may have asked or will ask to imply any intention other than that. I know the gentleman is fully aware of the prerogatives exercised in the House as it relates to the majority and leadership rights concerning House employees, and that is of considerable importance.

In reading section 7 and the previous section I cited, I cannot help but come to the conclusion that a good portion of the present prerogatives, particularly as it relates to transfers under these classifications and as it relates to promotions under classification, if the party involved is well qualified, those present prerogatives are being scheduled and are being minimized or decreased.

I am sure the gentleman knows that many extremely well qualified people, thoroughly familiar with many functions of the House, make themselves available to the majority and minority on the basis of that qualification, in some instances former Members of the House. Does that mean those persons, regardless of the qualifications, are in a straitjacket; that is, does this set up a straitjacket procedure whereby that person, well qualified, could not accept such a position? The House would be denied his services because he cannot do other than to start at the lowest in the future. I am talking about the lowest classification.

Mr. SCHENCK. I may say to the gentleman the entire purpose of this legislation is to give the widest possible latitude to the leadership on both sides of the aisle, taking into full account the experience, qualification, and background of the persons they are appointing or transferring. Therefore, I am certain that the questions that the gentleman has in mind need not be alarming to anyone.

Mr. CRAMER. I must admit it is extremely confusing in its present form, and on the basis of some of the answers I have received.

Section 10 reads as follows:

> Except as otherwise provided by this Act, each individual appointed to a position subject to the House Employees Schedule (HS) or the House Wage Schedule (HWS) shall be placed in the minimum step of the appropriate compensation level (HS level or HWS level) of such schedule.

I think that establishes that a person has to start at the bottom. What does the "except as otherwise provided" mean? It is the only exception.

Mr. SCHENCK. This relates to new employees, and not existing employees.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHENCK. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BURLESON. The schedule has a starting level. That has nothing to do with steps, but the highest starting level. There are 13 of them, and that would be $17,800. That would progress in various steps over the years involved to $20,860. So you have a starting salary in the highest level at $17,800.

Mr. CRAMER. If the gentleman from Ohio will yield further, may I ask the gentleman from Texas if the salaries he referred to come under paragraph 4 on page 3, relating to the House Press Gallery, the House Radio and Television Correspondents' Gallery, and the House Periodical Press Gallery? Those starting salaries are less than that, are they not?

Mr. BURLESON. They can be. Again, that is a matter of judgment of whoever is running the department. That is one of the things the committee is going to have to decide. We do that now, as a matter of fact. Members or employees come to the committee with questions about that.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Chairman, I have been happy to yield time for questions, but the time on our side is rapidly running out, so I must reserve the balance of my time and reluctantly refuse to yield further at this time.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Maryland yield?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. I think it is important that the Members of the House know what this does before this legislation is enacted. As to the answer that I received with regard to changes and transfers between classifications, I will ask the gentleman, Is that position governed by the starting salary?

Mr. FRIEDEL. The gentleman is speaking of new employees?

Mr. CRAMER. New employees.

Mr. FRIEDEL. I think you would have to reverse that and say that the starting salary depends on the classification of the position and that would be decided by the committee. For instance, if a position is classified as level 5, the employee would start in the 1st step at $7,000 and could go up to the 10th step with a salary of $8,800, with 18 years of service.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD. I have been looking through the bill and the committee report and I do not find any schedule set forth. I wonder why it was not included, and if it is not included, can we have it put in the RECORD for future reference?

Mr. FRIEDEL. It will go in the RECORD.

Mr. FORD. In other words, it will go in the RECORD and be available for future reference.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. QUIE. If there is going to be a change in the future, will that change be made by the committee or will it be necessary for you to come back to the House in order to secure any authority? Now when an employee's salary is increased, you have to get a resolution adopted. Under this bill will you have to come back to the House?

Mr. FRIEDEL. This bill sets up a system of automatic increases in successive steps which do not require any action by the Congress or by our committee. It will work the same as the Civil Service Classification Act. If any of the rates for various steps are revised from time to time as situations demand, our committee will change the schedule without additional legislation.

Mr. QUIE. You do not have to come to the House?

Mr. FRIEDEL. No.

Mr. QUIE. We are giving blanket authority to the committee.

Mr. FRIEDEL. You must realize we have classifications for each of the employees. If the employee comes within the act we have that authority to say what classification his job shall be and what salary he will receive.

Mr. QUIE. If you are going to change the salaries in that schedule that you are printing in the RECORD—if you are going to change that in the future you do not have to come back to the House for authority and you can do it any time you want to; is that correct?

Mr. FRIEDEL. That is correct.

Mr. CRAMER. This does not affect the employees of any Members' offices, or any of the committees of the House?

Mr. FRIEDEL. That is correct.

Mr. CRAMER. This has to do with House employees?

Mr. FRIEDEL. It applies only to four offices, the Clerk of the House, the Sergeant at Arms, the Doorkeeper, and the Postmaster, or rather, to the employees under those four officers of the House.

Mr. CRAMER. Will the gentleman indicate in what instances this will result in salary increases, and can you state what they are and what the job is and how much it amounts to?

Mr. FRIEDEL. In the first year the cost is estimated to be about $130,000. We hope that finally within 4 or 5 years it will level off, and that there will be a reduction rather than an increase.

Mr. CRAMER. What present employees will get an increase, and how much will they get?

Mr. FRIEDEL. There are 455 employees whose salary is set by this bill. Some of them will receive increases, but none of them will receive a reduction in pay.

Mr. CRAMER. How many of them will receive increases?

Mr. FRIEDEL. Probably about an average of three out of four of them will receive an increase from $1 on up.

Mr. CRAMER. That is a cumulative increase for this coming year and will amount to $130,000?

Mr. FRIEDEL. Yes, and of course the gentleman must bear in mind that the application of the longevity clause has something to do with the increase. That is one of the nice things about this bill. Faithful workers will be rewarded. Some workers who have been here for a long time will receive the longevity benefit, and get the increase automatically instead of having to come back year after year with special resolutions to grant these faithful employees an increase in salary.

Mr. CRAMER. What is the committee's present intention with reference to this $130,000 increase—what is the intention with respect to the maximum salary for any of the employees?

Mr. FRIEDEL. That would come under the Classification Act ceiling. The maximum salary is $24,500. We do not have anyone receiving that salary of $24,500.

Mr. CRAMER. But you will have authority to set that ceiling, however, will you not?

Mr. FRIEDEL. That is the limitation set in this bill.

Mr. CRAMER. What is the present top salary?

Mr. FRIEDEL. The top level that we have today is level 12, which goes up to a salary of $18,890, with a few exceptions who are receiving more because it was provided for by legislation. Rather than decreasing their salaries we let them stay at the present salary.

Mr. CRAMER. Would the gentleman object to placing the present salaries and the prospective salaries that will go to make up this $130,000 increase in the RECORD at this point?

Mr. FRIEDEL. My colleague does not know what he will be getting into if that is done. If we ever made that information available there would not be one person satisfied, no matter if the individual was getting a $300 increase, or a $2,000 increase, and you would have much dissatisfaction and antagonism, one against the other. We are doing this not on the basis of individuals, but on the work that is done, and on the basis of the job under the proposed classification. We did not go into the matter of individual employees at all, and it would be a mistake to do that. I would be opposed to even suggesting that that be done.

Mr. CRAMER. Would the gentleman object to doing that so far as the major employees are concerned whose salaries are well known, such as the Clerk and the minority clerk, and the Sergeant at Arms, and the minority sergeant at arms, and so on? And I am referring to the new schedule, and to the $130,000 increase. That is what I am asking for—what the proposed new schedule would be.

Mr. FRIEDEL. The Clerk of the House does not come under this bill. This applies only to the employees under the Clerk of the House. The Sergeant at Arms does not come under this bill; it only applies to employees under the Sergeant at Arms. This bill does not apply to the Postmaster of the House, it only applies to the employees under the Postmaster, and so on.

Mr. CRAMER. May I ask the gentleman this question: Does the minority clerk come under this bill?

Mr. FRIEDEL. The minority clerk does not come under this bill, but if they are employees of the Clerk they come under the bill.

Mr. CRAMER. In other words, the Clerk does not come under the bill, but the minority clerk does?

Mr. FRIEDEL. No, he does not.

Mr. CRAMER. Neither one comes under the bill?

Mr. FRIEDEL. No, neither one comes under the bill.

Mr. CRAMER. I thank the gentleman.

House employees schedule

Increment	Level	Steps										Step increase	Longevity		Longevity increase
		HS—1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10		11	12	
0	1	$4,000	$4,150	$4,300	$4,450	$4,600	$4,750	$4,900	$5,050	$5,200	$5,350	$150	$5,650	$5,950	$300
$600	3	4,600	4,750	4,900	5,050	5,200	5,350	5,500	5,650	5,800	5,950	150	6,250	6,550	300
$700	3	5,300	5,475	5,650	5,825	6,000	6,175	6,350	6,525	6,700	6,875	175	7,225	7,575	350
$800	4	6,100	6,275	6,450	6,625	6,800	6,975	7,150	7,325	7,500	7,675	175	8,025	8,375	350
$900	5	7,000	7,200	7,400	7,600	7,800	8,000	8,200	8,400	8,600	8,800	200	9,200	9,600	400
$1,000	6	8,000	8,200	8,400	8,600	8,800	9,000	9,200	9,400	9,600	9,800	200	10,200	10,600	400
$1,100	7	9,100	9,330	9,560	9,790	10,020	10,250	10,480	10,710	10,940	11,170	230	11,630	12,090	460
$1,200	8	10,300	10,530	10,760	10,990	11,220	11,450	11,680	11,910	12,140	12,370	230	12,830	13,290	460
$1,300	9	11,600	11,860	12,120	12,380	12,640	12,900	13,160	13,420	13,680	13,940	260	14,460	14,980	520
$1,400	10	13,000	13,260	13,520	13,780	14,040	14,300	14,560	14,820	15,080	15,340	260	15,860	16,380	520
$1,500	11	14,500	14,790	15,080	15,370	15,660	15,950	16,240	16,530	16,820	17,110	290	17,690	18,270	580
$1,600	12	16,100	16,410	16,720	17,030	17,340	17,650	17,960	18,270	18,580	18,890	310	19,510	20,130	620
$1,700	13	17,800	18,140	18,480	18,820	19,160	19,500	19,840	20,180	20,520	20,860	340	21,540	22,220	680

House wage schedule

HWS	Steps		
	1	2	3
1	$3,348.80	$3,516.24	$3,683.68
2	3,898.96	4,114.24	4,329.52
3	4,449.12	4,688.32	4,927.52
4	5,023.20	5,286.32	5,549.44
5	5,573.36	5,860.40	6,147.44
6	5,836.48	6,147.44	6,458.40
7	6,123.52	6,434.48	6,745.44
8	6,362.72	6,697.60	7,032.48
9	6,625.84	6,984.64	7,343.44
10	6,912.88	7,271.68	7,630.48
11	7,247.76	7,630.48	8,013.20
12	7,582.64	7,989.28	8,395.92
13	7,965.36	8,372.00	8,802.56

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY].

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I wish to speak for a few moments in support of this bill, as the chairman of the House Recording Studio. I suppose most Members have had some experience with that studio. We have, we believe, a very efficient organization.

Members will recall that a few years ago this studio was run as a joint project of the House and Senate, but it was separated several years ago and since that time, under laws adopted by the House, the studio has been under the Clerk. However, we have a supervisory committee composed of three Members of the House—my good friend, the gentleman from Ohio, FRANK BOW, the gentleman from New York, Mr. LEO O'BRIEN, and myself. I have been chairman of the committee since it was first created by the House.

In our studio the employees are mostly technical men, television and radio technicians. Frankly, the members of our committee are not experts in fixing the salaries of those men, and we should like very much for the panel or committee to be set up under this law to relieve us of this responsibility.

This resolution will not change our authority, except that it will relieve us of the responsibility of fixing the compensation of the employees of the studio. The Clerk still will have the right to make appointments, subject to the approval of our committee. He will have the right to hire and fire, to promote and demote, subject to the approval of our committee. At the present time he also has the right to fix the salaries subject to our approval. That is something which could well be done by a general committee, which would make the salaries uniform for the various groups of House employees.

Our committee has considered this resolution and has endorsed it. I am very glad to present the views of the committee at the present time.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to talk further on this. I believe everything has been covered. I compliment the committee for wonderful and diligent work, and the long hours put in.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Ohio have any further requests for time?

Mr. SCHENCK. I have no further requests for time, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 12318

A bill to provide an equitable system for the classification of certain positions under the House of Representatives, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "House Employees Position Classification Act".

PURPOSE

SEC. 2. It is the purpose of this Act to provide a classification system for the equitable establishment and adjustment of rates of compensation for, and for the efficient utilization of personnel in, certain positions under the House of Representatives to which this Act applies, through—

(1) the creation and maintenance of orderly and equitable compensation relationships for such positions—

(A) in accordance with the principle of equal pay for substantially equal work, and

(B) with due regard to (i) differences in the levels of difficulty, responsibility, and qualification requirements of the work, (ii) the kind of work performed, (iii) satisfactory performance, and (iv) length of service;

(2) the application of appropriate position standards and position descriptions for such positions; and

(3) the adoption of organization and position titles in the House which accurately reflect the respective functions, duties, and responsibilities of those organizations and positions in the House to which this Act applies.

APPLICATION

SEC. 3. This Act shall apply to—

(1) all positions under the Clerk, the Sergeant at Arms, the Doorkeeper, and the Postmaster, of the House of Representatives, except the positions of telephone operator, and positions on the United States Capitol Police force;

(2) the position of minority pair clerk in the House;

(3) all positions under the House Recording Studio; and

(4) all positions under the House Press Gallery, the House Radio and Television Correspondents' Gallery, and the House Periodical Press Gallery.

COMPENSATION SCHEDULES

SEC. 4. (a) (1) The Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives (hereinafter referred to as the "committee") shall establish and maintain, and, from time to time may revise, for positions to which this Act applies (other than positions within the purview of subsection (b) of this section the compensation for which is fixed and adjusted from time to time in accordance with prevailing rates), a compensation schedule of per annum rates, which shall be known as the "House Employees Schedule" and for which the symbol shall be "HS", subject to the following provisions:

(A) Such schedule shall be composed of such number of compensation levels as the committee deems appropriate.

(B) Each compensation level shall consist of twelve compensation steps.

(C) The per annum rate of compensation for each compensation step of each compensation level shall be in such amount as the committee deems appropriate, except that the per annum rate of compensation for the maximum compensation step of the highest compensation level shall not exceed the maximum rate of compensation authorized by the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

(2) The rates of compensation for such positions shall be in accordance with such schedule.

(b) The committee shall establish and maintain, and, from time to time, may revise, for positions under the Clerk, the Sergeant at Arms, the Doorkeeper, and the Postmaster, of the House of Representatives, the compensation for which, in the judgment of the committee, should be fixed and adjusted from time to time in accordance with prevailing rates, a compensation schedule providing for per annum or per hour rates, or both, established in accordance with prevailing rates and consisting of such number of compensation levels and steps as the committee deems appropriate, which shall be known as the "House Wage Schedule" and for which the symbol shall be "HWS". The rates of compensation for such positions shall be in accordance with such schedule.

POSITION STANDARDS AND DESCRIPTIONS

SEC. 5. (a) (1) It shall be the duty of the committee to prescribe, revise, and (on a current basis) maintain position standards which shall apply to positions (in existence on, or established after, the effective date of this Act) under the House of Representatives to which this Act applies.

(2) The position standards shall—

(A) provide for the separation of such positions into appropriate classes for pay and personnel purposes on the basis of reasonable similarity with respect to types of positions, qualification requirements of positions, and levels of difficulty and responsibility of work, and

(B) govern the placement of such positions in their respective appropriate compensation levels of the appropriate compensation schedule.

(b) (1) Subject to review and approval by the committee, the Clerk, the Sergeant at Arms, the Doorkeeper, and the Postmaster, of the House of Representatives, shall prepare, revise, and (on a current basis) maintain, at such times and in such form as the committee deems appropriate, position descriptions of the respective positions (in existence on, or established after, the effective date of this Act) under the House of Representatives to which this Act applies which are under their respective jurisdictions, including—

(A) with respect to the Clerk, positions under the House Recording Studio,

(B) with respect to the Sergeant at Arms, the position of minority pair clerk in the House, and

(C) with respect to the Doorkeeper, positions under the House Press Gallery, the House Radio and Television Correspondents' Gallery, and the House Periodical Press Gallery.

(2) The position descriptions shall—

(A) describe in detail the actual duties, responsibilities, and qualification requirements of the work of each of such positions,

(B) provide a position title for such position which accurately reflects such duties and responsibilities, and

(C) govern the placement of such position in its appropriate class.

(c) The Clerk, the Sergeant at Arms, the Doorkeeper, and the Postmaster, of the House of Representatives, shall transmit to the committee, at such times and in such form as the committee deems appropriate, all position descriptions required by subsection (b) of this section to be prepared, provided, and currently maintained by them, together with such other pertinent information as the committee may require, in order that the committee shall have, at all times, current information with respect to such position descriptions, the positions to which such descriptions apply, and related personnel matters within the purview of this Act. Such information so transmitted shall be kept on file in the committee.

(d) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the committee shall have authority, which may be exercised at any time in its discretion, to—

(1) conduct surveys and studies of all organization units, and the positions therein, to which this Act applies;

(2) ascertain on a current basis the facts with respect to the duties, responsibilities, and qualification requirements of any position to which this Act applies;

(3) prepare and revise the position description of any such position;

(4) place any such position in its appropriate class and compensation level;

(5) decide whether any such position is in its appropriate class and compensation level;

(6) change any such position from one class or compensation level to any other class or compensation level whenever the facts warrant; and

(7) prescribe such organization and position titles as may be appropriate to carry out the purposes of this Act.

All such actions of the committee shall be binding on the House officer and organization unit concerned and shall be the basis for payment of compensation and for other personnel benefits and transactions until otherwise changed by the committee.

PLACEMENT OF POSITIONS IN COMPENSATION SCHEDULES

SEC. 6. The committee shall place each position (in existence on, or established after, the effective date of this Act) under the House of Representatives to which this Act applies in its appropriate class, and in its appropriate compensation level of the appropriate compensation schedule, in accordance with the position standards and position descriptions provided for in section 5 of this Act. The committee is authorized, when circumstances so warrant, to change any such position from one class or compensation level to another class or compensation level. All actions of the committee under this section shall be binding on the House officer and organization unit concerned and shall be the basis for payment of compensation and for other personnel benefits and transactions until otherwise changed by the committee.

STEP INCREASES

SEC. 7. (a) Each employee in a compensation level of the House Employees Schedule (HS), who has not attained the highest scheduled rate of compensation for the compensation level (HS level) in which his position is placed, shall be advanced successively to the next higher step of such HS level, as follows:

(1) to steps 2, 3, and 4, respectively—at the beginning of the first pay period following the completion without break in service of more than thirty months, of one year of satisfactory service in the next lower step;

(2) to steps 5, 6, and 7, respectively—at the beginning of the first pay period following the completion without break in service of more than thirty months, of two years of satisfactory service in the next lower step;

(3) to steps 8, 9, and 10, respectively—at the beginning of the first pay period following the completion, without break in service of more than thirty months, of three years of satisfactory service in the next lower step; and

(4) to steps 11 and 12, respectively—at the beginning of the first pay period following the completion, without break in service of more than thirty months, of five years of satisfactory service in the next lower step.

(b) The receipt of an increase in compensation during any of the waiting periods of service specified in subsection (a) of this section shall cause a new full waiting period of service to commence for further step increases under such subsection.

(c) Any increase in compensation granted by law, or granted by reason of an increase made by the committee in the rates of compensation of the House Employees Schedule, to employees within the purview of subsection (a) of this section shall not be held or considered to be an increase in compensation for the purposes of subsection (b) of this section.

(d) The benefit of successive step increases under subsection (a) of this section shall be preserved, under regulations prescribed by the committee, for employees whose continuous service is interrupted by service in the Armed Forces of the United States.

(e) The committee shall establish and maintain, and, from time to time, may revise, a system of automatic advancement, by successive step increases in compensation, on the basis of satisfactory service performed, without break in service of more than thirty months, for employees subject to the House Wage Schedule (HWS). In the operation of such system of step increases the committee may prescribe regulations to the effect that—

(1) the receipt of an increase in compensation during any of the waiting periods of service required for advancement by step increases under such system shall cause a new full waiting period of service to commence for further step increases under such system;

(2) any increase in compensation granted by law, or granted by reason of an increase made by the committee in the rates of compensation of the House Wage Schedule, to employees within the purview of such system of step increases shall not be held or considered to be an increase in compensation for the purposes of subparagraph (1) of this subsection; and

(3) the benefit of successive step increases under such system of step increases shall be preserved, under regulations prescribed by the committee, for employees whose continuous service is interrupted by service in the Armed Forces of the United States.

APPOINTMENTS AND RECLASSIFICATIONS TO HIGHER COMPENSATION LEVELS

SEC. 8. (a) Each employee in a compensation level of the House Employees Schedule (HS), who is appointed to a position in a higher compensation level of such schedule, or whose position is placed in a higher compensation level of such schedule pursuant to a reclassification of such position, shall be paid compensation in such higher compensation level, in accordance with the following provisions, whichever is first applicable in the following numerical order of precedence:

(1) at the rate of the lowest step for which the rate of compensation equals the rate of compensation for that step, in the compensation level from which he is appointed, which is two steps above the step in such

level which he had attained immediately prior to such appointment;

(2) at the rate of the lowest step for which the rate of compensation exceeds, by not less than two steps of the compensation level from which he is appointed, his rate of compensation immediately prior to such appointment; or

(3) at the rate of the highest step of such higher compensation level, or at his rate of compensation immediately prior to such appointment, whichever rate is the higher.

(b) The committee may provide by regulations for the payment of compensation, at an appropriate compensation step determined in accordance with such regulations, to each employee subject to the House Wage Schedule (HWS) who is appointed to a position in a higher compensation level of such schedule or whose position is placed in a higher compensation level of such schedule pursuant to a reclassification of such position.

REDUCTIONS IN COMPENSATION LEVEL

SEC. 9. Each employee in a position of a compensation level of the House Employees Schedule (HS) or the House Wage Schedule (HWS), whose employment in such position and level is terminated and who is reemployed, with or without break in service, in a position in a lower compensation level (HS level or HWS level) of such schedule, or whose position is placed in a lower compensation level of such schedule pursuant to a reclassification of such position, shall be placed by the committee in such step of such lower compensation level as the committee deems appropriate.

APPOINTMENTS

SEC. 10. Except as otherwise provided by this Act, each individual appointed to a position subject to the House Employees Schedule (HS) or the House Wage Schedule (HWS) shall be placed in the minimum step of the appropriate compensation level (HS level or HWS level) of such schedule.

ESTABLISHMENT OF POSITIONS

SEC. 11. The committee may authorize the establishment of additional positions of the kind to which this Act applies, on a permanent basis or on a temporary basis of not to exceed six months' duration, whenever, in the judgment of the committee, such action is warranted in the interests of the orderly and efficient operation of the House of Representatives. The compensation of each such position may be paid out of the contingent fund of the House of Representatives until otherwise provided by law. An additional position of the kind to which this Act applies shall not be established without authorization of the committee.

PRESERVATION OF APPOINTING AUTHORITIES

SEC. 12. This Act shall not be held or considered to change or otherwise affect—

(1) any authority to establish positions under the House of Representatives which are not within the purview of this Act, or

(2) any authority to make appointments to positions under the House of Representatives, irrespective of whether such positions are within the purview of this Act.

REGULATIONS

SEC. 13. The committee is authorized to prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

DUAL COMPENSATION

SEC. 14. For the purposes of applicable law relating to the payment to any employee subject to the House Employees Schedule or the House Wage Schedule of compensation from more than one civilian office or position, the rate of basic compensation of each employee subject to any such schedule shall be held and considered to be that rate which, when increased by additional compensation then currently authorized by law for House employees generally, equals or most nearly equals the per annum rate of compensation of such employee under such schedule.

SAVING PROVISIONS

SEC. 15. (a) Notwithstanding any provision of this Act, the aggregate (gross) rate of compensation of any employee immediately prior to the effective date of this Act shall not be reduced by reason of the enactment of this Act.

(b) For the purposes of applicable law relating to the payment to any individual of compensation from more than one civilian office or position, each employee of the House to whom this Act applies who, immediately prior to the effective date of this Act—

(1) is receiving basic compensation from more than one civilian office or position and

(2) is in compliance with such law

shall be held and considered to be in compliance with such law on and after such effective date, notwithstanding the enactment of this Act, so long as such employee continues to receive, without break in service of more than thirty days, the same or lower rate of basic compensation in a position to which this Act does not apply.

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

SEC. 16. (a) Section 105(f) of the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1957 (70 Stat. 371; Public Law 624, 84th Congress; 2 U.S.C. 123b(f)), which relates to compensation of personnel under the House Recording Studio, is amended by striking out "and fix the compensation of".

(b) The proviso under the heading "House of Representatives" and under the caption "Office of the Doorkeeper", which relates to compensation of pages of the House of Representatives, in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1949 (62 Stat. 426; Public Law 641, Eightieth Congress; 2 U.S.C. 88c), is amended by striking out "shall be at the basic rate of $1,800 per annum and".

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 17. This Act shall become effective on January 1, 1965.

Mr. FRIEDEL (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FRIEDEL

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FRIEDEL: On page 2, line 23, strike out the comma.

Mr. FRIEDEL. That involves a typographical error.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. FRIEDEL

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Chairman, I have two other amendments which are related. I ask that they be considered en bloc. I offer the amendments.

The Clerk read the amendments, as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. FRIEDEL: On page 3, line 3, strike out "the House Press Gallery,"; and on page 3, line 5, strike out the comma; and on page 5, line 25, strike out "the House Press Gallery,"; and on page 6, line 1, strike out the comma.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman explain the amendments and tell us why the Press Gallery is being eliminated?

Mr. FRIEDEL. They asked to be taken out. We have a letter to that effect. That request was granted.

Mr. CRAMER. Did any other group ask to be taken out?

Mr. FRIEDEL. No, sir.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FRIEDEL] a question which disturbs me. I have tried to find some hearings on this bill. As nearly as I can determine, there have not been any, or at least not any available to all Members. Are there any hearings available?

Mr. FRIEDEL. We have the reports available to the Members.

Mr. SAYLOR. But that is not what I asked for. I want to know what hearings were held.

Mr. FRIEDEL. We have not printed the hearings.

Mr. SAYLOR. Did you have any?

Mr. FRIEDEL. Yes, sir. We had many of them.

Mr. SAYLOR. Who appeared to testify?

Mr. FRIEDEL. Well, in fact, we met with the leadership on both sides of the aisle. We also met with the Sergeant at Arms, the Doorkeeper, the Clerk of the House, and the patronage committee.

Mr. BURLESON. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. FRIEDEL. Yes.

Mr. BURLESON. This is not the sort of a bill you would call in people from all over the country to testify on. This is our business, and everybody who has any business with it is here and can speak for themselves and can express their opinions. That is what we are now doing. Why would you want to have people come in from the outside to talk about a thing which is our own commonsense responsibility? That is the reason why there are no printed hearings.

Mr. SAYLOR. I sort of think that this is the kind of a bill that the taxpayers of the country would like very much to find out what is going on. We have some provisions in this bill, which if they do not scare any other Members of Congress, have me scared. You have a provision in here, section 10, that says that you cannot make any promotions under this bill. You are going to move a man from one position to another and you have to be placed in the middle step when you go to promote anybody. I just happen to believe that if this bill goes through, in about two Congresses from now the same group downtown who originally conceived this legislation and who over the years dropped a few hints about it are going to come up and tell the Members of Congress whom they can hire and what they can pay the people in their office. If this bill goes through, it is the first step toward putting the legislative employees under the jurisdiction of the executive branch of the Government.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. Now, I will yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GIBBONS. I have heard a lot of ridiculous arguments on this bill today, but that is the most ridiculous one I have heard.

Mr. SAYLOR. I do not think it is ridiculous, because it is the truth.

Mr. GIBBONS. I do not think it is and I deny it and I think every member of the committee will.

Mr. SAYLOR. I happen to know some people downtown in the Civil Service Commission and the General Accounting Office who have been trying to get this across for 4 or 5 years.

Mr. GIBBONS. I know of no Members on the minority side that are any more reliable or any finer gentlemen or who will fight any more for the prerogatives of this House than do the minority members of this Committee on House Administration. Every one of them who knows what is going on in this House supports this bill. I believe if you talk to the members of the committee who have studied and worked on this, the minority members included, they will all back me up. What we are trying to do is bring order out of a chaotic condition that no one created on purpose but which happened because of the way the business of the House of Representatives has grown. We are just trying to bring order and simple justice out of this. This is a good piece of legislation. It preserves the prerogatives of the majority and the minority as far as hiring and firing are concerned, but it will eliminate personal lobbying for pay raises that goes on around here. There are quite a few employees of this House of Representatives, and it has depended primarily on how good a lobbyist he was to determine how well he got paid. We are seeking to eliminate that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maryland has expired.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, some rather serious allegations have been made about the purpose, the origin of this legislation. The committee has complete records as to what has transpired since this idea first came to the Committee on House Administration. When I first came to the Congress 5 years ago, one of the first things I noted and one of the first statements I made in this committee was that we must develop some kind of a system to bring order out of the chaotic employment situation in regard to almost 500 officers of the House of Representatives. This idea did not come to me from downtown, from the General Accounting Office, or from any place else. It is just a logical conclusion that the situation under which we were laboring was an untenable one. How anyone could justify a situation where you have 5 people doing exactly the same work, one of them has been in this office for 20 years, he retires and a new man is hired, with no experience, with no special training, and is hired at the salary at which the 20-year veteran retired, leaving some three or four people under him at perhaps $3,000 or $4,000 or $5,000 less salary per year, I do not know. The gentleman from Florida has stated that it was a matter of lobbying or of seniority which determined the salary in these circumstances. So far as I am concerned, the only help which we got from these departments downtown was help that we solicited. These departments downtown did question each employee of the House in these categories. They wrote complete job descriptions. They made recommendations; not one set of recommendations, but at least six different sets of recommendations for us to look at.

As a matter of fact I thought sometimes that these people should have been a little firmer in their recommendations, because they simply presented these ideas and said, "We do not know what you want to do with them, but here is a consistent schedule for two, three, four, and five."

If there were ever a resolution that came to this House in the interest of the taxpayers this is it, because there is not a single question but that over a period of years if we do not develop the same kind of attitude which has had us by the neck until this time, you are going to have a better group of employees and they are going to be getting a more reasonable salary schedule and we will be saving through getting better work and we will be saving through a really logical salary schedule.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KYL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Iowa has correctly stated the circumstances with regard to this legislation. The contention of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR], that this legislation or the idea of this legislation originated downtown is completely without foundation and without fact. The House Committee on Administration and one of the subcommittees thereof conceived this idea in an effort to establish a system which would be workable for patronage employees of the House. This subcommittee made a request of the chairman of the full committee who in turn made a request of the General Accounting Office and the Civil Service Commission to furnish us some assistance in trying to evolve a workable system for these patronage employees.

This is not a step toward domination by other branches of Government of whom a congressional office will employ or how they will be employed in time to come. Surely Congress will reserve that right. It is nothing more than what the gentleman from Iowa, our able chairman and others have said, a simple, direct effort to establish a workable pay system for patronage employees of the House of Representatives. We all know something must be done. To say that if the House had any backbone they would defeat this particular legislation because of speculation about the future is another misrepresentation of its intent, because I do not think that the Members of the House or the Committee on House Administration are without backbone. I do not think the House is without backbone in determining what they will do about patronage employees of this House, whether they are majority or minority employees. Accept it for what it is. It will bring order out of chaos.

Mr. KYL. Will the gentleman from Louisiana agree with me relative to the time spent on this matter, that a conservative estimate of the expenditure of committee time on this measure would be certainly in excess of 50 or 60 hours of committee action, not to count the many hours of consultation and figuring outside of the committee?

Mr. WAGGONNER. I think the gentleman is conservative in his estimate of the time consumed in studying this legislation.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KYL. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SAYLOR. First, I might say, with due deference to our colleagues, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS] and the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WAGGONNER], that I was in this House of Representatives before either one of them came here and I happen to know and can name if need be some people downtown who were for this legislation before they came to Congress.

I can also say to my colleague the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. KYL] who is now talking about the taxpayers, this is the first time I ever heard of an increase of $135,000 in a bill and he is not worried about the taxpayers.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FRIEDEL].

The amendments were agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. QUIE

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. QUIE: On page 4, after line 19, add the following: "Any change in the House employee schedule or the House wage schedule after December 31, 1964, must receive the approval of the House."

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, after listening to the debate on this bill, it seems to me that the House could be more sure of what happened in the salary schedules in the future if we have a provision in the bill to the effect that any change had to come back to the House for approval.

As I understand the situation now, if there is any change in an employee's salary, it must come from a resolution which is offered to the House. I agree with the purpose of this bill, but I do not want to give carte blanche to the Committee on House Administration for any future changes in the salary schedule of our employees.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it is true that each single employee's salary cannot be changed by the House if this bill passes, even with my amendment. I believe this is a good provision to have in the law, since the schedule should be considered with all jobs in mind. As someone said, if someone lobbied better in the past, they can get the salaries of their appointees increased. This will still be prevented, but with my amendment the schedule becomes a part of House legislative action just the same as when classified employees or postal employees schedules are changed. That schedule is printed in the bill and it becomes a matter of law and it is done through an Act of the Congress. If any employee receives an increase in salary, such increase should be provided in the schedule unless the House changes the schedule.

Mr. Chairman, I would feel much more confident about the operation of this new program if we did have this authority left in the hands of the entire House in the future. In this way the schedule—and the only one I have seen is the one that the gentleman from Maryland has at his desk and it has not been printed in the RECORD prior to this so the Members could see it—the only schedule which I have seen is that one which I assume is the one that would go into effect if this bill is passed. However, according to this bill, the committee could change this schedule tomorrow. But after this year and with a new Congress, you would have to come back to the House for approval if my amendment is adopted.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE].

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman's amendment, as I understand it, would vitiate the bill. We will be right back where we started. We would have all of this language, but it would be meaningless if we have to come back to the House in order to take care of every individual's salary and the position he occupies.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the members of the Committee to place these salaries in a category and in that category there are these various steps involved which would be automatic. If an individual is to be promoted, then he is promoted into another level, but not above his present salary, or less as to that matter. He would then receive his deserved increases in the steps within that level.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, if we have to come back for the assessment of each salary and each position, then there is really no need in having this legislation at all.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. QUIE. I believe the gentleman misunderstands my amendment. My amendment would only apply to these two schedules about which you speak in section 4, the House employees' schedule and the House wage schedule.

As I understand it, the schedule applies to all employees. It does not apply to any specific one. So, the schedule as I saw it in front of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FRIEDEL], becomes a schedule, if this bill is enacted. Then, before any change in the schedule can occur, the authority would still be left in the bill but any new employee must go down to the lowest level in the schedule, just as you are seeking to do. This does not vitiate the act.

Mr. BURLESON. The gentleman is partially correct and I appreciate his point but remember the employee could start at a level commensurate with the job. This could be at a $17,500 salary with chances of advancing in time to $24,500. If the elected officer involved has an employee he wishes to promote into another level, it is submitted to the Committee on House Administration, as we do now. We determine the need, we determine the merit of each individual, and the work he does. If I understand the gentleman's amendment correctly, it would be more nearly proper to come in at section 13 on page 14. I would not admit it proper, but I invite the response which will go along with it. But in respect to whether such positions are within the purview of this act, that would be the place, really, to offer it if you wanted to bring back before the House everything done under this resolution. Many times you bring them in here, and nobody knows what they are about, whether there is merit to them, whether it carries a responsibility or an increase.

Actually, if you wanted to do what I understand, that would be the place to do it. Again, hesitant as I am, to accept, responsibility has got to go along with this action or it cannot possibly be made workable.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD. I think there is much merit to the intent and purpose of this legislation, but I am concerned, as the gentleman is concerned, that the wage schedules for the employees of the House and the House employees' schedule can be revised without any notification of the House as a whole. We find in the law the classification of compensation schedule. Under the interpretation that I understand is correct, those compensation schedules and those classification schedules can be changed by the committee. It is my opinion that these two schedules ought to at least be approved if changed in the future. This does not apply to any one individual. This is only applicable to a broad change in the classification schedules, or in the compensation schedules, and I think it is reasonable that the House as a whole should act in those particular areas, not individuals, but in the broad area of compensation.

Mr. BURLESON. I tried to say earlier in my opening remarks that I do not claim this is perfect, that there would be a need to make adjustments later on. There is some trial and error involved. We brought these experts from the Department. Referring to what the gentleman from Pennsylvania has said, everyone on the committee knows they were invited to come up here.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania made the statement that these people came up to the Hill to impose this upon us. I think the gentleman from Iowa has made it clear and can testify that I requested their help under direction of the committee to present something upon which we could base a workable system. We have adopted one which we think more nearly fits the situation which exists up here, and one that is comparable to the various agencies of the Government.

Under this plan we have selected a plan to adapt to these various positions or vice versa should we find there are parts of it that are not workable. There is no reason we could not say, "This is a different situation and we need to do something about it." In that case, I think we would bring it before the House to approve.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MADDEN. In section 13 the committee is authorized to prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act. Suppose the head of a department has many employees, say 100 or 200. It appears now that this provision that the committee is authorized to prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act would probably interfere with the man in charge of the department.

Mr. BURLESON. That is right.

Mr. MADDEN. That is, the officer responsible for carrying out the functions and the work of the department. I wonder what the gentleman's interpretation of section 13 is.

Mr. BURLESON. I will say to the gentleman without reservation that there is no intent that this measure should impair, diminish, or add to the responsibility, or the authority, or the prerogatives of any elected officer of the House any more than is the case today. We do the same thing today. When the Clerk of the House, the Postmaster, or the Sergeant at Arms comes in for more employees or a change of personnel, they come before the committee, we advise together, we grant or deny the request or we compromise it. We do this at the present time.

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman now chairman of the committee might feel that way about it today, but 5 or 10 years from now there might be another chairman of the committee who would look at that section in a different way. According to the wording of that section, he could go into any department and take over the handling of the personnel of the House.

Mr. BURLESON. I appreciate the gentleman's remarks and I take them as a compliment, but the same thing applies to others, possibly to the Speaker of the House. There is a certain amount of discretion. You do not operate on that sort of basis.

Mr. MADDEN. The committee is authorized to prescribe such regulations as may be necessary—of course, that is his language—as may be necessary to carry out the work. If I were an accountant and had 70 or 80 employees, if the committee could come in and take over my authority, it would greatly handicap me in performing that work.

Mr. BURLESON. The gentleman and I have been around here a long time. In many measures we have used the words "such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe." It is a matter of administration. I know of measures I have supported here in the House and later on, because of "such rules and regulation as may be promulgated" by someone, I regretted my action. Now, I am not asking for any additional authority for the committee of which I am chairman but I have also found that to have a responsibility without commensurate authority is not a comfortable position. So this measure does define some authority but it is my observation that something is needed we do not now have and I hope this is a beginning of solving a problem I think we all recognize.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. The sorry spectacle of another Government department, failing to carry out the law and showing preferential treatment at the taxpayers expense, has come to my attention.

On September 16, 1964, I wrote to the Postmaster General requesting information as to how the Post Office Department disposed of the claim for approximately $1 million against the Curtis Publishing Co., which publishes the Saturday Evening Post, for violating postal rate regulations. Up to the present time I have not received an adequate explanation from the Post Office Department.

In 1958, a claim arose against the Curtis Publishing Co. for improper use of the mails by which Curtis sent material through the mails without payment of adequate postage. Former Postmaster General Summerfield advises me that as soon as the violations occurred, a request was made to the Curtis Publishing Co. for reimbursement to the Post Office Department and the taxpayers for the full amount of the postage due. He further advised me that when he left office in 1961 that claim was still pending against the Curtis Publishing Co.

The present Postmaster General disavows any knowledge of such claim which I believe simply means that under the present administration the Post Office Department has decided not to collect the $1 million from the Curtis Publishing Co.

Recently postal rates have been increased and the American public has been called upon to pay higher postal rates yet the administration is showing favoritism to this company by permitting them to forget the amount owed the Government.

Whether this is favoritism to the Curtis Publishing Co. for a recent editorial in the Saturday Evening Post, favorable to the election of Johnson and HUMPHREY, is left to the judgment of the American people, many of whom have received notification on letters indicating "postage due" which must be paid before delivery of their mail.

In my correspondence with the Post Office Department, no statement is contained therein which indicates that former Postmaster General Summerfield settled this matter or abandoned the claim against the Curtis Publishing Co. The Department conveniently sweeps the entire matter under the rug by saying, "From the files left for us concerning this matter we find that there was no such claim pending against this company in 1961."

The simple fact is there was a claim against the Curtis Publishing Co. for approximately $1 million in 1958 and it was not settled or abandoned prior to January 20, 1961. What then has the Post Office Department done so that this matter has been conveniently forgotten?

This is not the only claim against a large publisher which was pending when the Democrat administration took over in 1961 and as soon as I have developed the facts with respect to these matters I feel the public is entitled to know the truth.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. QUIE) there were—ayes 17, noes 47.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 12318) to provide an equitable system for the classification of certain positions under the House of Representatives, and for other purposes, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the chart accompanying the report on the bill just passed may be included in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may extend their remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

CHANGES OF CLASSIFICATION OF POSITIONS UNDER THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, in the hope that I might allay some of the questions which some of our colleagues have raised in reference to a change of schedules, I shall be glad to take the responsibility, and to be reminded of it at any time by anyone—I have no doubt my able colleague, the gentleman from Ohio, will keep me reminded, as he does on many things—of bringing any change of these schedules to the floor to advise the membership, and to have advice from the membership on any change which may occur. I hope that will be a satisfactory assurance that we plan no sereptitious action in connection with these provisions which have just been adopted by the House.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. QUIE. There will be printed, I understand, the schedule which will go into effect because of the passage of the bill. Would the gentleman be willing to have printed in the RECORD any future changes in the schedule which may occur?

Mr. BURLESON. I shall be glad to do that and to discuss the matter on the floor or with any Member personally.

Mr. QUIE. That seems acceptable. Then if any Member does have a criticism, he can go to the Committee on House Administration.

Mr. BURLESON. I regret not having made this statement before the gentleman offered his amendment but was not aware of his purpose at the time.

Mr. QUIE. I thank the gentleman.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR UNDERTAKING CERTAIN CONSTRUCTION BY THE STATE OF MISSOURI

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2460) to extend the period of time within which certain construction may be undertaken by the State of Missouri on lands conveyed to such State by the United States.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the gentleman at the proper time will explain the intent and purpose of the bill, I presume.

I might say that this was voted out of the committee unanimously, so I do not intend to object at this time or at a future time in the consideration of this legislation.

Mr. FALLON. Yes. Will the gentleman yield to me for that purpose?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. FALLON. S. 2460 extends the time to the State of Missouri to develop land which they bought from the Federal Government with an agreement to start improvements before July 1964. The time now expires July 13, 1964. This bill extends the time. They had some difficulties in raising money to improve the lands due to legislative entanglements and bond issues. However, the committee was given the understanding in its hearing that these difficulties have now been ironed out and that the State is ready to proceed with the improvement of these lands this fall.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Do I understand correctly that this bill involves no cost to the Federal Government?

Mr. FALLON. The gentleman is correct. No cost at all.

Mr. CRAMER. I will say on this that we are unanimously in favor of it in the committee.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the third paragraph of the Act entitled "An Act to authorize the sale of certain lands to the State of Missouri", approved July 13, 1959 (73 Stat. 181), is amended by striking out "within five years" and inserting in lieu thereof "within ten years".

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H.R. 9659) was laid on the table.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the acting chairman of the Public Works Committee, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON], and the chairman of the subcommittee headed by the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON]; and specifically the ranking minority member from California, Mr. JOHN BALDWIN, for bringing this "must" legislation up in the waning days of this Congress, by unanimous consent. In fact, I wish to thank all Members for their forbearance in allowing unanimous-consent consideration of this Department of Army recommended bill, which I first introduced on January 20, 1964, as H.R. 9659. S. 2460 is identical, and was simultaneously—or soon thereafter—introduced in the other body by the senior Senator from Missouri and has passed that body. By this manner of discharging it from the committee and acquiescing today the legislative intent of both bills becomes a reality and the last barrier is removed from a "start" by the State of Missouri and its subcontractors, of a hotel-motel near the southern end of Table Rock Dam in lands heretofore sold to the State of Missouri with provisos concerning actual construction and certain improvements within a given time period.

These bills simply extend for an additional 5 years the time requirements for such construction. As stated before the subcommittee of the House Committee on Public Works in recent hearings, the Corps of Engineers have cooperated, the Department of Army and the Bureau of the Budget interpose no objection; and there is no expense to the Government while the previously created ARA loan is being implemented and appropriated for, per arrangements by the State of Missouri. The action of the subcommittee and full Committee on Public Works was unanimous, for which I am grateful; and it is estimated that this improvement for the comfort of the great numbers of retirees that are streaming into the Ozarks from throughout the United States and abroad and for those who come for recreation on beautiful Table Rock Lake will be instituted in January of 1965 or soon thereafter.

I appreciate and urge unanimous consideration of this action recommended by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON]. I further appreciate the cooperation of majority and minority counsel, the Committee on Public Works, as well as Members on both sides of the aisle who have cooperated in this "must" legislation.

TO CHANGE NAME OF BAY HEAD-MANASQUAN CANAL TO POINT PLEASANT CANAL

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2654) to change the name of the canal known as the Bay Head-Manasquan Canal and as the Manasquan River-Barnegat Bay Canal to Point Pleasant Canal.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—could the gentleman explain the bill? As I understand it, this merely is a change in the name of the New Jersey intracoastal waterway to the Point Pleasant Canal. There are no Federal costs involved in it, as it is a change of name only, and the committee is unanimously in favor of it. Is that not correct?

Mr. FALLON. The gentleman is correct.

M. CRAMER. I withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the canal known as the Bay Head-Manasquan Canal and as the Manasquan River-Barnegat Bay Canal which is located in the Borough of Point Pleasant, New Jersey, shall hereafter be known as Point Pleasant Canal and any law, regulation, document, or record of the United States in which such canal is designated or referred to under the name Bay Head-Manasquan Canal or Manasquan River-Barnegat Bay Canal shall be held to refer to such canal under and by the name of Point Pleasant Canal.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMEND SECTION 14 OF FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY ACT OF 1954

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1593) to amend section 14 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1954 concerning the interstate planning and coordination of the Great River Road.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I ask the gentleman if he would explain the purpose of the bill. It, too, was reported unanimously. There are some additional funds involved, but the minority believe they are fully justified.

I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. FALLON. Of course, this amends the legislation to increase the funds for the planning of the Great River Road from its initial authorization of $250,000 to $500,000.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 14 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 70), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"For the purpose of expediting the interstate planning and coordination of a continuous Great River Road and appurtenances thereto traversing the Mississippi Valley from Canada to the Gulf of Mexico in general conformity with the provisions of title 23, United States Code, and with the recommended plan set forth in the joint report submitted to the Congress November 28, 1951, by the Secretaries of Commerce and Interior pursuant to the Act of August 24, 1949 (Public Law 262, Eighty-first Congress), there is hereby authorized to be expended by the Secretary of Commerce from general administrative funds not to exceed $500,000; the amount expended under this section shall be apportioned among the ten States bordering the Mississippi River on the basis of their relative needs as determined by the Secretary of Commerce."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ROADS AND TRAILS FOR THE NATIONAL FORESTS

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1147) to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to construct and maintain an adequate system of roads and trails for the national forests, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—but just for the purpose of the record and for the information of the Members of the House, I think it is well to indicate that there are no additional Federal expenditures under this bill, either. The bills being considered today are only bills previously passed by the other body and the Committee on Public Works believes that it is essential they be passed before the close of this session of Congress. This is one of the most meritorious bills. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON] to ask him if he does not concur in that statement and for any further explanation of the bill that he cares to make.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, this bill reported by the Public Works Committee is to permit the construction and maintenance of an adequate system of roads and trails in the national forests.

Mr. CRAMER. That is correct. I ask the gentleman if I was not correct when I stated that there are no additional Federal expenditures involved in this legislation?

Mr. FALLON. Not at the present time.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Congress hereby finds and declares that the construction and maintenance of an adequate system of roads and trails within and near the national forests and other lands administered by the Forest Service is essential if increasing demands for timber, recreation, and other uses of such lands are to be met; that the existence of such a system would have the effect, among other things, of increasing the value of timber and other resources tributary to such roads; and that such a system is essential to enable the Secretary of Agriculture (hereinafter called the Secretary) to provide for intensive use, protection, development, and management of these lands under principles of multiple use and sustained yield of products and services.

SEC. 2. The Secretary is authorized, under such regulations as he may prescribe, subject to the provisions of this Act, to grant permanent or temporary easements for specified periods or otherwise for road rights-of-way (1) over national forest lands and other lands administered by the Forest Service, and (2) over any other related lands with respect to which the Department of Agriculture has rights under the terms of the grant to it.

SEC. 3. An easement granted under this Act may be terminated by consent of the owner of the easement, by condemnation, or after a five-year period of nonuse the Secretary may, if he finds the owner has abandoned the easement, make a determination to cancel it. Before the Secretary may cancel an easement for nonuse the owner of such easement must be notified of the determination to cancel and be given, upon his request made within sixty days after receipt of the notice, a hearing in accordance with such rules and regulations as may be issued by the Secretary.

SEC. 4. The Secretary is authorized to provide for the acquisition, construction, and maintenance of forest development roads within and near the national forests and other lands administered by the Forest Service in locations and according to specifications which will permit maximum economy in harvesting timber from such lands tributary to such roads and at the same time meet the requirements for protection, development, and management thereof, and for utilization of the other resources thereof. Financing of such roads may be accomplished (1) by the Secretary utilizing appropriated funds, (2) by requirements on purchasers of national forest timber and other products, including provisions for amortization of road costs in contracts, (3) by cooperative financing with other public agencies and with private agencies or persons, or (4) by a combination of these methods: *Provided,* That where roads of a higher standard than that needed in the harvesting and removal of the timber and other products covered by the particular sale are to be constructed, the purchaser of the national forest timber and other products shall not be required to bear that part of the costs necessary to meet such higher standard, and the Secretary is authorized to make such arrangements to this end as may be appropriate.

SEC. 5. Copies of all instruments affecting permanent interests in land executed pursuant to this Act shall be recorded in each county where the lands are located. Copies of all instruments affecting interests in lands reserved from the public domain shall be furnished to the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 6. The Secretary may require the user or users of a road under the control of the Forest Service, including purchasers of Government timber and other products, to maintain such roads in a satisfactory condition commensurate with the particular use requirements of each. Such maintenance to be borne by each user shall be proportionate to total use. The Secretary may also require the user or users of such a road to reconstruct the same when such reconstruction is determined to be necessary to accommodate such use. If such maintenance or reconstruction cannot be so provided or if the Secretary determines that maintenance or reconstruction by a user would not be practical, then the Secretary may require that sufficient funds be deposited by the user to provide his portion of such total maintenance or reconstruction. Deposits made to cover the maintenance or reconstruction of roads are hereby made available until expended to cover the cost to the United States of accomplishing the purposes for which deposited: *Provided,* That deposits received for work on adjacent and overlapping areas may be combined when it is the most practicable and efficient manner of performing the work, and cost thereof may be determined by estimates: *And provided further,* That unexpended balances upon accomplishment of the purpose for which deposited shall be transferred to miscellaneous receipts or refunded.

SEC. 7. Whenever the agreement under which the United States has obtained for the use of, or in connection with, the national forests and other lands administered by the Forest Service a right-of-way or easement for a road or an existing road or the right to use an existing road provides for delayed payments to the Government's grantor, any fees or other collections received by the Secretary for the use of the road may be placed in a fund to be available for making payments to the grantor.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GRAHAM BURKE PUMPING PLANT

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2649) to designate as the Graham Burke Pumping Plant the pumping plant being constructed in the State of Arkansas as part of the White River backwater unit of the Lower Mississippi River flood control project.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, but for the purpose of the record, there are no Federal expenditures involved in this bill. The purpose here is merely to change the name of the dam; is that not correct, I ask the gentleman from Maryland?

Mr. FALLON. The gentleman from Florida is correct.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the pumping plant being constructed in the State of Arkansas as part of the White River backwater unit of the Lower Mississippi River flood control project shall hereafter be known as the Graham Burke Pumping Plant, and any law, regulation, document, or record of the United States in which such pumping plant is designated or referred to shall be held to refer to such pumping plant under and by the name of the Graham Burke Pumping Plant.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO AMEND SUBSECTION 120(f) OF TITLE 23, UNITED STATES CODE

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2968) to amend subsection 120(f) of title 23, United States Code; and I also ask unanimous consent that the committee amendment thereto be withdrawn.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, this was supported unanimously by the committee on both sides, certainly on this side. But I would like to ask the gentleman, Is it not true that what this bill does is to apply the A-B-C sliding scale to emergency situations in the future?

Mr. FALLON. That is correct.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of

America in Congress assembled, That subsection 120(f) of title 23, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(f) The Federal share payable on account of any repair or reconstruction provided for by funds made available under section 125 of this title shall not exceed 50 per centum of the cost thereof: *Provided,* That, in the case of any State containing nontaxable Indian lands, individual and tribal, and public domain lands (both reserved and unreserved) exclusive of national forests and national parks and monuments exceeding 5 per centum of the total area of all lands therein, the Federal share shall be increased by a percentage of the remaining cost equal to the percentage that the area of all such lands in such State, is of its total area: *Provided further,* That the Federal share payable on account of any repair or reconstruction of forest highways, forest development roads and trails, park roads and trails, and Indian reservation roads may amount to 100 per centum of the cost thereof, whether or not such highways, roads, or trails are on any Federal-aid highway system. Any project agreement for which the final voucher has not been approved by the Secretary on or before the date of this Act may be modified to provide for the Federal share authorized herein."

The **SPEAKER.** Without objection, the committee amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make it clear that the committee amendment to S. 2968, the withdrawal of which has just been agreed to by the House, has been withdrawn because of the timing with respect to adjournment. If the amendment was left in and the bill passed as reported by the Committee on Public Works, it would have to be returned to the other body and it might not be acted upon prior to adjournment. By following the procedure of having the amendment withdrawn no further action is needed on this bill by the other body. In view of the need for emergency repairs to roads, resulting from disasters such as the recent floods in Montana, Washington and other areas of the Northwest, and similar disasters in other parts of the country which occur from time to time, it is felt that action on this bill is urgently needed. I wish to make it clear that it is understood that the substance of the amendment is, for all practical purposes, now in effect and that any activities carried on under S. 2968 would be in accordance with language originally proposed as an amendment.

For the record I should like to explain the present understanding which is along the lines of the original committee amendment. There is no conflict between subsection 120(f) of title 23, United States Code, as it would be amended by this bill and Public Law 88-451 which was enacted to provide specific relief for the State of Alaska for damages resulting from the earthquake of March 27, 1964, and subsequent seismic waves. Public Law 88-451, among other things, authorizes expenditures from the emergency fund under section 125 of title 23, United States Code, for the repair or reconstruction of highways in Alaska, with the Federal share of the costs thereof to be the same as that payable on account of regular Federal-aid highway projects financed with Federal-aid primary, secondary, or urban funds, which Federal share is the same as that which would be made applicable to all emergency fund expenditures by the provisions of this bill. Public Law 88-451 further provides that the increase in expenditures attributable to that portion of the Federal share of such costs that are over and above the 50 percent authorized by subsection 120(f) of title 23, United States Code, shall be reimbursed to the emergency fund by appropriations from the general fund of the Treasury, and provides an additional $15 million for such increase in expenditures.

The committee wishes to make it clear that the additional $15 million under Public Law 85-451 shall be reimbursed to the emergency fund from the general fund of the Treasury rather than the highway trust fund.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks on the bills that have just been passed by the House.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, does the gentleman have an amendment relating to this bill which has just been considered that he wished to have considered also?

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, that was covered in the first unanimous-consent request. I asked unanimous consent that the committee amendment thereto be withdrawn.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

TO DESIGNATE AS CLAIR ENGLE LAKE THE RESERVOIR CREATED BY THE TRINITY DAM, CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT, CALIF.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 3143) to designate as Clair Engle Lake the reservoir created by the Trinity Dam, Central Valley project, Calif.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, could the gentleman explain what the bill does and from what committee it came and if there are any additional Federal costs involved or whether there were any objections to the bill while being considered in the committee?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Senate bill 3143 would name the Trinity Reservoir "Clair Engle Lake." There is a reservoir at the present time behind Trinity Dam which is a principal source of water for the operation of the Trinity division of the Central Valley project in California.

This bill has been offered in memory of our late Senator Clair Engle who was also a Member of this House. The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs brought this bill out without objection. It was on the Consent Calendar but due to the late session of the Congress, the Senate bill is being considered.

There are no additional expenses attached to this bill. It merely changes the name "reservoir" to "Clair Engle Lake."

Mr. CRAMER. Do I understand that there was no objection to the legislation in the committee and that it was unanimously reported by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. If the gentleman will yield further, there was to my knowledge no objection and it was so reported.

Mr. CRAMER. Was it taken up by the Interior Committee?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. It was taken up by the Interior Committee and passed without opposition.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the reservoir created by the Trinity Dam, Central Valley project, California, shall hereafter be known as Clair Engle Lake as an appropriate tribute to the outstanding leadership and great service which the late Clair Engle performed on behalf of the development of our natural resources in the State of California and the Nation, and especially his enlightened vision for the necessity to conserve and put to the best possible beneficial use the water and power resources of this Nation, and any law, regulation, document, or record of the United States in which such reservoir is designated or referred to shall hereafter be held to refer to such reservoir by the name of Clair Engle Lake.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H.R. 12471) was laid on the table.

TO AMEND TITLE II OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 9393) to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide full retroactivity for disability determinations, to extend the period within which ministers may elect coverage, and to validate wages erroneously reported for certain engineering aids employed by soil and water conservation districts in Oklahoma, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 8, line 4, insert:

"SEC. 4. (a) Section 209 of the Social Security Act (relating to definition of wages) is amended—

(1) by striking out "or" at the end of subsection (i);

(2) by striking out the period at the end of subsection (j) and inserting in lieu thereof ", or"; and

(3) by inserting immediately after subsection (j) the following new subsection:

"(k) Remuneration paid to or on behalf of an employee if (and to the extent that) at the time of the payment of such remuneration it is reasonable to believe that a corresponding deduction is allowable under section 217 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954."

"(b) Section 3121(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to definition of wages) is amended—

"(1) by striking out 'or' at the end of paragraph (9);

"(2) by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (10) and inserting in lieu thereof '; or'; and

"(3) by adding after paragraph (10) the following new paragraph:

"'(11) remuneration paid to or on behalf of an employee if (and to the extent that) at the time of the payment of such remuneration it is reasonable to believe that a corresponding deduction is allowable under section 217.'

"(c) Section 3306(b) of such Code (relating to definition of wages) is amended—

"(1) by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (8) and inserting in lieu thereof '; or'; and

"(2) by adding after paragraph (8) the following new paragraph:

"'(9) remuneration paid to or on behalf of an employee if (and to the extent that) at the time of the payment of such remuneration it is reasonable to believe that a corresponding deduction is allowable under section 217.'

"(d) The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to remuneration paid on or after the first day of the first calendar month which begins more than ten days after the date of the enactment of this Act."

Page 8, after line 4, insert:

"SEC. 5. (a) Clause (8) of section 1002(a) of the Social Security Act is amended to read as follows: '(8) provide that the State agency shall, in determining need, take into consideration any other income and resources of the individual claiming aid to the blind, as well as any expenses reasonably attributable to the earning of any such income, except that, in making such determination, the State agency (A) shall disregard the first $85 per month of earned income, plus one-half of earned income in excess of $85 per month, (B) shall, for a period not in excess of twelve months, and may, for a period not in excess of thirty-six months, disregard such additional amounts of other income and resources, in the case of an individual who has a plan for achieving self-support approved by the State agency, as may be necessary for the fulfillment of such plan;'.

"(b) Clause (14) of section 1602(a) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"'(14) provide that the State agency shall, in determining need for aid to the aged, blind, or disabled, take into consideration any other income and resources of an individual claiming such aid, as well as any expenses reasonably attributable to the earning of any such income; except that, in making such determination with respect to any individual who is blind, the State agency (A) shall disregard the first $85 per month of earned income plus one-half of earned income in excess of $85 per month, and (B) shall, for a period not in excess of twelve months, and may, for a period not in excess of thirty-six months, disregard such additional amounts of other income and resources, in the case of an individual who has a plan for achieving self-support approved by the State agency, as may be necessary for the fulfillment of such plan, and in making such determination with respect to any other individual who has attained age 65 and is claiming aid to the aged, blind, or disabled, of the first $50 per month of earned income, the State agency may, after December 31, 1962, disregard not more than the first $10 thereof plus one-half of the remainder; and'."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I do so not because of any objection to the bill or the amendments thereto, but to ask the chairman to advise the Members of the House as to the nature of the Senate amendments to the House bill.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to set forth in the RECORD a fuller explanation of these two amendments.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, as the Members will recall, H.R. 9393 was unanimously passed by the House on April 30, 1964. As passed by the House the measure contained three provisions affecting the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program.

First, it provided an amendment to the disability insurance program to permit a disabled worker to establish the beginning of his disability, for purposes of social security protection, as of the date he actually became disabled, regardless of when he files his application. Under present law in the case of applications filed after June 30, 1962, the period of disability may begin no more than 18 months before the application for disability benefits is filed.

Second, the bill would extend, generally through April 15, 1965, the time within which ministers can elect to be covered under social security. Ministers who failed to elect social security coverage before the deadline of April 15, 1962, which applied to most of them, would thus have another opportunity to elect coverage.

Third, the bill would validate certain earnings reported under social security of engineering aids working for local soil and water conservation districts in Oklahoma who were reported in good faith, but erroneously, as State employees under the coverage agreement between the State of Oklahoma and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

H.R. 9393 has been passed by the other body with amendments which do not affect the provisions of the House bill. The other body added two amendments, the first of which would exclude from the definition of "wages" for social security and unemployment insurance purposes, amounts received by a newly hired employee as reimbursement of moving expenses incurred in reporting to his place of employment.

It will be recalled that prior to 1964, amounts received by a new employee as moving expenses were included in gross income and were subject to social security, unemployment insurance, and income tax withholding. The Revenue Act of 1964 provided a special deduction for the moving expenses of new employees and also changed the income tax withholding provisions to exempt these amounts from withholding to the extent that, at the time the payment was received, it was reasonable to believe that the employee could claim a deduction for moving expenses.

The amendment of the other body would bring the social security and unemployment insurance tax provisions into conformity with the new income tax withholding provision. Thus to the extent a deduction may be available, reimbursement for these moving expenses would not be subject to either the social security or unemployment tax.

The second amendment added by the other body concerns the aid to the blind program under the public assistance provisions of the Social Security Act.

It will be recalled that the Public Welfare Amendments of 1962 amended titles X and XVI of the Social Security Act to provide that, in determining need for eligibility purposes in the aid to the blind program, a State shall, in addition to the specified exempted amounts of earned income in present law, exempt such other amounts of income and resources for an individual who has a plan approved by the State agency for achieving self-support, as will be necessary to fulfill the plan. Under this legislation the period of additional exemption cannot be in excess of 12 months for any individual.

The amendment of the other body would retain existing law but would permit a State, at its option, to allow a period beyond 12 months but not in excess of 36 months of additional exemption for an individual who has such a State-approved plan.

Mr. Speaker, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Department of the Treasury have indicated that they have no objection to the amendments adopted by the other body, and I urge acceptance of these amendments by the House.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, this is to take care of certain State plans?

Mr. MILLS. Yes.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. That are a little more liberal?

Mr. MILLS. That is right, but it would, of course, apply to all the States if they wanted to extend the date.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, while I support the bill (H.R. 9393), I regret that it appears to be the only social security bill passed by this session of the Congress.

After considerable effort on the part of the Ways and Means Committee, the House passed a social security bill, H.R.

11865, which provided for an increase in cash benefits together with other provisions liberalizing coverage.

Regretfully, this bill, H.R. 11865, will not become law because at the direction of the Johnson administration the Senate conferees have wrecked the conference on the bill. The Senate conferees have taken the position that if they cannot have medicare, we will not have a social security bill.

When the conference adjourned in an impasse, the House-Senate conferees had reached substantial agreement on all other issues. The advocates of medicare are solely responsible for the failure of the 20 million recipients of social security to receive these additional benefits. Among the benefits which the administration has washed down the drain, there were included:

First. A $7 increase in monthly cash benefits.

Second. A $35 minimum benefit for many of those over age 72 who do not meet the work requirements of present law.

Third. Liberalization of the work test in order to permit the aged to supplement their social security benefits with part-time jobs.

Fourth. Social security benefits for dependents who are attending school up to age 22, instead of age 18.

Fifth. Social security benefits for widows beginning at age 60, rather than at age 62.

Sixth. Liberalization of the gross income upon which farmers may elect to pay social security.

If they cannot have medicare, the Senate conferees are willing to deny to the aged any benefits whatsoever. Their obstructionist attitude has defeated a program of reasonable and needed improvements in the social security system to which I think the aged are fully entitled. This is a cruel and thoughtless act on the part of the administration and the advocates of medicare.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF PERIOD DURING WHICH FEDERAL PAYMENTS MAY BE MADE FOR FOSTER CARE IN CHILD-CARE INSTITUTIONS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 10473) to extend the period during which Federal payments may be made for foster care in child-care institutions under the program of aid to families with dependent children under title IV of the Social Security Act, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment as follows:

Page 1, after line 5, insert:

"SEC. 2. (a) Section 406(a) of the Social Security Act is amended by inserting '(1)' after 'needy child', by striking out 'under the age of eighteen,', and by inserting before the semicolon at the end thereof ', and (2) who is (A) under the age of eighteen, or (B) under the age of twenty-one and (as determined in accordance with standards prescribed by the Secretary) a student regularly attending a high school in pursuance of a course of study leading to a high school diploma or its equivalent, or regularly attending a course of vocational or technical training designed to fit him for gainful employment'.

"(b) So much of section 407 of such Act which precedes paragraph (1) is amended by striking out 'under the age of eighteen' and inserting in lieu thereof 'who meets the requirements of section 406(a)(2),', by inserting a comma after 'parent', and by striking out 'relatives specified in section 406(a)' and inserting in lieu thereof 'relatives specified in section 406(a)(1)'."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I do so not with any intention of objecting, but because I think these are sound amendments, but would ask the chairman to explain the Senate amendments for the benefit of the membership.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, as unanimously passed by the House on May 27, 1964, H.R. 10473 provided for an extension—to June 30, 1967—of the period during which Federal payments may be made for foster care in child-care institutions under the program of aid to families with dependent children under title IV of the Social Security Act. In the absence of the enactment of this legislation, authority for Federal matching for children placed in nonprofit, private child-care institutions will expire on September 30, 1964.

The bill has been passed by the other body with amendments not affecting the House bill. These amendments provide for an extension of Federal matching under the program of aid to families with dependent children for those children between the ages of 18 and 21 who are still attending high school or a vocational school.

Eligibility for Federal matching in such cases would require that the child be in regular attendance in pursuance of a course of study leading to a high school diploma, or its equivalent, or in regular attendance in a course of vocational or technical training designed to fit him for gainful employment. Upon reaching age 21, or withdrawing from school, eligibility for Federal matching would cease.

The extension of the program as provided in the amendments of the other body would be optional with the States. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare estimates the cost of this provision at $2 million for the first full year of operation and $11 million per year after 5 years, assuming that half of the States are then participating.

Mr. Speaker, the assumption that children are no longer dependent upon attaining age 18 is not valid as applied to children still attending school. Indeed, the present cutoff at age 18 may have the effect of forcing those children who are most in need of a high school education or vocational training to leave school. The provisions added to H.R. 10743 by the other body would enable such children to continue their education and would enhance the probabilities of their becoming self-sufficient citizens.

Moreover, the other body's amendments appear to be corollary to the action of the House in H.R. 11865. It will be recalled that section 3 of that measure, as passed by the House, would provide for the payment of a child's insurance benefit after attainment of age 18 in the case of a child attending school. I, therefore, urge acceptance of the amendments by the House.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I would add, that we had intended to amend the Social Security Act to permit benefits under the old-age and survivors insurance system to be continued for those attending school up to age 22, instead of the present cutoff at age 18. This amendment was part of H.R. 11865 as it passed this House and as it passed the Senate. This is one of the items that was killed today as the result of the adamant position taken by the Senate conferees in the conference on the social security amendments that should have been enacted by this Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

The title was amended to read as follows: "An Act to extend the period during which Federal payments may be made for foster care in child-care institutions under the program of aid to families with dependent children under title IV of the Social Security Act, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CORRECTING CERTAIN ERRORS IN THE TARIFF SCHEDULES OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 12253) to correct certain errors in the Tariff Schedules of the United States, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. JONES of Missouri and Mr. CURTIS objected.

FISCAL POLICY

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, the administration spokesmen are beating the political drum so loudly these days that it is drowning out the sound of the danger alarm of the Nation's critical fiscal situation, both at home and abroad. And while they speak of great prosperity out of one side of their mouths and poverty out of the other, our balance-of-payments deficit continues to grow. Those who are willing to accept the political propaganda which portrays our fiscal economy as being sound must necessarily be blind to the facts and figures.

Under existing law the Federal Reserve banks are required to maintain a gold reserve equal to at least 25 percent of their combined net and deposit liabilities. U.S. gold reserves have been shrinking steadily since 1947 and have today reached a most critical point. The U.S. gold supply has dipped slightly below the $15½ billion mark. Since 1957 our balance-of-payments deficit has been averaging about $3 billion a year. Because of this deficit we have been obliged to sell almost $6.5 billion in gold, while our short-term liabilities to foreigners has increased by about $11 billion. Our domestic requirements, established by statute, are approximately $12 billion, while foreign claims have soared to $26 billion. In cold facts, we find ourselves today in the chaotic situation of requiring a total of $38 billion of gold to meet the aggregate of our foreign and domestic requirements and yet have a gold supply of less than $15½ billion. In other words, we are $22½ billion short in the balance of our gold reserves.

Repeatedly during the past year legislators have been quietly assured that the administration is aware of the seriousness of this problem and is taking steps to correct it. With tongue in cheek, Treasury Department experts say they look for an improvement in the situation. The fact of the matter is, however, that there has been no improvement and, as one of the foremost fiscal experts in the country recently stated, the half-hearted techniques being used to protect our remaining gold supply such as currency swaps and direct Treasury borrowing abroad are mere palliatives that do not reach the real heart of the issue. We are merely buying time—delaying the day when the chickens will come home to roost.

We have seen the proponents of foreign aid shunt aside the fundamental problem of our balance of payments. The fact of the matter is that until we can increase the margin between U.S. exports and imports we are just going to have to reduce expenditures abroad. Furthermore, if the tax cut signed into law in 1964 is going to be meaningful in any respect, it will have to be financed by noninflationary methods. Talk all you like about a flexible easy money policy as being a stimulant to the economy, we must still recognize that this type of policy will eventually strike at the people who can least afford to absorb inflation. Encouraging the growth of our economy is indeed necessary and laudable, but it must be done in a sound and fiscally sensible manner lest it lead to a collapse.

Congress has just completed its 88th session. It did not exercise the fiscal prudence which the people of this country were told would be the hallmark of this session. Speeches and messages regarding fiscal responsibility and economy budgets such as we heard at the turn of this year have proven to be mere words. The figures show that the budget is actually $6 billion above what Congress appropriated for the current fiscal year and $23 billion higher than former President Eisenhower suggested as the 1961 fiscal budget. Actual spending will total $104 billion, notwithstanding the $98.6 billion figure of the Johnson administration. This exceeds the highest spending of any time, even during World War II when we were frantically building the military and our defenses. Political pump priming has been given priority over sound fiscal policy this year in the face of the recent increase in the public debt to an astronomical $324 billion.

Good judgment and concern for the future would certainly dictate that the next President of the United States propose to Congress that Federal expenditures for at least 2 years be maintained at the 1962–63 level. It just does not make sense to invoke a tax cut without implementing it with some fiscal discipline and prudence.

It may be difficult for the average citizen to find the time to study the facts as they pertain to the very complex system of managing our fiscal affairs both at home and abroad; but unless this is done and unless positive steps are taken without delay, we are certain to find ourselves in the position of being too late with too little.

The strength of this Nation depends upon many things including a strong national defense, sound internal security and a growing economy. But equally important is a sound fiscal structure. Any fiscal crisis in this country in the next few months could be as disastrous to our position of leadership in the free world as a breakdown in any of these other areas of our national life. It is imperative that we cease to treat these fundamental problems as stepchildren in our family of national obligations. The time has come to face them realistically and in a positive manner.

HON. WALTER NORBLAD

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply shocked and saddened the other day to learn of the sudden passing of my good friend, the gentleman from Oregon, Walter Norblad. In the 6 years I have had the honor to serve in this body I had come to know Walt well and to admire and respect him. He was one of the ranking members of his party on the Committee on Armed Services. His service there was always marked by good humor, diligence, and a deep concern for the security and strength of our country.

Those of us who knew Walter Norblad well and had the privilege to serve with him know the loss that his sudden passing has meant to this House and to the people of Oregon. To those whom he served so well and to his wife and family I extend my deepest sympathy.

THE HONORABLE CARL VINSON

Mr. SMITH of Virginia assumed the chair.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in the entire history of our country there is no man, whether in or out of the legislative branches of the Congress, particularly in the performance of his duties in the legislative branch of the Congress, who has made a more outstanding record and contribution to the history of the progress of our country than our distinguished friend and colleague, the gentleman from Georgia, Carl Vinson.

The pages of American history will carry the great contributions made by this wonderful gentleman, a great American and an outstanding legislator. His noble, refreshing outlook on life has been an inspiration to all of us. There is no man who has done more in one of the most trying periods of the world's history and of our Nation's history to bring about a strong and powerful defense for our country, recognizing the importance of peace through strength, than our distinguished friend.

The gentleman from Georgia, Carl Vinson, has served the longest of any Member of the National House of Representatives. He has served as chairman of committees for many years. His name is legend, not only among the Members who serve with him now but the Members who have served with him in the past, and in the minds of the American people, without regard to political party or affiliation. I or any one of us could talk for a week about the gentleman from Georgia, Carl Vinson, and we would think we had just begun to express our thoughts about this wonderful gentleman, who has shown the finest thoughts and actions that could possibly be shown by any human being.

There are many men who have rendered honorable and trustworthy service in this body. I have never served with any Member who did not serve in this body in an honorable and trustworthy manner, but none have served in a more honorable and more trustworthy manner than the gentleman from Georgia, Carl Vinson.

Carl Vinson is retiring voluntarily—a young man looking forward, not backward—with 50 years of service. Yes, 50 years of service—what a remarkable achievement in the life of anyone.

Carl Vinson is one of Georgia's greatest contributions to the United States of America. Georgia has made great contributions in the past and at the present time through the service of her sons in the National Government. But the State of Georgia has made no greater contribution than when the people of his congressional district sent to the Halls of

Congress 50 years ago this great man and continued to return him throughout all these years to serve them and to serve the State of Georgia and to serve our beloved country.

Mr. Speaker, speaking and acting for the delegation from the State of Georgia, and in doing this I am speaking and acting for the delegation from Georgia, I offer a resolution and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 899

Whereas the Honorable Carl Vinson, a Representative from Georgia, has continuously served as a Member of the House of Representatives since November 3, 1914; and

Whereas he has presided with distinction as Chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs and the Committee on Armed Services, and in these positions of responsibility has provided trusted leadership in the field of national defense for thirty years; and

Whereas his fifty-year tenure as a Representative is unique in the annals of the House, surpassing all records for length of service in this body; and

Whereas his legislative career, which has constantly reflected the highest concepts of public stewardship, has contributed immeasurably to the efficiency and vitality of the defense establishment, and the security of the United States; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives commends the Honorable Carl Vinson, the beloved dean of the House, for his incomparable record as a legislator, his manifold contributions to the strength of our country, his constant and unimpeachable devotion to the public interest and expresses the conviction that as he retires from this body after his twenty-sixth term, he carries with him the love, respect and admiration of his colleagues and the gratitude of the Nation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Smith of Virginia). The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was unanimously adopted.

Mr. McCORMACK. Might I take my colleagues into my confidence and disclose a secret. I had conferred with the members of the delegation from Georgia. They had agreed that I should offer the resolution, but it is a great surprise to our friend the gentleman from Georgia, Carl Vinson, because he did not know about it until a little after noontime today. The first time he knew about the resolution was when I showed it to him. I might say also that the gentleman from Indiana, Charley Halleck, and I worked together, as did others, in order that this event, which is such a pleasure on our part, and which is such an honor to the gentleman from Georgia and which he has so richly deserved, might be brought about.

I yield now to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Halleck].

Mr. HALLECK. It is true that the Speaker discussed with me the matter of this resolution and, after some discussion on my side of the aisle, I discovered that not only I but all of us over here were happy and pleased and proud to join in the support of the resolution.

Now, "Uncle Carl," as I call him, is a Democrat. Well, some of us have found that out, maybe sometimes the hard way, but we still love him, may I say.

Mr. Speaker, I have not served here quite as long as our colleague, the gentleman from Georgia, Carl Vinson. He is winding up 50 years of distinguished service and I am a little reluctant to talk about how long I have been here, because there are a few people back home who suggest that maybe I have been here too long.

I am trying, you understand, to overcome that sentiment as best I can, because, unlike our colleague from Georgia, I am not retiring, I am hoping to be back.

And having said that much, may I just add what the gentleman from Georgia's service should mean to all of us who have been here for some time, and certainly to the younger Members who have come here very recently, that service in the House of Representatives of the United States of America is one of the greatest privileges that can come to any person. Serving here, of course, is an honor, but as the gentleman from Georgia has so well pointed out, it is likewise a great responsibility. And if one is not ready to assume that responsibility then certainly he should not be here.

Our friend, the gentleman from Georgia, has certainly shouldered more than his fair share of the responsibility for the conduct of this great Nation of ours. His burdens have been in the area having to do primarily with the defense of our beloved land and in that area no one could have served with more zeal, with greater effectiveness, or more complete dedication than has the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Vinson].

So, "Uncle Carl," as you leave we shall all remember you as long as we are around and we shall always wish you were still with us. Maybe I should qualify that, because we do not want this to be too austere. There have been a few times when I hoped that maybe you should not have been quite so persuasive on a few matters that have come before us. But you have been persuasive and influential, because you have been the stalwart friend of everyone who has served here with you.

And so, Congressman Vinson, an outstanding Representative from the great State of Georgia, we wish you well; we wish you many, many more years of happiness and pleasure and service in whatever field of endeavor you may determine is to your liking. And I have not the slightest doubt that, wherever you go or whatever you undertake to accomplish, if you pursue it with the same dedication that you have demonstrated here in all of your years in the Congress of the United States you will prove yourself to be a continuing great citizen of your area, your State, and of the United States of America.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, never during my service in this House have tributes been paid to any Member that were more beautiful; never have tributes been paid that were more deserved. Carl Vinson makes any Member of the House who knows him and who has served with him proud that he is a Member of this body.

Carl Vinson came to Congress nearly 50 years ago—not much more than a boy. He leaves us in about 3 months a full-grown man, full grown in all the attributes of manhood.

Mr. Speaker, wherever Carl Vinson goes dignity goes with him; wherever he sits there sits wisdom, also.

Mr. Speaker, service in the House of Representatives is a great profession. I believe it is as great as the profession of law, medicine, or teaching. Perhaps it is the greatest profession of them all. It requires a continuing accounting of stewardship over the years. In this profession no other in all the history of this country has been more successful.

Mr. Speaker, service in this House is a great art, the art of understanding the requirements of the generation in which we live, the art of getting along with other people, the art of persuasion, the art of legislation. Here with us yet is one of the greatest artists of them all. I have known, as all of you have known, many men who walk high among men in the world. But I have never known a man who walks taller. He has made the House of Representatives look good, look great wherever he has been. He is one of the great men of all time.

Mr. Vinson, there are many reasons why I am happy to have been a Member of this House. However, there is none greater than the honor of having served with you and having had the benefit of your counsel and your wisdom and your assistance over the years. May the Lord of all great men walk with you through long years of good health and happiness ahead.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the distinguished majority whip, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Boggs].

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Georgia [Carl Vinson] is not hard to describe. Ever since I have known him I would say that he is a man who invariably looks to the future and that in his work here his entire career may be characterized as dedication to duty.

Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from Georgia in his own remarks referred to the fact that when he first came here the Springfield rifle was the principal weapon of defense in our country. Today, of course, we have moved into the missile era. Also he may have said that during his service we have moved from the horse and buggy to the space era. We have moved from a small Nation struggling to become a continental power through two terrific wars to the victories, to which he contributed immensely, to the leader of all free mankind.

This man, Mr. Speaker, more than any other man in that significant half century in the history of this the greatest Nation on earth, has contributed more than anyone else. I think it is fitting and proper that the House today should pause and pay tribute to him. Despite his greatness he is a very human man, he is a very compassionate man, and a man who is genuinely close to the people and close to their problems. He understands the problems of the young people. He has maintained his interest in the young in his own family, both his own and his adopted family.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress, this Nation, loses one of its great champions—a man who loves this institution and who understands its significance to our democratic society—when we lose the gentleman from Georgia, CARL VINSON, as a Member in the House of Representatives.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished minority whip.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, the resolution unanimously adopted by the House a while ago is couched in words that speak for themselves. We all add a hearty "amen" to what it expresses.

It clearly indicates the respect each and every one of us has for the gentleman from Georgia, Uncle CARL. As he reminisces a little about his 50 years of service in the House and his many, many friends here they will seem to him to have been 50 short years.

I have been privileged as the ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services to sit next to Uncle CARL every day for many, many years. We have at times had some differences. But generally there has been complete support of the position Uncle CARL took because at all times he knew what he was doing, and was at all times objectively trying to do that which was in the best interest of his Nation, State, and district.

When we said farewell to him in committee we presented him with a television set. I hope it is already installed in his home. We were doing this for a purpose. It was to be certain he could watch on television as to how we were behaving in Washington.

The President of the United States has a hot line to Moscow. Mr. VINSON should have a hot line from here into Georgia so he can call us and tell us what to do. We will miss his guidance and will need his advice.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would recommend an appropriation for such a hot line straight to Georgia. It would be funds well spent to meet such crises as may arise on defense matters.

Mr. Speaker, our chairman has been a great leader. I have learned many things from him, and should I ever occupy the chair he happens to occupy in the Committee on Armed Services I trust I can do even in some measure as well as he has done, and that the committee will support me as well as it has supported him. As every one knows his support by the committee has been remarkable. We are going to miss him; but I am sure he will be here in spirit with us. We sincerely hope he will have many, many years to enjoy life exactly as he desires.

May I conclude by suggesting that the first job our chairman of the Committee on Armed Services in the new Congress should do is to assign and set up a special committee to from time to time call on the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], and to advise him of what is going on. We believe he will miss his committee. We will certainly miss him.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. STEPHENS].

Mr. STEPHENS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank you on behalf of the State of Georgia for the leadership you have taken in recognizing the work of our distinguished colleague, CARL VINSON. I am not the senior member of the delegation by a number of years, though as Mr. VINSON leaves the Congress my seniority in the Georgia delegation will naturally go up considerably. However, I am the Member responding first because I will have the honor of representing the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] in the coming Congress.

In the redistricting of Georgia I got seven of the counties he has represented including his home in Baldwin County. I feel I am fortunate in having him as my constituent because I know from time to time I will need his advice. I can say also that I will have the distinction of being the only Member of Congress who will have a constituent who served in the Congress for 50 years or more. I appreciate having that distinction.

When I first was elected in 1960, I went down to see the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] and sat in his parlor in Milledgeville, Ga., in his home on the outskirts of town. He looked at me and asked: "Boy, how old are you?"

I replied: "I am 47."

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] said "When you were 1 year old I was elected for the first time."

His long service has meant much to us. We in Georgia are proud of CARL VINSON. Many, many years ago a distinguished Georgian, Francis S. Bartow, came up to Virginia. He was later killed on the battlefield at Manassas. When he left Georgia with his Confederate unit he said: "I go to illustrate Georgia."

I know of no other quotation that would better fit the service the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] has done while he has been here. He has been an illustrious Representative and son of the State of Georgia and has reflected great credit on us.

I thank you for making it possible for us to pay tribute to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON]. Other Members of the Georgia delegation, I am sure, will add their commendations.

I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts, Speaker McCORMACK, for taking the leadership in recognizing the fine work of our colleague, Congressman CARL VINSON.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I have been on speaking terms with the distinguished Speaker for 24 years. I did not know he would have an occasion like this and not let me know, because I would have loved to have prepared something that may have had some semblance of coherence on this occasion.

I do not suppose there will be another time when we can laud my great chairman while he serves in the Congress, because I understand there is a possibility that we may adjourn between now and Christmas, but in case we do adjourn any time in the near future, I want to take this opportunity to add these few remarks I may possess to those plaudits about my great chairman.

First of all, I want to include the South Carolina delegation in the resolution which the House has unanimously passed. While I personally may profit by the genteman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] leaving—certainly I or the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] will profit—the Nation will lose and consequently both the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] and I will suffer a terrible loss regardless of whomever may be elevated to that venerable chair which the gentleman has occupied so ably, for so many years.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] has left a legacy of knowledge to those of us who may remain here and those who may come here later. He has led us and the Nation by example. He has by example taught us. He has counseled us in the ways of strength for our Nation and consequently for our world. He has lived for one purpose alone, to serve his country, and to see his country the greatest nation militarily on the face of the earth, a nation capable of enforcing the peace, if indeed, we are to have peace. If we do not have peace, it will not be CARL VINSON's fault.

He leaves of his own choosing. He leaves in the virility of youth, as the Speaker has said. He leaves us as a young man. He does not have to be carried out. His motto is:

LET ME LIVE OUT MY YEARS

Let me live out my years in heat of blood!
Let me die drunken with the dreamer's wine!
Let me not see this soul-house built of mud
Go toppling to the dust—a vacant shrine.
"Let me go quickly, like a candle light
Snuffed out just at the heyday of its glow.
Give me high noon—and let it then be night!
Thus would I go.
And grant that when I face the grisly Thing,
My song may trumpet down the grap Perhaps.
O let me be a tune-swept fiddle string
That feels the Master Melody—and snaps.
JOHN G. NEIHARDT.

Source—"The Home Book of Modern Verse." An extension of the "Home Book of Verse." New York, Henry Holt & Co., 1925, p. 967.

This is the way the gentleman from Georgia, CARL VINSON, wants to go. He wants, as he says, to wear out and not rust out. I suspect he will do neither, because as long as he lives, and I hope there will be many more venerable years, he will be an inspiration to those of us whom he has tried to teach, and has tried to prepare to take his place.

If the Committee on Armed Services, which he loves, does not do well it will not be his fault. If we do not do well it will break his heart. But we will have his best wishes, Mr. Speaker, as he leaves. We will have the inspiration of the gentleman from Georgia, CARL VINSON, to press us forward to fulfill the staggering responsibilities which will be imposed upon us who will follow him. With that inspiration, Mr. Speaker, and with the best wishes of the Nation and with the cooperation of the Congress we will not fail.

In the words, Mr. Speaker, of Edwin Markham, the gentleman from Georgia, CARL VINSON—

has held his place—
Held the long purpose like a growing tree—
Held on through blame and faltered not at
praise.
And when he fell in whirlwind, he went down
As when a lordly cedar, green with boughs,
Goes down with a great shout upon the hills,
And leaves a lonesome place against the sky.

Mr. Speaker, there will be a lonesome place against the sky in these legislative halls when the gentleman from Georgia, CARL VINSON, leaves. This void may not be filled for a long time. We will miss him. Future generations will remember him until time is no more.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, it is with a feeling of sadness as it is brought so forcefully to our recollection and to our attention that Uncle CARL VINSON will soon be leaving us. He will be greatly missed on the floor of Congress. He will be especially missed, however, in the Committee on Armed Services.

I have served with him on that committee for 12 long years. It simply will not seem the same without Chairman VINSON.

It has been said that any great person whom you live close to will leave something of his ability and something of his character and something of his greatness when he leaves you. I am sure that is especially true of CARL VINSON.

Though I have only known him for 14 years, and 12 of those years on the committee, I feel like I knew him as long ago as 1941. My first command in World War II was the old Forsyth, Ga., tank company from Monroe County, Ga. It was then redesignated Company A, 193d Tank Company. I took that command on the 25th of June 1941. Incidentally, Monroe County is one of the counties in CARL VINSON's congressional district. Every man in that company, businessman or boy who had been working in the mills or on the farms—they all knew CARL VINSON. They were all proud of him. I just wish, Mr. VINSON, that you could have heard some of the remarks that those men made about you. I have repeated some of them to you. But I really learned to know you and so I was especially happy when I was placed on the Committee on Armed Services in my second term in the Congress. There have been times, although not many instances, when we have not agreed. I will, however, say that in most matters that were in controversy in the committee, as our chairman well knows, I have agreed with him far, far more time than I have disagreed.

Mr. Speaker, I wish I had the time and I know that it would be most interesting here to tell of the many interesting incidents which brought out the genial and brilliant repartee of CARL VINSON. I will say this, however, that at times it has been pretty rugged in that committee but I will also say that never in my life have I been associated with a man who I felt was any more deeply patriotic in the absolute love of his country than CARL VINSON.

We will miss him for a long, long time. The only thing I can say now is that we wish for him the greatest beauty life can bring to a really great man.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HAGAN].

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the privilege and opportunity of joining with my colleague, the Honorable Robert G. Stephens, Jr., in expressing appreciation to you, the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, on behalf of the Georgia delegation for persenting this resolution today honoring our distinguished colleague and dean of the House of Representatives, the Honorable CARL VINSON. When I was first sworn in, in 1961, as a Member of Congress, during the afternoon of January 3 we were quite busy in my office, when a secretary told me that I had a telephone call from the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON]. Of course I grabbed the telephone, and Mr. CARL said, "I am coming up to see you." I said quickly, "My Heavens, Mr. CARL, I will come down to see you." And he replied, "No, I am coming up."

So we brushed off the desks and cleaned up things in a hurry, and in came Hon. CARL VINSON, the dean of our delegation.

He sat down by my desk and he said, "Well, old boy, I just want to tell you that you are starting out in the very four walls I started out in, in 1914."

Under the system of drawing for office accommodations I had unknowingly drawn the office he started out in, in 1914.

Very quickly I replied, "Mr. CARL, I hope something off these walls brushes off on me in a hurry."

I hope it has. I will always be grateful for the past 4 years I have spent as a Member of Congress serving with and observing a great man at work for his country.

After he had told me that I was in his old office, he sat down and talked with me for some 30 minutes or more. I shall never forget the talk that we had in my office, the advice and the counsel which he voluntarily and freely gave to me.

Mr. VINSON, I want to tell you and the Members of this House that it has been a great experience to serve with you. It is something I shall cherish through all my days, as I know each Member will. I know that much of my fortunate association with you has brushed off on me and I hope it will remain with me in my future service as a Member of this body.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, this is truly a historical and eventful occasion. Fifty years of continuous service in the House of Representatives. Think of it. What a wonderful and marvelous service.

I consider it a signal honor to have the privilege of voting for the resolution paying deserved, appropriate, and well-earned tribute to my warm personal friend, our beloved colleague the Honorable CARL VINSON, of the great State of Georgia. It is a pleasure and privilege to be here today and to join with my colleagues of the House in eulogizing one of our great leaders on the eve of his departure after 50 years of loyal, effective, and dedicated service.

To have served in this House with CARL VINSON is a rich and and rewarding experience. Beyond a doubt, he has in one way or another during his brilliant career been helpful to and influenced every Member of this House. His wise counsel has been heeded. His sound arguments have been followed. His warm friendship has touched tender hearts. His example as a good man, as a Member of Congress, and chairman of a great committee, the Committee on Armed Services of the House, has no peers.

As I have sat in this Chamber during sessions of the House innumerable times and observed the artful performance of our colleague, I have come to realize that he is not only a master in performing his responsibility, but how much he has meant to the strength and the greatness of America.

Although I realize how difficult it is in my inability, I have tried to take a leaf from his "book" in assuming my responsibility as chairman of another committee, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. He has been an inspiration to me and I know to many others, and we shall miss him and his guidance from day to day.

I have had the privilege of serving with many great leaders in this House, but none greater than our colleague and friend, CARL VINSON.

No one has rendered a greater service in the legislative annals of this country. He is not only a great Georgian, but he is a great American. For many years he has not only been the Congressman from his district, but a true representative of all the United States.

We owe him a debt of thanks for directing a legislative program that has given us the greatest military force in the history of mankind. We owe him a debt of thanks for the military strength of our Nation and for the security of our people.

And as you leave us, Mr. Chairman, and these halls you have adorned so long, of your own volition, you take with you our continued love, devotion, and appreciation, and our best wishes for continued good health and happiness and the blessings of life you so richly deserve.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I share the views that have been expressed here concerning the gentleman from Georgia, CARL VINSON. As a member of the House Armed Services Committee for some 16 years it has been my privilege to observe the gentleman from Georgia in his masterful performance as chairman of that group. His capacity for leadership is uncanny. I believe it is safe to say that every member of that committee looks upon the gentleman from Georgia, CARL VINSON, as a personal friend. Everyone respects his profound wisdom and guidance, his dedication to the public interest, and his devotion to duty.

The distinguished gentleman from Georgia has served here for half a century. He has been in the thick of the big legislative battles that have been fought here. His very presence lends dignity and depth to any issue that commands his interest. He is a leader in the real meaning of that word.

My most distinguished constituent is former Vice President, John Nance Garner, of Uvalde. I always make it a point to call on him when I have occasion to visit in his hometown. The man he mentions the most, in discussing his associates in the House, is the gentleman from Georgia, Carl Vinson. His admiration and respect for the Georgian is deep and abiding. Indeed, the gentleman from Georgia, Carl Vinson, can count his friends who have served with him here in the thousands. Perhaps therein lies the real test of greatness—the capacity to command such universal respect by contemporaries. That is the record of the gentleman from Georgia, Carl Vinson.

To me he has been a friend and an inspiration. No problem of mine has ever been too small to engage his sympathy and cooperation in the search for adjustments and solutions. I admire him very much. My life has been enriched by having known him and having had the opportunity to know and observe him in his performances as a Member of this body and as chairman of the Armed Services Committee.

Today I join with my colleagues in wishing for the gentleman from Georgia, Carl Vinson, a full measure of good health and happiness in his retirement. He will be missed. No one can ever hope to fill his shoes.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, as one who has never served on the Armed Services Committee, I appreciate the opportunity to testify as to the outstanding leadership of Chairman Vinson. One does not need to be a member of his committee or even of the Congress to know that no man has ever exercised a greater influence in the defense of our country. As chairman of the old Committee on Naval Affairs "Admiral" Vinson was largely responsible for the building of our modern Navy which played such a vital part in the winning of World War II. More recently as chairman of the Committee on the Armed Services he has played an equally vital part in developing our nuclear and missile might.

Carl Vinson has done all this without any special training in either military or scientific theory. He has acquired his knowledge of these technical matters by personal study and hard work.

There are others who have technical knowledge but there are none who have been able to so successfully convert their knowledge into action through their ability to influence action in the Congress. Carl Vinson has been able to do so—basically because every Member of this House knows that he can rely unqualifiedly on every representation made by the chairman.

As one of those who have stood in the wings and observed and admired his great contributions, I want to add my word of admiration and appreciation. We will not soon see his like within our midst.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, it has been a unique and enriching experience for us all to be associated and to serve with "Uncle Carl" Vinson. He is an extremely modest man, and I know that over the years there has been more than one occasion when he has blocked attempts to arrange special occasions which his friends and colleagues would have liked to arrange in his honor.

Today is different. The session is drawing to a close and with it our dear friend and colleague Carl Vinson is ending his service which began in the House of Representatives 50 years ago. It is, therefore, most fitting and appropriate that we pause briefly to express our affectionate regard and admiration for him. "Uncle Carl" has the distinction of now having served longer than any other Member of this body. Even more important, he has the added distinction of having built up a shining record through the years of selfless, devoted, and efficient public service that has not been surpassed by any of our great statesmen.

As chairman of the important Committee on Armed Services, "Uncle Carl" has been a peerless legislator, dedicated to building up our defense and operating with keen vision and prophetic foresight. To his tireless efforts we owe many of the most important steps taken throughout the years to increase our defense posture and insure our national security. He has been well and accurately termed "a principal architect of American defense policies."

In my own capacity as chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, a major portion of my responsibilities has intermeshed to an extent with those of "Uncle Carl" particularly with regard to our annual reviews and oversight of the mutual defense assistance programs. His sage wisdom and profound knowledge of military matters have evoked our confidence as well as our admiration and we have come to rely and depend on his judgment. We shall indeed miss him.

It is my hope that as he retires from the Congress he will still visit his old friends and colleagues here at the Capitol from time to time and share with us the rare skills of statesmanship which he has developed through the past half century. May I join with his host of other friends in expressing my own deep appreciation as an American for what his life and work has contributed to our well-being, and to wish him the best of health and happiness for many, many years to come.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I have listened to the remarks about the incomparable career of our incomparable friend from Georgia [Mr. Vinson]. I happily associate myself with all the splendid sentiments which have been expressed in regard to this great American. In my opinion, no man in the future will equal or excel the length of service or the quality of service of this good man from the State of Georgia.

Mr. Speaker, anyone among us could speak at great length about our friend who voluntarily departs these halls at the end of this session. I shall not detain the House further, but I could not refrain from again expressing my unbounded admiration and esteem for the distinguished Carl Vinson, of Georgia.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, for over a quarter of a century I have known the name and fame of Carl Vinson and that period only covers half of his service in the Congress.

For 14 years, I have been privileged to serve with him on the House Armed Services Committee. While he conducted the affairs of the committee with a firm hand, it was the hand of experience. While he had no patience for trivia, the hours he worked his committee on important matters were long and the perception he had on the problems before him was deep. While the years he served were numerous, the accumulated experience of over half a century equipped him for debate of the most delicate or complex nature. He had a mind of his own and he exercised his will as he understood the facts before him. He wore no man's collar but was never indifferent to the desires and thoughts of others.

I have a great respect for him as a legislator and chairman and deep affection for him personally. I know I have learned much from him because no man could be at his side for so long without becoming better for it. He has worked hard and is entitled to rest from the heavy burden he has carried. We hope he will keep in touch with us. May the years ahead for him be plentiful and filled with contentment.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, it seems there is nothing left to be added to the praises, tributes, and honors which have already been bestowed on our distinguished colleague, Carl Vinson, and all of them have been delivered from the heart, for he is a man who holds not only our respect but our love. Respect because he embodies those qualities which command the respect of all men—love because those qualities which can be cold have been warmed and tempered by his humility and love of his fellow man.

It has been my honor and privilege during the past 16 years to work closely with Uncle Carl on the Armed Services Committee. He did not horde the wisdom gained over a half century experience in the House, but gladly drew on it to give counsel and advice—and most of all encouragement—to those of us who sat at his knee.

No man, we are told, is indispensable, but if this be true, Carl Vinson comes as close as possible to being the exception to the rule. The mountains will seem higher and the woods more impenetrable without him here to guide us, but we will not be lost because the legacy which he leaves behind will blaze our trail into the future.

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues today in paying due honor and tribute to our great friend and colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Georgia, Mr. Carl Vinson. He is a great American and an effective leader. I have learned much from him as I have served as a member of his powerful Armed Services Committee. We all regret to see the retirement of our friend, Carl Vinson, from the Congress. We wish him continued good health and happiness in his future years. America, the world, and this legislative body loses a fine legislator and leader in the retirement of our wonderful friend, Carl Vinson.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, it is hard to express in words the great contributions that Carl Vinson has made to the Congress and to our country. It is equally difficult to express our appreciation, our thanks, and our regret that he is leaving.

It has been a rich personal privilege and honor for me to serve under this great American on the House Committee on Armed Services. We have all learned to appreciate his tremendous energy and enormous abilities, his vast wisdom and knowledge, and his total commitment to the security of our country and the welfare of our people.

Today the United States of America is the strongest nation in the world. Better than ever before we are prepared to deter and to defeat Communist aggression; to defend the liberty of freedom-loving people. Certainly no one man more fully deserves the credit for this accomplishment and this position than Carl Vinson.

The gentleman from Georgia deserves and requires our unbounded thanks not because he has served longer in this House than any other man. He deserves it because he is a distinguished American and one of the great statesmen of this or any other time.

I join with my colleagues in wishing this remarkable man many, many years of happy retirement. We know they will be active and productive, for that is the nature of Carl Vinson.

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Speaker, today the House is paying tribute to a great American and a great legislator, Carl Vinson, of Georgia.

So much has been said of his ability, his wisdom, and his patriotism, that I can add very little. Yet, I must rise to express my own sense of gratitude for the privilege of serving here with him. Georgia, and the Nation, will be the losers when he lays aside his public duties. He will be sorely missed by the Nation and by his colleagues.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to join my colleagues in tribute to one of the great men who have served in the Congress of the United States, the revered and beloved dean of this House, and my cherished and esteemed friend, Carl Vinson. For half a century he has served his country with rare dedication and unique distinction as a Member of this House. In the half-century of his service here, the United States of America has moved from a rural to an urban nation; from a nation dominated by the sentiment of isolation—the belief that few of our vital interests lay outside of our own territory—to the leadership of the free world and the strongest nation upon the earth; from a time when colossal combinations of industry were coming to birth to produce what have now become the industrial giants of the world. In this half-century the level of life in America has been immeasurably lifted for all Americans. Human life has been prolonged, human health protected and human happiness increased throughout this blessed land. Few men to all this magnificent American expansion and growth have contributed more than Carl Vinson.

From the time he entered this House he had a vision of the great America which we know today and he determined to help that dream of America come true. He saw his fellow citizens of the South struggling with problems of discriminatory freight rates, manipulated or inadequate markets, a shortage of money and excessively high interest rates, lacking adequate employment, needed housing, required health facilities, protection against unemployment, old age, and disability; with the potential of the South's rivers unharnessed, excessive cost of power; the soil being washed away, the natural resources of a potentially rich land undeveloped or being squandered through exploitation and all the evils of inadequate wages and poverty often appalling.

Carl Vinson resolved in his heart that he would help to lift these burdens from the bent backs of his people; that he would dedicate himself to lifting his beloved Southland to the place which its resources and the genius of its people entitled it to enjoy; that he would help to move the South into the main stream of pulsating American life. And, Carl Vinson has kept his promise to himself and his covenant with his people. He has been both a great southerner and a great American, honored by his district, his State, by his colleagues in this House and in the other body and only this week signally recognized and rewarded by the President of the United States with the highest civilian award his country can bestow upon him.

The record of Carl Vinson is the record of America for the last half a century because Carl Vinson has helped to build this majestic America and the America of tomorrow will arise from the foundation of the America of today which few men more than Carl Vinson have helped to build.

In the field of national defense, Carl Vinson stands and long has stood supreme. As chairman of the Armed Services Committee of the House, he determined that the strength of America should be second to none and all nations upon the face of the earth; that America should be so strong that if like ancient Atlas, it were called upon to bear the free world upon its shoulders its strength would be equal to the task; and so today out of his committee, out of his dedicated service, his vision and genius has come the mightiest arsenal the mind of man has ever conceived, a power in America that today safely bears the cause of freedom on its banner and on its back. Every American can sleep with tranquility because of the mighty American armada of which Carl Vinson is the father and which he has so zealously and jealously nourished.

Like Elijah, he has come to the time when he passes his mantle to another. We know that he who takes it in the Armed Services Committee of this House shall bear a challenging obligation to wear it with the honor and the nobility with which it has been so long worn by Carl Vinson. We know that the inspiration and the leadership which Carl Vinson has given to the building and the perpetuation of the military might of America will be worthily carried on by those who take up the burden after him for they shall always be asking themselves when making the critical decisions about our country's service and strength, "Is this what the 'Admiral' would have us do?"

To his colleagues he has been a warm and cherished friend ever helpful, ever considerate, always kind. The glow of his personality has warmed this Chamber and the hearts of his colleagues. Today, full of honors from his district, his State, his colleagues and his country and beloved by all, he voluntarily retires from this House. Like Winston Churchill who served only a little while longer than Carl Vinson and recently took a last lingering affectionate look at the House of Commons which had been his home for so long, Carl Vinson will shortly take his own fond look at this Chamber which has been his home for half a century. I suspect that he will with his memories leave much of his heart here in the Chamber he has so long loved and where he has been so long beloved. He will return home to the bosom of his district, his State and his Southland, and his name, already a legend, will ever be uppermost on their scroll of honor. His illustrious career will ever be a challenge and an example to younger men who shall follow him and the dedication of his life to his country shall ever be an inspiration to every patriot.

And, we know that he will continue to go about doing good, casting the warm glow of his friendship upon countless friends, counseling his countrymen and still dreaming dreams of the America yet greater than this noble land he has so much helped to build.

Fond farewell, "Admiral," your country shall ever honor you, your colleagues shall ever honor you and love you.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, among the many privileges of being a Member of Congress is the value of associations which one makes and over the years of my service I consider it a privilege to express my admiration for the gentleman from Georgia, Carl Vinson.

Carl Vinson has served his country well over many years and his outstanding record in the House of Representatives is something to the everlasting credit of the United States of America. His alert mind and indefatigable zeal has always commanded the respect and admiration of his colleagues among whom he has made a host of friends. I will always treasure his friendship and my admiration for his example of Americanism will never be forgotten.

Like everyone else, I wish him well in the days of his retirement which I hope he will enjoy to the fullest extent and in the knowledge that he has earned the everlasting respect of the citizens of our country.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, the greatness of any human institution depends in large part on the men who lead its affairs. The ability, the dedication, and the spirit of such individuals affect the character of the institution, its performance, and its public standing.

In the long history of the U.S. House of Representatives, there have been many men whose names are indelibly inscribed in the memory of every American citizen. The character of these men, and their accomplishments, have sustained this institution in which free men, conscious of their responsibilities to their respective electorates, have come year after year to resolve their differences and to enact laws for the benefit of our entire Nation.

Chairman Carl Vinson whom we are honoring today, is one of those men. He has served in this House for half a century—in itself a feat unequaled by any other Representative. But more importantly, his record of public service during those 50 years has earned him a position of unique prestige in the history of our Nation.

I have known "Uncle" Vinson for 16 of those 50 years. When I first came here, he already had the reputation of a giant among legislators. His great parliamentary skill, his intimate knowledge of the workings of this House, and his many years of experience in dealing with national as well as international issues, made him an outstanding leader. He fulfilled the responsibilities of that position with unfailing courtesy and patience, and with singular dedication to the public good. He has been untiring in championing the interests of this great Nation and of his beloved State of Georgia.

Mr. Speaker, it has been an honor and an experience I shall never forget, to have served in this House with Chairman Vinson. I know that we shall all miss him deeply. And I also know that, as he leaves these Halls that he has loved so dearly, he takes with him the gratitude of a Nation that he has served with great distinction, and the affectionate respect of all his colleagues. We wish him the Lord's most bountiful blessings in his retirement.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, we of the Georgia delegation are indeed privileged to have this opportunity of honoring our beloved colleague, the Honorable Carl Vinson. We are particularly pleased that this was made possible by the provision of a house resolution of which you, Mr. Speaker, are the author. I can think of no one who deserves this distinctive honor more than the illustrious dean of our Georgia delegation as well as of this distinguished body.

Carl Vinson leaves a remarkable record of long and dedicated service which goes back 50 years—service in the interests of his constituents, his colleagues and his country, particularly the defense of his country. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Vinson] leaves the chairmanship of the House Committee on Armed Services after 14 of the last 18 years, in which his efforts for peace through a strong military have not been in vain.

Carl Vinson leaves a responsibility to his constituents which is transferred to five Members of the Georgia delegation each of whom has received one or more of the counties which the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Vinson] represented for 32 years.

Prior to 1933, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Vinson] represented the old 10th District at a time when Georgia had 12 representatives. The Redistricting Act of 1931, which became effective with the election of 1932, transferred Mr. Vinson's home county of Baldwin from the old 10th to the new Sixth District. The Redistricting Act of 1964 transferred seven of those sixteen counties to the new 10th District which will be represented by my colleague, Mr. Stephens; two counties to the First District represented by my colleague, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Hagan]; and one county to the Eighth District represented by my colleague, Mr. Tuten. Three counties will now be a part of the new Third District and three counties, Bibb, Jones, and Monroe are transferred to the new Sixth District. I have the honor to have been renominated as the Democratic nominee to represent the new Sixth District in the 89th Congress.

Carl Vinson leaves his friends and fellow Members of the House of Representatives. But left behind is a legacy of friendship, devoted service and wisdom in the exercise of his duties, not to be forgotten but to be long remembered. With the voluntary retirement of Carl Vinson goes a man with a purpose not to be discouraged.

Carl Vinson was elected to Congress 5 days before I was born. During that entire period of nearly a half a century he has rendered outstanding public service. He has benevolently dominated the committees of which he has been chairman in a manner which is perhaps as unequaled as is his record of continuous service in this body. He presided over the Committee on Naval Affairs and the Committee on Armed Services during a period of transition and growth which has seen the establishment of the most effective defense structure in the history of the world. His contributions to this growth and posture of strength have been dynamic, judicious, and above all, effective.

Carl Vinson served in the General Assembly of Georgia with my father. It was through my father that I first came to know the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Vinson]. Since the beginning of my service in the House of Representatives, I believe that I have now earned on my own the friendship first inherited from my father. He is a sage and venerable colleague. He is a warm personal friend.

Mrs. Flynt joins me in extending our congratulations to him upon reaching a point of service unequaled in American history and which will reach the 50th year of continuous service on November 3, 1964. We wish for him many years of good health and happiness and continuous effective service.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. Speaker, two of the most instructive and satisfying years of my life have been spent in service on the House Committee on Armed Services under the chairmanship of one of the all-time great men of this body, the Honorable Carl Vinson.

The resolution unanimously adopted by the House praises the gentleman from Georgia for "his incomparable record as a legislator, his manifold contributions to the strength of our country, his constant and unimpeachable devotion to the public interest." This is praise that is truly deserved. Yet it is not all that is to be said of Carl Vinson.

As a member of the committee he has headed for so long and, with such great distinction, I can testify that, in his day-to-day contacts with other members, Mr. Vinson shows courtesy and consideration greater than I have ever seen extended by any other man. Many times I have gone to him with problems that were of importance only to me and the people of my district. He always had time to listen. He always displayed understanding. He was unfailingly helpful.

Others here have spoken, and spoken with eloquence, of Chairman Vinson's unmatched contributions to the defense of our Nation. And he has indeed been a great man for the United States of America. Yet the tremendous responsibility he has carried never set him aside from his fellowmen. He is a tremendous human being, a kindly man of integrity and understanding, and it is as such that I salute him from a heart filled with admiration and affection.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, every so often it becomes an individual's privilege and good fortune to be associated with a person who makes or leaves a lasting impression. It has been my privilege to be associated with two such people in the Congress, one the late Sam Rayburn, from Texas, the other, the Honorable Carl Vinson who has served in the House of Representatives for a longer period than any other individual.

He has dedicated his entire life to service to his country and is asking nothing in return. My only wish is that he enjoy his well-earned retirement to the fullest extent.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, Carl Vinson is variously and affectionately known by his colleagues and associates as "Mr. Chairman," "Dr. Vinson," "Admiral Vinson," "Mr. Democrat," "Mr. Dean of the House," "Mr. National Defense"; but to me he is "Mr. All America."

Presidents, Cabinet members, great generals, admirals, Justices of the Supreme Court have come and gone these past 50 years, but the name of one statesman runs throughout this entire span of half a century—Carl Vinson, of Georgia.

During this time, the United States came into its own as the greatest world power of all time. Fifty years ago when Vinson took the oath of office in the well of this House, our Nation was a second-rate military power when compared to the great military powers of Europe. Mr. Vinson played a leading role in the creation of a two-ocean Navy, in developing air power second to none in the world, and a highly trained mobile American Army and Marine Corps.

Though beginning his service in the "horse and buggy days," he is a man of vision and imagination who prepared for the future defense of freedom with missiles, atomic energy, and nuclear power on land, under the sea, and in space.

Mr. Speaker, our beloved colleague was a confidant and adviser of all the Presidents of the United States since Woodrow Wilson. He sat with them in the cabinet room in times of peace, depression, and in three world wars. The Nation has indeed been fortunate in being blessed during critical times with the keen insight, courage, and stability of this great statesman.

CARL VINSON is devoted to Congress and particularly to this House as a great American institution. He is a student of the history of Congress from the Continental Congress which created the Republic and created our Army, Navy, and Marines, down to and through this 88th Congress, with its magnificent record of accomplishment and achievement.

I grew to love, admire, respect, and work closely with Chairman VINSON as secretary of his informal committee of the House on textiles. I do not believe any committee in the history of the Congress has done more to preserve a great and vital American industry with its millions of employees. I sat on Mr. VINSON's right during some of the most historic conferences concerning the fate of an entire industry in the modern history of our Nation. I was with him when he conferred many times with President Kennedy, President Johnson, Cabinet members, leaders of defense, Members of the Senate, and the great textile executives and labor leaders of the United States. President Kennedy's seven-point textile program was largely the work of Mr. VINSON. He was the leader in winning its approval and in its implementation. Mr. VINSON's skill, tenacity, courage, and determination during this long, hard but successful fight is a magnificent tribute in itself. My conferences with him and the great leaders of our time in the fish room, the rose garden, the Cabinet room, the State Department, and elsewhere will always be to me a refreshing and enlightening reminiscence.

Mr. VINSON set a good example of accomplishment and achievement for the youth of our Nation. He led a disciplined and a spartan life. He was always in the office around 7 in the morning. He could do a day's work before many of us began. Mr. VINSON was a man of alacrity and decision. He was a man of action. He has called me at 7 with instructions to have a several-page memo to the President ready by 9 o'clock. One afternoon he directed me to get the signatures of 129 Members of Congress to a letter going to the President late that evening. He did not tell me how this was to be accomplished, but he expected it to be done. While serving with him, I learned to do the impossible.

I am fortunate indeed having known this great American. I will be a better Member of this body having so closely associated with him. He is a great teacher and this House and the Congress will always benefit from his genius and leadership. I often saw admirals, generals, and even the Secretary of Defense have to wait to see Mr. VINSON while he received a message from a colleague's secretary or conferred with a constituent from his beloved Georgia.

I will greatly miss Mr. VINSON, his drive, and dynamic leadership here in the Congress, but he has earned and deserves a rest among his people and in the land he loves.

Mrs. Dorn and my family join me in wishing for Mr. VINSON, his fine staff, and his great constituency, to whom he was so devoted, the very best always.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged and pleased to rise in support of House Resolution 899, a resolution which, when adopted, will officially recognize the unique and outstanding contributions made to this body by our distinguished colleague and friend, the Honorable CARL VINSON, of Georgia.

The resolution commends the Honorable CARL VINSON, the beloved dean of the House, for his incomparable record as a legislator, his manifold contributions to the strength of our country, his constant and unimpeachable devotion to the public interest and expresses the conviction that as he retires from this body after his 26th term, he carries with him the love, respect, and admiration of his colleagues and the gratitude of the Nation.

No man in the history of the Congress of the United States has deserved this type of accolade and recognition more than our friend and colleague, CARL VINSON. The retirement of CARL VINSON at the end of this 88th Congress will leave the Members of his immediate congressional family, the Committee on Armed Services, without its mentor and father confessor.

To those of us who have been privileged to serve with this distinguished American on the Armed Services Committee, the retirement of CARL VINSON will take from each of us the unique and special opportunity we have had to seek and obtain his sage counsel and advice.

Every member of the Committee on Armed Services has looked to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] as the patriarch of his official family. A leader without fear, a teacher with infinite patience, a friend with boundless benevolence, a confessor with infinite compassion, a raconteur with rapierlike wit, a patriot with selfless dedication to his country and with all these marvelous attributes, a genuinely humble and modest man.

We who will be left behind as he leaves these hallowed halls of the Congress will continue to strive to justify his faith in us. He will leave behind him among his contemporaries on the Committee on Armed Services the will and the conviction to carry on in the high and lofty traditions established by him. This, in the final analysis, is the real test of his greatness as a leader.

The genius to leave behind him the commonsense and dedication of purpose that has characterized his entire service in the Congress is truly the real mark of his greatness.

We who have sat at his knee and listened to his counsel, obeyed his commands, and acknowledged and accepted his criticisms have been made immeasurably richer and better fitted for our task by our association with him.

This man, CARL VINSON, is truly a giant among giants. He has served his country well. He has never permitted hostile fortune or criticism to daunt him in his pursuit of righteousness; he has kept heart in adversities when all around him have lost it, he has gone through intrigue and retained his honor; and he has always willingly relinquished personal ambition and acclaim when the welfare of his Nation was the goal.

He has, in short, epitomized "greatness," and has provided us with a standard of performance to which we will all continually strive, but never fully attain.

I am saddened by the retirement of CARL VINSON, but I am at the same time grateful for the kind and wonderful providence that has permitted me to be a very small part of his rich and wonderful life.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, as the gavel sounds for the adjournment of this 88th Congress, it will mean the loss of the experience and talents of a number of our most able colleagues. One of the greatest men who has ever served in this body, the Honorable CARL VINSON, of Georgia, is one of them.

On July 16, 1963, it was my privilege to add my congratulations to the many others that were extended to CARL VINSON upon his breaking the record for length of service in the House of Representatives. Today, it is with sincere regret that I acknowledge the retirement of my friend, one of our most dedicated colleagues.

Twenty-five times the people of the Sixth District of Georgia, have sent CARL VINSON to these Chambers to represent them. A tribute and a record in itself. In 1917 he was assigned to the committee then called the House Committee on Naval Affairs and by 1931 had become its chairman. In the 81st Congress he assumed the chairmanship of the House Committee on Armed Services.

During the period that CARL has served in the Congress history shows that the military capabilities of the United States has been put to very strenuous tests a number of times. What history books will not show is that the ability of the United States to successfully meet these challenges was due in a great part to the outstanding work of CARL VINSON. The knowledge and experience that he has given to the task of having our defenses adequately prepared for action in a world of ever changing and new weapon systems will be most difficult to replace.

CARL has served his district and his country with distinction and greatness. He has my best wishes for continued health and happiness upon his retirement.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I count myself most fortunate to have been privileged to serve for many years on the Armed Services Committee under the capable leadership of the beloved and distinguished CARL VINSON, of the State of Georgia. I can truthfully say that I have never known a more dedicated and patriotic American than this man who has represented the people of his district, State and Nation in such an outstanding manner for the past 50 years.

Not many men have had the privilege of serving their country as has this distinguished legislator. With unusual vision and wisdom, he has led the Naval Affairs Committee and then the House Armed Services Committee through the tribulations of wars, police actions, and the vicissitudes of false eras of peace. I believe his contributions to the defense establishments of this Nation are without parallel and I am certain those of us who have been closely associated with the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] are better Members of this body for having had this rare opportunity.

CARL VINSON's leadership and guidance will be greatly missed here in the Congress, but our best wishes follow him as he returns to his beloved Georgia. He has more than earned this rest and may he enjoy it to the fullest extent possible.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I have served in Congress a long time. During my tenure of office, I know of no one who has had a greater influence on the work and the accomplishments of Congress than the Honorable CARL VINSON, of Georgia. I know of no one who has played a more important part in shaping the defense of America and who has contributed more to the fact that we now have an unbeatable defense. I know of no one who has had a greater influence on my own congressional career. He has been my friend, my counselor, and at times my critic. I feel that my own public service and my life are immeasurably richer because of his interest and constant helpfulness. This is true of a great many Members of the Congress. Everyone who has lived close to CARL VINSON has benefited from his sound counsel, his colorful personality, his warm friendship, and his great knowledge.

Of all the men I have known, I believe that more than any other the Honorable CARL VINSON, the dean of the House of Representatives, epitomizes "greatness." His matchless record as a legislator, his innumerable contributions to the welfare and prosperity of our country, his devotion to the interests of the people of his own district as well as the Nation, and his tireless efforts in behalf of the defense of this country are without equal.

The retirement of CARL VINSON will leave a void that will not be filled in our time. His long years of public service have been marked by an unswerving devotion to duty and to his country, regardless of the personal sacrifice involved. To CARL VINSON his country comes first. His warm personality and understanding of human nature have endeared him to those of us who have for many years been privileged to call him our friend. He will be sorely missed. It is with a feeling of real sadness that I say goodby to a real patriot and to a person whose friendship I consider priceless.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, on several occasions heretofore I have addressed the House concerning the magnificent, inspiring career, monumental contributions to our defense, the Nation and the world and the extremely laudable, outstanding service of the distinguished gentleman from Georgia, my esteemed and beloved friend, Congressman CARL VINSON, who is retiring from the House this year.

As this great, inspiring American completes his 50 years of truly, incomparable service and retires from the House, I am desirous of making a few additional comments. First, as a member of the House Armed Services Committee, I can state categorically that the Honorable CARL VINSON's departure from his top place in our ranks will leave a void that can never precisely be filled.

He has a uniqueness and an individuality all his own. He is not only a great leader, but he is truly an institution, a strong personality, a powerful intellect and an untiring worker compounded of many astonishing ingredients and attributes.

He was said to hold a tight rein on the committee and that is true. Unceasing in his own labors, he was systematic, methodical, dogged, and incessant in pressing for action and in completing any and every program given to his charge.

It was said of him that he was dictatorial and that is also true, with the mitigating qualification that he wielded his gavel with an earthy humor that enjoined bitterness, quickly dispelled resentment and speedily replaced any bitterness with the balm of resignation.

The committee learned to expect his vigorous techniques and to be reconciled to them, hopeful in the belief that another day might bring a different result, as it so often did.

The chairman never hesitated to move up the hill one day and down the next, and this probably is the best tribute that could be paid to his openmindedness, his flexibility and willingness to change his mind when some compromise, never one of principle, would leave a better flavor and make for a stronger bill.

His knowledge and understanding of military and defense problems in the overall sense far exceeded that of any other man in the Congress or the country for that matter.

Even members of the Joint Chiefs or specialists in the Defense Department as individuals could not hope to have the wide, all-encompassing information and knowledge that the chairman possessed of our great Defense Department and our widely deployed armed services. This knowledge was acquired through the years and was supplemented by continuous hard study and work.

The chairman's day started very early in the morning and continued into the hours of the night, uninterrupted by extraneous interests or social engagements.

CARL VINSON was in truth, Mr. Navy—"The Admiral," as we knew him—Mr. Marine Corps, Mr. Army, Mr. Air Force, and Mr. Defense all wrapped up in one inquiring, restless personality endowed with a sharp, searching mind, a ceaseless quest for the facts and an indomitable purpose.

The chairman knew how to select, organize, and work with his brilliant staff. He was a hard taskmaster, but a loyal, devoted, generous friend, a man of kindness, compassion, and generous impulse.

The chairman knew how to get his bills through the House and in this respect probably had no equal in the legislative history of the Nation. His formula in this regard was careful, infinitely painstaking preparation, well-drawn, well-considered bills and committee reports, exhausting hearings, careful presentation of the facts and clear, accurate explanations of the provisions down to the very last detail.

He thoroughly knew the temper of the House as well as any eccentricities it might at times display, and he understood the motives, the methods, and the concerns of individual Members.

He was eloquent in presentation, alert and resourceful in debate, and always honest, fair, and courteous with the House.

His eagerness and zestful enthusiasm in getting his bills through was an unforgettable spectacle to behold. So compelling was his eagerness that he never relaxed for one moment when measures reported out of the committee were pending on the floor and were handled by chairmen of subcommittees or other members. On these occasions, it was his custom to sit close by and direct a barrage of "sotto voce" instructions and staccato orders to the Member in charge of the bill.

For this great Georgian, the game was not over until the last man was out, the rollcall completed, and the bill passed.

There was something in his makeup, whether it came from his stanch forebears, from his early environment, from the homes, fields, and woods of his beloved native State, or from the deep recesses of his sterling character in the making of which all these things played a part that deeply impressed one who knew him well, that here in this great man was an ineffable strain of gentleness, human feeling, kindness, and concern for his fellow man. Behind the facade of formality and ritual that played a necessary part in his public life, in the chairman's human relations there was a deep understanding, a generosity of impulse, and a kindness of spirit that no austere procedure could efface.

CARL VINSON, deep down, was not what one might term an outgoing personality. But, deep down, he was approachable, understanding, sympathetic, and willing to give his counsel and help to those who sought them.

Around his chairmanship and committee work he shaped an aura, an image, and a deep impression of the very serious challenging problems that were presented to him and the committee, and no one attending any of the sessions whether witness, Member, official, or spectator could mistake even for one moment that this man and his committee were engaged in the profoundly critical business of carrying out the constitutional mandate of defending the United States in the best and most complete, efficient way that this great end could be achieved.

The name of CARL VINSON will live long in the history of this Congress and this country.

He was a man of great ability, great mentality, great purpose, and great achievement. His name will be noted in the annals of America in superlatives.

He will be known in history, just as he has been known to us who so deely respect, admire, and love him, as one of the greatest Americans ever to serve in this body and one of the greatest leaders this Nation has ever known.

I am sorry to see this great leader leave the House, and I tried many times to dissuade him from carrying out the decision he had made to retire. But in his retirement, as in all other things, he knew just what he wanted to do. He had thought the matter out carefully, and when he came to a decision and his mind was made up he was intent on carrying it out.

Among the superlatives that I would like to apply to the great CARL VINSON is this—that he is the youngest octogenarian that I have ever known—solid, alert, active of body, and keen of mind.

We will miss him, and he will miss us too, because the House has been his life for the past 50 years, and it will not be easy for this "war horse" to forget the excitement, the clash, the clamor, and tumult that usually surrounds this hallowed place, and I know that he will never forget the many warm, admiring friends that he has here any more than we will ever forget him.

He will always be a tonic and an inspiration to me, and to all of us who served with him, and I wish for him many years of contentment, relaxation, happiness and peace, and all the rewards that his long, busy, useful life entitles him to receive.

I hope that in the serenity of his country home in Georgia, surrounded by his old friends and neighbors, and his dear ones, that he will find satisfactions and enjoyments that are somewhat different and more relaxing than the ones he found here.

I hope that his farm and his fine herd of cattle and everything else on his lovely place will flourish and keep him busy and I know one thing for certain that the people around his farm, with no reflection upon their activities and diligence in the past, will keep busy now that the "head of the manor" has returned home.

The shouting and the tumult cease,
The captains and the kings depart.

But no shouting and no tumult can ever dim the memory, and the achievements, and the essential goodness and nobility of the illustrious gentleman from Georgia, the incomparable CARL VINSON. May choicest blessings always attend him and his loved ones. And give him continued good health, long life, and happiness.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I want to make one further observation. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], has received many honors, but I know there is no honor that he has received which he will treasure more than the honor and the expression of friendship we have just bestowed upon him today.

I might further point out to my colleagues that I have searched the record of the House of Representatives and have not found any similar resolution adopted by this House in relation to any Member in the past. So, so far as I can find out, this is the first time in the history of the House of Representatives that a distinguished Member of this body has been so recognized.

I now yield to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]: I want to express to you my deep appreciation and sincere gratitude for your most generous, kind, and complimentary remarks. You have stated it correctly. There is no award, no plaque, no recognition which it may have been my privilege through my life to receive that I appreciate as much as the encomiums the House is now bestowing upon me.

It is with complete sincerity that I say to you, that my heart is filled to overflowing. My cup runneth over—

This is the beginning of the end—but only the end of my service in Congress, because I do not intend to rust away in my remaining years; I intend to wear out, little by little, day by day, as we all must.

There is no office that an American can hope to aspire to which at the one time confers such high honor, while providing such a great opportunity for service, as that of being a Member of Congress.

It is now almost 50 years since I was first honored by the people of my district in Georgia when they elected me, on November 3, 1914, to this, the greatest legislative body in the world.

As I draw toward the end of that service—my mind turns back to those long years of fulfillment; my mind turns back to the wonderful friendships that I have made here.

It is perhaps only by chance that I have had the privilege and the honor to serve in this Congress during the most momentous years in the history of the world.

Quite literally, my service started with the Springfield rifle and is ending with the Polaris submarine and the intercontinental ballistic missile—things not even thought of on the day that I first came to this body.

And not only have I had the privilege to see history made in the field of national defense, but have also spanned a period of the greatest social and economic growth of any period in the history of mankind.

Believe me when I say that I feel undeserving of the kind remarks that have been made on this floor today. But notwithstanding this, I will treasure this day until the end.

I thank you, and every one of you, from the bottom of my heart.

I thank every Member of this House that I have had the honor and pleasure of serving with.

And my thanks go not only to the remarks which have been made here today but for all the courtesies that have been extended to me by the Members of this House throughout all of these years.

I can say with gratitude that I have always been treated fairly and generously and I hold in my heart today the deepest affection for each and every one of you.

It is my sincere hope that all of you who are Members of this body today will be able to derive from your service the same sense of fulfillment that I have experienced. No one could ask more.

As we all know, with the honor of being a Member of Congress, there is also the burden of great responsibility.

I can only hope that in some very small measure it can be said of me in the words of Alexander Pope:

Friend to truth; of soul sincere,
In action faithful, and in honour clear;
Who broke no promise, serv'd no private end,
Who gain'd no title, and who lost no friend.

And let me emphasize again the deep debt which I owe to the people of my district in Georgia for having conferred upon me the rare honor and privilege of representing them in this great body for these many many years.

As all of you know, I am a Democrat, and I am proud of my affiliation and my party. But my friendships, my admiration, my respect, and my affection are not limited to those of my own party.

Each of us here is a dedicated American who places the general welfare of the Nation above all other allegiances.

I shall forever be grateful for the honor of knowing each of you. My life has been enriched by that association.

And, Mr. Speaker, if I have made any contribution to the greatness of this Nation, to our economic well-being, and above all, to our national security, then that would be the greatest achievement I could ever hope to attain.

It has been said that the morning is the time for preparation:

That the afternoon is the time of achievement.

And that the evening is the time of reward.

It is evening.

I have received my reward, and you have made my day in this Congress of the United States a complete fulfillment of what I have sought in life.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may extend their remarks in the RECORD, and may have 5 legislative days in which to do so; and I ask unanimous consent that all Members who speak today or who extend their remarks in the RECORD may have their remarks printed in the RECORD following mine and preceding the remarks of our dear and beloved friend from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

ADDITIONAL LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to advise that it is planned now to proceed for a while at least with special orders and to return to the legislative program a little later in the afternoon.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman.

TERMINATION OF THE SOKOLOV SPY TRIAL

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma for yielding to me at this time. I have just read on the news ticker that what was termed as the most outstanding spy trial in the history of this century has been terminated in my district. I have learned the indictment presented against the Sokolovs, husband and wife, has been dismissed on the motion of the United States attorney from my district on the grounds that national security was involved. I have the utmost respect and confidence in Mr. Joseph P. Hoey, the United States attorney, and in the office of the Attorney General in this matter. However, since the national security is involved, by reason of the terms of that motion, which I only know in its meager form from the ticker, it is my suggestion that the records of this case be brought before the appropriate committees of the House so that behind closed doors we can determine if the national security will be served by the release, on the motion for dismissal, of the defendants in this action.

I hope that Members of the House will join me in getting the appropriate committees of the House to scrutinize carefully these records, because I want no one who has committed espionage against this country to leave this land unless the national security is truly being served.

PRIVATE AND PAROCHIAL SCHOOLS

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include statistical tables and other miscellaneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, the fathers of the Constitution were confronted with many critical issues at the time of the consideration and adoption of the Constitution, 1783–89. One of the most pronounced of the issues was the separation of church and state.

The adoption of the following: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof" in article I of the Constitution set out in descriptive terms their considered solution of the question of the separation of church and state.

Little did they realize that in time scholars, professors, constitutional lawyers, judges, and statesmen, would give different interpretation to the intent of these terms and their applicability to the problems of the times.

It is difficult to disregard 6½ million students in the elementary and secondary schools, whose institutional needs and problems are parallel to, if not greater than, those youngsters who attend the public schools.

It is honest to say that the private and parochial schools cannot survive. In many instances, especially in expanding schools, the great financial pressures and lack of lay teacher personnel will at this time force their discontinuance or curb student acceptance.

The Declaration of Independence beginning: "We hold these truths self-evident" proclaimed the natural law under God—not manmade law but God-given law—a government founded under and obeying God's law. Thus at the time of the very infancy of the movement toward the establishment of the Republic, the very reasons for its establishment were the acceptance and recognition of all religions in that the laws of God became the principles of the fundamental basic declarations for the existence of our Government. Thus from the earliest years our Government gave support, recognition, and encouragement not to one religion but to all religions.

There are many examples of the close relationship of church and state, for example:

First, during the Revolutionary War units of State militia were provided chaplains. Thousands of the military chaplains served the military contingents in all wars and are in the pay of the Government. Chapels are provided with all necessary accouterment services. The military personnel are given counsel, sometimes at the request of the officials.

At the congressional level, since 1887, a chaplain invokes God's blessing at the beginning of each day's deliberations. Their salaries are paid by the Government.

It is a most difficult thing to argue for or against the proposal because a great majority of Americans and many legislators at every level of government agree that it is unjust and discriminatory to exclude the parents of parochial school children from Federal-aid-to-education legislation now pending before Congress.

It is with great respect for the contra-contentions that one must enter upon the question of the validity of their arguments.

To begin with, the American idea of religious acceptance is based traditionally on the side of an attitude of cooperation between the church and the state. The principle was discussed by Justice William Douglas in the majority opinion stating:

> We are a religious people whose institutions presuppose a Supreme Being.

This statement in *Zorach* v. *Clauson*, 343 U.S. 306 (1952) is indicative of the relationship between education and public welfare based upon its identity with a religious principle.

The Northwest Ordinance in 1787, our first national venture in school aid, stated:

> Religion, morality and knowledge being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged.

The provisions of S. 1021 violate the earliest traditions of our religious freedoms because the establishment of the Republic itself in its several colonies was a result of religious pressures motivating the foundation of these various settlements. The religious tenets of the founders contributed to the welfare of the unit government and vice versa. The rigid Puritans of New England, the Catholics of Maryland and the Anglican Church of Virginia functioned for colony welfare and received support through state funds.

The original American concept of the separation of church and state was a result of the principle enunciated by the Catholic colony of Maryland—as set out in the Religious Toleration Act of 1649—"There should be no established religion." Thus the freedom of religion and the freedom of conscience was established by public proclamations.

From colonial times, direct subsidies have been given churches and religions by exempting their properties and salaries from taxation. Historically, police and fire protection, water and utilities have been furnished churches and church schools without charge. The fact of religious affiliation did not outlaw a school or college but rather made it the beneficiary of special financial treatment.

This is the tradition which gives Federal financial help to build Catholic hospitals, Jewish hospitals, Protestant hospitals; to build dormitories and dining rooms at Catholic University as well as at Methodist American University; to pay the tuition of all GI's at any college, religious or nonsectarian; to equip colleges with scientific equipment; to give medical grants to sectarian medical schools, and to provide medical examinations for all children of the chest, eyes, and teeth at all schools.

Memorials and posters are found in our public schools and public courthouses listing the Ten Commandments. Oaths of office are required for public servants, requiring a belief in Almighty God. Our entire judicial system depends upon the sanctity of an oath taken before God to tell the truth. The qualification of witnesses in many instances depends upon the recognition of God and their moral duty to speak truthfully.

The sessions of houses of legislature and many other public functions open upon a prayer. Public officials constantly call upon the Deity to support their work. In some States Protestant ministers actually teach in the public schools. Catholics do not decry these practices. They are a reflection of our national character, which is basically religious.

We are not a secular people, and with George Washington we stand in suggesting that religion and morality are necessary for a well-ordered republic. Secularism is not our tradition and the attempt, as contained in Senate bill 1021, to require the complete secularization of American education is in fact contrary to the American tradition.

It is the contention of the private and parochial school groups that if grants to them are not included in the administration's $2.3 billion aid bill now that their cause is hopeless for many years. The contention is borne out on the State and local levels of aid to schools.

The legal contention that grants made for partial support for many purposes would not affect the legality of the legislation as long as the aid is not for full support. For example: to pay part of construction costs in expansion of facilities, increase the salaries of the lay teachers to those of the public schools in the respective areas.

Instead of loans these should be outright grants. General grants have been given under the different foreign aid programs and were directed to be used for private and parochial school purposes

The need in the Catholic schools is increasing for lay teachers, the present ratio being 5 religious teachers to 3 lay faculty members. In the future—1970—the ratio will be reversed.

In the Chicago Archdiocese schools, the largest in the country, enrolling 234,523 students, 200 new lay teachers were hired in September 1961, 400 more were replacements. The religious furnished 20 to 30 new Sisters only—because of the post-depression period of low births—and second, a delay caused by the rule to finish college for degrees.

The financial sacrifices expected of the lay teacher, paid one-third of the minimum rate for public school teachers—$1,500 less—presents a difficult problem.

Federal education, which excludes private or parochial schools, would defeat the American principle of democracy in education that there is more than one kind of ultimate reality as to philosophy, culture, religion, and other basic and fundamental values.

Democracy destroys itself when it repudiates this concept that these differences exist. If it ignores the private or parochial school in the aid bill then one out of every seven children is excluded. It shows preference over one system or part of education over another. This action, showing a preference, classifies the Government in the category of being the preferred education. The detrimental effect upon community morale will be resolved in bringing about a fissure of unfriendliness and suspicion between members of the community, their churches, and the respective schools.

What should be resolved, purely as an economic question of facts, has now become a great political and off-the-cuff expert constitutional question. The public debates and circulated documents on the subject both by individuals and public officials against aid, including Government briefs prepared by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, have resulted unfortunately in giving the impression of unfriendliness to church-related schools.

Woe be the day if the private and parochial schools closed shop.

In the Chicago area alone the figures are awesome.

The large city areas present an interesting study for the comparisons necessary to weigh the terrific political impact upon the public attitude on the question of Federal aid to education at the primary and secondary levels.

The city of Chicago is typical of most large cities with heavy Catholic populations.

	Primary	Secondary
PUBLIC SCHOOLS		
Number	394	51
Attendance	370,144	100,102
Total	470,246	
CATHOLIC		
Number	279	70
Attendance	186,982	47,541
Total	234,523	
LUTHERAN		
Number	33	2
Attendance	14,488	1,970
Total	16,458	

From these figures for the attendance ratios of the different school systems, 40 percent of the pupils are in primary grades.

	Percent public	Percent Catholic plus Lutheran[1]	Total
Elementary	60	40	561,614
High	67	33	249,613

[1] Catholics enroll 97 percent of students attending parochial schools.

It is to be noted that the parochial school system is financed by tuitions, donations of parishioners and sponsoring of socials, bazaars, movies, picnics, and theatrical productions.

Lutheran school financing at both levels is left to each parish.

Tuition is charged, also receive support through donations of the parishioners. Tuition accounts for 85 percent.

Tuition costs[1]

	Catholic	Lutheran
Primary	$50	$181
Secondary	$50-300	225

[1] Family $100 or $30 each pupil and $75 each family.

The Catholic elementary school system is increasing by 10,000 pupils per year, necessitating a classroom expansion of 200 classrooms to accommodate the increase. Accelerated facility increases are expected at the high school level because of heavy birth rate after World War II and who are now about to be graduated from the elementary schools.

Projected increase of students, 1961—Primary and secondary

Catholic	10,000
Lutheran	3,000

Certainly this high cost of financing through tuition, donations, and other promotions by the parishioners should not be discounted merely as a selection for religious training. The tremendous sums spent for building, maintaining, servicing, and operating the buildings alone come to a staggering figure. The saving to the public coffers is up in the millions. The present tax dollar would become a school expense dollar and taxes would be increased half again. These citizens also contribute to the public coffers as taxpayers for the public schools.

The building program expansion, added personnel, and operating costs would bankrupt the city and cripple the public school system, reducing it to a 3-day week. And you do not train teachers and educators overnight to augment the faculties.

The overall figure for the State of Illinois for parochial and private schools in the primary grade is 14 to 15 percent of the costs.

The estimated school population in Illinois, 5 to 17, 1959, 2,318,000; and 1960, 2,404,000.

Estimated public elementary and secondary school enrollment, 1959-60, 1,810,000; and 1960-61, 1,750,779.

As to percentage of school population 1959-60, 78.1 percent and 1960-61, 72.8 percent.

Percentage of increase in public school elementary and secondary school enrollment, 1949-50 to 1959-60, 56.9 percent; and 1960-61, 45.4 percent.

Pupil-teacher ratio in public elementary and secondary schools, fall 1959, 23.3 pupils per teacher.

Nonpublic enrollment as percentage of total enrollment in elementary and secondary schools 1955-56, 22.9 percent.

Estimated school population, 1960	2,404,000
Public school enrollment, 1960-61	1,750,779
Parochial and private (estimate)	654,221

Percentage of revenue of public elementary and secondary schools from local governments:

	Percent
1953-54 to 1957-58	3.6
1957-58	68.7
1960-61	76.9

From State:

	Percent
1959-60	23.8
1960-61	20.4

State aid per instructional staff member:

1957-58	$2,372
1960-61	2,189

State aid per pupil:

1957-58	$117
1960-61	110

Revenue from State source, per pupil enrolled 1957-58 was $94.

Percentage revenue increase for public elementary and secondary schools 1953-54 and 1957-58 was 106.3 percent.

Per capita total State general revenue 1958, $100.53.

Per capita State tax collections 1959, $75.08.

Per capita total general revenue of State and local government 1958, $226.22.

Estimated average salary of classroom teachers in public schools in Illinois:

1959–60	$5,340
1960–61	5,725

Estimated average salary of classroom teachers in private and parochial schools in Illinois:

1959–60	$3,840
1960–61	4,225

Instructional staff in public schools in Illinois:

1959–60	$5,500
1960–61	5,950

Instructional staff in private and parochial schools in Illinois:

1959–60	$4,000
1960–61	4,450

Nonpublic school enrollment in elementary and secondary schools:

	Percent
1955–56	22.9
1960	15.0

Of elementary school teachers with 4 or more years of college preparation 1959–60, 73.9 percent.

Percentage increase in estimated average salary of instructional staff in Illinois:

	Percent
1958–59 to 1959–60	4.8
1959–60 to 1960–61	5.3

Percentage increase in estimated average salary of instructional staff in Illinois:

	Percent
1949–50 to 1959–60	59.1
1950–51 to 1960–61	62.1

As the progressive revolution in public education at the primary and secondary levels moves forward employing new technique changes as a trend toward more depth and content in the curriculum—we become more and more concerned with the challenging problems provided by the increase in enrollment.

The Nation's public elementary and secondary schools enrollment numbers 43.1 million students; the private and parochial schools, 5.5 million; and the colleges 4.8 million—thus 53.4 million pupils and students equaling 28 percent of the population will be in full-time attendance—a peak enrollment for 1964–65.

In the Chicago area school system of 483 elementary schools with an enrollment of 406,816 pupils—an increase of 8,644 over the 1963–64 school year. The 53 general, technical, and vocational high schools enrollment of 146,358 students—an increase of 8,505 over 1963–64—the usual 4-percent increase. The eight branches of the city junior enrollment of 35,000 students, and the three branches of the Chicago Teacher's College total 9,250—a complete total of 597,424 students in the Chicago public school system.

The steady increase in enrollment necessitated the construction of 180 new rooms—also mobile classrooms—265—50 more than last year—and branches for schools.

The overcrowded high school situation can only be alleviated by a greatly expanded budget. The bond issue money for expansion is depleted and the only funds remaining for this purpose are those provided for in the building fund segment of property taxes. The property tax rate of $2.31 for each $100 of assessed valuation provides only 30 cents for the building fund—a portion of which must be spent for repairs, maintenance, fuel, and bond amortization. The total remaining for school construction amounts to 14 cents or $14 million. Construction of 5 more schools with a total of 77 classrooms will be completed in 1965—32 rooms at Jones High School and the rest expansion of elementary schools—Stockton 14; new schools at 117th and Morgan, 1st through 6th grade; 103d and Hamlin, 9 classrooms; and 8 rooms at Wacker Elementary School. A part of the Jackson Elementary School will be used as a branch of Crane High.

The changes effected in teaching starting with new mathematics along lines of set theory, the binary number system, intersection function and symbolism. A new approach to physics, biology, and grammar based on structural linguistics—a solid treatment of the subject matter. It resulted from the realization that the student was capable of doing more in every subject in an accelerated course, and would meet any challenge if prepared with basic knowledge of the subject. Also, the school year was lengthened, extended through the summer as well as added hours to the schoolday. In these optional periods, courses in driver education, club, chorus and band instructions are given. The students of special talents are given advanced courses in college mathematics, an honors course in science and history. Also, team teaching programs for at least 30 percent of the students. The elementary changes are getting pupils to "learn to read" programs with a more sophisticated style and an enlarged or more extensive vocabulary. Foreign languages, ancient history, and algebra are part of the regular curriculum.

The Catholic parochial school system developed over the period of nearly 90 years is suffering from financial growing pains. The costs of teachers and other personnel, as well as the needed expansion of physical properties due to the ever increasing attendance has forced many dioceses to change their grade school patterns. In Cincinnati, Archbishop Karl J. Alter announced that because of both costs and overcrowding the first grade enrollment would be canceled, necessitating this retrenchment. This edict affects 10,000 first graders in the cities of Cincinnati, Dayton, and Springfield, who will enter the public school system in September 1964.

Other areas; namely, suburban Milwaukee—St. Aloysius Parish—will cancel the first four grades in 1965, because the local board of education refused to build a 24-room school for 600 students, the overload costs for which the parish cannot possibly meet such a mounting financial burden. The dateline was set for the local authorities to do something about it.

Classes have been discontinued in Green Bay, Wis.; Saginaw, Mich.; Virginia schools, suburban to Washington, D.C.; Williamsport, Pa.—St. Mary's High School, established 1913—resulted in 208 pupils transferred to public schools.

The estimated attendance of pupils in the Catholic schools at all levels of education in the United States are approximately 5,900,000, at an estimated cost of $1.8 billion annually—teachers numbering 183,000.

A noble experiment is being developed in Lexington, Mass.—no Catholic school system—where the John F. Kennedy School of Religion will extend to public school pupils—some 1,900 Catholics in attendance—a weekly class of religious instruction after regular school hours. If successful, this may be the solution to the whole question.

There is a prevalent feeling among the liberals that the Catholic schools serve no purpose in the religious sense, and should be closed. Further, that the Catholic youth no longer need be in a defensive position in religious debate, averring that the practical religious instruction necessary to be a good Christian in the community is sufficient.

The archdiocese of Cincinnati gave as its basic reason the dropping of the first grade from its school as financial. Last September the superiors of the Women's Religious Institute in its report to the U.S. hierarchy stated that a teaching Sister must earn $2,000 per year at least for her community during her teaching years. This covers the expense incurred to prepare her as a teacher and the care for her before, during, and after her teaching career.

The salaries of the Sisters of Cincinnati vary with their academic preparation. During 1963 the lowest salary was $1,000 per year and the highest $1,500. The total for 1,026 teaching Sisters was $1.2 million annually.

This year the raising of their salaries was imperative—although the figure of $2,000 was impossible to attain. The minimum was raised to $1,500 and the maximum $1,800. The increase cost $360,800.

Consider the lay teacher of the school system increasing in number from 129 in 1950 to 867 in 1963. The medium salary in the parochial schools amounts to $3,400—about $1,500 below the starting salaries in the Cincinnati public schools. Lay teachers represent 45 percent of the teaching staff in the parochial schools—a great financial strain on many of the parishes.

So that in discontinuing the first grade, 225 lay teachers were not needed at a saving of $765,000. The increase in the Sisters' salaries will cost $360,800. Thus a saving of $404,200 which can be further used to increase the lay teachers' salaries about $100 per year without increasing the burden on the parishioners.

This action not only insures an increase in salaries, but also helps reduce the size of the classes ultimately to the goal of 40 pupils—thus improving the quality of education.

The high school enrollment is 20,615 students—Cincinnati also has seven private high schools enrolling 2,249. Last year the high school tuition was $100 per year plus $25 for textbook rental and laboratory use. In addition, the parish paid the high school $60 per student, making a total of $185 per pupil.

This September the raise in fees include $140 tuition from the parent, and a $30 fee. The parish contributes $70 per pupil, $30 goes to the school—total $200 per pupil. The extra $40 goes into a common fund to be used to pay the debts owing by some schools, and to build four new high schools.

Since 1950, eight new high schools were built and four enlarged at a cost of $15 million.

The financial problem of Cincinnati concerns both the elementary and the high schools. Perhaps $170 per pupil, plus the $30 fee is low by ordinary standards, yet it can be quite a financial burden for many families.

This action to meet a specific problem by dropping the first grade certainly will affect the numbers of the pupils, increasing in attendance the public schools. The increased costs are at the taxpayers expense. These matters so carefully spelled out by Carl Ryan in the Catholic Digest are indicative of a real analysis of the economics of a Catholic school system.

> Even though the parochial school system has a special concern for religion—it is just as deeply concerned—

In the words of Archbishop Lawrence J. Shehan, of Baltimore—

> with other aspects of truth as is any other educational system. The object of education is truth, the whole truth in which religious truth occupies a preeminent place and exercises an integrating force. To exclude the truth about man's origin and destiny is to truncate education.

In an interesting article by Bishop Robert J. Dwyer in the Register, he stated that on May 8, 1852, the Catholic hierarchy of the United States held the first plenary council of the American church at Benjamin Latrobe's Cathedral of Our Lady's Assumption, Baltimore, Md. There were 28 prelates in attendance, many of them pioneers in the early years of Catholic emergence in the Colonies, and were themselves the founding fathers of their dioceses.

The splendor of this religious function edified the populace. The prelates, dressed in their bluish purple choir dress, moving into the church behind the apostolic delegate, Francis Patrick Kenrick, fifth archbishop of Baltimore who was the celebrant, with solemnity and poise took their respective places near the altar. The sermon was given by the brilliant orator, Archbishop John Hughes, of New York, a master of spiritual forensic fire.

The council was a momentous event in the history of the church—it was called at the instance of Pope Pius IX to chart plans as to the policy of operation and the formulation of rules of discipline. Other synods and councils had been held, beginning with Bishop Carroll's convocation in 1791—attended by a few priests and a scattering of Catholic laymen—but the many questions confronting the prelates of the first council were a veritable challenge to the future existence of the Catholic Church in America.

Organized bigotry was rampant throughout the land—nativists and Know-Nothings screamed with epithets of division against Catholics—blaming their frustrations, both economically and politically upon the church.

The Ursuline Convent in Boston was destroyed in flames by a drunken mob, and in Philadelphia rioters desecrated Catholic churches and homes. These vicious acts must be met by far-reaching programs that would give moral strength and spiritual courage to the laity. Action was necessary to combat the spread of bigotry. The philosophy of the period, accentuating the doctrine of materialism and rationalism, had already wide acceptance throughout the land. The clarion call of success assume a puritan ethos that it was the reward of thrift and application, and a growing acceptance of secularism as the only realistic compromise between practical Christianity and progress. Although a Protestant nation in majority, America's acceptance of moral and intellectual relativism as the only liberal solution for the human dilemma.

The slavery issue, rising to explosive proportions was not discussed—especially in that few Catholics owned slaves, and also that their work was ecclesiastical—the discipline of the clergy and laity, and for liturgical observance and conformity, the founding of seminaries, encouragement of priestly vocations to supply the needs of a growing church.

Among the great prelates of the council in attendance besides Archbishop Francis Patrick Kenrick, were Bishops Richard Pius Miles, of Nashville; Michael Portier, of Mobile; Joseph Sadac Alemany, of San Francisco.

The primary concern of the bishops in 1852 was Catholic education. Arguments pro and con on the question of establishing a parochial school system, separate and apart from the public secularist system finally were resolved in a favorable decision.

It was the erudite archbishop of St. Louis, Peter Richard Kenrick, brother of the Baltimore metropolitan, who penned the pastoral letter addressed to the faithful at the council's end.

> No portion of our charge—

He wrote—

> fills us with greater solicitude than that which our Divine Master, by word and example, has taught us to regard with more than ordinary sentiments of affection—the younger members of our flock. If our youth grow up in ignorance of their religious duties or unpracticed in their consoling fulfillment; if, instead of the words of eternal life, which find so sweet and full an echo in the heart of innocence, the principles of error, unbelief, or indifference are impaired to them, if the natural repugnance, even in the happiest period of life, to bend under the yoke of discipline, be increased by the example of those whose relation to them gives them influence and authority—what are we to expect but the disappointment of all hopes which cause the church to rejoice in the multiplication of her children.

Although written more than a century ago, these principles hold true today. The letter ended with a charge to the Catholic parents to build and support their own schools, citing the encyclical of Pope Pius IX issued November 21, 1851, in which the disillusioned pontiff called for a massive counterattack on secularism and false liberalism of the age, by and through an intensive program of Catholic education.

Thus, the bishops considering all the facts and principles, calmly and wisely set the policy of the church in the area of education. Their intensive study of the question and also the decision of the secularists in New York a decade before to build a wall of separation between religion and the school had set the policy for education for the entire Nation.

If the contemporary critics of Catholic education labeling it as a kind of clerical folly would study the consideration of roots and values by the old council fathers in coming to their momentous decision for the establishment of schools to nurture the young in the religious principles of their church—then a common ground of understanding would be reached—for the facts have not changed in any essential way, nor have the principles altered.

The educational values of our schools has evoked the national interest for the greater public benefit. Today's scholars are yesteryear's students in elementary and secondary schools. The college student's potential in education is determined by this basic training. The strengthening or improvement of this earlier schooling will contribute to the successful acceleration of studies in their collegiate careers.

The funds required for schools are becoming increasingly difficult at State, local, private, and parochial levels—each year the increase in students, teachers, personnel, classrooms, and so forth, calls for greater sums to be expended. The property tax, once adequate, is in even the more advanced communities, inadequate to meet the needs. The States have shouldered the burden, and now provide about 40 percent of the financing of public education. Many States lack the means of financing an adequate program of education, and all States suffer tax disadvantages, as compared with the broad base of the Federal systems of revenue available at the Federal level. The competition between States to attract industry, residents, and investments is keen. Another of the great problems is the shifting of population—caused by the granting of millions of dollars of Federal contracts to concerns in coastal and southern areas. The resultant effect is undereducation which is now a national problem. Every American city is affected. Thus, there is a clear need for Federal participation in the direct support of education and such participation has been Federal practice. The question now is how to participate and what funds should be provided. No matter how the money is collected or how it is distributed, it is the people who pay for the schools. Every taxpayer pays. So in the last analysis, the public decides whether the support of the schools will be generous or niggardly.

As to the parochial schools, direct aid is a dead issue. Recent decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court have reiterated the established principle of the separation of church and state. Yet the question of religion in education has not been solved at all. It is always with us—such as Bible reading, observance of religious holidays, public aid for parochial schools. For many of our citizens, the question is far from settled.

The problems of the public schools are manifold—so much so that it is labeled as a very unsystematic system, that is comprised of a tremendous number of students, teachers, and total finances to meet its responsibilities and purposes.

The contributions made by Archbishop Shehan, written by Wilfrid Sheed, of the Saturday Evening Post explaining the Sister shortage of teachers, the abandonment of the parochial schools and the public and parochial school compared—went to the very heart of these questions. The intelligent and formidable facts cannot be contraverted. We are appreciative of their efforts in marshaling the data and analyzing the factors contributing to the parochial school dilemma:

SISTER SHORTAGE

Several factors have brought about an apparent decline in the number of teaching Sisters. Within the past few years, many communities—all the larger ones—have pledged themselves to send up to 10 percent of their active Sisters to the missions, especially to South America, where they are needed even more than in the United States.

Furthermore, until recently, it was customary for young Sisters to teach while they were pursuing postgraduate studies. Now, however, it has everywhere been agreed that this was an unwise policy, dictated by the pressures of the moment. Communities have withdrawn many Sisters from teaching posts to permit them to become full-time students.

These factors have caused a temporary interruption of the regular flow of teachers into classrooms. When this period of special stress has passed, we can expect a resumption of the normal flow.

Meanwhile, many communities are enlarging facilities; for they have no doubt about future growth. With good programs of vocation recruitment, the future will see an increase in the number of teaching Sisters. I do not mean that the supply will meet the demand in the foreseeable future; but the picture is not nearly so dark as some have painted it.

—ARCHBISHOP SHEHAN.

"The Need for Full Answer on Schools," by Bishop Robert J. Dwyer, is a provocative and challenging article published in the Register:

NEED FOR FULL ANSWER ON SCHOOLS: WHAT MRS. RYAN MISSED

(By Bishop Robert J. Dwyer)

Our heart goes out to the little maid of long ago who was heard to express the wish that she had been born in the piping times of King Charles II, for the reason, as she understood it, that in the England of the merry monarch "education was much neglected." It can hardly be said that education is neglected today; indeed, the criticism might be offered that it is, if anything, overstressed, and that a great many young people are exposed to it without being prepared for it or interested in the slightest degree in its advertised benefits. But such a suggestion is rankest heresy in the eyes of those who believe, with Jean-Jacques Rousseau, that all the child needs is the spark and the opportunity. Far be it from us to dispute this fundamental of the American creed.

With September we are hard upon that season when whining schoolboys, equipped by prescription with satchels and shining morning faces (what would happen to a boy with an afternoon face?), creep snail-like back to gymnasium and locker room. The vast majority will wend their way to those elaborate and functional structures known as the public schools, which the American tax system has provided in practically every corner of the land. It is entirely possible for the alert child to obtain there a magnificent education through the paternal solicitude of the government, Federal, State, county, and municipal. It is supposed to be the very best that money can buy, and if we are reminded, sotto voce, that there are some things which money cannot buy, the American public as a whole has pretty well made up its mind to make shift without them.

A minority, nevertheless, numbering something over 6 million students, will seek out other schools, designated as private or parochial. These, by and large, are much less impressive to look at than the public schools, since they are provided and operated, not by the omnipotence of the tax power, but by tuition fees and freewill offerings. For the most part these schools are managed under religious auspices, the Catholic Church supporting by far the greater number. And these schools, by the very fact of their existence and their legal recognition, are as much a part of the "American educational system" as those designated as public schools.

There are, it is well known, certain extremists in America who would seek to deny to these schools the legal right to exist. Their reasoning is that education, of its nature and as an essential function of society, should belong exclusively to the all-powerful state, and that any interference with the state in the performance of this function, according to the will of its legislators, should be declared unlawful. Most Americans, fortunately, see no reason to go so far. They balk at the concept of the state as actually omnipotent, and they refuse to deny legal recognition to the nonpublic schools. At the same time, however, they are largely persuaded that education is best handled by the benevolent state in our republican democracy and that it is somewhat foolish to attempt to maintain a separate school system either for conscientious motives or for the sheer exercise of individual educational liberty.

Where the majority American opinion is adamant is on the matter of extending public tax benefits to the nonpublic schools. This viewpoint has hardened over the years and has now become a fixed principle in the popular analysis of educational rights and privileges. The fact that other nations, such as Canada, Great Britain, and the Netherlands, almost or equally as democratic as ourselves, have investigated and found other and fairer ways of handling this identical problem, has not so far made any significant impact upon the American mind. Whether we like it or not, there exists a monumental prejudice in this country against including the nonpublic schools in any program of public financial benefit. And it is not apparent that the recent efforts to present the case for the private and parochial schools in a clearer light has made a discernible impression on public opinion.

An inevitable result is that the physical contrast between the two branches of the system is increasingly marked. This does not mean, necessarily, that the parochial or church-related schools are poor or ill-equipped; it means, rather, that by comparison with the public school edifices they are less glamorous, less endowed with educational luxuries, less lavish with those attractive and expensive features which the American public has decreed should be incorporated into the school fabric. There are private and religious schools, of course, which vie with the best the tax dollar can provide, but in general the comparison is a trifle depressing. And the gap, rather than closing up, is steadily widening with time.

What about the educational comparison? Here, obviously, we are on much more difficult ground for judgment, for education partakes of the life of the spirit, and is beyond the power of the tax dollar to buy. Buildings and equipment can be compared; it is infinitely more difficult to compare the quality of teaching and its results. There are good teachers and bad teachers in both branches of the system; there are the dedicated and the indifferent, the wise and the foolish, those who know how to fan the spark and those who can only extinguish it. If the public school can pay salaries large enough to attract educational excellence (though not enough to guarantee it), the religious school in particular can depend to a very large extent upon the self-sacrifice of its devotees and their willingness to do more for the cause than the letter of the contract calls for. This is a hidden asset, not to be overlooked in the comparison.

It is unquestionably true, however, that over the long pull the private and parochial schools must labor under a heavy financial handicap. Failing a change in American thinking on the matter of tax benefits for all children and students alike, without reference to the branch of the system they happen to be enrolled in by choice, there must be a heightened appreciation of the value of these schools if they are to enlarge their scope and compete more effectively on the physical and scholastic levels. So far as the support provided for these schools is concerned, it is time for a thorough-going review, the country over, of aims and methods, of goals and adaptations, so that the total system will not fall short of fair competition.

Thinking for the moment of the Catholic school complex alone, there can be little doubt but that the church in America has allowed the whole question of school support to drift along at haphazard, depending upon easily available resources rather than seeking out permanent and stable reservoirs for the system as a whole. The problem has been approached piecemeal, as though each diocese were a separate kingdom, rather than from the standpoint of national need. It may even be suggested that the American Catholic laity has not yet been really alerted to the magnitude of the task before it, nor to the possibilities of solution which await it. And it may be questioned whether this factor, quite as much as the relative poverty of the Catholic body as a recent immigrant group, does not account for the failure of that body to provide an adequate endowment for its schools.

Mrs. Mary Perkins Ryan has asked whether Catholic schools are the answer. So far as we can judge, she has been given an overwhelming answer in the affirmative by the Catholic parents and students of the Nation. They are the answer to the intellectual, moral, and spiritual needs of our youth in a secular society. They provide the seasoned and reasoned antidote for the virus of an arrogant materialism. But really, Mrs. Ryan missed the point. Her question should have read, "Has Catholic America as yet come up with the full answer for her own schools?" Then there would be something to argue about.

NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D.C., January 27, 1964.

To: Members of the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives.

From: John M. Lumley, director, Division of Federal Relations.

I am sure you will find the enclosed report, "Estimates of School Statistics," recently published by our research division, both interesting and informative.

The report presents statistical predictions for public elementary and secondary schools for the school year 1963–64 and revised estimates for the school year 1962–63. Included are figures on administrative organization, pupils, professional staff, and revenues and expenditures for the Nation as a whole and for each of the 50 States and the District of Columbia. In addition, the States have been grouped according to geographical area, and regional subtotals are included where possible. As you know, this is an annual publication of the National Education Association.

If you desire additional copies, we shall be happy to furnish them.

The preliminary estimates indicate that 5,653,000 students have enrolled in the Catholic elementary and secondary schools 1963–64. The department of education of the National Catholic Welfare Conference reports a continuing deceleration noticed the last 3 years in the grade school enrollment which formerly required as high as 3 to 4 percent expansion in some past school years. High schools, on the other hand, show a marked increase.

Elementary school enrollment indicate 4,600,000 students in comparison to 4,546,360 last year—high schools 1,053,000—1963–64; compared to last year, 1,041,357 students.

The major factors in the slow growth of pupils at the elementary level was due to grade dropping—Cincinnati eliminated kindergarten transferring 10,000 to the public schools; also a continuing shortage of teachers—nuns—being held in college to complete their courses for higher college degrees; also, new regulations in several dioceses reducing the number of students in classes and thus reducing the financial strain facing parishes from recent expansion units and the necessity of increasing the number of lay teachers. For the last 20 years the enrollments have been on the increase—between 1962–63 secondary schools increased 3.2 percent, and elementary 1.4 percent.

In 9 years between 1954–63, elementary school enrollment increased 40.5 percent, but secondary enrollment spurted up 68.9 percent.

In 1963, the 10,775 Catholic elementary schools were staffed by 115,468 teachers; the secondary schools numbered 2,487 with a faculty of 51,065.

These figures serve to prove that the parochial system is contributing heavily to the burdensome responsibility of providing educational facilities and opportunities to the youth of our Nation. Its very existence relieves the nonparticipating taxpayers of tremendous sums if these students were forced to transfer to the public school system. So that this small talk of vociferous critics seeking the abandonment of parochial schools is not only ridiculous, but would necessitate, in certain areas, recourse to certain tuition fees for attendance to the public schools—especially at the secondary level. The expansion of school facilities, new schools and increased teachers and personnel, equipment, laboratories, and so forth, would create a tax crisis in the billions.

The problem of the parish school discussed by Father C. Albert Koob in an article published in the Register, September 13, is informative and illuminating. And further, the closing of the small parish school results in a financial problem for the local community and the contributing State.

SMALL PARISH SCHOOL SAID THING OF PAST—DRIVE FOR EXCELLENCE WILL END IT

WASHINGTON.—The drive for academic excellence is numbering the days of the small parish school, an official of the National Catholic Educational Association (NCEA) has predicted here.

On the eve of the new school year, Father C. Albert Koob, O. Praem, associate secretary of the NCEA's secondary school department, said, "You cannot today run a good high school with less than 500 pupils.

"Academically and economically it doesn't work," he maintained. "Even a school with 300 pupils complicates things enormously. You cannot offer all the courses you should and the backbreaking cost of acquiring equipment such as is needed for good laboratories is not worth it for a small school."

But even with big, new schools, he noted, students will still be turned away for lack of space.

"It is imperative we increase our academic challenge for students. And, we must accept the truth that we are not going to educate more than 50 percent of the eligible students," Father Koob said.

As a result, Father Koob predicts greater cooperation between Catholic high schools and the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine (CCD) and increased shared-time education between Catholic and public schools.

Father Koob thinks that the CCD and Catholic high schools will coordinate religious instruction programs, using the same textbooks and perhaps the same teachers.

Shared-time education will further this coordination, he said. Under such plans, students can split their school days between Catholic and public schools.

"Shared time is going to blossom. I am convinced of it. There will be more and more as the climate changes toward acceptability of high schools. I think the day will come when new Catholic high schools will be built in close proximity to the public schools," Father Koob observed.

Touching on other parochial school problems, Father Koob predicted Catholic school tuition will go higher. "The question is what the school must have and what the traffic will bear."

Admission procedures will continue to be troublesome, he noted, especially where high schools already are unable to enroll all graduates of Catholic grade schools.

"Every diocese handles this problem in its own way," he explained. "The challenge is not to limit enrollment only to the brightest youngsters. To avoid this, some diocesan superintendents have divided the standard IQ ratings into divisions and accepted a set quota for each division from applicants.

"I'm afraid we will have to get used to the idea that not everyone is going to get in anymore," Father Koob observed.

It has been frequently stated by doubters that the Catholic Church has curbed the teaching of modern science at the classroom level because of religious conflict with scientific principle. At the college level the colleges of medicine, dentistry, pharmacy, engineering, law, biology, chemistry, and physics degrees in the sciences belie this accusation—perhaps at the secondary school level the heavy costs of laboratories as discussed by Father Koob prevents the expansion of science teaching at the lab level. Federal aid could not only raise the standard of instruction, but also create the impetus necessary to increase the number of scientists so much needed, but also better prepare them for their college specializations in this field:

[Article appearing in the Register, Oct. 14, 1962]

SCIENCE REDUCING RIFTS WITH FAITH, POPE SAYS

VATICAN CITY.—Science itself is reducing the apparent conflicts between religion and science, declared Pope John XXIII.

"By permitting the acquisition of a better knowledge of the extraordinary riches of creation," the pontiff added, "progress adds to the praise that the human creature raises in thanksgiving to his Creator."

These remarks came as the Pope awarded the gold medal of the Pontificial Academy of Sciences to Swedish physiologist Bengt Erik Anderson for his research into how the nervous system relays such impulses as hunger, thirst, and fear to the brain.

The Pope, in presenting the award, said:

"The church readily encourages the world research directed toward a better knowledge of man and the universe in accordance with the mission given by God to Adam in the first pages of Genesis. Thus we wholeheartedly congratulate this young scientist whose books on the nerve mechanism of hunger, thirst, and body temperature have become standard."

"The church is closely interested in the problems that rightly command the attention of the men of our times." the Pope stressed as he spoke of the theme of the academy's meeting—"The Problem of Cosmic Radiation in Interplanetary Space."

"You know," he added, "how we share the joy that greets with emotion the resounding successes of present-day technicians and scientists whose achievements permit the harnessing of nature in a way that not long age seemed to defy the liveliest imagination."

HIGHLIGHTS: 1963–64 AND 1962–63

Statistics of public elementary and secondary schools in the United States

	1963–64	1962–63	Change	
			Amount	Percent
Basic administrative units:				
Total school districts	31,319	32,820	−1,501	−4.6
Operating school districts	27,517	28,730	−1,213	−4.2
Nonoperating school districts	3,802	4,090	−288	−7.0
Pupil enrollment:				
Total [1]	41,757,665	40,390,049	+1,367,616	+3.4
Elementary school	26,814,754	26,162,345	+652,409	+2.5
Secondary school	14,907,911	14,194,666	+713,245	+5.0
Average daily membership	39,752,600	38,600,000	+1,152,600	+3.0
Average daily attendance	37,247,112	36,015,853	+1,231,259	+3.4
Number of high school graduates	1,947,318	1,732,243	+215,075	+12.4
Instructional staff	1,718,802	1,651,230	+67,572	+4.1
Classroom teachers:				
Total	1,574,818	1,512,653	+62,165	+4.1
Elementary school	925,027	893,656	+31,371	+3.5
Secondary school	649,791	618,997	+30,794	+5.0
Men teachers	479,761	455,831	+23,930	+5.2
Women teachers	1,095,057	1,056,822	+38,235	+3.6
Average annual salaries:				
Instructional staff	$6,164	$5,921	+$243	+4.1
All classroom teachers	$5,963	$5,732	+$231	+4.0
Elementary school teachers	$5,797	$5,560	+$237	+4.3
Secondary school teachers	$6,214	$5,980	+$234	+3.9
Income:				
Total revenue and nonrevenue receipts	$23,058,612,000	$21,700,050,000	+$1,358,562,000	+6.3
Revenue receipts by source:				
Total	20,153,344,000	18,769,388,000	+1,383,956,000	+7.4
Federal	708,996,000	681,964,000	+27,032,000	+4.0
State	8,070,419,000	7,379,522,000	+690,897,000	+9.4
Local, intermediate, and other	11,373,929,000	10,707,902,000	+666,027,000	+6.2
Nonrevenue receipts	2,905,268,000	2,930,662,000	− 25,394,000	−0.9
Expenditures:				
Total expenditures	$21,201,199,000	$19,735,070,000	+$1,466,129,000	+7.4
Current expenditures for elementary and secondary day schools	16,896,948,000	15,606,328,000	+1,290,620,000	+8.3
Current expenditures for other programs (community services, community colleges, adult education, etc.) when operated by the local school districts	413,679,000	371,371,000	+42,308,000	+11.4
Capital outlay	3,211,735,000	3,130,697,000	+81,038,000	+2.6
Interest on school debt	678,837,000	626,674,000	+52,163,000	+8.3
Current expenditures for elementary and secondary day schools per pupil in ADM	425	404	+21	+5.2
Current expenditures for elementary and secondary day school per pupil in ADA	455	433	+22	+5.1

[1] Includes 33,038 unclassified enrollees in 1962–63 and 35,000 in 1963–64.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

Each State has a State department of education, headed by a chief State school officer, which exercises general control over public elementary and secondary schools. Many States, particularly those with large numbers of small school districts, have intermediate administrative units operating between the State and the local level. These intermediate units do not operate schools but render consultative, advisory, and statistical services, and perform regulatory and inspectional functions. The local school district is the basic administrative unit for the operation of elementary and secondary schools or for contracting for school services. The governing body of the district is the school board. The chief administrative officer is the superintendent of schools.

Basic administration units

In organization, size, and characteristics local school districts vary greatly throughout the United States. They may be an independent governmental unit or an agency of a State, county, or local government. All school districts in 29 States are independent governmental units; in 4 States and the District of Columbia all districts are dependent. In the remaining States there are school districts of both types.[1] Better than four out of every five school districts are not coterminous with other local governmental units.[2]

A school district may operate a school system for all or for some of its children or may pay other school districts for these services. In complexity of operation, these basic local units range from one-teacher rural systems to large metropolitan systems serving thousands.

Data compiled from Bureau of the Census information indicate the wide range in the size of school systems. For the 1961–62 school year, 36.2 percent of operating public school systems had an enrollment of fewer than 50 pupils, whereas 3.4 percent had enrollments of 6,000 or more.

The number of basic administrative units reported in 1931–32 was 127,422. Primarily as a result of reorganization laws, which have facilitated the consolidation and annexation of school districts, the number of such units has declined steadily. The 1963–64 total of 31,319 represents a 75.4-percent decrease from the 1931–32 figure; a 50.3-percent decrease in the 10-year period since 1953–54; and a 4.6-percent decrease in the last year.

The trend over the past 10 years in the total number of basic administrative units in the States and the District of Columbia is shown below by combining figures of the U.S. Office of Education with NEA Research Division estimates (NEA Research Division estimates are starred):

	Basic administrative units
1953–54	62,969
1955–56	54,859
1956–57	*53,197
1957–58	47,594
1958–59	*43,507
1959–60	40,520
1960–61	*37,475
1961–62	[1] 35,650
1962–63	*32,820
1963–64	*31,319

[1] Preliminary figure of USOE.

INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF MEMBERS

The instructional staff comprises classroom teachers, principals, supervisors, librarians, guidance and psychological personnel, and related instructional workers. In these estimates the figures for the total instructional staff are closer to the actual figures than are the figures for the components of the staff. Over the years, the increased accuracy of State reporting has accounted for part of the shift among components of the staff. Another factor in the shift between classroom teachers and principals has been the gradual elimination of the position of teaching principal. The teaching principal, who was formerly classified as a classroom teacher, has become a nonteaching principal because of the consolidation of small districts or the growth of enrollments in districts.

Total instructional staff

The total instructional staff in 1963–64 is estimated at 1,718,832. This is an increase of 4.1 percent over the revised estimate of 1,651,230 staff members in 1962–63. The estimates of the NEA Research Division of the numbers of classrcom teachers, principals, supervisors, and other instructional staff are shown below for each of the past 2 years:

Instructional staff	1962–63	1963–64
Elementary school classroom teachers	893,656	925,027
Secondary school classroom teachers	618,997	649,791
Total classroom teachers	1,512,653	1,574,818
Principals and supervisors	87,837	91,059
Other instructional staff	50,740	52,955
Total staff	1,651,230	1,718,832

Since 1953–54 the instructional staff has increased 56.5 percent, an average gain of 4.6 percent a year. The trend in the total instructional staff since 1953–54 is shown below as a combination of the figures of the U.S. Office of Education and NEA Research Division estimates (NEA Research Division estimates are starred):

School year	Instructional staff	Percent gain	
		Over 1953–54	Over previous year
1953–54	1,098,320		
1954–55	*1,150,755	4.8	4.8
1955–56	1,213,459	10.5	5.4
1956–57	*1,271,191	15.7	4.8
1957–58	1,333,332	21.4	4.9
1958–59	*1,394,913	27.0	4.6
1959–60	1,464,031	33.3	5.0
1960–61	*1,521,966	38.6	4.0
1961–62	[1] 1,586,700	44.5	4.3
1962–63	*1,651,230	50.3	4.1
1963–64	*1,718,832	56.5	4.1

[1] Preliminary figure of U.S. Office of Education.

Column 11 of tables 2 and 3 (not printed in the RECORD) gives the percent that average daily attendance is of average daily membership for 1962–63 and for 1963–64. The difference between 100 percent and the percents shown in this column is the percent of average daily absence.

---

[1] U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, "Census of Government, 1962: Governmental Organization," vol. I, Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1963, p. 4.

[2] Ibid., p. 9.

High school graduates

An estimated 1,947,318 high school pupils will graduate in 1963–64. This is an increase of 12.4 percent over the 1,732,243 estimated for 1962–63 and an increase of 72.5 percent over the number graduated in 1953–54. This upward trend reflects both an increased number of births and a higher retention rate of pupils. The figures below show the 10-year trend by combining the figures of the U.S. Office of Education and the NEA Research Division estimates (starred):

	Number of high school graduates
1953–54	1,129,000
1955–56	1,252,000
1957–58	1,332,000
1959–60	1,627,000
1961–62	[1] 1,678,000
1962–63	*1,732,243
1963–64	*1,947,318

[1] Preliminary figure of USOE.

Since 1953–54 the number of high school graduates has increased at a faster rate than total enrollment in public elementary and secondary schools, a 72.5-percent increase in graduates as compared with a 44.4-percent increase in total enrollment. For every 1,000 pupils enrolled in public schools in all grades (K-12) in 1953–54, 39 were graduated; in 1963–64, 47 out of every 1,000 will be graduated.

School year	Elementary school classroom teacher	Secondary school classroom teachers	Total classroom teachers
1953–54	657,520	374,618	1,032,138
1954–55	*690,987	*389,342	*1,080,329
1955–56	722,890	410,203	1,133,093
1956–57	*750,702	*440,163	*1,190,865
1957–58	778,324	459,525	1,237,849
1958–59	*808,475	*484,248	*1,292,723
1959–60	833,772	521,186	1,354,958
1960–61	*848,853	*554,483	*1,403,336
1961–62	*872,800	*583,700	[1] 1,456,500
1962–63	*893,656	*618,997	*1,512,653
1963–64	*925,027	*649,791	*1,574,818

[1] Preliminary figure of U.S. Office of Education.

The elementary-school classroom teachers totaled 925,027 in 1963–64, a gain of 3.5 percent over the revised estimate of 893,656 for 1962–63. The elementary-school classroom teaching staff has increased 40.7 percent since 1953–54.

By 1963–64 the secondary-school classroom teachers numbered an estimated 649,791, a gain of 5 percent over the revised estimate of 618,997 for 1962–63. Over the years since 1953–54 the number of secondary-school teachers has increased 73.5 percent.

For 1963–64 the total number of classroom teachers is estimated at 1,574,818, a gain of 4.1 percent over the revised estimate of 1,512,653 for 1962–63. Since 1953–54 the total classroom teaching staff has increased 52.6 percent.

The figures below show the percent of change in the number of classroom teachers since 1953–54 and changes year by year.

[In percent]

School year	Increase in number of classroom teachers over 1953–54			Increase in number of classroom teachers over previous year		
	Elementary	Secondary	Total	Elementary	Secondary	Total
1954–55	5.1	3.9	4.7	5.1	3.9	4.7
1955–56	9.9	9.5	9.8	4.6	5.4	4.9
1956–57	14.2	17.5	15.4	3.8	7.3	5.1
1957–58	18.4	22.7	19.9	3.7	4.4	3.9
1958–59	23.0	29.3	25.2	3.9	5.4	4.4
1959–60	26.8	39.1	31.3	3.1	7.6	4.8
1960–61	29.1	48.0	36.0	1.8	6.4	3.6
1961–62	32.7	55.8	41.1	2.8	5.3	3.8
1962–63	35.9	65.2	46.6	2.4	6.0	3.9
1963–64	40.7	73.5	52.6	3.5	5.0	4.1

Teachers salaries

The revised estimate of the average salary of the instructional staff in 1962–63 was $5,921. The estimate for 1963–64 is $6,164. The gain of $243 represents an increase of 4.1 percent.

These average salary figures are for the entire instructional staff—classroom teachers, principals, supervisors and other instructional personnel. In the computation of the national average, each State average is weighted by the number of instructional staff members in the State.

The trend in average salaries is shown below as a combination of figures of the U.S. Office of Education and estimates of the NEA Research Division (NEA Research Division estimates are starred):

Year	Average annual salary of instructional staff	Percent of increase	
		Over 1953–54	Over previous year
1953–54	$3,825		
1954–55	*3,950	3.3	3.3
1955–56	4,156	8.7	5.2
1956–57	*4,350	13.7	4.7
1957–58	4,702	22.9	8.1
1958–59	*4,939	29.1	5.0
1959–60	5,174	35.3	4.8
1960–61	*5,449	42.5	5.3
1961–62	[1] 5,710	49.3	4.8
1962–63	*5,921	54.8	3.7
1963–64	*6,164	61.2	4.1

[1] Preliminary figure of USOE.

Salaries of the instructional staff have gained every year in the past 10 years, at an average annual rate of 4.9 percent. The average salary per member of the instructional staff in 1963–64 is estimated at $6,164, an increase of $2,339, or 61.2 percent over the average salary of $3,825 in 1953–54. However, in terms of purchasing power as measured by the Consumer Price Index of the U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics (1957–59=100), the average salary of instructional staff members was $4,078 in 1953–54 and had advanced to $5,755 in 1963–64. Insofar as the Consumer Price Index is an accurate measure of the increases in the cost of living for instructional staff members throughout the United States, the real gain in the purchasing power of average salaries amounted to 41.1 percent in the 10 years since 1953–54.

For 1962–63 the estimated average salary of classroom teachers was revised to $5,732, or 97 percent of the average salary of the total instructional staff. The revised average annual salary of elementary-school teachers in 1962–63 was $5,560; and of secondary-school teachers, $5,980.

For 1963–64 the average salary of classroom teachers is estimated at $5,963, or 97 percent of the figure for the entire instructional staff. This is a gain of 4 percent over the figure for 1962–63. The estimated average salary of elementary-school teachers in 1963–64 is $5,797; and of secondary-school teachers, $6,214.

The average salaries of elementary-school teachers are lower than those of secondary-school teachers; however, over the past years the difference appears to be growing smaller. In 1953–54 the average annual salary of elementary-school teachers was 86.5 percent of the corresponding figure for secondary-school teachers. By 1963–64 the average salary of elementary-school teachers increased to 93.3 percent of the salary estimated for secondary-school teachers. The decrease in the difference may be the result of several factors: (a) increased preparation of elementary-school teachers, (b) more acute shortage of elementary-school teachers in the past 10 years, (c) longer periods of service, and (d) improved status in the position of elementary-school teachers.

Table 6 (not printed in the Record) columns 6 through 12, and table 7 (not printed in the Record), columns 8 through 14, show by State the percent distribution of classroom teachers by salaries paid. The trend in this distribution for the United States is shown below:

School year	Percent of classroom teachers paid—						
	Below $3,500	$3,500 to $4,499	$4,500 to $5,499	$5,500 to $6,499	$6,500 to $7,499	$7,500 to $8,499	$8,500 or more
1953–54	55.8	26.6	[1] 17.6				
1954–55	48.5	29.2	[1] 22.3				
1955–56	42.6	31.4	[1] 26.0				
1956–57	35.0	33.0	[1] 32.0				
1957–58	25.6	33.5	[1] 40.9				
1958–59	17.0	31.7	26.7	15.7	[2] 8.9		
1959–60	12.8	29.7	28.2	17.4	[2] 11.9		
1960–61	9.2	26.0	27.2	19.3	10.9	[3] 7.4	
1961–62	5.7	20.9	28.9	22.6	12.9	[3] 9.0	
1962–63	4.3	17.7	28.0	23.4	14.5	8.1	4.0
1963–64	2.8	14.5	27.5	25.4	15.8	9.1	4.9

[1] $4,500 or more; detailed breakdown not available.
[2] $6,500 or more; detailed breakdown not available.
[3] $7,500 or more; detailed breakdown not available.

In 1953–54, about 56 percent of all classroom teachers were paid less than $3,500. It is estimated that in 1963–64 fewer than 3 percent will be paid less than $3,500. In 1953–54 about 1 classroom teacher in 6 was paid $4,500 or more; in 1963–64 about 5 classroom teachers in 6 will be paid $4,500 or more.

Differences among the States in teachers' salaries are great. Estimated average annual salaries paid instructional staff by State in 1963–64 vary from a low of $3,975 to a high of $7,800 (excluding Alaska). Salaries of instructional staff for the 50 States are distributed as follows:

Estimated average annual salary of instructional staff, 1963–64:	*Number of States*
Below $4,000	1
$4,000 to $4,499	2
$4,500 to $4,999	7
$5,000 to $5,499	11
$5,500 to $5,999	5
$6,000 to $6,499	13
$6,500 to $6,999	7
$7,000 to $7,499	2

Estimated average annual salary of instructional staff, 1963–64—Con.	Number of States
$7,500 to $7,999	1
$8,000 to $8,499	1

In 1963–64, the salary in the State with the highest average is about twice that in the State with the lowest average annual salary of instructional staff. In 1953–54 the ratio between the highest and the lowest average State salaries was about 2.5. Notwithstanding this decrease in percentage relationship, the dollar gap has widened by about $1,000 over this 10-year period.

SCHOOL FINANCE

The total revenue and nonrevenue receipts of public schools are estimated at $23,058,612,000 for 1963–64. This is an increase of 6.3 percent over the revised estimated total receipts of $21,700,050,000 in 1962–63. The total expenditures, including current expense, capital outlay, and interest, increased from $19,735,070,000 in 1962–63 to an estimated $21,201,199,000 in 1963–64, an increase of 7.4 percent.

Revenue receipts

This series includes revenue receipts available for expenditures for current expenses, capital outlay, and debt service for public schools. Included as revenue receipts are all appropriations from general funds of Federal, State, county, and local governments, receipts from taxes levied for school purposes, income from permanent school funds, and endowments, income from leases of school lands, interest on bank deposits, tuition, gifts, etc.

For 1962–63, revenue receipts are estimated at $20,153,344,000, an increase of 7.4 percent over the revised estimate of $18,769,388,000 for 1962–63. From 1953–54 through 1963–64, school revenue receipts increased a total of 156.2 percent at an average annual rate of 10.0 percent for the decade. Below are shown the revenue receipts since 1953–54 as reported by the U.S. Office of Education and the NEA Research Division (NEA Research Division estimates are starred):

School year	Revenue receipts		
	Amount (thousands)	Percent increase over 1953-54	Percent increase over previous year
1953–54	$7, 866, 852		
1954–55	*8, 467, 128	7. 6	7. 6
1955–56	9, 686, 677	23. 1	14. 4
1956–57	*10, 431, 700	32. 6	7. 7
1957–58	12, 181, 513	54. 8	16. 8
1958–59	*12, 423, 756	57. 9	2. 0
1959–60	14, 746, 618	87. 5	18. 7
1960–61	*15, 320, 340	94. 7	3. 9
1961–62	[1] 17, 500, 120	122. 5	14. 2
1962–63	*18, 769, 388	138. 6	7. 3
1963–64	*20, 153, 344	156. 2	7. 4

[1] Preliminary figure of USOE.

The following figures show the percents of revenue receipts from Federal, State, and local sources for the years 1953–54 through 1963–64 as reported by the U.S. Office of Education and the NEA Research Division (NEA Research Division estimates are starred):

School year	Percent of school revenue derived from—		
	Federal sources	State sources	Local sources
1953–54	4. 5	37. 4	58. 1
1954–55	*2. 5	*37. 3	*60. 2
1955–56	4. 6	39. 5	55. 9
1956–57	*3. 7	*39. 8	*56. 5
1957–58	4. 0	39. 4	56. 6
1958–59	*3. 6	*39. 5	*56. 9
1959–60	4. 4	39. 1	56. 5
1960–61	*3. 8	*39. 8	*56. 4
1961–62	[1] 4. 3	[1] 39. 0	[1] 56. 7
1962–63	*3. 6	*39. 3	*57. 1
1963–64	*3. 5	*40. 1	*56. 4

[1] Preliminary figure of USOE.

For the United States as a whole, the distribution of school revenue by source has remained fairly constant since 1955–56; about 4 percent from Federal, 40 percent from State, and 56 percent from local and other sources. In 1963–64 the greater portion of school revenue was derived from local sources in 31 States; from State sources, in 19 States. State-by-State figures are given in tables 8 and 9 (not printed in the RECORD), columns 6 through 8, for the years 1962–63 and 1963–64.

The following figures give a regional breakdown of the percent of school revenue by source for 1963–64:

Region [1]	Percent of school revenue derived from—		
	Federal sources	State sources	Local sources
New England	4. 0	27. 9	68. 1
Mideast	2. 5	39. 7	57. 8
Southeast	4. 9	59. 1	36. 0
Great Lakes	2. 7	29. 6	67. 7
Plains	3. 0	25. 9	71. 1
Southwest	4. 8	49. 2	46. 0
Rocky Mountain	4. 4	33. 2	62. 4
Far West	3. 6	42. 1	54. 3
Total, 50 States and District of Columbia [1]	3. 5	40. 1	56. 4

[1] See footnote [1] to text table.

Nonrevenue receipts

Nonrevenue receipts include all moneys received from loans, sales of bonds, sales of property purchased from capital funds, and insurance adjustments. The nonrevenue receipts for 1963–64 were $2,905,268,000, down 0.9 percent from the estimate of $2,930,662,000 for 1962–63. From 1953–54 to 1963–64, nonrevenue receipts increased 59.3 percent. The trend in nonrevenue receipts is shown in a combination of figures from the U.S. Office of Education and the NEA Research Division (NEA Research Division estimates are starred):

School year:	*Nonrevenue receipts (in thousands)*
1953–54	$1, 824, 004
1955–56	2, 356, 189
1957–58	2, 514, 676
1959–60	2, 615, 707
1960–61	*2, 791, 361
1961–62	[1] 2, 717, 658
1962–63	*2, 930, 662
1963–64	*2, 905, 268

[1] Preliminary figure of USOE.

Total expenditures

The total amount to be spent during 1963–64 for current expense, capital outlay, and interest on school debt is estimated at $21,201,199,000. This represents a 7.4-percent increase over the total expenditures of $19,735,070,000 in 1962–63.

The total expenditures over the past 10 years, as reported by the U.S. Office of Education and by the NEA Research Division, are as follows (NEA Research Division estimates are starred):

School year	Amount (in thousands)	Total expenditures	
		Percent increase over 1953–54	Percent increase over previous year
1953–54	$9, 092, 449		
1954–55	*9, 824, 499	8. 1	8. 1
1955–56	10, 955, 047	20. 5	11. 5
1956–57	*11, 994, 992	31. 9	9. 5
1957–58	13, 569, 163	49. 2	13. 1
1958–59	*14, 253, 239	56. 8	5. 0
1959–60	15, 613, 255	71. 7	9. 5
1960–61	*16, 807, 934	84. 9	7. 7
1961–62	[1] 18, 169, 057	99. 8	8. 1
1962–63	*19, 735, 070	117. 0	8. 6
1963–64	*21, 201, 199	133. 2	7. 4

[1] Preliminary figure of USOE.

Current expenditures of public elementary and secondary day schools

Current expenditure of elementary and secondary day schools includes amounts paid for general control, instructional service, operation, maintenance, and basic local. Current expenditure comprises all governmental contributions to the retirement fund and expenditure for school services, including attendance, health services, transportation, food services, and others. This figure does not include payments for capital outlay and interest on school debt or, except when otherwise noted, amounts spent for community colleges, adult education, summer school, and community services.

The estimated current expenditure increased from $15,606,328,000 in 1962–63 to $16,896,948,000 in 1963–64. The following figures show the increases in current expenditure as reported by the U.S. Office of Education and the NEA Research Division (NEA Research Division estimates are starred):

School year	Current expenditures for public elementary and secondary day schools		
	Amount (in thousands)	Percent increase over 1953–54	Percent increase over previous year
1953–54 [1]	$6, 790, 923		
1954–55	*7, 340, 300	8. 1	8.1
1955–56 [1]	8, 251, 420	21. 5	12.4
1956–57	*8, 921, 100	31. 4	8.1
1957–58 [1]	10, 251, 843	51. 0	14.9
1958–59	*10, 851, 079	59. 8	5.8
1959–60 [1]	12, 329, 389	81. 6	13.6
1960–61	*13, 147, 075	93. 6	6.6
1961–62 [1]	[2] 14, 562, 557	114. 4	10.8
1962–63	*15, 606, 328	129. 8	7.2
1963–64	*16, 896, 948	148. 8	8.3

[1] Includes expenditures for community colleges, adult education, and summer school programs in California.

[2] Preliminary figure of USOE.

Annual increases over the past 10 years have averaged 9.6 percent. In the 10 years since 1953–54, current expenditures for public elementary and secondary day schools have increased 148.8 percent.

Current expenditure per pupil in ADA

The current expenditure per pupil in average daily attendance (ADA) for elementary and secondary day schools for 1963–64 is estimated at $455, an increase of $22 over the revised figure of $433 for 1962–63. The following figures show in amounts and percents the increases in current cost per pupil in ADA for each year since 1953–54 (NEA Research Division estimates are starred):

School year	Current expenditure per pupil in ADA for elementary and secondary day schools		
	Amount	Percent increase over 1953–54	Percent increase over previous year
1953–54	$264. 76		
1954–55	*275. 00	3. 9	3.9
1955–56	294. 22	11. 1	7.0
1956–57	*309. 00	16. 7	5.0
1957–58	341. 14	28. 8	10.4
1958–59	*350. 50	32. 2	2.6
1959–60	375. 14	41. 7	7.2
1960–61	*393. 00	48. 4	4.8
1961–62	[1] 415. 00	56. 7	5.6
1962–63	*433. 00	63. 5	4.3
1963–64	*455. 00	71. 9	5.1

[1] Preliminary figure of USOE.

Current expenditure per pupil in ADA increased from $265 in 1953–54 to an estimated $455 in 1963–64, a rise of 71.9 percent. Variations among the States in expenditures per pupil are great. Estimated expenditures per pupil in ADA for 1963–64 vary from a low of $241 to a high of $705. Expenditures per pupil in ADA for the 50 States and the District of Columbia are distributed as follows:

Current expenditure per pupil in ADA for elementary and secondary day schools:	*Number of States*
$200–249	1
250–299	3
300–349	6
350–399	9
400–499	8
450–499	13
500–549	7
550–599	2
600 and over	2

Current expenditure per pupil in ADM

Average daily membership (ADM) is recommended as a better measure than ADA for use in computing per-pupil expenditures. It represents an average of the pupils belonging—those attending (ADA) plus those absent—and provides a better measure of the number of pupils for whom the expenditures were made. Because some States have not adopted this method of pupil reporting, figures on expenditures per pupil in ADM are incomplete.

Column 4 of tables 10 and 11 (not printed in the RECORD) gives the expenditure per pupil in ADM for 1962–63 and for 1963–64 for each of the 41 States and the District of Columbia reporting ADM. From this incomplete return, the NEA Research Division has estimated the expenditure for the 50 States and the District of Columbia per pupil in ADM to be $404 for 1962–63 and $425 for 1963–64, or about 93 percent of the expenditure per pupil in ADA for each of these years.

Current expenditures for other programs

Current expenditures for programs other than elementary and secondary day school programs include expenditures for summer schools, community colleges, adult education, and for community services (public libraries, community centers, recreational programs, etc.) when operated by local school districts.

Current expenditures for other programs amounted to $371,371,000 in 1962–63 and to $413,679,000 in 1963–64, an increase of 11.4 percent.

Capital outlay

Capital outlay was estimated at $3,130,697,000 for 1962–63 and at $3,211,735,000 for 1963–64. The 10-year trend in expenditures for capital outlay is given below for the years 1953–54 through 1963–64 by combining figures from the U.S. Office of Education and estimates of the NEA Research Division (NEA Research Division estimates are starred):

School year	Capital outlay expenditures (in thousands)	Percent increase over 1953–54	Percent of change over previous period
1953–54	$2,055,178		
1955–56	2,387,187	16.2	[1] +16.2
1957–58	2,852,747	38.8	[1] +19.5
1959–60	2,661,786	29.5	[1] −6.7
1961–62	[2] 2,883,000	40.3	[1] +8.3
1962–63	*3,130,697	52.3	[3] +8.6
1963–64	*3,211,735	56.3	[3] +2.6

[1] 2 years.
[2] Preliminary figure of U.S. Office of Education.
[3] 1 year.

Expenditures for capital outlay show substantial increases from 1953–54 through 1957–58, a decrease for 1959–60, and increases since 1961–62 but at a less rapid rate than for the 1950's.

Interest on school debt

For the school year 1962–63 the total expenditure for interest was estimated at $626,674,000. For the school year 1963–64 this expenditure increased to $678,837,000, a gain of 8.3 percent. The trend from 1953–54 through 1963–64 is shown below by combining figures from the U.S. Office of Education and the NEA Research Division (NEA Research Division estimates are starred):

School year	Expenditures for interest (in thousands)	Percent increase over 1953–54	Percent increase over previous period
1953–54	$153,884		
1955–56	215,699	40.2	[1] 40.2
1957–58	341,922	122.2	[1] 58.5
1959–60	489,514	218.1	[1] 43.2
1961–62	[2] 575,000	273.7	[1] 17.5
1962–63	*626,674	307.2	[3] 9.0
1963–64	*678,837	341.1	[3] 8.3

[1] 2 years.
[2] Preliminary figure of U.S. Office of Education.
[3] 1 year.

Since 1953–54, interest payments on school debt have more than quadrupled. In 1953–54, interest on school debt constituted 1.7 percent of the total expenditures; by 1963–64 an estimated 3.2 percent of the total expenditures will be paid in interest.

TABLE 2.—*Estimated expenditures for public schools, 1963–64*

Region and State	Total current expenditures for public elementary and secondary day schools			Current expenditures for other programs (in thousands) [1]	Capital outlay (in thousands)	Interest on school debt (in thousands)	Total current expenditures, capital outlay, and interest (in thousands) (cols. 2, 5, 6, and 7)
	Amount (in thousands)	Per pupil in ADA	Per pupil in ADM				
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Great Lakes	$3,376,640	$464	(4)	$41,350	$718,000	$143,760	$4,279,750
Illinois	900,000	479	(4)	2,650	170,000	40,000	1,112,650
Indiana	456,740	467	(4)	11,200	[2] 86,300	5,760	560,000
Michigan	770,000	452	(4)	20,000	187,000	42,000	1,019,000
Ohio	898,000	446	$422	5,500	187,000	41,000	1,131,500
Wisconsin	351,900	498	468	2,000	87,700	15,000	456,600
Plains	1,391,815	447	(4)	23,120	287,000	51,975	1,753,910
Iowa	262,000	456	(4)	2,050	48,000	7,500	319,550
Kansas	206,000	448	(4)	8,250	58,500	5,250	278,000
Minnesota	365,000	509	483	6,000	70,000	20,000	461,000
Missouri	330,000	419	(4)	4,700	58,000	12,300	405,000
Nebraska	110,000	385	368	1,700	27,000	4,000	142,700
North Dakota	55,855	420	402	350	13,500	2,000	71,705
South Dakota	62,960	403	387	70	12,000	925	75,955
New England	930,797	480	452	6,140	121,486	17,804	1,076,227
Connecticut	275,000	552	522	2,100	36,000	10,500	323,600
Maine	75,600	378	359	180	10,000	1,850	87,630
Massachusetts [3]	434,000	475	444	3,400	47,000	(4)	[5] 484,400
New Hampshire	[6] 48,027	427	403	155	9,986	1,604	[6] 59,772
Rhode Island	68,000	500	469	250	15,000	3,000	86,250
Vermont	30,170	387	368	55	3,500	850	34,575
Mideast	4,007,000	591	(4)	34,535	617,500	195,170	4,854,205
Delaware [3]	46,000	498	470	135	14,000	1,470	61,605
Maryland	316,200	489	452	6,000	65,000	15,700	402,900
New Jersey	634,000	568	525	4,200	108,000	30,000	776,200
New York	1,982,000	705	(4)	[7] 15,000	400,000	95,000	2,492,000
Pennsylvania	963,800	485	458	6,800	[2] 25,000	53,000	1,048,600
District of Columbia [3]	65,000	517	478	2,400	5,500	0	72,900
Southeast	2,787,634	319	299	39,694	432,069	91,443	3,350,840
Alabama [3]	214,000	280	265	380	17,000	2,000	233,380
Arkansas	119,106	302	284	598	28,533	2,988	151,225
Florida	[8] 419,256	388	365	[9] 16,481	[9] 83,756	[9] 11,055	[9] 530,548
Georgia	281,886	306	282	5,000	45,000	10,000	341,886
Kentucky	182,000	300	281	185	[2] 12,500	[10] 14,000	208,685
Louisiana	286,000	399	372	350	40,000	14,200	340,550
Mississippi	[11] 125,200	241	220	7,500	23,000	3,400	159,100
North Carolina	344,570	320	301	2,500	50,000	9,000	406,070
South Carolina	154,000	265	248	1,800	18,000	4,800	178,600
Tennessee	234,000	291	276	1,400	33,000	9,000	277,400

See footnote at end of table.

TABLE 2.—*Estimated expenditures for public schools, 1963–64*—Continued

Region and State	Total current expenditures for public elementary and secondary day schools			Current expenditures for other programs (in thousands) [1]	Capital outlay (in thousands)	Interest on school debt (in thousands)	Total current expenditures, capital outlay, and interest (in thousands) (cols. 2, 5, 6, and 7)
	Amount (in thousands)	Per pupil in ADA	Per pupil in ADM				
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Southeast—Continued							
Virginia	$303,800	$350	$328	(4)	$65,000	$9,000	$377,800
West Virginia	123,816	300	285	$3,500	16,280	2,000	145,596
Southwest	1,269,710	392	372	28,175	212,500	49,800	1,560,185
Arizona	152,000	455	432	------------	38,000	5,400	195,400
New Mexico	106,350	440	429	375	18,000	1,400	126,125
Oklahoma	186,000	351	343	800	31,500	4,000	222,300
Texas	825,360	387	363	27,000	[12] 125,000	[12] 39,000	1,016,360
Rocky Mountain	466,915	433	(4)	4,975	97,300	16,885	586,075
Colorado	[13] 197,515	460	432	[13] 3,600	[12] 45,000	[12] 8,885	255,000
Idaho [3]	51,300	316	(4)	------------	7,000	1,900	60,200
Montana [3]	73,500	493	470	175	12,500	2,900	89,075
Utah	[11] 100,900	394	382	1,200	28,000	2,000	132,100
Wyoming	43,700	540	515	(4)	4,800	1,200	49,700
Far West	2,575,587	528	(4)	234,200	717,500	108,400	3,635,687
California	1,987,500	[14] 530	497	220,000	602,000	90,000	2,899,500
Nevada	39,700	464	441	200	13,500	2,200	55,600
Oregon	213,387	549	516	3,500	32,000	4,200	253,087
Washington	325,000	515	(4)	10,500	70,000	12,000	427,500
Alaska	32,500	634	596	40	[3] 3,880	[3] 1,400	37,820
Hawaii	58,350	402	378	1,450	4,500	2,200	66,500
Total, 50 States and the District of Columbia	16,896,948	455	425	413,679	[2] 3,211,735	678,837	21,201,199

[1] Includes community services, summer schools, community colleges, and adult education.

[2] Does not include capital outlay by State and local school building authorities in Indiana, Kentucky, and Pennsylvania.

[3] Estimated by NEA Research Division.

[4] Not available.

[5] Does not include interest.

[6] Original figure adjusted by NEA Research Division to include State contributions to teacher retirement and social security.

[7] Expenditures for summer schools and adult education only.

[8] Original figure adjusted by NEA Research Division to include cost of administration at the State level, State contributions to teacher retirement fund, and Federal funds for school lunch program.

[9] Original figure adjusted by NEA Research Division to include expenditures for public junior-college program.

[10] Includes interest payments to holding companies.

[11] Original figures adjusted by NEA Research Division to include net expenditure for school lunch and milk programs.

[12] Excludes expenditures for junior colleges.

[13] Expenditures for summer schools and adult education are included in col. 2.

[14] ADA used in calculating per-pupil expenditures excludes excused absences.

No matter what position one may take on the question of whether there should be Federal aid to education, one thing is certain, that its decision should be determined on the question of need and social implications.

Certainly if the national interest is correct, then the public interest today is for all-out education for everyone. The number of dropouts have increased steadily to the point that the problem has become national in its scope of concern. So much so that the Congress has passed remedial legislation not only to curb this tendency of withdrawal but to reenroll the youth by attractive vocational programs and scholarship loans.

Also surveys as to the educational qualification of teacher personnel have been conducted resulting in new opportunities given to teachers to pursue advanced courses to receive masters and doctors degrees in their specialized branch of education.

Yet in the elementary and secondary fields of education at the private and parochial school level authorities feel that they are being discriminated against because of constitutional restrictions—these actually prove dire need of Federal aid in order to survive (especially in the poorer parishes) or fail in giving the maximum educational values to the pupils due to lack of funds for adequate teaching personnel.

It is argued that Federal aid that restricts funds exclusively to public supported schools can only be justified if it is the intent of the United States to establish a public monopoly in the field of education by making it difficult or impossible for other educational institutions to compete. The Congress must solve the dilemma perhaps in the 89th Congress—the issue is highly controversial and the lines of combat still a surging force for a compromise solution.

WINNING THE COLD WAR: THE U.S. IDEOLOGICAL OFFENSIVE

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I am taking the floor this morning to report to the House of Representatives on the progress of a study initiated 18 months ago by the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. The title of our study is "Winning the Cold War: The U.S. Ideological Offensive."

I. INTRODUCTION

Mr. Speaker, since the Communists seized power in Czechoslovakia by "peaceful" means in 1948, our foreign policymakers have been confronted with a new and serious problem:

How can the United States best meet the Communist challenge on the political and ideological level?

What must we do, apart from our military programs and our international economic aid and trade undertakings, in order to first, counter Communist efforts to penetrate and subvert the free world nations; second, help prevent complete communization of countries already under Communist control; and third, more effectively advance U.S. foreign policy objectives on the world scene?

These questions have concerned both our policymakers and the American public for more than 15 years. This concern has been fully justified because of the profound change which took place since the end of World War II in the conduct of international relations.

Events transpiring since 1945 have demonstrated clearly that the traditional tools of foreign policy—diplomacy, military power, and economic policy—no longer suffice to advance the legitimate objectives of a nation in its relations with the rest of the world.

The concurrent revolutions of the 20th century—in communications, science, education, and in other fields—have opened a new dimension for foreign policy operations. On a scale unmatched in the past, they brought the masses of people into direct contact with the conduct of foreign relations.

The revolution in communications has played an important role in this development. By using modern means and techniques of communication, governments can now appeal to target audiences in foreign countries over the heads of their leaders. They can inform, convince, even strive to motivate entire populations to a specific course of action. In turn, these foreign audiences exert increasing pressures on their own governments to continue, or to change, given policies.

In this new dimension of foreign policy operations, the ideological and psychological, words and ideas serve as weapons. Persuasion is the goal—and, frequently, the principal means for the attainment of political objectives.

The Communists have been quick to appreciate the potential of this new dimension of foreign policy. They adopted ideological warfare—political agitation and propaganda—as a key instrument for carrying out the strategy of Communist world revolution. Their massive effort in this field, and the political successes it has achieved, presented the governments of the free world with a serious challenge.

During the past two decades, the U.S. Government has used a variety of programs in coping with the Communist challenge on this plane. These programs range from exchanges of persons and oversea information activities to strategic psychological operations. All of them are intended to serve a single overriding purpose: to provide support abroad for U.S. foreign policy by combating Communist propaganda, by countering Communist political agitation, by promoting understanding of U.S. foreign policy goals, and in other ways.

How well are these programs administered? Are they fulfilling their primary mission? Do they meet the requirements of our foreign policy? Are they effective in meeting the Communist challenge in the cold war, and advancing our foreign policy objectives?

These are legitimate questions. Unfortunately, the answers to them have not been forthcoming very readily.

The Congress, of course, periodically reviews these programs. Generally, however, a given congressional committee will look only at those programs which come under its immediate jurisdiction. For years now, there has been no overall review of all the programs in this category, of their relationship to each other, and to our foreign policy, and of their effectiveness in coping with the threat posed by the Communist ideological offensive. The last congressional inquiry which concerned itself with such questions as they related to our oversea information programs, took place over a decade ago.

Because of this, the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements of the Committee on Foreign Affairs decided in March 1963, to undertake a comprehensive review of all programs which operate in the fourth dimension of our foreign policy. As chairman of the subcommittee, I am taking this opportunity to report to the House of Representatives on our undertaking and on its progress during the two sessions of the 88th Congress.

In initiating this study, the subcommittee concentrated on four immediate tasks. We decided:

First. To inquire into the nature of the ideological challenge presented by the international Communist movement, and to explore different views about the best ways to meet it;

Second. To inventory all governmental programs which are neither strictly military nor strictly economic in nature, but which are intended to provide support abroad, on the ideological and psychological level, for our foreign policy;

Third, to study the relationships which exist between these programs, and to see how they are coordinated and brought to bear on the conduct of U.S. foreign policy; and

Fourth. To survey the oversea program of private U.S. organizations which have an impact on the American image abroad and thus either directly or incidentally affect the implementation of our foreign policy.

In subsequent parts of this report I shall describe what my subcommittee did during the past 18 months in carrying out the above-described plan. In the sixth and concluding part I will comment on some of the changes which took place, partly as a result of our subcommittee's activities, in the administration of various governmental programs. I will also attempt to outline very briefly the job that remains to be done before this study can be considered successfully completed.

II. THE COMMUNIST CHALLENGE

What are the basic elements of the Communist strategy for winning the cold war—a strategy that employs ideological as well as military and economic weapons?

What part do the ideological elements—Communist doctrine, propaganda and political agitation—play in that strategy?

What can the U.S. Government do to counter Communist efforts on this nonmilitary plane?

What role can private initiative—business, labor, the academic community, and other private organizations—play in the struggle to win men's minds?

The answers to such questions were sought by the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements during the initial part of a study which we initiated in March 1963.

To obtain the answers, the subcommittee invited a cross-section of leaders in business, industry, labor, and in communications, as well as writers, commentators, and other interested persons, to present their views in open hearings.

The hearings opened on March 28, 1963. with the testimony of Edward R. Murrow, Director of the U.S. Information Agency and continued intermittently through September 13. In the course of those 6 months, the subcommittee received testimony from 53 witnesses, as follows:

Thomas Aitken, Jr., vice president, INFOPLAN, of Interpublic, Inc., New York. N.Y.

Mrs. Mariada Arensberg, executive secretary, Cuban Freedom Committee, Washington, D.C.

Hon. WILLIAM H. AYRES, a Representative in Congress from the State of Ohio.

Stanley Ballard, secretary, American Federation of Musicians, AFL–CIO.

Adrian Berwick, senior editor, the Reader's Digest international editions, Pleasantville, N.Y.

Theodore Bikel, actor, council members, Actors' Equity Association.

Ralf Brent, president, Radio New York Worldwide, New York, N.Y.

Edward S. Butler, executive vice president, Information Council of the Americas, New Orleans, La.

Leo Cherne, executive director, Research Institute of America, Inc., New York, N.Y.

Louis Cheskin, of Louis Cheskin Associates, Chicago, Ill.

James B. Conklin, president, International Educational Broadcasting Corp., Sherman Oaks, Calif.

Hon. George P. Delaney, Special Assistant to the Secretary of State and Coordinator on International Labor.

Angus Duncan, executive secretary, Actors' Equity Association.

George Englund, motion picture producer-director, Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer Studios, Culver City, Calif.

Lionel C. Epstein, attorney, Ginsburg & Leventhal, Washington, D.C., and member of board of trustees of the Experiment in International Living.

Hy Faine, national executive secretary, American Guild of Musical Artists.

Rudolph Faupl, U.S. worker representative to the International Labor Organization and international representative, International Association of Machinists.

Lloyd A. Free, president, Institute for International Social Research, Princeton, N.J.

John W. Gardner, Chairman, U.S. Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs.

Carl Harms, actor, recording secretary, Actors' Equity Association.

Miss Melissa Hayden, prima ballerina, New York City Ballet Co.

Hal Holbrook, actor, member Actors' Equity Association.

Dr. Kenneth Holland, president, Institute of International Education, New York. N.Y.

Dr. Robert T. Holt, department of political science, University of Minnesota.

Earle Hyman, actor, council member, Actors' Equity Association.

Richard A. Humphrey, director, Commission on International Education, Washington, D.C.

Walter Joyce, managing editor, Printers' Ink, New York, N.Y.

Herman Kenin, president, American Federation of Musicians, AFL–CIO.

Dan Lacy, managing director, American Book Publishers Council, New York.

John E. Lawyer, Acting Director, Office of International Organization Affairs, International Affairs Bureau, Department of Labor.

Dr. Arthur H. Litchfield, chairman of the board, Governmental Affairs Institute.

John McMullan, news director, Washington Bureau, Knight Newspapers.

Henry Mayers, president, the Mayers Co., Los Angeles, Calif., and chairman, Cold War Council.

Rosario Mazzeo, personnel manager, Boston Symphony Orchestra.

George Meany, president, AFL-CIO.

Herbert C. Merillat, executive director, American Society of International Law.

H. Philip Mettger, president, Governmental Affairs Institute.

Dick Moore, editor, Equity magazine.

John D. J. Moore, vice president, W. R. Grace Co., and chairman, U.S. Inter-American Council.

Hon. Edward R. Murrow, Director, U.S. Information Agency.

Stanley Plesent, General Counsel and Congressional Liaison, USIA.

Stanley F. Reed, president, Reed Research Foundation, and president, Technology Audit Corp., Washington, D.C.

Hon. J. Leonard Reinsch, Chairman, U.S. Advisory Commission on Information.

John Richardson, Jr., president, Free Europe Committee, New York, N.Y.

Hon. James Roosevelt, a Representative in Congress from the State of California.

Kermit Roosevelt, vice president, Governmental Relations Department, Gulf Oil Corp., Washington, D.C.

Robert H. Scholl, director of public relations, Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey), New York.

Eric Sevareid, author, commentator, and news analyst, New York, N.Y.

Thomas C. Sorenson, Deputy Director for Policy and Plans, USIA.

Miss Blanche Thebom, concert and opera singer, Metropolitan Opera Co.

Dr. Theodore Vallance, director, Special Operations Research Office, American University, Washington, D.C.

Hon. George L-P Weaver, Assistant Secretary of Labor for International Affairs.

Eddie Weston, actor, second vice president, Actors' Equity Association.

In addition, the subcommittee received a number of written statements which addressed themselves to the subject under study and which were prepared by civic-minded citizens, without cost, to the U.S. Government.

The testimony of witnesses who appeared before the subcommittee, together with a number of additional statements, has been printed under the title "Winning the Cold War: The U.S. Ideological Offensive—Hearings Before the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements, Parts I Through V." Other papers submitted to the subcommittee have also been of help to its members and were retained for possible future publication.

The five volumes of hearings mentioned above make fascinating reading and in the opinion of at least one news correspondent, point to several far-reaching conclusions.

First, that ideological activities—teaching of the Communist doctrine, persuading people to its cause, and motivating them to take political action in support of Communist objectives—constitute an integral and eminent part of the Communist strategy of world revolution.

Second, that the thrust of the Communist ideological effort, added to the impact of the concurrent revolutions of the 20th century in science, education, communications, and rising expectations of the masses of people of the underdeveloped countries, has profoundly influenced the entire character of the East-West confrontation and created serious challenge for the foreign policy of the United States. This conclusion—that the nonmilitary conflict is not only significant but may prove decisive to the outcome of the global struggle between the world Communist movement and those who oppose it—was underscored in a statement made by the late President John F. Kennedy on April 2, 1961, and cited by one of the witnesses who appeared before our subcommittee. President Kennedy said:

> We dare not fail to see the insidious nature of this new and deeper struggle. We dare not fail to grasp the new concepts, the new tools, the new sense of urgency we will need to combat it, whether in Cuba or South Vietnam. And we dare not fail to realize it is this struggle which is taking place every day without arms or fanfare, in thousands of villages and markets and classrooms all over the globe. * * * No greater task faces this Nation or this administration. * * * Too long have we fixed our eyes on the traditional military needs; on the armies prepared to cross borders; on missiles poised for flight. Now it should be clear this is no longer enough; that our security may be lost piece by piece, country by country, without the firing of a single missile or the crossing of a single border.

Third, that the U.S. Government has not attempted to meet the nonmilitary challenge posed by the Communist movement, and to advance our own foreign policy objectives abroad, with anything approaching a well-coordinated campaign of the size and scope of our other foreign policy undertakings. Rather, in the opinion of several witnesses, the U.S. Government has pitted a handful of limited, fragmented and frequently uncoordinated programs, against a massive, integrated, worldwide Communist ideological offensive.

Fourth, that private American initiative, embodied in programs conducted abroad by private American individuals and organizations, may play a vital role in deciding the outcome of the cold war—and that this realization was slowly beginning to produce positive results.

These broad conclusions emerged from the testimony of witnesses who appeared before our subcommittee during the initial part of our study. This does not mean that all of the witnesses agreed upon each and every conclusion—nor even that two or more witnesses would define any single conclusion in precisely the manner in which it appears above. Any attempt such as this to summarize the rich variety of views and ideas advanced by a group of thoughtful and well-informed persons is bound to do some injustice to each individual presentation. The same, of course, applies to the membership of our subcommittee. I know that each of its members could well improve upon this summary.

Nevertheless, these four tentative conclusions became the base from which the subcommittee continued its study. We were fully conscious of them as we moved into the next phase of our undertaking.

III. GOVERNMENT AGENCIES AND PROGRAMS

A few minutes ago, I indicated that the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements, of which I am the chairman, was deeply concerned about the apparent lack of meaningful information relating to one important part of our Government's effort in the cold war.

We knew, of course, what our Government was doing on the economic plane because the foreign aid program and our foreign trade policies are subject to a systematic, regular review by the Congress.

We knew, also, what our Government has been doing to meet the Communist threat on the military plane. Our national defense budget and our military assistance program are studied each year by the appropriate congressional committees and debated at length by both Houses of the Congress.

We did not have readily available, however, similar information about the total U.S. Government effort on the ideological plane: an effort designed to counter the Communist ideological offensive and to provide support abroad for our foreign policy through oversea information programs, exchanges of persons, strategic psychological operations, and related activities.

There was no single document, congressional or executive, no single source, which contained adequate information about the full range of these activities—who was doing what, why, and at what cost to the U.S. taxpayer.

And we had to have this information before we could begin to study these activities and reach some judgment about their worth and effectiveness.

In order to meet this need, the subcommittee directed its staff to prepare an inventory of governmental programs operating in this field. The inventory was to be brief in order to be suitable for quick and easy reference. Also, it was not to contain any material with a security classification. Such material could not be published but had to remain in appropriate files, available to Members of Congress and other authorized personnel.

In cooperation with the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, the work on the compilation of the inventory began in May 1963. Dr. Allan S. Nanes, analyst in U.S. foreign policy in the Legislative Reference Service, prepared the document under the supervision of the subcommittee and its staff. It was published on January 3, 1964, as a committee print, entitled "The U.S. Ideological Effort: Government Agencies and Programs."

With the publication of this document, the subcommittee and the Congress as a whole had available to them an extremely useful reference work which contained the answers to the basic questions: who was doing what, under what authority, and, generally, at which cost to the U.S. taxpayer.

I shall not attempt at this point to describe the inventory in detail because it is readily available to all Members of Congress. I would like, however, to comment on its three main features.

First, the inventory revealed that over 20 Government departments and agencies are currently engaged in conducting programs which are neither strictly military nor strictly economic in character but which can provide support for U.S. foreign policy.

Second, it indicated that the annual expenditures on these programs are in excess of $500 million per year.

Third, it pointed to an area of apparent weakness in the U.S. ideological effort: lack of adequate coordination.

This third point became the subject of the next step in the subcommittee's inquiry.

Having inquired into the nature of the challenge confronting our foreign policy on the ideological plane.

Having brought together information about governmental programs operating on this plane;

The subcommittee was now ready to take a closer look at the programs themselves. And we began at the top by inquiring into the direction and the management of the U.S. ideological effort in the cold war.

IV. THE UNCOORDINATED EFFORT

I referred earlier to the fourth dimension of foreign policy: the ideological and psychological.

This dimension embraces a wide range of programs and activities which are intended to communicate information and ideas to foreign audiences, to influence them, or to move them to a particular course of action.

Included in this category are radio and television broadcasting, distribution of publications, community relations projects, educational and cultural exchanges, strategic psychological operations, and a host of other programs.

As shown in the inventory published by the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements ("The U.S. Ideological Effort: Government Agencies and Programs," Foreign Affairs Committee Print, 1964), operations of this type are currently conducted by more than 20 departments and agencies of the U.S. Government. Their cost runs into hundreds of millions of dollars annually. They constitute the third and increasingly important dimension of U.S. foreign policy.

How do these programs operate? How are they coordinated with each other? How is the experience and information derived through these programs channeled and brought to bear on the formulation of foreign policy decisions? How are foreign policy decisions transmitted to the operational heads of these programs and implemented?

In a series of executive hearings held in January and February 1964, the subcommittee addressed these and many other questions to the representatives of the four governmental agencies principally involved in foreign policy decisions: the Department of State, the U.S. Information Agency, the Agency for International Development, and the Department of Defense.

The testimony of these witnesses, after the required security deletions, was published under the title, "Winning the Cold War: The U.S. Ideological Offensive—Hearings Before the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements, Parts VI Through VIII." In addition, this three-volume set contains an appraisal of "The Cold War Since 1960," prepared by the Department of State, as well as several research studies of the U.S. Information Agency.

On the basis of information received in the course of the two sets of hearings conducted by the subcommittee—March–September 1963 and January–February 1964—the subcommittee issued report No. 2 entitled "Ideological Operations and Foreign Policy," House Report No. 1352, 88th Congress, 2d session, 1964. The subcommittee's findings, outlined in that report, may be summarized as follows:

First. The basic goals of U.S. foreign policy have been expressed clearly and have remained fairly constant. They are designed to advance our national interests and security by encouraging a peaceful world community of free and independent countries whose governments are responsive to the just aspirations of their people, and by combating Communist designs for world domination.

Second. The concurrent revolutions of the 20th century—in science, warfare, communications, education, and other aspects of life—have in turn revolutionized the practice of diplomacy. Foreign policy operations have acquired a new dimension: the ideological or psychological. This revolution has been recognized only recently by the United States—much later, in fact, than by many other countries.

Third. In the pursuit of its basic objectives in the world, the United States, unlike the Soviet Union, has assigned relatively low priority to the ideological and psychological area of foreign policy operations. The attention and the resources devoted to these operations do not begin to approach those expended on foreign military and economic activities.

Fourth. There exists in the executive branch a broad range of nonmilitary and noneconomic programs which are directed at foreign audiences and can provide support for U.S. foreign policy. These, however, are yet to be orchestrated into an effective instrument of our foreign policy. The concept of an "ideological offensive"—of coordinating these programs and their application—thus far has been only partially implemented by the executive branch.

Fifth. A number of U.S. Government programs which operate in the third dimension of foreign policy suffer from fuzziness of concept. Their purposes and the roles which they are supposed to play in the execution of U.S. foreign policy have not been clearly defined.

Sixth. The coordination of programs operating in a particular field—for instance, information, research, exchanges of persons—is less than fully effective. While considerable progress has been made in recent years to improve coordination, there is evidence that greater effort will be required to complete the job and to eliminate duplication and underutilization of resources.

Seventh. The implementation of the country team concept has improved the oversea coordination of U.S. programs. Careful selection and adequate training of personnel placed in charge of U.S. country teams is indispensable to the success of U.S. operations abroad.

Eighth. Perhaps the weakest aspect of the U.S. ideological effort in support of foreign policy is the apparent lack of a clearly defined, operational authority. Such direction is necessary, in our opinion, to coordinate programs operating on this plane and thereby maximize the effectiveness of our effort.

Ninth. The fragmentation of congressional supervision over programs comprising the third dimension of U.S. foreign policy presents another problem. At least six major committees and an even larger number of subcommittees exercise jurisdiction over programs in this area of foreign policy operations. From the standpoint of legislative authorizations and appropriations, programs are judged, supported, or criticized, as the case may be, on an individual basis rather than in the context of the total effort in support of U.S. foreign policy.

Tenth. Too little effort has been expended in exploring the contribution of private American citizens and organizations abroad to the advancement of U.S. foreign policy objectives. These private operations have a tremendous potential.

At the conclusion of its report, the subcommittee made the following recommendations:

First. The need for organizing U.S. Government operations on the ideological and psychological plane and blending them into an effective effort in support of U.S. foreign policy, particularly with respect to the cold war challenge on this plane, should be acknowledged at the highest level in our Government.

Second. Operational authority for the management of ideological and psychological activities in support of U.S. foreign policy should be unified and placed at an appropriately high level in the executive branch.

Third. A systematic evaluation of all Government programs with a potential for influencing the attitudes of foreign audiences should be undertaken with a view to eliminating duplication, abandoning programs which are no longer related to the requirements of our foreign policy, and providing those which are, with a clearly defined mission.

Fourth. The coordination of programs operating in each of the several fields—exchanges of persons, information, strategic psychological operations, and others—should be greatly improved. The implementation of recommendation No. 2 appears indispensable to the attainment of this objective. In addition, responsibility for coordination at lower levels should be clearly defined and adequate authority provided to make possible effective discharge of such responsibility. The cumbersome structure of interdepartmental coordinating committees should be streamlined by reducing the number of such committees to the minimum required for effective operation.

Fifth. To the extent possible, educational and informational activities should be brought into a single agency or department—as suggested by the U.S. Advisory Commission on Information. Existing division of operations and responsibility between the Department of State, the U.S. Information Agency, and, to some extent, the Agency for International Development, is illogical and not conducive to efficiency and economy.

Sixth. Government officials and personnel responsible for the conduct of ideological and psychological operations should be trained in the requirements and techniques of ideological warfare. It is not practical to try to bring all of these activities into a single Government department or agency. It is both feasible and necessary, however, to provide appropriate training to the personnel of Government departments involved in this type of foreign operations.

Seventh. The input of the ideological and psychological dimension of foreign policy—particularly in the field of basic research in behavioral sciences—should be increased.

Eighth. Cooperation with private enterprise should be strengthened. Prompt attention should be given to ways and means of achieving that goal.

After issuing report No. 2, the subcommittee turned its attention to programs conducted abroad by private American organizations. That subject will be discussed in the next part of my report.

V. THE IMPACT OF PRIVATE INITIATIVE

In submitting its Report No. 2 to the Congress, the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements stressed the important role of programs conducted abroad by private U.S. citizens and organizations. The subcommittee found that—

> These private activities—personal contacts, exchanges, assistance programs, mass media communications activities, and other endeavors—are in large part responsible for the conditions of the U.S. image abroad. These activities mirror the diversity of our people's interests, talents, and convictions. They serve as an excellent indicator of the condition of life attainable in a free, democratic society. And they demonstrate to the world the peaceful, humanitarian sentiments of the American people.

The subcommittee further suggested that because of their diversity and volume, these private endeavors undoubtedly have "some implication for the attainment of U.S. foreign policy goals." Unfortunately, the subcommittee was in no position to gage the impact of these activities because information relating to their direction and scope, available to the subcommittee, was frequently inadequate and inconclusive.

The need to explore the potential of private American initiative abroad without attempting to bring it under Government control, was explained in the following passage from the subcommittee's report:

> The subcommittee is convinced that it would be improper and harmful for the Federal Government to attempt to control or direct for political purposes the activities abroad of private American citizens and organizations. At the same time, the subcommittee believes that closer contacts should be established between responsible Government officials and private efforts in particular fields. On the one hand, the Government ought to know at all times what private American individuals and organizations are doing in a given country—if for no other reason than simply to prevent duplication of effort and waste of scarce resources. On the other hand, ways and means could be devised to keep such private individuals and entities informed about U.S. policies and programs in particular regions or fields of endeavor—again, to prevent duplication, to point out areas into which private effort could be channeled constructively, and to indicate in what respects private undertakings might work at cross-purposes with Government programs.

In an effort to help meet the need clearly evident in this area, the subcommittee undertook to survey the oversea activities of private American organizations. A questionnaire designed to elicit information about the size and scope of such undertakings, their direction and relationships—if any—to U.S. Government-sponsored programs, and related factors, was prepared by the subcommittee staff under my direction. This questionnaire was mailed earlier this month to a sample of approximately 1,500 foundations, universities, labor organizations, church-related groups, voluntary organizations, and people-to-people projects.

We are hopeful that the results of this survey will prove of interest and help not only to our committee and to the Congress, but also to the many private American organizations which are interested in, or are conducting, oversea programs. We are planning to release the results early next year.

VI. AN ENCOURAGING BEGINNING

In parts 1 through 5 of this report, I outlined briefly the progress of the investigation undertaken 18 months ago by the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. This investigation is concerned solely with programs which comprise the fourth dimension of our foreign policy; namely, programs which provide support for our foreign policy by reaching, informing, and influencing foreign audiences. Our activities in this dimension of foreign policy, their effectiveness and success, may well decide the outcome of the cold war.

In summary, during the past 18 months, my subcommittee:

First. Held two series of hearings during which we received testimony from some 70 witnesses. These hearings have been published in eight volumes;

Second. Had prepared under its direction, and published, an inventory of governmental programs operating in the third dimension of foreign policy;

Third. Issued two reports which included a number of specific recommendations for strengthening our effort in this field; and

Fourth. Initiated a survey of activities conducted abroad by private U.S. citizens and organizations—activities which have a bearing on the implementation of our foreign policy.

This summary of the subcommittee's activities does not convey, of course, the full impact of our undertaking. I say this because it is often impossible to measure the indirect effects of an investigation of this type. We have concentrated primarily on getting together a body of information about the subject under study. Simultaneously, however, we have pointed out shortcomings which exist in some of our programs, suggested areas in which new approaches could be tried, and lent our support to innovations and improvements which, in some cases, were being considered in the executive branch and which, on the basis of our investigation, appeared sound to us.

The results of our efforts in such cases are reflected in a number of tangible improvements which have been put into effect during the past year and a half. We do not claim full credit for them. But I believe that our activities were at least partly instrumental in bringing them about.

Last month, for instance, the President issued a memorandum to the heads of executive departments and agencies, directing them to exert every effort to assure that competent, qualified citizens of the United States be available for service on the staffs of international agencies—a development which has been of interest to our subcommittee and which was dealt with in our Report No. 1 on "U.S. Participation in the International Labor Organization."

Similarly, earlier this year there was established in the executive branch an interdepartmental Foreign Area Research Coordinating Group—an innovation which was strongly recommended by our subcommittee in Report No. 2. In that report, we dealt at length with the shortcomings in the coordination of governmental research in foreign affairs. We also made this recommendation:

> Effective methods must be evolved to insure that the results of research conducted by Government agencies are promptly made available to all agencies concerned with foreign policy operations. Other arrangements must be worked out to divide research assignments and make certain that all requirements are covered to the extent that funds are available. A system of priorities must be established and enforced to insure that scarce resources—human and financial—are applied first to the most urgent tasks.

The establishment of the coordinating group is a step in the direction recommended by this subcommittee.

Similarly, the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency earlier this year established a Social Science Advisory Board to advise the Agency on matters of social science research—another innovation which our subcommittee considers significant and desirable from the standpoint of foreign policy operations.

In still another field, the representatives of several government agencies who have contact with private American organizations operating abroad, have put their heads together and are trying to devise steps which will promote more effective cooperation—a development which we have encouraged.

There is one more area that I would like to mention—the area of cultural and educational exchanges—in which our subcommittee has been active. We have seen a number of improvements in these programs in recent times. For example, greater effort is being made to evaluate and to improve current methods for handling foreign nationals brought to the United States under Government sponsorship for education, training, or observation. These visitors are being afforded much greater exposure than ever before to our way of life, our political and social institutions, our philosophy of government, and the goals of our foreign policy. This has been vigorously advocated by our subcommittee.

These are but a few examples of changes which have been put into effect during the past year and a half with the encouragement and support of this subcommittee.

On the negative side, there are a number of recommendations which our subcommittee has made but which have not been implemented to date. I hope that we will see some improvement in this situation during the coming year.

Mr. Speaker, in concluding this report, I want to make one thing clear: While the beginning has been encouraging, the job which our subcommittee undertook is far from being completed. We have much work ahead of us. And we intend to see it done.

I want to take this opportunity to express my sincere appreciation to Dr. THOMAS E. MORGAN, of Pennsylvania, chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, whose understanding and support have made our project possible.

I also want to thank the distinguished members of my subcommittee: Representatives L. H. FOUNTAIN, of North Carolina; OMAR BURLESON, of Texas; DONALD M. FRASER, of Minnesota; PETER H. B. FRELINGHUYSEN, of New Jersey; ROBERT R. BARRY, of New York; and H. R. GROSS, of Iowa, whose ability, patience, and tact have enabled us to move as far as we have during these past 18 months. Their devotion to the public good warrants the respect of every patriotic American.

"UNDER GOD"

Mr. RYAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker and Members of Congress, before this session of Congress comes to an end, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues in Congress and to the attention of all solid-thinking Americans, another of the sinister and cunning attacks presently being made on religion in America. This is another vicious attack on religion and our strong religious convictions of our belief in God and on our belief in the existence of God.

Several years ago an action was started in the State of New York against the Commissioner of Education to order him to delete the words "Under God" from the Pledge of Allegiance to the U.S. flag, which was being used in public school class and assembly. The petitioners objected to the use of such pledge on the ground that it constituted a religious exercise and interfered with the parental right to dictate the religious or irreligious philosophy of children.

This matter proceeded through the New York courts and to the New York Court of Appeals. It is to their everlasting credit that the Court of Appeals of the State of New York unanimously affirmed the decision of the lower Courts, which, in essence, stated that the words "under God" in the pledge of allegiance did not constitute a religious exercise and did not interfere with the parental right of dictating the religious or irreligious philosophy of their children.

But the petitioners were not satisfied and continued their efforts to knock out the words "under God" and brought the action directly to the U.S. Supreme Court. This case was filed before the Highest Tribunal on the date of September 9 of this year.

They, the petitioners, further claim that the decisions reached in the New York courts were rendered before the U.S. Supreme Court made their controversial decision in the cases of *Matter of Engel* v. *Vitale*, 370 U.S. 421, and the case of *Abington School District* v. *Schempp*, 374 U.S. 203. These are the cases which banished prayer from the public schools. Of course, this ruling started a flood of criticism in this country and the controversy is still raging.

Mr. Speaker, 11 years ago in 1954, my predecessor, the Honorable Louis Rabaut, brought before the Congress a resolution to amend the pledge of allegiance to the flag by adding the simple, pious phrase "under God."

At that time, Mr. Rabaut said:

> We must extend the public proclamation of our religious traditions and our dependence on divine providence, for our country was born under God, and only under God will it live as a citadel of freedom.

With this new inspiration, the Congress and the American people began to analyze our national image once again.

They asked, "Is the American heritage, the American history, and the American way of life truly reflected in our institutions?"

Their search for the truth began with the Pledge of Allegiance.

The Reverend George M. Docherty, pastor of the New York Presbyterian Church, said in one of his sermons:

> I could sit down and brood upon the Pledge of Allegiance, going over each word slowly in my mind. And I came to a strange conclusion. There was something missing in the pledge * * * a very definite factor in the American way of life was being ignored * * * and that factor was the belief in God. Without these words, the American Pledge of Allegiance could be the pledge of any republic, including Russia.

And so the truth was recognized.

Americans from all over the country proclaimed, "We are a religious Nation; we are a religious people."

This period of spiritual awakening brought forth a new patriotism, a natural alinement between our souls and our lips which voiced the belief that we were "one Nation under God."

It seems most improbable that any segment or minute minority of our society would want to destroy the beauty, the solemnity, the completeness of that pledge.

And yet, today, there are sinister forces about us who are shouting, "it is un-American," "it is a destruction of personal liberties," "that there is no place for God in the government of this land."

"The words 'under God' must be struck out of the Pledge of Allegiance."

Mr. Speaker, I say we must be aware of these attacks against our faith in divine providence.

For herein lie the real assassins of democracy—those who would destroy the moral fibers of our society and break down the human dignity of man.

This small but powerful aggressive minority has been plotting, conspiring, shrewdly attacking, and slowly crushing the national references to God.

They will continue to work secretly and openly until their objective is reached, to make us a godless state.

They will continue to ridicule basic American principles until they dismember our way of life and destroy our heritage.

Shall we, as Americans, endorse this malign movement, or stand idly by and watch with helpless minds and hands while this incredulously small minority dictate against the wishes of the majority of the people?

If so, I can predict the day when the inscription "In God We Trust" will no longer be present on our national coins.

The words "Pray for Peace" on our postage stamps will be found only in rare stamp collections.

The Prayer Room in the U.S. Capitol will be declared unconstitutional.

Schoolbooks, having references to God, will be outlawed.

Chaplains will no longer have a place in the armed services.

And the worship, the recognition, and the outward service to a Supreme Being will be grossly restricted.

Fellow Americans, we must awake from our trusting state of complacency, and strengthen our moral weapons against those who would betray us.

Our Nation is steeped in religious tradition.

Remember the Mayflower Compact which begins "In the name of God. Amen."

Recall the arguments of George Mason to the General Court of Virginia 4 years before the Declaration of Independence that:

> The laws of nature are the laws of God, whose authority can be superseded by no power on earth.

And in the words of William Penn:

> Those people who are not governed by God will be ruled by tyrants.

We should remember the Constitutional Convention which began with a prayer.

We should remember Abraham Lincoln's immortal Gettysburg Address when he declared:

> That we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain; that this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom, and that government of the people, by the people, for the people shall not perish from the earth.

Our own Supreme Court has recognized all of these facts in past decisions—it ruled in 1892 that "this is a religious nation," in the case of Church of the Holy Trinity against the United States.

And more recently, in 1951, the Supreme Court ruled in the case of Zorach against Clauson that "we are a religious people whose institutions presuppose a Supreme Being."

But our first, and perhaps most beautiful, recognition of God was expressed in our Declaration of Independence and I quote:

> We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness.

Although written many years ago, this Declaration strikes directly at the roots of communism, atheism, and materialism.

Unless we, as a nation, confirm our belief in the existence of God and His relationship to man, we drop man, himself, to the significance of a grain of sand and open the floodgates to tyranny and oppression.

I, therefore, call upon the present Members of Congress and the Members who will assume office in January, and all Americans to be ever vigilant against these attacks; to become aware of the fact that this is another in a series of planned attacks being made upon our established American religious traditions and our way of life; that it is part of a pattern of attacks being made by a small group of people and some of them operating under the guise of well-sounding patriotic names; that the very document that bestows freedom to every American—our Constitution—is being challenged and used as a vehicle to undermine our religious beliefs and traditions.

I plead that you, as Members of Congress, join in the fight to expose these facts to the American people; thereby helping to protect and defend the very basic religious freedoms and principles which we have always enjoyed.

SUMMARY REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to express appreciation to the members of the House Committee on the District of Columbia for their extraordinary efforts, cooperation, and diligence during the two sessions of the 88th Congress. By their studied consideration and disposition of legislative matters before them, they have so ably assisted the Congress in meeting its constitutional responsibility—section 8, article I—of governing the Nation's Capital.

This has been perhaps the busiest Congress our committee has experienced, certainly in recent years. Within a month of the convening of this Congress, the House Committee on the District of Columbia commenced hearings and investigations, starting with joint sessions, initiated by our committee, with the District Committee of the other body, to look into the alarming crime situation in this Capital City. Hardly a week has gone by since that the committee or subcommittees have not been in session, either in open hearings taking evidence, or in executive meetings considering and drafting legislation deemed by the committee to be necessary for the District officials to carry out their delegated responsibilities. The testimony taken by the House District Committee and subcommittees in this Congress alone covers 5,446 printed pages and 1,288 pages of transcripts not printed.

The subcommittee chairmen, in particular, have contributed materially and magnificently by their advice and time, their study and devotion, to the committee's tasks, and to the record of achievement summarized below.

Further, I should like to commend the staff of the legislative counsel's office of the House, whose technical advice and assistance on drafting legislation materially aided the committee. This staff was always available, and we are particularly appreciative of their help.

The committee members are deserving of well-earned respite from their labors, and I wish for them all a refreshing season with their families and their constituents. We hope to be on hand again, with the convening of the next Congress in the new year, to continue in our determined efforts to meet the needs of the Nation's Capital.

Specifically, I wish to report on the activities of the House District Committee in the two sessions of the 88th Congress, as follows:

First. During this Congress, 252 bills and joint resolutions have been referred to and considered by the House Committee on the District of Columbia, 228 of these being House bills and joint resolutions and 24 being Senate-passed bills.

Second. Over 234 scheduled meetings have been held by the committee or subcommittees thereof. Of these, 146 were open hearings: 112 subcommittee hearings on various bills, and 34 hearings of the full committee and subcommittees on diverse subjects including joint crime and joint fiscal hearings with the District Committee of the other body, investigations of the operation of urban renewal programs in the District of Columbia, traffic congestion, one-way streets, parking, and other matters listed in the committee calendar. There were 80 executive meetings of the full committee and subcommittees perfecting drafts of legislation for report to the Congress, as well as innumerable meetings and conferences of committee members and the staff on legislative matters.

Third. During this Congress, 68 bills have been reported by the District Committee to the House. Of these, 64 bills have been considered and approved by the House and sent to the Senate. Of this number 43 have had Senate approval and have been signed by the President.

Following is a brief summary of the bills reported by this committee to the House. The law numbers of those which also passed the Senate and were signed by the President are included:

Accidents, traffic reports: H.R. 1982, to require that all collisions involving motor vehicles in the District of Columbia, which result in property damage in excess of $100, or in personal injury to any degree, be reported immediately to the District of Columbia Chief of Police. Presently, only collisions involving personal injury are required to be so reported.

Alcoholic Beverage Control Act: H.R. 8920, to extensively revise the present law and make the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Board an independent agency. After considerable debate, the House on rollcall voted 258 to 98 to adopt a motion to recommit the bill to committee.

Armory Board: H.R. 39, to increase its membership to five, by adding two additional civilians; thus making three civilian members, plus President of the District of Columbia Board of Commissioners and the commanding general of the District of Columbia Militia.

Association of the Universalist Women (a nonprofit corporation in the District of Columbia): H.R. 5342 authorizes consolidation thereof with the Alliance of Unitarian Women (a nonprofit corporation in the State of Massachusetts). The proposed consolidation of these two women's organizations is desirable at this time for the reason that they are affiliated with the Universalist Church and the Unitarian Church of America, respectively, and a merger of these two churches has already taken place. (Public Law 88-19).

Borrowing authority: H.R. 4277 increases the amount which the District might borrow from $75 million to $150 million, which in conference between the Houses was further increased to $175 million. (Public Law 88-104.)

Business Corporation Act of 1954: H.R. 4330 amends the same to correct inaccuracies, improve the language of the act, and to make substantive changes to keep the act current and similar to the Model Business Corporation Act prepared by the American Bar Association, and with the statutes of the States. (Public Law 88-111.)

Canine Corps of the Metropolitan Police Department: H.R. 1935, to authorize the expansion of said corps presently having a strength of 50 dogs. Subsequently, provision for 25 additional man-dog teams was included in the District of Columbia appropriations bill.

Chancery locations: S. 646 (H.R. 5882) regulates the location, construction, alteration, repair, conversion, and occupancy of foreign chanceries in the District of Columbia. (Public Law 88-659.)

Charitable Solicitations Act: H.R. 5990, to amend present law and require as condition precedent to the issuance of a certificate of registration or an exemption therefrom for permission to solicit funds for charitable purposes, that the Commissioners make certain findings that such solicitation is in the public interest as will benefit or assist in promoting the public health or welfare and will not offend the public morals.

Columbia Plaza urban renewal project: H.R. 9974, to terminate same as being a distortion of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945, and restore property to former owners to permit private redevelopment thereof without cost to the Federal or District Governments.

Correctional industries fund: S. 1082 (H.R. 6454) establishing a revolving fund with maximum net worth limitation of $2,500,000 to be used for the performance and production of such services as will contribute to the rehabilitation, skill in trades, and occupation of inmates of institutions under the District of Columbia Department of Corrections. (Public Law 88–622.)

Credit unions: H.R. 8313 repeals the District of Columbia Credit Union Act, as amended, to permit 16 local credit unions presently incorporated thereunder, to be chartered under the Federal Credit Union Act, along with 159 credit unions in the District already chartered under the Federal act. (Public Law 88–395.)

Crime and criminal procedures: H.R. 7525, an omnibus crime bill consolidating various bills and proposals into amendments to the District of Columbia Criminal Code, in order to provide the police with additional tools for law enforcement and to assist the prosecuting officials and the courts in ameliorating crime conditions in the Nation's Capital through amendment to the Mallory rule, the Durham rule, and others. While this bill passed the House on August 12, 1963, it did not receive favorable Senate action in this Congress. This is particularly regrettable since the latest Federal Bureau of Investigation report shows an overall increase of 34.7 percent in the crime rate in the District of Columbia during the first 6 months of 1964 over the same period in 1963—as against an increase in serious crime in the Nation as a whole of 15 percent during the same period.

Dangerous and unsafe buildings: H.R. 7441 amends the act of March 1, 1889, as amended, to provide for uniform assessment of costs incurred by the District in making repairs to unsafe buildings and providing for removal of dead or diseased trees, among other nuisances. (Public Law 88–486.)

D.C. Transit System franchise: S. 1553 amends the act of July 24, 1956, so as to eliminate duplicate auditing, and authorizing the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Commission, in lieu of the District of Columbia Public Utilities Commission, to make an annual determination of the D.C. Transit System's net operating income, and to certify the same to the District of Columbia Board of Commissioners for the purpose of computing exemptions from the District of Columbia motor vehicle fuel and real estate taxes. (Public Law 88–212.)

Deeds of trust: H.R. 682, to provide for the substitution of trustees under deeds of trust in the District of Columbia by means of a written instrument entered into by all the parties, or their successors in interest, notwithstanding any provision of the deed of trust to the contrary.

Dental hygienists: H.R. 6350 authorizes the District of Columbia Board of Dental Examiners to waive any theoretical examination of an applicant for a license as a dental hygienist if he holds a certificate from the National Board of Dental Examiners. (Public Law 88–460.)

Discharge of parolees (from supervision): H.R. 4333, to authorize the Parole Board for the District of Columbia to discharge a parolee from supervision when the Board deems that the purpose for which the parole was granted has been accomplished.

Diseases, communicable: H.R. 2485, to prevent the spread thereof by amending existing law so as to authorize the Department of Public Health of the District of Columbia to treat minors for venereal disease upon their own consent, when they present themselves voluntarily to the Department's health centers, rather than having to obtain such permission from their parents or guardians. (Public Law 88–137.)

District of Columbia Training School: H.R. 7440, to provide for voluntary admissions to this institution for mentally retarded citizens of the District of Columbia, in addition to admissions presently authorized by commitment through court order.

Divorce: H.R. 10777, to liberalize the District of Columbia laws, commencing with the act of March 3, 1901, relating to divorce, legal separation, and annulment of marriages, to make them conform to more modern laws of other States, including Maryland and Virginia, reducing the waiting periods therein prerequisite to filing actions, eliminating the 6-month period before decree of divorce becomes final, etc.

Educational employees on leave: H.R. 5337 amends the act of June 12, 1940, to increase partial pay for public schoolteachers and other school employees while on leave of absence for educational purposes. (Public Law 88–472.)

Exemptions from attachment: H.R. 7882, to amend the act of March 3, 1901, to stop the practice which has been developed of filing in the District of Columbia actions for garnishment against an employer who also has a business in Maryland so as to secure payment by attachment of wages of an employee who is a nonresident of the District.

Federal payment to the District: H.R. 6177, increasing the authorized Federal contribution to the District from $32 million to $45 million. This authorization was subsequently increased to $50 million in conference between the two Houses. (Public Law 88–104.)

Fire protection: H.R. 5044 amends the act of August 14, 1950, to require that the District of Columbia, Maryland, and Virginia, all parties to mutual-aid firefighting agreements, indemnify each other from all claims arising from the operations of firefighters outside their own jurisdictions. (Public Law 88–473.)

Horizontal property regimes (condominium ownership): H.R. 4276 provides for establishment of same in the District of Columbia by permitting fee simple ownership of a unit in a multiunit structure which may be designed for residence, office, the operation of any industry or business, or any other type of use, with its accessory units. (Public Law 88–218.)

Horizontal property regimes: H.R. 11222 amends the foregoing Public Law 88–218 to permit condominium units, such as townhouses, to be located on, or consist of, more than one floor of a building, as was intended in the original act. (Public Law 88–475.)

Income and Franchise Act amendments: H.R. 8407, to exempt mortgage loans of nonresident loan institutions from District of Columbia franchise tax.

Judges retirement: H.R. 5871, to amend the act of April 1, 1942, to permit retirement of local judges after 10 years' service and providing for disability retirements of judges or annuities for their widows or children. (Public Law 88–644.)

Judges retirement, increase in: H.R. 12198, to provide for increase in retirement salaries of judges of the District of Columbia Court of Appeals and the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions.

Learners' license fees: S. 1964 increases from $2 to $5 minimum the fee charged for a District of Columbia driver's permit, to be used by the District of Columbia Government to finance an expanded driver-education program, particularly among school-age drivers. (Public Law 88–287.)

Life Insurance Act of 1934: H.R. 8355 amends the same by increasing capital stock requirements of life insurance companies organized in the District of Columbia from a minimum of $100,000 to $200,000, and other provisions respecting changes in the corporate charters and unissued stock. (Public Law 88–556.)

Life Insurance Act of 1934: H.R. 7497 amends the same with respect to the filing of annual statements by life insurance companies and publication thereof in local newspapers. (Public Law 88–193.)

Life Insurance Act of 1934: H.R. 1937 amends same to make the District of Columbia perjury statute applicable to those persons who make false statements under oath when applying for licenses or renewal of licenses as insurance agents and brokers in the District of Columbia. (Public Law 88–57.)

Life Insurance Act of 1934: H.R. 6128 amends same to permit life insurance companies to maintain current and complete records of all stockholders either at their principal places of business or with their stock transfer agents. (Public Law 88–458.)

Life insurance companies: H.R. 3191 amends the act of February 4, 1913, regulating the lending of money on securities in the District of Columbia, so as to exempt life insurance companies from the so-called loan shark provisions, just as banks, and building and loan associations, are already so exempt. (Public Law 88–191.)

Marriages, premarital examinations: H.R. 11302, to require laboratory tests, as do 45 of the States, to determine if applicants for marriage licenses are infected with syphilis.

Mentally ill, constitutional rights of: S. 935 revises the procedures for the hospitalization of the mentally ill in the District of Columbia, committed by voluntary act or through civil commitment proceedings. (Public Law 88–597.)

Milk and ice cream containers: H.R. 6413 amends the act of March 3, 1921, to permit the packaging of smaller quantities of milk, ice cream, and other dairy products than is permissible under present law. (Public Law 88–405.)

Motor vehicles liens files: S. 490 (H.R. 6348) amends the act of July 2, 1940, by eliminating the requirement for maintenance of duplicate alphabetical files for recording and releasing liens on motor vehicles and trailers registered in the District of Columbia. (Public Law 88–89.)

Municipal court: H.R. 3537 amends the act of April 1, 1942, to increase the court's jurisdiction in cases involving $3,000 to $10,000; extending the subpena power of the court to a 25-mile jurisdiction; changing the name of the court to District of Columbia Court of General Sessions; changing the name of the local appellate court to the District of Columbia Court of Appeals. (Public Law 88–60.)

Municipal theaters: H.R. 7399, to provide for the preparation of plans for the utilization of Loew's Capitol Theater and Keith's Theater by purchase, lease, or otherwise, and for their operation as municipal or semimunicipal theaters.

Nurses: H.R. 1933 amends the act of February 9, 1907, so as to lower from 21 to 19 years the age requirement for registration as a nurse by the Nurses' Examining Board of the District of Columbia. (Public Law 88–81.)

Podiatrists: H.R. 9962, to authorize the District of Columbia Board of Podiatrist Examiners to waive its own written and oral examinations with respect to an applicant for a license as a podiatrist if he holds a certificate from the National Board of Podiatrist Examiners.

Police and firemen: H.R. 10683 repeals all existing restrictions as to residence requirements for District of Columbia police and firemen so that in lieu of present requirements that they live within 20 miles of the U.S. Capitol there will be no restrictions, there being none as to place of residence of all other employees in the Federal or District of Columbia Governments in the Nation's Capital. Amended by Senate to permit Commissioners to set 25-mile residence limit for police and firemen. (Public Law 88–517.)

Police, firemen, U.S. Park Police, and White House Police: H.R. 10215 extends the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951 to cover District of Columbia police, firemen, U.S. Park Police, and White House Police and give them the same annual sick leave benefits accorded civilian employees of the Federal and District of Columbia Governments. (Public Law 88–471.)

Police and firemen's pay: H.R. 12196 amends District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958, to give police and firemen an average pay increase of 8.9 percent. (Public Law 88–575.)

Pour over trusts: H.R. 3190 amends the act of March 3, 1901, to authorize a testator, by the terms of his will, to pour over or add properties passing under his will to existing inter vivos trusts or testamentary trusts and thus give increased flexibility in the distribution of funds by a testator. (Public Law 88–192.)

Practical Nurses' Licensing Act of September 6, 1960: S. 933 (H.R. 5097), to permit "grandfather clause" licensing without written examination for applicants living in the District and practicing in the metropolitan area for at least 6 months during the base period.

Pupils, disciplining of: H.R. 4274, to amend the act of June 20, 1906, so as to permit principals and teachers in the public schools of the District of Columbia to use reasonable force in exercising their lawful authority to maintain order in the schools, and to forbid the Board of Education to abrogate this authority. At present, the District of Columbia statutes are silent on this point.

Pupils, dismissal: H.R. 4273, to amend the present District of Columbia compulsory school attendance law (D.C. Code, 31–207) so as to permit the suspension or dismissal of unruly pupils within the age limits of compulsory attendance.

Redevelopment Act amendments of 1964: S. 628, to enlarge the authority of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency to undertake urban renewal projects in nonresidential as well as residential areas, and to correct serious deficiencies in and to improve the operation of the District of Columbia urban renewal program by providing safeguards in amendments to existing law.

Relocation costs: S. 1024 (H.R. 6351) authorizes District of Columbia Commissioners to provide relocation services and payments for moving expenses to persons, businesses, and nonprofit organizations displaced as the result of government action (by condemnation of unsafe and insanitary buildings, enforcing housing regulations, highway construction, and acquisition of land for District of Columbia buildings, etc.), similar to such services as are provided in the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945 for displacements in urban renewal areas. (Public Law 88–629.)

Right-of-way over District of Columbia Training School Grounds: H.R. 5081 authorizes the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to sell to the Baltimore Gas & Electric Co. a right-of-way for the construction of towers for a high-voltage transmission line to cross a portion of the grounds of the District Training School at Laurel, Md. (Private Law 88–67.)

Salary increases: H.R. 10487 provides for substantial pay increases for District of Columbia Commissioners, Superintendent of Schools, District of Columbia court judges and other higher paid District of Columbia officials. Provision for these increases was included, at request of the chairman, in H.R. 11049 (Federal Employees Salary Act of 1964). (Public Law 88–426.)

Sales tax: H.R. 8451 amends District of Columbia Sales Tax Act to exempt sales of property (as by the Washington Terminal Co.) to carriers and used in "running" repairs of certain railroad equipment. (Public Law 88–564.)

Sales tax: H.R. 12371 exempts from the District of Columbia sales tax certain printing operations of the majority and minority rooms of the House of Representatives, established many years ago to perform printing services for Members of the House.

Scottish Rite of Freemasonry, United Supreme Council: H.R. 11652 exempts property of this charitable and benevolent organization from District of Columbia real estate taxes since the improvements to be constructed on such property will be used exclusively for charitable, religious and educational purposes. (Private Law 88–296.)

Secret Service: H.R. 9995 amends the District of Columbia Policemen and Firemen's Retirement Act to allow members of the U.S. Secret Service division credit toward retirement for their prior service with the Metropolitan Police, the U.S. Park Police, or the White House Police. (Public Law 88–476.)

Security dealers, regulation of: H.R. 9419 provides for the regulation of the business of selling securities and the licensing of persons engaged therein in the District of Columbia, similar to State "Blue-Sky" laws which regulate securities sales throughout the country. (Public Law 88–503.)

Shrine convention: House Joint Resolution 888 promulgates special regulations for the 91st Annual Convention of the Imperial Council, Ancient Arabic Order of the Nobles of the Mystic Shrine for North America, to be held in Washington in July 1965. (Public Law 88–386.)

Small Claims Act: S. 489 (H.R. 2696) amends the act of March 5, 1938, to correct an inconsistency between two provisions of law relating to actions in the small claims and conciliation branch of the court now designated the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions. (Public Law 88–85.)

Southeast Community Hospital: S. 2944 exempts the Greater Southeast Community Hospital Foundation, Inc., from District of Columbia real estate taxes on certain land conveyed to it by the U.S. Government, said organization being a charitable organization and the property in question being restricted for use by a charitable purpose, namely, a 400-bed facility serving the residents of southeast Washington and adjacent areas in Maryland. (Private Law 88–299.)

Teachers' pay: H.R. 12042 amends District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955 to give teachers an average pay increase of 5 percent. This was increased to 7 percent in conference between the two Houses on H.R. 12196. (Public Law 88–575.)

Transit development program: H.R. 8929, to authorize the National Capital Transportation Agency to undertake the construction of subways, rail rapid transit, commuter railroad, and related facilities for the mass transportation of persons within the District of Columbia and between the District and points in Montgomery and Prince Georges Counties, Md., and Arlington County, Va.

Unclaimed moneys in trust: S. 2054 (H.R. 8377) provides procedures whereby the District of Columbia government can be relieved after a period of 10 years of the administrative burden of maintaining unclaimed accounts of money that have been deposited in trust with an agency or department of the District government, totaling at present some $25,000. (Public Law 88–211.)

Unemployment Compensation Act of August 28, 1935: H.R. 6353 amends the same to require the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Board to advise the Department of Public Welfare whether an applicant for public assistance is eligible to receive unemployment compensation. (Public Law 88–514.)

Uniform Commercial Code: H.R. 5338 provides for the adoption by the District of Columbia of the Uniform Commercial Code already adopted in over 23 States. (Public Law 88–243.)

Woodrow Wilson House: H.R. 9975 exempts from all taxes the late President's home, now held in trust by the National Trust for Historic Preservation in the United States. (Public Law 88–470.)

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, what is conflict of interest? Members of Congress are expected to represent their constituents and I think it is fair that he serve the interest of industries in his congressional district. A Member would not be discharging his obligations if he did not represent his constituents in Washington. "But," asks the St. Louis Post-Dispatch editorially, "for pay? That is the question."

I think the House owes it to itself and to the people of the country to explore this subject. It could begin by approving House Resolution 770 introduced by the gentleman from New York [Mr. Miller] or House Resolution 896 which would create a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the allegations of conflict of interest in a specific case.

The editorial which appeared in the Post-Dispatch a few days ago follows:

Mr. Miller's Interests

Representative William E. Miller, of New York, the Republican vice-presidential nominee, says he has "consistently served the interests" of industries in his congressional district, which is fair enough. He was elected to represent his constituents and he would not be discharging his obligations if he did not take care of their interests in Washington.

But for pay? That is the question. Mr. Miller said on September 7 that he received a salary of $7,500 a year from the Lockport Felt Co. Last Saturday the New York Herald Tribune said that when he was an officer and director of the concern he had twice spoken on the floor of Congress against legislation that would have adversely affected the felt firm. On neither occasion (July 23, 1956, and February 4, 1958) did he reveal his interest in the company.

Senator Goldwater, the Republican presidential candidate, was reported by aids to feel there was no conflict of interest in Mr. Miller's business connections and his role as a Representative. Mr. Goldwater scorned the "baseless and infamous attacks" on Mr. Miller, apparently referring to a demand by Democratic National Chairman John Bailey for an investigation of whether "Mr. Miller is a Congressman or a paid lobbyist for a felt company."

It should not be too difficult for the public to make up its mind on the merits of the case, but we do not believe the outcome should have much bearing on Mr. Miller's qualifications to be Vice President. He had no qualifications to begin with. He was chosen by Mr. Goldwater as a reward for organizing Goldwater supporters while he was chairman of the Republican National Committee, and because "he drives Lyndon Johnson nuts." It is pretty hard to subtract from that.

CLOUDS ON THE ECONOMIC HORIZON

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, during any election campaign it is difficult to objectively and dispassionately examine the health of the Nation's economy. This year it appears impossible. The Johnson administration's political use of economic statistics to "prove" the strength and durability of the current economic expansion obscures the soft spots that are developing in the economy which may very well cause us serious trouble in the near future.

Yet, it is essential for the well-being of our country that the administration take off its rose-colored glasses and face some of the disturbing developments that are emerging. To ignore them throughout the political campaign, as the Johnson administration is disposed to do, might lead to an early recession next year with all the hardship and suffering that would mean in terms of lost jobs and incomes.

The current recovery is now 44 months long. At that advanced stage, it is particularly sensitive to setbacks. During the past week the newspapers have been filled with reports of developing economic problems that could trigger a sharp plunge into recession. Let me note them briefly.

The General Motors strike has idled 265,000 workers. A number of economists see the trend of auto sales as the key to the future health of the economy. There is no doubt that the auto strike threatens to depress industry sales. Before he strike, General Motors had been building about 17,000 cars a day. Estimates show that the strike is now costing the firm at least $35 million a day in sales. In addition, the purchasing power of the workers themselves is being cut sharply. The company has reported that its hourly wageworkers in the plants struck by the United Auto Workers are losing more than $7 million a day in wages. This could rise to $9 million a day as additional workers in General Motors parts plants are laid off as the company runs out of storage space for completed parts.

Because of the fear of a possible steel strike and also as a hedge against future price inflation, business is beginning to stockpile steel. According to the Wall Street Journal, the steel inventory buildup is "so diverse and broad that it could severely disrupt the economy, even if the United Steel Workers of America reach a peaceful settlement with the steel industry."

In other words, the buildup of steel stocks now may portend a disruptive shrinking of orders later on. In addition to the contractional effect that is experienced as holders of large steel inventories pare holdings later, the U.S. economy loses some business permanently during a big inventory buildup. More and more companies turn to foreign steel suppliers when domestic mills are unable to supply them.

The recent Chrysler wage settlement, which far exceeded the administration's wage-price guideposts, has planted the seeds of inflation and may stimulate an inventory buildup that goes far beyond that already being experienced in steel. It may also result in pressures for wage and fringe benefit increases in excess of the productivity guideposts by unions in industries with less ability than the auto industry to resist cost-push pressures.

The first sign of a renewed inflationary surge is already being seen in the trend of raw material prices. The index stands at 108.5 percent of the 1957–59 base, up sharply from 94.2 percent a year ago.

Another disturbing sign was the 7-percent drop in August from the level of last August in contracts for new construction. The construction contract index of F. W. Dodge Co. stood at 121 in August, down sharply from 132 a year earlier and down 18 percent from the December record of 148. The decline primarily reflects a further setback in housing activity.

The recent rise in home mortgage foreclosures is also prompting serious concern among economists. The Federal Home Loan Bank Board said recently that the ratio of home loan mortgage foreclosures by savings and loan associations rose from 1.29 per 1,000 in the first quarter of this year to 1.38 in the quarter ending June 30. This compares to 1.24 a year earlier and was the highest foreclosure ratio since the Board began the series about 2 years ago.

The Wall Street Journal recently reported that the foreclosure ratio on mortgages insured by the Federal Housing Administration rose to 3.47 in the June quarter from 3.43 in the March quarter and that the ratio for loans guaranteed by the Veterans' Administration increased to 2.07 from the previous quarter's 1.93. The ratio of conventional, or non-Government-backed mortgages, advanced to 1.17 from 1.08.

In a recent speech, C. C. Balderston, Vice Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, warned about dangers to the quality of credit. He said that the relaxation of mortgage terms has "perhaps not always" been within "bounds of prudence." Two areas of business debt that bear watching, he said, are the "apparent large growth" of debt by unincorporated businesses and debt on income producing properties including apartments, hotels, motels, and office buildings.

Other possible signs of trouble include the sharp increase in business failures. According to Dun and Bradstreet, business concerns were failing at a seasonally adjusted rate of 59.1 per 10,000 in August, up from 54.9 in July. It was the third consecutive monthly rise and it put the business failure figure at the highest level in the past year.

Another possible sign of trouble is in the trend of orders for machine tools, which is an important indicator of future economic activity. August orders for machine tools declined seasonally by 15 percent from the previous month's level. Factory orders also fell 5 percent in August from the July level.

At the same time as the economy is showing these signs of strain, there is new evidence that the chronic problems of high-level unemployment and balance-of-payments deficits are far from solved. For the second month in a row the seasonally adjusted unemployment rate rose in September and now stands at 5.2 percent of the civilian labor force. As for the balance-of-payments problem, the general glow of optimism that emanated from the administration in the first quarter was proved premature by a return to a deep deficit position in the second quarter.

These signs of possible trouble in the economy must be viewed in the context of the administration's deliberate plans for heating up the economy before the election in order to give the illusion of genuine prosperity. The administration's fiscal policy is now highly stimulative. It is resulting in a net outflow of Federal cash payments to the public during the last half of 1964 of nearly $12 billion. As pointed out recently by the U.S. News & World Report, that policy is expected to reverse course next year. During the first half of 1965, the Federal Government will be taking out of the economy nearly $8 billion more than it will be putting in.

Partly reflected in these figures is the fact that many taxpayers next spring will face abnormally high tax payments or receive smaller refunds than usual because of the administration's policy of cutting tax withholding rates this year more than the cut in 1964 liabilities.

Coming at a very advanced stage of the business cycle, at a time when the economy is already beginning to show sign of strain, this abrupt turn in fiscal policy is highly irresponsible. It could be devastating in its impact on the Nation's future economic health and stability.

It is high time that the administration discussed these issues fully and frankly with the American people and stopped playing politics with the economic well-being of the Nation's working men and women.

THE MATHIAS REPORT—4 YEARS OF ACTION IN CONGRESS

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, I believe that at the end of a session of Congress we have a particular responsibility to make available to the people of our districts a report on our trusteeship during service in the Congress. It is essential in a representative type of government that constituents should share as much of the thinking and as much of the reasoning and logic that have gone into action in the House of Representatives as is humanly possible.

At my request my staff has prepared a report of my activities during the last 4 years. The adjectives they have used are generous but the facts are accurate. I include this report to my constituents at this point in the RECORD.

THE MATHIAS REPORT—4 YEARS OF ACTION IN CONGRESS

MATHIAS BUILDS FOR THE FUTURE OF MARYLAND

Continuing service to the Sixth District

Congressman Mac Mathias is a man of action. He is a life-long resident of the Sixth Congressional District. He has been representing you in the U.S. House of Representatives for the last two terms. His record shows that these 4 years have been productive years. In the 88th Congress Mathias has strengthened and developed the foundations laid during his first term. Mathias' record is one of understanding and concern about the problems of the Sixth District, of Maryland, and of the United States. It is a record of conscientious planning and individual attention to the issues as they come before the Congress, and to the individual problems of the Sixth District as they developed. It is a record of responsible and responsive representation. This record was built by a man of experience, integrity, and personal knowledge of the people he represents. He's your man in the Nation's Capital. Let's keep him there. He gets things done.

Potomac River Basin

Mathias actively participates in the Potomac River Basin development, of vital importance to our area because of the need for flood control, open spaces, and economic development.

He—

1. Voted funds for the Army Corps of Engineers to make a study of the Potomac River Valley which resulted in the most comprehensive survey ever made of the river system.

2. Opposed any high dam on the Potomac east of Harpers Ferry (Seneca), favoring a series of small dams between Harpers Ferry and the sources which, with proper development, will preserve the scenic beauty of this historic valley and at the same time provide for the necessary economic benefits which are needed by both metropolitan and rural areas.

3. Fights for a plan for flood control, recreation, development, and conservation of municipal and industrial water supply, and pollution abatement, through legislative action, and cooperation and coordination with interested groups and officials in all levels of government—local, State, National.

This one illustration provides a small view of the record Mathias has compiled and of the job he is doing. The rest of this booklet is devoted to expanding that view and to showing why western Maryland can truly be proud of its Congressman—Mac Mathias.

MATHIAS: EXPERIENCE, REPRESENTATION, AND ACTION

Mac Mathias is a U.S. Congressman whose courage and integrity is evident in his several roles. As a Congressman, he is in fact three men: legislator, educator, and mediator.

I. As a legislator Mathias has experience at all levels of government—National, State, district, county, and city. He is completing his second term in the National Congress. He has served in the State legislature and as assistant attorney general of Maryland. He has served in county government and as city attorney of Frederick.

II. As an educator of his people through constant communication with them, Mathias is also their student. His exhaustive effort to keep in touch with his constituents helps him provide accurate representation for his district as he ascertains the needs and desires of the people and makes his actions and opinions known.

III. As a mediator between his constituents and the Federal Government, Mathias takes effective action on behalf of our district and of our Nation, always working for the best interests of both.

Mac Mathias plays all three roles as he meets with Government officials to point out the tremendous industrial potential and economic opportunities of western Maryland.

Mac Mathias means experience, representation, and action for Maryland as he testifies before the various House committees to request flood control and protection funds as in the case of the Bloomington Dam project, or speaks out for reorganization of the District of Columbia juvenile court system to bring about more efficient and expeditious handling of juvenile problems or rises on the floor of the House of Representatives to debate the issues that are a concern to all of our people.

In all these things Mathias is a dedicated and conscientious Representative of the Sixth District. Whether in a committee or on the floor, whether conferring informally or delivering a speech.

Mac Mathias speaks out boldly and acts decisively for Maryland.

I. MATHIAS: EXPERIENCE

Voting attendance

The most direct way for the voice of the people to be heard is through the participation and votes of their representatives. In the two Congresses—the 87th and 88th—in which he has served, Congressman Mathias has maintained a 92.4 percent voting attendance record. Whenever an absence was anticipated, Mathias' position on the issue was recorded. Congressman Mathias is making sure that the voice of his people is heard.

House committees

Much of a Congressman's work is done in the committees on which he serves. Mac Mathias is a member of the prestigious Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives. He is the only Washington metropolitan area Congressman serving on the District of Columbia Committee which has jurisdiction over the city of Washington. Since a large section of the Sixth District lies within the District of Columbia metropolitan complex, actions by the District of Columbia Committee are of great importance to these residents. Mathias' outstanding attendance record at committee sessions is one more indication that he is always on the spot where things are being done and that he is doing them.

Special committees

In the 87th Congress, Mathias was a member of the Republican policy committee special task force, Operation Employment, a group which had the responsibility of examining problems of persistent unemployment and forming a legislative program to effectively combat them. The Manpower Development and Training Act, which is providing funds for vocational education, was substantially the result of the work of this committee.

First-hand information

Mathias' education in liberal arts and in the legal profession, combined with his active participation in government at all levels and his on-the-job training as a farmer, make him especially qualified to deal with a variety of issues. Added to this background is his personal interest in history and a conscientious desire to be thoroughly informed on all matters which concern our country and our people. He likes to find out things for himself in addition to hearing and studying the reports of others. For this reason he often works late in his office or the Library of Congress, personally digging into the details of pending and potential legislation.

This same quest for first-hand information leads Congressman Mathias on personal fact-finding missions in the Sixth District, in the State, and in the Nation—wherever the facts may be found. It includes his personally conducted meetings with Sixth District farmers to discuss the state of the farm economy, the effects of the drought, or the use of farm chemicals such as heptachlor. It includes his traveling, literally, "down to the sea in ships" to gain first-hand knowledge about antisubmarine warfare, and to Iceland to gather information about the Greenland-Iceland-United Kingdom barrier, the northernmost extension of North America's distant early warning line—the DEW line—the lifeline of security to the North American Continent. It includes his flight over Cuban waters to check on anti-American activity in that area. It includes his inspection trips of the Potomac Valley, the C. & O. Canal, the Appalachia area, and tours of factories in the District for facts about the unemployment situation. It includes bus, train, and auto travel in metropolitan rush hours to be constantly informed on the shifting pattern of commuter problems.

Indeed, Mac Mathias is all business when it comes to doing his job. He realizes and understands the tremendous responsibility of a U.S. Congressman and he has the ability and experience to fulfill that responsibility.

II. MATHIAS: REPRESENTATION

In order to keep in touch with the people of the Sixth District Mathias maintains an extensive communications system which includes:

1. A periodic newsletter which discusses Mathias' position on important issues and has a current circulation of 25,000.

2. A weekly bulletin (Capitol Comment) discussing the past week's legislative actions or the activities of Government agencies that are of particular interest to his constituents.

3. A weekly news column which runs in most newspapers in the district.

4. A weekly taped news broadcast which is sent to all radio stations in the district, and carried by most.

5. Frequent interviews on radio and personal appearances on television news programs.

6. Frequent news releases to all communications media on issues before Congress and other subjects which concern the district.

7. Evenings, weekends, and during adjournment Mathias travels to all parts of his district, conferring with individuals, speaking before schools, church groups, civic clubs, and other community groups.

8. Maintains offices in the district in the post office buildings at Cumberland and Hagerstown for the convenience of constituents.

These means of communications together with the steady flow of mail to and from his office, make up a direct line between Mathias and his district. They furnish a continuous flow of information so that he is always aware of the feelings of his constituents. As a result, Mathias knows what the people want and need, and he works to see that it gets done.

III. MATHIAS: ACTION

Individual problems

Mathias has a sincere and continuing interest in the Sixth District and its people. He is ready to help any citizen who has a grievance, is wound up in redtape, or feels he is getting unfair treatment at the hands of some Federal authority. As a U.S. Congressman, Mathias has the power to intervene on their behalf, and if their cause is a just one, he does not rest until the matter has been settled.

For example:

1. Mathias and his staff have helped with the specific problems of more than 4,000 individuals—problems which have involved the Social Security Administration, the Veterans' Administration, the Immigration Service, the Bureau of Employees Compensation, the House and Home Finance Agency,

the Small Business Administration, and many other bureaus, agencies, and departments, of the Government.

2. Mathias and his staff have filled over 10,000 specific requests for information about Government activities and programs and requests for Government publications.

3. Mathias' district offices and a full-time district assistant are always available for immediate advice, consultation, and reference. This service along with his frequent tours of the district and his ready accessibility in Washington have proved to be an invaluable contribution to his representation of your interests.

Mathias always exerts a full effort to help his constituents. Here are a few excerpts from letters commenting on the work he is doing:

On a civil service retirement problem: "I wish to inform you that I have received my retirement refund from the U.S. Civil Service Retirement Division. I would also like to take this opportunity to render my sincere thanks for time and effort you have devoted to this matter."

On a Veterans' Administration problem: "I feel indebted to you for the time and effort devoted to my problem by your office. Although I realize I have imposed upon the time you need for important problems of Government, it is nevertheless reassuring to find that one's Congressman and all of the machinery of Government are available when a real grievance exists. Please accept my sincere thanks for all you have done in my case."

On a claim for disability insurance: "Everything has turned out O.K. I want to thank you for your effort and hope you have a long and happy career in your work and the good job you are doing as our Representative."

On a social security problem: "This is just a note to let you know I appreciate all you have done for me in behalf of my social security money. I started to receive my benefits March 19, 1964. Again I wish to thank you for your kindness."

From a serviceman's parents: "We are deeply indebted to you and your staff for your thoughtful suggestions and assistance at a time when the future of our son was hanging in the balance. Thank you again for your interest in our son's welfare."

On immigration and naturalization: "We have been very pleased to learn that the District Director of the Immigration Office at Baltimore, Md., has granted my husband a waiver on his exchange visitor visa. Kindly we thank you for the previous esteemed assistance that you gave us. It will remain a part of our best memories and present goals."

On an income tax problem: "I received my income tax refund and I would like to express my thanks for your action on my behalf. I am certain that your interest expedited my refund. Many thanks."

On an employment problem: "When I first wrote to you my husband and I were facing a future without a future and without hope. It sure makes both of us feel good to know that there is someone who is willing to help us help ourselves."

Development of Maryland potential

The national legislation Congressman Mathias has worked and voted for is vital to the continued economic and cultural development of Maryland and to expanded job opportunities for all of our citizens. This includes his work and votes for:

1. The tax cut bill of 1964.
2. Manpower Development and Retraining Act.
3. Area Redevelopment Act of 1961.
4. Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.
5. Appalachia program.
6. Trade Expansion Act.

(See legislation just mentioned under separate sections.)

In addition, Mathias' independent and conscientious leadership for Sixth District area legislation, and his personal efforts with local citizens and national officials to develop our full economic, job and educational potential include:

1. Sponsorship of Western Maryland Economic Conference in which all elements of the community were given the opportunity to express and discuss with their Congressman the economic problems of Western Maryland and to propose solutions, many of which have been incorporated into legislation. (See above listing of legislation.)

2. Fought for the authorization and appropriation of funds for the Bloomington Dam which aids in the overall development of the Potomac Valley and in the economic development of the Luke-Bloomington area in Allegany and Garret Counties.

3. Support and votes for the Federal highway programs—a Federal-State cooperative program to develop modern arteries for commerce and travel. Funds provided through this program have contributed to construction of Washington's spectacular beltway, easing commuters' problems. Easy access to major markets has been a problem for Western Maryland producers. Modern transportation arteries can solve that problem. In addition, the opportunities for the tourist-vacation-recreation industry in Western Maryland are unlimited. Easy access and modern highways will bring many people to our area and many dollars to our economy.

4. Support for and cooperation with the Maryland Port Authority, an important element in the growth of America's, and Maryland's export markets. Baltimore was the only port among the Nation's leading seaports to register an increase in oceangoing ship traffic during 1963. This means an increase in Western Maryland Railroad traffic.

5. Recognition of the particular problems of Sixth District agriculture and introduction of legislation to effect a remedy, including:

(a) Dairy farmers indemnity bill: To indemnify farmers whose markets are cut off as a result of some Government action for which the farmers are not themselves responsible, such as the case of heptachlor—a chemical recommended by the Department of Agriculture which resulted in the Public Health Service cutting off the milk market because its use caused substandard milk;

(b) Consolidated Home Administration Act amendment: To authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make economic disaster loans, as well as loans for natural farm disasters;

(c) A bill to eliminate the test of financial need as a prerequisite of sale of feed for livestock in emergency areas;

(d) A bill to provide additional drought disaster relief by reimbursement of one-half the cost of shipment of hay.

6. Votes for funds for special assistance to local school districts through federally impacted areas aid law. Communities throughout the district, particularly those of Montgomery and Frederick Counties, benefit by millions of dollars under this program due to the location of Federal personnel in the area.

(See also: Development of Potomac River Valley, p. 1; and sections on "Mathias Voting Record on Major Legislation." "Mathias: Legislative Action.")

IV. MATHIAS: RECORD ON MAJOR ISSUES AND LEGISLATION

Mathias is dedicated to the people he serves and the principles in which he believes. But a Congressman needs more than dedication in order to fulfill his responsibility and command respect; he must have courage and integrity. He must stand up for his principles and fight for what he believes to be right.

Mac Mathias is just such a man. He is not afraid to speak out boldly and to act decisively; he does not hesitate to stand up and fight for Maryland. His record is a vivid illustration of his principles and the independence and conscience with which he supports them.

Agriculture

As a farmer, Congressman Mac Mathias is keenly aware of the problems faced by those in agricultural pursuits. He believes that today's farmers are overregulated, overcontrolled, and underrewarded for their efforts and their contributions toward the good life that Americans lead.

Congressman Mac Mathias voted—

Against the Feed Grains Act of 1963 because he believed the program granted excessive power to the Secretary of Agriculture, restricting the farmer's voice in his own affairs, without realistically providing a means for the reduction of surplus feed grain commodities which was the announced object of the act.

For the bill to provide additional facilities at State agriculture experimental stations because substantial funds provided will go for research into the myriad agricultural problems confronting today's farmer.

Against the Cotton and Wheat Act and the Food Stamp Act because he believed these two major issues should have been considered separately in the interest of good legislation, and not as a political trade-off. The passage of such hastily contrived, loosely drawn and politically motivated legislation is seldom, if ever, in the national interest. Mathias believes both acts adversely affect agriculture, consumers, and the economy because—

(a) The food stamp bill, for which Mathias testified in the Agriculture Committee, had merit as originally conceived—on a Federal-State cooperative basis with States determining their needs and surplus food passing through normal retail channels rather than directly from Government warehouses—was politically subverted and the proper role (in fact, any role) of the States was withdrawn.

(b) The wheat-cotton bill was presented without the wheat section of the bill having been considered by the House under proper legislative procedure—with no opportunity for Members to offer amendments or consider changes.

(c) The wheat section of the bill amounted in substance to what had been overwhelmingly rejected by farmers in the wheat referendum of May 1964.

(d) The cotton section of the bill raises the price of cotton on the farm, lowers the price of cotton at the port of export to get it into oversea commerce, necessitating giving a subsidy to American textile manufacturers to equalize their position with that of oversea purchasers. This is a round-robin of ridiculous approaches to a serious problem, costly to the taxpayer and consumer and providing no real solution. A subsidy on a subsidy on a subsidy.

(Note.—For specific problems of Sixth District farmers and Mathias' proposed solution, see item 5.)

Department appropriations

Mathias voted for appropriations bills which provide funds for the operation of the Agriculture, Defense, Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare, State, Justice, Commerce, Treasury, and Post Office Departments in the executive branch of the Government, and the Judiciary.

The economy and job opportunities

Mathias believes our growth, prosperity and hopes of moving the country forward depend on the confidence of all our people—large and small, business and labor, producer and consumer—and their expectations for the future. Mathias believes the widest possible opportunity for achievement by the forces of private initiative must be maintained. He believes that instead of taxing away private investment the Government should exercise economy—and increase possibilities for the growth of our productive capacity. Specifically:

(a) MATHIAS voted for the tax cut of 1964. When the administration pledged itself to hold spending at the level of the previous year, an assurance against inflation, the tax cut took on real meaning, because—

1. It freed dollars for private investment and consumer spending, thus creating an expanded economic base which will produce more jobs and more revenue.
2. Opens tax sources for much needed local revenue enabling local governments to meet more of their own needs and reduce the necessity of turning to Washington for funds and solutions.
3. Puts more money into the pocket of the individual taxpayer.
4. Gives meaningful tax relief to small business, enhancing their chances for growth and development.

(b) MATHIAS voted against bills to raise the debt ceiling because ever-mounting deficit spending is dangerous. It creates inflation which is the robber of the fixed-wage earner. There are many useful programs in which the Government is and can be engaged, but which should be considered in order of need and priority and, except in cases of emergency, within the confines of anticipated revenue.

(c) MATHIAS voted for the Manpower Development and Retraining Act—as a member of the House Republican policy committee special task force Operation Employment, he helped write it—a program which goes to the heart of unemployment and underemployment by providing assistance in training and retraining the Nation's labor force to cope with the expanded job opportunities actually created by automation.

(d) MATHIAS voted for the Area Redevelopment Act—to provide assistance in the economic development of areas including sections of western Maryland, plagued with persistent unemployment.

Subsequent to the passage of the Area Redevelopment Act, Congress acted to supplement the provisions of the act and appropriate more funds for its operation.

When the act and its administration was reviewed by the Congress it was revealed that a majority of the funds appropriated under the act remained unallocated. Also, that of the funds allocated a substantial portion had been approved for projects that were not within the intent of Congress or the purview of the act.

Considering the Comptroller General's report, indicating sufficient funds, poor administration, and violation of congressional intent, MATHIAS' vote against additional ARA funds has been fully justified. He continues to work for the principle ARA was designed to accomplish, seeking to restore ARA to its proper, appropriate, and intended course.

(e) MATHIAS voted for the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964—to establish a Job Corps offering education, vocational training, and useful work experiences to young men and women; to authorize Federal grants for community action programs conducted by State, local, and private nonprofit agencies in the areas of employment, improvement of human performance, and motivation; to raise living standards of migrant workers; to offer a business incentive program administered by the Small Business Administration; and for other purposes.

In the course of debate on this bill, MATHIAS sought to amend and improve its quality. He voted for the Frelinghuysen substitute adding both more funds and more State participation. Failing in this attempt he voted for final passage because in his judgment it is people and not politics that are important. A section in this bill to indemnify dairy farmers is of critical economic importance to many Maryland communities.

(f) MATHIAS voted against the interest equalization tax—by imposing a tax on the purchase of foreign securities, this bill imposes a barrier on the flow of investment money for the first time in the history of the United States. The way to stop the flow of U.S. capital abroad, and thus improve our balance-of-payments problem, is to improve the freedom of investment—the creation of new jobs—in our own economic climate by preserving the integrity of the dollar and not by arbitrarily restraining investment abroad.

(g) MATHIAS voted for the Federal Aid Highway Act—authorizing appropriations for Government contributions to construction costs of primary and secondary State highways and city extensions and for road projects in national forests, parks, and Indian reservations.

Education

MATHIAS' record of support for education is demonstrative of his concern for a highly literate nation to meet the ever increasing demands of and on our society. He has worked and voted for:

(a) Aid for federally impacted areas (which includes a large portion of the Sixth District)—a program to relieve local communities of the burden imposed upon their school systems and tax structures by the location of tax-exempt Federal institutions and certain Government personnel within local school districts. MATHIAS cosponsored this law.

(b) Higher Education Facilities Act, including the National Defense Education Act—a program to provide low interest loans for students with particular attention given those engaged in the study of science, mathematics, engineering or modern foreign languages; to provide on a matching grant basis with States, funds for the purchase of equipment for use in teaching the subjects mentioned above; to provide certain fellowships; to provide for grants for construction of undergraduate academic facilities.

(c) Vocational Education Act—a program of assistance to States in teaching certain skills and trades—particularly useful to the developing needs of an increasingly automated society—at a below-college level.

(d) Health Professions Educational Assistance Act—provides construction grants to help build teaching facilities for medical, dental, pharmaceutical and nursing students. The act also authorizes establishment of student loan funds to finance educational expenses in those schools desiring to participate. MATHIAS cosponsored this law.

(e) Library Services Act—amending the 1956 Library Services Act—to extend Federal assistance to public libraries in urban, as well as rural, areas and to authorize matching Federal grants for construction of libraries.

Many of the provisions contained in the library services bill introduced in 1962 by Congressman MATHIAS are included in these amendments.

(f) Aid for training teachers of the deaf—makes available to children who are handicapped by deafness the specially trained teachers of the deaf needed to develop their abilities and makes available to individuals suffering speech and hearing impairments the specially trained speech pathologists and audiologists needed to help them overcome their handicaps. MATHIAS cosponsored this law.

Government employees

A major segment of our Sixth District population is involved in the daily work of carrying on our Government. Congressman MATHIAS is continually interested and concerned about the welfare of those in the Government service. He has:

(a) Fought for the right to a hearing for all Government employees threatened with suspension or discharge.

(b) Voted for the pay raise bill of 1964 which increases the salaries of Civil Service employees, postal employees, employees of the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration, and other Federal officials and raises the compensation schedules for Foreign Service Officers and employees.

MATHIAS believes it is inefficient, uneconomical, and unbusinesslike for the Federal Government to pay salary scales that are not comparable and competitive with those in private enterprise.

(c) Introduced legislation to liberalize the Hatch Act—allowing certain local political activities to be carried on by Federal employees.

(d) Introduced legislation to increase annuities under the Civil Service Retirement Act—to allow the naming of survivor annuitants after remarriage and to allow tax exemptions for disability annuities awarded under the Civil Service retirement program.

(e) Spoke out in the House of Representatives condemning threats made against job security and promotion of civil service employees who failed to make certain political contributions.

Individual liberty

MATHIAS believes that today we have a clear challenge before our generation to maintain the principles upon which the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution are founded. He is concerned by the increasingly difficult problem of applying the ideals of our Revolution to the complex, exploding world of the 20th century with its spectacular technology and changing social patterns. These ancient liberties which are the bedrock of American freedom must be defended with courage. MATHIAS has warned that every personal freedom guaranteed by the first amendment has been under serious attack within the past 4 years.

1. Personal Freedom

Congressman MATHIAS—

(a) Fought Government control of the right to organize charitable fund drives.

(b) Fought Government censorship of mail.

(c) Defended separation of church and state and is constantly on the alert to new threats to religious freedom and conviction.

(d) Protested legislative meddling in the judicial process by opposing the Tuck bill and in so doing helped sustain the bulwark of judicial protection for constitutional rights.

(e) Voted for legislation to provide a hearing for Government employees threatened with suspension or discharge.

2. Civil Rights

(a) MATHIAS sponsored moderate, constructive civil rights legislation, incorporated into the Civil Rights Act of 1964 for which he voted. This law implements constitutional provisions on civil rights. It provides for equal employment opportunities without regard to race, creed, or color; guarantees public accommodations in interstate commerce; strengthens voting rights, and more nearly secures for all Americans the full enjoyment of constitutional privileges and responsibilities.

(b) MATHIAS sponsored the so-called States rights amendment to the civil rights bill which guarantees States an appropriate opportunity to correct deprivation of constitutional rights before Federal officials intervene.

International affairs

MATHIAS upholds the constitutional concept that the direction of foreign policy is lodged in the executive branch of the Government. He has voted and acted to sustain this principle, believing that a President must be the architect of his administration's foreign policy. Mathias believes the President is answerable for foreign policy at the polls, that he is the only official in the Nation with access to the military, diplomatic, and economic information necessary to the formulation of foreign policy and that his unique responsibility for the conduct of foreign affairs should not be obscured by unnecessary legislative hobbles.

National defense

Mathias has supported, through his work and his votes, the best possible program for the strength of the United States and the free world. This includes his "yea" votes on—

1. Defense Department authorization and appropriations bills.
2. Military construction bills, and bills which authorize appropriations for aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for the Armed Forces.
3. Mutual security bills.
4. Space authorization and appropriations bills for the United States to conduct research and development in space exploration and conquest.
5. Extension of the National Defense Education Act.
6. Atomic Energy Commission appropriation bills.

Natural resources

In a day of ever-expanding metropolitan complexes, population explosion, water supply problems and generally increased human tensions, it is imperative that our natural resources be preserved and used as constructively as possible to the benefit of the spirit, the economy, and our overall development—as individuals and as a nation.

In the 88th Congress Mathias voted for—

The Public Works Appropriations Act which made appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the TVA, and certain river basin commissions.

The Flood Control and Navigation Act which provides for the construction of various new reservoirs and flood control projects, including the Bloomington Dam, and flood control facility at Kitzmiller.

The bill which provides for a 2-year program of improvements in 11 river basins and navigable streams, flood-control, and waterpower projects.

The Water Resources Research Act which provides for a 10-year program to finance water resources research centers at land-grant colleges and State universities and to encourage similar projects at other institutions.

The bill which provides for the development and coordination of Federal and State outdoor recreation plans through studies, research, and education programs under the guidance of the Secretary of the Interior.

The land and water conservation fund bill which will help to meet the tremendous expansion of demand for outdoor recreation space so badly needed now and in the immediate future.

The wilderness bill which establishes a national policy to preserve wilderness and sets up standards and guidelines for handling wilderness. The Constitution made Congress responsible for this country's wilderness lands; it is the purpose of the wilderness bill to meet this responsibility.

Mathias sponsored legislation to improve the C. & O. Canal and to make it a National Historical Park.

It is interesting to note that the 88th Congress, as a result of the enactment of these two major bills, has become known as the Conservation Congress.

Peace

Economic Conversion and Disarmament

Mathias works for peace. He believes that to insure peace our country must remain strong and secure, economically as well as militarily. Unemployment and poverty conditions are created, paradoxically, by the simple advance of progress, by the development of new tastes on the part of the consumer public, and by the changes in policy and needs within the Department of Defense. We talk of disarmament and look forward to the day when we can achieve disarmament and live in a peaceful world. Mathias has been critical of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency because it has not devoted more effort to a study of the economic consequences of disarmament. Mathias has been seated with the U.S. delegation at the United Nations during debate on the social and economic consequences of disarmament.

In the interest of preparedness for peace Mathias introduced a bill in the Congress to provide for a study of the consequences of disarmament on our economy and to provide new ways to achieve an economic conversion from a nation centering on defense industry to a nation centering on peaceful industrial enterprises. He believes there are many new areas in which we can go that will keep our country free and employed for generations to come. One example he cites is the new science of oceanography which has great promise and into which many of our present defense people could easily move with little or no adjustment or additional training.

Mathias believes we must work for multilateral (every nation) arms control and disarmament agency to achieve that end. He believes strongly, however, that disarmament and arms control must be multilateral, that unilateral disarmament would be suicidal.

Reapportionment

Fair and equal representation is essential to the preservation and enlargement of our ideal of democratic government in America.

In 1960 as a Frederick County member of the Maryland House of Delegates, Mac Mathias voted for house bill 55, proposing a constitutional convention to obtain fair representation by State action and avoid the necessity of Federal intervention in legislative apportionment.

He is the author of congressional redistricting bills, designed to bring about fair and equal representation in Washington.

He was the only Member of the U.S. Congress to testify before a State legislature in 1962 in favor of one man—one vote redistricting.

He has spoken extensively on this subject to many and various audiences, encouraging citizen participation in effecting an equitable solution to this problem.

He voted against depriving the courts of jurisdiction to hear citizens' complaints about unequal representation.

Social security and health

Mathias' concern and action in social security (not limited to the Social Security Act) and health care is well known. He has voted for or announced his position for:

1. The establishment of a temporary program of extended unemployment compensation.
2. The 1961 amendments to the Social Security Act, which increased the minimum benefits from $33 to $40 per month, and increased the benefits for aged widows.
3. The Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act, which is designed to prevent repetition of abuses in the administration of employees' benefit plans. Mac believes that employees have a right to a sense of security that their funds, which amount to billions of dollars each year, are honestly and prudently managed.
4. The Community Facilities Act of 1961, concerned with the well-being of our senior citizens. Mathias worked for the expansion and improvement of community nursing and hospital facilities and services for health care for the aged.
5. The amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, which raises the minimum wage over a 3-year period and which brings 3,642,000 additional employees under coverage of the act.
6. The Clean Air Act, an attempt to solve the health problems of polluted air.
7. The Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act of 1963, which provides grants for the construction of public and other nonprofit facilities for the mentally retarded. The act also authorizes a program of grants for training needed professional personnel to conduct education programs for children mentally retarded, seriously emotionally disturbed or physically handicapped.
8. The Health Professions Educational Assistance Act of 1963, which provides construction grants to help build teaching facilities for medical, dental, pharmaceutical, and nursing students. The act also authorizes the establishment of student loan funds in those schools of medicine, osteopathy, and dentistry which wish to take part.
9. The maternal and child health and mental retardation amendments of 1963, which increase aid to States for maternal and child health services and for crippled children's programs. The act also provides grants for maternity care and research projects to prevent mental retardation.
10. The social security amendment which liberalizes requirements of the Social Security Act regarding filing time for benefits under disability provision.
11. The hospital and medical facilities amendments which extend the Hill-Burton Act providing Federal aid for construction and modernization of hospitals, nursing homes, and other medical centers.
12. He sponsors legislation to remove old-age medical assistance from State welfare administration and to encourage States to administer the medical sections of the Kerr-Mills law—as a matter of health, rather than welfare. He favors expansion and further implementation of Federal-State programs as the most practical and helpful approach to the problem of health care.

Veterans and servicemen

Mathias voted or announced his position for—

The bill which increases payments to parents and children of veterans who died of service-connected disabilities.

The bill which increases payments to widows of veterans whose death was due to service-connected disabilities.

Education assistance to children of veterans with total and permanent service-connected disabilities.

The bill which extends disability income provisions of national service life insurance policies through age 65 under certain conditions.

A 5-year program of aid to States on a matching basis for nursing home facilities in State veteran homes.

H.R. 1927—Veterans pension liberalization bill: Improve non-service-connected pension program for veterans of World War I and World War II, by allowing new exclusions in income in determining pension eligibility. Wife's earned income may be excluded by the veteran in calculating his income. The 10-percent disability and unemployment requirement has been dropped by this bill, making it possible for veterans to receive pensions at age 65 if they had 90 days active service in war and, if single, do not earn more than $1,800 a year, or, if married, no more than $3,000, and were honorably discharged.

Washington metropolitan area

One-half of the people of the Sixth District live in the Washington metropolitan area and metropolitan problems have inestimable effect on them.

Mass transit is one of our most urgent problems. MAC MATHIAS, working through proper legislative and administrative channels, has pushed hard for improved bus service, to amend the Washington Area Transit Regulation Compact and to thaw the freeze on funds for more and better highways in our area. These items are not final solutions to our increasing and long-range transit problems.

MATHIAS favors and voted for a rapid rail transit system—the District of Columbia mass transit bill. When it failed to pass he introduced legislation calling for an immediate study of the WMA transit problem by the responsible Federal, State, and local authorities and directing the officials to propose intermediate solutions until rapid rail transit can be achieved.

MATHIAS opposed the much publicized Urban Mass Transit Act because it could not effectively meet the need of this area, an encroachment by the Federal Government into a problem that is 95 percent private enterprise and 95 percent exclusively a motorbus operation. A mass transit solution by the Federal Government for the WMA in cooperation with State and local agencies is appropriate because of the location here of the seat of Government.

MATHIAS has introduced legislation to create an Office of Community Development in the Executive Office of the President which will coordinate the many Federal programs with State and local efforts in housing, urban renewal, sewage, water, and air pollution and transportation.

MATHIAS has urged and continues to urge Maryland planning officials to set aside open spaces long in advance of urban development, to provide for future transportation facilities, watersheds for city water supplies, and adequate recreation facilities. He supports and votes for Federal legislation dealing with these same problems, and for Federal-State-local cooperative approaches to our growing needs.

MATHIAS voted for the Housing Act of 1964 (conference report) to fund new and existing housing and urban programs through 1965. Specifically, the law provides low interest loans to property owners in urban renewal areas to rehabilitate property and avoid total demolition and reconstruction; provides for needed additional public housing units; reforms sections of the basic Housing Act.

(See sections on the economy, natural resources, education, development of Potomac River Valley, MATHIAS: Legislative Action.)

MATHIAS: LEGISLATIVE ACTION

MAC MATHIAS is constantly working to provide the most effective legislation for the benefit of the Sixth District and of the entire country. Accordingly, he has introduced legislation which strengthens our existing laws and establishes new ones where they are urgently needed. In the 88th Congress, MATHIAS has introduced bills including the following:

Higher education bill: To provide income tax deductions for the cost of higher education.

Fire and Casualty Act: Amend to apply perjury statutes in the case of submission of false information in application.

Impacted areas bill: To provide for Federal assistance to schools affected by Federal activities.

District of Columbia delegate bill: To establish an Office of District of Columbia Delegate in the House of Representatives and for the election of the same.

Civil Rights Act: Amend the act of 1957.

Life insurance exemption: Exempt District of Columbia life insurance companies from regulations of loans on securities.

Federal salaries tax bill: To prohibit State taxation of nonresident Federal employees unless domiciliary State imposes it.

Annuitant designation bill: To permit annuitants under the Civil Service Retirement Act to elect supervisorship annuities upon remarriage.

C. & O. Canal bill: To establish a C. & O. National Park in the State of Maryland.

Medicare bill: To amend the Social Security Act to permit States to establish separate agencies for the administration of medical assistance to the aged. (Lifting it out of the welfare agency.)

District of Columbia crime bill: To authorize judicial officers to require giving of evidence concerning crimes committed in the District of Columbia and to hold on subpena for 6 hours.

Health professions bill: To increase opportunities for training of physicians, dentists and professional and public health officials.

Coal mine safety bill: To amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act to provide for further protection from coal mine accidents.

Maryland and Virginia fire protection: Amend the mutual aid fire protection program for Maryland, Virginia and the District of Columbia for the benefit of volunteer firemen.

Political activities bill: Amend the Hatch Act to prevent pernicious political activities and to permit certain part-time Federal employees to engage in special political activities.

Soil study bill: Provide for a study of soil uses, adjust wheat and feed production and establish a cropland retirement program.

Federal employment qualification bill: To modify application of the law regarding the disqualification of former officers and employees through former duties or official responsibilities.

Reapportionment bill: To require reapportionment of districts to achieve the same number of inhabitants. (One-man, one-vote.)

Water pollution bill: To amend the Federal Water Pollution Act to provide for the sealing off of abandoned mines to prevent pollution of the waterways.

Community development bill: To establish an Office of Community Development in the Executive Office of the President.

Star-Spangled Banner Committee (stamp bill): To provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the 150th anniversary of the Star-Spangled Banner.

Senior citizens outside income bill: To remove the limitation on the amount of outside income that can be earned while receiving social security benefits.

Residual oil bill: To impose quota limitations of the imports of foreign residual oil.

Arts committee bill: To establish a Citizens Committee on the Arts.

Amelung Glass Works bill: To provide for the inclusion of the Amelung Glass Works of Frederick County, Md., in the Registry of National Landmarks.

Monocacy Battle bill: To authorize the President to declare July 9, 1964, as Monocacy Battle Centennial Day.

Freedom of religion bill: To prohibit the interference with the free exercise of religion.

Cloud seeding bill: To provide for a study of weather modification activities.

Vice Presidential vacancy bill: Proposing an amendment to the Constitution providing for the selection of a new Vice President whenever there is a vacancy in the office.

Botanical Survey bill: To create a U.S. Botanical Survey and to study the effects of pesticides.

Insanity proceedings bill: To provide for insanity proceedings in the District of Columbia.

National Guard leave bill: To provide for leave of absence for the members of the National Guard who are officers or employees of the United States when called to Federal or State military service in aid of civil authority.

Federal employees pay raise bill: To adjust the rate of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government.

Economic conversion bill: To establish a National Economic Conversion Commission for study of economic results of disarmaments.

Railroad retirement bill: To repeal the provisions of the Railroad Retirement Act which reduced the annuities of spouses of retired employees by the amounts of social security benefits.

Civil Service retirement increase bill: To increase the annuities payable to certain annuitants from the civil service retirement and disability fund.

Dairy farmers indemnity bill: To pay indemnities to dairy farmers in certain cases of pesticide contamination.

Federal employees State service: To provide for the inclusion of certain State services rendered by Federal employees in the computation of civil service retirement.

Economic disaster relief bill: To provide for loans in the case of economic and scientific disasters.

Hay shipment bill: To provide for reimbursement for one-half the cost of hay shipment to disaster relief areas.

Financial need bill: To eliminate the test of financial need as a prerequisite for the sale of feed for livestock in emergency areas.

District of Columbia teachers bill: To increase annuities of District of Columbia teachers.

Bus tax bill: Granting consent of Congress to interstate compacts relating to the taxation of motor fuels consumed by interstate buses.

Highway safety bill: Grant consent of Congress to interstate compacts promoting highway safety.

Antitrust conference bill: To establish a Conference on Antitrust Laws for the purpose of evaluation and revision.

Laundry workers labor bill: To provide for the inclusion of certain laundry workers under the provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act.

Equal rights bill: To provide for equal rights for men and women.

Loyalty pledge bill: To prohibit the requirement of loyalty pledges for Agriculture Stabilization and Conservation Committee.

National anthem bill: To adopt a specific version of "The Star-Spangled Banner" as the national anthem.

Twenty-five private bills: For the relief of individuals in the Sixth District.

ACADEMY APPOINTMENT: MAC MATHIAS' IMPARTIAL SYSTEM FOR SELECTION OF FUTURE MILITARY OFFICERS

Congressman MATHIAS believes every young man in the Sixth District should be given an equal opportunity to compete for appointment to the U.S. service academies. Politics plays no part in the selection of candidates. The nominations are based on physical and intelligence tests together with recommendations of a nonpartisan service academies personal review board consisting of 10 prominent civic, military, and educational leaders from the Sixth District.

Every boy who desires an academy appointment and is a resident of the Sixth District may take a series of competitive examinations. The highest scorers, who are physically qualified, then appear before the personal review board for screening.

The review board considers the qualifications of leadership capacity and interest in the services as a career, along with physical qualifications and competitive examination scores. Their recommendations are then submitted to the academic boards of the respective academies, and they, in turn, make the final selection on the basis of merit.

The Mathias system of selection for academy appointments rates high in Washington. Its impartial process gives every applicant the same opportunity and maintains the high standards for admission which are a part of the service academy tradition.

MATHIAS LOOKS TO THE FUTURE

1. Medical assistance: MATHIAS believes that the miracles of medical science should be available to every American. He supports broad medical coverage, Federal research programs, tax relief for those with unusual medical expense.

He has introduced and will pursue legislation to remove present medical assistance programs from welfare administration. And he believes that eligibility limits for such assistance should not be lower than $3,500 per year for a couple over 65.

2. Education: MATHIAS believes that every American should receive the education that he merits. He supports aid to higher education and to specialized education for the deaf, the handicapped, and others. He supports impacted area funds. He proposes to broaden the National Defense Education Act to place greater emphasis on postgraduate teacher training.

3. Conservation: MATHIAS supports establishment of national parks such as the C. & O. Canal National Historical Park. He proposes a national soil study as set out in H.R. 6545 to provide a plan to conserve the soil of America. He proposes continuing policies of water pollution control and abatement.

4. Potomac River: MATHIAS advocates preservation of the scenic and historic values of the Potomac, conservation of the natural resources of the Potomac Valley and development of dams on the upper river and its tributaries to regulate the seasonal water levels.

5. Peace: MATHIAS supports the United Nations and adequate AID funds. He will push plans for peace and insist on a study of the economic effects of disarmament.

6. Agriculture: MATHIAS will press for abolition of all subsidies and controls in agriculture and the return to a free market. He will fight for a farm relief package which he has already introduced including: (a) The removal of "financial hardship" as a prerequisite to receiving disaster relief funds. (b) Indemnification of dairy farmers when markets are cut off as a result of Government action for which the farmers are not responsible. (c) Credit advancement from Federal sources in case of economic or scientific disasters, as well as natural farm disasters. (d) Provision for additional drought disaster relief.

7. Transportation: MATHIAS will fight for (1) a D.C. Rapid Transit System—the rail and subway system, (2) better buses and bus transportation, and (3) the end of delay in highway planning and construction.

8. Individual liberties: MATHIAS will alert the Nation to attempts made to curtail individual liberties such as censorship of mail, wiretapping, threat to separation of church and state, interference with freedom of assembly and freedom of the press.

9. Foreign policy: MATHIAS will uphold constitutional provisions for conduct of foreign policy. He will fight for realism in a consistent foreign policy with the security of the United States as the first consideration.

MATHIAS favors every penny of foreign aid that can be invested properly, efficiently, and with a prospect of a good return in promoting the interest of the United States.

MEET MAC MATHIAS

CHARLES MCC. MATHIAS, JR., brings a wide range of qualifications and experience to one of the most demanding of all jobs—U.S. Congressman. He is completing his second term in the U.S. House of Representatives, serving on two important House committees—the Judiciary Committee and the District of Columbia Committee. His record is a chronicle of personal achievement and public service, of independence and conscience, of integrity and conviction.

He was born in Frederick, Md., on July 24, 1922, attended the public schools of Frederick County, was graduated from the Frederick High School, and entered Haverford College. Mr. MATHIAS interrupted his college education to enlist in the Navy in World War II, served in the Pacific as a gunnery officer, completed his undergraduate studies at Haverford and Yale University, and received his law degree from the University of Maryland in 1949. Following admission to the Maryland bar, he joined his father in the practice of law in Frederick. Later he was admitted to the Supreme Court bar.

Prior to his election in November 1960 as Representative of the Sixth Congressional District of Maryland, Congressman MATHIAS had gained firsthand experience in all levels of government. On the local level he has been a precinct worker, State convention delegate, and assistant to the State chairman. He has been appointed or elected to the offices of assistant attorney general of Maryland, city attorney of Frederick, and delegate in the Maryland General Assembly. He was reelected to the U.S. House of Representatives in 1962 by the largest plurality ever given a Maryland Republican congressional candidate.

He has served as an officer of the Children's Aid Society of Frederick County; trustee of the Episcopal Free School and Orphan House; vestryman of Frederick's All Saint's Episcopal Church; president of the Historical Society of Frederick County; and officer of the Maryland State Junior Chamber of Commerce; and is on the executive committee of the Maryland Civil War Centennial Commission.

MATHIAS is married to the former Ann Hickling Bradford, of Cambridge, Mass. Mr. and Mrs. Mathias and their two young sons, Charlie age 5, and Robbie age 3, live on a small farm near Frederick.

Mr. MATHIAS is presently a lieutenant commander in the U.S. Naval Reserve.

His background as both a lawyer and a farmer and his hobby of historical study provide him with special qualifications to represent the Sixth Congressional District of Maryland which includes a combination of urban, rural, and metropolitan areas.

THE HONORABLE JOE M. KILGORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HARRIS). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 60 minutes.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have the privilege of extending their remarks on the services of the Honorable JOE M. KILGORE, about whom I expect to make some remarks today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the impending retirement of Representative JOE M. KILGORE, of the 15th District of Texas, from this House and from the national scene where his work has been so outstanding, represents a serious—and, if I may say so—a premature loss of an exemplary type of government leadership on the Federal level. The more than 500,000 people in the southern district of Texas whom Representative KILGORE so earnestly and so ably spoke for in this Chamber and in the debates and the deliberations of this body, will be hard put to find another legislator from their midst to replace him.

This is not only because, the gentleman from Texas, Representative KILGORE, had learned his way around this Chamber since his election to this body with the 84th Congress in 1954, but because of the innate character of the man. And however abundant the 15th District and Texas may be in political and legislative talent, men of the unique gifts that distinguish my fellow Texan are not to be found easily. There is special ground for melancholy reflection on the disappearance of this good man from our midst because JOE KILGORE, in spite of his decade and more of service among us, is only in his middle forties. From the standpoint of my own personal experience, this is the beginning of a career in politics and not the point for retirement, and it is for this reason that I hope the enthusiasm and the gratitude of the people of the State of Texas will find a reason for persuading him back into the field of political leadership and on as high a plateau of prestige and opportunity as this great State affords.

JOE KILGORE served with distinction on the House Armed Services Committee. And I, through my work with the Joint Committee on Defense Production, the Joint Economic Committee, the Banking and Currency Committee and my close association with him as a friend and fellow Texan, came to know somewhat intimately the nature of his contribution. Representative KILGORE had two qualities for which I happen to hold the highest respect and both of which I find of immense value in the work that engages us here in the House for the good of our country.

The first of these qualities was judgment.

I do not pretend to be a professional psychologist, but I insist that there is something in the judgment of a man on a combat mission, who is required on the instant to make decisions involving life or death, that somehow improves his judgment in matters remotely removed both from combat and physical courage. JOE KILGORE had served in the Mediterranean theater of operations as a combat pilot with the U.S. Air Corps. This, as we know, called for the highest order of human courage, and beyond that a judgment that could make or ruin a mission upon which many lives and strategic results depended.

Well, it has seemed to me as I sat with JOE KILGORE on problems before this House, that again and again, when it came to decision he had the cool judgment and the accuracy that brought about the best results for us all. I have no doubt that this judgment derived some strength and some wisdom from his experience both as a lawyer in Edinburg, Tex., and from his service in the Texas Legislature as chairman of the judiciary committee. For, as I evaluate Representative KILGORE's considerable talents, his judgment was invested with a kind of judicial good sense, and a tolerance of other people's points of view, so that he saw a problem from every perspective, some of them different from his own.

It has been my function to stand up in this place, it seems to me, too often in recent days to speak of colleagues who are retiring and leaving this Chamber and this is not a good sign from the viewpoint of the best interests of representative government. I have great faith in Texas and the products of her leadership. I know that the 15th District will send us good men and we will of course welcome them with our cooperation and our friendship. But I, for one, will miss Joe Kilgore no end and I look forward earnestly to seeing him—and quite soon—again in some high post of duty for the good of the public interest and his country. For men like Kilgore, who have fought for their country and put their very lives on the line, have a certain special quality that makes them exceptionally worthy of the public regard, and gives them a place in our hearts that stays with us forever.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to my colleague from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, change in the personnel of the Texas delegation is infrequent, and it is extremely unusual that we feel that a district could improve by making a change. Therefore, when a beloved Member retires from Congress as was the case in the 15th District 10 years ago this fall, most of us are prone to feel that the new man could never "measure up."

Any new man comes into our delegation under a handicap. Certainly, Joe Kilgore's predecessor—Hon. Lloyd Millard Bentsen, Jr., was—and is, highly respected, but Joe soon convinced all of us that we had received an unusual addition to our group. His background and experience was calculated to make him a valuable Congressman—a lawyer, one of the best in the valley—a soldier, one with a really outstanding record of leadership and personal bravery—a legislator, one with four terms of effective experience in the Texas House.

We knew his background and we welcomed him but we did not know his fascinating personality or his steel-trap mind. Since he has been one of us we have all come to know Joe Kilgore not only as one of the most pleasing men with whom we ever dealt, but also as one of the best informed and, above all, as one of the most dependable. He never refuses to face the facts. He knows the facts and he has that rare ability to analyze those facts and recognize the inevitable conclusion whether he likes that conclusion or not. In short, he is intellectually, as well as personally, honest.

Mr. Speaker, Joe Kilgore has the elements of greatness. He is returning to his home State undefeated to follow the practice of his profession. I have no doubt but what he and his family will find it stimulating and rewarding, but I also have no doubt that the people of Texas will again demand his services. If that should mean a return to Washington, I know of no one who will be more welcome.

Joe, to you and Jane and the boys, we wish you all every success and when, and if, this session adjourns and we all get back to Texas—come over and visit us. Frances and I will be looking for you.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Fisher].

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, it happens that I represent a district in Texas which joins the one so ably represented by our friend and colleague, Joe Kilgore. There are three districts in Texas which border Mexico. Joe represents one, I another, and our colleague, Ed Foreman, has the third district which includes El Paso.

These three districts, combined, represent about 1,000 miles of area along the Mexican border. Naturally there are many unique problems involved in representing the border area.

Joe Kilgore cast a long shadow up and down the Rio Grande. He is known from one end of that border to the other. There he is highly respected and revered. That appraisal of him exists not only in his own district and along the border, but throughout the State among all those who know him personally or by reputation.

Joe is an expert in many fields. Aside from being a capable legislator, who is dedicated to the public interest, he is a brilliant lawyer and a very personable individual. I doubt that there is any one man in Texas today who is potentially more promising and more capable of performance in the public service than is true of Joe Kilgore. Everyone who knows Joe likes him. Everyone who is familiar with his performance admires his energy and his qualities. It is most regrettable that a man of his stature and promise should leave, even temporarily, the public service. I wish to join with my colleagues in expressing that regret and in expressing the hope that this will indeed be a temporary lull in his public career. His district, the State of Texas, and indeed the entire Nation is desperately in need of men like Joe Kilgore today. I extend to him and his family my very best wishes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Thomas].

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, it is with deep regret on the part of all of us that we are going to lose our distinguished, beloved, and most capable colleague, Joe Kilgore. Joe Kilgore announced he is not running for reelection. Had he announced he was running he would be here just as long as he wanted to run. By any yardstick you want to measure Joe Kilgore, he is a good man, an outstanding man, a man that is away above the average in intelligence and in ability to get a job done. He is worth his weight, and I do not say that loosely. He fits his area like a glove fits the hand. He knows his people, he knows the economy of the area, and he has done a tremendous job. Anyway, it was his decision to leave. It was not forced on him. He did it freely. I am sure that is exactly what Joe and his lovely family want to do.

Joe Kilgore will always succeed in anything he undertakes and, as far as I am concerned, I want to wish him the best of everything. I hope he comes back to see us and visit us, and to give us of the Texas delegation the benefit of his good judgment and his good commonsense. He is amply supplied with both of them.

It is a great pleasure for me to join my Texas colleagues in commending Joe Kilgore in the fine things that have been said about him. They are well deserved.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Burleson].

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, it is with mixed emotions that I speak on this occasion, paying tribute to our beloved and distinguished colleague, Joe Kilgore. The one emotion is that the occasion must arise. I regret exceedingly that he is leaving Congress. He is doing so voluntarily. The regrets are many but aside from losing the daily association of a warm and generous friend is the fact that our State and our Nation will not have the leadership, yes, the statesmanship of this able and esteemed man. I know of no one who has rendered more devoted public service—fearlessly, unselfishly, with mature and honest judgment, than Joe Kilgore.

The second point in connection with his leaving is one I feel personally and is one to which I respond with deep emotion. This concerns the warm friendship and affection he has generated among his associates here in the House of Representatives. No man could be more loyal to his friends. He has that admirable trait of character which in earlier days was an expression in our part of the country in describing one who could always be implicitly trusted—"his word is as good as his bond"—and so it is with Joe Kilgore. No better guarantee could be had on anything than his word. As for myself, there is nothing in my thinking or my vocabulary, there is nothing to express a greater trust, a higher respect or an unqualified esteem than to be able to say this about any man. It can be said without reservation of Joe Kilgore.

Mr. Speaker, whatever the future may hold for Joe Kilgore, he can be assured he leaves this Congress with the confidence, the trust and genuine admiration of his many friends.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the day will not be far away when this fine man may be called back into public service—possibly into a higher and even more useful position.

He has richly earned and deserves the highest praise which can be expressed toward him, and it is my fervent hope that the rewards of faithfulness and dedication to right will accompany him, his lovely wife Jane, and their four children all the days ahead.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Rogers].

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, first I want to commend our fine dean for obtaining this time so we could pay our respects to a beloved colleague who is going back into private life, our fine friend and colleague from the lower Rio Grande Valley, the Honorable JOE KILGORE.

JOE has always done a wonderful job in anything he has undertaken. He was a great lawyer and a fine State legislator. When he came to Congress we all welcomed him because we knew him as a fine American and a fine patriot. Of course, he is not infallible. He is in much the same situation most of us are, he overmarried himself. His fine wife has been a great source of strength in what he has done in life. He and his wife and their four children, three boys and a girl, are a fine family and certainly are a great contribution to this Nation.

When JOE first came to this Congress I had known him for a long time. I welcomed him with open arms. I knew him as a man of integrity, one you could depend on, a religious man; one I thought would be a great colleague in the Congress of the United States.

We here in this body include among our colleagues so many different types of men, all fine Americans, coming from different areas. JOE hails from the Rio Grande Valley, one of the finest places in the United States. It has many fine men, but JOE stands head and shoulders above many and equal to the best. My association with him has always been rich and rewarding, something that I will keep in my memory.

There is one other thing I want to say about JOE before I quit that I think is a great tribute. He has maintained a wonderful office staff. He chose people who knew their business and worked with him. By doing this he has rendered a service to the people of this great area of Texas that I would say is second to none in the Nation.

I am sorry he has decided to go back into private life, and I wish for him, his wife, and children a very great future.

Mr. PATMAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT].

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I count it a great privilege to join with our colleagues in this round of well-deserved tributes to our friend and colleague JOE KILGORE. Like most of his colleagues, I deeply regret JOE's decision to leave this Chamber. I know that decision was not made lightly. It must have been an agonizing decision for him. Yet I rejoice with him, as I know all of the rest of us do, in his return to his native State, so beloved by him. We hope for him and his splendid family many fruitful and happy years ahead.

We will be denied the great services that he has brought to this body, yet I have a feeling that the keen intellect and the indefatigable energy that have characterized the services of JOE KILGORE all his life will not be denied to the United States. Certainly he still will maintain that great interest that always has been his in the future of America. Surely JOE KILGORE will be available to serve his country in whatever capacity the future may have in store.

I count as one of the rich and rewarding experiences in my life the privilege of knowing and working with JOE KILGORE. I first met JOE and came to know and appreciate him when we were students at the University of Texas. He was an upper classman of mine. I early developed an intense admiration and respect for his ability, for his intellect, and for his deep sincerity.

To some degree, our careers have paralleled, and I have come to know and appreciate him more as the years have passed. JOE KILGORE and I both left the University of Texas to serve in the Army Air Corps. JOE performed truly distinguished service to our Nation in its time of great need, as attested by the awards conferred upon him for his combat command of B-24 units.

Then in 1947 I had the privilege of meeting JOE again when we both were freshmen members of the Texas Legislature. JOE KILGORE soon developed the legislative skills which made him a real leader in that body. He developed the reputation of a man whose word is his bond. That rare quality of intellectual honesty is present in him to an unusual degree.

Again in 1955 JOE and I came together as freshmen to the U.S. House of Representatives. In the 10 years that have intervened I have developed an even richer and even fuller and even more dedicated admiration for this man. I know JOE KILGORE as a man of character and a man of courage. I know him as a man of intelligence and a man of integrity.

In this body of men, described by our late beloved Speaker, Sam Rayburn, as the most critical jury in the world, I think it significant that JOE KILGORE has maintained the universal respect of all his colleagues. There is absolutely none of the phony in JOE KILGORE. He is exactly what he purports to be. He is a man of humility and a man of great sincerity. Yet beneath these qualities JOE KILGORE is undoubtedly one of the ablest men it has ever been my privilege to know in any capacity anywhere.

So, JOE, we your colleagues wish for you wherever you go,

Sunshine on your windowpane each morning.

The song of a bird in your treetop each evening.

Work for your able hands.

A straight path for your feet.

Hands of friends upon your latchstring.

Happiness at your hearthside.

And God's blessing to you and yours always.

Mr. PATMAN. Thank you, sir.

I now yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ROBERTS].

Mr. ROBERTS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege to know JOE KILGORE since he was a freshman member of the Texas House of Representatives, where he served with outstanding credit to himself and to the State. During his tenure in the Texas Legislature he served as chairman of the important house judiciary committee.

JOE KILGORE started his service to his country almost before he was grown. He left the University of Texas in 1941 to volunteer for the U.S. Air Corps. As a combat bomber pilot in the European Theater of Operations he earned the Silver Star, the Distinguished Flying Cross, the Air Medal with two Oak Leaf Clusters, and numerous other unit and personal citations. He still holds a commission as a colonel in the U.S. Air Force.

The best public relations job that JOE KILGORE ever did was to persuade Miss Jane Redmond to become Mrs. Kilgore. They have three grown sons and a daughter.

While JOE KILGORE is moving to Austin, the State capital, to pursue a private law practice, he need not think the citizens of Texas will agree to lose him from the theater of public service. His experience is too great and his integrity too well known for the citizens of the State of Texas to allow him to withdraw into private life.

The people of the 15th Congressional District think so much of JOE KILGORE that they allowed him to do something that probably none of us will be privileged to do. They have selected as his successor an outstanding young man recommended to them by their present Congressman, JOE KILGORE. I cannot think of a higher tribute to any Member of Congress.

He has been my friend. He is an able spokesman for his State and for his Nation and I shall miss him.

Mr. Speaker, all of us wish him good luck and Godspeed and the best of everything to JOE KILGORE.

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. YOUNG].

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, among the many wonderful pleasures in serving in the capacity of a Member of Congress there is one sad occasion, and that is when we have to say "goodbye" to an esteemed Member who has chosen to pursue another path in life.

I want to thank the dean of our delegation for securing this time so that those of us who are present can say a word of parting to our dear friend and colleague, Congressman JOE KILGORE, of McAllen, Tex.

I have known Congressman KILGORE not as long as some of my colleagues have, but during the period I have known him I have known him well and have had the privilege of serving in a district adjacent to his, which coincides with his by common boundary for many miles. Therefore I feel I can speak with some authority when I speak of the great affection the people of JOE KILGORE's district have for JOE KILGORE. It is a well-earned affection.

I have many, many mutual friends with JOE KILGORE, in his 15th Congressional District, and I can say without equivocation that without exception the many people I know in JOE KILGORE's district have a rare recognition of the great work he has done for that district, of his sincerity, of his great loyalty, and of his deep devotion to the duty they gave him when they sent him to the Congress of the United States.

I know that JOE KILGORE could serve in the House of Representatives for as long as he was willing to serve, because I know the people in his district would continue to send him to the House of Representatives for as long as he would serve.

I join my colleagues in wishing Joe well in his new pursuit. I know he will do well in the practice of law or in any other course he chooses, because Joe is put together that way. But that does not lessen the sadness we all feel when we realize that the Texas delegation, the House of Representatives, and we, ourselves, will be deprived of the benefit of having association with a man of the caliber of Joe Kilgore.

Mr. Speaker, it is with a saddened heart that I say at this time farewell to Joe Kilgore and to his lovely wife and his wonderful family. We all wish them well.

Mr. PATMAN. I thank the gentleman. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Mahon].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the dean of the Texas delegation has asked for this time in which to pay tribute to the great work and character of one of our favorite colleagues, the gentleman from Texas, Joe Kilgore.

Never in my service here have I encountered a man of higher character or nobler sentiments than the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. Kilgore]. He has done a good job for his district, for our State, and for the Nation, and he deserves the gratitude of the people for it.

He had a fine career before he came here, and I predict that in the days to come he will continue to have a fine career of service to his fellow man.

I join with others in saluting this outstanding Texan, my friend, Joe Kilgore.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Pickle].

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, since our University of Texas days, Joe Kilgore and I have been strong friends. It seems like I have known him forever—indeed there has not been a time in the last 30 years that we have been separated for long and even then we kept in close touch.

During our University of Texas days he was an outstanding student leader in the classroom and on the campus. He was so popular he missed being student president on a campus of nearly 10,000 students by only a dozen votes—and mine. His law fraternity—Delta Theta Phi—had elected three men president of the student body immediately prior to his candidacy and even then under such odds, Joe staged such a campaign that he was edged by only a dozen votes.

His home was McAllen, Tex., where his father was engaged in the citrus canning business. In those days on the campus he used to say he was promoting the valley, or in his words, his actions were "for the good of the industry."

It was my pleasure to be in touch with the legislature during those days and I can say that the gentleman from Texas, Joe Kilgore was considered the ablest man in that body. He handled more important legislation and passed more important legislation than any other person during that period. Whenever there was "heavy lifting" to be done, the gentleman from Texas, Joe Kilgore was the man who was given that assignment.

His handling of the mike—or snorting pole, as we called it—on the floor of the Texas House was a thing of beauty and joy forever. He knew what to say, when to say it, and when to ask for the vote—and like any successful salesman—then and later—he knew that when he had made a sale it was time to quit.

For, Amigo Joe was more than a personality—he was a delighted institution.

Joe Kilgore volunteered for the Air Corps in 1941 and was trained as a heavy bomber pilot. When war came, Joe Kilgore was immediately sent as a heavy bomber pilot and participated in the first raids on Tobruk, Bengasi, Greece, and Crete and commanded the second American raid on Naples, Italy, in December of 1942. While serving overseas, he participated in 30 aerial misisons and has been credited with 300 combat hours in the European-African-Middle Eastern theater, distinguishing himself as both pilot and officer. One of the most highly decorated Members of Congress, Kilgore was awarded the Silver Star, Distinguished Flying Cross, Air Medal with two Oak Leaf Clusters, and several unit and personal citations. Active in the Air Force Reserve, he holds a commission as a colonel.

The following letter is one example of his heroism and courage:

April 25, 1963.

Hon. Joe M. Kilgore,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Kilgore: This is a letter of inquiry. For sometime, now, I have wondered if you are the same Joe Kilgore that prevented Italian fighters from killing 10 of your squadron mates over Naples, December 11, 1942?

On that memorable date, B-24's of the 98th Bomb Group hit Naples Harbor late in the afternoon. One Lieutenant Bacon saw the heavy flak over the target, peeled off and unloaded his bombs on the city. Next in line, we went over the target, but had no one to assemble on. Italian fighters hit us, causing us to lose two starboard engines and wounding three on board.

I was told, later, by Dan Storey, who joined us in the Italian PW camp, that it was you who left your own formation and slid over to us to prevent the fighters from killing all of us.

To this tall Texan, wherever he might be, I have wanted to give him my personal thanks.

Yours truly,

Charles L. Jennette.

After the war, Joe Kilgore soon became a prominent lawyer in the valley and it was only natural that his people would elect him as a member of the Texas Legislature, where he served for 8 years with great distinction, became chairman of the house judiciary committee.

So successful was he that inevitably he was elected to the Congress of the United States with the help of many strong friends and the special help of his black-eyed, vivacious, and lovely wife, Jane.

As a Member of the Congress again he was in a special position to help the valley "for the good of the industry."

It would be superfluous for me as a freshman Member of this great body to relate to you the outstanding service of Joe Kilgore in the House.

All of you have noticed for 10 years the smooth performance of this black-haired, silver-tongued, distinguished gentleman.

He served with great recognition on the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, on which I am now privileged to serve, and the members of that committee tell me over and over again that Joe was one of the ablest men who ever served on that powerful committee.

For the past 2 years he has served on the Armed Services Committee—a committee for which he is especially qualified and in whose activities he has been keenly interested as an Air Force officer and as one of the best informed men on military matters in the House of Representatives.

On both of these committees and in his other dealings, Joe Kilgore was far more than the representative of the 15th Congressional District. His acquaintance was statewide, and his quiet competence was so recognized, his dedication so sincere that Joe Kilgore has become both a Congressman and a Senator at Large to thousands of Texans.

Because of his willingness to help, he works longer hours than anyone on the Hill—and long after most of us have gone home, the lights in Joe Kilgore's office are still burning. This has been at a great sacrifice because Joe Kilgore intensely loves his wife and four lovely children. No family in America is closer than this one group and it is a mark of great honor that a family man of this high caliber would be still so dedicated to his duties as a Congressman. This has meant a personal sacrifice, but Joe has given it because of his high sense of duty.

When Joe decided to retire this year, he had earned the respect of every person in this country and was entitled to easier days. Yet, even to this hour Joe Kilgore—and his excellent staff—is at work first and is still working late serving his people.

These are achievements, but all this is not the real story of Joe Kilgore. The real story of Amigo Joe is found in the warmth and the cordiality of the individual. He is closer than a brother to most members of our delegation. His always pleasant personality, his deep laugh, his great and abiding sense of humor to relate stories on himself, his friends, and his times, has made him a leader and a rallying point in our delegation and in this Congress. Always, he has been Gentleman Joe, possessed of more important legislative facts and figures than anyone in Congress—with the possible exception of our own colleague, the inimitable Bob Poage.

No man will ever stride down the aisles of this House who is held in higher esteem than Joe Kilgore. How we will miss him.

Let me conclude by saying this—here is a man possessed with the capabilities, the character, the integrity, the judgment, and the poise to serve as a Congressman, a U.S. Senator, the Governor of his State, a Cabinet officer, or President of the United States.

He anticipates practicing law in my home town of Austin, Tex., and the people of Austin and central Texas already know how fortunate we are to have this great man in our midst.

As we say "hasta la vista" to Amigo JOE, we also say to ourselves and to the Nation that JOE KILGORE's career is still just beginning.

At this time we convey to him in the words of his beloved Southwest: "salud y pesetas y mucho tiempo para gustarlas."

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the minority leader.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I am happy on this occasion to add my word of praise and tribute to a great Texan, JOE KILGORE. The only thing bad about him that I can say is that he should have come from Indiana, but since he chose to come from Texas we salute him as a great Texan, and as a great Member of this body whom we shall all miss.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS].

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I am very glad to join the Texas delegation and my other colleagues in the House in paying tribute to the services of my good friend, our beloved colleague, JOE KILGORE. It is with mixed feelings that I take the occasion to join in this tribute to our colleague because he talked to me about his voluntary retirement from this Congress and what he hopes to accomplish and expects to do in the future; but at the same time I know he goes with regret that he will not be back with us. I know we shall miss him and we regret to see him leave.

JOE was a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. I, as chairman of that committee, have had the privilege of serving with him and observing the work that he accomplished.

I want to say that I think JOE KILGORE is one of the finest Americans and one of the greatest Texans that I have had the honor and the privilege to serve with in this House. I regretted to see him leave our committee as we all regret to see him leave the House.

We wish him well, and to him and Jane go our best wishes for many, many more years of happiness and good health.

Mr. PATMAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. BLATNIK. I thank my friend, the distinguished dean of the Texas delegation, for yielding to me at this time.

Mr. Speaker, obviously it is most proper and understandable and certainly appropriate that eulogies, commendations, and the fine statements made by his fellow colleagues from the great State of Texas of JOE KILGORE be said as have been said so effectively and with such meaning.

Mr. Speaker, I thought perhaps it would be very appropriate that also those who come from other States, the North, the South, the East, and the West who have had occasion to serve with JOE KILGORE on the House Public Works Committee add to the remarks which have been made in his behalf.

Mr. Speaker, it has been a real pleasure and a real opportunity to serve with JOE KILGORE on the Committee on Public Works. We served with this fine young man when he first came to Congress, a young man with an earnest and keen mind, quiet spoken, yet very effective and certainly a respected Congressman. JOE KILGORE has a sort of delicate and considerate humor which portrays a deep personal warmth.

Mr. Speaker, it did not take long before all of us had not only the highest regard and deepest affection for our coworker on the House Public Works Committee, but a great respect for his effective and diligent work, certainly in behalf of his own district and his State, but also because of his deep interest and concern for problems wherever they were throughout the country.

Particularly do I personally want to express to the Members of the House what my association with JOE KILGORE has meant to me. The good fortune has been mine not only to work with one of the finest Members of the House, but to develop a warm friendship which I know shall last as long as we live.

Mr. Speaker, I am personally grateful for that opportunity. But above all, I believe it can be safely said that JOE KILGORE has set standards of public service and dedication and devotion to duty far beyond the call of duty, and has set standards of personal conduct, standards of not only consideration of others but in a sense compassion for the rights and the feelings of others, standards of the highest order, which I do feel can well serve to be a source of constant guidance and inspiration to all of us.

Mr. Speaker, JOE KILGORE has left with me a deep and lasting impression which I shall always cherish. I join his many friends in wishing him and his gracious and charming wife, continued success, contentment, and good health in abundance.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished majority leader from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished dean of the Texas delegation for yielding to me. I appreciate the fact he has taken this time to pay tribute to a young man who has served with distinction for several years in this House.

JOE KILGORE has been a very effective Member of the House of Representatives. He is a man of deep understanding, a man of great ability and knowledge. He knows what is going on.

I had the honor of serving in the Democratic whip organization with JOE KILGORE. He presided over the largest whip zone in the United States within the Democratic Party in this House, the great State of Texas. He performed his functions with efficiency and with dispatch. Speaker Rayburn many times told me that JOE was one of the best whips he had ever known. His service as a member of the Democratic whip organization was characteristic of his fine service on his committee and in the House itself.

I shall miss JOE. I regret that he has decided to retire. He is one of those young men who could remain in Congress, had he decided to do so, for many years to come.

I do of course at this time extend to him my personal best wishes for health, happiness, and prosperity. I am sure that wherever he is or whatever he does he will continue his devoted service to his fellow men.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, I was indeed unhappy that my very good friend and colleague, JOE KILGORE, decided not to run again, for our warm friendship has extended from our early days in the State legislature, and my admiration for him as a servant of the people has grown through the years.

Most of JOE KILGORE's life has been devoted to the service of the people of this great country. He served with great distinction as a pilot in World War II, setting an excellent example not only for the men who served under him, but also adding to the traditions of excellent and dedicated service that have been the history of the Air Corps. Upon his return from service he offered himself as a representative in the Texas Legislature, and again his service was exemplary, and that which set an example for his colleagues and those to follow. When he sought membership in this body his constituents unhesitatingly sent him here, and I think every Member of this House will agree that again he discharged his duties and conducted himself in an exemplary manner in representing his district, his State, and his Nation with intelligence and vigor.

You only need to visit his home once to realize that this high standard of conduct is evident in his role as husband and father, and I share with many others on the floor of this House a feeling of deep regret that JOE has seen fit not to offer his services again. But I am confident that whatever endeavor JOE chooses to follow upon adjournment of this body that he again will be a tremendous success and an asset to the community and the area in which he resides.

The House has been fortunate, and I have been fortunate, to have as a friend this great lawyer, soldier, and statesman, JOE KILGORE.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in paying my heartfelt respect to JOE KILGORE. I have enjoyed my service with him. He has the universal respect of all who serve with him. He is known as a man of great ability and very high character. No man could have a greater recommendation or enjoy a greater respect. I know I am better for having been associated with him. As he leaves the House, and as I leave it, I wish him the best of everything. I know that a fine future lies before him.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, the retirement of the Honorable JOE KILGORE is one which must be met with mixed emotions. On the one hand it gives me a chance to say how much I think of him as a Representative of Texas, as an outstanding legislator, and as a friend. On the other hand, it is difficult to believe that the Congress will be without the services of such an outstanding American.

I want to say to Joe Kilgore that he has been the kind of friend and advisor that I needed as a new Congressman. His dedication to his job has been an example for all of us. His judgment and thinking about legislation have been indispensable to our country. The leadership he has provided in the Congress will be sorely missed.

We who know him realize, however, that his interest and concern about public affairs will lead him to other areas of public service and our country will continue to benefit from his abilities and leadership.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, the district of Representative Kilgore, the State of Texas, and the Nation have lost immeasurably because of the voluntary retirement from Congress of Representative Joe Kilgore. In my opinion, Joe is an ideal Member of Congress. He is able, effective and unusually well informed. Because he has the perfect personality to succeed in legislative work, his success truly has been great. He long will be remembered by each Member of the Texas delegation and all the colleagues with whom he has served.

We all know Joe is an outstanding attorney. Long ago he evidenced the capacity to do unusually well in the field of law. We know he will do well in this field or any other field of endeavor he follows.

My family and I and all of us wish for him and his splendid and outstanding family every success and happiness in the future.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, many fine tributes are being accorded our friend and colleague Joe Kilgore today as he prepares to depart from Congress. He deserves every bit of it. I deem it a high honor to know him and count him as my friend. It is a personal privilege to express my own high esteem for the gentleman from Texas.

I well remember, it was 10 short years ago, that the gentleman from McAllen stepped into his role as Congressman for the people of the 15th District of Texas. The choice of the people of his district was destined to become an important figure in a continuing fight for the honest and sound principles of constitutional government, which are dear to the hearts of the people who chose him as their Congressman. His stature was quickly recognized, even as a freshman. The majority was not always with Joe Kilgore in the things he stood for; Joe Kilgore was not always on the side of some of the political giants that stood here in this chamber; but this courageous Texan stood on his belief and his conscience and never wavered from the stand he thought was right. But most important of all, I sincerely believe that he was not only voting his conscience, but he also knew he was voting for his country, and for the good of the people, whom he represented. His debt was to the people of his Nation, his State, and district and he never forgot it.

It is easy to see that Joe Kilgore, time after time, put his country above his political and personal life. His statesmanship made his political tenets a personal fight because of his love of God and what he believes to be right.

Without reservation, I consider him as capable as any man in this House of Representatives. He can look back on his 10 years in Congress and take just pride in his legislative accomplishments which have so tremendously benefited so many Americans. His district is justly proud of his service. He has greatly contributed to our society.

As he returns to private life, it is with the knowledge of a job well done. The United States of America is the loser for his retirement, but will continue to have the benefit of his interest and wisdom.

History will record our words, just as it will record the honest 10-year record of Joe Kilgore—an imprint that cannot be washed away. I join in extending to him every good wish for happiness and continued success in his return to private life, but want him to know that he will leave among us here in the House, a void that will be difficult to fill. He will always be remembered as a conscientious fighter for constitutional government. May his tribe increase.

I cannot forget to express our thanks to Mrs. Kilgore for sharing Joe with us. Jane is as gracious and lovely a person as it was ever our privilege to know, and J.D. and I want her to know we will miss her, and the handsome children. So Joe and Jane, J.D. and I wish you well, and may our paths cross many times in the future.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as this session of Congress draws to a close I realize with sadness that our distinguished colleague and my close personal friend, the Honorable Joe Kilgore, is concluding his service in the House of Representatives.

Joe Kilgore served in the Texas Legislature with distinction for four terms as chairman of the judiciary committee of the Texas House of Representatives and he has served with distinction in the U.S. Congress since the 84th Congress.

Joe Kilgore's philosophy of government, in my opinion, is completely sound. I have never known him to react to any situation through distrust or prejudice. He is a friendly and compassionate person, but he retains a commonsense, businesslike application to the affairs of government. He is not a person who is happy about spending money which we do not have. He is not the type of person who will compromise principle in the face of pressure or for the sake of gaining temporary popularity with some pressure group. He is an individual who has had the courage of voting his convictions, even though it would have been more pleasant at times to vote the other way.

Joe Kilgore was a combat pilot in the U.S. Army Air Corps during World War II and has retained his interest in the Armed Forces and the preparedness of the United States, and in recent years he has served with distinction on the Armed Services Committee.

Joe Kilgore has represented a unique district. It has a deepwater port, it has 350 miles of common border with Mexico. It has a large Latin American population and it is the location of extremely important citrus and vegetable producing areas. Joe Kilgore has made outstanding contribution through his leadership in resolving problems with Mexico regarding disposition and use of the waters of the Rio Grande. He has done all of the things that all of us try to do to see that his district receives its fair share of Federal participation projects, such as National Guard armories, Federal buildings, post offices, military installations and similar Federal activities.

I regret very much that Joe Kilgore will not be serving in the next Congress. As I think back over his service and our years of friendship, I believe the best way to characterize my feelings toward him is to say that he is the kind of Congressman that I would like to have represent me.

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues today in paying tribute to my good friend and neighbor, the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. Joe Kilgore] upon his retirement from Congress. He has served our great State of Texas and our Nation long and well. I am honored and pleased to have served in this Congress with him. We wish him much success and happiness in his future.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, old friends view the retirement of a beloved colleague with mixed emotions.

Joe Kilgore has made us a real fine hand. He has been a good and faithful representative of his people; and he has made his mark as he has labored among us.

We hate to lose him; and yet, no one can begrudge him a life which will be closer to his family and to his home than the life of a Member of Congress could possibly be.

Joe has not disclosed his plans to me, but I am sure that wherever he goes and whatever he does he will be as successful as he has been here in Washington. Perhaps he will stay at home and practice law. Perhaps he has other political ideas.

Whatever his choice, he takes with him the best wishes of all of us who have been associated with him.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, it was with much regret that I learned some months ago of the decision of our friend and colleague, Hon. Joe Kilgore, not to seek reelection. Few young men who have come to this House and remained such a short time during my more than 30 years in this body have made a more lasting impression upon me. His virtues and marks of strong character have imprinted themselves in this body.

Possibly outstanding among other characteristics has been the creation of the image of a sound conservative statesman. In his service here he has always placed the welfare of his country above his party or personal ambition. He has done this in an atmosphere where the popular thing is to play the game. Political courage rather than political expediency has been his hallmark of service in this body.

Mr. Speaker, I join with Joe Kilgore's many friends in this House in wishing for him the best of everything as he enters again the practice of his profession of the law.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in the House in wishing my good friend Joe Kilgore continued success in the future. I have had the pleasure of knowing Joe Kilgore since we both came to the 84th Congress in 1955 and hold his friendship and counsel in high regard.

He has represented his district and State well and I know his constituents are proud of his service. I am sure that all of the Members of the House will miss Joe Kilgore and the wisdom he has lent to this body.

I extend to Congressman and Mrs. Kilgore my sincere good wishes for continued success and happiness.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I will miss my young colleague's devoted and dedicated service here in the House; but I hope, Mr. Speaker, for not very long. I believe some day in the near future he will be back here with us or he will be serving with distinction and honor in the Senate of the United States or as Governor of the great Lone Star State.

Joe Kilgore is the type of American sorely needed during these critical times when constitutional government, States rights, and individual liberty are being threatened at home and abroad. This House and this Congress could use more men of the ability, integrity, and fearlessness of the gentlemen from Texas.

Mrs. Dorn, my family and staff join me in wishing for him and in predicting for him great future success and much happiness.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, Hon. Joe M. Kilgore is an intelligent and persuasive Member of the House. His decision to retire came as a shock to his admiring colleagues. Why would one so young and aggressive fortified with good commonsense come to such a decision? Perhaps he looks to other fields to conquer. His intellectual grasp of legislative problems marks him as a valuable Member of the Congress.

His strong stand for States rights and individual liberty ingratiated him with Members of similar attitudes. He was courageous and fearless in his stand. It is not necessary for one to agree with the philosophy of life advanced by another to understand the basic problems affecting local political thought and action.

Mr. Kilgore, I am sure, will return to the political arena at some future date. His affinity for political life will return him to the scene of his endeavors. His dedication to the service of others can only find its true outlet in politics.

I am pleased to have enjoyed the privilege of his friendship. May God grant him godspeed.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to extend their remarks in the Record concerning our colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Kilgore], and insert extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Harris). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

A CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT TO RESTORE THE INTEGRITY OF THE CONSTITUTION AND THE BILL OF RIGHTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Bruce] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Speaker, since the Supreme Court handed down its prayer decisions, I have spent many months in study and research to determine the root cause of those rulings and the remedy for such constitutional misinterpretations.

As the culmination of that effort, I have just introduced a resolution proposing a constitutional amendment, the adoption of which I believe is mandatory if the Congress is to restore the integrity of the Constitution and the Bill of Rights which for some 25 years have been violated by frivolous and extremist decisions of the Supreme Court.

Over the last quarter century, the Court has perpetrated an unheralded, unrecognized constitutional revolution without any approbation from the Congress and the people, and up until now, the Court has gotten away with its judicial mischief. It is my conviction that the American people stand to lose all their treasured religious freedoms if the Court continues its present pattern, unless we in the Congress take the necessary steps to curb the excesses of the highest tribunal.

These are not idle words. Fundamental to the prayer decisions, the Supreme Court has made the Bill of Rights the issue.

The revolutionary lever the Court has used is its proposition that the 14th amendment has—to use its phrase—"absorbed the 1st amendment." The net effect of this fiat of the Justices has been to invert the first amendment, to turn upside down the basic intent of the framers of the Bill of Rights to leave all authority in the area of religion with the States.

Through this device invented by the excessive license of a Court unrestrained by knowledge of the amending process of article V, the Federal Government has found a way to breach the wall of protection of the rights of the people and the powers of the States that was the Bill of Rights. A constitutional amendment is mandatory to end the dangerous onslaught of Federal power spearheaded by an unchecked and unrestrained Supreme Court. Here is the case for my amendment.

A CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT TO "RESTORE" THE INTEGRITY OF THE CONSTITUTION AND THE BILL OF RIGHTS

Our Founding Fathers in their great wisdom produced the tightly woven fabric of a Union of sovereign States from the fibers of the 13 American Colonies. Because of their long experience with the oppressions of government from which they had fled, and finally shed their blood to overcome, they were sorely tried in their efforts to establish a structure which would leave the States sovereign and yet would pull them securely together.

They announced their success when they declared in a convention of the States on September 17, 1787:

> We the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defence, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.

The Founding Fathers, with that Constitution, established a General or Federal Government with its executive, legislative, and judicial branches clearly defined, and so designed as to act as checks and balances upon each other.

But further considerations led to an additional effort, one that would insure to a greater degree that this new creation—a whole new structure of government—would not grow into a threatening power similar to the one the colonists had just overthrown.

And so it was that the Bill of Rights was born. The first 10 amendments were enacted and their purpose was to provide a check against any or all of the three branches of the General Government to prevent their encroachment upon the rights of the people and the powers of the States.

The first 10 amendments for many decades accomplished the purpose for which they were intended and conceived. The power of the Federal Government remained quite well contained within the areas walled off by the Constitution. The States operated within the areas of sovereignty guaranteed by the Bill of Rights.

Today, in 1964, however, we see that this has changed, and upon close examination, we find that the Federal Government has been sequestering the authority of the States from those sovereign entities. Imperceptibly to most, glaringly to some, the General Government has encroached upon the authority and powers of the States, even to the point where basic rights of the American people have already been denied them by that Central Government in Washington.

The encroachment of which I speak has taken place through the unchecked rampage of the third branch of the Federal Government, the Supreme Court.

In recent years the Supreme Court, through certain decisions, has breached the wall of protection of the rights of the people and the powers of the States that was the Bill of Rights. Today, in 1964, the American people find themselves in the position where they have been denied by that Court their basic right to pay homage to their Creator in a public school. They find in the unmistakable language of at least one Supreme Court Justice the impending loss of traditions of chaplains in the Armed Forces and in our prisons, the motto, "In God We Trust," on our coins, and other long-honored American practices, on the grounds that any such manifestation of religion is unconstitutional when financed with the slightest amount of public funds. They worriedly hear another Justice express the view that public expressions like "In God We Trust" are probably permissible since we do not really mean them anymore. Otherwise, as religious manifestations, he implies they are impermissible.

Such practices, long the custom of the American people, are in the process of being denied them by the Federal Government. The Supreme Court—in the guise of "extending" the Bill of Rights to the States—has indeed been denying the Bill of Rights to the people of this Nation.

Today, in 1964, we see the Bill of Rights being shattered by the fiat of nine men. It is no exaggeration to say that the majority—five men—are doing so. Indeed, the opinion of one Justice decides the balance between majority and minority on many decisions. Hence, the rights of the American people are being gradually, imperceptibly, taken away from them by the Federal Government through that Government's High Tribunal. This was thought to be impossible because of the Bill of Rights. It has become possible because the Supreme Court—and the Supreme Court alone—has so interpreted the Constitution and its amendments in recent years as to tear asunder the whole fabric of the crowning glory of the Founding Fathers, the Bill of Rights.

Those mighty men of vision who gave us first the Declaration of Independence, then fought the Revolution, then gave us the Constitution and finally culminated their gigantic contribution of freedom to their posterity with the Bill of Rights, were they alive today, would, I am sure, send many Paul Reveres riding throughout the land to shout to the people of the danger that has arisen. They would shout of the danger that has arisen from their handiwork—the creation they feared so greatly—the Central Government which they founded to secure the Union of sovereign States, the General Government they so diligently labored to enchain so its mighty power would never be used to destroy that which it was created to safeguard, the Union of sovereign States.

The Supreme Court has in fact amended the Bill of Rights so as to nullify the Bill of Rights. Yet the power to amend the Constitution rests with the people through the action of the Congress and the legislatures of the States as set forth by article V of the Constitution.

The recent decisions by the Supreme Court regarding prayer in the schools caused me to research this subject, and the conclusions are inescapable. The Supreme Court has amended the Constitution by inverting the Bill of Rights. Unless the Court is checked now, the Bill of Rights will fast become a dead letter. I say this quite simply, but firmly, because it is true.

The Court has used as a lever to accomplish this end the 14th amendment, with which I find no fault, but which the Court has in a most incredible manner grossly distorted and distended in order to use it as a weapon against the whole meaning of the Bill of Rights. I do not say this was what the Court itself sought to accomplish. I do say this is what the Court has done, and continues to do.

As I stated, my concern over the license of the Supreme Court in its interpretations in the school prayer cases led directly to my studies in this area and directly to the conclusions I have stated. However, as I worked on my research, the Court made its decisions in the area of apportionment of State legislatures. I had been in the process of drawing up a constitutional amendment which would nullify the judicial mischief of the Supreme Court as made evident in the prayer decisions.

I found my judgments and conclusions completely reinforced by the very strong dissent of Justice John Marshall Harlan in the case of Reynolds against Sims, June 15, 1964. I commend this dissent to my colleagues. I quote Justice Harlan very briefly:

> Today's holding is that the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment requires every State to structure its legislature so that all the members of each house represent substantially the same number of people; * * * I think it demonstrable that the 14th amendment does not impose this political tenet on the States or authorize this Court to do so. * * *
>
> Since it can, I think, be shown beyond doubt that State legislative apportionments, as such, are wholly free of constitutional limitations, save such as may be imposed by the republican form of government clause (Constitution, art. IV, sec. 4), the Court's action now bringing them within the purview of the 14th amendment amounts to nothing less than an exercise of the amending power by this Court.

I am indebted to Justice Harlan for saying what I have already stated here and which I will repeat as I introduce my amendment, namely that the Supreme Court has arrogated unto itself the powers limited to the Congress and the States by article V of the Constitution.

The Court has amended the Constitution through its decisions—and this is clearly beyond its scope. What is even more tragic is that the Court has amended the Bill of Rights through its usurpation of powers denied to it by article V of the Constitution, and thereby has breached the wall of separation of powers erected so painstakingly by our Founding Fathers, the first 10 amendments.

The time has come, indeed the hour is already very late, for action to be taken by the Congress to terminate this trend and to nullify the damage already done by what I call judicial mischief.

The Supreme Court, through its decisions, builds up the body of constitutional law. We must guarantee that that body of law never becomes a Rube Goldbergian contraption which distends so warpedly and disjointedly further and further out from the true line of growth intended by the Founding Fathers that it eventually collapses and takes down with it all that is good and true and purposeful in the Constitution itself.

Today I offer a constitutional amendment which the facts in question necessitate. Let me state clearly for the sake of those who will cry out that I am tampering with the Supreme Court, and with the constitutional prerogatives of that body, that the amendment which I offer does not do that. I do not think that is necessary. But that they might be refreshed in their memory of the Constitution, let me recollect for them that article III of the Constitution establishes the Supreme Court and spells out the scope of that branch of the Federal Government. After establishing the Court, and its scope, section 2 of that article says this:

> In all cases affecting ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls, and those in which a State shall be a party, the Supreme Court shall have original jurisdiction. In all the other cases before mentioned, the Supreme Court shall have appellate jurisdiction, both as to law and fact, with such exceptions, and under such regulations as the Congress shall make.

Thus I answer in advance any of those loud outcries in opposition to the right of the Congress to limit the Supreme Court in its appellate jurisdiction if the elected representatives of the people should choose to do so.

However, as I have just stated, I do not feel it necessary to limit the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court to nullify the misdeeds it has perpetrated in violation of article V of the Constitution in a number of far-reaching decisions made over recent years.

What is mandatory is to limit the license-taking of the Court.

My purpose is to clarify the situation. My aim is to eliminate the court-created confusion that has come into being. My goal is to destroy the distortions of the 14th amendment, and through those, the distortions of the Bill of Rights, perpetrated by the Supreme Court. And it is my purpose to do this without reducing in the slightest the powers of the Supreme Court to which, over the many decades of American history, our people owe so much for the preservation of their liberties.

In a word, I seek the "restoration" of the integrity of the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. It is interesting that the decision on apportionment led me to make not even the slightest change in the amendment on which I was working because the prayer decisions had so clearly laid bare the heart of the problem.

I stated my thoughts on this problem when I presented my position to the House Judiciary Committee on May 20, 1964. That committee was holding hearings on the subject of an amendment to the Constitution regarding voluntary prayer and Bible reading in public schools.

I made the following statement on that date to the committee:

> A constitutional amendment is urgently needed to "restore" powers to the States and/or the people reserved to them by the Bill of Rights, and limit the Court's license but not its constitutional powers. I believe this can be accomplished.

THE SUPREME COURT AND THE PRAYER DECISIONS

I told the committee I was in favor of amending the U.S. Constitution to clarify the situation that has come into being because of the Supreme Court's decisions regarding prayer in public schools. What is that situation?

In my judgment, the first amendment has been subjugated to an absurd misinterpretation in the Schempp and Murray decisions issued as one ruling on June 17, 1963, to the effect that it is unconstitutional for the States to prescribe a reading from the Holy Bible or the Lord's prayer at the opening exercises of each schoolday even if it is voluntary, with children who wish to do so permitted to absent themselves during that portion of the exercises.

My objection is that the Court, in ostensibly protecting the rights of some citizens, has now grossly abridged the privileges and immunities of all citizens long established in the religious area and threatens to abridge more of those freedoms. A constitutional amendment is needed to undo this impossible situation conjured up by the Court.

The Supreme Court held that the practice in Schempp and Murray on the part of the State violates the so-called establishment clause and also the free exercise clause of the 1st amendment as "absorbed" by the 14th amendment.

I believe that this is an absurd and mistaken interpretation which does not square with the Constitution, the intent of Congress, the intent of the States ratifying the amendments to the Constitution, or with American traditions.

Let me preface these remarks by saying that I am mindful of the value and acceptance of Court decisions as establishing or building constitutional law. But I beg my colleagues to keep in mind the numerous occasions on which the Court has reversed such Court-established law.

Note this extract from page x of the introduction to "The Constitution of the United States of America"—annotated, Library of Congress, 1953:

> Another obstacle has been of the Court's own making. Whether because of the difficulty of amending the Constitution or for cautionary reasons, the Court took the position, as early as 1851, that it would reverse previous decisions on constitutional issues when convinced they were erroneous. An outstanding instance of this nature was the decision in the legal tender cases, in 1871, reversing the decision which had been rendered in *Hepburn* v. *Griswold* 15 months earlier; and no less shattering to the prestige of stare decisis in the constitutional field was the income tax decision of 1895, in which the Court accepted Mr. Joseph Choate's invitation to "correct a century of error." The "constitutional revolution" of 1937 produced numerous reversals of earlier precedents on the ground of "error," some of them, the late Mr. James M. Beck complained, without "the obsequious respect of a funeral oration." In 1944 Justice Reed cited 14 cases decided between March 27, 1937, and June 14, 1943, in which one or more prior constitutional decisions were overturned. On the same occasion Justice Roberts expressed the opinion that adjudications of the Court were rapidly gravitating "into the same class as a restricted railroad ticket, good for this day and train only."
>
> Years ago the eminent historian of the Supreme Court, Mr. Charles Warren, had written: "However the Court may interpret the provisions of the Constitution, it is still the Constitution which is the law and not the decision of the Court."
>
> In short, it is "not necessarily so" that the Constitution is preserved in the Court's reading of it.

Justice Clark stated for the majority in Schempp, "the 1st amendment's mandate has been made wholly applicable to the States by the 14th amendment," and quoted Justice Roberts' 1940 decision in Cantwell against Connecticut:

> The fundamental concept of liberty embodied in that 14th amendment embraces the liberties guaranteed by the 1st amendment. The first amendment declares that Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof. The 14th amendment has rendered the legislatures of the States as incompetent as Congress to enact such laws.

Note how completely at odds this is with the Court's 1922 decision in Prudential Insurance Co. against Cheek, 259 U.S. 530, 543:

> Neither the 14th amendment nor any other provision of the Constitution of the United States imposes upon the States any restrictions about "freedom of speech" or the "liberty of silence."

It is important to recall the insight into Court thinking and practice revealed by Justice William O. Douglas. On at least 150 occasions, Douglas has remarked that the amending process to the Constitution was slow, long, and drawn out. Apparently, he would have the Court hasten it. Jurists and attorneys were startled to hear him say to the New York State Bar Association on April 12, 1949:

> So far as constitutional law is concerned stare decisis must give way before the dynamic component of history.

Since stare decisis is the tradition or principle that once a decision on the meaning of all or part of a statute or section in a constitution is made in a given case before the Court, that decision is similarly followed in new cases touching upon that matter, Justice Douglas' declaration of its relatively ephemeral nature in his eyes, crystallized for all who wanted to see, that constitutional law well might degenerate into "decision by impulse." The Constitution is a flexible document, but by article V of the Constitution, the people, through their Representatives, constitutionally have the power to make the changes, not the Court.

I believe that the Court, in its prayer decisions, shows the degeneration of constitutional law that one logically would expect if the Douglas view prevailed. Whatever "the dynamic component of history" may have dictated, clearly the people did not desire the upsetting change ordered by the Court.

At the time of the adoption of the Constitution of the United States, there were five States which still had officially established, State-supported churches. They were Massachusetts, Maryland, Connecticut, South Carolina, and New Hampshire. In the Schempp decision, Justice Brennan, concurring, acknowledged that "the last of the formal State establishments was dissolved more than three decades before the 14th amendment was ratified."

A footnote to Brennan's opinion at this point in the decision reads:

> The last formal establishment, that of Massachusetts, was dissolved in 1833.

This, my colleagues, was decades after the adoption of the first amendment.

While I want it clearly understood that I would emphatically oppose the idea of an official church in any of our States, it is important that we know the precise historical situation with regard to the meaning of the first amendment which reads:

> Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press, or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

It is clear from the historical records that Madison and the framers wished to insure that the new Federal Government would neither make any one church a national religion nor interfere with the powers of the States to establish or dissolve an official religion within the jurisdictions of those States.

Brennan further acknowledged in Schempp, although he disagreed:

> It has been suggested, with some support in history, that absorption of the first amendment's ban against congressional legislation "respecting an establishment of religion" is conceptually impossible because the framers meant the establishment clause also to foreclose any attempt by Congress to disestablish the existing official State churches.

To me this is something of a self-deception on Brennan's part to say there is only "some" support in history for this thesis, since he himself notes the continued existence of official State churches long after the acceptance of the first amendment, with that of Massachusetts not being dissolved until 1833. It is obvious that the first amendment was written into the Bill of Rights to constitutionally protect the rights of the people and the powers of the States in the area of religion, even to the extent of making their own choice on whether or not they should establish, or dissolve, official religions within their own jurisdictions.

The 10th amendment buttressed this fact. It reads:

> The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.

Brennan's argument against the suggestion he quoted begs the question. He went on to say:

> Whether or not such was the understanding of the framers and whether such a purpose would have inhibited the absorption of the establishment clause at the threshold of the 19th century are questions not dispositive of our present inquiry.

Then he makes the statement that I have already quoted, about the last State establishment being "dissolved more than three decades before the 14th amendment was ratified."

Brennan says in effect—the intention of the Founding Fathers to leave the States free in this area by means of the first amendment doesn't matter any more.

This is ridiculous, and central to my argument, because the prayer decisions denied the States and the people thereof the powers and rights the first amendment clearly left to them. The understanding of the framers was and is of absolute importance in today's confusion.

Brennan is implicity acknowledging the Court's inversion of the first amendment.

Let me take this a step further. Again in Schempp we find in the dissent of Justice Potter Stewart this amazing statement:

> I accept too the proposition that the 14th amendment has somehow absorbed the establishment clause, although it is not without irony that a constitutional provision evidently designed to leave the States free to go their own way should now have become a restriction upon their autonomy.

I urge that this comment be read and reread and reread by every Member of the Congress.

Stewart's statement highlights several very important points:

First, it is a Supreme Court "proposition," to use his word, "that the 14th amendment has somehow absorbed the establishment clause" of the 1st amendment, not a specification of Congress in legislating the 14th amendment.

Second, as Stewart points out, the first amendment was a "constitutional provision evidently designed to leave the States free to go their own way." We have seen that this is proven true by (a) the 1st amendment, (b) the 10th amendment, and (c) history—the continued existence of State churches after the ratification of the 1st amendment until State action dissolved the last of them in 1833.

Third, to paraphrase Stewart concerning the powers of the States, it is indeed ironical that the very first amendment, first in the Bill of Rights, "should now have become a restriction upon their autonomy."

This "proposition," that the 14th amendment "somehow absorbed" the 1st amendment that was adopted constitutionally to protect the rights of the people and the powers of the States in this area, and which "proposition" now restricts the rights of the people and of the States in this area—this complete reversal of the original intent of the constitutional framers—underlies the utter confusion of the Supreme Court's interpretations.

Certainly confusion was never the intent of the Congress and the States in giving birth to the 14th amendment.

By its distorted reasoning concerning the 14th amendment, the Supreme Court took interpretive license with the 1st and 10th amendments in a singularly unrestrained manner, and as a result, overthrew the very purpose for which those amendments were written into the Bill of Rights.

The Court has based its extremist thinking and interpretations in the prayer cases—and others—on this language in section I of the 14th amendment:

> No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

Congress, in adopting this amendment, did not include language specifying:

> With regard to the establishment of religion and the free exercise thereof, the individual States are hereby subject to the same strictures by this 14th amendment that the Congress is by the 1st amendment, notwithstanding the reservation by the 1st and 10th amendments of all jurisdiction in this area to the States and/or the people.

This is what the Court has now ruled, however.

On the other hand, the Congress did not express the purpose of the 14th amendment in specific language such as:

> Individual citizens of any State are by this 14th amendment freed from any compulsion that might be applied under the powers of that State and/or its people in the area of religion, which powers were and are reserved to them in the Bill of Rights through the provisions of the 1st, 9th, and 10th amendments.

I am not saying that the Congress should have, but that it did not have, such specific language in the 14th amendment. Because Congress was not this definitive in either direction, however, the Court has taken the license of making its own mistaken interpretations of the 14th amendment the basis of going toward the extreme of taking all power away from the States in the area of religion, whereas the framers had left all power in that area to the States and to the people.

We have already seen the extreme reached where the Court denied the people the privilege of prayer that was long established in public schools. In the words of the same 14th amendment, the Court has seriously abridged the privileges of citizens to publicly acknowledge God in starting the school day.

Yet we have seen from history that the 1st and 10th amendments protected the residual powers of the States and the people even to have established religions within their States where they so chose. It is further illuminating to look at James Madison's original proposal that led to the adoption of the first amendment. It read:

> The civil rights of none shall be abridged on account of religious belief or worship, nor shall any national religion be established, nor shall the full and equal rights of conscience be in any manner, or on any pretext infringed.

Because of the conflict over the terminology used in describing their differing concepts of government, between those who desired a Federal union of the States and those who desired a National Government, Madison withdrew the word "national" in his proposed amendment.

Let us look at the versions of the amendment passed by each House of Congress, before the Senate-House conference consolidated thinking upon a final version.

The House of Representatives resolved that "Congress shall make no law establishing religion, or to prevent the free exercise thereof, or to infringe the rights of conscience."

The Senate version was, "Congress shall make no law establishing articles of faith or a mode of worship or prohibiting the free exercise of religion."

Madison was concerned with individual rights but nevertheless his proposal did not incorporate language that would specifically deny to the States complete freedom in matters of religion. The two versions of the Houses of Congress show clearly that they sought to restrict Federal power in this area and not that of the States. The final version carried out this intention, leaving the States—as Justice Stewart noted—"free to go their own way."

If some today would want to construe from the wording of Madison's original proposal that he wished to have restricted the States as well as Congress, then the action of both Houses in specifying and isolating Congress in the first amendment versions, indicate all the more the original intent of the Founding Fathers to leave autonomy in religion to the States and the people.

Then why cannot our children in 1964 acknowledge God as they open the school day?

There is a contradiction someplace. Where is it?

Central to the confusion that reigns over the religious issue as interpreted by the Court is a Court-created contradiction within the 1st amendment, and/or between its original meaning and what we today have been led to believe it intended concerning powers of the States and the people, and/or between the 1st and 10th amendments and the 14th amendment, and/or within the 14th amendment.

The people and the States had rights and powers in the field of religion left to them by the 1st, 9th, and 10th amendments.

The 14th amendment did not take all those powers from the States or any of those rights from the people in any language, specific or vague, authored by the Congress.

Had it done so, it would have been immediately and widely recognized that the 14th amendment was intended to invert the purpose of the 1st and 10th amendments in the area of religion and, of course, this never happened. The 14th amendment did free the individual from any compulsion—without due process of law—by the States under powers and authority which the States retained in that area after adoption of that amendment.

Yet, in our day, the Court bases its strained application of the 1st amendment against the States in the prayer cases on the "proposition" that the 14th amendment "somehow absorbed" the 1st amendment.

As Representatives of the people we must face the question, which in its fullness seems to be expressed in the admittedly perplexed statement of Justice Stewart, exactly how did the 14th amendment "absorb" the establishment and free exercise clauses of the 1st amendment?

As we approach the issue, it is of more than passing interest to recall the decision of Chief Justice John Marshall in Barron against Baltimore in 1833. In that case the Court held the Bill of Rights placed no restraints upon the State and local governments. Marshall ruled that the Bill of Rights "demanded security against the apprehended encroachments of the General—National—Government, not against those of the local governments. These amendments contain no expression indicating an intention to apply them to the State governments. This Court cannot so apply them."

The textbook, "American Constitutional Law," by Tresoline, Macmillan Co., New York, comments, page 349:

> Thus, with the exceptions of the restrictions in the original Constitution, the States were left free to define, protect, limit, or abolish political and civil rights as they saw fit without interference from the Federal courts.

Hence, the need of section 1 of the 14th amendment was, and is, obvious, to protect a citizen from possible oppression by a State.

The great Chief Justice Marshall held the Supreme Court could not apply the Bill of Rights to the State governments.

That was in 1833. The 14th amendment was declared ratified by the Secretary of State on July 28, 1868.

Not until 1940 in Cantwell against Connecticut did the Court make the claim that the free exercise clause of the 1st amendment had been absorbed by the 14th amendment.

Not until 1947 in Everson against Board of Education did the Court make the claim that the establishment clause of the 1st amendment had been absorbed by the 14th amendment.

In 1925 the absorption concept had been first stated by the Court relative to free speech and freedom of the press in Gitlow against New York.

But we note that the 14th amendment contains no language that either substitutes the words, "The States" for the word "Congress," or adds the words "and the States" after the word "Congress" in the 1st amendment.

Yet this is what the Court has now done. It has applied the Bill of Rights against the States by reading into it language that was never there and still is not there. The 14th amendment prohibited the States from depriving any citizen of privileges, immunities, life, liberty, and property without due process of law.

It did not prohibit a State from establishing a religion, which power I submit the States still have under the 1st and 10th amendments, though now no citizen could be forced to belong to or support that religion.

Yet, the Supreme Court has ruled that a State cannot even have a voluntary prayer in its public schools, a far cry from setting up an official church.

In so ruling, the Court used the device of the Court-proclaimed "absorption" of the 1st amendment by the 14th amendment to deprive the vast majority of citizens in the several States involved in the prayer decisions of their long-established privileges under the Bill of Rights. Out of the traditional American respect for the Court, other States and citizens have acquiesced to its mistaken decisions and terminated their traditional exercises.

The Court, by its extreme misinterpretations, has deprived citizens of liberties in a manner prohibited by the 1st amendment to Congress and clearly prohibited to the States by the 14th amendment.

What has taken place?

The fact that the 14th amendment deprived the States of the power of compulsion in the area of religion and other areas that would be oppressive to an individual's rights, in no other way deprived the States of their constitutional authority in those areas.

Yet, the Court has in effect so ruled, and the States, emasculated of authority, can no longer guarantee the rights of their citizens in the area of religion.

Let us trace the path followed by the Supreme Court, slowly, step by step, to see what has happened via its proposition.

The Supreme Court decided to read the 1st amendment into the 14th amendment. The Justices then used the Court-amended 14th amendment to amend in turn that same 1st amendment—this was the absorption process. But they thereby amended the 9th amendment and the 10th amendment. The Court had now prohibited to the States powers that had been reserved to the States in the Bill of Rights by the 1st and by the 10th amendments and had deprived the people of rights guaranteed them in the Bill of Rights by the 9th and 10th amendments.

The Court has used the Bill of Rights to amend the Bill of Rights to defeat the Bill of Rights.

This is intolerable judicial mischief.

The question now becomes simply this: If Congress can make no law respecting the establishment of religion, and the States—according to the Court—can make no law respecting religion, then who or what organ of government remains to protect the people from the Supreme Court which is making law respecting religion?

In effect the Federal Government which initially had no power over religion—this being a matter reserved to the States and/or the people—now has arrogated unto itself what has begun to look like all power in that area.

The Original States refused to delegate this authority to the Federal Government. They did this specifically by means of the very first amendment to the Constitution. They spelled out this power as being prohibited to the Congress, the Federal lawmaking body.

Ironically, a century and a half later, we find that another organ of the Federal Government, the Supreme Court—with no constitutional mandate from the States and the Congress to legislate in any area—by its own distortion of the amendments mentioned herein is not only depriving those States of the powers the Bill of Rights left to them, but is taking unto itself those powers—supposedly in protecting the rights of the people.

But precisely here is where the Court is undoing the wisdom of the Founding Fathers.

The Court—so far unchecked—is now in the position of being able to deprive citizens of their rights on the Court's own flimsy grounds. Five men, the majority of the Court, hold the entire future of religious freedoms in America in their hands. How that future will develop is completely in their control as things stand now.

This situation cannot be tolerated.

What the fathers feared to take from the States and give to a body of Congress representing all the States, certainly cannot be allowed to be taken from the States and kept by nine individuals who wear the robes of the Supreme Court, no matter how fine they may be and no matter how devoted they are to their duty.

Because of the fait accompli of the Court, a constitutional amendment is urgently needed to "restore" the Bill of Rights. We can limit the Court's license without reducing its constitutional powers.

The Federal Government by the device of withdrawing States rightful powers under the Bill of Rights, has struck down the long-established right of the people to acknowledge God at the opening of the school day, although nothing in the Constitution as amended deprived the people of this right. The Supreme Court in its decisions indicated clearly the probability of a future striking down of other long-established public religious privileges and customs such as our tax-supported chaplains in the armed services, the use of the religious motto, "In God We Trust," and many others.

These privileges have been traditional precisely because the great freedoms in the religious area were specifically reserved by the 1st, 9th, and 10th amendments to the States and the people. I submit they still are. Only frivolous extremist decisions by the Supreme Court indicate they are not.

It is our duty to undo the damage done by the Court to the Bill of Rights. It is our duty to defend the Bill of Rights, to maintain the vital purpose of the Founding Fathers who added the first 10 amendments to the Constitution to erect a wall of protection for the people and the States against the Federal Government.

I do not desire the States to set up official religions in the form of prescribed churches, though I submit they have that power if the people of those States chose to do so under the Bill of Rights, the 14th amendment notwithstanding. I would personally oppose it. Constitutionally, however, that power remains—but the States, by the 14th amendment, have no power to coerce any citizen to belong to an officially preferred church. That would be a deprivation of that person's right to differ, to disbelieve, or simply to remain aloof. For the same reason neither could a State force support of an official church.

However, the history of our Nation has established the validity of permitting the people to make their own decisions in an atmosphere of liberty. The State-established churches "withered away" in the atmosphere of liberty before the middle of the 19th century, and today the mere suggestion of a State-established church would be the object of scorn.

The people have no other way of regaining what the Court mistakenly has taken from them, but by constitutional amendment. It is our duty to restore the freedom and privileges rightfully theirs, and to this end, I am today introducing the amendment I am confident will do the job without injury to the legitimate power of the Supreme Court.

THE FUTURE OF AMERICA'S RELIGIOUS LIBERTIES

A preview of what is in store for the American people regarding their religious freedoms can be had simply by taking a good look at the views of Justice William O. Douglas—especially as proclaimed in Engel against Vitale, the New York regents prayer case—and the related opinions of Justice Brennan as set down in Schempp.

The majority's opinion was that the New York prayer in the schools was unconstitutional because "the State's use of the regents' prayer in its public school system breaches the constitutional wall of separation between church and state."

Justice Douglas, concurring, took a different tack. He said:

> First, a word as to what this case does not involve.
>
> Plainly, our Bill of Rights would not permit a State or the Federal Government to adopt an official prayer and penalize anyone who would not utter it. This, however, is not that case, for there is no element of compulsion or coercion in New York's regulation requiring that public schools be opened each day with the following prayer: "Almighty God, we acknowledge our dependence upon Thee, and we beg Thy blessings upon us, our parents, our teachers and our country."

Douglas, disdainful of the truth, here tossed around lightly the Bill of Rights.

It is evident from the utterly erroneous and deliberate statement about the Bill of Rights that he made above, that the Court not only has turned the whole purpose of the first 10 amendments upside down, but now is rewriting history.

What Douglas meant, of course, is that the Bill of Rights, as amended by the Court's version of the 14th amendment, does what he says it does. But by leaving out this tragic misconstruction of recent years by the Court, Justice Douglas blatantly attempts to brainwash the American people into thinking the Bill of Rights had the States as its target as well as the Federal Government when it was authored by the Founding Fathers.

Of course, no State may punish anyone who would not utter an official prayer—but this is because of the 14th amendment and not the Bill of Rights. Douglas compounds the brainwashing, because by putting his statement as he does, we are led to forget that the Court threw out the authority of the States to have official prayer, which authority was and is reserved to them under the Bill of Rights. We are misled into thinking the States never had that power because of the Bill of Rights.

Obviously, the Court is not only misconstruing the Bill of Rights, but is playing around with history about the first 10 amendments.

Let it be understood that I have not quoted Douglas out of context. Not once in his opinion does he make any reference to the 14th amendment and the Court's interpretation of it as being the grounds upon which he applies the Bill of Rights against the States.

He knows it, but millions of Americans who respect the Court, do not realize this. Were they to, their respect for the Court, or at least its recent decisions, would diminish as has my own and that of many of my colleagues because their respect for the Bill of Rights is greater. And further, were they to realize that the Court is the perpetrator of the deception I have outlined, they would not tolerate the substance of the decisions.

Douglas says in his opinion:

> The first amendment leaves the Government in a position not of hostility to religion but of neutrality * * * The first amendment teaches that a government neutral in the field of religion better serves all religious interests.

While I will not disagree with the sense of the second sentence just quoted, the first is false as he uses it in relation to the States as basic to his opinion. By the Constitution's purpose, that sentence should be restricted to this: The first amendment leaves the Federal Government in a position not of hostility to religion but of neutrality.

Again, in the majority opinion, the reference to the "constitutional wall of separation between church and state, deliberately ignores the fact that whatever wall of this nature there was in the Constitution was built against the Congress to protect the States in this area from invasion by the Federal Government. This misconstruction, of course, as I have tried to make clear, can only be accomplished by first stretching the meaning of the 14th amendment to twist the 1st amendment's meaning like a pretzel.

To return to Douglas' views. Now that we have seen what he did not think Engel involved—which put him at odds with his colleagues on the majority—let us hear his views on the problem:

> The point for decision is whether the Government can constitutionally finance a religious exercise. Our system at the Federal and State levels is presently honeycombed with such financing. Nevertheless, I think it is an unconstitutional undertaking whatever form it takes.

This is of the utmost importance for us to apreciate in its full impact.

At this point Justice Douglas chose to insert a footnote mentioning the many "'aids' to religion in this country" and in light of his statement above, they are all unconstitutional in his view. I shall quote this footnote in full in a moment.

Douglas went on in his opinion a bit later:

> The question presented by this case is therefore an extremely narrow one. It is whether New York oversteps the bounds when it finances a religious exercise.

He has acknowledged there was no compulsion to recite the regents' prayer:

> A child is free to stand or not stand, to recite or not recite, without fear of reprisal or even comment by the teacher or any other school official.
>
> In short, the only one who need utter the prayer is the teacher; and no teacher is complaining of it. Students can stand mute or even leave the classroom, if they desire.

He does not feel as some Justices pointed out that this being set apart constitutes compulsion on the student who does not wish to take part in the exercise.

The problem is simply that it is unconstitutional if the State finances a religious exercise. But Douglas chose to ignore a bothersome precedent which this same modern Court set in Everson against Board of Education, and based his opinion on the dissent in that case by Justice Rutledge. Everson supported State financing, not directly of a religious exercise, but of a related aspect, as Douglas pointed out in Engel:

> My problem today would be uncomplicated but for *Everson* v. *Board of Education*, 330 U.S. 1, 17, which allowed taxpayers' money to be used to pay "the bus fares of parochial school pupils as a part of a general program under which" the fares of pupils attending public and other schools were also paid. The Everson case seems in retrospect to be out of line with the first amendment.

Douglas indicated his displeasure when he went on:

> Its result is appealing, as it allows aid to be given to needy children. Yet by the same token, public funds could be used to satisfy other needs of children in parochial schools—lunches, books, and tuition being obvious examples.

How Douglas strained at the gnat—a straining which bodes no good for the religious freedoms of the American people—is seen in his direct comments about the New York situation:

> What New York does on the opening of its public schools is what we do when we open court. Our marshal has from the beginning announced the convening of the Court and then added "God save the United States and this honorable court. That utterance is a supplication, a prayer in which we, the judges, are free to join, but which we need not recite any more than the students need recite the New York prayer.
>
> What New York does on the opening of its public schools is what each House of Congress does at the opening of each day's business. Rev. Frederick B. Harris is Chaplain of the Senate; Rev. Bernard Braskamp is Chaplain of the House. Guest chaplains of various denominations also officiate.
>
> In New York the teacher who leads in prayer is on the public payroll; and the time she takes seems minuscule as compared with the salaries appropriated by State legislatures and Congress for chaplains to conduct prayers in the legislative halls. Only a bare fraction of the teacher's time is given to reciting this short 22-word prayer, about the same amount of time that our marshal spends announcing the opening of our sessions and offering a prayer for this Court.

> Yet for me the principle is the same, no matter how briefly the prayer is said, for in each of the instances given the person praying is a public official on the public payroll, performing a religious exercise in a governmental institution.

Here we have it clearly. Justice Douglas has already expressed the conviction that the marshal's prayer to open the Supreme Court is unconstitutional and that the House and Senate Chaplains opening their respective daily sessions with prayer also thwart the Constitution.

Douglas need only convince four other Justices—Brennan, as we shall see, already is convinced—if the prayers are for real—and this concept, unbelievable as it is to God-fearing, patriotic Americans, will soon be the law of the land.

Douglas, in addition to believing that no compulsion was involved in the regents' prayer case also said after the quotation just made:

> At the same time I cannot say that to authorize this prayer is to establish a religion in the strictly historic meaning of those words. A religion is not established in the usual sense merely by letting those who chose to do so say the prayer that the public school teacher leads. Yet once Government finances a religious exercise it inserts a divisive influence into our communities.

This is most odd. Justice Douglas said that in Engel no compulsion was involved, and that no establishment of religion was involved.

Then upon what constitutional provision does he base his opinion?

He supports it with the Rube Goldbergian contraption that is now his concept of constitutional law as established by this Court's amending the Bill of Rights to make it mean whatever the Justices choose to make it mean.

For instance, he quotes previous decisions, none of which quotations mention financing of religious exercises by government. He says in one instance:

> By reason of the first amendment government is commanded "to have no interest in theology or ritual" * * *, for on those matters "government must be neutral."

He cited McGowan against Maryland—dissenting opinion—as the source for the two quotes he incorporated in the above passage.

But note carefully how Douglas zoomed out to his position that financing by government of religious exercise—even indirectly—is unconstitutional, after stating no establishment of religion is involved and no compulsion is involved. And this in spite of the Court's approval of New Jersey's financing parochial school children's rides. Douglas just wants it to be that way. He feels perfectly free to say so—with the only shred of constitutionality he requires for his grounds being that—according to him—government, not just Congress, is forbidden to have anything to do with religion, by the now distorted first amendment of the Supreme Court's making.

This is highly important. I will later take up this point in discussing the matter of authority.

In the later Schempp decision Douglas stated more fully his views on government financing religion:

> But the establishment clause is not limited to precluding the State itself from conducting religious exercises. It also forbids the State to employ its facilities or funds in a way that gives any church, or all churches, greater strength in our society than it would have by relying on its members alone.
>
> The most effective way to establish any institution is to finance it. * * * Financing a church either in its strictly religious activities or in its other activities is equally unconstitutional. * * * Budgets for one activity may be technically separable from budgets for others. But the institution is an inseparable whole, a living organism, which is strengthened in proselytizing when it is strengthened in any department by contributions from other than its own members.
>
> Such contributions may not be made by the State even in a minor degree without violating the establishment clause. It is not the amount of public funds expended; * * * it is the use to which public funds are put that is controlling. For the first amendment does not say that some forms of establishment are allowed; it says that "no law respecting an establishment of religion" may be made. What may not be done directly may not be done indirectly lest the establishment clause become a mockery.

Here is more brainwashing. By omission of the Court's inverting the first amendment, the people are led to believe that amendment actually restricted the States as he says.

If we are not afraid to look at the facts, Douglas' thinking on the first amendment as he applies it to the States guarantees the loss of all the freedoms he cited in his long footnote that I am about to quote. Logically, the inverted Bill of Rights must lead to this.

Every one of the freedoms we know in the area of religion can probably be traced to a point which will show at least a minuscule expenditure of public funds. We can be sure that in view of the extreme stretching of the Constitution already noted here, the Court would have no difficulty in ferreting out some evidence that government financing is involved, at least indirectly, in every religious freedom we have. With State authority usurped by the Federal Government, this is our fate.

I shall only cite one case, one of negative aid. Financing by government is involved in the tax money not collected from our exempt church properties. Think of the heavy extra burden placed on every churchgoing citizen to pay the taxes this Court, if it is consistent, will someday declare the churches must pay on the grounds that their present exempt status is absolutely unconstitutional. When that decision comes, as it must, if the Court is consistent, many sects will disappear overnight or their ability to worship in their own church will have. The Supreme Court, and thus the Federal Government, will have completely abolished a great basic freedom of the members of those particular sects. And by Court fiat. Is that due process of law?

I now quote in full the footnote I mentioned at the outset of this section devoted to the impending fate of the religious freedoms of the American people. Clearly Justice Douglas considers each and every one of the actions mentioned in the footnote to be unconstitutional. He took this summation from Fellman, "The Limits of Freedom," 1959, pages 40–41:

> There are many "aids" to religion in this country at all levels of government. To mention but a few at the Federal level, one might begin by observing that the very first Congress which wrote the first amendment provided for chaplains in both Houses and in the armed services. There is compulsory chapel at the service academies, and religious services are held in Federal hospitals and prisons. The President issues religious proclamations. The Bible is used for the administration of oaths. NYA and WPA funds were available to parochial schools during the depression. Veterans receiving money under the GI bill of 1944 could attend denominational schools, to which payments were made directly by the Government. During World War II, Federal money was contributed to denominational schools for the training of nurses. The benefits of the National School Lunch Act are available to students in private as well as public schools. The Hospital Survey and Construction Act of 1946 specifically made money available to nonpublic hospitals. The slogan "In God We Trust" is used by the Treasury Department, and Congress recently added God to the pledge of allegiance. There is Bible reading in the schools of the District of Columbia, and religious instruction is given in the District's National Training School for Boys. Religious organizations are exempt from the Federal income tax and are granted postal privileges. Up to defined limits—15 percent of the adjusted gross income of individuals and 5 percent of the net income of corporations—contributions to religious organizations are deductible for Federal income tax purposes. There are limits to the deductibility of gifts and bequests to religious institutions made under the Federal gift and estate tax laws. This list of Federal "aids" could easily be expanded, and of course there is a long list in each State.

We should take a long look at the many freedoms and privileges enumerated in Douglas' footnote which he would take away from us because he says they are unconstitutional.

I do not like the future of America's freedoms with Justice Douglas deciding what they shall be.

Does not his thinking make clear that with the Supreme Court having arrogated unto itself power and authority in the area of religion which the Founding Fathers wisely left to the States, America is already on the road to losing long-established liberties? These liberties have been carefully safeguarded by the States. We are beginning to lose them through this wanton aggression by the Federal Government.

Repeating what I have said before, in the name of extending the Bill of Rights, the Supreme Court has been destroying the Bill of Rights.

Let us now examine the views of Justice Brennan expressed in his concurring opinion in the Schempp decision regarding some of these other freedoms whose fate lies in his hands and those of the other Justices.

Prefacing a long section in which he gives his views of the "absorption" process he states:

> No one questions that the framers of the first amendment intended to restrict exclusively the powers of the Federal Government.

> Whatever limitations that amendment now imposes upon the States derive from the 14th amendment. The process of absorption of the religious guarantees of the 1st amendment as protections against the States under the 14th amendment began with the free exercise clause.

We have seen that the process of gaining these "protections against the States" has cost the American people their protection against the Federal Government once guaranteed them by the Bill of Rights.

He says a few paragraphs later:

> That no organ of the Federal Government possessed in 1791 any power to restrain the interference of the States in religious matters is indisputable.

Now that Brennan feels the Federal Government has the power to interfere with the authority of the States as well as having legitimate power—by the 14th amendment—to restrain the States power of compulsion without due process against their citizens, let us see how he would interfere with the rights of those same citizens. Let us first get the drift of his particular outlook. He reviews an earlier judgment:

> In the Sunday law cases, we found in State laws compelling a uniform day of rest from worldly labor no violation of the establishment clause (*McGowan* v. *Maryland,* 366 U.S. 240). The basic ground of our decision was that, granted the Sunday laws were first enacted for religious ends, they were continued in force for reasons wholly secular, namely, to provide a universal day of rest and ensure the health and tranquillity of the community. In other words, government may originally have decreed a Sunday day of rest for the impermissible purpose of supporting religion but abandoned that purpose and retained the laws for the permissible purpose of furthering overwhelmingly secular laws.

Our Sunday off once was unconstitutional? Does Brennan mean that?

If government does some thing for religious reasons it is unconstitutional. If the same thing is done for secular reasons it is constitutional. So holds the Court, says Brennan.

Brennan summarized his "views concerning the merits of these two cases" considered in the Schempp decision:

> The history, the purpose and the operation of the daily prayer recital and Bible reading leave no doubt that these practices standing by themselves constitute an impermissible breach of the establishment clause. Such devotional exercises may well serve legitimate nonreligious purposes. * * * I would suggest that patriotic or other nonreligious materials might provide adequate substitutes—inadequate only to the extent that the purposes now served are indeed directly or indirectly religious.

Justice Brennan is not opposed to safeguarding religious freedoms incidentally:

> Likewise nothing in the establishment clause forbids the application of legislation having purely secular ends in such a way as to alleviate burdens upon the free exercise of an individual's religious beliefs. Surely the framers would never have understood that such a construction sanctions that involvement which violates the establishment clause. Such a conclusion can be reached, I would suggest, only by using the words of the first amendment to defeat its very purpose.

I find it highly ironic that in that last sentence Justice Brennan refers to the very practice of which the facts prove Brennan himself and his colleagues on the Court to be guilty in arriving at their misinterpretations.

Justice Brennan, revealing the Court's concern with future adjudication, discusses chaplains in the Armed Forces and in penal institutions:

> It is argued that such provisions may be assumed to contravene the establishment clause, yet be sustained on constitutional grounds as necessary to secure to the members of the Armed Forces and prisoners those rights of worship guaranteed under the free exercise clause.
>
> Such activities and practices seem distinguishable from the sponsorship of daily Bible reading and prayer recital. For one thing, there is no element of coercion present in the appointment of military or prison chaplains.

He thinks a decision may uphold chaplains. But in disclaiming coercion he obviously is not taking into consideration the coercion Justice Douglas decries—the use of tax money to pay those chaplains, tax money coerced from the taxpayer through the compulsion of the government process.

At any rate he says:

> Such a principle might support, for example, the constitutionality of draft exemptions for ministers and divinity students.

And further:

> The saying of invocational prayers in legislative chambers, State or Federal, and the appointment of legislative chaplains, might well represent no involvements of the kind prohibited by the establishment clause.

Brennan's use of the word "might" seems to offer us less hope than more.

On another matter he says:

> Nothing we hold today questions the propriety of certain tax deductions or exemptions which incidentally benefit churches and religious institutions, along with many secular charities and nonprofit organizations. If religious institutions benefit, it is in spite of rather than because of their religious character. For religious institutions simply share benefits which Government makes generally available to educational, charitable and eleemosynary groups.

But when Brennan would be asked why they share those benefits, he would have to answer because this privilege has been legislated. At that point he would be bound, if consistent, to hold that the original legislation extending such a privilege was unconstitutional. Schools might escape, but what secular purposes would he have to conjure up as being served by churches that would be so great as to render their religious purpose incidental?

However, the real insight into Justice Brennan's thinking is set forth at the very end of his opinion in Schempp. It amplifies the indications we have seen in the excerpts already considered. It follows in full:

> F. Activities which, though religious in origin, have ceased to have religious meaning: As we noted in our Sunday Law decisions, nearly every criminal law on the books can be traced to some religious principle or inspiration. But that does not make the present enforcement of the criminal law in any sense an establishment of religion, simply because it accords with widely held religious principles. As we said in *McGowan* v. *Maryland,* 306 U.S. 420, 442, "the establishment" clause does not ban Federal or State regulation of conduct whose reason or effect merely happens to coincide or harmonize with the tenets of some or all religions." This rationale suggests that the use of the motto "In God We Trust" on currency, on documents and public buildings and the like may not offend the clause. It is not that the use of those four words can be dismissed as "de minimis"—for I suspect there would be intense opposition to the abandonment of that motto. The truth is that we have simply interwoven the motto so deeply into the fabric of our civil polity that its present use may well not present that type of involvement which the first amendment prohibits.
>
> This general principle might also serve to insulate the various patriotic exercises and activities used in the public schools and elsewhere which, whatever may have been their origins, no longer have a religious purpose or meaning. The reference to divinity in the revised pledge of allegiance, for example, may merely recognize the historical fact that our Nation was believed to have been founded "under God." Thus reciting the pledge may be no more of a religious exercise than the reading aloud of Lincoln's Gettysburg Address, which contains an allusion to the same historical fact.

I strongly urge that any person who feels hopeful that our religious liberties will be perpetuated, reread this essay on hypocrisy by Justice Brennan.

Nothing I can say can more accurately expose his views for the hypocrisy they represent.

He actually has stated without hesitation that the sturdy American motto "In God We Trust" is constitutional as long as we don't really mean it any more. That is, of course, if it is to be used publicly—on coins, documents, public buildings, et cetera.

The public use of the pledge of allegiance is not unconstitutional as long as we do not really put our hearts into it and believe God still undergirds this Nation.

I do not accuse Justice Brennan of being hypocritical, for he is being very open about it all. But he advocates hypocrisy on our part.

It may well be that Justice Brennan is sorrowful about the situation he finds himself in. Wanting to maintain these religious freedoms, nevertheless he feels bound to rule them unconstitutional now that his court has applied the first amendment against the States. Perhaps he is suggesting to the American people the "rationale" he outlined as the only way out of the corner he and his colleagues have put us into.

In summary, it should be obvious from the thinking of Justice Douglas and Justice Brennan, that the many religious freedoms traditionally ours under the Constitution are on the way out, unless we in the Congress act quickly to undo the damage perpetrated by the Court in recent years. Once the Court's premise is accepted, that the first amendment applies against the States, the people have no defense against the Court's depriving them, one freedom at a time, of their traditional religious liberties.

THE STATUS OF AUTHORITY: ORIGINALLY, UNDER THE BILL OF RIGHTS—NOW, UNDER THE SUPREME COURT

Since there must be authority resident in some body in all areas involving public questions, let us look at the question, "Where does authority reside in the area of religion?"

First, let us ask, "Where did the Founding Fathers place this authority?"

They left this authority with the States, which, of course, had it before the ratification of the Constitution and the Bill of Rights, by virtue of their sovereignty. The States did not surrender that authority. Had they been willing to, the Founding Fathers could have given that authority to the President, the Congress, or the Supreme Court, or established another branch of the new Federal Government in which to entrust it. But they did none of these things. They continued to entrust this authority and responsibility to the States.

Then, what about the concept of "separation of church and state" that the Court keeps referring to? It was basic to the decision of the majority as presented by Justice Black in the Engel case:

> The petitioners contend among other things that the State laws requiring or permitting use of the regents' prayer must be struck down as a violation of the establishment clause because that prayer was composed by governmental officials as a part of a governmental program to further religious beliefs. For this reason, petitioners argue, the State's use of the regents' prayer in its public school system breaches the constitutional wall of separation between church and state. We agree with that contention since we think that the constitutional prohibition against laws respecting an establishment of religion must at least mean that in this country it is no part of the business of government to compose official prayers for any group of the American people to recite as a part of a religious program carried on by government.

Once more we find the Supreme Court effecting the brainwashing that government is constitutionally prohibited to the area of "an establishment of religion"—which establishment includes anything the Court wants it to.

The Court does not say the Constitution prohibited only the Congress in this area, nor that the Court alone, and not the American people, through their representatives, amended the first amendment to deny the States this authority which that amendment left to them.

Where is that "constitutional wall of separation between church and state" cited in the Constitution?

Justice Stewart, dissenting in Engel, provides the answer:

> Moreover, I think that the Court's task, in this as in all areas of constitutional adjudication, is not responsibly aided by the uncritical invocation of metaphors like the "wall of separation," a phrase nowhere to be found in the Constitution.

There simply was and is no broad concept of a wall of separation in the Constitution between church and state. What division there is lies in the first amendment which prohibited Congress from establishing a preferred religion or church on the national level, or from prohibiting the free exercise of religion. This indeed was a separation, and a limited one, nothing like the all-inclusive phenomenon that the Court likes to conjure up.

And, as we know, this particular limited separation restricting Congress, emphasized the complete lack of such separation insofar as the States were concerned, since they were thereby left all authority in the religious area.

It has suited the Court's purpose, however, to take a metaphor not to be found in the Constitution and utilize it to the hilt as a psychological weapon to buttress decisions that otherwise might be seriously questioned by many citizens.

If this metaphor is not in the Constitution then where did it come from?

Its source is given in "The Constitution of the United States of America"—annotated, Library of Congress, 1953, page 759:

> In 1802 President Jefferson wrote a letter to a group of Baptists in Danbury, Conn., in which he declared that it was the purpose of the first amendment to build "a wall of separation between church and state."

The Library's study in turn gives "The Complete Jefferson," by Saul K. Padover, Duell, Sloan & Pearce, New York, as its source.

Upon checking out the Danbury letter in Padover's volume, we find, interestingly enough, another proof of the Supreme Court's distortion of the facts. To set this forth clearly I quote the entire Jefferson letter as recorded by Padover:

> JANUARY 1, 1802.
>
> *To Messrs. Nehemiah Dodge, Ephraim Robbins, and Stephen S. Nelson, a committee of the Danbury Baptist Association, in the State of Connecticut.*
>
> GENTLEMEN: The affectionate sentiments of esteem and approbation which you are so good as to express towards me, on behalf of the Danbury Baptist Association, give me the highest satisfaction. My duties dictate a faithful and zealous pursuit of the interests of my constituents, and in proportion as they are persuaded of my fidelity to those duties, the discharge of them becomes more and more pleasing.
>
> Believing with you that religion is a matter which lies solely between man and his God, that he owes account to none other for his faith or his worship, that the legislative powers of government reach actions only, and not opinions, I contemplate with sovereign reverence that act of the whole American people which declared that their legislature should "make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof," thus building a wall of separation between church and state. Adhering to this expression of the supreme will of the Nation in behalf of the rights of conscience, I shall see with sincere satisfaction the progress of those sentiments which tend to restore to man all his natural rights, convinced he has no natural right in opposition to his social duties.
>
> I reciprocate your kind prayers for the protection and blessings of the common Father and Creator of man, and tender you for yourselves and your religious association, assurances of my high respect and esteem.

Jefferson's meaning is so clear and so opposed to the Court's misuse of it, that little comment is needed by me.

First, he notes that "the legislative powers of Government reach actions only, and not opinions" thereby demonstrating his conviction that Government does have authority in the area of religion—the direct contrary of what the Supreme Court has been implying, especially in the words of Justices Douglas and Brennan, as we have seen.

Jefferson, of course, was not promoting Government interference in religious matters. Nor am I. My entire point concerns the legitimate authority and responsibility of State governments in this area which the Court has denied them through its recent decisions. The Court has gradually been restricting State government authority on grounds that government in general must stay out of religious matters altogether because just about anything it would do in that area would constitute "an establishment of religion."

Jefferson, secondly, defines the first amendment as an "act of the whole American people" declaring "that their legislature" should make no law, and so forth. Certainly his choice of language delimits the "wall of separation between church and state" to the Congress of the United States—the whole American people's Legislature—and proves beyond doubt he did not in any way intend to apply the concept of such separation to any other level of government.

President Jefferson demonstrated his absolute support for the complete sovereignty of the States in the area of religion on a major occasion 3 years later. In his second inaugural address he made this statement:

> In matters of religion I have considered its free exercise is placed by the Constitution independent of the powers of the General Government. I have therefore undertaken on no occasion to prescribe the religious exercises suited to it, but have left them, as the Constitution found them, under the direction and discipline of the church or state authorities acknowledged by the several religious societies.

His reference here was to the Louisiana Territory.

Thomas Jefferson respected the true constitutional wall of separation—that division of the powers of States from the powers of the General or Federal Government. Thus we see his upholding of the authority of the States in his own words. He considered matters of religion placed independent of the powers of the Federal Government which he headed, by the Constitution. He made it plain he respected the restriction by that same Constitution on the Congress in matters of religion—matters as spelled out in the first amendment—not the all-inclusive concept of our modern Court, that the Constitution restricted all government.

Hence, we see again the extremist tendency of this Court to stretch for its own purposes phraseology not even in the Constitution.

The Court is fond of quoting James Madison's "Memorial and Remonstrance Against Religious Assessments." Written in 1785, it is, of course, no part of the Constitution, any more than is the metaphor, "separation of church and state." It was written to oppose a measure in the Virginia Assembly to levy a tax for the benefit of "teachers of the Christian religion," 4 years before the drawing up of the first amendment.

Summing up his opposition, Madison wrote:

> Who does not see that the same authority which can establish Christianity, in exclusion of all other religions, may establish with the same ease any particular sect of Christians, in exclusion of all other sects? That the same authority which can force a citizen to contribute 3 pence only of his property for the support of any one establishment, may force him to conform to any other establishment in all cases whatsoever?

In this language we see Madison was concerned with the possibility that some one sect might get the upper hand if Virginia had the power to establish such a sect as the official one. For this reason he opposed Virginia's establishing Christianity as the official or preferred religion "in exclusion of all other religions."

We have much earlier in my presentation taken note of Madison's draft in which he proposed what became the first amendment, and how each House of Congress resolved his proposal into final form. The "Annals of Congress," 1789-91, pages 730-731, records Madison's explanation of the wording he used in his proposal:

> He apprehended the meaning of the words to be, that Congress should not establish a religion, and enforce the legal observation of it by law, nor compel men to worship God in any manner contrary to their conscience * * * if the word "national" was inserted before religion, it would satisfy the minds of honorable gentlemen. He believed that the people feared one sect might obtain a preeminence, or two combine together and establish a religion to which they would compel others to conform. He thought if the word "national" was introduced, it would point the amendment directly to the object it intended to prevent.

It should be clear from these quotations of Madison, for which I am indebted to Edward S. Corwin's "Constitution of Powers in a Secular State," the Michie Co., Charlottesville, Va., 1951, that Madison meant by "establishment" the setting up of a preferred sect. To him it involved giving a church a special position of legal privilege, the fixing of a "preeminence" for one sect or combination of sects above all others.

Madison, in his "Remonstrance" was concerned with the State of Virginia. In his proposal for what is now the first amendment, he was concerned with the Federal Government. Yet we have seen how the present Court has seen fit to apply his words against all the States.

From all this, it should be clear that despite the Court rulings, there is no provision in the Constitution prohibiting government from the area of religion. The reasoning at the heart of the Court's misinterpretations is erroneously drawn from words outside the Constitution, and from the Justices' inverted first amendment.

The Supreme Court in its extreme interpretation of the 14th amendment to effect its own separation of church and all government, has done so by breaking down the wall of separation of powers between States and the Federal Government, which wall is the Bill of Rights and the Constitution.

Since the Schempp case, I say that it is clear that authority in the area of religion now resides in the Federal Government.

No, not with the President. No, not with the Congress. But yes, emphatically, yes, with the Supreme Court—and that means the Federal Government.

The Supreme Court—claiming to be wiser than the fathers of this great Nation—has seen fit to transfer the constitutional powers of the States in this area to the Federal Government by arrogating this authority unto itself.

Today we have seen the fears of the Founding Fathers regarding the power of the Federal Government realized in this unprincipled, unconstitutional assumption of authority on the part of the Court. Nine men have taken constitutional authority in the area of religion and have deposited it in their own hands.

The Court sanctifies its deceitful action in the guise of upholding separation of church and state, but in so doing has brought dictatorial powers to the Federal Government in this area. We have seen the Court deny to the children of America the God-given right to acknowledge Him as their Creator each morning as they open their school day. The Federal Government—now not separated from religion—now is separating the American people from their religious rights.

The Court has hoodwinked the American people into excessive fear of their State governments in relation to religious questions, so the Court could get away with seriously weakening the States authority.

The Court, in an extreme affectation of restraining government, has caused the people to forget the very positive purpose of government, its very reason for being, namely to safeguard the rights of the people.

The Court, conjuring up, and then reacting to, excessive fear of oppression by State government in the area of religion, has itself become guilty of the very oppression it claims to be combating with its decisions.

A basic fear of unwarranted government intrusion into any field is mandatory if a people are to keep their freedoms. Hence the expression, "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty." But a look at the purpose of government will bring things back into perspective.

The questions I am here concerned with fundamentally concern the balance of powers mandatory to the safety of the freedom of the American people. Unfortunately farfetched decisions of the Court under the 14th amendment have upset that balance. Decisions theoretically aimed at protecting citizens from the States have deprived those same citizens of their protection from the Federal Government.

We must accomplish the real purposes of the 14th amendment without upsetting the real purposes of the first 10 amendments, as the Court has been doing.

Let us recall the immortal words of the Declaration of Independence to learn the purpose of government:

> We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness. That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.

In majestic simplicity the Founding Fathers expressed a tremendous truth.

To secure the rights endowed upon men by their Creator is the whole purpose of government.

"Deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed." There is the whole scope of government authority—whatever is circumscribed by the people it serves.

No one in the Congress is more outspoken than I, both in speech and in vote, on the issue of government's—any government's—transgression of the rights of the people. On bill after bill submitted by the administration I have voted no because I knew and feared their encroachment upon the rights of the people by the Federal Government—beyond the limits of its power as set by the people in the Constitution I am sworn to uphold and defend.

In the same manner I oppose the transgressions of a similar nature by any State government upon its citizens.

But, as the saying goes, we cannot throw out the baby with the bath water.

We cannot eliminate government or its authority, because of possible or actual transgressions. As the Declaration of Independence admonishes, even when a tyrannical government is overthrown, following that action new forms of government must be established to secure the people's rights .

To eliminate government authority is to eliminate the only means by which the people can exercise their rights with security.

There is no question on anyone's part that all power ultimately resides in the people. But is it as clear that governments are the institutions which alone can guarantee the freedom of the people to exercise those rights—while churches and political parties and unions and other organizations within society can only advocate and fight for freedom?

We presently are enmeshed in the Jeckyll and Hyde manipulations of the Constitution by the Court which bespeak affection for our liberties while stripping us of our ability to exercise our rights.

By tampering with the Bill of Rights, the Supreme Court has taken authority and responsibility away from the States by which they had functioned as the guardians of the rights of the people to worship as they chose.

Without these State governments as the securing agents for their rights, the people are finding themselves shorn of their freedom to exercise those rights.

When I said a moment ago that since the Schempp decision all authority in the religious area resides with the Federal Government—through the machinations of the Supreme Court—I did not mean to imply that Congress or the President shall be found legislating or issuing edicts relating to all religious problems.

What I do mean, purely and simply, is that the judicial branch of the Federal Government will continue to sequester the religious rights of the American people from them—one right at a time, if indeed not all at once—by continuing to sequester the authority of the States by which those rights have been protected.

In the role of now protecting our rights, the Court denies us our rights.

Thus we have the situation wherein our Chief Tribunal—an integral part of the Federal Government—will continue its process of depriving the American people of the State government authority to secure their religious liberties established by the Bill of Rights and shown to be necessary by the Declaration of Independence. The Court's establishing itself, by its own violation of the provisions of article V for the amending process, as sole authority in religious questions, will bring about disaster.

I would certainly oppose the oppression by a State of the religious rights of an individual citizen.

I do oppose the emasculation of the Bill of Rights that is destroying the power of a State to safeguard the religious rights of all its citizens.

For with the one, injustice would be perpetrated. But with the other, tyranny will reign—tyranny limited perhaps to the religious sphere, but tyranny, nonetheless.

Without the power of authority in the hands of the States, the Court will reign. The American people will be ruled in the religious area by nine appointees of the President instead of being protected by the constitutions of the 50 States and the Constitution of the United States. The Bill of Rights will have become a mockery.

I do not accuse the Supreme Court of intending to take all rights from the people by taking all powers from the States. But we cannot be blind to the path that the Court is taking in the one area concerning our religious freedoms. That path leads to complete impotency on the part of the people to exercise their religious liberties. Thus they will have no religious rights. As long as the Court rules that government may make no law respecting an establishment of religion, and as long as the Court defines what that establishment includes, the American people will have religious rights in name only.

As long as the Court can make up its own rules as it goes along, stretching the basic Constitution, the Bill of Rights and the later amendments, and basing its decisions on words outside the Constitution, the fate of our religious freedoms is sealed.

I have sought to demonstrate how the Supreme Court has violated the integrity of the Constitution and the Bill of Rights by way of its unconstitutional amending of that great charter.

What the Court has done, nevertheless, stands today, unchecked, as the constitutional law of the land.

No matter how distorted the rulings or incongruous the reasoning behind those decisions, what the Court has ruled is the law. It is not what the Founding Fathers set forth; it is not what we would prefer it to be. It is what the Court made it.

Thus, my conclusions are inescapable. The Court must, if it remains consistent with its own decisions, continue to eliminate our religious freedoms.

Before this decade is out, the Court may well rule out all or most of the freedoms and privileges in and beyond the long footnote to Justice Douglas' opinion in Engel.

If we fail to uphold the Constitution by acting now, Douglas' footnote will become a long litany of lost liberties.

And to whom shall the people turn when those freedoms are lost?

Sympathetic officials, though wanting to help, would be hogtied by the law of the United States promulgated by the Supreme Court, that no agent of government—at any level of government—could interfere in the religious area.

No level of government could secure the rights of the people by helping them to implement those rights. True, all power resides in the people. But they would have been rendered powerless by the Court's judgments which rendered powerless the State governments' original constitutional authority to guarantee those rights.

At such a sad point in our history, would the American people have any recourse?

Yes, they will have one. The same one we have now.

Their only resort will be to overthrow the rulings of the Supreme Court, and this by constitutional amendment—if they will have the liberty left to do that.

I make that qualification because the action of the Court in sequestering other rights from the people by sequestering powers of the States has not been limited to the religious area. One of these is the right of the people—left to them by the 9th and 10th amendments—to determine their own legislatures according to their own State constitutions.

It will be far more difficult for the people to act to regain liberties all or almost all gone at some future time.

The time for us to act is now.

For the Court's own sake, we must act now.

Unfortunately, the Justices failed to exercise the judicial restraint its wisdom and prudence should have dictated and article V of the Constitution compelled. Whether the Court drifted into its present state of mind without knowing what it must lead to, or went that way by premeditated plan, I cannot say. But any innocence or good intent is no defense. What is inexcusable is that the Court—the top Justices in the Nation—went right ahead and overturned the whole purpose of the Bill of Rights.

Of all Americans, the Supreme Court Justices know best the limitation of power imposed upon them by article V of the Constitution.

The Court had to know what it was doing. It knows what it is doing.

Hence, any resentment against the Court is largely of its own making, in that the Justices—and no one else—have struck a mortal blow against the Bill of Rights.

That resentment is rising. The Tuck amendment which passed the House, a measure which limits the appellate power of the Court, is in direct answer to that justified resentment by constitutionally minded American citizens.

Let us act now, not out of resentment or anger, justified as it may be, but in a serious effort to get to the cause, not the effect, of the unwise decisions made by the Court.

OUR DUTY TO DEFEND AND UPHOLD THE CONSTITUTION

The Judiciary Committee of the House recently held hearings on proposed amendments to the Constitution that would, in general, have permitted prayer and/or Bible reading in the public schools if this were on a voluntary basis.

I favored such an amendment, but my support was given in hopes that such an amendment would be a first step on the road. However, none of the proposals came close to the heart of the problem as I have outlined it here, and as I did to the committee. The various amendments would merely have made legal what the Court had ruled illegal regarding school prayer, but would let stand the unconstitutional principle underlying the Court's ruling. To me it is vital that the problem be attacked at its core.

The core of the problem is the illegality of the Supreme Court's action in violation of Article V of the Constitution of the United States in ruling the first amendment applicable against the States.

This constituted a usurpation of the legislative process in amending the Constitution which article V permits only to the Congress and the legislatures of the States.

I repeat here the statement of Justice Potter Stewart in his dissent in the Schempp case:

> I accept too the proposition that the 14th amendment has somehow absorbed the establishment clause, although it is not without irony that a constitutional provision evidently designed to leave the States free to go their own way should now have become a restriction upon their autonomy.

His use of the words I underlined shows the Court's inability to demonstrate precisely how the 14th amendment did what the Court says it did, namely deprived the States of a power the Bill of Rights left to them, authority in the religious area.

Indebted as I am to Justice Stewart for his concise summation of the irony in question, I cannot agree with the proposition as he does. For to do so is to acknowledge that the Supreme Court has somehow legitimately amended the first amendment to make it restrictive of the powers of the States which the first amendment originally clearly left to the States. I do not call it ironic, I call it tragic, for it is unconstitutional for the Supreme Court to amend the Constitution of the United States. It can only interpret it; it cannot apply tortured reasoning to distort it or pervert it in any way so as to actually amend it.

What to me is ironic indeed, is that evidently many good legal minds have been willing to accept the Supreme Court's rulings in the prayer cases, but stoutly resist the so-called prayer amendments as "tampering with the Bill of Rights."

Nothing in my opinion so sharply focuses the confusion existing today regarding the prayer in the schools issue and the constitutional amendments proposed in the Congress in that regard, as two statements in a staff study prepared by counsel to the House Judiciary Committee and published March 24, 1964.

In a worthy cataloging of some 146 resolutions proposing these various amendments, the study's introduction opens by quoting the first part of the first amendment, and then immediately states:

> The 14th amendment makes these commands applicable to the States."

Yet, on page 27, after briefly discussing reservations in the Court's opinions in the Schempp case, and citing two other cases specifically, this statement appears:

> Since these and similar cases may place concrete limits on the decisions in *Engle* v. *Vitale* and the Schempp case, members of the committee may wish to consider whether to await further clarification by the Supreme Court before acting on these proposals to amend the Bill of Rights for the first time since its adoption more than 170 years ago.

I have read any number of statements by prominent citizens opposing any thought of an amendment to the Constitution to solve the prayer issue since they feel it would be much worse to amend the Bill of Rights.

In view of what I have outlined in this presentation, these good people have been deluded. They have been the victims of a brainwashing by arguments which have never gotten down to touching upon the core of the problem. The nonsense, instigated and compounded by the Supreme Court, has been further compounded by positions such as that in the Judiciary Committee's Study.

The Court, and no other organ of government, has amended the Bill of Rights to apply it against the States, and then has consistently ruled by that distortion for the last 25 years or so, through its gross misinterpretation of the 14th amendment.

It has gone on so long far too many Americans have come to accept it.

The Court has sold a bill of goods, and even learned men have bought it.

Let me analyze the contradiction unconsciously recorded before our eyes in the staff study by quoting from it and by numbering and simplifying the points made therein:

> 1. The first amendment to the Constitution of the States begins: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof. * * *"
>
> 2. The 14th amendment makes these commands applicable to the States. (*Cantwell* v. *Connecticut*, 310 U.S. 296, 303; *Murdock* v. *Pennsylvania*, 319 U.S. 105, 108.)
>
> 3. Members of the committee may wish to * * * await * * * before acting on these proposals to amend the Bill of Rights for the first time since its adoption more than 170 years ago.

There are three points. Now let me simplify them:

> 1. "Congress shall make no law."
>
> 2. The 14th amendment says the States, as well as Congress, shall make no law.
>
> 3. "These (new) proposals (would) amend the Bill of Rights for the first time."

Here is the unconscious illogic of those who oppose the prayer amendments, based on their failure to see what has really happened. Certainly I should not have to explain what is wrong with the logic of the three points made above. But that there is no question, I will. It is this:

In No. 1, the States are left full power regarding the whole area of religion by the Bill of Rights.

In No. 2, the States are denied this power—supposedly by the 14th amendment.

In No. 3, we are told the Bill or Rights has never been amended.

Anyone can see, once it is set before them so clearly, that the Bill of Rights certainly has been amended—if point No. 2 is indeed true. If true, the Bill of Rights was amended July 28, 1868, the day the Secretary of State declared that a sufficient number of States had ratified the 14th amendment.

They cannot have it both ways. The 14th amendment either amended the 1st amendment or the 14th did not amend the 1st. They cannot say that the 14th changes or enlarges, or applies, or absorbs the meaning of the 1st to now include the States as well as Congress and still say that the Bill of Rights has never been amended.

And if indeed, the 14th amendment had amended the 1st amendment, then indeed the Bill of Rights has already been tampered with and it would not be such a bad thing to unamend it. In view of this, much of the opposition to the prayer amendments should evaporate among those who truly abhor the idea of the Bill of Rights being drastically changed. But at least it should be clear to all that any attempt by the proponents of the prayer amendments, if successful, would not be the first change in the Bill of Rights.

However, since the actual situation is that the Court has merely interpreted the 14th amendment to deny the States the authority in the area of religion left to them in the 1st amendment, it is a legitimate action on the part of the Congress to correct the situation.

Clearly, if Congress and the legislatures of the States had intended the 14th amendment to absorb the 1st, Justice Stewart would not be so perplexed as to how to explain that absorption and its resultant ironic restriction of the States constitutional freedom and authority in the area of religion.

It is the duty of Congress, in view of this abysmal situation wherein the right of the people to worship their Creator publicly is slowly being strangled by the Court, to put the record straight. We should put the Bill of Rights straight by enunciating the fact that the 1st amendment remains unchanged and continues to leave to the States full authority in the area of religion, circumscribed only by the 14th amendment's requirement of due process of law as a restraint upon the States powers of compulsion.

Let us be done with the dishonesty, or ignorance, or oversight, whichever it may be, in public discussion which has caused so many of our good people to oppose the prayer amendments because they oppose what they have been led to believe would constitute the first interference with the Bill of Rights.

My own support of the prayer amendments has been half-hearted because they do not get to the basic issue, one which is vital to America's very existence.

THE SUPREME COURT HAS MADE THE BILL OF RIGHTS AN ISSUE

This is what is really at stake.

Either we stand on the Bill of Rights as it was originally intended, or we accept the perversion which is the Supreme Court's version of the Bill of Rights.

Let this be clear:

To accept the Supreme Court's version of the Bill of Rights is to accept and approve not only an amended 1st amendment, but an amended 9th amendment, an amended 10th amendment, an amended 14th amendment, an amended article I and an amended article V of the Constitution.

It is to accept the striking down of States' authority by the Federal Government, despite the first amendment.

It is to accept the usurpation of the Federal Government to deny a right of the people, despite the ninth amendment.

It is to accept the usurpation of the Federal Government to take away a power of the States, despite the 10th amendment.

It is to accept the usurpation of the Federal Government to abridge the privileges and immunities of citizens in a manner prohibited to the States by the 14th amendment.

It is to accept the usurpation of the Federal Government to misread, misinterpret, and misapply the constitutional amendments enacted by the people through their representatives in the Congress and the legislatures of the States.

It is to accept the usurpation of the Supreme Court, whose powers are delimited by article III of the Constitution, to violate article I of the Constitution which provides that "All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States."

It is to accept the usurpation of the Supreme Court to violate article V of the Constitution which forbids the Court any part in the amending of the Constitution.

It is to accept the trend toward centralism and the end of the Federal principle of our National Government.

I stand with the Bill of Rights as established by our Founding Fathers.

I attribute to the Justices no malice, but rather a fallacious, tortured reasoning that has led to their erecting a Rube Goldberg structure of constitutional law in recent years.

However, the result is very clear. The American people have been denied their rights. The Federal Government has struck down and usurped the power and authority of the States. Claiming to be extending the Bill of Rights, the Court has been destroying it.

I hold that the Supreme Court has violated the Constitution, and because of my oath to uphold that great charter of freedom for the American people, it is my duty to work for the restoration and integrity of the Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

I therefore introduce the following resolution:

Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to restore the integrity of the Constitution and the Bill of Rights and to establish the source of men's rights and governments' powers in the organic law of the land

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is hereby proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of the several States:

SECTION 1. The scope of the Fourteenth Amendment, which limits the compulsive power of the States in order to give equal protection under due process of law to every citizen against oppression by a State, shall be construed neither to derive from, nor to absorb the First Amendment, nor to make that amendment applicable to the States. Neither shall it be construed to remove, to diminish, or to delegate to the United States, the authority and responsibility of the States in any area reserved to them or to the people by the Constitution and the First Ten Amendments, nor to otherwise amend the Bill of Rights to permit any intrusions of Federal Government power prohibited thereby.

SEC. 2. Except in the case of total repeal, or repeal with ratification as changed, no amendment or combination of amendments to the Constitution shall be construed to reverse, invert, or change in any manner, the purpose, intent, or meaning of any other amendment. Nor shall any amendment be construed, either of itself or in conjunction with any other amendment, to prohibit to the States any of the powers or authority reserved to them or to the people by the Constitution and the Bill of Rights, unless that amendment itself embodies language stating in precisely limiting terms what specific power or authority is thereby prohibited to the States or delegated to the United States.

SEC. 3. The specific prohibition, reduction or delegation of any such power or authority shall not be interpreted to extend in any degree to other powers or authority reserved to the States or to the people by the Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

SEC. 4. To establish the source of men's rights and governments' powers, we hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.

SEC. 5. The right of the people, through their elected and appointed officials, publicly to offer prayer and manifest in other ways their dependence upon the Creator, or to extend equal privileges to religious institutions, shall not be abridged by any organ of government.

SEC. 6. The expression of such manifestations toward the Creator on behalf of the people of this Nation shall in no way be construed to violate the liberties of any citizen or group of citizens.

SEC. 7. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress.

ANALYSIS OF THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT, BY SECTIONS

First, let us summarize the situation which makes this amendment so necessary.

The Supreme Court has established that anything any level of government does in the religious area may violate the Constitution, and we can conclude, would be unconstitutional, if any of these criteria apply to what is done: First, it is violative of the concept of separation of church and state; second, it is not outweighed by a superior, more primary secular purpose; and, third, it involves the most minuscule, direct or indirect government financing.

All these criteria, of course, will be determined and adjudged by the Supreme Court.

The Court has set forth these criteria by way of making two basic errors which:

First, extend the first amendment to the States in a manner which completely overturns the original purpose of that amendment.

Second, extend the meaning of the words "an establishment of religion" in the first amendment to include whatever the Court wishes them to encompass.

The Court has made these errors by:

First, basing its decisions on concepts not written into the Constitution.

Second, failing to exercise the judicial restraint imposed upon the Court by article V of the Constitution which established Congress and the State legislatures as the means of amending the Constitution.

Third, adhering to the fallacious notion which lacks any legal validity as far as the Court is concerned, that "So far as constitutional law is concerned stare decisis must give way before the dynamic component of history."

Indeed, this last item may well explain all the rest.

Justice Douglas' utterance of those words in 1949 gives us good reason to believe the Supreme Court, or at least its majority, has had a purpose in view—a purpose other than just interpreting the Constitution in adjudicating the cases brought before it.

This purpose—whatever it may be—has led to what I call gross judicial mischief. Worse, the result of that mischief has been the distortion and emasculation of the Bill of Rights.

The Court has amended the Bill of Rights in order that it might further its own social purpose, the scope of which is determined by "the dynamic component of history."

My amendment is composed of several sections, each with a specific purpose.

We are faced with a complicated situation which I have endeavored to set forth in my presentation of the case. The Supreme Court has not just made a single erroneous ruling. It has made the misjudgments I have just summarized, and then applied those errors to cases for the last 25 years or so, thus building up a compounded confusion which unfortunately is Constitutional law, because the Court has made it so.

This process must be undone.

In addition, the rulings of the Court clearly point to dangers to our liberties in the near future. These dangers must be insured against and prevented.

My amendment will accomplish these ends, and yet will not reduce in the slightest the powers of the Court. The amendment will correct the misinterpretations of the Court, but will not limit its appellate power.

The issue at stake is the Bill of Rights. My amendment will reestablish the integrity of the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. It will restore the Bill of Rights to what it was originally intended to be and to do. It will achieve this purpose by destroying the version of the first 10 amendments the Supreme Court cast from its distorted mold of the original.

My amendment will restore to the States the powers usurped by the Federal Government, powers the States again will be free to utilize to safeguard the rights of the people which have been abridged by the Supreme Court.

Section 1: The scope of the 14th amendment, which limits the compulsive power of the States in order to give equal protection under due process of law to every citizen against oppression by a State, shall be construed neither to derive from, nor to absorb the 1st amendment, nor to make that amendment applicable to the States. Neither shall it be construed to remove, to diminish, or to delegate to the United States, the authority and responsibility of the States in any area reserved to them or to the people by the Constitution and the first ten amendments, nor to otherwise amend the Bill of Rights to permit any intrusions of Federal Government power prohibited thereby.

Section 1 of my amendment deals directly with the major problem at hand, the use of the 14th amendment by the Supreme Court is its lever to give new meaning to the 1st amendment opposite to that intended by the Founding Fathers. It deals with the diminishing of States' powers caused by that action of the Court. It unravels the Court's acts by delimiting the scope of the 14th amendment.

First. It upholds the purpose of the 14th amendment to limit the compulsive power of a State against a citizen by restraining that power under the due process clause.

Second. It establishes the scope of the 14th amendment as wholly self-contained, making the crutch of an inverted 1st amendment inapplicable.

Third. It establishes that the 14th amendment does not absorb the 1st amendment, and sets aside the Court's application of the 1st amendment against the States under that false concept.

Fourth. It reestablishes the sole concern of the first amendment as being with the Congress, exclusively.

Fifth. It establishes the limits of the 14th amendment, permitting no construction of it that would in any way lessen the authority and responsibility of the States in areas left to them by the Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

Sixth. It reestablishes the limits of the Federal Government's powers as those defined by the Constitution and the Bill of Rights, thereby prohibiting to the Court the authority it has assumed at the cost of lessening States authority.

Seventh. It reestablishes the full intent and meaning of the Bill of Rights, unamended and unchanged in any way by the 14th amendment or any interpretation of that amendment.

Eighth. It reestablishes the integrity of article V of the Constitution by setting aside the amending of the first amendment by the Court in violation of that article.

Ninth. It reestablishes the integrity of article I of the Constitution by setting aside that legislating of the Court, the legislative process being reserved by that article to the Congress.

Tenth. It terminates the Court-determined concept that never was in the Constitution, that substituted the word "government" for the word "Congress" in the first amendment.

Eleventh. It reestablishes the integrity of the 14th amendment, restoring it to its sole function as a protection against possible oppression by a State without due process, and terminates its use as a device that permits the Federal Government to abridge the rights of the people and reduce the powers of the States.

Section 2: Except in the case of total repeal, or repeal with ratification as changed, no amendment or combination of amendments to the Constitution shall be construed to reverse, invert, or change in any manner, the purpose, intent, or meaning of any other amendment. Nor shall any amendment be construed, either of itself or in conjunction with any other amendment, to prohibit to the States any of the powers or authority reserved to them or to the people by the Constitution and the Bill of Rights, unless that amendment itself embodies language stating in precisely limiting terms what specific power or authority is thereby prohibited to the States or delegated to the United States.

Section 2 of my amendment defends against a potential danger similar to the present evil that section I deals with.

First. It enforces a judicial restraint upon the Court noticeably lacking in recent years.

Second. It prevents a repetition of the setting of one constitutional provision against another in a manner that, unlike a balancing of powers, establishes a contradiction within and between the amendments.

Third. It vastly reduces the ability of the Court to interpret so as to legislate, in violation of section I of article I of the Constitution which establishes Congress as the sole legislative body.

Fourth. It prevents the Supreme Court doing in the future with one or more amendments what it has already done with the 14th amendment to invert the purpose of the 1st amendment.

Fifth. It guarantees that the will of the people, as worked in any amendment, shall not be frustrated without their knowledge or consent, as we have seen happen.

Sixth. It guarantees that any constitutional change will be made only with the full approval of the people in accord with the amending process as established in article V.

Seventh. It prevents the Court from misinterpreting and misapplying any amendment or group of amendments to reduce any power or authority of the States left to them by the Bill of Rights by requiring the Court to comply strictly with the letter of the amendments, leaving it no room for the license that it has taken in the last quarter century.

Eighth. It requires drafters of future amendments to use the most exact and pointed language possible if a lessening of States powers is involved, to further prevent Court misinterpretation of their purpose.

Section 3: The specific prohibition, reduction or delegation of any such power or authority shall not be interpreted to extend in any degree to other powers or authority reserved to the States or to the people by the Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

Section 3 of my amendment prohibits the Supreme Court from playing fast and loose with the powers of the States.

First. It further applies the judicial restraint that has not been self-imposed in the past, forcing the Court to limit itself to specifics in all cases where powers of the States are at stake, curtailing its excesses in which it has taken liberties with generalities including concepts not even in the Constitution.

Second. It insures the permanence of the full exercise by the States of all authority and powers not precisely curtailed by any specific amendment.

Third. It prevents the creation of any new propositions that are somehow called into being, such as the absorption of one provision by another in a manner which defies explanation, as typified in the amazing statement we have seen by Justice Stewart in his opinion in the Schempp case.

Section 4: To establish the source of men's rights and governments' powers, we hold these truths to be self-evident that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.

Section 4 of my amendment, taken directly from the Declaration of Independence, infuses into the Constitution and thus our organic body of law, fundamental American concepts honored by all our citizens since the founding of the Republic, but ignored or in effect belittled by the Supreme Court in its jurisprudence of recent years.

First. It establishes in the organic law of the land the source of men's rights as being their Creator.

Second. It fixes in law the concept that government's purpose is the safeguarding of those rights.

Third. It establishes in law the truth that no government or branch of government has the power to grant or withdraw the unalienable rights of men.

Fourth. It establishes the conviction of the Union of the States in one voice what each of the 50 States acknowledges through its individual constitution—the existence of the Creator.

Fifth. It establishes in law and not merely judicial lip-service, what Justice Douglas expressed in Zorach against Clauson, "We are a religious people whose institutions presuppose a Supreme Being."

Sixth. It establishes a barrier to help stem further erosion of what I have called, because of these principles of the Declaration of Independence, the public spiritual character of this Nation.

Seventh. It establishes in law the grounds upon which all acts of public homage to the Creator have long been based, from Presidential proclamations fixing Thanksgiving Day on down to the children's prayers with which the school day used to begin.

Eighth. It establishes in law that this Nation is composed of men who are created by the Creator, that this Nation now exists under God, indivisible, and is not afraid to proclaim it as a living fact, not past history.

Ninth. It demolishes the hypocrisy of Justice Brennan's rationale that the various patriotic exercises and activities used in the public schools and elsewhere which, whatever may have been their origins, no longer have a religious purpose or meaning, are now constitutional, if like the motto "In God We Trust," they have been "simply interwoven—so deeply in the fabric of our civil policy that * * * present use may well not present that type of involvement which the first amendment prohibits."

Tenth. It demolishes the hypocrisy expressed by Brennan that "The reference to divinity in the revised pledge of allegiance, for example, may merely recognize the historical fact that our Nation was believed to have been founded 'under God'."

Eleventh. It affirms in organic law that the principles of the Declaration of Independence are a living guide to this Nation, that they will live with her current history as well as in the long tradition of the United States.

Twelfth. Contrary to the trend of the Supreme Court, it demonstrates a renewed vigor in the American tradition of profound reverence for the Creator, and enshrines that tradition as fundamental in our great legal charter, insuring against its crumbling into the dust of forgotten greatness.

Thirteenth. It destroys the Court's concept that our Government is a completely secular institution.

Fourteenth. It establishes in law that these principles, for which the American Revolution was fought, enrich the American concept of government, giving it the noble purpose of securing the God-given rights of the governed.

Fifteenth. It reaffirms the great conviction Thomas Jefferson feared we might lose, which he expressed in these words now enshrined in stone in his memorial, "Can the liberties of a nation be secure when we have removed a conviction that these liberties are the gift of God?"

Sixteenth. It insures the Court ever ruling unconstitutional the acknowledgment of God's existence on the part of any official or organ of government.

Seventeenth. Without disparaging the general idea contained in these words from the Court's opinion expressed by Justice Clark in Schempp, "In the relationship between man and religion, the state is firmly committed to a position of neutrality," this section precludes the Court or any other organ of government from being neutral to the extreme of denying man his right to honor his Creator in public places which is what the Court has done in its prayer decisions.

Eighteenth. It makes it impossible for the Court to be neutral on the question of the existence of the Creator, without in any way imposing any burden on the doubter or unbeliever or causing them to be treated differently than the believer.

Nineteenth. It renders it impossible for the Court to favor either the beliefs of atheism or the beliefs of agnosticism as opposed to belief in the existence of the Creator, but it in no way precludes the Court from ruling in favor of an atheist or an agnostic or any group of such citizens whose case presents clear evidence of any compulsion without due process by the Federal Government or a State.

Twentieth. It establishes as constitutional the equality of all men, fixing in our organic law the fact of that equality being an endowment of a Creator common to all.

Twenty-first. It encourages a higher appreciation for all citizens, no matter what their race, creed, or color, and provides a great asset in law for upholding basic moral and civil rights.

Twenty-second. This section establishes that no government or branch of government has legitimate powers beyond those consented to by the citizens governed, thus further reinforcing the Bill of Rights as a wall of separation or division of powers between those of the States and those of the Federal Government.

Section 5: The right of the people, through their elected and appointed officials, publicly to offer prayer and manifest in other ways their dependence upon the Creator, or to extend equal privileges to religious institutions, shall not be abridged by an organ of government.

Section 5 of my amendment sets forth a long-honored, basic right of the American people which is now in temporary eclipse because of the Court's prayer decisions. While section I of my amendment will nullify those decisions, nevertheless the fact that once this right was lost by the people seems to require that it be especially defined as a warning to those who might seek to abolish it again. Until the prayer decisions, such a provision would never have been thought necessary in the land of the free.

First. It affirms that public prayer or other public manifestations of dependence upon or homage to the Creator is a right of the people.

Second. It affirms that public officials, elected or appointed, may lead such manifestations, or give aid in order that they might be made, in conformity with the will of the people.

Third. It affirms the right of the people to set aside special days specifically for the purpose of acts of religious conviction, such as Thanksgiving Day, Christmas, et cetera, which are marked as religious holidays.

Fourth. It affirms the right of the people to have paid officials whose specific purpose is to minister to the spiritual needs of the Nation, such as chaplains in our armed services, prisons, Federal and State legislatures, et cetera.

Fifth. It affirms the right of the people to emblazon their national motto "In God We Trust" on currency, on public buildings, on emblems of any kind, et cetera.

Sixth. It affirms the right of the people to establish new customs as well as to continue all of the traditional ones, which demonstrate in a public manner to themselves and to all the world the devotion of America to the Creator of her people.

Seventh. It affirms the fact that the extension of privileges equally to religious institutions, such as tax exemption, is constitutional, as long as no preferred status is established for any one sect or group of sects.

Eighth. It affirms that the people shall never have this right infringed upon in any way by any branch of government at any level.

Section 6: The expression of such manifestations toward the Creator on behalf of the people of this Nation shall in no way be construed to violate the liberties of any citizens or group of citizens.

Section 6 of my amendment affirms the priority that is established by the truths of the Declaration of Independence incorporated in section 4. The fact that man is created imposes upon him some obligation to his Creator, which obligation has since the beginning of time been fulfilled through prayer and other religious devotions. Some men, of course, do not accept the idea of any such obligation. We must accept their decision as their personal choice, no matter how much we disagree with them. However, the self-determined choice of the few can in no way force the cancellation of the obligation on man, nor the fulfillment of that obligation by the many who choose to do so.

First. This section provides that judicial deference toward the self-proclaimed rights of any citizen or group of citizens shall never again be the basis for striking down the God-given right of all the people to publicly manifest their dependence upon their Creator.

Second. It allows the many to acknowledge their Creator in a public manner without in any way compelling the doubter and the unbeliever to participate, and it provides that they cannot compel the participants to desist because of their own self-imposed nonconformity.

Third. It negates the concept of the Supreme Court that the "odd ball" feeling of the nonparticipant is a form of compulsion by the participants.

Fourth. It rather upholds the commonsense of the situation, that the nonparticipant in public homage to the Creator has made his own choice to remain aloof, and that personal choice gives him no constitutional basis for abridging the right of choice on the part of others.

WHAT MY AMENDMENT DOES NOT DO

Perhaps criticism will be leveled at this measure after a hasty reading of its provisions. However, a great amount of thought has gone into my amendment, and I wish to assure any possible critics of the things it will not do.

First. It will not invalidate the 14th amendment, as many have urged should be done. On the contrary, it upholds that amendment. In the speech with which I introduced the resolution proposing this amendment I have pointed out the need for the provisions of the 14th amendment. It is my complete conviction the Supreme Court has perverted the meaning of that article.

Second. It will not tamper with or change in any way the Bill of Rights, as the Court has done. It will, on the contrary, restore the first 10 amendments to the full scope of their original purpose and meaning. It restores the Bill of Rights to its fundamental purpose—to serve as a wall of division between the powers of the States and the powers of the Federal Government, and to protect the rights of the people from any intrusion by the Federal Government.

Third. It does not set up any requirement for a religious test for any citizen to hold any office.

Fourth. It does not preclude the changing of any of the first 10 amendments, although it certainly does not advocate this.

Fifth. It does not automatically throw out every decision made by the Supreme Court over the last 25 years or so and every ruling made by lower courts in light of those decisions. Individual attention will be required to determine which decisions may be nullified, and new suits will probably need to be instituted.

Sixth. It does not change or weaken the basic principle that all rights are inextricably bound up with corresponding responsibilities and that one man's rights cannot be separated from his duty to respect the rights of every other human being.

Seventh. It does not unite church and state or merge them in any way. Rather, it reaffirms the traditional parallel service they offer to the Creator, one providing a means of communication with the Creator, the other maintaining the liberty within which man is enabled to exercise that and every other right given him by that Creator.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRUCE. I yield.

Mr. FINDLEY. I wish to compliment the gentleman from Indiana on the statement he is making. It is but one of the latest of the many examples of fine public service that he is rendering.

It was my pleasure to come to the Congress with the gentleman from Indiana as a freshman in 1961 and to work closely with him on a good many projects. Now that the 88th Congress is nearing its close it is saddening to me to realize that the gentleman from Indiana will not be with us next year due to the circumstances of political fortune. But our loss will be someone else's gain. I am certain that many colleagues join me in best wishes to this fine servant of freedom.

Mr. BRUCE. I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRUCE. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois regarding the service of DON BRUCE, of Indiana. He will be sorely missed in the Halls of the House of Representatives. He was and is one of the ablest and most promising young statesmen I know anywhere in the United States. I am satisfied that the political world has not heard the last of my friend, DON BRUCE. It is my hope and my prayer and I know I am joined in this by Members of the House on both sides of the aisle that the great ability that he has will again be brought into the service of the United States of America in some capacity.

As DON BRUCE leaves the House we wish him the very best of good fortune in everything he does in the future.

Mr. BRUCE. I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Arizona. It has indeed been a real privilege to serve here in the House of Representatives with men on both sides of the aisle. I do not think anyone could ever have the opportunity to serve in this body and not have that service remain with him always as an inspiration. I think you go out a bit better than when you came in because of the traditions of this great body and because of the caliber of the men who serve here.

I remember the first time I spoke here in the well of the House. I did so with a feeling of awe. I still do, when I think of the great men who have stood here.

I had no personal ambitions at all, yet I found myself in this position. This is something I shall always cherish.

It was a difficult decision for me to make not to be a candidate for the House of Representatives again. I do not know what the future holds, but I know what the present has held. It has held warmth. It has held inspiration. To those on both the minority and the majority sides of the aisle, may I express my sincere thanks for your kindness and for the privilege of having served with you.

What the future holds we do not know.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1965

Mr. MAHON submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 12633) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes.

TO AMEND SECTION 560 OF TITLE 38, UNITED STATES CODE

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 2434) to amend section 560 of title 38, United States Code, to permit the payment of special pension to holders of the Congressional Medal of Honor awarded such medal for actions not involving conflict with an enemy, and for other purposes.

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 1929)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2434) entitled "An act to amend section 560 of title 38, United States Code, to permit the payment of special pension to holders of the Congressional Medal of Honor awarded such medal for actions not involving conflict with an enemy, and for other purposes", having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same.

OLIN E. TEAGUE,
W. B. DORN,
JAMES A. HALEY,
W. H. AYRES,
E. ROSS ADAIR,
Managers on the Part of the House.

HARRY F. BYRD,
RUSSELL B. LONG,
GEORGE SMATHERS,
JOHN WILLIAMS,
FRANK CARLSON,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2434) entitled "An act to amend section 560 of title 38, United States Code, to permit the payment of special pension to holders of the Congressional Medal of Honor awarded such medal for actions not involving conflict with an enemy, and for other purposes", submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Prior to the enactment of Public Law 87-138 there had been a 65-year age limitation on the payment of a $10-a-month pension to holders of the Congressional Medal of Honor.

With the enactment of Public Law 87-138 the pension was increased to $100 and the age limitation was reduced to 50. The bill which became Public Law 87-138; namely, H.R. 845, of the 87th Congress, had no age requirement in the form which it passed the House. The Senate inserted the 50-year requirement and this requirement was accepted by the House in order to get the legislation providing for a pension increase on the statute books.

In the 88th Congress when H.R. 2434 was passed by the House, there was no age limitation and in addition to making 17 peacetime holders of the Congressional Medal of Honor eligible for the pension, it would have removed the 50-year age requirement. The Senate accepted the 17 peacetime holders but rejected the change in the 50-year limitation and returned the measure to the House. The House accepted the Senate amendment with an amendment setting the age limitation at 40 years. The Senate rejected this proposed compromise and asked for a conference.

The Senate in conference agreed to the 40-year limitation proposed by the House as a compromise.

OLIN E. TEAGUE,
W. B. DORN,
JAMES A. HALEY,
W. H. AYRES,
E. ROSS ADAIR,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report on the bill (H.R. 2434) to amend section 560 of title 38, United States Code, to permit the payment of special pension to holders of the Congressional Medal of Honor awarded such medal for actions not involving conflict with an enemy, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MAKING IT IN ORDER TO CONSIDER CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 1927 UPON ITS FILING

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order to consider the conference report on H.R. 1927 immediately after it is filed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, was this the bill which was in conference this afternoon, may I ask the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. It is the bill that was in conference this afternoon.

Mr. ADAIR. Does the gentleman have any reason for optimism on the question as to whether or not the conferees might reach an agreement on this legislation?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Indiana knows, and he participated, the conferees met this afternoon at 3 o'clock. It is my personal opinion, and I believe all the conferees will agree, that we were two-thirds or four-fifths of the way as far as the conference was concerned. We disagreed on one item. I would have to say I do not have any reason to believe that we will agree. It is in the hands of the Senate conferees.

Mr. ADAIR. It would be the gentleman's disposition to stand firm on the present position of the House conferees on this matter and not to give in?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. The vote of the conferees would be unanimous as far as the House conferees are concerned, and it would be a firm position.

Mr. ADAIR. The gentleman is asking that if a conference agreement can be reached tomorrow, if a report may be filed and the bill presented on tomorrow?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Without this unanimous consent request, if the House adjourns tomorrow the bill will not be considered.

Mr. SECREST. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SECREST. It is my personal opinion as a member of the committee, but not one of the conferees, that this House should not go home without passing that pension bill, especially if we raise social security and then do not pass the pension bill. In any event, it should be considered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 1927—REPORT NO. 1930

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 1927) to amend title 38, United States Code, to revise the pension program for veterans of World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict, and their widows and children, and for other purposes.

JOINT STATEMENT ON DEMOCRATIC PARTY UNITY—1964 ELECTION

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of myself and a group of Democratic colleagues listed below, I wish at this time to present to the House a joint statement on Democratic Party unity in the 1964 election. The statement speaks for itself:

JOINT STATEMENT ON DEMOCRATIC UNITY—1964 ELECTION

We, the undersigned members of the Democratic caucus of the House of Representatives, believe that the crucial issues of the 1964 presidential election make it imperative that all conscientious Democrats close ranks behind President Lyndon B. Johnson and his vice-presidential runningmate, Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, in a unified effort to achieve overwhelming victory over the forces of extremism and reaction which threaten our Nation.

We feel that it is the duty of all Members and candidates seeking election on the Democratic ticket to give full support to President Johnson, Senator Humphrey, and the principles of our party as set forth in the platform adopted at our national convention.

All of us are aware that, in past campaigns, some Members of the Democratic caucus have openly supported presidential candidates of other political parties, or have worked for slates of unpledged or independent electors in their States. This they have every right to do. We do not feel, however, that such Members should be welcomed back into the Democratic fold and be entitled to committee assignments and other privileges on an equal basis with those members of the Democratic caucus who supported our national candidates and platform.

With a maximum, unified campaign effort, we are confident that President Johnson and Senator Humphrey and the forward-looking Democratic platform which we all advocate will be given an unprecedented mandate by the American voters in November. We feel that the new administration and the American public are entitled to expect that the progressive Democratic programs will be implemented by Congress. They must not be thwarted by a repudiated minority holding legislative positions of power which permit them to frustrate the mandate for progress.

We are, therefore, taking this means to serve notice of our firm intention to oppose the seating, in the January 1965 Democratic caucus, of any present Member or candidate elected to the House of Representatives on the Democratic ticket who supported, campaigned for, or otherwise advocated the election of a President or Vice President other than the candidates duly nominated by the Democratic Party at our convention. Similar action will be directed toward any Member or candidate who supported so-called unpledged or independent slates of electors for President and Vice President.

To do less than this would betray the principles of our party and repudiate the voice of the American electorate.

We welcome the support of other Members who share our views and who likewise believe in the vital necessity for strong Democratic Party unity in the 1964 presidential election and a return to full party responsibility in the House of Representatives in the 89th Congress.

John A. Blatnik, of Minnesota; Richard Bolling, of Missouri; John Brademas, of Indiana; Julia Butler Hansen, of Washington; Chet Holifield, of California; James G. O'Hara, of Michigan; Melvin Price, of Illinois; Henry S. Reuss, of Wisconsin; Frank Thompson, Jr., of New Jersey; Morris K. Udall, of Arizona.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

REPORT TO THE PEOPLE OF THE 16TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I want to report to the people of the 16th Congressional District of New York whom I represent. I wish to include my voting record for this year on all of the issues that confronted this session of the 88th Congress.

Today is the 2d of October and I will not be able to include the last votes of the session. However, 112 rollcall votes are listed. I was present and voted on 106 of these votes. I missed no key or controversial vote. I realize that the titles of the bills do not include a complete description of the issues involved. However, I deem it important that the people of my district know of my activities here in the House. Of the 157 quorum calls for attendance in the House, I was present for 146. On most of these quorums for which I was not present, I was on official business for members of my constituency—in four instances I was with President Johnson.

Date	No.	Measure, question, and result	Vote
1964 Jan. 14	5	S. 1153, an act to amend the Federal Airport Act to extend the time for making grants thereunder, and for other purposes. On motion to recommit with instructions. (Reduce amount money involved.) (Failed 201 to 110.)	No.
Jan. 14	6	S. 1153, an act to amend the Federal Airport Act to extend the time for making grants thereunder, and for other purposes. (Passed 298 to 11.)	Yes.
Jan. 21	11	H.R. 4879, a bill to amend the Library Services Act to increase the Federal assistance for the improvement of public libraries. On Frelinghuysen amendment. (Failed 183 to 179.)	No.
Jan. 21	12	H.R. 4879, a bill to amend the Library Services Act to increase the Federal assistance for the improvement of public libraries. On motion to recommit with instructions. (Failed 188 to 174.)	No.
Jan. 21	13	H.R. 4879, a bill to amend the Library Services Act to increase the Federal assistance for the improvement of public libraries. (Passed 254 to 107.)	Yes.
Jan. 28	17	H. Res. 582, a resolution providing for consideration of H.R. 6041, a bill to amend the prevailing wage section of the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended; and related section of the Federal Airport Act, as amended; and the National Housing Act, as amended. On ordering previous question. (Yeas 297, nays 105.)	Yes.
Jan. 28	19	H.R. 6041, a bill to amend the prevailing wage section of the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended; and related section of the Federal Airport Act, as amended; and the National Housing Act, as amended. (Passed 357 to 50.)	Yes.
Feb. 8	30	Adjourn, on motion to. (Passed 220 to 175.)	Yes.
Feb. 10	32	H.R. 7152, a bill to enforce the constitutional right to vote, to confer jurisdiction upon the district courts of the United States to provide injunctive relief against discrimination in public accommodations, to authorize the Attorney General to institute suits to protect constitutional rights in education, to establish a Community Relations Service, to extend for 4 years the Commission on Civil Rights, to prevent discrimination in federally assisted programs, to establish a Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity, and for other purposes. (Passed 290 to 130.)	Yes.
Feb. 18	35	H.R. 7381, a bill to simplify, modernize, and consolidate the laws relating to the employment of civilians in more than 1 position and the laws concerning the civilian employment of retired members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes. On motion to recommit. (Failed 262 to 83.)	No.
Feb. 20	39	H.R. 9637, a bill to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1965 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels, and research, development, test, and evaluation, for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes. (Passed 336 to 0.)	Yes.

Date	No.	Measure, question, and result	Vote
1964 Feb. 25	43	H.R. 8363, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to reduce individual and corporate income taxes, to make certain structural changes with respect to the income tax, and for other purposes. Conference report on adoptions. (Yeas 326, nays 83.)	Yes.
Feb. 26	48	H.R. 9022, a bill to amend the International Development Association Act to authorize the United States to participate in an increase in the resources of the International Development Association. On motion to recommit. (Yeas 208, nays 188.)	No.
Feb. 27	51	H.R. 8316, a bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to prohibit the Federal Communications Commission from making certain rules relating to the length or frequency of broadcast advertisements. (Passed 317 to 43.)	Yes.
Mar. 4	56	H.R. 9666, a bill to amend further the Peace Corps Act (75 Stat. 612), as amended. On motion to recommit. (Reduce amount from $115,000,000 to $95,963,971.) (Failed 309 to 90.)	No.
Mar. 5	59	H.R. 8000, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to impose a tax on acquisitions of certain foreign securities in order to equalize costs of longer term financing in the United States and in markets abroad, and for other purposes. (Passed 238 to 142.)	Yes.
Mar. 10	63	H.R. 8070, a bill for the establishment of a Public Land Law Review Commission to study existing laws and procedures to the administration of the public lands of the United States, and for other purposes. (Passed 339 to 29.)	Yes.
Mar. 11	65	H. Res. 650, a resolution providing for consideration of H.R. 8986, a bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees in the Federal Government, and for other purposes. On agreeing to resolution. (Yeas 251, nays 147.)	Yes.
Mar. 12	67	H.R. 8986, a bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees in the Federal Government, and for other purposes. (Failed 222 to 184.)	Not voting, paired for.
Mar. 19	76	H. Res. 556, a resolution providing for consideration of H.R. 5838, a bill to amend the act of Mar. 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1449), as amended, to incorporate in the Organic Act of the National Bureau of Standards the authority to make certain improvements of fiscal and administrative practices for more effective conduct of the research and development activities. On agreeing to resolution. (Yeas 264, nays 99.)	Yes.
Mar. 23	80	H.R. 5338, a bill to amend the act of Mar. 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1449), as amended, to incorporate in the Organic Act of the National Bureau of Standards the authority to make certain improvements of fiscal and administrative practices for more effective conduct of its research and development activities. On motion to recommit. (Failed 172 to 151.)	No.
Mar. 23	81	H.R. 5838, a bill to amend the act of Mar. 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1449), as amended, to incorporate in the Organic Act of the National Bureau of Standards the authority to make certain improvements of fiscal and administrative practices for more effective conduct of its research and development activities. (On passage 164 to 162.)	Yes.
Mar. 24	85	H.R. 10532, a bill making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes. On Olsen of Montana amendment. (Strike out $9,380,000 and insert in lieu $10,630,000, of which $1,250,000 shall be available for the minting of 100,000,000 silver dollars.) (Failed 193 to 160.)	Yes.
Mar. 24	86	H.R. 10532, a bill making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes. (Passed 326 to 20.)	Yes.
Mar. 25	88	H. Res. 660, a resolution providing for consideration of H.R. 10456, a bill to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and administrative operations, and for other purposes. On agreeing to resolution. (Yeas 357 to 0.)	Yes.
Mar. 25	89	H.R. 10456, a bill to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and administrative operations, and for other purposes. (Passed 283 to 73.)	Yes.
Apr. 6	91	S. 1828, an act to amend the joint resolution establishing the Battle of Lake Erie Sesquicentennial Celebration Commission so as to authorize an appropriation to carry out the provisions thereof. On suspending rules and passage. (Yeas 233, nays 39.)	Yes.
Apr. 8	97	Adjourn, motion to. (Failed 239 to 173.)	No.
Apr. 8	98	H.R. 10222, a bill to strengthen the agricultural economy; to help to achieve a fuller and more effective use of food abundances; to provide for improved levels of nutrition among economically needy households through a cooperative Federal-State program of food assistance to be operated through normal channels of trade; and for other purposes. On motion to recommit. (Failed 223 to 195.)	No.
Apr. 8	99	H.R. 10222, a bill to strengthen the agricultural economy; to help to achieve a fuller and more effective use of food abundances; to provide for improved levels of nutrition among economically needy households through a cooperative Federal-State program of food assistance to be operated through normal channels of trade; and for other purposes. (Passed 229 to 189.)	Yes.
Apr. 8	100	H. Res. 665, a resolution taking H.R. 6196 from the Speaker's table and agreeing to Senate amendments. On agreeing to resolution. (Yeas 211, nays 203.)	Yes.
Apr. 9	102	On motion to dispense with further proceedings under the call on roll No. 101. (Yeas 223, nays 132.)	Not voting.
Apr. 9	104	On motion to dispense with further proceedings under the call on roll No. 103. (Yeas 234, nays 122.)	Yes.
Apr. 10	109	Recommittal motion designed to limit expenditures of appropriations to committees and the Architect of the Capitol, whose expenditures and contracts are matters of public record and are available to public inspection. (188 yeas to 131 nays.)	No.
Apr. 14	111	H.R. 10809, making appropriations for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Department of Labor, and related agencies for fiscal year 1965. (Passed, 344 yeas to 21 nays.)	Yes.
Apr. 15	114	S. 2394, to facilitate compliance with the convention between the United States of America and the United Mexican States, signed Aug. 29, 1963. This action cleared the legislation for Presidential consideration. (Passed, 347 yeas to 5 nays.)	Yes.
Apr. 22	118	H.R. 10939, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1965. (Passed, 365 yeas to no nays.)	Yes.
May 6	121	H.R. 11134, making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the judiciary, and related agencies for fiscal year 1965. (Passed, 340 yeas to 12 nays.)	Yes.
May 7	123	H.R. 1045, to authorize appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with sec. 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954. The bill would authorize appropriations totaling $2,636,577,000 for the AEC for fiscal year 1965.	Yes.
May 13	126	S. 2214, to amend the International Development Association Act to authorize the United States to participate in an increase in the resources of the International Development Association. Vote on motion to recommit bill. (Failed, 247 nays to 132 yeas.) Action cleared the legislation for President. (Passed S. 2214 by voice vote.)	No.
May 18	127	H.J. Res. 1020, authorizing the expression of appreciation and the issuance of a gold medal to Henry J. Kaiser (a ⅔ majority is required for a suspension passage). (By a record vote 150 nays to 143 yeas the House refused to suspend the rules and pass H.J. Res. 1020.)	N.V.F.
May 20	130	Amendment to H.R. 11202, making appropriations to the Department of Agriculture and other related agencies. Amendment would provide $1,600,000 for construction of a National Peanut Research Center at Dawson, Ga. (Rejected, 198 nays to 181 yeas.)	Yes.
May 20	131	Motion to recommit H.R. 11202, Department of Agriculture and related agencies appropriations. Motion with instructions to insert language to prevent use of any funds for payment of export subsidies on any surplus agriculture commodities sold to Communist countries unless approved by the President and reported to Congress. (Motion failed, 187 nays to 186 yeas.)	Nay.
May 20	132	H.R. 11202, making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for fiscal year 1965. Bill provides appropriations totaling $5,182,665,000, which amount is $406,257,000 below the budget requests, and $1,059,632,215 less than the 1964 appropriation. (Bill passed, 311 yeas to 64 nays.)	Yes.
May 26	136	H.R. 11369, making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1965. The bill provides appropriations totaling $1,599,014,500, which amount is $279,985,500 below the budget estimates, and $13,134,500 above the 1964 appropriation. (Passed, 340 yeas to 5 nays.)	Yes.
May 27	138	H. Res. 724, rule under which H.R. 5130 was considered. (Passed, 218 yeas to 115 nays.)	Yes.
May 27	139	Motion to recommit H.R. 5130, to amend the Federal Desposit Insurance Act and title IV of the National Housing Act (relating to the insurance of savings and loan accounts) with respect to the maximum amount of insurance which may be provided thereunder. (Passed, 197 yeas to 142 nays.)	Nay.
June 3	141	H.R. 10503, to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1966 and 1967 for construction of certain highways in accordance with title 23 of United States Code, after adopting 3 committee amendments. (Unanimous record vote of 294 yeas.)	Yes.
June 3	143	Motion to adjourn. (Rejected, 289 nays to 10 yeas.)	Nay.
June 3	145	Motion to adjourn. (Rejected, 271 nays to 16 yeas.)	Nay.
June 10	152	Recommit with amendments to H.R. 11380, to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended. (Amendments failed, 211 nays to 193 yeas.)	Nay.
June 10	153	Foreign aid authorization, H.R. 11380, to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended. (Passed, 230 yeas to 175 nays.)	Yes.
June 11	155	H.R. 11049, to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees in the Federal Government. Federal employees' pay bill. (Passed, 243 yeas to 157 nays.)	Yes.
June 16	157	H.R. 11579, public works appropriations, making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, the Panama Canal, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the Delaware River Basin Commission for fiscal year 1965. The bill provides funds totaling $4,325,969,200, which amount is $46,479,800 below the budget estimates and $79,534,500 under the 1964 figure. (Passed, 360 yeas to 11 nays.)	Yes.
June 17	160	Motion to recommit H.R. 11376, to provide a 1-year extension of certain excise-tax rates. Motion designed to reduce the retailer's excise tax on jewelry, furs, toilet preparations, and luggage and handbags from 10 to 5 percent on July 1, 1964, and to repeal such taxes on July 1, 1965. (Motion rejected by 185 yeas to 207 nays.)	No.
June 18	162	H.R. 11375, to provide for the period ending June 30, 1965, a temporary increase in the public debt limit set forth in sec. 1 of the 2d Liberty Bond Act. Bill provides for a debt limit of $324,000,000,000 until June 30, 1965. (Passed, 203 yeas to 182 nays.)	Yes.
June 25	168	Amendment to the mass transit bill, H.R. 3881, to insure equal treatment for all transport workers. (Passed, 233 years to 171 nays.)	Yes.
June 25	169	Recommittal motion for H.R. 3881, designed to defer action on the legislation pending conclusion and evaluation of certain engineering studies and plans. (Rejected by 215 nays to 190 yeas.)	No.
June 25	170	H.R. 3881, to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems in metropolitan and other urban areas, after adopting a committee substitute amendment that provided a new text for the bill. (Passed, 212 yeas to 189 nays.)	Yes.
June 30	173	H.J. Res. 793, the foreign aid bill, providing for waiving of all points of order against H.R. 11812, making appropriations for foreign assistance and related agencies for fiscal year 1965. Agreed on 6 hours of debate on the legislation and after concluding all general debate and reading the 1st paragraph for amendment, House deferred further action. (Adopted. 222 yeas to 162 nays.)	N.V.F.
July 1	176	Motion to recommit H.R. 11812, making appropriations for foreign assistance and related agencies. Motion designed to effect a cut of $247,800,000 through reductions in 6 categories of economic assistance funds. (Failed, 208 nays to 198 yeas.)	No.

Date	No.	Measure, question, and result	Vote
1964 July 1	177	H.R. 11812, foreign aid appropriations, making appropriations for foreign assistance and related agencies for fiscal year 1965. (Passed, 231 yeas to 174 nays.)	Yes.
July 2	179	H. Res. 789, to provide for the concurrence of the House of Representatives to the Senate amendments to H.R. 7152, the civil rights bill. This action cleared for Presidential consideration. (Passed, 289 yeas to 126 nays.)	Yes.
July 2	181	H. Res. 795, providing for the appointment of a special committee of the House of Representatives to investigate the campaign expenditures of the various candidates for election to the House of Representatives. (Passed, 264 yeas to 92 nays.)	Yes.
July 2	182	Conference report on S. 2, to establish water resources research centers and to promote a more adequate national program of water research. (Conference report adopted by vote of 347 yeas to 0 nays.)	Yes.
July 21	184	H.R. 319, offensive mail matter, to protect postal patrons from morally offensive mail matter, amended. (Passed and sent to Senate, 325 yeas to 19 nays.)	Yes.
July 21	185	H.R. 11611, to establish a National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress, amended. (Passed and sent to Senate by record vote of 259 yeas to 75 nays.)	Yes.
July 22	187	H. Res. 738, the rule providing for the consideration of and 4 hours of debate on H.R. 3846, to establish a land and water conservation fund to assist the States and Federal agencies in meeting present and future outdoor recreation demands and needs of the American people. (H. Res. 738 adopted, 337 yeas to 8 nays.)	N.V.F.
July 28	190	H.R. 3873, fishermen's medical care, to permit certain owners of fishing boats to receive medical care and hospitalization without charge at hospitals of the Public Health Service. (Passed, 202 yeas to 170 nays.)	Yes.
July 29	192	H. Res. 802, the closed rule with 5 hours of debate on H.R. 11865, social security amendments. (Adopted by vote of 350 yeas to 29 nays.)	Yes.
July 29	193	H.R. 11865, social security, to increase benefits under the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system, to provide child's insurance benefits beyond the age of 18 while in school, to provide widow's benefits at age 60 on a reduced basis, to provide benefits for certain individuals not otherwise eligible at age 72, to improve the actuarial status of the trust funds, and to extend coverage. (Passed 388 yeas to 8 nays.)	Yes.
July 30	195	H. Res. 803, providing for disagreeing to Senate amendments to H.R. 11049, to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees in the Federal Government, and agreed to conference request by Senate. (Adopted, 244 yeas to 131 nays.)	Yes.
July 30	197	H.R. 9070, wilderness preservation, to establish a National Preservation System for the permanent good of the whole people. (Passed, 373 yeas to 1 nay.)	Yes.
Aug. 3	198	Vote to refuse to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 1096, Ice Age Reserve, Wis., authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to cooperate with the State of Wisconsin in the designation and administration of the Ice Age National Scientific Reserve in the State of Wisconsin (a ⅔ majority is required to suspend the rules). (House refused to suspend rules by vote of 164 yeas to 154 nays.)	Yes.
Aug. 3	199	H.R. 3672, Colorado-Wyoming reclamation, to provide for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Savery-Pot Hook, Bostwick Park, and Fruitland Mesa participating reclamation projects under the Colorado River Storage Project Act. (Amended and passed by 250 yeas to 67 nays.)	Yes.
Aug. 4	200	Defense appropriations conference report on H.R. 1039, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1965. Sent to Senate. (Adopted, 359 yeas to no nays.)	Yes.
Aug. 4	201	Motion to recede and concur in Senate amendment No. 14, made 35 percent of funds for repair, alteration, and conversion of naval vessels available for work in privately owned shipyards. Defense appropriations. (Motion adopted, 186 yeas to 178 nays.)	No.
Aug. 7	210	H.J. Res. 1145, to promote the maintenance of international peace and security in southeast Asia. (Unanimous record vote of 414 yeas.)	Yes.
Aug. 7	212	Motion to reverse previous motion on H.R. 11377, antipoverty bill, to strike enacting clause	No.
Aug. 7	213	Amendment to antipoverty bill, H.R. 11377, to mobilize the human and financial resources of the Nation to combat poverty in the United States. Amendment substituting the text of S. 2642, a similar bill, with several modifications that eliminated the unemployment compensation provision; expanded the veto power of State Governors to public agency programs and eliminated the debt forgiveness feature. (Amendment adopted 228 yeas to 190 nays.)	Yes.
Aug. 8	215	Motion to recommit H.R. 11377, antipoverty bill. Motion designed to replace the text of H.R. 11377 with the provisions of H.R. 11050, proposed Human Resources Development Act of 1964. (Rejected 29 nays to 117 yeas.)	No.
Aug. 8	216	H.R. 11377, antipoverty bill, to mobilize the human and financial resources of the Nation to combat poverty in the United States. (Passed 226 yeas to 184 nays.)	Yes.
Aug. 11	217	H.R. 1927, with amendments, to revise the pension program for veterans of World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict and their widows and children. (Unanimous vote of 388 yeas.)	Yes.
Aug. 11	218	H.R. 5990, to amend the District of Columbia Charitable Solicitation Act to require certain findings before the issuance of a solicitation permit thereunder. (Amended and passed by 301 yeas to 81 nays.)	Yes.
Aug. 12	219	H.Res. 836, the rule for the consideration of S. 1451, conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to render judgment upon certain claims arising under the Trading With the Enemy Act. (Rule adopted, 374 yeas to 3 nays.)	Yes.
Aug. 12	220	S. 1627, enabling the United States to contribute its share of expenses of the International Commission for Supervision and Control in Laos. (Passed without amendment by 268 yeas to 89 nays, and thus cleared for Presidential action.)	Yes.
Aug. 13	222	Motion to recommit H.R. 11296, making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices for fiscal year 1965. Recommittal motion designed to reduce by $250,000,000 the funds provided by amendment No. 204 for research and development by NASA. (Motion rejected, 270 nays to 114 yeas.)	No.
Aug. 13	224	Motion to recommit H.R. 12175, toextend and amend laws relating to housing, urban renewal, and community facilities. (Motion with instructions rejected, 194 nays to 184 yeas.)	No.
Aug. 13	225	H.R. 12175, to extend and amend laws relating to housing, urban renewal, and community facilities. (Passed with amendments by vote of 308 yeas to 68 nays.)	Yes.
Aug. 14	228	S. 1006, to increase authorizations for subsidizing the construction of fishing vessels, with amendments. Returned to Senate. (Passed by 198 yeas to 124 nays.)	Yes.
Aug. 14	229	H. Res. 663, to provide an additional $10,000 for expenses of the Committee on Education and Labor. (Failed, 156 nays to 115 yeas.)	N.V.F.
Aug. 17	231	H. Con. Res. 343, to express the sense of the Congress with respect to the enforcement of the provisions of art. 19 of the United Nations Charter. (Passed by a unanimous record vote of 351 yeas.)	Yes.
Aug. 17	232	S. 524 (in lieu of H.R. 6242), to provide for the registration of contractors of migrant agricultural workers. (Amended and returned to the Senate by record vote of 343 yeas to 7 nays.)	Yes.
Aug. 17	233	H.R. 9000, to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act so as to provide further for the prevention of accidents in coal mines. (Failed by record vote of 202 yeas to 151 nays—a ⅔ majority is required to suspend the rules.)	Yes.
Aug. 18	236	H.R. 1839, meat imports, to provide for free importation of certain wild animals and to provide for the imposition of quotas on certain meat and meat products. (Passed, 232 yeas to 149 nays.)	No.
Aug. 18	237	Conference report on H.R. 8864, to carry out the obligations of the United States under the International Coffee Agreement of 1962. The House insisted on further disagreement to Senate amendments; requested a conference with the Senate and appointed conferees. (Conference report rejected, 194 nays to 183 yeas.)	Yes.
Aug. 18	238	H.R. 8000, interest equalization tax, to impose a tax on acquisitions of certain foreign securities in order to equalize costs of longer-term financing in the United States and in markets abroad. (Passed, 221 yeas to 147 nays.)	Yes.
Aug. 18	239	S. 1007, to guarantee electric consumers in the Pacific Northwest first call on electric energy generated at Federal hydroelectric plants in that region and to guarantee electric consumers in other regions reciprocal priority. (Passed and sent to Senate, 230 yeas to 134 nays.)	Yes.
Aug. 19	240	Conference report on S. 3049, to extend and amend laws relating to housing urban renewal, and community facilities, and thus cleared the bill for Presidential action. (Passed, 309 yeas to 70 nays.)	Yes.
Aug. 19	241	H. Res. 845, the rule under which H.R. 11926, to limit jurisdiction of Federal courts in reapportionment cases, was considered. (Passed, 242 yeas to 148 nays.)	No.
Aug. 19	242	H.R. 11926, to limit jurisdiction of Federal courts in reapportionment cases. Adopted an amendment designed to stay enforcement of pending district or circuit court orders on reapportionment. (Passed, 218 yeas to 175 nays.)	No.
Aug. 20	245	H.R. 9586, to provide for the establishment of a National Council on the Arts to assist in the growth and development of the arts in the United States. (Passed by 213 yeas to 135 nays.)	Yes.
Sept. 1	247	S. 2701, Isthmus Canal, to provide for a study to determine a site for construction of a sea level canal between the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans. Amended and returned to Senate. (Passed by a record vote of 320 yeas to 23 nays.)	Yes.
Sept. 1	248	H.R. 4487, to prevent or minimize injury to fish and wildlife from the use of insecticides and pesticides. (Amended and passed by a record vote of 236 yeas to 110 nays.)	Yes.
Sept. 3	252	A recommittal motion designed to tighten the definition of friendly governments for purposes of title I, Public Law 480. (Adopted by 182 yeas to 175 nays.)	No.
Sept. 3	253	H.R. 12298 to extend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (Public Law 480). (Passed by record vote of 349 yeas to 6 nays.)	Yes.
Sept. 3	256	S. 2220, to encourage physicians and dentists who have received student loans under certain Government programs to practice in areas having a shortage of physicians or dentists. (Rejected by record vote of 160 nays to 140 yeas.)	Yes.
Sept. 22	260	H.R. 12633, making supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1965. (Passed 208 yeas to 103 nays.)	Yes.
Sept. 23	262	Ice Age Reserve, Wisconsin, H.R. 1096 authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to cooperate with the State of Wisconsin in the designation and administration of the Ice Age National Scientific Reserve in the State of Wisconsin. (Passed, 180 yeas to 118 nays.)	Yes.
Oct. 1	265	H. Res. 892, the rulemaking in order the consideration of H.J. Res. 1183, making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 1965. Thus obviated consideration of legislation. (Failed, 158 to 193.)	Yes.
Oct. 1	268	S. 3060 to extend and amend the National Defense Education Act of 1958. Recommittal motion. (Failed, 107 to 236.)	No.
Oct. 1	269	S. 3060 to extend and amend National Defense Education Act. (Passed, 320 to 20.)	Yes.

CONGRESSIONAL CONTRIBUTIONS TO DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a statement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, we all, in my opinion, should know the actual facts relative to the relation between the District government and the Federal Government in connection with schools and all other matters in the Nation's Capital. The Constitution places a great deal of the responsibility of the Nation's Capital on the shoulders of the Congress.

I am enclosing a statement I have had prepared by the members of my staff. I hope every Member of Congress will have an opportunity to read this statement:

CONGRESSIONAL CONTRIBUTIONS TO DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM

Reckless and unfounded statements have appeared in the press from time to time, charging the Congress, and the House District Committee and the District of Columbia Appropriations Subcommittees in particular, with a lack of concern for the public school system in the District of Columbia. These accusations have utilized such phrases as "gross neglect," "callous indifference," "shortchanging," "niggardly attitude," and the like.

In order to clarify the record and to pay fitting tribute to my colleagues in the Congress for their constant and indefatigable efforts to keep the schools of the Nation's Capital at a properly high level, I wish to submit the following facts:

I. TOTAL APPROPRIATIONS AND PER PUPIL EXPENDITURES

During the 12-year period from fiscal year 1953 through fiscal year 1964, the total appropriations for schools, and the resulting operating expenditures per pupil, increased as shown in the following table:

Fiscal year	Total school appropriation	Pupils in average daily membership	Operating expenses per pupil in average daily membership
1953	$25,872,200	98,357	$262.87
1954	29,897,900	102,046	276.02
1955	35,001,570	104,412	283.20
1956	35,928,326	105,796	312.61
1957	39,093,326	106,427	328.16
1958	50,072,772	109,248	351.96
1959	52,963,968	112,358	382.48
1960	54,095,500	116,500	387.68
1961	58,674,700	120,917	413.42
1962	63,092,110	126,646	411.78
1963	67,197,750	132,698	432.36
1964	79,486,593	137,858	[1] 451.13

[1] Estimated.

Sources: District of Columbia Budget Office; Statistical and Finance Offices of District of Columbia Board of Education.

The figures listed above for operating expenses per pupil in average daily membership are consistently at or near the top for such expenditures in all U.S. cities of comparable size.

II. CAPITAL OUTLAY

During this same period, appropriations for capital outlay for public schools have been as follows.

Appropriations for capital outlay, District of Columbia public schools, from fiscal year 1963 to fiscal year 1965

Fiscal year	Total capital outlay appropriations		
	Permanent improvements	Construction projects	Total capital outlay
1953	$400,000	$1,051,000	$1,451,000
1954	124,000	3,189,000	3,313,000
1955	428,000	6,947,000	7,375,000
1956	600,000	3,873,300	4,473,300
1957	400,000	5,781,700	6,181,700
1958	537,000	10,105,722	10,642,722
1959	750,000	8,170,300	8,920,300
1960	708,000	6,203,000	6,911,000
1961	750,000	6,194,000	6,944,000
1962	899,000	7,987,000	8,886,000
1963	900,000	6,973,000	7,873,000
1964	1,087,200	14,538,800	15,626,000
1965	1,387,500	13,017,600	14,405,100
Total	8,970,700	94,031,422	103,002,122

Prepared by Department of General Research, Budget, and Legislation, Sept. 2, 1964.

As a part of this capital outlay expenditure, during the period from fiscal year 1955 through fiscal year 1963, more than $50 million was spent for construction of more than 900 new classrooms. In addition, during the present fiscal year 103 more new elementary school classrooms, and new high school classrooms to accommodate 499 pupils, will be completed at a cost of nearly $10 million.

III. SALARIES

In recognition of the fact that salaries for school personnel must be kept at a level which will enable the District of Columbia to compete successfully with other school jurisdictions in the recruitment and retention of trained, competent teachers and other professional employees, as well as to meet increased living costs, the Congress has provided the following percentage increases over the past decade. For purposes of comparison, percentage salary increases for other District of Columbia government employees are shown also.

Type of personnel	1955	1958	1960	1962	1964	Total
Teachers	14.9	14.0	7.5	10.6	7.0	54.0
Policemen and firemen	7.5	13.8	7.5	11.6	8.9	49.3
Classified employees	7.5	10.0	7.5	9.6	4.2	38.8

Source: District of Columbia Personnel Office.

Thus, over this period teachers and other school personnel have enjoyed a substantially greater percentage increase in salary than have any other group of District employees. The minimum salary for District of Columbia teachers has increased during this time from $3,130 to $5,350, and today the District of Columbia teachers' salary schedule is in general the highest in the Washington metropolitan area and, in fact, the highest among all U.S. cities of less than 1 million population.

IV. DISCIPLINE IN THE SCHOOLS

In general, administrative problems in the District of Columbia public school system, as in all government agencies, are beyond the control and jurisdiction of the Congress. However, we members of the House District Committee have received many reports in recent years that discipline in some of the schools in the city has broken down completely. We have had complaints from teachers and parents, telling of assaults by pupils upon other pupils and even upon teachers, in the classrooms. At a public hearing during the first session of the present Congress we received testimony to the effect that this problem has reached a crucial stage, completely disrupting the process of education in some classrooms. Several witnesses, including the District of Columbia Superintendent of Schools, appealed for legislation which would authorize the judicious and necessary use of corporal punishment and the suspension or expulsion of utterly incorrigible pupils whose behavior is unfair to these students who are trying to absorb an education. In accordance with this plea, the House District Committee sponsored and the House passed legislation last year which would achieve these purposes. However, neither measure has been acted upon in the Senate.

I feel strongly that these facts and figures paint a picture which utterly belies the allegations and insinuations of indifference and neglect on the part of the Congress toward the District of Columbia school system; and I wish to take this opportunity to express my appreciation for the concern and the cooperation of my colleagues on the House District Committee and in the Congress in their efforts to maintain a sound system of public education for the children in the Nation's Capital.

FACTS ON THE STATE DEPARTMENT SECURITY FILE BURNING ORDER

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, September 25, the Chicago Tribune carried a by-lined article by Willard Edwards of the Chicago Tribune Washington Bureau disclosing issuance of an order under date of August 28 by the Office of Security of the State Department to its field agents in the United States directing destruction by burning of certain specified files.

Specifically, the directive ordered resident agents—as designated under a reorganization order issued August 6—to destroy by burning "all completed investigative reports" and to destroy by burning "all accumulated administrative material * * * with the exception of field personnel files, current instructions, and the Office of Security Handbook." It further directed that resident agents "destroy index cards by burning."

The directive called for compliance not later than October 1, 1964.

On Monday, September 28, the gentleman from California [Mr. UTT] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JOHANSEN] each acting independently, sent a communication to Secretary of State Dean Rusk requesting an immediate stay order on the file-burning directive. Congressman JOHANSEN further requested Secretary Rusk to "designate a State Department representative to contact" him immediately for a conference regarding the order.

At this point, Congressman JOHANSEN and Congressman UTT joined their efforts to secure the full facts regarding the order and its import.

In response to Congressman JOHANSEN's telegram, G. Marvin Gentile, Director, Office of Security, contacted him and two conferences were held by Congressman UTT and Congressman JOHANSEN with Mr. Gentile on the mornings of September 29 and 30.

Without elaborating all of the details and subject matter of these conferences, it suffices to state that we focused our questioning of Mr. Gentile on these principal points regarding the practical effect of compliance with the file-burning order:

First. Did the directive require destruction of any Office of Security records in the field for which there would not be a remaining original or copy either in the resident agents' files, in the field agents'—regional office—files, or in the central files of the Office of Security in Washington?

Second. Did the directive require destruction of source, lead, or contact files heretofore prepared and retained by resident agents or require the transfer of such files to the field agent's office or the central office, thereby making the resident agent's needed working tools too remote from the resident agent to be readily useful?

Third. Did the directive forbid future accumulation and maintenance by the resident agent of working tools falling in this category?

Fourth. If the August 28 directive was not intended to produce any of the results described in items 1–3 inclusive, was this fact established clearly and beyond any possible reasonable misunderstanding on the part of the resident agents to whom it was addressed?

Fifth. Finally, to what extent, as of September 29 and/or 30 had the file-burning directive been complied with?

With respect to the first three areas of inquiry, Mr. Gentile stated to us categorically:

First. That the August 28 directive did not require destruction of any Office of Security records in the field for which there would not be a remaining original or copy either in the resident agents' files, in the field agents'—regional office—files, or in the central files of the Office of Security in Washington.

Second. That the August 28 directive did not require destruction of source, lead, or contact files heretofore prepared and retained by resident agents or require the transfer of such files to the field agent's office or the central office thereby making the resident agents' needed working tools too remote from the resident agent to be readily useful.

Third. That the August 28 directive did not forbid future accumulation and maintenance by the resident agent of working tools falling in this category.

With respect to item No. 4 of our inquiry, Mr. Gentile stated it was his belief that resident agents, as experienced security men, would automatically understand that the file-burning order did not relate to lead, source, or contact files normally and regularly developed and maintained by these resident agents as working tools.

Mr. Gentile, however, volunteered the suggestion that it might be desirable to issue a "clarifying directive" underscoring the fact that this category of files and records—the working tools of the resident agent—were not included in the file-burning order.

Mr. Gentile assured us that he would immediately discuss the matter with his superiors, suggest drafting of such a supplementary directive, and if such action was approved would furnish us with a copy of this new directive.

It is our information that in a subsequent conference with Senator JAMES O. EASTLAND, chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee and chairman ex officio of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, Mr. Gentile stated that under the proposed "clarifying directive" the agents "will be told that they need not burn any records of special interest or value to them in future investigations." This assurance to Senator EASTLAND was reported by Willard Edwards, of the Chicago Tribune Washington Bureau in a bylined story appearing in the October 1 Chicago Tribune.

On October 1, we were supplied with a copy of a document of that date entitled, "State Department Domestic Field Investigative Program." This document was transmitted to us by Henri G. Grignon of the Office of Security.

This supplementary directive makes no specific reference whatever to the category of source, lead, and contact files heretofore maintained or hereafter to be maintained by resident agents. On the contrary, item 8 of the October 1 directive states:

> Indexes of leads and cross references of names have always been and will continue to be maintained in, and furnished when necessary by the Washington headquarters. Field offices and resident agents maintain control cards of cases under active investigation and in some cases have retained those cases after the investigation was completed. These cards, which are duplicates of cards originated and maintained in Washington, together with duplicate investigative reports, which some resident agents had maintained, are the kind of records that were ordered destroyed in the directive of August 28. No data reports, information, names, leads, etc., were ordered destroyed that were not already available in Washington headquarters. In those few instances where a current case file will be needed for further investigative work by a field agent, duplicate copies of the previous reports will be sent from Washington to the appropriate field office as well as all other pertinent additional information from the Washington files.

It is our considered judgment that the October 1 directive, far from assuring preservation of the working tools heretofore maintained by resident agents and far from assuring resident agents the right hereafter to develop and maintain such files, totally ignores this vital matter, and far from clarifying the situation actually reaffirms and possibly makes the original August 28 directive even more drastic.

With respect to item No. 5, we are unable to secure any definitive information whatsoever as to the extent to which the implementation of the August 28 directive has been carried out by the resident agent. We are told only that as of October 1 it had not been completely complied with. We were given no indication that our stay order request of September 28 has been complied with.

Meanwhile, from other sources which we regard as unimpeachable in both their knowledgeability and reliability, we have received information which confirms and even increases our apprehensions and alarm over the import of the August 28 and October 1 directives.

On the basis of this information, we further believe that either from lack of knowledge on his part, or because of instructions from superiors, Mr. Gentile gave us gravely misleading answers to our inquiries. Incidentally, we were both struck by the fact that in both of his interviews with us, Mr. Gentile was unaccompanied by any other State Department representative, which raises the question in our minds as to whether he is not the State Department's "fall guy" in the Department's effort to disclose—or conceal—the true nature and import of the file-burning directives.

What is the nature of this additional and contradictory information we have secured?

First. We are now informed that the official designation of the field agents' files we had undertaken to describe as lead, source, or contact files and records is "Reference Files", and that these "Reference Files" bear no relationship whatsoever to the "Case Record Control Cards" which Mr. Gentile brought to our attention.

Second. We have further learned that in the category of these so-called Reference Files are four important items heretofore maintained by all field offices, including particularly those persons now designated under the reorganization order as "Resident Agents." These four items are "Main Indexes," "Cross-Reference File," "Subversive Organization Index," and "Source of Information File." We should point out that each of these items is part of the vital and absolutely indispensable "working tools" of field agents and particularly of resident agents, and that they are so regarded by any knowledgeable investigative officer.

Without going into the details of the nature of each of these four categories of "Reference Files" we would point out that the "Source of Information File," for example, involves a contact file of individuals who have been found to be helpful to the resident agent in the past.

Third. We are further informed that knowledgeable and experienced resident agents of the State Department's Office of Security have been told categorically that the August 28 directive required the burning of these "Reference Files"; and that these agents understand that these files specifically included source of information files; and that these agents insist that their destruction will mean the loss of valuable and irreplaceable files, records, and indexes.

Fourth. We are further advised that the records, material, and information contained in these "Reference Files" are the only existing files, records, and information of this character.

Fifth. While we have not had opportunity to research the point in detail, we believe there are strong grounds for the conclusion that such destruction of the only existing files may constitute a violation of Federal law relative to the disposal of files and records. We believe this is a matter which should be subject to further diligent inquiry.

One incidental but important item in the August 28 and October 1 directives relates to the procedure to be followed by the resident agent in preparing and transmitting his investigative reports to the field office.

The October 1 directive states that the resident agent is to dictate this investigative report "into a dictating machine" and send "his report, together with his notes, to the appropriate field office." It further states that this procedure is "similar if not exactly comparable to the way investigative reports are processed by the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Civil Service Commission."

The directive further states that the field office has a stenographic pool "which will type his investigative reports and send one copy to the Washington headquarters."

Mr. Gentile categorically stated that the transcript of the dictaphone record is not returned to the resident agent for reading, editing, correction, and initialing. He stated that this was identical to the FBI procedure.

We are informed on the contrary that local FBI agents are supplied with the transcribed report for such reading, editing, correction, and initialing before it is forwarded to Washington or placed in the district or regional office file.

We strongly believe that denial of such opportunity for reading, editing, correcting, and initialing of the transcript by the originating resident agent is a very serious omission.

Now to sum up:

First. We believe the foregoing makes absolutely imperative and mandatory an immediate hold order by the Secretary of State forbidding any as yet uncompleted compliance with the August 28 and October 1 directives. We are transmitting a copy of this complete statement to Secretary Rusk with a renewed request for such a hold order.

Second. We believe that a major public service to the security of the United States was rendered by Willard Edwards of the Chicago Tribune through his public disclosure of the file-burning order. It is no criticism of Mr. Edwards that we express the further opinion that his news reports to date have understated, rather than overstated, the gravity of the Office of Security action.

Third. We recognize that official committee and staff investigation of this matter rests by priority with the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Senate. Our efforts to get at the facts in this situation were in no sense intended to usurp or intrude in the jurisdiction or prerogatives of that subcommittee.

But we were acutely aware of deep public concern over this development and we were aware that Members of the House have been flooded with inquiries and protests in consequence of disclosure of this action by the Office of Security. It is in order to meet our own responsibility with respect to these very proper inquiries and to assist our colleagues in meeting their same responsibilities that we undertook this difficult and frustrating inquiry on our own initiative.

Fourth. The issuance of the August 28 and October 1 directives would be inexplicable and alarming in any circumstance. It is made doubly so by two concurrent developments. On last Monday, the report of the Warren Commission was made public. This report included findings that there were serious lapses in the maintenance of files and communications of information relative to Lee Harvey Oswald, and that these lapses and deficiences involved the State Department, among other agencies of the Federal Government. The timing of the State Department directives regarding file burning, in the light of the knowledge which State Department officials must have had of the Warren Commission's lines of inquiry, could hardly be more incredible.

Furthermore, the Office of the President of the United States has recently issued a directive to all agencies calling upon them for tighter procedures with respect to security name checks, particularly for "appointees to the Federal service." The White House memorandum further declares that "such procedures are an essential part of any effective security program." It should be noted that the major function of the State Department Office of Security field agents relates to field investigations of applicants for employment in the State Department. It is, of course, utterly impossible to reconcile the file-burning directives of August 28 and October 1 with this clear and explicit directive and warning from the White House.

Our experience in this instant matter has been a case study in frustration. We have been given answers that do not answer; justifications that do not justify; and promises that were not kept.

The United States would be winning the cold war if the State Department were as successful in creating confusion and frustration among our enemies as it is in producing these same results with Members of Congress who seek straightforward, honest, accurate, meaningful answers to legitimate and relevant questions about State Department operations.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Harris). The Chair lays before the House the following communication.

The Clerk read as follows:

Hon. John W. McCormack,
The Capitol,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Speaker: I herewith submit my resignation as a member of the House Committee on Appropriations, effective immediately.

Sincerely,
William H. Milliken,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEE

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk House Resolution 900 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 900

Resolved, That James D. Weaver, of Pennsylvania, be, and he is hereby, elected to the standing Committee of the House of Representatives on Appropriations.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

IN THESE CHALLENGING TIMES DEFENSE PRODUCTION OF LONG DEMONSTRATED EFFICIENCY, SUCH AS THE WATERTOWN ARSENAL, SHOULD BE ADEQUATELY MAINTAINED BEYOND ANY REASONABLE DOUBT

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, as we approve large appropriations for multitudinous programs, including the war on poverty and foreign aid projections, a great many Members have expressed to me their very deep concern about proposed eliminations and reductions of certain defense facilities throughout the country. Let me assert, Mr. Speaker, that I completely share that concern.

I may ask, What will it profit us to improve every facet of our society, if we fail to prevent a nuclear holocaust; if we fail in any respect to defend our security?

Obviously the most practical way to avoid the catastrophy of nuclear destruction, while we strive for world peace, is to demonstrate clearly and consistently to every potential enemy that we possess and retain an increasing and overwhelming supply of military instruments for preparedness and retaliation, if it should be forced upon us.

Recent experience proves such supply should include conventional as well as nuclear weapons. As the result of certain programs of armament production elimination and closings of certain defense facilities, many of them in critical pilot line areas, an increasing number of Members of Congress, military authorities, and civilian experts are seriously disturbed about the continuing effectiveness of our planned defense security system.

Because of my personal grave concern over Defense Department announcements of projected restriction and elimination of Navy Yards in my area and the historic Watertown Arsenal in my district, I have joined with all the members of my State and regional area here in questioning the wisdom of such planning in the light of past experience and the dark shadows now obscuring any certain future vision.

The Watertown Arsenal has been a vital pilot line factor in our defense system for 142 years. When Army officials announced, last April, their intention to phase out the activities of the Watertown Arsenal, I immediately solicited the U.S. Senators from our State and the entire Massachusetts congressional delegation to urge the Secretary of Defense to review and promptly rescind this announcement. At my insistence, we all met with the Secretary on May 1, last. We emphasized to him that such proposed action was not in the best national interest and I presented facts and figures in support of our contentions. The Secretary took our urgent request under advisement, but later informed the delegation that he intended to sustain the original decision.

Following that advice our delegation held several conferences with the able, energetic representatives of the arsenal employees and civic and business leaders from the Watertown and Greater Boston area, and representatives of our State government. I then prepared a vigorous appeal to the President in which we outlined the unique defense contributions of the Watertown Arsenal throughout its long existence, the extreme personal hardships that would inevitably be visited upon the families of so many faithful Federal employees, the pronounced adverse effect such action would have upon the area economy and the grave doubt that the military determination in this case was based upon provable grounds.

This appeal to the President was signed by every member of the Massachusetts delegation. The President forthwith asked the Secretary to review and reply to us, which the latter did and in substance reiterated his previous intention to uphold the Army decision.

Following this report from the Secretary, our delegation under my leadership, again met with employee representatives and business and community leaders to formulate additional plans to press further in our objective efforts to keep the arsenal in full operation in the national interest.

It was next decided that another appeal should be presented to the President urging that he grant us an interview so that we might personally present the facts and our views for his personal consideration and action. It was my privilege once again to prepare this documented request to the President in which we reiterated our previous contentions and asked for a meeting with him and urged his personal intercession.

Mr. Speaker, that urgent request was forwarded to the President on August 12, last; we received a timely reply from him and on September 22 we received a further report from Secretary McNamara advising that the President had asked him to contact us, and he, the Secretary, stated that he would be pleased again to meet with the members of Massachusetts delegation at our convenience to review the arsenal decision and extend additional consideration.

We are not satisfied with the Army's unsound decision in this case and propose to continue our work together for still another conference with the President, because we hold very deep convictions that the action of the Army in this, and in other similar instances, is not consistent with the adequate defense of the Nation. In view of recent expanded military activities abroad, in Vietnam and elsewhere, it is impossible, we assert, for the Army to show beyond a reasonable doubt that the closing of this and other defense installations is in the best national interest.

To many Members of Congress and to many recognized military experts, these proposed restrictions and the elimination of vital production facilities appear to be entirely unjustified and are based on dangerous, unwarranted speculations about our clearly demonstrated essential defense and security needs.

For myself and the Massachusetts delegation I reaffirm our resolute intention to persevere in our intercessions with the Secretary of Defense, the Army, the President, and in every other way given to me, to bring about the reversal of the decision to close the Watertown Arsenal.

We appreciate the consideration extended to us by the Department and the President. We are thankful for the efforts to cushion the shock of the closing, as it were, by deferring the final date of closing and assuring every displaced worker a job. These are well-intended concessions to our cause no doubt. But they are palliatives. They do not meet our demands or serve the best interest of either the faithful employees or the defense of the United States. Only an order canceling out the closing order can provide the fair, just, and national interest answer to this crucial problem.

We submit in full respect to all those concerned in this matter that the national defense comes before penny-pinching, ill-advised economy. The continuance of the great Watertown Arsenal with its modern equipment, fine physical plant and its pool of highly skilled specialist workers is of far more importance to the welfare and safety of this country than the relatively meager sums that would be saved by its closing. False economy is no substitute for a powerful, well-rounded national defense.

Mr. Speaker, our command is forward. Let us continue our fight for Watertown until we win it either by administrative action or by statute law. We cannot compromise the rights of our workers; we cannot trifle with the safety and security of the country and the cause of the free world.

FINAL REPORT—1964

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VANIK] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker the 88th Congress is now drawing to a close marking the end of a historical period in our Nation's history. At the beginning of this session our Nation had closed ranks behind a vigorous administration led by President John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

Our ship of state never faltered as it sailed through the roughest seas in our history. Under the stewardship of a man eminently qualified for this enormous responsibility, President Lyndon Baines Johnson, we were led from moments of anguish to new achievements in memory of our fallen President and toward our new President's hope for the "great society."

And so it was that the American people through their constitutional system of government, have survived an enormous shock and thereby achieved greatness. It is my belief that the essentially significant legislation which passed out of this session of Congress is, without doubt, an expression of the will of the people of this Nation.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

During this period, foreign affairs have dominated our lives. President Kennedy, still plagued as he was by detractors, strengthened our military capabilities, while continually striving for attainment of real peace in this world.

The Cuban missile crisis, which gripped the world in 1962, proved to our adversaries that while we sought peace in this world, we would not take foolhardy action to jeopardize the welfare of our Nation, the hemisphere, or the world. Through the steadfast courage of our late President, Khrushchev's bluff was called, and our foreign policy regained immeasurable stature.

As in the past, the United Nations has been under attack by those who denied its purpose. Yet during the last several years it has served with greater effect than its founders might have expected. It has served to lessen tensions throughout the world. In the Congo, the United Nations forces have valiantly served to help unite a rebellion-torn land. Without United Nations forces serving in the Gaza Strip, war would have resulted. The U.N. forces present on Cyprus today are just another example of efforts to mitigate strife on this wartorn island. During the past 2 years, United Nations membership has been strengthened as many new nations gained recognition. These developing nations are benefiting from the democratic charter and the many services of the United Nations. Yet, our concern, so eloquently expressed by President Kennedy and President Johnson is for a lasting world peace and a meaningful prosperity for the underprivileged and suppressed, the neglected and forgotten, who now constitute a majority of the world.

Under the steadfast leadership of U Thant, Secretary-General of the United Nations, we have a great opportunity to build and maintain a vibrant organization for world dialogue, a lightning rod for world tension, a shelter from political oppression.

STATE OF THE NATION

Plagued with recessions and growing unemployment, our Nation was led into a new economic era under the Kennedy-Johnson administration. For 8 years our country had been on the brink of economic recession. Under skilled leadership, our gross national product, the sum total of the output of industrial and business activity of our Nation increased by an average of over 4½ percent a year or double what it had been during the previous 8 years.

For the first time in 50 years this Congress reformed our antiquated income tax structure. Although this tax cut legislation provided the larger percentage of reductions for those in the higher brackets, it did stimulate the economy, and tax revenues continue at substantially the same levels. It did "trigger" the economy. My hope is that future tax reductions will be made for those in the lower income brackets who need every part of their income for "living." It is my further hope that the new Congress will provide tax deductions for parents facing the high cost of education for their children.

Under the strong leadership of President Johnson, industry and labor joined hands to avoid the inflation which might result from our increased prosperity. In so doing labor has won increased fringe benefits with minimal increases in cash payments, while industry has held down price increases to the level at which they were 4 years ago. Our Nation is in its 47th month of industrial prosperity without one sign of any slackening in the pace set by this administration.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

The nuclear test ban treaty is perhaps the greatest achievement of modern time. We have been and are assured that our stature as a world leader has been immeasurably increased.

The United States involvement in the crisis in southeast Asia has increased by necessity. It has been the policy of this administration to firmly oppose the expansion of Communist domination wherever the threat is presented. Vietnam and the whole Indo-Chinese peninsula, which would provide the Communists the principal access to the rich mineral-bearing islands to the south and the encirclement of India, has been a major target of the Communists during the last three decades.

The instability of this part of the world constitutes a grave threat which we cannot overlook. President Johnson will not hesitate to act firmly in Vietnam, Cuba, or anywhere else where Communists threaten. The American people support these policies in full knowledge of the burdens and the risks they entail.

Our defense capability is superior today, although defense expenditures have been reduced $2½ billion. Further savings can be brought about if the full utilization is made of Government-owned plants, such as the Cleveland Ordnance Tank Plant. I am vigorously pursuing efforts to see that the production contracts for the Sheridan tank and its complementing howitzers are produced in Cleveland. The Defense Department would achieve greater savings and Cleveland would benefit with a greater number of jobs and higher payrolls.

SPACE

Our activities in space have been increased many times during the last 2 years. Notable was our success with the Ranger rocket in photographing the surface of the moon with such a degree of accuracy that our efforts to develop the moon space craft were greatly advanced. We have come closer in our effort to establish a worldwide communications link through a network of synchronized communications satellites for which COMSAT was established as a corporation chartered by this Congress to coordinate these efforts.

SOCIAL SECURITY

During this past session efforts were stepped up to increase social security benefits and pass a meaningful medicare bill. The House passed a 5 percent across-the-board increase in total social security benefits. The Senate passed a a similar bill adding to it a modified medicare plan which was then sent to a conference committee.

During this last week of the session it appeared that medicare would be overridden by the majority of the conference committee who were against such a proposal.

As I have stated numerous times, I am very much in favor of a hospital care plan for the elderly as a part of the social security program. I am convinced that there is no private plan which will provide a sufficient amount of hospital care for an elderly person whose needs are three times that of a younger person.

No matter how hard private insurers try, their efforts to assist a majority of the aged are unsuccessful. In a speech concerning the State "65" programs that exist in many States including Ohio, I stated on October 1 in the House, that this program provides "too little, at too high a price." Our elderly cannot afford to pay 20 percent of their annual income in premiums for a coverage which only pays one-half of the hospital bill. The needs that exist among the 120,000 social security beneficiaries in my district alone can never be served by such programs. They must be met by a comprehensive social security program which is strengthened by monthly deductions during the time in which a person is able to work.

This issue of medicare will remain a vital one in the coming session of Congress. It is my hope that the new Congress will make improved social security with higher benefits, and medicare the first order of business.

EDUCATION

This Congress has been called the education Congress. It has passed an enormous College Facilities Construction Act which hopes to meet the problem of over 7 million young people who will enter college during the next 7 years. This legislation will provide much-needed classroom space for junior colleges, colleges, and universities. Additional new funds were provided for student loans and grants. In addition, this Congress recognized the increased costs of education and therefore increased the maximum loans for any one student from $5,000 in 5 years' time to $10,000 in 8 years' time to include the increased number of years of graduate study, for which so many students are now enrolled. A student may now borrow up to $1,500 per year, for which one-half will be waived, if he agrees to teach for at least 5 years after completing his college education. Grants will also be available more readily for study in fields other than science and technology, such as history, social studies, and English.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

The Vocational Education Act of 1963 is one of the most useful laws to be passed. For the first time the vocational education program has now been directed away from agriculture and toward modern industry. Each State has been asked to develop a statewide plan under this act for the utilization of construction grants for new vocational institutions and machinery. In addition, funds will be available for providing increases in staff and curriculum for the local vocational education programs.

Cleveland stands to benefit substantially under this legislation through the renovation of a manpower training center—the Mayflower School—in which will be housed all of our training and retraining programs. Cleveland school dropouts are now eligible to attend the vocational training centers such as the Mahoning Center opened in Youngstown. A Cleveland center is now in the planning stage.

COMMUNITY ACTION FOR YOUTH

Cleveland was one of 10 cities selected for a demonstration project under the Juvenile Delinquency Control Act of 1961. The program was established in the Hough area in 1962 and is generally referred to as the CAY program.

CAY has come through an extremely turbulent first year of operation. It has emerged with many programs which will ultimately benefit the community. It is hoped that with time this project will help determine the means through which young people, who are potentially delinquent, can best be assisted to contribute to rather than detract from our society.

This program was recently under the scrutiny of the Congress and survived with an additional year's appropriation of nearly $1 million to carry on its work. The community action programs, which are now a part of the antipoverty program, were developed from the juvenile control project, such as CAY, which exist throughout the country. For this reason alone these projects have served a great purpose.

SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM

The Federal school lunch program, so vital to urban areas, has finally been implemented in the junior and senior high schools in the city of Cleveland. While this is a salutatory achievement which is long overdue, we have yet to work out a worthwhile hot lunch program in the elementary schools. It is among these younger children where low-cost hot meals of nutritional value are most important and imperative, but Cleveland has made a long stride in the right direction in this area. I am proud of these recent developments.

MENTAL HEALTH

For the first time in the history of Congress communities were encouraged to develop local mental health centers and mental retardation facilities through a modest Federal grant program. Provisions were also made for the instruction of teachers for retarded children.

CIVIL RIGHTS

For the third time in the past century a Congress has attempted to clarify the rights of all its citizens. This Congress has distinguished itself from its two predecessors by passing the most comprehensive and just civil rights legislation ever passed in this Nation.

A full year from the date that President Kennedy sent his message to Congress, the Senate passed the civil rights bill which the House had passed a full 4 months earlier. Significantly, for the first time ever in matters of civil rights the sacred Senate cloture was invoked to close the debate.

The voting rights of all citizens, regardless of race, color, or creed, were upheld by this bill. The extension of the life of the Civil Rights Commission was provided. Federal grants were authorized to be withheld from recipients who discriminated. But most significantly, voting rights, public accommodations, and equal employment emerged as the keystones of this legislation.

In addition, a Community Relations Service was established with former Governor of Florida Leroy Collins as its chief to arbitrate and conciliate the differences which arise concerning race relations and the implementation of this legislation in any community.

What this bill has done is to restate the sacred American principle that every citizen of this country has equal access to those legal rights provided in the Constitution. Equality under the law has received a powerful mandate, and America is stronger as a result.

ANTIPOVERTY PROGRAM

The poverty which afflicts many of our citizens in cities and on farms has long been termed the blight of America. Much has been said, but very little has been done to "face up" to the plight of the neglected who start off in despair as "social dropouts." Under the leadership of President Johnson this Congress agreed to an expenditure of $770 million to begin the task of obliterating poverty in this country.

This program establishes work study programs for college students who can only remain in the classroom with such financial assistance. It establishes a Job Corps which will call up the services of young people who are currently unemployed and out of school, to contribute to the improvement of our parks and our cities, while learning lasting skills for their own benefit.

In this connection I have suggested that the old Crile Hospital site be utilized as a dormitory facility, so that Cleveland's youth could be the first beneficiaries in the Nation of this educational program. It is my hope that the Crile Hospital site be used temporarily in this program so that it remain in the Federal portfolio until a large Federal establishment with its new jobs and payrolls can be developed on this site. Cleveland, with its cyclical industries, critically needs the stability of added Federal payrolls. If the Federal Government loses control of this property, it will be permanently lost for this important Federal purpose.

IMPACTED AREA LEGISLATION

During the last session of Congress I introduced H.R. 10102 similar to a bill introduced in the Senate by Wayne Morse of Oregon. The legislation is meant to amend the existing impacted areas law, Public Law 815, to include those local areas which are hard pressed by the presence of Federal program activity like aid to dependent children, social security, unemployment compensation, and veterans disability benefits. In areas like Cleveland, where these programs exist to a great extent, the inability of the local area to meet the demands and the burdens which are placed on the local school systems, is evident.

It is my feeling that direct Federal aid should come to the Cleveland public school system to offset our inability to meet our educational needs through a local financing program. It is in these areas of greatest need in our city that we must place the very best educational institutions which we have. These children are in need of special assistance to qualify them for the rigorous competition they must face.

AREA REDEVELOPMENT

As a member of the committee which considered amendments to the Area Redevelopment Administration Act, it has been my judgment that Cleveland should have been considered eligible for aid under ARA, since unemployment in the city reached well over 7 percent or 28,000 unemployed. Under the circumstances it was imperative that we receive the assistance which could be provided under ARA.

My pleas were instrumental in the expanded ARA policies which made Cleveland a participant. During the past few months Cleveland has received a grant to determine how best we might utilize vacant plant facilities for attracting new industry. In addition, over 600 unemployed people have been enrolled in ARA retraining programs, such as clerk-typists, auto service mechanics, custodial workers, combination welders, and spray painters. In the near future it is hoped that applicants from large and small industries will be the beneficiaries of low-cost, long-term loans, in which they will improve, expand, and increase their local business activity, thereby increasing employment.

The manpower development and training program, which began under the Kennedy administration, was amended during this Congress to include basic literacy training as a part of its regular program. In this way many people who could not begin retraining otherwise have now done so. In Cleveland over 500 people have graduated from this training program. Eighty percent have already been hired. Another 1,500 people are currently in training or soon will be training for many skills for which training is provided. We should not stop these efforts. There are many trades within the city for which workers are needed. There are many businesses within the city which could use new workers, if new business can be stimulated. We must continue to create jobs and train our unemployed to fill them.

FOOD STAMPS

After a great deal of effort, a pilot project for the use of food stamps was initiated in Cuyahoga County in 1962. Many people were skeptical about the effectiveness of this program. The first year over $2 million worth of food stamps were utilized, which meant that for every $6.50 spent by a family, $10 worth of food could be purchased with the stamps. In 1963, $6½ million worth of stamps were utilized by 67,000 families in Cuyahoga County. I was proud to support the extension of this program on a national basis.

URBAN RENEWAL AND HOUSING

Cleveland has been the beneficiary of great assistance through the help of the Kennedy-Johnson administration of untold millions of dollars in urban renewal projects. While Erieview has been successfully launched and the convention center is completed, the University-Euclid and Gladstone projects are not as far advanced as they might be at this time.

In conjunction with the University-Euclid project I have been critical of the increased use of Federal funds to build a greater number of college dormitory facilities, particularly at Case Institute of Technology, because fewer Cleveland young men will have an opportunity to be able to commute to school. Cleveland students should have the choice of attending the various institutions in our midst.

It is my hope that we will pass an amendment to the Community Facilities Act to require universities which serve large urban areas, to retain a certain number of openings for local students. It is a fine tribute to our two universities that they have become national institutions, yet they must not overlook the products of Cleveland schools.

CONSUMER AFFAIRS

This past 2 years has been an extremely busy time for overseeing the problems of the consumer—particularly at the supermarket. Early in the session I mounted an attack on the citrus fruit industry in the United States for their unjustified increases in the cost of orange juice. I requested that the people use substitutes.

Through editorial and consumer support throughout the United States, prices subsided after a congressional investigation brought public pressure to bear upon this matter. Similarly, I attacked the question of rising prices of flour, which occurred immediately after our sale of wheat to the Soviet Union. The increase was unjustified and manipulated.

Sugar prices began spiraling in a similar manner and again brought a congressional investigation on the matter. The price of coffee has suffered equally at the hands of manufacturers and growers who have attempted to utilize the existence of an international coffee agreement as their excuse for artificially spiraling prices.

I expect to vigorously fight to hold the price line. If we fail in this respect, inflation will result and everyone will suffer.

MASS TRANSIT

Since I entered Congress a decade ago, I have joined colleagues in striving for a comprehensive mass transit law to aid our strangled metropolitan areas. During this past session nearly $400 million was appropriated to allow local areas to outline comprehensive metropolitan transit plans. We must be the first to participate in this program. The city of the future will need mass transit to survive. Cleveland needs a rapid transit extension to the southeast and to the airport. The further our rapid transit system is extended, the greater will be its use and its success.

FEDERAL FACILITIES

The battle which started in late 1959 to establish a new Federal office building in the city of Cleveland culminated with the appropriation of $34 million in February of 1964. Ground was broken for the facility during the summer of this year. Soon our city skyline will be graced by a 32-story Federal office building which will unite Federal agencies which are now located in over 30 different locations throughout the city.

In a recent study delivered to Congress on the various military finance centers, we were pleased to note that the Navy Finance Center in the city of Cleveland was considered as the most efficient of any in the country. It has been my hope that we could transfer other facilities to Cleveland under the responsibility of the Cleveland Navy Finance Center to insure added savings for this activity.

With the assistance of the Cleveland Growth Board and many private and public officials, I helped organize delegations to come to Washington and urge establishment of the Environmental Health Center on the Crile Hospital site. An attempt was also made to secure the $60 million electronics research laboratory on that same site. In these efforts Cleveland benefited tremendously from the fact that we united as a city to present a picture of our academic, industrial, and social environment. We are now well known to the Federal Government for our resources.

WATER POLLUTION

A movement is underway in Cleveland to clean up Lake Erie. During the 30 years of my public life I have been continually alarmed at the pollution of our air and water, the most vital of our natural resources.

In this connection I have held meetings during the last half of the session of this Congress with Federal and congressional officials who are deeply involved in the question of water pollution. I requested that Congressman John Blatnik, who is closely identified with water pollution control in this Congress, to visit in Cleveland to determine what can be done on a congressional level to halt the deplorable conditions which exist in Lake Erie. In addition, I have been in touch with Governor Rhodes whose responsibility it must be to call in the responsible Federal agencies to deal with this problem. It will be my objective to utilize every possible Federal resource to help in the solution of this problem.

CONCLUSION

As this session of Congress closes, I reflect in pride and gratitude at the manner in which our beloved President Kennedy made America "move forward." He made us feel that America is still a young country, yet mature enough to face up to its responsibilities at home and abroad. President Lyndon Baines Johnson said "let us continue" and he pressed hard on the throttle for a stronger, better America. Congress heartily responded to these men of strength with its measure of accomplishment. Our work is neither perfectly done nor totally done, but it is well begun.

REPEAL SECTION 14-B OF THE TAFT-HARTLEY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from New York [Mr. Ryan] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker one of the most cherished institutions in America is that of "free collective bargaining." Ever since the right of workers to bargain collectively with their employers was guaranteed by the historic Magna Carta of labor, section 7(a) of the Wagner Act, we have accepted the concept that contracts establishing standards of wages and working conditions should be negotiated between unions representing workers and their employers without interference.

The American labor movement, with more than 16 million workers in a wide variety of trades and occupations, can be justly proud. Ever since the shoemakers of Philadelphia organized the first American union in 1806, the labor movement has contributed to building a better life for American working men and women. The list of dedicated labor leaders who have strived to better the living and working conditions for the members of their unions is long and exciting—from labor's earliest days, through the forging of the industrial union movement in the turbulent years when labor was struggling for legal recognition, to the present and a host of leaders who give the labor movement dignity and inspiration today—America can be proud of these leaders, and can be prouder still of the thousands of unheralded "Jimmy Higgins" who have worked without recognition for the right to organize and bargain for a better life.

But the labor movement has also had to battle the efforts of those who would break unions, sabotage free collective bargaining and shackle the labor movement. For years, under the false banner of an illusory "right to work," the enemies of labor have tried to destroy free collective bargaining. It is ironic that those who loudly claim to desire "freedom" for the worker are trying mightily to hamper and remove the freedom of unions and employers to bargain without outside restraint.

Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill, H.R. 12711, which would repeal section 14(b) of the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947, better known as the Taft-Hartley Act. Section 14(b) enables the States to enact laws prohibiting the negotiation of agreements providing for union security and agreed upon by both management and labor. In effect, section 14(b) allows government hindrance and interference with free collective bargaining.

American workers organized into labor unions are covered by more than 150,000 collective-bargaining agreements. The workers covered by these contracts represent more than one-third of the nonfarm work force in the country. More than 95 percent of these contracts were renegotiated without recourse to strikes.

Although a major strike can occupy the headlines for days and even weeks, it is a little-understood fact that more than twice as many man-days of work are lost each year through injuries and accidents than through strikes. Even less noted is the fact that the scourge of unemployment is much more detrimental. As Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz pointed out in 1962, the Nation "lost more man-hours of production—in the last 11 months—from unemployment than we have in the last 35 years from strikes."

Mr. Speaker, in the last 15 years a well-financed and intensive drive has been mounted by antiunion forces to secure the passage of State "right-to-work" laws. Although these forces met with initial success in a number of States, in recent years they have almost without exception been dealt a crushing rebuff at the polls. The most recent and heartening example was this year in the State of Oklahoma. Only 7 percent of the work force in Oklahoma is organized into labor unions, but the voters of the State realized the full antilabor implications of the misnamed "right-to-work" drive and handily defeated the proposed "right-to-work" referendum.

The setbacks to the forces of the compulsory open shop, as right to work should properly be called, have not blunted their purpose to impose the compulsory open shop on all American workers. This is one reason why I have introduced a bill to preserve the freedom to negotiate contracts without hindrance for all American workers.

Let us take a close look at some of the forces behind the open-shop movement. It is my contention that they are motivated not by concern for the rights of workers but by their own desire for cheap and unorganized labor.

The major organization pushing for compulsory open-shop laws is called the National Right to Work Committee. This group, with headquarters in Washington, was founded in 1955 after the consolidation of several autonomous State organizations. With around 15,000 members and an annual budget of close to a half-million dollars, this committee issues propaganda, distributes a slanted movie which has been condemned by the National Labor Relations Board, and instigates "right-to-work" campaigns around the country.

What are the ties of the National Right to Work Committee with the radical right? I do not claim that the committee, or a majority of its members, are John Birch Society zealots. I do claim that a substantial number of the men who are active in the committee are well known in the radical right and that several of the members are active in the John Birch Society, which spreads some of the most poisonous and inflammatory propaganda since the days of the "Know Nothings" in the last century.

A report in the Washington Post—April 2, 1961—of John Birch Society operations in Kansas noted that:

> The leadership of the Birch Society overlaps heavily with the leadership of the organizations that successfully campaigned in 1958 for a right-to-work amendment to the State constitution.

Ties of other leading figures in the National Right to Work Committee with other rightwing groups such as the Manion Forum, the misnamed Christian Crusade, and the Young Americans for Freedom, have been amply documented. The implication is clear—one of the prime goals of the radical rightwing in America is the destruction of free collective bargaining and the substitution of a State-coerced compulsory open-shop movement.

What are some of the other arguments in favor of the repeal of section 14(b)? One of the most compelling is that the level of wages, and concomitantly the standard of living of workers in States with right-to-work laws is under the national average. In their desire to break unions and subvert freely negotiated collective bargaining contracts, open-shop backers have contributed to a lower standard of living for millions of Americans. To illustrate this, let me cite the following facts:

Fifteen of the twenty States with right-to-work laws have a higher percentage of families living in poverty, that is, with incomes under $3,000 per year, than the national average.

At the same time in 1962—the last year for which complete statistics are available—average wages in right-to-work States were 7 percent below the national average, while in States that permit the union shop average wages were 4 percent above.

These figures indicate that so-called right-to-work laws, by prohibiting the establishment and negotiation of union security, depress the wages of millions of Americans.

A second argument against State right-to-work laws is that they foster industrial discord and fail to produce any increase in industrial production. Let me cite the views of a prominant industrialist on this point. Dan A. Kimball, president of the Aerojet-General Corp., has said that:

> The right-to-work law constitutes a real threat to our national security at a time when industrial harmony is essential. I have examined both sides of the right-to-work proposal and have found—that it is bad for the employee, for the employer. I am against it.

Mr. Speaker, section 14(b) of the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947 should be repealed. I have tried to demonstrate that not only do right-to-work laws fail to help the workingman—in fact, they operate to his detriment—but they are also the weapon of a concerted drive on the part of rightwing forces to subvert and destroy the whole institution of free collective bargaining.

Mr. Speaker, in this crucial election year, the Democratic Party again has made clear its opposition to right-to-work laws. Let me quote from the 1964 Democratic platform:

> The industrial democracy of free, private collective bargaining and the security of American trade unions must be strengthened by repealing section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act.

On the other hand the 1964 Republican Party platform is silent on the subject, whereas in 1960 that party's platform supported:

> The right of employers and unions freely to enter into agreements providing for the union shop and other forms of union security as authorized by the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947.

The presidential candidate of the Republican Party, Barry Goldwater, is firmly on record in favor of right-to-work laws. "I strongly favor enactment of State right-to-work laws," he has announced.

America, indeed, has a choice.

Mr. Speaker, I have great faith in the dedication to democratic values and institutions on the part of the vast majority of American working people, and I admire the integrity of the trade union movement in this country. Organized labor played a significant role in the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the war on poverty, and many other programs to benefit the American people. It has pressed hard for programs such as hospital care for the aged and higher minimum wages, most of which would not directly benefit organized labor but which would help those Americans living in poverty, more than 35 million of our fellow citizens. I salute American labor, and I am proud to sponsor a bill to repeal one of the main obstacles of free collective bargaining in this country.

THE HONORABLE CARL ELLIOTT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of House, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Andrews] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, one of the most able Members of this body, and of the Alabama delegation, will not be with us after this session of Congress. I refere to Congressman Carl Elliott. I personally regret that the voters of Alabama did not see fit to return this dedicated man to Congress.

Carl was born in Vina, Ala., the eldest of nine children. He attended the public schools of Franklin County, and worked his way through the University of Alabama, graduating with an A.B. degree in 1933 and an LL.B. degree in 1936.

During the time he was at the University of Alabama he was elected by his fellow students as president of the student body. Following his graduation he practiced law with a marked degree of success in Russellville and Jasper before his election to the 81st Congress. He is a former president of the Walker County Bar Association, a veteran of World War II, a member of the American Legion, of the 40 and 8, AMVETS, and the Disabled American Veterans of America. He is a former president of the Jasper Lions Club and also zone chairman and deputy district governor. He is a member of the Order of the Eastern Star, Masons, the I.O.O.F., PTA, Woodmen of the World, and served two terms as a member of the Alabama State Democratic Executive Committee.

Carl and his lovely wife, Jane, have four children. This family is one of the happiest I have ever known.

Carl was the author of the National Defense Education Act when it passed Congress in 1958 and he was the man who steered it through the House of Representatives.

In my opinion, there has been no single piece of educational legislation that has done more to improve the quality of education while at the same time making it possible for the very capable but needy students to go on to a higher education than the National Defense Education Act. Millions of young people all over the United States have profited by his farsighted wisdom. The youth of our Nation and those of us who are deeply concerned about improving education in our country owe him a debt of gratitude.

Everyone will agree it is easy to give lipservice to the importance of education on the national scene. Carl Elliott has done more than just give lipservice. He has devoted years of unselfish service toward making adequate education and job opportunities—because of adequate education—available to our youth. He knows when we invest in our youth we are investing in tomorrow. He is sincere in his desire to improve educational conditions, and this country of ours is a better place in which to live because he served in the House of Representatives.

Carl Elliott is one of the most conscientious, and hardest working men I have ever known. He is as honest as the day is long, and his friendship is cherished by those of us fortunate enough to know him and to work with him in this legislative body.

To me Carl Elliott's word is and has always been his bond. He possesses what I consider are the essential qualifications of a good public servant. First and foremost, he is honest; second, he is able; third, he has courage; and above all he is sincere.

For the past 3 years Carl has served with distinction on the all-powerful Rules Committee. He is the second Alabaman to serve on this powerful committee.

I hope that when he leaves here as a Member of this body he will have the same degree of success in whatever undertaking he applies himself to as he has enjoyed as a past Member, and with him certainly will go our best wishes. I am sure his accomplishments will continue to be a source of pride to his many friends.

I cannot tell you, Mr. Speaker and Members of this body, how much I appreciate the sincerity of Carl Elliott and how much I have enjoyed his friendship. I say to you again that not only has the great State of Alabama that we represent lost a great man, an honest man, and an able man, but the services of

CARL ELLIOTT will be sorely missed by the people of this great Nation of ours.

I love CARL ELLIOTT.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding to me at this point. I want to join him in this farewell and Godspeed to a colleague of ours. I remember CARL ELLIOTT because in my very first days in this House I was privileged to serve on the Committee on Education and Labor with CARL ELLIOTT. I remember well the lesson that he taught me in regard to the need of this Nation for all of the opportunities that we could give to those who are underprivileged by providing for them decent facilities in their public library services.

It was his pioneer work in this field that paved the road for me and for the membership of this House in this year of our Lord 1964 to expand his original concept of aid to libraries into a universal aid to all libraries in this Union.

I say to the gentleman from Alabama that we are losing a friend in the House, but it is only a temporary loss I am sure, because a man of his caliber, his character and his stature is bound, if he so desires, again to join those of us in this House fortunate enough still to be here, to do the great work that is still undone.

CARL ELLIOTT has been a bulwark of strength to the people of this Nation in his services to all of us.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. I thank the gentleman for that wonderful statement about my colleague, and at this time I yield to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES].

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I join my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Alabama, in paying my respects to our good friend, CARL ELLIOTT. In my first 6 years in the House I was privileged to serve on the great Committee on Education and Labor. During that time CARL ELLIOTT and I were very closely associated, particularly in the field of vocational rehabilitation of the physically handicapped and allied areas.

CARL ELLIOTT is a man whose heart is as big as this Capitol. He has great compassion for his fellow man, particularly those who are in trouble and who need help. He is a great legislator. He has been a fine Member of the House and even more important, to me at least, a man whom I can classify as a very good and trusted personal friend. I will miss him here in the House. I certainly agree with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT] in his statement that this country has not heard the last of CARL ELLIOTT. He will go on to serve it either in public life or private life as the fine citizen that he is.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Arizona, and at this time I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MONAGAN.]

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to join with the gentleman from Alabama in paying tribute to our colleague, CARL ELLIOTT.

He has been, of course, an outstanding Member of this body. The gentleman has very well described the lasting contribution that he has made to a great deal of legislation in the field of education. He has also been a great Representative of the people of his district and of the State of Alabama. His representation has been on a high level. He has always acted with the national interest of the United States in mind.

I want to say how much I personally regret seeing CARL ELLIOTT leave this House. At least we may be pleased that his influence here in the House lives on among the Members and persists in the legislation which he has helped to write.

Like the other gentlemen who have spoken, I am confident and hopeful that he will continue in some other sphere to make the same contribution to the State of Alabama and the United States that he has made here in the House of Representatives.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. I want to thank the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MONAGAN] for his remarks.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. JENNINGS].

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me, and I want to congratulate him upon taking this opportunity to make these remarks and to permit others to express the kind remarks that have been said about the distinguished public servant, CARL ELLIOTT.

Mr. Speaker, I have served with CARL ELLIOTT for a period of 10 years, during which time I have learned to respect him, to admire him, and to know him as a gentleman of high integrity and moral standards, with a desire to do only what is best for his constituents, his State, and the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps CARL ELLIOTT will be known better in the field of education than in any other field, because of his work with the National Defense Education Act, which could possibly be referred to as the "Carl Elliott Act."

Mr. Speaker, it has been my pleasure to visit in his district and to know his people, to have him visit in my district and visit in my home, and to know my people. Of all the many good things that I know about CARL ELLIOTT I believe the high watermark of his career was when he convinced his lovely wife to change her name to Mrs. Elliott. They have a delightful family, worthy of the fine American citizenship which they have exemplified.

Mr. Speaker, I, too, know that this is just an interim recess for CARL ELLIOTT, because he will either be serving in this House or he will be serving his country and his State in a capacity which I am sure will be similar in service to his achievements in years past and will reflect the citizenship and the loyalty which he has demonstrated to his Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure in joining the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ANDREWS] in paying this tribute to a great American.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. I thank the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HUDDLESTON].

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to join my colleagues in paying tribute to one of the finest and most outstanding Members of the House of Representatives, my good friend from Jasper, Ala., the Honorable CARL ELLIOTT.

It has often been said that CARL has done more for the cause of education than anyone else in the history of the American Congress. The National Defense Education Act of 1958, CARL's bill, has often been referred to as the most important piece of education legislation since 1862. He has truly dedicated his years of public service to making life more meaningful for those who have not enjoyed adequate job opportunities and education.

Congressman ELLIOTT's committee service has been extensive and includes work on the Veterans' Affairs Committee, Education and Labor Committee, chairman of the Subcommittee on Special Education, House Administration Committee, and the Rules Committee. During the 1st session of the 88th Congress, he was appointed as chairman of the new Select Committee on Government Research.

We will indeed miss CARL, his lovely wife, Jane, and their wonderful family. I know that he will continue in future endeavors to render outstanding service to the people of his State and Nation.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. I thank the gentleman from Alabama for his remarks.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. I yield to the distinguished Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, when we talk about CARL ELLIOTT we are talking about not only a great American but a legislator's legislator. We are talking about a man with a beautiful outlook on life, a man whose broadness of understanding in his association with his fellow man is an inspiration for all of us to follow.

Mr. Speaker, when we talk about CARL ELLIOTT we are talking about a dedicated legislator who devoted his time untiringly in the service of the people of his district, his great State of Alabama, and of our beloved country.

As leader and as Speaker I am richly indebted to CARL ELLIOTT for the many considerations that he has extended to me. As all of us know, the problems of leadership are not always easy. CARL ELLIOTT is one who has made my load and my task easier. Therefore, I am richly indebted to him. I am not one who forgets those who were civil to me, because I have a long memory.

The people of his district are justified, as well as the people of Alabama, in feeling proud of CARL ELLIOTT, a son of the great State of Alabama, one who has added prestige, honor, and glory to the people of his district, and the people of Alabama, and his country.

CARL ELLIOTT, in my opinion, as some of my colleagues have stated, has only temporarily left the public service. I do not know what the future holds in store for him. It is very difficult to look into the future and see what is going to develop, but one thing is certain: I can see in the reasonably near future that the talents, the ability, and the personality as well as the understanding mind of CARL ELLIOTT will be utilized on the Federal level in some important position. In the elective field in the years that lie ahead, if he has the ambition to reenter that field, CARL ELLIOTT's future is still ahead of him. He leaves here not with his career behind him, but with his future ahead of him because of his great contributions to the strength and progress of our great country.

I repeat, and I emphasize, I have every confidence that in the reasonably near future the talents and the abilities of CARL ELLIOTT will be utilized in some very important position.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. I thank the Speaker for the fine statement, and I sincerely express the hope that his predictions will come true.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I join others today in their expressions in reference to CARL ELLIOTT, of Alabama.

It has been my very great privilege to serve with CARL ELLIOTT since he has come to the Congress, and especially to serve with him on the House Rules Committee and also on the very important Select Committee Investigating Government Research, of which I happen to be also the ranking member.

CARL ELLIOTT is a man who is big in size. As an individual person he is big in character, he is big in ability. In the years we have worked together I have never known of CARL ELLIOTT doing a small or little thing. Throughout the years that we have been together in committee work never has he evidenced any spirit of animosity in any of his actions that influenced him in any way. He has been more than fair with those of us on the minority side who have served with him on various committees.

I join, if I may, with the Alabama delegation, with the Speaker of this great House, and with other Members in not only wishing him well in the years ahead but expressing to him a personal gratitude for the friendship and the cooperation that he has extended to me as well as to his other colleagues in the House during our service here.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I would like to be associated with the words of well-deserved tribute being paid to CARL ELLIOTT. It has been my peasure to serve with him on the Select Committee Investigating Government Supported Research and Development. I can attest to the fairness and friendliness with which he has treated me as a junior member.

Certainly one mark of a man is how he treats his juniors.

The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ELLIOTT] has been very fair in his conduct of the committee and very helpful to me. It is for this reason I particularly want to be associated with the gentleman and the other Members of the Alabama delegation and others who are paying tribute to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ELLIOTT].

The reasons for the defeat of CARL ELLIOTT constitute a significant chapter in the political history of representative government. A perceptive and poignant comment on them was written by Walter Pincus in the Washington Evening Star on September 8, 1964, which I include at this point in the RECORD because of their importance and significance. CARL has taken his defeat with a grace and dignity, for which his friends should well be proud.

ELLIOTT LEAVING HOUSE WITH $20,000 DEBT

(By Walter Pincus)

Representative CARL ELLIOTT, of Alabama, 16 years in Congress and for the last 4 years a member of the powerful House Rules Committee, leaves office at the end of this session faced with the problem of raising $20,000 to pay outstanding campaign bills from his unsuccessful statewide primary race this past June.

Though his situation may not be typical, Mr. ELLIOTT's present dilemma is worth studying for it portrays a side of politics that is little publicized.

Mr. ELLIOTT's former district was a rural one—the largest town having a population of 10,000. In 1948, when he first ran for Congress, the Democratic nomination was—as it is now—tantamount to election. His first primary race cost $12,000, of which, he said recently, $7,500 was his own money.

PLIGHT BORN IN 1960

Once he became the incumbent, finances were no problem. During the Eisenhower years he occasionally had a Republican opponent in the general election, but the State Democratic organization would help out with $1,000 and party committees would put up advertising money.

Mr. ELLIOTT's present plight was born in 1960. As a result of that year's census, Alabama lost one of its nine congressional seats. Its legislature failed to pass a redistricting bill, and in 1962 and again this year the Democratic primary candidates had to run at large.

Also in 1960, John F. Kennedy was elected President. It was President Kennedy who encouraged Mr. ELLIOTT to take a seat on the Rules Committee—one of the added seats which had the effect of breaking Chairman HOWARD SMITH's conservative control over legislation reaching the House floor.

If the necessity of running at large led to Mr. ELLIOTT's financial problems, his becoming a member of the Rules Committee led directly to political difficulties, for it gave the conservatives an issue to use against him.

Running at large in the 1962 Democratic primary, where only eight of the nine incumbents could be selected, Mr. ELLIOTT had to raise a campaign war chest of nearly $100,000—an amount almost unheard of among his rural constituency. He and his supporters decided upon two fund-raising devices—a mailed appeal for $10 contributions and a series of dinners.

BARE RETURN FROM MAIL

The mailed appeal contained a personal message from the Congressman along with a blank check made out to his campaign committee. Mr. ELLIOTT recalled recently that the cost of printing and mailing the appeal came to $3,000; the return on the effort was $3,400.

The dinners proved more successful. Ranging in price from $100—in the Congressman's hometown—to as little as $5, some $60,000 was raised.

When it was all over his deficit came to nearly $30,000. Mr. ELLIOTT all but used up his savings to meet almost $20,000 of the bills with his own money.

This year, with the need as great, his close advisers decided the dinners had drained so much money from the district that they could not be repeated. Instead, finance committees were established in each county to solicit directly. In rural areas, this type of solicitation—where the solicitor has to be reimbursed a day's pay and expenses—usually brings in little political money. Nonetheless, the ELLIOTT campaign drew a respectable $40,000.

In addition, a reception was held in Washington one Sunday afternoon and about $7,500 was raised. Another $10,000 came from Alabamans outside his district, and members of the Elliott family put up $2,000.

COALITION BEAT HIM

That money would have been enough, Mr. ELLIOTT said recently, had it not been for the United Conservation Coalition of Alabama.

Ten days before the Democratic primary, this group—which has among its members, according to Mr. ELLIOTT, members of the White Citizens Council, Ku Klux Klan, John Birch Society and the State's growing Republican Party—met in Montgomery and decided to print cards for distribution around the State listing eight of the nine candidates. Mr. ELLIOTT's was the name left off.

The card, when it appeared, carried a conservative slogan on one side, and on the other: Gov. George Wallace's slogan, "Stand Up for Alabama"; a reproduction of the State's Democratic Party emblem; the list of eight favored candidates; and a warning that ballots would not count unless all eight candidates were marked off.

Mr. ELLIOTT did not learn of the meeting or the card for 4 days, and needed another 3 to gather facts about it. He held a press conference the Saturday before the election, then decided the only effective thing he could do to combat the card was to appear on statewide television on election eve.

His program, carried by half the stations in Alabama cost him $15,000—all paid in advance the day before the election. He had to mortgage his car that day—for $3,100—to complete the payment. His TV appeal was not successful.

CHARACTER OF DISTRICT

Mr. ELLIOTT believes his problems in raising money primarily stemmed from the rural character of his district. As he recently put it, "a Member of Congress doesn't have many things to do for rural constituents to reflect pocketbook advantages * * * and therefore there is no reason (for constituents) to build a bridge of influence (through contributions to him) into the Federal Government."

He believes the fundraising advantages in this area rest with State officials. "A Governor," he said recently, "with a few hundred million dollars to build roads, buy cars for State patrols and gas for those cars, books for schools * * * there are enough people who want these contracts to make fundraising for a Governor easier."

He sees a fundraising advantage also for his colleagues from cities, where party organizations can build campaign war chests. But "rural areas," he says, "by training and outlook tend to let a Congressman fend for himself."

That is not to say there aren't people who will pay all a Congressman's bills. "I've heard there are people who pick up the whole tab," Mr. ELLIOTT said, noting particularly some railroads and power companies. "But you vote like they want."

This method of contributing, as he described it, involved executives making donations in an organized manner. Management personnel at the State, regional, district and city level contributing together to one campaign, Mr. ELLIOTT estimated, could provide $60,000 in a State the size of Alabama.

TURNED DOWN GIFTS

There were contributions in his last campaign which Mr. ELLIOTT says he turned down, despite the fact that he sorely needed the money.

"I had an outfit offer me in Alabama," he related, "a substantial contribution provided I vote against wage and hour amendment proposals. * * * I told them I always supported expansion of that act and didn't believe any new action was due in the coming Congress and I didn't believe I could take their contribution.

"I was told a fellow could arrange a $1,000 contribution if a certain person, not the fellow giving the money, were appointed postmaster * * * I told him I wasn't going to recommend that fellow and not to go any further.

"An Alabama group offered $500 to be given by their check. I turned them down twice because they were highly controversial."

Laws relating to campaign contributions appear to be easily circumvented by those who want to, but frequently present inconveniences to those who don't. One section prohibits national banks from contributing to Federal elections—and defines a loan as a contribution. This has the effect of preventing the conscientious candidate from seeking loans, and the prudent banker from making them for campaign purposes.

AVOIDS PERSONAL GIFTS

Alabama and Federal laws limit a candidate's spending to $10,000, so committees are the rule. Mr. ELLIOTT tries not to receive any contributions directly—particularly cash—and sends the donors to one of his committee chairmen. "Where a fellow insists (that I take the money personally)," the Congressman said, "I do, if I'm certain he's acting in good faith.

"There are stories told of people who have made money on campaigns, but it's hard for me to visualize. I don't know it anyway but hand-to-mouth. The wonder of it all is the vast majority (of congressional candidates) do their best to play it honest."

As for the future of campaign fund raising: "It will be a high point in our civilization when, in a democracy, the people become so sophisticated they are willing to give $50 or $25 to candidates who need it."

In the meantime, Mr. ELLIOTT's financial problems take a good part of each day's work. Three weeks' effort by friends brought in only $3,000. "This business of campaign fund raising is awful hard even for a winner. For a loser * * *."

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I should like to add my commendation to the remarks that have been made on behalf of my friend, CARL ELLIOTT, who, unfortunately, I am sorry to say, is leaving the Congress at the end of this session. I hope that the course of politics will be such as to bring him here again soon.

He has served on the Rules Committee for a number of years. In that time I have had close contact with him and have learned to know the sterling character that he is. He is a man of fine convictions and strong convictions. He is a man who is sympathetic always to the needs of those who are less fortunate in life. He has been a strong voice in the operation of the committee of which I have the honor to be chairman. I wish him well, and am glad to know that we are having this little occasion here this evening so that we may briefly pay our respects to him and state our high regard for CARL ELLIOTT.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Alabama for yielding to me.

I have known CARL ELLIOTT ever since he became a Member of the House. He served with distinction on several committees, including, of course, the Committee on Education and Labor and the Committee on Rules.

I thought of the first great legislative effort of CARL yesterday when we were adopting the conference report on the amendments to the National Defense Education Act. I well remember those days late in one session some years ago when CARL was carrying around the conference papers on the original National Defense Education Act, which bore his name. I remember talking with Mr. Rayburn, then Speaker, about the matter of getting this matter programed at the very end of the session. CARL and I looked closely at the matter of getting it on the program.

This bill which bears his name is one of the great legislative landmarks in the legislative history of Congress. It marks a new departure in this area as far as legislation is concerned. It has come to be one of the most vital pillars in the whole of education in this country.

I was asked just a few days ago what I considered to be three of the greatest pieces of legislation that I had had the opportunity to vote for during my years in Congress, and I put this down as one of the three. Any person who is associated with this legislation must be regarded as having had an illustrious career in the Congress of the United States. CARL ELLIOTT was the author of this bill, and in turn the bill which he authored has immmortalized his name.

Few people in our country really have the opportunity of serving in Congress, but few who do serve in Congress have the opportunity to have such a major part in such an important piece of legislation as that.

I am proud to have been a friend of CARL ELLIOTT. He is a Congressman and a gentleman in every sense of both of those words. He has been one of the great Members of this House, sincere, kind, devoted, and dedicated to the principles in which he believes.

We shall miss CARL ELLIOTT here. I for one hope that he some day will be back with us. We can ill afford to lose men of the quality and character of CARL ELLIOTT.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. I yield now to the distinguished majority whip, the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I should like to subscribe to all that has been said with respect to our distinguished colleague from Alabama, CARL ELLIOTT.

I first met CARL when we were college boys together. I met him as a fellow student. I was impressed with him then, and I have continued to be impressed with him to this very day.

As others have said here this afternoon, he is an uncommon man in that he has great strength of character, and a tremendous dedication to public service as well as a magnificent intellect. But he has never lost his touch with what we might describe as the "average man" or the "common man."

I think it was Grover Cleveland who said that public office is a public trust, and CARL ELLIOTT has truly exemplified that great saying in his service as a public official. CARL ELLIOTT has shown throughout his career here the value not only of a fine intellect, but also the value and necessity of hard work and commonsense.

Sometimes, Mr. Speaker, what is characterized as the end is only the beginning. I think this will prove to be true in the case of our colleague from Alabama. He would be with us here in the next session of the Congress—and of course I do not know if I will be here, and I am presumptuous in saying that I may be—but in any event I think he would be here with us in the next session of the Congress if it had not been for an unusual situation that prevailed in his great State of Alabama.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, would my colleague be good enough to yield for a moment at this point?

Mr. BOGGS. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. I just want to say I concur in the gentleman's last remark 100 percent.

Mr. BOGGS. I think, Mr. Speaker, that I am not being unduly or overly prophetic when I say that CARL ELLIOTT's career still lies ahead of him in whatever he may choose to do because our Nation has too few people like CARL ELLIOTT, people who are willing to enter upon political careers and who are willing to sacrifice financial gain in order to serve our country. As the distinguished majority leader has said, CARL ELLIOTT has been the author of some of the most significant pieces of legislation that have been passed by the Congress. When he leaves here when this session of the Congress adjourns, CARL ELLIOTT can say to himself that our country and his

State are better because he has been here and served with us.

So far as I am concerned personally, Carl Elliott has been a friend and a colleague. I shall miss him in this capacity, but I hope to have the pleasure of being associated with him for many years to come.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. I thank the gentleman for his fine statement.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the able gentleman from Alabama for his kindness in permitting me as one who is proud to be a son of Alabama to say that I believe with all my heart that one of the greatest tragedies that has ever befallen the great State of Alabama, America, and this House of Representatives, is the passing from it for the present time of a man who has devoted 16 years of distinguished service to his district, his State, and his country—Carl Elliott.

Mr. Speaker, when Christ was being crucified He said, "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do." I venture to say, and to hope, that those who have removed Carl Elliott from their service and from the service of their country, will some day lament and repent the error of their way.

Carlyle said that Mirabeau had an eye; that he could see somehow through the tumult and the turmoil the things of vital interest to a mighty nation.

Carl Elliott's career of 16 years in this House has revealed that he, too, had an eye with peculiar perspicacity, able to see the things meaningful to America. He saw that the children of America needed a better education and that the real strength of America lay in the excellence of its people.

With all of his towering strength, Carl Elliott has lifted the boys and girls of America through a better education to walk on higher ground, not only that they might live better but also that they might better serve their country.

Carl Elliott is a man whose impeccable character and honesty have been an example to his colleagues and to his country. He is a man of great scholarship and learning, who has therefore been able immeasurably to improve the quality of legislation and to assist his colleagues in designing legislation of magnificent service to the country.

Carl Elliott is a man of shining courage. I believe that sometimes it is more rare to have political courage than to have personal courage because to stand up against the winds of political hostility, to refuse to yield to forces that are ignoble and unworthy, to decline to turn one's back upon the people who need a champion as their spokesman and a warrior for their cause sometimes requires greater character and courage than is required of a man to face dangers of another sort.

Men are naturally reluctant to give up service in this illustrious body. Sometimes a man has to make a choice between being true to his conscience and true to the best interests of his country and losing, perhaps, the honor and those things which go with public service. It is not always an easy decision to make. But Carl Elliott made the decision to stand like Stonewall Jackson at Manassas, as he has always stood, a man of character, courage, and conviction.

I venture to say, Mr. Speaker, that the days are not distant when the great people of Alabama, who basically love Carl Elliott as he has loved them, will honor him with the highest office they can bestow upon him. Then we would hear ringing through the councils of our country in the voice of Carl Elliott the words and sentiments of Thomas Jefferson and the Declaration of Independence and all Carl Elliott has stood for and fought for in the years he has been here. I feel it will not be long before his voice shall be heard again in the halls of Congress, in either this or the other body.

Mr. Speaker, on occasion when we bid one we affectionately esteem farewell, we say, "Hail and farewell," but the conviction that Carl Elliott will soon return to the Congress makes us say to Carl Elliott: statesman, scholar, and gentleman, "Farewell and hail."

May the blessings of the providence you so richly deserve ever accompany you.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. I thank the gentleman for his fine statement.

Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the gentleman from California [Mr. Corman].

Mr. CORMAN I thank the gentleman from Alabama.

The unique value of our system is that men of great ability from across the land participate in the Government for all of us. As we have heard the gentleman from Florida, certainly I, from California, recognize that the gentleman from Alabama, Carl Elliott, has made a great contribution not merely to his own district and not merely to his own State but to his Nation. That contribution was felt in California, just as it was felt across the land.

I, too, look forward to the day when his great qualities of leadership, understanding, and respect for the law will be with us again.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. I thank the gentleman, and I now yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Bolling].

Mr. BOLLING. I thank the gentleman from Alabama for yielding to me.

There is very little that can be said in addition to what has already been said. It seems to me that one of the great tragedies of my experience in this House of Representatives is the fact that one of the ablest of its Members has been defeated by a people temporarily bereft of their reason. I am sure that the people of Alabama—and I think I can speak of Alabama with some conviction because I grew up there—will soon come to understand that in retiring the gentleman from Alabama, Carl Elliott, they retired one of their ablest spokesmen for several generations. His fault, if any, was foresight. His guilt, if any, was courage.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his statement. I now yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Madden].

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, when the 88th Congress adjourns this legislative body will lose one of its most brilliant and experienced Members, the gentleman from Alabama, Congressman Carl Elliott. Carl Elliott has ably served his district, State, and Nation in this legislative body since January 3, 1949—over a period of 16 years. By reason of his outstanding ability, industry, and knowledge of legislative procedures he has gradually risen to be one of the most highly respected and valuable Members of this national House of Representatives.

Had it not been for the unfortunate situation of being suddenly thrown into a statewide contest for reelection, he would continue to be a Member of this body. No doubt his congressional district that he has represented so well would have reelected him and retained his valuable services for many years to come.

When the people throughout the State of Alabama have become familiar with the great record he has made as a Member of this House, there is no doubt in my mind that he will again be called, if he so desires, for more extended service to his State and Nation. Alabama and the Nation can ill afford to lose the services of so able a statesman as the gentleman from Alabama, Carl Elliott.

I wish to join other Members of Congress in extending to him my regret for his departure as a legislator. I, indeed, enjoyed serving with Carl on the Rules Committee during the last few sessions of Congress. I hope that he will see fit to continue giving to our Government the service of his exceptional talents and experience in future years.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Indiana for his statement.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Rains] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, it is always a sad occasion when the best of friends must part. The American people are losing one of their best friends and the House is losing one of its finest Members with the retirement of my colleague, the gentleman from Alabama, Carl Elliott.

Ever since Carl Elliott came here 16 years ago I have watched with pride and admiration as he made his record. His dedication and hard work have been unparalleled in this Chamber, as each of you well know.

He has served here at great sacrifice. There has been no Member, to my knowledge, who has applied himself more diligently or with more devotion to the task of representing the best interests of his people. It is indeed regrettable that Alabama and the Nation must lose, for the present, his faithful service, and his sane, intelligent approach to progressive legislation.

But in leaving the Congress Carl Elliott has left contributions to our Nation which will be acclaimed long after each of us has left this mortal realm. Who can appraise the value of the National Defense Education Act, which has become a cornerstone of this Nation's future and a keystone to our survival? What price tag can be set on the Library Facilities Act which has brought books into remote hollows and dales of this country and which has assured library services for schools across the land?

While the gentleman from Alabama, Carl Elliott, has served here as your friend and mine, he probably has no greater friends than the youth of this Nation for whom he has contributed so much valuable legislation.

The schools and colleges in Alabama know this. They know that they are losing a stalwart ally and one who will not be easily replaced.

In one of Shakespeare's plays it is said that "our praises are our wages." Many of us in politics will agree. And if this be true, then Carl Elliott is one of the wealthiest men I know. And the praise he has received is praise he has most honestly earned.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Rogers].

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for permitting me to join my colleagues in paying our respects to a fine gentleman, Carl Elliott. My acquaintanceship and association with Carl, his wife, and his family has been most rewarding. I want to say at this time, in the interests of time, that I would simply say ditto to the many fine things that have been said and the many tributes that have been paid to this fine man today.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I want to say that no man has even won a warmer spot in the hearts of his friends here in this House than Carl Elliott. As I have said previously, his outstanding characteristic, in my opinion, is his sincerity. I want to say that there comes to my mind a poem I read years ago about the heart of a friend. It goes thusly:

The heart of a friend never wonders or doubts.
No matter how many years intervene.
The old faith is there
And naught can compare
With the comfort it gives though unseen.

Yes, the heart of a friend is the one thing I prize
As life lengthens and twilight descends.
It is the last boon I will ask
When I have finished my task
That I live in the hearts of my friends.

I can assure Carl Elliott that he will live in the hearts of his friends as long as those who served with him remain in this Chamber.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues today in paying high tribute to the distinguished service of my friend, Carl Elliott, with whom it has been my special privilege to serve on the House Committee on Rules.

It can be fittingly said with regard to the service of Carl Elliott that he has brought to his work a dedication of purpose and a sense of conviction which has been an inspiration to the entire membership of the House. His presence as a member of this body will be genuinely missed, but I know he will continue to make significant contributions to his community, State, and Nation.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to the character and service of our friend from Alabama, Carl Elliott. I cannot improve on what has been said about our friend but I must claim the honor of joining my colleagues in a brief word of tribute to a great American. I predict that Carl Elliott will continue to find ways to serve his State and Nation. He will carry with him the confidence and good will of his colleagues here.

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure on behalf of the Alabama delegation to request this time in order that the Membership of the House might have an opportunity to join with our delegation in paying tribute to a valuable Member of this body who is retiring at the end of this session. I refer to Carl Elliott of Alabama.

Carl was born in Vina in Franklin County, Ala., on December 20, 1913. He attended the public schools of that county and graduated from the University of Alabama with an A.B. degree in 1933 and an LL. B. in 1936. He practiced law in Russellville and in Jasper until he was elected in the 81st Congress. Carl has been a member of and has held positions of trust and honor in many patriotic, political, religious, and social organizations. He is married to the former Jane Hamilton, who has been more than helpful to him in his career. They are the proud parents of four fine children: Carl, Jr., and Martha Owen who are both students at the University of Alabama; John Hamilton and Lenora Jane who are students in their hometown of Jasper.

Carl Elliott has been an energetic and hard worker here in Congress and has many honors to his credit. The most notable one has been his authorship of the National Defense Education Act which he steered through this body. There has been no single piece of legislation in the educational field which has done more to make it possible for needy students to achieve higher education than this Education Act. Carl is one who, in fact, in word, and in deed, has dedicated his public service to help the cause of higher education. Recently, when the extension of the National Defense Education Act amendments were before this body, many Members took occasion to pay tribute to the fine record achieved by Carl, and he is most deserving of these tributes by his colleagues.

Congressman Elliott's outstanding service in the House in the educational field is by no means all for which he will be remembered; another of his special accomplishments was conceiving the idea of forming a Select Committee on Government Research, and he has given freely of his time and efforts in this endeavor. He pioneered the organization and setup of the committee and did much to call to the attention of governmental agencies, Congress, and the public just where there was an overlapping of research programs and by so doing has saved countless amounts of the taxpayers' money.

Although Carl Elliott has the respect of Members of both parties, there can never be any question that his faith, his allegiance, and his espousal have always been to the Democratic Party.

As Carl Elliott leaves this body, I know that each Member of the House joins me in wishing for him, his lovely wife, Jane, and their fine family the very best of everything in their future endeavor; they richly deserve it.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, Congressman Carl Elliott was elected to the 81st Congress—1948—and reelected to each succeeding Congress.

His straightforward attitude in accepting responsibilities and his calm, analytical judgment has endeared him to his colleagues. He is cooperative and understanding of others who may disagree with his decisions in legislative matters.

His authoritative knowledge of the educational requisites of the youth of our Nation is tangibly evident in the laws passing through his committee that reflect his thinking.

It is unfortunate that the fortunes of politics have thwarted his ambition to continue in the dedicated services to his Nation in the Halls of Congress. Certainly we hold the suppressed desire that his retirement is temporary and there is no reason to believe that in the not too distant future this brilliant intellectual statesman will be returned by the electorate of Alabama. He belongs in the Congress of the United States. His loss to the citizens of Alabama is a great loss to the Congress and the Nation. We regret his departure and hope for his return. May he enjoy the days of temporary departure from the Congress with his darling wife Jane and his four lovely children. May God bless him and his family with happiness and an abundance of prosperity.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in paying tribute and saying goodbye to Carl Elliott, a respected Member of this body since 1949.

Carl has been a leader ever since the days of college when he was elected as president of the student body at the University of Alabama. In the ensuing years he was a practicing attorney in his home town of Russellville and served with distinction in the Army during World War II. He also served for a period of 8 years as a member of the Alabama State Democratic Executive Committee prior to his election to the Congress.

I had the pleasure of serving with Carl on the Veterans' Affairs Committee during the 81st and 82d Congresses and regretted to see him leave this committee. He nevertheless served with distinction on the Education and Labor Committee, the House Administration Committee, the Rules Committee, and also chairmaned the Select Committee To Investigate Government Research Activities. He authored the National Defense Education Act of 1958, assisted in framing legislation granting aid to federally impacted school areas; authored the Rural Library Services Act and generally demonstrated in numerous ways his great concern for the welfare, not only of the people he represented in Alabama, but for the whole country.

His presence will be greatly missed in this body as well as his leadership in the many fields in which he excelled. I wish to take this opportunity to join with his many friends in wishing him Godspeed.

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. Mr. Speaker, it is a real pleasure to join with my colleagues in honoring one of our most distinguished Members.

Alabama has contributed many great men to the Nation, and well up on this list must be inscribed the name of our friend and colleague, Carl Elliott.

He has been an outstanding Member of the House since coming here in 1948. His devotion to and love of country is something to be admired, and he has worked hard toward those objectives which he believes are in the best interests of all our people. He brought to his congressional duties a wide knowledge of public affairs and a warm humanity which have made him highly esteemed and universally liked. His honesty, integrity, and frankness are well known, and it has been a real pleasure to be associated with him.

During his years in Congress he has served in many capacities, and in every instance he has distinguished himself and the State of Alabama. His work as a Member of the House Education and Labor Committee has been particularly outstanding and he will be long remembered as the author of the National Defense Education Act. He can take justifiable pride in his many legislative accomplishments, particularly those in the field of education.

Carl Elliott is a remarkable man, and his retirement will be a real loss to the House. We shall miss his aid and wisdom as a legislator, but, more than that, in the days ahead we shall miss his quiet, unassuming, friendly presence, and his dedication to the common good of our Nation.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I extend my best wishes to our colleague Congressman Carl Elliott, of Alabama. Carl Elliott has served his district and the Nation with devotion.

Since coming to the 81st Congress in 1948, Congressman Elliott has risen to be chairman of the House Select Committee To Investigate Government Research Activities and also sat on the Rules Committee for the past two Congresses. I know that my colleagues in the House will miss his valued counsel and warm friendship, which he so willingly extended to all in his 16 years of membership in the House of Representatives.

Again, I wish to Congressman and Mrs. Elliott best wishes for continued success and happiness.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, with full consciousness of the notable contributions so many of my colleagues have made to education of our American youth, I can say without fear of contradiction that Carl Elliott, our colleague and my old friend from north Alabama, has done more than any other single person in our time to foster universal education.

Carl Elliott is leaving the House at the termination of this Congress, but he will be remembered not only in this body, but wherever anyone prizes education as the mainspring of our American democratic system.

Although Mr. Elliott has been a champion of freer and wider education, his interests and knowledge in many other fields attested to his versatility. He proved himself to be an authority in many aspects of agriculture, modern science, industry, and conservation of natural resources. His record as a legislator and as a member of the Rules Committee is known universally here and is unanimously praised. He has been a close friend of mine for years and I will always appreciate his counsel and sharing of his vast knowledge of issues before us and our people.

It is universally agreed in the Congress itself, among our leading educators and, I hope, among hundreds of thousands of Americans that Carl Elliott was the father of the National Defense Education Act. It was his legislation; it was he who explained its provisions within the Education and Labor Committee; and it was he who guided it through the House.

No single piece of legislation has done more to give capable but needy students the opportunity for higher education than Carl Elliott's inspired legislation. Its success is attested to by the record which shows that almost 700,000 loans have been made since his legislation became effective in 1958. No Member of Congress could ask for a better or more noble monument.

It is notable that Carl Elliott's legislation came during the Eisenhower regime. That is a tribute to his powers of persuasion and also to his popularity and respect in the House. His most persuasive argument was that Americans, who spend 15 times more on legalized gambling than on education, ought to take a gamble on American youngsters. The gamble certainly has paid off.

His awards and citations from the leading educational organizations and institutions are too numerous to catalog here, but in addition to what he has done for our older educational system, he fathered legislation to help rural libraries, train teachers of retarded children, tax relief for teachers studying to improve their abilities, and was outstanding in his championship of vocational education and rehabilitation of the crippled and handicapped.

We of Alabama will long note his efforts to promote our State's economy, his good record on farm legislation and help to farmers through REA, study programs, and practical helps. Our campaign for waterways development has lost an able ally and champion. But Carl Elliott can leave the Congress with the deep satisfaction and knowledge that he made an enviable record that set a standard not only for the Alabamians who may succeed him, but for any Member of the House in the future. We wish him success in whatever endeavor he chooses and these are plentiful for a man of Carl Elliott's talents.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, Carl Elliott's service here in this the greatest legislative body in the world has been marked with humility and a humbleness of character which all men in public life should emulate.

When and wherever you met Carl Elliott, you felt better having met and talked with him. Whether it was on the floor, in committee, or just walking down the hall or in the tunnel, I always liked to run into Carl.

Carl Elliott fought for an education during the depression years, overcame adversity and hardship to take his place as one of the great Members of the Congress. His service here is marked by a devotion to education and to furthering opportunity for the youth of our land. Some of the most pleasant experiences of my service here have been long confidential conversations with Carl Elliott. We talked of the farm, erosion, poverty, and success. Carl has a sense of humor and epitomizes the southern philosophy of courtesy, good manners, church service, and concern for the other fellow.

Carl Elliott is a young man with a wealth of commonsense, a superb education, experience in national affairs; and I predict for him a higher position and a wider field of public service in the years to come.

We will hear a lot more from our friend, Carl Elliott, in the future.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be permitted to have 5 legislative days within which to extend and revise their remarks on this subject.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

WAGE BOARD EMPLOYEE CLASSIFICATION STANDARDS, OLMSTED AIR FORCE BASE

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, I am including another letter written by me to the Honorable Eugene M. Zuckert, Secretary of the Air Force. The reply to my letter of September 10—previously read on the floor by me—in my judgment, was far from satisfactory. It did not answer the basic questions involved. I am hoping that Secretary Zuckert will give me specific answers to the rather specific questions posed in the present letter.

Also, I believe it would be a fine step forward for the Air Force and all concerned if he would follow my recommendation in urging a moratorium on wage board classification surveys and downgrading until such time as a more fair and realistic method of assigning grade levels may be established.

My letter to Secretary Zuckert follows:

Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C., October 2, 1964.
The Honorable Eugene M. Zuckert,
Secretary of the Air Force,
Washington, D.C.

My Dear Mr. Secretary: On September 10, 1964, I wrote you in regard to complaints I have been receiving from wage board employees at Olmsted Air Force Base. Therein were listed the main complaints received at that time.

On September 18, I wrote you again to advise you of my visit to the Middletown air materiel area. In talking with many wage board employees I found widespread dissatisfaction, much to my regret. In that letter, I pointed out that the employees had stressed their concern about job classifications, constant reclassification and downgrading and being required to do work of a higher classification when called upon to do so.

Also, on September 18, 1964, I forwarded to Col. G. J. Kelley, in the Office of Legislative Liaison, a copy of a letter I had received from the local president, NAGE, MAAMA chapter 3-14, outlining in some detail complaints and objections about wage board employee classification standards.

Response to the above letters has been received from Col. William E. Poe, Office of Legislative Liaison, in which he enclosed a summary of information prepared by the Office of the Director of Civilian Personnel.

The summary dealt mainly with complaints one to five listed in my letter of September 10. The remainder of the summary dealing with classification standards, reclassifications and downgrading, I find unresponsive. Naturally, I don't have an Air Force Manual or transmittal sheet 33. Furthermore, I am not a personnel expert.

Why is it necessary to adjust the grades of portions of an occupation upward or downward to aline it with other positions of equal difficulty? When the job has been classified and set up and a grade assigned, why should it have to be alined with other positions? Why is it necessary to reclassify a skill three times in a period of 10 years? Can a classification standard be established to encompass all AFLC depots when the workload differs greatly?

Wage board employees tell me they are considered semiskilled during a wage board survey for pay purposes. Yet they are entrusted with aircraft costing millions. Automobile mechanics, they contend, make more money to work on an automobile. The skill requirement for these workers has increased greatly in the past 10 to 15 years as aircraft has become more complicated and the parts more sophisticated.

In the sheet metal shop, they feel that the downgrading of the 56 sheet metal mechanics is wrong by any standard. These mechanics are part of a group (now only slightly over 100) of aircraft sheet metal mechanics left at Middletown Air Materiel Area. They are part, also, of a small group of fast-disappearing general aircraft sheet metal hand mechanics left in this country. The wage board workers tell me that most Air Force depots and civilian aircraft companies use specialists—men who perform one or two small features of the trade, semiskilled and production-type people. If the Air Force loses these capabilities, where are you going to find replacements? Many of these men have worked in this field for over 20 years. You do not find men to do this type of work growing on trees.

I just do not understand why a man had a grade of WB-16, step 5, 20 years ago and today is doing the same work at the grade of a WB-10, step 3. This same employee was capable of making a recommendation which will save the Air Force over $100,000. In the course of his job he has been required to spend long, long weeks on TDY duty in some mighty dreary, isolated spots in the world. He has been required to go to Vietnam and to fly on a mission over the Mekong Delta. All of these things are a part of his job. Yet he receives his same semiskilled pay. He has to fly on military aircraft which means that his commercial insurance carried to protect his family is not valid. I realize that his Federal Government insurance has no restrictions on it, but that is hardly adequate insurance coverage for a man with a wife and small children.

When I receive a report which tells me that an initial draft of a classification standard is exposed to comment and criticism of a substantial segment of interested Air Force personnel—I must confess that I do not think that tells me a thing. Is it submitted for comment to the workers who are being downgraded? Do they agree with it? Is any weight given to their opinion?

I am disturbed to find the morale of the wage board workers so low. I think the Air Force should be concerned. The average civilian mechanic in the Air Force calculates that during the past 7 or 8 years he has lost $6,000 in earnings due to downgrading. Certainly nowhere in civilian enterprises could a similar situation be found, particularly where increasing skill on the part of the mechanic has constantly been required. These are good people who have served the Government long and faithfully. They feel they have nothing to look forward to. So far, I do not feel I have anything to send them which offers any encouragement.

Mr. Secretary, I strongly recommend and urge a moratorium on wage board classifications surveys and downgrading until such time as a more fair and realistic method of assigning grade levels may be established. Surely Air Force headquarters, the local installations and the wage board workers can find an equitable and fair solution which will be satisfactory to all concerned. It seems to me there is an urgent necessity to try.

Very sincerely yours,
John C. Kunkel,
Member of Congress.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 1965

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, as my last official act on the floor of this House, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 11812) making appropriations for foreign assistance and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, line 8, strike out "Development grants" and insert "Technical cooperation and development grants".

Page 2, line 11, strike out "$18,000,000" and insert "$16,800,000".

Page 2, line 13, strike out "$2,100,000" and insert "$1,600,000".

Page 2, line 17, strike out "$405,000,000" and insert "$401,000,000".

Page 2, line 19, strike out "$150,000,000" and insert "$99,200,000".

Page 2, line 21, strike out "$85,000,000" and insert "$84,700,000".

Page 2, line 26, strike out "$782,200,000" and insert "$773,727,600".

Page 3, line 5, strike out "$52,500,000" and insert "$51,200,000".

Page 4, line 12, after "projects" insert "or programs".

Page 5, line 17, after "fund'" insert ", 'Alliance for Progress, development loans',".

Page 8, line 5, strike out "obligation" and insert "expenditure".

Page 8, lines 13 and 14, strike out "adversely effect the economy of the United States" and insert "result in adverse effects upon the economy of the United States or the industrial mobilization base which outweigh the economic or other advantages to United States of less costly procurement outside the United States".

Page 10, line 16, strike out "$6,000,000" and insert "$12,000,000".

Page 12, line 11, strike out "$20,500,000" and insert "$20,850,000".

Page 14, line 15, strike out "$45,400,000" and insert "$34,800,000 together with the unobligated balance of the appropriation under this head for the fiscal year 1964".

Page 14, line 15, after "$45,400,000" insert ": *Provided*, That the final sentence in section 2(e) of the Migration and Refugee Assistance Act of 1962 is hereby repealed".

Page 19, after line 2, insert:

"Sec. 404. The appropriations, funds, other authorizations, and authority with respect thereto in this Act shall be available from October 1, 1964, for the purposes provided in such appropriations, funds, other authorizations, and authority. All obligations incurred during the period between September 30, 1964, and the date of enactment of this Act in anticipation of such appropriations, funds, other authorizations, and authority are hereby ratified and confirmed if in accordance with the terms thereof."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I have no intention of objecting, will the gentleman from Virginia please take a few minutes to explain the amendments which the Senate has added to the bill?

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I shall be very happy to do so.

Mr. Speaker, the foreign aid appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1965 as amended by the Senate is $296,300,000 under the budget estimates. It is $77,172,400 under the bill passed by the House.

I know that under those circumstances my good friend, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross] is not going to want to agree to the amendments, but I assure him that this is a good bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Again let me say that I am opposed to the foreign handout program. I appreciate the fact that the bill is some $77 million below the House figure which leads me to this conclusion, that the House did not do a very good job of holding down the bill when it passed the House. If there is no rollcall I want the Record to show that I am opposed to it.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, may I say to the gentleman that the House, in my judgment, did a very good job.

The bill also contains funds for the foreign assistance program—title I of the bill—which is $256,972,400 below the amount authorized by the conference report, which the House has just adopted.

While it may appear on the surface that the Congress is appropriating more money for title I—foreign aid—than it did last year, there is an actual reduction in funds available to the program of approximately $235 million due to the fact that there is not as big a carryover of funds into fiscal 1965 as compared to a carryover of approximately $400 million into fiscal 1964.

I believe the amount of funds recommended is adequate to enable the President to carry out the foreign aid program during the current fiscal year.

One item I would like to comment on is the malaria eradication program. As the gentleman knows, our committee has always looked with favor upon that program and I know the gentleman agrees with me in saying that it is our hope that the total reduction in the estimates for the foreign aid program will have no effect upon the proposed program for the malaria eradication program for fiscal year 1965.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I certainly agree with the gentleman from Virginia and I hope the AID will adequately fund this important program during the current fiscal year.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I am a little concerned about the $99.2 million recommended for the President's contingency fund. I believe we are cutting that vital appropriation a little too closely. However, if a need should arise for additional funds—and this is for emergencies—I am sure the Congress will give sympathetic consideration to a request for such emergency funds as may be necessary.

I include at this point a table showing pertinent comparisons of the foreign assistance appropriation bill for fiscal 1965:

Summary tabulation, foreign assistance appropriation bill, 1965

TITLE I—FOREIGN ASSISTANCE

Item	Appropriations, 1964	Budget estimates, 1965	Passed House	Passed Senate	Senate bill compared with—		
					1964 appropriations	Budget estimates	House bill
FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT							
ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE							
Development grants	$155,000,000	$224,600,000	$204,600,000	$204,600,000	+$49,600,000	−$20,000,000	
American schools and hospitals abroad	14,300,000	18,000,000	18,000,000	16,800,000	+2,500,000	−1,200,000	−$1,200,000
American hospitals abroad (special foreign currency program)	4,700,000				−4,700,000		
Surveys of investment opportunities		2,100,000	2,100,000	1,600,000	+1,600,000	−500,000	−500,000
International organizations and programs	116,000,000	134,400,000	134,272,400	134,272,400	+18,272,400	−127,600	
Supporting assistance	330,000,000	405,000,000	405,000,000	401,000,000	+71,000,000	−4,000,000	−4,000,000
Contingency fund	50,000,000	150,000,000	150,000,000	99,200,000	+49,200,000	−50,800,000	−50,800,000
Inter-American social and economic cooperation program	135,000,000				−135,000,000		
Alliance for Progress:							
Development grants	80,000,000	85,000,000	85,000,000	84,700,000	+4,700,000	−300,000	−300,000
Development loans	375,000,000	465,000,000	425,000,000	425,000,000	+50,000,000	−40,000,000	
Development loans	687,300,000	922,200,000	782,200,000	773,727,600	+86,427,600	−148,472,400	−8,472,400
Administrative expenses, AID	50,000,000	52,500,000	52,500,000	51,200,000	+1,200,000	−1,300,000	−1,300,000
Administrative expenses, State	2,700,000	2,900,000	2,900,000	2,900,000	+200,000		
Subtotal, economic assistance	2,000,000,000	2,461,700,000	2,261,572,400	2,195,000,000	+195,000,000	−266,700,000	−66,572,400
MILITARY ASSISTANCE							
Military assistance	1,000,000,000	1,055,000,000	1,055,000,000	1,055,000,000	+55,000,000		
Limitation on administrative expenses	*(24,000,000)*	*(23,500,000)*	*(23,500,000)*	*(23,500,000)*	*(−500,000)*		
Total, title I, foreign assistance	3,000,000,000	[1] 3,516,700,000	[1] 3,316,572,400	3,250,000,000	+250,000,000	−266,700,000	−66,572,400
TITLE II—FOREIGN ASSISTANCE (OTHER)							
FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT							
Peace Corps	$92,100,000	$106,100,000	[2] $87,100,000	[2] $87,100,000	−$5,000,000	−$19,000,000	
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY—CIVIL FUNCTIONS							
Ryukyu Islands, Army, administration	10,000,000	14,441,000	14,441,000	14,441,000	+4,441,000		
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE							
Assistance to refugees in the United States	39,717,137	45,400,000	45,400,000	34,800,000	−4,917,137	−10,600,000	−10,600,000
DEPARTMENT OF STATE							
Migrants and refugees	10,550,000	8,200,000	8,200,000	8,200,000	−2,350,000		
FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT							
Inter-American Development Bank	50,000,000	205,880,000	205,880,000	205,880,000	+155,880,000		
International Development Association	61,656,000	61,656,000	61,656,000	61,656,000			
Total, title II, foreign assistance (other)	264,023,137	441,677,000	422,677,000	412,077,000	+148,053,863	−29,600,000	−10,600,000
TITLE III—EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON							
Limitation on operating expenses	*($1,314,366,000)*	*($1,350,060,000)*	*($1,350,060,000)*	*($1,350,060,000)*	*(+$35,694,000)*		
Limitation on administrative expenses	*(3,500,000)*	*(3,781,000)*	*(3,781,000)*	*(3,781,000)*	*(+281,000)*		
Total title III, Export-Import Bank	*(1,317,866,000)*	*(1,353,841,000)*	*(1,353,841,000)*	*(1,353,841,000)*	*(+35,975,000)*		
Grand total, all titles	3,264,023,137	3,958,377,000	3,739,249,400	3,662,077,000	+398,053,863	−$269,300,000	−$77,172,400

[1] In addition, all unobligated balances to be reappropriated.

[2] In addition an estimated $17,000,000 in unobligated funds as of June 30, 1964, is reappropriated.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Arizona yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I ask the gentleman from Arizona if he does not agree that this $77 million cut, the total is fairly close to the target that was set when the hearings were held by the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN].

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. As I recall the target that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN] and I set, it was somewhere in the neighborhood of $3 billion. So I say to my friend the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] that this is not yet in the area that we had hoped to arrive at when this bill first began on its legislative path. But it is better than the House bill.

In the colloquy which has just occurred on the floor I am with the gentleman from Iowa. I am sorry to say that in this one instance—in fact, this is the first time, I believe, that this has occurred since I have been on the Appropriations Committee—that the Senate has actually cut a House appropriation bill which, in my opinion, certainly would lend itself to the thought that maybe the House appropriated too much money originally.

Mr. GROSS. And if the gentleman from Arizona will yield further, perhaps augers well for the future?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I hope so.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman from Arizona yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I might say to the gentleman from Arizona that after almost 20 years of service on the Committee on Appropriations I can recall this sort of thing having happened previously. I believe that once or maybe twice over that period of 20 years the Senate has appropriated under the amount previously approved by the House.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GARY. May I say to the gentleman that at least I believe we are establishing one record, because I have served in this Foreign Operations Subcommittee since it was first created and I believe this is the first time that the foreign aid appropriation bill has been enacted into law without being referred to a conference committee. So the House and Senate have gotten pretty close together.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I might say to my good friend the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] I believe there is another first: Insofar as I know this is the first time since I have been on the committee that this bill has not been the last appropriation bill to pass at any session of the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD following my remarks a table making pertinent comparisons of the appropriation bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO THE PUBLIC LAND LAW REVIEW COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 3, Public Law 88-606, the Chair appoints as members of the Public Land Law Review Commission the following members on the part of the House: Mr. ASPINALL, Mr. O'BRIEN, Mr. WHITE, Mr. SAYLOR, Mr. KYL, and Mr. BURTON of Utah.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1965

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the unanimous-consent agreement made yesterday, I call up for immediate consideration the conference report on the bill (H.R. 12633) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the gentleman proposes to take some time to discuss this conference report?

Mr. MAHON. I do.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 1928)

The Committee of Conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12633) "making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 5, 6, 7, 18, 19, 20, 28, 32, 37, 42, 50, 53, 54, 55, 58, 61, and 62.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 3, 8, 9, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 23, 26, 30, 33, 35, 36, 44, 46, 47, 48, 49, 56, 57, 65, and 66, and agree to the same.

Amendment No. 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,291,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment No. 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: "Omit the matter stricken, and delete the matter inserted by said amendment,"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment No. 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$825,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment No. 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken by said amendment, amended to read as follows: ", of which not to exceed $2,000,000 may be used for additional personnel"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 24: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,465,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert: "$2,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 27: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$8,533,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 29: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert: "$90,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 34: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert: "$50,000"; and the Senate agree

Amendment numbered 41: That the House
to the same.
recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 41, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$800,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 52: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 52, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"INTEROCEANIC CANAL COMMISSION

"Salaries and expenses

"For expenses necessary for an investigation and study, including surveys, to determine the feasibility of, and the most suitable site for construction of a sea-level canal connecting the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, $400,000."; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 59: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 59, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert: "$45,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 64: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 64, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,250,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 10, 11, 12, 31, 38, 39, 40, 43, 45, 51, 60, and 63.

GEORGE MAHON,
ALBERT THOMAS,
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
JOHN J. ROONEY,
JOHN E. FOGARTY,
WALT HORAN (except as to amendment No. 41),
FRANK T. BOW (except as to amendment No. 41),
MELVIN R. LAIRD (except as to amendment No. 41),
Managers on the Part of the House.

JOHN O. PASTORE,
SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
CARL HAYDEN,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
MIKE MONRONEY,
E. L. BARTLETT,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
KARL E. MUNDT,
MARGARET CHASE SMITH,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12633), making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

CHAPTER I

Department of Agriculture

Amendment No. 1: Agricultural Research Service, salaries and expenses; appropriates $1,291,000 for meat inspection instead of $1,225,000 as proposed by the House and $1,357,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 2: Soil Conservation Service, flood prevention; appropriates $900,000 for emergency conservation measures as pro-
Amendments Nos. 3 and 4: Agricultural
posed by the Senate.
Marketing Service; appropriate $25,000,000 for the food stamp program as proposed by the Senate instead of $15,000,000 as proposed by the House, and delete language authorizing transfers from section 32 funds. While Senate language prohibiting the use of section 32 for this purpose has been eliminated, the conferees concur with the intent of such language. Also, the conferees are in agreement that the funds in this bill may be consolidated with funds for this purpose provided in the regular 1965 appropriation bill and may be operated as one account.

Amendments Nos. 5, 6, and 7: Farmers Home Administration; eliminate funds added by the Senate for rural housing for domestic farm labor. The conferees agree that appropriations for this new program should be considered in connection with the regular annual appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture.

Amendment No. 8: Federal Crop Insurance Corporation; appropriates $250,000 for administrative and operating expenses as proposed by the Senate instead of the transfer of this amount from section 32 funds as proposed by the House.

CHAPTER II

Department of Defense—Military

Amendment No. 9: Changes chapter number.

Amendment No. 10: Operation and maintenance, Navy; reported in technical disagreement; the managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to concur in the Senate amendment that $860,000 may be transferred to Salaries and expenses, Weather Bureau, for the operation of ocean weather stations.

Amendment No. 11: Operation and maintenance, Air Force; reported in technical disagreement; the managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to concur in the Senate amendment that $150,000 may be transferred to Salaries and expenses, Weather Bureau, for the operation of the Marcus Island upper-air station.

Amendment No. 12: Research, development, test, and evaluation, Defense agencies; reported in technical disagreement; the managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to concur in the Senate amendment that $990,000 may be transferred to Salaries and expenses, Coast and Geodetic Survey, for expenses of the worldwide seismological network program.

CHAPTER III

District of Columbia

Amendment No. 13: Changes chapter number.

Amendment No. 14: General operating expenses; appropriates $42,100 as proposed by the Senate instead of $17,100 as proposed by the House.

CHAPTER IV

Independent Offices

Amendment No. 15: Changes chapter number.

Amendment No. 16: Housing and Home Finance Agency, urban mass transportation grants; appropriates $60,000,000 for urban mass transportation grants as proposed by the Senate instead of $75,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 17: Urban mass transportation loans; appropriates $5,000,000 for urban mass transportation loans as proposed by the Senate instead of $2,500,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 18: Open space land grants; deletes the proposal of the Senate to appropriate $10,000,000 for open space land grants.

Amendment No. 19: Rehabilitation loans; deletes the proposal of the Senate to appropriate $10,000,000 for a new program of rehabilitation loans.

Amendment No. 20: Public Housing Administration; deletes the proposal of the Senate to appropriate $50,000 for administrative expenses.

Amendment No. 21: National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress; appropriates $825,000 for expenses of the Commission instead of $650,000 as proposed by the House and $1,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 22: Selective Service System; restores language proposed by the House amended to earmark not to exceed $2,000,000 instead of $3,000,000 for additional personnel and deleting the limitation as proposed by the Senate.

CHAPTER V

Department of the Interior

Amendment No. 23: Changes chapter number.

Amendment No. 24: Office of Water Resources Research; appropriates $1,465,000 for salaries and expenses instead of $1,400,000 as proposed by the House and $1,530,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 25: Bureau of Commercial Fisheries; appropriates $2,500,000 for construction of fishing vessels instead of $3,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. Of the amount provided not to exceed $250,000 shall be available for administration.

Amendment No. 26: Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife; appropriates $1,041,600 as proposed by the Senate instead of $825,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 27: National Park Service; appropriates $8,533,000 for construction instead of $6,700,000 as proposed by the House and $8,984,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase over the House bill includes $452,000 for acquiring land in the Everglades National Park, Fla.; $281,000 for acquisition of land for the Morristown National Historical Park, N.J.; and $1,100,000 for acquisition of land for the Fire Island National Seashore, N.Y.

Amendment No. 28: Bureau of Indian Affairs; deletes proposal of the Senate to appropriate $146,000 for construction. The conferees are agreed that of the excess funds available from the amount programed for dormitory facilities at Nome, Alaska, $126,000 shall be used for completion of the rehabilitation of the power system for the San Carlos irrigation project, Arizona, and $20,000 shall be used for engineering, planning, and surveying a water system at the Fort Yates Agency, N. Dak.

Amendment No. 29: Geological Survey; appropriates $90,000 for surveys, investigations, and research instead of $160,000 as proposed by the Senate. The amount provided is for obtaining flood information for future planning in the Montana area. The conferees are agreed that the agency shall provide $70,000 from available funds for the repair and replacement of gaging stations and cableways damaged by the Montana flood.

Amendment No. 30: Bureau of Land Management; appropriates $1,000,000 for management of lands and resources as proposed by the Senate.

Historical and memorial commissions

Amendment No. 31: Battle of New Orleans Sesquicentennial Celebration Commission; reported in technical disagreement; the managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to concur in the Senate amendment appropriating $25,000 for expenses of the Commission.

Amendment No. 32: Saint Augustine Quadricentennial Commission; deletes the proposal of the Senate to appropriate $25,000 for expenses of the Commission.

Independent offices

Amendment No. 33: Public Land Law Review Commission; appropriates $350,000 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the Senate.

Executive Office of the President

Amendment No. 34: National Council on the Arts; appropriates $50,000 for salaries and expenses instead of $100,000 as proposed by the Senate.

CHAPTER VI

Department of Labor

Amendment No. 35: Changes chapter number.

Amendment No. 36: Manpower administration; appropriates $350,000 for farm labor contractor registration activities as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 37: Wage and labor standards; appropriates $40,000 for the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped (under the appropriation "Bureau of Labor Standards") as proposed by the House instead of $50,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

Amendment No. 38: Office of Education, defense educational activities; reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment which will have the effect of appropriating $60,750,000 for defense educational activities instead of $48,750,000 as proposed by the House and $65,750,000 as proposed by the Senate and will prohibit the use of any funds available under the appropriation "Payments to school districts" for payments to the District of Columbia during the fiscal year 1965. This action is not intended in any way to prejudice the District of Columbia's future participation in the program financed under "Payments to school districts," however, the Congress has already approved a school budget for the fiscal year 1965 in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act.

Amendment No. 39: Office of Education, salaries and expenses; reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment which appropriates $1,000,000 contingent upon the enactment of S. 3060 or similar legislation.

Amendment No. 40: Public health service; reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment which will have the effect of appropriating $5,000,000 for "Community health practice and research" as proposed by the Senate with additional language to provide that these funds shall be derived by transfer from the appropriation to the economic opportunity program, and add a citation to the Public Health Service Act.

Executive Office of the President

Amendment No. 41: Office of Economic Opportunity; appropriates $800,000,000 instead of $750,000,000 as proposed by the House and $861,550,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 42: Office of Economic Opportunity; restores the provision of the House deleted by the Senate to limit to 4,000 the number of permanent positions.

Amendment No. 43: Office of Economic Opportunity; reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment which will have the effect of providing that not to exceed $2,000,000 may be transferred to "Grants to States for public assistance" to carry out existing demonstration projects authorized by Section 1115 of the Social Security Act. The amendment proposed by the Senate made mandatory the transfer of $2,000,000 for this purpose.

CHAPTER VII

Legislative Branch

Amendment No. 44: Changes chapter number.

Amendment No. 45: Payment to widow of deceased Senator; reported in technical disagreement; the managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to concur in the Senate amendment.

Amendment No. 46: Joint items, contingent expenses of the House, Capitol police; appropriates $22,100 as proposed by the Senate.

CHAPTER VIII

Public Works

Department of Defense—Civil Functions

Department of the Army

Amendments Nos. 47, 48, and 49: Inserts chapter and center headings.

Rivers and Harbors and Flood Control

Amendment No. 50: Deletes the proposal of the Senate to appropriate $350,000 for general investigations.

Amendment No. 51: Reported in technical disagreement; the managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to concur in the Senate amendment appropriating $2,860,000 for Construction, general.

Amendment No. 52: Interoceanic Canal Commission; appropriates $400,000 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the Senate and deletes language "to remain available until expended" proposed by the Senate.

Department of the Interior—Bureau of Reclamation

Amendment No. 53: Deletes center heading.

Amendment No. 54: Deletes $364,000 for Construction and rehabilitation as proposed by the Senate. The conferees are in agreement that $364,000 of available funds shall be used for initiating planning on the Dixie project, Utah.

Amendment No. 55: Deletes $155,000 for the Upper Colorado River Storage project as proposed by the Senate. The conferees are in agreement that $155,000 of available funds shall be used for initiating planning on the following projects: Fruitland Mesa project, Colorado, $75,000; and Bostwick Park project, Colorado, $80,000.

CHAPTER IX

Department of State

Amendment No. 56: Changes chapter number.

Amendment No. 57: International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, construction; appropriates $300,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The Judiciary

Amendment No. 58: Salaries of referees; deletes the proposal of the Senate to appropriate $60,000.

Small Business Administration

Amendment No. 59: Revolving fund; appropriates $45,000,000 instead of $50,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Appalachian Regional Commission

Amendment No. 60: Reported in disagreement.

Commission on International Rules of Judicial Procedure

Amendment No. 61: Salaries and expenses; deletes the proposal of the Senate to appropriate $50,000.

Department of Commerce

Amendment No. 62: General administration, participation in Alaska centennial celebration; deletes the proposal of the Senate to appropriate $15,000. The Department of Commerce is to do this work with existing funds in salaries and expenses, general administration.

Commission on Civil Rights

Amendment No. 63: Salaries and expenses; reported in disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur in the language proposed by the Senate.

Equal Employment Opportunity Commission

Amendment No. 64: Salaries and expenses; appropriates $2,250,000 instead of $2,500,000 as proposed by the House and $2,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

CHAPTER IX

Claims and judgments

Amendments Nos. 65 and 66: appropriate $33,309,898 as proposed by the Senate instead of $32,284,904 as proposed by the House.

George Mahon,
Albert Thomas,
Michael J. Kirwan,
Jamie L. Whitten,
John J. Rooney,
John E. Fogarty,
Walt Horan (except as to amendment No. 41),
Frank T. Bow (except as to amendment No. 41),
Melvin R. Laird (except as to amendment No. 41),
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, this is the conference report on the final appropriation bill of the session. With respect to appropriations for the session, it now appears that we will have appropriated, after this bill is passed, about $127,000,000 more for fiscal year 1965 than we appropriated for the fiscal year 1964. That is the preliminary indication. Furthermore, as the House knows, the last official estimate from the executive branch is that we will spend less in fiscal 1965 than in fiscal 1964. I would say that is holding the line pretty well under all the circumstances.

We have reduced the budget estimates of appropriations in this session in excess of $4 billion; the tentative cut is $4,134,000,000. We shall shortly submit for the Record a more detailed statement on the appropriation business of the session.

The conference report which is now before us was predicated upon budget submissions totaling $1,480,951,000. All of these budget requests did not come to the House Committee on Appropriations. Some of them were not ready at the time the bill was before the House. In round figures, $110 million in the budget submission was directed to the initial attention of the Senate.

This conference report contains appropriations of about $1,117,000,000.

The conference agreement is under the budget estimates by about $363,000,000.

The conference agreement is above the House bill by about $118,000,000.

It is under the Senate bill by $102,000,000-plus.

The men who worked on the conference for the House were the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Thomas], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Kirwan], the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Whitten], the gentleman from New York [Mr. Rooney], the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. Fogarty], the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Jensen], the gentleman from Washington [Mr. Horan], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow], the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Laird], and myself.

Under the circumstances, we think a reasonably good job was done in arriving at the conference agreements.

I include a more precise summary of the totals for the bill:

The supplemental, 1965

A. Budget estimates considered—		
By the House	$1,370,468,374	
Additional estimates by the Senate	110,482,994	
Estimates considered (including $150,000,000 of 1966 transit funds)		$1,480,951,368
B. House bill		998,645,874
$371,822,500 under estimates considered, including the $150,000,000 transit item.		
C. Senate bill		1,220,098,068
$260,853,300 under estimates, including cut of $150,000,000 transit item. $221,452,194 above House bill.		
D. Conference bill		1,117,196,068
$363,755,300 under budget estimates. $118,550,194 above House. $102,902,000 under Senate.		

I might say that the conference with the Senate was rather pleasant. It was opened in a most unique way. Today is the 87th birthday of the distinguished Senator from Arizona, Mr. Hayden, the chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee. In a very unorthodox way, we began the conference by singing "Happy Birthday to Carl Hayden." I know we reflected the sentiments of the entire membership of the House when we paid tribute to this great American, a former Member of this body.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I have several questions to ask the gentleman.

First of all, do I correctly understand that the bill as it now stands is $118,550,000 above the bill as it left the House?

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is correct. We would point out that $45 million of that, for example, is represented by a budget submission for small business loans which was sent directly to the other body. Then there are certain funds provided as a result of disasters throughout the country.

The various items are explained in the report statement, which, of course, I fully realize the gentleman from Iowa has not had opportunity to see.

Mr. GROSS. The total of the bill as it now stands is what?

Mr. MAHON. It is $1,117 million, plus. This is above the amount passed by the House, and we rather expected it to be above the figure as it passed the House because the other body considered certain requirements which were not considered by this body.

Mr. GROSS. I would like to ask why the $4 million increase in rural housing for domestic farm labor?

Mr. MAHON. That was not agreed to in conference. It was stricken out. There is nothing in here for it.

Mr. GROSS. It was not agreed to?

Mr. MAHON. No, it was not agreed to. It was strongly presented, but the House did not agree.

Mr. GROSS. As the gentleman well knows, I am working at a disadvantage in not having the figures adopted in conference.

Mr. MAHON. I realize that this is true.

Mr. GROSS. I trust the gentleman will bear with me.

It is a small item, but was there an increase of $25,000 for the District of Columbia? And I should also like to ask the gentleman at the same time whether there is any money in this supplemental appropriation bill to help bail out the District of Columbia Stadium?

Mr. MAHON. There is no money for the stadium here. The $25,000 for the District of Columbia to which the gentleman refers is for the Public Utilities Commission to carry out the provisions of the recently enacted District of Columbia Securities Act. This is another of those items that went directly to the Senate. I will ask the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER] if I am correct in this. He is chairman of the Subcommittee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. NATCHER. The statement is correct, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. GROSS. On page 37 of the Senate report I note an increase of $350,000 with respect to the National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress.

Was this adopted in conference?

Mr. MAHON. The budget estimate was $1 million. The House cut it to $650,000. The other body put in the total of $1 million. In conference the figure of $825,000 was agreed to.

Mr. GROSS. So there is an increase, then, of around $200,000 in the part of the House?

Mr. MAHON. $175,000.

Mr. GROSS. I mean above the House figure.

Mr. MAHON. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. Well, they did pretty well, then.

With respect to the so-called poverty appropriation the Senate report shows an increase of $111,550,000.

Mr. MAHON. I would like to say to my friend from Iowa, with respect to the anti-poverty program, the budget estimate was $947,500,000. The House recommended an appropriation of $750 million. The other body raised this by $111,550,000. The House conferees felt that this sum was too much, and after considerable discussion the figure of $800 million was agreed to, which is $147,500,000 less than the budget request.

Mr. GROSS. Then it is $50 million more than the House bill. Is that correct?

Mr. MAHON. It is $50 million more than the House bill and $61,550,000 less than the Senate bill. We got better than an even split, in other words.

Mr. GROSS. Now, with respect to the proposal for a new canal, that is, a new sea level canal study, what was the increase, if any, or the decrease in that appropriation?

Mr. MAHON. With respect to the Interoceanic Canal Commission, the budget estimate was $5 million. The other body put in $400,000. This figure was finally agreed on in conference. The language in the Senate version of the bill making the funds "available until expended" was stricken.

Mr. GROSS. So now there is $400,000 for the initiation of preliminary studies for that purpose. Is that correct?

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. GROSS. I see. And do I understand there is a $300,000 increase for the International Boundary and Water Commission?

Mr. MAHON. This was one of the items in conference. That is one place where the House conferees yielded to the wishes of the Senate, and we provided the whole budget estimate of $300,000.

Mr. GROSS. Where is this money to be spent and for what purpose?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman yield to me?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. It is my understanding that part of this money for the International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, will be used to clean out some rattlesnakes down in Arizona; and that is a serious statement.

Mr. GROSS. None of it will be spent in Texas—if we are getting that close—do you mean to say that none of it will be spent in Texas?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. No. This is for the emergency clearing of vegetation and sediment deposits in the lower Colorado River. That was authorized by a bill which passed the Congress as recently as the 10th of August, now known as Public Law 88-411.

Mr. GROSS. In respect to the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, what happened? And what happened with respect to the appropriation for civil rights?

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Insofar as the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission is concerned, for salaries and expenses, the request originally was in the amount of $2.5 million. The House allowed this amount. The other body allowed $2 million.

The action of the conference today was to split the difference between the positions of the House and of the Senate, and it is therefore carried in the pending conference report at $2,250,000 for this purpose.

This Commission is very important. This is the Commission which is going to see that there is no discrimination on account of, among other things, sex.

Mr. GROSS. Well, that is enlightening. At an increased cost of $250,000?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. No, at a reduced cost of $250,000.

Mr. GROSS. Above the House figure?

Mr. MAHON. Lower than the House figure.

Mr. GROSS. Did the total figures for the Civil Rights Commission increase, or did you stay with the House figures on that Commission?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. There was no change in the figure for the Civil Rights Commission.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa, the ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, our chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], has already explained the bill. I do want to say that, of course, most every Member of Congress and a great many people throughout this country know I voted against this billion dollar supplemental bill when it was before the House recently. I have not changed my mind one iota. Hence I could not find it proper to sign the conference report. I want that to be known, also.

There are at least two items in this conference report which I could approve wholeheartedly. Those are the $45 million for small business and the funds provided for the Defense Education Act. But I could not swallow all the rest of the wormy apples just because there were a few good apples in the barrel.

Mr. Speaker, it is true that we have reduced the President's budget, as the chairman has just announced, but the other body saw fit to increase the House figures in this bill by $221 million.

It was no small job, I might say, in conference to get that reduced to $118 million, which is $102 million plus below what the other body had put in their bill.

Now, in closing, let me say that we have not, in this Congress, done too badly with this huge budget of $98,297,358,000 which the President sent up here this session.

The Congress up to this time has appropriated $94,162,919,000, or a reduction below the President's budget of $4,134,439,000. When you add that to the $6.5 billion by which the Congress reduced the budget requests last session, that is a reduction that the 88th Congress has made below the President's budgets for 1964 and 1965 of about $10.6 billion. This represents a saving for each American family on an average of over $200, which is not hay, as we say out in Iowa. I think the American people will appreciate that. However, I must say that it should have been reduced by at least twice that much and we would have hurt nobody and no agency of the Government.

Mr. Speaker, I think that the Congress should be thanked for a job which was most difficult to do in reducing these two budget requests by about $10.6 billion. I hope that we can finally bring the budget into balance and save this country from financial destruction.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McFALL). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I would simply like to join my colleague from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] in his opposition to this bill. I want the RECORD to show, if there is not a rollcall, that I am opposed to it.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield for a question.

Mr. JENSEN. I also want to make it known that if a vote comes on this bill, I shall vote no.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. I understand the other body has added to item No. 50 regarding the Department of the Army rivers and harbors and flood control general investigations $350,000, "provided that this appropriation shall become effective only upon enactment into law of S. 2782 or similar legislation," which is the Appalachia bill. The purpose of the $350,000 was to attempt to implement section 206 of that bill. I am sure the gentleman is fully aware of the fact the House has not considered the matter, and I would like to ask the gentleman as to the disposition of this item in conference.

Mr. MAHON. Item No. 50, to which the gentleman from Florida made reference, was considered in conference. It had been added in the Senate, and the conference report strikes this item from the bill. It is not in the conference report.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MAHON. I am glad to yield to my friend.

Mr. CRAMER. Item No. 60 refers to the Appalachian Regional Commission. I understand that, too, was added to the appropriation bill in the other body. It deals with salaries and expenses of the Appalachian Regional Commission, also relating to the Appalachia bill which has not passed the House. Can the gentleman indicate what action was taken in conference concerning that?

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES], expressed an interest in this provision.

This, of course, is not a part of the conference report proper but is in the form of an amendment in disagreement which will be considered after the conference report has been disposed of. What the conferees did was to rewrite this language to make $800,000 available for the Appalachia program in the area of salaries and expenses contingent upon the authorization of the Appalachia program. So these funds would not be available for expenditure unless Congress took further action and approved the Appalachia program.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. CRAMER. Do I understand then that the inclusion of this language does not in any way commit the House in the next session to the Appalachia program which has not yet been adopted by the House?

Mr. MAHON. This would not commit the House to any action on Appalachia. But if the Appalachia program should be approved by the next Congress funds would become immediately available for salaries and expenses for the Appalachian Regional Commission. So this is no commitment at all to the Appalachia program.

Will the gentleman permit me to read the amendment which will later be offered after the conference report has been disposed of.

> For necessary expenses of the Federal representative and his alternate on the Appalachian Regional Commission and for payment of the administrative expenses of the Commission, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), and hire of passenger motor vehicles, $800,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall become effective upon enactment into law of authorizing legislation.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to a member of the conference committee and of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, is it not a fair statement that the conference committee was in unanimous agreement that these funds would not be available unless the Appalachia authorization is enacted, and frankly I do not think it ever will be, and in no event could it possibly be until January, because the Appalachia program is not now programed for House action during this session of Congress?

Mr. MAHON. There was no agreement that the funds would become available even in January, as the gentleman stated, or at any time unless the authorizing legislation should become law.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, will not the gentleman agree with me that it was completely understood in the conference that acceptance of this provision which the gentleman has said will be offered is not a commitment upon anyone to vote for the Appalachia program?

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is right. This would merely act to accelerate the Appalachia program in the event Congress in its wisdom decides to adopt it.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I might say to the gentleman that I am opposed to the program but I am supporting this with the understanding that this does not commit anyone to support the Appalachia program, although it will provide funds if Appalachia does pass in the first part of the next Congress.

Mr. MAHON. It would expedite the program if Congress should adopt it.

Mr. BOW. But this is not a commitment upon anyone?

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. BOW. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I hate to be picayunish about the wording which we have got here, but it seems to me what you have done is that you have appropriated $800,000 for a Federal representative and an alternate who do not exist, but you put the foot in the door and imply approval of this project.

I am afraid that some of us have the feeling that if we appropriate this money, that gives encouragement to the introduction of legislation and it might even be during this next week. Under the pressure of trying to get out of here, it might bring about pressure so that the Members would go on and pass an Appalachia bill or it might give somebody an idea to call the Congress back into session after the election and implement an Appalachia bill.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if, as the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] said, there was an understanding this money was not going to be spent until January, why should we put it in here?

However, Mr. Speaker, the thing I am going to vote against this amendment on is because I think it sets a bad precedent to appropriate money for a contemplated issue and to make money available to carry on a campaign. It says here that this money would be available for services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946.

Upon inquiry to the Commission I find that that section of the law is for the hiring of specialists. A specialist can be a public relations man to go about and promote Appalachia and to put more pressure on it.

Mr. Speaker, when we get down to the point of voting, I believe that this is one amendment that should be voted down.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to respond to my friend the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES]. This is not a foot in the door for Appalachia. This does not mean that the Congress will not adjourn sine die. I understand that we will adjourn sine die either tonight or tomorrow. So this does not in any way change our adjournment plans.

It simply means that when there is a difference between a House bill and a Senate bill some sort of agreement must be worked out in conference. This agreement was worked out.

This $800,000 will not be available, not one penny of it will be available, for the payment of any kind of salaries or for the employment of any kind of consultant or expert, or for any use whatever, unless Congress decides at a later date—no doubt next year—to approve the Appalachia program. In the event this happens, this appropriation would enable the program to move forward somewhat earlier than otherwise because it would not then be necessary to provide a special appropriation bill to get the Appalachia program underway.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the opponents of Appalachia should be reasonably well satisfied with this compromise agreement and those who are in favor of Appalachia should realize that Appalachia has not been approved and we have not approved an appropriation for its operation, and that these funds are not available to Appalachia unless authorization is enacted subsequently.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to say that over the many years of service which I have had in this Congress I have stayed in this House late into the night for appropriations for Florida, California, Montana, Wyoming, Missouri, and any State that one can mention for the purposes of public works for projects such as Hells Canyon or Broken Bow, Flatfoot, Flathead Indians, and every other kind of a conceivable program that we have had before us.

We are not at all fooled, those of us from Appalachia. We understand that this is not anything that we can hang our hat on except the implied promise that this Congress will give at some future date reasonable consideration to 11 States of this Union that now find themselves in a position for the first time in the history of this Nation of having to come before this Congress and say to you, "We need some help."

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the action of the chairman and the conferees in saying that at least that there is or might be a serious need in this area.

However, I resent the implication when they say they can make this money available even if the Congress does not pass the legislation. All it will do will expedite the job that some of us feel has to be done.

If the majority of this Congress feels these States do not deserve the consideration of the rest of the Nation, it will not pass the legislation, and the $800,000 will be safe and secure in the Treasury.

Yesterday we passed a bill providing about $600,000 for the Flathead Indians. There was not one word of opposition from the gentleman from Missouri or anywhere else. We did not oppose it. We supported it because we thought it was reasonable.

I have supported more projects with unpronounceable names than any other Member of the Congress I can conceive of. This is only a promise affecting millions of Americans who have contributed their share to the rest of the country. We are not asking that the money be appropriated. If we did our duty you could not quit tonight. You would be having a fight for that area that needs your votes.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McFALL). The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 10: Page 4, line 3, insert:

"OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY

"Not to exceed $860,000 of this appropriation may be transfererd to the appropriation 'Salaries and Expenses', Weather Bureau, Department of Commerce, fiscal year 1965 for the operation of ocean weather stations."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 11: Page 4, line 8, insert:

"OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE

"Not to exceed $150,000 of this appropriation may be transferred to the appropriation 'Salaries and Expenses', Weather Bureau, Department of Commerce, fiscal year 1965 for the operation of the Marcus Island upper-air station."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows.

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 12: Page 4, line 13, insert:

"RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, DEFENSE AGENCIES

"Not to exceed $990,000 of this appropriation may be transferred to the appropriation 'Salaries and Expenses', Coast and Geodetic Survey, Department of Commerce, fiscal year 1965 for the expenses of the Worldwide Seismological Network Program."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 31: Page 12, line 1, insert:

"BATTLE OF NEW ORLEANS SESQUICENTENNIAL CELEBRATION COMMISSION

"For necessary expenses of the Battle of New Orleans Sesquicentennial Celebration Commission, established by the Act of September 12, 1964 (Public Law 88–591), $25,000, to remain available until expended."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 38: Page 13, strike out lines 17 to 24, and on page 14, line 1, and insert the following:

"For an additional amount for 'Defense educational activities,' $65,750,000, of which $10,300,000 shall be for capital contributions to student loan funds and loans for non-Federal capital contributions (not to exceed $300,000) to student loan funds, $10,000,000 shall be for grant to States for equipment and minor remodeling of facilities for the purposes included in section 301 of Public Law 85–864, as amended, and for supervisory and other services, $3,000,000 shall be for grants to States for testing, guidance, and counseling, and $5,000,000 shall be for transfer to the appropriation account 'Payments to school districts': *Provided*, That, in lieu of amounts heretofore specified, allotments for grants to States under sections 302(a) and 305 for acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling shall be made on the basis of $70,400,000, allotments for loans to private nonprofit schools shall be made on the basis of $9,600,000, and allotments under section 302(b) for supervisory and other services shall be made on the basis of $6,000,000: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be available only upon enactment of S. 3060, Eighty-eighth Congress, or similar legislation, amending the National Defense Education Act of 1958."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

"In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"For an additional amount for 'Defense educational activities,' $60,750,000, of which $10,300,000 shall be for capital contributions to student loan funds and loans for non-Federal capital contributions (not to exceed $300,000) to student loan funds, $10,000,000 shall be for grants to States for equipment and minor remodeling of facilities for the purposes included in section 301 of Public Law 85–864, as amended, and for supervisory and other services, and $3,000,000 shall be for grants to States for testing, guidance, and counseling: *Provided*, That, in lieu of amounts heretofore specified, allotment for grants to States under sections 302(a) and 305 for acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling shall be made on the basis of $70,400,000, allotments for loans to private nonprofit schools shall be made on the basis of $9,600,000, and allotments under section 302(b) for supervisory and other services shall be made on the basis of $6,000,000: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be available only upon enactment of S. 3060, Eighty-eight Congress, or similar legislation, amending the National Defense Education Act of 1958: *Provided further*, That none of the funds available for "Payments to school districts" shall be paid to the District of Columbia or any agency thereof as a result of Federal impact on the schools of the District of Columbia during fiscal year 1965."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 39: Page 14, line 24, insert the following:

"SALARIES AND EXPENSES

"For an additional amount for 'Salaries and expenses,' $1,000,000: *Provided*, That this amount shall be available only upon enactment into law of S. 3060, Eighty-eighth Congress, or similar legislation amending the National Defense Education Act of 1958."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 40: Page 15, line 4, insert the following:

"PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

"COMMUNITY HEALTH PRACTICE AND RESEARCH

"For an additional amount for 'Community Health Practice and Research, $5,000,000.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

"In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

" 'For an additional amount for 'Community Health Practice and Research,' $5,000,000 to be derived by transfer from the appropriations for the Economic Opportunity Program, Office of Economic Opportunity: *Provided*, That the appropriation under this head in the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act, 1965 (Public Law 88-605) shall be available to carry out section 306 of the Public Health Service Act'."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 43: Page 16, line 20, insert the following:

"*Provided further*, That $2,000,000 of this appropriation shall be transferred to 'Grants to States for public assistance' to carry out existing projects authorized by section 1115 of the Social Security Act, as amended."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 43 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: "In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $2,000,000 of this appropriation may be transferred to 'Grants to States for public assistance' to carry out existing projects authorized by section 1115 of the Social Security Act, as amended."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate Amendment No. 45: Page 17, line 5, insert the following:

For payment to Lucretia C. Engle, widow of Clair Engle, late a Senator from the State of California, $22,500.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 45 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 271]

Abbitt
Alger
Ashley
Ashmore
Aspinall
Auchincloss
Avery
Bass
Beckworth
Berry
Bonner
Brooks
Brotzman
Broyhill, Va.
Buckley
Burton, Calif.
Casey
Cederberg
Celler
Chenoweth
Curtis
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Dorn
Dulski
Edmondson
Ellsworth
Evins
Finnegan
Fino
Flynt
Ford
Forrester
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Giaimo
Gill
Grabowski
Grant
Griffin
Hanna
Hardy
Hawkins
Hays
Healey
Hébert
Henderson
Herlong
Hoffman
Holifield
Holland
Horton
Hull
Jarman
Jones, Ala.
Kee
Keith
Keogh
Kyl
Laird
Landrum
Lankford
Leggett
Lesinski
McIntire
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Matsunaga
Michel
Miller, Calif.
Miller, N.Y.
Montoya
Morris
Morrison
Nedzi
Nix
Pilcher
Pillion
Powell
Purcell
Quillen
Rains
Reid, Ill.
Reifel
Rivers, Alaska
Roberts, Ala.
Roosevelt
Rostenkowski
St. George
Schwengel
Scott
Selden
Senner
Sheppard
Sikes
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Springer
Staebler
Stafford
Steed
Sullivan
Talcott
Taylor
Thompson, La.
Thompson, Tex.
Toll
Tupper
Vinson
Weltner
Wilson, Ind.
Younger

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 310 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1965

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 51: On page 18, line 21, insert the following:

"CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

"For an additional amount for 'Construction, general', $2,860,000, of which not to exceed $860,000 shall be available for emergency flood control construction of debris basins and channel clearing in the Santa Barbara, California, area affected by recent fires, and such work is hereby authorized."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 51 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 60: On page 20, line 20, insert the following:

"APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION

"*Salaries and expenses*

"For necessary expenses of the Federal representative and his alternate on the Appalachian Regional Commission and for payment of the administrative expenses of the Commission, as authorized by law, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), and hire of passenger motor vehicles, $800,000."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 60 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert the following:

"APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION

"*Salaries and expenses*

"For necessary expenses of the Federal representative and his alternate on the Appalachian Regional Commission and for payment of the administrative expenses of the Commission, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), and hire of passenger motor vehicles, $800,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall become effective upon enactment into law of authorizing legislation."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 63: On page 22, line 19, insert the following:

": *Provided*, That the proviso under this heading in the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1965, shall not apply during the current fiscal year."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 63 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and insert certain tables relating to the appropriations by this Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF COMMITTEE TO WAIT UPON THE PRESIDENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 901).

The Clerk read as follows:

> *Resolved*, That a committee of two Members be appointed by the House to join a similar committee appointed by the Senate, to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that the two Houses have completed their business of the session and are ready to adjourn, unless the President has some other communication to make to them.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] as a committee to wait upon the President.

LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, may I announce that pursuant to the unanimous-consent request which the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] obtained a few minutes ago, it is likely that we will be in session tomorrow, and a vote will be needed in order to adopt the conference report on veterans' pension legislation. Certainly we expect to adjourn not later than tomorrow.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. WILLIS. Do I understand from the gentleman it would be in order tomorrow if ways can be found to accomplish it to consider unfinished business, such as the sugar bill?

Mr. ALBERT. If the gentleman will yield, I am not able to make any commitment in that regard because it is not within my power.

The only purpose of meeting tomorrow will be to consider unfinished legislation that is ready for consideration.

Mr. WILLIS. Sometimes that is not accomplished by a snap of the finger. If it is possible to assemble the Rules Committee that can be done, as I understand it, and we can get a rule to send the bill to conference, it would be in order to do that.

Mr. ALBERT. It would be in order. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, this whole matter has been under discussion all day. It is fair to say, I think, that it is a probability that some conference report on the veterans' benefit bill can be worked out, then we would adjourn sine die.

Mr. ALBERT. Of course, it is our desire to expedite adjournment sine die as quickly as we can finish our business.

WITNESSES BEFORE COMMITTEES SITTING IN EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 3162) to amend section 105(a) of the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1965, with respect to the disclosure in reports required thereunder of the names of persons who have appeared as witnesses before committees sitting in executive session.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

> *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled*, That section 105(a) of the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1965, is amended by inserting immediately after the second sentence thereof the following: "Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this subsection, in any case in which the voucher or vouchers covering payment to any person for attendance as a witness before any committee of the Senate or House or Representatives, or any subcommittee thereof, during any semiannual period, indicate that all appearances of such person covered by such voucher or vouchers were as a witness in executive session of the committee or subcommittee, information regarding such payment, except for date of payment, voucher number, and amount paid, shall not be included in the report compiled pursuant to this subsection for such semiannual period. Any information excluded from a report for any semiannual period by reasons of the foregoing sentence shall be included in the report compiled pursuant to this subsection for the succeeding semiannual period.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECORDS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 902) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

> *Resolved*, That upon assurances of proper protection, preservation, and return, the Clerk of the House of Representatives is directed to make available to the Administrator of General Services the records of the House of Representatives relating to the First Federal Congress for reproduction and publication in accordance with the historical objectives of Public Law 88-383.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WITNESSES BEFORE COMMITTEES SITTING IN EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, what happened to the bill H.R. 3162?

The SPEAKER. That was passed.

Mr. BEERMANN. There was so much confusion that I could not hear what was going on. I think some information ought to be given to the House about this bill. Could the gentleman from Texas explain the bill?

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, in response to the gentleman's question with reference to the bill just passed, this is a measure which permits committees in executive session, in considering matters relating to security, to withhold publication of the names of witnesses whose person and testimony may be considered sensitive to the subject matter of the investigation, for a period of not to exceed 6 months.

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BEERMANN. I would like to inquire of the gentleman from Texas if this will preclude the publishing of names of witnesses heard or to be heard in executive session in reference to the Bobby Baker case or the Billy Sol Estes case or the McCloskey case or any of these cases that might come up? I would not want this House to be hoodwinked and learn 6 months from now that a resolution was passed not knowing what was in it Friday night October 2. To find later, 6 months from now, that information was allowed to be covered up or published.

Mr. BURLESON. Of course, I cannot give any assurance to the gentleman that the name of any witness might not be withheld if there is substantial reason for withholding the name of such a witness. I think that would be within the purview of the committee handling the matter. If the matter had to do with a pending criminal case, let us say, and where the testimony would be material to the outcome of that case in a court of competent jurisdiction then it is entirely possible that the name of a witness could be withheld. But primarily as I understand the matter, and the explanation for the necessity of having this legislation has convinced me of the merit of this resolution. This has to do more with the Internal Security Committee of the other body or the House Un-American Activities Committee in matters relating to the national security. With reference to these other matters it would seem to me somewhat farfetched. I am not making the gentleman any promises because I simply do not know, but I would have confidence that judgment in these matters would be carefully exercised.

Mr. BEERMANN. I do not want to be suspicious, just a month before election, but I would certainly like to be assured that this is strictly for national security or defense purposes and nothing else. I would make a real point of this, if it is my privilege to do so, if the record is published later and we find that this is not the case.

Mr. BURLESON. Of course, the gentleman's right and his prerogatives are his and I appreciate that. But I am convinced that this has to do with matters relating to security on matters of defense of our country. As the gentleman well knows, under the present procedure the Appropriations Committee has many witnesses before it whose testimony is highly sensitive and this would cover that situation. I see the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] on his feet and I would think also that we have some highly sensitive information at times given before the Committee on Foreign Affairs. Of course, you read most of it in the papers the morning before. But nevertheless some of this testimony sometimes does relate to the national security and provision should be made by law to protect a practice already in operation.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Let me ask the gentleman where in this bill is language to be found restricting it to sensitive information? I find no such restriction in the bill.

Mr. BURLESON. Those are my words. I have used the words "sensitive information" and I am simply saying that anything withheld under this measure would be in my opinion sensitive and delicate.

Mr. GROSS. Then may we have the assurance of the gentleman that it is limited to that?

Mr. BURLESON. No, sir; I am not giving any such assurance. I am just saying it is my understanding that it relates to security matters discussed in committees of the Congress. I will repeat, I cannot conceive that there would be any surreptitious handling of testimony in the ordinary run-of-the-mill matters, whether it be with reference to the cases which the gentleman from Nebraska is referring to or something else. I think it is reasonable to assume that.

Mr. GROSS. May I ask the gentleman whence comes the demand for this kind of legislation? From what source does this demand come?

Mr. BURLESON. It comes from the other body and under the usual reciprocity of action between the two bodies it was assumed that there would be no objection here in this body.

Mr. GROSS. Did the gentleman's committee hold any hearings to justify the necessity for this legislation?

Mr. BURLESON. No hearings have been held. It came as a Senate bill, and we present it as such.

Mr. GROSS. I am sorry that in the confusion I missed the callup of this bill, because I fear that we have done something here we are going to live to regret. I regret that the gentleman is not able to state more justification for this legislation.

Mr. BURLESON. I believe we have found time and time again that there has been justification for this sort of judgment to be exercised by responsible men, Members both of this body and the other body. I trust my colleagues. I trust the chairmen of committees to exercise judgment in these things. If we cannot trust our colleagues, where are we to look for trust unless we look awfully high—straight up?

Mr. GROSS. That is not the answer.

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954 TO AUTHORIZE THE USE OF CERTAIN VOLATILE FRUIT-FLAVOR CONCENTRATES IN THE CELLAR TREATMENT OF WINE

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conferees on the part of the House be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H.R. 4649) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to authorize the use of certain volatile fruit-flavor concentrates in the cellar treatment of wine; and I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 4649) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to authorize the use of certain volatile fruit-flavor concentrates in the cellar treatment of wine, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 4, line 3, after "by" insert "the first section and sections 2 and 3 of".

Page 4, after line 6, insert:

"SEC. 5. (a) Section 4063 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to exemptions from the tax on motor vehicles) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(c) REBUILT PARTS AND ACCESSORIES.—Under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate, the tax imposed under section 4061(b) shall not apply in the case of rebuilt parts or accessories.'

"(b) Section 4062 of such Code (relating to definitions) is amended by striking out subsection (b).

"(c) The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to articles sold on or after the first day of the first calendar quarter which begins after the date of the enactment of this Act."

Page 4, after line 6, insert:

"SEC. 6. (a) Section 4142 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to definition of radio and television component) is amended—

"(1) by striking out the heading of such section and inserting in lieu thereof 'SEC. 4142. DEFINITIONS.';

"(2) by inserting before 'As' the following:

"'(a) RADIO AND TELEVISION COMPONENT.—'; and

"(3) by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(b) SALE PRICE OF REBUILT TELEVISION PICTURE TUBES.—In determining the sale price of a rebuilt television picture tube, there shall be excluded from the price, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate, the value of a television picture tube accepted in exchange.'

"(b) The table of sections for part I of subchapter C of chapter 32 of such Code is amended by striking out

"'Sec. 4142. Definition of radio and television component."

and inserting in lieu thereof

"'Sec. 4142. Definitions.'

"(c) The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to articles sold on or after the first day of the first calendar quarter which begins after the date of the enactment of this Act."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I take this time in order that the chairman may advise the Members of the House as to the Senate amendments he intends we should concur in.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, as the Members will recall, as passed by the House on June 29, 1964, H.R. 4649 amended the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit winemakers to take advantage of a technological development in the production of wine which involves removing volatile fruit-flavor concentrates—which impart flavor and aroma to fruits and which are normally lost in the fermentation process—from the juice before the fermentation process and then adding it back to the wine after this fermentation.

The amendments of the other body did not affect the provisions of the House bill, which are unchanged, but added two provisions on other tax matters: First, repealing the 8-percent manufacturers' excise tax on rebuilt automotive parts; and second, making the 10-percent manufacturers' excise tax on radio and television components inapplicable to so much of the price of rebuilt television picture tubes as is represented by the fair market value of the used picture tube traded in. Both of these amendments would be effective as of the first calendar quarter beginning after the date of enactment of the bill.

It is pointed out in the Finance Committee report on this bill that the manufacturers' excise tax on rebuilt automotive parts causes troublesome administrative problems, as well as compliance problems to the large number of small rebuilders scattered throughout the country; that committee concluded that it should not be necessary to await consideration of all excise taxes before acting with respect to this small, but troublesome, problem which involves a revenue loss of $8 million a year.

Difficult administrative problems have been encountered in respect to the existing provision of law which requires that the taxable price for a rebuilt television picture tube is the charge made to the purchaser for the rebuilt tube plus the fair market value of the old tube traded in; furthermore, a tax has already been paid on the value of the old tube. The amendment of the other body thus would make the manufacturers' excise tax on radio and television components inapplicable to so much of the price of rebuilt television picture tubes as is represented by the fair market value of the picture tube traded in, a treatment already provided in the case of rebuilt automotive parts.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Further reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I might say that this is probably an area in the excise tax field which leads to more difficulty in interpretation and operation than any other we face in the excise tax field. In each of these cases an excise tax has been paid on the original part, when it was new. This will merely remove the excise tax in those areas where it has been rebuilt.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE TO NOTIFY THE PRESIDENT

The SPEAKER. The Chair will receive a report.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, your committee to notify the President is ready to make a report.

Mr. Speaker, your committee appointed to join a committee of the Senate to inform the President that the Congress is ready to adjourn, and to ask him if he has any further communications to make to the Congress, has performed that duty. The President has directed us to say that he has no further communications to make to the Congress.

KIM SOOK HEE AND KIM LOU

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2759) for the relief of Kim Sook Hee and Kim Lou.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I inquire of the gentleman if this is one of the bills that are now pending before the full Committee on the Judiciary?

Mr. FEIGHAN. That is correct. These bills were pending before the committee. We had them ready for presentation to the full committee at our last meeting. However, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Celler], the chairman, made a point of order that the House was in session which precluded approval by the full committee on this bill.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Further reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, did you not take this up with the chairman of the committee and he said he did not think this was the proper place to take them up until the full committee passed on them?

Mr. FEIGHAN. I did not take it up with him. The gentleman from New York [Mr. Celler] is in New York and not available.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Then, I object.

JAMES D. W. BLYTH ET AL.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 7532) for the relief of James D. W. Blyth, his wife Jean Mary Blyth, and their daughter Penelope Jean Blyth.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I inquire of the gentleman if this is one of the same bills that have been pending before the full committee?

Mr. FEIGHAN. That is correct.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. And according to the answer you have just given, you never took it up with the chairman or the ranking minority member of the committee?

Mr. FEIGHAN. With reference to the ranking minority member——

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. That is the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCulloch].

Mr. FEIGHAN. I did not myself, but I believe one of the minority members of the subcommittee did.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Then, I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

Let the Chair ask the gentleman, are the other bills of the same category?

Mr. FEIGHAN. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I understand there are about 16. Are there not?

Mr. FEIGHAN. No, there are not. There are eight. They are Senate bills, with one exception, and all have been approved by the Senate and approved by the House Subcommittee on Immigration and Nationality.

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. Rogers] is going to object to the other bills, the Chair does not see any purpose in bringing up any more bills.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, also reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I should like to ask the distinguished gentleman from Ohio if my bill or bills for the relief of certain unfortunate people in my district along the Brooklyn waterfront who desire to unite their families, which were approved by the distinguished gentleman from Ohio and his subcommittee last spring and never reported to the full Committee on the Judiciary, are in this list?

Mr. FEIGHAN. No, they are not. And you know why.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, may I suggest to the gentleman from Ohio that certainly if the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary and the ranking minority member are consulted in connection with this, then we may take it up tomorrow, but at the present time the full committee has not passed upon them, and I am constrained to object.

BASILIO KING, HIS WIFE, AND THEIR CHILDREN

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 1179) for the relief of Basilio King, his wife, and their children, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 3, strike out [101(a)(7)(B)] and insert: 101(a)(27)(B).

Page 1, lines 5 and 6, strike out [Henry Alexander Victor King].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Ohio reserve his objection so that I may make a statement?

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I reserve my objection.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Ohio yield to me?

Mr. ASHBROOK. I yield.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I am the proponent of this bill. Basilio King was my tentmate in the South Pacific during World War II. He is one of the finest men I have ever known, a gentleman and a scholar, a man who has given great service to this country. He served as a lieutenant in the U.S. Army. Because of unfortunate situations he could not get his citizenship under his service in the Army.

I have known him over the years. He is a Chinese-born Filipino and when we were in the South Pacific, in the Philippines, many times at night we would discuss the question of his great desire to become a citizen of the United States.

I told him I would try to help him, Mr. Speaker, after this period of time I met him in the Philippines. This gentleman is a fourth degree Knight of Columbus, a member of the Rotary Club of Manila, a successful businessman, and a man with a great desire to be a citizen of this country. He loves the United States. He has two children who are now citizens of the United States.

I introduced this private bill 3 years ago. It passed the House but did not pass the Senate. I introduced it again in this Congress. It passed the House, after full committee hearings, and then passed the Senate. It came over here simply because there was a mistake in a number in the bill.

Mr. Speaker, let me say this to you. Basilio King, in addition to the service that he gave to his country during the war when I served with him, worked with the U.S. Government in the CIA in anti-Communist work in the Philippines shortly after the war and received the commendation of this Government for that service.

The gentleman from Ohio whose district adjoins mine is objecting because a lawyer claims that Basilio King owes him some money. Basilio King is a wealthy man who can pay his bills, but he denies this. If he came here it could be worked out. There is one other lawyer who wrote to Basilio King claiming that he owed him money and said that he had influential friends "on the Hill" and that if he expected to have his bill passed he had better come and see him.

I think the House is entitled to know this. I think Basilio King is entitled to have this House realize that he is not a scoundrel; he is not a man who is trying to be a deadbeat, to beat some lawyers out of what is owed to them. He is a man who has been loyal to the United States.

I regret sincerely, Mr. Speaker, that anyone would object to a man of this character, a man who has been as loyal as this man has been to the United States, would object to his becoming a citizen. And I would hope that my friend from Ohio would withdraw his objection and let this fine man enter the United States, as I think he has the right to do.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, while I have nothing but the kindest feelings toward my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow], I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman does not object?

Mr. ASHBROOK. I do object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

DATE OF ADJOURNMENT OF THE 88TH CONGRESS SINE DIE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a concurrent resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 371

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the two Houses of Congress shall adjourn on Saturday, October 3, 1964, and that when they adjourn on said day, they stand adjourned sine die.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

DATE OF ASSEMBLING OF THE 89TH CONGRESS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.J. RES. 1192

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the 89th Congress shall assemble at noon on Monday, January 4, 1965.

The joint resolution was engrossed, ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE OF THE SENATE AUTHORIZED TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS DULY PASSED BY THE TWO HOUSES

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a concurrent resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 372

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That notwithstanding the sine die adjournment of the two Houses, the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President pro tempore of the Senate be, and they are hereby, authorized to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING OF THE RULES AND MANUAL OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES FOR THE 89TH CONGRESS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 903

Resolved, That a revised edition of the Rules and Manual of the House of Representatives for the Eighty-ninth Congress be printed as a House document, and that 1,600 additional copies shall be printed and bound for the use of the House of Representatives, of which 700 copies shall be bound in leather with thumb index and delivered as may be directed by the Parliamentarian of the House for distribution to officers and Members of Congress.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPEAKER AUTHORIZED TO ACCEPT RESIGNATIONS, APPOINT COMMISSIONS, BOARDS, AND COMMITTEES

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the 2d session of the 88th Congress, the Speaker be authorized to accept resignations, and to appoint commissions, boards, and committees authorized by law or by the House.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

NOTWITHSTANDING SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT CLERK AUTHORIZED TO RECEIVE MESSAGES AND SPEAKER AUTHORIZED TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the sine die adjournment of the House, the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate and that the Speaker be authorized to sign any enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZATION TO PRINT REPORTS FILED WITH THE CLERK FOLLOWING SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that reports filed with the Clerk following the sine die adjournment by committees authorized by the House to conduct investigations may be printed by the Clerk as reports of the 88th Congress.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members of House shall have the privilege, until the last edition authorized by the Joint Committee on Printing is published, to extend and revise their own remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on more than one subject, if they so desire, and may also include therein such short quotations as may be necessary to explain or complete such extensions of remarks; but this order shall not apply to any subject matter which may have occurred, or to any speech delivered, subsequent to the adjournment of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the chairmen of all the standing committees and subcommittees of the House may extend their remarks up to and including the publication of the last RECORD and to include a summary of the work of their committees; also that the ranking minority member of such standing committee or any subcommittee may have the same permission to extend their remarks and to include a summary, if they desire, from their point of view, separately from that of the chairman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

SUMMARY OF THE ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE 88TH CONGRESS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the work of the 88th Congress, working with two great Presidents, has produced a robust and all-embracing prosperity, shared by every family in the land.

Peace has been buttressed with new weapons and stronger alliances of peace and friendship all around the world.

The frightful threat of atomic war has been lessened measurably by the first worldwide treaty to outlaw atmospheric testing of all atomic weapons.

For the first time in our constitutional history, we have outlawed second-class citizenship. The Civil Rights Act guarantees equal treatment of all races and creeds in every federally assisted program; and these rights and privileges are further protected by the new Community Relations Service, and the extended Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity.

Again for the first time in history, the 88th Congress has made the war on poverty an integral part of the Federal establishment. Our new Office of Economic Opportunity already is in business, with funds available for its work in the present fiscal year.

The 88th Congress' record in the field of education will be emblazoned in the history books of all time. The long-awaited Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, the Vocational Education Act of 1963, the Health Professions Education Assistance Act of 1963, and the National Defense Education Act amendments of 1964 ornament the work of this Congress with a comprehensive and profound attack on the Nation's education problems of every nature.

This notable Congress in its two sessions, in 1963 and 1964, enacted more than 625 new public laws to keep this Nation abreast of the times in a world yearning and striving for peace, progress, and prosperity.

Equal pay for women has been assured in every industry—again, for the first time in our constitutional history.

We met our challenging balance-of-payments problem head-on, by enactment of a new equalization tax on foreign securities purchased by American investors.

In these two historic sessions, total new authorizations for military hardware were $32.2 billions; and this includes new record amounts for research and development of new weapons systems.

Our new Polaris missiles today are three times more effective than the first Polaris warheads of 1960–61. Our defense systems today are stronger and more reliable—on the ground, in the air, in space, in our ships at sea, and in our submarines beneath the oceans of the world.

This Nation is strong, confident, unafraid.

Our program of tax reduction across the board has stimulated economic growth and robust prosperity on every business front.

We have made a beginning in a new program of Federal aid to meet the pressing transportation needs of our great metropolitan areas.

We have established for the first time in our constitutional history a new national commission to ease the impact of industrial automation.

Salary increases for both the civil and military personnel have benefited every community in America.

We have authorized more than $1.2 billion for continued urban renewal projects in our blighted and overcrowded slums.

We have authorized systematic extension and preservation of some 35 million acres of wilderness areas for healthful recreation; plus a new 10-year land and water conservation program from coast to coast.

These programs contemplate an expenditure of some $2 billion over the coming decade for conservation, recreation, and wildlife preservation to enrich the life of all America.

We have authorized $700 million for a new powerline tie along the entire Pacific coast—to bring into operation the greatest electric power pool in the world.

We have broken new ground in a determined Federal attack on air pollution, on stream pollution, on care for the mentally retarded, on juvenile delinquency.

Indeed, every concern of the American people, and every demand of orderly constitutional government has received the careful and conscientious attention of the 88th Congress.

Through drastic revision of our atomic power program, we have authorized the gradual release of atomic materials to private ownership by electric power companies. The Government leasing program in atomic fuels will begin to phase out in 1971.

Through the new Chamizal Treaty with Mexico we have renewed and strengthened our bonds of peace and friendship with that great Republic.

In the same manner we now have realized a new treaty with Canada, to the north, for the joint development of the power resources of the mighty Columbia Basin—a project which has been an engineer's dream for almost half a century. Today that treaty, and that dream, are realities.

Our sessions often have been long, and trying. The demands on our time often have been pressing and raucous. We live in a world of great expectations and unbounded hopes for the good life and the great society.

The 88th Congress has responded nobly to the demands of the hour and the petitions of all the people.

The record we leave is a record of proud accomplishments, of devoted patriotic purpose, of faithful defense of the Constitution, and response to the needs of a mighty and growing Nation.

From the pages of history will come, I feel certain, the merited accolade—"Well done."

TRANSFER OF SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Special Order heretofore granted to me be transferred to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Smith].

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

WALTER NORBLAD

Mr. WHALLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Cederberg] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, the passing of Walter Norblad was a tragic loss to his district and our Nation. Walter will always be remembered as a dedicated man concerned for the individual needs of the constituents he represented so well. We became fast and true friends over the years visiting in each other's homes. It was always a pleasure to be with Walter and enjoy his good company, and clean humor. Words cannot adequately express the loss Mrs. Cederberg and I feel at losing this close and valued friend. We express our deepest sympathy to Walter's wonderful wife, Elizabeth, and their son, Albin, and know that they have consolation in the contribution Walter made to his country.

NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT

Mr. WHALLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maine [Mr. McIntire] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, the passage of the conference report on S. 3060 by the House of Representatives was indeed commendable action.

This legislation attends two considerations particularly important to my State of Maine—the National Defense Education Act and aid to schools in federally impacted areas.

The student loan program of the National Defense Education Act has proved highly beneficial to a substantial number of students in the State of Maine. Since the initiation of the program, for instance, over 3,000 students have availed themselves of the long-term-low-interest-rate loan program at the University of Maine alone. Other institutions of formal learning in Maine also have a good record of student participation in this student loan program.

This program has proved itself good in its operation. Across the land, it has opened educational doors which otherwise would be closed to a multitude of deserving students. It has brought broad benefits to the individual student and has also, in the process, made a contribution to the collective society.

The aid to federally impacted areas measure is implicitly necessary to all school districts having proximity to military and other Federal establishments.

Because some major military installations are located in my State a goodly number of school districts in Maine have participated in this program.

This program recognizes that it is a Federal responsibility to assume some of the cost of educating the children of parents working for or at Federal establishments. It is fair and sound legislation and the Congress has, in its wisdom, seen fit to extend it from time to time, and so is it acting to do again.

WHO IS TO BLAME FOR LOW FARM PRICES?

Mr. WHALLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LATTA] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I have noted that this administration is appealing for votes from the farmers of the Nation. How, may I ask, can it conscientiously do this? I, for one, Mr. Speaker, believe that farmers this election year will remember what this administration has done to reduce rather than increase farm prices throughout the Nation and particularly in the Fifth District of Ohio. I say this as I recall the passage of the administration's certificate wheat plan on April 8, 1964, after a similar plan had been rejected on May 20, 1963, by the wheat farmers. The wheat farmers in my district were so fearful of what this plan would do to their incomes that they voted against it 9 to 1. In our State of Ohio, 68,722 voted against this administration proposal and only 20,169 voted for it. In the Nation, 638,572 voted against the proposal and only 584,284 voted for it. Notwithstanding this vote, President Johnson and his Secretary of Agriculture, Orville Freeman, insisted that a certificate wheat plan be passed and imposed on the farmers of the Nation regardless of their expressed wishes. A Democrat majority in the House of Representatives and in the Senate saw to it that President Johnson's certificate wheat plan became the law of the land. The vote in the House was 211 to 203. I voted "no."

Before this legislation was passed, its opponents, including myself, maintained that the price of wheat would drop to approximately $1.30 per bushel if such a plan were put into effect. According to the U.S. Department of Agriculture's September 30, 1964, issue of Agricultural Prices, the average price received by farmers for wheat on September 15, 1964, was $1.36 per bushel as compared with a $1.84-per-bushel average on September 15, 1963. Even those few farmers who signed up for this plan have suffered as they have been averaging approximately $1.72 per bushel for their wheat. Mr. Speaker, this is a tremendous drop in wheat prices and cannot help but be reflected in the total income earned by farmers.

In spite of this price-depressing certificate wheat plan, Secretary Freeman could have used another means at his disposal to raise Soft Red Winter wheat prices for our farmers. I have reference to the exportation of Soft Red Winter wheat such as that produced in Ohio, under the multibillion-dollar food-for-peace program. For reasons unknown to me, Mr. Speaker, the present Secretary of Agriculture has steadfastly refused to allow Soft Red Winter wheat to be exported under this food-for-peace program otherwise known as Public Law 480.

Mr. Speaker, every farmer in my district suffered when Secretary Freeman dumped corn on the market to force compliance with his corn program. Now every farmer is suffering by reason of the administration's dumping of wheat on the market with the obvious purpose of forcing noncooperators to bend to its will. In order to keep wheat prices down, the administration has dumped 59 million bushels of Commodity Credit Government-owned wheat stocks on the open market since July 1, 1964. This wheat was sold at the lowest price permitted under the law—$1.37 per bushel. Under the law, it could have been sold at a higher price. By comparison, during the same period last year, the Government sold only 14.4 million bushels of wheat and the minimum price then was $1.90 per bushel.

During the time this certificate wheat plan was being debated in the Congress, the term "bread tax" came up many times. Members of Congress were well aware that a "bread tax" as such was not provided for in the bill. However, they knew that the net effect of such a program would be exactly that—a bread tax. In order for a miller to mill wheat sold by noncooperators, it is necessary for him to purchase a certificate costing 70 cents per bushel from the Government. The money received from such sales goes to the Government—not to the noncooperating wheat farmer.

Such certificates add to the milling costs of the miller. Any increased milling costs can be expected to be passed on to the consumer. Since this certificate plan went into effect, every housewife has noted the increased cost of bread.

Everyone knows that during the past 2 years, imports of beef and veal have seriously depressed livestock prices. What has the administration done about these imports?

President Johnson entered into a meaningless agreement with Australia and New Zealand, using as a basis for that agreement the highest 2-year average of imports in the history of our Nation. The administration opposed every effort to enact meaningful and effective beef import legislation and President Johnson still refuses to exercise the authority he has under the very mild beef import quota bill which was finally approved by the Democrat Congress.

In January 1964, President Johnson told the Congress in his farm message that he would submit an administration recommendation for a sugar program early in the session. It was not until 10 months later that he finally got around to making a sugar program recommendation. It dealt only with foreign sugar quotas. His recommendation provided that foreign quotas be extended for 6 months and failed to recognize the problems facing the U.S. sugar producers and the desire for an orderly expansion of the U.S. sugarbeet industry. In fact, the Democrat chairman of the House Agriculture Committee went so far as to propose that U.S. sugarbeet producers take a substantial reduction in their 1965 production while at the same time proposing that import fees charged foreign exporters shipping sugar to the United States be reduced. Mr. Speaker, the position taken by this administration on this question and the inaction by this Democrat-controlled Congress means that sugarbeet production in my district cannot be expanded in the foreseeable future.

Under the Johnson-Freeman administration, the parity ratio has continued to plunge. The parity ratio, as every farmer knows, measures the relationship between farm prices and farm living and production costs. During President Eisenhower's administration, the parity ratio averaged 84.5. In 1963, the parity ratio dropped to 78, the lowest level since 1939. For the first 9 months of 1964, it has averaged only 75.

According to the latest figures from the Department of Agriculture, total net farm income in the State of Ohio for the year 1963 was $349.5 million, or about a million dollars less than it was in 1960. On top of that, the prospects are that it will be even less in 1964.

Mr. Speaker, the farmers in my district are intelligent people. They know who is responsible for their low prices. It is useless for this administration to now attempt to hoodwink them into believing that they "never had it so good."

SOVIET GLEE

Mr. WHALLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. LIPSCOMB] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, Izvestia, the official Soviet newspaper, is reported to have gleefully revealed the news recently that the U.S.S.R. and Britain signed an agreement for the British to supply a fiber plant under long-term, 15-year credit for the major portion of the cost.

I wonder if the Soviets are just as gleefully anticipating what in my view they could well feel are the signposts of administration thinking of what U.S. policies should be on trade with the Soviets and the rest of the Communist bloc in the period ahead.

And it should be clearly understood that increasingly our transactions with the Communists are becoming more than just trade. When you use tax money to sell subsidized products or commodities or to guarantee credits that is a form of aid no matter how the transactions may be described or disguised to try to make them palatable.

The campaign that is underway to try to sell the American people on trade with the bloc, to force across to the public the idea that more trade and dealings with the Communists is a good thing, may well be illustrated by Secretary of Agriculture Freeman's actions in circulating a press release around the country recently containing outlandish claims about how beneficial the wheat sales to the U.S.S.R. were to the United States.

I asked Secretary Freeman to furnish specific data and information on which the claims were based. As expected, the reply which came from an assistant secretary, was replete with doubletalk and figures essentially unresponsive to my inquiry.

It is known that the Soviets tried practically everything to tailor the wheat situation into one that would benefit them most, including revising estimates of needs, insisting on changes in previously stipulated shipping arrangements, and so forth. The Soviets even used over $12 million worth of wheat bought from us to reship to Rumania to partially repay a 1963 loan of wheat to the U.S.S.R. The administration, for its part, not only ignored the opportunity to achieve concessions from the Reds, but it went so far as to force through Congress a provision containing authority to the President to make findings that it is in the national interest to underwrite credit sales to the U.S.S.R. through the Export-Import Bank.

Secretary Freeman, it will be remembered, toured the U.S.S.R. in 1963 and on his return discussed statements Chairman Khrushchev made to the effect that he would give strong emphasis during the next 5 years to agriculture production. A short time later an export license was granted to authorize exportation to the U.S.S.R. of highly automated mining machinery valued at an estimated $9.5 million to mine potash in the U.S.S.R. for fertilizer. The Commerce Department admitted that the equipment would make a significant contribution to the economic potential of the bloc.

Since then, a steady stream of export licenses has been granted authorizing exportation to the bloc of a variety of items relating to agriculture and farm production, including equipment, pesticides, herbicides, fertilizers, and others.

Here is one export license granted that I am sure will shock many American people as it does me.

On August 11, 1964, the Department of Commerce issued an export license authorizing the shipment of butter valued at $860,000 to East Germany. What was kept under cover, however, was that this deal involves a subsidy by the U.S. taxpayers of over a half a million dollars to enable such a sale of butter to be made to the Communists.

The details of the situation, as the license was approved by the Commerce Department, are that the American exporters made a deal with the East German importer to sell 2,204,600 pounds of butter at $39.009 per hundred pounds. The U.S. taxpayer, however, through the Agriculture Department pays a subsidy of $24.50 per hundred pounds to enable the American exporter to acquire the butter. That comes to a $540,127 tab for the American taxpayers.

I can see no reason whatsoever for the taxpayers to pay 1 cent to help bail the Communists out of their agricultural and economic straits. Figuratively speaking, this butter can help lubricate the Communist machinery which imposes totalitarian rule on the people; it can serve as mortar to strengthen and help keep up the Berlin wall; it can help polish the boots of the puppets who bow and scrape to the Kremlin.

A concerted effort is underway to sell strategic items to Rumania under claims that Rumania is becoming independent of the Kremlin and that we should help that Communist country achieve that goal.

A few months ago, from May 18 to June 1 of this year, representatives of the United States and Rumania got together for talks on economic subjects. Naturally, trade was the primary topic of discussion, and it certainly appears that trade Communist style is what the Rumanians are getting. By trade Communist style I mean that they are interested in buying not consumer goods, but equipment, techniques, and technologies, and so forth to build up their state-run industries. Furthermore, they want credit. Naturally the administration has made a finding that it is in our national interest to underwrite credit sales to them.

At the conference the United States agreed to grant licenses to ship to Rumania a large number of strategic items, including: Polyisoprene rubber manufacturing plant, monomer included; polybutadiene rubber manufacturing plant, monomer included; ammonia plant; catalytic cracking plant; oil collecting, separating, treatment and transportation unit in closed up system—LACT—and manufacturing license; installation of turbines with combustion gases for electric power stations and reserve; plants for the manufacture of drawn sheet glass, polished window glasses, safety and enameled glass; synthetic glycerine manufacturing plant capable of producing epichlorohydrin as a coproduct; plant for making synthetic and artificial leather; in situ development design of a fiscous crude oil reservoir and delivery of the necessary equipment; drilling rock-bits; tubular goods used in deep-drilling—over 3,500 meters; drill-collars and kelleys used in deep-drilling—over 3,500 meters.

The United States also advised the Rumanians that we would be willing to consider selling a nuclear power reactor under certain conditions.

But that is not all. Not only did the administration agree to grant licenses for these items, but spokesmen for the Commerce Department also contacted a number of U.S. firms and organizations to discuss with them the Rumanians' interest in getting these facilities. Some of these were firms I understand the Rumanians said they wished to contact in connection with their buying program. Others are organizations which the Commerce Department said it knows produce facilities such as those of interest to the Rumanians and on that basis contacted them.

In response to my inquiry the Department said it really was not trying to solicit interest in entering into negotiations with the Rumanians for these items but merely to "inform the firms or organizations of the Rumanians' interest" in such things and that the firms would have to decide themselves whether they wanted to enter into negotiations or discussions.

I asked why the Department believes it falls within its duties and functions to make contact with U.S. firms about industrial facilities for Red bloc nations. Former Assistant Secretary of Commerce Behrman said that under the export expansion program of the Department such a service has been performed for years for free world nations through the Department's publication International Commerce.

More recently—

He said—

> this has been extended to include business opportunities in certain of the bloc countries.

So, from all appearances, the Department is acting somewhat in the capacity of a purchasing representative or agent for the Communist Rumanian Government.

Licenses to disclose technical data for a number of the items the United States agreed to sell in the United States-Rumanian talks have already been issued. For example, on August 20, 1964, the Department of Commerce issued a license to authorize shipment to Rumania of technical data with regard to a proposal to sell a catalytic cracking plant of 1 million ton-year capacity.

Why, it must be asked, is the administration helping to build up the Communist oil industry?

For many months it has been known that the Soviets were pushing oil exports to the free world for economic and political reasons. And there is little question that the Red bloc oil offensive continues to be a major threat to the free world.

A major Communist goal is to obtain foreign exchange to buy technical knowledge and equipment to build up basic industries such as the chemical, agricultural, petroleum, and other industries.

Just a few months ago the State Department itself in discussing the Soviet oil offensive stated, in part:

> The export of Soviet oil continues to be of concern to the United States and to our allies. U.S. policy has consistently been to discourage free world countries from dependence on Soviet exports as a major source of oil supply.
>
> For the Soviets, oil trade with the free world serves both economic and political purposes. Their principal objective is apparently to earn foreign exchange needed to acquire materials and equipment from outside the bloc. At the same time, the Soviets are mindful of the potential political benefits of displacing or supplementing Western sources of supply, particularly in the developing countries. The Soviets have not always been successful on this latter point as some of the developing countries have learned of the disadvantages of overdependence on the bloc as a major source of supply—the unreliability of these sources and the Soviet attempts at wielding political influence. In addition, the United States and its allies became aware at an early date of the dangers of overdependence on Soviet bloc oil and have agreed to exercise caution and restraint in importing Soviet bloc oil.

The National Petroleum Council several years ago at the request of the Department of Interior, made a study of the effects on the free world of the export of petroleum from the Soviet bloc.

This study was updated by the Council and a supplement to the Soviet bloc oil exports report was filed by the Council in March 1964.

Here are some of the principal conclusions of the Council contained in the report:

> The volumes of Soviet bloc oil available for export to the free world will steadily increase. In addition to furthering the political objectives of the Communists, there is a strong foreign exchange incentive to seek further penetration of Western oil markets.
>
> In recent years the Soviet bloc has increased its influence in the free world through exporting steadily rising volumes of oil at prices substantially below existing commercial levels. The penetration has been especially marked in Western Europe where the bloc, with 8 percent of sales, is now one of the largest suppliers.

Another principal conclusion of the Council is that:

> Purchase of Western oil industry equipment and technology would enhance the Soviet's ability to produce, refine, and export oil.
>
> If limitations are imposed upon Soviet oil exports to the free world they will probably reflect:
>
> (a) Western nations' unwillingness to be dependent on Soviet oil for their energy imports.
>
> (b) The effect of bottlenecks stemming from shortages of several specific items in the Soviet oil industry: Refining capacity, especially in catalytic cracking and catalytic reforming; drillpipe, rigs, and bits; natural gas compressors; large diameter pipe.
>
> The U.S.S.R may be exporting almost 30 percent of its total oil production by 1970, with over two-thirds of these exports moving to the free world. Clearly, the U.S.S.R. does not need to buy oil industry equipment from the West simply to fulfill its own internal requirements. The effect of selling oil industry equipment to the bloc is to enhance its ability to export oil to Western nations and correspondingly to increase the dependency of the latter on the Soviets for a growing amount of basic energy requirements.

Here is another report of interest. Last year in the fall of 1963 an American delegation of petroleum industry representatives toured Rumania under an exchange program.

It has been indicated it was reported that the Rumanians have done a fair job of expanding their gas and oil industry since nationalization in 1948. Their overall technology is not up to date and they have antiquated equipment, it was reported. It was further indicated however that the Rumanians were aware of their shortcomings and were trying to remedy them, and that they made numerous mentions of possible trade with the United States as a means of acquiring the latest in equipment and technology.

What happens? Only a few short months later the administration sits down and agrees to sell them a number of strategic items to help build up the petroleum industry.

What I am discussing here today touches only some of the highlights of what is happening in the field of export control relating to shipments to the Red bloc. Many activities are underway which slowly but surely are undermining the whole framework of our system of controls, which is designed to help prevent the Communist world from using our equipment and know-how to strengthen themselves for world conquest.

It may be true that the United States has voiced strong objections against other free world nations extending long term credits to the Soviets and other bloc nations. That should not however lull anyone into a false sense of security. A pattern of more trade, including more strategic and subsidized items, is emerging. It must be stopped before it is too late.

I appeal to all Americans and particularly to all areas of the business community to give deepest thought to this problem and any administration efforts they may encounter aimed at expansion of our dealings with the Communist bloc. A lot more than dollars is involved. More importantly—far more importantly—we must remember we are dealing with a sworn foe of free people and free governments.

THE $300 MILLION COTTON MESS NEEDS INVESTIGATION

Mr. WHALLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Findley] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge an investigation of the newest and biggest cotton mess ever, so big moneywise that it makes the Billie Sol Estes scandal look like peanuts.

Official reports from the U.S. Department of Agriculture indicate that the big textile mills have pocketed a multimillion-dollar windfall as the result of the cotton mill subsidy program enacted earlier this year.

The mill subsidy should be scrapped at the earliest possible date. Personally, I favor going back to the 1958 program, which had the cotton industry heading for a sound basis until Secretary Freeman unwisely jacked up support prices and thus destroyed the program.

Under the new program mills are getting subsidy payments which will reach $300 million before the year is over. Some of the big mills will get upwards of $18 million each.

Obviously, the mills are not passing these subsidies on to consumers in the form of lower prices.

In fact, cotton product prices are up instead of down, despite the sharp drop in net cost of raw cotton.

When the proposal was before Congress, Johnson administration officials assured Congress the mill subsidies would yield savings to consumers amounting to double the subsidy, or $600 million a year. Instead of $600 million savings, consumers are getting higher prices.

In opposing this legislation in the House, I predicted it would amount to a windfall for the textile giants, and now official reports indicate this is true.

I cited page 7 of the September "Cotton Situation" report just issued by the Department of Agriculture:

> Cloth prices about the same. The average wholesale value of fabric (20 constructions) made from a pound of cotton in August was 61.00 cents per pound, up slightly from the 60.95 cents in July and 60.60 cents in August 1963. The average price for the 1963-64 season was 61.65 cents compared with 60.52 cents for the previous year.
>
> Prices paid by mills for cotton used in these 20 constructions, which reflect the 6.5 cents equalization payments, were at the lowest level since May 1946. At the same time, mill margins in August were at the highest level since February 1953. For 1963-64 crop year mill margins, the difference between the price of a pound of cotton and its approximate cloth equivalent averaged 26.19 cents, up from 24.91 cents for the previous year.

The American people are entitled to the facts on this mess. Agriculture Secretary Freeman should be called on the carpet to explain, if he can, why the wholesale cost of cotton fabric has actually climbed since the mill-subsidy program went into effect. During this same period, as the result of the 6½-cent-a-pound handout to mills, the net cost of raw cotton has gone down to the lowest level since 1946.

Taxpayers are entitled to know what they are getting for the extra $300 million a year that is being poured out for mill subsidies.

Secretary Freeman should explain what measures, if any, were taken in the administration of the program to protect consumers and prevent this unconscionable windfall to textile mills.

The legislation was approved in the House earlier this year by a narrow eight-vote margin, and then only after the Johnson administration gave firm assurances that consumers would get the advantage of mill subsidies. Mr. Freeman should be required to explain why these promises were not fulfilled.

Something is very wrong in this program which permits the tycoons of the textile industry to put these tax dollars into their own pockets. The Billie Sol Estes scandal involved a mere $20 million. This is 15 times as big, involving $300 million, and it deserves an immediate investigation.

CONGRESSMAN WYDLER SEEKS FURTHER ACTION AGAINST AIRCRAFT NOISE

Mr. WHALLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Wydler] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, the problem of aircraft noise is one against which the Federal Government must take a more active part. I am sure the people in the Elmont area of Long Island agree with me.

Since my election to Congress I have worked to alert my congressional colleagues to the importance of this problem and the need to do something about it. I have asked them to join in action to bring it under control.

Upon taking office in January of 1963, I began a systematic survey of all the governmental agencies to bring together all the information as to what was being done in this area by the Federal Government.

Up until that time, a great amount of buckpassing was going on between agencies.

Upon receiving all reports, it became clear that little effort was being made to solve that problem.

I was assigned in Congress to the Science and Astronautics Committee. This committee's main function is in overseeing our Nation's space program, but since it was also engaged in aeronautics I decided to try to get our Space Agency to devote funds and effort to research that would help eliminate aircraft noise.

On June 11, 1963, I issued a release promising to "press the National Science Foundation and NASA to increase their efforts" in this field. I stated:

> Noise is the fallout problem of the aircraft industry. The public will not suffer in silence forever. Unless a solution is found we can expect a public roar that will drown out aircraft noise from our metropolitan skies.

I believe that warning was heeded for the airlines have set up the Aviation Development Council. This is a step in the right direction. I have been in contact with the executive secretary of the council, James T. Pyle, and we are cooperating in seeking solutions.

We must maintain our airports as they represent an important part of our civilization and progressive way of life. However, one of the penalties of progress is noise nausea. This offensive nuisance is the result of the increasing use of machines to serve our needs. Machines make noise and we are always demanding machines that do more things, have more power, and go faster, the noise level also increases. We are reaching a point where the control of noise is a necessity.

Nowhere is this more clearly demonstrated than in the case of airplane noise. Although many people use airplanes, very few own them, and as a result there are very few defenders of airplane noise. Those who excuse this nuisance as a necessity are pretty well limited to Government officials in the Federal Aviation Agency and airline owners.

The biggest chance for a real breakthrough is coming as this country is now about to embark on the development of a supersonic commercial air transport. The administration is proposing to spend $750 million of your money in this development.

This will make funds available for a crash program of research to develop proper noise suppressors and quiet engines.

The FAA has stated as its goal that these supersonic aircraft should be noisier than present jet aircraft. This would be intolerable. The American public should not have to finance the development of more earshattering engines. Enough is enough.

I am going to insist on noise levels within the limits of the new Boeing 727, which is lower than other jets. At my request, our committee recommended that this be done.

As I told the FAA:

> I believe the American public has every right to expect that Federal funds will be used to develop not only a faster jet but a quieter one as well.

This year, NASA agreed to increase its research into the problem of airplane noise.

A. J. Evans, Director of the Aeronautics Division at NASA, requested $2,510,000 for this year to handle airplane operating problems. About $485,000 of this was to handle existing airplane noise research.

This was to start on a new program. It was a breakthrough of the indifference barrier that has existed on the Federal level. However, I was not satisfied with this and my Subcommittee on Advanced Research and Technology added $2 million to the NASA budget to intensify the planned efforts to control aircraft noise.

These funds will be used in research on the internal design of the jet engine to reduce the noise levels. Our subcommittee report requires NASA to report progress to us in the field.

The only setback was suffered in the Senate when the Democratic administration ordered that our $2 million authorization be cut to $1 million. The Senate Committee acceded to the administration's request.

I have attended conferences held by the Metropolitan Regional Council on this problem. I have been in constant touch with the presiding supervisor of the town of Hempstead, Palmer D. Farrington, to help in any way possible in his well known and great efforts to enforce ordinances and laws protecting the public's right to a reasonable degree of quietness. All these efforts must be continued and intensified.

I was shocked when a recent request by the Elmont Center Civic Association to have a place where a complaint could be lodged available on a 24-hour basis was refused in the interest of the President's "economy program."

I have been asked by the president of the association to help it in obtaining proper markings on commercial aircraft so that noise offenders can be properly identified. I will do all I can in this field. It is apparent that much more can be done to alleviate this problem. I promise and pledge my maximum effort and ask my colleagues to join me in this most important undertaking.

NAACP MEETING IN HARRISBURG, PA.

Mr. WHALLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KUNKEL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, on September 24, 1964, in the forum of the State education building, a splendid meeting of the NAACP, Dauphin County Branch, and its guests was held.

The Reverend Franklin L. Henley, president of the Dauphin County branch and minister of St. Paul's Baptist Church, 1201 North 17th Street, Harrisburg, Pa., has been doing a yeoman's job in aiding and promoting the peaceful development of the Civil Rights movement in our area. He has been active in every phase of the movement and the adjustment which has been occurring.

I had the privilege of speaking to the audience present at this meeting. Included herewith is the speech I delivered:

> SPEECH OF CONGRESSMAN JOHN C. KUNKEL, NAACP MEETING, HARRISBURG, PA., SEPTEMBER 24, 1964
>
> My advocacy of civil rights is lifelong. It is based on heritage and tradition, on education and study. But primarily on my firm belief in the equality of all men before God.
>
> My great-grandfather, Dr. William W. Rutherford, was one of the early abolitionists. His home, located where the Dauphin County courthouse now stands, was an underground railroad station for fugitive slaves during the Civil War. This occupation was unpopular. He was rotten egged on several occasions by the majority who disagreed strongly with his views.
>
> Here I am 100 years later, urging the same principles and receiving a good measure of approval for my efforts. While my efforts on behalf of them are more effective (due to my representing you in the Congress of the United States), nevertheless it does not require so much courage on my part as was shown by my great grandfather. After all, a hundred years have made a tremendous difference. Progress has been slow but there has been progress. "Now we have taken the big leap."
>
> During my lifetime, well before ever seeking public office, I tried in many small ways to help promote the cause of equality.
>
> Apparently this family trait will reach into the next generation. My stepson, Dr. Minster Kunkel was given the NAACP Freedom Award by the State of Pennsylvania in recognition of his trip to the Congo. During that time he performed surgery on well over 550 Congolese patients in an effort to help the sad conditions existing there.
>
> Naturally I was an ardent supporter of civil rights legislation during the present Congress. As a matter of fact I have supported all civil rights legislation, including antipoll tax and antilynching during my 15½ years of service.
>
> My efforts have been directed also on many occasions to securing greater job opportunities at higher levels with various business firms and people in Dauphin County and in many other little ways which are so important in the long run. If all of us keep our eyes open for these little things and do them, we'll speed the pace toward true equality by leaps and bounds.
>
> The civil rights bill is a tremendous step forward. It adds the stamp of legislative approval to that given by the Supreme Court and the executive branch of the Government. It is broad in scope. It covers all the major areas in which discrimination now exists. It is a legislative affirmation of the citizenship rights of all of us. We know the underlying reason for the legislation was to rectify the plight of the Negro. But the basis of the legislation is equality for all mankind. Keep this in mind.
>
> In practical effect this law also transfers the burden of proof in securing rights from the Negro to the alleged offender. No statutory law can completely end discrimination. Remember that. It takes time and many court interpretations to work out exactly what the law means. How far it goes. Cases

will be arising under this law for years to come. But the pattern is set. The language is clear.

I feel the answers will be just and what we expect them to be.

Undoubtedly additional personnel will be needed by the Department of Justice to aid and carry out the new duties thrust upon it. You can count on me to do my best to see that the Department of Justice is supplied with fully adequate manpower to do the job.

Final success will depend greatly on cooperative action at the State, county, city and local levels. You people here at home have a lot of work to do—work in which I will be proud to assist whenever time permits.

All of us must strive to make these changes as rapidly and as quickly as can be done. We must work together in harmony. Here in Dauphin County we have been having just that kind of outstanding leadership and fine cooperation which ultimately will bring to full fruition the goals of this legislation. This has to be done bit by bit all over this vast Nation of ours—in the States, the towns, the villages, the townships. It requires an adjustment in the thinking of many. All of us must learn to believe in equality deep down in our hearts. Ultimate success lies in the hearts and minds of men.

Given equal opportunity for education, jobs and full access to all facilities, it will not be long until the Negro will have completely proven that he can attain equality with the best of us. In fact, many have done so already, such as Ralph Bunche and Carl Rowan. But the field of sports gives us the most tangible proof of this. The Negro has had a greater degree of equality in this field for some years. Our Negro athletes have shown that they rank with the best. Willie Mays and Jim Brown are prime examples. What would we have done in the last few Olympics if it had not been for our Negro athletes? In tennis and golf the Negroes are rapidly rising to the top. You never hear of any racial feeling or race discrimination in the field of sports, except on rare occasions. I believe this proves what can and will happen in all fields of human endeavor.

The national leaders of NAACP and other national leaders such as Martin Luther King, have taken the position that now is the time for restraint. I thoroughly agree with them. We must avoid race riots and violent disturbances. My own judgment is that many of the recent riots, which in most cases have been called race riots, are in many instances primarily pure hoodlumism based on a desire to loot and having little if anything to do with the race question. We must remember, also, in this connection that the Communists never miss an opportunity to step in and promote disturbances. May I add parenthetically here that the Negro leadership deserves unstinted praise for the way in which they have kept their movement free of communistic influence during all the recent turmoil.

We in the United States are frequently criticized for having discriminatory practices. We should be. I follow history and current events very carefully. But nowhere in the world is there a society free from discrimination. It exists everywhere. India has its caste system. The British have a rigid social structure. South America is the same. So it goes east, west, north, and south. However, only here in the United States is there a sincere and nationwide movement afoot to end all discrimination. The rest are shutting their eyes to their own sins and criticizing us. Furthermore, we will succeed. But it will take time. Rome wasn't built in a day.

Many people ask me what changes should be made in the law. Undoubtedly as time goes on many changes will be needed in the law. But, for the time being, I think we should all give full support to the law as it is. Flaws will appear—then they can be corrected.

Maybe it is because I am an optimist. But frankly I think we have done extremely well in this country during the past few months. I do not like to hear the comment about "restraint until after the election" because I believe we should have restraint before and after the election and at all times—just so long as we can see tangible progress being made. I was delighted to read in the paper today about the quick action the Supreme Court was going to take on the recent public accommodation case. If the Court will act quickly on all cases brought under the civil rights bill, then the exact scope can be found more quickly and everyone's rights can be protected at a much earlier time. Quick Court action is a key to the success of this bill.

It will hasten the time when we can all hear the voice of Leviticus "proclaiming liberty throughout the land to all the inhabitants thereof."

Reverend Henley delivered a magnificent, down-to-earth talk which really reached into the fundamentals of the problem. I hope the Members will read this address of his with the care and attention it richly merits.

Reverend Henley's speech follows:

ADDRESS OF REV. FRANKLIN L. HENLEY

Mr. Chairman, distinguished candidates, honorable platform guest, and fellow citizens, I am delighted to welcome you tonight to the First Freedom Rally sponsored by the Dauphin County Branch, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. The branch not only welcomes you, but we wish to express our sincere thanks to the candidates for coming here to present their platform upon which they seek support, now, and on November 3. We also thank you, the citizens, for coming out to hear these oustanding community, State, and National leaders.

The NAACP as you know, is a nonpartisan organization composed of members of all political parties, except the Communist Party and such allied political organizations, the Ku Klux Klan, the White Citizens Council, the John Birch Society, and the Black Muslims. The NAACP was not organized to fight other citizens and has lived up to this during the 55 years of its history. The purpose of the organization is to fight against the social cancer that exists in our society, which is discrimination, segregation, and injustice. The cure is equality and justice for all citizens in every phase of American life. Unless this cure, which is the only social medicine with therapeutic value, is accepted, our society is doomed, just as sure as a man suffering with advanced physical cancer.

During this month and next, meetings are being sponsored by our organization throughout our Nation to ask the political candidates of both major parties to join with us in a cure of this social ill.

The Negro does not seek any advantage over other citizens. Why should he? Yet, propaganda against our organization and the civil rights bill is being spread real thick throughout our country today. The civil rights bill does not give any advantage to the Negro, but seeks, according to the statement made by the distinguished U.S. Senator, WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon, to bring the Negro as a citizen into the Constitution of the United States of America. I ask you tonight, Is there anything wrong with this? Is there anything wrong with assuring every citizen the right to buy a home wherever he desires, to be accepted as an employee based on qualifications alone and that qualification should not include color? Is there anything wrong in American citizens being given the opportunity to register and vote? Is there anything wrong in serving American citizens in places of public accommodations, if that citizen meets all the rules and regulations of the establishment, such as proper attire, etc.; should he be denied simply because of his color? If this practice is continued it will dehumanize some members of a race so treated, and fill them with contempt for law and decency. When a business is opened to the public, this includes the Negro, for he is a large part of the American public. There is no such thing as a private business, all businesses must be licensed by the government, and must depend upon the public for its existence. The Negro is a part of the government, and pays his taxes the same as other citizens, therefore, his money pays the salaries and other expenses involved in maintaining the licensing agency, as well as the other services the government must give to each business, such as inspection, police and fire protection, building and upkeep of streets and roads that lead to the places of business, and many other services.

I ask you tonight, fellow Americans, can there be anything wrong with sending our children to the best schools? Should we be forced to send our children to schools ill equipped and staffed with teachers who are not prepared for their jobs?

If a teacher, Negro or white, is not prepared to teach white children, he is not prepared to teach Negro children, and we do not want him teaching our children. We need the best equipment and the best teachers, because of 100 years of neglect, and in order to cure the social ills in America, somehow, the educational level of the Negro must be brought up to the national level. We are not responsible for this neglect; therefore, we must not be expected to make up for it alone. This condition exists because we were not brought into the mainstream of American life after our slave experience. As we study world history we notice that this has not happened to others, after their freedom from servitude. Even after wars, we move to bring the subdued people back into the mainstream of the world's economy. The American section of Germany and the nation of Japan are two examples: We have poured money and skill into these two countries, so that today they are the most prosperous people on earth, almost completely without unemployment. The Negro was brought to America against his will, and used to clear the land, build the roads, worked inhuman hours in the mines and mills, contributing human energy to make this country great, yet after 100 years of citizenship he has not been accepted into the mainstream of opportunities which he helped to create for others. By keeping alive segregation, discrimination and injustice have created a society in America that is responsible for the ghettoes, the high rate of crime, juvenile delinquency, and a lack of skill among the Negroes which has resulted in a high rate of unemployment. The average income of the Negro college graduate is below that of the whites completing only the eighth grade. Using President Johnson's guideline of $3,000 between poverty and no-poverty, I would like to give you this picture. In 1962, 44 out of every 100 Negro families earned less than $3,000 a year, compared to 17 out of 100 white families.

More than 60 percent of the white families were farmers in the Southern States. These conditions create tension in the Negro community, and all the poverty and social programs will not relieve the tension until the Negro is accepted completely as a human being. I am not speaking of being accepted on a social level, this is personal, and like water, will seek its own level. I am speaking of involvement; that is the opportunity to become a part of Government, business, employment, and community, State, and National responsibilities.

In conclusion, permit me to say to you that the NAACP and all responsible Negroes are opposed to violence and rioting in every form. We know that this type of action will hurt our cause. We also know that political leaders using violence by Negroes as a political issue will hurt their cause at the polls November 3. They are using it to insult and degrade more than 20 million decent and loyal citizens, knowing that less than one-tenth of 1 percent of our people are involved in this ugly act, that cannot be condoned or tolerated by the members of our race. These same politicians have failed to say one word about the violence going on continuously in the State of Mississippi, where more than 22 churches have been burned, and many others bombed. They have said nothing about the Negro Educator and Reserve Officer in the U.S. Army, who was torn to bits by the KKK in the State of Georgia, and the particular type of justice that freed the confessed killers. They have said nothing about the violence that took place in the States of Vermont and Oregon on Labor Day. These politicians cannot see these acts, because they are color blind. You know, and I know, that this is not equal justice under the law. So tonight we ask of you, equal opportunity and justice after you are elected to the office you seek. We wish for you the very best during your campaign, and for many years of faithful and dedicated service to the greatest people on earth. May God be with you and guide you in the making of every decision for the good of all the people.

WE NEED PRAYER AMENDMENT

Mr. WHALLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, it is obvious by now that the liberals have been successful in blocking our efforts to correct the unfortunate Supreme Court decision which has had the effect of forcing our public schools to become materialistic and has reversed the historical religious tradition of our society. At the outset, let me again say that I firmly believe in the separation of church and state but this does not mean I would enjoin God or deconsecrate our Nation which, I fear, will be the logical consequence of these decisions.

It might be helpful to clear up some of the facts on what the decision does and does not accomplish. It does outlaw compulsory prayers and most Americans would agree with this conclusion. However, many supporters of the High Court's decisions in the Engle and the Schempp or Murray rulings, maintain that this is all the decisions do. This is not the case—in fact, it throws the entire religious question into a cloud, not only as it relates to the school but also regarding every aspect of religion from a nonpersonal standpoint such as income tax deductions for religious contributions and tax-exempt status of church properties. The Court did strike down compulsory prayers in the Engle case which was decided in 1962 but it went much further the next year in the Murray case when it outlawed the Lord's Prayer but broadened the proscriptions through language which invites future cases. The Court said:

> For a governmental connection with religion to withstand the strictures of the establishment clause there must be a secular legislative purpose and a primary effect that neither advances nor inhibits religion.

Note this does not refer only to prayers or only to schools, for that matter. Were Madalyn Murray to bring a suit objecting to Christmas carols or a Christmas program in public schools, it would be my opinion that the presently constituted Court would say that such exercises was religious worship within the meaning of the 1963 case and therefore unconstitutional.

Thus, it is not only important to note what the Court does and does not say but also what it "very well may say" in future cases following their specious line of reasoning. Few Americans have really studied this facet of the problem. The civil rights bill was passed under an aura of emergency and its arguments are similar. Few people have thought of what can follow if you destroy State and local responsibilities under the guise of getting Federal control over the corner drugstore in a southern town.

During the debates on the civil rights bill I pointed out that if it were logical to stretch the interstate commerce clause and the 14th amendment to cover local businesses it is just as logical to extend it to the sale of private homes and remove the freedom individuals now have to sell to whomever they desire. The logic of the Murray case can easily be extended to many areas such as—

First. Removing "under God" from Pledge of Allegiance.

Second. Removing "In God We Trust" from coins.

Third. Outlawing the income tax deduction for donations to churches or religious organizations.

Fourth. Outlawing the tax-exempt status of church property and church income.

Fifth. Forbidding the Government to use tax dollars for construction of chapels on military establishments.

Sixth. Forbidding the Government from using tax dollars for paying military or institutional chaplains.

The Court alleges that the Government's role is one of maintaining a "strict neutrality, neither aiding nor opposing religion." Who could argue that the taxpayers are not indirectly aiding religion by allowing church property to go without an assessed property tax while taxing other private property? Who could argue that the Government is not "aiding" religion by paying for the chapels at the military academies? There is no end to the litigation we can expect because the simple fact of life is that government does aid religion—as distinguished from the first amendment guarantee regarding the prohibition of a union of government and religion—in many, many ways. If neutrality is a virtue, and since 1963, constitutional as it relates to the requirement that government "neither advances nor inhibits religion," the Nation's leading atheist, Madalyn Murray, and others should have a field day.

Have you ever stopped to figure out how a government can be neutral. How does a teacher maintain a neutral position? If a student were to ask a teacher whether or not the Declaration of Independence is correct and whether in truth we do have a Creator, what would be the neutral answer? How can we be so silly as to suppose that a wall of separation between church and state is a wall of neutrality?

The people of Ohio in their constitution, adopted March 10, 1851, certainly presuppose a divine being. The preamble states:

> We, the people of the State of Ohio, grateful to Almighty God for our freedom, to secure its blessings and provide for our common welfare, do establish this Constitution.

Most of the States have similar statements. Yet we are supposed to have a neutrality. The United Nations is a good example of neutrality. As a concession to the atheistic Communists, no reference is made at any point in the charter to a divine being and this may be the heart of their trouble. The liberals are always saying something to the effect that "God is all right but you have to keep Him in His place." The majority should not have to be so restricted by a Court which gives opinions inconsistent with our Constitution or our heritage.

The same people who rush to the support of this Court decision such as the National Council of Churches are the ones who also seem to feel that we can be neutral in the battle between atheistic communism and Western civilization with its Judeo-Christian heritage. We can no more be neutral in this than we can be neutral when Madalyn Murray and American atheists attack our religious heritage. When the National Council of Churches and the Supreme Court tell us in the most blasé manner that the Bible is all right as a historical document to study and would relegate it to the same historical emphasis of Plato's "Republic" or the works of Karl Marx, they surely misread our American heritage. Note the Court's language in the Schempp-Murray case:

> In addition, it might well be said that one's education is not complete without a study of comparative religion or the history of religion and its relationship to the advancement of civilization. It certainly may be said that the Bible is worthy of study for its literary and historic qualities.

What a perversion of the place of the Bible in our Judeo-Christian heritage.

Probably the most interesting plea I have received from many sincere and well-intentioned constituents—in most cases Protestant ministers or church lay leaders—is that I should not support the Becker amendment or efforts to amend our Constitution because they do not "want the first amendment changed." Again this shows a misconception of what has happened in the past 30 years as far as the Supreme Court interpretations are concerned. I always ask them this: "When you say you do not want to change the first amendment, do you mean the first amendment as the framing fathers wrote it, as it stood when the Supreme Court changed it in 1940, when it changed it during the fifties, or when it was changed in 1962 and 1963?"

What has happened has been a slow obliteration of the fundamental principles embodied in the Constitution by a court which has become the chief social tinkerer in this Nation and has written decisions implementing their social and political ideas and not the law as it has stood and as it was meant to be. Justice Douglas probably put his finger on the crux of the matter when he stated in 1949:

> So far as constitutional law is concerned, stare decisis must give way before the dynamic component of history.

Of course, it just so happens that stare decisis is a legal principle which has always guaranteed that we would have a government of laws rather than men since it basically means that once a decision has been rendered, subsequent courts will follow the established law. It prevents chaos since if the Court changed its interpretation of the Constitution every few years, no one could really know what the law is and we could not live in an orderly manner. Stare decisis is legal terminology for what the layman might call self-restraint. The Court does not have self-restraint and that is precisely why we are in a state of chaos and, as I noted before, the Murray decision has in reality invited more litigation so the tinkerers can implement more of their nonconstitutional ideas of a social and political nature.

Before 1940, it was constitutionally construed—properly, I believe—that the first amendment was designed, as Justice Stewart puts it, "to leave the States free to go their own way." The Supreme Court literally inverted the meaning of the amendment and declared that the establishment clause of the first amendment was absorbed by the 14th amendment and therefore what formerly left the States free to go their own way was turned against them after the Cantwell against Connecticut decision in 1940. This steady attrition process has continued until the pinnacle was reached in the 1962 and 1963 school prayer decisions. Yet, we hear those who blindly say, "do not change the first amendment."

What does the first amendment say? It says "Congress shall make no law." Congress made no law in either the Engle or the Murray cases but the Supreme Court rushed in anyway. We should not let their arbitrary action go unchallenged for to do so will further erode the delicate balance of separation of powers and further send us down the road to a centralized dictatorship. The Court moves in a strange world where up is down and down is up. The situation is somewhat like a story which was used in the late 30's when the Court was coming up with what most constitutional lawyers thought then to be radical decisions. They had not seen anything until the Warren Court got in full swing. Justice Frankfurter, the Earl Warren of his time, was shown as a first base umpire calling a runner out who was safe by 10 feet and, in addition, the first baseman had not even caught the ball. When questioned by the irate team manager who charged out of his dugout to protest the decision, Justice Frankfurter put his nose in the air, crossed his arms defiantly and proclaimed: "Fair is foul as safe is out. Clearly the runner was out."

This pretty well describes the curious and warped decisions which have been handed down by the Warren Court which is telling the American people and their elected representatives "Fair is foul as safe is out. Clearly the runner is out."

Mr. Speaker, I deplore the lack of self-restraint on the part of the Supreme Court. I deplore their invasion of the field constitutionally delegated to the Congress, that of legislation. I heartily support the efforts to restore the original vitality of the 1st and 10th amendments. The Becker amendment did not go far enough, in my judgment, to redress the damage accomplished by the liberal Court members, Democrat and Republican appointees included. While I signed the discharge petition to release the Becker amendment for consideration by the House, my heart really lies in the proposal which I have introduced jointly with my good friend from Indiana, DON BRUCE. It is regrettable that the liberal leadership of the Congress has blocked consideration of the Becker amendment and the scores of other proposals which have been offered. I am hopeful that we can achieve some action on this pressing matter in the next Congress and if I am here in January I will reintroduce the following joint resolution which dies with this adjournment of the 88th Congress:

JOINT RESOLUTION PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES TO RESTORE THE INTEGRITY OF THE CONSTITUTION AND THE BILL OF RIGHTS AND TO ESTABLISH THE SOURCE OF MEN'S RIGHTS AND GOVERNMENTS' POWERS IN THE ORGANIC LAW OF THE LAND

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is hereby proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of the several States:

"SECTION 1. The scope of the 14th amendment, which limits the compulsive power of the States in order to give equal protection under due process of law to every citizen against oppression by a State, shall be construed neither to derive from, nor to absorb the 1st amendment, nor to make that amendment applicable to the States. Neither shall it be construed to remove, to diminish, or to delegate to the United States, the authority and responsibility of the States in any area reserved to them or to the people by the Constitution and the first 10 amendments, nor to otherwise amend the Bill of Rights to permit any intrusions of Federal Government power prohibited thereby.

"SEC. 2. Except in the case of total repeal, or repeal with ratification as changed, no amendment or combination of amendments to the Constitution shall be construed to reverse, invert, or change in any manner, the purpose, intent or meaning of any other amendment. Nor shall any amendment be construed, either of itself or in conjunction with any other amendment, to prohibit to the States any of the powers or authority reserved to them or to the people by the Constitution and the Bill of Rights, unless that amendment itself embodies language stating in precisely limiting terms what specific power or authority is thereby prohibited to the States or delegated to the United States.

"SEC. 3. The specific prohibition, reduction or delegation of any such power or authority shall not be interpreted to extend in any degree to other powers or authority reserved to the States or to the people by the Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

"SEC. 4. To establish the source of men's rights and governments' powers, we hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.

"SEC. 5. The right of the people, through their elected and appointed officials, publicly to offer prayer and manifest in other ways their dependence upon the Creator, or to extend equal privileges to religious institutions, shall not be abridged by any organ of government.

"SEC. 6. The expressions of such manifestations toward the Creator on behalf of the people of this Nation shall in no way be construed to violate the liberties of any citizen or group of citizens.

"SEC. 7. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress."

Mr. Speaker, let me conclude by pointing out that we have a great tradition, yes, a spiritual and cultural heritage, of which we ought not to be denied by Judges lacking self-restraint on the one hand and endeavoring to carry out absolutist, incorrect constitutional interpretations on the other. Certainly nothing in the Constitution contemplated or deserved the type of decision which the Court handed down in the Engle and Murray cases. Moreover, there is nothing constitutional or moral about saying that our great religious tolerance must be religious sterility. To maintain that any form of religious observance in a school, whether it be in the form of a simple noncompulsory prayer or Bible reading, constitutes compulsion is nonsense. Surely the spire of every church must also be an indirect compulsion as is the contribution to a church which gets tax deductibility and so forth. Indeed, we are entering a long, rocky road if we follow the Supreme Court in the direction they are pointing. We must not do this and the people must exercise the option which is granted to them in our Constitution in the form of the amending process.

Let us etch on our hearts the words which are inscribed on the Jefferson Memorial, a tribute to the man who uttered them, our third President:

> Can the liberties of a nation be secure when we have removed a conviction that these liberties are the gift of God.

No, my Speaker, I do not believe we can be secure unless we reaffirm our religious heritage and reject the Engle and Murray decisions. It is not enough to say that our children should receive their religion in their homes and in the churches. For them to receive this blessing and then live in a nation whose government endeavors to maintain a neutrality will lead them to the very logical conclusion that neutrality is in reality godlessness.

CONGRESSMAN SIBAL REPORTS

Mr. WHALLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SIBAL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, each year, at the close of Congress, I issue a report of my activities for the benefit of my constituents. Under unanimous consent, I now submit my report for this year.

FOREIGN POLICY

Americans are being killed by Communists in South Vietnam in a vicious, twilight war too little understood—or explained—at home. Now and then the shroud is torn away, as it was when our ships were attacked and retaliated in the Gulf of Tonkin. But then it dropped down again, a mystery masking a deeper mystery underneath.

The world is full of crises and dangerous pressures overshadowing all our lives. All the work of Congress is carried on against this backdrop of international uncertainty and danger.

I have worked for a strong, bipartisan foreign policy to demonstrate that Americans are united in the defense of freedom.

I supported foreign aid but voted for reductions in the program to underline the need for greater care and selection in conducting it. Aid should not be handouts but should be used to enable poor countries to develop and stand on their own feet.

I opposed the administration's plan to guarantee loans to pay for sales of American wheat to Communist countries. The wheat-sale program was presented originally to Congress as strictly cash-and-carry. Even accepting the administration's judgment that these deals are of greater benefit to us than to the Communists, it is certainly wrong to extend credit to the Communists at the taxpayer's expense.

I supported all requested appropriations to permit the United States to meet its obligations to the United Nations.

Because global war between the great powers in this nuclear age is unthinkable, I supported the limited nuclear test ban treaty and I voted for the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. As we seek to resolve the challenges of aggressors, we also must seek through every avenue to end the possibility of a resort to nuclear arms.

I offered legislation to create a House Committee on the Captive Nations and another bill calling for the evacuation of Soviet troops from Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania and for the holding of free elections in those countries. The captive nations are living evidence of Communist oppression behind the Iron Curtain. They symbolize the meaning of the cold war.

As long as a single nation is enslaved by another, our own freedom is in danger. These bills would put the American on formal record, through their Congress, as fully committed to the cause of human rights everywhere.

DEFENSE

A strong defense is the first necessity of a strong foreign policy. I have supported all administration requests on defense budgets. In addition, I voted for funds to develop a manned bomber program contrary to the administration's policy. This is because I believe the President will need in the future the flexibility which he cannot have relying on missiles alone.

While voting for a strong defense, I also support legislation to provide planning for the conversion of defense industries in the event that spending for arms is reduced. This is necessary to minimize the impact on the economy and on the jobs of people working in these industries.

CIVIL RIGHTS

I voted for the Civil Rights Act of 1964. This historic act, which by itself makes the 88th Congress a landmark in American political annals, is designed to guarantee to all minorities, Negroes particularly, the enjoyment of constitutional rights which most of us take for granted.

I urge its full acceptance by all citizens and strongly deplore public violence and disorder by all factions.

TAXES AND SPENDING

The impact of Federal taxing and spending policies, particularly the constant deficits, continues to be a source of worry and potential trouble in the future. I voted for the tax cut but also voted to make it dependent on comparable cuts in Federal spending. I voted against spending measures totaling nearly $20 billion.

I believe in balanced budgets, especially in times of prosperity such as we are currently enjoying. I consistently opposed raising the limit on the national debt. This debt, now totaling close to $320 billion, costs $11 billion a year in interest, which comes out of the taxpayer's pocket.

VETERANS

The most important bill approved by Congress for veterans was legislation providing long overdue increases in pensions paid to needy veterans. I voted for this along with other bills providing benefits to widows, parents, and children of veterans who died of service-connected disabilities. I support a GI bill for veterans of the cold war, similar to the program provided for veterans of World War II and Korea.

CONSERVATION

This Congress made notable strides in the vital field of conservation of our natural resources. Towering above all conservation legislation was the wilderness bill, which sets aside millions of acres of wilderness land to be preserved forever wild. This Congress also enacted valuable legislation to combat air and water pollution, to control the use of dangerous pesticides and to create a national park on Fire Island. I voted for all of them enthusiastically. In addition, I introduced legislation to ratify the Northeastern Water and Land Resources Compact through which the New England States plan to coordinate their river and water conservation programs.

THE NATIONAL ECONOMY

I voted for the Economic Opportunity Act to help the poverty stricken lift themselves off relief rolls and onto payrolls. This is a national program to deal with a national problem.

I voted for the Manpower Development and Training Act and for equal pay for women.

I also voted for higher pay for Federal employees, both civilian and military, to maintain and improve the quality of Government service.

Bills I introduced included legislation that would grant deductions to help workers pay for costs of extra training needed to get better jobs. Another bill of mine would grant similar deductions for the travel and living expenses of persons who must work away from home, such as employees in the building trades.

CONGRESSIONAL ETHICS

Prompted by shocking evidence of misbehavior on the part of a few individuals in Government, notably in the Bobby Baker case, I introduced legislation establishing a code of ethics for Members of Congress and their employees. Another bill of mine in this area would authorize a congressional investigation into the business dealings of Members of Congress and Capitol employees. The Baker case and other scandals have left a moral smudge over the Government that must be cleared away.

STRENGTHENING CONGRESS

To provide Congress with up-to-date means for protecting its role as the voice of the people and to help maintain the vital balance of power between the legislative and executive branches, I introduced a bill to give Congress permanent staffs of scientific and technical advisers.

Recently, the Library of Congress established a special scientific office to provide such advice. The Director, Dr. Edward Wenk, Jr., who came from the President's scientific staff to take this position, declared that if there had been no Sibal bill, it would have taken years to persuade the Library to take this step.

Another bill of mine would strengthen the hand of Congress in dealing with intelligence agencies operated by the Government. The bill would create a special joint committee of the House and Senate to maintain constant survey of our intelligence agencies.

EDUCATION

Legislation for which I voted under the heading of education included: broadening the National Defense Education Act; the Medical Education Act; the Higher Education Act; expanded vocational training; aid for research in mental retardation; the Nurses Training Act; and the Library Services Act.

I introduced legislation providing an income tax deduction of up to $1,500 a year for the parents of college students.

THE NEW HAVEN RAILROAD

The continuing New Haven Railroad crisis poses the most serious economic problems for the Fourth District and the State of Connecticut. It has been one of my major concerns throughout my service as your Congressman.

That this vital but bankrupt railroad is still operating can be considered a tribute to the trustees in charge of it and to the local, State, and Federal governments, who have helped.

As a member of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and of its Subcommittee on Transportation, I am fortunate in holding a key position from which to represent the interests of the people of the Fourth District and the State.

I have strongly urged the Interstate Commerce Commission to require that the New Haven be included in the proposed merger of the New York Central and Pennsylvania Railroads and that the commuter operations be considered separately. I have proposed an interstate compact by which the commuter operation can be handled.

I voted for the Mass Transit Act, which will help in planning for the future. I maintain close touch with the trustees, the Governors of New York and Connecticut and the Federal agencies concerned. I have also kept in contact with Judge Anderson who has jurisdiction over the New Haven's bankruptcy proceedings.

COMMITTEE WORK

From my committee, Interstate and Foreign Commerce, has flowed a great variety of legislation, reflecting its broad responsibilities. All legislation dealing with transportation, radio and television, public health, the Federal regulatory agencies, the stock market, and the Weather Bureau comes through this committee.

This year, this committee drafted the law reforming the operations of the stock market and the Medical Education Act, among many others. The committee is also deeply involved in the problems of air safety and in the development of a supersonic passenger aircraft, both special interests of mine.

Early in my congressional service, I became convinced of the need for a coordinated national transportation policy and introduced a bill setting the framework for this.

I am now second-ranking Republican member of the Subcommittee on Transportation, an ideal platform from which to work on the New Haven Railroad and other transportation problems. I am also a member of the Subcommittee on Investigations which is the watchdog committee for the Federal regulatory agencies.

GENERAL

I have proposed an amendment to the Constitution to assure women the same legal rights that men now have.

Another bill of mine would make Columbus Day a national holiday in fitting tribute to the great discoverer.

Helping me in my work is a versatile, trained staff which works both in Washington and in my district office at 69 Wall Street in Norwalk. Both they and I stand ready to help constituents in every way we can. When Congress is in session, I return home nearly every weekend and have office hours in Norwalk on Saturdays. When Congress is not in session, which is not much of the time these days, I am in my district office on weekdays as well.

I report regularly to my constituents over local radio stations, through a column written for the newspapers and by means of newsletters.

My record on major legislation this year

Bill No.	Description	My vote	Outcome
H.R. 9637	Authorizes $16,900,000,000 for planes, missiles, and ships	Yes	Passed.
H.R. 10456	Authorizes $5,200,000,000 for space program	Yes	Passed.
H.R. 10945	Authorizes $2,600,000,000 for Atomic Energy Commission	Yes	Passed.
S. 3075	Requires sales instead of leases of nuclear fuels to private electric power companies	Yes	Passed.
H.R. 950	Strengthens security provisions for National Security Agency	Yes	Passed.
H.R. 8200	Authorizes civil defense fallout shelters in Federal buildings, schools, and hospitals	Yes	Passed House.
H.J. Res. 1145	Approves action by President in repelling attacks on U.S. forces in southeast Asia	Yes	Passed.
H.R. 11380	Foreign aid—motion to recommit to reduce by $222,200,000	Yes	Defeated.
H.R. 11380	Foreign aid—final passage	Yes	Passed.
H.R. 7406	Increases U.S. participation in Inter-American Development Bank	Yes	Passed.
S. 2455	Expands Peace Corps	Yes	Passed.
S. 2214	Allows United States to join 16 other nations in $750,000,000 increase in lending capital of IDA	Yes	Passed.
H. Con. Res. 343	Expresses sense of Congress that every effort be made to compel delinquent nations to pay dues to United Nations failing which to deny them their votes in the General Assembly.	Yes	Passed.
H.R. 11202	Agricultural appropriations—Motion to recommit bill to prevent export subsidies being paid on any crops sold to Communist countries unless approved by the President and reported to Congress.	Yes	Defeated.
H.R. 11202	Agricultural appropriations—Final passage of $5,200.000,000 bill	No	Passed.
H.R. 11376	Excise taxes—Motion to recommit to repeal taxes on furs, toilet articles, luggage, ladies' handbags, and jewelry	Yes	Defeated.
S. 2701	Authorizes study to determine site for construction of sea-level canal between Atlantic and Pacific Oceans	Yes	Passed.
S. 2642	Creates Office of Economic Opportunity	Yes	Passed.
H.R. 8363	Tax-reduction bill	Yes	Passed.
H.R. 8000	Imposes tax on foreign securities	No	Passed.
H.R. 11375	Raises temporary limit on national debt from $315,000,000,000 to $324,000,000,000	No	Passed.
S. 6	Mass transit bill	Yes	Passed.
S. 1642	Stock market reform bill	Yes	Passed.
H.R. 10503	Extends Federal highway program	Yes	Passed.
S. 1153	Extends Federal aid for airport construction	Yes	Passed.
H.R 6041	Requires Federal contractors to conform to local fringe benefits as well as prevailing wage scales	Yes	Passed.
H.R. 7152	Civil Rights Act of 1964	Yes	Passed.
H.R. 4638	Provides funds to pay for transfer of Executive Office and power between election and inauguration of new President	Yes	Passed.
H.R. 11049	Federal pay raise	Yes	Passed.
H.R. 9586	Establishes a National Council on the Arts	Yes	Passed.
H.R. 11926	Limits power of Supreme Court to act on reapportionment of State legislatures	Yes	Passed House.
S. 1057	Provides public defenders for indigent defendants in Federal criminal cases	Yes	Passed.
H.J. Res. 247	Would permit TV debates between presidential and vice presidential candidates	Yes	Killed in Senate.
H.J. Res. 245	Limits funds allowed Members of Congress for travel abroad	Yes	Passed House.
H.R. 11865	Increases social security benefits	Yes	Passed.
H.R. 10041	Extends program of aid for hospital construction	Yes	Passed.
H.R. 11241	Nurses Training Act	Yes	Passed.
S. 3049	Housing Act of 1964	Yes	Passed.
S. 2265	Library Services Act, extends assistance to urban areas	Yes	Passed.
S. 3060	Extends National Defense Education Act	Yes	Passed.
H.R. 319	Protects public from morally offensive material in mails	Yes	Passed House.
S. 3001	Military pay increase	Yes	Passed.
H.R. 1927	Increase veterans pensions	Yes	Passed.
H.R. 6196	Cotton-wheat subsidy program	No	Passed.
S. 1605	Requires Federal approval of pesticides prior to public sale	Yes	Passed.
H.R. 10222	Broadens food stamp plan	No	Passed.
H.R. 1839	Restricts imports of beef	No	Passed.
S. 2	Establishes centers for research on water resources	Yes	Passed.
S. 4	National wilderness bill	Yes	Passed.
H.R. 3846	Establishes land and water conservation fund to assist States develop outdoor recreation programs	Yes	Passed.
S. 649	Increases aid to communities to combat water pollution	Yes	Passed.
H.R. 4487	Requires labeling of pesticides to warn against hazards to fish and wildlife	Yes	Passed.

IMMIGRATION LEGISLATION TO PROVIDE A METHOD OF UTILIZING UNUSED QUOTA NUMBERS

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today an immigration bill which is designed to facilitate and expedite the reuniting of families by creating a quota reserve consisting of unused quota numbers. Under my bill, the unused quota numbers would be utilized for the issuance of immigrant visas to close relatives of U.S. citizens or lawful resident aliens and to highly skilled specialists whose services are urgently needed in the United States.

The size of the quota reserve will, of course, vary depending upon how many quota numbers remain unused at the end of each fiscal year. Generally, in the course of the last decade, the total of unused immigration quota numbers averaged between 51,000 and 55,000 annually. In the last fiscal year, 1963, the number was 53,951. Thus, we know that under my proposed immigration legislation, there is not and cannot be an annual increase of total immigration above that which is provided by existing law.

There are only 3 countries which have allotted to them, under the law, an immigration quota consisting of over 7,000 numbers annually. The countries are: Great Britain, Germany, and Ireland. Those are the countries which do not fully avail themselves of their allocations.

On the other hand, all other immigration quotas number less than 7,000 annually and it is precisely for immigrants chargeable to these small quotas that my bill will provide relief.

Briefly, each quota country will be entitled to a percentage of the quota reserve equal to the percentage which such country's regular quota bears to the unused numbers placed in the quota reserve. For example, if a country's quota represents 5 percent of that total, the immigrants from that country would have access to 5 percent of the quota reserve. If the regular quota represents 10 percent of the quota reserve—and this is, approximately, the case with the Polish and Italian quotas—such country would have access to 10 percent of the quota reserve.

THE GOP AND THE REA—AN IMPRESSIVE RECORD

Mr. WHALLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NELSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, Democrat fronts have been instructed to convince the farmers that Republicans are against the rural electrification program. The record proves such a line as false, and the best proof is the record.

The Congress enacted this law in 1936, which makes the program 28 years old, and let us see what happened during the eight Eisenhower years, three of which I served as Administrator:

Rural electrification program, 28 years old

Distribution loans:	
20 years Democrat administration	$2,655,014,286
8 years Republican administration	$1,055,562,544
Customers added (farms):	
20 years Democrat administration	4,694,621
8 years Republican administration	1,257,019
Generation loans:	
20 years Democrat administration	$1,074,423,099
8 years Republican administration	$514,062,478

Telephone program, 15 years old

Telephone loans:	
7 years Democrat administration	$458,647,116
8 years Republican administration	$630,680,973
Customers added:	
7 years Democrat administration	797,836
8 years Republican administration	1,175,227

It is obvious from these comparative figures that the REA program made great strides during the short 8-year period of Republican administration.

Those of us who serve in political positions know full well that issues can be selected to produce any answer one wishes to get. One poll will show a Congressman 100 percent right, another 100 percent wrong. In my own case, I am listed at 80 percent-plus right on conservative ratings and with the leftwing Americans for Democratic Action about 100 percent zero.

The Republicans have among their leaders many men who have played a leading role in this program—Norris, Cliff Hope, Cooper, Mundt, and in the House of Representatives the great majority of the Republicans support the program providing it is conducted in keeping with the intent of Congress as well as the act. We do not support any program that seeks to duplicate facilities, that tends to move toward a socialization of the power industry which will surely destroy and absorb the rural electrification program if we choose to play the game of the public ownership crowd. The success of the rural electrification program has been in the fact that it has harnessed the wisdom of good managers, directors, attorneys, and engineers associated with the many cooperatives throughout the country.

During the Republican years, the partisan fronts insisted that the Administrator and the agency have clean hands as far as using the position and the agency for political purposes.

In recent years not a word bellows forth when Administrator Clapp tours the country involving himself in congressional races to the point of traveling with candidates trying to unseat Republican incumbents. The Administrator has now moved to an attack in the presidential race. His action is in violation of the legislative intent if not of the REA Act itself, and no other Administrator has ever so boldly and brazenly violated tradition, yet not a word from fronts that would protect the program from political exploitation.

The Rural Electrification Administration has now become a collection agency for campaign funds. We have documented the fact that in violation of the Hatch Act and the Corrupt Practices Act employees of REA have been paraded to the top office and tapped for $100 political dinner tickets, $50 down and $10 a month, but there is not a word against this practice from the partisan front that seeks to brand Republicans anti-REA.

I may conclude by saying that no Republican candidate for public office will harm the REA, but neither would we hold still and see it absorbed by power-hungry public ownership devotees who have little regard for a sound government. We wish, however, to keep the program strong by a continued recognition of a free enterprise system, and the secret of the success of the program has been that, by and large, the honorable, able men who have managed this program nationwide have proceeded in this tradition.

The performance dealing with this program indicates clearly that rural electrification has enjoyed progress under Democrats and Republicans, and as a Republican I am proud of our record.

HOW LOW HAVE WE SUNK?

Mr. WHALLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, how low have we sunk? When you pick up a newspaper and see the heading "Letter From Sailor Reveals Details of Tonkin Incident," one cannot but wonder what has happened to a proud nation when its leaders would deceive you and it takes a poor sailor on an American ship to tell the elected Representatives of the people what really happened in the recent Gulf of Tonkin incident. A certain arrogance has built up in the Defense Department by which they on the one hand feel they can withold information and "time" its release to suit their political whims and, on the other, when necessary, lie to the American people.

This, of course, is what Arthur Sylvester meant in December 1961 when cornered by Cuban crisis distortions and lies, told the American people that it is an inherent right of government to lie to preserve itself in a time of national emergency. The American people have had a bellyful of this type of highhanded chicanery and intrigue.

I enclose the following article from the Washington Daily News of Friday, October 1, 1964, which shows just how low we have sunk:

LETTER HOME BARES NAVAL CLASH DETAILS

DUBUQUE, IOWA, October 2.—A sailor aboard a U.S. Navy ship involved in the third brush with North Vietnamese forces in the Tonkin Gulf says his ship sank two Communist vessels and damaged another.

His disclosure, in a letter to his mother, told the Nation more about the incident than the Defense Department has. The Pentagon has refused to say whether any Communist ships were sunk, although a Moscow report has said some were.

It wasn't until after the letter was made public that the Pentagon made public the names of U.S. vessels involved.

The sailor, Fireman James J. Kress, wrote to his mother, Mrs. Joseph Kress, about the incident involving U.S. destroyers and torpedo boats from the Vietnam mainland.

He said the crew of the U.S.S. *Edwards* was called to general quarters (battle stations) on September 18 "and we stayed there from 8 p.m. until 1 a.m.

"We picked up about seven contacts on the radar screen, the *Edwards* blew two of them out of the water for certain and shot up another one. I don't know if the U.S.S. *Morton* destroyed any or not.

"One of them boats like to got us [sic]. It was trying to sneak up on our radar. It came within 2,000 yards before we blew it up."

He said the crew later was asked to sign statements that they had seen PT boats.

The Defense Department confirmed that the destroyers *Edwards* and *Morton* were involved in the incident, but refused again to comment on whether any of the attacking boats were sunk.

The names of the ships were released after the Department was informed of Fireman Kress' letter by the Dubuque Telegraph-Herald.

City Editor Neil Shively, of the Telegraph-Herald, said he called the Defense Department and talked to an officer in the information service.

"He really didn't tell us much more than was revealed when (Defense Secretary) Robert McNamara made the statement (September 19). But he confirmed that the U.S.S. *Edwards* and the U.S.S. *Morton* were the two destroyers involved on September 18–19," Mr. Shively said.

H.R. 8704

Mr. WHALLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. BOB WILSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, in 1957 the Armed Services Committee held lengthy hearings on H.R. 8704, a bill to prohibit the delivery of members of the armed services of the United States to the jurisdiction of any foreign nation. This bill was introduced by our former colleague, Hon. Paul Kilday, of Texas, and after considerable debate it was reported out by the committee but was not called to the floor of the House of Representatives for a vote. Unfortunately it died that year and no effort has been made to revive it.

The need for this measure has been dramatized over the past 2 years by the sad plight of a constituent of mine, Corp. Dale McCuistion, who is now in a Turkish jail facing a 3-year confinement unless he can come up with $17,500 ransom which he was fined for alleged dealing in black market money.

I am hopeful the next Congress can again consider Mr. Kilday's legislation to prevent such miscarriages of justice against American servicemen.

Many people across the country have become interested in Dale McCuistion's sad plight and are lending him a helping hand. One such person is Paul J. O'Neill, Republican candidate for Congress in Miami, who has enlisted the help of columnist Jack Lofoed. I certainly hope public interest across the country can be aroused and sufficient funds raised to allow Corporal McCuistion to return with his family to San Diego.

I ask unanimous consent to include as a portion of my remarks the article "American Soldier Needs Your Help," which appeared in the Miami Herald on September 30, 1964.

AMERICAN SOLDIER NEEDS YOUR HELP

I've asked you to help, with your contributions to get Dale McCuistion out of a Turkish jail, where he may have to spend 3 more years in lieu of a fine of $17,500. He's an American soldier, convicted of dealing in dollars on the black market. When the alleged offense occurred, during the corrupt administration of Premier Menderes, everybody in Turkey dabbled in exchange—Government officials, businessmen, housewives—so eventually American soldiers decided to cut themselves a slice. Since the official exchange rate was 9 lire to the dollar compared with the international one of 14, action boiled.

One night four sergeants, James King, Joseph Proietti, Giancomo Recavuto, and Dale McCuistion, were funning it up in an Izmir cafe. A girl dropped into a vacant chair beside them. She was a belly dancer, once married to an American newspaperman.

The gal needed 500 bucks, she said, and would pay 15 lire. The boys agreed this was too good to pass. They didn't know it, but the quivering Delilah was a police stoolie.

Next night McCuistion and King were strolling when they were blackjacked, and given the boot. Taken to the police station, they were ringed by black mustached, scowling faces, and told to sign a confession written in Turkish. They refused. So, they were hung by their wrists a few inches above the floor, and beaten on back and buttocks with leather straps. After a while they signed.

Proietti and Recavuto were arrested in their homes, also without warrants, and held incommunicado. Several days later American headquarters was notified. Two officers, one a doctor, examined the men, and found McCuistion and King suffering from a bad beating.

Everything the Izmir Police had done was illegal—entrapment, arrest without warrant, the third degree.

American headquarters asked that jurisdiction in the case be delegated to them. Mehmet Helvcioglu, the prosecutor, refused. "Your Government has not intervened," he said, "though this is a diplomatic matter, not one between a local court and a military detachment."

* * * * *

Eventually, the case of the four sergeants came up. They were defended by a non-English speaking Turkish attorney. An officer of the Judge Advocate General's Department sat in, but had no active part.

The Pentagon still insists King and McCuistion were not beaten, though their own officers reported they had been, and the lieutenant in charge of the arresting squad was disciplined for brutality.

American officers rotated back to the States, were not sent back temporarily for the trial, though they had admissible testimony to offer. In short, their country tossed the sergeants to the dogs.

Recavuto was acquitted, Proietti and King sentenced to 7 months in Buca prison, fines of $700. They served their time, and were released, one in the summer of 1962, the other in the fall.

McCuistion was more stubborn, and elected to appeal. Eventually, he was convicted again, and given 3 years and the $17,500 fine. What I am trying to do, through you, is to help Dale's friends in California raise that sum. It will save him 3 more years of hell, while his wife and five children suffer. You can send your contribution to me, or to the "GI Prisoner in Turkey Fund," care of the First National Bank, San Diego, Calif.

Of all the countries with whom we have status-of-forces treaties, Turkey is the worst in which an officer or enlisted man can serve.

"It's Alcatraz with an accent," one of them told me. "A lot of us have our families with us, and live off base. Our quarters are broken into, and robbed, automobiles stolen or busted up. Police don't even make a pretense of doing anything, and the MP's aren't allowed to intervene. An American can be arrested for many little things, like tearing Turkish money, criticizing the Government, or selling an item from the post exchange.

"The car of a friend of mine was stolen, and the prosecutor blocked his rotation home for several months, insisting the automobile had been sold on the black market. When a family arrives all items brought into the country are checked, including the numbers on appliances. When a tour is completed, every article must be accounted for, or the family isn't permitted to leave.

"Even worse, our wives are insulted in the streets. Degenerates exhibit themselves, and the cops do nothing. Anti-American feeling is strong and the Turks love to sink the gaff into us."

This is a country we regard as a stanch ally, and into which we have poured $4 billion. This is the nation which has Dale McCuistion in prison, and will hold him there 3 more years unless we raise his fine.

INTERGOVERNMENTAL COMMITTEE FOR EUROPEAN MIGRATION

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ROONEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure, today, to call attention to the excellent records of international service to mankind performed by one of my most distinguished constituents and the intergovernmental agency he has served these past 2 years.

Prof. Joseph McFadden, of Lehigh University, Bethlehem, Pa., served from September 1, 1962, to August 31, 1964, as Deputy Director of the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration (ICEM). Mr. McFadden has now returned to his duties at Lehigh University.

During his 2 years' service with ICEM, Mr. McFadden earned the respect and admiration of men from every government, large or small, which has participated in the interdependent work of this Committee.

I remember, only too well, the day in early 1961, when Professor McFadden came to me at my office in Bethlehem and told me that he had been strongly inspired by the inaugural address our late, beloved President John F. Kennedy had given.

It was not only the famous phrase: "Ask not what your country can do for you, ask what you can do for your country," which inspired Mr. McFadden. It was, instead, the whole tenor of President Kennedy's remarks.

Joe McFadden felt, as I did, that this inaugural address was one of the greatest calls to spiritual and moral responsiveness and responsibility in our Nation's history. He was deeply moved by the implication inherent in President Kennedy's remarks that all Americans could find some way in which to contribute their talents, their skills and their time toward a greater, more beneficent and provident America in this modern world.

A few months later, thanks to the intercession of my distinguished predecessor, Congressman Walter, Joe McFadden was appointed Deputy Director of ICEM with headquarters in Geneva, Switzerland. He served with great distinction in that post and has now returned to his home, where he has once more assumed the responsibility of educating young men and women.

In many ways, his service with ICEM has been a milestone of Joe McFadden's distinguished career. He first became a member of Lehigh's faculty in 1948, beginning as an instructor and assuming a full professorship in 1962 before he departed for Geneva.

During the intervening years, however, he served on the Bethlehem school board and became the first president of the Bethlehem Area Union School District which was formed under his guidance.

Throughout his career, as a private citizen, public servant and a teacher of considerable reputation, Joseph McFadden has continued to lend his foresight and astute judgment to the community in which he has lived. In Bethlehem, it was a local community; in his work with ICEM, it was the world at large.

In 1952, the remarkable qualities of this good man were recognized by Gov. Adlai Stevenson, who chose him to serve as one of Pennsylvania's presidential electors.

All through his life, Joseph McFadden has been a man dedicated to the furtherance of humanitarian ideas and concepts. He served with great distinction as an infantry lieutenant in the Canadian Army during World War II, entering that service because he was attending St. Joseph's University in New Brunswick, Canada, in 1942. He was later graduated from Syracuse University in New York, where he met and later married his charming wife, the former Catherine Haley. They now have five children.

Professor McFadden's contributions to his city, his country, and to ICEM have been enormous. Although still a relatively young man, he has stored up an enviable reservoir of public and private acclaim for the work he has done.

The quality of that work can best be demonstrated by a brief summary of the work of ICEM itself.

Since its creation in 1951, ICEM has been directly responsible for the resettlement of 1,350,000 refugees and migrants throughout the free world.

It was on the initiative of the United States that ICEM was formed, succeeding the International Refugee Organization with wider responsibilities and greater scope.

It is important to remember that ICEM was established by the Congress own initiative in 1951, acting through the House Committee on the Judiciary. As a result, the first conference directed at a working organization was attended by 16 nations when it was convened in Brussels.

It was my esteemed predecessor in this office, Congressman Francis E. Walter, who, with the late Hon. Chauncey W. Reed, undertook the task of drafting the framework of ICEM and, in 1953, to write its constitution.

Today, 29 nations are engaged in this important endeavor. And their work grows more impressive each year.

With nearly 6,000 refugees entering our own country on parole each year under Public Law 86-648, it is evident that ICEM has been charged with responsibilities to the American people and the peoples of the entire free world.

I think all my colleagues in the House have a right to feel pride in the work of ICEM, as I do.

I am particularly proud of the great outpouring of praise from the members of the Committee from every country on the occasion of Prof. Joseph McFadden's departure as Deputy Director.

I am confident that Mr. McFadden's successor as Deputy Director, Mr. Walter Besterman, will do an equally fine job. Mr. Besterman was formerly legislative assistant to the Committee on the Judiciary's Subcommittee on Immigration and Nationalities.

We of the 15th Congressional District, however, must reaffirm our pride in the past achievements of ICEM under the able, astute, and humane guidance of Joseph McFadden.

I am sure that the Members of this distinguished body will wish Mr. McFadden well in his return to the groves of academe and to the resumption, once more, of his dedicated service to the city and community he loves so well.

I want to commend Lehigh University, also, for the foresight and civic spirit its administrators have shown in permitting Professor McFadden to take a leave of absence from his duties. There are many colleges and universities throughout our proud Nation who perform similar service to their country each year. Such selflessness is in the highest tradition of liberal arts education in which students and faculty alike are taught that men rise no higher than when they give unselfishly of their time, their talent, and their energy to the country they love and the world in which they live.

THE BALSAM WOOLLY APHID

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. TAYLOR] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply concerned over extensive damage caused to fir trees in scenic areas of western North Carolina by an insect known as the balsam woolly aphid.

This aphid has inflicted heavy damage on balsam fir trees in scenic areas on Mount Mitchell State Park, the Pisgah, Nantahala, and Cherokee National Forests, the Blue Ridge Parkway, and the Great Smoky Mountains National Park in North Carolina and Tennessee, and other sections of the southern Appalachians.

If this pest continues unchecked, he threatens to wipe out the beautiful balsam trees which adorn the mountains of the southern United States.

The insect was first observed on Mount Mitchell in 1957, where some 275,000 trees have been killed to date. No practical method has been found for control of this aphid where large numbers of trees are infested. Cost of chemical control ranges from $75 to $300 per acre in reasonably accessible areas, and treatment may need to be repeated every 3 to 5 years.

The balsam tree has a high scenic value in recreation areas and is valued by an expanding Christmas tree industry.

Unfortunately the insect has an exceedingly high reproductive capacity, having a potential of increasing from one adult to more than 3 million at the end of a year. The aphid spreads quickly by air currents, birds, other wildlife, or by crawling to nearby fir trees. The aphid feeds on living tissue immediately beneath the surface of the bark and can kill a tree within 2 years.

The problems encountered in fighting the wooly aphid are formidable. Agencies of the State and Federal governments are locating and spraying infected trees adjacent to public recreation areas, but unfortunately the aphid is spreading faster than funds have been made available to control it.

Some economical way needs to be found immediately to control this insect. The balsam trees are a natural tourist attraction, and tourism ranks first among western North Carolina industries. The answer appears to lie in research. Additional funds are also needed immediately to step up spraying operations.

The Southeastern Forest Experiment Station in Asheville, where research on this problem has been centered, has advised me of its willingness to intensify research into the possibilities for controlling the aphid. It is my hope that Congress will give careful consideration to this problem by appropriating funds with which an adequate defense can be made against the aphid while methods are sought for its permanent eradication from the southern Appalachians.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON PUSHES COAL USE AND DEVELOPMENT OF COAL INDUSTRY

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ROONEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, when I ran for election to this seat in July of 1963, I urged President Kennedy to seize the initiative and place the resources of the Federal Government behind the effort to reinvigorate our lagging coal industry.

My district was once part of the great and proud "king of industries." For years, now, our local mines have either been totally closed down or have operated on nothing more than a part-time basis.

It is my firm conviction that coal is still one of our greatest and most vital natural resources. I believe the industry has a good future ahead of it, but it will take time and research. Most of all, it will take the enlightened support of a Federal Government which understands the plight of miners and mineowners alike.

It gives me the greatest sense of pleasure to call the attention of my colleagues in the House to a recent article in Forbes, the business magazine, which praises highly the efforts of President Johnson and his administration in this field.

I am proud to say that, today, as never before in history, our National Government is paying attention to the potential of the coal industry. I can think of no greater service we could perform to the thousands of miners who are either unemployed or only partially employed in Carbon County, Pa.

The article from Forbes is a detailed account of the magnificent forward steps now being taken by President Johnson and Secretary of Defense McNamara.

The article follows:

Coal: To the Rescue?

The U.S. coal industry has been doing better lately (Forbes, May 15, 1963, p. 23). Now, it may be on the verge of some real growth. Out of a recent luncheon came a plan that may give coal a tremendous boost.

It could mean a new era of prosperity for such leading coal companies as Consolidation Coal, Pittston Co., Island Creek, Peabody, Eastern Gas & Fuel. It could add luster to the prosperity of such coal-carrying roads as the Norfolk & Western and the Chesapeake & Ohio; it could benefit less profitable coal-carrying railroads like the New York Central and the Pennsylvania. It could mean substantial extra business for such equipment and supply companies as Joy Manufacturing, McGraw-Edison, Hewlitt-Robins, to name but a few.

Everyone concerned is keeping his fingers crossed; the prevailing attitude perhaps was best expressed by Joseph P. Routh, chairman of Pittston: "We may get somewhere this time."

TEAM EFFORT

The luncheon was held at the White House. Present were several of the Nation's biggest mine operators, including Routh and George Love, chairman of Consolidation Coal. Also present were executives of railroads like the Pennsylvania and the Chesapeake & Ohio whose major business is the hauling of coal. Sitting with them were leaders of the mine and railroad unions, both of West Virginia's Senators and the President of the United States.

The topic of conversation: What could be done to increase exports of coal, as well as consumption at home?

As a result of the luncheon, President Johnson appointed a committee of Cabinet and sub-Cabinet members. He put Defense Secretary Robert McNamara in charge and told him to push coal for all it's worth. (Commented Routh approvingly: "McNamara is a businessman.") At the same time, he sent instructions to W. Michael Blumenthal, the U.S. representative at the conversations now underway in Geneva among signatories of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trades. The President told Blumenthal to give coal top priority. Blumenthal's job: to persuade nations that have trade barriers against U.S. coal to lower them.

THE ROADBLOCK

Exports of coal to Western Europe, Canada and Japan have been rising steadily—from 36.4 million tons worth $348 million in 1961 to 50.4 million tons worth $478 million in 1963. This year, the industry expects to export 52.5 million tons with a value of $498 million. That will be 12 percent of the United States total coal output.

Tariffs don't bother the industry. The U.S. coal industry is so amazingly efficient that it can jump right over tariffs. Despite them, it can lay down coal in Western Europe for $5 a ton less than any West European mine can.

What really keeps U.S. exports down are the nontariff barriers. Britain, for example, won't let a single lump of U.S. coal into the country; West Germany has a miserly quota of 5 million tons.

According to a Government study, if Blumenthal can induce the nations with nontariff barriers to let them down a little, exports can be pushed to 73 million tons valued at $735 million by 1970. A real lowering of the barriers would allow exports of 125 million tons worth $1.3 billion by that year. Such a growth in exports alone could raise U.S. output 5 to 15 percent.

Some day, predicts a Government official, the big coal companies may be as internationally minded as the big oil companies already are—and with international marketing organizations to match. Says Dr. Georg Tugendhat, the European Common Market's coal expert: "Never has there been so opportune a moment for American coal in the free world. For the next 15 years, Europe will be dependent upon large imports of fuel. The question is: Will they consist wholly of gas and oil—or will American coal have a place?"

Some industry men are dubious about the chances of the Blumenthal mission succeeding. Others are mildly optimistic. They realize that many European businessmen would like more cheap U.S. coal. And they realize that the United States is not without bargaining power in these matters. The Johnson administration, moreover, is determined to help. So much so that Walter Tuohy, president of the Chesapeake & Ohio Railway, was moved to write recently: "Our President (Johnson) has genuine concern for the coal industry."

Says J. Raymond Maust, chairman of Maust Coal & Coke Corp.: "Exports will really move if the Government can pull this off."

Adds Gilbert Humphrey, son of ex-Treasury Secretary George Humphrey and chairman of M. A. Hanna Co.: "We've been trying for years to get the Government to go to bat for us. It looks like they're really taking action now."

HELP AT HOME

The coal industry's rosy vision of the future does not, however, depend solely on raising exports. The industry has asked McNamara to freeze imports of foreign residual oil for the east coast at the present level. This would give coal and residual oil a guaranteed 50–50 share of the market. Explaining the industry's view, Pittston's Routh said: "Residual oil imports must be linked with coal exports, because for every 10 million tons more of export business we get, we might lose 10 million tons of business at home if these residual oils keep pouring in."

The McNamara committee is now studying the industry's request and the industry has great hopes that it will be granted. The Government has made no firm promises about helping coal against oil. But, as Joseph E. Moody, president of the powerful National Coal Policy Conference, so hopefully put it: "They haven't said no, either."

THE BASIC REASONS

Other reasons for the industry's optimism do not depend on anything the Government may or may not do. Mechanization and lower railroad charges have enabled the coal industry to cut costs and prices materially. As a result, the use of coal by power companies is steadily increasing. After declining steadily for years, U.S. coal production started to rise. In 1961 it was 403 million tons; in 1962, 422 million, in 1963, 452 million. It is expected to reach 468 million this year.

And the end of this rising curve is not yet in sight. Ten miles west of Indiana, Pa., a group of investor-owned electric utilities is building a huge mine-mouth power station to convert coal into electricity. Six companies will own the extra-high-voltage facilities which will transmit the electricity from the site to eastern markets. The concept of mine-mouth generation would reduce fuel costs greatly.

The hope is to make "coal-by-wire" cheap enough to compete with gas and oil in the heating of homes.

In the West is another project that makes coal men beam. Southern California Edison and the Dallas Power & Light Co. plan to use fossil fuels (meaning coal, natural gas, and oil), rather than atomic energy, for water-desalinization plants.

Research into new uses for coal also is opening up new vistas. "We are fairly close now," one scientist says, "to making gaseous and liquid fuels out of coal—fuels that could well compete in the future with petroleum products."

THE POLITICAL REASONS

The Johnson administration's special interest in the coal industry springs from two considerations: First, by pushing the export of coal, the administration hopes to ease the balance-of-payments problem. If the industry's maximum export goals can be met, coal could earn an extra $800 million a year in hard foreign currencies for the United States. Secondly, Government experts have figured that if coal production in Appalachia can be increased by 100 million tons, it will pour $300 million more a year into the area, as well as $1.5 billion in new mining and railroad investment.

Said a high executive of a major coal-carrying railroad hopefully last month: "As far as Europe is concerned, the economics are already right. What we need from the U.S. Government is help in breaking down the trade barriers. That's something we can't do by ourselves."

Enter Bob McNamara and other top Johnson aids, with orders to try getting results as soon as possible.

THE NEED FOR A NEW IMMIGRATION POLICY

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Rodino] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, the hour is late—the 88th Congress nears adjournment—and still, hopelessly sidetracked in Subcommittee No. 1 of the House Judiciary Committee, the subcommittee having jurisdiction over immigration and nationality matters, lies a most important legislative measure—an immigration proposal sent to the Congress on July 23, 1963, by the late President Kennedy. I hastened to join with the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on the Judiciary, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Celler] and 55 other Members in introducing legislation, identical to H.R. 7700 which offered to the United States for the first time, an immigration proposal which would reasonably and equitably repeal the repugnant national origins system which has been the basis of our quota system since 1924.

I applauded with enthusiasm on January 8, 1964, when President Johnson endorsed this legislative proposal and incorporated it in his state of the Union message. President Johnson stressed:

> We must lift by legislation the bar of discrimination against those who seek to enter our country, particularly those with much needed skills and those joining their families. In establishing preferences, a nation that was built by the immigrants of all lands can ask those who now seek admission: "What can you do for our country?" But we should not be asking: "In what country were you born?"

I repeat these words of our President, now, because I fear that there are those among us who have forgotten—or who have lost sight, or who have compromised the true objective of immigration reform.

I know where I stand. My convictions are steadfast.

In every new Congress, since I came to the Congress in 1949, I have introduced bills to repeal the national origins system—a system which by its discrimination and inflexibility is an injustice to the thousands of U.S. citizens who are separated from their loved ones.

On March 21, 1951, I submitted to the Joint Committee, then holding hearings on legislation to codify the conglomeration of immigration and nationality laws: "* * * to me the distribution of quotas under the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1924 is a shocking display of a discredited theory of racism. I think it is time to call the law for what it is—an attempt to set out a theory of racial superiority."

Unfortunately, the tenor of that time, permeated by fear and timidity about receiving peoples from certain parts of the world, caused the national origins system to be incorporated in the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952. And, I categorically add, no other provision of law has offended so many Americans and has so injured America's image in the eyes of the world.

Since 1957 every Congress has been called upon to enact additional laws which have partly whittled away the national origins formula. These measures which softened the inequities of existing law by reuniting families and admitting highly skilled specialists were commendable. But those efforts were overshadowed by the basically restrictive and inflexible immigration law. Piecemeal legislation has never reached the core of the problem. Each time the pressures for immigration reform developed, the so-called one shot laws were enacted.

How can we justify the policy of the basic law when during the last 6 years, laws were approved in respect to refugees and nonquota immigration irrespective of place of birth? We must contrast the policy of law as written with the policy of conduct and action.

How many more times must the Congress be faced with piecemeal legislation? Is there no rule against perpetuities?

The Kennedy-Johnson immigration proposal is a fresh and courageous approach to the elimination, for once and for all, of the discrimination existing in our immigration laws. This long postponed change will recognize the dignity of the individual—predicated upon the principle that one person is no less desirable than any other person regardless of his race, or his place of birth.

After my frequent appeals, and the appeals of many of our colleagues, for prompt consideration, hearings were commenced on June 11, 1964, on all general immigration bills as well as H.R. 7700. The hearings continued for over 3 months.

I listened to the Attorney General, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Labor and witness after witness denounce the national origins system. I elicited from witness after witness the primary objective—the elimination of the national origins system.

Secretary of State, Dean Rusk, testifying before the subcommittee, commended the Congress on the fine record the Congress had established in approving legislative acts which clearly reflected the intent of the Congress to relieve pressures created by quota restrictions, but the Secretary stressed the tremendous importance of eliminating the discrimination in principle—the stigma which reflects upon the generosity the United States has shown to thousands of immigrants, refugees, and the hopeless.

The words of the Secretary are dramatic:

> It does not bother me to say to someone outside the United States, "we are sorry that we cannot admit you because we have run out of numbers" but it does make it difficult from a political and psychological point of view to say, "we are sorry that we have run out of numbers for Greeks."

Mr. Speaker, the immigration policy of the United States, notwithstanding any generosity, will be a continuous effrontery to every American and a source of embarrassment to the United States so long as our statute books contain the symbolic element of discrimination; a prejudice directed to some peoples which is repugnant to the true character of the American people.

Equality, under law, must be assured to all people. I shall persist in my efforts, even in the closing hours of this Congress, for enactment of H.R. 7700; immigration reform envisaged by President Kennedy and President Johnson.

I am a practical man. I know that we can no longer admit everyone who wishes to come here—we must be able to provide for those who do come with jobs, with homes, and with futures. A modern society is limited as to the rate at which it can expand and accommodate new settlers. I have pledged my every effort for enactment of immigration legislation which will express the true concepts of freedom and equality for which this Nation stands. I have never waivered from this pledge—nor will I ever.

This is where I stand.

PERSONAL VOTING RECORD

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Johnson] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I feel it is my duty as a Member of the House of Representatives to make crystal clear my position on the issues which are brought before the House of Representatives for a decision. At the conclusion of each of the three Congresses in which it has been my privilege to serve—in the 86th, the 87th, and now the 88th—I have compiled my voting record so that all the people of the Second Congressional District of California may have an opportunity to view it.

During this period of time, I am pleased to report that my actual voting participation has averaged approximately 96 percent. The remaining 4 percent of votes I have missed over the 6 years have been due solely to absence caused by official business or by illness. In each instance when I have been absent, I have made my position known through pairing, through announcement of my position in the Congressional Quarterly, or through announcing my position to the press of the Second Congressional District.

May I say I feel I can be proud of being on the record in this manner 100 percent for 6 consecutive years.

If there is no objection, I would like to include in the Record at this point the tabulation of my voting record for the 88th Congress.

Voting record of Congressman Harold T. Johnson, 88th Cong.

1ST SESS.

My stand	Issue	Status
For	Election of Speaker John W. McCormack	McCormack elected.
For	To retain House Rules Committee at 15 members to permit freer flow of legislation to House floor	Approved.
For	Authorizing expenditure of $360,000 by the House Un-American Activities Committee during 1963	Approved.
For	Supplemental Department of Agriculture appropriation of $508,000	Public Law 88-1.
For	To extend military draft	Public Law 88-2.
For	U.S. citizenship for Sir Winston Churchill	Public Law 88-6.
For	To authorize purchase of military aircraft, missiles, and Navy vessels in fiscal year 1964	Public Law 88-28.
For	Making appropriations to Treasury and Post Office Departments, Executive office, and certain independent agencies	Public Law 88-39.
For	To appropriate $450,000,000 for accelerated public works program aiding several 2d District counties	Public Law 88-25.
Against	To repeal silver backing for currency	Public Law 88-36.
For	To increase opportunity for training physicians, dentists, and other public health personnel	Public Law 88-29.
Paired against	Feed grain bill	Public Law 88-26.
Announced for	Motion to strengthen outdoor recreation program	Public Law 88-29.

Voting record of Congressman HAROLD T. JOHNSON, *88th Cong.*—Continued

1ST SESS.

My stand	Issue	Status
For	To finance additional facilities for research at State agricultural experiment stations	Public Law 88-74.
For	Providing for congressional foreign travel allowance outside United States	Passed House.
For	To tighten Internal Security Act of 1950	Public Law 88-290.
Paired for	To tighten District of Columbia school discipline	Passed House.
For	Final approval of supplemental appropriations bill for 1963	Public Law 88-25.
For	To end debate on Philippine war claims (Public Law 88-94)	Debate continued.
For	Authorizing travel outside United States by House Education Committee	Defeated.
For	Providing temporary debt limit of $307 billion	Public Law 88-30.
For	Equal pay for women	Public Law 88-38.
For	Authorizing Speaker to appoint delegates to International Labor Organization Conference in Geneva	Passed House.
For	To extend Mexican farm labor program 2 years	Rejected.
Against	To prevent President from creating Urban Affairs Agency	Public Law 88-351.
Against	Motion to cut off civil rights discussion	Rejected.
For	Department of Agriculture appropriations	Public Law 88-250.
For	Legislative appropriations	Public Law 88-248.
For	To extend Area Redevelopment Act	Rejected.
For	To extend excise taxes 1 year	Public Law 88-52.
For	Appropriations for Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the judiciary	Public Law 88-245.
For	To increase Federal payments to District of Columbia	Rejected.
For	Appropriations for Department of Defense	Public Law 88-149.
For	To appoint military appeals judges to hold office during good behavior	Passed House.
Against	Motion to kill extension of Geographical Limits Sedition Act	Motion defeated.
For	To approve planning for National Air Museum in Interior Department budget	Approved.
For	To approve appropriations for Department of the Interior and Forest Service	Public Law 88-79.
Announced against	To prevent GSA from coordinating use of automatic data processing equipment to make Federal agencies more efficient	Rejected.
For	Air pollution program	Public Law 88-206.
Against	Motion to deny funds for transfer of executive responsibilities upon expiration of a President's term of office	Rejected.
For	To increase lending authority of Export-Import Bank of Washington	Public Law 88-101.
For	To extend life of National Cultural Center Act	Public Law 88-100.
For	To strengthen quality of vocational education	Public Law 88-210.
For	To extend until Nov. 30, 1963, existing public debt limit	Public Law 88-106.
Against	Motion to kill bill to help in District of Columbia law enforcement	Rejected.
For	College construction aid bill	Public Law 88-204.
Against	To make deep cuts in foreign aid	Approved.
For	Passage of foreign aid bill	Public Law 88-205.
For	Appropriations to NASA for research and development, construction of facilities and administrative operations	Public Law 88-113.
For	Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Centers Construction Act of 1963	Public Law 88-164.
For	To establish congressional committee for research program investigations	Approved.
For	Tax Reduction Act	Public Law 88-272.
For	Military pay increases	Public Law 88-132.
For	Authorizing construction of Corregidor-Bataan Memorial	Public Law 88-240.
Announced for	To extend Civil Rights Commission	Public Law 88-152.
Against	Motion to hamstring space program by cutting funds	Rejected.
For	Independent offices appropriations, including NASA	Public Law 88-215.
For	Authorizing collection, reproduction, and publication of historical documents	Public Law 88-383.
For	To revise provisions of Unemployment Compensation Act relating to States	Public Law 88-173.
For	To establish Commission on Political Status of Puerto Rico	Public Law 88-271.
Announced for	Extension of continuing appropriations	Public Law 88-162.
Paired for	To authorize Education and Labor Committee to travel overseas	Rejected.
For	Military construction authorization	Public Law 88-177.
For	Extension of Mexican farm labor program to December 1964	Public Law 88-203.
Against	Motion to prevent tightening of District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act	Passed.
For	To increase national debt limit by $6,000,000,000	Public Law 88-187.
For	To enforce International Coffee Agreement	In conference.
For	To allow Armed Forces personnel to participate in international sports events	Passed House.
For	Military construction appropriations	Public Law 88-220.
For	To appropriate funds for flood control and reclamation projects, including several 2d district projects	Public Law 88-257.
For	Arms Control and Disarmament Act authorization	Public Law 88-186.
For	To revitalize the Reserve Officers Training Corps	Awaiting signature.
For	To extend apportionment requirements of Civil Service Act to temporary summer employment	Passed House.
Against	Cotton subsidy bill	Public Law 88-297.
For	Motion to kill $400,000,000 rapid transit program for National Capital	Motion carried.
Against	To provide funds for site and planning of VA Hospital at Bay Pines, Fla	Defeated.
For	To take up consideration of H.R. 7457 providing legal assistance for indigent defendants in criminal cases	Approved.
For	To take up H.R. 8770 to amend Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962	Motion carried.
For	To appropriate funds for civil functions administered by Defense Department	Public Law 88-257.
Against	Motion to bar use of funds of Export-Import Bank to guarantee credit of Communist governments	Passed House.
For	To appropriate foreign aid funds	Public Law 88-258.
Against	To prohibit construction of Knowles Dam	Passed.
For	To coin 50-cent pieces bearing the likeness of John Fitzgerald Kennedy	Public Law 88-256.
For	H.J. Res. 875, supplemental appropriations for certain activities of Department of Health, Education, and Welfare related to mental retardation.	Public Law 88-268.
Paired, announced for.	To permit consideration of foreign aid appropriations bill without further delay	Defeated.
For	To permit Export-Import Bank to extend credit to Communist countries for purchase of U.S. commodities if President considers it in national interest and notifies Congress 30 days in advance.	Public Law 88-258.

2D SESS.

For	To extend the Federal Airport Act which has benefited more than 50 2d District airports	Public Law 88-280.
Against	Motion to deprive cities of benefits under Library Services Act	Defeated.
For	Passage of Library Services Act to help urban and rural libraries	Public Law 88-269.
Paired for	To amend Davis-Bacon Act to include fringe benefits in prevailing wage determinations	Public Law 88-349.
For	To adjourn for day at 10:07 p.m. Friday, February 8th and continue civil rights debate following Monday at 10:00 a.m.	Passed.
For	To pass civil rights law	Public Law 88-352.
For	Motion to kill dual compensation bill relating to retired military personnel	Defeated.
For	To authorize purchase of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and to perform military research and development in fiscal 1965	Public Law 88-288.
For	To accept conference report on tax reduction bill	Public Law 88-272.
Against	To kill bill authorizing U.S. participation in International Development Association	Defeated.
Announced for	To prohibit Federal Communications Commission from making rules relating to length of broadcasting advertisements	Passed House.
Against	Motion to cut back on Peace Corps program	Defeated.
For	To impose tax on foreign securities in order to equalize costs of longer term financing in the United States and markets abroad	Public Law 88-563.
For	To create Public Land Law Review Commission to study ways of correcting inequities in present public land laws	Public Law 88-606.
For	Passage of Federal employees pay bill	Defeated.
For	To change certain fiscal and administrative procedures relating to Bureau of Standards	Passed House.
Against	To limit transfers of appropriations within agencies	Defeated.
For	To restore funds for construction of Coast Guard vessels	Defeated.
For	Passage of Treasury, Post Office, and executive agencies appropriations	Public Law 88-392.
For	To take up NASA program of research and development	Passed.
Announced for	Passage of NASA authorizations	Public Law 88-369.
For	To establish Battle of Lake Erie Sesquicentennial Celebration Commission	Public Law 88-328.
Against	Motion to require States to pay half the value of food stamps issued under food stamp program	Rejected.
For	Food Stamp Act of 1964	Public Law 88-525.
Against	Final passage of cotton-wheat farm subsidy bill	Public Law 88-297.
Against	Motion to restrict expenditures of congressional committees and Architect of the Capitol	Approved.
For	Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare appropriations	Public Law 88-605.

Voting record of Congressman Harold T. Johnson, *88th Cong.*—Continued

2D SESS.

My stand	Issue	Status
For	To implement Chamizal Convention between United States and Mexico	Public Law 88-300.
For	Department of Defense appropriations	Public Law 88-446.
For	Appropriations for Departments of Justice, State, Commerce, and judiciary	Public Law 88-527.
For	To authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission	Public Law 88-332.
Against	Motion to prevent United States from meeting financial obligations to International Development Fund	Rejected.
For	To award gold medal to Henry J. Kaiser (⅔ majority required)	Rejected.
For	To provide for construction of National Peanut Research Center in Dawson, Ga	Rejected.
For	Department of Agriculture appropriations	Public Law 88-573.
For	Military construction appropriations	Public Law 88-576.
For	Motion to raise maximum insurance on depositors' accounts in banks and savings and loan associations	Rejected.
For	To extend Federal Highway Act providing assistance for improvement of interstate, State, forest and public lands highways and forest roads and trails.	Public Law 88-423.
Against	Motion to cut deeply into foreign aid program	Rejected.
For	Passage of foreign aid authorization bill	Awaiting signature.
For	Passage of revised Federal civil service and postal employees pay bill	Public Law 88-426.
For	Public works appropriations, including $25,000,000 construction program for 2d Congressional District	Public Law 88-511.
Against	To reduce excise taxes against recommendations of Bureau of the Budget and other agencies, including Ways and Means Committee.	Rejected.
For	Temporary increase in national debt	Public Law 88-327.
For	Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964	Public Law 88-365.
Against	To reduce economic assistance funds for foreign aid	Rejected.
For	Passage of foreign aid	Awaiting signature.
For	Final passage of civil rights bill	Public Law 88-352.
For	To appoint special committee to investigate campaign expenditures of candidates for election to House of Representatives	Approved.
For	To establish water resource research centers at land-grant colleges and universities	Public Law 88-379.
For	To crack down on distribution through mails of pornographic and morally offensive matter	Passed House.
For	To establish Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress	Public Law 88-444.
For	To establish land and water conservation fund	Public Law 88-578.
For	To permit certain owners of fishing boats to receive medical care at Public Health Service hospitals	Public Law 88-424.
For	To increase benefits of widows, children, and retired people under social security program	Passed House and Senate.
For	Passage of wilderness bill	Public Law 88-577.
Announced for	Ice Age National Scientific Reserve	Passed House.
Paired for	To authorize Savery-Pot Hook, Bostwick Park, and Fruitland Mesa projects in Colorado and Wyoming	Public Law 88-568.
Against	To restrict Navy to use of private shipyards for at least 35 percent of its ship conversion and repair program	Approved.
For	Final passage of Department of Defense appropriations	Public Law 88-446.
For	To support President Johnson's action in southeast Asia	Public Law 88-408.
For	To substitute Senate passed poverty bill for that before the House of Representatives	Approved.
For	Final passage of bill	Public Law 88-452.
For	To revise pensions for veterans of World Wars I and II, and Korean war, and their widows and children	Passed House and Senate.
For	To tighten requirements of District of Columbia Charitable Solicitation Act	Passed House.
For	To pay U.S. share of expenses of International Commission for Supervision and Control in Laos	Public Law 88-468.
Against	To kill funds for research and development of National Aeronautics and Space Administration	Rejected.
For	To extend Housing, Urban Renewal and Community Facilities Act which will benefit lumber industry	Public Law 88-560.
For	To increase authorizations for aiding construction of fishing vessels	Public Law 88-498.
For	To appropriate additional funds for Education and Labor Committee	Rejected.
For	To express sense of Congress that U.N. members must pay their assessments or lose their vote	Approved.
For	To require farm labor contractors in interstate commerce to register with Secretary of Labor	Public Law 88-582.
For	To increase safety regulations in coal mines	Rejected.
For	To impose quotas on imports of beef, veal, and mutton	Public Law 88-482.
For	To implement International Coffee Agreement (conference report)	Rejected.
For	To impose tax on certain foreign securities in order to restrict foreign borrowing in U.S. capital markets	Public Law 88-563.
For	To guarantee Pacific Northwest electric consumers first call on electrical energy generated by Federal Government in that area	Public Law 88-552.
For	To limit jurisdiction of Federal courts in matters pertaining to reapportionment	Passed House.
For	To establish National Council on Arts	Public Law 88-579.
For	To study sea-level canal to supplement Panama Canal	Public Law 88-609.
For	To coordinate programs designed to protect fish and wildlife from injury due to use of pesticides	Passed House and Senate.
Against	Motion to modify definition of friendly governments in connection with Public Law 480 shipments of surplus farm commodities	Approved.
For	To extend food for peace and other Public Law 480 surplus food programs in Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act.	Awaiting signature.
Against	To forgive Government loans to physicians and dentists who studied under Health Professions Educational Assistance Act	Rejected.
For	Supplemental appropriations bill, including funds for 2d District Job Corps camps	Passed House and Senate.
For	To cooperate with State of Wisconsin in administering Ice Age National Scientific Reserve	Passed House and Senate.
For	To permit continuing appropriations for Federal agencies	Rejected.
For	Extension of National Defense Education Act and Federal program of assistance to schools in areas affected by Federal installations.	Passed House and Senate.

MY RECORD IN CONGRESS

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Powell] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, this year marks the close of 20 years in Congress, and during the last 4, I served as the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor. I would like to report today on what has happened during these 4 years.

I have brought to Harlem the first senior citizens apartment house built under the Community Facilities Act at 124th Street and Mount Morris Park. I have brought to Harlem, through the Manpower Development Act which came out of my committee the first training center, JOIN, at East 104th Street. I have brought to Harlem, the first and only middle-income cooperative, the Clayton Apartments, 135th and Lenox Avenue. I have brought to Harlem the first massive attack on the problems of our teenagers—HARYOU-ACT.

I have brought to Harlem the only Small Business Administration project in Manhattan to train Harlem businessmen and to lend them up to $15,000 without any security.

CIVIL RIGHTS

The civil rights bill is now the law of the land. Before this legislation was sent to the Judiciary Committee from the White House, my committee had already passed what is now title IV—which set up the machinery in the Office of Education to assist the schools in desegregating; title VI—which withholds Federal funds from public agencies engaging in discriminatory practices, a concept which I created in 1954, then called the "Powell amendment"; and title VII—the Fair Employment Practices Commission, which I first proposed when I came to Congress 20 years ago.

Under my chairmanship, in 4 years, 32 laws have been passed.

Teaching hospital for Howard University, $30 million.

National Council of the Arts, $150,000.

Fair labor standards amendments, $1,867,160.

Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, amendment (no funds needed).

Labor Department, Assistant Secretary, $25,000.

Metal and nonmetallic mines (study), $100,000.

District of Columbia disability compensation, $325,000.

Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act, $858,000.

Work Hours Act (no funds needed).

Railroad unemployment insurance account, reimbursement, $18,441.

Federal Employees' Compensation Amendments to include employees of Canal Zone (no funds needed).

Registration of contractors of migrant workers (no funds needed).

The war on poverty bill (Economic Opportunity Act of 1964), $947,500,000.

Juvenile delinquency, $15 million.

Vocational Education Act, $123,500,000.

Manpower Development and Training Act, $407 million.

Higher Education Facilities Act, $378 million.

Extend National Defense Education Act; extend impacted areas, $740 million.

Opportunities for women: Practical Nurse Training Extension Act, $5 million. Equal pay for equal work, $340,000.

General education and labor aid: Amendment to Library Services Act, $45 million.

National School Lunch Act, $324,890,000.

Teachers for the deaf, $1,500,000.

Education of the blind, $875,000.

Captioned films for the deaf, $1,500,000.

President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped, $400,000.

Davis-Bacon Act, $242,000.

Commission on Automation, $1 million.

My friends, this is my record. I have fought hard and won many battles. I have passed, in 4 years, 32 public laws. In these 4 years, these laws which I have just enumerated total $6,843,125,433—spent or appropriated. Beginning in 1965, these laws will bring annually about $4 billion for the people who need education and need protection in labor.

THE FUTURE

But I am not content. This is just a beginning. I vow that I will continue to fight.

I will fight for tripling the funds now available under the Economic Opportunity Act. I believe that we should spend at least as much money on the war on poverty for American citizens as we spend for foreign aid.

I will fight for including surplus food in our poverty program so that no American will go hungry. I will fight for a shorter workweek. I will fight for a $2 an hour minimum wage.

I will fight for extending the minimum wage, for men and women, to cover agricultural processing workers, hotel, restaurant, and bar employees and laundry workers. I will fight for a massive Federal program to immediately employ all those who are physically able.

I will fight for improvement of our education system so that every child is trained for a job, so that any person who wishes to obtain a college education may do so. I will fight for vastly increased Federal aid to education. I will fight for strong migratory labor laws.

I shall continue to fight until every single one of us is able to live the full life in the great society.

I am your servant.

THE 1964 WHEAT PROGRAM

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PURCELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, this Chamber has been the scene of some unfounded charges directed at the 1964 wheat program and the Department of Agriculture's administration of that program. I wish to address myself to those statements—made on the floor of the House on September 16, 22, and 28.

The Congressman from Illinois leveled three general charges at the Department of Agriculture—charges which cannot stand up under close scrutiny. The following three allegations were the basis of the Congressman's remarks:

First. That the Secretary of Agriculture is "dumping" CCC-owned wheat and that this is depressing the U.S. farm price.

Second. That the U.S. domestic price—being lower than the U.S. export price—represents a denial to American farmers of the world price.

Third. That the higher U.S. export price is responsible for the failure of U.S. export shipments to rise as rapidly as world shipments.

Those are the charges that the Congressman from Illinois has directed at the Department of Agriculture. Permit me, Mr. Speaker, to sort out these charges and factually deal with them one by one, for the fact that they were accorded the respectability of being aired in this House makes it necessary that their fallacies be exposed.

First, the charge that the Secretary of Agriculture is "dumping" wheat owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation is without foundation. There has been no "dumping."

The Commodity Credit Corporation sold 104.3 million bushels of wheat from July 1 through September 18, 1964. Most of this wheat has been of the class Hard Red Winter with smaller amounts of Hard Red Spring wheat. An extremely small quantity of Soft White and Soft Red wheat has been sold by CCC so far this marketing year. As shown in the following table, the total quantity sold by CCC this year is appreciably above the amount sold in any of the previous 3 years. This apparently is as deeply as the Congressman from Illinois considered the matter before leveling the "dumping" charges.

Wheat: CCC sales and dispositions, July 1 through mid-September

[In million bushels]

	1961	1962	1963	1964
Total sales and dispositions	67.4	39.4	65.7	104.3
For export	40.9	37.1	47.1	69.2
For domestic use	26.5	2.3	18.6	35.1

Commodity Credit Corporation sales are in response to market demands. Sales are only made when the price of wheat is high relative to the effective loan rate. Hard Red wheat and Hard Red Spring wheat prices have been abnormally high relative to the effective loan rate since July 1, as shown on the following table:

Wheat: Average monthly terminal market prices less effective loan rates, July, August, and September,[1] 1962, 1963, and 1964

	No. 1 Hard Red Winter Wheat			No. 1 Dark Northern Spring Wheat—Minneapolis	No. 1 Hard Amber Durum Wheat—Minneapolis	No. 1 Soft White Wheat—Portland	No. 2 Soft Red Winter Wheat	
	Kansas City	Fort Worth	Portland				Chicago	St. Louis
1962:								
July	+0.02	+0.18	+0.11	+0.06	+0.04	+0.25	−0.02	−0.01
August	−.03	+.15	+.05	+.00	−.05	+.23	−.08	−.07
September	−.04	+.14	+.02	−.01	−.14	+.18	−.13	−.11
1963:								
July	+.01	+.20	+.25	+.17	+.09	+.06	−.15	−.15
August	+.05	+.20	+.18	+.07	−.03	+.06	−.17	−.16
September	+.09	+.19	+.26	+.18	−.03	+.12	−.05	−.02
1964:								
July	+.14	+.22	+.34	+.12	+.13	+.16	−.03	−.11
August	+.16	+.23	+.34	+.14	+.04	+.14	−.01	−.02
September [1]	+.19	+.23	+.32	+.20	+.05	+.10	+.01	+.01

[1] September 1964 through the 25th only.

The cash prices for these wheats have been high because farmers in areas where these classes of wheat are produced have been receiving payments for certificates earned by voluntarily agreeing to participate in the 1964 wheat program; because of the more liberal, simplified policy with respect to farm-stored wheat; because the monthly carrying charges on CCC-owned wheat have been increased this year; and because the new wheat standards became effective on June 1, 1964.

The hard wheat markets have not been able to obtain a sufficient quantity of wheat at prices that are reasonable in relation to the effective loan rate. The above table documents the relationship between the market price and effective loan rate for this and the 2 previous years. Notice the relatively wide disparity between the cash price and effective loan rate for the first 3 months for the 1964 marketing year for the Hard Red Winter and Spring wheats—the classes that have been sold in quantity by CCC. At Kansas City, the cash price is currently about 110 percent of the effective loan. The effective loan includes current year storage charges to date of sale.

All CCC sales for domestic use have been at or above the legal minimum of 105 percent of the loan rate plus reasonable carrying charges. This year the monthly carrying charges on CCC wheat are 1.5 cents a bushel—in prior years charges were 1 cent per bushel a month.

When cash market prices are above the effective loan rate by a greater amount than has been true in previous years it is impossible to conclude that CCC has been "dumping" wheat.

The above table documents the fact that soft wheat prices are high relative to previous experience. It also shows that the cash price for Soft Red wheat has been about the same as the effective loan rate both at Chicago and St. Louis. As is obvious from this table, an adequate supply of Soft Red wheat has been available to the Kansas City and St. Louis markets at a price below the CCC statutory minimum—they have not demanded an additional supply of wheat.

It is fortunate that market needs for the soft wheats have been fulfilled at prices reasonable in relation to the effective loan rate. The following table clearly shows that CCC could not influence the price of Soft White or Red wheat even if market prices had been out of line relative to the effective loan rate. CCC-owned stocks of Soft Red wheat were less than half a million bushels on July 1. Thus, if every bushel of Soft Red wheat in CCC hands had been sold—and it has not been—the total would have been equivalent to less than one-half of 1 percent of total sales and dispositions by CCC. Second, CCC-owned stocks of Soft Red wheat on July 1 represented two-tenths of 1 percent of the new crop of Soft Red wheat. The percentages with respect to Soft White wheat are similar.

Wheat: CCC-owned stocks, July 1, 1964, and 1964 production, estimated by classes

[In million bushels]

	Class of wheat				
	Hard Winter	Hard Spring	Durum	Soft White	Soft Red
CCC stocks	613.7	178.3	38.1	0.6	0.5
Production	638.3	180.3	61.3	184.0	226.1
Stocks as percent of production	96.1	98.9	62.2	.3	0.2

Under these circumstances, it is impossible to visualize how CCC could hold down the price of Soft Red wheat. On the contrary, all actions the Department has taken, mentioned above, tend to strengthen prices relative to the support level.

Wheat prices are lower this year than last. However, it is a fact that the 1964 voluntary wheat certificate program authorized a national average loan rate 4 cents a bushel higher than would have been the case if those voting with the Congressman from Illinois last April had managed to defeat the wheat-cotton bill. Soft red wheat prices would have been lower than they now are, in response to the lower loan rate and the added supply that would have been produced by those choosing to divert wheat acreage after passage of the Agricultural Act of 1964. In view of this, the Congressman's complaint about the wheat-corn price relationship also has a very hollow ring. The Congressman from Illinois has voted—in fact—for even cheaper wheat.

Fortunately, the loan level does not represent the participating farmers' only wheat income—as would have been the case without new legislation. The 1964 program provides for additional payments in the form of certificates for participants share of the national crop going into domestic food use—and for a part of the export market. The domestic certificate is worth 70 cents a bushel—the export certificate 25 cents.

Thus, participating wheat growers this year are assured of $2 a bushel—national average—for wheat sold for domestic food use and have, so far this marketing year, obtained returns—including the value of certificates—equivalent to $1.76 a bushel on their entire production.

The second charge was that the United States is denying farmers the benefits of the higher world price which is not the case.

Recall the national average loan rate would have been $1.26 instead of the $1.30 a bushel provided under the 1964 voluntary certificate plan. The 1964 wheat crop would have exceeded the 1,290 million bushels now in prospect. Additional production coupled with a lower market price support level undoubtedly would have resulted in a lower season average price than will obtain.

Wheat from the United States would have been available to importing countries at a market price reflecting this lower loan rate and excess supply position. Other wheat exporting countries would have been forced to lower the price of wheat to meet this competition. In view of current world wheat prospects for the 1964–65 marketing year, the lower world price probably would not have resulted in an increase in sales. The current wheat program, authorizing export certificates, has prevented this potential loss to all exporting countries from becoming a reality.

Therefore, it seems clear that the 1964 wheat program contributes to a higher world price and because of this, returns from exports will be higher than they would have been in the absence of legislation.

Export certificates, authorized by the Agricultural Act of 1964, simultaneously help improve farm income and insure continued world wheat price stability at a higher level than would be the case without the act. The difference between the cost of wheat to the exporter—including the export certificates—and the price necessary to keep U.S. wheat competitive in world markets is refunded to the exporter. A higher world price simply means a lower subsidy payment.

Certificate operations do not depress the price to the U.S. farmer. On the contrary, total returns to U.S. farmers—especially those participating in the program—are considerable above what the free market would provide.

Finally, it was charged that the higher export price is responsible for the failure of U.S. export shipments to rise as rapidly as world shipments. The facts show otherwise.

The U.S. export price is 10 cents a bushel higher than it was a year ago. This is mainly due to the abnormal pattern and level of world wheat trade last year. The competitive ability of the United States to export wheat is exactly as good as it was under previous years' programs. It is unchanged. The policy was—and continues to be—to make U.S. wheat available at a price competitive in world markets. Our wheat has been and continues to be subsidized to the extent necessary to make it sell—but without being dumped.

In addition to a 15-billion bushel error in the Congressman's data on Canadian-export sales, he apparently is unaware of the fact that the bulk of the exports by Canada, Australia, and Argentina so far this marketing year are to Red China, Eastern Europe, and the Soviet Union. In view of Congressman FINDLEY's opposition to U.S. trade with Communist countries his concern over our share of the market is an ironic one.

The Secretary of Agriculture has had a difficult job in administering the 1964 program in such a way as to protect wheat growers from the tremendous loss in income that they seemed to be facing following the 1963 referendum. I submit that he is doing an outstanding job—as evidenced by the fact that some $450 million in income is being restored to growers above what they would have received without the new program.

THE TEXTILE FIBER PRODUCTS IDENTIFICATION ACT

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KORNEGAY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced amendatory legislation aimed at furnishing American consumers fuller information under the terms of the Textile Fiber Products Identification Act.

As we know, protection of the consumer was the paramount legislative intent in the original passage of this act. Prior to its enactment, there had been misuse of certain popular fiber names in the labeling and advertising of some products.

To eliminate the risk of deceptive merchandising practices, the Textile Fiber Products Identification Act specifically prohibited any mention of fibers present in a fabric in amounts of 5 percent or less.

At the time the act was made into law, this provision was certainly considered in the best interests of our consuming public. Textile industry experts agreed that no fiber as then used could contribute meaningfully to the properties of any fabric unless present in amounts of more than 5 percent.

However, such are the dynamics of the American textile industry that this proscription is now, as it applies to at least one fiber, a legal anachronism, serving to hinder rather than aid consumer interests. The fact that fibers can contribute to the performance of fabrics, in lesser amounts than those provided by the present law, was acknowledged not long ago by the Federal Trade Commission.

In its revised regulations under the Wool Products Labeling Act, the FTC allowed for the disclosure of any fiber present in the product which has a clearly established and definite functional significance, regardless of the amount. I am advised that the language of the Textile Fiber Products Identification Act does not permit a conforming administrative change. Amendment must be by legislative action.

Thus, my own amendment to the Textile Fiber Products Identification Act would eliminate the rigid 5 percent rule in those cases where a fiber content of less than this amount does serve a significant and functional purpose.

Perhaps a word of explanation is in order. A particular manmade fiber has been developed, namely spandex, whose properties are such as to impart excellent elastic qualities to many textile products even though used in quantities of less than 5 percent. Spandex is a generic name which embraces several brand-name fibers. These fibers and their promotion are important to fabric mills, garment makers and retailers. As a result, we are not talking about an amendment for the benefit of a segment of the industry.

I believe the foregoing represents sufficient practical arguments for adopting this amendment to the Textile Fiber Products Identification Act. But there is another factor, that of cost. Spandex is an expensive fiber. If spandex is properly used in smaller quantities, the cost saving can be passed on to the consumer in the form of lower prices.

Of course, this use of spandex has no value to either producer or consumer unless this dramatic story—the remarkable stretch properties added by these small amounts of spandex—can be told to the public effectively through specific mention of spandex. If industry cannot mention spandex in advertisements and extend that advertising to the garments by reference to spandex on the labels, it is left without fully and properly informing the customer of the difference between a fabric containing spandex and a rigid fabric. Moreover, in the case of consumers who are aware of the contribution of spandex, the trade is deprived of any effective means of alerting their customers to the presence of the desired spandex in a particular fabric or garment.

My amendment thus modernizes the Textile Fiber Products Identification Act and thereby recognizes the tremendous technological strides taken by the textile industry. While only one new fiber appears to benefit from this change, I believe it may well provide the incentive for the development of new fibers which may equally benefit the consuming public. Further, it brings the Textile Act into conformity with present practices allowed under the Wool Products Labeling Act.

BOISE, IDAHO AND PELILEO, ECUADOR PARTNERS IN ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS SELF-HELP PROGRAM

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. HARDING] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARDING. Mr. Speaker, the other day I had the pleasure of flying from my home State to Washington, D.C., with a distinguished visitor from Ecuador. My companion was Dr. Jorge Garcia, the mayor of a small Andean town named Pelileo.

Dr. Garcia also serves as the president of the Pelileo town plan committee as well as performing the many duties that have fallen to him as the director of the small hospital. He is indeed a remarkable man and I was happy to have the opportunity to get to know him.

Another companion on that flight was Mr. Leo Ruelas, the director of the food for peace program in our economic mission in Quito, Ecuador, and the official escort of Dr. Garcia on his visit to the United States. Mr. Ruelas also served as interpreter for the doctor.

Learning that Dr. Garcia's schedule allowed him to spend a few days in our Nation's Capitol before returning to his home, I invited him to join me at lunch so that we might continue our visit. We were joined by the senior Senator from Idaho, Senator FRANK CHURCH, and afterward showed the doctor some of the sights of our Capitol Building.

The primary purpose of Dr. Garcia's visit to the United States was to participate in the Annual Institute of the Boise Valley World Affairs Association, held on September 25–26 in Boise, Idaho. The theme of the Institute was "The Power of the Alliance for Progress." At one of the sessions, Dr. Garcia spoke on the subject "What the Alliance Means to Us."

Other speakers at the 12th annual institute were Mr. James H. Boren, Director of the Partners of the Alliance program, AID, from Washington, D.C.; Mr. Leo Ruelas; Dr. Boyd Martin, dean, college of letters and sciences, University of Idaho, Moscow, Idaho; and Mr. John Chapman, Boise attorney.

Dr. Martin and Mr. Chapman were members of a four-man Idaho team sent recently to Ecuador on behalf of the Idaho Partners of the Alliance Committee. This Idaho team, which also included Mr. Gayle Allen and Mr. George Wilhelm, both of Boise, traveled extensively within Ecuador to observe self-help projects being carried out by rural communities throughout the country. Such a visit enabled them to formulate the general pattern of the Partners program they are launching to help Ecuadoreans who are in turn attempting to help themselves.

Pelileo was one of the towns visited by the Idaho group. They were met and greeted by hundreds of the villagers led by their mayor, Dr. Garcia. One of the main projects that Idaho has undertaken in the partners program is the town plan of Pelileo.

The town plan is an imperical approach to community development. U.S. mission personnel visit communities from which assistance has been requested and in which self-help methods and achievements have been demonstrated. A committee is formed, and with this committee, the problems of the community are identified, established in a priority order, and local resources are pooled to solve these problems.

The municipal council contributes land, the provincial council contributes money, the cooperatives and unions provide the labor, the National Government renders technical assistance, the United States joins the town alliance by contributing excess property, Public Law 480 commodities, limited cash, and some technical assistance. Thus a town plan is formed with this criteria.

The projects of the Pelileo Town Plan include the need to provide a potable water supply, improve irrigation and soil conservation methods, develop small manufacturing plants, construct a fruit cannery, and institute terrace planting. The team was highly impressed with the self-help efforts of the people of Pelileo in the long road back to recovery. The town was destroyed by a mighty earthquake in 1949 that leveled every building, took 7,000 lives, yet did not take the will of the people to make their city live again. They have been rebuilding since.

Mr. Wade B. Fleetwood, special assistant in the Partners of the Alliance program, within the Agency for International Development, is an Idahoan and former executive secretary to Senator FRANK CHURCH. Mr. Fleetwood represented our State in Pelileo last May and visited with the town plan committee prior to the arrival of the Idaho team. He has told me of the respect and admiration he holds for Dr. Garcia and his work in Pelileo.

Toward the goal of realizing a new Pelileo, the final papers of an agreement between the Idaho Partners of the Alliance and the Pelileo Town Plan Committee, represented by Dr. Garcia, were signed in Boise last Saturday. Idaho thus pledged, through the participation of the State's private sector, to help in technical and other types of assistance.

Idaho was one of the early leaders of the nearly 17 States that are now participating in the Partners of the Alliance program. These States range all the way from Idaho and Oregon in the West, to Texas and Alabama in the South, to New Jersey and Massachusetts in the East, and to Michigan in the North. The paramount feature of the partners program is the direct participation of people in cooperation with people in areas of Latin America in helping in the completion of projects seeking to better living conditions in the Americas. Toward the objective of meeting these basic needs, Idahoans are proud to be working partners. It was our privilege to have Dr. Garcia in our midst to discuss the needs and objectives of both groups in the work they are doing.

Mr. Speaker, as background material on the visit of Dr. Garcia to Idaho, I ask that, under the permission heretofore granted me by unanimous consent of the House, newspaper accounts be included following my remarks:

[From the Idaho Daily Statesman, Boise, Idaho, Sept. 25, 1964]

ECUADOR MAYOR ARRIVES FOR ANNUAL INSTITUTE OF WORLD AFFAIRS GROUP

Idaho's partnership with Ecuador in the Alliance for Progress has had a tremendous impact on that South American republic, a director of the program said Thursday.

James H. Boren is in Boise to take part in the Boise Valley World Affairs Association annual institute tonight and Saturday, which has as its subject: "The Power of the Alliance for Progress."

Boren is the director of the Partners of the Alliance Programs of which there are 17 in as many States. Twelve other States are organizing partnership programs with sister Latin American countries and states, Boren pointed out.

EFFORT LAUDED

Boren praised Idaho's efforts in organizing its partnership with Ecuador. "I think that Idaho is doing a wonderful job," he said. "This program also has the active interest of Senators CHURCH and JORDAN. And I don't want to forget John Chapman and Byron Johnson," he added. Chapman and Johnson, both Boise attorneys, are cochairman of the Idaho Partners, which is a privately sponsored organization.

Boren, a former administrative assistant to Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH, Democrat, of Texas, said the Idaho organization was formed in the spirit of the original concept of the Alliance "that it is an alliance of all the people."

Boren took his present post a year ago after working 2 years with the Peruvian alliance plan. He described the program further: "What distinguishes the Alliance from past foreign assistance programs is that we are now stressing not grants, but loans. But it's more basic than that. We're helping countries build their own institutions to work out their own problems."

A VITAL FORCE

George Eidam, institute chairman of the Boise association, said his group is presenting this year's program in the belief that the Alliance is a vital force in stemming the tide of Communist infiltration in Latin Amerca.

Boren will speak at 7:30 this evening and he will be followed by Leo Ruelas, one of the directors to the United States aid mission at Quito, capital of Ecuador.

The institute will continue through Saturday at the Boise Junior College Science Auditorium.

The Saturday program will start at 1:30 p.m., with a talk by Dr. Boyd Martin, dean of the college of letters and sciences, the University of Idaho, entitled "What the Alliance Means to the Western Hemisphere."

Dr. Jorge Garcia, mayor of Pelileo, one of the Ecuadorian towns, visited by the initial organizers of the Idaho Partners, will tell "What the Alliance Means to Ecuador."

Chapman will open the Saturday evening session at 7:30 and a panel discussion, moderated by Milton Small, will close the institute.

[From the Idaho Daily Statesman, Boise, Idaho, Sept. 26, 1964]

WORLD AFFAIRS GROUP TOLD U.S. AID RECIPIENTS SHOULD RESPOND TO HELP

The power of the Alliance for Progress lies in a fundamental principle underlying it, that the people of a country receiving U.S. aid must respond with self-help efforts before the Alliance is complete.

This was the sentiment expressed by two officials of the Alliance, who spoke at the opening session of the 12th annual Institute of the Boise Valley World Affairs Association Friday night.

Two sessions this afternoon and tonight will complete the institute, which is being held at the Science Lecture Hall Auditorium on the Boise Junior College campus.

SOLVE PROBLEMS

A basic premise of the Alliance plan, said James H. Boren, director of the Partners of the Alliance program, is that people of the sister South American republics, states, counties and towns build their own institutions to solve problems.

A working example of this, he said, is the town plan, organized earlier this year with the aid of Idahoans in Pelileo, Ecuador. Idaho was one of the earliest of 17 States to join the Kennedy administration program as a "partner." As such, it has adopted Ecuador as its sister state.

Also in Boise to take part in the institute are Leo L. Ruelas, director of the food for peace program of the Alliance mission to Quito, Ecuador, and Dr. Jorge Garcia, mayor of Pelileo. Dr. Garcia will appear on this afternoon's program.

FIRST PLAN

Ruelas Friday night said the Pelileo town plan is the first in which a partner of the Alliance has taken part. Some of its problems, he pointed out are similar to those of the Gem State. It is located in mountainous country and is attempting to develop both industrially and agriculturally.

One of the priority problems, he said, is creating a potable water supply and bringing water down the mountains for irrigation. Soil conservation also is of concern to officials of the town plan. The neighboring countryside grows in addition to fruit such as peaches and pears, a product known as "cabuya" or hemp.

The town plan idea, said Ruelas, has grown from an old Indian custom known as minga, which essentially is a project wherein the individual donates a day of work for the good of the community.

AMONG PROJECTS

"We went into the communities and formed committees to discuss problems they might have," he said. "Then we asked the question: 'Which ones have priority?' "

Among future projects at Pelileo will be the development of a hemp-manufacturing plant, construction of a cannery and a demonstration of terrace planting on the hilly countryside.

Ruelas, a native of California with a master's degree in education, said he became a "new frontiersman" by joining the Alliance 2½ years ago. He described the town plan idea as a "social development project."

"We will realize a complete alliance when the people demonstrate they are willing and ready to help themselves," he said.

AID VILLAGE

Dr. Garcia, in an interview, said he was at first amazed, then gratified at the willingness exhibited by foreigners to come to the aid of his village. He said through an interpreter he is still "awed" with the interest in his people's welfare by the visiting Idahoans. He said it is the hope of his people that the initial enthusiasm will not wane.

Speakers today and their topics are: Dr. Boyd Martin, University of Idaho, "What the Alliance Means to Me"; Dr. Garcia, "What the Alliance Means to Us"; John Chapman, Boise attorney, "Idaho Partners of the Alliance."

All institute speakers will take part in a final panel discussion entitled "The Power of the Alliance."

PEOPLE-TO-PEOPLE EFFORT: ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS HAILED AT BOISE MEET

The United States in its foreign policy must meet the Communist challenge in the underdeveloped areas of the world in Asia, Africa, and Latin America, Dr. Boyd Martin, dean of the college of letters and sciences at the University of Idaho, said Saturday.

Dr. Martin spoke at a meeting of the 12th annual institute of the Boise Valley World Affairs Association at Boise Junior College. The institute was concluded Saturday night with a panel discussion on "The Power of the Alliance for Progress."

Martin said the Alliance was one method of meeting the Communist challenge and that it offers the means to "mobilize the best we have against human misery, illiteracy, disease, poverty and injustice, the very things on which communism feeds."

"Expanding the economy, improving the social order and improving the political mores of less developed areas of the world is imperative to our own salvation," said Martin.

CITES UNDERDEVELOPED

"Even in the free world, two-thirds of the people reside in economically underdeveloped areas. Of the 120 countries of the world, 75 are underdeveloped. Of the 3 billion people in the world, 60 percent are living in abject poverty. The Communists control 1 billion of the 3 billion people.

"The real question facing the United States and the Western Hemisphere is this:

"What economic system, what political order, what social structure will these people in these 75 underdeveloped countries representing one and a quarter billion people, choose as alternative to poverty and disease? Will they turn to an ultra-materialistic system, denying human freedom? Or will they choose a new level of well-being through political democracy?

"The outcome depends on worldwide competition for minds and stomachs of men in these areas. The real threat comes from beyond our borders and the influence of the massive success of the Soviet system in the world. The Russian people, for example, have the highest standard of living they have ever known, although it is far less than that of the United States."

LOSS COULD BE FATAL

Martin said the "loss of South America could be fatal to the United States and the free world," and warned that "we could have another South Vietnam in any part of South America on our hands."

He said the Alliance "is not a program for the fainthearted because the Communists compete vigorously. They will engage in disorganization while we engage in a constructive program."

Mrs. Boyd Martin presented a personal check for $1,000 to Dr. Jorge Garcia, the mayor of Pelileo, Ecuador, and one of two medical doctors in that community.

In addition, Martin Nelson, president of the Boise Valley World Affairs Association, presented to Garcia a plaque on behalf of the people of Boise.

A partnership agreement was signed by Mayor Eugene Shellworth and Mayor Garcia under a "people-to-people" program whereby the people of Boise and Idaho seek to help the people of Pelileo and Ecuador to help themselves.

CIVIL RIGHTS CASES SHOULD HAVE TRIAL BY JURY

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MATTHEWS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit a very timely editorial which appeared in the St. Augustine Record, of St. Augustine, Fla., in its issue of Sunday, September 27, 1964.

I hope many Americans will read this article to ascertain that Americans are not receiving a trial by jury as they deserve. Those of us who spoke against and worked against the passage of the civil rights bill pointed out time and time again that the bill would deny basic constitutional rights to many citizens. This has come to pass, as pointed out so effectively in the article which follows:

Law, Justice in County Feel Lash of Federal Court Power

St. Augustine has felt, perhaps more than any other city, the lash of Federal judicial infringement on the rights of citizens and the constitutional powers of local and State courts.

"We the jury find the defendant guilty or not guilty," are words that have meant the very foundation upon which justice for individuals and our judicial system has been built. Under our constitution every man has the right of trial by jury, if he so desires.

But, in these times when States rights are looked upon as sort of a crackpot belief by the Federal Government, the words of "We the jury," as applied to justice in St. John's County has been changed it seems, by the Federal court judge to read: "I, Federal District Judge Bryan Simpson find."

Proceedings in the Federal district court for the year show that the aging district judge sits indivisibly as judge, jury, and prosecuting attorney whenever white citizens of the county are brought before him on petitions filed by integrationists.

He has established himself as the law in St. Johns County when the so-called question of civil rights is concerned.

Other judges, lawyers, and persons familiar with the personal as well as property rights of individuals and judicial proceedings have expressed alarm over some of the court actions of Judge Simpson. These persons, for obvious reasons, prefer that their names not be mentioned.

During the past year over 500 cases involving misdemeanors by Negro and white civil rights advocates have been moved from our municipal, county, and State courts to the Federal district courts by the "snap of the finger," so to speak. These same 500 cases involve breaking of the laws of the municipality of St. Augustine, St. Johns County, and the State of Florida.

In most incidents, the defendants publicly broke the law—some giving notice to the press ahead of time of their intention to do so.

Cases have been taken directly before Judge Simpson, or appealed directly to the Federal court from the municipal, justice of the peace, and circuit courts without following the proper judicial course of law. Our State courts have been sidetracked.

There seems to have been a hot line between civil rights attorneys and Judge Simpson. Petitions by Negroes are granted quickly, and white defendants have been ordered to appear in the district court on short notice. In all cases against white defendants, rulings have been made.

But, over 500 cases against integrationists, some of them a year old, sit in the Federal district court and the Federal court of appeals. Some observers are inclined to believe that they will be there for a long time.

There have been so many petitions, appeals, and counterappeals that it is confusing as to the exact number of cases pending. But, Judge Chas. C. Mathis, Jr., has over 490 case which have been transferred from his court to the Federal court during the past year. There are over 150 more cases being held up by the county judge's court, pending Federal court rulings of similar cases.

Usually there is a $25 fee to file cases in the Federal court. It is understood that this fee in the some 500 cases has been waived, so it is not costing the integrationists anything. The legal staff, headed by Tobias Simon of Miami, is furnished the plaintiffs, and the bonds set in the cases have not been paid.

The grounds for petitioning that cases be transferred to the Federal court is that the plaintiffs claim that they cannot obtain a fair trial in St. Johns County. This, of course, is an insult to the integrity of our city, county, and State courts, and the people of St. Johns County.

As one observer said: "How do they know they can't get a fair trial? They never go to trial."

Judge Mathis, who has gained a reputation during his many years on the bench, as a fair judge without playing favorites, had this to say:

"The faith and confidence of the lawyers, laymen, and law-enforcement officers in the Federal judiciary system has been shaken, if not destroyed, by the action of the Federal District Court in Jacksonville in cases entertained and considered as civil rights cases. The citizens of St. Johns County now see this court as a threat to their freedom rather than as a guardian of their rights."

Justice of the Peace G. Marvin Grier, from whose court some cases have been petitioned to the Federal court, commented: "I do not believe that recent decisions of Judge Simpson are in keeping with the best traditions and ethics of American jurisprudence.

"I do believe that failure to render prompt decisions on petitions to transfer local cases to the U.S. court is rendering impotent the municipal, county, and State courts and is gradually breaking down all concepts of law and order."

When racial strife was at its height here, Judge Simpson made conditions worse by ruling that police could not place a ban on night demonstrations, and even issued an order requiring the Governor of Florida to show cause why he should not be held in contempt of court when he ordered such a ban on night demonstrations to preserve law and order.

Such bans were granted and put into effect in many northern cities where Negro rioters ran amok.

Chief of Police Virgil Stuart, in reviewing racial trouble which existed here, stresses that it is essential to law and order that demonstrations, mass meetings, parades, public gathering, chanting, singing, etc., be regulated by city ordinance.

"By using this permit method the police department has heretofore always been able to regulate meetings, public gatherings and parades so that they would not conflict with other similar activities," the chief said.

But the Federal courts issued a restraining order which in effect nullified the right of the police department and the city of St. Augustine to control the movements of large groups of people over the public streets and public parks.

"The results of the court order created mass confusion whereby large groups of people marched in the public streets at any time of the day and night. In our efforts to control and stop riots as provided under the city ordinance governing disorderly crowds we ordered the leaders to discontinue these mass demonstrations, parades, public meetings, etc. upon public property. Again the court ruled against the city of St. Augustine and the police department stating that it had no right to issue such an order notwithstanding the fact that many violations of laws occurred, including numerous juveniles and minors violating our curfew laws," Chief Stuart added.

Stressing that most of the trouble occurred at night, Chief of Police Stuart added that "the Federal courts through their orders restraining the law enforcement agencies have caused police to almost completely lose control of the law enforcement in the city."

Mayor Joseph A. Shelley said:

"Although I was personally treated with courtesy by Judge Simpson, it is my opinion that the judge deviated from normal courtroom procedure to such a degree as to make it difficult for defense attorneys to properly represent their clients. His actions indicated that he may have prejudiced a hearing before all the facts were presented."

City Commissioner James Lindsley said he felt that "Judge Simpson has greatly overstepped his bounds as a Federal magistrate, and has done St. Augustine a terrible disservice, both to the white and colored citizens."

Commissioner Harry Gutterman stated: That the Federal court by failing to render prompt decisions on the many petitions before it is "rendering impotence to the municipal, county, and State courts," and is contributing to breaking down law and order in the city and county.

Willard Howatt, attorney for the board of county commissioners, commented: "This continual infringement upon the States rights is slowly and surely depriving the people of this county of all their constitutional rights and leading to a dictatorship."

Chairman Dan Mickler and other members of the board of county commissioners have openly condemned rulings by Judge Simpson in regard to law enforcement and court actions in the county.

Sheriff L. O. Davis, who has been a constant visitor before the Federal court in Jacksonville, is now being sued by a white and a Negro integrationist for $20,000 for allegedly not providing them with protection while they were swimming with a group of Negroes at St. Augustine Beach.

Sheriff Davis said he was attempting to "get the trial of the suits in another court for there is no way for a white person from St. Johns County to get a fair trial before Judge Simpson."

Those attending the numerous Federal court sessions say that white witnesses and defendants were often browbeaten by civil rights attorneys, and their statements under oath often questioned by Judge Simpson.

Attorneys for plaintiff had the "run of the court," while attorneys for the defense were often muffed from the bench.

Next to challenging the authority of the Governor and the State of Florida, and ruling that demonstrators could demonstrate at any time at night they choose, the next most controversial decision was Judge Simpson's ruling holding Deputy Sheriff Charles Lance, Jr., in contempt of court for allegedly harassing Negro integrationists, who Lance swore under oath he was protecting instead, and the judge's ruling that Lance must resign as a deputy sheriff.

Lance was ordered to pay $200 toward the fee of attorneys for the Negroes. Tobias Simon, the principal attorney for the plaintiffs, announced to newsmen that the money would be contributed to the NAACP legal defense fund.

In ordering the bonded deputy sheriff to resign, Judge Simpson was quoted by the Associated Press as admitting that "I have no authority to do that, but this is a special case, since he is a nonpaid special deputy."

However, Lance is not a special deputy but a bonded deputy with all of the powers of a deputy sheriff.

The judge's ruling is under appeal to the U.S. Court of Appeals, Fifth Circuit.

Judge Simpson has held one motel operator in contempt of court and ordered 17 other business places to conform to the civil rights law. In Judge Simpson's behalf, it must be said that he refused a petition by attorneys for the Negro plaintiffs that the operators of these 17 places of business be ordered to pay $1,000 each toward their attorney's fees.

Donald E. Buck, county prosecuting attorney, had this to say about the actions of the Federal court:

"The U.S. Federal court judges are appointed by the President, confirmed by the Senate and serve for life. The appointments to the Federal bench are usually political payments doled out by the party in office. The people have no voice in selection of the judges and the people have no power to remove them. Under the present court structure it is virtually impossible to remove a Federal court judge for any reason, including incompetency, senility, indolence, etc."

Aristotle, famous Greek, once wrote "That judges of important causes should hold office for life is not a good thing, for the mind grows old as well as the body."

"Senator Sam J. Ervin, Jr., of North Carolina, said in August 1964: 'It is a tragic hour in our history when Federal laws and Federal court rulings are designed to give demonstrators an immunity from prosecution for their offenses.'

"Insofar as State courts of the United States are concerned today the Federal judge sits invisibly in the State trial court behind the State judge, State prosecutor, and State jury with an absolute despotic power at any time to stop the trial of a criminal defendant with the threat of a jail term to everyone involved in the State trial except the criminal defendant."

Conclusion: The purpose and intent of the above report on recent activities of the Federal judiciary has been compiled in an endeavor to enlighten others concerning recent rulings by Judge Bryan Simpson concerning civil rights cases in St. Augustine.

The report in no way is meant to bring personal ridicule to any man, but rather to point out what is felt to be the injustice of a particular system. We have discussed at length recent actions of the Federal court with many lawyers and judges. Not one lawyer could inform us on what legal basis cases in local courts had been granted appeals to the Federal courts. Not one lawyer could explain under what laws the Federal court had the power to usurp the constituted responsibilities of county and State courts.

We must conclude that if Judge Simpson is acting under the law of the land * * * then the "Law of the land" has ceased to be the "Law of the people."

We suggest that every citizen who feels that the power of the Federal judiciary is infringing the rights of State courts, write their Senator and Congressman and request that they take immediate steps to correct any laws that grant such power to the Federal courts.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Fascell] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, a prime responsibility of the House Committee on Government Operations is to examine and evaluate the efficiency and economy of the operations of the executive branch departments and agencies.

Early in the 88th Congress the Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations was reestablished under that name, after a lapse of some years. I was appointed its chairman. Congressmen Richard E. Lankford, Torbert H. Macdonald, Cornelius Gallagher, John B. Anderson, and Robert McClory were named as members of the subcommittee. The subcommittee's principal obligations pertain to the operations of the Department of Justice, Treasury Department, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, Federal Reserve System, U.S. Tariff Commission, Federal Home Loan Bank Board, Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, Tax Court of the United States, Securities and Exchange Commission, Subversive Activities Control Board, and the National Labor Relations Board.

I am honored to pay tribute to the members of the subcommittee for their diligent and constructive efforts. With pardonable pride, I believe we can say that we have made valuable contributions in this Congress. It is noteworthy, that in everything the subcommittee did there was unanimity of action, clear evidence of the fact that the sole interest of all who served in the subcommittee's efforts was to improve and make more economic the operations of the governmental agencies within our jurisdiction.

In the somewhat less than 2 years of its existence, the subcommittee has held public hearings during seven investigations. Six formal reports have resulted, and another is pending. In addition, the subcommittee has conducted numerous studies and investigations which did not result in formal reports, but in many of which administrative corrections were secured.

As the 88th Congress moves toward its end, it seems fitting to submit a résumé of the accomplishments of the Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations.

The following are synopses of the subcommittee's investigations in which it held extensive hearings which resulted in formal reports approved by the House Committee on Government Operations:

COMMON TRUST FUNDS

Overlapping authority and duplication of regulation by administrative agencies lessens the efficiency of the operations of the executive branch and is wasteful of taxpayers' dollars. The effect on the persons and industries involved is to subject them to confusion and to the hardship and expense of attempting to alleviate the situation thus created.

The common trust funds report resulted from a study of the overlapping of authority and duplication of regulations with respect to the administrative supervision of common trust funds for managing agency accounts. This conflict arose when the Comptroller of the Currency revised Regulation 9 to permit trust departments of national banks to invest collectively in common trust funds moneys received by them for managing agency accounts and Smathers-Keogh Act retirement plans. The Securities and Exchange Commission took the position that such common trust funds were subject to the Securities Act of 1933.

Among other things, the report concluded:

First. Section 584 of the Internal Revenue Code and its antecedents exempted a common trust fund from income tax if maintained by a bank exclusively for the collective investment of moneys contributed by the bank in its capacity as trustee, executor, administrator, or guardian, and in conformity with the regulations of the Federal Reserve Board.

Second. During the quarter century—1936 to 1962—when the Federal Reserve Board supervised common trust fund operations of national banks, the funds were restricted by Board regulations to moneys contributed by banks in their capacities as trustees, executor, administrator, or guardian.

Third. The Securities and Exchange Commission considered such common trust funds exempt from the Investment Company Act of 1940 under the specified exemption in section 3(c)(3) thereof, and from the Securities Act of 1933, as involving no public offerings of securities. The SEC claims that common trust funds of managing agency accounts bear such similarity to mutual funds as to make them amenable to the Securities Act of 1933; and that while an exemption from the 1940 act is available under the act's employees pension trust fund provisions of section 3(c)(13) for common trust funds of Smathers-Keogh accounts, "securities" under the 1933 act are involved.

Fourth. The Comptroller claims total exemption for such common trust funds from the applicability of the securities laws. At about the time of the issuance of the revised regulation—April 5, 1963—the Comptroller requested the Commissioner of Internal Revenue to issue a ruling exempting common trust funds of managing agency accounts from income taxation.

Fifth. Regulation by both the SEC and the Comptroller of the Currency of the operation of common trust funds held in banks for their customers would impose hardships on banks, through the necessity of complying with separate registration, reporting, and other requirements, and the additional legal, operating, and other costs involved. Such duplicate regulation would probably make it uneconomic for banks to handle managing agency accounts in modest amounts or to receive deposits under the provisions of the Smathers-Keogh Act.

Sixth. Whatever ruling the Internal Revenue Service makes on tax status, the matters of conflict and duplication of regulations by the two agencies over the same subject will persist until resolved.

Seventh. Congress has exempted bank securities and common trust funds from the provisions of the 1933 and 1940 acts, in the manner stated in those acts.

The committee recommended that the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce consider legislation which would specifically exempt common trust funds of managing agency accounts and Smathers-Keogh plans from the Federal securities laws and to provide such protection for investors as may be deemed necessary. Such exemption of common trust funds would result in savings of up to $250,000 per year, the estimated prospective cost of SEC supervision.

If recommended legislation is passed it would eliminate: First, expenses of litigation and problems associated therewith; second, duplication of regulation; and third, undue hardship imposed on banks by a dual system of registration and reporting.

Subcommittee member Congressman ANDERSON and I introduced bills for that purpose—H.R. 8499 and H.R. 9410—on which the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee held hearings on June 9 and 11, 1964.

The subcommittee hearings on common trust funds have been printed. The report which followed the hearings is House Report No. 429, issued June 19, 1963.

FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION—ASSUMPTION OF EMPLOYEE BENEFIT COSTS AND CHANGE IN AUDIT DATES

Since 1946 the Comptroller General, in reports to the Congress, had recommended that the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation pay its share of the cost for Federal retirement, disability, and employment compensation costs provided to its employees. Starting in July 1957, the FDIC began to make payments to the civil service retirement and disability fund but had not made any payments from June 16, 1933, to July 1, 1957, nor had the FDIC reimbursed the fund for administration costs. The total reimbursement for payments to the fund including administration costs and interest at the rate of 2 percent is estimated at $5,137,690.

Present law requires the General Accounting Office to audit the FDIC on a fiscal year basis although it reports and operates on a calendar year basis.

Among other things the subcommittee concluded that:

First. The cost of Federal retirement, disability, and employees compensation benefits provided employees of the FDIC, and the costs of administration thereof, insofar as they are not contributed by FDIC, are borne from appropriated funds.

Second. The FDIC supports the Comptroller General's recommendations that it repay the Government's costs if such benefit is not heretofore paid by FDIC.

Third. The payments which FDIC has agreed to make would be payable out of the Corporation's capital fund. Current costs of the FDIC's share of such employee benefits are payable out of its operating and administrative costs.

Fourth. The present requirement of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act that General Accounting Office audits of FDIC be made on a fiscal year basis as of June 30 each year results in confusion, unnecessary duplication of effort, and waste.

The report recommended that the House Banking and Currency Committee consider legislation to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to require the FDIC to make reimbursements for contributions to the civil service retirement fund from June 16, 1933, to June 30, 1957, with interest at the rate of 2 percent to date of payment; to make reimbursement to the Federal employees' compensation fund for payments made from 1943 to June 30, 1962, with interest at the rate of 2 percent to date of payment and to pay into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts a fair share of the cost of administering the civil service retirement system and employees' compensation funds from June 16, 1933, and to require the General Accounting Office to make its audits and reports of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation on a calendar year basis instead of a fiscal year basis.

Payments into the civil service retirement fund, reimbursement to employees' compensation fund, interest, and administrative cost reimbursement by the FDIC would exceed $5,137,689.

There would be other financial savings arising out of change to calendar year auditing, through the elimination of waste and duplication. These, however, while real, are difficult to calculate.

More efficient and economical operation would result, by eliminating duplication, and providing more accurate reporting.

The subcommittee hearings have been printed. The report which followed the hearings is House Report No. 919, issued November 22, 1963.

WINDOW DRESSING IN BANK REPORTS

This report resulted from a study of the call report laws requiring banks to report and publish statements of their condition at the request of Federal supervisory agencies. The study was initiated because of the charge by the Comptroller of the Currency on July 3, 1963, that the supervisory purpose of call reports had fallen into disregard and that this default from sound bank supervision had brought about the widespread practice of window dressing.

Among other things the report concluded:

First. Call reports stating the conditions of banks supervised by agencies of the Federal Government originated with the National Currency Act of 1863, and since 1869 have been required to be stated as of some past date specified by the supervising agency, so as to reflect the actual running conditions of the banks.

Second. Window dressing, as applied to a bank's reports of condition, is the use of temporary non-business-purpose transactions to enable a bank to state a more favorable financial showing on a particular date than would normally be the case.

Third. There are no valid statistics on the extent of window dressing. It is generally known to supervisory agencies to exist in about one-half of the 200 largest banks, with decreasing percentages of prevalence among the smaller banks.

Fourth. Banks which engage in the practice often give but limited publication to the call reports required by law, but widely publicize voluntary statements in which their reported condition is inflated through window dressing.

Fifth. Window dressing is a deceptive, uneconomical practice, which has a tendency to undermine public confidence in the banking industry, with possible resultant adverse consequences to the economy of the Nation.

Sixth. The banking industry as a whole regards window dressing as an undesirable practice which should be stopped; however, individual banks which window dress would be reluctant to stop the practice unless all were required to do so.

Seventh. The supervisory agencies claim to have the means, through their examination staffs, of detecting, or even coping with window dressing; however, utilization of their staffs for that purpose is curtailed because of the difficulty of objectively distinguishing normal transactions from nonpurpose transactions, and lack of an adequate number of examiners.

Eighth. Window dressing in bank reports is not illegal under Federal law, nor have the supervisory agencies issued any rules or regulations forbidding or limiting its practice.

Ninth. To be effective, efforts to eliminate window dressing must run not only to call reports but to the voluntary statements as well.

Tenth. Although the problem of window dressing is common to all, the supervisory agencies have not made any coordinated, concerted, overall effort to deal with it.

The committee recommended that in order to eliminate window dressing, and at the same time to preserve the statistical and supervisory value of call reports,

First. The Federal bank supervisory agencies make a coordinated, concerted, continued use of their powers of moral suasion to have the banking community refrain and desist from the use of nonpurpose transactions and from window dressing of bank reports and statements.

Second. The Federal bank supervisory agencies adopt uniform rules or regulations under which, commencing with the second call date in 1964:

(a) Every bank shall be required: First, to include in every required and voluntary report and statement of condition a certification that no window dressing is contained therein; and second, to file with its Federal supervisory agency as many copies of such reports and statements as such agency shall require.

(b) Any supervisory agency which finds through bank examination or otherwise that contrary to such certification a bank has engaged in window dressing shall give public notice of its findings by publication of the name of the bank, the extent of the window dressing and other details thereof in the Federal Register and by press release; and shall refer the matter to the Attorney General for possible prosecution under the false statements statutes.

Implementation of the recommendations would result in elimination of the century-old, deceitful practice of window dressing, eliminate the threat it presents to undermining the public's confidence in banks, and provide the supervisory agencies and the public with reliable statistical information of banking operations.

The subcommittee's hearings are printed. The report which followed the hearings is House Report No. 90, issued November 22, 1963.

CRIMES AGAINST FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

This investigation was initiated as a result of the continual increase in internal and external crimes against financial institutions. The purpose of the inquiry was to determine the adequacy of existing regulations, examination procedures, security measures, and so forth, in order to determine what more effective measures the Federal supervisory agencies could take to minimize these crimes. Investigation disclosed that there are practically no statutes which deal with affirmative methods to provide bank security and that there is a minimum of regulation by the Federal supervisory agencies. The Federal supervisory agencies rely on persuasion and recommendation to have the banking institutions utilize the security devices, procedures, and methods, auditing procedures which are made available by the FBI, the American Bankers Association, NABAC, the trade associations of the savings and loan associations, and others on the theory that this is a function of bank management.

Among other things, the subcommittee found that—

First. Since World War II there has been an ever-increasing rise in crimes against banking institutions, both in external crimes such as robberies and burglaries and in internal crimes committed by officers and employees of banks, such as embezzlements.

Second. There are no Federal supervisory agency regulations which specify any standards or requirements for banking institutions structures, design, vaults, safes, alarm systems, or for any security procedure, devices, or means.

Third. The Federal supervisory agencies have issued no regulations, rules, or instructions which management, or the agencies, can use to determine whether management is meeting its obligations as to security.

Fourth. The problems presented by crimes against banking institutions are common to all supervisory agencies. However, there is virtually no coordination and cooperation among the agencies with reference to security matters.

Fifth. The Federal supervisory agencies have not, either individually or in cooperation with each other, made or conducted any studies regarding the physical security needs of bank building, mobile bank offices, vaults, tellers' cages, or of the effectiveness of any protective or preventive devices or means.

Sixth. There is ample information available on the means of preventing both internal and external crimes. There are numerous aids and devices available for use in the prevention of crimes and for the apprehension of criminals. However, many bankers resist the use of these means and devices. The use of any of them is not compulsory, even though all the Federal supervisory agencies are agreed that the use of some is essential to good security.

Sixth. The banks which represent the greatest security problems against internal crimes are those which feel they are too small to afford the controls and audits which would protect them, or which have so few personnel that it becomes difficult to protect against the one who might be responsible for internal defalcations. These small banks also resist obtaining adequate fidelity insurance protection.

Seventh. Practically all losses by banking institutions resulting from crimes are covered by insurance. While insurance protects the institutions, its existence has had a tendency in some cases to make bank management lax as regards security against banking crimes.

Eighth. The fundamental obligations for the management and control of banks rest with bank directors. Failure properly to fulfill that responsibility in respect of bank security may subject directors to personal liability for any losses sustained.

Ninth. Modern bank design and the increase in outlying branches have contributed to the increase in bank holdups.

The committee recommended, in order to combat the rise in crimes against banking institutions:

First. That the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, the Comptroller of the Currency, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, hereafter called supervisory agencies, each establish by rules or regulations specific guidelines for the prevention of external and internal crimes against banking institutions under their supervision, consistent with the requirements of the several kinds and sizes of such institutions, and the public interest.

Second. That in establishing such guidelines the supervisory agencies give consideration to incorporating therein, as requirements, adequate audit, compulsory vacations, direct verification, decoy money, and other widely accepted measures referred to in this report.

Third. That the examiners employed by the supervisory agencies be given such training in the methods of prevention of external and internal crimes as will enable them to ascertain and advise on any security deficiencies in the institutions they examine; and that to assist in the examination for security against external crimes the examination report forms call for detailed information in that regard, similar to the American Bankers Association's bank inspection form referred to in this report.

Fourth. That the supervisory agencies consider making it a requirement on the institutions they supervise that fingerprints of prospective officers, directors, and employees of such institutions be submitted to the Federal Bureau of Investigation for criminal record checks.

Fifth. That the supervisory agencies establish an interagency committee for the purposes of making a coordinated effort to lessen bank crimes through the collection and analysis of bank crime statistics and the study and development of means of combating such crimes; and to assist banking institutions toward greater security against such crimes by undertaking such research projects as may be deemed advisable, including the requirements, from the security standpoint, of a model institution, and the testing and evaluating of security means and devices.

Sixth. That the adequacy of the institution's crime prevention facilities and procedures be considered whenever a supervisory agency must act upon its application for charter, deposit insurance, branch offices, or any other application requiring agency approval.

Seventh. That the supervisory agencies impress on the directors of the institutions they supervise the collective and individual responsibilities of directors for the adequate security of their institutions against losses from crimes.

Eighth. That consideration be given to legislation which would permit the supervisory agencies to approve or disapprove major changes in management arising from changes in control or ownership of institutions they supervise, and to exclude underworld elements from becoming directors, officers, or employees of banking institutions.

H.R. 12267, which became Public Law 88–593, is indicative of the kind of action which may be necessary to prevent larcenous conduct and underworld elements from taking over the control or ownership of financial institutions. That laws requires that notices in the change in bank control and in certain "insider" loan transactions must be given to the Federal supervisory agencies.

Presently losses from crimes to banking institutions under Federal supervision total about $15 million per year. It is anticipated that the forum provided by the subcommittee for the exchange of views in this area of crime prevention, and the information afforded by the inquiry and the hearings will result in stricter security measures, with consequent material reduction in losses.

The subcommittee hearings are printed. The report which followed the hearings is House Report No. 1147, issued February 20, 1964.

JUDGMENT COLLECTION PRACTICES AND POLICIES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

The Department of Justice is the principal Federal agency through which monetary claims of the United States are adjudicated and collected. The investigation was initiated to determine whether the operations of the Department were such as to obtain maximum recovery of fines, penalties, and judgments and whether the Department's supervisions of such operations were proceeding with economy and efficiency.

The committee found, among other things, that the Department's reports on outstanding judgments, first, were not accurate; second, no division or branch of the Department had, or was exercising, overall responsibility for judgment collections; and that third, the Department wrote off over $91 million in judgments over a 5-year period, as uncollectible, but had no records to show the specific basis on which this was done.

The following recommendations were made:

First. In order to improve its practices and procedures relating to the collection of money due the United States as the result of court actions it is recommended that the Department of Justice:

(a) Assign to a single division or branch the overall responsibility for judgment collections activities, including the correlating of the collection activities of the divisions and of the U.S. attorneys.

(b) Give consideration to extending its IBM/mark-sense card reporting system to reflect postjudgment collection activities in individual cases.

(c) Give consideration to enlarging the collection activities within the 92 Federal judicial districts by the employment, on a salary, fee or commission basis, of persons specialized in making collections.

(d) Establish general criteria for the guidance of U.S. attorneys in determining whether cases warrant closing for uncollectibility, and, require that cases closed for debtors' inabilities to pay be supported by memoranda justifying such actions, such memoranda to be reviewed by Department personnel.

(e) Give consideration to the establishment and maintenance of general control ledgers on all claims and judgments outstanding in each of the U.S. attorney's offices and in the Department of Justice.

Second. In computing its reports under the Budget and Accounting Procedures Act of 1950 the Department should determine and report the actual amount of judgments written off for uncollectibility.

Third. In the interest of aiding the Department in improving its practices and procedures relating to collections of judgments, it is recommended that the Comptroller General of the United States:

Cause audits to be made by the General Accounting Office of the collection activities of the litigating divisions of the Department, and of any offices of U.S. attorneys deemed necessary, such audits to be followed by reports to be made available to the Department and to this committee.

The initiation of the investigation caused the Department of Justice to review its operations, and to install certain improvements. Adoption of the committee's recommendations by the Department should result in increased collections, the amount of which cannot be forecast or measured. In addition, more efficient operations should result since the operations would be based on more accurate knowledge of amounts required to be collected.

The Comptroller General, as a result of the recommendations, has programed a review of the activities of four U.S. attorneys' offices, to be started this fall, which will cover the items covered by the report.

The subcommittee's hearings have been printed. The report which followed the hearings is House Report No. 1640, issued July 31, 1964.

GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE AUDITS OF THE FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANKS AND THE FEDERAL SAVINGS AND LOAN INSURANCE CORPORATION ON A CALENDAR YEAR BASIS

In February and March 1964, the Comptroller General recommended that Congress consider legislation to put audits by the General Accounting Office of the Federal Home Loan Banks and the Federal Savings and Loan Corporation on a calendar year basis, rather than on a fiscal year basis. This recommendation paralleled a similar recommendation as to FDIC audit dates, discussed above.

Investigation by the subcommittee disclosed that the banks maintain their records and prepare financial statements on a calendar year basis, and that a change to that basis would effect economies both for the banks and the General Accounting Office. Legislation was required before the change could be made.

Monetary benefits would arise by reason of more efficient operations and scheduling of work by the GAO. Actual reductions in cost are not determinable in precise amounts.

H.R. 10705, a bill to amend the Government Corporation Control Act to change the General Accounting Office audit to a calendar year basis from a fiscal year basis for the Federal Home Loan Banks and the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation introduced by the chairman of the subcommittee, was passed, and became Public Law 88-518 when it was signed by the President on August 30, 1964.

The subcommittee's hearings have been printed. The committee report is House Report No. 1419, issued May 20, 1964.

In the following study extensive hearings were held at which witnesses from the Federal monetary agencies, from the commercial and banking industries and from the Congress were heard:

COIN SHORTAGE

This investigation was initiated to determine the degree of efficiency and economy with which the functions of production and distribution of coin were being performed by the Treasury Department and the Federal Reserve System.

Just prior to the subcommittee's hearings, the Treasury announced a crash program to more than double coin production by the end of fiscal year 1965, at which time it was estimated coin would be produced at the rate of 9 billion per annum. Other steps recommended by the Treasury included the continuance of the 1964 date on coins, which has since become law, and the expanded use of private industry facilities.

While the cost of the Treasury's crash program required a supplemental appropriation of some $4.5 million the Government will recover increased seigniorage of about $36 million before deductions for transportation, wastage, and other costs.

Coin shortages serve to hamper business and thus slow down the economy, which can pyramid losses and reduce the income of both the private sector and the Government. By focusing attention on the reasons for the shortage a means is provided for helping to relieve it, which can result in untold monetary and nonmonetary benefits.

A report following the subcommittee's study was approved by the subcommittee on August 14, 1964. The matter is pending for further action in the next Congress. Under present plans early hearings are contemplated with the view to determining the effects of the Treasury's crash program and reviewing the entire coin situation at that time.

The hearings which were held in the 88th Congress by the subcommittee have been printed.

Numerous other investigations were conducted by the subcommittee, in which no public hearings were held or reports issued. The following are specimens of such studies:

Federal Home Bank Board—Amendment to regulations regarding giveaways and brokerage for new accounts and additional deposits in savings and loan associations: Investigation of written complaint by advertising-broker that the amendment was arbitrary and capricious as to persons engaged as brokers and in sale of giveaways was found to be without foundation and required no further action by the subcommittee.

Treasury Department—Accounting for interest coupons on bearer bonds: Inquiry, after complaint, into accounting system for handling paid bearer bond coupons disclosed that present accounting system dates back to fiscal year 1925 when Congress determined that the then annual cost of $234,000 for sorting and recording paid interest coupons was not justified. Because of the much greater volume of activity at present, the costs would be much higher. There does not appear to be any justification for returning to the previous system of sorting and recording each coupon.

Department of Justice—Complaint regarding refusal of FBI to enter an investigation of an alleged bombing on the ferry *Knickerbocker* in New York Harbor in October 1960: Investigation disclosed that this was a matter over which the city of New York and the United States had joint jurisdiction; that the FBI offered its assistance and services to the New York City Police Department which did not see fit to utilize the services. Investigation also showed that the complaint against the Department of Justice was apparently based upon a misunderstanding created by an error in transmission of information. There was no further action to be taken by the subcommittee.

Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco—Unexplained loss of $7.5 million in Treasury certificates: Inquiry disclosed loss of $7.5 million bearer Treasury certificates from the Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco. Investigation by the Secret Service failed to disclose how loss occurred. When House Banking and Currency Committee started investigation and held hearings, and agency gave assurances that procedures have been instituted designed to prevent a repetition, this subcommittee discontinued its investigation.

Federal Home Loan Bank Board—Complaints by small savings and loan associations regarding proposed reserve requirements reviewed: Regulations analyzed upon promulgation by Board. No further action required.

Comptroller of the Currency—Inquiry in regards to published report that Department of Justice was investigating the Comptroller for failure to publish procedures in accordance with Administrative Procedure Act disclosed that there was no actual investigation by the Department: The Comptroller's office reported that procedures were under revision, and that they would be published. No further action by the subcommittee was warranted.

Treasury—Inquiry into possible ability to de-ink old currency, and reuse or sell the paper. Treasury response received and reviewed. Investigation closed, since it is indicated that Treasury has given consideration to the matter but finds no feasible way of accomplishing it at this time.

Internal Revenue Service—Complaint of delay in obtaining refund by taxpayer: Complaint taken up with Commissioner which resulted in full investigation by Commissioner, disclosing that delay was due to change of taxpayer's address and return of the refund by the post office to Internal Revenue Service.

Treasury—Tax and loan accounts: This matter had been under study starting in the 87th Congress by Foreign Operations and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee, predecessor of this subcommittee, to ascertain relative benefits Government received from free bank services as against interest earned by banks on tax and loan accounts for which they did not reimburse the Government. During the course of this study and while awaiting the results of inquiries by the Treasury and GAO on the subject, the chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee announced his intention to introduce legislation to require banks to pay interest on accounts and for Treasury to reimburse banks for services rendered by them. Investigation was terminated, to prevent duplication of efforts by two House committees.

National Labor Relations Board—Complaint of a manufacturers association that NLRB in its decisions is not carrying out the intentions of Congress as reflected in labor laws: Inquiry disclosed that NLRB decisions are reviewable by courts; further, that legislation designed to reach subject matter of complaint was pending. No further action necessary.

Treasury Department—Customs Bureau: Complaint that Bureau discriminates against persons who wish to purchase trademarked items from abroad. Inquiry disclosed that subject is covered by statute and regulation—15 U.S.C. 1096, 1124, 19 U.S.C. 1526 and title 19 section 11.14 CFR. There was no evidence of violation of statute or regulation. Complainant advised, and matter closed without further action.

Internal Revenue Service—Complaint by citizen of Richardson, Tex., that claim for refund should have been allowed: Complaint studied as well as replies from Internal Revenue Service and decision resulting from litigation. Investigation failed to disclose any legal basis for action and matter was closed.

Federal Reserve Board—Complaint against the Federal Reserve Board in connection with complainant's personal litigation against Bank of America and Transamerica corporation studied as well as decisions in the case which were adverse to complainant. There was found to be no basis for any action by this subcommittee.

Reports made to the Congress by the Comptroller General of the United States as a result of investigations made by the General Accounting Office which pertain to departments and agencies under the jurisdiction of the Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee totaled 31 in the 88th Congress. Eight of them are still under consideration. Two reports have been acted upon by the subcommittee, one of them resulting in House Report No. 919, dealing with GAO audits of the FDIC, the other in House Report No. 1419, the ultimate result of which was the enactment of Public Law 88-593 changing the audit dates of the Federal home loan banks and the FSLIC. The remainder have been closed as requiring no further subcommittee action.

REPORT ON 16TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MURPHY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, these are the results of my questionnaire which I mailed to the constituents of the 16th Congressional District of New York which includes all of Staten Island and part of Brooklyn.

The detailed questions appear below with a percentage breakdown of the expression of feeling by the more than 175,000 voters of this district.

It is interesting to note that over 30 percent of those who responded classified themselves as political independents. It also is gratifying to note that the greatest affirmative feeling was the adult education provisions of the antipoverty bill.

Significant, too, is the high percentage of those who support a constitutional amendment to permit nonsectarian prayer and Bible reading in public schools, on a voluntary basis.

What do you think?

	Yes	No	No opinion
1. Do you think the international image of the United States is firmer since President Johnson took office?	36.8	48.5	14.7
2. Do you think that limited trade with Soviet bloc nations will help the United States by deepening the rift between Moscow and Peiping?	38.8	50.9	10.3
3. Do you support the "hard line" in Asia firmly enough to approve bombing North Vietnam bases to halt Communist aggression in South Vietnam?	75.5	16.7	7.8
4. Do you think the United States should be receptive to Cuba's recent efforts to resume diplomatic relations with us?	19.9	76.0	4.1
5. Do you favor my proposed constitutional amendment to permit nonsectarian prayer and Bible reading in public schools on a voluntary basis?	75.7	12.8	11.5
6. Do you favor direct Federal aid to alleviate the critical shortage of classroom space in the elementary schools, intermediate schools, and colleges?	67.8	22.6	9.6
In public schools only?	36.8	40.3	22.9
In parochial and private schools also?	41.8	43.4	14.8
7. Do you feel that U.S. participation in the United Nations helps to prevent war?	72.6	21.1	6.3
8. After reading my discussion of President Johnson's antipoverty bill, do you approve of the Job Corps?	70.9	22.2	6.9
Adult education?	78.4	14.7	6.9
Loans to small businessmen?	73.2	18.1	8.7
9. In party identification, do you consider yourself:			
Democrat?	50.4		
Republican?	19.0		
Independent?	30.6		

THE FREEDOM CENTER IN SEOUL, KOREA

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I am taking the floor this morning to call to the attention of the House a project of singular importance, undertaken recently by the Asian People's Anti-Communist League.

I am referring to the Freedom Center currently under construction in Seoul, Korea. This unique project is designed to give the citizens of the free nations both the opportunity and the means for developing effective strategy and tactics for combating the Communist threat.

In brief, the Freedom Center will be a research and training institution designed to produce cold war operational knowledge and to train leadership groups which, in the words of the Asian People's Anti-Communist League, will be able to "outplan, outthink, outorganize, and outdedicate the Communists."

In the center, students and leaders alike will be able to study such subjects as how to organize a democratic political party or labor union, how to draw up and execute effective social reforms, how to counter Communist propaganda and the tactics of Communist political agitators, and many others.

A publication issued by the Asian People's Anti-Communist League describes the main functions to be carried out by the Freedom Center, as follows:

First, to initiate and carry on a research program designed to develop an integrated, operational science that will demonstrate logically the errors and contradictions of the Communist ideology, thereby contributing to better understanding of the values of freedom.

Second, to initiate and develop effective strategy and tactics through which citizens of the free world will be able to meet and to defeat the Communist conspiracy.

Third, to educate and train anti-Communist leaders and cadres of the league's member units in all aspects of the international Communist movement, and in ways and means to be employed to meet and defeat Communist attempts at subversion.

Fourth, to initiate and develop a program for exposing and frustrating Communist propaganda, and for propagating the gospels of freedom.

Fifth, to perform other functions required to carry out the objectives of the center.

This is indeed an ambitious program. When implemented, it should have far-reaching implications for the cause of freedom not only in Asia but throughout the world.

Mr. Speaker, this great project was initiated at the Second Extraordinary Conference of the Asian People's Anti-Communist League, held in Seoul, Korea, in May 1962. Four months later, construction commenced on a 50-acre plot of land donated by the Government of the Republic of Korea. Simultaneously, a fundraising campaign was initiated by the league. By May of this year, approximately $1.3 million was raised through this campaign—one-half of the total needed for the project. Most of this money was raised in Korea—through government contributions and private donations—but the project also received some help from supporters in other countries.

Mr. Speaker, I wish that all Members of the House could see the plans for the Freedom Center, and photographs taken recently which show construction progress achieved to date. From the standpoint of size and design, this is a very impressive project. The framework of the 17-story International Freedom House, which will symbolize the 17 nations which fought for the defense of Korea under the United Nations flag, is completed through the 12th floor. The framework of the main building is finished. Only the international conference hall, the third principal building planned for the center, is still on the drawing board. I understand that additional funds will have to be raised before construction of this building can begin.

Mr. Speaker, the Freedom Center in Seoul, Korea demonstrates what can be accomplished through private initiative to advance the cause of freedom in the cold war. The entire concept of this center reflects clear recognition of the fact that the struggle which goes on in the world today will be resolved ultimately in the minds of men. In this struggle, words, ideas, and personal dedication to the cause of freedom, are as important as tanks and guns. As a matter of fact, the ideological elements may prove decisive to the resolution of the cold war conflict.

This very subject has deeply concerned a subcommittee which I have the honor to chair—the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. For 18 months now, my subcommittee has been studying the U.S. ideological effort in the cold war. We have looked at numerous Government programs and published an inventory of U.S. Government activities in this dimension of our foreign policy.

In addition, however, we have begun to study the significance of the private effort on this plane. To date, as shown in the eight volumes of hearings and the two reports published by my subcommittee, we have made considerable progress. But our job is not over, and we are continuing with our undertaking.

Mr. Speaker, the members of the Asian People's Anti-Communist League, and the people of South Korea as a whole, are to be congratulated on undertaking the establishment of the Freedom Center. I am confident that the value of this project, and its impact, will continue to grow.

I also want to take this opportunity to extend my congratulations to a very active and eloquent supporter of the Freedom Center whom I have met personally—Dr. Chin Kim. Dr. Kim has been staying in Washington on a fellowship, studying the operations of our Congress. We had frequent discussions about the Freedom Center and other issues of mutual interest. I have enjoyed these exchanges of views and found them stimulating.

I may add that Dr. Kim is no stranger to the United States. Trained at the University of Korea, he also studied at Florida Southern College, George Washington University Law School, and Yale Law School. After receiving two advanced degrees from the latter institution, he returned to his homeland and began teaching at the Seoul National University and the Korea University. Since March 1962 he has served as associate dean of the Graduate School of Law of Seoul National University.

In addition he has performed public service in his country by serving as member of two boards of appeals of the Veterans' Administration, and as member of the Commission on Studies of Legislation of the Republic of Korea.

I was delighted to have had the opportunity to know Dr. Kim. And I congratulate him again on the Asian People's Anti-Communist League's Freedom Center in Seoul, Korea.

CANAL ZONE POLICE FORCE: RED INFILTRATION

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, since the Panamanian mob assaults on the Canal Zone in January of this year, many Members of the Congress have addressed this body on little-known features of Panama Canal problems, most notably my able and scholarly colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD]. It was, indeed, with shock that I read in the RECORD of March 9, 1964, his devastating exposure and condemnation of a proposal of the Governor of the Canal Zone, evidently acting under State Department instructions, to employ alien Panamanians as members of the Canal Zone police force as being "tantamount to treason."

Subsequent information from the isthmus has confirmed the seriousness of his warnings as to the dangers of Red infiltration into this important Panama Canal protective agency. On the front page of the September 12, 1964, issue of the Panama American are two significant news stories. One tells of a Castro-Communist plot to establish a Red government in Panama with subversion of the National Guard of Panama. The other repeats an official call for applications to the Canal Zone Government from Panamanians for positions on the Canal Zone police force, and this in contemptuous disregard of the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the facts that have been outlined to this body repeatedly as to the dangers at Panama, how can responsible officials of the executive branch of our Government expect to prevent subversive infiltration of the Canal Zone police force by such employment practices? It is, indeed, high time for the investigating committees of the Congress to inquire into what has been going on in the Canal Zone before it is too late and to place responsibility for this reprehensible proposal on the individuals in our Government behind it.

The indicated news stories from the Panama American and another one from the Sunday News of New York follow:

[From the Panama American, Sept. 12, 1964]

CASTRO-COMMUNIST PLOT BARED BY CHIRIQUI RAID

A remarkably accurate drawing of the sleeping barracks in the National Guard station in David, Chiriqui, sparked speculation today that one or a number of guardsmen perhaps were in a Castro-Communist plot to establish a Red government in Panama.

The drawing was among the documents, arms, and other revolutionary material found in the La Primavera (David) home of Diego Pardo Wednesday during a raid carried out by the guard acting on a tip from a 20-year-old Colonite who claimed he is a radio and TV actor.

As a result of a denunciation made by Francisco Alvarado Bares, the guard cracked down on the Pardo home, confiscating the evidence and placing the 66-year-old owner and his 18-year-old son Manuel, under arrest.

September 15 was the date selected for the big Communist strike, Bares was reported to have said.

Among the items found in the Pardo home were sketches of the National Guard station in Puerto Armuelles, a topographic plan of the province indicating a mountain peak suitable for installing equipment for guiding aircraft in flight and lists of the location of farms in the province.

Authorities also found lists of the leaders of Marxist cells in Chiriqui, the names which were all in code, it was reported.

It is believed that the drawing must have been done by a person well familiar with the barracks, in short, one who actually lived there.

Two other persons are under arrest in connection with the discovery of the revolutionary materials in the Pardo home, which is believed to have served as a training center for the participants in the alleged plot.

The pair are Evangelio and Prudencio Gonzalez, who were nabbed in the Puerto Armuelles banana country.

According to the guard, Bares revealed that part of the subversive movement, aimed at setting up a Red regime included the assassination of Chiriqui Land Co. manager Harvey W. Johnson, who is based in Puerto Armuelles.

Bares' denunciation to the guard was made public yesterday by Juan B. Acosta, a Chiriqui district attorney who is in charge of investigating the alleged conspiracy.

Acosta said that Bares declared he was invited to Chiriqui by Vidal Espinal Erea, a Spaniard he met while they were both inmates of the Carcel Model in Panama City.

While in David, Bares was reported to have revealed he and Espinal visited the Pardo home where Bares became aware that a revolutionary plan was afoot. This plan, he disclosed, included attacks on National Guard stations, terrorism and strikes.

[From the Panama American, Sept. 12, 1964]

Canal Zone Police Still Seek Panamanians for Jobs

More applications are still wanted from Panamanians to fill 15 positions on the Canal Zone police force, the Panama Canal Company revealed today.

The positions pay more than $5,000 per year starting salary.

A total of 25 police jobs will be filled by Panamanian citizens—15 as soon as applicants can be processed and hired.

The pay range for these positions is $5,033.60 to $7,009.60.

To apply, applicants must be under 30 years of age, weigh at least 150 pounds and be at least 5 feet 9 inches tall.

Ability to use both English and Spanish is essential.

Applications should be made to Gordon M. Frick, deputy personnel director operations, Building 366, Ancon. More information is available by calling Balboa 2336.

[From the New York News, Sept. 13, 1964]

Red Informer Helps Uncover Panama Plot

Panama City, September 12.—A Communist stool pigeon today reeled off details of a subversive plot uncovered yesterday when police raided a Red training center in the western Panamanian city of David.

Francisco Alvarado Bares, one of five suspects arrested by the raiders, is talking freely, District Attorney Juan B. Acosta said. Two of those arrested are Spaniards, a father and son.

The revolt reportedly would have been touched off next Tuesday by a series of strikes, raids on police stations and terrorism.

Confiscated documents were said to have included instructions on the manufacture of bombs, military plans, topographical charts showing secret trails, guerrilla training manuals, and jungle survival instructions.

Acosta said the suspects planned to kill Harvey Johnson, American manager of the Chiriqui Land Co.

The district attorney quoted Alvarado as saying he first learned of the plot while serving a vagrancy term in the Colon jail. He said he was taken by one of his fellow prisoners to meet the elder Spaniard.

REPORTS TO CONSTITUENTS

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Morrison] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, with leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a letter and a report that I am sending to some of my constituents:

Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

My Dear Friend: I am writing this letter to ask for your valuable vote and support in my reelection to Congress, Tuesday, November 3. I have had the great honor and privilege of representing you for 22 years and I have helped literally thousands of you people when you have called on me in past years. I am now calling on you and will consider it a great personal favor if you will help me, as I have tried to help you, by getting your friends, neighbors, relatives, and everyone else whom you can to support me and to vote for me.

I would like to appoint you as my personal representative and ask you to set a goal of contacting 10 voters, getting their assurance that they will go to the polls. Then, if you do everything possible to see that they do go to the polls on Tuesday, November 3, and cast their vote for me, I will thank you from the bottom of my heart. You can rest assured of anything you need me to do for you in the future. I will certainly look forward to the opportunity of returning your kind efforts.

I have certainly tried in every way to justify your confidence by trying to assist each and every person who called on me regardless of their walk of life or political alinement. No problem has been too small nor none too large to receive my urgent attention. I think you will agree that I have tried to be one of the best Congressmen that ever served the Sixth District.

I do not want to appear boastful as to my efforts, but I do feel that by writing you this letter that it will enable me to let you know how extremely grateful I am to serve as your Congressman.

Your Congress has faced a multitude of difficult issues and problems during the past years. I have consistently voted for all measures that would aid the farmers, the dairymen, the businessmen, the laboring men and women, the schoolteachers and school employees, and the veterans, our elderly citizens, and for the various bills that improve our security and standards of living.

I pledge to do everything within my power to continue to help you to remedy the troubles that beset you at this time and to improve your working and living conditions. You may, therefore, rest assured that I shall continue to put forth my best efforts in your behalf to see that our section of the country continues to prosper and progress.

I trust that my legislative experience for the past 22 years and my record as your Congressman in these 22 years will warrant your continued consideration for your vote for my reelection, November 3.

With warmest regards and best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,
James H. Morrison,
Member of Congress.

P.S.—As I have said in the past, I want you to feel that at any time I can ever serve you in my capacity as Congressman, please do not hesitate to call on me. Also, if you can get more than 10 people to vote for me on November 3, so much the better. Thanks and best regards.

J.H.M.

Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Friend: I am writing this letter to you to give you a report on my accomplishments in your behalf during the last 22 years that I have been given, by you, the wonderful privilege and great honor of representing the Sixth District in the Congress of the United States.

Likewise, I am writing you this letter to ask for your valuable vote and support on Tuesday, November 3, for my reelection to Congress for my 12th term. A mayor of one of our cities put it this way when asked about his opinion of Jimmy Morrison:

"In the first place you can't argue with success, and no man has been more successful in Louisiana politics than Jimmy Morrison. There is of course a reason for this success and I believe it is his hard work and dedication. No man tries harder or works harder to please his constituents. He is kind, goodhearted, and generous, but overshadowing all of this is the greatest attribute of all: Jimmy is the same fellow on all occasions and all the time. He never seems to change. Unlike some politicians, he is the same after election as he is before, the same between elections, and just about the same year in and year out. I can say one thing, I never called on him that he didn't put forth a great and extra effort to help me. He doesn't just help elected officials like myself, but he helps every one of his constituents who call on him regardless of their walk in life."

Quite naturally, I take the mayor's remarks as a compliment and I assure you that I shall continue to work for you and do the best possible job for you as your Congressman.

To represent you in the Nation's Capitol is a tremendous challenge and comes with it a great responsibility in these difficult and trying times.

As your Representative, I have always devoted my full time to the countless problems of our district. The many decisions that I have made over the years have been uniformly based on what you people wished me to do for your district, State, and Nation.

Perhaps one of the bills which helped every man, woman, and child tremendously was the tax reduction bill which I supported vigorously which amounted to $11½ billion.

Without being boastful I think you will agree with me that the following projects were of tremendous aid and benefit to our district and State:

1. Coauthor of the bill providing for $357,000 to dredge a 40-foot channel from Baton Rouge to New Orleans. This has greatly contributed to the heavy expansion in industrial development in Baton Rouge and the Baton Rouge area to the south along the Mississippi River. This 40-foot channel provides Baton Rouge's port with deep enough water for any type of boat or any oceangoing vessel. This has added additional wealth and thousands of jobs.

2. The Indian Village Port Allen cutoff project which was started by me in 1943 and completed a few years ago at a cost of $16 million gave Baton Rouge and Port Allen the

opportunity of obtaining the wonderful port facility which is growing rapidly each year and provided thousands of jobs directly and indirectly.

3. Worked hard to prevent the capital gains tax formula from being changed regarding pulpwood and timberland which greatly aided this important industry.

4. Through my efforts, I was successful in getting over $300,000 for the complete remodeling, air conditioning, enlarging, and equipping with new fixtures, the post office at Bogalusa. This will give Bogalusa practically a brand new post office and will be in keeping with the growth and progress of this wonderful city.

5. Hammond recently had $300,000 spent to completely renovate its post office. I worked hard to get this project which has been of exceptional benefit to this community.

6. A survey is being made by the U.S. Engineers on the Bogue Lusa Creek in Bogalusa, and I am doing my utmost to see that the devastating floods that have damaged property and homeowners in the Bogalusa area will be prevented.

7. Below is a list of Federal funds which I have worked so hard to get for these local projects in these local communities:

Sewer facilities, Gonzales, $132,000.

Water facilities, Darrow, $132,000.

Sewer facilities, new roads, $165,000.

Gas system, Varnado, $120,000.

Sewer facilities, Hammond, $970,000.

Water system, Tangipahoa, $78,000.

Sewer facilities, Ponchatoula, $410,000.

Dredging, Bon Fuca Bayou, Slidell, $138,000.

Sewer facilities, Denham Springs, $980,000.

Drainage, Amite-Comite Rivers, Baton Rouge, $4 million.

8. In the last 10 years, I have voted for and supported legislation for Federal funds for highways and I have helped bring in over $117 million in Federal funds for highways for the Sixth District in the past 10 years.

9. For hospitals at Baton Rouge, Hammond, Ponchatoula, Mandeville, Slidell, Covington, Bogalusa, Franklinton, Livingston Parish, Independence, Jackson, and other communities, I have assisted in securing over $20 million.

10. Devil Swamp Barge Canal at Baton Rouge received over $3 million in Federal funds.

11. I have worked hard to get over $25 million in Federal funds for LSU and Southeastern.

12. The new Federal Building and Post Office at Baton Rouge will cost $5 million which I was able to get worked out with Federal funds.

To show you how hard I have worked to get probably more Federal funds than any other Member for my district, I might point out the difference in what the people of Louisiana paid in Federal taxes and what Louisiana got in Federal funds:

Recent annual amount paid in Federal taxes by all citizens of Louisiana, $827,640,000.

Recent annual amount received in Federal funds by all citizens of Louisiana, $1,741,772,000.

Therefore, Louisiana received almost a billion dollars more in Federal funds than Louisiana paid in Federal taxes.

13. Just recently, through my efforts in cooperation with our two Senators and other Louisiana Congressmen, $2,500,000 was given by the Federal Government to LSU, Tulane, Loyola, and three other southern universities, to locate a research center at Covington, La., which in all probability will develop into a $10 to $20 million institution.

14. Not only have I fully cooperated with all the new industries, and few districts in the United States have had as many new industries located in their respective borders as has had the Sixth District of Louisiana, but I have done everything possible to cooperate with the existing industries, and have done everything possible to bring in these new industries, by offering my full cooperation at all times.

15. I would like to point out that whereas 14 States made a terrific bid to have the Space Center and Testing Center, which is located at Michoud and the Slidell area in Louisiana, located in their respective States, I can point with justifiable pride that I played a big part in locating this missile industry in Louisiana, which will mean employment for over 10,000 people, and in the future will become the largest single industry in the whole State.

16. For the past 22 years, I have worked very closely and in full cooperation with our Federal aviation officials, and have fought and was successful in getting over $5 million in Federal funds for airports in the Sixth District, including Harding Field in Baton Rouge.

17. No other Member of Congress has worked any harder than I have to expedite the allocation of millions of dollars of Federal funds for the Federal interstate highway program of Louisiana, and in addition to this great program, to secure millions of dollars in Federal aid for all eligible primary, secondary, and farm-to-market highways in this State.

18. I have at all times offered my full cooperation, and have worked with all civic and governmental agencies in the Sixth District, for the benefit and welfare of the district and State. I have worked for an increase in funds for the past 22 years to secure Federal funds to match welfare assistance in the amount of $1,141 million. In other words, in the last 22 years, the Federal Government has provided for old age and welfare cases, for unfortunate people, for sick people, for people who were unable to take care of themselves in Louisiana, over $1 billion in the Sixth District and the State of Louisiana, which matched with State funds amounted to over $2 billion.

19. I have handled personal problems of thousands of constituents who called on me concerning matters affecting veterans, farmers, working men and women, day laborers, local officials, elderly people, businessmen, retired people, and all those who had problems and saw fit to call on me in the last 22 years.

20. Just recently I put forth a tremendous effort to protect the dairy farmer from having any Federal dairy control, which practically every dairy farmer in the entire Sixth District and State felt would be detrimental to the Louisiana dairy industry.

21. I have done everything possible in the last 22 years to cooperate with and assist the oil and gas industry in the Sixth District and the State of Louisiana, which has been so vital to the economy of our district and State.

22. I have been a stanch backer and put forth all possible assistance to aid the strawberry farmers, the vegetable and truck farmers, the tung oil growers, the dairy farmers, the cotton farmers, the small truck farmers, the chicken and egg producers, the rice farmers, the sugarcane farmers, the beef cattle producers, and all the other farmers in this congressional district. That is why my membership on the powerful House Agriculture Committee is so important.

23. I have devoted an enormous amount of time to veterans' problems and have voted for and supported all veterans' legislation that was beneficial in the past 22 years, and have done everything possible to aid the veterans of World War I, World War II, and the Korean war. I want to assure the veterans of this District and State of Louisiana, that I shall continue my efforts in their behalf.

24. I am sure you recall the many times that I have taken the floor to denounce communism, and urge my fellow Members to do everything possible to make this Nation both strong from within and without. I have supported and worked for all appropriations for the defense of this country, and I feel that our only salvation to continue to be a free and great Nation is to keep our country strong both economically and militarily.

My friends, it is difficult to impress on you how important experience and seniority are in Congress. No truer words were ever spoken than "there is no substitute for experience." As far as seniority is concerned it is one of the most valuable assets on Capitol Hill. I rank 388th out of 435 Congressman. In other words 377 Members stand behind me in rank of seniority.

With the seniority you have given me and the experience I have received, I think I can continue to do the job you want done, and when you consider that I served you longer in Congress than my opponent has lived in Louisiana, I certainly hope you will cast your vote for my reelection.

I will be most grateful, I assure you.

Sincerely,

James H. Morrison.

HON. JOE M. KILGORE

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Gonzalez] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise to say goodby to my colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Joe M. Kilgore], humble in the knowledge that he has served in this hallowed Chamber for a full decade, whereas I am but a freshman, and with pride for this opportunity to say a few words on this occasion. It is, of course, essentially a joyous occasion. For Congressman Kilgore is leaving us voluntarily, in the prime of his life, youthful and vigorous, and I am confident he will be as successful in his new endeavors as he has been here in Congress. But it is mixed with sadness too, as are all partings and separations.

Congressman Kilgore represents one of the finest and most beautiful districts in all of Texas, the 15th Congressional District. That district consists of 13 counties in south Texas: Cameron, Dimmit, Frio, Hidalgo, Jim Hogg, La Salle, Maverick, Medina, Starr, Webb, Willacy, Zapata, and Zavala. They are proud and meaningful names in the history of Texas and of this Nation. Hidalgo County, for example, is named for Father Francisco Hidalgo, a missionary who helped settle the wild country now known as Texas. Jim Hogg County is named for one of Texas greatest Governors. Governor Hoggs was the first native-born Texan to be elected to that office.

The people of the 15th District, many of whom are my friends, are a proud and industrious people. They are experiencing, I feel sure, a mixture of sensations, as I am, happy to know that their native son is returning to live among them, sad in the knowledge that they are losing their faithful and hardworking Congressman.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say one more thing. A good bit of San Antonio, my home city, travels with Joe Kilgore wherever he may go. He was educated at Westmoreland College, which is now called Trinity University in San Antonio. And, what is infinitely more important, he is married to a San Antonio girl, Mrs. Jane Redman Kilgore. So we of the 20th Congressional District will follow the future career of Congressman Kilgore with deep interest and warm friendship.

RESTORE THE DESECRATED CEMETERIES

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Multer] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, time and again our attention has been called to the terrible deeds of the Nazis during World War II. Not the least of these malicious acts was the desecration of cemeteries. Ghoulish as this conduct was, little has been done to right these wrongs.

The World Center of European Rabbis some years ago organized a World Organization for the Preservation of Jewish Cemeteries in Europe. These destroyed cemeteries are located in Russia, Poland, Hungary, Rumania, and Czechoslovakia, France, Belgium, Holland, and Norway.

The president of the World Center is Rabbi Moses Joseph Rubin. He and his colleagues are revered, learned, and respected gentlemen. They have been working hard to accomplish their task. They are deserving of our assistance in attaining their goals.

Although these European cemeteries may appear to be far away in thought and in distance, they are close to the American families, each of whom has 1 or more relatives interred there.

More than 400,000 Americans have already signed a petition seeking help for the work of this fine organization.

The millions of slaughtered cannot be restored but something can be done to restore the Jewish cemeteries that have been destroyed.

These rabbis are merely asking that the German Government make the funds available with which to do the work. They do not even ask that money be turned over to them.

They ask that the money be turned over to the International Red Cross, who will pay the bills as the work is done.

Just as such a demand would be, these rabbis do not ask for the trial and punishment of the ruthless, conscienceless vandals responsible for these heinous deeds.

They merely ask that the funds be made available with which to restore the defiled cemeteries, rebuild broken fences and replace tombstones and grave markings to give some semblance of decency to these sanctified burial grounds.

They properly suggest that the German Government, which has to date made reparations for an only insignificant part of the losses sustained, should bear this financial burden.

HON. FRANK J. BECKER

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Teague] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it was with regret that I learned that my good friend and colleague, Frank Becker of New York had decided that he would not return to the House in 1965.

Frank had considerable legislative experience before coming to the Congress of the United States, having served for four terms in the New York State Legislature. When he arrived in Washington, he was assigned to the Armed Services Committee because of his vast experience in the military legislative field. While a member of that committee his interest was manifested in building and maintaining a military organization of which this country could be proud.

The people of the Fifth Congressional District of New York are losing a very able Representative, and the Congress of the United States is losing a good American.

SEAFARERS INTERNATIONAL UNION RECOMMENDATIONS

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Multer] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, ever since the end of World War I we have been committed to the development of an American merchant marine capable of carrying a major portion of our foreign commerce and of serving as a military auxiliary in time of war.

Unfortunately, during recent years the American merchant marine has declined in size, strength, and prestige. The Soviet Union, meanwhile, has been doing the opposite. It has been building up its merchant marine fleet very fast. In recognition of this widening gap, President Johnson created, on June 17, 1964, the Maritime Advisory Committee. The Seafarers International Union, AFL–CIO, is of course extremely concerned about this problem and has formulated a series of recommendations for the development and maintenance of a balanced and adequate American-flag merchant fleet.

The S.I.U. has urged a stricter application of our cargo preference laws to remove the inequities between the subsidized and the unsubsidized operators. They have urged an end to the use of runaway registries as tax-evading gimmicks by American corporations and that American-flag tankers should be provided with a fixed percentage of American oil imports. A further recommendation would be to end Interstate Commerce Commission sanction of the selective rate-cutting practices of the railroads and to provide representation on the Commission of shipping interests.

The Seafarers International Union has made, in addition to the above, some broad recommendations for the reassessment of the altered Maritime pattern since the enactment of the Merchant Marine Act of 1963. They have urged formulation of a new national maritime policy firmly committed to the promotion and development of all segments of the American-flag fleet.

The S.I.U. has sent to each of us a copy of their recommendations which were presented to the Maritime Advisory Committee on August 10, 1964. I urge our colleagues to study these recommendations and I urge the President's Committee to implement them.

THE CHURCH AND STATE IN POLAND

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Pucinski] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have taken this special order today to bring to the attention of my colleagues an excellent study prepared by the Library of Congress entitled "Church and State in Poland."

This very extensive analysis was prepared by Dr. Peter Siekanowicz, of the European Law Division, and represents, as far as I know, the most exhaustive analysis of the problems faced by the church in Communist-dominated Poland.

One thing can be stated with absolute certainty. Even though the Communists have been trying to destroy the Catholic Church in Poland since the end of World War II, they have failed. They have failed because of the indomitable spirit of the Polish people and their spiritual leader, Cardinal Wyszynski.

The study, which I shall include with my remarks today, clearly indicates the tremendous difficulty which the Catholic Church experiences under the Communist government which today temporarily prevails in Poland.

But a study of this report shows the determination with which the Polish people cling to their basic concepts of freedom and dignity. I have not the slightest doubt that the Communist regime, which now holds the people of Poland in bondage, will ultimately collapse from the weight of its own oppression, and freedom again will return to the people of Poland.

I have selected this particular time to include the study by Dr. Siekanowicz, an eminent scholar whose research deserves the highest commendation, because in 1966, the people of Poland will observe the 1,000th anniversary of the birth of Christianity in Poland.

The difficulties which the church is experiencing in Poland today reflects yet another chapter in the impressive struggle which the Polish people have waged during these 1,000 years on behalf of religious freedom.

There can be no doubt that communism will never be able to destroy the spirit of the Poles, and this excellent study clearly points the way to why we can look to the collapse of communism in Poland with confidence and certainty.

Mr. Speaker, this historic study by Dr. Siekanowicz follows:

CHURCH AND STATE IN POLAND

(By Dr. Peter Siekanowicz)

I. INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

Three stages are discernible in the relations between the church and the state in postwar Poland. The first covers the period between 1945 and 1950, the second, 1950 and October 1956, and the third, October 1956 up to the present. This division into periods is for the purpose of presenting the methods applied by the Communists toward the church in order to achieve the apparent ultimate end which is common to all periods; i.e., the undermining and final annihilation of religious life in Poland.

The church was to disintegrate from within according to the original plan. The tactics employed from 1945 to 1950 for the achievement of this objective were attempts to kindle disputes within the church, to separate it from Rome, to cause disagreements between the people and the hierarchy and to create diversions within the clergy and the believers. These methods were frustrated. Methods of terror were applied during the years 1950 to October 1956. In 1950, the bishops were forced to make an agreement which was intended to subject the church to government administration and control. Show trials were ordered. A great number of clergymen were imprisoned and Primate Wyszynski was placed under detention.[1] An atmosphere of martyrdom similar to that surrounding the first Christians caused Catholics to close their ranks, to cooperate with their hierarchy and to intensify their religious life.

The general dissatisfaction with the Stalinist regime which prevailed in Poland from 1945 to October 1956 led first to the Poznan riots in June 1956. Confusion arose within the ranks of the Communist Party; the Government lost its powers, and Poland was on the brink of an uprising. To secure the regime, the Communist Party released Gomulka from prison and, in October 1956, at the Eighth Plenary Session of the Central Committee, elected him first secretary, thereby elevating him to the position of a political leader. At the same time, Primate Wyszynski was released from detention and other bishops, after 5 years of imprisonment, were set free. Five bishops who had been removed from their seats were restored to their offices. The so-called rehabilitation proceedings of the courts resulted in vacating previous criminal condemnations, and the prisoners were adjudged not guilty. Primate Wszynski, as the spiritual leader of the nation, and Gomulka appealed to the country to maintain internal peace and order, warning against the bloodshed which at that time was rampant in Hungary with catastrophic results for the Hungarian people. Bishops and the whole clergy were granted freedom of speech at that time. Peace and order were restored. All these events gave ground for the hope of a new era in the internal life of Poland.

It is the task of this report to present church and state relations as they developed after October 1956.[2] The new era was initiated by the agreement of December 6, 1956, concluded between the representatives of the church and the Government.[3]

II. BACKGROUND OF THE AGREEEMENT OF DECEMBER 6, 1956

According to general opinion at that time, the agreement of December 6, 1956, was to restore full freedom to religious life in Poland and to the church in particular. The motives of the Communist Party in making the agreement with the church were explained by First Secretary Gomulka at the Ninth Plenary Session of the Central Committee of the party held in June 1957, as follows:[4]

"It is needless to say that our party is based on a scientific materialistic and dialectic doctrine and that the idealistic doctrine is strange to the party. Despite this fact we made an agreement with the Catholic church and even agreed upon religious instruction in schools as an elective subject. In this respect, a state of affairs arose which not only does not exist in other Socialist countries, but not even in such capitalistic countries as France and the United States. Of course, this state of affairs does not fit in with the doctrine of our party.

"However, our party may not close its eyes to any reality. It may not apply administrative pressure in its policy toward believers, nor take into account [the fact] that the previous dispute with the church put millions of believers in opposition to the people's authority, made it difficult for them to take part in our building [of socialism] and repelled them from socialism. This state of affairs had to be changed. Our party takes the position that the idealistic doctrine will exist for a long time beside the materialistic doctrine. Believers and nonbelievers, church and socialism, the people's authority, and the church hierarchy will also live side by side. This is beyond any doubt. We should draw conclusions from that, and not only we but the church also.

"We have drawn [these conclusions], taking the position that coexistence is necessary which, of course, does not abolish the specified forms of ideological struggle, but it should exclude political war. On our road to socialism we take into account that millions of believers of the Roman Catholic Church live in Poland. We do not interfere with the doctrinal Roman way of the church in religious matters. The church also should take into account and acknowledge the fact that Poland changed her previous social system; that she builds socialism. In matters involving the interests of the people's Poland and her nation we should like to go with the church along the Polish road. From this will depend to a great extent the long-range forming of relations between the people's state and the church."

III. BASIS FOR CHURCH AND STATE RELATIONS

It is not the law itself which is the prime and determining factor in the relations between church and state. The resolutions of the Communist Party adopted at its conventions and plenary sessions, as well as the public speeches of its leaders, establish the political attitude toward the church. In the implementation of these political lines, executive regulations, directives, instructions and circular letters, often confidential and conflicting with the basic laws, from which there is no redress, have been issued. Religious denominations are grouped into two branches: The Catholic Church and the various non-Catholic denominations. Relations with the Roman Catholic Church are formally regulated by law and by the agreements concluded between the representatives of the Government and the episcopate. Relations between the state and non-Catholic denominations are established separately with each individual denomination by a special piece of legislation.[5]

IV. SEPARATION, COEXISTENCE OR SUBJUGATION

A. General characteristics

Under the Constitution of 1952, the church is separated from the state (art. 70).[6] This separation does not conform to an understanding of the term such as is entertained in the West. The Communist regime is not indifferent to the religious life of the nation and Marxist doctrine does not tolerate the existence of any competing spiritual power. It fights religion as a "superstition." Therefore, after October 1956, the campaign against the church in Poland, in terms of the ideological struggle specified above by Gomulka, did not cease. New tactics were employed, because, as was stated by the official organ of the party, the methods of the preceding era resulted in "the strengthening of the ties between the church and the believers, and the increase of the underground religious life and the discord between that part of the working masses which feels bound to the Catholic religion." Since, as was stated "in the agreement between church and state the basic outlines concerning * * * the relation between church and state were laid down" and "in the matters of the form of the laicization of the social life many problems were not explained," new concepts were laid down which may be divided into two groups.[7] One group involves an attempt to separate the believers from the church and to tie them to the Government. The other may be characterized as a campaign against the church itself by the destruction of the bases upon which a religion develops and thrives.

To separate the believers from the church, Gomulka, at the third convention of the party held on March 10–19, 1959, stated that "the inseparable condition for securing a social basis for the people's democracy is the political unity of the working masses in the work for Poland, the unity overcoming artificial divisions and above all the division between believers and nonbelievers. Our party tends to unite all people * * * it evaluates the attitude of the citizens exclusively according to their attitude toward socialism in practice. The basic indicator of the value of a citizen is his work for the country, his real contribution to the building of a socialist Poland."[8] The campaign against the church has been carried on by undermining its doctrinal basis, and its administrative and social activity as well as by undercutting the financial foundations of the church. The doctrinal teaching of the church has been continuously attacked by Communist propaganda through party channels and through atheistic organizations. The administrative activities of the church have been hampered by constant annoyance of the clergy and diversionary actions. Confiscation of church property and exorbitant taxation have brought church institutions to ruin. These problems are discussed in detail in the following chapters.

---

[1] V. Gsovski, editor. "Church and State Behind the Iron Curtain." New York, Praeger, 1955, pp. 172–182, 188–194, 197–229, cited hereinafter as Church and State.

[2] Ibid., pp. 165–252.

[3] For text of the agreement, see ch. VIII, A.

[4] Nowe Drogi (Warszawa) (theoretical and political organ of the Central Committee of the Polish United Workers [Communist] Party), No. 6, 1957, pp. 27–28.

[5] Church and State, op. cit., pp. 170, 182, 238–241.

[6] Ibid., pp. 176–178.

[7] Nowe Drogi No. 6, 1958, p. 93.

[8] Nowe Drogi, No. 4, 1959, p. 61.

B. Combating religion

The primary effort of the Communist regime in Poland is to combat religion as such. Gomulka in his statements at the ninth plenary session excluded "political war" despite the fact that Cardinal Wyszynski avoids any action which could lead to such a contest. His position with respect to "coexistence," however, expressly admitted the "ideological struggle." This struggle, as is explained in the party press, creates a "new vision of the world and finally drives out religious faith." "We observe, it is said, the process of the final degradation of the scientific doctrine of Christianity." To accelerate this process "there exists the necessity for criticism of religion, propaganda for the scientific world outlook as well as activities leading to the extinction of religion, and the gradual presentation to the people of the value of lay culture." "All the tendencies strike at the * * * religious doctrine, in its organization, and in the church." [9]

The activities to extinguish religion have been carried on in two stages, by the party itself and through atheistic organizations. In the first stage, before antireligious propaganda reaches the people at large, it is limited to those groups of the intelligentsia which have the greatest possibility to influence ideologically the masses. Such groups include party activists, teachers, lawyers, and physicians as well as workers of the greater industrial centers. University students in particular and schools are assigned the special tasks discussed below.

The creation of atheistic organizations started in October 1956, at the time when the agreement with the church was concluded, as the "free thought movement." In January 1957, the first Club of the Atheistic Intelligentsia was established and similar clubs were organized in all large cities. The National Association of Atheists and Free Thinkers was established and in January 1958, the Polish Association of Religious Science was set up to coordinate the activities of the various associations.[10] The Central Institute for Perfecting Lay Cadres, with the objective of coordinating "the propagation of a scientific, materialistic outlook on life, lay culture and socialist morality," was established in December 1963.[11]

Atheistic propaganda recently increased, especially in the armed forces where atheist education is a permanent component part of the training and one of its fundamental elements. There are several hundred groups in the army which unite a total of nearly 20,000 members in the Association of Atheists and Free Thinkers. In shaping "the materialistic outlook on life of the cadres, [and] other ranks and families of servicemen," the aim of the military authorities is to "overcome the views of that ideology which finds expression in religious beliefs; atheist indoctrination is an important element making for the shaping of a proper attitude toward the world." [12]

C. Attacks against religious centers

In its policy to destroy religious faith in Poland, the Communist regime strikes especially at religious shrines and centers. Thus, the shrine of the Pauline Fathers in Czestochowa, the most venerated in Poland, is the main object of Communist attacks. Its position is similar to that of Lourdes and Fatima. (It should be mentioned that a copy of the image of Virgin Mary of Czestochowa is placed on the altar of the private chapel of the Pope.) The history of the shrine is closely connected with the history of the Polish nation. Under the partitions of Poland it was the center from which the voice of religion rang out and united the Poles divided by the frontiers of the partitioning powers, Prussia, Austria, and Russia. Pilgrimages were arranged from all parts of Poland regardless of the frontiers and even the invaders themselves dared not threaten the sanctity of this religious center.

Under the Communists, the shrine in Czestochowa is the center from which the spiritual leaders, the primates of the Roman Catholic church and Cardinal Stefan Wyszynski make their announcements. The most important letters of the Episcopate originate there. This shrine has been slandered and libeled by the Communists. A typical example of this defamation is an article in a Gomulka periodical in which the shrine is called a factory of illusion. "Among the praying crowd," it is stated, "the clergy, the officers of the army, are fed with illusions * * * it does not matter that the prayers of the pilgrims will not be fulfilled. The factory of illusion serves the collection of political capital * * * the distributors of the illusion do not want to take responsibility for the fate of the nation * * * their allies are ignorance, backwardness, the difficult life of the people and the immemorial pursuit of happiness." [13] Pilgrims are not granted the facilities in transportation which are accorded to passengers going to sports events or political assemblies, Cardinal Wyszynski stated in a sermon on August 26, 1963.[14]

D. Suppression of the church doctrine

The agreement of December 6, 1956, includes a provision by which the representatives of the Government assured the representatives of the Episcopate that it would "remove the obstacles which existed during the preceding period with respect to the realization and full freedom of religious life." The official interpretation of these promises was given by Gomulka at the third convention in March 1959, as follows:

"We treat the church as a religious institution dedicated to satisfying the needs of the believers. The church is separate from the state. It may act freely only on the basis of the recognition of the social system of the People's Republic of Poland. We shall not permit reactionary political activities of any kind whatsoever. In social affairs connected with the policy of the state, the church and the clergy must be led by the affairs of the state. The church must be a church only, it must limit itself to religious affairs and remain in the church." [15]

As to practicing religion, it was stated that "the state should treat the belief and religious practices of every citizen as a private affair * * * it should guarantee * * * the freedom to practice a religious cult as well as the freedom to preach lay principles and to propagate scientific doctrines." [16]

Since "Marxist ideology and therefore religious doctrine is always tied up in some way with politics although not always directly * * * and since religious doctrine does not favor success in the struggle for socialism and the humanization of life here on earth," [17] any church activities which are not solely of a liturgical character are considered political. Consequently, it was stated, "The essential line of our laicization activities should be to counteract any attempt to exploit religion for political ends * * * vigorous objections should be made in the Party press to the numerous attempts to propagate in Poland the reactionary political views called Catholic social science. Therefore, furious attacks have been made against Catholic publications and against Homo Dei in particular, in which articles have been published concerning sociology, ethics, family life, new methods of pastoral activities, church music, liturgy, new methods of preaching, as well as articles discussing papal encyclicals Rerum Novarum and Quadragesimo Anno, concerning labor." [18]

E. Suppression of social activities of the church

It must be pointed out that not only has the church doctrine been undermined by the Government but charitable works, one of the basic social activities carried on by the church since Apostolic times, have been taken away from the church also and monopolized by the Government. In this respect, the post-October 1956 Government not only did not soften the policy of the preceding era but made it still more rigid. "Caritas," the church charitable institution taken over by the Government in January 1950, has been retained up to the present.[19] Social activities such as hospitals, educational institutions, social organizations of various types have been taken over partly by the Government and the remnants, still in the hands of the church, are burdened with such heavy taxes that practically no activities of this type can be carried on. [20]

F. Millennium of Poland

Attacks by the Communists are not limited to the present time but also have been made against the historical past of the church. In 1966 the millennium of the Polish Nation will be celebrated. The year 966 is the most significant in the life of the Polish Nation because it is the first known historical date of the origin of Poland as a nation. This was the year in which the Poles embraced Christianity. The tremendous role of the church throughout the thousand years of life of the Polish Nation is indisputable. Catholicism is inseparately connected with the national feelings of the Poles. In difficult eras, the church was the sole visible spiritual power which bound together the nation as a whole. This was particularly apparent in the times when Poland was divided by the frontiers of the powers which partitioned the country at the end of the 18th century and attempts were made to denationalize the Poles by means of religious persecution. The Communists now call these spiritual feelings a "mythology" and they are considered to be one of the obstacles "in the process of laicization * * * and in the struggle for a lay culture in Poland." [21]

The Government, therefore, in its celebration of the millennium appears prepared to discredit anything which might point up the historical role of the church in Poland. The preparations of the church for the celebration of the millennium are being combated by atheistic propaganda and material is being confiscated such as the writings prepared by the Primate's Institute in Czestochowa. The Novena ordered by the Episcopate had been ridiculed and religious celebrations of the millennium are censured as "manifestations of fidelity to Catholicism and the Vatican." [22] In the resolution adopted by the Sejm [diet] on February 28, 1958, it was expressly stated that "The millennium festivities should increase the power of our nation for the construction of socialism." [23] The millennium is being popularized by the Government as the process of the "class struggle of the people's culture, progressive, laicized against [a] feudal, backward and spiritualistic [culture]." The end of this process is being linked by government propaganda with the date of the establishment of the People's Poland in 1945 in which, it is stated, the people's culture and the materialistic doctrine finally prevailed.[24]

---

[9] Nowe Drogi, No. 5, 1959, pp. 62–63.

[10] Tygodnik Powszechny (Kraków), No. 44.

[11] Polish Affairs (London), Nos. 1–2, 1964, p. 7.

[12] Fakty i Mysli (Warszawa), December 15, 1963, cited from Polish Affairs, Nos. 1–2, 1964, p. 7.

[13] Polityka (Warszawa), No. 32, August 9, 1958, p. 3; see also Press, Publications and Censorship, infra.

[14] Mysl Polska (London), No. 3, 1964, p. 2.

[15] Nowe Drogi, No. 4, 1959, pp. 61–62.

[16] Nowe Drogi, No. 4, 1959, pp. 61–62.

[17] Nowe Drogi, No. 6, 1958, p. 100.

[18] Nowe Drogi, No. 6, 1959, pp. 72–81.

[19] Church and State, op. cit., pp. 190–194.

[20] See "Taxation and Financial Foundations of the Church," infra.

[21] See "Press, Publications and Censorship," infra.

[22] Orzel Bialy (London), No. 10, 1960, p. 2.

[23] Monitor Polski (Warszawa), No. 16 Law No. 98.

G. Religious instruction in schools

A severe and long struggle has been fought in postwar Poland in regard to religious instruction in schools which was mandatory for centuries. It was also mandatory under the partitioning of Poland as well as after the nation regained independence in 1918. Molding the character of the youth according to the teachings of the church has always been the substance of religious instruction and remained so even after the Communists took over in 1945. The ultimate result of religious instruction, however, has been affected by postwar political changes. While the church endeavors to preserve the soul and the character of the Polish nation as it has been throughout the centuries, the Communist regime fights to convert the Poles to atheistic socialism. The struggle carried on since 1945 has gone through several stages which may be summarized as follows.

After 1945 mandatory religious instruction in schools was upheld for all churches recognized by the State.[25] Under the agreement of December 6, 1956, religious instruction was made a voluntary and an elective subject for children whose parents expressed the desire to have them receive it. Despite these limitations, the Catholic clergy and the press offered their support in carrying out the stipulations of the agreement. Primate Wyszynski on December 30, 1956, declared that "although at present religious instruction in schools is elective, for you and your children, however, it is mandatory, because it is binding on the Catholic conscience." The leading Catholic weekly stated that "it is our duty to accept the agreement with confidence and understanding of the general situation and to do our best to see that it takes effect in the atmosphere as it was concluded."[26]

While the Catholics accepted the provisions of the agreement with "confidence" and considered the "atmosphere" in which it was concluded as friendly, the Communist regime prepared a plan to undermine and eventually liquidate religious school instruction. This plan consisted of limiting the circle of persons qualified to give religious instruction in schools and actions undermining the provisions of the agreement of December 6, 1956, until religious instruction was finally liquidated in 1961. All this happened despite promising statements of Gomulka at the ninth plenary session of the central committee of the party cited above, in which he spoke of "coexistence" and the "new state of affairs which does not exist [even] in France and the United States."

The number of the clergy greatly diminished after World War II as a result of deaths from natural causes and deportations by both the Germans and the Russians. Diocesan seminaries did not produce new priests during the war. To remedy the shortage of priests, specially selected nuns were educated in special schools and after taking an examination they received canonical authorization for catechistic instruction in schools. They constituted 60 percent of the religious teaching personnel. The regulations of January 26, 1957[27] (issued a month after the agreement was signed) and the directives of August 5, 1957,[28] Concerning Qualifications for Religious Instructors, limited the class of teachers to persons who had finished theological studies and persons not employed as teachers of lay subjects in any school. By the regulation of August 4, 1958,[29] all members of religious orders were prohibited to give religious instruction in schools. By the issuance of these administrative regulations, the minister of education removed all except priests from the schools, violating in this unilateral form the provision of section 2 of the agreement and thereby depriving the majority of the schools of religious instruction.

Another atheistic organization, Towarzystwo Szkoly Swieckiej (the Lay School Association), was established in January 1957. The first convention of this association held in May 1958, was sponsored by the government and the party. The key speech was delivered by a member of the political bureau of the party (Jerzy Morawski). The resolutions adopted according to the lines set forth in the key speech included as the objective of the association "the struggle for progressive lay thought and socialist education. The lay educational system." It was stated, "constitutes the doctrinal basis of the people's state and should be put into effect by the state in all schools." To achieve this objective, the resolution appeals for a concentration of efforts by the party and by its members to obtain the support of parents and the cooperation of all schools of all types, "for the struggle to create a front against intolerance and militant clericalism * * * and for building a socialist society free from * * * superstition * * * and for 'Marxist rationalism'."[30]

These resolutions were developed at the third convention of the Communist Party, held March 10-19, 1959, in the speech of Gomulka, which reads as follows:

"The construction of the socialist mind of the people and that of the young generation, in particular, is no less important in the development of socialism than the development of its economic bases. For this reason, it is not of indifference to us what philosophical, sociological, economical, pedagogical, etc., doctrines are spread among the people, and what indoctrination our intelligentsia is receiving. It is not of indifference to us how, in these spheres of science, the Marxist position looks in its fight against bourgeois views."[31]

The resolution adopted at that convention stated that "raising the work of schools of all systems and types to a higher level, and strengthening their socialist development is one of the crucial tasks of the plan concerning the development of the people's Poland in 1959-1965."[32]

In the enforcement of this resolution, parents and educators were put under pressure to express themselves in favor of lay schools[33] and religious instruction was gradually shifted from the schools to parish premises.[34] Subjects strange to socialism were removed from the school curriculums and new ones based on the Marxist-Leninist doctrine were introduced.[35] Teachers were instructed by the Ministry of Education to "transform the mind of the youth according to Marxist-Leninist teachings, to liberate youth from superstition, and to prepare youth for practical participation in the life of the party."[36]

In February 1961, the special seventh plenary session of the central committee of the party was devoted to the reorganization of the entire educational system in Poland.[36a] The political bureau prepared a report which was the basis for discussion and resolutions. The school, it was stated, "should educate youth to become convinced and active builders of the new system. The school in the People's Poland is a lay school." Religious instruction in schools was considered incompatible with the new character of education. Carrying out the tasks set forth by the new educational system was apportioned among parents, teachers, and youth organizations.

The school was charged with responsibility "for the result of the preparation of the maturing generation for life and participation in the building of socialism." Since, as it was stated, "the school itself is not able to meet all the requirements of education and to overcome difficulties without the aid of the people, parents should help the school in its educational activities in molding the minds and characters in the spirit of cooperation with the educational tasks of the Socialist school." Special emphasis was placed on the political attitude of teachers. Youth organizations such as the Zwiazek Mlodziezy Socjalistycznej (Socialist Youth Union), Zwiazek Mlodziezy Wiejskiej (Peasant Youth Union), and Zwiazek Harcerstwa Polskiego (Polish Scouts Union), constitute the core of Socialist education * * * supplementing the activities of the school in the preparation of pupils for life in a Socialist society * * * and leading the way in the * * * realization of the tasks set forth by the Plenum of the Central Committee" of the party.

The party itself was made the chief supervisor of the educational system as a whole and of the parents' school committees, and teachers and youth organizations insofar as their cooperation in the fulfillment of the tasks assigned to them is concerned. The essential task of the party with respect to the educational system is the political leadership and constant everyday care of the education of the young generation, the carrying on of "the offensive ideological struggle against ideological views strange to socialism against the influences of the bourgeois morality, and the struggle for the saturation of the whole educational system with the Socialist ideological substance." "The protection of the school from politically hostile pressure * * * and from clerical circles." The party supervises the new programs of teaching and the textbooks. For this purpose, it should "surround itself with numerous and valuable educational personnel * * * and perform constant political control." With respect to parents' school committees, the party should "pay special attention (to see) that the parents' school committees are composed of persons enjoying high esteem and known as individuals with progressive convictions"; the members of the party should treat their work on parents' school committees as one of the essential directives of the party. One of the party's tasks is the "development of organizational and political activities among teachers," in particular, "systematic ideological and educational activities among teachers, informing them about the policy of the party * * * and deepening their political knowledge." The party "should give essential help to youth organizations (referred to above) in the realization of the basic branches of their work."

The principles stated above form the motivation and commentary for the enactment which embodied them in legal form in the statute of July 15, 1961, "concerning the development of education."[37] This law inflicted the final blow to religious instruction in schools as provided for by section 2 of the agreement of December 6, 1956.

---

[24] Orzel Bialy, No. 10, 1960, p. 2.

[25] Church and State, op. cit., p. 187-188, 233-236.

[26] Tygodnik Powszechy, No. 2, 1957, p. 3.

[27] No. GM 2X341/57, Dziennik Urzedowy Min. Osw. (Department bulletin of the Ministry of Education), No. 1, Law No. 4.

[28] No. K. 1—1026, Dziennik Urzedowy Min. Osw., No. 13, Law No. 167, and 1959, No. 3, Law No. 38.

[29] No. GM 1X3146/58, Dziennik, Urzedowy Min. Osw., No. 9, Law No. 121.

[30] Nowe Drogi, No. 7, 1958, p. 140-144.

[31] Nowe Drogi, No. 4, 1959, p. 73-74.

[32] Nowe Drogi, No. 2, 1961, p. 6.

[33] Orzel Bialy, No. 42, 1960, p. 8.

[34] Orzel Bialy, No. 47, 1960, p. 2.

[35] Nowa Szkola (Warszawa), No. 9, 1960, cited from Orzel Bialy, No. 5, 1961, p. 2.

[36] Orzel Bialy, No. 5, 1961, p. 2.

[36a] Nowe Drogi, No. 2, 1961.

The next step was an attempt to limit religious instruction exclusively to church buildings, to place it under Government control, and to subordinate clergymen to the Government administration by the regulation of the Minister of Education of August 19, 1961, "concerning the operation of catechistic centers."[38]

In spite of threats the pastors of the parishes did not comply with the regulation except for a small group of pro-Government clergymen. Cardinal Wyszynski summoned the pastors of all parishes to a conference in Czestochowa on August 26, 1961, a pastoral letter was issued in which it was stated that, "Since religious instruction in schools has been abolished, we shall continue it outside schools within the framework of our church pastorate * * * similar to the work of the apostles at the beginning of Christianity." Clergymen were instructed to refuse to take any compensation from the Government for this work and to disobey the ministerial regulation. The following seven points of motivation for the letter were: (1) The regulation violates the jurisdiction of the church; (2) it violates the basic right of parents to religious education for their children, who, in the majority of cases, will not be able to obtain religious instruction; (3) the regulation is incompatible with the commitment accepted by the party and the Government that religious instruction would be held where the majority of parents so desire; (4) the regulation gives school inspectors the authority to extend control over the religious instruction even on church property; (5) the existence of the catechistic centers was made dependent upon the arbitrary discretion of the Government agency charged with deciding whether the requirements to which these centers are subject have been met; (6) the regulation admits a limited number of persons qualified to give religious instruction; (7) the regulation provides for the closing of catechistic centers revealing in this way the tendency toward the complete liquidation of religious education. The letter emphatically states that "should a reasonable agreement with respect to religious education not be reached, we should not hesitate to request from you, dear pastors, complete subjugation and supreme sacrifice so that the essential mission of keeping millions of children and youth for Christ be fulfilled."[39]

The regulation has not been enforced so far nor has any agreement been reached. Recently an attack against the church hierarchy was renewed in the Communist press in connection with religious instruction requesting the introduction of administrative sanctions in the enforcement of the ministerial regulation. "Bishops," it was stated, "took the position that the state has no right to supervise religious instruction. They issued directives to the clergy to ignore the orders of the authorities, to refuse to register catechistic centers, to refuse control over premises where religious instruction is given, to refuse supervision of religious instruction, and to refuse to submit reports. The state may not agree to have religious instruction given outside the control of the school authorities. The refusal of control must lead to administrative sanctions."[40]

H. Interference with internal affairs of the church

Despite the assurance in the agreement of December 6, 1956, of complete freedom in religious life, the Government enacted on December 31, 1956, a decree concerning the organization and appointment to ecclesiastical offices,[41] by means of which it encroached upon the very heart of the internal organization and functioning of the church. This decree replaced the previous harsh decree of 1953, regulating the same matter,[42] which was settled by the agreement of December 6, 1956. Instead, however, of improving it as the representatives of the church understood it would do, the new decree worsened the situation of the church. It not only extended its provisions to territorial divisions of the church but made it possible for the Government administration to interpret them as extending not only to the appointment but also to the removal of clergymen from office. This practice was applied to Bishop Kaczmarek, the ordinary of the Kielce diocese, who had been imprisoned in 1953 and rehabilitated after October 1956. In 1959, the Government announced that it no longer considered Bishop Kaczmarek the ordinary of the diocese and proclaimed his office vacant. Similar action has been applied to clergymen in lower ecclesiastical offices.[43]

Beside meddling in the administrative affairs of the church, the Government has been continuing diversionary action among believers and among the clergy following the practice of the era preceding October 1956.[44] This diversionary policy among believers was defined as follows in the official party organ:

"It is necessary to carry out such a policy toward various Catholic circles which would make a differentiation between more or less politically progressive circles and reactionary ones, between circles more or less inclined to cooperate with the progressive lay circles and intolerant and extremist obscurants."[45]

These "progressive circles" had been created in the preceding era; namely, in the period before October 1956, a diversionary group of Catholics was created under the name of "Pax" as a "third force" between the Government and the church. Owing to connections of the "Pax" leader (Boleslaw Piasecki) with General Sierov, Chief of the Soviet NKVD, "Pax" was granted a monopolistic position in the Catholic press and publications, the privilege to sell religious articles, to engage in parliamentary "Catholic" representation, take journeys abroad, and make official appearances and participate in governmental-social organizations in the name of Catholics. A number of Catholic intellectuals and journalists who were not able to find other employment were grouped around the "Pax," and through its press and publications as well as public appearances created confusion among the people, even interferring with the wiretapped sermons and speeches of the primate and the bishops.

Still more confusion was created abroad by spreading propaganda concerning the cooperation between church and state, despite the protests of the Episcopate and the placing of "Pax" publications on the "Index of Prohibited Books" by the Vatican. "Pax" retained this privileged position after October 1956, rendering the same services to the Communist regime in its policy of discriminating between "realistic," "progressive," "backward," and "fanatic Catholics" as well as in creating confusion abroad concerning the real relations between church and state.[46]

The prohibition issued to the clergy by Primate Wyszynski to keep them from collaborating with the "Pax" publications program was suppressed by the Government.[47] In defining the policy of the party toward the church at the third convention held in March 1959, Gomulka stated "that our party is opposed to any attempts to kindle religious fanaticism. A similar position is shared in Poland by various realistic and more enlightened Catholic circles which follow progress and are looking for their place in the society building socialism. Some of these circles declare themselves for socialism in a definite way."[48]

Diversionary activities among the clergy are carried on by the whip and carrot method. The show trials of the preceding era are now replaced by the tactics of constant annoyance, the creation of an atmosphere of uncertainty, and by heavy taxation. Defamation of the clergy is an everyday practice, and for such practice special files of clergymen are kept by the Government agencies. A press campaign exposes not only clergymen's sermons to ridicule, but it is not uncommon to print composite pictures of clergymen in compromising situations with women. Clergymen are often called to police stations where they are shown photographs of themselves in the company of persons of a suspicious appearance. Harassment at night by threatening telephone calls are not infrequent. Confidential instructions are issued to withhold allotments of fuel for heating from clergymen, churches, and religious orders.

The episcopal message of March 28, 1963, protesting against these practices states that "thousands if not tens of thousands of government officials in Poland are doing nothing but watching and looking for new nuisance measures for the persecution of religious life."[49] Under these circumstances, clergymen overburdened with pastoral work are "like soldiers in the mud at Verdun who were not called upon to pronounce sophisticated theses but only to hold the positions." The church is fighting for its very existence. It gave up what is not essential long ago.[50]

A small group of clergymen not strong enough to resist this pressure surrendered, and their attitude similar to "Pax" has been exploited for the political purposes of the party.[51] It was stressed by Gomulka at the third convention of the party in defining the policy toward the church that it was endorsed by "an increasing number of clergymen."[52] It should be noted that the Government has, at its disposal, a church fund derived from confiscated church land which, according to the statute of March 20, 1950, is designated to "provide clergymen with financial and medical support and help as well as to establish rest homes for them; in justifiable cases, to grant clergymen medical aid, and to grant special old-age pensions to especially deserving clergymen."[53] Confidential instructions direct county offices of denominational affairs to exempt some clergymen from taxes for "ideological concessions." There are also cases in which some parish priests have been called "for private conferences" by Government agencies.[54]

An especially painful blow has been inflicted on the freedom of education of young priests in diocesan seminaries by subjecting such teaching to Government control.[55] School inspectors supervise these seminaries and Government officials have removed the books from their libraries, which, according to their opinions, were incompatible with the teaching requirements in the People's Poland.[56]

---

[37] For text of the Statute, see ch. VIII, B.

[38] The text is translated in ch. VIII, C.

[39] Osservatore Romano (Vatican), Nos. 25, 26, and 27, September 1961.

[40] Zycie Warszawy (Warszawa), Mar. 3, 1964, cited from Mysl Polska, No. 6, 1964, p. 2.

[41] For text of the decree, see ch. VIII, D.

[42] Church and State, op. cit., p. 214–224, 237.

[43] Intercatholic Press Agency Bulletin (New York), No. 3, 1964; see also Church and State, op. cit., p. 202.

[44] Church and State, op. cit., p. 206.

[45] Nowe Drogi, No. 6, 1958, p. 100.

[46] Tygodnik Powszechny, No. 21, 1957.

[47] Orzel Bialy, No. 30, 1957, p. 1.

[48] Nowe Drogi, No. 4, 1959, p. 61.

[49] Intercatholic Press Agency Bulletin, No. 3, 1964.

[50] Orzel Bialy, No. 25, 1962, p. 1.

[51] Church and State, op. cit., p. 206.

[52] Nowe Drogi, No. 4, 1959, p. 61.

[53] See "Naturalization of Church Property," "The Church Fund," infra.

[54] Orzel Bialy, No. 22, 1962, p. 1.

I. The Catholic University of Lublin

In its campaign against the church and religion, the Communist government has paid special attention to the Catholic University of Lublin. While the shrine in Czestochowa is the Catholic spiritual religious center, the Catholic University of Lublin has been the unique Catholic educational center in this region of Europe. There was no need to create Catholic universities in Poland prior to World War II. Religious life was free and besides the Catholic theological faculties which existed in all universities there were Protestant and Orthodox faculties as well. Two factors, however, determined the establishment of the Catholic University in Lublin in 1918. Lublin is the largest city with a historical background situated near the Soviet border. The need to create a school of higher learning permeated with the Christian atmosphere on the border of the two worlds, one Christian and the other atheistic, and, in addition, one representing Western civilization and the other the East, dictated this undertaking. The other factor was the need for finding a new seat for the Polish Theological Academy of [the former] Petersburg [now Leningrad], which had been liquidated in the Bolshevik Revolution.

Lublin University had all the faculties of a regular university between the two world wars. During World War II it continued its work underground. In 1944 it was the first university in Poland to resume its work under the new regime, filling the gaps caused by the war. Both priests and the generation growing up during the war were educated there. The scholarly standards have affected the intellectual formation of the whole religious life in Poland. It is a private school receiving no subsidies either from the the Episcopate or from the Government. Its funds derive from offerings sent by millions of supporters in Poland and abroad, including the United States, and from church collections made five times a year.

Several measures have been applied by the Communist regime to undermine the University of Lublin. In 1950-51, the Government deprived it of its law school and the faculties of economics, political science, and later of pedagogy and the social sciences. Discrimination has been practiced against its graduates. It should be kept in mind that the Government is the sole employer in both Government administration and the economic area. The reduction of the university faculties and the discriminatory policy resulted in the reduction of the functions of the university and the number of students. In addition, the taxation policy, discussed elsewhere, brought the university to financial ruin. Its teaching is completely under the control of the Office for Denominational Affairs and the competent school authorities. Thus, the Catholic University of Lublin is at the mercy of the Government which may liquidate it at any time. If it has not been done already, it is because its existence under the circumstances described above serves to spread the Communist propaganda abroad about the coexistence of church and state.[57]

J. Governmental machinery in denominational affairs

The governmental policy concerning denominational affairs is exercised through the Office for Denominational Affairs, established by a statute of April 19, 1950 (Dziennik Ustaw (Journal of Laws) No. 19, Law No. 150). It is divided into a Department for the Roman Catholic Denomination, a Department for Non-Catholic Denominations and a Division for the Supervision of Denominational Associations. How deeply this Office penetrates religious life is shown by its organic charter adopted by the Resolution of the Council of Ministers of May 27, 1950.[58] Under this charter the jurisdiction of the Department for the Roman Catholic Denomination and the Department for Non-Catholic Denominations includes "supervision of the correct execution of the provisions concerning religious denominations; supervision of the putting into effect of the [provisions concerning] freedom of belief; supervision of denominational schools as well as of subsidies and donations for the purpose of the satisfaction of denominational needs."

In particular this jurisdiction covers the following:

The securing of the rights and duties of the clergy and the assisting personnel; affairs connected with the system and the activities of the denomination, its institutions, establishments [and] personnel; affairs concerning the rendition of an opinion involving applications filed by organizational units, denominational units or by individuals [to be determined by] other [than the Office for Denominational Affairs] authorities and Government agencies; affairs concerning the rendition of opinions involving assemblies and collections connected with the religious worship; affairs concerning the activities of the higher denominational schools [Catholic University of Lublin], diocesan and religious order seminaries [educating candidates for priests]; affairs concerning preparatory schools for diocesan and religious order seminaries; [affairs] concerning persons employed by a religious cult; affairs concerning the system and activities of the denominational schools as well as the curriculums and the programs of teaching in these schools; [and] affairs concerning the distribution of subsidies and donations for the satisfaction of the essential needs of a denomination.

The Division for the Supervision of Denominational Associations has supervisory jurisdiction over registration, recordation, the organizational system, personnel, and the activities of the denominational associations as well as over the associations of religious orders and congregations, and affairs concerning the rendition of an opinion involving subsidies and donations from Government and non-Government funds.

The Office for Denominational Affairs is headed by an official of ministerial rank under the direct authority of the Prime Minister. Its local agencies are for the most part run by young activists from the Communist Party's Socialist Youth Union, militant atheists, and trained enemies of the church. The antichurch activities of this institution and its agencies were so greatly intensified in 1963 that the management of the campaign was decentralized so that the local agencies have become spearheads of the offensive, resolutely making the existence of the church and its organization ever more difficult in every township and in nearly every village.[59]

K. Press, publications, and censorship

The 1952 constitution guarantees the freedom of the press and of printing (art. 71). This provision, however, was made a dead letter by the enactments regulating the distribution of printing paper, censorship, printing, and distribution of the press.

Printing paper, under the decree of April 26, 1948 (Dziennik Ustaw, No. 24, law No. 163), and the executive regulation of May 15, 1953 (Dziennik Ustaw, No. 32, law No. 129), has been monopolized by the state. A permit is required for the use of any kind of paper for printing, and it may be used only in conformity with the terms provided for in the permit. Printing paper may be neither acquired nor disposed of without a permit. In addition to the permit to acquire paper, an additional permit for its use must be obtained. Any person possessing printing paper is obliged to report the amount to the competent authority as well as submit a list of its uses supported by documents. Violations of these provisions are under the sanction of a criminal penalty of 3 months in jail or a fine or both.

Censorship of the press and other publications as well as the control over the distribution of printed material is exercised by the central and local offices of the Control Over the Press, Publications and Public Performances, created by the decree of July 5, 1946 (Dziennik Ustaw, No. 34, Law No. 210). The distribution of printed material is a monopoly of the governmental enterprise "Ruch" (Movement), and printing establishments have been nationalized.

Under these circumstances, the press and printing are not a matter of right but of a Government license. Needless to say, the antireligious and the "Pax" press enjoy full freedom and are supported by the Government while the Catholic press remains under strict Government control[60] and is being suppressed. This applies not only to the press in the true meaning of the term but even to material mimeographed by church authorities and books dealing with religious matters. A typical example of this practice was a police raid on the shrine in Czestochowa on July 21, 1958, in which a Government attorney and a representative of the Ministry of the Interior participated. The purpose of the raid was to search for and seize mimeograph machines and search the Primate Cardinal Wyszynski Institute in which the material for the Millennium of Poland was stored. The search was conducted with ruthlessness, arrests were made, and mimeograph machines and printed material were seized.[61] In the fall of 1963, the customs administration in Poland seized 60,000 books, chiefly connected with the preparation of the Millennium of Poland and the program of the church's moral, religious, and pastoral work during the period 1957–66. as well as with the historical development of the religious life in the thousand years.[62] The books were published by the Pallotini Fathers in France and sent by the World Union of Catholic Women Organization as a gift. The books were not returned to the sender but were sent for pulping to the paper mills without giving any opportunity for appeal.[63] It should be noted that both the printed matter seized on July 21, 1958, in Czestochowa and the 60,000 books from France contained some material which had previously passed Government censorship and was even printed in the Government Printing Office.[64]

---

[55] See "Government Machinery in Denominational Affairs," infra.

[56] Intercatholic Press Agency Bulletin, No. 3, 1964.

[57] Tygodnik Powszechny, No. 38, 1958; Orzel Bialy, No. 22, 1958, No. 27, 1962.

[58] Monitor Polski, No. A-78, Law No. 905.

[59] Polish Affairs, Nos. 1-2, 1964, p. 6-7.

[60] The following are the atheistic publications: Biblioteczka Ateisty; Euhemer; Glos Wolnych; Argumenty; Fakty i Mysli; Mysli Wolna. In October 1956 only two Catholic publications survived: Ruch Biblijny i Liturgiczny and Collecteanea Theologica dealing with subjects of such special nature that, in effect, they appeal only to a very limited circle of readers. The leading Catholic weekly Tygodnik Powszechny was discontinued Mar. 8, 1953, because of its refusal to print an article in connection with the death of Stalin. It was transferred to a new group of journalists organized around the "Pax" Association (see for details, "Interference With Internal Affairs of the Church," supra). Tygodnik Powszechny was published in this way until May 13, 1956, when it was merged with the "Pax" publications Dzis i Jutro and Kierunki. The reestablishment of Tygodnik Powszechny under the guidance of the former group of writers took place under the new regime on Dec. 25, 1956. The relative freedom did not last long. This weekly publishes articles with great caution and does not reveal the internal affairs of the church. This is why the material for this report is taken mainly from publications outside of Poland.

[61] Orzel Bialy, No. 33/34, 1958, p. 4.

Cardinal Wyszynski in his sermon on August 23, 1963, stated the following:

> All the time we have been waiting for justice in our motherland. Not only for a few privileged individuals and groups but also for citizens and for believers in particular. If we were afraid to demand our rights it would mean that we do not feel free. We, however, do feel free and therefore we demand that abuses and persecutions be stopped * * * a man has the right to freedom and his convictions, the right to express his opinion. However, when Polish bishops want to exercise their rights, their lips are sealed. * * *[65]

V. UNDERMINING OF THE ECONOMIC FOUNDATIONS OF THE CHURCH

The Communist policy to deprive the church of its economic foundations has been carried on through the nationalization of church property and by taxation.

A. Nationalization of church property—The church fund

A distinction has to be made between church land and church buildings. Church land was confiscated by the statute of March 20, 1950 (Dziennik Ustaw, No. 9, law No. 87) in order to "remove the last vestiges of feudal privileges held by religious associations and at the same time to secure the material needs of the clergy." Under the law, confiscation included landed property of any kind whatsoever belonging to the church and other denominational communities or to their institutions, establishments, religious orders, religious associations, or to any organizational units and agencies, without regard to their legal status and the objectives for which the incomes deriving from these properties were used.

Land which constitutes the farm holdings of parish priests, provided it does not exceed 50 hectares, or, in the provinces of Poznan, Pomerania, and Silesia, 100 hectares, is exempt from nationalization since the Government considers such holdings as the basis of the parish priests' maintenance. This policy is connected with the attempts made by the Government to separate the lower clergy from the higher church hierarchy. Furthermore, the Council of Ministers may decide that certain categories of landed property or certain parts thereof may remain under the management of a church institution, establishment, association, or other organized unit or organ of the church. The council may also transfer such landed property to the management of another church organization, the proceeds being used for the benefit of the particular unit. Since such transfer of land may be granted against payment of compensation to the church fund or may be granted free, the Government retained in its hands the instrument for its policy to carry on discriminatory and diversionary actions within church institutions and individual demoninations. In addition, the Government retained the administration of the church fund established out of incomes derived from the confiscated church land and the excess of parish priests' holdings stated above.

The organization of the church fund is regulated by the charter adopted by the Council of Ministers which provides for the method of appointing its officers and establishing its activities. It is subject to the supervision of the chairman of the Council of Ministers (art. 3 of the statute of April 19, 1950, Dziennik Ustaw, No. 19, Law No. 156 and executive regulation of the Council of Ministers of June 3, 1950, Dziennik Ustaw, No. 26, Law No. 233, sec. 8). The statute enumerates the following purposes for which the church fund may be used: (1) Maintenance and reconstruction of churches; (2) financial support and help for clergymen as well as the establishing of rest homes for them; (3) in justifiable instances, granting clergymen medical aid; (4) special old-age pensions for especially deserving clergymen; (5) charitable activities. In addition, the Council of Ministers may extend the church fund to other church and charitable needs.

In addition to the chuch land, the Government confiscated church buildings in the Western (former German) territories by the issuance of an order to the local fiscal agencies to collect "rent" for the church buildings instead of levying taxes on them. By collecting "rent," the Government made itself the owner of the church buildings and created the relationship of "landlord and tenant" between itself and the church.[66]

B. Taxation and financial foundations of the church

The following are the provisions concerning taxation of the church, church institutions, and the clergy:

1. Income Tax

Churches: The law on income tax of October 26, 1950, repromulgated in 1957, Dziennik Ustaw,[67] No. 7, Law No. 26, does not exempt religious organizations and institutions as such from income tax. According to article 1 of the decree, the duty to pay the tax applies to both physical persons and legal entities as well as to associations without the status of legal entities regardless of their lay or religious character. Article 2, section 2, makes exemptions with regard to religious bodies if their incomes were used for specific purposes provided for by the law as follows:

"[The following] are exempted from income tax * * * in a given year * * * legal entities and associations not having the status of legal entities if, in conformance with their charters, they used, in the tax year or in the year immediately following, all income received during the tax year, directly for the purpose of general utility, education, culture, sports, religion, charity, or social welfare. Income is understood to be the sum of all earnings after deduction of expenses connected with the operation of a legal entity or of an association not having the status of a legal entity, expenses connected with the already possessed sources of incomes and expenditures for activities performed from time to time as provided for by the charter. The persons and associations mentioned in the first sentence are, however, subject to the duty to pay the tax on the earnings derived from income sources which are subject to the turnover tax and are not exempt from this tax [Provisions concerning turnover tax are discussed below]."

The executive order of February 28, 1951, Dz. U., No. 16, Law No. 127, section 2, issued in pursuance of the above income tax law with respect to the above provision states the following:

"1. If the earnings derived from sources of income not subject to the turnover tax, even in part and indirectly are used for purposes other than those specified in article 2, section 2, the legal entities mentioned in this provision are subject to taxation for the whole income.

"2. The exemption from the income tax provided for in article 2, section 2 of the decree applies under the condition that the circumstances supporting exemption be proved.

"3. Earnings designated for the acquisition or maintenance of vessels used solely for the performance of religious ritual are deemed to be income designed for liturgical purposes. Earnings designated for the maintenance of clergymen, members of religious orders and servants are not considered as income used for a religious sect."

Detailed instructions and directives regarding the practical application of article 2, section 2, of the income tax law were issued by the circular letters of the Ministry of Finance of February 25, 1959, No. PO 7/59, Dziennik Urzedowy of the Ministry of Finance No. 4, law No. 9, No. PO 1964/3/59 and of August 9, 1959, No. PO 14532/3/59. These directives state that the provisions of article 2, section 2, of the income tax law specifying the number of objectives for which the incomes of legal entities should be used in order to meet the conditions for exemptions from income tax, cannot be construed to mean that church and religious entities may use their incomes for all the purposes enumerated therein. The condition for exemption from taxation is the employment of the whole of the income for the purposes which an individual legal entity is called upon to fulfill. If the incomes of the church legal entities or of the religious orders are derived from economic activities which are classed as those covered by the turnover tax, such incomes are subject to the income tax. In parishes and dioceses the condition for exemption from income tax is that the incomes derive from sources other than those classified as covered by the turnover tax and, in addition, that the incomes are totally and directly used for the purpose of the religious ritual. If, at least part of the income was used for other purposes, for instance, for seminaries, then, the whole income is subject to income tax.

The problems connected with the subject matter discussed by the above directives may be arranged as follows:

Religious ritual purpose: Earnings used directly for religious ritual purposes are understood to be incomes used for the acquisition or maintenance of the following objects used solely for the performance of religious rituals:

(a) Liturgical vessels and objects such as chalices, containers for sacred oils, monstrances, etc.;

(b) Liturgical vestments;

(c) Church linen;

(d) Sacramental wines;

(e) Maintenance of church objects in a usable condition (houses of worship). Expenditures for the maintenance of churches, chapels, and other sacred objects in a condition fit for use are considered as spent for ritual purposes. Earnings, even in part, designated for investments, including the construction, reconstruction, or extension of existing church buildings or the adaptation of the buildings for sacral purposes are not deemed incomes used for the purposes specified in article 2, section 2 as they are not spent directly for the purpose of the ritual. On the other hand, according to the rules stated above, the sums received by parishes from the diocese for the reparation of churches should be considered as the use of the income for ritual purposes. However, as the instruction states, if the tax was levied on a church legal entity (for instance, a diocese) so that such entity used part of the income for the building, reconstruction, new construction or extension of churches or repair of buildings serving sacral purposes, the income tax should be levied on all the earnings. If the church legal entity files an application for the amelioration or cancellation of the tax, such application together with the records of the case and with the motion of the presidium of the local people's council should be forwarded to the Ministry of Finance.

---

[62] See Millennium of Poland, supra.

[63] Polish Affairs, Nos. 11–12, 1963, p. 14.

[64] Polish Affairs, Nos. 11–12, 1963, p. 14.

[65] Orzel Bialy, No. 36, 1963, p. 1.

[66] International Press Agency Bulletin, No. 3, 1964; see also pp. 61–63.

[67] Hereinafter abbreviated as Dz. U.

(f) Expenditures for the conservation of both private and national historical monuments made with the consent of the conservation authorities should be deducted from the income of the church or religious order forming a legal entity.

Charitable and educational activities: The conditions specified in article 2, section 2, of the income tax law may also be satisfied by parishes, or dioceses and religious orders if the use of the income for general community improvement such as building schools, combating alcoholism and similar activities recognized as having generally useful purposes by the presidium of the local people's council, as well as for charitable and social welfare purposes, is within the framework of existing legislation and regulations. The sums spent by church legal entities or religious orders for aid to individual persons may not be considered as expenditures for charitable and social welfare purposes according to article 2, section 2.

Maintenance of members of the clergy and of religious orders: Sums spent for the maintenance of clergymen, members of religious orders (congregations), are subject to taxation because they constitute neither the costs of the operation of the legal entity nor the expenses for ritual purposes. However, if members of a religious order are employed outside the religious order and their earnings are transferred to the religious order, such earnings are included in its income. In such cases, the religious order's expenses for the maintenance of its nonworking members, within the limits of the sums transferred to the religious order by the working members of the religious order, do not result in the religious order's loss of its exemption fom the income tax. If, however, such expenses exceed the amount of the earnings transferred by the working members, the basis for the levying of the income tax is the amount of the maintenance costs exceeding the transferred sums. The incomes of contemplative religious orders used for the maintenance of their members are also subject to taxation. However, upon the petition of the religious order, amelioration in tax payments and even the cancellation of the tax in whole or in part may be granted in justified cases.

Costs of operation of ecclesiastical legal entities and religious orders constituting legal entities in general: The deductions of the expenditures connected with the operation of the ecclesiastical legal entities, religious order and religious order congregations which conform to the law on associations (Dz. U. 1949, No. 45, law No. 335 and of 1950, No. 44, law No. 401) include compensation of superiors and members of ecclesiastical legal entities and executive boards of religious order congregations.

Costs of functioning of parishes: The costs of the functioning of a parish as a legal entity are the compensation of persons (church servants) employed in the parish on the basis of an employment contract, the maintenance of the parish office, and similar administrative expenses indispensable for carrying on the regular work of the parish. They do not include the salaries of the pastors and assistant pastors of parishes. (See "Clergy, and Income Tax," below). The money collected by the parishes for the maintenance of the seminaries and of the Catholic University of Lublin are entered as ephemeral sums in determining the income of the parish. The same applies to sums collected and transferred to parishes by the dioceses because these sums, being ephemeral for the parish, are taxed in the diocese.

Costs of functioning of dioceses: The costs of the functioning of a diocese as a legal entity are the compensation of the administrator of the diocese and of the clergy employed as administrative personnel (salaries), of nonclerical persons employed in the curia on the basis of a contract of employment, expenses for the maintenance of the offices, heating, lighting, etc., and administrative expenses indispensable for the normal functioning of the curia office. Contributions allotted by dioceses to parishes to repair churches constitute the use of income for ritual purposes according to article 2, section 2. It should be mentioned here that in determining diocesan incomes those earnings received from the individual parishes should be included. Therefore, in the evaluation of the incomes of the parishes, the sums transferred by the parishes on behalf of the dioceses should be credited as deductible expenses from the income.

Costs for maintenance of diocesan seminaries: The moneys transferred by dioceses for the maintenance of seminaries are not considered as expenditures for the functioning of the dioceses. Neither do they constitute direct use of the income for ritual purposes. These allotments are taxed in the seminary and are therefore considered as ephemeral sums and are not included in the income of the diocese. The seminarists' fees should be included as income. Compensation of teachers and of administrative personnel (clergymen included) employed on the basis of employment contracts, expenses for the maintenance of classrooms and for inventory and similar indispensable expenses for the normal work of a teaching institution are considered as the costs of the functioning of the diocese as a legal entity. Expenses for the maintenance of seminarists are not considered as either the costs of functioning of the seminary or the use of income for the purposes specified in article 2, section 2, and as a rule are subject to taxation. However, upon the petition of the seminary, in justified cases, the amount of the tax may be reduced to an amount equal to the sums paid for the maintenance of the seminarists after the deduction of the fees paid by them. Also deferment in payment and, in individual cases, even the cancellation of the tax may be granted.

Religious order seminaries: The principles specified above with respect to diocesan seminaries are not applicable to seminaries of religious orders which do not have status as legal entities. Expenses of religious orders for the maintenance of such seminaries are not considered either as costs of the religious order or as constituting a direct operational use of the income for ritual purposes. If the religious order incurs such expenses, an income tax shall be levied on its income. Should, however, the expenditure for the seminary of the religious order be the sole basis for taxation of the income, the directives provided for in the preceding paragraph concerning the method and procedure for the amelioration of payments apply accordingly.

Taxpayers: With respect to church legal entities, the taxpayers are parishes, dioceses, and diocesan seminaries, and with respect to religious orders, they are religious order conventions, provincial curiae and religious order houses (cloisters). The above directives, effective as of the 1959 tax year, apply to church legal entities, religious orders, and religious order congregations operating in conformance with the provisions of the law on associations. The competent department for denominational affairs ascertains whether the above-mentioned religious legal entities function in conformance with the law on associations.

Account books: In order to keep religious institutions in line with the above provisions, the Minister of Finance issued an order of February 20, 1962, Dz. U., No. 18, law No. 77, "Concerning the Keeping of Account Books by Church Legal Entities, Religious Order Congregations and Clergy Congregations." Detailed provisions of this Executive order may be summarized as follows: All incomes and expenditures both in cash and in kind must be entered in the account books. The books should show the incomes derived from individual sources, which are subject to the turnover tax and are not exempted from this tax, and the incomes exempted from the turnover tax. Within the items of income which are not subject to turnover taxation, there should be separate entries for ephemeral sums collected on behalf of the church or of the denominational congregation as a whole as well as on behalf of institutions and administrative units of the church and of the denominational congregations, charitable and social institutions, and so forth. Book entries concerning expenditures should show the expenditures for (1) Ritual purposes, charity, welfare and the common good; (2) the outlays connected with the acquisition of a given source of income; (3) expenses from ephemeral sums spoken of above. Incomes and expenses should be supported by documents.

Clergy: The above-cited circular letter of the Ministry of Finance of February 25, 1959, No. PO 1694/3/59, in addition to containing directives relating to the taxation of churches and denominational congregations as religious institutions, regulated the taxation of clergymen separately. It relates mainly to the payroll tax and the income tax.

1. Payroll tax: Compensation of the clergy and members of the religious orders paid by curial or other diocesan institutions on the basis of payrolls, as well as compensation of the clergy and members of the religious orders derived from employment such as earnings of teachers, prefects, members of the management of houses, etc., are subject to taxation according to the payroll tax law of May 16, 1946, repromulgated in 1956, Dz. U., No. 7, law No. 25. The latter law makes the organizations, institutions, and denominational congregations responsible for the appointment of persons charged with the duty of computing and collecting, in the name of the paymaster, the payroll tax and the timely payment of the collected tax to the account of the proper financial agency.

2. Income tax: Incomes of clergy, besides the incomes subject to a turnover tax, are subject to taxation according to the income tax law. The clergy is obliged to file income tax returns according to the regulations issued by the Minister of Finance of October 9, 1957, Dziennik Urzedowy of the Ministry of Finance No. 9, law No. 31. The duty of the clergy as physical persons to keep tax books was suspended. If, however, the members of the clergy present such books to fiscal authorities, they must be treated as other assessment material. The number of inhabitants in the parish should be a criterion for the assessment of the amount of the income tax of the Roman Catholic church clergymen. The above circular letter gives detailed instructions as to how to compute incomes derived from the pastoral functions of the pastors of the parishes jointly with the value of the premises occupied by them. According to these instructions the incomes should be listed the following way.

Number of inhabitants in the parish in recovered territories (former German) and in the dioceses of Przemyél and Tarnów:		Number of inhabitants in the remaining areas of the State
Up to 500	9,200 zlotys	9,200 zlotys.
Above 500 to 1,000	12,000 zlotys	13,000 zlotys.
Above 1,000 to 2,000	16,000 zlotys	18,000 zlotys.
Above 2,000 to 3,000	20,000 zlotys	22,000 zlotys.
Above 3,000 to 5,000	24,000 zlotys	27,000 zlotys.
Above 5,000 to 8,000	28,000 zlotys	32,000 zlotys.
Above 8,000 to 10,000	33,000 zlotys	37,000 zlotys.
Above 10,000 to 15,000	38,000 zlotys	42,000 zlotys.
And to each 1,000 inhabitants above 15,000	1,500 zlotys	2,000 zlotys.

Income tax returns filed by clergymen declaring incomes within the above limits should be taken as a basis for the levying of taxes. If a clergyman filed his income tax return below the above limits, the higher fiscal agencies should be consulted which in turn should consult the Office for Denominational Affairs of the Local People's Council and a proper curia. According to circular letter of the Minister of Finance of August 10, 1959, No. PO 14536/3/59, the same criteria apply to clergymen of other denominations who collect money from their believers for their religious services. Tabulations drawn up as guides (see above) concerning incomes have also practical significance but only in cases where the number of believers in a given parish does not substantially depart from the number of inhabitants within the area of the parish. In the remaining cases, financial agencies, after consulting the departments for denominational affairs, should as a rule assess the amount of incomes on the basis of the income tax returns filed by the clergymen of these denominations. Denominations which do not collect payments for their religious services (iura stolae) and clergymen who perform their services in the parish on the basis of an employment contract and receive a regular monthly compensation are subject to a payroll tax on this compensation which constitutes the cost of the functioning of the parish.

2. Turnover tax: The turnover tax is regulated by the decree of October 26, 1950, Dz. U., No. 49, Law No. 449. The duty to pay taxes extends to both physical and juridicial persons as well as to associations which are not legal entities. Pecuniary transactions of a civil and professional character involving property and services are subject to taxation. The following activities are tax free: (1) Teaching in scholarly establishments as well as career work of teachers and educators of the youth; (2) scientific, educational, artistic, literary and writing activities not connected either with the operation of an enterprise or with publishing on one's own account; (3) services rendered for compensation to which the payroll law applies.

The Minister of Finance is authorized, however, to exempt from taxation individual types of transactions in the whole area of the state or in individual areas thereof as well as to specify the terms of this exemption; he also has the power to lower the rates of taxation and to fix the terms of the tax rates. By the executive order of the Council of Ministers of June 6, 1951, Dz. U., No. 35, law No. 273, issued in pursuance of the turnover tax decree, the following activities were exempted from a turnover tax:

1. Activities performed by libraries, reading rooms, museums, galleries of art and exposition enterprises operated or maintained by legal entities, or associations not possessing the status of legal entities, the main objectives of which are scientific, educational, cultural, sports, religious ritual, social welfare and charity, provided the legal entities and associations mentioned above have acquired the right to exemption in the year preceding the fiscal year, as provided for in the income tax law.

2. Services rendered by dormitories, asylums, shelterhouses, and similar arrangements whose main purpose is social welfare, services operated and maintained by the above-mentioned persons and associations if these activities are performed on behalf of persons needing such social welfare. Under the directives of February 25, 1959, No. PO 1694/3/59, church legal entities and religious orders are obliged to declare monthly advance payments if they perform activities subject to the turnover tax or if the church legal entity or religious order makes expenditures for purposes other than those which justify exemption from income tax. Tax exemption may be granted after the yearly income tax returns has been filed and after the taxpayer has proved the circumstances supporting his claim to exemption from the income tax.

3. Land tax—Introductory remarks: The land tax is regulated by the decree of June 30, 1951, Dz. U., No. 23, law No. 143. According to article 6, the basis for the tax assessment constitutes the entire profits of an agricultural farm earned in a tax year for both crops and livestock production expressed in zlotys. This is called an estimated income. The tax is computed on the basis of the assessment by the application of an alterable or inalterable tax basis. The Council of Ministers establishes every year: 1. alterable tax bases within the limits up to 48 percent of the basis of the assessment for individual groups of individual agricultural farms. These bases may be uniform throughout the country, or different in various areas; 2. inalterable tax bases within the rate limits of up to 10 percent of the basis of the assessment for individual farms possessed by (a) public institutions, social and professional organizations, as well as legal entities, the income of which, in conformance with the charter, is used entirely for general use, education, science, sports, culture and charity.

Executive order of the Council of Ministers of June 8, 1955, Dz. U., No. 23, law No. 144, issued in pursuance of section 3 subsection 1, item 6 of the above Land Tax Decree reads as follows:

"Inalterable tax bases are hereby established for agricultural farms administered by legally recognized denominational congregations and their institutions, religious orders and religious order congregations as well as legally existing religious associations the income of which, in accordance with the charter, is entirely used for ritual purposes or educational, charitable and social welfare—at the rate of 8 percent of the tax basis."

If the conditions stated above have not been met, the tax shall be assessed on an alterable basis (Directives of February 25, 1959, No. PO 1694/3/59).

4. Local taxes: The decree of May 20, 1955, Dz. U., No. 21, law No. 36, "Concerning Local Taxes and Fees," concerns churches with respect to the local land tax and the tax levied on premises.

Land tax: Article 6, section 1, item 3, exempts from the local land tax real property owned by denominational congregations and their institutions, religious orders and religious order congregations as well as religious associations as regards the part exclusively and directly serving ritual purposes as churches, houses of worship, chapels and which are at the same time under their administration.

Tax on premises: Under article 15 premises occupied by denominational congregations and their institutions, religious orders and religious associations, if they serve exclusively and directly ritual purposes like churches, houses of worship and chapels, are exempted from taxes. According to the directives of February 25, 1959, No. PO 1694/3/59, issued by the Minister of Finance with respect to local taxes, the land tax levied on real property owned by denominational congregations and their institutions, religious orders and religious order congregations as well as religious associations, should be assessed in accordance with the provisions of the decree concerning local taxes. Therefore, those realties which serve exclusively and directly ritual purposes such as churches, houses of worship and chapels are subject to taxes also. These rules should as well apply to Western [former German] territories, but only with regard to realties owned by the above-mentioned church and religious order units. It was explained that realties in Western territories formerly owned by the German church and religious legal entities do not constitute property of the church and religious order units which utilize them at present. The title to these realties is in the state. Therefore, a land tax should not be levied on church legal entities or on religious orders. On the other hand, taxes on premises should be levied in conformity with the provisions concerning local taxes and fees and this rule also applies to Western territories. Consequently, only premises serving religious and ritual purposes exclusively and directly are exempted from taxes.

From the foregoing and everyday practice it follows that the church is treated not as a social nonprofit institution but as a private profitmaking enterprise. By the taxation policy the church has been drained of its income and has been paralyzed in its activities. Taxes of 60 percent have been levied on "incomes" from baptisms, weddings, funerals, Sunday church collections, and even on the food served in soup kitchens for the poor. The levying of taxes on the incomes of parish priests deserves special attention. While antireligious propaganda, as stated above, maintains that there is a decline in the number of believers, the Minister of Finance takes a different position in his taxation policy. Namely, he identifies the number of inhabitants with the number of the people practicing religion. Therefore, the personal incomes of clergymen are levied not according to the number of the parishioners but according to the number of inhabitants of a parish regardless of their creed.[68] Heavy local taxes have been levied on clergymen occupying apartments of more than two rooms. This state of affairs has brought on nervous breakdowns for many priests, and bishops are inundated with orders to pay taxes sent to them by parish priests to whom they have been issued by the fiscal agencies.[69]

Diocesan seminaries and the Catholic University of Lublin are in an extremely difficult situation by reason of the tax policy. Some seminaries had to be closed. The tax arrearages of the Lublin University exceeds 30 million zlotys.[70]

The consequences of this policy were described in the Episcopal letter of September 4, 1960, as follows:

"The church has been deprived of its financial foundations. If parishes, dioceses, and religious orders still possess anything, these are inappreciable remnants. Hospitals, educational, and social institutions as well as all larger houses have been taken over by the Government. And what remains in the hands of the church has been charged with such heavy taxes that despite our best will we are not able to pay them. Clergymen, monks, and nuns live today on their manual work and on the Christian charity of believers. This is especially felt in the Western territories, where the so-called economic bases of the diocesan seminaries, parishes, and dioceses have been confiscated under the claim that they are "post-German" property despite the fact that they have their character of the church property and to a great extent were rebuilt and improved by the hands of the Poles."[71]

---

[68] See pp. 54–56.

[69] Orzel Bialy, No. 22, 1962, p. 1.

[70] Mysl Polska, No. 3, 1964, p. 1.

Thus, the church has been placed in a trap which may be sprung at any time it suits the policy of the party.

The diversionary group of "Pax,"[72] on the other hand, enjoys a privileged position similar to that enjoyed prior to October 1956. It possesses 35 industrial establishments and many bookshops. The turnover of its enterprises is greater than that of all other enterprises left in private hands. Its profit exceeded 100 million zlotys in 1957 and its arrearages in taxes for a period of 5 years are estimated at 130 million zlotys.[73]

VI. DEFENSE BY THE PEOPLE

If a man is a member of the party and "builds socialism" it does not necessarily mean that he is a Communist. Very often "only God and his pastor, to whom he comes under the cover of the night, who baptizes his children or participates in a wedding behind the closed doors in the church, know this [that he is not a Communist]."[74]

Parishioners arrange collections among themselves to help their pastors and the church when they are exposed to the danger of attachment by execution on their property. Examples of the use of physical force by the people against Government actions directed against the church are often cited by the press. Antireligious propaganda explains this as religious fanaticism. In Nowa Huta, a new industrial center near Kraków, a cross was placed in March 1957 on the spot where a church was to be built. Rumors were spread that the cross was to be removed. Teams of workers kept guard by the cross, riots broke out and the police abandoned the plan. In the village of Przysucha near Kielce, the Government intended to dismantle a church, however, the workers sent to do the job were chased away by the population with clubs and stones.[75] Pilgrims in Czestochowa protested against a police raid on the shrine on July 21, 1958. Rioting began, arrests were made, and women, children, and the monks were beaten by the police.[76] In September 1961, fiscal authorities in Torun ordered the attachment of the personal property of the diocesan seminary for taxes but the workers refused to carry it out. To avoid fiscal execution, the population makes clandestine collections of food for the seminarists.[77]

The Government keeps its watchful eye on the attitude of the population and on the reactions abroad. The fear of close ties between the population and the clergy, riots and, above all, frustrating results of the propaganda spread by the Government concerning the relations of church and state warns the Government not to force its policy by employing too drastic measures in its relations with the church. The protests of the Episcopate and the cardinals, on the other hand, cause the Government to suspend its repressive measures. So, Lenin's policy of three steps forward and one step backward is fully applied.

VII. CLOSING REMARKS

The conciliatory period initiated by the agreement of October 6, 1956, did not last long. In 1961, Cardinal Wyszynski sent a letter to Czeslaw Wycech, speaker of the house, in which the abuses committed by the Government toward the church were cited. The cardinal requested that a committee be established to investigate the violations of the freedom of the church guaranteed by the constitution but so far no action has been taken.[78] Conferences between the church and the Government representatives have been held for a long time but without any results.

The atmosphere with regard to the church now prevailing in Poland is depicted from time to time in the sermons of Cardinal Wyszynski. In a sermon delivered in 1961, the Cardinal stated the following:

"The spirit of a human being is the spirit of rebellion against any slavery and falsehood. We know very well what it means to have shackles. You have experienced it, you have (also) experienced freedom. You do not need to read treatises dealing with freedom, it is enough to listen to the beating of your hearts. There may be nations who do not speak a word about freedom and people feel free. There may, on the other hand, be other countries where all the papers are filled with dissertations and speeches on freedom, but there is no freedom there. People achieve freedom and people deprive themselves of freedom. When humanity comes to know how freedom was given, woe to those who would try to take this freedom away. People will hide themselves. A man in defense of his freedom and his dignity will go down into catacombs and start a life in conspiracy in relation to external life."[79]

Before his departure for Rome for the Ecumenical Council, on September 23, 1963, the cardinal said: "It is not easy to leave the capital for several months at a time when the church in Poland is affected by the sufferings and injustices which we are not spared." Another bishop, during the council at Rome, on October 25, 1963, stated that in countries where religion has been persecuted "the believers suffer martyrdom and are kept in shackles * * * in those countries it is true audacity on the part of the parents even to baptize their children."[80]

As a whole it may be stated that the church in Poland persists not on a legal basis but rather owing to the very fact that it has existed for 1,000 years and is supported by more than 90 percent of the population—Roman Catholics.

VIII. TRANSLATION OF PERTINENT LAWS AND DOCUMENTS

A. Agreement of December 6, 1956[81]

The common commission, consisting of the representatives of the government and of the Episcopate, has considered a series of problems concerning relations between state and church which require regulation. In the course of conferences, the representatives of the government have affirmed their readiness to remove the obstacles which prevailed during the preceding period of time with respect to a realization of the full freedom of religious life.

The representatives of the Episcopate stated that, as a consequence of the changes in public life tending to secure the rule of law and to repair injustices, the government and the state authorities will find a full understanding of these tendencies in the church hierarchy and the clergy.

The representatives of the Episcopate have also expressed their full support for government undertakings aiming at the strengthening and the development of the People's Poland, the concentration of the efforts of all citizens in harmonious work for the welfare of the country, the conscientious abiding by the laws of the People's Poland and the fulfillment by the citizens of their duties toward the state.

The common commission has considered and settled a series of problems important to the state and the church.

1. For the purpose of the regulation of the legal relation of the state to the church administration, the common commission shall initiate with the state authorities the abolition of the existing decree of February 9, 1953, "Concerning the Appointment of Clergymen to Ecclesiastical Offices."[82] The new enactment regulating these problems shall guarantee the influence of the state on appointments to the offices of archbishop, diocesan bishop and coadjutor, with the right of succession, as well as parish priest, however, the requirements of the church jurisdiction shall be respected.

The draft of the new enactment shall be submitted to and agreed upon by the Joint Commission.

2. For the purpose of religious instruction in schools, the following principles have been established:

The voluntary taking of religious instruction in elementary and public schools by children whose parents shall express such desire is hereby assured full freedom and is guaranteed. Religious instruction shall be conducted as an elective subject. School authorities are obliged to make it possible to conduct religious instruction by an appropriate distribution of school business.

Teachers of religious subjects shall be selected by the school authorities in agreement with the church authorities. The teachers shall be on the payroll of the Ministry of Education. The program of religious instruction as well as the textbooks for religious instruction shall require the approval of both the church and the state authorities. Inspections of religious instruction shall be conducted by both the church and the state authorities. The state authorities shall make it possible for the children and youth freely to attend religious practices outside the school.

School authorities and the clergy shall assure full freedom and tolerance for both believers and nonbelievers and shall resolutely counteract any signs of an infringement on freedom of conscience.

3. The principles of the securing of religious care for the sick have been agreed upon.

The Ministry of Health shall issue new directives in the implementation of these principles.

4. The principles of religious care for prisoners and the appointment of prison chaplains have been agreed upon.

5. Consent has been granted for the return of the nuns resettled in 1955 in the provinces of Opole, Wroclaw, and Katowice. Those among them who do not feel that they have ties with Poland may leave the country if they so desire. The return of the clergy expelled from their parishes in the western provinces [formerly German] was also decided.

6. An agreement was reached between the Episcopate and the Government concerning

---

[71] Orzel Bialy, No. 42, 1960, p. 1.

[72] See Interference With Internal Affairs of the Church, supra.

[73] Orzel Bialy, No. 30, 1957, p. 1.

[74] Orzel Bialy, No. 25, 1962, p. 1.

[75] Orzel Bialy, No. 25, 1962, p. 1.

[76] Orzel Bialy, No. 33/34, 1958, p. 1.

[77] Orzel Bialy, No. 22, 1962, p. 1.

[78] Osservatore Romano, Dec. 31, 1961.

[79] Orzel Bialy, No. 12, 1961, p. 1.

[80] Mysl Polska, No. 3, 1964.

[81] See Agreement of Apr. 14, 1950, Church and State, op. cit., pp. 197–208, 233–236.

[82] Ibid., pp. 218–224, 237.

five new bishops appointed by the Apostolic See in the western territories.[33]

B. Statute of July 15, 1961, Dz. U. No. 32, law No. 160, concerning the development of education

Introduction: Education constitutes one of the essential elements of the socialist development of the People's Republic of Poland. The educational system has the task of preparing qualified workers for the national economy and cultural [and] dedicated builders of socialism. An educational system adapted by these tasks and the character of teaching and education is established by this statute.

Article 1: Teaching and education in schools and other educational institutions has the task of the universal development of the pupils and the education of dedicated and creative citizens of the People's Republic of Poland.

Schools and other educational institutions shall educate in the spirit of socialist morality and the socialist principles of common society life * * *.

Article 2: Schools and other educational institutions are lay institutions. Both teaching and education in these institutions are of a lay character.

Article 21: 1. Education outside of school hours is conducted by the schools.

2. The out-of-school education is organized in youth cultural houses for children and youth, school centers and sports clubs, reading rooms for children and young people, children's playgrounds, vacation centers and other places.

3. The out-of-school education has the task to:

* * * * *

(3) Create conditions for social activities.

Article 23: Youth and social organizations shall cooperate with the schools in the realization of educational tasks according to the principles established by the Minister of Education.

Article 35: 1. Educational affairs are under the jurisdiction of the Minister of Education.

2. The Minister of Education controls education, directly or through the agencies of the school administration of the presidia of the people's councils.

Article 39: 1. Schools, educational and nursing institutions as well as other institutions dealing with education may be conducted by professional [or] youth organizations, social institutions or other organizations and institutions, legal entities or physical persons, only with a permit issued by the Minister of Education, on the terms and principles established by him and under his supervision.

2. Any out-of-school educational activities as well as any other form of work with children and youth are subject to the supervision of the Minister of Education, who may establish the principles and terms of conducting these activities and work.

3. In granting to organizations and institutions of a religious character the permits provided for in section 1, the Minister of Education may waive the requirements provided for in article 2.

Special provisions shall regulate the requirements with respect to the education and qualifications of teachers. According to article 31, the "education of teachers and educators has the task of giving the teacher and educator a theoretical and practical preparation for his duties and for the fulfillment of the tasks provided for by the statute." Therefore, one of the requirements for teachers and educators is the proper "ideological background."

C. Regulation of the Minister of Education of August 19, 1961, Dziennik Urzedowy Ministerstwa Oswiaty, concerning the operation of catechetical centers

Section 1: Catechistic centers (punkty katechetyczne) may be established for the purpose of rendering accessible religious instruction to children whose parents or guardians so desire.

Section 2: Catechistic centers may be organized and conducted by the parish (denominational communities) administrators.

Section 3: 1. Catechistic centers may be maintained in public churches under the management of the parish (denominational communities) administrators.

2. These centers may also be created in other parish (denominational communities) premises provided adequate hygienic and sanitary requirements are met.

Section 4: Lectures, the subject of which is religious instruction for school-age children, may be given in catechistic centers (catechization).

Section 5: The lectures in catechistic centers may not exceed 2 hours per week for a child and may not conflict with his lectures at school.

Section 6: Lectures for children in catechistic centers may be conducted by secular clergymen who must obtain a permit from the competent school inspector. In justified cases lectures may be given also by laymen who have obtained a permit from the competent school inspector.

The permit may be revoked if the person conducting the lectures violates the provisions of this regulation or if other circumstances occur which for pedagogical reasons make it impossible to give the lectures to the children.

Section 7: 1. Lectures in catechistic centers may commence after the registration of the center with the competent school inspector.

2. The requirements for the registration of a catechistic center are proof by the parish (denominational community) administrator of the possession of premises fulfilling the requirements specified in section 3, and an indication of the person possessing a permit to conduct lectures in the catechistic center.

3. Catechistic centers which are in operation at the time when this regulation takes effect are also subject to the duty of registration. The parish (denominational community) administrator should register these centers up to October 31, 1961.

Section 8: Control over the activities of the catechistic centers is exercised by the school inspector.

Section 9: 1. For the organizing, conducting, and administering of catechistic centers within the parish (denominational community) area, a compensation of 1,000 zlotys monthly will be paid according to the contract, the form of which is attached to the regulation.

2. In justified cases in addition to the contract specified in subsection 1, also a contract with another secular clergyman may be entered into and for the conduct of the catechistic center the compensation of 700 zlotys will be accorded.

3. In connection with the provisions specified in subsections 1 and 2, it is not permissible to receive payments or offerings of any kind whatsoever either from the parents and guardians of the children or from the children [themselves] for the purpose connected with the organization, maintenance, and conduct of catechistic centers.

Section 10. This regulation takes effect on the day of its promulgation [it was promulgated on August 20, 1961].

D. Decree of December 31, 1956, Dz., U., 1957, No. 1, law No. 6. Concerning the organization of and appointment to ecclesiastical offices

Article 1: The creation, transformation, abolishing and establishing of territorial boundaries and seats of dioceses and parishes of the Catholic Church within the area of the People's Republic of Poland requires previous consultation with the jurisdictionally competent state agency.

Article 2: 1. The [central] government is the jurisdictionally competent agency for the changes specified in article 1 with respect to dioceses, and the territorially competent presidia of the provincial people's councils are jurisdictionally competent with respect to parishes.

2. Should the appropriate state agency not raise any reservations within 30 days from the notification, then it will be considered that the consent has been granted.

Article 3: Ecclesiastical offices, both church and monastic, in the People's Republic of Poland may be occupied exclusively by Polish nationals.

Article 4: Appointments to the offices of archbishop, bishop of diocese, coadjutor with the right of succession, parish priest and parish administrator, require the previous ascertainment that no reasonable reservations of the jurisdictionally competent state agency exist against persons to be appointed to these offices.

Article 5: (1) The central government is competent to raise reservations against an appointment to the office of archbishop, bishop of diocese, and coadjutor with the right of succession; the presidium of the territorially competent provincial people's council [is competent to raise reservations] against the appointment of a parish priest or the parish administrator.

2. Should no reservations be raised by the central government within 3 months or by the provincial people's council within 30 days from the notification, then it will be considered that the consent has been granted.

3. In case of a difference of opinion with regard to the reservation raised, the final decision is taken through consultation of the church authority with the Government.

Article 6. Persons appointed to the ecclesiastical offices specified in article 4, before taking office, must take an oath of loyalty to the People's Republic of Poland according to the following formula:

I solemnly promise to be loyal to the People's Republic of Poland, to respect its legal order and not to undertake anything which might endanger the welfare of the People's Republic of Poland.

Article 7. If the activities of a clergyman are harmful to the state the competent state agency shall request the competent superior church authority, giving its reasons, to issue appropriate orders and in case of the ineffectiveness (of these orders) to remove the clergyman from his ecclesiastical office.

Article 8. A final court judgment condemning a clergyman to forfeiture of civic rights results in the removal of the clergyman from his ecclesiastical office.

Article 9. The provisions of this Decree also apply to other churches and denominational communities by analogy.

SINO-SOVIET SPLIT

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Pucinski] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

---

[33] The text of the Agreement was cited in the work of Edward Malkiewicz and Stanislaw Podemski. Polozenie prawne kosciolów i zwiasków wyznaniowych w Polskiej Rzeczypospolitej Ludowej, Warszawa, 1960, pp. 129–130.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, world headlines are being captured increasingly by Red China.

It now is becoming abundantly clear that the Sino-Soviet split is real and that China is making an active bid for world leadership.

This is a challenge that the United States must face—now.

There are different ways of meeting such challenges.

A problem can be ignored or shoved into the background until it reaches the exploding point, when solutions must be sought in an atmosphere of desperation and tension.

Unfortunately, too often this has been the pattern of U.S. foreign policy.

Experience clearly demonstrates that this method is not a desirable one. We need only look to the tragedy of Yalta to see how devastating are the results of an indecisive foreign policy.

The world is moving forward at a cataclysmic pace. Nuclear power has changed traditional relationships among states. In these times, recognition of the true nature of events is difficult, and the formulation of new strategies to deal with them is even more so.

But if American foreign policy is to be formulated on a truly rational basis, then we can no longer afford to ignore these changes.

The challenge of Communist China is only one of the great problems which must be faced by the United States and the free world.

Like all of them, it is exceedingly complex, but a bare outline of its component parts will be presented here in the hope of provoking more research and discussion and perhaps even some guideline for an answer.

Mr. Speaker, I am particularly grateful to Miss Elaine Huarisa, of my staff, who did the research for this study. Miss Huarisa has a masters degree in political science from Georgetown University.

The most recent strategy of the Chinese Communists can be described rather crisply: Communist China wants to become the leader of the nonwhite world. Her appeal is being directed to two-thirds of the world's population of the continents of Asia, Africa, and Latin America. The nations of these areas are largely underdeveloped, but the expectations and hopes of these people have been aroused. They want change and they want it now.

The Chinese Communist claim that the revolution in their own country provides the answer; that Mainland China is a model for all countries seeking rapid modernization. At the same time, the Chinese Reds are actively engaged in a program of violently discrediting both Western and Soviet efforts to aid these less developed nations. The white world is identified by the Chinese Reds with colonialism, which has aroused deep-seated hatred in nearly all the developing nations of Asia, Africa, and even South America. These people are told that the colonialists deliberately impeded progress of the nations under their control in order to enrich themselves. The Soviets are castigated for their support of moderate regimes in these areas. The Chinese Communists contend that there can be no compromise and that victory can be assured only when the Communists are in control; and only if they are nonwhite Communists like the Chinese. Violence is judged to be the quickest and surest means to this end.

The Communist ideology of the Chinese leaders causes them to view this struggle for control over the nonwhite world in a different manner than people in the West. To them it is total warfare. But a type of warfare which is not defined merely as a clash of arms; it includes all means which can be used to advance the Communist cause. Thus, activities which are often divorced from political goals in the West are always subservient to them in Communist nations. Although Peiping's techniques in the underdeveloped nations vary somewhat, certain fields of operations form the basis of this effort. In Communist hands, diplomatic recognition is used not merely to facilitate the exchange of viewpoints between two governments; it is also a means of introducing a large staff of intelligent agents trained in subversion into another nation. Activities in the economic field such as trade, economic aid, and technical assistance also serve the same end. Cultural delegations and the exchange visits of various groups enable the Communists to make grassroot contacts.

Communist propaganda methods are extremely sophisticated. All types of modern communications are being used in order to reach as many segments of the population as possible. Finally, support of revolution and training in guerrilla warfare is also being given.

The degree of success, history, and extent of Peiping's campaigns in Asia, Africa, and Latin America differ considerably. Asia has been the primary target, and at the present time, many of the nations of this region are immediately threatened with Communist domination.

Communist China has a number of unique advantages in this region. The Peiping regime can claim to have inherited China's traditional leadership of Asia. Moreover, it appears that Peiping was allowed to direct and control Communist movements in most of Asia until the outbreak of the Sino-Soviet split. Many overseas Chinese hold important positions in the southeast Asian nations, and thus their support is most valuable although it often is obtained through intimidation or other forceful means. China sprawls across the continent of Asia. Her borders touch many Asian nations, and no great distance separates her from the others. In the very shadow of this overpopulated Communist giant, there are southeast Asian nations with rich undeveloped farm land and other valuable natural resources. Peiping's need for them is growing more and more intense due to the sharp drop of Soviet aid and trade in the past few years.

Communist Chinese diplomacy has played an important role in Asia. Peiping's first friendly overtures to individual nations began in 1952, and, by 1955, this nation began to claim the leadership of the Afro-Asian bloc. This mainly was due to the Bandung Conference where Premier Chou En-lai was spectacularly successful in winning the support of attending leaders.

In the following 2 years, he personally visited 8 Asian nations and the premiers of 3 returned his visit. Thus by 1957, when Peiping began to adopt a more openly militant stand toward non-Communist nations, all the neutral nations of Asia and Pakistan, a SEATO member, had extended diplomatic recognition to this regime. The very size of the embassies which Pieping has established indicates that the staff cannot be engaged solely in the conduct of diplomacy. Also, these people are given the protection of diplomatic immunity which means that they cannot be arrested if they are found to be engaging in illicit activity.

The greatest share of Peiping's trade with the free world has been with the nations of Asia. Between 1951 and 1958, this nation spent large sums of money for trade fair exhibits in Asia and concluded a substantial number of trade agreements with Asian nations. Since 1955, however, Communist China's imports from Asia have dropped sharply although approximately 90 percent of her exports to developing nations went to those in Asia. This export balance has evidently been an important factor in Peiping's ability to substantially increase imports from Africa and Latin America. There also have been sharp shifts in trade with individual Asian nations which accompanied changes in foreign policy. This was particularly evident in the case of India.

In 1956, Peiping began to extend economic aid and technical assistance to neutral Asian governments, particularly Cambodia, Ceylon, Indonesia, Burma, and Nepal. These programs have been initiated in spite of drastic shortages of food and manufactured goods in China, and other economic difficulties. The Chinese Communists are evidently willing to go to great lengths to create the impression that China is making substantial economic and industrial progress.

It is guerrilla warfare, however, which seems to give the free world its most severe problems in southeast Asia.

Most of these rebel movements have their base in North Vietnam, and for this and other reasons, it is impossible to ascertain the extent of Peiping's control over them. But one fact does appear certain: the incorporation of southeast Asia into mainland China does not appear to be the ultimate aim of the Chinese leaders. Instead, they have actively promoted policies in this area which would lead to the establishment of a whole network of Communist states, similar to the "cordon sanitaire" which the Soviets established when they seized the captive nations of central Europe after World War II. The Chinese Reds have learned their lessons well from their former Kremlin masters.

Guerrilla warfare is being waged in three southeast Asian nations.

The position of the United States in Asia has been seriously imperiled in South Vietnam where American advisers have played a prominent role.

The Pathet Lao are steadily decreasing the area of neutralist control in Laos.

Guerrilla bands have begun to infiltrate northeast Thailand. A free Thai movement has also been organized within the boundaries of China.

These three Chinese Red battlegrounds can no longer be treated as isolated Communist expeditions. They are part of a highly integrated master plan drawn by the Chinese Reds and must be dealt with as a single menace. We are doomed to continued setbacks if we continue to treat South Vietnam as a single Communist target.

Chinese Communist aggression in Asia, however, has not been confined to indirect support of guerrilla warfare.

Tiny, backward Tibet was brutally invaded and conquered by Red Chinese troops. In the autumn of 1962, an invasion of India was launched which provided a startling revelation of Indian weakness.

Moreover, Peiping had isolated India from her neighbors through border agreements and pacts of nonaggression with Burma, Pakistan, Afghanistan, and Nepal.

It should come as no surprise, then, that these recent manifestations of Communist strength in Asia have caused some significant shifts in foreign policies of several nations. Since 1962, Burma and Cambodia have swung notably closer to Peiping. France's recent recognition of Communist China is also being interpreted particularly in Asia as an acknowledgment of Peiping's growing strength.

One can on'y conjecture about the reasons behind the exchange of diplomatic representatives between France and Communist China. It may be that they feel that this is a way of projecting themselves into the councils of world power. There are signs that both France and Red China have felt that they have been denied leadership in the international community by the major world powers. The fact that France has no history of racial bias certainly may have smoothed the path for diplomatic recognition. France has had no demonstrations similar to those in Moscow by African students who rebelled against their inferior treatment in Russia. Thus, they may feel that association with France may be less of a detriment to their campaign in the nonwhite world than alliance with the Soviet Union.

But Red China's hopes for Africa may meet with a little more difficulty; albeit, this could be confined only to problems of a technical nature.

Many of the factors which have facilitated the Communist Chinese penetration of Asia are missing in Africa. Distance is a primary obstacle as Communist China does not have the economic and technical resources necessary for effective communication with Africa. Peiping entered the struggle for influence in Africa considerably after the Soviet Union and the West. Also, China has had relatively little contact or experience with this continent in the past few centuries.

Recent events, however, have indicated that Peiping's aspirations and influence in Africa cannot be disregarded. Exchange visits between the African nations and Communist China have increased significantly within the past year. Premier Chou En-lai has just completed a 7-week tour in which he visited 10 African nations. Also, it seems that Chinese Communist supporters played some role in the recent disorders in Africa.

Mr. Harry Homewood of the Chicago Sun-Times has succinctly and powerfully interpreted the significance of these events:

> Now the exchange of visits between Red Chinese Communists and African politicians grows * * * the African intentions are unknown, they are superb politicians. But the intentions of the Red Chinese are easy to read. Africa, relatively empty of people, presents an attractive mecca for China's teeming millions and a powerful force of nonwhite Communists to combat Khrushchev and his brand of communism.

Mr. Harry Homewood stated further:

> It is interesting, I think, to note that the two-way traffic of visitors between Peiping and various African capitals has increased greatly in the past few months. The Queen of Burundi, the Minister of Information for Somalia, Jomo Kenyetta's wife from Kenya, journalists from Tanganyika and Uganda, the Chairman of the National Union of Southwest Africa, representatives from the South African Republic, assorted Moslem leaders from Zanzibar—all have been recent visitors to Peiping.
>
> Now the exchange of visits between Red Chinese Communists and African politicians grows—the African intentions are unknown, they are superb politicians. But the intentions of the Red Chinese are easy to read. Africa, relatively empty of people, presents an attractive mecca for China's teeming millions * * * and a powerful force of possible nonwhite Communists to combat Khrushchev and his brand of communism.

It was through diplomacy that Peiping's first contacts with an African nation were made. Discussions between Premier Chou En-lai and President Nasser took place within the framework of the Bandung Conference. In 1956, 1 year later, Egypt became the first African nation to extend diplomatic recognition to Communist China.

Through the medium of the Afro-Asian Solidarity Conference with its headquarters in Cairo, the Red Chinese began to develop contacts with the emerging African States. Since 1958, 12 of these nations have extended diplomatic recognition to Communist China. Chou En-lai's recent tour has reportedly prompted 5 additional States to take steps toward Peiping's recognition.

While Peiping has conducted a large scale campaign for diplomatic recognition among all nations, Chou En-lai has reserved his special praise and support for leftist governments and groups opposing colonial rule or moderate regimes. The practical consequences of the Sino-Soviet split have sometime been most evident in Africa.

Chinese Communist support has figured rather prominently in three African independence movements.

During the war in Algeria, the FLN apparently received an extensive amount of military aid from Peiping, and Chinese aid has continued since the independence of Algeria. In 1959, the Soviet Union welcomed the possibility of a peaceful settlement through De Gaulle's proposal for Algerian self-determination while Peiping violently denounced this course of action. No Soviet aid as yet has been extended to Algeria, but in a move obviously designed to steal the stage from the Chinese, Moscow offered a substantial amount of aid to Algeria just as Chou En-lai was about to begin his visit.

The UPC, a revolutionary movement in the Cameroon has been another recipient of Chinese Communist support. The Soviets seemed to have unsuccessfully urged UPC leaders to turn this insurgent movement into an opposition party operating within the legal political framework. At the present time, the Soviets seem to be trying to split the UPC in order to create factions loyal to Moscow.

It appears that the Soviets and Red Chinese are competing for control of the MPLA, the Communist-dominated movement for Angolan independence.

The struggle between Moscow and Peiping appears most confused in those nations receiving help from both.

Several African nations are simultaneously receiving aid from the Soviet Union and mainland China, but evidence of Sino-Soviet competition in this aspect of policy has been confined to Guinea. The interest-free loan and terms of the technical assistance agreement which Communist China offered to Guinea were obviously designed to place Soviet aid in an unfavorable light.

Since 1961, when the Guinean Government accused the Soviet Union of instigating riots against it, relations between these two nations have been quite cool, but relations between Communist China and Guinea have remained cordial.

In Ghana, a similar clash has been avoided although both the Soviet Union and Communist China are engaged in trade and aid programs. Dr. Nkrumah has carefully maintained a neutral position between Moscow and Peiping.

In Somalia, the Ministry of Information has received the bulk of Chinese aid while the Soviets have concentrated upon the army.

The Communist Chinese also have developed an area of concentration in their African campaign: east Africa.

This fact is an ominous one in view of recent disturbances there.

A coup in Zanzibar captured world headlines.

Uganda and Tanganyika were jarred by army mutinies.

Various civil disturbances have taken place in Kenya.

Somalia's border conflicts with Kenya and Ethiopia may yet explode into a major crisis.

Conflicting roles have been ascribed to Chinese- and Cuban-trained Communists in all of these disorders.

But whether or not they were the primary instigators of these disturbances, such situations provide excellent opportunities for the seizure of leadership. The artificial boundaries of many African nations, racial hatreds, the lack of trained leadership, and other inequities are likely to lead to the recurrence of such disorders throughout Africa.

This may be the means by which the Communists will make their greatest gains in the emerging nations of this continent, because the Communists are scavengers of modernization who prey on those nations shifting from the primitive to modern.

Although startling indications of increased Chinese activity in Africa have taken place within the past few months, the beginning of this trend took place in 1960.

Seven new organizations have been founded since that year to direct and coordinate Peiping's penetration of Africa in the fields of propaganda, military aid, the training of African Communists, and cultural exchange. A reorganization at the highest policy level evidently took place in 1961 when a special committee for African affairs was established within the central committee of the Chinese Communist Party.

It is apparent the Red Chinese are determined to step up their drive to capture the whole of Africa into their sphere of influence; an influence that could prove decisive in winning Red China a seat in the United Nations.

The catalyst to accomplish this may very well prove to be a brutal but convincing appeal to nonwhite nationalism.

But, the presence of serious dangers to the free world in Africa does not mean that this continent is lost to either Communist China or the Soviet Union.

The West has far more African experts than the Communists.

There have been notable Communist failures in the fields of economic aid and student exchanges.

African leaders are fiercely jealous of their independence.

If we are to save Africa for the free world, now is the time for the West to assess the importance of these strengths and weaknesses in each African nation.

Much can be done; much needs to be done.

Not even Latin America is proving beyond the reach of the Communist Chinese. There is a large Indian and Negro population in this area, and these nonwhite groups are on the whole at the bottom of the social and economic scale. There are those who believe the Latin himself is also nonwhite.

Although most of these nations have long been independent, they have been ruled by small elites.

Extremist solutions are bound to appear attractive when extreme wealth coexists with grinding poverty.

Thus, the Communist Chinese appeal for violence is finding supporters in extreme leftist elements throughout Latin America. Communist parties in these nations are splitting into pro-Chinese and pro-Soviet factions. Impatience with the Soviet doctrine of peaceful coexistence is found particularly among the younger members.

Cuba is the sole Latin American nation which has accorded diplomatic recognition to mainland China, and this island is being used as a base for the extension of subversive movements throughout Latin America. It is rumored that two other nations are considering trade agreements with Peiping which may lead to diplomatic recognition. A Chinese-Latin American Friendship Association was formed in 1960, and exchange visits of cultural delegations and of representatives of various occupational and interest groups are increasing rapidly.

There are those who have engaged in a heated dialog for some time now as to the number of Soviet troops remaining in Cuba. They would be shocked to learn the number of Red Chinese troops in Cuba far outnumbers the Soviets.

Latin America's trade with China is also growing. According to recent figures released by the United Nations, exports to Communist China from Latin America increased 1,110 percent from 1955 to 1961. Although this figure is spectacular largely because of the previously low level of Chinese trade, it is nevertheless significant.

Latin American nations are expanding trade with the Communist bloc as a whole. They are doing this because they think that they must. There is a surplus in Western markets of the agricultural products and raw materials which make up the bulk of Latin American exports, and prices have fallen steeply.

There is serious reason to fear the consequences of rising ties between the Communist bloc and Latin America. Thus, programs such as the one which France has recently begun to increase trade with this area to stop the Communists should be encouraged, even though our own relations with France are at low ebb.

One field of Chinese Communist activity, propaganda, has not been discussed under the various areas as much of this propaganda is designed to have a worldwide impact. Also, propaganda activities constitute the leading arm of Peiping's campaign in the underdeveloped areas.

This is one area in which the Chinese can compete with the Russians on even footing as it is one of the least costly methods of penetration.

This is quite a contrast to the value of mainland China's economic program which equals approximately 5 percent of the Soviet total.

Propaganda has continuously been Peiping's main weapon in all quarrels and campaigns. Through the vitriolic language generally used by the Chinese Communists, communications media have been turned into avenues of verbal assault.

One of the principal themes of Communist China in this worldwide battle to influence the minds of men has been the contention that the fundamental division between the oppressors and the oppressed corresponds to that between white and nonwhite.

Since the inauguration of this theme in 1960, Peiping has quite openly sought to aline the nonwhites against the whites.

Lately, however, a more subtle tactic is being used.

The Chinese Communists are openly denying that they are seeking world leadership through racial division.

Instead, Peiping has launched a two-pronged attack directed principally against the United States.

Colonialism is termed the cause of all evils suffered by the underdeveloped nations, and the present efforts of the white nations in these areas are called neocolonialism.

The United States is termed the arch imperialist.

When any incident occurs between a developed and an underdeveloped nation such as the recent Panama dispute, Peiping launches a massive propaganda drive proclaiming support for the latter nation.

Second, the Communist Chinese have been inundating the world with their distorted view of racial disturbances in the United States, and they urged all peoples to proclaim their support for the American Negro.

This is a good example of another change in the modern world to which we must adjust—the line between domestic and foreign issues is rapidly disappearing.

Almost every major problem of a major power has international consequences.

A variety of communications media are being used in this Chinese Communist drive. A wide variety of literature in many different languages is being published by Peiping and distributed on a lavish scale particularly in countries according the Red Chinese some type of recognition.

Publications are designed to appeal to a wide variety of educational levels.

There are magazines for students, women, labor organizations, and other key groups. Peiping has established news agencies in the capitals of many nations including Cairo, Rabat, Conakary, and Accra in Africa, and Havana, Rio, and Buenos Aires in South America.

A wide variety of newspapers use these services.

Radio Peiping has an international broadcasting station which transmits programs in a wide variety of languages. Within 4 years, Red China has built up its radio broadcasts in African languages to a total of 91 hours a week almost twice the total of the Soviet Union.

A significant number of broadcasts in Asian languages are made as well as Spanish and Portuguese programs beamed to Latin America.

The Communist Chinese will succeed in their myriad efforts only to the extent that they are able to capture and hold the support of individual people. Their appeal is greatest among people made desperate by hunger, disease, poverty, and illiteracy because they promise change now.

At least two broad ways of meeting this challenge exist: fighting poverty wherever it exists and attempting to weaken the power of Communist China in the international sphere. It may seem impossible to implement such extensive programs. But Europe quite rapidly rose to unprecedented prosperity after the devastation of the Second World War due to economic aid, intelligent planning, and close cooperation. Together the United States and its free world partners can meet this new challenge from Communist China. They can meet it only through continued vigorous leadership on our part.

We have shown here today how Red China has been trying to put white against nonwhite.

If the free world does not awaken to the full menace of Red China's grand design for race warfare, we may well find that man will be confronted with the most brutal battle of civilization before the decade is over—a battle of nonwhite against white; a battle that cannot be fought with conventional weapons; a battle in which even the most powerful deterrents will prove useless; a battle that could indeed throw civilization back to the dark ages of ignorance and starvation.

We, in America, can demolish Red China's design for world conquest, by showing the entire world, and in particular, the two-thirds of the world's nonwhite population, that democracy means equality for all—regardless of race, color, or creed.

We can shatter Chou En-lai's wild dream by sending some of our own distinguished nonwhite Americans to the far corners of the world to demonstrate firsthand the real opportunities that lie for all when man is free to develop his own resources.

FINAL RETURNS ON CONGRESSMAN STRATTON'S 1964 CONGRESSIONAL QUESTIONNAIRE TO THE PEOPLE OF THE 35TH DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, this year, as I have every year since becoming a Member of this House, I sent out an annual questionnaire to the people of New York's 35th District, whom I have the honor to represent. I sent out some 60,000 of these questionnaires. Almost 6,000 persons were good enough to reply, a 10-percent response. I have now tabulated these returns and I am taking this opportunity of making them available for the information of my colleagues.

While this cannot pretend to represent any really scientific sampling of sentiment, I will point out that the questionnaires went out to almost every home in my district, without regard for party affiliation. I might also say that I have found in past years that these returns did reflect with considerable accuracy the views of the people I have been privileged to serve in this body.

Perhaps I should just add one other comment. The choices offered in the final question, No. 11, were printed up before the Republican National Convention, which accounts for the fact that more than two names were listed.

The results follow:

Do you favor—	Yes	No	Undecided
1. Continuation of foreign aid to areas where economic and military assistance can give reasonable promise of preventing the further spread of communism?	81.2	12.2	6.6
2. The President's antipoverty program, to help wipe out unemployment and increase job opportunities?	72.0	19.6	8.4
3. The wilderness bill, which would permanently set aside certain unspoiled outdoor areas for conservation and recreation purposes?	82.7	8.4	8.9
4. Continuing to support the Vietnamese people in their fight for independence and against Communist enslavement?	72.8	13.3	13.9
5. Legislation requiring the Defense Department to channel a larger share of defense contracts and subcontracts into unemployment areas?	73.6	15.6	10.8
6. Continuation of the accelerated public works program, providing Federal assistance to local communities in constructing needed local public works projects?	64.9	23.1	12.0
7. Federal legislation to provide scholarship and increased loan funds for qualified and deserving college students?	73.3	18.8	7.9
8. Expanding social security to include some form of hospitalization insurance for retired persons?	65.4	27.7	6.9
9. Legislation authorizing the Federal Government to create additional recreational facilities paid for by a small increase in taxes on motorboat fuel (the so-called land and water conservation bill)?	48.3	33.7	18.0
10. A voluntary program, like the Proxmire bill, to enable dairy farmers within a particular milk order area, if they so desire, to cooperate in bringing their milk production more closely into line with demand?	47.4	17.1	35.5

11. Which of the following do you now favor for President?

	Percent		*Percent*
Johnson	61.6	Nixon	4.2
Goldwater	12.6	Romney	1.1
Scranton	3.3	Wallace	.2
Rockefeller	1.2	Others	1.5
Lodge	2.8	Undecided	11.5

ALBERT HASKELL, JR., OF CORTLAND, N.Y.

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, the people of Cortland, N.Y., were saddened the other day to learn of the passing of Albert Haskell, Jr. Mr. Haskell had been for many years one of the outstanding leaders in this important industrial and educational community. He was admired and respected by all who knew him and his services to his city and his county were too numerous to be readily detailed.

Mr. Speaker, no finer tribute could be paid to any man than was paid to Albert Haskell on September 23 in an editorial in the Cortland Standard. Under leave to extend my remarks I include the editorial:

LIVING MEMORIALS TO ALBERT HASKELL, JR.

Professional men, businessmen, laboring men—the entire Cortland community—paused this morning to pay last respects to Albert Haskell, Jr.

They will long remember what he did here. What he did, in the law, in industry, in business, in religion, in humanitarian affairs will live on for generations to come.

Foremost of the living memorials to the life and times of Albert Haskell, Jr., are his family, his wife, his children, and grandchildren. Amid all his worldly accomplishments, people came first to Mr. Haskell—his family—and all the rest of the people; so many, he could not have possibly known them all. But he was concerned for them, their jobs, their health and happiness.

Lawyer, district attorney, State assemblyman, the professional man strived to serve the best interests of all those who came to him. The records in the courts of the county and State will stand as testimony to his sincerity and success.

As a businessman and industrialist, Mr. Haskell gave freely of his time and turned his talents to the bettering of opportunities for all. He was the first president of the Cortland County Development Co. The industries it brought here, the hundreds of jobs created, and, most important, the fulfillment of the faith of the people who invested in it were a dream come true for Mr. Haskell and his community.

Mr. Haskell was a living example of the motto of Rotary International which he served and loved so well. He always placed "service above self"—in his devotion to his church, St. Mary's parish, as a charter member and former president of the board of regents of LeMoyne College, and in development of Christ the King Retreat House in Syracuse.

The humanitarian—his inspiration to other men were best expressed at a testimonial dinner given him last January.

A businessman said, "When Albert sits down among men there is also a feeling of trust, friendship * * * a feeling of men believing each other and liking each other."

A priest commented, "There is a need for humanizing our society, and Albert Haskell does that. I never meet Mr. Haskell that I don't feel better."

So did we all.

CONGRESSMAN BOW REPORTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, this is the seventh edition of "Congressman Bow Reports," the record of my activities in behalf of the half-million people of the 16th Congressional District during the 88th Congress.

It is a privilege to represent Stark, Tuscarawas, and Wayne Counties in the House of Representatives and it is my duty to give an accounting of that representation and of the major issues that have occupied our attention here. A report of this kind has gone to the people of my district at the close of each Congress.

It seems to me that President Lyndon B. Johnson's "Salute to the Congress" on the south lawn of the White House August 19 is a good place to begin my report this year. You will recall that the President hailed the 88th Congress that evening by saying that:

> This session of Congress has enacted more major legislation, met more national needs, disposed of more national issues, than any other session of this century or the last.

And he went on:

> I am happy tonight to say this has been a cooperative Congress. For these measures and many others have been brought into being by votes from both parties.
>
> So let none suggest, let none suppose, that debate has been suspended, principles laid aside, or convictions have been diluted.
>
> The opposite is much more nearly the case.
>
> But from full debate, from advocacy of principles, and devotion to convictions, strength has been forged into the laws enacted.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad the President made these comments for there seems to be a curious misunderstanding among many of our people concerning the roles of the President and the Congress. Some people, even some candidates for Congress, appear to believe that the President's responsibility is to suggest legislation and the Congress is somehow dutybound to enact the legislation he suggests. Despite the philosophy expressed in the words I have just quoted, I sometimes think our former colleague who is now occupying the highest office in the land, might like to have a Congress that would do his bidding without question. He might have his wish if a great many of us were replaced by some of those who aspire for our positions on a platform of complete and unthinking subservience to the Presidential mandate.

RUBBERSTAMP REPRESENTATION?

I could not be such a Congressman. I have served here in the administrations of Harry S. Truman, Dwight D. Eisenhower, John F. Kennedy and now Lyndon B. Johnson. I have supported many of the programs suggested by each of them and opposed others. To me it is a high responsibility to give every issue the most serious study in the light of my own convictions and my knowledge of conditions in my own district, in Ohio, the Nation, and the world, and to vote accordingly.

Recently I have been taken to task because I have differed with some of the votes of the Republican presidential candidate, Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, and I have been asked why I support his election if I voted differently from him on this issue or that. The answer is that I never expected, nor do I ever expect to agree 100 percent with any other man, no matter how closely we may be allied within the ranks of our political party, and I would have little respect for any man who did so. With Senator GOLDWATER in the White House, I would expect to support him on most issues, try to improve his plans on others, oppose him occasionally, as I have done in the other administrations of the past.

A CONSTRUCTIVE CONGRESS

During his speech in the salute to Congress, the President listed some of the accomplishments of the past 2 years. I will use his list as the basis for my report on legislative work.

The President said that this had been a constructive Congress because it had enacted:

First, The test ban treaty: This, of course, was an action of the Senate. The House does not vote on treaties. I hope that the advocates of this treaty are right in believing that it is a constructive contribution to world peace. I hope we do not find that it is a trap which will limit seriously our ability to develop the means of defending ourselves against aggression or the peaceful use of nuclear energy.

Second. A tax cut bill: The tax cut measure was originally billed as a tax reform, and certainly there are many ways in which our tax laws should be reformed. However, there was little reform in the tax cut we enacted. Total reduction in the income tax liability of American individuals and corporations is estimated at $11 billion.

A great many people were opposed to a tax cut at a time when our President was asking for billions of dollars worth of new spending programs and we face a deficit of several billion dollars. I was one of them. However, by the time the tax bill reached the House for debate, my Task Force on Budget Reduction was well on the way to cutting over $7 billion worth of waste and unnecessary spending from the Federal budget. During debate I pointed out the absolute necessity of further economy. I supported a Republican proposal to make the tax cut effective only if the 1965 fiscal year budget was held to $98 billion. Administration spokesmen promised that they would support our economy drive. In view of these assurances, I voted for the tax cut, believing as I do that the heavy burden of taxation is one of the greatest limitations on individual opportunity and on business expansion. Subsequently the administration did submit a budget below the Republican economy goal—and we have reduced that budget, to date, by almost another $4 billion.

Third. A series of education measures. The 88th Congress made an almost unprecedented record in support of education. We enacted the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act, Higher Educational Facilities Act, Vocational Education Act of 1963, the extension of the Manpower Development and Training Act, and the Nurses Training Act. I supported these measures. The Library Services Act also was extended and the programs broadened. Extension of the National Defense Education Act, which I support, appears to be a certainty.

The general Federal aid to education bill was not reported for debate this year. Once again, I offered as substitutes my proposals to divert 1 percent of income tax collections or one-fourth of cigarette tax collections to the States for educational purposes if the need for such funds can be established. This would provide Federal aid without Federal control.

Fourth. Hospital legislation. The Congress broadened the Hill-Burton program under which Federal grants, administered by the State health departments, have helped to build 6,810 hospitals with 289,500 beds and 1,522 public health centers in the past 18 years. The new law continues this program for 5 years but also permits grants for the modernization of older hospitals. I voted for this legislation, as I have always done in the past. It is an outstanding example of successful Federal-State-local cooperation. We also enacted a mental retardation facilities act which will help in construction of mental health centers in various communities.

Fifth. The mass transit bill. This is a measure to provide $375 million each year for 3 years to the large cities to subsidize improved commuter facilities. I voted against it. The facts are that communities and States cooperating with private enterprise can solve the urban transit problem, without Federal aid or Federal interference. This is a typical case of Federal Government intrusion into an area where its assistance is unnecessary. It means expanding Federal power and placing a heavy tax burden on all of our citizens to solve a local problem for those who live in urban centers.

A COMPASSIONATE CONGRESS

The President then said that this has been a compassionate Congress because it passed:

First. The Civil Rights Act: This is easily the most controversial measure that Congress has enacted in several years, as well as the most misunderstood. I have had to emphasize repeatedly a few of the things that it does not do. For example, it does not have anything to do with one's right to buy or sell property; it does not have anything to do with de facto school segregation or "bussing" children; it does not set up any job quotas or permit any preference because of race.

What it does is endeavor to enforce the provisions of the 14th and 15th amendments to the Constitution, which have been flagrantly violated in some areas of the country for 100 years. It is not as broad or far reaching as our own Ohio laws on this subject.

I agree entirely with those who say that fellowship between persons of different races, as between people of different nations, is a matter of the heart. We cannot legislate it. We can only set forth guidelines to guarantee that in official and public activities, all men have equal opportunity. This is what I voted for.

Second. A food stamp plan: This is a program under which persons on welfare rolls can buy $10 worth of food stamps for $6. The program will operate in 1,500 depressed areas. I voted against it because: First, I believe that the States should share in the cost of the program—it will be a 100-percent Federal subsidy unlike any other welfare program—and; second, the experimental program conducted earlier in 25 areas was not at all satisfactory.

Third. A program to attack poverty: This program provides for a modern-day CCC called the Job Corps which will enlist 40,000 young men and women this year—100,000 next year—for conservation training at Job Corps camps or vocational training at institutions to be established in unused army camps at a cost of over $4,000 per boy per year. It also provides funds for work-training programs in communities and work-study programs—similar to the NYA of the thirties—in universities. Also, some $315 million is authorized to support local community antipoverty programs and $35 million for rural poverty programs.

I voted against this bill primarily because it is a duplication of many existing programs. For example, we have just enlarged and improved vocational education, and this bill creates another vocational education program.

We are spending $40 billion yearly on the kind of programs proposed in this bill, and I do not believe that adding another $1 billion program that overlaps and duplicates is going to cure poverty.

We need an expanding industrial plant that will provide new jobs for youngsters and we need trained people to fill those jobs. We are making tremendous progress in this direction in our own area. Canton's antidropout program is nationally recognized, and our business expansion has cut the unemployment rate dramatically in the past several years.

To his list of compassionate legislation, the President could have added the amendments to the social security program increasing benefits, extending payments to orphans while they complete school, and improving disability requirements, and the bill liberalizing veterans' pensions. As this report is prepared, because the session is still in progress, we do not know what final action may be taken on these two bills. I supported both of them.

A CONSERVATION CONGRESS

The President then mentioned conservation legislation.

It seems to me that enactment of the Wilderness Act and the Land and Water Conservation Act are two of the most important accomplishments of any recent Congress.

The Wilderness Act will permit us to set aside as primitive areas some 9 million acres already in Federal ownership for future generations to enjoy and study.

The Land and Water Conservation Act will finance Federal-State cooperation in the development of parks and recreation areas, and the improvement of recreation areas in national forests and parks. I was glad to support them both.

This, then, is the legislative record of accomplishment applauded by the President. I was active in shaping many of these measures and, as Mr. Johnson said, virtually all of them were improved by bipartisan debate, amendment, and compromise. It is interesting to me to note that I voted for 10 of the accomplishments the President approved and opposed him on only 3.

PRAYER ISSUE

Several other legislative problems deserve comment.

Thousands of people wrote to me or signed petitions concerning the Supreme Court decision in the school prayer and school Scripture reading cases. Other Members of Congress reported the same. This public pressure eventually resulted in Judiciary Committee hearings on a constitutional amendment to clarify the situation. The amendment progressed no further.

There was never a chance that a constitutional amendment could be submitted to the States by this Congress. However, any significant change in the membership may result in action in the 89th Congress.

Recent suits asking that the words "Under God" be eliminated from the Pledge of Allegiance and that we abolish the Armed Forces chaplain service seem certain to increase pressure for action on this matter.

FARM PROGRAMS

The President also failed to mention the wheat-cotton program.

The wheat-cotton bill is one of the most iniquitous programs to be enacted into law. It imposes on wheat farmers a program that they rejected overwhelmingly in a referendum only a year ago.

The 2-year program for wheat and cotton was passed in April 1964. It had the effect of lowering the price of wheat in 1964 from $2 to $1.72 when diversion payment is included. A further reduction to $1.67 per bushel is a certainty under the regulations promulgated by Secretary of Agriculture Freeman. Farmers who do not join the program will get only $1.20 to $1.25 per bushel.

Farmers, this year, will receive $2.25 billion, or 17 percent of their net income, from the Federal Government. This is an unhealthy and alarming trend. It is converting our farm population into a "captive class" in our society, dependent upon governmental subsidy and benevolence for their existence. The Federal Government's programs for increasing farm surplus through irrigation and reclamation have depressed farm prices on one hand, while on the other hand, it subsidizes farmers who cannot receive a fair market price for their labor and products.

This wheat-cotton bill has the effect of creating a "bread tax" for the consumer. Bread prices are already up 1 or 2 cents a loaf in some areas. Further increases are expected in the price of bread.

ANOTHER LAYER OF COTTON SUBSIDIES

Cotton farmers receive various forms of Federal subsidies. On top of these, the Federal Government subsidizes our export of cotton by 8½ cents per pound.

This cotton bill imposes another layer of cotton subsidy on top of all the others. It was enacted under political pressures from the administration and special interest groups.

This bill not only continues present cotton subsidy programs, but provides $360 million in cash credits to the cotton textile manufacturers. This huge sum is $100 million more than the industry's total profits of $260 million for the year 1962.

This legislation gives an economic competitive advantage over American synthetic fiber manufacturers. It retards technological progress and punishes both the taxpayer and the American consumer.

I voted against this bill. It is still my conviction that the problems of American agriculture will be solved by less, not more, Government control and that a proper farm program should encourage improved farm income in the marketplace, under farmer management instead of Government orders.

Three other measures primarily of interest to farmers were enacted with my support. First, we established a system for placing reasonable limits on imports of beef, pork, and veal. Second, we provided for indemnity payments when milk is seized because it contains traces of pesticides—which had been recommended for use by our Government. Third, we extended Public Law 480 under which millions of pounds of surplus agricultural commodities have been bartered, donated, or sold to hungry people abroad since its enactment in 1954. I am proud to have been an original sponsor of this program.

FOOD FOR COMMUNISTS

This Congress saw two major battles concerning the sale of farm commodities to Communist nations.

It has been the policy of Congress for many years, expressed in three different laws, to forbid sale of our grain to Communist nations. The late President Kennedy asked that policy be changed urging the sale of wheat for cash as a means of improving our gold situation and promising that 50 percent of shipments would be carried in American vessels.

Shortly after the President's untimely death, the conditions he laid down were disregarded. In December, the House amended the foreign aid bill to prohibit the sale of commodities to Communist countries on credit. This amendment was violently opposed by President Johnson and after several days of heated debate, it was defeated on Christmas eve. I call this the Commie credit card program.

In May I proposed to amend the agriculture appropriations bill to prohibit the payment of an export subsidy on grain shipped to Communist nations. At that time the American taxpayer had paid $42 million to subsidize shipments of wheat to Soviet Russia on terms more favorable than any other nation. This motion also was bitterly opposed by the President and it was defeated by one vote.

I have never opposed using our surplus to feed needy people. I do oppose using it to enable Russia to fulfill its commitment to its satellite nations including Cuba, which received our grain from the Soviet Union. This only helps the Communists to maintain their control over the slave people of its vast empire.

FOREIGN COMPETITION

Foreign trade continues to be a major problem. Our industries suffer severe handicaps by reason of high duties and other restrictions on our products in foreign countries. We, on the other hand, encourage imports by constantly reducing our tariffs and even through U.S. Government purchase of foreign goods.

More than 800 American industries asked for protection from the new round of tariff cuts proposed by the administration. Their pleas were largely ignored and our negotiators are now in Geneva proposing to cut the tariffs on an industrywide basis.

In an effort to restrict further injury, I introduced legislation that would establish definite means of determining when a domestic industry is endangered by unfair foreign competition. These include measurements of imports versus domestic production, employment in the industry, et cetera. The bill would protect, among others, steel, dairy products, brick, glass, and ceramic tile.

As a concrete example of the unfair tariff structure, I can point out that the U.S. duty on a ton of foreign steel is $2. On the other hand, a ton of U.S. steel going into Britain must pay a duty of over $13, in France $46, and in Canada $33. This helps to explain why foreign countries sell us 10 tons of steel for every ton we export. Similar examples can be given with regard to brick, tile, toys, autos, dairy, and many other commodities. They prove that the so-called reciprocal trade agreements have not been reciprocal. We must have strong and realistic negotiations to tear down foreign barriers to our goods.

MEDICAL CARE—THE BOW BILL

As this is prepared, the Congress has not yet made its final decision on the proposal to establish a limited program of hospital care for people over 65, financed by social security taxes. The House Ways and Means Committee rejected the proposal. The Senate voted for it. The conference committee of Representatives and Senators has not yet made its report.

An effort has been made to blame Republicans for congressional failure to provide further assistance to the elderly. The fact is that the Ways and Means Committee and the House of Representatives have overwhelming majorities of Democrats. If all Democrats supported the President's program, this bill would have been law many years ago. They do not. Many of them are appalled by the amount of additional taxes that would be levied on younger workers to support a social security hospital program; many of them are worried about bankrupting the present social security system; and many frankly fear that this program would prove to be the first step toward complete regimentation of all medical care in the United States after the model of the British socialized medicine system. This is admittedly the goal of some of the sponsors of the bill.

Many people would like to be able to debate and support a better solution to the problem.

The Bow bill, which I introduced 3 years ago, is a better solution to the problem. It would provide comprehensive medical care—including hospital services, surgical services, and doctor's services—by permitting every person over 65 to purchase good medical care insurance. This he could do regardless of his physical condition or prior medical history, and on a guaranteed renewable basis. The Government would make certain that he had the money to pay the premiums, either through tax credits or outright payments. The money would come from the general fund like any other Federal program that serves all the people. It would not increase taxes on younger workers. It would not permit Government control of hospitals or the medical profession. It would take care of the heavy expenses that accompany serious illness and lift this burden and worry from the hearts and minds of our retired citizens.

The Bow bill could be enacted into law if the administration would relax its stubborn insistence on a social security hospital program and permit consideration of my voluntary, free enterprise solution.

BOW ECONOMY EFFORT

Early in the 88th Congress I was appointed chairman of a Republican Task Force on Budget Reduction. We were alarmed at the tremendous increase in Government spending proposed by the administration. We resolved to find ways to reduce this burden. With expert help and by diligent efforts, and with the cooperation of some Democrats, including the late Clarence Cannon, of Missouri, chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, and Congressman MICHAEL J. KIRWAN of Youngstown, a ranking member, we were able to cut $6.5 billion from the President's budget in the first session of Congress.

Thus far in the second session of Congress, we have cut almost $4 billion from the President's budget.

Despite this economy drive, the administration's spending programs created a red ink balance of over $8 billion for the last fiscal year. In this Congress we have been asked to increase the limit on the public debt three times. I opposed these increases, but I was in the minority. The increases were granted. The ceiling is now $324 billion, and the debt is $31 billion more than when Mr. Eisenhower left the Presidency, an added burden of over $600 for each American family of four.

The cost of living index has increased in the same period from 214 to 223. This is the kind of inflation that hits the pocketbook of every American citizen, and is especially cruel to the older person who lives on an annuity, a pension, or social security retirement. This must be stopped.

Incidentally, the subcommittee of which I am a member reduced the budgets for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce a total of $255 million. This is money that would otherwise have been appropriated and spent. I might add that it is 11,333 times greater than my annual salary, and 1,619 times the salary of the 7 Representatives who make up the subcommittee. The operation of the entire Congress costs the taxpayers about $210 million per year, so that we saved enough on these three department budgets to pay all the expenses of the legislative branch of Government.

OTHER BOW PROPOSALS

For the past several years I have sponsored legislation to create an Interoceanic Canal Commission, the purpose being to consider construction of a new canal to supplement or replace the Panama Canal. It was difficult to get consideration of this legislation until the Panama crisis erupted this year when others immediately took up the idea. The proposal is now law. It is regrettable that action was not taken earlier, for no matter what the political situation may be in Panama, the present canal is outmoded and we must have a new and larger facility to carry on trade and commerce with South America.

I have continued to support every proposal to call attention to the plight of the captive nations of Europe and Asia, and submitted a resolution calling for an observance of the independence days of these nations. I think it is very important to do whatever we can to keep alive the spirit of freedom in these Iron Curtain countries, and to look forward to the day when they regain their independence. To forget them, or to accept their status as permanent parts of the Communist colonial empire would be a grave mistake.

I was the first Representative to introduce the equal pay for women legislation in the 88th Congress. The bill had failed in the 87th Congress because it had been attached as a rider to another measure. It is now Public Law 88–38.

I introduced again my proposal to reduce Federal expenditures and the Federal payroll by filling only three of every four job vacancies created by resignations, retirements, or death.

My proposal to permit the deduction of the expenses of tuition and related expenses for college students was not acted on in the House of Representatives. A similar proposal was defeated by a margin of three votes in the Senate, because of administration opposition to it.

INDIVIDUAL PROBLEMS

The many activities of the Federal Government touch the lives of all citizens, and so it is that hundreds of them write to their Congressmen each year for advice and help with Federal programs and problems. Farmers, reservists, veterans, social security annuitants, small businessmen and people with immigration problems are my most numerous correspondents, and I am glad to be able to assist them by reason of the knowledge and contacts developed during my years in Washington. The ability to be helpful in such matters is largely a matter of experience, knowing where to go and what to do, and this is something that I have acquired over the years, as has my staff.

Business, large and small, also has its share of Federal Government problems, and I am constantly on the alert to help our industries learn about and secure Government contracts. I am certain the average citizen would be surprised to know the extent of Government business done by the diversified industries of the 16th Congressional District, but I can assure them that it is a very important factor in providing employment, responsible in no small degree for the fact that we have overcome the heavy unemployment of several years ago.

Mr. Speaker, I am told that various candidates who seek election to Congress are assuring businessmen that additional defense contracts will be channeled into their districts if they are elected. This kind of promise can be fulfilled only by violating the law and Government procurement policies, for the only legitimate way to obtain Government business is to bid low when there is an invitation to bid or to offer the best deal when procurement is negotiated. I sincerely hope that no one proposes to have a nationwide series of TFX scandals for that is what politicial decisions on defense contracts would mean.

ACCOMPLISHMENT—16TH DISTRICT

It gives me a real sense of accomplishment to return to the 16th District and to find in almost every town and village some project with which I have been able to help during my service in Congress.

The new terminal at Akron-Canton Airport, the flood control work now progressing in Canton, new post office buildings in many towns, the construction work on Interstate 77 in Tuscarawas County, the development at the Muskingum conservancy district, new buildings at our colleges and many other improvements have come about with my assistance. The Post Office Department is still dragging its feet, unable to determine precisely where it will locate the new $3,275,000 postal facility in Canton, but the funds have already been appropriated at my request and the project will go forward soon.

WELCOME RECOGNITION

The high priority that is being given to the program for desalting sea water and improving brackish water so that it may be used for human consumption, irrigation, and industrial uses is welcome recognition of an effort started by the late Senator Clair Engle and myself 12 years ago.

We introduced the legislation to establish the saline water research program in the Department of the Interior because we knew that water supply was rapidly becoming the No. 1 problem of modern civilization and that we would have to find ways and means of making salt water usable.

On July 21 of this year, President Johnson announced that the research program had been immensely successful so that high priority could be given to putting the results of that research into use in the construction of large-scale desalting plants. He directed the Interior Department, the Atomic Energy Commission, and his own staff to carry the program forward on a crash basis. This program will be of great value to people throughout the world.

In closing, I would like to include with my remarks a letter I received recently from the Special Assistant to the President. Much is said and written about political differences, but despite the fact that we belong to different political parties, we do enjoy a good working relationship with the White House and this is as it should be in a republic where everyone is working for the common good. The letter follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, August 17, 1964.

Hon. FRANK T. BOW,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR FRANK: Now that the session is ending and the people of this country are becoming aware of the tremendous job accomplished by the Congress, I would like to say that it has been a pleasure to be associated with you during this turbulent but always absorbing period of history.

While we cannot be close politically, nevertheless the bonds created by the job we are all trying to do for the country are very real—and I would like to express my deep personal respect and my appreciation for the courtesies which you have always extended.

With warm regards and best wishes from me and my staff.

Sincerely yours,
LAWRENCE F. O'BRIEN,
Special Assistant to the President.

VOTING RECORD

I have been present and recorded on 91 percent of the votes and quorum calls during my 14 years in the House of Representatives, a record equaled by very few who have served as long. Following are some of the major votes of the 88th Congress:

Voting record of Congressman FRANK *T. Bow, 88th Cong.*

Date	Issue	Vote	Result
	1ST SESS., 1963		
Mar. 11	Authorizing funds for the House Committee on Un-American Activities	Yea	Approved.
Apr. 24	Health Professions Educational Assistance Act	Yea	Approved.
Apr. 25	To extend the feed grain program	Nay	Approved.
May 7	To regulate congressional trips abroad	Yea	Approved.
May 15	To increase the national debt limit	Nay	Approved.
Aug. 6	To strengthen and improve vocational education	Yea	Approved.
Aug. 8	To increase the national debt limit	Nay	Approved.
Aug. 14	Higher Education Facilities Act	Yea	Approved.
Aug. 23	To continue the foreign aid program	Nay	Approved.
Sept. 25	Tax reduction bill	Yea	Approved.
Nov. 7	To increase the national debt limit	Nay	Approved.
	2D SESS., 1964 TO DATE		
Jan. 28	To amend the Davis-Bacon Act	Yea	Approved.
Feb. 10	The Civil Rights Act of 1964	Yea	Approved.
Apr. 8	Food stamp plan	Nay	Approved.
May 20	To prevent subsidy on grain sold to Communist countries	Yea	Failed.
June 10	To continue foreign aid program	Nay	Approved.
June 11	Federal employees salary increase	Yea	Approved.[1]
June 18	To increase national debt limit to $324,000,000,000	Nay	Approved.
July 22	Land and Water Conservation Act	Yea	Approved.
July 29	Increasing social security benefits	Yea	Approved.
July 30	The Wilderness Act	Yea	Approved.
Aug. 8	Economic Opportunity Act	Nay	Approved.[1]

[1] There were several rollcalls on each of these issues.

SOLID REASONS WHY PRESIDENT JOHNSON WILL BE ELECTED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, as you and some of my other colleagues know, the State Democratic Executive Committee of Tennessee, by resolution, recently named me as campaign director for President Johnson and Senator HUMPHREY and other Democratic nominees in my State.

This call to duty has required that I spend considerable time in Tennessee in recent weeks. Because of the large and important relationship of this campaign to the work of the Congress, I am taking this opportunity to report briefly to the Members of the House on the campaign as I see it.

The American people are weighing the record of this Congress and its predecessor the 87th Congress. They are, by all indications I have been able to observe, preparing to return a resounding vote of confidence to our congressional leadership as well as our Democratic Party's leadership in the executive branch of the Government.

The strong Democratic trend we are observing in this campaign is a solidly based trend. It rests on a solid foundation of accomplishment by the Congress, the President, and his administration.

It is clear that in the voter's mind, one of the very strongest points in Lyndon

B. Johnson's favor is that he is a man of Congress, and that he is able to work constructively with the Congress as no other American President has been able to do in our time, perhaps in our entire history.

Likewise, one of the strongest points for his running mate, Senator HUMPHREY, is that he also is a seasoned man of Congress. He, too, has been showing increasingly that he has a great capacity to work cooperatively and effectively not only with members of his own party, but with members of the opposition party in the field of legislation and government.

As we look ahead in this campaign—what are the indicators? There are many solid reasons why President Johnson will be elected.

All the public opinion polls and the other dependable soundings of voter sentiment tell the same story:

An overwhelming Democratic tide is gathering force throughout the country.

In my own State of Tennessee, the polls indicate a rising Democratic trend in most of the areas where the opposition earlier expected to win.

It is true that the polls are subject to error, but not since 1948 have they been off more than a few percentage points, and mostly they have been remarkably accurate.

Moreover, what the polls are mirroring now is not a horse race but a shoo-in nationally for the Democratic ticket headed by President Johnson and his running mate, Senator HUMPHREY.

In the latest Gallup poll, President Johnson holds a lead that is well over 2 to 1. It is 68 percent for Johnson to 32 percent for GOLDWATER—far and away the greatest lead any presidential candidate ever held in the polls at this stage of the campaign.

The American press is also turning to President Johnson and the Democratic Party for continued leadership.

The Scripps-Howard chain, which publishes newspapers in 17 important cities over the country—including the Memphis Commercial Appeal—has endorsed President Johnson and called for his election. This is the first time since 1936 that this influential group of newspapers has backed a Democratic nominee for President.

The Kansas City Star, which had not supported a Democrat for President since 1892, now supports President Johnson.

For the first time in its long history, the Cleveland Plain Dealer is backing a Democrat for President.

The Houston Press, the influential Texas daily identified with Oveta Culp Hobby—who was the first Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in the Cabinet of President Eisenhower—has endorsed President Johnson.

The Hearst Newspapers also has called for the election of President Johnson. In a signed editorial, William Randolph Hearst, Jr., urges President Johnson's return to the Presidency on the basis of his training, his experience and his performance and called for his election as best in the interest of our country.

Likewise, the Saturday Evening Post—a great and long-time respected news magazine of Republican persuasion has recently in a strong editorial endorsed the record of President Johnson and called for his election. Not since its founding by Benjamin Franklin has the Post ever before supported a Democrat for President.

The Post urges the election of President Johnson, declaring that he "will make a good President because he already is a good President."

Moreover, the Post strongly urges the defeat of the Republican candidate for the good of the Republican Party. The Post says:

> We hope that the Republican candidate is crushingly defeated.

The Post observes further that President Johnson's opponent has not even made a good Senator and characterized him as a dangerous extremist.

The Post concludes that the two-party system can be restored and that the voters should have a choice—not a calamity.

This is pretty strong language, but it helps to tell the story of the trend in this election and the radical changes that the Republican nominee has made in the GOP. This division is both strong and widespread.

Meanwhile support for President Johnson is steadily mounting and increasing.

I have been trying to keep a list of the major reasons why the voters are bent on producing a Democratic landslide in November. This list already is too long to read in the brief time I have allotted for this report. I will, thus, confine myself to 15 solid reasons why this remarkable Democratic groundswell is now underway.

First. President Johnson overwhelms his opponent in experience in the fields of government, diplomacy, and national security.

Second. President Johnson's record of getting along with the Congress, and establishing outstanding records of legislative accomplishment, is unsurpassed.

Third. The 4 years of the Kennedy-Johnson administration have brought unprecedented prosperity to the country. Our economic expansion and growth has broadened steadily during the 10 months that President Johnson has been in the White House.

Fourth. President Johnson and the Democratic Congress have cut taxes—making the greatest tax cut in our history—and have introduced needed reforms in Government while at the same time strengthening our country's position of supreme military power.

Fifth. President Johnson is a prudent man. He is never unaware that under the law his is the only finger that can touch the nuclear trigger. Control of nuclear power will not be disbursed to field commander and military generals as recklessly proposed by his Republican opponent.

Sixth. President Johnson is respected by the leaders of foreign nations, friend and possible foe alike. His administration's policies command the confidence and support of our allies. His firm hand is recognized throughout the world. He has made it known that America will never initiate aggression but will respond appropriately and effectively against any overt action against our country.

Seventh. Under his leadership, through his service in the House and the Senate and continuing with his work as President, America has startled the world with achievements in space and has rewon for our country leadership in the field of space and science.

Eighth. President Johnson is a man of the people—the first southern President in a 100 years. He has made known his credo—"All the people"—and has said that he will not be a President for labor, not a President for business, not a President for the conservative nor the liberal, not a President for the North or the South, but a President for all the people.

This position is one of the main reasons for his solid support and approval by all the people of our country.

Ninth. His opposition is fragmented. President Johnson appeals not only to Democrats, but to independents and thoughtful Republicans as well.

Tenth. Farmers like him, understand him and have confidence in him based on his lifelong record of performance. His first job was learning to plow a straight furrow. His administration's farm programs for a healthy and expansive agricultural economy represent a continuation of his leadership in this field during his years of service in the Congress.

Gross farm income rose from $37.9 billion to $42.2 billion in the past 4 years under a Democratic administration.

President Johnson is fully aware that a farm recession would seriously affect our whole country—his Republican opponent proposes to "cut and gut" farm programs which would, if carried out, have a calamitous effect. It would mean a drop in farm income of $730 million for cotton farmers in the South; a $230 million loss for tobacco growers; a loss of income of $3 to $3.5 billion for agriculture in the Southern States; and $6 billion income loss for the American farmer and agriculture as a whole.

Eleventh. President Johnson is a true friend of education. He taught in the Texas public schools during the depression. He has worked with the 88th Congress in the accomplishment of important new education programs. As a result, this Congress is now known as the Education Congress.

Twelfth. While almost all Americans are prosperous, some have been neglected and still live in misery and poverty. The President's poverty program is the boldest kind of venture of its kind attempted in the 20th century.

President Johnson's opponent attacks this proposal to "war on pockets of poverty" and opposes all needed programs of assistance to our States and localities for essential services and greater opportunities for all of our citizens.

Instead of just opposing, President Johnson works for greater Federal-State-local cooperation in accomplishing the common task created by our country's continuing rapid growth.

Thirteenth. The President is dedicated to building the great society—not only to increase our country's natural wealth, but to improve cultural advantages for all of our citizens.

Fourteenth. The President is dedicated to the development of our natural resources and to the preservation of TVA, which his opponent would literally sell down the river. The President has a consistent record of working for the preservation and continued development of our natural resources and the elimination of polluted air and polluted streams.

He recognizes that resource development and public works projects have built much of the sinews and strength of the United States and made America great. He has been in the vanguard of resource development champions.

Fifteenth. In the field of foreign affairs, the President has pledged himself to maintain peace through our mutual security programs and with the aid and cooperation of our allies. His hand which is firm and his leadership which is recognized is needed. His election must be assured.

Mr. Speaker, these are 15 solid reasons why President Johnson will be elected on November 3. They are compelling reasons why he should be elected to the office of the Presidency.

They are reasons why I feel that Tennessee along with most of our States and the great majority of the American people are going to vote for and call upon President Johnson to continue to serve as President of the United States.

The differences between the candidates are clearly defined. In every instance, President Johnson stands unequivocally on the affirmative side and his opponent on the negative.

The choice in November is as definite and clear as the difference between day and night—between yes and no.

President Johnson works to make the Government an instrument of service to our people for growth and advancement. He looks upon our Government as a servant of the people.

The Republican candidate's doctrine is that our Federal Government is an alien power to be distrusted, to be feared and opposed by the people. But the American people are not frightened. And they must not be made to fear and distrust their own Government.

As President Johnson has called for unity in our country, let us all unite and move confidently forward to a Democratic victory in November. This will be in the best interest of our country.

EIGHTY-EIGHTH CONGRESS LEGISLATIVE REVIEW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, during my service as a Representative from the First Congressional District of Indiana, I have made a practice at the close of each session to briefly review some of the top legislative accomplishments which the Congress has enacted.

The Kennedy-Johnson administration, with the aid of a Democratic Congress, has been more successful in its legislative programs to establish a prosperous economy and preserve the peace of the world than any administration in the history of our Nation.

We have kept America strong both at home and abroad.

President Johnson has proven to be one of our greatest Presidents by using his remarkable abilities as a leader and legislator in following through successfully with the great programs that the late lamented John F. Kennedy and he, as Vice President, initiated and launched beginning on January 20, 1961.

WORLD PEACE AND NATIONAL DEFENSE

The Kennedy-Johnson diplomacy has performed miracles in dealing with foreign nations including the explosive tendencies of the Communist tyrants who are gradually losing world prestige and power.

The administration has stood firm in southeast Asia, West Berlin, and Africa.

The age-long rivalry and hidden bitterness are gradually exploding between the Soviet Union and Communist China.

The outstanding experts in our State and Defense Departments, by reason of their long diplomatic experience, will eventually succeed in restoring free government and liberty to the captive nations of Europe without the shooting of a gun or the exploding of a bomb.

PEACE CORPS—FOREIGN ASSISTANCE

Members of Congress who opposed legislation creating the Peace Corps several years ago now applaud the work our Peace Corpsmen are accomplishing by establishing good will in 46 nations.

Up to this day, the Communists have not been able to take over and successfully aggress any additional nations during the Kennedy-Johnson administration.

The Communists took over Cuba back during the previous administration and, to my mind, at that time, action should have been taken when Castro seized multimillions of American properties including hotels, factories, oil plants, and industries without a word of protest.

PROSPERITY IS HERE

After three major recessions during the 8 years of the Eisenhower administration, we have had a healthy and gradual increase in business, industry, and employment with general contentment and prosperity under Presidents Kennedy and Johnson.

Our gross national product has increased over $100 billion since January 1961.

Gross public debt, 1945: $259.1 billion.

Gross national product, 1945; $218 billion.

Gross public debt, 1964: $312.5 billion.

Gross national product, 1964: $624 billion.

Secretary of the Treasury Dillon, in testifying before our National Democratic Platform Committee in Atlantic City, August 24, stated our gross national product should rise to $650 billion by July 1965. These figures reveal that the calamity-howlers and Republican politicians are talking to deceive the public. Our economic foundation was never more secure than today.

TAX CUT

The tax cut measure, which I supported and voted for early in 1964, is doing exactly the job which was outlined by the President. The $11.5 billion tax cut has expanded our economy by increasing purchasing power. It has created jobs and demand for goods. We are enjoying the longest and strongest peacetime expansion in 50 years. In the first half of 1964, profits by business, expanded public income has brought an additional $1.6 billion into the Federal Treasury.

EMPLOYMENT

Twenty years ago Vice President Wallace was ridiculed when he predicted 60 million Americans would be gainfully employed in a few years. He was ridiculed by conservative businessmen and most newspapers for such a wild assertion. Today, 72 million persons are employed and 5 million of this number have been added during the past 3 years. Prices have been stable and the average factory worker today earns $103 a week, the highest in history.

Our program in the next session of Congress will be to further cut down the unemployed in this country and expand minimum wages to millions who are not now covered.

AUTOMATION

We passed the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, known as the antipoverty bill. This legislation will aid millions of Americans who are now living on incomes of $3,000 a year or less and most of them with families.

This bill will give almost half a million Americans, without opportunities, a way to escape their heritage of poverty and become self-supporting.

EDUCATION

Presidents Kennedy and Johnson, with the aid of a Democratic Congress, passed more constructive legislation to expand education during the last 4 years than was enacted, collectively, in the previous half century.

We passed measures to help extend loans and finances to educate veterans, doctors, nurses, high school students, dropouts, and employees who had been thrown out of work by reason of automation. We have helped thousands of qualified boys with no money to enter colleges and universities.

Only yesterday the House by extending the National Defense Education Act to June 30, 1967, will expand and strengthen teaching at all levels and provide additional finances so that thousands of top students graduating from high school can go on to college and compete in this scientific-atomic age.

LIBRARIES

We have also aided and expanded facilities and help for hard-pressed libraries in cities as well as in rural areas.

I was the author and proponent of the first "visiting library" legislation for the rural and urban areas 10 years ago during the 81st session of Congress.

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

We have passed legislation to aid areas to combat, successfully, juvenile, delinquency. These delinquent juveniles are generally youths who have been denied the proper training and supervision in home surroundings. Thousands of these youths can be saved and made substantial citizens if given just a little help to establish themselves by training and preparation for employment and work.

HEALTH AND WELFARE

The medicare bill has been meeting powerful and well-financed opposition on the part of the AMA and other reactionary forces. Although we are at the closing day of this Congress, I do hope a substantial bill can be enacted before we adjourn to give medical service to the older people of our country.

I would rather have the legislation taken up next January than to compromise on a "skim milk" medicare bill which would fall far short of the necessary medical aid for our older citizens.

SOCIAL SECURITY

Both Houses have approved an increase in social security benefits, as well as a broadening of eligibility requirements for the program. The Senate version of the social security bill includes a modified hospitalization program financed through social security. At the present time, a House-Senate conference committee is working to iron out the differences in the two bills.

AIR AND WATER POLLUTION

We have made substantial progress in educating the minds of the American public on the necessity for effective legislation to clear the air of pollution which is pouring out of the smokestacks of hundreds of industries in metropolitan areas.

The health of the people in these communities is being impaired by reason of the laxity on the part of major industries in making expenditures to eradicate the impurities flowing out of their smokestacks.

We have spent billions in successful scientific exploration on the atomic bomb and the mysteries of the stratosphere; and, there is no reason why the Federal Government cannot protect the health of the American people from air and water pollution.

MASS TRANSPORTATION

This Congress for the first time in our history has passed a comprehensive mass urban transportation act which will greatly aid in relieving our traffic problems and street crossing tieups in our metropolitan areas.

Calumet region of Indiana, located adjoining 6 million people in the Chicagoland area, is one of America's foremost victims of the modern traffic problem. Multimillions of automobiles, trucks, and railroad cars pass through Indiana's Calumet region annually. It lies in the pathway of America's east to west and west to east transcontinental traffic.

The numerous railroads coming through the Calumet region contribute greatly to the blocking of street crossways and traffic through our area. This transportation problem cannot be solved locally. We need Federal help and the bill enacted into law during this session will be a starter toward the relief needed in the Calumet area.

AGRICULTURE

I have supported every measure to maintain and improve farm income and expand buying power in the rural areas. One of the major reasons for the great depression 30 years ago was that low-income farmers were almost excluded from the buying market.

CIVIL RIGHTS

The civil rights legislation which was enacted into law by this Congress has been the first major legislation to protect the rights of all American citizens so they may enjoy liberty and equality regardless of race, religion, and color.

VETERANS

When I came to Congress during the dark days of World War II, I was one of 72 World War I veterans serving in Congress who caucused in January of 1943, and organized a veterans' group to fight for the GI bill of rights. It was this group of World War I veterans who brought about legislation so the World War II and Korean veterans could become reestablished in civilian life and avoid the privations, want, and unemployment suffered by the returning veterans of World War I. Since the GI bill of rights, we have continued to improve and expand the education and health benefits and employment of our World War II and Korean veterans.

FEDERAL HIGHWAYS AND PUBLIC WELFARE

The Kennedy-Johnson administration has enacted programs to expand highway construction and Federal work projects which were much needed and contributed toward our unprecedented prosperity of 1964.

PUBLIC HOUSING

I do not need to call to the attention of the American people the public housing and other legislation to provide homes for all our citizens regardless of their financial condition. Millions can now own their own homes through small

CANDIDATE BARRY GOLDWATER

Barry Goldwater, the Republican presidential nominee has consistently opposed most of the legislation which I have outlined in this legislative review. This is probably one of the reasons why dozens of newspapers over the country have, for the first time in their existence, publicly and editorially endorsed Lyndon B. Johnson and Hubert Humphrey the Democratic presidential and vice presidential nominees in the coming election.

A national magazine stated this week that approximately 70 percent of the newspapers have endorsed the Democratic presidential and vice presidential candidates. This is practically the reverse of newspaper endorsement in former presidential election years.

THE EDITORIAL IN THE CHICAGO SUN TIMES

I think the editorial in the Chicago Sun Times endorsing President Johnson and vice-presidential nominee Humphrey reflects in a general way the thoughts set out by other newspapers in their endorsements:

> The election of President Johnson would mean a continuation of fundamental foreign policies that have guided the United States under both Democratic and Republican administrations since World War II. Goldwater has a long record of opposition to those policies. Goldwater alone of the leaders of either party in this country has shown a dangerous casualness toward the use of atomic weapons. He would delegate to military commanders in the field the authority to initiate the use of small tactical nuclear weapons. The authority to push the nuclear button by law belongs only to the President.
>
> While we disagree and will continue to disagree with some Democratic domestic policies we concede and applaud the fact that Mr. Johnson has proposed a positive program. He has definite ideas about what he believes is necessary to make this country a better place in which to live. Goldwater's program is a negative one. He stresses what he would undo in Government rather than what he would do. His aim, he says, is not to pass laws but to repeal them. Which laws would he abolish?
>
> Personality, experience, ability, and knowledge are all factors to be considered in the election of a President.
>
> Goldwater differed with the 1960 Republican platform and voted contrary to the majority of his Republican colleagues in the Senate on at least 23 occasions.

Time does not permit me to elaborate on other legislation and progress which the Kennedy-Johnson administration has made in the last 4 years especially pertaining to conservation, forest preservation, streams, fisheries, and so forth.

The above résumé of accomplishments by your Congress in the last two sessions merely touches the high points coming to my mind at this time. Many more problems confronting our national economy have been aided and solved by proper legislation for the benefit of all people in our land.

After adjournment, I expect to be home during the rest of the year and am looking forward to meeting personally as many people as possible whom I have had the honor to represent in our National House of Representatives to the best of my ability.

HON. J. VAUGHAN GARY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Smith] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of regret and sorrow that I have to announce formally to the House that our good colleague and friend, who has served so long from the area of Richmond, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Gary], is voluntarily retiring from Congress at the end of this Congress.

Vaughan has been here for something like 20 years. Prior to his election to the Congress from the city of Richmond in the Third District of Virginia, he had already made a successful career in his profession and in the business neighborhood of his home city. Since he has been in the Congress he has become one of the most influential, able, vocal, efficient and effective Members of Congress.

We will all miss him when he retires from this body. I believe he will return to his profession in which he attained such high success before his election to the Congress. I hope we will see him often.

I know that you all join with me in expressing our affection for him and our regret that this able and very knowledgeable and experienced legislator will not be with us in the next session of the Congress.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, the tribute which the dean of our delegation is paying to our Virginia colleague, the Honorable VAUGHAN GARY, needs to be bipartisan because the object of that tribute has himself, in his demeanor, in his language, and in his conduct comported himself in a nonpartisan manner during the tour of service that he has rendered to his people, his State, and his Nation in this body.

May I say I am proud to number him among my personal friends. I call him friend because he has been nothing but a friend to me during the 12 years I have been privileged to serve here. He has been a friend because he has commanded my respect and, yes, my admiration. It has been not only his keen intellect and his insight into the problems which have come before this body and not only his expertise in the special field of knowledge in which his committee has jurisdiction but because of his cheerful manner and his athletic prowess. I have been privileged to participate with him in some athletic events, and may I say that he acquits himself nobly on the athletic field, as he does on the floor of this Chamber.

Our fondest regards go with him on his retirement, and we wish him and his family all the best that life has to offer.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to express my deep appreciation to the gentleman from Virginia for yielding to me to pay my tribute to one whom I consider to be one of the outstanding men in this Congress, one who has won the respect of every Member regardless of his walk of life and regardless of political affiliation.

I would like to second everything that has been said by my colleague from the Sixth District of Virginia, because I concur in the tribute that he has paid to VAUGHAN GARY. I, too, have had the opportunity to do battle with our distinguished colleague on the athletic field, and I found that he displayed great courage and fortitude and skill in that field, also.

I have served with VAUGHAN GARY for 10 years in many capacities.

Perhaps one of the fondest memories I shall have will be of the service I have noted he has rendered in the small group which meets each Thursday morning known unofficially as the prayer breakfast group. He has been president of this group. He has won the admiration and respect of every member of that group.

I know of no higher tribute that could be paid to any man than to say, "He is a Christian gentleman." Certainly VAUGHAN GARY is a Christian gentleman.

I wish him well, regardless of his endeavors in future years. He has won a retirement I hope he can enjoy with health and happiness.

For him and his family I wish many successful and happy and prosperous years. I know I speak for all our colleagues in the House when I say that our lives have been made richer because we have had the opportunity of serving with such a distinguished, dedicated, honest, considerate, Christian gentleman.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman from Virginia yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, since I was a boy I have been acquainted with the expression, "Virginia gentleman." Over these many years in my lifetime I have never met anyone who symbolized the words "Virginia gentleman" more than the distinguished gentleman from Virginia, VAUGHAN GARY.

I have known VAUGHAN very well over these many years since he first came to the House of Representatives. I have roomed with him. I have traveled with him from early in the morning until late at night.

It has been a rewarding experience to me because being associated with VAUGHAN GARY is an experience which does good for anyone. It teaches one to respect and adore his God, to be nice to other people, to stay always "on the ball," and to be as highly intelligent as it is possible to be.

That, in a few words, has been my experience with VAUGHAN GARY.

I have sat next to him for many of these years on the House Committee on Appropriations which makes appropriations for foreign aid. I have been glad on many occasions to follow his leadership and his approach to difficult problems.

It was with real reluctance I noted, from the time VAUGHAN first announced it, his intention to retire at the end of the 88th Congress. The House of Representatives is losing one of its most valuable Members, and is suffering an irreparable loss.

I wish for VAUGHAN and his lovely wife and his family many, many years of happiness, success, and Godspeed.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to join with my colleagues in the House in wishing Godspeed to my very good friend, VAUGHAN GARY, as he leaves these Chambers.

As the gentleman from New York just said, VAUGHAN GARY epitomizes the "Virginia gentleman" in every way.

It has been my privilege to serve with him as a member of the Appropriations Committee, and more particularly of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee. As such a member, I also have traveled with him.

Of all the attributes which VAUGHAN GARY has, I believe the greatest one, and the one which has been as valuable to this Government as any other, is his ability to make friends and influence people throughout the world. He is as fine an ambassador of this country as any man ever was or any man ever could be.

The charm, the wit, the integrity he possesses, and the intelligence with which he grasps a situation and masters it—all these things add up to a very superior individual, which he is in every way.

His leaving the House will leave a real void. I might say, as a very personal friend, it will also leave a void so far as I am concerned, because my associations with him have been not only extremely pleasant but also extremely rewarding. I regard this as one of the molding factors in my career.

He has been very kind to new Members. I remember before I knew him as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, and knew him well, how kind he was to new men who were trying to find their way around the maze which we sometimes call this legislative process. So it is with a great deal of pleasure but also with profound regret that I bid him Godspeed and that I wish to him, to Mrs. Gary, and to their family all of the best as the years go by.

I just venture to say, Mr. Speaker, I doubt that the United States has heard the last of VAUGHAN GARY as a citizen who is worthwhile, because whether it is as a public servant or a private servant, a man who is as patriotic, as solicitous of the welfare of his fellow man as VAUGHAN GARY is will be serving the country in some capacity or another.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues from Virginia and my colleagues on the Committee on Appropriations in this expression of regret over the loss of the services through voluntary retirement of one of the most distinguished Members of this House. VAUGHAN GARY is a Congressman's Congressman. He has rare traits of personality, character, and intellect that make him one of our most outstanding and respected Members. He is studious, he is articulate, he is devoted to high principles. Every Member of the House who has watched VAUGHAN GARY over the years knows that he comes to the floor with his bills well prepared; that he presents his material as well as any other Member of the House; that he knows what he is talking about; that he thoroughly understands the work required of the agencies over which his committee has jurisdiction. He has been a very valued member of the Committee on Appropriations and has performed outstanding service for the House and the country as well as for his own constituents. He has tried to make sure as he has gone into the various requests that have come from the agencies that the taxpayer gets a dollar's worth of benefit out of a dollar's worth of taxes. He has been careful with the taxpayers' money. He has made a real contribution to good government and to good sense in government.

We will miss him in the years ahead. We can ill afford the departure of this outstanding colleague. He is a rare public servant and a great American. We wish him in his retirement from the House all that life can afford in health, happiness, and prosperity.

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. DOWNING].

Mr. DOWNING. I join my colleagues in paying tribute to VAUGHAN GARY. In my opinion, he is one of the ablest Congressmen in this body. Twenty years ago he came to this body and for 20 years he has rendered the most valuable services to his district, to his State, and to his Nation. Our distinguished majority leader, CARL ALBERT, of Oklahoma, once called him a Congressman's Congressman. Secretary of the Treasury Douglas Dillon once called him one of the truly outstanding Members of Congress. He has received letters from at least three Presidents of the United States commending him for his services to his country. The late great Speaker, Sam Rayburn, once classified him as a great Congressman and one of the most influential Members of the House of Representatives.

I shall miss VAUGHAN deeply. I love him. If one thing stands out in my memory from my association with VAUGHAN GARY it is not only his ability, his integrity, his honesty, but I think above all his courage. VAUGHAN had the courage to call the shots as he saw them. As all of my colleagues so well know, all too often we are faced with a proposition which is not popular with the people back home, or it is popular; and because of our knowledge of it or because we have deep-seated principles concerning the issue, we have to take a stand in opposition to the wishes of the people we represent. This is what I call a moment of courage. We have all had to face it. And when that situation arises we have got to decide whether we are going to be a Congressman or whether we are going to be a man.

Congressman GARY never faltered in any instance.

He set himself on the record as a man. I am going to miss him.

I wish for him and Mrs. Gary and his two lovely children every happiness and I look forward to seeing him again in some important position with the U.S. Government.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to join my colleagues in paying a sincere tribute to the gentleman from Virginia, VAUGHAN GARY, and to wish him every happiness as he and Mrs. Gary and their family proceed into the future. I hope he enjoys himself because he deserves it.

It has been my privilege to serve on the Committee on Appropriations with VAUGHAN GARY for 20 years. He has been a hard and dependable worker on that committee, which work is quite rigorous at times and demands a searching insight into the operations of this great Government of ours. But they have always found VAUGHAN GARY searching for the wisest way to spend the people's money. He wants a dollar's worth of value for every dollar that is spent that will bring progress, peace, and stability and maintain the honor of this great Nation among the nations of the world and maintain law, order, and prosperity and peace and stability here at home.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I want to join other Members of the House in paying my respects to a very great American. It has been the highest privilege that I have had as a Member of this body to work alongside a great American in trying to preserve the constitutional processes of appropriations. I doubt whether many Members of this House are fully familiar with the tremendous service that the gentleman from Virginia, VAUGHAN GARY, has given to this country. I think he is one of the greatest Americans I have ever known, and I regret his going more than I can say.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Virginia yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, I do not think any words of mine can add to the very eloquent tributes that are being paid to our friend and colleague, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY].

May I simply say that after 12 years of service in this House of Representatives there are few of our colleagues whose presence enriches the lives of the rest of us. I think this cannot, perhaps, be said of so very many of us, because there are not many of us who have the remarkable humor, the remarkable love of fellowman, the unique ability to be interested in the problems of everyone else.

So, Mr. Speaker, may I simply say to the gentleman from Virginia, VAUGHAN GARY, we shall all miss you, but it shall be more than just a personal missing—we shall feel most severely the lack of your advice, counsel, and splendid example.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I too want to add my voice to the fine things that have been said for and in behalf of a fine American.

I have always thought that although you may never wholly agree with any man, with any of your associates—and ofttimes we do not here on the floor of this House—I have felt that when a man was dedicated to what he thought was right, what he thought was right for his district, his State, and his Nation, I have found that usually he came out with what was right.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that can be said of the gentleman from Virginia, VAUGHAN GARY. I have relied from time to time upon his sage and valuable advice. I too shall miss his association tremendously here from day to day.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] has rendered an invaluable service to his district and to his State and to his Nation.

I wish for him the very best of all good things in whatever his efforts and whatever his endeavors are in the future.

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, as the youngest Member of the Virginia delegation, I suspect that there is really little that I might add to the distinguished achievements of this individual who will be leaving the United States Congress:

Mr. Speaker, Longfellow said:

> The heights by great men reached and kept
> Were not attained by sudden flight,
> But they, while their companions slept,
> Were toiling upward in the night.

Mr. Speaker, I suppose this is really a tribute which could be applied to VAUGHAN GARY. When one looks at the great contributions which he has made in the legislative field, when one talks of the things that he has accomplished and the service he has performed, when those who are senior to myself and who have served with him for many years can point out certain attributes of human character that distinguish him and I recognize that as a new Member here in the Congress in the first learning to know him that I too see these very great qualities, there are really true, perhaps, basic values, such things as virtue and character, hard work and integrity, of courage and ability that transcend party lines, that cross over the aisle. Because of those things we respect an individual for what he is and because of what he has done.

Mr. Speaker, VAUGHAN GARY has served this country in not just the Halls of Congress. He served it in World War I. He served his State and his Nation. He served his civic community, as president of the Virginia State Chamber of Commerce. He served it in the General Assembly of his State, he served it in charitable efforts and he has been willing to lend a hand serving in many areas that do not give to him the recognition that he has received as a Congressman.

Mr. Speaker, his has been a long career of public service. I would say that, perhaps, it has been a lifetime of public service. For that reason what VAUGHAN GARY has done is really an inspiration to others, not only the Commonwealth of Virginia but indeed in these United States. He is a very warm person. He has been understanding and kind to me. That same warmness of understanding I am certain has been shared by other Members of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, I know that in reviewing his record there is little I might add because I feel what he has done and his tribute should continue to be written in the annals of this Congress so long as this Republic shall survive.

Vaughan Gary has aimed high, and he has written well, and what he has done will be read in the annals of our Nation's history.

In summary, I would say perhaps he had done what the great author Lowell had in mind when he said:

> Life is a leaf of paper white,
> Whereon each one of us may write
> His word or two, and then comes night.
>
> Greatly begin! though thou have time
> But for a line, be that sublime—
> Not failure, but low aim, is crime.
>
> —Lowell.

I join in this tribute to him.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I too want to join my friends from Virginia and my other colleagues in paying a great tribute to that fine Christian Virginia gentleman, Vaughan Gary. As the previous speaker, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Marsh] has said, I too am a very junior Member of this fine body.

Shortly after my arrival here in the Congress I became a good friend of Vaughan Gary. Not only was he recognized as one of the great legislators in the presentation of legislation for which he held the responsibility of leadership, but I also recognized him in our weekly meetings of the congressional prayer breakfast group where I found him to be the true Christian many of you have spoken about.

I do not look upon the retirement of Vaughan Gary as the beginning of the end of a career. I rather would like to look upon it as the beginning of a new era, one that will bring him further greatness and benefit for not only our colleagues, but for the benefit of mankind which he serves in the true spirit of brotherly love.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I would like to add my comments in tribute to a great American.

I know that our Minnesota delegation, and I well remember the comments made by our beloved colleague, Walter Judd, relative to his affection for Vaughan Gary. I join with Walter in how he feels about this great American.

On many Thursday mornings I have attended the prayer breakfast and there I first observed our mutual friend, and I can say truly that this gentleman practices what he preaches.

I might further add that he is always a gentleman, always courteous, and obviously dedicated. He is a man of influence because I believe that all of us understand that he is dedicated to his task. He is sound in judgment, he is courteous to his fellow colleagues, and a great believer in our great country.

I want to say that I shall regret his leaving the Congress and hope his many years ahead will be blessed because of his deserving qualities.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, Vaughan Gary is an able, conscientious, courageous, dedicated, effective Member of Congress. He is a Virginia gentleman in the best traditions of the Old Dominion. I hope that he will be back to visit with us, and to counsel with us often.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Morton].

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, I know the city of Richmond well. My late father spent the last 20 years of his life there. I had the opportunity to visit in the city and to make many friends. My stepmother still lives in Richmond and I have the opportunity to visit it occasionally now.

I should like to add to what has been said by saying that I know from firsthand knowledge that the city of Richmond is a better place because of Vaughan Gary having represented it in the U.S. Congress.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to concur in the many nice things that have been said about Vaughan Gary. I regret very much he is leaving the House of Representatives.

In a lighter vein, let me say that it has been my experience to meet him in a horseshoe pitching contest about once a year for the past several years. He has an unbroken string of victories. I hope he will remain somewhere within reasonable proximity of Washington so that I may have the opportunity once in a while to try to beat him at this game of horseshoes.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Hagan].

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I join with our colleagues in honoring Vaughan Gary. I regret that I have had only two terms in Congress with him, but I shall never forget the fine impression which he has made upon me during the time we have been together here in this body.

Vaughan Gary is a great man. He is a man's man. I believe he is a man endowed by our Creator with certain abilities of service to his Government and to his people. It has been a great privilege to serve with a man of such fine Christian character and ability as Vaughan Gary.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Hardy] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, the eagerness and enthusiasm with which we look toward the adjournment of each Congress is tempered by the sobering realization that some of our colleagues with whom we have enjoyed working for so long do not plan to return. Vaughan Gary is one of those who did not seek reelection and has decided to retire after 20 years of outstanding service in the House.

It has been my privilege to serve with him for 18 of those years, and I have known no one whose stewardship has been more diligent. Vaughan has distinguished himself as a conscientious, hard-working, faithful servant of his district of Virginia and of the Nation. An outstanding legislator and statesman, he has placed service to his country and his constituency always in the forefront of his concern.

Vaughan has earned the admiration and respect of all of us by his fairness and considerate handling of bills on the floor, as well as by his arduous work in committee. But most of all we have known him as a friend, as one who was never too busy to help with the problems of others.

I am sorry Vaughan will not be returning next year. We shall miss him. I know the good wishes of all of us go with him in whatever pursuit to which his many talents and energies are applied. We hope that in the months to come he will return to visit us frequently and give us the benefit of his sage advice and counsel.

Mr. Speaker, there was an excellent editorial on Mr. Gary in the Norfolk Virginian-Pilot of March 2, 1964. For the information of the House, I include it with these remarks:

Well Done, Mr. Gary

To say that Representative J. Vaughan Gary, of Richmond, stepping down after 19 years, served his district well does not begin to catch his scope.

A working, conscientious beaver of a man on the House Appropriations Committee, he served his country as few House members are able to do. He was the patron of all the bills that financed the Marshall plan.

As for his effect on Virginia, his independence has been a joy to watch. When moderation was merited, he took that course despite the heavily conservative makeup of much of his district.

At the other end of the spectrum, labor was often cross with him and the large Negro vote in Richmond always went to his Republican opponent. Somebody was always trying to "get Vaughan." How he survived is something of a mystery.

He was the most embattled of all the Virginia Congressmen. In 19 years, he ran 11 times, and nearly every campaign was hard-fought. Between these wars there were always rumors of wars, but Mr. Gary shrugged them off. "I always try to think out my votes, but, after they're gone, I forget 'em," he said.

Some Congressmen shine on the House floor in oratory. Mr. Gary was a worker in committees. He is a compact, vital man, all a-twinkle. His hair crinkles, his eyes twinkle, his conversation is explosive, like a dynamo throwing off blue sparks.

He never bothered to build a political organization. But at some point in every campaign his personal friends would become aware that "Vaughan is in trouble," and go to work. Just as he sought to vote on a bill's merits, so a cross section of Richmonders from a variety of factions would vote on his merits, to their credit as well as his.

It's a pleasure to say: Well done, Mr. GARY. Very well done.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, upon a previous occasion here on the floor I expressed my esteem and admiration for the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] who is returning, voluntarily, to private life at the end of this session of Congress. He has been an invaluable Member through the years of his service here. We have served together on the Committee on Appropriations and I have found him always to be an invaluable ally and associate in the cause of good government and wise fiscal policies.

He has written his name large in Washington. His service here will be long remembered. The people of his district and of the Nation owe him a great debt of gratitude for his sterling performance in behalf of our great country.

I wish my good friend and associate a great abundance of happiness upon his retirement from the House. I know that he will find in his return to private life challenging and interesting problems with which to wrestle. He is not one to retire from the doing of good and the performance of valuable services to the people of his community and the Nation.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the resignation of our colleague, J. VAUGHAN GARY, is a great loss to the House of Representatives.

In the Virginia delegation we have always had a bond of friendship and cooperation regardless of partisan affiliations. VAUGHAN GARY has always been one of our most sincere, conscientious and able Members. We of this delegation will miss him; the Congress will miss him; and the people of Virginia will miss him.

I wish him and his family well in the years that lie ahead, and sincerely hope he will enjoy the retirement he so justly deserves.

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to my longtime friend and colleague, the Honorable J. VAUGHAN GARY, who is retiring from the House of Representatives after having served his district, his State, and his Nation in a distinguished manner for many years. I have known VAUGHAN GARY for more than 45 years. We are college fraternity brothers and I served with him in the House of Delegates of Virginia long before either of us ever thought of becoming Members of Congress. He is a gentleman in every sense that the word implies; a man of honor, integrity, and ability. He has risen to a high position in the House of Representatives and enjoys in an unusually high degree the confidence and esteem of his colleagues.

I regret to see him leave our body, but nevertheless I hope that this will not sever our relationship for I look forward with pleasure to seeing him from time to time, and to association with him in other arenas of activity.

VAUGHAN GARY has lived up to the standards which should be expected of a Member of Congress and I am sure that the people of his district, as well as his State and the Nation, are proud of the contributions which he has made in this body.

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, the retirement of VAUGHAN GARY from this body will mark the end of a congressional service which is widely respected by his colleagues and the people of his State. He is a legislator of notable ability and the energy with which he has discharged his duties has been matched by his dedication to the task of representing his district and the Nation at large.

During recent years he has made a commendable record as chairman of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Treasury and Post Office matters. His experience in this field and his tireless efforts to master the highly technical aspects of these agencies has made him an expert in the affairs of these areas of Government. He has devoted much time to his committee work and has been a tireless devotee to the task of congressional supervision over the executive agencies.

Congressman GARY was elected to the 79th Congress and to each succeeding Congress, after compiling a distinguished record of civic service in his native Richmond.

He served as a member of the Virginia House of Delegates from 1926 through 1933 and was active in a number of local and State organizations. He served as president of the Virginia State Chamber of Commerce, the Virginia Tuberculosis Association, and the Richmond Bar Association and has been active as a member of the boards of trustees of the University of Richmond and Fork Union Military Academy.

His retirement from Congress will allow him more time for such community activities and enjoyment of the practice of law. We wish him well and join in this period for commending a faithful public servant.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to join in this great tribute to our distinguished colleague, the honorable J. VAUGHAN GARY, from Richmond, who came to the House of Representatives in the 79th Congress and who is retiring this year.

This veteran member of the Appropriations Committee is the friend of every Member of the House. He is an effective legislator who has mastered the art of "gentle persuasion." He has most ably represented his district and the Nation in the best tradition of this parliamentary body. He has been my neighbor in the House Office Building and my close personal friend and adviser.

I wish for Mrs. Gary and him a happy and well-deserved retirement and hope that VAUGHAN will frequently visit this body to which he has made such a tremendous contribution.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, Congressman J. VAUGHAN GARY has served in the Congress from the 79th through the 88th Congress. He has served his State and the Nation with a brilliancy that establishes his niche among the most versatile of the statesmen of his day.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations he handled most important legislation in the public interest. His influence among his colleagues determined the passage of many controversial measures. He was an expert in House procedures and in direct terms depicted the purposes of the legislation and its contribution to public purposes.

He is a truly Virginian gentleman. His legalistic abilities were reflected in his presentment of legislation.

The loss of his tremendous services and specialized abilities are unfortunate. May his retirement from the Congress be rewarded by a real enjoyment of life's privileges to one whose stewardship has met every requirement of a dedicated patriot. I wish him and his darling wife Eunice and his daughter Carolyn Hugo and his son Mr. J. Vaughan, Jr., the best of health, happiness, and the riches of this life with God's blessings.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I will always remember with much pleasure my association here in the House with our beloved colleague from Richmond, the old capital of the Confederacy.

The first time that I remember seeing VAUGHAN GARY, very appropriately, was when he addressed the Christian breakfast group of the House in the Van den Berg Room of the Senate in 1947. VAUGHAN GARY realized that our Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and its Bill of Rights were founded upon the Christian concept of the worth and dignity of the individual.

VAUGHAN'S service here in the House was marked by a devotion and dedication to the concepts of the Founding Fathers of our country. I will always remember VAUGHAN GARY'S Americanism, his concern for the American taxpayer, and his contribution in building a strong America with invincible defenses.

I believe our country in the future will find need for VAUGHAN GARY'S leadership, experience, courage, and integrity. Mrs. Dorn and my family join me in wishing for him, his wonderful wife, and fine family much happiness and continued success always.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, among those Members of this body who have announced that they would not return in 1965 was my good friend VAUGHAN GARY, of Virginia. I am sorry that he will not be with us, but his work and able representation will long live in the House.

His presence will be missed on the committees on which he served, and his conservative approach to money matters through his position on the Appropriations Committee I am sure resulted in a much more efficient operation of those agencies for which he was responsible.

I am sure that VAUGHAN will not "retire" and that he will continue to be available to those who will seek his assistance and wise counsel.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who so desire may be privileged to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD relative to our colleague, Mr. GARY.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

REPORT ON THE 88TH CONGRESS

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, at the end of each session and each Congress, I have always summarized the year's activities, reprinted them at my expense, and mailed them to my constituents. Each Congress we consider thousands of bills and pass several hundred so I can only briefly summarize the ones of most widespread interest to central Iowa.

Last year's session was the longest peacetime session in history. The months and months of committee work performed last year resulted in a great volume of proposals being placed in the legislative pipeline and this year's session enacted more important legislation than any other Congress. With our increasing population and the now rather firm policy of increasing the constituents each Member serves instead of increasing the number of Congressmen, most Members are now resigned to the idea that the workload will never again be light enough to be taken care of in a normal work year, at least as long as the Communist threat lasts.

MEDICAL AND HEALTH

Public Law 88–129 provides for a 3-year program to expand facilities of medical, dental, and related type colleges and $30.7 million for students loans.

Public Law 88–156 provides for $350 million in aid to States for maternal and child health services, crippled children's programs, and maternity care and research projects to prevent mental retardation.

Public Law 88–591 authorizes a 5-year program to expand nursing school facilities and for loans for student nurses.

Public Law 88–164 provides $329 million to aid States in providing mental retardation research facilities and in constructing community mental health centers.

Public Law 88–443 extended Hill-Burton construction program and included funds for areawide planning of health facilities that have mostly been only on a citywide basis.

Public Law 88–305 requires USDA approval of pesticides before selling them to the public.

EQUAL PAY FOR WOMEN

Public Law 88–38 prohibits discrimination in pay on the basis of sex in work that is subject to the minimum wage laws.

This measure had been before Congress for 18 years.

HOUSING

Public Law 88–158 increases to $275 million the loans to organizations constructing housing for the elderly.

Public Law 88–54 extends for 2 years the authority of FHA to insure mortgages.

MILITARY FORCES

Public Law 88–132 increases the pay for members of the Armed Forces and readjusts pay schedules. Another bill passed this year grants a further pay increase.

EDUCATION

Public Law 88–204 authorizes $400 million per year to aid college classroom construction. Iowa's share will be over $4 million per year. Colleges and universities would be required to pay at least two-thirds of the cost of each construction project. An Iowa-appointed committee will determine which schools receive the help and how much; but almost all schools are expected to double enrollments within 10 years and need to receive contributions.

Public Law 88–210 provides for new grants to States to expand vocational education.

S. 3060 expands the National Defense Education Act programs and extends the impacted areas aid to local school districts for 1 more year. College loans for students were increased a total of 100 percent but still total only about one-third the number required to loan each student an average of $700 who has the ability to go to college and would be accepted.

This is the most legislation for education that has been passed in any Congress since the Land-Grant College Act of 100 years ago.

AGRICULTURE

Public Law 88–26 extends through 1965 the feed grain program that was in effect for 1963. The bill contained my amendment permitting adjustments to make base acreages more fair. The State and county committees are working on this now. It also contained my amendment which will increase average yield bases in Iowa by including the yields of the past 2 years in the base years. This increased Iowa's share $4.5 million last year and it will be more next year.

The Mexican farm labor program was stopped.

Public Law 88–354 establishes a Commission to study the price spread from producer to consumer.

WHEAT SALES

Russia was in the world market for wheat last year. A prohibition against American businessmen selling to them through the Export-Import Bank on normal commercial terms was proposed but rejected. They bought 65 million bushels for $140 million and have paid for it. They are not in the market for wheat this year. Our Government-held stocks are now lower than in many years.

RECREATION

Public Law 88–578 establishes a land and water conservation fund to assist States in developing outdoor recreation programs and acquiring recreation areas.

Public Law 88–9 authorizes coordination of Federal and State outdoor recreation plans.

Public Law 88–577 sets aside 35 million acres of federally owned wilderness areas to be preserved in its primitive state for public use.

SAYLORVILLE DAM

A total of $1.6 million was appropriated to begin construction of Saylorville Dam just north of Des Moines. It will help control floods in Des Moines, increase minimum flow of water through Des Moines in dry weather, and provide a permanent lake of about 5,500 acres.

SQUAW CREEK AND SKUNK RIVER

Although it was not in the budget, money was appropriated to provide surveys for these projects. They are both near Ames.

They would protect the Iowa State University building program and the industrial development area of Ames, as well as controlling floods for 150 miles downstream and providing recreation.

RED ROCK DAM

Twenty-eight million two hundred thousand dollars was appropriated to continue construction of the Red Rock Dam making a total of $46.5 million that has been invested in it so far. It is being built in three sections. The second (spillway section) is now being completed.

HIGHWAY

Public Law 88–157 extends the interstate highway program through 1971 and continues the billboard control program for 2 years.

INTERNATIONAL

Public Law 88–285 authorizes an expansion of about one-half in the Peace Corps. Congress has indicated it intends to replace some foreign aid grants with Peace Corps programs which cost much less and most believe will be more effective.

Public Law 88–186 extended the Arms Control Research Agency through 1965.

The nuclear test ban treaty was negotiated by President Kennedy and ratified by the Senate.

House Joint Resolution 1145 approved and supported the determination of the President to repel attacks on U.S. forces and to prevent aggression jeopardizing peace and security in southeast Asia.

President Johnson presented requests for foreign aid that were $566,988,000 less than the requests last year. Congress cut it another $300 million but decided that any greater cut would require an even greater increase in the military budget.

LABOR LAW

Public Law 88–133 increases benefits under railway retirement and unemployment acts and strengthens the trust fund's financial position.

Public Law 88–349 amends the Davis-Bacon Act to include pension and other fringe benefits in wage scales.

VETERANS

Public Laws 21 and 134 increase payments to dependents of veterans who died of service-connected disabilities.

Public Law 88–151 permits the Veterans' Administration to waive recovery on home loans in certain hardship cases.

Public Law 88–20 provides additional compensation for service-connected loss of hearing in both ears.

Public Law 88-22 increases benefits for veterans suffering complete loss of speech.

TAX BILL

Public Law 88-272 reduced Federal taxes by $11.5 billion by cutting personal income taxes an average of 19.4 percent and exempting all earnings less than $3,000 per year from paying Federal income taxes. It also reduces corporate taxes. It did not contain many of the reforms requested by the administration. Due to increased profits and less unemployment, even with the lower rates, tax revenues for the first 3 months of 1964 were up $1.5 billion over the same period last year.

The administration and Congress are now working on a bill to eliminate excise taxes where the proceeds are not used directly for the benefit of the taxpayer paying them.

FOOD

Public Law 88-525 expanded the food stamp program and counties in Iowa became eligible to participate at the option of the State government and county board of supervisors.

Families in need could buy stamps at less than fair value to purchase certain foods.

In the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, the Government furnished $634 worth of food and milk to needy people, institutions, school lunch, military and veterans programs. This compares to $425 million in 1957 and $411 million worth furnished in 1960 and shows the extent to which great emphasis has now been placed on food. The diets of about 6 million needy and 16 million schoolchildren are affected. Food exported for cash has increased greatly.

PAY BILL

Public Law 88-448 provides pay adjustments for the 2.5 million Federal employees and officials. The committee headed by Clarence Randall of Inland Steel appointed by Presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy made conclusions as to the scales that would make Federal salaries comparable to non-Federal pay scales. The bill brings judges, scientists, Congressmen, Senators, and executive personnel to about two-thirds the amount recommended and brings the other 95 percent of the Federal employees up to the nongovernment rate of 1962. President Johnson requested it and Senators GOLDWATER and DIRKSEN both supported and voted for it.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Public Law 88-352 bans discrimination based upon religion, or race in: First, voting in Federal elections; second, distribution of Federal aid; third, public education; fourth, certain types of publicly owned or publicly operated facilities or accommodations; and fifth, employment. The prohibition relative to employment, generally speaking, covers employers of 100 or more workers—to be gradually reduced to 25 workers—and does not cover private clubs, employees working on religious activities, religious educational institutions. It also establishes a group—headed by former Governor Collins, of Florida—to seek satisfactory settlements of complaints without publicity or court action. The law does not provide preference to any religion or race, does not provide for racial balance in schools, and does not involve sale or use of private homes.

DEFENSE

Although most of our tax money is spent for defense hardware, bases, and to pay for the armed forces and personnel, legislation in this area has been relativley noncontroversial. The 88th Congress provided legislation to increase nuclear warheads in our strategic alert forces, tactical nuclear forces in Europe, tactical air squadrons, airlift capability, special forces trained to deal with guerrilla warfare, polaris submarines and also in certain other areas.

However, the Congress did resist pressures from both outside and within Congress to reverse the Defense Department's orders closing obsolete military bases and canceling orders for overstocked items. Although there is still much pressure by some who say their States do not get their share, the majority still do not support replacing competitive bidding with some geographical distribution of defense contracts on some kind of cost plus basis.

Although defense costs are up about $6 billion compared to 1960 and although we have much greater strength than we had before the buildup started at the time of the Berlin blockade early in 1961, the cost reduction program has offset most of the extra cost of the increased strength provided in the past year and it is now expected that the cost reduction program can probably offset the increased cost of more complicated weapons systems.

MISCELLANEOUS

Public Law 88-273 expands help to privately owned small business investment companies which in turn help small businesses who are unable to secure needed loans from regular sources at reasonable rates.

Public Law 88-277 authorizes the furnishing of facilities for a newly elected President between election and taking office for an orderly transition between administrations.

Public Law 88-280 extends the airport act.

Public Law 88-467 brings trading in over-the-counter securities under the SEC and requires certain facts be disclosed to buyers of these stocks.

Public Law 88-452 is the antipoverty program consisting of work training and work study programs, and provisions designed to encourage local action.

The appropriation bills, 88th Cong., 2d sess., as of Sept. 22, 1964

[Does not include back-door appropriations or permanent appropriations [1] under previous legislation. Does include indefinite appropriations carried in annual appropriation bills]

Title and bill No.	Budget estimates to House	Amount as passed (House)	Amount as passed (Senate)	Amount as approved (Senate)
1964 DEFICIENCIES				
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (H.J.Res. 875):				
Original resolution, 88th, 1st [2]	$41, 886, 000	$41, 886, 000	$258, 090, 000	----------
Subsequent consideration, 88th, 2d [3]	[4] 247, 802, 000	[5] 247, 802, 000	[5] 31, 598, 000	[6] $289, 688, 000
Total, H.J. Res. 875	289, 688, 000	289, 688, 000	289, 688, 000	289, 688, 000
Department of Labor (H.J. Res. 962)	42, 000, 000	42, 000, 000	42, 000, 000	42, 000, 000
Disaster relief (H.J. Res. 976)	50, 000, 000	50, 000, 000	50, 000, 000	50, 000, 000
Deficiency, 1964 (H.R. 11201)	1, 307, 380, 789	1, 264, 913, 689	1, 349, 637, 143	1, 336, 687, 143
Total, 1964 deficiencies	1, 689, 068, 789	1, 646, 601, 689	1, 731, 325, 143	1, 718, 375, 143
1965 APPROPRIATION BILLS				
District of Columbia (H.R. 10199)	($357, 702, 300)	($338, 205, 200)	($342, 181, 975)	($341, 242, 200)
Federal payment, 1965 regular	53, 220, 000	40, 720, 000	44, 220, 000	40, 720, 000
Loan authorization	(14, 400, 000)	(26, 400, 000)	(26, 400, 000)	(26, 400, 000)
Interior (H.R. 10433)	1, 035, 678, 000	1, 009, 175, 600	1, 029, 226, 400	1, 028, 277, 200
1965 regular appropriations	998, 903, 000	976, 475, 600	993, 554, 400	994, 069, 200
Loan authorization	(20, 000, 000)	(14, 000, 000)	(14, 000, 000)	(14, 000, 000)
1964 supplementals	36, 775, 000	32, 700, 000	35, 672, 000	34, 208, 000
Treasury-Post Office (H.R. 10532):				
1965 regular appropriations	6, 271, 991, 000	6, 225, 420, 000	6, 240, 423, 000	6, 233, 273, 000
1964 supplementals (by transfer)	(1, 675, 000)	(1, 100, 000)	(1, 100, 000)	(1, 100, 000)
Legislative (H.R. 10723)	222, 587, 355	173, 626, 640	210, 380, 685	210, 300, 885
1965 regular appropriations	[7] 222, 375, 655	[8] 173, 446, 640	[9] 210, 231, 685	210, 300, 885
1964 supplementals	211, 700	180, 000	149, 000	----------
Labor-HEW (H.R. 10809)	7, 561, 968, 000	6, 908, 063, 000	7, 081, 193, 000	7, 089, 707, 000
1965 regular appropriations	7, 104, 782, 000	6, 908, 063, 000	7, 081, 193, 000	7, 089, 707, 000
1964 supplementals	457, 186, 000	----------	----------	----------
Defense (H.R. 10939):				
1965 regular appropriations	47, 471, 000, 000	46, 759, 267, 000	46, 774, 401, 000	46, 752, 051, 000
1964 supplementals (by transfer)	(6, 000, 000)	(6, 000, 000)	(6, 000, 000)	(6, 000, 000)
State, Justice, Judiciary (H.R. 11134)	1, 957, 764, 700	1, 702, 627, 800	1, 730, 855, 700	1, 717, 157, 800
1965 regular appropriations	1, 915, 089, 700	1, 702, 177, 800	1, 700, 405, 700	1, 686, 707, 800
1964 supplementals	42, 675, 000	450, 000	30, 450, 000	30, 450, 000
Agriculture (H.R. 11202)	5, 832, 922, 600	5, 182, 665, 000	5, 338, 672, 525	5, 137, 162, 200
1965 regular appropriations	5, 582, 259, 600	5, 182, 665, 000	5, 323, 872, 525	5, 127, 162, 200
Loan authorization	(753, 000, 000)	(795, 000, 000)	(795, 000, 000)	(795, 000, 000)
1964 supplementals	6, 573, 000	----------	14, 800, 000	10, 000, 000
Independent Offices (H.R. 11296)	14, 244, 653, 400	8, 118, 965, 500	13, 613, 224, 000	13, 454, 859, 000
1965 regular appropriations	14, 099, 653, 400	8, 118, 965, 500	13, 613, 224, 000	13, 454, 859, 000
1964 supplementals	145, 000, 000	----------	----------	----------
Military Construction (H.R. 11369) 1965 regular appropriations	1, 879, 000, 000	1, 599, 014, 500	1, 582, 969, 000	1, 570, 968, 000
Public works (H.R. 11579) 1965 regular appropriations	4, 372, 449, 000	4, 325, 969, 200	4, 443, 283, 200	4, 430, 794, 700

See footnotes at end of table.

The appropriation bills, 88th Cong., 2d sess., as of Sept. 22, 1964—Continued

[Does not include back-door appropriations or permanent appropriations[1] under previous legislation. Does include indefinite appropriations carried in annual appropriation bills]

Title and bill No.	Budget estimates to House	Amount as passed (House)	Amount as passed (Senate)	Amount as approved (Senate)
1965 APPROPRIATION BILLS—continued				
Foreign assistance (H.R. 11812) 1965 regular appropriations	$3, 958, 377, 000	$3, 739, 249, 400	$3, 662, 077, 000	$3, 662, 077, 000
Supplemental, 1965 (H.R. 12633)	1, 370, 468, 374	998, 645, 874	1, 220, 098, 068	1, 117, 196, 068
Total, 1965 regular	95, 299, 568, 729	86, 750, 079, 514	92, 889, 952, 578	92, 369, 885, 853
Total, 1964 supplementals (included in 1965 bills)	688, 420, 700	33, 330, 000	81, 071, 000	74, 658, 000
Total, all appropriations	97, 677, 058, 218	88, 430, 011, 203	94, 702, 348, 721	94, 162, 918, 996
Total, loan authorizations	(787, 400, 000)	(835, 400, 000)	(835, 400, 000)	(835, 400, 000)

[1] Tentatively estimated in January budget at about $11,800,000,000 for fiscal year 1965.

[2] This resolution passed both Houses in 88th Cong., 1st sess. House bill included $41,886,000 for activities to combat mental retardation; Senate bill added $216,204,000 for "Payments to school districts." Resolution not finally adopted in 1st sess.

[3] Action renewed in 88th Cong., 2d sess.

[4] Estimates submitted to Congress in H. Doc. 203, dated Jan. 21, 1964, considered as follows: "Payments to school districts," $216,204,000 (previously added by Senate); "Defense educational activities," $31,168,000; "Compliance activities, Mexican farm labor program," $430,000.

[5] Resolution not actually reported by Appropriations Committees for House or Senate consideration. Figures shown for balancing purposes. Amounts shown as reported and passed by Senate include $31,168,000 for "Defense educational activities"; and $430,000 for "Compliance activities, Mexican farm labor program."

[6] Final amount appropriated includes $41,886,000 for activities to combat mental retardation; $216,204,000 for "Payments to school districts"; $31,168,000 for "Defense educational activities"; and $430,000 for "Compliance activities, Mexican farm labor program."

[7] Resolutions not reported by Appropriations Committees. Considered and passed in House and Senate without committee action. Figures shown for balancing purposes.

[8] Excludes Senate items.

[9] Includes Senate items.

NOTE.—Totals reflect amounts approved and comparisons at latest stage of congressional action on each bill.

HON. SHERMAN P. LLOYD

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Utah [Mr. BURTON] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. **BURTON** of Utah. Mr. Speaker, it is with some degree of personal sadness that I announce to our colleagues in the House what some of them already know and that is when the 89th Congress convenes next January we will be without the services of a great friend of mine and a great friend of many people who are in this body. I have reference, of course, to my colleague, the gentleman from Utah "SHERM" LLOYD. "SHERM'S" decision to retire from this body is a voluntary one. He undertook to offer his services to the people of Utah as a candidate of the party that I represent, for the Senate of the United States. He was running against a very worthy opponent. After a hard-fought campaign "SHERM" was eliminated. The closeness of the campaign is attested to by the fact that had a few more than 800 voters cast their votes otherwise "SHERM" would be our party's candidate for the U.S. Senate.

I have had an opportunity to work with "SHERM" in government and in politics for the last several years. Before I was elected to this great body I served as administrative assistant to the Governor in the State of Utah at the same time that "SHERM" LLOYD was serving as majority leader of our Utah State Senate. He also served as minority leader of the senate and established himself by a fine career in the Utah State Senate. We were all happy that he was elected to represent Utah's Second Congressional District.

I have regarded "SHERM'S" advice and his friendship in the highest possible terms. I think that his departure from this body is a great loss to the Congress. I say this, that those of us who are familiar with Utah and its politics certainly do not regard this as the end of a career in political life for the gentleman from Utah, "SHERM" LLOYD. He has a wonderful family and I want to take this opportunity to wish "SHERM" and his beautiful wife, Edith-Ann, Godspeed and to express my personal esteem and high regard for them.

Mr. **DEL CLAWSON**. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **BURTON** of Utah. I yield to my friend the gentleman from California.

Mr. **DEL CLAWSON**. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the gentleman in the well in paying tribute and respect to our colleague, the gentleman from Utah, SHERMAN P. LLOYD, whom it has been my pleasure to know as a friend, during the short time that we have both served in the 88th Congress.

"SHERM" has been a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency where I, too, have served. Ours is a rather deep friendship that has developed in the brief period that we have been associated together in the House of Representatives.

"SHERM" exemplifies the true qualities of a public servant, a man who recognizes the obligations and responsibilities of a public trust. In my opinion he is a fine and splendid symmetry of the qualities of character that make a man and a Christian. The House of Representatives has been a better place and this particular Congress a better Congress because of his influence and because of the record of service that "SHERM LLOYD" has established.

I wish him and his family Godspeed and a very pleasant and successful future in a position where he can further distinguish himself, I am sure, in the State of Utah.

Mr. **BURTON** of Utah. I thank you colleague, the gentleman from California.

Mr. **MORTON**. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **BURTON** of Utah. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. **MORTON**. I would like to associate my remarks also with the remarks of the gentleman from Utah [Mr. BURTON]. I have come to know the gentleman from Utah, "SHERM" LLOYD, very well during the past 2 years. I have been very impressed with his knowledge, not only of his State but of his knowledge particularly of the distribution of food and the management of the whole food supply system. For a good many years I believe he was connected with this area of Utah's economy and he has certainly been able to contribute a great deal here in the House of Representatives as a result of his knowledge in this field.

I wish him Godspeed in whatever undertaking he goes into and I am sure he will be successful.

Mr. **BURTON** of Utah. I thank the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. **MARSH**. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **BURTON** of Utah. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. **MARSH**. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman now in the well of the House for taking this time to pay tribute to a man whom I consider to be a very outstanding Member of the House of Representatives. It is a real pleasure and it has been a real pleasure and privilege for me to be associated with him as a colleague in the 88th Congress. I have heard a great deal about him from friends in Utah and I find that all the fine things that were said about him by those who knew him best were quite true.

He is a man of very fine character. He is a kind person. He is the type of individual I feel has done his very best to represent his State in the traditions to which he subscribes and which are the best traditions of the State of Utah.

Mr. **BURTON** of Utah. I thank the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. **DON H. CLAUSEN**. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **BURTON** of Utah. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. **DON H. CLAUSEN**. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my friend, the gentleman from Utah, LARRY BURTON, in paying tribute to our friend and colleague, the Honorable "SHERM" LLOYD from the Second District of Utah.

"SHERM" LLOYD has served his district, the State of Utah, and the United States with great dignity and ability. It is indeed regrettable that a young man with such great talent will not be returning to serve this great legislative body in the years to come. While I recognize the fact that his departure was of his own choosing, nevertheless, those of us who were privileged to serve with him want to wish him Godspeed in whatever future career or endeavor he selects.

We will welcome him always as he returns to this Nation's Capital as a visitor or some time in the future in another legislative capacity. With these great abilities, I am convinced we have not heard the last of "SHERM" LLOYD. I am privileged to call him my friend. We worked together in the interest of the great mink farming industry of his State, where our mutual district's interests were concerned.

I am proud to call him my friend. "SHERM" LLOYD is a great legislator, an outstanding American, and a fine Christian gentleman. May God bless him and his family now and for the rest of his natural life.

Mr. BURTON of Utah. I thank the gentleman from California.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleague, the gentleman from Utah [Mr. BURTON] in paying tribute to another great Utahan from the Beehive State—"SHERM" LLOYD.

As minority leader, it is my job to size up our freshmen Members and I can say this to this House: "SHERM" LLOYD came to us as a "freshman" only in terms of seniority. He brought to this body experience and judgment not always found in such abundance in new Members.

"SHERM" is regarded highly by members of both parties and by his colleagues on his committee.

"SHERM" has a personality that is warm and at the same time sincere.

One of the great rewards I have had in 30 years service in this great deliberative body is that of knowing and working with men of the caliber of "SHERM" LLOYD.

We all wish "SHERM" and his lovely wife Edith Ann, the best in the future as well as Godspeed.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege to know the gentleman from Utah, Congressman SHERMAN LLOYD, and his dear wife, Edith Ann, during the period of the 88th Congress.

As first-term Members we have worked and learned and worked together—serving our respective districts.

As representative of the Second District of Utah, SHERM LLOYD has served with talent and distinction. SHERMAN LLOYD's earlier service in the Utah State Senate furnished the experience and preparation which made him a valuable Member of the U.S. House of Representatives as well as a good friend.

Mr. Speaker, I am confident that SHERM LLOYD will find other opportunities for public service. At least, this is my hope. The public needs quality leadership such as that which Representative LLOYD possesses. It is my hope that this leadership will find its proper place in the public life of our Nation.

Mr. MARTIN of California. Mr. Speaker, SHERMAN PARKINSON LLOYD, who has so ably represented the Second District of Utah in the House of Representatives, will be greatly missed in the 89th Congress.

As his friend and colleague, I am sorry to see LLOYD's exceptional talents lost to the House of Representatives, the U.S. Senate, and to the Nation. However, knowing his effectiveness and stature as a legislator, we in Congress believe that his tenure in the House of Representatives may very well mark the beginning of far greater achievements in public service.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, as this 88th Congress draws to an end, my thoughts turn to those colleagues whom I have known and with whom I have served these past 2 years. The gentleman from Utah [Mr. LLOYD] stands out in my mind as an outstanding Representative and public servant. He and I have been warm friends and I have often shared with him my thoughts, ideas, and experiences.

"SHERM" will not be a Member of the 89th Congress. Those of us who have known him, respect him. We will sorely miss his counsel, his advice, and his leadership. I join with his many friends in wishing for him every good thing in life.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleague, the gentleman from Utah, in expressing my deep respect for SHERMAN LLOYD. During his brief 2 years in Congress, he has demonstrated himself to be a man of the highest integrity, tremendous energy, courage, and conviction. His dedication to his party and his country has been apparent throughout his service. It has been a high privilege for me to serve with this able legislator and dedicated American.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to extend their remarks on this subject.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, those of us who have been fighting for improved social security benefits are angry and deeply distressed at the arrogant disregard by the Democratic administration for the welfare of our elder citizens.

You have killed a $7 increase in monthly cash benefits, provisions permitting increased earnings without loss of social security benefits, benefits for dependents attending school up to the age of 22, benefits for widows beginning at age 60, rather than 62, and improvements for farmers under social security.

The Democratic leadership has killed these measures that would be so beneficial to our elder citizens because of your arrogant and arbitrary insistence on attaching medicare to social security. This overwhelmingly Democratic Congress has refused for 4 years to enact the administration's medicare proposal. At the same time you have refused to consider the various alternative programs to expand medical care benefits for those who need them, while preserving the strength and freedom of our present system.

When it turned out that you did not have the votes for social security medicare, you petulantly, cruelly, and thoughtlessly killed the social security bill that means so much to our elder citizens. Let me tell all of my Democratic colleagues here today—our elder citizens are not going to forget this infamous act when they vote on November 3. With your 3-to-2 majority in the House and 2 to 1 in the Senate, you Democrats have something to explain to your people back home and it is going to take some tall talk to convince anyone who has an ounce of commonsense.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and concurrent resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 12318. An act to provide an equitable system for the classification of certain positions under the House of Representatives, and for other purposes;

H. Con. Res. 358. Concurrent resolution to provide for the printing of 5,000 additional copies of "Immigration Hearings Before Subcommittee No. 1 of the Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, parts 1, 2, and 3.";

H. Con. Res. 364. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of an additional 1,000 copies of the document entitled "Study of Population and Immigration Problems; Population of the United States."; and

H. Con. Res. 370. Concurrent resolution relating to the enrollment of the bill H.R. 5871.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11380) entitled "An Act to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12633) entitled "An Act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to Senate amendments numbered 40, 43, and 60 to the above-entitled bill.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to Senate amendment numbered 38 to the above-entitled bill.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 646) entitled "An Act to prohibit the location of chanceries and other business offices of foreign governments in any residential area in the District of Columbia."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 3060) entitled "An Act to amend and extend the National Defense Education Act of 1958 and to extend Public Laws 815 and 874, Eighty-first Congress (federally affected areas)."

MORALITY IS STILL THE KEY ISSUE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I am sometimes amazed how it is that change is really not change and issues remain the same through the centuries. Morality in Government, morality in leadership has been a key issue since biblical times and it indeed is a key issue in 1964. A speech by Dr. Charles Malik, delivered in 1961, well might have been delivered today and I will insert it in the RECORD so that everyone can gain an understanding from its wonderful moral message.

Dr. Charles H. Malik—distinguished philosopher, educator, diplomat, theologian, writer, and lecturer—has been decorated by 12 governments, and holds honorary degrees from 36 colleges. He was Ambassador of Lebanon to the United States, 1945–53; Minister for Foreign Affairs of Lebanon, 1956–58; President of the General Assembly of the United Nations, 1958–59. He was a university professor at the American University, Washington, D.C., and professor of philosophy at the American University of Beirut, Lebanon, and is now associated with American University at Beirut, Lebanon.

I call this message to everyone's attention. Clear thinking decisions, moral decisions are needed in November:

PASSING TO THE OFFENSIVE

(Commencement address by Dr. Charles Malik, at the commencement exercises of Seattle University, in Seattle, Wash., on Friday, June 9, 1961)

I

Those who have known in their lives and in their traditions the dignity of man and his freedom, those who for centuries have believed in, and have flourished on the basis of, the inviolability of the human person, have tended to be too much on the defensive. Often they have talked and acted as though they were in the wrong. A certain fright and timidity, nay a certain false modesty, has assailed them. Even if at times they find themselves apologizing for some shameful fact—and shame and apology could be signs of spiritual strength—they nevertheless appear to forget that in every sphere of life the offensive, if genuinely and rightly mounted, is the best means of self-defense. Nothing I believe is more needed today than for those who know and believe in God, truth, man, and freedom, to pass to the offensive.

There are five fronts in which it is necessary today to pass to the offensive. I may entitle these fronts the front of communism, the front of neutralism, the front of those who are engaged in undermining the unity of the Western world, the front of materialism, and the front of what I would term the least common denominator. The center of the first two fronts lies outside the Western world, the center of the last two fronts lies inside the Western world, and the center of the third front exists at once inside and outside.

II

Morally and spiritually the Communists put you and me on the defensive; they make us feel guilty, and we supinely accept the terms of their debate. They talk in terms of "capitalism," "imperialism," "colonialism," "monopolies," "profits," "exploitation," "means of production"—all purely economic, purely materialistic terms. And how do we engage ourselves in debate with them? We usually answer that the exploiting capitalism of the 19th century no longer exists, that imperialism has been liquidated, that monopolies are now owned by the people, and that, as to profits, everybody now shares in them. It is evident that there is about this response a pathetic air of apology, a ring of feebleness, a sickly note of timidity, and those who make it clearly suffer from a guilty conscience. When we thus accept to be drawn into debate with the Communists on their own terms we confirm them in the feeling that they were right; it is as though we were telling them: you are right in your attack; we are sorry for our past ways; but, behold, we have now corrected them.

This will not do. The Communists should be answered, not apologetically, not as though they were right, but in terms taking them completely off their guard. They should be answered in human, moral, and spiritual terms.

After saying two or at most three sentences on economic and social questions, or perhaps even before saying them, we should be in a moral-existential position ourselves to turn to these men and say to them:

What about freedom of thought and inquiry in your realm? Can people seek the truth really freely? Can they really dissent? Can they really question your fundamental presuppositions?

What about freedom of conscience and religion? Do you Communists go to church? Do you fall on your knees and pray? And why do you persecute those who do?

What about human rights and fundamental freedoms? Which of these rights are really enjoyed by your people?

Tell us please, what is the object of your ultimate worship? Is it the theory of dialectical materialism? Is it atoms in motion? Is it force and revolution? Is it the satisfaction of your bodily and mental desires? Is it the Communist Party? Is it Marx and Lenin? And if they say it is Marx and Lenin, then we should be able to quote them some 50 statements by these men on moral and spiritual matters that would put them morally completely on the defensive.

What about the unity and the continuity of the tradition? Why is your movement an absolute break in that unity and that continuity?

Is there any free criticism of the government in your realm? Have your people ever been given a genuine free political choice?

What about your iron dictatorship? What about your police state?

What about the minority rule under which all Communist states languish?

What about the fact that, far from ever being chosen by the people, communism was always imposed by force by a handful of men?

What about the methods of subversion all over the world in which every dark trick of deceit and destruction is used?

What about the camps of forced labor?

What about Hungary, what about Tibet, what about the Chinese communes?

And since you always love to repeat that you are working day and night to bury us and that our children shall all be Communists, then let us assure you that in this you are completely mistaken, and that we are working day and night to liberate your people from your yoke, so that the day will come, and we trust soon, when the very names of Marx and Lenin shall be forgotten.

It is most important that the Communists be put on the defensive. It is most important that the total arsenal of political, moral, and spiritual values be brought to bear upon this struggle. Naturally, if we do not believe in the primacy of these political, personal, moral, and spiritual values, we will not bring them up at all, or we will bring them up with our tongue in our cheek. But to keep on talking only in their materialistic terms, to accept timidly their universe of discourse, to be constantly on the defensive vis-a-vis their onslaught, is already to have been vanquished by them.

One is not seeking to win a game of words and arguments: It is history and destiny that are at stake. I would certainly settle for losing the argument of words provided I win the contest of history. The pathos of the situation today is that the argument reflects the contest. It is most important, therefore, to develop and execute policies and actions that will put the Communists and their friends historically on the defensive. Those who believe in man and his freedom, who know truth, and who trust in God, the guarantee of all freedom and all truth, must, therefore, pass to the offensive, not only of thought and conviction, but of that real, decisive, historical action which shall cause the Communists to take to their heels.

III

The neutralist front is becoming more and more significant. Those who, for whatever reason, wish to remain outside the gigantic world struggle between communism and freedom have every right to expect the rest of the world to respect their freedom.

As a matter of fact, real neutralism, implying real freedom of choice and real independence of judgment, is a triumph for the idea of freedom. The free world can only welcome it.

But a neutralist, rightly asking that his will be respected, has no right himself to impose his will on others. By his own logic, he must not object if others choose not to be neutral in this great struggle. Himself refusing to take a stand, the neutralist must respect those who do. A neutralist who is all the time working to extend the domain of neutralism, especially if this extension happens to be at the expense of only one side, is obviously not neutral.

Nor will one, who really wishes to—and can—stay outside the struggle, play one side against the other. A neutralist in that case identifies his interests with the division of the world. He flourishes so long as there is tension; as soon as tension relaxes, he ceases to reap much value from his neutralism. Below a certain degree of tension, and above a certain degree of tension when the pressure increases considerably on the neutralist to take a stand, neutralism ceases to be profitable. A neutralist, beginning by wanting to serve peace and understanding, could easily develop vested interests in the absence of peace and the absence of understanding.

Then there is a neutralism that is, in fact, a Communist front. In a life-or-death struggle this kind of neutralism cannot be tolerated.

Policies at the United Nations, policies at home, fundamental pronouncements, the tenor of the press, international political, economic and military arrangements, the whole political spiritual, and ideological orientation of the nation—all these things can serve as tests to distinguish the genuine from the false type of neutralism.

One sometimes gathers the impression that the West is on the defensive with respect even to the neutralist world. Therefore the needed offensive here is simply to welcome and support the neutralism that is genuine;

to be so strong and self-confident that one will not fall for the neutralism that is a fake; and to measure neutralism always by the radical historic struggle whose issue will determine the fate of everybody, neutralist and nonneutralist alike. Those who believe in man and his freedom, who know truth, and who trust in God, the guarantee of all freedom and all truth, must, while fully respecting the freedom of the true neutralist, nevertheless feel that in fighting for freedom, truth, and man they are really assuming responsibility, not only for themselves, but for the ultimate interests of the neutralist nation itself.

IV

There are people and forces, inside and outside the Western World, whose effect is to undermine whatever unity there is in that world. I am not thinking of the Communist whose very purpose is to conspire in that direction. I am thinking of the softheaded, the duped, the tired, the frightened, the sentimental, the superficial, the unauthentic, and the perfectly innocent who mean well. If these people have their way, freedom will finally fall by sheer division and default. An offensive must therefore be mounted on this front.

England cannot be separated from Europe. Therefore a determined effort must be made to heal the breach between the so-called Inner Six and Outer Seven.

France is an integral pillar of the West, and Western civilization is unthinkable apart from French culture. Therefore France does not deserve an unequal treatment, and every force that tends to weaken or embitter or humilate France must be resisted.

Germany must not be so slighted and intrigued against as to begin to think of neutralism as an alternative. Therefore Berlin must not be abandoned and those who desire a weak Germany must not prevail.

North Africa must be saved from chaos and bitterness. Therefore the Algerian problem must be settled soon, with a view to developing a North Africa that is positive, cooperative, and friendly to the West.

Japan is vital to every balance in the Far East. Therefore relations with Japan should be deepened further, in the service of freedom and man.

Latin America must not be allowed to drift toward neutralism and anti-Americanism. Therefore far-reaching measures must be devised and prosecuted with a view to cleaning up the Western Hemisphere of the Communist virus and promoting the friendliest relations between Latin and Anglo-Saxon on the basis of their common civilization.

The United States cannot go it alone in the modern world. Therefore isolationism, in all its subtle shades, should not have the last word, and America should embark on a bold, new policy of developing still more intimate relations with all her friends.

The impression is often gathered that, owing to national jealousies and conflicting national interests, the West is hopelessly divided on itself. A vigorous offensive for unity must therefore be mounted. For what is at stake today is not this or that nation, but the entirety of Western civilization, with its marvelous traditions of man, of freedom, of truth, and of God. Those who believe in man and his freedom, who know truth, and who trust in God, the guarantee of all freedom and all truth, must therefore sink all their national differences in the interest of their one common civilization, which is now so mortally threatened and so dangerously undermined.

V

I include many things under the front of materialism. Besides softness and the life of ease, besides the quest after money and material gain, besides the all-consuming passion after economic security, besides greed and covetousness, and besides trusting only our senses and what they deliver, besides these things I include the fundamental spiritual attitude which denies real order in the nature of things, which denies that there is a real objective higher and a real objective lower, which instead derives the higher integrally from the lower, which obliterates the dimension of rank, excellence, quality, depth, and which therefore knows no rest, no grace, and no ultimate peace.

But there is a higher and a lower in the nature of things. An animal is higher then a stone and a man is higher than an animal. And in man his moment of understanding is higher than this moment of bodily desire, and perhaps his love is even higher than his understanding.

Nothing is more needed today than a mighty spiritual offensive which will put the material in its place and restore to the spiritual its original primacy and preeminence. The mind that understands and creates, the spirit that suffers and sacrifices and loves and is at peace with itself, the fellowship of the pure and free and transparent, the joy of conversation and reason and sharing, the soul that rejoices in beauty and grace and being, the good will that is full of light and positive intent, God, the absolute mind, absolute spirit, absolute love, absolute reason, absolute grace, absolute goodness, absolute Being—these things come first, and everything else second. All the gadgets, all the machines, all the economic security in the world, all the titillations of our senses, all the hungers of our body, are nothing compared to these things. And these things have a being and an efficacy and an origin completely independent of all matter, all body, all machines, all security, and all the hungers of our nature.

This does not mean that I scorn or spurn or sneer at the wonderful products of industry. On the contrary, I look upon science and industry as among the most important benefactors of mankind, and upon their products as among the greatest monuments of the creative mind and spirit of man. And if I can afford it, and if I am not engaged in some mortifying exercise for the sake of something higher, I will always buy the best car, go to the best doctor, drink the finest wine, live in the finest house, and sleep on the most comfortable bed. But he who does not know how man may become so ensnared and infatuated by these things as to lose the original, sharp edge of his soul, has still much to learn.

Those who believe in man and his freedom, who know truth, and who trust in God, the guarantee of all freedom and all truth, cannot allow the creative sources of their being to be sapped by softness and materialism. Nor can they rise to the historic demands of the hour, in meeting the challenge of communism, in helping the noncommitted world, and in effecting the needed Western unity, except on the basis of the primacy of the mind and spirit. They must therefore rebel against the lower and reinstall the higher on its legitimate throne.

VI

The question of the least common denominator is the distressing phenomenon of people without an enduring backbone. Because diverse points of view in this age are mingling and challenging each other on every turn, people with a weak backbone soon take on the color of those who surround them. This is very reminiscent of the parable of the sower in the Gospel where the seed has fallen among thorns, the thorns being the other points of view which so confuse us as to depress the truth to the least denominator common to all.

Let a Jew be present in a company of Christians, and the name of Christ can no longer be mentioned. Let a Catholic be present in a company of Protestants—or conversely—and the question of the church is automatically muffled. Let a Moslem or a Buddhist or a Hindu be present in a company of Christians, and soon you hear the statement that all religions are alike. Let an atheist associate with people with faith, and soon the conversation turns to some political gossip or to social progress and the wonders of science. Let a man from Asia or Africa meet people from the West, and soon all that is important is technical assistance and the problems of development. Let a Communist meet a man from the free world, and soon the atmosphere is one of class struggle and pure economics.

Men of real backbone will never betray their fundamental convictions. They will never allow other points of view to dull or flatten their soul. They will at least remain silent, and silence often speaks a volume of words.

It is possible to be polite, without ever abandoning your convictions; it is possible not to offend, while absolutely remaining loyal to the best and deepest you know; it is possible to be understanding and helpful, without deluding others that you are one of them; it is possible to cooperate with others, while remaining firm in the truth as God gives you to see the truth; it is possible to sacrifice yourself for them, without asking or expecting anything in return.

In this age of softness, appeasement and compromise, it is most essential that we pass to the offensive of holding fast to the deepest we know. Nothing is more tragic than if those who believe in man and his freedom, who know truth, and who trust in God, the guarantee of all freedom and all truth, should, in the intensity of the challenge, forget their principles or water down their beliefs. When the soul thus loses its integrity, none can respect it any more. Nor can it in the end respect itself.

The law of freedom does not require that all points of view should merge into a blur. All that is necessary is an order of mutual respect. Above all change and accomodation, one point of view should remain immovable and grounded as on a rock. When the darkness lifts, that which is held by the rock will lift all men unto itself. And its immovability will itself cause the darkness to lift.

VII

The present moment in history requires, more than any other moment in the past, that those who know and believe in man, freedom, truth and God, pass to the offensive on every front. The Communists must be put on the defensive by shifting the grounds of the battle from the economic and material to the moral and spiritual. The neutralism of the neutralists must not be allowed to weaken freedom and promote communism. Whatever the national sacrifices, the unity of the West must be strengthened fivefold. The primacy of the spiritual must be affirmed over all that is material, primitive, elemental. Those who know and believe in the truth must remain firm as a rock in their belief, whatever their associations and whatever their trials.

To those who have completed their intellectual and spiritual preparation and are now leaving these halls of learning, this is my special message:

Live in this age—neither in the past nor in the dreams of your imagination. Understand that the battle which is now raging is perhaps the most decisive in history. Understand that the forces of darkness are joining hands on every side against all that is truth and God and light. Enter into the battle with all your enthusiasm and all your heart. Realize what an infinite honour it is to be living and engaged in the battle today. Never allow the enemy to put you on the defensive. Pass to the offensive on every frount. In your own lives trust God despite all your frailties. He will serve you in the end. You have seen great visions and you have dreamed great dreams. I beg you to remain faithful to the deepest you have known. In its own day it will lead you to the rock of certainty that can never be moved. And when you have run your course, may it be said of you that you overcame the powers of darkness, and may your heart be profoundly grateful.

THE WHEAT CERTIFICATE PLAN—SUCCESS OR FAILURE?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important issues facing American farmers this year involves wheat, one of our most important farm commodities.

HISTORY OF CERTIFICATE PROGRAM

The wheat certificate program has been known by a number of names since its inception in the 1930's. Starting as the domestic parity concept it was later changed to the multiple price plan and finally became known as the wheat certificate plan. A bill to establish this program was vetoed by President Eisenhower in 1956. In 1961 the Kennedy administration attempted to enact this program but Congress refused to do so.

In 1962 the mandatory, strict control wheat program was narrowly approved by the Congress as a part of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962.

In May 1963 over 1.2 million wheat farmers voted in a national referendum on the question of accepting that program. As we all know, some 52 percent of the Nation's wheat farmers said "no" to the mandatory program and as a result they were left with the administration's alternate program calling for 50 percent of parity price supports to those wheat farmers who complied with their wheat allotments.

During the time prior to and immediately after the wheat referendum, administration leaders, both in and out of Congress, repeatedly stated that "this was it" and there would be no new wheat program if farmers voted no.

These predictions of course never came to pass, because in April 1964 the administration was successful in forcing through Congress the so-called cotton-wheat bill which contained almost all of the features of the mandatory, strict control plan except for the imposition of marketing quotas. This so-called voluntary plan will now be in effect for 2 years—1964 and 1965. In the absence of new legislation at the end of the 1965 crop, the mandatory, strict control plan will again go into effect and wheat farmers will again be faced with the same choices they had in the 1963 referendum. Under present law the referendum for the 1966 crop is scheduled to be held prior to August 1, 1965.

In other words, the next Congress will decide whether to enact a new wheat program, or to extend the present so-called voluntary program, or to do nothing in which event the mandatory, strict control program will automatically be placed before wheat farmers again for another referendum.

In contemplating future wheat legislation, I feel it is important to analyze both the results and effect of the 1964–65 program in the context of five questions:

First. Is this program acceptable to wheat farmers and does it have their support?

Second. Has the small 15-acre wheat farmer benefited?

Third. Has the larger commercial wheat farmer benefited?

Fourth. Has the program been fair to corn and feed grain farmers?

Fifth. Has the program caused an increase in the price of wheat products to consumers?

THE 1964 PROGRAM PARTICIPATION

The following table shows by States the participation by farms in the 1964 program together with the percentage of farmers approving the mandatory, strict control program in the 1963 referendum.

Comparison of the "yes" vote in the 1963 wheat referendum with the signup for 1964 wheat program

States in order of percentage of growers who voted "Yes" in 1963	"Yes" vote in 1963 wheat referendum as a percentage of total vote	Signup for 1964 wheat program as percentage of total wheat farms
Georgia	86.9	36.1
Kentucky	85.7	17.2
South Carolina	83.3	24.4
North Carolina	80.9	22.0
Tennessee	76.3	15.0
Maine	75.0	36.7
North Dakota	65.8	85.2
Minnesota	65.7	32.4
South Dakota	65.3	56.3
Missouri	64.9	25.1
Iowa	63.7	14.8
Alabama	58.0	15.1
Wisconsin	55.5	12.2
Nebraska	54.5	67.9
Montana	51.7	70.1
Oregon	49.0	30.5
Colorado	48.9	62.0
Delaware	48.6	26.4
West Virginia	48.3	13.4
Washington	47.2	47.6
Texas	44.9	39.0
New Mexico	42.7	31.8
Kansas	42.6	68.3
Wyoming	41.3	47.2
Oklahoma	40.8	61.0
Virginia	38.7	20.8
Arkansas	34.1	2.6
New Jersey	32.1	20.3
New York	31.5	32.5
Illinois	29.9	18.2
Idaho	29.3	43.0
Florida	29.2	14.2
Utah	28.8	31.1
California	27.9	25.4
Connecticut	26.7	5.1
Indiana	25.6	15.6
Rhode Island	25.0	0
Arizona	24.2	20.2
Nevada	24.0	20.8
Mississippi	23.2	7.1
Ohio	22.7	22.0
Pennsylvania	22.0	16.0
Michigan	20.4	22.8
Massachusetts	18.2	20.8
Louisiana	16.9	10.6
Maryland	16.7	12.2
Vermont	11.6	1.6
Total	47.8	35.4

Source: American Farm Bureau Newsletter, July 22, 1964.

As can be seen, only 35.4 percent of the eligible wheat farms in this Nation are enrolled in the program as compared to the 47.8 percent who voted for the mandatory program.

The Department of Agriculture contends the program is "popular" and cites figures to the effect that wheat farmers on farms accounting for 76 percent of the Nation's wheat acreage allotment are enrolled in the program. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that people, not acres, decide whether programs are good or bad. The indelible fact remains that the 1964 program which was forced through Congress after wheat farmers themselves rejected the mandatory program is not acceptable to nearly two-thirds of our farmers. The certificate wheat program is obviously not popular with wheat farmers and it does not have their support.

EFFECT ON SMALL GROWERS

Recalling the fact that the overwhelming majority of small wheat growers are located in the eastern half of the Nation, it is especially important to examine the participation in the "15-acre" States. In Illinois only 18.2 percent are participating; in Ohio only 22 percent; in Indiana only 15.6 percent; in Michigan only 22.8 percent; in Iowa only 14.8 percent; in Minnesota only 32.4 percent; in New York only 32.5 percent; in Pennsylvania only 16 percent. Even in the States which approved the mandatory program such as Georgia, Kentucky, North Caroline, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Maine, participation is small ranging from 15 percent in Tennessee to 36.7 percent in Maine.

The small degree of participation by small growers means of course that nearly all of them are classed as "noncooperators." These small growers are therefore ineligible for a CCC loan, cannot receive domestic or export certificates and cannot get diversion payments. They must rely entirely on the market price which in 1964 is some 50 to 60 cents a bushel less than it was a year ago.

Thus the small wheat farmers, the ones a wheat program should in all fairness help, have been hurt the most.

COMMERCIAL WHEAT GROWERS INCOME DOWN

The administration has defended the 1964 wheat certificate program on the grounds that it is better than the program the administration sponsored as one of the choices in the 1963 national referendum. In effect, the administration is saying to wheat farmers that "the new program is better than the old program we left you with after you rejected the mandatory program."

In my book, that whole line of argument just doesn't make sense. The fact is that wheat farm income in 1964 is going to be some $200 million less than it was in 1963 and the Department of Agriculture admits it.

The commercial grower who complies with the program knows that when he counts up the value of his certificates, his diversion payment, and his market price, that he has less money in his pocket than he did in 1963.

The reason is simple. Under the 1963 program complying wheat farmers were eligible for a loan of $1.82 per bushel and an 18-cent price support payment on their entire production. Under the 1964 program these same farmers received a loan of $1.30 per bushel on all of their production, but receive 70-cent certificates on only 45 percent of their normal production and 25-cent certificates on another 45 percent of their normal production, with the balance not being covered by certificates at all.

In spite of the obvious drop in wheat income under the 1964 program, the Department of Agriculture has announced that the 1965 program will mean even less to wheat farmers.

This fact is reflected in the August 1964 statement issued by the executive committee of the National Farmers Union at Bailey, Colo., as follows:

> We are deeply disturbed by the 1965 wheat program as announced last week by the U.S. Department of Agriculture. We recommend reversal of the Department's action on wheat.
>
> It is extremely important that feed grain price supports be increased. Higher operating costs make such action mandatory.
>
> We all know so well feed grain and wheat prices form an important base for our rural economy, which is a major part of the income structure for a vast region of the Nation.

PROGRAM UNFAIR TO CORN AND FEED GRAIN FARMERS

Throughout the 40 years or so that the wheat certificates program has been debated, the Corn Belt has traditionally opposed the idea of placing cheap subsidized feed wheat into competition with feed grains. This was one of the reasons why I have opposed this program in the past.

In the latest issue of the Farm Journal the following story is carried on its "Last Minute Report Straight From Washington."

> The administration has dumped 59 million bushels of CCC wheat on the open market since July 1 to hold down farm wheat prices. This wheat was sold at the lowest price permitted—$1.37 per bushel, farm basis. It could have been sold at a higher price. The Government sold only 14.4 million bushels in the same period last year—and the minimum price then was $1.90. The purposes of the CCC dumping: to penalize farmers who didn't sign up in this year's wheat program, induce them to sign up next time, and to head off further increases in the price of bread. The USDA forecasts that 65 million bushels of wheat will be fed to livestock, compared with 15 million last year.

This story speaks for itself. A fourfold increase in feed wheat this year is just the start of further severe competition with feed grains for livestock markets. The continuation of this type of program will, in my opinion, continue to aggravate livestock prices and will cause increased surpluses of corn and other feed grains.

NOT FAIR TO CONSUMERS

During the many debates on this program in the Congress, the term "bread tax" has been used to describe its effect on consumers. Everyone of course recognizes that the certificate program is not a "bread tax" in the usual sense because it is not a part of our tax laws. Its effect on consumers, though, is exactly the same as an excise tax on bread and other wheat products.

The 70-cent certificate is a fixed cost which wheat processors must pay regardless of the market prices. It must be paid regardless of whether the wheat was purchased from participating or nonparticipating farmers. It covers all wheat processed into food and it is collected by the Government in a manner almost identical to the manner that regular excise taxes are collected.

In this regard, I have prepared the following table to compare the actual excise tax collected on sugar with the "bread tax" collected under the certificate program. As you can see, Mr. Speaker, the similarities are striking:

	Sugar tax [1]	"Bread tax" [2]
Quantity covered	All sugar processed in United States	All wheat processed in United States for domestic food consumption.
Amount	½ cent per pound	70 cents per bushel.
Who pays	Sugar refiners and processors	Wheat millers and processors.
How paid	Periodic returns filed together with correct amount of tax attached; sent to U.S. Treasury.	Periodic returns filed together with correct amount of "tax" attached; sent to Commodity Credit Corporation.
How collections are used	Amounts recovered by tax go into General Treasury. Sugar Act provides cash payments to domestic sugar producers.	CCC makes cash payments to "cooperating" wheat farmers.
Limitation on size of payments.	None	None.

[1] Amount of tax is constant. It must be paid by processor regardless of market price of sugar.

[2] Amount of "bread tax" is constant. It must be paid regardless of market price of wheat.

I would also point out that during the debate on the wheat-cotton bill, I predicted that flour and bread prices were sure to rise if this program were enacted. I inserted into the April 7, 1964, RECORD at pages 7179 to 7182, communications from 33 wheat-processing firms which explained why the price increase was sure to come.

Bread prices have increased and the reason is simple. In 1963 millers paid an average of $1.87 per bushel for wheat. This year they must pay $1.33 in the market plus 70 cents to the Government for the right to process that wheat. The consumer just picks up the difference for the increased cost.

This, I assure you, is not a partisan observation. I would point out that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] who sits on the other side of the aisle of this House, in the August 19, 1964, RECORD at page 20347, came to substantially the same conclusion that I have in regard to the effect on consumers when he said:

> Flour prices are up as much as 80 cents a hundred pounds; bread prices are up in some areas as much as 2 cents a loaf—and still more increases are on their way.
>
> All of this has come about because we voted a law which makes it necessary for millers to pay more for their wheat. What makes the deed even worse is that the price of wheat to farmers is down. The thing that is raising the price of bread and other flour products to consumers is the "certificate" we legitimized by our vote here.

THE ALTERNATIVE

The 1964–65 wheat program certainly does not meet the tests of a good program. It is unpopular with farmers, it is unfair to both small and commercial wheat farmers, it is bad for the corn belt, and it makes consumers unnecessarily pay more.

There is a way out, however, if partisan bickering can be placed aside. There are some 58 bills pending in this Congress which would repeal the certificate wheat program and replace it with a wheat program more acceptable to farmers, taxpayers, and consumers. The Republican Party is committed to the development of a better wheat program. The former Democratic Secretary of Agriculture, the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], is one of the authors of the bills to repeal the certificate wheat program, and Members of Congress of both parties support this effort.

Wheat and feed grain farmers the Nation over should, I feel, cast their votes this year for candidates, from the Presidency on down, who will support the termination of the certificate wheat program and its replacement with a better, more equitable program.

In conclusion I include at this point in the RECORD a feature article from the Wall Street Journal of August 18, 1964, which explains clearly and simply why the certificate wheat program is not on target:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Aug. 18, 1964]

WHEAT PROGRAM ISN'T ON TARGET

(By Harlan S. Byrne)

CHICAGO.—The new three-price wheat program, the Johnson administration's first major piece of farm legislation, appears to be pleasing almost no one. And it's putting to severe test the farm planners' insistence on rigid crop management as opposed to a freer market.

On a number of counts, the wheat program isn't working out the way it was designed.

For one thing, the program was aimed at cutting wheat output and thus helping shrink surplus supplies. Instead, farmers didn't reduce acreage as much as the administration had hoped for. Moreover, they poured on extra fertilizer and got a break from the weather. Consequently, output rose to 1,285,261,000 bushels, about 10 million more than in 1963.

Secondly, while the program was designed to bolster the income of wheat farmers, paradoxically it's principally benefiting the larger wheat growers, the major participants in the complex new system of subsidies and planting controls. At the same time, the program is cutting the profits of little growers who aren't going along with the program. The Johnson administration, of course, is dedicated to having the small family farm but, in the case of wheat, at least, seems to be working toward the opposite objective. Farmers in many sections are openly expressing displeasure with the program. Some protest groups have been organized and one farm group in the State of Washington is threatening a court test of the program's constitutionality.

Thirdly, Agriculture Secretary Freeman, in arguing for the program, predicted it wouldn't result in higher food prices. Yet the price big bakers pay for flour for bread actually jumped about 15 percent last month and over the last few days bakers across the country have started lifting prices on bread about 1 to 2 cents a loaf.

HIGHLY COMPLEX PROGRAM

The complexity of the program is enough to cause consternation. It retains several basic features of past farm programs. One is the price support loan designed to guarantee farmers fair prices in relation to costs. A farmer who gets a price support loan, usually at artificially high prices, has the choice of redeeming the loan and presumably selling the grain at a price above the loan rate, or forfeiting the grain to the Government when the loan matures. It's through crop loan forfeitures that the Government has piled up its grain gluts. The present program also continues subsidies that cut the price of exported wheat to world levels.

This year's program also contains striking departures from its predecessors. The loan rate was slashed to a national average of $1.30 a bushel from $1.82 in 1963. For a farmer agreeing to cut planting, the support drop is largely offset by a subsidy in the form of negotiable certificates. So in addition to the $1.30 loan, a complying farmer is eligible for subsidy on 90 percent of normal yield on his allotted acreage. On half of this, he's entitled to certificates worth 70 cents a bushel, his so-called share of the U.S. wheat market for human consumption; on the other 45 percent, his share of the export market, the subsidy is 25 cents. One feature for complying farmers is that they can collect the subsidy even in cases of crop failures. Funds for the subsidy come from payments by wheat processors and exporters—70 cents a bushel for wheat going into domestic human consumption and 25 cents for exports.

So in effect, the new program creates a three-price system: One for wheat used for human consumption in the United States; a second and much lower price for wheat that goes for livestock feed here and a third for wheat sold outside the United States.

Understanding the administration's stake in the program requires a backward glance. For years wheat has been one of the costliest crops, the Government's losses in the past 30 years exceeding $11 billion or nearly one-third of the total cost of all farm price supports. Accordingly, wheat has been a prime target of the administration's drive to trim agricultural surpluses, pare Federal price support expenses and bolster farm income.

THE 1963 LEGISLATION

Last year farm planners sought mandatory controls which for the first time would have limited the number of bushels of wheat a farmer could produce and sell. But in a referendum growers decisively rejected mandatory controls. Rebuffed, the administration washed its hands of any special price props for the 1964 crop, raising the prospect of a $600 million drop in wheat farm income this year from $2.3 billion in 1963. President Johnson, however, facing an early election, wanted to rush through legislation to cushion the slump in wheat income. What finally emerged was the program of voluntary controls calculated to reduce income $100 million or less. The legislation, coupled with a new cotton program, barely squeaked through Congress in April, under terrific pressure from the administration. Having pushed so hard for the plan, the administration obviously has a big stake in its success.

Farm planners and lawmakers can't say they weren't warned the program would have some confounding results. In congressional hearings, millers produced simple arithmetic to show that the program would boost wheat costs per hundredweight of flour by 40 cents or more.

Carl C. Farrington, a vice president of Archer-Daniels-Midland Co., Minneapolis, reminded lawmakers the burden of higher flour and wheat prices would hit hardest at the lower income groups. He cited statistics showing that the percentage of the family food budget spent for wheat products is nearly twice as great for the less than $2,000 a year income families as for families with incomes over $10,000.

"This is a fantastic situation," declares another Minneapolis miller. "Here we have a program that penalizes not only the lower income consumers but the smaller farmers. This sounds like Robin Hood in reverse." Flour millers are miffed, too, that they were chiefly singled out for processing payments to the Government to finance the subsidy.

Perhaps it's too early to say the wheat program won't work or that it isn't an acceptable alternative to adjustment of the farm economy to freer markets. But the way it's working so far should raise questions on Capitol Hill next year when future farm legislation is considered. If nothing else, the wheat program provides another lesson in the futility of Federal tinkering on the farm.

THE WHITE HOUSE SEMINAR—1964

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MURPHY], is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, nearly 6,000 college students worked this summer for the U.S. Government in Washington, D.C., and had an opportunity to exchange ideas with top Federal officials through the Third Annual White House Seminar meetings beginning Friday, June 26.

The White House seminars, under the direction of Mrs. Dorothy Davies, of the White House staff, were originated by the late President Kennedy to inspire the Nation's youth to meet the challenge of good government.

In a statement accompanying the announcement of this year's seminars, President Johnson said:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington.

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

Today, more than ever before, we need young men and women with long-range visions of what this Nation and this world must and can be. We need young people who are willing to work hard to translate these visions into reality.

During your summer stay in Washington, you will be associated with people who are dedicated to making great dreams come true. By their personal skill and high sense of responsibility and patriotism they are giving intense meaning to public service in the sixties.

You will honor this cause by approaching your work with a keen spirit of hope and achievement. I hope that you will bring to your task, whatever it may be, an inquiring mind and a committed heart. Try to learn everything you can from your work—and, in return, try to give your work everything you can.

This summer you are participating in your Government in a personal and direct way. I hope that it will be an exciting and satisfying experience, and I hope, too, that you will return to your homes or your campuses this fall with new resolve to help our Nation meet the great challenges of this decade.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

Mrs. Davies was the overall coordinator of details. Operating with no budget, she prevailed upon the agencies for transportation of the students to the Sheraton-Park Hotel where the sessions were held. Bernard L. Boutin, Administrator of the General Services Administration was most helpful in arranging the transportation as well as guards for the speakers. The Small Business Administration lent its assistance in many ways including photographic coverage.

National Broadcasting Co., radio and television, under the direction of Mr. Jim Grau, provided an entertainment program one Sunday evening, hosted by the President's daughter, Lynda Bird, at which time she thanked the students for their wonderful cooperation and urged them to continue their contribution to the Government. Among the entertainers at this program were: Theodore Bikel, Jerry Stiller and Ann Mira, Nancy Ames, Steve DePas, and the Serendipity Singers.

Eight of the sessions were held at the Sheraton-Park Hotel and Mr. Harold DeFord, resident manager, was responsible for making the Sheraton's Great Hall available.

Mr. Ed McMillan, resident manager of the International Inn was most helpful in providing professional entertainers who came on a vountary basis for the seminar.

SCOPE OF THE PROGRAM

The total number of seminar ID cards issued at the 41 departments or agencies, the House of Representatives, and the U.S. Senate for summer employees was 5,585.

The Department of Defense (including the Army, Navy, and Air Force) employed the largest number of students, 1,259; and several of the smaller agencies employed only one summer employee. Legal residences included all of the 50 States except Alaska.

The educational levels ranged from high school students to Ph. D. candidates. There were faculty members from several colleges and high schools included in the program.

Major areas of study included mathematics, dental hygiene, medicine, applied sciences, engineering, history, and political science.

Summer jobs varied widely in scope and importance. They included physicists, a television production specialist, and an analytical chemist. The rates of pay ranged from GS–1 to GS–14.

WHITE HOUSE SEMINAR KIT

Perhaps one of the most rewarding features of the seminar and yet the one that received the least publicity was the White House seminar kit.

This kit was packed with information concerning the various departments and agencies. It contained everything necessary for the intern to gain a cursory knowledge of the machinery of government. The kit also provided a Government code of ethics for the students and a message from the President. The kit has grown in the past 3 years to the extent that it is five times as large and probably five times as valuable. Many of the interns in the program have commented on the value of the kit. Some of the students felt that the kit should be made available to college employment officers. Almost everyone felt that the kit was of great help in matching their scholastic major with the available Government jobs.

Another interesting feature of the kit is that it was put together at no cost to the program. The material was donated by the departments and agencies, with the printing of the folders being done by the Civil Service Commission. The kits were stuffed by volunteers. For the cost of its production it will undoubtedly bring a hundredfold return to the Federal Government.

The following 41 departments and agencies participated in the program; and the number of students is indicated:

Agency for International Development	169
Department of Agriculture	192
Air Force	113
Army	512
Bureau of the Budget	18
Commission on Civil Rights	11

Commerce	208
Council of Economic Advisers	4
Department of Defense	132
District of Columbia government	11
Federal Aviation Agency	58
Federal Communications Commission	20
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	18
Federal Home Loan Bank Board	26
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	2
Federal Power Commission	29
General Services Administration	105
Government Printing Office	37
Health, Education, and Welfare	515
Housing and Home Finance Agency	23
Interior Department	189
Justice Department	122
Labor Department	188
National Capital Housing Authority	1
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	267
National Capital Planning Commission	5
National Capital Transportation Agency	1
National Gallery of Art	1
National Labor Relations Board	22
Navy Department	502
Peace Corps	78
Post Office Department	103
Securities and Exchange Commission	30
Small Business Administration	18
Smithsonian Institution	27
State Department	391
Subversive Activities Control Board	1
Treasury Department	261
U.S. Information Agency	30
U.S. Tariff Commission	16
Veterans' Administration	56

As an example of the statistics for one Department, I include a detailed breakdown of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Information reported on coordinating sheets on summer employees:

Total female employees	296
Total male employees	219
Total employees	515

LEGAL RESIDENCE

Alabama	2
Arkansas	1
California	10
Colorado	1
Connecticut	4
District of Columbia	72
Florida	3
Georgia	1
Illinois	4
Indiana	3
Iowa	5
Kansas	5
Kentucky	2
Louisiana	3
Maryland	199
Massachusetts	5
Michigan	10
Minnesota	3
Missouri	2
Montana	1
Nebraska	2
New Hampshire	2
New Jersey	5
New York	15
North Carolina	6
North Dakota	1
Ohio	10
Oklahoma	1
Pennsylvania	14
Rhode Island	2
South Dakota	2
Tennessee	4
Texas	6
Utah	5
Vermont	3
Virginia	80
West Indies	4

LEGAL RESIDENCE—continued

West Virginia	3
Wisconsin	5
Wyoming	2
Not Reported	8

JOB DESCRIPTION

Chemist	1
Clerk	1
Clerk-stenographer	21
Clerk-typist	149
C—DMT	10
Library assistant	1
Management analyst	1
Mathematical statistician	1
Medical aide	2
Medical student intern	19
Nurse's assistant	6
Personnel aid	1
Research assistant	10
Social insurance research agent	2
Social worker	5
Steward assistant	1
Student assistant	102
Youth group counselor	1
Not reported	181

GS GRADE/EQUIVALENT

GS–1	2
GS–2	146
GS–3	152
GS–4	95
GS–5	58
GS–6	1
GS–7	26
GS–9	1
Not reported	34

EDUCATIONAL LEVEL

High school: Graduate	66
College:	
Freshman	78
Sophomore	78
Junior	120
Senior	84
Graduate	77
Not reported	12

MAJOR AREA OF STUDY

Accounting	6
American literature	1
Art	1
Art education	1
Biochemistry	5
Biology	18
Biophyscis	1
Biostatistics	1
Business	1
Business administration	3
Business education	4
Chemistry	29
Comparative literature	1
Dentistry	3
Economics	12
Education	10
Electrical engineering	1
Elementary education	10
English	37
French	3
Foreign affairs	1
General business	1
General science	1
Government	4
Government welfare law	1
Guidance	1
History	13
Home economics	3
International affairs	4
Journalism	2
Languages	3
Latin American affairs	1
Law	6
Liberal arts	3
Management	1
Mathematics	28
Medical technology	1
Medicine	45
Merchandising	1
Microbiology	1
Music	5

MAJOR AREA OF STUDY—continued

Nursing	6
Occupational therapy	1
Optometry	1
Personnel management	1
Philosophy	2
Physical science	2
Physical education	2
Physical therapy	1
Physics	1
Political science	16
Premedicine	4
Psychology	39
Religion	1
Secondary education	1
Secretarial administration	1
Social science	1
Sociology	29
Spanish	1
Speech therapy	6
Veterinary medicine	3
Zoology	3
Not reported	119

SCHOOLS

High school:	
George C. Marshall High School	1
Montgomery Blair High School	1
Saint Agnes Episcopal High School	1
Surratsville High School	1
College:	
American University	9
Amherst College	2
Antioch College	6
Babson Institute	1
Barry College	1
Bates College	1
Baylor University	1
Bennington College	1
Boston University	4
Brigham Young University	3
Brown University	3
Gallaudet	1
Calvin College	1
Capital University	1
Carleton College	2
Carson-Newman College	1
Catholic University	6
Central State College	1
City College of New York	1
College of New Rochelle	1
College of William and Mary	10
Columbia University	2
Connecticut College	1
Converse College	1
Cornell University	5
Dartmouth College	2
Dickinson College	1
Duke University	5
Dunbarton College	2
Earlham College	1
East Carolina College	1
Emory and Henry College	2
Emory University	2
Fairmont State College	1
Fletcher School	1
Fordham University	1
Franklin and Marshall College	2
Frostburg State Teachers College	2
Georgetown University	18
George Washington University	30
Hampton Institute	3
Hanover College	1
Harvard University	5
Hendrix College	1
High Point College	1
Hollins College	1
Hood College	1
Howard University	28
Immaculata College	1
Immaculata Junior College	2
Indiana University	2
Johns Hopkins University	5
King's College	1
Lafayette	1
Lehigh University	1
Longwood College	1
Lynchburg College	1
Madison College	3

SCHOOLS—continued

College—Continued

Mary Washington College	3
MIT	1
Manhattanville College	1
Marymount College	1
McGill University	1
Meharry	1
Merrill-Palmer Institute	1
Miami University	1
Michigan State University	2
Middlebury College	2
Misericordia	1
Monmouth College	1
Montana State College	1
Montgomery Junior College	1
Morgan State College	1
Mount Holyoke College	4
Mount Mary	1
Mount Mercy College	1
Muskingum College	1
Nebraska Wesleyan University	1
North Carolina A. & T. College	1
North Carolina State	1
Northwestern University	3
Notre Dame College	1
Notre Dame of Maryland	1
Oberlin College	3
Ohio State	2
Ohio Wesleyan University	1
Oklahoma Baptist University	1
Oklahoma State University	1
Pembroke College	1
Pennsylvania State University	2
Princeton University	1
Purdue University	3
Radcliffe College	4
Radford College	3
Regis College	1
Rice University	1
Richmond Professional Institute	2
Roanoke College	1
Rosary College	1
St. Augustine's College	1
St. Bonaventure's College	1
St. Catherine's College	1
St. Francis College	2
St. John's College	1
St. John Vianney	1
St. Joseph College	2
St. Olaf College	1
Sarah Lawrence College	2
Simmons College	1
Smith College	6
Stanford University	1
State College of Iowa	2
State University College	1
Stern College for Women	1
Swarthmore College	1
Syracuse University	3
Temple University	2
Texas Christian University	1
Texas Southmost College	1
Texas Wesleyan	1
Thiel College	2
Towson State Teachers College	2
Trinity College	2
Tufts University	3
Tulane University	3
University of Buffalo	1
University of California	3
UCLA	1
University of Chicago	5
University of Connecticut	1
University of Georgia	3
University of Hawaii	1
University of Illinois	2
University of Kansas	3
University of Maryland	67
University of Miami	1
University of Michigan	3
University of Minnesota	3
University of Missouri	3
University of North Carolina	3
University of Notre Dame	1
University of Oklahoma	1
University of Pennsylvania	5
University of Richmond	3
University of Rochester	3
University of South Carolina	1
University of Southern California	1
University of Tampa	1
University of Tennessee	1
University of Utah	1
University of Virginia	1
University of Washington	1
University of Wisconsin	1
University of Wyoming	2
Ursinus College	1
Utah State	1
Utah University	1
Vanderbilt University	2
Vassar College	2
Wake Forest College	1
Washington and Lee University	1
Washington College	1
Washington University (St. Louis)	1
Wayne State University	2
Wesleyan University	3
West Chester State	1
West Virginia University	3
West Virginia Wesleyan College	1
Western College	1
Western Maryland College	1
Western Reserve University	3
Westminster	1
Williams College	3
Yale University	3
Not Reported	47

ORGANIZATION AND SPEAKERS

The White House seminar included 10 programs of approximately 1 hour duration, held at 10 o'clock in the main ballroom of the Sheraton Park Hotel. The first session was held on June 26, and the final session was held on August 19 on the White House lawn.

The speakers and dates:

The Honorable David Powers, Special Assistant to the President, and the Honorable Jack Valenti, Special Assistant to the President, June 26.

The Honorable Robert F. Kennedy, Attorney General of the United States, July 7.

The Honorable Carl Rowan, Director of the USIA, July 17.

The Honorable Sargent Shriver, Director of the Peace Corps, July 24.

The Honorable Cyrus Vance, Deputy Secretary of Defense, July 31.

The Honorable HUBERT HUMPHREY, Senator from the State of Minnesota, August 6.

The Honorable William Moyers, Special Assistant to the President, August 11.

The Honorable Dean Rusk, Secretary of State, August 14.

The Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States, August 19.

The White House seminar folk festival, July 26.

QUESTION-ANSWER PERIOD

A half-hour question period followed each of the lectures. Eight microphones were strategically placed on the floor. A volunteer usher stood at each microphone, and students lined up to direct questions to the speakers.

The students asked questions they felt were pertinent to the speaker's area of government. On the whole, the questions were of very high caliber. The speakers were generally enthusiastic about the question-answer sessions, and often extended the period of questioning beyond the half-hour limit.

From the remarks of the students and their replies to the White House questionnaire, the question-answer periods were valuable part of the seminar programs.

Several of the speakers followed the seminar sessions by walking through the enthusiastic and eager audience shaking hands and answering brief questions.

MEDIA COVERAGE

The networks gave excellent radio and television coverage to the White House seminars; this was especially true of NBC who gave more complete coverage than the other networks. It was also through NBC that the talent was lined up for the White House seminar folk festival. Throughout the summer Mrs. Davies appeared on several radio and television programs to discuss the White House seminars and what they were trying to accomplish.

The press gave good coverage to some of the seminars, yet they neglected others. They did, however, present during the summer many feature articles about the seminar and the interns who participated in it. Although most of the coverage was favorable, there was the occasional barb that is inevitable in any project of this magnitude.

The most significant coverage for the future will be found in the magazines; for it is here that the future summer intern will most likely take notice of the program. Articles already have been done in McCalls, Teen, and Glamour magazines. During the winter months more articles are in the offing in various magazines. This will help make the reader aware of the seminar program and the possibilities they have to apply for a summer job with the Government here in Washington.

Perhaps the best publicity of all will come from the interns themselves who will carry the program back to their schools. Past evidence has shown that many articles are written in college publications and that word of mouth carries the program to other interested students.

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT TO PARTICIPANTS IN THE WHITE HOUSE SEMINAR ON THE SOUTH LAWN

I hope that none of you will assume from the sign over there that Congress was going to come down here and be with us this morning. We know when Congress is coming. The big question is—when will they be leaving?

This is a nonpolitical occasion, I regret very much to say. It must be that way because you are bipartisan.

Out of the 5,000 here, one lady spent the summer working in the office of Senator GOLDWATER. I am told that she was a Democrat when she came and I trust she has not moderated her convictions.

Personally and as your President, I am proud of you. I am proud to see you. I am glad that you are members of both parties. I am happy that you are taking an active and constructive interest in your Government which is served well by members of both parties.

I stand before you this morning as an example of what can happen to someone who is your age who comes to Washington to work for a while and then carries it to an extreme.

This city is your city. Wherever you go, whatever you do, I hope Washington will mean to you what Paris meant to Ernest Hemingway, as he describes it in the book which many of you are reading. May the memories of your Capital be always for you a "Moveable Feast" of constant delight and continuing pride.

You will carry with you the memories of libraries and museums, concerts and coffee hours, folk festivals and, by all means, discotheques.

But my wish for you is that from this experience you will carry for the rest of your years a stronger and a surer faith in the role and the worth of the individual.

Your Government is large. You are sons and daughters of a massive age, an age when men and nations have been much concerned with massive force and massive struggles.

But I hope that your experience and your observations have instilled into you a new and lasting faith in the fact that is paramount.

On this earth, there is no force so strong, none so powerful, none so finally decisive as the influence for good or evil of the committed man or the committed woman.

The course of this Nation, the contest of this world, will finally be decided not by the force of the atom, not by the strength of arms, not by the weight of industrial production.

The future will finally fall to those that are most committed to their cause.

I know there are those who say of your generation that you are apathetic, that you are indifferent, that you are cold, hard, unfeeling and uncaring security chasers seeking only a sports car, a split level and an annuity. Well, this I do not believe.

I know there are those who consider it correct to play it cool—right to remain reserved—not good form to show great faith.

But for myself, I believe that this generation of young Americans is a committed generation, anxious and asking to be permitted to fulfill that commitment.

Where other generations of Americans have had a rendezvous with war, I believe that your generation, God willing, will keep a rendezvous with peace.

Whether at home or far away, I believe it will be your destiny to fight wars men have never fought before—wars against poverty, wars against disease, against illiteracy, against discrimination, against all those things which blight the lives and the hopes of our fellow man.

As you are committed, I want you to know that your President is committed, too—committed to the future and not to the past, because we live in an age when the times men know in their youth are old history before men themselves have grown old.

The times of my generation's youth are old history now. I came here—I was schooled here—in exciting and memorable years of our national history. None who ever knew those times can ever really forget them.

Your generation has no memory as mine does of Franklin Roosevelt and the New Deal. Your generation did not know—and I pray never will know—the great depressions and the experience of the great recovery.

With due respect but without regret, we leave behind 1934 and turn to work for the promise of 1964, for the answers of the Roosevelt years and the answers of the Coolidge years—the answers of the Wilson and McKinley years do not serve as replies to the questions of our age or the answers of our time or the replies to today.

No man of our times understood this so well as John Fitzgerald Kennedy. He understood as we must all understand that in these times the Government of the United States must be lean and trim and not large and soft. He understood that power must be principled—that when nations acquire the capacity to destroy human life they must assert the courage to redeem human life; that when nations are sure of their strength they must never be unsure of their search for peace. This is the course that we follow in our land today. No man can say that the road ahead will be easy, that our footing will always be sure, that there will be no obstacles, no perils. Wherever the strong and the free may walk, danger will stalk their trail.

I believe that 30 years from now when you are nearing the age that I have attained you will look back upon these 1960's as the time of the great American breakthrough—toward the victory of peace over war—toward the victory of prosperity over poverty—toward the victory of human rights over human wrongs—toward the victory of enlightened minds over darkness.

Thomas Wolfe has written: "The true discovery of America is before us * * * The true fulfillment of our spirit, of our people, of our mighty land is yet to come."

Come give us what youth alone can give us, and together let us make that discovery. Thank you for coming here.

The Honorable Dave Powers and Jack Valenti

On the morning of June 26 Dave Powers and Jack Valenti started the White House seminars. They spoke to a capacity audience in the grand ballroom of the Sheraton Park Hotel.

Mr. Powers spoke first, discussing primarily the fondness that President Kennedy had for young people. He described how much the late President felt that the future of the country lies in the hands of the young people. He also gave the audience many touching accounts of his personal relationships with the late President. He was very well received and the audience clapped long and loud.

Mr. Valenti followed Mr. Powers and the context of his speech centered around the average day in the life of President Johnson. He talked about the tremendous and backbreaking schedule that the President faces. He described what a typical day would be like for the President from the time that he arose until the time he retired. Mr. Valenti mentioned the tough time he was having in even keeping up with President Johnson. The audience was very impressed with the rigors of Presidential office.

For the next half hour, the speakers answered questions. The most recurrent questions centered on the late President Kennedy and President Johnson. The seminar ended when both speakers were called back to the White House. NBC gave the seminar film and radio coverage.

The Honorable Robert F. Kennedy

Robert F. Kennedy spoke to the second White House seminar on the morning of July 7. He received a standing ovation as he entered the ballroom.

The Attorney General opened his address by briefly mentioning the planned Kennedy library. He stressed that the library would be more than a memorial to the late President; it would be a viable unit of research into the workings of democratic government.

The rest of his talk centered around his own and his late brother's hope for young people. He stressed the need of excellence in government. He pointed out how important it was to the country to bring "qualified expertise" into the government at all levels.

After the talk he answered questions which centered around his post as Attorney General and his relationship to the late President Kennedy. He was also questioned as to his future.

At the conclusion of the question and answer period, the Attorney General and his wife walked into the audience, shaking hands as they proceeded. At one point they were almost swamped by the eager and enthusiastic seminar audience.

The seminar was given film coverage by NBC and CBS, with all networks providing radio coverage. It also received coverage from the press and wire services.

The Honorable Carl Rowan

Carl Rowan addressed the seminar on the morning of July 17th. His talk contained a detailed analysis of the role played by the U.S. Information Agency.

He stated how eager he was to talk about the USIA because he had learned, "both in laughter and dismay, how woefully uninformed much of the American public is about our role.

"Imagine, for example, that you are cogitating on some weighty matter like the Sino-Soviet split when the phone rings and a man insists you settle a $5 bet by explaining how the Cow Palace got its name."

Mr. Rowan then proceeded to read some of the strange mail that flows into the USIA every day. Many people seem to believe he stated that the USIA could supply information on all subjects.

In the rest of the speech Mr. Rowan outlined the purpose of the USIA. It was a very informative speech and the interns came away with a much better understanding of the Agency.

The questions addressed in this seminar to Mr. Rowan were very specific. After the seminar Mr. Rowan answered more questions to a group that quickly formed around him after he left the stage.

The seminar was given radio coverage by all three networks. NBC and CBS provided film coverage. The seminar was also given press coverage.

The Honorable Sargent Shriver

Sargent Shriver spoke to the White House seminar on the morning of July 24. He was one of the most popular speakers to address the interns. His easy going style quickly captivated the audience.

His address centered around the Peace Corps. He outlined its purposes, goals, and hopes. Mr. Shriver discussed the great amount of work still left to be done and the need for young people to do it. He gave examples of various corpsmen in different parts of the world, talking about what they were doing and the achievements and satisfaction that the work was providing.

The questions addressed to Sargent Shriver covered all facets of government. He answered them all astutely. After the question and answer period, he walked through the audience and talked to many of the summer interns. It was the general consensus of the participants in the seminar that Sargent Shriver was an excellent speaker.

The seminar received press coverage from the Associated Press and United Press International. CBS and NBC provided television coverage. All three networks provided radio coverage.

The Honorable Cyrus Vance

On July 31 Cyrus Vance addressed the White House seminar. He discussed the purposes and functions of the Defense Department.

At the conclusion of his speech he stated that he hoped some of the interns would find the Department of Defense a challenging opportunity for service to the country, either in uniform or as a civilian. He went on to state that: "If the day comes when the science and technology of this era can be applied fully and solely for the betterment of man, the result can be a society of such abundance as to eclipse the golden ages of mythology. The question of whether, or when, this is to be may well be determined in the next few decades. Many of the critical decisions affecting the outcome will be made here in Washington. And, I hope, by some of you who are here today."

Mr. Vance then answered questions. Many pertinent questions asked could not be answered because of security reasons.

Film and radio coverage was given by NBC and CBS, ABC provided radio coverage. His talk was also covered by both the national and local press.

The Honorable Hubert H. Humphrey

One of the speakers who everyone looked forward to with anticipation was Senator Humphrey. He proved to be no letdown. The Senator gave a brilliant talk, touching on many subjects.

He covered such diverse topics as urban renewal, South Vietnam, civil rights, the recent riots in northern cities, and the duties of a U.S. Senator.

The question and answer session was perhaps the most interesting one of the series with students asking many difficult questions, all of which were answered deftly by the Senator. His aids finally persuaded him to return to the Hill for some last minute business before a vote was taken on the civil rights bill. Before he left he signed autographs and mingled with the interns. This seminar was attended by many Senators, Congressmen, and Government officials.

NBC, CBS, and UPI gave the seminar film coverage. All three networks provided radio coverage. It also received coverage in the press.

THE HONORABLE DEAN RUSK

Dean Rusk on August 14 gave a very candid talk on U.S. foreign policy. He discussed many of the external problems that are facing the United States at this time. He then proceeded to discuss some of the long-range goals of our foreign policy.

Mr. Rusk also talked about the career possibilities with the State Department. He stated that he hoped many of the interns would make a career out of Government service, especially with the State Department.

After his talk, long lines immediately formed at the microphones to address questions to Mr. Rusk. The students were especially interested in the Vietnam and Cyprus questions. The questions were very thought provoking as was the case at every seminar. Secretary Rusk's talk was the last one to be held at the Sheraton Park.

Mr. Rusk's talk was given radio and television coverage by the three networks and UPI. It received excellent coverage by the press.

REACTION TO THE 1964 WHITE HOUSE SEMINAR

The consensus of opinion regarding the 1964 White House seminar can be summed up by quoting a letter from a summer Peace Corps employee to Mrs. Davies.

"Dear Mrs. DAVIES: As one of the 5,000 summer employees that attended the White House seminars, I should like to extend my personal thanks for a truly inspirational experience. The seminars gave me a new insight into government and a new respect for Government officials. They have also strengthened my desire to serve my country through Government service. President Johnson said in his address to us on the White House lawn that his life of Government service started in his youth when he visited Washington, D.C. I feel that my life shall have a similar experience. This summer was my first time in Washington, D.C., with the privilege of working for the Peace Corps.

"With sincere appreciation,

"EUGENIA MARKS,
Peace Corps summer intern, 1964."

This letter is representative of the reaction of most of the summer interns. Most of the participants were very pleased with the program as one can see by the accompanying questionnaire tally. Of the 884 ballots taken, 856 felt that they benefited from the seminar. The only complaint received in any number was that there was not a Republican speaker.

To get a clear analysis of the seminar, a questionnaire was taken which is shown on this page.

REACTION TO THE 1964 WHITE HOUSE SEMINAR

(By Carl T. Rowan)

In my opinion the White House seminar program is a highly worthwhile effort which has been most successful in better acquainting American students with the goals and operations of their Government.

I personally found my contact with this year's group to be extremely stimulating. The participants that I spoke with were interested, perceptive and articulate.

I am convinced that their experiences in Washington this summer will better equip them to be the leaders of our country in the years to come.

(By Cyrus Vance)

I was very much impressed by the group of students and by the intelligent questions they asked. I consider the White House seminar for summer students to be one of the most important programs instituted by President Kennedy. The program gives American college students all over the country an opportunity to see our Government in action, to acquire an interest in public service and to make a more informed decision on whether to seek a public career. Our Nation at this time needs the best of its young men and women in public service. I believe that this program is an important way of interesting such men and women in the Federal Government. As a matter of fact I hope some of my own children, while they are college students, will participate in this program during their vacation.

(By Sargent Shriver)

I am in full support of the summer internship program which introduces outstanding students to actual jobs in the Federal Government. This year, 5,000 college students are participating, and I am proud to say that 20 of them are working at the Peace Corps.

The students' experience with practical government comes from their jobs and from the White House seminars. The latter occur once each week when a prominent government official addresses the students on his current responsibilities. A question and answer period follows. This year Attorney General Kennedy spoke, as did Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, Secretary of State Dean Rusk and President Johnson.

On July 24, it was my privilege to address this group. The students were intelligent, aware young men and women who asked penetrating questions. I appreciated the opportunity to explain the work of the Peace Corps and the plans for the "war on poverty," and to clear up some prevalent misconceptions about both programs.

When these student leaders return to the campus, they will bring with them new insights into the functioning of their Government. This knowledge will benefit their community's understanding about the democratic process. For Government officials, the contact with student thought is useful to introduce new ideas to the operation of individual agencies and departments.

The student summer internship is a program which I believe should be continued and expanded.

(By HUBERT H. HUMPHREY)

I found the White House seminar program to be a most inspiring and challenging opportunity to speak frankly to the youth of our country.

WHITE HOUSE SEMINAR QUESTIONNAIRE—FINAL TABULATION

(1) Did you have a favorable reaction to the White House seminar? Yes, 881; no, 35.

(2) Was the subject matter of the lectures challenging enough? Yes, 557; no, 225.

(3) Do you feel that the topics should be: (a) More specific, yes, 324; (b) More closely related to the current activities of the speaker's area of government; yes, 446.

(4) Was the question-answer period of value? Yes, 696; no, 80.

(5) Should some sort of social event be included in the seminar program? Yes, 659; no, 161.

(6) Do you think that it is worth while to continue this program next summer? Yes, 835; no, 15.

(7) Would you recommend summer employment with a Government agency to your friends and/or associates? Yes, 827; no, 38.

(8) Do you plan to return to Government work next summer? Yes, 608; no, 172.

(9) Do you feel you have benefited from the seminar? Yes, 856; no, 28.

(10) Do you plan a career in Government service? Yes, 313; no, 354.

I think that all universities should be aware of the purpose of the seminar program and the accomplishments by inculcating in each group of participants the need for dedication and talent in the Government. I think the "Code of Ethics for Government Service" has been fully instilled in these young Americans and that they will truly carry with honor the torch that has been passed to them.

To Mrs. Davies again a thank you from all of the students and a well done from myself and my colleagues who had the pleasure of observing the fruits of her endeavors.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, one of the finest triumphs of the late President John F. Kennedy was his ability to stimulate and inspire young people in paths of excellence. It was President Kennedy's idea to bring together all the students working in the Government here in Washington for weekly seminars, at which the students had an opportunity to hear members of the Cabinet and other governmental leaders, and ask them questions.

This program was organized so successfully by Mrs. Davies of the White House staff that, as with other aspects of Government, the transition was smooth when President Lyndon B. Johnson assumed the reins of national leadership. I had the honor to attend a number of these seminar sessions, both at Sheraton Hall and at the climax of the 1964 summer series when President Johnson addressed the students on the White House lawn. I was deeply impressed by the program put together by Mrs. Davies and her able staff, and even more by the penetrating and knowledgeable questions posed by the students themselves.

I certainly hope that this program is expanded and continued, because it plays a very important part in training the future leaders of our democracy. I wish to commend Mrs. Davies, and all those associated with the program for their unselfish contribution in helping to make this a great success.

THE POULTRY INDUSTRY

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HAGAN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, during this year, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Poultry, I have become much impressed with not only the scope of this industry but also with the tremendous advances it has made and is continuing to make by way of servicing the American consumer. Equally impressive is the vast array of Government actions and services which the U.S. Department of Agriculture is providing to this great industry under the leadership of Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman.

The poultry industry of the midtwentieth century contrasts sharply in many important ways with the industry of one or two generations ago. In 1920, chickens were raised on more than 5.8 million farms, or about 90 percent of all farms in the United States. Farm poultry enterprises were almost entirely sideline operations maintained primarily to furnish farm families with eggs. Egg production, by modern standards, was grossly inefficient, averaging less than 100 eggs per hen per year. Feed and labor requirements per dozen eggs were high in relation to the present.

A generation and more ago, most of our poultry meat was a byproduct of egg production. Birds culled from laying flocks often were sold directly to the housewife as a live bird and cockerels raised with pullets were sold as fryers only in the fall. The production of both poultry meat and eggs was highly seasonal. The commercial broiler industry had not yet been born.

Thus, one of the most striking characteristics of the entire poultry industry is the sharp changes which have taken place in production and marketing methods, including transportation, refrigeration, processing, packaging, and merchandising. It has often been said that changes within the poultry industry, and particularly in the broiler and turkey industries, have been more dramatic than in any other segment of our agricultural economy.

Although the poultry industry is one of the oldest of all agricultural enterprises, the commercial production of poultry is relatively new. The reasons are many, but basically two factors predominate. First, has been the impetus on production caused by the tremendous increase in the consumer demand for poultry and poultry products. This demand stems from two facts:

First, the increase in human population and second, per capita increases in consumption. The per capita increase in consumption, in turn, stems in large measure from the increase in consumer per capita incomes. In addition, extremes of poverty are much less pronounced than they once were. Although this increase in income has not materially increased the total consumption of food per person, it has very definitely changed eating habits.

The second basic factor which has contributed to the commercialization of the poultry industry has been the great strides made in efficiencies of production. Improvements in feeds, disease control, management, equipment, breeding, and other factors have allowed commercialization to develop as economic conditions warranted.

The increase that has taken place in the average rate of lay per hen, for example, exemplifies the improvement in the efficiency of production. The rate has increased from 186 eggs in 1953 to 213 eggs in 1963. The amount of feed required to produce a pound of chicken meat has declined from about 4 to 4½ pounds 15 years ago, to less than 2¼ pounds at present. The efficiency of management has improved to the point where a man and his family can easily care for as many as 50,000 broilers at a time and produce 5 broods a year.

The total of these and other improvements in production efficiencies has been so significant and these changes have developed at such a rapid rate that production costs have been reduced relatively more than for most competing products. As a result, poultry and poultry products have, over the years, become much more competitive for the consumers' food dollar. Commercialization in the poultry industry is thus primarily the effect of increases in consumer demand and improvements in production efficiencies.

One effect of the trend toward commercialization of the poultry industry has been to provide bountiful supplies of all poultry products to consumers at reasonable prices. Chicken consumption per capita increased from 21.9 pounds to 30.8 pounds in the 10 years, 1953 to 1963, and turkey consumption increased from 4.8 to 6.7 pounds. Only the consumption of eggs declined as a result of changes in our eating habits. A major agricultural industry has developed which was once considered an industry of secondary importance. The farm income from poultry and poultry products is third in importance in all of agriculture. In recent years the income to producers has approximated $3½ billion.

The segment of the poultry industry which has developed most rapidly has been the production of broilers. Production has increased at a rate of approximately 20 percent a year since the industry's early development in the midthirties.

The commercialization and concentration of poultry production has contributed to the development of an efficient poultry marketing system. Major poultry marketing functions, for example, are now performed largely in producing areas. When flocks were small and scattered, procurement costs were high as many farms had to be visited to secure sufficient poultry to operate a processing establishment. Live poultry was often severely damaged from delays and multiple handling. Procurement was both costly and inefficient. Such costs had to be reflected in the spread between the prices paid at the farm and prices paid by consumers. The relationship between farm and retail prices has, over time, been relatively consistent.

The concentration of poultry production also made possible the development of larger and more efficient processing establishments where modern, up-to-date processing equipment and methods could be used. The modern highly mechanized slaughtering plants and egg candling and processing plants did not exist a generation or two ago. Processing and handling were largely manual operations and most poultry and egg businesses were extremely small by today's standards. Products not needed for local use were assembled from many small local buyers and shipped by rail to terminal markets from which some were redistributed to nearby consuming areas. Most poultry was processed and retailed in New York dressed form or sold as live birds. Eggs were generally sold ungraded and uncartoned. Distribution and merchandising methods, by modern standards, were primitive.

In summary, the poultry industry of today has been able to make the tremendous progress it has achieved in supplying more and better quality products to an ever expanding population because of many important developments. Research on breeding, poultry nutrition, disease control, and farm management and the development of an efficient marketing system laid the basis for the improvements made in industry efficiency. Primary credit belongs to the alert and enterprising farmers, processors, distributors, and manufacturers of equipment for poultry farms and plants who have forged ahead applying new knowledge to old problems with imagination and industry.

Who could have foreseen 40 years ago the level of progress the poultry industry has achieved today? Or, for that matter, the level of progress our whole food production and marketing system—and our whole economy—has achieved?

They have been years of progress that have made this country indisputedly the world leader—an accomplishment made possible principally by an immensely productive agricultural production and marketing system. For this, credit must go principally to commercial and competitive enterprise—but it should not preclude credit to the governmental services, research, and educational and regulatory programs that have fostered and promoted this progress.

Yet it seems that very few people in this country recognize the great contributions that have been made to their welfare—and to their way of living—by our farm and food industries and by the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

So far as the Department is concerned, a few people seem to regard it as an institution that piles up huge stores of grain with the one hand, while with the other it doles out money to farmers to stop growing so much. But as is not generally known, a very major part of the work of the Department is of primary benefit to the general public—and even those services that may be said to be only for farmers, such as research, extension, conservation, or even price supports, actually benefit the consumer in the long run by helping to sustain the most efficient form of farm production yet devised—the owner-operated family farm.

The poultry industry—and its customers—are as well served by the Department of Agriculture as any others. They have a highly useful statistical service which covers everything from poultry and egg market information to long-range projections. No industry in this country, or in the world, has better or more comprehensive economic information with which to make its production and marketing plans.

The research and education work of the Department is well known. Much of it is done in cooperation with the State universities—a partnership that goes back for more than 100 years. It extends all the way from basic research into the nature of living tissue to the development of new products and investigation into human requirements for nutrients and foods, how to meet them, and factors that affect food quality—plus, of course, much, much more, including breeding, feeding, management, merchandising, and marketing.

The protective and regulatory programs of the Department are far reaching, too. To mention only two—the regulation of futures trading on the Nation's commodity markets and work with farmer organizations and others to gain reasonable transportation services and rates for agricultural products.

The Department's marketing services have been well used by the poultry and egg industries. As production expanded, one of the first marketing services the Department rendered was to develop standards and grades for poultry and eggs to meet trading needs. During the 1920's the Department established official grading programs for these products.

Poultry inspection, which started in 1926 as a service to enable processors to export poultry products to Canada, made an important contribution to the development of the poultry industry. The ultimate result was the enactment of the Poultry Products Inspection Act of 1957—really a badge of maturity for this industry. Now about 85 percent of poultry sold off farms is being inspected for wholesomeness—and our poultry meat is being exported to all parts of the globe.

Perhaps less well known is another Department marketing service—that of assuring and protecting equal and fair competitive opportunity in marketing through prevention or elimination of discriminatory, deceptive, or monopolistic practices. This responsibility is assigned the Department under the terms of the Packers and Stockyards Act which, in effect, sets out a code of ethics for the marketing of livestock, meat, and poultry.

The Packers and Stockyards Act has been applicable to the poultry industry to some degree since its enactment in 1921, but amendments in 1935 and 1958 extended its coverage and in recent years marketing practices in the poultry industry have come in for more scrutiny on the part of those charged with administering this law. It seems likely that more action will be developing in this area in the future—in keeping with the age of maturity the poultry industry has attained.

The Department also—as you know—carries on a wide range of market development programs both at home and abroad.

Efforts to sell poultry abroad are carried on cooperatively by the Department and by the industry through its International Trade Development Committee. Results have been extremely gratifying, despite the setback of the Common Market restrictions. For instance, 50 foreign countries were markets for U.S. turkeys last year, whereas 10 years ago, only 4 countries were buying them. In just 1 year, sales of canned poultry meat have increased greatly—from a total of 7.8 million pounds in 1962 to 18.3 million pounds last year.

The Department for some years has helped to alleviate price problems in the turkey and egg industries through its surplus removal purchases, commonly known as section 32 purchases. Over the past 3 years, the Department has purchased more than 146 million pounds of turkeys and nearly 44 million pounds of dried egg solids under this program, plus 156 million pounds of broilers under the section 6 program which provides for school lunch purchases.

Turkeys, chickens, and egg solids have been introduced and have become widely accepted in the nationwide school lunch program through which our future citizens and customers are being molded. Moreover, the school lunch system has become this Nation's largest institutional feeder and these schools are now a $675 million market each year for foods over and above those they receive from the Government. They are influenced often in their local purchases by the Department's monthly listing of "Plentiful Foods," which also serves to supplement your organized merchandising efforts as a means of expanding consumption.

The Department's newest food distribution activity, the food stamp program, is also one which will—especially if it reaches the potential expected—provide a growing market for poultry, eggs, and other highly nutritious foods. This program is one which puts extra purchasing power in the hands of those whose incomes are too low to enable them to buy an adequate diet. Studies have shown that people receiving food stamps use them to purchase added amounts of the protective foods, such as meat, poultry, fruits, and vegetables, and dairy products.

These then are some of the areas—though by no means all—in which the Department over the years has cooperated with the poultry industry to help increase efficiency in marketing, hold down costs, and expand markets. Other areas, such as the credit services, the services to cooperatives, and so on, have not been mentioned, but it is important that the public gain an understanding of the benefits that accrue to them as consumers because of these services—and because of the progress and accomplishments of farm and food industries.

It is not because we expect consumers to be grateful. They have every right to expect the performance of a profit-motivated economy to provide them with the best possible food at the least possible cost. They have every right to expect their Government to provide the services which facilitate the operations of this system and safeguard its competitive operation.

No, the reason they should be concerned is because of the changes that this system is undergoing. These changes have implications not only for the Government services which up to now have undergirded efficiency and fair competition in our marketing system, but also for our whole farm and food economy—even for our way of life.

These are changes that now seem to have served consumers well—but they have raised disquietude in all parts of the farm and food economy.

Basically the changes relate to the impact of change upon a marketing system that had many built-in protections; that was visible with its workings open to easy view by both buyer and seller; that operated through a series of open markets in which products changed hands and prices were arrived at in explicit market transactions. Alongside this system there has grown another one that is much less patterned, less uniform. And so now we seem to have a mosaic of the big and the small, of central markets and decentralized trading, of traditional trading between successive processor-wholesaler-retailer stages on the one hand, but on the other, of telescoped integration by many means that in some cases virtually eliminates trading altogether. Size of firms and individual enterprises has grown; there are far fewer buyers of farm products; and in some geographic areas or for some products a few firms have greatly increased in volume.

The older system was far from perfect. And present market performance is not necessarily suspect, either generally or in particular cases. But where the protection mechanisms developed for an open market organization may or may not be applicable we need to be concerned about what has really happened, what the outcome of change is likely to be, what if anything we should do about change—and especially about the role of Government.

This, really, is the significance of the nonpartisan Commission to study and appraise the "revolution in marketing." While attention is directed to concentration of market volume at the retail level and to the implications of vertical integration and contract farming, this does not mean that these dimensions or relationships are necessarily evil or good—only that our knowledge is scanty.

Certainly there is no implication that consumers have not been well served to date by farmers, processors, and distributors. As to whether they will continue to enjoy the same advantages in the future—that is one of the questions that needs answering.

LOWER MANHATTAN EXPRESSWAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBSTEIN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to register my unequivocal opposition to a plan, which has become almost a plot, to gut the district I represent in this House, by an alleged "highway improvement" known as the Cross-Manhattan Expressway. This project would involve construction costing over $100 million, 90 percent of it Federal money, under the Interstate Highway System. Therefore, this House, which originates appropriations of Federal money, should be interested in what its Member who represents the district in which it is proposed that the money be spent, thinks about such use of said funds.

This project would entail connecting two of the bridges over the East River in New York City with the Holland Tunnel under the Hudson River to New Jersey, by means of a partly depressed and partly elevated multiple-lane highway. Although this plan has been unanimously rejected by the Board of Estimate of the City of New York and is opposed by every elected Councilman of the Borough of Manhattan, every State senator and assemblyman from downtown Manhattan and all three members of this body from Manhattan, agitation for its construction keeps cropping up from groups and individuals who are not democratically elected, such as the appointive Triboro Bridge and Tunnel Authority, the privately supported Downtown Manhattan Association, Commerce, and Industry Association, Regional Plan Association and Automobile Club of New York.

This sort of process may go on in any of your districts, whereby efforts are made to overrule decisions by the duly-elected representatives of the people in favor of some special interest acting through organizations and agencies that are not responsible to the people. I would hope that this House would agree with my feeling that such violation of the principles of representative government should be stopped whenever the Congressman from the district involved registers his complete opposition to a Federal project, since, if his judgment as to whether or not such rejection is in the interests of his constituents is faulty, they will have an opportunity to replace him within 2 years at the next election. I have no fear of losing votes in registering my complete opposition to the use of $100 million of Federal money for the Cross-Manhattan Expressway, because:

First. Interstate 80, entering New York City over the multiple-lane George Washington Bridge in Upper Manhattan is in process of being connected to the Major Deegan Highway, which leads directly to the Triboro Bridge, so that some cross-Manhattan traffic that now uses the Holland Tunnel-East River bridges route to get to Long Island from New Jersey will be diverted to this much quicker route.

Second. Interstate 78, now planned to go through Newark, Jersey City, and the Holland Tunnel to Manhattan, should not go to Manhattan at all, since before this year is out the Verrazano-Narrows Bridge, with six lanes of traffic in each direction, connecting to New Jersey by the Goethals Bridge near the northwesterly corner of Staten Island and the Outerbridge Crossing at the southwesterly end of Staten Island, each with three lanes in each direction, will be open for traffic, making choice of the two-lane in each direction Holland Tunnel a very poor one for almost any truck or passenger vehicle proceeding from New Jersey to New York City. It is obvious, in conformity with the sound principle enunciated by Mr. Whitton, the Federal Public Roads Commissioner, that interstate highways should go near a metropolis, with good access from them into the metropolis for traffic that actually has business in the metropolis, but should not channel through traffic through the metropolis; that Interstate 78 should be routed near but not through both Newark and Manhattan, by following the route presently designated 278 over the Goethals Bridge, the Clove Lake Expressway, the Verrazano-Narrows Bridge, and the Brooklyn-Queens Expressway, with ready access to Manhattan through the Brooklyn-Battery Tunnel and the East River bridges.

Third. I have lived all my life on the Lower East Side of Manhattan. When I was a boy and a young man there were elevated railways there. These structures, shutting out much sunlight and causing much noise and dirt, produced some of New York's worst slum conditions along the Bowery, Second, Third, Sixth, and Ninth Avenues. The "els" were torn down decades ago, but the regions they blighted have not yet fully recovered from the blight they caused. How much more blight would be caused by a structure that cuts off all light from the street below can be realized by looking at the conditions obtaining on Hamilton Avenue in Brooklyn, which carries over it the Gowanus Expressway, leading to the Brooklyn-Battery Tunnel. Neither I nor my constituents want a similar scar to be inflicted on Lower Manhattan Island in an area that would develop very quickly if the potential blight of the expressway were removed from it by having the plan to build it discarded once and for all, since that region has unparalleled assets of convenient location and excellent transportation for development into one of the finest sections of the city, for either business or residence purposes, once the property owners can finance improvements they have long had to defer because lending institutions prudently refuse to lend funds for rehabilitation or new construction of real estate menaced by condemnation and demolition.

Fourth. Two of New York's most distinctive neighborhoods, Chinatown and Little Italy, would be seriously disrupted if this expressway is constructed and the main business street of the Lower East Side, Delancey Street—as I still call it, being an oldtimer, although it has since been renamed Schiff Parkway—would be utterly ruined, all to no good purpose, since during the 3 to 5 years that construction would be going on, all traffic would have to find other routes to move at all; it would find those mentioned under points 1 and 2 above; and if the project were completed it would hardly be used, so that the best thing that could be done with it would be to tear it down.

Fifth. There are much better ways that Federal money could be used for highways in and around New York City, to expedite interstate traffic, than the harmful boondoggle I have described. These are methods that would divert traffic away from Manhattan, instead of attracting it there when it has no business in Manhattan itself, such as the proposal to connect Oyster Bay, Long Island, with Port Chester in Westchester County by a new Long Island Sound bridge, so that traffic between New England and Westchester and the rapidly growing counties of Nassau and Suffolk, with their magnificent Atlantic beaches, could avoid going into New York City altogether.

I have gone into this matter in some detail because of the persistence of the people and organizations determined to waste many millions of Federal moneys in a project that would cause irreparable injury to my district, its businesses and those who work in it. The same thing may happen to any of you. There may be a plan, Mr. Speaker, to connect the Massachusetts Thruway with Cape Cod or Cape Ann that would gut your district, and cause your constituents' homes and businesses to be sacrificed to bulldozers without serving public convenience and necessity sufficiently to justify such destruction and disruption. In such a case, it is my view that it should be the prerogative of the Congressman from such a menaced district, who is directly responsible to its people, to be able to raise his voice against such a project on the floor of this House, as I am doing today, and have his views given conclusive weight in deciding the question of whether the project shall be carried out.

PRINTING OF COMMITTEE ACTIVITY REPORTS

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, with reference to the printing of committee activity reports for the session, I wish to remind the chairmen of all committees that the Joint Committee on Printing has very properly ruled that the printing of such reports both as committee prints and in the RECORD is duplication, the cost of which cannot be justified.

It is requested that committee chairmen decide whether they wish these reports printed as committee prints or in the RECORD since the Government Printing Office will be directed not to print them both ways.

REVISION OF LAW RELATING TO GPO EMPLOYEES' PAY SCALE

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Joint Committee on Printing, I am today introducing a bill designed to amend section 40, of title 44, United States Code, more commonly known as the Kiess Act. The present law, which has been in effect for more than 40 years, contains several outmoded provisions which do not satisfy present-day requirements. The purpose of the present bill is to accomplish the following objectives: first, eliminate the fixed numerical limitation on the number of apprentices which may be hired by the Government Printing Office; second, provide for wages to be determined by the application of a formula approved by the Joint Committee on Printing; and third, remove the Joint Committee on Printing from the position of having to arbitrate wage disputes between craft groups in the Government Printing Office and the Public Printer.

The single objective of the bill, H.R. 8836, which I introduced last year at the request of the Public Printer, was simply to modify section 40 to the extent of removing the fixed numerical limitation on the number of apprentices in the Government Printing Office. The bill which I am introducing today includes not only this objective but also others, the need for which has been voiced by all members of the Joint Committee on Printing. It is realized that the present bill cannot be enacted in this session of Congress; however, its introduction at this time will enable interested parties to express their views prior to its further consideration in the next Congress. It is our desire that views and comments regarding the proposal be mailed to the Committee on House Administration for assessment and analysis, in order to guide Congress in its subsequent course of action.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BECKWORTH (at the request of Mr. THOMAS), for an indefinite period, on account of death in family.

Mr. RANDALL, for Saturday, October 3, on account of official business relating to Federal building construction in congressional district.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama, for 1 hour, today.

Mr. BOW, for 30 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. EVINS (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for 15 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FARBSTEIN (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for 15 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. PUCINSKI, for 30 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. MADDEN, for 30 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. DOWNING, for 60 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. BURTON of Utah, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. LIPSCOMB (at the request of Mr. WHALLEY), for 30 minutes, on October 3.

Mr. ASHBROOK (at the request of Mr. WHALLEY), for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. LAIRD (at the request of Mr. WHALLEY), for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. HOEVEN (at the request of Mr. WHALLEY), for 20 minutes, today.

Mr. BRAY (at the request of Mr. WHALLEY), for 30 minutes, on October 3.

Mr. HALPERN (at the request of Mr. WHALLEY), for 40 minutes, on October 3.

Mr. HALL (at the request of Mr. WHALLEY), for 30 minutes, on October 3.

Mr. FEIGHAN (at the request of Mr. MARSH), for 30 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MURPHY of New York (at the request of Mr. MARSH), for 30 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia (at the request of Mr. MARSH), for 20 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BURLESON (at the request of Mr. MARSH) was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. ZABLOCKI.
Mr. EDWARDS.
Mr. SILER.
Mr. MCCLORY.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. WHALLEY) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HOSMER.
Mr. SYNDER.
Mr. GRIFFIN.
Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.
Mr. JENSEN.
Mr. CHAMBERLAIN.
Mr. GROVER.
Mr. DOLE.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MARSH) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MCCORMACK.
Mr. POWELL.
Mr. GRABOWSKI.
Mr. FASCELL.
Mrs. HANSEN.
Mr. HAYS.
Mr. FARBSTEIN.
Mr. ROONEY of New York.
Mr. CAMERON.
Mr. RANDALL.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1096. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to cooperate with the State of Wisconsin in the designation and administration of the Ice Age National Scientific Reserve in the State of Wisconsin, and for other purposes;

H.R. 2772. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Harley Brewer;

H.R. 6218. An act to amend the act of June 29, 1960, to authorize additional extensions of time for final proof by certain entrymen under the desert land laws and to make such additional extensions available to the successors in interest of such entrymen;

H.R. 7348. An act for the relief of Frank B. Rowlett; and

H.R. 9124. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to vitalize the Reserve Officers' Training Corps programs of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, and for other purposes.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1531. An act to increase the appropriation authorization for the completion of the construction of the irrigation and power systems of the Flathead Indian irrigation project, Montana;

S. 1640. An act for the relief of certain employees of the Alaska Railroad; and

S. 3174. An act to amend section 5 of the Employment Act of 1946.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on the following dates present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

On October 1, 1964:

H.R. 1851. An act for the relief of Chester A. Brothers and Anna Brothers, his wife.

H.R. 2501. An act to authorize the promotion of qualified Reserve officers of the Army and the Air Force to existing unit vacancies;

H.R. 2512. An act to clarify the status of members of the National Guard while attending or instructing at National Guard schools established under the authority of the Secretary of the Army or Secretary of the Air Force, as the case may be, and for other purposes;

H.R. 6233. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain land of the United States to the Pascua Yaqui Association, Inc.;

H.R. 6593. An act for the relief of Earnest O. Scott;

H.R. 9718. An act to authorize the crediting of certain military service for purposes of Reserve retired pay; and

H.R. 12308. An act to authorize removal of a flight hazard at the U.S. Naval Air Station, Norfolk, Va.

On October 2, 1964:

H.R. 2772. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Harley Brewer;

H.R. 6218. An act to amend the act of June 29, 1960, to authorize additional extensions of time for final proof by certain entrymen under the desert land laws and to make such additional extensions available to the successors in interest of such entrymen; and

H.R. 9124. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to vitalize the Reserve Officers' Training Corps programs of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 58 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Saturday, October 3, 1964, at 11 o'clock a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2591. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Home Loan Bank Board, transmitting draft of proposed legislation entitled, "A bill to amend subsection (d) of section 5 of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, as amended, and section 407 of the National Housing Act, as amended"; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2592. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Home Loan Bank Board, transmitting draft of proposed legislation entitled, "A bill to amend section 408 of the National Housing Act, as amended, to provide for the regulation of savings and loan holding companies and subsidiary companies"; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2593. A letter from the Secretary, Export-Import Bank of Washington, transmitting report that Export-Import Bank of Washington on September 22, 1964, issued its guarantee with respect to certain cotton exports to Poland, pursuant to title III of the Foreign Aid and Related Agencies Appropriation Act of 1964, and to the Presidential determination of February 4, 1964; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2594. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, report on uneconomical leasing of motor vehicles for use in assembly and checkout operations at Minuteman missile launch sites and avoidance of congressional controls relating to acquisition of motor vehicles, Department of the Air Force; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2595. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, report on unnecessary procurement of cargo transporters, Department of the Army; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2596. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, report on excessive prices negotiated by the Defense Fuel Supply Center for storage of petroleum in a commercial facility at Grand Forks, N. Dak., Department of Defense; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2597. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, report on unnecessary costs incurred in the purchase of automatic flight control systems for A–4 series aircraft, Department of the Navy; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2598. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, report on unnecessary costs incurred in the procurement of defective torpedo tubes from the Youngstown Welding & Engineering Co., Youngstown, Ohio; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2599. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation of certain persons and a list of said persons, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2600. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation of certain persons and a list of said persons, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2601. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting audit of Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, pursuant to 48 Stat. 1256; 12 U.S.C. 1725(a); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PHILBIN: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 12435. A bill to authorize the sale, without regard to the 6-month waiting period prescribed, of zinc proposed to be disposed of pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act; with amendment (Rept. No. 1926). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HARRIS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Report on the activities of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce (Rept. No. 1927). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MAHON: Committee of conference. H.R. 12633. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1928). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee of conference. H.R. 2434. A bill to amend section 560 of title 38, United States Code, to permit the payment of special pension to holders of the Congressional Medal of Honor awarded such medal for actions not involving conflict with an enemy, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1929). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee of conference. H.R. 1927. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, so as to revise the rates of disability and death pension authorized by the Veterans' Pension Act of 1959, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1930). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 12771. A bill to establish the limits and conditions under which the United States will make grants to the States in assisting in defraying the cost of unemployment compensation benefits paid by the States, and to that end to increase the rate of the Federal unemployment tax and to establish the recession unemployment compensation account; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H.R. 12772. A bill to establish the limits and conditions under which the United States will make grants to the States in assisting in defraying the cost of unemployment compensation benefits paid by the States, and to that end to increase the rate of the Federal unemployment tax and to establish the recession unemployment compensation account; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H.R. 12773. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to establish active duty medical and dental officer strengths in the Air Force; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 12774. A bill to permit the heads of Federal agencies to retrocede to the States certain jurisdiction of the United States over land within the States; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. KORNEGAY:

H.R. 12775. A bill to amend the Textile Fiber Products Identification Act to permit the listing of labels of certain fibers constituting less than 5 percent of a textile fiber product; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RYAN of New York:

H.R. 12776. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to specifically provide for the guarantee of loans made to veterans to purchase dwellings in multifamily structures which are owned cooperatively or are condominiums; to the Committee on Veterans Affairs.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H.R. 12777. A bill to amend titles I and XVI of the Social Security Act to permit a State to establish or designate a separate agency to administer the portion of its State plan relating to medical assistance for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. UDALL:

H.R. 12778. A bill to amend the act of June 29, 1940, relating to the administration of the Washington National Airport, to transfer to the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency certain additional real property of the United States to facilitate the expansion of such airport for general aviation purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.R. 12779. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MILLS (by request):

H.R. 12780. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit amortization of railroad grading and certain other right-of-way improvements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin (by request):

H.R. 12781. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit amortization of railroad grading and certain other right-of-way improvements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 12782. A bill to provide for the conveyance of the Accotink Dam and Reservoir area to Fairfax County, Va., as a public park and recreation area; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CELLER (by request):

H.R. 12783. A bill to amend sections 337 and 338 of the Bankruptcy Act and to add new section 339; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12784. A bill to amend the Bankruptcy Act with respect to the use of chapter XIII; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12785. A bill to amend sections 64a, 238, 378 and 483 of the Bankruptcy Act and to repeal sections 354 and 459 of the act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

H.R. 12786. A bill to provide for specific employment policies in order to promote maximum employment, to reduce unemployment to its minimum acceptable levels, to promote an adequate rate of economic growth and to preserve reasonable price stability; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. MILLS (by request):

H.R. 12787. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 and the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to change the method of computing the retired pay of judges of the Tax Court of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PATMAN (by request):

H.R. 12788. A bill to amend subsection (d) of section 5 of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, as amended, and section 407 of the National Housing Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 12789. A bill to amend section 408 of the National Housing Act, as amended, to provide for the regulation of savings and loan holding companies and subsidiary companies; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin:

H.R. 12790. A bill to amend section 634 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to require annual reports to the Congress concerning refund claims filed by the United States with foreign countries in connection with the foreign assistance program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BURLESON (by request):

H.R. 12791. A bill to regulate and fix rates of pay for employees and officers of the Government Printing Office; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MOORE:

H.R. 12792. A bill to provide for the distribution of unused immigration quota numbers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRASER:

H.R. 12793. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to make certain acts against the person of the President and Vice President of the United States and certain other Federal officers a Federal crime; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRUCE:

H.J. Res. 1189. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to restore the integrity of the Constitution and the Bill of Rights and to establish the source of men's rights and governments' powers in the organic law of the land; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROTZMAN:

H.J. Res. 1190. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide that no person may be a Member of Congress who has not, when elected or appointed, been an inhabitant for at least 1 year of the State from which he is chosen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.J. Res. 1191. Joint resolution providing for a study and report to Congress by the Secretary of the Treasury concerning the use of some material other than silver in the minting of subsidiary coins; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ASHBROOK:

H.J. Res. 1193. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to restore the integrity of the Constitution and the Bill of Rights and to establish the source of men's rights and governments' powers in the organic law of the land; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WYDLER:

H. Res. 898. Resolution establishing a Special Committee on the Captive Nations; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 12794. A bill for the relief of Elie Andreakos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12795. A bill for the relief of Serafem J. Toucas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12796. A bill for the relief of Epifanios Tufexis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia (by request):

H.R. 12797. A bill for the relief of Francis Paik Hwang Hahn, his wife, Theresa Hisun Ahn Hahn, and their two minor sons, John Chang Soo Hahn and Andrew In Soo Hahn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 12798. A bill for the relief of Stephan Simon Jordan and Elisabeth Jordan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULTON of Tennessee:

H.R. 12799. A bill for the relief of Rajinder Naph Chadha; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 12800. A bill for the relief of Pinchas Reisman, his wife Ruth Reisman, and their two minor children Tova and Lea Reisman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12801. A bill for the relief of Pietro Malleo and his wife, Maria Malleo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 12802. A bill for the relief of Louis A. Oswald; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAY:

H.R. 12803. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ozel Turkbas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HANNA:

H.R. 12804. A bill for the relief of Kyung Sook Hahn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H.R. 12805. A bill for the relief of Fatemeh Moussavi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 12806. A bill for the relief of Vincenzo Boscarino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12807. A bill for the relief of Wilhelm Brach; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12808. A bill for the relief of Dr. George Varughese; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLUCZYNSKI:

H.R. 12809. A bill for the relief of Harry Nicolas Vakalopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 12810. A bill for the relief of Isaac Ozeri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12811. A bill for the relief of Joseph Yeheskel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H.R. 12812. A bill for the relief of Dr. Michael Hanna; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 12813. A bill for the relief of Maria Elmelinda Jargas Castro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 12814. A bill for the relief of Krystyna Kwiatkowska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHRIVER:

H.R. 12815. A bill for the relief of Odette M. Hudspeth; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHWEIKER:

H.R. 12816. A bill for the relief of Ottillia Murphy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H.R. 12817. A bill for the relief of Arley L. Beem, A.E.M.C., U.S. Navy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1053. By Mr. LONG of Louisiana: Petition of John Snyder and approximately 10,000 other persons with reference to the calling of a national referendum on the Civil Rights Act of 1964; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1054. By Mr. STRATTON: Resolution of the Board of Supervisors of Seneca County, Waterloo, N.Y., recommending legislation for financial aid toward sewage and pollution elimination; to the Committee on Public Works.

1055. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Henry Stoner, New York, N.Y., requesting consideration of his petition with reference to supporting legislation to restore the selling by U.S. mints of proof sets of coins; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Commandments for Congressmen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE SILER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, October 2, 1964

Mr. SILER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to place in the Congressional Record my own compilation of congressional commandments that I have sent back to the newspapers of my congressional district this week for publication. I would hope that they might prove to be applicable to all of us, including myself, who are now serving our great country in the U.S. Congress. This compilation is as follows:

Washington Report

(By Congressman Eugene Siler)

So far as I know there has never been compiled a set of commandments for Congressmen. It seems to me that a 10 commandments for Congressmen is something that might be long overdue and so I now publish such a decalog and would hope that many Congressmen could see fit to take them unto themselves. The Congressman's commandments, as conceived by me and publicized for your consideration, are as follows:

1. Thou shalt always be saturated with Americanism, preferring Americans to all others, remembering the Holy Writ, "If any provide not for his own, and especially those of his own house, he hath denied the faith, and is worse than an infidel."

2. Thou shalt have constant compassion for the poor because, "He that hath pity upon the poor lendeth unto the Lord."

3. Thou shalt balance the budget and reduce the public debt, beginning by terminating the annual outpouring of taxpayer billions for foreign aid.

4. Thou shalt not undertake to police the whole world, especially the faraway spots like Vietnam, 7,000 miles from our shores.

5. Thou shalt act and look like a Congressman, remembering thy position of leadership and high honor at the hands of the people.

6. Thou shalt not worship mammon by raising thine own salary, at least not until the budget is in balance and one or two reductions have been made in the national debt.

7. Thou shalt encourage private enterprise by taking the Government out of many of its current operations such as shipbuilding and dozens of other fields of endeavor.

8. Thou shalt revere the Constitution and adhere to it, turning a deaf ear to all those who claim it is very ancient, for so also is the Lord's Prayer.

9. Thou shalt not take junkets at the expense of the taxpayer, living high on champagne and staying at luxury hotels while many of thy people are struggling to make ends meet.

10. Thou shalt not put thy son or wife or daughter on thy payroll while he or she never darkens the door of thy office to render a public service to the people.

There they are. What do you think of them? If I did not think they could be used to produce a better America, then I would not even bring up the subject at all.

William McCauley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 2, 1964

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, it is with feelings of great esteem that I speak of William McCauley, Director of the Bureau of Employees' Compensation of the Department of Labor, who is retiring today after 46 years of the most dedicated and outstanding service to the Federal Government and the American people. With his retirement, the Government will lose an executive of great ability and a man of deep feeling for his fellow man. He has been not only sympathetic but highly constructive and responsible to the human needs of Federal employees, their dependents, and others who have been covered by the Federal Workmens' Compensation laws.

There are few public servants who have labored longer or with more devotion to duty, more talent or more loyalty than William McCauley. His record of service should be honored by all Americans who ask their public servants to go beyond the call of duty and exemplify the highest kind of dedication, integrity and honor in both their public and private lives. He has had a long and splendid working relationship with Congress. His entire career makes him a rightful recipient of honor and recognition by this body as well as by millions of Americans throughout this country and in other parts of the world. It is fitting indeed that we pause and pay tribute to the selfless devotion and accomplishments of this official.

Born in St. Louis, Missouri, on September 12, 1894, Mr. McCauley is the father of five children. During World War I, he served in the 16th Infantry, 162d D Battalion from May 1918 to May 1919. He received a high school education and prior to his initial appointment with the Government. worked as a bookkeeper for 3 years in Hot Springs, Ark.

The career of William M. McCauley in the Federal service provides a striking example of the Federal career system at its best. It is the story of a young man of 25, beginning his employment in 1918 as a clerk at $1,200 per year in a small organization of about 70 people, the old U.S. Employees' Compensation Commission, and through outstanding ability and devotion to his public trust, becoming Director of the Bureau of Employees' Compensation. This Bureau is responsible for administering Federal compensation laws covering close to 4 million workers.

Mr. McCauley's employment began 11 years after the enactment of the first compensation law in this country. This was only 3 years after the U.S. Employees' Compensation Commission was organized in 1916. Throughout most of his career, he has played a major role not only in the administration and interpretation of laws as enacted by Congress, but in the pioneering associated with workmen's compensation legislation, which was the forerunner of all social legislation in the United States.

In the development of workmen's compensation systems, the Federal Government's system and its administration have served as models for the various States. In awakening the public's responsibility to caring for the injured and their families, as well as in the legislation enacted to provide worker protection, Mr. McCauley has played an important role. The influence of the work performed by the Bureau of Employees' Compensation, under Mr. McCauley's direction and leadership, has been profound not only throughout the United States but in many foreign countries.

Until today, in his 71st year, he has directed and coordinated a comprehensive and complex program of workmen's compensation throughout the United States. It is noteworthy that, during most of his career, he has had to make important policy and program decisions in this pioneering field, with very little to aid him in translating the broad objectives of the Federal compensation laws into effective organizations and operations.

Despite varied and frequent amendments to the basic laws which have occurred during the past 35 or 40 years, he has invariably displayed high executive and administrative competence in carrying out the spirit and letter of congressional mandates, and in providing invaluable advice to Members of Congress. As an administrator, he has had to coordinate the complex legal, medical, actuarial and adjudicative requirements of the laws for which he was responsible.

The progressive importance of the responsibilities which he has had to assume may be somewhat gaged by the great expansion of the Federal employees compensation coverage and benefits which occurred in the last 46 years. From September 7, 1916, to October 31, 1917, the Commission received a total of 13,337 injury reports. The Bureau now receives approximately 200,000 injury reports annually. The annual budget has increased from $87,000 in 1918 to approximately $75 million at present. In terms of benefits, on a dollar basis, the job has increased more than 500 fold.

During the past 48 years since the Federal employees' compensation system went into effect, almost 8 million workers and their families have received medical and compensation benefits. In the development and expansion of the Bureau's operations, Mr. McCauley has demonstrated his ability to mold an efficient, economical organization that would best carry out the principles and laws on Federal workmen's compensation.

Over the years, he has demonstrated a capacity to meet the needs of the times, and with changing economic conditions has shown keen foresight and judgment in initiating action that would best serve the public interest. This has demanded perception, judgment, and responsibility of an exceptional nature. Decentralization of Bureau operations, the development of a rehabilitation program, and the initiation of legislation that liberalized benefits for injured workers and their families are examples of his progressiveness in meeting some of the current challenges of the Federal compensation program. By such action, equity of financial benefit has been achieved, claims are being adjudicated more rapidly, and a closer, more direct approach to claimants has been provided. Rehabilitation services, going beyond the limitations of financial assistance, have helped restore disabled workers to positions of productiveness and dignity.

In his dealings with congressional committees, Members of Congress, innumerable Government officials, union representatives, and representatives of foreign governments, he has invariably earned high praise for his sound recommendations, integrity, fairness, and dynamic leadership. He has resolutely taken the steps to assure equity in administering the Federal compensation program, and has consistently demonstrated his sympathetic understanding of the human problems underlying the letter of the law. His dedication to the public service, in every sense, has been a vital force to his own organization and to the American workers who have benefited through that organization. That he has admirably achieved both humanitarian and Government objectives is amply confirmed by the record and by the esteem in which he is held by worker and official alike.

In the administration of the Federal workmen's compensation program, Mr. McCauley has been confronted, continually, with the social and economic problems arising from accident, death, disease, disaster, and war. In meeting these problems, he has demonstrated a keen sense of social awareness that has been coupled with exceptional executive ability. He has practiced vigilant alertness to assure that the programs fulfill both the spirit and the letter of the law. His position has been a public trust, affecting the lives and economic security of a vast number of Federal workers and their families, and throughout his entire Government career he has never lost sight of the significance of this deep public trust.

That he has been a dedicated official of the highest distinction is readily apparent to all who have ever been in contact with him. In him are combined humility, humaneness, personal integrity, and great constructive energy. In the face of perplexing administrative and legislative problems, organizational and geographic displacements and the complexities of dealing with changes in his own superiors, he has invariably impressed all with whom he has dealt with his fairness, his sense of justice, and his strong, vital interest in his fellow human being.

Possessed of warm human traits, which have been combined with administrative and executive ability of the highest degree, this able official has been self-effacing and modest to the point of humility. These are traits which have endeared him to all with whom he has come in contact. In short, he has combined competence of a high order with innate modesty in the best American tradition. His career has meant to him but one thing—service, loyalty, and devotion to the American people and their Government.

In recognition of his outstanding service to the Government and the Nation, he received the President's Award for Distinguished Federal Civilian Service. It is the highest honor the Government can bestow on a civilian employee. The award was made by President Dwight D. Eisenhower on January 11, 1961, at the White House. Mr. McCauley is the first and only Labor Department employee to receive this award.

The award citation was as follows:

> A man of unusual foresight, judgment, and executive competence, he has exercised a profound influence in developing the Federal employees' compensation system to serve the human needs of the times.
>
> Through his keen sense of social awareness and superior administrative ability, he has greatly alleviated for Federal personnel and their families the social and economic problems arising from accident, disease, and disaster.

The Distinguished Service Award of the Department of Labor was made to Mr. McCauley by the Secretary of Labor on January 12, 1964. The citation was as follows:

> For more than four decades of dedicated service and profound influence on the Federal workmen's compensation program; for his keen foresight, sound judgment, integrity, and fairness in directing the Bureau's program.

It is obvious that William McCauley has earned the commendation of this body. I wish to offer him also our congratulations on his retirement, our compliments and our best wishes for the fruitful and happy years which lie ahead for this distinguished gentleman.

Need To Increase Exports, and Opportunities for Small Business—Statement by Senator Humphrey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 2, 1964

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement by the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] concerning the need to increase our exports, and the opportunities for small business in that regard.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICA'S EXPANDING MARKETPLACE—STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUMPHREY

It has become so commonplace to observe that the world is shrinking in size, that peoples have become more interdependent, and that we are living in the midst of the greatest technological revolution in history, that I think we are sometimes in danger of failing to recognize the full implication of these stupendous facts.

Profound changes in the conditions of human life demand rethinking of many of our attitudes and accustomed way of doing things. We must not, in the face of intellectual and scientific advancement of enormous proportions, cling to the past. We must instead move ahead courageously and creatively.

As an example of the advancement I refer to, consider that the computer is less than 20 years old, or that the harnessing of atomic energy is just as recent, and the possibilities for its constructive uses have barely been scratched.

Similarly, developments in the speed of communication, travel, and transport have been dramatic. It took thousands of years for man to advance from the speed of a fast horse to the speed of vehicles driven by engines. Then, in a couple of decades, the speed of travel leaped from that of the fastest land travel to over 400 miles per hour, the speed of the fastest propeller-driven aircraft. Now men have orbited the earth at over 16,000 miles per hour. Scheduled civil jet aircraft fly at close to 600 miles per hour, and supersonic planes will go into regular service before many more years have passed.

This era has brought opportunities greater than have ever existed before. Our mission as a people must be to translate these opportunities into things meaningful and beneficial to the lives of individual human beings: jobs, knowledge, goods of new usefulness and in new volumes. It is on this area that I wish to focus, and on one segment of it in particular.

The American domestic market has been huge, and it remains so. No one would deny it. There are great demands to be filled, innumerable opportunities to be seized. But we must not overlook the great new opportunities of export markets.

Today, less than 5½ percent of our gross national product is exported. Compare this with some European industrial countries which export 25 to 35 percent of their gross national product. Increasing our exports is the most challenging opportunity facing American business. It is the best solution to our balance-of-payments problem and it represents a real opportunity to create new jobs for Americans and new profits for business.

Most of our very large corporations do not overlook these opportunities. Many of them have engaged in foreign trade for decades; others have begun more recently to embark upon such trade with vigorous steps. But there are thousands upon thousands of other firms which could, and should, get into the act.

Some of them have been held back, I believe, because of the idea that, "We cannot compete against cheap foreign labor." This is a myth that must be laid to rest. The fact is that 80 percent of American exports of manufactured goods come from our 10 highest wage industries.

It is true that wage scales overseas, although substantially above what they were a few years ago, are still low relative to ours. The productivity of that labor, however, is also often low when compared with that of the American worker teamed with American machinery and managerial know-how. The plain truth is that the intensive investment in machines and tools which is characteristic of American business results in greater productivity for each labor hour.

Moreover, wages overseas, starting at a lower base, have generally been rising at a higher percentage rate than those in the United States, and the worker abroad has disposable income he never had before. This buying power is building a desire for manufactured consumer goods, for a standard of living comparable to that enjoyed by Americans, for products with the "Made in America" label which holds strong fascination for consumers in other lands and is in itself an almost magical selling force.

Experts tell me that, in international trade, price is rarely a problem for American goods. Much more important are such factors as delivery time, quality, technical innovation, style, credit arrangements—and imaginative salesmanship. What is called for is first class advertising, sales promotion, new ideas—the kind of salesmanship and distribution which we have applied so strikingly in our own country.

Let's look at the potential for the small businessman in oversea markets. I say the small businessman, because the giants of industry have long recognized the importance of international marketing. This new look for small businessmen must first revise all of the geography which we have learned. Geography must be related to time, for the ability to compete in new markets is importantly influenced by speed of transport. Today, the manufacturer in New England is closer to many European customers than he is to those in Philadelphia or Washington, D.C. The manufacturer in California is closer to Tokyo than to Chicago. The manufacturer in the Midwest is closer to Caracas than he is to New Orleans. In these comparisons, of course, I am contrasting jet-aircraft times of shipment to the rail and truck shipments typical in domestic trade.

Today it is possible for a businessman in London to decide he is short of an American product when he closes business for the day, cable Chicago for a resupply and have it in London for the opening of business the next morning. We can supply foreign customers by air from the United States faster than they can get supplies by truck from manufacturers in their own country. In the era of supersonic flights, which will be with us in the 1970's, a British businessman will be able to leave London in the morning and, because of the 5-hour time differential, arrive in New York 2½ hours before he left London, do a day's work in New York and be back home before midnight London time. Let's use this new concept of "time related to geography" to open new channels for our commerce.

This concept of speed broadening markets is not new. Remember the American clipper ships which were famous in every port in the days of sail. Remember the Pony Express which played so dramatic a part in the opening of the West; the building of railroads to the Pacific; the first interstate highway opened to trucking—all evidence that speed of transportation is close to the heart of a vigorous and expanding commerce.

Our sights must be on the fact that the world's markets are growing at a dramatic pace and Europe alone has a market almost the size of the United States. We cannot disregard the challenge. The Small Business Administration and the Department of Commerce are doing a magnificent job of breaking down the misconception that foreign trade is a mysterious and difficult process. Our Government today provides the American foreign trader with protection against most of the financial risks of foreign trading, such as currency devaluation in other countries, expropriation and other contingencies.

There is desire on the part of small businessmen to go into foreign trade as is evidenced by the fact that over 5,000 responded affirmatively to a questionnaire sent out by the Small Business Administration asking for expressions of interest in foreign trade. The problem is to move these expressions of interest into action, to implement the desire for export and to get the movement into high gear. The tools are there, we must get small business to "think big" and be aggressive in developing the assets which they have.

What are the steps to carry you forward into international trade?

1. Contact the Small Business Administration and the Department of Commerce at their nearest office and let them provide you with the information and the tools they have ready and waiting.

2. Use all other sources of business assistance overseas: the banks, airlines, or shipping companies that have programs and staffs for providing contacts, market reconnaissance, and other business data.

3. Study the areas receiving foreign aid from the United States—remember almost 80 percent of the aid money is spent on products from the United States.

4. Use all these facilities to set up well planned programs in advance and then go overseas and see for yourself how to get more business abroad.

5. Analyze the use of distribution by jet aircraft, which minimizes your oversea inventory, reduces your investment, improves your competitive position and brings you next door to previously distant markets.

6. Plan your selling costs on the basis of expanded production in your existing facilities and see how you can keep your prices down.

America has a great future in expanding markets abroad.

Senior Citizens Voting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALAN BIBLE

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 2, 1964

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Congressional Record a statement by my colleague, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. Cannon], and an accompanying letter.

There being no objection, the statement and the letter were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Senior Citizens Voting—Statement by Senator Cannon

Recently I received from the Housing Authority of the City of Las Vegas a most interesting letter describing the activities which took place during the recent primary election in my State.

The letter describes the formation of a precinct at the Archie C. Grant Park, a senior citizens housing project in Las Vegas. The registration of eligible voters in the Archie C. Grant Park exceeds 90 percent; and on election day, 146 of the 151 registered voters actually went to the polls. This is an outstanding and highly commendable example in the practice of responsible citizenship, and I commend the residents of Archie C. Grant Park on their accomplishment. I submit the letter for printing in the Record:

To Whom It May Concern:

"As always on election days, there are many human-interest stories, but it seems the one to top them all is one to come out of the newly established precinct No. 123 at the housing for the elderly, the Archie C. Grant Park on Bruce Street, Las Vegas, Nev.

"This project was opened last year, 1963, for senior persons of low income. In February of this year, 1964, Mrs. Marie Waffle, a resident of the project, always interested in availing herself and others of the privilege to vote, inquired from the county clerk about having a precinct established at the project for the tenants. She was told that if a 100-percent registration were secured, it might possibly be arranged. All experienced politicians know how much work it takes to get a precinct started, and that it probably would be more difficult because of the ages of the tenants, ranging from 62 to 83. This, however, did not deter the new registrar. Prior to the date of the primary elections, the Archie C. Grant Park had 90 percent of its tenancy registered. Precinct No. 123 was in business, and the social room of the administration building was designated as the voting place.

"Election officers all reside in the park. John Rasmussen, a well-known oldtimer and active in civic and fraternal affairs in Las Vegas for many years, served as guard. John has been active for many years in politics, not for any personal gains, but for what America has done for him—he being an immigrant lad from Denmark many years ago.

"There's nothing new on election day to have car pools—but here it was different. Jim Taylor, an oldtime rodeo rider and a resident of the project, and known to all horse lovers in Clark County, was at the polls at 7 a.m. with his car to offer transportation. Earl Ennis, another resident, also kept busy all day transporting voters. One enterprising politician contributed the use of two wheelchairs to assist the handicapped to get to the voting place. No political signs or placards of any nature were posted on the project.

"Oscar Horton, a Las Vegan since 1932 and a former painter at Mercury, Nev., suffered a stroke in 1963. With the aid of his wife, he walked to the polls from his car, having rejected his cane and wheelchair for this special occasion. Edith Hanson and Vella Morrison both recuperating from serious illnesses, made the effort and voted because their neighbors aided with car and wheelchair transportation.

"It was a thrill to watch Bill Reddaway, who had been unable to speak or walk as a result of a stroke and assuredly unable to vote for quite awhile, being assisted to the polls by one of the Clark County sheriffs.

"A first-time vote was the record for Ellen Ramey, 73 years of age, a resident of the city for many years, and another charmer, Nellie Bagsley, 83 years young who voted for the first time in 30 years. Nellie is a real pioneer, having come to Las Vegas in 1911, and can keep you enthralled with tales of early days, but sharp as can be on current events.

"In the hustle and bustle of our times, most voters are annoyed if they have to wait a few minutes at the polls, not so with the voters of this precinct No. 123. They simply drew out more chairs and kibitz with their friends and neighbors.

"When asked how many of the registrants voted—we were told 146 out of the 151. The registered voters living in the Archie C. Grant Park had voted and then the informant explained that those who had not voted, were out of town.

"In our book, it's 100 percent for the newly established 123d precinct on its 1st election day; and by the way, this was only a primary election. This is their way of reciprocating to those who have shown interest in their behalf."

Salute to Uganda

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 2, 1964

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, October 9, Uganda will celebrate its second anniversary of independence, and on this grand occasion, we wish to extend warm felicitations to His Excellency the Prime Minister of Uganda, A. Milton Obote; and to His Excellency, the Uganda Ambassador to the United States, Solomon B. Asea.

Sir Winston Churchill once wrote about this country:

> Uganda is a fairy tale. You climb up a railway instead of a beanstalk, and at the end there is a wonderful new world. The scenery is different, the vegetation is different, the climate is different, and, most of all, the people are different from anything elsewhere to be seen in the whole range of Africa.

What makes Uganda a fairy tale? First, its scenery is probably unmatched anywhere else in Africa, or perhaps in the world. It is rich in wildlife and natural beauty; among the many species of animals found there are the giraffe, the rare white rhino, the elephant, and the hyena. Uganda is a land of colorful flora, of gently rolling mountains interspersed with valleys, and of open plains. It is a land of rivers, lakes, and falls. Its history is a tale of adventure. In 1862 the English explorer, John Speke, undertook a hazardous journey through Uganda in search of the main source of the Nile and eventually found it in Lake Victoria; Alan Moorehead's "The White Nile" contains a fascinating account of Speke's explorations.

Uganda is a country unique in every way. Its economy is based on agriculture, like that of the rest of Africa, but its people are independent farmers with a larger share in the national economy that most Africans. The people of Uganda dress differently than those elsewhere in Africa. The traditional dress of the women is the "basutu," a Victorian-style dress with standup puff sleeves and skirts billowing to the ground—a fashion introduced by 19th century missionaries. Many of the men wear the traditional Arab khanzu, a sort of ankle length shirt.

Perhaps most interesting of all is Uganda's political system, which is a strange mixture of feudal and modern elements. The government is federal in structure, but one of the federal subdivisions, the kingdom of Buganda, is a powerful political entity which has a system of government, including a king and parliament, dating back four centuries. To mix further the old and the new, when Uganda became a republic on the first anniversary of its independence, the King of Buganda was named head of state, the President of Uganda. Uganda's uniqueness, however, does not extend to economic development. It has not escaped the development problems of other newly independent nations but it is meeting them rationally and competently. The government has carefully assessed development needs, and a development plan running to mid-1966 seeks to achieve an annual increase in GNP of 4 percent. Diversification and expansion of agricultural and livestock production is viewed as a first step in the country's long-term economic growth. Currently the emphasis is on improving the productive capacity of the individual peasant farmers who grow all Uganda's cotton and 98 percent of its coffee, its two chief exports.

In foreign policy, Uganda, as a member of the British Commonwealth, remains politically and economically affiliated with the West. Most of Uganda's trade is with other Commonwealth countries, and nearly all financial aid comes from the West. On the African Continent itself, Uganda is beginning to play an increasingly important role in the continentwide Organization for African Unity and in discussions looking toward an eventual East African federation of Kenya, the Republic of Tanganyika, and Zanzibar, and Uganda.

Our salute to Prime Minister Obote and the people of Uganda on the second anniversary of their independence is a pledge of our deep-felt friendship toward the Ugandans and our continuing interest in their unique and fascinating country.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. M. G. (GENE) SNYDER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 2, 1964

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I include the October 1 issue of my Washington Report for the information of the Members:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman M. G. "GENE" SNYDER, Third District, Kentucky)

OCTOBER 1, 1964.

DEAR FRIEND: As we go to press a few days before the end of the month, I anticipate congressional adjournment momentarily. No doubt this will be accomplished by the time the printer finishes this letter. Louise, Mark, and I have been able to spend most of last month in Louisville. The reapportionment filibuster in the Senate left little for the House to do during September.

The monthly Newsletter will not come as often during adjournment. I expect to have another report about December 15. I will continue the monthly reports when the 89th Congress reconvenes, if, of course, I am still your Congressman.

FOREIGN AID IMPACT

In a foreign aid debate last year, an administration spokesman said that 80 percent of our foreign aid money was spent by the recipient here in the United States. At the time, no one had any information to the contrary. Now, Dr. Lewis E. Lloyd, head of business research for the Dow Chemical Co., has completed a study for a private organization on this subject. In testimony presented to the Senate Committee on Appropriations on July 31, 1964, he states that in fiscal 1963 only $855 million out of a total of $5,170 million foreign aid grants and loans was spent in the United States. The rest was spent overseas for products, foreign labor, and for 3,379 personnel stationed overseas to administer aid. Thus 78 percent of grants and loans were spent outside the United States.

The General Accounting Office, auditors for Congress, has just accused the Commerce Department of improperly spending $7.4 million in taxpayers' money under two programs touted as remedies for unemployment, poverty, and economic lag. These are the so-called Area Redevelopment Act and the Public Works Acceleration Act. GAO said the Commerce Department permitted projects in nondepressed sections, which did not qualify for Federal aid under these laws, to get this aid. The war-on-poverty program and the equally big relief project for the so-called Appalachia area are new ventures wide open for the same type of bureaucratic expansion. Measures taken to help the genuinely needy are not much help to such people if the manna is distributed extravagantly to just about anybody who asks. Yet this is the fate of most Government programs of this nature. Only the most strict policing will save the poverty scheme from a like fate.

Information made public by FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover shows that serious crime in the United States has increased 40 percent in the last 5 years. In the report, Hoover stated "Crime in the United States jumped 19 percent during the first 3 months of this year—more than 2½ times the increase reported a year ago." Most of the increase is in large cities, where we have the greatest concentration of immigrants.

House Committee on Un-American Activities on Oswald: HUAC has released a report placing the responsibility for the assassination of President Kennedy squarely upon Communist "Hate America" campaigns and the tendency of Americans to underrate the Red threat to our freedoms. The report says: "Because hate is so large an element in Communist doctrine and propaganda, it is reasonable to conclude that Oswald's close association with the Communist movement and reading of its propaganda organs markedly influenced his conduct. Oswald was involved in the U.S. Communist agitation-propaganda effort, leading the attempted organization of a Fair Play for Cuba chapter in Dallas—and the Communist propaganda he read portrayed the President as the leader of that Government deemed by the Communists to be their principal enemy. Their (Communists) carefully contrived words are the father of thoughts that impel their adherents and sympathizers to actions that, in one way or another, are all designed to undermine and destroy our way of life. All Americans, I believe, were shocked to learn that our President had been assassinated by a citizen of the United States. Undoubtedly, it did not have to happen. Perhaps it would not have happened, if, during past years, the American people, as a whole, had worked harder to disclose the lies and half-truths in domestic Communist propaganda so that our youth would not be misled by it."

According to Representative RICHARD ROUDEBUSH, Republican, of Indiana, one of the strangest pieces of legislation passed by the House of Representatives recently was a bill to provide free Federal medical care to fishing boat owners. The cost of this "motorboat medicare" program, the Congressman notes, will come to $1,825,200 per year. Does this signal a new tactic by the proponents of medicare? Unable to get Congress to act favorably on a general program, will they try for passage of a series of "special interest" bills to initiate Federal medicare one group at a time? Arguments used by proponents of the "motorboat medicare" bill could be used for many other special interest groups. According to ROUDEBUSH, the major argument used was that fishing boat owners are entitled to free medical service because their occupation is "hazardous." By the same yardstick, miners, athletes, lion tamers—and editorial writers, might qualify.

A 45-CENT DOLLAR

During and since World War II, more than 90 billion inflationary dollars have been poured into our economy. The worth of our dollar has dropped to 45 cents. The Federal debt limit is $324 billion. Federal taxes have been cut, but heavy spending continues. In the last 33 years, the budget has been in the red 27 times. The fiscal deficit for 1963 was $6.2 billion. In fiscal 1964 this had increased to $8.3 billion. New programs recommended to Congress by the administration for fiscal 1965 will add more than $8 billion to the 1965 and future fiscal years' spending.

ART OF BABYSITTING

If you are worried about the mess in Washington, the chaos in Vietnam, the approaching bankruptcy of the United Nations, Communist gains in Africa and the Far East, relax. The Federal Government has other problems more pressing. After dealing with all these countries and problems, the administration has money left over which is spent on such subjects as the art of babysitting. Even though most homemaking magazines and a number of books have been covering such problems for years, the book produced by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare entitled, "A Guide for Babysitters," covers all aspects of the profession. It suggests such solid advice for sitters as this on page 5: "Your main job is to watch the child." But, according to HEW, girl babysitters had better keep an eye on the baby's father as well. "Some men forget," advises Mother HEW, "or almost forget—that sitters are sitters. They try to treat them like girl friends." No doubt it will be a bestseller.

Observe United States Day, October 23: The main purpose of United States Day is to pinpoint and dramatize the imminent danger of losing our freedom to internationalist planners who are determined to destroy the independence of the United States and set up a world government dictatorship. Help establish United States Day as a permanent institution to serve as a continual reminder to all citizens to be on guard against alien ideas of government that threaten the independence and sovereignty of the United States.

The U.S. public debt exceeds that of all the other non-Communist countries of the world. Tabulations by the Library of Congress disclose that at the end of last year the other non-Communist countries had a total debt of $232.6 billion. The U.S. national debt limit is $324 billion. While exact figures are not available from the Communist nations, the United States is believed to have a public debt at least $25 billion higher than all the nations of the world combined.

During the month of September, President Johnson signed the appropriation bill for water research projects throughout the United States. Included was the sum of $20,000 to implement the resolution of the House Public Works Committee which I was able to get adopted, for a study of the eventual flood protection of southwestern Jefferson County.

A recent report by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures reveals that employees are being added to the Federal payroll at the rate of 325 a week. The report shows 7,948 new employees have been added to the Government payroll during the first 6 months of this year; 2,626 during the month of June alone. This January–June increase averages 1,300 new Federal workers a month. Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS, Republican, of Delaware, comments: "Any administration that is still adding 325 new employees per week to the public payroll and which is spending over $125 million per week more than its income certainly must have its tongue in its cheek when it talks about economy." In announcing the economy drive last December, President Johnson promised that "we will have fewer Federal employees next year than this." "Washington Report" readers will recall my sincere "congratulations" to the President on that occasion. What has happened to that pledge? Net increase for the period since L.B.J.'s promise: more than 17,000.

Spreading freedom: The American people should spread freedom every opportunity that presents itself because every day we are losing a little bit more. Ever since World War II, the free world has been losing ground and Communists have been gaining. Fourteen countries and nearly 800 million people have fallen under Communist rule since 1945.

Now a new Soviet volunteer corps: The Soviet Union has begun a Communist volunteer corps as their answer to the U.S. Peace Corps. Disclosure of the new Communist corps came from a Tass (July 11) dispatch from Moscow. The dispatch revealed that "Soviet student volunteers are staying together with Algerians." Their task is to aid Algerians in rehabilitating war-ravaged areas in Algeria. Algerian President Ben Bella, in addressing the Soviet student volunteers, declared, "We returned from your country (the U.S.S.R.) with still greater faith, hope, and resolution to continue our socialist experience. Now that our country has joined battle against the oil and gas companies which are exploiting the people's labor * * * your work is a great support to us." It is interesting to note that Ben Bella was wooed in this country after gaining power in Algeria, but no sweet words of praise have ever fallen from his lips.

Until the next report, I solicit your prayers and advice—that my conduct as your Congressman—will be worthy of the commendation of all good men.

Sincerely,

M. G. "GENE" SNYDER.

Voting Record of Congressman Wayne L. Hays on Major Legislation of the 88th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE L. HAYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 2, 1964

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my voting record on major bills to come before the House of Representatives during the 88th Congress. I have done this every 2 years since I have been in Congress and mailed out copies so that my constituents could have a convenient method of checking my record. As voters in the 18th Congressional District they have the right to know how their Congressman represented them in Washington and how I voted on the major issues. The record follows:

How I voted	Issue	Status
Yes	Health Professions Education Assistance Act authorizes construction grant program for medical and dental schools and student loans.	Enacted.
Yes	Higher Education Facilities Act authorizes program of college construction loans and grants	Enacted.
Yes	Vocational Education act expands vocational education programs	Enacted.
Yes	Clean Air Act to strengthen air pollution control programs	Enacted.
Yes	Extends the Manpower Development and Training Act, increases authorization and broadens program	Enacted.
Yes	Antipoverty program (Economic Opportunity Act of 1964)	Enacted.
Yes	Defense Production Act extension for 2 years	Enacted.
Yes	Extend Civil Defense Act for 4 years	Enacted.
Yes	Civil Rights Act of 1964	Enacted.
Yes	Revenue Act of 1964 to reduce personal and corporate income taxes by $11,500,000,000	Enacted.
Yes	Library Services Act of 1964 extending assistance to urban area libraries in addition to those serving rural areas	Enacted.
Yes	Mass transit bill authorizing loans and grants to States and communities for mass transit facilities and service	Enacted.
Yes	Continue Federal highway construction program for 2 years	Enacted.
Yes	Federal employees salary increase	Enacted.
Yes	Peace Corps expansion	Enacted.
Yes	Food Stamp Act to distribute surplus and other foods to needy	Enacted.
Yes	Social Security benefits increase	Died in conference.
Yes	Extends Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act	Enacted.
Yes	Hill-Burton Act extension of aid for construction and remodeling of hospitals, nursing homes, and medical centers	Enacted.
Yes	Nurses Training Act providing construction grants and student loans	Enacted.
Paired for	Housing and Community Development Act of 1964	Enacted.
Yes	Extends National Defense Education Act and increases college student loan authorization	Enacted.
Yes	Military pay raise	Enacted.
Yes	Amend Veterans Pension Act to liberalize pensions of veterans and families of deceased veterans	
Yes	Provides educational assistance to children of disabled veterans	Enacted.
Yes	Authorizes program of nursing home facilities for veterans	Enacted.
Yes	Extends food-for-peace program	Enacted.
Yes	Arms Control and Disarmament Agency authorization	Enacted.
Yes	Extend programs for sale of surplus milk to Armed Forces and Veterans' hospitals	Enacted.
Yes	Establish $2,000,000,000 land and conservation fund to assist States in developing outdoor recreation programs	Enacted.
Paired for	Establish a national wilderness preservation system	Enacted.

The Story of the 88th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 2, 1964

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, the story of a Congress, as well as being a record of the words and deeds of their chosen representatives, is in large measure a capsule history of the public life of the whole American people. The story of the 88th Congress, I believe, will especially command the attention of future historians and generations due to the troubled and discontented nature of our national life which has been the scene of great tragedy, deep-rooted controversies and impassioned conflicts.

The hairline presidential election in 1960 has proven to be symbolic of the basic differences so much in evidence in the debates in this Congress as to the proper role of Government in the lives of our people. The leadership has been guided by one view: that our problems—social or economic, national or local—can and should be solved through new Federal laws granting more and more power and responsibility to a centralized authority. This approach places the demands of group interests above the preservation of individual freedom and responsibility. Under it, each citizen is reduced to a social or economic statistic, to a fraction of an interest group, a unit of a bloc vote. This determined effort to treat individuals in essentially materialistic terms has aroused widespread dissatisfaction.

For some 3 years Congress refused to approve most of the administration's programs. However, this year many have been cleared one way or another, in one form or another, with administration coercion used again and again to circumvent the independent reasoned deliberation of the Congress, causing many to voice displeasure and shock at the tactics of the majority leadership and the lack of respect shown by the administration for representative government. In this manner, the administration has achieved congressional approval of fundamental changes with respect to spending control, farm legislation, defense policy, and cold war strategy which have left many disturbed over the conduct of their government.

While Congress responded to the deeply felt national concern for the equal participation of our citizens in community facilities and public life, in many quarters there has been a growing awareness and alarm at the apparent loss of civic responsibility, for moderation, and for the rule of law. The Civil Rights Act of 1964, which I supported, I believe can be of service in this regard if enforced with reason, rather than impetuously or in a spirit of vengeance without regard for the consequences.

Likewise, the growing tendency in the decisions of the Supreme Court to assume new powers at will on the assumption that most social ills can be solved by judicial edict has been the source of deep concern to many. I have joined in efforts to check what I felt to be this overreach of judicial authority in order to preserve our system of checks and balances, the Federal character of our government, and the long-established principle of local self-determination with respect to apportionment of State legislatures, and religious observances in public schools.

Without doubt, Mr. Speaker, the story of the 88th Congress will be forever etched in black by the tragedy of November 22, 1963. In such troubled times I believe we may draw reassurance about the strength and durability of our system of government from the orderly functioning of our national life during those grave days, and in the renewed awareness that the preservation of the freedoms we now enjoy is dependent upon our willingness to take the time and trouble to govern ourselves at all levels through the orderly, time-proven procedures of our representative institutions.

One Man—One Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 2, 1964

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, it is an unfortunate fact that at the present time in many fields slogans have taken the place of thought.

Recently, we have heard much of the slogan, "one man—one vote." This slogan is, I believe, intended to reflect American constitutional government; and the implication is that any departure from this alleged principle represents a failure to meet our national ideals.

A moment's reflection demonstrates that the slogan is meaningless. Ever since ratification of the 19th amendment, women have voted. Some States permit minors to vote; other States do not. So far as I know, no States permit prisoners to vote. In addition to these exceptions to the general statement, one may ask "one man, one vote—where?"

Around Metropolitan Washington, for example, there are tens of thousands of military personnel and Government employees who, for reasons satisfactory to them, maintain voting residences and vote in their home States, but are counted by the Census Bureau as part of the population of Virginia or Maryland. College students, too, are now counted as part of the population of their college towns, though before 1940 they were counted as part of the population of their hometowns and States. To allocate votes strictly according to the Census Bureau's population count may, in fact, be very misleading.

These are, however, merely exceptions to the slogan, "one man—one vote." The slogan itself conceals a fundamental misconception of the American system of government. The American system of government is still, I believe, a representative Federal government. We have not yet come to the state of a pure democracy, such as a Greek city state or a New England town meeting, where, I understand every issue is decided by the votes of all the citizens. We have a far more subtle and far more effective form of government than those.

I discussed these issues at some length in a speech I delivered in Charlottesville, Va., on August 30, 1960. I pointed out that the various elements of the U.S. Government represent different constituencies selected out of the total population. Under the electoral college system, the President is normally chosen from a large State; and the entire executive branch, therefore, typically represents especially the big States. Members of the House of Representatives, coming from particular districts, represent those districts, whether urban, suburban, rural, agricultural, or industrial. Senators are selected by their entire States, large or small, and, therefore, give especial representation both to the small States and to the urban populations of all States. When the U.S. Supreme Court enters the legislative field, as it did in its "one man—one vote" decree, it is not easy to describe what constituency the Supreme Court represents—nominated, as its members are, by the President, and confirmed by the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent that an excerpt from my 1960 speech be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the speech was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

One Man—One Vote

Even though the population of the United States in 1787, at the time of the Constitutional Convention, was no greater than that of Virginia today, both being approximately 3,800,000, the framers of the Constitution thought it wise to preserve a division of the Nation into 13 States of varying area and population. Nearly 4 million people could best be governed under a decentralized Federal system, instead of a single centralized authority.

A single unified government for the entire United States would not have given proper scope to the wide differences among the people and their State governments and would have been all too likely to have resulted in oppressive dictatorship. Madison in No. 10 of the Federalist, from which I have quoted, pointed to two elements of the Federal Government which would minimize the undesirable effects of "factions." These two elements were first, the Federal nature of the government, with a limited Federal Government and many powers reserved to the States and the people, and second, the representative nature of the Federal Government itself.

The representative nature of the Federal Government finally agreed upon gave additional protection to the variety of interests within the Nation.

In the Congress, Senators, being chosen by States, were to be primarily responsive to their States. Until the adoption of the 17th amendment in 1913, they were actually chosen by the legislatures of the States, and, therefore, represented the people of those States only indirectly. Representatives were to be chosen from the districts within States and to speak for the interests of their particular districts.

The President was to be elected by the electoral college under a system, which, as it has developed, gives particular importance to the large States. A candidate who carries New York by one vote receives a huge block of electoral votes which outweigh overwhelming losses in a number of smaller States. This system, and the developments which have occurred in party machinery in the national political conventions, have given the large States a particularly strong voice in the selection of the President.

Thus, we see that representative government in the United States is the product of forces and influences which, while they do not necessarily always conflict, do arise from basically different systems of representation.

Of course, all these representatives should cooperate and work together, and under our two-party system, they do so in the vast majority of matters. But not in all matters. When the interests of a particular State represented by a Senator, or the interests of a particular district represented by a Member of the House, do not coincide with the views of the President or the majority of the Senators or the Representative's party, then the Senator or the Representative must carry out his responsibility to represent the interests of his State or district, in contrast to the other views presented. It is to his own system of representation that he owes his allegiance when these conflicts occur.

In this way the manifold interests of the country, or "factions," are reasonably assured of an opportunity for a hearing for their point of view, an opportunity to make their views known, before legislation is enacted.

To summarize, constitutional government in the United States was framed so as to provide an effective government and at the same time to prevent this effective government from becoming so overwhelming, so oppressive, that the liberty of the individual, and his initiative and enterprise, would be obliterated. These devices include the separation of the powers of the Federal Government into the three great departments, the division of governmental powers between the Federal Government and the several State governments, and the reservation of powers to the States and to the people. These devices, which are basic to our constitutional government, pose many problems, problems which may appear to be completely insoluble in theory. But the framers of the Constitution, as my quotation from James Madison shows, rose above the theories of political science and organization charts. Instead, they concerned themselves with human nature, with all its potentialities of good and evil. And the successful result of their efforts is a tribute to their wisdom and foresight.

The Honorable Harold C. Ostertag, of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 2, 1964

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, one of the most dedicated men I have ever known is retiring from public life at the close of this Congress; and as a friend and fellow New Yorker, I would like to say a few words of tribute to this gentleman who has given so generously of his life. The Honorable Harold C. Ostertag of the 37th District of New York has served the public for 33 years. He started his political career in 1932 when as a young man he was elected to the New York State Legislature where he performed his duties with distinction until 1951. On November 7, 1950, he was elected to the 82d Congress, and the fact that he has been reelected to each succeeding Congress is indicative of the admiration and respect in which he is held by his constituents.

For many years Harold and I served together on the House Committee on Appropriations and even though we are on opposite sides of the political fence, I have respected his judgment on matters which came before the committee.

I shall certainly miss him and do hope that he and his lovely wife, Grace, will have many, many years of good health and happiness.

Cameron Voting Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RONALD BROOKS CAMERON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 2, 1964

Mr. CAMERON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following report to my constituents:

ROLLCALL NO. 193, SOCIAL SECURITY, MEDICARE, FRUSTRATION AND FAILURE

On Rollcall No. 193 the greatest display of hypocrisy that I have witnessed in the Congress was demonstrated. This measure was a well-conceived piece of legislation, designed to provide the first across-the-board increase in social security benefits in over 6 years. The measure would have provided a 5-percent increase in benefits to some 20 million recipients of social security, as well as making an additional 600,000 individuals eligible for benefits. It also provided a decrease in the age for retired widows from 62 to 60 and allowed for children attending schools and colleges on a full-time basis to continue to receive benefits until the age of 21 rather than the present cutoff of 18.

I say that the measure was well conceived in that the House provided adequate financing for these needed increased benefits by raising the base upon which taxes are paid from $4,800 to $5,400, as well as making a modest increase in the rate to be paid by both employers and employees. I had hoped that the House bill would have also provided a medicare program similar to that advocated by Senator Abraham Ribicoff, former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. Senator Ribicoff's proposal was of a purely voluntary nature. It provided that persons eligible for social security benefits would have had an option to elect either to receive the basic 5-percent increase in benefits or a medicare program. The House did not adopt such an amendment; however, it passed this measure by the overwhelming vote of 388 to 8. Numbered among those 388 favorable votes were many persons who were voting for social security for the very first time and who did so, in my view, in bad faith for they did not have the slightest intention of sustaining that position when the bill was returned from the Senate for Senate-House conference.

When the Senate amendments were tacked on the defeat of the measure was guaranteed. Instead of adopting the Ribicoff approach to medicare, which was both voluntary and actuarially sound, the Senate added the Gore amendment, which provided, in effect, the complete King-Anderson approach to medicare and increased the across-the-board benefits of 5 percent provided in the House version to 7 percent. They did this without providing any additional funding and, therefore, threw the entire social security system actuarially out of balance. The funds paid out as a result of the Senate amendments would have been substantially more than the income to the fund. The argument was advanced that the Senate did this solely for bargaining purposes with the intent of retreating to the Ribicoff concept in Senate-House conference. I am of the opinion that this was not done in good faith, for the rules of the House are such that conference committees may not submit totally new material back to the House from the conference. They can only submit material that was included in the original House or Senate bill. As there was no voluntary approach in either of the bills as passed by the respective bodies, the conference was precluded from this compromise.

Thus it was not possible for the conferees to return a bill that included medicare and was actuarilly sound. Six of the conferees were for eliminating medicare and passing the social security provisions, the other six felt that if this were done that medicare would be set back another 10 years. This total impasse resulted in the bill dying in the Senate-House conference.

As a result, the 88th Congress has failed the senior citizens by providing neither the needed increases and adjustments in social security nor a medicare plan. I believe this was a deliberately calculated plot and certainly the lopsided vote in the House substantiates my view. It is absolutely incredible that the Congress enacted H.R. 3873 providing medical benefits for fishing boat entrepreneurs, as discussed under Rollcall 190, and failed the senior citizens.

MEDICARE—APPALACHIA

Though in the main the 88th Congress has been an exceptionally constructive one as evidenced by the enactment of legislation in the areas of civil rights, education, recreation, tax relief, poverty, and so forth, it is my view that this Congress has failed miserably in two vital areas.

As discussed above, my feelings are very strong with respect to the necessity of providing immediate amendment to the Social Security Act, such as the provisions originally passed by the House in H.R. 11865 and inclusion of the Ribicoff approach of a voluntary medicare plan for social security recipients.

The second area of failure is one involving the establishment of economic viability to the major depressed area of this country—Appalachia. The Appalachian legislation was passed by the Senate, was approved by the House committee, and a rule was granted by the Rules Committee 45 days prior to adjournment. The measure never came up on the floor because there were not enough votes on the House side to enact the legislation. The reasons are many and varied, but foremost among them must be the obstinance of northern liberals from both parties who took the position that they would support Appalachian legislation only after the southerners agreed to support medicare legislation. The irony of this is that the northern liberals acted exactly as the reactionary Republican Thaddeus Stevens did during the reconstruction period following the Civil War. They attempted to beat the southerners into submission, completely ignoring the long-range interests of the country as a whole.

At this point, I want to go on record urging the President to call a special session of the Congress to begin on Monday, November 16, for the purpose of enacting a Social Security and Medicare Act of 1964 and the Appalachian legislation. I hope that this view will be shared by many of my constituents and that you will so advise the President by writing the President of the United States, the White House, 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, Washington, D.C.

Following is my rollcall report:

Rollcall No.	Date	H.R. No.	R.B.C.	Vote		Not voting	Brief description
				Yea	Nay		
175	July 1		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Springer, Republican, of Illinois. (39 Members absent.)
176	July 1	11812	Nay	198	208	25	Motion to recommit foreign assistance appropriation bill for cuts.
177	July 1	11812	Yea	231	174	26	On passage of foreign assistance appropriation bill (for position on foreign aid see rollcall Nos. 152-3, 4th report, 2d sess).
178	July 2		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Williams, Democrat, of Mississippi. (27 Members absent.)
179	July 2	789	Yea	289	126	15	On House acceptance of Senate amendments to H.R. 7152, Civil Rights Act of 1964 (1 Member answered "present," for position on civil rights see rollcall No. 32, 1st report, 2d sess.).
180	July 2		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Gross, Republican, of Iowa. (57 Members absent.)
181	July 2	795	Yea	264	92	76	On appointment of Special House Committee to Investigate Campaign expenditures.
182	July 2	S. 2	Yea	347	0	85	On acceptance of conference report on water resources research act.
183	July 21		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Hall, Republican, of Missouri. (92 Members absent.)

Rollcall No.	Date	H.R. No.	R.B.C.	vote		Not voting	Brief description
				Yea	Nay		
184	July 21	319	Yea	325	19	88	On passage of bill to protect postal patrons from obscene mail matter and Communist propaganda.
185	July 21	11611	Yea	259	75	98	On passage of bill establishing a National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress.
186	July 22		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Haley, Democrat, of Florida. (74 Members absent.)
187	July 22	738	Yea	337	8	86	Resolution to permit consideration of H.R. 3846, land and water conservation fund.
188	July 23		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Springer, Republican, of Illinois. (64 Members absent.)
189	July 28		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Gross, Republican, of Iowa. (63 Members absent.)
190	July 28	3873	Nay	202	170	59	On passage of bill to permit certain owners of fishing boats to receive free medical care and hospitalization at Public Health Service hospitals.
191	July 29		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Martin, Republican, of California. (44 Members absent.)
192	July 29	802	Not voting.	350	29	52	Resolution to permit consideration of H.R. 11865, Social Security Amendments of 1964 (R.B.C. adjusting auto accident claim with insurance man; would have voted yea).
193	July 29	11865	Yea	388	8	35	On passage of Social Security Amendments of 1964.
194	July 30		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Gross, Republican, of Iowa. (47 Members absent.)
195	July 30	803	Yea	244	131	56	Resolution to permit consideration of the Federal pay bill by conference committee.
196	July 30		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Schwengel, Republican, of Iowa. (75 Members absent.)
197	July 30	9070	Yea	373	1	57	On passage of bill establishing a National Wilderness Preservation System.
198	Aug. 3	1096	Paired yea	164	154	113	Authorizing Ice Age National Scientific Reserve in Wisconsin (⅔ vote needed for passage; measure failed; R.B.C. attending Senator Engle's funeral in California).
199	Aug. 3	3672	Not voting.	250	67	114	Providing for construction, operation, and maintenance of certain reclamation projects under Colorado River Storage Project Act. (R.B.C. attending Senator Engle's funeral; would have voted yea.)
200	Aug. 4	10939	Yea	351	0	80	Acceptance of conference report on Defense Department appropriations.
201	Aug. 4	10939	Nay	186	178	67	Amendment to Defense appropriations permitting cutback in repair work done by U.S. Navy shipyards.
202	Aug. 4		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Morrison, Democrat, of Louisiana. (66 Members absent.)
203	Aug. 4		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Gross, Republican, of Iowa. (71 Members absent.)
204	Aug. 4		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Roosevelt, Democrat, of California. (44 Members absent.)
205	Aug. 5		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Teague, Republican, of California. (51 Members absent.)
206	Aug. 6		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Roosevelt, Democrat, of California. (42 Members absent.)
207	Aug. 6		Absent				Quorum call by Mr. Beermann, Republican, of Nebraska. (45 Members absent; R.B.C. at meeting with Secretary Rusk and Secretary McNamara re Vietnam crisis.)
208	Aug. 6		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Ayres, Republican of Ohio. (48 Members absent.)
209	Aug. 7		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Arends, Republican of Illinois. (48 Members absent.)
210	Aug. 7	1145	Yea	416	0	14	Adoption of resolution supporting President Johnson in his efforts to promote the maintenance of international peace and security in southeast Asia. (1 Member answered present.)
211	Aug. 7		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Johansen, Republican of Michigan. (32 Members absent.)
212	Aug. 7	11377	Nay	197	225	9	Parliamentary maneuver by Judge Smith of Virginia to kill the antipoverty bill.
213	Aug. 7	11377	Yea	228	190	13	Motion to substitute Senate approved antipoverty bill for House version.
214	Aug. 8		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Gross, Republican, of Iowa. (23 Members absent.)
215	Aug. 8	11377	Nay	117	295	19	Motion to recommit Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.
216	Aug. 8	11377	Yea	226	184	21	On passage of Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.
217	Aug. 11	1927	Yea	388	0	42	On passage of pension bill for veterans of World Wars I and II and Korea.
218	Aug. 11	5990	Nay	301	81	48	Amending District of Columbia Charitable Solicitation Act.
219	Aug. 12	S. 1451	Yea	374	3	53	Amending the Trading With the Enemy Act.
220	Aug. 12	S. 1627	Yea	368	89	74	U.S. support of International Control Commission in Laos.
221-234	Aug. 13–17		Absent				During this period R.B.C. was in California attending to District matters. He was also a delegate to the Democratic State Convention. There were 6 quorum calls and 8 rollcalls.
235	Aug. 18		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Goodell, Republican, of New York. (55 Members absent.)
236	Aug. 18	1839	Nay	232	149	49	Adoption of conference report on meat import quotas.
237	Aug. 18	8864	Yea	183	194	53	Adoption of conference report authorizing the President to carry out U.S. obligations under the International Coffee Agreement Act.
238	Aug. 18	8000	Yea	221	147	62	Adoption of conference report on Interest Equalization Tax Act to aid U.S. balance-of-payments position.
239	Aug. 18	S. 1007	Yea	230	134	66	Adoption of conference report on bill guaranteeing electricity in Pacific Northwest on preference basis.
240	Aug. 19	S. 3049	Yea	310	70	50	Adoption of conference report on Housing Act of 1964 (H.R. 12175).
241	Aug. 19	845	Nay	242	148	40	Resolution to permit consideration of H.R. 11926 to deny jurisdiction to Federal courts in reapportionment cases.
242	Aug. 19	11926	Nay	218	175	36	On passage of bill to deny jurisdiction of Federal courts in reapportionment cases. (1 Member answered present.)
243	Aug. 20		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Ashbrook, Republican, of Ohio. (58 Members absent.)
244	Aug. 20		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Bow, Republican, of Ohio. (84 Members absent.)
245	Aug. 20	9586	Yea	213	135	82	On passage of bill to establish a National Council on the Arts.
246	Sept. 1		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Haley, Democrat, of Florida. (89 Members absent.)
247	Sept. 1	S. 2701	Not voting.	320	23	87	Providing for study to determine site for construction of a canal connecting Atlantic and Pacific Oceans (R.B.C. at going-away lunch for summer office intern from Stanford University: would have voted yea.)
248	Sept. 1	4487	Yea	236	110	84	Bill to minimize injury to fish and wildlife from insecticides and pesticides.
249	Sept. 2		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Gross, Republican, of Iowa. (63 Members absent.)
250	Sept. 2		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Arends, Republican, of Illinois. (65 Members absent.)
251	Sept. 3		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Devine, Republican, of Ohio. (81 Members absent.)
252	Sept. 3	12298	Nay	183	175	71	Motion to recommit for amendment a bill extending Public Law 480, food-for-peace program. (1 Member answered present.)
253	Sept. 3	12298	Yea	349	6	73	On passage of bill extending Public Law 480, food-for-peace program. (2 Members answered present.)
254	Sept. 3		Absent				Quorum call by Mr. Quie, Republican, of Minnesota. (104 Members absent; R.B.C. en route to California).
255	Sept. 3		Absent				Quorum call by Mr. Harris, Democrat, of Arkansas. (108 Members absent R.B.C. en route to California).
256	Sept. 3	S. 2220	Not voting.	140	160	130	On passage of bill to encourage physicians and dentists who received student loans under Federal programs to practice in areas having physician and dentist shortages. (R.B.C. en route to California; would have voted yea.)
257	Sept. 14		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Gross, Republican, of Iowa. (264 Members absent; House adjourned for lack of a quorum.)
258	Sept. 22		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Younger, Republican, of California. (139 Members absent.)
259	Sept. 22		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Hall, Republican, of Missouri. (132 Members absent.)
260	Sept. 22	12633	Yea	208	103	128	On passage of bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending July 30, 1965.
261	Sept. 23		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Pelly, Republican, of Washington. (130 Members absent.)
262	Sept. 23	1096	Yea	180	118	132	On passage of bill authorizing the Secretary of Interior to cooperate with the State of Wisconsin in designation and administration of Ice Age National Scientific Reserve.
263	Sept. 30		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Saylor, Republican, of Pennsylvania. (111 Members absent.)
264	Oct. 1		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Hall, Republican, of Missouri. (97 Members absent.)
265	Oct. 1	H.J. Res. 1183	Yea	159	193	79	On passage of resolution making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 1965.
266	Oct. 1		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Gross, Republican, of Iowa. (89 Members absent.)
267	Oct. 1		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Griffin, Republican, of Michigan. (83 Members absent.)
268	Oct. 1	S. 3060	Nay	268	236	87	Motion to recommit for amendment bill providing for extension and amendments of National Defense Education Act of 1958 and Public Laws 815 and 874.
269	Oct. 1	S. 3060	Yea	320	20	88	On final passage of National Defense Education Act with conference committee amendments. (2 Members answered present.)
270	Oct. 2		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Roosevelt, Democrat, of California (89 Members absent).
271	Oct. 2		Present				Quorum call by Mr. Bow, Republican, of Ohio (114 Members absent).
272	Oct. 3	12633	Yea	211	78	151	On final passage of supplemental appropriations bill for fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, with conference committee amendments.

Czechoslovakian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 2, 1964

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, it is with mixed feelings that we commemorate the 20th anniversary of the national uprising in Czechoslovakia in 1944. The exhilaration of pride and admiration for the brave souls who revolted against their oppressors from both east and west is tempered with sadness as we consider the suppression of that free spirit which is the mark of the Czechoslovakian people no matter who their rulers may be. It is a sobering thought to contemplate the crushing of right by might, the struggle of principle against power.

Czechoslovakia in 1944 was caught between the crushing force of the Nazis, who had overrun their country since 1939, and the more powerful Red Army of the Soviet Union, which reached the Czechoslovakian frontier in 1944. At the moment when true liberation seemed at hand, the people, encouraged by the Government-in-exile about to return from London, rose against the puppet government and drove the Russians back from the Slovak-Polish frontiers, only to be suppressed again by the Germans before their final ousting by the Russians.

Despite the crushing blows that caused all resistance to cease, the noble effort of the Czechoslovak nationalists was not, indeed, in vain. Not only did it show once more that the independent spirit of Czechoslovakia was ever active; it also won for the National Committee, which had led the resistance, the recognition by the incoming leaders of its right to take over the government. The National Committees which were recognized at this time were to remain the effective basis of government until the 1948 Communist takeover.

The spirit of independence in Czechoslovakia has remained indomitable throughout all regimes. When it emerged triumphant after World War I, and the new nation took its place on the international scene, the world was to hail in Czechoslovakia one of the outstanding examples of true democracy in history.

Through all the years of its independence, between World Wars I and II, Czechoslovakia was recognized as the exemplification of true democracy. In the constitution of the new state, born in 1918, provision was made for liberty of the individual, freedom of the press, freedom of association, and freedom of assembly. And these were not mere paper freedoms. They were put into practice.

The Czech soul, as that remarkable founder of his country, Thomas Masaryk, saw it, was indelibly marked with an independence of spirit and originality of thought which became characteristic of that doughty little country.

Today we celebrate the anniversaries of those two great occasions: First, the birth of the new nation, 46 years ago, when after World War I it originated through that truly democratic process, the self-determination of people; and second, the manifestation of that same vigor of soul and bravery of heart that sought to regain and maintain freedom in 1944.

Nor have the people ever really lost that aura of freedom in Czechoslovakia, in spite of all the superimposed governments which have sought to destroy it. Though they languish politically behind the Iron Curtain these many years, the Western World has ever had a sense of the temporariness of this indignity thrust upon an unwilling people. Our admiration and our sympathy is ever with those who struggle for liberty as Czechoslovakia has struggled. It applauds the manifestation of an inextinguishable freedom of mind and spirit.

The Military Man Is Our Best Investment in the Cause of Peace: Address by Hon. Charles S. Gubser

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 2, 1964

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, we have lately been witnessing a concerted campaign designed for discrediting our military leaders and our entire Military Establishment in the conduct of our cold war policies and strategy.

On the highest levels, military decisions are being made by civilians without any regard whatever for the judgment of our chosen military strategists. Choices of weaponry for the future security of our country are being made with no consideration given to the recommendations of those who are most experienced and best informed in that field, the military man.

An excellent, well-documented address on this subject was given by our colleague, Hon. CHARLES S. GUBSER, to the members of the Fleet Reserve Association in their meeting on September 23 at Indianapolis, Ind. Entitled "The Military Man Is Our Best Investment in the Cause of Peace," Representative GUBSER's speech is included with my remarks at this point in the RECORD, under unanimous consent:

SPEECH OF THE HONORABLE CHARLES S. GUBSER, TO THE FLEET RESERVE ASSOCIATION, SEPTEMBER 23, 1964, INDIANAPOLIS, IND.

In addition to being the hub of the free world, Washington, D.C., is a vast city of organizations, associations, lobbyists, dedicated public servants, loyal employees, elected officials and appointed officials.

I measure my words carefully when I say that in Washington, among all who are privileged to know its operations, the Fleet Reserve Association enjoys a reputation that sets it apart from all other organizations.

It is made up of patriotic, loyal, dedicated men who have served their country and who continue to serve it.

It never seeks self-aggrandizement; it never asks for the impossible; it always is in the forefront of legislative proposals that truly benefit the armed services. Its leaders are invariably reasonable, intelligent men, who ask only for that to which they believe they are entitled. The Fleet Reserve Association never threatens nor pressures. It presents the truth and is always ready to substantiate its statements and stand behind them.

Though I shouldn't single out names when there are so many which could be mentioned, let me say that my frequent contacts with your Bob Means and Bob Nolan have had much to do with my strong and friendly feelings toward all of you.

So, because I respect your association, I am sincerely honored that I have been asked to make this address.

Tonight I have chosen the subject of the military man. I suppose a proper title for my speech could be "The Military Man Is Our Best Investment in the Cause of Peace." I shall present some views which are strongly held and have been previously expressed.

The American people have not forgotten Bunker Hill, Appomattox, Chateau-Thierry, Guadalcanal, and Panmunjon. Though memories have dimmed with time, the hearts of our people still hold a quiet pride in the achievements of our military men. Today in South Vietnam the bravery of our fighting men is vivid once again in the minds and hearts of every American. Two years ago, it was clear beyond dispute that the ultimate factor which brought this country through the Cuban crisis with its safety and honor intact was not negotiation. It was the realistic fact that this Nation's military power was too great, too dedicated, and too skillful for the Soviets to challenge it.

But during periods of relative calm and the absence of crisis, we hear the voices of a few who would discredit the military man.

Often our professional fighting men are represented as witless opponents to civilian intellectuals in their pursuit of wise negotiations which lead to peace. Often the military man is represented as a trigger-happy fool and a dangerous rightwinger. In these times between crises, we see efforts to discredit the military mind and military thinking.

What is the purpose of these efforts?

The attackers say they fear military domination of our country. They point to the great size and power of our Military Establishment and recent examples of military takeovers in other countries.

But these takeovers are not at all analogous to our own situation.

Historically and down to the present, there has been complete civilian control of our Military Establishment. This is as it should be. The heads of the Department of Defense are appointed civilians. The power of the purse, an absolute prerequisite for domination of military power, is in the hands of a civilian Congress. Our form of government provides these and other effective checks and balances to prevent military domination.

Rather than an imbalance favoring the military over the civilian, we actually have the reverse. Within the Department of Defense, the Secretary has increased the size and power of the Secretary's office. At the time Secretary McNamara took office, there were less than 2,000 employees in the Office of the Secretary of Defense. As of the first of this year, there were over 34,000 employees responsible to the Secretary's office.

Today, civilian decisionmaking dominates military expertise more than ever before. Without attempting to pass judgment upon them, my point is served by merely mentioning the decisions not to build a nuclear powered aircraft carrier; to phase out manned bombers; and to build the TFX. These were major civilian decisions taken in opposition to preponderant military advice.

In addition to weapons selection, there are other examples of increased centralization and power in the Secretary's office. By controlling intelligence and public information, the Secretary can control information going out to the military, up to the President, to Congress, and to the people. As a member of the Armed Services Committee, I have seen material bearing a top secret label in a closed session on one day and seen the identical material a few days later on national television. I have seen the highly secret A-11 announced as two different aircraft capable of performing two separate missions and I have heard the announcement of a secret system which is now claimed as a satellite killer. None of these announcements of previously classified information was made to serve a military purpose.

One of the prime safeguards in our system of checks and balances is the legislative appropriations process. Here again during the course of recent hearings, it became apparent that military views are not receiving proper consideration. During the hearings, decisions were being made that were opposed by the military in their testimony. Normally, much of this would have become public knowledge when the hearings were published. But the power of the executive civilians was exercised, and in the name of military security they cut out large portions of testimony by the military which would have indicated these disagreements. Thus, military judgment was hidden.

Thus, civilian power can disregard military advice and expertise. At the same time, the channels of information can be manipulated to foreclose the final avenue of appeal to the true sovereigns, the American people. Far from being domination by the military, this is an imbalance of civilian power.

Another favorite whipping boy of the antimilitary people is the so-called military-industrial complex. Our people are led to believe there is some sort of unified conspiracy between these two groups for the purpose of making money and gaining power.

Within the defense industry, particularly in recent years, competition has been so great that participation in a conspiracy is impossible. With the advent of large weapon system programs, the number of contracts are significantly fewer, and, as a result, the competition is keener. Then, too, the leaders within the defense industry are not unified politically. There are Democrats, Republicans, independents, and whatever else you may find in the cross section of American industrial life. As a result, any of the industrial associations related to defense generally assume a timid political posture.

The military is in a similar situation. Within the Military Establishment there are individuals of both political parties. They cannot offend the party in power, because it is in power, nor can they offend the party out of power, because it may come to power by the next election. The military, therefore, walks a political tightrope.

The net result is that all these factors tend to diffuse and dilute the possible power of the so-called military-industrial complex.

Many civilians state their aim as some form of disarmament and believe that accommodation of the Communists to some degree can produce a proper climate for such cooperation. Military judgment does not support this view except in cases where the absence of risk is certain. Military judgment in disarmament negotiations has, therefore, been kept to an absolute minimum. This is frightening and serious, in my opinion, since it plays into the announced Communist strategy to undermine and weaken the military establishments of all capitalist countries, particularly the United States.

It is the military man who must overcome the damning and insidious propaganda in films like "Dr. Strangelove" and "Seven Days in May" and present the logic which rebuts and resists such civilian opinions.

The military man believes our country should have a Military Establishment second to none in order to remain free and insure peace. But civilian antimilitarists have taken the position that parity with the Soviet Union will better insure the peace. This area of serious disagreement is one in which military opinion has either been ignored or downgraded. I agree with the military man.

The military man believes that in war, whether it be a small or big war, the end objective for this country can be only victory, and the suppression of an enemy's ability for further aggression. This again is an area of conflict with civilian antimilitarists who believe that victory over any form of Communist aggression would either create a dangerous imbalance in the world power structure or could stimulate an escalation to a nuclear war. The military believes that when any enemy says he will bury you and all his actions and all his words are dedicated to your destruction, you have every right and obligation to protect your people. The military man believes as George Washington did: "To be prepared for war is one of the most effectual means of preserving peace."

Further, he believes the use of force at the right time and at the right place will reduce the risk of war.

Gen. Curtis LeMay summed up the military position during this year's Defense appropriations hearings when he said: "If we can prevent a war from happening we will have succeeded in our mission. If the war happens, I think we have failed."

Unfortunately, there is too little said about the personal qualities of the men who hold these views. Far from being the crazed characters depicted in movies and best-selling novels, they are typical Americans.

The military man is a typical American who attended American schools and loves his home and family. He is one who thoroughly accepts and understands the requirement for civilian control of the military in our form of government. At West Point, the Naval and Air Force Academies, this basic premise is drilled into future officers. The same is done for enlisted men. In view of this and their understanding that many civilians fear military domination, they generally bend over backward to avoid any effort to dilute traditional civilian control of the military.

There are spiritual qualities in the military man that influence his thinking and his decisions. He respects life more than most, having lived close to death. His moral values are outwardly expressed in both love of God and love of country. He knows honor in his uniform and in his actions. He is a man in which this Nation can take pride. He needs our confidence and support. The military man is our best investment in the cause of peace.

The time has come when it is urgent that we take positive steps to protect this important investment. For too long we have downgraded military knowledge and experience. For too long we have whittled away at the personal security of the military man.

It is interesting that in recent years the caliber of military personnel has gone up dramatically, and yet at the same time the relative pay of the military as compared to civilian pay has gone down. Why this seeming inconsistency? There are two answers for it. One is sheer patriotism and love of service to country on the part of the military man. The second, and much the least important, are the fringe benefits of a military career. Yet, one by one, on a regular basis, these fringe benefits are disappearing. The commissary privilege is under attack this very minute. Some traditional price advantages to military personnel are now prevented by regulation. We have seen recomputation drastically curtailed as a traditional part of retired pay. We see retired pay represented as a serious financial drain on the future. Current administration policy is that hospital beds for retirees are being eliminated because they are not included in our present building program. One by one fringe benefits are going by the boards.

At this point I should like to pay particular tribute to the Fleet Reserve Association for the part it has played and is playing in maintaining the traditional medical care for retirees which dates as far back in our history as the year 1798. Though lawyers may quibble and disagree on the question, I as a lawmaker am firmly convinced that medical care for retirees was a legal, as well as a moral, right until the year 1956 when the Dependent's Medical Care Act was written.

Many of you remember the old Naval Hospital Fund to which you contributed. Though 20 cents a month wasn't much, it should be remembered that over a 30-year career of service, a Navy man would contribute $72 toward hospital construction. In my own community, we have just finished a new, ultramodern hospital for which we contributed only $33 per capita in local funds. Thus, those who served under the old law have more than bought the hospital facilities in which they receive care. This legal right still exists irrespective of the 1956 law. But even if we admitted medical care for retirees is not a legal right today, there certainly is no question that it is a moral right.

This is why I became so alarmed when this year's military construction bill did not contain provisions for retiree beds. In the case of the Oakland Naval Hospital, beds bought and paid for by retirees' contributions were to be destroyed and not replaced. I like to think that the strong protest I made during debate on the House floor on March 18 had something to do with the decision of the Defense Department to take another look at the question. Certainly the commonsense proposal by the Fleet Reserve Association, which I was honored to introduce had a tremendous influence on the Department and the forthcoming recommendations of the Rivers' subcommittee on military hospitalization.

I have seen the galley proofs of the Rivers subcommittee report which has not yet been released. I would violate a confidence if I told you of its recommendations, but I will say that the recommendations of the Rivers subcommittee will please you in that they constitute a tremendous step forward from the situation which existed on March 18 as the House, against our opposition, accepted the administration view that new military hospitals should not contain provision for retired beds.

I predict that as a result of the combined efforts of the Rivers subcommittee, your association, other retired groups, and your friends in Congress, there will be a definite percentage of constructed bed capacity for retirees. This makes nothing but sense, since it will provide a cushion to take care of the medical needs of a national emergency which can be operated in peacetime to an efficient capacity level by caring for retirees. If the Fleet Reserve Association had never won another battle in its history, its existence would have been amply justified by the results of the Rivers subcommittee hearings.

Along with the erosion of fringe benefits we see what appears to be a deliberate downgrading of the military man by a very strong array of forces in this country.

The trend raises a simple and basic question: How long can patriotism alone keep our service people from seeking the superior earnings, the convenience, and the social status that is available to their civilian contemporaries outside the service?

The needs of the service of the future are going to be even more exacting as we go further and further into the electronic age. The caliber of the people we will need must go higher and higher, and I wonder how long we can expect patriotism alone to produce the kind of man that the defense of this country requires?

I sincerely believe that this is a crisis that we have to face up to as a people. Something must be done to stop the conspiracy to downgrade the military man. He must be listened to and respected at all times instead of only when there is fighting and dying to do.

History has shown that armies without morale can be defeated easily and, in fact, can defeat themselves. One of the most frightening aspects of the present antimilitary atmosphere is the effect upon the morale of our servicemen. Too many good men are leaving and in this climate not enough good men are joining.

Antimilitary expression not only has an effect upon the military but upon our civilians as well. It tends to develop false views of the world in our citizens. It identifies our military strength with war instead of deterrence to war. It views compromise, accommodations, and appeasement as acts of peace because they are not violent acts in themselves. Reality becomes blurred as if influenced by a narcotic and further retreat from reality becomes easy as the real world becomes more dangerous.

In the words of President John F. Kennedy: "Regardless of how persistent our diplomacy may be in activities stretching all around the globe, in the final analysis it (all) rests upon the power of the United States."

In this world where there is a known aggressor threatening our very existence, it is an absolute necessity that we maintain a strong Military Establishment. Some of that strength is in missiles, some in aircraft, some in ships, but most of it is in men who need our support and deserve it. Smears, innuendos, and ignorant downgrading of our military can undermine the Military Establishment. In so doing, it could ultimately destroy this Nation.

The time has come when we must proudly speak of our strength and stop apologizing for it. Our military people deserve our applause and not the scorn of those who advocate "Peace at any price" and "Better Red than dead." The military man is our best investment in the cause of peace.

Democracy and Our Newspapers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT P. GRIFFIN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, October 2, 1964

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, most Americans during the week October 11–17 will reach for their newspapers not knowing or little caring that it happens to be National Newspaper Week.

Newspapermen themselves, already numb from the barrage of overlapping, conflicting, and sometimes ridiculous national weekly observances, will pause only briefly in their labor to pay tribute to their chosen field.

It is a busy world but this kind of observance is not appropriate to the occasion. Further comment is in order.

Newspapers are a vital part of our national life. At the same time, they are both the pulse of the community and the trusted purveyor of truth to the community.

Because it holds a position of intimacy and trust, the newspaper bears a fantastic burden of responsibility—the kind of responsibility that we in public office can fully understand.

Let us consider for a moment the problems of an editor who is confronted daily with a flow of significant news, most of which he cannot possibly fit into the columns of his publication. Every day he sits in Solomon's chair deciding what his readers will see in the next edition, discarding that which he considers least important. It is a perpetual moment of decision. It is no job for the fainthearted.

Certainly it is not a job for the misguided or the incompetent. For every time that only one side of an issue is reported, every time a reporter injects personal feelings to distort the truth, every time an error in fact inadvertently passes the editor's vigilant blue pencil, the reader is cheated of his right to know, robbed of his right to make an intelligent judgment.

Newspapers are in a constant battle to stay alive in a tough competitive business. It is a battle against time, a battle against prejudice, against cleverly disguised lies, evasive officials, and public apathy.

Individual newspapers do not always win this battle. And, as in other fields there are always a few unfortunately, who do not even try to win.

But, fortunately for all who believe in democracy, the vast majority of newspapers across this Nation do wage an aggressive battle to find the truth and to bring it to light.

Without newspapers our American way of life would soon die, for the light of democracy must be kindled and fed by the judgments of an informed people.

The greatness of our Nation depends on the greatness of our newspapers.

Anniversary of Czechoslovak Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, October 2, 1964

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow marks the 46th anniversary of the birth of the Czechoslovak Republic.

Despite oppression and brutal domination at the hands of Communist forces, the spirit of the Czechoslovak Republic and the heritage of greatness which the free leaders of that proud nation have left behind is still enshrined in the hearts of her sons and daughters, both within their homeland and abroad.

Despite the fact that the people of Czechoslovakia have been suppressed by totalitarian powers, incorporated forcibly into the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, deprived of their individual political, economic, and religious freedoms, the people of that country long for the day when their country will once again resume its rightful place in the family of free nations.

It behooves all who enjoy the fruits of a free society to recall the tragedy which the Czechoslovakian people have been forced to endure. In the postwar period from 1945 to 1948, the fate of that country was in the balance until that fateful day in February of 1948 when a Communist coup took over the Government and initiated the 15 years of suffering for the Czechoslovak people.

In those 15 years, the failures of the Communist regime in its attempt to impose a foreign ideology on Czechoslovakia are well known.

In attempting to control the fires of freedom, the Communist regime has tried to eliminate all the humanitarian ideals so cherished by that country's people.

The mute evidence of that failure lies in the barbed wire and minefields separating the people from the free world.

On the 46th anniversary of the birth of the Czechoslovak Republic, I want to extend my best wishes to the people of that brave country and to all Americans of Czechoslovakian ancestry. I join in the prayer that the oppression of their native land may soon be ended.

A Tribute to the People of Czechoslovakia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BERNARD F. GRABOWSKI
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, October 2, 1964

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, October 3, we shall celebrate the 46th anniversary of the birth of free Czechoslovakia in 1918. Czechoslovakia is not free any longer, of course, but perhaps the time has come when a better future for these oppressed people is again in view.

As the tensions between the Soviet Union and the United States diminish each day, we have not allowed ourselves to forget the fate of the men and women of Czechoslovakia who still live under Communist domination. More than ever, we must turn our attention to the task of freeing the courageous people of that land.

The history of Czechoslovakia and her people has been a stirring symbol of hope for the ultimate restoration of freedom and independence throughout all of eastern and central Europe. For over a thousand years, they have had to suffer the hard hand of alien and arbitrary rule. History records this, and also records their spirit of independence and their faith which have survived the test of time and tyranny.

With the breakup of the great empire of Austria-Hungary after World War I, there was a reshaping of the political geography of Europe. At that time, the Czech and Slovak drive for freedom and independence reached a high peak in the history of its people. At the head of the liberation movement was Thomas G. Masaryk, a noted scholar and writer, whose contributions on the subject of democracy will live forever. A man of action, he led his people to independence and for 11 fruitful years served as President of the newly formed Republic of Czechoslovakia.

His death in 1937 saved Masaryk from witnessing the terrible events which befell his beloved country. First, the Nazi occupation and, then, an even worse subjugation by the Soviet Union.

Their agents will have no more success in smothering the flames of freedom in Czechoslovakia, however, than those who attempted to do this in the past. Alien occupation and oppression have not yet been able to dim the aspirations and extinguish the hopes of her people. It has only increased their determination to regain their freedom and independence.

The resistance movement in Czechoslovakia is one of the most powerful in eastern and central Europe. The spirit of independence, love of country, and faith that will not fail are the greatest assets of her people as they struggle against Communist rule.

I know that we who are fortunate enough to be living in the free world appreciate this resistance movement, and look forward to the day when an independent Czechoslovakia will again arise and freedom is restored to her brave and courageous people.

National Airlines—30th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 2, 1964

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, congratulations to National Airlines on its 30th anniversary which it will reach on October 15, 1964. Thirty years may seem a long time, but in the life of a corporation it is a short span.

In 1934 National started a mail run from St. Petersburg, Fla., to Daytona Beach. The entire fleet consisted of one second-hand, 4-place aircraft, a sister ship to the "Spirit of St. Louis" with which Lindbergh made his historic transatlantic flight. From this modest beginning, National has grown to become a major trunkline serving the east coast from Boston to Miami and points in between, and the southern transcontinental route between Florida and California.

The award of the "rocket route"—the southern transcontinental route—linking the aerospace centers of Cape Kennedy, Houston, and the west coast, in June 1961, created a route system for National which attracted the young Frontier Airlines president, Lewis B. Maytag, Jr. In 4 years he had built up Frontier so that it was consistently in the black, but he saw greater scope for his energy and talents in National Airlines. He purchased a controlling interest in National in April 1962, paying $25.75 per share for stock then selling at $17 a share. Less than a year later his judgment was vindicated when National stock was worth $31.625 a share.

"Bud" Maytag, as he is known to his friends, is the youngest of the major airline presidents, being junior by 15 years—at age 37 years. He is the only airline president who is checked out to fly jets and personally flew a DC-8 fanjet for National on its acceptance flight. He obtained a pilot's license in 1947 and had organized two aviation-directed companies while still in his twenties. As a pilot he prefers a 1940 vintage, open cockpit PT-17 biplane, in which he does weekend stunting and on the fuselage of which "National" is written upside down. This is so that National will be right side up when he is "showboating" upside down, he says.

Under his direction the debt burden of National was eased through new financing arrangements, the types of aircraft in the fleet reduced from six to two—the DC-8 jets and the Electra propjets—and shares held by Pan American reacquired. The National fleet now consists of 9 DC-8 and 17 Electra aircraft. In keeping with the new look the hostesses were outfitted with uniforms designed by Oleg Cassini.

After 2 years of heavy losses, National was solidly in the black for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and has continued to improved. For the first 6 months of 1964 the net operating profit was $5,896,000. In the meantime National has continued to render excellent service to the people in the territory through which its routes are operated. Under the able management of its present officers we know National will continue to be one of our outstanding airlines.

Again, most hearty congratulations to National on its 30th anniversary with sincere wishes for its continued progress.

The Record on President Kennedy's Action in the Cuban Missile Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WM. J. RANDALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 2, 1964

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, during the month of September we all saw press accounts of how the Republican nominee reflected upon the integrity of our late President, John F. Kennedy, when he said in Seattle, Wash., that in 1962 the Kennedy administration waited until the perilous last moment to take action in the Cuban missile crisis so it would have the maximum domestic political impact.

It was my privilege to hear remarks of my senior Senator from Missouri, STUART SYMINGTON, who I expect has forgotten more about military preparedness and general know-how in matters of the military, as the last Secretary of Air for the Army and the first Secretary of the Air Force, than the junior Senator from Arizona will ever be able to acquire in the short time remaining for him in public life.

During the spring of 1963, I know it is a fact that the junior Senator from Arizona sat as a member of the U.S. Senate Armed Services Subcommitee on Preparedness when it held extensive hearings in executive session on the operations and effectiveness of the American intelligence community with respect to the Cuban missile crises of October 1962.

An interim report submitted to the Senate on May 9, 1963, on behalf of the entire subcommittee stated that the first hard photographic evidence of medium range and intermediate range missile installations in Cuba was obtained on October 14, 1962; and the first photographic evidence confirming the presence in Cuba of "Soviet highly mobile armored task groups" was obtained on October 25, 1962.

It will be recalled that on October 22, 1962, the late President John F. Kennedy, after having affected appropriate military preparations, confronted the Soviets before the world with an ultimatum that they remove from Cuba missiles which might be used in an aggressive attack upon this and other nations of the Western Hemisphere.

However, last September 9, speaking as Republican nominee for President, the Senator from Arizona, voiced in Seattle, Wash., the following allegation which reflected on the integrity of our late President:

> Despite weeks and months of warning about the missiles, an administration totally political in its goals and instincts could and would wait until the perilous last moment to take action, take action at a time that would have maximum domestic political impact.

Our senior Senator from Missouri, Senator SYMINGTON, who also serves on the Preparedness Subcommittee of the Senate, recently performed a service in the interest of truth and accuracy in setting the record straight.

I have asked unanimous consent that Senator SYMINGTON's remarks delivered in September, in Lexington, Mo., be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

SPEECH OF SENATOR SYMINGTON DELIVERED AT LEXINGTON, MO., ON SEPTEMBER 12, 1964

Senator GOLDWATER's recent attack, in Seattle, on the late President Kennedy, when he charged the latter with timing the Cuban missile crisis for political reasons at home, is not borne out by the record.

Both Senator GOLDWATER and I are members of the Senate Military Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee; and in the Spring of 1963 this subcommittee held extended hearings on the sudden Soviet military buildup in Cuba during October 1962.

In the last 2 days I have carefully reread the record of those hearings—and in the absence of President Kennedy, who is no longer here to defend himself, I am glad to report that the President moved with great dispatch after approving every single recommendation made by the head of the Central Intelligence Agency.

On the same day that the President received firm information the Soviets were moving strategic missiles into Cuba, he so informed congressional leaders. Within 4 days after the information was confirmed, he had completed the military buildup considered necessary in case the U.S.S.R. decided not to remove the missiles upon his demand, had informed our allies of the details of the development, had evacuated our dependents from Guantanamo, and had landed marines at that base. Thereupon the President promptly notified the American people of the crisis, and told them what he intended to do about it.

In other words, the record shows the matter was handled efficiently, and, for which we can all be very grateful, effectively. Cool courage was combined with restraint. The President knew the holocaust that would follow a full scale nuclear exchange.

He knew also, however, that life would not be worth living without freedom; and he acted accordingly.

Let us hope that in the future our leaders will continue to use our unparalleled power with prudence. In World War I our battle deaths were 53,000. In World War II they were 291,000. It is now estimated, by the experts, that a short but full-scale nuclear exchange would eliminate the existence of any possible aggressor. In turn, however, some 100 million Americans would be killed.

For that reason alone, the importance of restraint with firmness as exemplified in the Cuban crisis of 1962 and recently in the Tonkin Gulf, could not be overemphasized. Nobody can truly gain from a hydrogen sunset.

This is why it is so important for the world to work, if possible, under some form of international agreement.

This United States became great because it has always operated as a government under law. Throughout the world we have become the symbol of freedom under law; and in law we have placed our faith.

This faith was well expressed long ago by Jean Jacques Rousseau, when he said: "It is to law alone that men owe justice and liberties * * *. It is with this voice alone that political leaders should speak, when they command."

Public Works

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JULIA BUTLER HANSEN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 2, 1964

Mrs. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, Congress has, year by year, become more and more interested in the development of trade. The Third District of Washington, which I have the privilege of representing, is one of those areas in this Nation intimately associated with commerce and is consequently deeply concerned with the development of our rivers and harbors. Particularly during the past 4 years has this Congress recognized these needs and we have been deeply appreciative of the understanding and help of the Appropriations Committee and particularly the Subcommittee on Public Works, chaired by Ohio's outstanding Congressman, MIKE KIRWAN.

Because of this trade interest and the port district development in Congress, I think other Members of Congress may be interested in some of the figures recently obtained from one of the outstanding port districts in the Pacific Northwest, Longview, Wash. Harvey Hart, manager of this port, is considered one of the Nation's most knowledgeable and able members. Citizen participation in port affairs and an excellent relationship between the port district and the people have made it possible for Longview's projects.

Interestingly enough, the port of Longview is the youngest deep-water port in the State of Washington. It has, in the short space of 37 years, moved from a standing start to the first port in volume of exports in the State of Washington and it has completely saturated the capabilities of all present facilities, land, and cargo-handling capacity. Further progress and development requires expansion. This fall, this forward-looking port is proposing a $3 million general obligation bond—this to be voted on by the electorate of the district in November.

Some indication of the port's value to the district, the State of Washington, and the Nation are found in the following facts:

In 1963 the port handled 1,794,080 short tons of outbound waterborne cargo, and 482,973 short tons of inbound waterborne cargo. Shipments were made to 52 nations and received from 18 nations. The port used its berthing space to 90 percent of ultimate capacity and serviced 812 offshore vessels. The port is responsible for the direct and indirect employment of 2,380 persons out of 18,688 persons employed in the port district, and for a payroll of $16,250,000 out of a total payroll of $106,600,000—a total of 15.2 percent. Local potential buying power released in the district for 1963 was $14,370,000.

The expansion contemplated will increase the district payroll by approximately 400 persons, will measurably assist the export expansion program of President Lyndon Johnson, and will assist Washington ports in maintaining their competitive relationship with aggressive ports in Canada, other areas of the Pacific coast, as well as the gulf and Atlantic coasts, which have spent well over a billion dollars during the past 10 years on modernization and improvements. It also will add additional security to our national defense program.

Legislation and Voting Record of Representative Frelinghuysen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER H. B. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 2, 1964

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, since coming to Congress in 1953 I have issued reports to my constituents at the end of each session. I am submitting here a list of bills which I have introduced during the 88th Congress and a synopsis of my voting record during the 2d session of the present Congress as part of my final report to the people of the 5th Congressional District of New Jersey.

The list follows:

LEGISLATION INTRODUCED BY CONGRESSMAN FRELINGHUYSEN IN THE 88TH CONGRESS

H.R. 3134, to authorize assistance to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education, including junior colleges and technical institutes, in financing the construction, rehabilitation, or improvement of needed academic and related facilities (College Academic Facilities Act).

H.R. 3482, to amend the Civil Rights Act of 1957, and for other purposes (Civil Rights Act of 1963).

H.R. 3396, to authorize the addition of lands to Morristown National Historical Park in the State of New Jersey.

H.R. 5193, to extend for 1 additional year the temporary provisions of Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, as amended.

H.R. 6457, to amend section 111 of title 23 of the United States Code to permit States to allow certain service facilities to be constructed or located on the rights-of-way of the Interstate System.

H.R. 6727, to enforce constitutional rights, and for other purposes.

H.R. 7048, to authorize assistance to the States for surveying the needs of elementary and secondary education (Educational Improvement Act of 1963).

H.R. 9454, to establish a commission to be known as the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Memorial Commission.

H.R. 10617, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a 30-percent credit against the individual income tax for amounts paid as tuition or fees to certain public and private institutions of higher education.

H.R. 11050, to authorize a 3-year program to assist States and communities to mobilize and coordinate human and financial resources to combat the causes of poverty in the United States, and to assure coordination of Federal, State, and local programs designed to eliminate or alleviate any effects of poverty (the Human Resources Development Act of 1964).

H.R. 11709, to provide for the appointment of a Commissioner General for U.S. participation in the Canadian Universal and International Exhibition, and for other purposes.

House Joint Resolution 270, designating the 8-day period beginning on the 12th day of October of each year as Patriotic Education Week.

House Joint Resolution 445, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women.

House Joint Resolution 766, providing for the recognition and endorsement of the 17th International Publishers Congress.

House Joint Resolution 858, Select Committee To Watch Administration and Operation of Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

Voting record of Congressman Frelinghuysen, 88th Cong., 2d sess.

Legislation:	
Civil rights	Yea
Tax bill ($11.5 billion reduction)	Yea
Federal pay bill	Yea
Agriculture appropriation	Nay
Treasury-Post Office appropriation	Yea
Legislative appropriation	Yea
Labor-HEW appropriation	Yea
Defense appropriation	Yea
Foreign aid appropriation	Yea
Public works appropriation	Yea
Federal highways	Yea
Reduction of excise taxes from 10 to 5 percent	Yea
Increasing public debt	Nay
Mass transit	Yea
National Defense Education Act Amendments	Yea
Social security benefits	Yea
Omnibus housing	Yea

Letters to a Daughter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, October 2, 1964

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article from the October issue of the Ladies' Home Journal wherein is copied three wonderful letters written by Senator BARRY GOLDWATER to his daughter, Joanne.

Mr. Speaker, I place this article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that millions of American children might read and profit thereby, including my own grandchildren, Anne, Joan, Janet, MaryBen, and Donald.

The article follows:

LETTERS TO A DAUGHTER

Over the years, duty has often separated BARRY M. GOLDWATER from his four children. Experience taught him, long before his nomination as Republican candidate for the Presidency, that long-distance phoning was not enough. Only by writing his girls and boys at some length could the Senator express fully his concern for their growth and well-being in heart, mind, and body.

An early riser, he often composed these family letters at the crack of dawn, pecking them out on a portable typewriter. None was revised. Once, in his Senate office, he remarked to me, "Through letters I preserved emotional closeness with my children. It worked out better than you might have imagined."

The three letters presented here were written to his first-born child, Joanne, now Mrs. Thomas Ross. Made available to me by Senator GOLDWATER and Mrs. Ross, the selection ranges from the time Joanne was 12 years old until her wedding day.

Mrs. Ross is the wife of a resident surgeon at Harbor General Hospital in Torrance, Calif., and the mother of four children: 6-year-old Carolyn, 5-year-old Cynthia (whom they call "CC"), 3-year-old Thomas Michael and 1-year-old Alison. "I saved these letters because they were so beautiful," Mrs. Ross told me. "Daddy put so much of himself into them."

Urged in the letters to develop self-reliance, Mrs. Ross is meeting that injunction fully. "She is so unspoiled," her mother said, "that she does her own housework and her own cooking. She cares for the children herself, with the help only of babysitters, and even does her own sewing." The Goldwaters' modern desert home in Phoenix, Ariz., has a guest cottage which Joanne and her family often use.

Mrs. Ross speaks of her family with great affection. "Daddy and mother are opposite personalities. He likes camping. She is happier in a resort. Yet she has learned to cultivate his interests. My brothers, Barry, Jr., and Mike, are also very different from each other.

"Barry is so intense that he once developed an ulcer. He looks like daddy, and he is always trying to live up to daddy's image. Both daddy and he think they're right, and when they disagree there's quite a merry-go-round.

"Mike doesn't look like daddy, and isn't burdened with the image. Mike's his own man, sharp, clever, and witty. My 20-year-old sister—little Peggy as we call her, to distinguish her from mother, who is known as big Peggy—is an easy-going, sweet, beautiful, poised girl who grew up very fast."

The years spanned by the letters remain vivid to Mrs. Ross. "Camping trips with daddy," she told me, "are the outstanding memories of my childhood. We started the trips when I was 10. Little Peggy missed them all. Barry, Jr., and Mike were little boys and tagged along. It seemed I had all the fun."

FLORA RHETA SCHREIBER.

JUNE 11, 1948.

DEAREST JOANNE: Those beautiful quaking aspens you have seen in the forests as we have driven along have one purpose in life. I want to tell you about them because they remind me a lot of mommy and me and you kids. Those aspens are born and grow just to protect the spruce tree when it is born. As the spruce grows bigger and bigger, the aspens gradually grow old and tired and even die after a while, but the spruce which has had its tender self protected in its childhood grows into one of the forest's most wonderful trees. Now think about mommy and me as aspens standing there quaking ourselves in the winds that blow, catching the cold snows of life, bearing the hot rays of the sun, all to protect you from those things until you are strong enough and wise enough to do them yourself. We aren't quaking from fear but from the joy of being able to see your life develop, and you grow into tall, straight men and women. Now you have almost reached the point where you don't need us as much as you used to, just like the spruce reaches a place in his life where the aspens are not much use to him.

Now you stand like the young spruce, a pretty, straight young thing whose head is beginning to peep above the protection of mommy's and daddy's watchfulness.

We have seen you grow this far and have influenced you all we could toward the attainment of beauty that is now yours. Funny thing about that word beauty. I don't mean just a pretty face and a pretty body, but I mean something deeper. Take Mommy, she is the most beautiful woman in the world not because her face is pretty, but because people like her to be around, she smiles, she helps other people, she is kind and thoughtful, that, Joanne, is the true meaning of the word beauty. The spruce tree is like that too. He reaches the age we have been talking about and then he is pretty, but what he grows into after he goes on his own is up to him. Will his branches reach toward God's sky and protect those weary people who come to rest under him? Will you in your growing become a woman the world wants to know because you will offer the friendship of your heart to them? Or will the tree and you not grow these branches but hold them unto yourselves, becoming still a pretty tree and a pretty woman but ugly to the thinking of men and women?

Will this tree cover his branches with bright, shiny leaves that will reflect to all who pass the warmth of the sun, will you grow so that your smile and your eyes will reflect to all the happiness of your heart, or will you both become things of homeliness because you won't share with the world the joy of living and the happiness of your minds and hearts?

I am telling you all this because from now on a lot of what you eventually become, a lovely woman, a happy woman, a brilliant, popular woman depends on you. You can't go through life being these things and at the same time frowning.

You can't achieve these things and be grumpy, you have to grow so that your every deed and look reflect the glory that is now in your heart and soul. Smile, think right, believe in God and your family and your country. You can become one of the most beautiful women in this worldwide forest of men and women. It's up to you.

I love you,

DADDY.

JANUARY 13, 1950.

MY DARLING JOANNE: On this your 14th birthday I would like to wish for you all the happiness and beauty this world can offer a young and beautiful girl. I would also like to say a few things to you that can be said again and again during your life, so that explains the letter instead of just a talk whose words would float on out an open window.

These words you can save if you wish and read them again when you are older.

As you are now 14, I should tell you some things a girl of that age should be doing, and as far as that goes, a girl of any age. You must be tolerant and patient with other people. You must not be selfish. You must remember that because you have been fortunate to have been born in a family with a small amount of what people call wealth that you must be very careful of the things I have already mentioned, tolerance and patience. It is easy for you to forget these things, but you must never, never forget them.

Your attitude at times toward Mommy and me is one of impatience born of a thought in your head that we don't understand you or your desires as a young girl. We are not that old that we have forgotten our own young days, and what we advise you is born of experience. What we tell you are signposts along your life whose letters have been painted with the colors of years. We want you to heed us and to listen to us. As you grow older, what we tell you and advise you will be tempered with what you are able to associate with those things from your own growing experience, but right now when you are only 14 you must lean on us and believe us.

Laziness in your schoolwork and your work at home will only result in your being a lazy woman, and believe me, man to girl, there is nothing worse than a lazy woman unless it's two lazy women.

It is easy to become lazy. It is a bad habit that many, many people in this world have gotten into, but it is not a habit that attractive people will ever get into.

Watch these things I have told you about. Tolerance, patience and laziness. You have shown signs of all of them, and it has been only natural. You are still very young and you can change these things, and I am asking you that during this coming year you try real hard to correct them. Change your tone of voice to Mommy and me and your brothers and sister. We all want to live together in a happy, contented home, and with you screeching at the others it won't be so happy.

Remember, Joanne, that the happiest people in this world are the people who are busy trying to make others happy. The truest words ever said or written are: "Do unto others as you would have them do unto you." Keep those words close to your heart and let the feeling of them go through your every thought and every act. It is easy to say, "What's in it for me?" but it's hard to say, "Will it help others?" but those last four words can become the slide rule of your actions that will make your life the happy, wonderful thing that I know it will always be. I am proud to be your father.

Love always,

DADDY.

(Undated, circa 1952)

DEAREST JOANNE: I keep thinking that I will see you each day, and when night comes and that hasn't happened, then I renew again my pledge to write you on the morrow. This then is the morning for the letter, but believe me I would much prefer sitting with you someplace and talking this over with you than resorting to the coldness of black print on white paper. So when you read it, if there are questions, then we can talk next time we are together but then the subject isn't that kind it's just what your old man thinks about the period of your life you are going through. I say these things to you 'cause I remember just about your age I got to thinking the same things, and I guess I got as low in the mind as you seem to be. You see I started school with the idea that I didn't need to study. I wasn't exactly lazy, but I didn't apply myself. I had a much better time doing other things.

Sort of like you, isn't it? Well, one day I figured out that if I wanted to be a poor student, then I was on the right path, but if I wanted to pass and to make better grades, then a little work was in order, and by golly it worked, and you know what? everything else worked better too. I had more fun and I got along in other activities better, which leads me to this point. It's almost impossible for one person to be everything to herself or to anyone, there have to be compromises, like an airplane; when we want to make a fast one, then we have to forget payload and lift, if we want payload and lift, then we have to forget speed, to get the best airplane for all purposes we compromise among all the factors. By doing this we build better and better airplanes that go faster and faster and carry more and more, so it is with a person. If she wants to be a good student and nothing else, then she gives up other interests, if she wants to be social, then she forgets her schooling. Now, if she wants to be a little of both, she compromises, she studies a little more and plays a little less, and the first thing you know, she is better at both school and the extracurricular affairs.

What you should do then is to study a bit more and play a bit less, but never quit playing for studying or quit studying for playing. Your job is to make the best of what you have, and you have a whale of a lot. You have charm that others work hard to develop, you have brains, but you haven't been able to put them to their best use yet; you have many friends and you make friends easily, so, baby, you start with more than most girls ever wind up with and most important to your dad, you are honest, and whatever you do in this attempt to compromise your efforts, never, never give up the honesty that is the basic rock in your foundation of a successful life. The honors of the world mean nothing if your head rests uneasily on your pillow from the pangs of a guilty or dishonest conscience. I would rather hold my head high in honesty than be king.

Don't take this as criticism. It's only me watching you live through the same things I lived through, and I'm only trying to be a roadmap for you.

Love,

DADDY.

Congressman Bob Dole in His Votes on Key Issues During the 2d Session, 88th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT DOLE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, October 2, 1964

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, the 2d session of the 88th Congress began on January 7, 1964, and from then, to and including October 2, 1964, there were 112 rollcall votes, and I was present and voting on 111. Listed below is a summary of 82 key measures and my vote thereon. The 30 votes not listed related primarily to procedural matters, duplications and bills which were not, in my opinion, of general interest.

Some of the votes were easy and some very difficult, and I am certain my constituents will not agree with every vote cast. Nevertheless, as the session finally comes to an end, it is time for an accounting, and I therefore include a summary of my voting this session:

Voting record of Congressman Bob Dole, 2d sess., 88th Cong.

Date	Issue	Vote
1964		
Jan. 14	To recommit bill extending program of Federal aid for airports to reduce proposed authorization by $15,000,000 per year for 3 years. (Yea 110, nay 201.)	Yea.
Jan. 14	After defeat of recommittal motion, House passed bill providing for 3-year extension with modifications of the program of Federal aid for airport construction. (Yea 298, nay 11.)	Yea.
Jan. 21	Library services amendments proposed to confine Federal library services aid to rural and small town areas, while increasing the authorization for such aid, but eliminating a proposed new program of Federal grants for library construction. (Yea 179, nay 183.)	Yea.
Jan. 21	After failure of efforts to limit the scope and cost of the library aid program, the bill passed. It increased the authorization for Federal aid for library services from $7,500,000 to $25,000,000 for fiscal 1964 and authorized a new program of matching Federal grants for library construction with $20,000,000 for 1964 and authorizations with unspecified amounts for 1965 and 1966. Starting with fiscal 1965, the programs were extended to urban in addition to rural and small town areas. (Yea 254, nay 107.)	Nay.
Jan. 28	This bill proposed amending the Bacon-Davis Act to include most fringe benefits in making prevailing wage determinations. The Bacon-Davis Act generally provides that workers on most Federal construction contracts be paid not less than prevailing wages for the same area. (Yea 357, nay 50.)	Yea.
Feb. 10	Civil rights. (Yea 290, nay 130.)	Yea.
Feb. 20	Authorized $17,000,000,000 for defense research and development and for ship, aircraft, and missile procurement. (Yea 336, nay 0.)	Yea.
Feb. 25	Vote on the conference report on the $11,500,000,000 tax cut bill which reduced individual income tax and corporate tax rates. Various other changes were made in the tax laws, benefiting some taxpayers and hurting others. In my opinion, a tax cut without a consistent policy of reduced spending could result in large budget deficits and inflation with a further lowering in the purchasing power of the dollar. (Yea 326, nay 83.)	Nay.
Feb. 26	Bill proposed authorizing an additional U.S. contribution of $312,000,000 to the International Development Association which makes 50-year loans interest free but with a ¾ of 1 percent annual service charge, to underdeveloped nations. A vote for this recommittal motion was a vote against the bill. I objected to the bill on economy grounds, to the high percentage of American financial participation, to the liberal terms of the loans, and to the possibility that some of the loans might be counter to American interests and policy. (Yea 208, nay 189.)	Yea.
Feb. 27	House passed this bill amending the Communications Act of 1934 to prohibit the Federal Communications Commission from making certain rules relating to the length of frequency of radio and TV advertisements. (Yea 317, nay 43.)	Yea.
Mar. 4	This recommittal motion was designed to limit the fiscal 1965 Peace Corps authorization to the 1964 figure of $95,700,000 instead of the proposed $115,000,000 After failure of the recommittal motion, the bill passed by a voice vote. (Yea 90, nay 309.)	Yea.
Mar. 5	This so-called interest equalization tax was actually a tax on the purchase of most foreign securities by Americans from foreigners. The object of this bill was to ease our balance-of-payments deficit by discouraging foreign borrowing from U.S. sources. In my opinion the balance-of-payments deficit could be easily reduced by cutting foreign aid, without discouraging private American investment abroad. Foreign investments bring us a long-term benefit through their yield of profits. At the same time, they help develop private enterprise abroad. (Yea 238, nay 142.)	Nay.
Mar. 10	This bill establishes a Public Land Law Review Commission of 19 members to conduct a 3-year study of public land laws and regulations. (Yea 339, nay 29.)	Yea.
Mar. 12	Bill proposing a $545,000,000 pay raise affecting approximately 1,700,000 Federal workers. $10,000 increase in the salaries of Congressmen, from $22,500 to $32,500, was provided for by this bill. (Yea 184, nay 222.)	Nay.
Mar. 24	Vote on an amendment to restore $10,000,000 to Coast Guard funds for vessel, aircraft, and installation construction and improvement. (Yea 160, nay 193.)	Nay.
Mar. 24	Vote to pass a bill appropriating $6,200,000,000 for the Treasury, Post Office, Executive Office of the President, and various independent offices. This included funds for the electric lights at the White House. (Yea 326, nay 20.)	Nay.
Mar. 25	Bill authorizing $5,200,000,000 for National Aeronautics and Space Administration for fiscal year 1965. (Issue was increasing costs of "man-on-the-moon" project.) (Yea 283, nay 73.)	Nay.
Apr. 8	Recommittal motion to add provision to the food stamp bill requiring States participating in the program to pay half of the costs. (Yea 195, nay 223.)	Yea.
Apr. 8	This bill expanded and made permanent the food stamp program. On a pilot basis the program cost $44,000,000 in 1964. The bill carried an authorization of $400,000,000 over a 3-year period. The program may eventually mean food at below wholesale prices to 4,000,000 people at a cost to the Federal Government of perhaps $360,000,000 per year. (Yea 229, nay 189.)	Nay.
Apr. 3	Bill establishing special 2-year programs for wheat and cotton. (Yea 211, nay 203.)	Nay.
Apr. 10	Recommittal motion to limit expenditures of appropriations to congressional committees and the Architect of the Capitol to those expenditures which are a matter of public record. (Yea 188, nay 131.)	Yea.
Apr. 14	Appropriations of $6,900,000,000 for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare and related agencies. (Yea 347, nay 21.)	Yea.
Apr. 15	Legislation authorizing up to $44,900,000 for implementing the Convention of the Chamizal which settled a boundary dispute between the United States and Mexico at El Paso, Tex. (Yea 348, nay 5.)	Yea.
Apr. 22	Defense Department appropriations bill of $47,000,000,000 for fiscal 1965. (Yea 365, nay 0.)	Yea.
May 6	Appropriation of $1,700,000,000 for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, for related agencies and for the Federal Judiciary. (Yea 314, nay 40.)	Yea.
May 7	Bill authorizing $2,600,000,000 for the Atomic Energy Commission for fiscal 1965. (Yea 341, nay 3.)	Yea.
May 13	Recommittal motion which was in effect a vote to kill bill proposing an additional U.S. contribution of $312,000,000 to the International Development Association. (Yea 132, nay 247.)	Yea.
May 20	Amendment to provide $1,600,000 for construction of a National Peanut Research Center at Dawson, Ga. (Yea 181, nay 198.)	Nay.
May 20	Vote on recommittal motion to insert language to prevent use of any funds for payment of export subsidies on any surplus agricultural commodities sold to Communist countries unless approved by the President and reported to Congress. (Yea 186, nay 187.)	Yea.
May 20	Bill providing appropriations of $5,200,000,000 for the Agriculture Department and related agencies. (Yea 311, nay 64.)	Yea.
May 26	House voted $1,600,000,000 in funds for Defense Department military construction for fiscal year 1965. (Yea 340, nay 5.)	Yea.
May 27	Vote to recommit a bill proposing increasing Federal insurance coverage on depositors' accounts in banks and savings and loan institutions from the present $10,000 to $20,000. Some of the recommittal votes were by Members, myself included, who wished to combine consideration of proposals to tighten regulations concerning savings and loan institutions with the proposal to increase insurance coverage. (Yea 197, nay 142.)	Yea.
June 3	Bill authorizing $1,175,000,000 per year for 2 years for Federal-aid for highway construction and for Federal highway programs. (Yea 296, nay 0.)	Yea.

Voting record of Congressman BOB DOLE, *2d sess., 88th Cong.*—Continued

Date	Issue	Vote
1964 June 10	Vote on recommital motion with instructions to reduce the foreign aid authorizations for development loan funds and for the President's contingency funds by $222,200,000 of requested amount. (Yea 193, nay 211.)	Yea.
June 10	Bill authorizing $2,000,000,000 in new appropriations for foreign aid, bringing total foreign aid spending to $3,500,000,000 for fiscal 1965. (Yea 230, nay 175.)	Nay.
June 11	Following defeat of a 1st Federal pay raise bill because of its proposal to increase congressional salaries by $10,000, this 2d pay raise bill handled controversial question of congressional pay by proposing an increase of $7,500 plus additional automatic increases at the times of future general Federal pay increases. (Yea 243, nay 157.)	Nay.
June 16	Bill providing $4,300,000,000 appropriation for civil public works projects, water resources construction, reclamation, and the Atomic Energy Commission. (Yea 361, nay 11.)	Yea.
June 17	Vote to reduce retailers' excise taxes on jewelry, furs, toilet preparations, luggage and handbags from 10 to 5 percent on July 1, 1964, and repeal such taxes on July 1, 1965. (Yea 185, nay 207.)	Yea.
June 18	Bill to increase temporary national debt limit to $324,000,000,000 through June 30, 1965. (Yea 203, nay 182.)	Nay.
June 25	Authorization of a new Federal program of grants to States and localities to build or improve mass transit systems. An authorization of $375,000,000 over a 3-year period was included in the bill. (Yea 212, nay 189.)	Nay.
July 1	Vote to effect a cut of $248,000,000 in foreign aid appropriations through reductions in economic assistance funds. (Yea 198, nay 208.)	Yea.
July 1	Foreign aid appropriation bill providing $3,300,000,000 for foreign aid and $400,000,000 for related activities. (Yea 231, nay 174.)	Nay.
July 2	Resolution concurring with Senate amendments to the civil rights bill to clear it for Presidential signature. (Yea 289, nay 126.)	Yea.
July 2	Provision for appointment of a special House committee to investigate campaign expenditures of House candidates. (Yea 264, nay 92.)	Yea.
July 2	Bill proposing grants to States for establishing water resources research centers at colleges. and grants to States for water research projects. (Yea 347,	Yea.
July 28	Free medical care and hospitalization at Public Health Service hospitals was extended to certain owners of fishing boats by this bill, in addition to the seamen already eligible. (Yea 202, nay 170.)	Nay.
July 29	As originally passed by the House on this vote, the social security benefit and tax increase bill did not include medicare provisions. It provided for a 5-percent increase in benefits, raised the wage base for deductions from $4,800 to $5,400, slightly liberalized eligibility requirements, and increased the social security taxes paid by employees, employers and self-employed people. (Yea 388, nay 8.)	Yea.
July 30	Establishment of a national wilderness preservation system. Bill placed 9,000,000 acres of Federal land in it permanently with provisions for its further expansion. (Yea 304, nay 1.)	Yea.
Aug. 4	Conference report on adopting defense appropriations bill for $46,800,000,000 for fiscal year 1965. (Yea 359, nay 0.)	Yea.
July 21	Bill to protect postal patrons from receiving unsolicited mail which they regard as "morally offensive." Person receiving such mail can request the Post Office to notify a specific mailer not to mail him or his children any unsolicited material. (Yea 326, nay 19.)	Yea.
July 21	Bill for establishment of a National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress, at a cost of $2,000,000. Opposition was centered on the question of establishing another new commission. (Yea 261, nay 76.)	Nay.
July 22	Vote to consider a bill to establish a land and water conservation fund to assist the States and Federal agencies in meeting outdoor recreation needs. (Yea 338, nay 8.)	Yea.
Aug. 4	Motion to recede and concur with a Senate amendment to defense appropriations authorizing the Defense Secretary to make at least 35 percent of the funds for repair, alteration, and conversion of naval vessels available for work in privately owned shipyards. It was in place of a House provision which would have had a more limiting effect on the allocation of work to private shipyards to the advantage of Government navy yards. (Yea 186, nay 178.)	Yea.
Aug. 7	This resolution pledges support, including the use of armed force, as the President determines, to aid SEATO nations in southeast Asia which request assistance in defense of their freedom. It supported the President in taking necessary measures to repel armed attack against us and in preventing further aggression. (Yea 416, nay 0.)	Yea.
Aug. 8	This poverty bill included a package of programs to be administered by an Office of Economic Opportunity. Among them were a Job Corps, a work training program, a work study program, a Domestic Peace Corps (Volunteers in Service to America), urban and rural community action programs, loans to small farmers and businessmen. The bill authorized programs for 3 years, with a fiscal 1965 authorization of $947,500,000. (Yea 226, nay 185.)	Nay.
Aug. 11	This bill proposed revising the non-service-connected disability and death pension program for veterans of World War I, World War II, and the Korean war and their widows and children. It proposed various pension increases and liberalization of income limitations. (Yea 389, nay 0.)	Yea.
Aug. 12	Bill to authorize $683,000 for U.S. contribution to the expenses of the International Commission for Supervision and Control in Laos. (Yea 268, nay 89.)	Nay.
Aug. 13	Vote to recommit the conference report on independent offices appropriations bill to reduce by $200,000,000 funds provided for NASA research and development. The funds in question were part of those for the man-on-the-moon project. (Yea 114, nay 271.)	Yea.
Aug. 13	This motion to recommit was with instructions to add an amendment continuing indefinitely the Federal Housing Administration's insurance authority. Such permanent authority might have made it more difficult to obtain passage of future expensive housing bills in future years, as continuation of FHA insurance authority when contained in a housing bill is a factor working toward obtaining approval of a bill containing many other items. (Yea 184,	Yea.
Aug. 14	This bill revived an expired program of Federal subsidies to help build fishing boats and increased the percentage of the subsidy. This bill, in my opinion, simply revises another Federal subsidy program. (Yeas 198, nays 124.)	Nay.
Aug. 13	The housing bill as passed by the House authorized $992,000,000 in spending for fiscal year 1965. (Yeas 308, nays 68.)	Nay.
Aug. 17	Proposal to extend Federal inspection and safety requirements to the smallest coal mines, employing fewer than 15 people underground. Kansas safety laws are adequate, in my opinion, and the expense of additional improvements that would be required, would put many small mines out of business and add to unemployment. (Yeas 202, nays 151.)	Nay.
Aug. 14	House refused to approve an additional $10,000 for the House Education and Labor Committee to cover expenses of its ad hoc Poverty War Program Subcommittee. (Yeas 115, nays 156.)	Nay.
Aug. 17	This resolution was to express the sense of the Congress that we should make efforts to get financially delinquent U.N. nations to pay up and that the United States should urge that provisions of the U.N. Charter providing loss of votes in cases of continued financial delinquency be enforced. (Yea 352, nay 0.)	Yea.
Aug. 17	Bill calling for Federal registration of contractors making work arrangements between 10 or more migrant workers and growers in interstate agricultural employment in order to protect migrant workers from employer abuses. (Yea 343, nay 7.)	Yea.
Aug. 18	This bill provided for import quotas on chilled, frozen, or fresh beef and veal whenever imports threatened to rise 10 percent above the average import levels of 1959–63 adjusted for market growth. Under certain circumstances, the President was given the power to suspend or increase quotas. This legislation was designed to benefit beef producers, in a situation where the United States has become the world's largest importer of beef. Beef producers do not get Federal price supports which are granted to various other groups of farmers. (Yea 232, nay 149.)	Yea.
Aug. 18	House rejected the conference report on this bill to implement the International Coffee Agreement which had been ratified by the Senate as a treaty. It felt that the coffee agreement hurt the American consumer by in effect putting a floor under the price of coffee, and would point out coffee prices have risen since the agreement was ratified. (Yea 183, nay 194.)	Nay.
Aug. 18	This so-called interest equalization tax was actually a tax on the purchase of most foreign securities by Americans from foreigners. The object of this bill was stated as being to ease our balance-of-payments deficit by discouraging foreign borrowing from U.S. sources. In opposition, it was argued that the balance-of-payments deficit could be easily reduced by cutting foreign aid, without discouraging private American investment abroad. Foreign investments bring us a long-term benefit through their yield of profits. At the same time, they help develop private enterprise abroad. (Yea 221, nay 147.)	Nay.
Aug. 18	This bill guaranteed electric consumers in the Pacific Northwest first call on electric energy generated at Federal hydroelectric plants in that region. Its enactment cleared the way for construction of an intertie between northwestern and southwestern power grids with surplus northwestern power to go to the Southwest. In effect it represented a compromise between public power and private power. (Yea 230, nay 134.)	Yea.
Aug. 19	This bill authorized $1,100,000,000 for housing and urban renewal programs. It included new programs for rehabilitation loans to property owners in urban renewal areas, for building rental housing for farmworkers, for grants to train urban development administrators, for graduate fellowships in city planning. (Yea 310, nay 70.)	Nay.
Aug. 19	This bill proposed taking away from the Federal courts, including the Supreme Court, jurisdiction on the subject of reapportionment of State legislatures. Proponents felt that the Federal courts had exceeded their power in assuming jurisdiction over apportionment of State legislatures. (Yea 218, nay 175.)	Yea.
Aug. 20	Provided for the establishment of a National Council on the Arts to assist in the growth and development of the arts in the United States, at a cost of $150,000. (Yea 213, nay 135.)	Nay.
Sept. 1	Authorized the President to set up a Commission to study the feasibility of and to find a suitable site for construction of a sea-level canal between the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans to supplement the Panama Canal. (Yea 320, nay 23.)	Yea.
Sept. 1	This bill proposed coordination of Government programs in minimizing the effects of pesticides and insecticides on fish and wildlife. It proposed raising the Interior Department's authorization for pesticide research. In effect the bill, in my opinion, further complicated departmental jurisdiction over pesticide research and control and was not supported by either the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare or the Department of Agriculture. (Yea 235, nay 111.)	Nay.
Sept. 3	Vote on recommittal motion to add language to the bill to prohibit the sale of surplus farm products under the provisions of Public Law 480 ("Food for Peace" program) to "any nation or area dominated or controlled by a Communist government or by the world Communist movement." This language was aimed at preventing such sales to Communist Poland and Yugoslavia. (Yea 183, nay 175.)	Yea.
Sept. 3	Extended the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act for 3 years with new authorizations of $4,450,000,000. The funds were for titles I and II of the act: sales of surplus American farm products to foreign nations for foreign money and for U.S. donations of food to foreign nations. (Yea 349, nay 6.)	Yea.
Sept. 4	This bill proposed partial forgiveness of student loans received under certain government programs to doctors and dentists practicing in areas where there is a shortage. Opponents did not feel the inducement was necessary to attract doctors or dentists and that these persons must be motivated by a real desire, not lured to rural areas by a promise of something for nothing. (Yea 140, nay 161.)	Nay.
Sept. 22	A bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes. (Yea 209, nay 103.)	(1).
Sept. 23	Bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to cooperate with the State of Wisconsin in the designation and administration of the Ice Age National Scientific Reserve in the State of Wisconsin, and for other purposes. (Yea 180, nay 118.)	Yea.
Oct. 1	Resolution to make continuing appropriations for fiscal 1965. This resolution related only to the foreign aid appropriation bill which provides for a number of oversea activities of the U.S. Government. (Yea 159, nay 193.)	Nay.

---

[1] Absent, not voting.

Voting record of Congressman Bob Dole, *2d sess., 88th Cong.*—Continued

Date	Issue	Vote
1964 Oct. 1	Recommittal motion designed to provide a 2-year extension of the Federally Impacted Areas Acts, instead of the 1-year extension in the Conference Report on Extension and Amendment of National Defense Education Act of 1958. This would give assurance to the school districts that funds would be available for at least 2 more years, and at the same time give Congress sufficient time to consider fully its long-promised revision of these acts, which it was hoped would be the result of the study provided for in the bill. (Yea 107, nay 236.)	Yea.
Oct. 1	Final passage of 3-year extension and amendment of National Education Defense Act of 1958. Bill passed extends for 1-year Federally Impacted Area Acts, as recommittal motion to extend these acts for 2 years failed. (Yea 320, nay 20.)	Yea.

Brief Summary of Some Legislation Enacted During the 88th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 2, 1964

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, in reviewing the work of the 88th Congress, there is no question that the dominant issue was that of civil rights. This historic legislation attracted more national attention and consumed more hours of debate in the U.S. House of Representatives than any other legislation in recent congressional history.

The impact of the 10 titles of the civil rights bill is not as great in Illinois as in the Southern States. However, the implementation of the civil rights bill through voluntary action, as well as local, State, and National efforts, is bound to keep this subject in the forefront of our national life for at least a decade.

The tax cut legislation is probably second in significance. If the theory of reducing taxes and increasing expenditures—without inflation and spiraling national debt—is achieved, this too will be a landmark in our Nation's history. My votes against the tax cut as well as my opposition to the debt increase and various appropriation bills bespeak my lack of confidence in the new economic philosophy which has guided this administration. However, with other citizens, I will watch the outcome and will prepare to meet new legislative challenges affecting the fiscal business of our Government.

Many have commended the 88th Congress for its boost to education. In the field of vocational education, the Congress has recognized the need to modernize this traditional Federal program. Extension of the National Defense Education Act and various other aids to higher education also account for this recognition.

Certainly the Congress has reflected a national concern for our natural resources. A national wilderness preservation system has been established by congressional action. In addition, a land and water conservation fund has been created to further develop our outdoor recreational facilities. Water resource centers in various colleges around the country are authorized by another measure passed by this Congress. A bill passed recently establishes a committee to review our vast public land holdings. Other measures relating to water pollution, pesticides, and natural resource development also have received favorable action in the Congress.

Our Nation's preeminence in space and in national defense have received popular support from members of both parties. These programs have been supplemented by legislative action in support of ROTC programs at the high school and college levels, strengthening of the Coast Guard and civil defense, as well as increasing enrollment of our Air Force and Military Academies to equal the enrollment at our Naval Academy at Annapolis.

Passage of measures in behalf of public health, mental health, hospital construction, and similar subjects indicate further concern for our individual citizens in need.

Most of the measures referred to here were passed without regard to party alinements. Some other bills such as the poverty, wheat-cotton, feeds grain, and mass transit bills have been omitted as it is the opinion of this Member of Congress that they will not be among the measures with which this Congress will be identified in the annals of history. Still, a Congress such as the 88th, identified with education, conservation, and national defense, is one to be remembered.

Congressman James R. Grover, Jr., Reports to the Second Congressional District of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES R. GROVER, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 2, 1964

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, we are on the threshold of adjournment of the historic 88th Congress at the end of its 2d session.

I was elected to this first term in the House of Representatives after 6 years of intensive work as a legislator in the New York State Assembly where I represented an assembly district which comprised two-thirds of the Second Congressional District.

This 2 years in the 88th Congress has been the most interesting and informative 2 years of my life, and I have been honored to serve my constituents in this House with such distinguished statesmen as you, Mr. Speaker, and my dedicated colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

During these 2 years, I have tried to be a full-time Representative, and my percentage attendance at quorum calls and rollcalls is 98 percent. I have spent many hundreds of hours at my desk and at hearings and meetings of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee and the Public Works Committee and the respective subcommittees to which I have been assigned.

I am proud of the productivity of the 88th Congress in many fields, although I feel that in some areas this Congress has failed to hold in check the administration's demands for new programs and excessive deficit spending.

In regard to education, the following were favorably enacted:

Higher Education Facilities Act: legislation providing vocational education; health professions educational assistance in the form of expanded teaching and research facilities and student loans; maternal and child health services, including crippled children's programs and research projects to prevent mental retardation; and the Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act.

The National Defense Education Act Amendments extend, expand, increase, and revise the program for 3 years; more graduate fellowships are provided, as well as counseling, guidance, and testing services; it will strengthen Federal support of language development and increase training opportunities under a program of grants for training institutes for certain teachers, library personnel, and guidance and counseling personnel. The amendments provide for a considerable expansion of the title 2 program of equipment grants. Presently such grants may only be given for equipment used in the teaching of science, mathematics, and modern foreign language. This will be expanded to include history, geography, English, reading, and civics.

On the conservation front, we passed the wilderness bill to protect 14.7 million acres in 10 States from destructive commercialism. The Land and Water Conservation Fund Act was also passed to set up a partially self-liquidating $2 billion fund for acquisition and development of new recreation and game refuge lands. Many local conservation bills were passed, including the Fire Island National Seashore bill. I was privileged to cosponsor the Keating seashore bill first passed in the Senate and substituted by the Pike bill in the House.

When I first became a legislator 8 years ago, someone said:

> You will rarely see a law repealed—you will just make new ones; and you will never lower, but only raise, taxes.

I was pleased to vote for the biggest tax cut in years; and, conscience dictated that I support economies in Government to help pay for it. Recently, I was named one of the watchdogs of the Treasury, by a National Businessmen's Association who rated me 90 percent on key votes as saving taxpayers' dollars.

Outstanding and controversial legislation which passed were the Mass Transportation Act, the civil rights law, and the antipoverty legislation; otherwise known as the Economic Opportunity Act.

At this time, the future of medicare, social security, and Appalachian relief are somewhat in doubt, as is the veterans pension bill, passed by the House and now in conference.

This session has produced renewal of the Housing Act, extension of the Hill-Burton Act for construction and modernization of hospitals, and a new law to provide aid to education of nurses.

The annual bill for highway construction was passed and a trail-blazing National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress was formed.

In our foreign affairs, I opposed at first an appropriation to the International Development Association and later supported it as a logical self-help approach to foreign aid. And I supported efforts to reduce foreign aid to underscore my belief that it should be streamlined and placed on a more sound and businesslike basis. I supported the Vietnam resolution supporting U.S. retaliation when attacked on the high seas, and I supported the resolution calling for penalizing United Nations members who do not pay the assessments.

The Panama Canal Subcommittee reported a bill similar to mine to set up a commission for study of a new sea level canal. This bill passed in the House.

I am pleased to state my voting record on major issues:

Date	Issue	Vote
1964		
Jan. 14	Extension with modifications of time for 3 years for Federal aid airport construction, $75,000,000 per year authorization. (Yea 298, nay 11.)	Yea.
Jan. 21	Confining Federal library services aid to rural and small town areas, while increasing authorization. (Yea 179, nay 183.)	Yea.
Jan. 21	Increased authorization, Federal aid for library services, from $7,500,000 to $25,000,000 for fiscal 1964, authorized new program for matching Federal grants. (Yea 254, nay 107.)	Yea.
Jan. 28	Amend Davis-Bacon Act, include more fringe benefits in making prevailing wage determinations. (Yea 357, nay 50.)	Yea.
Feb. 10	Civil Rights Act of 1964. (Yea 290, nay 130.)	Yea.
Feb. 18	Recommittal motion on simplifying and consolidating laws relating to employment of civilians in more than 1 position. (Yea 83, nay 262.)	Nay.
Feb. 20	Military procurement authorization, $17,000,000,000 for defense research, development, and ship, aircraft, and missile procurement. (Yea 336, nay 0.)	Yea.
Feb. 25	Amend Internal Revenue Code of 1954, reduce individual and corporate income taxes. (Yea 326, nay 83.)	Yea.
Feb. 26	Recommittal motion, authorization of U.S. participation in increase in resources of International Development Association. (Yea 208, nay 188.)	Yea.
Feb. 27	Amend Communications Act of 1934 prohibiting FCC from regulating radio and TV commercials. (Yea 317, nay 43.)	Yea.
Mar. 4	Recommittal motion limit 1965 Peace Corps authorization. (Yea 90, nay 309.)	Nay.
Mar. 5	Amend Internal Revenue Code of 1954, tax acquisitions of certain foreign securities. (Yea 238, nay 142.)	Nay.
Mar. 10	Establish Public Land Law Review Commission to study existing public land laws and regulations. (Yea 339, nay 29.)	Yea.
Mar. 12	Federal employees' pay increase, included $10,000 increase in salaries of Congressmen. (Yea 184, nay 222.)	Nay.
Mar. 23	Authorize National Bureau of Standards to improve fiscal and administrative practices for more effective research and development. (Yea 164, nay 162.)	Nay.
Mar. 24	Appropriations for Treasury, Post Office Department, Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies. (Yea 326, nay 20.)	Yea.
Mar. 25	$5,200,000,000 appropriation for NASA for fiscal 1965. (Yea 283, nay 73.)	Yea.
Apr. 6	Appropriation to carry out provisions of act establishing the Battle of Lake Erie Sesquicentennial Celebration Commission. (Yea 233, nay 39.)	Yea.
Apr. 8	Expanded cooperative Federal-State program of food assistance to needy. (Yea 229, nay 189)	Nay.
Apr. 8	Passage of wheat and cotton bill with Senate amendments. (Yea 211, nay 203.)	Nay.
Apr. 10	Recommittal motion on legislative branch appropriations for fiscal 1965. (Yea 188, nay 131.)	Yea.
Apr. 14	Appropriations of $6,900,000,000 for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and related agencies for fiscal 1965. (Yea 347, nay 21.)	Yea.
Apr. 15	Authorization of implementing finances of convention between United States and Mexico to settle boundary dispute. (Yea 348, nay 5.)	Yea.
Apr. 22	Appropriations for Department of Defense for fiscal 1965. (Yea 365, nay 0.)	Yea.
May 6	Appropriations for Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, the judiciary, and related agencies for fiscal 1965. (Yea 314, nay 40.)	Yea.
May 7	Appropriations for Atomic Energy Commission for fiscal 1965. (Yea 341, nay 3.)	Yea.
May 13	Recommittal motion, amend International Development Association Act, authorize U.S. participation in increase in resources. (Yea 132, nay 247)	Nay
May 18	Issuance of gold medal to Henry J. Kaiser. (Yea 150, nay 143; ⅔ needed.)	Nay
May 20	Amendment to appropriations for Department of Agriculture for peanut research laboratories. (Yea 181, nay 198.)	Nay
May 20	Appropriations for Department of Agriculture for fiscal 1965. (Yea 311, nay 64.)	Nay.
May 26	Appropriations for Defense Department for military construction for fiscal 1965. (Yea 340, nay 5.)	Yea.
May 27	Recommittal motion, increasing amount of insurance on savings and loan accounts by Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. (Yea 197, nay 142.)	Nay.
June 3	Authorization appropriations for fiscal 1966 and 1967 for highway construction. (Yea 296, nay 0.)	Yea.
June 10	New appropriations for foreign aid for fiscal 1965. (Yea 230, nay 175.)	Yea.
June 11	Federal employees' pay increase, with increase for Congressmen reduced from previous bill. (Yea 243, nay 157.)	Yea.
June 16	Appropriations for public works projects of Department of Defense, Atomic Energy Commission, Department of the Interior, and other related agencies. (Yea 361, nay 11.)	Yea.
June 17	Recommittal motion, reduction of certain excise tax rates. (Yea 185, nay 207.)	Yea.
June 18	Increase temporarily national debt limit. (Yea 203, nay 182.)	Nay.
June 25	Amendment broadening job protection for employees in transit companies, mass transit bill. (Yea 234, nay 170.)	Yea.
June 25	Federal assistance on greater scale for mass transportation in metropolitan and other urban areas. (Yea 212, nay 189.)	Yea.
July 1	Appropriations for foreign aid for fiscal 1965. (Yea 231, nay 174.)	Yea.
July 2	Civil Rights Act of 1964. (Yea 289, nay 126.)	Yea.
July 2	Authorizing Speaker of House to appoint special committee to report on campaign expenditures. (Yea 264, nay 92.)	Yea.
July 2	Agreeing to conference report on act to establish water resources research centers at land-grant colleges. (Yea 347, nay 0.)	Yea.
July 21	Protection of postal patrons from obscene mail matter and Communist propaganda. (Yea 326, nay 19.)	Yea.
July 21	Establish National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress. (Yea 260, nay 76.)	Yea.
July 22	Resolution providing for consideration of bill to establish land and water conservation fund. (Yea 338, nay 8.)	Yea.
July 28	Permit certain owners of fishing boats to receive medical care and hospitalization without charge at hospitals of Public Health Service. (Yea 202, nay 170.)	Nay.
July 29	Increase benefits under Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system. (Yea 388, nay 8.)	Yea.
July 30	Establish national wilderness preservation system. (Yea 374, nay 1.)	Yea.
Aug. 3	Authorize Secretary of Interior cooperation in administration of Ice Age National Scientific Reserve in State of Wisconsin. (Yea 164, nay 154; ⅔ needed.)	Nay.
Aug. 3	Provide reclamation projects under Colorado River Storage Project Act. (Yea 250, nay 67.)	Nay.
Aug. 4	Appropriations for Defense Department for fiscal 1965. (Yea 186, nay 178.)	Nay.
Aug. 7	Joint resolution to promote peace and security in southeast Asia. (Yea 416, nay 0.)	Yea.
Aug. 7	Motion to strike enacting clause antipoverty bill. (Yea 197, nay 225.)	Yea.
Aug. 7	Substituting Senate version of antipoverty bill. (Yea 228, nay 190.)	Nay.
Aug. 7	Motion to recommit antipoverty bill. (Yea 117, nay 295.)	Nay.
Aug. 8	Passage of antipoverty bill. (Yea 226, nay 185.)	Nay.
Aug. 11	Increase in disability and death pensions for veterans. (Yea 389, nay 0.)	Yea.
Aug. 11	Amend District of Columbia Code withholding charitable solicitations license from any who it is felt would not promote health, welfare, and morals. (Yea 301, nay 81.)	Yea.
Aug. 12	Amend Trade With the Enemy Act, let Court of Claims have jurisdiction over validity of foreign claims. (Yea 374, nay 3.)	Yea.
Aug. 12	Authorize payment of U.S. share of costs of International Commission for Supervision and Control in Laos. (Yea 268, nay 89.)	Nay.
Aug. 13	Recommittal motion, independent offices appropriation bill. (Yea 114, nay 270.)	Nay.
Aug. 13	Housing Act of 1964, authorizing appropriations for FHA programs for fiscal 1965. (Yea 306, nay 68.)	Yea.
Aug. 14	Subsidizing program for construction of fishing vessels in U.S. shipyards. (Yea 196, nay 124)	Yea.
Aug. 14	Resolution to pay expenses incurred by special subcommittee on poverty out of contingent funds of the House. (Yea 115, nay 156.)	Nay.
Aug. 17	Resolution continuing efforts toward securing payment by members of the U.N. of their assessments in arrears. (Yea 351, nay 0.)	Yea.
Aug. 17	Require migrant farm labor crew leaders of 10 or more workers to register with the Department of Labor. (Yea 393, nay 7.)	Yea.
Aug. 17	Extend mandatory Federal inspection requirements to previously exempt small mines. (Yea 202, nay 151.)	Yea.
Aug. 18	Agreement on conference report establishing mandatory quotas on meat imports. (Yea 232, nay 149.)	Nay.
Aug. 18	Conference report International Coffee Agreement. (Yea 183, nay 194.)	Nay.
Aug. 18	Conference report amending Internal Revenue Code taxing acquisitions of certain foreign securities. (Yea 221, nay 147.)	Nay.
Aug. 18	Conference report on bill to guarantee electric consumers in Pacific Northwest first call on electric energy generated plants in that region. (Yea 230, nay 134.)	Nay.
Aug. 19	Conference report on bill extending and amending laws relating to housing, urban renewal and community facilities. (Yea 310, nay 70.)	Yea.
Aug. 19	Prohibit Federal courts from considering cases involving reapportionment of State legislatures. (Yea 218, nay 175.)	Nay.
Aug. 20	Establishment of a National Council on the Arts. (Yea 213, nay 135.)	Yea.
Sept. 1	Bill to study feasibility and site for new Atlantic-Pacific canal to supplement Panama. (Yea 320, nay 23.)	Yea.
Sept. 1	Coordinate Interior Department and Agriculture Department activities on pesticides. (Yea 236, nay 110)	Yea.
Sept. 3	Motion to recommit food-for-peace program to prohibit sales to Poland and Yuoslavia. (Yea 183, nay 175.)	Yea.
Sept. 3	Allow 50 percent forgiveness of Federal students with loans to doctors practicing in remote, rural areas. (Yea 140, nay 160.)	Yea.
Sept. 3	Extend the food-for-peace program for 3 years. (Yea 349, nay 6.)	Yea.
Sept. 22	Supplemental appropriations bill for fiscal 1965. (Yea 208, nay 103.)	Yea.
Sept. 23	Cooperation of Secretary of Interior with State of Wisconsin on Ice Age National Scientific Reserve. (Yea 180, nay 118.)	Nay.
Oct. 1	Resolution on continuing appropriations for fiscal 1965. (Yea 159, nay 193.)	Nay.
Oct. 1	Conference report on extension and amendment of National Defense Education Act of 1958. (Yea 320, nay 20.)	Yea.

Mr. Miller's Relationship With the Lockport Felt Co.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 2, 1964

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, today I wish to go into the question of Mr. Miller's relationship with the Lockport Felt Co. and related companies. This matter deserves more public scrutiny and more public information than has yet been given it.

From the days of Thomas Jefferson the House of Representatives has proceeded upon certain assumptions, assumptions that have perhaps not always been justified, but nevertheless are necessary if the people of the United States are to have any trust in their elected Representatives. In "Jefferson's Manual and Rules of the House of Representatives," the following is stated:

> Where the private interests of a Member are concerned in a bill or question he is to withdraw. And where such an interest has appeared, his voice has been disallowed, even after a division. In a case so contrary, not only to the laws of decency, but to the fundamental principle of the social compact, which denies to any man to be a judge in his own cause, it is for the honor of the House that this rule of immemorial observance should be strictly adhered to.

This has been followed in the Rules of the House of Representatives, rule VIII, with the right of a Member to vote, limited by the following restriction:

> Every Member shall vote on each question put, unless he has a direct personal or pecuniary interest in the event of such question.

The record of this Congress indisputably shows that on July 23, 1956, and on February 4, 1958, Congressman William E. Miller took the floor of the House of Representatives to voice objection to certain proposed legislation which was opposed by the Lockport Felt Co. Mr. Miller has explained this as merely an act that he would do for any constituent and has stated that he does not own any stock in the Lockport Felt Co.

Last night Mr. Miller stated he had been a director and an officer of the Lockport Felt Co. since 1947 and has received a salary of $7,500 a year from that company ever since that time. He denied ever having owned any shares of stock in that company. When, in connection with a recent Federal Trade Commission price-fixing proceeding against the Lockport Felt Co., Mr. Miller was asked about that matter, he was quoted as saying that he was not in management and not familiar with the matter.

Now, I do not know what management is if it does not include a director and officer of a company. I do not know what Mr. Miller would do to earn his $7,500 a year, the public does not know what Mr. Miller did to earn his $7,500 a year, but we do know that Mr. Miller did not disclose to the House of Representatives on July 23, 1956, or on February 4, 1958, that he was an officer or director of Lockport Felt Co. I think that the House of Representatives and the American public are entitled to know what he did to earn this amount of money.

In this connection, Mr. Miller has admitted owning stock in Lockport Holdings, Ltd., which he valued at $27,500. I find it significant that he did not disclose certain information which was reported in the Canadian press this summer in connection with the opening of a million-dollar plant in Vancouver, British Columbia. According to the report, Mr. Miller's stock in Lockport Holdings, Ltd., constitutes 25 percent of the stock in that company. According to that report, Mr. Lee, the president of Lockport Felt Co., owns another 25 percent, thereby giving Mr. Lee and Mr. Miller together a half interest in the company. According to that same report, Lockport Holdings, Ltd., owns the land and the buildings involved in this million-dollar plant. And what is the company putting up that million-dollar plant, but Lockport Pacific, Ltd. And who does that same story report as a director of Lockport Pacific, Ltd., but the same Mr. Miller.

This is a pretty deep involvement for a man who says he is not in management, for a man who says he had no financial interest in the well-being of the Lockport Felt Co. Perhaps the press story is wrong. Perhaps there is an innocent explanation. I say it would be an irresponsible Democrat and an irresponsible Republican and an irresponsible American citizen who did not demand that explanation.

In order to be very specific, I have set forth a series of questions which, if fully and candidly answered, may cast some light on this matter. This cannot be swept under the rug by some campaign cry of smear, for the facts and reported facts are there, and it is up to Congressman Miller, to the House of Representatives, and to the American people to see that the questions are answered. The questions are as follows:

First. State the services you performed for the Lockport Felt Co. in return for the payment of $7,500 a year for each year while you were a Member of the Congress of the United States.

Second. Explain what you meant by stating you were not in management when you are an officer and director of the Lockport Felt Co., and a director and significant stockholder of one or more related companies.

Third. Set forth the exact interest you have and the exact positions you hold in any of the Lockport related companies including, but not limited to, Lockport Felt Co., Lockport Holdings, Ltd., and Lockport Pacific, Ltd.

Fourth. State when you acquired those holdings, the amount you paid for such holdings, and their current market value today.

Fifth. State what other action, if any, you have taken since becoming a Member of the Congress on behalf of the Lockport Felt Co., with respect to legislation or matters before any agency of the U.S. Government, including correspondence with the various agencies of the executive branch of the Government. Explain why you did not disclose to the House of Representatives in 1956 and 1958 your relationship to the Lockport Felt Co., when you spoke and voted on its behalf.

Tomorrow I will have a statement concerning Mr. Miller's law firm in Buffalo, N.Y., and a list of questions concerning it.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday I personally delivered a copy of my statement to Congressman Miller's office with a request that it be sent to him. I will do the same with today's statement.

The ethical requirements of the legal profession, as set forth in numerous opinions of the Committee on Professional Ethics and Grievances of the American Bar Association, make two rules very clear.

First, where a person is not a partner in a law firm, it is highly improper for him to permit the firm to hold him out to the public as a partner. This is set forth, for example, in Opinions 97, 106, 115, and 126 of the committee.

Second, the relations of partners in a law firm are such that neither the firm, nor any member or associate thereof, may accept any professional employment which any member of the firm cannot properly accept. Opinions of the committee, numbers 72, 33, 49, 50, 185, and 220.

The standard directory for the legal profession is the "Martindale-Hubbell Law Directory." In its 1964 edition, at pages 4250–4251 of volume II, in setting forth the background of the various members of the law firm of Miller, Farmelo, Adams & Stenger, of Buffalo, N.Y., Mr. Miller's name is listed first. Included in that background is the fact that he has been a Member of the House of Representatives since 1951, a member of the Committee on the Judiciary since 1953, and chairman of the Republican National Committee since 1961. Nowhere in the directory is there any indication that Mr. Miller is less than an active partner.

Immediately after the recent Federal Trade Commission proceedings against the Lockport Felt Co., where that company signed a consent order to prohibit price fixing, it was learned that Mr. Miller's law firm in Buffalo had represented the Lockport Felt Co. in those proceedings. Mr. Miller's partners stated that Mr. Miller was inactive and did not participate in the affairs or the revenues of the firm. I do not believe Mr. Miller has spoken on this subject. But the simple question is raised, Is Mr. Miller a partner as shown in the law directory, where he is held out as the senior partner, with a full biography given, or is he not a partner and not responsible for his law firm's actions? He must be one or the other.

Now this law firm, according to the records, was not established until 1961 or 1962. It was in 1961 that two of his apparent partners left the U.S. Attorney's office and the firm was established. Prior to that time no listing for this firm was contained in the "Martindale-Hubbell Law Directory," but on the contrary Mr. Miller was listed as a sole practitioner in Lockport, N.Y., as distinguished from being the senior partner of a law firm in Buffalo. Since Mr. MILLER was a Congressman at that time and also chairman of the Republican National Committee in 1961, it is a little hard to understand the purpose of the law firm, or the purpose of his being the first name and his being the first biography, if he was not going to be active in the firm or participate in its profits. Perhaps he was just taking out insurance for the day when he was defeated when he ran for public office. If that is the case, he ought to say so frankly, and he ought to fully disclose all income, if any, he received from the firm and what business, if any, he channeled to the firm.

What really makes this a more serious problem is the fact that Mr. MILLER has stated that he was receiving a fee of $7,500 a year from the Lockport Felt Co. He has said that he was not in management when a question came up about a recent Federal Trade Commission price-fixing charge against the Lockport Felt Co., and that therefore he really did not know anything about it. Nevertheless, on January 31, 1964, a notice of appearance on behalf of the Lockport Felt Co., was filed with the Federal Trade Commission, and that notice of appearance is on the letterhead of Miller, Farmelo, Adams & Stenger, and in the listing of partners on the letterhead the first name listed is WILLIAM E. MILLER. In addition to the notice of appearance, the consent order of April 30, 1964, was signed on behalf of the entire law firm, being signed "Miller, Farmelo, Adams & Stenger. By: Neil R. Farmelo."

Does Mr. MILLER really contend that the same Mr. Miller who is a director of the Lockport Felt Co. and who is the first listed partner in the law firm representing the Lockport Felt Co. had no idea of what was going on? Would he not know that his name was being utilized in appearances before the Federal Trade Commission, an agency of the U.S. Government?

Again I ask what was he doing for the $7,500 a year which the Lockport Felt Co. was paying him? As I noted above, Mr. MILLER is quoted as saying he is not in management. When asked about his speeches on the floor of the House of Representatives on behalf of the Lockport Felt Co., he disclaimed being paid to make those speeches. Was his fee for legal services, and would it include the services of his firm before the Federal Trade Commission? Did his firm receive any fee from the Lockport Felt Co., and does Mr. MILLER share in the firm's profits?

The "Martindale-Hubbell Law Directory" provides in a number of instances an approximate estimate of net worth, and the directory specifically states that it is often difficult to obtain reliable estimates and, therefore, the ratings it gives are approximations only. Until the formation of this law firm in 1961 or 1962, Mr. MILLER showed a rating indicating his net worth was about $5,000 or $10,000. I assume that rating was low. On the other hand, Mr. MILLER's current net worth, at the values he gives, is well in excess of $200,000. Allowing a margin of error on both sides, there is still a very great gap. Disclosure of Mr. MILLER's income, and the sources thereof, in the last 4 years, therefore would certainly seem in order.

I do not raise these questions lightly.

Senator CLIFFORD CASE pointed out in a recent article on congressional conflicts of interest, contained in volume 24, No. 3, of the Federal Bar Journal, as follows:

> When conflicts-of-interest legislation was first passed by the Congress in the 19th century, the Congress was a part-time legislative body, meeting 6 or less months a year. However, the office of the 20th century Congressman is a year-round responsibility, and little time is left for conscientious Members to dabble in business or professional activities.

In that same article Senator CASE cited certain canons of professional ethics of the American Bar Association and stated:

> On the basis of canons 26 and 32, the committee on professional ethics of the ABA has rules that: "a law firm could not accept employment to appear before a legislative committee while a member of the firm is serving in the Legislature * * * (and that) a full disclosure before the committee would not alter this ruling nor would it be changed by the fact that the Member of the Legislature would not share in the fee received thereby." Opinion 296, August 1, 1959, 45 ABAJ 1272 (1959).

It seems to me that the same standards must follow in connection with the Congressman representing a client before the House of Representatives and with regard to the Congressman's participating as a member of the law firm appearing before a Federal agency. Again I wish to make clear that we do not know what the facts are here, but the issues are too important and the Congressman is seeking too high an office for there to be any doubt left on this score.

Mr. MILLER's statements have not provided the full facts. I think it is important to the integrity of the Congress, and to the integrity of the office that Mr. MILLER seeks, that he promptly disclose those facts. To make it easier for him, I have against listed some questions which I think should be answered fully and completely:

First. Are you a partner in the law firm of Miller, Farmelo, Adams & Stenger, and if so, to what extent did you participate in this law firm, either in fees or in work, and to what extent have you participated from 1961 on, including your anticipated participation in 1964 fees? In this regard you should reveal the partnership agreement beginning with the original agreement, and any changes made subsequent thereto.

Second. If you have not received any fees from your law firm, and will not for 1964, what was the purpose in setting up the firm and in allowing your name to be listed first on the firm letterhead and as the first biography in the directory?

Third. Why did you not prevent your law firm from utilizing your name in an appearance before the Federal Trade Commission?

Fourth. In how many other cases has your name been utilized before Federal agencies by your law firm?

Fifth. What services have you rendered in each year to the Lockport Felt Co. to receive an annual retainer of $7,500 a year?

Sixth. Is your law firm of Miller, Farmelo, Adams & Stenger receiving a fee for its services in the Federal Trade Commission proceedings?

Seventh. Did you receive payments for any services rendered by you or others in connection with the Federal Trade Commission proceedings or proceedings before any other Federal agency?

Eighth. What was your income for each year beginning with 1961, and what were the sources thereof?

I hope Mr. MILLER will promptly take the opportunity to give us his version of the facts so that the House, before it adjourns, may make a judgment on how to proceed.

SENATE

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 3, 1964

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, God, who putteth down the mighty from their seats, and exalteth the humble and the meek: As this hallowed Chamber, set upon a hill, and in the anxious gaze of all the earth, will so shortly be left empty and silent, may those who have here spoken and acted according to their consciences and their convictions for the welfare of the Nation and of the world, turn their faces homeward with a sense of dedicated stewardship, faithfully rendered, which deserves the appreciation of the Republic.

As for a while voices within these walls are silenced, we are solemnly conscious that across the weeks ahead the reverent gaze of the Nation will be, not on its stately legislative halls, but upon the unadorned, yet sacred, voting booths set up from sea to sea, in which, free from spying eyes, every citizen dowered with the precious right of the franchise can be alone with his own conscience, none daring to molest or make afraid.

Whatever the verdict of the people may be, we thank Thee that as Americans we can say with utter confidence, "God reigns, and the Government at Washington still stands"—and stands even amid the encircling gloom, as a beacon light of truth and liberty for all the earth.

We lift our prayer in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request by Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the

Journal of the proceedings of Friday, October 2, 1964, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries.

REPORT ON THE FOREIGN ASSISTANCE PROGRAM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 357)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States:

This report demonstrates the remarkable progress made in strengthening our foreign assistance programs and policies since 1961.

The 1961 act for international development called for major changes in the operation and emphasis of these historic programs. For more effective direction, the activities of several agencies were brought together under the Agency for International Development. New guidelines were laid down for our aid programs as part of the bold effort to make the 1960's the decade of development.

This report for fiscal 1963 shows clearly the ways in which these new guidelines are being translated into concrete programs. They provide the foundations for the lean, tightly managed aid program we plan for fiscal 1965. I want to call your attention particularly, therefore, to some significant features of this report which mark our progress during 1963 toward basic and continuing objectives of our foreign assistance policy.

INTEREST-BEARING LOANS REPLACE GRANTS

As the 1961 act directed, interest-bearing loans have replaced grants as the chief mechanism for assistance. Loans represented 57 percent of AID's commitments during fiscal 1963—the highest proportion in the history of the foreign assistance program.

AID IS MORE SELECTIVE

Our aid became increasingly selective and concentrated in fiscal 1963—a trend that has since been accelerated. Eighty percent of all economic assistance funds authorized that year were for just 20 countries. Sixty percent of total military assistance went to just nine key countries.

AID TO LATIN AMERICA INCREASES

To increase the impact of the Alliance for Progress, our aid to Latin America was sharply stepped up in fiscal 1963, reaching 23 percent of worldwide commitments, compared with 18 percent the preceding year and an average of only 2 percent from 1948 to 1960.

NEW POLICIES PROTECT THE DOLLAR

Policies designed to protect our balance of payments produced major results in fiscal 1963—a dramatic jump in the purchases of U.S. products. U.S. producers supplied 78 percent of all AID-financed commodities during the year, compared with 63 percent the preceding year, and less than 50 percent in earlier years.

INCREASED PARTICIPATION BY U.S. INDUSTRY

Under these policies U.S. business and industry exported $855 million in AID-financed goods and equipment to Asia, Africa, and Latin America during the year, and American shipping firms were paid about $80 million to carry AID-financed commodities to their destinations in the less-developed countries. These dollars meant more jobs for American workers.

As a result of the same policy, U.S. ships carried more than 80 percent of the total net AID-financed cargo that year, well in excess of the 50 percent required by the Cargo Preference Act.

PRIVATE ORGANIZATIONS PLAY A LARGER ROLE

The 1961 act also called for greater use of America's vast private resources in the battle against world poverty. During fiscal 1963, about one-fourth of all technical assistance was carried out not by AID personnel, but by American colleges, universities, business, professional firms, and service organizations on contract with AID.

More than 70 of our colleges and universities were at work in 40 countries under AID contracts, helping other people make progress in education, in health, in agriculture, in business, and industry.

During the year, there was a fourfold increase in cooperative programs designed to help private citizens organize savings and loan institutions, credit unions, rural electric cooperatives, housing and farm credit co-ops. These programs that go right to the people have continued to grow. To expand this significant work, AID relied heavily on contracts with experienced private groups such as the Credit Union National Association, the National League of Insured Savings Associations, the Cooperative League of America, and the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association.

INCREASED EMPHASIS ON PRIVATE ENTERPRISE

In recognition of the fact that foreign investors helped build our own Nation's economy and that private capital must do most of the job for the developing nations, we increased efforts to encourage American investment in the less-developed countries. Twelve countries signed investment guaranty agreements during fiscal 1963, bringing to 55 the number of less-developed countries participating in this successful program.

This year, for the first time, AID guaranteed a substantial amount of new U.S. private dollar investment in development banks organized to foster private enterprise in the less-developed countries. U.S. investors applied for guaranty coverage totaling $32 million for new or additional investments in such banks.

SIGNIFICANT SAVINGS BY IMPROVED MANAGEMENT

Fiscal 1963 saw the beginning of significant economies in the management of aid programs by the Agency for International Development. Economies made in that year included savings of more than $900,000 by centralized purchase of DDT, $1,200,000 during the first 6 months of the fiscal year alone through tighter travel policies and regulations, and $34 million saved through an aggressive program to use Government-owned excess property in oversea projects.

ECONOMIC AID TO EUROPE TERMINATED

Major assistance to Europe under the Marshall plan had ended by the mid-fifties, but a few smaller supplemental programs continued during the years after. Fiscal 1963 saw the last economic assistance commitment for Europe: a single grant of $125,000 authorized to finance the closing out of prior activities in Yugoslavia.

Finally, let me point out this. It is particularly appropriate that the same year which marked the termination of the historic and successful Marshall plan for Europe was also the year in which our efforts in the less-developed countries began giving unmistakable evidence of success.

With our help, developed countries like Britain, France, and Japan recovered from the war rapidly and were soon in a position to give rather than receive assistance. But when we first extended America's helping hand to the less-developed countries a decade ago, there was no such promise of rapid results. We knew it was right and necessary to help these poorer countries to a better life if we were to preserve our own good life and expand the family of the free. But only recently could we be certain that it was practical and only recently have been able to see with our eyes the proof of our earlier vision. In fiscal 1963, for the first time, it became unmistakably clear that countries like free China were ending their dependence on AID and that others would follow.

We know today that the progress in controlling diseases that have sapped men's strength to build and to work, the steady expansion of educational opportunities, the slow but persistent increase in national income and output in the countries we have aided are leading to further successes. We know that if our goal is still distant, our course is true.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *October 3, 1964.*

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore announced that on today, October 3, 1964, he signed the following enrolled bills, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

H.R. 1096. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to cooperate with the State of Wisconsin in the designation and administration of the Ice Age National Scientific Reserve in the State of Wisconsin, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 7348. An act for the relief of Frank B. Rowlett.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the morning hour Senators be allowed to speak for at least 3 minutes—longer, if need be.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RESOLUTIONS

NOTIFICATION OF THE PRESIDENT

Mr. MANSFIELD submitted a resolution (S. Res. 379) appointing a committee to notify the President concerning the proposed adjournment of the session, which was considered and agreed to.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. MANSFIELD, which appears under a separate heading.)

TENDERING THE THANKS OF THE SENATE TO THE PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

Mr. MANSFIELD submitted a resolution (S. Res. 380) tendering the thanks of the Senate to the President pro tempore for the courteous, dignified, and impartial manner in which he has presided over the deliberations of the Senate, which was considered and agreed to.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. MANSFIELD, which appears under a separate heading.)

TENDERING THE THANKS OF THE SENATE TO THE ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

Mr. DIRKSEN submitted a resolution (S. Res. 381) tendering the thanks of the Senate to the Acting President pro tempore for the courteous, dignified, and impartial manner in which he has presided over the deliberations of the Senate, which was considered and agreed to.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. DIRKSEN, which appears under a separate heading.)

AUTHORIZATION FOR PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE TO MAKE CERTAIN APPOINTMENTS AFTER THE SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT OF THE PRESENT SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD submitted a resolution (S. Res. 382) authorizing the President pro tempore to make certain appointments after the sine die adjournment of the present session, which was considered and agreed to.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. MANSFIELD, which appears under a separate heading.)

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, at the request of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] I ask unanimous consent that his name be added as a cosponsor to Senate Joint Resolution 45 originally introduced by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE] which is the constitutional amendment on the equal rights for women, and I ask that the name of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] be added at the next printing of the resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, at the request of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MCINTYRE], I ask unanimous consent that his name be added as a cosponsor to Senate Joint Resolution 45 at the time of its next printing.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. BAYH:

Report of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary relating to a proposed amendment to the Constitution which would guarantee that persons are not discriminated against solely because of their sex.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR WALTERS OF TENNESSEE

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, the close of any session of the Senate is attended with happiness. It is also attended with some sadness. I, for one, who represent the State of Kentucky, shall miss very much a representative of our neighboring State, the Volunteer State of Tennessee, Senator WALTERS.

Senator WALTERS, during his service in the Senate, has been faithful to his duties and attendance in the Senate and in the committees on which he serves.

Senators know that Senator WALTERS has often occupied the chair as the designee of the President pro tempore, the honored Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]. Senator WALTERS has always presided with dignity and fairness—yet with firmness. He has participated in the debates in the Senate on important questions which have been before it. He has brought to the Senate good judgment, and wisdom borne of his long experience in public affairs.

As one Member of the Senate, I am sure that I speak the sentiments of this body when I state that we shall miss his wisdom, his good judgment, and his fine qualities of character.

I wish to express my warm regard and pay tribute to our colleague and neighbor, Senator WALTERS, and at the same time to express my sadness that he will not be with us next year.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, apropos the remarks just made by the Senator from Kentucky, even though Senator WALTERS is retiring voluntarily, I remind him that he will always have the privilege of the floor. I hope that from time to time he will come back and meet with us, visit with us, and give us the benefit of his advice and counsel.

FAREWELL ADDRESS BY SENATOR WALTERS

Mr. WALTERS. Mr. President, I sincerely appreciate the opportunity I have had to know, associate, and serve with the finest group of men in the world—Members of the U.S. Senate.

I am frankly at a loss to find words to express my deep appreciation for the statements which were placed in the RECORD on Thursday, Friday, and today. You have been most kind and generous and from the bottom of my humble heart I say thank you.

I leave the Senate with a far greater understanding of what makes our democratic way of life superior to that of other political ideologies. I take away with me a much deeper appreciation of the enormity of the task which is a constant challenge to legislators and our Chief Executive. I have always been aware of the vital importance of each citizen's active participation in his Government; the full realization of this, however, is far more vividly clear to me now. I understand how vital each single individual is to the efficient functioning of the complex structure of our operation as a great and growing nation. As the 88th session of Congress draws to a close, so also does my career as a U.S. Senator. It has been an experience unparalleled in my entire life. The privilege of service I have enjoyed has been shared with only 46 persons from my State. I feel singularly honored to have my name linked with these great men.

I leave the scene with mixed emotions. I have thoroughly enjoyed representing the people of Tennessee, and I have had moments of real satisfaction especially when I could be of some substantial service. This last year and some months have enabled me to realize the culmination of all my dreams as a young man and my ambitions as an adult. I am sorry that I have not been able to speak with each of you personally to thank you for your many kindnesses and for the assistance which you have so generously and warmly extended to me. In my heart I have a deep and abiding affection for you. I hope that I will have a chance to visit with you often in the next session of Congress.

In closing may I offer a prayer that God will give you good health, His richest blessings, and the strength and wisdom to continue for many many years your outstanding service to your State and to our country.

On my desk I have a plaque which expresses these thoughts more eloquently—an old Gaelic blessing:

> May the roads rise with you, And the wind be always at your back; And may the Lord hold you in the hollow of His hand.

Goodbye, good luck, and God bless you.

THE UNSPOKEN SPEECH OF JOHN F. KENNEDY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, we are fortunate to have still one more John F. Kennedy speech—one that was never given. These unspoken words were to be delivered to a combined meeting of the Dallas Citizens Council and the Dallas Assembly that fateful day in November. What more poignant commentary on the act which prevented his appearance and took his life than when he wrote:

> There will always be dissident voices heard in the land, expressing opposition without

alternatives, finding fault but never favor, perceiving gloom on every side and seeking influence without responsibility.

The assassination was both an act of enormous influence on America and an act of enormous irresponsibility.

John F. Kennedy was to speak that day of the strengths of our Nation—strengths that were to be taxed and not found wanting during those next sorrowful days. As long as we are blessed with men like John F. Kennedy, men of wisdom, of honor, and of dedication to a greater America our Nation will be equal to all challenges.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the "Unspoken Speech of John F. Kennedy at Dallas, November 22, 1963," be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE UNSPOKEN SPEECH OF JOHN F. KENNEDY AT DALLAS, NOVEMBER 22, 1963

President KENNEDY. I am honored to have this invitation to address the annual meeting of the Dallas Citizens Council, joined by the members of the Dallas Assembly—and pleased to have this opportunity to salute the Graduate Research Center of the Southwest.

It is fitting that these two symbols of Dallas progress are united in the sponsorship of this meeting. For they represent the best qualities, I am told, of leadership and learning in this city—and leadership and learning are indispensable to each other. The advancement of learning depends on community leadership for financial and political support—and the products of that learning, in turn, are essential to the leadership's hopes for continued progress and prosperity. It is not a coincidence that those communities possessing the best in research and graduate facilities—from MIT to Cal Tech—tend to attract the new and growing industries. I congratulate those of you here in Dallas who have recognized these basic facts through the creation of the unique and forward-looking Graduate Research Center.

This link between leadership and learning is not only essential at the community level. It is even more indispensable in world affairs. Ignorance and misinformation can handicap the progress of a city or a company—but they can, if allowed to prevail in foreign policy, handicap this country's security. In a world of complex and continuing problems, in a world full of frustrations and irritations, America's leadership must be guided by the lights of learning and reason—or else those who confuse rhetoric with reality and the plausible with the possible will gain the popular ascendancy with their seemingly swift and simple solutions to every world problem.

There will always be dissident voices heard in the land, expressing opposition without alternatives, finding fault but never favor, perceiving gloom on every side and seeking influence without responsibility. Those voices are inevitable.

But today other voices are heard in the land—voices preaching doctrines wholly unrelated to reality, wholly unsuited to the sixties, doctrines which apparently assume that words will suffice without weapons, that vituperation is as good as victory and that peace is a sign of weakness. At a time when the national debt is steadily being reduced in terms of its burden on our economy, they see that debt as the greatest single threat to our security. At a time when we are steadily reducing the number of Federal employees serving every thousand citizens, they fear those supposed hordes of civil servants far more than the actual hordes of opposing armies.

We cannot expect that everyone, to use the phrase of a decade ago, will "talk sense to the American people." But we can hope that fewer people will listen to nonsense. And the notion that this Nation is headed for defeat through deficit, or that strength is but a matter of slogans, is nothing but just plain nonsense.

I want to discuss with you today the status of our strength and our security because this question clearly calls for the most responsible qualities of leadership and the most enlightened products of scholarship. For this Nation's strength and security are not easily or cheaply obtained—nor are they quickly and simply explained. There are many kinds of strength and no one kind will suffice. Overwhelming nuclear strength cannot stop a guerrilla war. Formal pacts of alliance cannot stop internal subversion, displays of material wealth cannot stop the disillusionment of diplomats subjected to discrimination. Above all, words alone are not enough. The United States is a peaceful nation. And where our strength and determination are clear, our words need merely to convey conviction, not belligerence. If we are strong, our strength will speak for itself. If we are weak, words will be of no help.

I realize that this Nation often tends to identify turning points in world affairs with the major addresses which preceded them. But it was not the Monroe Doctrine that kept all Europe away from this hemisphere—it was the strength of the British fleet and the width of the Atlantic Ocean. It was not General Marshall's speech at Harvard which kept communism out of Western Europe—it was the strength and stability made possible by our military and economic assistance.

In this administration also it has been necessary at times to issue specific warnings—warnings that we could not stand by and watch the Communists conquer Laos by force, or intervene in the Congo, or swallow West Berlin or maintain offensive missiles on Cuba. But while our goals were at least temporarily obtained in these and other instances, our successful defense of freedom was due—not to the words we used—but to the strength we stood ready to use on behalf of the principles we stand ready to defend.

This strength is composed of many different elements, ranging from the most massive deterrents to the most subtle influences. And all types of strength are needed—no one kind could do the job alone. Let us take a moment, therefore, to review this Nation's progress in each major area of strength.

I

First, as Secretary McNamara made clear in his address last Monday, the strategic nuclear power of the United States has been so greatly modernized and expanded in the last 1,000 days, by the rapid production and deployment of the most modern missile systems, that any and all potential aggressors are clearly confronted now with the impossibility of strategic victory—and the certainty of total destruction—if by reckless attack they should ever force upon us the necessity of a strategic reply.

In less than 3 years, we have increased by 50 percent the number of Polaris submarines scheduled to be in force by the next fiscal year; increased by more than 70 percent our total Polaris purchase program; increased by more than 75 percent our Minuteman purchase program; increased by 50 percent the portion of our strategic bombers on 15-minute alert, and increased by 100 percent the total number of nuclear weapons available in our strategic alert forces. Our security is further enhanced by the steps we have taken regarding these weapons to improve the speed and certainty of their response, their readiness at all times to respond, their ability to survive an attack, and their ability to be carefully controlled and directed through secure command operations.

II

But the lessons of the last decade have taught us that freedom cannot be defended by strategic nuclear power alone. We have, therefore, in the last 3 years accelerated the development and deployment of tactical nuclear weapons, and increased by 60 percent the tactical nuclear forces deployed in Western Europe.

Nor can Europe or any other continent rely on nuclear forces alone, whether they are strategic or tactical. We have radically improved the readiness of our conventional forces; increased by 45 percent the number of combat-ready divisions; increased by 100 percent the procurement of modern Army weapons and equipment; increased by 100 percent our ship construction, conversion, and modernization program; increased by 100 percent our procurement of tactical aircraft; increased by 30 percent the number of tactical air squadrons; and increased the strength of the Marines. As last month's Operation Big Lift, which originated here in Texas, showed so clearly, this Nation is prepared as never before to move substantial numbers of men in surprisingly little time to advanced positions anywhere in the world. We have increased by 175 percent the procurement of airlift aircraft, and we have already achieved a 75 percent increase in our existing strategic airlift capability.

Finally, moving beyond the traditional roles of our military forces, we have achieved an increase of nearly 600 percent in our special forces—those forces that are prepared to work with our allies and friends against the guerrillas, saboteurs, insurgents, and assassins who threaten freedom in a less direct but equally dangerous manner.

III

But American military might should not and need not stand alone against the ambitions of international communism. Our security and strength, in the last analysis, directly depend on the security and strength of others—and that is why our military and economic assistance plays such a key role in enabling those who live on the periphery of the Communist world to maintain their independence of choice. Our assistance to these nations can be painful, risky, and costly—as is true in southeast Asia today. But we dare not weary of the task. For our assistance makes possible the stationing of 3.5 million allied troops along the Communist frontier at one-tenth the cost of maintaining a comparable number of American soldiers. A successful Communist breakthrough in these areas, necessitating direct U.S. intervention, would cost us several times as much as our entire foreign aid program—and might cost us heavily in American lives as well.

About 70 percent of our military assistance goes to nine key countries located on or near the borders of the Communist bloc—nine countries confronted directly or indirectly with the threat of Communist aggression—Vietnam, Free China, Korea, India, Pakistan, Thailand, Greece, Turkey, and Iran. No one of these countries possesses on its own the resources to maintain the forces which our own Chiefs of Staff think needed in the common interest. Reducing our efforts to train, equip, and assist their armies can only encourage Communist penetration and require in time the increased oversea deployment of American combat forces. And reducing the economic help needed to bolster these nations that undertake to help defend freedom can have the same disastrous result. In short, the $50 billion we spend each year on our own defense could well be ineffective without the $4 billion required for military and economic assistance.

Our foreign aid program is not growing in size—it is, on the contrary, smaller now than in previous years. It has had its weaknesses—but we have undertaken to correct them—and the proper way of treating weaknesses is to replace them with strength, not to increase those weaknesses by emasculating essential programs. Dollar for dollar, in or out of Government, there is no better form of investment in our national security than our much-abused foreign aid program. We cannot afford to lose it. We can afford to maintain it. We can surely afford, for example, to do as much for our 19 needy neighbors of Latin America as the Communist bloc is sending to the island of Cuba alone.

IV

I have spoken of strength largely in terms of the deterrence and resistance of aggression and attack. But, in today's world, freedom can be lost without a shot being fired, by ballots as well as bullets. The success of our leadership is dependent upon respect for our mission in the world as well as our missiles—on a clearer recognition of the virtues of freedom as well as the evils of tyranny.

That is why our Information Agency has doubled the shortwave broadcasting power of the Voice of America and increased the number of broadcasting hours by 30 percent—raised Spanish language broadcasting to Cuba and Latin America from 1 to 9 hours a day—increased sevenfold to more than 3.5 million copies the number of American books being translated and published for Latin American readers—and taken a host of other steps to carry our message of truth and freedom to all the far corners of the earth.

And that is also why we have regained the initiative in the exploration of outer space—making an annual effort greater than the combined total of all space activities undertaken during the fifties—launching more than 130 vehicles into earth orbit—putting into actual operation valuable weather and communications satellites—and making it clear to all that the United States of America has no intention of finishing second in space.

This effort is expensive—but it pays its own way, for freedom and for America. For there is no longer any fear in the free world that a Communist lead in space will become a permanent assertion of supremacy and the basis of military superiority. There is no longer any doubt about the strength and skill of American science, American industry, American education, and the American free enterprise system. In short, our national space effort represents a great gain in, and a great resource of, our national strength—and both Texas and Texans are contributing greatly to this strength.

Finally, it should be clear by now that a nation can be no stronger abroad than she is at home. Only an America which practices what it preaches about equal rights and social justice will be respected by those whose choice affects our future. Only an America which has fully educated its citizens is fully capable of tackling the complex problems and perceiving the hidden dangers of the world in which we live. And only an America which is growing and prospering economically can sustain the worldwide defenses of freedom, while demonstrating to all concerned the opportunities of our system and society.

It is clear, therefore, that we are strengthening our security as well as our economy by our recent record increases in national income and output—by surging ahead of most of Western Europe in the rate of business expansion and the margin of corporate profits—by maintaining a more stable level of prices than almost any of our oversea competitors—and by cutting personal and corporate income taxes by some $11 billion, as I have proposed, to assure this Nation of the longest and strongest expansion in our peacetime economic history.

This Nation's total output—which 3 years ago was at the $500 billion mark—will soon pass $600 billion, for a record rise of over $100 billion in 3 years. For the first time in history we have 70 million men and women at work. For the first time in history average factory earnings have exceeded $100 a week. For the first time in history corporation profits after taxes—which have risen 43 percent in less than 3 years—have reached an annual level of $27.4 million.

My friends and fellow citizens, I cite these facts and figures to make it clear that America today is stronger than ever before. Our adversaries have not abandoned their ambitions—our dangers have not diminished—our vigilance cannot be relaxed. But now we have the military, the scientific, and the economic strength to do whatever must be done for the preservation and promotion of freedom.

That strength will never be used in pursuit of aggressive ambitions—it will always be used in pursuit of peace. It will never be used to promote provocations—it will always be used to promote the peaceful settlement of disputes.

We in this country, in this generation, are—by destiny rather than choice—the watchmen on the walls of world freedom. We ask, therefore, that we may be worthy of our power and responsibility—that we may exercise our strength with wisdom and restraint—and that we may achieve in our time and for all time the ancient vision of "peace on earth, good will toward men." That must always be our goal—and the righteousness of our cause must always underlie our strength. For as was written long ago: "Except the Lord keep the city, the watchman waketh but in vain."

THE NEED FOR AUTO SAFETY STUDIES

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, earlier this year I introduced proposed legislation calling for studies of tire safety standards. I am convinced that we must cut through the maze of misleading information, in order to establish standards which will be reliable and will enable tire purchasers to know that the tires they buy are safe.

Though this bill related only to tires, there is growing concern with other aspects of auto safety. It has been suggested that certain minimal standards of automobile design should be established, so that dangerous features will be eliminated from our automobiles. I ask consent to have printed in the RECORD excerpts from a recent article by James Ridgeway. It is an interesting discussion of some of the problems involved in this question.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAR DESIGN AND PUBLIC SAFETY

(By James Ridgeway)

Right now there is no such organization to tell a customer how safe a car is, and under what conditions; there isn't even a pamphlet to give you an idea of what to look for in terms of a car's safety-design features. The Federal Government requires safety specifications in airplanes and ships, and keeps a sharp eye on buses and trucks operating in interstate commerce, but has no authority to check on autos. New York persuaded manufacturers to put seat belt attachment points in cars; but this year New York State Senator Edward J. Speno's efforts to pass legislation establishing safety standards for tires were beaten down by auto and tire interests. In Massachusetts a bill was introduced in the State legislature this year to set up a commission to determine standards of safe design. But it was tabled after the legislative committee which was considering it made a visit to Detroit, all expenses paid by the auto makers, to view their research work into car safety.

Now Speno wants Federal and State Governments to join in spending $3 million to design a really safe car. Legislation would follow to compel manufacturers to incorporate its safety features in all cars.

Three agencies of the Federal Government have some slight interest in automobile design. One of them is the Division of Accident Prevention of the U.S. Public Health Service. Between fiscal 1962 and 1963 it administered a $2.7 million study into why accidents happen. Only $134,000 went for research into automobile safety design. Dr. Paul V. Joliet, Division Chief, says if he had more money and enough staff he would be willing to put out a report on car design similar to the Surgeon General's report on cigarette smoking. However, Dr. Leon Goldstein, head of the Division's research operation, says that while he is anxious to see research into car design he doubts that the man in the street needs to know much about it or about safety design in general. The consumer should put his faith in Government agencies which are there to protect him. And he feels there is fruitful coordination between Government-sponsored researchers and manufacturers now and that it should not be upset. He doesn't want to start an unfair scare on any one model car.

One recipient of the Public Health Service's research grants is the automotive crash injury research project of Cornell University. Dr. Horace E. Campbell, a leading specialist in the automobile accident field, said recently that this unit "knows what the chief defects of cars are, and which makes in actual experience on the road are the more dangerous. It is presumed that we are not told the facts that would allow us to buy in a discriminating way because a large portion of the project's support comes from the automobile manufacturers." Since some of the money comes from the Government, Dr. Campbell asks why the taxpayer shouldn't be furnished with the data that would "warn him away from the most dangerous cars."

The Bureau of Roads of the Department of Commerce put out a report in 1959 calling for greater safety in auto design. However, it spends most of its time getting better roads built. It will begin to get into the regulating business slightly when it administers standards that Congress recently set for manufacturers of brake fluid. The General Services Administration is more likely to push the Government into vehicle safety design. It was recently instructed by Congress to set safety standards to be met by manufacturers who sell vehicles to the Government.

The most curious of all the Government programs, and one at first might suspect the one most closely identified with the consumer, is the President's Committee for Traffic Safety. It has an annual budget of about $200,000. Of the total, $150,000 comes from Federal funds; the other $50,000 is a gift from the insurance and automotive industries which appear to dictate its activities. The salaries of the Executive Director and two assistants come out of the industry funds, and they take their cues from an advisory council which primarily is made up of representatives of private organizations. Although the President's Committee seal is used on the group's literature, the White House has little to do with the Committee's activities. For instance, a pamphlet entitled "The Vehicle Equipment Safety Compact" has the President's Committee's shield on its cover, which might seem to imply the backing of both the Committee and the President. Actually the pamphlet is an attack on Federal participation in highway safety. It was printed and disseminated by the Automobile Manufacturers Association, without approval of the President's Committee.

"What Motorists Really Think About Traffic Safety" is another pamphlet. On the inside cover is a letter from the executive secretary of the President's Committee praising the Pure Oil Co., the publisher. This seems to be contrary to another committee policy, for one of its officials, Dr. Richard Tossell, said recently, "The Committee doesn't endorse or sponsor views of any other organization." As Dr. Tossell described the Committee's work, it relies on the advisory council to bring matters to its attention, and then it tries to "stimulate" some sort of program. To put it more bluntly, the Committee is Detroit's public relations annex at the White House.

When we told Dr. Tossell of our inquiries into the Corvair business he said the best thing to do was to go straight to Corvair; they would surely put us straight. And he added: "The interests of industry are in progress."

The Government programs concentrate largely on "human failure," to which is commonly attributed 90 percent of all car accidents. But experts have said that a safely designed car could save tens of thousands of lives a year, not to mention preventing hundreds of thousands of injuries.

By the end of July, 25,630 people had died since the first of the year in automobile accidents—an all-time high, and 11 percent above last July's total, which then was a record. Each year the Federal Government spends millions in aircraft accident prevention research and up to $100,000 per victim to find the causes of airplane accidents. The design of every airplane down to every nut and bolt is checked for safety by the Government. When it comes to automobiles, the Government spends less than a nickel per casualty to find safer designs for automobiles, and there is no regulation whatever.

THE FUTURE OF PRIVATE PENSIONS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, my very able former Legislative Assistant, Merton C. Bernstein, is the author of one of the finest works I have ever read on the subject of private pensions. I allude to his recently published work, "The Future of Private Pensions," which came off the press earlier this year.

Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, my good friend and able colleague from Illinois, has written the foreword to Mr. Bernstein's book, and he closes his comments with this observation:

> It is high time that the American public began to think more intelligently on the problems of old-age security and the relative parts to be played by public and private action. Mr. Bernstein has made a most important contribution to this end. His book deserves a wide reading.

Because of the excellent nature of Senator DOUGLAS' comments on the subject of the Bernstein volume, I ask unanimous consent that the foreword of Senator DOUGLAS be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the foreword was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOREWORD

(By Senator PAUL DOUGLAS)

Merton Bernstein has written an important and much needed book. Private pension plans have been growing rapidly since World War II, and probably now number more than 32,000. They seem to cover about 22 million manual and salaried workers, or about half of the steady jobholders in nonfarmwork. They are predominantly confined to the larger manufacturing concerns, to the private utilities, and to financial institutions. Small concerns in general and the service and mercantile trades in particular have very few of their workers covered.

As a legislator, I have been forced to wrestle with many of the brain-splitting complexities of the various pension plans, not only under social security but also on the railways, in private industry, and for the self-employed. I can only admire, therefore, the ability with which Mr. Bernstein has classified this huge mass of material and has laid bare the central problems which emerge.

Three salient conclusions from all the data seem to be irrefutable. The first is that under the present provisions of the plans only from one-third to one-half of those ostensibly covered, and for whom contributions are made, will actually benefit at journey's end. Thus, the private pension system as at present constituted will give added protection only to from one-sixth to one-quarter of the steady workers in nonfarm employment. Voluntary separations, individual discharges, mass layoffs, the closing of plants, and the failure of enterprises all greatly reduce the number who can attain the years of continuous service required to qualify under the private plans.

The second conclusion is that thus far the private pension plans benefit the higher salaried employees most. The benefits decrease as one moves down the industrial ladder, with the lower paid and more casual workers who change jobs most frequently receiving proportionately least.

Finally, while the benefits paid to those who retire are very desirable additions to their income, they are insufficient for the maintenance of the great mass of recipients and, even when added to the benefits under the Federal social security system, do not provide a minimum of subsistence for a large percentage of the retired workers. Moreover as Mr. Bernstein points out, when the husband, who is normally older than his wife, dies at an earlier age than his wife, the widow and the surviving dependents suffer even more.

Deciding how to cope with all these problems is most difficult. Mr. Bernstein is properly cautious and guarded in his conclusions, but he does not ignore any issue and presents fully every alternative.

Perhaps the ideal solution would be one recommended long ago by Luther Conant; namely, that each year's work should carry with it the right, upon retirement, to a given slice of income, and that this right would then be carried by the employee when he left the employ of a participating concern. In the technical jargon of the actuaries, such rights are described as fully vested. But to do this would increase costs tremendously. An adequate system of retirement pensions, including social security, would probably cost not far from 14 percent of the payroll covered by social security. It may be too much to expect the vast majority of individual firms voluntarily to accept such a burden, and they cannot be blamed if they seek to confine the benefits to those who have been with them for relatively long periods of time and if they are reluctant to scatter their benefits wholesale to those who soon leave their employ. Employers, under pressure from the unions and from the nature of the situation, have greatly reduced the initially imposed requirement that the workers were to be entitled to such benefits only if they reached the age of 65 and had been employed in the given plant or enterprise for 20 or 25 years. But they cannot, I believe, be expected to grant the right of full vesting.

Mr. Bernstein, however, advances powerful arguments to support a fuller degree of vesting and multiemployer funds. But I take it that he is somewhat skeptical as to the speed with which any such developments are likely to occur. His interesting suggestion is for the creation of a national clearinghouse, into which workers who change jobs may bring such vested rights as they take with them, and which will keep the books and make the ultimate payments from funds transferred by the employers.

It is high time that the American public began to think more intelligently on the problems of old-age security and the relative parts to be played by public and private action. Mr. Bernstein has made a most important contribution to this end. His book deserves a wide reading.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, subsequent to the publication of his book, Mr. Bernstein, now a labor arbitrator and lecturer at Yale Law School, published an article in Nation magazine of June 15, 1964. This article should give us pause, because it demonstrates the inadequacy of many private pension plans in coping with the problems occasioned by premature retirement due to automation. As Bernstein points out:

> Whenever automation displaces workers, the workers not only lose their jobs, but a high proportion of them see their expected retirement savings wiped out.

This is a sobering observation, Mr. President. The Bernstein article published in Nation, entitled "The Pension Mirage," should be read by all my Senate colleagues. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PENSION MIRAGE

(By Merton C. Bernstein) [1]

In the war that has been declared on poverty, scant attention is being paid to the economy's veterans—the retirees and those about to be mustered out of the ranks of the employed. We had better look to their problems soon because, behind the crisis of unemployment, another crisis is building. Whenever automation displaces workers, whenever a plant lays off hordes of workers or a whole company shuts down, the workers not only lose their jobs, but a high proportion of them also see their expected retirement savings wiped out. This happens because private pension plans are out of phase with changing patterns of employment.

For example, when Studebaker, after 40 years of operation, closed its last plant in the United States, the sudden unemployment of its several thousand workers made headlines across the country. Unreported was the second tragedy: The disappearance of the expected retirement savings of more than five out of six employees still on the payroll. Simply stated, the Studebaker pension fund, limited to this one company, had insufficient money to meet the valid claims built up over decades of service. Luckily, there was enough in the account for those already retired and for another 1,100 who were beyond 60 and immediately eligible for retirement. Of the remaining 5,700 employees, the bulk—3,900—were older than 40 and had worked more than 10 years for Studebaker. This group was entitled under the terms of the plan to the "vesting" of their credits; that is, a legally binding promise to pay a man, at 65, benefits in accordance with his term of service. Vesting is intended to protect those who, having earned substantial credits in a retirement plan, may leave the company or be dismissed before reaching retirement age. Unfortunately, at Studebaker, as is common, the obligation was limited to the resources of the fund, which ran dry meeting the claims of retirees. Hence the other long-service employees lost both job and expected pension savings; and, of course, so did the other 1,800 workers who were not yet 40.

This story is being repeated across the Nation when plants close or lay off their workers because of rapidly changing technology, defense emphasis, export markets, and consumer patterns. Sometimes pension credits mean nothing because the cupboard is bare—as with the Packard shutdown in Detroit a few years ago. More often, displaced workers lose pension credits because their plans do not contain vesting provisions or because the qualifying conditions are too stringent.

We have yet to awaken to the full dimensions of the financial pickle of the elderly—who are becoming more numerous and constitute an ever larger portion of the population. At present, more than 17 million Americans have reached 65, the arbitrary age at which our social security system and most private pension plans permit retirement with full benefits. Ever since World War I, the working life of the average American has been getting shorter, while the average lifespan has been lengthening. Pension plans have established a retirement age for many enterprises, and often it is compulsory. So fewer and fewer of the aged will have jobs; yet they will be living longer than people have in the past.

On what will they live? The mainstay of most retirees and their widows is social security, as the old-age and survivors' insurance program has come to be known. Despite a series of major improvements that began in 1950, social security benefits, if not supplemented, maintain people in a style to which none of us wishes to become accustomed. Retired workers receive from OASI an average of about $76 a month ($80 for men and $60 for women); couples average $125 (a husband and wife over 65 receive 1.5 times the husband's primary benefit). Alas, widows average but $58 a month—or a not so grand total of $696 a year.

Because social security benefits in the 1940's were so inadequate—far below even today's modest scale—unions began to bargain hard for employer-financed pension plans as part of the wage- and working-condition package. Starting in World War II, and more markedly since the onset of the Korean conflict, the plans have multiplied. They were facilitated for employers by favorable tax treatment and the phenomenal increases in value and earnings of the stock in which more and more of the pension funds became invested. So today, it is estimated—unfortunately no one really knows—that something more than 43,000 plans with assets greater than $66 billion "cover" perhaps 23 million working people. (Of course, that's a good deal less than the 43 million nonfarm employees who work full time, and the figure rises to 80 million if seasonal workers are included.)

But being covered carries no assurance of receiving a pension. Approximately 85 percent of the employees covered are in single-employer plans which condition pension eligibility upon retirement at 65 after long service with the company; alternatively, "vesting" is available to employees separated from a job if they are over age 40 or 45, and if they have worked continuously for that one company for 10 or 15 years. The catch is that the ups and downs of the economy keep people moving in and out of jobs by the millions. Nor is the seniority enjoyed by many older workers a sure defense against displacement; the category of work to which their seniority attaches may be wiped out.

Rapid shifts in defense production are probably the most dramatic job destroyers. A congressional decision to discontinue a plane or missile can cost tens of thousands of jobs in a matter of months. Scrapping the Skybolt missile caused one company to lay off 1,700 workers within days; 2,000 to 3,000 were dropped thereafter. One subcontractor alone separated 3,200 employees. In the aggregate, these changes are enormous. From a postwar high of 928,000 in 1957, aircraft employment dropped to 640,000 in 1960.

Technological change—of which, I suggest, we've seen only the beginning—eats up jobs by the hundreds of thousands. A short time back, some evangelists of automation declared that jobs would be made, not lost, as it advanced. Even if that should prove to be true, new devices displace workers, and not only from factory jobs but from service and white-collar positions.

Competition from overseas, shifts in domestic tastes, shifts in the population profile (more babies, more oldsters, fewer people in their middle years), changes in demand for goods and services all mean a shifting pattern of consumption; that in turn means a high job turnover—and many lost pension credits. Technological developments often make it advantageous for a company to shut down an old plant and build a new one nearer markets or sources of supply. Such shifts are facilitated when new techniques free the employer from dependence on a skilled labor supply.

Some companies, usually under union pressure, consent to partial benefits for separated employees, but the law has yet to compel such payments. Without exception, the courts turn down employee pleas to preserve pension credits earned before a merger, mass layoff or other organization switch. The judges usually do not look beyond the precise terms of the plans themselves, which rarely provide for plant or unit shutdowns, mergers, and the like. Courts overlook the fact that employer contributions to pension plans have come to be regarded and dealt with by both companies and unions—and, indeed, by Congress in several major pieces of legislation—as a form of compensation. In effect, the employees are denied part of their pay.

In one such shutdown which went into litigation, some 10,000 jobs were lost and with them all pension credits; even employees who would have reached retirement age during the span of the current collective bargaining agreement (some with 20 and more years of service) lost all the potential value of pension credits. In another plant shutdown case, employees within a few weeks of age 65 were fired, and thereby lost all their retirement benefits. On occasion, an employer who shuts down recaptures the use of the funds that had been set aside for pensions.

Obviously, most existing pension plans do not fit rapidly changing employment patterns; the courts are unimaginative and wooden, and the Treasury Department has been doing too little too late. Other remedies are required.

The prescriptions usually offered for improvement are vesting—for long-term, older employees—and multiemployer plans. The trouble is that large groups of employees, caught in mass layoffs, do not have sufficient service (10, 15 or even 20 years) and the requisite age (typically 40, 45 or even 50 and 55) to meet vesting conditions. Moreover, vesting as now practiced, means high administrative cost and low benefits subject to erosion by inflation. And while multiemployer plans are some improvement, because an employee who spends his working life in one industry can carry his credits from one employer to another, they are no help at all when the industry is declining, as the plight of the mineworkers so pathetically attests.

---

[1] Merton C. Bernstein, a labor arbitrator and a lecturer at Yale Law School, was formerly special counsel to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare of the U.S. Senate; also legislative assistant to Senator WAYNE MORSE. He is the author of "The Future of Private Pensions" (Free Press).

Private employment-based pension plans were called into being to supplement a sadly inadequate social security retirement program. Since 1950, OASI has only just kept pace with inflation. Hence, private-plan supplements are still needed and will continue to be. Hence, also, they clearly require some basic redesigning. What we need, in essence, is a pension system which allows an employee to obtain at least some of the value implicit in every year of pension credits he earns, and to carry it with him to any future job. Although there have been timid calls for "portable pensions," all such proposals are based upon the kind of vesting described, with shortcomings even beyond those sketched.

What I urge is a national clearinghouse to facilitate the transfer of pension credits as employees move from job to job throughout their career. The clearinghouse could be operated as an all-public or an all-private affair, or under one of several public-private arrangements. It should offer a master group plan for small companies, which find it burdensome and costly to cover their employees—and rarely do so. This will become a matter of growing importance as the service trades, in which small firms are common, account for an ever larger portion of the work force.

The details of a national scheme are complex, the problems many—but they are all manageable. To get started, we need awareness of the problem and sufficient concern to seek solutions. We have lacked both.

THE U.S. TAX SYSTEM AND INTERNATIONAL TAX RELATIONSHIPS

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, in my judgment Mr. Stan Surrey is one of the outstanding scholars of the tax system. He has made a very fine study, from which I think every scholar of the tax system, and particularly CPA's, could well profit. I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD an address by Stanley S. Surrey, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, before the Tax Executives Institute, in Montreal, Quebec, Canada, on September 21, 1964.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE U.S. TAX SYSTEM AND INTERNATIONAL TAX RELATIONSHIPS—PERSPECTIVE IN 1964

(Remarks by Stanley S. Surrey, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, before the Tax Executives Institute, Montreal, Quebec, Canada, September 21, 1964)

I appreciate the opportunity to meet with you and discuss recent trends in international tax relationships. Much has happened in the last 4 years respecting U.S. tax policy in the international field. It may therefore be helpful to review these developments and place them in perspective. The main focus in this consideration will be to project these developments into the future, and to ascertain some of the aspects that will require our thought and attention in the next few years. I will divide this consideration into three main parts—income tax treaties, U.S. statutory taxation of foreign income, and U.S. statutory taxation of foreigners.

Since the consideration covers a wide area and in some instances is rather detailed, it may be helpful to summarize at the outset the principal matters discussed. The following summary represents the significant areas of current activity in U.S. international tax relationships.

SUMMARY

The Treasury Department is seeking in a wide range of activity to improve the rules and procedures applicable to the taxation of income earned abroad by U.S. taxpayers and income earned in the United States by foreigners. The governing purpose of this activity is to modernize international tax rules and mechanisms in the interest of (1) reducing tax restrictions on the free flow of capital and goods between developed countries, and (2) increasing U.S. private activity, especially private investment, in less developed countries.

The reduction of tax restrictions on international trade and investment between developed countries lies primarily in lessened taxation by the country in which the income arises. This step should be of material assistance to U.S. companies trading abroad in developed areas and to U.S. companies which have established operating activities abroad, since it will remove a number of tax problems now faced by such companies in these countries. In the same fashion, a removal of problems faced by foreigners under U.S. taxation will promote increased foreign investment and trade in the United States.

As respects less developed countries, the approach is that of encouraging U.S. private activity through U.S. tax incentives to private investment in those areas. This approach is to be accompanied by a lessening of the tax problems now arising for our investors, traders and others under the laws of the less developed countries, without at the same time causing those countries a revenue sacrifice which they find unacceptable.

This overall program is being carried out by (1) reshaping our income tax treaties with developed and less developed countries, (2) the issuance of comprehensive regulations under the 1962 Revenue Act provisions relating to foreign income, (3) improvement in the guidelines and procedures applied by our Internal Revenue Service in the administration of our laws relating to foreign income, and (4) consideration of a broad revision of U.S. statutory rules governing the taxation of foreigners receiving income from the United States.

1. As to treaties with developed countries, the United States is engaged in an intensive reexamination of our existing income tax treaty provisions, prompted by the desire to modernize these provisions and, where appropriate, bring them into conformity with the recently published OECD model draft. This reexamination substantively moves in the direction of lessened taxation by the country of the source of income—for example, nontaxation of capital gains of foreigners, allowing increased activity by trading companies without subjecting those activities to taxation at the source, separating the taxation by the country of source of operating activities from that of investment income, thereby leaving the latter usually subject to the lower rates of tax under the treaties.

This substantive reexamination is being accompanied by improved drafting techniques, a revision of the method of issuing regulations under the treaties with the objective of achieving a master set of U.S. treaty regulations, and—a very significant matter—an improvement in the treaty techniques for intergovernmental arrangements. The objective of the last mentioned matter is to eliminate, or reduce, possible double taxation growing out of administrative allocations of income and expense by the tax authorities of the United States or other countries between the related entities of a taxpayer engaged in operations in the United States and abroad.

2. As to treaties with less developed countries, the United States is engaged in discussions with a number of less developed countries on the basis of a new approach to income tax treaties with them. In order to encourage private investment in these countries the United States is offering to extend, through such treaties, a 7-percent credit comparable to that now allowed on investment in the United States (adopted in the 1962 act), to investment in less developed countries. As a companion treaty tax incentive it is also suggesting deferral of current taxation by both the United States and the foreign country of compensation received in the form of stock in a foreign corporation in return for transferred technical know-how, patents, technical services, and the like. This extension of the 7-percent credit by treaty is separate from the consideration now being given in Congress to the President's recommendation for a 30-percent credit through statutory enactment, on which it is presumed hearings will be held next year. The new approach also involves a lessening, through appropriate treaty provisions, of the problems for our investors, traders, business visitors, and others arising under the tax laws of these countries without at the same time involving them in a loss of tax revenues which they would find unacceptable.

Tentative agreements have already been reached with Thailand and the Philippines. The former incorporates various provisions relating to investment including the 7-percent credit and tax deferral on stock compensation, and both embody significant clauses protecting the taxpayers of one country against discriminatory tax treatment by the other treaty country.

3. As to regulations under the 1962 act, the Treasury expects to complete publication of all the foreign income regulations by the end of the year. These regulations, comprehensive in scope, are designed to facilitate the transition to the new 1962 rules. The regulations on the determination of the earnings and profits of a foreign subsidiary, formulated with the invaluable advice of experts drawn from our major international accounting firms, are a significant step in the development of international tax accounting rules. The Service plans to continue to obtain expert consultant guidance in its application of these rules. The regulations on the minimum distribution rule adopt a simplified application of that rule permitting a taxpayer to obtain the protection the rule affords without being involved in complex detail.

4. As to improved tax administration, the Treasury expects that comprehensive proposed regulations governing section 482 allocations and a comprehensive revenue procedure regarding section 367 rulings will be issued by the end of this year. These steps are a phase of the study of the problems now arising under section 482 allocations and related matters. Another example of the steps here being taken is the consideration of various methods of alleviating a double taxation situation for past years where foreign taxes have been paid on income subject to reallocation under section 482. One approach which the Internal Revenue Service is considering is that of adjusting any proposed deficiency by the amount of foreign taxes paid. As respects internal Internal Revenue Service procedures, a Service order to be issued in the near future will place the existing field groups of the Office of International Operations under the supervision of the district directors, with close coordination between the field activities and Washington to be assured under the regular procedures for that purpose. The combination of these actions should eliminate many of

the present problems facing taxpayers and the Service alike in the transition to an improved tax administration capable of handling with wisdom and responsibility the tax issues involved in modern international tax relationships.

5. As to the U.S. taxation of the income of foreigners, the Treasury is engaged in a comprehensive reexamination of our hitherto little-noticed statutory rules governing the tax liabilities of foreigners receiving income from the United States. This reexamination, stemming in large measure from the recent report of the President's Task Force on Promoting Increased Foreign Investment in U.S. Corporate Securities (the Fowler report), bears promise of legislative proposals which would modernize this area through removing aspects of our laws that are unnecessarily restrictive to the investment or other activity of foreigners in the United States, and, further, coordinate these legislative developments with our tax treaty program.

I. INCOME TAX TREATIES

The pace of income tax treaty negotiation and the scope of the issues relating to these treaties have increased materially in the last year or so. The causes are varied, and can best be considered, along with their consequences, by separating the subject into three principal classes—income tax treaties with developed countries, those with less developed countries, and discussions involving international agencies and conducted on a multinational basis.

Developed countries

As respects the developed countries, the ratification of the treaty with Luxembourg gave the United States a full complement of tax treaties with the European Common Market countries. Moreover we have treaties with almost all of the developed countries, the principal exceptions being Spain and Portugal. But the conclusion of tax treaties cannot remain a static process. The impact on internal tax legislation of changing currents in the business financial, and political spheres is evident to all who follow that subject, and is responsible for constant revision and development in domestic tax legislation. But while these changes are equally present in the international scene, their effect on the substance and scope of the tax treaties to which the United States is a party has until recently been far less pronounced. The balance is now being redressed, however, as the result of several forces, and as a consequence, the United States is now engaged in a wide ranging reexamination of the provisions contained in its tax treaties.

One major force has been the publication in 1963 of the OECD draft of a model income tax convention. This effort, commenced in 1958, was designed to provide "a means of settling on a uniform basis the most common problems of double taxation." Once published, despite the many reservations of the participating countries—and the United States had significant reservations—the draft convention has become the starting point for the developed countries as they engage in treaty discussions. Most of the European countries, for example, desire at least to begin with the text of the draft convention and to follow it as closely as possible. In turn, however, as countries apply the draft convention to concrete treaty issues, the many problems of interpretation and application that are involved begin to emerge. Any concentrated examination of the precise words and effect of a tax provision that penetrates below the surface of the provision is bound to disclose ambiguities, shortcomings, and unsolved questions. The effort to deal with these difficulties has involved the United States in a very considerable concentration on the technical aspects of our treaties.

Another force for change has been the spillover to treaties of the concentration of technical attention that has characterized U.S. tax legislation. As tax expertise spreads wider and as the impact of taxation on the expanding horizons of business produce more and more tax problems, more people are seeking to embody solutions to more of these problems in the provisions of tax treaties. The money value of these problems has also risen in significance with the growing importance of international business. In addition to its responsibility for considering these problems thus presented to it, Government also has its own rising tide of problems that demand attention. The increasing importance of balance-of-payments factors adds a new dimension that must constantly be borne in mind. The adeptness with which tax experts—here and abroad—join tax treaty provisions with domestic legislation tends to produce exquisite structures of tax reduction and avoidance—witness the arrangements flowing from the Netherlands Antilles tax treaty before its recent revision. This demands an equal alertness and agility on the part of Government. In addition, changing national tax legislation and policies have their impact on international rules, and thereby require reexamination and renegotiation of those rules.

Combined with these two forces is the fact that many of our treaties were concluded some time ago—the treaty with France signed in 1939 is an example—so that they are in need of revision almost in their own right apart from these forces. With the increasing tempo of events, these earlier treaties more clearly show their age.

Substantive Reexamination

These are some of the forces for change. Let us turn to the treaty provisions in which they are likely to produce change. Almost every provision of our tax treaties is undergoing reexamination, both in substantive scope and drafting, so that an exhaustive description is impossible. I have therefore selected for mention several of the more significant matters.

Force of Attraction

The standard U.S. tax treaty has up to now provided that if a foreign taxpayer has a permanent establishment in the United States, then all of its investment income and all of its business income from U.S. sources becomes subject to our regular rates of tax. As a consequence, for example, any reduced rates of withholding tax applicable under the treaty to dividend, interest or royalty income cease to apply. In this sense the permanent establishment attracts the income not in fact attributable to it. The OECD draft convention, following some of the European treaties, takes a contrary approach which does not embody this force of attraction. Under it the presence of the permanent establishment permits taxation of the profits in fact attributable to it, but other items of income continue to be taxed under the treaty rules independently applicable to the various items.

The United States entered a reservation to this OECD draft approach. Nevertheless, we have been giving it considerable study. Our present view is that we are ready to explore with other treaty countries the development of an appropriate clause. Such an approach which departs from our traditional provisions in the direction of the OECD approach, but which attempts to avoid some of the administrative problems and policy dilemmas which we believe would be entailed by outright acceptance of the OECD clause, would be in keeping with our overall national policy of encouraging international trade. For example, under this approach a U.S. exporter whose affairs required a degree or form of activity involving permanent establishment status abroad would not at the same time subject its other income to increased foreign taxation. It would make unnecessary the practice under the existing treaties of artificially isolating the business activities in a subsidiary solely to prevent the force of attraction from affecting the taxpayer's other foreign income. Moreover, this approach, as respects activity in the United States, would be in accord with our policy of encouraging foreign investment in the United States.

Under such a provision investment income and also business income from activities unrelated to the business in which the permanent establishment is engaged would not be attracted to it and would not be taxable as part of its income. The agreement with Germany on the matters to be incorporated in a new protocol embodies a provision to this effect. We are proceeding carefully with this approach, trying to eliminate at the start problems which may result from the interaction of the provision with our domestic source rules and also keeping an eye on the administrative problems involved.

Definition of Permanent Establishment

The OECD draft convention has introduced further particularity into the definition of permanent establishment, the overall thrust of the changes being to restrict somewhat the scope of the definition. Put differently, a taxpayer engaged in trade and related activities can under the OECD draft undertake more extensive activities in a foreign country before it acquires a permanent establishment status that subjects its business profits to taxation by that country. Our policy position is to move in this direction, again in keeping with our overall policy of encouraging international trade. A number of drafting difficulties are involved in the attempt to state the boundary lines, and the OECD draft provision in turn presents some unforeseen ambiguities. We are working through these technical issues, guided by the policy direction I have indicated. We would hope that the countries involved can achieve a greater clarity and completeness in the OECD definition of a permanent establishment.

Capital Gains

The standard U.S. tax treaty up to now has not restricted the jurisdiction of the United States to tax the capital gains of foreigners. On the other hand, the OECD draft convention, following the European treaties, restricts taxation of capital gains to the country of residence, other than gains on real property and property forming a part of a permanent establishment. In considering some of our earlier treaties, the Senate was unwilling to relinquish U.S. tax jurisdiction in this area, influenced partly by the scope of trading activities conducted in this country by World War II refugees. Therefore the United States originally entered a reservation on this subject. Recently, however, we have been exploring the desirability of the OECD approach. It is likely, given the wider scope of capital gains taxation in this country, that other countries will seek this change in our treaties. Such a change would be in keeping with our policy of encouraging foreign investment in the United States. Accordingly, we are now willing to consider the inclusion of such a provision, though we are giving continued consideration to whether we should exempt the trading gains of a foreigner who remains in this country for significant periods of time. Also we must work through the issues relating to an appropriate definition of capital assets for this purpose. The agreement with Germany on a new protocol embodies a capital gain exemption provision and the lines of the new approach will be worked out in that document.

Undistributed Profits

The standard U.S. tax treaty has reserved our right to apply our tax on accumulated profits and our personal holding company tax to the income derived by a foreign corporation from the United States. Again, the OECD draft convention takes the opposite approach and would prohibit the application of these taxes. Here also we are exploring the policy and technical ramifications of moving to the OECD approach.

It will be seen that the thrust of the matters I have been discussing is in the direction of restricting the scope or degree of taxation in the country of source. It cannot be said that all of this is in response to firmly held views in the countries concerned that policies be consciously shaped to this end. On the other hand these developments are in keeping with the pattern of double taxation treaties between developed countries. While the policies to be taken into account in the United States do not all uniformly point to the same result, it seems clear that the direction is toward restricting the scope of our taxation of foreigners currently taxable in the United States on their U.S. income, if at the same time foreign countries are willing to move in a similar direction.

Effect of Split Corporate Tax Rates and Other Factors on Withholding Rates on Dividends

In several recent negotiations the United States has been presented with the need to consider the relationship of the standard treaty withholding provision on dividend income to a variety of domestic tax policies of the other treaty countries. These tax policies have caused the other contracting parties to seek a treaty withholding rate on dividends going to the United States which would be higher than the U.S. rate on dividends going to the foreign country. For example, in Germany the tax policy involved is that of a split rate corporation tax under which distributed profits are taxed at a susbtantially lower rate than undistributed profits. Such an internal policy is said to require a higher withholding rate on dividends paid by a German subsidiary to its foreign parent than is customary under standard treaties and the OECD draft—which is 5 percent in certain parent-subsidiary cases and 15 percent on other dividends. In other situations, as in Belgium, the problem may arise from an opposite approach to the internal double taxation of dividends, under which the domestic shareholder receives a tax credit for a part of the corporate tax, and from the internal development of that policy. In other cases, as in Canada, the problem may arise from a desire to differentiate between domestic subsidiaries with a high degree of foreign ownership and those with greater domestic participation.

Whatever the cause of the issue, the United States has found itself in the position of being asked to agree to a treaty provision under which our withholding rate on dividends to a particular country would be less than the rate levied by that country on dividends moving to the United States. We have in these cases—in order to protect our investors from an increased level of foreign taxation and to protect the United States from revenue loss under the foreign tax credit—taken the firm position that international withholding rates should be reciprocal and hence we cannot agree to an upward adjustment by other countries to accommodate to their internal tax policies. In the simplest case, for example, the fact that a foreign country may have a corporate tax rate of 30 percent compared to the United States 48-percent rate does not warrant a nonreciprocal set of withholding rates under which the rate of the foreign country would be higher than ours. Moreover, we do not prefer a solution which makes the rates reciprocal through an increase in our rate as well, since that course is both contrary to the OECD draft and to the policy behind that draft of relieving double taxation and granting more freedom to international capital movements.

Clearly issues of this nature are difficult of resolution, stemming as they do from domestic tax policies of the other country which present difficulties for it in its international economic relations. The United States has held firm to its basic position while at the same time accommodating the most acute problem which that position entailed for the other country. Thus, the tentative protocol with Belgium reduces the Belgian statutory rate from 18.2 percent to a reciprocal 15 percent for shares held in registered form, which form of holding characterizes parent-subsidiary investment, while permitting the higher rate on bearer shares to remain until administrative difficulties involved in applying a reciprocal rate could be solved. Moreover, it was found that in actual practice the Belgian law was such that the rate on bearer shares rarely in fact exceeded 15 percent. The agreement with Germany on a new protocol retains a reciprocal withholding rate of 15 percent but permits Germany to impose an additional 10 percent when the U.S. parent immediately reinvests the dividend in situations where the reinvestment is more than minor in amount. In Canada, the Canadian Government found that the reduction in the U.S. corporate tax rate resulting from our 1964 tax legislation permitted the problem to be solved automatically, so it could retain a maximum Canadian withholding rate that is the same as the U.S. rate, thus eliminating a treaty problem.

Income From Independent Personal Service

The standard U.S. tax treaty as respects the income derived by professional and other persons through their personal services is to subject the income to taxation in the source country only when the person is present in the country more than 180 days in the taxable year. The OECD draft, however, places jurisdiction to tax at the source on the existence of a fixed base regularly available to the taxpayer in the source country. Since this fixed base concept is foreign to our tax concepts and its scope and effect are thus uncertain, we entered a reservation on this provision. As another approach, some countries seek to tax at the source in all cases where the payments are deducted by their domestic taxpayers. The general thrust of these approaches would appear to be in the direction of a larger scope for the source country, especially if the fixed base concept is given a wide application. We believe that the entire matter requires further study and, while we have not as yet made a final decision on our policy in this area, our thinking is in the direction of retaining a time period criterion rather than introducing a new concept.

The above are some of the significant provisions under reexamination. Others, for example, relate to the treatment of interest in the case of financial institutions, the treatment of life insurance premiums, permission to collect in the United States on an adversary judgment obtained by the tax authority in a country whose legal development corresponds to our own, the problems in the taxation of dividends and interest payments moving over international borders and then returning in the case of the international corporation with various foreign subsidies, and so on. Recently, the Treasury Department held a 2-day meeting with lawyers, accountants, and executives interested in the tax treaty area to discuss the issues raised by our reexamination of the tax treaty provisions. Further conferences will be held as our study progresses.

Drafting

Closely allied to this substantive revision is a comprehensive reexamination of the drafting of our tax treaties. Experience over the years with the existing terminology, the closer scrutiny that has come with more eyes and minds poring over the words and details, and the existence of the OECD draft have led us to the view that drafting improvements are both needed and possible. A part of this redrafting will involve a reorganization of the order and arrangement of treaty provisions.

Clearly all this will take time, for often the press of problems does not permit the patient consideration that both countries would have to give to a new treaty draft. Moreover, it is an extremely difficult task to achieve a high level of standardization of terminology in a process that, after all, involves intricate negotiation and the inevitable compromises in thought and phrasing necessary to surmount the differences that arise. All of this is likely of course to lead to a greater technical complexity, and those with a nostalgia for a simpler era of international tax relationships will shake their heads. But as national tax systems grow more complex, and as the expertise of those engaged in domestic tax matters spreads to those, in Government and out, dealing with international tax matters, one cannot expect to retain simple international bridges between intricate national systems.

Interpretation

One way of meeting the growing complexity of tax treaties is to improve the interpretative process applicable to these treaties. For example, we are exploring the desirability of a single master income tax treaty regulation covering all the income treaties. There would then be appendixes to show the points at which the several treaties contain provisions, if any, at variance with the master framework. This approach, if it proves feasible, should have several advantages: It will permit more rapid promulgation of regulations since only the variations of a particular treaty must be noted; it will permit a clear awareness of the precise places at which a particular treaty varies substantively from the standard form; it will indicate that differences in phrasing—so often occasioned by problems of language, the stylistic tastes and idiosyncrasies of the particular negotiators, sticky points of internal law, the phrasing required to embody carefully structured compromises or the like—do not involve intended differences in result.

In addition, the publication of more descriptive material will be helpful. The Treasury has expanded the technical explanations which it presents to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and which are in turn published by that committee. We are also hopeful of increasing the number of published rulings relating to treaties.

Implementation of Treaty Provisions

Improvements in substantive provisions must be followed by improvements in the administrative implementation of those provisions, or else the full benefits of substantive change will not be realized. Thus, the techniques of allocation of income and expenses between parent and subsidiary and of the allocation of expenses to a permanent establishment need modernizing so that rational allocations are pursued by both countries and inconsistent determinations avoided as far as possible.

Moreover, efforts must be made to develop treaty mechanisms which permit the appropriate accommodation of allocations made by the tax authorities of one country and accepted as proper both by the taxpayer and by the tax authorities of the other country. Such a treaty mechanism could, for example, remove impediments of domestic law to the accommodation, such as statute of limitations or the finality of previous assessments. Further, where the tax authorities disagree as to the appropriate allocation, mechanisms should be sought which would permit any resulting double tax burden to be shared among the two governments and the taxpayer in a proper fashion, so that all three would have an interest in keeping differences in allocation approaches to a minimum. Indeed, this subject of proper international allocations and the mechanisms for handling changes in allocations and the differences that arise in concrete cases represents one of the most important areas of treaty development.

Other illustrations of matters where improvement would appear desirable are: The mechanics of applying reduced dividend withholding rates to bearer shares and the determination of the amount of the credit to be granted by the other country in these situations require reexamination, in view of the complexity of ascertaining the applicable rate under some European systems where the dividend is paid, for example, by a corporation which in turn derives income from other corporations. The responsibility of one treaty country to pick up the differential between the regular withholding rate and the treaty rate of the other country when the former finds an income payment flowing to one who is not a resident must be met with more fidelity. The information to be exchanged between treaty countries must be in a form more susceptible of use by the various countries, and in turn should be used. The competent authorities must keep in closer contact to be more fully aware of double tax situations, in addition to the allocation problems earlier mentioned, and other difficulties that their nationals may be experiencing through the defective meshing of two administrative determinations.

Currency of Tax Treaties

I believe the discussion so far has been sufficient—perhaps more than sufficient—to indicate that the technical substance and terminology of tax treaties are likely to undergo significant changes in the next few years. Moreover, this is a steadily evolving process in which the United States can play only its role in a large cast. As treaties are constantly written and revised between other countries, the new patterns that emerge are in turn related to our treaties. If, for example, Germany enters into a revised treaty with France that embodies what both countries believe is an improvement over a standard clause, then either France or Germany in turn is likely to present the improvement to the United States when a protocol or revision of their treaty with us is under consideration. In other words, unlike domestic legislation, the pace of change in the treaty area is shaped by the thoughts and imagination of many treasury departments and finance ministries.

This constant pressure for change, and for changes that a variety of countries regard as appropriate, makes it difficult to keep our treaties current. A desirable change may be made in the technical definition of permanent establishment in a treaty we make with say, Germany. How do we proceed to incorporate this technical improvement into our other treaties? At the present the only course is to await a time when enough matters accumulate or an important event suddently occurs to warrant a protocol or revision of a treaty with, say, France or Belgium and then seek to incorporate the German improved permanent establishment definition. The process is of course shaped by the procedures of treaty approval—negotiation, initialing of a draft by the delegations, signature by the President's representative, hearing by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, and Senate ratification. Clearly, if possible we should avoid having the Senate committee sit constantly to consider technical treaty changes.

Consequently, as the network of treaties expands, as the treaties grow in complexity, and as the pace of technical change becomes faster, it would appear desirable to see if a procedure can be devised which would permit more rapid accommodation of existing treaties to these developments. One possible avenue for exploration is to provide in each treaty that its technical provisions may be altered through an exchange of notes.

The change would have to be in accordance with a provision already approved by the Senate in another treaty, so that the Senate would thereby have passed upon the substance of the matter involved. The Secretary of the Treasury would be authorized to make such a finding and would be required to notify the Senate committee of all such exchanges of notes. Under this approach, a technical change in the definition of permanent establishment approved, say, in the German treaty could by an exchange of notes be applied to the Luxembourg treaty. The Senate committee would through new treaties or extensive revisions of existing treaties, be scanning all these technical provisions from time to time. It thus would be in a position in effect to keep under review the activities of the executive branch in these note exchanges, since if it decides in a new treaty not to approve a similar provision, the authority for future note exchanges respecting that particular point would end unless the committee indicated otherwise. The entire procedure would, of course, be limited to technical matters and would not extend to basic substantive matters such as the rates of withholding. Since, of course, treaty provisions essentially provide rules ameliorating national law so as to prevent double taxation and avoid inconveniences, such a procedure to keep the treaty rules current would be of distinct benefit to taxpayers. It is interesting in this regard to note that several of our existing treaties may by Executive action be extended to territories of the treaty country, "with such modifications as may be found necessary for special application in a particular case" (quoting from the United Kingdom treaty).

Estate Tax Treaties

The discussion above has been in terms of income tax treaties. The United States has 12 estate tax treaties, but this phase of the treaty process has never reached the pace of the income tax treaties. The OECD fiscal committee, however, is now turning its attention to a draft of a model estate tax convention. It is to be expected that this development, combined with the increasing number of taxpayers who are citizens of or residing in one country while holding investments in other countries, will cause an increased interest in these treaties. The Treasury Department is therefore commencing to reexamine the positions taken in the existing treaties and the technical drafting of those treaties, together with a consideration of the matters in the estate tax area appropriate for international accommodation.

Less developed countries

The United States has concluded income tax treaties with practically all of the developed countries. But it has in force only two treaties with less developed countries, that with Pakistan ratified in 1959 and that with Honduras, which was ratified in 1957 but which on the initiative of Honduras is scheduled to terminate at the end of 1964 unless a new agreement now under discussion is reached. Curiosity alone would lead us to inquire as to the causes for this sharp contrast in treaty development. Indeed, the commitment of the United States to the economic growth of the less developed nations has involved the Treasury in a thorough exploration of the whole subject of tax treaties with these nations.

Desirability of Such Treaties

The first question is, why do we care at all about the present situation—in other word, is it in the interest of the United States to have treaties with less developed countries? Viewing this question from the standpoint of our citizens, some of the main benefits involved in such treaties would appear to be along the following lines: A treaty with appropriate source rules could provide predictability in this area, in contrast to the present uncertainty occasioned by the absence of formulated source rules in many countries; the application of the permanent establishment definition would free our traders of nuisance or hampering taxes and here also afford predictability in place of uncertainty; the application of treaty provisions regarding the taxation of business and cultural visitors would have similar results for our executives and professional persons traveling on business to these countries and our teachers temporarily in schools in these countries; adoption of a foreign tax credit approach by the less developed countries would aid our citizens living in those countries; the establishment of definite rules permitting the proper allocation of expenses and other items between a U.S. parent and its foreign subsidiary and to foreign branches would produce a proper measure of net income in the less developed countries; a reduction in the dividend rate of withholding in situations where the combined corporate and withholding rates exceed our rate (especially in the absence of grossing-up requirement in establishing the amount of the dividend to be included in the parent's income) would eliminate unused foreign tax credit; the taxation of real estate rentals on a net basis and the exemption or reduced taxation of royalty income would produce more appropriate results; the adoption of a clause preventing discriminatory tax treatment of our individuals and corporations would prevent a disparity in treatment between the taxpayers of the country and our citizens with activities in that country; the establishment of a consultative mechanism between the two tax administrations and the general air of tax stability that can accompany a tax treaty would be reassuring to our investors and traders.

This is not to say that every treaty would necessarily exhibit this entire gamut of benefits, but certainly each could embody a reasonable number of these aspects as well as others that could be of benefit in particular situations. In sum, our investors and traders can receive benefits through such treaties, and these would be an item on the plus side when the question arises of investment or trade with the less developed countries. The United States, as a government, is in turn interested in steps which improve the plus side of private U.S. activity in less developed countries.

Given these reasons for our having an interest in such treaties, how do they appear when seen by the less developed countries? Of course the benefits to our investors are one side of a coin of which the other side could be regarded by most less developed countries as distinctly helpful if it would increase U.S. private investment in their country. But they could also view the other side of the coin as involving losses in revenue—through lowered withholding rates, net income taxation, the impact of certain source rules or of the permanent establishment definition—resulting from reduced taxes on income leaving their borders for the United States. Thus the question becomes that of seeing what for them is the other side of the coin—or, put more accurately since both of these effects are on the other side of the coin, how is the balance to be cast. It must be remembered that in large part this would be the only coin involved under the standard form of tax treaty. This form, however, was shaped by the economic and tax relationships existing between industrialized countries, where there are two coins, since the investors and traders of each country are aided. While each country has revenue losses reflecting the benefits obtained by the investors and traders of the other country, similarly in turn it has gains for its own investors and traders. But there are fewer investors and traders in less developed countries with activities in the United States, though it is true that the welfare of those that do exist may be of significance to these countries.

In addition to this lack of equivalent reciprocal benefits, the revenue losses involved in standard treaty provisions are likely to be a more significant percentage of the overall revenues of a less developed country. Also, as a psychological matter, as well as an absolute matter, a sacrifice of revenues from income accruing to foreigners is likely to be viewed by the less developed country as a more serious step.

As a consequence less developed countries in the past have been concerned about entering into a tax treaty with the United States unless the standard treaty is altered to be more in their interest as they regard it than is the present form. Two lines of suggested departure can be seen: one is the adoption by the United States of an incentive—in addition to our unilaterally granted code incentives, such as the lower Western Hemisphere trade corporation tax rate, a foreign tax credit, and the nonapplication of "grossing-up" to that credit—to our investors to invest in the less developed countries; the other is a scaling back of the revenue sacrifice which the standard treaty demands of the source country.

Treaty Incentives to U.S. Investment in Less Developed Countries

For a number of years it has appeared that an investment incentive feature has been regarded by many of the less developed countries as critical to the consideration of tax treaties with the United States. However, our treaty negotiations with less developed countries had led into the blind alley of tax sparing. I need not here digress to consider at length the pros and cons of a credit for tax sparing. This matter had been carefully considered in 1961 and 1962 by the Department of State and the Treasury Department, and it was concluded that a tax treaty with a credit for sparing as a possible incentive had serious weaknesses. Those weaknesses were such as to outweigh the advantages of tax treaties with less developed countries. As a consequence the three tax sparing treaties (India, Israel, United Arab Republic) which had been pending before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations since 1960 were withdrawn earlier this year.

Tax Credit for Investment

The Treasury Department late in 1962 had indicated that incentives tied to the act of new investment would seem to offer more fruitful possibilities than tax sparing. The view was then expressed that an approach similar to the investment credit enacted in 1962 to stimulate U.S. domestic investment deserved consideration. Our exploration of this approach since then has led us to conclude that an application through treaties of the principle of the 7 percent domestic investment credit to investment in a less developed country would be appropriate. Under such an approach, a U.S. investor investing in a domestic or a foreign corporation operating in a less developed country could be permitted through a treaty to obtain a credit against his U.S. tax, on income from any source, of 7 percent of the amount of the investment. In view of the fact that the Congress has in a variety of tax measures sought to grant a preference to investment in less developed countries as compared with developed countries, this extension to less developed countries of a type of investment incentive already approved by the Congress as desirable tax policy in the United States would thus appear appropriate in a tax treaty. It could be provided in the treaty that the adoption of this credit would be subject to reexamination after the expiration of a specified period, say 5 years.

The President has recommended that a 30-percent credit be granted by statute to stimulate investment in less developed countries. Such a large and direct tax preference to that form of investment should be authorized by statute rather than by a treaty. The amount of the credit involved, its simultaneous application across the board to the less developed areas, and its initial grant without the development of the types of appropriate complementary measures on the part of less developed countries considered above, are factors which underlie such a statutory approach rather than the treaty procedure. The extension in a treaty to an investment in a less developed country of a credit at the same 7-percent figure as applicable domestically is thus both a different matter and one not in any way at variance with the recommendation for a very much larger statutory credit. The technical detail used to implement the treaty credit could of course draw on the structural underpinning worked out in connection with the 30-percent credit proposal, since they would be similar in their basic structural aspects.

Deferral on Know-How Contributions

In addition to this 7-percent credit, two other measures which could operate as incentives are considered appropriate for inclusion in a treaty with a less developed country. The first is a provision for tax deferral where technical matter or information, such as patents, processes and know-how, or technical services are provided by a U.S. person to a foreign corporation in return for stock of that corporation. Under this provision, the recipient could elect not to include the stock in income for the purpose of both the U.S. tax and the foreign country tax, this deferral to continue until some later date, such as a sale of the stock. This procedure would avoid the cash problem involved in having to pay a current tax on the receipt of stock which the U.S. person desires to hold rather than sell. The second is a provision permitting a charitable deduction (within the statutory percentage limits) from the U.S. tax for a contribution made to an organization in the less developed country which is a charitable organization under the laws of both countries. (A similar provision is present in the United States-Canada treaty.) This would permit in some cases a simpler, direct procedure for the making of gifts to charitable activities in the less developed country.

Scaling Down of Revenue Sacrifice by Less Developed Countries

As to the second line of departure from the standard tax treaty, that of the scaling down of the revenue sacrifice of the source country, here the less developed country, it is clear that there is room for accommodation. In view of the U.S. tax credit, what must be weighed by the source country in the appraisal of a tax treaty is the balance between the loss of revenue that it may suffer when taxation at the source is restricted compared with the benefits to the foreign investor or trader, and in turn to the less developed country, of the elimination of inconvenience and travail. A lesser sacrifice of revenue by a less developed country, i.e., a less restrictive effect on source taxation than under the standard tax treaty, means ipso facto continued payment of tax to that extent by our investors and traders. In most cases, no problem of tax burden is involved in view of our foreign tax credit, and what remains may be the detail and inconvenience of filing tax returns, paying tax etc. to the less developed country in a situation where this would not be so as respects a developed country a party to a standard treaty.

(Of course, where the developed country treaty provision only reduces the rate of taxation rather than providing exemption, then the detail and inconvenience are equally present whether the country is developed or less developed.) On the other hand, however, this drawback to our investors and traders would seem clearly outweighed by the benefits involved in having the treaty itself—certainly a modified type of treaty has advantages as against no treaty at all—and by the special incentives above described which would not be included in the standard treaty with a developed country.

Consequently, if a less developed country desires to cast the balance more to its favor through a lessening of the restrictions on source jurisdiction, the United States, keeping in mind the benefits to be obtained from a treaty and the absence of the reciprocal factors usually present in many of the provisions in the case of industrialized countries, could in its own interest find it appropriate to concur in that approach. This is so, however, if the modifications from the standard treaty operate to involve only a smaller shrinkage in the amount of the resulting foreign tax credit granted by the United States than is produced by the standard form. In this event the U.S. Government is in effect bearing the revenue burden of the modifications rather than the taxpayer being affected through still paying a tax at the source in excess of the amount which it can credit against his U.S. tax. Moreover, the modifications should not swing too far from the standard treaty, so that the resulting new balance still remains acceptable overall.

With all this in mind, we are engaging in discussions with a number of less developed countries on the framework of a modified form of treaty which we would consider appropriate to our tax relations with those countries. The modified form would include the three incentives mentioned above—the extension of the 7-percent credit, tax deferral for stock received for technical items, and a deduction for direct charitable contributions—and would, as respects the principal treaty clauses involved, develop along the following lines:

Dividends

The standard tax treaty generally provides rates of tax for dividend withholding of 15 percent for dividends on portfolio investment and from 5 to 15 percent for parent-subsidiary dividends, with 5 percent in the OECD draft. For many less developed countries, such rates would be distinctly lower than their present rates and thus would present them with revenue considerations. The important aspect, as respects our investors, is that of parent-subsidiary investment and the concern is that the rate of tax on the foreign subsidiary combined with the present withholding rates produces in some countries a tax in excess of the U.S. tax, especially since there is no grossing-up for dividends from less developed countries. Any excess over our allowable foreign tax credit becomes an added tax burden on the investor. We therefore are seeking in our modified treaty to achieve whatever reduction in the dividend withholding rate of the less developed country is needed to prevent such an excess credit, and are pointing out the importance of this step to increased investment in the less developed country. We would not in appropriate cases, however, feel it necessary to refuse to enter into a treaty solely on the ground that the withholding rate was not reduced still further if the less developed country does not find it possible to do so.

Interest

The standard tax treaty generally reduces the withholding rate on interest to 15 percent or less, and often exempts interest entirely. We are pointing this out to less developed countries and are indicating that such a reduction could result in a reduction in the interest rates paid by their borrowers if the U.S. lending institutions are presently increasing their interest rates to pass on to the borrower the cost of the foreign withholding tax. However, some less developed countries are apparently not interested in sacrificing revenues to subsidize their borrowers, and would therefore object on revenue grounds to a reduction in their withholding rate on interest. If such objection is made, we would not insist, in otherwise appropriate situations, on following the standard treaty. Some less developed countries are willing to eliminate their withholding rates on interest paid on loans made by governmental organizations and perhaps charitable organizations which are tax exempt in the United States.

Royalties

The standard treaty often exempts royalty payments on patents, know-how, motion picture rights and the like, from withholding, and in the case of natural resource royalties and real estate rentals provides for taxation on a net income basis. Many less developed countries appear unwilling to yield any revenue obtained from patent and know-how royalties, and hence many strongly object to outright exemption in such cases. In appropriate situations complete exemption need not be a sine qua non of the treaty. However, it would seem desirable to place the tax on a basis that reflects expenses involved in earning the royalty in cases where such expenses may be significant. In view of the concern that some less developed countries may have over administrative difficulties in this approach, it would be appropriate to seek a reduced rate of tax if the rate is to be based on the gross royalty payment, or some other ad hoc method of taking significant expenses into account. In the case of mineral royalties and real estate rentals, a net income approach appears desirable.

Business Visitors and Personal Service Income

The standard treaty, here reflecting the desire to avoid inconvenience to the temporary visitor, usually provides for exemption from taxation of the personal service income of business visitors where the stay is temporary and the income not large. Thus, many treaties use such standards as $5,000 and 180 days as dividing lines. We would regard the standard treaty approach as generally appropriate to a less developed country as well, for here the factor of eliminating inconvenience to the temporary visitor would seem more significant than the possible revenue loss to the less developed country.

But this is an area where different countries are likely to cast the balance over a range of many possible variations, depending on their attitudes toward such visitors, and indeed to the various classes of visitors—employees of U.S. corporations, independent professional people such as engineers or lawyers, cultural visitors, entertainers, and so on. Hence a variety of tests are likely to emerge, and it is difficult to stress too strongly any single approach. We do regard it as desirable to seek approaches that are simple and certain in their application, which are the attributes possessed by the standard treaty provision.

Permanent Establishment

The trend in the standard treaty is slowly to add more particularity to the definition of permanent establishment in the direction of contracting its scope. The result, of course, is favorable to traders, since it permits a greater range of activity without the inconvenience of a tax payment in the country to which he exports. But some less developed countries may not be as receptive to this freeing of the trader from tax contact with them if it means a loss of revenue. They are more likely to want to expand rather than contract the definition. Thus they are troubled by the fact that exporting to a developed country may, because of the country's size, volume of imports, and the like require, if the trading is to be successful, a degree of activity that will often involve the trader in acquiring a permanent establishment status and thus subjecting itself to tax in the developed country.

But in some less developed countries, their small size and small volume of trade may permit a successful trader to handle the trade through only short trips of his employees to the less developed countries. The degree of "presence" within the less developed country may in relative terms bear the same ratio to its volume of trade as in the case of exports to a developed country, but in absolute terms fall short of the "presence" required to constitute a permanent establishment under the standard treaty. Consequently, in a situation in which a less developed country feels that these issues are important, where otherwise appropriate we have explored adding to the definition of permanent establishment such factors as an agent who regularly secures orders in the less developed country, or maintains a stock of goods from which he regularly makes deliveries.

Also, the use of an agent of independent status could constitute a permanent establishment if the agent acted almost exclusively for the exporter and engaged in these activities. In addition, it may not always be appropritae to eliminate the force of attraction principle.

Source-of-Income Rules

Many less developed countries do not have in their tax laws a formulated set of source rules sufficiently comprehensive to cover the usual run of international transactions. Since tax treaties depend for their operations on the existence of such rules, we desire that a treaty with a less developed country in such a situation embody as far as possible the standard source rules that have gained general international approval. We do not see any special reasons or situations which would make the same source rules less appropriate for less developed countries than for developed countries. Thus, we do not see that it is required in the case of a less developed country to adopt a rule that allocates the income from personal services to the country from which payment for those services is made, or as respects a country with significant exports of one or more commodities to adopt a rule that allocates the income of the trader (importing from that country) to the place of purchase if no other activity is there involved.

There are a few additional treaty provisions in which less developed countries may have an interest that may differ from that present in treaties between developed countries. For example, they may desire somewhat greater freedom from taxation in the United States for the students, trainees, teachers, and government officials they send to the United States; they may seek some reassurance that their tax administrations can cope with the provision which allows as deductions to a permanent establishment executive and administrative expenses wherever incurred and can prevent the "overreaching" by the foreign taxpayer which they fear may exist under this provision. Here the reassurance may well lie in a discussion of the problems and careful analysis of their worries rather than any explicit treaty change, since the allowance of properly allocable expenses of this nature is important to arriving at the correct net income.

The Treasury believes that a modified tax treaty can be devised to form the basis of discussions with less developed countries. We are in effect developing two standard tax treaties, one for developed countries and one for less developed countries. Of course the division is not rigid and, depending on the particular countries, some treaties would involve an appropriate blending of the two forms. We have engaged in discussions with a number of countries and others are scheduled.

Agreements With Thailand and Philippines

Discussions with the Government of Thailand have resulted in substantive agreement at the working level. The proposed treaty would embody the 7-percent investment credit provision, and in many other respects follow the lines of development suggested above. This agreement is subject to the review and approval of both governments, and we are very hopeful that final agreement can be reached in the weeks immediately ahead. Also, discussions with the Government of the Philippines have resulted, as previously announced, in the initialling of a draft agreement. While this agreement contains many of the approaches discussed above, it does not contain the 7-percent investment credit or the tax deferral for stock received for technical matters, nor does it contain any major reductions in the Philippine taxes on investment income.

The two governments believed the complex of provisions regarding investment requires further study and hence they were not incorporated at this time. But the governments considered the agreement on the remaining matters to be of such importance as to warrant moving ahead with the draft agreement in that form at this time. The Philippine draft agreement, as also in the case of Thailand, does contain a provision preventing discriminatory tax treatment of the taxpayers of the other country, and this clause has been expanded to extend this protection to enterprises of one country that are owned by persons of the other country.

These two working agreements, both in their similarities and dissimilarities, demonstrate that the United States and less developed countries are able to enter into useful and mutually beneficial income tax treaties along the lines of approach I have discussed. These agreements also indicate that flexibility in the application of these approaches is important and necessary, and with that flexibility there is sufficient room within these approaches to meet the differing situations which particular countries and the United States may face in their international economic relationships.

OECD discussions

Many of the treaty matters which I have discussed in the context of negotiations with other countries are also presently being considered in the multinational context of the OECD Fiscal Committee. This committee will pursue the numerous questions marked for further study in the report accompanying its draft convention, as well as the questions that will arise from the intensive examination which that draft will undergo in the course of treaty negotiations. The OECD Fiscal Committee is also studying on a broad basis such matters as tax incentives for investment in less developed countries, and the treaty problems growing out of differences in jurisdictional concepts of taxation.

II. U.S. STATUTORY TAXATION OF FOREIGN INCOME

Our summary of the treaty area thus indicates we are in a period of considerable activity marked by a number of major new developments. These offer promise of taking us into an entirely new stage in the treaty process. When we turn to the unilateral aspects of our international tax relations, and consider first the U.S. statutory taxation of foreign income, the picture is that of quiet on the legislative side but activity on the administrative side.

Revenue Act of 1962

This is an expected and appropriate development in the light of the Revenue Act of 1962. That act marked the most extensive range of tax legislation affecting the foreign area to be embodied in a single measure. It involved a revision of our statutory international tax rules designed to bring them into harmony with nontax international developments and to end the abuses which had been cumulating in this area.

The principal features of the 1962 revision are based on a concept of tax neutrality between investment abroad in developed areas and in the United States. Under this concept it is inappropriate for our tax laws to offer artificial tax inducements to investments in developed countries, since given the growing similarity between the investment climates of the United States and the developed world it is no longer in our national interest to offer tax incentives designed affirmatively to encourage investment to leave our shores rather than to stay at home. The 1962 legislation was thus directed at the three principal tax inducements under prior law: First, the so-called tax haven form of operation which combined the deferral feature of our law with patterns of foreign organization and operation to reduce materially the overall rate of taxation; second, those operations designed to combine the deferral feature with a final sale or liquidation at capital gain rates; and third, the failure in connection with our foreign tax credit to gross up dividends from foreign subsidiaries. While the deferral feature is retained for non-tax-haven operations, changes in the U.S. tax law regarding domestic investment, such as reduced corporate tax rates, liberal depreciation guidelines, and the 7-percent investment credit limited to domestic investment, are bringing our corporate income tax close to the major European corporate taxes, with only a few exceptions.

Alongside these policies, the 1962 act continued the policy of using the tax system to encourage investment in less developed countries, primarily, as respects this legislation, through not extending the gross-up requirement to less developed country dividends, and excepting from the tax haven rules the holding company form of operation when interest and dividend income derived from less developed countries are reinvested in those areas.

In the field of personal taxation, the 1962 act eliminated the abuses that had crept in through the unlimited exemption of earned income for residents abroad, the accumulation of tax-free income in foreign trusts, the use of foreign investment companies to convert dividend income into capital gain, and the investment in foreign real estate to escape our estate tax laws.

These new legislative rules necessarily required a fresh appraisal of tax planning and organization for foreign investment. It is probably too early to mark clearly definitive patterns, since there appears to be a rather wide range of responses. Thus, one gathers that the type of tax planning structured around the tax haven form of holding companies or sales companies is largely disappearing—certainly the number of new Swiss subsidiaries has plummeted downward.

As respects existing tax haven organizations, there appears to be a considerable number of orderly reorganizations designed either to eliminate those subsidiaries no longer important to the overall structure without the tax benefits they formerly provided or to convert them into corporations outside the scope of the tax-haven rules through adding non-tax-haven income from sources such as manufacturing operations or sales activities involving unrelated corporations. Some of the reorganizations are designed to probe the possibilities of decontrol, as by increasing the share of a European partner or in rather closely held companies by spreading the U.S. ownership over a number of 9-percent friendly oriented owners, so as to reduce the relevant ownership below 50 percent. There may be a trend toward a greater use of Western Hemisphere trade corporations, as a result of the court interpretations of the applicable rules relating to these corporations and the elimination of the 2-percent tax on consolidated returns.

There also may be a trend toward a greater use of operations in branch form abroad rather than operations through a foreign subsidiary in response to the elimination of the consolidated returns tax and to the equilibrium levels being reached by our tax rates, taken in connection with the 1962 changes, and foreign rates. New patterns are being considered for new investments, such as joint ventures organized with a foreign partner with that partner retaining control of the selling corporation and the U.S. partner control of the manufacturing corporation. All of this tax planning has its frontiers on which the more venturesome operate, with an eye both to possible interpretations of the U.S. law and to possible tightenings in European tax rules dealing with their own tax haven and similar difficulties.

Regulations under 1962 act

The 1962 act also necessitated an intensive concentration by the Treasury on the tax administration requirements of the new legislation. Especially in its tax-haven provisions that legislation embodied a variety of techniques new to our statutory structure. The tax-haven legislation was a pioneering technical task, for which there was no international precedent to guide our tax technicians and draftsmen. This has happened before in our international tax history—for it was the United States that pioneered the foreign tax credit. Pioneering always involves a certain amount of complexity, which in the tax-haven area was increased through the basic congressional decision to retain a general deferral rule but to withdraw the deferral privilege from a wide variety of activities requiring particular delineation. In recognition of these aspects of the legislation, the Treasury has moved as rapidly as possible to issue comprehensive regulations, so that all of the regulations under the 1962 provisions will have been published by the end of this year. It has also acted to permit taxpayers to make the transition to the new rules in as informed and flexible a manner as possible. It has been aided in these steps by the very helpful assistance given to it by the committee on foreign tax problems of the American Bar Association section of taxation and the committee on international taxation of the New York State Bar Association, and by the thoughtful comments submitted by this institute and other industry groups in connection with the proposed regulations.

Two of these regulations merit special attention. The structure of much of the 1962 legislation turns on the concept of the earnings and profits of a foreign subsidiary. While this concept was involved in some aspects of prior law, such as the foreign tax credit, it had never been seriously implemented. Clearly the 1962 act required a new technical approach to this concept, one that would produce a careful delineation of the operative rules. The Treasury was aware that the accounting approach to a consolidated statement of the domestic and foreign operations of some of our international corporations also involved this concept. Consequently it formed an informal and ad hoc committee composed of representatives from our major international accounting firms and chaired by Prof. Gerhard G. Mueller, of the University of Washington, an authority on international accounting. Working for over a year through many meetings and drafts this group has given the Treasury invaluable advice on its regulations prescribing the determination of the earnings and profits of a foreign subsidiary. These regulations are essentially designed to merge accepted rules of international accounting with requirements of the tax code. They may well become a strong impetus to a greater standardization of international accounting and to a more mature consideration of many of the basic concepts and rules, just as the presence of our domestic tax laws has meant so much to domestic accounting.

The Treasury intends to pursue this cooperative and informed approach to the development of international tax accounting. Thus, it now plans to have expert consultant guidance in the task of examining the laws and accounting practices of selected European countries so as to determine the adjustments appropriate or required to meet the standards set forth in the regulations. Clearly such a careful and informed approach is needed to guide the Internal Revenue Service in its administration of the 1962 act.

The other regulation that is of special interest relates to the minimum distribution concept of the 1962 act, which continues tax deferral for activities otherwise within the tax haven rules if the enterprise is taxed at a combined foreign and U.S. tax rate not substantially below the U.S. rate. Under this concept a schedule of overall effective foreign tax rates and corresponding percentages of income distributions to the United States—the lower the foreign rate the higher the percentage of distribution required—is provided which, if complied with, justifies foregoing the U.S. tax on the undistributed income of the foreign corporation. In such a case the foreign form of organization has not operated as a tax inducement to investment abroad nor involves abuse since no tax saving has been effected, either because of the level of rates paid abroad or the amount of foreign earnings that were actually repatriated or a combination of both. In the application of this concept, the act sets a percedent for looking at the foreign activities of a U.S. corporation on a consolidated basis, as if together they comprised a single entity. In this respect the tax law is beginning to recognize the international corporation and to grapple with the technical tax problems which it involves.

Recognizing the importance of this concept, and its potential for ready differentiation between cases where deferral may be continued and where our tax should apply, the Treasury has attempted to make the application of the concept as feasible as possible. Thus the regulations permit the bypassing of much of the detail otherwise required for its operation by sanctioning a simplified approach under which the payment of a 47-percent tax rate (approximately 45 percent in 1965 and thereafter) on the foreign earnings operates as a "safe haven" under the tax haven sections. As tax technicians develop greater familiarity with the 1962 act concept, it is possible these regulations may in turn be further simplified.

Improvement in administrative aspects—Section 482, allocation; section 367, and related matters

These aspects growing out of the 1962 act are only one phase of developments in the field of tax administration relating to foreign income. The goal guiding the Treasury in this field is that we must develop as quickly as possible an informed tax administration capable of dealing wisely and expeditiously with the problems that our expanding foreign investment, our expanding foreign trade and—the inevitable and necessary response—our expanding tax rules will place before the Internal Revenue Service. The work in the earnings and profits area, both in the formulation of the regulations and in the continuous informed research and guidance required for their sensible application, is one phase of this program.

Another phase of the program is the development of rules under section 482 responsive both to the scope of the problems arising under that section and the needs of taxpayers and revenue agents for rational guidance in meeting these problems. Thus we are preparing regulations, expected to be issued in proposed form this year, formulating guidelines for determining the arms length price to be used as the allocation standard in a variety of situations. These guidelines will be as refined as possible and as closely related to the actual facts of the particular case as is possible. The situations encompass, for example, sales by U.S. companies to their foreign affiliates, sales by foreign companies to their U.S. affiliates, the use by one member of a controlled group of properties or patents owned by another member, and the payment by one member of the expenses of another member. These guidelines in turn will be supplemented by rules on a number of critical issues arising under the application of section 482, such as the treatment of interest-free loans, and whether reallocated income may be repatriated tax free.

These efforts to formulate appropriate standards to govern allocations under section 482 and similar matters are to be accompanied, as indicated above under the treaty discussion, by intensified efforts to achieve appropriate international techniques whereby the allocations of our taxpayers and administrators can be appropriately meshed with the rules and procedures of the other countries involved.

We are also aware of the problems that are arising as a result of section 482 allocations and are closely studying those problems. For example, one of the problems confronting us is the avoidance of double taxation for past years. The problem arises here because relief from any double taxation resulting from the section 482 allocation may not be available in the foreign country due to statutory limitations or legal or other administrative factors. One approach which the Internal Revenue Service is considering is that of adjusting any proposed deficiency by the amount of foreign taxes paid.

In much the same fashion the Service is moving to step up the pace of developing appropriated guidelines in its application of section 367, to be published this year in a comprehensive revenue procedure.

Another step in the process of keeping tax administration sufficiently informed and responsible in this area is the forthcoming Internal Revenue Service order which will place the existing field groups of the Office of International Operations under the supervision of the district directors. This step will put issues in this area under the same procedures as any other matter as regards technical advice, rulings and audit review, thereby assuring close coordination between the field activities and Washington. The work of the Chief Counsel's Office in its interpretative and regulations activities will also be kept closely coordinated with problems arising in audit activity.

The activities of the Commissioner's Council on International Tax Administration is a phase of this overall development.

The combination of these steps should in large part eliminate present problems facing taxpayers and the service alike in the transition to an improved tax administration capable of handling with wisdom and responsibility the tax issues involved in modern tax relationships.

Finally, we may note the statistical and other data which will become available to the Treasury for the first time as a result of the processing of the returns required by the 1962 act. These data should be of material assistance in keeping abreast of issues and developments respecting the foreign operations of U.S. taxpayers.

In sum, our energies are here being directed to seeing that tax administration respecting foreign income comes of age, just as has happened in one area after another on the domestic side in response to new problems—and, I might add, just as other governments are beginning to recognize in their handling of their foreign income problems.

Study of European indirect taxes

To complete this consideration of the U.S. statutory taxation of foreign income mention should be made of two matters that take us beyond the 1962 act and the tax administration consequences we have been discussing. The first of these relates to the effects which the European tax systems, in their greater emphasis on indirect taxation, may have on the foreign trade of those countries and of the United States. In recent years considerable and increasing attention has been given to the turnover and value added taxes of Western Europe, and especially to the international trade aspects of those taxes—the rebates which free European exports from their scope and the compensating taxes which are levied on their imports—our exports—to bring them within their network. The first round of attention brought assertions that these foreign components and the very presence of these indirect taxes discriminated adversely against our foreign trade, and the quick remedy suggested was a tax subsidy under our income tax for our exports.

But careful study of that remedy disclosed many problems, ranging from a large waste of revenue if the proposed tax benefits were extended to existing exports on to the complexities and dislocations in accepted patterns of exporting if the benefits were offered only to increases in exports, and involving difficult questions of just how and in what areas a tax subsidy would either be appropriate or helpful and what would be the balance between revenue lost and benefits obtained. Approaching these questions in difficulty were the issues relating to international factors. Thus, would such a subsidy be permissible under GATT rules? If permissible, would the adoption of such a subsidy by a major exporting country set in motion a chain reaction of retaliatory adoptions by other countries?

The policy and technical difficulties presented by the subsidy approach were sufficiently serious to shift attention to an approach which involves an intensive analysis of the European situation, and discussions within the OECD, to see if the existing rules have a sound economic basis. At the same time the United States in the OECD has pressed for a standstill in rebates and compensatory taxes to maintain the status quo as far as possible pending the results of this study. The basic need for additional economic data and further analysis of the economic issues involved has become evident as the work progresses.

The 30-percent tax credit for investment abroad

The second matter to be mentioned, and to which reference was made in the discussion of tax treaties with less developed countries, is that of the President's recommendation in connection with the AID legislation of a 30-percent credit against U.S. tax for investment in less developed countries. The technical structure of such a credit, as developed by the Treasury Department in conjunction with the AID agency and the State and Commerce Departments, is embodied in the bill, H.R. 11524, introduced by Congressman BOGGS. It is presumed that hearings will be held on this subject next year. The credit would operate as an incentive to such investment and rests on the judgment of the AID administration and others both that an incentive of this nature appears needed to increase the rate and amount of our private investment in these countries and that such a development is important as respects our policies regarding less developed countries, and the further view that the tax system under these circumstances is an appropriate method of effecting this type of incentive.

III. UNITED STATES STATUTORY TAXATION OF FOREIGNERS

The past few years have thus witnessed extensive legislative changes in 1962 respecting the U.S. statutory taxation of foreign income followed now by a period of intensive administrative activity aimed at improving and modernizing tax administration in this area. When we turn, however, to the topic of the United States statutory taxation of foreigners receiving income from this country, we perceive an almost complete absence of activity in either the legislative or administrative field. Nor has this quietude been a feature of only the recent past. For a long period of time the taxation of foreigners has represented a corridor of our tax code in which the dust gathered and was rarely disturbed. But now this corridor is being opened for a careful examination which is quite likely to produce significant legislative changes.

Interestingly enough, the main cause of the searching inquiry into this hitherto little-noticed aspect of our tax law illustrates the importance of nontax factors on international tax relationships, and underscores the imperative need periodically to consider whether our tax rules are responsive to basic changes in the economic and other aspects of international affairs. The most significant economic aspect of our international position has for several years been the balance-of-payments situation of the United States. We have seen how this was one of the factors responsible for a reexamination of our taxation of foreign income. We have also witnessed how balance-of-payments problems were responsible for the adoption of a brandnew tax, the interest equalization tax—a device which broke new ground in making a tax system available as one of the ways in which a country could meet temporary balance-of-payments problems. It thereby significantly widened the flexibility and scope of our maneuverability in this area. And now we find that the balance-of-payments situation is the factor which has prompted the study of our statutory taxation of foreigners.

All this does not mean that basic provisions of our revenue laws should swing to and fro in response to balance-of-payments movements. Of course a tax device which is designedly temporary and which can be temporarily added without affecting the rest of the tax system, such as the interest equalization tax, is a proper short-range response. But clearly, many if not most of our tax provisions require a stability of concept and structure that would be impaired if they had to bend this way or that to each shift in balance of payments or other vital aspects of our economic well-being.

On the other hand, current imperatives can be the occasion for a searching check of tax concepts and structures to ascertain if they embody clearly outmoded patterns which would not serve us well for as far as we can reasonably read the future. So it was with the Revenue Act of 1962, where the study showed both a need to move toward greater tax neutrality and—and here is the important relationship to balance of payment—that such a move at that time was consistent with our present balance-of-payments goals and hence could appropriately be made at that time.

The examination of our statutory taxation of foreigners is of the same nature. Our balance-of-payments position is such that it is desirable for us at this time to obtain a higher level of foreign investment in the United States. In seeking ways to achieve and encourage that investment it is proper to ask whether our tax laws affecting foreigners operate as a barrier to investment in this country by foreigners. If so, here also a shift to a more neutral position—that is, a position which would make U.S. taxes as neutral a factor as possible in the decision of a foreigner whether to invest at home, in another country, or in the United States—would seem appropriate. Such a shift of course would have to be consistent with other tax policies. But assuming that this consistency existed, then here also we can say that a change at this time is appropriate since change now is in harmony with our balance-of-payments program. In other words, balance-of-payments objectives can prompt the study of tax provisions and can properly affect the timing of desirable basic changes in tax concepts. But as far as possible, excepting measures specifically linked to a temporary period—such as the interest equalization tax—the basic changes should be of such a nature that it would be proper to retain the new provisions even if our balance-of-payments posture were to alter.

Coming now more directly to the taxation of foreigners, a Presidential Task Force on Promoting Increased Foreign Investment in U.S. Corporate Securities and Increased Foreign Financing for U.S. Corporations Operating Abroad (the Fowler report) recommended to President Johnson on April 27, 1964, a series of tax and nontax measures to achieve the objectives its title embodied. The Treasury Department was consulted by this task force in the preparation of its report, and at the request of the President is now engaged in intensive consideration of its tax recommendations. Practically all of the tax recommendations relate to the taxation of foreigners investing in the United States, and represent in basic approach a reduction in the extent to which the United States now taxes such foreigners. The consideration of these recommendations and their implementation has involved the Department in the study of matters beyond the specific recommendations of this task force. In large part the questions under consideration can be grouped into several main subjects. The discussion is here, as elsewhere in this paper, confined to the income tax, though it should be noted that the application of our estate tax to foreign decedents is also under examination.

Application of progressive rates

The United States applies a basic 30 percent withholding tax, except as reduced under treaties, to most compensation and investment income flowing to foreign individuals, but then subjects the foreigner's total income from U.S. source to our progressive individual income tax rates if the latter produce a higher tax. At 1965 rates the point where the progressive rates cut in is $21,200 of income. Few foreign individuals with incomes above that level, however, in fact pay these progressive rates, escaping them legally by making their U.S. investments through personal holding companies incorporated abroad, or illegally through the use of nominees to disguise their real ownership or other devices which make it impossible for the Service to cumulate the various income payments. Thus less than $1 million in taxes is collected from the application of progressive rates on nonresidents. Given this situation, is it desirable to continue the present approach in the case of investment income? While it might be regarded as correct in theory, although most countries do not use this approach, is its complexity in administration worth the effort? Would elimination of this approach lead Americans to give up their citizenship while still retaining their investments in this country, and if so, should this be met by some specific provision?

Relating to this matter of the progressive rates is the present application of our personal holding company provisions to foreign corporations having U.S. investment income, which application is now required since this form of holding would otherwise permit avoidance of the progressive rates. If progressive rates were to be dropped, then consideration could be given in turn to dropping application of the personal holding company tax. Some troublesome problems would have to be solved such as a personal holding company with some U.S. shareholders, or a company in a treaty country, favored by a reduced U.S. withholding rate under the treaty, but owned by nonresidents of that country who would secure the lower U.S. treaty rate. Related also to the progressive rates is our present source of income rule which treats a dividend from a foreign corporation deriving its income from U.S. sources as itself from U.S. sources. If the progressive rate approach is dropped, could this second dividend tax likewise be dropped at least where the U.S. source income of the foreign corporation is itself dividend income rather than trade or business income?

The dropping of the progressive rate approach means that returns would not be required from any foreigner having only investment income, so that his tax contact with the United States would be only through the withholding system.

Foreign investor also engaged in U.S. trade or business

As indicated above, a foreigner investing in the United States can have his investment income subjected to rates above the 30 percent withholding rate if the income is large enough to bring into play the progressive rates. But, under another rule, even investment income below $21,200 can be subject to progressive rates if the foreigner is engaged in trade or business in the United States, since then our Code requires that he be taxed on all his U.S. source income at the regular U.S. rates. The question here is whether this joining of the two types of income should occur, or whether instead the investment income, assuming it is not related to the trade or business, should be kept separate and thereby subjected only to the withholding tax. This joinder rule is, it may be noted, one of the "bittersweet" tax rules, since some taxpayers benefit by the joinder. Thus, a taxpayer with income from real estate not regarded as a trade or business can, through joinder with a trade or business, transform a 30-percent rate on the gross rentals into a tax at regular rates but on a much lower net income. Royalty income is another example. The allowance of a dividend-received deduction to a foreign corporation which both receives dividends from U.S. sources and is engaged in trade or business in the United States is still another example. Hence any change in the joinder rule would require careful consideration of the gross income approach now applied to rental or royalty income to see whether a net income concept is more appropriate, even though the activity is not regarded by itself as a trade or business.

Capital gains

The U.S. system of taxing U.S. capital gains of foreigners places great stress on the physical presence of the foreigner in the United States—if he is here when the gain is realized, or if he is here for a total of 90 days, then he is subject to our capital gains tax on his U.S. gains. Such a rule would seem to invite only careful planning for its avoidance, so that it is productive of nuisance but not revenue. Consideration could be given to its abandonment, except perhaps where the presence in the United States is of longer duration, such as 6 months, and perhaps where the gains are also more speculative in nature, as short term gains.

Withholding system

The issues discussed above indicate that we now place great reliance on our withholding system to collect taxes on foreigners, and may place even greater reliance on that method in the future. Naturally, this leads to the question whether that withholding system is functioning satisfactorily; for example, does it reach all recipients; does it confine the various lower treaty rates to the recipients intended to be benefited or are others as well, such as residents of nontreaty countries, riding the coattails of the treaties; is our exemption of U.S. citizens from this withholding being abused by foreigners claiming to be citizens? Prudence would require that we give the withholding system a careful scrutiny.

Basic problems

These represent some of the matters currently being studied by the Treasury Department. Since the overall thrust of the possible changes is that of reduced U.S. taxation of foreigners investing in the United States, it can be argued that such changes would attract more investment to the United States. This is the belief of the Presidential Task Force mentioned earlier. The types of investors who would respond and the extent of the response are probably not subject to empirical demonstration. Certainly changes of this nature should, however, at the very least improve the U.S. investment climate for foreign investors. But the case for reexamination of these rules need not be pitched on proof of a large absolute increase in foreign investment in the United States. Rather, it is necessary to consider whether changes are appropriate from the standpoint of a more rational application of our tax to foreigners, and hopefully one that would be somewhat simpler.

This approach in turn leads us to two important questions. The first is that of ascertaining what are the criteria of rationality when we are seeking to frame a tax structure applicable to foreigners. Clearly we must keep in mind that we are here dealing with international tax relationships. This means we should see that any new rules are in conformity with acceptable international norms. The United States, with its large flows of capital and goods in and out of our country, has a responsibility to take a major role in developing a proper international tax framework against which the tax rules of any particular country can be considered. One basic factor in this respect is a fair and sensible allocation among the various countries of income from activities that reach across international borders. Another factor is a proper balance between the tax paid by our citizens on their U.S. income and that paid by foreigners on the same income. Still another factor is the desirability of maintaining as far as possible the free movement of capital and goods, with taxes in any country as neutral a factor as possible consistent with the domestic policies to be served by a tax system.

For example, care must be taken to see that in making changes designed to remove unwarranted tax barriers to investment in the United States we do not thereby turn the United States into a tax haven country vis-a-vis foreign investors. Moreover, we must be careful to prevent our adopting tax rules for foreigners that could be combined with the tax rules of another country to transform that country into a tax haven that would attract foreigners seeking to invest in the United States. We have ourselves seen the problems which tax havens can cause for our tax system and economic policies, and hence have our own obligations not to place such holes in the international tax fabric.

The recent changes in the Netherlands Antilles income tax treaty were made for this reason, since the former treaty when combined with the tax laws of the Antilles had made it an artificial way station for foreigners investing in the United States. We now recognize that in all of our treaties we must be careful to avoid another Antilles situation, and the provision in the Luxembourg treaty guarding against this possibility is an example of our approach. We must also keep in mind the problems that can exist if our tax rules are so attractive that we drain off capital from less developed areas, such as Latin America, which are badly in need of that capital at home.

Relationship to tax treaties

The second question involves the relationship of these statutory tax rules respecting foreigners to our income tax treaties. Both these statutory rules and the treaties involve the same subject matter—that of the U.S. taxation of the income of foreigners derived from U.S. sources. The code rules considered above represent our statutory or unilateral approach; the treaties represent our bilateral approach. The treaties have the function, in this respect, of placing restrictions on the unilateral rules, in that the treaty rules are more favorable to foreigners than the code rules. When we examine many of the statutory changes under consideration, we find they are similar to the changes discussed earlier in our new approach to income tax treaties. Thus both move along parallel lines—e.g., lessened taxation of capital gains, the elimination of the force of attraction of a trade or business (statutory) or of a permanent establishment (treaty).

Any changes made unilaterally could thus present us with distinct difficulties in the treaty area. For treaties are bilateral and the restrictions are reciprocal. The concessions we make in a treaty to the foreigners of country X investing in the United States are usually matched by the concessions country X makes in the treaty to our citizens investing in that country. Hence, if we decide in a treaty to eliminate our taxation of the U.S. capital gains of foreigners or to eliminate the force of attraction of a permanent establishment in the United States for the investment income of a foreigner owning that establishment, we expect to receive similar treaty concessions from the other country. Such concessions both benefit our investors and traders abroad, and through lowered foreign taxes, and hence lowered foreign tax credits, provide us with a revenue increase to balance the revenue lost through our concessions. What, therefore, happens to our bargaining powers if these concessions are unilaterally made by the United States through a statutory change? This problem is a very real one, since many treaty negotiations develop essentially into formidable contract bargaining.

The desire to protect our revenues and own investors and traders, and caution as well, would thus point to making any changes, otherwise appropriate, only through treaties and not unilaterally. The principal offsetting factor is that of time—treaties do move slowly and all else being equal if the changes are desirable they should be made at this time. The problem thus becomes one of searching for a mechanism which will protect the treaty process and still permit unilateral change. One possibility worth consideration is that of making the unilateral statutory changes but providing in the code that the Secretary of the Treasury can rescind the more important of these changes as respects the residents of any foreign country if he finds that the country is not taking reasonable steps in treaty negotiations to grant relief to our citizens similar to the relief granted to its citizens by our statutory changes. Several present code sections could be regarded as consistent, if not direct, precedents: Section 883 excluding from our tax the profits from the operation of foreign documented ships or aircraft if the country of documentation grants an equivalent exemption to our shipping and aircraft; and section 891 authorizing the President to double the rates of our tax as to citizens of a foreign country which he finds is subjecting our citizens to discriminatory or extraterritorial taxes. The objective in exploring the mechanism suggested, or others that may be suitable, is to achieve a flexibility in approach to our international tax relationships that will permit us to move in harmony both through statutory changes and treaty revisions.

CONCLUSION

The Treasury Department is engaged in a wide ranging program of improving our international tax relationships in the interest of increased international trade and investment and of the increased economic development of less developed areas. The above description of this program is necessarily lengthy and detailed. The program covers a range of activities reaching from tax treaties and multinational tax discussions to U.S. statutory legislation and on to Treasury regulations and operating procedures of the Internal Revenue Service. Moreover, in the tax field the full meaning and scope of any provision, be it in a treaty, statute, regulation or other form, lie in the details of that provision. Taxation is a technical subject and the details count.

A program of this breadth requires time for its full completion, and the persistent, patient activities of not only our tax officials but also those of many countries. It can also be immeasurably aided by the informed and patient cooperation of private tax experts, through associations or in their private capacities, who can bring their experience and problems to the shaping of the solutions. The Treasury welcomes this cooperation. It believes that the goals involved in this program will commend themselves to those concerned with international economic problems and that the accomplishment of those goals will represent a significant step forward in our international tax relationships.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALTERS in the chair). Is there further morning business?

THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS AND CONDUCT

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, a few months ago, when the report of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration was filed concerning its investigation into the affairs of Robert Baker and employees of the Senate, I offered a resolution to establish a permanent Select Committee on Standards and Conduct. The resolution was adopted by the Senate on July 24 by a vote of 61 to 19, and became Senate Resolution 338 of the 88th Congress.

When I offered the resolution, I explained to the Senate my purpose. It was that such a committee would be charged with one duty. But the duty with which this committee would be charged is a duty carrying a very serious responsibility—to consider any charges of misconduct which might be made against employees of the Senate or Members of the Senate.

The resolution provided that the Select Committee on Standards and Conduct be composed of three Members of the majority party and three Members of the minority party.

I considered that because of the importance of its assignment, the President of the Senate would draw from both the majority and the minority party, Members of experience, and Members who were known throughout the country—a membership which would give to the select committee public acceptance and respect. In saying this, I do not derogate the members of any other committee, for other committees are charged with special legislative responsibilities.

And as the membership of the select committee would be equally divided between the two parties, I believed any charges of partisanship of politics would be removed, so far as this is possible.

The investigation by the Rules Committee into the affairs of the former secretary of the majority, Mr. Baker, has been resumed. It has been renewed in the closing days of this session of the Congress, and following the two great political conventions. Though we act with the highest responsibility, it is apparent that whatever the Rules Committee may do, it will be charged with politics.

The Congress is drawing to a close and the Senate will soon adjourn. I say to the distinguished majority leader and the distinguished minority leader that the Senate did adopt this resolution by an overwhelming vote, and the President of the Senate should appoint three Members from the majority side and three Members from the minority side to the Select Committee on Standards and Conduct established by Senate Resolution 338. The majority leader and the minority leader know that when I say this, I do not speak formally or in mere words. They know also of my respect for them.

I do not think it is sufficient to say that Members will not serve. I believe that Members should be named, and the President of the Senate should appoint them. Those who are appointed must then determine according to their conscience and sense of duty whether they will serve.

I hope very much that when the Congress reconvenes, this committee will be appointed.

I believe, for the reasons I have given, that such a committee would hold the respect of the country. It would be impartial and nonpolitical. It would protect the interest of the innocent, and that is important. And it would pursue to the very end any credible charges that might be made against an employee or Member of the Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I appreciate the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Kentucky. That committee will be appointed. I assure the distinguished Senator that at an appropriate moment the minority leader and I will take this matter up with the President of the Senate, and see that the will of the Senate, as expressed in the proposal of the Senator from Kentucky, is put into effect.

RADIO PRESS INTERNATIONAL'S PANEL PROGRAM "FROM THE PEOPLE"

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record a program in which I participated, known as Radio Press International's "From the People." This program is moderated by Harry Clarkson. The panelists were Herb Brubaker, RPI Washington chief, and May Craig, of the Portland, Maine, Press Herald.

There being no objection, the program was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

RPI's Panel Program "From the People"

(Interview with Senator Mike Mansfield, Democrat, of Montana, majority leader of the Senate; moderator, Harry Clarkson; panelists, Herb Brubaker, RPI Washington bureau chief, and May Craig of the Portland, Maine, Press Herald.)

Mr. Clarkson. Senator Mansfield, can Members of the 88th Congress go home to their constituents and campaign on a good record?

Mr. Mansfield. They most certainly can. I think the record of the 88th Congress, and most especially the record this year, will rank with the record of any year in the history of the Republic. President Johnson sent down 51 recommendations beginning in January of this year. As far as the Senate is concerned, all 51 of these recommendations have been approved and passed.

Mr. Brubaker. Staying on the subject of this congressional session Senator, because of the length of the 2d session of the 88th Congress will you next year be working on ways you can shorten congressional sessions?

Mr. Mansfield. Well, I'm always working on a policy of that nature, but never with much success. I would point out that with the beginning of October we have completed 21 months in session, and that's a long time to go. And it takes a great deal out of some of the Members because the duties and responsibilities of Senators seem to be increasing with the passage of time.

Mr. Brubaker. Would it be possible and wise to make suggestion next year that possibly there be year-round session with summer recess?

Mr. Mansfield. Well there have been proposals made especially by Senator Magnuson, to the effect that there ought to be two sessions each year. One, a legislative session so-called, the other appropriations, and the idea would be to spend more time on the appropriation bills and consider them on their own, rather than sandwiching them in with other matters during the course of the year. Personally I favor the Magnuson bill and I think it should be given consideration and I would hope that if, and when, it is given consideration some proviso will be put into the effect that there will be a recess between the sessions.

Mr. Brubaker. Senator Mansfield, at the beginning of this program you noted the 51 recommendations of the administration, but not passed have been any recommendations regarding Presidential security. Are you disappointed along this line and what are your hopes for next year?

Mr. Mansfield. Yes, I am, and as long as you raised the question of what the Senate has done in relation to the President's recommendations, I'd like to point out that even the Democrats have a majority of 2 to 1 that these were not really Democratic triumphs in toto, because on many, many occasions anywhere from 4 to 10 Republicans crossed over from their side of the aisle so to speak to join with the Democrats and if it hadn't been for them some of this legislation would not have been passed. Insofar as the question of security is concerned, I am disappointed that we've taken no action but I hope that on the basis of the Warren Commission Report and the Dillon panel set up by the President to look into the Warren Commission's recommendations that we will be able to consider this and related matters in a package form shortly after the Congress comes back next January.

Mr. Brubaker. This past Thursday, Senator Mansfield, you urged the national candidates in essence to show restraint while campaigning because of security problems. What do you think of the President's Monday barnstorm of New England? Is that dangerous?

Mr. Mansfield. Well, the President likes to mix with people and it seems that a crowd acts as a magnet. The same thing could be said of our late and beloved President John F. Kennedy as well. But the thing that worries me is the possibility of an accident or something in the form of a deliberate attempt on the man's life. We only have one President and I think that he and the others who are running for the Presidency and Vice-Presidency on the two major tickets should consider the interests of the Nation because after all, we do have a vested interest in all of them.

Mr. Brubaker. So in addition to greater security precautions on the part of the Secret Service you would urge President Johnson and other national candidates to go a little bit easier as it were while campaigning and not stay out so much in the crowds?

Mr. Mansfield. I would hope they would. Though it would be difficult as far as the Secret Service is concerned, I think all things considered that they have really done a magnificent job.

May Craig. Senator, one problem that we certainly have not got far on is Vietnam. Should we frankly take over there and fight that war or * * *?

Mr. Mansfield. We should not. We are in Vietnam to bring stability to South Vietnam, to maintain the independence of that country. It is not an American war, it is a Vietnamese war. We have 18,000 men there at the present time in an "advisory" capacity. If that war is going to be won it is going to be the primary responsibility of the Vietnamese themselves.

May Craig. Are they not divided? Do you see any coherence in what they do? Do they even take our advice which is all we feel we can do?

Mr. Mansfield. They are divided, that is true, into sects, into age groups, and into differences between the mountain people so to speak and the lowlanders, the rest of the Vietnamese. But all we can do is to do what we can to bring about, if it is at all possible, a degree of stability which will allow these people who have been engaged in a war of one kind or another since 1939, to have some peace. It is an extremely difficult area. I think the President has been most frank in what he has said to the American people. He has brought the leadership, both Democrat and Republican, into his confidence because he has called us down there 10 or 11 times on Vietnam, most especially, other matters as well, to keep us up to date on developments there.

May Craig. Senator, do you really think the Vietnamese people have the ability to fight to win? They are so divided among themselves and it has been so long.

Mr. Mansfield. Yes, but they are a scrappy people, they are a fighting people and if they ever get together I think they can bear the burdens which are theirs primarily. I would say that I regret very much, and this is not hind sight for me because I stated so at the time, that President Ngo Diem was assassinated because I thought then that he was, and I still think, that he was the only possibility to achieve the degree of unity and coordination necessary to preserve the Republic of South Vietnam.

May Craig. Well, Senator, people suggest we should pull out. Would that not be disastrous for our prestige as well as the loss of all southeast Asia?

Mr. Mansfield. Well, prestige is immaterial. I think we place too much emphasis on prestige but I certainly do not think we should pull out. We ought to see this thing through and I'm sure we will.

May Craig. Do you not think prestige would be involved in pulling out?

Mr. Mansfield. Yes, but I think people pay too much attention to prestige or face and not enough attention to reality.

May Craig. Well, Senator Mansfield, if the Communists got all the rice there would that not be disastrous?

Mr. Mansfield. Oh, I said it would be disastrous, I just disagreed with you on your emphasis on prestige and face because I think that has been overemphasized all too often. I'm more interested in the reality of a situation than I am in what it means in face or prestige.

Mr. Brubaker. Senator Mansfield, earlier this week in New England, Mr. Johnson made it clear that the administration has no policy of moving the Vietnamese war north. Yet the very following day Assistant Secretary of State for the Far East, Mr. Bundy, made it clear that if pressured to do so we would move north. Is there a contradiction here?

Mr. Mansfield. Well, evidently, but there is only one man in charge of foreign policy in this country and that is the President of the United States.

Mr. Brubaker. Should the administration take greater pains to seek unity within its own house on this issue if there is dissent?

Mr. Mansfield. I don't know whether there is dissent or not, but when the President speaks he speaks in his constitutional capacity as Commander in Chief and President and the man in charge of foreign policy.

Mr. Brubaker. Earlier this year you made a Senate speech raising the possibility, or at least discussion of neutral Vietnam. Are there still hopes for this? Should we work toward that end?

Mr. Mansfield. No. I'm glad you raised that question. Because what I did at the time was to express my feeling when General de Gaulle of France advanced an idea that some consideration should be given to the neutralization of all southeast Asia it was my feeling that we ought to find out what he was talking about. We have a habit of shrugging aside immediately suggestions made by President de Gaulle, who in my opinion is one of the great men in the world today. Now, his suggestions might be valid or they may be worthless but there is certainly no harm in looking into them, finding out what he has in mind, giving them consideration, if they are worthwhile take advantage of what he proposes, if they are not, throw them aside.

Mr. Brubaker. Senator Mansfield, while we are on the topic of Charles de Gaulle, what do you think of his trip through Latin America in which he's obviously urging these nations to seek national independence?

Mr. Mansfield. I think it's an excellent idea. The ties between France and Latin America culturally and otherwise have been in existence for many decades, in some areas for centuries and I think it's a good idea for other countries to become interested in Latin America and I would hope that as these other countries do become interested that they would do what they could to help bring about a better way of life for people in that part of the hemisphere and in that way give them some hope for the future.

Mr. Brubaker. You don't think he's attempting to subvert American policy there, or at least weaken it somewhat?

Mr. MANSFIELD. No I do not. I think he's trying to advance the cause of France and he's playing on the cultural sympathies which exist between Latin America and France so that a better relationship will be the result. I believe that President de Gaulle is the first man to visit Mexico and Latin America who holds high position in France since Maximilian came to Mexico with the French Army during the American War Between the States.

Mr. BRUBAKER. Senator MANSFIELD, staying on the topic of foreign policy—there's talk that President Johnson will visit Europe after the election if he's reelected. Will you urge the President to wait until January 20 when we have a Vice President?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Well, one reason why the President has not gone outside the territorial confines of the United States except on the basis of his visit earlier in the middle of last month to Canada to sign the Columbia Basin Treaty and also to Mexico to finalize the Chamizal Treaty with Mexico a few days ago is because he has had no Vice President. It would be my belief that the President who is prudent and circumspect in this matter would be guided by what he thought would be in the best interests of the Nation as to whether or not he should undertake a trip of this kind before he's inagurated, if elected, to a full term, or afterward.

MAY CRAIG. Senator MANSFIELD, I was interested in your concern of the President's security. But you know perfectly well he loves people and he's a willful man. How are you going to make him obey any of the recommendations made by the Secret Service or anybody else?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Well, you can't make him obey. You couldn't make President John F. Kennedy obey. But I would hope that a word of caution would serve as a sort of flag to warn him to be a little more careful because, as I've said previously, we only have one President.

MAY CRAIG. I understand that, I know that you are for legislations which would assign also to the other nominee, GOLDWATER has already received many threats including bombing. I understand the President has given, informally given, him some protection.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That I don't know anything about.

MAY CRAIG. Yes, I understood that was so. Just what exactly do you think ought to be done for the President himself?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I think that enough is being done at the present time. But the situations which develop make it extremely difficult for the Secret Service personnel to guard him as they would like to. I would point out that it's impossible to give him absolute security, but if the Secret Service suggestions were followed I would think that the situation would be more tolerable.

MAY CRAIG. The Warren Commission did however say that he could not be guarded against every potential danger and that you have said yourself, I believe.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct.

MAY CRAIG. What else have you got in that proposed legislation of yours?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Just that.

Mr. BRUBAKER. Senator MANSFIELD, let's get back to foreign affairs. Do you believe it would be wise for President Johnson to seek an early summit meeting with Khrushchev?

Mr. MANSFIELD. No, not unless there was some spade work done ahead of time, so that if they did meet it would have some significance. By that I mean that the Ambassadors of the two countries ought to get together to consider what the problems are, see what can be done in the way of accommodation, and then if there is the possibility of really doing something which will be beneficial then I would think that the two Chiefs of State could meet for the purpose of finalizing an agreement. I am opposed to summit meetings as summit meetings, because they offer a field day to the radio, the TV, and newspaper people. They are used for propaganda purposes, and as far as practical results are concerned very little is achieved.

Mr. BRUBAKER. At this point you see no need for a summit?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I do not.

Mr. BRUBAKER. Senator MANSFIELD, what would be the consequences if BARRY GOLDWATER were the President? In the international affairs?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Well I think the country would function. And I would think that Senator GOLDWATER, if he achieved the Presidency, would be a lot more responsible than a good many people think.

Mr. BRUBAKER. Returning to domestic affairs, at the beginning of this program you said that many of these measures requested by the administration were passed with the great help and cooperation of the Republicans. Doesn't this soften the political impact of the Democrats on these issues?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Well, I don't think that there are really any issues involved because what the Congress has accomplished it accomplished to a large extent in a bipartisan manner. And I think that any Member of the Congress, Republican or Democrat, can go home to his people and really brag about the accomplishments of this body. After all, there is such a thing as country above party and if a man like EVERETT DIRKSEN who time and time again has placed the interest of the country ahead of the interests of his party, if he does that I think that he should be able to take a bow, and I think the Republicans who did the same should do likewise.

Mr. BRUBAKER. Yet Senator MANSFIELD, BARRY GOLDWATER voted against many of these measures, supported by Senator DIRKSEN. Does this kind of isolate BARRY GOLDWATER from most pubic opinion and most of his party?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Well that would be a hard question to answer, because most of the candidates for the House and Senate are going to campaign on the basis of their own record. I don't think that they will make any comparison to what BARRY GOLDWATER has done, that will be done in the newspapers and I would suppose through pamphlets and the like. But BARRY GOLDWATER has voted as he honestly thought best. He was sent by the people of Arizona to represent them and as long as a man is honest in his convictions, and I think Senator GOLDWATER was, the answer lies not with the opponents primarily but it does lie with the people of Arizona, although that will not be the case now because he is not a candidate for reelection to the Senate.

Mr. BRUBAKER. Senator MANSFIELD, do you agree with Senator KARL MUNDT, of South Dakota, who says that thus far we've had a low-level, schoolyard type of campaign? That issues haven't been important enough?

Mr. MANSFIELD. There's been too much of it, yes.

Mr. BRUBAKER. Would you elaborate on that please, Senator?

Mr. MANSFIELD. No.

MAY CRAIG. I know you've praised Congress, I love Congress. I've covered it 30 years, but I find it very inefficient and wasteful of the Member's time. The public in general feel so too. How could you make it function more efficiently?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Well May, if anyone ought to know the answer to that question it should be you, because it just isn't true. As I tried to say at the beginning of this program, we have more to do with each passing year and people turn more and more to the Congress. Here I come from a small State in population like Montana and my mail on a 7-day week average comes to about 100 letters a day. It's pretty hard to keep up with it. I have to go downtown and visit various departments to take care of the needs of my constituents, legitimate business, I meet with various groups when they come back here. I certainly give primary interest to the problems of Montana but then I am also a Senator of the United States so there's no wastage of time as far as the Senate is concerned, nor do I think there is in the House. The exact opposite would be true.

MAY CRAIG. Well it is a year round job and you work inhuman hours and travel back and forth to home all the time to serve there and serve here. It seems to me something has to be done to make it more efficient and easier on the Members.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Well I wish it could but I do not know how you can do it unless you want to elect associate Senators who can take on part of the job, and I would not approve that, because I think each State has room for only two Senators at a time. So we do the best we can. Nobody drafts us for this job. We know what we are getting into and we know what the job entails when we run for reelection. We do the best we can. Sometimes we succeed and sometimes we do not. We cannot please everyone but you have to call them as you see them and let the results speak for themselves.

MAY CRAIG. The House of course has strict rules. The Senate is the last home of unlimited debate. Are you for filibusters and cloture? Discuss that a moment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes, I am for the filibuster up to a point. I think that rule 22 ought to be shifted from two-thirds of those present and voting, to three-fifths of those present and voting. I do not believe in a straight majority because I think it would be possible to shift under certain circumstances 1-2-3 Senators one way or the other. I certainly do believe in unlimited debate within reasonable limits.

Mr. BRUBAKER. Senator MANSFIELD, on this program last week CARL CURTIS, of Nebraska, made this charge: "Lyndon Johnson is solely responsible for restraining what he calls the Bobby Baker probe." BARRY GOLDWATER says the same thing. Do you see this directly?

Mr. MANSFIELD. No, I do not. After all, as far as the probe is concerned, that was the Senates responsibility. When the matter was first called to my attention by Senator WILLIAMS he and I met with the minority leader, Mr. DIRKSEN. We agreed on a resolution. That resolution was extended twice, before it lapsed, and on the basis of new evidence presented by Mr. WILLIAMS in mid-September or thereabouts, on information that came to his attention around mid-August, I assured him that I would meet with the policy committee. We met. We decided that on the basis of the evidence Senator WILLIAMS presented that the investigation should be reopened. I introduced a resolution to that effect and the Rules Committee is now undertaking an inquiry based on the new evidence presented by the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. BRUBAKER. Would you concede, Senator MANSFIELD, that it would have been more appropriate for the select subcommittee created as the result of the Baker issues would have been a better investigatory body for these new charges?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I would not.

Mr. BRUBAKER. Why not, Senator?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Because the committe isn't created in the first place. It would have been a slap at the Rules Committee which is in charge of the Senate rules and regulations with prime responsibility in matters of this kind.

Mr. BRUBAKER. Senator MANSFIELD, do you feel there might be some unfortunate political consequences in the Baker issue?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I don't know what will come out of it. All I hope is that the committee goes to the bottom and lays it on the table.

Mr. Brubaker. Is there concern in your home State of Montana over this?

Mr. Mansfield. Oh, I'm sure there's concern in all 50 States.

Mr. Brubaker. Do you receive a good number of letters on the issue?

Mr. Mansfield. Not too much.

Mr. Clarkson. In closing, Senator Mansfield, how will the vote go in the West in the presidential race and congresssional races?

Mr. Mansfield. Well, I would anticipate that as of now, I want to qualify that, as of now, that we might gain—2 or 3 seats in the Senate. I would anticipate, as of now, that the House Democrats will increase their membership and I would anticipate, as of now, that President Johnson would carry the great majority of the Rocky Mountain States.

Mr. Clarkson. Senator Mansfield, what particular reason would it appear that the Democratic Party would do better in the West in 1964 than they did in 1960?

Mr. Mansfield. Well unfortunately, the question of religion, had an impact in the last election. That will not be so visible now. Furthermore, in the West we look upon Texas as a part of that area and speaking personally there has been over the years, the decades, a close connection between west Texas and Montana based primarily on the cattle drives in earlier years but including other factors as well.

RECESS SUBJECT TO THE CALL OF THE CHAIR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the Senate is awaiting House action on two bills. There is no need for Senators to sit twiddling their thumbs while we are waiting for such action. Therefore, I move that the Senate stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 11 o'clock and 13 minutes a.m.) the Senate took a recess subject to the call of the Chair.

At 11:40 a.m. the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. Mansfield in the chair).

BAKER'S COMPANY, SERV-U CORP., GETS SECURITY CLEARANCE FROM DEFENSE DEPARTMENT

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, in the early part of this year Mr. Robert G. Baker took the fifth amendment rather than answer questions before the Senate Rules Committee in connection with some of his official activities while serving as an employee of the U.S. Senate. Some of his business partners and associates, as well as Mr. Baker himself, took the fifth amendment when asked questions by the Senate Rules Committee concerning their method of operating the Serv-U Corp. The committee was trying to determine to what extent this vending machine company of Mr. Baker's and his partners' had received preferential consideration from defense plants which were operating with Government contracts.

With this background as well as the many unanswered charges which still remain in connection with the manner in which Mr. Baker was able to pyramid his net worth from approximately $80,000 to over $2¼ million in a 4-year period while creating negligible tax liabilities, I was amazed to find that the Defense Department on July 20, 1964, gave the Serv-U Corp.—which is principally owned by Mr. Baker—confidential clearance in connection with its contracts with the Rocketdyne plant of North American Aviation.

This confidential security clearance for facilities was approved by Mr. Robert E. Bonn, Chief, Operations Division, Security Office, Department of the Air Force, on July 20, 1964, and was based upon a memorandum which his department had received in June 1964 from Col. James R. McBrayer, Jr., Chief, Security and Law Enforcement Division, Office of the Inspector General. In that memorandum Colonel McBrayer specifically approved this final facility security clearance for the Serv-U Corp.

I recognize that this is not clearance of a top security nature, nor does this security clearance mention Mr. Robert Baker but just the company and its listed officers. However, it is common knowledge that Mr. Baker is and was the principal owner.

The American people will be interested to know that not only is this administration determined to whitewash the Bobby Baker episode but it continues to embrace him with open arms.

I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the Record the letter dated October 2, 1964, signed by Mr. David E. McGiffert, Assistant to the Secretary of Defense, in which he confirms this security clearance, along with copies of the June 9, 1964, and July 20, 1964, security clearances.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Office of the Secretary of Defense,
Washington, D.C., October 2, 1964.

Hon. John J. Williams,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Williams: Your letter of September 14, 1964, addressed to the Secretary of Defense, regarding the Serv-U Corp. and Mr. Robert G. Baker, has been referred to me for reply.

You requested a copy of the June 9, 1964, letter relative to this matter which Col. James R. McBrayer, Jr., Chief Security and Law Enforcement Division, Office of the Inspector General, Air Force Systems Command, sent to the Western Contract Management Region Office, Mira Loma, Calif. A copy of Colonel McBrayer's letter is attached.

Please note that Colonel McBrayer did not direct that Serv-U Corp. be cleared, but concurred in the Western Contract Management Region Office's recommendation that a facility clearance be granted to Serv-U Corp.

The Department of Defense Industrial Security Manual under paragraph 5a provides that the contractor: "Shall assure that classified information is furnished or disclosed only to authorized persons. To this end he shall determine to what extent his employees, subcontractors, vendors or suppliers require access to classified information in the performance of tasks or services essential to the fulfillment of the contract. He shall take all reasonable measures to adjust plant layout and organize work so as to limit such access to the least number of individuals or firms consistent with the efficient performance of the contract."

The Department of Defense policy to which Colonel McBrayer referred, is based on the fact that in most cases food, beverage, or vending equipment organizations can furnish service to a contractor by locating their equipment at the facility so that personnel servicing such equipment do not have to move through or adjacent to areas where classified material is exposed. Consequently, the policy is to not grant a facility clearance to such organizations except in those cases where their personnel cannot reasonably be isolated from classified areas, provided the management of the facility being serviced can justify the continued need for the service.

In this case the Rocketdyne Division of North American Aviation did in fact substantiate to the satisfaction of the Air Force cognizant security office, Western Contract Management Region, the need for Serv-U Corp. to be granted a facility clearance. The organization which preceded Serv-U in providing service to the Rocketdyne plant of North American Aviation also held a facility clearance under this exception.

Serv-U Corp. was granted a final confidential facility clearance on July 20, 1964, in connection with its contract with the Rocketdyne Division of North American Aviation, Inc. A copy of the letter of notification of facility security clearance (DD Form 562) issued to Serv-U Corp., which you also requested, is attached.

Your observation is correct that the principal officers of a corporation are cleared individually, concurrently with the clearing of a corporation for a facility clearance. In connection with the granting of the facility clearance on July 20, the following persons—all of whom already held clearances—were named by the Serv-U Corp. as its executive personnel: Mr. William R. Armstrong, Jr., president and treasurer; Mr. Charles N. Baker, vice president and security officer; Mr. Ernest Cline Tucker, board chairman and secretary.

Since Mr. Robert G. Baker was not named as an officer or director of Serv-U Corp., the question of an individual security clearance for him in connection with the Serv-U facility clearance granted July 20 did not arise and he does not hold such a clearance.

Please let me know if you require any further information.

Sincerely,

David E. McGiffert,
Assistant to the Secretary,
(Legislative Affairs).

Hq. AFSC, Andrews AFB,
Washington, D.C., June 9, 1964.

To: WCMR (RWIO).

1. The Office of the Secretary of Defense in developing their policy on the clearance of service type organizations considered the possibility of requiring facility security clearances in some unusual cases.

2. In view of the information contained in your report of special inquiry, May 27, 1964, and the exception authorized by DOD in some cases, this headquarters concurs with your decision to grant a final facility security clearance to Serv-U Corp.

3. This letter does not constitute authority to clear all service-type firms since each case must be considered on its own merits.

James R. McBrayer, Jr.,
Colonel, U.S. Air Force, Chief, Security and Law Enforcement Division, Office of the Inspector General.

(For the commander.)

Headquarters, Western Contract Management Region, U.S. Air Force, Mira Loma Air Force Station,
Mira Loma, Calif., July 20, 1964.

Serv-U-Corp.,
Inglewood, Calif.

Gentlemen: Reference is made to the request by a procuring activity of one of the military departments that your organization be given, with respect to your facility located at 717 S. Hindry Avenue, Englewood, Calif., a security clearance authorizing the receipt and use, by each facility, of classified information required in connection with pre-contract negotiations or contract performance. Reference is also made to your executed Department of Defense security agreement (DD Form 441).

You are hereby advised that, with respect to the above-named facility, security clearance of a type indicated below has been granted to your organization by the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, by authority vested in the Secretary of the Air Force: Confidential.

This letter of notification is effective only so long as the Department of Defense, security agreement between your organization and the Government is effective. It does not obligate any procuring activity of any of the military departments to do business with or enter into any contract with your organization.

This is not a notification that your plant either has or has not sufficient protective measures for safeguarding classified information necessary for the performance of a classified contract. Such a determination will be made by the Department of Defense following a physical inspection of your facility.

Reproduction of this letter of notification in any form, except for the necessary records of your organization or unless requested by competent military authority, is not authorized.

The fact that your organization has qualified for, and has been granted a security clearance may not be used for advertising or promotional purposes.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT E. BONN,
Chief, Operations Division,
Security Office.

By direction of the Secretary of the Air Force.

RECESS SUBJECT TO CALL OF THE CHAIR

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 11 o'clock and 41 minutes a.m.) the Senate took a recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

At 12:39 p.m. the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. METCALF in the chair).

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, for the consideration of nominations reported today from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The nominations on the Executive Calendar.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSTON, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

Seven postmaster nominations.

POSTMASTERS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations of postmasters be considered en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I ask that the President be immediately notified of the nominations confirmed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY HON. YOSHIRO KIKUCHI, MEMBER OF JAPANESE PARLIAMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is my honor and pleasure at this time to introduce to the Senate a Member of the Japanese Parliament, Vice Minister in the Japanese Cabinet, a visitor to this country—Hon. Yoshiro Kikuchi. [Applause, Senators standing.]

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate is honored and delighted to have the privilege of greeting this distinguished visitor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, we are delighted to have this fellow parliamentarian from a friendly, allied nation visit us. I am sorry that he did not arrive in this Chamber prior to today, when more business would have been transacted and more Senators would have been in attendance.

We are honored that he has seen fit to visit us. We hope that this is only the beginning of future visits by his colleagues in the Japanese Diet, so that we may become better acquainted personally and understand one another's problems, on a national and international scale.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I join the majority leader in extending the hand of welcome and felicity to our visitor. Japan has done exceedingly well in developing stability in the Orient. It augurs well for that part of the universe.

We can well salute the Japanese for a job so superbly done in trade and industry.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as a Senator from a west coast State, the State of Oregon, and as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, I extend to our parliamentary colleague from Japan a most hearty welcome. I hope that upon his return journey to Japan we may have the pleasure of visiting with him in the State of Oregon.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 3162) to amend section 105 (a) of the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1965, with respect to the disclosure in reports required thereunder of the names of persons who have appeared as witnesses before committees sitting in executive session.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 4649) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to authorize the use of certain volatile fruit-flavor concentrates in the cellar treatment of wine.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 1927) to amend title 38, United States Code, to revise the pension program for veterans of World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict, and their widows and children, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2434) to amend section 560 of title 38, United States Code, to permit the payment of special pension to holders of the Congressional Medal of Honor awarded such medal for actions not involving conflict with an enemy, and for other purposes.

REVISION OF PENSION PROGRAM FOR VETERANS OF WORLD WAR I, WORLD WAR II, AND THE KOREAN CONFLICT — CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 1927) to amend title 38, United States Code, to revise the pension program for veterans of World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict, and their widows and children, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report see House proceedings of today.)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 560 OF TITLE 38, UNITED STATES CODE—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Virginia [Mr.

BYRD], I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2434) to amend section 560 of title 38, United States Code, to permit the payment of special pension to holders of the Congressional Medal of Honor awarded such medal for actions not involving conflict with an enemy, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of October 2, 1964, p. 23758, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

RECESS SUBJECT TO CALL OF THE CHAIR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is my understanding that a message from the House relating to final action on the conference report on the supplemental appropriation bill is on its way here from the House. It may take 5 or 10 minutes. In the meantime, I again move that the Senate stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 44 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess subject to the call of the Chair.

At 1 o'clock and 1 minute p.m., the Senate reassembled, and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. METCALF).

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 1684. An act for the relief of Fotini Dimantopoulou;

S. 2499. An act for the relief of Leobardo L. Gonzalez;

S. 2698. An act for the relief of Linus Han;

S. 2730. An act for the relief of Dr. Jorge A. Picaza;

S. 2759. An act for the relief of Kim Sook Hee and Kim Lou; and

S. 3035. An act to provide for the disposition of judgment funds now on deposit to the credit of the Red Lake Bank of Chippewa Indians.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 1179) for the relief of Basilio King, his wife, and their children.

The message further announced that the House had receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38 to the bill (H.R. 12633) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes, and concurred therein with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 7532. An act for the relief of James D. W. Blyth, his wife Jean Mary Blyth, and their daughter Penelope Jean Blyth;

H.R. 11294. An act for the relief of Cho Seung Man and Kim Chul Hee;

H.R. 11512. An act for the relief of Angelo Iannuzzi; and

H.R. 12435. An act to authorize the disposal, without regard to the prescribed 6-month waiting period, of zinc from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile.

The message notified the Senate that a committee of two Members had been appointed by the House to join a similar committee appointed by the Senate, to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that the two Houses have completed their business of the session and are ready to adjourn, unless the President has some other communication to make to them.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred, as indicated:

H.R. 7532. An act for the relief of James D. W. Blyth, his wife Jean Mary Blyth, and their daughter Penelope Jean Blyth;

H.R. 11294. An act for the relief of Cho Seung Man and Kim Chul Hee;

H.R. 11512. An act for the relief of Angelo Iannuzzi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12435. An act to authorize the disposal, without regard to the prescribed 6-month waiting period, of zinc from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS—1965

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 12633, which was read as follows:

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38 to the bill (H.R. 12633) entitled "An Act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes," and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"For an additional amount for 'Defense educational activities,' $60,750,000, of which $10,300,000 shall be for capital contributions to student loan funds and loans for non-Federal capital contributions (not to exceed $300,000) to student loan funds, $10,000,000 shall be for grants to States for equipment and minor remodeling of facilities for the purposes included in section 301 of Public Law 85–864, as amended, and for supervisory and other services, and $3,000,000 shall be for grants to States for testing, guidance, and counseling: *Provided*, That, in lieu of amounts heretofore specified, allotments for grants to States under sections 302(a) and 305 for acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling shall be made on the basis of $70,400,000, allotments for loans to private nonprofit schools shall be made on the basis of $9,600,000, and allotments under section 302(b) for supervisory and other services shall be made on the basis of $6,000,000: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be available only upon enactment of S. 3060, Eighty-eighth Congress, or similar legislation, amending the National Defense Education Act of 1958."

PAYMENTS TO SCHOOL DISTRICTS

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the House amendment to Senate amendment No. 38 eliminates the $5 million included in the bill for "Payments to school districts" and eliminates the language transferring the $5 million to the appropriation "Payment to school districts." The House amendment to the Senate amendment also eliminates the language agreed to in conference yesterday prohibiting any payments to the District of Columbia.

The result of the new language will be to allow the District of Columbia to participate in the program in accordance with the authorization acts.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the paragraph from the Labor-Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriations Act, fiscal year 1965, appropriating funds for "Payments to school districts."

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PAYMENTS TO SCHOOL DISTRICTS

For payments to local educational agencies for the maintenance and operation of schools as authorized by the Act of September 30, 1950, as amended (20 U.S.C., ch. 13), $332,000,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall also be available for carrying out the provisions of section 6 of such Act.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, when the President approves S. 3060, the National Defense Education Act Amendments, 1964, the District of Columbia will be covered under Public Laws 815 and 874, the federally impacted areas laws, and will become entitled to payments under these laws on the same basis as all other local educational agencies now covered by these laws.

If the sums available for Public Law 874 payments to local educational agencies under the regular Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act, 1965, prove to be sufficient for the purpose, the District of Columbia and all other local educational agencies will be paid their entitlements in full. If these sums prove to be insufficient to pay in full the amounts to which all local educational agencies, including the District of Columbia, may be entitled, the sums available will be allocated among these local educational agencies in proportion to their entitlements as specifically required by Public Law 874.

The congressional intent that the District of Columbia share in any distribution of these sums for the fiscal year 1965 is made abundantly clear by the action of Congress in rejecting the proviso clause in the conference bill which would have specifically prevented the District from sharing in the 1965 appropriation under Public Law 874.

Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the Senator from Arizona, the Senator in charge of the bill and the distinguished chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, whether he shares the view on the intent of the action which I have just expressed on the floor of the Senate?

Mr. HAYDEN. I do.

Mr. MORSE. I congratulate the Senator from Arizona and all members of the conference committee.

I also wish to express my deep appreciation and thanks to the managers on the House side who, as a result of the discussions this morning, agreed to the amendment which has been submitted to the Senate, which I urge the Senate to adopt at this time.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a table on the supplemental appropriation bill for 1965 which reflects the budget estimates for each item in the bill, the amounts allowed by the Senate, and the final amount agreed to in conference.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Supplemental Appropriation Act for 1965 (H.R. 12633)

SUMMARY OF THE BILL

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimates	Bill		Conference
			House version	Senate version	
	CHAPTER I				
	AGRICULTURE				
	AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE				
338	Salaries and expenses	$1,357,000	$1,225,000	$1,357,000	$1,291,000
	SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE				
	Flood prevention			900,000	900,000
	AGRICULTURAL MARKETING SERVICE				
344	Food stamp program:				
	Appropriation	15,000,000	15,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000
	Transfer from sec. 32 funds	*(45,000,000)*	*(10,250,000)*	( )	
	FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION				
S. 98	Rural housing for domestic farm labor	8,000,000		4,000,000	
S. 98	Salaries and expenses (*by transfer*)	*(400,000)*		*(200,000)*	
	FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE CORPORATION				
	Administrative and operating expenses			250,000	250,000
	RELATED AGENCIES				
	NATIONAL COMMISSION ON FOOD MARKETING				
338	Salaries and expenses	1,000,000	700,000	700,000	700,000
	Total, Chapter I	25,357,000	16,925,000	32,207,000	28,141,000
	CHAPTER II				
	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—MILITARY				
	Operation and maintenance, Navy:				
	Transfer to "Salaries and expenses, Weather Bureau"			*(860,000)*	*(860,000)*
	Operation and maintenance, Air Force:				
	Transfer to "Salaries and expenses, Weather Bureau"			*(150,000)*	*(150,000)*
	Research, development, test, and evaluation, Defense agencies:				
	Transfer to "Salaries and expenses, Coast and Geodetic Survey"			*(990,000)*	*(990,000)*
	Total, Chapter II			*(2,000,000)*	*(2,000,000)*
	CHAPTER III				
	DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA				
	(DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FUNDS)				
	Operating expenses:				
338 and S. 98	General operating expenses	*(47,800)*	*(17,100)*	*(42,100)*	*(42,100)*
338	Education	*(181,800)*	*(181,800)*	*(181,800)*	*(181,800)*
338	Health and welfare	*(113,000)*			
338	Settlement of claims and suits	*(7,228)*	*(7,228)*	*(7,228)*	*(7,228)*
	Total, Chapter III	*(349,828)*	*(206,128)*	*(231,128)*	*(231,128)*
	CHAPTER IV				
	INDEPENDENT OFFICES				
	GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION				
	Real property activities:				
338	Construction, public buildings projects	Language	Language	Language	Language
	General activities:				
338	National historical publications grants	500,000	350,000	350,000	350,000

See footnotes at end of table.

The Supplemental Appropriation Act for 1965 (H.R. 12633)—Continued

SUMMARY OF THE BILL

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimates	Bill		Conference
			House version	Senate version	
	CHAPTER IV—Continued				
	INDEPENDENT OFFICES—Continued				
	Housing and Home Finance Agency				
	Office of the Administrator:				
346	Salaries and expenses	$165,000			
	Urban mass transportation grants:				
338	Fiscal year 1965	75,000,000	$75,000,000	$60,000,000	$60,000,000
338	Fiscal year 1966	150,000,000			
338	Urban mass transportation loans	5,000,000	2,500,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
338	Administrative expenses, urban transportation activities	375,000	187,500	187,500	187,500
	Urban planning grants	[1] *(22,650,000)*	11,325,000	11,325,000	11,325,000
	Rehabilitation loans			10,000,000	
	Low-income housing demonstration program	[1] *(2,500,000)*	1,250,000	1,250,000	1,250,000
	Open-space land grants	[1] *(5,000,000)*		10,000,000	
	Public works planning fund	[1] *(12,000,000)*	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
346	Federal-State training programs	5,075,000			
346	*Limitation on administrative expenses, Office of the Administrator, public facility loans (increase)*	*(100,000)*			
	Total, Office of Administrator	235,615,000	100,262,500	107,762,500	87,762,500
	Public Housing Administration				
346	Administrative expenses	75,000		50,000	
	Federal National Mortgage Association				
346	*Limitation on administrative expenses (increase)*	*(100,000)*	*(100,000)*	*(100,000)*	*(100,000)*
	Total, Housing and Home Finance Agency	235,690,000	100,262,500	107,812,500	87,762,500
	National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress				
340	Expenses	1,000,000	650,000	1,000,000	825,000
	Selective Service System				
343	Salaries and expenses	11,375,000	6,500,000	6,500,000	6,500,000
	Securities and Exchange Commission				
349	Salaries and expenses	390,000	150,000	150,000	150,000
	Total, Chapter IV	248,955,000	107,912,500	115,812,500	95,587,500
	CHAPTER V				
	INTERIOR				
	Office of Water Resources Research				
338	Salaries and expenses	1,535,000	1,400,000	1,530,000	1,465,000
	Bureau of Commercial Fisheries				
388	*Limitation on administrative expenses, fisheries loan fund (increase)*	*(25,000)*	*(25,000)*	*(25,000)*	*(25,000)*
S. 98	Construction of fishing vessels	3,000,000		3,000,000	2,500,000
	Bureau of Sports Fisheries and Wildlife				
338	Management and investigations of resources	1,050,000	1,050,000	1,050,000	1,050,000
340	Construction	700,000	825,000	1,041,600	1,041,600
	National Park Service				
338	Management and protection	155,000	155,000	155,000	155,000
340	Construction	10,400,000	6,700,000	8,984,000	8,533,000
	Bureau of Indian Affairs				
345	Payment to the Seneca Nation	12,128,917	12,128,917	12,128,917	12,128,917
	Construction			146,000	
	Geological Survey				
345	Surveys, investigations, and research	545,000		160,000	90,000
	Bureau of Land Management				
S. 98	Management of lands and resources	1,000,000		1,000,000	1,000,000
	DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE				
	Forest Service				
338	Forest protection and utilization: Forest land management	940,000	800,000	800,000	800,000
	Historical and Memorial Commissions				
338	Battle of Lake Erie Sesquicentennial Celebration Commission	13,553	13,553	13,553	13,553
	Battle of New Orleans Sesquicentennial Celebration Commission			25,000	25,000
	St. Augustine Quadricentennial Commission			25,000	
	INDEPENDENT OFFICES				
	Public Land Law Review Commission				
347	Salaries and expenses	500,000		350,000	350,000

See footnotes at end of table.

The Supplemental Appropriation Act for 1965 (H.R. 12633)—Continued

SUMMARY OF THE BILL

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimates	Bill		Conference
			House version	Senate version	
	CHAPTER V—Continued				
	EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT				
	NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE ARTS				
S. 98	Salaries and expenses	$125,000		$100,000	$50,000
	Total, Chapter V	32,092,470	$23,072,470	30,509,070	29,202,070
	CHAPTER VI				
	DEPARTMENT OF LABOR				
	MANPOWER ADMINISTRATION				
S. 97	Farm labor contractor registration activities	500,000		350,000	350,000
	BUREAU OF LABOR STANDARDS				
338	President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped	60,000	40,000	50,000	40,000
	Total, Department of Labor	560,000	40,000	400,000	390,000
	DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE				
	OFFICE OF EDUCATION				
S. 99	Expansion and improvement of vocational education	25,000,000			
342	Defense educational activities	74,400,000	48,750,000	65,750,000	60,750,000
342	Salaries and expenses	1,000,000		1,000,000	1,000,000
	PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE				
338	Chronic diseases and health of the aged	1,920,000			
343	Community health practice and research	5,000,000		5,000,000	[2] *(5,000,000)*
	Total, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare	107,320,000	48,750,000	71,750,000	61,750,000
	EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT				
	OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY				
337	Economic opportunity program	947,500,000	750,000,000	861,550,000	800,000,000
	Total, Chapter VI	1,055,380,000	798,790,000	933,700,000	862,140,000
	CHAPTER VII				
	LEGISLATIVE BRANCH				
	SENATE				
	Payment to the widow of Senator Engle			22,500	22,500
	HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES				
	Payments to widows of deceased Members		45,000	45,000	45,000
	Contingent expenses (miscellaneous items)		92,000	92,000	92,000
	CAPITOL POLICE				
	Capitol Police board			22,100	22,100
	Total Chapter VII		137,000	181,600	181,600
	CHAPTER VIII				
	PUBLIC WORKS				
	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL FUNCTIONS				
	DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY				
	CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL				
	General investigations			350,000	
S.77	Construction, general	[3] *(5,600,000)*		2,860,000	2,860,000
	INTEROCEANIC CANAL COMMISSION				
341	Salaries and expenses	5,000,000		400,000	400,000
	BUREAU OF RECLAMATION				
	Construction and rehabilitation			364,000	
	Upper Colorado River storage project			155,000	
	Total, Chapter VIII	5,000,000		4,129,000	3,260,000
	CHAPTER IX				
	DEPARTMENT OF STATE				
	INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND CONFERENCES				
338	Contributions to international organizations	1,366,000	1,366,000	1,366,000	1,366,000
	INTERNATIONAL BOUNDARY AND WATER COMMISSION				
S. 102	Construction	300,000		300,000	300,000

See footnotes at end of table.

The Supplemental Appropriation Act for 1965 (H.R. 12633)—Continued

SUMMARY OF THE BILL

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimates	Bill		Conference
			House version	Senate version	
	CHAPTER IX—Continued				
	THE JUDICIARY				
	COURTS OF APPEALS, DISTRICT COURTS, AND OTHER JUDICIAL SERVICES				
S. 98	Salaries of referees (special account)	$60,000		$60,000	
	INDEPENDENT OFFICES				
	COMMISSION ON INTERNATIONAL RULES OF JUDICIAL PROCEDURE				
S. 98	Salaries and expenses	158,000		50,000	
	SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION				
S. 100	Revolving fund	60,000,000		50,000,000	$45,000,000
	APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION				
S. 105	Salaries and expenses	800,000		800,000	800,000
	DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE				
S. 103	Participation in Alaskan centennial celebration	15,000		15,000	
	CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1964				
	DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE				
	COMMUNITY RELATIONS SERVICE				
318	Salaries and expenses	1,100,000	$1,100,000	1,100,000	1,100,000
	DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE				
	OFFICE OF EDUCATION				
318	Civil rights educational activities	8,000,000	8,000,000	8,000,000	8,000,000
	DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE				
	LEGAL ACTIVITIES AND GENERAL ADMINISTRATION				
318	Salaries and expenses, general legal activities	1,093,000	1,093,000	1,093,000	1,093,000
	COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS				
318	Salaries and expenses	295,000	295,000	295,000	295,000
	EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION				
318	Salaries and expenses	2,500,000	2,500,000	2,000,000	2,250,000
	DEPARTMENT OF LABOR				
	MANPOWER ADMINISTRATION				
318	Special study on discrimination because of age	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
	Total Civil Rights Act of 1964	13,088,000	13,088,000	12,588,000	12,838,000
	Total, Chapter IX	75,787,000	14,454,000	65,179,000	60,304,000
	CHAPTER X				
	TREASURY DEPARTMENT				
	BUREAU OF THE PUBLIC DEBT				
338	Administering the public debt	570,000	570,000	570,000	570,000
	BUREAU OF THE MINT				
338	Salaries and expenses	4,500,000	4,500,000	4,500,000	4,500,000
	Total, Chapter X	5,070,000	5,070,000	5,070,000	5,070,000
	CHAPTER XI				
339 and S. 101	Claims and judgments	33,309,898	32,284,904	33,309,898	33,309,898
	Total, all chapters	1,480,951,368	998,645,874	1,220,098,068	1,117,196,068

[1] Reconsideration requested; denied in independent offices appropriation bill for lack of authorization.

[2] To be derived by transfer from appropriations for the economic opportunity program.

[3] Reconsideration requested; denied in 1964 deficiency appropriation bill for lack of authorization.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oregon will state it.

Mr. MORSE. Has the supplemental appropriation bill sent to us by the House now been approved by the Senate?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, was agreed to. The supplemental conference report was agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. Then the bill will now go to the White House?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. It goes to the President for signature.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Chair.

APPROPRIATION STATISTICS—88TH CONGRESS

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a table which reflects the budget estimates on all of the appropriation bills, the amounts allowed by the House and the Senate, and the final amounts agreed to in conference for all bills of the 88th Congress, 2d session.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Table of Appropriation Bills, 88th Cong., 2d sess.[1]

Title and bill No.	Budget estimates to House	Amount as passed House	Budget estimates to Senate	Amount as passed Senate	Final amount as approved	Final action compared with estimates to Senate
1964 DEFICIENCIES						
Department of HEW (H.J. Res. 875):						
Original resolution, 88th, 1st	$41,886,000	$41,886,000	$41,886,000	$258,090,000		−$41,886,000
Subsequent consideration, 88th, 2d	247,802,000	247,802,000	247,802,000	31,598,000	$289,688,000	+41,886,000
Total, H.J. Res. 875	289,688,000	289,688,000	289,688,000	289,688,000	289,688,000	
Department of Labor (H.J. Res. 962)	42,000,000	42,000,000	42,000,000	42,000,000	42,000,000	
Disaster relief (H.J. Res. 976)	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	
Deficiency, 1964 (H.R. 11201)	1,307,380,789	1,264,913,689	1,436,177,743	1,349,637,143	1,336,687,143	−99,490,600
Total, 1964 deficiencies	1,689,068,789	1,646,601,689	1,817,865,743	1,731,325,143	1,718,375,143	−99,490,600
1965 APPROPRIATION BILLS						
District of Columbia (H.R. 10199)	(357,702,300)	(338,205,200)	(357,862,300)	(342,181,975)	(341,242,200)	(−16,620,100)
Federal payment, 1965 regular	53,220,000	40,720,000	53,220,000	44,220,000	40,720,000	−12,500,000
Loan authorization	(14,400,000)	(26,400,000)	(14,400,000)	(26,400,000)	(26,400,000)	(+12,000,000)
Interior (H.R. 10433)	1,035,678,000	1,009,175,600	1,035,961,000	1,029,226,400	1,028,277,200	−7,683,800
Loan authorization	(20,000,000)	(14,000,000)	(20,000,000)	(14,000,000)	(14,000,000)	(−6,000,000)
Treasury-Post Office (H.R. 10532): 1965 regular appropriations	6,271,991,000	6,225,420,000	6,268,691,000	6,240,423,000	6,233,273,000	−35,418,000
Legislative (H.R. 10723)	222,587,355	173,626,640	255,999,745	210,380,685	210,300,885	−45,698,860
Labor-HEW (H.R. 10809)	7,561,968,000	6,908,063,000	7,803,190,000	7,081,193,000	7,089,707,000	−713,483,000
Defense (H.R. 10939): 1965 regular appropriations	47,471,000,000	46,759,267,000	47,471,000,000	46,774,401,000	46,752,051,000	−718,949,000
State, Justice, Judiciary (H.R. 11134)	1,957,764,700	1,702,627,800	1,999,164,700	1,730,855,700	1,717,157,800	−282,006,900
Agriculture (H.R. 11202)	5,588,832,600	5,182,665,000	5,583,535,600	5,338,672,525	5,137,162,200	−446,373,400
Loan authorization	(753,000,000)	(795,000,000)	(795,000,000)	(795,000,000)	(795,000,000)	(+42,000,000)
Independent Offices (H.R. 11296)	14,244,653,400	[2] 8,118,965,500	14,249,653,400	13,613,224,000	13,454,859,000	−794,794,400
Military construction (H.R. 11369): 1965 regular appropriations	1,879,000,000	1,599,014,500	1,879,000,000	1,582,969,000	1,570,968,000	−308,032,000
Public works (H.R. 11579): 1965 regular appropriations	4,372,449,000	4,325,969,200	4,440,749,000	4,443,283,200	4,430,794,700	−9,954,300
Foreign assistance (H.R. 11812): 1965 regular appropriations	3,958,377,000	3,739,249,400	3,958,377,000	3,662,077,000	3,662,077,000	−296,300,000
Supplemental, 1965 (H.R. 12633)	1,370,468,374	998,645,874	1,480,951,368	1,220,098,068	1,117,196,068	−363,755,300
Total, 1965 regular appropriations	95,987,989,429	[2] 86,783,409,514	96,479,492,813	92,971,023,578	[1] 92,444,543,853	−4,034,948,960
Total, 1964 supplementals (included in 1965 bills)	(688,420,700)	(33,330,000)	(685,103,700)	(81,071,000)	(74,658,000)	(−610,445,700)
Total, all appropriations	97,677,058,218	[2] 88,430,011,203	98,297,358,556	94,702,348,721	94,162,918,996	−4,134,439,560
Total, loan authorization	(787,400,000)	(835,400,000)	(787,400,000)	(835,400,000)	(835,400,000)	(+48,000,000)

[1] Does not include permanent appropriations estimated to total $11,800,000,000.

[2] Amount of $5,200,000,000 reported by House Committee for NASA and eliminated on point of order by House due to lack of legislative authorization.

CAN THE LEOPARD CHANGE ITS SPOTS?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Can the Leopard Change Its Spots?" published in the October issue of Nation's Agriculture over the signature of Charles B. Shuman, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAN THE LEOPARD CHANGE ITS SPOTS?

(By Charles B. Shuman, president, American Farm Bureau Federation)

Several candidates facing election are busily engaged in trying to convince the voters that they have changed. Now they seek no longer an image of being determined to replace the competitive enterprise system with a socialistic government-managed economy. Yet their voting records in Congress are approved by the extreme left Americans for Democratic Action (ADA).

Other candidates claim to be a champion of economy in government despite their record of support for every spending measure that comes down the pike. Will the leopards change their spots?

What can the average citizen believe? Election campaign promises often mean little once the victory is won. Those ancient words of wisdom, "By their works thou shalt know them" apply quite well today. The best way to evaluate a candidate is to examine his voting record, if an incumbent, or his written commitment if a newcomer.

What are some of the issues for candidate testing in this 1964 election?

Foreign policy and national defense are being actively debated and each voter must make his own decision. Most Americans want peace but not peace at any price. Is our national defense adequate or is it being gradually eroded? Is our foreign policy based on strength and courage, or are we placing too much reliance on "friends" bought with foreign aid?

The steady increase in the centralization of power in the Federal Government is another important issue. This transfer of responsibility and authority to Washington weakens State and local governments. Supreme Court decisions on school prayer and reapportionment of State legislatures reflect the theory that local self-government is inadequate—that social justice requires the use of Federal power. Does the end justify the means? Will a huge Central Government make wiser decisions than the sum total of the democratic processes working at State and local levels?

A third vital issue of special interest to farmers is the role of Government in the business life of the Nation. Liberal favors replacing the competitive market system with Government price and supply management. The present administration has deliberately wrecked wheat and feed grain prices by dumping surplus stocks on the market—the objective being to force farmers to accept direct income subsidy payments. Do farmers want to depend on annual congressional appropriations for their income? Do consumers believe that their needs will be better satisfied by the Federal bureaucracy than by producers responding to market changes? The most recent antimarket scheme, the wheat certificate program, has already drastically cut farm income and at the same time raised bread prices to consumers.

An overriding issue is economic conservatism versus far-left liberalism. Not only are some of the candidates trying to avoid being identified with either philosophy, but attempts are being made to misinterpret the meaning of the terms. Liberals describe conservatives as reactionaries bent on "dragging the Nation back to the 19th century." The truth is, the present-day reactionaries who would roll back history are actually the so-called liberals. They have no faith in the ability of free men to make wise choices in the market. They advocate Government management and control of all major areas of individual decision and action. Liberalism is the road back, not to the 19th century, but to a form of feudalism with government as the master of its serfs—the citizens.

The leopard does not change his spots. Every voter should look at the spots of the candidates and vote his convictions in November.

TELEGRAM FROM SENATOR RANDOLPH TO THE PRESIDENT, URGING HIM TO CALL CONGRESS BACK AFTER ELECTION TO COMPLETE ACTION ON APPALACHIA AND MEDICARE MEASURES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am delighted to extend a courtesy to the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], who is necessarily absent today because of an important commitment in West Virginia, to read to the Senate a telegram which he sent to the President today—and on which I completely share the views expressed by the Senator from West Virginia—which reads as follows:

OCTOBER 3, 1964.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House:

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The 88th Congress adjourns today without having completed action on two of the major programs advanced by your administration to secure economic progress and justice for all Americans. This Congress, with your effective leadership, has compiled a historic record of accomplishment. But there remain the unfinished tasks of providing a beginning plan of health care for the elderly under social security and enacting the Appalachian regional development program.

Failure to complete these two programs will entomb the hopes for economic security and advancement of approximately 17 million elderly citizens and 16 million citizens of Appalachia. The 88th Congress, despite its record of significant achievements, has thus failed to respond affirmatively to the vital needs of one-sixth of the American population.

The 88th Congress has, however, completed much of the difficult spadework on legislation for health care for our senior citizens and has all but completed its work on the Appalachian program, even providing at your request initial funds for establishment of the Appalachian Commission. The $800,000 appropriated for the Commission will, however, raise false hopes and work a cruel deception on the people of Appalachia if this program is not authorized by the Congress. The effects of much of the work of the 88th Congress in this respect will be lost and precious time for developing Appalachia will be wasted if action is deferred to the 89th Congress.

I therefore respectfully urge that after the election of November 3 you call the 88th Congress back into special session no later than November 16 to complete action on these vital measures to assist our senior citizens and to aid in the economic development of Appalachia.

JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
U.S. Senate.

Mr. President, I share the views that have been expressed in the telegram from the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] to the President of the United States.

I highly commend the President for his courage, foresight, and statesmanship with regard to the position that he has taken on medicare. The President is unanswerably right. The issues involving medical care for the elderly under the social security program constitute a great moral issue which faces all the people of this Nation. It is an issue that must be fought out in the campaign and decided by the electors on November 3.

I say to the American people from my desk in the Senate today that they have the responsibility of citizenship and statesmanship on this issue. They must keep in mind that the level of statesmanship in the country will be no higher than their own.

I hope that the voters of the country will, in selecting the candidates for Congress—Republicans and Democrats alike—consider the position that they have taken on this moral issue. As a religious nation, as a nation whose people prate that they believe in spiritual values, we cannot continue the injustice that the aged and infirm of the country are experiencing at the very moment I speak. The elderly are entitled to hospitalization and medical care as encompassed in the bill that is recommended by the President. The bill would be administered as part of the social security system of the country.

With respect to the political doctors of the country who are placing their lack of social conscience and their selfishness above the moral values, I say to the people of America, "Hold them to an accounting and make clear to the doctors in every community of the country that the time has come for them to live up to the true moral obligations of the medical profession." The medical profession cannot, on moral grounds, justify a continuation of its opposition to this fundamental, moral issue that the President has so courageously supported.

I believe that the Senator from West Virginia is right when he suggests to the President that Congress should come back after election. And on the basis of the verdict that I am satisfied the voters of the country will register on November 3, we should then take up the medicare bill and pass it without delay.

THE LEGISLATIVE RECORD OF THE 88TH CONGRESS, 2D SESSION, AND A REVIEW OF THE HIGHLIGHTS OVER THE PAST 4 YEARS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for 176 years, almost two centuries, the Congress of the United States has been meeting to pass legislation required for the needs of a growing nation. As the years have passed the problems confronting this Nation have become increasingly complex.

These problems, simple, viewed in retrospect, have become complex and varied as our land passed from a predominantly agricultural country to one of the most highly industrialized nations of the world. We have arrived at a position of leadership among the nations of the planet. With leadership comes responsibility. The eyes of the world look to us—to see how well we handle our domestic affairs as well as our relations with other nations. It is against this backdrop that one must consider the record of this session of the 88th Congress.

With the Nation just recovering from a great tragedy, the innate character of the American people asserted itself as it has always done in periods of crisis. It is the American way to meet the challenges of leadership. The people, the President, the Congress were equal to the challenge. Congress met this challenge in a way which will be recorded in history as a year of outstanding achievement. The record in review underscores the extent of the achievement.

The 1964 Revenue Act signed into law on February 26 reduced individual and corporate income taxes by $11.5 billion—the biggest Federal income tax cut in history. The individual reductions increased consumer purchasing power by more than $9 billion a year. The corporate reduction amounts to more than $2 billion a year, which is added to business tax cuts of $2.5 billion a year provided by the investment tax credit and depreciation reform of 1962.

The combined stimulus to investment and consumption has spurred economic growth and created hundreds of thousands of new jobs. The economy has come out of the 1960 recession—the fourth since World War II—into the longest and strongest peacetime economic expansion in this century. Even more important, the unemployment rate, which was about 7 percent at the beginning of the expansion, finally dipped below 5 percent in July for the first time since September of 1960.

The success of the tax cut has confounded skeptics and hostile critics as well. Contrary to their predictions, it has in fact produced new jobs and it has not superheated the economy into inflation. Its success in spurring growth and creating jobs in an atmosphere of stable prices offers continuing evidence of the soundness and effectiveness of the administration's economic policies.

As another means of maintaining economic momentum and reducing the swelling outflow of long-term capital from this country, Congress enacted a temporary interest equalization tax to bring the cost of U.S. capital into closer alinement with costs prevailing in most other industrialized countries. The effectiveness of this tax, which applies retroactively, has already been amply demonstrated by a substantial reduction in the outflow of American capital, since the plan was announced. The serious outflow of gold, which has so troubled the previous administration, has been eased.

It is a recognized responsibility of the Federal Government, under the Constitution, to provide for the general welfare of the United States, and to promote the economic well being of all in the United States. The antipoverty, or economic opportunity bill, just enacted, is designed to strengthen and coordinate efforts to fulfill that responsibility. This bill makes it the policy of the United States to eliminate the paradox of poverty in the midst of plenty, to strike away barriers to full participation by everyone in the abundance of our society. To accomplish this, the bill provides for youth programs, for community action programs, a program to meet the special problems of poverty in rural areas, special loans for small businesses, work experience programs, volunteer worker's corps, and a system of Federal aid for adult basic education programs. The war on poverty is an investment in the future of the Nation because its economic effect will generate, in time, more tax revenue than it will cost. As the President stated in his message, the fight against poverty: "will be an investment in the most valuable of our resources—the skills and strength of our people."

In answer to another of President Johnson's requests, the Senate passed a bill designed to make possible the economic development and rehabilitation of the Appalachian region. It is primarily a coal-producing region covering an 11-State area, or more than 165,000 square miles and inhabited by 15 million Americans. This measure will give hope to millions now reduced to a bare subsistence level through no fault of their own but because of changing technologies. The programs contained in this act are not merely palliative but aimed at the source of the problem. These programs are focused largely on a developmental highway system, acceleration of water facilities construction, a timber management and marketing program, expanded programs for promoting new uses of coal, improved mining practices, land restoration, and human resources.

To meet the persisting problem of unemployment which is associated with rapid automation, Congress established a 14-member National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress directed to study past and current effects of technological change; innovations in production and employment; and the means for channeling new technology into existing industries.

Congress modernized the Davis-Bacon Act and brought its standards into conformity with modern wage payment practices. In signing the bill into law, President Johnson said:

> This bill basically brings the law up to date. * * * The new law sensibly provides that wage determinations shall, in addition to cash wages, take account of prevailing benefits such as medical and hospital care, pensions and workmen's compensation, unemployment insurance, vacations, holidays, and other such factors.

On March 27 of this year, our 49th State—Alaska—experienced a devastating earthquake which took the lives of many and rendered untold damage. Congress quickly enacted legislation authorizing grants up to $23.5 million to provide emergency assistance to the State government of Alaska and its local government entities.

As additional assistance to the State in its reconstruction period, Congress provided $56.5 million in loans and grants as special aid for Alaskan highways, urban renewal, harbors, and housing.

Again with the welfare of the people in mind, Congress broadened the Small Business Administration's authority to make loans from its disaster fund to cover all natural disasters, extended loans to firms that have suffered substantial economic injury, facilitated investment in small business investment companies and investment by small business investment companies.

Congress enacted an omnibus Securities and Exchange Commission reform bill extending to approximately 3,000 industrial concerns, whose stock is traded over the counter, the same financial reporting, proxy solicitation, and insider trading requirements that currently apply to companies listed on a stock exchange. This was done to help protect the American investor, both small and large.

Congress provided a higher and therefore more realistic pay base for the military, the judiciary, the legislative, and executive branches.

Congress authorized an additional $1.1 billion to extend and improve existing housing programs for the low-income groups, the moderate income groups and the elderly.

To strengthen our international position—as well as internal unity in the face of aggression—the Senate by a vote of 88 to 2, and the House by a vote of 414 to 0, approved the action of President Johnson in meeting the recent unprovoked attacks on U.S. forces in southeast Asia by the Communist regime in North Vietnam, by instructing the Navy to:

First. Continue the patrols in the Gulf of Tonkin off the coast of North Vietnam.

Second. Double the force by adding an additional destroyer to the one already on patrol.

Third. Provide a combat air patrol over the destroyers.

Fourth. Issue orders to the commanders of the combat aircraft and two destroyers to first, attack any force which attacks them in international waters; and second, attack with the objective not only of driving off the force but of destroying it.

In answer to the President's request for an efficient foreign aid program, the Congress provided a $3.5 billion authorization to help transitional societies along the path toward stronger economies and institutions; to help others to preserve their independence; and to help new nations learn to deal with contemporary problems and opportunities.

To augment the successful Peace Corps program abroad, Congress authorized $115 million for fiscal 1965 which will permit the Corps to enlarge its present number of volunteers from 7,000 to 14,000 by the end of 1965. Few programs have so well succeeded in capturing the imagination of young Americans and strengthening their ideals and hopes for a better world.

Facing the need for a second canal linking the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, Congress authorized the President to establish a five-member Commission, from private life, to make an investigation to determine the feasibility of and the most suitable site for the construction of such a canal, and the best means of construction, whether by conventional or nuclear means. The Commission is to report to Congress by July 31, 1965.

To further strengthen our international bonds, Congress authorized $461,760,000 in additional U.S. contributions to the Inter-American Development Bank. However, only $50 million of this amount is a cash outlay for the Special Operations Fund which makes loans with more flexible interest and repayment terms. The balance, or $411,760,000, increases the capital stock of the Bank. Congress also enacted an administration bill authorizing the U.S. Governor of the International Development Association to vote for an overall increase in the resources of the association. To pay for our share, $312 million was authorized over a 3-year period beginning in fiscal 1966, payable in three installments of $104 million each. In signing the bill into law, President Johnson hailed it as "another milestone in our historic commitment to help other people lift from their weary shoulders the burdens of poverty and disease, illiteracy and hunger."

As President Johnson suggested in his state of the Union message of January 8:

> Let this session be known as the session which did more for civil rights than the last hundred sessions combined.

This we did. With heavy bipartisan majorities Congress enacted into law the most comprehensive civil rights measure in history. For the first time there exists a law which seeks to rectify the injustices of 100 years by laying the groundwork for making real to all Americans the constitutional right to vote, the right for all to enjoy equal public accommodations, an equal right to public facilities and public education, and a right to enjoy equal opportunity in employment. It is a fair law, a moral law. Yet as President Johnson said in signing the bill:

> It does not restrict the freedom of any American so long as he respects the rights of others. It does not give special treatment to any citizen. It does say that those who are equal before God shall now also be equal in the polling booths, in the classrooms, in the factories, in hotels * * * and other public places.

This was not an easy accomplishment; it took 83 days in the Senate.

Another legal aid, long overdue and enacted by this Congress, is the Criminal Justice Act of 1964 designed to promote the cause of criminal justice by providing for representation of defendants who are financially unable to obtain an adequate defense in criminal cases in the courts of the United States.

Since 1960, Congress has been attempting to lend assistance to cities endeavoring to improve their commuter services and mass transportation systems. It was in that year the Senate passed a bill authorizing $100 million in Federal public facility loans to local agencies to aid primarily in mass transit planning; unfortunately action was not completed. In 1961 Congress included in its housing act a provision that $50 million of the public facility loan fund could be used for low-interest-rate loans to local agencies for mass transportation and $25 million for Federal grants to cover two-thirds of the cost of mass transportation demonstration programs. This year, Congress took another significant step forward by approving the administration's bill authorizing over a 3-year period $375 million in Federal grants to States and localities to assist public or private transit companies in providing adequate transportation in our cities.

The Federal Aid Airport Act has been extended for another 3 years through June 30, 1967, and $2.3 billion has been authorized to improve and extend our highway systems.

In response to a Presidential recommendation, Congress enacted a new 2-year cotton program designed to aid the producers and the domestic textile mills, and a 2-year wheat certificate program, thus providing needed ameliatory action to two vital and ailing sources of the economy.

Congress established a 15-member bipartisan Commission on Food Marketing, composed of 5 members from the Senate, 5 from the House, and 5 appointed by the President from outside the Federal Government, to investigate and document the changing structure of the marketing system for farm and food products, which is to make recommendations and submit a final report to Congress and the President by July 1, 1965.

Congress transformed a limited number of successful food stamp pilot programs into a national program that enhances the dignity as well as the diet of millions of Americans.

Congress also extended and expanded the food-for-peace program to provide the needy abroad with a more adequate diet.

As in all areas, President Johnson continued our late President John F. Kennedy's interest in the field of health. This Congress has made a great contribution to a healthier nation by extending and expanding hospital construction; by establishing two mental health programs to combat mental illness in the boldest assault ever made by Government on this national tragedy that affects so many Americans; by expanding and improving the nurses' training program and the public health trainee program; by authorizing a 4-year program of Federal aid to State and local government to combat air pollution; and by providing for pesticide control and registration.

In the field of education, the 88th Congress has accomplished more than any predecessor in history by enacting the medical training aid bill of construction grants for health-teaching facilities, low-interest loans to assist students of medicine, dentistry, and osteopathy; the higher education bill; a $1.2 billion program to aid college construction over a 3-year period to meet enrollment increases of 350,000 students each year; an expanded vocational education and construction program; an expanded library services bill extending Federal aid to urban and rural library facilities; an expanded and improved National Defense Education Act; an extension of the impacted areas program; an expanded teachers training program; an adult education program; a program for training teachers of exceptional children; an extension of the Juvenile Delinquency Control Act; an expansion of the War Orphans' Educational Act; and an extension of long-term, low-cost loans to include students of optometry.

With the population of the United States approaching 193 million people, Congress and the administration have acted to improve the conservation policies of our Nation by establishing a land and water conservation fund to permit the States to plan, acquire, and develop outdoor recreational facilities; by establishing the National Wilderness Preservation System to set aside permanently 9.2 million acres, which may be expanded to 14.7 million acres, of federally owned lands for inclusion in the wilderness system for primitive and unconfined types of recreational uses; by authorizing a 10-year, $82.5 million program of Federal aid to land-grant colleges and universities to expand water resources research and scientific training programs; by coordinating the outdoor recreation development program between the Federal Government and the States; and by establishing numerous national seashore and national park recreational areas. Commentators are already calling this the conservation Congress.

In defense and related undertakings, Congress appropriated $46.7 billion for defense; authorized $18.4 billion for military procurement and construction; expanded Polaris, Minuteman, airlift programs, and general effectiveness of our military posture; authorized $7.8 billion for space and atomic energy programs; extended the civil defense program; and raised the authorized strength of cadet corps of U.S. Military and Air Force Academies.

The record of the 2d session of the 88th Congress is outstanding. Now let us turn to a review of the past 4 years under a Democratic administration and 4 continuous years of achievement. Faced with many problems at home and abroad at the beginning of the 87th Congress, how well has this Congress of the Kennedy and Johnson administrations responded?

Changes in administration always bring in their wake disruptions of a more or less serious nature but the shift in power from a Republican to a Democratic administration in early 1961 was quite orderly. With less delay than could have been anticipated, the Senate started the legislative mill on the lengthy process of moving new bills through successive stages of introduction, referral to committees, committee hearings, reporting, and passage.

Over the 4-year period, Congress has also enacted two major farm bills to reduce farm surpluses and help solve persistent agricultural problems; enacted an emergency price support for feed grains which started the first upward climb of farm income and the first reduction of surpluses in 8 years; made possible more REA loans, more crop insurance, expanded research and development program, increased credit, 75-percent increase in small watershed projects, and increased agricultural research; extended and revised the Mexican farm labor program, correcting inequities where they existed and enhancing the dignity of the workers involved; liberalized farm credit laws to make credit resources more responsive to farmers' needs; extended the school milk program for 5 years; authorized a 3-year, $3 million program for migrant farmworker health clinics; extended the housing program to residents of rural areas; created an area redevelopment program for economically distressed areas—a program which Congress had been attempting to establish since 1956 to combat the recesses of poverty and hopelessness where factories and mines stood idle; increased social security benefits and liberalized the disability provisions; initiated a program of aid to dependent children whose parents are unemployed, and provided similar benefits for unemployed railroad workers; increased the minimum wage to $1.25, and extended coverage to 3.4 million workers; abolished the poll tax by constitutional amendment after 20 years of congressional effort; repealed the non-Communist affidavit for students; enacted three major housing bills liberalizing provisions for low-income and elderly groups; enacted a 3-year, $435 million manpower retraining program to retrain the unemployed in new skills; improved the Work Hours Act to provide a standard 40-hour workweek; enacted a bill to provide for self-employed voluntary pension plans; enacted the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, one of the most far-reaching and modern trade expansion acts in history; initiated the Alliance for Progress, a new concept of social reform and self-help for Latin America; enacted the Communications Satellite Act of 1962, creating a private communications satellite corporation for profit but subject to Government regulation to operate a worldwide commercial satellite system; established a U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency to deal with the problem of reduction and control of armaments looking toward ultimate world disarmament, the first of its kind in the world; established a U.S. Travel Service to promote and encourage tourist travel from abroad; extended the Sugar Act in 1962, fixing quotas of domestic and foreign producers; extended the International Wheat Agreement; ratified the all-important nuclear test ban treaty, banning nuclear weapon testing in the atmosphere, in outer space, and underwater, thus translating the dream of Presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy into reality; ratified the OECD Treaty, by which the United States joined in a 20-nation organization of the Atlantic States to promote economic stability; provided equal pay for women, a bill which had been before Congress for 18 years; expanded and improved water pollution control and created a 4-year program to combat air pollution; enacted new drug-safeguard legislation for the first time since 1938; enacted the Vaccination Assistance Act, the first Federal assistance to States and communities for immunizations against such diseases as diphtheria, smallpox, whooping cough, polio, and tetanus; enacted a teachers' training program for exceptional and handicapped children; extended and improved the impacted areas program and included the District of Columbia within its framework; extended the improved saline water conversion program; established numerous seashore and national park recreational areas; coordinated the outdoor recreation development program between the Federal Government and the States; and passed 6 anticrime bills during the 87th Congress to combat organized crime.

I ask unanimous consent that a detailed résumé of this 4-year review of major highlights, which includes Presidential recommendations and measures initiated by Congress, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the résumé was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOUR-YEAR REVIEW OF LEGISLATIVE ACTIVITIES, 1961–64

ECONOMIC AREA

Agriculture

Year 1961

Omnibus farm bill: Enacted a major farm bill to reduce wheat and feed grain surpluses; authorized Secretary to consult with farmers, farm organizations, and other groups to develop new farm programs; extended the Agricultural Trade and Development Act to December 31, 1964; consolidated and modernized the Farmers Home Administration; extended the Wool Act for 4 years to March 31, 1965; extended Great Plains conservation program to December 31, 1971; authorized a 5-year extension of the school milk program to be paid by direct appropriations; and extended the Veterans' Administration and armed services milk program to 1964, with CCC furnishing the funds. Public Law 87–128.

Feed grains: Authorized a 1-year emergency price support for the 1961 corn crop at $1.20 a bushel with the other feed grains to be supported at fair and reasonable levels in relation to corn, in an effort to raise the incomes of feed-grain producers and to reduce the mounting surpluses of feed grains in Government hands. Public Law 87–5.

Drought relief: Enacted a temporary 1-year program authorizing the sale of Government surplus corn and feed grains to needy farmers and ranchers in drought areas at 75 percent of Government price-support levels and permitting livestock grazing on grasslands idled by the soil bank and other conservation programs. Public Law 87–127.

Farm loans: Increased proportion of appropriated farm loan funds available for individual farms with a debt of over $10,000 from 10 to 25 percent to help meet the rapid and increased cost of farming. Public Law 87–8.

Mexican farm labor: Extended and revised the Mexican farm labor program for 2 years, to December 31, 1963; prohibited infringement upon the rights of domestic workers. Public Law 87–345.

Farm credit: Liberalized farm credit laws to permit installment payments on Federal land bank loans to be scheduled more frequently than semiannually if desirable to the borrower; permit Federal land bank loans to be made to corporations set up by farming families (now restricted to persons); extends from 5 to 7 years the permissible maturity of intermediate-term loans; required in applying the earnings at the end of each fiscal year that one-half of 1 percent of the loans outstanding be held in reserve up to an accumulation of 3½ percent of the outstanding loans. Public Law 87–343.

Year 1962

Second farm bill: As enacted this bill has four major titles, which contain numerous innovations as aids to reducing farm surpluses and solving agricultural problems by providing for a new permanent supply-management wheat program, a 1-year extension of the present feed-grain program and replacing the 1958 corn law with a provision effective in 1964 permitting the Secretary to set price supports for corn between 50 and 90 percent of parity and expansion of surplus disposal under Public Law 480. Includes a new land-use-adjustment program to take land out of production and divert its use to recreational and public purposes. Public Law 87–703.

Farmers Home Administration loans: Raised the annual limitation on Farmers Home Administration insured loans from $150 to $200 million. These farm ownership loans made to families with a farm background and experience or training to help them buy, enlarge, or develop farms and to refinance debts. Public Law 87–798.

Textile imports: Authorized the President, for the purpose of carrying out any agreement under section 204 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1956, to limit imports of any agricultural commodity or product covered by such agreement from countries not participating in the agreement, if, in the President's judgment, such imports would seriously affect domestic producers. Public Law 87–488.

Migrant farmworkers health clinics: Authorized a $3-million-a-year, 3-year program in Federal grants to public or nonprofit agencies and organizations for paying part of the cost of establishing and operating family health clinics and special health projects for domestic migratory farm families. Public Law 87–692.

Cotton disposal: Provided for disposal of all extra-long-staple cotton in the strategic stockpile by transferring domestic cotton for the CCC for unrestricted use at not less than 115 percent of current support price plus reasonable carrying charges, and foreign cotton for export only at not less than the world price. Public Law 87–548.

Feed grains: Liberalized requirements for participation in the 1962 feed grain program by permitting farmers to plant barley on land taken out of wheat production and made barley interchangeable with other feed grains. Public Law 87–425.

Federal Extension Service: Authorized funds appropriated in excess of the 1962 funds to be distributed on the basis of an equalized formula for the first 20 percent. Public Law 87–749.

Forestry research: Authorized matching grants for forestry research to land-grant colleges, agricultural experiment stations, other colleges and universities offering graduate training in sciences basic to forestry and having a forestry school. Public Law 87–788.

Year 1963

Feed grains: Extends through 1964 and 1965 crop years the feed-grains program in effect in 1962 and 1963, providing price support for producers who make voluntary acreage reduction. Public Law 88–26.

Mexican farm labor: Extends the Mexican farm labor program to December 31, 1964. Public Law 88–203.

Tobacco allotment leasing authority: Extends for an additional 2 years the authority to transfer, by lease, tobacco acreage allotments from one farm to another within the same county for a more economical operation. Public Law 88–68.

Producer livestock programs: Permits voluntary programs for promotion, research, and education relating to livestock. Public Law 88–61.

Agricultural experiment stations: Authorizes Federal assistance to States, on a matching basis, to help finance additional research facilities at State agricultural experiment stations. Public Law 88–74.

Year 1964

Agriculture Act of 1964: Enacted a new 2-year cotton program with producers receiving three different price supports (24, 30 up to 34.5 cents a pound) and domestic textile mills receiving an 8.5 cents subsidy on purchase of domestic cotton, and a 2-year wheat certificate program with price supports at about $2 a bushel for domestic consumption and $1.55 for export. Public Law 88–297.

County committeemen: Provides a 3-year staggered term for agricultural stabilization and conservation county committeemen. Public Law 88–534.

Crop insurance: Expansion of Federal crop insurance coverage. Public Law 88–589, approved September 2, 1964.

Federal agricultural services to Guam: Authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to establish and maintain a 5-year program of agricultural aid to Guam but limits the cost of the program to $60,000 a year. Public Law 88–584, approved September 7, 1964.

Food for peace: Extends food-for-peace program, Public Law 480, to December 31, 1966, and authorizes $2.7 billion for title I and $400 million, plus carryover, for each year for title II. Public Law 88– .

Food Marketing Commission: Established a 15-member bipartisan Commission on Food Marketing, 5 members from the Senate, 5 from the House, and 5 appointed by the President from outside the Federal Government. Authorizes the Commission to investigate and document the changing structure of the marketing system for farm and food products, make recommendations and submit a final report to Congress and the President by July 1, 1965. Authorizes $1.5 million for operation expenses. Public Law 88–354.

Food Stamp Act: Authorizes expansion of the 3-year-old food stamp pilot programs under the jurisdiction of the Department of Agriculture, and provides $75 million for fiscal 1965, $100 million for fiscal 1966, and $200 million for fiscal 1967. Public Law 88–525.

Grain gifts: Permits the Commodity Credit Corporation to buy processed food grain products for donation under the foreign assistance and domestic welfare program. Public Law 88–550.

Meat imports: Provides that import quotas can be proclaimed by the President for a calendar year if the Secretary of Agriculture estimates that imports for that year of beef and mutton will exceed 110 percent of the annual average imports of these products in the period 1959–63 (plus an additional amount representing growth). This will permit imported beef and mutton to retain its proportionate share of the U.S. meat market as it expands. Public Law 88–482.

Migrant farm labor contractors: Establishes a system of Federal registration for interstate farm labor contractors, or crew leaders. Public Law 88–582.

Misuse of relief feeds: Established civil and criminal penalties for misuse of feed made available for relieving distress or preservation and maintenance of foundation herds. Public Law 88–585, approved September 11, 1964.

Potato futures: Bans all trading on commodity exchanges in potato futures but permits trading to continue for the months in which it already has been initiated. (S. 332, passed Senate July 21. H.R. 904, House Calendar.)

Rice transfer: Permits a rice producer permanently withdrawing from rice production to transfer his history without transferring his land. Public Law 88-261.

Sugar: Extends the present foreign sugar quotas to June 30, 1965, and increases temporarily domestic beet and cane sugar allotments by 500,000 short tons. H.R. 12253, passed Senate amended September 29.

Atomic Energy Commission

Year 1961

AEC authorization: Authorized $270,440,000 for a total of 40 new AEC projects including the Stanford linear electron accelerator and electric generating facilities. Public Law 87-315.

Year 1962

AEC authorization: Authorized appropriations of $242,695,000 for AEC construction projects. Public Law 87-701.

Year 1963

AEC authorization: Authorizes $216,271,000 for the Atomic Energy Commission. Of this amount, $172,562,000 is for new construction projects. Public Law 88-72.

AEC supplemental authorization: Authorizes an additional $17 million for construction of 12 new facilities for the nuclear weapons development program. Public Law 88-189.

Year 1964

AEC amendments: First major revision of the AEC Act since 1954, which would give the atomic energy industry, including utilities using nuclear energy for electric power, the right to own fissionable material. Public Law 88-489.

AEC authorization: Authorizes a total appropriation of $2,636,577,000 of which $2,298,467,000 is for operating expenses and $338,110,000 is for plant and capital equipment. Public Law 88-332.

AEC changes: Extends for an additional 5 years AEC's authority to require licensing of atomic energy patents. Public Law 88-394.

Civil rights

Year 1961

Civil Rights Commission: Extends the life of the Commission for 2 years, or until September 30, 1963. Public Law 87-264.

Year 1962

Poll taxes abolished: Congress approved a constitutional amendment barring the requirement of a poll tax as a qualification for voting in Federal elections and primaries. The amendment, if ratified by three-fourths of the States within 7 years, will become the 24th amendment to the Constitution. There are only five States with such a requirement: Alabama, Arkansas, Mississippi, Texas, and Virginia.

Year 1963

Civil Rights Commission: Extends for a year to September 30, 1964, the life of the Civil Rights Commission. Public Law 88-152.

Equal pay for women: Amends the Fair Labor Standards Act to provide that equal work must be compensated with equal pay regardless of the sex of the workers (this measure had been before Congress for 18 years). Public Law 88-38.

Manpower Training Act amendments: Waives the State matching requirement for fiscal 1965 and extends the act for 2 additional years with the requirement that States match one-third and one-half, respectively, in fiscal years 1966 and 1967; authorizes training in education at the basic level for those unable to qualify for occupational training provided evidence exists of intention to undertake training and authorizes an additional 20 weeks of training allowances for this group; expands the program by lowering the age limit for youth training allowances from 19 to 17, subject to a restriction of a 1-year waiting period for school dropouts, by increasing the proportion of youth receiving training allowances to 25 percent of those receiving allowances and restricts the allowances to those in special youth training projects; and authorizes $50 million in new funds for fiscal 1964 and $100 million for fiscal 1965. Public Law 88-214.

Year 1964

Civil Rights Act of 1964: Enforces the constitutional right to vote, confers jurisdiction on the U.S. district courts to provide injunctive relief against discrimination in public accommodations, authorizes the Attorney General to institute suits to protect constitutional rights in public facilities and public education, extends the Commission on Civil Rights for 4 years, prevents discrimination in federally assisted programs, establishes a Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity, and guarantees the right to a jury trial in all criminal contempt cases arising under the bill except voting rights cases which are covered under the 1957 act. Public Law 88-352.

Public defenders: Provides legal assistance for indigent defendants in criminal cases in U.S. courts. Public Law 88-455.

Commerce and transportation

Year 1961

Federal Aid Highway Act: Enacted the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1961, revising the original estimated authorization for 41,000-mile, 13-year program of interstate highways by increasing the Federal Government's share from $25 to $37 billion; extended for 2 years the incentive bonus for States to enter into agreements for billboard controls. Public Law 87-61.

Federal Airport Act extension: Extended the Federal Airport Act for 3 years to June 30, 1964, and authorized a total appropriation of $225 million, or $75 million annually. Public Law 87-255.

Ship trade-ins: Liberalized the law regarding obsolete trade-ins by authorizing the Federal Maritime Commission to take trade-ins either when the owner signs the contract for construction or purchase of a new vessel or (at the owner's option) within 5 days of the delivery date of the new vessel. Public Law 87-401.

Dual-rate shipping: Permanently legalized the operation of steamship conferences and dual systems of contracts for shippers and strengthened the antimonopoly provisions. Public Law 87-34.

Steamship operators: Authorized steamship operators under subsidy contracts to use part of their required reserve for research and planning. Public Law 87-271.

Mass transit: Authorized a new $75 million program to help overcome commuting problems in cities; $25 million is authorized for demonstration grants (covering up to two-thirds of project cost) for projects to explore ways of overcoming mass transit problems; $50 million is authorized for low-interest loans to public bodies for acquiring, constructing, and improving transportation facilities and equipment. Public Law 87-70.

Year 1962

Alaska-Hawaii through routes: Established through routes and joint rates for carriers serving Alaska or Hawaii and the other States. Public Law 87-595.

Gas rates: Granting Federal Power Commission authority to suspend changes in gas-rate schedules covering sales for industrial use only. Public Law 87-454.

Aircraft accidents: Provided express authority in the Federal Aviation Act to facilitate the investigation of aircraft accidents. Public Law 87-810.

Aircraft loan guarantees: Extended the aircraft guarantee loan program an additional 5 years to September 7, 1967, and increased the amount of the loans from $5 to $10 million except for all-cargo carriers—which amount is $15 million. Public Law 87-820.

Intrastate motor carriers: Authorizes the Interstate Commerce Commission to grant the right to common motor carriers operating within a single State to engage in interstate or foreign operations within the State. Public Law 87-805.

Vessel subsidy—Extension: Extended to July 7, 1964, authority to pay maximum of 55 percent subsidy for construction of vessels whose keels were laid after June 30, 1959; provided a 60-percent differential for reconstruction and reconditioning; repealed the 6-percent west coast differential for all bids opened following enactment. Public Law 87-877.

Railroads—Tax relief: Permitted any regulated transportation company to spread its net operating loss over 7 succeeding years in computing its taxable income. Public Law 87-710.

Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1962: Authorized a total of $2.3 billion for fiscal years 1963-65 to continue the Federal-aid highway program for the regular system. Public Law 87-866.

Year 1963

Dual rates: Extends to April 3, 1964, the provision of law which requires the Federal Maritime Commission to approve, disapprove, cancel, or modify existing dual rate contracts in use in U.S. waterborne foreign commerce. Public Law 346 enacted in 1961 authorized foreign commerce carriers to enter into "effective and fair" dual rate contracts but set up specific standards which these contracts must meet. This bill extended the Commission's time to make certain these contracts do or do not comply with the requirements. Public Law 88-5.

Federal Aid Highway Act amendment: Apportions through 1971 funds for completion of Interstate and Defense Highway System; fixes January 1965 as cost estimate deadline; raises Federal payments for construction engineering; continues billboard control program for 2 years. Public Law 88-157.

Seat belts: Provides safety standards for seat belts sold in interstate commerce for use in motor vehicles. Public Law 88-201.

Year 1964

Coast and Geodetic Survey: Authorizes the appointment of the Director and Deputy Director of the Coast and Geodetic Survey from civilian life, with the restriction that both positions not be filled simultaneously by either officers or civilians. (S. 1004 passed Senate June 1.)

Coast Guard authorization: Authorizes $93,299,000 for Coast Guard for new ships, helicopters, and construction for fiscal 1965. Public Law 88-281.

Delaware River Port Authority compact: Extends the powers of the present Delaware River Port Authority compact to include additional bridges and ferries within the provisions of the compact. Public Law 88-320.

Disaster road program: Increases Federal participation in the cost of reconstruction of Federal-aid highways brought about by a disaster in the area where over 5 percent of the lands are nontaxable Indian lands and other public domain lands. S. 2968. Public Law 88- .

Federal airport extension: Extends the Federal aid to airport program for 3 years, from June 30, 1964 to June 30, 1967. Public Law 88-280.

Fishing subsidies: Increases to 50 percent the subsidy for construction of fishing vessels, and extends the program to July 1, 1969. Public Law 88–498.

Great Lakes and St. Lawrence Seaway: Authorizes a study to determine if there are means and economic justification for providing year-round navigation on the Great Lakes and St. Lawrence Seaway. (S. 530, House Calendar.)

Highway authorization.—Authorizes for fiscal 1966 and 1967 as follows: $2 billion from the highway trust fund for ABC highways; $358 million for all other roads and parkways. Public Law 88–423.

Highway traffic safety compacts: Includes the District of Columbia within the provisions of a 1958 joint resolution authorizing interstate traffic safety compacts. Public Law 88–466.

Mass transit: Authorizes a 3-year, $375 million program of Federal grants to aid States to develop comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems in metropolitan and other urban areas. Public Law 88–365.

Merchant marine, construction differentials: Continues to June 30, 1965, the current statutory limitation for construction-differential subsidy payments under the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. Public Law 88–370.

Primary highways, mileage increase: Permits a State to increase its Federal-aid primary system mileage when provision is made for completion and maintenance of 75 percent, rather than 90 percent as required by existing law. S. 1282 passed Senate July 2, 1964.

Vessel construction: Authorized reimbursement for certain vessel construction expenses. Public Law 88–410.

Vessel construction reserve fund: Extends to December 31, 1965, the period during which construction reserve funds must be expended or committed for new vessel construction. Public Law 88–595.

War risk insurance: Permits U.S. citizen-owners of vessels built in U.S. shipyards with construction subsidies to obtain war risk insurance coverage by eliminating provision of existing law requiring vessel valuation reductions in the cases of vessels constructed under Government subsidies. Public Law 88–478.

Withholding tax, salaries: Exempts the wages and salary of certain employees of regulated interstate transportation carriers from withholding tax requirements of States and local subdivisions, unless it is the employee's residence. S. 1719 passed Senate June 19.

Communications

Year 1961

Broadcasting: Liberalized antitrust laws to validate certain contracts for televising professional sports games. Public Law 87–331.

Year 1964

Alien radio operators: Amends provisions of the Federal Communications Act of 1934 dealing with operators and station licenses to permit the FCC to authorize alien amateur radio operators to operate their amateur radio stations in the United States, its possessions, and Puerto Rico, provided there is in effect a bilateral agreement between the United States and the alien's government on a reciprocal basis. Public Law 88–313.

Nonbroadcast operations: Authorizes the Federal Communications Commission to grant special temporary authorizations for 60 days in those cases where an application for a special temporary authorization is filed pending filing an application for regular operation. Public Law 88–307.

Petitions: Requires that petitions for intervention in hearings for a broadcasting license be filed with the Federal Communications Commission within 30 days after publication of the issues in the Federal Register. Public Law 88–306.

Public information disclosure: Amends section 3 of the Administrative Procedure Act to establish a general philosophy of full agency disclosure unless information is exempted under clearly delineated statutory language and to provide a court procedure by which citizens and the press may obtain information wrongfully withheld. S. 1666 passed Senate July 31.

Defense, military and space

Year 1961

Ready Reserves: Granted authority, requested by the President, to call to active duty up to 250,000 ready reservists, authority to continue until July 1, 1962; and to grant discretionary authority to the Secretary of Defense to extend enlistments, appointments, and other service obligations up to 12 months, which would otherwise expire on July 1, 1962. Public Law 87–117.

Alien enlistment: Authorized peacetime enlistments in the Army and Air Force by persons who have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence. Public Law 87–143.

Military procurement: Authorized $12.4 billion procurement program for aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for fiscal 1962. Public Law 87–53.

Military: Clarified the reemployment provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act. Public Law 87–391.

Additional military procurement authorizations: As requested by the President, authorized additional funds to provide for additional equipment primarily to improve the nonnuclear defense capabilities of our ground forces and of the Navy and Air Force; to provide increased air and sealift; and to expand our antisubmarine warfare program. The overall request for additional authorization for procurement of weapons, equipment, and ammunition was for $1,753 million; however, of this amount, additional authorizations are required only for $958,570,000. Public Law 87–118.

Military construction: Authorizes $831 million for construction and improvement projects at military bases at home and abroad, including missile sites and nuclear submarine bases. Public Law 87–57.

Aeronautics and Space Council: Reactivated and strengthened the usefulness of the Aeronautics and Space Council, and provided that it be administered by the Vice President. Public Law 87–26.

NASA authorization: Authorized $1,784,300,000 for the National Aeronautics and Space Agency. Public Law 87–98.

Civil aviation insurance: Extended until 1966, for 5 years, title XII of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, to provide that in the event of war the Nation's civil air fleet would have adequate insurance coverage for war risks. Public Law 87–89.

War hazards: Increased monthly disability and death compensation payable under the War Hazards Compensation Act. Public Law 87–380.

Military: Amended the Uniform Code of Military Justice to provide specific authority for prosecution of bad check offenses. Public Law 87–385.

Marine Corps: Improved the combat effectiveness of the Marine Corps by providing for the expanded assignment of supply-duty-only officers to unrestricted duty. Public Law 87–123.

Emergency evacuation: Provided for advances in pay to Armed Forces personnel in cases of emergency evacuation of dependents from overseas areas. Public Law 87–188.

Reserves: Provides more flexible regulations regarding terms of enlistment in the National Guard to make service in that unit more attractive; other changes include making ROTC graduate training program run from 3 to 6 months at the discretion of the service Secretary. Public Law 87–378.

Year 1962

Ready Reserves: Gave President standby authority to call 150,000 military reservists to active duty if an international crisis should require it. Public Law 87–736.

Berlin resolution: Approved a concurrent resolution putting Congress on record for any action, including the use of military force, needed to uphold Western rights in Berlin. Adopted unanimously by both Houses.

Cuban resolution: Approved a resolution on Cuba stating the United States will use force if necessary to halt the spread of communism in this hemisphere. Public Law 87–733.

Military procurement: Authorized $12,969,300,000 for the procurement of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels during fiscal 1963. Public Law 87–436.

Military construction authorization: Authorized $1,455,672,500 for construction and related authority for the military departments and the Department of Defense. Public Law 87–554.

Space authorization: Authorized $3.7 billion for National Aeronautics and Space Administration for fiscal 1963. Public Law 87–584.

Communications satellite system: Established Communications Satellite Corporation, subject to Government regulation, to plan and operate with foreign governments and businesses a commercial communications satellite system. Public Law 87–624.

Quarters allowance for the military: Increased the basic quarters allowance for military career people, from corporal to general, in order to meet the increased cost of housing in the civilian market; and increased the housing allowance for dependents of temporary military personnel. Public Law 87–531.

Armed Forces travel expenses: Increased to $16 (now $12) a day the maximum per diem allowance in lieu of subsistence for members of the Armed Forces. Public Law 87–500.

Defense production extension: Extend to June 30, 1964, the remaining powers of the President under the Defense Production Act of 1950, to establish priorities for defense contracts; power to allocate materials for defense purposes. Public Law 87–505.

Renegotiation Act extension: Extended to June 30, 1964, the authority of the Government to recapture excessive profits on certain Government contracts. Public Law 87–520.

Civil defense emergency authorities extended: Extended to June 30, 1966, the provision of title III of the Civil Defense Act which authorized the President to declare a national emergency for civil defense purposes and to assume emergency powers during such an emergency. Public Law 87–501.

Reserves—Lump-sum payments: Equalized the treatment between "Reserves" and "Regulars" by increasing the readjustment payments to 2 months' basic pay for each year of active duty for a Reserve member released after 5 years' active duty; and authorized maximum readjustment of 2 years' basic pay or $15,000, whichever is lesser. Public Law 87–509.

Armed Forces—Educational opportunities: Permitted qualified members of armed services and Public Health Service to accept from nongovernmental sources, competitive fellowships, scholarships, or grants for educational purposes. Public Law 87–555.

Year 1963

Space authorization: Authorizes fiscal 1964 appropriations totaling $5,350,820,400 for National Aeronautics and Space Administration. Public Law 88–113.

Military pay increase: Effective October 1, 1963, authorizes pay increases averaging 14.4 percent for 1.9 million military personnel at a cost of about $1.2 billion a year. Public Law 88–132.

Military training: Permanently fixes 6 years of service for enlistees in Reserve program to fulfill their military obligations. Public Law 88–110.

Draft extension: Extends to July 1, 1967, the following provisions of law: authority to induct persons into the Armed Forces; authority to issue selective service calls for physicians and dentists; suspension of permanent limitation on the active-duty strength of the Armed Forces; authority to pay quarters allowance to all enlisted members of the Armed Forces with dependents; and the authority for special pay to physicians, dentists, and veterinarians. Public Law 88–2.

Military procurement: Authorizes $15.3 billion procurement program for aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for fiscal 1964. Public Law 88–28.

Military construction: Authorizes a total of $1,642,253,380 for military construction for fiscal 1964. Public Law 88–174.

Coast Guard officers: Establishes a new officer promotion system in the Coast Guard and provides interim authority for involuntary retirement of Coast Guard officers in the grades of captain and commander to alleviate stagnation of promotion to those grades. Public Law 88–130.

Professional nurses—U.S. merchant marine: Grants authority for registration of professional nurses as staff officers in the U.S. merchant marine. Public Law 88–128.

Year 1964

Academy cadets: Raises authorized strength of cadet corps of U.S. Military and Air Force Academies. Public Law 88–276.

Armed Forces: Authorizes crediting certain military service for purposes of Reserve retired pay. H.R. 9718. Public Law 88– .

Civil defense authorities extension: Extends through June 30, 1968, three civil defense authorities which provide for 50 percent contributions to State and local governments toward the cost of personnel and administrative expenses for federally approved civil defense programs; provides payments for travel and per diem expenses of trainees at civil defense schools; and permits procurement and maintenance of radiological equipment and granting or lending of this equipment to States. Public Law 88–335.

Defense Production Act extension: Extended through June 30, 1966, the remaining powers of the President under the Defense Production Act of 1950, which established priorities for defense contracts, allocates scarce materials, and guarantees defense loans. Public Law 88–343.

Draft: Exempts from induction a sole surviving son of a family whose father died as a result of military service. Public Law 88–360.

Military construction: Authorizes a total of $1,534,994,000 for military construction both within and outside the United States—$1,492,684,000 is new authority; $3,310,000 is an increase in prior years' authorizations; and $39 million for Reserve components. Public Law 88–390.

Military pay increase: Provides for an annual increase of $207 million for a total of 2,762,000 persons in the military service as follows: 2.5-percent increase for all military personnel, enlisted and commissioned, with more than 2 years' service; for commissioned and warrant officers with less than 2 years' service, the bill provides for an 8.5-percent increase in basic pay. Public Law 88–422.

Military procurement: Authorizes a total of $16,976,620,000 for the procurement of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels and for research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces for fiscal 1965. Public Law 88–288.

Missing Persons Act: Amends the act to permit continued crediting of pay and allowances to a person who is detained in a foreign country against his will, and restores to the law a provision for filing and paying income tax on the 15th day of the 3d month after termination of a missing status or after the executor or administrator of the estate of a missing person has been appointed. Public Law 88–428.

National Guard: Provides protection for members of the National Guard who incurred disability while performing duties in addition to regularly scheduled drills. H.R. 2512, Public Law 88– .

Naval Air Station, Pensacola: Approved a resolution commemorating the golden anniversary of the Naval Air Station, Pensacola, Fla., and authorizing the design and manufacture of a galvano in commemoration of this significant event. Public Law 88–318.

Naval promotions: Extends from June 30, 1965, to June 30, 1970, the so-called Navy and Marine Corps hump authority enacted in 1959, which permits mandatory retirement under certain prescribed conditions in the grades of commander and captain prior to the normal point of retirement. Public Law 88–393.

Pearl Harbor Day: Authorizes the President to designate December 7, 1966, as Pearl Harbor Day in commemoration of the 25th anniversary of the attack on Pearl Harbor. Public Law 88–366.

Prisoners of war: Precludes payment of pay and allowances to a prisoner of war who, while in the custody of the enemy, voluntarily renders aid, comfort, assistance, or cooperation to the enemy. S. 3062, passed Senate August 1.

Renegotiation Act extension: Extends to June 30, 1966, the Government's authority to recapture excessive profits on certain Government contracts and related subcontracts; and makes the provisions of the act applicable to contracts with the Federal Aviation Agency. Public Law 88–339.

Reserve officers' promotion: Extends to July 1, 1965, the authority for the Army and Air Force to exceed present statutory ceilings for the authorized number of Reserve officers in each grade below lieutenant colonel for the purpose of promoting Reserve officers to fill unit vacancies and to appoint them to fill mobilization requirements. H.R. 2501. Public Law 88– .

Reserves: Authorizes Reserve officers to combine service in more than one Reserve component in computing service necessary to qualify for uniform maintenance allowance. H.R. 2509. Public Law 88– .

Reserve Officers Training Corps: Makes permanent the authority for flight instruction for members of the Reserve Officers Training Corps. S. 3063, passed Senate August 1.

ROTC: Improved and expanded the Reserve Officers' Training Corps program in an effort to provide a steady flow of high quality junior officers to the Armed Forces. H.R. 9124. Public Law 88– .

Surplus cadmium: Authorizes defense stockpile officials to sell 5 million pounds of surplus cadmium, a soft metal needed by the domestic electroplating industry. Public Law 88–319.

Space authorization: Authorizes a total appropriation of $5,227,506,000 for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for fiscal 1965. Public Law 88–369.

Space and Air Museum: Authorizes construction of a $40 million National Air and Space Museum as a branch of Smithsonian Institution. S. 2602, passed Senate July 23.

District of Columbia

Year 1961

District of Columbia elections: Implements the 23d amendment to the Constitution giving the residents of the District of Columbia the right to vote for President and Vice President; retains the voting age at 21 and provides for a 1-year residency requirement. Public Law 87–389.

Year 1962

District of Columbia police and firemen: Provided for an average salary increase of 11.6 percent for policemen and firemen. Public Law 87–882.

Year 1963

District of Columbia fiscal affairs: Authorizes a permanent annual Federal payment to the District of Columbia of $50 million. Increases the borrowing authority from a flat $75 million to $175 million. Public Law 88–104.

Year 1964

Commercial code: Establishes a uniform commercial code for District of Columbia. Public Law 88–509.

Commercial redevelopment: Provides authority for the use of the urban renewal process in redevelopment of commercial areas within the District of Columbia. S. 628, House Calendar.

Constitutional rights of the mentally ill: Revises the procedures for hospitalization of the mentally ill in the District of Columbia and guarantees to those hospitalized certain civil rights. Public Law 88–597.

Correctional industries: Creates a correctional industries revolving fund for the District of Columbia government with a net limitation of $2,500,000 to be used for performance and production of services which will contribute to the rehabilitation of inmates of institutions in the Department of Corrections of the District of Columbia. S. 1082. Public Law 88– .

Credit unions: Repeals the District of Columbia Credit Unions Act and permits them to become Federal credit unions. Public Law 88–395.

Foreign chanceries in the District of Columbia: Prohibits the location of chanceries and other business offices of foreign governments in any residential area in the District of Columbia. S. 646. Public Law 88– .

Freeway tunnel: Authorizes location of a portion of a vehicle tunnel under parts of the U.S. Capitol Grounds. Public Law 88–381.

Minimum wage: Brings the minimum hourly wage in the District of Columbia to $1.25 in two steps—$1.15 6 months after passage and $1.25 in September 1965; also provides coverage for most male workers. S. 860, passed Senate August 21.

Medical assistance for the aged: Permits the District of Columbia government to provide medical assistance for the aged under the provisions of the Kerr-Mills amendments to the Social Security Act of 1960. S. 763, passed Senate August 15.

Policemen, firemen, teachers: Provided for an 8.9-percent increase for firemen and policemen and a 7-percent increase for teachers. Public Law 88–575.

Relocation costs: Authorizes the District of Columbia Commissioners to pay relocation costs of individuals, families, businesses, and nonprofit organizations displaced by District government activities. S. 1024. Public Law 88– .

Retirement: Reduces minimum service requirement for retirement of judges of the Court of General Sessions, the Court of Appeals, and the Juvenile Court for the District of Columbia. H.R. 5871. Public Law 88- .

Security brokers: Provides for licensing and regulation of securities broker-dealers in the District of Columbia. Public Law 88–503.

Teachers: Admits temporary District of Columbia teachers to the Government insurance programs. H.R. 5932. Public Law 88- .

Education

Year 1961

Impacted areas—National Defense Education Act extensions: Enacted bill which extends for 2 years, until June 30, 1963, Federal assistance to help build schools in districts burdened with substantial increases in their school memberships due to Federal activities, and authorizes an additional $20 million for this purpose. Also extended for 2 years, until June 30, 1964, the provisions of the National Defense Education Act, passed in 1958, to stimulate a nationwide effort to strengthen instruction in science, mathematics, and modern foreign languages. Public Law 87–344.

College housing: Increased the loan authorization by $300 million for each of the 4 years beginning July 1, 1961, through 1964. Public Law 87–70.

Freedmen's Hospital: Transfers Freedmen's Hospital to Howard University as its teaching hospital. Public Law 87–262.

Nurse scholarships: Extended for 4 years (to June 30, 1965), $5 million a year program for grants and scholarships for training of practical nurses under Vocational Education Act. Public Law 87–22.

Vocational teacher training: Authorized two 1-year programs of Federal grants for training teachers of the deaf, and advanced training of speech pathologists and audiologists. Public Law 87–276.

Juvenile delinquency: Authorized a program of Federal grants to communities and nonprofit agencies of $10 million a year for 3 years to aid in financing projects to combat juvenile delinquency. Public Law 87–274.

Year 1962

Educational television: Authorized a 5-year, $32 million program of grants to the States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico, to establish or improve the educational television broadcasting facilities in our public schools, colleges, and in adult training programs. Public Law 87–447.

War orphans education aid: Raised the present ceiling age of 23 to 31 when a war orphan must have completed his education provided the suspension was due to conditions beyond his control. Public Law 87–819.

Captioned films for the deaf: Strengthened and improved the existing program of providing captioned films for nonprofit purposes to groups of deaf persons, by authorizing the production and distribution of training films for the deaf, research in the use of educational and training films and training persons in the use of these films for the deaf and raised the established loan ceiling of $250,000 to $1,250,000. Public Law 87–715.

National Science Foundation amendment: Eliminated the non-Communist disclaimer affidavit required in the existing National Science Foundation Act; made it a crime for any member of a Communist organization to apply for or to use any scholarship or fellowship awarded under section 10 of the act; required each applicant for scholarship or fellowship to provide the NSF with a full statement of the crime of which he has been convicted and information regarding any criminal charges punishable by confinement of 30 days or more. Public Law 87–835.

Year 1963

Vocational education—Impacted areas—National Defense Education Act: Authorizes new matching grants to the States to expand vocational education programs, extends the National Defense Education Act for 1 year to June 30, 1965, and extends the impacted areas program for 2 years to June 30, 1965. Public Law 88–210.

Higher education: Authorizes a 5-year $1.2 billion program of grants and loans for construction of college academic facilities at public and private higher education institutions. Provides for $230 million a year in grants and $120 million a year in loans. Earmarks $50,600,000 a year of the grant funds for junior colleges and technical institutes. Public Law 88–204.

National Cultural Center: Extends the National Cultural Center Act to September 1, 1966; increases the number of general trustees to 30 and provides staggered terms for the additional trustees. Public Law 88–100.

Science and Technology Commission: Establishes a 12-member Commission on Science and Technology to study the possibilities and methods of strengthening the Government's contribution in promoting national security, national progress in scientific and technical development, world peace, and in insuring maximum use of all scientific know-how and information by coordinating Federal research and development programs with those of private industry and nonprofit organizations including educational institutions. (S. 816, passed Senate March 8.)

Medical education aid: Authorizes 3-year program of $175 million in matching grants to expand teaching and research facilities of medical, dental, and related-type colleges, and $30.7 million in student loans. Public Law 88–129.

Exceptional children—Teachers: Authorizes grants to public or other nonprofit institutions of higher learning to assist them in providing professional or advanced training for personnel engaged or preparing to engage in employment as teachers of handicapped children. Public Law 88–164.

Adult Indian vocational training: Increases from $7,500,000 to $12 million a year the amount authorized to be appropriated for the Indian vocational training program. Public Law 88–230.

Student trainee travel expenses: Authorizes payment of travel expenses to student trainees on completion of college when assigned to positions where the Civil Service Commission determines there is a manpower shortage. (Present law provides for these expenses only if the trainee has been promoted to the shortage category position.) Public Law 88–146.

Year 1964

Adult education: Provides for adult education and training programs under the antipoverty bill. Public Law 88–452.

Canal Zone area for scientific study: Removes the existing limitation of $10,000 on annual appropriations for the administration by the Smithsonian of the biological research area in the Canal Zone. S. 808, passed Senate July 23.

Historical documents: Authorizes $2.5 million over a 5-year period for grants to State and local agencies, to colleges and universities, and to other nonprofit organizations and institutions, for collecting, describing, preserving, compiling, and publishing documents which are basic to an understanding and appreciation of U.S. history. Public Law 88–383.

Juvenile Delinquency Act extension: Extends to June 30, 1966, the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act and authorizes an appropriation of $10 million for fiscal 1965, but requires a special authorization by Congress for fiscal 1966. Public Law 88–368.

Library Services Act: Amends the Library Services Act to increase Federal aid for expanding public library improvements to urban as well as rural areas and to authorize matching grants for construction of public library services. Public Law 88–269.

National Defense Education Act—Impacted Areas Amendments: Extends for 3 years, to July 30, 1968, all titles of the National Defense Education Act of 1958; extends for 2 years, to June 30, 1967, impacted areas legislation and includes the District under the statutes (Public Laws 815 and 874); and expands existing program of institutes for advancing teaching quality to $30 million for each fiscal year 1965 through 1968, and broadens the scope of eligible institutes. S. 3060. Public Law 88- .

Student loans: Extends to students of optometry the present authority providing long-term, low-cost loans to students of medicine, dentistry, and osteopathy. S. 2180. Public Law 88- .

Teacher quality: Authorizes the Commissioner of Education, through universities, to provide institutes for elementary and secondary schoolteachers to improve their schools in such subjects as history, English, geography, and foreign languages. S. 3060. Public Law 88- .

Wildlife refuge—revenues: Provides for increased distribution of revenues from the national wildlife refuge system to the counties where the lands are located. Funds must be expended solely for the benefit of public schools and roads in that county. Public Law 88–523.

Federal employees

Year 1962

Civil service retirees: Provided a 5-percent increase, effective January 1, 1963, to all entitled annuitants on that date. Public Law 87–793.

Pay reform: Enacted a two-step pay reform measure for the classified, postal, Foreign Service, and Veterans' Administration employees to lessen the discrepancies between industry and the Federal worker. Public Law 87–793.

White House Police force: Created a permanent White House Police force under the supervision and control of the Secretary of the Treasury to protect the Executive Mansion and Grounds in the District, any building in which White House offices are located, and the President and members of his immediate family. Increased the force from 170 to 250. Public Law 87–481.

Year 1964

Dual compensation: Clarified various laws relating to dual compensation. Public Law 88–448.

Federal employees' health benefits: Amends the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act to remove certain inequities and to improve the administration of the act. Public Law 88–284.

Federal Pay Reform Act of 1964: Raises Federal pay for executives, judges, Members of Congress, and 1.7 million civil service and postal workers. Public Law 88–426.

Smithsonian Institution: Authorizes the Smithsonian Institution to employ aliens in a scientific or technical capacity. Public Law 88–549.

Finance

Year 1961

Debt limit: Increased the public debt limit by $13 billion to $298 billion through June 30, 1962. Public Law 87–69.

Year 1962

Public debt: Enacted a $2 billion temporary increase in the public debt—from $298 billion to $300 billion (to June 30, 1962). Public Law 87–414.

Public debt limit increase: Provided for a temporary debt limit of $308 billion through March 31, 1963, and $305 billion from April 1, 1963, through June 24, 1963, and $300 billion for the remainder of fiscal 1963.—Public Law 87-512.

Export controls: Extended for 3 years the Export Control Act of 1949 which authorizes the President to prohibit or curtail exportation from the United States of certain articles because of security reasons or because they are in short supply. Strengthened the criminal provisions and provided for a fine of five times the value of exports involved in a willful exporting of certain materials with knowledge that it will be used for benefit of any Communist-dominated nation and/or 5 years' imprisonment. Public Law 87-515.

Year 1963

Public debt ceiling: Places a ceiling of $307 billion for the remainder of fiscal 1963 and $309 billion through August 31, 1963. Public Law 88-30.

Public debt ceiling: Extends the temporary debt limitation of $309 billion to November 30, 1963. Public Law 88-106.

Public debt ceiling: Raises the ceiling to $315 billion to June 29, 1964. Public Law 88-187.

Year 1964

Alumina and bauxite: Extends to July 16, 1966, the suspension of duty on alumina when imported for use in producing aluminum, and on bauxite ore and calcined bauxite. Public Law 88-362.

Aviation exports: Provides that aircraft engines, propellers, and parts and accessories may be imported into the United States for purposes of repair, duty free if they are subsequently removed as part of an aircraft departing the United States in international air traffic. Public Law 88-334.

Bankruptcy: Empowers the Supreme Court to prescribe rules of practice and procedure under the Bankruptcy Act. H.R. 2859. Public Law 88- .

Coffee: Provides for free importation of soluble or instant coffee by removing the present duty requirements of 3 cents a pound. Public Law 88-337.

Coin shortage: Authorizes the mint to inscribe the figure "1964" on all coins minted until adequate supplies are available. Public Law 88-580.

Copying shoe lathes: Continues to June 30, 1966, existing law suspending duty on copying lathes used for making rough or unfinished shoe lasts. Public Law 88-336.

Federal Reserve bank authority, extension: Extends to June 30, 1966, the present authority of the Federal Reserve banks to purchase securities directly from the Treasury in amounts not to exceed $5 billion outstanding at any one time. Public Law 88-344.

Graphite: Continues through June 30, 1966, suspension of import duty on graphite. Public Law 88-329.

Lead: Authorizes sale of 50,000 short tons of lead from the national stockpile without regard to the 6 month waiting period. Public Law 88-373.

Manganese ore: Suspends until June 30, 1967, the import duty on manganese ore, including ferruginous manganese ore, and manganiferous ore, containing over 10 percent by weight of manganese. Public Law 88-338.

Metal scrap: Continues to June 30, 1965, the existing suspension of duties on metal waste and scrap, and the existing reduction of duties on copper waste and scrap. Public Law 88-324.

Molybdenum: Authorizes disposal of 11 million pounds of molybdenum from the national stockpile without regard to the 6-month waiting period. Public Law 88-377.

Particleboard—Tariff classification: Provides a uniform treatment for duty purposes of wood particleboard entered or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption after July 11, 1957, and before August 31, 1963, at the rate of 5 percent ad valorem if not excluded from classification by reason of any specified processing. Public Law 88-333.

Personal household effects: Extends to June 30, 1966, existing provisions of law permitting free importation of personal and household effects brought into the United States under Government orders. Public Law 88-323.

Public debt: Clarifies the components of and assists in the managements of the national debt and the tax structure. S. 2281, passed August 5.

Public debt limit: Provides a temporary debt limitation of $324 billion from the date of enactment to June 30, 1965. Public Law 88-327.

Wools: Provides for duty-free treatment of Karakul wools and certain other coarse wools imported for use in the manufacture of pressed felt for polishing plate and mirror glass. Public Law 88-331.

Zinc: Authorizes sales of 75,000 short tons of zinc from the national stockpile without regard to the 6-month waiting period. Public Law 88-374.

General Government

Year 1961

White House: Established the White House as a national monument. Public Law 87-286.

Year 1962

MacArthur Medal: Authorized the President to award a gold medal to General of the Army Douglas MacArthur. Public Law 87-760.

Year 1963

Former Presidents: Authorizes former Presidents of the United States (unless otherwise prohibited) to be entitled to seats in the U.S. Senate as Senators at Large; with the right to speak on the floor of the Senate and to participate in committee activities. Senate Resolution 78 adopted October 1.

Coinage of Kennedy 50-cent piece: Authorizes the Treasury Department to mint new 50-cent pieces with the likeness of the late President John F. Kennedy. Public Law 88-256.

Mrs. Kennedy: Provides, for a 12-month period, office space, equipment, and staff for Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy's use; provides a lifetime use of the franking privilege; authorizes Secret Service protection for a 2-year period for Mrs. Kennedy and her two children. Limits staff salaries to $50,000 a year and authorizes an appropriation of $65,000 to carry out purposes of the act, of which $15,000 is for the President's burial. Public Law 88-195.

Year 1964

Abraham Lincoln: Creates a Joint Committee to Commemorate the 100th Anniversary of the Second Inaugural of Abraham Lincoln. Public Law 88-427.

Administrative Conference: Establishes a permanent Administrative Conference of the United States to provide machinery where the Federal administrative agencies can, with the active assistance of outside authorities on administrative practices, formulate recommendations to improve their own procedures. Public Law 88-499.

Arizona historic site: Established the Fort Bowie National Historic Site, Ariz. Public Law 88-510.

Graff House site: Authorizes the Secretary of Interior to acquire the site of the house, known as Graff House, in downtown Philadelphia in which Thomas Jefferson drafted the Declaration of Independence, and to provide for erection, with donated funds, a replica of the house. It will then become a part of the Independence National Historical Park in Philadelphia. Public Law 88-477.

John Muir Historical Site: Authorized establishment of the John Muir National Historic Site, Calif. Public Law 88-547.

Kennedy Art Center: Renames the National Cultural Center the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts and authorizes Federal participation in its financing. Public Law 88-260.

Leif Erikson Day: Authorizes the President to proclaim October 9 in each year as Leif Erikson Day, thus giving national recognition to the early explorations and discoveries of Leif Erikson and his men on the North American Continent. Public Law 88-566.

Metropolitan planning: Provides for more effective use of Federal loans or grants for urban renewal, open-space projects, construction of hospitals, airports, water supply and distribution facilities, highways, etc., by encouraging better coordinated local review of State and local applications. S. 855, passed Senate January 23.

National Arts Cultural and Development Act: Establishes in the Executive Office of the President a National Council on the Arts of 25 members appointed by the President from among private citizens widely recognized for their knowledge, experience, and interest in the arts. Public Law 88-579.

National Tropical Botanical Garden: Confers a Federal charter on the National Tropical Botanical Garden. Public Law 88-449.

Pennsylvania historic sites: Establishes the Allegheny Portage Railroad National Historic Site and the Johnstown Flood National Memorial, Pa. Public Law 88-546.

Post office leases: Extends to December 31, 1966, the authority of the Postmaster General to enter into negotiated leases of real property for periods not exceeding 30 years. Public Law 88-480.

Presidential disability: Proposed an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide for continuity in the Office of the Chief Executive in the event the President becomes unable to exercise the powers and duties of the Office, and provides for filling vacancies in the Office of the Vice President whenever such occurs. Senate Joint Resolution 139, passed Senate September 28, 1964.

Public lands: Authorizes the heads of Federal departments and agencies for whom land or an interest is acquired, to reimburse the owners or tenants for any expense, loss, or damage incurred by persons in moving themselves, their families, and possessions to another residence or location. S. 1509, passed Senate June 30.

Puerto Rico: Establishes a Commission to recommend procedures for settlement of political status of Puerto Rico. Public Law 88-271.

Smithsonian Police Force: Authorizes the expansion and arming of the Smithsonian Police Force to include new buildings such as the Museum of History and Technology Building, the Civil Service Commission, and others. The number of police could go from 181 to 287 at a cost of $456,573. Public Law 88-391.

Wool Products Labeling Act: Authorizes the Federal Trade Commission to exclude any headwear from the labeling requirements of the Wool Products Labeling Act if labeling is not necessary for the protection of the consumer. S. 1778, passed Senate July 31.

Congressional review of Federal grants-in-aid: Established a uniform policy and procedure for periodic congressional review of grant-in-aid programs which are designed to assist States and their political subdivisions in meeting recognized national needs. S. 2114, passed Senate June 19.

Medal of Honor pension: Provides for payment of a $100 a month pension for holders of the Medal of Honor by including within the eligibility of existing law 17 individuals who received the Medal of Honor based on noncombatant service. H.R. 2434. Public Law 88- .

Health

Year 1961

Community health services: Expanded and improved community health services and facilities for the health care of the aged, construction of nursing homes, and training of public health personnel. Public Law 87-395.

Year 1962

Drugs: Strengthened Federal regulation under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to provide consumers with better, safer, and less expensive drugs. Public Law 87–781.

Vaccination Assistance Act of 1962: Authorized a 3-year program of special project grants to States and, with State approval, to local communities to pay part of the cost of intensive vaccination programs against four contagious diseases—polio, diphtheria, whooping cough, and tetanus. Public Law 87-868.

Major disasters: Authorized assistance to be given by the Federal Government to Guam, American Samoa, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands in case of a national disaster. Public Law 87–502.

Community facilities: Increased from $7.5 to $15 million the appropriation authorization for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands to permit construction of needed hospitals, utility systems, and school buildings as well as the political and economic development of the area. Public Law 87–419

Public facility loans: Provided eligibility to Indian tribes for assistance under the public facility loan program, title II of the Housing Amendments of 1955. Under present law, eligibility for loans is limited to "municipalities and other political subdivisions and instrumentalities of States." This provision has been interpreted as not including Indian tribes which resulted not only in discrimination but an inconsistency since all tribes are eligible for low-rent public housing, housing for the elderly, and assistance under the Area Redevelopment Act. Public Law 87–808.

Air pollution control study: Extends to June 30, 1966, and authorizes up to $5 million annually in appropriations for a continuation of the present study being conducted by the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service and the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, in conjunction with various State agencies into the causes, effects, and ways to abate air pollution with special emphasis on the effects of automobile exhaust fumes. Public Law 87–761.

National school lunch funds: Revised the formula for apportioning cash assistance funds to States in the school lunch program to base it on the number of lunches served the previous year plus the assistance-need factor instead of the present system of number of children aged 5 to 17 plus the assistance-need factor. Public Law 87–823.

Public health: Authorized establishment within PHS a National Institute of Child Health and Human Development and a National Institute of General Medical Sciences. Public Law 87–838.

Migratory health services: Authorized $3 million annually in Federal grants to public or nonprofit agencies and organizations for paying part of the cost of establishing and operating family health clincis and special health projects for domestic migratory farm families. Public Law 87–692.

Water pollution control: Authorized an additional $270 million to help communities construct sewage treatment plants to control water pollution, thus raising the annual limit on grants from $50 million yearly to $80 million for fiscal 1962, $90 million for fiscal 1963, $100 million for fiscal 1964, through and including 1967. In addition, this measure increased from $3 to $5 million the annual Federal matching grants to States to administer water pollution control programs and extended the program through June 30, 1968, and authorized $5 million a year for the Secretary to use to develop demonstration program to treat sewage, to measure pollutants, and to evaluate the effects of sewage treatment. Public Law 87–88.

Year 1963

Retardation and community centers: Authorizes an overall 10-year $320 million program of aid to the mentally ill to: (a) Construct research centers and facilities; (b) construct and establish community mental health centers; and (c) train teachers of children who are mentally retarded or mentally ill as well as other handicapped children. Public Law 88–164.

Maternal and child health and mental retardation: Authorizes 5-year $350 million program to increase aid to States for maternal and child health services and for crippled children's programs; provides grants for maternity care and research projects to prevent mental retardation. Public Law 88–156.

Water pollution control: Establishes a Federal Water Pollution Control Administration within HEW and authorizes a 4-year $80 million program of demonstration grants for research and development of better sewer systems authorizes establishment of water quality standards and establishes procedures to evaluate progress in developing decomposable detergents so they will not cause or continue to pollution of surface and underground waters. (S. 649, passed Senate Oct. 16, 1963.)

Clean Air Act: Authorizes a 4-year $95 million program on Federal aid to State and local governments to combat air pollution. Public Law 88–206.

Medical care for Coast and Geodetic Survey: Subject to regulations of the President, this bill entitles retired ships officers and retired crew members of Coast and Geodetic Survey vessels to medical, surgical, and dental treatment, and hospitalization at facilities of the Public Health Service if the employee was on duty on July 1, 1963, or date of enactment, whichever is later. Public Law 88–71.

Dependent children—Foster care: Extends for 1 year, to June 30, 1964, authority granted under the Public Welfare Amendments of 1962 which permits the responsibility for placement and foster care of dependent children under the program of aid to needy families with dependent children to be exercised by a public agency other than the agency which regularly administers this program. Public Law 88–48.

Year 1964

Drug controls: Regulates the manufacture, distribution, and possession of habit-forming barbiturate drugs, amphetamine, and other habit-forming central nervous system stimulant drugs to protect the public's health. (S. 2628, passed Senate Aug. 15.)

Fishermen's medical care: Restores to self-employed U.S. fishermen eligibility which existed from 1798 to 1954 for medical care in hospitals, outpatient clinics, and other medical facilities of the Public Health Service in the event of illness or injury incurred while engaged in their hazardous and essential occupation. Public Law 88–424.

Food additives: Extends the final effective date of the Food Additives Amendment of 1958 from June 30, 1964, to December 31, 1965, authorizing the Secretary of HEW to permit the continued use of certain food additives pending the completion of testing to ascertain their safety. H.R. 12033. Public Law 88- .

Hill-Burton hospital construction: Extends for 5 years the Hill-Burton Hospital Construction Act and authorizes a total of $840 million over the 5-year period 1965–69 for construction and modernization of health facilities. Authorizes $350 million over the 5-year period for the construction of nursing homes and chronic disease hospitals; $100 million for the construction of diagnostic or treatment centers over the 5 years; $50 million for construction of rehabilitation facilities over the 5-year period; authorizes grants for areawide health facility planning in metropolitan and other areas—$2.5 million in fiscal 1965 and $5 million in each of the next 4 fiscal years, with 50–50 Federal-State matching and permits States to use 2 percent of their allotments, not to exceed $50,000 a year, to improve and strengthen the State administration of the construction program on a 50–50 matching basis. Public Law 88–443.

Nurses training: Authorized funds to expand and improve nurses training programs. Public Law 88–581.

Pesticide registration: Requires registration and Department of Agriculture approval of pesticides before they can be sold to the public. Public Law 88–305.

Physically handicapped: Increases the authorization for appropriations for the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped from $300,000 a year to $400,000 in order to finance the expanding work of the Committee in behalf of job opportunities for the mentally restored, the mentally retarded, and the increasing numbers of physically handicapped being rehabilitated for employment. Public Law 88–321.

Protection of fish and wildlife from pesticides: Increases the authorized annual appropriation for pesticide research by the Department of the Interior from $2,565,000 to $3.2 million for fiscal year 1965 and thereafter $5 million annually. H.R. 4487; passed Senate, amended September 3.

Public health training: Expanded and improved public health training programs. Public Law 88–497.

Housing

Year 1961

Housing Act of 1961: Enacted a housing program, authorizing $4.9 billion in new funds. The act provides for a new 2-year experimental plan of low-interest rate, 35-year mortgage loans for middle-income housing (except in hardship cases the mortgages may be extended to 40 years); requires a 3-percent downpayment on low-income housing, with a permissive inclusion of settlement costs; authorizes $75 million for mass transportation systems, and $50 million for "open space" grants; and includes a reauthorization of approximately 100,000 public housing units. Public Law 87–70.

FHA: Increased by $1 billion the mortgage insurance authorization of FHA. Public Law 87–38.

Year 1962

Senior Citizens Housing Act of 1962: Authorized an additional $100 million (to $225 million) for the existing program of direct loans to provide housing for the elderly. Established a new program for rural areas and authorized $50 million for loans to private nonprofit corporations, consumer cooperatives, and public agencies to build rental housing for the elderly and related facilities such as dining halls and infirmaries. The new plan to be administered by the Farmers Home Administration includes $50 million loan fund to help elderly persons purchase an existing home or housing site. Public Law 87–723.

Year 1963

Mortgage insurance authority: Extends for 2 years, to June 30, 1965, authority of FHA to insure mortgages for sale and rental housing for low and moderate income groups. Public Law 88–54.

Housing for elderly: Authorizes an additional $50 million for loans to nonprofit corporations and consumer cooperatives to provide housing for the elderly designed to meet their special needs. Public Law 88–158.

Year 1964

Elderly housing in rural areas: Approved a 90-day extension (through September 30, 1964) of the Farmers' Home Administration authority to insure loans on rental housing for the elderly in rural areas. Public Law 88–340.

Housing Act of 1964: Omnibus housing bill authorizing a $1.1 billion extension and improvement of existing housing programs for 15 months. Public Law 88–560.

Veterans' housing: Authorizes the Veterans' Administration to extend aid on account of defects in certain veterans' housing. (S. 2470, passed Senate July 29.)

International

Year 1961

Foreign assistance authorization: Authorized a total appropriation of $4,253,500,000 for fiscal 1962; a long-term (5-year) Development Loan Fund program authorizing an appropriation of $1.2 billion for fiscal 1962 and $1.5 billion for each fiscal year from 1963 to 1966; and established a new foreign aid agency. Public Law 87–195.

Latin American aid: Appropriated $600 million for Latin American aid program, which includes $100 million in disaster relief for Chile, $394 million for loans by the Inter-American Development Bank, $6 million for social and economical programs of the Organization of American States, and $100 million for loans and grants by the International Cooperation Administration. Public Law 87–41.

OECD: Ratified the creation of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development consisting of 18 European member nations, the United States, and Canada, to promote economic stability and an orderly growth of the economies of the member states.

Peace Corps: Carried out the President's recommendation to establish a Peace Corps of American volunteers to carry America's skills and talents and idealism abroad to help other peoples to help themselves. Public Law 87–293.

Disarmament: Established a U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency to deal with the problem of reduction and control of armaments looking toward ultimate world disarmament. Public Law 87–297.

U.S. Travel Service: Established a U.S. Travel Service in the Department of Commerce to promote and encourage tourist travel from abroad. Public Law 87–63.

Surplus as aid: Authorized disposal of additional $2 billion in surplus commodities under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act. Public Law 87–27.

Sugar Act: Extended the Sugar Act of 1948 for 15 months to June 30, 1962, fixing quotas of domestic and foreign producers; and continuing the President's authority to exclude Cuban sugar imports and reallocate its quota. Public Law 87–15.

Agricultural aid: Authorized the administration to continue and expand the use of our agricultural abundance in helping needy people in the less developed countries through development programs under title II of Public Law 480, Agricultural Trade Development Act. Public Law 87–92.

Export-Import Bank: Authorized Export-Import Bank to guarantee and insure U.S. exporters and importers against political and credit losses in foreign countries. Public Law 87–311.

Red China: Expressed as the sense of the Congress that—

1. The United States should continue to support the Government of the Republic of China as the representative of China in the United Nations;

2. The United States shall continue to oppose seating of the Chinese Communist regime in the U.N. so long as that regime persists in defying the principles of the U.N. Charter; and

3. The American people support the President in not according diplomatic recognition to the Chinese Communist regime.

Loans to friendly nations: Authorized loan of naval vessels to certain friendly nations. Public Law 87–387.

Year 1962

Foreign aid authorization: Authorized $1.2 billion in foreign aid for fiscal 1963 for development grants, investment guarantees, investment surveys, international organizations and programs, supporting assistance and the contingency fund, and $2.4 billion over a 4-year period for the Alliance for Progress, which includes $600 million for fiscal 1963. Public Law 87–565.

International Monetary Fund: Granted the Secretary of the Treasury standby authority to lend up to $2 billion to the International Monetary Fund so that 10 industrialized nations, including the United States, can participate in a special lending program. Public Law 87–490.

Peace Corps: Authorized $63,750,000 to finance the operations of the Peace Corps during fiscal 1963. (Forty million dollars was authorized last year but only $30 million appropriated.) Public Law 87–442.

U.N. bonds: Authorized an appropriation of $100 million for a loan to the U.N. on a dollar-for-dollar matching basis with other nations for the purchase of U.N. bonds to ease the financial crisis caused by the Congo. Public Law 87–731.

Migration and Refugee Assistance Act: Assists in the resettlement of refugees and escapees by authorizing the President to participate in three programs: contributions to the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration (ICEM); contributions to the U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR); and the U.S. escapee program (USEP). Establishes specific authority to assist Cuban refugees who have come to the United States. Public Law 87–510.

Sugar Act extension: Extended to December 31, 1966, the Sugar Act of 1948 and set new quotas for domestic and foreign sugar producing areas. Public Law 87–535.

Sugar—Western Hemisphere: Reserved 150,000 tons of premium-priced sugar for Latin American supplies for 1963 and 1964, and 75,000 for balance of 1962. Public Law 87–539.

International Wheat Act extension: Extends International Wheat Agreement of 1949 to implement the International Wheat Agreement ratified in 1962, by authorizing the President, acting through Commodity Credit Corporation, to make available wheat and wheat flour at prices necessary to exercise the rights, obtain the benefits, and fulfill obligations of United States. Public Law 87–632.

Philippine war damage claims: Authorized an appropriation of $73 million for unpaid balance of awards made to claimants under the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946; payments to be made only to claimants or their successors in interest; no new claims will be allowed. Public Law 87–616.

Ryukyu Islands: Increased from $6 to $12 million the authorization of funds for economic development in the Ryukyu Islands. Public Law 87–746.

Foreign bank deposits: To help slow the U.S. gold outflow, removed for a period of 3 years the Federal Reserve Board's present ceiling—which ranges up to 4 percent varying with the duration of a deposit—on interest rates paid by U.S. commercial banks on time deposits of foreign governments, their central banks or other monetary authorities, and international institutions of which the United States is a member. Public Law 87–827.

Trade Expansion Act of 1962: Gave the President general authority to cut all tariffs as much as 50 percent over the next 5 years; empowered him to remove tariffs as much as he believes desirable on products in which the United States and Western Europe account for most of the world trade; permitted the President to negotiate tariff reductions on entire categories of commodities instead of item by item as at present; established a new program of subsidies to serve as a substitute for tariff protection for workers and companies hurt by import competition; prohibited the United States from granting tariff concessions to Poland and Yugoslavia and eliminated present concessions to these nations; and removed the peril-point provision of present law which empowers the Tariff Commission to recommend minimum safe tariffs on specific items prior to international trade negotiations, and authorizes the Commission only to advise the President on the probable economic effect of any proposed trade agreement action. Public Law 87–794.

Nonquota immigrant status: Provided nonquota status for certain first preference quota immigrants needed urgently in the United States because of their education, training, experience, skills, and abilities and also for certain fourth preference quota immigrants such as brothers, sisters, married sons, or married daughters of citizens of the United States including spouses and children. Public Law 87–885.

Year 1963

Foreign-aid authorization: Authorizes $3.6 billion in foreign-aid funds for fiscal 1964. Public Law 88–205.

Churchill: Proclaimed Winston Churchill an honorary American citizen. Public Law 88–6.

Export-Import Bank Act extension: Extends the life of the Export-Import Bank of Washington for 5 years to June 30, 1968, and increases the lending authority of the Bank by $2 billion (to $9 billion) and insurance coverage from $1 to $2 billion. Public Law 88–101.

Peace Corps expansion: Authorizes an additional $38,250,000, or a total of $102 million, for the Peace Corps for fiscal 1964. Public Law 88–200.

World Bank capital stock increase: Amends the Bretton Woods Agreement Act to authorize the U.S. Governor of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (World Bank) to vote for a $1 billion increase in the capital stock of the Bank. Increase is required to permit new member countries of the Bank to suscribe and to enable present members to increase their subscriptions. Public Law 88–178.

Foreign Service buildings amendment: Authorizes $49,824,000 for a 2-year Foreign Service buildings program; and amends the Philippine War Claims Act of 1962 by earmarking (1) between $30 and $40 million for claimants up to $25,000, (2) between $30 and $40 million for the Government of the Philippines to use for educational purposes, and remainder to revert to the U.S. Treasury (antilobbying amendment). Public Law 88–94.

Duty-free allowance: Extends for 2 years, to June 30, 1965, the $100 exemption from import duties allowed on foreign goods brought back from outside the United States, but continues the $200 exemption for the Virgin Islands until April 1, 1964, when it will drop to $100. Public Law 88–53.

Year 1964

Bridge construction: Authorizes the construction of certain international bridges. S. 3074 passed Senate August 5, 1964.

Canadian exhibition: Authorizes the President to appoint a Commissioner General to plan and arrange for U.S. participation in the Canadian Universal and International Exhibition to be held in Montreal in 1967. Public Law 88–586.

Chamizal Treaty—Implementation: Authorizes $44.9 million to implement the Convention on the Chamizal for the acquisition of lands to be transferred to Mexico and to make possible the relocation of the channel of the Rio Grande and other required relocations. Public Law 88–300.

CIA retirement: Provides an improved retirement system for employees of the Central Intelligence Agency who are engaged in conducting and supporting intelligence activities abroad. H.R. 8427, Public Law 88– .

Claims against Cuba: Authorizes the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission to receive and determine the amount and validity of claims of American nationals against the Government of Cuba which have arisen since January 1, 1959, for the nationalization or expropriation of their property and for disability or death arising out of violations of international law by Government of Cuba. H.R. 12259, passed Senate, amended, September 8, 1964.

Coffee implementing bill: Implements the ratification of the 1963 International Coffee Agreement by authorizing the President to require certificates of origin on coffee entering the United States and to control imports from nonmembers, if neccessary. H.R. 8864. In conference.

Foreign Agents Registration Act amendments: Strengthened existing law by revising definitions, by providing injunctive remedy, by stricter requirements for disclosing political activities and expenditures, by prohibiting campaign contributions, by prohibiting contingent fee contracts between agents and foreign principals, by requiring full identity disclosure of agent and principal, and by prohibiting officers and employees of the U.S. Government from acting as agents of foreign principals. S. 2136, passed Senate July 6.

Foreign aid: Authorized $3.5 billion for foreign aid for fiscal 1965. H.R. 11380. Public Law 88– .

Foreign chiefs guard: Provides broad new authority to protect the heads of foreign states and other designated officials. Public Law 88–493.

Foreign fishing: Prohibits fishing in territorial waters of the United States and certain other areas by persons other than U.S. nationals or inhabitants. Public Law 88–308.

Foreign Service annuities: Provides reduced annuities under the Foreign Service retirement program for service which terminated prior to October 16, 1960, to provide an annuity for a surviving widow, at not less than $2,400. S. 745. Public Law 88– .

Foreign Service Buildings Act amendments: Authorizes appropriation of $12.2 million and $12.4 million, respectively, for fiscal years 1966 and 1967 for maintenance, repairs, and other operating expenses of Foreign Service buildings; and authorizes, beginning in fiscal year 1966, the transfer between areas and departments of not to exceed 10 percent of funds previously authorized for purchase, construction, major alteration, and long-term leasing of buildings overseas. Public Law 88–414.

Inter-American Development Bank: Authorizes $461,760,000 in additional U.S. contributions to the Inter-American Development Bank; $50 million of this amount is a cash outlay for the Special Operations Fund which makes loans with more flexible interest and repayment terms. Balance of $411,760,000 is to increase the capital stock of the bank. Public Law 88–259.

International Development Association: Authorized the U.S. Governor of International Development Association to vote for an overall increase in the resources of the Association. Public Law 88–310.

Laos: Authorized the United States to contribute its share of expenses of the International Commission for Supervision and Control in Laos. Public Law 88–468.

Mexican independence: Provided for presentation by the United States of a statue of Lincoln to Mexico commemorating the anniversary of its independence. Public Law 88–399.

Naval vessel loan extension: Authorizes the extension of existing loans of 40 ships to 12 friendly foreign countries. Public Law 88–437.

Oil pollution: Expresses the sense of Congress that the Administrator of the St. Lawrence Seaway Corporation should seek to enter into and carry out cooperative arrangements with government authorities, both in the United States and Canada to reduce oil pollution in the St. Lawrence Seaway and adjacent waters. H. Con. Res. 45, passed House May 4, 1964; passed Senate July 29.

Peace Corps authorization: Authorizes a fiscal 1965 appropriation of $115 million for Peace Corps activities, thus making it possible for the corps to finance 14,000 volunteers through the summer of 1965. Public Law 88–285.

Roosevelt Campobello International Park: To implement the international agreement between the United States and Canada relating to Roosevelt Campobello International Park, this bill provides for establishing a joint United States-Canadian Commission to be called the Roosevelt Campobello International Park Commission, with the functions of accepting title to the former Roosevelt estate, restoring the home, and administering the site as an international park. Public Law 88–363.

Sea level canal study: Authorized the President to appoint a five-member commission from private life to make an investigation and study to determine the feasibility of, and the most suitable site for, construction of a sea level canal connecting the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, and the best means to effect its construction, whether by conventional or nuclear means. Findings to be reported to Congress by July 31, 1965. Public Law 88–609. .

South Pacific Commission: Increases U.S. contribution to operations of the South Pacific Commission, whose jurisdiction includes American Samoa, Guam, and trust territories. Public Law 88–263.

Temporary assistance for returning U.S. citizens: Extends to June 30, 1967, the provisions of section 1113(d) of the Social Security Act which authorize temporary assistance to citizens of the United States and to dependents if they are identified by the State Department as having returned, or having been brought, from a foreign country because of the destitution of the U.S. citizen or the illness of such citizen or any of his dependents or because of war or threat of war, and if they are without available resources. Public Law 88–347.

U.N. dues: Expresses the sense of Congress that the President should direct the permanent U.S. delegate to the U.N. to continue efforts toward securing payment by members of the U.N. for assessments which are overdue. House Concurrent Resolution 343, passed House August 17; passed Senate August 20.

Vietnam: Enacted a joint resolution supporting President Johnson's actions in repelling any armed attack against U.S. forces in southeast Asia by the Communist regime in North Vietnam. Public Law 88–408.

Treaties

Year 1961

Belgium Treaty: Ratified a commercial treaty with Belgium to provide protection for property and interests of American citizens and companies in Belgium and to assure fair and nondiscriminatory treatment in commercial, industrial, and financial activities, in return for like assurances in the United States.

Brazil: Ratified a treaty of extradition with Brazil.

Columbia River: Ratified a treaty between the United States and Canada for cooperative development of the Columbia River.

Geneva radio regulations: Ratified the Geneva radio regulations containing a number of provisions relating to the international regulation of radio communication to assist the United States in carrying out its scientific efforts in radio astronomy and space research.

German war bonds: Ratified a second agreement with Germany for the validation of East German dollar bonds to enable owners of these bonds to establish they were acquired from legitimate sources and not through Soviet sources in Berlin at close of World War II.

International Telecommunications Convention: Ratified Executive J which continues in effect the principal provisions of the International Telecommunications Convention to maintain and extend international cooperation of the improvement and rational use of telecommunications of all kinds.

Loadline: Ratified a modification to the International Load Line Convention.

Oil pollution: Ratified the International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution of the High Seas by Oil.

Vietnam Treaty: Ratified a commercial treaty with Vietnam to provide protection for property and interests of American citizens and companies in Vietnam and to assure fair and nondiscriminatory treatment with respect to engaging in commercial, industrial, and financial activities, in return for like assurances in the United States.

Pollution of sea by oil: Implemented the International Convention for the Prevention of the Pollution of the Sea by Oil, which prohibits discharge of oil from tankers and imposes fines and penalties for violations. Public Law 87–167.

Year 1962

Ratified a 3-year extension, to July 31, 1965, of the wheat agreement: The agreement, which supersedes a pact due to expire July 31, embraces 25 wheat-importing countries and 10 exporters including the United States.

ICAO: Ratified an amendment to the International Civil Aviation Convention increasing the size of the ICAO Council from 21 to 27 members.

IAEA: Ratified amendment enlarging the Board of Governors of the International Atomic Energy Agency from 23 to 25 members.

WMO: Ratified amendments to the World Meteorological Organization increasing the membership of the Executive Committee of the Organization and eliminating an inconsistency relative to voting on membership.

Tax treaty: Ratified a tax convention between the United States and Canada.

NAFC: Ratified a declaration of understanding to the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Convention.

SOLAS Convention: Ratified the 1960 Safety of Life at Sea Convention which was signed by our Government and 39 other governments to promote maritime safety.

Luxembourg: Ratified a commercial treaty between the United States and Luxembourg to provide an agreed basis for protection of property and interests of American citizens and companies in Luxembourg with reciprocal rights for Luxembourg citizens in the United States.

Year 1963

Nuclear test ban treaty: Ratified the treaty banning nuclear weapon tests in the atmosphere, in outer space, and underwater, signed at Moscow on Augusut 5, 1963, on behalf of the United States, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

International Coffee Agreement: Ratified the International Coffee Agreement to stabilize prices in world trade by establishing quotas for exporting countries and binding importing countries to limit their purchases of coffee from countries not parties to the agreement.

Civil Aviation Convention: Ratified Convention on International Civil Aviation.

Sweden Extradition Convention: Ratified Convention on Extradition between United States and Sweden.

Brazil—Protocol: Ratified additional protocol to the Treaty of Extradition between the United States and Brazil.

Israel Extradition Convention: Ratified Convention on Extradition between United States and Israel.

Korea Consular Convention: Ratified Consular Convention between United States and Korea.

Japan Consular Convention: Ratified Consular Convention between United States and Japan.

Chamizal Treaty: Ratified the treaty settling the longstanding dispute over the Chamizal district in the El Paso-Ciudad Juarez region of the United States-Mexican boundary by providing for an exchange of land resulting in a net transfer of 437.18 acres to Mexico.

Year 1964

Austrian Assets Convention: Ratified an agreement providing for the return of certain Austrian property located in the United States and vested during World War II by the Alien Property Custodian under the Trading With the Enemy Act, amounting to approximately $450,000.

Belgium extradition: Ratified extradition treaty with Belgium.

Greece—Tax protocol: Ratified a tax protocol: Ratified a 2-year extension (to Dec. 31, 1950 between the United States and Greece into conformity with the 1962 Revenue Act.

International Sugar Agreement—Protocol: Ratified a 2-year extension (to Dec. 31, 1965), of the organizational provisions of the International Sugar Agreement of 1958.

Japan Tax Convention: Ratified the 1960 protocol between the United States and Japan modifying and supplementing the 1954 Income Tax Convention.

Japan Tax Convention: Ratified the 1962 protocol between the United States and Japan modifying and supplementing the 1954 Income Tax Convention.

Lights in the Red Sea treaty: Ratified an agreement to share the expenses of maintaining two lighthouses on the Red Sea islands of Abu Ail and Jabal at Tair.

Luxembourg Tax Convention: Ratified the convention between the United States and Luxembourg to avoid double taxation of income.

Netherlands tax protocol: Ratified the protocol between the United States and the Netherlands, modifying and supplementing the 1955 extension to the Netherlands Antilles of the 1948 Income Tax Convention.

North Pacific Fur Seals Convention—Protocol: Ratified the protocol amending the interim convention on conservation of North Pacific fur seals.

Northwest Atlantic fisheries: Ratified a protocol to bring harp and hood seals under the provisions of the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Convention of 1949 in order to make it possible to study and make recommendations for the conservation of these seal herds.

Pollution of Sea Treaty: Ratified amendments to the International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution of the Sea by Oil, to add new categories of ships, both large and small, extended the prohibited zones from 50 to 100 miles, and strengthened the penalty provisions.

Radio regulations: Ratified a partial revision of the radio regulations designed to allocate frequencies in the radio spectrum for satellite communications, space research, navigational satellites, meteorological satellites, telecommand, telemetry, tracking of space vehicles, and amateur radio operations.

Sweden Tax Convention: Ratified the supplementary convention between the United States and Sweden modifying and supplementing the 1939 Income Tax Convention.

Judicial

Year 1961

Circuit judges: Created 73 additional U.S. district and circuit court judgeships to help ease the present workload and overcrowded court calendars. Public Law 87–36.

Tax Court judges' widows and dependent children: Provided a system of annuities for the surviving widows and dependent children of judges of the U.S. Tax Court. Public Law 87–370.

Judgment and compromise settlement: Provided for the swift payment of judgments and compromise settlements against the U.S. Government won by State and foreign claimants. Public Law 87–187.

Racketeering enterprises: Prohibits the use of the mail or any transportation in interstate or foreign commerce for the purpose of distributing the proceeds of any unlawful activities (business enterprises involving gambling, bootlegging, narcotics, etc.). Public Law 87–228.

Transmission of bets: Forbids the use of wire communications (telephone, telegraph, or any other means of interstate wire communications) for gambling. Exempts information carried for use of the press and wireless communication. Public Law 87–216.

Wagering paraphernalia: Prohibits interstate transportation of wagering paraphernalia for bookmaking, wagering pools, numbers games, or similar games carried by means other than common carrier in the usual course of its business, but allows transportation of equipment from a State where it is manufactured into a State where parimutuel betting is legal. Public Law 87–218.

Felons: Extended Fugitive Felon Act to all felonies. Public Law 87–368.

Espionage: Extended laws against espionage and censorship to acts committed anywhere in the world. Public Law 87–369.

Tax stamps: Made it a Federal crime to transport fraudulent State tax stamps in interstate commerce. Public Law 87–371.

Plane hijacking: Made airplane hijacking a Federal crime subject to a possible death penalty. Public Law 87–197.

Aircraft claims: Authorized immediate payment of up to $1,000 to anyone who might suffer injury or personal damages as a result of an accident involving military aircraft or missiles. Public Law 87–212.

Year 1962

Gambling devices: Broadened the definition of gambling devices to cover additional types of machines manufactured for gambling purposes, and requires detailed records of all such devices shipped in interstate commerce. Public Law 87–840.

Antitrust: Authorized Department of Justice to demand the records of business firms under investigation for possible use in antitrust cases. Public Law 87–664.

Smith Act amendment: Defines and clarifies the term "organize" as used in the Smith Act of 1940 to make it apply to continuing as well as original Communist activities. Public Law 87–486.

Juvenile delinquents: Requires that juveniles adjudged delinquents be committed to the custody of the Attorney General for observation and study and that a full report be submitted within 60 days by the Bureau of Prisons. Public Law 87–428.

Guam: Extended to Guam the power to enter into interstate compacts to enforce criminal laws and policies of the States. Public Law 87–406.

Vending-machine slugs: Broadened the Federal criminal law dealing with the manufacture and sale of slugs and similar devices which could be used in lieu of coins in vending machines. Public Law 87–667.

District court jurisdiction: Made it possible to bring actions against Government officials and agencies in U.S. district courts outside the District of Columbia which, because of certain limitations on jurisdiction and venue, could formerly be brought only in the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia. Public Law 87–748.

Torts: Provided for the recovery by the Government of the value of hospital care furnished to an individual tortiously injured by a third party. Public Law 87–693.

Year 1963

Crimes abroad: Permits prosecution in U.S. district courts of offenses against this country committed abroad. Public Law 88–27.

Tort claims: Permits civil action on tort claims to be brought in the district court of the district where the act or omission occurred. Public Law 88–234.

Courts: Clarifies the status of Federal circuit and district judges retired from regular active service. Public Law 88–176.

Year 1964

Annuities: Increases the annuities of widows of Supreme Court Justices from $5,000 to $10,000 a year, payable monthly. S. 1686, House Calendar.

Child adoption: Eliminates the black market in child adoption by imposing Federal criminal sanctions on persons engaged in interstate or foreign commerce in the traffic of placing children for adoption or permanent free care. S. 1541, passed Senate September 25, 1964.

Court of Claims: Authorizes five additional Commissioners for the U.S. Court of Claims. S. 102, House Calendar.

Courts: Improves judicial procedures for serving documents obtaining evidence, and proving documents in litigation with international aspects. H.R. 9435. Public Law 88– .

Sports bribes: Prohibits any bribery scheme in commerce to influence the outcome of any sporting contest and provides, on conviction, for a $10,000 fine and/or imprisonment up to 5 years. Public Law 88–316.

Labor

Year 1961

Federal unemployment compensation: Authorized Federal advances to permit the States to extend unemployment benefits up to an additional 13 weeks for workers who have exhausted their regular benefits during the recession, thus providing an unemployed worker with benefits up to a total of 39 weeks—in an effort to ease the unemployment problem throughout the country. Public Law 87–62.

Railroad unemployment compensation: Approved benefits of a similar nature for unemployed railroad workers under the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act. Public Law 87–7.

Railroad retirees: To bring the railroad retirees in line with the beneficiaries of social security, this amendment to the Railroad Retirement Act permits men without 30 years' service to receive reduced annuities upon reaching age 62; and reduces from 3 to 1 year the required time which must elapse after marriage before a wife or husband, otherwise qualified, may receive the annuity. Public Law 87–285.

Minimum wage: Increased minimum wage to $1.25 (from $1) and extended coverage to 3.6 million additional workers. Public Law 87–30.

ICC loans: Extended for 27 months (to June 30, 1963) authority of Interstate Commerce Commission to make loans to help ease the credit difficulties of railroads. Public Law 87–16.

Year 1962

Manpower retraining: Authorized a 3-year, $435 million, program of training of unemployed in vocational schools or on-the-job retraining to develop new skills; first 2 years' cost to be paid with Federal funds, third year 50–50 matching with the States. Public Law 87–415.

Work Hours Act: Provided for a standard workweek of 40 hours with not less than time and a half for overtime after an 8-hour day or 40-hour week. Public Law 87–581.

Year 1963

Manpower Training Act Amendments: Waives the State matching requirement for fiscal 1965 and extends the act for 2 additional years with the requirement that States match one-third and one-half, respectively, in fiscal years 1966 and 1967; authorizes training in education at the basic level for those unable to qualify for occupational training provided evidence exists of intention to undertake training and for this group an additional 20 weeks of training allowances are authorized; provides for the expansion of the program by lowering the age limit for youth training allowances from 19 to 17, subject to a restriction of a 1-year waiting period for school dropouts, by increasing the proportion of youth receiving training allowances to 25 percent of those receiving allowances and restricts the allowances to those in special youth training projects; and authorizes $50 million in new funds for fiscal 1964 and $100 million for fiscal 1965. Public Law 88–214.

Railroad labor dispute: Creates a seven-member arbitration board, composed of two members appointed by the carriers and two by the union to arbitrate the two key issues of firemen's jobs and train crew jobs (President named three since the four could not reach an agreement). Public Law 88–108.

Railroad Retirement Act: Restores the railroad retirement and railroad unemployment insurance systems to a satisfactory financial condition by reducing the actuarial deficit in the railroad retirement system by $61 million a year and improves the financial condition of the unemployment system by about $20 million a year. Public Law 88–133.

Year 1964

Commission on Automation: Establishes a 14-member National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress. Public Law 88–444.

Davis-Bacon Act Amendments: Modernizes the Davis-Bacon Act to bring its standards into conformity with modern wage payment practices, by including health and welfare fringe benefits, and any other bona fide fringe benefit, or contributions to funds, plans or programs, in determining prevailing wages required to be paid on construction jobs subject to the Davis-Bacon Act. Public Law 88–349.

National economy

Year 1961

Aid to dependent children: Authorized a 14-month program, from May 1, 1961, through June 1962 of aid to dependent children, permitting States to aid needy unemployed parents and their children who are not now eligible for aid in which the Federal Government participates; and increased by $3 million the minimum amount to which the Federal Government will participate on a matching basis in State programs carrying out the special medical care provision for recipients of old-age assistance. Public Law 87–31.

Area redevelopment: Established the Area Redevelopment Administration in the Department of Commerce, and authorized a 4-year program of $300 million in loans and $94 million in grants for industrial plants and public facilities in economically distressed areas. Public Law 87–27.

Social security: Increased minimum old-age insurance benefits and benefits to widows under the Social Security Act; provided reduced benefits to men at 62; liberalized disability provisions, increased tax for workers and employers by one-eighth of 1 percent; increase (for 1 year) the amount of public assistance payments for old-age assistance, aid to the blind, and aid to the permanently and totally disabled. Public Law 87–64.

Small business loans: Increased by $20 million the amount the Small Business Administration may commit for loans under their regular business loan program, which will enable SBA to continue its loan program without interruption for approximately 1 month. Public Law 87–198.

Small business amendments: Increased SBA's revolving fund by $105 million which, in addition to the $20 million approved in Public Law 87–198, increases the total SBA revolving fund to $1,125 million. Public Law 87–305.

Small Business Investment Act: Increased limit on amounts Small Business Administration may lend small business investment corporations and on latter's investments in individual enterprises. Public Law 87–341.

Lead-zinc subsidy: Aided the domestic lead-zinc industry by authorizing a 4-year program of stabilization payments for small mine owners—75 percent for lead and 55 percent for zinc or the difference between 14½ cents a pound and the market price whenever the market falls below 14½ cents. Public Law 87–347.

Duty-free allowance: Reduced the duty-free exemption from $500 to $100 through June 30, 1963, to counter our unfavorable balance of payments. Public Law 87–132.

Year 1962

Accelerated public works program: Authorized the President to allocate $90 million for job-creating public works projects in areas where there is heavy unemployment, the funds to be allocated to Federal agencies for acceleration or initiation of authorized projects. Public Law 87–658.

SBA amendments: Increased the Small Business Administration's revolving fund ceiling to $1,666 million. Of the $1,666 million authorized, $1,325 million will be used for regular business and disaster loans. Earmarks a separate fund of $341 million for loans to small business investment companies. Public Law 87–550.

Self-employed voluntary pension plans: Encouraged establishment of voluntary pension plans by self-employed professionals by permitting them to set aside up to $2,500 or 10 percent of their income, whichever is lesser, in an approved retirement program and permits them to deduct from taxable income up to a maximum of $1,250 in any one year for contributions to the fund. Public Law 87–792.

Disasters: Authorized taxpayers in any disaster area declared as such by the President of the United States to charge off their casualty losses on the preceding year's tax return when the disaster happens after January 1 and before the time prescribed by law for filing their income tax returns. Public Law 87–426.

Social Security Amendments of 1962: Extended and improved public assistance and child welfare service programs of the Social Security Act. Public Law 87–543.

Pension plans: Strengthened the 1958 Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act by providing additional enforcement procedures and imposing criminal sanctions. Public Law 87–420.

Year 1963

Lead-zinc: Amends the Lead-Zinc Small Producers Stabilization Act of October 3, 1961, to make certain that payments under this act will be made only to small producers whose primary products are lead and zinc. This is achieved by (1) providing that a small producer must have as his principal product or products lead and zinc; and (2) defining the term "principal product and products" to mean that more than 50 percent of the value of metal or minerals produced or sold is lead or zinc or a combination of both. Public Law 88–75.

Year 1964

Antipoverty program: Enacted as the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 authorizing a $947 million program to combat poverty through youth training, education, vocational and work experience programs; community action programs which mobilize community resources to combat poverty; special programs to combat poverty in rural areas; aids to small businesses; and establishment of a domestic Peace Corps to aid in problems of migrant farmworkers, Indians, and to aid in the job camps. Public Law 88–452.

Appalachia: Authorized $1,060 million for the economic development of the 11-State Appalachian region. S. 2782, passed Senate September 25. (House Calendar.)

Dependent children—Care: Extends to June 30, 1967, existing law permitting the responsibility for placement and foster care of dependent children under the program of aid and services to needy families with children to be exercised by a public agency other than the agency which regularly administers this program. Public Law 88–345.

Disability—Social security: Permits a disabled worker to establish the beginning of his disability, for purposes of social security protection, as of the date he actually became disabled, regardless of when he files his application. Extends through April 15, 1965, the time within which ministers, including Christian Science practitioners, can elect to be covered under social security. Allows the States to extend the duration of the income exemption for certain needy blind who have State-approved rehabilitation plans. H.R. 9393. Public Law 88– .

Foster care for dependent children: Extends to June 30, 1967, existing law which permits Federal participation in payments, under the program of aid and services to needy families with children, for certain children requiring foster care who are in nonprofit private child-care institutions. H.R. 10473. Public Law 88– .

National bank loans: Amends section 24 of the Federal Reserve Act to liberalize the conditions of loans by national banks on forest tracts. Public Law 88–341.

National Service Corps: Enacted as a part of the antipoverty bill to aid migrant farmworkers, Indians, mental hospital patients, and to help out in the job camps. Public Law 88–452.

Small Business Act Amendments: Broadened the causal basis if SBA's authority to make loans from its disaster fund to cover all natural disasters. Public Law 88–264.

Small Business Investment Act Amendments: Increases to $700,000 (from $400,000) the amount the Small Business Administration may purchase in capital stock and debentures of small business investment corporations. Public Law 88–273.

Youth Conservation Corps: Enacted as a part of the antipoverty program to provide useful work and basic education to youths aged 16 through 21. Public Law 88–452.

Alaska earthquake grants: Authorized grants of up to $23.5 million to provide emergency assistance to the State government of Alaska and its local government entities as a result of the Alaskan quake on March 27. Public Law 88–311.

Alaska reconstruction: Authorizes an additional $55,650,000 in obligational authority to provide special aid for highways, urban renewal, harbors, housing and State finances to aid Alaska in its reconstruction due to the March 27 earthquake. Public Law 88–451.

Rongelap Island residents—Trust territory: Provides relief of not more than $950,000 for certain residents Rongelap Island in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands affected by the fallout which followed the explosion of an atomic bomb at Bikini Atoll on March 1, 1954. Public Law 88–488.

Social security-health care: Authorized a $7 a month across-the-board increase in social security benefits and provided for a program of hospitalization and nursing home care for persons 65 or other. H.R. 11865. In conference.

Reorganization

Year 1961

Government reorganization: Restored the authority of the President to submit plans for the reorganization of the Government. Public Law 87–18.

Labor: Authorized an additional Assistant Secretary to perform functions relating primarily to the employment and effective utilization of women in our labor force. Public Law 87–137.

FTC reorganization: Provided for the reorganization of the Federal Trade Commission to expedite the present workload (plan No. 4). Effective July 9.

CAB reorganization: Authorized the reorganization of the Civil Aeronautics Board to provide greater flexibility and a more expeditious handling of CAB cases (plan No. 3). Effective July 3.

Maritime reorganization: Authorized reorganization of Maritime Board (plan No. 7). Effective August 12.

ICC reorganization: Authorized reorganization of Interstate Commerce Commission. Public Law 87–247.

FCC reorganization: Authorized FCC to delegate functions in adjudicatory cases to expedite and improve the administrative process. Public Law 87–192.

SEC investigation: Authorized $750,000 for the Securities and Exchange Commission to conduct a special investigation of the adequacy of its rules, for the protection of the investor, governing stock exchanges and over-the-counter securities trading. SEC is to report its findings to Congress by January 3, 1963. Public Law 87–196.

Internal Revenue employees: Appropriated funds for an additional 4,265 Internal Revenue Service employees. Public Law 87–159.

Travel expenses: Increased the allowances of Government employees for traveling expenses when on official business. Increases include from $10 to $16 per diem allowances and from 10 to 12 cents a mile by private automobile. Public Law 87–139.

Interstate commerce—Property destruction: Strengthened existing Federal law by making it unlawful to destroy, injure, set fire to, or otherwise damage goods moving in interstate or foreign commerce, break into or enter any railroad car, vessel, aircraft, truck, or other vehicle for such purpose. Public Law 87–221.

Postal employees: Extended to employees in the postal field service the same salary retention protection in cases of reduction in grade as provided under the Classification Act since 1956. Public Law 87–270.

Scientific and supergrades: Authorized an additional 480 supergrade positions and 280 additional scientific positions for the executive branch. Public Law 87–367.

Year 1962

Reorganization Plan II: Established Office of Science and Technology as a new unit within the Executive Office of the President—capable of and designed to keep the President informed and advised on national policy matters relating to science and technology. (Plan went into effect June 8, 1962.)

SEC reorganization: Permits Securities and Exchange Commission to lighten its workload by delegating certain functions to individual Commissioners or staff members; gives rulings or decisions made by a single Commissioner or staff member the same force and effect of judgment by the full Commission. The Commission, however, can review any decision and would be required to do so on the request of a single Commissioner. Public Law 87–592.

Postal-rate increase: Raised postal rates to produce an estimated $600 million in additional revenues to cut the large postal deficit. Increased first class from 4 to 5 cents an ounce, airmail from 7 to 8 cents effective next January 7; with graduated increases for second- and third-class mail. Public Law 87–793.

Federal Reserve System: Authorized the Federal Reserve System to spend an additional $30 million to build branches and other facilities. Public Law 87–622.

U.S. marshals' fees: Increases fees for U.S. marshals' services to private litigants. Public Law 87–621.

Hatch Act: Liberalized the provision requiring the Civil Service Commission to impose a minimum penalty of 90 days' suspension for violations of section 9 of the Hatch Act by reducing the suspension period to 30 days. Public Law 87–753.

Trust territory: Removed ceiling on authorization for government of Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. Public Law 87–541.

Census reports—Confidential status: Specifically provided that company-retained copies of reports submitted to the Census Bureau be kept confidential. Public Law 87–813.

Conflicts of interest: Enacted a measure making major revisions in Federal Government conflicts-of-interest laws to make uniform and bring up to date existing laws aimed at preventing present and former Government employees from improperly mixing private interest with their public office. Public Law 87–849.

FCC: Added a new section to the Communications Act of 1934 to grant authority to the Commission to impose monetary forfeitures for violation of the Commission's rules and regulations by radio stations operating the common carrier and safety and special radio fields. Public Law 87–448.

Household and personal effects under Government orders: Extends to July 1, 1964, free-entry provisions for personal and household effects brought into the United States under Government orders. Public Law 87–790.

Government Training Act: Restored travel authority to attend training meetings to Foreign Service employees of Department of State, Tennessee Valley Authority, and Presidential appointees. Public Law 87–566.

U.S. Park Police: Provided for the creation of trial boards for the U.S. Park Police as a means of assuring better discipline and more equitable treatment. Public Law 87–797.

Year 1963

Additional mint facilities: Authorizes a 10-year construction and building equipment program for the Bureau of the Mint operations and limits aggregate appropriations to $30 million. Public Law 88–102.

Reorganization Plan No. 1: Transfers to General Services Administration complete authority for operation of Franklin D. Roosevelt Library at Hyde Park, N.Y., now managed jointly with Department of the Interior. Effective July 27, 1963.

Year 1964

Internal security: Strengthens security provisions of the National Security Agency. Public Law 88–290.

Presidential transition: Authorizes $900,000 for the orderly transition of Executive power between election and inauguration of new President. Public Law 88–277.

Reorganization Act: Reinstated the President's authority to submit reorganization plans to Congress through June 30, 1965. Public Law 88–352.

SEC: Omnibus reform bill extending to approximately 3,000 industrial concerns whose stock is traded over the counter the same financial reporting, proxy solicitation, and insider trading requirements that currently apply to companies listed on a stock exchange. Public Law 88–467.

Resources buildup

Year 1961

Saline water conversion program: Extended the saline water conversion program, enacted in 1952, from 1962 through 1967 and authorized a total appropriation of $75 million, but does not limit the annual appropriation to a pro rata share of the total amount. Public Law 87–295.

Cape Cod Park: Established Cape Cod National Seashore Park to preserve for public enjoyment the scenic, scientific, and historic features of the cape. Public Law 87–126.

Migratory waterfowl conservation: Authorized a 7-year migration waterfowl conservation program permitting advances to States to purchase necessary lands. Public Law 87–383.

Year 1962

Point Reyes National Seashore: Authorized an appropriation of $14 million to acquire land to preserve, for public recreational purposes, Point Reyes National Seashore in California. Public Law 87–657.

Padre Island: Established Padre Island National Seashore as a seashore recreational area. Public Law 87–712.

Rivers and harbors and flood control: Authorized $2.3 billion for 91 rivers and harbors projects and 105 flood control projects. Public Law 87–874.

Navajo-San Juan-Chama projects: Authorized $221 million in appropriations to construct the Navajo Indian irrigation project and the San Juan-Chama project to supplement water supplies for domestic and industrial uses, and to provide recreation and fish and wildlife benefits. Public Law 87–483.

Fryingpan-Arkansas project, Colorado. Authorized Department of Interior to spend up to $170 million to construct facilities for the diversion of water from the Colorado River Basin in western Colorado to the Arkansas River Basin. Water will be used for irrigation, flood control, power, and to meet the municipal water needs of Colorado Springs and other cities. Public Law 87-590.

Rogue River Basin project, Oregon: Authorize Federal construction of the Agate Dam and Reservoir as an addition to the irrigation works of the Rogue River Valley Irrigation District in Oregon at a total cost of $1,802,000. Public Law 87–727.

Elephant Butte-Caballo Reservoirs: Provided for establishing additional facilities at

Elephant Butte Reservoir and at Caballo Reservoir—cost limited to $607,000. Public Law 87-542.

Arbuckle reclamation project, Oklahoma: Authorized Federal construction of multiple-purpose Arbuckle project in south-central Oklahoma to provide municipal, domestic, industrial water supplies, and flood control at a cost of $13.3 million, of which $10.5 million is reimbursable. Public Law 87-594.

Spokane Valley project: Modified earlier legislation to enlarge the present irrigation plant at an estimated cost of $7,232,000 to furnish more water for irrigation purposes. Public Law 87-630.

Forest survey authorization: Increased from $1.5 to $2.5 million the authorization for keeping current a survey of the Nation's forest resources. Public Law 87-685.

Mann Creek reclamation project, Idaho: Authorized $3.4 million for Federal construction of Mann Creek Federal reclamation project in Idaho for irrigation and recreational purposes. Public Law 87-589.

Missouri River Basin project: Authorized the Department of Interior to defer the collection of operation and maintenance charges due in 1962 from the Angostura Irrigation District to ease the financial problem in that area resulting from decreased crop production caused by droughts. Public Law 87-440.

Oysterbeds—Delaware Bay: Authorized $100,000 for grants to five States presently involved in rehabilitating oysterbeds in Delaware Bay—grants to be used for research and related activities necessary in developing and propagating disease-resistant strains of oysters. Public Law 87-580.

Delaware-New Jersey compact: Granted congressional consent to States of Delaware and New Jersey to enter into a compact to establish the Delaware River and Bay Authority for developing the border areas. Public Law 87-678.

Baker reclamation project, Oregon: Authorized Federal construction of a $6,168,000 multipurpose reclamation, flood control, and recreational project in northeastern Oregon. Public Law 87-706.

National Fisheries Center and Aquarium in District of Columbia: Authorized Federal construction and operation of a $10 million National Fisheries Center and Aquarium in the District of Columbia. Public Law 87-758.

Chief Joseph Dam project, Washington: Authorized $3,210,000 for construction of control works and a pumping plant at Palmer Lake to enlarge the facilities to irrigate an additional 1,500 acres and supply about 3,650 acre-feet of supplemental water annually to the remaining irrigable area. Public Law 87-762.

Year 1963

Outdoor recreation: Authorizes development and coordination of Federal and State outdoor recreation plans through studies, research, and education programs under guidance of Secretary of Interior. Public Law 88-29.

Reclamation Project Act: Provides for renewal, subject to negotiation, of long-term contracts between Secretary of Interior and municipal, industrial, and domestic users of water service under the Reclamation Project Act of 1959. Public Law 88-44.

Rivers and harbors authorization: Authorizes $816.8 million for rivers and harbors and flood control for fiscal 1964. Public Law 88-253.

River and Harbor Act: Abolishes the Beach Erosion Board established under the River and Harbor Act of 1930, and establishes a Coastal Engineering Research Center to conduct research relating to coastal engineering and near-shore oceanography. Public Law 88-172.

Rio Grande dams: Authorizes Secretary of Interior to market electric power generated at Falcon Dam and Amistad Dam on the Rio Grande. Public Law 88-237.

Oil-gas compact: Grants congressional consent to a 4-year renewal and extension from September 1, 1963, to September 1, 1967, of the interstate gas and oil conservation compact. Public Law 88-115.

Year 1964

Bighorn Canyon National Recreation Area: Authorizes $320,000 to provide for establishing the Bighorn Canyon National Recreation Area in Montana and Wyoming. S. 2048, passed Senate August 5.

Canyonlands National Park: Authorizes the establishment of Canyonlands National Park in Utah as a shoreline recreation area. Public Law 88-590.

Cochiti Reservoir: Authorizes approximately 50,000 acre-feet of water from the San Juan-Chama unit of the Colorado River storage project for filling a permanent pool for recreational purposes at Cochiti Reservoir of the Rio Grande Basin. Public Law 88-293.

Crooked River project extension, Oregon: Expands existing facilities of the Crooked River Federal reclamation project, central Oregon, to provide water for irrigation of an additional 2,850 acres of land. Public Law 88-598.

Dixie project, Utah: Authorizes Federal construction of a $42,700,000 Dixie multipurpose project in Utah. Public Law 88-565.

Fire Island National Seashore: Authorizes $16 million to establish Fire Island National Seashore as a national recreation area covering about 23 miles of shoreline and approximately 43 acres of land within Suffolk County, N.Y. Public Law 88-587.

Fisheries research: Promotes State commercial fisheries research and development activities. Public Law 88-309.

Flathead Indian irrigation project, Montana: Increases the appropriation authorization from $1 million to $6.2 million for continuing the construction of the irrigation and power systems of the Flathead Indian irrigation project in Montana. S. 1531, passed Senate July 31. H.R. 6151, House Calendar.

Garrison diversion unit: Reduces the proposed irrigated acreage to 250,000 acres for the Garrison diversion unit of the Missouri River Basin. (S. 178, passed Senate February 18.)

Hydroelectric projects on the Colorado River: Preserves the jurisdiction of Congress over construction of hydroelectric projects on the Colorado River below Glen Canyon Dam and provides no licenses or permits be issued under the Federal Power Act for the reach of the Colorado River between Glen Canyon Dam and Lake Mead during the period ending December 31, 1966. Public Law 88-491.

Indiana Dunes: Established the Indiana Dunes, lying along the southern shore of Lake Michigan as a shoreline recreation area and authorized $23 million to carry out the purposes of the act. S. 2249. Passed Senate September 29, 1964.

Kennewick irrigation division extension: Authorizes construction, operation, and maintenance of the Kennewick division extension, Yakima project, Washington, in order to bring an additional 6,300 acres of land under irrigation in the Columbia River Valley. S. 2630, passed Senate June 25, 1964.

Lake Mead National Recreation Area: Grants statutory authority for the official operation of Lake Mead National Recreation Area in Arizona and Nevada, established by an interbureau agreement in 1936. Authorizes additional lands to be acquired to build up the shoreline area at an estimated cost of $1,200,000. S. 653, Public Law 88- .

Land conservation: Establishes a land and water conservation fund to assist the States in the improvement of outdoor recreation facilities. Public Law 88-578.

Lower Colorado River flood control: Authorizes conclusion of agreements with Mexico for construction of flood control works on the lower Colorado River. Public Law 88-411.

Manson irrigation unit, Washington: Authorizes construction operation, and maintenance of the Manson unit, Cheland Division Chief Joseph Dam project, Washington, to irrigate an additional 5,770 acres of orchard lands. S. 2533, passed Senate June 25, 1964.

Meteorology: Authorized Secretary of Commerce to use funds received from State and local governments for special meteorological services. S. 970, passed Senate August 1, 1964.

Missouri River Basin: Increases the authorizations by $120 million for continuing work in the Missouri River Basin. Public Law 88-442.

Nebraska Mid-State Division: Authorized construction of an $84,202,000 Mid-State reclamation project in Nebraska to be integrated physically and financially with the other Federal works of the Missouri River Basin project. S. 388, passed Senate June 1964.

Oceanographic research: Facilitates oceanographic research by removing impediments which have been hampering the operation of research vessels, and particularly the large, new, modern scientific ships which have been and are being made available under the expanded national oceanographic program. S. 2552, passed Senate August 1, 1964.

Ozark National Rivers: Provides for the establishment of the Ozark National Rivers in Missouri as a part of the outdoor recreation program. Public Law 88-492.

Pacific Northwest power sales: Guarantees electric consumers in the Pacific Northwest first call on electric energy generated at Federal hydroelectric plants of that region and guarantees electric consumers in other regions reciprocal priority. Public Law 88-552.

Pecos River Basin: Authorizes continuing program to reduce nonbeneficial consumptive use of water in the Pecos River Basin, N. Mex. and Tex. Public Law 88-594.

Public Land Review Commission: Establishes a 19-member bipartisan Commission to conduct a review of existing public land laws and regulations and to recommend necessary revisions. Public Law 88-606.

Rio Grande canalization project: Authorizes the United States to pay part of the maintenance costs on watershed project works needed to protect the Rio Grande canalization project from situation. Public Law 88-600.

Riverton reclamation project, Wyoming: Reauthorizes the Riverton extension unit, Missouri River Basin project, to include all the Riverton reclamation project except the Muddy Ridge area. Public Law 88-278.

Riverton project, Wyoming: Authorizes an additional $1.2 million for the third division of the Riverton reclamation project in Wyoming. Public Law 88-569.

Roads and trails: Authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to construct and maintain an adequate system of roads and trails for the national forests. S. 1147 (House Calendar).

Robert S. Kerr Research Center: Designates the Southwest Regional Water Laboratory of HEW at Ada, Okla., as the Robert S. Kerr Water Research Center. H. Con. Res. 189, passed House March 16, 1964; passed Senate June 19, 1964.

St. Louis River Dam: Authorizes the Eveleth Taconith Co. of Minnesota to construct a dam on the St. Louis River, Minn.; authority to terminate if actual construction is not commenced within 5 years and completed within 10 years from date of passage. Public Law 88-322.

Sanford Reservoir: Provides for the establishment and administration of public recreational facilities in the Sanford Reservoir area, Canadian River project, Texas. Public Law 88-536.

Savery and Pot Hook: Authorizes $47 million for Federal construction of the Savery-Pot Hook, Bostwick Park, and Fruitland Mesa projects as participating projects in the comprehensive development of the water resources of the Upper Colorado River Basin Act. Public Law 88-568.

Teton Basin project: Authorizes construction of the Lower Teton division of the Teton Basin reclamation project, Idaho. Public Law 88-583.

Water resources research: Authorizes 10-year, $82.5 million program of Federal aid to land-grant colleges and universities to stimulate and expand water resources research and scientific training programs. Public Law 88-379.

Whitestone Coulee unit: Authorizes Federal construction of the Whitestone Coulee unit of the Okanogan-Similkameen division, Chief Joseph Dam project, Washington, to irrigate some 2,660 acres at a cost of $5,312,000 with $4,338,000 of this amount reimbursable. Public Law 88-599.

Wilderness bill: Sets aside a 9.2-million-acre wilderness preservation system which may be expanded to 14.7 million acres of federally owned land as a wilderness unavailable for commercial use. Public Law 88-577.

Wildlife conservation in Oregon and California: Provides a permanent basis for administration of the Tule Lake, Lower Klamath, and Upper Klamath National Wildlife Refuges in Oregon and California to promote wildlife resources conservation on the Pacific flyway. Public Law 88-567.

Taxation

Year 1961

Corporate excise extension: Extended for an additional year the existing 52 percent corporate income tax rate, excise tax rates on automobiles, liquor, and tobacco, and taxes on local telephone calls and passenger transportation, to prevent a loss of revenue of some $2.5 billion. Public Law 87-72.

Income tax returns: Curbed tax evasion by assigning identifying numbers to all taxpayers. Public Law 87-397.

Year 1962

Tax revision: Enacted a major revision and reform of our Federal tax system. Public Law 87-834.

Tax changes: Permitted an employer to claim tax deductions for his contributions to employee pension plans which include medical care among their retirement benefits; broadened the allowable individual tax deductions for medical expenses; permitted oil companies, for 1962 only, to deduct drilling costs on tax returns in 1 year rather than claim them as depreciation over several years; and required a State or local government operating retail liquor stores to buy only one $54 Federal liquor tax stamp a year instead of one for each store. Public Law 87-863.

Tax Rate Extension Act of 1962: Extended for 1 year the existing corporate tax rate and certain excise tax rates, while reducing or eliminating taxes on the transportation of persons. Public Law 87-508.

Retirement income credit: Increased to $1,524 from $1,200 the maximum annual amount a retired person can subtract from his tax payment. Public Law 87-876.

Fishermen taxation: Permits fishermen to file their declaration of estimated tax and pay the estimated tax by January 15, after the end of the year in question. This privilege will begin after tax year beginning December 31, 1962. Public Law 87-682.

Year 1963

Tax-rate extension: Continues for 1 year, to July 1, 1964, present corporate tax rate of 52 percent and the present rates of excise tax on distilled spirits, beer, wine, cigarettes, passenger cars, automobile parts and accessories, general telephone service, and transportation of persons by air. Public Law 88-52.

Unemployment tax rates: Eases Federal unemployment insurance taxes established to repay the Government for extra compensation payments made to unemployed workers between 1957 and 1960. Public Law 88-174.

Accrued vacation pay—Deductible: Extends to January 1, 1965, period during which accrued vacation pay may be deducted as a business expense for income tax purposes even though liability to a specific individual has not been established. Public Law 88-153.

Unemployment tax: Reduces the 1963 tax for unemployment compensation and readjust allotments to States for administrative expenses. Public Law 88-31.

Taxes: Permits deduction for child care by a wife who has been deserted by her husband. Public Law 88-4.

Ground rent: Provides a deduction from income taxes for payment of redeemable ground rent. Public Law 88-9.

Year 1964

Collapsible corporations; personal holding companies: Amends the collapsible corporation provisions of the tax laws so they will not apply to the sale of stock in a corporation which consents to a special tax treatment on any later disposition by it of its assets; also provides that in certain circumstances, royalties received for the privilege of using a patent, invention, or similar property are to be treated as rent if the patent, etc., is used by the corporation in the manufacture of personal property which it leases to customers. Public Law 88-484.

Excise taxes: Extends to July 1, 1965, the present rates of excise tax on distilled spirits, beer, wine, cigarettes, passenger cars, auto parts and accessories, general telephone service, and transportation of persons by air. Public Law 88-348.

Fruit-flavor concentrates: Authorizes the use of certain volatile fruit-flavor concentrates in the cellar treatment of wine; repeals the 8-percent manufacturers' excise tax on rebuilt automotive parts; makes the 10-percent manufacturers' excise tax on radio and television components inapplicable to as much of the price of rebuilt television picture tubes as is represented by the fair market value of the used picture tube traded in. H.R. 4649. Public Law 88- .

Interest equalization tax: Provides an interest equalization tax designed to bring the cost of capital raised in the U.S. market by foreign persons more closely into alinement with the costs prevailing in markets in other industrial countries, and will aid our balance-of-payments position by restraining the heavy and accelerated demand on our capital market from other industrialized countries; effective from July 19, 1963 (August 17 for listed securities) through December 31, 1965. Public Law 88-563.

Motor fuels' taxes: Grants consent of Congress for the States and the District of Columbia to enter into a compact on apportioning motor fuels' taxes consumed by interstate buses, and to enter into a bus taxation and reciprocity agreement. (S. 2208, passed Senate August 15.)

Payments in lieu of taxes: Extends to June 30, 1966, period for which payment in lieu of taxes may be made with respect to certain land transferred by the RFC to other Government departments. Public Law 88-330.

Tariff Schedules Technical Amendments Act of 1964: Amends the Tariff Schedules of the United States to correct certain errors brought about by the adoption of these schedules. Closes so-called tariff loopholes such as where an importer or foreign producer discovers a way to avoid the protective incidence of a particular duty-rate description, generally by a manipulation of his goods. Provides for the free entry of mass spectrometers for the use of certain educational institutions, polyethylene imine, and certain types of limestone. Changes the rates of duty on certain dictating machines, continuous cast aluminum, brooms made of broomcorn, and certain plastic or rubber-coated textile luggage and handbags imported prior to September 1, 1964. Extends the present foreign sugar quotas to June 30, 1965 and increases temporarily domestic beet and cane sugar allotments by 500,000 short tons. H.R. 12253. (In conference.)

Tax amendments: Narrows application of personal holding company provisions and makes provision for small business investment companies to establish reserves for losses on their holdings of convertible debentures of small business concerns. Develops a new set of rules for recoveries of foreign expropriation losses by limiting the tax on the recovery to the benefit previously received in deducting the loss, but applying current tax rates. Existing law provides for deduction of soil and water conservation expenditures, this bill provides that where these expenditures are made by an assessment district, the related assessments are to be deductible to the members of the district even though the funds are expended by the district to acquire land, easements, or to relocate roads or powerlines, or other obstructions, to the extent that these expenditures are in connection with soil or water conservation or drainage purposes. Removes the limitation on the authorization of expenditures for the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures. H.R. 8050, passed Senate, amended September 28, 1964.

Tax exemption: Provides an exemption from the tax on unrelated business taxable income in case of labor unions and agricultural organizations where certain conditions are met. Public Law 88-380.

Tax reduction: Enacted an $11.5 billion tax reduction for individuals by an average of 20 percent and from 52 to 48 percent for corporations when fully effective in 1965. Public Law 88-272.

Tobacco products—Tariff regulations: Prevents double taxation of certain tobacco products exported and returned unchanged to the United States for delivery to a manufacturer's bonded factory. Public Law 88-342.

Veterans

Year 1961

Disability benefits: Increased weekly disability benefits for longshoremen and harbor workers to $70 (from $54); provided comparable increases in death cases from $81 to $105; and increased statutory maximum compensation payable for all injuries other than cases of permanent total disability or death from $17,280 to $24,000. Public Law 87-87.

Veterans' widows: Increased payments to veterans' widows. Public Law 87-268.

Veterans' home loans: Extended direct and guaranteed home loan programs for World War II veterans to July 26, 1967, and for Korean conflict veterans to February 1, 1975; authorized an additional $1.2 billion for direct loan program through fiscal 1967. Public law 87-84.

NSLI special dividend: Authorized the payment of a special insurance dividend averaging from $100 to $150, for those veterans who have RS or W insurance. The RS insurance is entirely term insurance and the premium increases at the end of each 5-year period. The W insurance is both term and permanent, with the increased rate at the end of each 5-year period. Public Law 87-233.

Year 1962

Disability compensation increase: Provided for increases from 5.3 to 11.1 percent for veterans disabled 10 to 100 percent, retroactive to July 1, 1962. Public Law 87-645.

Veterans' Administration: Appropriated an additional $55 million for readjustment benefits payments to Korean war veterans attending school under the GI bill of rights; and provided for a $115,247,000 increase, by transfer, in the VA loan guarantee revolving fund to enable the Federal Government to repossess homes on which GI home mortgages have been foreclosed. Public Law 87-404.

Veterans: Extended the time during which individuals affected by Public Law 87-117 may pursue and complete a program of education or training under the Korean GI bill or the War Orphans' Education Act. The individuals affected served an additional tour of duty because of the war threats in 1961. Public Law 87-815.

VA pensions—hospitalization: Continues pensions for married veterans while hospitalized in veterans' hospitals. Public Law 87-556.

Disability compensation: Increases compensation for certain veterans disabled by blindness or kidney involvements. Public Law 87-610.

National service life insurance—assignments: Broadened assignment provisions of national service life insurance available to World War II veterans and maturing on or after date of enactment of this bill. Public Law 87-557.

War Orphans' Educational Assistance Act: Permits eligible beneficiaries under the War Orphans' Educational Assistance Act to attend foreign educational institutions. Public Law 87-546.

VA—hospital and medical care: Furnished hospital and medical care, including outpatient treatment, to peacetime ex-servicemen for service-connected disabilities on same basis as care and treatment is furnished war veterans. Public Law 87-583.

Deceased veterans' benefits: Permits payment of compensation, retirement, or pension benefits withheld from deceased veterans during VA hospitalization only to spouse, children, or dependent parents. Public Law 87-544.

Endowment at age 96: Permits veterans holding U.S. Government life insurance to exchange for a policy providing death protection only, with reduced premiums. Public Law 87-549.

Blind veterans—Vocational rehabilitation: Permits World War II or Korean veterans blinded by reason of a service-connected disability to obtain vocational rehabilitation training up to June 30, 1975. Public Law 87-591.

Year 1963

Veterans' family benefits increase: Increases by approximately 10 percent monthly rates of dependence and indemnity compensation payable to widows, children, and parents of veterans dying of service-connected causes. Public Law 88-21.

Compensation increase—Veterans' widows: Increases from $112 to $150 the basic monthly rate of dependency and indemnity compensation payable to widows of veterans who died from service-connected disabilities. Public Law 88-134.

Veterans—Vocal cords: Adds "complete organic aphonia with constant inability to communication by speech" to the existing types of service-connected disabilities, and authorizes an additional $47 award for such disability. Public Law 88-22.

Deafness of both ears: Adds "deafness of both ears, having absence of air and bone conduction" to the types of service-connected disabilities for which compensation is awarded. Monthly compensation will be $47. Public Law 88-20.

Burial exepnses: Extends the time during which a veteran's family may claim an allowance for burial expenses. Public Law 88-3.

Grants-in-aid: Extends for 5 years the program for reimbursement of the Philippine Government covering hospitalization for service-connected veterans who served with the U.S. Armed Forces during World War II. Public Law 88-40.

Veterans—Waiver of indebtedness: Authorizes the Veterans' Administration to waive recovery on defaults on home loans in certain hardship cases. Public Law 88-151.

Year 1964

Disability: Preserves disability ratings under laws administered by the VA where such ratings have been in effect for 20 years. Public Law 88-445.

Disability-death benefits: Authorizes veterans' benefits for disability or death resulting from injuries sustained prior to January 1, 1957, by reservists traveling in connection with training duty. H.R. 11332. Public Law 88- .

Educational assistance: Provides educational assistance to the children of veterans who are permanently and totally disabled as a result of a service-connected disability arising out of active military, naval, or air service during a period of war or the induction period. Public Law 88-361.

Home loans: Authorizes the Veterans' Administration to guarantee home loans on a newly constructed dwelling or construction of a dwelling having maturities extending up to 35 years if agreed on between private lenders and borrowers. (S. 385, passed Senate January 16.)

Medical benefits for Medal of Honor recipients: Provides hospital, domiciliary, and medical care for non-service-connected disabilities to recipients of the Medal of Honor. Public Law 88-481.

NSLI: Raised age limit to 65 for total disability income provisions on national service life insurance policies. Public Law 88-355.

NSLI: Provides for waiver of premiums for certain veterans holding national service life insurance policies who are totally disabled before age 65. Public Law 88-364.

Nursing home care for veterans: Provides veterans with urgently needed nursing home care and nursing care facilities while reducing the cost to the United States for caring for these veterans. Public Law 88-450.

Outpatient dental services: Authorizes dental services and treatment in cases where discharges were corrected by competent authority from dishonorable to conditions other than dishonorable. Public Law 88-431.

Paraplegic housing program: Expands the paraplegic housing program to include blind veterans who have lost the use of a leg but not confined to a wheelchair. Public Law 88-401.

Pensions: Amends the veterans law relating to the payment of non-service-connected pensions, disability and death, by adding new exclusions of income used in determining eligibility, increase the pension rate for veterans, widows and/or child in the low-income bracket and provides additional allowances for those veterans requiring aid and attendance, those permanently housebound, as well as for those who are so helpless or blind as to require the regular aid and attendance of another person. H.R. 1927. Public Law 88- .

Research contractors: Authorizes the United States to indemnify a contractor engaged in a medical research or development project for the Veterans' Administration against certain risks of an unusually hazardous nature. Public Law 88-433.

Veterans' loans: Authorizes the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to sell direct loans made to veterans and to guarantee the loans. Public Law 88-402.

STATUS OF PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S LEGISLATIVE RECOMMENDATIONS, 87TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION, 1961

Total major recommendations	53
Enacted into law	33
Rejected by one or the other House or no action taken	20
Total percentage	62

	Recommended	Approved	No action	Percentage
National security	2	2	0	100.0
International affairs and finance	8	7	1	87.5
Commerce, housing, and space technology	6	4	2	67.0
Agriculture	4	4	0	100.0
Natural resources	4	2	2	50.0
Labor and welfare	20	10	10	50.0
General government	9	4	5	44.0

MAJOR LEGISLATION APPROVED

National security

1. Authorize additional appropriations for aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for Armed Forces.

2. Authorize the President to order units and members in the Ready Reserve to active duty for not more than 12 months.

International affairs and finance

3. Etablish a permanent Peace Corps.

4. Establish a strengthened and enlarged Disarmament Administration.

5. Authorize a new AID (Act for International Development) agency and program.

6. Authorize a 10-year social and economic plan for the Americas (Alliance for Progress).

7. Encourage travel to the United States (establish Office of International Travel).

8. Reduce temporarily the exemption from duty enjoyed by returning residents.

9. Ratify United States-Canada Columbia River Development Treaty.

Commerce, housing, and space technology

10. Establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of susbtantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically distressed areas.

11. Make certain adjustments in the Federal aid highway program.

12. Assist in the provision of housing for moderate- and low-income families, promote orderly urban development, extend and amend laws relating to housing, urban renewal, and community facilities.

13. Provide a 5-year extension of the Federal Airport Act (expired June 30, 1961).

Agriculture

14. Provide a special program for feed grains for 1961.

15. Extend the Sugar Act of 1958, as amended.

16. Authorize an additional $2 billion for this calendar year under title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended (Public Law 83-480).

17. Enact the Agricultural Enabling Amendments Act of 1961.

Natural resources

18. Extend and expand the current saline water conversion program.

19. Cape Cod.

Labor and welfare

20. Establish temporary program for payment of additional unemployment compensation to workers who have exhausted their benefits.

21. Provide aid to dependent children of the unemployed on a temporary basis.

22. Raise minimum wage to $1.15 immediately and to $1.25 within 2 years; extend coverage of Fair Labor Standards Act to several million workers not now covered.

23. Improve old-age survivors, and disability insurance program.

24. Enact community health facilities legislation.

25. Provide a more effective water pollution control program.

26. Amend and expand the student loan and other provisions of the National Defense Education Act (expires June 30, 1962).

27. Anticrime legislation.

28. Juvenile delinquency.

29. Authorize additional Assistant Secretary in the Department of Labor.

General government

30. Provide for reorganization in the Civil Aeronautics Board (Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1961).

31. Provide for reorganization in the Federal Trade Commission (Reorganization Plan No. 4 of 1961).

32. Provide for reorganization in the Federal Home Loan Bank Board (Reorganization Plan No. 6 of 1961).

33. Provide for reorganization of maritime functions (Reorganization Plan No. 7 of 1961).

MAJOR LEGISLATION DISAPPROVED OR NOT ACTED UPON

International affairs and finance

1. Authorize payment of certain Philippine war damage claims.

Commerce, housing, and space technology

2. Increase postal rates, effective July 1.

3. Authorize an additional Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

Natural resources

4. Establish shoreline areas.

5. Enact a wilderness protection bill.

Labor and welfare

6. Amend the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act with respect to method of enforcement and provide certain additional sanctions.

7. Enact Manpower Development and Training Act of 1961.

8. Enact Youth Employment Opportunities Act of 1961.

9. Enact health insurance program (free choice of doctor and hospital) for all persons aged 65 and over who are eligible for social security or railroad retirement benefits.

10. Establish National Institutes of Child Health and Human Development in National Institutes of Health.

11. Authorize additional assistance to medical and dental schools.

12. Authorize additional assistance to institutions of higher learning.

13. Authorize educational TV.

14. Enact 3-year program of general Federal assistance for public elementary and secondary classroom construction and teachers' salaries.

15. Provide effective air pollution control program.

General government

16. Provide for reorganization in Federal Communications Commission (plan No. 2).

17. Enact essential income tax changes.

18. Provide for reorganization in the Securities and Exchange Commission (plan No. 1).

19. Provide for reorganization in National Labor Relations Board (plan No. 5).

20. Abolish poll tax, amend the Constitution.

STATUS OF PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S LEGISLATIVE RECOMMENDATIONS, 87TH CONGRESS, 2D SESSION, 1962

Total major recommendations	54
Enacted into law or anticipated approval	40
Rejected by one or the other House or no action taken	2
Action not yet completed	12
Total percentage to date	74

	Recommended	Approved	Rejected	Action not completed
National security	4	3	0	1
International affairs	10	9	0	1
Commerce, housing, and technology	6	5	0	1
Agriculture	1	1	0	0
Natural resources	7	5	0	2
Labor and welfare	17	9	1	7
General government	9	8	1	0

MAJOR LEGISLATION APPROVED

National security

1. U.N. bond issue.
2. Mutual security.
3. Authorizing the President to order Reserve units of the Ready Reserve.

International affairs and finance

4. Enlarging Peace Corps.
5. Customs simplification.
6. IMF loan fund.
7. Refugee resettlement.
8. International Wheat Agreement (treaty).
9. Philippine war damage.
10. International Wheat Agreement Act.
11. Reciprocal trade and trade adjustment.
12. Tax reform.

Commerce, housing, and space technology

13. Additional Assistant Secretary of Commerce.
14. FCC–UHF conversion.
15. Communications satellite.
16. A–B–C highways.
17. AEC authorization (Hanford reactor).

Agriculture

18. Farm bill.

Natural resources

19. San Juan-Chama and Navajo projects.
20. Fryingpan-Arkansas project.
21. Arbuckle project, Oklahoma.
22. Point Reyes.
23. Padre Island.

Labor and welfare

24. Manpower development and training.
25. Pension and welfare disclosure.
26. Educational TV.
27. Public welfare.
28. Drug labeling bill.
29. Increased compensation for 2 million disabled veterans.
30. Public works acceleration.
31. Mass immunization.
32. Conflict of interest.

General government

33. Reorganization Plan No. 2 (science and technology).
34. Poll tax constitutional amendment.
35. SEC reorganization plan.
36. Postal rate modification.
37. Federal pay reform.
38. Slot Machine Act.
39. New National Institute for Child Health, etc.
40. Civil investigative demand.

MAJOR LEGISLATION ACTION NOT YET COMPLETED

National security

1. Civil defense.

International affairs

2. Standby tax authority.

Commerce, housing, and space technology

3. Mass transportation.

Natural resources

4. Wilderness bill.
5. Outdoor recreation, land conservation program.

Labor and welfare

6. College aid and scolarships.
7. Federal aid to education.
8. Youth Employment Opportunities Act.
9. Aid to medical education and research.
10. Adult Basic Education Act.
11. Educational Improvement Act (teacher quality).
12. Temporary unemployment compensation.

MAJOR LEGISLATION DISAPPROVED OR NOT ACTED UPON

Labor and welfare

1. Health care for older citizens.

General government

2. Department of Urban Affairs.

STATUS OF PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S LEGISLATIVE RECOMMENDATIONS, 88TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION, 1963

With the new recommendations submitted by President Johnson, there have been a total of 129 legislative recommendations. There are 15 appropriations including the 2 supplementals for fiscal 1963. The combination makes a total of 144. There are three on which specific draft legislation have not been submitted—narcotics control, user charges (fuel and airfreight), and Urban Affairs Department. Excluding these 3, we have a total of 141. Based on 141, the following figures apply:

	Number	Percent
Action completed	62	44
Conference report filed	1	.70
Passed Senate	31	22.70
Total	94	67.40

All but 10 percent (excluding the three on which draft legislation has not be submitted) are either enacted, in conference, reports filed on the calendars, subject of hearings, or in the markup stage.

ACTION STATUS OF PRESIDENTIAL RECOMMENDATIONS, DECEMBER 20, 1963

(Legislative, 126; appropriations, 15)

Recap

Action completed	62
Passed Senate	31
Senate Calendar	2
Passed House	2
House Calendar	7
Committee action	21
No action	14
Rejected	1
No legislation	[1]3
Conference report filed	1

[1] Excluded from totals; awaiting submission of specific proposals.

Action completed (*62*)

1. AEC authorization. Public Law 88–72.

2. AEC supplemental authorization. Publice Law 88–189.

Appropriations:

3. Agriculture supplemental for 1963. Public Law 88–1.

4. Supplemental, 1963. Public Law 88–52.

Fiscal year 1964:

5. Agriculture. Public Law 88–250.

6. Defense. Public Law 88–149.

7. District of Columbia. Public Law 88–252.

8. Foreign aid appropriations. Public Law 88–258.

9. Independent offices. Public Law 88–215.

10. Interior. Public Law 88–79.

11. Labor-HEW. Public Law 88–136.

12. Legislative. Public Law 88–248.

13. Military construction. Public Law 88–220.

14. Public works. Public Law 88–257.

15. State - Justice - Judiciary - Commerce. Public Law 88–245.

16. Treasury-Post Office. Public Law 88–39.

17. Civil Rights Commission extension. Public Law 88–152.

18. Clean Air Act. Public Law 88–206.

19. Corporate excise tax extension. Public Law 88–52.

20. District of Columbia fiscal affairs. Public Law 88–104.

21. District of Columbia National Cultural Center. Public Law 88–100.

22. Disarmament Agency, increased authorization. Public Law 88–186.

23–27. Education:

Exceptional children; teachers. Public Law 88–164.

Higher education. Public Law 88–204.

Manpower Training Act Amendments. Public Law 88–214.

Medical education. Public Law 88–129.

Vocational education-NDEA-Impacted Areas. Public Law 88–210.

28. Equal pay for women. Public Law 88–38.

29. Export-Import Bank extension. Public Law 88–101.

30. Feed grains. Public Law 88–26.

31. Foreign aid authorization. Public Law 88–205.

32. Foreign Service buildings. Public Law 88–94.

33. Housing for elderly; increased authorization. Public Law 88–158.

34. Kennedy 50-cent coin. Public Law 88–256.

35. Mental health. Public Law 88–164.

36. Mental retardation; child health. Public Law 88–156.

37. Military construction authorization. Public Law 88–174.

38. Military pay. Public Law 88–132.

39. Military procurement authorization. Public Law 88–28.

40. Outdoor recreation. Public Law 88–29.

41. Peace Corps expansion. Public Law 88–200.

42–44. Public debt, increase ceiling:

To August 30, 1963. Public Law 88–30.

To November 30, 1963. Public Law 88–106.

To June 29, 1964. Public Law 88–187.

45. Railroad labor dispute. Public Law 88–108.

46. Railroad retirement amendments. Public Law 88–133.

47. Reorganization Plan I, Roosevelt Library. Effective June 26.

48. Silver policy repeal. Public Law 88–36.

49. Space authorization. Public Law 88–113.

50. Tax on air passenger transportation; extend at 5 percent. Public Law 88–52.

Treaties ratified

51. Nuclear text ban.

52. Coffee Agreement.

53. Consular convention with Korea.

54. Consular convention with Japan.

55. Extradition treaty with Brazil, amend.

56. Extradition treaty with Israel.

57. Extradition treaty with Sweden.

58. Protocol to International Civil Aviation Convention.

59. Chamizal Treaty.

60. Universal military training extension; 4 years. Public Law 88–2,

61. Veterans' family benefits. Public Law 88–21.

62. World Bank, increase capital stock. Public Law 88–178.

CONFERENCE REPORT FILED (1)

1. Pacific Northwest power. S. 1007.

Passed Senate (*31*)

1. Airport construction extension. (Passed Senate August 26; House Calendar.)

2. Area redevelopment. (Passed Senate June 26; House Calendar; rule hearings, September 24.)

3. Dairy program. (Passed Senate October 10.)

4. Equal time suspension. House Joint Resolution 247. (Passed Senate October 2.)

5. International air rates. S. 1540. (Passed Senate November 26.)

6. Juvenile Delinquency Act extension. (Passed Senate September 25; House subcommittee approved October 8.)

7. Land-use adjustments. S. 1588. (Passed Senate October 11.)

8. Kennedy Art Center. Senate Joint Resolution 136. (Passed Senate December 18.)

9. Library services and construction. S. 2267. (Passed Senate November 26.)

10. Mass transit. (Passed Senate April 4; House Calendar.)

11–14. Migratory labor. Four bills: S. 521, S. 523, S. 524, S. 525.

15. National Council on the Arts. S. 2379. (Passed Senate December 19.)

16. National Defense Education Act; extend loan forgiveness provision. S. 569. (Passed Senate October 24.)

17. National Service Corps. (Passed Senate August 14; House Labor Subcommittee approved December 11.)

18. President's Transition Act. (Passed Senate, amended, October 17.)

19. Public defenders. (Passed Senate August 6; House Calendar.)

20. River basin planning. (Passed Senate December 4.)

21. SEC amendments. (Passed Senate July 30; House hearings November 19–21, December 3–5.)

22–24. Shorelines:

Lake Mead. (House Calendar.)

Canyonlands.

Ozark National River.

25. Sleeping Bear Dunes. S. 792. (Passed Senate December 19.)

26. Supplemental, mental retardation. House Joint Resolution 875. Passed Senate, amended, December 20.

27. U.N. Participation Act amendments. (Passed Senate Deoember 6; House Calendar.)

28. Water pollution control. (Passed Senate October 16; House public works hearings, December 4–6, 10, 11.)

29. Water resources research program. (Passed Senate April 23; House Interior subcommittee approved December 5.)

30. Wilderness. (Passed House April 9.)

31. Youth employment. (Passed Senate April 10; House Calendar; rule requested April 22.)

Senate Calendar (2)

1. Inter-American Development Bank. H.R. 7406. Agreement to vote January 14, 1964.

2. International Development Association. S. 2214. Agreement to vote January 4, 1964.

Passed House (2)

1. Coffee Agreement; implement. H.R. 8864. (Passed House November 14.)

2. Reorganization Act extension (amended). (Passed House June 4.)

House Calendar (7)

1. Adult basic education. H.R. 5542.

2. Civil Rights Act of 1963. H.R. 7152.

3. Equal employment opportunity. H.R. 405.

4. Interest equalization tax. H.R. 8000.

5. Land conservation fund. H.R. 3846.

6. Patent fee increase. H.R. 8190.

7. Pay bill. H.R. 8986.

On the House Calendar (see "Passed Senate"):

Airport construction. (Rule December 16.)
Area redevelopment.
Lake Mead.
Library services. (Rule December 16.)
Mass transit.
Migratory labor; contract registration.
Public defenders. (Rule December 4.)
U.N. Participation Act.
Youth employment.

Committee action (*21*)

1. Airports, Dulles and National: Management. House Interstate executive consideration underway.

2. Bureaus of Community Health and Environmental Health in NIH, create. H.R. 2410. (House Interstate hearings April 23–26; May 14, 15; June 10).

3. Civil service retirement financing. S. 1562. (Senate Post Office and Civil Service hearings concluded August 14.)

4. Cotton subsidy. H.R. 6196. (Passed House December 4; Senate Agricultural hearings May 20–27.)

5. District of Columbia home rule. H.R. 5794. (House District of Columbia hearings November 18–20.)

6–8. Education:

Cooperative research. H.R. 8408. (House Education ordered reported August 27.)

Elementary and secondary school construction. H.R. 5344. (House subcommittee hearings underway.)

Teacher quality. H.R. 6013. (House subcommittee reported August 27.)

9. Fallout shelters. H.R. 8200. (Senate Armed Services Subcommittee hearings adjourned subject to call December 13.)

10. Food stamp plan. (S. 1387, Senate Agriculture; H.R. 8107, House Agriculture executive October 30.)

11. Foreign Affairs Academy. (S. 865, Senate Foreign Relations markup July 10; H.R. 3668, House Foreign Affairs.)

12. Housing for elderly; make single persons eligible for moderate income housing. (S. 1170, Senate Banking hearings October 2–4.)

13. Medicare. (S. 880, Senate Finance; H.R. 3920, House Ways and Means hearings November 18–22; resume January 20, 1964.)

14. Minimum wage coverage expansion. (H.R. 5898, H.R. 6075. House Labor subcommittee hearings underway.)

15. National forest road and trails. S. 1147. (Senate Public Works Subcommittee concluded hearings July 31; executive August 15.)

16. Presidential Commission on Automation. Senate Joint Resolution 105. (Senate Labor hearings suspended December 5.)

17. Stockpile disposal. S. 2272. (Hearings March 7, 1962, January 30, 1963, December 3, 1964.)

18. Tax reform; cut. (Passed House September 25; hearings October 15 to December 10; executives started December 12.)

19, 20. Transportation policy (two bills). (S. 1061, S. 1062, Senate Commerce hearings concluded October 24; H.R. 4700, H.R. 4701, House Interstate executive October 15–17; November 12.)

21. Watershed Act Amendments; multiple use. S. 566. (Senate Agriculture hearings June 3.)

No action (14)

1. Air carriers; limit subsidy payments. S. 1884. (Senate Commerce.)

2. Bank accounts; savings and loans; increase insurance coverage. S. 1799. (Senate Banking will wait for House; H.R. 7404 House Banking.)

3. Civil defense; foodstuff stockpile. (S. 1711 Senate Armed Services; H.R. 5121, House Armed Services.)

4. Food and Drug Amendments. H.R. 6788. (House Interstate.)

5. General university extension. H.R. 1779. (House Education and Labor.)

6. Group practice facilities; mortgage insurance. (S. 1426, Senate Labor; H.R. 4534, House Interstate.)

7. Hill-Burton Act; extension and expansion. S. 894. (Senate Labor.)

8. Immigration Amendments. (H.R. 7700, House Judiciary; S. 1932, Senate Judiciary.)

9. Mental health; vocational rehabilitation. (S. 968, Senate Labor; H.R. 5194, House Labor.)

10. Political campaign tax incentives. H.R. 7308. (House Ways and Means.)

11. Public welfare work; training. (S. 1803, Senate Finance; H.R. 7262, House Ways and Means.)

12, 13. Social Security Amendments. (S. 1357, S. 1358, Senate Finance; H.R. 5839, H.R. 5840, House Ways and Means.)

14. Unemployment compensation; permanent program. (S. 1542, Senate Finance; H.R. 6339, House Ways and Means.)

Rejected (1)

1. District of Columbia rapid transit. Recommitted (December 9).

No legislation (3)[1]

1. Narcotics control. (President reviewing Advisory Commission report.)
2. User charges: fuels, airfreight.
3. Urban Affairs Department.

STATUS OF APPROPRIATIONS BILLS

Enacted into law (14)

Agriculture.
Defense.
District of Columbia.
Foreign aid.
Independent offices.
Interior.
Labor-HEW.
Legislative.
Military construction.
Public works.
State-Justice-Judiciary-Commerce.
Treasury-Post Office-Executive Office
Agriculture supplemental, 1963.
Supplemental, 1963.

Passed Senate, amended

Supplemental, mental retardation, impacted areas.

STATUS OF PRESIDENTIAL LEGISLATIVE RECOMMENDATIONS, 88TH CONGRESS, 2D SESSION, 1964

Total recommendations	129
Action completed	93
In conference	3
Passed Senate	10

Although there were a total of 129 recommendations, including annual appropriations, made by President Johnson, he stressed action on 52 major items. Following is legislative action on these 52 items:

ACTION COMPLETED

1. Adult education.
2. AEC authorization.
3. Airport Act extension.
4. Alaska earthquake grants.
5. Alaska reconstruction.
6. Antipoverty.
7. Canyonlands.
8. Chamizal Convention Act.
9. Civil Rights Act of 1964.
10. Commission on Automation.
11. Cotton-wheat program.
12. Domestic Peace Corps.
13. Excise tax extension.
14. Federal pay reform.
15. Food Marketing Commission.
16. Food stamp plan.
17. Foreign aid authorization.
18. Highway authorization.
19. Hill-Burton extension.
20. Housing Act, including an expansion of FNMA investing powers.
21. Inter-American Development Bank—increase U.S. shares for Special Operations.
22. Interest equalization tax.
23. International Development Association.
24. Juvenile delinquency extension.
25. Land conservation fund including user fees.
26. Library services and construction.
27. Military construction.
28. Military pay increase.
29. Military procurement.
30. Mass transit.
31. NDEA amendments.
32. Nurses training program.
33. Ozark National Rivers.
34. Pacific Northwest power.
35. Peace Corps authorization.
36. Pesticide registration.
37. President's Transition Act.
38. Public defenders.
39. Public health trainee program.
40. Reorganization act extension.
41. SEC reforms.
42. Space authorization.
43. Tax reduction.
44. Vietnam resolution.
45. Water resources research.
46. Wilderness preservation.
47. Youth Employment Act.

IN CONFERENCE

48. Coffee implementation.
49. Social security-health care.

PASSED SENATE

50. Area redevelopment amendments—House Calendar.
51. Water pollution—House Calendar.
52. Aid to Appalachia—House Calendar.

RECAP AND STATUS REPORT OF ALL 129 RECOMMENDATIONS—ACTION STATUS OF PRESIDENTIAL LEGISLATIVE RECOMMENDATIONS, SENATE DEMOCRATIC POLICY COMMITTEE, 88TH CONGRESS, 2D SESSION, OCTOBER 2, 1964

RECAP: TOTAL 129

Action completed (93).
In conference (3)
Passed Senate (10).
Senate Calendar (2).
Passed House (1).
House Calendar (2).
Committee action (9).
No action (8).
No legislation (1).

ACTION COMPLETED (92)

1. Adult Education. Public Law 88-452.

2. AEC Authorization. Public Law 88-332.

3. Airport Act extension. Public Law 88-280.

4. Alaska Earthquake Grants. Public Law 88-311.

5. Alaska Reconstruction. Public Law 88-451.

6. Antipoverty. Public Law 88-452.

7-23. Appropriations: Alaska emergency relief fund, Public Law 88-296; deficiency for 1964, Public Law 88-317; labor supplemental for 1964, Public Law 88-295; supplemental for 1964, Public Law 88-268.

Fiscal 1965: Agriculture, Public Law 88-573; Defense, Public Law 88-446; District of Columbia, Public Law 88-479; foreign aid, Public Law 88- ; independent offices, Public Law 88-507; Interior, Public Law 88-356; Labor-HEW, Public Law 88-605; legislative, Public Law 88-454; military construction, Public Law 88-576; public works, Public Law 88-511; State-Justice-Commerce, Public Law 88-527; supplemental, Public Law 88- ; Treasury-Post Office, Public Law 88-392.

24. Canyonlands. Public Law 88-590.

25. Chamizal Convention Act. Public Law 88-300.

26. Civil Rights Act of 1964. Public Law 88-352.

27. Coast Guard authorization. Public Law 88-281.

28. Commission on Automation. Public Law 88-444.

29. Cotton-Wheat programs. Public Law 88-297.

30. District of Columbia Relocation Assistance. S. 1024. Public Law 88- .

31. Domestic Peace Corps. Public Law 88-452

32. Excise Tax Extension. Public Law 88-348.

33. Federal Pay Reform. Public Law 88-426.

34. FNMA—Broaden Scope of Private Investing. Public Law 88-560.

35. Food for Peace. Public Law 88- .

36. Food Marketing Commission. Public Law 88-354.

37. Food Stamp Plan. Public Law 88-525.

38. Foreign Aid Authorization. Public Law 88- .

39. Forest Roads and Trails. Public Law 88- .

40. Highway authorization. Public Law 88-423.

41. Hill-Burton extension. Public Law 88-443.

42. Housing Act of 1964. Public Law 88-560.

43. Inter-American Development Bank—increase U.S. share of Fund for Special Operations. Public Law 88-259.

44. Interest Equalization Tax. Public Law 88-563.

45. International Development Association—enlarge resources. Public Law 88-310.

46. Juvenile Delinquency Act extension. Public Law 88-368.

47. Kennedy Art Center. Public Law 88-260.

48. Lake Mead Recreation Area. Public Law 88- .

49. Land Conservation Fund. Public Law 88-578.

50. Library Services and Construction. Public Law 88-269.

51. Military Construction. Public Law 88-390.

52. Military Pay Increase. Public Law 88-422.

53. Military Procurement. Public Law 88-288.

54. Mass Transit. Public Law 88-365.

55. Migrant Farm Labor Contracts. Public Law 88-582.

56. National Council on the Arts. Public Law 88-579.

57-59. National Defense Education Act amendments: Extended the existing program for 3 years including the loan forgiveness provision; extended the impacted areas program for 1 year; and provided for a teacher quality improvement program in such subjects as history, English, geography, foreign languages, and remedial reading. S. 3060. Public Law 88- .

60. National Historical Documents. Public Law 88-383.

61 Nurses Training Program. Public Law 88-581.

---

[1] Not included in totals for Presidential recommendations.

62. Ozark National Rivers. Public Law 88-492.

63. Pacific Northwest Power. Public Law 88-552.

64. Peace Corps authorization. Public Law 88-285.

65. Pesticide Registration. Public Law 88-305.

66 President's Transition Act. Public Law 88-277.

67. Public Debt. Public Law 88-327.

68. Public Defenders. Public Law 88-455.

69. Public Health Trainee Program. Public Law 88-497.

70. Reorganization Act extension. Public Law 88-351.

71. Sea Level Canal Study. Public Law 88-609.

72. SEC Reforms. Public Law 88-467.

73. Space authorization. Public Law 88-369.

74. Tax reduction. Public Law 88-272.

75. User fees. Public Law 88-578.

76. Vietnam resolution. Public Law 88-408.

77. Water resources research. Public Law 88-379.

78. Wilderness Preservation System. Public Law 88-577.

79. Youth Employment Corps. Public Law 88-452.

TREATIES

80. Austrian Property Convention. Ratified February 25, 1964.

81. Belgium Extradition Treaty. Ratified August 7, 1964.

82. International Sugar Agreement protocol. Ratified January 30, 1964.

83. Japanese 1960 protocol modifying the 1954 Income Tax Convention. Ratified July 29, 1964.

84. Japanese 1962 protocol modifying the 1954 Income Tax Convention. Ratified July 29, 1964.

85. Luxembourg Tax Convention. Ratified July 29, 1964.

86. Netherlands Antilles protocol modifying Tax Convention. Ratified July 29, 1964.

87. North Pacific Fur Seal Convention—protocol. Ratified January 30, 1964.

88. Northwest Fisheries Convention. Ratified June 23, 1964.

89. Prevention of pollution of sea by oil—amendments. Ratified February 25, 1964.

90. Radio Regulations Convention—partial revision. Ratified February 25, 1964.

91. Red Sea Lights Convention. Ratified February 25, 1964.

92. Sweden supplementary Tax Convention. Ratified July 29, 1964.

93. Tax protocol with Greece. Ratified June 23, 1964.

IN CONFERENCE (3)

94. International Coffee Agreement. H.R. 8864.

95. Social security—health care. H.R. 11865.

96. Sugar—extended foreign quota provisions 6 months. H.R. 12253.

PASSED SENATE (11)

97. Aid to Appalachia. S. 2782 (September 25). (House Calendar.)

98. Area redevelopment—expand. S. 1163 (June 26, 1963). (House Calendar.) Rule granted August 6.

99. Dairy program. S. 1915 (October 10, 1963). H.R. 7261: House Agriculture killed August 5.

100. Indiana Dunes. S. 2249 (September 29).

101. International air rates. S. 1540 (November 26, 1963). House Interstate hearings, May 19-21.

102. Land-use adjustments. S. 1588 (October 11, 1963). H.R. 6491: House Agriculture hearings, June 24-27, 1963.

103. Revitalize District of Columbia downtown area. S. 628 (July 16, 1963). House Calendar.

104. Veterans' housing. S. 2470 (July 29, 1964). House Veterans' Affairs.

105. Water pollution control. S. 649 (October 16, 1963). House Calendar.

106. Water resources planning. S. 1111 (December 4, 1963). House Calendar.

SENATE CALENDAR (2)

107. Higher education student loans. S. 3140.

108. Stockpile disposal. S 2272.

PASSED HOUSE (1)

109. Watershed Act amendments. H.R. 9938 (May 18). Senate Agriculture hearings, 1963.

Fallout shelter program, patent fee increase. (See "Committee Action.")

HOUSE CALENDAR (2)

110. Establish 5-year community program for elderly. H.R. 10088.

111. Transportation policy. H.R. 9903. Rule denied April 28.

Appalachia aid, ARA, revitalize District of Columbia downtown area, water pollution control, water resources planning. (See "Passed Senate.")

COMMITTEE ACTION (9)

112. District of Columbia home rule. S. 1650: Senate District of Columbia Committee. H.R. 5794: House District of Columbia Committee hearings. November 18-20, 1963, February 24, 1964.

113. Fallout shelter program. H.R. 8200: Passed House September 17, 1963. Senate Armed Services Subcommittee deferred action March 2, 1964.

114. Immigration law revision. S. 1932: Senate Judiciary Subcommittee hearings underway. H.R. 7700: House Judiciary hearings underway.

115. Minimum wage. S. 2487: Senate Labor. H.R. 11838: House Education Subcommittee approved; full committee deferred action July 1, 1964.

116. Overtime pay and tripartite committees. S. 2486: Senate Labor. H.R. 9802: House Labor Subcommittee. Approved July 21, 1964.

117. Patent fee increase. H.R. 8190: Passed House January 22. Senate Judiciary hearings concluded February 28, 1964.

118. Truth in lending. S. 750: Senate Banking Stabilization Subcommittee, executive, July 8, 22, 29.

119. Truth in packaging. S. 387: Senate Judiciary, executive, October 29, 1963. H.R. 2382: House Judiciary hearings in 1963.

120. Vocational Rehabilitation Amendments. H.R. 5194: House Labor Subcommittee executives underway.

NO ACTION (8)

121. Community work-training program. S. 1803: Senate Finance. H.R. 7262: House Ways and Means.

122. Food and drug amendments. S. 2580: Senate Labor. H.R. 6788: House Interstate.

123. FTC—cease and desist orders. H.R. 9941: House Interstate.

124. Futures trading on commodity exchanges. S. 2859: Senate Agriculture. H.R. 11278: House Agriculture.

125. Group practice facilities. S. 1426: Senate Labor. H.R. 4534: House Interstate.

126. Housing and Community Development Department. S. 2475. Senate Government Operations. H.R. 9982: House Government Operations.

127. Meat and poultry inspection. S. 2176: Senate Agriculture.

128. Unemployment insurance. S. 1542: Senate Finance. H.R. 6339: House Ways and Means.

NO LEGISLATION (1)

129. District of Columbia mass transit. Killed in the first session by the House; no revised legislation received.

APPROPRIATIONS

Action completed

Year 1964:

Alaskan Emergency Supplemental. Public Law 88-296.

Deficiency. Public Law 88-317.

Labor Supplemental. Public Law 88-295.

Supplemental. Public Law 88-268.

Year 1965:

Agriculture. Public Law 88-573.

Defense. Public Law 88-446.

District of Columbia. Public Law 88-479.

Foreign Aid. Public Law 88- .

Independent Offices. Public Law 88-507.

Interior. Public Law 88-356.

Labor-HEW. Public Law 88-605.

Legislative. Public Law 88-454.

Military Construction. Public Law 88-576.

Public Works. Public Law 88-511.

State-Justice-Commerce. Public Law 88-527.

Supplemental. Public Law 88- .

Treasury-PO. Public Law 88-392.

Summary of legislative record

SENATE ACTIVITY

	82d 1st Jan. 3-Oct. 20	83d 1st Jan. 3-Aug. 3	84th 1st Jan. 3-Aug. 2	85th 1st Jan. 3-Aug. 30	86th 1st Jan. 7-Sept. 15	87th 1st Jan. 3-Sept. 27	88th 1st Jan. 9-Dec. 30	88th 2d Jan. 7-Oct. 3
Days in session	172	125	105	133	140	146	189	186
Hours in session	996:46	763:35	559:41	860:44	1,009:48	1,005:00	1,044:43	1,352
Total measures passed by Senate	1,060	848	1,325	1,210	1,052	1,133	861	823
Senate bills	411	342	574	612	434	459	333	209
House bills	429	320	566	346	375	433	294	431
Senate joint resolutions	14	22	22	22	21	25	21	10
House joint resolutions	29	21	20	54	32	27	25	19
Senate concurrent resolutions	23	25	25	24	34	23	26	13
House concurrent resolutions	19	14	21	28	24	23	22	28
Senate resolutions	135	104	97	124	132	143	140	113
Public laws	255	288	390	316	383	401	258	352
Confirmations	26,069	23,420	39,897	44,620	43,567	48,962	66,603	53,590

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is with a great amount of satisfaction that I place in the RECORD a table of the appropriation bills on which the Congress took action during the 2d session of the 88th Congress. It is with a great amount of pride that I call attention to the prudent savings of $4,134,439,560 over the budget estimates.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows.

Appropriation bills, 88th Cong., 2d sess., as of Oct. 3, 1964

Title	Budget estimates to Senate	House-passed figure	Senate-passed figure	Public law figure	Increase or decrease between public law figure and Senate budget estimate	Public Law No.
Health, Education, and Welfare	$289, 688, 000	$289, 688, 000	$289, 688, 000	$289, 688, 000	----------	88-268
Labor	42, 000, 000	42, 000, 000	42, 000, 000	42, 000, 000	----------	88-295
Disaster relief	50, 000, 000	50, 000, 000	50, 000, 000	50, 000, 000	----------	88-296
Deficiency, 1964	1, 436, 177, 743	1, 264, 913, 689	1, 349, 637, 143	1, 336, 687, 143	−$99, 490, 600	88-317
Total, 1964	1, 817, 865, 743	1, 646, 601, 689	1, 731, 325, 143	1, 718, 375, 143	−99, 490, 600	
1965 APPROPRIATION						
District of Columbia	(357, 862, 300)	(338, 205, 200)	(342, 181, 975)	(341, 242, 200)	(−16, 620, 100)	
Federal payment	53, 220, 000	40, 720, 000	44, 220, 000	40, 720, 000	−12, 500, 000	88-479
Interior	1, 035, 961, 000	1, 009, 175, 600	1, 029, 226, 400	1, 028, 277, 200	−7, 683, 800	88-356
Treasury-Post Office	6, 268, 691, 000	6, 225, 420, 000	6, 240, 423, 000	6, 233, 273, 000	−35, 418, 000	88-392
Legislative	255, 999, 745	173, 626, 640	210, 380, 685	210, 300, 885	−45, 698, 860	88-454
Labor-Health, Education, and Welfare	7, 803, 190, 000	6, 908, 063, 000	7, 081, 193, 000	7, 089, 707, 000	−713, 483, 000	88-605
Defense	47, 471, 000, 000	46, 759, 267, 000	46, 774, 401, 000	46, 752, 051, 000	−718, 949, 000	88-446
State-Justice-Judiciary	1, 999, 164, 700	1, 702, 627, 800	1, 730, 855, 700	1, 717, 157, 800	−282, 006, 900	88-527
Agriculture	5, 583, 535, 600	5, 182, 665, 000	5, 338, 672, 525	5, 137, 162, 200	−446, 373, 400	88-573
Independent offices	14, 249, 653, 400	8, 118, 965, 500	13, 613, 224, 000	13, 454, 859, 000	−794, 794, 400	88-507
Military construction	1, 879, 000, 000	1, 599, 014, 500	1, 582, 969, 000	1, 570, 968, 000	−308, 032, 000	88-576
Public works	4, 440, 749, 000	4, 325, 969, 200	4, 443, 283, 200	4, 430, 794, 700	−9, 954, 300	88-511
Foreign aid	3, 958, 377, 000	3, 739, 249, 400	3, 662, 077, 000	3, 662, 077, 000	−296, 300, 000	88-
Supplemental	1, 480, 951, 368	998, 645, 874	1, 220, 098, 068	1, 117, 196, 068	−363, 755, 300	88-
Total, 1965 [1]	96, 479, 482, 813	86, 783, 409, 514	92, 971, 023, 578	93, 444, 543, 853	----------	----------
Grand total	98, 297, 358, 556	88, 430, 011, 203	94, 702, 348, 721	94, 962, 910, 996	−4, 134, 439, 560	----------
Total, loan authorization	(787, 400, 000)	(835, 400, 000)	(835, 400, 000)	(835, 400, 000)	(48, 000, 000)	----------

[1] Budget estimates for 1964 included in 1965 regular bills.

PRINTING AS SENATE DOCUMENT OF REPORT OF ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF 88TH CONGRESS, AND REVIEW OF THE LEGISLATIVE ACHIEVEMENTS OF THE PAST 4 YEARS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate Democratic Policy Committee be permitted to print as a Senate Document the yearend report of accomplishments and statistics for the 88th Congress, 2d session, together with a review of the legislative achievements over the past 4 years.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the legislative business, so far as bills are concerned, is now complete. But before I send to the desk the first of a number of resolutions, I take this occasion to express my thanks to the distinguished minority leader and to all Senators, both Republicans and Democrats, for the cooperation, understanding, tolerance, and courtesy which they have shown to me through the years.

I believe the record of this Congress is about as good a record as has been made by any single Congress in the annals of our Republic. In addition to the legislation which has been passed, I point out that this Congress has seen fit to reduce the budget request of the President in the approximate sum of $4 billion.

The results achieved by this Congress are not the sole result of the two-to-one Democratic majority. Time and again from 4 to 10 Republican Senators furnished us with the margin of victory. So, any Senator, be he Democrat or Republican, should go home and take credit for what he or she has done to effect this record. It is a record based on impartiality and bipartisanship. It is a record of which the Nation can well be proud.

I send to the desk a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration. But, before that is brought up, may I at this time express my deepest thanks to the staff members on both the Republican and Democratic side. I deeply appreciate all they have done. They have performed nobly, and with great diligence. They have been strong right arms to the leadership and, without their dedicated services—and this includes all of them—the Senate would not have functioned as well as it did this past year.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be stated.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 379), as follows:

> *Resolved,* That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the Presiding Officer to join a similar committee of the House of Representatives to notify the President of the United States that the two Houses have completed the business of the session and are ready to adjourn unless he has some further communication to make to them.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair appoints the distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] and the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] as a committee to notify the President.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR EVERETT DIRKSEN

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, as we are about to conclude the labors of the 88th Congress, I wish for a moment to stand and pay my very deep respects to the leader of the Republican Party in the Senate—a giant among all his fellow citizens, a great and a good man, one whose voice here and across America has been the voice of leadership, mellifluous and persuasive—EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN.

Senator DIRKSEN has continued to add luster to his name in the manner in which he has supplied courage, high ability, and undeviating devotion to the cause of the United States on this troubled globe.

Free from malice, bitterness or envy, EVERETT DIRKSEN has been big, and he has been great. Many, far more skilled at recollection than I, have embellished this RECORD again and again as to the manner in which he led the Senate time and time again to legislative victories for the cause of American freedom and for the benefit of humankind. Surely, if the American adage, "equal treatment under law," has meaning in our country today, it is because of the long and tedious hours, days, weeks, and months in which he so assiduously and freely gave himself to the cause of equal treatment under law. That is a cause in which the American people believe. It is a cause which triumphed in this session. It represents another milestone in the progress of our country and the cause of mankind.

In those grave and difficult hours, when the clouds of conflict and danger arose over the horizon, the voice of the Republican from Illinois, who thought not in partisanship terms, but in terms of his land, once again led to great legislative triumphs to keep this country strong, that she might remain free. He demonstrated to the world that this country, while keeping strong, wished to explore timelessly the manner in which we might cooperate with any country in the world which agreed to our goals for peace with justice for all nations and states around the world.

With all my Republican colleagues, whatever their ideological persuasion may be, I shall never forget the manner in which our leader has discharged his duty to his country, to his political party, and to his beloved friends on this side of the aisle.

But it does not stop there, for our leader has been a Member of the Senate, and this dividing aisle has not divided his friendships. As we leave, he takes with him the friendship, the fondness, and the respect of all of us.

I must add that we on the Republican side salute the leader of your party, Mr. President (Mr. Metcalf in the chair), as a good, gallant, able, and patriotic man whose differences of opinion as they have arisen have never been a cause for exasperated feelings, for he has been devoted to the public trust.

I thank the staff—our staff and your staff, Mr. President; the staff of the Senate—and all who have helped to make this the greatest legislative body in all the world.

AMENDMENTS TO THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, there are many accomplishments of the present session of the Congress about which the junior Senator from Louisiana feels very happy. Unfortunately, this Congress has not done as much as it should, in the judgment of the junior Senator from Louisiana. I wish the record to show that if the Senate votes today to adjourn sine die, the junior Senator from Louisiana will not be in favor of the action.

One reason I make that statement is that while Congress passed a big pay raise bill and led the charge by giving Members of Congress a $7,500 increase, and while we voted great tax reductions which benefited corporations and individuals—while we did a great amount for a number of people, if this Congress adjourns sine die today, it will have ignored relief for many people. I have in mind the poor, the needy, and the underprivileged. I have in mind the aged, and the orphaned children. A bill which would give those people relief is in conference between the Senate and the House, and as Senators well know—and the press has so advised the Nation—that conference is now deadlocked on the issue of medical care.

It is the judgment of the Senator from Louisiana that the Congress should remain in session 2 or 3 additional weeks. If we could do so, we could find some way in which to resolve the complete impasse that exists between the House and the Senate on the issue of health care. I make that statement because in my judgment Representative Wilbur Mills, chairman of the House Committee on Ways and Means, is one of the truly great men in this Congress. He is not an arrogant or unreasonable man. He is a very considerate person. He has given the Senate every consideration for which we could ask except with reference to that particular amendment. He has his own views. He represents the House. I believe he does so extremely well. It is the judgment of the junior Senator from Louisiana that we could find a way to resolve the impasse if we only had more time to work on it.

I hope that if the Senate does adjourn sine die, the President will call us back in November and give us an opportunity to continue to work on that subject to see to it that, starting in January, every aged person who might be poor, to the extent that he is receiving a public welfare check, would receive an automatic increase as a result of the Federal matching funds provided in the social security bill, and that every mother with an orphaned child in a family that might have lost the breadwinner and the husband would receive additional assistance. I would hope that the cash benefit increase for every aged person drawing social security would become law.

My estimate is that there are 20 million people whom I chose to call the least of them all, if I may use the phrase of the Master, who will be ignored if this Congress quits sine die and fails to come back.

In other respects, Congress has made a magnificent record. I am extremely happy that we were able to agree to the veterans compensation bill that will increase pensions for veterans who have suffered some disability. It will give them much needed benefits, to which they are entitled.

We finally resolved the 10-year impasse between the House and the Senate on veterans insurance. There are potentially 16 million veterans who would benefit from the Senate amendment. The House went halfway. It took care of 8 million veterans who may take out national service life insurance, but it takes care of those who could not get insurance from private plans. The compromise was that if a veteran has any disability, even zero percent, provided it were of a serious enough nature that it would entitle him to a pension, he is eligible to take out national service life insurance.

In my judgment, when this bill becomes law and veterans begin to take out insurance, our friends in the House of Representatives are going to find it so popular that next year the House Members will agree to have the other 8 million veterans covered.

It has been a 10-year fight. We passed such measures by unanimous consent, but could not get to a conference with the House. I am glad to say that once we were able to get our feet under the same conference table with Members of the other body, we were able to make an adjustment. This will be a monumental piece of legislation for our veterans.

It was a great pleasure to me, as manager of the tax cut bill this year, that we passed the Revenue Act. The measure we passed was not an increase in taxes, but a tax cut, and was one of the best revenue acts Congress has passed in a long time. I think it was the most significant one passed in this century.

We have done well in these fields, but I regret to see Congress adjourn without having done something for the aged, especially the needy on social security pensions, who are entitled to consideration which they would get if Congress did not adjourn today.

As one who did not vote for the medicare amendment to the social security bill, and as one who fought against it, but as a conferee on the part of the Senate, I do not believe a loyal conferee of the Senate is entitled to give up until we have tried as best we can. A while longer and I think we could get medicare.

While that measure was voted for by a small majority in this body, those who voted for it are zealous in their feelings as to what should be done in that field. It is my belief that if the President calls us back into session in November, we shall be able to find a way to clear the impasse between the Senate and House. I was of the opinion that we could have come to an agreement if we had had enough time to do the matter justice.

NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, at the request of the Senate, the distinguished minority leader and I have telephoned the President of the United States and informed him that the business of the Senate was done. When we, following our mandate from this body, gave him that information, he was in agreement. As a matter of fact, he seemed to be somewhat relieved.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I reminded the President that in other Congresses, when he was a Member of this body, and we used to telephone the incumbent President of the Senate, it sometimes took place at midnight. I recall one occasion when we got the President out of bed at 6 o'clock in the morning, out of a deep sleep. I am sure he was enjoying it. But here we are in the very middle of Saturday afternoon, with football warriors clashing all over the countryside. So as we hear the sounds of creaking collarbones, we telephone the President at mid-day to tell him we have finished our labors.

The President was in good humor, and we tried to assure him we were in good humor here.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Was the President also informed that we regret we were not able to pass the sugar bill in this session? I see the able Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Inouye] smiling. So far as he is concerned, no act is so much the better. I also hope we can work on that act before the first of the year.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Would the Senator like to have us call the President back?

TRIBUTE TO SENATE LEADERSHIP

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Although Vermonters as a rule are restricted in the use of superlatives, and I have used mine up for the week, yet I wish to apply what I have left to my credit to the leadership of the Senate on both sides of the aisle, because the leadership we have enjoyed under Senators Dirksen and Mansfield is indeed open to superlatives. I have never known a Congress in which the leadership enjoyed the confidence and respect of Members on both sides of the aisle to the extent that our two leaders have while they have been in their respective positions.

Although I have no serious regrets about going home after a 21-month stay here, I look forward to serving under them in January.

SENATORS' TRIBUTE TO MIKE MANSFIELD AND HUBERT HUMPHREY

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, the 88th Congress has been an unusually productive and progressive one. Many Members, both sides of the aisle, have contributed to this success but I should particularly like to commend my two leaders on this side—our Democratic Majority Leader MIKE MANSFIELD and our majority whip and next Vice President, HUBERT HUMPHREY.

MIKE MANSFIELD in his completely honorable, quiet, and considerable way, has guided the Senate to this pinnacle of accomplishment; without fanfare or hoopla. He was responsible for developing a high sense of cooperation with the members of the minority, and with this cooperation we have achieved milestones in the legislative field. No man has worked harder, or with greater consideration for his fellow Senators.

MIKE MANSFIELD can take pride in this Congress, and the good people of Montana can certainly take pride in him. He will leave us for a few weeks to go back to the hustings in his State. He carries from Washington our affection and very best wishes, and can expect a warm welcome when he returns in January.

Another indispensable part of the team, HUBERT HUMPHREY, is leaving the Senate, in one sense I hope, to come back to us as our Presiding Officer. We will miss his dash and hustle, the challenging and provocative ideas he has put forth, his cheerful and effective leadership in committee and on the floor. As he goes forth, carrying the program for the great society under the banner of our great President Lyndon B. Johnson to the people of this Nation, we in the Senate take comfort in the fact that our next Vice President is a man of outstanding ability and good sense.

HUBERT HUMPHREY too, will be back with us in January, and we all can look forward to his first official remarks as he convenes the Senate in the 89th Congress.

RESOLUTION FOR ADJOURNMENT SINE DIE

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a concurrent resolution from the House of Representatives, which the clerk will read.

The clerk read the resolution (H. Con. Res. 371), as follows:

> *Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring)*, That the two Houses of Congress shall adjourn on Saturday, October 3, 1964, and that when they adjourn on said day, they stand adjourned sine die.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was considered and agreed to.

THANKS OF THE SENATE TO THE PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I send a resolution to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 380) was read by the legislative clerk, as follows:

> *Resolved*, That the thanks of the Senate are hereby tendered to the Honorable CARL HAYDEN, President pro tempore of the Senate, for the courteous, dignified, and impartial manner in which he has presided over its deliberations during the 2d session of the 88th Congress.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

THANKS OF THE SENATE TO THE ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 381) was read by the legislative clerk, as follows:

> *Resolved*, That the thanks of the Senate are hereby tendered to the Honorable LEE METCALF, Acting President pro tempore of the Senate, for the courteous, dignified, and impartial manner in which he has presided over its deliberations during the second session of the Eighty-eighth Congress.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

AUTHORITY TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 372, which was read, as follows:

> *Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring)*, That notwithstanding the sine die adjournment of the two Houses, the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President pro tempore of the Senate be, and they are hereby, authorized to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the concurrent resolution is agreed to.

AUTHORITY FOR SECRETARY TO RECEIVE MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the final adjournment of the present session of the Congress, the Secretary be, and he is hereby authorized to receive messages from the House of Representatives.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZATION TO PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE TO MAKE APPOINTMENTS TO COMMISSIONS OR COMMITTEES

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I submit a resolution and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 382) was read, as follows:

> *Resolved*, That notwithstanding the final adjournment of the present session of the Congress, the President pro tempore of the Senate be, and he is hereby, authorized to make appointments to commissions or committees authorized by law, by concurrent action of the two Houses, or by order of the Senate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

AUTHORIZATION FOR INSERTIONS IN RECORD FOLLOWING ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators may be permitted to make insertions in the RECORD following the adjournament of Congress until the last edition authorized by the Joint Committee on Printing is published; but this order shall not apply to any subject matter which may have occurred or to any speech delivered subsequent to the adjournment of Congress.

PRINTING OF COMMITTEE ACTIVITY REPORTS

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, with reference to the printing of committee activity reports for the session, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Printing, I remind the chairmen of all committees that the Joint Committee on Printing has very properly ruled that the printing of such reports, both as committee prints and in the RECORD, is duplication, the cost of which cannot be justified.

It is requested that committee chairmen decide whether they wish these reports printed as committee prints or in the RECORD, since the Government Printing Office will be directed not to print them both ways.

MEETING OF 89TH CONGRESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate House Joint Resolution 1192, providing that the 89th Congress shall assemble at noon on Monday, January 4, 1965, which was read twice by its title.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

ADJOURNMENT SINE DIE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 41 minutes p.m.) the Senate, in accordance with House Concurrent Resolution 371, adjourned sine die.

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

Under authority of the order of the Senate of October 3, 1964, the Secretary of the Senate, subsequent to the sine die adjournment of the Senate, received a message from the House of Representatives, on October 3, 1964, which announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 3074) to give the consent of Congress to the construction of certain international bridges, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 10820. An act for the relief of Mrs. Michiko Miyazaki Williams;

H.R. 11317. An act for the relief of Soo Bong Kim; and

H.R. 11956. An act for the relief of Woo Soon Kook.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and, pursuant to the order of the Senate of October 3, 1964, they were signed by the President pro tempore on October 5, 1964:

S. 646. An act to regulate the location of chanceries and other business offices of foreign governments in the District of Columbia;

S. 1147. An act to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to construct and maintain an adequate system of roads and trails for the national forests, and for other purposes;

S. 1593. An act to amend section 14 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1954 concerning the interstate planning and coordination of the Great River Road;

S. 2460. An act to amend the act of July 13, 1959, so as to extend the period of time within which certain construction may be undertaken by the State of Missouri on lands conveyed to such State by the United States;

S. 2649. An act to designate as the Graham Burke Pumping Plant the pumping plant being constructed in the State of Arkansas as part of the White River backwater unit of the Lower Mississippi River flood control project;

S. 2654. An act to change the name of the canal, known as the Bay Head-Manasquan Canal and as the Manasquan River-Barnegat Bay Canal, to Point Pleasant Canal;

S. 2968. An act to amend subsection 120(f) of title 23, United States Code;

S. 3060. An act to amend and extend the National Defense Education Act of 1958 and to extend Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress (federally affected areas);

S. 3143. An act to designate as Clair Engle Lake the reservoir created by the Trinity Dam, Central Valley project, California; and

S. 3162. An act to amend section 105(a) of the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1965, with respect to the disclosure in reports required thereunder of the names of persons who have appeared as witnesses before committees sitting in executive session.

Under authority of the order of the Senate of October 3, 1964, the Secretary of the Senate, on October 5, 1964, received a message from the House of Representatives, announcing that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the President pro tempore on October 6, 1964:

S. 1684. An act for the relief of Fotinin Dimantopoulou;

S. 2499. An act for the relief of Leobardo L. Gonzalez;

S. 2698. An act for the relief of Linus Han;

S. 2730. An act for the relief of Dr. Jorge A. Picaza;

S. 2759. An act for the relief of Kim Sook Hee and Kim Lou;

S. 3035. An act to provide for the disposition of judgment funds now on deposit to the credit of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians;

H.R. 1179. An act for the relief of Basilio King, his wife, and their children;

H.R. 1927. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to revise the pension program for veterans of World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict, and their widows and children, and for other purposes;

H.R. 2434. An act to amend section 560 of title 38, United States Code, to permit the payment of special pension to holders of the Congressional Medal of Honor awarded such medal for actions not involving conflict with an enemy, and for other purposes;

H.R. 4649. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to authorize the use of certain volatile fruit-flavored concentrates in the cellar treatment of wine, and for other purposes;

H.R. 5871. An act to modify the retirement benefits of the judges of the District of Columbia court of general sessions, the District of Columbia court of appeals, and the juvenile court of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H.R. 8427. An act to provide for the establishment and maintenance of a Central Intelligence Agency retirement and disability system for a limited number of employees, and for other purposes;

H.R. 9393. An act to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide full retroactivity for disability determinations, to extend the period within which ministers may elect coverage, and to validate wages erroneously reported for certain engineering aids employed by soil and water conservation districts in Oklahoma, and for other purposes;

H.R. 9976. An act for the relief of Elmer Levy;

H.R. 10473. An act to extend the period during which Federal payments may be made for foster care in child-care institutions under the program of aid to families with dependent children under title IV of the Social Security Act, and for other purposes;

H.R. 11380. An act to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes;

H.R. 11812. An act making aprpopriations for Foreign Assistance and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes;

H.R. 12259. An act to amend the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949 to provide for the determination of the amounts of claims of nationals of the United States against the Government of Cuba;

H.R. 12318. An act to provide an equitable system for the classification of certain positions under the House of Representatives, and for other purposes;

H.R. 12633. An act making supplement appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 1192. Joint resolution fixing the time of assembly of the 89th Congress.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

The Secretary of the Senate, on October 5, presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 646. An act to regulate the location of chanceries and other business offices of foreign governments in the District of Columbia;

S. 1147. An act to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to construct and maintain an adequate system of roads and trails for the national forests, and for other purposes;

S. 1593. An act to amend section 14 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1954 concerning the interstate planning and coordination of the Great River Road;

S. 2460. An act to amend the act of July 13, 1959, so as to extend the period of time within which certain construction may be undertaken by the State of Missouri on lands conveyed to such State by the United States;

S. 2649. An act to designate as the Graham Burke Pumping Plant the pumping plant being constructed in the State of Arkansas as part of the White River backwater unit of the lower Mississippi River flood control project;

S. 2654. An act to change the name of the canal, known as the Bay Head-Manasquan Canal and as the Manasquan River-Barnegat Bay Canal, to Point Pleasant Canal;

S. 2968. An act to amend subsection 120(f) of title 23, United States Code;

S. 3060. An act to amend and extend the National Defense Education Act of 1958 and to extend Public Law 815 and 874, 81st Congress (federally affected areas);

S. 3143. An act to designate as Clair Engle Lake the reservoir created by the Trinity Dam, Central Valley project, California; and

S. 3162. An act to amend section 105(a) of the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1965, with respect to the disclosure in reports required thereunder of the names of persons who have appeared as witnesses before committees sitting in executive session.

The Secretary of the Senate, on October 6, 1964, presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 1684. An act for the relief of Fotinin Dimantopoulou;

S. 2499. An act for the relief of Leobardo L. Gonzalez;

S. 2698. An act for the relief of Linus Han;

S. 2730. An act for the relief of Dr. Jorge A. Picaza;

S. 2759. An act for the relief of Kim Sook and Kim Lou; and

S. 3035. An act to provide for the disposition of judgment funds now on deposit to the credit of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians.

APPROVAL OF SENATE BILLS AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

The President of the United States, subsequent to sine die adjournment of the Senate, notified the Secretary of the Senate that on the following dates he had approved and signed the following bills:

On October 2, 1964:

S. 2049. An act to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to accept gifts and bequests for the purposes of the Department of Commerce, and for other purposes.

On October 3, 1964:

S. 1082. An act to establish in the Treasury a correctional industries fund for the government of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

On October 6, 1964:

S. 1024. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to pay relocation costs made necessary by actions of the District of Columbia government, and for other purposes.

On October 8, 1964:

S. 653. An act to provide an adequate basis for administration of the Lake Mead National Recreation Area, Ariz., and Nev., and for other purposes;

S. 1531. An act to increase the appropriation authorization for the completion of the construction of the irrigation and power systems of the Flathead Indian irrigation project, Montana; and

S. 2687. An act to extend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, and for other purposes.

On October 13, 1964:

S. 646. An act to regulate the location of chanceries and other business offices of foreign governments in the District of Columbia;

S. 1147. An act to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to construct and maintain an adequate system of roads and trails for the national forests, and for other purposes;

S. 1593. An act to amend section 14 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1954, concerning the interstate planning and coordination of the Great River Road;

S. 1640. An act for the relief of certain employees of the Alaska Railroad;

S. 1684. An act for the relief of Fotini Dimantopoulou;

S. 2180. An act to amend title VII of the Public Health Service Act so as to extend to qualified school of optometry and students of optometry those provisions thereof relating to student loan programs;

S. 2460. An act to amend the act of July 13, 1959, so as to extend the period of time within which certain construction may be undertaken by the State of Missouri on lands conveyed to such State by the United States;

S. 2499. An act for the relief of Leobardo L. Gonzalez;

S. 2649. An act to designate as the Graham Burke Pumping Plant the pumping plant being constructed in the State of Arkansas as part of the White River backwater unit of the lower Mississippi River flood control project;

S. 2654. An act to change the name of the canal, known as the Bay Head-Manasquan Canal and as the Manasquan River-Barnegat Bay Canal, to Point Pleasant Canal;

S. 2698. An act for the relief of Linus Han;

S. 2730. An act for the relief of Dr. Jorge A. Picaza;

S. 2759. An act for the relief of Kim Sook Hee and Kim Lou;

S. 2968. An act to amend subsection 120(f) of title 23, United States Code;

S. 3035. An act to provide for the disposition of judgment funds now on deposit to the credit of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians;

S. 3143. An act to designate as Clair Engle Lake the reservoir created by the Trinity Dam, Central Valley project, California;

S. 3162. An act to amend section 105(a) of the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1965, with respect to the disclosure in reports required thereunder of the names of persons who have appeared as witnesses before committees sitting in executive session; and

S. 3174. An act to amend section 5 of the Employment Act of 1946.

On October 16, 1964:

S. 3060. An act to amend and extend the National Defense Education Act of 1958 and to extend Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress (federally affected areas).

APPOINTMENTS BY THE PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of October 3, 1964, the President pro tempore, on October 9, 1964, designated the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY] as a delegate to the Inter-American Economic and Social Council at the ministerial level, to be held in Lima, Peru, December 4 to 12, 1964.

Also, on October 9, 1964, the President pro tempore designated the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] as delegates to the 10th annual meeting of the International North Pacific Fisheries Commission to be held in Tokyo, Japan, to convene November 16, 1964.

Also, on October 9, 1964, the President pro tempore designated the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], and on October 19, 1964, designated the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] as delegates to the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration to be held in Geneva, Switzerland, from November 9 to 14, 1964.

Also, on October 20, 1964, the President pro tempore designated the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK] as members of the Lewis and Clark Trail Commission.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate October 3, 1964:

POSTMASTERS

TENNESSEE

Rodney M. Bumpus, Clarksville.
Norman F. Hutchinson, Murfreesboro.
John M. Mitchell, Spencer.
Harold S. Parks, Spring Hill.

OKLAHOMA

J. Patrick Moore, Bristow.
Basil D. Tedlock, Chouteau.
Grant E. Stout, Claremore.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 3, 1964

The House met at 11 o'clock a.m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

I Samuel 7:12: *Hitherto hath the Lord blessed us.*

O Thou infinite and eternal God, we rejoice that the coming in and the going out of all our days are in the keeping and control of Thy kind and beneficent providence.

Grant that, as the hour for adjournment of the 88th Congress draws nigh, we may be grateful for the high and holy privilege we have had of walking and working together in the service of our God, our country, and humanity.

May we have within our hearts the testimony that we have sincerely sought to incorporate Thy divine will into all the legislation that has been proposed and enacted.

We leave this Chamber, commending and committing one another to Thy love and care, and beseeching Thee to bestow Thy grace and benediction upon our President, our Speaker, the Members of Congress, and all who have rendered service in various capacities.

May the Lord bless us and keep us; the Lord make His face to shine upon us; the Lord lift the light of His countenance upon us and give us peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries.

PENSION PROGRAM FOR VETERANS

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 1927) to amend title 38, United States Code, to revise the pension program for veterans of World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict, and their widows and children, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. 1930)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 1927) to amend title 38, United States Code, to revise the pension program for veterans of World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict, and their widows and children, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 4.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, and 14 and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

Page 4, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out line 9 and all that follows through line 11 on page 13, and insert:

"§ 725. Limited period for acquiring insurance

"(a) Any person (other than a person referred to in subsection (f) of this section) heretofore eligible to apply for National Service Life Insurance after October 7, 1940, and before January 1, 1957, who is found by the Administrator to be suffering (1) from a service-connected disability or disabilities for which compensation would be payable if 10 per centum or more in degree and except for which such person would be insurable according to the standards of good health established by the Administrator; or (2) from a non-service-connected disability which renders such person uninsurable according to the standards of good health established by the Administrator and such person establishes to the satisfaction of the Administrator that he is unable to obtain commercial life insurance at a substandard rate, shall, upon application in writing made within one year after the effective date of this section, compliance with the health requirements of this section and payment of the required premiums, be granted insurance under this section.

"(b) If, notwithstanding the applicant's service-connected disability, he is insurable according to the standards of good health established by the Administrator, the insurance granted under this section shall be issued upon the same terms and conditions as are contained in the standard policies of National Service Life Insurance except (1) five-year level premium term insurance may not be issued; (2) the net premium rates shall be based on the 1958 Commissioners Standard Ordinary Basic Mortality Table, increased at the time of issue by such an amount as the Administrator determines to be necessary for sound actuarial operations, and thereafter such premiums may be adjusted as the Administrator determines to be so necessary but at intervals of not less than two years; (3) an additional premium to cover administrative costs to the Government as determined by the Administrator at times of issue shall be charged for insurance issued under this subsection and for any total disability income provision attached thereto, and thereafter such costs may be adjusted as the Administrator determines to be necessary but at intervals of not less than five years; (4) all cash, loan, extended and paid-up insurance values shall be based on the 1958 Commissioners Standard Ordinary Basic Mortality Table; (5) all settlements on policies involving annuities shall be calculated on the basis of The Annuity Table for 1949; (6) all calculations in connection with insurance issued under this subsection shall be based on interest at the rate of 3½ per centum per annum; (7) the insurance shall include such other changes in terms and conditions as the Administrator determines to be reasonable and practicable; (8) the insurance and any total disability income provision attached thereto shall be on a nonparticipating basis and all premiums and other collections therefor shall be credited to a revolving fund established in the Treasury of the United States and the payments on such insurance and total disability income provision shall be made directly from such fund.

"(c) If the applicant's service-connected disability or disabilities render him uninsurable according to the standards of good health established by the Administrator, or if the applicant has a non-service-connected disability which renders him uninsurable according to the standards of good health established by the Administrator and such person establishes to the satisfaction of the Administrator that he is unable to obtain commercial life insurance at a substandard rate and such uninsurability existed as of the date of approval of this section, the insurance granted under this section shall be issued upon the same terms and conditions as are contained in standard policies of National Service Life Insurance, except (1) five-year level premium term insurance may not be issued; (2) the premiums charged for the insurance issued under this subsection shall be increased at the time of issue by such an amount as the Administrator determines to be necessary for sound actuarial operations and thereafter such premiums may be adjusted from time to time as the Administrator determines to be necessary; for the purpose of any increase at time of issue or later adjustment the service-connected group and the non-service-connected group may be separately classified; (3) an additional premium to cover administrative costs to the Government as determined by the Administrator at the time of issue shall be charged for insurance issued under this subsection and for any total disability income provision attached thereto (for which the insured may subsequently become eligible) and thereafter such costs may be adjusted as the Administrator determines to be necessary but at intervals of not less than five years and for this purpose the service-connected and non-service-connected can be separately classified; (4) the insurance and any total disability income provision attached thereto shall be on a nonparticipating basis; (5) all settlements on policies involving annuities shall be calculated on the basis of The Annuity Table for 1949; (6) all calculations in connection with insurance issued under this subsection shall be based on interest at the rate of 3½ per centum per annum; (7) the insurance shall include such other changes in terms and conditions as the Administrator determines to be reasonable and practicable; (8) all premiums and other collections on the insurance and any total disability income provision attached thereto shall be credited to the National Service Life Insurance appropriation, and the payments on such insurance and total disability income provision shall be made directly from such appropriation. Appropriations necessary to carry out the provisions of this subsection are hereby authorized.

"(d) (1) There is authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be required to provide capital for the revolving fund to carry out the purpose of subsection (b) of this section. Such appropriations shall be advanced to the revolving fund as needed and shall bear interest as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the average yield on all marketable interest-bearing obligations of the United States of comparable maturities then forming a part of the public debt and shall be repaid to the Treasury over a reasonable period of time.

"(2) The Administrator is authorized to set aside out of the revolving fund established under subsection (b) of this section such reserve amounts as may be required under accepted actuarial principles to meet all liabilities on insurance issued under subsection (b) of this section and any total disability income provision attached thereto. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to invest in and to sell and retire special interest-bearing obligations of the United States for the account of the revolving fund. Such obligations issued for this purpose shall have maturities fixed with due regard for the needs of the fund and shall bear interest at a rate equal to the average market yield (computed by the Secretary of the Treasury on the basis of market quotations as of the end of the calendar month next preceding the date of issue) on all marketable interest-bearing obligations of the United States then forming a part of the public debt which are not due or callable until after the expiration of 4 years from the end of such calendar month; except that where such average market yield is not a multiple of one-eighth of 1 per centum, the rate of interest of such obligation shall be the multiple of one-eighth of 1 per centum nearest such market yield.

"(3) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 782 of this title, the Administrator shall, from time to time, determine the administrative costs to the Government which in his judgment are properly allocable to insurance issued under this section and any total disability income provision attached thereto, and shall transfer from the revolving fund, or the National Service Life Insurance appropriation, as appropriate, the amount of such cost allocable to the Veterans' Administration to the appropriation 'General Operating Expenses, Veterans' Administration', and the remainder of such cost to the general fund receipts in the Treasury. The initial administrative costs of issuing insurance under this section and any total disability income provision attached thereto shall be so transferred over such period of time as the Administrator determines to be reasonable and practicable.

"(e) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 782 of this title, a medical examination (including any supplemental examination or tests) when required of an applicant for issuance of insurance under this section or any total disability income provisions attached thereto shall be at the applicant's own expense by a duly licensed physician.

"(f) No insurance shall be granted under this section to any person referred to in section 107 of this title or to any person while on active duty or active duty for training under a call or order to such duty for a period of thirty-one days or more."

And the Senate agree to the same.

O. E. Teague,
W. J. Bryan Dorn,
Walter S. Baring,
R. A. Everett,
W. H. Ayres,
Ross Adair,
John P. Saylor,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Harry Byrd,
Russell Long,
George Smathers,
Clinton Anderson,
Paul Douglas,
John Williams,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

Statement

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 1927) to amend title 38, United States Code, to revise the pension program for veterans of World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict, and their widows and children, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate accepted most of the House provisions, but added rates which were more liberal than those approved by the House on August 11, 1964, when it passed the bill by a unanimous vote of 388 ayes to 0 noes.

Amendment No. 1: Section 3 of the House bill removed from existing law the requirement that a veteran who has attained age 65 must have a 10-percent disability and that his unemployability be attributable thereto in order to be eligible to receive a veteran's pension.

A survey conducted by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs in the month of April 1964 covering all 68 regional offices of the Veterans' Administration showed that of 10,587 pension cases denied for all reasons, 5 were denied for inability to show a 10-percent disability at age 65; 60 were unable to show unemployability.

The Senate amendment struck out this provision of the House bill.

The House recedes.

Amendment No. 3: Under existing law, whenever there is no widow entitled to pension there is paid to the child or children pension at the monthly rate of $35 for one child, and $15 for each additional child. The Senate amendment added a new section to the bill increasing the $35 amount to $38.

The House recedes.

Amendment No. 4: In determining a veteran's eligibility for pension under existing law, the first $1,200 of the wife's income is excluded, but the balance is counted.

The House bill proposed to exclude $1,200 or all earned income, whichever was greater.

The Senate amendment proposed to exclude $1,500 or all earned income, whichever was lesser.

The Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 5: Section 8 of the House bill provided that in the case of a veteran who is in receipt of an aid and attendance allowance and is hospitalized, the allowance will not be discontinued until the first day of the second month during his admission. The Senate amendment struck out this provision.

The House recedes. An identical provision was included in Public Law 88-450 which was enacted after the bill passed the House.

Amendments Nos. 6, 7, 8, 9, and 11: These amendments make technical changes in the House bill.

The House recedes in order to conform to the other action agreed upon by the committee of conference.

Amendments 10, 12, 13, and 14: Sections 11 and 12(b) of the House bill provided an effective date of November 1, 1964, for the 10-percent income exclusion factor. Section 12(b) of the House bill also provided that the 10-percent income exclusion factor made by the amendment to section 503(6) of title 38, United States Code, would not apply to any individual receiving pension on October 31, 1964, under chapter 15 of title 38, or subsequently determined entitled to such pension on such date, until his contributions have been recouped under the provisions of section 503(6) of title 38, United States Code, as in effect on October 31, 1964.

The Senate amendments struck out the effective dates of November 1, 1964, thus making the 10-percent income exclusion factors effective on the general effective date of the bill, January 1, 1965. The Senate amendment also struck out the two October 31, 1964, dates and substituted for each the date of December 31, 1964.

The House recedes.

Amendment No. 15: No provision relating to insurance appeared in the House version; the Senate added an amendment permitting the reopening of national service life insurance for all veterans who served in the Armed Forces between October 8, 1940, and December 31, 1956—healthy veterans and those with service-connected disabilities. The plans, under the Senate version, would have included term and permanent plans.

The Senate also added the form of modified life insurance which was passed by the House in the form of H.R. 220 in the 1st session of the 88th Congress. Similar proposals had passed the House in the 86th and 87th Congresses. All of these proposals were offered in an effort to prevent the World War II policyholders from having to pay the higher term rates for the advanced ages or face the probability of losing their insurance. The conference agreement retains this feature.

The conference agreement on the other insurance features permits a reopening of national service life insurance for 1 year for service-connected disabled as well as a limited group of nonservice connected who are generally rated as uninsurable or who can only obtain insurance at substandard rates. In all cases administrative costs would be borne by the insured. This is estimated to be $5 per policy per year. Examples of types of disabilities which are not compensable under the provisions of the Veterans' Administration's schedule for rating disabilities and which would not qualify for this insurance are—a healed appendectomy scar, tinnitus not associated with trauma, and dental disorders such as treatable carious teeth, replaceable missing teeth, pyorrhea, and vincent's stomatitis.

Approximately 3,300,000 service-connected veterans are estimated to be eligible for this insurance and an unknown number of nonservice-connected veterans.

The reopening premiums are:

Annual net costs per $10,000 insurance

	Ordinary life		
	Age 35	Age 45	Age 55
Preferred risk, service connected, insurable	$149.20	$228.40	$365.40
Substandard risk, service and nonservice connected	200.80	287.10	451.30

And the Senate agree to the same.

OLIN E. TEAGUE,
W. J. BRYAN DORN,
WALTER S. BARING,
R. A. EVERETT,
W. H. AYRES,
ROSS ADAIR,
JOHN P. SAYLOR,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (interrupting the reading of the statement). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the statement of the managers be dispensed with and that it be printed in full at this point in the RECORD, together with a comparative table showing the various legislative stages of this legislation to be printed immediately following the statement of the managers.

There was no objection.

The statement and comparative table are as follows:

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 1927) to amend title 38, United States Code, to revise the pension program for veterans of World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict, and their widows and children, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate accepted most of the House provisions, but added rates which were more liberal than those approved by the House on August 11, 1964, when it passed the bill by a unanimous vote of 388 ayes to 0 noes.

Amendment No. 1: Section 3 of the House bill removed from existing law the requirement that a veteran who has attained age 65 must have a 10-percent disability and that his unemployability be attributable thereto in order to be eligible to receive a veteran's pension.

A survey conducted by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs in the month of April 1964 covering all 68 regional offices of the Veterans' Administration showed that of 10,587 pension cases denied for all reasons, 5 were denied for inability to show a 10-percent disability at age 65; 60 were unable to show unemployability.

The Senate amendment struck out this provision of the House bill.

The House recedes.

Amendment No. 3: Under existing law, whenever there is no widow entitled to pension there is paid to the child or children pension at the monthly rate of $35 for one child, and $15 for each additional child. The Senate amendment added a new section to the bill increasing the $35 amount to $38.

The House recedes.

Amendment No. 4: In determining a veteran's eligibility for pension under existing law, the first $1,200 of the wife's income is excluded, but the balance is counted.

The House bill proposed to exclude $1,200 or all earned income, whichever was greater.

The Senate amendment proposed to exclude $1,500 or all earned income, whichever was lesser.

The Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 5: Section 8 of the House bill provided that in the case of a veteran who is in receipt of an aid and attendance allowance and is hospitalized, the allowance will not be discontinued until the first day of the second month following his admission. The Senate amendment struck out this provision.

The House recedes. An identical provision was included in Public Law 88-450 which was enacted after the bill passed the House.

Amendments Nos. 6, 7, 8, 9, and 11: These amendments make technical changes in the House bill.

The House recedes in order to conform to the other action agreed upon by the committee of conference.

Amendments 10, 12, 13, and 14: Sections 11 and 12(b) of the House bill provided an effective date of November 1, 1964, for the 10-percent income exclusion factor. Section 12(b) of the House bill also provided that the 10-percent income exclusion factor made by the amendment to section 503(6) of title 38, United States Code, would not apply to any individual receiving pension on October 31, 1964, under chapter 15 of title 38, or subsequently determined entitled to such pension on such date, until his contributions have been recouped under the provisions of section 503(6) of title 38, United States Code, as in effect on October 31, 1964.

The Senate amendments struck out the effective dates of November 1, 1964, thus making the 10-percent income exclusion factors effective on the general effective date of the bill, January 1, 1965. The Senate amendment also struck out the two October 31, 1964, dates and substituted for each the date of December 31, 1964.

The House recedes.

Amendment No. 15: No provision relating to insurance appeared in the House version; the Senate added an amendment permitting the reopening of national service life insurance for all veterans who served in the Armed Forces between October 8, 1940, and December 31, 1956—healthy veterans and those with service-connected disabilities. The plans, under the Senate version, would have included term and permanent plans.

The Senate also added the form of modified life insurance which was passed by the House in the form of H.R. 220 in the 1st session of the 88th Congress. Similar proposals had passed the House in the 86th and 87th Congresses. All of these proposals were offered in an effort to prevent the World War II policyholders from having to pay the higher term rates for the advanced ages or face the probability of losing their insurance. The conference agreement retains this feature.

The conference agreement on the other insurance features permits a reopening of national service life insurance for 1 year for service-connected disabled as well as a limited group of nonservice connected who are generally rated as uninsurable or who can only obtain insurance at substandard rates. In all cases administrative costs would be borne by the insured. This is estimated to be $5 per policy per year. Examples of types of disabilities which are not compensable under the provisions of the Veterans' Administration's schedule for rating disabilities and which would not qualify for this insurance are—a healed appendectomy scar, tinnitus not associated with trauma, and dental disorders such as treatable carious teeth, replaceable missing teeth, pyorrhea, and vincent's stomatitis.

Approximately 3,300,000 service-connected veterans are estimated to be eligible for this insurance and an unknown number of nonservice-connected veterans.

The reopening premiums are:

Annual net costs per $10,000 insurance

	Ordinary life		
	Age 35	Age 45	Age 55
Preferred risk, service connected, insurable	$149.20	$228.40	$365.40
Substandard risk, service and nonservice connected	200.80	287.10	451.30

And the Senate agree to the same.

COMPARATIVE TABLE SHOWING IN THE FIRST COLUMN THE PRESENT PROVISIONS OF TITLE 38, UNITED STATES CODE; IN THE SECOND COLUMN THOSE PROVISIONS AS THEY WOULD HAVE BEEN AMENDED BY THE HOUSE PASSED BILL, H.R. 1927; IN THE THIRD COLUMN THOSE PROVISIONS AS THEY WOULD HAVE BEEN AMENDED BY THE SENATE AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 1927; AND IN THE FOURTH COLUMN THOSE PROVISIONS AS THEY WOULD BE AMENDED BY THE CONFERENCE AGREEMENT

LAW	H.R. 1927 AS PASSED HOUSE—SECTION 1	SENATE AMENDMENT—SECTION 1	CONFERENCE AGREEMENT—SECTION 1
Sec. 503(6), title 38, U.S.C. (6) Payments to an individual under public or private retirement, annuity, endowment, or similar plans or programs equal to his contributions thereto:	*Sec. 503(6), title 38, U.S.C.* (6) 10 per centum of the amount of payments to an individual under public or private retirement, annuity, endowment, or similar plans or programs;	Same as House passed bill.	Same as House passed bill.
* * * * *	* * * * *		
(Pars. (9)-(13) added by H.R. 1927.)	(9) amounts equal to amounts paid by a veteran for the last illness and burial of his deceased spouse or child;	Same as House passed bill.	Same as House passed bill.
	(10) profit realized from the disposition of real or personal property other than in the course of a business;	Same as House passed bill.	Same as House passed bill.
	(11) payments received for discharge of jury duty or obligatory civic duties;	Same as House passed bill.	Same as House passed bill.
	(12) payments of educational assistance allowance or special training allowance under chapter 35 of this title;	Same as House passed bill.	Same as House passed bill.
	(13) payments of bonus or similar cash gratuity by any State based on service in the Armed Forces.	Same as House passed bill.	Same as House passed bill.
	SECTION 2	SECTION 2	SECTION 2
Sec. 506(a)(2), title 38, U.S.C. (2) shall require that any such person file each year with the Veterans' Administration (on the form prescribed by him) a report showing the total income which he received during the preceding year, the corpus of his estate at the end of that year, and his estimate for the then current year of the total income he expects to receive and of any expected increase in the corpus of his estate; and	*Sec. 506(a)(2), title 38, U.S.C.* (2) shall require that any such person, other than a child, file each year with the Veterans' Administration (on the form prescribed by him) a report showing the total income which he received during the preceding year, the corpus of his estate at the end of that year, and his estimate for the then current year of the total income he expects to receive and of any expected increase in the corpus of his estate; and	Same as House passed bill.	Same as House passed bill.
	SECTION 3		
Sec. 521(a), title 38, U.S.C. Non-Service-Connected Disability Pension § 521. Veterans of World War I, World War II, or the Korean conflict (a) The Administrator shall pay to each veteran of World War I, World War II, or the Korean conflict, who meets the service requirements of this section, and who is permanently and totally disabled from non-service-connected disability not the result of the veterans' willful misconduct or vicious habits, pension at the rate prescribed by this section.	*Pension for non-service-connected disability or for age* § 521. Veterans of World War I, World War II, or the Korean conflict (a) The Administrator shall pay to each veteran of World War I, World War II, or the Korean conflict, who meets the service requirements of this section, and (1) who is sixty-five years of age or older, or (2) who is permanently and totally disabled from non-service-connected disability not the result of the veteran's willful misconduct or vicious habits, pension at the rate prescribed by this section.	No change in existing law made by Senate amendment.	No change in existing law made by Conference Agreement.

COMPARATIVE TABLE SHOWING IN THE FIRST COLUMN THE PRESENT PROVISIONS OF TITLE 38, UNITED STATES CODE; IN THE SECOND COLUMN THOSE PROVISIONS AS THEY WOULD HAVE BEEN AMENDED BY THE HOUSE PASSED BILL, H.R. 1927; IN THE THIRD COLUMN THOSE PROVISIONS AS THEY WOULD HAVE BEEN AMENDED BY THE SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 1927; AND IN THE FOURTH COLUMN THOSE PROVISIONS AS THEY WOULD BE AMENDED BY THE CONFERENCE AGREEMENT—Continued

LAW

Table in Sec. 521(b), title 38, U.S.C.

Single Veteran

Column I		Column II
Annual income		
More than— but	Equal to or less than—	
	$600	$85
$600	1,200	70
1,200	1,800	40

Table in Sec. 521(c), title 38, U.S.C.

Veteran With Dependents

Column I		Column II	Column III	Column IV
Annual income		One dependent	Two dependents	Three or more dependents
More than— but	Equal to or less than—			
	$1,000	$90	$95	$100
$1,000	2,000	75	75	75
2,000	3,000	45	45	45

Tables in Sec. 541 (b) and (c), title 38, U.S.C.

Widow Without Children

Column I		Column II
Annual income		
More than— but	Equal to or less than—	
	$600	$60
$600	1,200	45
1,200	1,800	25

Widow With a Child

Column I		Column II
Annual income		
More than— but	Equal to or less than—	
	$1,000	$75
$1,000	2,000	60
2,000	3,000	40

H.R. 1927 AS PASSED HOUSE

SECTION 4

Single Veteran

Column I		Column II
Annual income		
More than— but	Equal to or less than—	
	$800	$90
$800	1,300	70
1,300	1,800	40

Veteran With Dependents

Column I		Column II	Column III	Column IV
Annual income		One dependent	Two dependents	Three or more dependents
More than— but	Equal to or less than—			
	$1,200	$100	$105	$110
$1,200	2,200	75	75	75
2,200	3,000	45	45	45

Widow Without Children

Column I		Column II
Annual income		
More than— but	Equal to or less than—	
	$800	$65
$800	1,300	45
1,300	1,800	25

Widow With a Child

Column I		Column II
Annual income		
More than— but	Equal to or less than—	
	$1,200	$80
$1,200	2,200	60
2,200	3,000	40

SENATE AMENDMENT

SECTION 3

Single Veteran

Column I		Column II
Annual income		
More than— but	Equal to or less than—	
	$600	$100
$600	1,200	75
1,200	1,800	43

Veteran With Dependents

Column I		Column II	Column III	Column IV
Annual income		One dependent	Two dependents	Three or more dependents
More than— but	Equal to or less than—			
	$1,000	$105	$110	$115
$1,000	2,000	80	80	80
2,000	3,000	48	48	48

Widow Without Children

Column I		Column II
Annual income		
More than— but	Equal to or less than—	
	$600	$64
$600	1,200	48
1,200	1,800	27

Widow With a Child

Column I		Column II
Annual income		
More than— but	Equal to or less than—	
	$1,000	$80
$1,000	2,000	64
2,000	3,000	43

CONFERENCE AGREEMENT

SECTION 3

Single Veteran

Column I		Column II
Annual income		
More than— but	Equal to or less than—	
	$600	$100
$600	1,200	75
1,200	1,800	43

Veteran With Dependents

Column I		Column II	Column III	Column IV
Annual income		One dependent	Two dependents	Three or more dependents
More than— but	Equal to or less than—			
	$1,000	$105	$110	$115
$1,000	2,000	80	80	80
2,000	3,000	48	48	48

Widow Without Children

Column I		Column II
Annual income		
More than— but	Equal to or less than—	
	$600	$64
$600	1.200	48
1,200	1,800	27

Widow With a Child

Column I		Column II
Annual income		
More than— but	Equal to or less than—	
	$1,000	$80
$1,000	2,000	64
2,000	3,000	43

LAW	H.R. 1927 AS PASSED HOUSE	SENATE AMENDMENT	CONFERENCE AGREEMENT
Sec. 542(a), title 38, U.S.C. (a) Whenever there is no widow entitled to pension under section 541 of this title, the Administrator shall pay to the child or children of each veteran of World War I, World War II, or the Korean conflict who met the service requirements of section 521 of this title, or who at the time of his death was receiving (or entitled to receive) compensation or retirement pay for a service-connected disability, pension at the monthly rate of $35 for one child, and $15 for each additional child.	No change in existing law made by House passed bill.	SECTION 4 (a) Whenever there is no widow entitled to pension under section 541 of this title, the Administrator shall pay to the child or children of each veteran of World War I, World War II, or the Korean conflict who met the service requirements of section 521 of this title, or who at the time of his death was receiving (or entitled to receive) compensation or retirement pay for a service-connected disability, pension at the monthly rate of $38 for one child, and $15 for each additional child.	SECTION 4 (a) Whenever there is no widow entitled to pension under section 541 of this title, the Administrator shall pay to the child or children of each veteran of World War I, World War II, or the Korean conflict who met the service requirements of section 521 of this title, or who at the time of his death was receiving (or entitled to receive) compensation or retirement pay for a service-connected disability, pension at the monthly rate of $38 for one child, and $15 for each additional child.
Sec. 521(d), title 38, U.S.C. (d) If the veteran is in need of regular aid and attendance, the monthly rate payable to him under subsection (b) or (c) shall be increased by $70.	SECTION 5 (d) If the veteran is in need of regular aid and attendance, the monthly rate payable to him under subsection (b) or (c) shall be increased by $100.	SECTION 5 Same as House passed bill.	SECTION 5 Same as House passed bill.
(SEC. 521(e) added by H.R. 1927.)	SECTION 6(a) (e) If the veteran has a disability rated as permanent and total, and (1) has additional disability or disabilities independently ratable at 60 per centum or more, or, (2) by reason of his disability or disabilities, is permanently housebound but does not qualify for the aid and attendance rate under subsection (d) of this section, the monthly rate payable to him under subsection (b) or (c) shall be increased by $35.	SECTION 6(a) Same as House passed bill.	SECTION 6(a) Same as House passed bill.
Sec. 502(c), title 38, U.S.C. (SEC. 502(c) added by H.R. 1927.)	SECTION 6(b) (c) For the purposes of this chapter, the requirement of "permanently housebound" will be considered to have been met when the veteran is substantially confined to his house (ward or clinical areas, if institutionalized) or immediate premises due to a disability or disabilities which it is reasonably certain will remain throughout his lifetime.	SECTION 6(b) Same as House passed bill.	SECTION 6(b) Same as House passed bill.
Sec. 521(e), title 38, U.S.C. (e) For the purposes of this section— (1) in determining annual income, where a veteran is living with his spouse, all income of the spouse which is reasonably available to or for the veteran except $1,200 of such income shall be considered as the income of the veteran, unless in the judgment of the Administrator to do so would work a hardship upon the veteran;	SECTION 7 (f) For the purposes of this section— (1) in determining annual income, where a veteran is living with his spouse, all income of the spouse which is reasonably available to or for the veteran in excess of whichever is the greater, $1,200 or the total earned income of the spouse, shall be considered as the income of the veteran, unless in the judgment of the Administrator to do so would work a hardship upon the veteran;	SECTION 7 (f) For the purposes of this section— (1) in determining annual income, where a veteran is living with his spouse, all income of the spouse which is reasonably available to or for the veteran in excess of whichever is the lesser, $1,500 or the total earned income of the spouse, shall be considered as the income of the veteran, unless in the judgment of the Administrator to do so would work a hardship upon the veteran;	SECTION 7 Same as House passed bill.
Sec. 3203(f), title 38 U.S.C. (f) Where any veteran in receipt of an aid and attendance allowance described in section 314(r) of this title is hospitalized at Government expense, such allowance shall be discontinued from the first day of the second calendar month which begins after the date of his admission for such hospitalization for so long as such hospitalization continues. Any discontinuance required by administrative regulation, during hospitalization of a veteran by the Veterans' Administration, of increased pension based on need of regular aid and attendance or additional compensation based on need of regular aid	SECTION 8 Same as existing law. See section 5(a), Public Law 88–450, approved August 19, 1964.	No change in existing law made by Senate amendment because section 8 of House passed bill is the same as existing law.	A provision identical to section 8 of the House passed bill was enacted into law by section 5(a) of Public Law 88–450 after the House passage of H.R. 1927. Therefore, no change in existing law is made by the Conference Agreement.

COMPARATIVE TABLE SHOWING IN THE FIRST COLUMN THE PRESENT PROVISIONS OF TITLE 38, UNITED STATES CODE; IN THE SECOND COLUMN THOSE PROVISIONS AS THEY WOULD HAVE BEEN AMENDED BY THE HOUSE PASSED BILL, H.R. 1927; IN THE THIRD COLUMN THOSE PROVISIONS AS THEY WOULD HAVE BEEN AMENDED BY THE SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 1927; AND IN THE FOURTH COLUMN THOSE PROVISIONS AS THEY WOULD BE AMENDED BY THE CONFERENCE AGREEMENT—Continued

LAW	H.R. 1927 AS PASSED HOUSE	SENATE AMENDMENT	CONFERENCE AGREEMENT
and attendance as described in subsection (l) or (m) of section 314 of this title, shall not be effective earlier than the first day of the second calendar month which begins after the date of the veteran's admission for hospitalization. In case a veteran affected by this subsection leaves a hospital against medical advice and is thereafter admitted to hospitalization, such allowance, increased pension, or additional compensation, as the case may be, shall be discontinued from the date of such readmission for so long as such hospitalization continues.			
Sec. 612(h), title 38, U.S.C. (New subsection added by H.R. 1927.)	SECTION 9 (g) Any veteran who as a veteran of World War I, World War II, or the Korean conflict is receiving increased pension under section 521(d) of this title based on need of regular aid and attendance may be furnished drugs or medicines ordered on prescription of a duly licensed physician as specific therapy in the treatment of an illness or injury suffered by the veteran.	SECTION 8 Same as House passed bill, except that new subsection is designated "(h)" to reflect amendment made to section 612 of title 38, U.S.C., by section 7 of Public Law 88–450, approved August 19, 1964.	SECTION 8 Same as House passed bill, except that new subsection is designated "(h)" to reflect amendment made to section 612 of title 38, U.S.C., by section 7 of Public Law 88–450, approved August 19, 1964.
Sec. 3104(a), title 38, U.S.C. (a) Except to the extent that retirement pay is waived under other provisions of law, not more than one award of pension, compensation, emergency officers', regular, or reserve retirement pay, or initial award of naval pension granted after July 13, 1943, shall be made concurrently to any person based on his own service.	SECTION 10 (a) Except to the extent that retirement pay is waived under other provisions of law, not more than one award of pension, compensation, emergency officers', regular, or reserve retirement pay, or initial award of naval pension granted after July 13, 1943, shall be made concurrently to any person based on his own service or concurrently to any person based on the service of any other person.	SECTION 9 Same as House passed bill.	SECTION 9 Same as House passed bill.
Sec. 9(b), Public Law 86–211 (b) Nothing in this Act shall affect the eligibility of any person receiving pension under title 38, United States Code, on June 30, 1960, for pension under all applicable provisions of that title in effect on that date for such period or periods thereafter with respect to which he can qualify under such provisions. This subsection shall not apply in any case for any period after pension is granted, pursuant to application, under title 38, United States Code, as amended by this Act.	SECTION 11 Effective November 1, 1964, in computing the income of persons whose pension eligibility is subject to the first sentence of section 9(b) of the Veterans Pension Act of 1959, there shall be excluded 10 per centum of the amount of payments received under public or private retirement, annuity, endowment, or similar plans or programs.	SECTION 10 In computing the income of persons whose pension eligibility is subject to the first sentence of section 9(b) of the Veterans Pension Act of 1959, there shall be excluded 10 per centum of the amount of payments received under public or private retirement, annuity, endowment, or similar plans or programs.	SECTION 10 In computing the income of persons whose pension eligibility is subject to the first sentence of section 9(b) of the Veterans Pension Act of 1959, there shall be excluded 10 per centum of the amount of payments received under public or private retirement, annuity, endowment, or similar plans or programs.
	SECTION 12(a) Except as otherwise provided herein, this Act shall take effect on January 1, 1965.	SECTION 11(a) Same as House passed bill.	SECTION 11(a) Same as House passed bill.
	SECTION 12(b) The amendment to paragraph (6) of section 503, title 38, United States Code, shall take effect on November 1, 1964, except that it shall not apply to any individual receiving pension on October 31, 1964, under chapter 15 of said title, or subsequently determined entitled to such pension for said day, until his contributions have been recouped under the provision of that paragraph in effect October 31, 1964.	SECTION 11(b) The amendment to paragraph (6) of section 503, title 38, United States Code, shall not apply to any individual receiving pension on December 31, 1964, under chapter 15 of said title, or subsequently determined entitled to such pension for said day, until his contributions have been recouped under the provision of that paragraph in effect on December 31, 1964.	SECTION 11(b) The amendment to paragraph (6) of section 503, title 38, United States Code, shall not apply to any individual receiving pension on December 31, 1964, under chapter 15 of said title, or subsequently determined entitled to such pension for said day, until his contributions have been recouped under the provision of that paragraph in effect on December 31, 1964.

LAW	H.R. 1927 AS PASSED HOUSE	SENATE AMENDMENT SECTION 12	CONFERENCE AGREEMENT SECTION 12
		Sec. 12. (a) Subchapter I of chapter 19 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section: "§ 725. Limited period for acquiring insurance "(a) Any person (other than a person referred to in subsection (e) of this section) heretofore eligible to apply for National Service Life Insurance after October 7, 1940, and before January 1, 1957, shall upon application in writing made within one year after the effective date of this section, submission of evidence of good health satisfactory to the Administrator at the time of such application, and payment of the required premiums, be granted insurance under the same terms and conditions as are contained in standard policies of National Service Life Insurance except (1) five-year level premium term insurance may not be issued or renewed on the term plan after the applicant's fiftieth birthday; (2) the net premium rates shall be based on the 1958 Commissioners Standard Ordinary Basic Mortality Table, increased at the time of issue by such an amount as the Administrator determines to be necessary for sound actuarial operations, and thereafter such premiums may be adjusted as the Administrator determines to be so necessary but at intervals of not less than two years; (3) an additional premium to cover administrative costs to the Government as determined by the Administrator at time of issue shall be charged for insurance issued under this subsection and for any total disability income provision attached thereto, and thereafter such costs may be adjusted as the Administrator determines to be necessary but at intervals of not less than five years; (4) all cash, loan, and paid-up insurance values shall be based on the 1958 Commissioners Standard Ordinary Basic Mortality Table and all extended term insurance values shall be based on 130 per centum of such table; (5) all settlements on policies involving annuities shall be calculated on the basis of The Annuity Table for 1949; (6) all calculations in connection with insurance issued under this subsection shall be based on interest at the rate of 3 per centum per annum; (7) all rights under such insurance and any total disability income provision attached thereto, whether in force or lapsed, shall terminate effective upon the date the policyholder enters on active duty or active duty for training under a call or order to such duty for a period of thirty-one days or more; (8) the insurance shall not be payable for death which occurs while the insured is on active duty or active duty for training under a call or order to such duty for a period of less than thirty-one days, if dependency and indemnity compensation is payable in such case at the time of death, however, the cash	Sec. 12. (a) Subchapter I of chapter 19 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section: "§ 725. Limited period for acquiring insurance "(a) Any person (other than a person referred to in subsection (f) of this section) heretofore eligible to apply for National Service Life Insurance after October 7, 1940, and before January 1, 1957, who is found by the Administrator to be suffering (1) from a service-connected disability or disabilities for which compensation would be payable if 10 per centum or more in degree and except for which such person would be insurable according to the standards of good health established by the Administrator; or (2) from a non-service-connected disability which renders such person uninsurable according to the standards of good health established by the Administrator and such person establishes to the satisfaction of the Administrator that he is unable to obtain commercial life insurance at a substandard rate, shall upon application in writing made within one year after the effective date of this section, compliance with the health requirements of this section and payment of the required premiums, be granted insurance under this section. "(b) If, notwithstanding the applicant's service-connected disability, he is insurable according to the standards of good health established by the Administrator, the insurance granted under this section shall be issued upon the same terms and conditions as are contained in the standard policies of National Service Life Insurance except (1) five-year level premium term insurance may not be issued; (2) the net premium rates shall be based on the 1958 Commissioners Standard Ordinary Basic Mortality Table, increased at the time of issue by such an amount as the Administrator determines to be necessary for sound actuarial operations, and thereafter such premiums may be adjusted as the Administrator determines to be so necessary but at intervals of not less than two years; (3) an additional premium to cover administrative costs to the Government as determined by the Administrator at times of issue shall be charged for insurance issued under this subsection and for any total disability income provision attached thereto, and thereafter such costs may be adjusted as the Administrator determines to be necessary but at intervals of not less than five years; (4) all cash, loan, extended and paid-up insurance values shall be based on the 1958 Commissioners Standard Ordinary Basic Mortality Table; (5) all settlements on policies involving annuities shall be calculated on the basis of The Annuity Table for 1949; (6) all calculations in connection

COMPARATIVE TABLE SHOWING IN THE FIRST COLUMN THE PRESENT PROVISIONS OF TITLE 38, UNITED STATES CODE; IN THE SECOND COLUMN THOSE PROVISIONS AS THEY WOULD HAVE BEEN AMENDED BY THE HOUSE PASSED BILL, H.R. 1927; IN THE THIRD COLUMN THOSE PROVISIONS AS THEY WOULD HAVE BEEN AMENDED BY THE SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 1927; AND IN THE FOURTH COLUMN THOSE PROVISIONS AS THEY WOULD BE AMENDED BY THE CONFERENCE AGREEMENT—Continued

LAW	H.R. 1927 AS PASSED HOUSE	SENATE AMENDMENT	CONFERENCE AGREEMENT
		value, if any, less any indebtedness shall be paid to the designated beneficiary, if living, otherwise to the insured's estate; (9) the insurance shall include such other changes in terms and conditions as the Administrator determines to be reasonable and practical; (10) the insurance and any total disability income provision attached thereto shall be on a nonparticipating basis and all premiums and other collections therefor shall be credited to a revolving fund established in the Treasury of the United States and the payments on such insurance and disability provision shall be made directly from such fund. "(b)(1) There is authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be required to provide capital for the revolving fund to carry out the purpose of this section. Such appropriations shall be advanced to the revolving fund as needed and shall bear interest as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the average yield on all marketable interest-bearing obligations of the United States of comparable maturities then forming a part of the public debt and shall be repaid to the Treasury over a reasonable period of time. "(2) The Administrator is authorized to set aside out of the revolving fund established under subsection (a) of this section such reserve amounts as may be required under accepted actuarial principles to meet all liabilities on insurance issued under subsection (a) of this section and any total disability income provision attached thereto. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to invest in and to sell and retire special interest-bearing obligations of the United States for the account of the revolving fund. Such obligations issued for this purpose shall have maturities fixed with due regard for the needs of the funds and shall bear interest at a rate equal to the average market yield (computed by the Secretary of the Treasury on the basis of market quotations as of the end of the calendar month next preceding the date of issue) on all marketable interest-bearing obligations of the United States then forming a part of the public debt which are not due or callable until after the expiration of four years from the end of such calendar month; except that where such average market yield is not a multiple of one-eighth of 1 per centum, the rate of interest of such obligations shall be the multiple of one-eighth of 1 per centum nearest such market yield. "(3) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 782 of this title, there are hereby authorized to be made available for expenditure out of the revolving fund such sums as Congress may deem appropriate to pay the	with insurance issued under this subsection shall be based on interest at the rate of 3½ per centum per annum; (7) the insurance shall include such other changes in terms and conditions as the Administrator determines to be reasonable and practicable; (8) the insurance and any total disability income provision attached thereto shall be on a nonparticipating basis and all premiums and other collections therefor shall be credited to a revolving fund established in the Treasury of the United States and the payments on such insurance and total disability income provisions shall be made directly from such fund. "(c) If the applicant's service-connected disability or disabilities render him uninsurable according to the standards of good health established by the Administrator, or if the applicant has a non-service-connected disability which renders him uninsurable according to the standards of good health established by the Administrator and such person establishes to the satisfaction of the Administrator that he is unable to obtain commercial life insurance at a substandard rate and such uninsurability existed as of the date of approval of this section, the insurance granted under this section shall be issued upon the same terms and conditions as are contained in standard policies of National Service Life Insurance, except (1) five-year level premium term insurance may not be issued; (2) the premiums charged for the insurance issued under this subsection shall be increased at the time of issue by such an amount as the Administrator determines to be necessary for sound actuarial operations and thereafter such premiums may be adjusted from time to time as the Administrator determines to be necessary; for the purpose of any increase at time of issue or later adjustment the service-connected group and the non-service-connected group may be separately classified; (3) an additional premium to cover administrative costs to the Government as determined by the Administrator at the time of issue shall be charged for insurance issued under this subsection and for any total disability income provision attached thereto (for which the insured may subsequently become eligible) and thereafter such costs may be adjusted as the Administrator determines to be necessary but at intervals of not less than five years and for this purpose the service-connected and non-service-connected can be separately classified; (4) the insurance and any total disability income provision attached thereto shall be on a nonparticipating basis; (5) all settlements on policies involving annuities shall be calculated on the basis of The Annuity Table for 1949; (6) all

LAW	H.R. 1927 AS PASSED HOUSE	SENATE AMENDMENT	CONFERENCE AGREEMENT
		cost of administration of insurance issued under subsection (a) of this section, and any total disability income provision attached thereto, for transfer to the appropriation "General Operating Expenses, Veterans' Administration", or as may otherwise be specified in appropriation acts. "(c) Any person who applies for insurance under subsection (a) of this section and who cannot qualify for insurance thereunder solely because of a service-connected disability for which compensation would be payable, if 10 per centum or more in degree, shall be granted insurance under the same terms and conditions as are contained in standard policies of National Service Life Insurance except (1) five-year level premium term insurance may not be issued or renewed on the term plan after the applicant's fiftieth birthday; (2) an additional premium to cover administrative costs to the Government as determined by the Administrator at the time of issue shall be charged for insurance issued under this subsection and for any total disability income provision attached thereto (for which the insured may subsequently become eligible) and thereafter such costs may be adjusted as the Administrator determines to be necessary but at intervals of not less than five years; (3) the insurance and any total disability income provision attached thereto shall be on a nonparticipating basis; (4) all settlements on policies involving annuities shall be calculated on the basis of The Annuity Table for 1949, and interest at the rate of 3 per centum per annum; (5) all rights under such insurance and any total disability income provision attached thereto, whether in force or lapsed, shall terminate effective upon the date the policyholder enters on active duty or active duty for training under a call or order to such duty for a period of thirty-one days or more; (6) the insurance shall not be payable for death which occurs while the insured is on active duty or active duty for training under a call or order to such duty for a period of less than thirty-one days, if dependency and indemnity compensation is payable in such case at the time of death, however, the cash value, if any, less any indebtedness shall be paid to the designated beneficiary, if living, otherwise to the insured's estate; (7) the insurance shall include such other changes in terms and conditions as the Administrator determines to be reasonable and practicable; (8) all premiums and other collections on the insurance and any total disability income provision attached thereto shall be credited directly to the National Service Life Insurance appropriation and any payments on such insurance and total disability income provision attached thereto shall be made directly from such appropriation. Appropriations necessary to carry out the provisions of this subsection are hereby authorized. Notwithstanding the provisions of sec-	calculations in connection with insurance issued under this subsection shall be based on interest at the rate of 3½ per centum per annum; (7) the insurance shall include such other changes in terms and conditions as the Administrator determines to be reasonable and practicable; (8) all premiums and other collections on the insurance and any total disability income provision attached thereto shall be credited to the National Service Life Insurance appropriation, and the payments on such insurance and total disability income provision shall be made directly from such appropriation. Appropriations necessary to carry out the provisions of this subsection are hereby authorized. "(d)(1) There is authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be required to provide capital for the revolving fund to carry out the purpose of subsection (b) of this section. Such appropriations shall be advanced to the revolving fund as needed and shall bear interest as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the average yield on all marketable interest-bearing obligations of the United States of comparable maturities then forming a part of the public debt and shall be repaid to the Treasury over a reasonable period of time. "(2) The Administrator is authorized to set aside out of the revolving fund established under subsection (b) of this section such reserve amounts as may be required under accepted actuarial principles to meet all liabilities on insurance issued under subsection (b) of this section and any total disability income provision attached thereto. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to invest in and to sell and retire special interest-bearing obligations of the United States for the account of the revolving fund. Such obligations issued for this purpose shall have maturities fixed with due regard for the needs of the fund and shall bear interest at a rate equal to the average market yield (computed by the Secretary of the Treasury on the basis of market quotations as of the end of the calendar month next preceding the date of issue) on all marketable interest-bearing obligations of the United States then forming a part of the public debt which are not due or callable until after the expiration of four years from the end of such calendar month; except that where such average market yield is not a multiple of one-eighth of 1 per centum, the rate of interest of such obligation shall be the multiple of one-eighth of 1 per centum nearest such market yield. "(3) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 782 of this title, the Administrator shall, from time to time, determine the administrative costs to the Government which in his judgment are properly allocable to insurance issued under this section and any total disability income provision attached

Comparative Table Showing in the First Column the Present Provisions of Title 38, United States Code; In the Second Column Those Provisions as They Would Have Been Amended by the House Passed Bill, H.R. 1927; in the Third Column Those Provisions as They Would Have Been Amended by the Senate Amendment to H.R. 1927; and in the Fourth Column Those Provisions as They Would Be Amended by the Conference Agreement—Continued

LAW	H.R. 1927 AS PASSED HOUSE	SENATE AMENDMENT	CONFERENCE AGREEMENT
		tion 782 of this title, there are hereby authorized to be made available for expenditure out of the National Service Life Insurance appropriation such sums as Congress may deem appropriate to pay the cost of administration of insurance issued under this subsection, and any total disability income provision attached thereto, for transfer to the appropriation "General Operating Expenses, Veterans' Administration," or as may otherwise be specified in appropriation Acts. "(d) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 782 of this title, a medical examination (including any supplemental examination or tests) when required of an applicant for issuance of insurance under this section or any total disability income provision attached thereto shall be at the applicant's own expense by a duly licensed physician. "(e) No insurance shall be granted under this section to any person referred to in section 107 of this title or to any persons while on active duty or active duty for training under a call or order to such duty for a period of thirty-one days or more. "(f)(1) Whenever insurance issued under this section and any total disability income provision attached thereto is terminated as provided in this section, the cash value, if any, less any indebtedness, of a permanent plan policy shall be paid to the insured. Any person whose term or permanent plan policy, not including a reduced paid-up policy, was so terminated while it was not lapsed may, upon written application and payment of the required premium made within one hundred and twenty days after separation from active duty or active duty for training, replace such policy and any total disability income provision attached thereto which was in force at the time of termination. The policy and provision issued to replace the terminated insurance shall be on the same plan and shall not be in excess of the amount of insurance which was terminated. Any person whose permanent plan policy was so terminated while such insurance was not lapsed may reinstate such insurance and any total disability income provision attached thereto which was in force at time of termination, upon written application, payment of the required premium and reserve within the one hundred and twenty day period specified above. A person whose paid-up policy was so terminated may reinstate such paid-up insurance within the one hundred and twenty day period specified above, and any total disability income provision attached thereto which was in force at time of termination, upon written application and payment of the required premium and reserve. Waiver of premiums and total disability income benefits otherwise authorized	thereto, and shall transfer from the revolving fund, or the National Service Life Insurance appropriation, as appropriate, the amount of such cost allocable to the Veterans' Administration to the appropriation 'General Operating Expenses, Veterans' Administration', and the remainder of such cost to the general fund receipts in the Treasury. The initial administrative cost of issuing insurance under this section and any total disability income provision attached thereto shall be so transferred over such period of time as the Administrator determines to be reasonable and practicable. "(e) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 782 of this title, a medical examination (including any supplemental examination or tests) when required of an applicant for issuance of insurance under this section or any total disability income provisions attached thereto shall be at the applicant's own expense by a duly licensed physician. "(f) No insurance shall be granted under this section to any person referred to in section 107 of this title or to any person while on active duty or active duty for training under a call or order to such duty for a period of thirty-one days or more."

LAW	H.R. 1927 AS PASSED HOUSE	SENATE AMENDMENT	CONFERENCE AGREEMENT
		under this chapter shall not be denied in any case of reinstatement or replacement of insurance or the disability provision under this paragraph in which it is shown to the satisfaction of the Administrator that the total disability of the applicant began before the date of his application for such reinstatement or replacement. The provisions of the immediately preceding sentence shall not be applicable in any case in which such total disability existed prior to the date of application for, or the effective date of, the insurance originally issued under this section. "(2) Any person whose rights under a term or permanent plan policy or any total disability income provision attached thereto were terminated under this section, while the insurance and provision were in a lapsed status, may upon separation from active duty or active duty for training, replace such policy and provision on the same plan and not in excess of the amount of insurance terminated, upon written application made within one hundred and twenty days after separation from such duty, payment of the required premium and submission of evidence of good health satisfactory to the Administrator. "(3) Any person whose rights under a term or permanent plan policy or total disability income provision attached thereto were terminated under this section, whether the insurance and provision were in force or lapsed, may upon separation from active duty or active duty for training (A) reinstate such permanent plan policy and provision upon written application, payment of the required premium and reserve, and submission of evidence of good health satisfactory to the Administrator; or (B) reinstate such term policy and provision (within the term period) upon written application, payment of the required premiums, and submission of evidence of good health satisfactory to the Administrator. "(4) Five year level premium insurance may be issued under this subsection but not renewed on the term plan after the applicant's fiftieth birthday. Insurance replaced under this subsection shall be issued at the premium rate for the applicant's then attained age."	
		(b) Section 704 of title 38, United States Code, is amended (1) by inserting "(a)" immediately before "Insurance"; and (2) by adding at the end thereof the following: "(b) Under such regulations as the Administrator may promulgate a policy of participating insurance may be converted to or exchanged for insurance issued under this subsection on a modified life plan. Insurance issued under this subsection shall be on the same terms and conditions as the insurance which it replaces, except (1) the premium rates for such insurance shall be based on the 1958 Commissioners Standard Ordinary Basic Table of Mortality and inter-	(b) Section 704 of title 38, United States Code, is amended (1) by inserting "(a)" immediately before "Insurance"; and (2) by adding at the end thereof the following: "(b) Under such regulations as the Administrator may promulgate a policy of participating insurance may be converted to or exchanged for insurance issued under this subsection on a modified life plan. Insurance issued under this subsection shall be on the same terms and conditions as the insurance which it replaces, except (1) the premium rates for such insurance shall be based on the 1958 Commissioners Standard Ordinary Basic Table of Mortality and interest at the rate of 3 per centum per an-

COMPARATIVE TABLE SHOWING IN THE FIRST COLUMN THE PRESENT PROVISIONS OF TITLE 38, UNITED STATES CODE; IN THE SECOND COLUMN THOSE PROVISIONS AS THEY WOULD HAVE BEEN AMENDED BY THE HOUSE PASSED BILL, H.R. 1927; IN THE THIRD COLUMN THOSE PROVISIONS AS THEY WOULD HAVE BEEN AMENDED BY THE SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 1927; AND IN THE FOURTH COLUMN THOSE PROVISIONS AS THEY WOULD BE AMENDED BY THE CONFERENCE AGREEMENT—Continued

LAW	H.R. 1927 AS PASSED HOUSE	SENATE AMENDMENT	CONFERENCE AGREEMENT
		est at the rate of 3 per centum per annum; (2) all cash, loan, paid-up, and extended values shall be based on the 1958 Commissioners Standard Ordinary Basic Table of Mortality and interest at the rate of 3 per centum per annum; and (3) at the end of the day preceding the sixty-fifth birthday of the insured the face value of the modified life insurance policy or the amount of extended term insurance thereunder shall be automatically reduced by one-half thereof, without any reduction in premium. "(c) Under such regulations as the Administrator may promulgate, a policy of nonparticipating insurance may be converted to or exchanged for insurance issued under this subsection on a modified life plan. Insurance issued under this subsection shall be on the same terms and conditions as the insurance which it replaces, except that (1) term insurance issued under section 621 of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 shall be deemed for the purposes of this subsection to have been issued under section 723(b) of this title; and (2) at the end of the day preceding the sixty-fifth birthday of the insured the face value of the modified life insurance policy or the amount of extended term insurance thereunder shall be automatically reduced by one-half thereof without any reduction in premium. Any person eligible for insurance under section 722(a), or section 725 of this title may be granted a modified life insurance policy under this subsection which, subject to exception (2) above, shall be issued on the same terms and conditions specified in section 722(a) or section 725, whichever is applicable. "(d) Any insured whose modified life insurance policy is in force by payment or waiver of premiums on the day before his sixty-fifth birthday may upon written application and payment of premiums made before such birthday be granted National Service Life Insurance, on an ordinary life plan, without physical examination, in an amount of not less than $500, in multiples of $250, but not in excess of one-half of the face amount of the modified life insurance policy in force on the day before his sixty-fifth birthday. Insurance issued under this subsection shall be effective on the sixty-fifth birthday of the insured. The premium rate, cash, loan, paid-up, and extended values on the ordinary life insurance issued under this subsection shall be based on the same mortality tables and interest rates as the insurance issued under the modified life policy. Settlements on policies involving annuities on insurance issued under this subsection shall be based on the same mortality or annuity tables and interest rates as such settle-	num; (2) all cash, loan, paid-up, and extended values shall be based on the 1958 Commissioners Standard Ordinary Basic Table of Mortality and interest at the rate of 3 per centum per annum; and (3) at the end of the day preceding the sixty-fifth birthday of the insured the face value of the modified life insurance policy or the amount of extended term insurance thereunder shall be automatically reduced by one-half thereof, without any reduction in premium. "(c) Under such regulations as the Administrator may promulgate, a policy of nonparticipating insurance may be converted to or exchanged for insurance issued under this subsection on a modified life plan. Insurance issued under this subsection shall be on the same terms and conditions as the insurance which it replaces, except that (1) term insurance issued under section 621 of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 shall be deemed for the purposes of this subsection to have been issued under section 723(b) of this title; and (2) at the end of the day preceding the sixty-fifth birthday of the insured the face value of the modified life insurance policy or the amount of extended term insurance thereunder shall be automatically reduced by one-half thereof, without any reduction in premium. Any person eligible for insurance under section 722(a), or section 725 of this title, may be granted a modified life insurance policy under this subsection which, subject to exception (2) above, shall be issued on the same terms and conditions specified in section 722(a) or section 725, whichever is applicable. "(d) Any insured whose modified life insurance policy is in force by payment or waiver of premiums on the day before his sixty-fifth birthday may upon written application and payment of premiums made before such birthday be granted National Service Life Insurance, on an ordinary life plan, without physical examination, in an amount of not less than $500, in multiples of $250, but not in excess of one-half of the face amount of the modified life insurance policy in force on the day before his sixty-fifth birthday. Insurance issued under this subsection shall be effective on the sixty-fifth birthday of the insured. The premium rate, cash, loan, paid-up, and extended values on the ordinary life insurance issued under this subsection shall be based on the same mortality tables and interest rates as the insurance issued under the modified life policy. Settlements on policies involving annuities on insurance issued under this subsection shall be based on the same mortality or annuity tables and interest rates as such settlements on the modified life policy. If the

LAW

H.R. 1927 AS PASSED HOUSE

Summary of cost

Fiscal year:	
January 1 to June 30, 1965	$43,880,590
1966	72,619,530
1967	97,341,610
1968	106,002,745
1969	111,437,400

SENATE AMENDMENT

ments on the modified life policy. If the insured is totally disabled on the day before his sixty-fifth birthday and premiums on his modified life insurance policy are being waived under section 712 of this title or he is entitled on that date to waiver under such section he shall be automatically granted the maximum amount of insurance authorized under this subsection and premiums on such insurance shall be waived during the continuous total disability ability of the insured."

(c) The analysis of subchapter I of chapter 19 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"725. Limited period for acquiring insurance."

(d) The amendments made by this section shall take effect as of the first day of the first calendar month which begins more than six calendar months after the date of enactment of this Act.

Summary of cost

Fiscal year:	
January 1 to June 30, 1965	$44,862,000
1966	83,477,000
1967	112,906,000
1968	127,682,000
1969	137,539,000

Cost of administering section 725 of title 38, United States Code (reopened NSLI program), per 1,000,000 policies

Fiscal year:	
1966	$4,688,000
1967	3,318,000
1968	2,684,000
1969	2,644,000
1970	2,604,000

Cost of section 704 (b) and (c) of title 38, United States Code (modified life plan insurance)

Fiscal year:	
1966	$207,500
1967	93,900
1968	75,550
1969	106,100
1970	219,050

CONFERENCE AGREEMENT

insured is totally disabled on the day before his sixty-fifth birthday and premiums on his modified life insurance policy are being waived under section 712 of this title or he is entitled on that date to waiver under such section he shall be automatically granted the maximum amount of insurance authorized under this subsection and premiums on such insurance shall be waived during the continuous total disability of the insured."

(c) The analysis of subchapter I of chapter 19 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"725. Limited period for acquiring insurance."

(d) The amendments made by this section shall take effect as of the first day of the first calendar month which begins more than six calendar months after the date of enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I assume that the gentleman will take some time to explain the bill as it now stands.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Yes; I will.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, a great many people deserve praise for this bill being on the floor today. There are too many of them to mention them all by name, but I would like to mention Robert Guthrie of the Legislative Counsel's Office and who handles our committee's drafts. Also I wish to particularly thank Edward Craft, the legislative counsel, William Adams, of that same office, and Mrs. Richard Gscheidle, and our staff of the committee who worked until about 3 o'clock this morning preparing this bill for the floor today.

Mr. Speaker, this bill, as it passed the House, related solely and exclusively to non-service-connected pensions. It reflected months of work on the part of the committee, and particularly the Subcommittee on Compensation and Pensions.

When it reached the other body, it was reported with slightly more liberal rates than those provided in the House bill. A more restrictive amendment, however, affecting the income of the spouse, was passed by the Senate, and the conference agreement provides for a return to the House provision.

The Senate Committee on Finance, in reporting the bill, added a proposal providing for the reopening of national service life insurance for both healthy and service-connected disabled veterans. The legislative history of this question follows:

HISTORY OF HOUSE ACTION ON BILLS TO REOPEN NSLI PROGRAM

EIGHTY-FOURTH CONGRESS

Provisions of S. 3067, to reopen NSLI, added to H.R. 7089—House-passed Servicemen's and Veterans' Survivor Benefits Act. Passed Senate on voice vote July 2, 1956. House disagreed to Senate amendment and agreed to a conference, July 3, 1956—unanimous consent—volume 102, part 9, page 11780, Congressional Record. Senate amendment rejected in conference. Public Law 84–881.

EIGHTY-FIFTH CONGRESS

Provisions of S. 1088, to reopen NSLI, added to H.R. 11382—House-passed bill to authorize conversion or exchange of section 621 NSLI term policies. Passed Senate on voice vote August 11, 1958. House concurred in Senate amendments with amendments to restore House-passed bill August 23, 1958—unanimous consent—volume 104, part 15, page 19621, Congressionall Record. Senate concurred in House amendments. Public Law 85–896.

EIGHTY-SIXTH CONGRESS

Provisions of S. 1113, to reopen NSLI, added to H.R. 7650—House-passed pension bill. Passed Senate August 13, 1959, by rollcall vote. House disagreed to this amendment, August 14, 1959—unanimous consent—volume 105, part 12, pages 15910–15912, Congressional Record, and returned bill to Senate. Senate receded by voice vote. Public Law 86–211.

Provisions of S. 2675, to reopen NSLI, added to H.R. 11045—House-passed NSLI modified life plan bill. Passed Senate on rollcall vote, June 2, 1960, and died in House with adjournment of 86th Congress.

EIGHTY-SEVENTH CONGRESS

Provisions to reopen NSLI added to H.R. 879—House-passed disability compensation rate increase bill. Passed Senate by voice vote July 17, 1961. Died in House with adjournment of 87th Congress.

Provisions of S. 977, to reopen NSLI, added to H.R. 856—House-passed NSLI modified life plan bill. Finance Committee amendment agreed to by rollcall vote and bill passed Senate by voice vote September 1, 1961. Died in House with adjournment of 87th Congress.

S. 3597, to reopen NSLI, passed Senate by voice vote August 8, 1962. Bill amended by House to restrict reopening of NSLI program to service-connected disabled veterans. As amended, passed House by voice vote August 16, 1962—in lieu of H.R. 12333—volume 108, part 12, pages 16781–16783, Congressional Record. Conferees appointed but did not meet or file report prior to adjournment of 87th Congress.

EIGHTY-EIGHTH CONGRESS

Provisions to reopen NSLI added to H.R. 220—House-passed NSLI modified life plan bill. Passed Senate by voice vote June 20, 1963. Bill now lying on Speaker's table awaiting House action.

Mr. Speaker, a great deal of work has gone into H.R. 1927, which makes further improvements in the non-service-connected pension program for veterans of World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict and which carries forward the basic principles of the original program; that is, pensions should be based on need and the most help should go to those who need help the most because of low income or serious health problems. The greatest raises in the bill are for the low-income group. There are substantial increases for the aid and attendance group and an additional rate is allowed for a newly created category called "housebound." The bill also provides drugs for aid and attendance cases.

Our colleague, the Honorable Roland V. Libonati, of Illinois, is the author of this bill and as he terminates his career in Congress he certainly should be able to take much satisfaction from the knowledge that this bill will help hundreds of thousands of needy Americans who served the cause of their country during a time of war.

This bill was processed by the Subcommittee on Compensation and Pensions headed by the Honorable William Jennings Bryan Dorn, of South Carolina, with the following members: The Honorable Horace R. Kornegay, of North Carolina, the Honorable Ray Roberts of Texas, the Honorable Paul A. Fino, of New York, and the Honorable Charles M. Teague of California. Congressman Kornegay, who presided at many of the hearings, deserves special recognition for his work on the bill.

This bill contains insurance provisions and has required the careful attention of the members of our Insurance Subcommittee headed by the Honorable Robert A. Everett of Tennessee. The members of the Insurance Subcommittee are as follows: the Honorable Horace R. Kornegay of North Carolina, the Honorable Robert T. Secrest of Ohio, the Honorable George E. Brown, Jr., of California, the Honorable Charles M. Teague of California, the Honorable Robert F. Ellsworth of Kansas and the Honorable James E. Bromwell of Iowa. These men have given a great deal of attention to the insurance problem and I wish to call attention to their work on the subcommittee. I would like to express my personal appreciation to the House conferees who worked with me on this bill. We met on four occasions and I had the utmost cooperation of these House conferees, who were: the Honorable William Jennings Bryan Dorn of South Carolina, the Honorable James A. Haley of Florida, the Honorable Walter S. Baring of Nevada, the Honorable Robert A. Everett of Tennessee, the Honorable William H. Ayres of Ohio, the Honorable E. Ross Adair of Indiana and the Honorable John P. Saylor of Pennsylvania.

I am pleased to say that the affairs of the Veterans' Affairs Committee are conducted in a strictly nonpartisan manner and I have enjoyed the fullest cooperation from the ranking minority member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, the Honorable William H. Ayres of Ohio, in developing this bill and, for that matter, on all of the legislative undertakings of the committee. I appreciate the cooperation I have had from my Republican colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, there are two World War I veterans on our committee. The Honorable Roland V. Libonati of Illinois is terminating his service, but I trust that the Honorable James A. Haley of Florida will be with us in the next session. He is one of our ranking Members and he has had a great of experience through his service as a subcommittee chairman on the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. He is the ranking Democratic member of our Hospital Subcommittee. Congressman Haley is a World War I veteran with an outstanding war record. He was one of the originators of the American Legion and his support and advice have been invaluable in developing legislative programs for veterans of World War I.

Due to the fact that it was not possible to consider this bill in conference until the closing hours of this session, we were confronted with a difficult technical problem and had it not been for the special efforts of Robert F. Guthrie, Edward O. Craft, and Marianne J. Gscheidle of the House Legislative Counsel's Office, we would have had a most difficult time in preparing the necessary papers on this legislation. I take note, also, of the efforts of Hugh Evans in the Senate Legislative Counsel's Office, working with us on this project.

I need not remind our Members that the two subjects involved in this legislation have been highly controversial and subject to a great variety of opinions. We have been able to produce this bill only because we have had the enlightened cooperation of the leadership of the veterans' organizations. Daniel F. Foley, national commander of the American Legion, and his Washington office: Clarence Olson, legislative director, John Corcoran, rehabilitation director, Robert Murphy, assistant legislative director, have worked hard to bring this legislation about. We have received the same high degree of cooperation from Joseph J. Lombardo, national commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and his legislative director, Francis W. Stover. We have had the fullest cooperation from the Disabled American Veterans Commander Douglas H. McGarrity, and DAV Director of Legislation Charles Huber, as well as from National Commander Edmund Gulewicz of the AMVETS and Legislative Director John Dagenais. National Commander William R. Kime of the Veterans of World War I of the USA, gave us his fullest cooperation and was most understanding in helping us work out the compromises that were necessary to achieve passage of this bill. Mr. J. Bates Gerald of South Carolina, regional commander of the Veterans of World War I, also made a personal contribution in developing the necessary compromises for passage of this legislation.

William J. Driver, the Deputy Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, and Cyril F. Brickfield, Chief Benefits Director of the Veterans' Administration, played significant roles in the last-hour negotiations which made compromise possible.

The Senate also included the so-called modified life plan of insurance, which first passed the House in the 86th Congress, was approved by the House in the 87th Congress, and passed the House in the 88th Congress in the form of H.R. 220. This modified life plan has been preserved in the conference agreement.

With regard to the general reopening, the conference has approved a reopening for service-connected disabled veterans estimated to cover approximately 3,300,000 veterans, and an unknown number of non-service-connected veterans who are generally rated as uninsurable and who cannot obtain insurance even at substandard rates. In all cases, administrative cost would be borne by the insured. Insofar as the insured group is concerned, this insurance may be issued only to those who have disabilities making them uninsurable according to the standards of good health established by the Administrator, and such person further must establish to the satisfaction of the Veterans' Administration that he is unable to obtain commercial life insurance at a substandard rate. By substandard rate, the conference means a rate which would be substantially higher, as an example, 10 percent to as much as 200 percent more, than that charged by a commercial insurance company for a normal, healthy individual. The conference agreement is quite definite in providing that only individuals coming within this limited class shall be entitled to insurance.

The reopening period is for 1 year, to begin 6 months after date of enactment, and no term insurance may be issued in any form. In other words, permanent plans only may be available.

The pension section is effective from January 1, 1965.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I should like to commend the gentleman and his committee for inserting this insurance provision even though it does not go as far as I and others have advocated. I have provided in my bill that the option extend to all veterans and I believe that the burden on the Government would thereby be less. Nevertheless I do support the proposed change as a mark of our feeling that in fairness this one-shot opportunity should be given to service-connected veterans and some non-service-connected veterans who lost their rights through no fault of their own. I feel that it is a forward step and I am very happy to see it included in this legislation.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, as one of the conferees on the part of the House on this bill, may I say that too high praise cannot be paid to Olin Teague, the chairman of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs; Bryan Dorn, Jim Haley, Walter Baring, Robert Everett, Bill Ayres, and Ross Adair. It was only because of the insistence of these men that the position of the House with regard to the insurance provisions were maintained, and made it possible for us to come in here today with a conference report.

I have been on a number of conference committees since I have been in the House of Representatives, but never have I seen House conferees stand so firm and so united on the position that this House has taken over the past 8 years with regard to insurance, as your House conferees did on this matter.

There are two changes that I think should be noted. The first, that only those who have service-connected disabilities are permitted to get insurance, with one exception; a non-service-connected veteran may get insurance provided he cannot get insurance from any other source.

You must be turned down even by an insurance company which will rate a man at a higher premium before the Veterans' Administration is permitted to extend to him insurance.

Mr. Speaker, several people from the Veterans' Administration said to us in our conference that these would place the rates so high it would be virtually impossible to get insurance in almost every instance. But this was what the Senate had asked for and this is what the conferees agreed to.

Mr. Speaker, this insurance legislation will cover only World War II and Korean veterans.

As far as the service-connected veterans are concerned from World War II and Korea, the provisions that we have placed in this bill with regard to insurance are the identical provisions which are already in the law with regard to any man who is now in the service and who is discharged with a disability.

This same provision is carried forth in this bill. Therefore, there is no difference between a World War II or Korean veteran with a disability and any other veteran who is now serving his country.

Mr. Speaker, the managers on the part of the House in accepting the changes in the veterans' pension provisions that have been specified by the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Teague], have done a remarkable job for all of the veterans of this country. It reflects tremendous credit upon the House of Representatives and the great Committee on Veterans' Affairs that this piece of legislation is before us in the closing hours of the 88th Congress.

I urge the adoption of this conference report.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Everett], who was chairman of the Subcommittee on Insurance.

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to concur in what has been said by our distinguished chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the gentleman from Texas, Olin Teague, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Saylor], both of whom have worked hard in bringing about the adoption of this conference report.

First. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Saylor] has shown outstanding interest in this legislation and by his diligent work and efforts throughout the years since I have been on this committee he has been a team man and without his help we could not have passed this legislation.

Second. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Adair], also a member of this committee and also a member of the conference has been most helpful and his sound advice and counsel has also helped to make this legislation possible.

Third. Our distinguished colleague, W. H. Ayres, has also been an outstanding member of this committee and this conference. No one here worked harder than Bill, as we affectionately call him, in helping veterans of all wars of this great Nation.

Fourth. Our distinguished colleague Walt Baring, of Nevada, has always worked hard in behalf of all veterans at all times—I have had the privilege of visiting in his State on behalf of his interest of a veterans' hospital in Las Vegas. I hope that we can build such an institution there some time in the future.

Fifth. To Bryan Dorn and Jim Haley. Their record speaks for itself in their interest of veterans. They have been most helpful and without all of their help we could not have adopted this report.

However, I believe in the closing hours of this session we should give a great deal of credit to one of the members of our committee who has done much throughout the years in helping the veterans throughout this land. That is none other than the gentleman from Cook County, Chicago, Ill., Roland Libonati. He is the author of this bill as it now comes before you, H.R. 1927. He has certainly worked hard. The record speaks for itself that throughout the years he has been active in the American Legion, he has been active in the veterans' organizations and he has been active throughout these many years in helping the veterans through his fine work in his home State and in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say that our committee has stood firm for the position of the House of Representatives when it passed this bill by a vote of 388 to 0. I certainly want to thank the Members of the House for the wonderful cooperation that they have given us.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding to me this time.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Adair].

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, previous speakers upon this bill have explained its contents. As has been pointed out, it provides a modest and needed increase in pensions. In my opinion this is actually almost a cost-of-living increase since the last similar legislation was enacted.

There is, however, a second aspect of the case which needs further comment, and that is the opening of the national service life insurance to some veterans, for a period of 1 year.

A number of people are concerned lest this be a complete reopening of the NSLI program. Therefore it should be understood that this is for a limited period of time, 1 year, for a limited class of persons, that is, World War II and Korean veterans. Not all of those, but only those who fall within the qualifications. These are the service connected disabled and those who are unable to buy commercial insurance because of disability not related to service. As the gentleman from Pennsylvania pointed out, those who are to be taken into the NSLI program under these provisions will have to bear the cost of their own program. This will to that extent not be a part of the general NSLI program but will, rather, operate out of a separate fund. The costs are likely to be high. I think almost inevitably so. Hence it will be a matter of judgment whether or not individuals who can qualify wish to apply for this insurance.

To those insurance men who have indicated a fear of the possible reopening of the NSLI program, I will say that if they study the legislation and take into account what is here being said today, I am certain they will be reassured that we are not throwing open the doors widely to NSLI reapplications but, rather, to very limited classes of persons.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the conference report.

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the House conferees for their untiring efforts in bringing this legislation before us for consideration. I know that there have been many anxious and frustrating moments for them as became increasingly clear that H.R. 1927 might die with the close of this session.

Those who have served their country in time of crisis deserve our gratitude not merely in those years immediately following the close of hostilities but down through the decades that follow. The fruits of the sacrifices of our veterans are ours to enjoy through the years. It is well for us to be mindful of them in their personal material needs. We are demonstrating this with the passage of this legislation. However, we have yet a greater responsibility to them and that is as legislators to use wisely the time they have purchased with their sacrifices that we might pursue freedom. Unless we protect for ourselves and work ceaselessly to extend the freedom for which they gave of themselves, their efforts will have been in vain and in a real sense even these efforts at legislation are meaningless.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Ayres].

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1927 is a monument to a gentleman from Illinois who is retiring from this body, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Libonati]. He and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Everett] worked long and hard to get a pension bill that all of the major veterans' organizations could agree on.

Mr. Speaker, it is also a tribute to the gentleman from Texas, chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for having worked so hard yesterday, when the obstacles were great, to bring this conference report to you this morning.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no Member in this House who will oppose this conference report, and I say to my friend from Illinois [Mr. Libonati], even though he will not be a Member of this body next year, I hope he will come back and advise us as to what we should do in the future. His leadership has been great.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to see H.R. 1927 brought to passage today. It represents the combined efforts of a great many people and will do much good for hundreds of thousands of needy veterans, widows, and children.

I had the honor of heading the subcommittee which considered this legislation. Much of the hearings were handled by the Honorable Horace R. Kornegay of North Carolina and I wish to express my thanks to him and to the following members of my subcommittee: the Honorable Ray Roberts of Texas, the Honorable Paul A. Fino of New York, and the Honorable Charles M. Teague of California.

This bill went through some difficult stages and the work of Mr. J. Bates Gerald of South Carolina, regional commander of the Veterans of World War I of the USA, was significant in achieving the necessary compromises to permit passage of this legislation. J. Bates Gerald is one of South Carolina's finest citizens and has been an outstanding business, civic and veteran leader for many years.

Our subcommittee appreciated the cooperation of the National Commander of the American Legion Daniel F. Foley, and Legislative Director Clarence Olson, and Assistant Legislative Director Robert Murphy of that organization; National Commander Joseph J. Lombardo of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the USA and his legislative director, Francis W. Stover; National Commander Douglas H. McGarrity of the Disabled American Veterans and his director of legislation, Charles Huber; National Commander Edmund Gulewicz of the AMVETS and Legislative Director John Dagenais.

We also had the finest cooperation from Commander William R. Kime of the Veterans of World War I of the USA.

This bill was authored by the Honorable Roland V. Libonati of Illinois, our colleague who is terminating his service in the Congress. We have enjoyed our association with Roland Libonati on the committee and I, for one, regret very much to see him leave the Congress. He has been a great leader in veterans' matters and I hope that H.R. 1927 will stand as a tribute to his many years of interest and work in veterans' affairs.

Our chairman, the Honorable Olin E. Teague of Texas, has worked long and hard to achieve passage of this bill and of several other very important bills in this session. The veterans of this Nation have a great friend in Olin Teague and he deserves their everlasting thanks.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, It is pleasing to me to be in a position to support this bill once again before I leave these legislative halls as a Member of the House of Representatives. I am glad in the realization that this important measure has been resolved between the two bodies of the Congress and I want to commend the conferees on the part of the House for their persistent efforts to bring this veterans legislation to a satisfactory conclusion before final adjournment of the 88th Congress.

Mr. Speaker, this bill, H.R. 1927, as finally resolved by the House and Senate, is not only worthy of our favorable consideration but it is sorely needed as well.

The adjustments and increases in the pension provisions overcome inequities and are in keeping with the current day cost of living.

The insurance feature of this bill is reasonable and in no way opens the door for veterans insurance. In any event, I am happy that we have taken this action today in the passage of this most important veterans pension legislation and I heartily support it.

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, I support legislation that will protect the rights, interests, and reasonable concerns of all veterans. I, therefore, rise in support of the conference report on H.R. 1927.

I would like to compliment those Members of the House and Senate who labored over this bill. This legislation, which liberalizes non-service-connected pension payments to veterans of World War I, World War II, the Korean conflict, and their widows and children, is long overdue. It is on a basis of need, and it is justly deserved.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, a journey of a thousand miles starts with the first step. Approving the conference report today liberalizing the Veterans' Pension Act for veterans of World War I, widows, and dependents, is certainly a step in the right direction. Mr. Speaker, one of the first bills I introduced when I came to Congress 10 years ago was to grant veterans of World War I a flat $100 per month pension. I believe this is small recognition for the outstanding service these forgotten men rendered to our country. The bill passed today will increase pensions for those who need it the most. This is as it should be. However, with the high cost of living, I think the committee should consider a general, out-and-out pension bill.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my long-time friend and colleague, the able chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, TIGER TEAGUE, for his diligent work along with the committee in bringing out this legislation. I want to particularly commend my esteemed and able colleague from Illinois, ROLAND LIBONATI, the author of this bill. Much to our regret, Congressman LIBONATI is leaving the House at the end of this session. I know of no greater tribute his colleagues could pay to him than to pass a veterans' pension bill that he sponsored. Before coming to Congress, LIBBY, as he is affectionately known, served as a State senator in Illinois with great distinction for many years. He was always found battling for veterans, their widows and orphans. After being elected to Congress, he continued his strong fight for veterans from the Spanish-American War through the Korean conflict. He has served with great distinction on the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs and the House Committee on the Judiciary. In closing let me again thank LIBBY, Chairman TEAGUE, and the other members of the Veterans' Affairs Committee for bringing new hope to our World War I veterans through passage of a liberalized pension bill. I hope we can all continue to work together to further improve the living standard of this gallant group of people.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on this conference report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE].

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, with the retirement at the end of this Congress of the gentleman from Illinois, the Honorable ROLAND V. LIBONATI, the House of Representatives will lose one of its most dedicated and valuable Members. It is with deep personal regret that I look toward the time when "LIBBY" will leave public service, taking from his district, his State, and his country a truly great legislator. I cannot help but feel that because of his vast store of knowledge of government he will have a difficult time remaining in retirement, so insistent will be the demands on his time by those who will seek his counsel.

No Member loved the House of Representatives more than the gentleman from Illinois, ROLAND LIBONATI. This was born of his love of public service and the recognition that nowhere in government can a man better serve his fellow man than in the legislative branch. Despite his diligence and his zeal in his committee assignments, which required so much of his time, LIBBY seldom missed a minute in his attendance of House sessions. He could be seen in his favorite seat from the time of Chaplain's opening prayer, until the Speaker's gavel signaled the end of a day's session.

More often than any other Member of the House he served as Speaker pro tempore through the late afternoon sessions—a valuable service to the Speaker, whom I know has expressed himself many times as being appreciative of LIBBY's wonderful cooperation.

Veterans throughout the country recognize, as do the laboring men, the sincerity of LIBBY's efforts in their behalf.

It was fitting that is was ROLAND LIBONATI who introduced and managed through House approval the bill for non-service-connected pension payments to veterans of World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict and their widows and children on which we will take final action today. This was the kind of legislation which was most dear to LIBBY's heart.

Commenting on the passage of this veterans' bill in the House, LIBBY said this:

> I am gratified that in this small way I will be able to contribute aid and succor to our veterans. These men gave unselfishly of their lives when the call to duty came. No computer or budget expert can figure out the cost of being taken from your homes and loved ones to fight in a foreign land, no mathematical formula compensates for injury or death.
>
> We, who are mindful of the many sacrifices made by out veterans, are determined that they shall not suffer now that they are no longer in uniform. We shall not impose upon them the foe of want or need or impoverishment.

Yes, this House will miss ROLAND LIBONATI. The veterans, he loved so so much, will miss him, the people he served so loyally and effectively will miss him, and there will be a definite void in the Illinois delegation because of his retirement.

I extend to LIBBY and his lovely and devoted wife, Jeannette, and their fine son, Michael, my sincere good wishes and express the hope it will always be my good fortune to keep in close personal contact with them.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be permitted to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on this subject.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KLUCZYNSKI].

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, Hon. ROLAND VICTOR LIBONATI has served in Congress as the Representative from the Seventh District of Illinois since December 1957 and was not a candidate for reelection. During his years in the House he was one of the first Members on the floor of the House and was one of the last to leave before daily adjournment. He was a man with a pleasant smile and always was willing to be of help to any of his colleagues. His record of attendance in the House it outstanding. He was a very active member of the House Judiciary, and Veterans' Affairs Committees, and his knowledge of law was of great value when measures were under consideration. He was founder of the American Boys' Camp for Indigent Children which is located at Coloma, Wis. He was an active member of the American Legion and fought valiantly for all legislation of interest to the veterans.

It was my pleasure to have served with him in the General Assembly of the State of Illinois where he made an outstanding record.

I feel that I express the sentiment of a great many Members of the House in wishing LIBBY, his wife, Jeannette, and their son, Michael, every success in all their future undertakings.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join the Illinois delegation in paying tribute to our colleague and friend Congressman LIBONATI, of Chicago, who is voluntarily retiring from Congress.

Very few Members of this legislative body have had the vast and long experience in public office as enjoyed by Congressman LIBONATI. Before coming to Washington in the 85th Congress, he had served many terms as an Illinois State representative and as a State senator. As evidence of his ability, during his service in the Illinois House, he was elected as Democratic whip from 1944 to 1957 and as minority leader from 1957 to 1958.

No Member of this House has done more for the veteran and serviceman than he. Congressman LIBONATI has visited my district and spoken before the Legion and other service organizations on a number of occasions during the past years. He has attended many State and national Legion conventions. The veterans will sure miss his outstanding contributions toward veterans' legislation on the floor of this House.

I know that every person who is acquainted with "LIBBY" regrets his retirement and wishes him every success in his future endeavors either in the practice of law or further public service to his city, State, and Nation.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI].

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, final action today by the Congress of the United States on the bill, H.R. 1927, to revise the pension program for veterans of World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict and for their widows and children, is a fitting monument to one of the most dedicated Members of this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, it is regrettable and it is a great loss, not only to all of us here in the Congress but to the people of the Seventh Congressional District of the State of Illinois, to the people of the entire State of Illinois, and to the people of the United States that ROLAND LIBONATI has chosen not to seek reelection.

We here in the House of Representatives have had the privilege of working with him and observing his dedication to the service of the people of his district, the State, and the Nation.

As some of our colleagues have already pointed out, he was invariably the first Member in the Chamber during the days that we have been in session and always has been one of the last to leave. And, one of the great losses that we will suffer through his absence from this Chamber is not to have the privilege of hearing LIBBY make a speech. When LIBBY was a State senator in Illinois he had the reputation of being the most dynamic orator in that body.

He always took the strongest position on all the great causes that served to benefit the needy, the poor, and the oppressed. LIBBY brought his interest in humanitarian causes from the State Legislature of Illinois, where both he and his brother worked so diligently, to the Congress of the United States. He has long been the champion of those causes which sought to relieve the burdens of the oppressed and the needy. He was and is one of the great defenders of freedom and civil rights and all the things that stand for dignity in a human being.

So, Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues from the State of Illinois in wishing LIBBY a happy retirement.

When the gavel falls today to close this session of the 88th Congress, ROLAND LIBONATI will have put in 33 years of public service—distinguished public service. I hope his wife, Jeannette, and he are going to enjoy his retirement. I know they are looking forward with great pleasure to seeing their son, Michael, who is an honor student at Yale University Law School. LIBBY leaves his son, Michael, a brilliant and proud legacy of public service.

May ROLAND LIBONATI enjoy forever the satisfaction of knowing he served a grateful Nation with distinction during the most dynamic years in its history. These old halls will be emptier without him.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me for a suggestion?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I yield to the majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. There is not sufficient time on this conference report for Members who want to eulogize our wonderful friend LIBBY, so I suggest that we take the matter up under a special order, so all of us can get in on the act.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to correct a typographical error in the report on page 6 in the last paragraph.

The report says:

> * * * who can only obtain insurance at substandard rates.

It should read:

> * * * who cannot obtain insurance even at substandard rates.

I wish to point that out, Mr. Speaker, and I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MAKING IN ORDER DECLARATION OF RECESSES BY THE SPEAKER TODAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at any time during the remainder of the day it may be in order for the Speaker to declare recesses subject to the call of the Chair.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1965

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I call up amendment numbered 38 to the bill (H.R. 12633) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Senate amendment No. 38: on page 13, strike out lines 17 through 24 and line 1 on page 14, and insert the following:
>
> "For an additional amount for 'Defense educational activities,' $65,750,000, of which $10,300,000 shall be for capital contributions to student loan funds and loans for non-Federal capital contributions (not to exceed $300,000) to student loan funds, $10,000,000 shall be for grants to States for equipment and minor remodeling of facilities for the purposes included in section 301 of Public Law 85–864, as amended, and for supervisory and other services, $3,000,000 shall be for grants to States for testing, guidance, and counseling, and $5,000,000 shall be for transfer to the appropriation account 'Payments to school districts': *Provided*, That, in lieu of amounts heretofore specified, allotments for grants to States under sections 302(a) and 305 for acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling shall be made on the basis of $70,400,000, allotments for loans to private nonprofit schools shall be made on the basis of $9,600,000, and allotments under section 302(b) for supervisory and other services shall be made on the basis of $6,000,000: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be available only upon enactment of S. 3060, Eighty-eighth Congress or similar legislation, amending the National Defense Education Act of 1958."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:
>
> "For an additional amount for 'Defense educational activities,' $60,750,000, of which $10,300,000 shall be for capital contributions to student loan funds and loans for non-Federal capital contributions (not to exceed $300,000) to student loan funds, $10,000,000 shall be for grants to States for equipment and minor remodeling of facilities for the purposes included in section 301 of Public Law 85–864, as amended, and for supervisory and other services, and $3,000,000 shall be for grants to States for testing, guidance, and counseling: *Provided*, That, in lieu of amounts heretofore specified, allotments for grants to States under sections 302(a) and 305 for acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling shall be made on the basis of $70,400,000, allotments for loans to private nonprofit schools shall be made on the basis of $9,600,000, and allotments under section 302(b) for supervisory and other services shall be made on the basis of $6,000,000: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be available only upon enactment of S. 3060, Eighty-eighth Congress, or similar legislation, amending the National Defense Education Act of 1958.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the House approved the conference report on the supplemental appropriations bill, H.R. 12633. When the bill first went to the other body on September 22, 1964, it did not contain funds for the District of Columbia to participate in the program for aid to federally impacted school districts—authorization for such did not at that time exist.

The Senate, by amendment No. 38, which we are now considering, provided an appropriation of $65,750,000, of which $5 million would have gone to the District of Columbia.

The conferees deleted the $5 million, and inserted a provision that prohibited the use of any funds in the appropriation "Payments to school districts" on behalf of the District of Columbia during fiscal year 1965. The House yesterday went along with the conference report and that recommendation. The Senate agreed to the conference report and all other amendments in disagreement except this one, and that is why we are again required to bring the matter before the House. The motion which is now before the House would provide that the House position in eliminating the $5 million for the District of Columbia in this bill be sustained, but the language prohibiting participation by the District of Columbia would be dropped.

The funds necessary for participation by the District of Columbia would come from the appropriation already made for "Payments to school districts" in accord with the formula established by basic law.

This has not heretofore been possible. It has now been authorized by Congress by action taken only yesterday.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to my friend from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas, the good chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, has explained this situation exactly as it exists, and I concur in this motion and trust that the House will give its approval to same.

Mr. MAHON. I thank the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Now, what has happened overnight, if the gentleman will tell me? What has happened overnight to change the position of the House? Where yesterday the House said that the District was not to get between $4 and $5 million for allegedly impacted schools, the Appropriations Committee this morning says the District should have the money.

Mr. MAHON. In the bill as it originally passed the House—and I am not speaking of the conference report—there was no provision with respect to the $5 million for the District of Columbia; but in the conference, as I stated before, the House insisted on striking out the $5 million for the District which had been placed in the bill by the other body. The conferees agreed on striking out the provision. This conference action was rejected in the Senate. A further compromise has been reached by which the $5 million appropriation is left out of this bill but the District of Columbia is permitted to participate in the program. The Congress provided in the National Defense Education Act amendments which were approved yesterday, that the District of Columbia should participate on all fours with other areas of the Nation, and we are simply complying with the decision of Congress and making it possible for the District of Columbia to participate in whatever amount the law provides. That will probably be in the area of $4 to $5 million, as I understand it. In other words, the other body refused to accept the conference recommendation on this amendment, and the pending motion is the best compromise we could work out. I will say, in providing funds for the District of Columbia next year, this action will be taken into consideration.

Mr. GROSS. Do I understand, then, or is the gentleman in possession of any information as to why the District of Columbia budgeteers immediately took between $4 and $5 million of the District budget for educational purposes apparently in anticipation of getting this money or having some word that they were going to get the money? What I do not understand is why we went up the hill yesterday and apparently going down today. Did we get sandbagged somewhere along the line?

Mr. MAHON. This was a matter of compromise, and we did the best we could. It is true that the Congress has now enabled the District to participate in this program. I cannot speak for the budget officers of the District of Columbia.

Mr. GROSS. Only yesterday the conferees of the other body were joined with the conferees on the part of the House in opposition to this appropriation. Yet in a matter of a few hours the whole situation is reversed. I ask again the question, is the House today being sandbagged to the tune of $5 million by someone?

Mr. MAHON. To some extent that might be so.

We took the position that the District of Columbia gets certain contributions from the Federal Government and that this should be sufficient, but we have had to modify our position in order to come to a final agreement on this last appropriation bill of the session.

Mr. GROSS. The point is that only yesterday the gentleman and the conferees on the part of the House and their counterparts in the other body agreed, and the House agreed that this $5 million should not be in the bill. That was your wisdom and your judgment yesterday, that the money should not be in the bill. I resent the fact that today we are being sandbagged.

Mr. MAHON. The money is not in this bill. This only makes it possible for the regular law to operate.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding at this time. The discussion on this amendment has left some doubt as to the rightness of the action advised by the chairman of the conference.

The problem of the District and its inclusion in the impacted area legislation is an old one and this Congress has finally corrected the oversight by previous Congresses that failed to keep the faith with the peoples of the District of Columbia.

The position as I see it at this moment is this:

The Senate passed this appropriation bill and included therein a specific appropriation of $5 million for the District of Columbia as its share under the impacted area legislation.

Yesterday the House decided this was the wrong way to provide for the District under the act.

Today we have an opportunity to put this matter in its proper place under the law.

This amendment now before us will give the District its equal and fair share of all funds provided by the Congress to meet the needs as contained in the provisions of the impacted area legislation.

This is a good amendment and the conferees are to be congratulated for putting the District under the law equally with all other impacted school districts.

I appeal for your vote in support of the conference action.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the "ayes" appeared to have it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 211, nays 78, not voting 151, as follows:

[Roll No. 272]

YEAS—211

Adair
Addabbo
Albert
Andrews, N. Dak.
Arends
Ashley
Auchincloss
Ayres
Baldwin
Barry
Bates
Battin
Belcher
Bell
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bolton, Frances P.
Bolton, Oliver P.
Bow
Bray
Bromwell
Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, Va.
Burke
Burleson
Burton, Utah
Cahill
Cameron
Chelf
Chenoweth
Clark
Cleveland
Cohelan
Collier
Conte
Corman
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtin
Daddario
Dague
Daniels
Delaney
Dent
Derounian
Donohue
Downing
Dulski
Duncan
Dwyer
Edwards
Elliott
Ellsworth
Everett
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Findley
Flood
Fraser
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gary
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gonzalez
Goodling
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Grover
Gurney
Hagen, Calif.
Halleck
Halpern
Hansen
Harding
Hardy
Harris
Harrison
Harsha
Healey
Hechler
Holifield
Horan
Hosmer
Jarman
Jensen
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Pa.
Johnson, Wis.
Jonas
Jones, Mo.
Karsten
Kastenmeier
Kelly
Kilgore
King, Calif.
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Kox
Kunkel
Langen
Libonati
Lindsay
Long, La.
Long, Md.
McDade
McDowell
McFall
McMillan
MacGregor
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Mathias
Matthews
May
Meader
Mills
Minish
Monagan
Moore
Moorhead
Morgan
Mosher
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Natcher
Nedzi
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Konski
Olsen, Mont.
O'Neill
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pickle
Pike
Pirnie
Poage
Powell
Price
Pucinski
Quie
Reid, N.Y.
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Roberts, Tex.
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Roudebush
Roybal
Rumsfeld
Ryan, Mich.
Ryan, N.Y.
St Germain
St. Onge
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Secrest
Sheppard
Shriver
Sickles
Smith, Iowa
Smith, Va.
Staggers
Steed
Stephens
Stinson
Stratton
Stubblefield
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thomas
Thomson, Wis.
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vinson
Wallhauser
Watts
Whalley
White
Wickersham
Widnall
Willis
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.
Wright
Wydler
Young
Zablocki

NAYS—78

Abele
Abernethy
Andrews, Ala.
Ashmore
Baker
Becker
Beermann
Bennett, Fla.
Betts
Bonner
Brock
Broyhill, N.C.
Bruce
Byrnes, Wis.
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Clawson, Del
Colmer
Cooley
Corbett
Dole
Dowdy
Fisher
Ford
Foreman
Gathings
Goodell
Griffin
Gross
Gubser
Hagan, Ga.
Haley
Hall
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Hoeven
Huddleston
Hutchinson
Jennings
Johansen
King, N.Y.
Latta
Lennon
Lipscomb
Lloyd
McCulloch
Marsh
Milliken
Minshall
Ostertag
Passman

Pillion
Poff
Pool
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rich
Rogers, Tex.
Saylor
Schadeberg
Schenck
Short
Siler
Snyder
Taft
Tuck
Tuten
Utt
Van Pelt
Waggonner
Watson
Weaver
Westland
Wharton
Whitener
Whitten
Williams
Winstead
Wyman

NOT VOTING—151

Abbitt
Alger
Anderson
Ashbrook
Aspinall
Avery
Baring
Barrett
Bass
Beckworth
Berry
Blatnik
Brademas
Brooks
Brotzman
Buckley
Burkhalter
Burton, Calif.
Byrne, Pa.
Carey
Casey
Celler
Clancy
Clausen,
  Don H.
Curtis
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Denton
Derwinski
Devine
Diggs
Dingell
Dorn
Edmondson
Evins
Finnegan
Fino
Flynt
Fogarty
Forrester
Fountain
Frelinghuysen
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Giaimo
Gill
Glenn
Grabowski
Grant
Hanna
Hawkins
Hays
Hébert
Henderson
Herlong
Hoffman
Holland
Horton
Hull
Ichord
Jones, Ala.
Karth
Kee
Keith
Keogh
Kilburn
Kornegay
Kyl
Laird
Landrum
Lankford
Leggett
Lesinski
McClory
McIntire
McLoskey
Macdonald
Martin, Calif.
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Matsunaga
Michel
Miller, Calif.
Miller, N.Y.
Montoya
Morris
Morrison
Morse
Morton
Moss
Murray
Nelsen
Nix
O'Hara, Mich.
Olson, Minn.
Osmers
Pilcher
Purcell
Quillen
Rains
Randall
Reid, Ill.
Reifel
Riehlman
Rivers, Alaska
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts, Ala.
Robison
Roosevelt
Rostenkowski
Roush
St. George
Schwengel
Scott
Selden
Senner
Shipley
Sibal
Sikes
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Springer
Staebler
Stafford
Sullivan
Talcott
Taylor
Thompson, La.
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Toll
Tollefson
Trimble
Tupper
Weltner
Wilson, Ind.
Younger

So the motion was agreed to.

The clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Keogh for, with Mr. Hébert against.

Mr. Sibal for, with Mr. Alger against.

Mr. Morse for, with Mr. Hoffman against.

Mr. Horton for, with Mr. Kilburn against.

Mr. Frelinghuysen for, with Mr. Laird against.

Mr. Roosevelt for, with Mr. Fountain against.

Mr. Toll for, with Mr. Henderson against.

Mr. Barrett for, with Mr. Taylor against.

Mr. Byrne of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Scott against.

Mr. Nix for, with Mr. Kornegay against.

Mr. Osmers for, with Mr. Quillen against.

Mr. Martin of Massachusetts for, with Mr. Talcott against.

Mr. Springer for, with Mr. Martin of Nebraska against.

Mrs. St. George for, with Mr. Martin of California against.

Mr. Stafford for, with Mr. Clancy against.

Mr. Schwengel for, with Mr. Younger against.

Mr. Nelsen for, with Mr. Ashbrook against.

Mr. Glenn for, with Mr. Smith of California against.

Mr. Tupper for, with Mrs. Reid of Illinois against.

Mr. Carey for, with Mr. Berry against.

Mr. Fogarty for, with Mr. Michel against.

Mr. Shipley for, with Mr. Curtis against.

Mr. Hays for, with Mr. Casey against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Brooks with Mr. Avery.

Mr. Sikes with Mr. Riehlman.

Mr. Brademas with Mr. McLoskey.

Mr. Giaimo with Mr. Keith.

Mr. Blatnik with Mr. McClory.

Mr. Weltner with Mr. Tollefson.

Mr. Trimble with Mr. Skubitz.

Mr. Hanna with Mr. Kyl.

Mr. Grabowski with Mr. Anderson.

Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Don H. Clausen.

Mr. Moss with Mr. Devine.

Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Fino.

Mr. Morrison with Mr. Wilson of Indiana.

Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. Derwinski.

Mr. Leggett with Mr. Reifel.

Mr. Macdonald with Mr. Robison.

Mr. Rivers of Alaska with Mr. Morton.

Mr. Aspinall with Mr. Brotzman.

Mr. Matsunaga with Mr. McIntire.

Mr. Gill with Mr. Holland.

Mr. Sisk with Mr. Finnegan.

Mr. Evins with Mr. Dorn.

Mr. Fuqua with Mr. Celler.

Mr. Hull with Mr. Staebler.

Mr. O'Hara of Michigan with Mr. Murray.

Mr. Montoya with Mr. Dawson.

Mr. Fulton of Tennessee with Mr. Lesinski.

Mr. Thompson of Texas with Mrs. Kee.

Mrs. Sullivan with Mr. Abbitt.

Mr. Morris with Mr. Baring.

Mr. Denton with Mr. Hawkins.

Mr. Ichord with Mr. Lankford.

Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mr. Buckley.

Mr. Herlong with Mr. Olson of Minnesota.

Mr. Slack with Mr. Burkhalter.

Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Diggs.

Mr. Landrum with Mr. Purcell.

Mr. Randall with Mr. Burton of California.

Mr. Selden with Mr. Dingell.

Mr. Karth with Mr. Pilcher.

Mr. Roberts of Alabama with Mr. Rivers of South Carolina.

Mr. Senner with Mr. Grant.

Mr. Beckworth with Mr. Bass.

Mr. Roush with Mr. Forrester.

Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Davis of Tennessee.

Mr. Flynt with Mr. Rains.

Mr. WATSON, Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina, Mr. WYMAN, and Mr. DOLE changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. BELL changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Speaker, during the rollcall vote on amendment No. 38 to the supplemental appropriations bill for fiscal year 1965 I was away from the Chamber on official business and was unable to hear the bells indicating that the vote was being taken. Therefore, unfortunately, I was not present. Had I been present I would have voted "nay."

DISPOSAL OF ZINC FROM THE NATIONAL STOCKPILE

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 12435) to authorize the sale, without regard to the 6-month waiting period prescribed, of zinc proposed to be disposed of pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and, of course, I will not object, I wish the gentleman would just make a short statement on this and tell us what the contents of the bill are so the membership can know.

Mr. PHILBIN. I will be glad to do so.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 12435 authorizes the disposal of 50,000 short tons of zinc now held in the national and supplemental stockpile, without regard to those provisions of law requiring a 6-month waiting period before effecting disposal.

The current conventional war stockpile objective for zinc, which was set on June 17, 1963, has been revised downward from 178,000 short tons to zero. As a result, the 1,505,641 short tons of zinc now in the stockpile is excess to present requirements.

Zinc, particularly in the higher grades, is in extremely short supply for use in the die-casting industry. Present consumption exceeds production. In fact, for the past 2 years, United States consumption of zinc has exceeded domestic production by an average of about 100,000 short tons per year. Estimates for zinc use in 1964 indicate that consumption will top the record year, 1955. Present availabilities of excess zinc in Government inventories are more than ample to satisfy the needs which the producing industry at present is apparently unable to fulfill.

Mr. Speaker, I am confident that the release of this 50,000 tons of zinc from the stockpile will not disrupt or depress the domestic market.

I ask for approval of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein extraneous material.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the latter request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The material referred to is as follows:

BENTON HARBOR, MICH.,
September 30, 1964.

Hon. PHILIP J. PHILBIN,
House of Representatives, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

Very much urge that H.R. 12435 concerning release of zinc from stockpile be recommended this session. Metal released previously much appreciated but will be consumed by mid-November. Approximately 30 independent zinc alloy-making firms having difficulty getting enough needed supplies. Also estimate up to 1,500, repeat 1,500, users of zinc and zinc alloys for galvanizing, die-casting and brassmaking will be scratching for supplies by late December. Any interruption of production for even the smallest die-caster could interrupt a large automotive or appliance plant using their contracted parts. This is not just a remote possibility but may occur in January. If the stockpile bill is not passed until January, by the time the metal is actually sold and delivered it would be March. This could present some very serious problems as there are literally thousands upon thousands of firms dependent on these products for their own production. I do not want to appear panic stricken, but it is better to have the metal available than to risk interrupting our present high-level economy.

Sincerely yours,
HERBERT D. MENDEL,
President, Michigan Standard Alloys.

WOODSIDE, N.Y., *October 2, 1964.*

Congressman PHILIP PHILBIN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We have 300 employees who may be laid off next week due to lack of zinc. Please vote for H.R. 12435 to release zinc from the stockpile.

ALLEN STEVEN CORP.

CHICAGO, ILL.,
October 1, 1964.

Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Re H.R. 12435: Imperative additional stockpile release of zinc for fourth quarter be declared immediately to avoid shutdown of our plant as well as many other plants we are now supplying due to lack of 4/9 zinc basically used for diecasting purposes. Thank you for your assistance.

HARCO ALUMINUM, INC.

CLEVELAND, OHIO,
September 30, 1964.

Hon. PHILIP J. PHILBIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Urge your cooperation in passing bill H.R. 12435. The zinc situation needs immediate relief.

J. P. BAUER,
Purchasing Agent,
Precision Castings Co.

DETROIT, MICH.,
September 30, 1964.

Hon. PHILIP J. PHILBIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Subject bill H.R. 12435 zinc stockpile automotive diecasting dire need additional stockpile zinc fourth quarter.

WOLVERINE DIECAST,
H. T. ADAMS.

MAYWOOD, ILL.,
October 1, 1964.

Hon. PHILIP PHILBIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Re H.R. 12435 zinc stockpile we face a serious zinc shortage in the middle of November or early December that will surely curtail our productions and might almost completely stop it. We are engaged in the production of zinc alloy diecastings and appeal for substantial stockpile release during the last quarter of this year. Your attention to this matter will be most gratefully appreciated.

EUGENE CALLEN,
President, Callen Manufacturing Corp.

GRAND RAPIDS, MICH.,
October 1, 1964.

Hon. PHILIP J. PHILBIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Reference to House rule bill No. 12435 additional zinc should be released from the stockpile so that we can meet the die cast hardware requirements of the appliance, furniture and automotive industries for the fourth quarter of this year.

M. S. KEELER, II,
President, Keeler Brass Co.

PETOSKEY, MICH.,
October 1, 1964.

Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Reference bill H.R. 12435 stockpile zinc automotive hardware die casters desperately need additional fourth quarter zinc.

PETOSKEY MANUFACTURING CO.,
JOE KILBORN.

BENSENVILLE, ILL.,
October 1, 1964.

Hon. PHILIP J. PHILBIN,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Request passage of H.R. 12435 this session or severe zinc shortage will overtake diecast industry and will have paralyzing effect on economy. Prompt passage insuring delivery of zinc during November and December will maintain present level of industry output. Thanks for cooperation on recent stockpile release.

DONALD CARROLL METALS,
DONALD CARROLL.

CHICAGO, ILL.,
October 1, 1964.

Congressman PHILIP PHILBIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Bill H.R. 12435 special program zinc imperative release zinc for fourth quarter.

JET DIE CASTING CORP.

GRAND RAPIDS, MICH.,
October 1, 1964.

PHILIP J. PHILBIN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Subject bill H.R. 12435, stockpile zinc automotive hardware industry requires additional stockpile zinc release for fourth quarter.

E. J. NEWHOUSE JERVIS CORP.

HOLLAND, MICH.,
September 30, 1964.

Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Subject bill H.R. 12435, zinc stockpile. We are drastically short on zinc for diecasting—automotive and appliance parts for fourth quarter.

H. J. WINDOLPH,
President, Holland Diecasting & Plating Co., Inc.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
September 30, 1964.

Hon. CARL VINSON,
Chairman, Armed Services Committee,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

The American Die Casting Institute urgently requests enactment of H.R. 12435 authorizing stockpile release of zinc because of the continuing shortage of needed metal to meet automotive and industrial requirements for diecastings. We urge action before adjournment to assure uninterrupted operations by our industry.

DAVID LAINE,
Secretary, American Die Casting Institute.

GRAND RAPIDS, MICH.,
September 30, 1964.

Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Reference bill H.R. 12435, stockpile zinc. Automotive and appliance hardware diecaster desperately need additional fourth quarter zinc to meet production demand.

GRAND RAPIDS ZINC CORP.,
H. P. STOUTEN.

HOLLAND, MICH.,
September 30, 1964.

Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Reference bill H.R. 12435, diecasting industries desperately need additional stockpile zinc, fourth quarter.

SCOTTS, INC.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
October 1, 1964.

Congressman CARL VINSON,
Chairman, Armed Services Committee,
Washington, D.C.:

The American Hot Dip Galvanizers Association strongly recommends passage of H.R. 12435. Zinc to be distributed in the same method as the last release. Urgently needed by the small businessmen represented by our membership.

CHARLES E. PERRY,
Secretary-Treasurer, the American Hot Dip Galvanizers Association.

GRAND RAPIDS, MICH.,
October 1, 1964.

Mr. PHILIP J. PHILBIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Reference bill H.R. 12435 stockpile zinc. We urge you to assist the passage of this bill to release zinc. The die cast industry desperately requires material for fourth-quarter schedules.

ATTWOOD CORP.,
JAMES B. COOK,
President.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
October 1, 1964.

Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN,
Chairman, Armed Services Subcommittee No. 2, Washington, D.C.:

The American Hop Dip Galvanizers Association strongly recommends passage of H.R. 12435. Zinc to be distributed in the same method as the last release. Urgently needed by the small businessmen represented by our membership.

CHARLES E. PERRY,
Secretary-Treasurer, the American Hot Dip Galvanizers Association.

CLEVELAND, OHIO,
September 29, 1964.

Hon. PHILIP J. PHILBIN,
Chairman, House Armed Services Committee, Subcommittee No. 2, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

Release of zinc as now requested is essential. It is vital to the production of zinc diecastings used by hundred of plants across the country in order to maintain their production. Your help in the passing of House bill H.R. 12435 will be a vital service to industry.

SUPERIOR DIE CASTING CORP.

GRAND RAPIDS, MICH.,
September 30, 1964.

Congressman PHILIP PHILBIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Reference bill H.R. 12435: Consuming industries unable to purchase sufficient quantities of zinc for the fourth quarter. Urgently require additional stockpile release.

MESCO ALUMINUM & COPPER CO.,
R. M. MESSENGER.

GRAND RAPIDS, MICH.,
September 30, 1964.

Congressman PHILIP PHILBIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Reference bill H.R. 12435, Stockpile: Zinc-consuming industries urgently need additional zinc for fourth quarter as they are unable to purchase sufficient quantities for demand.

GRAND RAPIDS ALLOYS, INC.,
J. T. REED.

BOLIVAR, TENN.,
September 30, 1964.

Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Reference bill H.R. 12435: Automotive and appliance hardware industries urgently require additional stockpile zinc for the fourth quarter, as suppliers are unable to meet the demand.

W. B. Kessinger,
Executive Vice President, Jervis Corp.

Bolivar, Tenn.,
September 30, 1964.

Congressman Philip J. Philbin,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Reference bill H.R. 12435: Automotive and appliance hardware industries urgently require additional stockpile zinc for the fourth quarter, as suppliers are unable to meet the demand.

Monroe Metals, Inc.,
T. Stanley Cox.

Grand Rapids, Mich.,
September 30, 1964.

Congressman Philip Philbin,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Subject bill H.R. 12435, stock pile zinc diecasting industry urgently requires stockpile zinc to supplement insufficient supply for fourth quarter demand.

Grand Rapids Smelting,
E. H. Miller.

Cleveland, Ohio.,
September 30, 1964.

Hon. Philip J. Philbin,
Chairman of House Armed Services Subcommittee No. 2, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

We urge your prompt action on H.R. 12435 due to extreme shortage of zinc. This affects many industries including diecasting which is our business.

Nelmor Manufacturing Co.

Cleveland, Ohio,
September 29, 1964.

Hon. Philip J. Philbin,
Chairman, House Armed Services Subcommittee No. 2, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

We are still experiencing extreme difficulty in obtaining necessary zinc. In order to continue to supply our customer the leading manufacturers in the United States, we deem it necessary to secure additional releases of stockpile zinc.

Pressure Castings, Inc.,
William A. Briggs, *President.*

Detroit, Mich.,
September 30, 1964.

Congressman Philip J. Philbin,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

In reference to House bill H.R. 12435, zinc stockpile bill, auto hardware suppliers are desperately in need of additional zinc for the fourth quarter. Therefore urge you do your utmost to support the passage of this bill.

Continental Diecasting Co.

Amory, Miss.,
September 30, 1964.

Congressman Philip J. Philbin,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Re bill H.R. 12435 auto and appliance hardware industry urgently require additional stockpile zinc for fourth quarter as suppliers are unable to meet demand.

Cramco, Inc.,
W. B. Jones, *Vice President.*

Grand Rapids, Mich.,
September 30, 1964.

Congressman Philip J. Philbin,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Reference bill H.R. 12435 stockpile zinc. Diecasting industry urgently needs zinc for the fourth quarter. Unable to purchase sufficient quantities.

Grand Rapids Brass Co.,
I. L. Heyniger.

Detroit, Mich.,
September 30, 1964.

Congressman Philip J. Philbin,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Subject bill H.R. 12435 stockpile zinc. Please release more zinc from the stockpile to relieve a critical zinc situation in the fourth quarter and to prevent an impending price rise.

Arco Diecast & Metals, Inc.,
H. B. Aronow, *Vice President.*

Mr. ARENDS. As I understand it, this was a unanimous report from our Armed Services Committee and has been checked out with every phase of the Government and there is complete agreement that the action is necessary and desirable at this time.

Mr. PHILBIN. The distinguished gentleman is correct.

Mr. ARENDS. The industry has no objection and, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I shall not object to this release of 50,000 tons of zinc from the stockpile, but I would like to point out to the House that in our Subcommittee on Mines and Mining where we have had many of the agencies of the Federal Government that have recommended further low limits for zinc, or that objectives of the stockpile remain at zero, that this committee has not been conclusively shown or has agreed that such a stockpile objective is correct. I would say to the House that as of this time we have already released 75,000 tons of zinc from the stockpile in response to a request by the consuming industry.

At the time of that request, the diecasting industry and the consuming industry indicated that such release would be sufficient for this year. Now they are back here again asking for an additional 50,000 tons of zinc from the stockpile. I suggest that what the gentleman from Massachusetts says about this release not further depressing the price of zinc is not altogether correct. Its effect will be to keep the price of zinc depressed. If the price of zinc could be allowed to go up approximately 1 cent we could produce, particularly in my district in Idaho, where they are trying to revitalize a facet of zinc mining industry, enough zinc to make up part of the deficiency that now exists.

I should like to point out the general principle of taking metals from stockpiles to depress or hold the price of metals down is not a correct action. I think you could use the same analogy with silver. We are now depleting our Treasury stocks of that metal at a very rapid rate and future prices for silver are now at $1.38 for next summer, the subsidiary coinage value of silver. Traders are predicting a price of $2.50 per ounce by the end of next year.

I think we should take a realistic look at the zinc metal supply problem and try to get the price of zinc commensurate with the cost of domestic production and then use the stockpile disposal authority to stabilize the price and to maintain a prosperous domestic zinc mining industry. I should hope that the Congress convening next year will take such action. If I am a Member of this body this will be my objective.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I assure the gentleman that the committee will give his views very careful consideration when this matter is again considered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I want to associate myself with the remarks of my colleague the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. White]. I am satisfied that instead of solving this problem, this bill will only serve further to keep the metal industry in this country in a depressed condition, particularly the lead and zinc industry, and prevent it from assuming its rightful place in the production market. I certainly hope when Congress convenes next year we will not be again faced with a release from the stockpile of lead and zinc and that the American mining industry and their miners will be permitted to produce the lead and zinc which they can, to supply the ever-growing demands for both these basic metals.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, but I would like to take this occasion to call to the attention of the House the entire matter of silver that I think has not come sufficiently to its attention. A resolution came before the Committee on Banking and Currency some time ago asking for authorization for the Treasury Department to study the silver situation. Only one hearing was held on that resolution. The Treasury Department never appeared in response to it. Every indication from the witnesses who did appear was that there is a major shortage facing this country and the world. Consumption in this country is increasing constantly and consumption in the world is almost twice the present annual production. We have done nothing about it.

Moreover, we have done nothing about setting up a U.S. strategic stockpile. It is estimated that we need a stockpile of 500 million ounces, but we have taken no action to set up such a stockpile.

I think the policies being followed in this bill and with regard to silver have been in part a cause of this situation. We are doing nothing to correct it. It is a problem that the United States is going to have to face up to very quickly.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 12435

A bill to authorize the sale, without regard to the six-month waiting period prescribed, of zinc proposed to be disposed of pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Administrator of General Services is hereby authorized to dispose of, by negotiation or otherwise, approximately fifty thousand short tons of zinc now held in the national stockpile. Such disposition may be made without regard to the provisions of section 3 of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act, relating to dispositions on the basis of a revised determination pursuant to section 2 of said Act, to the effect that no such disposition shall be made until six months after publication in the Federal Register and transmission to the Congress and to the Armed Services Committees thereof of a notice of the proposed disposition, but in such disposition the Administrator of General Services shall comply with the other provisions of such section 3, particularly those which require that the plan and date of disposition shall be fixed with due regard to the protection of producers, processors, and consumers against avoidable disruption of their usual markets.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike everything after the enacting clause and substitute the following:

"That the Administrator of General Services is hereby authorized to dispose of, by negotiation or otherwise, approximately fifty thousand short tons of zinc now held in the national stockpile established pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98–98h) and the supplemental stockpile established pursuant to section 104(b) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1704(b)). Such dispositions may be made without regard to the provisions of section 3 of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act: *Provided,* That the time and method of disposition shall be fixed with due regard to the protection of the United States against avoidable loss and the protection of producers, processors, and consumers against avoidable disruption of their usual markets."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read a third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "To authorize the disposal, without regard to the prescribed 6-month waiting period, of zinc from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROGRESS MADE IN STRENGTHENING OUR FOREIGN ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 357)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

This report demonstrates the remarkable progress made in strengthening our foreign assistance programs and policies since 1961.

The 1961 Act for International Development called for major changes in the operation and emphasis of these historic programs. For more effective direction, the activities of several agencies were brought together under the Agency for International Development. New guidelines were laid down for our aid programs as part of the bold effort to make the 1960's the Decade of Development.

This report for fiscal 1963 shows clearly the ways in which these new guidelines are being translated into concrete programs. They provide the foundations for the lean, tightly managed aid program we plan for fiscal 1965. I want to call your attention particularly, therefore, to some significant features of this report which mark our progress during 1963 toward basic and continuing objectives of our foreign assistance policy.

INTEREST-BEARING LOANS REPLACE GRANTS

As the 1961 act directed, interest-bearing loans have replaced grants as the chief mechanism for assistance. Loans represented 57 percent of AID's commitments during fiscal 1963—the highest proportion in the history of the foreign assistance program.

AID IS MORE SELECTIVE

Our aid became increasingly selective and concentrated in fiscal 1963—a trend that has since been accelerated. Eighty percent of all economic assistance funds authorized that year were for just 20 countries. Sixty percent of total military assistance went to just nine key countries.

AID TO LATIN AMERICAN INCREASES

To increase the impact of the Alliance for Progress, our aid to Latin America was sharply stepped up in fiscal 1963, reaching 23 percent of worldwide commitments, compared with 18 percent the preceding year and an average of only 2 percent from 1948 to 1960.

NEW POLICIES PROTECT THE DOLLAR

Policies designed to protect our balance of payments produced major results in fiscal 1963—a dramatic jump in the purchases of U.S. products. U.S. producers supplied 78 percent of all AID-financed commodities during the year, compared with 63 percent the preceding year, and less than 50 percent in earlier years.

INCREASED PARTICIPATION BY U.S. INDUSTRY

Under these policies U.S. business and industry exported $855 million in AID-financed goods and equipment to Asia, Africa, and Latin America during the year, and American shipping firms were paid about $80 million to carry AID-financed commodities to their destinations in the less-developed countries. These dollars meant more jobs for American workers.

As a result of the same policy, U.S. ships carried more than 80 percent of the total net AID-financed cargo that year, well in excess of the 50 percent required by the Cargo Preference Act.

PRIVATE ORGANIZATIONS PLAY A LARGER ROLE

The 1961 act also called for greater use of America's vast private resources in the battle against world poverty. During fiscal 1963, about one-fourth of all technical assistance was carried out not by AID personnel, but by American colleges, universities, business, professional firms, and service organizations on contract with AID.

More than 70 of our colleges and universities were at work in 40 countries under AID contracts, helping other people make progress in education, in health, in agriculture, in business, and industry.

During the year, there was a fourfold increase in cooperative programs designed to help private citizens organize savings and loan institutions, credit unions, rural electric cooperatives, housing, and farm credit co-ops. These programs that go right to the people have continued to grow. To expand this significant work, AID relied heavily on contracts with experienced private groups such as the Credit Union National Association, the National League of Insured Savings Associations, the Cooperative League of America, and the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association.

INCREASED EMPHASIS ON PRIVATE ENTERPRISE

In recognition of the fact that foreign investors helped build our own Nation's economy and that private capital must do most of the job for the developing nations, we increased efforts to encourage American investment in the less developed countries. Twelve countries signed investment guaranty agreements during fiscal year 1963, bringing to 55 the number of less developed countries participating in this successful program.

This year, for the first time, AID guaranteed a substantial amount of new U.S. private dollar investment in development banks organized to foster private enterprise in the less developed countries. U.S. investors applied for guaranty coverage totaling $32 million for new or additional investments in such banks.

SIGNIFICANT SAVINGS BY IMPROVED MANAGEMENT

Fiscal 1963 saw the beginning of significant economies in the management of aid programs by the Agency for International Development. Economies made in that year included savings of more than $900,000 by centralized purchase of DDT, $1,200,000 during the first 6 months of the fiscal year alone through tighter travel policies and regulations, and $34 million saved through an aggressive program to use Government-owned excess property in oversea projects.

ECONOMIC AID TO EUROPE TERMINATED

Major assistance to Europe under the Marshall plan had ended by the midfifties, but a few smaller supplemental programs continued during the years after. Fiscal 1963 saw the last economic assistance commitment for Europe: a single grant of $125,000 authorized to finance the closing out of prior activities in Yugoslavia.

Finally, let me point out this. It is particularly appropriate that the same year which marked the termination of the historic and successful Marshall plan for Europe was also the year in which our efforts in the less-developed countries began giving unmistakable evidence of success.

With our help, developed countries like Britain, France, and Japan recovered from the war rapidly and were soon in a position to give rather than receive assistance. But when we first extended America's helping hand to the less developed countries a decade ago, there was no such promise of rapid results. We knew it was right and necessary to help these poorer countries to a better life if we were to preserve our own good life and expand the family of the free. But only recently could we be certain that it was practical and only recently have been able to see with our eyes the proof of our earlier vision. In fiscal 1963, for the first time, it became unmistakably clear that countries like free China were ending their dependence on AID and that others would follow.

We know today that the progress in controlling diseases that have sapped men's strength to build and to work, the steady expansion of educational opportunities, the slow but persistent increase in national income and output in the countries we have aided are leading to further successes. We know that if our goal is still distant, our course is true.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *October 3, 1964*.

CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN INTERNATIONAL BRIDGES

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House Committee on Foreign Affairs be discharged from further consideration of the bill S. 3074 and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "International Bridge Act of 1964".

Sec. 2. The consent of Congress is hereby granted to the construction, maintenance, and operation of any bridge and approaches thereto, which will connect the United States with any foreign country (hereinafter referred to as an "international bridge"), and to the collection of tolls for its use, so far as the United States has jurisdiction. Such consent shall be subject to: (1) the approval of the proper authorities in the foreign country concerned; (2) commitment by the State in which the bridge would be located to review the detailed plans and specifications for the bridge with respect to structural soundness and to inspect the bridge on completion and periodically thereafter; and (3) the provisions of the Act entitled "An Act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters", approved March 23, 1906 (33 U.S.C. 491–498), except for section 6 (33 U.S.C. 496), and (4) the provisions of this Act which follow hereafter.

Sec. 3. No bridge may be constructed, maintained, and operated pursuant to section 2 unless the President has first given his approval thereto. In the course of determining whether to grant such approval, the President shall secure the advice and recommendations of (1) the International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, in the case of a bridge connecting the United States and Mexico, (2) the Governor of the State in which the bridge would be located, and (3) the heads of such departments and agencies of the Federal Government as he deems appropriate.

Sec. 4. The approval of the Secretary of the Army, as required by section 1 of the Act of March 23, 1906 (33 U.S.C. 491), shall only be given subsequent to the President's approval, as provided for in section 3 of this Act, and shall be null and void unless the actual construction of the bridge is commenced within two years and completed within five years from the date of the Secretary's approval: *Provided, however*, That the Secretary may, for good cause shown, extend for a reasonable time either or both of the time limits herein provided.

Sec. 5. If tolls are charged for the use of an international bridge constructed under this Act, the following provisions shall apply, so far as the United States has jurisdiction:

(a) in the case of a bridge constructed or taken over or acquired by a private individual, company, or other private entity, tolls may be collected for a period not to exceed sixty-six years from the date of completion of such bridge, and at the end of such sixty-six years, such bridge and approaches thereto, if not previously transferred to a public agency pursuant to section 6, shall become the property of the State wherein the United States portion of such bridge is located, and no further compensation shall be deemed to be due such individual company or entity; or

(b) in the case of a bridge constructed or taken over or acquired by a State or States or by any municipality or other political subdivision or public agency thereof, the rates of toll shall be so adjusted as to provide a fund sufficient to pay for the reasonable cost of maintaining, repairing, and operating the bridge and its approaches under economical management, and to provide a sinking fund sufficient to amortize the amount paid therefor, including reasonable interest and financing cost, as soon as possible under reasonable charges, but within a period not to exceed forty years from the date of completing or acquiring the same. After a sinking fund sufficient for such amortization shall have been so provided, any such bridge shall thereafter be maintained and operated free of tolls.

An accurate record of the amount paid for acquiring the bridge and its approaches, the actual expenditures for maintaining, repairing, and operating the same, and of the daily tolls collected, shall be kept and shall be available for the information of all persons interested.

Sec. 6. Nothing in this Act shall be deemed to prevent the individual, corporation, or other entity to which, pursuant to this Act, authorization has been given to construct, operate, and maintain an international bridge and the approaches thereto, from selling, assigning, or transferring the rights, powers, and privileges conferred by this Act to any public agency and any such successor agency is authorized to exercise the rights, powers, and privileges acquired under this section in the same manner as if such rights, powers, and privileges had been granted by this Act directly to such agency: *Provided, however*, That with respect to the collection of tolls the provisions of section 5(b) shall apply.

Sec. 7. The provisions of this Act shall apply only to international bridges the construction of which is approved under such provisions.

Sec. 8. Nothing in this Act shall be construed to affect, impair, or diminish any right, power, or jurisdiction of the United States over or in regard to any navigable waters or any interstate or foreign commerce.

Sec. 9. The Secretary of the Army shall, at the end of each calendar year, transmit to the Congress a report of all approvals pursuant to this Act during such year.

Sec. 10. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this Act is expressly reserved.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. O'HARA OF ILLINOIS

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 1, line 8, after the words "with any" insert "contiguous."

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. O'HARA OF ILLINOIS

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 2, line 22, strike out section 4 and insert section 4 (a) as follows:

"Sec. 4. (a) The approval of the Secretary of the Army, as required by section 1 of the Act of March 23, 1906 (33 U.S.C. 491) shall only be given—

"(1) subsequent to the President's approval, as provided for in section 3 of this Act, and

"(2) subsequent to the expiration of the first period of 60 calendar days of continuous session of the Congress, following the date on which the Secretary of the Army shall have notified the Congress of his intention to give such approval; but only if, between the date of notification and the expiration of such 60-day period, there has not been passed by either of the two Houses a resolution stating in substance that that House does not favor the construction of the bridge as proposed to be approved by the Secretary of the Army.

Approval by the Secretary of the Army in accordance with this subsection shall be null and void unless the actual construction of the bridge is commenced within 2 years and completed within 5 years from the date of such approval. The Secretary may, for good cause shown, extend for a reasonable time such 2-year limitation or 5-year limitation, or both.

"(b) For the purposes of subsection (a)—

"(1) continuity of session shall be considered as broken only by an adjournment of the Congress sine die; but

"(2) in the computation of the 60-day period there shall be excluded the days on which either House is not in session because of an adjournment of more than 3 days to a day certain."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. Speaker, with the rapid population buildup on both sides of the international boundary between the United States and Mexico, there is a continuing and increasing demand for authority from the Congress for the construction of new international bridges. This bill seeks to make separate congressional authorization for individual international bridges unnecessary in the ordinary instance. The bill proposes to give the consent of the Congress, subject to the conditions and limitations set out in the bill itself, for the construction of such international bridges.

It should be noted that the bill, in placing certain limitations on the construction, maintenance, and operation of such bridges and on the collection of tolls for their use, does so insofar as the United States has jurisdiction. It further states that such consent shall be subject to the approval of the proper authorities in the foreign country concerned. In connection with the limitation on the period of time for which tolls may be collected, there is also a provision for such bridge thereafter becoming the property of the State wherein the U.S. portion of such bridge is located or for the bridge becoming free of tolls under other circumstances.

These limitations take into account the fact that U.S. sovereignty stops at the dividing line between the United States and the foreign country involved, and the bill does not seek to invade the sovereignty of that foreign country.

The Congress, of course, realizes that any general or specific legislation having to do with the construction, maintenance, and operation of international bridges, or the assignment or replacement of them, must of necessity be limited to the area of the sovereignty of the United States. Only that portion of the bridge which is located in the United States is fully within the control of the Congress. The portion of the bridge which lies in the foreign country is, of course, within the control of that country, and this legislation recognizes that the construction, maintenance, and operation of such an international bridge must of necessity have the approval of the proper authorities in that foreign country and that the bridge be under the joint control of the two countries.

Thank you.

The bill as amended was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHIPPEWA INDIANS

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 3035) to provide for the disposition of judgment funds now on deposit to the credit of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the funds on deposit in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians that were appropriated by the Act of June 9, 1964, to pay a judgment by the Indian Claims Commission in docket 18A, and the interest thereon, after payment of attorney fees and expenses, may be advanced or expended for any purpose that is authorized by the tribal governing body and approved by the Secretary of the Interior. Any part of such funds that may be distributed per capita to the members of the tribe shall not be subject to Federal or State income tax.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, the bill we presently have before us, S. 3035, is identical to H.R. 12130, introduced by our colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Langen].

The purpose of the bill is to provide for the disposition of a $1,797,761—less attorney fees and expenses—judgment awarded the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians by the Indian Claims Commission.

Under the provisions of the bill the funds plus accrued interest may be expended for such purposes as are authorized by the Red Lake Tribal Council and the Secretary of the Interior. In anticipation of this award and this legislation the tribal council has submitted a plan to the Secretary which includes a tribal credit program, a scholarship program, a trust fund for emergency purposes, an industrial development promotional plan, possibly, a per capita payment among the enrolled members.

The Red Lake Band has been waiting for this award for many years. I am hopeful it will be forthcoming shortly. The necessary funds to pay the judgment were appropriated by Congress in June 1964. No further expenditure of Federal funds will be entailed. The reports from the Secretary of the Interior and the Bureau of the Budget are favorable.

May I advise our colleagues that neither our Subcommittee on Indian Affairs nor the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs held hearings on this legislation. This was not due to any objections thereto, since we reported favorably on numerous other similar bills for other tribes, but because of the pressure of time. In lieu of hearings, the sponsor of H.R. 12130, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Langen] explained his bill to members of the subcommittee individually and asked them to sign a letter to Chairman Aspinall urging that the legislation be brought directly to the floor in the manner we are following at the moment.

Mr. Speaker, I am including in my remarks a letter from the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Langen] to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. Aspinall] signed by 12 of the subcommittee's 16 members asking that this action be taken.

The letter follows:

October 1, 1964.

Hon. Wayne Aspinall,
Chairman, House Interior and Insular Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Aspinall: As a member of the House Indian Affairs Subcommittee, I have no objection to the passage of S. 3035, a bill to provide for the distribution of judgment funds now on deposit to the credit of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians.

Inasmuch as the bill has passed the Senate, moneys have been appropriated, and there is no controversy relating thereto, it seems only proper that the bill should be approved during this session of Congress.

Sincerely yours,
James A. Haley, John P. Saylor, E. Y. Berry, Roy A. Taylor, Morris Udall, Edward R. Roybal, Charlotte T. Reid, Mark Andrews, Pat Martin, John O. Marsh, Jr., J. Ernest Wharton, Homer E. Abele.

P.S.—This constitutes more than a quorum of signatures. The other three members of the committee are out of town and so their signatures could not be obtained at this time. These members are the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Edmondson], the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. Gill], and the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. Morris].

Odin Langen.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the enactment of S. 3035.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECORD OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES IN THE 88TH CONGRESS

Mr. SECREST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SECREST. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives in the 88th Congress has achieved a remarkable record, especially in the field of conservation, education, and veterans' legislation.

I regret that some measures which I have supported wholeheartedly have not been enacted into law. One of these is the Tuck bill which I voted for and which was designed to protect rural areas in the apportionment of State legislatures.

Another is the measure to increase social security payments which passed the House and failed in conference between the House and Senate. Millions of social security retirees desperately need more income.

Another measure on which I spent much time and which means much to every county of my district is the Appalachia bill.

There is no doubt in my mind that these bills will be enacted into law during the next session of Congress, but I am sorry to see this Congress adjourn with these bills pending. The quicker the next Congress gets to them, the better it will be for the country. In fact, I would like to see a special session of Congress right after the election to complete the unfinished business that remains on the calendar. If this is done, much time can be saved.

THE PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGN

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include editorials from various newspapers.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, one of the most striking trends in the current presidential campaign has been the startling shift in the editorial position of the Nation's newspapers from the traditional one of supporting the Republican nominee whoever he may be to that of supporting the Democratic nominee, in this case Lyndon Baines Johnson.

I have asked my colleagues to help round up a collection of representative editorials and related matter from newspapers in different sections of the country so that there could be brought together in one place this remarkable consensus. Joining with me in this cooperative effort have been Representatives John Moss, Ralph Harding, John McFall, Donald Fraser, Neal Smith, Dan Rostenkowski, and Graham Purcell, as well as the staff of the Democratic study group.

The chorus of praise for the administration of Lyndon Johnson rises higher each day from the editorial offices. Newspapers have carried items about these endorsements in various newspapers. I include these as well as a sampling of editorials across the Nation. They help to place this campaign in proper focus:

[From the Democrat, Sept., 1964]

L.B.J.–H.H.H. TICKET WINS ACCLAIM IN MAJORITY OF THE NATION'S PRESS

(Note.—The following are excerpts of editorial reaction to the 1964 National Democratic ticket.)

The Baltimore Sun: "After Mr. Johnson's achievement in keeping the Nation on even keel through a storm of crisis, and in view of his subsequent accomplishments, the Democrats are justified in making him not only their automatic choice but their genuine choice, by enthusiastic acclamation.

"Among the possibilities ahead, to say the least of it, is the possibility of a Johnson victory over Mr. Goldwater in November. To lead the party in pushing that possibility closer to the point of certainty, as well as to stand as representative in a changing age of traditional principles of their party, the Democrats are fortunate in their presidential candidate."

New York Journal-American: "The nomination of Lyndon Baines Johnson was as certain as the tide tables in Atlantic City. But Mr. Johnson not only compelled the nomination by the full tide of his political dominance in the Democratic Party—he earned it by his accomplishments in the 9 months he has been in the White House.

"Those accomplishments are:

"1. Personal: He moved in quickly to establish his own authority as President following the assassination of President Kennedy. He demonstrated that he was more than a master politician, that he could fulfill the responsibilities of leadership demanded by the greatest office in the world. He created the Johnson image.

"2. Domestic: Of 30 items President Johnson put on his priority list, the 88th Congress enacted more than 20. They began with the $11.5 billion-a-year tax cut. They reached a dramatic climax with the civil rights act.

"3. International: He displayed to doubtful allies and to coldly appraising enemies a knowledgeable grasp of foreign policies and affairs. He showed firmness where he believed it necessary—for example, in dealing with the fracas over the Panama Canal, or, recently, in his response to Communist gunboat aggression in the Gulf of Tonkin.

"Mr. Johnson has every reason to run on his record, on which 75 percent of a cross-section of voters, in a recent poll, gave him a favorable rating. He has been a good President."

The Philadelphia Inquirer: "There is a section of President Johnson's acceptance speech before the Democratic National Convention * * * that has special significance, not as part of a campaign document, but as a declaration of Government policy.

"Pointing out that one of our greatest responsibilities is to assure fair play for all Americans, the President stated that every American has the right to be treated as a person, and that he should be able to find a job, educate his children, vote in the election, and be judged on his merits.

"So long as he is President, he went on, he intends to carry out what the Constitution demands—and justice requires—equal justice under law for all."

The Washington Post: "The President today not only is the candidate of the Democratic Party. To an extent seldom exceeded in American history he is the very embodiment of the party. * * * Political skill amounting to genius, an application to the work at hand almost terrifying in its intensity and a relish for the opportunities and burdens of power, have brought President Johnson to this point in his career. He has won the verdict of his party colleagues. He can await with some confidence the verdict of his countrymen. He has now to court the verdict of history."

The New York Times: "In the 9 months he has held the office which he attained under such tragic circumstances, Lyndon B. Johnson has acquitted himself well.

"He effected the transition from the Kennedy administration to his own with dignity and skill; he made no serious misstep at a time when missteps would have been easy, and he had carried on with conspicuous success the legislative program established by his predecessor * * *.

"As the campaign develops, the points of difference between Mr. Johnson and Mr. Goldwater will become increasingly apparent in respect to such issues as civil rights, management of the economy, the social responsibilities of government, the control of nuclear weapons, the policy of the United States toward its actual friends and its potential enemies.

"We will discuss these in detail in the ensuing weeks but they are clear enough already. In our opinion they point to an inescapably logical conclusion: the necessity of electing Lyndon Johnson as President of the United States and of administering a decisive and definitive defeat to the voices of the past."

Milwaukee Journal: "Senator Humphrey will bring to the ticket a deep sympathy for Americans who are denied their full share of our prosperity and a determination to do something about it. He is an expert in many areas of domestic legislation. He has acquired an understanding and competence in the field of foreign affairs that is vital to a Vice President in our dangerous era. Hubert Humphrey is capable of being President. That cannot be said for the vice-presidential candidate on the Republican ticket."

Madison (Wis.) Capital Times: "This is a strong ticket the Democrats have put together and it will need its strength in the days ahead. Elections are not won in convention halls, however, and the Johnson-Humphrey team faces determined opponents in Goldwater and Miller. The Democrats will need all the political savy they can muster if they are to bring what L.B.J. has called the great society to America on the back of the Democratic donkey."

San Francisco News-Call Bulletin: "By all measurable standards, the Democrats are fielding a strong team for the big game November 3."

[From the Medford (Oreg.) Mail Tribune, Sept. 10, 1964]

ON DISTRUSTING GOLDWATER

"Unhesitatingly, this newspaper supports the candidacy of President Lyndon B. Johnson. We are convinced that the cause of world peace would be better served by Mr. Johnson and his foreign policy, with its roots deep in both Democratic and Republican administrations. We frankly fear that the Goldwater philosophy, transformed into Presidential policy, might plunge the world deeper into the uncertainty of greater international tensions. We believe that to entrust the peace to a Goldwater administration would be an unnecessary and undesirable gamble for the Nation to take."

Who said that? The New York Times? Or any other spokesman for the so-called liberal establishment?

No—that is from the Kansas City Star, which has a long record of "moderate conservatism," and which this year, for the first time since Grover Cleveland in 1892, is supporting a Democratic candidate.

Another case in point is the Binghamton Sun-Bulletin, the oldest morning daily newspaper in the State of New York, which has supported "with greater or lesser enthusiasm every Republican nominee since the party was founded in 1856" and before that supported Whig candidates.

The Sun-Bulletin said: "We cannot accept the ideas, the philosophy, or the purposes of Senator Barry M. Goldwater, the GOP nominee this year. We believe the views he has espoused could do great harm to the Nation if he were in a position to carry them out. President Johnson, by contrast, has already proved himself fit for the job. He has revealed himself to be a mature, experienced, responsible man given to moderation rather than extremism."

In this instance—if in few others—we could hardly agree more with these conservative papers.—E.A.

[From the Medford (Oreg.) Mail Tribune, Aug. 30, 1964]

A SHARPER CONTRAST

If the contrast between the two presidential candidates is sharp, the contrast between the two vice-presidential nominees is even more so.

Congressman Miller is a little-known Member from an upstate New York constituency, chiefly known heretofore as National GOP Committee chairman.

Senator Humphrey, on the other hand, is a man of real and well-earned stature in his own right. He has had long experience in business, in city government, and in the Senate, where, starting as a brash and outspoken liberal, he has earned the respect, admiration, and affection of friend and foe alike.

If this seems unfair to Miller it is no more than the truth, for his background as small-town lawyer, Army lieutenant, district attorney, and Congressman hardly qualify him for office as President of the United States.

According to the authoritative Congressional Quarterly: "The bulk of the legislation introduced by Representative Miller has been concerned with local constituency issues. Much of it has dealt with the development of Niagara River power and related problems. Miller has not been the initial author of any major legislation."

Contrast this to Humphrey, who originated the idea for the Peace Corps, who has been active in the fight for realistic and fair civil rights legislation, for the war on poverty, who is a widely traveled and acknowledged expert on foreign affairs—and many, many other important fields which have been probed by his indefatigable energy and brilliant mind.

The President had a lot of fun with the "suspense" of his selection of a vice-presidential nominee the other night. But he was absolutely right in saying that Senator Humphrey was one of the most highly qualified men in the Nation to be President, as well as one commanding great and widespread support, not only among Democrats, but among men of good will everywhere.

Finally, there is the contrast—and this applies to the top candidates as well as the second spot men—inhumor, compassion and other human qualities.

Barry Goldwater and Bill Miller may be adept with the wisecrack, the sharp and humorous retort. But they do not have, it is evident from watching them closely, the depth of good will, good humor and wit which distinguish their opponents.

And while these may not be the only qualities needed by leaders in a free society, they are vitally important ones.—E.A.

[From the Wichita Falls (Tex.) Times, Sept. 6, 1964]

LYNDON B. JOHNSON FITTED FOR PRESIDENT

The Times choice for the President of these United States is Lyndon B. Johnson. In our opinion, he is the best qualified man in America to fill this job. He is the only man who has come up through the ranks to fill the job in the White House.

He has been in Congress as a Representative and Senator, majority leader of the Senate, Vice President, and President. No other American can claim this distinction. Lyndon Johnson has had 27 years' experience in Washington. He is alert, aggressive, resourceful, energetic, and experienced. The Nation needs him because he is familiar with the processes of our Government.

Lyndon Johnson is an idealist who has respect for the realities of life. He has devoted his career to the betterment of the status of the unfortunate with achievements that have brought lasting benefits to the people of this Nation. He has voted against "isms" which have no sound basis in our free Government. His knowledge of national and worldwide affairs, his habit of hard work, his practical progressiveness, his awareness of this country's world responsibilities—all these things make him ideally fitted for President of these United States.

[From the Sacramento (Calif.) Bee]

L.B.J. SEES NATION AS CHALLENGED BY FUTURE

Strength, pacification, and vision distinguished the acceptance speech of President Lyndon B. Johnson in Atlantic City, August 29, 1964.

At a time when there is so much inexplicable talk of holding the status quo or of dismantling the social gains the Nation has made, Johnson rejected both standing still and going back.

There are things to be done and Government must lead the way. This was the essence of what Johnson said. And this philosophy and analysis of Government's obligation did not entertain the thought of curtailing freedom as some fear but of expanding it. He said: "The man who is hungry, who cannot find work or educate his children, who is bowed by want—that man is not fully free."

What challenges lie ahead for the Government and all Americans? Johnson spoke as a man who recognizes that now is not the time to roll up the future like a rug, tuck it under the arm as a man who has completed a day's work and walk off the job.

He saw cities defiled by poverty and made chaotic by planlessness to be rebuilt. He saw a beautiful land from the Big Sur to the wind-grieved coast of Maine to be protected as a heritage for all Americans. He saw the person, present and future, crippled by lack of education.

It was a compassionate speech. And he does not believe the Government should abdicate or that the people want it to abdicate its responsibilities to fight for a full life.

And there was granite in the speech. America must maintain its military strength but never be reckless or impulsive in this period of the cowled hydrogen bomb.

He spoke out strongly for the first duty of government, the maintenance of law and order. He made it clear that the necessary solutions for a good society cannot be sought by violence in the streets.

Above all, Johnson spoke against the sag in government which comes when leaders think the job has been done. As did the late President John F. Kennedy, he summoned the forces of the Nation to continue its productivity until all men have jobs and enough goods to consume. That end never will admit of rest.

First, last and always, Johnson made it clear that men, not jobs, are the sacred objects of government's efforts. This speech laid out a Johnson program. It is a program which is built on the dramatic past and calls for ever-increasing dynamism.

[From the Sacramento (Calif.) Bee]

ANOTHER JOHNSON

It is becoming increasingly evident that President Lyndon B. Johnson has an ear for the language of the people and an instinct for reaching them where they live.

From any other candidate his sentimental musings in his Detroit speech could have fallen heavily, like a loaf of bread with too little yeast. Yet Johnson's did not. As strange as it is to consider, he may have a touch of the poet in him. It hardly fits the image of such a can-do personality. There was, nevertheless, a touch of poetry in what he said. Consider this:

"When I was young I often walked out after supper and looked up at the scattered Texas sky. As a boy, on those still nights, I wondered what those heavens had seen, what they would see, and what they might bring to me. The world has turned many times since, but still in the evening I sometimes walk out and look across the great capital city where I live, and I dream the same dreams and I ask the same questions."

And he has a dream for America, he said. He hopes for the day when all Americans will say: "Group to group, man to man, there on this earth, as in the eyes of God, walks my brother."

As he said, this is not a grand vision of a powerful and feared nation. It concerns the simple wants of people but this is what America is really all about.

Whoever has not looked up at the night sky, that bath of blue black in the hollow of the universe's dark maw, and has not asked those questions common to all is insensitive to life around him. As for Johnson's dream, where all will walk as brothers, it is a dream as old as Moses, yet as eternally new as a baby's first cry.

[From the Sacramento (Calif.) Bee]

BEST FITTED PRESIDENT?

Congressman JOHN E. MOSS of the third, Sacramento County, district offered the thought recently that President Lyndon B. Johnson may have been history's best fitted man to take over the duties of the White House.

He stated: Twenty-four years in Congress fitted Johnson for the Presidency. Evidence of this has been the smooth takeover of power. Never before has there been a more workmanlike assumption of power than occurred after the death of President Kennedy.

This fact not alone was fortunate for the country but it should set a new standard for the selection of vice-presidential candidates. Party nominees for the veepship should represent more than geographic or ideological balance. They should be thoroughly qualified for the job of President, just in case.

Moreover, the President should make full use of the Vice President both for the services he can perform and also to keep him abreast of the problems and duties of the White House job. Unless these rules are followed, the next time there is a succession the country may not be so lucky.

[From the Sacramento (Calif.) Bee]

LYNDON BAINES JOHNSON'S FIRST CONCERN EMERGES: THE PEOPLE

Once upon a time there was a Chautauqua speaker greatly gifted in the language of imagery and epigram who could charm people into a sort of grand limbo with his magic oratory, and the people marveled. There was only one difficulty. When they thought back upon what he had said, he had said—nothing. They were left only with words.

President Lyndon B. Johnson is no Chautauqua speaker. As an orator, as one capable of commanding attention by the sheer orchestration of his prose, he leaves much to be desired.

Yet harkening back to his acceptance speech at the Democratic National Convention one finds, in rereading it, he had something important to say and what he said was important. He left one with the clue, also, to what measure of man he is and to his guiding interest in government. That interest: human welfare.

Throughout his speech the President referred to the needs and ambitions of the people. He said that while there is prosperity for most there is no prosperity for all, and the secure in affluence and the safe in power must not turn from the needs of their neighbors.

Government must be compassionate, he declared, and be concerned about the old, the ill, the hungry. Most Americans want medical care for older citizens, he stated, and so does he; they want decent homes in decent neighborhoods and stable prices and an education for every child to the limit of his ability and a job and to be free from poverty and, said Johnson, he wants these too for America.

He asserted every American has the right to be treated as a person, to vote, to be granted equal justice, to touch beauty and rejoice in the closeness of family and that the people seek a nation where every man can, in the words of the oldest promise, pursue happiness, not just security. And the man who is hungry, who cannot find work or cannot educate his children, who is bowed by want—this man is not wholly free.

The Johnson concern, then, is for people, the general welfare. He has pledged himself to the goals of the people and in language the people clearly understand.

Government, as Johnson senses, is something more than a housekeeping agency for national affairs, a command post for the military, a seat of judgment for the guilty. It is a corporation in which every man, woman, and child holds an equal partnership in the democratic institutions of justice, opportunity, equality.

Perhaps, then, the reason for the Johnson appeal has been identified. He talks of people as people and of their dreams and their ambitions, and their opportunities and their equality. What he is doing, even if he does not know it, is singing the song of man, much as Walt Whitman a century ago sang it, and the people like what they are hearing.

[From the Sacramento (Calif.) Bee, September 19, 1964]

L.B.J.: COME, LET US REASON TOGETHER

The portions of President Lyndon B. Johnson's Sacramento speech which captured the headlines were his disclosures this Nation has produced two potent new defense weapons—radar which seeks out bandit blips beyond the horizon and a means to intercept and to blast out of the heavens any armed satellite.

These are significant additions to the U.S. arsenal.

Yet equally important was Johnson's discussion of American intent in civilization's historic moment of truth. He committed the Nation, guns and men, to freedom. Yet the same American which is prepared to meet any threat from any quarter is prepared also to pursue sweet reason.

The President was speaking from a position of strength but this is a strength he said we never wish to use except for peace.

In what Johnson said, in what he implied, in the attitude he struck, memory conjures up another President, John F. Kennedy, and Kennedy's speech at the American University in June 1963. One is struck with the continuity that carries through, the Kennedy administration into the Johnson administration, and is encouraged. The policies of both best represent the hopes and prayers of the sensible, the rational, the hopeful among Americans.

Kennedy asked, to paraphrase: What kind of peace do we seek? Not a pax Americana enforced on the world by American weapons and not the peace of the grave or the security of the slave, but a genuine peace to make life on earth worth living—a peace which will allow for differences, a peace fashioned out of the evils of the face of modern war. An attainable peace, based not on a sudden revolution in human nature but on a gradual evolution in human institutions.

And the commitment Johnson sees? This Nation was conceived in freedom and remains committed to freedom, and no diversion shall turn it from this. Yet America's cause and its concern remain in the same peace. And men in all lands can have faith America will use its strength wisely to produce that peace. Its arms will be ready but its hand will be extended to those who will join in the pursuit of justice, decency, and peace for all men.

In the final analysis this new commitment to peace and to the clearing of avenues which lead to its pursuit is more significant than the disclosures on weaponry, important as are these.

Such is the evidence that Johnson, as did Kennedy, candidly views means as well as ends and is prepared to reckon with the hard realities in the pursuit of accord, while attending at the same time to the Nation's position of strength.

Johnson was saying to the world from his Sacramento podium, as often he used to say to the Senate: "Come, let us reason together."

[From the Sacramento (Calif.) Bee]

Top GOP'ers Shift

Rarely if ever has there been such a pronounced and large flight from the GOP as is being witnessed in the campaigns of President Lyndon B. Johnson and his Republican rival, U.S. Senator Barry Goldwater, of Arizona.

Hard upon the announcements of individual bolts from the GOP by nationally prominent persons comes the news that an organizing group of 40 to 50 businessmen who are lifelong Republicans is starting a campaign to enlist more adherents of their party for the Democratic Johnson-Humphrey ticket. This well-heeled group is also pledged to contribute funds, of which the members themselves have an abundance.

What makes this organization especially noteworthy is that it is more than merely a crutch of wealthy businessmen. In this group are many who are politically sophisticated and have been active in Republican administrations.

For instance, there is Sidney Weinberg, senior partner of the investment banker firm of Goldman & Sachs. During the administration of former President Dwight D. Eisenhower, he was thought by many to have been its guiding hand. And there is Robert B. Anderson, who was Secretary of the Treasury under Eisenhower.

Their GOP desertion depicts a sobering conviction that neither the economy of the Nation nor the Nation itself would be safe under the rule of Goldwater. It also exhibits the conviction of this group that there will be safety and progress under Johnson.

[From the Minneapolis (Minn.) Star, Aug. 25, 1964]

Does L.B.J. Seek Revolution?

(By Eric Sevareid)

New York.—President Johnson has shown that he understands the secret of the Presidential office—that it can be just as small or just as big as the man who occupies it.

What particularly fascinates me about this man is the breathtaking scope of his ambitions for himself and the country—and, of course, for him the two are synonymous.

To take the short-range goals first, he wants to beat the record of Roosevelt in defeating Landon by a 62 to 38 percent popular vote. In legislation passed, he wants to beat even the Roosevelt record in those famous "100 days" of 1933. He believes he can get 20 of 31 major bills passed by election day, and that this will be a monument in legislative history.

But the vision he possesses, or that possesses him, goes much, much further. It is my own impression that he is thinking of the coming 8 years in terms of a "Johnson revolution," a distinct era that will be forever impregnated with his name and his works.

What is going on now he seems to regard as merely preliminary; indeed, one has the feeling that he regards the coming election test as a kind of annoyance, to be dispatched and forgotten. He doesn't just want an election victory, but a victory so overwhelming that it will provide the rocket thrust for a personal political flight of spatial proportions.

Not yet even renominated, he is organizing task forces to get at the most troubling ills of the American society—urban blight and mass transit; the tangled relationships between local; State and Federal Governments; the pockets of unnecessary poverty and delinquency; the insecure condition of the elderly; the problem of educational institutions caught in the floodtide of the birth rate; the gobbling up of America's surface by commercial interests; the consequent despoiling of our once-fair landscape; the threatened exhaustion of water levels and other resources.

He thinks of the Civil Rights Act, not just as an end in itself, but as the removal of a roadblock that can make these other goals attainable, for, in his own long legislative experience, the Negro question has fouled progress on a thousand matters, from medicare to urban renewal.

It is not only the people who perish when there is no vision. Presidents without one also perish from history's pages. This President has no intention of perishing either from the current scene next November or from the history books of the next century.

If his mental picture of his own role seems gargantuan, it is partly because of the current contrast—he is a man engaged in making no little plans at a time when the landscape is filled with men crying out that everything ought to be smaller, government, budgets, foreign commitments—and dreams.

[From the New York Times, Sept. 20, 1964]

Goldwater on Poverty

The essence of Senator Goldwater's quarrel with the national consensus that has prevailed for three decades in basic approach to domestic policy is reflected in his attack on the administration's antipoverty program. His conviction appears to be that most of the poor are to blame for their own low estate and that all the apparatus of the welfare state is designed to rob the industrious to fatten the drones.

He is careful, of course, to emphasize that he has a "deep concern" about poverty and that he believes unreservedly in "a society of compassion." Yet he mocks as beyond the dreams of avarice of most of the world's people the cutoff point of $3,000 a year the administration has set to represent the dividing line between poverty and a decent standard of living for American families. And he adds to the callousness of his analysis of the poverty problem by a particularly graceless reference to "apes" piling up coconuts for other "apes" too lazy to do anything for themselves. The standard made-in-Moscow label is appended to the whole antipoverty program, and it is cast into outer darkness as a "worthless nostrum."

There are valid criticisms to be made of the Johnson plan to eradicate poverty, principally on the basis of its inadequacy—an inadequacy that will be made worse if Congress approves the House Appropriations Committee's recommendation for a cut of nearly $200 million in the initial allocation of funds. But it is senseless to suggest that there is no need for Federal action to assist in giving all our citizens—and especially our youth—a full opportunity to participate in a society that each year can produce more and more with fewer and fewer people directly employed in field and factory.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Radio Station WWDC]

Logical and Obvious Choice

On that fateful November day when John F. Kennedy was assassinated, Lyndon Baines Johnson took the Presidential oath of office. While the world watched with baited breath, his hands took firm hold of the reins. It was as if he had prepared all his life for that very moment.

And ever since President Johnson has moved with a sure touch, skillfully persuading Congress to act on important legislation, personally participating in everything vital to the continued growth and prosperity of our Nation.

The Johnson record during the past year is reason enough for WWDC to break with its previous custom and endorse a candidate for President of the United States. But if this station had any doubts, they were erased when Barry Goldwater was nominated as the Republican candidate last July.

Mr. Goldwater's ideas—not as expressed now in the heat of a campaign—but as carefully delineated in his own book, "The Conscience of a Conservative," would, in WWDC's opinion, put this country on a backward course domestically, on the brink of nuclear war internationally.

For these and many other reasons which we will detail in later editorials, Radio Station WWDC announces its support of Lyndon Johnson—the logical and obvious choice—for President of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, at this point in my remarks I wish to insert a number of editorials and news articles about Lyndon B. Johnson:

Johnson—Laborer to Washington Power

(By Albin Krebs)

The President of the United States gestured toward the leather chair behind his desk and told his visitor: "Some day, you'll sit in that chair."

Almost in horror, the visitor recoiled: "No, Mr. President, that's one chair I'll never sit in. I wouldn't trade desks with you for anything in the world."

The President who spoke that day in 1957 was Dwight D. Eisenhower; his visitor, the then Senator Lyndon Baines Johnson, of Texas.

Friday, after a sniper's bullet killed President John F. Kennedy, Mr. Johnson became the 36th President of the United States.

Three years after his meeting with Eisenhower, Mr. Johnson, who is now 55, changed his mind about the desirability of the presidential office and ran for the Democratic nomination against Mr. Kennedy.

Losing, he then joined Mr. Kennedy on the ticket, much against the wishes of his supporters. They felt that as majority leader of the Senate he would be able to serve his country much more effectively than in the traditionally titular role of Vice President.

Mr. Kennedy sent him abroad on several occasions, notably in 1961, when the people of Berlin needed assurance the United States was staunchly behind them in the Berlin Wall crisis. Mr. Johnson rode at the head of a display of armed might to let the East Berlin Communists know his country meant business.

As Vice President, Mr. Johnson, a 6-foot-3, 200-pound man who has always been supercharged with energy, took on so many chores he needed three offices from which to operate—in the Capitol, in the New Senate Office Building, and in the White House. He had a staff of 17.

Mr. Johnson has devoted two-thirds of his life to public service, climaxing his career in Congress as one of the most powerful and effective majority leaders the Senate has known. During Eisenhower's administration, Mr. Johnson was regarded as many as the second most influential man in the Nation.

Mr. Johnson is a Texan through and through. His ancestry reaches back six generations into the State's history and his forebears include Baptist preachers, educators, and politicians. His father was a State legislator, his mother a schoolteacher.

The Johnsons moved to Johnson City, which remains the President's hometown, when he was 5, from Stonewall, Tex., where he was born August 27, 1908. He was graduated from high school at 15.

While in his teens, he had little use for learning and hoboed to California with some other boys. He worked as a road laborer, a car washer, a handyman, and finally drifted back to Texas, where his father persuaded him to enter Southwest State Teachers College.

In college, where he worked his way through as a janitor and handyman, Mr. Johnson became interested in debating. When he was graduated, he began teaching speech in Houston.

In 1931, he went to Washington, D.C., as secretary to the late Representative Richard Kleberg, part owner of the famed King Ranch. In 1935, through the influence of an old family friend, the late House Speaker Sam Rayburn, he got a job as Texas director of the National Youth Administration.

Mr. Johnson put 20,000 young Texans to work, and in the process built up a respectable political following. In 1937, he beat out 10 other candidates for U.S. Representative. Surprisingly, for conservative Texas, he ran on a platform of support for President Franklin D. Roosevelt's Supreme Court revision plan.

Roosevelt, while cruising on Galveston Bay, heard about the young man who was such an ardent New Deal supporter. Roosevelt called him aboard his yacht; they liked each other instantly.

When Mr. Johnson got to Washington, Roosevelt saw to it he was appointed to the powerful House Naval Affairs Committee. "He was like a daddy to me," said Mr. Johnson, who still speaks in a homely Texas drawl.

The young legislator lost his first race for the Senate, against the colorful Gov. W. Lee (Pappy) O'Daniel, in 1941. But in 1948, he defeated Gov. Coke Stevenson by 87 votes and remained in the Senate until his election as Vice President.

As Senate majority leader, which he became in 1953, Mr. Johnson devoted all his energies to building a record for the Democratic Party in a Republican administration. He also built his reputation as a masterful legislative craftsman.

The senatorial whirlwind, as some of his colleagues called him, worked a high-powered, 18-hour-a-day schedule, threatening, wheedling, cajoling and compromising with his fellow Senators in his efforts to push through legislation he believed was needed "not just for the Democrats, but for the whole country."

The pressures mounted, and in 1955, he was felled by a severe heart attack.

Mr. Johnson, who recovered from his heart attack and returned to the Senate to exert his power, has been called self-centered and considerate, humanitarian and power-hungry, a political genius and a shrewd opportunist, tough and vulnerable, vain and friendly, and sensitive and flamboyant.

His friends say he is a man flexible enough to have been all those things. Mrs. Johnson, 50, a member of a wealthy Austin family, characterizes her husband as "the most complicated, yet the simplest of men, and sometimes a really sad fellow."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, Sept. 25, 1964]

We're for Lyndon

The Washington Daily News urges the election of Lyndon B. Johnson.

We know very well that our readers will make up their own minds and vote according to their own judgment. But we think they are entitled to know where we stand and why.

We held back from formally choosing up sides until the campaign had given Barry Goldwater a fair chance to state his case. He has done that now, and although we admire his energy, courage, and frankness and consider him a personally attractive individual, we do not find his arguments persuasive. We do not think he has shown that he has the qualifications for the Presidency.

It will be no surprise to our readers that we think well of L.B.J.

Four years ago this newspaper indorsed Lyndon Johnson for the Democratic Presidential nomination, saying: "The times call for a man in the White House who has demonstrated qualities of leadership, who has experience and judgment, a man of vitality and courage and patriotism that rises above partisanship."

In these 4 years, Mr. Johnson has enhanced all those qualities. In his 3 years as Vice President, and especially in the 10 months he has been President, he has grown taller in meeting responsibilities with calm confidence and competence.

The times still call for proved qualities of leadership. And this paramount consideration, in our opinion, makes Mr. Johnson a natural choice.

We know no better way to judge a man than on his performance record.

Mr. Johnson has shown he knows how to handle the job of President. He can make hard decisions and act decisively in foreign crises, without being brash or provocative, as he demonstrated in the Panama riots and the Gulf of Tonkin incidents.

He is a unifying force—proved by the manner in which he has enlisted the growing support of divergent elements of our population. When he says he wants to be President of all the people, he means it—and works at it.

He knows how to get things done, as he has shown in winning from Congress a sweeping program of legislation which Congress previously merely studied.

The kind of President Mr. Johnson has been could have been charted by the type of Democratic leader he was for 6 years in the U.S. Senate.

The White House, in those years, was occupied by a Republican, General Eisenhower. A small-minded partisan in Mr. Johnson's place could have frustrated President Eisenhower's every move, causing confusion in a party-divided Government.

Mr. Johnson chose, instead, to cooperate with the White House on constructive legislation, preferring the good of the country to the immediate advantage of the party.

There were two outstanding examples of this: The sputnik crisis indicating the United States had lagged dangerously behind Russia in space exploration, and the U-2 incident which brought United States-Soviet relations to the ragged edge.

Here were chances to reap partisan profit by loading all the blame on a Republican President. Instead, Mr. Johnson used his powerful influence and great political skills to calm the storm and get America to work on a course that enabled this Nation to catch and pass the Soviets.

Lyndon Johnson has impressive credentials, a long record of constructive national leadership. He has earned our country's confidence.

Brattelboro, Vt., Reformer, which in 53 years as a daily has never before backed a Democratic presidential candidate:

Time To Choose

This is the first of three editorials in which this newspaper will examine the strength and weaknesses, as it sees them, of principal candidates for public office in the coming primaries and elections. In doing so we we naturally will name the candidate we hope will be elected in November.

Before getting into the state political contests, let us say it should have long been obvious to our readers that we do not support the Republican nominees for the Presidency and Vice Presidency. In other words, we do not believe that Senator Goldwater and Congressman Miller are qualified for these high offices; we do not subscribe to the extreme conservatism which each of them represents; we do not believe that those who guided the Goldwater capture of the Republican Party at the national level are representative of the Republicanism as we know it, and we truly believe that both the goals and the methods of the Goldwater-Miller campaign are not only divisive, but highly dangerous.

We, therefore, shall urge the continuance of President Johnson in this vital office in these critical times, and the election of Senator Humphrey as a Vice President capable of leading the Nation if such should be required of him by any tragic turn of events. We are not concerned whether they are Democrats or Republicans. Rather, we are grateful they provide not only a choice of men but an opportunity to make that choice knowing they are men with demonstrated and deep concern for the welfare and security, and the basic principles of our country.

[From the Blackfoot (Idaho) News, Friday, Sept. 11, 1964]

Lyndon Johnson Should Prevail

The issues of the election of 1964 now are becoming apparent. As voters are asked to make up their minds about the sort of government they wish to install for the next 4 years, it is becoming clear that middle-aged citizens have never quite seen its like before.

This may become known as the year in which the party labels of Democrat or Republican became meaningless.

It is ironical to consider who heads the tickets of the two major parties.

The party that inherited at its birth in 1856 the traditions of the Federalists, who insisted the cohesion between States demanded assignment of strong powers to the

Central Government, and the party who presented as its first president the man who saved the union, is now headed by Senator Barry Goldwater.

The party that traditionally feared a strong Central Government; that was jealous of States rights; that divided over the great moral issue of the 1860's and thereby fell into discredit and weakness for the 50 years that followed, is now headed by a man from the South, Lyndon Johnson.

The main issues that will be decided in 1964 are these:

Will the people of the United States, who for 100 years have closed their eyes to the problems of a racial minority, face honestly the changes that will be involved if those persons are to be given an opportunity to enter full citizenship?

Will the majority of the citizens of the United States, living in the nuclear age under which all the ground rules of warfare known in the past have become obsolete, turn their attention to a search for a peaceable world, mindful of the threat that hangs not only over our own land but also that of our opponents, plus the balance of the world that is fearful of the results no matter which side might prevail?

Will we, as citizens, continue to curse the Federal Government which we have turned to for provision of the needs that we individually take as our rights and necessities, when our local and State governments proved themselves ineffectual?

Will we, as citizens of Idaho and of the other 49 States, hold to our form of State government despite the unfairness of representation and resultant ineffectuality that exists virtually everywhere?

Do we look on the Supreme Court of the United States as the champion and defender of the rights of the individual citizen, or do we consider it an alien power that is a threat to us in some manner, as we have been assured by those who wish to continue to benefit from traditional State governments that are easier for them to control?

It is the belief of this newspaper that the party that espouses the right of racial minorities to an opportunity to develop to the extent of their human abilities should be supported.

It believes that John F. Kennedy was right when for the first time in 98 years he threw the moral power of the Presidency into the racial issue by saying: "Is it right that a Dr. Martin Luther King shall, because of his color, be denied entering a hotel or restaurant that he chooses?"

It refutes the view of Senator Goldwater that it is unconstitutional for a State to be denied the privilege of discriminating against a group of U.S. citizens in its midst because of their color.

It believes that the United States must assume some risk and work with other nations of the world toward a mutual building of a supranational organization, such as the United Nations, even though we may have to concede mutually some concepts of national sovereignty, much in the same manner that the 13 Original States had to concede State sovereignty to form a more perfect union.

It believes that the principle established by the Supreme Court that the vote of any citizen cast in a State election shall be equal to the vote of any other citizen of that State is in line with the principles written into the Bill of Rights.

This newspaper considers these beliefs to be fundamental to the election of 1964. On each score it believes that the party headed by Lyndon Johnson offers more hope for the people of the United States and the furtherance of the American dream than does the party headed by Senator Barry Goldwater.

It is, therefore, its hope that Lyndon Johnson shall prevail.

[From the Minneapolis (Minn.) Morning Tribune, Nov. 28, 1963]

President Johnson: "Let Us Continue"

President Johnson's first address to Congress struck a precisely proper and moving note. One could have no doubt about the depth of his feeling when he said, "All I have I would have given gladly not to be standing here today."

And one could feel with equal impact his sincerity when he declared, "Let all the world know, and none misunderstand, that I rededicate this Government" to the "unswerving" continuation of the policies set forth by President Kennedy. Recalling his late Chief's words on Inauguration Day almost 3 years ago—"Let us begin"—he added his own imperative, "Let us continue."

It may be hopefully significant not only of the mood of Congress but of the Nation that Mr. Johnson was most fervently and lengthily applauded after two stirring sentences in his appeal for greater tolerance among Americans for each other:

"Let us put an end to the teaching and preaching of hate and evil and violence." And:

"Let us turn away from the fanatics of the far left and the far right, from the apostles of bitterness and bigotry, from those defiant of law, and those who pour venom into our Nation's bloodstream."

If this mood truly prevails in Congress, and if Congress senses that it is running overwhelmingly strong and deep among the people, President Johnson may indeed win substantial legislative victories, especially in that one, extremely emotional, issue on which he placed so much stress, the civil rights bill.

Many Congressmen of both parties have already felt considerable kinship with Mr. Johnson as "one of ours"—i.e., because of his 23 years of service in the House and Senate. His forthright expression of respect for the independence and integrity of the legislative branch in his message yesterday should help cement this new-found legislative-Executive friendship.

At the same time, the new President made it specifically clear that he would not look lightly on any attempt at "erasing Executive flexibility in the conduct of foreign affairs." He intends, it may be inferred, to be a positive leader, albeit a friendly one.

One almost dares hope that in this atmosphere of mutual friendly respect, or respectful friendliness, the new President and Congress may surprise us all with their legislative accomplishments in the next 6 months.

[From the Longview (Tex.) News]

First Choice

When Lyndon Baines Johnson—the man from Texas whose only label is "an American first, a Democrat second"—was nominated by acclamation as the Democratic Party candidate for the Presidency, it was a great day for both Texas and the Nation.

In these perilous times when our Nation and the free world walk a tightrope of hopeful peace over a seething cauldron of world unrest and uprising fanned by Communist revolutionary agents, it is vitally important to free people everywhere to have a man of broad experience, wise judgment, and a cool head as Chief Executive of the United States.

We believe that—come war with its perils from the outside, or continued peace with its pressures from inside—our Nation's hope at this crucial time must be placed in the capable hands of an experienced leader whose courage and faith are unquestioned, whose fairness and responsibility are well known in all quarters, and whose calm and deliberate action in emergency is respected or feared by all.

Our Governor—John Connally of Texas—backed up by seconding approval of eight other nationally prominent Democratic leaders—sounded the basic keynote that should govern public decisionmaking in this presidential campaign when, in his nominating address for his longtime personal and political friend, he said of President Johnson:

"When he speaks, it is the voice of commonsense, the clear voice of reason, the calm voice of responsibility to this Nation.

"Mr. Johnson has never let America down, and he never will, because he is an American first, a Democrat second.

"We can thank God that Lyndon Johnson is, above all else, a man not of rashness, but of responsibility; a man not of uncertainty, but of decision; a man not of indifference, but of compassion; a man not of fear, but of hope; a man with the steady hand of leadership to guide America and the world to new fulfillment of mankind's ageless dreams."

While Mr. Johnson is a native Texan, he now occupies a place of responsibility that is broader in scope and greater in demand than as a Representative or Senator from our State. As the President, naturally he seeks to be the President of all the American people. In this role, as in some of his previous high positions as minority leader in the 83d Congress and Senate majority leader in the 84th, 85th, and 86th Congresses, he has not always pleased all Texans.

It has been our privilege to know Lyndon Johnson for some 30 years. We have not always agreed with him, have told him so and openly opposed some of his positions, especially some sections of the Civil Rights Act. But we have had great respect for his ability, admired his courage and forthrightness, and have found him to be enormously warm and friendly and charming—characteristics of great usefulness and value in the Presidency.

Experienced observers of the Washington scene recently said of Mr. Johnson that he "thinks big, aims high, and usually gets what he wants." When we apply this to the announced Johnson goals of peace, preparedness, and prosperity, most Americans can agree the bigger he thinks and the higher he aims for our country, the safer we will be as a nation and the happier as a people. He most certainly has proved over the past 9 months that he has the sure hand of experience and calm judgment to hold our Nation on a steady course in a time of emergency.

President Johnson has made it clear that he is attempting to take a sane and reasonable position in the center, between extremes on the left and on the right. This is a position in which he confidently expects to find sufficient middle ground on which to unite the great majority of Americans in a purposeful forward program for peace and progress. This is a position in which he has drawn appreciation and respect and understanding from both business and labor, educators and churchmen, industrialists and workers, and the great body of us who call ourselves the common people.

As one of the most active and hardest working Vice Presidents the Nation has ever known and as President during a period of national tragedy, Mr. Johnson has proved that he is a man of the people who is in close touch with reality both at home and abroad. As fate took a hand in his rise to the Presidency, so circumstances appear to be moving him surely toward his own full term in the White House, a personal call to high duty that would bring out the very best in any man.

Just as Mr. Johnson became the first choice of his party—standing head and shoulders above any possible challenger, so that none dared to let his name be considered—we believe that during the give-and-take of a wide open campaign leading up to the general election in November, it will become increasingly clear to Americans in every walk of life that Lyndon Baines Johnson should be the Nation's first choice for President.

Carl L. Estes.

[From the Austin (Tex.) American]

L.B.J.: SUPPORT DESERVED

The Austin American commends Lyndon B. Johnson to the voters of Texas in the November election.

It supports him now for President, as it has since 1938 in each of his steps upward in government and national leadership.

Texans had recognized his effectiveness. Their judgment was ratified by his nomination last month for President when no other Democrat was proposed.

Lyndon Johnson began his remarkable career in office here in central Texas. As State National Youth Administration director, he helped lift young Texans from the blank misery of depression. As 10th District Congressman, he had a decisive role in broadening the area's flood control and water conservation program, so that his efforts of that day are reflected in the benefits of abundant water for the area's economy now and in future. He had the leading role in bringing electrification to the farms and ranches of Texas, and of fostering a homebuilding program for city and rural dwellers alike.

Texans promoted Lyndon Johnson to the Senate. There he fought for the State's economic interests and development, protection of its natural resources, and development of its potential through such measures as preserving the oil depletion allowance to finance exploration and development.

His hard work, his broadening skill in government, and leadership were recognized by his colleagues, and the Senate advanced him to its majority leadership within its alltime record celerity.

His Texas neighbors recognized his fitness for the Presidency. They supported him in 1956 for the nomination. By 1960, the movement was recognized nationally, and he received approximately one-third the total nominating vote for President. He was the immediate choice of the party for the Vice Presidency.

As Vice President, Lyndon Johnson brought the office to its highest effectiveness in American history. He served as a major figure in advancement of domestic affairs and a chief figure in representing America's credo of freedom and security to the world.

History shows that when fateful events called him to the Presidency, Lyndon Johnson was among the Vice Presidents best qualified by training and experience to assume the awesome duties of President.

This Texan has made history for his party, for America and the world in the 10 months in which he has guarded the Nation's destiny. His firm achievements are recorded not only in domestic affairs and major legislation, but also in the calming of great critical uncertainties of major nation's conflicting views.

His loyalty to the Democratic Party's national program, as expressed by President Kennedy and ratified by the American public, may have no ready parallel.

He secured enactment of major Democratic objectives, some with strong bipartisan support, some controversial. He brought on his own measures for welfare and progress and has scored repeated victories in approval by Congress of the matters he pressed for action.

That touches a few high spots of President Johnson's career. When a Texan is asked, "Why support the Democratic ticket?" the record itself offers a persuasive answer. There is, too, for Texans and for voters of the Nation, the belief that in a day of very wide divergent views, Lyndon Johnson represents those sentiments and principles of national import that are keyed to the welfare and security of the people and the preservation of peace.

In the two contrasting views presented the American voters now, Lyndon Johnson is the exponent of practical, courageous, successful measures which have guided and will guide the Nation in the years ahead. He can deal with the toughest leaders of ambitious world powers and make the American principles stand up in the competition.

It is a matter of pride that Texas has a native son in the White House, and that a Texan alone was considered by his party for the coming term as President.

Lyndon Johnson made a notable contribution to Democrats of Texas, when he found their party shattered in conflict, losing even a one-party State in national elections, and he closed much of that hurtful breach in party ranks. To a degree he has welded harmony among divergent views nationally and is bringing the Democratic Party to new virility, making it an instrument of new hope and of inspiration to Americans.

Thus, the Austin American feels that Lyndon Johnson can and will lead the Nation effectively through economic and social problems at home, through problems of diplomatic conflict involving many nations.

We commend him for the reasoned and thoughtful support of his fellow Texans.

[From the Williamson County (Tex.) Sun, Sept. 3, 1964]

THE LID'S OFF AND AWAY WE GO

Now we're all set for the fireworks.

L.B.J. versus GOLDWATER, HUBERT versus MILLER, conservatism versus liberalism.

And as usual, neither candidate or platform pleases any except the most dedicated, while the rest of the people must choose the things they like best and least and vote according to their own judgment.

Texans, for example, weren't exactly enthusiastic over the choice of HUBERT HUMPHREY as Vice President. Down here where many people think pretty conservatively, his public image is radically to the left. Yet these same people who wonder if they can vote for a man so dedicated to liberal ideas must consider that his record in support of the American farmer has been outstanding and that Texas, for all its splendid cities and flowing oil wells, is still an agricultural State.

The Sun, of course, is for the Democratic ticket. Lyndon Johnson is a great President. His election is vital to the future of this country, to continued peace and progress. Not only this, but L.B.J. is a Texan, former Congressman of the 10th District. We know him and we trust him; we have confidence in his greatness as a national and world leader.

His opponent just isn't in his class.

[From the Port Arthur (Tex.) News]

LYNDON JOHNSON FOR PRESIDENT

Certainly not because he is a Texan, or even a Democrat, but solely because we believe he is more qualified for the high office than is his adversary, the News supports Lyndon B. Johnson for election as President of the United States.

Without undertaking to espouse all of the policies and practices of his long and distinguished career, we believe that overall he has better demonstrated—in native talent, stability of temperament and maturity of judgment—a capacity to lead the American people during the ensuing 4 years.

As the most notable chapter of his national service thus far, we point to the statesmanlike manner in which he has guided the country during this critical period of administrative transition.

Few men in U.S. history have been abruptly summoned to the Presidency under as tragic and awesome circumstances as was Lyndon Johnson, on November 23, 1963. Within a few dreadful hours of the moment when he saw John F. Kennedy assassinated, Mr. Johnson manfully took hold of the official reins of Government with a firm and confident grasp.

There was never a letdown, no fumbling or stumbling, no indecision or confusion, in the orderly management of affairs of state. The sturdy caliber of the man was tested and proved in this fiery crucible of destiny. Further proof of his stanchness marked the 9 months preceding his nomination as Mr. Kennedy's successor. It has all added up to overwhelming evidence of his unique qualification for the office of Chief Executive.

Deprecate it as coincidence as some do, American prosperity at home and American stature abroad has climbed to new heights under the adroit guidance of President Johnson.

No indeed, he has not solved all our ills at home or our troubles overseas, and he won't do so if he is kept in the White House until 1969. But he has made a valiant start and he is better prepared to devise further solutions than anybody else seeking the Presidency.

We think the Nation owes it to itself, not to him, to give him a chance to keep up the masterful job he is doing.

We have high personal respect for the Republican nominee, Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, whose zeal and courage and integrity are beyond all question.

But those attributes—commendable as they are—don't alone assure that he would make a competent President.

In all candor, we must make the point that the Senator lacks the depth of perception and the consistence of evaluation that Mr. Johnson is equipped with.

It is no reflection on his motives to say that the Senator is inclined toward rashness—that he is prone to take an impetuous stand in the flush of ardor, and then when he cools off, to back away and spend much time "explaining" what his position really was—or is.

Even for a Presidential candidate, this irresolution is disturbing, but it commits the Government to nothing and may be written off as politics.

There is no national involvement at stake.

But is there any guarantee that—put at the helm of our ship of state—Mr. GOLDWATER would handle the tiller with a less impulsive hand? As the Nation's pilot, especially in international waters, an unthoughted utterance or decision or order wouldn't be mere campaign oratory. It could well nail us all to a reckless course leading to unhappy—and unwanted—consequences.

We would feel far safer in relying on a skilled and seasoned skipper like Lyndon Johnson, who thinks first and then acts.

[From the Waco (Tex.) Tribune-Herald, Sept. 5, 1964]

OUR NATIONAL PRESIDENT ATTRACTING WIDE SUPPORT

As the 1964 presidential campaign begins, it appears that more Americans are making up their minds earlier than usual on the candidates. Even more striking is the evidence that President Lyndon B. Johnson is attracting support on a bipartisan basis that is broader than a Democrat has received at this stage of a Presidential race in this century.

This does not surprise people who have known Lyndon B. Johnson through his more than 30 years of public service. His talent for achieving unity among those of divergent views and backgrounds, unity on behalf of the public interest, has been displayed successfully in the past in lesser positions than the one he now holds. Today, and for the past 9 months, President Johnson has demonstrated that he can be the President of all the people, and that he wants to be just that.

When President Kennedy was murdered, the world and the Nation tensed with anxiety to see what would happen in the highest office of the world's most powerful nation. Who can forget the crisis, brief though it turned out to be? It was brief because Lyndon Johnson moved swiftly and surely into the role of President. The details of his calm, prudent, but rapid series of actions are too recent to need recounting now. The results since, with Congress, with other nations, and with the people of the United States, are vividly in the foreground of events today. In a word, President Johnson generates confidence that he knows his role, plays it superbly and wants for this Nation—all the people of this Nation—the best possible life of opportunity and self-fulfillment.

This is the chief explanation for the fact that Americans of all kinds, including many who never before have followed a Democratic presidential candidate, are standing up to be counted on the side of President Johnson for reelection. On the basis of his record of performance and his demonstrated leadership ability, Lyndon Johnson deserves election as President of the United States.

This is a dangerous, unstable world. Ours is a nation made up of many kinds of people, holding all varieties of beliefs and attitudes. The President of the United States must hold the Nation together and confront the rest of the world with a united, strong posture. The responsibility cannot be handled recklessly, nor in a rigid framework of a philosophy that allows for no adjustment or compromise. Crisis abroad and disagreement at home, treated unwisely, could ruin us. There is no margin for error.

In his conduct since becoming President, Lyndon Johnson has coped with international flareups and domestic discords: Panama, the Cuban water incident, the naval attack in the Gulf of Tonkin; the tax cut, the civil rights law, railroad labor crisis, the Economic Opportunity Act, racial and hoodlum disturbances. In each, and in others as well, he fitted action to the need, neither going off halfcocked nor waiting until nothing could be done. It is dawning on more and more citizens that here is a man whose clarity of wisdom and understanding of his high office are combined in rare degree with dedication to serve the Nation's best interests.

This will be a hard and distressing campaign in many ways. Partisans will not spare their opponents on either side. But somehow the Nation must come out of the 2-month exercise united, not divided; healed, not bleeding. The best hope for this final result is in the election of Mr. Johnson to the Presidency.

[From the Binghamton (N.Y.) Sun-Bulletin]

As far as this newspaper is concerned, there is no need to wait for the Democratic Convention formalities to declare our preference in this year's presidential election contest. The lines are clearly drawn. The decision is before us. We support Lyndon B. Johnson.

The Sun-Bulletin traces its ancestry as a newspaper back to 1822. In 142 years we have never until now supported a Democratic candidate for President. We have endorsed, with greater or lesser enthusiasm, every Republican nominee since the party was founded in 1856. Before that, we supported the candidates of the Whig Party. But there are moments in the history of our Nation when principle must come before party. This is such a moment.

We cannot accept the ideas, the philosophy or the purposes of Senator BARRY M. GOLDWATER. We believe him to be a reckless and irresponsible man, tempermentally unfitted for the Presidency. We believe the views he has espoused could do great harm to the Nation if he were in a position to carry them out.

As a political leader, he has demonstrated vindictiveness against those who disagree with him within his own party; and we think that, as President, his influence would be divisive, not unifying. As a political thinker, he has outlined a so-called conservative philosophy which, in many respects, is the very opposite of conservatism.

On the international scene, he has declared himself in favor of a miltary adventurism that could lead us to nuclear war. He has revealed an ignorant and oversimplified concept of the world. He would use the ultimate weapon carelessly, to attain limited objectives. Any fool can fight communism by plunging us into a nuclear holocaust; what we need is the wise leadership that will preserve and enlarge our freedoms without destroying the whole world in the process.

In domestic affairs, he is nothing less than an anarchist. He would, in the name of individual liberty, unravel the fabric of our society and present us with chaos that could only smash our freedoms.

Senator GOLDWATER has been presented to the public as a man of courage and integrity. Courage he has, but we wonder about his integrity. He voted against the civil rights bill, against the tax bill, against ratification of the nuclear test ban treaty; and he has said that he was prepared to stake his political career on these negative actions. But in virtually every other respect he has changed his menu to fit the hunger for votes. He proclaimed his endorsement of extremism and then watered it down. He has altered his position on the United Nations, on social security, and on foreign policy. He criticized the Eisenhower administration's conduct of foreign policy, and now promises to consult with Mr. Eisenhower on national security issues and appointments if he is elected.

Most recently, he attacked the Johnson administration on the false premise that President Johnson had authorized his field commanders to use nuclear weapons (as Senator GOLDWATER himself proposes to do); and within a few days declared that he was either misunderstood or didn't mean what he said.

This is an irresponsible, impulsive man with headstrong, reckless ideas. We think he is unfit for the Presidency.

President Johnson, by contrast, has already proved himself fit for the job. He managed the transition from one administration to another, after the tragedy in Dallas, with dignity, calmness and assurance. He has been responsible for the passage of the civil rights bill and the tax bill. He has launched the war on poverty. He has led the country upward, to a new level of prosperity. He has demonstrated an unusual skill in getting people to work together for the common good, as in the case of the threatened railroad strike. He has managed foreign affairs with a firm and intelligent hand, weathering crises from Panama to Cyprus without panicking. In the affair of the Gulf of Tonkin he acted with firmness and dispatch, but without hysteria or exaggeration.

He has revealed himself to be a mature, experienced, responsible man, given to moderation rather than extremism, with a deep human understanding and a devotion to the interests of the American people. By temperament as well as by experience, by performance as well as philosophy, President Johnson has earned the support of intelligent workers.

We endorse him wholeheartedly.

[From the Austin (Tex.) Statesman, Sept. 4, 1964]

L.B.J. DESERVES VINDICATION OF HIS LEADERSHIP BY ELECTION, NOVEMBER 3

In our opinion, Lyndon Baines Johnson deserves election to his first term as President in November balloting.

Johnson was levitated into the Presidency in circumstances of tragedy. His skilled leadership maintained the national direction with foresight and efficiency. Not everyone, even in his own party, has supported the new President. But throughout the Nation there has been a recognized awareness that a transition was accomplished without halt or even lost motion.

The legislative requests of the new President contained sufficient recognizable merit to gain endorsement, through law, of both Houses of Congress—and received substantial assistance from the opposition party.

The Johnson record is undeniably strong. With almost unerring logic, he pinpointed some of the great national issues which draw large-scale acceptance.

As President he also has demonstrated a "national interest" rather than purely sectional regards, significant because a southerner simply wasn't supposed to be able to achieve success on a national ticket.

Johnson has achieved a widespread "unanimity" of support among various economic sectors of the Nation, including labor and business.

Johnson appears to have no limit to the physical and mental energy required in the most difficult job in the world.

His choice of Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, obviously was a contribution toward making a strong ticket. HUMPHREY has matured greatly over the years, and has demonstrated strongly the fact that a public servant can learn by experience. He is no business baiter, but shows moderate-liberal tendencies which should make him a strong acquisition to the ticket. He knows the issues and is a master debater.

Johnson has increasingly counseled the need for greater education opportunities for America's youth, and minimization of the school dropout problem so disheartening to those who know that the dropout sentences himself to a life of mediocre activity and minimal income.

He is dedicated to a strong national defense as the best preventive of disastrous war, and the record supports him. He is not disposed toward recklessness either in Cuba or southeast Asia.

These and other problems are not alone those of the President. They are the problems of every citizen.

Johnson has earned his own first term.

[From the Boston (Mass.) Atlantic magazine, September 1964]

THE 1964 ELECTION

In the Atlantic for October 1860, James Russell Lowell, our first editor, published a strongly worded editorial in which he advocated the election of Abraham Lincoln. It began with these quiet words: "In a society like ours, where every man may transmute his private thought into history and destiny by dropping it into the ballot box, a peculiar responsibility rests upon the individual. Nothing can absolve us from doing our best to look at all public questions as citizens, and therefore in some sort as administrators and rulers. For, though during its term of office the government be practically as independent of the popular will as that of Russia, yet every fourth year the people are called upon to pronounce upon the conduct of their affairs. Theoretically, at least, to give democracy any standing ground for an argument with despotism or oligarchy, a majority of the men composing it should be statesmen and thinkers."

In the election this fall, which will go far to determine the conduct of the United States in the next 25 years, we stand for the election of President Lyndon B. Johnson. We admire the President for the continuity with which he has maintained our foreign policy, a policy which became a worldwide responsibility at the time of the Marshall plan. We respect the quiet confidence which he has engendered among American businessmen and in the unions. We believe that as the first southerner to occupy the White House since the Civil War, the President will bring to the vexed problem of civil rights a power of conciliation which will prevent us from stumbling down the road taken by South Africa. The firmness and the commonsense with which he pressed for the passage of the tax cut and the bill on civil rights recall a remark which the late President Kennedy made to a trusted reporter when he was stumping California in the primary. "Of us all," said J.F.K., "Lyndon Johnson is the best qualified for the office."

The methods and strategy by which a politician rises to power are an index of his character. In his drive for the nomination, and ever since, Senator GOLDWATER has accepted the proposition that a ruthless minority taking over first the Republican Party and then the Nation shall break with the past as it chooses. His proposal to let field commanders have their choice of the smaller nuclear weapons would rupture a fundamental belief that has existed from Abraham Lincoln to today: the belief that in times of crisis the civilian authority must have control over the military. His preference to let States like Mississippi, Alabama, and Georgia enforce civil rights within their own borders has attracted the allegiance of Gov. George Wallace, the Ku Klux Klan, and the John Birchers. His threat to walk out of the United Nations if he does not approve of its action is a repudiation of what the best brains, Republican and Democrat, have helped to contribute to that peacekeeping institution. Quick-flash utterances such as these may appeal to malcontents, but not to "statesmen and thinkers."

A President is trusted to make decisions, the most momentous decisions in our lives. In making up his mind he must reckon with those who disagree with him. We think it unfortunate that BARRY GOLDWATER takes criticism as a personal affront; we think it poisonous when his anger betrays him into denouncing what he calls the radical press by bracketing the New York Times, the Washington Post, and Izvestia. There speaks not the reason of the Southwest but the voice of Joseph McCarthy. We do not impugn Senator GOLDWATER's honesty. We sincerely distrust his factionalism and his capacity for judgment.

EDWARD WEEKS, *Editor*.

[From the Saturday Evening Post, Sept. 19, 1964]

WHY LYNDON JOHNSON MUST BE ELECTED

A healthy, vigorous two-party system is absolutely indispensable to the survival of American democracy. Its proper functioning requires each of the major parties to put forth a man who is unmistakably and unquestionably qualified to be trusted with the incalculably grave and terrible powers of the Presidency.

In the presidential election of 1964, the two-party system has been seriously endangered. One of the great parties, the Democratic, has fulfilled its duty by putting forth a man, Lyndon B. Johnson, who has many flaws and leaves much to be desired, but who is unquestionably as well qualified to be President as any tried and tested leader the Democratic Party now affords.

The other great party, the Republican, has shirked and betrayed its duty by putting forth a man, BARRY GOLDWATER, who is manifestly unqualified to be President and whose unsuitability for this awesome responsibility becomes clearer with every passing day and with every reckless word he utters.

The two-party system has thus been endangered because this misfeasance on the part of the Republican Party has left the enlightened, the rational, the prudent, the responsible American voter no acceptable other choice in this election. He is not even given the option of an echo. He is given only the option of a question mark, of a man who is seemingly congenitally unable to say what he means or even know what he says, to say anything clearly or to hold the same conviction 2 days in a row. BARRY GOLDWATER's tongue is like quicksilver; his mind is like quicksand.

The Post, therefore, urges the election of Lyndon B. Johnson as President.

It urges, even more strongly, the defeat of BARRY GOLDWATER.

We are confident that Johnson will make a good President because he already is a good President. In the 10 brief months he has held the highest office, he has shown an ability unmatched in this century to bring all the diverse and warring factions of Congress behind the enactment of positive, progressive, and needful legislative programs. In his greatest test as Commander in Chief—the attack on our Navy in the Gulf of Tonkin—he has acted with both forcefulness and restraint which is required in the man who alone controls the utlimate weapon and bears all the fearful responsibility which that entails.

We are equally confident that GOLDWATER would not make a good President. He has not even made a good Senator. He has been in the Senate 11 years and not one piece of memorable legislation attaches to his name. He has been in its councils through the most momentous and revolutionary decade in the history of this Republic as we have strained every seam and fabric of our traditional habits and thinking to keep abreast of an age when all the supposed boundaries of man's environment are being broken, gravity defied, space penetrated, the moon reached, the riddle of the human cell being unraveled. Merely to understand, much less to master, this surge and change, heavy with unguessed new treasures of technology to increase man's wealth, has required and will require Government entry into areas never before imagined. But BARRY GOLDWATER has managed to live through this whole tremendous epoch with his face turned squarely to the past, his eyes closed, and his mind preoccupied with one—and only one—idea: somehow to shrink the Government back into the familiar and comfortably small proportions of his Arizona youth. BARRY GOLDWATER has left no mark in the Senate because, as he has truthfully declared, he sought to erase marks rather than to make them: "I have little interest in streamlining Government or in making it more efficient, for I mean to reduce its size. I do not undertake to promote welfare, for I propose to extend freedom. My aim is not to pass laws, but to repeal them. It is not to inaugurate new programs, but to cancel old ones * * *." He is like the Cincinnati kettlemaker who, when first hearing of Kentucky ironmaker William Kelly's use of air to make steel, exclaimed, "I want my iron made in the old way or not at all." His mind is surely not in phase with today's world.

GOLDWATER changes his "conviction" almost as often as his shirt. One day he is for abolishing social security, the next day for strengthening it, one day for giving field commanders control over nuclear weapons, the next day for restricting control to the NATO supreme commander. Many of his statements are inherently contradictory nonsense—e.g., to cut all Government expenditures, while expanding defense (which already take more than half of every tax dollar spent)—like advertising a car that is bigger on the inside but smaller on the outside. Some of his statements, if they have any meaning at all, are rather frightening in the subconscious thoughts which seem to lie behind them, particularly those concerning his strange love affair with German prowess: "With all due respect to American military leaders, Germany would have won both World Wars if she had not been badly led. I think it was the Germans who originated the modern concept of peace through strength." This last remark prompted Hamilton Fish Armstrong, editor of Foreign Affairs, to ask the New York Times to clarify whether it was Hitler's or the Kaiser's "peace through strength" that GOLDWATER had in mind. However, it is always possible that he really had nothing in mind, as when he told reporters who briefly boarded his cruising *Sundance*, "I've thought for some time that talks with the Red Chinese might be profitable." He later radioed ashore that what he really meant was that the United States should be ready to threaten the Chinese, telling them that "if they didn't stop, then you would blow up a bridge or show some other sort of force." He finally cleared everything up by adding, "I'm not really recommending this, but it might not be an impossible idea."

GOLDWATER is a grotesque burlesque of the conservative he pretends to be. He is a wild man, a stray, an unprincipled and ruthless political jujitsu artist like Joe McCarthy, whose last-ditch defender he remained even when three-fourths of the Senate had voted to condemn their Red-hunting colleague. He still defends McCarthy, well knowing that he imputed treason to General Marshall and to President Eisenhower. He will not condemn the John Birch Society, though knowing that its leader, Robert Welch, has called Eisenhower a Communist agent. Yet, in order to get Eisenhower's vacuous blessing, GOLDWATER was capable of a tongue-in-cheek erasure of his infamous "extremism" slogan, a statement that was not written in haste but with extreme care, and gone over time and again by GOLDWATER before he uttered it. These words can, and should, forever symbolize the total fraudulence of his claim to be a true conservative: "Extremism in the defense of liberty is no vice, and * * * moderation in the pursuit of justice is no virtue." That statement deserves to be the "Rum, Romanism, and Rebellion" of this election, and BARRY GOLDWATER deserves to be defeated for it alone, no matter how much he tries to clown it away. He knew what he meant by it, and so does every John Birch fanatic and Ku Klux vigilante.

For the good of the Republican Party, which his candidacy disgraces, we hope that GOLDWATER is crushingly defeated. It was clear, from poll after poll, that the rank and file of Republican voters overwhelmingly preferred other leaders to GOLDWATER. It was equally clear that the fanatical Goldwater bias of a majority of convention delegates revealed the capture of the Republican Party by a new breed of so-called leaders whose selection had been steamrollered by extremist, well-heeled types. The men who have most deserved to lead the Republican Party, by virtue of their long, distinguished, and responsible service in it and to the country, have been made to feel unwelcome, hissed and hated in it, as they were repudiated by it. A crushing defeat for GOLDWATER will drive the fanatic saboteurs of the Republican Party back into the woodwork whence they came. It will provide the opportunity for the party's true leaders to build anew from the wreckage that these heedless, reckless, ill-mannered, and arrogant men are sure to leave. Then the two-party system can be restored, and the voter will again have a choice, not a calamity.

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Sun-Times, Sept. 8, 1964]

WHY WE ENDORSE MR. JOHNSON

On June 10, a month before the Republican National Convention at San Francisco, the Sun-Times declared it would support President Johnson's candidacy if Senator BARRY GOLDWATER became the GOP presidential nominee.

That which has happened since has strengthened our conviction that the well-being of America and the peace of the world will be better served by keeping Mr. Johnson in the White House.

The Nation faces a choice between two opposing philosophies of government, a choice that will affect American lives for years to come. We cannot accept the Goldwater philosophy. Neither do we believe the Arizona Senator has the capacity to serve as the Chief Executive of this Nation.

The Sun-Times in 1952 and in 1956 endorsed Dwight D. Eisenhower for President. In 1960 our choice was Richard M. Nixon. This year we are for the Democratic candidates, Mr. Johnson and HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, not because our views have changed but because the Republican Party changed—temporarily, we hope—when it chose GOLDWATER. That change would not have occurred if the GOP had nominated Gov. William W. Scranton, Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller or Gov. George Romney.

The election of President Johnson would mean a continuation of fundamental foreign policies that have guided the United States under both Democratic and Republican administrations since World War II.

GOLDWATER has a long record of opposition to those policies. His record and statements justify the fear that if he were elected, international tensions would increase. What he would do is uncertain since he has been erratic and inconsistent in his discussions of world affairs. He stresses the military rather than the diplomatic approach in solving international problems.

The bipartisan policies followed by Washington in the last few years have not brought total peace but they have avoided total war. Communist aggression has been held in check with force where necessary and with diplomacy where possible. Despite the loss of Cuba to the Communists the free world has been strengthened. Every President in this nuclear age—Mr. Truman, Mr. Eisenhower, Mr. Kennedy and Mr. Johnson—has been aware of his responsibility to act both with courage and restraint in situations that could bring war.

GOLDWATER alone of the leaders of either party in this country has shown a dangerous casualness toward the use of atomic weapons. He would delegate to military commanders in the field the authority to initiate the use of small tactical nuclear weapons. The authority to push the nuclear button by law belongs only to the President. Considering GOLDWATER's reckless and jingoistic attitude toward the use of nuclear weapons we could not vote for him even if his vague and sometimes conflicting domestic policies were susceptible to rationalization.

We have often disagreed with the Democrats on domestic matters and we expect to disagree from time to time with President Johnson. For example, we believe Mr. Johnson was wrong in pressing Congress to graft a hospitalization plan for the aged on the social security system. But we would rather have a President who is wrong about medicare than one who is wrong about nuclear warfare.

While we disagree and will continue to disagree with some Democratic domestic policies we concede and applaud the fact that Mr. Johnson has proposed a positive program. He has definite ideas about what he believes is necessary to make this country a better place in which to live.

GOLDWATER's program is a negative one. He stresses what he would undo in Government rather than what he would do. His aim, he says, is not to pass laws but to repeal them. Which laws would he abolish? The GOP platform is no help in guessing what Government might be like with GOLDWATER in the White House. The platform promises a continuation of some Federal efforts that GOLDWATER has said should be abolished; for example, in 1960, in "Conscience of a Conservative," GOLDWATER said there should be prompt and final termination of the farm subsidy program. He has now accepted a platform that pledges to continue price supports. GOLDWATER last week said he realizes many changes in Government cannot be made overnight.

We must believe that GOLDWATER would follow his own bent in the White House rather than his party platform. Last January he said that "at best, political platforms are a packet of misinformation and lies." If he is true to his own earlier beliefs, he will make serious overtures to sell TVA and withdraw the Government from some social welfare programs, public power, housing, and urban renewal.

President Johnson has shown an appreciation of the need for prudence in spending. He has helped develop the climate of confidence in which the economy is booming and has attracted support from important elements in the business community. He has come to grips with the problem of poverty that still exists in this most affluent of all societies.

Personality, experience, ability, and knowledge are all factors to be considered in the election of a President.

President Johnson has shown an ability to get things done. He knows the art of politics and that of getting men and women to work with him to bring his programs to realization. He has proved himself to be a masterful leader.

GOLDWATER gives every evidence of the military approach in the handling of his fellow men. He is neither a compromiser nor a persuader. In his victory at San Francisco he permitted no deviation from his extremist line and it was not until the meeting at Hershey, weeks later, that he made a gesture toward party unity by consulting with the elements he had defeated.

GOLDWATER differed with the 1960 Republican platform and voted contrary to the majority of his Republican colleagues in the Senate on at least 23 occasions. At the San Francisco convention, the American public saw the difference between GOLDWATER and his own party clearly when speaker after speaker praised the Civil Rights Act and took credit for helping pass it. GOLDWATER, their candidate, had voted against it.

GOLDWATER has been the spokesman for an element in America that has been unhappy at the speed and complication of the 20th century; one that distrusts Federal Government even in areas where local government has failed. He attracts groups that resent Negro demands for equal rights.

In their hearts, most Americans, we believe, know that GOLDWATER's election would complicate the race problem, not ease it. Those who would vote for him because they resent Negro civil rights militancy, would neither end the militancy nor help bring about the understanding and harmony that will make it unnecessary. Mr. Johnson, we believe, is better fitted to try to bring about that understanding.

In BARRY GOLDWATER's world the United States is a fearful place in which to live, plagued by centralized planning, redtape, regimentation and public officials who are leading the Nation into socialism.

He would turn back the clock to a halcyon day. He would return to a day that in reality never existed and cannot exist. Technology, science, our expanding population, the increased mobility of our people, the rising standards of living and education, the demands of Negroes for their constitutional rights, the shrinking of the world in time and space, the changes abroad that have matched the changes here—all have, indeed, made life today more complicated and swifter. We may not like it, but 20th century government must play a role in the lives of everyone.

Since this is so, we would feel more secure, more optimistic and confident of America's future with Mr. Johnson or Humphrey in the White House than Goldwater or his running mate, William E. Miller. Mr. Johnson is aware of the challenges and problems of our times. We cannot believe GOLDWATER truly understands them.

[From the Corpus Christi (Tex.) Caller-Times, Sept. 6, 1964]

Thirty years of public life have convinced President Lyndon B. Johnson that there are no simple solutions to most of the great problems facing this country and mankind. His approach to questions of substance in domestic and foreign affairs has been marked by a patient search for areas of agreement.

Critics from both extremes of the political spectrum have directed much of their fire at his willingness to compromise. Yet our constitutional system is utterly dependent on the willingness of reasonable, responsible men to adjust their differences. Long ago Johnson recognized that compromise was an essential element in the democratic process and adopted as his text this passage from Isaiah 1: 18: "Come now, and let us reason together."

When Johnson speaks out on issues of importance he usually speaks plainly and directly. He has not had to spend much time explaining what he said.

There is no mistaking Johnson's sincerity, nor his determination to improve if he can the lot of the poor, the unemployed, and the unemployable. Perhaps he cannot solve these age-old problems of mankind, but his history will not say that he did not try.

We believe that Johnson most clearly represents the national consensus at this moment in our history. The national mood is one of moderation, of avoiding extremes, of willingness to move forward with progressive programs, and above all an unwillingness to turn back the clock. He stands in the mainstream of American political thought. We are confident that the people of the United States know this and that they will elect him to his first full term in the White House.

Let us continue to work on the unfinished business of a great society with Lyndon B. Johnson.

ROBERT M. JACKSON,
Editor.

[From the Orlando (Fla.) Sentinel]

WHY WE SHOULD SUPPORT THE DEMOCRATIC TICKET

There are few among us who would argue the fact that: This is Goldwater country.

We are speaking of Florida in general and central Florida in particular.

And, although the latest Gallup poll as published by the Sentinel last Sunday shows President Johnson as leading his rival by 65 to 29 percentage points, which is decidedly more than two to one, many Floridians, if they voted today, would vote against the Johnson-Humphrey ticket.

This does not mean that they know GOLDWATER and Mr. MILLER better than they know either Mr. Johnson or Mr. HUMPHREY, nor that GOLDWATER and MILLER promise to do more toward improving our living conditions or continuing the economic growth of central Florida and the whole State. It simply means that people vote against candidates, instead of voting for them—in 99 out of 100 cases. Perhaps the exception to the trend was the first Roosevelt election back in 1932. In that election, people actually voted for the candidate, for a change. They were that disgusted with President Hoover and the Republicans.

But, as a rule, we get mad at a candidate whether he is a sheriff running for reelection or a President trying to get a second term, and we stir up an emotional storm against him—not stopping to ponder and cogitate and assess the value of the man we decided to vote for, nor for what he stands, nor what he promises to do or undo to our State and our particular area.

There are so many among us in this Goldwater country who are, all of a sudden shooting from the hip at Lyndon Johnson that the Sentinel thinks the moment propitious for the newspaper to draw back the curtains, come out in public, hold up our hand for a moment of silence and say something nice about the President.

The first nice thing we would like to say about President Johnson is that, throughout the years, since he was a young Congressman in the Roosevelt era, he has been a friend of Florida.

The second thing we would like to say about him is that we have personally known him for 30 years. We have found him a loyal and a compassionate friend and a man who, first as Senate leader, then as Vice President and then as President, has always been friendly to Florida and its projects.

This newspaper, back in 1955 we believe it was, saw the greatness of Lyndon Johnson and we used up our entire front page one Sunday morning to nominate him for the Presidency of the United States. We were the first publication in the world to take such action and recognize Johnson's talent at such an early date.

We put an item on the Associated Press wire about our suggestion of Lyndon Johnson for President that night and while the old reliable AP carried it, only 10 or 12 papers printed it. The editors were blind to Lyndon Johnson that night back there in 1955 but they certainly are not blind to the tall Texan today.

The next day he had a heart attack. But we were later assured that it was not caused from our spectacular selection of this man, whom we had known and admired for so many years as a do-it public servant.

So, for us to oppose Lyndon Johnson, now, in the greatest fight of his long political career, would make us an ingrate.

But let's leave personalities out of the debate.

Let us say that we know President Johnson, admire him, speeded through a day with him in his mountain country district 30 years ago, as he pointed with pride to a series of dams he had built and miles of wires he had strung to bring the first electricity to the farmers and cattlemen.

Heretofore, these people had been buying coal oil (kerosene) by the barrel, as well as lamp wicks by the gross and lamp chimneys by the dozens.

After that feat, the private power corporation offered him a job at $30,000 a year, much more than he was then making as a Congressman.

There is no need to throw them—Federal efforts in Florida—away in the heat of political disagreement or because we are emotionally upset over the civil rights or the civil wrongs act. We don't like it any more than some of its more ardent opponents. But it is the law. GOLDWATER cannot change it, even if he desired to do so. But GOLDWATER's record on integration is more militant than that of Johnson. He integrated his store in Arizona years ago and took the lead in the movement in his State.

But that is beside the point. GOLDWATER is worse than that.

GOLDWATER is against the moon shot. He is against the heavy military budget. We refuse to vote to return Cape Kennedy to the rattlesnakes and wilderness.

If GOLDWATER wins, all of these Florida installations are in jeopardy—and we still have the civil rights law, and GOLDWATER is going to enforce it, because when as and if he takes the oath of office, he swears to enforce it and all other laws on the books.

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Daily News, Sept. 8, 1964]

FOR PRESIDENT: JOHNSON

Down through this Nation's history, Presidents have been elected for a variety of reasons, ranging from prowess in battle or the accident of pleasant looks and manners, to the rare circumstance of standing head and shoulders above all other public men of the era.

The Nation has benefited from many, and survived them all—survived to become the greatest, most influential on earth. And as it has grown, the demands upon the character, wisdom, and strength of its President have grown.

Now the survival of the United States, of the free world community, and of freedom on earth has come to depend directly and immediately upon the decisions the President is called upon to make. So the first consideration in the selection of a President must be the ability he demonstrates, in the sum total of his words and deeds, to make those decisions soundly.

Weighing the two principal candidates in this light, the Daily News has concluded that Lyndon B. Johnson deserves election.

There is, first, his record in office.

From the moment of Mr. Kennedy's assassination through the tumultuous months that have followed, Mr. Johnson has conducted himself and his office coolly, creditably, and with judgment and courage.

We have quarreled vigorously with some of his policies, and we shall doubtless continue to do so. We disagree with what we judge to be his philosophy on the expanding role of Central Government. We wish he would demonstrate greater concern for frugality. Like the Kennedy platform of 1960, the Johnson platform of 1964 tends to promise all things to all people, and to edge the Nation a little closer to a welfare state. We look to Congress to play its traditional role in curbing these tendencies.

The Bobby Baker case remains as a black mark against the President, and the circumstances surrounding his family's television business in Texas strongly suggest the use of his senatorial prestige for private gain. We do not condone these things, or blink at them. Still, no one has produced proof or even substantial evidence of wrongdoing. As a Senator he was also a sharp businessman—a not unprecedented thing—and since becoming President he has conducted himself like a President.

As President he has worked powerfully and effectively with the Congress for those causes he deems right. The tax cut, the far-reaching Civil Rights Act, the antipoverty measures have been major achievements, filling manifest national needs. Business, large and small, has found him sympathetic to its problems. The nations abroad who share our faith in freedom have found him trustworthy. And the Communists, having tested his mettle in the Gulf of Tonkin, hold him in respect.

In short, President Johnson promises to hold the country on an even course, pressing steadily for progress but exercising care lest some radical or impulsive action in this time of perpetual tension propel the Nation past the point of no return and precipitate nuclear war.

The words, the demeanor, and the voting record of Senator GOLDWATER provide no such reassurance.

Through the years this newspaper far more often than not has supported the Republican cause, and continues to support the great, guiding principles that descended intact from Abraham Lincoln to Dwight Eisenhower.

In Senator GOLDWATER we find no trace of these principles; indeed, we find it next to impossible to discover GOLDWATER's genuine convictions on many of today's most pressing issues.

And on some of those issues where he has made his position unmistakable—such as his stubborn opposition to even the slightest step toward disarmament, including the nuclear test ban treaty—he has stood in appalling contradiction to commonsense and to the consensus of his own, as well as the opposition, party. Having declared himself openly in favor of brinkmanship he has underscored this predeliction in proposing sending Marines to turn on the water at Guantanamo, in suggesting giving top field commanders discretion in the use of nuclear weapons, and in urging a "total victory" program that would foreclose any world accommodation short of obliterating the Communist countries (and in that process obliterating our own).

In these and other easy answers to tough, infinitely complicated, infinitely dangerous problems, he has managed to suggest—plausibly, to many of his ardent followers—that today's world is really not so complex and perilous as the statesmen and the intellectuals try to make it out. We believe that it is infinitely more complex and perilous than GOLDWATER realizes. And we earnestly hope that if and when the Arizona Senator discovers the truth, it will be on his own time, not America's.

Senator GOLDWATER's opposition to the civil rights bill and his open hospitality to the segregationists of the Deep South have struck a sympathetic note in many hearts in the North and South among those who fear the intrusion of the Negro race into neighborhoods and patterns of life that have until now been exclusively white.

It may be that Negro leaders in their eagerness have tried at times to move too far too fast. But we believe the main thrust of American thinking in this latter half of the 20th century runs contrary to the view that the Negro must "be kept in his place." We believe most Americans feel conscience-bound to accord equal opportunity under the law to all Americans, and we believe that the end result will be gradually to turn the Negro race to a prideful productive national asset.

And on the larger scene, we believe the mainstream of America must flow forward, in the face of whatever obstacles, in the willingness to assume whatever burdens—forward toward the next century and not backward toward the last.

The candidates' respective choices of running mates reinforce our estimates of the caliber of the leaders. In HUBERT HUMPHREY, President Johnson chose a strong and talented individual in his own right—a man whose judgment and character have matured with his rise to posts of increasing responsibility.

In choosing a virtually unknown and totally undistinguished Congressman named WILLIAM MILLER to share the ticket, GOLDWATER told his public in effect: "Never mind about the Vice Presidency; when you've said 'GOLDWATER' you've said it all." This presumption of a charmed life is somehow of a piece with the rest of the Senator's overall failure to comprehend the world he lives in.

We have had our disputes with HUMPHREY as we have had them with Mr. Johnson. But beside MILLER he stands 10 feet tall, and we vigorously endorse the Johnson-Humphrey ticket.

[From the Houston (Tex.) Post, Aug. 30, 1964]

FOR A BETTER USA—VOTE FOR L.B.J.

The Presidency of the United States is a unique office. It combines the functions of chief of state, head of government, and party leader.

It therefore imposes upon the man who occupies the Office unique burdens, chief among them that he must be President of all the people of the United States, not simply those who happen to belong to the party he heads.

The President represents the aspirations of all the people: The hope of citizens of blighted Appalachia for a life above the subsistence level, the hope of city dwellers for an environment free of violence, the hope of each citizen to be treated on his own merits by the society in which he lives, the hope for a stable economy that is essential to all our other hopes, and, finally, the hope of men and women the world over for freedom from the fear of the mushroom cloud.

As usual, Thomas Jefferson said it best: "The care of human life and happiness is the first and only legitimate object of good government."

But the President of the United States has not only to represent these aspirations, he has to exercise the leadership to move the Nation in the direction of a better life.

He first has to provide leadership for the Congress by proposing a legislative program designed to meet these needs. He must then continue to use his influence and power to see that his program, or as much of it as possible, is passed by the Congress.

And, if he is a strong President, he inevitably sets the tone of the political life of the country. If he is essentially a positive, progressive man the history of his administration will be one of continuing effort to solve the problems of our society. If he is obsessed with fear and anxiety and distrust, he will put those stamps on our society.

The choice between the two presidential candidates that the Nation will make in November is nothing less than a choice about the whole basic quality of our national life for the next 4 years.

The choice is a clear one. The Post believes that President Lyndon Johnson is the best qualified to lead this country.

His record in the past 9 months has been impressive. When he became President the administration's legislative program was mired in a congressional morass. The foreign aid bill was thoroughly entangled in congressional redtape. It took strong and dramatic action to get the bill out of Congress by the year's end. That action was forthcoming.

And President Johnson's legislative leadership has continued firm and sure.

Indeed, virtually all of President Johnson's career as a public servant has fitted him to exercise this leadership. He was the youngest man ever elected minority leader. When the Democrats again became the majority party in the Senate (in 1954), Mr. Johnson became majority leader at a difficult time in our history.

It would have been easy for him to have followed a policy of destructive opposition to the programs of a Republican President.

He did not do so.

He exercised his power in a responsible and constructive way that won him the respect and admiration of all who observed his actions. In doing so he helped the Nation over what could have been a rough time—the 6-year period of divided control of Government when the GOP held the White House and the Democrats controlled the Congress.

There have been in the past 9 months the usual number of crises abroad, and President Johnson has met these with the same sort of prompt and effective action.

The North Vietnamese can testify amply to that.

The threatened railroad strike last April yielded to the same kind of firmness and decisiveness.

One of the basic yardsticks by which any administration is judged is the success of its economic policies. In this field, the present administration has had remarkable success. It can point to a 42-month period of economic expansion, unmatched in peacetime history. Moreover, that expansion has been sustained in the face of declining defense expenditures.

The increase in gross national product by $120 billion since January of 1961 is something any administration can be proud of.

President Johnson's record of accomplishment is outstanding by any standard. Were no other considerations involved in this campaign, the record would be the strongest reason for endorsing President Johnson.

But there is an even stronger reason, and that is the issue of what kind of a nation we really want to be. The issue was well put in these paragraphs from the Democratic platform:

"Of first priority is our renewed commitment to the values and ideals of democracy.

"We are firmly pledged to continue the Nation's march toward the goals of equal opportunity and equal treatment for all Americans regardless of race, creed, color, or national origin.

"We cannot tolerate violence anywhere in our land—North, South, East, or West. Resort to lawlessness is anarchy and must be opposed by the Government and all thoughtful citizens.

"We must expose, wherever it exists, the advocacy of hatred which creates the clear and present danger of violence.

"We condemn extremism, whether from the right or left, including the extreme tactics of such organizations as the Communist Party, the Ku Klux Klan, and the John Birch Society.

"We know what violence and hate can do. We have seen the tragic consequences of misguided zeal and twisted logic.

"The time has come now for all of us to understand and respect the unity of spirit and purpose from which our future greatness will grow—for only as we work together with the object of liberty and justice for all will the peace and freedom of each of us be secured."

[From the San Antonio (Tex.) Express, Aug 27, 1964]

LYNDON JOHNSON IN THE PRESIDENCY: ABILITY, KNOWLEDGE, EXPERIENCE

The Democratic Party Thursday ratified what the world already knew and Lyndon B. Johnson has been nominated as the first candidate from the Deep South, if Texas can really be included in that region.

Thus, Texas-born-and-reared Lyndon Johnson has broken the tradition against selecting a nominee from the South. Dwight Eisenhower was born in Texas; Zachary Taylor was from Louisiana when he was elected; but no candidate from the South has been nominated since the Civil War and President Johnson lived with the political realization that even he was not likely to get the nomination.

He not only has the nomination but he must be considered the overwhelming favorite to win the election.

The President is a proven leader.

He has a record of legislative and executive ability.

He has demonstrated a capacity for decisionmaking—if one will concede his delay in indicating a preference for the vice-presidential candidate was done to maintain interest in an otherwise unexciting Democratic convention.

He knows the mechanics of government and has a rare grasp of the art of politics—which is the art by which the business of government functions.

He is a prudent man, deliberate, energetic, and exceptionally well informed in the job he now holds.

He knows and is known, favorably, in the capitals of the world.

As a southerner, he led the fight for implementation of the constitutional rights of all citizens.

We have supported much of what he has proposed; we have opposed several programs he has advocated—and may oppose more if he is elected; but the choice is now quite clear. The Democrats have nominated the better qualified candidate.

[From the Kansas City (Mo.) Star, Aug. 30, 1964]

AS WE SEE IT: THE CASE FOR LYNDON B. JOHNSON

These are dangerous and still-troubled times for all of us, times that demand the most careful and prudent leadership both in our affairs at home and in the world.

Abroad, the family of nations grows. New countries emerge in the ferment of freedom, often without the sense of responsibility that is essential to world stability.

On new battlegrounds and old, freedom continues its struggle against communism in that spasm of history that is called the cold war. The drama plays on, with the ominous threat of nuclear holocaust ever a part of the plot.

At home our great struggle is over what loosely is termed civil rights. But the term is an oversimplification. It is a problem of race. It touches upon traditions and a way of life. It borders on economics and the persistently high rate of unemployment that particularly affects Negroes. There has been no internal challenge of such proportions since the Civil War.

Abroad and at home, it is a time in which national decisions must be weighed carefully and made judiciously. We refer not only to the decisions that our elected leaders may make, but also to the millions of individual decisions to be made by the voters in November. As citizens, they have a meaningful duty to discharge.

Believing this in all conscience, the Star is making its decision, as each of its readers must do. The convention are past, the platforms written. The issues are joined. Unhesitatingly, this newspaper supports the candidacy of President Lyndon B. Johnson.

We are convinced that the cause of world peace would be better served by Mr. Johnson and his foreign policy, with its roots deep in both Democratic and Republican administrations. It would be safer to keep his finger on the nuclear trigger than to place the awesome responsibility on Senator GOLDWATER. We frankly fear that the Goldwater philosophy, transformed into Presidential policy, might plunge the world deeper into the uncertainly of greater international tensions.

Of course, no one can be wholly satisfied with the rate of progress toward peace and world understanding. All of us share the frustrations of this atomic era. But inch by inch there has been progress. In the Goldwater makeup, in the GOP platform, in the candidate's statements, we see every reason to fear an end of such progress and, in fact, a period of retrogression with increased tensions.

Let us put it another way, and bluntly: We believe that to entrust the peace to a Goldwater administration would be an unnecessary and undesirable gamble for the Nation to take.

On the domestic front, civil rights is the overriding issue. It is pointless to hope that it can be kept out of the campaign. It is dangerous to ignore the explosiveness of the issue. And it is unduly optimistic to see any lasting solutions for years to come.

Here, then, is a point of the utmost relevancy to the Goldwater candidacy: Should he win, he would unquestionably do so with the support of the extreme segregationist groups of the South and with the backing of those groups, North or South, that place the Negro inside their circle of hate.

We believe that BARRY GOLDWATER is as determined as any other man to solve this problem. But as President, could he? We are not at all certain, for his election itself could create division, not unity. Support from the extreme racists would inevitably transform itself into pressure on the President—pressure for actions that could destroy the uneasy bridges of understanding between the races.

By contrast, President Johnson has been a strong leader in the civil rights cause, despite his Texas background. Because of that background, he has a kinship to the whole South and is better equipped to understand its problem. Regardless of the convention outbursts from the South, the Star believes that, for the long pull, Mr. Johnson would be much more effective in solving the racial problem than would his opponent.

We recognize the American tradition of rallying around each new President. Undoubtedly there would be, in the terminology of politics, a "honeymoon" of sorts for Barry Goldwater, should he be elected. Nevertheless, we foresee many difficulties for him. Above all else, he would face world and national leadership with the forces of hate from both extremes intensified rather than lessened.

Moreover, it seems to us that Lyndon B. Johnson deserves election on the record he has made in the months since an assassin's bullet tragically struck down John F. Kennedy. What a crisis Mr. Johnson faced at that time. He has, we believe, dealt with it masterfully.

This is not to say that we go along with everything Mr. Johnson has done or says that he will do. Most certainly we do not.

But we were impressed in the days of transition from the Kennedy to the Johnson administration and we have continued to be impressed. In the manner of an old pro, L.B.J. convinced the 88th Congress, which had been on a virtual sit-down strike in its first session, that certain actions were essential in the national interest. Mr. Johnson got the country moving again.

In the foreign field—and in this area we were admittedly uncertain of his leadership—the President has demonstrated his ability to serve effectively as the Nation's spokesman. All in all, his performance as a Chief Executive thrust suddenly onto the world stage has inspired confidence both in Lyndon Johnson and in the United States.

The latest test of the Johnson leadership came in Vietnam, when Communist PT boats attacked U.S. ships not once but twice. In the first instance, there was a Presidential warning; when that was ignored and the attack was repeated, the United States struck back with a pinpoint demonstration of military power which left no doubt that this country meant business. And even as the bombs were falling, the White House had started the diplomatic moves designed to keep local confrontation from becoming world conflagration.

It was firmness coupled with prudence. And that word, we suggest, belongs without qualification with another essential word of our times: Preparedness.

It seems significant to us, too, that Mr. Johnson's critics have made such a point of assailing him as a man who tries to work both sides of every political fence, to be all things to all people. Particularly at this time, we believe his talent for compromise to be an asset. We cannot afford a divided country, and Mr. Johnson has displayed an ability to draw Americans together, to be the President of all the people.

Thus, the case for Lyndon Johnson. What of the case against Barry Goldwater, as we see it?

Certainly we do not dislike the Senator. We cannot accept the line of those who say he is a phony or a demagog. Unquestionably, Senator Goldwater is totally sincere. He is entitled to his views. In our judgment he means what he says. And frankly, we think he has said too much.

We are bothered by that unbending insistence that he is, in all cases, absolutely right, that he has simple answers to all questions. We have seen nothing that indicates moderation on the part of Barry Goldwater—and we do not except that unity meeting in Pennsylvania. Such inflexibility, as we see it, does not belong in the White House. He has shown no comprehension of the art of compromise, which is essential to the functioning of government. Consider, if you will, the Senator's record:

He stood with the very few lawmakers who voted against ratification of the test-ban treaty that was a first if feeble step toward the distant goal of real peace.

He voted against the tax bill even though a large majority of his own party favored the measure.

In the cloture vote and in the final action on civil rights, Barry Goldwater was in the "No" column—again, one of but a very few in the GOP.

We cite merely a part of the record. But there is, here, evidence to prove that this is a very opinionated man who sticks by his opinions, whatever the cost. Now we have heard a lot of quibbling over word meanings and the like since the Republican convention, and it probably hasn't meant much. But it is one thing, we suggest, to have convictions; it is another to be opinionated. The latter describes the man in whom there is conviction carried to a potentially dangerous extreme.

You may, of course, admire conviction when it is described as political guts. But you may also see in the record of consistent opposition a demonstrated inability to work with people to get things done—even with members of the Senator's own party. How, we wonder, could Barry Goldwater work with other world leaders? Where would such a lone-wolf attitude take us?

We regard this election as the Nation's business, not Europe's. Nevertheless, The Star can see why the Western nations should get the chills at the mere nomination of Barry Goldwater. Without falling back on the overused cliches—"shooting from the hip" and the like—we see, in the Goldwater philosophy and method of operation, a recklessness that gives us the chills, too.

One instance in point. When Castro shut off the water to the Guantanamo base, the Goldwater reaction was to send in the Marines. In fact, Washington had prepared for such an emergency. Today, the water has not been turned on. The base is self-sufficient. The United States has not retreated. Nor has it unnecessarily risked nuclear war.

We would not place undue stress on one incident. But there have been many others of like nature. And there is the Goldwater approach, reflected in the platform he virtually dictated at San Francisco. Should that platform become reality in the Goldwater spirit, we would foresee a setback in the search for peace. It seems to assume that it is impossible to work with the Communists in any way or to negotiate with them. It raises questions on cooperation even with our allies. It places the major stress on military might, not on firm but prudent diplomacy.

Similarly, that defense of—or apology for—extremism in the acceptance speech made us wonder precisely what road this Nation might be forced to travel with Barry Goldwater as its leader. Here, we must note that on the surface, the Senator seemed conciliatory at Hershey, with his profession of faith in the Eisenhower way. But was it the real Goldwater? Or was the real Goldwater the man who left San Francisco flush with the victory of the rightwing takeover of the party? The man who made that amazing acceptance speech?

We need not debate whether the speech—and the defense of extremism was, of course, the real essence of it all—was a political blooper. But this we do know: The unity conference at Hershey was necessary because the words of the nominee at San Francisco were so open to adverse interpretation. We cannot buy a presidential candidate who so consistently uses language that he needs later to explain—or others need to explain for him. Clarity of mind, expression and thought are essential for a President. We cannot afford a Chief Executive who, later, would have to explain precisely what he meant. In this world of cold war, that would be dangerous indeed.

Thus, the choice is proposed, and the Star has made its choice. In taking this position, we believe that we are in line with the traditional thinking of this newspaper, even though the Star has generally supported Republican candidates for the Presidency.

The Star has never made any pretense at being a liberal newspaper. We have believed consistently that the country could be served best by a philosophy of moderate conservatism.

In the distant past, this newspaper opposed populism when it was on the move throughout our territory. It supported sound money principles and the gold standard through the years of William Jennings Bryan. In 1912, when business seemed to be gaining too much power, we did not hesitate to follow the Bull Moose of Theodore Roosevelt.

In the New Deal era we stood fast against extreme liberalism and leftwing extremists. Consistently, we have opposed Ku Kluxism, that frightening symbol of internal hatred, even as we have spoken out against John Birchers and the hate groups of today.

On civil rights, we have supported that movement in the name of justice and morality, while denouncing lawlessness on the part of any racial group, white or Negro. We will continue to speak forthrightly, whether in criticism of the reckless white segregationists of the South or the reckless Negro integrationists of the North.

Let it be known that in supporting President Johnson, we are not buying the Democratic Party as such, nor its platform. The Star will continue to make its decisions on State and local candidates as it sees each situation, irrespective of the national election.

We do not condone the Bobby Baker scandal, any more than we did similar scandals of the Truman and Eisenhower administrations. We believe that Congress has been woefully neglectful in protecting itself against a repetition of such sordid affairs. We are not convinced that the Baker investigation has been as thorough as it ought to have been.

We will go even further: We wish the Johnson family were not in the television business. Not that there is anything wrong with that business. Undoubtedly, by placing his properties in trust when he became Chief Executive, the President in his own mind removed any possibility of a conflict of interest. Nevertheless, the Presidency is such a precious thing in our system that it should at all times be above reproach or even the slightest whisper of undue advantage.

Having said all this, and promising frank criticism of Mr. Johnson's campaign and administration when we feel it necessary, we restate the case: On the record and on his demonstrated capacity for leadership both at home and abroad, the Star believes that the President deserves 4 years more in the White House.

As a newspaper, we hope that the campaign will be conducted without a spewing of hatred by extremists on either side, without bitter divisiveness, without damage to the national morale that might take so many years to repair. We hope that the campaign somehow will leave a Nation strong and united, not weakened and divided.

For obviously there are many things on which all of us can agree. We know that any sacrifice must and will be made in defense of freedom, and we know that our Nation must be strong militarily, economically, and spiritually. These are truths for this election and for any election.

And there is another truth to which we hold with firm conviction: Each candidate should be given a full and fair hearing. Let the campaign be hard-hitting, as determined as each contender would make it. But we hope that it will at no time degenerate into brawls, disorderly demonstrations, picketing, and the like. This is a vital election to be held in the American way. The American way means fairplay for both men.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Aug. 17, 1964]

WHICH PARTY IS THE "WAR PARTY"?

(By Max Freedman)

Senator GOLDWATER has said "This Nation has gone to war only under one party—and that is not the party that I represent." This is not the same as accusing the Democrats of belonging to the war party, but it is perilously close to that despicable charge.

To remove all doubt, Senator GOLDWATER said the weakness and mistakes of Democratic administrations brought America into two World Wars, into the Korean war, and into the new phase of the war in Vietnam. Let us examine this charge in some detail.

Fifty years ago, at the start of the First World War, this country wanted to be isolated from Europe's agony. The United States had no power to prevent the outbreak of that struggle. At that time it counted for little in the war plans of the great powers. The country wanted to protect its rights at sea, avoid the bloodshed, and if possible help to shorten the conflict by a process of mediation.

These aims were almost universal. They helped to reelect President Wilson in 1916. His Republican opponent, Charles Evans Hughes, shared Mr. Wilson's desire to stay out of the war. The voters, by a small margin, decided that Mr. Wilson rather than Mr. Hughes should be trusted with this task.

It should be remembered that only a small minority, at this stage, supported the demand of former President Theodore Roosevelt that America should join the war on the side of Britain and France. Most Americans, without regard to party, still preferred armed neutrality to participation in the war.

In April 1917 this country went to war because Germany's new policy of unrestricted submarine warfare, with its unlimited attacks on American shipping, seemed to offer the American people no choice.

Does Senator GOLDWATER now say that the Republican Party could have prevented Germany from applying that policy? Or does he argue that America should meekly have submitted to the submarine attacks and done nothing about them?

There has never been any evidence that Germany paid the slightest attention in shaping her own war plans to what Republican politicians were saying or doing. Moreover, it is a repulsive insult to Republicans to suggest that they would have been less eager than Democrats to protect American interests and American honor from German attack.

On analysis, the mysterious wisdom of the Republicans becomes as nonexistent as their cowardice. What is clear is that the Republicans in 1917, no less than the Democrats, could not have kept America out of the war without serious damage to its freedom and honor.

Senator GOLDWATER has chosen to rewrite history, and to convert a national tragedy into a partisan debate, to advance his personal political fortunes in an election campaign.

Before the Second World War, the outstanding Republican in Congress on all matters of foreign policy was Senator Borah. He denied that war was coming in Europe and insisted that he had better information than the State Department.

In 1940 President Roosevelt was able to win an extension of the draft in the House of Representatives by only one vote. Even those Americans who wanted to aid the Allies always insisted that they wanted all aid short of war.

Then came Pearl Harbor. Once again one must ask the question: Could the Republicans have prevented the attack or would they have done nothing about it? If this question answers itself, what right has Senator GOLDWATER, in logic or in honor, to cast slurs on the Democrats now?

When Mr. Acheson defined America's defensive perimeter in Asia in January 1950, he used exactly the terms used by Gen. Douglas MacArthur. Now the general was never a Democrat nor was he ever a favorite of the Democrats. Korea was excluded from General MacArthur's perimeter as from Mr. Acheson's.

A few weeks before the Communist attack, the House of Representatives, led by Republicans, slashed America's military commitment to South Korea—the real signal for the attack. Besides, Mr. Acheson had said that the United States would organize resistance through the United Nations against any aggression on a country outside America's own perimeter. This was the precise procedure followed in Korea.

There is a vast difference, however, before the two candidates on the war in Vietnam. Senator GOLDWATER has told us that he would call for victory in Vietnam and then would turn the war over to the Joint Chiefs of Staff to do whatever they wish to achieve that victory.

President Johnson will never give that responsibility to any Secretary of Defense or to any group of generals. Here is one issue where the voters have a choice, not an echo.

THE NEED FOR FEDERAL ACTION IN MISSISSIPPI

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of myself and 17 colleagues I wish to take this opportunity to bring to the attention of the House a joint open letter which we addressed on October 1, 1964, to President Lyndon B. Johnson.

In our letter we express our deep concern about continued violence and terror in the State of Mississippi and recommend to the President an eight point minimum program for Federal action.

We urge the following:

First. A massive permanent increase in the number of FBI agents assigned to Mississippi.

Second. The opening of branch offices of the FBI throughout Mississippi, with first priority to the southwest area.

Third. A full FBI report concerning the violence in Mississippi this summer, similar to the recent report on the summer riots in the North.

Fourth. Vigorous and strict enforcement of 18 U.S.C. 241, 242, 387 and other Federal statutes applicable to acts of violence and intimidation intended to deprive constitutional rights.

Fifth. The convening of a special Federal grand jury in the southern district of Mississippi to investigate the possible connections between law enforcement officials and the bombings and other acts of violence in southwest Mississippi.

Sixth. The establishment of a branch office of the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice in Mississippi.

Seventh. The opening of a branch office of the Federal Community Relations Service in Mississippi.

Eighth. Hearings conducted by the Civil Rights Commission in Mississippi.

Mr. Speaker, we welcome the support of other Members who share our views and belief that the Federal Government must act now to protect those courageous Americans who seek only to exercise their constitutional rights.

The full text of the letter follows:

AN OPEN LETTER

OCTOBER 1, 1964.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The breakdown of law and order in the State of Mississippi, particularly since June of this year when the Mississippi summer project launched an intensified civil rights drive, has been of continuing and increasing concern to us.

On June 15 many of us joined in a letter to the Attorney General signed by fourteen Members of Congress which urged that Federal marshals be assigned to Mississippi to prevent violence. On June 16 in speeches on the floor of the House several of us warned of violence and the grave danger civil rights workers would be facing. Within days this warning became a ghastly reality. James Chaney, Andrew Goodman, and Michael Schwerner were brutally murdered.

Several of us have visited the State and made specific recommendations to the Department of Justice based upon our firsthand findings. Several of us have spoken on the floor of the House and elsewhere concerning the deprivation of constitutional rights in Mississippi and the violence perpetrated against those who are working to secure those rights. Recently a group of us held an informal hearing with citizens of McComb, Miss., whose homes had been bombed.

Throughout this period all of us have been concerned constantly over the deplorable situation in Mississippi. We have met frequently with each other and with officials of the Department of Justice and representatives of civil rights organizations. We know of the violence, terror, and intimidation that has taken place and continues to take place in Mississippi.

The Nation's attention was briefly focused on the ruthless murder of three young civil rights workers in Neshoba County—murders that are still unsolved. Not so well known is the fact that during this summer and to this date there have been several hundred arrests, scores of beatings and bombings, and countless lesser intimidations and harassments of those courageous individuals who have joined in the struggle for equality. (According to the Department of Justice, in McComb, Mississippi, alone since June there have occurred 17 bombings of churches, homes and businesses; 32 arrests; 9 beatings; and 4 church burnings.) Other threats, intimidations and harassments are numerous. All of these acts were perpetuated against those who participated, or aided, in voter registration and other civil rights activity. Violence has noticeably increased since the summer volunteers departed. This is particularly true in the southwest area.

Law and order is clearly not being maintained. There is no protection afforded those engaged in civil rights activity. The FBI has been unsuccessful in solving most of the organized bombings and other acts of terror and violence.

The Federal Government must take all necessary steps to prevent further violence and bloodshed in Mississippi. We strongly urge the immediate implementation of at least the following minimum recommendations.

1. A massive permanent increase in the number of FBI agents assigned to Mississippi.
2. The opening of branch offices of the FBI throughout Mississippi, with first priority to the southwest area.
3. A full FBI report concerning the violence in Mississippi this summer, similar to the recent report on the summer riots in the North.
4. Vigorous and strict enforcement of 18 U.S.C. 241, 18 U.S.C. 242, 18 U.S.C. 387, and other Federal statutes applicable to acts of violence and intimidation intended to deprive constitutional rights.
5. The convening of a special Federal grand jury in the southern district of Mississippi to investigate the possible connections between law enforcement officials and the bombings and other acts of violence in southwest Mississippi.
6. The establishment of a branch office of the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice in Mississippi.
7. The opening of a branch office of the Federal Community Relations Service in Mississippi.
8. Hearings conducted by the Civil Rights Commission in Mississippi.

We are sure these recommendations will receive your serious consideration.

Sincerely,

William F. Ryan, Augustus F. Hawkins, Henry B. Gonzalez, W. Donlon Edwards, Robert N. C. Nix, Robert W. Kastenmeier, Henry Reuss, Donald M. Fraser, Edith Green, James Roosevelt, John H. Dent, Edward R. Roybal, Phillip Burton, Adam C. Powell, Jeffery Cohelan, George Brown, Charles Vanik, Charles C. Diggs, Jr.,

Members of Congress.

THE AWARD OF THE MEDAL OF FREEDOM TO REINHOLD NIEBUHR

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, Reinhold Niebuhr, the eminent theologian, was presented the Medal of Freedom by President Johnson on September 14, 1964. I take particular pleasure in noting this award to my distinguished constituent, as I have long admired Dr. Niebuhr. Fitting indeed are the measured words of the Presidential citation with regard to this man and his influence:

> Theologian, teacher, social philosopher, he has invoked the ancient insights of Christianity to illuminate the experience and fortify the will of the modern age.

Dr. Niebuhr was honored along with 30 other American men and women. The list of this year's recipients of the Medal of Freedom is a roster of men and women who have contributed superlatively to the quality of American life. Intellectuals and teachers, writers and artists, scholars and journalists, scientists and politicians, labor leaders and businessmen, engineers and physicians, each has given to the country eminent service, has represented the Nation honorably before the world, and has given us a measure of excellence toward which to strive. Of none of these great and famous people is this more true than of the dedicated scholar and devoted teacher, Reinhold Niebuhr. The beneficent influence of his thinking may confidently be expected to illuminate the field of theology, and inspire theological students, for generations to come. Dr. Reinhold Niebuhr holds a rightful place in the forefront of the great society.

ACTION NEEDED FOR SUGAR INDUSTRY

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, one of the major pieces of legislation yet unattended by this 88th Congress lies in the area of sugar. Left unanswered are many questions which remain in the minds of not only the sugar growers, but the processors and consumers as well—and that includes the entire Nation, as sugar constitutes a basic portion of not only our economy but the American diet as well.

The lack of a solution to the sugar dilemma leaves the mainland cane area, in which Florida plays a great role, with an excess of sugar which cannot be sold though harvested by the end of this year. This is sugar which was grown at the request of the U.S. Government last year when we became concerned with rising sugar prices, and I strongly urge the Department of Agriculture to maintain an adequate and fair price level for consumer and processor alike until next year when the Congress will have an opportunity to act on increased quotas for our domestic producers.

As the distinguished chairman of the House Agriculture Committee has said, the mainland sugarcane producers of Florida have demonstrated great spirit of cooperation with the other segments of America's sugar industry, and Florida's sugar industry is to be commended for its efforts to reach a compromise with the rest of the industry in order that the Congress may act. This compromise not yet reached, the Congress must now await agreement by the industry itself before taking future action to protect consumer and producer alike.

Mr. Speaker, the next few months are critical ones, for sugar affects the lives of all of us. I urge that agreement be reached within the sugar industry, and feel that this being done, action by the Congress will follow.

REPORT TO RESIDENTS OF THE 19TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, many political pundits were prepared to bury Congress when it reconvened in January 1963. But their forecast that Congress was incapable of legislating effectively proved to be invalid. This 88th Congress, under the leadership of President Lyndon B. Johnson, wrote one of the most impressive leadership records in history. More constructive legislation, such as the precedentmaking Civil Rights Acts of 1964, and the reduction in Federal income taxes, was passed in this session of Congress than ever before. Roscoe Drummond, the noted political analyst, confirmed this opinion in his column of September 19, 1964, when he wrote:

> This has certainly been a do-something Congress. Its record of achievement merits the praise and esteem of the whole Nation.

For myself, I am grateful for the privilege of having been a Member of this Congress.

To substantiate these claims, I should like to review for my constituents some of the important measures enacted into law by this session of Congress. This review is not meant to obscure the unfinished business of Congress, such as the enactment of a medicare plan for the elderly under social security and an improved Presidential Succession Act. But I make this report with the sincere conviction that the Nation can take pride in the accomplishments of its Representatives in Congress.

NATIONAL ECONOMY

This Congress energized the national economy by passing legislation lowering rates of personal and corporate income taxes, thus increasing the purchasing power of the consumer and encouraging industry to expand production, Public Law 88-272.

The Economic Opportunity Act of 1964—the antipoverty program—established the Office of Economic Opportunity to control and coordinate all resources and programs aimed at eliminating the pockets of poverty that remain in this—the wealthiest nation in the world. This Office will administer a job corps of urban and rural youth, and a work-training and work-study program. In addition, it will encourage local action to reduce poverty. Additional programs will provide the youth of the Nation with the opportunity to develop skills and continue education. The act also provides loans to very low income families for enterprises which will help increase their level of earnings. I am confident that ultimately this legislation will convert welfare recipients into contributors to our national prosperity.

The Domestic Peace Corps, which is part of this program, was introduced by me 2 years ago. I am pleased to have it incorporated as a part of this most important legislation.

Enacted into law was Public Law 88–365 which provides a program of Federal assistance in financing facilities for needed urban mass transportation systems. Ultimately this legislation will help residents of cities like New York get to and from their jobs faster and more comfortably than now.

A National Commission on Food Marketing to study trade procedures and price relationships between the producer and the consumer was established. One of the items to be studied is the concentration of buying power in the hands of a small number of persons and the effect of the "supermarket" system on the consumer.

Public Law 88–423, approved in August 1964, authorizes funds for the construction of primary and secondary State highways and for their extensions into our cities as well as for road projects in national forests, parks, and Indian reservations.

SOCIAL SECURITY, HEALTH, AND WELFARE

In addition to stimulating the economy, Congress in 1964 also gave attention to the health and welfare needs of our people.

The Housing Act of 1964 represents the continuation and broadening of a number of programs under which many thousands of our citizens have been able to purchase their own homes or to rent decent apartments at prices they can afford. It authorizes $1.2 billion for urban renewal, 37,500 new low-rent public housing units throughout the country, and loans for housing for the elderly, for farm housing, and other existing programs. It provides for construction of facilities for migrant farmworkers. It extends the maturity of FHA-financed home mortgages, and lowers the downpayments required; and it provides compensation for persons and businesses dislocated by urban renewal projects. It is anticipated that this legislation will make home ownership possible for many more of our citizens, and that it will make low-rent housing available for our needy. In addition, it will make housing for the elderly financially possible for many of our senior citizens.

During previous years I offered amendments to the housing bills seeking to improve them in keeping with the needs of my constituency. This year I sought to amend the bill by restricting Federal aid to housing in urban renewal areas to low- and middle-income developments. Although my amendment was not accepted, I am certain the effect of the debate, which I helped to lead, will help attain the desired end since it clarified the intent of Congress.

The Congress launched the first all-out attack on the largest health problem in the country—mental illness and retardation. It also took constructive action to improve the hospital bed shortage by extending for 5 years to June 30, 1969, the Hill-Burton Act, providing Federal aid for construction, modernization of hospitals, nursing homes, and other medical centers. The Hill-Burton Act, originally enacted in 1946, provided assistance for 7,306 projects including almost 311,000 hospital beds and 2,011 health facilities. First steps have been taken toward the coordination of hospital systems and facilities to provide more efficient and economical health care. The bill passed this year continues the program initiated in 1946 and provides funds for areawide planning of health facilities.

It has been estimated that the United States will need 850,000 professional nurses by 1970. At present there are 550,000 professional nurses in practice. The 5-year program enacted by this Congress anticipates an increase of 130,000 nurses. While this is short of the estimated need, the legislation should do much to increase the number of graduates of nursing schools. The Nurses Training Act of 1964 includes grants for construction and rebuilding of school and college facilities, traineeships for advanced professionals, and loans for students. This program will help patients and also will help many young girls find a satisfactory, professional career.

Another health measure will alleviate the critical shortage of adequately trained professional public health personnel. It provides for a 5-year extension of training programs to increase the number of professional public health personnel; it also will expand health project grants to schools of medicine, dentistry, engineering, social work, and pharmacy.

The Library Services Act, originally enacted by the 84th Congress as a step toward providing public library services for the Nation, was once again extended, providing matching grants for the construction of public libraries. It is available to all parts of the Nation. This should greatly benefit the Nation's 60 million people who are served by inadequate libraries and the 1.5 million in urban areas with no public libraries at all.

We broadened and made permanent the stamp program for distribution of surplus and other foods to those families requiring such assistance. The bill authorizes the Department of Agriculture to provide surplus foods to States requesting such aid. This food stamp program, established on a pilot basis in 1961, proved to be an effective means of expanding farm markets and of improving the food consumption and nutrition of low-income households. This is now, thanks to the 88th Congress, a permanent program.

We passed legislation which permits the purchase of processed grain foods by the Commodity Credit Corporation for donation under domestic welfare and foreign aid programs. It is anticipated that this legislation will result in a savings to the Government in the program of donating surplus grain to needy persons.

To my regret, I must report that the medicare program unfortunately was not passed by this session of Congress. It is my firm opinion that our senior citizens should have medical care as a matter of right; and I shall continue to fight for home and hospital care for the elderly under social security so long as I hold public office. This year, as in previous years, I had cards printed at my own expense which were signed by thousands of my constituents and which I delivered to the Ways and Means Committee to convince them of the desire of my people for this legislation. Once again these petitions were ignored by a handful of callous men who are heedless of the needs of others. I remain confident this vital legislation will be passed soon.

VETERANS

Over 25 veterans measures have already been signed into law, which makes this Congress one of the most productive ever in this field. Some of these can be described as milestones and were achieved only after a continuous, difficult uphill battle.

Of particular note is the bill which provides additional beds and nursing home care facilities for veterans

Another milestone is embodied in Public Law 88–361, which provides educational assistance to the children of veterans who are permanently and totally disabled from disabilities incurred during their war service.

Of great significance to 2 million service-disabled veterans is the bill which provides that a service-connected disability which has been continuously rated at or above a certain percentage for 20 or more years shall not thereafter be reduced below such percentage. This means that the disability ratings of most World War II veterans will be frozen shortly since the great bulk were incurred during the period which ended in 1945.

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Foreign aid is a multipurpose instrument of foreign policy. It helps transitional societies develop stronger economies and institutions; it helps other nations preserve their independence; and it helps primitive societies learn to deal with contemporary problems. Currently, our foreign aid program is shifting from supporting assistance to repayable loans, and other nations of the free world are joining with us in providing such assistance. As this shift toward repayable loans continues, it is felt that future Government aid will be diminished and that the hardship on the American taxpayer will be lessened. This Congress has appropriated $3,250 million for foreign aid in fiscal year 1965.

Since August of 1961 when the first Peace Corps volunteers set foot on foreign soil, more than 10,000 volunteers have seen duty in 46 countries. On signing the order creating the Corps on a pilot basis in March, 1961, the late President Kennedy said:

> Our Peace Corps is not designed as an instrument of diplomacy or propaganda or ideological conflict (but) to permit our people to exercise more fully their responsibilities in the great common cause of world development.

So successful has this program become that an additional 20 countries have requested Peace Corps missions, but they cannot be supplied immediately since the demand for trained volunteers exceeds the supply. This year Congress authorized expansion of the Peace Corps. This bill came before the Committee on Foreign Affairs, of which I am a member; I cosponsored the legislation and spoke for it during debate.

The test ban treaty between this country and the Soviet Union was signed during this Congress. This is a landmark in our relations with the Soviet Union since it provides not alone for the discontinuance of testing of nuclear weapons in the atmosphere but also encourages the coexistence policy which is so vital in this nuclear age.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AND INTERNAL SECURITY

This Congress has provided for the insurance of our military strength while making every practical effort to prevent a nuclear war.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Perhaps the major achievement of the 88th Congress was embodied in the civil rights legislation which was enacted on July 2, 1964, because this involves a moral issue that cannot be ignored or evaded, however politically convenient it may be to do so. The Civil Rights Act of 1964 is a major landmark in American history; in my view it is the culmination of the century-old struggle of all Americans, whatever their race, color, creed, national origin, or sex, to obtain equal rights along with the dignity and freedom which is their birthright. It guarantees that all Americans will enjoy the same rights and opportunities and reaffirms our dedication to the American democratic ideal. Technically, the bill provides for: enforcement of voting rights, which I believe will change the political structure of the South; injunctions against discrimination in public accommodations; protection of rights to education. In addition, it extends the Civil Rights Commission for 4 years to January 31, 1968, establishes a Community Relations Service and a Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity, and requires nondiscrimination in federally assisted programs. In short, it eliminates discrimination against minority groups in the United States. Despite the fears that some forces have implanted, I believe this legislation will help improve our democracy.

This Congress has also passed legislation authorizing U.S. district courts to appoint public defenders for defendants in criminal cases who cannot afford legal assistance. I joined in the debate on the floor of the House favoring this legislation because I have seen many situations where poor defendants were not adequately protected in our courts—not because of what they did but because they were poor. This legislation will, I am confident, improve our system of justice.

NATURAL RESOURCES

Conservation of our natural resources also has been emphasized in the work of the 88th Congress.

We established a 10-year land and water conservation fund to assist the States in developing outdoor recreation programs. The need for this legislation is highlighted by the increasing use which the American people have been making of our Federal and State recreation areas.

A National Wilderness Preservation System, established by this Congress, will close 35 million acres of land to commercial use and keep them in their primitive state. This program will aid scientific research as well as preserve the primitive beauty of these lands for the benefit of all of the people in the United States.

YOUR REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS

And now, if I may, I should like to turn from the accomplishments of the 88th Congress as a whole to my own activities as your Representative to Congress. First, I should report that this has been an extraordinarily busy year. My constituents have asked for help on a multitude of problems. I am pleased to report that in most cases I was able to provide the help they requested. I would also like to express at this time my pleasure in receiving an increased volume of communications from residents of my area advising me of their opinions on the various subjects which were before the House of Representatives for consideration. I found to my satisfaction that we were in complete agreement on most of the issues in question. Of course, not all of my constituency agreed with me, nor I with them, but to the best of my ability and mindful of what would be best for the greatest part of the constituency and for the Nation as a whole, I acted in accordance with the dictates of my conscience.

Many of my constituents have, over the past year, asked about my voting record. I would say that I have supported the legislation described earlier in this report, and that I was the cosponsor of many of the bills which were enacted. I have introduced proposals which formed the basis for legislation reported out of committee in various versions, and some which are still under committee consideration. Specifically, I refer to legislation which is incorporated in the foreign aid bill, the Housing Act—it is, incidentally, interesting to note that some of my proposals have been adopted by the New York State Legislature although not by the U.S. Congress—amendments to the Immigration and Nationality Act, and a resolution to appoint a Committee on Economic Conversion which will help the Nation convert from a defense to a peacetime economy.

Unfortunately, no action was taken on my bill which, by amending the Food and Drug Act, would have reduced the prices of certain drugs. Nor was action taken on my bill calling for an investigation of the Blue Cross and Blue Shield rates. However, I expect to reintroduce them next year if I am reelected and shall do whatever I can to obtain favorable action on them.

Similarly I shall continue the fight for medicare. This legislation is absolutely essential for our senior citizens. They deserve insurance, such as can be provided under our social security system, against financially crippling illness.

Among other bills which I expect to reintroduce in the next Congress will be my proposals to: first, further liberalize the existing immigration laws; second, to obtain more low- and middle-income housing in my district; third, to further liberalize the Social Security Act, and fourth, to help the consumer through the passage of the "truth in packaging" bill.

Furthermore, I assign a very high priority to revision of our Presidential succession law, including a mechanism of selecting a Vice President should the Chief Executive die in office.

As a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and a member of the Subcommittee on the Near East and the Subcommittee on State Department Organization and Foreign Operations, I am, understandably, vitally interested in the foreign affairs and policies of this country and have, over the years, directed a great many of my efforts toward the attainment of peace in the Middle East. Time and again I have urged that the Arab States and Israel be brought together in direct peace negotiations, and I have been unremitting in my efforts to make sure that sufficient aid is given to Israel in order to help that little bastion of democracy in the Middle East maintain her ability to withstand all pressures brought against her by her Arab neighobrs. In this connection, during the recent debates on foreign aid, I pointed out that by feeding half of the people of the United Arab Republic—Egypt—without receiving return payment we are making it possible for that country to purchase arms and engage in aggressive action against Israel. I also explained that Russia has been supplying Egypt with arms, and that by providing Egypt with funds to buy them we were assisting the Soviet arms industry. I explained that German scientists are in Egypt building weapons of terribly destructive power, and that Egypt was now not only acting aggressively toward Israel, but toward Yemen, Ethiopia, and other African nations. As a result of these arguments, I hope our policy toward Egypt will be modified.

Today we face new uncertainties in a world still turbulent and dangerous. We have no lack of challenges: In South Vietnam, in Africa, in the Middle East and at our own back door in Cuba. Events clearly indicate that we must continue to provide military assistance to our allies and that we must expand and improve our programs of assistance to underdeveloped countries. So long as the program achieves its broad objectives, I will continue to endorse the act of faith which this legislation embodies.

Incidentally, as a result of my seniority on the Foreign Affairs Committee, it is anticipated that in the next Congress I will become chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Economic Policy. This subcommittee deals with matters affecting trade, international, financial and monetary organizations, foreign loans and technical and economic assistance.

During the debate in the House of Representatives in connection with extension of the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act, I brought to the attention of my colleagues the excellent work being done in our district by the Mobilization for Youth program. The fight against juvenile delinquency must be continued and in this connection I was also happy to join in the debate on the President's antipoverty bill which is aimed, among other things, toward the elimination of the causes of juvenile delinquency.

In sum, this has been a productive year. I have sought, in my congressional work, to reflect the wishes of my constituency as far as possible in keeping with my conscience.

In conclusion I should like to remind you that I have established a congressional office at 200 West 72d Street, New York City—telephone—Triangle 7-3163—which is open Monday and Thursday evenings from 8 to 10 p.m. and on Saturdays from 10 a.m. to 12 noon. I also maintain a congressional office at 276 Fifth Avenue, New York City, room 608—telephone—Murray Hill 4-2200. For those residing in the southern part of my district, I use the meeting rooms of the local Democratic organizations to make myself available to my constituents. I would hope that all my constituents would feel free to use these offices whenever I can be of assistance to them, or whenever they wish to advise me of their views on pending legislation. Naturally, I might add, all of them are welcome to visit me in my Washington office.

A STUPID BLUNDER ON THE SOCIAL SECURITY BILL

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the Democratic leadership, and indeed President Johnson himself, must accept responsibility for the fate of the bill to increase the benefits to retirees under social security.

As I had predicted, stubborn insistence for a so-called medicare amendment has caused a deadlock and killed the entire bill. Therefore, recipients of social security will be deprived of an increase in their monthly payments of either 5 percent or $7 per month. This is especially regrettable, it seems to me, because of the higher cost of living which has occurred in the last 3 years.

Mr. Speaker, there are 50,000 persons 65 years and over in the First Congressional District of my State of Washington whom I have the honor to represent in Congress. Not long ago I warned them of the fact that attaching a medicare amendment would kill the whole bill. I deeply regret that I was correct and that a group of deserving and worthy persons must suffer because the Democratic administration insisted on playing politics with this situation.

I hope these retired citizens will not overlook this stupid blunder when they vote next November. Those who profess so loudly their concern for the elderly have completely failed to live up to their words.

A MONOGRAPH ON THE LIFE OF RICHARD POTTS

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, the history of a nation can be a positive influence on its future. History as told by the stories of the lives of our predecessors can be a positive influence and guide for us who sit in the Congress, and to those who will follow us here. I have prepared a monograph on the life of Richard Potts, a Member of Congress from Maryland, and I submit it for the Record.

RICHARD POTTS

"What am I to do for a Secretary of State?" inquired the President of his able Secretary of the Treasury. This was the burden of a confidential letter written by George Washington from Philadelphia on October 29, 1795, to Alexander Hamilton.

The urgency of the question can only be understood in the light of the events that had caused a vacancy in the State Department. Edmund Randolph, who had succeeded Thomas Jefferson as Secretary of State in 1794 had been forced to resign under a cloud in 1795 as the result of charges which reflected on his honor after the interception of French diplomatic dispatches by a British warship.

Washington directed Hamilton, "pray learn * * * what the qualifications of Mr. Potts, the Senator are, and be as diffusive as you can with respect to others, and I will decide on nothing until I hear from you, pressing as the case is."[1]

Hamilton replied immediately on November 5, 1795, saying: "I have conferred with Mr. King with respect to Mr. Potts. We both think well of his principles and consider him a man of good sense. But he is of character ill suited to such an appointment and is not extensive either as talents or information. It is also a serious question whether the Senate at this time ought to be weakened."[2]

This faint praise must have been fatal to the chances of Richard Potts, for Timothy Pickering, of Salem, Mass., was soon afterward made Secretary of State. Yet of all the Marylanders who helped to create the Republic none is more typical of his time and place in history than Richard Potts, of Frederick County.

The settlement of the Potts family in Maryland seems to have been the result of the lively commerce that was carried on in pre-Revolutionary days between the Atlantic seaboard and the West Indies, which together formed British Colonial America. William Potts, who had been born in Kings County, Ireland, about 1690, settled at Bridgetown in the island of Barbados in the 18th century. His son, also William Potts, was born in Barbados in 1718, but he subsequently left his island birthplace and came to take up land on the Choptank River in Maryland. In 1741 he married Sarah Lee, the daughter of Philip Lee, of Prince Georges County. Despite this twofold tie with Maryland he returned to Barbados about 1753 or 1754 and he died at Guadeloupe, West Indies, in 1761. Richard Potts, the second son and fourth child of William and Sarah Lee Potts, was born July 19, 1753, at Upper Marlboro, Prince Georges County, Md.[3]

A letter written by William Potts, of Athlone, Ireland, under date of February 4, 1756, to William Potts (the second) is primary evidence of the origin and background of the family. Not only did this Irish cousin share his knowledge of the family history, but he sent a gold ring which has been worn by the head of the family in America from that day to the present time.[4] The letter begins:

"Dear Cousin: I this day Received yours, then I just had an opportunity of meeting a gentleman going to the Temple By whom I have sent a gold signet, with our arms engraved on it, Left me by my Grandfather. I am sorry It is not of more Value, but such as it is, I am extremely glad to have an opportunity of Indulging yr Curiosity. My Brother James, whom I told you of before, I believe will be the Bearer or Mr. Costella.

"I am sorry the winds were so averse to our meeting, and had I known the Cause time enough, would have gone to Pargate, for we were sadly Disappointed, as we Proposed yr stay here would be of some Continuance. This Opportunity so unexpected, Occasions my being so brief. In respect to our Family, it is just to Inform you, we are Originally English. I would Inclose a Draught of the seal with propper colours, but any Person Skilled in Heraldry May know the Colours, by the seal."[5]

Of the early life of Richard Potts little is known. Apparently William Potts took his whole family back to Barbados with him, including Richard. After his father's death in 1761 Richard Potts returned to Maryland to live near Annapolis.[6] He evidentally read law under the aegis of some practicing attorney; a persistent tradition identifies his mentor as Samuel Chase, of Annapolis, a signer of the Declaration of Independence. Doubt is cast upon this tradition, however, by the fact that the roster of members of the bar of Frederick County from 1748 to 1948, prepared by the Frederick County Bar Association, indicates that Richard Potts was not admitted to the Frederick bar until 1786, although this date is, itself, not definitive.

The most interesting, and perhaps the best, clue to Richard Potts' legal education is contained in the papers of the Johnson family. Although James Johnson's candid commentary on his own illustrious forebears was written a generation after Richard Potts' death, it is authoritative and distinctly implied that Potts studied law under Thomas Johnson.[6] James, in speaking of his uncle, Baker Johnson, states:

"Baker, the colonel, with his brother Roger, received a classical education and was brought up to the law in the office of his brother, the Governor. He commenced the practice of law simultaneously with Richard Potts, his fellow student, in Montgomery County, Frederick County, and Washington County, and they for many years engrossed the three countries. He was inferior to Potts in talents as much as he was superior to him in popular manners and a small share of art which bore him triumphantly through a long course of practice."[6]

It seems clear, at least that Richard Potts had established himself in Frederick prior to 1775. On March 5, 1776, he was appointed Clerk to the Committee of Observation for Frederick County. In order to understand the importance of this position it is necessary to recall briefly the composition of civil government in Maryland during the Revolutionary period, after the Royal and Proprietary authorities had departed and before constitutional forms were introduced.

---

[1] Writings of Washington, vol. 34, p. 348, Government Printing Office, 1940.

[2] Letter from Alexander Hamilton dated November 5, 1795, Papers of George Washington, Library of Congress.

[3] "The Potts Family" by Thomas Maxwell Potts, printed by subscription 1901.

[4] Now owned by Mr. Arthur Potts of Frederick. (1957)

[5] Copied from the original by Dr. William Crawford Johnson in 1888 from papers of his great uncle, George Murdoch Potts.

[6] "Letters of Information" by James Johnson for his children, dated Baltimore, September, 1842. Copied from the original July 4.

The highest authority in the State was the Provincial Convention, which had succeeded to the powers, authority and duties of the Lord Proprietor, the Governor, and the General Assembly. Its membership consisted of five delegates from each county who were elected as "the most discrete and sensible men of each county." The convention had full power to act for the province and for the counties and could order the counties to perform and executive all such matters and things "as such convention or majority of the counties of the province shall determine necessary for the preservation of the liberties of America." The convention also exercised judicial power and sat in judgment on charges of disloyalty referred to it by the Councils of Safety.

The second level of Revolutionary government consisted of the two Councils of Safety, one for the Eastern Shore and one for the Western Shore. Each council consisted of eight members and could act separately in an emergency, but it was apparently intended that they should meet and operate as a unit whenever possible. During the recess of the Convention the councils exercised executive powers and military authority. They also entered the judicial field by acting as an accusatory body in all cases where there was a charge of disloyalty.

The primary level of government was the Committee of Observation in each county chosen by freeholders of the county who had a "visible estate" of 40 pounds or who would be qualified to vote for Burgesses September 2, 1775. The Committee had plenary power to execute the resolves of the Continental Congress and the Provincial Convention. It could further take measures to enforce the nonimportation agreements, the censure of persons judged guilty of breach of the decrees of the Congress, to seize any persons on probable proof that they were guilty of disloyalty, to receive any voluntary contributions to the cause of liberty, and to keep in close communication with the Convention and with other Committees of Observation throughout the province.[7]

That Richard Potts, only 23 years of age and a relative newcomer to the county, should have been chosen for the important post of clerk to the committee on observation certainly leads to the deduction that he early exhibited the ability and integrity that marked his whole life.

Within a year Richard Potts received a second signal recognition of his patriotism and ability. In June of 1776 the Maryland Convention had authorized a levy of militia and subsequently Thomas Johnson of Frederick County was commissioned brigadier general and placed in command of these troops. Thus was created the famous "Flying Camp" in which many Maryland men saw their first service in the Revolutionary War. For the expedition into Pennsylvania and Delaware in 1777 Johnson chose Richard Potts as his aide. This campaign experience was curtailed, however, by Johnson's election as Governor of Maryland, and his return to Annapolis to become the first Chief Executive of "The State" of Maryland.[8]

After the dissolution of the "Flying Camp" Richard Potts returned to Frederick and became clerk of the court on May 20, 1777, for a term of about 1 year. The volumes of the land records written during his incumbency still bear the initials RP. In the year following his clerkship he was chosen to represent the county in the house of delegates for the years 1779 and 1780.

On May 12, 1780, he purchased the property that was to be his residence until his death.[9] The premises that he acquired were parts of lots 109 and 110 as laid out on the original plat of Frederick and fronting 130 feet on Market Street. The conveyance as made by one Frederick Missell, who was described as a butcher, but the property was identified as having lately been the home of Dr. Alexander Hamilton Smith. The purchase of this house seems to be indicative of the general prosperity and success that was attendant upon him at this phase of his career.

The expanding area of his influence was apparent in 1781 when he was elected to the Continental Congress. Potts' service in the Congress must have been satisfactory, for it brought him further honor. On November 1, 1784, he was chosen by Luther Martin, reputed to be the ablest Maryland lawyer of all time and then attorney general, to be the State's attorney for western Maryland. After this experience as prosecutor his next public duty was to return to the house of delegates. His colleagues in the house included Thomas Johnson, Abraham Faw, and Thomas Sim Lee. It is noted, however, that he was absent at the opening of the legislature on November 5, 1787, and it is not clear that he attended any of the sessions of that assembly. It is probably this circumstance which has led Scharff into the error of stating that Richard Potts was elected a State senator in 1787, but declined to serve.[10]

In 1778 the Frederick County members of the house of delegates were all nominated as members of the State convention to consider the Federal Constitution. They were unopposed and all accepted the responsibility thereby imposed upon them.[11]

When the constitutional convention met in Annapolis, Richard Potts was present with the other Frederick County members. He evidently took an active and influential part in the discussions of the convention and he was chosen as a member of the Committee of Thirteen, which was appointed to consider amendments proposed by William Paca. The question of amendments to the original draft of the Constitution was a hot one and for a time it appeared that ratification of the Constitution itself might depend upon amendments being made before it was submitted to the States for final action. In Maryland, however, the Federalists mustered enough strength to ratify the Constitution and adjourn the convention before any decision had been reached by the Committee of Thirteen. It is now, of course, a matter of history that the first 10 amendments were adopted shortly after the Constitution itself, as a result of the discussions of the various State conventions and the recommendations of such men as those who served on Maryland Committee of Thirteen.

The honor of being a member of the convention which ratified the U.S. Constitution was only the theshold of a new field of endeavor for Richard Potts. On September 26, 1789, he was appointed first U.S. Attorney for the District of Maryland by President George Washington. The original commission signed by the President is now in the possession of Mr. Arthur Potts of Frederick.

His service as U.S. Attorney was succeeded by a term as chief judge of the fifth district, to which honor he was appointed by Gov. John Eager Howard in 1791, by a commissioned fellow Frederick lawyer, Chancellor Alexander Contee Hanson. His first term on the bench was but a short one. In 1792 he was chosen a presidential elector and participated in the election of President Washington for his second term. Shortly thereafter an event of considerable importance took place in Maryland, which was to have a significant effect on Richard Potts' life. Up to that time it had been permissible for a man to serve both in the State and National legislatures, but in 1792 such dual service was prohibited. Charles Carroll of Carrollton, one of Maryland's signers of the Declaration of Independence, was serving both as a State senator and a U.S. Senator, and for personal reasons he chose to retain his seat in the Maryland Senate instead of in the Congress. In a letter to Senator John Henry dated December 3, 1792, Carroll described the situation.

"Last Friday, the law disqualifying Members of Congress from holding seats in our legislature, etc., passed the Senate. Myself and Mr. Worthington only voting in the negative. On the same day I resigned my seat in the Senate of the United States. Tomorrow my succesor will be appointed—three persons are mentioned, Mr. Potts, James McHenry, and Colonel Stone."[12]

Mr. Potts got the appointment.

This was not the first occasion upon which his capacities as a lawyer and statesman had commended him to Washington. In 1794, the President had particularly wanted Potts to serve as one of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, because, "among other inducements," he was "well read in law." The honor, despite its source, was, however, declined.[13]

Service in the U.S. Senate was undoubtedly a rewarding experience to a man who had fought for the patriot cause from the earliest days of the Committee of Observation through the military exploits of the "Flying Camp" to the dark days of political strife in the Continental Congress while the Revolutionary War dragged on. Nevertheless, in response to an appeal from his friends, Richard Potts surrendered this position in 1796 to return to his home in Frederick County and resume his duties as chief judge of the fifth district.

He served in this capacity until 1801, when he was elevated to the Court of Appeals of Maryland, where he sat until 1804. It was at that period in Potts' career that he made one of the most interesting acquaintances of his lifetime. One of Judge Potts' sons, William, was a student at St. John's College in Annapolis where he was a classmate of a young southern Marylander named Roger Brooke Taney. It was probably through this friendship that Taney came to Frederick County upon his graduation from college and set himself up as a practicing attorney.

When Taney arrived in Frederick, Thomas Johnson, the elder statesman of the Federalist Party, was in retirement and Richard Potts was the active party strategist. Potts' prestige was great since he had resigned his seat in the U.S. Senate at the request of his neighbors who wished him to return to the Maryland bench and that circumstance, coupled with his position as a large landowner, made him the undoubted head of the local Federalists.

At this early stage in his career Roger Brooke Taney was an enthusiastic Federalist, not having yet embraced the tenets which afterward alined him with Andrew Jackson. He attached himself to Judge Potts and was to owe much to him and his family.[14] After the Federalists' defeat in 1800, Judge Potts, Dr. Philip Thomas, and others established an antidemocratic paper, the Fredericktown Herald. Roger Brooke Taney was an active contributor to the partisan columns of this journal. In 1806, Taney, Charles Carroll of Carrollton, John Eager Howard and Judge Richard Potts received the Federalist nomination for the State senate, but they were not elected in that Republican year. Although Roger Brooke Taney was later converted to Jacksonian Democracy, the high principles and sound theory of the law that he must have learned from Judge Potts in his formative years in Frederick certainly influenced his life through the long term during which he presided in the Supreme Court of the United States.

---

[7] "Maryland During the American Revolutions," Esther Mohr Dole, Chestertown, 1951, p. 85.

[8] Ibid.

[9] Land Records of Frederick County, Liber W.R. 2, folio 532.

[10] Scharff's History, supra.

[11] "Life of Thomas Johnson," supra.

[12] "Charles Carroll of Carrollton," Ellen Hart Smith, Cambridge, 1942.

[13] Writings of Washington, supra, vol. 33, p. 442.

[14] "Roger B. Taney," Carl Brent Swisher, New York, 1935.

Richard Potts, as became the son of British Colonials, was an active member of the Protestant Episcopal Church. Although the records of All Saints' Parish for the colonial period have been lost or destroyed his name appears as a member of the parish in the enrollment made during the reorganization authorized by the Vestry Act of 1798. Judge Potts was elected to the Vestry of All Saints' Parish on Easter Monday, 1804, and was reelected on Easter Monday, 1807.[15]

There is reason to believe that Judge Potts took an active interest in the erection of a new Episcopal Church on Court Street in Frederick. He and his Federalist friend, Dr. Philip Thomas, were said to have been the real purchasers of a lot on Publick Alley (now Court Street) being parts of lots 68 and 69 as laid out on the original plat of Frederick Town. Potts name does not appear on either the deed by which this land was acquired from the heirs of Col. Thomas Price,[16] nor the conveyance by which it was granted to the Vestry[17] for the same consideration for which it was purchased, $477.22. Although the Land Records do not disclose the character of Judge Potts participation, the parish still holds itself in his debt for his interest in this transaction.[18]

Judge Potts national reputation in his own time is indicated to some extent by the unusual honor which came to him in 1805. In that year he was awarded an honorary degree of doctor of laws by the College of New Jersey, now Princeton University. The records of the university do not disclose the particular reason for this recognition, but his long career of service to his State and Nation had certainly made him conspicious, even in an age peopled with patriots.

In spite of the busy life that he led in law and in politics, Richard Potts had time to raise a large family. His first wife, Elizabeth Hughes, of Hagerstown, whom he married in 1779, bore him nine children. Unfortunately, there were no descendants in the second generation as a result of this marriage, His son, Richard Potts, Jr., however, built the mansion on Court Square in Frederick which has since been known as the Potts House[19] and which was designed by Robert Mills, the architect who designed the Washington Monument in Baltimore and was President Andrew Jackson's Architect of Public Buildings.

After the death of Elizabeth Hughes Potts, Judge Potts married, in 1799, Eleanor Murdoch of Frederick. Miss Murdoch was the sister of the wife of Richard Potts, Jr., which must have created an unusual family situation, but in any event the marriage was a happy one and resulted in the birth of several children from whom the judge's posterity is descended. An attractive portrait of Judge Potts, probably about the time of his second marriage and ascribed to Charles Willson Peale, is still in possession of the family in Frederick, together with a portrait of Eleanor Murdoch Potts of a slightly later date by an unidentified artist.

An interesting letter to his wife written from Annapolis while he was on the appellate bench not only reveals the warmth of his family affection, but also affords a glimpse into the routine of the court, as well as an indication of the diversity of his business interests.

"My dear Nelly: I thank you for your letters of the 3 & 5th. Letters of that kind, respecting our family will always be interesting and give pleasure—I hope our little Girl is quite well before this. The General Court adjourned the day after I got here so that the Court of Appeals was not long delayed on that account. I had had an attack of the headache yesterday & today, it is now going off. Mr. Mackall is confined today with a violent cold. His indisposition & mine in the absence of another member Mr. Rumsey who is probably sick, made it necessary to adjourn the Court; and the anxiety of several Lawyers to be at the Circuit Court at Baltimore induced the Court to adjourn until Thursday, by which probably 3 days will be lost. Under present circumstances I have no expectation of being Home until late next week. Your Mama & Miss Shaaff went to Mr. Maynadier's yesterday to stay this evening & Mrs. Shaaff & Harriet went out today and they will all return this Evening. I am glad your father told Mrs. Kimball[20] what he did respecting the corn. She shall have as much good Corn on my return as she received bad. I didn't myself see the Corn—I did agree that Amos should have a great Coat. I wish Sammy to enquire about the sending wood to the persons I engaged to supply—Mrs. Kimball, Mrs. Cushing, Mr. Noland & Deat the Brewer, & others to supply them so as to not oblige them to get of any other person in my absence—Billy Potts hath been here he came down on Saturday & stayed until Monday—I never saw him look so well. He promises to visit Frederick next month—Your friends here are all well—principally out of town or have moved. Give my Love to the Children & believe me sincerely & aff'ly:

Yours,

RICHARD POTTS.

The same Governor & Council were elected that were last year.

Annapolis, Nov. 9, 1802[21]

Nine years after his second marriage Richard Potts died on November 26, 1808, and was buried in All Saints' Graveyard on All Saints' Street in Frederick. When this historic Episcopal burying ground was abandoned his remains were disinterred and removed to Mount Olivet Cemetery in Frederick, where they now rest in the Potts lot.

It is to be regretted that the judicial system of his day did not record for us some of the judicial opinions of Judge Potts. Neither do we have preserved any of his speeches in the various legislative bodies of which he was a member, nor any of his published articles in the newspapers which he sponsored. But for a sample of his style, albeit stilted and formal, we may turn to his last will and testament, which is recorded in the office of the register of wills in the courthouse in Frederick in liber GM–RB No. 1, folio 429. This will is not only valuable to illustrate Potts' clear exposition as a writer, but it is also an excellent example of the way an otherwise dry legal document may give us the flavor of a bygone age. A portion of Richard Potts' will is quoted:

"I Richard Potts of Frederick Town Frederick County and State of Maryland being in Good Health and of sound and disposing memory, mind, and understanding considering the uncertainty of life and that it is appointed for all men to die so with a view of setting my worldly affairs and relieving my family as much as may be from Inconvenience arising from a dying Intestate make my last will and Testament in manner following—First I direct my Body to be decently interred by my Executors avoiding all unnecessary Expense—2dly I direct all my Just Debts to be fully paid by my Executors—3rd I give Devise and bequeath to my dearly beloved and well deserving Wife, Eleanor Potts my House and Lott in Frederick Town where I now reside to her, her heirs and Assigns forever—I also give and bequeath to my said wife all my household furniture, Plate, Provisions and liquors that I may have in the House for the use of my family at the time of my Death so that she may not be in any manner accountable for any part of the same recommending and not Doubting but that she will appropriate the coarser articles of provisions which can be spared from her family in Town to the use of my Labouring people on the farms—I also give unto my said wife my Carriage and Harness I may leave together with any two of my horses she may elect to have as Carriage Horses—I also give unto my said wife one Male Slave and four female Slaves to be selected by her from all the Slaves I may leave at my Death except such as I may by name by this will otherwise dispose of—It is proper hereto declare that it hath never been my Intention to make any material difference between my children but to divide my estate as equally as may be between them but considerations not to be resisted have compelled me to distinguish between them."

The loss of Richard Potts was a severe one to the community and he was deeply missed by his many friends. Among these was a cousin of Eleanor Murdoch Potts, who was then a young man who had recently left the Frederick County bar to follow his profession in Georgetown, but who was already varying the routine legal practice with the delight of poetic composition. Francis Scott Key, apparently was another young lawyer who had looked to Judge Potts for guidance and encouragement.

As soon as he heard of Potts' death he wrote at once to George William Murdoch, the judge's brother-in-law:

"MY DEAR GEORGE: I have received your letter confirming the accounts I had before received. Indeed I sincerely share in the feelings which this loss must have excited in you all. This event my dear George, calls upon you for the most vigorous and perservering exertions. In Mr. Potts your mother and indeed all your family have lost a most invaluable friend; whose kindness, advice, and assistance were ever at their command."

GeorgeTown, Nov. 29, 1808.[22]

Sometime after Judge Potts' death, Key looked upon a small portrait of the judge, which is now in the possession of Miss Emily Crawford Johnson of Frederick, and was apparently so overcome by his memories that he turned the portrait over and wrote upon its wooden back the following lines:

"Such was thy form O Potts, but who can find
A hand or colours to express thy mind?
A mind unmov'd by ev'ry vulgar fear.
In a false world, that dared to be severe.
Wise without art, without ambition great
Though firm yet pliant, active though sedate.
With all the richest stores of knowledge faught.
Yet better still by nature's prudence taught.
That loved the griefs of the distres'd to heal
Could pity frailties it could never feel.
That when misfortune sued ne'er sought to know

---

[15] "History of All Saints' Parish in Frederick County" by Ernest Helfenstein, Frederick, Md., 1932.

[16] Land Records of Frederick County, Liber W.R. 40, folio 149.

[17] Ibid, Liber W.R. 42, folio 470.

[18] "History of All Saints' Parish," supra.

[19] Now the home of Mr. and Mrs. John Randolph Cheatham.

[20] Possibly the proprietress of the noted Frederick tavern, The Golden Fleece.

[21] Original letter in possession of Miss Emily C. Johnson.

[22] "Francis Scott Key, Life and Times," by Edward S. Delaplaine, New York, 1937.

What sect, what party, whether friend or foe;
That lived on equal virtue's temp'rate laws,
Despis'd all calumny and shun'd applause.
That to his own perfections singly blind
Would for another think this praise designed."

Since Richard Potts left a large estate his wife continued to live on in comfort and even style for a long and useful life. The story was told by her great-grandson, Dr. William Crawford Johnson, that she aided the distressed French refugees who made their way to Frederick after the French Revolution, and the uprisings in the French Colonies in the West Indies. Many of these unfortunate people lived on Market Street in Frederick between Second and Third Streets, on the west side of the street just across from the hospitable Potts home. Mrs. Potts' benefactions in this French Quarter of Frederick, which soon became known as Paris row, have helped preserve the memory of her charity and good works.

In 1838, Mrs. Potts sold the house on Market Street to Ezra Houck whose family continued to own it for many years and subsequently tore down the original dwelling and erected a new one, which is now known as the professional building. Several years earlier Mrs. Potts had moved to Court Square, where she first rented the home of John Brien, which is now designated as 103 Council Street.[23] Subsequently, she purchased the adjoining and almost identical mansion (Ross house), which had been erected by John McPherson and it was in this spacious house that she was to pass her last days.[24] A miniature showing her as an old lady, blind and with eyes closed, is now in the possession of a member of the family. Francis Scott Key had not forgotten his happy days spent in the Potts home and he did not neglect to visit his aging cousin whenever he was in Frederick. Although his fame as a lawyer and poet had grown considerably, since he wrote the elegy upon seeing a portrait of Richard Potts, he was still willing to compose in honor of his Frederick relative. On October 22, 1840, he dedicated a poem to Mrs. Eleanor Potts describing the patience with which she sat in a southern window with a guitar, passing the day of her blindness. Both the original of this poem and the guitar are still carefully preserved.[25] Key's words are so sincere that something of Eleanor Pott's character seems to emerge from them.

"I sat beside an aged saint,
It was a pleasure there to be,
Her kind and gentle words to hear,
The calm, contented face to see.

"'Twas then, as by her side I sat,
She softly touched the light guitar
And tones, that had my childhood charmed,
Fell, in sweet sadness, on my ear.

"And I prayed that the light of the days to come
Might brighter and brighter prove,
And the gloom of this darken'ed world be lost?
In the light of the world above."

—*Pipe Creek*, October 22, 1840.

REPORT TO THE PEOPLE OF WESTERN WESTCHESTER AND PUTNAM COUNTIES, N.Y.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, political and legislative analysts are busy assessing the relative accomplishments and failures of the 88th Congress. Therefore it is time for each Member to do some soul searching to see how he measures up individually, in relation to the record we have collectively established.

The 88th Congress has been a tremendously productive one, although as usual much remains to be done. One characteristic of this Congress upon which all can agree is that it has been in session longer than any other in a period of so-called peace.

Actually, the world will not be wholly at peace until it rids itself of all forms of tyranny which constantly threaten the security of free nations around the globe. Hardly a day goes by without a new crisis erupting somewhere—and just because that "somewhere" may be far removed from our shores does not mean that we can afford to sit back complacently and say, "Well, it is still a safe distance away from us." A distance of 90 miles or 5,000 miles is uncomfortably close in this day of modern weaponry—and freedom-loving nations, especially the United States with its farflung commitments, cannot afford the luxury of apathy in this challenging and turbulent period of history.

With the ever-increasing demands on Congress, its Members, especially those who are conscientious about attendance, find that we have less and less time to spend at home in our districts. Ironically, those with the best attendance records often find ourselves the targets of criticism, ostensibly because we are not at home as much as we would like to be, whereas in reality we are doing the job in Congress for which we were elected.

Our job as I see it is mainly twofold: First, to represent the interests of our people, not only in Congress itself, but in many other matters pertaining to the Federal Government; and, second, to keep the people informed of our activities with respect thereto.

This report is but one of many media, including newsletters, news releases, questionnaires, radio and TV appearances, speeches, meetings, and daily correspondence, and so forth, through which I have tried to maintain a close relationship with my constituents.

REPRESENTATIVE GOVERNMENT

My annual questionnaire has served as an effective instrument of representative government. From the large number of important issues facing the Congress each year, I have selected for my questionnaire those which promise to be the most controversial. Response to this year's questionnaire was very enthusiastic, and I am indebted to those who took time to cooperate with me in this mutually beneficial project. I also acknowledge with great appreciation those thousands of individuals who have shared their thoughts with me through their letters.

DOMESTIC AFFAIRS

There are of course many national issues which are of concern to us. I will first of all report on those covered in my 1964 questionnaire, and then proceed to summarize others which are equally important.

THE TAX CUT AND THE BUDGET

A balanced budget is a rare phenomenon in the American scene as the history of Federal budgeting is one of overestimation of receipts and underestimation of expenditures, with inevitable deficits.

There are particularly compelling reasons this year for a tighter budget, not the least of which is the new tax law providing reductions in individual and corporate income tax rates which was approved in February of this year, and which bears a close resemblance to my bill H.R. 4774.

A declaration attached to the tax legislation stated that "it is the sense of Congress" that increased revenues produced by economic stimulation from the tax cut should first be used to balance the Government's administrative budget and then to reduce the national debt, and that Congress and the President should take "all reasonable means to restrain Government spending."

This declaration, which I supported along with the tax bill, aptly expresses the sentiment of the majority of western Westchester-Putnamites, who indicated that they favored income tax relief only with a balanced budget. They also agreed that the tax cut, with corresponding reductions in Federal spending, would prove to be a stimulus to our economy.

Last January the tax bill was in a precarious position because of widespread opposition to President Kennedy's spending proposals, and district residents seemed to reflect reservations which existed at that time. However, with the submission of what appeared to be a lower budget for fiscal 1965 by President Johnson, the Congress and the American people gained sufficient confidence in the economy to reconsider the then-pending tax relief bill.

The effect of the new tax law and whether it can meet its goals will be unclear until fiscal 1967, according to Treasury Secretary Douglas Dillon. However, even though the administration talks economy in Government, its budget goal will be difficult to achieve if Congress approves all of its election-year spending proposals. Parallel concepts of economy and vast spending just do not go hand in hand, and it now appears that the original Johnson budget may have been a carefully contrived "gimmick" to get the tax bill through Congress.

The way to pave the road toward further income tax relief is to stand firmly behind every effort to restrain unnecessary spending. It is heartening to know that a majority of my constituents share my own firm conviction in this regard.

One of the biggest disappointments of this session was the defeat of the Republican-sponsored bill, which I supported, to end once and for all the excise taxes on cosmetics, furs, toilet preparations, luggage, and handbags. These taxes, which particularly discriminate against women, were designed to slow down sales of luxury items during the war. It seems incredible that they still remain on the books. An election-year promise has just been made by the administration, reversing **its 1964 position.**

---

[23] "Winebrener and Ross Houses" by Mrs. C. D. Winebrener. Original paper in the archives of the Historical Society of Frederick County.

[24] Land Records of Frederick County, Liber J.S. 49, folio 368.

[25] Now owned by Mrs. R. Tyson Greer, Sykesville, Md.

CIVIL RIGHTS

It was reassuring to learn that the vast majority of my constituents stood affirmatively with me on the question of guaranteeing full individual constitutional rights to every American. The Civil Rights Act of 1964 has little effect on New York State where similar statutes have been on the books for many years.

In brief the Civil Rights Act provides: equal voting rights, equal opportunity for education and employment, as well as equal access to public accommodations in hotels and restaurants catering to interstate traffic. In addition, the law extends the life of the Civil Rights Commission.

The section of the new law dealing with voting rights embraces provisions similar to those contained in my bill H.R. 5010. This is also true with respect to the Civil Rights Commission, except that my bill H.R. 5314 would have given the Commission permanent status as an agency of the U.S. Government.

To Lincoln, democracy meant "an equal chance." That is all we, Republicans and Democrats alike, have endeavored to provide in the Civil Rights Act of 1964. It is also noteworthy that both the Republican and Democrat Party platforms carry commitments to enforce the civil rights statutes.

The issue transcends party politics and should also transcend personal prejudices. The extent to which racial discrimination is abolished depends not on legislation alone, but on each and every citizen of the United States and his moral obligation to rise above personal prejudices, and afford his fellow man "an equal chance" to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

MEDICAL CARE FOR THE AGED

The greatest number of those responding to my 1964 poll favored a voluntary program of medical aid for the aged as opposed to a compulsory plan such as that proposed by the administration. This year's results compare favorably with those received 2 years ago on the same issue.

Discussions of the problem of medical care for the aged during the past 2 years only reinforces my belief that my bill, H.R. 3922, offers the best solution. As outlined in my last newsletter, H.R. 3922, provides for an income tax credit—or a purchase certificate—of up to $150 a year for a guaranteed, renewable comprehensive private health insurance policy purchased by or for persons aged 65 or over whose income is $4,000 or less if single, or $8,000 or less if married.

Thus my bill sets an income limitation on participation at a level which excludes only those who clearly would have less difficulty in paying for their own insurance. Those with higher incomes would still be able to deduct the full cost of health insurance from their income tax.

Unlike other plans which have been offered, my bill provides: First, participation on a voluntary basis; second, a choice of benefits patterned after those customarily offered by private carriers; third, surgical and physicians services as well as hospitalization and convalescent care; fourth, a major medical policy covering private duty nursing, drugs, X-rays, and so forth; fifth, minimal administrative work.

The administrative machinery under my bill would be relatively simple. Once a year when filing his income tax return a person claiming a tax credit would attach to his form a certificate issued to him annually by his insurance company certifying to his coverage. To a person having no tax liability or insufficient liability against which to take the tax credit, the Government would issue a certificate which he could use to purchase the insurance.

My bill is in line with the current trend of private health insurance policies designed exclusively for the aged, and with the growing practice of employers in purchasing health insurance for retired employees. It would strengthen the already-impressive development of private insurance in this country.

The proposal to provide medical care under the social security structure has been explored and found wanting. It is time to look for other means of accomplishing the purpose of providing our senior citizens with better medical and hospital care than they are getting today. My bill offers opportunity for constructive action which will be welcomed by the American people and I call for serious consideration of this relatively new concept of how we can meet a very real problem in a commonsense and practical way.

Over 40 Congressmen from both parties have introduced bills embracing this same general approach to this extremely important problem.

On this the last day of Congress, the House conferees justly refused to agree to the Senate passed social security approach to medicare. Insistence by the Executive and the Senate on using the social security system has destroyed all hope of easing the medical burden of our senior citizenry at this time.

Going down with the ship was the long overdue across-the-board increase in social security benefits which I had wholeheartedly supported in the House. It would seem that the Democrats, with a 2-to-1 majority in the Senate and a 3-to-2 majority in the House, failed miserably to provide the necessary leadership to pass this vital relief which rising prices has made mandatory.

COMMUTER TRANSIT

The largest number of people responding to my questionnaire favored a voluntary, rather than a compulsory, approach to the commuter transportation problem.

As many Westchester-Putnam residents already know I sponsored a bill, H.R. 7136, providing a voluntary approach by authorizing a $300 annual income tax deduction for commuter transportation to and from work. My bill would correct existing law under which few people are permitted to claim deductions for work-connected travel. Unlike the administration's Urban Mass Transportation Act, which indirectly benefits only those who use public transportation facilities, my bill provides a direct method of relief to all commuters regardless of means of transportation. At least 20 other Congressmen of both parties have supported the tax deduction approach by introducing measures similar to my own, all of which are pending before the House Ways and Means Committee.

Out of the Banking and Currency Committee and to the House floor in June of this year came the administration's urban mass transportation bill, which had already passed the Senate in 1963. The bill fell short of the expectations of a majority of House Members. It was only because there was no hope of getting an alternative proposal before Congress at this time that a barely sufficient number of Members voted for the administration's bill.

My "qualified" support of the Urban Mass Transportation Act reflects my grave concern over the increasing demand for the type of fast, efficient, and coordinated commuter service which is essential to the growth of areas such as Westchester and Putnam Counties. The urban mass transit program will offer some help to commuters in this direction.

CONSERVATION

The 88th Congress has excelled in the area of conservation legislation. Among the more significant conservation bills which I have supported and which have become law during this Congress are measures: First, establishing a National Wilderness Preservation System—Public Law 88-577; second, creating a land and water conservation fund—Public Law 88-578; and third, establishing in New York the Fire Island National Seashore—Public Law 88-587.

THE HUDSON RIVER

The most important conservation issue affecting Westchester and Putnam Counties concerns a license application pending before the Federal Power Commission—involving the construction, operation, and maintenance of a complex of proposed projects for the development, transmission, and utilization of power—extending from Cornwall to New York City via Putnam and Westchester Counties. It is known as the Cornwall pumped-storage project.

The project as initially and presently conceived calls for heavy, high-voltage, overhead transmission lines which would traverse Putnam and Westchester Counties without yielding any benefit to the residents of these areas. To the contrary, the lines: First, would consume approximately 1,000 acres of valuable land, and would discourage development of another 2,000 acres along the transmission route; second, would adversely affect individuals owning property adjacent to the transmission route; third, would destroy much of the scenic and historic significance of Westchester and Putnam Counties as well as the Hudson River area around Storm King Mountain.

In cooperation with local and county governments, civic groups, and conservation organizations, I have taken a number of steps in an effort to prevent the above-enumerated consequences of the Cornwall pumped-storage project.

March 4, 1964: Made formal request to the Federal Power Commission for opportunity to testify on the Cornwall pumped-storage project. This followed months of informal discussions with the FPC, and thorough staff research of the project.

May 4, 1964: Personally appeared before the FPC and testified in opposition to the project. Analysis of statement was sent to those who had written me up to this time.

August 29, 1964: Sent staff aid to SANB—Save America's Natural Beauty Association—in Yorktown to present statement reaffirming continued opposition to high lines, and offer to support local efforts directed against the project.

August 31, 1964: Requested by letter to Chairman, FPC, that record be reopened for further evidence—in support of motions which had been filed by local governments, civic groups, and conservation organizations.

September 1, 1964: Appealed to the Secretary of Interior to: first, direct the Interior Department to study the potentiality of Storm King Mountain as a national historical monument; second, expand southerly, to include the Storm King Mountain area, the national scenic riverways surveys of the Hudson River.

September 6, 1964: Participated in Hudson River flotilla sponsored by the Scenic Hudson Preservation Conference, and led by Commodore Chauncey Stillman's "Westerly," in a demonstration of protest against the project.

September 29, 1964: Introduced legislation, H.R. 12707, calling for the establishment of a Hudson River Conservation and Preservation Commission—to study, evaluate, and recommend to Congress ways in which to maintain the scenic and historic significance of the majestic Hudson.

September 29, 1964: Advised the Chairman of the FPC with respect to the introduction of H.R. 12707, and requested that the Commission postpone a final decision until Congress has opportunity to act on legislation.

October 2, 1964: Upon receipt of the FPC order reopening the record and fixing oral argument delivered official request to Chairman Swidler to present further testimony in oral proceedings to be held November 17.

REAPPORTIONMENT

As a result of a series of Supreme Court decisions, there has been prolonged debate in the second session of this Congress on reapportionment of State legislatures. Both House and Senate have offered solutions to the Supreme Court's decisions. In the House of Representatives, I voted and have been a spokesman for the Tuck bill which in effect would return State reapportionment responsibility back to the legislatures of the States where it has been considered throughout the history of our Government until the 1962 Baker against Carr decision which reversed prior precedents.

Recently I joined with Senator JAVITS in introducing a companion resolution which proposes a constitutional amendment permitting the people of any State, if they wish it, to choose by referendum to have one house of their legislature apportioned on a basis other than population. This resolution was prompted by the recent Supreme Court decision, Reynolds against Sims, which gave sanction to the Federal courts to arbitrarily bypass the wishes of the people in referendums. To nullify a legally constituted election by a Federal court is a most outrageous and dangerous byproduct of judicial interference in legislative matters and ignores completely that ours is a government of, by, and for the people.

I am decidedly in favor of reapportionment and I want to stress that a vote for the Tuck bill in no way signifies opposition to the principle of equal representation of the people in at least one house of the legislature such as in the Congress. Rather, the controversy is one of jurisdiction—should the Federal courts have jurisdiction over a matter which the Supreme Court ruled a legislative function until 1962? The Tuck bill says no. Justices Frankfurter and Harlan in their 1962 dissent agreed that the use of the judiciary for such political reforms reflects a mistaken view of the function of the Federal courts. As these apostles of judicial restraint so succinctly said in their joint dissent:

> In this situation, as in others of like nature, appeal for relief does not belong here. Appeal must be to an informed, civically militant electorate. In a democratic society like ours, relief must come through an aroused popular conscience that sears the conscience of the people's representatives.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

As the sole Republican Member from the State of New York on either the Senate or the House committee having primarily to do with foreign affairs, I feel an especially heavy responsibility to know and interpret facts correctly and also to appraise present events in proper perspective in order to formulate judgments for the future.

This year's questionnaire covered three important areas of foreign affairs—the mutual security or the AID program, the U.N., and Cuba.

MUTUAL SECURITY

Mutual security is the foremost aim of U.S. foreign policy in the fight against communism. The foreign aid program represents a substantial part of this policy, and with all the past haggling over the program it has at last hit home to the State Department that the American people expect a better job to be done than in the past. This year's bill emphasized congressional displeasure with the administration's shortsighted management of the AID program.

Western Westchester-Putnam residents will be pleased to know that the bill corresponds to their opinions on foreign aid as expressed in my January questionnaire. A majority favored adjustments in the program, with an overwhelming number supporting a smaller, more select program.

This bill is a tight one—pared to fundamental essentials and concentrating on the most strategic areas in the world. Although the dollar amount of AID is considerable, it represents a drastic reduction over past expenditures as follows:

Aid budget

Year	Percentage of gross national product	Percentage of Federal budget
1949	2.0	11.5
1965	.5	3.5

Properly administered, foreign aid is not a handout or giveaway as it is sometimes referred to by its critics. Three-fifths of our economic aid is in the form of dollar repayable loans and over 80 percent of the funds must be spent for goods and services produced in the United States. As a result American business benefited directly from the foreign aid program last year through nearly $900 million of export orders. The present program provides that two-thirds of our loans be made to 7 countries; two-thirds of all military aid will support 11 countries along the Sino-Soviet periphery; and four-fifths of supporting assistance will go to the four strategic areas of Korea, Vietnam, Laos, and Jordan.

To overcome gross inadequacies in the AID program I sponsored amendments to encourage: first, other advanced countries to assume their proportionate share of the aid burden; and second, American private enterprise to divert a greater share of its foreign investments to the developing nations. Both the House and Senate, which approved the amendments, and AID officials of the State Department have been responsive to these measures.

Under the 1965 program, the AID will concentrate on encouraging our allies to increase donations and improve loan terms. In the past year, Germany has already responded, and Britain and Canada have made plans to do likewise. France has increased its donation, devoting a much higher percentage of her gross national product. Other countries have indicated that they are also planning to liberalize their contributions, thereby bringing about the prospect of a more equitable distribution of responsibilites in the area of economic foreign assistance.

During 6 years in Congress, of which 4 have been as a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I have advocated the continuation of American private involvement in the aid program as an incentive to the growth of private enterprise in the emerging nations of the world.

As a result of this year's legislation, American businessmen will be able to take advantage of: first, the more liberal ceiling on the investment guarantee program; and second, the expansion of U.S. investment surveys to determine the feasibility of new ventures in developing countries. The role of American private organizations will also be augmented through greater participation opportunities in AID training programs having to do with technical projects and health services.

Included in most aid programs is the spirit of self-help and mutual cooperation where recipient governments and people share the costs. A specific example of this principle in action is the American self-help housing project which is based on a formula where the local government contributes 30 percent, the eventual owner 40 percent, and AID 30 percent of the necessary funds. Our goal to assist underdeveloped countries achieve self-sufficiency is indeed becoming a reality.

Seventeen nations have already completed the transition from reliance on grant aid to economic self-support. Fourteen additional nations are on their way to final termination of aid funds.

To critics of the program, I say this is not the time for the United States to abandon the aid program—unless, of course, they are prepared to abandon the free world to a Communist takeover.

THE UNITED NATIONS

A majority of the voters favor maintaining present United Nations policies. Surprisingly the majority were "not sure" whether or not they favored expansion of multilateral programs within the framework of the U.N., or U.S. withdrawal if Red China is admitted. This uncertainty reflects the conflicting approaches and discordant policy with which the U.S. mission has handled United Nations problems.

Many times in the Foreign Affairs Committee and on the floor of the Congress I have pressed for the United States to work toward revitalization of the original purpose of the United Nations—that of an international forum for peace—and against the idea that the U.N. should become a vehicle to surrender sovereignty and security in exchange for collective verbal guarantees. The United States should never entertain relinquishing leadership in the United Nations because of factions working against us. On the contrary, United States must provide compelling and effective leadership for enforcement of existing U.N. regulations and give essential guidance for basic improvements in its organization. Only in this way can we insure the U.N.'s continued strength for the future.

The Eisenhower record in the United Nations is one of complete support for basic U.N. policies and programs, taking the initiative in transforming the United Nations into a more effective and dynamic instrument for fulfilling the purposes of the charter. This policy merits continuation. The United States must press for a change in voting in the General Assembly in order that the makeup more equitably reflects population size as well as ability to support the organization. Recently Congress took a decisive stand in a resolution which had my wholehearted support, saying members of the U.N. should lose their voting rights unless dues and assessments are paid. Correspondingly, it is now up to the executive branch to insist upon enforcement of the International Court of Justice ruling that assessments must be paid within 2 years or voting rights will be denied.

The United Nations has changed its complexion since its inception. From 59 member nations to over 100 the responsibilities of the United Nations have grown correspondingly, with the real test being its capability of meeting the rapidly changing problems of the world. The United States, in the world leadership role can meet this challenge through a farsighted, well-articulated policy toward the world organization.

The trend in emerging nations favors the western democracies, and it is heartening to know that every new African nation that has joined the United Nations has been modeled after our form of government. To fail to continue our leadership in the U.N. would be a deliberate slap at the free world that has been struggling to free itself of Communist encroachments on their borders. Our continued dedication to the United Nations must be to revitalize its original purpose and create an instrument capable of meeting new challenges to the peace and security of the world. The U.N. can well be the framework through which world tensions and threats subside and where economic and social progress of the world can be born.

CUBA

The Cuba problem is no longer a myth to the free world. The well-armed island south of Florida poses an especially menacing threat to all the Americas. It is a fact that Cuba has the most powerful military establishment in Latin America—and its threat is as much subversive as military.

Constituents of Westchester-Putnam have registered their opinion through the questionnaire, calling for a firmer stand against the Cuban regime by increased economic and diplomatic sanctions. The majority at this time would not approve an invasion of the island, but few would maintain present policies. Americans throughout the Nation apparently agree with this opinion. Seventy-seven percent registered in a national poll that we should insist that Russian troops be removed from Cuba which is what I flatly emphasized to the Soviet Foreign Minister when I was in Moscow last summer.

Presently the United States has two alternatives short of war: One, to strengthen Latin America to resist Communist subversion. This the United States is doing through foreign aid and encouraging greater multilateral economic assistance to its Latin neighbors. And, second, to employ every available means through economic and diplomatic sanctions to reduce the ability of the Cuban Government to advance the Communist cause. In this we now have the support of the Organization of American States. Firm OAS action is to the great advantage of the Western World, for experience has shown that deterring communism has best been accomplished through unity and power.

REPRESENTATIVE GOVERNMENT

Since coming to Congress 6 years ago, I have voted on several thousand issues including what are now the most important laws of our land, many of which I have had the honor to cosponsor.

Bills reported out of committee almost always carry the name of the chairman of the committee even though they represent a composite judgment of all committee members.

I have had great opportunity, as a minority member, to participate in the deliberations of importance to the Nation. This is because the two committees on which I serve are the most nonpartisan in the Congress—the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Throughout the last 6 years it has been my distinct honor to serve the people of Westchester and Putnam Counties. Few Congressmen have experienced such compatibility or such enlightened interest and response from the electorate as I have. This has made my job a truly rare and rewarding privilege and has made possible representative government at its best.

COMMEMORATION OF SLOVAK NATIONAL UPRISING OF 1944

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, on October 3, Slovak and Czech Americans commemorate the anniversary of the heroic Slovak national uprising of 1944, paying tribute to the many victims of that uprising and stressing the lasting friendship between the people of Czechoslovakia and the United States. This date is also the 46th anniversary of the birth of free Czechoslovakia in 1918, a date an oppressed people still recall with the determination that they shall once more be free.

The cause of the Allies in 1944 was greatly aided by the valiant fight of the pro-Western, democratic Slovak people whose nation was invaded by German aggressors on August 29 of that year. For 2 months the insurgent Slovak forces, hampered by a shortage of arms and equipment, stubbornly held out against the superior might of the Nazis. The Soviet Union had promised military aid, but when the Russians realized that the uprising could not be controlled to suit their own ends, they stopped the Western Allies from sending equipment for 10,000 men into Slovakia, and the Slovak defenders were crushed by the Germans.

Recently, Khrushchev, true to the Russian policy of distorting history, claimed the Slovak national uprising as a heroic Communist act. The falsity of this claim is an insult to the memory of the Slovak patriots who gave their lives in that struggle 20 years ago as well as to those in the free world and behind the Iron Curtain who still cherish the hope and belief that the enslaved people of Europe will one day be free again.

REPORT TO THE PEOPLE OF THE EIGHTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN—XVIII

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a report to the people of the 8th Congressional District of Wisconsin on my voting and attendance record for the 2d session of the 88th Congress.

The report includes all rollcall votes. Its purpose is to collect in one place and in concise form information which is scattered through 23,000 pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The descriptions of the bills and the amendments or motions in the report are for purposes of identification only; no attempt is made to describe the legislation completely or to elaborate upon the issues involved. This word of caution is advisable in view of the fact that the descriptions used are, for the most part, taken from the official titles of the bills which, unfortunately, do not always reflect the nature or true purpose of the legislation. Upon request, I will be pleased to furnish more complete information concerning any particular bill, as well as a summary of the issues involved and the reasons for my vote.

The furnishing of this report continues a service I began in the 1st session of the 80th Congress. This is the 18th report of my voting and attendance record. These 18 reports show how I voted on 2,277 questions in the House of Representatives. Based on quorum calls and the record votes, they also show an attendance record of 93 percent.

In addition to the votes shown in this report, there were 159 quorum calls in the House which are omitted to conserve space. This accounts for the nonconsecutive numbering of the rollcalls. I answered "present" to 145 quorum calls, and I was absent for 14 quorum calls.

88th Cong., 2d sess.

Rollcall No.	Date 1964	Measure, question, and result	Vote
		S. 1153, authorizing $75,000,000 a year in fiscal 1965-67 for Federal aid for airport construction:	
5	Jan. 14	On motion to recommit with instructions to reduce authorizations by $15,000,000 a year. (Rejected 110 to 201.)	Yea.
6	Jan. 14	On passage. (Passed 298 to 11.)	Yea.
		H.R. 4879, expanding the rural Library Services Act to include urban libraries and construction aid:	
11	Jan. 21	On amendment confining aid to rural and smalltown areas, increasing such aid, and deleting construction program. (Rejected 179 to 183.)	Yea.
12	Jan. 21	On motion to recommit with instructions to delete construction program. (Rejected 174 to 188.)	Yea.
13	Jan. 21	On passage. (Passed 254 to 107.)	Nay.
		H. Res. 582, providing for consideration of H.R. 6041, amending Davis-Bacon Act to require Federal contractors to conform to local area fringe benefits:	
17	Jan. 28	On motion to end debate and prevent amendment providing for judicial review of Labor Secretary's prevailing wage determinations. (Agreed to 297 to 105.)	Nay.
		H.R. 6041, amending Davis-Bacon Act to require Federal contractors to conform to local area fringe benefits:	
19	Jan. 28	On passage. (Passed 357 to 50.)	Yea.
30	Feb. 8	On motion to adjourn until Feb. 10, postponing further consideration of civil rights bill. (Adopted 220 to 175.)	Nay.
		H.R. 7152, 1964 civil rights bill:	
32	Feb. 10	On passage. (Passed 290 to 130.)	Yea.
		H.R. 7381, revising laws regulating employment of retired military personnel and employment of civilians in more than 1 Federal position:	
35	Feb. 18	On motion to recommit. (Rejected 83 to 262.)	Nay.
		H.R. 9637, authorizing funds for Department of Defense procurement:	
39	Feb. 20	On passage. (Passed 336 to 0.)	Yea.
		H.R. 8363, 1964 tax reduction bill:	
43	Feb. 25	On conference report. (Adopted 326 to 83.)	Yea.
		H.R. 9022, authorizing an additional U.S. contribution of $312,000,000 to International Development Association for loans to underdeveloped nations:	
48	Feb. 26	On motion to recommit. (Adopted 208 to 188.)	Not voting.[1]
		H.R. 8316, prohibiting the Federal Communications Commission from making certain rules governing length or frequency of broadcast commercials:	
51	Feb. 27	On passage. (Passed 317 to 43.)	Yea.
		H.R. 9666, authorizing $115,000,000 for Peace Corps in fiscal 1965:	
56	Mar. 4	On motion to recommit with instructions to reduce authorization to $95,963,971, the amount appropriated in fiscal 1964. (Rejected 90 to 309.)	Yea.
		H.R. 8000, imposing tax on purchases by Americans of foreign securities:	
59	Mar. 5	On passage. (Passed 238 to 142.)	Nay.
		H.R. 8070, establishing a commission to conduct a 3-year study of public land laws and regulations:	
63	Mar. 10	On passage. (Passed 339 to 29.)	Yea.
		H. Res. 650, providing for consideration of H.R. 8986, increasing pay of Federal employees and Members of Congress:	
65	Mar. 11	On resolution. (Adopted 251 to 147.)	Nay.
		H.R. 8986, increasing pay of Federal employees and Members of Congress:	
67	Mar. 12	On passage. (Rejected 184 to 222.)	Nay.
		H. Res. 556, providing for consideration of H.R. 5838, providing for the transfer of funds to the National Bureau of Standards from other agencies:	
76	Mar. 19	On resolution. (Adopted 264 to 99.)	Nay.
		H.R. 5838, allowing the transfer of funds to the National Bureau of Standards from other agencies:	
80	Mar. 23	On motion to recommit with instructions to require that transfers of $250,000 to the Bureau be submitted to the Appropriations Committees. (Rejected 151 to 173.)	Yea.
81	Mar. 23	On passage. (Passed 164 to 162.)	Nay.
		H.R. 10532, making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, the Executive Office of the President and 3 independent agencies in fiscal 1965:	
85	Mar. 24	On amendment to increase Coast Guard funds by $10,000,000. (Rejected 160 to 193.)	Nay.
86	Mar. 24	On passage. (Passed 326 to 20.)	Yea.
		H. Res. 660, providing for consideration of H.R. 10456, fiscal 1965 authorization for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration:	
88	Mar. 25	On resolution. (Adopted 357 to 0.)	Not voting.[1]
		H.R. 10456, authorizing $5,200,000,000 for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for fiscal 1965:	
89	Mar. 25	On passage. (Passed 283 to 73.)	Not voting.[2]
		S. 1828, authorizing the payment of $13,553 toward the cost of the 1963 celebration of the 150th anniversary of the Battle of Lake Erie:	
91	Apr. 6	On suspending rules and passage. (Passed 233 to 39.)	Not voting.[3]
		H.R. 10222, authorizing $400,000,000 for the Secretary of Agriculture to set up and finance food stamp programs:	
97	Apr. 8	On motion to adjourn for the day. (Rejected 173 to 239.)	Yea.
98	Apr. 8	On motion to recommit with instructions to require participating States to share half the costs of local food stamp programs. (Rejected 195 to 223.)	Yea.
99	Apr. 8	On passage. (Passed 229 to 189.)	Nay.
		H. Res. 665, agreeing to Senate amendments to H.R. 6196, adding wheat program to cotton subsidy:	
100	Apr. 8	On resolution. (Adopted 211 to 203.)	Nay.
102	Apr. 9	On motion to dispense with further proceedings under the call on rollcall No. 101. (Adopted 224 to 132.)	Nay.
104	Apr. 9	On motion to dispense with further proceedings under the call on rollcall No. 103. (Adopted 234 to 122.)	Nay.
		H.R. 10723, making appropriations for the legislative branch for fiscal 1965:	
109	Apr. 10	On motion to recommit with instructions to limit expenditures to activities that are a matter of public record. (Adopted 188 to 131.)	Yea.
		H.R. 10809, making appropriations for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies for fiscal 1965:	
111	Apr. 14	On passage. (Passed 347 to 21.)	Yea.
		S. 2394, effectuating Chamizal Convention which settled boundary dispute between United States and Mexico:	
114	Apr. 15	On passage. (Passed 348 to 5.)	Yea.
		H.R. 10939, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for fiscal 1965:	
118	Apr. 22	On passage. (Passed 365 to 0.)	Yea.
		H.R. 11134, making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the judiciary, and related agencies for fiscal 1965:	
121	May 6	On passage. (Passed 314 to 40.)	Yea.
		H.R. 10945, authorizing appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission for fiscal 1965:	
123	May 7	On passage. (Passed 341 to 3.)	Yea.

See footnotes at end of table.

88th Cong., 2d sess.—Continued

Roll-call No.	Date 1964	Measure, question, and result	Vote
		S. 2214, authorizing an additional U.S. contribution of $312,000,000 to the International Development Association, for loans to underdeveloped nations:	
126	May 13	On motion to recommit. (Rehearings had already been held on similar bill, H.R. 9022.) (Rejected 132 to 247.)	Nay.
		H.J. Res. 1020, authorizing a congressional gold medal for Henry J. Kaiser:	
127	May 18	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Rejected 150 to 143, a ⅔ majority being required.)	Nay.
		H.R. 11202, making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for fiscal 1965:	
130	May 20	On amendment to add $1,600,000 to build peanut research facility at Dawson, Ga. (Rejected 181 to 198.)	Nay.
131	May 20	On motion to recommit with instructions to prohibit subsidies on agricultural products shipped to Communist nations. (Rejected 186 to 187.)	Yea.
132	May 20	On passage. (Passed 311 to 64.)	Yea.
		H.R. 11369, making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for fiscal 1965:	
136	May 26	On passage. (Passed 340 to 5.)	Yea.
		H. Res. 724, providing for consideration of H.R. 5130, doubling the Federal insurance on a depositor's account in banks and savings and loan associations from $10,000 to $20,000:	
138	May 27	On resolution. (Adopted 218 to 115.)	Nay.
		H.R. 5130, doubling the Federal insurance on depositor's account in banks and savings and loan associations from $10,000 to $20,000:	
139	May 27	On motion to recommit. (Adopted 197 to 142.)	Yea.
		H.R. 10503, authorizing $1,175,000,000 for highway construction in each of fiscal years 1966 and 1967:	
141	June 3	On passage. (Passed 296 to 0.)	Not voting.[1]
143	June 3	On motion to adjourn for the day in order to cut off discussion of antipoverty bill, H.R. 11377. (Rejected 10 to 290.)	Nay.
145	June 3	On motion to adjourn for the day in order to cut off discussion of antiproverty bill (H.R. 11377). (Rejected 16 to 272.)	Nay.
		H.R. 11380, authorizing $2,000,000,000 for foreign aid in fiscal 1965:	
152	June 10	On motion to recommit with instructions to reduce authorization for development loans by $750,000,000 and contingency fund by $50,000,000. (Rejected 193 to 211.)	Yea.
153	June 10	On passage. (Passed 230 to 175.)	Yea.
		H.R. 11049, providing a $533,200,800 pay raise for Federal employees and Members of Congress:	
155	June 11	On passage. (Passed 243 to 157.)	
		H.R. 11579, making appropriations for public works for fiscal 1965:	Nay.
157	June 16	On passage. (Passed 361 to 11.)	
		H.R. 11376, extending certain excise tax rates for 1 year:	Yea.
160	June 17	On Byrnes motion to recommit with instructions to eliminate, over 2 years, retailer's excise taxes on furs, jewelry, toilet preparations, and luggage and handbags. (Rejected 185 to 207.)	Yea.
		H.R. 11375, increasing temporary national debt limit to $324,000,000,000 through June 30, 1965:	
162	June 18	On passage. (Passed 203 to 182.)	Nay.
		H.R. 3881, authorizing $375,000,000 for a program to subsidize urban mass transportation systems:	
168	June 25	On amendment preventing any action to eliminate featherbedding. (Adopted 234 to 171.)	Nay.
169	June 25	On motion to recommit with instructions to defer action pending conclusion and evaluation of engineering studies and plans. (Rejected 190 to 214.)	Yea.
170	June 25	On passage. (Passed 212 to 189.)	Nay.
		H. Res. 793, waiving all points of order against H.R. 11812, making appropriations of $3,300,000,000 for foreign aid in fiscal 1965:	
173	June 30	On adoption. (Adopted 222 to 162.)	Nay.
		H.R. 11812, making appropriations of $3,300,000,000 for foreign aid in fiscal 1965:	
176	July 1	On motion to recommit with instructions to reduce economic aid funds by $247,800.000,000. (Rejected 198 to 208.)	Yea.
177	July 1	On passage. (Passed 231 to 174.)	Nay.
		H. Res. 789, providing for House approval of Senate amendments to H.R. 7152, the civil rights bill:	
179	July 2	On adoption. (Adopted 289 to 126.)	Yea.
		H. Res. 795, authorizing special House committee to investigate and report on campaign spending of House of Representatives candidates:	
181	July 2	On adoption. (Adopted 264 to 92.)	Yea.
		S. 2, authorizing Federal grants for water resources research centers and programs:	
182	July 2	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted 347 to 0.)	Yea.
		H.R. 319, protecting postal patrons from morally offensive mail matter:	
184	July 21	On passage. (Passed 326 to 19.)	Yea.
		H.R. 11611, establishing a National Commission on Automation:	
185	July 21	On passage. (Passed 260 to 76.)	Yea.
		H. Res. 738, providing for consideration of H.R. 3846, establishing a land and water conservation fund:	
187	July 22	On adoption. (Adopted 338 to 8.)	Yea.
		H.R. 3873, reinstating self-employed commercial fishermen to coverage of the Public Health Service Act:	
190	July 28	On passage. (Passed 202 to 170.)	Yea.
		H. Res. 802, providing for consideration of H.R. 11865, Social Security Amendments of 1964:	
192	July 29	On resolution. (Adopted 350 to 29.)	Yea.
		H.R. 11865, Social Security Amendments of 1964:	
193	July 29	On passage. (Passed 388 to 8.)	Yea.
		H. Res. 803, providing for disagreeing to Senate amendments to H.R. 11049, increasing pay of Federal employees and sending bill to conference:	
195	July 30	On resolution. (Adopted 246 to 131.)	Yea.
		H.R. 9070, establishing a National Wilderness Preservation System:	
197	July 30	On passage. (Passed 374 to 1.)	Yea.
		H.R. 1096, authorizing Federal cooperation with Wisconsin in designating and administering Ice Age National Scientific Reserve:	
198	Aug. 3	On motion to suspend rules and pass bill. (Rejected 164 to 154, a two-thirds majority being required.)	Yea.
		H.R. 3672, authorizing $47,000,000 for construction of Savery-Pot Hook, Bostwick Park, and Fruitland Mesa irrigation projects under Colorado River Storage Project Act:	
199	Aug. 3	On suspending rules and passage. (Passed 250 to 67.)	Nay.
		H.R. 10939, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for fiscal 1965:	
200	Aug. 4	On conference report. (Adopted 359 to 0.)	Yea.
201	Aug. 4	On motion to concur in Senate amendment specifying at least 35 percent of repair work be performed in private shipyards. (Adopted 186 to 178.)	Yea.
		H.J. Res. 1145, expressing the support of Congress of necessary measures to prevent further aggression in southeast Asia:	
210	Aug. 7	On suspending rules and passage. (Passed 416 to 0.)	Yea.
		H.R. 11377, antipoverty bill:	
212	Aug. 7	On motion to strike enacting clause (reject bill). (Rejected 197 to 225.)	Yea.
213	Aug. 7	On amendment substituting text of Senate provisions for bill reported by House committee. (Adopted 228 to 190.)	Nay.
		H.R. 11377, antipoverty bill:	
215	Aug. 8	On motion to recommit with instructions to substitute text H.R. 11050. (Rejected 117 to 295.)	Nay.
216	Aug. 8	On passage. (Passed 226 to 185.)	Nay.
		H.R. 1927, revising pension program for veterans of World Wars I and II and the Korean War:	
217	Aug. 11	On passage. (Passed 388 to 0.)	Yea.
		H.R. 5990, requiring certain findings before issuance of charitable solicitation permits in District of Columbia:	
218	Aug. 11	On passage. (Passed 301 to 81.)	Yea.
		H. Res. 836, providing for consideration of S. 1451, authorizing U.S. Court of Claims to judge claims by former stockholders of General Dyestuff Corp.:	
219	Aug. 12	On resolution. (Adopted 374 to 3.)	Yea.
		S. 1627, providing for payment of $683,000 for fiscal 1964 operating expenses of International Commission for Supervision and Control in Laos:	
220	Aug. 12	On passage. (Passed 268 to 89.)	Nay.
		H.R. 11296, making appropriations for sundry independent offices for fiscal 1965:	
222	Aug. 13	On motion to recommit conference report with instructions to reduce National Aeronautics and Space Administration funds by $200,000,000. (Rejected 114 to 270.)	Not voting.[1]
		H.R. 12175, Housing Act of 1964, authorizing funds for housing and urban renewal programs through Sept. 30, 1965:	
224	Aug. 13	On motion to recommit with instructions to extend indefinitely FHA insurance authority. (Rejected 184 to 194.)	Yea.
225	Aug. 13	On passage. (Passed 308 to 68.)	Yea.
		S. 1006, subsidizing 50 percent of the cost of construction of certain fishing vessels:	
228	Aug. 14	On passage. (Passed 198 to 124.)	Nay.
		H. Res. 663, providing additional $10,000 for expenses of the Committee on Education and Labor:	
229	Aug. 14	On resolution. (Rejected 115 to 156.)	Nay.

See footnotes at end of table.

88th Cong., 2d sess.—Continued

Roll-call No.	Date 1964	Measure, question, and result	Vote
231	Aug. 17	H. Con. Res. 343, expressing the sense of Congress that the United States continue efforts to secure payments of assessments in arrears by United Nations members: On resolution. (Adopted 351 to 0.)	Yea.
232	Aug. 17	H.R. 6242, providing for registration of contractors of migrant agricultural workers: On suspending rules and passage. (Passed 343 to 7.)	Yea.
233	Aug. 17	H.R. 9000, extending Federal controls over small coal mines: On suspending rules and passage. (Rejected 202 to 151, a two-thirds vote being required.)	Nay.
236	Aug. 18	H.R. 1839, providing for quotas on imports of beef, veal, and mutton: On conference report. (Adopted 232 to 149.)	Yea.
237	Aug. 18	H.R. 8864, implementing enforcement of International Coffee Agreement of 1962: On conference report. (Rejected 183 to 194.)	Yea.
238	Aug. 18	H.R. 8000, imposing tax on purchases of certain foreign securities: On conference report. (Adopted 221 to 147.)	Nay.
239	Aug. 18	S. 1007, guaranteeing electric consumers in Pacific Northwest first call on electric energy generated at Federal hydroelectric plants in that region: On conference report. (Adopted 230 to 134.)	Yea.
240	Aug. 19	S. 3049, Housing Act of 1964, authorizing funds for housing and urban renewal programs through Sept. 30, 1965: On conference report. (Adopted 309 to 70.)	Not voting.[1]
241	Aug. 19	H. Res. 845, providing for consideration of H.R. 11926, limiting jurisdiction of Federal courts in reapportionment cases: On resolution. (Adopted 242 to 148.)	Not voting.[1]
242	Aug. 19	H.R. 11926, limiting jurisdiction of Federal courts in reapportionment cases: On passage. (Passed 218 to 175.)	Yea.
245	Aug. 20	H.R. 9586, providing for a National Council on the Arts: On passage. (Passed 213 to 135.)	Yea.
247	Sept. 1	S. 2701, providing for a study of the feasibility and possible site of a sea level isthmus canal between the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans: On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 320 to 23.)	Yea.
248	Sept. 1	H.R. 4487, authorizing expanded research into the effects of insecticides and pesticides on fish and wildlife: On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 236 to 110.)	Yea.
252	Sept. 3	H.R. 12298, extending Public Law 480, authorizing sales and donations of surplus agricultural commodities to foreign nations: On motion to recommit with instructions to forbid sales to Communist countries. (Adopted 182 to 175.)	Yea.
253	Sept. 3	On passage. (Passed 349 to 6.)	Yea.
256	Sept. 3	S. 2220, authorizing forgiveness to certain doctors of up to 50 percent of student loans made under Health Professions Educational Assistance Act: On passage. (Rejected 140 to 160.)	Nay.
260	Sept. 22	H.R. 12633, making supplemental appropriations for fiscal 1965: On passage. (Passed 208 to 103.)	Nay.
262	Sept. 23	H.R. 1096, authorizing Federal cooperation with Wisconsin in designating and administering Ice Age National Scientific Reserve: On passage. (Passed 180 to 132.)	Not voting.[1]
265	Oct. 1	H. Res. 892, providing for consideration of H.J. Res. 1183, making continuing appropriations for certain departments of Government for fiscal 1965: On passage. (Rejected 158 to 193.)	Nay.
268	Oct. 1	S. 3060, extending and amending National Defense Education Act of 1958 and Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Cong.: On motion to recommit conference report with instructions to make bill more nearly conform to bill as passed by the House. (Rejected 107 to 236.)	Yea.
269	Oct. 1	On passage. (Passed 320 to 20.)	Yea.
272	Oct. 3	H.R. 12633 Supplemental Appropriations for 1965: On motion to agree to Senate amendment providing funds for impacted area school payments to the District of Columbia. (Adopted 211 to 78.)	Nay.

[1] Absent. If present, would have voted "yea."

[2] Absent. If present, would have voted "nay."

CONTINUING REPORT OF TASK FORCE ON LATIN AMERICA

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, the Latin American Task Force of the House Republican Policy Committee, in its continuing study of Latin America and Communist Cuba, has offered many recommendations to this administration. None have been adopted. The task force has rightly criticized the Democratic administration for the following failures:

First. Nonleadership of the OAS, even in critical times and even when challenged to provide leadership by another member state, as in the case of the presently pending charge of aggression by Venezuela which we are apparently willing to sweep under the rug.

Second. Failure of the Bay of Pigs invasion because of lack of courage to follow through and public pronouncements of nonsupport, compounded by the abortive tractors for prisoners blackmail proposal and finally the exchange of $56 million in medicines for prisoners—giving Castro an exchangeable commodity with the Reds.

Third. Failure to follow up with onsite inspections and stiff sanctions through the OAS during and following the quarantine.

Fourth. Weak-kneed accession to the demands of Castro—made during the quarantine—for immunity against refugee raids and cancellation of low-level flights.

Fifth. Cutting the moral foundation from under the trade embargo against Cuba by trading wheat on credit to Russia and by refusing to fully carry out congressional mandates to block use of U.S. ports to companies trading with Cuba or to cut off aid to countries permitting its ships to trade with Cuba.

Sixth. Loss of initiative in cutting off flow of subversive trainees from Latin countries and the United States, stopping arms drops in the Caribbean and preventing the flow of millions of pieces of Communist propaganda when the opportunity was ours in 1963 OAS meeting.

Seventh. Withdrawal of support and encouragement of splits between refugee groups resulting in effective exile efforts to organize Castro opposition.

Eighth. Concession to Castro granted by permitting Cuban planes and Canadian-Cuban flights to pass over U.S. territory.

Ninth. Effort to buy friends in Latin America through use of Alliance for Progress funds fails, announced objectives of Alliance not accomplished, and inability to make program effective in combating communism and ridding the Hemisphere of underdevelopment prevails.

Tenth. Passive acceptance of the Khrushchev doctrine of coexistence with communism for the Monroe Doctrine.

Eleventh. Clumsy floundering on Panama resulting in weakened position by agreeing to discuss treaty revisions, by having no Ambassador in Panama or the OAS during crisis and by refusing to assert full treaty rights.

Twelfth. Vacillating policy on military coups, condemning some, condoning others, and failing to distinguish between anti-Communist military takeovers possibly necessitated by Communist threats to the security of the country involved as compared to grabs for power.

As chairman of the task force on Latin America, I am herewith making the following report:

THE COMMUNIST THREAT: CONTAINMENT AND COUNTER-OFFENSIVE

THE MILITARY THREAT

The discovery of nuclear missiles in Cuba during October of 1962 laid to rest any arguments against Cuba presenting an offensive military threat to the United States.

On October 14, a Strategic Air Command U-2 reconnaissance aircraft overflew the Cuban province of Pinar del Rio and brought back photographic evidence of the San Cristobal medium-range ballistic missile complex. Later it was determined that there were at least 42 medium-range and intermediate-range ballistic missiles in Cuba. These weapons, both capable of delivering nuclear warheads, have respective ranges of 1,100 miles and 2,200 miles. Other offensive weapons included 42 IL–28 jet light bombers.

Ostensibly, these offensive weapons were removed after the crisis in October. There have been repeated reports, however, of missile sightings by exiles and sources within Cuba. Earlier this year a series of explosions shook La Guantana (in March) and missiles were reported to be involved in the mishap. These reports deserve serious consideration. Such reports were received before the crisis of 1962, but, in the words of the Stennis Investigating Subcommittee, "the intelligence analysts were strongly influenced by their judgment as to Soviet policy and indications that strategic missiles were being installed were not given proper weight by the intelligence community. A contributing factor to this was the tendency on the part of intelligence people to discredit and downgrade the reports of Cuban refugees and exiles."

John A. McCone, Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, has testified that all attempts to verify these reports of hidden weapons have produced negative findings; however, he added, "Absolute assurance on these matters could only come from continuing, penetrating onsite inspection."

Aside from the ballistic missiles and the jet bombers, the Soviets introduced 24 SA–2 (SAM—surface-to-air missiles), Mig–15, 17, 19 and the supersonic Mig–21 fighters, Cruise antishipping missiles, KOMAR class missiles and boats. These weapons especially the SA–2 missiles, were defensive, but they were used to defend offensive weapons—MRBM's and IRBM's. It must be stressed that these defensive weapons are still in place and could give very effective protection to new offensive weapons should they be reintroduced. This fact along with reports of missiles stored in caves and at other locations is cause for grave concern to the task force. Furthermore, this defensive net could be used to shield new types of offensive weapons systems such as bases for missile-firing submarines.

SOVIET TROOPS IN THE AMERICAS

At the height of the crisis of 1962 is was estimated that at least 17,000 soviets were present in Cuba. Some estimates went as high as 40,000. The real danger with the presence of the Soviet troops in Cuba is the precedent it sets in the Western Hemisphere.

Historically, whenever non-American troops have been introduced into the hemisphere reaction had been hostile. In Latin America the Spanish, the English, and the French have been repulsed in their efforts to recolonize the New World. The traditional statement of "America for the Americans" has been the Monroe Doctrine. Americans, North and South, have called upon this principle for defense.

The Soviet introduction of troops and the introduction of Soviet intercontinental ballistic missiles was a gross act of aggression. The ostensible withdrawal of some of these weapons has served to detract from the magnitude and seriousness of this move. It took place in a supposed climate of easing tensions and relative diplomatic openness between Russia and the United States. But this atmosphere was violated and this violation must serve as a warning that we are compelled to be eternally vigilant. In a sense, trust and good will were abused and even used as a means of international deceit.

The presence of Soviet troops and weapons in Cuba must be challenged continuously and on every front until they are withdrawn. As conditions stand at present Soviet troops could be moved into any other Latin American country—if we allow the precedent to stand.

For example, British Guiana may get independence later this year. Premier Cheddi Jagan, strongly pro-Castro, could have a difficult time ruling in the face of strong opposition parties in his country. Violence has erupted many times in the past 2 years and has been controlled only with the aid of British troops. Jagan could easily follow Castro's lead and invite Soviet "technicians" in to maintain order and keep him in power. British Guiana's ports lie on the Caribbean within easy reach of Cuba which is only 1,500 air miles away.

The task force urges continuous overflights of Cuba to insure that the United States is not surprised again. Promised onsite inspection should be pursued. Refugee and exile reports should be given more credulity. In the Southern United States adequate antimissile defenses must be established in light of Mr. McCone's advice that missiles could still be hidden in Cuba.

U.S. naval forces should intensify patrols of the international waters off Cuba to determine the numbers and types of ships traveling to Cuba. It must be recalled that ships traveled thousands of miles through the international waterways approaching Cuba with missiles and aircraft parts on their decks—these weapons went undetected by us.

THE SUBVERSIVE THREAT

While Cuba used as a base for weapons of nuclear warfare can pose a direct and immediate military danger to the continental United States, the subversive threat of Cuban communism is perhaps a greater evil. In the words of Representative ARMISTEAD I. SELDEN, JR., chairman of the House Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs, "It is perhaps possible technically to classify ballistic missiles as 'offensive' or 'defensive' in scope. There is, however, certainly no such thing as 'defensive' subversion. Cuba is a launching pad, and trained, armed Communist agents are the ultimate 'offensive' weapon upon which Mr. Khrushchev relies in his plans to destroy the inter-American system."

THE TOOLS OF SUBVERSION

The Stennis subcommittee investigating the Cuban military buildup stated, "The evidence is overwhelming that Castro is supporting, spurring, aiding and abetting Communist revolutions and subversion throughout the Western Hemisphere and that such activities present a grave and ominous threat to the peace and security of the Americas."

The OAS Special Committee To Study Subversion found that to spread the revolutionary movement more than 100 Sino-Soviet periodicals circulate through the Americas. In 1961 alone Cuba imported 250,000 copies of works of Mao Tse-tung in Spanish. "Guerra de Guerrillas" (guerrilla warfare) by Ernesto Guevara and "Ciento Cincuento Preguntas a un Guerrillero" (150 questions to a guerrilla fighter) by Gen. Alberto Bayo circulate widely in the Americas. Castro's news service "Prensa Latina" also aids in spreading revolution.

Perhaps the most effective means used by Castro in his subversion is the radio. The use of long wave (broadcast band) makes available a large audience. In Latin America, with its high rate of illiteracy this is especially relevant. Recent introduction of low-cost transistor radios has enlarged the audience tremendously. In the last few years these transistors have become the most popular luxury item among the lower classes in Latin America. They are being purchased by the thousands, especially from Japanese sources, and one may see them in use in market stalls, in the streets, and in the most modest of homes.

Short wave sets are also available in low-cost transistors. In 1961 Cuba began the international broadcast service "Radio Havana, Cuba." Broadcasts now total more than 266 hours per week. These programs are beamed by powerful 220-kilowatt transmitters.

The subject of Cuban international broadcasts does not merely attempt to describe a rosy picture of life under the revolution, but deals in the lowest type of propaganda directed at the United States. The technique of the "big lie" is employed constantly and there is a use of Marxist terminology and interpretation to a point that seems ridiculous to the educated listener. The level of the propaganda is so low that one is almost inclined to discount its effect, but we must remember that most of Castro's listeners are people with the lowest levels of education and per capita incomes in the world. What may seem incredible to us may be totally acceptable to the uninformed, backwoods peasant. This is perhaps one of the major faults with the material put out by the USIA in Latin America. It is of comparatively high standard. Some of the populace, the small educated segment, may appreciate the quality of our propaganda. However, it may very well be over the heads of the great mass of people.

Aside from the above-mentioned means of subversion, Cuba has opened 60 cultural centers in American republics.

In June of 1961 Castro announced a fellowship program which included 1,000 grants to students from various Latin American republics. This points up the primary importance the regime has attached to indoctrination of American youth.

The special OAS committee on subversion took note of two special tactics used by the Castro regime in its efforts at subversion. "One is bringing hundreds of persons from all the countries of the hemisphere in order to indoctrinate them and train them in the techniques of subversion. The second is the well-known plan of sabotage, terrorism and guerrilla action that has been unleashed in certain countries, particularly in Venezuela."

Immediately after the October missile crisis spokesmen for the Cuban regime began making a series of speeches openly advocating armed insurrection in Latin America as a means of introducing social and economic changes based on the Communist system.

CASTRO'S CALL FOR COMMUNIST REVOLUTION IN THE AMERICAS

In December of 1961, Castro called upon Latins to form a revolutionary cadre. "The masses are the ones who make history, but in order for them to be able to make history it is necessary to lead them into combat. This is the duty of revolutionary leaders and organizations—to get the masses marching and launch them into the fight." As with Lenin, Castro indulges in this contradiction in Communist doctrine. Revolution is seen as inevitable and certain to take place out of historical necessity—then they say that the masses must be instructed, incited and led into the fight; this destroys the theory that history and time are the originators of the explosion.

Again, in January of 1963, Castro called for a revolutionary leadership. "We must think about how to change that situation (i.e., social and economic conditions in Latin America). There are persons who are experts on figures, but what are needed are persons who are experts on changing the situation, experts on leading the people in revolutions."

Ernesto Guevara, Cuban Minister of Industries, advocated violent revolution for Latin America in his interview with the London Daily Worker. "The Cuban Revolution has shown that in condition of imperialist domination such as exists in Latin America, there is no solution but armed struggle. There is no other solution for these countries except revolution." With Guevara's use of Marxist terminology it is clear he means Communist revolutions tied to the Socialist bloc.

SOVIET INTERVENTION

The placement of missiles was dramatic proof of Soviet intentions for Cuba and any other American state they might come to influence—to use them as a base from which to strike at the United States, either with armed force or subversion.

The Stennis committee put it this way: "The Soviets are in Cuba primarily for the purpose of increasing and spreading communism influence and power in Latin America and we can be sure that they will exploit their foothold to the greatest extent possible."

LATIN AMERICA'S IMPORTANCE TO THE FREE WORLD

The importance of preventing the conversion of Latin America to communism cannot be overstated.

Forty-five percent of all Latin American exports go to the United States. (1958, $3,596 million) imports from the United States are even higher. The United States counts on Latin American support to a great extent in the U.N. The military implications of a Communist Latin America were made clear by nuclear missiles in Cuba. The moral support that Latin America lends to the free world in the struggle with communism is beyond calculation.

Cuba is a small island 7 million inhabitants. The loss of Cuba as a supplier and as a consumer for American products was no great blow to our economy. But could we remain as uneffected if the number of Communist Latin countries increased? What would be the effect on our economy of a substantial loss of consumers and suppliers? And what of the great quantity of U.S. property that would surely be confiscated? (current investment $10 billion).

These economic blows, added to the military and political impact of a Communist Latin America would certainly be telling to U.S. security and status as a world power.

For these reasons the United States must work with a sense of urgency to contain the threat of communism, as represented in Cuba and on the other hand encourage the kind of social, political and economic growth and development that will make a Communist takeover unlikely.

THE USE OF FORCE TO COUNTER SUBVERSION

In 1948, 1951, 1954, and in 1962 OAS meetings took up the challenge of the Communist threat. But until the recent meeting, in July of 1964, the action they were willing to take was mostly verbal. This time it was different. The meeting set two historic precedents: First, it defined subversion as an aggressive threat under article 6 of the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance ("Rio Treaty"). The resolution warned that "if it (Cuba) should persist in carrying out acts that possess characteristics of aggression and intervention against one or more member states of the organization, the member states shall preserve their essential rights as sovereign states by the use of self-defense in either individual or collective form, which could go so far as armed force, until such time as the Organ of Consultation takes measures to guarantee the peace and security of the hemisphere."

The second matter of importance to arise from the meeting was the fact that the majority of nations were willing to vote for a strong resolution over the protests of a minority. In the past the states have sought to avoid measures that were highly undesirable to certain members. The rationale was that to pass resolutions disagreeable to some of the members would be to weaken the structure of the Inter-American Organization. Mexico, Chile, Boliva, and Uruguay opposed the resolution. It was passed and all nations except Mexico have complied with the stipulation that diplomatic relations with Cuba be broken.

The task force points out that this resolution provides strong legal grounds to future collective resistance to Castro subversion. The specific charge brought against Cuba in this meeting was a shipment of arms sent by Castro and intended for rebels fighting the constituted Government of Venezuela. The charge was stated in broad terms, however, to note that the arms shipment was only a part of Cuba's pattern of "intervention and aggression * * * affecting the territorial integrity and the sovereignty of Venezuela, as well as the operation of its democratic institutions." It was upon this comprehensive charge that the Foreign Ministers acted, so paragraph 5 of the resolution can be construed to mean that armed force can be taken up to repel attacks on territorial sovereignty, national integrity or democratic institutions. By the strictest interpretation of this resolution a single nation, acting in its self-defense, could take individual action "which could go so far as armed force" to terminate aggressive action by Castro. This could mean, for example, an armed attack by Venezuela upon Cuba if subversion and violation of her democratic institutions should continue.

WILL THE UNITED STATES ASSUME LEADERSHIP?

The United States must take measures to insure Castro that this resolution will be implemented. Preparation for collective action by the members of the OAS should begin. Measures for collecting evidence of Cuban-directed subversion and violation of national sovereignty should be established within the Organization of American States. Full publicity should be given to future violations of sovereignty by Castro. The preparation for countermeasures, "which could even go so far as armed force," should grow continuously and in proportion to the subversive threat. These countermeasures can serve possibly as a deterrent to stop the flow of arms, trained terrorists, printed propaganda, venomous radio attacks and other tactics of subversion. But to deter properly there must be a real credibility that force will be used. The legal foundations for collective action exists. It is up to the United States to provide the leadership in its use.

THE RESPONSIBILITY OF INDIVIDUAL STATES

As well as preparation for collective offensive action the individual states must take defensive steps to stop the flow of Communist subversion.

The special OAS committee in its conclusion on combating subversion stated, "The utilization of Cuba as a base for promoting subversive activities imposes on the countries of the hemisphere the task of developing adequate methods to combat subversion. Because of their nature, such techniques of subversion must be opposed principally by individual action on the part of each government. To this end it would be in order for the American governments to examine their security laws and the organization and means at their disposal in order to determine whether they are adequate, and to adopt the measures that may be necessary in each case. Individual action on the part of each government is the first line of defense, but cooperation between the governments is also essential in order that the measures taken by the countries individually may be fully effective."

ANTI-COMMUNIST ACTION IN FREE SOCIETIES

The committee also noted the difficulties American states face in implementing measures to counteract Communist subversion. Measures taken to limit Communist activity, such as action taken to prevent agents from freely entering and leaving the country, propaganda entering by mail, subversive student activities, illegal marches and demonstrations designed to undermine public order—these and other activities are difficult to control while maintaining a free society. To implement effective anti-Communist measures and retain a respect for human rights is truely a difficult task.

The special committee of the OAS on subversion added, "that the security measures which are taken to counteract subversive action of international communism will have very limited effects unless at the same time the American governments intensify their efforts to raise the standard of living of their peoples through the overall development of their economies and fuller social justice, all of which should be achieved within the framework of democratic institutions and respect for the dignity of the individual."

COMBATING COMMUNISM AMONG THE YOUTH

The task force would like to add a special comment on the threat of Communist influence among young people, and especially students, in Latin America.

The youth of Latin America face a trying future. Their numbers are growing faster than in any other part of the world. Opportunities for active employment and contribution to society are not growing in proportion. Traditional restrictions and a general lack of social mobility hold opportunities for the youth in business, government, military career service, scientific occupations at a low level. This lack of opportunity is frustrating to the Latin American youth. Traditionally their resentment has been vented in antigovernment sentiment and anti-Yankeeism. Today with opportunity at a steady low, coupled with an increasing population, the pressures are building up.

Universities, such as San Carlos in Guatemala, are hotbeds of Marxism and anti-Americanism. Especially in the economics and law faculties, the open support for Communist Cuba is strong.

U.S. authorities, despairing at extremely radical and hostile attitude of these groups and the apparent impossibility of changing their sentiment, do little or nothing to influence them. Consequently there is no communication between the Americans or any pro-American group and these radical students. The students are really ostracized groups—they are at war with the government, the Americans and the society that seems to have no place for them.

The task force believes channels of communication should be established between these groups and sources of pro-American sentiment. It was this radical dissident group that formed the core of Castro's establishment. They were ignored and ostracized. In the end they communized the society that rejected them.

As difficult as the job will be the task force would strongly urge officials of the USIA, the binational centers and political affairs officers in the embassies to direct efforts toward this radical Marxist core found in nearly every Latin American public high school and university. The establishment of some dialog could go a long way to lessen the air of hostility that surrounds these dissidents. Many times they are suffering from gross misconceptions about life in the United States, the history of United States-Latin American relations, activities of U.S. business in the area and U.S. policies in general as they relate to Latin America (the Alliance). These misconceptions have been passed on to the students by professors and others who had a similar lack of opportunity to learn the truth about the United States and our dealings with Latin America.

RECOMMENDED ACTIONS

The Communist threat: Containment and counteroffensive

1. Reaffirm the Monroe Doctrine

The Monroe Doctrine is the principle upon which the United States can rebuild its hemispheric policy. This historic document has been used by Americans, North and South, to bar extrahemispheric powers from establishing colonies or extending their forms of government into our lands. This policy was used to prevent Axis powers from intervention in the hemisphere. It was endorsed by the OAS at Caracas in 1954. Soviet troops and the establishment of communism in Cuba violate this doctrine, it is the first time the nations of the hemisphere have allowed such a violation to stand.

The Government of the United States must recommit itself to the Monroe Doctrine. A continuation of a policy of inaction and indecision will only confuse our friends and encourage communism to pursue its march through the Americas.

2. Recognize a Cuban Government in Exile

Recognition of a Cuban Government in exile would serve as a final sign of our commitment to rid Cuba of the Castro regime. Other American governments should be encouraged to follow suit, thus completing the ostracism of Communist Cuba.

Historically the United States has recognized free governments in exile. Today, for example, we recognize the exiled governments of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania in spite of the fact that these countries are behind the Iron Curtain. A government in exile could receive assistance from the United States as well as other governments of the hemisphere. It would provide a rallying point for all Cuban refugees. It could give aid to the Cuban undergound. It would provide hope to the oppressed in Cuba. It could give direction and authority to a movement to win back the freedom of Cuba.

The argument that the exiles could not unite around one group no longer stands. Recently, a group named the Comite Pro-Referendum was able to locate 75,103 Cubans in exile throughout the world. A five-man slate was proposed and voted upon by mail ballot. The slate received 98 percent of the votes cast. This group of five highly respected Cubans could serve as a nucleus for formalizing the government in exile.

3. Implement the OAS Resolution of July 26, 1964

Because of Communist Cuba's aggression and intervention against the Government of Venezuela the Ninth Meeting of Consultation of Foreign Ministers resolved that all American governments would discontinue trade and break diplomatic relations with Castro. Furthermore, they warned Cuba that, should subversion continue, the governments of the hemisphere would take collective action "which could go so far as the use of armed force."

This resolution should be made credible. Mexico, as the last American Government that has relations with Cuba, should be urged by every available means by the United States and other hemispheric nations to withdraw recognition from the Communist regime. In 1958 the United States imported $458 million in goods from Mexico; tourist trade from the United States was over $300 million. From 1946 to 1962 our economic assistance to Mexico amounted to $760 million. Thus, we continue to freely provide aid which should be used as a tool to force withdrawal of recognition. Similar efforts to terminate the airline connection Mexico has with Cuba should be brought into play.

Measures should be taken, using the Inter-American Defense Board and other inter-American agencies, for collective action against the Castro regime's traffic in subversives, terrorists, and propaganda. The resolution of July gives the OAS legal grounds even for use of "armed force" in the event of Cuba's continued "aggressive actions." Preparation for a ready, standby inter-American backed counterforce should be planned. It would not only put us in a state of readiness to repel future subversion but will serve as a deterrent to all Castro's activities. What is needed is assertion of strong leadership by the United States and a restatement of our firm commitment to the integrity of all free OAS nations in opposition to the Communist challenge.

4. Implementation of a Meaningful Trade Ban Between Our Allies and Cuba

U.S. efforts to get our allies to terminate trade with Cuba have been nearly a total failure. Logically, our friends point to our trade with Communist Russia, Poland, and Yugoslavia and claim that "the United States has a surplus of wheat and we have a surplus of buses; if you can sell your wheat to Russia why should we refrain from selling our buses to Cuba?" The United States can give the Cuban trade ban logical and moral strength by discontinuing our sales to Communist countries and by withdrawing all aid to nations continuing to do business with Castro.

REPORT TO CONSTITUENTS

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, the following is a report to the people of the Third Congressional District of Minnesota on my voting and attendance record for the 1st and 2d sessions of the 88th Congress. The report includes all rollcall votes and a summary of the quorum calls.

I am including this record because I believe that the people of the congressional district which I have the honor of representing deserve to know how their Congressman votes. In order for our representative system of government to prosper, the people must be fully informed of the actions of their elected representative.

All of the people will obviously not agree with their Congressman on every issue, as it is impossible for any two men or women to always be in agreement. The residents of Anoka and suburban and rural Hennepin Counties should have this opportunity to fairly and factually examine my stand on each of the vital issues coming before this Congress.

The preparation of this report is one expression of my sincere belief that a public official's first responsibility is to the people he represents. I have manifested this belief in the questionnaire sent earlier this year to each home in the Third Congressional District. I was gratified to receive more than 22,500 responses. In this way as well as through a heavy correspondence and a wide and frequent participation in public meetings back home during the past 21 months I have encouraged each and every citizen to express himself to me.

The purpose of this report is to collect in one place and in concise form information which is scattered through thousands of pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I hope to continue my work on the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives on the problems of congressional districting and State legislative apportionment. Progress on these issues is vital if suburbanites are to speak through equitable voices in Washington and St. Paul.

As a reserve officer in Army Intelligence, I have taken a particular interest in foreign affairs and American military policy. In this area I have worked to sharpen and improve our foreign aid program, to strengthen our association with allies pursuant to article 51 of the United Nations Charter, and to guarantee the very best in training and equipment for our military forces.

In the fields of education and employment, I have worked with other Congressmen on a study of the root causes of unemployment and have been privileged to contribute during the last 4 years to improvements in vocational education and to the creation and strengthening of the manpower retraining program. As one of the coauthors of the bill to provide partial tax credits for the cost of higher education, I look forward to continuing my efforts until this idea becomes law.

It is imperative that we maintain the strength of individual initiative and responsibility and that we amplify the local and State governmental role in our Federal structure. In this field, I was happy to work for the Federal tax cut after spending disciplines were initiated. I look forward to continuing my efforts to responsibly withdraw the Federal Government from certain excise tax areas so as to provide local government with the needed revenue sources to best provide the community services desired by suburban residents. I will pursue my efforts to see that the Federal Government matches income and outgo in the handling of the people's tax money.

In the 88th Congress, I have devoted considerable work and study to legislation and other methods by which we might improve morality and ethics in government. With others of my colleagues, I have also worked with bipartisan groups of political scientists seeking ways to make the House of Representatives more efficient and effective. This is imperative if the legislative branch of our National Government is to continue to function properly as a coequal partner with the executive and judicial branches. The House of Representatives and the Congress must maintain their rightful constitutional status. Only in this way can the individual American citizen be assured that his National Government will serve and be responsive to the best interests of all of us.

The descriptions of the bills and the amendments or motions in this report are for purposes of identification only; no attempt is made to describe the legislation completely or to elaborate upon the issues involved. This word of caution is advisable in view of the fact that the descriptions used are, for the most part, taken from the official titles of the bills which, unfortunately, do not always reflect the nature or true purpose of the legislation. Upon request, I will be pleased to furnish more complete information concerning any particular bill, as well as a summary of the issues involved and the reasons for my vote.

To conserve space, I have not listed each separate quorum call. There were 296 calls since January 9, 1963. I was present on 254 quorum calls for an attendance percentage of 86 percent.

Voting record, Congressman Clark MacGregor, *88th Cong.*

1ST SESS.

Date, 1963	Measure, question, and result	Vote
	Election of Speaker	Halleck.
Jan. 9	H. Res. 5. A resolution relating to the rules of the House of Representatives. On ordering previous question. (Yeas 249, nays 183.)	No.
Jan. 9	H. Res. 5. A resolution relating to the rules of the House of Representatives. On agreeing to resolution. (Yeas 235, nays 196.)	No.
Jan. 9		
Feb. 27	H.J. Res. 284. A joint resolution making supplemental appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes. On passage. (Yeas 254, nays 154.)	Yes.
Feb. 27	H. Res. 249. A resolution to authorize the expenditure of certain funds for the expenses of the Committee on Un-American Activities. On agreeing to resolution. (Yeas 386, nays 20.)	Yes.
Mar. 11	H.R. 2438. A bill to extend the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, and for other purposes. On passage. (Yeas 388, nays 3.)	Yes.
Mar. 12	H.R. 4374. A bill to proclaim Sir Winston Churchill an honorary citizen of the United States of America. On passage. (Yeas 378, nays 21.)	Yes.
Mar. 13	H.R. 2440. A bill to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1964 for procurement, research, development, test, and evaluation of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes. On amendment No. 2. (Strike out $322,986,000 and insert $686,686,000—research and test on RS-70.) (Yeas 226, nays 179.)	No.
Mar. 13	H.R. 2440. A bill to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1964 for procurement, research, development, test, and evaluation of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes. On motion to recommit with instructions. (Failed, yeas 149, nays 258.)	Yes.
Mar. 13	H.R. 2440. On final passage to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1964 for procurement, research, development, test, and evaluation of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes. (Yeas 374, nays 33.)	No.
Apr. 4	H.R. 5366. A bill making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes. On passage. (Yeas 386, nays 17.)	Yes.
Apr. 10	H.R. 5517. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes. On Boland, of Massachusetts, amendment. (Public works acceleration, $450,000,000.) (Yeas 228, nays 184.)	No.
Apr. 10	H.R. 5389. A bill to repeal certain legislation relating to the purchase of silver, and for other purposes. On passage. (Yeas 252, nays 122.)	No.
Apr. 10	H.R. 12. A bill to increase the opportunities for training of physicians, dentists, and professional public health personnel, and for other purposes. On motion to recommit with instructions. (Failed, yeas 171, nays 239.)	Yes.
Apr. 24	H.R. 12. On final passage of the bill to increase the opportunities for training of physicians, dentists, and professional pubic health personnel, and for other purposes. (Yeas 288, nays 122.)	No.
Apr. 25	H.R. 4997. A bill to extend the feed grain program. On motion to recommit. (Failed, yeas 196, nays 205.)	Yes.
Apr. 25	H.R. 4997. On final passage of the bill to extend the feed grain program. (Yeas 208, nays 195.)	No.
Apr. 29	H.R. 1762. A bill to promote the coordination and development of effective Federal and State programs relating to outdoor recreation, and for other purposes. On Griffin amendment. (Yeas 292, nays 50.)	Not voting.[1]
May 6	H.R. 40. A bill to assist the States to provide additional facilities for research at the State agricultural experiment stations. On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Yeas 275, nays 30.)	Yes.
May 7	H.J. Res. 245. A joint resolution to provide that Members of Congress shall be limited to per diem allowances and necessary transportation costs in connection with travel outside the United States, and for other purposes. On passage. (Yeas 387, nays 2.)	Yes.
May 8	H.R. 5517. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes. Conference report on motion to recommit with instructions. (International conferences and contingencies.) (Yeas 207, nays 190.)	Yes.
May 9	H.R. 950. A bill to amend the Internal Security Act of 1950. On passage. (Yeas 340, nays 40.)	Not voting (paired against).
May 13	H. R. 4274. A bill to amend sec. 103, title 31, of the District of Columbia Code of 1961, as amended. On passage. (Yeas 278, nays 53.)	Not voting.[1]
May 14	H.R. 5517. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes. Conference report, on adoption. (Yeas 242, nays 129.)	Not voting (paired against).
May 14	H.R. 5517. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes. Conference report on ordering previous question on motion to concur in Senate amendment No. 76. With an amendment. (Philippine war damage claims.) (Failed, yeas 168, nays 207.)	No.
May 14	H. Res. 340. A resolution granting additional travel authority to the Committee on Education and Labor. On agreeing to resolution. (Failed, yeas 153, nays 217, "present" 1.)	No.
May 15	H.R. 6009. A bill to provide for the periods ending June 30,and Aug. 31, 1963, temporary increases in the public debt limit set forth in sec. 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act. On motion to recommit with instructions. (Failed, yeas 195, nays 222, "present" 1.)	Yes.
May 15	H.R. 6009. A bill to provide for the periods ending June 30 and Aug. 31, 1963, temporary increases in the public debt limit set forth in sec. 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act. On passage. (Yeas 213, nays 204.)	No.
May 23	H. Res. 362. A resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 6060, a bill to prohibit discrimination on account of sex in the payment of wages by employers engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce. On agreeing to resolution. (Yeas 362, nays 9.)	Yes.
May 29	H. Res. 368. A resolution authorizing the speaker to appoint delegates and alternates to attend the International Labor Organization Conference in Geneva. On agreeing to resolution. (Yeas 278, nays 52.)	Yes.
May 29	H.R. 5497. A bill to amend title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes. On passage. (Failed; yeas 158, nays 174, "present" 1.)	Yes.
June 4	H.R. 3496. A bill to further amend the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, so that such act will apply to reorganization plans transmitted to the Congress at any time before June 1, 1965. On Brown of Ohio amendment. (Yeas 226, nays 175.)	Yes.
June 6	H.R. 6754. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes. On passage. (Yeas 288, nays 79.)	Not voting (paired for).
June 11	H.R. 6868. A bill making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes. On passage. (Yeas 271, nays 122.)	No.
June 12	H.R. 4996. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Area Redevelopment Act. On passage. (Failed, yeas 204, nays 209, "present" 1.)	No.
June 13	H.R. 6755. A bill to provide a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal tax rate and of certain excise tax rates. On passage. (Yeas 283, nays 91.)	Yes.
June 18	H.R. 7063. A bill making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes. On passage. (Yeas 301, nays 93.)	Yes.
June 19	H.J. Res. 247. A joint resolution to suspend for the 1964 campaign the equal opportunity requirements of sec. 315 for nominees for the offices of President and Vice President. On passage. (Yeas 263, nays 126, "present" 1.)	Not voting.[1]
June 24	H.R. 6177. A bill to amend sec. 2(*a*) of art. VI of the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1947 relating to the annual payment to the District of Columbia by the United States. On motion to recommit with instructions (increase Federal payment from $34,000,000 to $42,000,000.) (Failed, yeas 99, nays 237.)	Yes.
June 26	H.R. 7179. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes. (Yeas 410, nays 1.)	Yes.
July 9	H.R. 3179. A bill to provide that judges of the U.S. Court of Military Appeals shall hold office during good behavior and for other purposes. On passage. (Yeas 314, nays 82.)	Yes.
July 16	H.R. 4897. A bill to repeal subsec. (d) of sec. 2388 of title 18 of the United States Code. On motion to recommit. (Failed, yeas 40, nays 339, "present" 2.)	No.
July 17	H.R. 5279. A bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes. Conference report, on motion to recommit with instructions. (Insist on disagreement to Senate amendment No. 52, National Air Museum Building.) (Failed, yeas 144, nays 245.)	Yes.
July 17	H.R. 5279. Conference report, on adoption. (Yeas 333, nays 50.)	No.
July 18	H.R. 5171. A bill to authorize the Administrator of the General Services Administration to coordinate and otherwise provide for the economic and efficient purchase, lease, maintenance, operation, and utilization of electronic data processing equipment by Federal departments and agencies. On motion to recommit. (Failed, yeas 96, nays 258.)	Yes.
July 24	H.R. 6518. A bill to improve, strengthen, and accelerate programs for the prevention and abatement of air pollution. On passage. (Yeas 273, nays 102.)	Yes.
July 25	H.R. 4638. A bill to promote the orderly transfer of the executive power in connection with the expiration of the term of office of a President and the inauguration of a new President. On motion to recommit with instructions. (Failed, yeas 29, nays 343.)	No.
July 30	H.R. 3872. A bill to increase the lending authority of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, to extend the period within which the Export-Import Bank of Washington may exercise its functions, and for other purposes. Conference report, on motion to insist on its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and asks a further conference. (Yeas 379, nays 11, "present" 1.)	Yes.
July 31	H. Res. 453. A resolution providing for consideration of, and waiving points of order against, the conference report on the bill, H.R 5207, to amend the Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1926. On agreeing to resolution. (Yeas 234, nays 166.)	Yes.
Aug. 1	H. Res. 467. A resolution providing for consideration of H.R. 7500, a bill to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and administrative operations; and for other purposes. On agreeing to resolution. (Yeas 387, nays 1.)	Yes.
Aug. 1	H.R. 7500. The appropriations bill to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. On passage. (Yeas 335, nays 57.)	Yes.
Aug. 5	S. 1652. An act to amend the National Culture Act to extend the termination date contained therein, and to enlarge the Board of Trustees. Motion to suspend rules and pass. (Yeas 293, nays 33.)	Yes.
Aug. 6	H.R. 4955. A bill to strengthen and improve the quality of vocational education and to expand the vocational education opportunities in the Nation. On motion to recommit with instructions. (Failed, yeas 181, nays 217, "present" 1.)	Yes.

See footnotes at end of table.

Voting record, Congressman CLARK MACGREGOR, 88th Cong.—Continued

1ST SESS.—Continued

Date, 1963	Measure, question, and result	Vote
Aug. 6	H.R. 4955. Passage of the bill to strengthen and improve the quality of vocational education and to expand the vocational education opportunities in the Nation. (Yeas 378, Nays 21.)	Yes.
Aug. 7	H. Res. 477. A resolution providing for consideration of H.R. 7824, a bill to continue, for the period ending Nov. 30, 1963, the existing temporary increase in the public debt limit set forth in sec. 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act. On agreeing to resolution. (Yeas 303, nays 72.)	Yes.
Aug. 8	H.R. 7824. On motion to recomit with instructions the bill to continue the existing temporary increase in the public debt limit set forth in sec. 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act. ($307,000,000,000.) (Failed, yeas 163, nays 229.)	Yes.
Aug. 8	H.R. 7824. Final passage of the bill regarding sec. 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act. (Yeas 221, nays 175.)	No.
Aug. 12	H.R. 7525. Motion to recomit a bill relating to crime and criminal procedure in the District of Columbia. (Failed, yeas 114, nays 222.)	Not voting (paired for).
Aug. 14	H.R. 6143. A bill to authorize assistance to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education in financing the construction, rehabilitation, or improvement of needed academic and related facilities in undergraduate and graduate institutions. On passage. (Yeas 287, nays 113, "present" 1.)	Yes.
Aug. 23	H.R. 7885. On motion to recommit with instructions for a bill to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes. (Reduce $585,000,000.) (Yeas 222, nays 188.)	Yes.
Aug. 23	H.R. 7885. Final passage of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961. (Yeas 224, nays 186, "present" 1.)	Yes.
Aug. 28	H.R. 7500. Conference report, on motion to recommit with instructions. A bill to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and administrative operations; and for other purposes. (Failed, yeas 176, nays 200.)	Yes.
Aug. 28	H.R. 7500. Conference report, on adoption to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. (Yeas 248, nays 125.)	No.
Sept. 10	S. 1576. An act to provide assistance in combating mental retardation through grants for construction of research centers and grants for facilities for the mentally retarded and assistance in improving mental health through grants for construction and initial staffing of community mental health centers, and for other purposes. On passage. (Yeas 335, nays 18.)	Yes.
Sept. 11	H. Res. 504. A resolution to create a select committee to investigate research programs conducted by or sponsored by the departments and agencies of the Federal Government. On agreeing to resolution. (Yeas 336, nays 0.)	Yes.
Sept. 24	H. Res. 527. A resolution providing for consideration of H.R. 8363, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to reduce individual and corporate income taxes, to make certain structural changes with respect to the income tax, and for other purposes. On agreeing to resolution. (Yeas 324, nays 67.)	Yes.
Sept. 25	H.R. 8363. On motion to recommit with instructions. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. (Failed, yeas 199, nays 226.)	Yes.
Sept. 25	H.R. 8363. Final passage of the bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. (Yeas 271, nays 155.)	No.
Oct. 1	H.R. 5555. Conference report, on adoption. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to increase the rates of basic pay for members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes. (Yeas 333, nays 5.)	Yes.
Oct. 1	H. Res. 539. A resolution providing for consideration of H.R. 7004, a bill to amend Public Law 193, 83d Cong., relating to the Corregidor-Bataan Memorial Commission. On agreeing to resolution. (Yeas 314, nays 12.)	Yes.
Oct. 7	H. Res. 541. A resolution agreeing to the Senate amendment to H.R. 3369. On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Civil Rights Commission, extend.) (Yeas 265, nays 80.)	Yes.
Oct. 8	H.R. 7179. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes. Conference report, on adoption. (Yeas 336, nays 3.)	Not voting.[1]
Oct. 10	H.R. 8747. A bill making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes. On motion to recommit with instructions. (Failed, yeas 145, nays 192.)	Not voting.[1]
Oct. 10	H.R. 8747. Final passage making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices. (Yeas 302, nays 32.)	Not voting.[1]
Oct. 14	H.R. 5871. A bill to amend sec. 11 of the act of Apr. 1, 1942, in order to modify the retirement benefits of the judges of the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions, the District of Columbia court of appeals, and the juvenile court of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes. On passage. (Yeas 150, nays 86.)	Not voting.[1]
Oct. 15	H.R. 6237. A bill to amend sec. 503 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to authorize grants for the collection, reproduction, and publication of documentary source material significant to the history of the United States, and for other purposes. On passage. (Yeas 158, nays 154.)	Not voting (paired against).
Oct. 21	S. 1576. An act to provide assistance in combating mental retardation through grants for construction of research centers and grants for facilities for the mentally retarded and assistance in improving mental health through grants for construction and initial staffing of community mental health centers, and for other purposes. Conference report, on adoption. (Yeas 299, nays 13.)	Yes.
Oct. 22	H.R. 8821. A bill to revise the provisions of law relating to the methods by which amounts made available to the States pursuant to the Temporary Unemployment Compensation Act of 1958 and title XII of the Social Security Act are to be restored to the Treasury. On passage. (Yeas 350, nays 1.)	Yes.
Oct. 23	H.R. 5945. A bill to establish a procedure for the prompt settlement, in a democratic manner, of the political status of Puerto Rico. On passage. (Yeas 320, nays 44.)	Yes.
Oct. 28	H.J. Res. 782. A joint resolution making continuous appropriations for the fiscal year 1964, and for other purposes. On passage. (Yeas 280, nays 11.)	Not voting.[1]
Oct. 29	H. Res. 314. A resolution to grant additional travel authority to the Committee on Education and Labor. On agreeing to resolution. (Failed, yeas 119, nays 164.)	Not voting (paired for).
Oct. 31	H.R. 6500. A bill to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes. Conference report, on adoption. (Yeas 356, nays 1.)	Not voting.[1]
Oct. 31	H.R. 8195. A bill to amend sec. 510 of title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended. On passage. (Yeas 173, nays 160, "present" 6.)	Not voting (paired for).
Nov. 6	H.R. 6143. A bill to authorize assistance to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education in financing the construction, rehabilitation, or improvement of needed academic and related facilities in undergraduate and graduate institutions. Conference report, on adoption. (Yeas 258, nays 92.)	Yes.
Nov. 6	H.R. 8920. A bill to revise the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act. On motion to recommit. (Yeas 258, nays 98.)	Yes.
Nov. 7	H. Res. 564. A resolution providing for consideration of H.R. 8969 a bill to provide for the period ending June 30, 1964, temporary increases in the public debt limit set forth in sec. 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act. On agreeing to resolution. (Yeas 212, nays 149.)	No.
Nov. 7	H.R. 8969. On motion to recommit a bill to provide temporary increases in the public debt limit set forth in sec. 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act. (Failed, yeas 172, nays 197, "present" 2.)	Yes.
Nov. 7	H.R. 8969. Sec. 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act. On passage. (Yeas 187, nays 179, present 3.)	No.
Nov. 14	H.R. 8864. A bill to carry out the obligations of the United States under the International Coffee Agreement, 1962, signed at New York on Sept. 28, 1962, and for other purposes. On passage. (Yeas 181, nays 145.)	No.
Nov. 18	H.R. 2988. A bill to amend title 10 United States Code, to provide for participation by members of the Armed Forces in international sports activities. On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Yeas 285, nays 30.)	Yes.
Nov. 18	H.R. 8135. A bill to provide for the establishment and administration of public recreational facilities at the Sanford Reservoir area, Canadian River project, Texas, and for other purposes. On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Yeas 283, nays 30.)	Yes.
Nov. 18	H.R. 9139. A bill making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes. On passage. (Yeas 332, nays 5.)	Yes.
Nov. 19	H.R. 9140. A bill making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and certain river basin commissions, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes. On passage. (Yeas 358, nays 27.)	No.
Nov. 20	S. 777. An act to amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act in order to increase the authorization for appropriations and to modify the personnel security procedures for contractor employees. On passage. (Yeas 251, nays 134, "present" 1.)	Yes.
Dec. 2	H.R. 9124. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to vitalize the Reserve Officers Training Corps programs of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, and for other purposes. On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Failed, yeas 177, nays 154.)	Yes.
Dec. 2	H.R. 10. A bill to extend the apportionment requirement in the Civil Service Act of Jan. 16, 1883, to temporary summer employment, and for other purposes. On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Yeas 301, nays 18.)	Yes.
Dec. 4	H.R. 6196. A bill to encourage increased consumption of cotton. On motion to recommit. (Yeas 179, nays 224, "present" 2.)	Yes.
Dec. 4	H.R. 6196. A bill to encourage increased consumption of cotton, to maintain the income of cotton producers, and to provide a special research program designed to lower costs of production. On final passage. (Yeas 216, nays 182.)	No.
Dec. 9	H.R. 7885. Conference report. Adopted on the foreign aid authorization bill for fiscal year 1964, and sent the legislation to the Senate. (Yeas 195, nays 164.)	Yes.
Dec. 9	H.R. 8929. A bill to authorize the prosecution of a transit development program for the National Capital region. Vote to recommit. (Yeas 278, nays 76.)	No.
Dec. 10	H.R. 8747. Conference report. Making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices for fiscal year 1964. (Yeas 356, nays 22.)	Yes.
Dec. 10	H.R. 8747. Vote on preferential motion to recede and concur in amendment No. 92 to conference report on H.R. 8747. (Yeas 170, nays 204.)	Yes.
Dec. 10	H.R. 6518. Conference report. A bill to improve, strengthen, and accelerate programs for the prevention and abatement of air pollution. (Yeas 273, nays 109.)	Yes.
Dec. 10	H. Res. 579. The rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 7457, to provide legal assistance for indigent defendants in criminal cases in U.S. courts. (Yeas 345, nays 12.)	Yes.
Dec. 12	H.R. 9140. Conference report. A bill making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and certain river basin commissions for fiscal year 1964, and sent the legislation to the Senate. (Yeas 328, nays 47.)	No.

See footnotes at end of table.

Voting record, Congressman CLARK MACGREGOR, *88th Cong.—Continued*

1ST SESS.—Continued

Date, 1963	Measure, question, and result	Vote
Dec. 12	H.R. 4955. On motion to recommit the conference report. (Yeas 180, nays 193.)	Yes.
Dec. 12	H.R. 4955. Conference report. A bill to strengthen and improve the quality of vocational education and to expand the vocational education opportunities in the Nation, and sent the legislation to the Senate. (Yeas 300, nays 65.)	No.
Dec. 13	H.R. 9139. Conference report. Making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1964. (Yeas 300, nays 4.)	Yes.
Dec. 16	H.R. 9499. Recommittal motion designed to incorporate language to bar use of funds of Export-Import Bank to guarantee credit of Communist governments. (Yeas 218, nays 169.)	Yes.
Dec. 16	H.R. 9499. A bill making appropriations for foreign aid and related agencies for fiscal year 1964. (Yeas 249, nays 135.)	Yes.
Dec. 17	H.R. 8667. Senate Amendment No. 26, authorizing $50,000,000 for construction of Knowles Dam and Reservoir, Flathead, Mont., was reported in disagreement and the House insisted on its disagreement. (Yeas 329, nays 41.)	Yes.
Dec. 17	H.R. 9413. To provide for the coinage of 50-cent pieces bearing the likeness of John F. Kennedy. (Yeas 352, nays 6.)	Yes.
Dec. 19	H.J. Res. 875. A bill making supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1964 for certain activities of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, related to mental retardation. (Yeas 324, nays 4.)	Yes.
Dec. 21	H. Res. 598. Rule providing for the consideration and points of order against the conference report on H.R. 9499, making appropriations for foreign aid and related agencies for fiscal year 1964. (Yeas 182, nays 95.)	No.
Dec. 21	H.R. 9499. Recommittal motion with instructions for House conferees to insist on disagreement to Senate amendment No. 20 which gives the President discretionary authority to allow Export-Import Bank to guarantee credit of certain governments. (Yeas 141, nays 136.)	Yes.
Dec. 23	H. Res. 600. A motion to consider waiving points of order against the conference report on H.R. 9499 and for other purposes. On question, Will House now consider the resolution? (⅔ required—Failed, yeas 202, nays 105.)	No.
Dec. 24	H.R. 9499. A bill making appropriations for foreign aid and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes. Conference report, on motion to recede and concur in Senate amendment No. 20 with amendment. (Export-Import Bank guarantee national security.) (Yeas 189, nays 158.)	No.

Date, 1964	2D SESS.	
Jan. 14	S. 1153. Recommittal motion. (Yeas 110, nays 201.)	Not voting.
Jan. 14	S. 1153. A bill to amend the Federal Airport Act to extend the time for making grants thereunder. (Yeas 298, nays 11.)	Not voting.[1]
Jan. 21	H.R. 4879. A bill to amend the Library Services Act to increase the Federal assistance for the improvement of public libraries. On Frelinghuysen amendment. (Failed, yeas 179, nays 183.)	Not voting.
Jan. 21	H.R. 4879. Motion to recommit. (Yeas 174, nays 188.)	Not voting.
Jan. 21	H.R. 4879. A bill to amend the Library Services Act to increase the Federal assistance for the improvement of public libraries. On passage. (Yeas 254, nays 107.)	Not voting.[1]
Jan. 28	H. Res. 582. Vote on a motion to order the previous question on H.Res. 582, the rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 6041. (Yeas 297, nays 105.)	Yes.
Jan. 28	H.R. 6041. A bill to amend the Davis-Bacon Act to include fringe benefits in prevailing wage determinations. (Yeas 357, nays 50.)	Yes.
Feb. 10	H.R. 7152. The civil rights bill. (Yeas 290, nays 130.)	Yes.
Feb. 18	H.R. 7381. A bill to simplify, modernize, and consolidate the laws relating to the employment of civilians in more than 1 position and the laws concerning the civilian employment of retired members of the uniformed services. (Yeas 83, nays 262.)	No.
Feb. 20	H.R. 9637. A bill to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1965 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, research and development, test and evaluation for the Armed Forces. (Yeas 336, nays 0.)	Yes.
Feb. 25	H.R. 8363. Conference report. The Revenue Act of 1964. (Yeas 326, nays 83.)	Yes.
Feb. 26	H.R. 9022. Recommittal motion, to amend the International Development Association Act to authorize the United States to participate in an increase in the resources of the International Development Association. (Yeas 208, nays 188.)	No.
Feb. 27	H.R. 8316. To amend the Communications Act of 1934 to prohibit the Federal Communications Commission from making certain rules relating to the length or frequency of broadcast advertisements. (Yeas 317, nays 43.)	Yes.
Mar. 4	H.R. 9666. Recommittal motion to amend further the Peace Corps Act. (Yeas 90, nays 309.)	No.
Mar. 5	H.R. 8000. A bill to impose a tax on acquisitions of certain foreign securities in order to equalize costs of longer term financing in the United States and in markets abroad. (Yeas 238, nays 142.)	No.
Mar. 10	H.R. 8070. To establish a Public Land Law Review Commission. (Yeas 339, nays 29.)	Yes.
Mar. 11	H. Res. 650. The open rule providing for the consideration of and 3 hours of debate on H.R. 8986, to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees in the Federal Government. (Yeas 251, nays 147.)	No.
Mar. 12	H.R. 8986. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees in the Federal Government. (Yeas 184, nays 222.)	No.
Mar. 19	H. Res. 556. The open rule providing for the consideration of, 2 hours of debate on, and the waiving of points of order against H.R. 5838, to incorporate in the Organic Act of the National Bureau of Standards the authority to make certain improvements of fiscal and administrative practices for more effective conduct of its research and development activities. (Yeas 264, nays 90.)	Yes.
Mar. 23	H.R. 5838. Recommittal motion designed to limit transfers of appropriations to $250,000 in each instance and to require reports thereon to be submitted to the Appropriations Committees of Congress. (Yeas 151, nays 172.)	Yes.
Mar. 23	H.R. 5838. A bill to incorporate in the Organic Act of the National Bureau of Standards the authority to make certain improvements of fiscal and administrative practices for more effective conduct of its research and development activities. (Yeas 164, nays 162.)	Not voting.[3]
Mar. 24	H.R. 10532. Request for a separate vote on the Bonner amendment to restore $10,000,000 to funds of the Coast Guard for acquisition, construction, and improvements. (Yeas 160, nays 193.)	No.
Mar. 24	H.R. 10532. A bill making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Department, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent offices for fiscal year 1965. (Yeas 326, nays 20.)	Yes.
Mar. 25	H. Res. 660. The open rule under which H.R. 10456 was considered. (Yeas 357, nays 0.)	Yes.
Mar. 25	H.R. 10456. A bill to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and administrative operations. (Yeas 283, nays 73.)	No.
Apr. 6	S. 1828. Suspension of rules to pass with an amendment. A bill to amend the joint resolution establishing the Battle of Lake Erie Sesquicentennial Celebration Commission so as to authorize an appropriation thereof. (Yeas 233, nays 39.)	Yes.
Apr. 8	H.R. 10222. Recommittal motion. The Food Stamp Act of 1964, designed to require participating States to pay 50 percent of the value of food stamps issued to participants within the States.(Yeas 195, nays 223.)	Yes.
Apr. 8	H.R. 10222. The Food Stamp Act of 1964. (Yeas 229, nays 189.)	No.
Apr. 8	H. Res. 665. Providing for House concurrence to a Senate amendment to H.R. 6196, to revitalize the American cotton industry. (Yeas 211, nays 203.)	No.
Apr. 10	H.R. 10723. Recommittal motion. Designed to limit expenditures of appropriations to committees and the Architect of the Capitol, whose expenditures and contracts are matters of public record and are available to public inspection. (Yeas 188, nays 131.)	Yes.
Apr. 14	H.R. 10809. A bill making appropriations for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for fiscal year 1965. (Yeas 344, nays 21.)	Yes.
Apr. 15	S. 2394. A bill to facilitate compliance with the convention between the United States of America and the United Mexican States, signed Aug. 29, 1963. (Yeas 347, nays 5.)	Yes.
Apr. 22	H.R. 10939. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1965. (Yeas 365, nays 0.)	Yes.
May 6	H.R. 11134. A bill making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies for fiscal year 1965. (Yeas 340, nays 12.)	Yes.
May 7	H.R. 10945. A bill to authorize appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with sec. 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954. The bill would authorize appropriations totaling $2,636,577,000 for the Atomic Energy Commission for fiscal year 1965. (Yeas 339, nays 3.)	Yes.
May 13	S. 2214. Motion to recommit. To amend the International Development Association Act to authorize the United States to participate in an increase in the resources of the International Development Association. (Yeas 132, nays 247.)	No.
May 18	H.J. Res. 1020. Authorizing the expression of appreciation and the issuance of a gold medal to Henry J. Kaiser. (Yeas 150, nays 143.) (Measure lost because ⅔ majority is required for a suspension passage.)	No.
May 20	H.R. 11202. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes. On Pilcher amendment. (Yeas 181, nays 198.)	No.
May 20	H.R. 11202. Agriculture appropriations. Motion to recommit with instructions which sought to insert language to prevent use of any funds for payment of export subsidies on any surplus agriculture commodities sold to Communist countries unless approved by the President and reported to Congress. (Yeas 186, nays 187.)	Yes.
May 20	H.R. 11202. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for fiscal year 1965. (Yeas 311, nays 64.)	Yes.
May 26	H.R. 11369. A bill making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1965. (Yeas 340, nays 5.)	Yes.
May 27	H. Res. 724. The rule under which H.R. 5103 was considered. (Yeas 218, nays 115.)	No.
May 27	H.R. 5103. A bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act and title IV of the National Housing Act (relating to the insurance of savings and loan accounts) with respect to the maximum amount of insurance which may be provided thereunder. (Yeas 197, nays 142.)	Yes.
June 3	H.R. 10503. A bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1966 and 1967 for construction of certain highways in accordance with title 23 of United States Code. (Yeas 294, nays 0.)	Not voting.[1]
June 10	H.R. 11380. Recommittal motion. Designed to effect a reduction of $222,200,000 by cutting the contingency fund $50,000,000 and the Development Loan Fund by $172,200,000. (Yeas 193, nays 211.)	Yes.
June 10	H.R. 11380. A bill to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961. (Yeas 230, nays 175.)	Yes.
June 11	H.R. 11049. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees in the Federal Government. (Yeas 243, nays 157.)	No.

See footnotes at end of table.

Voting record, Congressman CLARK MACGREGOR, *88th Cong.—Continued*

2D SESS.—Continued

Date, 1964	Measure, question, and result	Vote
June 16	H.R. 11579. A bill making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, the Panama Canal, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the Delaware River Basin Commission for fiscal year 1965. (Yeas 360, nays 11.)	No.
June 17	H.R. 11376. A motion to recommit. A bill to provide a 1-year extension of certain excise tax rates. (Yeas 185, nays 207.)	Yes.
June 18	H.R. 11375. A bill to provide for the period ending June 30, 1965, a temporary increase in the public debt limit set forth in sec. 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act. (Yeas 203, nays 182.)	Not voting.[2]
June 25	H.R. 3881. A request for a separate vote on an amendment to the Mass Transit Act designed to insure equal treatment for all transport workers. (Yeas 234, nays 170.)	No.
June 25	H.R. 3881. Recommittal motion on Mass Transit Act designed to defer action on the legislation pending conclusion and evaluation of certain engineering studies and plans. (Yeas 190, nays 214.)	Yes.
June 25	H.R. 3881. A bill to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems in metropolitan and other urban areas. (Yeas 212, nays 189.)	No.
June 30	H. Res. 793. Providing for waiving of all points of order against H.R. 11812, making appropriations for foreign assistance and related agencies for fiscal year 1965. (Yeas 222, nays 162.)	No.
July 1	H.R. 11812. Recommittal motion. Designed to effect a cut of $247,800,000 through reductions in 6 categories of economic assistance funds. (Yeas 198, nays 208.)	Yes.
July 1	H.R. 11812. Making appropriations for foreign assistance and related agencies for fiscal year 1965. (Yeas 231, nays 174.)	Yes.
July 2	H. Res. 789. A bill to provide for the concurrence of the House of Representatives to the Senate amendments to H.R. 7152, the civil rights bill. (Yeas 289, nays 126.)	Yes.
July 2	H. Res. 795. A bill providing for the appointment of a special committee of the House of Representatives to investigate the campaign expenditures of the various candidates for election to the House of Representatives. (Yeas 264, nays 92.)	Yes.
July 2	S. 2. Conference report. A bill to establish water resources research centers and to promote a more adequate national program of water research. (Yeas 347, nays 0.)	Not voting.[1]
July 21	H.R. 319. A bill to protect postal patrons from morally offensive mail matter. (Yeas 325, nays 19.)	Yes.
July 21	H.R. 11611. A bill to establish a National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress. (Yeas 259, nays 75.)	Yes.
July 22	H. Res. 738. The rule providing for the consideration of, and 4 hours of debate on H.R. 3846, a bill to establish a land and water conservation fund to assist the States and Federal agencies in meeting present and future outdoor recreation demands and needs of the American people. (Yeas 337, nays 8.)	Yes.
July 28	H.R. 3873. A bill to permit certain owners of fishing boats to receive medical care and hospitalization without charge at hospitals of the Public Health Service. (Yeas 202. nays 170.)	No.
July 29	H. Res. 802. The closed rule with 5 hours of debate on H.R. 11865. (Yeas 350, nays 29.)	Yes.
July 29	H.R. 11865. A bill to increase benefits under the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system and to provide child's insurance benefits beyond the age of 18 while in school, to provide widow's benefits at age 60 on a reduced basis, to provide benefits for certain individuals not otherwise eligible at age 72, to improve the actuarial status of the trust funds and to extend coverage. (Yeas 388, nays 8.)	Yes.
July 30	H. Res. 803. Providing for disagreeing to Senate amendments to H.R. 11049, to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees in the Federal Government. (Yeas 244, nays 131.)	No.
July 30	H.R. 9070. A bill to establish a national preservation system for the permanent good of the whole people. (Yeas 373, nays 1.)	Yes.
Aug. 3	H.R. 1096. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to cooperate with the State of Wisconsin in the designation and administration of the Ice Age National Scientific Reserve in the State of Wisconsin, and for other purposes. On motion to suspend rules and pass. (⅔ required.) (Yeas 164, nays 154.)	Not voting.[2]
Aug. 3	H.R. 3672. A bill to provide for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Savery-Pot Hook, Bostwick Park, and Fruitland Mesa participating reclamation projects under the Colorado River Storage Project Act. (Yeas 250, nays 67.)	Not voting.[2]
Aug. 4	H.R. 10939. Conference report. Making appropriations for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1965. (Yeas 351, nays 0.)	Yes.
Aug. 4	H.R. 10939. Motion to recede and concur in Senate amendment No. 14 to H.R. 10939, which made 35 percent of funds for repair, alteration, and conversion of naval vessels available for work in privately owned shipyards. (Yeas 186, nays 178.)	Yes.
Aug. 7	H.J. Res. 1145, to promote the maintenance of international peace and security in southeast Asia. (Yeas 416, nays 0.)	Yes.
Aug. 7	H.R. 11377. Record vote to reverse action taken by the Committee of the Whole to strike enacting clause. (Yeas 197, nays 225.)	Yes.
Aug. 7	H.R. 11377. A bill to mobilize the human and financial resources of the Nation to combat poverty in the United States (antipoverty bill). On Landrum substitute amendment. (Yeas 228, nays 190.)	No.
Aug. 8	H.R. 11377. Recommittal motion to substitute the Frelinghuysen bill to deal with problems of poverty in the United States, the proposed Human Resources Development Act of 1964. (Yeas 117, nays 295.)	Yes.
Aug. 8	H.R. 11377. A bill to mobilize the human and financial resources of the Nation to combat poverty in the United States. (Yeas 226, nays 184.)	No.
Aug. 11	H.R. 1927. With amendments, to revise the pension program for veterans of World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict, and their widows and children. (Yeas 388, nays 0.)	Yes.
Aug. 11	H.R. 5990. Amended, to amend the District of Columbia Charitable Solicitation Act to require certain findings before the issuance of a solicitation permit thereunder. (Yeas 301, nays 81.)	Yes.
Aug. 12	H.R. 836. The rule for the consideration of S. 1451, the conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to render judgment upon certain claims arising under the Trading With the Enemy Act. (Yeas 374, nays 3.)	Yes.
Aug. 12	S. 1627. Enabling the United States to contribute its share of expenses of the International Commission for Supervision and Control in Laos. (Yeas 268, nays 89.)	No.
Aug. 13	H.R. 11296. Recommittal motion, designed to reduce by $250,000,000 the funds provided by amendment No. 204 for research and development by NASA. (Yeas 114, nays 270.)	Yes.
Aug. 13	H.R. 12175. Recommittal motion with instructions. (Yeas 184, nays 194.)	Yes.
Aug. 13	H.R. 12175. A bill to extend and amend laws relating to housing, urban renewal, and community facilities. (Yeas 308, nays 68.)	Yes.
Aug. 14	S. 1006. House passed with amendments, to increase authorizations for subsidizing the construction of fishing vessels, and returned the bill to the Senate. (Yeas 198, nays 124.)	No.
Aug. 14	H.R. 663. To provide an additional $10,000 for the expenses of the Committee on Education and Labor. (Yeas 115, nays 156.)	No.
Aug. 17	H. Con. Res. 343. To express the sense of the Congress with respect to the enforcement of the provisions of art. 19 of the United Nations Charter. (Yeas 351, nays 0.)	Not voting.[1]
Aug. 17	S. 524 (in lieu of H.R. 6242). To provide for the registration of contractors of migrant agricultural workers. (Yeas 393, nays 7.)	Not voting.[1]
Aug. 17	H.R. 9000. To amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act so as to provide further for the prevention of accidents in coal mines. (Yeas 202, nays 151.)	Not voting (paired against).
Aug. 18	H.R. 1839. To provide for free importation of certain wild animals and to provide for the imposition of quotas on certain meat and meat products. (Yeas 232, nays 149.)	No.
Aug. 18	H.R. 8864. To carry out the obligations of the United States under the International Coffee Agreement of 1962. (Yeas 183, nays 194.)	No.
Aug. 18	H.R. 8000. To impose a tax on acquisitions of certain foreign securities in order to equalize costs of longer term financing in the United States and in markets abroad. (Yeas 221, nays 147.)	No.
Aug. 18	S. 1007. To guarantee electric consumers in the Pacific Northwest first call on electric energy generated at Federal hydroelectric plants in that region and to guarantee electricity consumers in other regions reciprocal priority. (Yeas 230, nays 134.)	No.
Aug. 19	S. 3049. To extend and amend laws relating to housing, urban renewal, and community facilities, and thus cleared the bill for Presidential action. (Yeas 310, nays 70.)	Yes.
Aug. 19	H. Res. 845. The rule under which H.R. 11926 was considered, to deny jurisdiction to the Federal courts to hear and decide State legislative reapportionment cases. (Yeas 242, nays 148.)	No.
Aug. 19	H.R. 11926. To deny jurisdiction to the Federal courts to hear and decide State legislative reapportionment cases. (Yeas 218, nays 175.)	No.
Aug. 20	H.R. 9586. To provide for the establishment of a National Council on the Arts to assist in the growth and development of the arts in the United States. (Yeas 213, nays 135.)	Yes.
Sept. 1	S. 2701. To provide for a study to determine a site for construction of a sea level canal between the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans. (Yeas 320, nays 23.)	Yes.
Sept. 1	H.R. 4487. To prevent or minimize injury to fish and wildlife from the use of insecticides and pesticides. (Yeas 236, nays 110.)	No.
Sept. 3	H.R. 12298. A recommittal motion designed to tighten the definition of friendly governments for purposes of title I transactions. (Yeas 183, nays 175.)	Yes.
Sept. 3	H.R. 12298. To extend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954. (Yeas 349, nays 6.)	Not voting.[1]
Sept. 3	S. 2220. To encourage physicians and dentists who have received student loans under certain Government programs to practice in areas having a shortage of physicians or dentists. (Yeas 140, nays 160.)	No.
Sept. 22	H.R. 12633. Making supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1965. (Yeas 208, nays 103.)	Not voting (paired for).
Sept. 23	H.R. 1096. Authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to cooperate with the State of Wisconsin in the designation and administration of the Ice Age National Scientific Reserve in the State of Wisconsin. H. Res. 882, the rule under which the legislation was considered, had been adopted earlier by a voice vote. (Yeas 180, nays 118.)	Not voting (paired against).
Oct. 1	H. Res. 892. The rule making in order the consideration of H.J. Res. 1183, making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 1965, and thus obviated the consideration of the legislation. (Yeas 158, nays 193.)	No.
Oct. 1	S. 3060. Recommittal motion, designed to provide a 2-year extension of the impacted area aid program and to alter subjects taught under title III was rejected. (Yeas 107, nays 236.)	Yes.
Oct. 1	S. 3060. Conference report. To extend and amend the National Defense Education Act of 1958 and Public Laws 815 and 874 of 81st Cong., and sent the legislation to the Senate. (Yeas 320, nays 20.)	Yes.

---

[1] If present, would have voted "Yes."

[2] If present, would have voted "No."

KIM SOOK HEE AND KIM LOU

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2759) for the relief of Kim Sook Hee and Kim Lou.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the Administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, section 205(c), relating to the number of petitions which may be approved in behalf of eligible orphans, shall be inapplicable in the case of a petition filed in behalf of Kim Sook Hee by Mr. and Mrs. Anthony Caucutt, citizens of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JAMES D. W. BLYTH AND OTHERS

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 7532) for the relief of James D. W. Blyth, his wife Jean Mary Blyth, and their daughter Penelope Jean Blyth.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, James D. W. Blyth, his wife Jean Mary Blyth, and their daughter Penelope Jean Blyth shall be held and considered to have complied with the requirements of section 316 of the Act as they relate to residence and physical presence.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FOTINI DIMANTOPOULOU

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1684) for the relief of Fotini Dimantopoulou.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Fotini Dimantopoulou shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota control officer to deduct one number from the quota for the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEOBARDO L. GONZALEZ

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2499) for the relief of Leobardo L. Gonzalez.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Leobardo L. Gonzalez may be naturalized upon compliance with all the requirements of title III of the Immigration and Nationality Act, except that no period of residence or physical presence within the United States or any State shall be required in addition to his residence and physical presence within the United States since September 2, 1961.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LINUS HAN

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2698) for the relief of Linus Han.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Linus Han may be naturalized upon compliance with all the requirements of title III of the Immigration and Nationality Act, except that no period of residence or physical presence within the United States or any State shall be required in addition to his residence and physical presence within the United States since January 21, 1963.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. JORGE A. PICAZA

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2730) for the relief of Dr. Jorge A. Picaza.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Doctor Jorge A. Picaza may be naturalized upon compliance with all of the requirements of title III of the Immigration and Nationality Act, except that no period of residence or physical presence within the United States or any State shall be required in addition to his residence and physical presence within the United States since June 19, 1944.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHO SEUNG MAN AND KIM CHUL HEE

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 11294) for the relief of Cho Seung Man and Kim Chul Hee.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Cho Seung Man and Kim Chul Hee may be classified as eligible orphans within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of the Act, upon approval of petitions filed in their behalf by Mrs. Carl Volz, a citizen and national, respectively, of the United States, pursuant to section 205(b) of the Act, subject to all the conditions in that section relating to eligible orphans. Section 205(c) of Immigration and Nationality Act, relating to the number of petitions that shall be approved, shall be nonapplicable in these cases.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANGELO IANNUZZI

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H.R. 11512) for the relief of Angelo Iannuzzi.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 101(b)(1)(B) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Angelo Iannuzzi shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien minor son of Mr. and Mrs. John B. Campolong, citizens of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WOO SOON KOOK

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H.R. 11956) for the relief of Woo Soon Kook.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Woo Soon Kook may be classified as an eligible orphan within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of the Act, upon approval of a petition filed in his behalf by Mr. and Mrs. John T. King, citizens of the United States, pursuant to section 205(b) of the Act, subject to all the conditions in that section relating to eligible orphans. Section 205(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, relating to the number of petitions which may be approved, shall be inapplicable in this case.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SOO BONG KIM

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 11317) for the relief of Soo Bong Kim.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Soo Bong Kim may be classified as an eligible orphan within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of the Act, upon approval of a petition filed in his behalf by Mr. and Mrs. Keith King, citizens of the United States, pursuant to section 205(b) of the Act, subject to all the conditions in that section relating to eligible orphans. Section 205(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, relating to the number of petitions which may be approved, shall be inapplicable in this case.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. FEIGHAN, of Ohio: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Soo Bong Kim shall be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor: *Provided,* That the administrative authorities find that the said Soo Bong Kim is coming to the United States for the purpose of being adopted by Mr. and Mrs. Keith King, citizens of the United States, that the preadoption requirements, if any, of the state of proposed adoption have been met, and that she is found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. In the event the adoption does not occur within the time prescribed by the Attorney General, the said Soo Bong Kim shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 242 and 243 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event that a final decree of adoption is issued, the said Soo Bong Kim may be classified as an eligible orphan within the meaning of section 101(b)(1) (F) of the Act and the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Soo Bong Kim as of the date of her entry pursuant to this Act upon submission and approval of an application for adjustment of status under section 245 of the Act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BASILIO KING, ET AL.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 1179) for the relief of Basilio King, his wife, and their children, with amendments of the Senate thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

(1) Page 1, line 3, strike out [101(a)(7)(b)] and insert: 101(a)(27)(B)

(2) Page 1, lines 5 and 6, strike out [Henry Alexander Victor King,]

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NORA ISABELLA SAMUELLI

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2413) for the relief of Nora Isabella Samuelli.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman reserve his objection so that I may address myself to the Senate bill.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I will reserve the right to object so that the gentleman may explain.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Colorado reserves the right to object.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, this bill, S. 2413, would grant to a lady who for approximately 3½ years had worked for the U.S. Information Agency in the American legation in Rumania. This lady was born in Rumania. She was arrested by the Communist regime and charged with being an American spy and put in jail for 12 years. Her sister, who was also born in Rumania, was working in the British Embassy or legation in Rumania and she likewise was arrested and charged with being a British spy and was incarcerated for the same period of years—12 years. The sister who worked for the British Embassy upon her release from prison and with the payment of $6,000 made to the head of the secret Communist shakedown operation obtained an exit visa from Rumania, and was then given citizenship by the British Government.

The lady who worked for the U.S. Embassy was released from the Communist prison at the same time. The same relative in the free world also paid $6,000 to secure her exit permit from the Rumanian regime. But there the similarity stopped.

This bill seeks to enable the beneficiary to file a petition for naturalization immediately. This Rumanian woman who worked for the U.S. Information Agency in Rumania and was incarcerated for 12 years is now stateless and is presently in the United States on a visitor's visa.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

SOCIAL SECURITY AND MEDICAL CARE

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRAY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I believe it is most unfortunate that the Congress is adjourning without taking final action on the bill to increase social security benefits.

On July 29 the House passed a bill providing for an increase of 5 percent in social security payments. This amount was not really adequate because the cost of living has increased by 8 percent since the last benefit increase. The Senate changed the increase to a $7 increase.

BILL WOULD HAVE IMPROVED COVERAGE

There were other important changes in this legislation.

It would have allowed persons over age 72 to qualify for benefits with only three-quarters of covered employment.

It would have allowed payments for a surviving child until age 22 if the child is attending school. Presently such benefits end at age 18.

There are still flaws and imperfections in the social security system, which we are trying to correct. Some improvements would have been made by this legislation, and it is regrettable that the bill has been killed.

This social security increase was killed because of the administration's insistence upon the inclusion of hospitalization benefits in this bill, to which the conferees of the House and Senate would not agree. So we have no opportunity to vote on a conference report which would have so greatly improved social security.

The Congress is the custodian of the social security program. This is a sacred trust, upon the faithful execution of which depends to a great degree the happiness, security and well-being of our citizenry as well as the economic security of our Nation.

DANGERS TO SOCIAL SECURITY SYSTEM

May I repeat the warning I made to this body in 1960:

> History is filled with instances of the currency of a country becoming valueless, thus destroying the standards of living of the people. I well remember at the close of World War II when the Chinese rickshaw boy in Shanghai was earning a million Chinese dollars a day, yet he could not buy a loaf of bread with that million dollars. Many countries have gone through similar crises.

You say that such a condition could not happen here. I do not believe that it will, but it could. The interest on our national debt is now $10 billion a year. Our national debt when I spoke on this subject in 1960—just 4 years ago—was $291 billion and now it is raised to $316 billion.

I repeat again that we must do a better job in preserving the people's money, not only for those drawing social security today, but to protect the purchasing value for those who will not begin drawing for 10, 20, 30, or 40 years.

SOCIAL SECURITY MUST NOT BECOME A POLITICAL FOOTBALL

Social security has become a way of life in planning for the future of an overwhelming majority of families in America. Social security is not and must not be made a political issue.

I well remember that before President Eisenhower was elected in 1952 allegations were made that he would take social security away or destroy it. A song was even used, one line of which went: "Don't let them take it away."

Social security was not taken away in the 8 years of the Eisenhower administration any more than it was in the years under President Truman.

When Eisenhower took office in 1953 he aptly described the social security system as the "cornerstone of the Government's programs to promote the economic security of the individual." During his administration coverage was extended to approximately 12 million additional workers, including farmers, ministers, self-employed, farm laborers, teachers, domestic workers, and a host of others. Benefits were liberalized both for retirees and for survivors. A lower retirement age for women was established and two increases in benefit levels were enacted. There were 4.6 million monthly beneficiaries under the social security system in June 1952; but by June 1960 this figure had increased to 14.3 million. The average retired worker benefit increased from $42 per month in 1952 to $74 in 1960. Disability benefits under social security were added during that period, greatly easing the problems of our disabled.

I was happy to have participated in the broad strengthening of this most important program.

GREAT PROGRESS MADE IN LAST THREE DECADES

Perhaps I have had more reason to be interested in and to follow the development of social security because of my experience. In 1937 I was appointed president of the department of public welfare in my home county of Morgan in Indiana. Although social security legislation had been passed 2 years earlier, covered workers began paying 1 percent of their wages into the fund in 1937 and benefits could be drawn 3 years later, in 1940. The average benefit at that time was $22.71 per month for retirees. In 1937 it was the responsibility of the Morgan County Public Welfare Department to pass on old-age pensions, blind pensions, and authorization for the payments of aid to dependent children. During those years I became increasingly aware of the great need for social secuity, the first payment of which was then 3 years in the future.

I have watched the development of social security through these years and I am proud of the results which we have accomplished. Not only has social security added to the health, happiness, and well-being of our older citizens and kept the wolf from the door of the families of deceased workers, but by providing a supply of steady income it has prevented severe recessions.

LOWER RETIREMENT AGE

The House Ways and Means Committee has before it many bills that would change social security provisions. For years several Members, including myself, have sought to lower the voluntary retirement age to 60 years. We made some progress when we succeeded in lowering the retirement age for women from 65 to 62 and later allowed men optional retirement at age 62.

I am aware that a lowered retirement will increase the cost of the program. However, I believe that such retirement at age 60 should be conditional upon the retiree giving up his job; this will do much to relieve unemployment. The great majority of those who are physically able to continue work past age 60 will do so; those who would retire would release a job for someone who is unemployed. Careful consideration should be given to this in this age of automation.

MEDICAL CARE FOR THE AGED POSES PROBLEMS

Medical cost is a problem for all Americans, especially so for our elderly whose income is lessened and whose infirmities increase. The cost of medical care has risen sharply in recent years, partly because the quality of such care has increased. People today are spared much suffering and given renewed health.

In the social security bill recently passed by the House, the social security tax on the income of the wage earner, half paid by him and half paid by the employer, would have reached 9.6 percent by 1971. Senator RIBICOFF, former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare under President Kennedy, has stated that we cannot safely raise the social security tax beyond 10 percent.

I believe that we can agree that medical service should not be denied to anyone because he or she has not the money to pay for such services. Neither do we believe that that unfortunate person should be forced to mortgage his home or pay out his last meager savings.

However, we should completely study whether those who have plenty should have their medical services paid. Also, we should carefully study how these medical services should be paid, by added social security tax or by a general tax. The responsibility of the States and local governments should be considered, as well.

OTHER FORMS OF MEDICAL ASSISTANCE

For many years persons who lacked the financial resources to take care of themselves have received help under old age assistance. This has included payment for medical services where needed, but we are hoping for a better method than this.

Since the passage of the Kerr-Mills Act of 1960, many States have provided additional help on a joint Federal-State program to persons over age 65 who can take care of themselves normally but who cannot pay expensive medical bills. Expanded aid under this program in Indiana was killed by the Governor's veto. The veto was later declared unconstitutional, but the State has not yet adequately implemented the program.

MANY IN AMERICA HAVE A FEAR OF THE FEDERAL BUREAUCRAT MOVING INTO THE MEDICAL FIELD

Many in America have a deep fear of the Federal bureaucracy moving into the medical field. Health insurance, which most Americans carry, has proven very successful. It also is expensive because medical services are expensive. Unfortunately there are those who cannot afford to purchase adequate health insurance. This especially applies to older people for whom such insurance would be even more expensive.

Representative FRANK BOW, of Ohio, has introduced legislation whereby the Government would subsidize health insurance. This would keep the Government out of the medical business, yet give to the aged the same health care received by those who can pay for this health insurance protection.

Such a plan would allow each person to decide the type of insurance coverage and supplement it as he or she sees fit. It would keep the Federal Government out of the medical profession inasmuch as it merely would be handling money and not be directly involved in providing services. It would not necessitate any new Federal bureaucracy.

People having such insurance through an employer or union plan, through a fraternal organization or other group, could continue coverage and receive this financial help in meeting the cost. Any group plan would be eligible provided it met Government standards.

Such a program would be expensive, for adequate health care is expensive.

I trust that Congress will adequately study this entire problem to determine what should be done for the better health of all Americans and not to form another unresponsive Federal bureaucracy.

MUST KEEP SOCIAL SECURITY STRONG

It is sad that Congress did not approve this increase in social security instead of allowing the problem of medical care to block the entire program of improvements.

It would be whistling in the dark if we were not aware of the problems facing the social security system. Social security failed in Germany under Bismarck because the national economy was not strong enough. France is faced with serious problems in its social security system. We must not let this happen here.

We must realize that there is nothing that is free. All benefits that are paid today or will be paid tomorrow are the result of the work and endeavor of the women and men of America. Social security payments today and tomorrow must be sustained by an expanding economy, and we must preserve the purchasing power of the dollar. We owe a solemn obligation to all Americans to see that social security never is made a political football for the ambitions of any person or any party.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I deeply regret that at the close of this session the provisions of the bill H.R. 11865, which would have liberalized the Social Security Act have not been agreed to. It is very unfortunate that the conferees were not able to go forward with this bill, which had such unanimous support in the House, because of amendments placed in the legislation by the Senate.

In failing to enact the House bill into law we have delayed many of our older people and many others who benefit under the Social Security Act from their receipt of benefits, which I hope we will be able to provide by law in the next Congress.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I would appreciate it very much if my colleague from Indiana would yield to me.

Mr. BRAY. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARVEY].

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. At this time I wish to pay tribute to one of our Hoosier colleagues who is retiring at the end of this Congress. I refer to DON BRUCE, the gentleman from the 11th District of Indiana.

Mr. BRUCE has served two terms in the House, and not only has endeared himself to the Members of the House but also has achieved an outstanding record of contributions to his district, to his State, and to his country. We are proud indeed that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRUCE] has had this opportunity to demonstrate his great qualities and to make this contribution.

I am likewise sorry that he will not be serving in the House in the next Congress, the 89th Congress. I wish for him and for his wife Hope much success. I know they deserve all of the happiness I am sure is in store for them.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRAY. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I join in what my colleague, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARVEY] has said. We shall all miss DON BRUCE.

I believe it should be pointed out that his leaving this body has been voluntary on his part. There is no question in my mind that if he had elected to return here he would have been renominated and reelected overwhelmingly.

Having said that much, may I also say that the House of Representatives has lost one of its most able Members—hard working, dedicated, intelligent and articulate. He has served with honor and distinction on the great Committee on Education and Labor and on the Committee on Un-American Activities. In the work of both of those committees he has made a magnificent contribution to the welfare of his country and has shed the light of glory upon the great Hoosier commonwealth from which we come, the State of Indiana.

In closing I wish to say to DON: I trust, when we come back here next year, you will have occasion to come back this way from time to time.

I do not believe that his political star has sunk. I would say, rather, it is on the ascendancy.

We in the Indiana delegation in the House of Representatives on this side of the aisle—and this is not to say we have not had most friendly relationships with our friends from Indiana on the other side of the aisle—the seven of us who have served in the past 2 years, certainly have had a close knit, very friendly attitude and spirit of cooperation among all, in which we have tried to represent the people of the State who sent us here.

So I say to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRUCE] as he leaves this body I am sorry that he will not be with us next year, but I wish him well in whatever he may undertake in the future.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleagues in the praise of Mr. DONALD BRUCE. He has just finished his second term in Congress. Few men have left more of an imprint in this body in those brief 4 years. He is a man who has not yet reached the prime of life, but his work has added greatly to this body. I do not believe there is a more articulate speaker or a more persuasive speaker on the evils of communism and the dangers of communism than our colleague from Indiana, DONALD BRUCE. I am certain that he has a great public life ahead of him. I know we all join in wishing him and his lovely wife and children the very best.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to our colleague from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR].

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, there is little that can be said in addition to what my Hoosier colleagues have already said about our friend and colleague, DONALD BRUCE. We have enjoyed serving with him during the years he has been here, and we have certainly profited, as have all Members of the House, by his presence and his companionship. As has been pointed out, he has served with vigor, dedication, and distinction upon two difficult and important committees. To each of these he has contributed greatly. The fact that he is departing voluntarily from this House is significant, and I join those others who predict for him a long and brilliant future. I, too, would wish for him, his wife, and his children much happiness and much success.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROUDEBUSH].

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my Republican colleagues from Indiana in expressing my sorrow and my regret on the fact that DONALD C. BRUCE, our 11th District Congressman, is leaving the House of Representatives. I have known DON now for something like 20 years, long before he became a Member of this fine body. I well remember his fine work as a news commentator in his home city of Indianapolis, Ind. His contributions to community life were many, but we remember him best during those years as an intelligent and effective leader of those forces which have lent their energies to the task of alerting the American public to the threat of Communist subversion. He continued this struggle throughout his service in the Congress as an effective member of the House Un-American Activities Committee.

If the gentleman will yield further, I will say that I have known many men in my time, but I would say that DONALD C. BRUCE is one of the finest Americans it has been my privilege to know. Certainly he has done a wonderful job these past 4 years as a member of two of the most important committees of this House. His participation in and his contribution to good government are unquestioned. I join with my colleagues in expressing again my sorrow and in extending my best wishes for future success to him and my warmest and best regards to his lovely wife, Hope, and to his fine children.

In closing I will say, "DON, the House of Representatives will have a big empty seat as a result of your absence and I know your colleagues here will miss you very much."

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS].

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding so that I may asosciate myself with the remarks of the distinguished gentleman in the well, the remarks of the minority leader and of our colleagues from the State of Indiana.

DON BRUCE has spoken often for me in my district in Maryland and I am very happy to say a few words for him and to him today in the House. On many occasions DON has come into Maryland at my request to address various groups on matters of public interest. He has always brought with him good will, good information, and has brought to the audiences that he has addressed a new concept and understanding of public issues.

In the time we have served in the House together—and we came here together—DON BRUCE and I have on occasion differed on specific issues, but I think that the votes that we have cast have all been good Republican votes in the sense that we are both seeking to preserve in this country individual freedom, to preserve and maintain the marketplace of America as a center of free enterprise.

DON's many visits to Maryland have emphasized the fact that the party in which we share membership is a great national party, drawing from its roots many sources of inspiration and guidance and comprehending all the concerns and interests of America.

I hope that as DON goes on to other work he will continue to carry with him this message that our party is one of the great and positive influences which is moving forward in America today, covering a broad spectrum of American life.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. STINSON].

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Speaker, as a Member of the freshman class of the 88th Congress, I would like to take this opportunity to thank DONALD BRUCE for all the help he has given to the new Members this year. He has been unselfish with his time. He has given us advice and leadership. He has been truly wonderful in making himself available in behalf of the freshmen Members. I consider DON BRUCE a very dear personal friend of mine, as do the other Members of the freshman class. I want to wish him every possible success for the future in anything he may undertake. I consider him one of the truly great Americans of this country. I know he will continue to serve his country in any way he possibly can.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. Chenoweth].

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in paying tribute to our colleague, Don Bruce. I regret to see him leave the House. I consider him one of our most able, and capable Members. I have formed a most favorable impression of him in the time that I have served with him in this body, and I have greatly enjoyed my association with him. He is an outstanding American and his retirement from Congress is a great loss to this country. I consider him an authority on many subjects, including foreign policy and our relations with other nations. In my opinion he is one of our best informed men on the Cuban situation. I want to thank Donald Bruce for his many courtesies to me. I wish him success in all of his plans for the future.

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRAY. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in extending a word of praise and thanks for the service that Don Bruce has given to this House of Representatives and also to the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I happen to be one who came to this House of Representatives as a Member at the same time as Mr. Bruce. It did not take very long before all of us realized that here was a man who was dedicated to the cause for which he has devoted his life.

Mr. Speaker, I served with Don Bruce on the House Committee on Un-American Activities. I have been with him on the platform. I have observed him here in the House of Representatives. I have profound respect not only for what he says but for what he is and what he stands for.

Mr. Speaker, I remember many men because they passed through these halls and have been Members of the House of Representatives. I will remember some for what they have said. I will remember Don Bruce for what he has done for America.

Mr. Speaker, I extend to Don Bruce my greetings and my best wishes for his services which will continue in behalf of this country, even outside the membership of this House.

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRAY. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Indiana for yielding to me at this time.

I too want to add a word of commendation to our good friend Don Bruce, the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. Speaker, I was elected the same year Don was elected and now have served 4 years in this House of Representatives with him. I have always found him very ready with the good word for our country.

Mr. Speaker, I commend Don Bruce for his understanding of the problems of our day and for the articulate manner in which he has represented his district, his State, and the Nation in Congress.

My wife, Marjorie, and I have enjoyed knowing and visiting with Don and Hope.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Don for his efforts in this House of Representatives and pay tribute to his wonderful representation in Congress in upholding the constitutional and representative form of government.

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRAY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a pleasure to join my colleagues in paying tribute and honor to a good friend and colleague, Don Bruce, on his leaving the Congress.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, I feel that I have been made a better man, a better American, a better Congressman for having known and worked with Don. We need more men in America today, Democrats and Republicans alike, of every race, color, religion, and creed, who have the courage of their convictions; who are willing to say "no" to socialism and Communist aggression; who are willing to say "yes" to individual initiative, freedom, and free enterprise.

Mr. Speaker, we need more men like Don Bruce. We say, "Thank you, Don, for the tremendous job you have done in the Congress and we wish you continued health, happiness, and success in the future."

Mr. BROMWELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRAY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. BROMWELL. Mr. Speaker, I feel that my affection and regard for the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Bruce] needs no voucher. Nevertheless, I cannot forbear saying a few words on this occasion, in the company of colleagues who are wishing Don Bruce well.

Mr. Speaker, service with Don in the House of Representatives has been an edifying experience. I should like to say that in my opinion the true nature and the extent of his service to the people during the past 4 years may not be fully realized for some time to come.

Don Bruce has a genuine quality which is a part of the fabric of our national life. To be sure, the House of Representatives will miss his presence, but his work will continue, in which we wish him well.

Mr. BRAY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRAY. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the very fine remarks that have been made by the gentleman in the well of the House and all of the colleagues of Don Bruce here today. I do not wish to repeat those. I think I cannot paraphrase them in a better manner, but I do want to join in this just and deserving tribute to this man who has not only served well but who is now exemplifying his tenacious hold and his driving, throbbing, dynamic, and pulsating desire to help the Nation by continuing work in this coming election, and even involving a trip to those Ozark hills of home about which I speak so often, in recently helping me with my election.

Our best wishes to him and his family. We expect to see him on the national scene.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that those who have spoken on the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Bruce] may have permission to revise and extend their remarks, and also that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Albert). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRAY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I have only known Don Bruce for a relatively few years, but I have become well acquainted with him during that time. I deeply appreciate that friendship. I know of the excellent work he has done on the committees on which he has served. I am familiar with his total dedication to duty here in the Congress. He will be missed not only because of his ability, but on account of his integrity, and I hope and trust that in the future there will be a place for him in a legislative, executive, or other responsible position where talents are badly needed.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, I was surprised to learn of the retirement of our colleague, Donald Bruce. It was my privilege to officiate as Speaker pro tempore on Special Orders in the House numerous times at the request of our beloved Speaker, Mr. McCormack—and Mr. Bruce actively participated in the addresses and discussions with the membership.

He was an able and articulate individual who, because of his previous training as a commentator, gave promise of the intellectual energies he so well displayed in his work in the Congress.

His vast store of acquired knowledge in the field of communism made for him a reputation for being an authority on the evils and dangers confronting the liberty-loving nations of the world.

Certainly this energetic, brilliant, sincere, and inspiring political leader should not leave public life permanently. He has a great future in public service and we wish for him and his family good fortune, health, and happiness.

MEDICARE SHOULD BE UNDER SOCIAL SECURITY

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, heading the list of unfinished business of the

88th Congress is legislation to provide medical care for our senior citizens, to raise the ceiling on retirement benefits, and to authorize a continuation of survivors' benefits to children after their 18th birthday provided they are still in school completing their education.

This is sad news for millions of our citizens who have waited anxiously for Congress to act during this session. The hardest blow falls upon those citizens in their golden years who urgently need medical care and do not have the funds to cover the ever rising costs of hospitalization and connected services.

Some opponents of this pending legislation have claimed that our country cannot afford these programs, that medicare would run a deficit which we cannot afford. The pessimistic estimate of the annual deficit for medicare is stated as $200 million. It is ironic that our country could afford to hand over in excess of $2 billion to the Communist Dictator Tito, yet we cannot afford medicare for our own people. The Tito handout would cover the costs of the most pessimistic deficits on medicare for a period of 10 years. Something is basically wrong when our own people must be denied remedy for their most urgent needs, yet we pump billions of their dollars into a program to prevent the collapse of our proven enemies.

A REPORT ON THE 88TH CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 40 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, when the 2d session of the 88th Congress opened 10 months ago, the Nation was despondent and bewildered. We had just lost a beloved young President in an act of madness rarely paralleled in history. I had a strong personal admiration for the President, an admiration which all Americans shared. John F. Kennedy achieved and inspired much in his few short years.

In the past 10 months, we as a nation have recovered from the sense of shock and bereavement which followed this great tragedy. Truly we had to do that. A great nation—and no one knew this better than John Kennedy himself—mourns for its leaders but must then turn resolutely to the future. We have emerged from our melancholy and are once more moving forward.

We are moving forward, Mr. Speaker, because we are a single people, united in purpose. Republicans and Democrats alike, we rallied behind a new President in a moment of crisis and gave him our support. I must say that he met the sudden challenge thrust upon him. And Congress, too, Mr. Speaker, rose grandly to its responsibilities. The same body which a year ago was accused of indifference, ineptness, and indecision has shown that it, too, possesses the reservoir of resourcefulness necessary to respond to crisis. Mr. Speaker, I say to the House and to my constituents of the Sixth Congressional District of New York that the Congress has performed in commendable fashion.

I say this without complacency, for I continue to believe that we must reform our rules and procedures if we are to meet the challenges of the 20th century in the way they must be met. But I believe we have demonstrated that Congress remains a vigorous and vital organism within our democratic structure.

The 88th Congress, which is terminating its work today, began slowly but finished with a rush. This Congress has made giant steps forward in the fields of civil rights, tax liberalization, urban mass transit, education, public health, the preservation of natural resources, consumer protection, the fight against poverty, veterans affairs, and housing. Mr. Speaker, I am proud and privileged to have been associated with these steps forward. I have given my support to forward-looking legislation because I believe that our society is dynamic and that progress is made by moving ahead and not backward. I take satisfaction in the contribution I have made to the record of the 88th Congress.

Our most noteworthy achievement, beyond any doubt, was the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. For a century, American society has deprived its Negro members of the rights that were theirs under the Constitution. We have established in the past year that we can no longer perpetuate injustice. Since I have been in Congress, I have been relentlessly devoted to the cause of civil rights legislation, having introduced many bills covering all aspects of the issue. In this session I was the first member of my party to cosponsor the administration's omnibus rights bill in the House. This was followed by committee testimony and floor speeches. I was the third member of the House to sign the discharge petition aimed at winning early action. It was heartening that both parties supported the cause overwhelmingly. One of my proudest possessions is a pen President Johnson used to sign the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which he presented to me in recognition of my work on the bill.

The Civil Rights Act is a fair and reasonable law. It protects the rights which are the substance of the American tradition. Its sections strike at discrimination in public accommodations, voting, employment, and the distribution of Federal funds. It grants to the Justice Department the necessary authority for enforcing the equal rights law, but, at the same time, it seeks to minimize the adjustment probems by empowering a Community Relations Service to assist in peaceful implementation at the local level. I am convinced of the law's constitutionality. I do not claim that it will at once cure a malady that has endured a hundred years. But it is a wise and necessary step toward repairing a breach in our social fabric. The American people, in their understanding and decency, will help the law achieve its intended objectives.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress also acted with decision this session to lighten the very heavy tax burden that for too many years has been carried by both individuals and enterprises. I would have liked to see tax cuts that were not only more extensive, by raising personal exemptions, but also more selective, bringing relief to the elderly, the homeowner, those who must finance a college education, and others who are unjustly penalized by the law.

At the same time, I fought the discrimination that bestows privileges on many groups, such as the oil industry, which enjoys the 27½-percent depletion allowance. Some of my recommendations were acted upon, Mr. Speaker, and were included in the omnibus tax bill that was presented to the House. I hope to report success in a subsequent Congress on the recommendations that were not. Despite its shortcomings, the tax cut bill was a step forward and I supported it wholeheartedly. I regard the vigorous growth of our economy over the past several months as one of the rewarding consequences of this legislation.

I note with satisfaction, Mr. Speaker, that the 88th Congress has been designated by the President of the United States as "the education Congress," in recognition of the measures it has enacted to improve American education. We passed the Higher Education Facilities Act, of which I was a cosponsor, to provide funds for a 5-year building program for colleges and universities. We made available additional money for low-interest loans to students. We passed the Health Professions Education Assistance Act, which offers matching grants for the construction of facilities to teach medicine and dentistry and establishes a program of loans for needy students in the vital medical fields. For my efforts in behalf of this legislation, which I had advanced since I came to Congress, President Kennedy gave me a pen he used to sign the bill.

I also want to point out that the celebrated antipoverty bill, of which I was a sponsor, is essentially an education and training bill, designed to end the terrible cycle of poverty and ignorance to which many of our fellow citizens are subjected. Among its provisions, for example, is an attack on illiteracy, which victimizes 11.5 million adult Americans. The Job Corps, the work-study program, and the work-training program also focus on education. We recognize thereby the heart of the problem.

Let me also cite important advances made by this Congress in assisting in the education of the blind and the deaf, the mentally retarded and the otherwise handicapped. The Congress also passed a new law to assist in the construction of public libraries, in which so many of our communities are deficient.

I strongly advocated and voted for every one of these essential measures, Mr. Speaker, because I am convinced that we cannot retain our greatness as a people without excellent education for all. I also voted for them because I regard it as vital that every American—the adult as well as the youth, the Negro as well as the white man, the handicapped as well as the sound—acquire the education that permits him to attain his fullest potential. I am gratified at having played an important role in the significant educational achievements of the 88th Congress.

But as I mentioned in the opening lines of my report, Mr. Speaker, these achievements—and I emphasize education—by no means give us grounds for complacency. We must enact legislation to improve the quality of our schooling on the elementary and secondary level, which we have thus far largely ignored. The obstacle has been religious controversy, a kind of controversy that is normally outside American experience. I am not doctrinaire about a method for solving this dilemma. I am sure it can be resolved in accord with the First amendment to the Constitution, which guarantees freedom of religion. But we must not, in our quibbling, lose sight of our objective, which is the finest educational system in the world. We can afford no less. The educational achievements of the 88th Congress must be looked upon as the first hesitant steps in a bold, forward-looking Federal policy of assistance to education at all levels.

Mr. Speaker, another of the great challenges of our time, and one with which I am particularly concerned, can be called the "urban dilemma." I represent one of the most heavily urbanized regions of the world. My neighbors and I in Queens have come face to face with the urban revolution. The concentration of millions of people in a relatively limited geographical area raises problems that our forefathers could not have imagined. We cannot ignore the problems that urban concentration has created. My district has a close and immediate interest in making the Federal Government acutely conscious of the urban dilemma. I take it as a personal responsibility, Mr. Speaker, to keep speaking out until the magnitude and the meaning of this urban revolution is understood by all my colleagues and by every American.

I was privileged to be in the front rank of those pressing for the enactment of a Federal program to combat air pollution. We were rewarded by the Clean Air Act, the first national effort to deal with the hazards of an unhealthy atmosphere. I cosponsored and helped guide through my committee, the Committee on Banking and Currency, a bill to assist urban mass transportation. My many constituents who commute substantial distances each day understand the transit problem well. Though Congress did not see fit to authorize the full $500 million over a 3-year period that I advocated, the Urban Mass Transportation Act which became law did promise $375 million to assist commuter facilities. It is a good beginning.

But, Mr. Speaker, let there be no mistake: I am not satisfied with the effort that the Federal Government is making in behalf of the cities. I am disappointed that the administration, having failed once to win approval for establishment of a Department of Urban Affairs, has never tried again. I believe sincerely that the urban dilemma cannot be adequately dealt with until we have a Department of Urban Affairs to look out for the interests of the city, just as the Department of Agriculture looks out for the interests of the farm. Only a Department of Urban Affairs can devise the programs, develop the expertise, conduct the research, channel the funds, disseminate the information—in short, create a cohesive urban policy for the Federal Government. A Department of Urban Affairs, of course, solves nothing in itself. But it is a necessary prerequisite, in my opinion, to getting the action our cities need. I look forward, Mr. Speaker, to a resumption of the campaign for the establishment of a Department of Urban Affairs in the next session of Congress.

On the recommendation of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, of which I am a member, the 88th Congress made the broadest advances in many years in behalf of veterans and their dependents. A comprehensive nursing-home-care bill was passed, which I cosponsored in the House. Liberalized pension allowances have been provided and we have achieved a breakthrough in permitting a limited reopening of the GI life insurance program. Hopefully a full reopening, a longtime objective of mine, will be achieved in the next session.

I was also pleased to lend my name and my energy during the current Congress, Mr. Speaker, to two important proposals in the field of mental health. I sponsored legislation to assist the States in building centers to combat mental illness and mental retardation, through both treatment and research. I regret, Mr. Speaker, that the Congress has not shown comparable foresight in dealing with the problem of narcotics addiction. We need an all-out attack against the illicit narcotics trade, in which evil men make vast profits by exploiting the weak. But we also need enlightened approaches, a system of rehabilitation centers, and aftercare hospitals to help cure the addict, who is the real focus of the tragedy. I sincerely hope that the next Congress will cast its attention on this grievously neglected social problem.

My most grievous disappointment of the current session came in the collapse of efforts during the past few days to enact a bill providing medical care for the elderly and increased social security benefits. The failure of a House-Senate conference to agree on the terms of the legislation cannot be regarded as anything but tragedy. New legislation in this field, including provisions to assist widows and their dependents, and to raise outside earnings limitations for social security recipients, must become a dominant concern of the next Congress.

We also need to terminate the monopoly conditions that permit outrageously high prices for drugs. We need a law to curb the sale of firearms and to controll the possession of lethal weapons generally. We must thoroughly revise our excise tax system. I cannot stress too vigorously the importance of new immigrant legislation, to eliminate the impracticalities and inequities in the current law. We must have a basic revision that will facilitate the reunion of families, and the shocking national-origins quota system and other discriminatory features, and create a clear and comprehensive policy for the admission of persons seeking refuge from persecution and totalitarianism.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that we in Congress have not disposed of all the challenges that face the Nation. I will continue to devote my efforts toward resolving these problems.

I am particularly proud, Mr. Speaker, that the 88th Congress took the unprecedented action of establishing a National Council on the Arts to recommend methods for the Federal Government to enrich the Nation's cultural life. I have long worked to persuade my congressional colleagues of the importance of Federal encouragement of the arts. It is my hope that this initial step will be succeeded by legislation which will make our Government, like the governments of Europe, a patron of our Nation's artistic tradition. I would also like to note that, in recognition of my interest in the arts, I was named a member of the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission, to help select an appropriate monument for our late President. I was also active in promoting the legislation to establish a National Cultural Center in Washington. When the bill was signed, President Kennedy invited me to the White House for the ceremony. It was a sad honor for me, Mr. Speaker, to attend a similar ceremony at the invitation of President Johnson for my cosponsorship of a bill to rename the Center for the late President.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I turn to the important field of foreign policy, mindful that under our Constitution the President exercises primary responsibility. As an original sponsor of the legislation establishing the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, I was especially pleased that Congress recognized the value of its work by appropriating funds to develop safe means of achieving limitation-of-arms agreements with other powers.

The House passed a realistic foreign aid bill. I remain convinced that the steady economic and social improvement envisaged in this program is essential to the strength of the free world. For our own security interests, we cannot stand by while underdeveloped countries become engulfed by totalitarian influence. We must attempt to show these nations that freedom and independence can lead to economic and social gains, and that Communist tyranny, beckoning with easy and deceptive answers, is not the road to a better life.

In this connection, the Congress underlined the importance of long-term assistance by joining with other nations to enlarge the loan funds available to the International Development Association, the multilateral agency for channeling capital to underdeveloped countries. This measure, as well as the activities of the Inter-American Development Bank, come within the jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on International Finance of which I am ranking minority member. I was pleased to serve as an official U.S. delegate in Panama this year to the annual conference of the Development Bank, an important arm of the Alliance for Progress. I was able to evaluate and report to my colleagues on the progress of hemispheric efforts to bolster the free enterprise structure in Latin America.

I would like to note, Mr. Speaker, that I remain disturbed by this administration's course of appeasement toward President Nasser of Egypt, whose military buildup threatens the peace of the Middle East. The United States must implement the strong antibias and antiaggression provisions included in the current foreign aid bill, which emerged from the earlier Keating-Halpern and Halpern-Rooney amendments. We could thus be sure that no assistance was given to countries that discriminate against certain groups of Americans on racial or religious grounds or which are preparing aggressive war against other recipients of American aid.

Mr. Speaker, it is doubly regrettable that the Senate again failed to ratify the Genocide Convention, an action which I have long urged. This treaty would not only make illegal the tragic racial persecution that characterized the Hitler period, but would put the United States squarely on the side of its traditions of human dignity. Equally regrettable was the failure of Congress to give expression of support to current efforts in the United Nations to make racial and religious discrimination an international crime.

Time does not allow that I set forth the whole spectrum of activity accomplished and left undone. In balance, I feel that this Congress has achieved a great deal. We know full well that our work is not complete and that the road ahead will not become less difficult. But I am encouraged that representative government can act both wisely and with dispatch. I look to the 89th Congress with faith and confidence in the future.

THE WHEELING AND DEALING ADMINISTRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I submit that public office is still a public trust, even though some people in this country today would undoubtedly consider that to be an extreme concept. Our citizens, despite disillusionment and disappointment, still expect public officials to be able to distinguish between right and wrong. They also expect that their officials will make that distinction without hesitation when an ethical question confronts them.

Unfortunately, public officials are disillusioning and disappointing the citizens once more. The Johnson administration continually involves itself in schemes, manipulations, and circumstances which raise great doubt as to the ethical standards—if any—its members follow. The Bobby Baker case is a good example. The Billie Sol Estes case is another. The Post Office Department's recent order—costing the public an estimated $400,000 a year—to hang portraits of President Johnson and Postmaster General Gronouski in local post office lobbies in violation of all previous policy and precedent is yet a third.

There is no evidence that Fort Knox has been pilfered. However, the facts that are known have given this administration a reputation for "wheeling and dealing" in less than a year in office. The only difference I see between wheeling and dealing and outright corruption is one of degree. The wheeling-dealing official skirts the edge of corruption with slick tricks, but the corrupt official at least admits his dishonesty to himself. However, both are thieves, and the two techniques eventually injure the public in some way.

The wheeler and dealer's activities also injure the whole corps of public servants. Once the reputation of the public leadership is established for getting away with slick practices, it spreads and blemishes even the honest official and employee, regardless of their grades and positions, because it creates suspicion as to the general integrity of Government. The plain fact is that public office must be completely insulated against even the appearance of wrongdoing, corruption, and immorality, which wheeling and dealing generates.

I regret that I must report information which, if true, indicates the Johnson administration—and the Democrat Party—have been wheeling and dealing again. I serve notice that my information is not complete. However, even the facts in my possession support the existence of a situation whose circumstances are so equivocal as to generate the strongest suspicions about their propriety. Certainly, they warrant explanation.

According to my information, an important business is the servicing of aircraft at airports where aircraft owners do not maintain their own facilities. This business handles aircraft ranging from the smallest private planes to multiengined aircraft of scheduled airlines which may have been diverted from airports at which they ordinarily land.

Private companies, called fixed-base operators, service such aircraft. The service includes furnishing gas and oil and spare parts, making repairs, supplying passenger accommodations, storing aircraft including tieing them down, and so on. A charge is made for each service. The business is obviously not only important and necessary, but profitable, especially at larger airports with a heavy traffic.

Private companies furnish such services under contracts which the Federal Aviation Agency awards through competitive bidding at airports under its jurisdiction. These services are classified as "aeronautical services," as distinguished from such airport services as taxicab facilities, newsstands, and so on. Congress, in the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, clearly set forth the policy that aeronautical services at airports it covered were not to be monopolies, but that the public was to have the benefit of competition. This policy means, of course, that at least two private companies will be available to furnish aeronautical services of this type to the public.

The Federal Aviation Agency administers this congressional policy. It awards the contracts under which private companies furnish such aeronautical services for transient aircraft, and it is responsible for assuring that a private company will not secure a monopoly.

My information is that the Federal Aviation Agency has failed to meet this responsibility. The circumstances related to this failure make it even more reprehensible, Apparently, the Agency has consistently enforced the Congress policy against monopolization at all airports over which it has jurisdiction except two. These two are Dulles International Airport and Washington National Airport. These two airports exist mainly to serve the headquarters of the Federal Government at Washington. The Federal Government owns these two airports. They are the only commercial airports in that category—and the Federal Aviation Agency operates them, manages them lock, stock, and barrel. Only one private company furnishes aeronautical services for transient aircraft at these two airports under Federal Aviation Agency authority. Therefore, the Government is in the position not only of condoning but actually authorizing an illegal monopoly contrary to the expression of Congress, which it prohibits at other non-federally-owned airports under Federal Aviation Agency's jurisdiction.

This situation apparently began when FAA received bids to furnish aeronautical services to transient aircraft at Dulles International Airport. Page Airways, Inc. and Butler Aviation Co. bid on the contract. Federal Aviation Agency awarded the contract to Page Airways. No evidence shows that Page Airways was not entitled to receive the contract. However, the important point is that FAA still has not awarded a contract authorizing a second company to compete with Page Airways.

The same situation exists at Washington National Airport. Butler Aviation Co. held the basic contract for furnishing aeronautical services for transient aircraft for a number of years. As its contract terminated, both Butler Aviation and Page Airways bid on the new contract. Again, Federal Aviation Agency awarded the contract to Page. Then it refused Butler's proposal that it continue furnishing the same services in competition with Page Airways. Until this time, FAA has not awarded a contract authorizing any other company to compete with Page Airways at National Airport.

Federal Aviation Agency's failure to authorize a second company—Butler or any other—to compete against Page Airways at these two airports has handed Page Airways a monopoly on furnishing aeronautical services for transient aircraft. This condition violates the congressional policy stated in the Federal Aviation Act of 1958. It obviously puts the U.S. Government in the position of violating the law which it will not permit other nonfederally owned airport owners and operators to violate.

This is obviously an untenable position for the Government to occupy. The question is why it has been permitted to exist.

One answer is that the administration is giving preferential treatment to Page

Airways, Inc. Federal Aviation Agency will obviously deny that favoritism is involved and furnish a multitude of technical reasons to support its denial. However, if the administration does try to demonstrate that Federal Aviation Agency handling of these two cases—apparently the only two in existence—is justified, then it should also explain another situation at the same time.

On July 28, August 4, August 8, and August 11, 1964, Page Airways, Inc., operated flights in their DC-3 aircraft from Washington National Airport to Atlantic City carrying members of the Democrat National Committee. The Democrat National Convention was going on at that time.

Did Page Airways feel obligated to perform this service as payment for its monopoly at Dulles and National Airports? Or did the administration—in its inimitable wheeler-dealer way—pressure Page Airways to furnish such air transportation as a token of its appreciation for its monopoly at the two U.S. Government-owned airports? Certainly, the relationship between Page's obviously favorable—and illegal—monopoly position and its performance of this kind of ferrying service for the Democrat Party is curious.

However, there are other angles which make the whole situation's implications more suspect, if my facts are accurately reported, as I believe they are.

Page Airways, Inc., used DC-3 aircraft to ferry Democrat National Committee members to Atlantic City for the Democrat National Convention. At that time Page Airways had an application pending for authority "for operation of DC-3 aircraft for compensation for hire."

Ordinarily, such an application is summarily dismissed if the applicant operates the service for which he is seeking authority while his application is pending. However, Federal Aviation Agency states that in this instance a "company executive assured this Agency in writing that no remuneration was received."

This assurance adds a provocative note under the circumstances. The cost of operating heavy aircraft—or, for that matter, any aircraft—is not a matter of pennies, but is expensive. Why did Page Airways absorb the cost of this operation, if it did, when it had an application pending and under consideration? Why did the administration permit its party workers to accept this gratuity when it knew or should have known that Page Airways had an application for operating authority pending? Was Page Airways trying to influence consideration of its application by doing a favor for the administration before which its application was pending? Or did the administration pressure it into furnishing this expensive service under threat that favorable consideration would not be given to its application if it did not comply?

The plain and undeniable fact is that unusual and equivocal circumstances in this situation generate the suspicion that it is not being handled with integrity. All of the circumstances are typical of the "wheeler-dealer, you scratch my back, I'll scratch yours" reputation for which this administration is winning a certain notoriety.

The administration has complete control of the records relating to this incident. It can explain the circumstances if it wants to. It will be interesting to read its justifications—if it furnishes any.

In the meantime, I recommend that the appropriate committee of this House should look into this matter when the Congress reconvenes, regardless of what, if anything, the administration says about it. I propose to continue my inquiry into it in the interim.

THE HONORABLE ROLAND V. LIBONATI

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the Honorable ROLAND V. LIBONATI, and his retirement from Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, during consideration of the conference report on the veterans' pension legislation I informed the House of the retirement plans of our distinguished colleague from Illinois, the Honorable ROLAND V. LIBONATI.

The House membership knows the dedication of this Member. They have seen him day in and day out in his familiar seat to the right of the Speaker, from the time of the opening prayer by the Chaplain to the closing gavel of the Speaker. He loves the House of Representatives. I know of no man in the 20 years I have served in the House that has been more dedicated to his duty both in committee and on the floor of the House. He has made a valuable contribution to the legislative programs of the House.

LIBBY has been dedicated in the service of the veteran. No one has been a better friend of the veterans of this country than ROLAND LIBONATI. He began this interest in veterans' affairs many, many years ago. It is a sincere dedication on his part. It has been evidenced both in public life and in private life, in politics and when he was not in the public service.

No Member of this House has left, carrying with him greater admiration and affection of his colleagues than LIBBY. As my colleague from Illinois [Mr. MURPHY] has said, LIBBY's trademark has been and will always be, love of his fellow man.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE. I will be delighted to yield to my friend from Illinois.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, for many years I have known ROLAND VICTOR LIBONATI. I never had a better friend save possibly his brother, Elidor, and two brothers were never more closely knit together than the two Libonatis. I knew and loved them both.

Congressman LIBONATI might have come to the Congress at an earlier date, but always it had been the ambition of his brother to come to Congress, and ROLAND loved his brother more than his own placement. So while ROLAND served magnificently in the State Legislature of Illinois, he never set his sights on Congress because of the great love in his heart for his brother. Many of the old-timers here will remember the brother, Elidor, with warm affection. He was on the staff of the late Congressman A. J. Sabath in the 81st Congress and he was held in the highest esteem by everybody. His untimely death was a crushing shock.

We are going to miss LIBBY. Somehow you cannot call him anything else. You say, "LIBBY." It is a word of affection—a nickname in the diction of the heart.

I knew LIBBY at the beginning of his legal career. He became a great defense lawyer. When LIBONATI talked to juries he won them over because the words came from the conviction of his heart.

I share one priceless thing with ROLAND VICTOR LIBONATI. It is faith in all men. There is so much more good in any human being than there is bad. That is what you get to know so very well as you pass your years in courtrooms as counsel for the defense. When you are defending someone that all the world is against and you are his attorney, you see the gold in his heart that no one else may ever have suspected. So always LIBBY and I have had the same philosophy, I guess, and in many ways the same background of experience.

LIBBY became a great defense counsel, one of the Nation's best.

Whenever I have gone back to Chicago since LIBBY came to this body people would come up to me and say, "How is LIBBY doing?" and I would always reply, "LIBBY is making a tremendous mark down in Washington. He has the respect of every Member of the House. More than that, he has the affection of every Member." And what I reported to my friends in Chicago was the gospel truth. I never knew a Member of this body who was not LIBBY's friend.

A great man—a great heart—a great brain. We are going to miss him. We are going to miss LIBONATI in the Speaker's chair when so often he would preside when the House would be working late, sometimes going to 7, 8, or 9 o'clock at night and in the chair presiding would be our LIBBY.

There is a reason for his leaving. I have mentioned his great heart. No passion of his being compares, however, with the love that he has for his wife Jeanette and his son Michael. It is a great love, an all-enveloping love, a noble love. His wife has suffered sorely from the climate here. While he loves the Congress—this is his life—he loves his wife more than life itself. That is the reason LIBBY is leaving us. Into retirement from the Congress of his love he is carrying the great and commanding love that he has for a wonderful woman. She is a wonderful woman and they have a wonderful son. May joy and the happiness of accomplishment attend the trio always.

Mr. Speaker, I can say no more. My emotion has engulfed me.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Murphy].

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Price] for his courtesy in yielding to me today.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know how I feel today standing in the well of this House. Today is Roland Libonati's last day on the floor. As I saw him sitting here today, I looked back on the illustrious career he has had in legislative matters and in legislative bodies.

Libby and I are contemporaries. We grew up together. We played in sports around the city of Chicago. We both became lawyers. He became one of the outstanding defense lawyers of the Illinois bar. We have just heard another great defense lawyer, one of the greatest, the gentleman from Illinois, Barratt O'Hara, paying him compliments in his vocation.

But a lot of people did not know Libby. He is a peculiar man, because he has real love for his fellow man. A lot of people do not know that he was one of the founders of the American Legion. A lot of people do not know that many of the underprivileged people, the youth of Chicago, for many summers went up to Wisconsin to attend boys camps and girls camps which Roland Libonati ran for many years. These camps would accommodate over 1,500 of our youths.

He made a great record in the Illinois State Legislature where he served for 6 years in the house and for 16 years in the senate. He also served as minority whip and minority leader. We have all known him here for the past 8 years in the last four Congresses. He worked hard in the Committee on the Judiciary. But he also took on extra work in the Veterans' Committee and asked to be assigned to that committee so that he could carry on his work in behalf of the veterans of the United States.

Our families are very closely allied. My son graduated with his son from St. Ignatius High School. His son is at Yale; mine is at Marquette.

Mrs. Libonati is one of the loveliest ladies in Washington, one of his inspirations. As the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'Hara] has stated, through illness she has stayed by his side.

We shall miss one of our most popular, humane Members of this body. I hope God sees fit that he carries on his great career in the practice of law for many years to come.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Albert].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Murphy] has said he did not know just how he felt as he took the well of the House.

Certainly I rise today with mingled feelings of joy and sadness—joy that on this last day of the 88th Congress one of the great legislative enactments in the field of veterans' affairs of all time bears the name and the stamp of my good friend Roland Libonati; and sadness because Libby is leaving us.

In all my years on this planet I have never known a more lovable, affable, courteous, or helpful human being. His personality radiates wherever he goes. Libby is a friend of man. Like Will Rogers, I believe he can say he has never seen a human being he did not like. Certainly, as the great and eloquent orator from Illinois [Mr. O'Hara] has just said, no one who ever knew him did not love him.

Libby is a wonderful human being.

Having said that much, Mr. Speaker, may I also say that during my years in this House I have never known a single Member who has spent so much time on the floor of the House when the House was in session as Congressman Libonati. I never had to send out a whip call for Libby. He was always here to help, always here to do his duty, always here in this Chamber that he loves.

Mr. Speaker, in this area Libby is as irreplaceable as he is irreplaceable in the hearts of his colleagues with whom he has served in this Chamber.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Whitener].

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I join with the distinguished majority leader, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Price], and others who have expressed regret that on this final day of the 88th Congress we must say "goodbye" to a great American who has served with us so brilliantly.

When Roland Libonati first came to the Congress I was assigned, along with him, to the Committee on the Judiciary, where we have served through the years as seatmates. I have come to know of his vast ability in the field of law, and of the soundness of his thinking and of his constant concern that as representatives of the people we should remember that in this system of ours we must legislate so that even the smallest citizen will be protected.

We have had much to work on together in that committee. I can say that without exception Congressman Libonati knew and recognized the right and could be depended upon to do that which he felt was in the best interests of all mankind.

Something has been said about his connection with the veterans' organizations. I can say that I have never known of any man more dedicated to the welfare of those who have served their country in time of war. The enactment of the Libonati Bill will serve as lasting evidence, to all who read, of his great interest and zeal with respect to the cause of veterans.

Roland Libonati is a man with a great sense of humor. He never loses that sense of humor unless he is in a situation where he feels some injustice is about to be done. Then, I must say, he can manifest very strong feelings in the other direction.

It has been said that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Libonati] is a devoted family man. I can testify firsthand that that is true, because it has been my privilege on many occasions to be in the home and in the presence of this distinguished gentleman and his wife and fine son. I know of the mutual affection which prevails in that household.

We are going to miss Congressman Libonati on the Committee on the Judiciary and here in the House of Representatives. To be sure, I shall miss him in a more personal way because of my close friendship and the many opportunities that I had to travel with him and to visit with him and to enjoy athletics and other recreational programs with him.

I know that I speak for many who served with us on the Judiciary Committee when I say that we shall miss him in that committee.

I extend to him and to his lovely wife and his fine son my best wishes for continued health, happiness, and all the prosperity that a good friend would want another good friend to have.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Collier].

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I am pleased and proud to associate myself with the words of tribute paid to our colleague, Roland Libonati, here today. Anything I might say at this point with regard to some of the well-deserved compliments he has received would indeed be repetitious. However, I do want to say that I have certainly enjoyed a warm and pleasant friendship with Libby since I have been a Member of this body.

Last December I had occasion to visit the General Vaughn Veterans' Hospital in my district to discuss a matter with a group of veterans there in the spinal injury ward. In the course of discussing the problems with these several paraplegics, the name of the one man in the U.S. Congress that was repeatedly mentioned in connection to me in securing help with their problem was that of Roland Libonati.

I can only say to you, Libby, and to your very gracious wife and fine son that I wish you the best of everything, or perhaps I can best sum up my sentiments by saying I wish you everything that you wish yourself.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished majority whip, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Boggs].

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join in the praises here today of our dear friend, "Libby." I was particularly pleased with what Congressman Whitener, of North Carolina, said about "Libby's" wonderful family, and about visiting in his home. I shall miss "Libby" a great deal on this floor because he has been a "Rock of Gibraltar." But anyone who ever had the privilege of his home and partook of his food and hospitality will miss him just as much for that reason.

I have never in my life—and I am a person who comes from a place where they have pretty good food—enjoyed food more than at "Libby's." "Libby" is just about the champ. I say, "Libby"; it has got to be Mrs. Libonati.

I know all of you who have been here know that he has done us a great disservice in deciding to leave. We all know that he has served with great distinction on the Committee on the Judiciary. In addition to that, he has been one of the most faithful people in attendance on the sessions of the House of Representatives. I know that it is difficult to be here all the time, and in my responsibility, Mr. Speaker, I have tried to keep them here. "LIBBY" is always here. I think this is a mark of a good Congressman. I do not say that to be critical of those who happen to be elsewhere. But after all this is where we legislate ultimately, and those who have the responsibility for asking the Members to be here on important occasions are always profoundly grateful to a Member who is here. And "LIBBY" is always here because of his sense of duty.

As a matter of fact, I will say that this is something that has characterized our distinguished colleague, his sense of duty and dedication. I shall miss him very, very much, and I wish for him and his fine family many, many years of happiness, good health, and prosperity.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAY].

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I had the pleasure a few minutes ago, when we passed the conference report on the veterans' bill, to make some remarks about our dear friend, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. LIBONATI]. I shall not be repetitious now, but I would not want this occasion to pass without thanking my good friend, the gentleman from Illinois, MEL PRICE, and all of our colleagues who have extended felicitations and best wishes to our friend, LIBBY, who is going back to Illinois.

Mr. Speaker, there will be a void in this House because we could always find LIBBY here every day that this House was in session. He was always on the job. Many times presiding.

Mr. Speaker, I think the words of the late President John F. Kennedy would best fit our friend, the gentlemen from Illinois [Mr. LIBONATI], and I would like to repeat them if I may.

> With a good conscience our only sure reward, with history the final judge of our deeds, let us go forth to lead the land we love, asking His blessing and His help, but knowing that here on earth God's work must be truly our own.

I think those words speak far more eloquently than any words I might utter, because I think they fit ROLAND LIBONATI. We have known of his great work in the Illinois General Assembly before coming here and for 8 years in the Congress, and we know that LIBBY has dedicated his life to others. As was stated by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. COLLIER], there are few veterans in the United States, particularly those who have spent months and even years in the veterans' hospitals, who do not know of the great work that ROLAND LIBONATI has done for the veterans, their widows and orphans.

I say to LIBBY, we shall miss you. We wish you Godspeed, and we hope to see your smiling face back again on every occasion.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend very much for yielding to me at this time.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I have been here a good many years and I have never heard such spontaneous expressions of admiration and respect and regard for a Member who has chosen to retire.

Mr. Speaker, it happens that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. LIBONATI]—"LIBBY" as he is fondly known—and I have served on the Committee on the Judiciary together for as long as he has been here. "Libby" also is my right-hand man on a subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee which handles probably more legislation than any other subcommittee of that parent committee. "LIBBY" has always been prompt, helpful and on the job. His counsel and advice has always been sought and cheerfully given. "LIBBY" is an individual all unto himself. He is agreeable, he is affable, he is approachable, he is a man on which you can count. "LIBBY" is a religious man, he is a good man, he is a good family man, he is a good churchman.

Mr. Speaker, we shall miss him. However, I certainly want to join all others in this spontaneous expression, as as I said earlier, of deepest affection for a man who deserves it so well in saying that I wish him and his fine wife and his boy long years of not only prosperity but happiness and calm contentment that he so much deserves.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, it is with sincere sadness that I join my colleagues in this tribute to a great American, a fine legislator, and a truly dedicated public servant.

Mr. Speaker, I have had the privilege of knowing Congressman LIBONATI, or "LIBBY" as we affectionately call him, since he came to Congress. I have leaned heavily upon him for counsel and advice, because upon meeting him I realized that this is a man who is dedicated, sincere, and thorough in whatever he undertakes. As has been said earlier by others, and said so well, whatever he undertakes, he does thoroughly.

Mr. Speaker, even before I came to Congress I heard about his interest in youth. He is the founder and owner of a camp for boys in Coloma, Wis., where boys who otherwise would not have an opportunity can go to camp. He is still engaged in active efforts in fighting juvenile delinquency and he gives much of his time, his money, and himself for these young boys who are at an age where they can be taught and controlled. Mr. Speaker, the boys' camp in Wisconsin is a monument to our dear friend, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. LIBONATI].

The crowning achievement of his active and illustrious service in this great legislative body was the passage of H.R. 1927 the bill he authored to provide increased payments for non-service-connected disabilities to veterans, their widows, and children. This legislation is another monument to our retiring colleague from Illinois.

Mr. Speaker, it was stated earlier—and I must agree—from personal observation that he is truly a devoted family man. He dearly loves his beautiful and wonderful wife, Jeannette, and is devoted to his son. His decision to leave Congress was in no small measure influenced by his devotion to his family.

Mr. Speaker, although we are saying them, I do not think farewells and goodbyes are in order. If I know "LIBBY" he will be back with us again and he will give us the benefit of his jovial disposition, his wise counsel, and incomparable wit. We shall miss "LIBBY" My wife joins me in extending every good wish for health and happiness to Congressman LIBONATI and his family.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILBERT].

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join in the tribute being paid to our very dear friend, ROLAND LIBONATI. All of us affectionately refer to him as "LIBBY."

I have had the great privilege of serving with "LIBBY" on the Committee on the Judiciary; in fact, we are both members of the same subcommittee, the Subcommittee on Claims, and he and I sit next to each other. In all my years and experience in the halls of various legislatures, having served on various committees, I have never found a man of the stature of ROLAND LIBONATI. He has a deep feeling for, and an insight into the people who appear before the Claims Committee in connection with claims bills. He is truly the champion of the cause of the common man. I myself have learned more law while sitting next to "LIBBY" that if he were a professor of a law school, giving the chapter and verse on the various bills that appear before us.

I regret sincerely his leaving the Halls of Congress, but I know he will be back here again in some capacity in an area where he can be of great service to the people of our country.

I hope for him and his family a long life and happiness, and much enjoyment in the years ahead.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT].

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I have known LIBONATI long before he came to this body. It so happens that he preceded me here by a mere 5 days. This is the only point I have ever had any kind of a controversy with our good friend about. It appears he was here just long enough to learn the rules of seniority. I did not know that he had only been here 5 days before me, and for at least 2 months I was bowing and scraping every time I came to the House floor. When I did find out he was only 5 days senior to me I started to sit in the seat he had reserved for himself daily in the House. In fact, it got to the point where he was there so much and so often. He had a habit of smoking a little cigar that is not very popular because it does not give off a delightful odor. A great Speaker of this House, the late lamented and kindly remembered Sam Rayburn, came back one day. He waved through this thick smoke Libby was producing and he said "You know, I am going to have to get somebody to clear up the Cherokee strip." Because of that, we finally called Libby chairman of the Cherokee strip in the corner of this House.

You can tell many stories about Libby, but I think the story that will go down in all our minds for all time, and as long as we live, will be the fight that Libonati made, even over and above the fights he made for legislation, to keep certain legislation from being enacted, legislation that might have endangered the welfare and the well-being of every citizen, low or high, in this Nation.

The courage of a man is not always measured by what he accomplishes in a positive manner, but sometimes it has to be considered and measured in some of the negative things that are accomplished by him. We consider in this body only the positive, that which we pass and make into law, but in my humble opinion some of the things we do not pass have a great deal more meaning to the people, since we are not promoting legislation with universal appeal or universally accepted by all our people.

Libonati's history in this House is only a continuation of his work in the General Assembly of Illinois. I met with him many, many times when I was a member of the senate of the State of Pennsylvania. We collaborated on legislation between the two States. He sent to my senate in the State of Pennsylvania legislation dealing with reciprocity, and I had the opportunity to work with him on it.

I am hopeful this is the beginning and not the end of another career. I know he will take his place wherever he goes and shine as brilliantly as he has shone in this House.

Incidentally, the loss is not that of Roland Libonati, the loss is to the people of his State and of this Nation. No man ever served that I believe better fitted the words of the poet:

Lives of great men all remind us
 We can make our lives sublime,
And, departing, leave behind us
 Footprints on the sands of time.

The shadows will be long before his footprints are obliterated.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Rodino].

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, we have heard today the fine tribute paid to a friend and colleague. We have heard of his outstanding contribution in the area of public service, and all of us who are here now who have known Roland Libonati can confirm that his has certainly been a job well done.

I should like to speak very briefly of the more intimate qualities of this man as I learned to know him many years back as a friend. I believe we can well say as we run through the thread of this life that, as a noted writer once said, we are rich only in what we give, we are poor in what we refuse and keep.

Libby's life is certainly a rich one when we measure it by this standard, for he has given to his family a great love, to his friends great affection, and to his country that deep devotion and dedication which will stamp him as one of the great and truly outstanding public servants. I believe one can say that as he leaves these Halls of Congress we know that the stamp of Roland Libonati will ever be on our hearts, and we know that the people and the Nation he has served will say to him, "We are indebted and deeply grateful for that which you have given."

And, in closing—to quote the words of a great writer, "I expect to pass through life but once. If therefore, there be any kindness I can show or any good thing I can do to any fellow being, let me do it now, and not defer or neglect it, as I shall not pass this way again."

This, my colleagues and friends, is the philosophy of Roland Libonati.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues today in paying honor and tribute to our good friend and colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, Roland Libonati.

Prior to his election to this august body, Mr. Libonati was engaged in the practice of law in the State of Illinois, where I understand, he was recognized as an able, outstanding, and successful trial lawyer. His understanding and knowledge of the law enabled him to make constructive and valuable contributions to the deliberations of the Judiciary and Veterans' Affairs Committee upon which he served. Although I am not a member of those committees, many of the Members serving on those committees have mentioned to me the high regard and respect that they have for his knowledge and opinions.

He has served his district, his State, and his country with honor and distinction.

To me he has been a friend and an inspiration. I consulted with him on many problems and he was always ready to give of his time and knowledge to assist a colleague. I have learned much from him and my life has been enriched by having known him. He has worked hard and is entitled to a rest. As we part today on this closing day of the 88th Congress. May I join with his many other friends to wish him, his wife, Jeannette, and his son, Michael, the best of health and many, many years of happiness together.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with my colleagues in the commendations being made about this great liberal from Illinois, Roland Libonati.

Mr. Speaker, I know this gentleman for his congressional and political integrity as well as for his integrity, probity, rectitude, and unswerving loyalty to his friends and associates.

Mr. Speaker, his leaving will be a great loss to the Congress of the United States, but it will be a great gain to the State of Illinois when he again returns home to the great city of Chicago and serves his people there.

It has been a great pleasure to serve with this distinguished gentleman over the last 8 years in this august body.

May God bestow upon him and his family many years of health and happiness.

Mr. RYAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I consider it a special privilege to join my colleagues who are now praising and paying tribute to a great Congressman, the gentleman from Illinois, Roland Libonati.

To me, he has always been the "Humanitarian" of this Congress and I say this with real emphasis and complete sincerity.

When I first became a Member of the Congress approximately 3 years ago, I was thrilled to meet so many outstanding Americans and I was deeply impressed by many of the Congressman.

But one of the deepest and permanent impressions was made upon me by Congressman Roland Libonati. His vast knowledge of Congressional procedures, his seemingly unlimited source of knowledge on so many varied subjects, his constant attendance at every session of Congress, and I should say here that he probably has the best record of attendance of any Member, were some of his outstanding attributes. But his greatest asset was his sincere consideration, his natural warmness and his personal feeling for the ordinary person.

His personal charm and the effervescence flowing from him easily and quickly placed everyone at ease.

I could always go to him for advice on any matter, knowing that I could do so and have the feeling that "Libby" was glad to have been of assistance. I know that other Members felt the same way also.

It was my pleasure to have been with him on several tours and have the opportunity of sharing his gracious personality and charm. I once heard the Reverend Father Fulton J. Sheen state, "that to know a man, is to love him." This is so strikingly true in the case of "Libby" as we all affectionately call him and refer to him.

On these tours with "Libby," all of us had the relaxing feeling that he would write a complete and detailed report of the trip that would be placed in the Congressional Record. He had great ability as a writer, so we helped accumulate the information to add to his already complete file.

I humbly say that I have learned much from "Libby," and that I was a better Congressman because of this knowledge and information.

I know that "Libby" will be missed by Members of Congress—that the lack of his presence in the Chamber together with all of his charming qualities will be sorely felt.

I want to join all the others in extending my best wishes for good health for him and his family, much happiness and success and prosperity for our good friend, "Libby," the humanitarian of the Congress.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join in the very warm, heartfelt tribute which the House is paying today to our esteemed and beloved colleague, ROLAND LIBONATI.

We are all sorry that this able, distinguished, dedicated friend is leaving the House. He has made a truly memorable record here. Brilliant lawyer, skilled legislator, great American, hearty and loyal friend, LIBBY has won our hearts and our affections and our great admiration for his versatile abilities and charming personal qualities.

We will miss him here, but we will always remember him for his outstanding service and his friendly, warmhearted companionship.

A man of many parts and great talents, LIBBY has commanded our sincere respect and high admiration.

I wish for him, his charming wife and devoted family, great success and happiness for many years to come and hope we will see them often in the future.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my best wishes to our dear friend, LIBBY LIBONATI, who is leaving us at the end of this Congress to return to private life.

ROLAND VICTOR LIBONATI first joined us in the 85th Congress, after having won distinction and honors in both branches of the Illinois Legislature, where he served as Democratic whip and also for a period as minority leader. He has proved himself a tireless worker and a legislator of the highest skill and statesmanship. At the same time, his kind and genial personality, with his ready willingness to be of help in all worthy causes, has won the admiration, respect, and warm personal friendship of all of us who have had the privilege and pleasure of working with him in this House.

As LIBBY retires, he carries with him our best wishes for many, many more years of happiness. He leaves with us warm memories of esteem and personal friendship. I feel that my own life has been enriched by my contacts with him and that I have gained much by the opportunity to observe his work and his application of his devout beliefs and his patriotic philosophy.

Although LIBBY is going home today, I hope that he will not find Washington too far away to visit frequently in the future. His host of friends in the Capitol will find it both a compliment and a real pleasure whenever he can visit us and he will always be most welcome on the floor of the House.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to add a few words about our retiring friend from Illinois [Mr. LIBONATI].

There are few indeed who have shown the legal ability and the moral courage that he has in several instances in this body.

I well remember the day when the Government was attempting to obtain a very dangerous authority in the matter of seizures. ROLAND LIBONATI led the fight against this attempt, and the administration plan was defeated by one vote. It was without doubt one of the finest exhibitions of ability and courage which I have witnessed in this body.

For such an excellent contribution to our deliberations and to the Nation, ROLAND LIBONATI will be sorely missed.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in paying tribute to my good friend, ROLAND LIBONATI, for his untiring work on the Veterans' Affairs Committee and his effective representation of the people of the Seventh District of Illinois.

It has been my pleasure to serve with Congressman LIBONATI for more than 6 years and I am indeed sorry that he has decided to leave the Halls of Congress. He has compiled an enviable record in the House and it will be hard to fill his place.

Even before coming to Congress the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. LIBONATI] devoted many years of his life to service on behalf of the people in the Illinois State Assembly and in the State Senate. He is a distinguished lawyer and a great humanitarian, having founded an American Boys' camp for indigent children.

This bill we are considering, H.R. 1927, is indicative of Congressman LIBONATI's concern for our veterans; a concern which he repeatedly displayed on the Veterans' Affairs Committee and which has resulted in the enactment of many bills for the benefit of veterans and their dependents. We will remember it as a fitting tribute to a dedicated public servant.

As ROLAND leaves us today, I want to extend my very best wishes to him for health, happiness, and success in the future.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, it is with considerable regret that I learned that our distinguished colleague, the Honorable ROLAND V. LIBONATI, will not be returning to Congress next year.

LIBBY, as he is affectionately known to all of us, came to the Congress in 1957 and has served consistently since that time. No other Member could match his record for attendance during the deliberations of the House of Representatives. This kindly man, devoted to this parliamentary institution and its high purposes, considered his responsibilities gravely and diligently.

Congressman LIBONATI has an affectionate high regard for his colleagues and enjoys the esteem of every Member of this body.

I wish for him and his devoted wife, Jeannette, a happy life in Chicago, where he returns to the practice of law, a profession in which he has developed an excellence, second only to his great legislative ability.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart and also a grateful heart that I rise today. A heavy heart because one of my closest friends, my colleague from Chicago, the Honorable ROLAND V. LIBONATI, is leaving the U.S. Congress. A grateful heart because it has been my privilege to know him, not only as a colleague but as a warm personal friend.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate my remarks with the previous speakers. "LIBBY" is a charitable man. He has done much for not only the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars with his ability here in Congress but also the widows and orphans of veterans. He is a man very easy to get along with and has a pleasant word for everyone. He is a sentimental man with a heart as big as himself. No job is too big for "LIBBY" and he offers his help without reservation.

It will be my earnest prayer, Mr. Speaker, that the Good Lord will spare "LIBBY" and his family with blessings and happiness for years to come. It is also my earnest wish that the people whom "LIBBY" represented in Chicago would send him back for I will say that his leaving the Congress is a great loss to the Nation, the State of Illinois, and the district he represents.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my colleagues in this expression of esteem for my friend, ROLAND V. LIBONATI, who is retiring.

During my freshman term in the House, the 87th Congress, it was my privilege to serve with LIBBY on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. His dedicated work in behalf of those who have served our Nation so well and their dependents is typical of his devoted and dedicated service to all during his tenure in the House and in his life before he came to Washington. LIBBY will be sorely missed when the 89th Congress convenes.

ROLAND LIBONATI is and always has been a devoted family man. It is his devotion for his chaming wife that has prompted him to retire from the House to be with her in a climate more suitable to her health.

My very best wishes to LIBBY and his family for many happy, healthy, and prosperous years together. The Washington scene will not be quite the same without them—they will be sorely missed.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, ROLAND LIBONATI is one of those great Members who have done the most for those men who sacrificed and served our Nation in time of war. As a member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee for 16 years, I have never known a more conscientious member of our committee. He was faithful in attendance, and attentive always to the witnesses and to the needs of our veterans. I have never known a member of our committee more devoted to the welfare of our veterans, their widows and orphans.

ROLAND LIBONATI will go down in history as one of the greatest. The bill which bears his name is a tribute to his skill and genius. Its enactment is the epitome of committee and parliamentary maneuver. The veterans and, yes, the American people, from Canada to Mexico and from Maine to California are grateful to this distinguished and able veteran. ROLAND LIBONATI is a great American, a distinguished orator, loyal, patriotic, and has dedicated his life to the principles and ideals which have made our Nation the heart and core of freedom and the hope of the Western World.

Mrs. Dorn and my family join me in wishing for him much happiness, continued success, and the best always.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is with mixed emotions that

I join my colleagues today in paying tribute to my friend, the Honorable Roland V. Libonati, of Illinois, who has decided to retire from the U.S. House of Representatives and return to the practice of law. On rare occasions during our lives do we have the good fortune to meet a person who possesses the qualities that we attribute to great men. Our able and devoted colleague, Roland V. Libonati, is such a man. His absence from this body will be sorely felt.

When Libby first became a Member of the House of Representatives on December 31, 1957, he already had a record of accomplishments that any man could look back upon and say that he had done his part for his fellow man. He had a brilliant record as an outstanding lawyer, as a member of the house of the Illinois State Legislature for 6 years, and as a member of the senate of the Illinois State Legislature for 16 years where he served as majority whip beginning with his second term and as minority leader during his last term.

Libby did not rest on the record he had by then made but added to it during the 7 years that he was a Member of this House of Representatives a list of accomplishments that could stand by themselves as a remarkable record of service.

The loss of his talents and friendship will be hard to replace. When we reminisce in future days about the years we had the privilege to serve in Congress with him, I am sure that we will all have many enjoyable stories to tell. The war veterans of my congressional district and all my constituents would want me to extend their thanks for his work as a member of the House Committee on the Judiciary and the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

I do not join my colleagues in saying goodby to our friend and colleague for I am hopeful that Libby and I will have many opportunities to continue our friendship. It has been a pleasure and a privilege to work with and to know him and may God bestow upon him, his lovely wife, and his fine son, many, many years of good health and happiness.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, a most able member of my Committee on Veterans' Affairs who has worked tirelessly in behalf of the veteran has announced that he will not return to this body. Libby as he is most affectionately called by his colleagues has said he was going to retire—but I for one do not believe it. Any man who has devoted the majority of his life in serving his fellow man as Roland Libonati has done, cannot just retire—he will go on serving.

Whatever he does Mr. Speaker, or wherever he goes, I want to wish him Godspeed.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, Roland V. Libonati, has had an assessment of his character made today by the Congress of which he has been a Member for so long. As a lawyer this record will mean a great deal to him. It is a measure of his worth as it has been judged by his colleagues and it weighs heavily in his favor. Not in memory can one recall such acclaim. He has been appreciated by his fellows, and from their judgment has come a picture of the complete man—a great legislator—constant in his devotion to his duties—knowledgeable in the matters before him for consideration—successful in seeking their solution—and always with a compassionate regard for his fellow Americans. A devoted husband who has had as a source of strength by his side his wonderful and charming wife—Jeannette; a fond father who looks with pride and joy upon a son who follows in his footsteps in training for the law at the Yale Law School; a friend in the true sense of that word to all who have served with him in the House.

I have a strong personal affection for Libby and his family. He is an unusual man with talents so diverse and capacities so large that every contact with him becomes an experience in itself. He may rest with pride for he has left a mark on all of us which cannot but help us in the work we do. We will miss Libby, as is clearly evident and we wish him success and good health in the years ahead.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues from Illinois in their tribute to our friend, Roland Victor Libonati, who is not seeking reelection this year. Few men have ever won the admiration, respect, and affections of his colleagues in the Congress as quickly as "Libby." His captivating smile, friendly personality, scholarly mind, frank expression, forcible eloquence, dedication to service, and deep religious faith have earned for him a niche in the Halls of the Congress that will be a lasting memorial to a great American. His departure from the Congress will be a great loss to his district, State, and Nation, which he has served so well. May he and his devoted wife enjoy health and happiness during his retirement.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, the rich rewards of service in the Congress are the friendship and respect that stem from our close association in this great Legislative Hall. I shall especially treasure my friendship with our distinguished colleague from Illinois, Representative Roland V. Libonati, who is concluding nearly 8 years of outstanding service in this body. He plans not to return, a decision which I am sure is a disappointment to his constituents whom he has served so well. But he has by long years of brilliant and dedicated service in the legislature of his native State and in the Congress of the United States earned his respite. We shall miss his friendly greeting, his warm smile, his wise counsel, but we wish him well and many more years of happiness.

His outstanding service should be a source of much personal satisfaction to him and to his family. He has earned the gratitude of the people of Illinois. We who have been privileged to serve with him know so well how great has been his contribution to the welfare and security of the United States.

SUGAR LEGISLATION

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, certain provisions of the Sugar Act expire at the end of this year. These are the provisions which determine how much of our foreign sugar needs shall be supplied by each foreign country. Failure of this Congress to extend this portion of the act may cause some confusion in the sugar market unless the Secretary of Agriculture immediately announces that he has ample authority to control total sugar imports into the United States. I urge him to make such announcement without delay—now.

He will continue to have that authority under the Sugar Act. The act will still specify how the Secretary shall determine the total amount of foreign sugar to be imported. He will have more latitude in determining which countries may ship sugar to us and how much each may send us.

The sugar quota system has served our country well. It has benefited many groups—the domestic producers and processors of sugarcane and sugarbeets, the foreign countries which supply sugar to the United States, the housewives, the industrial sugar users, and the cane sugar refiners located in the continental United States. We must maintain the sugar quota system, and I am sure we will.

Mr. Speaker, the failure of this Congress to act on sugar legislation leaves unsolved a major problem for U.S. sugarcane and sugarbeet growers and processors. Last year there was a worldwide scarcity of sugar, and the Secretary of Agriculture called upon the sugarcane and sugarbeet industries in the continental United States to expand production. Both groups responded to the Secretary's request and greatly increased their output of sugar. Unfortunately, the additional sugar they have produced cannot be sold until Congress takes affirmative action to permit the sale of this overquota sugar.

There are no Government storage programs for sugar. Therefore, the extra supply of sugar produced at Government request must be stored and carried in inventory at the expense of the sugar industry.

Mr. Speaker, this is a grave injustice, inflicted upon sugarcane and sugarbeet farmers and processors in the 24 States growing these crops. It is not my purpose to point the finger of blame at this time. The blame for this sad situation must be borne by a number of individuals and groups.

I appeal to the Secretary of Agriculture to do all that he can to alleviate the hardship facing our domestic sugar industry. One thing that will help is a better price for sugar, and the Secretary can bring about a better price by the manner in which he administers the quota system. Mr. Speaker, I hope others will join me in urging the Secretary of Agriculture to provide a sugar price at least equal to the price objective of the Sugar Act.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Cooley] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, from the very beginning of this session, as chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, I have tried faithfully and diligently to bring about an agreement between all segments of the sugar industry and the agencies of the executive branch of the Government. Numerous conferences have been held and much time has been consumed. Representatives of some segments of the sugar industry were at all times willing and ready to compose differences, to compromise, and to reach an agreement, but, unfortunately, all the important matters involved continued in controversy. I shall not at this time attempt to discuss in detail all of the implications and ramifications involved in the controversy. I shall do that later.

I take this time only to congratulate and commend the distinguished, able, and beloved Congressmen from the States of Louisiana and Florida and those who have so well and ably represented the continental cane producers. At all times this group has been cooperative and intensely interested in solving all the problems which perplex all segments of the industry. Mr. Joe Farris, who represented this group of industry, has at all times been fair and forthright, and above all, reasonable and realistic. Speaking for his part of the industry he long ago indicated to our committee that the continental cane producers would be willing to build up their inventories and to accept acreage reductions in 1965.

If only Congress would authorize the sale of sugar produced during the years of 1963 and 1964. Mr. Farris could not have been more reasonable and more cooperative. Mr. Speaker, I pay tribute to our beloved colleague, Ed Willis, and our able whip, Hale Boggs, both of whom have at all times worked right along with Mr. Farris and the producers of the areas. No Members of Congress could have been more energetic or effective than Ed Willis and Hale Boggs, but unfortunately, we now come to the end of a long, hard fight and I must share with them their great disappointment. Ed Willis well and ably represents the largest cane sugar producing area in the country, yet he and his constituents must suffer and experience losses only because of the segment of the sugar industry which were not willing to be reasonable. I think I am safe in saying that every member of our 35-man committee will agree with the remarks I have just made and that every one of them would welcome an opportunity to authorize the American cane producers to sell all of the surplus sugar produced in 1963 and 1964, since these producers were willing to accept acreage reductions in 1965. Notwithstanding this situation, the compromise could not be agreed upon. Certainly no one can say that Ed Willis, Hale Boggs, and Joe Farris have not done everything that could possibly be done to provide relief for the cane producers of our country.

Because of this cruel and unending controversy, we are now witnessing a sad spectacle. I want to thank Ed Willis, Hale Boggs, and Joe Farris for their fine efforts in behalf of the sugarcane producers of America. I shall have more to say later.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIS. I am pleased to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS. First, I would like to commend the gentleman on the outstanding job that he has done in behalf of the sugar producers and the others in that industry in this country. I know of no man who has worked harder to bring about the resolution of the differences that have arisen between the various segments of this great industry.

I would also like to say, I have joined with the gentleman in making these requests of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, a point of order, are there special orders pending?

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, a point of order—are there special orders pending?

Mr. BOGGS. It is for that reason that I ask unanimous consent, if the gentleman from Iowa would not object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I object until the special orders are disposed of.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

Mr. GROSS. I object, Mr. Speaker, until the special orders are disposed of.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

THE SUGAR PROBLEM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Albert). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Long], is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS. I am sorry that the gentleman from Iowa, whom I admire so much, would not give us a minute or two to present this problem, but I am happy it so happens that the man who is sacrificing his time is one of my distinguished colleagues from Louisiana.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to carry on the thought I was trying to present a moment ago, which is that the producers in our section are now about to harvest the crop. I say "about to harvest the crop" but at the moment we are under the gun of a severe hurricane. That hurricane at the moment is in the sugar belt of Louisiana. The amount of damage which may occur, to lives and property and everything else in the area, as well as crops, is something I do not even like to contemplate.

I might say to my distinguished colleague from Louisiana, as he undoubtedly knows, President Johnson has mobilized all the emergency forces of the Government of the United States in connection with this disaster with which we seem to be faced in my home city of New Orleans and throughout southeastern Louisiana, and possibly the Mississippi gulf coast. Much of the fate of the great sugar industry may be determined in the next few hours by an act of God. It is His decision. It is something I hope will not be as severe as the indications now point to.

Mr. Willis said that he had asked the Secretary of Agriculture to invoke the remedies now available under the present sugar law. I concur in that and have been in constant touch with the Secretary. I have asked that he do this at once so that we may have an orderly harvest and a fair price. I have done everything in my power to resolve the difference in the industry for their mutual benefit.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I desire personally to commend the distinguished Democratic whip who is addressing the House, and the distinguished gentleman who is now acting as Speaker pro tempore, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Willis], for the hard fight they and others interested in this problem have made to try to get a satisfactory resolution of the sugar problem in this Congress. They have worked on the matter for months.

Every Member of the House knows as well as I that there are not in the House two more industrious or effective Members, two more respected Members, than these distinguished gentlemen from Louisiana, who have shown such concern and who have given so much attention to the problems of the sugar farmers of their districts and of this country.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join in the remarks of the distinguished majority leader. My knowledge of this matter is not as extensive as that of the majority leader, but, upon the adoption by the Senate of the sugar amendment to a tariff matter originating in the Ways and Means Committee, I became aware quickly of the interest of the distinguished majority whip and of the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Willis], and of other Members of the Louisiana delegation, as well as delegations of other States interested in this problem.

I should like for their friends to know that they discussed this matter with me on numerous occasions. They were most hopeful that some arrangement could be worked out whereby some additional legislation could be passed in this session of Congress.

We made the effort of trying to get the matter to conference, as the membership here knows, in order to try as best we could to help resolve this very perplexing problem and a problem which I know is of great interest to these gentlemen.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Waggonner].

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I want to take this time to express my keen disappointment, along with the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Willis] and my other colleagues here today, over the fact that Congress has not been able to enact much needed follow-on sugar legislation. However, I hasten to add that the fact that Congress has not yet been able to agree on sugar legislation is in no way attibutable to or the fault of Ed Willis or the Louisiana delegation. If ever any man worked for the best interests of the people in the sugar industry, Ed Willis is that man. He has worked long and he has worked hard. His efforts have not been fruitless. He continually looks after the interests of all the people, and I know that he is going to continue to do just exactly that. Sugar is important to Louisiana. We of the Louisiana delegation are united in our efforts to assist. I do not think there is any man in this Congress who knows more about the problems of the sugar industry than does Ed Willis. I trust that the Secretary of Agriculture will exercise good judgment in utilizing his discretionary authority until Congress can enact legislation which will meet the needs of the industry and I believe he will.

The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Boggs], our majority whip, a colleague from Louisiana, said a few moments ago that the sugar industry in our State at least faces a crisis that other areas do not face with hurricane Hilda bearing down on the State of Louisiana. The damage will be terrific. He knows what he is talking about.

Mr. Willis, Mr. Boggs, and the entire Louisiana delegation has worked long and hard for the sugar industry in Louisiana and our other cane and beet sugar States. The effort does not end here.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield to the majority whip.

Mr. BOGGS. The gentleman has no idea why I am asking him to yield, and I would not take this time if I knew of any other way to get time, but objections are being heard to requests to address the House for 1 minute.

I asked the gentleman to yield in order that I might say to the House that among the distinguished Members of this body who will be missing when we reconvene in January will be the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Long]. I know that every Member of this body will miss him more than I can describe.

I have known Gillis Long since he first came to Washington, which was a good many years ago. I employed him as general counsel for the Special Committee on Elections. He did the most thorough job of researching the election laws of this country that I have ever seen. That research has been the basis for every amendment to the Corrupt Practices Act which has been introduced since then and that was a good many years ago.

In a very short time he has distinguished himself as a diligent Member of this House, and a man aware of the problems of our State and our region and a dedicated citizen of the great United States of America. He has given his full time and fine intellect, as well as great energy, to the people of my beloved State of Louisiana.

Gillis Long, just as I said yesterday about Carl Elliott, has only begun to serve the people of the United States. He is a dedicated man. He has an excellent mind and he applies that mind. In this Nation we have today 190 million people all of whom have difficult problems, and our Nation itself is the leader of the free world. Men of his caliber are needed in public service, and I hope he will remain in public service and will remain active in the political affairs of my great State of Louisiana.

Now, Gillis did not expect me to say this, but I am glad that I had the opportunity to do so.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I thank the gentleman very kindly.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Speaker, I want to say that all the four gentlemen from Louisiana who have spoken so strongly have represented all the agricultural interests of their districts. The problem with sugar is that both the cane growers in Louisiana and the beet growers in the West have a crisis situation that will not be solved unless we can force some early hearings next year, in January, on this sugar problem, by the House Committee on Agriculture. I hope we can all cooperate in that effort.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, as our distinguished majority whip stated, my term as a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives is fast drawing to a close, together with the responsibilities of office and the tremendous satisfactions which that service has given me.

In trying to review and report on this demanding 2 years to my people I am faced with the realization that to evaluate my own performance honestly I must in a sense pass judgment on the accomplishments of the Congress as a whole.

Nine months ago I would have been somewhat disappointed in that record. I found myself part of a body which was under serious attack on all sides as a "do nothing" Congress. And I, as most of my colleagues, had to accept the criticism of the reformers and the invectives of the crepe hangers who shouted, almost with a voice, that things were moving too slow, that not enough was being done.

But today I can stand proudly as a Member of a Congress that has built a record which will go down as one of the most constructive and creative of the last 30 years.

I do not mean to suggest that this has been a rubberstamp Congress, one which said "yes" to everything which the administration proposed. On the contrary, many of its most significant acts were marked with controversy and heated debate which resulted in improvement in the final legislative product.

For my part, I have found myself on many occasions in opposition to leaders of both parties, as in the question of the civil rights bill and at other times I have opposed programs important to the national administration, such as foreign aid.

But I believe—and I hope that time will so judge me—that I have been an apostle of enlightened opposition—not opposition for its own sake or opposition which simply played a theme which I knew to be popular in my State or region.

As a public servant I have been ruled by a strong belief that blind adherence to anything—party, principle, or public opinion—is the virus which weakens our great and noble institution. This belief has led me to become the object of bitter attacks by those who seek, in their frustration over the complexities of life, simple and obvious answers to every problem. To those who would look to the party for answers to every question I have given little comfort, though I have been loyal to my party. To those who insist on clinging to a certain belief regardless of circumstances, I have offered little solace. And instead of joining those who are the slaves of public opinion, when that opinion has been forged by cynical people using misinformation and deception, I have tried to give my people leadership—even though there were obvious political risks in such a course.

I have followed this path because I feel that to do less in these troubled years would commit a treason to our Republic. Political opportunism, practiced singly and in a limited sphere, perhaps does little harm to the cement which holds our Republic together—but multiplied a dozen times, or a hundred times, in this great, responsible, creative branch of government does violence to the land and cripples the strong fingers of democracy.

I have tried to live my life as a public servant in the knowledge that I could not be the instrument of any group or any interest. For the vote of a sharecropper is as strong and meaningful as that of an industrialist, and to serve them all, I could serve none completely.

With the passing of this Congress, I see some paths closing and some still open to our people. I see that, despite our pleadings for understanding and patience, the South has been handed a mandate by the rest of the Nation in the field of civil rights. We disagree with the dictum, we deplore what we feel are its excesses, its cost in the freedom of the individual, but it has come. And now we must decide what to do about it.

The great constitutional questions raised by this act are still to be resolved, both in the courts of law and in the arena of public opinion. But until those questions are answered, what is our choice: tacit submission or outright disregard for and violation of the law? No, I believe we have a choice which is neither of these extremes. I believe that, with brave and resourceful leadership by the white and Negro community we can build a new kind of relationship which is neither the degradation of the master-slave relation or the naive dream of those who believe in immediate solutions to problems which have festered for a hundred years or more.

This new world will require extra effort by our States and local communities at a time when they are sorely burdened. It will require courage of our leaders, because the scars are so deep that even the suggestions I make here today will be interpreted by some people as a sign of weakness. But I submit to you that the alternative to this painful and demanding search for a solution is a forced and unnatural legal equality which will be more costly in terms of human misery and social upheaval than its champions can imagine.

There is a universal physical law that nature abhors a vacuum. Most of the problems now facing our country are based on the fact that there are also great social vacuums. And where the individuals and the States have failed in their responsibilities this vacuum has been filled by the Federal Government. In much the same way, our country has attempted to fill the vacuum in world leadership created by the falling apart of old orders and the emergence of new problems. In our desire to be all things to all men perhaps we have come perilously close to becoming all things to no man.

Our Federal Government has tried to fill the vacuums created by lack of dedicated and resourceful State leadership in many fields. This is true in education, it is true in race relations. Perhaps it is too late to change this trend from power clustered at the top; the journey back to genuine local rule and individual responsibility will be much more difficult than the journey to the present state. And it will require intelligent decisions about which programs can best be handled by the States and which are the proper role of the Federal Government. We must never lose sight of the fact that many of the powers assumed by the Federal Government today were simply taken because the States failed in their responsibilities somewhere along the line.

But the journey back to some measure of local responsibility in many areas of government will be profitable for everyone concerned if it brings with it the realization that to gain freedom we must sometimes be willing to risk it.

Government can be an instrument held by responsible people or it can become a benevolent caretaker for a people too eager to "let Uncle do it," at a cost which far exceeds its worth.

UPON BEING CALLED A LIBERAL

Before recounting my stewardship for the last 2 years, I would like to say a word about labels.

Perhaps more than anything else, my 2 years as a Member of the U.S. Congress has taught me the evils of labeling, of placing people in convenient pigeonholes and labeling them with whatever cliches have been must commonly applied to that species. The urge and inclination to do this by many people is but a continuation of the effort to make everything simple. But, everything is not simple.

Since coming here, I have found that even in this great, enlightened body we tend to place our colleagues in niches which hampered their effectiveness. I have been surprised how many people have come into my office expecting to find me a ranting, raving demagog, a fiery cross clutched in one hand and a bottle of moonshine in the other. The time has come for an end to the labels and the misuse of even the most common word.

On a television program when I first came to Congress, the interviewer asked me how I regarded myself—as a liberal or conservative. In dozens of ways since then I have had to answer the same kind of question, asked in the light of dozens of momentous issues.

Those terms have become so distorted that, in my State, to be called liberal is almost to be accused of a capital crime, and being relegated to that group has a faint aura of treason.

To freshen my own outlook, I turned the other day to Webster's Dictionary, which I hope can be trusted not to have any devious political intent. I found there a definition which I found easy to apply to my own outlook toward government and people. The definition of "liberal" which I found there is, partly, as follows:

> A political philosophy based on belief in progress, the essential goodness of man, and the autonomy of the individual and standing for tolerance and freedom of the individual from arbitrary authority in all spheres of life, especially by the protection of political and civil liberties and for government under law and with the consent of the governed.

As the Christian Science Monitor pointed out recently, this shows how sadly the meaning of even the most basic terms has been distorted in today's world. If we accept the definition I just outlined, I am indeed a liberal, and I can proudly hold my head up with that assertion. In the matters of States rights and Federal power, I submit that we need to reassess our definitions as surely as we must go back to the basic roots of our great political philosophies and water them with an enlightened and objective hand.

BY THEIR FRUITS

If there is any objective way to judge a Congressman's performance, it is through a comparison of what he has done and what he pledged to do. My plans for the Eighth District when I ran for Congress were set out in a brief statement of platform principles. I would like to examine those promises and discuss briefly what I did or attempted to do to fulfill those promises.

FULL EMPLOYMENT

I pledged to do everything within my power to assure full employment for the people of my district. Many of the measures I voted for in the Congress had that general purpose, but in addition there were actions which I can point to that had a direct and immediate effect.

I used every means at my disposal to push through approval of an Area Redevelopment Administration loan which helped build the Dixie Foundry in Marksville. When in full operation this plant will employ about 40 people.

A $3 million plywood plant in Florien, expected to employ 350 people when in full operation, was one of two such plants for Louisiana that I helped get started through a $6.5 million program of Federal loan and private enterprise.

England Air Force Base expanded its mission, with the addition of a new wing that required $750,000 in emergency construction which I was able to secure from the Defense Department.

Fort Polk, which many had expected to close down again, remained open and was granted $625,000 in added funds for needed improvements, over and above its usual very substantial appropriation.

Only recently, England AFB got an added $1,700,000 in facilities improvement funds.

And all of these military projects meant money spent in our district and added payrolls for the future.

The employment generated by nearly 50 public works projects and Government grants and loans amounting to nearly $4,800,000 also meant many man-woman months of work, and payrolls spent in our district.

In Agriculture, I supported the retention of price supports for our cotton farmers, and voted for the 1964 agriculture bill in the belief that it was the best hope available for the small farmers in our district. I did so with the knowledge that certain organized interests and large farmers opposed the measure and threatened political retaliation.

As proof of my further interest in the farmer, I favored a bill which broadened the food stamp program which had proved so valuable in a pilot program in Avoyelles Parish. I favored the "food for peace" program to helped ease our surplus program and offset the balance of payments deficit.

I voted to raise the limits on loans by Farmers Home Administration to allow farm people to build a better quality home.

And, most important to our beef industry in Louisiana, I introduced legislation to put severe limitations on the amount of meat which could be imported from foreign countries. A measure substantially the same as mine was finally signed into law, thus protecting our domestic industry from a flood of cheap imported meat.

I was also the originator of legislation to require the future marking of imported meat so that consumers can tell when the meat they are buying is not American produced. I hope the next Congress will give serious consideration to this proposed legislation.

During my 2 years in Congress I have voted for those measures which I felt were designed to strengthen our national economy, and which attempted to solve our problems of unemployment and poverty.

One of the significant programs which I supported was the creation of the Office of Economic Opportunity, or the antipoverty program. It was my feeling that, with its efforts toward job training for urban and rural youth, its work training and work study programs, its attempts to foster local efforts to fight poverty, this program deserved the support of those who were concerned about our mounting problems in these areas. This is not a giveaway program—it is a program to help those who want to help themselves.

I also supported the tax cut of $11.5 billion, which is pumping an estimated $10 million a month extra into the pockets of Louisiana taxpayers.

In other actions which supported a strong economy, I: first, supported the establishment of the National Commission on Food Marketing; second, worked in the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, on which I served, for passage of new securities regulations to protect the investor; third, supported expanded programs for highways and airports; and, fourth, voted to amend the Davis-Bacon Act to require Federal contractors to conform to local area fringe benefits as well as prevailing wage scales.

In addition to these measures which I supported, I introduced a bill which would give our teachers tax deductions in the amount they pay for tuition and certain other costs for advanced schooling.

In the field of national defense I supported several important programs: First, the expenditure of $16.9 billion to build planes, missiles, ships, and research; second, funds for research and development of our space effort through the National Aeronautics and Space Administration; third, $1.5 billion for construction projects at military installations at home and abroad; fourth, extension of the Civil Defense Act; fifth, strengthened provisions of the National Security Agency; and, sixth, I worked to keep a strong and vital military community, worked for the enlargement and permanence of both Fort Polk and England Air Force Base.

Throughout my term in Congress I have also supported a strong defense posture, backing our firm stand during the Cuban missile crisis and supporting the American position during recent aggressive acts in the Tonkin Gulf area off North Vietnam.

In matters of foreign aid I have consistently been a foe of giveaway programs, preferring instead to support military and technical assistance programs and programs which required participation of the individual people of other nations.

In every case where a foreign aid bill has been voted upon, I have voted "no," lies to the contrary notwithstanding. I did support the International Development Association, where the United States joined with 16 other nations to provide lending capital for loans to friendly foreign countries.

I also joined in a resolution which passed the Congress expressing the sense of Congress that other members of the United Nations be required to pay their fair share of that organization's expenses or lose their voting power.

In the area of programs for the aging and needy I supported the increase in monthly payments to 19½ million old-age, survivors, and disability beneficiaries under the Social Security Act. I did not, however, support the medicare provision tacked on as an amendment by the Senate, feeling that it endangered the social security system and was not needed in Louisiana.

In my Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I worked for extending the Hill-Burton Act and other health and education programs such as: First, a 5-year program to combat the nurse shortage; second, expansion of the public health programs, with increases in the number of trainee shops and increased health project grants; and third, new and encouraging mental health programs.

And I fully supported programs such as the Housing Act, Library Services Act, and the improvement and strengthening of the National Defense Education Act.

I strived to see that the people of the Eighth District had their rightful share of money spent for Federal installations. The most significant of these were the improvement programs at the Natchitoches Fish Hatchery and the forest research center in Alexandria. Both of these installations have an important role in expanding and developing our district's natural resources, and I fully support their growth and expansion.

In the matter of civil and States rights I have tried to carry out my pledge to help maintain harmonious race relations and to keep government as close to home as possible.

I opposed the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and when it was passed I introduced legislation calling for a national referendum on its provisions. I originated a petition calling for this national referendum and secured over 10,000 signatures on it.

During hearings on the bill, I gave evidence of meddling by the Civil Rights Commission in the affairs of college fraternal groups and succeeded in helping to get through an amendment to the bill specifically prohibiting such investigations and similar investigations of private clubs, church groups, and lodges.

In addition to these things, I have worked hard to see Red River again returned to prominence as a navigable stream. I worked hard to get the comprehensive survey which is expected to show that navigation is feasible again on Red River.

I also got a $25,000 special appropriation to study a notorious drainage problem in Rapides and Avoyelles Parishes.

I have worked in the interest of the Nation's veterans, introducing a realistic pension bill and reinstatement of lapsed GI insurance. I supported a measure to provide matching funds for nursing-home facilities in State veteran homes.

In keeping with my view on the rights of the States to govern their own affairs, I voted for a bill which would prohibit the Supreme Court from dictating to State legislatures in the matter of reapportioning their membership.

SOME VIEWS ON THE FUTURE

This, then, is my accounting of the stewardship which I have shown in the 2 years as U.S. Representative. As I leave office, there are some observations which I feel obliged to make regarding the future of my district and its people.

A few years ago, the Eighth District was on the verge of becoming an economic blight. Employment was becoming increasingly worse, there was no industrial upsurge, not much promise for the future.

The small hill farms, such as I was raised on, have virtually disappeared from the scene. Welfare was becoming a major industry in our area.

Within the last few years there have been signs of some change. A more permanent military community exists; community efforts, such as the one in Sabine and Avoyelles Parishes have produced local industry; we have begun to use our natural resources again, with the prospect of a major timber industry looming in the not-too-distant future; and our people are beginning to see the possibilities of trade and new markets as a result of the proposed Red River navigation project.

No one, not even the most optimistic, would say that all our problems are solved. There are still too many unemployed, and we have to continually increase our capacity for providing new jobs. Too many of our young people are still going to greener pastures when they leave school, instead of staying in our district and giving us the benefit of their leadership. But there are still hopeful signs.

There are new challenges which must be faced, however, and these will determine whether this "second chance" will become nothing more than a momentary bright spot.

There are forces in our communities which would like to see an end to progress. There are those who believe that we can continue to exist apart from the demands of the century we are in and the world that lies ahead. This cannot be. The future of our people and our land lies in our ability to shake off the influence of these false prophets, to wake up to new ideas and new service, to grasp opportunity without fear.

I have tried to serve the people of my district with honor and dignity, and I have tried to place their interests above my own personal needs. I have kept faith with my conscience and my duty as I saw it. I shall always do as much in any public position I might have the honor to hold.

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POOL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. POOL. Mr. Speaker, I have visited in Gillis Long's district and know the esteem by which he is held by those good people of his district.

We in Congress will miss Gillis, his wife and their two wonderful children. The greatest tribute I can pay him is to say that he works from his heart. All of us know that he practices the golden rule. He has been, in my opinion, the outstanding freshman Congressman of this session. I join with my colleagues in wishing him great success in his new career. We all love him.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. Udall] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret that I realized today is the the last day of service in the House for the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Gillis Long]. I do not believe that any congressional district ever had more diligent, conscientious, and able service than the district he has spoken for in the 88th Congress. This is a man who has shown a great capacity for public service, and I think more will be heard from him in the years to come. I think that few Members of the Congress have accomplished so much in such a short time, and I wish him well in whatever he chooses to undertake.

Above and beyond this, I shall miss Gillis Long and his fine wife, Cathy, because they are kind, warm, human beings with a concern for other people and their problems.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Waggonner] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, as my friend and colleague, Gillis Long, leaves the Congress I want to express my pleasure and gratitude for his friendship and service to our State and Nation. As a Member of this Congress I believe Gillis has followed the admonition of Daniel Webster in his efforts to develop the resources of our land, call forth its powers, build up its institutions, promote all its great interests and see whether we also in our day and generation may not perform something worthy to be remembered. In Louisiana we would say this is a trademark of the Longs. Gillis is no exception. Gillis Long is not in my opinion ending his career in public life. It has only begun. I wish him well and nothing but the best and look forward with anticipation to our continued friendship and association in his endeavors in the years ahead.

THE TONKIN BAY INCIDENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Bromwell], is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROMWELL. Mr. Speaker, it was with some surprise that the Nation learned on yesterday further amplification of the information we had received from the Defense Department concerning the incident occurring in the Gulf of Tonkin on the night of September 18.

Previously, it was known that unnamed U.S. vessels had been engaged with certain unidentified radar blips and that after action by the U.S. vessels the blips disappeared.

Now it is known that the destroyers U.S.S. *Edwards* and U.S.S. *Morton* were in fact the vessels engaged. There exists, however, a discrepancy in public knowledge as to the enemy, and the net result of the action.

Fireman James J. Kress, of Dubuque, Iowa, has stated in a letter to his mother that the targets of the *Edwards* and the *Morton* were in fact torpedo boats, and that two such boats were destroyed and another badly damaged.

Now this letter has been widely publicized and the accuracy of this last statement has been tested by a request to the Department of Defense by Neil Shively, a newspaperman of Dubuque, Iowa.

For this the Defense Department has replied only that:

> The shapes in the radars of the two destroyers disappeared from the radarscope.

Now, we recall, Mr. Speaker, that the first incident in Tonkin Bay publicly attracted the attention of the President himself, who went before the people to take the American position. But on this occasion we find the Department of Defense in the most unusual position of neither confirming or denying a report of enemy vessels engaged and enemy forces defeated.

Why is this, Mr. Speaker? It would appear that only three circumstances could possibly obtain. Either Fireman Kress' statement is true, it is false, or the facts are not susceptible of proof. And none of the three circumstances runs contrary to U.S. policy as we know it, or in any way brings dishonor to our country in a full disclosure of the facts.

I note with dismay that there is news on the wire today concerning the August incident in the Gulf of Tonkin, but not a word of the September 18 incident.

It is hard to see what national interest is served by having to obtain our information from the boys who serve in the enlisted ranks.

I am in hopes that the Department of Defense will clarify this matter.

THE ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE 88TH CONGRESS

Mr. POOL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCormack] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the work of the 88th Congress already has produced a robust and all-embracing prosperity, shared by every family in the land.

Peace has been buttressed with new weapons and stronger alliances of peace and friendship all around the world.

The frightful threat of atomic war has been lessened measurably by the first worldwide treaty to outlaw atmospheric testing of all atomic weapons.

For the first time in our constitutional history, we have outlawed second-class citizenship. The Civil Rights Act guarantees equal treatment of all races and creeds in every federally assisted program; and these rights and privileges are further protected by the new Community Relations Service, and the extended Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity.

Again for the first time in history, the 88th Congress has made the war on poverty an integral part of the Federal Establishment. Our new Office of Economic Opportunity already is in business, with funds amounting to more than $947 million available for its work in the present fiscal year. National prosperity and personal economic security are now legal concerns of the National Government, and we have no less than 114 different programs of Federal assistance in operation today to assure the future security and progress of the American people on every economic front.

This notable Congress in its two sessions, in 1963 and 1964, enacted more than 625 new public laws to keep this Nation abreast of the times in a world yearning and striving for peace, progress, and prosperity.

Equal pay for women has been assured in every industry—again, for the first time in our constitutional history.

We met our challenging balance-of-payments problem head-on, by enactment of a new equalization tax on foreign securities purchased by American investors.

In these two historic sessions, total new authorizations for military hardware were $32.2 billions; and this includes new record amounts for research and development of new weapons systems.

Our new Polaris missiles today are three times more effective than the first Polaris warheads of 1960–61. Our defense systems today are stronger and more reliable—on the ground, in the air, in space, in our ships at sea, and in our submarines beneath the oceans of the world.

This Nation is strong, confident, unafraid.

Our program of tax reduction across the board has stimulated economic growth and robust prosperity on every business front.

We have made a beginning in a new program of Federal aid to meet the pressing transportation needs of our great metropolitan areas.

We have established for the first time in our constitutional history a new national commission to ease the impact of industrial automation.

We have strengthened and broadened the social security program through larger retirement and health benefits.

Salary increases for both the civil and military personnel have benefited every community in America.

Increased benefits for aged and disabled veterans have eased the pinch of poverty and distress in a million homes across the land.

We have authorized more than $1.2 billions for continued urban renewal projects in our blighted and overcrowded slums.

We have authorized systematic extension and preservation of some 35 million acres of wilderness areas for healthful recreation; plus a new 10-year land and water conservation program from coast to coast.

These programs contemplate an expenditure of some $2 billion over the coming decade for conservation, recreation and wildlife preservation to enrich the life of all America.

We have authorized $700 million for a new powerline tie along the entire Pacific coast, to bring into operation the greatest electric power pool in the world.

We have broken new ground in a determined Federal attack on air pollution, on stream pollution, on hospital construction, medical education, juvenile delinquency.

Indeed, every concern of the American people, and every demand of orderly constitutional government has received the careful and conscientious attention of the 88th Congress.

Through drastic revision of our atomic power program, we have authorized the gradual release of atomic materials to private ownership by electric power companies. The Government leasing program in atomic fuels will begin to phase out in 1971.

Through the new Chamizal Treaty with Mexico we have renewed and strengthened our bonds of peace and friendship with that great Republic.

In the same manner we now have realized a new treaty with Canada, to the north, for the joint development of the power resources of the mighty Columbia Basin—a project which has been an engineer's dream for almost half a century. Today that treaty, and that dream, are realities.

Our sessions often have been long, and trying. The demands on our time often have been pressing and raucous. We live in a world of great expectations and unbounded hopes for the good life and the great society.

The 88th Congress has responded nobly to the demands of the hour and the petitions of all the people.

The record we leave is a record of proud accomplishment, of devoted patriotic purpose, of faithful defense of the Constitution, and response to the needs of a mighty and growing nation.

From the pages of history will come, I feel certain, the merited accolade—"Well done."

SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1964

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a speech I made on September 28.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, all Members, of course, are aware that the conferees on the social security bill, H.R. 11865, Social Security Amendments of 1964, were unable to reach agreement and the conference was adjourned yesterday without any legislation which could be recommended by the conference committee.

Both the Committee on Ways and Means and the Senate Committee on Finance spent a good deal of time in developing our respective bills. Both committees and the House and the Senate voted benefit increases for all social security insurance beneficiaries. It is unfortunate, that because of the failure of getting agreement in conference due to the hospitalization insurance provision, we are unable to provide for cash benefit increases which both bodies had approved but in different form. For my own part, I made it clear that I would be most willing to agree to some form of benefit increases and resume consideration of the medical care problems of our elder citizens early in the next Congress. My concern, as the record shows, is and has been the preservation of a sound social security insurance system. I have tried to make this point on many occasions and I have been most disturbed about putting the two together under the existing social security insurance system.

I think no one will disagree that we could have obtained agreement on the cash benefit increases in conference either by taking the House or the Senate version of these benefit increases or some compromise in between the two versions of the bill. This would have permitted the Committee on Ways and Means to resume its consideration of the problem of medical care of our elderly citizens after the first of the year since this matter is the unfinished business of the committee following our action in June on H.R. 11865.

In a press release setting forth a summary of our committee's action on social security, dated June 25, 1964, it was stated:

> It was understood and agreed by the committee that the foregoing changes in title II of the Social Security Act would be made without prejudice to possible action at a future time on the subject of hospital insurance under social security or on the subject of amendments to the medical assistance for the aged under title I of the Social Security Act.

It was my thought that this position of our committee was a sound position for the conference because it would have been impossible anyway in the conference to provide any hospitalization benefits prior to January 1, 1966. This would have been true even had the conference accepted the Senate amendment without change.

It was also my thought in conference that the Committee on Ways and Means should resume consideration of the medical care problems of the aged next year. Any provisions for medical care for the aged could have been made available just as early as had been provided in the Senate amendment on hospitalization insurance benefits. However, as it developed it was not possible to obtain this result.

We were faced with a situation which has concerned me all along and that was the inclusion of a service benefit—hospitalization—along with cash benefits under the social security insurance system. It has always been my position that if such action were taken this could result in a situation in future years where we could provide only very limited increases in cash benefits if indeed we could provide any at all.

Those interested in the social security insurance system must bear this in mind along with all of the other facets of the problem. This overall view must be taken, in my opinion, before we determine the method to be followed in making available hospital benefits or any medical benefits under any prepayment program.

A recent speech which I made spells out in more detail some of the major considerations involved in my decision on this matter and I am inserting the speech at this point:

REMARKS OF WILBUR D. MILLS BEFORE MODEL LUNCHEON MEETING OF ARKANSAS-MISSOURI DISTRICT KIWANIS CONVENTION, LITTLE ROCK, ARK., SEPTEMBER 28, 1964

Mr. Chairman, officers, and members of the Arkansas-Missouri District Kiwanis International, and distinguished guests, it is a genuine privilege to meet with groups such as yours which have rendered such a variety of service to our community, State, and Nation.

On occasions such as this, I cannot help but reflect on the contributions which the Kiwanis as a community service organization has made to the fundamental moral strength of our great country. Your emphasis on local effort is refreshing, and your concentration on private endeavor to meet community needs is to be highly commended.

The many projects which you have sponsored throughout the years to promote charitable objectives, to aid handicapped children, and to combat juvenile delinquency are well known. You are to be congratulated on the efforts which your various local clubs have directed toward affording recreation for our children, safety programs for their protection, and the promotion of civic pride and civic cooperation, as well as ethical standards in our day-to-day economic relations. I sincerely congratulate each of you on the work you are doing and the service you are rendering.

* * * * *

From among the variety of possible subjects, I believe the one of most current and widespread interest in the House of Representatives is the action which is being taken on the social security bill and, more specifically, on the Senate amendments concerning hospital care for the aged which were added to that bill. Our House-Senate conference committee is about to conclude its work and the issue will be before the House of Representatives, whether or not the conferees bring back a provision on hospital care.

First, I would like to mention, quite briefly, the principal content of the House bill and the Senate amendments which were added to it. Second, I want to discuss certain substantive aspects of the issue of medical care for the aged under the social security program.

However, before going to the merits of this subject, I must point out that in reading the daily newspapers you undoubtedly have been given the impression that I have a tremendous amount of power over the scheduling and flow of legislation in the House of Representatives, since many of the newspapers have widely reported that, singlehandedly, I have for 6 or 7 years prevented this legislation from being considered by the other 434 Members of the House. The most recent report in this regard is that I am not going to permit the Senate amendment to be voted on by the House. The story varies, you see, depending upon where the proposal is at any given time.

I must confess that it is flattering in one sense of the word to be viewed in this light, but I can assure you that there is no individual in the House of Representatives, including the Speaker or the majority leader who can prevent the consideration of legislation which a majority of the Members of the House are determined to consider. In fact, one of the great strengths of the House is that under the rules of the House, a determined majority can always work its will and there is no single man, nor group of men, in the House that can prevent this.

It just so happens in this instance that apparently a majority of the Members of the House of Representatives share the deep concern which I have over using the Old-Age, Survivors and Disability Insurance System for financing a medical or hospital care program. This is the real reason why the proponents of this legislation so far have not pursued their avenues of bringing it to a vote on the floor.

CONTENTS OF HOUSE AND SENATE BILLS

Turning now to the social security bill as it was passed by the House of Representatives on July 29 of this year, it contained a benefit increase for the nearly 20 million social security beneficiaries of 5 percent across-the-board. Among the provisions extending and improving the system were the extension of child's benefits to age 22 while he is in college; provision for voluntary retirement of widows at age 60 with an actuarially reduced benefit; provision of limited benefits to some 600,000 aged beneficiaries who are age 72 and over who have had some social security coverage but not enough to meet the minimum requirements of existing law; and several provisions extending coverage of the system to persons presently not eligible for such coverage. The bill as passed by the House contained no provision relating to hospital insurance for the aged.

The bill as passed by the Senate does contain such a program, essentially the so-called King-Anderson bill, as well as other quite significant changes which made it an entirely different measure from the one which the House approved by 388 to 8. The House bill, with a more moderate increase in social security taxes and with an increase in the wage base from $4,800 to $5,400, is fully financed. The Senate bill is inadequately financed although it provided a greater increase in social security taxes—up to an ultimate 5.2 percent each on employer and employee—and a greater increase in the wage base, to $5,600. It is the hospital insurance amendment and the financing aspect of this legislation which is giving the conference committee grave concern.

I have always maintained that at some point there is a limit to the amount of a worker's wages, or the earnings of a self-employed person, that can reasonably be expected to finance the social security system. Not only is this a gross income tax, but it adds to the cost of American goods and services and thus affects our competitive position. I do not believe that the American people will support unlimited taxation in the area of social security.

HOSPITALIZATION UNDER THE SOCIAL SECURITY PROGRAM

Turning to the hospitalization insurance amendment, let me first outline what it would do and what it would not do.

Benefits would consist of payments for the following kinds of services:

1. Inpatient hospital care for 90 days per benefit period subject to deductible of $10 per day for the first 9 days, but not less than $20; or, upon election, 45 days per period with no deductible, or, upon election, 180 days with a deductible of the lesser of (a) 2½ times the average per diem rate for such services throughout the Nation under the program (until 1968 the bill sets the per diem rate at $37, thus the deductible initially will be $92.50) or (b) charges customarily made for such services by the hospital which furnished them. There may be only one election under this provision and it is irrevocable. The election must be made during the first 2 months.
2. Skilled nursing facility services up to 60 days in a benefit period after transfer from a hospital in an institution which is affiliated or under common control with a hospital.
3. So-called home health services up to 240 visits a year.
4. Outpatient diagnostic services—no durational limit but subject to a $20 deductible per 30-day period.

Note carefully that the bill is concerned primarily with services in a hospital. Contrary to widespread assumptions on the part of many elderly people, the bill does not cover such items as doctors' visits to the home, visits to doctors' offices, surgical services, drugs which many elderly people require, private nursing services or any nursing home services except where the patient has come out of a hospital and goes into a hospital-affiliated nursing home. This eliminates about 97 percent of the nursing homes.

Judging by my mail, there are many thousands of elderly persons in this country who believe that this so-called medicare program will take care of all of their hospital and medical requirements. This simply is not true. Unfortunately, "medicare under social security" has become an all-embracing slogan which in my opinion has not advanced the cause of those who need it.

I have always strongly supported a soundly conceived and soundly financed social security program as a bulwark against loss of earnings when a worker becomes disabled, retires or dies. One has but to look to the legislation to strengthen and improve the system, which has been enacted over the past decade and which bears my name, to witness the evidence of my sincere belief in this program.

However, I have also considered that the first responsibility of the Committee on Ways and Means and, indeed, the entire Congress, to this system of social insurance is to see to it that it is maintained on a sound financial basis.

I can assure you that year after year we have been confronted with pressures to liberalize the system in first one way or another. The liberalizations which we have made have always been accompanied by sufficient financing to keep the system on a sound actuarial basis.

In other words, we can accept only those reasonable changes which we know will not threaten to bring down the system as a whole. I will continue to strongly resist any proposal which might, in my opinion, do serious or lasting damage to the basic purpose of the OASDI system on which so many millions of our citizens rely.

I have not approached the subject of health care with a closed mind; indeed, I believe I have spent as many hours as any man seeking solutions to the obvious problems which face our older citizens. And there are problems, I assure you, in this field.

Beginning in 1957, when the original Forand bill was first introduced, there has not been a Congress in which the Committee on Ways and Means did not look carefully, conscientiously and sincerely into this issue. And we have reported and passed a great deal of legislation to assist our older citizens who cannot afford the care they need. But from this review and exploration have arisen the grave doubts which I have expressed as to what would happen to the system as a whole if we embark upon this new venture.

EVERY COST ESTIMATE SO FAR BY HEW HAS BEEN TOO LOW

The experience which the Committee on Ways and Means has had scrutinizing this problem has shown that every estimate made thus far by the Department of HEW as to the cost of this proposal has been unrealistically low. And bear in mind, we are dealing in billions, and with a course of action into the indefinite future.

Let me be specific. The original Forand bill introduced in 1957 provided more benefits than the current King-Anderson proposal. In the relatively short span of about 7 years, the Department of HEW now concedes that the cost of the original Forand bill was unrealistically low and that, in fact, it has almost doubled based upon the estimates they are now making.

Again, in 1960, the proposal was reintroduced, with smaller benefits. The Committee on Ways and Means spent approximately 3 months on the subject of medical care, including this bill, and concluded at that time that the proposal was still greatly underfinanced. When we had our hearings this year on the current proposal, again, interrogation substantiated the fact from the officials of HEW that the bill of 1960 would now be at least one-third underfinanced. This is only approximately 4 years ago.

In 1963, when the King-Anderson bill, the name of the current proposal, was introduced, it called for a tax increase of .25 percent each on employer and employee with a wage base increase to $5,000. However, by the time we conducted hearings on this proposal in 1964, only 1 year later, the Department had already readjusted, on its own, its estimate of the cost, and it then stated that the wage base would have to be $5,200, thus conceding that the estimate made in 1963 had already, in 1 short year, been outdated.

Thus, even though the proposal with which we are now dealing does not have the broad range of benefits which were included in the original Forand proposal—for example, there are no surgical benefits whatsoever in the current proposal, under the prodding of the Committee on Ways and Means the cost estimates have been moved upward. But this is not by any means the full story.

OPPOSITE EFFECT OF ASSUMPTIONS IN CASH PROGRAM COMPARED TO SERVICE PROGRAM

The central fact which must be faced on a proposal to provide a form of service benefit—as contrasted to a cash benefit—is that it is very difficult to accurately estimate the cost. These difficult-to-predict future costs, when such a program is part of the social security program, could well have highly dangerous ramifications on the cash benefits portion of the social security system. The American people must be assured of the continued soundness of the OASDI program.

The basis of this assurance is the conservative nature of the assumptions upon which the OASDI system is based. One of these is the so-called level earnings assumption whereby the condition of the system is measured on the basis of the most recent year for which payroll information has been recorded. It is conservative in that it does not anticipate increases in earnings level even though such increases have been the history of the American economy over the long run. This safety factor which is built into the system comes into play because of a benefit structure which pays back less, proportionately, to higher income people than to those whose average wages are lower. Thus, if future earnings increase, as they are very likely to do, this savings results because more people will have their benefits computed in the less weighted part of the benefit formula.

Under these circumstances, Congress can, and has many times in the past, been able to adjust cash benefits upward. On the other hand, there have been some instances where we have been faced with underestimates of costs and these savings have had to be used to make the system whole.

But I now come to a very important point: This same assumption, which is conservative and safe for cash benefits, has just the opposite effect when applied to a noncash benefit such as hospitalization, which will become more costly rather than less costly when earnings rise. In questioning the Chief Actuary of the Social Security Administration in our hearings on the King-Anderson bill this February on the official estimates of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, I brought out the previously unpublicized fact that the actuarial soundness of the hospital proposal was wholly contingent on keeping the wage base—the maximum taxable earnings in a year—updated. In practical terms, this meant that if the hospital insurance system which would be created by the bill was to remain sound, the taxable wage base would have to be increased at least $150 each year. Clearly, this would be a case of the tail wagging the dog. The Congress would be left completely hamstrung, with only two alternatives: (1) A total program which we would know was actuarially unsound, or (2) a commitment into the indefinite future to a steady but wholly uncontrolled increase, due to the hospital part of the program, in the amount of wages taxed for social security purposes. Clearly, we could not conscientiously be a party to such an abrogation of congressional responsibility.

RATE OF INCREASE IN HOSPITAL COSTS

But this is not the end of the story. Interrogation also developed the fact that another part of the financing foundation rested on shifting sand. This was the contrary-to-fact assumption that after 1961 hospital costs would not increase any faster than earnings. The facts are that the average rates from 1955 through 1963 show that the average earnings in covered employment have increased 4 percent per year whereas the average daily hospitalization costs have increased 6.7 percent per year. We have nothing to assure us that the rate of increase in hospitalization costs will not continue for the next 10 years at the same or even greater rate as it has for the past 10 years.

Between the time when the matter was considered by the Ways and Means Committee in July of this year and the time when it was considered in the Senate, a new idea was developed to make this problem disappear. It is called cost sharing. The idea is clever and theoretically it has the veneer of actuarial soundness. Although it is complicated in language, it is based on the simple concept that any increases in hospital costs after 1968 would be borne by the beneficiaries rather than the future social security taxpayers.

In a way, we are indebted to the designers of this device because it really shows what the impact of increasing costs would do to the OASDI system. If hospital costs rise as they have in the past 10 years, and the wage base remains at $5,600 as under the Senate bill, we find suddenly in 1969 hospital beneficiaries will be informed by the Social Security Administration that they have to pay at least $8 a day for their prepaid hospitalization and possibly more.

Now, I do not have to tell those of you here that the pressures would be so terrific on the Congress by the time this so-called cost-sharing plan was to become effective that there undoubtedly would be no alternative but for the Congress to eliminate what would be called this "outrageous deductible." The same thing happened in Great Britain with respect to the imposition of a relatively minor deductible on prescription drugs. Congress would be right back where it is today looking for further financing.

We might be wise if, in this context, we consider seriously a recent statement of Labor Minister Gilbert Granval who is responsible for France's social security system. He said in a report to President Charles de Gaulle: "The financial breaking point is near. The solution cannot be found in the framework of the present system." He is quoted as saying that the chief drain on the French social security system has not been the retirement and other benefits but the health insurance system.

ASSUMPTION OF UNFUNDED LIABILITY

There is much that needs to be said about this subject to put it into context. It is not possible for me to cover the subject today. However, on the question of financing, a further very serious problem is the effect which the assumption of the liability for the hospital costs for all of the currently retired persons will have on the social security program as a whole. I do not believe that it is generally understood that this unfunded liability would amount to at least $33 billion. It must be realized that the currently retired individuals under the social security program have not paid any taxes as such for hospital insurance benefits. This is where the prepayment argument when applied to the King-Anderson proposal completely breaks down.

MUST WORK FOR SOUND SOLUTION

I want to make it clear that I have always thought there was great appeal in the argument that wage earners, during their working lifetime, should make payments into a fund to guard against the risk of financial disaster due to heavy medical costs. There is no question but that this is a very persuasive proposition.

There also can be no question but that the facts which have been brought to light in our intensive study of the situation over the past several years, in addition to sowing the problems which would result from attaching a service benefit by the way of a hospital or medical care program to the social security insurance system, also just as clearly demonstrate that there are problems for the elderly in the area of hospital and medical care costs that are becoming more intense as time goes on. The facts which we have discovered point up the constantly rising hospital costs and the constantly rising costs of other elements of total medical care for the aged.

I am acutely aware of the fact that there is a problem here which must be met. In 1960 when the Committee on Ways and Means spent considerable time in exploring possibilities, and evolved the legislation which bears my name, we all recognized that the course of events would have to demonstrate to us what, if any, further actions would be necessary.

The many problems which have so forcefully been brought to our attention through our deep and intense study of this matter quite obviously cannot and will not be ignored. I think one of the difficulties that has actually impeded the reaching of a sound solution is the insistence by the proponents of medical care on proceeding toward a solution through the existing OASDI system rather than in an all-out effort to solve the problem itself with some flexibility in their approach. In other words, there may well be within our reach solutions to the admittedly difficult and increasing problems of medical care for the aged which lie outside of attaching a Federal program to the framework of the OASDI insurance system. I suggest that we move toward a solution with less emphasis on the method of the solution; let us look through and behind slogans of the proponents and opponents with less emphasis on the Madison Avenue approach.

I for one will continue to view this problem with an open mind and will continue my efforts to work for the best interests of our elderly citizens and to help them enjoy the later years of their lives without the nagging fears which so many of them now face due to the possibility of disastrous medical bills. I would be hopeful that the basic prepayment concept might lead us in the direction of sound approaches to this matter. There are other principles which we can embody to insure a sound medical program while at the same time preserving our basic social security insurance system.

I appreciate the opportunity of having visited with you to review my thoughts on one of the more significant legislative subjects of today.

SIXTY-SEVENTH NATIONAL ZIONIST CONVENTION

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCormack] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, October 2, 1964, I had the honor of addressing the 67th Annual National Zionist Convention, held in Washington, D.C., at the Willard Hotel. The Zionist Organization of America is a great American society dedicated to the principles of brotherhood, goodwill, and peace. Under leave to insert my remarks in the Record, I include the speech that I made before this distinguished gathering:

Mr. Chairman, Rabbi Joseph S. Shubow, Mr. President, Dr. Nussbaum, Honorary President Dr. Neumann, Mr. Serlin, deputy speaker of the Knesset, distinguished leaders of the Zionist Organization of America, ladies and gentlemen, I am highly honored by the distinction conferred upon me by the leadership of the Zionist movement and the great and influential Zionist organization of America. I have been a member of the U.S. Congress for 36 years and during all those years, and even earlier when I was a member of the Massachusetts Senate, I was always a friend of Zion, a champion of the Zionist movement, and I am honored to state, a trusted defender of the state of Israel since its emergence 16 years ago. I am sure that you all remember that it was our great President, Harry S. Truman, who was the first among the leaders of the world to recognize the state of Israel. The fact that President Truman immediately extended recognition to the new state gave it impetus, strength, and standing among the nations of the world. Our late beloved President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, continued this program of support for Israel. He was always strong and firm in the belief that in that area of the world, the state of Israel stands as a bulwark of strength and of peace. The foreign aid programs continue to manifest our belief and confidence in the state of Israel, and I know that the people of Israel will long remember Presidents Truman and Kennedy. I was fortunate in having been introduced to the ideals of Zionism by a distinguished leader of your people and by a genuine friend of mine, the late Honorable Elihu D. Stone, of Boston, and by other dear friends who have always kept me informed of all the important events and honorable aspirations of the Jewish people and the Zionist cause.

I am honored to state that I have on several occasions addressed great Zionist assemblies in Boston and at the beautiful temple of my dear friend, Rabbi Joseph S. Shubow, who together with Mr. Stone often visited my offices in Boston and in Washington. I am delighted to state that my devotion to the Jewish people and to the ideal of the Jewish State has been fully justified by the remarkable accomplishments of medinath Israel, the State of Israel, in its superb, cultural, intellectual, scientific attainments, as well as in its amazing military prowess. I know that Israel has no special military ambitions but rather seeks peace in the Middle East, and aims to work in harmony and in cooperation with all its Arab neighbors. I have had the privilege of the friendship of your most distinguished Zionist leaders since the inception of your great movement in 1897; I refer to the privilege that was mine to have known the late great American, Justice Louis D. Brandeis, and that inspiring and most eloquent leader, Dr. Stephen S. Wise, and also the eminent orator and scholar, Dr. Abba Hillel Silver, and his distinguished coworker, Dr. Emanuel Neumann, and numerous other eminent leaders of your great cause.

The Zionist organization came into being in the year of 1897 at that historic Congress of eminent Jewish leaders called by Dr. Herzl in Basle, Switzerland, and I am aware that at the first Congress Dr. Herzl predicted that certainly within 50 years the world would see the establishment of the Jewish State. And it is indeed amazing that his prophetic insight became a reality in November 1947, when the United Nations authorized the emergence of the Jewish State in the land of Israel, which was made holy by your people, sanctified by your prophets, sages and saints. Of course, at first it all seemed to be a fantastic dream, but your people have always been a people of dreamers who have always hoped to bring about an era of brotherhood, goodwill and peace through the creation of the Jewish State.

I am happy to state on this historic occasion that I shared this dream in the earliest days of my public service, and that I was always interested not merely in a Jewish national homeland, or in a Jewish commonwealth, but as I stated then, I reiterate today, a free and independent Jewish state in what the ancients called Palestine.

I have always viewed the Zionist movement as a Hebrew Renaissance, tapping all the sources of Jewish genuis and intellectual and scientific achievement for the welfare of all humanity. And furthermore, the young, small state of Israel, of only less than 8,000 square miles must be safeguarded, sustained, and supported; it must be clearly established that Israel is here to stay, that the state of Israel, as an honored member of the United Nations, must be treated with every courtesy, justice, and honor on a basis of equality with all other nations that are honored members of the United Nations. For any neighboring state to contemplate the destruction of Israel, or to seek to damage its life in any way, is tantamount to treason against world public opinion and treachery against the Charter of the United Nations which clearly states that for nations to be members of the United Nations they must be peace loving in character and not practice any boycott or undertake any other action which contravenes international law and the fundamental laws of the United Nations.

The ZOA still has many unfinished tasks in not only helping to cultivate the state and assist it economically, but in maintaining a spiritual and cultural association wth a Zion restored and a Jerusalem rebuilt. I state to you of the American Zionist leadership and to your great following throughout the United States, that your original leaders had a truly terrifying task in rallying public opinion before the U.N. decision in November 1947 and the recognition of the Jewish State in 1948. The achievements of Zionism ard of Israel are truly wondrous to behold; the remarkable spirit which has been infused into the mighty little people of Israel to build hundreds of new cities and towns, several great universities and seats of scientific learning, as well as to fructify a barren soil and to reclaim the desert—these constitute virtual miracles such as your ancestors knew in Biblical days, especially in your incredible ability to ward off the assaults of surrounding hostile states that sought your destruction and that still seek erroneously your annihilation. The Zionist movement and the State of Israel have earned every right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

I realize that you have several great projects which are the personal concern of your great movement and powerful organization. I am especially impressed by the remarkable work which you are doing in the agricultural vocational training center known as Kfar Silver and named in honor and now in memory of that great leader, Dr. Abba Hillel Silver, who was most impressive when he presented the case of Zionism and of Israel reborn before the United Nations. I am delighted to learn that Kfar Silver already has over 300 students who have come from all parts of the world to be trained in agriculture as a profession. I am confident that with the singular genius shown by Jewish scientists in the process of desalination of salt water so that millions of gallons of water will become available to the Holy Land which has been a parched land, Israel will be able to cultivate the desert and waste areas which have been neglected for centuries and also to fructify the great Negev which centuries ago harbored a great civilization. Thus added joys will come not only to Israel, but also to Israel's great Arab neighbors, so that the Middle East can once again become a glorious and flourishing center of life, culture, and civilization.

I am very happy to see that our own American Government has made a special treaty with Israel in order to help achieve this amazing scientific goal which will redound to the glory not only of Israel, but of all humanity.

I accept your very gracious tribute to me for whatever service I have been able to render to a great people and to a great cause, namely, the cause of national freedom and independence, and the cause of world brotherhood and universal peace. In this spirit I honor the distinguished Israeli statesman, Mr. Yosef Serlin, deputy speaker of the Knesset, who thoroughly deserves to be your honored guest at the great luncheon because of his enviable record of personal and public achievement to the Zionist movement and to the establishment of the State of Israel.

I ask God's blessings upon you all.

MORE STATE DEPARTMENT DOUBLETALK

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, it is too bad there is no Berlitz School of Languages which would equip persons—including public officials—outside the State Department to intelligibly interpret State Department pronouncements.

In reporting to the House yesterday on some of the facts regarding that Department's security file burning order, I confessed to a sense of frustration over efforts to get straightforward, honest, accurate, meaningful answers from a State Department official.

A subsequent development in a totally unrelated matter leads me to believe I have some distinguished and far abler company in this problem of comprehending State Department doubletalk.

Testimony by Hon. J. Edgar Hoover, capable Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, before the Warren Commission, has been made public and contains a reference by Mr. Hoover to a "report of the State Department that indicated this man—Oswald—was a thoroughly safe risk, he had changed his views, he was a loyal man now and had seen the light of day, so to speak."

Disclosure of this testimony has brought a retort from State Department press spokesman Robert J. McCloskey that "a thorough search discloses no Department of State report concerning Lee Harvey Oswald that states or in any way implies that he was a 'thoroughly safe risk.'" Mr. McCloskey adds:

> We have been unable to locate any Department of State document apparently referred to by Mr. J. Edgar Hoover in his testimony.

Nevertheless, Mr. McCloskey did permit newsmen to examine the Oswald file yesterday. It included a 1961 dispatch signed by Boris H. Klossen, State Department counselor for political affairs in the American Embassy in Moscow, reading as follows:

> Twenty months of the realities of life in the Soviet Union have clearly had a maturing effect on Oswald.
>
> He stated frankly that he had learned a hard lesson the hard way and that he had been completely relieved of his illusions about the Soviet Union at the same time that he acquired a new understanding and appreciation of the United States and the meaning of freedom.
>
> Much of the arrogance and bravado which characterized him on his first visit to the Embassy appears to have left him.

Maybe Mr. McCloskey is so profoundly skilled in State Department semantics that he is unable to see anything in that statement which "in any way implies" that Oswald was regarded by the State Department as a "thoroughly safe risk."

But it is evident that the State Department regarded Oswald a sufficiently safe risk to be readmitted to the United States—with the State Department advancing him travel money to come home.

The issue here is not that this conclusion was tragically mistaken—possibly unavoidably so. The issue here is that by its typically State Department doubletalk the State Department is trying to convey to the American people the impression that blunt-speaking, forthright J. Edgar Hoover does not know what he is talking about.

As between Mr. Hoover and the FBI on the one hand, and Mr. McCloskey and the State Department, on the other, most Americans will have no great problem deciding which one they understand—and believe.

PERSONAL STATEMENT

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, following a practice adopted last year, I am placing in the RECORD today my annual statement of personal financial condition. In so doing I would like to reiterate the comments I made in my latest newsletter to residents of Wisconsin's Second Congressional District, commending the presidential and vice-presidential candidates of both parties for making a full and public disclosure of their net worth.

These candidates have set an example which I hope will lead Congress to make such disclosure a matter of course for all Members. Without a standing rule on periodic reporting of outside interests, a number of Members will continue to make such reports on their own initiative, while others will decline to for a variety of reasons.

The 89th Congress, in its own interest and the interest of all its Members, might well take up the question of a disclosure rule applicable to all as one of its first items of business.

Mr. Speaker, my personal statement follows hereunder:

ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER, *Statement of financial condition, Sept. 30, 1964*

Cash: On account with the Sergeant at Arms bank, House of Representatives		$1,084.14
Securities		None
Residential real estate:		
House in Arlington, Va.:		
Sale price	$28,000.00	
Less mortgage	18,618.56	
Total equity		9,381.44
Household goods and personal effects		4,200.00
Miscellaneous assets:		
Deposits with U.S. Civil Service retirement fund through July 31, 1964; available only in accordance with applicable laws and regulations		9,412.90
Cash-surrender value of life insurance policies—		
On the life of Robert W. (2)	0	
On the life of Dorothy C. (1)	$270.43	
Total		270.43
Automobiles:		
1957 Hudson	$150.00	
1963 Oldsmobile	2,400.00	
Total		2,550.00
Total, miscellaneous assets		12,733.33
Total, assets		27,398.91
Liabilities		None
Income for calendar year 1963 excluding congressional salary and expenses: Speaking honorarium, less than		500.00

THE DISTINGUISHED GENTLEMAN FROM PUERTO RICO (DR. ANTONIO FERNÓS-ISERN)

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, one of the sad overtones of this last day of any session comes from the knowledge that there are those amongst us who will not rejoin those who successfully stand for election a month from today. But as much as we may miss them, the occasion loses those sad overtones when we consider that they will at last be enjoying a more relaxing life, one in which they can think of themselves and their families, rather than of their duties alone.

One of our group who has chosen to retire merits our special consideration, and our thanks for the privilege of having served with him: the distinguished gentleman from the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

When I came to this body almost 16 years ago, "TONY" was already here. I remember well how graciously he treated me and all the rookies that arrived that year. And I remember how in these 16 years, through many days and periods of stress, he has always retained that grace.

In any profession, there are those whose arrival or departure stirs no emotion, whose presence among their colleagues in no way affects those colleagues. "TONY" is not such a man. For wherever he might be, his colleagues could not but be the better for his presence.

But more than simply a gracious gentleman and a delightful, true, and generous friend, "TONY" has been a dedicated and singularly effective spokesman for his constituents. The Commonwealth of Puerto Rico is thus losing an outstanding representative; but, at the same time, fortunately, it is regaining a lovable and good neighbor, returning to his native home.

We shall all miss you, "TONY." No one shall miss you more than I. May you and your lovely lady enjoy many years of relaxing retirement on your beautiful isle. And may it be soon when we meet again.

THE 88TH CONGRESS—A REPORT TO THE PEOPLE

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan Mr. O'HARA may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the "education Congress," the "peace Congress," the "human rights Congress," the "health Congress," the "conservation Congress"—all of these phrases have been used at one time or another to describe the 88th Congress which is now writing the final chapter of an impressive 2-year record.

Although there is disagreement about the most important accomplishment of the 88th Congress, I believe most observers would agree with President Johnson who has called it "one of the most productive Congresses in recent history."

On November 27, 1963, President Johnson delivered his first message to a joint session of the U.S. House of Representatives and Senate. In his message, he made it clear to our Nation—and to the world—that he fully intended to follow the course charted by his predecessor.

Recalling the words, "Let us begin," from President Kennedy's inaugural address of January 20, 1961, President Johnson declared: "Let us continue."

President Johnson has fulfilled that pledge. We have continued along the course laid out by President Kennedy nearly 4 years ago, and major parts of the New Frontier program have been enacted into law.

Now, with the 88th Congress about to close its legislative books, it might be well to review some of the accomplishments of the past 2 years under Presidents Kennedy and Johnson. These accomplishments constitute a legislative record seldom surpassed in our Nation's history.

As President Johnson has said:

> This session of Congress has enacted more major legislation, met more national needs, disposed of more national issues, than any other session in this century or the last.

THE "PEACE CONGRESS"

If the nuclear test ban treaty—signed in 1963 by the United States, Great Britain, and the Soviet Union—lives up to its promise, it may go down in history as the outstanding long-range accomplishment of the 88th Congress.

The limited test ban treaty, which President Kennedy called "a shaft of light cut into the darkness," was ratified by the Senate on September 24, 1963, by a vote of 80 to 19. A majority of Senators on both the Republican and Democratic sides of the aisle voted to ratify the treaty.

The treaty prohibits nuclear explosions in the atmosphere, in outer space, and underwater. It does not apply, however, to underground nuclear tests which we are continuing at our Nevada testing range.

While our Nation was taking this cautious—but important—first step along the road to what hopefully will prove to be a more secure world peace, we did not drop our guard. On the contrary, we have built up our military forces to the point where we are stronger than ever before and better able to meet the challenge of Communist aggression in any part of the world.

THE "EDUCATION CONGRESS"

As a member of the House Education and Labor Committee, which handles education legislation in the House of Representatives, I was particularly pleased with the record of the 88th Congress in the field of education and the related field of job training and retraining. This Congress accomplished more in this vital area than any Congress in history.

The legislative breakthrough in education and job training included passage of a medical education aid measure, expansion and improvement of the Manpower Development and Training Act, the Higher Education Facilities Act, an expanded vocational education program, an improved library services and construction program, improvements in the National Defense Education Act, extension of the program to assist local school districts whose enrollments are swollen by children of Federal employees, an expanded teachers' training program, an adult education program, a program for training teachers of exceptional children and extension of the Juvenile Delinquency Act.

In addition to these measures, many of which had been sought for several years, the education record of the 88th Congress was crowned by the passage of President Johnson's war on poverty program.

The Economic Opportunity Act—containing the framework for the antipoverty program—includes several education provisions. It is designed to give us additional weapons to attack the paradox of poverty in the midst of plenty by establishing a youth training and work corps, a domestic Peace Corps, a system of Federal aid for adult basic education, community action programs to attack poverty at the local level and other programs.

THE "HEALTH CONGRESS"

The 88th Congress enacted more health legislation than any previous Congress. In the fields of mental illness and mental retardation, particularly impressive legislative steps were taken to meet problems which had been overlooked for too long by our Federal Government.

The Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act authorized a 4-year program of grants to assist in construction of facilities for research and treatment of the mentally ill and retarded.

A second measure provided additional Federal assistance to States and communities in preventing and treating mental retardation. Included in this legislation were new grants and expansion of existing maternal and child health and crippled children's programs.

Other important legislative actions in the field of health included bills expanding and extending the program of Federal assistance in hospital construction, broadening and improving the nurses' training and Public Health trainee programs and creation of a 4-year program to assist State and local governments in combating air pollution.

From my point of view, there is one glaring omission in the health record of this Congress. It has not enacted a program of hospital insurance for persons over 65 financed through the social security system. This, in my opinion, should be the first order of legislative business when the next Congress convenes in January 1965.

THE "HUMAN RIGHTS CONGRESS"

The year 1964 will mean different things to different people. But by many American citizens, it will be remembered as the year Congress approved the Civil Rights Act.

Passage of this bill followed a full year of careful deliberations and debate—first in the House and then in the Senate. In the Senate, the bill was the target of the longest filibuster in history. After 75 days, the Senate took the precedent-setting step of voting cloture—of shutting off debate—on the civil rights bill.

The civil rights legislation, designed to guarantee equality of citizenship and opportunity for all Americans, was first proposed by President Kennedy, then endorsed by President Johnson and finally supported by large majorities of Republicans and Democrats in both the House and Senate.

THE "CONSERVATION CONGRESS"

Many Americans will remember the 88th Congress primarily because of its action to preserve our natural resources.

Conservationists are calling the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act the most important conservation legislation in a generation. This measure sets up a program to assist the States in planning, acquiring and developing outdoor recreation facilities, and to step up the Federal Government's activity in acquiring outdoor recreation areas to meet the demands of our growing population.

Another landmark conservation measure enacted by the 88th Congress established a National Wilderness Preservation System to preserve for the enjoyment of future generations some of our Nation's remote and unspoiled areas. Conservationists had tried for many years to pass a wilderness bill, but it remained for the 88th Congress to do the job.

This Congress also passed legislation to authorize a 10-year program to expand and improve water resources research, to coordinate the outdoor recreation development program between Federal and State Governments, and to establish several national seashore and national park recreation areas.

As part of the war on poverty program, unemployed young Americans will be put to work on needed conservation projects in much the same way that the Civilian Conservation Corps provided this sort of opportunity to jobless Americans during the 1930's.

OTHER MAJOR ACTIONS

The 2-year legislative record above is confined to five areas—peace, human rights, education, health, and conservation. There is more, however, to the list of achievements of the 88th Congress.

Let us examine a few of the more important accomplishments. The 88th Congress could also be cited as:

The Congress which enacted the $11.5 billion tax cut, the largest income tax reduction in our Nation's history. Economic indicators suggest that the tax cut is living up to its advance billing by stimulating our economy and helping to provide more jobs for more Americans.

The Congress which provided equal pay for equal work for women—a measure which had been before Congress for years.

The Congress which authorized Federal courts to provide representation for defendants who are financially unable to secure an adequate defense in criminal cases.

The Congress which expanded the provisions of the Davis-Bacon Act to include fringe benefits in determining prevailing wages on Federal construction contracts.

The Congress which improved the food stamp program to elevate the nutritional level of low-income, needy American families.

The Congress which expanded and extended the food-for-peace program to help feed the needy abroad.

The Congress which on two occasions has taken steps to improve the level of military pay and which increased the salaries of postal and all other civil service employees.

The Congress which raised the level of non-service-connected pension payments to veterans of World War I, World War II, and the Korean war and their widows and children and which improved the veterans' nursing home care program.

The Congress which expanded the highly successful Peace Corps, which appropriated the funds needed to speed up our Nation's space program and which authorized the funds to maintain a national defense and a Military Establishment second to none.

This all too brief summary of the legislative record of the 88th Congress includes only the more important measures adopted during the past 2 years.

It is a record of which every American, regardless of political persuasion, can be proud. For this record was not built by one political party. It resulted, in many instances, from cooperation between a Democratic administration and Republicans and Democrats alike in the Congress.

It is, in a very real sense, an American record—one which benefits Americans in all walks of life and in all sections of the country. It was a privilege, as a Member of the 88th Congress, to have taken part in building this record.

EDUCATIONAL SPECIFICATIONS

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, down through the ages, mankind has been in constant quest for those things which make for a fuller and better life—not only for the individual, but for the entire society of man. We have made tremendous strides in the elevation of the human being through the use of new ideas and higher ideals.

The search is not ended. In fact, it has just begun. We have envisioned a world in which it is necessary for each and every individual to acquire the very best education which can be assimilated to the peak of his or her mental capacity.

Buildings are erected according to specifications. It is not enough to say that we want a building so many feet long and so many feet high, with a specified number of rooms. Somebody must sit down and consider every separate piece of material which goes into the structure, from the lowest foundation to the tip of the highest spire. He must consider its characteristics of strength, durability, beauty, or whatever, that will meet the requirements of the separate piece and the building as a whole. He must prescribe, in fractions of an inch, the exact size and shape of each piece. Then he must determine the order in which the parts are to be put together. Finally, he must produce a set of drawings and instructions which will serve as precise directions for the work of those who actually build.

In the modern world, every piece of machinery, from the tiniest screw to the mightiest battleship, is built to plans and specifications. Even the ancient art of agriculture is subjected to the rigors of planning and specifying procedures which are known to produce results. Because we have introduced scientific planning in American agriculture, we are able to produce abundantly beyond the dreams of the ancients.

The planner is an artist. He possesses vision in more than mortal degree. His knowledge must extend through the entire range of the properties of the materials he intends to use. In more primitive times, the artist was often invested with occult powers. Generally those powers were attributed to an alliance with Satan rather than with God. The plans of several of the European cathedrals are assigned, by legend, to demoniac sources.

The actual builder is an artisan. He needs not so much vision and knowledge of materials as skill of hand and faithful adherence to directions.

Sometimes the artist is also the artisan. Michelangelo could look at a block of stone and see in it an awe-inspiring statue. But only his skilled fingers could remove the rubbish and lay bare the figure in all its dimensions and majesty.

The educational systems of the United States—indeed, of the whole world—are under fire today. We are not doing enough to transmit the useful and usable accumulations of intelligence of the ages to our young people. Education lays claim to remarkable achievement within this century, and rightly so. Only 50 years ago, at the beginning of World War I, we were confronted with the jolting fact that illiteracy was a serious impediment to the prosecution of the war. An all-out drive was made to get children into school and teach them to read and write. It was a task whose Herculean proportions were not fully understood or appreciated. But we have succeeded to an admirable degree. Unfortunately, the ability to read and write does not carry with it any assurance of comprehension or of competence to meet the complex and changing needs of modern life.

The educational world has been breathlessly busy during the last half century in building educational systems capable of supporting the totality of the burdens laid upon them. Universal literacy is only a small part of that load. To it has been added the demand that schools prepare young people for harmonious participation in family life, for intelligent exercise of their functions as free citizens of a complex government, for maximum usefulness in an economic world which requires increasing competence in highly sophisticated skills, for devotion to moral principles and practices, for subordination of naive human impulses to a concern for the general good.

The builders of educational systems have expended a large part of their efforts in analyzing needs and proposing goals. In our own State, the West Virginia Education Association, in conjunction with the State department of education and the School Boards Association, has just produced a most admirable work of that kind. This has been approved by the West Virginia State Board of Education and will be presented to the West Virginia Legislature at its next session in January 1965.

West Virginia educators—as well as the general public—have been deeply concerned about the situation in our State. The educators have worked feverishly to devise a better system; the general populace, led by public officials, has searched diligently for the funds necessary to operate a better system—higher wages and better working conditions for the teachers, and better classroom facilities and equipment which are necessary for a modern education. I feel that the West Virginia educational system has a bright future. These dedicated people are acting with an energy and zeal indeed worthy of applause.

We have a clear picture of the educational structure we want. What we need is an itemized list of the materials to be used and an understandable explanation of the manner in which they must be assembled. Frankly, the need points to an educational artist.

It appears to me that this Government has acted with wisdom and foresight in several recent instances of similar great need. A few years ago we were faced with the apparent necessity of creating and controlling nuclear explosions. Nobody knew how to do it. More recently, our space authorities have had the problem of originating vehicles which would carry human beings outside the bounds of this planet, and bringing them back alive. In each case, the most promising experts were chosen to undertake the job, and given full authority to pursue their own methods.

Would a similar effort by each of the 50 States to find an educational genius capable of building a better educational system meet with such happy success as was the case with the nuclear and space efforts?

The idea that our educational problems will never be solved is totally unacceptable. Good and brave men are working on them. What is that old motto? "The difficult we do right away; the impossible takes a little longer."

There is a consensus in this land that our future lies in our ability to transmit the wisdom of the past and the present on to the coming generations. The procedures by which such transmission can be assured may be elaborated by artistic imagination using the techniques of modern science. We need educational experts and their detailed specifications. Even that will not be enough. We need a sort of creative genius which will inspire our youth to employ all the powers of our vast accumulations of intelligence in the service of our Maker and of the millions who are formed in His image. If our education is to preserve and advance society, and not to destroy it, that education must be interlaced from beginning to end with morality.

"Righteousness exalteth a nation; but sin is a reproach to any people."

CORNERSTONES OF A DURABLE SOCIETY

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, a society, to be durable, must adjust itself to conditions as they arise. The dominant condition which confronts the 20th century is change.

In the last half century, change has been swift and irresistible. It has carried us, whether we would or not, from a nation of splendid isolation to a nation of worldwide power and worldwide responsibility; from a handicraft economy to unrestricted automation; from a rural to an urban society; from "rugged individualism" to inescapable interdependence. Individual initiative, however, is still the key to progress.

A durable society must also be bound to the past, so far as that past is worthy, with bands of steel. Material things change; the spirit which gives life to a society does not change. Into our American society there was breathed at its birth the breath of idealism and virtue and good will and freedom. These are unyielding cornerstones of a political structure that can adjust its environment to the ever-changing requirements of the day which is present with us, and still stand firm against the tides of time that might sweep us out into oblivion.

The instrument of adjustment to change is the National Legislature. Its function is "to blend in one tangible whole the manifold features of change."

As the 88th Congress closes the session which began nearly 2 years ago, it is time to ask the question: Has this Congress met its obligation to preserve undisturbed the foundation stones of the Republic, and still make the adjustments required by a progressive society determined to make life worthwhile for all men? The answer is: It is proud to stand on its written record.

Ours is a representative form of government. It is taken for granted that everybody knows what this means. But it is probable that few citizens are fully aware of the extraordinary protection against tyranny this system affords. It may be worth while to probe a little into its operations.

In our representative system, all legislative power is delegated to a body called the Congress. Congress itself is composed of two separate Chambers. One of them, the Senate, consists of two Representatives from each State of the Union. So long as the Constitution stands, each State will have two Senators. No populous State can ever overwhelm a small State by a vote in the Senate. Here we have an insuperable barrier to the domination of minorities by majorities. The rights of minorities must be respected.

The other Chamber of the Congress is called the House of Representatives. Congress itself fixes the total number of the Members of this body, called Representatives, with a capital "R." At the present time, this number is fixed at 435. There is nothing sacred about this number; it may be changed to a larger or a smaller one. It is deemed small enough to avoid the confusion of a mob, and yet large enough to provide proportional representation from the more populous States. It is a matter of experience that very large legislative bodies—in nations other than our own—do take on some of the characteristics of a mob. Our system avoids this danger.

Representatives are apportioned to the several States on the basis of their populations as determined by the decennial census. The number assigned to any one State may change every 10 years in accordance with the change in its population, in relation to the change in the rest of the Nation. And these changes have been made with scrupulous exactitude throughout our history. At the present time, each Representative represents approximately 430,000 people, but any State with a smaller population must still have 1 Representative.

Representatives speak for not only a particular State, but for a particular area of that State, called a district. The delineation of the several districts is a power reserved to the States themselves. The Supreme Court has ruled that each district must contain as nearly as possible the same number of inhabitants. But this is apparently the limit of Federal interference in fixing the boundaries of districts. Districts once fixed after a 10-year census will remain intact at least until the next census, regardless of phenomenal change in population.

In most districts there is a limited number of predominant interests, perhaps only one. That may be agricultural, manufacturing, mining, commerce, or ethnic affiliation, or any subdivision of these larger groups. I am proud to say the interests in the Second District of West Virginia are among the most diversified of any in the Nation. Thus it becomes almost impossible that any valid interest in all this great Nation will fail to have a voice to speak for it in the National Legislature.

These details are recited not because they are unfamiliar to Americans, but to emphasize the wisdom which fashioned on this continent a governmental structure designed to preserve freedom. With the same purpose in mind, let us look into the methods by which a Congress, so organized, proceeds to translate national interest into national purpose.

The business of the Legislature is to devise rules of conduct—laws—which every citizen of this Republic must respect and obey. In Congress there are 535 individuals, each interested in promoting a particular variety of economic or social development. In so large a country as this is, few interests are truly national in scope. All the Nation today is concerned, and rightly so, with the details of national defense. Outside of this area, opinion readily divides. A proposal to modify the laws may seem advantageous to one interest, disadvantageous to another.

The 88th Congress has received and considered approximately 16,000 proposals—bills—to make changes, large or small, in national law. On an average, then, each Member has submitted 30 proposals.

Surely the Members have been alert to the wishes and welfare of their constituents.

Of the vast number of bills introduced, only about 500 have been enacted into public law. The average drops to somewhat less than one per Member. A few of the bills proposed were so-called private bills, that is, they apply to only one individual, or at most to a few individuals, and not to the general public. They are designed to remedy various types of injustice which have strictly limited application. They are not included in the list of public bills. But even these must have the same careful scrutiny and pass through the same legislative processes as the public bills.

Why do so many proposals fail to become law? Largely because local interest must be reconciled with national interest. A proposal must gain the judgment of a majority of each Chamber, separately, that the proposal does in fact promote the interests of the locality without injury to the national purpose.

Pictures of early Congresses that have come down to us depict a crowd swayed by the oratory of a gifted Member. Fluency of speech is admittedly an asset, but it gains few votes today. That is why visitors in the galleries of the Chambers are often disappointed. Nobody is making an impassioned speech. What counts is cool and unemotional judgment on the total impact of a proposed law on the country as a whole.

As an example, on one matter of widespread popular interest, at least 150 separate bills were introduced. They were both supported and opposed by numerous groups and individuals. Yet none of the proposals got anywhere. A careful appraisal was made by the committee to which the bills were referred, and their considered judgment was that any action at this time would have an undesirable total impact on the Nation. Congress moves slowly but surely when time permits. But in a crisis it moves overnight, as has been demonstrated time and again.

Mr. Speaker, the 88th Congress has been good to my district and State. It has been my lot to participate actively in exceedingly important legislation. One of our accomplishments of which I am most proud is a formula for dealing with a threatened railroad strike which would have paralyzed industry. The strike was averted with due consideration of the rights of the workmen, and also the financial problems of the operating railroads. Another was the Securities Exchange bill which was enacted after some 3 years of study and modification. In committee, hundreds of interested citizens presented their views on what is necessary to make our financial markets responsive to public interest and not to personal gain. Billions of dollars in savings are now piling up to the credit of individuals and organizations. It is essential to industrial expansion that these savings find safe and secure investment outlets. Scarcely a person in the Nation is unaffected, either through his individual savings or through such vast accumulations of capital as pension funds. The Securities Exchange bill will help to promote confidence in the integrity of the great exchange markets through which a large part of all our investments are made.

This Congress has been active in maintaining and strengthening our military posture. Again I have been able to contribute useful information. I was one of a fortunate few who made detailed inspection of our defensive military line in Europe, and also of our space program in the United States. On the basis of firsthand knowledge, this Congress has enacted legislation which increases the defense and striking power of every arm of the service, by percents varying from 44 to 200.

Coming back again to the daily life of an average citizen, I would mention a quite different matter. For some years I have been introducing in Congress a measure which would put some order and system into the reckoning of standard time. During this session, the measure has gained nationwide support. It seems highly probable that the next Congress will pass such a measure. It is an illustration of the persisistent effort which must be made by a Member to get his proposal before the public and to attract necessary support.

Keeping the pledge of the Kennedy-Johnson campaign of 1960 to act constructively for those areas whose economic progress had not kept pace with the rest of the Nation, the 87th and 88th Congresses together have initiated numerous programs to revitalize industrial and commercial expansion, and to bring community life into the 20th century. It is not my purpose here to list them in detail. New industries have been started and old ones have been expanded with the aid of Government loans. Research in new processes and improved methods of utilizing natural resources has been instituted, and this research is already paying off in useful products hitherto unknown. Hospitals have been built to bring the techniques of the latest science to the service of health. Superhighways have been extended into isolated areas and opened them up to industry, to commerce, and to travel. My State of West Virginia has shared generously in these programs. Their effect has been to raise the standard of living and to enthuse new hope for the future into West Virginians generally. Their money value cannot be computed during the bustling days of transition. But we know that we are going forward.

Perhaps one illustration will suffice. In the Second Congressional District of West Virginia alone, beginning in the last months of 1962, and extending through July 1964, 106 separate Federal projects have been approved under the area redevelopment program. These projects involve water and sewer systems, street and road construction, flood control, recreation facilities, and the like. Some of them have been completed, and progress in the others varies from the starting stage to near completion. The Federal Government has committed $10,303,000 to these 106 projects, to which must be added a comparable sum raised by the vision and energy of our citizens. Dead communities do not have this regard for the future.

This summary cannot be concluded without notice of three or four other achievements of this Congress. The Federal tax cut was, for the worker, a raise in salary. He could add it to his savings, or go out into the market and acquire something he had hoped to purchase. He has been doing both, and industry is benefited either way, either by increased sales or by funds available for improvement of plant. Then there is the education bill for colleges, said to be the most significant measure for higher education in the century. College enrollments explode, in response to the rising demand for more sophisticated training, but physical equipment of colleges does not explode. The education bill will help to meet an acute need. For our veterans, there is increased attention to the handicaps they have incurred in opposing their bodies and minds to the tragedies of war, and more suitable recognition of our profound gratitude to them.

I have taken this roundabout course, Mr. Speaker, to testify to my faith in the greatness of this Nation and in the soundness of the political structure which makes it work. This country spells opportunity to all, in any field of human activity, opportunity commensurate with their talents and virtue. Ambition and hustle are prized as virtues, because they speed the path to progress. But their unsocial extravagances must be subordinated to the general good. A benignant government promotes progress and at the same time restrains excesses.

Every day almost 10,000 new Americans are entering our society through the process of birth. They have a wonderful heritage. Part of that heritage is due to the character of the older generations, and part is due to the perfection of a political structure which meets the changing needs of people while maintaining its basic integrity. These young people are destined to work out a society still more advanced. As I look back on the work of the 88th Congress, I am happy in the belief that we have met our obligation to speed their progress. Many pieces of unfinished business, however, remain to be completed during the next Congress.

THE APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACT

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Taylor] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, it came as a disappointment to me and my constituents in western North Carolina that the House legislative schedule prevented enactment of the Appalachian Regional Development Act by the 88th Congress. I hope that this bill will be among the first pieces of legislation considered next year.

The highway building proposals in the Appalachian bill, coupled with its other features, promises relief to an area which has suffered economically because of an inadequate highway system.

The Appalachian area was settled in the early days by pioneers, who were adventurous and not content to sit still but wanted to advance and explore and seek new opportunities. They moved to a rugged mountain area which offered a challenge and a promise; and for a while, that promise was realized.

But as the years moved on, in many cases, timber and mineral resources were depleted. During recent years, the people in this area have been caught in the backlash of an industrial revolution. The revolution in American agriculture which took the mules from the farm and replaced them with expensive machinery destroyed small mountain farms or made them uneconomic. The 14 western North Carolina counties which I am privileged to represent in Congress lost 14,000 farm jobs between 1947 and 1957. In counties where additional jobs in industry have not been created, there has been much unemployment, underemployment, and outmigration.

In most sections of the Appalachian Mountains, as in my area, the people have been active in trying to solve their own problems. Since 1948, Western North Carolina Associate Communities has been an active organization promoting regional development. This organization founded the Western North Carolina Regional Planning Commission which, with the aid of a professional planning agency, made an economic analysis of the area and outlined a development program. The development report stated that the key to the development of western North Carolina is roads and highways, and I know that the same applies to other sections of Appalachia.

I am strongly supporting this Appalachian bill. It offers hope and economic uplift to a section of our Nation. But I will confine my remarks in the main to the importance of the highway construction provisions of the bill.

Civilization moves with transportation and transportation has been an important factor in the development of each section of our great country. The Appalachian region lies close to great concentrations of people and wealth, but isolation caused by inadequate highways and transportation facilities has prevented the extension of such growth and economic prosperity into the Appalachian Mountains. The establishment in this region of an adequate system of highways is the key to its development.

Highways are needed to ease traffic congestion in some places and are needed as an instrument of economic development throughout the Appalachian area.

By opening the door to transportation, we lay the foundation for private enterprise to come in to build and develop wealth and jobs. The area is rich in climate, in water, and timber resources, and in human resources. Make the area accessible with modern highways and these resources will bring about its development along industrial and recreational lines and will convert it into a land of promise.

I commend the President's Appalachian Regional Commission, headed by Franklin Roosevelt, and the House Public Works Committee on placing the main emphasis in Appalachian development on highway construction. I believe that they were right in determining that some 85 cents of each dollar spent under the program should go for highways.

Federal spending in the Appalachian area has not been in proportion to its population. In 1963 the Appalachian area had 8.5 percent of the country's population, but received only 4.9 percent of the dollars spent by the Federal Government. This area has always been short in military and defense spending. The Appalachian program is not a handout. It will be aiding this section in getting its part of the tax dollar spent by the Federal Government.

In planning and carrying out the Appalachian development program, we must retain in our people that self-respect which comes from self-reliance. Mountain people are proud people. They are far less interested in relief than in new opportunities for self-sufficiency.

A few years ago a tremendous snowfall hit the Appalachian area and heavy drifts isolated mountain families for days. One Red Cross team used a helicopter to reach a remote family on a mountainside in my congressional district. A man and woman on snowshoes finally beat a path to the cabin door and introduced themselves to the elderly couple by saying, "We are from the Red Cross." The mountaineers' response went like this. "Well, I hope you will excuse us from giving a contribution this year. Times have been pretty hard, you know."

So the people we want to help are not looking for a handout. They are looking for their rightful opportunity to make their own contribution to our total economy by gainful employment and full production within their personal capabilities.

The various sections of our great country have individual needs and problems. In some cases, the economic need is harbor development; in other cases, dredging of rivers for commerce or dam construction is needed. Out West, the need is development of water resources, and I have supported programs to meet these great public needs. In the Appalachian area, our need is access roads and highways. It is most important that Congress take effective action to meet this great regional need and approve the Appalachian development program.

THE TAXPAYER MUST NOT ETERNALLY SUBSIDIZE POLITICAL BUNCOMBE CARRIED ON BY CERTAIN TAX-FREE "EDUCATIONAL" FOUNDATIONS

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEED] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times recently printed an editorial taking cognizance of the work my good colleague, the gentleman from Texas, the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN, has been doing exposing the abuses in some tax-exempt foundations. The Times notes how extreme organizations, political in action, are in fact receiving Government subsidies to spread their bunkum and poison in the form of tax-free privileges. They operate as charitable or educational institutions.

Under the gentleman from Texas' [Mr. PATMAN] prodding, the Internal Revenue Service is making a serious effort to do what should be done regarding certain obvious abuses of the law. I am convinced, however, that Congress itself must soon come up with some fresh corrective legislation. It is perfectly absurd for the taxpayers of America, in their right minds, to subsidize the idiocies of so much of the extremist propaganda which incites to hate and spreads falsehood as fact. All this under the umbrella of tax free, educational, or charitable foundations.

Enough editorializing by TOM STEED. Now let us see what the Times has to say on the subject:

POLITICAL SUBSIDIES

Representative WRIGHT PATMAN'S investigation of the Nation's foundations has revealed a series of abuses of the tax-exempt privileges. The study of the extreme rightwing political movement made by the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith provides additional evidence. Its report shows that foundations allegedly established for educational or charitable purposes are using tax-free funds to finance political activities specifically prohibited by the tax code.

The semisecret John Birch Society has not sought tax exemption, presumably because it does not want to reveal anything about its finances, but other extremist organizations are less fastidious; they freely accept a Federal subsidy in the form of tax exemption while carrying out their attacks against integration, the tax system, and the Supreme Court.

Liberal regulation and lax supervision are mainly responsible for the flourishing of foundations and the excursion, by a minority, into the prohibited political area. This activity is not confined to rightwing organizations. The Internal Revenue Service has been unduly timid about enforcing its own code forbidding political activity by tax-exempt foundations, and overly permissive in allowing foundations to be established with no examination of their goals.

Prodded by Mr. PATMAN, the IRS is planning new rules to limit questionable business dealings of foundations. There is just as much need to put an end to overt political activities. This does not require new regulations, but more effective policing. The IRS can halt the abuse either by removing the tax-exempt status of errant foundations or by challenging the tax exemptions taken by individual or corporate contributors. Such action would not put any barriers on free speech, but it would help to insure that hate propaganda will not be subsidized by the taxpayers.

THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, it is extremely distressing to me that this 88th Congress is about to close without having concluded action on amendments to the Social Security Act. As my colleagues know, I felt the pending bill is quite inadequate; yet it is better than no bill at all. The other body added to the measure passed by the House provisions for medical care for the aged; we could not get the House conferees to agree to accept these provisions; and if we had agreed to their elimination, it would undoubtedly be many years before medicare would again be considered.

As matters now stand, the bill has not been defeated; it is simply in limbo. If, as I fervently hope will happen, we are successful in electing a stronger Democratic and more liberal Congress in November, the 89th Congress will, I am confident, be in a better position to act early next year on a better social security bill, including adequate medicare provisions. I earnestly hope the people will be so aroused that we will have an 89th Congress which will demand not only increased social security benefits, with medicare, but some kind of retroactive clause so that those who had hoped for increased payments will not lose out entirely in these intervening months.

A strong effort should also be made next year if an inadequate bill is reported by the Committee on Ways and Means to change the usual closed rule so that we shall have an opportunity to make our voices heard on alternative provisions.

THE LATE FRANK DALEY, OF BEVERLY, MASS.

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BURKE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, on September 12, 1964, Frank Daley, of Beverly, Mass., a well-known public relations man passed away.

Frank had a full and complete life, loved by all those who knew him. He was one of the most interesting men I have ever known. I recognized him as a real "idea man." Frank Daley had a sense of humor that reflected a sparkling personality. He was a dapper dresser with an excellent taste for clothes.

He was a lovable fellow, with a warm personality and a deep concern for his fellow man and unending tolerance and understanding for the young.

Frank was a man of principle. His work over the years covered some of the most important men in national politics including our late beloved President John F. Kennedy and the late beloved Senator Estes Kefauver, of Tennessee. His work for Senator Kefauver was a masterpiece.

He was connected with the theater for many years, doing public relations for such well known stars as Bert Lahr, Edward Everett Horton, Roddy McDowell, and many others. He was friendly with the great showmen, Ted Lewis, Kate Smith, John Carradine, and a host of others.

In all of these endeavors he gave unstintingly of his time.

Yes, Frank Daley made an impression on one that will never be forgotten. His friendship for the Members of the Massachusetts congressional delegation was well known.

We in the Nation's Capital always looked forward to seeing Frank. He was refreshing in his own unique way and always had a funny story to tell. We are all going to miss Frank a great deal. He leaves behind countless friends especially among the young people on the Hill who shared a rapport with him that was amazing. Frank has left an indelible mark on all of those who knew and loved him.

Our prayers and deepest sympathy go out to his lovely wife, Marie, and his daughter, Patti.

REPUBLICAN CHARGES AGAINST AMERICANS FOR DEMOCRATIC ACTION

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. EDWARDS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, the closer we come to election day, the more certain seems the abysmal defeat of the Goldwater-Miller faction of the Republican Party. Now in their desperation, their charges get wilder and wilder.

One of the favorite targets of this element of the Republican Party is Americans for Democratic Action. In the interests of truth, I would like to insert in the Congressional Record some of the more irresponsible accusations being flung around—and follow them with the facts. At the same time, I would like to point out that these same contorted charges appear in letters to the editor columns around the country. The language is always identical—but the signatures are always different. Fortunately the American public is too wise and too decent to fall for a nationally organized smear campaign and every such attack on ADA provokes a stream of letters to the national headquarters at 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C., asking for membership applications.

The Miller statements which follow were made in a speech at Lockport, N.Y., September 5.

Charges by Republican Vice Presidential Candidate William Miller Against Americans for Democratic Action in His Speech at Lockport, N.Y., September 5, 1964

Miller statement No. 1: "Do we want a Vice President from the Americans for Democratic Action which advocates diplomatic recognition of Red China * * * which advocates admission of Red China to the United Nations * * * which advocates removal of the travel ban so that Chinese Communists can come travel through this country?"

ADA position:

ADA urges immediate initiation, together with our allies, of negotiations toward diplomatic recognition of the Peiping regime and its accreditation to the U.N. as the Government of China, not as gestures of moral approval of its past actions but as means of establishing the normal channels of international communications. Such steps would increase our access to information on Chinese affairs and the possibility of affecting Chinese foreign policy. The admission of China to the U.N. should be linked to the condition that the inhabitants of Formosa shall themselves democratically decide whether they shall be admitted to the U.N. as an independent nation or shall rejoin mainland China.

Recognition of Communist China and its accreditation to the U.N. does not mean abandonment of Formosa. Until a U.N. solution is reached, the U.S. treaty pledge to defend Formosa should remain unaltered. We should press for immediate and democratic elections by the inhabitants of Formosa. U.S. military aid should be limited to only such forces as are necessary to its defense. (With the explicit understanding that this pledge does not include the defense of Quemoy and Matsu.

We urge the removal of all passport barriers preventing travel by Americans to China (as has already been done in the case of journalists) in order that U.S. relations with it may evolve through a full and informal public debate.

We further urge lifting of barriers to trade in nonstrategic materials in recognition of the fact that trade builds understanding and our economic isolation from China's 650 million people achieved little.

Reasons behind ADA positions:

Red China is at present a danger to its neighbors, in coming years, as it acquires nuclear weapons, it will pose a grave danger to the world. Red China's continuing hostility in southeast Asia, its unprovoked border aggressions against India, and its internal policy of repression and hardship are policies that ADA condemns and will not condone.

However, ADA hopes for a just and lasting peace in which the tensions of the world can be met and resolved and in which we meet the problems of reality that face us today and are likely to face us for generations to come. ADA perceives that no effective disarmament program for world peace can take place without the cooperation of the Red Chinese and as such they must be brought into discussions of disarmament and weapons control.

Moreover, ADA recognizes that if the United Nations can be a more effective instrument for world peace it includes participation from all the peoples of the world. To fail to recognize 650 million people, roughly one-fifth of the world's entire population, can lead only to the weakening of the U.N. and the abandonment of our faith in the achievement of a peaceful, orderly world.

ADA wishes also to confront facts—no matter how unpleasant—that go to make up the world we live in. One of these unpleasant facts is that since 1947, the defacto government of the Chinese mainland and more than a half-million people is the Chinese Government. No longer can we indulge ourselves in the fiction that Chiang Kai-shek will overthrow this Government from his outpost on the Island of Taiwan. It has become increasingly evident as Red China has taken an increasingly important role in world affairs that we must be able to deal with this government on the mainland in an effective fashion. This can only be done effectively through the normal diplomatic channels, no matter how distasteful this may seem. It is ADA's hope that through normalization of diplomatic relations and through pursuit of an aggressive and democratic foreign policy in the rest of southeast Asia, the Government of China can be made to see reason and the threat to world peace can be blunted. Only direct communication can be successful for this purpose.

ADA believes that we have a continuing obligation to the people of Taiwan and to those nationalist Chinese who emigrated from the mainland when the Red Chinese took power.

ADA has never urged removal of the travel ban so that Chinese Communists can travel through this country. What it has urged (see below) is removal of all passport barriers preventing travel by Americans to China. On an exchange basis, this might lead to the U.S. Government considering admission of some Chinese as visitors (as, indeed, it offered in the case of the journalists). Obviously, the U.S. Government would decide who, how many, under what conditions, and what parts of the country they could visit.

The position set forth above is presently unacceptable to the Chinese Communists. Even a proposed exchange of journalists was never carried out because Peiping made it conditional upon the handing over to it of Taiwan.

Chinese extremism is partly a cause and partly a result of its isolation from much of the world. Broadened contacts can in the long run, as in the case of the Soviet-Union, blunt the sharper edges of dogma. In addition, ADA recognizes that part of the revolutionary aspirations of the Chinese Government stem from economic conditions within the country that forces the government to rigidly regiment the economic side of its internal order and constantly seek outlets, sometimes belligerently, for development of markets and products. ADA feels that relaxation of trade barriers would temper some of this revolutionary fervor and assist us in addition to have better relations with our long-standing allies, e.g., Great Britain, who for economic reasons of their own have found it profitable to trade with Red China.

In conclusion it would be best to quote from the architect of one of America's harder philosophies toward Red China, John Foster Dulles, former, and late Secretary of State:

"If the Communist government of China in fact proves its ability to govern Red China without serious resistance, then it, too should be admitted to the United Nations. However, a regime that claims to have become the government of a country through civil war should not be recognized until it has been tested over a reasonable period of time."

"If the United Nations membership were made substantially universal, that might end a preponderant voting superiority of the United States and its friends which, while pleasant is somewhat fictitious."

"Communist governments today dominate more than 30 percent of the population of the world. We may not like that fact; indeed, we do not like it at all. But if we want to have a world organization, then it should be representative of the world as it is." (War or Peace, by John Foster Dulles, 1950.)

Miller statement No. 2: "Do we want a Vice President from the Americans for Democratic Action which just this January advocated total abandonment of the Panama Canal—which said we should turn it over to the United Nations?"

ADA position: ADA proposes the opening with the Government of Panama of negotiations aimed at meeting its legitimate interests and placing responsibility for administering the Panama Canal with a commission affiliated with the United Nations.

Reasons behind ADA's position:

The world is no longer one in which the United States can view any one country of Latin America as its private fief. With the Cuban revolution and the recent elections in Chile, as well as the more subtle pressures exerted in Venezuela, Brazil, and other Latin American countries, the United States has come to realize that its economic interests are in jeopardy by the rightful claim of countries for control over their own resources. No longer can we rough ride over the hemisphere.

During the winter of last year, our adamant refusal to recognize that a 61-year-old treaty might not be valid in meeting the conditions of the modern world nearly precipitated a crisis and military outbreak. The Panama Canal does not yield such revenues as to be financially advantageous to this country with the possibility of conflict looming ever present in the dispute over ownership. Our military interests in the area could best be served by the construction of another canal by international agreement in which we were a partner. Panama as an underdeveloped country could stand to profit from the usage of the canal and from the revenues derived from it. However, the precedent that expropriation can be done at will by any country in this hemisphere should not be established. As such in order to keep Panama as our good neighbor, in future relations in Latin America in similar situations where U.S. owned interests in both the public and private domains are involved, we favor the establishment of negotiations as the means by which we can make our commitments and treaties conform to the realities of the 20th century world. In addition, we hope that in the long-range future all the countries of Latin America and the world will come to view the United Nations as the potential meeting ground for all peoples and where a truly democratic world society can have some expression.

Miller statement No. 3: "The American people have learned through a bitter experience that a coalition government with the Communists today means a Communist satellite government tomorrow. Nowhere is this more clear than in Laos, communism's latest acquisition. Do we want a Vice President from Americans for Democratic Action, which advocates that we now extend this disastrous coalition program to Cambodia, to Vietnam, and to indeed all of southeast Asia?"

ADA position: ADA neither urged nor condemned the establishment of a coalition government in Laos. It has never at any time advocated coalition governments in Cambodia, Vietnam, or anywhere else in southeast Asia.

ADA reemphasizes its profound dissatisfaction with the continuing deterioration of peaceful conditions in southeast Asia. Ongoing military operations and resorts to force to resolve political issues coupled with internal instability of the new states makes the entire area an inviting arena for great power conflict rather than cooperation.

Therefore ADA calls upon the administration:

1. To oppose widening the area of combat operations into North Vietnam and the making of further substantial commitments of arms and forces in South Vietnam. The task of restoring peace in South Vietnam remains the primary responsibility of the Republic of South Vietnam. The U.S. Government is comprised in its international relations by an official policy which affirms its military forces are in South Vietnam in an advisory capacity and not as combat troops when its 18,000 "advisers" engage in logistical support, piloting of planes and group combat operations against the Vietnamese Communist guerrilla forces.

2. To support the strengthening of the International Control Commission created by the 1954 Geneva Conference so that it can fulfill the purposes for which it was devised, to make use of Geneva Conference machinery toward the end of achieving an independent zone in southeast Asia—free from military forces of all powers—and whose independence would be guaranteed by the major nations, including mainland China.

3. To support all steps to extend a U.N. presence in the southeast Asia area. The most useful function of the U.N. would be to implement, with an appropriate peace-keeping force, the independence of southeast Asia as a whole.

4. To seek a political solution recognizing the principle of self-determination which in the final analysis, should be the ultimate aim of U.S. policy. No single diplomatic method assures guarantee of solution. Southeast Asia, as a cross-road of the U.S.-China confrontation and a sensitive area of nations newly emerged from colonialism, remains one of the most acute tension points in the world.

Reasons behind ADA position: ADA would like to see the victory of the ideals of democracy and freedom all over the world. ADA, however, also realizes that the prospect of "total victory" is meaningless in today's world short of nuclear catastrophe which would result in victory for no one and defeat for all. ADA is hesitant about simple solutions involving increased military engagement because they may mean an accelerated war, a direct confrontation in prolonged war with the Chinese, or possibly nuclear holocaust.

Miller statement No. 4: "Do we want as a Vice President the vice chairman of Americans for Democratic Action which advocates that both the United States and the OAS adopt a complete "hands-off" policy toward Castro * * * not even economic sanctions * * * which, as a matter of fact, urges that we readmit Cuba to the OAS and welcome Castro into the Alliance for Progress to pour upon him gifts of our own American economic aid?"

ADA position: ADA has never advocated a complete "hands-off" policy toward Castro, has never opposed economic sanctions, and has not proposed that we "pour upon him" American aid.

In its testimony to the Democratic platform committee this year, ADA noted that Castro, after beginning his revolution as a declared democrat, has turned increasingly to communism after he took power, and declared:

"We believe * * * that the time has come—while maintaining our pressures on Cuba * * * to propose solutions which will safeguard our legitimate interests, yet be reasonable enough to draw the support of the peoples involved and to demand consideration by the more moderate elements among their leaders.

"In the case of Cuba, we believe that American interests (and the interests of the hemisphere and of peace) would be best served if the Cuban Government could be persuaded to assume a position of genuine nonalinement and could by giving guarantees of nonintervention in the affairs of its neighbors, qualify for readmission to the Organization of American States.

"The ultimate aim of our policy is the reestablishment of democratic liberties in Cuba. In the long run, given patience and self-restraint on our part, we believe that the Cuban people will insist upon the restoration of these liberties when they see visible progress being achieved elsewhere in Latin America through democratic means."

In earlier platform position, ADA has held forth the prospect of welcoming the Cubans into the Alliance for Progress, but only at such time as the crisis resulting from the Castro revolution is resolved.

Reasons behind ADA position:

The administration has repeatedly declared that economic sanctions against Cuba are being applied, not to topple the Castro regime, but to force it to terminate its military alliance with the Soviet Union and its intervention in the affairs of its neighbors. These seem to ADA to be reasonable requirements. The desire to qualify for readmission to the OAS should provide an additional incentive for Castro to accept them—and, indeed, he has several times recently hinted that he might.

The leading democratic refugee groups now consider that change in Cuba can be brought about only by the Cuban people, and that American intervention would be counter productive. ADA concurs in this view. We believe that pressure upon Castro by the Cuban people for the restoration of democratic liberties will increase as they see "progress being achieved elsewhere in Latin America through democratic means," and that Castro will either have to yield to this pressure or risk being ousted from power.

Miller statement No. 5: "Shall we give them a leader from Americans for Democratic Action which advocates that we recognize the permanence and legitimacy of communism in East Germany? Do we want a Vice President who says the United States should turn over Berlin to the United Nations?"

ADA position: ADA has at no time advocated U.S. recognition of the permanence and legitimacy of communism in East Germany, nor advocated that the United States should turn over Berlin to the United Nations. In a special resolution of September 15, 1961, ADA did suggest consideration of defacto recognition (which is recognition not of legitimacy or of permanence, but only of an existing situation) in return for reliable guarantees of Western access and Western presence in Berlin. In the same resolution, ADA saw advantages in a U.N. presence in Western Berlin, but only in addition to, not in replacement of, the Western forces there.

That resolution was adopted in the midst of the Berlin crisis. Subsequently, the position of the West vis-a-vis the Soviet Union has been improved through U.S. arms buildup, the Cuban confrontation, etc. ADA's most recent policy statement, adopted by this year's convention is as follows:

"The American commitment to the short-range goals of West Germany's defense, and that of West Berlin, are legitimate and should continue; also, the long-range commitment to German reunification in freedom. These special goals should not be seen as necessarily incompatible with East-West agreements, either for central European reductions in military force, for a nuclear arms freeze, or for a creation of a thermonuclear free zone embracing both central and Eastern Europe so long as these do not radically affect the existing balance of forces. There are democratic forces in the West which share Americans' concern lest the unity of the West be irretrievably split. Europe needs American assurance that the American presence will remain; but East-West tensions cannot abate unless tangible and reciprocal arms reduction between blocs take place."

Reasons behind ADA position:

ADA has consistently held that human freedom is not a negotiable item on the world market and that human freedom must be defended with force, if absolutely necessary. Thus, ADA is pledged to continue the defense of West Berlin and West Germany in the face of attacks from the Soviet Union, the satellite powers or Eastern Germany. ADA hopes for a solution to the Berlin problem and to general East-West tension in Europe short of war which could well result in nuclear destruction, possibly even with the nuclear aspect of the conflict initiated by the West. Thus, ADA seeks to have American foreign policy aimed at a maximum reduction in tensions in the European Continent.

ADA has long been pledged to German unity, under freedom and resulting from a free and inspected plebescite of the wishes of the German people on both sides of the dividing line. However, ADA has been consistently aware that a valid plebescite in East Germany cannot take place unless Walter Ulbricht, head of the East German Government, or Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev agree. Thus, in the absence of agreement, the United States should explore alternative means of keeping the West Germans free under an inspected arms agreement that would significantly reduce the tensions and possibility for conflict in Europe.

Miller statement No. 6: "Do we want a Vice President today from the ADA which advocates that we now proceed to send continued aid to our Communist enemy in Yugoslavia, Poland, and other Eastern European countries?"

ADA position: ADA supported the policy of limited aid to Poland and Yugoslavia, initiated by the Eisenhower administration with the purpose of encouraging these countries to maintain a degree of independence of Moscow. Should similar situations arise elsewhere, ADA—and doubtless also the U.S. Government—would consider them on their merits.

Both position and reasons are, strictly speaking, irrelevant to the Miller quote, since aid is not included in the position recommendations.

We believe the time has come for new Western initiatives with regard to the Communist states of Eastern Europe. The greater freedom and higher living standards of Western Europe will increasingly expose, by contrast, the deep flaws in the rigidly centralized political and economic systems of the East and arouse powerful impulses in these nations for a return to the greater Europe of which they are historically a part.

Meanwhile, we advocate these immediate steps to improve American contracts and understanding with the Soviet Union and Eastern European nations:

1. A vigorous expansion of trade in nonstrategic goods, on reasonable rather than unduly restrictive credit terms.

2. A steady and substantial increase in the present programs for cultural and technical exchange and the mutual removal of restrictions on the entry of books, magazines, and newspapers.

3. Stepped-up cooperation in research and development in nonmilitary fields such as space communication, and exploration, medical research, meteorology and geophysics.

4. Expansion in the exchange of visits by private citizens and public officials up to and including the topmost levels of Government.

Reasons behind ADA position:

The world today is witnessing the fragmentation of the so-called Communist bloc. Nations, formerly satellites of the Soviet Union are now rivals and others are charting an increasingly independent course. ADA believes both in the policy of national self-determination and in spreading the blessings of freedom and economic subsistence to the widest number of people it can in the world. It believes that the breakup of the Communist monolith is a healthy sign which in Eastern Europe has been ushered in by increasing financial independence from the goods provided by the Soviet Union.

ADA believes that the United States can assist in the continuing trend toward a polycentric world of lessening hostility by the encouragement of trade with countries of Eastern Europe and by the type of exchange of personnel and information that might bring about more mutual knowledge and favorable relations in the future. ADA is cognizant that there is a risk in this approach as there is in any attempt to bring about favorable relations and peace. But if American action can lead to the democratization of Eastern European countries as is already apparent in some; e.g., Poland; then the risk is well worth taking. If the effort will lead to a smaller likelihood of war, then many generations will come to thank us for our foresight today.

Miller statement No. 7: "Do we want a Vice President who is now Vice Chairman of the ADA, which tells us that we must repeal every single piece of internal security legislation—which says abolish the Committee on Un-American Activities—which says that we must repeal all loyalty oaths—except, of course, those to the Democratic Party?"

ADA position: While we recognize the vital need for legislative investigations in a free democracy, we condemn the perversion of that function obtaining political advantage through the exposure of popular individuals and ideas. We urge that congressional investigations be limited to obtaining information leading toward legislative action. We urge that the Un-American Activities Committee of the House of Representatives be discontinued. We favor the adoption of a congressional resolution designed to protect witnesses before congressional committees against slanderous attacks under cover of congressional immunity; to guarantee them the right of effective and immediate reply to attack; and to limit questioning to the announced scope of the hearing after adequate notice.

ADA recognizes the vital necessity of protection of sensitive agencies and private industry concerned with national defense from Communist or Fascist activities; however, we oppose the application of any Federal, State, or local loyalty or security program to any except sensitive positions; and with respect to sensitive positions, and denied a full and fair hearing, including confrontation of the accuser, for any person whose public or private employment or reputation is jeopardized by a loyalty or security proceeding.

We urge that all employees removed as loyalty or security risks under the Executive orders of Presidents Eisenhower and Truman be given the opportunity to have their cases reexamined on their merits.

We oppose loyalty oaths other than the traditional oath taken by Government employees to support the Constitution and the laws of the United States.

We believe that the most serious Communist threat to our internal security lies in espionage and sabotage, and that the Communist Party is a conspiracy toward that end. We wholeheartedly support energetic enforcement of the laws against espionage and sabotage.

However, we oppose any limitation to the right to advocate unpopular political proposals as being unrelated to the enforcement of laws against espionage and sabotage. We propose repealing statutory provisions which limit the right to free speech, free association, and free political expression, such as are contained in the Smith Act, the Internal Security Act of 1950, and the Communist Control Act of 1954. We urge the abolition of the Attorney General's list of subversive organizations.

Reasons for ADA positions:

The first amendment freedoms of a free press, free association, free assembly, and freedom of belief are the sine qua non of a democratic society. ADA believes strongly that these freedoms are indeed that which differentiate a democratic society from the societies of fascism and communism and the other totalitarian forms that populate this earth.

ADA believes that American society is strong enough to withstand any difficulties that the granting of these freedoms to all people within its boundaries might create and that these freedoms are worth fighting for. ADA does not condone acts of subversion, but it believes that each person has a right to believe what he wants to believe and join organizations that believe what they want to believe even if these beliefs are completely alien to the democratic way of life.

It is for this reason that ADA opposes the House Committee on Un-American Activities and sections of the internal security legislation that denies these fundamental rights to all American citizens. ADA believes that the mandate for the House committee which allows it to investigate propaganda (in other words, the published thoughts of persons) is in direct violation of the first amendment. It believes further that the committee's sordid history of trial by exposure, of using its power to silence minority opinion must be stopped if this society is to remain free. It believes further that this committee has constituted itself as a trial court to punish citizens for beliefs not in line with those of committee members and in setting up these trials for public display, it has violated all the constitutional guarantees of due process that Americans committed to democracy cherish.

ADA also opposes sections of the 1950 Internal Security Act, the Communist Control Act, and the Smith Act, insofar as these sections infringe on beliefs, publications, and associations. ADA believes that the menace of internal communism in the United States is small, but such that it is can effectively be handled by existing police forces operating within the framework of constitutional liberties in apprehending acts but not thoughts and publications of subversion. The history of witch hunting is long, stretching beyond the inquisition to Socrates and probably before that. In each case a society has become so afraid of its own values that it has refused to tolerate dissent. Dissent, however, is the very lifebread of a democratic society. Without it ideas do not change and concepts become stale. Progress cannot be achieved without challenge and those who seek to stifle challenge are the very ones opposed to progress and in reality opposed to the open marketplace.

Nor do professions of loyalty have a place in American society. They are more than useless, they are a positive invasion of government in the individual's right of belief. No one dedicated to subversion would hesitate to take a loyalty oath, but a person conscientious in his dedication to the principles behind the first amendment might well feel compelled not to sign such a statement. There should be loyalty provisions for sensitive Government jobs dealing with the vital areas of American foreign policy and defense and these provisions should be sufficiently stringent to prevent those who might act to subvert the Government of the United States from being employed in those areas, but even here due process is necessary. This country will be noted in its own eyes and the eyes of the world by how it lives up to its own principles in dealing not with the easy solutions, but with the difficult ones. ADA believes that the United States is capable of meeting that challenge.

Thomas Jefferson once wrote, "I have sworn upon the altar of God eternal hostility toward any form of tyranny over the mind of man." ADA has taken a similar oath.

CONGRESSMAN HARDING SUPPORTS HOSPITAL CARE FOR THE AGED

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. Harding] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARDING. Mr. Speaker, probably one of the most misunderstood pieces of legislation to be considered by this Congress is a program of hospital care for senior citizens. I am sure that some of the misunderstanding is generated because of the attempts of certain organizations to brand this program of hospital care for senior citizens as socialized medicine.

This simply is not so. I personally am 100-percent opposed to socialized medicine or to any program which would interfere with the traditional doctor-patient relationship as we know it in America.

However, I support a program that will enable American citizens to contribute a small amount from their weekly earnings to provide for assistance in meeting the costs of expensive hospital care in their twilight years. I believe that the program which was proposed by President Kennedy and is now supported by President Johnson is such a program.

Mr. Speaker, we find that during the 1930's social security was bitterly opposed by the AMA, some insurance executives, many newspapers, and most Republicans. Today it is difficult to find anyone who opposes social security. I predict that in another 30 years it will be just as difficult to find anyone who opposes the program of hospital care for senior citizens. I am confident that such a program will be approved in the 89th Congress because the need is apparent.

Inasmuch as much of the misunderstanding of this program in Idaho seems to exist in the minds of doctors and insurance executives, I would like to read the following statements on the subject of hospital care for the aged by Dr. Benjamin Spock, the renowned baby doctor, and Michael H. Levy, president of the Standard Security Life Insurance Co. of New York. I believe that these two statements will provide food for thought for those who are seeking the truth on this subject.

MEDICAL CARE FOR THE AGED—WHAT YOUNG FAMILIES SHOULD KNOW

(By Benjamin Spock, M.D.)

Though the King-Anderson bill (for hospital insurance for the aged through social security) may seem a far cry from child care, I think it actually concerns most young families and their children too. In any case I believe it is a sensible and just proposal that has often been misrepresented, and I want to do my part as a physician in letting people know about it. (Its fate in the House of Representatives will probably depend on what Congressmen hear from their constituents.)

No one who hasn't paid a hospital bill out of his own pocket in recent years has any idea how large it can become. The average hospital charge is now $35 to $40 a day. It takes only 25 to 30 days to get to $1,000, quite apart from the doctors' bills.

When serious illness strikes retired people, it is often their married sons and daughters who have to pay a major part of the hospital and doctor bills, at a time in their lives when their own ordinary family expenses are heaviest. Usually this means that the grandchildren's welfare has to be sacrificed to some degree too. Music lessons or tooth straightening may be postponed or given up. Sometimes the savings that have been slowly accumulated for years to send the children to college will be used up in a few weeks. So adults of all ages should be thinking about the facts of illness in the aged and about proposals for meeting them.

People over 65 years of age require a lot of hospitalization—three times as much as those under that age. In fact, 9 out of 10 of them will need to be hospitalized at least once, and 2 out of 3 more often than that. Their hospital stay averages 15 days—twice the amount for younger people.

But many people over 65 have too little income to pay for hospital bills or for adequate hospital insurance. Half the couples have less than $2,800 a year between them. Half the single persons living alone have under $1,300 a year. As for savings that can be cashed, half the aged have less than $1,000 and one-third have less than $100. When people who are still working lose their savings, they can try to accumulate them again. For retired people this is usually impossible.

As you can imagine, adequate hospital insurance is a lot more expensive for people past 65 because they require three times as much hospital care. Blue Cross premiums and provisions vary in different regions. A majority of the special Blue Cross policies for older people cost more than $200 a year per couple. Commonly they have dollar limits for rooms and services. Only half cover care in a nursing home or the services of a visiting nurse. Commercial insurance plans cannot be as generous as Blue Cross. One of the most popular of these, covering a maximum of 31 days of illness, costs a couple $192; another, covering 60 days, costs $204. Couples with incomes much under $2,800 will have great difficulty paying such amounts. Nearly half of the people over 65 do not carry any kind of hospital insurance. Less than 1 million of the 18 million aged have adequate health insurance.

Most of the retired people who do have commercial hospitalization insurance cannot count on it to pay a large part of their sickness bills. Two of the best-known commercial policies pay only $10 a day, for instance, for bed and board, which is only half the usual hospital charge for these. Such limitations in the policies—in terms of dollars or days or diseases or services—and the fact that hospitalization policies do not pay the doctor bills mean that they cover only a fraction of the total cost for medical care. It has been calculated that only 15 percent of the total private expenditure for medical care of the aged is now covered by insurance.

One of the objections of those who oppose the King-Anderson bill is that the percentage of American people covered by hospital insurance has been steadily rising. The rise for the population under 65 has been good. But the increase for those over 65 has been considerably less, and it is hard to see how it could ever reach a satisfactory level in view of the low incomes of most of the aged.

The King-Anderson bill is based on the realities that the aged need a lot of hospital care and that most of them can't afford to pay the bills or to buy insurance that would cover the bills. So it proposes that people pay for this insurance gradually, during their working years, by an increase of one-fourth of 1 percent in the social security tax on their earnings. The working person with yearly earnings of $4,800 would pay $12 a year, a dollar a month, for his retirement hospital insurance. The employer would pay an equal amount. The self-employed person would pay four-tenths of 1 percent. (The tax increases as the income increases up to $5,200; there is no further increase after that.) Everyone would be entitled to the same benefits.

The purpose in tying retirement hospital insurance to social security and thus making it obligatory is to be sure that everyone is covered, particularly those who would be least able or least likely to insure themselves on a private and individual basis.

The payment for hospital bills would be sent directly to the hospital, much as it goes from a Blue Cross office to a hospital.

When a person became eligible at 65 he would decide on one of three plans for payment, before he ever needed to be hospitalized. (He couldn't wait to see how his illnesses turned out.)

1. If he did not want to pay any part of his hospital bill himself (no deductibles), his insurance would cover 45 days of hospital care for each illness.

2. The period of hospitalization covered by insurance would be increased to 90 days (twice as long) if he agreed to pay $10 a day from his own pocket for each of the first 9 days of his stay. (If he stayed 3 days, for example, he'd pay $30 himself. If 9 days or more, he'd pay $90 himself.)

3. The insurance would cover 180 days in the hospital if he agreed to pay either a certain calculated amount (the average American hospital cost for 2½ days, at present $93), or his total bill if it was less than that amount.

The first plan, for 45 days, would take care of 95 percent of the hospital stays of retired people (except in hospitals for mental illness and tuberculosis). However, it would fail to cover the 1 illness in 20 which lasts a long time and against which a person particularly needs insurance.

The theoretical aim in plans with deductible features is that they will both cover the occasional prolonged hospitalization and discourage any hospitalization that is not strictly necessary—one to get a lot of tests done, for instance. But some of the doctors generally in favor of the King-Anderson bill disapprove of a feature that might inhibit a person from seeking hospitalization when it was truly necessary.

There are other benefits in the provisions of the bill aside from hospitalization but related to it.

1. Nursing-home care, up to 180 days, in a home affiliated with a hospital, after discharge from a hospital. The provision for affiliation with a hospital is to insure that the nursing home has medical and nursing supervision and is meeting some kind of standards. The provision about discharge from a hospital is to insure that the admission to the nursing home is for the care of an actual illness, not just for custodial care for preexisting infirmity.

2. Hospital outpatient diagnostic care costs, beyond the first $20, incurred within a 30-day period. This is to discourage the admission of a patient to a hospital just because he needs tests and laboratory examinations, if these can be done just as well in a clinic.

3. Payment for 240 home visits a year by visiting nurses or other health workers. This is not only to provide such home care when it is needed but also to encourage early discharge from a hospital when home care by such health workers will serve the purpose just as well.

What are the objections to the King-Anderson bill? The one most often raised is that it is unnecessary because Congress created the Kerr-Mills Act for Medical Assistance to the Aged (MAA), which went into effect 3 years ago. The intent of this act was to provide Federal funds to match State funds to pay the medical bills of older people who have enough money to live on but not enough to pay for medical expenses for serious illnesses. Each State must legislate what its own program will be: what the financial bracket of the eligible people will be, what diseases are covered, for how long, at what rate. Then each State must appropriate money regularly. The Federal Government does not set the policies (except for a few minimal requirements) but only matches the States' funds—on a very generous basis.

People like myself who are in favor of the King-Anderson bill believe that the Kerr-Mills Act has proved very inadequate for the purpose intended (though it will continue to have some usefulness in special situations). The State legislatures, in order to guard their own funds, have generally set the upper limits for applicants' income and savings at such a low level that only those who are near the bottom of the economic ladder are eligible. In fact, in 14 States many people who qualify for other relief programs are not considered poor enough to qualify for Kerr-Mills assistance. Virtually all cash savings must usually be used up first, even though they can never be replenished. So Kerr-Mills is not working out, as Congress intended, as a way to help the many who can pay their way except when it comes to heavy medical bills (the "medically indigent"); it is assisting only the small number who are already generally indigent or who promptly become so in illness.

The benefits of Kerr-Mills are very unevenly distributed. After 3½ years, 18 States still do not have programs in operation. The poorer States have the most meager and spotty programs, and so receive less money from the Federal Government. (Some States give assistance for only a few days, or for only certain diseases, or require the patient to be paying simultaneously.) Five of the most wealthy States, with 32 percent of the aged population, got 83 percent of the Federal money expended in 1963, on the basis of their own more generous appropriations.

The most serious drawback of Kerr-Mills, in the view of people who feel as I do, is that the States have to establish a means test to limit those receiving this charity help. The people requesting assistance must reveal their sources and amount of income, their property, and sometimes the incomes and property of their relatives, to prove that they are indigent. Fifteen States have "family responsibility" provisions, which in effect impose a means test on the relatives so that the State can determine whether they should pay the bills instead. (This provision makes many poor but proud people withdraw their requests for assistance.) Twelve States have provisions for taking title to the homes of recipients after their death.

One cannot argue against a means test when Government funds are being given to individuals on a charity basis. But when eligibility is limited to the small number who are impoverished, this still leaves millions of retired people who have enough to live on but who cannot pay the high costs of illness and who would resist asking for charity up until the bitter end. The King-Anderson bill, by contrast, proposes that all workers insure themselves (and their spouses) during their working years; the benefits are similar for everyone.

The underlying basis of the opposition of many physicians and of the American Medical Association to the King-Anderson bill is the fear that if the Federal Government is allowed to play any part, however indirect, in the provision of medical care, attempts at further participation will follow. After hospital insurance for the aged might come hospital insurance for everyone, they say, then perhaps Government insurance for paying doctors' bills, with the Government setting fees and determining procedures. The physicians in favor of King-Anderson (who probably constitute 10 percent of the profession) reply that the fear of hypothetical legislative steps in the future is not a valid reason for opposing a bill greatly needed now which does not affect the doctor-patient relationship, the doctor's treatment, the doctor's bill. (The bill does provide that the hospitals whose bills are to be paid by Social Security must meet the minimal requirements of some State or National accrediting body, but no sensible person could argue for payment to hospitals below those minimal levels.)

Most of the specific objections raised by spokesmen for organized medicine and other opponents of the King-Anderson bill do not seem very substantial to me. It is said that the laboring man would be paying for the rich man's hospitalization. Actually, both would be paying in proportion to their incomes up to $5,200 and both would be entitled to the same benefits. So the man whose salary has averaged under $5,200 will have an advantage because he has paid less for his protection. The argument that the rich would get help they don't need ignores the fact that they would have paid for their protection like everyone else. The same applies to all kinds of insurance; the company does not refuse to pay because a policyholder is wealthy. Besides, the percentage of wealthy retired people is very small. Claims that King-Anderson would prove much more expensive than estimated are unsubstantiated. The figures were compiled by responsible actuaries in the Social Security Administration, and there is no incentive for them to distort their calculations.

The fear that the plan would interfere with other health insurance seems unjustified if experience with social security retirement benefits is any indication—commercial pension plans and annuity sales flourished after the introduction of social security. It should be remembered that King-Anderson covers only basic hospital costs—not private rooms, not private nurses and, most important, not doctors' bills. This leaves plenty of scope for additional insurance if it can be afforded.

The argument that King-Anderson would not be insurance but a tax is only a quibble. The program would spread the risks and be financed on actuarial basis—the essence of insurance.

The claim that the hospital coverage would not be complete has validity but should really be put forward by the proponents of the bill, not by the opponents. It would not cover care in the hospitals devoted to mental illness or tuberculosis. (The public ones are supported by the State.) It would not cover ordinary hospitalizations beyond the 45-, 90- or 180-day limits of the three options. To cover more would require a larger percentage tax on wages. The present King-Anderson proposal is a compromise, the best that could be worked out by the sponsors in Congress and the Social Security Administration, with the advice of experts in the fields of welfare, hospitals, medicine.

For me it is hard to see why there should be serious objection. Americans are in favor of insurance in preference to charity. Most working people have hospital insurance. So do the retired people who are financially comfortable. Why should not the aged with low incomes have the same security and the same dignity? They cannot afford to buy it after retirement, but they certainly can pay a dollar a month for it during their working years.

STATEMENT OF MICHAEL H. LEVY, PRESIDENT, STANDARD SECURITY LIFE INSURANCE CO., OF NEW YORK

I am Michael H. Levy, president of the Standard Security Life Insurance Co. of New York.

I believe unqualifiedly in the American free enterprise system as opposed to the welfare state. However, there are certain problems which are either too complex or too great for solution by anyone or anything other than the representative of all of the people, the Federal Government. That is why I am in favor of medicare under social security.

My company sells life and health insurance. We are deeply involved in the creation and sale of hospital/surgical expense and major medical insurance for persons of all ages. We have helped to pioneer in quality health insurance for older persons, being, we believe, the only company in the United States offering a true noncancelable and guaranteed renewable hospital/surgical expense policy issued at any age and renewable for the life of the insured. By "noncancelable and guaranteed renewable," I mean that the premiums may never be increased, that benefits may never be reduced, that the company must continue to renew the policy in unchanged form as long as premiums are paid.

The problem with which we are confronted is a problem of humanity and not of profits. The primary consideration of everyone in this situation must be the providing of minimal, basic hospital care to the senior citizens whose resources are inadequate. If this is the case, we have alternatives. One is to provide protection through the private insurance industry. The other is to provide it through the Federal or State Governments.

Although many of the great life and casualty companies of America have demonstrated a willingness to create policies specifically designed for the over-65 group, approximately 8 million in that group remain uninsured by private companies as of now. Evidently the few dollars of monthly premiums required are more than those people can afford.

Kerr-Mills has provided an unsatisfactory solution to the problem because only four States, Hawaii, Massachusetts, New York, and North Dakota, have comprehensive programs. The benefits in the other 24 States and the 4 other jurisdictions where the program operates has been poignantly pointed out by the distinguished Senator fom Michigan, PAT MCNAMARA, as being either nominal, inadequate, or nonexistent. This, Mr. Chairman, was a good first move to solve the problem and there is no doubt in my mind but that you and Congress thought the 50 States of the Union would act more rapidly and more generously than experience has indicated they actually have.

Stringent eligibility and lien recovery provisions have, as you know, unfortunately hamstrung the programs. Furthermore, the medical assistance to the aging program is not only geographically limited but there is a wide variation, from State to State, in the duration, level, and type of benefits made available.

If, because of lack of funds, people cannot afford to buy from the private companies, if the MAA program has proven inadequate or inequitable, then we must turn to the Federal Government through a medicare program within the framework of the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system—social security.

I do not agree with my conferees in the industry or with the highly respected members of the medical profession who claim that medicare under social security would either sign the death knell for private enterprise in the United States or affect either the economy or well-being of the insurance industry, the medical profession, or the insurance buying public. To the contrary, I believe that, as with the original social security concept for retirement, the providing of basic hospital care financed under a social security system of medicare would enable the insurance industry to create supplemental coverages for those who could afford such, would assure hospitals of nonindigent patients and guarantee to physicians that their patients would be able to pay a hospital bill.

I have heard some of my honorable colleagues state that medicare under social security would be a camel with his nose under the tent for Federal domination of the insurance industry. Realistically, I think that the camel put his head and neck under the tent years ago and, frankly, I am not afraid of that hobgoblin.

Insofar as the medical profession's professed fear of socialistic medicine—several rereadings of the act would seem to indicate absolutely nothing whatsoever to indicate the validity of such apprehension. I am convinced that the Members of Congress at this time are not moving toward socialized medicine in the United States or, for that matter, socialization of the insurance industry.

I would like to conclude by once again emphasizing my preoccupation with the need as compared to the method. Millions of people need some kind of basic hospital coverage. The question is how best to give it to all of them.

I am firmly convinced that, although many desirable choices have been offered, no one seems to command enough backing from a practical point of view to warrant serious consideration and, therefore, I turn to what seems to be the only reasonable alternative, medicare under social security.

May I add a postscript before I close. The private insurance industry, whether through programs of the individual companies such as Continental Casualty or through the cooperative efforts of companies in programs such as NY-65, has made herculean efforts to resolve this formidable problem. The failure of their efforts has been through no fault of their own because too many millions of those over 65 do not have the dollars needed to put those programs on a universal basis. Only through a widespread tax program such as social security or through the general revenues of the Federal Government itself can such a program embracing coverage for millions of people be successfully consummated.

REPORT TO THE PEOPLE ON THE 88TH CONGRESS

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to join many of my colleagues who, at the end of a session of Congress, place in the Record for the benefit of their constitutents a summary of the actions of the Congress and the part their Representative played therein.

This report is being made in line with my sincere belief that the people have a right to know what their Representative is doing in their behalf, the votes he has cast on major legislation, and the bills he has been most active in enacting into law.

SENIORITY: PUBLIC WORKS AND JUDICIARY

Congress operates on the seniority system. After 10 years of continuous service, I will be the chairman of the powerful Public Works Committee if the Republicans gain control of Congress; and, in the alternative, will be minority leader of this committee if the Democrats retain control.

Due to the House retirement of Bill Miller of New York, I will be elevated to the third ranking position of the Committee on the Judiciary. Membership on this committee is made up of lawyers who consider legal problems involved in constitutional amendments, antitrust laws, immigration, interstate compacts, claims against the Government, and Supreme Court decisions.

HIGHWAY INVESTIGATING SUBCOMMITTEE

I will continue as ranking member or, if the GOP gains control of Congress, will be chairman of the Highway Investigating Subcommittee that has uncovered wrongdoing in many States and which polices the Federal-aid highway program.

HISTORY BEING MADE

Interestingly, in 1965, your Congressman will be the first Florida Congressman of either party in the House to attain the top ranking position on a full committee—Public Works—since the Reorganization Act of 1946.

PARTY LEADERSHIP

Vice chairman of House GOP conference: Under our two-party system, party leadership in Congress is a vital responsibility. My colleagues bestowed upon me one of the high honors of leadership this session by electing me unanimously as vice chairman of the GOP conference which is the final forum for major policy decisions.

Assistant whip: The gentleman from Illinois, Representative Les Arends, minority whip, designated me as assistant whip in charge of the Southeastern States.

Policy committee member: All of my colleagues who were elected to the Congress the same year as was I, in 1954, chose me as their representative on the GOP policy committee.

Vice chairman, congressional campaign committee: The gentleman from California, Representative Bob Wilson, chairman, recommended and the campaign committee elected me as vice chairman of the committee that has the duty of preserving the two-party system in the House by encouraging the election of Republicans to that body.

JUDICIARY COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES

As a ranking member of this committee, one of the busiest in the House, my role has been an active one in many fields.

ANTICRIME LEGISLATION

I cosponsored many bills to fight organized crime in America.

The following became law in the 87th Congress: Outlawing the transportation of wagering paraphernalia; outlawing interstate travel in aid of syndicated crime; outlawing transmission of gambling information; tighten laws on interstate transporting of gambling devices; extension of the Fugitive Felon Act to include syndicated crime.

ANTICOMMUNIST LEGISLATION

In the 86th and 87th Congresses, my bill to modify the Mallory decision of the Supreme Court passed the House. The bill prevents confessions obtained voluntarily from being inadmissible in evidence solely because of a reasonable delay between arrest and arraignment of the accused. The 88th Congress did not act because of the reluctance of the Senate.

In the 85th Congress, I cosponsored the law to close the FBI files to the Communists and criminals. These files were opened to them by the Supreme Court decision in the Jenks case.

In the 87th Congress, my bill to redefine the Communist Party in the United States to include local and State cells became law. This clarified the Supreme Court decision in the Yates case.

In the 88th Congress, I have continued to press for legislation in cases where I believe the Supreme Court decisions needed to be clarified or legislation concerning them acted upon.

PRAYER DECISION

The subcommittee on which I serve had months of hearings on this matter. I cosponsored a proposed constitutional amendment which I believe our committee could and should have modified and reported out so that freedom of religion could be preserved in a voluntary, nonsectarian manner, undictated by State authorities and thus preserving prayer and Bible reading in public schools and the public acknowledgment of the existence of Almighty God.

LEGISLATIVE REAPPORTIONMENT

Congress was tied up on this subject due to the Dirksen amendment in the Senate and the Tuck bill in the House for many extra weeks. The Judiciary Committee held lengthy hearings but did not report out a constitutional amendment. Congress adjourned without taking any action.

There is little doubt that legislative malapportionment is a serious problem. Many disagree, however, with the Supreme Court taking jurisdiction of this matter that previously had been decided to be a State matter and of a political nature.

The Court did take jurisdiction under the equal protection clause of the Constitution. I believe, having heard all the evidence, that Congress could have drafted a constitutional amendment that would have been acceptable to the American people including populous underrepresented areas providing for the apportionment of one house solely on the basis of population and the other house largely on population but permitting within fixed limits reasonable State legislative latitude to consider other essential factors.

I opposed the Tuck bill to perpetuate underrepresentation of populous areas because in my opinion it is an unconstitutional effort to kill court power to interpret the Constitution. A proper constitutional amendment is the only answer.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Months of hearings, debate and controversy resulted in the most sweeping bill, the Civil Rights Act of 1964, ever enacted in this field, including the acts of 1957 and 1960.

It authorized unlimited funds to enforce existing civil rights and to extend the jurisdiction of the Federal Government to enforce integration in public accommodations, public facilities, and in all State grant-in-aid programs. It authorized the Attorney General to intervene in private suits. It established a Federal Fair Employment Commission to oversee employment, promotion, and recordkeeping practices in private businesses.

Opponents questioned the constitutionality, the breadth of its coverage, the broad power granted the Attorney General and the Federal Government as well as infringement on State authority.

VOTE FRAUDS

For 6 years, I have been waging a battle against vote frauds, vote stealing, ballot box packing and falsification of voting records. My antivote fraud legislation became law this year with the Federal Government having power to investigate and report to Congress all vote fraud cases involved in Federal elections.

The right to have votes cast and counted is a basic right of every American.

PUBLIC WORKS: PUBLIC BUILDINGS

Under the Jones-Cramer Public Buildings Act of 1959, the construction of public facilities throughout the United States is progressing in an orderly fashion and with a minimum of politics on a planned basis.

The St. Petersburg Federal Building was authorized under this act and is scheduled for construction next year.

INTERSTATE HIGHWAYS

The 1956 Interstate Highway and Defense Act which I helped draft and cosponsored provides for a pay-as-you-go 41,000-mile limited access highway system in the United States, including 1,274 miles in Florida.

Under this act, the Howard Frankland Bridge, the Tampa Expressway, and Route 4 to Orlando have been built. All these serve Pinellas County.

ST. PETERSBURG EXPRESSWAY

Interstate 4 is scheduled to be extended into downtown St. Petersburg from the Howard Frankland Bridge before 1972, it having been authorized as a part of the Interstate System. Surveys and traffic studies for this expressway are underway now.

FALLON-CRAMER HIGHWAY ACTS

In 1962 and 1964, **George Fallon** of Maryland and myself successfully cosponsored the semiannual authorizations, about $1 billion annually, for the Federal-aid highway system in addition to the Interstate System.

HIGHWAY INVESTIGATIONS

As ranking Republican on the Special Subcommittee To Investigate the Federal-Aid Highway Program, I can report to you that much fraud, graft, and corruption have been ferreted out and substantial corrections have been made in the program thereby saving billions of dollars and protecting the safety of the American motorist.

TOLL ROADS

I have led a fight to prevent toll traps from being placed on the otherwise free Interstate Highway System and have fought for free highways where they could be built without tolls.

ST. PETERSBURG TO MIAMI INTERSTATE LINK

The Fallon-Cramer bill to close this gap through a study to program additional interstate mileage passed the House and triggered a nationwide study of this subject.

STATEWIDE: PUBLIC WORKS

Public works in the entire State of Florida are my responsibility as the only member of the Florida delegation in Congress on the Public Works Committee—as well as Judiciary. The following major projects as examples have been advanced:

Authorization for engineering studies of Four River Basin flood control project. As a result of the Cramer resolution, adopted in committee, Lake Tarpon won approval to proceed with an outlet—overflow—channel to Tampa Bay.

Survey of missing link of Intracoastal Waterway from Anclote to St. Marks—$90,000.

Continuing authorization of the Central and Southern Florida Flood Control District approved.

Initiated a red tide survey which is still in progress.

Won needed Republican support to get the Cross-Florida Barge Canal underway with ground breaking in 1964.

Recent Pinellas programs of progress

Project	Status	Federal cost
Highways:		
Howard Frankland Bridge (90 percent Federal funds)	Completed	$12,951,902
St. Petersburg Expressway (secured approval as part of Interstate System).	Under study	----------
Waterways:		
Intracoastal Waterway	Completed	1,285,000
St. Petersburg Harbor	do	40,000
Johns' Pass survey Pass-a-Grille survey	do	10,000
Ozona Harbor	do	106,000
Clearwater Little Pass	do	86,000
Anclote (Tarpon Springs)	do	267,000
Frenchman's Creek—Gulfport	do	22,000
Four-River Basin flood control (including Anclote River and Lake Tarpon).	Underway	[1] 240,000
Beach erosion control studies:		
Mullet Key (Fort De Soto Park)	do	29,000
All gulf beaches in Pinellas County	do	22,000
Public buildings: St. Petersburg Federal Building	Land cleared and purchased and construction to be in fiscal year 1965 budget.	900,000
		4,400,000
Bay Pines Veterans' Administration Hospital:		
164 new beds	Completed	245,000
New operating rooms	do	262.000
New cafeteria and laundry	do	888,000
Expansion and modernization	Modernization to take place; expansion uncertain.	
50 new nursing home beds	Underway	----------
Post offices:		
Largo-Seminole branch	Completed	67,000
St. Petersburg-Winston Plaza station	do	80,000
Maderia Beach branch	do	27,000
Dunedin	do	111,000
Palm Harbor	do	23,000
Ozona	do	11,000
St. Petersburg—Euclid station	do	106,000
Tarpon Springs	do	87,680
Largo post office	do	77,000
Safety Harbor	do	16,000
St. Petersburg, main post office	do	1,913,000
Pinellas Park	do	12,626
Clearwater Beach	do	42,815
Clearwater	Authorized—site not selected	----------
Federal agencies recently located in Pinellas:		
Southeast Regional Commercial Fisheries Office (located at Don-Ce-Sar).	----------	[2] 125,700
Fishery Research Laboratory (located at Don-Ce-Sar):		
Red tide research	----------	[2] 58,200
Estuarine research	----------	[2] 166,300
STRIKE Command Task Force Headquarters, Snell Isle	----------	([3])
Atomic Energy Commission (GE plant)	----------	[2] 16,000,000
Senior Citizens Accident Research Center, St. Petersburg (Division of the National Institutes of Health).	----------	[4] 71,000
Drainage: Drainage study in Pinellas, Hillsborough, and Hernando Counties.	Underway	100,000

[1] Authorized to start.

[2] Annually.

[3] Cost classified.

[4] Annually (expected to increase).

BAY PINES: A PERMANENT FACILITY

Our efforts in behalf of Bay Pines continue. When Bay Pines was threatened with extinction, I testified before the House and Senate Appropriations Committees urging that specific language be inserted in the reports of those committees calling upon the VA Administrator to spend the earmarked $1.722 million appropriated for Bay Pines expansion and modernization and that it remain available for the Bay Pines project until expended. This was done.

The battle to preserve Bay Pines has been successful. Both VA Administrator Gleason and Deputy Administrator Driver have made it clear that Bay Pines is a permanent facility. The modernization program at Bay Pines will be undertaken—214 new beds have been added in the last 3 years. The fight for a new additional hospital continues.

ACADEMY APPOINTMENTS

One of my very first moves as a Member of Congress was to remove the appointments of young men to service academies from politics. I base all my appointments on a competitive examination administered at my request by the Civil Service Commission and on other needed qualifications. This has resulted in appointing only the highest caliber of young men to the service schools.

INDUSTRY

As a member of the Florida State Legislature in 1951, I introduced the first light industry bill in Pinellas County's history. As county attorney in 1953, I drafted and steered through the legislature the light industry council bill. As a Member of Congress, I have continued my interest.

The following information has been released and officially confirmed by the Florida Development Commission: From the period January 1, 1961, through December 31, 1963, Pinellas County had 156 new plants and major plant expansions which created an estimated 6,100 new jobs. During the same period Hillsborough County had 105 new plants and major expansions, creating an estimated 2,673 new jobs.

SENIOR CITIZENS

Because of the large number of senior citizens in my district, I have been in the forefront in battling for meritorious legislation which affects their welfare. Although the problem of senior citizens living on a fixed retirement income is not as pronounced in areas in which a large and young working force is able to earn pay increases when prices rise, I have had an intimate knowledge of the sad effects of inflation on retirees. To a retiree living on a fixed retirement income, with little or no chance of earning additional money, inflation, which robs the retiree of purchasing power, is public enemy No. 1.

My opposition to halting inflation is a matter of record and explains, in a large part, why I have consistently opposed big, free-spending programs in which an absolute need was not established and which have contributed to an unbalanced budget.

This also explains one of my reasons for opposing the inflationary pay raise for Members of Congress.

It is also my concern for senior citizens that has led me to oppose medicare under social security. Recognizing a medicare problem among many, I have introduced the Bow-Cramer free-enterprise medicare bill. By financing hospital services under social security, the Social Security Trust Fund would be overburdened and placed in financial jeopardy. Such a prospect would deal a death blow to senior citizens who depend upon social security for their livelihood. It would be equally injurious to the young working man who would have to pay upwards of 10 percent of his income for benefits he may never receive.

SENIOR CITIZEN LEGISLATION

Following are some of the major bills I have introduced and/or voted for in behalf of senior citizens:

Sponsor of a comprehensive medicare bill for senior citizens financed through the General Treasury rather than the social security system—voted for Kerr-Mills medicare bill in 1960 in recognition of this need.

Voted consistently for increases in social security benefits.

Introduced bill to increase outside earnings allowed those under social security and other Government retiree programs.

For lowering age at which social security recipients could retire and for disability at age 50.

For Civil Service retiree benefits.

For private health insurance plans for Government employees and retirees.

Proposed a Bureau of Senior Citizens in Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

For increases in aging disease research funds.

For senior citizen housing and nursing homes.

Introduced legislation to allow people over 65 to take 100 percent tax deductions for medical services and drugs.

VETERANS

Meeting the needs of the growing veterans population on Florida's west coast has been one of my major concerns. In line with this goal, I introduced and voted for the non-service-connected pension act of 1965 for veterans of World War I, World War II, and Korea; signed the discharge petitions, as well as introduced bills, providing benefits for World War I veterans, their widows, and dependents; introduced a bill to provide outpatient treatment for veterans of World War I; introduced a bill providing for a national veterans cemetery in the central west coast area of Florida and am presently fighting for expanding the veterans cemetery at Bay Pines which has reached capacity; introduced a bill for senior citizens geriatric center at Bay Pines; fought successfully for the first new Veterans' Administration beds program for Florida in many years—started with 814 new beds under Eisenhower in 1957—fighting for a Spanish-American War Memorial at Fort DeSoto Park.

LABOR

I supported the Landrum-Griffin disclosure and labor reform bill—and was placed on Jimmy Hoffa's purge list as a result. I have consistenly supported the right of labor to organize and bargain collectively. I supported the Davis-Bacon provisions of the 1956 Interstate Highway Act.

SMALL BUSINESS

Introduced legislation to encourage the establishment of voluntary pension plans for self-employed persons which became law.

Introduced small-business tax-reform bill which would allow small businesses to enjoy the tax advantages of large corporations.

EDUCATION

I introduced a bill which would allow parents of college students to deduct reasonable percentage of the cost of education from income tax.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

I have consistently supported a strong anti-Communist foreign policy. While I have supported reasonable foreign aid and military assistance for friendly nations, I have opposed giving foreign aid to Communist countries.

CUBA

As far back as June of 1960, I called for U.S. military surveillance of Cuba. This would have prevented Russian military intervention in Cuba. I revealed that U.S. citizens were traveling to Cuba through Mexico and have introduced legislation designed to halt such travel.

In an effort to be constructive, as chairman of the Latin American Task Force, I have recommended serious consideration of the following actions, all of which are short of war, but all of which are in the best interests, in my opinion, of the Western Hemisphere:

First. Recognize a free non-Communist government or coalition government in exile.

Second. Restatement and full implementation of the Monroe Doctrine.

Third. Assertion of strong leadership by the United States in concert with the member states in the OAS to make the Alliance for Progress a successful instrument to aid Latin American nations and end Communist expansion in this hemisphere.

Fourth. Implementation of meaningful trade ban between our allies and Cuba.

Fifth. Bring an end to arms shipments to Cuba and arms buildup being sponsored by Russia and Red China as a violation of the Monroe Doctrine and of the Cuban resolution passed by Congress.

Major legislation this Congress

Issue	My position	Status
National Defense:		
$93,972,061,000 appropriation for defense	Supported	Enacted.
$3,156,848 appropriation for military construction projects	Supported	Enacted.
Increased pay and subsistence allowances for military personnel	Supported	Enacted.
Space: Appropriations for NASA and Atomic Energy Commission	Supported	Enacted.
Education:		
Health Professions Educational Assistance Act of 1963	Supported	Enacted.
Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963	Supported	Enacted.
Vocational Education Act of 1963	Supported	Enacted.
Manpower Development and Training Act extension	Supported	Enacted.
National Defense Education Act	Supported	Enacted.
Foreign aid:		
$4,700,000,000 extension of food-for-peace program	Supported	Enacted.
Foreign aid authorization and appropriation:		
1963: Motion to reduce by $585,000,000	Supported	Adopted.
1964: Motion to reduce by $222,200,000	Supported	Adopted.
Increase size of Peace Corps	Supported	Enacted.
Study for new canal in Central America	Supported	Enacted.
Wheat to Russia on credit	Opposed	Enacted.
Health and welfare:		
Child health services and research projects to prevent mental retardation	Supported	Enacted.
Construction of community mental health centers	Supported	Enacted.
Housing and Community Development Act of 1964	Supported	Enacted.
Federal aid for construction and modernization of hospital and nursing homes	Supported	Enacted.
Food stamp plan ($6 for $10 worth of stamps replaces free surplus food)	Opposed	Enacted.
Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 (CCC camps and Domestic Youth Corps)	Opposed	Enacted.
Civil Rights Act of 1964	Opposed	Enacted.
Equal pay for women	Supported	Enacted.
Social security: Social security increases	Supported	Killed; White House refused to support without medicare rider.

Major legislation this Congress—Continued

Issue	My position	Status
National spending policies:		
$455,500,000 area redevelopment authorization bill	Opposed	Failed.
Tax cut (bill) (supported only after effort made to save dividend credits)	Supported	Enacted.
Poverty bill (including CCC camps and Domestic Youth Corps). (Supported substitute sound antipoverty bill.)	Opposed	Enacted.
Mass transit bill	Opposed	Enacted.
Pay raise for Members of Congress	Opposed	Enacted.
Debt limit increases:		
1963: From $309 billion to $315 billion	Opposed	Enacted.
1964: From $315 billion to $324 billion	Opposed	Enacted.
Veterans:		
Provide nursing home facilities for veterans	Supported	Enacted.
Provide educational assistance to children of disabled veterans	Supported	Enacted.
Non-service-connected veterans pensions	Supported	Enacted.
Conservation:		
National Wilderness Preservation Act	Supported	Enacted.
Outdoor recreation development	Supported	Enacted.
Water resources research	Supported	Enacted.
State aid for development of commercial fisheries	Supported	Enacted.
Increase flood control basin authorizations (cosponsor)	Supported	Enacted.
Agriculture:		
Appropriations limitations of export subsidies to Red bloc countries	Supported	Failed House.
Wheat-cotton subsidies (increases consumer costs)	Opposed	Enacted.
State legislative reapportionment: Tuck bill (bill to perpetuate underrepresentation of populace areas)	Opposed	Passed House, Senate killed.
Highways: 1964 Highway Act (cosponsor)	Supported	Enacted.

It would be impossible to discuss all of the more than 1,600 new laws passed this session of Congress. Following is a brief discussion of some of the more controversial major bills that have not been discussed previously in this report:

TAX REDUCTION

Because of the announced planned deficits by this administration, I voted to tie spending cuts to tax cuts. I opposed the bill's provision eliminating the dividend tax credit of 4 percent over a 2-year period. Since many retirees living on savings would be hurt by this provision, I am still shocked that an administration that claims to be for the elderly would insist on repealing this Eisenhower backed 1957 act which I supported.

I supported the final passage of the tax cut bill after fighting to reduce spending and eliminate bad provisions. The administration indicated that it would hold down spending as a condition for final passage of the bill—since proven false—and we were able to insert a provision in the bill allowing those taxpayers 65 years of age or over relief on the capital gains tax from the sale of their homes.

POVERTY BILL

This bill proposes to spend more than $1 billion the first year allegedly to fight poverty. There are 42 existing programs related to economic and health wellbeing, already costing in excess of $30 billion in appropriations, and other Federal, State, local and private programs amounting to some $66 billion. It establishes a Job Corps as well as a Domestic Peace Corps reminiscent of the CCC Camps of the 1930's. Unfortunately, it offers no permanent solution to the root causes of poverty but instead puts more money into proven failures. I opposed the bill, believing that the money could be better spent in vocational training, education and helping to relocate the unemployed and in providing private enterprise incentives to expand and thus increase employment.

Over $8 billion has been spent since 1961 on Federal direct special antipoverty affairs. Another $1 billion spent ineffectively is not the answer.

FOREIGN AID

In good conscience, I could not and did not support the foreign aid bill this year which requested more than needed, almost $3.5 billion of the already overburdened American taxpayer and without adequate guarantees against waste and Communist country aid. I supported the proposal to cut the bill by $222.2 million. The proposal failed. I supported adequate military aid to friendly nations.

The foreign aid bill has become an example of bureaucratic bungling. We give aid to our enemies as well as our friends. We are even forcing aid upon nations who refuse it. Just this year, Cambodia rejected our aid. Five months later, we obligated $1.65 million in funds in that country. Cambodia has since gone Communist.

In last year's foreign aid bill, there was a guaranteed credit provision for the sale of U.S. wheat to Soviet-bloc nations which I opposed. We now know that Cuba has been getting some of this wheat.

FOOD STAMP PLAN

Under this program, eligible families on an average get $10 worth of food stamps, to be redeemed at any food store, for $6 in cash. I opposed this program because I feel it to be self-defeating, too costly—$375 million—and injects the Federal Government into the distribution and sale of all foodstuffs not surpluses. If a State or county enters into this program, it loses surplus food now being distributed free to needy families. Obviously, the most needy families could not afford to purchase any stamps as required under the program. The surplus food program still seems to be the best answer to aiding the needy as the food it distributes costs the needy family nothing, is less costly to the Government, reduces farm surpluses and keeps the Government out of the general food purchasing business.

CONCLUSION

In the 88th Congress, as during the preceding 8 years during which I have had the privilege to serve in Congress, I have continued my fight for fundamental principles that I believe to be the touchstone of America's greatness, strength, moral determination, and freedom.

Ours is and must remain the freest, strongest, more productive, richest, and most benevolent nation in the world which casts us in the role of the leading nation of the free nations of the world.

We will remain free and strong only so long as we adhere to the fundamental time-proven moral, spiritual, and governmental principles.

I shall continue my fight for those principles, some of which are: The preservation of our free enterprise system; a strong anti-Communist policy at home and abroad; protection and preservation of the value of the dollar; careful, prudent, responsible Government spending; the end to deficit spending, unbalanced budgets; adherence to basic constitutional concepts; recognition of the responsibilities and rights of the States; the right, through fair, clean elections for the people to make the final choice and thus make representative government work.

VOTING RECORD OF REPRESENTATIVE GERALD R. FORD, FIFTH DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a report of my voting and attendance record during the 2d session of the 88th Congress.

The record includes all rollcall votes and all quorum calls. The description of bills is for the purpose of identification only; no attempt has been made to describe the bills completely or to elaborate upon the issues involved.

The purpose of this report is to collect in one place information which is scattered through thousands of pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I want to be able to provide any interested constituent with a simple compilation of my voting and attendance record.

The report is as follows:

Voting record of Representative G*ERALD* R. F*ORD*, *5th District of Michigan*

No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
	1964		
1	Jan. 7	Quorum call	Present.
2	Jan. 8	Quorum call	Present.
3	Jan. 8	Quorum call	Present.
4	Jan. 14	Quorum call	Present.
5	Jan. 14	S. 1153: To recommit to committee the bill to amend the Federal Airport Act in order to reduce the authorization of funds by $15,000,000 a year for each of 3 years. (Defeated 110 to 201.)	Yes.
6	Jan. 14	S. 1153: On final passage of the act to amend the Federal Airport Act. (Passed 298 to 11.)	Yes.
7	Jan. 15	Quorum call	Present.
8	Jan. 20	Quorum call	Present.
9	Jan. 21	Quorum call	Present.
10	Jan. 21	Quorum call	Present.
11	Jan. 21	H.R. 4879 (S. 2265): To amend the Library Services Act to eliminate the library construction program, to confine Federal aid to rural areas, and to make more money available for rural libraries. (Defeated 179 to 183.)	Yes.
12	Jan. 21	H.R. 4879 (S. 2265): To recommit the Library Services Act to committee in order to eliminate the library construction provision from the bill. (Defeated 174 to 188.)	Yes.
13	Jan. 21	H.R. 4879 (S. 2265): On final passage of the Library Services Act extending Federal aid to urban as well as rural areas and increasing the authorization for 1964 from $7,500,000 to $45,000,000. (Passed 254 to 107.)	No.
14	Jan. 22	Quorum call	Present.
15	Jan. 22	Quorum call	Present.
16	Jan. 28	Quorum call	Absent.[1]
17	Jan. 28	H.Res. 582: On a motion to order the previous question on the resolution to take up H.R. 6041, amendments to the Davis-Bacon Act, in order to provide for consideration of an amendment permitting judicial review of decisions by the Secretary of Labor. (Passed 297 to 105.)	Absent.[2]
18	Jan. 28	Quorum call	Absent.[1]
19	Jan. 28	H.R. 6041 On passage of the bill to amend the Davis-Bacon Act to include fringe benefits in prevailing wage determinations. (Passed 357 to 50.)	Absent.[2]
20	Jan. 31	Quorum call	Absent.[1]
21	Jan. 31	Quorum call	Absent.[1]
22	Feb. 1	Quorum call	Absent.[1]
23	Feb. 1	Quorum call	Absent.[1]
24	Feb. 3	Quorum call	Present.
25	Feb. 4	Quorum call	Present.
26	Feb. 5	Quorum call	Present.
27	Feb. 6	Quorum call	Present.
28	Feb. 7	Quorum call	Present.
29	Feb. 8	Quorum call	Present.
30	Feb. 8	On a motion to adjourn at about 10 p.m. during consideration of the civil rights bill. (Passed 220 to 175)	No.
31	Feb. 10	Quorum call	Present.
32	Feb. 10	H.R. 7152: On final passage of the civil rights bill. (Passed 290 to 130)	Yes.
33	Feb. 17	Quorum call	Present.
34	Feb. 18	Quorum call	Present.
35	Feb. 18	H.R. 7381: To recommit to Committee on Post Office and Civil Service the Dual Compensation Act relative to the employment of civilians in more than 1 position and the civilian employment of retired members of the Armed Forces. (Defeated 83 to 262.)	No.
36	Feb. 19	Quorum call	Present.
37	Feb. 19	Quorum call	Present.
38	Feb. 20	Quorum call	Present.
39	Feb. 20	H.R. 9637: To authorize an appropriation of $16,900,000,000 for the procurement of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels. (Passed 336 to 0.)	Yes.
40	Feb. 24	Quorum call	Present.
41	Feb. 25	Quorum call	Present.
42	Feb. 25	Quorum call	Present.
43	Feb. 25	H.R. 8363: To adopt the conference report on the Revenue Act of 1964. (Passed 326 to 83.)	No.
44	Feb. 25	Quorum call	Present.
45	Feb. 26	Quorum call	Present.
46	Feb. 26	Quorum call	Present.
47	Feb. 26	Quorum call	Present.
48	Feb. 26	H.R. 9022: To recommit to committee the bill to amend the International Development Association Act to authorize the United States to participate in an increase in the resources of the International Development Association. (Passed 208–188.)	No.
49	Feb. 27	Quorum call	Present.
50	Feb. 27	Quorum call	Present.
51	Feb. 27	H.R. 8316: To amend the Communications Act of 1934 to prohibit the FCC from making rules relative to the length and frequency of radio and TV commercials. (Passed 317 to 43.)	Yes.
52	Mar. 3	Quorum call	Present.
53	Mar. 3	Quorum call	Present.
54	Mar. 4	Quorum call	Present.
55	Mar. 4	Quorum call	Present.
56	Mar. 4	H.R. 9666: To recommit to committee the Peace Corps authorization bill in order to reduce the authorized funds for 1965 from $115 to $95,900,000. (Defeated 90 to 309.)	No.
57	Mar. 5	Quorum call	Absent.[3]
58	Mar. 5	Quorum call	Absent.[3]
59	Mar. 5	H.R. 8000: To impose a tax on acquisitions of certain foreign securities as a means of alleviating the balance-of-payments problem. (Passed 238 to 142.)	Absent.[4]
60	Mar. 9	Quorum call	Present.
61	Mar. 10	Quorum call	Present.
62	Mar. 10	Quorum call	Present.
63	Mar. 10	H.R. 8070: To establish a Public Land Law Review Commission to study laws and procedures relating to the administration of the public lands of the United States. (Passed 339 to 29.)	Absent.[2]
64	Mar. 11	Quorum call	Present.
65	Mar. 11	H.R. 650: To adopt the resolution calling for consideration of H.R. 8986, the bill to increase salaries of Federal employees and officials, including Members of Congress. (Passed 251 to 147.)	No.
66	Mar. 12	Quorum call	Present.
67	Mar. 12	H.R. 8986: To increase salaries of postal and Federal employees and certain officers of the Federal Government including Members of Congress. (Defeated 184 to 222.)	No.
68	Mar. 16	Quorum call	Absent.[1]
69	Mar. 17	Quorum call	Present.
70	Mar. 17	Quorum call	Present.
71	Mar. 18	Quorum call	Present.
72	Mar. 18	Quorum call	Present.
73	Mar. 18	Quorum call	Present.
74	Mar. 19	Quorum call	Present.
75	Mar. 19	Quorum call	Present.
76	Mar. 19	H.R. 556: To adopt an open rule providing for 2 hours debate and waiving points of order against H.R. 5838, a bill relative to the Organic Act of the National Bureau of Standards. (Passed 264 to 99.)	No.
77	Mar. 19	Quorum call	Present.
78	Mar. 23	Quorum call	Present.
79	Mar. 23	Quorum call	Present.
80	Mar. 23	H.R. 5838: To recommit to committee the bill relative to the Organic Act of the National Bureau of Standards in order to amend it to require that no transfer of funds in excess of $250,000 shall be made without submission of the proposed transfer to the Appropriation Committees of the House and Senate and if no adverse action is taken by either committee within 30 days the transfer is approved. (Defeated 151 to 172.)	Yes.
81	Mar. 23	H.R. 5838: To approve the bill amending the Organic Act of the National Bureau of Standards. (Passed 164 to 162.)	No.
82	Mar. 24	Quorum call	Present.
83	Mar. 24	Quorum call	Present.
84	Mar. 24	Quorum call	Present.
85	Mar. 24	H.R. 10532: On a motion to add $10,000,000 to this appropriation bill to provide additional funds for construction and repair of Coast Guard vessels, etc. (Defeated 160 to 193.)	No.
86	Mar. 24	H.R. 10532: On final passage of the $6,200,000,000 appropriation bill for the Treasury and Post Office Departments and the Executive Office of the President and certain independent agencies. (Passed 326 to 20.)	Yes.

See footnotes at end of table.

Voting record of Representative G*ERALD* *R.* F*ORD*, *5th District of Michigan*—Continued

No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
	1964		
87	Mar. 25	Quorum call	Present.
88	Mar. 25	H.R. 660: On adoption of an open rule for the consideration of H.R. 10456, the NASA authorization bill, totaling $5,100,000,000. (Passed 357 to 0.)	Yes.
89	Mar. 25	H.R. 10456: On final passage of the $5,100,000,000 NASA authorization bill. (Passed 283 to 73.)	Absent.[2]
90	Apr. 6	Quorum call	Present.
91	Apr. 6	S. 1828: To amend the joint resolution establishing the Battle of Lake Erie Sesquicentennial Celebration Commission in order to authorize the appropriation of not more than $13,553.23 for use of the Commission. (Passed 233 to 39.)	Yes.
92	Apr. 7	Quorum call	Present.
93	Apr. 7	Quorum call	Present.
94	Apr. 7	Quorum call	Present.
95	Apr. 8	Quorum call	Present.
96	Apr. 8	Quorum call	Present.
97	Apr. 8	On a motion that the House adjourn (the time being about 9:20 p.m.). (Defeated 173 to 239.)	Yes.
98	Apr. 8	H.R. 10222: On a motion to recommit to the Committee on Agriculture the Food Stamp Act in order to add a provision requiring the States to finance 50 percent of the cost of the free stamps issued under the act. (Defeated 195 to 223.)	Yes.
99	Apr. 8	H.R. 10222: On final passage of the Food Stamp Act. (Passed 229 to 189.)	
100	Apr. 8	H.R. 665: To agree to the Senate amendment (wheat provisions) to H.R. 6196, the cotton bill previously passed by the House. (Passed 211 to 203.)	No.
101	Apr. 9	Quorum call	Absent.[1]
102	Apr. 9	On a motion to dispense with further proceedings under quorum call No. 101. (Passed 222 to 132.)	Absent.[4]
103	Apr. 9	Quorum call	Absent.[1]
104	Apr. 9	On a motion to dispense with further proceedings under quorum call No. 103. (Passed 232 to 122.)	Absent.[4]
105	Apr. 9	Quorum call	Absent.[1]
106	Apr. 9	Quorum call	Absent.[1]
107	Apr. 10	Quorum call	Present.
108	Apr. 10	Quorum call	Present.
109	Apr. 10	H.R. 10723: To recommit to committee the legislative appropriation bill in order to require the records of expenditure by congressional committees and the Architect of the Capitol to be available for public inspection. (Passed 188 to 131.)	Yes.
110	Apr. 14	Quorum call	Present
111	Apr. 14	H.R. 10809: On approval of the 1965 appropriation bill in the amount of $6,900,000,000 for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Labor, and related agencies. (Passed 344 to 21.)	Yes.
112	Apr. 15	Quorum call	Present.
113	Apr. 15	Quorum call	Present.
114	Apr. 15	S. 2394: To authorize an appropriation of $44,900,000 to carry out the provisions of the convention on the Chamizal made with Mexico relative to exchange of land at El Paso, Tex. (Passed 347 to 5.)	Yes.
115	Apr. 21	Quorum call	Present.
116	Apr. 21	Quorum call	Present.
117	Apr. 22	Quorum call	Present.
118	Apr. 22	H.R. 10939: To approve the $46,700,000,000 appropriation bill for the Department of Defense. (Passed 365 to 0.)	Yes.
119	Apr. 29	Quorum call	Present.
120	May 6	Quorum call	Present.
121	May 6	H.R. 11134: To approve the appropriation bill for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies in the amount of $1,700,000,000. (Passed 312 to 40.)	Yes.
122	May 7	Quorum call	Present.
123	May 7	H.R. 10945: To adopt the bill authorizing appropriation of $2,600,000,000 for the Atomic Energy Commission. (Passed 340 to 3.)	Yes.
124	May 11	Quorum call	Present.
125	May 13	Quorum call	Present.
126	May 13	S. 2214: To recommit to committee the bill to provide additional funds for the International Development Association, an affiliate of the World Bank. (Defeated 132 to 247.)	No.
127	May 18	H. J. Res. 1020: To authorize the expression of appreciation and the issuance of a gold medal to Henry J. Kaiser. (Defeated 150 to 143; a two-thirds vote being necessary under "suspension of the rules" procedure.)	No.
128	May 19	Quorum call	Present.
129	May 20	Quorum call	Present.
130	May 20	H.R. 11202: To add $1,600,000 to the appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture for the construction of a national peanut research facility at Dawson, Ga. (Defeated 181 to 198.)	No.
131	May 20	H.R. 11202: To recommit to committee the agricultural appropriation bill in order to provide an amendment prohibiting export payments or export subsidies on any agricultural commodities sold to a Communist country. (Defeated 186 to 187.)	Yes.
132	May 20	H.R. 11202: On final passage of the $5,100,000,000 appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture. (Passed 311 to 64.)	No.
133	May 20	Quorum call	Present.
134	May 21	Quorum call	Present.
135	May 26	Quorum call	Present.
136	May 26	H.R. 11369: To approve the military construction appropriation bill in the amount of $1,590,000,000. (Passed 340 to 5.)	Yes.
137	May 27	Quorum call	Present.
138	May 27	H. Res. 724: To adopt the rule for consideration of H.R. 5130, a bill to increase the insurance on deposits in banks and savings and loan associations. (Passed 218 to 115.)	No.
139	May 27	H.R. 5130: To recommit to the Committee on Banking and Currency the bill to increase from $10,000 to $20,000 the insurance coverage on banks and savings and loan associations. (Passed 197 to 142.)	Yes.
140	June 3	Quorum call	Present.
141	June 3	H.R. 10503: To pass the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1964 authorizing appropriations for fiscal years 1966 and 1967 for construction of certain highways. (Passed 294 to 0.)	Yes.
142	June 3	Quorum call	Present.
143	June 3	On a motion to adjourn the House. (Defeated 10 to 289.)	Absent.[4]
144	June 3	Quorum call	Absent.[1]
145	June 3	On a motion to adjourn the House. (Defeated 16 to 271.)	Absent.[4]
146	June 4	Quorum call	Present.
147	June 4	Quorum call	Present.
148	June 9	Quorum call	Present.
149	June 9	Quorum call	Present.
150	June 9	Quorum call	Present.
151	June 10	Quorum call	Present.
152	June 10	H.R. 11380: To recommit to committee the foreign aid authorization in order to reduce the amount for the Development Loan Fund by $172,200,000 and the contingency fund by $50,000,000. (Defeated 193 to 211.)	Yes.
153	June 10	H.R. 11380: On final passage of the bill authorizing new appropriations in the amount of $2,040,000,000 for foreign aid. (Passed 230 to 175.)	Yes.
154	June 11	Quorum call	Present.
155	June 11	H.R. 11049: To approve the bill increasing salaries of Federal employees, administrative and judicial officers, and Members of Congress. (Passed 243 to 157.)	No.
156	June 16	Quorum call	Present.
157	June 16	H.R. 11579: To approve the public works appropriation bill in the amount of $4,300,000,000. (Passed 360 to 11.)	Absent.[2]
158	June 17	Quorum call	Present.
159	June 17	Quorum call	Present.
160	June 17	H.R. 11376: To recommit to committee the bill extending certain excise taxes for 1 year in order to reduce from 10 percent to 5 percent for 1 year and then to eliminate the retailer's excise tax on jewelry, furs, toilet preparations, luggage, and handbags. (Defeated 185 to 207.)	Yes.
161	June 18	Quorum call	Present.
162	June 18	H.R. 11375: To increase the public debt to $324,000,000,000 until June 30, 1965. (Passed 203 to 182.)	No.
163	June 22	Quorum call	Present.
164	June 23	Quorum call	Present.
165	June 24	Quorum call	Present.
166	June 24	Quorum call	Present.
167	June 25	Quorum call	Present.
168	June 25	H.R. 3381: To amend the Mass Transportation Act relative to its provisions concerning labor-management. (Passed 233 to 171.)	No.
169	June 25	H.R. 3381: To recommit to committee the Mass Transportation Act in order to defer action pending the evaluation of certain engineering studies. (Defeated 190 to 215.)	Yes.
170	June 25	H.R. 3381: In final passage of the Mass Transportation Act with an initial authorization of $375,000,000. (Passed 212 to 189.)	No.
171	June 30	Quorum call	Present.
172	June 30	Quorum call	Present.

See footnotes at end of table.

Voting record of Representative GERALD *R.* FORD, *5th District of Michigan*—Continued

No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
173	*1964* June 30	H. Res. 793: To adopt the rule waiving all points of order against H.R. 11812, the foreign aid appropriation bill, and providing 6 hours of debate on the legislation. (Passed 222 to 162.)	No.
174	June 30	Quorum call	Present.
175	July 1	Quorum call	Present.
176	July 1	H.R. 11812: To recommit to committee the foreign operations appropriations bill in order to reduce the funds for economic assistance by $247,800,000. (Defeated 198 to 208.)	Yes.
177	July 1	H.R. 11812: On final passage of the foreign operations appropriations bill in the amount of $3,700,000,000. (Passed 231 to 174.)	Yes.
178	July 2	Quorum call	Present.
179	July 2	H. Res. 789: To approve H.R. 7152, the civil rights bill as passed by the Senate. (Passed 289 to 126.)	Yes.
180	July 2	Quorum call	Present.
181	July 2	H. Res. 795: To approve the appointment of a special committee of the House to investigate campaign expenditures of candidates for election to the House. (Passed 264 to 92.)	Yes.
182	July 2	S. 2: To approve the conference report on the bill to establish water resources research centers and to promote water research. (Passed 347 to 0.)	Yes.
183	July 21	Quorum call	Present.
184	July 21	H.R. 319: To protect postal patrons from morally offensive mail matter. (Passed 325 to 19.)	Yes.
185	July 21	H.R. 11611: To establish a National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress. (Passed 260 to 76.)	Yes.
186	July 22	Quorum call	Present.
187	July 22	H. Res. 738: To adopt rule providing for 4 hours of debate on H.R. 3846, the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act. (Passed 338 to 8.)	Yes.
188	July 23	Quorum call	Present.
189	July 28	Quorum call	Present.
190	July 28	H.R. 3873 (S. 978): To permit certain owners of fishing boats to receive medical care and hospitalization without charge at hospitals of the Public Health Service. (Passed 202 to 170.)	No.
191	July 29	Quorum call	Present.
192	July 29	H.Res. 802: To adopt closed rule with 5 hours of debate on Social Security Amendments of 1964. (Passed 350 to 29.)	Yes.
193	July 29	H.R. 11865: To increase benefits under the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system, improve actuarial status of trust funds, and to extend social security coverage. (Passed 388 to 8.)	Yes.
194	July 30	Quorum call	Present.
195	July 30	H. Res. 803: To agree to a conference with the Senate on H.R. 11049, the Federal employees pay raise bill. (Passed 246 to 131.)	No.
196	July 30	Quorum call	Present.
197	July 30	H.R. 9070 (S. 4): To establish a national wilderness preservation system. (Passed 374 to 1.)	Yes.
198	Aug. 3	H.R. 1096: To authorize the Secretary of the Interior to cooperate with the State of Wisconsin in designation and administration of the Ice Age National Scientific Reserve in the State of Wisconsin. (Defeated 164 to 154; a ⅔ majority required.)	No.
199	Aug. 3	H.R. 3672: To provide for construction, operation, and maintenance of the Savery-Pot Hook, Bostwick Park, and Fruitland Mesa participating reclamation projects under the Colorado River Storage Project Act. (Passed 250 to 67.)	Yes.
200	Aug. 4	H.R. 10939: To adopt conference report on appropriations for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1965. (Passed 359 to 0.)	Yes.
201	Aug. 4	H.R. 10939: To adopt the Senate amendment to the defense bill providing 35 percent of funds for repair, alteration, and conversion of naval vessels available for work in privately owned shipyards. (Passed 186 to 178.)	Yes.
202	Aug. 4	Quorum call	Present.
203	Aug. 4	Quorum call	Present.
204	Aug. 5	Quorum call	Present.
205	Aug. 5	Quorum call	Present.
206	Aug. 6	Quorum call	Present.
207	Aug. 6	Quorum call	Present.
208	Aug. 6	Quorum call	Present.
209	Aug. 7	Quorum call	Present.
210	Aug. 7	H.J. Res. 1145: To promote the maintenance of international peace and security in southeast Asia. (Passed 416 to 0.)	Yes.
211	Aug. 7	Quorum call	Present.
212	Aug. 7	H.R. 11377: To strike the enacting clause from the so-called antipoverty bill. (Defeated 197 to 225.)	Yes.
213	Aug. 7	H.R. 11377 (S. 2642): On motion to substitute the text of S. 2642 which modified in a number of respects H.R. 11377, the so-called antipoverty bill. (Passed 228 to 190.)	No.
214	Aug. 8	Quorum call	Present.
215	Aug. 8	H.R. 11377: On motion to recommit to committee in order to substitute H.R. 11050, the Human Resources Development Act of 1964. (Defeated 117 to 195.)	Yes.
216	Aug. 8	H.R. 11377 (S. 2642): On final passage of the antipoverty bill. (Passed 226 to 185.)	No.
217	Aug. 11	H.R. 1927: To revise the pension program for veterans of World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict, and their widows and children. (Passed 388 to 0.)	Yes.
218	Aug. 11	H.R. 5990: To amend the District of Columbia Charitable Solicitation Act to require the Commissioners to make certain findings before issuing a solicitation permit. (Passed 301 to 81.)	Yes.
219	Aug. 12	H. Res. 836: To grant a rule for consideration of S. 1451, conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to render judgment upon certain claims arising under the Trading With the Enemy Act. (Passed 374 to 3.)	Yes.
220	Aug. 12	S. 1627: To enable the United States to contribute its share of expenses of the International Commission for Supervision and Control in Laos. (Passed 268 to 89.)	No.
221	Aug. 13	Quorum call	Present.
222	Aug. 13	H.R. 11296: On a motion to recommit to committee the independent offices appropriation bill in order to reduce by $250,000,000 the funds provided for research and development by NASA. (Defeated 114 to 270.)	No.
223	Aug. 13	Quorum call	Present.
224	Aug. 13	H.R. 12175: On a motion to recommit the housing bill to committee in order to add a provision permitting FHA to continue to insure loans beyond Oct. 1, 1965. (Defeated 184 to 194.)	Yes.
225	Aug. 13	H.R. 12175: To extend and amend laws relating to housing, urban renewal, and community facilities. (Passed 308 to 68.)	Yes.
226	Aug. 14	Quorum call	Present.
227	Aug. 14	Quorum call	Present.
228	Aug. 14	S. 1006: To authorize an increase in subsidies for the construction of fishing vessels and an annual appropriation of $10,000,000 for 5 years for the subsidies. (Passed 198 to 124.)	No.
229	Aug. 14	H. Res. 663: To provide an additional $10,000 for expenses of the Committee on Education and Labor. (Defeated 115 to 156.)	No.
230	Aug. 17	Quorum call	Present.
231	Aug. 17	H. Con. Res. 343: To express the sense of Congress that the President continue U.S. efforts toward securing full payment of U.N. assessments by all United Nations members and to apply the penalties if assessments are not paid. (Passed 351 to 0.)	Yes.
232	Aug. 17	H.R. 6242 (S. 524): To provide for the registration of contractors of migrant agricultural workers. (Passed 343 to 7.)	Yes.
233	Aug. 17	H.R. 9000: To amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act to provide more Federal control relative to safety measures in coal mines. (Defeated 202 to 151; ⅔ majority required to suspend rules.)	No.
234	Aug. 17	Quorum call	Present.
235	Aug. 18	Quorum call	Present.
236	Aug. 18	H.R. 1839: To adopt the conference report on the bill altered by the Senate to provide for the imposition of quotas on beef, veal, and mutton. (Passed 232 to 149.)	No.
237	Aug. 18	H.R. 8864: To adopt the conference report on the bill to carry out the obligations of the United States under the International Coffee Agreement of 1962. (Defeated 183 to 194.)	No.
238	Aug. 18	H.R. 8000: To adopt the conference report on the bill imposing a tax on acquisitions of certain foreign securities. (Passed 221 to 147.)	No.
239	Aug. 18	S. 1007: To adopt the conference report on a bill guaranteeing electric consumers in Pacific Northwest first call on electric energy generated at Federal hydroelectric plants in that region and to guarantee electric consumers in other regions reciprocal priority. (Passed 230 to 134.)	No.
240	Aug. 19	S. 3049: To adopt the conference report on a bill to extend and amend laws relating to housing, urban renewal, and community facilities. (Passed 310 to 70.)	No.
241	Aug. 19	H. Res. 845: To adopt rule for consideration of H.R. 11926, the bill to remove from the jurisdiction of Federal courts cases involving apportionment of State legislatures. (Passed 242 to 148.)	Yes.
242	Aug. 19	H.R. 11926: To deny to the Federal courts jurisdiction over apportionment of State legislatures. (Passed 218 to 175.)	Yes.
243	Aug. 20	Quorum call	Present.
244	Aug. 20	Quorum call	Present.
245	Aug. 20	H.R. 9586: To provide for the establishment of a National Council on the Arts to assist in the growth and development of the arts in the United States. (Passed 213 to 135.)	Yes.
246	Sept. 1	Quorum call	Absent.[3]
247	Sept. 1	S. 2701: To suspend rules and pass a bill to provide for a study to determine a site for construction of a sea-level canal between the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans. (Passed 320 to 23.)	Absent.[3]
248	Sept. 1	H.R. 4487: To pass the bill designed to prevent or minimize injury to fish and wildlife from the use of insecticides and pesticides. (Passed 236 to 110.)	Absent.[2]
249	Sept. 2	Quorum call	Present.
250	Sept. 2	Quorum call	Present.

See footnotes at end of table.

Voting record Representative GERALD *R.* FORD, *5th District of Michigan*—Continued

No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
	1964		
251	Sept. 3	Quorum call	Present.
252	Sept. 3	H.R. 12298: To recommit to committee the bill amending the Food-for-Peace Act in order to tighten the definition of friendly governments which may receive surplus agricultural products. (Passed 183 to 175.)	Yes.
253	Sept. 3	H.R. 12298: On final passage of the bill to extend and amend the Food-for-Peace Act. (Passed 349 to 6.)	Yes.
254	Sept. 3	Quorum call	Present.
255	Sept. 3	Quorum call	Present.
256	Sept. 3	S. 2220: To recommit to committee the bill to encourage physicians and dentists who have received student loans under certain governmental programs to practice in areas having a shortage of physicians or dentist. (Defeated 140 to 160.)	No.
257	Sept. 14	Quorum call	Present.
258	Sept. 22	Quorum call	Present.
259	Sept. 22	Quorum call	Present.
260	Sept. 22	H.R. 12633: On final passage of the supplemental appropriation bill of 1965 in the amount of $998,600,000, including $750,000,000 for the antipoverty program and $77,600,000 for mass transportation. (Passed 208 to 103.)	No.
261	Sept. 23	Quorum call	Absent.[1]
262	Sept. 23	H.R. 1096: To adopt the bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to cooperate with the State of Wisconsin in the designation and administration of the Ice Age National Scientific Reserve in the State of Wisconsin. (Passed 180 to 118.)	Absent.[4]
263	Sept. 30	Quorum call	Absent.[3]
264	Oct. 1	Quorum call	Present.
265	Oct. 1	H.R. 892: On adoption of the rule making in order the consideration of H.J. Res. 1183, making continuing appropriation for fiscal 1965. (Defeated 159 to 193.)	No.
266	Oct. 1	Quorum call	Present.
267	Oct. 1	Quorum call	Present.
268	Oct. 1	S. 3060: To recommit to the conference committee the bill to amend the National Defense Education Act in order to delete funds for institutes and equipment for teaching of history, civics, geography, and English literature. (Defeated 107 to 236.)	Yes.
269	Oct. 1	S. 3060: On final passage of the conference report on the bill to extend and amend the National Defense Education Act. (Passed 320 to 20.)	Yes.
270	Oct. 2	Quorum call	Present.
271	Oct. 2	Quorum call	Absent.[1]
272	Oct. 3	H.R. 12633: To agree to the Senate amendment to the supplemental appropriations bill providing about $5,000,000 for the schools of the District of Columbia as being in an impacted area. (Passed 211 to 78.)	No.

[1] Speaking engagement.

[2] If present, would have voted "yes."

[3] In Michigan.

[4] If present, would have voted "no."

SOCIAL SECURITY

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SCHADEBERG] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, it is with regret that I must report to the people of my district that this 88th Congress did not pass the legislation that would have increased social security payments for those who are so dependent upon receiving them. It is unthinkable that men could play politics with the welfare of our senior citizens. Surely they deserve more consideration by the present administration which claims "to have a heart" than a flat refusal to increase payments simply because it could not have its way in adding medical payments to the system.

Surely if there was even a faint concern for our elderly, the administration would have been willing to give much-needed relief now and waited another 3 months to propose medical benefits. Will we wait until another election year for this or is it the opinion of those who are demanding a more rapid pace in socializing this country that the American people are awakening to the gimmicks to buy votes and they will not want to corrupt the social security system if it is not done now? Or is it the intent of this administration to have our senior citizens included under the antipoverty program where the bureaucrats will tell them how to spend what they are given? Time will tell.

In the next session of Congress I will introduce two bills to assist those under social security who are deserving of consideration:

First. I intend to reintroduce my bill to allow earnings up to $1,800 before reductions are made in social security benefits. I will, however, increase the limit to $2,400 because the wild spending policies of this administration have wreaked havoc on the purchasing power of our dollars.

Second. I will introduce a bill to make payments for social security on the part of both employer and employee deductible from income. This is most reasonable since the social security payments of those who pay them are in effect a sizable tax and it is unfair to place a tax upon a tax.

We must stop this march toward an all-powerful central bureaucracy controlling every aspect of the lives of our citizens and create legislation that will break the economic chains big government has fastened on them. Government should encourage self-reliance and self-help. We must help people to help themselves.

CONGRESSMAN QUIE'S REPORT TO CONSTITUENTS

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, evaluation of the work of the 88th Congress will soon be in the hands of the historians.

For myself, however, I shall always think of the 88th Congress as the education Congress; some the conservation Congress; and others the civil rights Congress. While all of this can be logically said, we covered many other important pieces of legislation as well: agriculture, foreign affairs, health, tax cut, labor, and so forth. However, if any one thread runs through congressional action, it is that Federal involvement in State, local, and individual affairs increased tremendously.

It is my purpose today to attempt to outline our activities and to evaluate, when possible, both the immediate meaning and the long-range effect of our work.

CONGRESS WRITES OUTSTANDING RECORD IN EDUCATION

Mr. Speaker, the people of the First District have been greatly interested in education. We have outstanding elementary and secondary schools, many nationally known for their programs of excellence.

My district has four outstanding private colleges: St. Mary's, St. Olaf, St. Teresa, and Carleton; two highly rated community colleges at Austin and Rochester and a fine State college at Winona.

The First District is the home of excellent institutions for the training of the handicapped. It has some fine efforts in the field of vocational training, including outstanding institutions for nurse training and secretarial training.

Therefore, it was with more than passing interest that the people of the First District viewed development of education legislation in this Congress. As a member of the House Education and Labor Committee, I was privileged to be able to serve the people of my district by helping to develop the legislation which eventually gained passage.

HIGHER EDUCATION ACADEMIC FACILITIES ACT

The Higher Education Academic Facilities Act of 1963 has been referred to as the most important piece of education legislation in over 100 years. I was pleased that the Education and Labor Committee saw fit to pattern its final bill after a substitute measure that I had offered in place of the administration version in 1962. Beginning with this effort, we worked together in bipartisan fashion to develop a superior bill.

This bill will stimulate the construction of much needed academic facilities in our colleges and universities in order that the huge increase in the number of people seeking a college education can be assimilated. When this legislation was passed, there were 4.2 million students in college and it was predicted that this figure would swell to 7 million by 1970. There is more than a passing Federal interest in this bill because of the number of professionally, scientifically, and technically trained people necessary for employment in Federal projects already underway which deplete the number available for the private sector of our economy.

The assistance is in the form of grants and loans for the construction of classrooms, laboratories, and libraries. Special emphasis toward the development of junior colleges is evident by the earmarking of 22 percent of the funds for that purpose.

The difference between the House and Senate versions of this bill, which was eventually compromised, points out one complex problem confronting the Federal Government in its assistance to education. The Senate limited the program to the academic facilities which would be utilized in national defense type subject matter, while the House provided that the facilities could be constructed for teaching any subject other than religion. In the compromise the categories were expanded to science, mathematics, modern foreign languages, engineering, and libraries, and we adopted an amendment which I offered to permit the use of the facilities constructed for those categories in the teaching of other subject matter when not in use for the former. If we continue categorical aid where there is no purpose for it, an imbalance in our educational system can develop, and an inadvertent Federal direction over education occurs. We may someday find that we have shortchanged ourselves as severely in the humanities as U.S. schools were doing in the sciences prior to the National Defense Education Act in 1958.

Mr. Speaker, while realizing the great importance of the Higher Education Academic Facilities Act, I believe that two other acts are of equal value in creating an atmosphere of educational opportunity.

These are the Vocational Education Act, passed in this Congress, and the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, which we strengthened, improved, and extended this year.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION ACT

Beginning in 1917 with the Smith-Hughes Act and again in 1946 with the George-Barden Act, the Federal Government has indicated its interest in vocational education. Within that acceptance of the Federal role in vocational education, I helped develop the Vocational Education Act passed in this Congress. The Vocational Education Act broadens the use of vocational education to fit individuals for gainful employment. The stress on gainful employment was not a part of previous laws. It gives more latitude to the States in the utilization of their vocational education assistance and emphasizes the need for construction of area vocational schools by earmarking at least 25 percent of the new Federal allotment for this purpose. These schools are devoted entirely to training young people for gainful employment through full-time study.

With this bill also, there were differences between the Senate and House versions. All were satisfactorily compromised, I believe, with the exception of sections providing for the work-study program and residential vocational schools 100-percent financed by the Federal Government, which were in the Senate bill and which a majority of the conference accepted. I believe there is merit to residential vocational schools and 100-percent financing in the District of Columbia where the Federal Government has direct responsibility. However, I have always opposed on principle the assumption by the Federal Government of 100 percent of the responsibility for any program of assistance to people in an area of a State. The only case studies of community improvement which have proven successful is where the community itself assumes a substantial share of the responsibility for community improvement.

One of the strengths of the Higher Education Academic Facilities Act, the Manpower Development and Training Act, and the Vocational Education Act is the provisions in the legislation which make the role of the Federal Government a partner, not the paternalistic dictator of the States and local governments. These bills prove that the Federal Government can act positively to correct a need in cooperation with State and local governments and institutions without preempting their traditional areas of authority. This traditional partnership is preserved through matching grants and through loans which must be repaid. As a postscript I should point out that the Congress has refused to appropriate any money for the 100-percent federally financed residential vocational schools or this work-study program.

MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACT

This year the Congress acted to extend and strengthen the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, which I had helped to develop. This act has been providing a program of testing, counseling, and occupational training for those unemployed who cannot secure full-time employment without training. It also establishes programs for on-the-job training needed to equip underemployed persons with the appropriate skills.

The act was strengthened through the expansion of youth training programs to reach those most in need of training—young people who have dropped out of school. The idea of relocation allowances will also be used on a trial basis.

NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT

Another step in education was recently taken when the Congress expanded and extended the National Defense Education Act. Funds were increased for student loans and graduate fellowships. Forgiveness of loans was extended to all teachers, and equipment allowances to English, history, civics, geography, and reading. Institutes were added for teachers of disadvantaged youth, English, history, geography, reading, educational media specialists, and librarians. Guidance and counseling training and assistance was expanded to the elementary school and college levels.

As in the Higher Education Facilities Act, we faced the problem of categorical delineation of Federal assistance in the National Defense Education Act. When the act was first passed in 1958, the Federal Government began assistance to public elementary and secondary schools for the purchase of necessary equipment in the teaching of science, math, and modern foreign languages, because a stimulus was needed to increase the quality of teaching and increase the number of students in those subject matters.

Many now say that this is unfair to other subjects. Since certain additional categories were added in the recently passed bill, the only way to prevent Federal emphasis on one subject over another is to amend the law next year to permit the purchase of equipment for any academic subject.

This controversy in the National Defense Education Act extension and expansion bill arose again with the inclusion of institutes for the retraining of teachers of history, geography, and literature. Originally institutes were conducted for guidance and counseling personnel and modern foreign language teachers.

The National Science Foundation financed institutes for science and math teachers. We are all familiar with the great change in math courses as the result. Many of us felt that there could be no great objection to institutes for educational media specialists, librarians, teachers of disadvantaged youth, reading, or English language arts, but there was a potential controversy of a political philosophical nature in the subject matter taught in history, geography, and literature if the Federal Government were to finance the institutes. I believe we should amend the law next year, requiring an institution to secure the prior approval of its State department of education before a project is approved by the U.S. Commissioner of Education in an effort to prevent Federal direction of the subject matter of these courses.

HEALTH PROFESSIONS EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE ACT

The Health Professions Educational Assistance Act of 1963 provides for a 3-year program to expand facilities of medical, dental, nursing, and related type colleges. This law also includes student loan funds for doctors, dentists, and now optometrists.

NURSES TRAINING ACT

The Nurses Training Act of 1964 establishes a 4-year program of grants for construction and rehabilitation of nursing schools; establishes a program to assist 4-year, 2-year, and hospital schools of nursing to meet the additional costs of strengthening, improving, and expanding their training program; extends for 5 years the existing program of traineeships for advanced training of professional nurses to be teachers, administrators, and supervisors; and establishes a student loan program with a provision to forgive 50 percent of the nurse's loan if the nurse is employed in a public or nonprofit institution for 5 years.

The consideration of these bills showed up two other areas of controversy: First, the two loan programs just mentioned are a duplication of the student loan program in the National Defense Education Act, and if more professions seek the same treatment, it will greatly fractionalize a good Federal program making administrative costs higher; second, in this past Congress, a forgiveness feature for doctors and dentists was denied. Constant effort continues to include other occupations. I think it is unwise for the Federal Government to use this subsidy to direct people into occupations which it believes to be in shortage. I think a much wiser use of grant moneys would be to assist needy students secure the college education and let them choose their own occupation.

A number of other education bills were also passed—expansion of the Library Services Act removing its former limitation to rural areas, and a bill giving assistance to the training of all teachers of handicapped children. Previously, only the teachers of the mentally retarded and deaf were included.

If there were any one piece of legislation where I was sorry for its defeat, it was a measure to provide tax deductions to parents who pay their children's way through college.

I introduced a bill of this nature and feel it would not only be of assistance to parents in financing their children's education, but would also motivate and enable more young people to go to college.

POVERTY

The so-called war on poverty was entitled the Economic Opportunity Act. While undoubtedly well intentioned as a means of combating poverty, the narrow margin of its passage and the administration's unique methods of gaining support for it leaves the act's possible value in the shadow. I believe that poverty can be attacked by strengthening existing programs enabling the private sector of our economy to expand and create more jobs, and through education and training which will be greatly assisted through the programs I have just mentioned.

The Economic Opportunity Act adds 11 new programs to the 42 which the Federal Government is already engaged in. Some of these are: the Job Corps which sets up conservation camps for the training of some youths in the 3 R's and other camps in employment skills, 100 percent financed by the Federal Government; work training programs with the Federal Government paying 90 percent of the wages for young people hired to work in hospitals or playgrounds, et cetera, and work-study programs which will be used to hire needy college students. The so-called community action program puts in gear a Federal force to develop employment opportunities, improving human performance and motivation, by bettering conditions under which humans live, learn, and work with 90- to 100-percent Federal financing. It further authorizes loans to $1,500 each to low-income farms, $25,000 loans to establish or expand small businesses, and pilot projects to employ and train heads of families receiving help under aid to families with dependent children. The bill also provides that all obligations to the Federal Government may be compromised. The Volunteers in Service to America is a domestic peace corps which is to work in community projects, on Indian reservations, and so forth.

In addition to these provisions, the act also creates a new and unbelievably powerful Office of Economic Opportunity whose Director has absolute control and absolute power to use in bypassing State and local governments.

TAX CUT: FOR BETTER OR WORSE

For a long time, Members of both sides of the aisle have agreed that a good way to expand the economic base to create new jobs is by making more money available to the private sector of the economy through tax cuts. It is interesting to note that both of the presidential candidates are pledging tax cuts, if elected.

The 88th Congress cut taxes by $11.9 billion. I was glad to be able to support this measure in its final form. However, it is important that we keep constantly in mind that increased Federal spending can cause inflation; and that inflation can rapidly wipe out the benefit of this and any subsequent tax cuts. It is our duty to be constantly prudent and to be critical of requests for huge increases in Federal spending.

Tax cuts can and should work to our benefit and that of the economy. It is to be hoped that other cuts, not only in income and corporate taxes but in excise taxes as well, will be forthcoming. But we must always remember that just as a family cannot borrow itself rich—neither can a nation.

AGRICULTURE

Mr. Speaker, in addition to serving on the Education and Labor Committee, it is my privilege to serve the farmers of the First District as a member of the House Agriculture Committee.

Among important pieces of legislation affecting farmers undertaken in this Congress were new feed grains legislation, the Cotton-Wheat Act, limitation of red meat imports, and establishment of a National Food Marketing Commission.

A subject related to American agriculture was the administration's decision to sell wheat to the Soviet Union. Although the decision is in the hands of the President through the Department of Commerce, a good deal was said on this subject in the Congress when an unsuccessful effort was made to prohibit granting of credit to the Soviet Union.

The first important agriculture bill to come before Congress was the feed grains bill before the May 1963 national wheat referendum. The feed grains bill was passed at that time to secure additional support in the referendum. While I favored extending the feed grains program to 1964 and 1965, I was opposed to doing it at that time, since I felt it should be acted on after the referendum. I felt that if the referendum failed—as it did—a comprehensive wheat and feed grains law could be enacted and premature action on feed grains would make this difficult. My position did not prevail and therefore the wheat legislation languished another year before any action was taken.

The most significant development in agriculture, of course, was the defeat of the wheat referendum.

COTTON BILL

After this, the cotton bill passed the House. The cotton industry is in trouble in that the price support was set at 32½ cents a pound and an export subsidy was paid to exporters to bring the price down to the world level of 24 cents. This enabled foreign manufacturers to purchase cheap cotton from the United States and then to sell it back to us as manufactured cotton goods below our domestic manufacturing price. In an effort to remedy this, a subsidy will be paid under the new cotton bill to the domestic cotton manufacturers so that they might be able to secure their raw material at a price comparable to foreign purchasers. Naturally, these subsidies add a tremendous cost to the program for the taxpayers.

When the cotton bill was sent to the Senate, a wheat bill, similar to the one turned down in the referendum, was added. The difference was that this wheat program did not provide for mandatory quotas with penalties. The leadership, by using this mechanism, denied the House an opportunity to work its will on the wheat legislation. The House had only an opportunity to vote for or against the cotton-wheat package, which gained a narrow margin of passage, 211 to 203.

I felt the cotton bill unwise because of the direct payments to processors, the tremendous expense and, unless continued in future years, a more drastic amount of damage to the cotton industry would occur than that now anticipated.

WHEAT

I felt that the wheat legislation was also unwise. In 1965, the price support loan will be $1.25 a bushel. This is a drop from $1.82 a bushel in 1963. In addition to this, a farmer would receive 75 cents a bushel certificates on the normal production of 45 percent of his allotted acreage and a 30 cents a bushel certificate on another 35 percent of his production. On the remaining 20 percent he would receive no payments in addition to the price support loan of $1.25. This is unwise because income is actually reduced below the 1963 level, the domestic market price of wheat can drop below even the world market price and the Secretary of Agriculture is given authority, which he is fully utilizing, to sell CCC-held surplus wheat back into the market for as little as 105 percent of the $1.25 effective support level price. This will prohibit the market price from going above $1.32 next year, making participation in the program practically mandatory rather than voluntary, as the farmer will be dependent on the Government to such a large extent for the income he receives from his wheat.

I had recommended and promoted a change in the resale formula so that CCC stocks could not be sold into the market for less than 115 percent of the support price, which would have the effect of allowing a freer and more competitive market and would force the Department of Agriculture to promoting higher market prices for farmers rather than holding them down.

My views, although supported by many of my colleagues and the farm organizations, did not prevail.

In addition, many of my colleagues joined me in proposing unsuccessfully alternative legislation that would have set the 1964 support loan at 65 to 90 percent of parity at the Secretary's discretion, and a diversion program similar to that in effect on feed grains. The management decision would be left in the hands of the farmer himself, as to which of wheat and feed grain crops he would raise. Both price support eligibility and diversion payments would have been conditioned on compliance with the program.

It was ironic that in the cotton and wheat legislation, joined in one bill, the processor of cotton was subsidized to the extent of one-fourth of the price support loan level of the commodity, while the processor of wheat was taxed to the extent of 60 percent of the price support loan level of the commodity.

MEAT QUOTAS

Mr. Speaker, a Meat Import Quota Act was passed with my support. It will go into effect December 31, 1964. It will apply to beef, veal, mutton and lamb imports. Quotas, if invoked by the President, will be based on the 5-year period from 1959 to 1963.

A sharp drop in the income of U.S. meat producers, estimated by the Agriculture Department to have fallen 20 percent since January 1963, and the huge increase in imports created the atmosphere for passage of this bill.

NATIONAL FOOD MARKETING COMMISSION

Mr. Speaker, I believe that Congress made one of its wisest decisions affecting agriculture when it voted to establish the National Food Marketing Commission, which can have long-range benefits for all Americans.

This bill establishes a wide-ranged study of the food industry by a bipartisan, 15-member Commission. Five members are from the Senate, five from the House, and five are appointed by the President. Among the questions the Commission will consider is why the prices to farmers are continuing to be low as the price to the consumer rises. The study will be complete from the farm to the table. I join my colleagues in anxiously awaiting the reports and recommendations of the Commission and I believe that its work can be of great significance to both farmers and consumers.

DAIRY

No changes occurred in our dairy laws. The class I base plan passed the Senate but neither it nor my amendments were reported by the House Committee on Agriculture. Direct payments proposals were defeated in the Senate and never came to a vote in the House.

LABOR

Mr. Speaker, this was not a Congress for extensive labor legislation. For instance, the proposed minimum wage expansion and the idea of double time for overtime never got out of hearings. However, the bills that did pass were significant.

The Davis-Bacon Act was amended to include prevailing fringe benefits in establishing prevailing wages. An equal-pay-for-equal-work bill was passed amending the Fair Labor Standards Act to provide that pay to women and men must be equal for comparable work. This covers all employees subject to the minimum wage law. A National Automation Commission was set up to assess past and current effects of automation on technological change.

Perhaps the most important action occurred on August 28, 1963, just 6 hours before a nationwide rail strike was to begin. The joint resolution passed by the Congress and signed by the President, required compulsory arbitration to resolve the primary issues in the railroad industry. These were whether there should be firemen on diesel locomotives and the manning of train crews. This action marked the first time in peacetime labor relations that Congress imposed compulsory arbitration in a labor-management dispute.

ILO

During the 88th Congress, I was fortunate to be able to participate as a delegate in the proceedings of the International Labor Organization conference in Geneva, Switzerland, which gave me new insights that will be invaluable in future work on the Education and Labor Committee.

The ILO has a membership of 110 member nations, many of them Socialist-oriented or outright Communist. The United States has been working hard to project a world image through the ILO of what a successful free economy and free trade unions can do. This is a difficult project and our prestige throughout the world is at stake.

But I believe that we should continue to work through ILO to advance the causes of free enterprise and free trade unionism.

CONSERVATION

Two important bills in this area were the wilderness bill and the land and water conservation fund.

The wilderness bill which gained passage was very similar to one I had introduced earlier and will assure future generations the opportunity to enjoy the same benefits of nature we enjoy. This is especially important in light of continuing migration to urban centers and the decreasing amount of outdoor areas in and around metropolitan areas. This bill will "zone" existing federally owned wilderness areas for perpetual preservation.

The land and water conservation fund bill also represents an important advance in preserving our natural resources. It permits the States to plan, acquire, and develop outdoor recreational facilities and permits acquisition of recreational areas. The funds will come from three sources: First, sale of surplus Federal real property; second, the tax on gasoline used in motorboats, and third, admission fees to Federal recreation areas.

I have introduced a bill for the construction of the Great River Road. This proposed roadway will follow the Mississippi River from Canada to Mexico and will make the First District accessible to millions of tourists. This Congress appropriated $500,000 for preliminary planning, and I am hopeful that passage of the construction bill will follow soon.

CIVIL RIGHTS

For a long time this issue overshadowed all others in the earlier days of this Congress. Respect for the Congress should have risen across the Nation as people saw the forthright way the civil rights bill was handled. Opponents did not use dilatory tactics and proponents made no effort to cut off debate. All sides were fully heard.

Though this bill provides the necessary legislative machinery to guarantee all people equal opportunity and equal rights in voting, participation in Federal programs, securing of a job, and being served in an establishment that accommodates the public, civil rights is, in the final analysis, a moral question. Discrimination can only be finally corrected by human understanding and moral persuasion.

MASS TRANSIT

The Senate and House passed a $375 million 3-year program of grants and loans to assist publicly owned urban transportation systems. I could not support the mass transit bill for a number of reasons. There is hardly enough money authorized to take care of one State, let alone the Nation. It will be necessary to appropriate another $10 to $15 billion to make the program effective. The Federal Government will have to borrow even more money to finance the program, thereby increasing the national debt again. Municipalities can invariably borrow at a lower interest rate than the Federal Government by issuing tax-free securities. The bill was drafted loosely to give the Housing and Home Finance Administrator very broad powers. Using the promise of Federal money as bait, what is to prevent him from dictating in all sorts of areas? He could become the virtual mayor or czar of every main street.

FEDERAL SALARY INCREASE

Congress passed a Federal pay raise bill. I opposed this measure. My objection was not to the increase in salaries and wages for Federal classified and postal workers. These were justified under the Wage Comparability Act of 1962, and I supported them. But it did not seem wise, nor a very good example, to approve such huge salary increases for top policy men in Government, such as Cabinet officers, Federal judges, and Congressmen, when the President had appeared before both labor and management asking them to hold wages and prices down to avoid inflation.

DEBT LIMIT INCREASE

In light of the President's request, it also seemed strange when Congress was asked to raise the national debt to the highest level in history. That is what occurred, however, and this Congress raised the debt limit for the fourth time in 2 years. It is now $324 billion, compared to $315 billion the previous year and $293 billion in 1961.

It is disturbing to note that just the interest on the debt has risen from $9.2 billion in 1960 to an expected $11.1 billion annually in this fiscal year. Many of us have been concerned about the possible repercussions from continued huge Federal deficits and believe we must continue to work for a sounder approach to Government economy.

APPORTIONMENT

As I speak, the apportionment question has not been fully resolved. It is this issue, triggered by the Supreme Court decision that both houses of bicameral State legislatures must be apportioned on a strictly population basis, that has kept us here in session so long.

It is my belief that the Supreme Court's recent decision runs contrary to tradition and the rights of the States to decide their own method of representation. For that reason, I have joined many colleagues in introducing a bill for a constitutional amendment that would allow one house of a bicameral legislature to consider other factors than population in its apportionment if a State wishes it. These could include political subdivisions, natural geographic barriers, and population distribution.

Many States need to reapportion. Though I believe one house should be apportioned on a strictly population basis, I believe the States deserve the right to choose the method of apportioning the second chamber.

Undoubtedly, early action will be taken on the constitutional amendment in the next Congress, unless the Supreme Court has forced most States to comply with their philosophy of apportionment in the meantime. It is unfortunate that this Congress refused to resolve this serious problem during this session.

SOCIAL SECURITY

It has been the objective of many of us to keep the social security program responsive to current needs and to remove inequities when possible and to keep the system financially sound so it will continue to pay benefits.

When both the Senate and the House passed bills to do this, it proved that the needs of our elderly were being recognized. The Senate, however, added a so-called medicare provision to their social security bill, which has long been a philosophically and politically controversial measure felt by many to endanger the strength of the whole social security system. When differences could not be resolved in a conference between the House and the Senate, the Senate conferees, at the direction of the administration, wrecked the conference on social security amendments because they could not have medicare. The House-Senate conferees had reached substantial agreement on all other issues. The advocates of medicare were solely responsible for the failure of the 20 million recipients of social security to receive these additional benefits. Among the benefits which were washed down the drain, there were included: First, a $7 increase in monthly cash benefits; second, liberalization of the work test in order to permit the aged to supplement their social security benefits with part-time jobs; third, social security benefits for dependents who are attending school up to age 22, instead of age 18; fourth, social security benefits for widows beginning at age 60, rather than at age 62; and fifth, liberalization of the gross income upon which farmers may elect to pay social security.

If they cannot have medicare, the Senate conferees are willing to deny to the aged any improved benefits whatsoever. Their attitude has defeated a program of reasonable and needed improvements to the social security system to which I think the aged are fully entitled.

VETERANS' PENSIONS

Veterans' Pension Act: The House considered and passed a bill to improve and liberalize the non-service-connected pension program for veterans. This measure was endorsed by all major veterans organizations. It allows new exclusions from income in determining pension eligibility. For example, it provides for a veteran to now exclude as income 10 percent of the total social security payments he receives in a year. All of the wife's earned income can be excluded, instead of only the first $1,200 of her income. The bill lifted a requirement that veterans must be 10 percent disabled and unemployable in order to receive a pension at 65, and it increases the additional allowance for aid and attendance cases from $70 to $100 a month. It also provides an increase of $35 a month to any veteran who is permanently disabled.

Americans have long believed that the men who have defended this country in wartime deserve the protection of pension programs. The bill we passed provides a needed revision. This bill practically was lost in the last day of adjournment over the question of opening the national service life insurance program to all veterans for 1 year which was added in the Senate. However, a compromise was reached to open the program to permit veterans who are ineligible for commercial insurance to reinstate their lapsed GI insurance.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Foreign aid: It is obvious that the mood of Congress is to hold the line on foreign aid spending. It is evident that the President recognized this when he made his request for a foreign aid bill this year. The purposes of the foreign aid program are: First, an extension of our national defense efforts which totals approximately $50 billion a year, better than 50 percent of our Federal budget. Approximately $1 billion of the foreign aid bill is in the form of military assistance; second, to strengthen the will and capacity of emerging nations to develop a system of government whereby the people control the government rather than the opposite. Approximately $2 billion is in the form of economic aid. Mistakes, constant reorganization, and inadequate reporting to the American people about the program have left our foreign aid program unclear and subject to grave criticism. I hope this will be changed in the future.

Public Law 480: This program, now called food for peace, was extended 2 years ago. It provides a system whereby U.S. surplus farm products can be sold to foreign countries for their own currency if they are unable to pay dollars; a system of famine relief; a program whereby welfare agencies can distribute the food abroad, and a long-term loan program. This amounts to approximately $1.7 billion of food moving by this means annually. Its purposes are threefold: First, extension of U.S. foreign policies; second, disposal of surplus agricultural commodities; and third, a humanitarian concern for other people.

Peace Corps: Demand for the volunteers by foreign governments far exceeds the number provided for in this legislation. The program was expanded to increase the number by 3,500 to 14,000 volunteers. This has proven to be one of the most effective programs of foreign assistance. Every country that received volunteers has asked for more. The high standards, which are being raised each year, and the record of previous volunteers can make the American people justly proud of this service.

Southeast Asia resolution: It was good to see the House give overwhelming approval, by a vote of 414 to 0, to an emergency resolution requested by the President to strengthen his hand in dealing with Communist aggression in southeast Asia. The resolution gives prior congressional approval of all necessary measures which the President may take both to repel an armed attack against U.S. forces and to prevent further aggression.

Once again in times of crises this resolution, as others preceding it have done, illustrates to all the world that regardless of political differences, Americans are determined to prevent further aggression and to work firmly and steadily for peace with freedom.

CONCLUSION

It has been a great privilege to serve the First District of Minnesota in this area of national life where the changes in the Federal Government occur. I am thankful to my constituents for this opportunity.

PERSPECTIVE NEEDED

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, it is becoming increasingly clear as the presidential campaign develops, that perhaps the most important issue is being ignored. This is not the issue as to which of the two political parties has the best candidate and the best program for the Nation and the world. The underlying issue that is perhaps even more important is the issue of whether or not we are maintaining the integrity of our decision-making techniques. Outrageous misrepresentations are emanating from supporters of each candidate and from each party. The situation is deteriorating seriously. It can be argued that the frustrations of misrepresentations are the breeding ground for the extremes being indulged in. But it is not my intention to discuss the reasons at this time. It can be hoped that, when the campaign is over, people will remember this matter, however, and some sober and serious thought can be given to see that we do not again run the risk of impairing our country's historic adherence to and dependence upon open and fair debate of the issues.

I notice in the current issue of the U.S. News & World Report that South Dakota's distinguished Republican Senator, Karl Mundt, is reported as having spoken out sharply in regard to this matter.

In addition, the Keene, N.H., Evening Sentinel has a thoughtful editorial devoted to this general problem.

Because of the great importance of this matter, Mr. Speaker, I enclose the editorial which appeared in the Keene, N.H., Evening Sentinel of Thursday, September 24, 1964, and also the account of Senator Mundt's remarks which appeared in the October 5, 1964, issue of the U.S. News & World Report:

[From the Keene (N.H.) Evening Sentinel, Sept. 24, 1964]

Most Basic Right

We have had some caustic and satirical things to say, over the past several years, about certain American institutions and habits.

We have questioned, for example, whether hair-pulling between mothers on a baseball diamond teaches young boys in Little League anything about fair competition and good sportsmanship.

We have doubted that tiresome reports on a cookie sale sponsored by a PTA really contribute anything of consequence to the cause of education.

We have wondered whether endless meetings, merely for the sake of meeting, solve some of society's fundamental problems, especially when the "meeters" go off on innumerable tangents and often never get around to pinning down the issues at hand.

We have been skeptical about the formation of a committee to do a job that could be done by a thoughtful and perceptive neighbor, if only the neighbor were advised of the job that needed doing.

We have questioned the desirability of overemphasis on athletic ability, while at the same time downgrading scholastic ability.

We have doubted the integrity of people who call themselves Christians, but who would not cross the street to help a neighbor in trouble if he did not happen to meet their social standards.

And there have been other American sacred cows from which we have drawn editorial blood.

But we have never questioned the sincerity or integrity of those who appeared to be devoting their life's effort to causes which we thought were unworthy of their intelligence and ability.

Unfortunately, however, our country appears to be caught today between two political extremes, in a predicament in which, for the nonconformist, whether it be a newspaper or an individual, there seems to be very little middle ground.

On the one hand, there are those who still have their rifles loaded and are standing beside the kitchen door, prepared to defend the Nation against foreign invaders, the Congress, the White House, and, most of all, the U.S. Supreme Court—not to mention those fellow Americans who have the audacity to disagree with them.

On the other hand, we have those who, equally convinced that their view is truly the key to the Kingdom of Heaven, would do the very things which they find most obnoxious in their opponents, by blacklisting them, condemning their sponsors, castigating them in ordinary conversation and in public print, and by resorting to labels which are just as obnoxious and misleading as those their opponents pin on them.

America is a land of unity, but it's also a land of disagreement. It's a nation that was built and has grown and flourished on a philosophy which gives each of us the right to argue for an hour with a man, but then take him home to dinner.

If we lose this, if we retain the ability to do one or the other, but not both, then we've lost more than we could lose by the most radical amendment to our Constitution. If we lose this, we've lost that which, in the final analysis, is the most basic "right" that Americans have: the right of two men to disagree, but remain friends.

[From U.S. News & World Report, Oct. 5, 1964]

Mundt's Protest: A "Cheap, Dirty Campaign"

South Dakota's Republican Senator Karl E. Mundt has spoken out sharply against the "cheap and dirty" language of the 1964 presidential campaign.

It is spoiling the American image abroad and insulting the "intelligence of the American voters," he told the Senate. The 64-year-old Senator called on the candidates to "restore some degree of dignity and decency" to the campaign.

The candidates of both tickets, he said, are "honest, able, dedicated, highly trained, patriotic individuals. They are not crooks, not thieves, dopes, dupes, trigger-happy or warmongers."

But, he asked, "What kind of madness has overtaken these candidates?" Particularly, he said, he was shaken by Mr. Johnson's reference, in a speech to the Steelworkers Union, to his opponent as a "raving, ranting demagog."

"We all know in our hearts that Barry Goldwater is not a raving, ranting demagog," Mr. Mundt said, "just as we know Lyndon Johnson is not a crook."

It is not too late, the Senator said, to "switch the campaign from one of invective to one of issues."

NATIONAL LAWYERS GUILD

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. Snyder] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, the National Lawyers Guild has been on the Attorney General's list of subversive organizations for years, put there by a Democratic Attorney General.

Under unanimous consent I place in the Record the text of a letter purportedly written to James Lafferty of the Guild's Committee for Legal Assistance in the South written by a prominent member of ADA. We have been told there is no connection between Communists and the racial disorders since passage of the Civil Rights Act. This letter makes me wonder. I feel that all members of the House should read it; I therefore insert it in the Record:

June 2, 1964.

The National Lawyers Guild is surely to be congratulated for its program of providing legal assistance and counsel to persons involved in civil rights cases in Mississippi.

From my discussions with members of the Department of Justice I had been aware of the difficult situations which exist in that State for those persons involved in civil rights demonstrations. Your efforts to redress this balance are certainly courageous and commendable.

Many thanks for your kind words about my attempts to bring about passage of an effective and meaningful civil rights bill.

Best wishes.

Hubert H. Humphrey.

RUTHERFORD DAVID ROGERS

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Bromwell] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROMWELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay tribute today to a fellow Iowan and to a man who has, with exceptional competence, shared in the top administration of an agency that is vital to the efficient and effective functioning of the Congress. I refer to Rutherford David Rogers, who for the last 7 years has been second in command at the Library of Congress. To our great loss, he recently resigned his post as Deputy Librarian of Congress to accept the directorship of the Stanford University libraries.

Described in a recent article in College & Research Libraries as "Iowa's gift to librarianship," Mr. Rogers, who was born and raised in Jesup, received his B.A. degree from the State College of Iowa. He went on to Columbia University, from which he obtained his M.A. degree in English and his B.S. degree in library science, and to a distinguished career in librarianship. The State College of Iowa, in 1958, recognized his unusual contributions to his chosen profession by awarding him its Alumni Achievement Award for Outstanding Leadership.

Mr. Rogers began his career as an assistant in the New York Public Library and in the Columbia College Library, and in 1941 he became librarian of the latter. From 1942 to 1946 he served in the Air Transport Command advancing from the rank of private to that of captain. After a brief stint as a research analyst in private business, he served successively as director of the Grosvenor Library, a fine research library in Buffalo, N.Y., as director of the Rochester Public Library and the Monroe County Library System, and as chief of the personnel office and of the reference department at the New York Public Library. In 1957 he assumed his duties at the Library of Congress as Chief Assistant Librarian. The title of his position was changed in 1962 to Deputy Librarian of Congress to reflect his full responsibilities.

Mr. Rogers, with his exceptional experience in research libraries, quickly gained an understanding of the problems and policies of the Library of Congress and earned the respect and liking of his colleagues and of Members of Congress, as well as a reputation for unusual competence.

The Library of Congress, which is the world's largest research library and the National Library of the United States, provides service not only to the Congress, but to the Government, the library and scholarly communities, and the public. Its collections now number over 44 million items, and they include books, newspapers, manuscripts, maps, music, photographic negatives, prints and slides, phonographic disks, tapes and wires, fine prints and reproductions, motion picture reels, and many other items, such as microfilm, microcards, microprint cards, broadsides, photostats, and posters. Today, they are unsurpassed by those of any other library.

During his term at the Library, Mr. Rogers played a leading role in the development and control of these collections, as well as in improving services on them. He took an active part, for example, in making the science-information services of the Library increasingly responsive to the rapidly changing needs of the scientific community, both Government and private, by participating in the expansion of the Science and Technology Division of the Library, in the establishment in the Library of the National Referral Center for Science and Technology, and in the creation of the just-announced Science Policy Research Division in the Legislative Reference Service to assist the Congress in dealing with public policy on science and technology matters. Mr. Rogers also served on the Interdepartmental Advisory Committee on Science Services. Among his other major contributions to the Library of Congress and to other large research libraries was his planning on the Public Law 480 book-procurement program, which commenced in 1962 and which has met with resounding success in acquiring important research materials for libraries in the United States with the use of excess United States-owned foreign currencies, and his work with the team of specialists who investigated the possibilities of automating research libraries, and whose findings were reported and recently published.

AUTOMATION AND THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

Active in the many facets of the American library world's organizational work, Mr. Rogers has served as member or chairman of more than 30 committees or special projects of the American Library Association, the Association of Research Libraries, and other library organizations.

In the American Library Association, for example, he served for almost 10 years as a member of the Committee on Intellectual Freedom and as its chairman in 1950–51. In 1959–63 he served as a member of the ALA Council. He is presently a member of the ALA Executive Board—1959–65—and a member of the ALA's International Relations Committee—1959 to date.

For the Association of Research Libraries, of which the Library of Congress and some 70 other leading U.S. research libraries are member institutions, he has been serving on committees dealing with the preservation of research library materials, the microfilming of foreign newspapers, documentation and information retrieval, acquisitions, and other problems.

In other activities of service to the book world, Mr. Rogers was a member of the Committee on the White House Library in 1962–63 and was chairman of the Advisory Screening Committee in Library Science—for Fulbright and Smith-Mundt grants—in 1961–63.

He is the author of numerous articles in professional journals, among them an article entitled, "Yes, Ivan Reads," reporting on the American Library Mission to Russia in 1961, when he was one of the American librarians in an official exchange between the United States and the U.S.S.R. He has traveled widely abroad and has represented the Library of Congress at a number of international library conferences, the most recent of which was a seminar on the Development of National Libraries in Asia and the Pacific Area, held in Manila, February 3 to 15, 1964.

Mr. Rogers is married to the former Margaret E. Stoddard, of Jesup; they have a 16-year-old daughter, Jane Shelley.

As a Member of Congress who has often been impressed by the competence of the Library administration and as a fellow Iowan, I commend Mr. Rogers for his many contributions to the Library of Congress and to library development in this country. I wish him well as he takes over the directorship of libraries at Stanford, where he will continue to serve an important research community and the entire Nation.

REPORT ON DEPARTURE OF WORLD'S FIRST SURFACE NUCLEAR TASK FORCE FROM GIBRALTAR

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Bates] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, just a little over 2 months ago, I stood in this Chamber to announce the departure of the world's first surface nuclear task force from Gibraltar on its historic cruise around the world. Today, 65 days and 30,000 miles later, the three ships returned to port, to the acclaim of thousands of enthusiastic Americans on hand to greet them.

I am told that while this was the first circumnavigation of the globe by surface nuclear ships, that it was actually the third time the earth has been girdled by nuclear craft. The most recent, in 1960, was a voyage of the submarine *Triton*, retracing Magellan's 36,000-mile route in 1519–21. The first circumnavigation was performed by the submarine *Skate* in a matter of 50 minutes, on a 12-mile circle of the North Pole in 1958.

A number of other significant facts are worth noting. The transit from Gibraltar to Karachi was made without stopping anywhere along the route—a 10,000-mile voyage completed in 3 weeks—the longest continuous run on record. Had there been a need to do so, it could have been done in two. There were four crossings of the Equator. There were no refuelings or replenishment operations conducted during the entire voyage.

The purpose of this voyage was twofold: To build confidence in and good will for the United States among the free peoples of the world by showing them this prime force for peace; and to gain experience in operating nuclear ships in company for an extended period of time. In both instances, the effort was an unqualified success. Listen to some testimonials from these visiting dignitaries from the West African Coast—an area, as you recall, not particularly noted for its sympathy toward the West and its purposes:

> What we have seen today is the best demonstration you could give us for the power for peace. Again, our sincere thanks to you and to the United States. Long live the United States of America.

Or this:

> The people of (my) country send thanks to President Johnson for the magnificent demonstration of precision and power for this display of friendship to (my) country in the invitations to see these wonderful ships and aircraft.

Still more:

> Express thanks for today's show and its tangible manifestations of U.S. friendship, freedom, liberty and justice. Only people who know freedom and independence could present such a show of power for peace.

The reception from other visitors, both on board and in port along the route was equally impressive. In all, six ports were visited by the ships of the task force in addition to several underway visits to the ships by dignitaries of nations along the African and South American coasts.

The peaceful posture of the force was preserved to great lengths. It deliberately avoided potential trouble spots such as the approaches to southeast Asia, including the heavily traversed Malacca Strait and Java Sea. But the lesson was not lost on our enemies that had the need arisen, these ships could have sped to such trouble spots at twice the normal speed of advance of an oil fired task force, and arrived there ready for immediate combat operations.

Such a force can move over 800 miles a day to close the distance between it and potential trouble spots. Positioned on the west coast, it could reinforce the 7th Fleet in half the time an oil-powered force would require. For even a huge carrier such as *Constellation* would have to be refueled at least once on the way, and again upon arrival before it could be ready for combat operations.

In view of the outstanding success of this inspired adventure, there now appears no possible justification for continuing to put oil-fired propulsion plants in our new combatant ships. We do not put piston engines in our long-range aircraft; we have long since ceased to build steam locomotives; the gasoline engine put the horse out of business a half century ago. Why, then, must we continue to inflict this anachronism on one of the most vital agencies of our Nation? Even the opponents of nuclear power admit its superiority in performance and the strategic advantages that stem from it. But, they say, it costs too much. I disagree. How do we count costs? In dollars alone? In human lives? In priceless advantage lost or gained in a life-and-death struggle over four oceans? What is the common denominator of cost when national security is involved? Certainly not dollars, important though they be. There is more, infinitely more, to this matter of national security costs than just dollars alone.

Yet, even in our dollar accounting we may be penny-wise and pound-foolish. Everything in our industrial experience tends to prove that the way to get costs down is to go into volume production. Perhaps the very reason the dollar costs of nuclear-powered surface ships are more than conventionally powered units is that we have never given ourselves enough experience in building them to profit from the learning curve which invariably operates to the cost advantage of each subsequent unit built. If we keep building nuclear ships by ones and twos, the costs will probably stay up, because each one is virtually a prototype. If we build them by dozens, we shall very quickly find that the momentum of large-scale production will slash the unit costs of the new ships to levels competitive with conventional plants. And not only the Navy will benefit. There will be a tremendous spin-off to private industry in the form of reduced costs of nuclear-powered installations, including those which go to sea in merchant ships.

President Johnson has recently announced the development of a two-reactor plant which will produce the same order of power as the eight-reactor plant of the *Enterprise*. From other sources comes the announcement that our latest atomic-powered submarines will require only one refueling during their expected lifetime. So the nuclear art progresses. I feel that the time is now ripe for the full exploitation of the potentialities which our scientists and development engineers have made ready for us. The production phase for nuclear-powered surface ships is now due. We should begin now, with the 1966 program, to insure that every major ship, carrier, cruiser, or destroyer, is equipped with a nuclear plant, as evidence of our intent to move forward steadily in this new age of the maritime atom.

We should start by building another nuclear task force.

PRAYER IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Becker] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, in June of 1964, because of a statement by the National Catholic Welfare Conference, in Washington, I decided to write a letter to the Catholic Bishops of the United States, asking them the following questions:

> Do you support the premise that children in public schools be permitted to pray on a voluntary basis?
>
> Do you oppose such an amendment?

Up to the present time, 55 bishops have replied to my letter, as follows:

In support	36
Opposed	8
Noncommittal	11

I am sure any unbiased person will admit that this response from 55 Catholic bishops, speaks for itself, as greatly in favor. Secondly, it must be remembered that four out of five of the Catholic Cardinals in the United States have taken public position in favor of prayer in the public schools.

However, this session comes to an end without the Congress taking any action on my constitutional amendment House Joint Resolution 693. I regret this more than I can put in words, and while I will not return to Congress next year, I shall not cease in my efforts to restore a 173-year right to the American people.

BOB WILSON REVIEWS HIS 12 YEARS OF CONGRESSIONAL SERVICE

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Bob Wilson] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, with the close of the 88th Congress I will complete my 12th year of congressional service to the people in the San Diego area. These have been 12 event-filled years and I am proud to have played a part in helping San Diego to grow and prosper.

Representing the 36th District of California in the Congress has been a challenging and rewarding experience. The job has been made easier by a dedicated staff of assistants who man my office in San Diego and in Washington. With their help I have answered nearly a million constituent letters and dealt with the pressing problems of countless citizens who in one way or another needed the personal attention of their Congressman. For example, I have over 70 private bills to my credit, each aiding an individual citizen in some important way.

I owe many thanks to my colleagues, both Republican and Democrat, who have worked with me in the House. It has been a particular pleasure to serve on the House Armed Services Committee—under both Republican and Democratic chairmen—Dewey Short, Republican, of Missouri, and the present chairman, Carl Vinson, of Georgia, who will be leaving the House this year after a lifetime of distinguished public service.

I would like to pay a special tribute also to the staff of the House Armed Services Committee, which has been particularly helpful in recognizing the complexity of the many problems facing a district such as mine. They have been loyal in assisting me in the representation of the district and in attending to the interest of my constituency—so long as those interests paralleled the overriding national interest.

Although Members of Congress are reimbursed for only four round trips to Washington per year, I have made it a practice to visit my district at least once or twice each month—usually paying my own travel expenses. Even though visits to the district sometimes precluded my being on hand for a few rollcalls or quorum calls in Washington, I believe they are an important and vital method of keeping in close touch with the ever-changing problems of the San Diego area.

In the area of legislation, I would like to take a moment to review some of the bills which I have helped bring into law—some affecting the vital military strength of our country. I have been particularly interested in personnel legislation for the armed services and have actively participated in discussions which may lead to an overhaul of the draft system.

It would be almost impossible to recap all of the thousands of activities which in one way or another involve a congressional district and the Federal Government. In our district alone, we have an unusually large number of military construction projects and more are anticipated. Each of these must have the authorization of my committee, the Committee on Armed Services, before the funds are appropriated.

I have earned recognition as a spokesman for the Navy, since there are more naval installations in my district than in any other congressional district. For this reason I am opposing the construction of the Coronado-San Diego bridge which would inhibit the free access of Navy ships in and out of the bay. This bridge, in my opinion, and the opinion of many naval experts, would be a booby trap for the South Bay, and would inhibit and destroy naval activities there.

It is also sometimes necessary to oppose Government moves which are detrimental, not only to the community, but also to the whole Nation. Such a situation is the closing of the San Diego naval repair facility in the adjoining 37th district. I have been vigorously fighting to keep this vital facility to provide a crucial service to our ocean-going fleet. I believe that its closing weakens our defense posture and endangers our national safety. It must be reopened.

Over the years, I have worked for such federally assisted local projects as a new airport tower and improvements for Gillespie Field, new post offices in Ocean Beach, Encanto, Bostonia, Lakeside, Chula Vista, Santee, Point Loma, College Park, and Imperial Beach.

I have pushed for funds for rock groins to stem erosion at Imperial Beach, helped obtain Federal land for San Miguel School, California Western University, University of San Diego, Chula Vista Hilltop High School, San Diego city schools, and the University of California. I introduced the first bill, now law, transferring the $3 million Camp Matthews land for the University of California at San Diego. As a result, the new veterans' hospital, for which I introduced the first legislation, will be located in my district.

I have worked for such improvements in our Defense Department installations as a new electronics building and helicopter test facility at the naval air station, new supercarrier piers, and $60 million in improvements at the Miramar Naval Air Station.

I have worked for sale of Government-owned Linda Vista homes to their occupants, helped write a wetback control law, promoted additional funds for fire control in Cleveland National Forest, and for the Sweetwater flood control survey and worked to return some 30,000 acres of Camp Elliott to the tax rolls.

For the many Federal employees in our area, I supported pay increases, medical, and insurance provisions for post office employees and other Government workers and military dependents and helped write pay-raise legislation for military personnel. I also supported legislation which would benefit retired Government employees and bills calling for increased veterans' benefits. I did not support the recent $7,500 pay increase for Congressmen.

In the area of social legislation, I supported the Kerr-Mills bill providing medical help to senior citizens and have supported constructive civil rights legislation.

In my first term, I helped promote action which persuaded the Maritime Administration to reduce the rates for the port of San Diego, pushed for simplified customs clearance for boats between San Diego and Mexico and introduced the first legislation for the San Diego seawater conversion plant. I introduced legislation credited with bringing major shipbuilding to San Diego, originated and pushed through an amendment for San Diego Harbor dredging for *Forrestal*-type carriers and obtained the appropriation to reopen Mission Bay Channel and provide additional dredging there. I worked in committee for the nuclear submarine pier which is now the permanent submarine home port facility and obtained $215,000 for an Army Corps of Engineers San Diego harbor improvement survey.

Of particular importance to the fishing industry, I introduced the Fisherman's Protective Act to benefit local tuna fishermen, was instrumental in bringing the International Conferences on Aviation and Tuna to San Diego and introduced the Fisherman's Policy Act to improve the fishing industry.

Other legislative activity includes the support of a $40 billion Federal highway program which benefited U.S. Routes 80 and 101; bills for the relief of Greek and Korean orphans; for land expansion for the Cabrillo Monument; and legislation to benefit Philippine servicemen; and assistance in the drafting of Federal Aviation Agency legislation to improve air service.

Of a particular interest and importance to the people of the San Diego area are several bills I introduced to encourage the study of oceanography. Among these is a bill to establish a National Oceanographic Agency to be located in San Diego. This important Federal agency would oversee all of the U.S. oceanography programs. In this connection, I have introduced a joint resolution calling for the United States to convene a World Conference on Oceanography in this country in 1965.

The problem of wetback control and the need for additional legislation to support contract agricultural workers has been of particular interest—I vigorously oppose the actions by this Congress in ending the bracero program this year and have introduced legislation to extend bracero hiring for 3 years.

The recent Supreme Court decisions involving prayers in schools and reapportionment of State legislatures cause me great concern. I introduced a resolution to permit noncompulsory prayers in schools, and supported the House action giving State legislatures 2 years to comply with reapportionment edicts. I support the constitutional amendment to permit at least one body of State legislatures to be apportioned on a basis other than population. Many other bills and resolutions have also had my active interest and support.

I have been awarded the honorary title of "Watchdog of the Treasury," also named by Redbook magazine as 1 of 10 Congressmen who had done the most for young people. Other awards came from the Medical-Dental Veterans, for doctor draft legislation, from the Filipino-American veterans organization for work on behalf of minority groups, from the Fleet Reserve Association, which made me an honorary life member for work on enlisted personnel legislation. The Assembly of Captive Nations has just notified me that I am to receive their 10th Anniversary Commemorative Medal.

These 12 years have been eventful and productive. I thank the good Lord and my constituents for giving me this opportunity to be of service.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that following the conclusion of legislative business today and the special orders heretofore granted, I may address the House for 15 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter and tables.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ALLEGED BURNING OF STATE DEPARTMENT PAPERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Wisconsin yield briefly?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I am delighted to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JOHANSEN], at page 23762 of the RECORD, addressed the House with regard to, as he says, facts on the State Department's security file burning order. Mr. Speaker, I should like at this time to include with these remarks a statement of the State Department with regard to their domestic field investigative program which indicates very clearly that no data, reports, information, names, leads, and so forth, were ordered destroyed that were not already available in the Washington headquarters.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, the matter referred to is as follows:

STATE DEPARTMENT DOMESTIC FIELD INVESTIGATIVE PROGRAM

On August 28, 1964, the Office of Security reorganized its field offices in the United States in order to increase the number of major cities in which we have security officers, reduce travel requirements imposed on our security officers, reduce the number of clerical personnel required to backstop these offices, and to give the Office of Security more flexibility in the utilization of security manpower for other security responsibilities.

Along with this reorganization, duplicate files, control cards (often erroneously referred to as index cards), and obsolete administrative data which had been maintained in field offices were ordered destroyed, since the originals of all this material were maintained in Washington.

This reorganization places the procedures and operations of the State Department domestic investigative program in the United States on a comparable basis to those of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Civil Service Commission and other investigative agencies of the U.S. Government.

The principal purpose served by State Department security agents in cities in the United States is to carry out security and suitability investigations on job applicants for State Department positions. Other functions which are not only secondary in nature, but also important, are the responsibilities of these State Department security agents to plan for the protection of visiting foreign dignitaries to the United States and to investigate alleged visa and passport fraud.

In carrying out their job applicant investigative responsibilities under the new organization, the following procedures will be in operation:

1. All applications for jobs are received in Washington.

2. The Washington headquarters of the Office of Security sends the name of the applicant together with information from their employment application to the appropriate field office. (There are now 7 field offices in the United States as opposed to 19 under the old organization.)

3. The field office records the receipt of the investigative request on a control card and then assigns the request to the field agent whose territory covers the city in which the applicant lives. (There are now agents in 27 major U.S. cities as opposed to coverage in only 22 under the old plan.)

4. The field agent conducts a complete investigation on the applicant. This includes a neighborhood check, interviews with employers and acquaintances, a check of the police and credit records, interviews with teachers and schools and in most cases a personal interview with the applicant. (Other investigative agencies do not normally interview the applicant personally.) The investigator follows all leads that are available in his territory.

5. Once he has completed all of his investigation, he dictates his investigative report into a dictating machine and sends his report together with his notes to the appropriate field office (his headquarters). This report that he has dictated contains all data that he has unearthed, all leads that he has followed up, all leads that should be followed up in other sections of the United States or overseas, résumés of all interviews; full information concerning the case is included in his investigative report. (This procedure is similar if not exactly comparable to the way investigative reports are processed by the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Civil Service Commission.)

6. The resident agent (located in 20 cities) will have an office normally in a Federal office building, but will not have a secretary, since he will dictate his reports on a dictaphone. (This also has saved seven secretarial positions which will be used to strengthen the Washington headquarters operation.) His investigative caseload covers a large territory, oftimes as many as two or three States, and as a result, he will be away from his office approximately 85 percent of his time investigating State Department applicants and in the performance of his other assigned duties.

7. His field office (there are seven of them) has a stenographic pool which will type his investigative reports and send the original and one copy to Washington headquarters. Washington headquarters will, therefore, have the complete agent's report of the case which includes all interviews, all leads, both those followed up and those suggested for further followup, and all material relating to the investigation of the applicant.

The field office has been authorized to retain duplicate copies of the finished investigative report. The agent's dictated record or tape will be maintained in the field office during the retention period for duplicate copies of the investigative report, although the resident agent will not see the transcribed copy of his report. In all cases, it will be reviewed for completeness and accuracy, and then it will be signed and approved by his supervisor who thereby assumes responsibility for the report along with the resident agent.

8. Neither the field agents (headquarters field offices) nor the resident agents have any authority to initiate any investigation nor to follow up any new leads on any case that is not first directed by Washington headquarters. This has always been the procedure in the State Department and is the same procedure followed by other Federal investigative agencies. Indexes of leads and cross-references of names have always been and will continue to be maintained in and furnished when necessary by the Washington headquarters. Field offices and resident agents maintain control cards of cases under active investigation and in some cases, have retained those cases after the investigation was completed. These cards, which are duplicates of cards originated and maintained in Washington, together with duplicate investigative reports which some resident agents had maintained, are the kind of records that were ordered destroyed in the directive of August 28. No data, reports, information, names, leads, etc., were ordered destroyed that were not already available in Washington headquarters. In those few instances where a current case file will be needed for further investigative work by a field agent, duplicate copies of the previous reports will be sent from Washington to the appropriate field office, as well as all other pertinent additional information from the Washington files.

This reorganization of State Department domestic field organization and operation was developed by Deputy Assistant Secretary for Security G. Marvin Gentile, who came to the State Department from the position of a senior security and investigative capacity with the Central Intelligence Agency. Prior to that time, he was an investigator with the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI).

OCTOBER 1, 1964.

CONGRESSMAN LESTER JOHNSON

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, on this closing day of the 88th Congress, I take the floor of the House to bid a farewell to a distinguished colleague and friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin, Congressman LESTER JOHNSON. He is retiring from the House at the conclusion of this session.

In my 16 years of service in this House, I have met a number of men and women whose personal integrity, ability, and devotion to the public good, have won the unqualified respect of their colleagues. LESTER JOHNSON is one of these men. I have been privileged to serve here with him, and to have him as a friend.

He came to this House in 1953 as the Representative of the ninth congressional district of Wisconsin. He was elected at a special election October 13, 1953, to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Congressman Merlin Hull. The first Democrat to represent that district in several decades. This, in itself, was an achievement of considerable proportions, for it marked the beginning of an increase in the Democratic representation from the rural areas of the North—an increase which has been sustained in years that followed.

LES JOHNSON's primary interests have always centered on problems and issues important to our rural communities. He served with distinction on the Committee on Agriculture and consistently fought for measures designed to improve the well being of small farmers, of townspeople, and of consumers residing in large cities. His long and persistent efforts to bring about reforms in Federal legislation dealing with agricultural issues, to open national markets to milk and other dairy products produced in Wisconsin, and to assure all consumers access to bountiful supplies of pure and wholesome milk, will never be forgotten. I have been associated with him in trying to secure the passage of such bills as the national milk sanitation bill, and I have frequently sought his advice on measures which came under the jurisdiction of his committee.

LESTER JOHNSON's interest in farm legislation did not, however, detract from the important contribution he made in securing the enactment of vital, and at times, pioneering legislation in many other fields. Throughout his service in the Congress, he has consistently voted for measures to keep our country strong and our economy expanding; to broaden the opportunities for our youth and to improve the well-being of our elder citizens; to develop our natural resources and to preserve them for future generations; to insure a rising standard of living for all our people; to improve our national security; and to advance the cause of freedom in the world. In the closing days of the 88th Congress the passage of the Ice Age park bill is a crowning tribute to his distinguished record of accomplishments.

Mr. Speaker, I regret that circumstances beyond our control are going to deprive us of LESTER JOHNSON's presence in this House. I shall miss his counsel, his help and support on issues in which we have a common interest. I sincerely hope, however, that he will continue to make his wide experience, his good judgment, and his great energy, available for public service, perhaps in some other governmental capacity. I know that this would be of benefit to our whole country.

My wife joins me in extending to LESTER and to his lovely wife Marjorie and his three charming daughters, Mary Lynn, Jane, and Jove, many years of health and happiness. Should he choose to continue in Government service or any other endeavor we wish him every success.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I desire to join the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin in paying tribute to one of the finest men and one of the finest legislators with whom I have had the honor to serve since I became a Member of this House. I also served with the gentleman from Wisconsin, LESTER JOHNSON, on the Committee on Agriculture for many years. I know that he is deeply dedicated to American agriculture; he has given outstanding leadership in the field of dairy legislation.

In this area he certainly was one of the most able men ever to serve in the House of Representatives.

Beyond that, he has been a great and progressive Member of the House as well as a conscientious Member. He has given attention to every important legislative question. He has looked to the broader interests of our country. He has indeed been a great Congressman in every sense of the term.

He is a man of integrity and ability. He is a fine, a warm, and a lovable person, whose friendship I shall cherish so long as I live.

I hope that in the years ahead it may be possible for LESTER to come back and serve again in this House. We can ill afford to lose a Member having his character and his qualifications. During his retirement from the House I know that he will continue to dedicate his life and his leadership to the things that are best for America. I wish him well in all his undertakings.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I thank the majority leader for his kind contribution.

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to concur in what has been said on behalf of LESTER JOHNSON. In the little more than 6⅔ years I have been a Member of this House I have known no Member who has been nicer to the new Members of the House than LESTER JOHNSON. He has helped me on numerous occasions.

He has always exhibited leadership of the type possessed by the people about whom we have read in the years we were preparing for our service here. He is a typical Member of the House of Representatives.

He has helped me in my Congressional district on a project known as the Cane Creek watershed project, which I appreciate very much.

I wish for him and for his family the best of everything in the years to come.

I concur in what has been said by the distinguished majority leader. I hope that his absence will be short-lived and that soon he will be back as a Member of this body.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I thank the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I am glad to yield to my colleague from Wisconsin.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, we are all grateful that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI] has taken the lead today in enabling us to say farewell for the time being to our great and beloved colleague, the Representative for so many years of the Ninth District of Wisconsin, LESTER JOHNSON.

LESTER JOHNSON is a true son of the middle border who has fought his great legislative battles on that frontier where the problems of agriculture and the problems of conservation meet.

LESTER understands and loves fertile soil, pure water, the things that grow from the soil and the wild things that live on the land and in the waters.

Whether it was in pursuance of his duty at the head of our congressional subcommittee on the dairy industry, or whether it was in taking the lead to provide more wetlands to extend the watershed conservation program, or most recently, the dramatic setting up of that great memorial, the Ice Age National Scientific Preserve in Wisconsin, LESTER JOHNSON has truly shown the connection between agriculture and conservation of our natural resources.

The historians some day will turn to the career of LESTER JOHNSON in studying both these great movements.

I join with our colleagues today in wishing all the best to our wonderful friend, that fine legislator, LESTER JOHNSON, and to his charming wife Marjorie. We wish them both long and happy years.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I thank my colleague.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. It is with personal sadness, Mr. Speaker, that I note the retirement of our colleague, LESTER JOHNSON. This tribute to him, however, is well deserved. No Member from Wisconsin worked harder or served with greater distinction.

While his tenure of some 11 years is marked by many outstanding contributions in the field of agriculture and farm legislation, the fact remains that he has also steadfastly maintained his progressive-minded interest in all major legislation and matters of public policy and his liberal and progressive attitude faithfully represented the political traditions of his area of Wisconsin.

LESTER JOHNSON's record in agriculture and conservation is a great one and the list of his contributions is long. It is not my role to recite them at this time. It is enough to say the Wisconsin dairymen and the American farmer have lost a champion in the Congress.

Personally his retirement is a loss to me, for no one has aided me more greatly and cooperated in counsel with me more fully in my 6 years of service here. However, I trust that he will certainly continue his public service in some capacity and that he can occasionally be found among us. We will miss him greatly.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to include at this point in my remarks several paragraphs from my congressional report to the Wisconsin State Democratic Convention, delivered on June 16 of this year:

> You have privileged me with 15 minutes of your time. I am going to take no more than that, but I first want to say how much I regret that Congressman LESTER JOHNSON is not sharing this platform today. In his absence, I would like to express my own gratitude for the deep debt we all owe the man whose election in 1953 paved the way for a resurgence of the Democratic Party in Wisconsin.
>
> We have come a long distance since that day in 1953 when Republicans had so hoped to win the Ninth as a birthday present for President Eisenhower. Our Democratic Governors have brought to the State the most enterprising government it has had in nearly half a century. They have given new life to Wisconsin's great progressive tradition. Wisconsin Democrats in Washington have played an equally vital role in the forward movement of our Nation, contributing that unique brand of public service which has always been the hallmark of the Badger State in the Capital.
>
> LESTER JOHNSON has, in a very literal sense, blazed the trail for all of this. No man is completely indispensable. No man is truly responsible for all that he makes possible. But everything must have its beginning somewhere, and, in politics, good things seldom happen by accident.
>
> LESTER JOHNSON's election was no accident. It was won and secured by the same patient labor that has characterized his 10 years of service on the House Agriculture Committee. In this post he has ably and persistently struggled with some of the decade's most frustrating questions of Federal policy. You all know that only rarely has major agricultural legislation commanded the support of a majority of the people, of the Congress, or even of the Agriculture Committee itself. This is nowhere as true as in the field of dairy legislation. LESTER's chairmanship of the House Dairy Subcommittee since 1959 has given Wisconsin a voice in the difficult business of making dairy policy. We will miss that voice badly just as we will not easily forget his specific achievements for dairy, rural electrification, and watershed development.
>
> I did not intend to make a farewell speech to or for LESTER today. Still, his retirement is a significant event of the 1964 legislative year, both for the Congress and for the State he has served there so well. Our congressional report would not be complete without mention of it.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I thank the gentleman, and I now yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. HAGEN].

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to pay tribute to LESTER JOHNSON, with whom I served on the House Committee on Agriculture and on the Dairy Subcommittee, of which he is chairman.

LESTER has been an extremely conscientious, intelligent, and informed Member of the House of Representatives, and deserves the thanks of the State of Wisconsin and of the Nation.

I hope that he is interested in serving the country in some executive capacity, and I would certainly support him in such an effort.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I thank the gentleman, and I now yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MATTHEWS].

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to join the many, many friends of our colleague, the Honorable LESTER JOHNSON, in paying tribute to him and saying how very much we are going to miss him here in Congress. So often we hear the statement that in Congress legislation is by committee. By that, of course, we mean that a bill must go through a long, tortuous process before it can be enacted into law. It would be interesting, I think, for the average American citizen, if he could, to follow this process through and see how absolutely essential it is for a group of dedicated men in committee to try to study a bill with all of its facets, and finally to report a measure that has a good chance of being enacted into law. I know of no man in the Congress who is a better committeeman than the gentleman from Wisconsin, LESTER JOHNSON. I have served with him on the Committee on Agriculture for many years, and I would say that he has about as good a committee attendance record as any man in the House.

He is honest, he is able, and he has always been loyal to his constituents and to his country. He has been aggressive in the field of agricultural legislation. I have said to him I do not believe anyone in Wisconsin can take his place. He has made tremendous contributions, and I want to congratulate him and say to him that he takes the best wishes of all of us here in the Congress. He is my personal friend. I have visited with him in his home and with his lovely wife. I know he is not going to retire but is going into some other area of activity. Whatever it is, I predict it will be a continuation of his distinguished record here in the House.

So I say to our friend, the Honorable LESTER JOHNSON, good luck, goodbye, and God bless you.

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. I am grateful to the gentleman for allowing me a few moments to add to the tributes paid by so many of his colleagues to the services of Lester Johnson as a Member of this body.

I have had the privilege in the past 3 years of serving on the Committee on Agriculture with Lester Johnson. I do not believe there is a man in Congress who demonstrates a more dogged determination in behalf of those things affecting the people he represents and at the same time remaining very sensitive to the needs of our Nation as a whole.

I certainly join with the distinguished majority leader in trusting that his stay away from this body will be a very brief one and that his State and Nation will benefit again soon by his further service in the Congress.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in March of this year, our colleague Lester Johnson of Wisconsin announced he would retire from the House of Representatives at the expiration of his term at the close of 1964.

When Lester was elected to the House in 1953 at a special election to fill the vacancy created by former Congressman Hull, he was the first Democrat to be elected from this area of Wisconsin. He was assigned to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of which I am now chairman. He was a most competent Member, but regretfully, he left my committee in 1955 to serve on the Agriculture Committee. It was on this committee that he made his presence felt and chairmaned its Dairy Subcommittee. He is well known today as a leader in the fields of dairy, conservation, and rural electrification and our rural population throughout the entire country, not just Wisconsin, will be losing a Member who at all times maintained their interests as a primary source of personal concern.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished and friendly colleague, Lester Johnson, in his decision to retire, deprives the Congress of one of its most valuable authorities on conservation and agricultural problems of the Nation.

His practical and theoretical knowledge of the dairy industry contributed much to the advances made and advantages given at the legislative level.

His affable smile and genial manner are not to be misunderstood as one being supple of disposition—behind these pleasantries common to the average American, he has a backbone through the center of which runs a rod of steel. The secret of his success is that he sees the practical side of every question in spite of the speechmaking and sharp doubletalk.

He pays no attention to what the newspapers say about him—for he reads few newspapers—he is too busy doing his job.

He talks little about himself and less in debate—but when he has some particular argument to debate, or point to be considered—then he speaks directly and in a concise manner, with clarity and punch.

His loyalty to friends is unswerving. He alone could have passed the memorial establishing the Ice Age Scientific Preserve in Wisconsin. It stands as a monument to his endeavors in this field. His purposeful study in bringing out the interdependence of farming and conservation programs for their common good as the necessary solution of their problems are now widely accepted by the authorities on these subjects.

Mr. Johnson contributed much to the dairy industry's stability in providing the leadership in passing legislation for the extension of greater wetland areas through the watershed conservation program.

The State of Wisconsin has lost one of the strongest of its influential legislators in the Congress—and the conservationists and farmers will miss a true friend.

May God bless Lester and his lovely wife, Marjorie, in their joyful retirement. May success and happiness follow them through life.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, in all my service here in this great body, I have never known a man more dedicated to his constituency than Lester Johnson. He labored day and night constantly working for the welfare of his people. He made a splendid record here on Capitol Hill for his State and his Nation. My association with Lester Johnson was always pleasant. He was one of the truly great "cloakroom characters" who eased the burden of others serving in the Congress. Lester Johnson's service here was marked by his diligent devotion to duty, and his attention to those little problems, which is a mark of true greatness. I know of no one I will miss more on the floor, in the cloakroom, in the restaurant and in his office than my colleague and warm personal friend, Lester Johnson. I congratulate the people of Wisconsin for their good judgment and foresight to share Lester Johnson's talents and devotion to duty with us here in the Congress and with the entire free world.

Lester married a lovely southern girl. The motto of Lester and Mrs. Johnson will always be "the other fellow." Mrs. Dorn joins me in wishing for them much happiness and every continued success.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 days in which to extend their remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE 88TH CONGRESS

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent, at the conclusion of the special order, at this point, that I may extend my remarks in regard to the accomplishments of the 88th Congress and my voting record and chart.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

REPORT TO THE PEOPLE OF THE FOURTH DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, today is the last day of the historic 88th Congress, which was in continuous session, except for brief recesses, for 21 months. As has been my policy, I wish to take this opportunity to make an "accounting of my stewardship" to the people of my district, the Fourth District of Wisconsin.

At the close of each session of Congress in which I have served, it has been my practice to make a report on my actions and my votes as a Member of Congress, believing that my constituents have a right to know my record as their elected Representative.

I do not expect that everyone will approve my every vote. No responsible public official can be all things to all people. My record is one of which I am proud, and it is my belief that it generally reflects the will of our people.

THE 88TH CONGRESS: AN OVERALL VIEW

It is my firm conviction that the 88th Congress will go down in history as one of the most significant in modern times. The laws it approved set a new course of progress and prosperity. Landmark decisions were made in nearly every field of our national life.

The 88th Congress, for example, enacted a tax cut of major proportions lessening the tax burden of our taxpayers and sustaining our booming economy. It acted vigorously to meet pressing needs in education. It took positive steps to make all American citizens, regardless of race, creed or national origin, more secure in the enjoyment of their basic rights. It worked to eliminate poverty in our otherwise affluent Nation. It ratified the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty which may prove to have been a "first step" away from the brink of disaster. And it accomplished many other things.

Much of the credit for these accomplishments must go, of course, to the outstanding leadership of the late President John F. Kennedy and to President Lyndon B. Johnson.

We began 1963 on a note of hope.

We had a young, forceful President who, during his 1,000 days in office, was to provide new inspiration, new impetus, to our Nation—who would stand fast in the face of Communist threats—who would point to new horizons in human opportunity and freedom—and who would win the hearts of millions of people throughout the world.

We had a strong and healthy economy which produced 2 years of increasing prosperity for our people.

We had launched new efforts to promote peace and freedom in the world—through the Alliance for Progress, through continuing our mutual security program, through the food for peace programs and through many other worthwhile undertakings.

We had launched a large-scale program of space exploration.

And we had brought to a halt, Communist expansionist drive by thwarting their plans to put intercontinental offensive missiles on Cuba, by calling their bluff in West Berlin, by rising to their challenge in southeast Asia and Africa: in short, by displaying strength and willingness to use it in defense of freedom.

As the year 1963 began to unfold, we turned our attention to our problems at home. The legislative program of President Kennedy, the last one that he was to present to the Congress, called upon our National Legislature:

To improve the opportunities for our youth by strengthening our educational system, by starting programs to get the young people off the streets, and by giving every deserving young man and woman the chance to receive a college or a university education;

To improve the lot of our elder citizens by providing for their health and pension needs, and by improving their opportunities for employment;

To strengthen our national economy by reducing taxes, promoting higher employment, and bringing new enterprises to depressed areas;

To secure to all our citizens the enjoyment of their basic rights;

To aid our metropolitan areas in solving their transportation problems;

To develop and preserve our bountiful natural resources for future generations;

To keep our Military Establishment the best and strongest in the world;

To improve the administration of our Government; and

To promote peace with freedom and justice in the world.

This was an ambitious program, and many people questioned the possibility of enacting it when they looked at it. But our needs at home were great—because they were frequently neglected during the postwar period when our attention, our energies, and our resources, were devoted primarily to the task of providing for the security of the free world in the face of unending Communist efforts to subvert it. So we had much to do at home. The President knew it—and so did the Congress. And as 1963 went on, following the President's leadership, the Congress applied its efforts to these tasks.

Then on November 22 a great tragedy befell our Nation: A tragedy which moved the conscience of every American and tore the hearts of millions of our friends across the seas. The loss of our great young President brought our work to a standstill—but not for long.

A new President took the reins of our Government in a peaceful and orderly transfer of Executive power—a transfer which showed the real strength of our democracy.

President Lyndon Johnson dedicated himself to finishing what President Kennedy had begun.

TAX REDUCTION AND ECONOMIC EXPANSION

A prime accomplishment of the 88th Congress was the passage of the $11.5 billion tax cut bill. This measure put back needed dollars into the pockets of our taxpayers and provided a valuable stimulus to America's expanding economy.

Recent Government statistics show that our gross national product, personal incomes, and the number of employed industrial workers have all advanced strongly. The gross national product, spurred by the tax cut, is expected to reach a record $623 billion by the end of 1964.

President Johnson has announced that as a result of the increases in earned income and the tax cut, the after-tax income of the average American is $139 higher today than it was in 1963. This "raise" amounts to $556 per year for a family of four and has led to increased consumer spending as well as to increased savings. All of this has been accomplished while the cost of living has remained relatively stable.

The tax cut is also credited with reducing nonfarm unemployment. In June, for example, the number of workers on nonfarm payrolls increased by 600,000 to a record total of 59.1 million.

In the Milwaukee area, the jobless rate dropped below 3 percent for the first time since 1960 as total employment rose 10,800 in 2 months. By mid-September, factory employment in our community increased by another 4,700 jobs.

In addition, among the provisions of the new tax law is one which I have long sponsored in the House of Representatives. It allows a person over 65 an exemption for the capital gains tax should he sell his home and not wish to build or buy another.

Under the old law, gains from a home sale were exempt only if an individual bought another residence within a year or built a new home within 18 months. This provision discriminated against elderly persons who no longer needed a family homestead and wished to move to an apartment, a trailer, or a nursing home. I believed it was unfair to deny the elderly citizens a tax break at a time in their lives when every dollar is important.

According to the Treasury Department, this new provision will save our elderly citizens over $10 million a year. In Wisconsin, the savings to these people may well amount to over one-half million dollars annually.

MEETING THE NATION'S EDUCATIONAL NEEDS

The 88th Congress is being called "the Education Congress" because of the many new or expanded programs it has enacted to provide our young people with adequate training and educational opportunities. These include:

The Higher Education Facilities Act, which authorizes a 3-year program of $835 million in grants and $360 million in loans for the construction programs of our colleges and universities;

The Health Professions Education Act, which authorizes a 3-year program of $175 million in matching grants for the construction of new medical and dental school facilities, and provides $30.7 million in loans for those studying the health professions;

The Vocational Education Act, which will expand Federal aids to vocational education by $731 million over the next 4 years. Our world-famous Milwaukee Vocational and Adult School should benefit from this law;

The Mental Retardation Facilities Act, which provides $51.5 million in grants in the next 3 years for the construction of mental health centers and related facilities, and for research and training of teachers to instruct handicapped children;

The Library Services Act Extension, which provides renewed Federal assistance for the construction of library buildings in urban areas;

The Nurse Training Act, which, in an attempt to meet the current shortage of nurses, provides $287.6 million over the next 5 years, for nursing school construction, training programs and student loans;

And the National Defense Education Act Amendments of 1964, which extend the use of National Defense Education Act funds to social science instruction, and make available to teachers in parochial and private schools, as well as those in public schools, the student loan "forgiveness" provision of the law.

One important piece of education legislation which failed to be enacted was the education tax credit proposal which I have sponsored with other Members of Congress. This proposal would allow parents of students in institutions of higher learning to deduct for income tax purposes, a portion of the expenses involved. An attempt to include this proposal as a part of the new tax law failed narrowly in the Senate this year, but prospects for its eventual enactment appear good.

THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1964

Probably no single piece of legislation in modern times has caused as much controversy as the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Unfortunately, much of the opposition to this law can be traced to misunderstandings about its scope and purpose.

In my close and careful study of this measure, I became convinced of two things: First, that our Wisconsin State Statutes have for years included antidiscrimination provisions which are even broader than those contained in the new Federal law; and second, that the effect of the Federal law will be confined largely, if not exclusively, to those parts of the Nation where State and local officials have consistently denied some of the citizens their basic constitutional rights.

Principally, this is what the bill does: it safeguards the right of all citizens to vote, and to use public schools and other public facilities on a nonsegregated basis. It forbids discrimination because of race, color, national origin, or religion in employment and in establishments which generally serve the public, such as restaurants, hotels, motels, movie theaters, and sports arenas. It provides that no person may be subject to discrimination in a program or activity receiving Federal funds, and establishes the Community Relations Service, designed to seek a voluntary solution of community problems arising out of discrimination.

It is also important to know what the bill does not provide. It does not infringe in any way on a person's ability to sell, lease or rent his house, upper flat or apartment to whomever he pleases. It does not forbid discrimination in barbershops, bowling alleys, or retail stores unless they are located in a covered establishment—for example, a barber shop in a hotel. It does not empower any Federal official or court to act to achieve racial balances by transporting children from one school to another.

The Civil Rights Act of 1964 was principally written by a respected Taft Republican and was passed with strong bipartisan support. The vote on final passage in the House was 290 to 130 and in the Senate, 73 to 27. The reason behind this united effort was the realization that the time had come to make equal rights for all American citizens a fact as well as a slogan. The racial disturbances of recent months are deplorable and should not be condoned. At the same time, however, reasonable men will agree that a constructive way to prevent them is to attack the problems which give rise to such unrest. By passing the Civil Rights Act, Congress acted to take the conflict out of the streets and into the courts, the traditional way to iron out such problems under our American system.

SAFEGUARDING OUR NATION'S SECURITY

The need for maintaining a strong defense against Communist aggression was fully recognized by the 88th Congress. More than one-half of total Federal spending in 1963-64—over $100 billion—is being devoted to strengthening our Defense Establishment and our forward positions abroad.

Further, the 88th Congress did not forget the needs of the men and women of our armed services. Realizing that modern technological warfare demands a professional standing Military Establishment, Congress provided substantial pay increases to our military personnel. These were designed to add incentives for career service.

Included in the authorizations for strengthening our national security was a 2-year total of $5.5 billion for the Atomic Energy Commission. This amount included funds for the production of nuclear devices and $13.5 million for a prototype reactor for an atomic merchant ship.

Approximately $10.9 billion was appropriated for fiscal years 1964 and 1965 for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, thereby sharply increasing the space budget. About one-half of that amount went for the Apollo moonshot project. The rest went for research, development and construction in other NASA programs.

FORWARD STEPS IN FOREIGN POLICY

Perhaps the single most prominent foreign affairs issue which confronted the 88th Congress was the ratification of the nuclear test ban treaty by the Senate. It marked a first step away from the nuclear arms race and potential world disaster.

Another important innovation designed to prevent international tensions from igniting into a nuclear war is the so-called hot line. Although the term is one which we associate with the telephone, the hot line actually is a telegraphic communications system linking the Kremlin with the Pentagon. It could prove very useful in preventing miscalculations and tragic misunderstandings in times of crisis.

The groundwork for both the test-ban treaty and the hot line was laid by the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, created by legislation which I cosponsored in the 87th Congress. Because of these and other achievements, the Congress extended the life of the Agency for 2 more years and appropriated $20 million for its operation.

Another agency which found favor in Congress because of its success was the Peace Corps. Established in the 87th Congress, the Peace Corps was expanded in the 88th Congress to allow more American men and women of all ages to assist the people of the developing nations. It was my privilege to sponsor legislation enlarging the Peace Corps and to participate in getting it approved by the Foreign Affairs Committee and by the House.

During the 88th Congress significant changes occurred in the operation of our foreign assistance programs. First, the amounts requested by the President decreased as a number of nations which formerly received our aid became self-sufficient. Today less than one-half of 1 percent of our gross national product is expended on foreign aid. Second, increasing emphasis was placed on loans, rather than outright grants. Third, the "buy American" policy on purchases financed by aid money was further emphasized. Over 80 percent of such expenditures are now made in the United States. In this way, we promote our own economic growth while we assist the economic development of the less fortunate nations.

Another item of particular note is the Executive Service Corps created by the Foreign Assistance Act of 1964. This program, which I have long advocated, will use the skills and know-how of American businessmen in countries where such knowledge is badly needed.

DOMESTIC LEGISLATION

In addition to legislation which I already mentioned, the 88th Congress enacted a number of other important measures. Among these are:

The Urban Mass Transit Act of 1964, which authorizes a 3-year, $375 million program of grants and loans to help States and communities improve mass transit facilities for their residents;

The Equal Pay for Women Act, amending the Fair Labor Standards Act to require equal pay for women who perform the same work as men;

Expansion of the Manpower Development and Training Act, to include more categories of unemployed workers and to increase funds for operating the program;

Legislation strengthening the air-pollution control program by encouraging State and local prevention and enforcement activities, and increasing fund authorizations for grants-in-aid through 1967;

Increased payments to widows, dependent parents and children of deceased veterans, and educational assistance to children of disabled veterans;

Increased salaries for civil service and other Government personnel to make them comparable to salaries in private business and industry;

The Land and Water Conservation Fund Act, establishing a fund to assist State and Federal agencies in meeting present and future outdoor recreation demands and needs of the American people;

The National Wilderness Preserve Act, to preserve in their natural state for future generations some 35 million acres closed to commercial use; and

Legislation to authorize the establishment of the Wisconsin Ice Age Park.

SOME UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Of course, no Congress could enact in 2 years all the legislation which people believe necessary for the welfare of the Nation and their own well-being. There were, indeed, some measures that should not have been approved, and some that should have been adopted. In my opinion, the most serious shortcoming was the failure of the Congress to approve an increase in benefits and other improvements in the social security law. The House-approved measure was amended by the Senate to include the provision to provide hospital and nursing home care for the aged. Although the need for health care legislation is very pressing, certain members of the House Ways and Means Committee were adamant in their refusal to approve the medicare provision. The leadership and the administration insisted that the bill be acted upon with the health care amendment, thereby signing the doom of both provisions. As an original sponsor of health care for the aged legislation, and a consistent supporter of improved social security benefits, I will continue to work for the passage of both of these needed bills.

The 88th Congress also failed to take positive action on my bill to create a Joint Congressional Committee on Intelligence Matters. There were some encouraging signs, however. The House Rules Committee held 2 days of hearings on the proposal, and both public and congressional opinion appear to be rising in favor of the creation of such a committee. Chances for passage in the 89th Congress appear good.

Voting record of Congressman CLEMENT *J.* ZABLOCKI, *88th Cong.*

Stand	Issue	Status
	NATIONAL DEFENSE, INTERNAL SECURITY, SPACE	
Voted for	$32.8 billion authorizations for new planes, missiles, ships, and defense research	Became law.
Voted for	Fallout shelter program providing new civil defense shelters	Passed by House.
Voted for	Funds requested by House Un-American Activities Committee	Passed by House.
Voted for	$10,900,000,000 space program, including "Apollo" man-to-moon project	Became law.
Voted for	Construction projects at Armed Forces bases at home and abroad	Became law.
Voted for	$5,500,000,000 program for Atomic Energy Commission	Became law.
Voted for	Strengthening security provisions of National Security Agency	Became law.
Sponsored	Resolution providing for the establishment of a congressional "watchdog" Committee on Central Intelligence	Hearings in House.
Voted for	$71,800,000 authorization for vessels, aircraft, and facilities for strengthening the U.S. Coast Guard	Became law.

Voting record of Congressman C*lement* J. Z*ablocki*, *88th Cong.*—Continued

Stand	Issue	Status
	INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS	
Voted for	Extension of the Export-Import Bank for 5 more years	Became law.
Sponsored	Expansion of Peace Corps activities	Became law.
Voted for	Foreign Assistance Acts of 1963 and 1964, including military aid to fight Communist aggression	Became law.
Sponsored	Byrd Commission to coordinate U.S. programs in Antarctica	Hearings in House.
Voted for	Increased U.S. participation in Inter-American Development Bank	Became law.
Voted for	Continued authorization for the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency	Became law.
Favored	Nuclear test ban treaty	Ratified by Senate
Sponsored	Creation of U.S. Academy of Foreign Affairs for training American diplomats and other U.S. Government employees assigned abroad.	Hearings in Senate.
Voted for	Continued U.S. participation with 16 other countries in the International Development Association	Became law.
Voted for	U.S. membership and participation in the South Pacific Commission	Became law.
	SOCIAL SECURITY, HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE	
Voted for	3-year program of grants and loans to aid construction of college and university facilities	Became law.
Voted for	Amendments to National Defense Education Act, including new aid to social sciences and extension of loan "forgiveness" to teachers in private schools.	Became law.
Sponsored	Legislation to provide dormitory and school for Capitol pages	Pending.
Voted for	2-year extension of the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act	Became law.
Voted for	Extension of Federal matching grants for construction of public libraries in urban areas	Became law.
Voted for	Program to build facilities for mentally retarded and community mental health centers, and to train teachers of handicapped	Became law.
Voted for	Health Professions Education Act, authorizing new medical-dental school construction assistance and student loans	Became law.
Voted for	$731,000,000 in expanded Federal aid to vocational education	Became law.
Sponsored	30-percent tax credit for educational expenses incurred at institutions of higher learning and high schools	Pending.
Voted for	Legislation increasing by 5 percent monthly payments under social security	Died in conference.
Favored	Hospital and nursing home care for the aged under social security	Died in conference.
Sponsored	Reduced full-benefits retirement age under social security to 60 years for both men and women	Died in conference.
Voted for	Equal pay for equal work for women	Became law.
Voted for	Increased authorization for housing for the elderly	Became law.
Sponsored	Senior Citizens Act, providing Federal aid to State and local programs for elder citizens	Approved by House committee.
Voted for	5-year extension of Hill-Burton Act program of matching Federal grants for hospital construction and modernization	Became law.
	GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATION AND OPERATION	
Voted for	The Civil Rights Act of 1964, enforcing constitutional guarantees of equal rights to all American citizens	Became law.
Voted for	Renaming National Cultural Center as the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts	Became law.
Voted for	Resolution creating special committee to investigate Federal research	Adopted by House.
Sponsored	Proposal to create a Commission on Congressional Organization	Pending.
Voted for	Extension of Presidential authority to submit reorganization plans to Congress	Became law.
Sponsored	Joint Congressional Committee on Consumer Interests	Pending.
Voted for	Increases in the basic pay rates of postal and classified employees and other Government personnel	Became law.
Voted for	Legislation authorizing U.S. district courts to appoint public defenders for indigent defendants in criminal cases	Became law.
Sponsored	Amendment to the Constitution revising the electoral college method of electing the President and Vice President	Pending.
Sponsored	Legislation to permit the sale of surplus U.S. property to State and local governments	Pending.
Voted for	Limitation on funds allowed Members of Congress on official travel abroad	Became law.
Voted for	Legislation making the dissemination of indecent literature illegal	Passed House.
	VETERANS AND SERVICEMEN	
Voted for	Increase in basic pay for all members of the Armed Forces	Became law.
Sponsored	Establishment of a nursing care program for veterans	Became law.
Voted for	Increased aid to veterans suffering loss of speech and hearing	Became law.
Voted for	Increased payments to widows, dependent parents, and children of deceased veterans	Became law.
Voted for	Legislation providing education assistance to children of veterans with total service-connected disabilities	Became law.
Sponsored	Extension of veterans' medical benefits to U.S. citizens who fought with allied armies in World Wars I and II	Pending.
Voted for	Raise in strength of cadet corps at U.S. service academies	Became law.
Voted for	Extension of disability income provisions of national service life insurance policies through age 60 under certain conditions	Became law.
Voted for	Exemption from draft for sole surviving son of a family whose father died as a result of military service	Became law.
Voted for	Increases in veterans' non-service-connected pensions and other benefits	To President.
	NATIONAL ECONOMY	
Voted for	$11,500,000,000 tax cut for individuals and corporations, and tax code reforms	Became law.
Sponsored	Tax exemption on profits from home sale by elderly persons	Became law.
Voted against	Extension of current wartime-imposed Federal excise taxes	Became law.
Sponsored	Increase of $200 in personal exemption on income tax	Pending.
Voted for	Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, key measure in President's war on poverty	Became law.
Sponsored	Youth Conservation Corps to employ jobless youths on conservation projects	Part of it became law.
Voted for	Expansion of vocational education programs to combat unemployment	Became law.
Voted for	Program of grants and loans to help States and communities provide mass transit facilities and service	Became law.
Voted for	Broader disaster loan authority for the Small Business Administration	Became law.
Voted for	3-year extension of aid to States and communities for airport construction	Became law.
Sponsored	Repeal of excise tax on restaurant meals when live music is provided	Hearings in House.
Voted for	Legislation prohibiting schemes to influence the outcome of sports events by bribery	Became law.
Voted for	$1,100,000,000 annual Federal contribution to State highway construction	Became law.
Voted for	Establishment of National Commission on Food Marketing, to assist producers and consumers	Became law.
Voted for	Davis-Bacon Act amendment requiring Federal contractors to conform to local area fringe benefits	Became law.
Sponsored	Equality of Opportunity Act to protect small businessmen against cutthroat retailing practices	Pending.
Voted for	Extension of Area Redevelopment Administration and increase in its lending authority	Passed Senate.
Voted for	$10,000 increase in Government insurance on savings accounts in banks or savings and loan associations	Defeated in House.
	NATURAL RESOURCES AND AGRICULTURE	
Voted for	Special small business loans to Great Lakes fishing industry damaged by "botulism scare"	Became law.
Sponsored	Legislation establishing a Great Lakes Basin compact to assist and direct the economic development of the Great Lakes	Pending.
Voted for	Creation of an Ice Age Park in Wisconsin	Became law.
Voted for	Establishment of a National Wilderness Preservation System on 35,000,000 acres closed to commercial use	Became law.
Voted for	Program of aid to water resources research centers at land-grant colleges, State universities, and other institutions	Became law.
Sponsored	Legislation protecting public from unsanitary milk and dairy products	Pending.
Voted for	Extension of the food for peace program	Became law.
Voted for	Extension and expansion of the national school lunch program to feed schoolchildren adequately	Became law.
Voted for	Legislation broadening and making permanent the stamp program for distribution of surplus and other foods to the needy	Became law.
Voted for	Administration wheat-cotton bill	Became law.
Voted for	Extension of special program to distribute surplus milk and other dairy products to the Armed Forces and at veterans' hospitals	Became law.
Voted for	Land and Water Conservation Fund Act, to meet present and future outdoor recreation needs of the American people	Became law.

Rollcall record of Congressman C*lement* J. Z*ablocki*, *88th Cong.*

Session	Total roll and quorum calls	Rollcalls	Not voting	Quorum calls	Absent on quorum[1]
1st	256	110	9	130	7
2d	272	112	1	156	3

---

[1] Absence on quorum call does not necessarily mean a legislative day's absence.

MRS. MICHIKO MIYAZAKI WILLIAMS

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill—H.R. 10820—for the relief of Mrs. Michiko Miyazaki Williams.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, has this bill been cleared on this side?

Mr. WILLIS. Yes.

Mr. HALLECK. With whom?

Mr. WILLIS. With the minority Members, Mr. McCulloch, Mr. Poff, and Mr. Moore.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is this bill going anywhere other than just through the House? I understand the other body has already adjourned.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is not a matter on which the Chair can give the gentleman any advice.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 10820

A bill for the relief of Mrs. Michiko Miyazaki Williams

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a)(23) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Michiko Miyazaki Williams may be issued a visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that Act: *Provided,* That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRIBUTE TO CONGRESSMAN HARRY SHEPPARD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. Cohelan], is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I take these few minutes to pay my own personal debt of gratitude and thanks to a great Member of this House, the very distinguished dean of the California delegation, the Honorable Harry Sheppard.

Harry has publicly announced that he will not be with us next year; that he is not running for reelection. I know that all of our colleagues, Mr. Speaker, join me in regretting this decision and wishing that this able and dedicated public servant would not put down the reins of leadership he has held so faithfully and so well for so many years.

There is no man in this Congress who knows more about the problems of military construction. As chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Military Construction, he has studied these measures at great length to insure that no requirement is left unmet, but that no unnecessary funds are expended. Our great military capability and facilities of today are in no small measure due to his efforts.

It has been my own personal privilege to serve as secretary of the California congressional delegation under Harry's chairmanship since my election to Congress in 1959. To sit by his side and to watch him deal with the broad range of problems that have come before our delegation has been a truly rewarding experience and a great education.

Harry Sheppard has been a devoted representative of his 33d District; he has been a great champion for the State of California; and he has been a great servant and leader for the American people.

It is hard to see him leave. It will be even harder to replace him.

But I know that we all wish him well; that we all want for him the many, many years of retirement which he has so richly and fully earned.

Goodby Harry. Good luck. And Godspeed.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution and concurrent resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H.J. Res. 1192. Joint resolution fixing the time of assembly of the 89th Congress;

H. Con. Res. 371. Concurrent resolution establishing that when the two Houses of Congress adjourn on Saturday, October 3, 1964, they stand adjourned sine die; and

H. Con. Res. 372. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Speaker of the House and the President pro tempore of the Senate to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found to be truly enrolled.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 1927) entitled "An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to revise the pension program for veterans of World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict, and their widows and children, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2434) entitled "An act to amend section 560 of title 38, United States Code, to permit the payment of special pension to holders of the Congressional Medal of Honor awarded such medal for actions not involving conflict with an enemy, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12633) entitled "An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a resolution as follows:

S. Res. 379

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the Presiding Officer to join a similar committee of the House of Representatives to notify the President of the United States that the two Houses have completed the business of the session and are ready to adjourn unless he has some further communication to make to them.

THE APPROPRIATIONS BILLS, 88TH CONGRESS, 2D SESSION

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter, tables, and charts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, with the disposition of the usual last-minute supplemental bill the appropriations business of the session is concluded. It has been a long session. Much has been accomplished—too much, in the opinion of some, not enough; in the opinion of others. And that encompasses the matter of appropriations. Some will say we have appropriated too much, others think not enough. But probably the great majority of all the people would agree that no legislation transcends in importance the business of taxation and appropriations. Without money, not even the smallest and most elementary functions of government can find expression. Not a wheel of government can turn without the motivation of an appropriation.

By leave of the House, I include for the information of Members and others a résumé of the appropriations bills of the session processed through the traditional annual appropriations process. While the great portion of the expenditure side of the Federal budget is disposed of through the regular annual appropriation bills, I must add that some items still find expression through backdoor devices of one kind or another and a not insignificant amount is spent each year under permanent law not requiring action annually by the Congress.

SUMMARY OF COMMITTEE ACTION ON THE BILLS

I should note that all regular appropriation bills for fiscal 1965 cleared the House by July 1. The major credit for the improvement in that connection belongs to the late distinguished and beloved gentleman from Missouri, the former chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, Mr. Clarence Cannon. Not in 4 years have all the bills been cleared to the other body as early as the first day of the new fiscal year. The momentum was lost, however, because the other body was so long preoccupied with another matter.

I shall include tabulations in more detail, but in summary the committee, in all bills of the session—both deficiencies and supplementals for fiscal 1964 and bills for fiscal 1965—considered budget estimates of appropriations aggregating $97,677,058,218. This divides $2,377,489,489 for fiscal 1964 and $95,299,568,729 for fiscal 1965 which began July 1 last. This does not include permanent appropriations recurring automatically under prior permanent law—principally interest on the debt—tentatively estimated in the budget last January at $11,800,000,000. This last figure could go higher. Nor are backdoor appropriation requests disposed of in bills reported by other committees of the House included in these totals.

The Committee on Appropriations cut these requests just over $4 billion—precisely, $4,046,779,245. Every regular bill for fiscal 1965 was below the budget requests. The general deficiency bill earlier in the session for fiscal year 1964 was not cut as much as it might otherwise have been but the ready explanation is that, in contrast to previous practice, it was confined to items qualifying under the strictures of the antideficiency law. The supplemental items—those not so qualifying—were considered in connection with the regular 1965 bills to which they were related. And in that connection, the table discloses that the committee—and the Congress—laid a heavy hand to those supplementals.

SUMMARY OF HOUSE ACTION ON THE BILLS

The House adopted the bills virtually as submitted to it with the exception of the deletion, on technical parliamentary grounds, of the entire $5,200,000,000 space agency appropriation. As sent to the other body, the bills of the session aggregated $88,430,011,203 in appropriations but this is a misleading figure because of the omission of the space agency. Adding it in to remove what otherwise is a gross distortion, the House total is $93,630,011,203, a reduction of $4,047,047,015 from the requests. Every bill was below the budget and, in total, on a fiscal year basis, 1965 was a little below the corresponding amount for fiscal 1964.

SUMMARY OF SENATE ACTION ON THE BILLS

In virtually every session—and this year is no exception—the President sends some additional budget requests to the Senate after the House has acted on the bills. In this session the Senate considered budget estimates of $98,297,358,556, some $620 million more than the House did. As passed by the other body, the bills totaled $94,702,348,721. Characteristically, the Senate did not manifest quite as much fiscal restraint as the House did—it cut the budget requests $3,595,009,835—but we must note that that is not greatly less than the House cut of $4,047,047,015. And the Senate total was below the budget on every regular bill for 1965 but one—and only nominally above on that.

In relation to the House bills, aside from the $5,200,000,000 distortion caused by the technical situation on the space agency, the Senate totals are $1,072,337,518 above the House—accountable in part but not entirely by the additional budget requests not considered in the House.

SUMMARY OF FINAL CONFERENCE ACTION ON THE BILLS

Not at all surprising, the conference totals fall in between the budget requests, the House amounts, and the Senate amounts. I doubt if there be a session within memory—certainly not for years—when the final conference results failed to follow this familiar pattern. It perhaps sounds trite but it is nonetheless eminently true that virtually all legislation is a compromise—some give, and some take. Conferences on appropriation matters are no different.

The session bills tentatively aggregate $94,162,918,996, a reduction of $4,134,439,560 below the budget requests of $98,297,358,556. It is important to the total picture to keep in mind that these totals exclude roughly $11,800,000,000 of permanent appropriations recurring under prior law.

On a fiscal year rather than session basis, the tentatively final figures on appropriations show a nominal increase of $127,869,164 for fiscal 1965 over fiscal 1964 to date, which means that so far we have pretty much held to the appropriation level of the preceding fiscal year. These comparisons do not of course reflect any change that may occur automatically under prior permanent law. Nor, of course, can anyone say what the future may bring in the way of supplements to the present totals for 1965.

PERMANENT APPROPRIATIONS UNDER PRIOR LAWS

Mr. Speaker, these permanent appropriations for the fiscal year 1965 will aggregate roughly $11,800,000,000—perhaps more—for various items of expenditure such as interest charges on the public debt, diversion of surplus nonbasic agricultural commodities, administration of the National Wool Act, wildlife management and improvement projects—duck stamp fees and taxes on certain sporting goods—interest on Internal Revenue refunds, payments to States for certain receipts of the national forests, and sundry other purposes enumerated in the annual budget. These items, some 75 in number, are commonly called permanent appropriations. They flow from basic laws, carrying permanent arrangements enacted in years past. Thus the appropriations are automatic in that Congress is not required to reenact them in the annual appropriation bills each session. By far the largest is interest on the debt—tentatively estimated in the January budget at $11,000,000,000.

Total appropriations of all kinds have exceeded $100 billion in each of the last three sessions. Specifically:

The 87th Congress, 2d session: $102,661,536,812.

The 88th Congress, 1st session: $103,798,634,671.

Total appropriations in the current session, including the permanent appropriations mentioned above, will also exceed the $100 billion mark. The precise amount is subject to revision because the permanent items will not become final until the close of the year, but as of now the tentative total is $105,962,918,996.

I include tables and summaries on the appropriation bills of the session handled through the traditional appropriations process:

Summary of totals of the appropriation bills, 88th Cong., 2d sess., Oct. 3, 1964

(NOTE.—Loan authorizations not in this summary of totals of the appropriations bills, not requiring action in the session might total $11,800,000,000 or more.)

	Rounded figures
A. House actions:	
1. Budget estimates considered (both fiscal 1964 and 1965)	$97,677,000,000
2. Amounts passed by the House (including, to avoid a gross distortion, the $5,200,000,000 reported for NASA but stricken on a point of order)	93,630,000,000
3. Reduction below budget requests (for the session)	—4,047,000,000
Consisting of—	
(a) Applicable to fiscal 1964 deficiencies and supplementals	—697,000,000
(b) Applicable to fiscal 1965 requests	—3,200,000,000
(c) Applicable to fiscal 1966 requests	—150,000,000
4. Appropriations for fiscal 1964 (tentative totals, approximately final)	92,242,000,000
5. Appropriations as approved by House for fiscal 1965 (including, to remove the distortion, the $5,200,000,000 for NASA)	91,950,000,000
6. Reduction by the House, amounts for fiscal 1965 below appropriations for 1964	—292,000,000
B. Senate actions:	
1. Budget estimates considered (all bills of session)	98,297,000,000
2. Amounts approved (all bills)	94,702,000,000
3. Comparisons—	
(a) Below budget estimates	—3,595,000,000
(b) Above the House bills (omitting, to avoid gross distortion, $5,200,000,000 for NASA)	+1,072,000,000
(c) 1965 amounts above 1964 amounts	+648,000,000
C. Final actions:	
1. Amounts enacted (all bills of the session)	94,163,000,000
2. These amounts are below the corresponding budget requests by	—4,134,000,000
3. The fiscal 1965 new appropriations in these bills ($92,370,000,000) are above the corresponding fiscal 1964 appropriations ($92,242,000,000) by about	+128,000,000

The appropriation bills, 88th Cong., 2d sess.—A summary

	Appropriation	The appropriations— Below (−) the budget requests	The appropriations— Above (+) or below (−) fiscal 1964 appropriations
1. Supplemental for fiscal 1964	[1] $74,658,000	[1] −$610,445,700	
2. Deficiency bills for fiscal 1964	1,718,375,143	−99,490,600	
3. Bills for fiscal 1965:			
Interior and related	994,069,200	−4,833,800	−$51,168,300
Loan authorization	(14,000,000)	(−6,000,000)	(+8,000,000)
Treasury-Post Office	6,233,273,000	−35,418,000	+177,507,000
Labor-HEW	7,089,707,000	−311,297,000	+1,102,445,500
Defense	46,752,051,000	−718,949,000	−1,471,159,000
Independent offices	13,454,859,000	−649,794,400	+178,945,950
Public works	4,430,794,700	−9,954,300	+23,554,000
Military construction	1,570,968,000	−308,032,000	−14,912,000
State, Justice, Commerce, and Judiciary	1,686,707,800	−228,381,900	−183,976,100
3. Bills for fiscal 1965 — Con.			
District of Columbia (Federal payment)	$40,720,000	−$12,500,000	+$352,000
Loan authorizations	(26,400,000)	(+12,000,000)	(+7,100,000)
Legislative	210,300,885	−45,487,160	−7,003,359
Agriculture	5,127,162,200	−439,800,400	−1,129,135,015
Loan authorizations	(795,000,000)	(+42,000,000)	(−60,000,000)
Foreign aid	3,662,077,000	−296,300,000	+398,053,863
Supplemental, 1965	1,117,196,068	−363,755,300	+1,104,364,625
Total for fiscal 1965 bills	92,369,885,853	−3,424,503,260	[2] +127,869,164
Loan authorizations and contract authority	(835,400,000)	(+48,000,000)	(−44,900,000)

---

[1] Considered in connection with the related fiscal 1965 bills.

[2] $215,358,607 shown on the larger, more detailed table, less $74,658,000 of enacted supplementals for 1964 carried in 1965 bills (see item 1), and less $12,831,443 claims and judgments appropriation in the 1964 deficiency bill not reflected in "Prior year appropriation" column.

The appropriation bills, 88th Cong., 2d sess., Oct. 3, 1964

[Does not include back-door appropriations or permanent appropriations [1] under previous legislation. Does include indefinite appropriations carried in annual appropriation bills]

Title and bill No.	Prior year appropriations	House: Budget estimates to House	House: Amount as passed	House action compared with— Prior year appropriations	House action compared with— Budget estimates
1964 DEFICIENCIES					
Department of Health Education and Welfare (H.J. Res. 875):					
Original resolution, 88th, 1st [2]		$41,886,000	$41,886,000		
Subsequent consideration, 88th, 2d [3]		[4] 247,802,000	[5] 247,802,000		
Total, H.J. Res. 875		289,688,000	289,688,000		
Department of Labor (H.J. Res. 962)		42,000,000	42,000,000		
Disaster relief (H.J. Res. 976)		50,000,000	50,000,000		
Deficiency, 1964 (H.R. 11201)		1,307,380,789	1,264,913,689		−$42,467,100
Total, 1964 deficiencies		1,689,068,789	1,646,601,689		−42,467,100
1965 APPROPRIATION BILLS					
District of Columbia (H.R. 10199)	($313,469,518)	(357,702,300)	(338,205,200)	(+$24,735,682)	(−19,497,100)
Federal payment, 1965 regular	40,368,000	53,220,000	40,720,000	+352,000	−12,500,000
Loan authorization	(19,300,000)	(14,000,000)	(26,400,000)	(+7,100,000)	(+12,000,000)
Interior (H.R 10433)		1,035,678,000	1,009,175,600		−26,502,400
1965 regular appropriations	1,011,029,500	998,903,000	976,475,600	−34,553,900	−22,427,400
Loan authorization	(6,000,000)	(20,000,000)	(14,000,000)	(+8,000,000)	(−6,000,000)
1964 supplementals		36,775,000	32,700,000		−4,075,000
Treasury-Post Office (H.R. 10532)					
1965 regular appropriations	6,055,766,000	6,271,991,000	6,225,420,000	+169,654,000	−46,571,000
1964 supplementals (by transfer)		(1,675,000)	(1,100,000)		(−575,000)
Legislative (H.R. 10723)		222,587,355	173,626,640		−48,960,715
1965 regular appropriations	[6] 217,304,244	[7] 222,375,655	[7] 173,446,640	[6] −43,857,604	[7] −48,929,015
1964 supplementals		211,700	180,000		−31,700
Labor-Health, Education and Welfare (H.R. 10809)		7,561,968,000	6,908,063,000		−653,905,000
1965 regular appropriations	5,987,261,500	7,104,782,000	6,908,063,000	+920,801,500	−196,719,000
1964 supplementals		457,186,000			−457,186,000
Defense (H.R. 10939):					
1965 regular appropriations	48,223,210,000	47,471,000,000	46,759,267,000	−1,463,943,000	−711,733,000
1964 supplementals (by transfer)		6,000,000	6,000,000		
State, Justice, judiciary (H.R. 11134)		1,957,764,700	1,702,627,800		−255,136,900
1965 regular appropriations	1,840,233,900	1,915,089,700	1,702,177,800	−138,056,100	−212,911,900
1964 supplementals		42,675,000	450,000		−42,225,000
Agriculture (H.R. 11202)		5,588,832,600	5,182,665,000		−406,167,600
1965 regular appropriations	6,246,297,215	5,582,259,600	5,182,665,000	−1,063,632,215	−399,594,600
Loan authorization	(855,000,000)	(753,000,000)	(795,000,000)	(−60,000,000)	(+42,000,000)
1964 supplementals		6,573,000			−6,573,000
Independent Offices (H.R. 11296)		14,244,653,400	8,118,965,500		[8] −6,125,687,900
1965 regular appropriations	13,275,913,050	14,099,653,400	8,118,965,500	[8] −5,156,947,550	[8] −5,980,687,900
1964 supplementals		145,000,000			−145,000,000
Military construction (H.R. 11369): 1965 regular appropriations	1,585,880,000	1,879,000,000	1,599,014,500	+13,134,500	−279,985,500
Public works (H.R. 11579): 1965 regular appropriations	4,407,240,700	4,372,449,000	4,325,969,200	−81,271,500	−46,479,800
Foreign assistance (H.R. 11812): 1965 regular appropriations	3,264,023,137	3,958,377,000	3,739,249,400	[9] +475,226,263	−219,127,600
Supplemental, 1965 (H.R. 12633)		1,370,468,374	998,645,874	+998,645,874	−371,822,500
Total, 1965 regular	92,154,527,246	95,299,568,729	86,750,079,514	−5,404,447,732	−8,549,489,215
Total, 1964 supplementals (included in 1965 bills)		688,420,700	33,330,000		−655,090,700
Total, all appropriations		97,677,058,218	88,430,011,203		−9,247,047,015
Total, loan authorizations	(880,300,000)	(787,400,000)	(835,400,000)	(−44,900,000)	(+48,000,000)

See footnotes at end of table.

The appropriation bills, 88th Cong., 2d sess., Oct. 3, 1964—Continued

Title and bill No.	Prior year appropriations	Senate				
		Budget estimates to Senate	Amount as passed	Senate action compared with—		
				Prior year appropriations	Budget estimates	House action
1964 DEFICIENCIES						
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (H.J. Res. 875):						
Original resolution, 88th, 1st [2]		$41, 886, 000	$258, 090, 000		+$216, 204, 000	+$216, 204, 000
Subsequent consideration, 88th, 2d [3]		[4] 247, 802, 000	[5] 31, 598, 000		−216, 204, 000	−216, 204, 000
Total, H.J. Res. 875		289, 688, 000	289, 688, 000			
Department of Labor (H.J. Res. 962)		42, 000, 000	42, 000, 000			
Disaster relief (H.J. Res. 976)		50, 000, 000	50, 000, 000			
Deficiency, 1964 (H.R. 11201)		1, 436, 177, 743	1, 349, 637, 143		−86, 540, 600	+84, 723, 454
Total, 1964 deficiencies		1, 817, 865, 743	1, 731, 325, 143		−86, 540, 600	+84, 723, 454
1965 APPROPRIATION BILLS						
District of Columbia (H.R. 10199)	($313, 469, 518)	(357, 862, 300)	(342, 181, 975)	(+$28, 712, 457)	(−15, 680, 325)	(+3, 976, 775)
Federal payment, 1965 regular	40, 368, 000	53, 220, 000	44, 220, 000	+3, 852, 000	−9, 000, 000	+3, 500, 000
Loan authorization	(19, 300, 000)	(14, 400, 000)	(26, 400, 000)	(+7, 100, 000)	(+12, 000, 000)	
Interior (H.R. 10433)		1, 035, 961, 000	1, 029, 226, 400		−6, 734, 600	+20, 050, 800
1965 regular appropriations	1, 011, 029, 500	998, 903, 000	993, 554, 400	−17, 475, 100	−5, 348, 600	+17, 078, 800
Loan authorization	(6, 000, 000)	(20, 000, 000)	(14, 000, 000)	(+8, 000, 000)	(−6, 000, 000)	
1964 supplementals		37, 058, 000	35, 672, 000		−1, 386, 000	+2, 972, 000
Treasury-Post Office (H.R. 10532)						
1965 regular appropriations	6, 055, 766, 000	6, 268, 691, 000	6, 240, 423, 000	+184, 657, 000	−28, 268, 000	+15, 003, 000
1964 supplementals (by transfer)		(1, 675, 000)	(1, 100, 000)		(−575, 000)	
Legislative (H.R. 10723)		255, 999, 745	210, 380, 685		−45, 619, 060	+36, 754, 045
1965 regular appropriations	[6] 217, 304, 244	[6] 255, 788, 045	[6] 210, 231, 685	[6] −7, 072, 559	[6] −45, 556, 360	[6] +36, 785, 045
1964 supplementals		211, 700	149, 000		−62, 700	−31, 000
Labor-Health, Education, and Welfare (H.R. 10809)		7, 803, 190, 000	7, 081, 193, 000		−721, 997, 000	+173, 130, 000
1965 regular appropriations	5, 987, 261, 500	7, 401, 004, 000	7, 081, 193, 000	+1, 093, 931, 500	−319, 811, 000	+173, 130, 000
1964 supplementals		[10] 402, 186, 000			−402, 186, 000	
Defense (H.R. 10939):						
1965 regular appropriations	48, 223, 210, 000	47, 471, 000, 000	46, 774, 401, 000	−1, 448, 809, 000	−696, 599, 000	+15, 134, 000
1964 supplementals (by transfer)		(6, 000, 000)	(6, 000, 000)			
State, Justice, Judiciary (H.R. 11134)		1, 999, 164, 700	1, 730, 855, 700		−268, 309, 000	+28, 227, 900
1965 regular appropriations	1, 840, 233, 900	1, 915, 089, 700	1, 700, 405, 700	−139, 828, 200	−214, 684, 000	−1, 772, 100
1964 supplementals		84, 075, 000	30, 450, 000		−53, 625, 000	+30, 000, 000
Agriculture (H.R. 11202)		5, 583, 535, 600	5, 338, 672, 525		−244, 863, 075	+156, 007, 525
1965 regular appropriations	6, 246, 297, 215	5, 566, 962, 600	5, 323, 872, 525	−922, 424, 690	−243, 090, 075	+141, 207, 525
Loan authorization	(855, 000, 000)	(753, 000, 000)	(795, 000, 000)	(−60, 000, 000)	(+42, 000, 000)	
1964 supplementals		16, 573, 000	14, 800, 000		−1, 773, 000	+14, 800, 000
Independent offices (H.R. 11296)		14, 249, 653, 400	13, 613, 224, 000		−636, 429, 400	[8] +5, 494, 258, 500
1965 regular appropriations	13, 275, 913, 050	14, 104, 653, 400	13, 613, 224, 000	+337, 310, 950	−491, 429, 400	+5, 494, 258, 500
1964 supplementals		145, 000, 000			−145, 000, 000	
Military construction (H.R. 11369): 1965 regular appropriations	1, 585, 880, 000	1, 879, 000, 000	1, 582, 969, 000	−2, 911, 000	−296, 031, 000	−16, 045, 500
Public works (H.R. 11579): 1965 regular appropriations	4, 407, 240, 700	4, 440, 749, 000	4, 443, 283, 200	+36, 042, 500	+2, 534, 200	+117, 314, 000
Foreign assistance (H.R. 11812): 1965 regular appropriations	3, 264, 023, 137	3, 958, 377, 000	3, 662, 077, 000	+398, 053, 863	−296, 300, 000	−77, 172, 400
Supplemental, 1965 (H.R. 12633)		1, 480, 951, 368	1, 220, 098, 068	+1, 220, 098, 068	−260, 853, 300	+221, 452, 194
Total, 1965 regular	92, 154, 527, 246	95, 794, 389, 113	92, 889, 952, 578	+735, 425, 332	−2, 904, 436, 535	+6, 139, 873, 064
Total, 1964 supplementals (included in 1965 bills)		685, 103, 700	81, 071, 000		−604, 032, 700	+47, 741, 000
Total, all appropriations		98, 297, 358, 556	94, 702, 348, 721		−3, 595, 009, 835	+6, 272, 337, 518
Total, loan authorizations	(880, 300, 000)	(787, 400, 000)	(835, 400, 000)	(−44, 900, 000)	(+48, 000, 000)	

Title and bill No.	Prior year appropriations	Final appropriation		
		Amount as approved	Final action compared with—	
			Prior year	Budget estimates
1964 DEFICIENCIES				
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (H.J. Res. 875):				
Original resolution, 88th, 1st [2]				−$41, 886, 000
Subsequent consideration, 88th, 2d [3]		[11] $289, 688, 000		+41, 886, 000
Total, H.J. Res. 875		289, 688, 000		
Department of Labor (H.J. Res. 962)		42, 000, 000		
Disaster relief (H.J. Res. 976)		50, 000, 000		
Deficiency, 1964 (H.R. 11201)		1, 336, 687, 143		−99, 490, 600
Total, 1964 deficiencies		1, 718, 375, 143		−99, 490, 600
1965 APPROPRIATION BILLS				
District of Columbia (H.R. 10199)	($313, 469, 518)	(341, 242, 200)	(+$27, 772, 682)	(−16, 620, 100)
Federal payment, 1965 regular	40, 368, 000	40, 720, 000	+352, 000	−12, 500, 000
Loan authorization	(19, 300, 000)	(26, 400, 000)	(+7, 100, 000)	(+12, 000, 000)
Interior (H.R. 10433)		1, 028, 277, 200		−7, 683, 800
1965 regular appropriations	1, 011, 029, 500	994, 069, 200	−16, 960, 300	−4, 833, 800
Loan authorization	(6, 000, 000)	(14, 000, 000)	(+8, 000, 000)	(−6, 000, 000)
1964 supplementals		34, 208, 000		−2, 850, 000
Treasury-Post Office (H.R. 10532)				
1965 regular appropriations	6, 055, 766, 000	6, 233, 273, 000	+177, 507, 000	−35, 418, 000
1964 supplementals (by transfer)		(1, 100, 000)		(−575, 000)
Legislative (H.R. 10723)		210, 300, 885		−45, 698, 860
1965 regular appropriations	[6] 217, 304, 244	210, 300, 885	−7, 003, 359	−45, 487, 160
1964 supplementals				−211, 700
Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare (H.R. 10809)		7, 089, 707, 000	+1, 102, 445, 500	−713, 483, 000
1965 regular appropriations	5, 987, 261, 500	7, 089, 707, 000	+1, 102, 445, 500	−311, 297, 000
1964 supplementals				−402, 186, 000

See footnotes at end of table.

The appropriation bills, 88th Cong., 2d sess., Oct. 3, 1964—Continued

Title and bill No.	Prior year appropriations	Final appropriation		
		Amount as approved	Final action compared with—	
			Prior year	Budget estimates
1965 APPROPRIATION BILLS—continued				
Defense (H.R. 10939)				
1965 regular appropriations	$48,223,210,000	$46,752,051,000	−$1,471,159,000	−$718,949,000
1964 supplementals (by transfer)		(6,000,000)		
State, Justice, judiciary (H.R. 11134)		1,717,157,800		−282,006,900
1965 regular appropriations	1,840,233,900	1,686,707,800	−153,526,100	−228,381,900
1964 supplementals		30,450,000		−53,625,000
Agriculture (H.R. 11202)		5,137,162,200		−446,373,400
1965 regular appropriations	6,246,297,215	5,127,162,200	−1,119,135,015	−439,800,400
Loan authorization	(855,000,000)	(795,000,000)	(−60,000,000)	(+42,000,000)
1964 supplementals		10,000,000		−6,573,000
Independent offices (H.R. 11296)		13,454,859,000		−794,794,400
1965 regular appropriations	13,275,913,050	13,454,859,000	+178,945,950	−649,794,400
1964 supplementals				−145,000,000
Military construction (H.R. 11369): 1965 regular appropriations	1,585,880,000	1,570,968,000	−14,912,000	−308,032,000
Public works (H.R. 11579): 1965 regular appropriations	4,407,240,700	4,430,794,700	+23,554,000	−9,954,300
Foreign assistance (H.R. 11812): 1965 regular appropriations	3,264,023,137	3,662,077,000	+398,053,863	−296,300,000
Supplemental, 1965 (H.R. 12633)		1,117,196,068	+1,117,196,068	−363,755,300
Total, 1965 regular	92,154,527,246	92,369,885,853	+215,358,607	−3,424,503,260
Total, 1964 supplementals (included in 1965 bills)		74,658,000		−610,445,700
Total, all appropriations		94,162,918,996		−4,134,439,560
Total, loan authorizations	(880,300,000)	(835,400,000)	(−44,900,000)	(+48,000,000)

---

[1] Tentatively estimated in January budget at about $11,800,000,000 for fiscal year 1965.

[2] This resolution passed both Houses in 88th Cong., 1st sess. House bill included $41,886,000 for activities to combat mental retardation; Senate bill added $216,204,000 for "Payments to school districts." Resolution not finally adopted in 1st sess.

[3] Action renewed in 88th Cong., 2d sess.

[4] Estimates submitted to Congress in H. Doc. No. 203, dated Jan. 21, 1964, considered as follows: "Payments to school districts," $216,204,000 (previously added by Senate); "Defense educational activities," $31,168,000; "Compliance activities, Mexican farm labor program," $430,000.

[5] Resolution not actually reported by Appropriations Committees for House or Senate consideration. Figures shown for balancing purposes. Amount shown as reported and passed by Senate include $31,168,000 for "Defense educational activities"; and $430,000 for "Compliance activities, Mexican farm labor program."

[6] Includes Senate items.

[7] Excludes Senate items.

[8] Amount of $5,200,000,000 reported for National Aeronautics and Space Administration eliminated on point of order by House due to lack of legislative authorization.

[9] On basis of comparing only new direct appropriations for all titles of the bill. On a total funds available basis (including carryovers from prior appropriations), House bill is estimated to be below the corresponding figure for 1964.

[10] Estimate of $55,000,000 for manpower development and training activities, Department of Labor, included in deficiency bill, 1964, above in this column.

[11] Final amount appropriated includes $41,886,000 for activities to combat mental retardation; $216,204,000 for "Payments to school districts"; $31,168,000 for "Defense educational activities"; and $430,000 for "Compliance activities, Mexican farm labor program."

NOTE.—Totals reflect amounts approved and comparisons at latest stage of congressional action on each bill.

FISCAL 1965 BUDGET

Mr. Speaker, we should keep in mind when considering these appropriation actions by the Congress that they are only a part of the annual budget picture. They deal only with the outgo side of the budget—and not even all of that. The session appropriations exclude, as we have noted, the so-called permanent appropriations—but those appropriations directly enter into the overall budget results.

Backdoor appropriation actions are not tabulated here—there is often some uncertainty as to what the bills or amounts are—but they, too, affect the budget picture.

Congressional action, or inaction, on new legislation urged in the budget or subsequently submitted—and for which budgetary allowance is usually made—also has a bearing when casting up results on the overall budget.

Then, of course, in a dynamic economy, budget income assumptions and projections have a habit of constantly changing and that, of course, affects the deficit outlook.

Then, too, as you are aware, the more widely known budget figures are on a so-called expenditure and receipts basis whereas Congress acts on the somewhat different appropriations basis. Expenditures from carryover balances importantly enter the calculations.

All these factors join and will to some extent continue to join to affect the fiscal 1965 budget submitted by the President last January. That budget, you will recall, tentatively projected fiscal 1965 expenditures—not appropriations—at $97,900,000,000 and a deficit of $4,900,000,000.

It then foresaw spending of $98,405,000,000 in fiscal 1964 and a fiscal 1964 deficit of $10,005,000,000.

But under the strong and continuing economy efforts of the President and rising revenues from a rapidly growing economy, actual budget results in fiscal 1964 were somewhat better than the earlier forecast. Revenues were higher. Expenditures were $97,671,000,000. The deficit was $8,303,000,000.

A distinguishing feature of the President's original 1965 fiscal year budget—one that met with widespread acceptance—was the change of direction in spending. The proposed expenditure of $97.9 billion for fiscal 1965 was approximately $500 million below expenditures then estimated for fiscal 1964. The administration took a new reading on the fiscal 1965 outlook when the debt ceiling was revised last June and reestimated 1965 expenditures at $97.3 billion—some $400 million below the actual expenditure in the fiscal year 1964 just closed. The reading also disclosed the temporary—and expected—shortfall of revenues because of the tax cut bill with the result the deficit outlook was revised to $5.8 billion.

Under the continuing impetus of the President's insistence on a dollars' value for a dollar spent there is every reason to expect that the course of reduced spending in fiscal 1965 as compared to 1964 will be held to in the months ahead and that this, in combination with rising revenues flowing from ever-expanding economic activity, will keep the promise of important strides toward a balanced budget. That is a noteworthy development.

FEDERAL CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES

There is always interest in the number of Federal civilian employees. The number has climbed somewhat in the past few years but the President has been hammering at the agencies to tighten their belts and by better management trim the number. The results seem to be reflected in the official figures. There has been a drop of 27,394 in executive branch employees in the fiscal year ended last June 30. Judging from the fact that June 1964 civilian employment was about 43,000 below what had been projected for that date when the budget was presented last January, we can reasonably anticipate further improvements in this connection especially in view of the determined efforts in the executive branch. And, of course, Congress made some cuts in the personnel requests projected in the various budget items for fiscal 1965.

I include a table in elaboration.

Summary of civilian employment—Executive branch

Date	Department of Defense (all functions)	All other	Total
As of Jan. 31, 1961 (actual)	1,032,835	1,308,250	2,341,085
As of June 30, 1961 (actual)	1,042,407	1,364,622	2,407,029
As of June 30, 1962 (actual)	1,069,543	1,415,111	2,484,654
As of June 30, 1963 (actual)	1,050,007	1,447,028	2,497,035
As of June 30, 1964 (as estimated in 1965 budget, January 1964)	1,039,293	1,473,107	2,512,400
As of June 30, 1964 (actual)	1,029,756	1,439,885	2,469,641

Date	Department of Defense (all functions)	All other	Total
As of June 30, 1965 (as estimated and proposed in budget for 1965) [1]	1,020,751	1,490,449	2,511,200
Changes:			
During 3 fiscal years of 1962–64	−12,651	+75,263	+62,612
During period January 1961 through June 1964	−3,079	+131,635	+128,556
Reduction during fiscal 1964	−20,251	−7,143	−27,394

[1] Probably will turn out to be somewhat lower.

Sources: Civil Service Commission data and table in budget for 1965, p. 53.

THE PUBLIC DEBT

Mr. Speaker, much of our debt—in fact, the great bulk of it—was accumulated during World War II. But a not insignificant portion has piled up in years in which the great majority of our people have enjoyed rising standards of living and record incomes but refused to live within our Government income. We have refused to adhere to a pay-as-you-go policy in years when we could have done so. So we owe more Federal debt. On a per capita basis, we owe less Federal debt because of the exploding population, but it is easy to take an overdose of that sedative and gloss over the whole dreary subject. The problem will not go away. When State and local government debts are added in—the same population is liable for all the public debt at all levels—even with the exploding population the per capita figure is rising, not falling. It is the inevitable result of failure to live within our Government revenues.

When Congress adopted the tax cut bill earlier this year it pledged, in section 1 of the bill, priority application of the promised floodtide of revenues to elimination of the deficit and then to reduction of the public debt. That we display sufficient national self-restraint and prudence to pay our own way when we can is a philosophy that appeals to a lot of people.

I append a recent Treasury statistical table on the Federal debt:

Summary of direct and guaranteed debt on significant dates

(Based upon statements of the public debt published monthly; consequently all figures are stated as of the end of a month)

Date	Classification	Total debt (including interest bearing debt, matured debt on which interest has ceased and debt bearing no interest)				General fund balance [3]
		Direct debt (gross)	Guaranteed debt [1] [2]	Total direct and guaranteed debt	Per capita [3]	
	WORLD WAR I					
Mar. 31, 1917	Prewar debt	$1,282,044,346.28		$1,282,044,346.28	$12.36	$74,216,460.05
Aug. 31, 1919	Highest war debt	26,596,701,648.01		26,596,701,648.01	250.18	1,118,109,534.76
Dec. 31, 1930	Lowest postwar debt	16,026,087,087.07		16,026,087,087.07	129.66	306,803,319.55
	WORLD WAR II					
June 30, 1940	Debt preceding defense program	42,967,531,037.68	[4] $5,529,070,655.28	[4] 48,496,601.692.96	367.08	1,890,743,141.34
Nov. 30, 1941	Pre-Pearl Harbor debt	55,039,819,926.98	6,324,048,005.28	61,363,867,932.26	458.47	2,319,496,021.87
Feb. 28, 1946	Highest war debt	279,213,558.897.10	550,810,451.19	279,764,369,348.29	1,989.75	25,960,900,919.30
June 30, 1946	Debt at end of year in which hostilities ceased	269,422,099,173.26	476,384,859.30	269,898,484,032.56	1,908.79	14,237,883,295.31
Apr. 30, 1949	Lowest postwar debt [5]	251,530,468,254.82	22,851,485.16	251,553,319,739.98	1,690.29	3,995,156,916.79
	SINCE KOREA					
June 30, 1950	Debt at time of opening of hostilities in Korea (hostilities began June 24, 1950)	257,357,352,351.04	19,503,033.97	257,376,855,385.01	1,696.74	5,517,087,691.65
Dec. 31, 1952		267,391,155,979.65	53,969,565.31	267,445,125,544.96	1,687.90	6,064,343,775.84
Aug. 31, 1964	Highest debt [6]	314,089,198,895.74	848,445,000.00	314,937,643,895.74	[7] 1,635.35	6,789,237,698.50
Aug. 31, 1963	Debt a year ago	306,534,617,949.59	674,131,500.00	307,208,749,449.59	[4] 1,617.85	6,845,784,751.58
July 31, 1964	Debt last month	311,183,046,209.68	821,353,850.00	312,004,400,059.68	[7] 1,622.33	6,149,569,635.69
Aug. 31, 1964	Debt this month	314,089,198,895.74	848,445,000.00	314,937,643,895.74	[7] 1,635.35	6,789,237,698.50

---

[1] Does not include obligations owned by the Treasury.

[2] Includes outstanding matured principal of guaranteed obligations for which cash is held by the Treasurer of the United States in the general fund balance for the payment of such obligations.

[3] Based upon estimates of the Bureau of the Census.

[4] Revised.

[5] Represents the lowest point of the debt at the end of any month following World War II. The lowest point of the debt on any day following that war was on June 27, 1949, when the debt was as follows:

Direct debt (gross)	$251,245,889,059.02
Guaranteed debt (not including obligations owned by the Treasury)	23,876,001.12
Total direct and guaranteed debt	251,269,765,060.14

[6] Represents the highest point of the debt at the end of any month. The highest point of the debt on any day was on Aug. 27, 1964, when the debt was as follows:

Direct debt (gross)	$314,617,411,027.06
Guaranteed debt (not including obligations owned by the Treasury)	838,495,000.00
Total direct and guaranteed debt (includes $360,525,070.30 not subject to statutory limitation)	315,455,906,027.06

[7] Subject to revision.

BACK-DOOR APPROPRIATIONS

No résumé of the appropriations business would be complete without a notation about so-called back-door appropriations. It is an unsound and indefensible procedure. While this year the House has restricted itself in contrast to some recent years past, it has thus far refused to completely refrain from the practice. The first thing to say about the practice otherwise is that it is not always easy to identify or keep track of all the bills and provisions having back-door characteristics and, occasionally, even more difficult to express the effect in precise dollar amounts. I am including a table of all such bills we have thus far identified. To this should probably be added the recent extension of Public Law 480, as follows:

[In millions]

	Title I	Title II
The requests (5 years)	$7,100.0	$450.0
House (3 years)	4,000.0	450.0
Senate (2 years)	2,700.0	375.0
Conference (2 years)	2,700.0	400.0

The amounts are of rather significant size though not as flagrant as in some recent years. But it cannot be successfully denied that in these end runs on the established system the programs involved enjoy special status. They do not have to compete under the same system with the hundreds of other budget items for the limited money available to go around. They get through, so to speak, regardless of their relative merits and priority standing in relation to the hundreds of other budget demands. It is not the best way to handle the finances of the Government.

I include the table:

Authorizations provided in substantive bills, 88th Cong., 2d sess.

[In millions of dollars]

		Request	House	Senate	Enacted	Congressional change (final)
Public Law 88-260 (S.J. Res. 136)	John F. Kennedy Center Act: Current borrowing authority, 1964	15.4	15.4	15.4	15.4	---------
Public Law 88-423 (H.R. 10503)	Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1964:					
	Current contract authority, 1965:					
	Agriculture	85.0	85.0	85.0	85.0	---------
	Commerce	36.0	36.0	42.0	40.0	+4
	Interior	54.0	54.0	54.0	54.0	---------
	Total current, 1965	175.0	175.0	181.0	179.0	+4
	Permanent contract authority, 1966:					
	Agriculture	95.0	85.0	85.0	85.0	−10
	Commerce	36.0	36.0	42.0	40.0	+4
	Interior	54.0	54.0	54.0	54.0	---------
	Total permanent, 1966	185.0	175.0	181.0	179.0	−6
Public Law 88-451 (S. 2881)	Alaska Omnibus Act Amendments of 1964:					
	Current contract authority, HHFA (urban renewal):					
	1964	25.0	---------	---------	---------	−25
	1965	---------	25.0	25.0	25.0	+25
Public Law 88-560 (S. 3049)	Housing Act of 1964:					
	Current contract authority, HHFA:					
	Low-income housing demonstration programs:					
	1964	5.0	---------	---------	---------	−5
	1965	---------	5.0	5.0	5.0	+5
	Urban renewal fund:					
	1964	1,400.0	---------	---------	---------	−1,400
	1965	---------	600.0	850.0	725.0	+725
	Open-space land grants: 1965	---------	25.0	25.0	25.0	+25
	Current borrowing authority, Agriculture (Farmers Home Administration), 1965	---------	150.0	150.0	150.0	+150
	Total:					
	1964	1,405.0	---------	---------	---------	−1,405
	1965	---------	780.0	1,030.0	905.0	+905
	Total:					
	1964: Current contract authority	1,430.0	---------	---------	---------	−1,430
	Current borrowing authority	15.4	15.4	15.4	15.4	---------
	1965: Current contract authority	175.0	830.0	1,086.0	959.0	+784
	Current borrowing authority	---------	150.0	150.0	150.0	+150
	1966: Permanent contract authority	185.0	175.0	181.0	179.0	−6

NOTE.—Amounts applicable to Public Law 480 extension are not in the table but are noted in the preceding narrative.

FIXING THE SALARY OF THE HOUSE PARLIAMENTARIAN

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I send to the Clerk's desk a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES 904

Resolved, That effective January 1, 1965, the salary of the Parliamentarian of the House of Representatives shall be at the gross annual rate of $28,500. The additional sums necessary to carry out this resolution shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House until otherwise provided by law.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE 88TH CONGRESS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, this has been a hard-working Congress. It has been a productive Congress. It has indeed been a historic Congress.

The great record which the 88th Congress has made in the fields of foreign and domestic affairs, its unprecedented achievements in civil rights, tax reduction, education, conservation, public works, poverty elimination, must, in my judgment, number it among the outstanding Congresses of all time.

The accomplishments of this Congress reflect the dedication and the industry of its entire membership. It crowns with immortality the magnificent leadership of our great Speaker JOHN MCCORMACK, the No. 1 legislator in the world. It has been a privilege which I shall cherish as long as I live to have had the honor of working at the side of our beloved Speaker over the years. JOHN MCCORMACK has shepherded the legislative program with courage, dedication, and boundless energy. He has presided over the House wisely and fairly. He has been daunted by no difficulty. He has kept heart through disappointment. He has shown himself an indomitable leader and through it all continued to be the fine Christian gentleman we have come to know and love through his long years of service in the House.

I have also cherished the friendship and help of the distinguished minority leader, CHARLIE HALLECK, and the very competent minority whip, LES ARENDS. Their gifts are well known to all of us and it will be recognized that without their skill and cooperation some of the luster of the record of the 88th Congress would be dimmed. They are great men and great Americans; I extend them my sincerest thanks.

I also want to express my appreciation to the distinguished assistant majority leaders, the Democratic whip, HALE BOGGS, and to his assistant whips. They have devoted great energy, time, and talent to the legislative tasks of this Congress. Their polls on legislative questions have been extremely reliable, helpful, and certainly of high quality.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot adequately express my personal appreciation for the myriad kindnesses extended to me by all the Members of the House, both Democrats and Republicans. The members of my own party have given me constant support which has been at all times sustaining and helpful, and for which I am deeply grateful.

I extend also my thanks to our great Parliamentarian, Lew Deschler, whose skills and knowledge are essential and invaluable to the conduct of the business of the House.

The officers and employees of the House, too, have contributed unstintingly, and they have unquestionably made our tasks easier and more successful in a thousand ways.

As we leave here to labor in other vineyards I extend to one and all my thanks for their friendship and help. I sincerely hope that every Member, officer, and employee of the House may enjoy the satisfaction that follows hard and successful work and that all of them may have a well-earned rest before we convene next January.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS. First, Mr. Speaker, let me say that I appreciate the majority leader's kind references to me and that I concur in his magnificent tribute to our distinguished Speaker, one of the great men of our times, one of the great leaders of our Nation, and also his very fine tribute to our minority leader CHARLIE HALLECK, who has cooperated with us and who has contributed—he and LES ARENDS and all of their associates—in making this a very successful session of Congress. This is true also with reference to our distinguished Parliamentarian, Lew Deschler, who is probably the greatest Parliamentarian on earth.

But, Mr. Speaker, the distinguished majority leader was unable to make any mention of himself. May I say to all of the Members of the House that I know of no more patient, no more understanding, or no more dedicated leader than CARL ALBERT.

Mr. Speaker, I have been closely associated with CARL ALBERT throughout this Congress and previous Congresses. One of the reasons I believe that this Congress has functioned, despite the fact that it has been a long Congress—probably the longest since World War II—with a minimum of personal tensions of any kind, is the fact that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT] has been understanding and considerate of the problems of all the Members of this body, regardless of whether they be on my side or on the side of the distinguished minority leader.

I should like to compliment him on his leadership, ability, and his understanding.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman.

I now yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, a lot of us have been running here a long time. It has been a high privilege and great honor to serve with a good many men. I have worked under several Speakers, I have seen a good many Congresses come and go; but I think this one has been the most productive Congress I can remember. Its great success can only be tied to two or three salient things, and that is our leadership.

By any yardstick you measure Speaker McCORMACK by, he will go down in history as one of the alltime great Speakers, and one of the things that makes him such a great man and a good man is he gets along with everybody. He is tolerant, he is kind, he is patient; but above everything else he protects the rights of this House. He does not let the judicial or the executive branch impose on us. He protects their rights, and he protects ours. But certainly he has had the unstinted cooperation of our genial colleagues, CHARLIE HALLECK and LES ARENDS. They are great patriotic Americans.

CARL ALBERT has worked long and hard, and with great intelligence and great human understanding. The day is not too far that his reputation throughout the country will be on the tongue of every available man and woman. He has had the unstinted support of our beloved colleague from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS] who is able, genial, and very intelligent.

When it comes to the Parliamentarian, may the good Lord keep and bless Lew Deschler. He is worth his weight in gold, diamonds, and uranium. And do not overlook "Fishbait."

Mr. Speaker, good luck to you. Go home and get some rest. You have really earned it.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman.

I now yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILGORE].

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. Speaker, as I terminate my service here in the House of Representatives I could not leave without expressing, not only on my behalf, but on behalf of the people of my district whom I have the privilege of representing, our genuine appreciation to the Speaker, the majority and minority leaders, for their continuing kindness and for their every consideration with respect to matters for which my constituents had a continuing interest.

We wish for this entire body, for its leadership on both sides, continuing good health and splendid management of the Nation's business.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the able leader, the distinguished Member, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT] for giving me the privilege of joining in this tribute.

Mr. Speaker, Ralph Waldo Emerson of Massachusetts said: "An institution is but the lengthened shadow of one man."

Erasmus said: "A good leader makes a good company."

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be able to join in the tribute to our great and beloved Speaker, who has led this House, and in great measure this Congress, to the enactment of a legislative program which has never been excelled for a comparable period in the whole history of legislation.

Under that program, Mr. Speaker, the young dream of a feeble Republic for equal rights for all men which was etched into the Declaration of Independence by the young Thomas Jefferson has become the law of the mightiest land on the face of the earth.

Under that program millions of Americans, including the aged and the lame, live in homes which not only prolong their lives but promote their happiness.

Under that program millions of American children born and unborn will get a better education, be able to live happier and more meaningful lives, and will become more perfectly children of God.

Under that program the mightiest Nation on the face of the earth, the richest and the most affluent, has dared to listen to the small voice of its own conscience and come to grips with the problem of the poverty of its own people and, resolved that they, too, shall be lifted to walk on higher ground in their own land.

Under that program the beauty of this land and nature has been protected and will be developed so that all Americans in the years to come and all visitors who shall come to know this blessed land shall see here the majesty of nature more perfectly glorify the grandeur of God.

All these things, Mr. Speaker, we can credit in large measure to the rich and long experience, to the reason and calm judgment, to the genius and the qualities of leadership in our great and beloved Speaker, the Honorable JOHN McCORMACK.

We are all proudly aware that as Napoleon had at his side the intrepid Ney and the peerless Murat, the Speaker has had the intrepid majority leader, the able, dedicated and distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma, and the peerless, the distinguished and efficient whip, who has been the right hand of the majority leader. They have all worked together for the common good. We have been fortunate that on the other side of the aisle there have been leaders, too, who have discharged their great duties to America, the land we all love.

Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege to know and to enjoy your friendship for a long time. I am proud that it has been now my privilege in this almost 2 years to be one of those who had the honor to serve under the banner of your noble leadership. That friendship has deepened with closer association and today I cherish it as a rare treasure.

I pray that the God who has spared you so long and favored you with so many victories may give you many more years to lead this House and our country to greater glories and triumphs in the days ahead.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to extend their remarks on the subject of the 88th Congress and the subject of the outstanding leadership of the Speaker of the House.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

The SPEAKER. The Chair requests my dear friend, our colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD], to assume the chair.

Mr. FORD assumed the chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FORD). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

HOUSE RESOLUTION 905

Resolved, That the thanks of the House are presented to the Honorable JOHN W. McCORMACK, Speaker of the House of Representatives, for the able, impartial, and dignified manner in which he has presided over the deliberations and performed the arduous duties of the Chair during the present term of Congress.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, first of all I want to thank the distinguished majority leader and those on his side who have just spoken for their words of commendation for some of us on my side, the minority side, of the House of Representatives. I am sure we all appreciate the things they have said. May I in my turn say for all of them and certainly for the distinguished Speaker of the House to whom I shall refer in just a moment, it has been a great pleasure to work with them.

Frequently in my time here, I have heard it said that so-and-so is a man you can work with. May I say that I have found in the leadership people on the majority side a real willingness—yes and more than that, a real desire to take us into their confidence from time to time and in doing that to try to promote as best we could the work of the House of Representatives and, of course, to promote as we work the welfare of our beloved country.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution which I have sent to the desk speaks in words which for me, as I support the resolution as I have offered it, are genuine and sincere. I am happy to support this resolution because I believe every word of it.

This has been for all of us a long and difficult session. While it has been difficult for all of us, no one has carried a greater burden than our beloved Speaker of this great House of Representatives, JOHN W. McCORMACK, of Massachusetts, my longtime friend.

Never have I forgotten and never shall I forget when as the lone Representative here of my party in the Indiana delegation 30 years ago and facing my first test on a matter—a sort of personal matter involving fine people in my district—my friend, JOHN McCORMACK whom I did not even know then, as I am sure he did not know me, came to my aid.

It was a relatively small matter, but without his help I could not have prevailed. I know, may I say to my colleagues and to you, Mr. Speaker, that the milk of human kindness runs strong in JOHN W. McCORMACK.

I know of many great-hearted acts he has performed for others, asking nothing in return but the goodwill of his fellow man, and that we are giving him and have given him in unstinted measure.

We have worked together through the years, often without regard to politics, for what we both felt was the best interests of our Nation. Of course, I am sure our beloved Speaker would be the first to recognize that there have been a few times when we have disagreed on some of the matters coming before the House of Representatives, but let me say for him—as I hope I can say for myself—never with malice, never with rancor, and never with any personal bitterness.

Speaker McCORMACK has been my great and good friend, as I hope, as I am sure he understands, I have been his. As our Speaker he has upheld the highest traditions of that high office. For his gentlemanly conduct, evenhanded for majority and minority as our Presiding Officer, for his fairness, for his tolerance, and for his patience we all owe him a great debt.

Now, as we come to the end of our labors here in this 88th Congress, I know all of the folks on my side of the aisle share my sentiments when I say to my good personal friend JOHN McCORMACK and to his lovely wife Harriet, to whom mommy and I are likewise devoted, "May the good Lord bless you and make his face to shine upon you."

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FORD). The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was unanimously agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the distinguished Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply touched by the action of the House of Representatives today in adopting the resolution just agreed to. I appreciate and value very much the kind and eloquent remarks made about me by my close and valued friend the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], the minority leader, an able and sincere legislator and a dedicated American.

May I say that the feelings of friendship for me so touchingly expressed by my dear friend CHARLIE HALLECK a few minutes ago are completely reciprocated on my part for him. Mrs. McCormack and I entertain for CHARLIE HALLECK and Mrs. Halleck a deep feeling of friendship, respect, and admiration.

I take great pride in saluting all Members of the House on both sides of the aisle for a magnificent record of achievement. This Congress ranks, as the distinguished majority leader said, among the most productive in all the annals of our national legislative history.

I have served in this House for nearly 36 years and never have I taken more pride in the industry, intelligence, and patriotism of the American legislator than in what has taken place in the consideration of the legislation and the debate that was had during this present Congress. You have clearly demonstrated for all the world to see that the interests of our country have first call upon your talents and your time, whether you are a Democrat or a Republican, a Member of this body or of both bodies. However, addressing myself to my colleagues here, a Member of this body of Congress is motivated to serve the national interest of our country and the best interests of our people. Naturally at times there is disagreement and honest disagreement about this or that bill or a portion thereof, but I have never served with a Member who was not actuated by the highest motives in the national interest of our country and in the best interests of our people.

As Speaker, I have always tried to preserve the dignity and the prerogatives of the House of Representatives. As Speaker, I have considered my primary duty to be twofold. One, parliamentary, and the other as the leader of my party in this body. When I assume that chair I am assuming my duty as Speaker, and one of my primary duties is to serve in a parliamentary manner. I see Members of the House not as Democrat or Republican. This is a great trust, and I try to live up to it by being fair to all Members and to see that their rights under the rules are protected. I always try to give latitude and that reasonable refreshing flexibility that would enable Members to serve their districts to the fullest extent possible in this body. Under no conditions would I try to curtail or limit their ability to debate. I hope to some extent I have lived up to the great office and to the great trust as Speaker of this National House of Representatives. To me that has always been something primary in my mind and something fundamental, that is, to be fair to all Members, to be just to all Members, and to see that the rules of the House are to be exercised so that the rights of all Members thereunder would be protected.

The record of this Congress has been an outstanding one. In several respects it has been historic in the passage of far-reaching legislation. It is not my purpose to state in detail the numerous pieces of important legislation that we passed. I shall insert a few of them in my remarks in the RECORD.

It was in this Congress that man's never-ending fight for dignity reached an almost definitive culmination. The passage of legislation guaranteeing equal justice and equal opportunity for all under the law without regard to race, color, or creed, was the result of bipartisan thought, effort, and action. The credit belongs to Members of both parties. The passage of the largest tax reduction bill in our country's history was also a historic action on the part of this Congress, thereby reducing the threat of recession and increasing our gross national product.

In the field of education, the record is outstanding. The list of education bills which it passed is historic and has never been matched by any previous Congress in our Nation's legislative history. The results in increased educational opportunities will, in the years that lie ahead, be most beneficial to our Nation and to our people.

The legislation that we have passed to preserve the national resources of our country is also an outstanding contribution to the welfare of our people.

The antipoverty bill was one of the finest contributions of human endeavor made by man for the benefit of his fellow men ever enacted into law.

Let me say that there are endless bills that one could mention and one could refer to. It is sufficient for me to say that my heart is overflowing in connection with the magnificent record accomplished during the past 2 years. I speak to you today not only as Speaker of the House but as a friend to each and every one of you. The position of Speaker is not only an important one, but at times it is an onerous one. You have been most tolerant to me, and your consideration of me has made my task easier. To Members who will not be sitting in this body in the 89th Congress I wish for you and your loved ones every future happiness and success. To those who will serve in the coming Congress I am looking forward to our continued service in the national interests of our country and in the best interests of our people.

I want to express my thanks to our distinguished friend, the No. 1 parliamentarian of the world, Lew Deschler, for his counsel, his advice, and his friendship. I want to express my feeling of appreciation to our beloved chaplain, Dr. Braskamp, for his spiritual guidance, speaking to all of us without regard to our religious convictions.

I extend to all members of the House organization, from the page boys up, my sincere thanks for the dedicated manner in which they have performed their duties and in which they have served the Members of the House of Representatives.

I am deeply grateful to the minority leader, Mr. HALLECK, for his many courtesies and outstanding consideration. Also I am deeply grateful, CHARLIE, to your right arm, the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, the Republican whip, Mr. ARENDS. Sound leadership works each with the other. Sound leadership operates with an understanding mind. When my party was in the minority I always tried to operate in that manner with my Republican friends. During the time I have been majority leader and Speaker of the House of Representatives, my dear friend, the able minority leader, has always operated in an understanding manner, and for that I am most grateful.

I am most fortunate in having as my associates in the Democratic leadership of the House CARL ALBERT and HALE BOGGS. No Speaker could have abler or more devoted and loyal associates on the leadership level than CARL ALBERT and HALE BOGGS. I am deeply indebted to both of them and I express to these two distinguished gentlemen, my friends, my heartfelt thanks, not only for their ability but, above all, as CHARLIE HALLECK knows, in the position of leadership, there should be loyalty. And in Carl Albert and Hale Boggs on the Democratic side I have had that loyalty.

Each day that I have served in this great body has been an inspiration to me. Each day, when I come here and see the dome of the Capitol, it is an inspiration to me, as if I were seeing it for the first time. Serving in this great body has been an inspiration to me.

We come and we go but we contribute according to our capacity and according to our dedicated minds. It is a great privilege for one to serve in the Congress, and I have never known a Member to serve therein who did not do so with the highest of motives and the greatest of honor and patriotism. Without regard to party, each Member serves our Nation and helps to preserve, in accordance with his or her views and convictions, our basic American traditions. While, as Charlie Halleck has said, there have been differences of opinion, each Member has acted with the highest of motives.

I extend my sincere thanks to the House for the adoption of the resolution. I extend my deep appreciation to my colleagues for the outward manifestation of friendship and respect; and I extend to all of you my very best wishes for an equally happy and productive future.

[Applause, the Members rising.]

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF THE U.S. GROUP OF THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY PARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCE

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Law 689, 84th Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the U.S. group of the North Atlantic Treaty Parliamentary Conference the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. Hays, Chairman; Mr. Rodino, Mr. Denton, Mr. Rivers of South Carolina; Mr. Clark; Mr. Arends, Mr. Lindsay, Mr. Chamberlain, and Mr. Hosmer.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. Wilson of Indiana (at the request of Mr. Halleck), for an indefinite period, on account of a death in his family.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Price, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. Long of Louisiana, for 20 minutes, today.

Mr. Ryan of New York, for 30 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Bromwell, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. Zablocki, for 15 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. Feighan, for 30 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. Cohelan (at the request of Mr. Marsh), for 5 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. Mills and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Stratton on the accomplishments of the 88th Congress and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Zablocki.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Hall) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Westland in two instances.
Mr. Ellsworth.
Mr. Rumsfeld in three instances.
Mr. Harsha.
Mr. Cleveland in two instances.
Mr. Saylor.
Mr. Jensen.
Mr. Beermann.
Mr. Taft in three instances.
Mr. Shriver.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Marsh) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Rostenkowski.
Mr. Patman.
Mr. Addabbo.
Mr. Multer in three instances.
Mr. Rogers of Florida.
Mr. Sickles in two instances.
Mr. Rooney of New York in three instances.
Mr. Vanik.
Mr. Pepper.
Mr. Charles H. Wilson.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 646. An act to regulate the location of chanceries and other business offices of foreign governments in the District of Columbia;

S. 1147. An act to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to construct and maintain an adequate system of roads and trails for the national forests, and for other purposes;

S. 1593. An act to amend section 14 of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1954 concerning the interstate planning and coordination of the Great River Road;

S. 2460. An act to amend the act of July 13, 1959, so as to extend the period of time within which certain construction may be undertaken by the State of Missouri on lands conveyed to such State by the United States;

S. 2649. An act to designate as the Graham Burke Pumping Plant the pumping plant being constructed in the State of Arkansas as part of the White River backwater unit of the Lower Mississippi River flood control project;

S. 2654. An act to change the name of the canal, known as the Bay Head-Manasquan Canal and as the Manasquan River-Barnegat Bay Canal, to Point Pleasant Canal;

S. 2968. An act to amend subsection 120 (f) of title 23, United States Code;

S. 3060. An act to amend and extend the National Defense Education Act of 1958 and to extend Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress (federally affected areas);

S. 3143. An act to designate as Clair Engle Lake the reservoir created by the Trinity Dam, Central Valley project, California; and

S. 3162. An act to amend section 105(a) of the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1935, with respect to the disclosure in reports required thereunder of the names of persons who have appeared as witnesses before committees sitting in executive session.

SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. In accordance with the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 371, the Chair declares the 2d session of the 88th Congress adjourned sine die.

Thereupon (at 3 o'clock and 16 minutes p.m.), pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 371, the House adjourned sine die.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION ENROLLED AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that on the following dates, that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

On October 3, 1964:

H.R. 1179. An act for the relief of Basilio King, his wife, and their children;

H.R. 2434. An act to amend section 560 of title 38, United States Code, to permit the payment of special pension to holders of the Congressional Medal of Honor awarded such medal for actions not involving conflict with an enemy, and for other purposes;

H.R. 4649. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to authorize the use of certain volatile fruit-flavored concentrates in the cellar treatment of wine, and for other purposes;

H.R. 8427. An act to provide for the establishment and maintenance of a Central Intelligence Agency retirement and disability system for a limited number of employees, and for other purposes;

H.R. 9393. An act to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide full retroactivity for disability determinations, to extend the period within which ministers may elect coverage, and to validate wages erroneously reported for certain engineering aides employed by soil and water conservation districts in Oklahoma, and for other purposes;

H.R. 9976. An act for the relief of Elmer Levy;

H.R. 10473. An act to extend the period during which Federal payments may be made for foster care in child-care institutions under the program of aid to families with dependent children under title IV of the Social Security Act, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 12259. An act to amend the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949 to provide for the determination of the amounts of claims of nationals of the United States against the Government of Cuba.

On October 5, 1964:

H.R. 5871. An act to modify the requirement benefits of the judges of the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions, the District of Columbia Court of Appeals, and the Juvenile Court of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H.R. 11380. An act to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes;

H.R. 11812. An act making appropriations for foreign assistance and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes;

H.R. 12318. An act to provide an equitable system for the classification of certain positions under the House of Representatives, and for other purposes;

H.R. 12633. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 1192. Joint resolution fixing the time of assembly of the 89th Congress.

On October 6, 1964:

H.R. 1927. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to revise the pension program for veterans of World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict, and their widows and children, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

Pursuant to the authority granted the Speaker by House Concurrent Resolution 372, 88th Congress, he did on the following dates sign enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

On October 5, 1964:

H.R. 1179. An act for the relief of Basilio King, his wife, and their children;

H.R. 2434. An act to amend section 560 of title 38, United States Code, to permit the payment of special pension to holders of the Congressional Medal of Honor awarded such medal for actions not involving conflict with an enemy, and for other purposes;

H.R. 4649. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to authorize the use of certain volatile fruit-flavor concentrates in the cellar treatment of wine, and for other purposes;

H.R. 5871. An act to modify the retirement benefits of the judges of the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions, the District of Columbia Court of Appeals, and the Juvenile Court of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H.R. 8427. An act to provide for the establishment and maintenance of a Central Intelligence Agency retirement and disability system for a limited number of employees, and for other purposes;

H.R. 9393. An act to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide full retroactivity for disability determinations, to extend the period within which ministers may elect coverage, and to validate wages erroneously reported for certain engineering aids employed by soil and water conservation districts in Oklahoma, and for other purposes;

H.R. 9976. An act for the relief of Elmer Levy;

H.R. 10473. An act to extend the period during which Federal payments may be made for foster care in child-care institutions under the program of aid to families with dependent children under title IV of the Social Security Act, and for other purposes;

H.R. 11380. An act to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes;

H.R. 11812. An act making appropriations for foreign assistance and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes;

H.R. 12259. An act to amend the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949 to provide for the determination of the amounts of claims of nationals of the United States against the Government of Cuba;

H.R. 12318. An act to provide an equitable system for the classification of certain positions under the House of Representatives, and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 1192. Joint resolution fixing the time of assembly of the 89th Congress.

On October 6, 1964:

H.R. 1927. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to revise the pension program for veterans of World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict, and their widows and children, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 12633. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

Pursuant to the authority granted the Speaker by House Concurrent Resolution 372, 88th Congress, he did on October 6, 1964, sign enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1684. An act for the relief of Fotinin Dimantopoulou;

S. 2499. An act for the relief of Leobardo L. Gonzalez;

S. 2698. An act for the relief of Linus Han;

S. 2730. An act for the relief of Dr. Jorge A. Picaza;

S. 2759. An act for the relief of Kim Sook Hee and Kim Lou; and

S. 3035. An act to provide for the disposition of judgment funds now on deposit to the credit of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on October 6, 1964, present to the President, for his approval, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1096. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to cooperate with the State of Wisconsin in the designation and administration of the Ice Age National Scientific Reserve in the State of Wisconsin, and for other purposes;

H.R. 1179. An act for the relief of Basilio King, his wife, and their children;

H.R. 1927. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to revise the pension program for veterans of World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict, and their widows and children, and for other purposes;

H.R. 2434. An act to amend section 560 of title 38, United States Code, to permit the payment of special pension to holders of the Congressional Medal of Honor awarded such medal for actions not involving conflict with an enemy, and for other purposes;

H.R. 4649. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to authorize the use of certain volatile fruit-flavor concentrates in the cellar treatment of wine, and for other purposes;

H.R. 5871. An act to modify the retirement benefits of the judges of the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions, the District of Columbia Court of Appeals, and the Juvenile Court of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H.R. 7348. An act for the relief of Frank B. Rowlett;

H.R. 8427. An act to provide for the establishment and maintenance of a Central Intelligence Agency retirement and disability system for a limited number of employees, and for other purposes;

H.R. 9393. An act to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide full retroactivity for disability determinations, to extend the period within which ministers may elect coverage, and to validate wages erroneously reported for certain engineering aids employed by soil and water conservation districts in Oklahoma, and for other purposes;

H.R. 9976. An act for the relief of Elmer Levy;

H.R. 10473. An act to extend the period during which Federal payments may be made for foster care in child-care institutions under the program of aid to families with dependent children under title IV of the Social Security Act, and for other purposes;

H.R. 11380. An act to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes;

H.R. 11812. An act making appropriations for foreign assistance and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes;

H.R. 12259. An act to amend the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949 to provide for the determination of the amounts of claims of nationals of the United States against the Government of Cuba;

H.R. 12318. An act to provide an equitable system for the classification of certain positions under the House of Representatives, and for other purposes;

H.R. 12633. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 1192. Joint resolution fixing the time of assembly of the 89th Congress.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS APPROVED AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

The President, subsequent to the sine die adjournment of the Congress, notified the Clerk of the House that on the following dates he had approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On October 2, 1964:

H.J. Res. 793. Joint resolution authorizing the United Spanish War Veterans to erect a memorial in the District of Columbia or its environs;

H.R. 1853. An act for the relief of Patti Jean Fulton;

H.R. 5042. An act for the relief of certain officers of the naval service erroneously in receipt of compensation based upon an incorrect computation of service for basic pay;

H.R. 5500. An act for the relief of Lt. John P. Mann;

H.R. 7788. An act for the relief of Jack B. Fisher;

H.R. 8300. An act for the relief of Gordon W. McGrew;

H.R. 8596. An act for the relief of Patrick J. Clyne;

H.R. 9201. An act for the relief of Capt. Charles H. Glassett, Jr.;

H.R. 10294. An act for the relief of Mrs. Lois Graybill;

H.R. 10526. An act for the relief of Marvin S. Kline;

H.R. 10634. An act for the relief of the Quality Bedding Co.;

H.R. 11332. An act to authorize certain veterans' benefits for disability or death resulting from injuries sustained prior to January 1, 1957, by reservists while proceeding directly to or returning directly from active duty for training or inactive duty training;

H.R. 11626. An act to authorize the payment of expenses incident to the evacuation of dependents of military personnel from Panama and Cyprus;

H.R. 11913. An act to authorize the disposal, without regard to the prescribed 6-month waiting period, of antimony from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile; and

H.R. 12091. An act to authorize the disposal, without regard to the prescribed 6-month waiting period, of approximately 9,500,000 pounds of sisal from the national stockpile.

On October 3, 1964:

H.R. 2501. An act to authorize the promotion of qualified Reserve officers of the Army and the Air Force to existing unit vacancies;

H.R. 2509. An act to authorize Reserve officers to combine service in more than one Reserve component in computing the 4 years of satisfactory Federal service necessary to qualify for the uniform maintenance allowance;

H.R. 2512. An act to clarify the status of members of the National Guard while attending or instructing at National Guard schools established under the authority of the Secretary of the Army or Secretary of the Air Force, as the case may be, and for other purposes;

H.R. 2753. An act to disclaim any title of the United States to certain real property in Modoc County, Calif.;

H.R. 2859. An act to provide for the promulgation of rules of practice and procedure under the Bankruptcy Act, and for other purposes;

H.R. 9435. An act to improve judicial procedures for serving documents, obtaining evidence, and proving documents in litigation with international aspects;

H.R. 10328. An act for the relief of certain commissioned officers of the Army or Air Force who were erroneously paid uniform allowance under the provisions of section 305 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 12033. An act to further amend the transitional provisions of the act approved September 6, 1958, entitled "An act to protect the public health by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to prohibit the use in food of additives which have not been adequately tested to establish their safety," and for other purposes.

On October 6, 1964:

H.J. Res. 753. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim October 15 of each year as White Cane Safety Day;

H.R. 3642. An act for the relief of Mike Mizokami, Sam Mizokami, Tom Mizokami, and Hatsuyo Mizokami;

H.R. 4972. An act for the relief of Robert E. McKee General Contractor, Inc., and Kaufman & Broad Building Co., a joint venture;

H.R. 4989. An act to amend title 28 of the United States Code to transfer the counties of Genesee and Shiawassee in the State of Michigan from the Northern Division to the Southern Division of the Eastern Judicial District and to authorize a term of court at Ann Arbor;

H.R. 5759. An act for the relief of Connecticut Beverage Co., Inc.;

H.R. 5932. An act to amend the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 so as to authorize certain teachers employed by the Board of Education of the District of Columbia to participate in a health benefits plan established pursuant to such act, to amend the Federal Employees Group Life Insurance Act of 1954 so as to extend insurance coverage to such teachers, to provide for retroactive salary increases for certain civilian employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes;

H.R. 6593. An act for the relief of Earnest O. Scott;

H.R. 10204. An act to extend the Osage mineral reservation for an indefinite period; and

H.R. 12289. An act to establish the Lewis and Clark Trail Commission, and for other purposes.

On October 7, 1964:

H.R. 11380. An act to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes;

H.R. 11812. A act making appropriations for Foreign Assistance and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 12633. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes.

On October 8, 1964:

H.R. 6233. An act to provide for the conveyance to certain land of the United States to the Pascua Yaqui Association, Inc.;

H.R. 9718. An act to authorize the crediting of certain military service for purposes of Reserve retired pay; and

H.R. 12308. An act to authorize removal of a flight hazard at the U.S. Naval Air station, Norfolk, Va.

On October 13, 1964:

H.R. 1096. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to cooperate with the State of Wisconsin in the designation and administration of the Ice Age National Scientific Reserve in the State of Wisconsin, and for other purposes;

H.R. 1179. An act for the relief of Basilio King, his wife, and their children;

H.R. 1927. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to revise the pension program for veterans of World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict, and their widows and children, and for other purposes;

H.R. 2434. An act to amend section 560 of title 38, United States Code, to permit the payment of special pension to holders of the Congressional Medal of Honor awarded such medal for actions not involving conflict with an enemy, and for other purposes;

H.R. 4649. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to authorize the use of certain volatile fruit-flavor concentrates in the cellar treatment of wine, and for other purposes;

H.R. 5871. An act to modify the retirement benefits of the judges of the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions, the District of Columbia Court of Appeals, and the Juvenile Court of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H.R. 6218. An act to amend the act of June 29, 1960, to authorize additional extensions of time for final proof by certain entrymen under the desert land laws and to make such additional extensions available to the successors in interest of such entrymen;

H.R. 7348. An act for the relief of Frank B. Rowlett;

H.R. 8427. An act to provide for the establishment and maintenance of a Central Intelligence Agency retirement and disability system for a limited number of employees, and for other purposes;

H.R. 9124. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to vitalize the Reserve Officers' Training Corps programs of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, and for other purposes;

H.R. 9393. An act to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide full retroactivity for disability determinations, to extend the period within which ministers may elect coverage, and to validate wages erroneously reported for certain engineering aides employed by soil and water conservation districts in Oklahoma, and for other purposes;

H.R. 9976. An act for the relief of Elmer Levy;

H.R. 10473. An act to extend the period during which Federal payments may be made for foster care in child-care institutions under the program of aid to families with dependent children under title IV of the Social Security Act, and for other purposes;

H.R. 12318. An act to provide an equitable system for the classification of certain positions under the House of Representatives, and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 1192. Joint resolution fixing the time of assembly of the 89th Congress.

On October 14, 1964:

H.R. 2772. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Harley Brewer.

On October 16, 1964:

H.R. 12259. An act to amend the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949 to provide for the determination of the amounts of claims of nationals of the United States against the Government of Cuba.

HOUSE BILL DISAPPROVED AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT—CHESTER A. BROTHERS AND ANNA BROTHERS

I am withholding my approval from H.R. 1851, a bill for the relief of Chester A. Brothers and Anna Brothers, his wife.

The bill would relieve the claimants of their legal obligation to pay interest, at the rate of 6 percent per annum, on delinquent payments of income taxes for the years 1955 and 1956. The taxpayers did not file income tax returns for these years until 1960 due to the misconduct of their accountant who, unknown to Mr. and Mrs. Brothers, failed to file their returns.

The interest payment required by law is not a penalty but is designed to reimburse the Government for the loss of the use of the money owing to it. Payment of interest is equitable because it prevents a taxpayer who pays his taxes late, for whatever reason, from enjoying an advantage over other taxpayers who pay their taxes promptly.

Each year there are many thousands of taxpayers who, for reasonable cause, make late payments of income taxes and who are obligated to pay interest on their late payments. Approval of this bill would, therefore, discriminate against many other taxpayers and would create an undesirable precedent.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *October 13, 1964.*

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2602. A letter from the Chairman, Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, transmitting report by the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, covering refunds and credits of internal revenue taxes for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1962, pursuant to section 6405 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (H. Doc. No. 370); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

2603. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the sixth semiannual report on activities of the U.S. Travel Service for period January 1964 to June 1964, pursuant to section 5 of the International Travel Act of 1961; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 12818. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H.R. 12819. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to increase the rates of basic pay for all enlisted members and certain officers of the uniformed services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin:

H.R. 12820. A bill to amend section 624(d) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to provide that all so-called "end-use inspectors" shall be subject to the control of the Inspector General, Foreign Assistance; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 12821. A bill for the relief of Luis Gonzalez Capistran; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12822. A bill for the relief of Gonzalo Murillo Herrejon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12823. A bill for the relief of Gilberto Perez Medinia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12824. A bill for the relief of Abel Cruz Morales; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12825. A bill for the relief of Felipe Preciado Oaigel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12826. A bill for the relief of Ignacio Guerrero Sanchez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 12827. A bill for the relief of Okonstantinos and Magdalini Likouresis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 12828. A bill for the relief of Rachel Ben-Shalom; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 12829. A bill for the relief of Jenshin Higa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Social Security Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, the time has come to call a spade a spade. We are winding up this session with some very serious legislation still tied up in committees.

I refer especially at this time of the failure to get an agreement in conference between the House and Senate on the social security amendments.

I for one and I know I speak for many more of my colleagues when I say that the conferees acted in bad faith when they failed to give the Members an opportunity to vote for beneficial legislation in behalf of our elder citizens.

Not many of us have taken the time to really study the plight of our aged and aging citizens. Few of us have really taken the time to analyze the Social Security Act and the reasons for its original passage.

The issue is one of inadequacy, simply because we failed to expand the benefits and to lower the age limit for retirement.

The original purpose of social security was to make retirement possible for the older worker, to give opportunity to the youth of America knocking at the employment agency doors, to make life bearable and to make retirement a self-satisfying achievement in reward for his lifetime of service to this Nation and its institutions.

However, a few willful persons in charge of the responsibility and in authority over the fate of this law have prevented this logic and reasoning and at this writing look at social security as a private insurance fund and demand that it must maintain liquidity in spite of the fact that this type of social legislation was created as a social measure designed to render a service rather than to depend upon its economic stability.

The general funds of our Nation are tapped for every conceivable type of social service and yet the mere suggestion that the social security law is to be honored in its intent rather than in its financial structure draws inimical criticism.

We can make it work but we must face up to the issue. Any suggestion that an act that started out with $85 and 65 years of age as its maximum provisions and 30 years later still maintains a 65-year limit for full benefits of $108 per month.

Compare this to the advances in our own incomes, our wages, our costs of living, and you can see why this Congress has failed in its obligation to these worthy citizens.

My own bill, introduced year after year, has been pigeonholed by the same committee that has killed time after time remedial legislation in the field of health and sickness benefits for this group of citizens.

I assure the House that I shall continue to fight for increased benefits, lowering the age limits and to provide for the care of those unable to finance proper medical care in their time of need.

This shall and must be the first objective of the next Congress.

I assure you it is mine.

Equal Rights for Men and Women

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BIRCH E. BAYH

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments, of which I am chairman, has had before it in the 88th Congress many important proposals relating to proposed changes in the Constitution of the United States.

Among these, Mr. President, is a proposed amendment to the Constitution which would guarantee that persons are not discriminated against solely because of their sex.

It is clear that throughout the history of the United States women have not enjoyed full equality. It was in 1920 that women were first permitted to vote in the United States—and then only after a long struggle for this precious right. And today we often find women unable to gain jobs for which they are qualified when they are employed, or to command salaries commensurate with those of men in the same positions.

Recently the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments and the Committee on the Judiciary approved a proposed amendment to the Constitution to secure these rights. Under unanimous consent I place in the RECORD an excerpt from the report of the Committee on the Judiciary relating to this proposal.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the report (No. 1558) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT

The substantive section of the proposed amendment is quite simple and straightforward. It reads as follows:

"Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex. Congress and the several States shall have power, within their respective jurisdictions, to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

Senate Joint Resolution 45 was introduced in the 88th Congress by Senator McGEE for himself and 35 other Senators as cosponsors. During the past 10 years, the Legislatures of Connecticut, Delaware, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, and Maryland have adopted resolutions memorializing the Congress to submit this amendment to the States for ratification.

This proposal has been before the Congress since the 19th amendment to the Constitution extended voting rights to women. In recent years, resolutions proposing this amendment were reported favorably by the Committee on the Judiciary in the 80th, 81st, 82d, 83d, 84th, 86th, and 87th Congresses. In the 81st and 83d Congresses, the amendment passed the Senate with a floor amendment, but it was never acted upon by the House of Representatives. In the 86th Congress, the same floor amendment was adopted by the Senate and then the resolution was recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary upon motion of its principal sponsors. (The provisions of this floor amendment or "rider" are discussed subsequently in this report.)

Adoption of this amendment will complete women's long movement for legal equality.

Like the 14th amendment, the restrictions of this proposed amendment apply only to governmental action. It would not apply to private or to individual action. The 14th amendment provides a body of case law as to what constitutes "State action" and its precedents will be available for judicial determination of the scope of this amendment.

There remain many well-known vestiges of ancient rules of law which treat women as inferiors. In many States, a woman cannot handle or own separate property in the same manner as her husband. In some States, she cannot engage in business or pursue a profession or occupation as freely as can a member of the male sex. Women are classified separately for purposes of jury service in many States. Community-property States do not vest in the wife the same degree of property rights as her husband enjoys. The inheritance rights of widows differ from those of widowers in some States. Restrictive work laws, which purport to protect women by denying them a man's freedom to pursue employment, actually result in discrimination in the employment of women by making it so burdensome upon employers. Such protective restrictions hinder women in their competition with men for supervisory, technical, and professional job opportunities.

Your committee has considered carefully the amendment which was added to this proposal on the floor of the Senate in the 81st, 83d, and 86th Congresses. Its effect was to preserve "rights, benefits, or exemptions" conferred by law upon persons of the female sex. This qualification is not acceptable to women who want equal rights under the law. It is under the guise of so-called "rights" or "benefits" that women have been treated unequally and denied opportunities which are available to men.

Just as equal protection of the law under the 14th amendment is not a mathematical equality, this amendment does not contemplate that women must be treated in all respects the same as men. Nor does it mean that all legal differentiation of the sexes will be abolished. "Equality" does not mean "sameness." "Equal" rights does not necessarily mean "identical" rights. For instance, a law granting maternity benefits to women would not be an unlawful discrimination against men. As a grant to mothers, it would be based on a reasonable classification despite its limitation to members of one sex.

Nor would the amendment mean that criminal laws governing sexual offenses would become unconstitutional. The public has such an interest in relations between the sexes that the conduct of both sexes is subject to regulation under the police power apart from any considerations of unequal treatment or protective status.

In the past, it has been suggested that this amendment would require equal treatment of men and women for purposes of compulsory military service. This is no more true than that all men are treated equally for purposes of military duty. Differences in physical abilities among all persons would continue to be a material factor. It could be expected that women will be equally subject to military conscription and they have demonstrated that they can perform admirably in many capacities in the Armed Forces. But the Government would not require that women serve where they are not fitted just as men with physical defects are utilized in special capacities, if at all.

Your committee wishes to emphasize one additional fact. The proposed amendment would confirm equal rights under law for both men and women. In instances where laws are burdensome to men solely because of their sex, they would benefit from the amendment. For instance, alimony laws probably could not favor women solely because of their sex. However, a divorce decree could award support to a mother if she was granted custody of children. This would be incidental to the children's support. Matters concerning custody and support of children properly should be determined solely with a view to the welfare of the children, without favoritism to either parent solely because of sex.

Both major political parties have repeatedly supported this proposal in their national party platforms. The United States, as a signatory to the United Nations Charter, has confirmed its faith in equal rights of men and women. Nevertheless, we withhold from our women a constitutional guarantee of equal treatment under the law and thus lag behind such countries as Burma, Egypt, Japan, Greece, Pakistan, and West Germany.

An impressive list of women's organizations have recorded their support of this proposal in the past. Among them are the following:

Alpha Iota Sorority.
American Association of Women Ministers.
American Federation of Soroptimist Clubs.
American Medical Women's Association.
American Women's Society of Certified Public Accountants.
American Society of Women Accountants.
Association of American Women Dentists.
General Federation of Women's Clubs.
National Association of Colored Women.
National Association of Women Lawyers.
National Council of Women Chiropractors.
National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs.
National Women's Party.
Osteopathic Women's National Association.
Susan B. Anthony Memorial, Inc.
Women's Auxiliary to American Osteopathic Association.
Women's Auxiliary to the National Chiropractic Association.
Women's Circle, Woodmen of the World.
Women's International Association of Aeronautics.

A Brief Summary of Totals of Appropriation Bills, 88th Congress, 2d Session

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am including for the RECORD a brief summary of the action taken by Congress on appropriation bills during the 88th Congress, 2d session.

This summary shows total appropriations enacted during this session of $94,163 million, a reduction of $4,134 million from the budget estimates, and an increase of $128 million over funds provided for fiscal year 1964.

In the 1st session of the 88th Congress, the President's budget was reduced approximately $6,500 million. This makes a total reduction for the two sessions of the 88th Congress ten billion six hundred million dollars.

I know that the taxpayers of America appreciate the work of the conservative Members of both the Republican and Democratic Parties in making this large reduction which represents a saving of over $200 on an average for each family in America.

I certainly want to express my own appreciation for the fine cooperation I have received from Members of Congress and others in handling the appropriation bills of this session and accomplishing the savings indicated above.

The summary follows:

Summary of totals of the appropriation bills, 88th Cong., 2d Sess.

(NOTE.—Loan authorizations not in this summary. And permanent appropriations not requiring action in the session total $11,800,000,000 in round figures.)

House actions:	*Rounded figures*
1. Budget estimates considered (both fiscal 1964 and 1965	$97,677,000,000
2. Amounts passed by the House (including, to avoid a gross distortion, the $5,200,000,000 reported for NASA but stricken on a point of order)	93,630,000,000
3. Reduction below budget requests (for the 1964 session)	—4,047,000,000
Consisting of—	
(a) Applicable to fiscal 1964 deficiencies and supplementals	—697,000,000
(b) Applicable to fiscal 1965 requests	—3,200,000,000
(c) Applicable to fiscal 1966 requests	—150,000,000
4. Appropriations for fiscal 1964 (tentative totals, approximately final)	92,242,000,000
5. Appropriations as approved by House for fiscal 1965 (including to remove the distortion, the $5,200,000,000 for NASA)	91,950,000,000
6. Reduction by the House, amounts for fiscal 1965 below appropriations for 1964	—292,000,000
Senate actions:	
1. Budget estimates considered (all bills of session)	98,297,000,000
2. Amounts approved (all bills)	94,702,000,000
3. Comparisons—	
(a) Below budget estimates	—3,595,000,000
(b) Above the House bills (omitting, to avoid gross distortion, $5,200,000,000 for NASA)	+1,072,000,000
(c) 1965 amounts above 1964 amounts	+648,000,000
Final actions:	
1. Amounts enacted (all bills of the 1964 session)	94,163,000,000
2. These amounts are below the fiscal year 1965 budget requests, in round figures	—4,134,000,000
3. The fiscal 1965 new appropriations in these bills ($92,370,000,000) are above the corresponding fiscal 1964 appropriations ($92,242,000,000) by about	+128,000,000

Congressman Bob Ellsworth Reports From Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent of the House, my final report from Washington to my constituents follows:

YOUR CONGRESSMAN BOB ELLSWORTH REPORTS FROM WASHINGTON

OCTOBER 1964.

SUMMARY

This issue of the Newsletter is a summary of some of the important actions of the 88th Congress, and the effect of those actions on us in the Third District of Kansas, and in the Nation.

NATIONAL SECURITY

The Congress has continued to support a powerful (and expensive) Defense Establishment. While there has been some argument over certain Pentagon policies—whether or not to continue production of manned bombers, whether or not our missiles are reliable enough, whether or not we are investing enough in research to develop advanced military technology—the fact is that the legislation authorizing the Government to carry out its policies has been supported almost unanimously.

Even so, three major policy questions remain unresolved, to confront the American people and the next Congress in 1965:

1. On what basis should major defense contract awards be made? For example, was the award of the TFX contract to a Texas plant in the national interest when another contractor had a better (according to the military) design and a lower bid?

2. Are we going to spend $12 billion or more to build an anti-ballistic-missile system? The Pentagon has been spending some $400 million a year to research such a system, which would theoretically knock out incoming ballistic missiles before they hit us. However, some Defense Department officials admit it is easier and cheaper to develop penetration systems that will knock out any known anti-ballistic-missile system, than it is to build such an ABM system.

3. What role should the Defense Department play in the conduct of our international affairs? Defense Secretary McNamara played a leading role in setting up the so-called Khanh regime in South Vietnam; a former Assistant Secretary of Defense has been moved over to take charge of our State Department's Far Eastern affairs; and General Taylor, until recently Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, is now our Ambassador to South Vietnam. It is evident that our southeast Asia–South Vietnam policies are not working, and the question of the wisdom of our military-oriented approach naturally presents itself.

TAX POLICY

The 88th Congress enacted one tax cut (in income tax rates) and postponed another (a cut in excise tax rates) to next year.

The theory of tax reduction at this time is that such cuts "unleash" the free enterprise economy, stimulating economic growth, returning spending decisions to the people, and generating greater dollar revenues on the rates that remain, due to increased plant investment and consumer spending. This theory, in general, is subscribed to by advisers of both President Johnson and Senator GOLDWATER.

The income tax cut of 1964 was particularly helpful to us in Kansas, because the emphasis was on cuts in the tax on the first $25,000 of corporation profits. This is the tax cut that helps small businessmen, and since Kansas is a State of many small businesses, Kansas will be one of the States that benefits most from the cut.

Next year Congress will probably cut the excise taxes, too. Many of us have been working and voting to cut these "nuisance" taxes for several months, and we are confident the job can be done in 1965. Included would be cuts in taxes on automobile parts and tires, luggage, cosmetics, telephone bills, and the like.

CIVIL RIGHTS

For 30 years Congress and our national leadership have been buying time—and wasting it—on the question of civil rights. Because of the political danger of any kind of meaningful action in this controversial and sensitive area, many politicians have avoided engagement in civil rights legislation. Finally, in 1964, the 88th Congress enacted an important Civil Rights Act—because most Members of the Congress believe in equality under the law as it is guaranteed by the Constitution, and because they had the courage and integrity to support those beliefs.

EDUCATION

The 88th Congress has become known as "The Education Congress." Probably no Congress in history has done as much to strengthen education in America as this one.

The Higher Education Facilities Act, for example, will make some $3 million available to colleges and universities in Kansas on a matching fund basis, for construction of much needed academic facilities. Baker University, Ottawa University, and the University of Kansas will be able to participate in the program.

The Health Professions Education Assistance Act provides construction grants to help build teaching facilities for medical, dental, pharmaceutical, and nursing students. The University of Kansas medical school has shown its interest and will undoubtedly participate in this act.

The Vocational Education Act authorizes Federal grants to States to assist them in maintaining and improving their existing programs and in developing new programs in vocational education. Kansas has an outstanding vocational education program. In this period of fast technological changes, and automation, good vocational education programs are essential to help keep workers' skills up to date.

And of course this Congress continued the important legislation which provides Federal assistance to schools in federally impacted areas. In our district, this includes schools in Baldwin, Bethel, DeSoto, Easton, Edgerton, Eudora, Kansas City, Lawrence, Lenexa, Louisburg, Mission, Olathe, Overland Park, Prairie Village, Shawnee, Spring Hill, Turner, Wellsville, and Winchester.

FLOOD CONTROL AND WATER CONSERVATION

Flood control is important all over the United States, and especially in eastern Kansas. Our farms, our factory jobs, and our homes all depend on controlling the Kaw and the Marais des Cygnes Rivers and their tributaries. Federal money invested in eastern Kansas flood control and water conservation saves double and triple the amount of the investment, in preventing loss of humans and property values through devastating floods.

Beyond that, the value of large lakes and reservoirs for outdoor recreation and sports is obvious.

The 88th Congress has appropriated over $9 million this year for projects located in or directly affecting our district:

[In thousands]

Clinton Reservoir	$240
Kansas City local protection works	100
Lawrence local protection works	300
Melvern Reservoir	230
Merriam local protection works	40
Perry Reservoir	8, 500

Perry Reservoir will provide major flood protection for downstream farms, homes, and factories; through State of Kansas participation in construction costs it will help provide water supply for local communities; and of course it will afford outstanding sport fishing and water recreation facilities for all of eastern Kansas. (We will be delighted to have Missourians come over, too.)

FARM PROBLEMS

An unfortunate mistake of the 88th Congress was enactment of the so-called wheat and cotton bill. The bill reduces Kansas wheat acreage, continues to subsidize surplus production in the South and East, and further cuts down on farmers' freedom to manage their farms as they see fit. But beyond all that, the new law has had the shocking effect of sharply reducing commercial sales of American wheat on world markets.

After a record year of Kansas wheat export sales for dollars, July of this year saw a sharp drop in such sales. Of course commercial dollar sales of Kansas wheat have in past years been a big help in our Nation's balance of payments. Now, with dollar sales of wheat down by 60 to 70 percent, our balance-of-payments position suffers. At the same time, we are losing commercial markets to Canada and other wheat-producing nations. While Kansas farmers are cutting their acreage, and the Metropolitan Kansas City area is losing wheat traffic, the whole wheat economy of other lands is booming.

The administration and the next Congress will have to work fast to correct this situation by the next crop year.

SPECIAL

Of special interest to all of us in eastern Kansas are individual projects that affect us directly, and for which your Congressman is responsible. Kaw River navigation study: With the Missouri River receiving authority for a 9-foot deep navigation channel, and with serious attention being given to making the Arkansas River navigible from Wichita, both the Kansas legislature and the Congress felt it was time to take another look at the feasibility of making the Kaw River navigible from Lawrence to the mouth, at Kansas City. Industrial flood insurance: Congress is being asked to give mutual flood insurance companies fair and equitable tax treatment, on a par with stock insurance companies. This would be of prime importance to factories and other industries in our area, since we have at least one major mutual flood insurance company located here—and enactment of this requested law would encourage further industrial growth in our part of Kansas. Unfair tax withholding: Airline pilots, railroad workers, and truck drivers, who travel constantly across State lines, are constantly harrassed by cities and States withholding taxes on the income attributed to that part of their travel which brings them through or across the city or State concerned. It is difficult if not impossible, in many cases, to get proper refunds at the end of the year. Therefore, I have asked Congress to enact legislation that would prohibit this unfair tax gathering technique. Passage of the bill would be a step toward fairness and equity.

SCHOOL TIME

Fall 1964 classes are in progress now. Mrs. Ellsworth joins me in expressing the hope that by study, hard work, and attention to the opportunities that surround us for helping our fellow man, this world can be made a better place for all.

Sincerely,

Bob Ellsworth,
Your Congressman.

Broad Benefits Achieved Under New Cotton Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, on last April 11, President Johnson signed into law the Agricultural Act of 1964. A paramount purpose of this law is to save cotton's domestic markets from destruction and to restore the cotton industry as a vital, dynamic segment of our national economy.

As author of the cotton program embraced in this act, I am proud now to report to the House that these objectives are being achieved.

This legislation eliminated the two-price cotton system, under which foreign mills were able to buy our cotton at 8½ cents a pound cheaper than could our own mills, and then ship cotton goods into the United States and undersell our domestic mills. The new law requires that American mills be able to buy American cotton at the same price it is offered for export.

Cotton competes more fairly with synthetic fibers.

The competitive position of our domestic mills, against imports of cheap foreign goods, has been vastly improved.

Instead of continuing its pell-mell slide, cotton's domestic consumption is turning up by a million bales or more this season. Moreover, a new atmosphere of confidence permeates the American textile industry.

The expansion of the use of cotton is tremendously important to our cotton farmers.

In the first quarter of this year—just before the new cotton program was enacted—investments in new textile plants and equipment were at the annual rate of $600 million. In the third quarter, this rate soared to $850 million, and it is expected to rise further to $900 million in the fourth quarter. This is an increase of 50 percent between the first and fourth quarters, while all other manufacturing industries have been going along at about 8 percent. Obviously, this is giving great stimulus to the national economy.

Equalization of raw cotton costs to domestic and foreign mills, coupled with modernization of the textile industry, is helping to put an effective brake on the manufactured cotton imports which had been coming into this country in an ever-increasing flood. In May and June following passage of the new cotton program, yard imports were down about one-third from the same months last year. Reports for May, June, and July on imports of cotton in cloth form are down 4 percent from last year.

Such are the results of competitive, one-price cotton in the few short months since the legislation was enacted.

Mr. Speaker, recently there have been some statements to the effect that the new cotton program has not worked out as anticipated. Such statements are decidedly misleading. One charge has been made that the reduced price for raw cotton is not being passed along beyond the mill level. A few isolated cases were cited where textile goods are a bit higher than before.

But the answer here is apparent to anyone who really wants to understand the situation. Prior to passage of the cotton program, there was great uncertainty about what would be done. Inventories of cotton goods were sharply reduced all along the line from the mills to consumers.

Right after the new cotton program became effective, prices of yarn and cloth generally took a definite drop. But with everyone eager to rebuild inventories of cotton goods, these prices have strengthened for the time being. This strengthening is nothing more than the result of a temporary situation when supply is inadequate to meet demand. When supply catches up, the tremendous competition within the textile industry will assure new adjustments in yarn and cloth prices.

In any event—in spite of the short-term supply and demand situation—I want to make it clear that prices are down.

Of the 36 constructions of cotton gray fabrics on which prices were shown in the Daily News Record of both January 2 and September 21, 1964, 29 were priced lower in September than in January, 3 showed no change, and 4 were up moderately in price. In the same publication, all counts of carded singles knit yarns shown were down 5 cents per pound across the same period, and carded plied yarns were down 4 cents. Combed yarn prices show drops ranging from 3 cents per pound in fine plied yarns to 6¾ cents in coarser singles.

Mr. Speaker, in summary, for those who are interested in developments since the new cotton program was enacted, I present at this point a rundown of facts on the textile industry:

1. Capital expenditures by the textile industry for 1964 are estimated by the U.S. Department of Commerce at $760 million, compared to $640 million in 1963. This is an increase of $120 million in 1964 over 1963.

Quarterly expenditures at annual rates for 1964 are: $600 million rate in January–April; $650 million rate in April–June; $850 million rate in July–September; and $900 million rate in October–December.

2. Unfilled orders for cotton broad woven goods in July 1964 (latest available month) were 8 percent higher than July 1963.

Cotton broad woven goods inventories in July 1964 were 5 percent below July 1963 and the lowest since August 1960.

3. Cotton consumption in April 1964 was 3 percent above April 1963. In August 1964, it increased to 7 percent above August 1963.

4. Mill consumption of rayon and acetate in April 1964 was 15 percent greater than April 1963. In August 1964, it dropped to 8 percent above August 1963.

5. Prospects for a continuing but modest upswing in manufacturing activity in the U.S. economy through 1964 and first quarter 1965 are very bright. This strong market outlook suggests continuing strength in textiles and increased cotton consumption.

6. Imports of cotton manufactures in the October 1963–July 1964 period ran about 9 percent below the level of a comparative period 12 months earlier.

7. Wage increases that average about 5 percent have been announced by textile mills producing goods from all fibers. When this increase becomes widespread it will represent a sizable increase in manufacturing costs. The annual textile mill products industry payroll is about $3.6 billion. A 5 percent increase would be $180 million and probably $100 million or more represents cotton processing.

My Voting Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES H. WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, this is the last day of the 88th Congress, and it is appropriate therefore to discuss such matters as the record of the past 2 years and in particular the voting record I have compiled during this period.

I am proud to report that I have voted in support of and been recorded on all major legislation in this historic Congress. I voted in favor of the several major bills in the field of education; I voted in favor of the tax cut; the civil rights bill; the war against poverty bill; the national wilderness preservation bill; the pay raise bills for our military and Federal civilian workers; the Hill-Burton hospital construction bill; the veterans pension bill; the expanded food stamp program bill; and the many other important measures that have made this 88th Congress so memorable.

Individual voting attendance figures and percentages do not have much meaning unless we consider the particular bills that were voted upon and the particular bills that were not voted upon. In addition, it is important to consider whether the votes actually cast were good votes or bad votes.

My voting participation record in the form of percentages for the entire period of this Congress stands at 74 percent. This means that I personally voted and was recorded either for or against almost three-quarters of the total number of bills brought before the House of Representatives.

I would like to have compiled a 100-percent voting participation record for the life of this Congress, but in company with more than 415 of the 435 Members of this House I found the goal of total participation to be an impossible one. The pressure of committee business, constituent problems, and the many other varied demands upon a Congressman's time made it impossible for me to remain on the floor of the House for each and every vote. However, I think the record will show that most of the votes I was required to miss had little importance to California or the Nation at large.

I was not able to record my vote on the bill to provide for the construction of the Savery-Pot Hook, Bostwick Park, and Fruitland Mesa participating reclamation projects; or the bill to amend the joint resolution establishing the Battle of Lake Erie Sesquicentennial Celebration Commission, but I am sure the residents of my congressional district will not hold this against me.

Where the leaders of the opposition party are concerned, my voting participation record is better than that of the Republican presidential candidate, and much better than that of the Republican vice-presidential candidate. Congressman WILLIAM MILLER has a total voting participation and attendance record of 49 percent in 1963 and 38 percent up to the end of August in 1964. Whether Congressman MILLER has been an adequate representative for his district is not for me to judge, but it is perhaps just as well that he was not present to cast his vote against most of the progressive legislation of the past 2 years.

I do agree with the Republican Party, however, that percentage records of voting participation and attendance are not the true measurement of a Congressman's worth. Congressman MILLER was chosen for the high honor of the vice-presidential nomination despite the fact that he has one of the worst records of attendance in the House of Representatives. I am sure that his support for his party's positions and policies was considered to be far more important than the number of times he was present on the floor of the House. By the same token, I am proud that I can be judged by my consistent support for the progressive policies of the Kennedy-Johnson administration, and by my record of support for the legislation that has made this 88th Congress one of the most effective of all time.

The Farmer: His Fortune and His Peril—A Report on Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, the 88th Congress, working with a sympathetic, vigorous, and helpful administration, has turned the tides of fortune for the farmers of America. This, and the preceding 87th Congress, forestalled a collapse of the farm economy. We have revived confidence of the future in rural America.

In January of 1961, when the 87th Congress convened—and it was the year that President John F. Kennedy was inaugurated in Washington—the Nation's agriculture, our basic and largest industry, was plunging headlong toward bankruptcy.

CATASTROPHE AVERTED

We averted the catastrophe that was then impending.

This Congress, and the preceding 87th Congress, called a halt to the destruction of the farm program.

First. We reversed the downslide of farm prices. In these 4 years, $16 billion has been added to the gross income of agriculture, as compared with the previous 4 years. Net income is up by $3 billion over this period.

Second. We have reversed the buildup of unmanageable surpluses, which by 1961 threatened to bring the entire structure of farm programs crashing down in ruins.

At the beginning of 1961 the surplus of feed grains totaled 85 million tons; the surplus of wheat totaled 1,400 million bushels. Through the emergency feed grains and wheat programs enacted by Congress and carried out by the administration, the buildup of surpluses has been stopped and turned into reverse. Stocks of feed grains are down by 15 million tons—almost one-fifth. Stocks of wheat are down more than one-third, to about 900 million bushels.

The reversal of the buildup in surpluses has freed agriculture from the most immediate threat of destruction of farm programs. Annual storage costs are down over $225 million. More than that—our actions during the past 3½ years have resulted in savings of over $2 billion that would ultimately have been added to the cost of farm programs if the Nation had attempted to continue with programs that were in effect in 1961.

Without our effort, it is entirely reasonable to assume that farm programs would have become impossible to maintain, and farm income would have fallen to less than one-half of what it is today. By averting a surplus calamity, and enactment of new forward-looking programs, we have constructed a base upon which to rebuild a farm program that will enable farmers again to share equitably in the Nation's prosperity.

THE PERIL WE FACE

But, Mr. Speaker, the Nation's agriculture stands today face to face with another peril. It is a political peril.

The Republican candidate for President is pledged, if elected, to the complete destruction of the farmers' price and production stabilization program. The consequence would be bankruptcy in rural America.

The American farmer is the world's most efficient producer. The output of the average agricultural worker in the past decade has increased almost three times as much as the average worker in industry. I will tell you frankly that the thing which burdens my conscience is the failure of our economy—in spite of all our efforts—to reward the farmer's efficiency with income gains as fast as those made by other people in our economy.

The year 1965 will be a year of big decisions for farm programs.

The wheat program will come up for renewal next year. The feed grain program will expire next year. The wool program has just 1 more year to go, and the sugar program is slated to expire at midnight, December 31, 1964—before the new Congress even gets back to Washington. The cotton program must be renewed in 1965.

Regardless of who is elected President, the Congress might vote to continue a cotton program, and a wheat program, and a feed grain program, and a wool program, and a sugar program. But when such bills are laid on his desk, the next President will have it within his power to bring about the "prompt and final termination" of all these programs one by one by the simple stroke of his pen.

This is the farmer's peril.

REPORT TO THE PEOPLE

Mr. Speaker, this Congress now is completing its work, and it is my duty, as chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, to review for the Members of the House, and to advise the country at large, concerning the work of this Congress, and of the administration, in behalf of agriculture. Moreover, I deem it to be my obligation to bring into perspective for the Nation the circumstances of our farmers and their families who have made this the best fed and best clothed nation on earth, and who now feed millions of hungry, freedom-loving peoples around the world.

I deem it my duty, also, to identify the peril of our farm people, and consequently our total economy, from the involvement of their business in partisan politics.

FARMERS' PROBLEMS IN PARTISAN POLITICS

Mr. Speaker, I would be less than frank with my colleagues if I did not tell the House that this review is presented, in one respect, with a heavy heart.

In years past I have been proud to stand in the well of the House and commend Republicans and Democrats alike for their devoted service to the farm families of America. There was a day when we could not tell one party from the other as legislation seeking a parity of position for rural America came into this House for consideration. I recall with great satisfaction those years when I fought shoulder to shoulder with Hon. Clifford R. Hope, of Kansas, then the Republican farm leader.

But, Mr. Speaker, those days and those years are long past.

It is distressing to me that, in presenting this report, I must note that, with very few exceptions, bill after bill in the interest of agriculture has met strong, and ofttimes overwhelming, resistance from the Republican Members of this body. Our Republican friends have made political issues of the policies of our Government that served our farm people so long and so well.

By the best statistics available to me, more than 90 percent of the Republicans were recorded as opposing the emergency feed grain bill, the voluntary wheat program of 1962, and the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962. On the bill to aid western cattle ranges in 1962, Senate Republicans voted 88 percent against it. Republicans voted almost as a bloc against the wheat-cotton bill passed in early April of this year, and against the food stamp plan expansion.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, those who fought hardest against virtually every effort in the Congress to restore a parity position to agriculture now are taking to public platforms shouting the loudest about what the Congress has "failed to do" for agriculture. I hope our farm people will not be misled. I personally like to think of the greater strides we could have made, to bring agriculture into parity position in the Nation's prosperity, if we could have had the cooperation and companionship of those who now so bitterly criticize our accomplishments.

URBAN SUPPORT OF AGRICULTURE COMMENDED

Mr. Speaker, at this point I want especially to commend the Democratic Members of this body who represent urban constituencies for their support of policies and measures in behalf of farm people. There are now only about 135 Members of this 435 Member body who represent districts with predominantly agricultural interests. No farm bill can pass in this body without support from a substantial number of our city friends.

Our Members from the cities have demonstrated that they will not be moved by schemes to prejudice city people against farmers.

It is unthinkable that urban people can be persuaded to such prejudice. A population predominantly predisposed to agriculture controlled the Congress and the State legislatures during the formative and development years of this country, and it was during this time of great rural influence and power that the laws and the free enterprise climate were created for the growth of the greatest industrial Nation on earth. To speculate now that the predominant urban population might turn upon and repress the less numerous population in agriculture would be to suggest that a former rural ascendency should have legislated against the growth of cities. Both propositions are preposterous.

I commend the statesmanship of the Members of this body representing urban constituencies who have supported sound and solid measures essential to the well-being of rural America.

A STORY IN THREE PARTS

Mr. Speaker, to bring this report into proper focus it is best to recount briefly the story of agriculture over the last one-third century. This story is divided into three distinct parts: A 20-year story; an 8-year story, and a 4-year story. These three parts together are unmistakable and implicit in their message on what is good and what is bad for the farm people of this country.

THE 20-YEAR STORY—1933–52 INCLUSIVE

In 1932, our farm people were wracked and wretched in poverty, in the depth of the great depression. The Democratic Party in its platform that year pledged "the enactment of every constitutional measure that will aid the farmers to receive for their basic farm commodities prices in excess of cost."

On this platform, on this pledge, the Nation's farm program was constructed.

This program made the law of supply and demand work for the farmer and not against him. Companion programs turned on the lights in rural America through REA, and soil and water conservation became a national objective and actuality. These and other undertakings brought a rebirth of hope.

Agriculture emerged from the great depression.

Farmers moved on to their greatest era of prosperity in all history.

For 11 consecutive years—1942–52 inclusive—farm prices were at or above 100 percent of parity. The Government actually made a profit of $13 million in its price support operations in the 20 years, 1933 through 1952, on basic farm commodities.

There was prosperity in the countryside. Business on Main Street was humming.

THE 8-YEAR STORY—1953–60 INCLUSIVE

In 1953 a Republican administration was installed in Washington. Mr. Ezra T. Benson became Secretary of Agriculture.

Production adjustment was deemphasized. Price supports were lowered. The farm program, as it had operated successfully for 20 years, was virtually destroyed.

Great surpluses accumulated. Farm prices went into an 8-year slide; and in those 8 years—1953–60—net farm income fell $20 billion below such income in the 8 previous years. Government costs on agriculture ran into the billions of dollars. In fact, more money was spent in those 8 years by the Department of Agriculture than in all the Department's previous 90-year history.

THE 4-YEAR STORY—1961–64 INCLUSIVE

When a Democratic administration returned to Washington in 1961, agriculture again was on the edge of ruin. Farmers were leaving the land by the hundreds of thousands. Many former flourishing Main Street towns were becoming ghost towns.

The new administration and the Congress moved promptly to halt and reverse the downslide in farm income. This we have accomplished. We have worked against great odds. We have found that many farmers lost faith in their own program during those 8 years when Secretary Benson was deliberately destroying this program. We have had to work against the opposition of the majority of our Republican friends. Notwithstanding all these difficulties, gross farm income has increased by $16 billion during the most recent 4 years, as compared with the 4 years prior to 1961. Net farm income is up by more than $3 billion during the same period.

Business on many Main Streets is humming again.

Broad consumer programs, making maximum use of our food and fiber abundances, especially for our needy people, have been established. Food-for-Peace shipments have been multiplied, carrying food and fiber from our farms to more than 100 million people in 100 nations. Community programs are underway in our Main Street towns.

All America, and the millions of people in the free world, are benefiting from the genius of our farmers' productivity.

Mr. Speaker, of course I do not impugn or question the motives of anyone, no matter how reckless or bitter he has been, in opposing sound and sensible and fair and equitable policies and programs for our farm people. However, I am at a loss to understand their position, in view of the foregoing facts and figures, and in view of the independent studies of economists from time to time that have set forth clearly what would happen in this country if our farm program were scuttled.

ECONOMISTS' CONCLUSIONS

I hold in my hand a paper just prepared, on request, by Dr. Walter W. Wilcox, senior specialist of the Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress. Dr. Wilcox was asked to review and draw conclusions from previous and well publicized separate studies by a committee from land grant colleges, by economists at Iowa State University and at Cornell University, by Professor Brandow at Pennsylvania State University, by economists at the Center for Agricultural and Economic Development at Iowa State University, and by Tyner and Tweeten, economists at Oklahoma State University.

Earlier I stated that the 87th and 88th Congresses had averted a catastrophe in agriculture, by halting the destruction of the farm program.

Dr. Wilcox utilized the methods developed in these earlier studies at Iowa State, Cornell, Pennsylvania State, and Oklahoma State, and has concluded that, in the absence of price support and acreage diversion programs, net farm income in 1961, 1962, and 1963, instead of averaging $12.6 billion a year, as it actually did, would have plunged to $6 billion. Moreover, he states that, under these circumstances, farmers' realized net income in 1964 and 1965 would not be expected to average more than $6 billion.

Mr. Speaker, it is true that the job we have done, to avert catastrophe in agriculture, has been costly. I have said on previous occasions, and I repeat and emphasize now that, outside of money spent on the weapons of defense against foreign enemies, this probably is the best investment the American taxpayers have made.

The study by Dr. Wilcox shows that for each $1 the Government expended on price support and acreage diversion programs during the last 3 fiscal years, farm income increased by $2.36. This margin has been the difference between bankruptcy and solvency.

Mr. Speaker, I repeat that this was a good investment. It has prevented a catastrophe in agriculture that would have sent a shock wave through the whole economy.

And, I repeat, I cannot understand what has moved our Republican friends to oppose the steps that had to be taken, for the good of all of us. And I cannot understand the position of the Republican candidate for President, when he calls for a complete scuttling of the farm program.

THE FARMER AND FREE ENTERPRISE

Mr. Speaker, the basic and unique difficulty in agriculture is that so many are engaged in the production of a single crop that individuals cannot measure their production so the whole crop commands a reasonable price in the marketplaces.

It should be obvious to everyone, in these circumstances, that so long as his capacity to produce far exceeds the demands of his markets, the farmer cannot expect to achieve stability of income and an equitable share of the Nation's prosperity, unless: First, the producers of the various crops develop bargaining power in the marketplaces, as other industries in our free enterprise economy have done, by placing restraints upon production and/or by orderly movement of commodities into the markets; or second, the Government, by various devices, subsidizes farm income to make up the difference between what the farmer receives in the marketplaces and a reasonable income representing the management, skill, labor and land, and machinery and materials he invests in the production of food and other farm commodities.

So there are obviously three roads open to agriculture:

First. Production adjustments and orderly marketing, to make the law of supply and demand work for the farmer, and not against him. This gives the farmer bargaining power in the marketplaces. He can command a parity price in the domestic market, and he is entitled to an equalization payment in his long-established export market. The cost of such programs is relatively small.

Second. Subsidy programs to bolster the income of those farmers who voluntarily hold down their production. Such programs are very costly, as we have seen in recent years.

Third. No price or production stabilization programs at all. Net farm income would drop to less than one-half what it is today. Government expenditures for stabilization operations would be eliminated completely.

Mr. Speaker, the old farm program followed the first road. The Republican candidate for President would travel the third and last road. Under the old program we placed in the farmer's hands, for use at his own election, the essential tools employed by other industries since the beginning of the free enterprise system, to command a price by measuring production to fit market demands and/or by orderly movement of commodities into the markets.

The old farm program worked, when Republicans and Democrats in the Congress, regardless of political affiliation, wanted it to work, and when the great majority of farmers enthusiastically supported the program.

THE RECORD

Mr. Speaker, the Congress now is ready to adjourn, and all of us will be returning home to report to our people on the service we have rendered here. The best wishes of the farmers of America will go with each Member of this body who has shown some devotion to these people who feed and clothe us.

The deep concern of many Members of this House for the well-being of agriculture is spread vividly in the records of the Committee on Agriculture. These records show that Members of this body introduced in this Congress 455 bills intended to improve the conditions on our farms. Our committee, with its 15 subcommittees, conducted 266 hearings and study sessions. We received hundreds of thousands of words of testimony, from farmers, spokesmen for farm organizations, Department of Agriculture officials, and from others interested in agricultural legislation. We have sought to develop sound and reasonable legislation which would be fair to farmers and consumers alike. We reported 44 bills. Of these, 32 have become law.

Mr. Speaker, in these last 4 years, the progress we have made can be traced in large part to the fact that the farmers of America have had friends in the White House—our martyred President Kennedy and now President Johnson.

Moreover, we have a Secretary of Agriculture, Orville L. Freeman, dedicated to the interests and well-being of farm people.

Many of us, when we return home, will be asked to review the record we have made in behalf of agriculture during these 4 years. Among the accomplishments, along with my foregoing discussion, I shall cite these:

SPECIFIC ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Total net farm income in 1961–63 averaged nearly $1 billion a year higher than in 1960.

Total net income per farm was 18 percent higher in 1963 than in 1960.

Farm purchasing power, or gross farm income, rose from $37.9 billion in 1960 to approximately $42 billion in 1963.

Percent of family income spent for food, by the average American family, declined to only 18.8 percent, the lowest in history, and lower than anywhere else in the world.

Feed grain surpluses have been brought down to manageable proportions; wheat surpluses this year will be the lowest since 1958.

These reductions in wheat and feed grain surpluses are saving taxpayers about a quarter of a billion dollars in storage, transportation, interest, and other costs.

Farm exports have increased by 35 percent in these last 4 years, and reached a record high of $6.1 billion in fiscal 1964.

Credit resources administered by the Farmers Home Administration are up 141 percent over 1960, and are averaging now $687 million a year.

Commodity programs are strengthening the farm income structure.

The rural areas development program has helped create an estimated 125,000 new jobs.

Participation in the agricultural conservation program has increased 20 percent since 1960.

More than 20,000 farmers have received technical help to develop recreation as an income-making crop on land which had been producing surpluses.

Over 600 rural communities have been aided in providing modern water services.

During the school year, 1963–64, a special lunch program was instituted for 315 schools and 12,000 children in rural areas where families have extremely low incomes.

Since January 1, 1961, $1.1 billion in electric loans has been made by the Rural Electrification Administration—about $350 million more than in the previous 3½ years.

Farmers in 1964 have protected crop investments totaling $500.5 million with Federal all-risk crop insurance—more than double the amount of insurance in force 3 years ago.

Two hundred and eighty-nine new small upstream watershed projects have been authorized in the last 3½ years; 3,000 local soil and water conservation districts are in the process of updating their long-range programs to reflect the broadened concepts of economic development; the Great Plains conservation program has been extended for 10 years and 36 counties have been added to the program.

Congress in June 1964 authorized the creation of a National Commission on Food Marketing to investigate the operation of the food industry from producer to consumer.

In the last 3½ years more than $5 billion worth of surplus farm commodities have gone overseas under food-for-peace programs. This is $1.5 billion more than during the previous 3½ years.

AGRICULTURE AND MAIN STREET, U.S.A.

Mr. Speaker, I deeply regret that the well-being of agriculture and of the people in agriculture has been made an object of partisan politics. It is a tragic thing for America. But since this is true, I must say this: The Democratic Party, as reflected in the Congress and in the administration, has stood firm and unwavering in its dedication and determination to achieve again and maintain parity of income and prosperity on the farms of America; moreover, we have established it as our aim, objective and overall goal the restoration, repopulation and revitalization of Main Street America.

Free enterprise—as opposed to baronial, feudal, and communal systems—began with the family farm on this continent. The family farm and the towns in the countryside scattered over the breadth of this land first established the economic foundation for our liberties. The contribution of rural America to the Nation's spiritual, social, and political vitality—down through the years—is immeasurable.

Our cities have created unprecedented opportunities for enterprising individuals to develop and employ their arts, their skills, and their labor. They have advanced the American heritage. They have drawn great strength from our far-flung countrysides, and the well-being of the urban populations will rest in a very substantial way—in the future as in the past—upon the contemporary prosperity and vitality of rural America. Moreover, it is a matter of simple justice that those people who have mastered the art of food abundance, and who have made the United States the best fed nation on earth, must share fully in the national prosperity that this abundance has helped to achieve.

Therefore, it is the purpose of the Democratic Party, as I know this party:

To continue and persist in the development of national policies, in cooperation with—and with the approval of—farmers, enabling the people who produce our food and fiber to enjoy a level of income and a standard of living on a complete parity with those engaged in other undertakings in our free enterprise system.

To adjust and attune Federal policies to the needs and the aspirations of Main Street America, to strengthen existing programs and to develop new, sound and imaginative free enterprise undertakings, as may be approved locally by the people involved, to aid in the bestowal of a new vitality to the many thousands of Main Street towns.

To intensify the use of our food abundance to feed the needy among our own people at home and to relieve hunger and encourage peace among freedom-loving peoples around the world.

To protect the Nation's most vital resources—the land, the streams, the forests—and to develop this wealth for the security and enjoyment of all the people and as a legacy to be bequeathed to the generations to come.

Tribute to Walter Besterman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to a great American, my good and honored friend, Mr. Walter M. Besterman. He has served the U.S. Congress with distinction since January 15, 1946, and is a recognized authority on immigration and nationality law of the United States, both past and present.

It is his true compassion toward all of his fellowmen, together with his great knowledge of history and perceptive understanding of the intricacies involved in the successful conduct of foreign affairs, which has made Walter Besterman so valuable an adviser to the Congress and the House Judiciary Committee.

We friends, feel a sense of personal loss on his departure from Capitol Hill, but we are proud that he was selected to serve the U.S. Government abroad as Deputy Director of the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration in Geneva, Switzerland. This organization was founded in 1951, largely through the inspired vision of Queen Juliana of the Netherlands and the late Honorable Francis E. Walter, and is presently comprised of 29 member nations. Briefly, its function is to assist in the resettlement of migrants and refugees from overpopulated areas in Europe into underpopulated areas of the world. The fact that more than 1.3 million persons have been resettled is eloquent testimony to the effectiveness of that organization.

Newspaperman, diplomat, linguist, and lawyer, no man is more highly qualified to accept the position as Deputy Director of that organization than Walter Besterman. He is no newcomer to Geneva. After receiving his Doctorate of Laws from the Geneva School of International Law, he was assigned as a reporter to the League of Nations. At the outbreak of World War II he was chief of the Warsaw Desk of the United Press and fled his native Poland when Warsaw fell to Hitler's armies.

Walter came to us as a new American, and he has often quipped "I only missed the *Mayflower* by 320 years." But, if Walter came to the United States through adversity, then it must truly be stated "Sweet are the uses of adversity." I know of no person who has more fully accepted or more diligently executed the responsibilities of U.S. citizenship.

It is gratifying to the U.S. Congress to have this fine recognition of Walter Besterman's ability, and to know he leaves us to accept an even more difficult assignment in world affairs.

Clinton Hospital Observes 75th Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, there appeared recently in the celebrated Clinton Daily Item a brilliantly written article by my talented friend and neighbor, Mrs. Carol Powers, entitled "Clinton Hospital Observes 75th Year."

I congratulate the author, Mrs. Powers, upon the splendid research job that she has done, her keen analysis and her thorough-going, penetrating study of the history of the Clinton Hospital, a great charitable institution which has played such a meaningful part for the past three quarters of a century in serving the medical and health needs of the Clinton community and several other towns in the area.

This fine article served a dual purpose. It fittingly contributed to the celebration of the 75th anniversary of this most worthy charitable enterprise, and it emphasized the remarkable leadership, ability, dedication, and public spirit that the Clinton Hospital has been able to command since it was founded 75 years ago.

The Clinton Hospital was the first hospital of its kind to be established in Worcester County outside of the city of Worcester.

At the time of its origin, medical science has not yet moved into the fabulous discoveries and techniques that it has developed since. The X-ray was in its earliest stage, modern diagnostic techniques unknown, surgery in the elementary stage, as measured by today's standards, internal medicine hampered by the absence of modern, scientific techniques, and the "wonder drugs" that are available today.

The whole process of caring for the sick and the disabled was just emerging into the dawn of the new day that was to herald the miraculous advances that were to take place in the latter part of the last century, and especially in the first 60 years of the 20th century.

Mrs. Powers' inspired article has many features to commend it, because it is so comprehensive, so detailed, and so precise in its treatment of every period of the long, rapidly unfolding history of the Clinton Hospital.

Most touching is the recital of the original conception of Clinton's public-spirited, farsighted leaders—their early recognition of the need of setting up a medical center in the town to treat the sick, the disabled, the handicapped, and the underprivileged on the basis of their need, rather than their financial means alone.

The clear vision and unwavering determination of these dedicated leaders who were drawn from every segment of the community—spiritual leaders, doctors and professional men, civic, industrial and mercantile leaders, farmers, workers, consumers and women's groups, is an exciting, as well as a very impressive story. A veritable cross section of the community itself took active part in the early efforts to build, furnish, and implement an institution devoted to the care and treatment of those in the area, who, because of their condition, were unable to help themselves, and urgently required the kind of alleviative and curative therapy and help that only trained medical and nursing specialists working in a suitable environment could provide.

The early struggles of the Clinton community under zealous leaders are well portrayed. That extraordinary, local leadership gave dynamic impulse and wise guidance that inspired men and women in every walk of life in the town is quite evident. Every class and group contributed generously of themselves and their substance and made real sacrifices to make Clinton Hospital a reality. That notable fact is beyond question.

That these humane endeavors continue down to this very hour is also unquestioned. Through every disappointment and obstacle, through periods of discouragement and depression, faced with problems that would defeat and stagger less hardy souls, these resolute, hometown leaders, loyally backed by the community, were inflexibly intent upon achieving their goals.

In every period of Clinton's history, they banded wholeheartedly together to work devotedly, to press militantly, to strive tirelessly, for the growth and improvement essential in order to bring the facilities, the personnel and the standards of the Clinton Hospital to highest possible levels for an institution of its kind.

One thing that stands out with particular clarity is the sound planning, prudent judgment and commonsense of those who drew the blueprints and carried out the plans. There were few visionaries or bleeding hearts among them.

With rare singleness of purpose, these devoted, sensible men and women, and the groups associated with them, never allowed themselves to be sidetracked by temporary differences of opinion or by transient setbacks. They worked for, and they found, that solidarity of purposes, method and objective that enabled them to drive forward together against every obstacle and objection, until they had lifted up the standards and the conditions of the Clinton Hospital from one new plateau to another, marking in each generation and time, the progress and advancement of medical science and modern hospital construction, administration, and procedure.

A great many people participated in the building and improving of the Clinton Hospital throughout the years, and they must, each and every one, receive great credit for their unselfish labors and contributions.

There were outstandingly generous benefactors who gave very substantial funds at every stage and in every period. Many extremely able, dedicated, and devoted doctors, nurses, administrators, and organizations, took a very prominent part in this great work, and many dedicated public officials joined with them to lighten the burden, to smooth the way of progress. All these must be commended and credited, thanked, and given the recognition they so richly deserve.

But there is one, high-minded, gifted doctor and inspired leader, who was, in fact, the moving genius who over a long period brought all these commendable efforts together, the great innovator, whose ideas, concepts, goals, and sterling leadership in several generations, whose persistency, whose vigorous sponsorship, and sure, steady, guiding hand, made him one person who, above all, must be credited with driving through to a successful conclusion the plans which he and the community had early formed to make the Clinton Hospital what it is today.

That man was the late, highly gifted and dedicated, esteemed Dr. Walter P. Bowers, who unselfishly devoted practically his entire life and fortune to the Clinton Hospital and was in truth its modern progenitor and most zealous champion.

It is true, to be sure, that many doctors in every generation, including several of the outstanding men of the present, who give the Clinton community and the Clinton Hospital such high standard medical service, joined him from time to time in his labors, as other leaders of the community did.

It can be said that, while some of these leaders did not always see eye to eye, when the chips were down and the various projects had been finalized, they all got behind Dr. Bowers and labored with him to complete his tasks in the construction, reconstruction, and new construction, and ultimately the modern equipping and implementing of the hospital virtually as we know it today.

Innovator, creator, builder, humane and able medical doctor, leader in his calling, he was ceaseless in his activity, moving forward and upward all the time, never settling for mediocrity, always aiming for, and usually getting, the best.

I can vividly and gratefully recall the many conferences and talks I had with Dr. Bowers and some of the other esteemed staff doctors concerning the plans for the new Clinton Hospital.

Doctor Bowers was clear sighted. He knew what he wanted, and how to get it, and nothing could deter him. He was able to win people over to his ideas, to enlist their cooperation and assistance, and to spark their enthusiasm.

It was Doctor Bowers who set up the very wonderful drive for the relatively large funds that were so urgently needed to construct the new hospital.

Here again, there were many people who helped him, but he was the moving spirit, the dominating figure, the human dynamo, that moved the machinery through difficult periods of fund raising, and the complex patterns of State regulations and governmental directives that had to be complied with in order to qualify the hospital and make it eligible for the direct monetary grants that it was able to get in such generous measure from the Federal Government and the valuable assistance it received from the State government.

At the same time, many applications for Federal aid were pending in the Commonwealth. It was in the early days of the Hill-Burton Act and funds available for Federal grants were quite limited and very strict priorities were established. It was not only necessary for Dr. Bowers, the board of trustees, and the managers of the hospital to arrange for compliance with standards and conditions, but it was also necessary for him to keep track of every single development.

Time and time again, he called upon me to confer with him, to alert me of some new development, some recent obstruction, or some new favorable turn in the general picture that would enable us to make a stronger case with the Federal Government and State officials for the proposed grant under the Hill-Burton Act.

Even at the outset of this constructive legislation, Dr. Bowers consulted with me about the legislative situation in Washington and urged my special interest in pressing for the then pending Hill-Burton law which would make every substantial hospital construction funds available for the Clinton Hospital, and at the urgent request of Dr. Lawrence F. Burke, another one of Clinton's greatest doctors, speaking for the able staff, I helped to coordinate all available information about the status and prospects of the legislation as well as its terms.

Fortunately, following long, sustained efforts, in which I was proud indeed to take a very active part in the Congress, this legislation was passed, funds were appropriated and the Clinton Hospital became one of the first institutions in the State to receive a very substantial grant amounting to nearly $225,000.

This assured the new construction and Dr. Bowers lived to see the realization of most of his dreams for the Clinton Hospital, which his brains, foresight, judgment, hard work and unstinted gifts of most of his personal fortune helped so materially to bring to fruition.

Of special help in our efforts to clear this application through the State board were Dr. Charles F. Wilinsky and Father Robert J. McEwen who steered our application for priority through that body.

Time and space prevents me from mentioning many others in every walk of life in our entire area who worked hard and contributed most generously to build the Clinton Hospital. The unstinted generosity and work of these individuals and families will always be gratefully recalled.

Mrs. Powers' admirable article, which the able, distinguished editor of the Clinton Daily Item, Mr. William Coulter, published in full, thus pinpointing and reemphasizing the memorable contributions of his own distinguished Coulter family, and the Item, to the Clinton Hospital, throughout the years, in service, publicity, and monetary support, well illustrates the great role that public-spirited, generous-hearted, openminded, proud, loyal citizens of Clinton and surrounding towns have played in the important beginnings and the fulfillment of the splendid hospital projects that meant so much in terms of human betterment and progress to so many of Clinton's people and the people of our neighboring towns.

Our New England towns are replete with evidence of the type of public service that conceived and built the Clinton Hospital. Clinton is especially renowned for it in the retrospective sense, and we hope for the continuance of this spirit and this kind of community service, in keenly reawakened form and enthusiasm in the future.

Unfortunately, this kind of unselfish service, this strong, united community spirit, we can view more in the past than in any broad, present sense, and that is something that could concern all of us deeply, because, unless we can keep alive and vigorous that public spirit, that wholesome, whole-hearted, cooperative effort, that all-embracing, fully shared pride in our town, that willingness on the part of our people at the local level, leaders of every level and calling, and the general public alike, to respond to the call of public duty, to take part in town government and the general betterment affairs of the community, and in the extracurricular tasks of government, to promote the broad interests of community life, to work, to give of themselves, to contribute their time, energy, and substances in the accomplishment of necessary public projects and to the sound progress of the community and the Nation, we will all be the poorer for this lack of active, individual responsibility for the public welfare, a primary responsibility of good citizenship, not only in our own community, but in our State and Nation as well.

We urgently need that kind of vibrant, rudimentary, early American public spirit today, if we are to continue in the great tradition of our free system, our illustrious forbears and our historic town, and if we are to continue to enjoy that measure of freedom, democratic idealism, and willingness to give of ourselves, upon which the Nation was founded and has grown to such strength and grandeur. It is up to us to keep that great, creative, communal, and sustaining spirit alive and give it practical expression in our thoughts, words, and deeds, not only in Clinton, Mass., where to be sure, as elsewhere, it is needed, but in every other town, village, hamlet, and city in the Nation. Thus shall we best protect and enrich our great and blessed heritage of freedom for the benefit of all and for countless future generations.

The United States and the Middle East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT TAFT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert the following speech, which I made before the Zionist Organization of America, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point:

THE UNITED STATES AND THE MIDDLE EAST

Dr. Nussbaum, Secretary Harriman, members of the Zionist Organization of America, and your guests, I am deeply honored to be here tonight to discuss with you problems of interest to all Americans. The fact that this is an election year looms large in the minds of many of us, and does not skip those who are candidates. But if ever there was an area of discussion that should be divorced from the realms of partisanship, it is the problems relating to Israel. They are and have been so varied and complicated that they can hardly stand any approach that is not carefully studied and judicious. Yet at the same time, they are so immediate that a moratorium on discussion does not seem desirable or wise. A new look is imperative before it is too late. For that reason many voices have spoken up from both parties. It has long been so.

I remember with pride the fact that the late great Rabbi Abba Hillel Silver first focused my father's attention on the birth pangs of Israel and won his deep interest and lifelong support. I value deeply the help and friendship of his most able son today.

One of my most vivid memories is of my discussions with my father regarding the preparation and delivery by me for him of his last major address, made before the National Conference of Christians and Jews in Cincinnati on May 26, 1953. I shared his sentiments then, and I share them still now, when he said:

"I have been criticized by some because I supported the independence of Israel and have stood on their side against Egypt and Jordan which tried to destroy them. I supported a free Israel because of my earnest belief in justice and freedom and the keeping of promises. The Balfour Declaration during the First World War, the British mandate of Palestine and our own undertakings which tied us in during the First World War and during the maintenance of the mandate, I believe clearly constituted a promise to establish a Jewish national home. A Jewish national home could only mean a state where Jews predominated and could not be ruled or persecuted by others. I believe the state should have been established at the height of the power of the Allies during the Second World War. If that had been done, I doubt if we would have ever had the Israel war, or the fleeing of the Palestine Arabs, or the dangerous conditions in that region of the world today because Israel had to take up arms to establish their own independence, the British having abandoned the mandate. I have supported the movement because it seemed to me it was the only way in which we could assure freedom for millions of Jews who lived in countries where they would always be subjected to intermittent attacks and persecution. I supported it because it undertook to relieve the world of the problem of resettling a large number of Jewish refugees, for which the world had proposed no better solution."

These beliefs he came by naturally. His father and the Congress in 1911 had terminated a Russian trade treaty on account of persecution of the Jews. He came by it intellectually, too, however, for the spirit and strengthening of individual freedom and dignity to which he was so dedicated seem to me to be inherent in the precepts of Zionism.

But while such principles remain everlasting, circumstances and attitudes change with remarkable haste. Reflecting on the dozen years that have passed, much has changed.

The population and economic strength of Israel have expanded greatly. So have the population and power of its Arab neighbors. The number of registered Palestinian refugees is about 1.2 million as compared to the original 725,000, and a new generation of Israeli and Palestinian refugees approach the brink of adulthood with new attitudes and problems.

The original UNWRA tasks of mere sustenance and shelter have shifted to rehabilitation, integration, and resettlement.

The Lebanon occupation and Suez crisis have left their own marks upon the history of the Near East and also of the world.

Nuclear spread and weapons potential cast a long shadow of fear over the existence of any armed conflict, yet, in spite of it, the virus of aggression has spread rather than receded in the Near East. The growth and encouragement of irredentism continues, and the flames are fanned by Nasser at every opportunity. Each step forward toward peace and stability seems to be followed by a step and a half back.

Many of these factors are beyond the control of any one of us or of our country. But we must recognize as an additional and contributing factor that there has been a basic change in, or at least a wide reorientation of, U.S. foreign policy toward avoiding confrontation with problems of international aggression, discrimination, and subversion. Now we attempt to meet them, if at all, only by negotiation and by trade favors and assistance.

In present horrible potentialities of nuclear holocaust, caution and prevention must certainly be paramount. The launching of such a conflict by ourselves must be, and is, wholly abjured, but our leaders seem unable to engage successfully in the bargaining contest with nonmilitary weapons, even though we have a tremendous moral and economic arsenal. Instead, our international relations resemble a labor negotiation with compulsory arbitration at the end of the road, yet we make concession after concession without getting much in return. This often strengthens rather than weakens our adversaries. We hear repeatedly from the State Department that each situation is enormously complicated and must be examined on its own, but the virtual abandonment for expediency of principles such as national self-determination, no benefit from aggression, and freedom and justice for individuals, can win us no respect. In the long run it will damage the likelihood of peaceful solutions. As in jurisprudence, the ad hoc approach eventually breaks down the certainty of and respect for law.

Admittedly, these are generalities. Let's be specific as to the Middle East. In spite of Nasser's continued and increasing threats to Israel, his undiminished military intervention in Yemen, and his machinations to control other Arab nations, we continue our aid to him. These issues arose most recently in relation to an amendment to this year's Public Law 480 food-for-peace bill proposed by Congressman OLIVER BOLTON. This amendment would have eliminated any possibility of the United Arab Republic qualifying as a "friendly" nation, because, as BOLTON put it, "The President has not seen fit to determine that an aggression is going on and is being perpetrated by the United Arab Republic" as the President is authorized to do under the Foreign Aid Authorization Act. Apparently, administration and State Department policy in this regard was expressed by Congressman GALLAGHER, a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, when he said:

"Termination of sales of surplus U.S. foodstuffs to the United Arab Republic would not affect that country's capabilities. It could survive without our food-for-peace program by tightening its belt, reducing the living standards of its people, and increasing its reliance on the Soviets. Termination would not affect the United Arab Republic military program, but it would leave us with reduced influence in the United Arab Republic and throughout the area. By removing ourselves from the United Arab Republic scene, particularly at this critical juncture in Near Eastern affairs, we could help the Soviets recapture without a battle the favored position it held in the post-Suez period when we had no surplus food disposal program in the United Arab Republic."

This statement lays bare the erroneous philosophy of our leadership that we must ignore or overlook aggression for fear the aggressor will turn elsewhere for aid. The contrary is true and the United States aid to Egypt ($204 million in fiscal 1963 and $144.5 million in fiscal 1964) has enabled the diversion of that nation's resources to preparing for and carrying out the business of aggression.

If this were an isolated instance of such policies, it might be excused, but the same attitudes seem to exist with regard to tyrannies of the left and of the right. For some reason, our leaders seem to feel ashamed to speak out and assume moral and actual leadership in foreign affairs even for causes we know are just and against actions we know are wrong. For instance, unlike the 1911 action I referred to before, we see action stymied on congressional proposals, such as my own, condemning cultural and religious repression of the Jews in the Soviet Union. Apparently we have become too sophisticated to point out unpleasant truths. Such a position would cost us nothing, but would hold up to world scrutiny the corruption and falsity of communism and its claims.

Examples of such default of leadership by the United States are unfortunately all too common. We see them in NATO, in the U.N., in the Far East, and especially in the Fulbright approach to the Cuban and Latin American Communist threats. They need not be detailed here. But they have a broad meaning that bodes ill for our position in the Near East, particularly as to the threats to Israel. And, with the Nasser-inspired and supported building of an irredentist army of Palestinian refugees, the time for a firm position is overdue. In spite of this, we find in the President and the administration leaders a great reluctance to use existing powers to cut off aid to Egypt. This was shown in the debate over the Gruening amendment to the foreign aid bill last November, when Senator HUMPHREY first wanted to eliminate the Presidential authority to deny aid if the recipient was merely "preparing for aggressive military efforts." But even he at that time agreed Egypt was actually involved, saying:

"I favor cutting off our aid to Egypt. From the available evidence, it would appear that Nasser is guilty," and again,

"We have ample information in regard to the conduct of Egypt, and there is no doubt about what Egypt has been doing."

How does this jibe with the failure to act, since or now, on the part of the Senator's present running mate?

What then should we be proposing and doing to recapture leadership of the free world on a basis of moral as well as military and material leadership? The course of the big stick is not the answer and can't be in a nuclear age. We will not gain by bullying or threatening. But strong trade, aid, and other economic weapons are in our hands. If we care to use them they can be of tremendous importance. Even so, they may not be half so potent as a clear and unequivocal restatement that we will do what we believe is right, we will do it consistently, and we will not ourselves be blackmailed or bullied.

For a start on such a course, I suggest that we move to cut off aid and trade with nations that we believe to be preparing for military aggression. We can encourage other freedom-loving and peaceful peoples, if necessary by boycott, to do the same.

We should move with dispatch to cause United Nations enforcement of its original Security Council positions and precepts for the Middle East such as free passage through the Suez Canal.

We should take leadership and push for enforcement of the World Court ruling regarding withdrawal of voting rights by those failing to support peacekeeping activities of the U.N. It will not suffice to stand silent as we did in the U.N. Congo troop removal where our fear of offense to Russia in pressing the voting issue apparently dominated our policy or lack of it.

We should push for reform of the U.N. Charter to eliminate the veto and to reconstitute the Security Council as the policy body of the organization. The unplanned buildup of the General Assembly and Secretariat powers are threatening the very existence of the U.N. as a peacekeeping organization. The voting ratios in the General Assembly constitute a particularly severe threat insofar as Israel is concerned.

These suggestions are not radical. They would move toward setting up a meaningful international organization and a body of international law with a U.S. position strongly backing it. The future of Israel and the cause of Zionism would be implemented and the course toward world peace best served. Our country would be answering its challenge with an acceptance of the task of its own "Aliyah." Your organization and your members can have a vast influence upon such a course.

Five Rollcalls Missed During Entire 88th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, during the 88th Congress, it was necessary for me to be absent on five occasions when seven rollcall votes were taken. Had I been present, I would have voted as indicated below:

On rollcall No. 111, April 14, 1964, final passage of H.R. 10809, HEW-Labor appropriations, I would have voted "yea." On rollcall No. 182, July 2, 1964, conference report on S. 2, water resources research centers, I would have voted "yea." On rollcall No. 198, August 3, 1964, on motion to suspend rules and pass H.R. 1096, Ice Age Reserve, I would have voted "nay." On rollcall No. 199, August 3, 1964, on motion to suspend rules and pass H.R. 3672, Colorado-Wyoming reclamation, I would have voted "yea." On rollcall No. 200, August 4, 1964, conference report on H.R. 10939, Defense Department appropriations, I would have voted "yea." On rollcall No. 201, August 4, 1964, to concur in Senate amendment to H.R. 10939, to make 35 percent of funds for repair and conversion of naval vessels available for private yards, I would have voted "yea." On rollcall No. 256, September 3, 1964, on passage of S. 2220, to encourage practice of physicians and dentists in shortage areas, I would have voted "yea."

Alexander Matsas, Ambassador of Greece

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, during my service in Congress, I have had the honor and privilege of receiving various letters of appreciation for the work we do here.

One that I value most highly is a telegram which I received from His Excellency Alexander Matsas, Ambassador of Greece, soon after I introduced my resolution urging justice for Cyprus.

It is a source of great pride to know that Greece, which has written such a heroic record in her brilliant defeat of communism after World War II, should include my efforts and those of my colleagues for our work toward obtaining true justice for Cyprus.

It is my hope that the Congress will interest itself in the great cause of justice for the people of Cyprus. Our own Government as early as 1947 unofficially fostered a plan of "enosis"—reunion with the motherland—which would have turned Cyprus over to Greece.

On thorough reflection, enosis continues to appear as the best vehicle for guaranteeing justice for Cyprus. The free world must at all costs help Cyprus resolve its problems so that there will not be any need for anyone seeking assistance from the Soviet Union or any other nation whose system of government is based on brute force and suppression of human dignity.

Cyprus clearly belongs in the family of free nations, managing its own affairs. The United States and the free world must exert all of their influence to hasten the day when peace and justice, in an atmosphere of complete freedom and democracy, shall again prevail on Cyprus.

Ambassador Matsas' telegram follows:

OCTOBER 1, 1964.

Congressman ROMAN PUCINSKI,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Please allow me to express my warm appreciation for your noble efforts in favor of justice for Cyprus. This cause is based on the ideals of equity, freedom, and democracy which are fundamental to the civilization of both Greece and the United States.

Cordially yours,

ALEXANDER MATSAS,
Ambassador of Greece.

My Voting Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, today is the last day of a long and busy 2d session marking the end of the 88th Congress. As I have in the past, I again feel it my duty to report my voting record to the people of my district, the Second Congressional District of Washington State.

In terms of miles, the Second District is a long way from the Nation's Capital. But from letters and from the response I have received to my annual district opinion questionnaire, I know that the people of my district are very much aware of the complex problems facing their Federal Government.

Many, indeed, are the bills that have been introduced in this Congress; 4,948 measures have been introduced in this second session alone. Obviously, a great many of these measures were never brought to a floor vote, and even fewer passed with an official rollcall requiring a definite "yea" or "nay" vote. The important land and water conservation fund bill, for example, passed in the House of Representatives only by voice vote.

Yet an examination of the record rollcall votes reveals that they represented some of the topmost issues to come before the Congress. Therefore, I have confined this record to those votes on which an official rollcall was taken on issues of importance to the Nation and to my district. To make my record as clear as possible, I have listed these votes by categories according to the general fields they encompass. My voting record for the 88th Congress follows:

BILLS OF GENERAL INTEREST

Voted for H.R. 9070, the wilderness bill, to give statutory protection to some 9 million acres of wilderness area.

Voted for H.R. 8070 to establish a commission and conduct a 3-year study of public land laws and regulations.

Voted for H.R. 11926, the Tuck bill, to give States the authority to determine the composition of their individual State legislatures.

Voted for H.R. 6041 to include fringe benefits in the Bacon-Davis Act requirement that workers on Federal construction projects be paid prevailing wages.

Voted against H.R. 8864, a bill providing for implementation of the administration-backed International Coffee Agreement at a resulting price increase of about 16 cents a pound to consumers.

Voted for H.R. 8316 to preserve the independence of American broadcasters by forbidding the Federal Communications Commission to impose rules regulating the length and frequency of radio and television advertisements.

Voted for House Joint Resolution 247 to suspend equal time radio and television requirements for the 1964 Presidential campaign and permit debates between the Republican and Democrat Presidential candidates.

BILLS AFFECTING THE GENERAL WELFARE

Voted for H.R. 11865 to provide a 5 percent across-the-board increase in social security benefits, and to make other changes.

Voted for S. 978 to restore Public Health Service benefits to self-employed commercial fishermen.

Voted for H.R. 12175 to extend the Housing Act of 1964 and to provide for an expanded housing program through June 30, 1965.

Voted for S. 1576 to authorize $238 million in Federal grants to help States combat mental illness and retardation.

Voted for S. 2 to provide Federal grants to States for water resources research.

Voted for House Resolution 579, a motion to consider H.R. 7457, a bill to provide legal assistance for indigent defendants in criminal cases before U.S. Federal courts.

Voted for H.R. 319 to prevent the mailing of obscene material.

Voted for H.R. 7152 to affirm constitutional rights for all Americans.

Voted against H.R. 10222, the administration-backed food stamp bill calling for wasteful spending of $400 million to subsidize food purchases.

Voted against H.R. 11377, the administration-backed poverty bill calling for $947.5 million in fiscal year 1965 alone to finance a series of wasteful programs duplicating State and Federal efforts already costing $100 billion annually.

BILLS AFFECTING GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Voted for H.R. 9140 to appropriate $4.2 billion for fiscal 1964 public works projects, including $1,042,000 for work in the Second District.

Voted for H.R. 5279 to provide fiscal 1964 appropriations for the Department of the Interior, including $205,000 for second district Federal fish hatchery construction.

Voted for H.R. 11579 to appropriate $4.3 billion for fiscal 1965 public works projects, including $1,121,000 for work in the Second District.

Voted for S. 1153 to extend Federal aid for airport construction.

Voted for H.R. 8986 to provide recommended salary increases for 1.7 million Federal employees and executives.

Voted for an economy motion to reduce spending from $115 to $95.7 million under H.R. 9666, the fiscal 1965 Peace Corps authorization bill.

Voted for an economy motion to kill S. 2214, a bill proposing an additional U.S. contribution of $312 million to the International Development Association.

Voted for an economy motion to limit expenditures under H.R. 10723, a bill appropriating funds for congressional committees and the Architect of the Capitol on matters of public record.

Voted against H.R. 6009, a bill to increase the public debt limit to $307 billion during May and June 1963, and to $309 billion during July and August.

Voted for House Resolution 504 to investigate ways of eliminating costly duplication in Federal research programs.

Voted against H.R. 3881, the administration-backed bill calling for $375 million from general taxation to finance mass transit systems in a few major cities.

BILLS AFFECTING NATIONAL DEFENSE, MILITARY PERSONNEL, AND THE NATIONAL SECURITY

Voted for H.R. 1927 to increase veterans' pensions and to liberalize other benefits under the Veterans' Pension Act of 1959.

Voted for H.R. 5555 to increase pay rates and retirement pensions for members of the uniformed armed services.

Voted for H.R. 9139 to appropriate $1.6 billion for fiscal 1964 military construction, including $693,000 for new construction at Paine Field and the Blaine Air Force Station.

Voted for H.R. 11369 to appropriate $1.6 billion for fiscal 1965 military construction, including $459,000 for a new telephone exchange and aircraft holding apron at Whidbey Naval Air Station.

Voted for H.R. 2440 to authorize $15.9 billion for the fiscal 1964 purchase, research, and development of military weapons, including the RS–70 experimental airplane and additional nuclear submarines.

Voted for H.R. 9637 to authorize $17 billion for the fiscal 1965 purchase, research, and development of military weapons, including ships, airplanes, and missiles.

Voted for H.R. 10945 to authorize $2.6 billion for the Atomic Energy Commission in fiscal 1965.

Voted for H.R. 10456 to authorize $5.2 billion in fiscal 1965 for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

Voted for House Resolution 249 to provide operating funds for the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

Voted for H.R. 950 to enforce strict security standards for employment with the National Security Agency.

BILLS AFFECTING FOREIGN POLICY

Voted for House Joint Resolution 1145 to support the President's stand in retaliating to attacks against U.S. Naval forces in the Bay of Tonkin off North Vietnam.

Voted for a motion which, if passed, would have cut $585 million from H.R. 7885, the fiscal 1964 foreign aid authorization bill. Voted against the foreign aid authorization bill on final passage.

Voted for a motion which, if passed, would have blocked the sale of American wheat to Russia by striking lending authority for the sale from H.R. 9499, the fiscal 1964 foreign aid appropriations bill. Voted against the foreign aid appropriations bill on final passage.

Voted for an economy motion which, if passed, would have cut $222.2 million from H.R. 11830, the fiscal 1965 foreign aid authorization bill. Voted against the foreign aid authorization bill on final passage.

Voted for a motion which, if passed, would have cut $248 million from H.R. 11812, the fiscal 1965 foreign aid appropriations bill. Voted against the foreign aid appropriations bill on final passage.

Voted for a motion to amend H.R. 12298, the Agricultural Trade and Development Act, to prohibit the sale of surplus U.S. farm goods to nations controlled or dominated by Communist governments. Voted for a 3-year extension of amended H.R. 12298 on final passage.

Voted for House Concurrent Resolution 343 to insist that the United Nations collect back assessments owed by member nations.

Voted for S. 2701 to authorize a feasibility study to find a second canal route to supplement the Panama Canal.

Voted for H.R. 4374 to proclaim Winston Churchill an honorary U.S. citizen.

BILLS AFFECTING BUSINESS AND THE GENERAL ECONOMY

Voted for S. 1007 to guarantee Pacific Northwest users a first-call preference on hydroelectric power produced in the Pacific Northwest, primarily at facilities of the Bonneville Power Administration.

Voted for H.R. 8363 to provide an $11.5 billion cut in Federal income and corporation taxes.

Voted against H.R. 6755, a bill to extend corporation taxes and "temporary" exise taxes imposed during the Korean war.

Voted for a motion on H.R. 11376 to, in effect, reduce retailer's excise taxes on certain items from 10 to 5 percent, and to permanently repeal such taxes on July 1, 1965.

Voted against H.R. 8000, a bill to impose a retroactive tax on the purchase by Americans of certain foreign securities.

Voted for H.R. 11611 to establish a national commission to investigate the problems of automation and technology.

BILLS AFFECTING EDUCATION

Voted for S. 3060 to extend financial assistance under Public Laws 815 and 874 to public schools in federally impacted areas.

Voted for H.R. 6143 to authorize $1.2 billion for Federal grants and loans to aid college construction.

Voted for H.R. 4955 to provide an additional $450 million for expanded and improved programs of Federal aid to vocational education; voted against Senate-added amendments to increase cost.

Voted against S. 2220, a bill which, if passed, would have provided for unnecessary reductions up to 50 percent on the repayment of student loans to certain physicians, osteopaths, and dentists.

BILLS AFFECTING AGRICULTURE

Voted for H.R. 1839 to require the President to impose import quotas on beef, veal, and mutton, when imports into this country rise above specified levels.

Voted for H.R. 40 to authorize Federal matching grants to States for the expansion of research facilities at State farm experiment stations.

Voted for H.R. 6242 to require annual Labor Department registration for all labor contractors dealing with 10 or more migrant farmworkers.

Voted against a costly amendment to H.R. 11202, the fiscal 1965 agriculture appropriations bill, calling for construction of a $1.6 million National Peanut Research Center. Voted for the reduced agriculture appropriations bill on final passage.

Voted against H.R. 6196, the administration-backed "cotton-wheat" bill providing for unnecessary subsidies, imposing rigid cotton and wheat acreage quotas, and providing civil and criminal penalties for certain instances of noncompliance.

Mr. Speaker, that concludes my voting record. The political philospher Edmund Burke is said to have remarked that seldom, if ever, "are all of the angels and all of the good" on one side. Certainly this would seem to be true of the many difficult issues that have come before this Congress; on none of them was the entire weight of public opinion solidly on one side. Yet each required a "yea" or "nay" vote. Not everyone will agree with every vote I have cast, but I have always been guided in my decision by what I honestly felt to be best for the Nation and the people I represent. I hope that most persons will approve of my overall voting record.

Los Angeles County Absentee Ballot Applications

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, for the information of those who may seek absentee ballots for the November 3 election and are residents of Los Angeles County, Calif., the following instructions and application form are applicable:

ABSENTEE BALLOT APPLICATION

The application must be signed by the applicant and be received by the registrar of voters between and including the following dates: October 5–27, 1964.

To apply for your absentee ballot, detach the form on the next page, fill in the blanks, sign it, and mail to the registrar of voters.

This form can be used by only one person. If you know of others who need to apply, instruct them to write a separate letter request containing the information called for by the form.

To be counted, your marked ballot must be mailed to the registrar of voters in time for him to receive it by 5 p.m., November 2—the day before the election. So apply for your ballot early, mark and mail it prompty. Do not risk losing your vote by any delay.

APPLICATION FOR ABSENT VOTER'S BALLOT—BY MAIL

GENERAL ELECTION—NOVEMBER 3, 1964

BENJAMIN S. HITE,
Registrar of Voters,
808 North Spring Street,
Los Angeles, Calif.

DEAR SIR: I, ---------- am a voter of Los Angeles County.

I am registered at my home address in Los Angeles County which is ----------.

The only reasons a voter may vote an absentee ballot are as follows: (Check the reasons applicable to you.)

☐ 1. I expect to be absent from my election precinct.

☐ 2. Because of physical disability, I will be unable to vote in my election precinct.

☐ 3. The tenets of my religion will prevent me from attending the polls throughout that day.

☐ 4. I reside more than 10 miles from polling place by the most direct route for public travel.

I am therefore making application for an absentee ballot for the above-named election.

Ballot to be mailed to me at ---------- Street, ---------- City, ---------- State.

----------------	----------------
Date	*Signature of Applicant*

This material also will be contained in my current Report From Congress. It is regrettable that the number of days which Congress has been in session over the past 3 or 4 years has had the effect of depriving citizens at home the opportunity to see and talk with their Congressman to the extent that is desirable. Our colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] discussed this subject with great perceptiveness on Thursday last. His wise remarks struck me so forcefully that I have felt it necessary to extend the following invitation to the people of the congressional district I am honored to represent: "You are cordially invited to meet your Congressman Sunday, October 18, 2 to 4 p.m., Lafayette Hotel Ballroom, Broadway at Linden." My report discusses the reason for this and other matters as follows:

OCTOBER 1964.

DEAR FRIENDS: Congress has been in session almost continuously since January 1963. Getting home to talk with you personally has been a matter of quick trips except for the 2-week recesses for the Democratic and Republican National Conventions.

The Hosmers miss seeing our old friends at home and meeting new ones. We also feel that the people should have the opportunity to see their Congressman, whether they approve of him or not. That is why the afternoon of October 18 has been set aside for this purpose. We surely hope to see you.

As this is written Congress has high hopes of adjourning for the year. That may come to pass before this reaches you—or the situation may change entirely. That is the nature of things in these swift moving times.

In any event, it is certain that a great election will take place on November 3. Vote as you please—but please vote. For those who need it, there is an absentee ballot application form on the last page of this report.

Last month's report promised details of the new social security and veterans' benefits to all who asked for them. The intervening filibuster in the Senate over reapportionment of State legislatures delayed action on these bills and many more. As soon as action is final we'll get the data to you.

The last minute rush characteristic of the closing days of a Congress leaves me hard pressed to give you an accurate report on other measures, too.

It appears an effort will be made to provide the added protection for our Presidents recommended by the Warren report on President Kennedy's terrible assassination.

Also in the mill is a proposed constitutional amendment to cope with the problem of Presidential succession and filling a vacancy in the Vice Presidency. The Nation has been without a Vice President for periods totaling 37 years. This amendment would permit a President to appoint one, subject to confirmation by the House and the Senate.

Although neither of these measures may pass this year, both are needed and likely to be enacted by early 1965.

A surprising number of people asked for the agriculture bulletins mentioned in the last report. It takes some time to get them together. Please be patient if yours have not arrived—they will be along soon. The supply has been used up, so no more requests can be honored.

This operation went smoothly except for the joker who sent in a request for a bulletin on bedbugs in another person's name. The sweet lady who got it was pretty irate for a while. I hope my apologies have made us friends once again.

As my 12th year in the Congress nears closing I want to express real appreciation to you for making this service meaningful and personally satisfying. You have written and spoken freely to me of the grave problems facing our country and the hopes and aspirations we share for an even better America. Together during these years we have worked toward realization of this dream.

More often than not we have agreed on particular issues. When there has been a difference of views, we've both understood that no two people ever see everything exactly the same. We have respected each other's judgment. In fact, often it is impossible to know—and seldom is it crystal clear—whether passing or not passing a specific law will be best for the United States in the long run.

The important thing is that our basic objectives are one and the same—a strong America and the freedom and well-being of its people.

Best personal regards,

CRAIG HOSMER,
Member of Congress.

Hon. John Pilcher

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I extend to Congressman JOHN PILCHER my sincere good wishes on his retirement from the Congress. Congressman PILCHER can well be proud of his service to his district and his country. I know that his many friends here in the Congress will miss his counsel and friendship.

The President, in selecting JOHN PILCHER to head the regional office of emergency planning in Georgia, has indeed chosen a well-qualified man. I know that the successes which he has attained as a legislator will follow him in his new position.

I extend to Congressman PILCHER my sincere good wishes for continued service to the people of this country in his new endeavor.

Address by Hon. Hubert H. Humphrey to Democratic Executive Committee of Cuyahoga County, Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, September 27, 1964, Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, the Democratic vice presidential candidate, attended the annual steer roast sponsored by the Democratic Executive Committee of Cuyahoga County at Euclid Beach Park and delivered a stirring address before an audience of approximately 12,000 people.

Senator HUMPHREY presented a dramatic record of the achievements of the Kennedy-Johnson administration and closed with a profound statement on immigration policy.

Senator HUMPHREY's address follows:

TEXT PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BY SENATOR HUBERT HUMPHREY, DEMOCRATIC VICE PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE, AT DEMOCRATIC STEER ROAST, CLEVELAND, OHIO, SEPTEMBER 27

Today I speak to one of the greatest Democratic gatherings in America.

This steer roast has known many dramatic moments. But none can surpass the visit 4 years ago of a courageous and eloquent young Senator from Massachusetts—the Democratic candidate for President of the United States.

Many of you will recall his vision of a greater America: "I would like it to be said that in our administration, our country moved here at home: It began to solve the problems that face our people; it put special emphasis on education, because no free society can survive without the best educational system in the world; it took care of our children and gave medical care to the aged, so that our older citizens could live out their lives in some security * * * I would like it to be said that we ended discrimination of all kinds in the United States * * * We want fair treatment for all Americans."

This was a vision worthy of a great Democratic President and a great Democratic Party. And for a dynamic and unforgettable 1,000 days, our beloved John F. Kennedy kept his promises to America. And when he was taken from us, and the whole world faltered, it was Lyndon B. Johnson who stepped forward bravely and told the Nation: "Let us continue."

As the running mate of President Johnson, I rejoice to say that with your help, we shall continue to move America forward.

The Democratic Party believes in the philosophy of government expressed by Woodrow Wilson, when he said: "I believe in democracy because it releases the energy of every human being."

To Democrats, people are partners in the government. Government exists for the people, because of the people, and is answerable to the people—all of them.

Believing this, and acting upon it, a Democratic administration began to release the energies of America and bring opportunity to all its people.

Four years ago, our economy was floundering in the midst of the third recession in 8 years. Today it is enjoying the longest sustained growth in all our history—releasing the energies of the American enterprise system.

Four years ago unemployment was dangerously high and no plans were made to meet the effects of automation or absorb new people coming on the labor market. Today employment is at an all-time high of 72 million people and we are slowly cutting the unemployment rate—releasing the productive energies of American workers.

Four years ago there were no plans to improve the woefully inadequate facilities of higher education to educate our children. Today, we have provided means to construct facilities, add new institutions, and provide more loans—releasing the intellectual energies of American students.

Four years ago our economically depressed areas had been ignored. "Poverty" was an unmentionable word—even though millions of Americans lived in its misery. Today the ARA, the accelerated public works, and the antipoverty bill are law—releasing the dormant energies of forgotten towns and forgotten people.

Four years ago the moral issue of human rights had not been faced. Today the civil rights bill has been passed—releasing millions of Americans from the indignities and humiliations of second-class citizenship.

Four years ago the world remained gripped by the tense, oppressive black cloud of nuclear fright and anxiety. Today the test ban treaty has been signed and we have taken the first steps toward a lasting peace—releasing the world from the effects of radioactive fallout.

Four years ago John F. Kennedy set before you a vision of a better America. You responded to this vision. America responded. And we started to move forward.

This progress did not just happen. It took courageous leadership. It took government that cared for people, identified with them, and above all trusted them.

Ohio has shared in the progress of these past 4 years. Your manufacturing employment is up. Your educational institutions have grown. Your retail sales are up. Your cities have begun urban renewal and to attack the problems of our rapidly growing urban society.

This thriving city of Cleveland is the eighth largest city in the United States. But Cleveland is going to get larger. So are all of the many large cities in this State. You still have problems to work out in urban renewal, in clean air and water, in good transportation, in decent homes for all of the people.

Industry in Ohio must grow and innovate to provide jobs for all your people. But likewise the considerable agriculture of this State must not suffer neglect. The wonderful orchards and vineyards of this Western Reserve, and the varied agriculture all over the State must be strong—both for you and for the Nation.

On election day, Cleveland—and all America—has a choice. You can choose the party of Wilson, Roosevelt, Truman, Kennedy and Johnson—the party that believes in releasing the energies of America. Or you can choose those who have said "No" to every constructive piece of Democratic legislation in the past 4 years, and will continue to say "No" to the challenges of the next 4 years.

You can choose the Democratic Party that seeks to revise and improve our outdated and inhumane immigration system, or you can choose those who seek to replace the Statue of Liberty with an iron, padlocked gate.

What is wrong with immigration legislation that has been supported by the last four Presidents of the United States—including General Eisenhower?

What is wrong with an immigration bill permitting family unification of blood relatives of U.S. citizens?

What is wrong with a bill providing for immigration of persons with special skills and exceptional ability needed by the United States? Such people will not take jobs away—they will create jobs in our economy.

What is wrong with a bill providing for refugee asylum for persecuted persons?

It is not a question of opening the "floodgates." It is a question of opening the "fairgates" to admit 45,000 more immigrants—one-fortieth of 1 percent of our present population.

I believe we will be a better nation when those 45,000 live among us.

I believe we will be a prouder, richer nation when the administration's immigration bill becomes law.

I believe we will be a more compassionate and commonsense nation when it becomes law.

I was proud to testify for the administration bill in these words: "A great society is not a closed society. It is open to enriching ideas and contributions of many cultures. It thrives on diversity. Immigration reform means substantial progress toward this goal. If our society sincerely judges its members on worth instead of birth, then our immigration policy should be based primarily on merit."

Worth—not birth—that is the Johnson-HUMPHREY promise to you. It is our pledge. It is our faith.

We have a job to do in the next 6 weeks. Let us make November 3 a resounding V-day—V for voting; V for victory—for all that is just, noble, courageous and decent in American life.

In every precinct, in every ward, in every State, we must spend the next 6 weeks unleashing the energies of our people in behalf of Lyndon B. Johnson and his vision of the great society.

We have a job to do. We must keep America moving forward.

Statement on Conference Report on Rule of Law Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, in the conference on the foreign aid bill, H.R. 11380, we agreed to adopt the rule of law amendment to section 620(e) of the act. This amendment modifies the act of state doctrine as laid down by the Supreme Court in the Sabbatino case by making clear that Federal and State courts are to be free in cases before them involving acts of foreign states to enforce principles of international law, including the requirement for prompt, adequate, and effective compensation in cases of expropriation as spelled out in the first part of section 620 (e). This amendment, like the rest of section 620(e), is important to the protection of investment abroad. However, the case in our courts may arise or the act of state doctrine be invoked, the amendment will enable a party who has suffered an expropriation in violation of these principles to bring suit asserting his claim to the expropriated property if there is an attempt to market it in the United States or to resist a suit by the expropriating government to seize the property.

I would like to make one point about the January 1, 1966, cutoff date we inserted in the amendment. This will give the Senate Foreign Relations Committee an opportunity to have hearings next year on how the amendment works in practice and whether it should be made permanent. I want to serve notice now that the burden will be on the State Department, which opposed the amendment, to give the amendment a chance to operate in practice and then to show us how the power of the President to suspend enforcement of the amendment in special cases for foreign policy reasons does not amply meet any problems that may arise in the actual conduct of foreign affairs.

The Honorable Wayne Hays

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL ALBERT
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege recently to be invited to a luncheon in honor of a group of NATO parliamentarians who were visiting the United States on a military tour. I was impressed by the dedication of these men to the objectives of NATO and to the improvement of understanding and the dissemination of information among Europeans and North American parliamentarians. I know of no element of our entire foreign policy proceeding which is more vital than that the House of Representatives be vigorously represented on the North Atlantic Treaty Parliamentarians' Conference. The Conference, by virtue of its membership, drawn from the various national parliaments, provides an informal link between the responsible NATO authorities and these parliaments. Through its discussions, it helps to promote a common feeling of Atlantic solidarity in the various legislative assemblies and to further the aims of the Atlantic Alliance.

My colleague, the gentleman from Ohio, WAYNE HAYS, was one of the original sponsors of the Conference and was chairman of the House delegation to the first Conference and all subsequent Conferences. He has served continuously in one capacity or another since 1955, and served as President in 1956–57. This year he is acting as one of the three vice presidents and is also the U.S. member of the standing committee. The Speaker recently named the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS] chairman of the House delegation to attend the 10th annual session of the Conference this coming November in Paris.

Over the past 9 years WAYNE HAYS has done yeoman service on this Conference for the House of Representatives. He and his colleagues are performing a function important to this body and without which it would be impossible for us to keep abreast of the exchanges and activities of the executive organs of NATO and parliamentarians.

I personally want to commend and thank the gentleman from Ohio for the gifts of his time and talents in this significant mission on behalf of the House. His contributions have been of the highest quality. WAYNE HAYS, as is well known, is one of the most effective Members of the House in all of his undertakings. He is also one of our most articulate Members and is a brilliant and highly skilled debater. His forensic ability is a source of both pride and pleasure to his colleagues.

There is no more knowledgeable or effective Congressman than WAYNE HAYS. He has distinguished himself as a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and of the North Atlantic Treaty Parliamentarians' Conference. His knowledge and skills in the latter area particularly are unique and could not be equaled or replaced by any member.

In addition to his distinguished work in international affairs, WAYNE HAYS has also earned the respect of all Members of the House as a strong and competent spokesman for his party. He is knowledgeable on all issues, alert to the problems arising in debate, courageous in his convictions, and certainly is one of the outstanding extemporaneous debaters in the entire House.

WAYNE HAYS is, above all, an effective spokesman for his own district. His people have a strong voice in the House of Representatives. The good work of their Congressman attests to their excellent judgment.

The Late Right Reverend Monsignor Felix F. Burant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago this country lost one of its great benefactors. On August 25, 1964, the Right Reverend Monsignor Felix F. Burant, pastor of St. Stanislaus Church in New York City passed away.

Monsignor Burant's death climaxed a rich and noble life dedicated to the service of others and to the espousal of a multitude of programs of spiritual, cultural, educational, and social significance. His sphere of interests was worldwide in scope but was chiefly centered in human problems. His dedication to his fellow men transcended race, color, or religious beliefs. In time of war he served his country as an Army chaplain, retiring with the rank of colonel. In time of peace he served by enlisting wide support in behalf of the hundreds of thousands of displaced Poles and Polish refugees and escapees. He maintained an active and valued interest in Polish-American organizations.

As a churchman, Monsignor Burant was a dedicated soldier of the cross. He was an active supporter of the Kosciuszko Foundation and a member of the foundation's national council.

Those who knew Monsignor Burant personally mourn the loss of a close and understanding friend and adviser. His church and the people of this country have lost a great humanitarian; a zealous champion of the underprivileged and homeless; and a noble Christian who enriched the country with his many successful achievements. We all shall miss him sorely, but we shall never forget him.

Summary of Congressman Donald Rumsfeld's Voting Record on Some Important Issues During the 88th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD RUMSFELD
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, the 88th Congress has considered more than 2,000 bills, resolutions, and amendments, all of which affect in some measure the welfare and strength of our Nation. Of these, more than 945 have been enacted into law.

I insert herewith a brief series of examples indicating my views and positions on some of the important issues considered by Congress during the past 2 years. The summary follows:

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS AND NATIONAL SECURITY

Toward the goal of world peace and freedom through sound foreign policies—carefully made known to the world and supported by strength—free world alliances, and meaningful international understanding through the United Nations and bilateral diplomacy, I have supported such measures as the resolution approving U.S. retaliatory action in the Gulf of Tonkin—Vietnam crisis—funds for the Laos Control Commission, expansion of the Peace Corps, enforcement of the U.N. Charter provisions denying voting rights to member nations (such as the U.S.S.R.) delinquent in payments for U.N. peacekeeping activities, "food for peace" programs, increased U.S. participation in the Export-Import Bank, U.S. participation in The Hague International Law Conference, and improvements in the ROTC program. While working for the elimination of waste in defense spending, I have generally supported Defense Department appropriations—a necessary expense for the security of the free world.

While supporting multilateral foreign aid through the International Development Agency—IDA—and the principle and goal of foreign aid programs, the continued failure to correct the lack of direction, lax administration, and wasteful practices in present programs led me to support various unsuccessful moves to reduce and revise the omnibus foreign aid bills and to oppose them when many deficiencies were not rectified.

In supporting freer trade, I have opposed such barriers as beef import restrictions and the International Coffee Agreement—which inevitably result in price increases to the consumer—and the equalization tax designed to curb private investment abroad. I supported a 1-year extension of the Mexican farm labor program in preference to a 2-year extension, and opposed continued U.S. aid under Public Law 480 (food for peace) to Nasser and the United Arab Republic in view of continued United Arab Republic aggressions in the Middle East.

ASSESSING LEGISLATIVE PRIORITIES: THE BUDGET BATTLE

Each Congressman has the solitary and painstaking responsibility of carefully studying and evaluating the merits and costs of the many measures considered, and of assessing the urgency and priority of each in the entire legislative spectrum. Thus, particularly in a year with an $8 billion deficit—making total deficits in the past 3 years of over $20 billion—it was necessary to ask not only whether a program was sound and necessary, but, also, whether it was of sufficiently high priority that it should take precedence over other worthwhile programs.

FEDERAL SPENDING

Traditionally, appropriations bills cover many dozens of items for various departments, agencies, and programs. Frequently, some obviously wasteful or unwise proposals, which could not pass on their own merits, are purposely tacked on to bills which contain many meritorious items. For example: A $7,500 pay increase for Congressmen, which I opposed, was tacked onto the postal workers' and Federal employees' pay increases; the creation of an Agricultural News Service which would compete with privately owned news services, which I opposed, was included in the agriculture appropriations bill; 30 unbudgeted public works "pork barrel" projects which were not adequately justified were included in the omnibus public works appropriation bill which also carried funds for the Atomic Energy Commission; and, a swimming pool for the unnecessarily luxurious new congressional office building, which I opposed, was included in the legislative appropriation bill, which also carried funds for the worthwhile activities of the Library of Congress. In such instances, I have opposed the bills knowing that if defeated, the undesirable items, as indicated in the debate, would be removed and the bills then returned for passage in more acceptable form.

I supported reductions in Federal income taxes to be contingent upon limits on Federal spending. When the bill in final form omitted these limitations, I opposed it. In addition, I supported cuts in corporate taxes, and, on two occasions, reduction in excise taxes. Having opposed excessive Federal spending, I also opposed all four Federal debt limit increases in the past 2 years.

CIVIL RIGHTS

I supported every civil rights measure to come before the 88th Congress, including extension of the Civil Rights Commission—1963—various amendments to prevent discrimination in Federal programs such as Federal aid to medical schools, et cetera, and the comprehensive Civil Rights Act of 1964, as well as aid to indigent defendants in Federal courts.

EDUCATION—THE TOOLS FOR TOMORROW

In the belief that the future of this country depends upon giving our people the tools with which to become contributing citizens in an increasingly technical society, I supported improved vocational education programs and expansion of the Manpower Retraining Act—both designed to assist unemployables—mental health and retardation legislation, grants for training and facilities, expansion of the National Defense Education Act, student loans, et cetera, and the Nurses' Training Act.

In addition, I sponsored legislation to provide for individual income tax deductions for educational expenses. This approach came within a few votes of passing in the Senate. Believing the tax deduction approach to be a sound one, and in view of current Federal deficits and other considerations such as the rejection by the House of an antidiscrimination amendment to the Federal aid to medical schools proposal, I opposed that measure as well as the higher education bill. Certainly, the area of education will continue to be of vital concern to our Nation.

CONSERVATION

To conserve, develop, and utilize our Nation's natural resources, I have supported such measures as the national wilderness preservation bill, the outdoor recreation bill, the land and water conservation fund, in addition to other conservation programs.

BUSINESS, LABOR, AGRICULTURE

I supported such measures as legislation to improve protections in the over-the-counter securities market, the atomic energy bill to facilitate commercial use of nuclear materials, a National Commission on Technology, Automation and Economic Progress, and amendments to improve the Davis-Bacon Act on prevailing wage rates and fringe benefits for labor. I opposed such measures as expansion of the programs of Federal aid to local libraries, feed grain subsidies, wheat-cotton subsidies—which increased the price of bread—massive Federal aid to local transit, while approving of "demonstration projects" through the Housing and Home Finance Agency such as the "Skokie Swift," as a spur to local initiative, and area redevelopment programs which have financed construction of golf courses, cocktail lounges, and so forth, often in competition with private enterprise.

Bills providing for increased social security benefits, funds for Alaska earthquake relief, and improvements in housing and urban renewal programs received my support. Measures which I opposed included the food stamp plan, which unwisely superseded sound existing programs for distribution of surplus food to the needy, and the $975 million Antipoverty Act of 1964, which will result in bypassing of State agencies. I did support Congressman FRELINGHUYSEN's alternative to the antipoverty bill, which was a reasonable expansion of existing programs which have proved effective in combating poverty, not by the dole but by increased vocational education, retraining, and so forth, and which would have utilized existing Federal and State agencies rather than create a superbureaucracy and establishing direct Federal-city relationships, thereby bypassing State governments, as was the case in the administration bill. Finally, I supported such measures as the Hill-Burton Hospital Construction Act, highway and airport construction bills, limitations on unnecessary travel—"junketing"—by Members of Congress, and repayment to the Seneca Indians for lands taken by the Government.

This summary covers approximately 60 of the issues which were considered by the 88th Congress. Complete information on any aspect of the work of the 88th Congress is available on request through my office—room 241, Cannon Office Building, Washington, D.C., 20515.

State Department Security Procedures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILWARD L. SIMPSON

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a recent press release issued by my office.

There being no objection, the press release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE DEPARTMENT SECURITY PROCEDURES

WASHINGTON, D.C.—U.S. Senator MILWARD SIMPSON said today the State Department still has on its payrolls "at least 15 top-level officers or employees" recommended for suspension or separation several years ago on security grounds. Senator SIMPSON said the 15—"definitely a minimum figure"—are among 250 listed by the late Scott McLeod as having records about which there were "serious questions." McLeod was Administrator of the Bureau of Security and Counselor Affairs, predecessor to the State Department's Office of Security and Evaluation.

"The 15 possible risks now holding highly sensitive and key positions in our Department of State are above the rank of GS-13," SIMPSON said. "At least 10 of the 15 are below GS-16. All hold jobs of substantial importance, including Deputy Assistant Secretary of State, Office Director, First Secretary of Embassy, Counsel General, and Counsel." SIMPSON said Foreign Service officers "are not unrepresented in the group of 15."

The Wyoming lawmaker stressed that he is not questioning the loyalty or the stability of any of the 15 officers "or anyone else in the State Department. What I do question is the unconscionable and ridiculous system under which these 15 could be retained by the Department without a complete reevaluation and investigation to clear up the original charges that led to recommendations for their dismissal or suspension.

Senator SIMPSON called on the Department of State to use the clear remedy available for determining if the 15 represent security risks by ordering an investigation and reevaluation of their security status. SIMPSON said the reevaluation should not only extend to the 15 officers but also to all State Department officials and employees ever recommended for suspension or separation on security grounds..

Senator SIMPSON explained that security procedures in the Department of State ostensibly prevent security risks from gaining access to sensitive posts or information. He said, however, that top level officers can overrule the security findings of subordinates charged with security evaluation. Numerous top level clearances have been issued to overrule recommendations that certain people be suspended or separated from the Department. SIMPSON said that such top level clearances have come even in the face of unanimous concurrences favoring dismissal. It is clear that in such instances the mere act of ordering or issuing a clearance does not change the facts which led to the adverse recommendation in the first place. In every case during the past 10 years where a security clearance has been granted or ordered by the Secretary of State, the Secretary's action came as an arbitrary repudiation of the judgment of security-conscious subordinates intimately familiar with the case, SIMPSON maintained.

Senator SIMPSON recalled the disclosure early this year of a secret document which listed more than 800 potential security risks 8 years ago in the State Department. He said the list had been compiled by Scott McLeod. Of the 800 listed, there were approximately 250 that McLeod considered questionable in regard to the broad security responsibilities of the State Department.

"There can be no doubt that the summary dismissal of State Department security evaluator Otto Otepka and the subsequent disgraceful treatment to which he has been subjected while awaiting a departmental hearing has a direct relationship to this list," SIMPSON said, "for Otepka is the last top security officer still with the Department from the days when McLeod ran its security."

Senator SIMPSON said the "heavy hands" of both the State Department and the White House are involved in Otepka's suspension and in the suppression of information on potential security risks now in the Department of State.

SIMPSON recalled that Otepka clashed with his superiors in 1962 over the granting of 152 security waivers by Secretary Rusk. The waivers, which Otepka vigorously protested, went to high-ranking State Department personnel, enabling them to skip the customary security investigation. This process had been invoked only five times during the Eisenhower administration.

SIMPSON quoted McLeod as having told his superiors in 1956 that "on the State Department rolls are some 800 individuals concerning whom the Office of Security has information which raises questions in major or minor degree with respect to the criteria of Executive Order No. 10450; namely, questions as to possible past Communist activity or associations, false statements, immoral conduct, homosexuality, intoxication, mental defects, etc. All have been cleared as qualified for access to classified (secret) information."

Senator SIMPSON said he had been informed, "on unimpeachable authority," that the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee has amassed a great volume of testimony and evidence which supports his observations on loose security procedures in the State Department.

The Democrat-controlled subcommittee began an inquiry nearly 3 years ago into conditions in the State Department's Office of Security and has questioned scores of witnesses and accumulated bulky documentary evidence.

"The subcommittee has not published any of its findings and apparently does not propose to do so before the November 3 election," SIMPSON remarked. The reason for the delay, he noted, might be deduced from the statement by a member of the subcommittee that the hearings contained "political dynamite."

"I think the American public is entitled, without further delay, to be informed of conditions bearing on our national security," Senator SIMPSON concluded.

The 88th Congress—A Record of Distinction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. SLACK, JR.

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Speaker, throughout my service in the House, it has been my custom to distribute to my constituents an annual report summarizing the work of this body with particular emphasis on the legislation which will bear directly on the problems of the people residing in the Third West Virginia District.

Legislation was passed in the fields of education, health, and welfare, natural resources, human rights, national security, international affairs, and science and technology.

EDUCATION

In the field of education, the work of this Congress has already been publicly acclaimed. Five important enactments affecting education have emerged:

First. The Higher Education Facilities Act will provide $1.2 billion in grants and loans over a 3-year period to help colleges and universities build classrooms, libraries and laboratories.

Second. The Vocational Education Act provides $956 million in matching grants for the expansion of State vocational education programs during the next 5 years.

Third. The Medical and Dental School Act authorizes $175 million in grants to encourage expansion of these schools, and also provides loans for students of medicine, dentistry, and osteopathy.

Fourth. Amendments to the National Defense Education Act provide increased loan funds for college students and continue the programs to encourage science, mathematics, and foreign language training by extending loans to 70,000 additional students.

Fifth. The Library Services and Construction Act authorizes $25 million to encourage development and expansion of both urban and rural libraries and also provides $20 million for new library construction.

MENTAL HEALTH

One of the historic actions of this Congress, allied to education, must surely be the Mental Health Act, a bold new attack on mental illness and retardation. This act provides $51.5 million over 3 years to train 20,000 teachers of mentally retarded and handicapped children, and authorizes grants for the construction of community mental health centers, emphasizing treatment in patients' home communities. It also authorizes a broad program to prevent and treat mental retardation by providing States and communities with research assistance and facilities for health education and rehabilitation.

NATURAL RESOURCES

Three significant new programs mark a new realization of the need to husband our natural resources in the face of established needs for a growing population:

First. Passage of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act marked the climax to a campaign by conservationists which had been gathering momentum and public support for over 10 years. The fund created by this act will draw revenues from certain existing Federal taxes and user and admission fees. The fund will be available to the States on a matching basis for planning, acquisition, and development of land and water areas for public outdoor recreation purposes. Through this program the Federal Government and the States will begin to acquire on an orderly, pay-as-you-go basis the outdoor recreation facilities that tomorrow's citizens will require.

Second. The Wilderness Act authorizes a national wilderness preservation system, permanently preserving 9.1 million acres of federally owned lands in their primeval state. The classified wilderness lands will be a paradise for sportsmen and campers, and during the next 10 years a study will be made of 52 million additional acres of Federal land to determine whether any of this acreage should be added to the wilderness system. This new program has been hailed as pioneering, landmark legislation; it will certainly go far toward permanent preservation of a priceless national asset.

Third. The Water Resources Research Act establishes a 10-year program of assistance to States in the establishment and financing of water resources research centers. Pollution of our water sources is one of the growing threats to our domestic society, and these research centers will concentrate on specific problem solving to roll back this threat before pollution overwhelms us in our cities and towns.

TOWARD GREATER HUMAN DIGNITY

Our economy presently functions at record levels of prosperity in all respects, but our prosperity has been partly purchased at a cost in social and economic dislocation. This cost is borne directly by the technologically unemployed, by those elderly persons prematurely displaced without adequate income, by the unprepared youth and the rural dwellers bypassed by national growth patterns, and by certain ethnic minorities.

These elements of our society do not and cannot assume their proper role unless their special problems receive specialized attention. Without it they will never be able to participate in the full benefits of American citizenship, bear their share of the taxload, and contribute to the strength of the economy by widening the base of our purchasing power.

The difficulties faced by these people cannot be resolved by endless direct relief programs. There must be businesslike, realistic approaches which not only enliven opportunity and open the door to new skills, but which also underscore the value of human dignity and strengthen hopes for self-improvement.

The 88th Congress passed six major bills endeavoring to recognize the importance of repositioning the less fortunate who have not kept pace with the majority in a growing nation and a prosperous economy.

First. The Economic Opportunity Act, the authorization for the so-called war on poverty. This measure will direct Federal and State efforts toward betterment of the circumstances faced by the 35 million Americans who presently subsist on incomes below the minimum level defined as poverty by recognized economists. These will be the approaches:

(a) A Job Corps to provide 100,000 youths age 16 to 21 with a 2-year vocational training and work experience.

(b) A work training program to enable 200,000 youths to work and train in their home communities on projects selected by local authorities.

(c) A work-study program providing part-time employment for 140,000 needy students to continue in college.

(d) A community action program to encourage urban and rural communities to prepare long-range plans to assist low-income individuals and families to obtain education, employment, job-training, vocational rehabilitation and housing.

(e) A corps of volunteers to serve these ends as a domestic Peace Corps among needy Americans.

Second. Extension of the food stamp plan to national scope. After 3 years of pilot operation in selected counties, the value of the program has been amply demonstrated and the mechanics of operation have been properly refined. The food stamp plan operations since 1961 have established beyond doubt that it not only raises the general health standard of eligible unemployed persons and their families, but also raises income to farmers and retailers while at the same time reducing farm product surpluses held in storage.

Third. Extension until 1967 of the work of the President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime, with its hopeful prospect for developing techniques which will break the poverty-dropout-delinquency-crime cycle among youth. One of the key demonstration efforts in this program is Action for Appalachian Youth, now under way in West Virginia with the support of Federal funds.

Fourth. Extension of the Manpower Development and Training Act, with $531 million in authorized new funds to permit training of 93,000 additional persons and support work training with a literacy training program.

Fifth. The Civil Rights Act, designed to guarantee to ethnic minorities the protection of the Constitution, with particular reference to education, voting privileges and work opportunities, so that all Americans will have an equal incentive to develop their full capabilities and share in the national progress according to their accomplishments.

Sixth. The Public Defender Act, which directs each U.S. district court to guarantee any indigent accused of a Federal crime adequate legal counsel at public expense.

TAX REDUCTION

The Revenue Act of 1964 which reduced income taxes by an average of 20 percent and will result in a net reduction of $11.5 billion in Federal income taxes collected this year, was a bold and unprecedented effort to strengthen the economy. Originally greeted with misgivings because it would certainly cause a budget deficit for the year, the effect of the tax cut has more than supported the forecasts of its proponents. The cut has helped spark the biggest peacetime business expansion in our history, with 4 million more persons employed than in January 1961, and personal income and corporate profits at all-time highs. The gross national product will reach a rate of nearly $625 billion this year, an increase of $120 billion since 1960. Reflecting confidence in the future, the business community plans to invest this year 13 percent more money in new plants and equipment than last year, resulting in even greater job opportunities to come.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AND SPACE

Our defense posture stands at its highest peak of development, and we can be confident that our military forces are stronger than those of any adversary. During the past 3 years we have created a limited war capability to deal with incidents and provocations that enables us to react with a selective response to an aggressor without risking allout nuclear war.

The space exploration has scored notable successes this year and proceeds on schedule from the standpoint of accomplishing military and space travel goals. For the current fiscal year we have appropriated a total of $53.5 billion for defense, military construction, and space program activities, about 60 percent of the entire Federal budget.

At the same time the hope for a lasting peace was given impetus by ratification of the atomic test ban treaty during this Congress, and by promising negotiations which led to an increase of 20 percent in funds for pursuit of a stronger program by the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

VETERANS

A group of measures passed by the 88th Congress adds substantially to the veterans' benefits program. These new enactments will increase pensions by excluding certain types of income in determining pension benefits, thereby providing about $330 million more for veterans during the next 5 years; increase benefits to dependents of veterans who die because of a service-connected disability; permit the Veterans' Administration to waive recovery on defaulted home loans in certain hardship cases; provide educational assistance to children of veterans with total service-connected disability; extend disability income provisions of national service life insurance through age 65 under certain conditions; and authorize a $25 million program of matching aid to States for nursing facilities in State veterans' homes.

LOOKING AHEAD

Two important actions by this Congress launched factfinding missions to explore problems which will require intensive consideration. One measure established a National Commission on Food Marketing to study trade procedure and price relationships from producer to consumer. The other authorizes a National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress to inquire into the question of how we should cope with the loss of industrial jobs because of new methods and machines.

HOUSING AND NURSING HOMES

The Housing Act of 1964 authorizes $1.2 billion to be used for urban renewal, for 45,000 new public housing units, for loans to create housing for the elderly, for farm housing, and for extension of a rental housing program for the elderly in rural areas.

The Nurses Training Act authorizes $287.6 million for a 5-year program for nursing school construction, nurse training programs, and student loans, as a means of expediting the training of the 300,000 additional nurses we will need by 1970, according to estimates by the U.S. Public Health Service.

A Tribute to Hon. Harold D. Cooley, of North Carolina, on 30 Years of Distinguished Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, we cannot adjourn this Congress appropriately without taking note that one of our most distinguished Members, the gentleman from North Carolina, HAROLD D. COOLEY, is completing his 30th year of service in this body.

This gifted Member from the Tarheel State, as chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, is the voice of the farm families of America in the Congress, a pleader for justice in their behalf, and a spokesman for their aspirations and their hopes.

Moreover, he is a worthy, brilliant, and forceful advocate and leader in behalf of all the interests of his district and State, in the councils of Government in Washington and in the country at large.

Mr. Speaker, North Carolina is the world's greatest center of tobacco production and manufacture; it is a great capital of cotton production and textile manufacture; it is the leader among the States in the manufacture of household furniture.

Our colleague, HAROLD COOLEY, has achieved a station in the Congress unique in its opportunities for service to the people he represents. He is chairman of the committee in the House of Representatives which has jurisdiction over the policies and laws relating to tobacco, to cotton, and to forestry in the United States which is the basic raw material of the household furniture industry.

Therefore, this North Carolinian is the leader in this great body on matters pertaining to the three great industries which are the basis of the solid economy of his State—tobacco, cotton, and furniture.

How wisely he has employed this position of influence and strength can be measured by the phenomenal growth of these industries and the progress and prosperity that now prevails in the area he represents in the Congress and generally where these industries flourish.

I will say that I know of no other Member of this body who has better served his people than HAROLD D. COOLEY.

Mr. Speaker, while attending to the particular matters relating to the wellbeing of the people of the Fourth North Carolina District which he represents in the Congress, this North Carolinian has maintained a national outlook. His imprint is upon many pieces of legislation national in scope.

Almost without exception, HAROLD COOLEY has played an important role—since the 1930's—in every piece of legislation that has gone into the making of the overall farm program. Hundreds upon hundreds of complicated and far-reaching bills, which meant new hope to farmers all over the country, have passed through his hands, as a member of the House Committee on Agriculture, and as chairman of this great committee. He is one of the architects of the concept, and the farm program built around this concept, that the farm families of America are entitled to a parity of income with all others who contribute to our total wealth and prosperity under the free enterprise system.

The farm people have nowhere a more dedicated, devoted, and effective friend and advocate than HAROLD D. COOLEY.

Mr. Speaker, our colleague from North Carolina has a natural and unique talent for leadership.

The House witnessed a dramatic demonstration of this leadership on last April 8. In a single day—in a single session of the House—he guided to final enactment three major bills—three of the major enactments of this Congress—the cotton bill, to revitalize the cotton industry of this country; the wheat bill, establishing a voluntary program which has prevented a one-half billion dollar loss to the Nation's wheat farmers in 1964; and the food stamp bill, through which our food abundance will be used in the future more effectively to relieve hunger among the needy in the United States.

This was an achievement of major enactments in one day perhaps without precedent in the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, with HAROLD COOLEY now completing his 30th year of service in the Congress, I want to salute the people down in North Carolina, for their wisdom in sending him here, and keeping him here. We, his colleagues, look forward to enjoying his friendship and to profiting by his leadership, for many years ahead.

Congresswoman Martha W. Griffiths Reports to the People of the 17th District of Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, this final report to the 17th District, as it is presently constituted, is a farewell to the old district and hail to the new district.

It has been a pleasure for the past 10 years to represent you. You have been the best district in America. Whether or not you were for me, I was for you. When I read the local papers I carefully noted the outstanding things that had been done by the people of our district. I loved your intelligent children. I was pleased when they made top records at the academies.

Those of you who live in Redford township, Livonia, Northville, Plymouth, and Northville and Plymouth townships after January 4, 1965, will be a part of either the 19th Congressional District of Michigan or the 2d District of Michigan. Those of you who live in the 22d ward remain in the 17th District. We have also added that part of the 16th ward east of Meyers which is bounded on the east by Livernois, on the north by Eight Mile, and on the south by the Pennsylvania Railroad tracks.

America's chief domestic problem in the sixties has been a persistently high rate of unemployment. Early in his term of office, President Kennedy decided that tax cuts, which would permit consumers to buy more and business to improve their plants, would be one way to increase employment. So, with some fear of inflation or hopelessly increasing the national debt, at last a general tax cut was enacted. To everyone's great relief it worked extremely well. Employment increased, the total amount of taxes collected increased, and business boomed.

In the main, the tax cut lowered the tax rates on individuals from a range of 20 to 90 percent to a new range of 14 to 70 percent and cut corporation taxes from 52 to 48 percent. It removed 1.5 million low-income taxpayers from the tax rolls; gave an overall tax cut of almost 40 percent to taxpayers earning $3,000 or less; gave an average cut of more than 26 percent to taxpayers earning between $3,000 to $5,000; gave an average cut of 20 percent to taxpayers earning between $5,000 and $10,000; and gave an average cut of more than 16 percent to taxpayers earning between $10,000 and $20,000. Reducing Federal taxes by a total of $11.5 billion, the Revenue Act of 1964 increased the take-home pay of every American wage earner. It is estimated that when fully effective the tax cut will add $35 to $45 billion more to the gross national product and approximately 2 million jobs to the economy.

The tax cut, however, is not sufficient to pick up the hard core of unemployed—the illiterate; the unskilled; and the uninformed. In today's world as well as tomorrow's, skill and learning are essential; new skills must be learned throughout your lifetime—at 50 as well as at 15.

The Congress passed two basic measures to help the unemployed qualify for available jobs and to prepare new workers and the current work force for changing employment patterns:

The Vocational Education Act authorizes $956 million in Federal matching grants for the expansion of State vocational education in the next 5 years. As the first major redirection of vocational education since the Smith-Hughes Act of 1917, the legislation will improve existing programs of job training and will develop new programs to fit individuals for gainful employment. Under the act, vocational education will be provided for high school students, high school dropouts or high school graduates preparing to enter the labor market.

The Manpower Development and Training Act amendments strengthen the Manpower Development and Training Act program passed by Congress in 1962 to correct the educational and training deficiencies of the unemployed. The amendments will permit the training or retraining of an additional 93,000 young and adult workers. Through this program, it is believed that 499,000 workers will be able to acquire new skills and a new stake in life.

In further response to the growing awareness of the interrelationship between economic growth and education, Congress acted in other areas of education. The following is a brief summary of major education legislation enacted by the 88th Congress:

First. The Higher Education Facilities Act is designed to assist institutions of higher education to construct needed classrooms, laboratories, and libraries. The act establishes a $1.2 billion program of loans and grants for construction of academic facilities for graduate schools, 4-year colleges, 2-year community colleges, and public technical schools. It is expected that over 2,000 institutions will benefit from this brick and mortar measure in meeting massive enrollment increases of 350,000 students per year.

Second. The Health Professions Educational Act provides a $175-million 3-year program for the construction of schools for the training of needed health personnel. In addition, the act initiates a low-interest loan program to assist medical, dental, and osteopathic students obtain their high cost education. The need for this type of legislation is best expressed in statistics. The average number of persons cared for by each family doctor in the United States has risen from 1,300 in 1950 to 1,700 in 1960. By 1970, the average number of patients per doctor is expected to rise to 2,000. To keep abreast of the physician to population ratio, the number of individuals entering medicine and dentistry must be increased from 12,500 to 19,000 per year.

Third. The National Defense Education Act extension increases funds for the National Defense Education Act student loan program. Since the program was first established in 1958, the Federal Government has been able to assist 600,000 qualified college students in securing a college education.

Fourth. The Nurses Training Act of 1964 provides loans to students of nursing; construction grants for nursing schools; and grants to improve nurses' training. The shortage of trained nurses today leaves 20 percent of our nursing positions unfilled.

Fifth. The Library Services and Construction Act authorizes Federal aid to develop library services in both urban and rural areas and establishes a new program of assistance for library construction. Only 4 percent of our libraries have been built since 1940, and many rural areas are still without library facilities. This act will help city libraries meet the demands of a growing urban population and, what is more, will help make library services available to 38 million Americans in rural areas.

To protect the health and well-being of our citizens, Congress directed considerable attention to problems connected with pesticides, pollution, and mental health.

In the case of pesticides, Congress passed legislation requiring registration and Department of Agriculture approval of pesticides before public sale. To assist in the prevention and control of air pollution and to assure an adequate supply of pure water for the future, Congress passed the Clean Air Act and the Water Resources Research Act.

A new attack was launched against mental retardation and mental illness with the passage of the Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act, and the maternal and child health and mental retardation planning amendments. The programs established call for research aimed at prevention; approved maternal and child health care to reduce the incident of mental retardation; assistance in the training of additional measures of handicapped children; and construction of facilities providing diagnostic services, outpatient and inpatient treatment, as well as transitional and rehabilitative services.

The 88th Congress after 18 years took special consideration on the plight of working women. By amending the Fair Labor Standards Act, Congress enacted the requirement that employees doing equal work on jobs demanding equal skill, effort, and responsibility be paid equal wages regardless of sex. Today, one worker in three in the labor force is a woman. Approximately 7 million women covered by the Minimum Wage Act are now guaranteed they will receive the same pay as men for the same type and amount of work.

To mobilize the vast human and financial resources to combat poverty affecting 35 million Americans, the Congress passed the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. The act will provide vocational training and work experience for thousands of young people aged 16 to 21; jobs and training for unemployed youngsters; part-time employment for needy college students; and assistance to migrant farm families and poverty-stricken farmers.

After more than a year of discussion and debate, the 88th Congress passed the civil rights bill. President Johnson in signing the bill stated:

> The purpose of the law is simple. It does not restrict the freedom of any American so long as he respects the rights of others. It does not give special treatment to any citizen.

In brief, the bill includes the following provisions: First, it bars voter discrimination based on race, color, religion, or national origin; second, it bars discrimination in places of public accommodation if they are in interstate commerce; third, it bars discrimination based on race, color, religion, or sex in employment affecting interstate commerce; fourth, it bars discrimination in any program receiving Federal aid; fifth, it extends the life of the Civil Rights Commission; and sixth, it sets up a Community Relations Service in the Department of Commerce to provide a conciliation service to ease racial tensions in communities threatened by disturbance.

The 88th Congress, in two pieces of legislation, displayed special concern in the protection of our natural resources and the increasing demand for outdoor recreation facilities. The national wilderness bill establishes a national policy for wilderness preservation and sets aside 9.2 million acres of Federal land within the system. The Land and Water Conservation Fund Act establishes a program to improve outdoor recreation facilities at State, local, and Federal levels. Its purpose is to provide a fiscally sound means to meet outdoor recreation demands by assisting States to acquire and develop lands with recreation potential.

In international affairs, the nuclear test ban treaty was ratified by the Senate on September 24, 1963. The treaty signed by the United States, the United Kingdom, and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics bans nuclear weapons tests in the atmosphere, outer space, and underwater. One hundred nations subsequently have ratified this treaty.

Congress enacted the Urban Mass Transportation Act to help overcome a major urban problem—transportation. The act provides $375 million to States and localities for construction and improvement of public and private urban mass transit systems.

Approval of the Federal pay raise bill climaxed a 15-month congressional battle. The Federal pay raise provides a $556.8 million salary increase for all Federal civilian career employees, Federal executives, judges, Members of Congress, legislative, and judicial employees. The congressional pay raise, unlike all other raises which were made retroactive, will become effective January 4, 1965.

Major legislation passed by the 88th Congress pertaining to veterans: first, increases by 10 percent payments to parents and children of veterans who died of service-connected disabilities; second, increases payments to widows of veterans whose death was due to service-connected disabilities; third, increases compensation for veterans suffering complete loss of speech; and, fourth, provides additional compensation for service-incurred loss of hearing in both ears. The Veterans' Pension Act amendments were passed in the final moments of the 88th Congress. The measure increases veterans' pensions and reopens the national service life insurance program to certain World War II and Korean war veterans.

In the last days of the 88th Congress the social security bill with its medicare provision, attached by the Senate, was killed by the conference committee to which the bill had been sent for the purpose of resolving differences in the House and Senate versions of the bill. Failure of this committee to report the measure prevented further vote by Congress. While it is regrettable that the social security bill did not succeed, all Senators were given the opportunity of registering their vote and future intentions on this vital matter affecting millions of older Americans. Unfortunately, the House did not get to vote for medicare.

Johnson Administration Tries To Buy Farm Votes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, to say the least, I was shocked to read a report from one of my constituents who happens to be a township ASCS chairman in Ogle County, Ill., about how the Johnson administration has embarked on a scheme involving an unprincipled and cynical use of taxpayer's money to campaign.

Indeed, I was amazed when I read his report how "the Democrats are really pumping money—taxpayer's—into this campaign."

His letter goes on to say that:

> All chairmen (25) for the county were called into the office on September 18 for a meeting which lasted 45 minutes. For this we received one-half day's pay. We were instructed to visit with about seven people about the farm programs. To answer as many questions as we could—if we could not answer them we were to send the questions to the county office for them to answer. For this we were to receive 1 day's pay.

In his letter to me he added:

> I've been a township chairman for several years now, and I have never seen such a payoff for votes. I know the whole State of Illinois is doing this, and maybe every State—this could cost up to $3 million. I'm for a sound farm program, but not this type of thing.

Mr. Speaker, evidently the Johnson administration has decided to stop at nothing in its drive to perpetuate itself in power for the next 4 years, including bringing into use during the campaign the full resources of the executive branch in the Federal Government in an unprecedented manner, for purely political and partisan purposes. In view of the foregoing, in its political drive, it intends to stop at nothing, including the use of Cabinet officials as political hatchetmen on the hustings. Now we find that the administration not only intends to use the Democratic National Committee's overloaded campaign coffers but also, now at the expense of the American taxpayer, the Johnson administration is using tax dollars taken from the pockets of American taxpayers to foster its own selfish political purposes.

However, I do not believe our farmers are going to be fooled by such a scheme. With the parity ratio at an alltime low of 74 percent and with the distressed and depressed state of affairs in the livestock industry, it is perfectly obvious that the Democratic administration has failed in its promise to American farmers.

Federal Charters for Mutual Savings Banks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Texas, Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN, at the request of the administration, introduced H.R. 12142, on July 30, 1964, which would authorize the establishment of Federal mutual savings banks. I also introduced a companion bill, H.R. 12167, which is identical.

There follows a section-by-section analysis of the bill which should prove helpful to those Members of the House who have asked that such a summary be prepared. I wish to caution those who use it that it is intended as a summary and not a definitive document. Reference to the bill itself is recommended for those who wish to review its provisions in detail. The analysis follows:

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF THE FEDERAL SAVINGS BANK BILL (H.R. 12142 AND H.R. 12167)

INTRODUCTION

The bill has two titles. Title I may be cited as the "Federal Savings Bank Act" and is divided into nine chapters. Title II redesignates the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation as the Federal Savings Insurance Corporation and contains provisions for the transfer of reserves from the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation to the Federal Savings Insurance Corporation of those State chartered mutual savings banks changing their insurance coverage to FSIC. Title II also contains technical and conforming amendments to existing law.

Chapter 1. General provisions

Section 11. Definitions and rules of construction: This section sets forth definitions of certain terms used in the bill, as well as rules of construction, primarily as aids to brevity and uniformity of construction and interpretation.

Section 12. Rules and regulations: This section authorizes the Federal Home Loan Bank Board to make rules and regulations (including definitions) for the "administration, enforcement, or effectuation" of the title.

Section 13. Examination: The Board would be required to conduct one or two so-called regular examinations each year of each Federal savings bank. Special examinations are permitted at any time. The Board will make assessments against the banks "in a manner calculated to yield a total sum approximately equal to the total cost" of these examinations.

The section also provides the Board with the power to render advice and comment, as it deems appropriate, on the affairs of a Federal savings bank.

Section 14. Reports: This section is the Board's authority to require periodic and other reports.

Section 15. Accounts and accounting: This section authorizes the Board to prescribe the accounting systems and practices for Federal savings banks.

Section 16. Right to amend: The right to alter, amend, or repeal this title is hereby expressly reserved by Congress.

Chapter 2. Establishment and voluntary liquidation

Section 21. Information to be stated in charter: This section requires that every Federal savings bank have words "Federal," "Savings," and "Bank" in its name. The charter is to set forth the locality in which the bank's principal office is to be located, and that it is issued subject to the act, amendments thereto, and all other applicable laws of the United States. The Board is authorized to make provision for amendments to charters, and to provide for additional material to be stated in them.

Section 22. Issuance of charter for new bank: The authority of the Board to grant charters is discretionary but the Board must withhold the granting of a charter where the statutory rèquirements have not been met. The Board must find—

(1) That the bank will serve a useful purpose in the community in which it is proposed to be established;

(2) That there is a reasonable expectation of its financial success;

(3) That the operation of the new bank "may" foster competition and "will not" cause undue injury to existing institutions, including commercial banks, that accept funds from savers on deposit or share accounts;

(4) That the applicants for the charter are persons of good character and responsibility; and

(5) That the new bank will have initial reserves of not less than $50,000.

Section 23. Issuance of charter for a converted bank: The Board may issue a charter for a converted Federal savings bank but only after determining—

(1) That the applicant is a mutual thrift institution;

(2) That (in the case of a Federal savings and loan association) at meetings held for the purpose within 6 months prior to the filing of an application with the Board, two-thirds of the directors have voted in favor of such conversion and two-thirds of the votes entitled to be cast by members are in favor of such conversion;

(3) That, in the case of an applicant which is a State-chartered institution, the conversion will not be in contravention of State law; and

(4) That the composition of the converting institution's assets is such that, with such exceptions as the Board may prescribe, the institution will be able to dispose of assets not eligible to be invested in by Federal savings banks.

In addition to the above four criteria, and the qualifications set forth in the bill in subsection (b), referred to below, the other statutory requirements are basically the same as those that apply in the case of an application for a charter for a new institution.

Under subsection (b) the Board is also required to consider the quality of the assets of the converting institution, its reserves and surplus, its expense ratios and such other factors as the Board may deem appropriate for this purpose. Making appropriate allowances for differences among types of financial institutions, the Board must also determine that the institution's history has been "of a character commensurate with the superior standards of performance expected of a Federal savings bank."

Section 24. Conversion of Federal savings banks into other institutions: The Board is authorized to permit a Federal savings bank to convert into any other type of mutual thrift institution. Such an application may not be granted, however, unless the Board finds that certain formal requirements have been met, one of which is the resulting institution will be insured by the FDIC or the FSIC.

The section provides for a 10-year prohibition against the conversion of a Federal savings bank to a stock institution whether taking place directly or through intermediate conversions. The Board (and the FDIC) would be empowered with authority, in the case of a conversion in violation of this section, to terminate the offender's status as an insured institution "without notice, hearing, or other action." The section applies to mergers, consolidations, assumption of liabilities and reorganizations as well as conversions.

Section 25. Voluntary liquidation: A Federal savings bank is permitted to liquidate voluntarily only after a finding by the Board that there is no longer a need in the community for the bank or that there is not a reasonable expectation that the continued operation of the bank will be financially sound and successful, that two-thirds of the bank's directors have voted in favor of the proposed plan of liquidation and that the plan is fair and equitable and meets the requirements of sections 26 and 45.

Section 26. Distribution of assets upon liquidation: Upon the voluntary liquidation of a Federal savings bank, or in the event of any liquidation of any institution while subject to the 10-year prohibition on conversion to a stock institution set forth in section 24 of the bill, any net assets remaining after satisfaction of all proper claims and demands (including those of depositors) shall be distributed to the Federal Savings Insurance Corporation. In the case of involuntary liquidation of a Federal savings bank, any such net assets remaining are to be distributed to the bank's depositors in accordance with such rules and regulations as the Board may prescribe.

Chapter 3. Branching and merger

Section 31. Branches: The section provides that branches may be established by a Federal savings bank only with the approval of the Board and after the Board has determined there is a reasonable expectation of the branch's financial success, that its operation may foster competition and will not cause undue injury to existing institutions, and provided competitive State-chartered institutions are permitted to establish branches or practice chain banking.

The section also provides that a converted Federal savings bank may retain any branch it had in operation immediately prior to conversion as well as any unexercised branching rights, subject to such exceptions and conditions as the Board prescribes.

In the case of a merger, acquisition of assets or assumption of liabilities of another institution by a Federal savings bank, the principal office of the institution which has been merged or transferred into it, as well as any branch operated by such other institution, may, with the approval of the Board, be maintained as a branch. Unexercised branching rights of the merged institution shall also belong to the Federal savings bank, subject to Board approval. However, the Board may not approve such branches unless they could be lawfully established either as a branch or an office of an affiliated institution under State law. On the other hand, if the Board determines that a merger, acquisition of assets or assumption of liabilities is advisable because of supervisory considerations, it may approve the branch(es) regardless.

Section 32. Merger into a Federal savings bank: A Federal savings bank may be permitted to acquire another mutual thrift institution by merger or otherwise, but only with the approval of the Board after its determination that the requirements of this section have been met.

The statutory requirements are basically the same as those that apply in the case of application for a charter for a new institution. The Board must also find that the proposed arrangement will be in the public interest taking into consideration the effect it will have on competition, including any tendency toward monopoly. The section would also require the Board (unless it finds it must act immediately to prevent the probable failure of one of the institutions involved) to request a report on the competitive factors from the Attorney General. Federal bank supervisors are also to be given an opportunity, if they wish to do so, to make such a report.

Section 33. Merger of a Federal savings bank into another institution: This section would permit a Federal savings bank to merge into or consolidate with another institution, or have another institution acquire its assets or assume its liabilities, provided the Board approves. The Board cannot grant such approval unless every party to the arrangement is a mutual thrift institution, that the requirements for approval by directors and depositors have been met and that such other institutions will, after such arrangement is carried out, be an institution insured by either the FDIC or FSIC.

Chapter 4. Management and directors

Section 41. Board of directors: This section requires that a Federal savings bank shall have a board of directors consisting of not less than 7 nor more than 25 members. Management and control of the Federal savings bank is vested in the directors. The Board may prescribe regulations relating to the management structure of Federal savings banks, and subject to such regulations, each board of directors may, by bylaws or otherwise, delegate such functions and duties as it may deem appropriate.

Section 42. Initial directors: The section provides that in the case of a new Federal savings bank, the initial directors are to be elected by the applicants for such terms as the Board prescribes by regulations. A Federal savings bank resulting from the conversion of an existing institution retains the directors it had prior to conversion, unless the Board expressly provides otherwise.

Section 43. Election of directors by depositors: Except in the case of initial directors and directors of converted institutions with "grandfather" rights, directors of Federal savings banks are to be elected by the depositors. The Board is given power to provide by regulation for the terms of office of directors, the manner, time, place, and notice of election, the minimum amount and holding period or date of determination of any deposit giving rise to voting rights, and the method by which the number of votes any depositor is entitled to cast.

Section 44. Selection of directors of banks converted from State-chartered mutual savings banks: This section confers "grandfather" rights upon Federal savings banks converted from mutual State-chartered savings banks allowing them to retain trustee-type boards of directors if they had that type of management on the date of enactment of the act, and continuously retained it up to and including the time of conversion.

Section 45. Approval of proposed merger, conversion, or liquidation: This section provides that a Federal savings bank may make application to the Board for merger, consolidation, transfer of assets or liabilities, conversion or voluntary liquidation only after a two-thirds vote of the depositors or, in the case of banks without depositor voting, a two-thirds vote of those electing such bank's directors. The Board may also on the basis of "supervisory considerations" permit such actions to be taken without such approval. The Board may also set aside these requirements in the case of "an emergency requiring expeditious action."

Section 46. Proxies: The section provides that proxies for the election of directors are revocable at any time. Proxies given with respect to approval of mergers, conversions, or liquidations are revocable at any time, must expire within 6 months, and must specify how the holder is to vote on the proposal for which the proxy is given. The Board is authorized to prescribe regulations governing proxy voting and the solicitation of proxies, to require the bank to disclose the financial interest, compensation and remuneration of those persons proposed as officers or directors and such other matters as it deems necessary for the protection of depositors.

Section 47. General provisions relating to directors, officers, and other persons: The section provides that the directors and officers of a Federal savings bank are in a fiduciary relationship to the bank and its depositors and authorizes the Board to prescribe regulations defining and governing the relationship. A director of a Federal savings bank is prohibited from serving as an officer or director of any other financial institution (commercial bank, a thrift institution, or an insurance company). An exemption to the prohibition is provided for any director of a converted institution who served as a director continuously from the date of enactment of the act. The Board may terminate, however (after opportunity for hearing), the services of such a director if there is an actual conflict of interest or a violation of some other provision of law.

The section also lists the residence and attendance requirements for directors and provides that they may not receive remuneration as a director except reasonable fees for attendance at meetings or for service as a member of a committee of directors. The section also prohibits a Federal savings bank (except under various specified restrictions) from making loans or extending credit, other than on security of deposits, to any director, officer, or employee of the bank, or any person or firm regularly serving the bank in a capacity of attorney-at-law or to any other type of business in which any of the parties have any interest. Additionally, no Federal savings bank may purchase any loan from any of the aforementioned parties except with the prior approval of a majority of directors not interested in the transaction.

Other provisions set forth statutory limitations and prohibitions on those who may serve as officers, directors, or employees of the bank, as well as on certain other types of transactions. For example, one provision provides that, unless allowed by the Board's general regulation, no officer, director, or employee of any Federal savings bank may at the same time be connected with the securities business.

Chapter 5. Sources of funds

Section 51. Reserves: The section sets forth the statutory requirements for the various types of reserves required of a Federal savings bank. In addition to the initial reserves required by section 22 of $50,000, a bank must maintain such other reserves as the Board may prescribe.

Section 52. Borrowing: This section provides that a Federal savings bank may borrow to such extent as the Board may authorize by regulation or advice in writing.

Section 53. Savings deposits: The section would authorize such bank to accept savings deposits, except from foreign governments or official institutions thereof, and except from private business corporations for profit (other than financial institutions acting in a fiduciary capacity), and would also permit the classification of depositors according to the character, amount, duration, or regularity of their dealings with the bank.

Section 54. Time deposits: Section 54 would authorize savings banks to accept time deposits for 91 days or more except from foreign governments and official institutions thereof, or from private business corporations for profit (unless acting in a fiduciary capacity).

Section 55. Authority of Board: The section provides the Board with regulatory authority over the authority given Federal savings banks in section 53 (savings deposits) and 54 (time deposits). Aside from overseeing a bank's program of promising to pay an additional rate of interest on savings deposits based upon a classification of depositors as provided in section 53, it is specifically prescribed in section 55 that "nothing in this section shall confer on the Board any authority with respect to interest rates."

Chapter 6. Investments

Section 61. General provisions: This section would prohibit a savings bank from making any loans or investments not authorized under this act or other provisions of Federal law. However, the Board is given the power to approve the acquisition or retention of assets by a Federal savings bank not so authorized (including stock in service corporations) upon determining that it is necessary or advisable for reasons other than investment.

Section 62. Definitions: This section sets forth definitions of certain terms used to identify eligible investments. For example, a "conventional loan" is defined as one "which is secured by a first lien on a fee simple or eligible leasehold estate in improved real property."

Section 63. Purchases and participations: The section would permit Federal savings banks, subject to the Board's limitations, to acquire by purchase or otherwise any loan or investment, or to acquire by origination or otherwise a participating or other partial interest in any loan or other investment, subject to certain restrictions.

Section 64. Investments eligible for unrestricted investment: Section 64 would permit a Federal savings bank to invest in general obligations of, or obligations fully guaranteed as to both interest and principal by the Federal Government and certain other government corporations, by any State, and certain international financial institutions.

The section also would permit investments in bankers acceptances (eligible for purchase by Federal Reserve banks) and stock of a Federal home loan bank.

Section 65. Canadian obligations: The section would provide authority, subject to certain limitations, for a Federal savings bank to invest in the general obligations of Canada or obligations fully guaranteed as to both interest and principal by Canada or any Province of Canada.

Section 66. Certain other investments: This section would permit a Federal savings bank to invest in general obligations of a political subdivision of a State; revenue or special obligations of Canada or a Province of Canada, a State, or a political subdivision of a State; debentures of mutual thrift institutions insured by the FDIC or FSIC; and corporate obligations (including equity securities). This investment authority would be limited by statutory limitations and would be subject to such further limitations as to amount, and such requirements as to investment merit and marketability, as the Board may by regulation prescribe. For example, not more than 2 percent of the Federal savings bank's assets may be invested in the securities and obligations of the issuer or obligor of such security or obligation. Furthermore, at the time of making investments in equity securities the Federal savings bank must have reserves and undivided profits of at least 5 percent of its assets, such holdings cannot exceed 50 percent of its reserves and undivided profits, and the quantity of equity securities of the same class and issuer cannot exceed 5 percent of the total outstanding.

Sections 67 through 70. Secured and unsecured loans: These four sections would permit a Federal savings bank to invest in loans secured by collateral, a deposit or share account, and/or a life insurance policy, subject to such conditions and limitations as the Board may impose. These banks would also be able to make, subject to such conditions and limitations as the Board may impose, unsecured loans up to $5,000 except to a private business corporation for profit.

Sections 71 through 73. Loans on improved and unimproved property: These three sections would permit nationwide conventional mortgage lending up to 80 percent of value for one-to-four-family residences and 75 percent of value for other types of real property, except as the Board may permit a higher limitation by regulation. These sections would also permit mortgage loans on commercial properties and leaseholds subject to the Board's regulatory powers. Authority would be granted to a Federal savings bank to make property improvement loans and loans upon unimproved property, subject to certain limitations.

Section 74. Guaranteed or insured loans: This section would permit a Federal savings bank, unless otherwise provided by regulations of the Board, to make loans where the repayment is wholly or partially guaranteed or insured by the United States, a State or any agency of either, or as to which the bank has the benefit of such insurance or guaranty or of a commitment or agreement thereof.

Section 75. Loan servicing: A Federal savings bank would be required in those cases where it invests in a loan on a one- to four-family residence more than 100 miles, and in a different State, from the principal office of such bank, to retain an FHA-approved mortgagee in such locality to act as an independent loan servicing contractor.

Chapter 7. Miscellaneous corporate powers and duties

Section 81. General powers: This section includes the usual provisions dealing with corporate powers and duties of a federally chartered institution, such as the right to sue and be sued, adopt bylaws, make and carry on contracts, etc.

Section 82. Service as depositary and fiscal agent of the United States: This section would allow a Federal savings bank, when so designated by the Secretary of the Treasury, to be a depositary of public money and a fiscal agent of the Government.

Section 83. Federal home loan bank membership: This section would provide that upon issuance of a charter to a Federal savings bank, it will automatically become a member of the Federal home loan bank, generally, of the district in which its principal office is located.

Section 84. Change of location of offices: This section would require approval of the Board before a Federal savings bank could change the location of its principal office or any branch.

Section 85. Liquidity requirements: The section would require that a Federal savings bank shall maintain liquid assets consisting of cash and obligations of the United States, as a "general liquidity requirement" of not less than 4 percent or more than 10 percent of the bank's deposits and borrowings. Additional liquidity may be required by the Board (referred to as a "special liquidity requirement") where the composition and quality of assets, or the composition of deposits and liabilities, or the ratio of reserves and surplus to deposits suggests that safety and soundness demand such action. The total of the "general" and the "special" liquidity requirements could not exceed 15 percent of the bank's deposits and borrowings. Penalties are provided for deficiencies in the general or special liquidity requirements. The Board is authorized, when it deems it advisable and subject to such conditions as it shall impose, to permit a bank to reduce liquidity below the minimum amount and during the time of national emergency or unusual economic stress suspend any part or all of these requirements.

Chapter 8. Taxation

Section 91.[1] State taxation: This section limits the authority of a State to impose a tax on a Federal savings bank to that which is no "greater than the least onerous" imposed on other types of financial institutions (except an insurance company). The section also would prohibit taxation of a Federal savings bank by any State other than the State in which the bank's principal office is located unless the bank is doing business therein. Certain types of activities in the mortgage loan business are listed as not falling within the definition "doing business."

Chapter 9. Enforcement

Section 91.[1] General provisions: The section would authorize the Board to act in its own name and through its own attorneys. The Board could also be made subject to suit by any Federal savings bank with respect to any matter under title I, or of its rules or regulations thereunder except as provided otherwise by chapter 9.

Section 92. Cease-and-desist orders: The section would authorize the Board to commence proceedings against a Federal savings bank if it believes a violation of the law, rule, regulation, or an unsafe or unsound practice has occurred or will occur by serving notice of charges upon the institution concerned. The charges must set forth the facts constituting the alleged violation or unsafe or unsound practice and fix a time (ordinarily not later than 60 days after the service of such notice) and place for the hearing. If at the hearing the facts contained in the notice are established, the Board shall issue and serve a cease-and-desist order upon the bank. Such order would become effective 30 days after service and remain effective unless "stayed, modified, terminated, or set aside by action of the Board or a reviewing court." Judicial review of such order must follow the procedure set forth in section 96 of this title. The section also provides that if the Board determines that the continuation of the violations specified in the notice served upon the bank would seriously prejudice the interest of its depositors, it may issue a temporary order requiring the bank to cease and desist from any such violation or practice. Such order would become effective upon service and remain effective until such time as the Board shall dismiss the charges specified in the notice or until the effective date of a permanent cease and desist order takes place. The subject bank within 10 days of service of such temporary order may ask the U.S. district court for an injunction to set aside, limit or suspend the order. Likewise the Board may apply to the U.S. district court for an injunction to enforce any such order.

Section 93. Suspension or removal of director or officer: The section would provide for the temporary suspension or removal by the Board from office of any bank officer or director. The grounds for such suspension may be the violation of final cease-and-desist orders, or the commission of acts constituting a breach of fiduciary duty. Such officer or director must be warned not to continue the violation or unsafe or unsound practice. The administrative procedures and provisions for judicial review are similar to those provided in the case of the issuance of a cease-and-desist order.

Section 94. Conservatorship and receivership: The section provides that the grounds for the appointment of a conservator or receiver shall be: (1) insolvency; (2) substantial dissipation of assets or earnings due to violations of law, rules, or regulations or due to unsafe or unsound practices; (3) unsafe or unsound condition to transact business; (4) willful violation of final cease-and-desist order; (5) concealment of records or refusal to make them available for inspection; (6) consent; (7) termination of membership in its Federal home loan bank; (8) termination of deposit insurance and (9) failure to pay withdrawal applications within 90 days. The authority of the Board to appoint conservators or receivers requires no notice and no hearing. However, the bank may seek judicial review by action in a U.S. district court filed by the bank within 30 days of seizure.

Section 95. Hearings and relief: The section would provide that any hearing set forth in chapter 9 will be held in the Federal judicial district in which the principal office of the bank is located unless the party afforded the hearing, consents to another place. The Administrative Procedure Act applies to such hearing.

Section 96. Judicial review: Any party subject to a proceeding or any person required by an order issued under section 92 to cease and desist certain violations or practices stated therein may obtain review of the Board's order in the U.S. Court of Appeals by filing a petition for review within 30 days of service of the Board's order.

Section 97. Enforcement: The Board may apply to a U.S. district court for the enforcement of any effective and outstanding order issued by the Board under this chapter. The section also limits injunctive and review powers of the court to those provided in chapter 9.

Section 98. Miscellaneous provisions: The section contains ancillary and implementing provisions for carrying out the various orders and includes subpena powers, as well as powers to make rules and regulations.

Section 99. Criminal penalties: The section provides for criminal penalties for those directors and officers who have been removed from office and who knowingly participate in the affairs of the bank or refuse to comply with the demands of a conservator or a receiver for possession of property, business, or the assets of the bank.

---

[1] Drafting error. (Use of the same section number in two instances.)

TITLE II

Section 201. Federal Savings Insurance Corporation: The Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation is redesignated as the Federal Savings Insurance Corporation.

Section 202. Merger, consolidation, or other transfers: This section would apply to any savings bank insured by the Federal Savings Insurance Corporation and would require the Board to approve any proposed merger, consolidation, or other type of transfer. The criteria to be followed by the Board is generally the same as in section 32. Likewise, the Board must request a report on the competitive factors from the Attorney General and advise the other bank supervisory agencies of their opportunity to also comment on these factors.

Sections 203, 204, and 205. Technical and conforming amendments: These sections would amend sections 403, 406, and 407 of the National Housing Act which would require FSIC to insure deposits of Federal savings banks and authorize it to insure the deposits of State-chartered mutual savings banks.

Section 206. Transfer of insurance reserves: This section provides that whenever a State-chartered mutual savings bank, which is an insured bank of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, qualifies to be insured by the Federal Savings Insurance Corporation or is converted, merged, or consolidated into a Federal savings bank, a proportionate share of the reserves of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation attributable to such institution would be transferred to the Federal Savings Insurance Corporation.

Section 207. Limitation of FDIC authority: This section would withdraw the authority of FDIC to grant in the future insurance on the deposits of State-chartered mutual savings banks.

Section 208. Criminal provisions: This section would make certain provisions of the Criminal Code now applicable to banks insured by FDIC also applicable to institutions which are members of any Federal home loan bank, or the accounts of which are insured by the Federal Savings Insurance Corporation. These provisions would also apply to examiners appointed by the Federal Home Loan Bank Board.

Sections 209 and 210. Miscellaneous provisions: These two sections are standard provisions relating to the construction and separability of any provision of this act.

The William McKinley Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, it has been my pleasure in the few moments of respite from the activities of the session and of the campaign to read a new book on our martyred President, William McKinley, written by his fellow townsman and eminent historian, Edward Thornton Heald.

Though considerably shorter than the several other recent biographies of William McKinley, this new book, "The William McKinley Story," contains much that is new and hitherto unpublished about President McKinley's background and associations in Stark County.

It should be an invaluable reference to students and historians who wish to have the facts about McKinley stripped of the speculation and interpretation that is characteristic of other biographies, though this is said not to diminish the value or importance of the other works.

I have many mementos of McKinley and among those I treasure is a copy of the lease signed by him and by my father when my father, C. C. Bow, rented office space in McKinley's building in 1896. My father enjoyed a long and close relationship with the late President and, as the Heald book reports, it was my father's sad duty to be chairman of one of the committees that handled the funeral arrangements.

Edward Thornton Heald, the author, has made the Stark County Historical Society his life work, crowned by the erection a few years ago of the new museum which contains an outstanding collection of McKinley information. Now retired from active direction of the society, Mr. Heald is devoting himself to historical programs of which this book is an outstanding achievement. I hope it will have wide circulation, particularly among students for whom it would be an excellent source of basic material.

Final Newsletter to Constituents of the 2d Session—88th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted, I would like to include in the RECORD the final issue of my newsletter which will be forwarded to my constituency.

The newsletter follows:

RESULTS OF 88TH CONGRESS—2D SESSION

At long last the 2d session of the 88th Congress has passed into history. Unlike the "do nothing" first session of this Congress, this was a "do everything" session. Many of the legislative acts passed were not needed, not desired, and counterproductive of the best interests of the country. This Congress invaded the rights of the citizen more deeply by time after time going beyond that wise limitation established by Abraham Lincoln, when he said, "The Government should do for the people only those things they cannot do for themselves."

In evaluating a Congress, it is well first to look at its fiscal performance. This 2d session of the 88th Congress appropriated a total of $105,962,918,996. By comparison, the 1st session appropriated $103,798,634,671, while the 2d session of the 87th Congress appropriated $102,661,536,812. As a further comparison, the appropriations for the last fiscal year of the Eisenhower administration were $83,799,241,957. Thus, in less than 4 years of Kennedy-Johnson administration, appropriations have gone up over $22 billion, or approximately 32 percent. Even so, this Congress appropriated $4,134,439,560 less than the administration requested. Had this cut not been made, the appropriations for this Congress would have been in excess of $109 billion. I do not intend to indicate that I am satisfied with the Congress performance, but I think it is fair to say that Congress is still acting as some anchor to windward against an executive department which seems bent on spending more and more of the country's substance, and leaving less and less of it for the people themselves to use.

The following bills (and I am only including those which seem to be most important) became law during this Congress:

1. Library Services Act amendment: The original Library Services Act was adopted in order to give some aid to rural and isolated communities in providing bookmobiles, and the like. I was on the Education and Labor Committee when the original bill was passed, and supported it wholeheartedly. However, the amendment, in typical bureaucratic style, tripled the size of the expenditures, and has moved the concept of library services aid into urban areas as well as rural. This has gotten beyond the concept of the Federal Government doing things for the people which the people cannot do for themselves, and therefore I felt it necessary to oppose this extension.

2. Civil rights bill: This bill provided for Federal penalties for the denial of voting, failure to desegregate public schools, discrimination in federally aided programs, and extended the life of the Civil Rights Commission for 4 years. These portions of the bill I favored. However, there was a public accommodations section affecting the operation of restaurants, lunch counters, soda fountains, gas stations, hotels and the like, which I deem to be in contravention of the constitutional guarantees for the peaceful enjoyment of private property. Also, there is a penalty for discrimination in employment practices. I deemed the latter to be desirable, but unenforceable.

While I am just as much against discrimination in public accommodations or employment as anyone can be, in my opinion, this cannot be accomplished successfully by Federal legislation any more than we could successfully bar the sale of intoxicants by constitutional amendment. In both instances, we have tried to legislate in the field of individual morality. It cannot be done.

3. Peace Corps authorization: The key vote came on a motion to recommit to cut the amount authorized from $115 million down to $95.7 million. In my opinion, the Peace Corps has done a good job and has not wasted the money which has been appropriated to it. I, therefore, voted against the motion to recommit, and in so doing gave a vote of confidence to the Peace Corps.

4. Federal employees' pay increase: This bill provides for $545 million more to be spent on salaries for the Federal Establishment each year. In addition, it called for a raise in salary of Members of Congress from $22,500 to $32,500. I voted against it, because I felt that giving Congressmen a raise under the present circumstances would be like raising the pay of a board of directors of a corporation which is operating in the red. When we balance the budget, we will deserve a pay raise.

5. NASA authorization: This bill provided $5.2 billion for activities of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for fiscal year 1965. As a former member of the Independent Offices Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, I have had unusual opportunities to observe the NASA programs. While I have voted to cut the man-in-space program down to the pace contemplated by the Eisenhower administration, I am very much in favor of most of the NASA effort. Therefore, on balance I voted for the authorization bill.

6. Cotton-wheat bill: In my opinion, the philosophy of the bill finally adopted was

all wrong. It will get the Government deeper into agriculture, instead of getting it on the road to extrication. It is an expensive bill to the taxpayer, and, in my opinion, in the long run it is against the best interest of the cotton farmers of our State. Therefore, I voted against the Senate version of the bill, which version has now become law. I had previously voted for the House version, which contained certain safeguards, and pointed toward eventual savings for both the cotton farmer and the taxpayer.

7. Agricultural Appropriations Act: When this bill was being considered, there was a motion to prohibit the use of any funds for payment of export subsidies on any surplus agricultural commodities sold to Communist countries. This very sensible motion lost by 1 vote, with 182 Democrats joining 5 Republicans to defeat it. I voted in favor of the motion, along with 155 other Republicans and 30 Democrats.

8. On June 18, 1964, the House voted 203 to 182 to increase the public debt limit to $324 billion. Not a single Republican voted to increase the debt limit. Personally, I feel that the debt limit is an artificial barrier which has little practical value, unless an administration is in power which has demonstrated its inability or unwillingness to live within its means. I submit that this administration has demonstrated exactly that, and, therefore, I favor using the debt limit to curb public spending as much as possible.

9. Mass transit bill: This bill authorizes a brand new Federal program of grants to States and localities to build or improve mass transit systems. The bill authorizes $375 million over a 3-year period. However, it is well known that this amount is only the beginning, and that eventually this program if continued will call for a Federal outlay of at least $10 billion. I voted against it because many of our localities have already demonstrated that they can attack and defeat their mass transit problems, either by themselves or with the help of the State in which they are situated. Here, again, is a program in which the Federal Government has no business.

10. The land and water conservation bill: This bill provided for the establishment of a fund to assist the States and Federal agencies in meeting present and future outdoor recreation demands and needs of the American people. This appears to be a very meritorious bill, and I voted in favor of its consideration.

11. The wilderness bill: This bill, which has been around for a long time, provides for the establishment of a national wilderness preservation system. The fact that it has been considered for many years, and negotiated between interested parties is borne out by the vote. There were 374 votes in favor and only 1 in the negative. I voted in favor of the bill.

12. Antipoverty bill: This bill has some features which are good, but in my opinion, many more which are bad. Therefore, I voted against it. Many people are pleased with the idea of a job corps being created because they associate it with the fine work done by the Civilian Conservation Corps in the thirties. While I doubt that our present position is comparable to the one we occupied in the thirties, I would be willing to try a job corps, as a means of getting young men off the streets temporarily so that they might be aided in finding themselves. However, it will not solve the problem of school dropouts, undertraining, and juvenile delinquency by itself.

The rest of the bill mainly deals with urban and rural community action programs, providing for grants and loans, mainly for purposes which are already covered in other legislation. In fact, the U.S. Government spends $8 billion a year right now fighting poverty. It is difficult to see how this act can perform the miracles its proponents claim for it.

13. Pay bill for military personnel: This bill increased the pay of members of the armed services. The pay increase is needed, and will help us attract the type of people required to give us really professional armed services. I voted in favor of it.

14. Amendments to the National Housing Act: While I am very much in favor of the Federal Housing Administration program for mortgage insurance, and some of the other phases of our Federal housing program, this bill went far beyond the proper scope of Federal activity. Among other things, it provides for training of people to go into community work. It extends the public facility loan program. It goes further into urban renewal and planning. It even provides for relocation payments for property owners affected by "coal mine subsidence or underground mine fires." Because of the very extravagant nature of this bill, I felt it necessary to vote against it even though I agreed with much of it.

15. A veterans pension bill passed both Houses of Congress in the last few minutes of this session. I voted for the bill. Under this law, every person drawing a pension will receive an increase. Interested veterans will soon be notified by the Veterans' Administration of the exact increase which can be expected. Under this law, World War II and Korean veterans who have service-connected disabilities can purchase up to $10,000 of National Service Life Insurance. This same option is also extended to veterans with non-service-connected disabilities who are uninsurable commercially.

This Congress will also be noted for some of the laws which it did not pass.

1. It did not pass a bill for medical care for the aged under social security. The House of Representatives adopted a bill to provide for an increase in social security payments for which I voted. The Senate tacked on a medicare proposal. The whole bill, including the increase for social security recipients died in conference.

It is particularly unfortunate that the standard provisions of the social security bill did not become law. Not only did they provide for an increase of $7 across the board for social security recipients (which is certainly badly needed), but also provided for a substantial increase in the amount that the people drawing social security can receive from their labors without loss of benefit payments. There is much criticism of the Democratic majority in the Congress and the Johnson administration for allowing all of this legislation to "go down the drain" because the Congress would not pass a bill which included medicare. This is another example of the arrogance of the executive department in demanding that the legislative branch completely abdicate its prerogatives and abandon its own views at the wish of the President. The persons who will suffer from this callousness will be those least able to bear it—social security recipients.

2. Neither the Tuck bill, the Dirksen-Mansfield amendment, or a constitutional amendment to deal with reapportionment cases was adopted. This apparently leaves the Supreme Court and inferior Federal courts free to continue along the same lines they have started insofar as the organization of congressional districts, and of the two houses of State legislatures are concerned.

3. The Appalachia bill was not passed. This was a bill to provide rather massive aid to areas in the Appalachian Mountain regions in the form of grants and loans, for the rehabilitation of these areas. This is a regional antipoverty effort, and will undoubtedly be brought up in the next Congress. I do not plan to vote for it, if I am a Member of the next Congress.

If this Congress has a hallmark, it is the return of subservience of the legislation to the Executive, which was so characteristic of New Deal days. Whether this return has been caused by armtwisting, promises of reward, or other reasons I am unable to tell. Suffice it to say during the early part of the Kennedy administration there appeared to be a lot of independence of thought and action in the House and Senate. I happen to feel that that type of legislative atmosphere is good for the country. Since the succession of President Johnson, legislation has passed which most people would have felt had not the slightest chance of passing, and which I am sure most of the Members of Congress would have voted against, on a secret ballot.

No matter how the elections come out, it is my hope that the independence of Congress will be reestablished in the 89th Congress. The election on November 3 is an important one, as every election is. Vote for the candidates of your choice, but vote.

Visitors: Mrs. Lon Smith, Mrs. Vida R. Grassie, Mr. and Mrs. J. Earl Smith, Mrs. Alice Flickinger, Mr. and Mrs. Horton, Yaeger and Catherine, Mr. and Mrs. Lee Hempy, Mrs. Louis Booker, Jr., Miss Marthanna Booker, Miss Novaline Thurlow, Miss Beatrice J. MacClary, Mr. and Mrs. L. J. Estrada, and Gary, Mr. and Mrs. Richard Fennemore, Mr. and Mrs. G. C. Curran, Mr. and Mrs. D. Jones, Mr. and Mrs. Albert Harward and Paulina, Mr. and Mrs. R. Scheid Roger, and Larry Gault.

Mr. and Mrs. G. Gerber, Dick Spurlock, Mr. and Mrs. Ernest H. Hill, Tom, Gregory, and Pamela, William Bruce Barton, Carole and Mike Cotten.

Mr. and Mrs. Don Sanderson, Sue and Kay, Americo Lazzari, Mr. and Mrs. G. G. Gaskin, Paul R. Madden, Harlen O. Wold, Robert M. Jaap, Chris C. Tountas, Dr. and Mrs. W. Albert Brewer and family, Helen Rymal. Mrs. JoAnn Freeman, and family. Charles B. Bitner, Mr. and Mrs. George Waggoner, Mr. J. D. Waggoner, Virginia A. Canfield, Ralph Gruhn.

Floyd Auckly, Ronald H. Burks, Mr. and Mrs. Ralph Babel, Villa L. Horner, Col. and Mrs. E. M. J. Alenius, Mr. and Mrs. Elmer T. Kemper, Dr. Karl H. Pfuetze, Hon. Priscilla Hays and Bruce, Mr. and Mrs. J. Warren, Mrs. Elmer D. Clark, Capt. and Mrs. Robert Johnson, Mr. Spencer Stewart, Keith S. Brown, Fred H. Bitner, John B. Smith, Jr., Mrs. G. Robert Herberger, Mr. and Mrs. C. L. Spoonmore, S. Ed. Greenwood, Mr. and Mrs. Gordon Green, Ray Adkins, Mr. and Mrs. William Hungerford and family.

Mrs. Jerrey Conroy and Bill, Roscoe C. Hildebrandt, Herman Laffoon, Bill Alcaida, Norman Scott, Homer M. Gilliland, Dempsey Scott, Harry Laffoon, Henry Little, Denise Florence, Agnes Savilla, William J. White, Dick Welsh, William Savilla, William Ray Alcaida, and Peter Homer, Sr.

People—Peace—Prosperity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, all must agree with those who say that this Congress has earned the right to be called the "Do Something Congress."

That is principally so because it has done more than any other Congress for people, for peace, and for prosperity.

We started with hope and optimism. Hardly midway through the session we were thrust into the depths of despair by the tragic and untimely death of our beloved President, John F. Kennedy.

An omniscient Providence, however, had caused us to have ready and able to take the reins of Government a great, a kind, a knowledgeable, a competent leader in the person of Lyndon Baines Johnson.

No one has ever become President of these United States better prepared and with greater capacity to exercise the high and important prerogatives of that exalted office.

Without faltering, he took over and proceeded to implement the programs of his fine predecessor and then continued to move forward with new ones.

People were recognized as human beings with dignity and equality regardless of race, color, creed, or place of origin, by supplementing good morals with good laws and by reenforcement thereof with justice to all.

Peace was promoted by word and by deed, by strength of character and by strength of arms. We are our brother's keeper. His freedom is ours. We cannot let him lose any of his, lest we lose all of ours.

Prosperity is not only a reality, but it is to be sustained and continued and expanded so that all people may live in peace with it.

I have always maintained that although party platforms and campaign pledges are to be run on before elections, they must not be run away from after elections. I have always told my constituents that the party or the candidate that does not perform should be turned out of office. Hence, our constituents have a right to know now as we close this 2d session of the 88th Congress how we measure up.

I hope the country and my constituents take as much pride in the results as I do.

Every liberally oriented group has endorsed my voting record as 100-percent correct. In all things I have acted as I believe the overwhelming majority of my constituents would have done if they occupied my high office.

Once again, as from the beginning of my service in Congress in 1947, I have not missed a single important vote. I have not missed a single vote where my absence could have affected the result, and I have been recorded on every rollcall either by voting or by announcing how I would have voted if present.

It would serve no good purpose to set forth a detailed listing of all the bills we passed in the House, or of all those that were amended either in committee or on the floor and not enacted, or of each of the 625 new public laws enacted. The detailed record is available for all who care to pursue it or to study it.

A statement in general terms will, however, be enlightening, provided we bear in mind that none of us claim that the full job has been done. Much more remains to be done. I hope to have the opportunity to participate in the next Congress in doing some of it.

Here is an abbreviated scorecard.

The first worldwide treaty to outlaw atmospheric testing of nuclear weapons was consummated and approved. Disarmament conferences are being continued and will be pressed with renewed vigor.

Unfortunately we have been compelled to spend tremendous sums of money to keep our defenses strong so that no one will dare attack us. At the same time, we strengthened our alliances of peace and friendship. We will continue our faith in the United Nations and are doing all possible to strengthen it as a peacekeeping force.

Second-class citizenship at home has been outlawed. The new Civil Rights Act guarantees equality and dignity to all races, creeds, and colors. It has been implemented with new aids for enlightenment as well as enforcement.

The war on poverty is now an integral part of the law of the land. National prosperity, the like of which we have never witnessed, is not for the fortunate many alone, it must be and will be extended to the unfortunate few. The personal economic security we provided is a necessary part of permanent prosperity.

One hundred fourteen different programs of Federal assistance sounds tremendous. It is not enough. There is still much to be done. The additional new jobs we created is fine. But we still have too many unemployed. We will continue to try to help them get work.

Equal pay for equal work for women, extended and increased minimum wages, increased unemployment insurance, and tremendous tax cuts are part of what we did to increase our well-being. We have liberalized our social security laws, but medicare must yet be accomplished. Easing the impact of automation is sought by a new law.

Improved mass transportation and more housing and slum clearance will be accomplished under new enactment.

Increased benefits for the aged and disabled veterans have been enacted, but we still have not enacted a proper provision for reinstatement of veteran insurance.

Conservation, recreation, and prevention of air and water pollution have received legislative attention and appropriations.

Hospital construction, training of nurses, medical education, and juvenile delinquency have not been overlooked.

Court congestion has been relieved and a public defender system set up to guarantee to the impecunious a fair trial.

In international affairs, the Peace Corps has proved itself as a great builder of good will, as well as a tremendous aid to the underdeveloped countries.

We have helped our friends and stood up to our potential enemies and to those who are inimical toward our friendly allies.

In the Middle East, we have refused aid to the belligerents and extended the hand of cooperation, technically, and financially to our friends. Israel has been again assured of our help against those who would destroy her, and Nasser and his allies have been warned to behave. The law permitting the President to withhold aid from unfriendly nations, like the United Arab Republic, has been invoked. The Roosevelt amendment to give the President the discretion to withhold the sale of surplus foodstuffs from Nasser was enacted with my support and that of Congressmen CELLER, FRIEDEL, JOELSON, and GILBERT, despite the attempt of a Republican Congressman to embarrass President Johnson with an amendment that would have tied his hands.

This has been a good, hard-working Congress. It has made an excellent record because it has responded to the needs of a mighty forward-looking, and ever-growing Nation, and a fast moving world.

But little of this would have happened, much of it would have been delayed or prevented if not for excellent leadership of the highest, the most patriotic, the most selfless kind.

Thank the Lord, we had that.

We had it in our late beloved John F. Kennedy.

We have it in Lyndon B. Johnson.

We have it in this House in Speaker JOHN W. MCCORMACK and in our majority leader, CARL ALBERT.

May the Lord bless them and keep them safe and healthy in mind and in body so that they may continue to lead us on the paths of peace and prosperity which all good people can travel.

SERVICE TO CONSTITUENTS

A Member of the House of Representatives serves in that body at the discretion of his constituents. In addition to his legislative responsibilities, his duty to them requires him to assist them with whatever problems they may have relating to the Federal Government. As the elected Representative of all the people of my district, whatever their political affiliation, I have urged them to share their views with me and to bring to my attention those problems with which I can assist them by writing to me at my office in Washington: House Office Building, Washington 25, D.C.

Annual Legislative Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am submitting herewith a copy of my annual legislative report for the 88th Congress, 2d session, which will be mailed to the residents of the 13th District of Illinois later this week.

The legislative report follows:

ANNUAL LEGISLATIVE REPORT—1964: 88TH CONGRESS, 2D SESSION

WASHINGTON, D.C.—The campaign banners of most candidates for public office have been fully unfurled for over a month, and, amid the drama of a presidential election year, the now somewhat weary Members of Congress are finally able to head home from Washington for the final month of our campaigns. During the recordbreaking 88th Congress, the House of Representatives has studied, debated, and voted on over 2,000 bills, resolutions, amendments, and motions, which touch on every conceivable topic affecting the welfare and security of our Nation.

Some interesting statistics: The 88th Congress—one of the longest in the history of our country—has filled close to 60,000 pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; 18,700 measures were introduced for consideration, more than 1,600 bills, resolutions, etc., passed the House, and over 945 bills became law.

The role of the Congress: Since the convening of the first Congress, each Member has been charged with the responsibility of helping to accomplish the lofty goals for government set forth in the Constitution, and each measure considered must be tested against these guidelines. Nonetheless, in passing on the legislative proposals which come before us the deliberations are necessarily reduced to practical considerations, such as:

Where can this problem be best solved?—Consideration of the nature of the problem involved, and a judgment as to which level of government, if any, is best suited to handle that problem;

How can this problem best be solved?—Debate as to the workability of the solution proposed; and

Which problems most urgently need attention, which can be deferred?—An evaluation of the financial resources available to meet all problems of Government, and an assessment of the relative urgency of one issue as compared with other problems—keeping in mind that national revenues are not unlimited.

Assessing legislative priorities: "The budget battle": Each Congressman has the solitary and painstaking responsibility of carefully studying and evaluating the merits and costs of the many measures considered, and of assessing the urgency and priority of each in the entire legislative spectrum. Thus, particularly in a year with an $8 billion deficit—making total deficits in the past 3 years of over $20 billion—it was necessary to ask not only whether a program was sound and necessary, but, also, whether it was of sufficiently high priority that it should take precedence over other worthwhile programs.

Attendance record: House average, 78 percent; RUMSFELD attendance, plus 96 percent.

President Johnson called his budget one of "economy and progress" which "carries us a giant step toward a balanced budget." But Representative Clarence Cannon, Democrat, of Missouri, chairman of the powerful House Appropriations Committee, said that "this budget is higher, not lower, than the current year" and "signifies more, not less, spending." Controversy has also centered on alleged recent shifting of expenditures from the current budget year to the prior budget, so as to attribute some of the Johnson deficit to the Kennedy administration. From the standpoint of new spending authority, the 1965 budget unfortunately points to the likelihood of continued Federal deficits.

Bills introduced: Part of a Congressman's responsibility is to identify problems and initiate action to resolve them. I have introduced or sponsored several bills and resolutions, including measures:

To raise the annual earnings limitation (now $1,200) for individuals receiving social security benefits so they may earn more without a reduction in benefits.

To permit individual tax deductions for education expenses. This approach to education financing came within a few votes of adoption when Senator RIBICOFF, Democrat, of Connecticut, offered such a proposal in the Senate earlier this year.

To express the sense of the House of Representatives condemning Government-supported persecution of religious minorities and anti-Semitic practices in the Soviet Union. (A sense of Congress resolution on this subject became law as an amendment to the foreign aid bill in the final days of this session.)

To call for an investigation by the House of conflicts of interest in financial activities of Congressmen and congressional employees.

To permit certain mailing privileges to facilitate disemination of educational material for the blind.

Space Committee work—House Committee on Science and Astronautics: We have seen in the last 2 years some dramatic examples of U.S. space proficiency. As a member of the House Science and Astronautics Committee, I have been privileged to participate closely in the consideration of authorization bills for the U.S. space programs. This Nation is committed to successfully meeting the challenge of space both with respect to civilian applications as well as the military threat which space breakthroughs pose. Our commitments must be met. However, the whole story is not told in headline events such as John Glenn's orbital flight or the Ranger moon landing. There is evidence that the Soviets are directing much of their space effort to military uses, as President Johnson recently confirmed, and it would be folly to overlook the development of this aspect of our space program. Consequently, I introduced a resolution to create a Select Committee on National Space Policy to review and appraise U.S. space goals and priorities. As a member of the Space Committee, I have supported budget restrictions which I believed would not hamper the effectiveness of the space program wherever possible, but have worked and voted to keep U.S. space efforts moving ahead.

Summer intern program: I have instituted a program for college students who reside in the 13th district. Each summer a young man and woman are selected to serve as "congressional interns" for 6 weeks on my Washington staff, to gain practical experience in Government and to encourage interest in public service.

OF SPECIAL INTEREST TO THE 13TH DISTRICT

Aircraft noise: At my request, the House Committee on Science and Astronautics accepted a reallocation of funds within the NASA budget for the purpose of stepping up research programs to alleviate the increasingly critical problem of aircraft noises. Noises from both conventional and jet aircraft today represent a serious annoyance, particularly in urban and suburban areas. With millions of dollars being spent to develop supersonic aircraft, this problem promises to become more critical in future years unless immediate steps are taken to protect the homeowner's peaceful enjoyment of his property while accommodating necessary progress in aircraft development.

Government publications available: Congressmen are provided with materials and publications for distribution to constituents. Examples of the types of material available on request include: reproduced copies of President Kennedy's Inaugural Address, the Pledge of Allegiance, a booklet entitled "Our American Government," another entitled "Our Flag," etc.

American flags: American flags which have been flown over the Capitol can be secured through my office. Sizes: 3 by 5 feet, $2.60; 5 by 8 feet, $5.60. Please include the name and address of the person or organization to whom the flag will be presented.

Academy nominations: Applications are now being accepted from young men interested in attending the U.S. Military, Naval, Air Force, and Merchant Marine Academies for classes entering June 1966. Applicants must be U.S. citizens, between 17 and 22 years of age, single, and residents of the 13th Congressional District of Illinois. Selection is based on merit.

Communication with the 13th district: In addition to frequent speaking appearances, meetings, and visits with civic groups and individuals, I have tried, always, to keep the district informed about legislation and congressional matters through the annual "national issues poll," the "legislative report," my weekly radio "Report from Washington," and periodic "newsletters" on the activities of Congress, mailed to the 13th district residents. These reports are available on request. Please notify my Washington office if you wish to be placed on the mailing list.

WHAT'S AHEAD IN THE NEXT CONGRESS

The 88th Congress has made some strides forward. We can expect even more difficult decisions in the coming years. As we review past accomplishments, it is well to note briefly some problems which still confront us.

World peace: This illusive but ever present goal remains unachieved as wars rage around the globe. There is no more precious possession than freedom, and ours is a heavy but noble and necessary responsibility as the bastion of freedom and leader of the free world.

The economy: Fiscal responsibility, encouragement to economic growth, and serious attention to the problems and benefits of automation are matters of high priority for the coming Congress.

Corruption in Government: Congress must come to grips with corruption in Government and conflicts of interest to assure that those in public office serve but one master—the people. We cannot tolerate another Bobby Baker case.

Congressional reform: The next Congress must recognize that the proper formulation of legislation requires adequate committee staffing for the minority as well as the majority party, and give consideration to placing control of the chief investigating committees of the House and Senate with the party not in control of the White House to assure vigorous investigation of wrongdoing.

The President: We must no longer delay resolving questions relating to Presidential succession, Presidential disability, and Presidential protection.

Other matters: Hopefully, the coming Congress will give attention to the establishment of a "Freedom Academy" to train men to cope with the more subtle, nonmilitary problems of the cold war; demand of the administration improvements in postal service; seriously study the vital question of Federal-State relationships if we are to cope effectively with the problems of a modern, changing, and dynamic society; and give prompt consideration to revision of the burdensome excise tax structure.

These are big orders, and there are no easy solutions. But I am confident that this Nation, blessed with its great human and economic resources, can effectively meet them. The extent to which each individual concerns himself with these challenges and with the working Government, will determine our success in meeting them.

Campaigns, elections, and you: There is no greater force in our society than an informed and expressed public opinion. Each individual has a responsibility to participate in the processes of government by selecting public officials at all levels. In the 1960 election, an average of 205 people per precinct voted for one party, 206 per precinct voted for the other party, and 224 of the potential voters per precinct didn't vote at all. Only 60 to 65 percent of the eligible voters voted in 1960. Illinois was above the average with 75.7 percent, but still below such other nations as Great Britain, 78.7 percent; Italy, 93.7 percent; and Norway, 79.1 percent. The importance of the great national and international issues facing this country demand and require the fullest participation and best judgments of all the people.

Personal note: It is my hope that these legislative reports, which also appear in the

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, have assisted you in considering the work of the 88th Congress. It is a privilege to represent the 13th Congressional District. The interest shown by the people of our district in the issues facing the Congress is a rewarding challenge—a challenge that makes me ever aware of my duty to represent all the people of our district responsibly, energetically, and thoughtfully.

Medical Care for Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I regret very deeply that stubborn insistence upon the social security system as the only medium through which we can provide medical care for the aged apparently will result in another year of deadlock and inaction on this pressing problem, and has postponed for at least several months the increased benefits for those who are drawing social security annuities. I think this is inexcusable.

I have done everything in my power to urge consideration of the Bow bill for medical care for the aged, a program that would do more, on a voluntary basis, at less cost, without inciting the violent arguments that have been aroused by the administration proposal and the threat of Federal control of health care.

I had hoped that it might be possible to enact the Bow bill this year, as a substitute for the plan embodied in the Senate amendments to the social security measure. It now seems that there will be no opportunity to do so.

The responsibility for another year of delay and inaction rests squarely with the leaders of the Democratic majority party who confess that they do not have sufficient votes in the House of Representatives to enact even the Senate version of the King-Anderson bill.

This was an admission that a substantial number of Democrats recognize the inadequacy of the King-Anderson bill and refuse to support social security hospitalization, because, as all of us know, there are 255 Democrat Members of the House, far more than a majority, and a united Democratic membership could pass any measure recommended by the administration if they believed it worthwhile.

The newspapers say that this will now become a political issue. I regret that. It had been a political issue in 1958, 1960, and 1962, and thousands of elderly Americans can tell you from firsthand experience that a political issue never paid for a day in a hospital, or a visit to the doctor, or a prescription drug. I say again, I regret that this may be a political issue for the fourth or fifth successive campaign, but if it is to be one, I want everyone to know that the Democratic leadership is responsible because the Democratic leadership, even recognizing that its own proposal is unpopular in its own party, steadfastly refuses to consider the Bow bill or any other substitute or alternative to King-Anderson unless it is financed by a social security payroll tax and controlled by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

BOW BILL SOLUTION

If the Bow bill could be brought to this House for debate, I predict that it would be enacted into law by an overwhelming margin and by next January 1 any person over 65 could have in his possession the means to acquire either of the comprehensive medical and hospital care insurance proposals outlined in that bill, regardless of his physical condition, regardless of his previous medical history, and on a guaranteed renewable basis for as long as he continued the premiums in force. And the Bow bill would assure him that this Government would make the necessary provisions, through the tax credit or by the medical care insurance certificate, to keep those premiums in force.

I have talked to hundreds of older people about this bill. Some of them have been devoted advocates of the King-Anderson plan, simply because they need assistance and it is the only assistance they have heard about. But when I explain the Bow bill to them, they are pleased, they applaud it, they ask me why the leaders of the House of Representatives will not let us debate the Bow bill, and they ask us why the newspapers of the Nation have given so little information concerning it.

If there is anyone who does not understand the bill, let me discuss it briefly.

INDIVIDUAL CHOICE

It is based upon individual choice. It is a system whereby Government and private enterprise can cooperate to advance the welfare of those older citizens who need help with health problems.

Further, it is a system under which a son or daughter, or any other relative, can discharge his family responsibilities for the elderly without undue financial strain. And it is a system whereby business and industry can extend to retired workers the fine insurance programs now provided for active workers.

The basis for this entire system is an income tax credit not unlike the principle so ably advocated by the gentleman from Wisconsin, the ranking minority member of the Ways and Means Committee.

An individual over 65 would be guaranteed the means with which to pay the premiums on a comprehensive medical care insurance program, the details of which are stated in the bill.

The Federal Government would issue a medical care insurance certificate to anyone over 65 who paid no Federal income tax and who was not insured by reason of any of the other provisions of the bill. He could take that certificate to the insurance carrier of his choice and use it to pay the premiums. The carrier would return it to the Treasury where it would be redeemed for cash, or the carrier might use it in partial payment of its own tax bill.

Every person over 65 whose income, though less than $4,000, was sufficient to require him to pay an income tax of $150 would receive a tax credit in that amount so that instead of paying the tax, he could use the money to buy the medical care program.

Any person who paid the premiums for this protection for a relative past 65 could take the same tax credit, as could any employer with respect to a retired employee.

And for the older persons who pay between $1 and $149 in income tax, the tax would be forgiven and a certificate issued in an amount sufficient to make up $150.

INSURANCE IS AVAILABLE

About this point in the explanation, someone always says that you cannot buy the kind of insurance I am talking about for $150. Or that someone will be left out because he is ill, or had a heart attack. And I can only say to these people that they are not abreast of developments in health insurance. Tremendous progress has been made. Policies that disregard prior medical condition or even current illnesses are commonplace and they cannot be canceled because someone is a bad risk. They are guaranteed renewable. This is a development that private enterprise has achieved in its own efforts to solve the problem, and the achievement should be recognized, applauded, and encouraged.

As to the adequacy of $150, let me say that I took occasion to ask actuaries of several major companies to draw me a plan which would cost that much. They did so. That plan is in the Bow bill. Later, I wrote to some 80 major insurance carriers and asked whether they would issue the kind of insurance described in my bill for $150. More than half replied that they would do so. Some have assured me that they would be able to write even better policies than I have established as the Bow bill minimum because the market of some 14 million people, and the possibility of combining resources to insure large groups, would make a savings likely.

Occasionally, I manage to convince the opponent of this fact, only to have him counter with the argument that my bill would constitute a windfall for the insurance carriers. How, I ask, can anything be more inconsistent? On one hand, they say that a company could not afford to offer the insurance for $150 and, on the other, they charge that it would be a windfall or a bonanza.

Insurance carriers today are trying to solve this problem and, in trying to do so, they are willing to cut costs and profits to the bone or to do without profits.

QUESTION OF PROFIT

But suppose some profit should accrue. Is that a crime in America? Consider how the profits of insurance companies are used today. They are a backbone of development in our economy. They are the financial foundation of countless new economic enterprises. And they pay taxes. We do not expect highway contractors to build our highways without profit. We do not expect food suppliers to deliver goods to veterans hospitals without profit. We do not expect Boeing to build aircraft without profit. Why, then, should anyone question the profit of insurance carriers providing a desperately needed service?

I think we should encourage insurance carriers to perform a service that they are well equipped and trained to do, thus relieving the Government of a burden that it is ill equipped to carry. Why should we create a new bureaucracy in HEW to handle hospitalization when we already have adequate private and nonprofit means of doing so?

A letter from a constituent, one of the thousands who has waited months while his claim for social security disability is processed, wrote to me recently and said he hoped that we would never give the social security administration responsibility for hospitalization. He foresaw the same long delays and endless investigations before admission to a hospital that he is now experiencing before he can collect the disability benefits to which he is entitled. And I could have told him, though I did not, that he was probably right. I am told that in Britain it now takes up to 2 years to arrange for surgery under the British plan of nationalized medicine. Is that what we want for our retired citizens?

It is true that we have made some provisions for the older person who is indigent. The Kerr-Mills Act, in effect in over 30 States, is beginning to provide a good service for the indigent. But I am concerned with those who are not indigent just as much as I am concerned with the very poor. Must an American citizen be reduced to near poverty before anyone will raise a hand to help him? That is the question. The purpose and the importance of the Bow bill is to provide help before illness reduces an older couple to indigence; to help them with medical costs before they must exhaust their savings or mortgage the family home.

There are so many arguments for the Bow bill.

CHILDREN CAN HELP

We are told that young people should not be forced to deprive themselves or their children in order to help aged parents. This is a new idea to me. I still believe that children have an obligation to their parents, and I still believe that most young Americans want to discharge their obligation. The Bow bill would make it so easy to do so, much easier than increasing the regressive payroll tax for social security hospitalization to 10 or 11 percent of gross earnings, with no deductions.

I should think that labor leaders would welcome the Bow bill. Here is a chance to secure for retired union members the kind of insurance protection they need, a program that most certainly could be included in labor-management contracts with ease. Can it be that labor leaders do not wish to bother with the retired man who no longer pays dues? Or could it be that some of them want Government control of medical care? Perhaps that is the explanation. Certainly individual labor union members with whom I have talked endorse my idea.

I mentioned the social security tax, Mr. Speaker. Social insurance is the term. The worker pays into the fund during all of the years of his life until he retires and then he will be cared for. His retirement and hospitalization will come from a self-sustaining fund to which he and his employer contributed for 45 years. The administration and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the AFL–CIO leadership and the leaders—though not the rank and file—of the National Council of Senior Citizens demand that this is the way and the only way to finance assistance for our old people. They are willing only to concede that the general revenue can be used for people who are not part of the social security retirement system.

I wonder why this must be the case. Why must everything we do for our old people be paid for by a self-sustaining fund based on payroll taxes? We do not apply this rigid standard to other Federal Government programs. With a very few exceptions—the interstate highway program and the acquisition of wetlands for waterfowl are the only two I think of immediately—all other Federal Government programs are paid for out of the general revenue of the Treasury, or by borrowing, which becomes an obligation of all of the people. We do not put our foreign aid program on a self-sustaining pay-as-you go basis. We do not put the construction of Federal buildings on a self-sustaining pay-as-you-go basis. We do not require that the farmers alone support farm programs. Why then do we single out the elderly, the retired Americans, and say that their medical care requirements must be financed by deductions from wages?

MEDICAL CARE PRIORITY

Some reply that it is because medical care for the aged would cost so much. To that I reply it is high time we set a system of priorities among the various demands for Federal funds. We should estimate our revenue, and put some aside to reduce the national debt, and then find out what we had left to spend and decide what programs are most deserving of a share. Defense is extremely important; perhaps it has first priority. But somewhere close behind it, with a high priority indeed, should be the solution of the problem that faces a retired American when catastrophic illness strikes him. Certainly I would give it priority far higher than the $3.5 billion foreign aid program; far higher than amounts spent on Federal hydroelectric projects; way ahead of grants for the training of Cuban refugee college students, and many, many other programs I could mention. This is the straightforward way to discharge what I believe is a national obligation.

SOCIALIZED MEDICINE?

Others say that the administration insists upon social security financing, and control by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, because the King-Anderson bill is only the camel's nose under the tent, the first, tiny step toward national compulsory health care for all citizens. This is brought out clearly in a column by Joseph Kraft in the Evening Star of September 4. Writing of the Senate action, Mr. Kraft says:

> Medicare was a particularly touchy issue because it involved a basic principle, the use of the social security system to finance health benefits. Once the principle has been accepted, it is merely a question of money. While the opening payments will be small, the door has been opened. It is now predictable that, step by step, over the years, the United States will develop a full-scale program of health insurance for all citizens.

Here is the real motive, and the reason why there is so much opposition to the King-Anderson bill.

Few people wish to see the day when the Federal bureaucracy will control all of the medical care and health facilities of this Nation. Government medicine will be bad medicine for the people of America. Instead of the highest standards of medical care in the entire world, we will be reduced to the inadequate and unsatisfactory system that has been the lot of the people of Great Britain since nationalized medicine was established.

These are my arguments and this is my plea to the leadership of this House and the President to abandon their stubborn insistence that their way is the only way to help our retired citizens. Open the door to other suggestions. Let us consider alternative plans. Let us debate the Bow bill. This is a problem that needs solution. It is time to act on it now.

Congressman Rostenkowski Reports to the People of the Eighth Congressional District of Illinois

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL D. ROSTENKOWSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit the following report to the residents of Illinois' Eighth Congressional District as a composite self-analysis of the legislative activities of the 88th Congress and my activities as their Representative.

With sine die adjournment on October 3, 1964, the 88th Congress was in session longer than any other peacetime Congress. The first session lasted until Christmas eve, while the second session remained active for 9 months of this year. But the results of the action taken, can label the 88th as a "do something" Congress. It should be said that its theme was "Progress and Prosperity With a Purpose." In all areas, its many accomplishments have labeled it as "one of the top legislative performers of our time." Roscoe Drummond of the Chicago Sun Times wrote, "Its record of achievement merits the praise and esteem of the whole Nation." And I might add that we have recovered our position as the No. 1 Nation in the world. It took 4 years of sound and responsible leadership under the Kennedy-Johnson administration and through progressive legislation we have regained the momentum necessary to forge ahead. But the success we do enjoy is not complete and much remains to be accomplished if we hope to maintain our position as leader of the free world and eventually defeat the communistic slavery which still engulfs part of the world. And this defeat can be accomplished not by forceful means—although we will never relax our defense posture, but will keep it strong as a deterrent against Communist aggression—but by the example of the riches that can be enjoyed through free enterprise, which cannot go unnoticed by the enslaved peoples, regardless of the censorship that surrounds them. The examples set by the free world, with us as its leader, will be the inspiration needed by the enslaved to shake their shackles and become part of the great society of freedom and enjoy its fruits.

Our forward motion on the road to recovery reached high gear in the last 9 months. But the acceleration started 4 years ago and with each succeeding year, we picked up speed to reach the momentum we now enjoy and which will catapult us to greater progress in the future.

I present this report for its readers to take note of what was necessary to regain our stature. And I also make it to show that important issues failed to be improved and must be brought to the forefront in the next Congress. Some might say they are "lost" causes, but the legislative process takes time and considering all that was necessary to get us moving again, time was at a premium.

NATIONAL ECONOMY

For the United States to regain its position as a progressive, prosperous nation, importance fell upon legislation dealing with our economic problems and to establish programs for economic growth. Of the legislation enacted, the most significant had to be the tax bill of 1963, which was written by the House Ways and Means Committee of which I am now a member. When the Kennedy administration first suggested the possibility of a sizable individual and corporate tax cut in 1961, the President's Council of Economic Advisers advanced the theory that the Federal tax burden should be reduced to stimulate use of the country's full economic capacity. Through this program we could increase the amount of national income, which would result in more revenue to bring a balance to the budget. The legislation was attacked by sarcastic nonbelievers who felt we would destroy our price structure and create chaos in our Nation's already floundering economy. But since the enactment of the tax reduction bill in February of this year, the dubious have been proven wrong and the economy has blossomed. Federal tax revenues are at a record level showing an increase of $2.5 billion for the first 7 months of this year as compared to the same period last year. Our gross national product has reached an annual rate of $618.5 billion in the second quarter, exceeding the predicted $617 billion, and far above the $577.4 billion for the same period last year.

Business enterprises are expanding and modernizing much faster than predicted. Capital spending is $4.3 billion ahead of last year.

Retail sales are booming and should reach a record volume of about $260 billion by this year's end. We are well ahead of the $246.4 billion in 1963 and double the volume of 17 years ago.

And in spite of this increased spending individual savings are at an alltime high—$35.4 billion for this year's second quarter compared with last year's figure of $27.1 billion.

Unemployment has dropped and will continue to do so with other programs now underway. The economy should continue to move upward in the months ahead.

The passage of the Economic Opportunity Act will assist those swept by the tide of progress that leaves backwaters of unemployment. The 3-year authorized program provides for a job corps training youth in conservation camps and in urban and rural residential training centers, a work-training program for youths on the community level, community action programs involving Federal aid and direction to civic groups and other private organizations, a domestic peace corps to be known as VISTA—Volunteers in Service to America—and a number of programs for rural areas.

With the extension of the Manpower Development and Training Act to June 30, 1967, we are assisting the displaced persons who are victims of automation to update their knowledge so they can be available for the many opportunities that result through progress. These people can thus keep pace with our new advanced society and be self-supporting while contributing their share to needs of our country. With expanding employment we can look to further tax reductions in many areas, while reaching a true balanced budget. With continued reductions in many areas of Government spending the scales can be favorably reversed.

This Congress approved fair minimum wages in many areas heretofore not covered, and provided equal wages for women doing the same job as their male counterpart.

With pay raises granted to postal and classified Federal employees as well as to the military, they can keep pace with the advancements in our economy.

VETERANS AND SERVICEMEN

In the closing hours of the 88th Congress, we passed a compromised veterans' pension bill to increase pensions for most war veterans and reopened the national service life insurance program for a limited number of veterans. The bill's provisions on pensions cover veterans of World War I, World War II, and the Korean war who have at least 10-percent disability that is not connected with their military service. Widows are also included.

To be eligible for a pension a veteran or widow must have an income of less than $1,800 a year if they are without dependents or less than $3,000 a year if they have dependents.

Under the insurance compromise, all veterans who have disability resulting from military service will have a year to enroll in the NSLI program. Their premiums for $10,000 of life insurance: $149.20 a year at age 35; $228.40 a year if they are 45; and $365.40 a year if they are 55.

In addition, veterans with non-service-connected disabilities who are unable to obtain insurance from private firms will be eligible. Their premiums for $10,000 of life insurance would be $200.80 a year at age 35; $287.10 a year at age 45; and $451.30 a year at age 55.

EDUCATION

This Congress was quite cognizant of the technical advancements taken place in our way of life, and we realized the need of proper education for our youth. We met the challenge before us with sound programs to provide the needed education to our young so they can be prepared to face the challenges of the future.

With the extension of the National Defense Education Act we enable promising students who seek a college education to borrow money from the Federal Government, working in cooperation with the higher institutes of learning, which is needed to finance this education. The money is to be paid by installments after the individual has become self-supporting. This program is truly one of the most progressive pieces of legislation of modern time. Students that have benefited from this act when it was first established in 1958 are now repaying their obligation with interest.

With other programs adopted to assist in financing the construction of needed academic and related facilities; assistance in the aid of education of nurses and other professional personnel in the health field; and assistance in vocational educational programs, we, in this Congress, have faced the challenge of advancing the education of our youth through sound judgment.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AND SECURITY

This Congress has not jeopardized our security in the world. We have provided for the military strength of this Nation, which is second to none. We have advanced our weaponry systems, maintained a balance of available manpower for defense at a moment's notice, if it should be needed, and generally continue our sound program of preparedness as a deterrent against aggression. And although this phase of our Federal Government operation requires the largest part of our revenue for its support, we reduced the cost of financing it by half a billion dollars from the previous fiscal year, without endangering our position. It is most ironical that we, a nation that does not desire world conquest but seeks to live in peace, must maintain the strongest military might to check aggression. It is unfortunate that we have to tax ourselves to this extreme, but it is an investment in protection for our homes, our resources, and our future. An investment against the destruction of self-determination as our way of life.

SOCIAL SECURITY, HEALTH, AND PUBLIC WELFARE

The strongest opposition to the program of progress in this Congress centered on providing for our senior years. Since the enactment of the Social Security Act back in the thirties—which has proven its worth to the point that it is reluctantly being recognized as a sound program of security and dignity for our senior citizens by those who have opposed all of its concepts since its beginning—the attack against improving this program is the strongest conducted by the conservative element in Congress. Although their present national leader states that he supports the social security system and wants to see it strengthened, he has led the action to oppose it.

Our biggest failure in this Congress was to approve much needed improvements in the Social Security Act. I had hoped we could reach an agreement on establishing a needed medical care plan under its provisions, but the most intensified assault on any piece of legislation in this Congress was focused on this, one of the truly worthy pieces of legislation considered. It was stymied in Congress and the reluctant opposition would not yield their position. The end result was the loss of across-the-board benefit increases, benefits to children who attend school full time after reaching age 18 and until age 22, lowering the age limit for widows to be eligible for benefits, and to enable certain groups of self-employed to be covered under the act if they so desired.

It was a bitter pill to swallow but as I have said, there are times when the legislative process is slow, especially when powerful opponents delay and sidetrack the issue. However, we cannot give up and I believe that the will of the people in their strong support of the Social Security Act and the need for the improvements I have mentioned, should prevail and we must work for these improvements in the next Congress.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

We continued aid to nations in great need, who are struggling to reach a position of self-reliance, and the progress being made by these nations has enabled us to reduce the costs of support. This is insurance for free world strength.

The establishment and continued work of the Peace Corps has been most beneficial in proving to the world that we desire peace and prosperity for all nations of the free world.

DOMESTIC AFFAIRS

Many improvements have been made in this area. We have faced the problem of meeting the demands of national transportation, both public and private, through the Mass Transportation Act. We met the challenge of urban renewal and the need for low-cost public housing, and we continued to improve our highway systems.

We looked after the needs of the mentally retarded; and provided for the construction of additional hospitals while modernizing those now in existence.

We have insured the rights of all citizens in all areas of our Nation, which we, in Illinois, have recognized and enjoyed under State laws dating back to the year of 1885.

We have acted to control water and air pollution and to seek means of eliminating these hazards to our health. We took a positive approach in developing outdoor recreation programs and preserving our wilderness areas for us to enjoy in our leisure hours.

PERSONAL REPORT

I am grateful to the citizens of the Eighth Congressional District in Chicago, Ill., for their confidence and support in this, the 88th Congress, as well as the 86th and 87th Congresses. This encouragement was most inspiring in accepting the important position as majority whip of Illinois, and a seat on the important Ways and Means Committee—the committee on committees—on which my colleagues elected to have me serve. And I hope that the roles I have assumed in this Congress will be a sense of pride to every one of the 490,000 residents of the Eighth Congressional District of Illinois, as I have been proud to serve.

This may appear to be a lengthy report but it is only a comprehensive analysis of the action of the 88th Congress. Therefore, my constituents can obtain more detailed information by writing me if they so desire. If they seek personal service for any of their problems, my district office at 2547 West North Avenue, Chicago, Ill., will be open daily from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. and on Monday and Thursday evenings from 7 until 9 p.m. during the winter months. Although the volume of mail I have received this past year has greatly increased, I have geared my staff to look after the needs of my constituents and make every effort to acknowledge their requests as quickly as possible. I shall continue to look forward to hearing from them.

Columbus Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. NEIL STAEBLER

OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. STAEBLER. Mr. Speaker, Monday, October 12, is the anniversary of the discovery of America, 472 years ago, and I wish to pay tribute to the greatness of mind and spirit of the man who led that famous expedition, Christopher Columbus.

Like others who have left the shores of Italy and Spain he was determined not to turn back, but to discover new lands and spread the civilization and faith of Europe beyond the seas. Columbus Day indeed serves to remind us of the contributions of those later generations who have sailed from Italy for which we in America should be profoundly grateful. The enrichment of our American way of life in the fields of music, art, literature, science, and labor by the courageous and generous sons and daughters of Italy has been particularly marked. Their contributions refute the contentions of those who would bar the door against liberalization of our immigration laws, who would retain the outmoded nationality quotas and who have so little faith in our future that they would turn away the compatriots of those who have helped to make America great.

We, like Columbus and his countrymen, must meet the unknown continent of the future with steadfastness of purpose and greatness of spirit, not with the meanness and confinement of little minds.

Social Security and Civil Service Retirement Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. AUGUST E. JOHANSEN

OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, is it acknowledged—however indirectly and unintentionally—that I have been right all along on these certain matters?

SOCIAL SECURITY

Just before the final adjournment, administration and congressional advocates of medicare under social security faced a clear cut choice: Either enactment of increased social security benefits and higher payroll taxes, substantially as voted earlier this year by the House, but without medicare or no election-year social security legislation in 1964.

They chose the latter. The explanation current in Washington is curious, to say the least.

The liberal Washington Post reported medicare sponsors believed "payroll taxes to support increased social security benefits would have been raised to such a level that it would have been difficult, if not impossible in the foreseeable future, to push through additional taxes to support medicare."

The Washington correspondent of the conservative Wall Street Journal similarly explained that proponents of social security financed hospital care for the elderly "feared these increases would preempt much of the higher payroll taxes needed to finance medicare."

At first blush, this seems like a belated but welcome rediscovery of arithmetic and emergence of a previously lacking awareness that even the taxpayer has "load limits."

Rejoicing, however, could be premature on both counts. Quite possibly this is only a preelection recollection that taxpayers are also voters.

The hard truth is that advocates of medicare were willing—indeed, eager—to take both expanded social security benefits and medicare so long as they thought they could get both. The further hard truth is that if medicare is later adopted—as is strongly urged by President Johnson—it will open the door to new, unprecedented, and recurring pressures to forget both arithmetic and the taxpayers' plight.

It is pleasant, though, to know that the liberals acknowledge—even briefly and under the spell of preelection good behavior—that there is some validity to the misgivings I have voiced and voted over the years regarding a sky-is-the-limit expansion of social security benefits and taxes.

CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT BENEFITS

In another matter—adequate funding of retirement benefits for present and future Federal civil service retirees—I won not only agreement with my past position but a pledge of future support for my stand.

Representatives of the National Association of Retired Civil Employees and the AFL–CIO Federal employee unions became alarmed over reports that I might use a parliamentary move to block House consideration of a bill increasing pensions for present and future retirees.

In a conference with them I agreed not to do so—and, indeed, to vote for the bill—on two conditions: first, that time would be allowed for floor debate to point out the serious financial condition of the retirement fund—the present fund deficit is $35 billion—and the need for adequate future congressional appropriations to the fund; and, second, that the employee organization leaders themselves would pledge to go all out next year to support legislation to begin correction of the situation.

The first condition became pointless because the administration itself did not permit the bill to come to the floor of the House—thereby killing the pension increase this year.

The employee leaders' pledge, on the other hand, was given unequivocally. If I am still in Congress next year I will introduce legislation to begin sound and adequate financing of the retirement fund—and will then call on the employee leaders to redeem their pledge.

The practical, human value of this retirement program—like that of social security—depends on its soundness as well as its generosity.

The Late Honorable Gardner R. Withrow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, it was with sadness that I read in the latest issue of the Trainman News of the passing away of our former colleague, the late Honorable Gardner R. Withrow, of Wisconsin. He passed away in his hometown of LaCrosse, after a prolonged illness.

I know that these tidings will bring sorrow to the hearts of Gardner's many friends in this House. He had served in this legislative body for 20 years, retiring in 1960. During his service here, his cheerful demeanor, his tact and courtesy, his wise counsel, and his unfailing willingness to help his colleagues, won him deep respect and the affectionate friendship of his fellow Representatives. He was truly one of the kindest and considerate men I ever knew, and I sorrow at his passing.

But apart from his tremendous personal qualities, Gardner Withrow was an able, conscientious and forward looking legislator. He represented the Third District of Wisconsin for two decades, championing the interests of his electorate, striving to make this a better world for us and for our children. Only three Wisconsin Congressmen have served in this body longer than he did. This, in itself, is a measure of the outstanding job he did for his people, and of the confidence and respect which he enjoyed in his district.

I may mention that Gardner Withrow's record of public service included also 2 years as a member of the Wisconsin State Assembly, from 1928 to 1930.

I would be remiss if I did not recall at this point Gardner Withrow's special concern and interest in problems faced by our transportation system and the people employed in it. The origin of that interest dates back to January 20, 1918, when he became a member of Lodge 176 of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen. He remained a member of that lodge for the remainder of his life, and served for a time as the brotherhood's Wisconsin State representative. His contribution to the enactment of substantive legislation in the field of transportation, and of railroad employees' retirement benefits, will long be remembered.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to extend my and my wife's profound sympathy to Gardner's widow and family. May they find consolation in this hour of their loss in the thought that the good Lord has called him to be among His very own.

A Faithful and Great President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, as this 88th Congress draws to a close, I wish to put on the record my admiration for the quality of leadership which President Johnson has given to this body and to the Nation since he assumed his high office under such tragic circumstances.

The 88th Congress has written a magnificent record of accomplishment, comparable only to its most productive period under the administration of Franklin Delano Roosevelt. Representing an urban area, as I do, I am especially pleased that we were able to act finally on a program for urban mass transportation and to pass a comprehensive housing and community development bill. These measures will help us carry on the work of reshaping our cities to meet the needs of present and future generations.

Perhaps greater landmarks in legislative history are the Civil Rights Act and the Economic Opportunities Act. These new measures are of monumental importance to our Nation. Many other acts go to make up the astonishing record of this Congress—a record that could not possibly have been achieved without the leadership of the President.

President Johnson has faithfully carried on all the responsibilities he inherited from President Kennedy. But he has already made a great contribution uniquely his own in uniting the country in a common effort to build a national prosperity in which all can share with equal opportunity. He is a great President, leading us into one of the greatest periods of our history. He deserves to and will surely be elected by an overwhelming majority of the voters on November 3.

The Appalachian Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, the so-called Appalachian bill—H.R. 11946—to put it mildly, is complex and comprehensive. I doubt if ever any measure covering such a vast area of human activity, coupled up with a most confused and confusing problem, "poverty," has ever been considered by any other legislative body, let alone the highly organized and erudite House of Representatives of the United States of America. The matter is by no means simplified when we realize that by some people, "poverty" is considered a virtue and history proves that it has never been overcome by legislative action. It can be corrected only by the human effort of the individual. This is the fact and it cannot be overcome by political sophistry. As that great political economist, William Graham Sumner, said many years ago:

> Poverty is the most fundamental and complex of social facts, and the most important of human interests; it is therefore the hardest to understand, the most delicate to meddle with, and the easiest to dogmatize about.

May I very briefly review the salient features of this measure? Others better qualified than I will elaborate on them.

First. The provisions of this bill apply only to one section of our country, although there are other parts of our land which are suffering from "poverty," and its citizens are suffering from the lack of opportunity to earn a livelihood. We might well ask ourselves if it is right and fair for us representing our whole Nation to authorize the expenditure of over a billion dollars of all our people's money for the benefit of a comparatively small area of our country.

Second. The bill covers a very comprehensive area of activity and why it was referred to the Committee on Public Works, which has authority over only 4 of the 12 activities proposed is a mystery. The Public Works Committee, which by the way is made up of a most conscientious and capable group of men, has control of the highway, water resource and sewage treatment, flood control, and rivers and harbors legislation, appearing in the bill. But there are many other matters included in this legislation which have no connection whatever with the jurisdiction of the Public Works Committee. These include: health facilities; pasture improvement and development; timber development operations; mining area restoration; vocational education facilities; amendments to the Housing Act of 1954; personal financial interests; and supplements to Federal grants to aid programs.

All of these measures come under the jurisdiction of other committees, yet their views were not asked for or received.

The overcoming of "poverty" under the leadership, advice, and financial aid of a centralized Federal Government, using the money of all the taxpayers for the benefit of one area or community, has been tried before in this country and met with absolute failure. May I remind my colleagues, and some of us may well remember, the attempts made under the administration of Franklin Roosevelt in New Jersey, where with public funds, the establishment of the "Jersey homesteads" was attempted which included municipal plants, housing, and factories. After a few years the whole thing failed and what remained was sold to private enterprise at a large loss to the Government. The same was true of other and similar ventures in West Virginia at places named "Eleanor," and "Arthurdale." This sort of policy just does not accomplish the elimination or even the abatement of "poverty": it is a waste of time and money at the expense of every citizen in the country. I can see no reason to believe that a larger but quite similar program should succeed under the guidance of another Roosevelt who is Under Secretary of Commerce.

This is a most serious matter and a very great responsibility. Everyone who is a red-blooded American is willing to make sacrifices to help our fellow citizens to a better life. There is no quarrel about that whatever. America is the "land of the free and the home of the brave," and our forefathers through the years of the past set an example of self-sacrifice in achieving a sound economy which we should emulate. Someone has said that, "God helps those who help themselves," and that is as true as can be. Let us devote our resources and energies in teaching the less fortunate how to help themselves and thereby justify themselves as worthy of help from others.

Every State in the Union has similar problems, and each State has the responsibility to improve and better the lives of its residents. What are the 11 States situated in this so-called Appalachian area doing to overcome "poverty" within their borders? How do they react to this plan? Are they all in accord with the paternalism of a big central government? Let us look at the record.

First. "Virginia: This State prides itself as having the lowest total percent of unemployment in the Nation, equaled only by Hawaii and the District of Columbia.

Second. Tennessee: Governor Clement emphasized in his testimony before the committee that not all of the designated Tennessee portion of Appalachia is depressed. To the contrary, he pointed out that the designated area comprised some of their most prosperous industrial portions of which they were justly proud. Remember that all of Appalachia-Tennessee is within the service area of the TVA, which is reported to have accomplished so much in improving the economy of that region.

Third. Maryland: There are only three counties in this State included in the Appalachia program, which embraces only 6.3 percent of the State's population. Maryland is justly proud that it completed its fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, with a surplus of about $32 million, and with an estimated surplus of about $31 million at the end of the fiscal year 1964. Do these people need aid from a Federal Government which is operating at a large loss?

Fourth. West Virginia: The Governor of West Virginia testified that the period of 1961–64 "has been one of great economic recovery." "Unemployment," he said, "which stood at 105,000 in January 1961 has been gradually cut down to less than 60,000 early in 1964." The value of private building contracts for industrial plants in West Virginia awarded during 1962 was $119,500,000—about 4.7 percent of the U.S. total of such contracts. This certainly does not indicate that West Virginia needs additional Federal aid.

Fifth. Pennsylvania: In 1963 the per capita personal income area was about the same as the national average, and the percentage of families having an annual income of less than $3,000 has been well below the national average in the Appalachia portion of Pennsylvania. It is well to note that as of April 15, 1964, Federal grants totaling $58,988,000 have been extended to this Appalachia portion under the Accelerated Public Works Act.

Sixth. Alabama: About one-half of the 32 counties in the Appalachian area of this State are in the Tennessee Valley Authority region and 8 of these counties are not eligible for Federal grants under the Accelerated Public Works Act because of high employment. In spite of this, as of April 15, 1964, Federal grants totaling $20,827,000 have been granted to the eligible area under the Accelerated Public Works Act. In addition to all this increased Government activity, under the space flight program, which plans to award contracts of about $1 billion, it would appear that the Federal Government was doing its share in the economic development of this State.

Seventh. Kentucky: In his testimony the Governor emphasized the action during the past 4 years to solve its Appalachia problems, and he is justly proud of the definite and sound progress that has been made. In addition to its own bond issue of $176 million, the State has received $27,561,000 for its Appalachia problem under the Accelerated Public Works Act.

Eighth. Ohio: The per capita personal income in Ohio is well above the national average, with a lower percentage of families having incomes of less than $3,000 and higher percentage of families with more than $10,000 a year. The Appalachia portion of Ohio includes less than 10 percent of the State's population and being comparatively well off does not share the problems of other portions of the Appalachia region. Ohio is capable of meeting any such problems without Federal aid.

Ninth. Georgia: There are 35 counties in the Appalachian area, one-third of which are in the area serviced by the Tennessee Valley Authority. Furthermore, 10 of these 35 counties have never been eligible for assistance under the accelerated public works program. The report of the President's Appalachian Regional Commission indicated an unemployment rate lower than in the balance of the United States.

Tenth. South Carolina: No part of this State was included in the Appalachia region as defined in the original proposal of the President; no reference concerning the economy of this State is in the report of the President's Appalachian Regional Commission; and no testimony was presented to the ad hoc committee regarding this State. But in this new bill, H.R. 11946, six counties of this State are included. None of these counties is eligible under the Area Redevelopment Act and only one is eligible for assistance under the Accelerated Public Works Act. Certainly taxpayers' money from the other States in the Nation should not be made available under such circumstances.

Eleventh. North Carolina: Of the 29 Appalachia counties in this State, 15 are ineligible for aid under the Accelerated Public Works Act, and according to the report of the President's Appalachian Regional Commission this area in the State had a lower unemployment rate than the rest of the Nation in 1950 and 1960. According to articles published in newspapers and magazines, business in Appalachia region is booming in North Carolina.

This brief summary clearly indicates that the States involved are not facing problems which they cannot themselves cope with, especially when the Federal laws extending aid to underprivileged communities are taken into consideration. I beg that you weigh these facts carefully before supporting this proposal.

Pulaski Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NEIL STAEBLER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. STAEBLER. Mr. Speaker, Sunday, October 11, is the 185th anniversary of the death of Count Casimir Pulaski, the heroic Polish patriot whose life was devoted to the struggle for freedom, first for his own country and then for ours.

He was among the most distinguished of those Europeans who saw the struggle for American independence as part of a struggle for mankind's freedom from tyranny, and he did not hesitate to do something about it. His daring and his courage at a critical stage of our Revolution gave new strength and life to the cause just as later Polish immigrants brought their abilities and enterprise to our growing Nation.

There are those today who seek to raise barriers against immigrants to our land, who belittle the contributions Polish and other nationality groups have made to our prosperity and who threaten unemployment if our immigration laws are liberalized. Pulaski Day serves to remind us of the contributions immigrants have made to our life and in particular, to help us recall the important part that has been played in our history by those of Polish descent.

Reports From Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. KUNKEL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter, I am including one of my newsletters outlining to my friends and constituents back home services rendered by my office and how they can best utilize those services with a minimum of time and effort. It also occurred to me that other Members of Congress might find this of interest and value in their relationships with their constituents.

The newsletter follows:

Early in 1963, I put out a memorandum explaining the operation of my office, in respect to individuals in my congressional district. There are thousands of people in my four counties who know from personal experience how we function. For the benefit of those who have not had contact with my office, I have decided that nothing could be more worthwhile than to use for this newsletter the memorandum I issued early in 1963 in explanation.

My offices, both in Harrisburg and Washington, are set up with the purpose of giving all the people of all the four counties of my congressional district the maximum amount of service in the shortest possible time. As you know, my office relates only to the Federal Government, and not to State, city, county, or local problems. Nearly everyone, however, is apt to have a problem with the Federal Government sooner or later. If he or she doesn't, he or she is lucky.

The purpose of this memorandum is to point out how you can take maximum advantage of my work and how you can save yourself time and trouble in the process. Remember: All cases go across my desk and have personal attention at some stage of the operation, usually at two stages.

Mrs. M. Willois Wertz, my secretary in Harrisburg (phone: 238-0395) was secretary for my good friend and predecessor, "Walt" Mumma, for 9 years. She has been with me since my election on May 16, 1961. She is thoroughly familiar with the practical problems of the various departments and agencies. She knows exactly what facts are necessary in order for me to get started on almost all of your special problems. If you will either stop in the office or call her on the telephone and give her the information, she will send the facts to me in Washington, and then I will immediately get started on them.

Many problems arise in connection with Olmsted, Mechanicsburg, social security, veterans affairs, railroad retirement, etc., etc., which can be taken care of right here in Harrisburg. Mrs. Wertz knows just who to contact on these. She knows how to proceed. Frequently she is able to get the answer locally without even getting in touch with Washington. Whenever necessary, she does get in touch with my Washington office, either by special delivery mail or by telephone.

In general, I get back to Harrisburg only a Saturday and Sunday. Occasionally, I am not able to get back even for those two days. If you wait to contact me, personally, you will lose a lot of time. Time is usually important to those who do contact me. So, my suggestion is that if an when you have a problem, you should get in touch with Mrs. Wertz at once. You can rest assured it will be referred to me if necessary. As you can well imagine, Mrs. Wertz, with 11 years' background, is thoroughly familiar with the congressional district and the people in it, as well as with the various governmental agencies to which their problems relate. Since Mrs. Wertz takes one day a week off, you should call the office first and arrange an appointment, so you will avoid the danger of being there on her day off.

I have office hours every Saturday and every Friday that I can get home on a Friday. My schedule is always filled solid. I can see just so many people, and no more. So this suggestion does not save any time or effort for me, but it does enable me to get started on your problem anywhere from 2 to 4 weeks earlier than otherwise would be the case. That is the reason I am stressing this suggestion.

I also have a field representative, George W. Jackson, of 213 South Ninth Street, Lebanon. The population distribution of the district makes it important for me, and for you, to have someone in Lebanon County in this position. George travels out in the district and makes calls on the people when they have problems which are too difficult to discuss in a letter. On the way from Lebanon to Harrisburg, he is able to stop and see people about their problems in Myerstown, Richland, Schaefferstown, Cornwall, Annville, Palmyra, Hershey, Hummelstown, Middletown, Campbelltown, Quentin, Lawn, etc. He also can cover the rest of Lebanon County with a good deal of ease. George also makes trips through the upper end of Dauphin County, and through Perry and Juniata Counties, periodically.

This gives my friends in those areas an opportunity to make a personal contact with someone from my office. I also make similar trips through the same areas, when possible. This is difficult for me to do while Congress is in session and my presence, therefore, is required in Washington, Monday through Friday of each week.

Mr. Jackson also helps arrange trips for school classes, Boy and Girl Scout troops, and other organizations making trips to Washington. This service has worked out most successfully. Mr. Jackson is able to arrange the trip so as to have it take the least possible time. I take care of making definite appointments (if possible) for visits to the White House and the FBI. Incidentally, it is quite important to let me know about your trip well ahead of time (particularly during April and May). It is almost impossible to arrange guided tours through the White House and FBI then. It is difficult to arrange this even if you let me know well ahead of time. A guided tour is far superior to the ordinary tour of the White House. Also, Mr. Jackson may be able to make your trip more pleasurable by suggesting interesting places of which you might not have thought.

So that you can have 24-hour service with my office, I subscribed to an answering service last year. This telephone answering service operates day and night. If you call, and no one is in the office, the answering service will take your name and telephone number. When Mrs. Wertz comes in the office the next day, she will call you.

If you have occasion to call me in Washington, my secretary there is Mrs. June Burke. She also was with the late Congressman Mumma for 4 years. She is really top notch. A good deal of the success of my office is due to the fine personnel.

Please don't forget my longstanding policy of doing what I can to help my constituents in any legitimate claim that have with the Federal Government, whether they are Republican, Democrat, or independent. By now, this policy is very widely known and recognized. I will certainly continue it. No one who comes to the office is ever asked their politics. The only question is whether you have a legitimate problem with the Federal Government.

Let me hear from you. Then there is the U.S. mail. My addresses are: 20 South River Street, Harrisburg, Pa., Room 123 Old House Office Building, Washington, D.C. Your views and thoughts on pending legislation are always welcome.

Cancellation of the Mobile Mid-Range Ballistic Missile

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD R. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, on August 29, 1964, the Department of Defense announced that all but two subsystems of the MMRBM would be canceled. The statement from the Department of Defense included the following reason for the cancellation: "Because the Congress reduced the Department of Defense's request for appropriations." The statement went on to say that the Department continues to believe that there is a definite need for this system.

I am particularly disturbed that the Defense Department chooses to blame Congress for the cancellation of this weapons system. Congress has bent over backward to be both reasonable and generous in view of the justification to the Congress and management of this program by the Department of Defense. The statement by the public relations mouthpiece of DOD therefore places blame where it does not belong and it has all the earmarks of being said for other purposes.

The Defense Appropriations Subcommittee of the House of Representatives has approved funds for this program consistently with the needs of the program as presented to us by the Department of Defense. Congress has chosen to support the Defense Subcommittee's recommendations. However, equally consistently, the Department of Defense has not utilized the funds appropriated to the Department. The following detailed tabulation will clearly show the facts:

Research, development, test, and evaluation—Mobile medium-range ballistic missile

[In millions of dollars]

Fiscal year	Present budget	Congressional appropriation	Department of Defense approved program	Funds released against appropriation program	Expenditures
1962	0	0	4.0	4.0	4.0
1963	100.0	[1] 80.0	25.8	25.8	25.0
1964	[2] 143.1	73.1	73.1	34.9	[3] 15.6
1965	110.0	40.0	37.0	0	0

[1] $25,000,000 was reprogramed to the MMRBM-related stellar inertial guidance system (Stings) program.

[2] An additional amount of $6,900,000 included in the "Military construction appropriation was disallowed in the enabling authorization.

[3] As of July 31, 1964.

As shown in the tabulation, although the Congress reduced funds for the MMRBM in both fiscal years 1963 and 1964, in neither year did the Department utilize even as much as 50 percent of the funds appropriated.

Congress itself tried to impress the representatives of the Department of Defense during the course of the hearings on the difficulties involved in deploying this weapons system. The committee recognized that in order to be within striking distance of an enemy, the MMRBM would have to be deployed on foreign soil. Congress urged the Defense Department over 3 years ago to obtain rights with the applicable foreign countries so that deployment would be possible. This was an absolute necessity before any extensive amount of moneys should be spent on this project. To date, the executive branch has not attempted to reach accord with other nations for those rights. In fact, we have been led to believe that there is an extreme reluctance on the part of the Department of Defense to take steps to solve this problem.

We believe the Department of State has put pressure upon the Defense Department not to actively pursue this program and obviously the negotiations for deployment rights. The State Department has clearly indicated that they prefer the MLF—multilateral force—to be used in the defense of Europe particularly and in other parts of the world where this type of weapons system would be required. In their justifications of the MLF, one can clearly see the arguments they would use for discouraging the MMRBM concept. It is reasonable therefore to expect that if the MMRBM ever becomes operational, it would be more difficult to proceed with the MLF concept.

There are arguments for the MMRBM approach and the MLF approach. We expect that the Departments of State and Defense would be candid enough to explain to the Congress and the American people why one approach is preferable to the other, and not try to evade the issue by placing blame upon Congress for the cancellation of MMRBM.

Aside from the above arguments, we on the Appropriations Subcommittee have been shown that the Department of Defense has not been, on numerous occasions enthusiastic about the program. Consistently witnesses have appeared before our committee and have not indicated that the reductions in appropriations which the committee recommended would be detrimental to the progress of the program. In this category of witnesses is Secretary McNamara himself. For example, this year he stated before our committee:

> I think one can argue either it is wise to proceed with the program itself, because, as you know, we have not had, as yet stated, a firm deployment plan for that weapon. We have, we believe, a sound basis upon which to recommend the program to you, but I think one can argue this pro and con and we should no doubt discuss it at length.

As further proof of this reluctance, last year in the fiscal year 1964 budget the House Appropriations Committee reduced the $143 million budget request for the MMRBM's by $100 million. It is customary for the Department of Defense to appeal to the Senate to restore those amounts which the House has deleted from appropriations bills when the Defense Department feels it has sufficient reason to request restoration of these funds. Its official appeal to the Senate last year did not request any restoration of the $100 million deleted by the House. The Deputy Secretary of Defense, Roswell Gilpatric, who testified for the Secretary of Defense at the Senate Appropriations Committee hearings, stated:

> In our formal reclamae we indicated we would try to manage with this reduction—the amount remaining in the House bill for MMRBM's will be sufficient to carry out that phase of the work and to continue general studies of the entire system.

Numerous other statements made by witnesses who appeared before the House and Senate Appropriations Committees would testify to this lack of administration enthusiasm and apparent indecision as to where the program was heading.

One final statement that perhaps will sum up the impression left by the Department of Defense with the Congress occurred in consideration of the fiscal year 1964 budget. Mr. MAHON, of Texas, the chairman of the subcommittee, asked Dr. Herald Brown what the effect was of the reduction Congress made in the program for fiscal year 1963. The program has been reduced by $100 million to $80 million. Dr. Brown stated:

> The program has been delayed and that allowed us to do what we had to do within the money appropriated by the Congress. The decision to delay was not caused by that cut.

Mr. MAHON said, "In other words, the cut did not retard the program in any way." Dr. Brown replied, "No, the cut did not retard the program because the program was delayed anyway."

The position of the Department of Defense may be best illustrated by an exchange that took place in May of 1963. It became apparent that the Department of Defense had not made a firm decision on proceeding with the development of the MMRBM. In essence, Dr. Brown asked us for the funds to fully proceed with the program, but did state that decisions to do so would not be made until a later date. The committee's reaction was summed up eloquently by my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD]. He said:

> In other words we could appropriate this money and then the Secretary will make up his mind sometime in June or July whether or not something should be done about it. * * * This puts the cart before the horse. This makes a mockery of the whole system of the hearings.

Mr. Speaker, Congress has been, and probably always will be, blamed for many things that happen, and there is no doubt that at times it is deserved. Not in this case, however, does the fault lie with Congress. The blame in this instance falls squarely on the Department of Defense and the Department of State. The MMRBM record clearly shows the executive branch of the Government in this administration was guilty of poor planning in the first instance, secondly guilty of confusing and uncertain justification before the Congress, and finally, guilty of poor management of the MMRBM weapons system program. This should be clearly shown to the American people, not just because this particular weapons system has been virtually cancelled, but because it reflects a line of reasoning and behavior that should be clearly recognized and understood by the Congress, as well as the people.

Included as a part of my remarks is the following article from Missile/Space Daily of September 1, 1964:

> DOD's after-the-fact announcement last weekend of the death of the Mobile midrange ballistic missile (MMRBM), first reported in the August 21 Missile/Space Daily, accuses Congress of killing the program by failing to appropriate sufficient funds.
>
> There are many reasons for eliminating the MMRBM from consideration as a potential U.S. weapon, but none seem to implicate Congress as the guilty party. The death of MMRBM was largely a result of international politics and many experts have said the program never was able to measure up to its initial promises and was doomed some time ago (M/S Daily, Feb. 13, 1964). The biggest problem was deployment—a medium range missile has to be deployed within comparatively easy striking distance of an enemy—and France held the key to its future. In a sense, it would be fairer to say the French President Charles de Gaulle killed the MMRBM.
>
> Since the MMRBM would have had to be deployed in Europe, the heart of the program was pierced when France would not give the United States permission to use its territory

without having control over the nuclear warheads. The United States has not attempted to reach accord with other European allies for similar rights. The State Department and the Pentagon flatly refuse to allow joint control over the missile system operation. At loggerheads over the MMRBM in the diplomatic field, DOD realized that even if the system were developed, there would be no place to station it. With this reasoning, DOD made it clear to congressional sources that it had no intention of using the bulk of the MMRBM funds and Congress, besides, was not about to appropriate large amounts of money for a program of marginal value.

With this knowledge in hand, the authorizing committee on Capitol Hill did the only logical thing in their power. They cut the MMRBM funds from the requested $110 million to $40 million—with the added restriction that the funds be used only for the stellar inertial guidance system which is applicable to other missile systems. When DOD failed to make a reclama for the funds earlier this year, it became obvious that MMRBM was doomed. Nothing that happened since has changed the situation one bit. So the weekend announcement from DOD on the lapsing of MMRBM contracts because of the lack of funding approval from Congress, although technically correct, skirts some of the important factors in a complicated situation which was more a diplomatic failure than a systems development one.

In killing the MMRBM, DOD said it "continues to believe that there is a definite need for this highly mobile, survivable, and accurate weapons system and that, to the extent congressional appropriations will permit, we should proceed with its development as an 'insurance' program to fill the range gap between the Army's Pershing missile and the Navy's A-3." The two areas in which work will continue are studies (1) of an advanced, highly accurate guidance system which can be used by other missile systems (General Precision, Inc., prime) and (2) studies on command and control elements which could have additional applications to other programs (Bunker-Ramo Corp. and Sylvania Electric Products, Inc., contractors).

The four phases of the developmental program to lapse where system integration, assembly and checkout being done by Hughes Aircraft Co.; reentry by aeroneutronic division of Philco; propulsion by Thiokol Chemical Corp.; and transport-launcher by Goodyear Aerospace.

Congressman Joseph P. Addabbo Reports on 88th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, I am indeed proud and feel privileged to have had the honor of serving the Seventh Congressional District, Queens County, N.Y.

I believe that the 88th Congress has been one of the outstanding Congresses on record and that it has accurately reflected the mood of our citizens and has been responsive to the needs and wishes of our people in both domestic and foreign affairs.

At the end of each session since I came to Congress almost 4 years ago I have summarized the year's activities, reprinted them at my expense, and mailed them to my constituents. Each of the years has been a breaking of the previous year's longest peacetime session. My only regret has been that the lengthy session reduced the time I would have spent in my district personally discussing and obtaining the views and attending to the needs of my constituents.

In addition to sending out a report on the highlights of the legislative accomplishments of the session, I sent a questionnaire to my constituents early this year covering many of the important issues which would have to be decided by me on behalf of the people I am privileged to represent. There were approximately 160,000 questionnaires sent out to my constituents, and I received a return of approximately 15 percent. Although this would seem a small return, from all surveys, the average return, I am led to understand, is approximately 5 to 10 percent, so I believe my district represents an active and informed district. Following are the questions asked and the answers received:

1. Do you support our policy of opposing admission of Red China to the United Nations?

	Percent
Yes	62.4
No	29.3
Undecided	8.3

2. Should the House Committee on Un-American Activities be continued?

	Percent
Yes	64.6
No	27.7
Undecided	7.7

3. Should the foreign aid program be:

	Percent
Increased	16.7
Decreased	21.3
Eliminated	17.1
Remain the same	38.2

4. Do you favor Federal aid to education for:

	Percent
School construction	69.3
Teachers' salaries	57.6
Public schools only	36.3
Private and parochial school participation	61.1

5. Do you favor increased salaries for Federal civil service and postal employees?

	Percent
Yes	71.4
No	23.2
Undecided	5.4

6. Should the Social Security Act be amended to:

(a) Include hospital care for the aged?

	Percent
Yes	71.6
No	24.2
Undecided	4.2

(b) Remove the limitation on outside earnings?

	Percent
Yes	73.3
No	22.9
Undecided	3.8

(c) Continue child's insurance benefits beyond age 18, if child is attending high school or college, as provided in my bill, H.R. 1987?

	Percent
Yes	71.5
No	24.3
Undecided	4.2

7. Do you support my position for an expanded program to combat narcotics addiction and for a Federal narcotics treatment center in the New York area?

	Percent
Yes	73.6
No	21.2
Undecided	5.2

8. Do you believe our expenditures for defense should:

	Percent
Be increased	46.1
Be decreased	21.1
Undecided	6.5

9. Do you believe our expenditures for space exploration should:

	Percent
Be increased	39.2
Be decreased	24.7
Undecided	6.5

10. Do you favor enactment of a Federal trade law to allow manufacturers to establish minimum retail prices in brand-name merchandise?

	Percent
Yes	64.7
No	25.1
Undecided	10.2

11. Do you favor the truth-in-lending bill which would require that all interest and credit charges for time-purchasing and borrowing be clearly itemized in writing at the time of the transaction?

	Percent
Yes	71.6
No	25.2
Undecided	3.2

12. Do you favor a domestic Peace Corps of young American volunteers to help fill the gap in our country's social, medical, educational, and recreational services?

	Percent
Yes	58.7
No	36.8
Undecided	4.5

13. Do you favor Federal assistance to meet the crisis facing mass transportation systems in metropolitan areas?

	Percent
Yes	63.2
No	29.8
Undecided	7.0

14. Do you favor a revision of our immigration laws to remove the nationality restrictions in the current act, while keeping immigration admissions at approximately the present level?

	Percent
Yes	63.2
No	29.7
Undecided	7.1

15. Do you favor enactment of the pending civil rights bill?

	Percent
Yes	62.2
No	29.1
Undecided	8.7

The 2d session of the 88th Congress, as did the 1st session, enacted legislation of a far-reaching nature both nationally and internationally. I have, in this session, as in the past session, held to what I believe to be in accordance with the dictates of the needs of our Nation and the dictates of the needs of the people from my congressional district as evidenced by the response to my questionnaire. I have supported the Kennedy-Johnson administration's programs when I believed the programs to be just and needed, and I have opposed and voted against the Kennedy-Johnson programs when I believed them not in accord with the majority thinking of the people of my district.

More than 600 laws have been enacted by the 88th Congress. Time and space make it impossible to discuss all of them. The following is some of the major legislation I have supported in this Congress:

MEDICAL AND HEALTH

Public Law 88-129 provides for a 3-year program to expand facilities of medical, dental, and related type colleges and $30.7 million for students' loans.

Public Law 88-156 provides for $350 million in aid to States for maternal and child health services, crippled children's programs, and maternity care and research projects to prevent mental retardation.

Public Law 88-591 authorizes a 5-year program to expand nursing school facilities and for loans for student nurses.

Public Law 88-164 provides $329 million to aid States in providing mental retardation research facilities and in constructing community mental health centers.

Public Law 88-443 extended Hill-Burton construction program and included funds for areawide planning of health facilities that have mostly been only on a citywide basis.

Public Law 88-305 requires USDA approval of pesticides before selling them to the public.

EQUAL PAY FOR WOMEN

Public Law 88-38 prohibits discrimination in pay on the basis of sex in work that is subject to the minimum wage laws.

This measure had been before Congress for 18 years.

HOUSING

Public Law 88-158 increases to $275 million the loans to organizations constructing housing for the elderly.

Public Law 88-54 extends for 2 years the authority of FHA to insure mortgages.

MILITARY FORCES

Public Law 88-132 increases the pay for members of the Armed Forces and readjusts pay schedules. Another bill passed this year grants a further pay increase.

EDUCATION

Public Law 88-204 authorizes $400 million per year to aid college classroom construction. Colleges and universities would be required to pay at least two-thirds of the cost of each construction project.

Public Law 88-210 provides for new grants to States to expand vocational education.

S. 3060 expands the National Defense Education Act programs and extends the impacted areas aid to local school districts for 1 more year. College loans for students were increased a total of 100 percent but still total only about one-third the number required to loan each student an average of $700 who has the ability to go to college and would be accepted.

This is the most legislation for education that has been passed in any Congress since the Land-Grant College Act of 100 years ago.

WHEAT SALES

Russia was in the world market for wheat last year. A prohibition against American businessmen selling to them through the Export-Import Bank on normal commercial terms was proposed but rejected. They bought 65 million bushels for $140 million and have paid for it. Our Government-held stocks are now lower than in many years.

RECREATION

Public Law 88-578 establishes a land and water conservation fund to assist States in developing outdoor recreation programs and acquiring recreation areas.

Public Law 88-9 authorizes coordination of Federal and State outdoor recreation plans.

Public Law 88-577 sets aside 35 million acres of federally owned wilderness areas to be preserved in its primitive state for public use.

INTERNATIONAL

Public Law 88-285 authorizes an expansion of about one-half in the Peace Corps. Congress has indicated it intends to replace some foreign aid grants with Peace Corps programs which cost much less and most believe will be more effective.

Public Law 88-186 extended the Arms Control Research Agency through 1965.

The nuclear test ban treaty was negotiated by President Kennedy and ratified by the Senate.

House Joint Resolution 1145 approved and supported the determination of the President to repel attacks on U.S. forces and to prevent aggression jeopardizing peace and security in southeast Asia.

FOREIGN AID

Foreign aid in 1965 will cost $3.4 billion—the smallest and tightest budget since the program began. More than 80 percent of this $3.4 billion will be spent in the United States for U.S. goods and services—providing 500,000 jobs. This $3.4 billion will account for 3.5 percent of the Federal budget and 0.56 percent of our national income—the smallest percentages ever; 70 percent will be for economic aid; 30 percent will be for military aid; two-thirds will be in the form of loans; one-third will be in the form of grants. Assistance will be highly selective and concentrated; 7 countries will get 67 percent of all development loans; 4 countries will get 78 percent of all supporting assistance; 11 countries will get 64 percent of all military assistance.

LABOR LAW

Public Law 88-133 increases benefits under railway retirement and unemployment acts, and strengthens the trust fund's financial position.

Public Law 88-349 amends the Davis-Bacon Act to include pension and other fringe benefits in wage scales.

VETERANS

Public Laws 21 and 134 increase payments to dependents of veterans who died of service-connected disabilities.

Public Law 88-151 permits the Veterans' Administration to waive recovery on home loans in certain hardship cases.

Public Law 88-20 provides additional compensation for service-connected loss of hearing in both ears.

Public Law 88-22 increases benefits for veterans suffering complete loss of speech.

H.R. 1927 liberalizes the pension program for veterans of World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict, and their widows and children. It also reopens national service life insurance for 1 year for service-connected disabled as well as a limited group of nonservice connected who are generally rated as insurable or who cannot obtain insurance even at substandard rates. In all cases administrative costs would be borne by the insured—estimated to be $5 per policy per year.

TAX BILL

Public Law 88-272 reduced Federal taxes by $11.5 billion by cutting personal income taxes an average of 19.4 percent. It also reduces corporate taxes. It did not contain many of the reforms I have proposed and hope may be enacted in the 89th Congress. Due to increased profits and less unemployment, even with the lower rates, tax revenues for the first 3 months of 1964 were up $1.5 billion over the same period last year.

I voted against the continuation of excise taxes on ladies' handbags, cosmetics, baby oil, and so forth. The administration and Congress are now working on a bill to eliminate excise taxes where the proceeds are not used directly for the benefit of the taxpayer paying them.

FOOD

Public Law 88-525 expanded the food stamp program. Under this program, families in need could buy stamps at less than fair value to purchase certain foods.

In the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, the Government furnished $634 million worth of food and milk to needy people, institutions, school lunch, military, and veterans programs. This compares to $425 million in 1957 and $411 million worth furnished in 1960 and shows the extent to which great emphasis has now been placed on food. The diets of about 6 million needy and 16 million schoolchildren are affected. Food exported for cash has increased greatly.

PAY BILL

It was my privilege to again support justified and needed pay adjustments for our postal and Federal employees.

Public Law 88-448 provides pay adjustments for Federal employees and officials. The committee headed by Clarence Randall, of Inland Steel, appointed by Presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy made conclusions as to the scales that would make Federal salaries comparable to non-Federal pay scales. The bill brings judges, scientists, Congressmen, Senators, and executive personnel to about two-thirds the amount recommended and brings the other 95 percent of the Federal employees up to the non-Government rate of 1962.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Public Law 88-352 bans discrimination based upon religion, or race in: First, voting in Federal elections; second, distribution of Federal aid; third, public eduction; fourth, certain types of publicly owned or publicly operated facilities or accommodations; and fifth, employment. The prohibition relative to employment, generally speaking, covers employers of 100 or more workers—to be gradually reduced to 25 workers—and does not cover private clubs, employees working on religious activities, religious educational institutions. It also establishes a group—headed by former Governor Collins, of Florida—to seek satisfactory settlements of complaints without publicity or court action. The bill, as passed, gives to the Nation that which has been and is the present law in New York State. The Federal law does not provide preference to any religion or race, does not provide for racial balance in schools, and does not involve sale or use of private homes.

DEFENSE

Although most of our tax money is spent for defense hardware, bases, and to pay for the Armed Forces and personnel, legislation in this area has been relatively noncontroversial. The 88th Congress provided legislation to increase nuclear warheads in our strategic alert forces, tactical nuclear forces in Europe, tactical air squadrons, airlift capability, special forces trained to deal with guerrilla warfare, polaris submarines, and also in certain other areas.

I have continually worked for increased defense contracts for the New York area and there has been formed a special committee to acquire additional work for the New York Naval Shipyard—Brooklyn, N.Y.

SENIOR CITIZENS

The Republican-Southern coalition has again trod upon the needed benefits for our senior citizens. The House passed an increase in social security benefits for our senior citizens—the Senate passed an increase in benefits plus a "medicare" amendment. In the House-Senate Conference Committee the Republicans were unanimously against this measure and they were joined by Southern Democrats—this coalition defeated this much-needed legislation.

I know this legislation will be given top priority in the 89th Congress and, if I am returned to office, I will again support it and fight for its early enactment.

MISCELLANEOUS

Public Law 88-273 expands help to privately owned small business investment companies which in turn help small businesses who are unable to secure needed loans from regular sources at reasonable rates.

Public Law 88-452 is the antipoverty program consisting of work-training and work-study programs and provisions designed to encourage local action.

Public Law 88-354 establishes a Commission to study the price spread from producer to consumer.

COMMITTEE WORK

It has been my privilege to serve on the Committee on Appropriations which deals with the spending of the taxpayers' moneys. As a member of this committee, I have tried to save taxpayers' dollars while providing for the needs of the Nation. Following is a full schedule of appropriations, which appropriations were voted out of the committee with bipartisan support:

The appropriation bills, 88th Cong., 2d sess., as of Sept. 22, 1964

Title and bill No.	Budget estimates to House	Amount as passed (House)	Amount as passed (Senate)	Amount as approved (Senate)
1965 APPROPRIATION BILLS				
District of Columbia (H.R. 10199)	($357,702,300)	($338,205,200)	($342,181,975)	($341,242,200)
Federal payment, 1965 regular	53,220,000	40,720,000	44,220,000	40,720,000
Loan authorization	(14,400,000)	(26,400,000)	(26,400,000)	(26,400,000)
Interior (H.R. 10433)	1,035,678,000	1,009,175,600	1,029,226,400	1,028,277,200
1965 regular appropriations	998,903,000	976,475,600	993,554,400	994,069,200
Loan authorization	(20,000,000)	(14,000,000)	(14,000,000)	(14,000,000)
1964 supplementals	36,775,000	32,700,000	35,672,000	34,208,000
Treasury-Post Office (H.R. 10532):				
1965 regular appropriations	6,271,991,000	6,225,420,000	6,240,423,000	6,233,273,000
1964 supplementals (by transfer)	(1,675,000)	(1,100,000)	(1,100,000)	(1,100,000)
Legislative (H.R. 10723)	222,587,355	173,626,640	210,380,685	210,300,885
1965 regular appropriations	222,375,655	173,446,640	210,231,685	210,300,885
1964 supplementals	211,700	180,000	149,000	
Labor-HEW (H.R. 10809)	7,561,968,000	6,908,063,000	7,081,193,000	7,089,707,000
1965 regular appropriations	7,104,782,000	6,908,063,000	7,081,193,000	7,089,707,000
1964 supplementals	457,186,000			
Defense (H.R. 10939):				
1965 regular appropriations	47,471,000,000	46,759,267,000	46,774,401,000	46,752,051,000
1964 supplementals (by transfer)	(6,000,000)	(6,000,000)	(6,000,000)	(6,000,000)
State, Justice, judiciary (H.R. 11134)	1,957,764,700	1 702,627,800	1,730,855,700	1,717,157,800
1965 regular appropriations	1,915,089,700	1,702,177,800	1,700,405,700	1,686,707,800
1964 supplementals	42,675,000	450,000	30,450 000	30,450,000
Agriculture (H.R. 11202)	5,832,922,600	5,182,665,000	5,338,672,525	5,137,162,200
1965 regular appropriations	5,582,259,600	5,182,665,000	5,323,872,525	5,127,162,200
Loan authorization	(753,000,000)	(795,000,000)	(795,000,000)	(795,000,000)
1964 supplementals	6,573,000		14,800,000	10,000,000
Independent Offices (H.R. 11296)	14,244,653,400	8,118,965,500	13,613,224,000	13,454,859,000
1965 regular appropriations	14,099,653,400	8,118,965,500	13,613,224,000	13,454,859,000
1964 supplementals	145,000,000			
Military Construction (H.R. 11369) 1965 regular appropriations	1,879,000,000	1,599,014,500	1,582,969,000	1,570,968,000
Public Works (H.R. 11579) 1965 regular appropriations	4,372,449,000	4,325,969,200	4,443,283,200	4,430,794,700
Foreign Assistance (H.R. 11812) 1965 regular appropriations	3,958,377,000	3,739,249,400	3,662,077,000	3,662,077,000
Supplemental, 1965 (H.R. 12633)	1,370,468,374	998,645,874	1,220,098,068	1,117,196,068
Total, 1965 regular	95,299,568,729	86,750,079,514	92,889,952,578	92,369,885,853
Total, 1964 supplementals (included in 1965 bills)	688,420,700	33,330,000	81,071,000	74,658,000
Total, all appropriations	97,677,058,218	88,430,011,203	94,702,348,721	94,162,918,996
Total, loan authorizations	(787,400,000)	(835,400,000)	(835,400,000)	(835,400,000)

Total budget requests, $97,677,058,218.

Total authorized by Congress, $94,162,918,996.

Total reduction by Congress, $3,514,139,222.

LOCAL ISSUES

I have continually worked with the Federal Aviation Agency and the Port of New York Authority to find means to give relief from the noise nuisance to the people of my district. The FAA and Port Authority, to some degree, have worked out new landing and takeoff flight patterns trying to alleviate this problem. I believe that progress has been made in this field, but much more must be done. I have flown with the FAA on various experimental flight patterns to prove that landing patterns are safe for the aircraft and can be developed to give further relief to the people of my district. I will continue to press the FAA and the Port Authority to work out additional programs so that we may find better and faster solutions to this serious problem which plagues the people of my district. I shall continue to press for additional research into the field of noise reduction.

As a member of the Committee on Appropriations, I have seen to it that the appropriation for a new Veterans' Administration hospital to serve the veterans of Queens and Long Island has been retained in the budget. I believe the hospital should be in Queens and the Veterans' Administration is just awaiting the decision of the State of New York on where the new medical school will be located.

ADMINISTRATIVE WORK

I have tried to give the people of my district, while here in Washington and back home in my district, 365 days of service per year. I maintain a full-time district office where I meet with my constituents whenever time permits me to be in the district. I have attended the various civic, veterans, and social affairs of my district. Through these media I have been able to discuss personally with my constituents problems facing them and the Nation. Through my previous reports on the congressional sessions and through this one, I have tried to keep my constituents informed and, through questionnaires, I have tried to be informed by them of their wishes, beliefs, and thinking.

It is a very great privilege and honor to me to have served the people of the Seventh Congressional District and, if reelected, it will be my pleasure to serve them in the 89th Congress with the same diligence and attention I have heretofore given. If the people of my district approve the service I have given to them and the representation I have given to them here in Washington, it will be my honor to return to the 89th Congress to continue the programs I have started, programs to alleviate the problems of the people of my district and our Nation.

The Great Gen. Casimir Pulaski

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, October 11 will mark the 185th anniversary of the untimely and tragic death of one of our greatest Revolutionary heroes. It was on that date in the year 1779 that a burst of grapeshot from the British guns during the battle of Savannah snuffed out the life of the brilliant young Gen. Casimir Pulaski.

It is often said that no greater sacrifice can be made than for a man to lay down his life for his country. I believe Polish-born Pulaski made even a greater sacrifice since he fought and died for this, his adopted country.

Casimir Pulaski came from a wealthy family. His childhood was replete with the things that wealth could buy. But young Pulaski sought things which money could not buy. Even in his teens, he was opposed to much of the way of life about him. He sought and found companionship and friendship with a growing group of Polish patriots who plotted the overthrow of Russian domination.

He joined the group that staged the uprising in 1768 in an attempt to drive the Russians from Polish soil. Unfortunately, the uprising was crushed and its leadership and many of its participants were forced into exile. Pulaski was one of them. His fortune was forfeited and his lands were confiscated.

In 1775 Pulaski was in Paris still fired with a spirit of independence, still hopeful of bringing freedom to his native land. It was fortunate indeed that Pulaski came into contact with Benjamin Franklin, for from this association Pulaski adopted the cause being espoused by Franklin—help to the American colonies in trying to overthrow the yoke of the British.

With a letter from Franklin, young Pulaski arrived in Philadelphia in the dark days of 1777. He offered his services to Gen. George Washington. It is not known whether it was the ebullient personality of Pulaski or the letter from Franklin that caused Washington to accept his offer and place him on his own staff as a volunteer.

In a matter of a few months, young Pulaski had so proven himself in battle that Washington urged the Continental Congress to give him the rank of brigadier general and to put him in charge of creating an American cavalry.

Pulaski's enthusiasm, his zeal, and his bravery was such that it outshone many of his contemporary American officers. His ardor to beat the British and gain independence for the Colonies was so intense he asked for and got permission to create an independent corps of cavalry. This unit known as the Pulaski Legion was moved into fighting toward the south and carved its niche in history at Charleston and later in the Battle of Savannah where Pulaski was to lose his life while commanding the American-French cavalry.

Mr. Speaker, it is one of our great tragedies that this young patriot, who did so much for General Washington and his fellow officers and for the men of the ragged and weary Continental Army, should have to die at the age of 31. He is revered not only because of his great achievements along with "mad" Anthony Wayne in scouting and foraging for the supplies so essential to the starving soldiers at Valley Forge. His memory is not hallowed alone for the gallant charges he led in battle after battle. We pay him homage not only for creating the cavalry which became the great arm of American military prowess and went on to cover itself with glory wherever and whenever our country has been forced to resort to armed defense.

No, Mr. Speaker, we honor the name of Casimir Pulaski because he had the vision of mankind enjoying full freedom and independence; because he had the will to pursue his dreams even to the ultimate sacrifice of his life; and because he made himself a shining and heroic example of a true patriot.

It is not happenstance that the millions of Polish-born Americans or their descendents revere and pay homage to patriot Pulaski. It is not by accident that millions of Americans descended from its many nationalities look back upon General Pulaski as one of the great fathers of our independence. No, Mr. Speaker, I feel that the arrival upon our shores at the most critical time in our history of such men as Pulaski was ordained by the Almighty. To Him, then, we should express our gratitude for the deeds and actions of Pulaski and for the deeds and actions of his countrymen who followed him and assured that the independence which he fought to win would remain unblemished and intact for the generations of Americans to follow.

We should, on October 11, rededicate ourselves to help Poland, the country from whence Pulaski came, to soon regain its freedom and independence and to become a member of the family of free nations of the world.

The 88th Congress, 2d Session—I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a summary of major legislative actions of this session. This summary is based primarily on material prepared by the Office of the Coordinator of Information of the House:

Major legislative actions, 88th Cong., 2d sess.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AND INTERNAL SECURITY

Bill No.	Description	Public Law No.
H.R. 9637	Authorizes $16,900,000,000 for procurement and construction of planes, missiles, ships, and for research, development, tests, and evaluation in fiscal 1965.	88-288
H.R. 10456	Authorizes $5,200,000,000 for National Aeronautics and Space Administration for 1965 for research, development, construction, and administration; includes $2,600,000,000 for Apollo man-to-moon project.	88-369
H.R. 10945	Authorizes $2,600,000,000 for Atomic Energy Commission for fiscal 1965, including $771,000,000 for reduced weapons program and $13,500,000 for prototype reactor for atomic merchant ship.	88-332
H.R. 9640	Authorizes $71,800,000 for vessels, aircraft, and construction of facilities for strengthening of U.S. Coast Guard	88-281
H.R. 10300	Authorizes $1,500,000,000 for construction projects at Armed Forces bases at home and abroad, including 9,800 family housing units for members of Army, Navy, and Air Force.	88-390
H.R. 10000	Extends for 2 years, to June 30, 1966, authority of President to fix priorities, allocate defense materials, and expand manufacturing capacity under Defense Production Act.	88-343
S. 3075	Requires Atomic Energy Commission to sell, instead of lease, nuclear fuels to electric power companies beginning Jan. 1, 1971, in gradual transition to private ownership of such materials by June 30, 1973.	88-489
S. 2963	Extends for 5 years, to Sept. 1, 1969, patent licensing provisions of Atomic Energy Act, makes indemnity provisions applicable to construction projects licensed to Aug. 1, 1967; authorizes transfer of additional nuclear materials to EURATOM.	88-394
H.R. 11035	Authorizes extension of loans to 12 countries of 40 U.S. naval vessels	88-437
H.R. 10314	Extends for 4 years to June 30, 1968, authority under Federal Civil Defense Act to aid State and local agencies to meet administrative, personnel, training, and radiological equipment costs.	88-335
H.R. 950	Strengthens security provisions of National Security Agency	88-290
S. 1917	Provides authority to protect heads of foreign states and other visiting officials	88-493
H.J. Res. 1145	Approves and supports the determination of the President, as Commander in Chief, to repel attacks on U.S. forces and to prevent further aggression jeopardizing peace and security in southeast Asia.	88-408
H.R. 11380	Authorizes $3,250,000,000 for foreign aid in fiscal 1965	(*)
H.R. 7406	Increases U.S. participation in Inter-American Development Bank	88-259
H.J. Res. 779	Increases U.S. contribution to operations of the South Pacific Commission, whose jurisdiction includes American Samoa, Guam, and trust territories.	88-263
S. 2455	Authorizes expansion of Peace Corps and $115,000,000 for fiscal 1965	88-285
S. 2214	Authorizes United States to participate with 16 other nations in $750,000,000 increase in lending capital of the International Development Association.	86-310

See footnotes at end of table.

Major legislative actions, 88th Cong., 2d sess.—Continued

NATIONAL DEFENSE AND INTERNAL SECURITY—Continued

Bill No.	Description	Public Law No.
H.R. 3198	Provides for programs of economic and social development of Pacific Trust Territories	88-487
S. 2394	Chamizal Act to effectuate boundary treaty between United States and Mexico	88-300
S. 1988	Prohibits fishing by foreign vessels in U.S. territorial and Continental Shelf waters under penalty of ship seizure and fine or imprisonment or both, except as provided by treaty or license by the Treasury Department.	88-308
H.R. 4198	Provides for free importation of "instant" coffee, now subject to duty of 3 cents per pound	88-337
H. Con. Res. 343	Expresses sense of the Congress that every effort be made in United Nations to obtain payment of dues by nations now delinquent, failing which the penalty of loss of votes in General Assembly be invoked.	(1)
H.R. 9436	Extends for 3 years to Dec. 31, 1966, the Commission and the Advisory Committee on International Rules of Judicial Procedure	88-522
H.R. 7419	Authorizes conclusion of agreements with Mexico for joint construction, operation, and maintenance of emergency flood control works on the lower Colorado River.	88-411
H.R. 9740	Authorizes U.S. cooperation with Canada in establishment of Franklin D. Roosevelt International Park at Campobello, site of his summer home.	88-363
S. 1627	Permits payment by the United States of its share of cost of International Control Commission in Laos	88-468
S. 2701	Authorizes study to determine site for construction of a proposed sea-level canal between Atlantic and Pacific Oceans	88-609
H.R. 12259	Fixes procedure for Americans whose property was seized by Cuba to establish a legal record of their claims	(*)
S. 3074	Requires approval of the President for construction of any international bridge connecting the United States and another country	(*)

TREATIES

Bill No.	Description	Public Law No.
Executive O (88th, 1st).	Protocol extending for 6 years and amending Interim Convention on Conservation of North Pacific Fur Seals, signed at Washington, D.C., Oct. 8, 1963, by Canada, Japan, the Soviet Union, and the United States.	(3)
Executive R (88th, 1st).	Protocol extending for 2 years the International Sugar Council, to continue collection and dissemination of statistics and hold periodic discussions on world sugar problems.	(2)

NATIONAL ECONOMY

Bill No.	Description	Public Law No.
S. 2642	Creates Office of Economic Opportunity to administer job corps of urban and rural youth, work-training and work-study programs, encourage local action to reduce poverty; authorizes $947,500,000 for fiscal 1965.	88-452
H.R. 8363	Lowers rates of personal and corporate income taxes; makes numerous changes in Internal Revenue Code for net reductions of $11,500,000,000, partially effective in 1964.	88-272
H.R. 11376	Extends for 1 year, up to July 1, 1965, the current schedule of excise taxes on liquor, cigarettes, automobiles and parts, telephone service, and airline tickets.	88-348
H.R. 8000	Imposes tax on purchases of foreign securities, with certain exceptions	88-563
H.R. 11375	Raises temporary limit on national debt by $9,000,000,000, from $315,000,000,000, to $324,000,000,000, for fiscal year ending July 1, 1965	88-327
S. 6	Authorizes 3-year, $375,000,000 program of grants and loans to help States and communities provide mass transit facilities and service	88-365
S.J. Res. 71	Establishes a National Commission on Food Marketing to study trade procedures and price relationships from producer to consumer; authorizes $1,500,000	88-354
H.R. 11611	Establishes a National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress	88-444
S. 1309	Broadens disaster loan authority of the Small Business Administration	88-264
S. 298	Raises amount SBA may invest in debentures of a small business investment corporation, and amount the latter may invest in any one firm	88-273
S. 1642	Brings trading in over-the-counter securities under control of Securities and Exchange Commission; provides for qualification standards and discipline over brokers, dealers, and their employees.	88-467
S. 2950	Authorizes minting of "1964" coins up to July 1, 1965, if necessary, to relieve coin shortage	88-580
H.R. 10503	Authorizes $1,100,000,000 annually for fiscal years 1966 and 1967 as Federal contribution to construction costs of primary and secondary State highways and city extensions; and for road projects in national forests, parks, and Indian reservations.	88-423
S. 1153	Extends for 3 years, to June 30, 1967, aid to States and communities for construction of airports; provides $75,000,000 a year on a matching basis	88-280
S. 741	Prohibits schemes in interstate commerce to influence by bribery the outcome of sporting events	88-316
H.R. 10669	Extends for 2 years to June 30, 1966, the Renegotiation Act for recovery of excess profits on defense contracts, including contracts with Federal Aviation Agency.	88-339
H.R. 6041	Amends Davis-Bacon Act to require Federal contractors to conform to local area fringe benefits as well as prevailing wage scales	88-349
H.R. 11499	Extends for 2 years to July 1, 1966, authority of Federal Reserve banks to purchase up to $5,000,000,000 of U.S. securities directly from the Treasury.	88-344
H.R. 8230	Increased to 60 percent from 40 percent the limit national banks may lend on growing timber in forest tracts	88-341
H.R. 10053	Extends for 1 year to June 30, 1965, the limit of 55 percent on construction-differential subsidy for vessels engaged in foreign trade	88-370
S. 1006	Increases from 33⅓ to 55 percent the subsidy for construction of fishing vessels; extends program for 5 years to July 1, 1968, with authorization of $10,000,000 annually.	88-498

GOVERNMENTAL REORGANIZATION

Bill No.	Description	Public Law No.
H.R. 7152	Provides for enforcement of voting rights; injunctions against discrimination in public accommodations; protection of rights to education; extends Civil Rights Commission for 4 years to Jan. 31, 1968; establishes a Community Relations Service and a Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity; requires nondiscrimination in federally assisted programs.	88-352
H.R. 4638	Authorizes General Services Administration to provide funds and facilities for orderly transition of Executive power between election and inauguration of new President.	88-277
S.J. Res. 136	Renames National Cultural Center as the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts; authorizes funds to match public contributions.	88-260
H.R. 3496	Extends to June 1, 1965, authority of President to submit reorganization plans to the Congress, except for creation of new agencies	88-351
H.R. 11049	Adjusts basic pay rates of postal and classified employees and certain officers of all 3 branches of Federal Government, generally effective July 1, 1964.	88-426
H.R. 6237	Authorizes 5-year, $2,500,000 program for collection, reproduction, and publication of original source documents significant to U.S. history	88-383
H.R. 9586	Establishes a National Council on the Arts in the Executive Office of the President	88-579
S. 1057	Authorizes U.S. district courts to appoint public defenders for indigent defendants in criminal cases	88-455
H.R. 5945	Establishes a commission to recommend procedures for settlement of political status of Puerto Rico	88-271
H.R. 7381	Repeals old statutes, enacts new law governing dual compensation of Federal employees including retired Armed Forces officers in civilian Government posts.	88-448
S. 1664	Establishes an Administrative Conference of the United States to study methods and problems of Federal agencies	88-499

SOCIAL SECURITY, HEALTH, AND WELFARE

Bill No.	Description	Public Law No.
H.R. 9876	Extends for 2 years, to June 30, 1967, the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act; authorizes $15,000,000 including $5,000,000 for special project in District of Columbia.	88-368
H.R. 10041	Extends for 5 years to June 30, 1969, Hill-Burton Act providing Federal aid for construction, modernization of hospitals, nursing homes and other medical centers; authorizes $1,300,000,000, including funds for areawide planning of health facilities on a 50-50 matching basis.	88-443
H.R. 11241	Authorizes $287,000,000, 5-year program to combat shortage of nurses, including grants for construction and rebuilding of school and college facilities, traineeships for advanced professionals, and loans for students.	88-581
H.R. 11083	Extends for 5 years, with authorization of $70,000,000, programs for traineeships to increase number of professional public health personnel and expand health project grants to schools of medicine, dentistry, engineering, social work, and pharmacy.	88-497
S. 3049	Housing Act of 1964, authorizes $1,200,000,000, for urban renewal, 37,500 new low-rent public housing units, loans for housing for elderly, for farm housing, and other existing programs; includes facilities for migrant farmworkers; extends maturity of FHA-financed home mortgages, and lowers down payments; provides compensation for persons and businesses dislocated by urban renewal projects.	88-560
S. 2265	Extends Federal assistance under Library Services Act to urban areas; provides matching grants for construction of library buildings; authorizes $45,000,000 for 1964.	88-269
S. 3060	Extends National Defense Education Act for 3 years to July 1, 1965, increases authorization for college student loans from $135,000,000 currently to $195,000,000 for fiscal 1968. Also extends for 1 year and requires review of authority to aid federally impacted school districts.	(*)
H.J. Res. 976	Appropriates supplemental $50,000,000 to President's disaster fund to aid Alaska earthquake relief	88-296

See footnotes at end of table.

Major legislative actions, 88th Cong., 2d sess.—Continued

SOCIAL SECURITY, HEALTH, AND WELFARE—Continued

Bill No.	Description	Public Law No.
S. 2772	Amends Alaska Omnibus Act to facilitate statehood by extending period of Federal grants and services	88-311
S. 2881	Authorizes $50,000,000 in further relief of Alaska earthquake and tidal damage	88-451
H.R. 9393	Liberalizes requirements of Social Security Act relative to filing time for benefits under disability provisions	(*)
H.J. Res. 1041	Extends for 90 days to Oct. 1, 1964, rental housing program for elderly in rural areas, pending further legislation	88-340
H.R. 10466	Extends to June 30, 1967, authority of HEW, under Social Security Act, to provide temporary assistance to U.S. citizens returning from a foreign country under emergency hardship circumstances	88-347
S. 978	Restores to certain owners of fishing boats the privilege of free medical care and hospitalization at U.S. Public Health Service hospitals	88-424
H.R. 10473	Extends to June 30, 1967, provision of Social Security Act permitting States to transfer dependent children from unsuitable foster homes to nonprofit institutions.	(*)

[1] Adopted.

[2] Ratified Jan. 30, 1964.

(*) Awaiting President's signature.

The Farmer: The Record and the Choice—A Report on Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, every 4 years in our wonderful Republic each political party must account to the people for its stewardship of the public trust. Each party must take its record to the people together with its proposals for the future. Accordingly the Democratic Party which has held complete control of both the White House and the Congress for these past 4 years must now make its accounting to the American farmer.

As the ranking Republican member on the House Committee on Agriculture, I would like to take this occasion to present the record and the proposals that Republicans have made in behalf of the American farmer.

THE GOP RECORD IN CONGRESS

Let me say at the outset that Republicans serving in Congress the past 4 years, as members of the minority party, have opposed those programs which we felt were not in the best interest of American agriculture, and we have supported those programs which we felt were good for farmers.

There is an important distinction for every farmer to keep in mind when he looks at the legislative record of the past 4 years and that is to remember that there is a big difference between being for the farmer and being for administration farm bills. In many cases a few more rubberstamp votes for an administration farm bill would actually have been a vote against the best interests of farmers.

Here are several examples of what I mean:

In 1961 the administration tried to impose marketing quotas and controls on cattle, hogs, poultry, lambs, and all other livestock products. In 1962 it tried to imprison dairy farmers in a penitentiary for failing to keep proper books and records. It also sought to establish mandatory, strict controls on corn and feed grain farmers. Another administration effort was to impose a strict control wheat certificate program on wheat farmers. The administration also tried to set up a subsidized grazing program which would aggravate already low livestock prices.

Of course Republicans in Congress opposed these programs and, except for the wheat program, each of them was narrowly defeated in Congress. In the case of the mandatory wheat certificate program, over 638,000 wheat farmers rejected it in the 1963 referendum.

While Republicans opposed programs which were not good for farmers, we supported, amended, and improved legislation which was beneficial to farmers.

Here again are several examples of what I mean. During the past 4 years we worked for the enactment of legislation dealing with the improvement of Farmers Home Administration loan programs; extension of the Sugar Act; extension and amendment of Public Law 480, the food for peace program; emergency hay harvesting on conservation reserve land; extension of the school milk program; surplus grain sales in disaster areas; extension of the Wool Act; extension of the Great Plains conservation program; extension of Armed Forces and veterans hospitals dairy programs; hog cholera eradication; extension of the Mexican farm labor program; bills to improve the rice, peanut, tobacco, and cotton programs; amendments to the Cooperative Forest Management Act; improvements in the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act; expanded rural telephone service; emergency loan programs; small watershed projects; animal disease eradication; improving education at our land grant colleges; and the establishment of a bipartisan commission to study the marketing of food from the farmer to consumer. In addition, we overwhelmingly supported the appropriations bills which provided the money needed to finance the necessary activities of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

These examples are consistent with the record of the last Republican Congress in 1953–54 when such important programs as Public Law 480; the Small Watershed Act; the school milk, armed services, brucellosis eradication, and veterans milk programs; and the flexible price support laws were enacted.

Much more could be accomplished in the development of closer bipartisan cooperation during these past 4 years had it not been for arm twisting and other pressure tactics used by the administration on members of the majority party.

THE ADMINISTRATION'S RECORD

The administration would lead farmers to believe they never had it so good, but we all know that just isn't true. The cost-price squeeze is worse than ever. Total farm debt is up $10 billion in the past 4 years; 2.1 million farm people have left the land, and 376,000 farms have disappeared since 1960. Taxpayer investment in surplus farm commodities stands in excess of $7 billion while employment in the U.S. Department of Agriculture together with total expenditures by that agency have climbed to all time highs.

The administration claims per capita and per farm income is up. Of course it is. The reason is simply that there are fewer farmers around today to share in the total net income for agriculture. The total income pie is about the same, but there are fewer farmers today to share in it.

The one statistic that the administration never mentions is the parity ratio. This figure has been published each month by the Department of Agriculture for over 30 years. The parity ratio measures the relationship between the prices farmers receive and the prices they pay for their living and production expenses.

In 1963 this parity ratio dropped to 78, the lowest since 1939. On September 15, 1964, it stood at 75. During the Eisenhower administration the parity ratio averaged 84.5.

The administration has been embarrassed by this revealing statistic and has changed its method of calculating the parity ratio. It is now adding Government payments. Even with Government payments added to the formula the parity ratio during this administration is going down to the lowest levels since depression days.

THE FUTURE

Rather than dwell on the failures of this administration which I admit are plentiful, I feel it is more important to go on to the future that faces American agriculture.

I think we should recognize that American farmers have made the most outstanding contribution to our economy of any single group in the Nation. Their efficiency, hard work, frugality, and enterprise have earned them both the appreciation of the American consumer and the admiration of the world.

Farmers are now being told by the administration that they face a choice of three roads for the future—one road of Government controls—or "supply management"—one road of complete withdrawal from agriculture by the Government, and one road of voluntary commodity programs. The administration says the Republican Party will pull the rug out from under the farmer by following the road to complete withdrawal. This is not true.

The Republican Party offers farmers a variety of programs designed to improve farm income while leaving the farm management decisions on the farm where they belong.

Our 1964 platform pledges the development of truly voluntary commodity programs using payments in kind out of Government-owned surpluses. It seeks to divert unneeded land to conservation uses. It promises price supports free of political manipulation and dumping. It seeks better farm prices in the market. It supports farmer-owned and operated cooperatives in their efforts to improve the bargaining power of farmers. It supports the rural electrification and rural telephone programs. It promises to resist efforts to make the American farmer dependent for his economic survival on either compensatory payments or arbitrary administrative action by any Secretary of Agriculture.

It also asks for improvements in the rural area development program which was started under the Eisenhower administration in an effort to expand income opportunities for low-income farmers and rural people.

It pledges effective and meaningful action on the importation of beef, veal, and cotton textiles.

It also seeks to establish new markets both at home and overseas.

It does not call for the termination of the cotton, tobacco, rice, and peanut programs. It recognizes that producers of these crops have in the past approved these programs, and it does not seek to change them unless better programs can be developed.

It asks for a better wheat program, one which is more acceptable to farmers than the present program under which only 35.4 percent of all wheat farmers are participating.

It seeks legislation to provide farmers with an adequate labor supply with fair wages to farm workers.

It pledges to work for a strong social security system.

It promises to correct, by constitutional amendment, the reapportionment decision of the Supreme Court which will, unless changed, make farmers and other rural people pay ever-increasing State taxes and lose their present representation.

The presidential candidate of the Republican Party, Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, has repeatedly stated that he supports the Republican platform. I know BARRY GOLDWATER. I know he is a man of his word. I know he will not pull the rug out from under the American farmer.

In addition to the platform, Republicans from rural areas have made a number of other proposals which I hope the next administration and the next Congress will consider. These are:

First. The appointment of a Secretary of Agriculture who has actual farm experience. Farmers need a spokesman in the Cabinet who has actually plowed, planted, and reaped a crop and raised livestock. They need a man who understands agriculture and speaks for farmers, and not a spokesman for the Americans for Democratic Action.

Second. No one makes a greater contribution to the family farm than the farm wife. She has to be a partner in the full sense in order to meet the many problems of today's farm family. Would it not be a good idea to appoint a real farm wife to a high position in the Department of Agriculture? I feel that the viewpoint of today's farm family could be recognized much more fully if this were done.

Third. Market prices for grains could be strengthened if Government sales policies were changed. Farm organizations throughout the Nation generally agree on the proposition that the CCC release price for the sale of surplus grain should be increased from 105 percent of the support price to 115 percent of support price. This should be done.

Fourth. Public Law 480, the Eisenhower food-for-peace program, should be continued. Increased emphasis should be placed on title IV long-term dollar credit sales to friendly nations. The expansion of these sales for dollars would help develop new markets overseas, help our balance-of-payments problem, and give our taxpayers a better return for their investment than in the case of sales for foreign currencies.

Fifth. The recommendations of President Eisenhower's Commission on Industrial Uses of Agricultural Commodities should be pursued and implemented. These recommendations have languished in Democratic Congresses for the past 6 years. Certainly a nation that can land men on the moon can find the secrets of chemistry needed to transform some of our surplus into useful and economical industrial products.

Sixth. The Sugar Act should be extended and U.S. beet and cane growers should be given the legal right to sell the sugar their Government asked them to produce. The administration has let the foreign quotas in the Sugar Act expire on December 31, 1964. It has also blocked efforts to enact legislation to permit the marketing of the 1963–64 production of U.S. sugar producers. This callous disregard of responsibility must be corrected.

Seventh. Next year the present feed grain and wheat programs expire. Voluntary programs for these crops should be enacted along the lines set out in the 1964 Republican platform.

Eighth. Finally, a Republican President should appoint as his advisers, a committee of real farmers and rural citizens. They could advise him on agricultural policy from the standpoint of how the complicated and grandiose proposals which come out of Washington's bureaucracy will affect real farmers out in the country. They can also advise him on new and better ways to promote our free enterprise system of farming.

Yes, there are three roads for farmers to travel in selecting which party will be entrusted with their welfare during the next 4 years. The first road toward controls, regimentation, and greater bureaucracy is the road the Democratic Party has long advocated and has tried many times to get farmers to travel. The second road to complete withdrawal is one which would mean great and unnecessary hardship for farmers and rural people. It has been rejected by the Republican Party. The third road, the one toward voluntary adjustment by individual farmers making their own decisions on their own farms based on their own problems and aspirations is the road which in 1964 the Republican Party offers to travel. The choice is up to the American farmer.

Cypriot Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, at the 42d supreme convention of the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association, 1,500 delegates unanimously adopted an important resolution on the troubled Cyprus situation.

The convention endorsed the principle of self-determination for Cyprus and condemned the recent attacks on Cypriots that have alarmed all civilized nations.

A great many Members of Congress sent the Ahepa convention wires and telegrams of support and encouragement.

I would like to make the resolution and the messages available to all Members of the House under unanimous consent and include them in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

1. The members of the Order of Ahepa again reaffirm their oft-stated opposition to communism and all other forms of tyranny and subversion.

2. Immediately after World War I, President Wilson gave hope and inspiration to the enslaved and downtrodden nations and peoples of the world by enunciating the principle and doctrine of self-determination.

This doctrine was wholeheartedly supported and became a cornerstone of American foreign policy. As a result of this policy, great segments of the world were liberated, and many peoples of the world have established their own democratic nations in Africa and Asia. It is a policy that continues to give hope and inspiration to those nations and peoples still enslaved behind the Iron Curtain. It is a policy that has given deserved credit to the United States. There is a struggle going on in the island of Cyprus. The people of Cyprus are entitled to self-determination for the purpose of establishing a democratic government where all the citizens will have equal suffrage, equal protection of the laws, religious freedom, and equal educational, economic, and social opportunities in accordance with American history and tradition.

The Order of Ahepa, in convention assembled in Toronto, Ontario, Canada, again endorses this basic principle of U.S. foreign policy, and urges the U.S. Government to wholeheartedly pursue and fully implement this policy of self-determination for the people of Cyprus.

3. The Christians of Constantinople and other parts of Turkey are being expelled and persecuted. Their properties are being confiscated without compensation. The Order of Ahepa condemns this arbitrary, unjust, and uncivilized treatment of these Christians by Turkey, and calls upon all men of good will everywhere to urge their respective governments to come to the aid of these unfortunate victims.

4. The Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople and its hierarchy are being persecuted and exiled unjustly. The Order of Ahepa condemns such barbaric practices and appeals to all people of every faith to join in this condemnation so that religious freedom may be reaffirmed in Turkey.

“I feel that the people of Cyprus should have the right to determine the form and type of government they prefer. The people should be permitted to decide this important question for themselves.

“J. Edgar Chenoweth,
“Member of Congress, Colorado.”

“The ideal solution is one which accords self-determination to the people of Cyprus with specific guarantees of the rights of the Turkish minority.

“Thomas J. Dodd,
“U.S. Senator, Connecticut.”

“I am hopeful that during the truce which is now in effect that the principle of self-determination may be clearly established for Cyprus.

“Eugene J. McCarthy,
“U.S. Senator, Minnesota.”

“I believe the people of Cyprus should enjoy the right of self-government under a constitution safeguarding the rights of all people.

“Harry F. Byrd,
“U.S. Senator, Virginia.”

“This month will mark the fourth anniversary of an independent Cyprus. Therefore, it is my sincerest hope that as the Cypriot people reconstitute their sovereignty and freedom from colonial status, a lasting peace will be resolved, through the efforts of the United Nations or other mediating offices, to enable this republic to progress in its development without conflict and disharmony.

“John W. McCormack,
“Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives.”

“As one who accepts Woodrow Wilson's belief that all peoples are entitled to the right of self-determination, I am satisfied that the people of Cyprus should enjoy the right of self-government under a constitution to be adopted by them which should contain adequate safeguards for the rights of the Turkish minority, as well as for the rights of all other Cypriots.

“Sam J. Ervin, Jr.,
“U.S. Senator, North Carolina.”

“In my judgment, the principle of self-determination should be the cornerstone of American foreign policy with regard to Cyprus and all other nations. I believe, with Woodrow Wilson, that all people shall have the free choice as to their form of government.

“Admittedly, the crisis in Cyprus is the direct consequence of the unfortunate British policy of playing one side against the other during the 1950's. The result today is that feelings are so strong that a solution is extremely difficult. I share your hope, however, that an agreement can be reached without resort to war.

“Lucien N. Nedzi,
“Member of Congress, Michigan.”

“I am afraid there will not be any permanent peace on Cyprus so long as a minority of 17 percent can exercise a veto over such critical government policies as taxation, foreign affairs, and defense. A government so organized has little if any chance of permanency. Certainly the rights of a minority in any country must be protected but in providing such protection it is equally important that the rights of the majority not be sacrificed.

“The principle of self-determination is one which I think most if not all citizens of the United States endorse. I do not see how any country can have an effective government if majority rule is to be abrogated. So I believe that the only practicable and workable solution of the Cyprus problem will depend upon the adoption of a new constitution to be voted on by all of the people of Cyprus, but such a constitution must include definite and permanent guarantees to protect the rights of the minority.

“Maintenance of a permanent outside force on Cyprus to preserve peace will be intolerable from many standpoints. This seems to me to leave the principle of self-determination by the people of Cyprus, in a fair election in which the right of all who are eligible to vote shall be guaranteed, offers the only practicable solution of what all recognize as a very serious problem.

“Charles Raper Jonas,
“Member of Congress, North Carolina.”

“I believe strongly in the right of self-determination of the people of Cyprus and this has been a basic American policy throughout our life as a nation. Even though the situation on this unfortunate island is an emotional one, the peace of the world requires that restraint be exercised by both parties to the dispute. It would be tragic, indeed, if two strong allies of the United States and bulwarks of the collective security organization against communism should enter into a conflict which would not only not solve the problem immediately, but whose inevitable result would be the triumph of the communism to whose restraint both are dedicated.

“John S. Monagan,
“Member of Congress, Connecticut.”

“Every Greek must sympathize with the determination of the Greek Cypriot to govern his own destiny and to live in peace. The savage conflict which is gripping the island of Cyprus is the bitter legacy of years of oppression of the Greek people by the Turks. After the hard-fought struggle for independence which finally ended in 1960 the Cypriot again finds his life destroyed by civil war and the threat of invasion. The Zurich Agreement was an honest, but futile effort to enable the Greek and the Turkish communities to live in peace together. The failure of that effort is clear. No form of government imposed from the outside can bring the island of Cyprus the peace and prosperity for which it has waited so long.

“Harrison A. Williams, Jr.,
“U.S. Senator, New Jersey.”

“Congratulations on the work you are doing to alert the free world to the serious situations in Cyprus. I support self-determination of Cyprus with majority rule so long as the rights of minorities are protected. There is no reason why a 17-percent minority should prevent the 82-percent Greek majority from having effective government.

“Hugh Scott,
“U.S. Senator, Pennsylvania.”

“Heartily endorse principle of national self-determination with adequate protection of minorities. Fervently hope your work may be fruitful and that this may be achieved in Cyprus.

“Joseph M. McDade,
“U.S. Congressman, Pennsylvania.”

“Please convey my congratulations and best wishes to your members, and especially the Indiana delegation, at your 42d supreme convention. I share your members' concern for the crisis in Cyprus and pledge to support efforts to secure peace and justice there.

“Vance Hartke,
“U.S. Senator, Indiana.”

“Many Americans have been appalled by the news from Cyprus of the air attacks upon the civilian population, the suffering unnecessarily caused, and the nightmare which for the last 6 months has been the fate of the people of Cyprus. Greek or Turk, much of this havoc was caused by the interference of Turkey and the so-called veto rule which deprived the majority of the democratic right to act and vested in the minority the power to disrupt the orderly processes of government regardless of its effect on the general populace. The attacks of the Turkish Air Force upon the unprotected coastal towns and villages of Cyprus without warning have affronted our sense of civilization recalling some of the worst episodes of a generation ago as mayor and as a private citizen conscious of God-given rights of every person regardless of race and religion. I hope and pray with my friends of Greek and Turkish descent and all Americans of good will that the negotiations now taking place in Geneva will find a just and permanent solution to the problem of Cyprus which will bring peace not only to that unfortunate island, to Greece, to Turkey but to the rest of the world as well.

“Robert F. Wagner,
“Mayor, City of New York.”

“I assure you that as a citizen of this Nation, I have always believed in majority rule with constitutional guarantees for minority groups.

“It is my hope, just as I know it is the hope of you and all the members of the Order of Ahepa, that the Cyprus question can be brought to a peaceful and equitable solution at an early date.

“Terry Sanford,
“Governor, North Carolina.”

“I want to assure you of my support of the principle of self-determination with regard to Cyprus. I might add that, it is my opinion that in the best tradition of democracy, the Greek people of Cyprus will not use this right of self-determination to ride roughshod over the rights of any minority group, but will protect the legitimate interests of such groups.

“Charles S. Joelson,
“Member of Congress, New Jersey.”

“Certainly, the people of any country have a right to determine their future. I agree that the people of Cyprus should have the right of self-determination and I am hopeful this principle can be recognized soon.

“Byron G. Rogers,
“Member of Congress, Colorado.”

“Considering the traditional emphasis in our foreign policy on the principle of self-determination ever since this principle was first postulated in the Declaration of Independence, I would like to urge that this tradition be kept in mind when policies concerning the Cyprus question are formulated.

"I have made a study of the Cyprus issue, and have concluded that self-determination would be the only policy consistent with the facts of the situation, as well as being consistent with our principles.

"I hope that it will be possible to continue our traditional policy of supporting self-determination, in regard to this issue.

"Dominick V. Daniels,
"Member of Congress,
"U.S. Representative from New Jersey."

"Certainly, I believe that the people of any country should have the right of self-determination. Likewise, the people of any nation should be free from interference in their internal affairs from other nations.

"John Bell Williams,
"Member of Congress, Mississippi."

"It certainly seems to me that the proposal for a constitution to be voted upon by all the people of Cyprus is the kind of proposal that we should support since it is in keeping with our basic policy of permitting all people to settle their problems through traditional democratic processes.

"As you well know, I have always been deeply interested in the problems of all Greek-Americans, and I know they share my concern about the serious situation which now exists in Cyprus.

"B. Everett Jordan,
"U.S. Senator, North Carolina."

"The right of self-determination for all peoples was first promulgated by our great President Woodrow Wilson right after World War I. It has since been one of the cornerstones of American foreign policy. We have supported this policy in the post-World War II period for all the nations in Africa and Asia. The late, martyred and beloved John F. Kennedy, both as President and Senator, was in the forefront of all American efforts to implement and effectuate this policy.

"I have consistently supported this policy in the past. I think that the people of Cyprus are entitled to self-determination. I am sure that judging by the past and recent history of the Greek people, that, as the majority, they will respect and protect the rights of the Turkish minority.

"Harold D. Donohue,
"Member of Congress, Massachusetts."

"I endorse a solution of the Cyprus problem in accordance with United Nations principles of self-determination and hope this can be achieved.

"Lister Hill,
"U.S Senator, Alabama."

"I join with you in supporting majority rule in Cyprus to self-government and self-determination of. I trust that the situation in Cyprus can be resolved peacefully in the best interest of all Cypriots.

"George M. Rhodes,
"Member of Congress, Pennsylvania."

"I wholeheartedly support the right of the people of Cyprus to self-government and self-determination of their Government. I would like to see all foreign armies removed from Cyprus if peace can be maintained by the United Nations Forces until an election and the independence of Cyprus can be secured and peace guaranteed.

"Olin D. Johnston,
"U.S. Senator, South Carolina."

"I have long been a strong supporter of the principle of self-determination for people everywhere in the world. Our forefathers believed in their right to determine the kind of government under which they were to live. As a result, we enjoy today the greatest measure of freedom of any other nation. American devotion to the principle of self-determination is reflected in our support of the United States.

"The Greek people on Cyprus are engaged in a historic struggle to determine the form of government under which they and their children are to live. Comprising the majority of the Cypriot population, the Greeks on Cyprus deserve the support of all those who respect the principle of self-determination.

"It is my hope that the Greek majority on Cyprus will be permitted to work its will. Only through such action can peace and economic progress be brought to a land which means so much to the cause of the free world.

"Basil L. Whitener,
"Member of Congress, North Carolina."

"As one who accepts Woodrow Wilson's belief that all peoples are entitled to the right of self-determination, I am satisfied that the people of Cyprus should enjoy the right to self-government under a constitution to be adopted by them, which should contain adequate safeguards for the rights of the Turkish minority, as well as the rights of all other Cypriots.

"Sam J. Ervin, Jr.,
"U.S. Senator, North Carolina."

"There is no question that the Greek people are not the aggressors in this situation. The House Foreign Affairs Committee, on which I serve, has been fully briefed on this problem. I am hopeful that the new cease fire will permit a solution that will uphold the rightful claims of the Greek people on Cyprus.

"F. Bradford Morse,
"Member of Congress, Massachusetts."

"As you may know, I have always maintained that the people of any country should be permitted to choose the government of their choice in free and open elections, and that there should be no interference by an outside alien power.

"You may be assured of my continuing stand in this matter.

"John Lesinski,
"Member of Congress, Michigan."

"I am deeply grateful to you for giving me the benefit of your thinking and that of the other members of your fine organization. I certainly agree that the people of Cyprus are entitled to the rights mentioned in your letter and I sincerely hope that steps can be taken to guarantee these rights to them.

"I hope that our State Department will take this position, and you can count on my support in any way in which I can help.

"With fond regards, I am

"John Stennis,
"U.S. Senator, Mississippi."

"As a nation we have always basically believed in self-determination. I am personally for this position as a matter of principle. In this instance I recognize that before this can be accomplished without danger of war, there are certain political questions with the major powers involved, Greece and Turkey, which must be resolved, and it is these upon which the concentration is being placed. Certain facts stand out in my mind: The present constitution is not workable. The Greek Cypriots do comprise approximately 80 percent of the population. Therefore, as in our own country, the majority is entitled to certain specific privileges and powers, but the 20-percent minority, as with us, is entitled to the protection of their individual liberties and civil rights.

"These are the matters which must be negotiated, and I believe can be negotiated, when the present highly charged emotional and military atmosphere has been pacified and relaxed.

"James Roosevelt,
"Member of Congress, California."

"I wish you to know that I am in agreement with the principle of self-determination in resolving the problems that beset the Island of Cyprus.

"In a democratic form of government, the rights of the minority must be protected, but it is the will of the majority which must prevail.

"Wayne N. Aspinall,
"Member of Congress, Colorado."

"I feel that every country should be free to establish and maintain its own government and handle its internal affairs without intervention from other countries.

"Tom G. Abernethy,
"Member of Congress, Mississippi."

"I concur fully, that the people of Cyprus have a right to self-determination without interference from other nations.

"Albert Watson,
"Member of Congress, South Carolina."

"To all of us interested in the issue of Cyprus these days there is great concern. We see hope, however, that peace can be restored so that all of the peoples of Cyprus may live in harmony. There must be respect for majority rights. There must be respect for minority rights. I am hopeful that the voice of the order of Ahepa will continue to be heard clearly in the days ahead.

"Joseph S. Clark,
"U.S. Senator, Pennsylvania."

"Please express to the delegates that I am in sympathy for a just and peaceful settlement of the Cyprus crisis, with the Cyprus citizens given their choice of self-determination.

"Haydon Burns,
"Mayor of Jacksonville, Fla., Democratic Nominee for Governor-Elect."

"At this hour in the history of the great Ahepa organization please be assured Members of Congress are aware of the critical situation existing and you may be sure I stand ready to assist in every way to assure the right of self-determination for all freedom-loving people.

"Robert T. McLoskey,
"Member of Congress, Illinois."

"Certainly I endorse wholeheartedly the traditional principle of determination, and share your conviction that free people should have the right to manage their own affairs without outside interference.

"Ed Edmondson,
"Member of Congress, Oklahoma."

"I support just solution of Cyprus problem in accordance with U.N. principles of self-determination. Hope such solution will be reached.

"John Sparkman,
"U.S. Senator, Alabama."

"I endorse the ancient principle of national self-determination which is in the very best tradition of the United States of America and Greece so long as in that same tradition there are adequate safeguards for minority groups.

"Daniel J. Flood,
"Member of Congress, Pennsylvania."

"Ahepa is to be commended for its dedication to the cause of freedom and its concern for the individual and his rights. May the warm fellowship be extended to all your members.

"William Scranton,
"Governor, Pennsylvania."

"Well, of course, I have had an opportunity for a long period of time to observe these international problems, and I can see no reason why self-determination should not be permitted to the people of any nation.

"For a major nation to step into a smaller nation and endeavor to predetermine its international political or economic welfare is, in my opinion, an erroneous procedure. Were I in a position to create a policy of this character, you may rest assured that the above statement would be the basic philosophy of the policy I would issue.

"Harry R. Sheppard,
"Member of Congress, California."

"I am concerned as we all are about the situation in Cyprus and most certainly endorse principle of self-determination for the island with protection of all minorities. I fervently hope there will be a peaceful solution to the current problems and disputes. I can assure you that the Congress will continue to give this matter the consideration and attention it warrants.

"Benjamin Rosenthal,
"Member of Congress, New York."

"I know your convention will raise its significant voice for continuing the fight for freedom in the world and particularly for self-determination for the heroic people of Cyprus.

"Claude Pepper,
"Member of Congress, Florida."

"It is essential, not only to troubled Cyprus, but to the peace of the world that a just and reasonable solution to this dispute be speedily achieved. In all negotiations compromises are usually necessary, but in my opinion there can be no compromise of the basic right of majority self-determination free from outside dictation or coercion. I have stressed this point to our officials and have urged continued adherence to the principle of representative government by the consent of the majority in the present crisis. This has been a fundamental policy of our diplomatic efforts on behalf of peace for almost half a century, since its promulgation by President Woodrow Wilson; without it, the search for peace must be futile.

"Let us hope and pray that, guided by right principles, a just and permanent accord may be reached in Cyprus and that the most close and cordial relations may exist between our nations.

"Joseph G. Minish,
"Member of Congress, New Jersey."

"You may be sure that I am continuing my efforts to bring peace, law and order to this afflicted island and its inhabitants which include such a large number of Greek people, entitled to have their rights as free men and women recognized, and to be protected against aggression from any and every source.

"At the outset of this recent outbreak, I again immediately communicated with the Department of State urging that the Department and our Government render every possible help, through the United Nations and otherwise, to stop military aggression and bring about peaceful conditions and orderly free government in Cyprus, and I fervently hope and pray that these great, humane objectives can speedily be realized.

"I want you and all our Greek friends to know that I will leave nothing undone to support and sustain our own Government in every measure to accomplish these ends, which I have urged upon our Government with all my heart.

"Let me again join you in pleading for self-determination, peace and fair and impartial, responsible, representative government in Cyprus, and I am both anxious and resolved to render this cause every possible measure of support and assistance. May peace, order and good government soon be realized in Cyprus.

"Philip J. Philbin,
"Member of Congress, Massachusetts."

"The vexing problem in Cyprus regarding the Greek and Turkish populations demands a prompt and equitable solution.

"Insofar as there is an overwhelming Greek majority on the island of 4 to 1, I would think the most reasonable solution would be to have a popular referendum to adopt a more practical and workable constitution. If the majority wishes to continue the independent status or to adopt a policy of union with Greece, absolute guarantees for the protection of the minority interests should be incorporated in the new Constitution.

"Serious consideration should be given to the very real possibility of repatriating the Turkish minority to its homeland—and, as a matter of fairness, extending the same offer to the Greek minority in Turkey—with appropriate compensation for property, travel and resettlement expenses. Most important is the settlement of the problem as rapidly as possible so that continued violence and bloodshed can be avoided.

"Claiborne Pell,
"U.S. Senator, Rhode Island."

"I believe that the people of Cyprus should have the opportunity to select the type of government that they wish for themselves. If the Cypriot people are allowed to settle their own affairs and exercise their right to determine for themselves the type of government they ought to have, this matter would resolve itself.

"The U.S. Government, moreover, should make it crystal clear that the present involvement of Turkey, Britain, and Greece is not only a violation of the principles upon which their government was founded but illegal and immoral as well. The people of Cyprus have certain inalienable rights which should be honored and respected without outside interference.

"Paul A. Fino,
"Member of Congress, New York."

"I would wholeheartedly support any program that will provide complete self-determination for Cyprus and all other countries, in letting the people of such countries decide their own destiny. This is fundamental to Americans.

"Frank B. Morrison,
"Governor, Nebraska."

"Strongly favor immediate cessation of Turkish aggression in Cyprus with eventual U.N. conducted plebiscite for its people. Divided Cyprus is contrary to British grant as well as basically unsound. Have protested Turkish aggression to U.S. Department of State as well as to White House.

"Louis C. Wyman,
"Member of Congress, New Hampshire."

"I welcome this opportunity to make clear to you my views on the Cyprus issue. I firmly believe that in Cyprus, as in the United States and elsewhere in the world, majority rule must be the basis of all representative government. Self-determination is vital for a final, peaceful settlement on Cyprus and this right must not be denied to the people of Cyprus. The people of Cyprus deserve an effective government, and with a minority veto, effective government is impossible. In my judgment, the proposal which is best for the foreign policy interests of the United States, as well as for Great Britain, Greece, and Turkey, is full self-determination, which I believe would result in union of Cyprus with Greece. Throughout the centuries, political self-government has been one of the great legacies of the people of Greece to our Western civilization. It is only right and reasonable that the people of Cyprus should also enjoy the precious principles of self-determination and majority rule which we in the United States have come to cherish so deeply for our own country. The civilized world is shocked by recent Turkish attacks on Cypriot civilians, including strafing and dropping napalm bombs on men, women, and children. It is intolerable that U.S. military assistance supplied by our Government and paid for by the taxpayers of the United States should be used in these barbaric attacks. I have strongly protested to the Secretary of State and urged an immediate cessation of military assistance to Turkey. You can be sure I shall continue to work for a fair and honorable treatment for the people of Cyprus.

"Kenneth B. Keating,
"U.S. Senator, New York."

Report on the 88th Congress to the People of Union County, N.J.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, as the historic 88th Congress draws to a close after remaining in session almost continuously for the past 21 months, it becomes my privilege once again to report to the people I represent on the record of this Congress and on my own part in making this record. This is a custom which I, in common with so many of our colleagues, have followed throughout my four terms in this House, and I consider it an important part of my responsibility for accounting to the people who have chosen me as their representative at the seat of government.

There is general agreement, Mr. Speaker, that this Congress has been one of the most productive in the history of our country. With this general evaluation, I would certainly agree. But I would add two qualifications: First, that much of the most constructive legislation we have passed has been enacted on a bipartisan basis, with the minority contributing significantly both to the substance of and the support for the legislation; and, second, that despite our successes this Congress has also been notable for its failure to act in several areas of the highest importance.

An especially regrettable example of this failure has just taken place in the inability of the conferees on the social security bill to reach agreement. Even though the House and Senate have both passed bills increasing and liberalizing social security benefits, the decision to adjourn without approving a compromise bill will deny to nearly 20 million Americans, including close to 60,000 in Union County, N.J., the modest benefits we have promised them.

For the overwhelming majority of these people—disabled and aged retired workers, aged wives and widows, and orphaned children and their widowed mothers—social security benefits are their major source of support; for a great many, they are the only source. This was a good bill, agreed to by the great majority of members of both parties. It was a fiscally responsible bill. And it was a badly needed bill which would, in a small way, have helped those receiving social security to catch up with the increases in the cost of living since the last general increase was approved 6 years ago.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I propose that the 89th Congress give first priority to enactment of this bill, with benefits retroactive, where appropriate, to the date the bill should have passed this year, when we convene early next January.

HIGHLIGHTS OF THE 88TH

Happily, Mr. Speaker, the overall record of the 88th Congress has been far brighter than the dismal note on which we are adjourning. As I see them, these were the highlights of our achievement:

Civil rights: This comprehensive legislation, which was supported by substantial majorities of both parties in both houses of the Congress, provides at long last the legal foundation for equal rights, equal opportunity and equal protection under the law for all our people, regardless of race, color, religion, or national origin—an objective firmly based on the Constitution and in the hearts of all men of good will.

Whatever controversy or opposition the bill aroused was largely the result of misunderstanding of the bill's actual provisions. It establishes no special preferences nor permits any reverse discrimination. It does not set up employment quotas or quotas of any kind, nor does it require "busing" of school children outside their neighborhoods. The new law is, in fact, somewhat less broad than the civil rights statutes which have been in effect in New Jersey and most other States for several years. While no legislation can fully solve such deeply moral and personal problems as racial relations, the law has already served to reduce racial tensions and to help take conflicts out of the streets and into the courts where they can be resolved peacefully and equitably.

Tax reduction: The wisdom of this $11.5 billion tax cut legislation is already evident in the renewed zest it has injected into the national economy. Reduced unemployment, more new jobs, increased consumer spending, and industrial production as well as growing savings can all be attributed, in part at least, to Congress' decision to remove the shackles of excessive taxation from our free enterprise system.

Congress' determination to encourage the private economy rather than resort to massive doses of Government spending has had related benefits, too. By keeping appropriations under tight control—more than $4 billion below administration requests this year, for instance—we have helped to avoid the dangers of inflation and we have reduced ahead of schedule the deficits caused by the tax cut. I believe we could have done better, however, if Congress had reduced somewhat the administration's requests for increases in the statutory ceiling on the national debt, and thus forced the executive agencies to do a better job of controlling their own spending.

Antipoverty: Of the four principal parts of the President's "war on poverty," Congress—wisely, I believe—approved only the basic antipoverty program. This 1-year experimental program will bring help directly to many of those most in need of help, people who need a lift out of the rut of permanent deprivation in order to become self-respecting and self-supporting citizens. But I opposed the other three parts of the plan, expansion of the area redevelopment program, additional funds for the accelerated public works program, and the proposed program for the Appalachian region—none of which I considered to be fair or workable.

NO NET BENEFITS

Essentially, all three proposals are unduly discriminatory, wasteful, and subject to political administration. Union County and other established industrial areas have been hurt by the special advantages these and related programs have given to selected regions of the country, but without corresponding benefits being gained by the areas which most need the assistance. I was pleased, therefore, to have had a hand in defeating, closely, the area redevelopment bill, and to note that the President decided not to go all out in support of the remaining two parts of his program.

Mass transportation: From the standpoint of potential help to urban-suburban areas like Union County which have been suffering from tighter and tighter traffic strangulation in recent years, approval of the Mass Transportation Act, which I cosponsored, marked a major victory. Though funds for the new program will be limited during the first year, the act should serve to stimulate the local cooperation and planning which are vital to the program's success and provide the means of demonstrating that an efficient rail-bus rapid transit system can make commuter travel faster, cheaper, and more convenient. Having worked toward this objective steadily since 1958 and participated in every stage of the consideration of this and its predecessor legislation, passage of our bill was most rewarding, as was the President's invitation to attend the signing of the legislation and accept a pen with which he signed it into law.

Housing: The Housing Act of 1964 was another case of landmark legislation. Rather than embark on chancy, untried new programs, the Housing Subcommittee, on which I served, concentrated on improving old ones: liberalizing FHA mortgage insurance, broadening housing for the elderly, reforming urban renewal, emphasizing the rehabilitation of structures before they become slums, aiding those who, through no fault of their own, temporarily default on their FHA-insured mortgages. In several major respects, the act followed legislation which our colleague, Congressman WIDNALL, and I introduced—a contribution acknowledged by the President when he again invited us to witness the signing of the bill into law at the White House.

In a related action, Congress included in the tax bill the substance of legislation I introduced which provided tax relief for persons 65 or over who sell their principal residence. Previously, most retired people—seeking smaller or less expensive housing arrangements—were subject to the capital gains tax on any profit they might realize from the sale of their house. Now, under our new law, they are exempt from the full tax if the selling price is $20,000 or less and exempt from a proportionate share of the tax when the price is higher, a fair break for people who can use it.

THE EDUCATION CONGRESS

Education: To many people, the 88th Congress has earned the title, "The Education Congress," a richly deserved epithet in view of the significance of such education bills as these, all of which I supported—the Higher Education Facilities Act which provides loans and grants for construction of college and university classrooms and laboratories; the Health Professions Education Act which does much the same for medical and dental schools and initiates a loan program for students needing help; amendments to the National Defense Education Act which broaden the usefulness of this important program especially in the area of student loans; extension of the Library Services Act to aid in construction or enlargement of libraries in urban areas; the Nurse Training Act, a long-overdue effort to meet the serious shortage of professional nursing assistance through construction of nursing schools, provision of training programs and student loans; and the Mental Retardation Facilities Act which should make a dent, at least, in the desperate need for mental health centers and related facilities and improve the training of teachers to instruct handicapped children.

Conservation: For those more inclined toward outdoor activity, this Congress will be known principally because of our enactment of two of the most far-reaching conservation programs in history—the well-known wilderness bill which will preserve for future generations millions of acres of parkland in their naturally wild state, closed to commercial use, and the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act which will help States, especially in heavily populated areas, set aside some of our diminishing natural resources for recreational use. Both bills, far-sighted as they are, received my support.

Among many other worthy efforts, Mr. Speaker, we passed at long last the Equal Pay for Women Act, legislation which I cosponsored and which provides a starting point for assuring economic justice and wage equality to working women.

We increased veterans' pensions, and raised the pay of military personnel and of civil service and other Government officials in order to bring their salaries more closely in line with prevailing rates outside the Government, and thus assure to the Government a continuing supply of competent employees to conduct the public business. I regret now, as I did then, the inclusion of pay raises for ourselves, though I take some comfort in the fact that those of us who voted against the first pay raise bill accomplished a 25-percent reduction in congressional raises and delayed their effective date until the next Congress. This, at least, provides our people with an opportunity to judge whether we deserve the increase.

We extended and expanded the experimental food stamp program to all 50 States—a program notable for, among other things, assuring that needy persons will actually obtain the food they need.

We broadened the Manpower Development and Training Act in order to increase the number and categories of unemployed workers who could be helped to obtain the new skills required in this technologically complex world.

LOOKING TO THE FUTURE

Congress also created two important Federal commissions to study problems related to these two programs. The first, the Commission on Automation, will study the effects of technological change on employment and try to find means of assuring that job opportunities will grow along with the spread of automation, while the Commission on Food Marketing will, in effect, trace the consumer's dollar all the way from the dinner table back to the farmer to learn who gets what share for which service.

Of special interest to urban areas like our own, Congress strengthened the air pollution control program, provided funds to organize water research centers, expanded the school lunch program, included fringe benefits within the wage protection afforded workers by the Davis-Bacon Act.

In the broad and vital area of national security, Congress once again provided more than one-half the Federal budget for strengthening our defenses, including funds to the Atomic Energy Commission for production of nuclear devices. The National Aeronautics and Space Administration received a big appropriations increase, chiefly to pursue its Apollo moon-shot project.

In the field of foreign affairs, Congress strongly supported the President in southeast Asia, including a vote of confidence following U.S. retaliatory action in the Tonkin Gulf, though many of us question the adequacy of his policy and the accuracy of the information provided us. We enlarged the Peace Corps, continued the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, expanded the food-for-peace program and required Yugoslavia and Poland to pay American dollars for food shipments to them. The Senate, with exclusive jurisdiction over treaties, ratified the nuclear test ban agreement—a step of enormous significance in the cold war atmosphere of the world.

Foreign aid, the most controversial program in this area, underwent a significant transition in the 88th Congress. In the first session, 1963, we reduced foreign aid funds from a requested $4.5 billion to a final appropriation of $3.2 billion, principally because it became evident that the budget request was excessive and the aid program itself needed tightening up, greater selectivity, and greater assurance that recipient countries could use our assistance effectively.

This year, the President lowered his request to below $4 billion, a more realistic figure, eliminated some countries from the program, placed greater emphasis on loans instead of grants, stressed the importance of buying American products with aid funds, and generally demonstrated a more effective and useful foreign aid program. Congress displayed its increased confidence by approving appropriations of nearly $3.7 billion.

The productive character of the 88th Congress, Mr. Speaker, suggests that one of the very first votes of the Congress early in 1963 was of decisive importance. This was the vote by which the House enlarged the Rules Committee and thus opened the way for consideration of so much important legislation. It did not, as the record shows, open the floodgates for a host of irresponsible spending programs. But it did allow the House to work its will on legislation which it had an obligation to consider, and so I consider my vote to enlarge the committee one of the most significant I have ever cast.

IMPORTANT TO OPPOSE

As I am sure our colleagues and constituents will agree, Mr. Speaker, it is often just as important to oppose unsound legislation as it is to support worthwhile bills. In addition to those I have mentioned, I voted against establishment of a peanut research center and the cotton-wheat double subsidy bill, two examples of the bankrupt nature of our farm program. I also opposed the imposition of a tax on the purchase of foreign securities, an administration proposal which seemed to me a harmful and ineffective way of trying to ease our balance-of-payments deficit. And I could not agree that imposing quotas on the importation of meat—a device designed to raise the price of imported meat to American consumers—was the right way to solve American cattle producers' problems, many of which seem self-imposed.

Despite the impressive achievements of this Congress, Mr. Speaker, the number and significance of its failures stand out starkly. In addition to the death of the social security bill, we failed to complete action on legislation providing a more effective means of filling vacancies in the Presidency and Vice Presidency in the event of death or inability. We should have passed two bills which I have cosponsored in the House—to control the distribution of "goof balls" and "pep pills" and other dangerous drugs, and to provide for periodic review by congressional committees of Federal grant-in-aid programs to determine whether to continue, revise or eliminate them—both of which have widespread support. And I see no justification for our continuing failure to reach agreement on a compromise plan under which we can provide health care for our older people.

I regret very much that we failed to repeal the war-time excise taxes on such consumer items as cosmetics, handbags, and so forth, or to protect the right of consumers to more adequate information about the quantity, quality, safety, and cost of the products they buy. We missed another opportunity to revise our immigration laws so as to eliminate, among other purposes, the inequitable and discriminatory quota system based on national origins. And we failed again to recognize the growing need for an Academy of Foreign Affairs which could provide superior training opportunities for Government officials with foreign affairs responsibilities. In each of these areas, I have introduced legislation.

CHALLENGE AND OPPORTUNITY

There are other failures, of course, both of omission and commission which seriously detract from the performance of the Congress now so close to adjournment, Mr. Speaker. But I know of none so fundamental to our own self-respect and to the respect we look for from our constituents than the refusal of this Congress to take action to reform our own legislative procedures—which have proved so unnecessarily cumbersome in this prolonged term—and to hold ourselves responsible for the same high code of ethics we demand of other public officials.

Until we act effectively and forthrightly in these two matters, Mr. Speaker, we shall continue to invite the doubt and cynicism of those whom we represent and thereby weaken the integrity of representative government. We have it in our power to restore the confidence of the American people in the soundness of this great institution. I hope we shall find the courage and wisdom to do so without further delay.

A Bill To Amend the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on October 3, 1964, I introduced a bill to amend the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945, and for other purposes.

It is similar in all respects to H.R. 12779, introduced on October 2, 1964, by our distinguished colleague from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL]. I have done so at this time in order to afford ample opportunity for those interested in the housing situation in the District of Columbia to study it and be prepared to give the new Congress their comments and suggestions early next year.

In introducing the bill I do not commit myself to support all of its provisions. I do believe that many of its provisions together with many of the amendments offered to S. 628 by the House District Committee and not acted upon this year, can go far toward improving the situation in Washington. I do hope that early next year we can have hearings on these various bills and report to the House a good bill that most Members can support and which will also have the support of the overwhelming majority of the residents and businessmen of the community.

Statement by Senator Hubert H. Humphrey on the Occasion of the Retirement of the Honorable Muñoz-Marín as Governor of Puerto Rico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Congressional Record a statement by me on the occasion of the retirement of Hon. Luis Muñoz-Marín as Governor of Puerto Rico.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

A great American—a great American in the finest and deepest sense of the term—once said that the only isms he cared about were realism and idealism. Realism to enable his fellow citizens to face even the harshest facts of life unflinchingly. Idealism to spur them to attack grave human problems courageously, energetically, imaginatively, democratically.

That is what this campaign—what any genuine political campaign—is all about. My party, the Democratic Party, dares to be realistic. We openly acknowledge that our country faces grave problems at home and abroad. And we intend to continue the struggle to solve them.

We are realistic enough to know that the way is long and hard. The process of reform that began under Franklin Delano Roosevelt, that continued under Harry Truman and John F. Kennedy, that is going forward under Lyndon Johnson, must go on until the American idea of freedom has real meaning for every citizen of the land, young or old, man or woman, boy or girl, no matter what the color of his skin, or his place of birth, or his economic status, or his native language.

The great American I speak of, this apostle of realism and idealism, is, of course, Luis Muñoz-Marín, founder and leader of the Popular Democratic Party of Puerto Rico.

I speak of Muñoz Marín not just as a great political leader and public servant in his own right but as a symbol of a people who have demonstrated their understanding of realism and their unswerving devotion to democratic ideals. A quarter of a century ago our fellow citizens from Puerto Rico faced circumstances so harsh that their outlook was called hopeless. But the people of Puerto Rico then swore an oath that surrender was unthinkable. And they set out, with a sort of faith born of desperation, to seek their own salvation. Muñoz-Marín ignited a spark of idealism that his people fanned into a flame of hope and achievement.

The people of Puerto Rico could not have done this if Muñoz-Marín had believed in do-nothing, know-nothing, care-nothing government. They could not have succeeded if Muñoz-Marín had asked them to retreat into the past with old slogans and outworn cliches.

He saw that his people lacked the most elementary needs and he determined that government should care about and should act to help provide them. He wanted Puerto Rico to have a 20th century government—a government with a mind as well as a heart.

He recognized that a people must have dignity and self-respect, and that to have them meant having jobs paying decent wages, decent schools for one's children, decent housing, and medical care at a price within the reach of the average wage-earner.

There were those here in 1940—as there were those in Puerto Rico, and as there are those here and there today—who said that government has no responsibility for promoting employment, no responsibility for protecting or enforcing the civil rights guaranteed by the Constitution.

There were those who said then, as there are those who say now, that a Federal system of old-age pensions, paid for by the people themselves, was an evil—that it would discourage private insurance and pension systems.

But the people of Puerto Rico did not agree with that. In fact, through their legislature, they petitioned the U.S. Congress to extend the social security system to Puerto Rico and that was done. They asked to pay taxes for social security, and they are paying them. And the charge that Federal social security inhibits private insurance has been decisively shown to be false—here and there.

There are those who said in 1940, as there are those who say today, that government has no right and no responsibility for public power development (although some of these people say it is all right in Arizona but bad in the Tennessee Valley). But Muñoz-Marín used the good credit rating of the people of Puerto Rico to borrow money in the United States to build a modern power system. Because you cannot have industry without power and you cannot have jobs without industry. And the people of Puerto Rico agreed with that.

Just one of the results of this policy of government caring and acting is that a fruitful form of partnership has evolved in Puerto Rico between government and the private sector. This is seen in the power system and the communications and transportation systems that provide the bases for industrial growth and in the 1,000 new factories that provide the basis for expanding production, employment, income, and purchasing power. The return to investors has increased, providing an incentive to new investment. Government revenues have increased to provide essential services. Worker income has increased. The per capita income of $131 in 1940 has become a per capita income of $830 in 1964.

This increase in the production of wealth has been good for the United States. Puerto Rico's purchases from the mainland United States exceeded $1,100 million last year. That is more than the purchases of eight European countries—Spain, Portugal, Ireland, Austria, Denmark, Finland, Sweden, and Norway—combined.

In paying tribute to Muñoz-Marín and the people of Puerto Rico for their progress in expanding economic justice we do not say that the job is done—only that it can be done. We know that the task must go on. Economic development is never complete.

But we must pay tribute also to Puerto Rico's efforts in the political, cultural, and spiritual realms. In their creative approach to the problem of political status and the contribution to the concept of federalism that the Commonwealth represents, in the guarantee of representation by political minorities in the legislature, in the programs that have broadened citizen participation in political life. We must express our appreciation for the work of the Commonwealth in promoting international understanding and cooperation and the basic aims of U.S. foreign policy—through the sharing of Puerto Rico's experience and techniques in human development with the peoples of more than 25 countries, particularly its programs of community and self-help housing that have made Puerto Rico one of the finest training grounds for the Peace Corps.

On a small scale, but on a significant scale, Puerto Rico has shown that the problems we intend to attack on a national scale can be dealt with and that as they are dealt with human freedom will be deepened and broadened. Freedom, real freedom, is what we expect from our realism and idealism. And this is the essence of our American heritage.

I congratulate Governor Muñoz-Marín, as he now retires from the government, on his years of distinguished service. I salute him as one of the great statesmen of this hemisphere.

A New Conservation Movement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. McCARTHY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, on October 1, Senator George McGovern, of South Dakota, delivered the banquet address at the Western Power and Water Consumers Conference held at Bismarck, N. Dak.

The address summarizes the work of the 88th Congress in relation to some of our resource and conservation problems and points out some of the tasks that lie ahead.

Under the consent previously obtained by the majority leader, I ask that Senator McGovern's speech be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

A New Conservation Movement

(Remarks of Senator George McGovern at the Western Power and Water Consumers Conference at Bismarck, N. Dak., October 1, 1954)

It is a very great honor to be here to address this banquet meeting of the Western States Water and Power Consumers Conference.

This organization is more and more filling a vacuum that has existed in our American society since vested interest groups captured the National Conservation Congress, organized by Gifford Pinchot and Teddy Roosevelt early in this century. That once great organization was allowed to die, after its capture, in 1916. We have had no comparable national, public-oriented conservation group since. While you do not claim to be a national organization, a national role is being thrust upon you.

History was made at your annual conference 4 years ago when the late President John F. Kennedy delivered his great Billings address on conservation. That was one of many proud moments in the all too brief life of our beloved President whose life and death still dominate our hearts. History has been made here and again today with the addresses of the Vice President-to-be of the United States—Hubert Humphrey—and my distinguished colleagues, those courageous champions of enlightened resource policy, Senators Lee Metcalf and Quentin Burdick.

The awards this evening to the late Senator Estes Kefauver and James G. Patton for outstanding contributions to the development of the Nation's resources contribute to your national stature.

Estes Kefauver's name will always be synonymous, not only with the advocacy of TVA and regional and national resources development, but with defense of the public interest in the benefits flowing from them.

The Dixon-Yates deal was the first step in a plan to bring an end to public resources development. Senator Kefauver's exposure of Adolph Wenzell's dual role in that scheme to subvert the Tennessee Valley Authority, serving both as an employee of the U.S. Budget Bureau and as an officer of a private utility financing house, temporarily thwarted a vested interest scheme to take over TVA and other Federal power agencies.

The Wenzell plan, drafted in the Budget Bureau, was a blueprint for the private interests whom he served. It reflected a continuing determination by the groups behind Wenzell to seize and control the agencies of resource development and reestablish private monopoly over electric power supply in this country; to deny the public the benefit of public works and resource development projects.

Estes Kefauver is missed in the U.S. Senate, in the Congress, and in the Federal Government. Some of the militancy about the public interest in resources development—and in monopoly control—died with him and urgently needs to be revived.

Jim Patton shall always be known for his earthy characterization of the treaty of Omaha between the Corps of Army Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation, ending their war in the Missouri Basin and joining the Pick and Sloan development plans, as a "loveless, shameless shotgun wedding." It hit the bull's eye.

Jim has for a quarter century now been an outstanding leader in efforts to bring about water and power development in the public interest.

Under his leadership the National Farmers Union, which has its roots here on the Great Plains and in the Rocky Mountains area, has been more than just a commodity-oriented farm organization. It has advocated resources development for people everywhere, including a Missouri Valley Authority for this great area, a CVA and a TVA on the Nile. It has been a leading force under Jim in many other fields—food for peace, social security, the United Nations, improved education, better housing, and a national policy of full employment. When Jim has a dozen awards such as the richly deserved recognition you have given him this evening, he will have begun to receive the honor to which he is entitled. His drive toward a great society has been conducted throughout his long years of devoted service to the farmers of America and to all those whose hearts beat for peace around the globe.

Most of us here started our lives in a period in world history when people regarded certain essential resources, especially land, minerals, and energy, to be rather sharply limited, and mankind fated for an unhappy existence as population outran production potentialities.

Malthus wrote that: "When acre has been added to acre until all the fertile land is occupied, the yearly increase in food must depend on the melioration of the land already in possession. This is a fund, which, from the nature of all soils, instead of increasing, must be gradually diminishing."

Malthus did not foresee that in the year 1964 the U.S. Secretary of Agriculture would be attempting to get 65 or 70 million acres of land out of production and that he would announce that in 1980 we will still need 51 million acres less in production than we now plant.

Secretary of Agriculture Freeman assumed in his projection that population would continue to grow at a medium rate and that we would continue to supply about $4 billion worth of agricultural goods annually to the people of other nations. Malthus had no idea that in 1964 New Mexico and Utah potash, and Montana, Wyoming, and Idaho phosphate, would be combined with nitrogen from the air to build soils to greater than their original productivity. He did not foresee that internal combustion engines would provide us with energy and free about 70 million acres of land from feeding horses and mules, nor could he foretell many other advances.

We can today build soil, or grow food in a pan of water if necessary. And we can grow not two, but a dozen blades of grass where one grew before.

Malthus, Ricardo, and their associates, in the middle 19th century, won economics the title of the "dismal science" with their forecasts of poverty and misery ahead for the human race. Unfortunately, there are many still living whose philosophy is based on the Malthusian concepts of inevitable scarcities and insist that abundance must be guarded and not shared because resources are limited; that a great society is unattainable.

Two 20th-century economists, Harold Barnett and Chandler Morse of Resources for the Future, last year published a new look at the prospects for the human race.

They found that because of scientific discoveries and man's expanding knowledge and scientific skills, we are today producing goods of all varieties, including allegedly vanishing minerals, at lower real costs than ever before with the single exception of timber. It takes less input in terms of time and resources to produce a commodity unit than ever before, although we are using many comparatively low-grade ores and supposedly wornout land as compared to Malthus' time.

We could double timber production—the one more costly product—in this country by replanting 52 million acres of presently idle timberland and by applying known forestry techniques to end mortality and retardation of growth in our forests caused by fire, insects, and disease. And if necessary, we can build with substitutes for timber.

The two modern economists wrote: "The classical economists saw the process of growth subject to limitations, and we agree, but they saw the limitations as residing in nature, and we see them residing in man."

We do not have resources to waste. They must be conserved. But the great limitation and problem today is adjusting human attitudes and human institutions so we can enjoy the benefits of the new world of resources which has been opened to us by science and new knowledge.

In underdeveloped countries there is a lack of both know-how and the capital with which to take advantage of the new world of opportunities.

In our own and other developed nations, we have institutional barriers—vested interests in the status quo (and even a spokesman or two for the status quo ante)—which may very well prove more difficult barriers to overcome than those of the underdeveloped lands. Given know-how and capital, and zeal to modernize their countries, and the leaders of the underdeveloped lands can write on relatively clean slates. But in the developed nations, there are entrenched interests who are so pessimistic about the enjoyment of resources through wise public policy that they make Malthus look like an optimist. They cannot visualize a great society and an affluent world with even the pockets of poverty wiped out. Fortunately, that philosphy has not dictated the course of John Kennedy or Lyndon Johnson, nor has it ruled the Congress now about to adjourn.

The 88th Congress is being called by a variety of names, both good and bad. The President remarked the other day when he signed the land and water conservation fund bill and the wilderness bill that if it were not famed for the tax cut, the nuclear test ban, education legislation, antipoverty measures, and the civil rights law, the 88th might well be called "the conservation Congress."

We have enacted landmark conservation legislation.

We have passed two measures to achieve development of more adequate recreational facilities for the Nation, establishing a Federal Bureau of Outdoor Recreation and a land and water conservation fund which, over the next 10 years, will make about $2 billion available for State and Federal recreation developments.

We have authorized the establishment of a number of new national recreation areas, including the Lake Meade National Recreation area, the Ozark National Scenic Rivers, Canyonlands National Park in Utah, and the Fire Island National Seashore off New York.

We passed a water resources research bill which your luncheon speaker, Senator QUENTIN BURDICK, and I, had the privilege of cosponsoring with Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, of New Mexico. It will get the State colleges, which have brought about the scientific revolution in food production, busy on water problems.

We stepped up pollution control and abatement activity. We cleared the way for extra high voltage transmission to link the States on the west coast. Compared to other Congresses, there is no question that the 88th was resource and conservation minded, and accomplished much more than most. It is entitled to the credit and praise we are hearing.

But it might also be asked if the 88th Congress did enough in the water, power, resources, and conservation fields to assure the realization of the abundance which Barnett and Morse find possible if men's limitations on development are removed. There are a number of urgent tasks which the 88th Congress has left undone.

The Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources, in its 1961 report, made five major recommendations. One of them was for coordinated and expanded research on water problems. Congress implemented that one with the water research act and the executive branch has an interagency committee of the Council for Science and Technology at work on coordination of water research underway in 19 different Federal bureaus and departments.

The select committee also reported that five river basins in the Nation will have reached the limit of their water supply by 1980, three more by the year 2000, and that the whole of the great American industrial area which lies in a belt across the northeastern part of the United States from Boston south to Washington, D.C., and then west to Sioux Falls and Kansas City, is threatened by water shortage or pollution problems.

We are pressing research in desalinization of water to see if water supplies in the Southwest cannot be supplemented by conversion of saline and brackish waters.

Despite the urgency of the water supply problems of the Southwest and the upper Missouri Basin, Congress did nothing on a bill to speed research in weather modification. It salved its conscience a bit by giving the Bureau of Reclamation $1 million for experiments in weather modification in the upper Colorado and upper Missouri Rivers—a pittance compared to need. The Select Committee on Water Resources recommended the development of plans by 1970 for optimum development of all river basins in the Nation. It recommended aid to States to speed their water planning. It called for a biennial assessment of water supply and needs by regions so all areas would be kept aware of their situation. A river basin planning bill, S. 1111, passed by the Senate and the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committees was not being pressed before the

Rules Committee and appeared likely to die there as I left the District of Columbia.

The bill includes a short step toward coordination of Federal water agencies by creation of a Federal Water Council; it authorizes river basin planning commissions and provides assistance to States for intrastate and interstate water planning. It also provides for the biennial assessment of water supply and water requirements by water regions.

The fact is that S. 1111 contains the bulk of the recommendations of the Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources. The bill and reforms in our water resource operations far beyond it are urgently needed, but apparently will not be enacted this year.

This conference this morning heard a discussion of the proposed North American Water and Power Alliance—a plan to link the Great Lakes and the Pacific Ocean and divert water from areas on this continent with an oversupply to areas of need in the United States. It is a tremendous concept of the sort we must entertain if we are to have a world of abundance.

But before this great $100 billion-plus plan is authorized, we must take some first steps. We must learn to walk before we can run. We must have river basin plans for the upper Missouri, the Columbia, the Colorado, the Great Basin, the San Juan-Pecos, and the South Pacific region.

We have achieved truly comprehensive river basin planning on a major river only once as a nation—the Tennessee Valley.

We have recognized the need for such plans nationally for more than a half century—since Theodore Roosevelt's Inland Waterways Commission reported in 1908.

Senator George Norris, with President Franklin D. Roosevelt's backing, proposed to repeat the TVA pattern throughout the Nation, but his bill failed in the thirties. Missouri Valley and Columbia Valley Authority bills failed in the forties.

The first Hoover Commission proposed that we end the major institutional barriers to coordinated water resource development within Government by establishing a Department of Natural Resources. But, in spite of the unusual coalition of forces behind that proposal, it did not even get a hearing in Congress. It was headed off by the Federal agencies and their clientele who felt they would be adversely affected. Dr. Arthur A. Maass subsequently wrote his much cited article on "The Lobby That Can't Be Licked" following that failure.

Let me return to the record of the Congress. We did not authorize a major water resources project during the 88th Congress.

Although the Supreme Court decided the long-pending Colorado River water case in 1963, the lack of an acceptable plan for lower Colorado River development foreclosed against either a California or an Arizona project.

At this moment, authorization of the great Garrison project in North and South Dakota appears hopelessly stalled in the House Rules Committee, along with the river basin planning bill, and the blame cannot all be laid at the door of the chairman of that committee, Representative Howard Smith.

Because it affects South Dakota both directly—a small amount of irrigation in my State is involved—and indirectly because it must probably precede the authorization of the Oahe irrigation project, I have followed Garrison very closely and helped with it when I could.

I want to interrupt the thread of my remarks again at this point to pay a much deserved tribute to Senator Quentin Burdick, author of the Garrison irrigation project bill. I salute, too, Senator Lee Metcalf, who has provided the Nation with more personal research service in his speeches on the IOU's than any other Member of the current Congress. It has been a great job, and its effectiveness will build up in the months ahead.

The fight for the resources development we must have to keep this Nation prosperous—to maintain our abundance—requires men of competence and energy, dedicated to the undertaking. Senator Quentin Burdick has proved himself such a man. His handling of the Garrison irrigation project to pass it through the Senate virtually unopposed was a superb legislative job. Although the House is not his direct responsibility, I happen to know that he has assurance that if Garrison is not finally approved by the present Congress, it will be the first order of business in the House Interior Committee next year.

The Senator from North Dakota has done much other effective work. His bill to increase the local share of revenues from wetlands will speed that much needed conservation work.

His strong support and cosponsorship of my voluntary wheat certificate proposal helped get it enacted into law, and wheat farmers should remember his effort to increase export certificate values when the measure was under consideration on the floor.

The Senator has supported all of the greatly needed resources and conservation legislation. He has proved himself both an effective legislative general and an effective trooper in every fight. We need him, and I am certain the people of North Dakota will send him back to Washington next month for a 6-year term.

We need him as we need men like Mansfield and Metcalf, of Montana; McGee, of Wyoming; and McCarthy, of Minnesota; because the major strides are yet to be taken in water development and many other resource fields. The Nation, and especially the Westeern States where resource developments are the key to economic growth, needs every forward-looking Congressman and Senator who can be sent to Washington if we are to strike away the institutional barriers, the human barriers, that bar the way to the great society.

The Congress now closing did nothing of significance in the mineral resources field, although there is great need for relief for some of our key mineral industries, and an even greater need for expanded research into methods of exploring for mineral deposits and handling lower grade ores.

The Congress did little to speed up the program for the national forests, or to hasten replanting of private forest lands, although that is a critical resource area.

It is admittedly asking too much to expect a single Congress to solve all of our resources problems, just as it is impossible for one Congress or an administration to settle all of the Nation's economic problems for a generation or two ahead. One is reminded of Congressman John Steven McGroarty, of California, who wrote a constituent in 1934: "One of the countless drawbacks of being in Congress is that I am compelled to receive impertinent letters from a jackass like you in which you say I promised to have the Sierra Madre Mountains reforested, and I have been in Congress 2 months and haven't done it. Will you please take two running jumps and go to hell."

Unfortunately for the cause of congressional candor, Congressman McGroarty was defeated.

But in defense of Congress, vast progress has been made since Congressman McGroarty's day.

We have taken some giant steps in the economic field since World War II.

We are today reaping some of the benefits of a farsighted economic planning and action measure first proposed by the man you have honored here tonight—Jim Patton. I refer to the Employment Act of 1946.

Since the adoption of that act, we have not had a major depression.

We have had recessions. We have had to learn to use economic tools effectively. For one 8-year period since the adoption of the act there was some skepticism in the executive branch of the Federal Government about the efficacy and propriety of certain economic measures. But the existence of a Council of Economic Advisers and a Joint Economic Committee in Congress, and a public awareness that economic tools exist to stimulate the economy, have resulted in steps to prevent recessions from deepening into a depression. When recessions were clearly underway in the fifties the administration finally acted to stop them, however reluctantly.

When President John F. Kennedy and Vice President Lyndon Johnson came into office determined to stimulate the rate of economic growth in the United States, the techniques by which it could be done were known. The tools were at hand, and the growth rate has been increased from about 3 percent to more than 5 percent per year.

The great success of the Employment Act of 1946, and the policies and instrumentalities that it brought into being, have convinced me that John F. Kennedy's point 4 proposal—and I refer to his point 4 in the historic Billings address to this organization in 1960—should be revived and enacted.

The late President said: "Fourth, we will establish a Council of Resource Advisers in the Office of the President, to coordinate planning in this field. We have had many short-term, limited, piecemeal studies. We have not had enough of the long-range, continuing, and comprehensive surveys, determining the needs of our country, the increase in our population, the available resources and how they can be fitted together to build a strong and vital country."

As a friend and warm admirer of President Kennedy, I cite that statement without embarrassment, although the objective was not achieved.

President Kennedy was convinced shortly after he took office that there was need to streamline the White House establishment, eliminate a number of special offices and councils engulfing the President, and stimulate existing agencies to do the tasks which needed doing. He asked the Council of Economic Advisers, the Office of Science and Technology, and the National Science Foundation to do some needed jobs in relation to resources. He then asked Congress to postpone a decision on a Council of Resource and Conservation Advisers to see how his assignments of duties would work out.

Much has been done. Resources research reports have been issued by the scientific agencies assigned to the job, and they have turned their attention to other tasks. A good deal of resources legislation has been proposed in both the executive branch and Congress, and much-needed measures have been passed.

Nevertheless, today we are short of data, plans, and projections for next steps in the resources future.

We have not made arrangements for the biennial assessment of water resources supply and demand by regions recommended in 1961.

We still have a major portion of the select committee report on water resources to implement.

We do not have data on which we could start work on an economic feasibility study of the North American water and power proposal, or alternatives to it.

We do not have updated projections of mineral requirements, their availability over a period of years domestically or by importation from other countries, and we have a far greater dependence on mineral imports than many countries, including Russia, as one example.

We are momentarily aware of our recreation needs and Secretary of Interior Stewart Udall has succeeded in persuading Congress to launch a program to meet them because of a recent short-term study. But we are not going to meet the recreation demands of sportsmen unless we also adopt an adequate national water plan, assuring an abundance of fish and migratory wild fowl habitat.

We are aware of a need for a nationwide, giant power system but have no plans for its development. We are proceeding in this area on a hit-and-miss basis in which the public interest and much of the economy in power costs it might permit may be sacrificed.

There is wholly inadequate public recognition of our forest needs. We are going to speed up reforestation and conservation work in the forests as a byproduct of the antipoverty program, but even the fraction of needed work proposed for the Job Corps has not been estimated.

Because of agricultural surpluses, Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman has made some splendid projections of land needs to the year 2000 and proposed a land-use adjustment program. It needs to be given greater support and attention as a part of an overall national resources program than it is now getting. Unfortunately, too many citizens regard Mr. Freeman's proposals as incidental to his farm program. It needs to be put in its true perspective as a major resource project by a top resources general staff.

We need a Council of Resource and Conservation Advisers as originally proposed by the late Senator James E. Murray in 1959, patterned after his bill which established the Council of Economic Advisers, to keep resource requirements and the adequacy of our resource programs constantly before us.

I feel sure that the late President John F. Kennedy, who asked only that the decision on such a Council be postponed during a trial of alternatives, would now agree that the Council should be established.

The vacuums in resources policy have not all been filled by the 88th conservation-minded Congress. The 88th did more than usual, but still not enough.

The Malthusian doctrine to which I referred earlier depicted mankind's lot as a hopeless one.

Chandler and Morse are only a little more optimistic about man's future; they think physical resources are adequate but see little hope that men will remove human obstructions to abundance with sufficient speed to assure a world of peace and plenty.

As an eternal optimist, surrounded here tonight by an audience of optimists about our resources future, I believe we can meet mankind's material needs in a growing world society. I want to propose that we renew our effort to establish a national resources and conservation general staff to keep our resource needs and shortcomings before us and to remind the executive branch and Congress annually of things that need to be done.

It is my intention to introduce the Council of Resources and Conservation Advisers bill, with as many cosponsors as we can get, when the 89th Congress convenes in January.

I solicit your support. This organization, because it deals with two resource necessities of great and continuing urgency, and because you have become the recognized national forum for quadrennial resource policy statements by Presidential election winners—this organization is becoming the midcentury successor to the Pinchot-Roosevelt National Conservation Congress which was established a half century ago. You have influence and responsibilities in the national scene—and the opportunities—which I hope you will accept and use to help sweep aside the human limitations on resource programs, to see that there is development and to see that the public gets the benefits.

It has been a great privilege and honor to be here with you and your honored guests, as it has been a great privilege and pleasure to work with the members of this group on many governmental affairs in the past. Godspeed in the critical years ahead.

The 88th Congress, 2d Session—II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I should like to complete at this time my offer for the RECORD of a summary legislative actions of this session, together with a summary of appropriations:

Summary of legislative action, 88th Cong., 2d sess.

VETERANS AND SERVICEMEN

Bill No.	Description	Public Law No.
S. 3001	Authorizes pay increases, totaling $207,580,000 monthly for all men and officers of the Armed Forces, except those in service less than 2 years.	88-422
H.R. 1927	Liberalizes non-service-connected pensions for needy veterans and widows; revises limits of permissible income without loss of pension	(*)
H.R. 221	Provides educational assistance to children of veterans with total and permanent service-connected disability	88-361
H.R. 8009	Authorizes 5-year, $5,000,000-a-year program of aid to States on matching basis for nursing-home facilities in State veteran homes	88-450
H.R. 6920	Extends disability income provisions of national service life insurance policies through age 65 under certain conditions	88-355
H.R. 2664	Exempts from draft induction sole surviving son of a family whose father died as a result of military service	88-360
H.R. 7356	Raises authorized strength of cadet corps of U.S. Military and Air Force Academies; fixes period of obligated service at 5 years	88-276
H.R. 9124	Provides uniform statutory authority for ROTC programs of all branches of Armed Forces; improves and expands program	(*)

AGRICULTURE

H.R. 6196	Continues present cotton price-support and subsidy for exporters; provides new subsidy to permit domestic processors to compete with foreign manufacturers. Authorizes new wheat marketing certificate program to maintain $2 a bushel price-support domestically and a minimum of $1.55 for export. Applies to 1964-65 cotton and wheat crops.	88-297
S. 1605	Requires registration and Department of Agriculture approval of pesticides before they can be sold to public	88-305
H.R. 10222	Broadens and makes permanent stamp program for distribution of surplus and other foods to needy by Department of Agriculture to States requesting such aid.	88-525
S. 2687	Extends for 3 years to Dec. 31, 1967, surplus commodity—"Food for Peace"—program under Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act; expands loans from counterpart funds to private enterprise abroad.	(*)
H.R. 1839	Restricts importation of beef, veal, lamb, and mutton to 6.5 percent of domestic consumption	88-482
H.R. 9747	Extends for 3 years to Dec. 31, 1967, special programs for sale and distribution of surplus milk and other dairy products to the Armed Forces and veterans' hospitals.	88-529
H.R. 11846	Permits purchase of processed grain foods by Commodity Credit Corporation for donation under domestic welfare and foreign-aid programs	88-550
S. 524	Requires registration and compliance with other standards for contractors hiring migratory farm labor	88-582
H.R. 9178	Provides for 3-year staggered terms for stabilization and conservation county committeemen	88-534
S. 277	Increases from 100 to 150 the number of new counties in which Federal crop insurance may be offered each year	88-589

NATURAL RESOURCES

S. 627	Authorizes 5-year, $28,250,000 program of aid to States for development of commercial fisheries	88-309
S. 2	Authorizes 10-year $82,500,000 program to finance water resources research centers at land-grant colleges and State universities and encourages similar projects at other institutions.	88-379
H.R. 3846	Establishes a 10-year, $2,000,000,000 land and water conservation fund to assist States in developing outdoor recreation programs	88-578
S. 1007	Authorizes construction of $700,000,000 Federal portion of 4-line transmission system to permit use in the Southwest of hydroelectric power generated in Pacific Northwest.	88-522
S. 502	Preserves jurisdiction of the Congress over construction of hydroelectric projects on the Colorado River below Glen Canyon Dam	88-491
S. 4	Establishes a National Wilderness Preservation System on 35,000,000 acres closed to commercial use and retained in their primitive state	88-577
S. 1363	Increases payments to counties in which wildlife refuges are located	88-523
H.R. 7588	Provides for criminal punishment of violation of regulations to protect national forests and grasslands	88-537
H.R. 8070	Establishes a commission to study existing laws and procedures relating to administration of public lands	88-606
H.R. 5159	Establishes as policy of Congress that lands administered by the Secretary of Interior be managed under principle of multiple use to produce a sustained yield of products and services.	88-607
H.R. 5498	Grants temporary authority for sale of public lands not needed to meet the requirements of Federal programs	88-608

*Awaiting President's signature.

Departmental appropriations, 88th Cong., 2d sess.—for regular activities

Title	Budget estimates	Amount as passed (House)	Amount as passed (Senate)	Amount enacted	Public Law No.
District of Columbia [1]	$357,702,300	$338,205,200	$342,181,975	$341,242,200	88-479
Interior	1,047,728,000	1,023,175,600	1,056,436,425	1,042,277,200	88-356
Treasury [2]	1,236,990,000	1,207,080,000	1,220,980,500	1,214,330,000	88-392
U.S. Tax Court	2,555,000	2,505,000	2,505,000	2,505,000	
Post Office	5,018,000,000	5,001,500,000	5,002,500,000	5,002,000,000	
Executive Office of President	14,446,000	14,335,000	14,438,000	14,438,000	
Legislative [3]	222,587,355	173,626,640	210,380,685	210,300,885	88-454
Labor [4]	757,580,000	618,024,000	618,024,000	565,904,000	88-136
Health, Education, Welfare	6,773,566,000	6,276,200,000	6,482,183,000	6,476,629,000	
Defense	47,417,000,000	46,759,267,000	46,774,401,000	46,752,051,000	88-446
State	401,712,000	343,837,000	383,296,000	376,827,000	88-527
USIA	174,890,000	166,300,000	159,389,000	154,400,000	
Justice	367,887,000	364,036,000	364,036,000	364,036.000	
Judiciary	61,827,000	60,360.000	60.360,800	60,360,800	
Commerce	911,969,000	730,086,000	727,481.900	725,501,000	
Related agencies [5]	30.544,000	29,538.000	27,738,000	27,563,000	
Agriculture	1,573,421,600	1,493,518,000	1,573,157,525	1,506,747,200	88-573
Related agencies [6]	4,156,582,000	3,788,978,000	3,765,515,000	3,630,415,000	
Deficiency, 1964 [7]	1,307,380,789	1,264,913,689	1,349,637,143	1,336,687,143	88-317
Independent offices [8]	14,244,685,400	8,091,608,000	13,588,597,050	13,454,859,000	88-507
Military construction	1,879,000,000	1,599,014,000	1,582,969,000	1,570,968,000	88-576
Public works	4,372,449,000	4,325,969,200	4,443,283,200	4,430,794,700	88-511
Foreign aid	3,958,337,000	3,739,249,400	3,662,077,000	3,662,077,000	(*)
Supplemental, 1965	1,370,468,374	998,645,874	1,220,098,068	1,117,196,068	(*)

[1] Federal contribution, $40,720,000; balance from District of Columbia revenues.

[2] Does not include permanent appropriations for debt service, tax refunds, trust fund payments, etc.

[3] Includes funds for Library of Congress, Government Printing Office, Architect of the Capitol, etc., in addition to those for House of Representatives. Funds for Senate to be added there.

[4] Includes $32,070,000 added for National Labor Relations Board, National Mediation Board, and Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, not part of Department's budget.

[5] Includes Small Business Administration, Civil Rights Commission, Maritime Commission, Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, Tariff Commission, and U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

[6] Includes credit agencies and corporations (Rural Electrification Administration, Farmers Home Administration, Commodity Credit Corporation, etc.) and special programs and functions including school lunch and foreign assistance.

[7] Includes funds for various agencies, but mainly to provide for pay increases in military and uniformed public health services.

[8] House-passed figure did not include funds for NASA pending enactment of authorization bill.

*Awaiting President's signature.

NOTE.—The Congress enacted Public Law 88-295 (H.J. Res. 962), supplemental, 1964, providing $42,000,000 for unemployment compensation to veterans and Federal employees. Also Public Law 88-297 (H.J. Res. 976), Alaska earthquake relief appropriation, and Public Laws 88-325 (H.J. Res. 1056) continung appropriations through Aug. 31, 1964, and 88-488 (H.J. Res. 1160) through Sept. 30, 1964.

Report From Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my Report from Washington, No. 4, to the residents of the 16th Congressional District, New York:

REPORT NO. 4

DEAR FRIEND: In this Report From Washington, I want to bring you up to date on the record of the 88th Congress, acquaint you with my participation in its legislation, inform you of my voting record in detail, and outline what I have accomplished for our 16th District in the past 2 years.

THE 88TH CONGRESS

Under the strong leadership of President Johnson and the Democratic team, the 88th Congress was one of the most productive in modern times. It enacted the most far-ranging civil rights bill in history; approved an $11.5 billion Federal income tax cut which has already enormously spurred our economy; set up a Federal-State cooperative program to tackle the mass transportation problems that particularly plague us in New York; set aside some 9 million acres of wilderness for future recreation and conservation; provided Federal grants to build higher education facilities; created a training program for employees whose jobs have been taken away by automation; gave top executives in Government new incentives to remain in public service by raising their salaries, and attacked pockets of poverty through a variety of Federal-State projects. Unfortunately, medicare failed to pass, along with the $5 to $7 increases monthly for some 20 million persons on social security. This was a blow, but I feel certain our pensioners can look forward to passage next session. It has been an honor to be a Member of the 88th Congress—and a privilege to serve you.

MY PARTICIPATION

When I was elected to Congress, I determined to do more than simply occupy a desk and answer rollcalls. Consequently, in the past 2 years I have cosponsored legislation to protect our city's lifeblood—the port of New York—from unfair competition from the St. Lawrence Seaway; to tighten the trade embargo against Castro Cuba; to end the discriminatory quota system in immigration which permits Great Britain an annual quota of 65,361—41,600 unfilled—yet allows Italy—with 265,773 waiting for admission—a quota of only 5,666; to keep mail-order guns out of the hands of teenagers; to authorize the development of a Telestar-type satellite which, when placed in orbit, would provide a fixed point for navigational checks by nonmilitary vessels; and to establish a center for information on possible harmful side effects of new drugs.

DISTRICT WORK

It is my conviction that a Congressman should be concerned with the welfare of his district, economically and otherwise. To that end, on Staten Island I expedited construction of the new $1,300,000 post office, which will increase the speed and convenience of mail service; revitalized the $9,461,000 project for hurricane protection from Fort Wadsworth to Tottenville, which will save millions in storm damage; secure a $95,000 study for a permanent cleanup of the Staten Island shorefront, an eyesore and a hazard for years; obtained a $24,000 survey for the permanent dredging of Lemon Creek, Princess Bay; expedited a $500,000 grant for critically needed expansion of St. Vincent's Hospital, and speeded emergency disaster aid for victims of the 1963 brush fires, which tragically wiped out homes and businesses.

In Brooklyn I expedited the $53,096,000 project for hurricane protection and beach erosion control from East Rockaway Inlet to Rockaway Inlet, including Jamaica Bay and Gerritsen Creek; obtained a $95,000 study for permanent harbor cleanup to include Jamaica Bay; secured Federal funds for new street lights on Flatbush Avenue, eliminating hazard to drivers and pilots in Floyd Bennett Field area; obtained a new contract post office for Gerritsen Beach; expedited construction of the new Ryder Avenue post office; supported neighborhood groups opposed to involuntary busing of schoolchildren.

In addition, it has been my privilege to have personally handled more than 7,000 requests for aid from the people of our district in these past 2 years.

OTHER ACTIVITIES

As a graduate of West Point and an Army Reserve officer, I have a professional as well as a patriotic interest in the state of our defenses. But with the ever-increasing complexity of our weapons systems, interest is not enough; to keep pace requires a continuous refresher course. Accordingly, I have made it my business to keep informed, through seminars and inspection trips, with the latest developments in our first lines of defense—the Strategic Air Command and the Polaris-armed nuclear submarines; as you know, I recently took a 2-day indoctrination cruise aboard one of the newest nuclear submarines, the *Tecumseh*. This activity has enabled me to make sound evaluations of defense proposals. Another inspection trip took me to Korea, where I conferred with Gen. Hamilton Howze, our Far East Commander, and found both the state of readiness and the morale of our troops and their Republic of Korea allies to be high. And here I would like to bring up another point. It was my good fortune to discover, in time, a shocking commercial abuse of U.S. flags, which were being baled and sold as rags here in New York. This outrage has been stopped and I have made certain it won't happen again.

MY VOTING RECORD

You have a right to see my voting record, and I am including it—in detail—in this Report From Washington on a separate sheet in order to make it handier for you to study it in detail. You may not agree with every stand I have taken; I would not expect you to. But I want to assure you that every vote in it was cast only after carefully weighing every factor, pro and con. Each vote represents my best judgment.

THE OPINION POLL

And now for what I'm sure all readers of Report From Washington have been waiting for—the results of What Do You Think? the opinion poll which went out to you in my last newsletter. The response was heavy, and there were many letters amplifying the answers to the questions. In answer to the question, "In party identification, do you consider yourself a Democrat, Republican, or Independent?" 50.4 percent of the 6,000-plus who responded considered themselves Democrats, 19 percent Republicans, and 30.6 percent Independents. This is the first time, I believe, that such a poll has been taken of the district.

On international issues, the poll showed that 75.5 percent supported a "hard line" in southeast Asia, even to the point of bombing North Vietnam bases, while 16.7 percent were opposed and 7.8 percent had no opinion; 76 percent felt the United States should rebuff any Cuban attempts to resume diplomatic relations, 19 percent thought the United States should be receptive, and 4.1 percent had no opinion; 50.9 percent opposed even limited trade with Soviet bloc nations, 38.8 percent favored such trade, and 10.3 percent had no opinion; 72.6 percent felt that the U.S. participation in the U.N. helps to prevent war, 21.1 percent felt that it did not, and 6.3 percent had no opinion.

On domestic issues, a thumping 75.7 percent favored the proposed constitutional amendment to permit nonsectarian prayer and Bible reading in the public schools on a voluntary basis, while 12.8 percent were opposed to it, and 9.6 percent had no opinion; 67.8 percent favored direct Federal aid to ease the critical shortage of classroom space in the elementary schools, intermediate schools, and colleges, 22.6 percent were against it, and 9.6 percent had no opinion; 36.8 percent thought such aid should go only to public schools, 40.3 percent thought not, and 22.9 percent had no opinion; 41.8 percent felt such aid should be extended to parochial and private schools, 43.4 percent were opposed, and 14.8 percent had no opinion; President Johnson's antipoverty bill was overwhelmingly endorsed: 70.9 percent favored the Job Corps, while 22.2 percent were against it, and 6.9 percent had no opinion; 78.4 percent approved adult education, 14.7 percent opposed it, and 6.9 percent had no opinion; 73.2 percent favored loans to small businessmen, 18.1 percent were opposed, and 8.7 percent had no opinion; 48.5 percent thought the international image of the United States was not as firm under President Johnson, 36.8 percent thought it was firmer since President Johnson took over, and 14.7 percent had no opinion.

I would like to comment only on one question, that having to do with the international image of the United States under President Johnson. I feel that it is probably more a reflection of the late President Kennedy's tremendous international popularity than any feeling that U.S. prestige abroad has declined. By far the greater part of foreign newspaper comment I have read has been highly favorable to President Johnson. He is doing a good job.

THE ECONOMY

There is some good economic news this time, too. The Nation's employment rolls are up almost 4 million over 1960, factory wages are up from $89 weekly in January 1961 to a current $103, today's paycheck buys 9 percent more than it did in 1960, and 100,000 jobs have been created in areas of chronic unemployment.

IN CLOSING

These past 2 years in Congress have been a richly rewarding and educational experience for me. To have a voice in shaping the laws of our country is an honor and a responsibility. I have kept that responsibility in mind in weighing the merits of every issue that has come before Congress, and I have done my best to live up to your trust in me.

Legislative Stewardship of U.S. Senator Robert C. Byrd, of West Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I am approaching the end of my sixth year in the U.S. Senate, and I feel it incumbent upon me to give an account of my legislative stewardship. This will complete my 18th year as a public servant, having been elected twice to the West Virginia House of Delegates, once to the West Virginia Senate, three times to the U.S. House of Representatives, and, in 1958, to the U.S. Senate.

ATTENDANCE ON ROLLCALLS

During my 6 years in the West Virginia House and Senate, I was present on 1,563 out of 1,600 roll and quorum calls. During my 6 years in the House of Representatives, I attended 862 out of 963 roll and quorum calls. Throughout my 12 years, therefore, of public service, before reaching the Senate, I had an attendance record of 94.6 percent. During my first year in the U.S. Senate, I attended 211 out of 216 rollcalls, an attendance record of 97.6 percent. During my second year, I attended 191 out of 207 rollcalls, an attendance record of 92.3 percent. During the third year of my U.S. Senate tenure, I answered 203 out of 206 rollcalls, an attendance record of 98.5 percent. In my fourth year of Senate service, I was present on 220 out of 227 rollcalls, an attendance record of 96.9 percent. Last year, I answered 209 out of 229 rollcalls, an attendance record of 92 percent. This year, I answered 285 out of 312 rollcalls, an attendance record of 91.3 percent. Even regarding those rollcalls whereon I was absent, I was, in many instances, paired so as to indicate my position pro or con.

CORRESPONDENCE

I am proud of the reputation I have made in giving personal attention to the correspondence received in my office. During my 12 years in the House and Senate, I have familiarized myself with every letter that has gone out of my office in reply to correspondence received. No correspondent, old or young, has ever found me inattentive to his or her correspondence, and I have attempted at all times to be courteous, sympathetic, and understanding.

AID TO DEPRESSED AREAS

I have devoted much effort in behalf of legislation to benefit depressed areas. I cosponsored the Area Redevelopment Act, which provided for the stimulation of new industry for stricken regions. In 1959, I conducted 3 days of public hearings on the bill in Charleston, Beckley, and Morgantown.

Even before the President's signature on May 1, 1961, made the Area Redevelopment Act the law of the land, I thought that West Virginia should be prepared to take full advantage of its benefits. I arranged a 1-day workshop and conference in Washington, which was attended by more than 400 West Virginia public officials. Among the Federal officials who addressed the workshop were the then Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson; Secretary of the Army Elvis Stahr; Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Abraham Ribicoff; and Under Secretary of Commerce Edward Gudeman. More than 20 Federal agencies sent representatives to the conference. In June of that year, I arranged a similar conference to be held in Beckley—Raleigh County—and this meeting was attended by more than 700 West Virginia officials and businessmen. At my request, Secretary of Commerce Luther Hodges keynoted the Beckley conference.

I supported the accelerated public works program, and worked to secure appropriations for its implementation.

I have also cosponsored other important legislation, including the Appalachian Regional Development Act, which passed the Senate this year, but which failed to receive House approval. I was able to amend the fiscal year 1965 supplemental appropriation bill to add $800,000 for the establishment of an Appalachian Regional Commission, and this money will be immediately available at such time as the Congress authorizes the Appalachian aid program.

COAL RESEARCH

I was a cosponsor of the Coal Research and Development Act of 1959, and I have succeeded, upon several occasions, in adding moneys, by amendments to appropriation bills, for the Office of Coal Research. The moneys I have added for Project Gasoline have greatly expedited the development of processes for producing high-octane gasoline from coal, and a pilot plant is scheduled to be located at Cresap, W. Va.—Marshall County.

RESIDUAL OIL

During my 12 years in the House and Senate, I have urged the regulation of imports of foreign residual fuel oil, a product which competes against our domestic coal, and I have had audiences with high officials in both Republican and Democratic administrations to plead for enforced curbs on imported residual oil.

SOCIAL SECURITY

Over the years, I have introduced and supported legislation to lower the social security retirement age for men and women to 60 years, with a retirement age of 55 for widows. In 1960, I introduced a proposal to lower the voluntary retirement age for men, under social security, to 62, as allowed for women, and my proposal was adopted by the Senate, but was deleted in conference with the House of Representatives. Later that year, President Kennedy, shortly after his election, appointed a special task force on depressed areas, and I served as a consultant. The task force unanimously adopted my motion to recommend to the President that legislation providing for a lower retirement age be given administration support. The President supported the proposal and it became law.

I have supported the medicare proposal each time it has come before the Senate, and I have consistently supported increased social security payments. I have also supported expansion of the amount of allowable earnings, now $1,200, for social security recipients.

SURPLUS COMMODITIES

As far back as 1954 and 1955, I was instrumental in urging the Federal Government to release a greater variety and quantity of commodities for distribution to needy families in West Virginia. In 1959 and in 1960, I brought U.S. Department of Agriculture officials to West Virginia in the interest of increasing the amount of commodities to needy families. I have supported the food stamp program, and I have supported appropriations to provide an expansion of that program into additional West Virginia counties.

FORESTS

In fiscal 1960, I secured a $50,000 appropriation for timber studies in West Virginia, and the interesting revelations about this almost undeveloped resource, which we possess in abundance, were contained in two Senate documents prepared by the Forest Service at my request.

On February 6, 1961, I proposed, in a letter to the Chief of the U.S. Forest Service, that a forestry laboratory be located in southern West Virginia, and I requested that Forest Service officials accompany me into the State. In that same month, such an inspection tour was conducted, and the Bluefield-Princeton area was selected by the Forest Service for the laboratory. As a member of the subcommittee making appropriations for the Forest Service, I secured an appropriation of $450,000 in 1961 for initial planning and construction of the Princeton forestry research laboratory, and I added $300,000 over the budget in committee last year for the facility, an amount which was reduced to $250,000 in conference with the House. This facility will, in years to come, help to attract wood products industries to our State.

Last year, I also amended the bill making appropriations for the Forest Service to add $31,500 for preliminary planning of a forestry sciences laboratory, to be constructed at West Virginia University in Morgantown. This laboratory will conduct research in young hardwood timber growing stock, engineering aspects of logging on steep hillsides, control of soil erosion, as well as research work in wildlife habitat.

WATERSHED MANAGEMENT RESEARCH

In fiscal year 1963, I secured a $150,000 appropriation for planning and construction of a watershed management laboratory at Parsons—Tucker County—and I was able to add $75,000, by way of amendment, to the budget request this year so as to expedite the staffing and work there. This laboratory was completed and dedicated only a few weeks ago, and the work there will result in improved water quality of the rivers and streams in the Appalachian region.

FISH HATCHERIES

Last year I amended an appropriation bill to add $138,000 for rehabilitation of the 60-year-old White Sulphur Springs fish hatchery. This amount was reduced in conference with the House of Representatives to $100,000, and important work has been going on at that facility where the concrete rearing facilities were in badly deteriorated condition.

I also amended the bill last year to include $30,000 to establish a fishery management project in the Elkins area of West Virginia.

In 1962, I secured, by amendment, $62,000 for completion of the Bowden National Fish Hatchery, near Elkins. Expanded facilities at the Leetown hatchery, Jefferson County, will result from my amendment earlier this year adding $180,000 to the appropriation for the U.S. Bureau of Sport Fisheries.

WATER POLLUTION

In 1962, I amended the fiscal year 1963 HEW appropriation bill, to include $500,000 for a water pollution survey of the upper Ohio River Basin. This figure was reduced to $100,000 subsequently in conference with the House, but this amount enabled the work to get underway. Last year, Congress agreed to my amendment to the fiscal year 1964 HEW appropriation bill adding $400,000 over the budget for the project, which is headquartered in Wheeling, Ohio County. This work will, in future years, be highly important to industrial expansion and public health in the entire Ohio River Basin.

This year, I was able to amend the HEW appropriation bill to add $270,000 for acid mine drainage studies underway in Randolph County.

MINING DISEASE RESEARCH

In 1962, I amended the HEW appropriation bill by adding $520,000 for research in chest diseases among coal miners, an amount which was reduced to $100,000 in conference with the House. This research work is being conducted in the Beckley area. Last year, I amended the fiscal year 1964 HEW appropriation bill by adding $400,000 to the budget for this program, the ultimate objectives of which are prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of chest diseases among miners.

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

Work on juvenile delinquency and other offenses in West Virginia was aided by congressional approval of my amendment to the fiscal year 1964 HEW appropriation bill adding $250,000 to the nationwide program to curb antisocial actions by juveniles.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

Congress accepted my amendment restoring to the fiscal year 1964 military construction authorization bill the $3,830,000 authorization to move the Naval Radio Receiving Station from Cheltenham, Md., to Sugar Grove—Pendleton County. Later, I supported the needed appropriation in my appropriations committee. As a result, 7 officers and 98 enlisted men will be stationed at the Sugar Grove site plus about 20 civilian personnel, I am informed. Housing accommodations, provided through my amendment, will be constructed for the naval personnel and their families.

Construction of a combined field maintenance shop of the West Virginia National Guard, located at Point Pleasant—Mason County—was made possible by my amendment to the fiscal year 1964 military construction authorization bill. My amendment authorized $84,000 in deficiency funds, the sum needed to meet the lowest submitted construction bid, all bids having exceeded the budget-authorized $340,000 for this facility. I then supported, in my appropriations committee, the necessary money to find the authorization.

I amended the fiscal year 1962 military construction bill to add Army Reserve centers at Martinsburg, Berkeley County—Morgantown, Monongalia County—and New Martinsville, Wetzel County—and to include an Army Reserve maintenance shop at South Charleston—Kanawha County—after which I supported the necessary appropriations to fund the authorizations.

In 1959, I was successful, during the consideration of the military construction bill by the Senate Appropriation Committee, in getting moneys, over and above the budget estimate, to permit construction of the Logan, Gassaway, Weston, and Clarksburg Armories. I have also supported appropriations for other armories throughout the State.

FEDERAL BUILDINGS

I have urged the appropriation of site acquisition, planning, and construction moneys for six Federal buildings which will be located in the following cities: Gassaway, Braxton County; Glenville, Gilmer County; Parsons, Tucker County; Pineville, Wyoming County; Summersville, Nicholas County; and White Sulphur Springs, Greenbrier County.

I have also helped to secure appropriations for social security district office buildings to be constructed in Welch—McDowell County—and Beckley—Raleigh County.

Expansion and remodeling of the Mount Hope Bureau of Mines building will go forward as a result of my having acted to restore $38,000 stricken by the House from the independent offices appropriations bill.

WEATHER BUREAU STATION

In 1962, I successfully amended the Department of Commerce appropriation bill to add $75,000 to establish a weather bureau station at Beckley, Raleigh County. This facility now operates 24 hours a day and is helping to prevent crop losses throughout the area and is beneficial to commercial air travel. I have also helped to secure appropriations for other weather station activities in various parts of West Virginia.

NATIONAL TRAINING SCHOOL FOR BOYS

Early in the administration of the late President John F. Kennedy, I urged that the 100-year-old Washington, D.C., National Training School for Boys be moved to Morgantown, Monongalia County. Last year, I was able to add $100,000 in committee, to expedite detailed architectural planning of the proposed $8.5 million facility.

COMMERCE FIELD OFFICE

In 1962, I amended, in committee, the fiscal year 1963 Commerce appropriation bill to include $40,000 for establishment of a Department of Commerce field office in Charleston, Kanawha County. The Senate accepted my amendment, but it was lost in a subsequent conference with the House. In 1963, funds for the Charleston field office were included in the President's submitted budget requests.

CFA FIELD OFFICE

As a result of my request to Mr. Robert C. Weaver, Administrator of the HHFA, a Community Facilities Administration field office was opened in Charleston—Kanawha County—in July 1962. This new field office has helped to speed the processing of applications for Federal assistance in the planning and construction of public housing facilities, and so forth.

SALTLICK CREEK WATERSHED PROJECT

Early in 1962, I asked the chairman of the Senate Agricultural Subcommittee on Watersheds to conduct a special hearing on the Saltlick Creek watershed project. A hearing was held on June 6, and the subcommittee approved the project. I then urged approval of the project by the Senate Committee on Agriculture, and favorable action was taken. Work is presently underway at the watershed project site.

ACCELERATED PUBLIC WORKS

I worked closely with Federal, State, and county officials in helping to secure approval of Federal grants as follows: $1.2 million for Stephens Lake development in Raleigh County; $1,207,800 for a new courthouse in Logan County; $435,000 for the Lincoln County Courthouse; $165,000 for a new municipal building at Summersville, in Nicholas County; and $1,245,000 for the Mingo County Courthouse. I also urged approval of an application to the CFA for a $141,000 grant to Oglebay Park—Wheeling—in 1963, and the funds were used to develop the Camp Russel Youth Center.

GLASS TARIFFS

I supported the U.S. Tariff Commission's recommendations to President Kennedy that tariffs on imported glass products be stiffened in order to bolster the economy of the ailing glass industry of West Virginia. President Kennedy approved the Commission's recommendation.

EDUCATION

I have supported Federal aid for school construction so as to eliminate the shortage of classrooms. I am firmly convinced that an adequate education of the Nation's youth is absolutely vital to the security of our country. I maintain that there must be local control of the educational system, but, where States are unable or unwilling to provide proper educational facilities for boys and girls, I submit that the Federal Government should act to see that the need is attended to.

KANAWHA RIVER BASIN STUDY

I amended the fiscal 1963 public works appropriation bill to add $200,000 to initiate a comprehensive study of the Kanawha River Basin.

Piecemeal studies of the Kanawha River Basin have been conducted in the past, but the economic growth along the Kanawha, especially in the Charleston complex, has intensified the urgency for an all-inclusive study of the basin's problems. The U.S. Army Engineers will seek to learn what kinds of installations are needed in the basin, where they are needed, and how soon they will be needed.

NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH CENTER

As a result of my efforts, $1 million appropriation was included in the fiscal year 1965 appropriation bill for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for planning of a National Environmental Health Center. I have long urged that the $8.5 million facility, or a portion thereof, be located at Martinsburg—Berkeley County. Now that the money has been appropriated for planning, the decision as to location rests with the executive branch of the Federal Government.

CANCER RESEARCH

I was successful in putting through the Senate a $10 million appropriation for special cancer research on leukemia. The Senate, on a rollcall vote, supported my defense of the appropriation, and House conferees agreed to it. I hope that, with this special appropriation, a vaccine can be developed to prevent contraction of the disease, which usually strikes children and which is presently considered as incurable.

VISITORS INFORMATION CENTER

A Visitors Information Center will be built at Cranberry Glades—Pocahontas County—as a result of my amendment adding $100,000 to the fiscal year 1965 appropriation bill for the U.S. Forest Service. This additional facility constitutes one more step toward making West Virginia a tourist mecca.

WATER RESOURCES PROJECTS

Since early in 1957, I have worked to promote and insure the construction of a flood prevention reservoir near the community of Justice, Wyoming County. Both as a Member of the House of Representatives and the U.S. Senate, I fought to secure favorable action on the authorization of this project. I have also, as a member of the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Public Works, acted to secure appropriations therefor.

One of my first actions, as a member of the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Deficiencies and Supplementals, was to amend the fiscal year 1963 supplemental appropriation bill to include $25,000 with which to assist the Army Engineers to initiate planning of the Justice Reservoir in Wyoming County, on the main stem of the Guyandot River. Previous to this action, I had been successful in securing ARA moneys for use by the Army Engineers in connection with aerial photography of the site before the foliage appeared on the trees, thus helping to accelerate work on this project.

I have worked for increased appropriations for modernization of navigational facilities on the Ohio and Monongahela Rivers. I was also instrumental, in 1962, in getting an initial appropriation of $20,000 for a restudy of the West Fork of the Monongahela River.

In 1961, I amended the fiscal year 1962 public works appropriation bill to add $95,000 for an engineering study of the Burnsville, Steer Creek, and West Fork Reservoirs in the Little Kanawha River Basin. The money was deleted in a subsequent Senate-House conference, but in 1962, $65,000 was appropriated for these engineering studies. Earlier this year, the chairman of the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Public Works assured me that he would try to look favorably upon an appropriation next year for planning of the Burnsville Reservoir.

I have supported appropriations for various other reservoir projects throughout the State, including those at East Lynn, Sutton, Beech Fork, Bloomington, and Summersville. I have also supported appropriations for the Cheat River survey, the Big Sandy River flood control study, and construction of the channel of Buckhannon River.

OTHER ACTIVITIES

In the foregoing paragraphs I have endeavored to mention merely the major efforts I have put forth in behalf of my State and its people. There are other actions, too numerous to mention here, which I have taken that have been of economic or social importance to many localities, and in the aggregate they will provide a base for new economic and social gains.

America's Coal Research Center

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, as author of the Saylor Act which created the Office of Coal Research in 1961, I consider it a personal responsibility to maintain a close watch on the Nation's various coal research projects, particularly those undertaken through Federal appropriations. I recently took advantage of the opportunity to visit the Bituminous Coal Research, Inc., laboratory at Monroeville, Pa., whose current activities include projects sponsored through the Office of Coal Research and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania as well as those underwritten entirely by coal and allied industries. I commend to my colleagues—particularly members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs—a tour of this research institution which stands in the center of great coalfields and adjacent to major fuel consuming industries.

BCR is a research facility whose construction was made possible through the cooperative effort of individual coal companies, railroads, electric utilities, and equipment manufacturing industries. I was extremely impressed and most appreciative of the guidance and information supplied by President James R. Garvey and his excellent staff, including John W. Igoe, vice president for administration and finance; John W. Tieman, manager of the mechanical division; and Dr. W. F. Berry, petrographer. It was gratifying to find these learned and articulate engineers entirely frank about every project and its possibilities. BCR has already published under the auspices of the Office of Coal Research a technical report on ultrafine coal pulverization and its application which is available to all interested parties at the Department of the Interior, the Library of Congress, the Department of Commerce, the National Coal Association headquarters at the Coal Building in Washington, and at university libraries throughout the country. The laboratory is also engaged in research on air pollution control, acid mine drainage, coal gasification, the application of petrography to coal carbonization the conversion of coal into gasoline, and other important probings and studies that we are confident will lead to new and expanded uses for solid fuel in the immediate future.

One of the earlier BCR successes which I had the opportunity to inspect is the so-called Easy-Flo bin that today is being used to handle such materials as salt, nylon flake, mixed glass, sand, coke, limestone, and ceramic pellets, as well as coal itself. The laboratory also developed a new system of injecting raw coal into a blast furnace—a device effectively reducing coke rate at steel plants. These and other accomplishments of the laboratory have already brought national recognition to Mr. Garvey, who was awarded the Percy Nicholls Award for notable scientific or industrial achievement in the field of solid fuels last year.

Mr. Speaker, my visit to BCR was a stimulating experience. I was also pleased to learn that experts in the energy field from Canada, England, Germany, Japan, India, and other fuel-producing and consuming countries are making it a practice to stop here whenever possible. I trust that BCR's imposing library will continue to be used as a center of exchange for coal research information on an international scale so that unnecessary duplications will be obviated and development expedited.

Mr. Speaker, the congressional district I represent produces more than 20 percent of Pennsylvania's total output of bituminous coal. If demand holds for the remainder of the year, our States production will show an increase of almost 7 percent over the 1963 total, and Armstrong, Cambria, and Indiana Counties will record at least a proportionate rate of increase. Nonetheless, our State total will not amount to even half as much as the total for the peak postwar year of 1947. This differential is regrettable in view of the sharp increases in the use of energy that have taken place since that time. With Pennsylvania's recoverable reserves listed at more than 35 billion tons—some four times the total produced in the past two centuries—there can be no relaxing of the effort to restore the Pennsylvania coal industry to its full potential and thus revitalize the economy of our mining counties. Through such research facilities as BCR, I am hopeful that it will not be too long before this objective is attained.

Review of the 88th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, the 88th Congress that adjourned Saturday, October 3, has been termed by many the most productive and fruitful in 30 years. It is my judgment that by any standard of measurement the description is deserved.

A single major new program, the enactment by bipartisan majority of a single creative approach to a national problem, is ordinarily enough to entitle a Congress to a place in the history books. This is as it should be—for we do not move radically and carelessly in our national life, and the Members of Congress are responsible citizens with a respect for public opinion.

The 88th Congress of 1963–64, preceded by the 87th in 1961–62, came at the end of a long period of soul searching in American life—a period of dormancy, so to speak, about the directions in which we should move. And suddenly there was general realization that a time for decision had come. The result was three tremendous legislative actions:

First. A major step was taken toward getting rid of an outmoded wartime tax system that placed too heavy a burden on both business and individual families. Congress this year completed action on a bill passed by the House in 1963 to slash income tax rates, needed years ago, that now simply stifled economic expansion and actually served to restrain the growth of Government revenue.

Second, Congress passed the Civil Rights Act of 1964—in essence a response to a recognized public conviction that the time had come to write into the lawbooks certain temperate but vital guarantees to make sure that all our citizens obtain the equal protection of the laws.

This was a bipartisan achievement, and neither Democrats nor Republicans could have done it by themselves—not at any time, under any President. My own Democratic Party was the majority but two Republicans—Representative WILLIAM M. McCULLOCH of Ohio and Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN of our own State of Illinois—helped work out the formulas that were the basis for the bipartisan meeting of minds. A majority of each party in both houses voted for the bill.

Third. In the field of foreign policy, where the Senate has special responsibilities—as the House has in initiating all tax bills—another bipartisan consensus between Democrats and Republicans produced ratification of the first-step nuclear test ban treaty.

The result is that in this world of danger and social upheaval, this world in which the power of self-destruction exists for the first time, the nuclear powers have halted the above-ground competitive tests that threatened to poison the atmosphere of our planet with deadly radioactivity and alter the future of mankind generation after generation.

This is an election year, and in the heat of elections many things are said that fall in the category of what Wendell Willkie, once a Republican candidate for the Presidency, termed "campaign oratory." The appeal of both parties is to the people, and the judgment may safely be left to the people.

This said, I must affirm my belief that the 88th Congress had strong and competent leadership, I feel now, as we did last year on the assassination of the beloved President John F. Kennedy, that the country was fortunate that Mr. Kennedy had selected Lyndon B. Johnson as his vice-presidential choice.

Both President Johnson and President Kennedy went into office with the conviction that there are changed and emerging world and national situations demanding affirmative responses. They believed that in the postwar years Congress had allowed problems to pile up without moving to meet them.

The reason for delay on issues was by no means discreditable. The Nation has been compelled to concentrate attention on war and national defense, on both foreign policy, and domestic issues of a new kind.

Beginning in 1938, President Roosevelt had the obligation to build up our naval forces with new and then modern warships,to defend our interests on the high seas in the event of war. The war broke out the next year when Hitler and Stalin invaded and divided Poland. The storm of war kept spreading, and in 1941 this Nation was involved. Then came Stalin's "Iron Curtain," the Berlin blockade and the airlift with which President Truman broke it. We had Korea and Lebanon and now Vietnam, and all the other outbreaks and pressures, the development of nuclear rockets and orbiting satellites. We found ourselves prosperous but with nagging loads of unemployment.

A period of dormancy and meditation, however, can be safely tolerated only for a limited time. A generation was long enough, in the opinion of Presidents Kennedy and Johnson, and many problems had become more pressing. And Congress was ready to act.

New departures were signaled when President Kennedy secured passage in 1962 of the Trade Expansion Act, expressing a new attitude toward U.S. international commerce—both exports and imports. It was designed to increase employment in our export industries and help meet a foreign drain on our gold reserves.

An area redevelopment plan for depressed communities was set in motion to meet heavy joblessness arising from the decline of ancient industries. A manpower training program was set up to meet the chronic unemployment caused by the impact of automation. A host of other measures were passed.

The 88th Congress, which met almost continuously for 21 months in 1963 and 1964, went on from this foundation to meet other accumulated or newly-recognized national needs.

The tax-cutting bill, spreading purchasing power and encouraging business investment, has helped keep our economy surging for an unbroken and unprecedented peacetime period of 44 months.

The Civil Rights Act put the stamp of legislative authority behind guarantees of normal rights for all Americans and was designed to move the expression of racial tensions out of the streets and into the courts and the human relations commissions of the States.

There are special problems of the people of the 24th Congressional District of Illinois which should be mentioned before details on other matters.

One problem in our area is flood ravages and navigation. A new-money appropriation of $400,000 was approved this year for preconstruction planning of the Kaskaskia River canalization project, which is estimated as an ultimate $60 million investment. It is my hope that in the next Congress, the 89th, we can obtain approval of the first funds for actual construction.

Another item of $200,000 was approved for preconstruction planning of flood-control works on Richland Creek, making a total of $300,000 appropriated for this purpose in the 2 years of the 88th Congress.

An additional $400,000 was voted for construction of flood-control facilities in East St. Louis and the vicinity, making a total of $700,000 for the 2 years. Initial funds for the start of construction of the New Athens floodwall, in the amount of $120,000, were appropriated.

A total of $3.3 million was appropriated for continued construction of Mississippi River navigation projects affecting our area, including the Chain of Rocks emergency dam to provide an adequate navigation channel during periods of drought.

In areas outside the immediate 24th District but affecting those who live here, two other projects are significant. Construction of the Shelbyville Reservoir was advanced by appropriation of $2.8 million, making a total of $3.8 million for the 2 years. And an additional $7.2 million was voted for continued construction of the Carlyle Reservoir, which will provide important recreational facilities for our people as well as flood control features.

For many years, as many know, my own work, in addition to seeking to promote the equitable interests of the district, has been devoted to two major committees: the House Committee on Armed Services and the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy.

I have been chairman of the Research and Development Subcommittee of the Joint Atomic Energy Committee and became chairman, during the 88th Congress, of a new House Armed Services Subcommittee in the same area. I have the honor to be a member of a House select committee, created by the 88th Congress, studying all Government research programs, including nondefense areas.

It is a source of great satisfaction to report that our military defenses and capabilities have been greatly advanced and made more versatile during the 2 years of this Congress.

There are voices being heard saying that we are "weak." Nothing could be further from the truth. The Johnson-Kennedy administration picked up our defense program from where it was in January 1961, and they restored and broadened it.

In 4 years our capacity for a military airlift—to speed strength wherever it is needed—has been expanded by 16 squadrons, and much of our airlift force has been equipped with modern jets.

Our tactical air forces—the forces used in combat in cooperation with other defense elements—have been increased. We have developed specially trained counterinsurgency forces to deal with guerrillas in so-called national liberation operations launched by aggressors.

The strength of our forces designed to fight a "conventional" war—that is, a conflict that does not involve nuclear destruction—has been greatly augmented. Four divisions have been added to the combat-ready forces of the Army. In organization these forces have been streamlined, in equipment they have been modernized.

Our stockpile of nuclear weapons is much larger; it is adequate and well protected. But it is the hope and prayer of the whole world that this stockpile will never have to be used. In the 88th Congress, as in the 87th Congress that preceded it, we supported the money requests that broadened and improved the variety of military response we can give in "brushfire" conflicts and aggressive "insurgencies," in reply to nuclear threats and nuclear bluffs, in the defense of the North Atlantic powers and in all the corners of the earth.

I am happy to report, in passing, that the 88th Congress did not neglect the Nation's veterans.

We passed a number of bills in 1963—limited in scope but important to those affected—increasing benefits to veterans suffering from speech loss or service-connected deafness, increasing burial allowances, increasing the benefits to dependent children and parents.

In the 1964 session Congress added a provision giving veterans 1 year to pick up and reactivate national service life insurance that had been allowed to lapse. For those with service-connected disabilities, the right to reactivate their national service policies is absolute for the 1 year. Veterans with disabilities not service connected can benefit if they are rated by private insurance firms as uninsurable or acceptable only at marked-up rates.

There are great areas in which the 88th Congress, in the field of domestic needs, adopted programs to bridge the gaps left by a generation of default.

It was a "Congress of Education." The Federal Government acknowledged that it had a major responsibility in helping finance our educational system—across the board.

One program set up loans to young people seeking training in the health professions, plus a matching-grant system for construction of college and university facilities.

A second measure set up grants and loans totaling $1.2 billion for construction of public and private educational facilities beyond the health field.

The National Defense Education Act, which otherwise might have expired this year, was extended. This provides loans for college students in specified fields. Congress continued a program of Federal aid to elementary schools in areas where Federal employees have been concentrated, and expanded it to new areas.

A fourth program authorized a major new vocational education effort, going far beyond what has existed in the past. It recognizes that science and technology are changing the nature of job demands and job opportunities, that complex training is needed which transform the nature of apprentice training and vocational training.

President Johnson remarked, correctly, that passage of all these bills meant that the 88th Congress would do "more for education than any Congress since the Land Grant College Act was passed" in 1863.

A great fresh start was taken also, in protection of the Nation's natural heritage by passage of the Wilderness Act, which sets aside 9.2 million acres of federally owned land for "wilderness" purposes. It specifically rules out use of the land for commercial purposes, and guarantees that our fast-growing population will be privileged to gaze upon the natural beauties of our land in generations to come. The wilderness system can be expanded, under the law, to 14.7 million acres.

Additional progress was made in the fight to preserve some of our seashores—a great part of which are now in private hands—for the use of all our people. The Fire Island National Seashore was authorized as a national recreation area, and this followed 1962 action setting up the Point Reyes National Seashore in California and the Padre Island National Seashore in the Gulf of Mexico.

A start was made toward preservation of the Indiana Dunes, which so many of our State know well, by Senate passage of a bill to create a shoreline recreation area. It is my belief that the House will be prepared to act in the next Congress.

Congress this year passed a cotton-wheat bill to protect the interests of our highly productive agricultural operators, thus completing action on a program that began in the first session with enactment of protection of feed-grain producers.

The food stamp program, which had existed until this Congress only under general powers of the Department of Agriculture, was given specific legislative sanction, and can now be expanded beyond a pilot operation.

This is a program in which I take particular interest, and had helped sponsor even during the Eisenhower administration. It allows needy families to purchase a broad variety of foods from our ample surplus stocks. It helps maintain the farm price-support system, protects the interest of merchants, and gives the needy a far better chance at good nutrition and balanced diets than they otherwise would have.

Congress this year renewed and substantially expanded the Hill-Burton program providing Federal funds for community hospitals and health centers. It was an action that followed pioneering steps by the 1963 session to place undergirding Federal support into the field of mental health.

Funds were authorized for research into mental illness or retardation, which are among the curses of our age, and additional money to help the States build community mental health centers and conduct their own research.

The 88th Congress also passed a pioneering law giving Federal support to research into the causes and remedy of air pollution, a major factor now suspected in diseases of the cardiac and respiratory systems.

Congress authorized a new program to assist our great metropolitan city and suburban areas to develop areawide rapid transit systems serving both cities and suburbs and wrote into the law protection of the job rights of workers on the existing systems.

It approved a housing law giving further support to cities struggling with blight and overcrowding.

All but one of the basic sections of President Johnson's antipoverty program were approved. The measure passed includes a Youth Conservation Corps, to provide useful work and basic education to young people out of school and out of jobs. It provides a National Service Corps—Domestic Peace Corps—giving young Americans a chance to devote a year or two of their lives here at home working with mental hospital patients, with farm-labor migrants, with Indians, and in the job camps of the Conservation Corps. It offers assistance to local actions aimed at combating poverty and special programs to aid rural areas.

The Appalachia program, passed by the Senate, did not reach the House floor, but it was approved by committee and is certain to be on the agenda again next year.

The 88th Congress this year passed a bill updating the Davis-Bacon Act that protects construction workers on Government projects from roving contractors seeking contracts on the basis of wage slashing. As passed during the thirties, the law provided that all bidders must agree to pay the areawide prevailing wage. The amendment specifies that this must include so-called fringe benefits, such as health and welfare insurance, pensions, vacation periods, and other protections, as well as merely dollar wages.

The 1963 session passed a law requiring payment of equal wages and salaries to women workers where they are doing work comparable to that of men. These two protective laws followed action in 1961 substantially broadening the protection given workers in interstate commerce by the wage-hour law, and raising the basic minimum by gradual steps to $1.25 an hour.

The 88th Congress also took recognition of the serious problems of job losses and job security arising from the impact of automated processes in industry.

There is no question about the overall impact and values of automation: It greatly increases productivity and it is moving broadly into white-collar as well as factory processes. But it may leave workers stranded without jobs and without the protection of phased out reduction in veteran workers. Congress created a Commission on Automation to bring authoritative proposals on the principles involved to guide industry, workers, and the Government itself in working out solutions.

Congress this year injected additional strength to the pioneering Manpower Training Act approved by the 87th. This program is aimed at one of the key facts in our economic situation—some workers lack the required skills to obtain new jobs when an industry dies out or processes change, although other industries may need workers. A higher level of skills and education generally is demanded by industry and business today, and an upgrading of the educational level of our people is needed. Skills are needed to provide trained workers as new industries come into existence.

The Training Act is a pilot program. The complexities of educating and training adults and jobless young people, of fitting together the needs of industry a few years from now and the trained workers, are enormous. The 88th Congress improved the program on the basis of experience gained in the first year or so. There will be further improvements, undoubtedly, in proposals to Congress next year.

Our foreign policy has been conducted with these past 2 years' strength and with what the founders of our Nation, in the Declaration of Independence, called a decent respect for the opinion of mankind.

A treaty with Mexico ended, with justice and good spirit, a nagging dispute about title to land disputed since the channel of Rio Grande shifted. Firmness and fairness prevailed when an ugly riot erupted in Panama, and the base was laid for discussions of a new canal in the isthmus and better relations generally. The Peace Corps was made a permanent service.

A new Federal pay system was approved, raising the salaries of civil service and postal employees to levels of comparability with private industry. A military pay increase bill was passed to provide equity to the personnel in the Armed Services and encourage the building of professional careers in the service.

More than 50 major bills—creating or strengthening services needed for the general welfare, for the security of our Nation, for the bold confrontation of newly recognized problems, were passed by the 88th Congress. These were measures proposed by both President Kennedy and President Johnson, and there were very few of the major recommendations that did not result in significant legislation.

It is truly an unusual record—certainly the most impressive since the first few years of Franklin D. Roosevelt's era. It is rated by Mr. Johnson himself as the best of this century, and this may eventually be the judgment of history.

Congressman Shriver Reports on 88th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, in keeping with my policy of informing the citizens of the Fourth Congressional District of Kansas of my activities as their Congressman in the U.S. House of Representatives, I submit for the RECORD this 4th annual report which highlights the 2d session of the 88th Congress.

The Congress actually has been in almost continuous session since January 1963. The 1st session of the 88th Congress was the 5th longest in our Nation's history—ending finally on December 30, 1963. The second session ended on October 3, 1964.

SHRIVER VOTING RECORD

More than 15,000 bills and resolutions were introduced during the 88th Congress in both the House and Senate. Your Congressman since coming to the House of Representatives has an attendance record of 95 percent.

It would be impossible, of course, to discuss in this report the more than 635 public laws passed in the 88th Congress. There are many which I supported, and others I opposed as not in the best interest of my Nation and district. My decisions were based upon careful deliberation, the views of my constituents, and my considered judgment of each proposal.

Following is a partial summary of important actions and my voting position:

Tax reduction: I voted for personal and corporate tax cuts amounting to $11.5 billion after the President reduced total budget requests to Congress for fiscal 1965 by $3.6 billion. I supported action which further reduced the President's budget by another $4 billion, further justifying the tax reduction.

Defense appropriations: I supported the Defense Department appropriations for fiscal 1965 in the amount of $46.7 billion and I insisted upon additional research and development funds requested by the Air Force for a new follow-on manned aircraft.

Education: I supported a program of grants and loans for college building construction, an expanded vocational educational program, and extension of the National Defense Education Act and Public Laws 874 and 815 which provide financial assistance to federally impacted school districts. The Fourth District will be receiving approximately $2½ million in such assistance. It was my privilege to sponsor successfully legislation extending Public Laws 874 and 815 for a 2-year period in the 1st session of the 88th Congress. In addition, I successfully sponsored legislation extending Federal payments in lieu of taxes on federally owned facilities to school districts, such as Derby and the Sedgwick County schools.

Social security: I supported in the House a bipartisan measure increasing social security benefits for our senior citizens to keep up with the increased cost of living. Unfortunately, the administration leadership in the Senate refused to delete a hastily added medicare program to be financed by a substantial increase in social security taxes.

Foreign policy: I supported a joint resolution passed by the Congress, and requested by the President, supporting a policy of American determination and firmness in Vietnam. I also supported a Republican motion to reduce foreign aid spending by $248 million with cuts in economic assistance funds. When this effort failed, I opposed the foreign aid appropriation bill calling for expenditure of $3.3 billion this year.

Federal pay raise: At a time when we are asking labor and management to hold the line and check inflation, I could not conscientiously vote for a bill to raise my own salary as well as the salaries of many high Government officials. Without question, there are Federal employees in the low and medium salary range who need salary adjustment, but we were dealing with an omnibus bill containing a great number of unacceptable and costly provisions.

Debt ceiling: Congress has raised the debt ceiling six times in little more than 2 years. I have opposed these increases each time. The last increase moved the debt ceiling to $324 billion. Our present debt is over $315 billion.

Conservation: I supported significant legislation passed by Congress this year which will establish a land and water conservation fund to aid development of greater recreation facilities and create water resources research centers throughout the Nation.

Poverty bill: The war against poverty is not new. However, in this election year the majority in Congress succeeded in creating a vast new bureau and authorized more than $1 billion in spending on various retread programs of the thirties. I have supported the efforts of many private organizations, local and State governments as well as the 42 existing programs of the Federal Government which long have been fighting poverty.

SHRIVER COMMITTEE SERVICE

It was my privilege to continue my service as a member of the House Committee on the Judiciary. The committee this year held extensive hearings on a number of legislative proposals which would permit voluntary prayer in the public schools. Significant civil rights legislation was also reported from the committee and passed by Congress.

In the 88th Congress, I served as ranking minority member of the Claims Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee. Forty-three public and six hundred and fifty-five private bills were assigned to the subcommittee. The subcommittee gave full and careful consideration to these measures which requested appropriations of over $15 million. Favorable action was recommended on only 245, and 199 of these carried appropriations of less than a million dollars—a savings of over $14 million.

SERVING CONSTITUENTS

In addition to the important legislative responsibilities of this congressional office, I have continued to assist and serve my constituents, to the best of my ability, in their individual relationships and problems with the Federal Government.

During the year my staff and I held 540 conferences with 62 different agencies in Washington in behalf of the Fourth District citizens.

We received and replied to over 1,200 requests for Government publications, documents, and information.

I have read personally each piece of mail addressed to me from my district, and have dictated the replies to these communications. It may be of interest that from January 1 until October 3, 1964, I received approximately 20,000 first-class communications from constituents.

It was gratifying to have nearly 1,300 Kansans sign the guest book in my Washington office during this 2d session of the 88th Congress.

OPINION POLL

Approximately 72,000 questionnaires were mailed to Fourth District citizens with the help of volunteers this year. More than 13,000 citizens returned their opinion polls to me for tabulation. I respect the opinions of my constituents on the important issues of our time. Throughout my tenure in Congress, these polls have been helpful to me in determining the thinking of Kansans on domestic and international legislative matters.

PERSONAL CONTACT

In addition to the annual poll and the mail from home, I have made frequent trips back to the district for personal visitations and speeches. In 1964, I returned to the Fourth District from Washington on the average of twice monthly.

FLOOD CONTROL-WATER CONSERVATION

Fourth District public works projects for flood control purposes received appropriations totaling $5,228,000 for the 1965 fiscal year. The Cheney Reservoir, which will be a reality in 1965, is scheduled to receive $1,480,000; $3 million was appropriated for continued construction of the Marion Reservoir and Dam; and $688,000 was appropriated for continued construction on the Council Grove Dam. In addition, $60,000 was approved for a continuing study of flood control problems on the Arkansas River, including the Halstead and Sedgwick areas.

ACADEMY COMPETITION

Each year it is my privilege to make certain nominations to the outstanding service academies of our Nation. Nominees selected by me compete in academy-administered examinations for the final appointments. Those chosen by the academies in 1964 were as follows: Richard E. Nelson, of Burdick, Kans., U.S. Air Force Academy; Neil D. Hughes, of Goddard, Kans.; James R. Swinney, of Wichita, Kans., and Wallace C. Magathan III, of Marion, Kans., U.S. Military Academy; Harland W. Jones, Jr., of Wichita, Kans., and Richard Lee Masters, of Wichita, Kans., U.S. Naval Academy.

I take this opportunity to extend my sincere appreciation to the citizens of my district for their cooperation and support. It is a pleasure and privilege for me to represent them in Congress.

Medicare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. BYRNE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, while disappointment may be the first immediate reaction to the disagreement which blocked enactment of the social security amendments at this session, there is a brighter side to the picture.

As a matter of hard political fact, under the parliamentary situation prevailing in the closing hours of this 88th Congress, the failure of the bill now actually makes its enactment early in the next Congress almost a certainty.

And at this time, with the help of an even larger Democratic majority in the House of Representatives to be elected on November 4 from throughout the Nation, it will include not only across-the-board increases in cash benefits but also the hospital care for the aged which we seek. Had the supporters of hospitalization protection agreed to drop it and permit the boost in payments alone the chances of reviving the proposition next January would have gone down the drain.

This is so because both the benefit increase and the hospitalization call for a rise in the social security payroll tax and it would be extremely difficult to gain approval of two tax increases, one immediately following the other.

Even if the hospitalization provisions approved in the Senate had been agreed to by the conference committee to which the bill was referred, our fight has really lost no ground because they could not be put into effect before January 1, 1966. Prompt action in the 89th Congress can still make hospital care effective that same date, and the cash benefits increase could be made retroactive to January 1, 1965.

The Sugar Act: Present and Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday morning, October 3, 1964, the representatives of the beet sugar interests of the United States and of the cane sugar refineries were so close together in their agreement on an extension of the foreign quota provisions of the Sugar Act that, had there been another 48 hours remaining of the congressional session, I feel confident we could have enacted a bill which would have extended the foreign quota provisions of the Sugar Act for another year, permitted the domestic areas to market the surplus sugar they have grown in 1963 and 1964 at the request of the Department of Agriculture, and brought all areas participating in our sugar program substantially back within the quota provisions of the act in 1965.

It is unfortunate that these two major segments of our sugar industry should not have been able to come into agreement long before this. The Sugar Act is one of our most successful and yet most delicately balanced laws. Its benefits extend not only to all segments of the domestic sugar industry and to the foreign suppliers which have quotas in this market but also to the consumers of the United States, to thousands of workers in refineries, seaports, and transport lines, to agriculture generally whose exports to sugar producing countries are paid for by our purchases of sugar, and to the U.S. Treasury, which has benefited by more than $490 million from the operation of the Sugar Act.

At the beginning of the current controversy over sugar late last year, the responsibility for disagreement must rest with the beet sugar interests of the United States which sought to parlay an ill-advised press release issued by the Department of Agriculture in May 1963 into a permanent increase in their share of the U.S. market, in derogation of an agreement which had been reached in 1962 and to the detriment of all the foreign countries which have been given access to our market and of the east coast refineries who handle this imported sugar. In the latter stage of the impasse over sugar legislation, the responsibility must rest with the cane sugar refiners, who refused to compromise their position during the final days of Congress when a compromise would have permitted an extension of the foreign quota provisions of the Sugar Act to have been adopted by Congress virtually by unanimous consent.

Mr. Speaker, the Sugar Act is a mystery to many people and this is understandable for it is one of the most complicated and delicately balanced laws on the statute books. Not only is the law complicated, but the very subject of sugar itself is complicated. It is grown in almost every part of the world, in diverse forms, with varying degrees of governmental protection, control, and subsidy, and put onto the market at different times of the year. A law designed to protect the domestic sugar producing industry and to provide U.S. consumers with an ample and stable supply of sugar at reasonable prices must of necessity be a complicated and difficult law.

We must face the fact that except for the Sugar Act, there would probably not be any sugar produced in the continental United States. We must face the fact that except for the Sugar Act and the incentive it provides to foreign suppliers to ship sugar into this market, we would have no assurance whatever of a continuing and adequate supply for U.S. consumers at stable and reasonable prices.

Mr. Speaker, I do not share the opinion which some have expressed that failure of the Congress to extend the foreign quota provisions of the Sugar Act at this session of the Congress will necessarily result in no foreign quotas for the sugar industry in 1965. On the contrary, I believe that the Secretary of Agriculture has the authority and the responsibility, under the provisions of the Sugar Act itself, to establish foreign quotas for sugar in 1965, even in the absence of specific direction from Congress as to how these quotas are to be distributed among participating countries and to continue to protect the interests of domestic producers and consumers in the United States as the Sugar Act intended they should be protected.

Section 201 of the Sugar Act says:

> The Secretary shall determine for each calendar year * * * the amount of sugar needed to meet the requirements of consumers in the continental United States.

Section 202 of the act says:

> Whenever a determination is made, pursuant to section 201, of the amount of sugar needed to meet the requirements of the consumers, the Secretary shall establish quotas, or revise existing quotas.

Then follows a detailed directive by Congress as to how the quotas are to be distributed. Subsection (a) of section 202 deals with domestic area quotas and specific quotas are provided for the continental beet and cane areas, for Hawaii, for Puerto Rico, and for the Virgin Islands.

Subsection (b) tells the Secretary the amount of the quota he should allocate to the Philippines.

The residual amount of the quota—the difference between the consumption estimate and the specific quotas established in subsections (a) and (b)—is to be allocated to foreign countries.

Subsection (c) tells the Secretary in detail how this remainder of the quota, that allocated to foreign countries, should be distributed among foreign supplying areas. It is, in effect, a limitation on his general authority to allocate the residual foreign part of the quota. It is significant to note that while the quotas prescribed in subsections (a) and (b) are in terms of specified tonnage, the allocations of subsection (c) are in percentages of this remainder. This subsection is the part of the law which continues only through 1964. The purpose of Congress in providing for this early termination date of the specific foreign quota allocation was to give the Congress an opportunity to review the performance of individual foreign countries in supplying sugar at the half-way point in the life of the present extension of the Sugar Act. The subsection, in my opinion, does not affect in any way the basic obligation and authority of the Secretary to establish quotas, set out in the first sentence of section 202. Expiration of this subsection at the end of the calendar year 1964 merely means that after that date, the Secretary has no specific directive nor limitation from Congress as to how the foreign portion of the total quota for the United States is to be allocated.

Section 412 of the act provides quite clearly that:

> The powers vested in the Secretary under this act shall terminate on December 31, 1966.

Section 403 of the act provides:

> The Secretary is authorized to make such orders or regulations, which shall have the force and effect of law, as may be necessary to carry out the powers vested in him by this act.

These provisions of law indicate quite clearly to me, Mr. Speaker, that the Secretary of Agriculture has both the authority and the responsibility to continue into 1965 the same kind of sugar quota regulations that have been in effect in 1964. Clearly, the authority of the Secretary to establish a national consumption estimate, to translate this estimate into specific quotas for the domestic areas and the Philippines, and to allocate the remainder among foreign areas, is not changed nor abrogated by the fact that Congress did not extend beyond 1964 the specific manner in which the foreign quota is to be distributed.

If I were the Secretary, I would distribute the foreign quota in 1965 in accordance with the latest available instruction from Congress, which is contained in the subsection expiring at the end of this calendar year. The precise manner of the allocation of foreign quotas is, however, a matter to be determined by the Secretary under the general provisions of the act.

It is my opinion, also, Mr. Speaker, that the provisions of the act relating to assessment of an import fee on global quota sugar expire with the expiration of section 202(c)(3) of the act, since they are related to and based upon the allocation provided in that subsection. The import fee on country quota sugar expires by its own terms at the end of 1964.

Mr. Speaker, our present difficulties with the Sugar Act began back in 1962, when it became necessary to rewrite our Sugar Act in order to eliminate our dependence on Cuba as a source of supply. Prior to that time, the Republic of Cuba had been our major offshore source of sugar, supplying more than 3 million tons of this commodity to U.S. consumers each year.

With the advent of the Castro regime in Cuba, it became necessary to look elsewhere for this major source of sugar for the U.S. market. The Committee on Agriculture would have assigned the Cuban quota to other foreign countries which, we believed from the record of sugar production in those countries, would be able adequately to meet the sugar requirements of the United States.

An employee of the Department of Agriculture, the then head of the Sugar Branch of the Department, contended, however, that all the other countries of the Western Hemisphere could not provide to the American market the sugar which had heretofore been obtained from Cuba. He insisted that the former Cuban quota could not be filled by other Western Hemisphere countries, but that we would have to go into the world market to obtain this part of our sugar supplies. Accordingly, there was written into the 1962 extension of the Sugar Act, over the protest of the House Committee on Agriculture and the opposite vote of the House of Representatives, a provision putting the remaining Cuban quota on a global quota basis, which meant that we would go into the world market for this portion of our sugar supplies.

On February 28, 1963, I made a major statement in the House of Representatives criticizing this global quota concept and analyzing its probable impact. All of the predictions I made at that time have come to pass.

It is clear now, as I predicted then, that the global quota provisions of our Sugar Act were largely responsible for the fantastic increase in sugar prices which took place in the latter half of 1962 and the first part of 1963. For the first time in almost 30 years, the United States entered the so-called world market for sugar and sought to fill 1.5 million tons of its requirements from this source. At the same time, the global quota provision of the Sugar Act meant that the U.S. price of sugar was tied to the world price, instead of insulated from it as it had been during the many previous years of the Sugar Act.

The result was entirely predictable. The entry of the United States into the world market at a time when sugar production was curtailed because of unfavorable weather in many parts of the world pushed the world price up beyond all reason. Since the U.S. price was then tied to the world price, because we depended on the world market for 15 percent of our supplies, the U.S. price followed the world price upward.

It had to be so, or we would have not obtained this 15 percent of our sugar supply in competition with other buyers on the world market.

This was the mistake we made in 1962. It is to be hoped that we will not repeat this mistake when we next extend the Sugar Act.

In 1962, an agreement on division of the market between domestic and foreign processing areas was reached after months of negotiation between all segments of the domestic sugar industry, the Department of Agriculture, and the State Department.

Under this agreement and the legislation embodying it which was enacted into law in July 1962, a little more than half of the previous Cuban quota of 3,200,000 tons was taken away from Cuba and assigned as basic quota to other areas.

Of the 1,723,000 tons taken from Cuba, 1,100,000 tons was assigned as basic quota to other foreign countries and 623,000 tons to continental U.S. producing areas.

From this amount, and from a reduction in other domestic area quotas of 161,000 tons, beets received a basic quota increase of 539,000 tons and mainland cane a basic quota increase of 255,000 tons.

This increased the basic beet quota from 2,100,000 tons in 1961 to 2,650,000 tons in 1963. It increased the basic mainland cane quota from 650,000 tons in 1961 to 895,000 tons in 1963.

This was not all a net gain for the mainland areas, for they gave up first claim on domestic deficients, which had been running about 365,000 tons per year.

The remainder of the Cuban quota—1,500,000 tons—was also withheld from Cuba and assigned by the House to other foreign countries on a temporary basis to be returned to Cuba when and if that country and the United States resumed diplomatic relations.

The Senate insisted that this remainder of the Cuban quota should become a "global quota" to be purchased on the world market from any friendly country, and this prevailed in conference.

An essential part of the agreement between the various segments of the domestic sugar industry and the Departments of State and Agriculture, which resulted in the 1962 extension of the Sugar Act, was that there should be no change through 1966 in the basic division of the market between domestic and foreign producing areas.

In the latter part of 1962 world sugar prices began to rise and, because the "global quota" tied the U.S. price to world prices, our sugar price followed.

By the spring of 1963, the raw sugar price in New York was almost double the price objective of the Sugar Act and the Department of Agriculture pushed every panic button in sight in an effort to "talk down" prices.

One of its actions was to announce on March 14, 1963, that there would be no restriction on sugarbeet acreage in 1964, and encouraging that area to expand production to meet a supposed supply shortage. On May 17, 1963, it made a similar announcement with respect to Louisiana and Florida cane.

On May 6, 1963, the Department issued another press release announcing that there would be no acreage restrictions on sugarbeets in 1965.

It is not known what reasoning lay behind this press release, since the law would seem to preclude any such advance announcement. The act says:

> Whenever the Secretary determines that the production of sugar from any crop of sugarbeets or sugarcane will be greater than the quantity needed to enable the area to meet the quota, and provide a normal carryover inventory * * * he shall establish proportionate shares (acreage allotments) for farms in such area.

Neither is it known why this same exemption from 1965 acreage controls was not extended to Louisiana and Florida cane producers.

Whatever the reason, no such exemption was granted mainland cane. Pursuant to the requirements of the law, the Department announced on September 30, 1964, that proportionate shares will be in effect for the 1965 mainland cane crop and that the overall acreage reduction in Florida and Louisiana will be 15 percent below the 1964 level.

But with respect to beets, the Secretary has indicated that he considers himself bound by the May 1963 press release and does not intend to impose acreage restrictions on beets in 1965.

The beet industry has used this anticipated continued expansion in 1965 and the surplus over quotas being produced in 1964 as the basis for a demand for an immediate increase in permanent beet quotas.

This has been resisted by other segments of the sugar industry and this is what the present dissention over sugar is all about.

No segment of the sugar industry has objected to the domestic areas—both beets and cane—being permitted to market the excess sugar they will produce in 1964 at the invitation of the Department of Agriculture, although every ton of sugar which is marketed in excess of their quotas means a ton of sugar that will be subtracted from the foreign quota.

Other parts of the industry do object, however, to the beet industry being permitted to market the excess produced in 1964 and then go on under unrestricted acreage to produce an even larger surplus in 1965.

The Sugar Act has operated smoothly and effectively for many years because it was carefully and skillfully designed and balanced to benefit consumers, refiners, mainland beet and cane producers, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, the Philippines, and other friendly foreign countries, as well as agriculture and the general economy of the country through the stimulation of foreign trade.

At the same time, it has benefited the taxpayer by more than paying its own way. During the course of its operation, it has returned a net income of $490 million to the Treasury of the United States.

In my opinion, it can continue to operate effectively only if we are wise enough to maintain this careful balance of benefits not only between the various segments of the sugar producing and consuming industry but also with the general national interest.

The continued operation of the act is particularly essential to the domestic producing areas—mainland beet and cane, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico—because, without the protection and the subsidies provided by the Sugar Act, farmers in these domestic areas would find it difficult, if not impossible, to produce sugar at a profit.

We are now faced with a situation where the actual and prospective buildup of surpluses in the mainland beet area is threatening the very continuation of the act. These surpluses cannot be marketed within the present provisions of the act, and there are those who are beginning to say it would be better to have no Sugar Act at all than to change the whole framework and theory of the act to meet this emergency situation.

It is essential that mainland cane and beet producers be permitted to market their excess production from 1963 and 1964. It is equally essential that production in both areas be brought back into line with their statutory quotas as quickly as possible.

Such agreement is probably essential to the continuation of the act. I am certain the act cannot continue if any major segment of the sugar industry comes to the conclusion it would be better off without it.

This year, for the first time, agreement has not been achieved.

This year, for the first time, not even the Government agencies involved have been able to agree on a proposal which they believed was in the national interest and had any chance of acceptance by the sugar industry as a whole.

This year I had hoped and planned to bring sugar before the Committee on Agriculture early enough to keep it from being the subject of last-minute legislation. I had announced hearings to start not later than May 15.

But on May 15 the committee had no recommendation from the administration nor from the industry itself on the solution of our present sugar problem. Not only was there no agreement within the industry as to the solution of this problem, there was complete disagreement as to the scope and subject matter of the proposed hearings.

Under these circumstances, there was no point in taking the time of the committee in exhaustive and pointless weeks of hearings on legislation which could not be enacted, for it is clear that no constructive sugar legislation can be passed by the Congress over the opposition of any of the major groups involved.

In the past 4 or 5 months, I have met time after time after time with every I have met with them singly and jointly and en masse. I have arranged meetings for them with other committee members and with informal groups of committee members.

The purpose and the theme of every one of these meetings has been identical—not to impose my ideas nor those of the committee on the industry, but to urge these industry representatives to get together, to solve their problems and reconcile their differences, and to come before Congress with a proposal which they can all support. In my opinion, this is the only way that the delicate balance and equity of the Sugar Act, and eventually the act itself, may be maintained.

During this period, I know that responsible officials of the Departments of Agriculture and State have also met with these same industry groups time after time. I know that their efforts have been the same as mine—to try to find some common ground on which the industry could agree, because without such agreement there can be no real solution, and will eventually be no act.

In order to bring beet production in 1965 completely back to the statutory quota, a reduction of 20 to 22 percent below 1964 acreage would be required. This is probably neither realistic nor equitable.

Other commodities, when put back under acreage allotments after a period of unrestricted production, have been given 2 or 3 years to make the adjustment.

When wheat acreage allotments and marketing quotas were suspended during World War II and the Korean conflict, acreage went up from 56 million to more than 78 million acres and when allotments were reimposed in 1954, acreage was cut to 63.5 million acres the first year and 58.2 the second year.

Cotton acreage allotments and marketing quotas were suspended during the years 1951, 1952, 1953 because of the Korean conflict and acreage went up from 18.8 million in 1950 to 29.3 million in 1951. When allotments were reimposed, acreage was reduced to 20 million in 1954 and then to 18 million in 1955.

The Secretary and the beet industry should note that the Congress has not authorized nor ratified unlimited sugarbeet production in 1965 and beet sugar in excess of quotas should not be produced in 1965 on the assumption that Congress will authorize its marketing.

A realistic reduction in sugarbeet acreage in 1965 comparable to the acreage adjustments in other crops would remove virtually all opposition to sale in 1965 of the beet and cane surplus produced in 1963 and 1964 and would do much to assure the continued operation of this heretofore highly successful program. At the time the Congress adjourned, the spokesmen for the industry were only a few percentage points apart in their search for an acceptable formula.

It is my hope and suggestion that the various segments of the domestic sugar industry will not discontinue their efforts but will continue to work toward a realistic and equitable formula which can be presented to Congress for its consideration early next year.

Nebraska First District Poll Results

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH F. BEERMANN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, I recently submitted a series of 10 questions to every mailing address in the First District of Nebraska. The questions covered current issues in Congress. The answers I have received indicate majority opinion in the First Nebraska District is not in tune with the administration.

In fact, as I read and reread the answers, I am convinced that this administration and the First District are miles apart in thinking. What this administration regards as progress my people apparently look upon as sheer waste.

Many replies carried marginal notes, two of which are unusual enough to bear repeating. The note were written in reference to question No. 1 which asked: "Do you think our crash program to land a man on the moon is worth its cost?" One reply said: "If God had wanted them on the moon, he would have created them there."

Another said: "What is the administration trying to do? Create another country to help with foreign aid?"

Here are the questions and the percentage of answers "yes" and "no":

	Percent—		
	Yes	No	No opinion
1. Do you think our crash program to land a man on the moon is worth its cost?	26.0	72.0	2.0
2. Do you believe government spending in excess of its income is good for the economy?	10.0	89.0	1.0
3. Should we continue to guarantee credit for Communist purchase of wheat or other commodities?	11.0	87.5	1.5
4. Do you favor legislation limiting imports?	68.0	21.0	11.0
5. Do you favor medicare for the aged financed by an increase in social security taxes?	26.0	72.5	1.5
6. Do you favor the new Federal program on poverty?	26.0	65.0	9.0
7. Do you favor a reduction in Federal control and regulation of agriculture?	81.0	16.0	3.0
8. Do you think we should make sizable reductions in our foreign aid expenditures?	82.0	16.0	2.0
9. Are you satisfied with the way the administration has handled the Cuban problem?	31.5	62.5	6.0
10. Do you favor the admission of Red China to the United Nations?	11.5	85.0	3.5

The Honorable Harry R. Sheppard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, as we approach the close of this 88th Congress the service of a most able and dedicated colleague of ours here in the House of Representatives, the Honorable HARRY R. SHEPPARD, of California, also draws to a close. HARRY's decision to retire is a regrettable one for the people of the United States. The efficient and untiring efforts that he has expended as the chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Construction of the House Committee on Appropriations have been a principal factor in the military strength of this country.

After 28 years of service here in the House of Representatives, HARRY SHEPPARD has more than earned the right to put aside the heavy responsibilities he has shouldered so ably these many years and enjoy his retirement.

In the many years that it has been my privilege to work with HARRY SHEPPARD, both of us being chairman of subcommittees of the House Appropriations Committee, a close friendship developed between us, a friendship that I shall miss, as well as the counsel and advice he has always so wisely given. I hope that opportunities to renew this friendship will present themselves often in the coming years.

The record that HARRY SHEPPARD has made in the history of the House of Representatives should be an example for his successor. He will be sorely missed not only by his many friends here in Congress but also by the people of his district and the entire Nation.

Barry Goldwater's "Where I Stand"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES E. GOODELL

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, many of us in the Republican Party are concerned over the numerous misrepresentations of the positions taken by BARRY GOLDWATER on various issues facing our country today.

As assistant to the chairman of the Republican platform committee for domestic affairs, it was my responsibility to study the suggested platform planks from each of our possible nominees. I was impressed that these suggestions were 95 percent in agreement. In San Francisco, we openly debated our 5-percent disagreement; now it is time that we talked about the 95-percent area where our differences are with the Johnson administration.

President Lyndon Johnson has fuzzed his record by talking about some conservative objectives, while pushing through Congress measures that contradict his words.

When it comes to balancing a budget in times of prosperity, controlling inflation, giving our farmers control over their own management decisions, preserving States rights and States responsibilities, defending the individual from incessant bureaucratic intrusion, and pursuing peace through a policy of firmness and strength, we are united as Republicans. These are but a few of the many policies enunciated in our 1964 Republican platform, "For the People." Republicans stand united upon them, while the Johnson administration has, at best, given lipservice to them.

BARRY GOLDWATER has spoken out in this campaign in favor of a constitutional amendment to permit prayer and Bible reading under voluntary circumstances in our public schools and in public places. He has spoken out for a constitutional amendment to permit States to apportion one house of their State legislature on a basis other than population. The Republican platform calls for both these amendments. The Democratic platform is silent on both issues. It is my conviction that the opposition is avoiding the discussion of such crucial issues facing our country today by misrepresenting the position of BARRY GOLDWATER on tactical nuclear weapons, social security, and a myriad of other issues.

I recommend to my colleagues and to all Americans a careful reading of the book, "Where I stand," by BARRY GOLDWATER. This is a clear, honest, and direct statement by Mr. GOLDWATER himself. It is an answer to those who misquote or distort the position of BARRY GOLDWATER for partisan purposes. I am sending copies of this book to all of my Republican committeemen in the 38th Congressional District and to others who have contributed substantially to the Republican cause.

"Let in the Sun"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Woody Klein, a reporter with the New York World Telegram & Sun has written a book on the problems of housing in New York City.

"Let in the Sun" is one of the finest discussions of this subject I have ever read and I was privileged to have the opportunity of writing the foreword to Mr. Klein's book.

All persons concerned with the problems of housing in our large cities will be interested in this book and, under previous permission, I insert the foreword in the RECORD.

FOREWORD TO "LET IN THE SUN" BY WOODY KLEIN

(By Representative JOHN V. LINDSAY)

I represent the 17th Congressional District on Manhattan's East Side in New York City. Some people call it the "silk stocking" district. This is a misnomer because the district contains the most varied mixture of people and incomes and living conditions of any congressional district in the United States.

My district is made up of the great central part of Manhattan Island; ranging from Yorkville to Cooper Union, from Greenwich Village to Columbus Circle, from the garment and theater areas on the West Side to the United Nations on the East River. The Bureau of the Census marks it as having the largest number of nationalities living within its borders of any congressional district in the country.

From block to block, the contrasts are sudden and striking. Around the edges of Central Park and down the avenues on the East Side are big luxury residential buildings. In this part of the city, many of the buildings have large rooms, penthouses, every modern-day comfort, and doorman protection. The apartment houses on Fifth Avenue have breathtaking views of the park and the entire skyline of Manhattan. Along the side streets there is good living, too. But there are also the refuse-strewn blocks where the sun never enters. It is always gray and one can sense fear and tension. At night you want the day and in the day you want the night to hide you from it and it from you.

I have spent endless hours cruising the avenues and streets of Manhattan—examining the construction wave that has demolished a sizable portion of the city, talking with families who are being displaced, and with distraught parents looking for a place to live that is both within their means and large enough.

Weekend after weekend I have come up to my district from Washington and listened to the frightening, oft-repeated tale of people who bear the burden and hardship of inadequate housing.

Four years ago, I set up a housing team, young men and women volunteers from my district who contribute their time and energy to assist constituents of mine who need a place to live, who are being choked by the rent squeeze, who are caught up in the tangle of landlords, lawyers, and local rent administrators, who are being forcibly relocated in the name of urban renewal and who have no one to turn to for help.

This housing team handles every kind of housing hardship imaginable. The volunteers spend many hours tramping up darkened stairways. Every day we receive a succession of requests for help to get into public housing. These are often sad and desperate cases and deserving of help, but there is never enough room.

A few blocks north of my district is the neighborhood known as East Harlem. In this community is a tenement, 311 East 100th Street, which is the subject of the pages that follow. "Let in the Sun" is the story of the life and death of this building. Erected to help solve the housing problems of New York shortly after the turn of the century, this house stands in 1964 as a tragic symbol of the failure of New York's housing reforms in the last 60 years.

Woody Klein, who has himself lived in New York's slums on assignment as a newspaper reporter, wrote a remarkable series of articles in 1959 in the New York World-Telegram & Sun. His graphic reports awakened the conscience of many New Yorkers, among them my own constituents in the district next door to East Harlem.

In this book, Mr. Klein takes us inside the tenement at 311 East 100th Street in the worst block in New York City. He introduces us to the people within, the landlords who owned the property and the government officials and social workers who tried in vain to save the building from total collapse.

The author says that the making of a single clum is a crime against society. He reenacts this crime, presents the testimony of each suspect, and draws a dramatic verdict which leaves no doubt where the guilt lies.

For the first time in recent history, the blame for our slums is fixed where it belongs. In a vigorous style reminiscent of Jacob Riis—the famous newspaper reporter who crusaded in New York against poverty in the 1890's—Mr. Klein gives us a firsthand account of what the people involved in the making of a slum feel and think.

His story of the building on East 100th Street is enough to alarm even the most complacent. He shows us how slums are malignant and how they spread. He shows us that no matter where we live in a city, it is a short walk to the tenements.

In the city of New York in 1964, housing is a problem of vast proportions. But the shortages we suffer are not confined to this city. Other great urban centers throughout the Nation are faced with comparable needs. In 1900, there were 24 million people living in American cities. Today there are more than 100 million.

I have been interested in housing ever since I became a Member of Congress. I have also been in favor of public housing because I know what it means to my district and to the city of New York and to all of the great urban centers of this country.

Adequate housing goes to the root of most urban problems. Education, safety, delinquency, narcotics, and health are directly affected by the housing conditions of the neighborhoods in our cities and towns.

The problems of adequate shelter in our great cities cannot be neglected, and no public officer can pretend they do not exist. Those of us who hold public trust are elected because we are expected to be leaders. If Government has any function at all it is to take action when needs arise which cannot be met by the individual acting on his own.

"Let in the Sun" is an important book. It should inspire a crusade for better housing in the 1960's. Mr. Klein skillfully demonstrates that none fo us can afford to forget the slums—that bad housing and the injury it inflicts on our communities are my problems and yours.

This book clearly shows that national wars on poverty will never be won unless they embrace within their strategy massive assaults on all of the elements that make up the slums. "Let in the Sun" is an eloquent appeal for a slumless America.

Report on U.S. Service Academies and Notice of Examination on October 31, 1964

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR FRIENDS: I am writing to tell you this is now the time during October when applications can be made to me as your Congressman for the civil service exams to be held on October 31. These exams are for congressional appointments from our district to the four U.S. Academies, for high school graduates in June 1965. These are fully paid scholarships at Air Force Academy, West Point, Annapolis, and Merchant Marine Academy, are for 4 years, leading to engineering degrees. U.S. expenditures on these average $8,000 to $10,000 per year for each cadet.

Our office works hard each year on a program to get good candidates—while each Congressman is allotted one principal appointment to each academy yearly—in the current year, we got appointed two cadets to the Air Force, two to West Point, six cadets to Annapolis (the tops in the United States), and one to Merchant Marine. So there is good opportunity for appointment.

Let me hear any good recommendation and my office will contact the young man and send him an application.

Here is good news on the cadets from our local area—Dormont and Greentree—that I I have appointed to the U.S. Academies from our large congressional district: Jim Wessel, of Dormont, son of Judge and Mrs. Art Wessel made the dean's list at West Point, is now captain serving in Germany, with the 34th Cavalry in Armor. Frederick Burdette, of Greentree Boro, entered West Point this year highly recommended by the American Legion post and is already succeeding. Fred writes on September 23: "I like it more and more each day."

Tom Crimm, of Dormont, graduated at Annapolis in 1958 is now serving with the 6th Fleet in the Mediterranean Sea. He is an engineer on the submarine *Irex*—really demanding service. Jim Davis, of Greentree, a graduate of Dormont High, son of Mrs. Margaret Davis, a widow, just returned from Japan in July. Jim graduated at Annapolis and has just been selected for promotion to commander. George Meighen, former president of the student council at Dormont High, has returned from Army duty on Okinawa. George graduated at West Point, and is now a major at Norfolk, Va. Jim Mitchell, of Dormont, started at Annapolis, switched to the Air Force, and is now attending Geneva College.

We in our district are proud of this fine record.

Sincerely,

JIM FULTON.

Pan American Development Foundation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, today in this era of advanced communication and increased mobilization, one realizes the necessity for a greater understanding of the problems confronting the peoples of the world. One recognizes that only through the efforts of the individual and the combined society of a great nation, can the peoples of less fortunate nations maintain their dignity and accept their responsibilities.

Official governments working together cannot truly effect the unity of mind necessary for the achievement of common goals. We are all aware that the eventual success of the Alliance for Progress is closely related to the support and cooperation of the private sector. The ideals and the program of the Alliance must reach out, so far as possible, to involve every man, woman, and child of the hemisphere in a true alliance to advance the economic and social development of the American countries. A need has arisen to stimulate the interest of the private sector and to channel its vast resources to development programs.

The Pan American Development Foundation has been established to create a new channel to give the general public an opportunity for direct, personal participation in the Alliance. The Foundation is highly important for at least three reasons: first, by identifying needed small projects, averaging a few hundred dollars, it is making participation of the private sector realistically feasible; second, the projects will have a significant and immediate impact on local public opinion in Latin America, vividly demonstrating what the Alliance is and what it can do; thirdly, it is actively working to encourage private philanthropy among our Latin neighbors themselves.

The Foundation operates in a simple and concrete manner. It is encouraging private citizens, businesses, and community organizations to sponsor specific projects ranging in cost from $3 to $30,000 which are suitable for private assistance and designed to further the human welfare goals of the Alliance. Private groups can select projects which interest them most and, through the Foundation's auspices, enter into direct contact with the recipients, thereby becoming directly and personally involved in their success.

One of the most significant aspects of the Pan American Development Foundation's work is the direct, immediate impact type of project that it sponsors. These projects are understandable, tangible evidence of the Alliance. Another aspect of the work of the Foundation is a hemispherewide Foundation, a multilateral organization operating parallel to the Alliance, seeking to encourage private philanthropy in Latin America and to stimulate the private sector in all the countries of the hemisphere to become involved in Alliance activities. Its board of trustees is composed of some of the men most knowledgeable about the Alliance, and commands respect in all the nations of the hemisphere. This board will encourage private philanthropy in Latin America in the most positive of manners—by action and by example. It will actively seek to raise matching funds in the Latin American countries to equal the contributions which it is making in each country.

It will also promote the idea of private philanthropy in another manner—by encouraging the recipients themselves to give to others. The people aided by the Foundation will not be receiving handouts. They will be expected, wherever possible, to match the Foundation's contributions by their own self-help efforts. For example, where production is increased due to the Foundation's help, the beneficiaries are requested to set aside part of that increased production to contribute to similar activities in other areas or other Alliance countries, so that soon Brazilians will be helping Guatemalans, and Venezuelans helping Bolivians. This "multiplier" effect will insure that contributions to the Foundation continue working long after the initial donation is made. Equally important, the self-respect and confidence that this helps to generate among the people who participate in these programs will pay dividends for generations to come. A letter from a Peace Corps volunteer working with these cooperatives speaks of the enthusiasm of co-op members for the "philosophy behind the assistance—that they would have a chance to repay and to have that repayment reinvested in Latin America."

The Foundation, which was inspired by the Organization of American States, is now an operating entity. From a modest beginning, its potential to serve as an instrument to encourage the direct, personal involvement of the people of all the countries of the hemisphere in the Alliance for Progress is obvious. It provides an effective answer to one of the serious problems of the Alliance, which had asked for public support without providing any channel for it.

If there is a deep reservoir of good will for the Alliance among the people of our country, as I am convinced there is, the Foundation will provide a concrete and tangible way for people to express that good will.

Summary of Veterans Legislation in the 88th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am showing below a summary of action in the Committee on Veterans' Affairs for the 88th Congress together with a compilation of laws enacted during the same period and those pending the President's signature:

SUMMARY OF VETERANS LEGISLATION REPORTED—88TH CONGRESS, THROUGH OCTOBER 7, 1964

SUMMARY OF VETERANS' AFFAIRS COMMITTEE ACTION—BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS REFERRED AND HEARINGS AND EXECUTIVE SESSIONS CONDUCTED

During the 88th Congress, 508 bills and resolutions were referred to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. Testimony taken in hearings conducted in 47 of the 50 open sessions consists of 3,927 printed pages.

Legislative hearings were held on the dates indicated below, with printed hearings bearing the following titles:

Veterans' organizations legislative objectives: January 30, February 7, March 12, and April 2, 1963.

VA legislative policy, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs: April 3 and May 28, 1963.

Intermediate care for veterans (Subcommittee on Intermediate Care) (11 bills): May 14, 15, 16, 21, 22, 23, and June 4, 5, 6, 11, 12, 13, 20, 25, and 26, 1963.

VA housing program (Subcommittee on Housing): November 20 and 21, 1963.

Veterans' housing legislation (Subcommittee on Housing): March 4, 1964.

Veterans' organizations legislative objectives, 1964: February 19, March 3 and 10, April 9, 1964.

Miscellaneous insurance bills and administration of insurance programs: March 24 and 25, April 8, 14, 15, 23, and May 25, 1964.

Veterans' Administration medical program: April 28, 29, 30; May 7, 8, and 12, 1964.

Pension bills providing non-service-connected pension benefits for veterans of all wars: May 19, 20, 21, 26, 27, and 28, 1964.

There were 21 executive sessions, resulting in the reporting of 41 bills. Of this number, 27 have been enacted into law; 2 bills awaited Presidential approval on October 7; 7 passed the House and were pending in Senate committees at adjournment; 1 passed the House, was amended and passed by Senate and returned to the House for further considerations and subsequently included as amendment to another bill; and 4 bills reported by the committee were left on the House Calendar, but of these, the substance of 3 passed the House in another bill which was not considered by the Senate.

Summary of Veterans' Affairs Committee action in 80th Cong. through Oct. 7, 1964, 88th Cong.

BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS REFERRED AND HEARINGS-EXECUTIVE SESSIONS CONDUCTED

	Congress								
	80th	81st	82d	83d	84th	85th	86th	87th	88th
Bills and resolutions referred	498	619	436	402	537	491	628	592	508
Hearings sessions	60	64	50	46	71	69	55	45	50
Hearings, printed pages	3,596	2,355	2,562	5,337	4,271	4,834	3,472	3,055	3,927
Executive sessions	49	34	27	55	37	28	21	15	21
Bills reported	60	44	36	36	48	44	42	52	41
Bills in House	16	1	--------	14	1	5	2	[1] 8	[2] 5
Pending in Senate committees	6	16	14	2	17	11	6	[3] 13	7
Bills on Senate Calendar or in Senate	--------	1	1	2	--------	--------	1	[4] 2	0
Recommitted	--------	1	1	--------	--------	1	--------	--------	--------
Bills vetoed	1	2	4	--------	--------	1	--------	--------	--------
Bills passed over veto	--------	1	2	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------
Laws enacted	36	24	22	25	30	26	33	[5] 32	[6] 29

[1] Including 4 bills enacted as amendment to other legislation: 1 left in House when similar Senate bill returned to Senate; and 1 similar to another bill enacted (Public Law 87-645).

[2] Provisions of 3 of these bills were passed by the House as a separate bill, and the provisions of 1 bill were included as an amendment to another bill which was awaiting approval of the President at date of this publication.

[3] Includes 2 bills enacted as amendments to other bills.

[4] Includes 1 bill enacted as amendment to another bill.

[5] Some laws included the substance of more than 1 bill reported separately. 39 separately reported bills were enacted, 7 as amendments to other legislation.

[6] Includes 2 bills awaiting approval of the President.

Veterans' Administration appropriations

Bills providing for appropriations for the Veterans' Administration are under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Appropriations and are included as a part of the Independent Offices Appropriation Acts. A summary of legislation pertaining to veterans could not be considered complete, however, without reference to the large appropriations which the Congress annually provides for operation of the vast system of veterans' benefit programs.

In the 4 fiscal years 1962 through 1965, over $21 billion has been provided for operation of these programs. The major portion of this expenditure has gone for direct monetary benefits, in the form of compensation for service-connected disability or death or for non-service-connected pensions to veterans, their widows, or dependent children (over $10 billion for compensation and almost $7 billion for non-service-connected pensions in the 4-year period). While cost of service-connected compensation payments is now declining, non-service-connected pension costs are increasing with each year. Cost of medical care (including the cost of medical administration, medical and prosthetic research, and hospital construction) rose during this period from a total actual expenditure in 1962 of $1,109,497,500 to a total anticipated for fiscal year 1965 of $1,265,238,000.

The chart below will provide a comparison of appropriations for Veterans' Administration for fiscal years 1962 through 1965. It will be noted that the overall expenditure has increased in each year, chiefly because of rising expenditure in the field of pension and in the medical program. On June 30, 1964, of the 2,226,000 living World War I veterans, 1,129,144 were receiving pension or compensation payments, and during the period June 30, 1963, to June 30, 1964, $2 billion were expended in behalf of veterans of World War I.

Other details concerning the budget of the Veterans' Administration for these 4 years appear on pages 14, 15, and 16; and a detailed analysis of all expenditures for veterans programs, by war, from the Revolutionary War to June 30, 1963, appears on page 13.

Comparison of appropriations and estimates

	1962 appropriation [1]	1963 appropriation [1]	1964 appropriation, Public Law 88–215, approved Dec. 19, 1963	1965 VA estimate submitted to Bureau of Budget	Public Law 88–507, approved Aug. 30, 1964
General operating expenses	$161,773,000	[2] $161,279,950	$159,750,000	$160,275,000	$155,125,000
Medical administration and miscellaneous operating expenses [2]	43,876,500	13,981,950	14,800,000	15,877,000	14,200,000
Medical and prosthetic research [3]	-------	30,500,000	33,742,000	37,282,000	37,000,000
Medical care [4]	989,371,000	1,048,172,300	1,081,186,000	1,128,384,000	1,115,935,000
Compensation and pensions	3,500,000,000	3,874,000,000	3,921,000,000	3,966,000,000	3,963,000,000
Readjustment benefits	135,000,000	95,800,000	67,000,000	110,800,000	37,100,000
Veterans' insurance and indemnities	39,200,000	32,000,000	30,200,000	17,500,000	13,700,000
Construction of hospital and domiciliary facilities	76,250,000	77,000,000	76,796,000	104,000,000	98,103,000
Grants to the Republic of the Philippines	1,000,000	[4] 350,000	310,000	310,000	310,000
Total	4,946,470,500	5,333,084,200	5,384,784,000	5,540,428,000	5,423,973,000

[1] Includes supplementals.

[2] 150,000 transferred from "Grants to the Republic of the Philippines" to "General operating expenses."

[3] Separate appropriation for "Medical and prosthetic research" in 1963.

[4] "Inpatient care" and "Outpatient care" consolidated into "Medical care" in 1962.

Laws enacted—88th Congress

Public Law 88-3 (H.R. 212): Permits payment of $250 burial allowance in behalf of veterans whose discharges are changed from dishonorable to other than dishonorable after their death. Claim must be filed within 2 years from date of correction or 2 years from the date of enactment, whichever is later. (Approved: April 2, 1963.)

Public Law 88-18 (H.R. 4549): Authorizes a very limited exception to the bar against employing retired officers, so as to permit the appointment of such a retired officer, prior to January 1, 1964, to the position of

Chief Medical Director of the Veterans' Administration. (Approved: May 8, 1963.)

Public Law 88–20 (H.R. 199): Adds "deafness of both ears, having absence of air and bone conduction," to the other types of service-connected disabilities specified in the law pertaining to veterans' disability compensation for which an additional award in the amount of $47 monthly is provided. (Approved: May 15, 1963.)

Public Law 88–21 (H.R. 211): Increases, generally by 10 percent, the monthly rates of dependency and indemnity compensation payable to eligible parents and children of veterans dying of service-connected causes. (Approved: May 15, 1963.)

Public Law 88–22 (H.R. 214): Provides for payment of a statutory award of $47 per month to those veterans who incurred a service-connected loss or loss of use of both vocal cords, resulting in constant inability to communicate by speech. (Approved: May 15, 1963.)

Public Law 88–40 (H.R. 249): Extends for another 5 years the program for reimbursement of the Philippine Government covering hospitalization and outpatient care for service-connected conditions of Commonwealth Army veterans who served with the Armed Forces of the United States during World War II. Permits the furnishing of drugs under certain conditions. (Approved: June 13, 1963.)

Public Law 88–126 (S. 330): Provides that after expiration of the Korean conflict veterans' education and training program (generally after January 31, 1965), approval of courses under the War Orphans' Educational Assistance Act shall be by State approving agencies. (Approved: September 23, 1963.)

Public Law 88–134 (H.R. 5250): Under the provisions of the Servicemen's and Veterans' Survivor Benefits Act (Public Law 881, 84th Cong., effective January 1, 1957), dependency and indemnity compensation is payable to widows, children, and parents based on the service-connected deaths of their husbands, fathers, and children, respectively. Specific monthly rates are provided for children and parents. The widow, however, until enactment of this law, was paid at the monthly rate of $112 plus 12 percent of the basic active duty rate of pay of her deceased husband. This law increases the $112 factor applicable to widows to $120 per month. (Approved: October 5, 1963.)

Public Law 88–148 (S. 13): Provides for conveyance of approximately 19 acres of land, which was originally donated to the Veterans' Administration by the city of Fayetteville, Ark., back to that city for use as a park and recreational area. (Approved: October 17, 1963.)

Public Law 88–151 (H.R. 242): Provides for waiver of recovery from veterans of indebtedness to the United States resulting from the payment of loan guarantee claims or from default on direct loans, under circumstances in which waiver is now denied. Specifically provides that where there has been a default and loss of the property the Administrator may waive recovery if he determines "that the default arose out of compelling reasons without fault on the part of the veteran or that collection of the indebtedness would otherwise work a severe hardship upon the veteran." (Approved: October 17, 1963.)

Public Law 88–207 (H.R. 5691): Allows the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to delegate to the Chief Medical Director authority to act upon the recommendations of disciplinary boards in cases involving inaptitude, inefficiency, or misconduct of physicians, dentists, and nurses appointed in the Department of Medicine and Surgery. (Approved: December 17, 1963.)

Public Law 88–274 (S. 2064): Relieves the Veterans' Administration from the requirement that it pay interest of approximately $4 million annually to the Treasury on $105.7 million advanced in fiscal year 1962 from Treasury to the direct loan revolving fund, but which was not used for making direct loans to veterans and on which no earnings were received. These funds were transferred from the direct loan revolving fund to the guaranteed loan fund to cover losses under that program, as provided in Public Law 87–404, a law originating in the House Committee on Appropriations, which directed the transfer of funds in lieu of appropriation of funds to finance increased cost of claims and property acquisitions resulting from defaulted guaranteed or insured loans. (Approved: February 29, 1964.)

Public Law 88–355 (H.R. 6920): Effective January 1, 1965, permits inclusion of a permanent and total disability income provision in national service life insurance policies, allowing payment of total disability income benefits of $10 per month for each $1,000 of insurance in effect from the 1st day of the 7th month following date of total disability incurred before attainment of age 65, and while the payment of premium is not in default. The disability benefit is payable from the 1st day of the 7th consecutive month of and during the continuance of total disability. A similar provision was previously available; however, benefits were not payable unless the disability occurred before attainment of age 60. On and after January 1, 1965, only the new age 65 provision will be issued. Applicants for the new age 65 provision must surrender any existing age 60 total disability income provision previously added to their policies. (Approved: July 7, 1964.)

Public Law 88–359 (H.R. 3941): Permits payment of the burial allowance of not to exceed $250 in behalf of a veteran who held a policy of burial and funeral insurance with a burial association, provided the money would not revert to funds of the organization or discharge the organization's obligation without payment for burial of the veteran. (Approved: July 7, 1964.)

Public Law 88–361 (H.R. 221): Extends the benefits of the war orphans' educational assistance program to children of veterans who have a "total disability permanent in nature" resulting from a service-connected disability arising out of service in the Spanish-American War, World War I, World War II, the Korean conflict, or the "induction period" (September 16, 1940, to December 6, 1941; January 1, 1947, to June 26, 1950; and February 1, 1955, until such time as inductions are no longer made). The term, "total disability permanent in nature" is defined for this purpose as a disability rated total for the purposes of disability compensation which is based upon an impairment reasonably certain to continue throughout the life of the disabled person. This would mean that the service-connected disability would be rated 100 percent on a regular schedular evaluation. Veterans rated 100 percent on a temporary or convalescent basis or under special provisions of the rating schedule do not qualify. Eligibility as a result of service during the "induction period", as in the case with respect to death cases, is subject to more rigid criteria than are applicable to the wartime cases. In the case of these veterans all conditions applicable to veterans whose disabilities were incurred in wartime must be met and in addition, disabilities incurred during the induction period must (1) have directly resulted from, and the causative factor must be shown to have arisen out of, the performance of active military, naval, or air service; or (2) have resulted directly from armed conflict or from an injury or disease received while engaged in extra-hazardous service, including service under conditions simulating war.

War orphans' educational assistance takes the form of monetary assistance to the children of veterans who die from service-connected causes and is designed primarily to aid in the obtaining of an education beyond the secondary school level. By enactment of Public Law 88–361, eligibility is extended, generally to children of 100 percent service-connected disabled veterans. The monthly allowance is $110 for a child enrolled for full-time training; $80 per month for a three-quarter time program of training; and $50 per month for half-time training. Assistance under this program is generally available after the child has graduated from high school or has reached the age 18 and normally cannot extend beyond his 23d birthday. In certain cases, as for example, when the child has served in the U.S. Armed Forces between his 18th and 23d birthdays, this upper age limit may be exceeded, but not beyond his 31st birthday. (Approved: July 7, 1964.)

Public Law 88–364 (H.R. 6777): Effective January 1, 1965, extends from age 60 to age 65 the delimiting age before which a persons insured under a national life insurance policy must become totally disabled to be eligible for waiver of premiums on such insurance. Insureds who become totally disabled between age 60 and age 65 prior to January 1, 1965, and who remain continuously totally disabled may obtain waiver of future premiums if their insurance is in force on January 1, 1965, and other requirements for the waiver are met. (Approved: July 7, 1964.)

Public Law 88–401 (H.R. 248): Expands the program of assistance to severally disabled veterans in acquiring homes equipped with special facilities made necessary because of the nature of their disabilities by providing eligibility for such housing to veterans with compensable service-connected disability of blindness in both eyes, plus the additional service-connected disability of loss or loss of use of a lower extremity. (Approved: August 4, 1964.)

Public Law 88–402 (H.R. 6652): Authorizes the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to sell direct loans to private investors at prices which he determines to be reasonable, but not less than an average of 98 percent of the unpaid principal balance plus the full amount of accrued interest for all loans sold. Previous law permitted sale of direct loans, but only at a price not less than the unpaid principal balance plus accrued interest. (Approved: August 4, 1964.)

Public Law 88–430 (H.R. 8251): Extends the statutory 1-year time limit on filing applications for outpatient dental services for a less than compensable dental condition or disability where the veteran's discharge or release from service under dishonorable conditions was later corrected to a discharge or release under other than dishonorable conditions. (Approved: August 14, 1964.)

Public Law 88–433 (H.R. 8611): Provides for the indemnification of contractors against liability and loss resulting from death, or injury to person or property, arising out of the direct performance of a medical research and development contract. (Approved: August 14, 1964.)

Public Law 88–434 (H.R. 7751): Authorizes the Veterans' Administration to construct for the Department of Defense an Army Reserve Center on a site to be provided for that purpose by the city of Los Angeles, Calif., and upon completion of such Reserve Center, authorizes the Department of Defense to assume full control and jurisdiction thereof and to relinquish to the Veterans' Administration all right, title, and interest in the now existing Army Reserve Center located on the Hazard Park tract in the Los Angeles, Calif., area. (Approved: August 14, 1964.)

Public Law 88–438 (H.R. 10610): Authorizes the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey, for 50 percent of its appraised value, approximately 39 acres of Veterans' Administration hospital reservation at McKinney, Tex., for recreational purposes. (Approved: August 14, 1964.)

Public Law 88–440 (H.R. 10611): Authorizes the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey to the city of McKinney, Tex., the sewage treatment plant at the Veterans' Administration hospital, in consideration of the free treatment of all sewage from the hospital for a period of 10 years from the date of conveyance. (Approved: August 14, 1964.)

Public Law 88–445 (H.R. 8925): Provides that a disability which has been continuously rated at or above a given percentage for 20 or more years for the purpose of service-connected compensation, under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, shall not thereafter be rated at any lesser percentage except upon a showing that the rating was based on fraud. Thus, a 30-percent rating which has been in effect for 20 continuous years could not thereafter be reduced to 20 or 10 percent. It could be increased, but if increased, then the protective feature would not apply to the higher rating until 20 years had elapsed. The protective feature would continue to apply during this period with respect to the 30-percent level, thus precluding reduction below that level. In the case of veterans with multiple disabilities, the proposal applies to each disability. (Approved: August 19, 1964.)

Public Law 88–450 (H.R. 8009): This law accomplishes the following:

SEC. 1: Permits the use of 4,000 additional nursing-care beds in the existing Veterans' Administration hospital system.

SEC. 2. Provides for care in a private nursing home, generally for no more than 6 months, for patients hospitalized by Veterans' Administration, but who have reached maximum hospital benefits. Cost may not exceed one-third of the average cost of treatment in a general hospital.

Increases aid to State homes by providing for:

SEC. 3. An increase in the per diem contribution to State homes caring for veterans eligible for admission to a Veterans' Administration hospital or domiciliary from $2.50 per day per veteran to $3.50 per day per nursing-home-care veteran, and

SEC. 4. A 5-year program of capital outlays (on a matching fund basis), of no more than $5 million per year to aid States in construction, modernization, and repair of nursing homes.

SEC. 5. Encourages veterans in need of medical care and receiving aid and attendance pension to reenter hospitals for brief stays without loss of their pension, thus preventing longer stays and more serious illness, by providing for continued payment of the aid and attendance allowance for at least 60 days following admission to a hospital.

SEC. 6. Furnishes prosthetic appliances, of the type and variety required in their everyday lives, and which would be furnished if they were in a hospital, to aid and attendance pensioners who are eligible for an invalid lift.

SEC. 7. Extends the period of time during which outpatient treatment may be given under the completion of bed occupancy program following hospitalization past the general 1-year period previously allowed for certain patients suffering from chronic illnesses afflicting the older population (cardiovascular renal disease, including hypertension; endocrinopathies; diabetes mellitus; tuberculosis; cancer; or neuropsychiatric disorder), thus keeping prospective nursing-home-care patients in their own homes as long as possible. (Approved: August 19, 1964.)

Public Law 88–481 (S. 1046): Permits hospitalization for non-service-connected disabilities of 17 individuals who were awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor but who are "peacetime" veterans. (Approved: August 22, 1964.)

Public Law 88–616 (H.R. 11332): Provides that reservists, or their survivors, who are injured or killed while proceeding directly to or returning directly from active duty for training or inactive duty training prior to January 1, 1957, be granted disability and death compensation benefits administered by the Veterans' Administration. In the case of disability compensation, the monthly wartime payment ranges from $20 a month for 10-percent disability to $250 for total disability, and higher rates for the most severely disabled. Peacetime rates are 80 percent of the wartime rates. Death benefits (dependency and indemnity compensation) are payable to the surviving widow for either peacetime or wartime service at the rate of $120 a month, plus 12 percent of the base pay of the serviceman. (Approved: October 2, 1964.)

Awaiting approval by the President

H.R. 1927: Amends the law relating to payment of non-service-connected pension for veterans of World War I, World War II, the Korean conflict, and their widows and children, in the following manner—

I. Permits exclusion of the following additional types of income of individuals in making a determination of annual income to qualify for pension or to remain on the pension rolls:

(1) Ten percent of payments to an individual under any public or private retirement, annuity, or pension plan, including social security, in the case of those applying for or receiving pension under the provisions of Public Law 86–211 or those who have elected to remain on the pension rolls under the pension program in effect prior to enactment of Public Law 86–211. This provision removes the possibility that enactment of legislation to increase social security payments, for example, by 5 percent, might operate to remove individuals from the pension rolls or to reduce their pension payments. (2) Amounts paid by a veteran for the last illness and burial of his deceased spouse or child. (3) Profit realized from disposition of real or personal property except for that realized through pursuit of a business. (4) Payments received as a result of performance of obligatory civic duty, such as jury duty. (5) Payments under the War Orphans Educational Assistance Act. (6) Bonus paid by a State to individuals as a result of their having served in the Armed Forces. (7) All earned income of a veteran's spouse or $1,200, whichever is greater. Prior law permitted exclusion of no more than $1,200 of wife's income, regardless of source.

II. Removes the requirement that a child alone report earnings to the Veterans' Administration annually.

III. Provides the following types of special assistance to veteran pensioners who are so helpless or blind as to require the regular aid and attendance of another person: (1) Permits VA to furnish drugs and medicines when prescribed by a physician; and (2) increases the special allowance payable to this group in addition to pension otherwise payable from $70 to $100 a month.

IV. Provides for payment of a special allowance of $35 a month, in addition to pension otherwise payable, to veterans who are "permanently housebound" because of the severity of their disabilities.

V. In addition to increase in aid and attendance rate described in III(2), and provision of special rate for "permanently housebound" described in VI, provides for increases in annual income limitations and pension payments as outlined below. Figures printed in roman type and enclosed in brackets represent income limitations and pension payments before enactment of this legislation, those printed in italic type are those to become effective on January 1, 1965.

VETERANS WITHOUT DEPENDENTS[1][2]

Existing law

[Annual income		Monthly pension payment
More than—	but Equal to or less than—	
	$600	$85
$600	1,200	70
1,200	1,800	40]

Proposed by H.R. 1927

Annual income		*Monthly pension payment*
More than—	*but Equal to or less than—*	
	$600	*$100*
$600	*1,200*	*75*
1,200	*1,800*	*43*

VETERANS WITH DEPENDENTS[1][2]

Existing law

[Annual Income		Monthly Pension Payment		
More than—	but Equal to or less than—	One dependent	Two dependents	Three or more dependents
	$1,000	$90	$95	$100
$1,000	2,000	75	75	75
2,000	3,000	45	45	45]

Proposed by H.R. 1927

Annual Income		*Monthly Pension Payment*		
More than—	*but Equal to or less than—*	*One dependent*	*Two dependents*	*Three or more dependents*
	$1,000	*$105*	*$110*	*$115*
$1,000	*2,000*	*80*	*80*	*80*
2,000	*3,000*	*48*	*48*	*48*

WIDOWS WITHOUT DEPENDENTS

Existing law

[Annual income		Monthly pension payment
More than—	but Equal to or less than—	
	$600	$60
$600	1,200	45
1,200	1,800	25]

Proposed by H.R. 1927

Annual income		*Monthly pension payment*
More than—	*but Eaual to or less than—*	
	$600	*$64*
$600	*1,200*	*48*
1,200	*1,800*	*27*

See footnotes at end of table.

Widow With 1 Dependent[3][4]

Existing law

[Annual income		Monthly pension payment
More than—	but Equal to or less than—	
	$1,000	$75
$1,000	2,000	60
2,000	3,000	40]

Proposed by H.R. 1927

Annual income		*Monthly pension payment*
More than—	*but Equal to or less than—*	
	$1,000	*$80*
$1,000	*2,000*	*64*
2,000	*3,000*	*43*

[1] Veterans so helpless or blind as to require the aid and attendance of another person added $70 to pension otherwise payable, $100 after effective date of this amendment to pension otherwise payable.

[2] Veterans who are so disabled as to be "permanently housebound" add $35 to pension otherwise payable. No comparable before enactment of this provision.

[3] Widows with more than 1 dependent add $15 to applicable rate for each additional child.

[4] Child, where no widow receiving pension payment, receives pension at the following rates: First child, $35; each additional child, $15. This amendment to the pension law increases rate for first child to $35, with rate for additional child remaining at $15.

Provisions Related to National Service Life Insurance

Incorporates the original provisions of H.R. 220, passed by the House March 6, 1963, which proposed a new plan of modified life insurance for national service life insurance policyholders, with a level premium throughout the life of the insured, but with the face value of the policy automatically reduced by 50 percent at the end of the day preceding the insured's 65th birthday. The plan would be permissive.

In addition, the amendment would permit reapplication during a 1-year period (to begin 6 months following enactment date), by a limited group of individuals who served in the Armed Forces October 8, 1940, through December 31, 1956 (including some service-connected disabled), for the following types of nonparticipating (no dividend) national service life insurance: Permanent plans of ordinary life, 20-pay life, 30-pay life, 20-year endowment, endowment at age 60, endowment at age 65; and the new modified life plan described herein. Administrative expense would be borne by the policyholder, including service-disabled, estimated at $5 annually per policy. Veteran applicants, who are not service-connected disabled, would be required to submit proof of insurability. Those who seek insurance as a standard risk must submit proof of good health but for their service disability, and cost of physical examination will be borne by applicant. In all cases, premiums are payable at the attained age of the veteran applicant.

In the case of the service-connected disabled group, eligibility for reapplication is limited to those who have disabilities for which compensation would be paid if the disability were compensable in degree. Service-connected disabled whose disabilities render them uninsurable according to standards of good health to be established by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, will be required to pay premium at an increased rate. In the case of those who do not have a service-connected disability, eligibility for reapplication is limited to those veterans who have disabilities making them uninsurable according to standards of good health established by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, and in addition are able to establish to the satisfaction of the Veterans' Administration that they are unable to obtain commercial life insurance even at a substandard rate, i.e., a rate which would be substantially higher than that charged by a commercial insurance company for a normal, healthy individual.

H.R. 2434. Provides for payment of a $100-a-month pension for holders of the Medal of Honor by lowering the 50-year age requirement to age 40, and by including, within the eligibility of the statute, 17 individuals who received the Medal of Honor based on noncombatant service. With one exception, all of these individuals served in the U.S. Navy.

Passed House and passed Senate with amendment, returned to House for further consideration

H.R. 220: Proposes a new plan of modified life insurance for national service life insurance policyholders, which provides a level premium throughout the life of the insured, but the face value of the policy will be automatically reduced by 50 percent at the end of the day preceding the insured's 65th birthday. The face value of any extended term insurance in force under the modified life policy would also be reduced by 50 percent at that time. The plan is permissive. Policyholders may be issued additional ordinary life insurance otherwise lost at age 65 by paying premiums for age 65 without medical examination.

In reporting this bill, the Senate Committee on Finance added an amendment, subsequently adopted by the Senate, which would provide for reapplication during a 1-year period by individuals who served in the Armed Forces October 8, 1940, through December 31, 1956 (including service-connected disabled), for the following types of nonparticipating (no dividend) national service life insurance: Term insurance (limited to aged below 50); permanent plans of ordinary life, 20-pay life, 30-pay life, 20-year endowment, endowment at age 60, endowment at age 65; and the new modified life plan proposed in the bill as first reported by the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs. Administrative expense would be borne by the policyholder, including service-disabled, estimated at $5 annually per policy. Veteran applicants, except for service-connected disabled, would be required to submit proof of good health and cost of physical examination would be borne by him. In the case of veterans in good health, premiums to be payable at a rate based on the 1958 Commissioners Standard Ordinary Basic Table of Mortality and at the attained age of the veteran at time of reapplication. Premiums for service-disabled to be based on American Experience Table and payable at attained age at time of reapplication.

House report: No. 65; March 6, 1963.

Passed House: April 1, 1963.

Referred: Senate Finance Committee; April 2, 1963.

Senate Report: No. 247; June 13, 1963.

Passed Senate: With committee amendment; June 20, 1963.

(Provisions of this bill, as first reported by Committee on Veterans' Affairs, were added as amendment to H.R. 1927.)

Bills passed by House, referred to Senate committees

H.R. 200: Repeal of mustering-out payments of between $100 and $300 for veterans of the Korean conflict. The effective date of repeal, January 31, 1965, is the date of expiration of other benefits provided by the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 (the Korean "GI bill").

House report: No. 63; March 6, 1963.

Passed House: March 18, 1963.

Referred: Senate Committee on Finance, March 19, 1963.

Rereferred: Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare; April 23, 1963.

H.R. 243: Authorizes payment of the statutory award of $47 per month for each anatomical loss or loss of use specified in the law in addition to the basic rates of disability compensation and the rate payable to those who are permanently housebound (but in no event to exceed a total of $340).

House report: No. 68; March 6, 1963.

Passed House: April 1, 1963.

Referred: Senate Committee on Finance; April 2, 1963.

Senate committee action: Considered and action indefinitely postponed in executive session, April 25, 1963.

H.R. 2436: Permits the furnishing of veteran benefits to certain persons conditionally discharged or released from the active military, naval, or air service.

House report: No. 789; October 1, 1963.

Passed House: October 7, 1963.

Referred: Senate Committee on Finance; October 8, 1963.

Senate commitee action: Passed over for further consideration at future date, executive session, June 25, 1964.

H.R. 4347: Requires that the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, prior to construction or acquisition of Veterans' Administration hospitals, domiciliaries, or outpatient dispensary facilities involving expenditure of in excess of $100,000, or prior to alteration of such facilities involving expenditure of in excess of $200,000, submit to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives a brief description of the facilities involved and the location of the project, with an estimate of maximum cost of the project, and prohibits appropriation of funds for such projects before an approving resolution has been adopted by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. Permits an increase of 10 percent in the cost of any project approved above the cost submitted for approval and approved by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. The committee may, by resolution of the committee, rescind approval of any project for which funds are not appropriated within 1 year from date of original approval. Projects authorized prior to enactment would not be affected.

House report: No. 165 (amended); March 28, 1963.

Passed House, amended; June 19, 1963.

Referred: Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee; June 20, 1963.

Senate committee action: None.

H.R. 8677: Requires that in each fiscal year during the 6-year period beginning July 1, 1963, and ending June 30, 1970, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs set aside $100,000 in funds appropriated for use of the Veterans' Administration for the conduct of research into spinal cord injuries and diseases, and other disabilities that lead to paralysis of the lower extremities.

House report: No. 808; October 2, 1963.

Passed House: October 21, 1963.

Referred: Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare; October 22, 1963.

Senate committee action: Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs reported favorably to full Senate committee; July 21, 1964. Full committee failed to report.

H.R. 9004: Transfers control of Pershing Hall, a building located in Paris, France, to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, and authorizes the Administrator to transfer control of such property to the head of any department or agency which requests it before the 60th day after the date of enactment. If no such request is received, the Veterans' Administration is required to retain control of the property for its use and to maintain the building as a memorial to the memory of General of the Armies of the United States John J. Pershing.

House report: No. 926; November 26, 1963.
Passed House: December 2, 1963.
Referred: Senate Committee on Finance; December 3, 1963.
Senate committee action: None.

H.R. 11461: Designates the Veterans' Administration Center (hospital and domiciliary) at Bonham, Tex., as the "Sam Rayburn Memorial Veterans Center"; the Veterans' Administration Hospital at Bedford, Mass., as the "Edith Nourse Rogers Memorial Veterans' Hospital"; and the Veterans' Administration Hospital at Jackson, Miss., as the "John Elliott Rankin Memorial Veterans' Hospital."
House report: No. 1696; August 5, 1964.
Passed House: September 1, 1964.
Referred: Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare; September 2, 1964.
Senate committee action: None.

The Metropolitan Dade County Community Relations Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANTE B. FASCELL
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, prejudice is the most resisting barrier to equal opportunity for minority groups. Although the force of law can help break the barrier, it will take the understanding and the testimony of conscience which change minds and hearts to cause the barrier of prejudice to fall completely.

It is natural that the minds and hearts of men are formed by the prevailing views of the community in which they are born and live. And it is natural that the prevailing views of a community are determined largely by what the most respected men of the community recognize as right and just. Responsibility for the demise of prejudice rests largely with such men—the leaders in religion, in education, in business, in civic affairs, and politics.

Dade County, Fla., has given an example to every community in the Nation. The Negro in Dade County will be finding increasing opportunities in education, employment, and housing, as well as access to public accommodations because community leaders of both races in Dade County assumed responsibility for bringing about in the minds and hearts of men a new recognition of human dignity and of the right to equal opportunity.

In the spring of 1963, religious leaders of Dade County, headed by Bishop Coleman F. Carroll of the Catholic Diocese of Miami, joined with other community leaders and with the Miami-Dade Chamber of Commerce to urge formation of an interracial relations committee.

Bishop Carroll, aside from his responsibilities within the Catholic diocese, is a great community leader. He has gone far beyond the call of his duties, and has interested himself in the problems of the aged, education, the Cuban refugees, and the betterment and welfare of all citizens. He has given, unstintingly, his time and his efforts to community and civic endeavors.

On June 11, 1963, the Dade County Board of County Commissioners established the Metropolitan Dade County Community Relations Board. The community relations board is made up of white and Negro leaders in the fields of religion, education, medicine, business and industry, and journalism.

The prevailing views of a community are based on inner consent. The community relations board bases its activities on just this immutable truth. It undertakes to evoke a wholehearted recognition of the worth and rights of every person regardless of race, creed, or color. It necessarily undertakes to do so by means of conciliation, of educational programs, and of studies and reports.

The board effected remarkable progress in community relations during its first year of existence. It has done so entirely by means of advice and persuasion. In this way men will come to see eye-to-eye and to adjust themselves willingly to the rights of others.

The community relations board is divided into four main committees dealing with four areas of social conflict: education, employment, housing, and public accommodations.

The education committee undertook a study of the connection between segregation in schools and quality of education. It has surveyed the extent of such segregation. And it has investigated the steps which other communities have taken to assure equal educational opportunity.

The Education and Employment Committees have cooperated in a program with school executive personnel and guidance counselors to encourage Negroes to obtain through scholastic and vocational training more education and skills corresponding to new job opportunities.

Among other accomplishments, the Employment Committee recommended to the Florida State Employment Service that a pilot project be set up to promote employment of members of minority groups.

The Housing Committee has undertaken to persuade builders, realtors, and bankers to adopt voluntarily fair housing practices. On June 9 and 10, 1964, the committee, together with the FHA and the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity in Housing, sponsored a seminar on open housing. With the assistance of the Communications Committee, which provides media for communications with the public, the Housing Committee has undertaken a program of community education regarding housing. The Housing Committee has, moreover, sought to mediate situations in which blockbusting was allegedly attempted.

The Public Accommodations Committee, through mediation and conciliation, has persuaded several motels and restaurants to serve all customers who are well-behaved and properly dressed regardless of race or color.

For the future, the Dade County Community Relations Board will attempt to persuade businessmen to undertake an equal opportunity employers program. It plans further research and expects to make recommendations regarding equal opportunity in education. And it is determined to elicit sympathetic understanding of Negroes' housing problems.

The new Federal Community Relations Service created by the Civil Rights Act of 1964 has a purpose similar to that of the Dade County Community Relations Board. It is the duty of the Federal Service "to provide assistance to communities and persons therein in resolving disputes, disagreements, or difficulties relating to discriminatory practices based on race, color, or national origin which impair the rights of persons in such communities under the Constitution or laws of the United States."

The Service has no authority to coerce anyone by the force of law. It can attempt conciliation only if it is invited to enter a dispute by one or both sides. It is meant to establish such communication between parties that mutual recognition of rights and duties—recognition which can hardly be coerced or forced—will ensue.

President Johnson could not have found a man better qualified by experience and understanding to head the Community Relations Service than LeRoy Collins.

Governor Collins exemplifies the finest qualities of southern statesmanship. Years of experience as Florida State representative, senator, and Governor have enabled him to acquire unusual understanding of the just hopes of the Negro community. His profound respect for the rights of all persons—moral rights as well as legal rights—qualify him to bring about through conciliation willing assent to the obligations of justice. Governor Collins himself said:

> This work of justice for all can succeed if the great mass of Americans will try. But it will take good neighbors acting with responsibility. It will take good manners and self-discipline, along with respect for law. The Community Relations Service will provide a means for achieving compliance without lawsuits. (Quoted on back of pamphlet entitled: "Facts About the Community Relations Service," August 1964.)

During July of this year, Mr. Collins, together with Secretary of Commerce Luther Hodges, former Governor of North Carolina, and Buford Ellington, former Governor of Tennessee, visited the Governors of several States—Virginia, North Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Tennessee—to offer Federal conciliation service.

Gov. Albertis Harrison, of Virginia, said:

> These gentlemen hope very much their service will not be needed, but if it is, it will be available. It will come at the local level if invited and if it can be helpful (Washington, D.C., Evening Star, July 16, 1964, p. A–2.)

Gov. Terry Sanford, of North Carolina, said:

> I'm impressed that the Service is not an enforcement agency. It will serve to better relations of good will. (Ibid.)

Cooperation between local community relations services like that of Dade County and the Federal Community Relations Service should create a network of conciliation assistance capable of bringing about nationwide consensus regarding interracial justice. Such a consensus is the only sure and enduring foundation of rights.

Accomplishments of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in the 88th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I am exceedingly proud of the record of legislative achievement made by the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee in the 88th Congress. This has been one of the most productive Congresses on record from the standpoint of matters under the jurisdiction of this committee, and it was truly a Congress which gave particular attention to the needs and enjoyment of future generations. The significance and importance of actions taken in the 88th Congress will grow with time as the measures enacted are implemented in the years ahead.

In the conservation field, establishment of the land and water conservation fund will go a long way toward meeting the future outdoor recreation needs of the American people, and the establishment of the National Wilderness Preservation System will preserve large areas of our Nation for the use and enjoyment of future generations. The several new units added to the National Park System, including the Canyonlands National Park in Utah, the Fire Island National Seashore in New York, and the Ozark National Scenic Riverways in Missouri, both protect outstanding scenic, scientific, and historic values and provide extensive outdoor recreation opportunities.

The Public Land Law Review Commission provides the mechanism for reexamination of both the law and the use of our public lands. Again, this landmark legislation looks to the future and to the conservation and wise use of our natural resources.

In the water field, we authorized seven new reclamation projects spread throughout the West and established a new water research program to help resolve the problems of the approaching national water crisis.

We authorized the electrical interconnection between the Pacific Northwest and the Pacific Southwest, a cooperative program involving Federal, public, and private development and providing the Nation's first high voltage direct current transmission.

We established a Commission to study and make recommendations with respect to the future status of Puerto Rico.

These are just a few of the important measures that came from the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. A total of 164 bills were reported by the committee and 144 of these were enacted, a truly remarkable record.

Mr. Speaker, this record of achievement would not have been possible, of course, without the hard work and cooperation of all members of the committee. The full committee met 83 times during the 88th Congress for the consideration of legislation and its subcommittees met 247 times for the same purpose. In addition, considerable time was spent in field hearings and inspections. I especially want to recognize the energetic leadership of the subcommittee chairmen—Hon. LEO W. O'BRIEN, Subcommittee on Territorial and Insular Affairs; Hon. WALTER ROGERS, Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation; Hon. JAMES A. HALEY, Subcommittee on Indian Affairs; Hon. ED EDMONDSON, Subcommittee on Mines and Mining; Hon. WALTER S. BARING, Subcommittee on Public Lands; and Hon. THOMAS G. MORRIS, Subcommittee on National Parks, I also want to express my appreciation for the help and cooperation of the Honorable JOHN P. SAYLOR, the ranking minority member of the committee.

The committee's professional and clerical staffs have continued, during the 88th Congress, to set a high standard of performance in handling the committee's legislative and administrative workload and in service to Members.

Mr. Speaker, for use of the committee members and for others who are interested in the details of the committee's activities and the legislation it considered, we have prepared a report on the committee's accomplishments. Copies of this report are available from the committee.

Notice Regarding Change of Congressional Office and New Government System Official Telephone Number

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR FRIENDS: The present session of Congress has now adjourned, after being in session since January. We are now transferring our Washington office records to our Pittsburgh office, as a new Congress is elected on November 3, to begin sessions in January 1965.

It has been a busy session in changing times for all of us, and I have tried hard, sincerely, to represent the people of our district, and our good country.

As many of our people in our district have asked me to help them on their problems, and to keep in close touch with our district, my Pittsburgh office is now open 6 days a week through the fall to serve you.

I am keeping your name on my personal list for our new congressional district, and want you to feel free to call on me for any advice, or friendly assistance that our office staff and I can give regarding our Federal Government in Washington. It is a pleasure to be of service to you personally at any time.

With my good regards,

JIM FULTON.

(NOTE.—Same Pittsburgh office. But new Government phone No. 644–2876, new Federal Building scheduled opening now postponed indefinitely.)

Report of the House Majority Leader on the Accomplishments of the 88th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure, indeed, to report on the accomplishments of this, the 88th, Congress. By any objective standard, we have added a shining chapter to the history of this House. I am tremendously proud of our record.

It is right and proper to examine my reasons for calling this an outstanding Congress. I have spoken of an objective standard; that is what I intend to apply.

I do not speak now as a political partisan. Surely, I am a member of the Democratic Party. And proud to be. The majority of the Members of this House and of the coordinate body are members of the Democratic Party; we have worked with two Democratic Presidents in the course of this Congress. I intend to give due regard to these facts in their place. But for now, let us seek a proper yardstick by which to judge a Congress. When we have found that, the relationship between the accomplishments of this Congress and the fact that the majority of the Members belong to the Democratic Party will be fairly obvious.

Commentators like labels. Of late, they have been applying two of them to the 88th Congress. Some are calling it "the education Congress"; others, "the conservation Congress." Both are true. We have written a record in each of those areas to rival that of any Congress in our history. But I submit, Mr. Speaker, that neither of these appellations touches the real wellspring of our activities in the past 2 years. I submit, rather, that the proper designation for this Congress is "the compassionate Congress."

And if this can truly be called "The Compassionate Congress," then I believe that we have found the answer to why this has been a Congress of singular achievement. For if we have been motivated by a deep feeling for, and understanding of, the needs and yearnings of our citizens, we have fulfilled the highest expectations of the Founding Fathers.

What is the purpose of government? Certainly, there is no better place to seek an answer than in the Declaration of Independence. For that document was written both to explain our separation from England and to enunciate the principles of the new government which we would establish. There Thomas Jefferson wrote:

> We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.

The Government was established, then, to secure the rights of the people. Since all men are equal, all possess these rights. Government exists to secure them for all.

The primary concern of Government must be people. All of the activities in which it engages must be geared to the betterment of the citizens. As Woodrow Wilson said:

> I hope that we shall never forget that we created this Nation not to serve ourselves, but to serve mankind.

And in his state of the Union message in 1962, President Kennedy said:

> A strong America cannot neglect the aspirations of its citizens—the welfare of the needy, the health care of the elderly, the education of the young. For we are not developing this Nation's wealth for its own sake. Wealth is the means—and people are the ends.

The condition of man, then, is the proper concern of Government. If we should lose sight of this and act as if power or wealth are our greatest asset we have truly lost our way. Surely, we must remain strong and prosperous; but only because if we do not, we cannot properly pursue our real goal.

If we agree, then, that the purpose of Government is to protect and cherish the citizen, we may properly ask how best this can be done. Specifically, how does the Government best care for those who have consented to be governed by it? I submit, Mr. Speaker, that man is cared for in the real sense only when his Government devotes itself to the creation of that atmosphere which is most conducive to his individual self-realization. His Government fulfills its function when it frees him from the enslaving forces of his environment, when it recognizes his dignity, when it has faith in him and gives him hope, when it grants him the opportunity to be himself.

What does it mean to be ourselves? It means, I believe, to be all that we are capable of being, to develop our full potential. This is the basic aspiration of all of our citizens and it is the function of Government to create those circumstances which will make possible its realization.

I have spoken thus far in a general way of the proper function of Government. And what I have said applies to all of the branches of Government. But I think it applies in a very special way to the legislative body. Congress is the public forum, the vehicle through which the will of the people is expressed. It is composed of the elected representatives of the people and is charged with the task of translating their needs and desires into enforceable legislation. And the basic need and desire of every citizen, as I have said, is to be allowed to develop his full potential. Therefore, that Congress which enacts legislation designed to grant to all citizens the opportunity to develop their full potential may truly be said to have represented the will of the people and, consequently, to have fulfilled the purpose for which it was instituted.

If the creation of the opportunity for self-realization is our goal, certainly equality in this opportunity is basic. Opportunity is not something to be extended to some and denied to others. And surely not by the Congress of the United States composed of representatives of all the people and constituting the forum of all of the citizens.

It cannot be denied that there are segments of our population which do not possess opportunity for self-realization equal to that of their more fortunate neighbors. The reasons are many but the result is identical: the victim does not share in the abundance of the Nation. And one can say that those who are thus alienated from their neighbors are in a position to develop their full potential.

Mr. Speaker, I think it will be obvious from even a summary consideration of our enactments during this Congress that we have devoted ourselves to these neglected segments of our population and have attempted to extend to them the opportunity and the hope which other citizens enjoy and which they, by right, deserve.

Certainly a lack of employment skills means a lack of opportunity. Our $921 million program of increased support for vocational education is geared to giving opportunity for economic betterment to those who have most need of it—the young, the unskilled, the school dropouts, the displaced workers.

The recommendations of the Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress, established this year, will enable us to derive the maximum economic benefit from technological advancement with the minimum of human displacement and suffering.

The amendments to the Manpower Development and Training Act, passed during the first session, will allow us to deal more effectively with the problems of the unskilled and inadequately educated.

The bulk of the war on poverty is aimed at preparing our untrained youth for employment.

What of the migrant worker? Much-needed protection is afforded by the law passed this year requiring the registration of crew leaders.

The requirement for equal pay for women when employed in essentially the same work as men is the extension of economic opportunity to a category of workers who too often have been the victims of discrimination.

And while I speak of discrimination, the Nation and the world will not soon forget that a modern emancipation proclamation is now law. The Civil Rights Act guarantees to all Americans the protection of the Constitution.

The Congress has entered a too-long neglected field with its two programs designed to combat mental retardation and mental illness. Certainly the prevention of mental retardation and the rehabilitation of the mentally ill extend hope and opportunity to a neglected segment of our population.

Our growing population of elderly persons are too often cut off from the abundance of this Nation. The omnibus Housing Act passed during this session provides $75 million for the construction of special housing for the elderly. And the Housing Act passed last session increases the authorization for direct loans to nonprofit corporations and cooperatives for the elderly.

Our handicapped citizens were not forgotten by this Congress. We increased the funds of the President's Committee on the Employment of the Physically Handicapped and extended to the handicapped most of the programs under the Housing Act.

The economic insecurity of young Indian boys was dealt with by the expansion of the vocational education program for adult Indians.

Look down the list of legislation passed by this Congress to aid veterans and you will see that we do not forget the sacrifices of these men and the physical handicaps they have suffered in our defense. Benefits can never compensate them but they can make it possible for them and for their families and survivors to lead lives of dignity.

Consider for a moment the cruel reprisals of poverty, reprisals in the form of lack of education, lack of employment skills, lack of opportunity, lack of hope, lack of dignity. The poverty of mind and spirit which accompany material poverty is the greatest tragedy. This year we have launched a massive assault on the causes of poverty with the enactment of the Economic Opportunity Act.

We have expanded and made permanent the food stamp plan whereby welfare recipients are enabled to have proper nutrition while the Government makes use of its agricultural surpluses.

The Omnibus Housing Act will provide 37,500 additional public housing units for low-income families.

And we have provided that the poor defendant shall not be without defense of counsel because he lacks funds to pay for this necessity.

In each of these cases cited we have made farsighted attempts to extend opportunity to our forgotten citizens. I can do no better than to quote President Johnson on the value of such a course. Speaking in West Virginia on September 20, 1964, he said:

> The day America hardens its heart, the day the fortunate turn away from the helpless, the day compassion turns to indifference, on that day we will decline from greatness.

Thus far I have emphasized the extension of opportunity to those who have least opportunity. But the responsibility of the Congress extends beyond this.

We must think of the average citizen who aspires to a finer and happier life, because only thereby can he develop to his full capabilities.

A finer and happier life of necessity includes knowledge. A trail-blazing parade of education bills passed by this Congress will make it possible for us to meet the needs of our burgeoning school population and, through meeting their needs, to enrich their lives and provide the leaders of tomorrow. We have initiated a 5-year, $1.2 billion program for the construction of academic facilities at public and private colleges and universities.

We have provided aid for schools overburdened by children of Government personnel.

We have authorized the expansion of Federal aid for public library services and construction.

We have provided aid for nursing education and for young people entering that necessary and understaffed profession.

We have done the same for medical, dental, and related-type education and for young people entering these fields.

We have done the same for public health personnel.

It is not difficult to see the relationship between the benefits of some of these programs and the benefits of a better life for our citizens through improved medical care. For if we provide more doctors, more nurses, more dentists, and more public health people we will bring the wonders of our laboratory research to more of our citizens.

Our extension of the highly successful Hill-Burton hospital and nursing home construction program will have the same effect.

The Clean Air Act, expanding and accelerating air-pollution control, will bring abatement of the contamination of our air and the resultant health hazards.

When we require safety in automobile seat belts and the registration of pesticides, we fulfill our function.

When we grant a pay raise and increase the health benefits of our Government employees, we make it easier to attract and hold high-caliber personnel and thus insure the competent administration of all of the other programs of which I speak.

When we insure the preservation and availability of publications significant in the history of America, aid in the construction of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, and establish a National Council on the Arts, we add to the cultural life of the Nation. And it is this which enriches and makes more meaningful the life of our citizens.

The tremendous accomplishments in the field of conservation—the wilderness bill, the Outdoor Recreation Act, the land and water conservation fund, the several national park bills—have a meaning in this context too. The urbanization and industrialization of our society have, to a large extent, cut us off from the wonders of nature and from their healing and ordering effects. By setting aside and conserving this natural beauty we provide man with the opportunity to enjoy what is an essential part of a meaningful life.

By maintaining a balanced and powerful Defense Establishment and by seeking and working for peace among nations, we largely free man from fear and allow him to devote his energies to self-betterment and self-realization.

If we promote the development of peaceful uses of atomic energy, we do so because of the overwhleming potential of the new force for the creation of many of the material elements of the good life.

When we enact the largest tax reduction in our history, stimulate the economy, and decrease unemployment, we do so to free men from economic insecurity. Without such freedom there is no time and no inspiration for good works and enobling thoughts.

All these things and more this Congress has done, Mr. Speaker. The wellspring of all of our activities has been care for the citizen. That is why this has been a compassionate Congress; that is why this has been an outstanding Congress.

I indicated earlier that I believe that it is more than coincidence that this remarkable record was compiled by a Congress controlled by the Democratic Party. The accomplishments of the past 2 years are very much in the tradition of that party. In 1796, in the first contested presidential election in our history, the Democratic Party, under the leadership of Thomas Jefferson, campaigned on the principles of "The rights of man." This year our platform is entitled "One Nation, One People." Both of these underscore the identity of the Democratic Party with the people of America—not a certain class of people or a certain group of people, but all of the people. Because our party is identified with the people, it is shaped by their needs and desires. And the basic need and desire of all of our citizens—today, yesterday, and tomorrow, in the city, the town, and the country, in youth and in age—is the need for self-realization.

In a letter to Henry Lee in 1824, Thomas Jefferson, the founder of the Democratic Party, defined Democrats as "those who identify themselves with the people, have confidence in them, cherish—them." This confidence has endured. Today, as then, the Democratic Party has confidence that under the proper conditions every man will reach his full capacity. This guiding principle of the Democratic Party is the principle which motivated this Congress.

If our notable record is more easily understood in the light of the basic principle of the Democratic Party, it must also be read in the light of our leadership. I pause now to pay tribute to one of the ablest and fairest of men, John W. McCormack, Speaker of this House. In his short speech of January 9, 1963, acknowledging his election as Speaker, he said:

> As Speaker of the House, I shall always protect the dignity and the prerogatives of this great body. I shall always protect the rights of all Members under the rules of the House—I shall always be fair to all of my colleagues.

Speaker McCormack has fulfilled his promises. As a man, he is most worthy of our affection; as a Speaker, he is most worthy of our respect. He is dedicated, above all, to the national interest. That dedication transcends partisan politics; it places him above pettiness and narrowness and meanness of spirit. It shapes the manner in which he directs our business which is, after all, the people's business. For this we are grateful, as should all of the citizens be grateful. For our good fortune in having such a leader is also their good fortune.

I am very proud of all of the Members of this House. They have worked tirelessly to translate great hopes into realities. They have discharged the public business with understanding, with cooperation, with an inspiring sense of responsibility. The differences among us have been honest ones; and they have been healthy ones. We have conscientiously searched for, and found, points of compromise. The result is a legislative program which truly reflects a broad national consensus.

I would single out for particular praise only one Member of this body. I refer to our colleague, Clarence Cannon, late chairman of the Appropriations Committee. On January 21 of this year he published a detailed schedule for reporting and floor consideration of the appropriation bills in this House during 1964. Through his tireless efforts and those of his successor, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Mahon], we completed work on all of the 1965 appropriations bills by July 1, the first day of the new fiscal year. On July 10, President Johnson issued a special statement expressing his "appreciation and that of the Nation for the efficiency and speed" with which this body had acted.

Mr. Cannon was a great American, an outstanding legislator, and an eminent parliamentarian. His contributions in more than 50 years in Washington, in more than 40 years as a Member of Congress, and in more than 20 years as chairman of the Appropriations Committee, are prodigious.

Certainly, I cannot record the legislative accomplishments of the past 2 years without reference to the occupant of the White House whom our Constitution directs to "give to the Congress information on the state of the Union, and recommend to their consideration such measures as he shall judge necessary and expedient."

John F. Kennedy was a man of great ability, a man of keen and pentrating mind, a man who evaluated soundly, a man of unlimited courage. He was well aware that in taking the oath of office he assumed burdens unparalleled in the history of our Nation. He bore his awesome responsibility well; his policies were sound and farsighted. He well knew that we delude ourselves if we believe that there are simple solutions in a world of complex and continuing problems. In his state of the Union message on January 11, 1962, he said:

> We sometimes chafe at the burden of our obligations, the complexity of our decisions, the agony of our choice. But there is no

comfort or security in this evasion, no solution in abdication, no relief in irresponsibility.

Learning and reason must guide our leadership or we shall surely go astray. From January 21, 1961 to November 22, 1963, our President brought learning and reason to his tasks. In a speech at American University in June, 1963, he said that "man can be as big as he wants." John Kennedy wanted to be big, and so he was. And we, too, are bigger because of him.

Not the least of President Kennedy's legacies to his country was his personal choice for his successor in the Office of the President, Lyndon Baines Johnson. President Kennedy could not have chosen a man better prepared to assume that high office, to rededicate this Nation to peace, both internal and external, to find the national consensus, and to unite all of the people in the pursuit of worthy goals.

That he has the courage of his predecessor was clear from the moment he took the oath of office under the most incomprehensibly tragic of circumstances.

That he would carry forward the many-sided programs of President Kennedy was clear in his first speech to the Joint session of Congress when he said: "Let us continue."

That he would seek unity within this Nation was clear from his statement at the University of Texas in May when he said:

> I intend to try and achieve a broad national consensus, which can end obstruction and paralysis and liberate the energies of the Nation for the work of the future.

That he is President of all of the people was clear from his statement to Congress on November 27, 1963 when he said:

> We will serve all the Nation, not one section or one sector, or one group, but all Americans. These are the United States—a united people with a united purpose.

That he would serve us well is clear from his statement in his special message on the antipoverty program when he expressed as the basic goal of his administration:

> An America in which every citizen shares all of the opportunities of his society, in which every man has a chance to advance his welfare to the limit of his capabilities.

Such is the caliber of the two Presidents with whom we have worked.

Mr. Speaker, I intend now to describe in detail those acts which I have already mentioned as well as numerous other pieces of legislation enacted by this Congress. I believe this will document my contention that this has indeed been a compassionate Congress.

HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Since man is our greatest resource, the health, education, and welfare of the citizens must be among the foremost concerns of the Government. The success of a government in freeing man from the enslaving forces of his environment is the success of a government in carrying out the function for which it was created.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is the agency of the Federal Government most immediately concerned with these activities. For the fiscal year 1964, we appropriated $5,077,114,500 for that Department. This was in addition to $214,641,000 included in the Supplemental Appropriation Act passed during the first session.

This year we appropriated $6,461,109,000 for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for the fiscal year 1965. And the Deficiency Appropriation Act included $160,812,000 for that Department.

EDUCATION

The relationship between education and the Nation's social, economic, technological, and moral progress is not difficult to perceive. Certainly the relationship of education to the full development of a man's potential is equally obvious. President Kennedy aptly described it as "the keystone in the arch of freedom and progress." Because these facts are indisputably true, any measure passed by the Congress of the United States which increases the quality of American education or extends its availability to more of the people is of great significance.

It follows, then, that the 88th Congress is truly a historic one in the field of education. We have passed several acts, any one of which is significant enough in itself to qualify this as "The Education Congress." Two of the acts to which I refer were passed during the first session and I described them in some detail in my report of last year. But because they are of such import, I should like to sketch their broad outlines here.

HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES ACT

The first of these acts is the Higher Education Facilities Act, Public Law 88–204, approved December 16, 1963. This was, indeed, a historic breakthrough, for it was the first general college aid program ever enacted, the fruit of several years of bitter controversy.

This measure authorized a 5-year $1.2 billion program of Federal grants and loans for the construction and improvement of public and private college facilities, including classrooms, libraries, and laboratories. The appropriation authorization was limited to 3 years so that Congress may review the program.

The appropriations were as follows: $230 million a year for matching grants to the States for the construction, rehabilitation, and improvement of undergraduate academic facilities, with 22 percent of this amount reserved for public junior colleges and public technical institutes; $25 million in the fiscal year 1964 and $60 million in the fiscal years 1965 and 1966 for construction grants to graduate schools or to cooperative graduate centers; and $120 million a year for loans for construction, rehabilitation, or improvement of both undergraduate and graduate academic facilities. It is hoped and anticipated that this program will enable colleges and universities to meet the needs of a student population which is expected to double in the years from 1960 to 1970.

The appropriations for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for the fiscal year 1965 included $463,150,000 for college facilities construction.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION ACT

The second of these acts is the Vocational Education Act, Public Law 88–210, approved December 10, 1963. The purpose of this measure is to update and expand the teaching of job skills and to provide job training and job experience. It also extends the National Defense Education Act and impacted areas school aid and increases college loan funds under the National Defense Education Act.

This act authorizes $921 million in Federal aid. Five hundred and eighty-one million dollars is for matching grants to the States to expand and modernize State and local vocational education programs for the fiscal years 1964 through 1967. This money must be used for job-orientated vocational training and for building and equipping job-orientated vocational high schools and adult training centers.

One hundred and fifty million dollars is for work-study programs and residential schools for the fiscal years 1965 through 1968 with some State matching of Federal work-study funds. The purpose of these programs is to keep needy students from becoming high school dropouts.

One hundred and seventy million dollars is for low-interest loans to college students in the fiscal years 1964 and 1965 under the National Defense Education Act. The National Defense Education Act is also extended for an additional year, to July 1, 1965. And an additional $20 million is authorized for guidance, counseling, and testing programs under the National Defense Education Act in the fiscal years 1964 and 1965.

Finally, this act extends the impacted area program for 2 years, to June 30, 1965, and authorizes $527,600,000 for this activity. Under this program, enacted in 1950, the Federal Government pays part of the costs for public school construction, operation, and maintenance where the impact of Federal military and civilian personnel places a burden on the local school facilities and services.

NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT AMENDMENTS AND IMPACTED AREAS PROGRAM

Two of the programs which were included in the Vocational Education Act were further extended and expanded in action taken by this Congress in the closing days of the second session.

As passed, this new legislation extends all of the provisions of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 for 3 years and increases the authorization from $135 million to $163.3 million in the fiscal year 1965, and to $179.3 million in 1966, $190 million in 1967, and $195 million in 1968.

The act passed this year amends the basic legislation in several important ways. The total effect of the changes is an expansion and liberalization of the entire program. Among the more important amendments are the removal of the annual institutional ceiling of $800,000, the extension of the loan program to accredited postsecondary business schools and technical institutions, both public and nonprofit private, and the increase in the yearly limit on loans to graduate and professional students from $1,000 to $2,500. The aggregate limit for such students was also increased from $5,000 to $10,000.

The student loan program under the National Defense Education Act has been highly successful. More than 680,000 students have had the opportunity to use the resources of the fund to achieve a college or graduate education. Approximately two-thirds of the loans have gone to students in science, mathematics, engineering, or modern foreign languages. This year we have extended these opportunities to persons who are preparing to teach English, reading, history, and geography. Federal support is also now available for the preparation of teachers working with disadvantaged youth, to librarians, guidance counselors, and educational media specialists.

The original act provided for the forgiveness of 50 percent of the loan to teachers in the public, elementary, or secondary schools. The majority of the Members felt that this was inequitable and the amendments passed this year extend this forgiveness feature to teachers in nonprofit private elementary and secondary schools and institutions of higher education.

We have also made it possible for part-time students carrying at least one-half of an academic workload to receive loans.

We have increased the maximum number of fellowships available under the program to 3,000 in the fiscal year 1965, to 6,000 in 1966, and to 7,500 in 1967 and 1968. The authorization for guidance, counseling, and testing was increased from its present $17.5 million level to $24 million in 1965, to $24.5 million in 1966, and to $30 million in 1967 and 1968. Similarly, the authorization for the language development program was increased from its present level of $8 million to $13 million in the fiscal year 1965, to $16 million in 1967, and to $18 million in 1968.

The amendments passed this year also extend the federally impacted areas legislation for 1 year. I described the operation of this program in my report last year and, briefly, in my summary of the Vocational Education Act above.

This is a very important act and a very fitting close to the work of a Congress which has devoted itself so successfully to the essential area of education.

A supplemental appropriation for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, signed by President Johnson on February 11, 1964, provided $216,204,000 for payments to impacted areas and $31,168,000 in college loan funds under the National Defense Education Act. On January 21, President Johnson had requested these supplemental funds because the impacted areas and student loan funds were exhausted. Unless immediate action was taken by Congress, schools would have been unable to pay their teachers and students would have been forced to drop out of college.

The appropriation for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for the fiscal year 1965 included $158,296,000 for vocational education and $332 million for payments to school districts under the impacted areas program.

And the Supplemental Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1965 included an appropriation of $60,750,000 for defense educational activities.

PUBLIC LIBRARY SERVICES AND CONSTRUCTION ACT

To this list of outstanding accomplishments in the field of education must be added the Public Library Services and Construction Act, Public Law 88-269. The recommendation for legislation on this matter was made by President Kennedy in his January 29, 1963, message on education. In that message he pointed out that 18 million people in this Nation have no access to any local public library service and an additional 110 million have only inadequate service. For lack of funds, the rate of replacement of public library buildings has been a mere 2 percent in a decade. Carnegie funds for the construction of libraries have not been available for the last 40 years.

On February 11, 1964, President Johnson signed into law the bill embodying the recommendations which President Kennedy had made and which he, President Johnson, had repeated in his budget message of January 21, 1964. In so doing he said:

> There are few acts of Congress which I sign with more pleasure, and certainly none with more hope.

He also spoke of "the enlightened Members of Congress and others who supported their activities" in guiding this bill through Congress. And well he might. This is truly an enlightened act, for it is an investment in the Nation's future. As Thomas Jefferson so rightly said:

> If a nation expects to be ignorant and free, it expects what never was and never will be.

As enacted, this measure amends the Library Services Act of 1956 as follows:

It removes a provision of that earlier act which limited Federal library service grants to rural areas with no towns of more than 10,000 population. As a consequence of this amendment Federal assistance will be extended to public libraries in urban as well as rural areas, but nonrural areas are not eligible for Federal aid until the fiscal year 1965.

It increases the matching grant authorization for public library services from $7.5 million each year to $25 million in the fiscal year 1964, with sums in the following 2 fiscal years to be determined by Congress. The minimum amount for which each State is eligible was increased from $40,000 to $100,000.

It also authorizes $20 million in the fiscal year 1964, with sums in the following 2 fiscal years to be determined by Congress, for matching grants to States for the construction of public library buildings. A minimum allotment of $80,000 is provided for each State and $20,000 for each territory. Additional allotments are made to a State on the basis of its population in relationship to the total population of the country.

It limits the Federal share in a State's construction plans to between two-thirds and one-third, depending upon the State's relative per capita income. A State is required to submit a satisfactory plan for construction of public libraries and to insure that laborers on the construction projects will be paid the prevailing wages as determined under the Davis-Bacon Act. Construction is defined to include the construction of new buildings, the expansion, remodeling, and alteration of existing buildings, initial equipment, architect's fees, and the costs of land acquisition. State plans are to be submitted to the U.S. Commissioner of Education. He is prohibited from disapproving a plan without a hearing and a State may appeal a ruling by the Commissioner to a U.S. Court of Appeals.

The final regulations under which the new act went into effect were not released to the States by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare until the end of June. But even at that time, proposed plans had already been received from 34 States. This fact should give some indication of the States' realization of the need for improvement of their public library systems and the eagerness with which this new act has been received.

The appropriations for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for the fiscal year 1965 included $55 million for grants for library services and construction.

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

A more specialized area of education, but education nonetheless, is that of developing techniques and training personnel for preventing and controlling juvenile delinquency. In 1961, a Democratic-controlled Congress enacted the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act, which authorized Federal grants of $10 million annually for 3 years for pilot projects demonstrating improved methods of prevention and control of juvenile delinquency and for developing courses of study and training personnel for employment in such programs.

In the 3 years of operation of this program, demonstration projects have been started in 7 cities, and plans for 11 other projects are in preparation. The Federal Government has invested $19 million in these projects and in training grants to a number of universities, foundations, and other research institutions. Failure to extend the act, due to expire on June 30, 1964, would have meant the termination of these projects and the loss of an opportunity to continue research into a very costly and tragic national problem.

On June 29, 1964, the Congress sent to the President a bill which extends the 1961 act for 2 years, until June 30, 1966. It authorizes $10 million for the program for the fiscal year 1965 and requires another authorization for the second year of the extension.

In addition, this act authorizes a special study of compulsory school attendance and child labor laws to determine their effects upon juvenile delinquency, and provides for a special antijuvenile delinquency demonstration project in the Washington, D.C., area. An additional $5 million was authorized for the Washington project.

Much useful information has been obtained from this program so far and much more can be anticipated as more projects are completed and evaluated. The annual cost to society of juvenile delinquency has been estimated as high as $2.6 billion. The increasing size of our youthful population makes it imperative that corrective action be taken. The program initiated in 1961 and extended this year is designed to meet that need.

The appropriation for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for the fiscal year 1965 included $11,500,000 for juvenile delinquency control.

MENTAL HEALTH

In response to President Kennedy's February 5, 1963, request for a "bold new approach" to the problem of mental illness and retardation, this Democratic-controlled Congress last year enacted two comprehensive administration programs. I described these acts in detail in my report last year but because of their lasting significance and the steps taken to implement them this year, I should like briefly to summarize their provisions here.

MENTAL RETARDATION FACILITIES AND COMMUNITY HEALTH CENTERS CONSTRUCTION ACT

The Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Health Centers Construction Act, Public Law 88-164, authorizes a 4-year, $329 million program of grants to States and public and private institutions for the construction of centers connected with universities and affiliated hospitals for research into the causes of mental retardation and facilities for the treatment of such cases; for the construction of community centers for the care and treatment of mental patients; and for the training of teachers of the mentally retarded, mentally ill, and handicapped children.

The authorizations under this act are as follows:

It authorizes $26 million over the 4-year period beginning July 1, 1963, for project grants to pay for a maximum of 75 percent of the costs of constructing research centers which would develop new knowledge for preventing and combating mental retardation. An additional $32.5 million over the same 4-year period is authorized to pay for up to 75 percent of the costs of constructing college- or university-associated facilities for the mentally retarded. Finally, it authorizes $67.5 million over the 4-year period beginning July 1, 1964, for formula grants to be allocated among the States to pay from 45 to 75 percent of the costs of constructing public and other nonprofit facilities for the care of the mentally retarded.

In addition, this act authorizes $67.5 million over the 3-year period beginning July 1, 1964, for formula grants to be allocated among the States to pay from 33⅓ to 66⅔ percent of the costs of constructing public and other nonprofit community mental health centers.

It authorizes $47 million over the 3-year period beginning July 1, 1963, to extend and strengthen the existing programs for training teachers of mentally retarded and deaf children and expands these programs to include the training of teachers of other handicapped children, such as the visually handicapped, the speech impaired, and the emotionally disturbed.

The appropriation for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for the fiscal year 1965 includes $35 million for the construction of community mental health centers under this act.

In view of the fact that we cannot even identify the cause of retardation in 75 percent of the cases, research in this area is essential. The number of mentally retarded in this country is estimated at between 5 and 6 million; one-half of the hospital beds in this country are occupied by mental patients; and 1 out of every 10 persons in the United States requires psychiatric attention sometime during his lifetime. Without research, the mitigation of this scourge is impossible. This legislation will encourage that research.

The alleviation of this terrible problem is very much in line with the philosophy of the Democratic Party, the Kennedy-Johnson administration, and this Democratic-controlled Congress. For we are concerned first and foremost with people. And we are particularly concerned with the welfare of those unable to share the opportunities of our society, and with lessening the number of those so afflicted.

MATERNAL AND CHILD HEALTH AND MENTAL RETARDATION AMENDMENTS

The second of President Kennedy's proposals is contained in Public Law 88-156, approved October 24, 1963. The need for this legislation was ably explained by President Kennedy. In signing this bill, he said:

> Infants born prematurely are 10 times more likely to be mentally retarded. Mothers who have not received adequate prenatal care are two or three times more likely to give birth to premature babies. Yet, in 132 large cities, studies have shown that an estimated 455,000 mothers are unable to pay for health care during pregnancy and after birth. This bill will help insure that no child need be born retarded for such reasons, which are wholly in our control.

Briefly, this act amends the Social Security Act to assist States and communities in combating mental retardation through expansion and improvement of maternal and child health and crippled childrens programs, through provision of prenatal, maternity, and child care for individuals with conditions associated with childbearing which may lead to mental retardation, and through planning for comprehensive action to combat mental retardation.

To carry out this program, this act increases the authorization for grants to the States for maternal and child health services from $25 million for each fiscal year to $30 million for the fiscal year 1964, $35 million for the fiscal year 1965, $40 million each for the fiscal years 1966 and 1967, $45 million for each of the fiscal years of 1968 and 1969, and $50 million for each succeeding fiscal year.

It increases the authorization for grants to the States for crippled children's services from $25 million for each fiscal year to the same figure as is authorized for maternal and child health services, as just described.

In addition, it authorizes appropriations of $5 million for the fiscal year 1964, $15 million for the fiscal year 1965; and $30 million for the fiscal years 1966, 1967, and 1968 for grants to assist in reducing the incidence of mental retardation caused by complications associated with childbearing.

Appropriations of up to $8 million each year for grants for research projects in this area are also authorized.

Finally, it authorized an appropriation of $2.2 million to assist States to plan for, and take steps toward the establishment of comprehensive State and community action to combat mental retardation.

In my report last year I noted that the appropriation for these two programs was in conference. On January 21, 1964, President Johnson requested a supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year 1964. Included in his request were funds for these two programs. Public Law 88-268, approved on February 11, 1964, appropriated $41,886,000 for mental retardation programs authorized under these two pieces of legislation.

HEALTH

The protection and improvement of the health of the people of the United States is certainly a legitimate activity of a government which is fulfilling its proper function. For, as Thomas Jefferson said:

> The care of human life and happiness is the first and only legitimate object of good government.

As I have said, this has been a guiding principle of the Democratic Party since its founding in 1792. This Democratic-controlled Congress has been true to its heritage. A description of some of the legislation enacted in the area will bear that out.

HILL-BURTON ACT

In 1946, Congress enacted the Hill-Burton Act—title VI of the Public Health Service Act. Its purpose was to assist the States in an inventory of their hospitals, to survey the need for construction of hospitals, to develop programs for construction of public and other nonprofit hospitals, and to aid in this construction. In addition, it authorized the Surgeon General to make grants for research, experiments, and demonstrations relating to the effective development and utilization of hospital services and facilities, and to promote the coordination of such programs.

The program established by this act, as amended through the years, has been highly successful. As President Johnson said in his message on health services, transmitted to the Congress on February 10, 1964:

> We can be proud of the many fine hospitals throughout the country which were made possible in the last 16 years by the Hill-Burton program of Federal aid.

As of June 30, 1963, this program had resulted in approval of 6,810 hospital and other health facility projects involving total spending of $6.1 billion, of which $1.9 billion were Federal funds. These projects produced 289,489 general, mental, tuberculosis, and long-term-care beds, and helped construct 1,522 rehabilitation centers, public health centers, diagnostic and treatment centers, and other health laboratories and outpatient facilities. In addition, this program has helped to raise State licensing standards, has attracted needed physicians and other health specialists to rural areas, and has encouraged the States to effect better coordination in planning facilities.

The provisions of this act, last amended in 1961, were due to expire this year. But in August President Johnson signed into law a bill extending the Hill-Burton Act for 5 years, to June 30, 1969, with a total authorization of $1,362,500,000. This new act also amends the original act in the following major ways:

In a new program, it authorizes $2.5 million for the fiscal year 1965 and $5 million each year for the fiscal years 1966 to 1969 to enable the Surgeon General to make Federal grants to private agencies and organizations for planning coordinated health facilities. The Federal share is not to exceed one-half of the cost of a project.

The existing grant program for the construction of public and nonprofit hospitals and public health centers was continued and expanded to include grants for hospital modernization. It authorizes a total of $680 million for construction and an additional $160 million for modernization and provides that funds earmarked for modernization will be allotted on a basis which will emphasize aid to hospitals in urban areas.

Finally, it continues provisions of the existing law which permanently authorize $10 million annually for the Surgeon General to conduct research, experiments, and demonstrations on the effective development and utilization of hospitals.

The appropriation for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for the fiscal year 1965 included $245,846,000 for hospital construction.

HEALTH PROFESSIONS EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE ACT

In my report last year, I described in detail the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act of 1963, Public Law 88-129, approved September 24, 1963. It is the culmination of years of effort to enact legislation designed to ease the increasingly serious shortage of doctors and other health personnel. This act authorizes a 3-year, $175 million program of matching grants for the construction of teaching facilities to train physicians, dentists, nurses, and professional public health personnel as well as pharmacists, optometrists, and podiatrists. In addition, the bill authorizes loans for students of medicine, dentistry, and osteopathy enrolled within a 3-year period. This authorization will extend into 6 years at a total estimated cost of $61.4 million.

President Kennedy, in signing this act, called it "one of the most significant health measures passed by the Congress in recent years." Certainly it is one from which all of the citizens will benefit, for, as President Kennedy said:

> With the accelerated national effort initiated by this act, better use will be made of the wealth of new medical knowledge now being gathered in the research laboratories throughout the land to maintain and improve the health of our growing population.

The appropriation for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for the fiscal year 1965 included $110,782,000 for health professions educational aid.

NURSE TRAINING ACT

Certainly our recent overwhelming laboratory successes in developing new drugs and new methods of diagnosis and treatment, and in increasing our knowledge of the nature and causes of the many diseases which plague mankind is of little value while there are not enough trained nurses to carry this new knowledge into the Nation's hospitals and clinics. And at the present time there is a critical shortage of nurses.

In the spring of 1961, the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service appointed a consultant group on nursing to advise him on nursing needs and to identify the appropriate role of the Federal Government in assuring adequate nursing services for the Nation. That group submitted its report in December 1962. According to that document, in order to meet the needs of the Nation in 1970, the United States will need 850,000 nurses, including 300,000 with an academic degree.

At present, there are 550,000 professional nurses in practice and it would not be feasible to increase this number by 300,000 by 1970. Realizing this, the group recommended that the number of nurses be increased by 130,000 to a total of 680,000 by 1970. This will require raising nursing school enrollments by 75 percent. In his February 10 message on health services, President Johnson made several recommendations to help meet this need. Many of them are embodied in the Nurse Training Act passed in August of this year.

This act adds a new title, with the following provisions, to the Public Health Service Act:

First, it authorizes $5 million for the fiscal year 1966, and $10 milion for each of the next 3 fiscal years for the construction or rehabilitation of collegiate schools of nursing, and $10 million for the fiscal year 1966, and $15 million for each of the next 3 fiscal years for the construction or rehabilitation of associate degree or diploma schools of nursing. The expansion of teaching facilities which will be possible because of this authorization, which totals $90 million, is essential if we are to increase the number of nurses. This construction program is patterned after that of the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act discussed above. It was rightly thought that that act was inadequate to the need of expanding nurse training facilities and in aiding nursing schools to improve the quality of their training. Therefore, this act focuses specifically on the nursing problem and provision is made so that collegiate schools of nursing are no longer eligible for construction aid under the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act.

Second, this act authorizes $2 million for the fiscal year 1965, $3 million for the fiscal year 1966, $4 million for the next 3 fiscal years, and such sums as are necessary to complete projects in the next 4 years to assist public and nonprofit collegiate and associate degree schools of nursing to improve and expand nurse training programs. This aspect of the program is designed to provide the quality education which is increasingly necessary as nurses take over some of the highly technical medical procedures once regarded as the prerogative of the physician.

Third, it authorizes $4 million for the fiscal year 1965, $7 million for the fiscal year 1966, and $10 million for the next 3 fiscal years for public and nonprofit diploma schools to defray a portion of the cost of training "federally sponsored" students. These are the students who have received a loan of more than $100 from the loan fund which is established by this act and which I shall describe below. The cost of providing nursing education is generally greater than the income received by the schools from tuition and fees. The deficit incurred by the hospitals which operate nursing schools is borne by the patients in the hospital but the continuing deficit has resulted in the closing of a number of diploma schools. In 1949, there were 1,134 diploma schools in the United States; in 1962, this number has decreased to 875 and some of these face the prospect of closing in the near future. Since this legislation is designed to increase enrollments, it will also increase the costs to diploma schools. This partial reimbursement of these schools should enable the remaining diploma schools to continue in existence and, hopefully, will encourage the establishment of others.

Fourth, this act authorizes $8 million for the fiscal year 1965, $9 million for the fiscal year 1966, $10 million for the fiscal year 1967, $11 million for the fiscal year 1968, and $12 million for the fiscal year 1969 for the training of professional nurses to teach nursing, to serve in administrative or supervisory capacities, or to engage in other professional nursing specialties. This is the extension of a traineeship program established in 1956 and scheduled to expire this year. It has substantially improved the preparation of nurses for leadership positions for the past 7 years and can be expected to continue to do so in the future.

Fifth, this act establishes a student loan program and authorizes $3.1 million for the fiscal year 1965, $8.9 million for the fiscal year 1966, $16.8 million for the fiscal year 1967, $25.3 million for the fiscal year 1968, $30.9 million for the fiscal year 1969 and such sums as are necessary for the next 3 fiscal years to complete the loans granted in 1969. This section is designed to help remove the financial barrier for students wishing to enter schools of nursing. Obviously, this barrier must be lessened if we are to have the nurses we need.

Sixth, this act establishes a National Advisory Council on Nurse Training within the Public Health Service to advise the Surgeon General in the development of regulations and policies needed to administer this act and to review the applications for grants for nursing school construction and for the improvement of nurse training.

In all of its provisions, this act is designed to attack a problem which is national in scope and which must be solved if all citizens are to benefit from our increased medical knowledge. As President Johnson said in signing this bill, it is "truly a notable achievement toward raising standards of health care in the United States."

The appropriation for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for the fiscal year 1965 included $17,600,000 for nurse training.

GRADUATE PUBLIC HEALTH TRAINING AMENDMENTS

The Second National Conference on Public Health Training, called by the Surgeon General in August 1963, devoted itself to public health manpower problems. Their studies proved without doubt that the supply of trained health professionals is not keeping pace with the population growth. In fact, the present rate of training barely offsets attrition and program expansion with little gain in providing more adequate training for the more than 20,000 inadequately trained personnel. In 1958, slightly less than one-half of all professional personnel in State and local health departments had received the training necessary to qualify them fully for their public health responsibilities. Five years later, in 1963, only 51 percent were adequately trained. In addition, more than 5,000 budgeted positions are now vacant in State and local health departments.

To maintain even the present inadequate staffing pattern in State and local health departments in relation to population growth and to offset attrition, at least 17,000 more trained workers must be produced by 1970. Many more public health personnel will also be needed by voluntary health agencies and Federal agencies which have health responsibilities. Many will also be needed to overcome the present acute shortage of teachers so that the faculties of the schools which train public health workers may be augmented.

This year, we have passed a bill designed to help meet this critical problem. This act amends the Public Health Service Act of 1956 to extend the existing program of public health traineeships for an additional 5 years and the existing program of project grants to schools of public health, schools of nursing, and schools of engineering for an additional 4 years. Both programs now carry the identical expiration date of June 30, 1969.

There are two types of traineeships. The long-term traineeship is a comprehensive training course in public health practice and administration, lasting a full academic years. The short-term traineeship, lasting from a few days to a few weeks, creates or improves skills in such areas as chronic diseases, accident prevention, care in nursing homes, and the public health aspects of physical therapy.

Under the project grant program, the Public Health Service has approved nearly 100 different projects to strengthen or expand public health training in 60 schools in the fields of public health, engineering, and nursing. The act passed this year expands the types of institutions which may qualify for project grants to include other public or nonprofit institutions which provide graduate or other specialized training in public health. These would include schools of medicine, dentistry, social work, and pharmacy.

The act contains specific appropriation ceilings for each of the next 5 years totaling $39,500,000.

This is a very significant piece of legislation, for it will help to increase the supply of critically needed professional public health manpower. Only with a sufficient supply of manpower in this field can we assure the protection of the health of our citizens; only with a sufficient supply of manpower in this field can we assure that the medical and scientific knowledge we possess will be put to the service of the general public.

The appropriation for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for the fiscal year 1965 includes $5 million for this program.

MEDICAL CARE FOR FISHING-BOAT OWNERS

In August of this year, President Johnson signed into law a bill designed to correct what the majority of the Members of this Congress consider to be an inequity. From 1798 to 1954, self-employed U.S. fishermen were eligible for medical care, without charge, in hospitals, outpatient clinics, and other medical facilities of the Public Health Service in the event of illness or injury incurred while engaged in their hazardous but essential industry.

In 1954, an administrative ruling differentiated between wage-earning fishermen and their coworkers who held ownership or part ownership in the craft from which they fished. Under this ruling, medical benefits formerly enjoyed by all were retained by the former but denied to the self-employed, although both risk the same disabling misfortunes and perils. This ruling was based upon an interpretation of the provision in the Public Health Service Act which provided aid for "seamen employed on vessels of the United States." The Public Health Service rules that the term "employed" referred to services rendered in an employee status.

The ruling created an unfortunate situation which imposed present or potential hardship on an estimated 10,000 fishing-boat owners.

The act passed this year will remove the inequity created by the 1954 ruling. It amends the Public Health Service Act to permit owners of fishing boats again to receive medical care and hospitalization without charge at hospitals of the U.S. Public Health Service.

SAFETY

Certainly the protection of the health of the citizens rightfully includes control over various types of dangerous substances and products. This Democratic-controlled Congress has not neglected this aspect of its responsibility.

CLEAN AIR ACT

In my report on the 1st session of the 88th Congress, I described Public Law 88–206, the Clean Air Act, signed by President Johnson on December 17, 1963. With air pollution an increasingly serious national problem, we moved to strengthen Federal, State, and local air pollution control programs by enacting a $95 million, 3-year, greatly expanded national effort to control air pollution through research, the establishment of pollution and control agencies, and legal action to halt existing causes of pollution brought about by urbanization, industrial development, and the increasing use of motor vehicles. Matching Federal grants are provided for State and local programs.

In signing this act, President Johnson rightly described air pollution as "a serious and growing threat to both our health and our safety." It is imperative that preventative and remedial action be taken to halt the trend toward greater contamination of our atmosphere. This act is at least the beginning of a solution to the problem.

PASSENGER SAFETY STANDARDS FOR GOVERNMENT MOTOR VEHICLES

Traffic accidents exact a very heavy toll in human life, health, and property in the United States. Every year nearly 3 million Americans are injured on our highways. In 1963, more than 43,000 persons were killed. The direct and indirect loss in 1963 from those 43,000 deaths and 3 million injuries has been estimated by the National Safety Council at more than $8 billion. Obviously, this is a major health problem.

This year we have enacted legislation designed to promote the increased adoption of safety equipment in motor vehicles. This measure provides that no motor vehicle manufactured on or after the date of enactment will be purchased by the Federal Government for use by the legislative, executive, or judicial branches of the U.S. Government or by the government of the District of Columbia unless it is equipped with such reasonable passenger safety devices as the Administrator of the General Services Administration shall require. The Administrator is directed to prescribe these standards and to publish them in the Federal Register and they will take effect 1 year and 90 days thereafter.

This act is intended to provide maximum safety protection to passengers in federally owned motor vehicles and to set a national example for the public which will encourage greater use of available proven safety devices on automobiles. Although the General Services Administration has—and uses—the power under existing law to prescribe procurement standards for motor vehicles acquired for the use of executive agencies, this legislation represents the express affirmation of Congress of the need for continuing attention to this important aspect of safety.

AUTOMOBILE SEAT BELT STANDARDS

And in my report last year, I spoke of the bill passed by the first session which requires that the manufacturers of automobile seat belts sold or shipped in interstate commerce meet certain safety requirements. The Secretary of Commerce is directed to prescribe and publish minimum safety standards for seat belts, and punishment for violations of these standards is prescribed.

PESTICIDES REGISTRATION

The past few years have witnessed a growing public concern about the safety of pesticides and the effectiveness of Federal pesticide-control policies. In her 1962 book, "The Silent Spring," Rachel Carson argued that many of the deadly pesticides and organic phosphates in use have unknown and cumulative effects which cannot be determined without many years of tests and experience. She concluded that with so much to be learned about the effect of these substances on human, animal, and plant life, they should not be so readily available for use until after far more exhaustive testing and experience.

Following publication of Miss Carson's book, President Kennedy ordered his Science Advisory Committee to look into the hazard of pesticides. Their report, released on May 15, 1963, stressed the great benefits derived from the use of pesticides but also pointed out that their greatly increased use had added to environmental contamination. The report concluded that too little is known of the long-term effects of pesticide poisoning on man and wildlife, and recommended the orderly reduction in the use of some pesticides and research to produce better and safer chemicals.

Another factor in this growing concern over the possible long-range effects of chemical accumulation in man and animals was what has been termed the "Mississippi River fish kill." In the last 4 years, it is estimated that 10 million fish have died in the lower Mississippi River basin. Because traces of pesticides have been found in the dead fish, serious doubt is cast on the premise that pesticides stay where they are applied and also on the contention that pesticides, used under conditions now considered safe, will not build up to poison the environment. In addition to the potential danger to man, tens of thousands of jobs and millions of dollars of fishery products are involved in the pesticide threat.

This was not a new area of concern for the Congress of the United States. In 1947, we passed the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act which required that the labels of all pesticide chemicals used against insects, fungi, and rodents, and certain other pesticides, be registered with the Department of Agriculture before the products could be sold in interstate commerce. In seeking registration, the manufacturer had to show that labeling claims made for his product's safety and effectiveness were correct. The Department of Agriculture was empowered to refuse to label a product if it was mislabeled, ineffective, or excessively dangerous to organisms other than those it was intended to control or if the package failed to warn that the substance was dangerous and to give directions for proper use.

A second measure was the pesticide chemical amendments to the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, passed in 1954. They were intended to establish a better procedure for determining in advance the quantity and types of chemical residues which could be left in or on fresh products which were to be offered for sale after spraying or other chemical treatment.

This year we took a further step. On May 12, President Johnson signed a pesticide-control act which he said would help to safeguard American health and lives. This act made three major changes in the 1947 Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act.

First, under the 1947 act, if the Department of Agriculture refused to approve a label, the manufacturer could register it under protest and market the product. In order to force it off the market, the Department of Agriculture had to prove that it was unsafe. Under the amendments approved this year, the right to protest registration was abolished. If an application for label registration is disapproved, the manufacturer can appeal to an advisory committee of experts and, if still unsatisfied, to the courts. In both cases, he must bear the responsibility for proving that the product is safe.

Second, under the 1947 act, if the Secretary of Agriculture found an already registered product to be unsafe, he was required to prove it unsafe in court in order to force it off the market. The new act permits him to suspend marketing immediately and sets up procedures to expedite hearings.

Third, under the old law a pesticide was considered to be misbranded if the label indicated that it had been registered under the act. This was because the Department of Agriculture did not wish to appear to be endorsing any product. The new act amends this to permit labeling of the registration number.

It is anticipated that these changes will tighten up the control over these potentially dangerous products and fulfill the Government's responsibility to protect the health and safety of the citizens.

GENERAL WELFARE

The Constitution of the United States empowers the Congress to provide for the general welfare and, certainly, all of the legislation which I am discussing is designed to promote the general welfare. But as I use these terms here, I refer to those programs of the Government which are intended to extend opportunity to persons who are restricted in their access to the benefits of our society because of the handicap of economic need.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT

From early New Deal days until the mid-1950's, substantial progress was made in lifting the incomes of our neediest families. This progress was not accidental. New Deal social and economic programs, like minimum wages and fair labor standards, social insurance and welfare aids for the aged, survivors, unemployed and indigent, were purposely designed to aid the neediest. Encouragement of the growth of unions helped lift the earnings of millions of the underpaid.

Rising postwar production and employment until the mid-1950's helped to continue this trend. Families with a cash income of less than $3,000, in 1962 dollars, dropped from 32 percent of the total in 1947 to 23 percent in 1956.

Since the mid-1950's however, that portion of our families still impoverished has remained practically stationary. Despite the continuing rise in the well-being of most Americans, families with incomes below $3,000 dropped only to 20 percent of the total in 1962. In fact, between 1956 and 1962 the share of total personal income going to the neediest one-fifth of our families actually went down.

At the present time, in the mid-20th century, one-fifth of our people have not shared in the economic abundance which has been granted to most of us. There were 47 million families in the United States in 1962. Fully 9.3 million families, comprising 30 million persons, had total money incomes below $3,000. More than 11 million of these family members were children, one-sixth of our youth. More than 1.1 million families are attempting to raise four or more children on such an income. Moreover, 5.4 million of these families, containing more than 17 million persons, had total incomes below $2,000. More than 1 million children are being raised in very large families—six or more children—with incomes of less than $2,000.

Just who are the poor? The 1964 annual report of the Council of Economic Advisers reports that of this 9.3 million families living in poverty, 22 percent are nonwhite; nearly one-half of all nonwhites live in poverty. The heads of more than 60 percent of all poor families have only a grade school education. One-third of all poor families are headed by a person over 65 and almost one-half of all families headed by such a person are poor. Of the poor, 54 percent live in cities, 16 percent on farms, and the remaining 30 percent are rural nonfarm residents. More than 40 percent of all farm families are poor. More than 80 percent of nonwhite farmers live in poverty. One-quarter of the poor families are headed by a woman; nearly one-half of all families headed by a woman are poor. Poverty is not confined to the unemployed; nearly one-half of the heads of poor families are gainfully employed. Poverty is not confined to any region of the country; the poor are to be found in every State of the Union and in nearly every community of any significant size.

When these characteristics of the poor are analyzed, the pervasiveness and complexity of the problem become apparent. The classifications used above reveal some of the major causes of poverty—lack of education, racial discrimination, unemployment, and so forth. There is a high degree of interaction between the causes of poverty which create "vicious circle" effects; the children of the poor are usually poorly educated and confined to low-income occupations.

The worst effect of poverty is the alienation of the individuals concerned. They are deprived of human dignity and fulfillment and exist without hope in a world scarcely recognizable and rarely seen by their fellow Americans. But poverty is costly not only to the poor but to the whole of society. Its ugly byproducts include ignorance, disease, delinquency, crime, irresponsibility, immorality, indifference. Poverty is not a private or local concern; it is a social and national problem. Its solution or mitigation would greatly benefit all of the citizens. If we could increase the average production of even 10 million earners among the poor, enough to lift their earnings a modest $1,000 each year, the Nation would have added $14 million a year to the national output. Whenever we give more people the chance to produce and consume we create new industry, higher production, increased earnings, and better income for all.

A solution to this problem would also mean reduction in costs of public welfare assistance and other services to the poor. Public assistance payments now cost us $4 billion each year, not to mention the costs of fighting delinquency, crime, disease, hunger, and the other products of poverty.

Unlike many undeveloped countries, the United States has the productive capacity to provide an adequate level of living for all of its citizens. At present, 4 million workers and 13 percent of our industrial capacity are not being utilized. It is apparent that this country has the capacity and the opportunity to face the problem of poverty and its attendant social evils. Until the technological advances of the 20th century made abundance a reality, the elimination of mass poverty was an unreasonable goal. Today, that is no longer true. As Gunnar Myrdal has pointed out in his recent book, "Challenge to Affluence":

> Never in the history of America has there been a greater and more complete identity between the ideals of social justice and the requirements of economic progress.

The Nation's most important resource is its people. No democratic government dare neglect the pervasive problem of poverty in the midst of widespread affluence.

President Johnson recognized this fact and proposed a realistic program wherein all possible resources will be mobilized to combat the needless wastes, costs, and ravages of poverty. His program attacks causes, not symptoms. And because the causes are so intricately linked and are continually interacting, the program is highly coordinated and multifaceted.

The proposal was heralded in his state of the Union message, transmitted to the Congress last January, in which he declared an "unconditional war on poverty in America." Again, in his economic report, he described as a major objective of his administration the effectuation of Government programs designed to eliminate poverty. And in a special message to Congress on March 16, President Johnson delineated and described his proposals. This Democratic-controlled Congress has enacted the President's program because a majority of the Members of both bodies are truly convinced that the United States will achieve its full economic and social potential only if every individual has an opportunity to contribute to the full extent of his capabilities and to participate in the workings of our society. The Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is designed to allow all of our citizens to do just that.

Title I of the act is devoted to programs for youth. To strike at the roots of poverty, the vicious cycle which runs from low income to inadequate education, and from inadequate education to economic incapacity must be broken. A concentration upon youth offers the best prospects for breaking the cycle and halting the transmission of defeatism and despair from one generation to another.

Part A established a Job Corps as a means of increasing the employability of young men and women aged 16 through 21. These young men and women will be provided with education, vocational training, and useful work experience, including work directed toward the conservation of natural resources, in rural and urban residential centers. The Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity—which Office I shall discuss later—is authorized to enter into agreements with any Federal, State, or local agency, or private organization for the establishment and operation of the conservation camps and training centers and for the provision of such facilities and services as, in his judgment, are needed. Where possible, education and training will be provided through local public educational agencies or by private vocational educational institutions or technical institutes where such institutions or technical institutes can provide substantially equivalent training with reduced Federal expenditures.

Further, he is authorized to arrange for the provision of programs of useful work experience and other appropriate activities for enrollees and to prescribe such rules and regulations as he deems necessary to provide for the selection of enrollees and to govern their conduct after enrollment.

The total enrollment of any individual in the Corps will not exceed 2 years except in special cases.

Enrollees will be provided with such living, travel, and leave allowances, and such quarters, subsistence, transportation, equipment, clothing, recreational services, medical, dental, hospital, and other health services, and other expenses as the Director deems necessary or appropriate to their needs.

No conservation camp, training center, or similar facility will be established within a State unless a plan setting forth the proposed establishment has been submitted to the Governor of the State and has not been disapproved by him within 30 days.

Within the Job Corps, there will be a Youth Conservation Corps in which no less than 40 percent of the enrollees will be assigned to camps where their work activity will be directed primarily toward conserving, developing, and managing the public natural resources of the Nation and developing, managing, and protecting public recreational areas.

Part B concerns work-training programs. The purpose of this program is to provide useful work experience opportunities for unemployed young men and women aged 16 through 21 through participation in State and community work-training programs so that their employability may be increased or their education resumed or continued, and in order that public agencies and private nonprofit organizations will be enabled to carry out programs which will contribute to the public interest and which would not otherwise be provided.

In order to carry out this purpose, the Director will assist and cooperate with State and local agencies and private nonprofit organizations in developing suitable programs. In approving the programs submitted to him, the Director will give priority to those with high training potential.

Federal assistance to any program approved will be up to 90 percent of the costs of the program for the first 2 years and up to 50 percent thereafter, unless the Director determines that additional funds are necessary.

The Director will establish criteria based upon population, unemployment, and family income levels in distributing assistance to the States under this section. Not more than 12.5 percent of the funds for any fiscal year will go to any one State.

Part C deals with work-study programs. Their purpose is to stimulate and promote the part-time employment of students in institutions of higher education. Only students who are from low-income families and are in need of the earnings from such employment to pursue their courses will participate. The Director will make grants to institutions of higher education to assist in the operation of the program, and the students will work for the institution itself or for a public or private nonprofit organization. The work will be related to the student's educational objective or will be in the public interest on a project which would not otherwise be undertaken. Students in the program must, in the opinion of the institution, be capable of maintaining good standing in their courses of study while employed under the program.

One-third of the funds will be allocated on the basis of the number of college students in each State, one-third on the basis of the number of high school graduates in each State, and one-third on the basis of the number of children under 18 years of age living in families with annual incomes of less than $3,000 in each State. The Federal share of the compensation of students employed in the work-study program will not exceed 90 percent for the first 2 years and 75 percent thereafter.

Title II is devoted to urban and rural community action programs. Part A, entitled "General Community Action

Programs," is designed to provide stimulation and incentive for urban and rural communities to mobilize their resources to combat poverty. The programs must provide services, assistance, and other activities of sufficient scope and size to give promise of progress toward the elimination of poverty or the cause or causes of poverty through the development of employment opportunities, the improvement of human performance, motivation and productivity, or the betterment of conditions under which people live, learn, and work. They are to be developed, administered, and conducted with the maximum feasible participation of residents of the area and are conducted, administered, or coordinated by a public or private nonprofit agency.

The Director is authorized to make grants to or to contract with appropriate public or private nonprofit agencies to pay part or all of the costs of a community action program which has been approved by him. He is directed to give special consideration to those programs which give promise of effecting a permanent increase in the capacity of individuals, groups, and communities to deal with their problems without further assistance. He is authorized to provide technical assistance to communities in developing, conducting, and administering their programs and training for specialized personnel needed to develop, conduct, or administer the programs.

Fifteen percent of the funds authorized for these programs may be used for the conduct of research, training, and demonstrations pertaining to community action programs. Twenty percent of the Federal funds will be allotted among the States at the discretion of the Director. Of the remainder, one-third will be allotted on the basis of the number of public assistance recipients in each State, one-third on the basis of the annual average number of persons unemployed in each State, and one-third on the basis of the number of children under 18 years of age living in families with annual incomes of less than $1,000 in each State. Federal assistance will not exceed 90 percent for the first 2 years and 50 percent thereafter unless the Director determines that assistance in excess of these percentages is required to carry out the purposes of this section.

Part B deals with adult basic education programs. It is the purpose of this part to initiate programs of instruction for individuals who have attained age 18 and whose inability to read and write the English language constitutes a substantial impairment of their ability to get or retain employment commensurate with their real ability.

The Director is authorized to make grants to the States which have adult basic education programs which have been approved by him. Federal funds will be allocated by the Director on the basis of the relative number of individuals in each State who have attained age 18 and who have completed not more than five grades of school. For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, the Federal share for each State will be 90 percent. For the succeeding fiscal year, the Federal share for any State will be 50 percent.

Part C concerns voluntary assistance programs for needy children. The purpose of this part is to allow individual Americans to participate in a personal way in the war on poverty by voluntarily assisting in the support of one or more needy children. The Director is authorized to establish a section in the Office of Economic Opportunity to act as an information and coordination center to encourage this voluntary assistance.

Title III covers special programs to combat poverty in rural areas. Part A is a grant of authority to the Director to make loans and grants. He is authorized to make loans having a maximum maturity of 15 years in amounts not exceeding $2,500 to any low-income rural family where, in the judgment of the Director, such loans have a reasonable possibility of effecting a permanent increase in the income of such families. He may also make loans to local cooperative associations which furnish essential processing, purchasing, or marketing services, or supplies or facilities predominantly to low-income rural families.

Loans will be made under this section only if there is a reasonable assurance of repayment and if credit is not otherwise available on reasonable terms from private sources or other Federal, State, or local programs.

Part B provides assistance for migrant and other seasonally employed agricultural workers and their families. It authorizes the Director to develop and implement a program to assist the States, political subdivisions of States, public and nonprofit agencies, institutions, organizations, farm associations, or individuals in establishing and operating programs of assistance for migrant and other seasonally employed agricultural employees and their families. The programs will be limited to housing, sanitation, education, and the day care of children. Institutions, organizations, farm associations, and individuals are limited to direct loans only.

Part D provides for indemnity payments to dairy farmers. It authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to make payments at a fair market value to dairy farmers ordered since January 1, 1964, to remove their milk from the market because it contained pesticides approved by the Government at the time of their use. It authorizes appropriations of the necessary sums to compensate the farmers until the expiration of the program on January 31, 1965.

Title IV concerns employment and investment incentives. The purpose here is to assist in the establishment, preservation, and strengthening of small business concerns and to improve their managerial skills. The Director is authorized to make, participate in, or guarantee loans, repayable in not more than 15 years, to any small business or any person interested in establishing a small business. Loans will not exceed $25,000 at any one time and in making them the Director will give consideration to their possible effect upon the employment of the long-term unemployed.

These loans will not be made in any community for which the Director has approved a community-action program unless this financial assistance is consistent with the program.

Authority to make these loans expires June 30, 1967.

Title V relates to work-experience programs. Its purpose is to expand the opportunities for constructive work experience available to persons who are unable to support or care for themselves or their families. The Director is authorized to transfer appropriated funds to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for pilot projects to employ and train heads of families receiving help under the aid to families with dependent children program. The Federal Government will pay the entire cost of these projects in the fiscal year 1965.

Title VI provides for the establishment of an Office of Economic Opportunity in the Executive Office of the President. It is headed by a Director appointed by the President by and with the consent of the Senate. This Office will administer and coordinate the entire program.

This title also authorizes the Director to recruit, select, train, and, upon the request of State or local agencies or private nonprofit organizations, refer volunteers to perform duties in furtherance of programs combating poverty at the State or local level. They will work in meeting the health, education, welfare, and related needs of Indians living on reservations, of migratory workers, residents of the District of Columbia and of United States territories, and of the mentally ill and retarded.

These Volunteers in Service to America will receive a stipend not exceeding $50 each month and such living, travel, and leave allowance, and housing, transportation, supplies, equipment, clothing, subsistence, health and dental care as the Director deems necessary or appropriate for their needs.

It also establishes an Economic Opportunity Council, composed of Federal department and agency heads, to consult with and advise the Director and a National Advisory Council, composed of the Director and 14 representatives of the public in general and appropriate fields of endeavor related to the purpose of the act.

This is the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. I have taken the time to review its provisions in detail because I think only in this way is it brought home clearly that this is a multifaced attack upon the causes of poverty. Only in this way is it clear, too, that this is not a giveaway program. It is called the Economic Opportunity Act because it offers far-reaching opportunities to those who have not been able to share in the abundance enjoyed by most of us. It offers them an opportunity to help themselves. It is a commitment by this Congress and this Nation to dedicate themselves to the elimination of deprivation and dependency in this land. It is an imaginative, earnest beginning to the war on poverty. This is a war well worth fighting.

The supplemental act for the fiscal year 1965 included $800 million for the implementation of this program.

FOOD STAMP ACT

On August 11, Congress sent to President Johnson legislation which expands and makes permanent a pilot program begun by President Kennedy in 1961. I refer to the food stamp program which was inaugurated in McDowell County, W. Va., in 1961, and gradually expanded until in March of this year programs were in effect in 43 rural and urban areas in 22 States with some 392,000 participants.

These programs were initiated by administrative order in 1961. The basic authority was section 32 of an act of August 24, 1935, which authorizes expenditures to encourage the domestic consumption of agricultural commodities through "benefits, indemnities, donation, or by other means among persons in low-income groups as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture." This same authority was used previously by the Department to operate a food stamp plan between 1939 and 1943. That plan had proved to be an effective method of increasing food consumption among the participating households and was only discontinued in 1943 when wartime conditions had greatly reduced unemployment and substantially increased demands upon U.S. food supplies. The authority granted in the 1935 act could legally be used to continue the programs begun in 1961 under the complete discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture. But section 32 of that act provides no guidelines or congressional controls over the operating details or size of the program. The bill we passed this year supplies this need.

President Johnson, in his message on the agricultural economy, transmitted to the Congress on January 31, and in his message on the antipoverty campaign of March 16, recommended that this program be made permanent and more widely available. The bill we have passed authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to administer a food stamp program and authorizes $375 million over the fiscal years 1965 to 1967 to meet the costs of expanding the program.

The food stamp program works in this manner: A State requests that a program be established in a certain area within its boundaries. That State then develops a plan of operation and submits it to the Department of Agriculture; and upon approval by the Department, the State certifies low-income households as eligible under the program. These needy families then exchange the amount of money which they would normally spend for food for coupons of a higher monetary value. The difference between the amounts the households pay and the value of the coupons received represents the Federal contribution.

The participating families use their coupons to purchase food out of regular commercial supplies at approved retail stores. Retailers redeem the coupons through the facilities of the commercial banking system.

The program is made available in any area only if the State requests it, submits a plan setting out eligibility standards consistent with other State programs and accepts the responsibility for local administration. As I have said, there were 43 programs in effect in March of this year. At that time, there were on file in the Department of Agriculture 234 additional requests for the program.

This has been a very effective program. It serves two worthy objectives simultaneously: the strengthening of the agricultural economy and the alleviation of distress among the needy of this Nation. It is a reasonable and just answer to the contradiction of vast food surpluses and hungry Americans. From the Government standpoint, it has a definite advantage over direct distribution in that there is no physical handling of food and no need to set up a distribution system to rival the regular retail outlets. The majority of this body sincerely believe that this is one of the best means yet found to maintain the health and efficiency of our low-income citizens and to maintain a higher level of farm income by enlarging and stabilizing the demand for food.

The Supplemental Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1965 included $25 million for the food stamp program.

HOUSING

In a special message transmitted to the Congress on January 27, 1964, President Johnson defined the goal of this administration in the area of housing as "a decent home in a decent neighborhood for every American family." The attainment of this goal necessarily requires attention to the housing needs of the neglected segments of our population. Rightly, then, this Democratic-controlled Congress has turned its attention to those needs.

HOUSING ACT OF 1964

This year we passed the first Omnibus Housing Act brought before the Congress since the enactment of the Housing Act of 1961. Like the act of 1961 and the housing acts of prior years, it covers a broad range of housing and community development programs and activities. In addition to extending the programs which are already operative, many changes were made to improve them and make them more workable. There are a number of features which should prove beneficial to the less fortunate members of our society by permitting them to participate more fully in the benefits of these programs. This applies particularly to low-income families, to elderly people, to those who are handicapped, and to those who are displaced from their dwellings.

I should like to take a moment here to note that this housing act will be the last to be associated in the minds of all of us with our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Alabama, ALBERT RAINS. For many years, the great strides which we have made in the area of housing have borne the imprint of that gentleman. His voluntary retirement at the close of this session is a loss to all of us.

Title I is devoted to Federal Housing Administration—FHA—mortgage insurance programs. The purpose of the changes in these programs is to make them more workable and, consequently, to encourage further the investment of private funds in the provision and improvement of housing. This section raises the dollar limit on the amount of home mortgage which can be insured by the FHA from $25,000 to $30,000 in the case of a one-family home, from $27,500 to $32,500 in the case of a two- or three-family home, and from $35,000 to $37,500 in the case of a four-family home.

It also raises the dollar limit on the amount of a mortgage which can be insured by the FHA on low-cost housing in nonurban areas from $9,000 to $11,000.

Under this title, the criteria under which the FHA insures home improvement loans for homes outside urban renewal areas is broadened to include property which is "an acceptable risk." Home mortgagees whose payments on FHA-insured loans are in default due to circumstances beyond their control are granted relief through a provision permitting lenders to extend the periods over which mortgagees can repay loans. In the same vein, additional protection against foreclosure for FHA-insured homeowners is provided.

In the area of rental housing, a provision of the National Housing Act limiting FHA-insured rental housing mortgages to the cost of physical improvements was eliminated by this new act and the FHA multifamily rental housing programs were amended by eliminating the per-room dollar limit on the maximum amount of an insured mortgage and substituting a limit based upon the number of family units in a project. Rental housing better suited for family living will result from this change in the method of computing the maximum amount of an insured rental housing mortgage.

In the area of cooperative housing projects, loans insured by the FHA are made available for a broader range of purposes than was formerly the case.

The FHA-insured home improvement loan program is expanded by this act to include loans to pay municipal charges against a property, such as charges for sewer or water facilities.

Approved private development and building organizations and private nonprofit nursing homes are now permitted to obtain FHA-insured mortgages.

FHA-insured mortgages have been available under the National Housing Act for condominium housing—apartments in a multifamily dwelling which are individually owned and have individual mortgages. But this new act amends that program by raising the dollar limit on the amount of mortgages which can be insured, by extending the term of such mortgages, and by authorizing the insurance of blanket mortgages to finance the construction of projects to be sold as condominiums.

This act amends the prior law to allow a nonprofit educational institution to pay an FHA-insured mortgage prior to its maturity without paying an adjusted premium charge and authorizes the FHA to aid homeowners who find structural defects in houses purchased with FHA-insured loans.

Title II relates to housing for the elderly and the handicapped. It authorizes an additional $75 million in appropriations for direct loans for housing for the elderly and makes individual elderly persons eligible for FHA-financed low- and moderate-income housing. It also extends a number of the existing programs for the elderly to the handicapped.

Title III concerns urban renewal. It provides that 3 years after enactment of this law, no locality will be certified to receive Federal urban renewal or public housing assistance unless it has had a minimum standards housing code in effect for at least 6 months. Such codes relate to health, sanitation, and occupancy requirements. Urban renewal funds may be used to enforce housing codes in urban renewal areas if the locality agrees to increase its code enforcement expenditures by an amount at least equal to the required local contribution to the Federal activities.

This section of the act requires that local agencies assure adequate housing for individuals as well as for families displaced by urban renewal projects and requires the Administrators of the Housing and Home Finance Agency and the Small Business Administration to provide relocation assistance and information to persons and businesses displaced by urban renewal or public housing projects.

Individuals as well as families are made eligible for rental or cooperative moderate-income housing built on property in an urban renewal area. No demolition project for urban renewal can be started unless the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency determines that the same objectives cannot be achieved by rehabilitation.

This title authorizes urban renewal projects for "air rights developments" to provide elevated sites for low- or moderate-income housing. Air rights projects will be undertaken in an area which is not in itself a slum but which consists primarily of land in highways, railways, or similar facilities which have a blighting influence. Projects will include the construction of foundations and platforms over such facilities as well as the acquisition of development rights. No more than 5 percent of the total urban renewal capital grants authorized by the act may be used for the development of air rights sites.

Relocation benefits to persons and small businesses displaced from urban renewal areas and public housing sites are increased. To businesses with annual earnings of less than $10,000, the sum of $1,500, in addition to payments of up to $3,000 for moving expenses and direct losses of property, is authorized. To individuals over 62 years of age and low-income families, up to $500 for monthly rental payments over a 5-month period is authorized. This is in addition to the existing payments of up to $200 for moving expenses and direct losses of property. Relocation payments will be made to persons displaced after January 27, 1964, only if they are unable to find a home in a low-rent housing project.

This title institutes a new program of low interest—3 percent—loans with a 20-year maturity to property owners in urban renewal areas to finance the rehabilitation required to conform to the housing code or to carry out the objectives of the urban renewal plan. It is anticipated that this new program—for which $50 million is authorized—will reduce the need for demolition and removal of structures which can be rehabilitated.

Thirty million dollars is authorized for urban planning grants to communities of less than 50,000 population and city and regional planning agencies are permitted to receive such grants directly, with the Governor or State agency's assent.

Urban planning aid is authorized for areas where employment opportunities are reduced because of the withdrawal of a Federal installation or a decline in Federal orders or activities. Such aid is also authorized for any depressed area, without regard to population, which qualifies for assistance under the area redevelopment program. The Federal share for planning in such an area is raised from two-thirds to three-fourths. Urban planning aid is also authorized for Indian reservations and to counties with over 50,000 population. Funds for the latter are limited to 15 percent of the total appropriation for the urban planning program. Prior to this act, only counties with less than 50,000 population were eligible for urban renewal aid except under certain circumstances.

Seven hundred and twenty-five million dollars for urban renewal capital grants is authorized under this title. Of this amount, $5 million will be used for urban renewal demonstration programs.

Title IV covers public housing for low-income families. It makes single low-income persons displaced by urban renewal eligible for low-rent public housing and authorizes a special subsidy of up to $120 per year to a housing unit occupied by persons displaced by urban renewal projects who cannot pay the regular rental charged to other low-income families.

Under this title, we authorized $30,250,000 to contract for the serving of 37,500 additional public housing units. These new units are urgently needed to meet the backlog of applications now on hand, a backlog amounting to over 40,000 units for which the Public Housing Administration had no authorization. We also authorized $5 million in grants for public housing demonstration projects.

Title V concerns rural housing. Here we extended the rural housing programs, including those for the elderly, through September 30, 1965, and increased the maximum insurable mortgage under the rural rental housing program for the elderly from $100,000 to $300,000. For this program we authorized $150 million.

In addition, we instituted a new grant program to pay up to two-thirds of the development cost of low-rent housing for domestic farm laborers. Ten million dollars is authorized for this program. Applicants for the grants will not be allowed to charge rentals exceeding amounts approved by the Secretary of Agriculture and will be required to maintain the housing in good condition.

Title VI concerns community facilities. Here we made minor amendments which will have the effect of reducing restrictions on certain recipients of public works planning loans. We also increased from $50,000 to $100,000 the amount available to the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency to conduct surveys of State and local public works planning. Twenty million dollars for public works planning advances is authorized.

Title VII concerns the Federal National Mortgage Association. Under existing law, the FNMA must acquire its funds from the Treasury by congressional authority. But this new act authorizes that agency to pool its first mortgages and to sell participations or interests in the pool to private investors. This will enable the FNMA to obtain cash to carry out certain functions, including the purchase of special mortgages on selected types of structures, such as nursing homes. This act also removes the present $20,000 limit on the mortgages which FNMA can purchase under its secondary market operations and increases the maximum amount of any short-term loan made by FNMA from 80 to 90 percent of the unpaid principal of the mortgage.

Title VIII covers training and fellowship programs. It establishes a new system of Federal-State training and research programs to develop skills in community development. The purpose of this program is to encourage States, along with colleges and universities, to develop training programs for technical and professional persons who will become administrators in local community development programs. Well-trained persons at the local level will repay the Federal share of the costs of these training programs many times over in improved efficiency in the use of Federal funds made available for urban renewal, urban planning, waste treatment facilities, highways, and so forth.

This title authorizes 50–50 matching grants to the States for these programs after a State plan has been approved by the Administrator. Ten million dollars is authorized for this program.

This title also authorizes a new 3-year program to provide fellowships in colleges and universities for the graduate training of professional city planning and urban and housing technicians and specialists. We authorized $500,000 for this program for each of the next 3 fiscal years.

Title IX concerns savings and loan associations. The provisions here are designed to strengthen our savings and loan associations so that they may meet the expanding needs of the communities they serve. Here we extended the basic lending area of a federally chartered savings and loan association to 100 miles, rather than 50 miles, from its home office. We raised from $35,000 to $40,000 the maximum loan on a single-family home, removed the limitation on the aggregate amount which can be loaned outside the basic lending area, and allowed investments of up to 5 percent of an association's assets in property in urban renewal areas.

This title also amends prior legislation to permit loans secured by a leasehold if the term of the leasehold does not expire for at least 15 years after the maturity of the loan and to permit an association to invest 2 percent of its assets in a savings and loan corporation located in the State of the association's home office. A Federal home loan bank is permitted to accept nonfederally insured home mortgages with maturities of up to 30 years and amounts up to $40,000—instead of 25 years and $35,000—as collateral for loans to its members. In addition, an association is permitted to invest in Government and municipal bonds and to invest up to 20 percent—rather than 15 percent—of its assets in federally insured loans for property alteration or improvement and the limit on such loans is raised from $3,500 to $5,000.

All of these provisions, and others which I shall not enumerate, will help to expand the service and broaden the scope of the savings and loan associations. They are invaluable local community institutions which today constitute by far the largest single source of home mortgage financing as well as a major channel of savings and investment for the average citizen.

Title X is the miscellaneous title. It makes minor amendments to existing legislation to settle specific problems in certain geographical areas of the country.

In all, this Housing Act of 1964 authorizes a total of $1,100,500,000, excluding new public housing units, to maintain these programs through September 30, 1965.

In signing this act, President Johnson thanked the Members of Congress for making "the most constructive attack by any Congress on the challenge of keeping America a fit and a fine place for our families." This is indeed a noteworthy achievement. But perhaps its more basic significance lies in the fact that it is an extension of opportunity to those who have benefited least from the abundance of this Nation. Again, as President Johnson said, it "carries forward our continuing efforts to eradicate slums and blight in our cities, to assure decent housing for those least able to find it—the poor, the elderly, the severely handicapped, and those in our rural areas."

HOUSING FACILITIES FOR THE ELDERLY

The record of this Democratic-controlled Congress in extending aid to our senior citizens to enable them to improve their housing conditions is indeed a notable one. In fact, we might even go back a year and mention the Senior Citizens Housing Act passed by the Democratic-controlled 2d session of the 87th Congress. That act authorized a $200 million expansion of Federal programs for the promotion of better housing for the elderly.

Last year, as I described in some detail in my report for the first session, we passed Public Law 88–158 which authorized an additional $50 million in loans to nonprofit corporations and consumer cooperatives to provide housing for the elderly.

On June 30, 1964, President Johnson signed Public Law 88–340, another indication of our continuing commitment to the alleviation of the problems of the estimated one-half of our aged population who live in substandard housing or housing unsuited to their special needs.

This act extended the program of insured rental housing loans for the elderly in rural areas for 90 days, to September 30, 1964. This was admittedly a stopgap measure designed to prevent the termination of a promising program which was set up under the Senior Citizens Housing Act of 1962 and which was due to terminate on June 30 of this year.

The omnibus housing act, discussed above, extends this program but that measure had not been enacted by June 30 when this particular program was due to terminate.

This is a program which permits the Secretary of Agriculture to insure loans made by private companies to individuals or companies to build rural rental housing for the elderly.

This is a necessary program. Nearly one-third of our elderly live on farms or in small towns. More than 1 million rural families live in homes of such poor condition that they endanger the safety and health of the occupants. This program, while new and conducted on a limited scale, is a very promising one.

CIVIL RIGHTS

The year 1963—the 100th anniversary of Abraham Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation—was a year of moral crisis for the American conscience as the fight for human dignity and equality of opportunity for all Americans moved into the legislative arena with great urgency. As Abraham M. Sonnabend wrote in "The People Take the Lead: A Record of Progress in Civil Rights, 1954–64:

> Historians may well look back on this period as the turning point of the second American revolution—a constructive revolution to realize in full, for all our people, the freedoms which are our heritage.

It is a fact that great progress has been made in securing the civil rights of all Americans, particularly within the past few years. The civil rights legislation passed by the 85th and 87th Congresses has done much to further the cause of justice for the Negro. Nonetheless, it is indisputable that citizenship has not yet been full realized for all Americans. By 1963, it had become apparent that more comprehensive legislation was needed.

In the past 2 years, the irrepressible drive for equal opportunity and for an end to the indignity of racial segregation has engaged millions of Americans. It was right, fitting, and inevitable that it would also engage their elected representatives.

CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION

In October 1963, President Kennedy signed a bill extending the life of the Civil Rights Commission to September 30, 1964. The civil rights bill, pending before Congress at that time, also extended the life of that agency and increased its powers. However, since action on the more comprehensive measure was not completed when the life of the Commission was due to terminate, the action of the Congress was significant. In passing this bill, we preserved the continuity of that body during the interim period. In my report at the close of the first session, I described the very noteworthy contributions made by the Civil Rights Commission during the 7 years of its existence.

The Appropriation Act for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce and related agencies for the fiscal year 1965, included an appropriation of $985,000 for salaries and expenses of the Civil Rights Commission.

CIVIL RIGHTS ACT

On July 2, 1964, President Johnson affixed his signature to Public Law 88–352, the Civil Rights Act of 1964. The importance of this occasion cannot be overemphasized. The signing of the bill came just 5 hours after Congress had completed action on this landmark piece of legislation. It climaxed an entire year of consideration, debate, and compromise within the country and within the Congress of the United States. Our action constituted one of the best possible illustrations of the democratic process in operation; we acted neither in haste nor in hate. This law received the bipartisan support of more than two-thirds of the Members of both Houses of Congress; an overwhelming majority of Republicans as well as Democrats voted for its passage. Tens of thousands of civic and religious leaders from all parts of the Nation support it; the great majority of the American people support it. It is now the law of the land but, more importantly, it is a resolution in conformity with a broad national consensus that every person is entitled to justice, to equality, and to an equal opportunity to enjoy the blessings of liberty.

This act was first proposed by President Kennedy in June 1963; he devoted himself to promoting its enactment until his death. And in his very first speech to a joint session of Congress, just 6 days after his succession to the Office of President, President Johnson urged "the earliest possible passage of the civil rights bill." He continued to recommend and to work for enactment in the months following.

The basic provisions of this act may be summarized as follows:

Title I concerns voting rights. It requires election officials to apply uniform standards in registering voters and prohibits them from disqualifying persons for immaterial errors or omissions on applications for voting in Federal elections. It creates, in voting rights suits, a presumption that a person who has completed a sixth-grade education in a predominantly English language school is sufficiently literate or intelligent to vote. Literacy tests must be given in writing unless an agreement with the Attorney General permits otherwise. If the Attorney General finds a pattern of discrimination, he may bring suit. He has had this power since 1957 but under the new act he or the defendant may ask for a three-judge Federal court from which an appeal may be taken directly to the Supreme Court.

Title II provides relief against discrimination in places of public accommodation on account of race, color, religion or national origin. The following establishments are covered under this title:

Any establishment which provides lodging to transient guests unless it contain less than five rooms for hire and is occupied by the proprietor as his place of residence.

Any facility primarily engaged in selling food for consumption on the premises, or any gasoline station, if it offers to serve interstate travelers or if a substantial portion of the products which it sells have moved in interstate commerce.

Any theater, stadium, or other place of public exhibition or entertainment if it customarily presents sources of entertainment which move in interstate commerce.

Finally, any establishment which is located in or contains an establishment otherwise covered by this title if it also serves the patrons of the establishment covered by this title—a barber shop in a hotel, for example.

An individual or, in cases of patterns of discrimination, the Attorney General, may bring civil injunctive suits in a Federal court. The court is authorized to waive the payment of fees, costs, and security, and appoint an attorney for the plaintiff.

In States which have a public accommodations law, an individual may not file suit until 30 days after he has notified the local agency handling discriminatory practices. Also, the Federal courts may delay consideration of such suits until State proceedings have been concluded.

In States without public accommodations laws, suit may be brought immediately but the court may refer the matter, for a period of no longer than 120 days, to the Community Relations Service established by this act. This referral does not apply to cases brought by the Attorney General, nor is he bound by the 30 days' notice to State officials provision.

Title III bans discrimination in public facilities. These include hospitals, libraries, parks, and swimming pools owned, operated, or managed by State or local governments. The Attorney General is authorized to initiate suits to desegregate such facilities if the person who complains to him is unable to do so.

Title IV seeks to speed school desegregation. It authorizes the Attorney General to initiate and intervene in public school desegregation suits when aggrieved persons are unable to do so and provides technical and financial assistance, when requested by school boards, to assist in solving problems arising out of desegreation.

Title V extends the life of the Civil Rights Commission for 4 more years and gives it two new duties. It is authorized to serve as a national clearinghouse for civil rights information and to investigate voting frauds.

Title VI deals with programs which receive Federal aid. It permits Federal agencies to withhold funds from programs or parts of programs when it has been found that a recipient of funds has discriminated on grounds of race, color, or national origin. Such a finding cannot be made without a hearing and not until the recipient has been given an opportunity for compliance and 30-days notice has been given to the appropriate House and Senate committees. A recipient whose funds have been terminated or refused has the right to judicial review of the agency action.

Title VII prohibits certain employers, labor unions, and employment agencies whose actions affect interstate commerce from discriminating against employees or members because of race, color, religion, sex, or national origin. No employers or labor unions will be covered for the first year and only those with 100, 75, and 50 or more employees or members will be covered during the second, third, and fourth years, respectively. Ultimately, employers and labor unions with 25 or more employees or members will be covered. Employment agencies are covered if they regularly undertake to secure employees for employers covered by this title.

This title also creates an Equal Employment Opportunity Commission to receive complaints of job discrimination, to investigate them, to seek voluntary compliance, and, next year, to refer cases to the Attorney General. Members of the Commission may file complaints and so may the Attorney General if he finds a pattern of discrimination. If an individual complains of discrimination in a State which has a fair employment law, the local or State agency administering the law must be given 60 days to resolve the complaint before it goes to the Federal Commission. A State enacting a new law is given 120 days to resolve the complaint during the first year of operation of its law. The Federal Commission is given 30 to 60 days to resolve the complaint.

If the problem remains, the aggrieved person may file a civil suit and the court may allow the Attorney General to intervene. Once the case is in court, the judge may grant the Federal or State commission an additional 60 days to settle the dispute.

Title VIII directs the Bureau of the Census to compile statistics of registration and voting by race, color, and national origin in areas of the country recommended by the Civil Rights Commission. These statistics will aid in determining patterns of discrimination.

Title IX authorizes the Attorney General to intervene in any civil rights case brought under the equal protection of the laws guarantee of the 14th amendment if he certifies that the case is of general public importance.

Title X establishes in the Department of Commerce a Community Relations Service to help communities resolve disputes relating to discriminatory practices.

Title XI is the miscellaneous title. It provides for a jury title in all criminal contempt cases arising under titles II through VIII. The limits of punishment, with or without a jury trial, are a fine of not more than $1,000 or imprisonment for a term of 6 months.

This act is truly a milestone in America's progress toward full justice for all of her citizens. It is the first time since Reconstruction days that Congress has enacted a comprehensive civil rights bill. Certainly the bill in itself will not solve the problem of relations between races of different color even in a land dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal. But it will give to all Americans a promise for the future and an assurance of good faith. It will give to the world a reaffirmation of the American ideal. And it will provide an atmosphere in which men of good will of both races can work together to overcome the tragic effects of long years of racial discrimination.

The Supplemental Appropriations Act for the fiscal year 1965 included appropriations totaling $12,838,000 for implementation of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

INDIANS

Through the years the Federal Government has developed several programs designed to aid the Indian, the first man in America but one who has not shared fully in the abundance and opportunity of this land.

The Bureau of Indian Affairs in the Department of the Interior is the agency of the Federal Government chiefly responsible for the protection and welfare of the American Indian. It serves as trustee for lands and money belonging to the Indians, supervises the reservations, helps teach them to use the resources of the land, and provides public services such as education and welfare aid. We appropriated $206,623,550 to that agency for the fiscal year 1964 and $210,586,500 for the fiscal year 1965.

The Public Health Service in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare carries on many activities for the protection and promotion of the health of the American Indian. We appropriated $64,310,750 for those activities for the fiscal year 1964 and $69,955,000 for the fiscal year 1965.

The Indian Claims Commission, an independent agency of the Federal Government established in 1946, hears and decides claims against the United States by any group of American Indians who live in the United States. To enable it to carry on its activities, we appropriated $297,000 for the fiscal year 1964 and $310,000 for the fiscal year 1965.

ADULT INDIAN VOCATIONAL TRAINING

In 1956, the Congress enacted legislation establishing an Indian vocational training program. Although that program has been in operation for only 8 years, it has proved to be a very effective tool in equipping American Indians between the ages of 18 and 35 with work skills.

The reasons for that legislation are very compelling. The standard of living of the American Indian is below that of the general population and the resources of the reservation are inadequate to support the increasing population. As a consequence, the Indian is turning more and more to wage work off the reservation. Being, in the main, unskilled, he works for lower wages or is unemployable.

The act passed in 1956 was an attempt to do something constructive about this problem. It has been of real benefit not only to the individual Indian but to the Nation, for the cost to the Federal Government for special services for the Indians is lowered as they are equipped adequately to support their families.

The number of Indians who are qualified and wish to participate in the program greatly exceeds the number for which funds are available. As of November 30, 1962, there were 1,283 individuals being trained under the program. An additional 346 applicants were waiting on registers at the various training destinations and 642 applications were in process at various reservations.

Late in 1963, the 88th Congress amended the 1956 act by increasing the amount authorized to be appropriated for the program from $7,500,000 to $12 million annually and by increasing the portion of this amount which may be used for administering the program from $1 million to $1,500,000.

RELOCATION, REHABILITATION, AND SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT OF MEMBERS OF THE SENECA NATION

Great damage caused by floods, not only in terms of property loss but in terms of loss of life, made it essential that the waters of the Allegheny River be dammed and flood control instituted. The site chosen for the dam, the only feasible one, was on the Allegheny River in the State of Pennsylvania, close to the boundary line of the State of New York. Funds for the construction of the Kinzua Dam were first made available in the Public Works Appropriation Act of 1958 and present plans call for the completion of the entire structure, at the cost of $107 million, early next year.

The lands to be flooded by the reservoir, either permanently or intermittently, total about 21,175 acres. Some 10,200 acres of these lands belong to the Seneca Indians, having been confirmed to them under article III of a treaty of November 11, 1794. Under the right of eminent domain, the Government has taken that land and it will be flooded in October of this year. The Seneca Nation contested in the courts the authority of the Corps of Engineers to condemn the land and to construct the project but it lost its suits.

The Seneca Nation has approximately 4,200 enrolled members. Around 3,000 of them live on reservation lands; the remaining have left to find employment and residence elsewhere. The Seneca Reservation consists of three disconnected parts. The larger inhabited part is known as the Cattaraugus Reservation where approximately 1,900 Senecas live. They are untouched by the Kinzua Dam or Reservoir.

The remaining Senecas, approximately 1,100 in number, live on the Allegheny Reservation. Of these, 482—making up 127 families—actually reside within the area of maximum reach of the Kinzua Reservoir. These families must be relocated.

The decisions of the courts in the suits instituted by the Seneca Nation make it clear that as a matter of legal obligation under the Constitution of the United States, the Federal Government is obliged to do no more than pay the Seneca Indians the fair market value of the property interests taken from them. However, it has been the policy of the Congress in the past to give preferential treatment to Indian tribes, beyond the compensation to which they are legally entitled, whenever their treaty lands are preempted for Federal projects. During the second session of this Congress, we passed a bill for the relocation, rehabilitation, and social and economic development of the members of the Seneca Nation.

There are three categories of money which will be paid under this act. The first category is that of direct damages sustained as a result of the encroachment of the reservoir. This includes the surface and subsurface value of the land to be inundated, together with the value of the dwelling places, barns, outbuildings, and other improvements to be demolished. The act we have passed authorizes a payment of $1,289,060 for these purposes.

The second category is that of indirect damages. The act allows $945,573 for such items as payment for relocation, for the lost use of timber, fish, fruits, berries, and herbs and for the loss of enjoyment of ready access to the river bottom. Also included are compensation for the loss of sand and gravel in the riverbed, the cost of supplying domestic water at the two relocation sites, together with the leveling, planning, staking, survey, and acquisition of the relocation sites. Finally, it includes the cost of moving and the possible loss of earnings while moving.

The third category of money authorized by this act is to be used to improve the economic, social, and educational conditions of all of the members of the Seneca Nation regardless of whether they are personally affected by the Federal project. This act authorizes $12,128,917 for the construction of new, modern homes for the displaced Seneca families, for the erection of new tribal community buildings, for a 20-year scholarship program and vocational education and counseling services. The purpose of these provisions is to lift the standard of living of the Senecas above the level which existed prior to the construction of the reservoir and dam so that they will generally be better off afterward than they were before.

The majority of the Members of this body believe that this is truly a just and generous settlement which will provide for the continued existence of an ancient nation with a great heritage.

The Supplemental Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1965 included $12,128,917 for this program.

JUDICIAL: CRIMINAL JUSTICE ACT

We are a nation dedicated to the precept of equal justice for all. However, certain practices in our society would seem to point to the fact that there is one kind of justice for the rich and the powerful and another for the poor. One of the cruelest forms which poverty takes is that in which an indigent defendant is denied the resources which are available to the affluent defendant. One very important resource is the assistance of counsel. The sixth amendment to the Federal Constitution assures the right to assistance of counsel in criminal cases. A concern that the mandate of this amendment be observed has moved the Department of Justice, the American Bar Association and the Judicial Conference of the United States, as well as distinguished members of the Federal court system speaking as individuals, to support, the enactment of legislation providing adequate representation. In fact, proposals for adequate representation for indigent defendants in our Federal courts have been introduced and studied for more than a quarter of a century. It is with deep gratification that I report that this Democratic-controlled Congress has transformed these proposals and recommendations into public law.

The need for this legislation is obvious. Nearly 10,000 persons, more than 30 percent of the total number of defendants in Federal criminal cases, annually require court-appointed attorneys because they are financially unable to retain their own. The bar has responded conscientiously to this obligation but there has been a growing realization that this procedure does not accomplish the full intent of the constitutional provision. The court-appointed lawyer must serve without compensation. Customarily, he is not appointed until long after the arrest and those appointed are often without trial experience or familiarity with criminal procedures.

The legislation enacted this year provides for the appointment of counsel to represent defendants in felony and misdemeanor cases where defendants are financially unable to obtain their own counsel. Counsel is appointed either from the bar directly or as furnished by bar associations or legal aid agencies, as each district court shall decide. It is specified that he will be appointed at the earliest stage of the proceeding and shall continue through each successive stage of appeal.

This act also provides for the compensation of counsel appointed by the court. Counsel so appointed will be compensated at a rate not exceeding $15 per hour for time spent in court or before a U.S. Commissioner and $10 per hour for time spent out of court, plus reimbursement for reasonable expenses. Compensation will not exceed $500 in a felony case or $300 in a misdemeanor case but higher compensation is authorized in extraordinary circumstances.

An important section of this act provides compensation for "services other than counsel." Included here are investigative, expert, or other services which are often necessary to an adequate defense.

Each district court and court of appeals is directed to put its approved plan into operation within 1 year after the date of the enactment.

I think the significance of this act is well summarized by Ronald Goldfarb in his article, "Crime, Wealth, and Justice," in the New Republic of August 22, 1964. There he said:

> The Criminal Justice Act, which Congress passed, reaches a high water mark in the

administration of justice, and joins the legislature in the movement of the judicial and executive branches toward more mature and civilized standards of social justice.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES SALARY ACT

The Federal Salary Reform Act of 1962 was not "just another pay raise" for Government employees. It was a "salary reform act" because it established the principle of comparability of Federal and private enterprise salaries for the same levels of work. Increasingly, over the years, Federal salary systems had failed to keep pace with the salary systems in private industry. President Kennedy recommended that Federal employee salaries "be fixed under well-understood and objective standards." The Federal Salary Reform Act of 1962 did just that by providing for an annual review of Federal salaries to assure continued comparability between public and private salaries. The basis for executive recommendations for salary changes is a survey of wage scales in private industry which is made annually by the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

In line with this survey, President Kennedy recommended that the 88th Congress adjust the salaries of Federal employees to make them comparable to those in private industry. And perhaps no President in history gave more public support to a Federal employee bill than President Johnson did to the Federal Employees Salary Act of 1964. In his budget message, transmitted to the Congress on January 21, 1964, he praised the principle of comparability as a "sound principle," a principle which "is fair to the taxpayer, to Government employees, and to the Government as an employer." It was his judgment that "Government economy will be best served by an upward adjustment in salaries" and he recommended that Congress enact legislation to accomplish that end.

On August 14, 1964, President Johnson signed into law the Federal Employees Salary Act, the most comprehensive pay raise bill ever to be passed by Congress. It covers more than 1.8 million persons in all three branches of the Federal service and provides $556.8 million pay raise for all Federal civilian employees and for Federal executives, judges, Members of Congress, and legislative and judicial branch employees. Pay increases vary from 3 to 33 percent.

Equity indicates that Federal officials deserved this pay raise. Members of Congress had had no pay raise since 1955 although the cost of living and salaries in general continued to rise. Executive pay in the Federal Government had not been adjusted since 1956. In April, President Johnson listed this bill among the "must" legislation to be considered by Congress during the second session. His reasoning—reasoning accepted by the majority of the Members of this House—is compelling indeed. As he said in remarks to the American Society of Newspaper Editors on April 17:

> To build good government, the first and most urgent need is good people. The pay bill soon to be debated in Congress reaches into the very essence of urgency if the Government means to retain excellence and quality.

It is certainly true, as President Johnson pointed out elsewhere, that:

> It is false economy to offer salaries that will attract the mediocre but repel the talented.

DUAL COMPENSATION

In August, too, President Johnson signed into law a bill which repeals and recodifies approximately 250 laws and rulings dating back to 1894. It is designed to revise and codify obsolete laws regulating the compensation of retired military personnel and the employment of civilians in more than one Federal position.

This is a highly technical piece of legislation but its major purposes may be stated here. Generally, it is intended to prohibit Government personnel from holding more than one full-time office or several part-time positions requiring more than 40 hours' work each week.

The provisions pertaining to military personnel are designed to enable Federal agencies, such as the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, to hire retired regular officers with technical skills which are in short supply. Other provisions modify certain advantages held by retired military men over other Federal civilian personnel, such as veterans' preference in cuts in force and in employment procedures.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES HEALTH BENEFITS ACT AMENDMENTS

On March 17, 1964, President Johnson signed a bill which amends the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 in several significant ways. The original act of 1959 established a prepaid, voluntary health insurance plan for Government workers and their families with costs to be shared equally by the Government and the beneficiaries. The 5 years of the operation of this plan have shown the need for some liberalizations and these were made in the amendments passed this year.

The most important changes effected by these amendments are as follows:

First. It increased the Government contributions to family enrollments of women with nondependent husbands so that it is the same as the contribution made by males.

Second. It continues the health-benefits coverage of unmarried children under family enrollments until they reach the age of 21 rather than 19.

Third. It includes unmarried foster children in family enrollments.

Fourth. It considers all employees who are enrolled in the health-benefits program by December 31, 1964, as having enrolled at their first opportunity. This is an important provision. Under the original act, in order to be eligible to continue coverage after retirement, an employee had either to retire on an immediate annuity after at least 12 years of service or for disability, or have been continuously enrolled in a plan from his first opportunity to do so. Some employees failed to enroll at their first opportunity and therefore could not have continued their coverage after retirement. With this amendment, an employee who enrolls in a plan on or before December 31, 1964, is considered to have enrolled at the first opportunity.

Fifth. It permits an enrolled employee to continue his coverage while receiving compensation from the Bureau of Employees' Compensation regardless of when the illness or injury entitling him to such payment occurred. Prior to this amendment, an employee who was put on compensation from the Bureau of Employees' Compensation as the result of an injury which was sustained before July 1, 1960—the date the Federal Employees Health Benefits program went into effect—lost his health benefits coverage.

GENERAL GOVERNMENT REORGANIZATION ACT

The Reorganization Act of 1949 was intended to give the President the authority to reexamine the organization of agencies of the Government and to determine what changes are necessary to promote the better execution of the laws as well as more effective management and expeditious administration.

That act has been amended and extended several times but the basic procedure whereby the President is authorized to submit to Congress plans to reorganize agencies through transfer, abolition, or consolidation of agency functions has remained the same. As the law now stands each plan submitted by the President automatically takes effect within 60 days unless it is disapproved by a simple majority vote in either House of Congress.

The act expired on June 1, 1963. In his budget message, transmitted to the Congress on January 21, 1964, President Johnson recommended that the authority to transmit reorganization plans to Congress be reinstated. On July 2 he signed Public Law 88-351, which extended the Reorganization Act through June 1, 1965. It also stipulated that the authority to submit reorganization plans does not extend to the creation of a new executive department.

Through the years, Presidential use of the authority granted by this act has resulted in reduced expenditures, increased efficiency, and the elimination of much overlapping and duplication of effort. It can be expected that comparable benefits will continue to accrue.

PRESIDENTIAL TRANSITION ACT

In my report at the close of the first session of the 88th Congress, I spoke of the Presidential Transition Act and reported that it was then in conference. Happily, differences in the bills passed by the Senate and by this House were compromised and that very important measure was signed by President Johnson in March of this year.

This legislation was requested by President Kennedy upon the recommendation of the President's Commission on Campaign Costs. As that Commission pointed out:

> In 1952–53, the cost to a special Republican committee of the transition period between the election and the inauguration exceeded $200,000. In 1960–61, the cost to the Democratic National Committee totaled at least $360,000. These funds were used largely to pay for office space, communications, staff salaries, and transportation. These costs have increased the financial pressures on the parties. The persons primarily involved are no longer candidates

> for office; they are the President-elect and Vice President-elect of the United States.

Certainly, it is not correct to regard the President-elect as a private citizen between the election in November and the inauguration on January 20. Certainly, the expenses for travel, communication, office space, printing, and so forth, are Government expenses, not private or partisan expenses. And certainly, it is in the national interest for the Government to support the orderly transfer of executive power.

As passed, this act authorizes the Administrator of the General Services Administration to provide to a nonincumbent President-elect and Vice President-elect, office space, compensation for staff personnel, experts and consultants, and payments of travel expenses, subsistence allowances, communications, and printing services. It also authorizes the Administrator, 6 months after the inauguration of a new President, to provide similar services to an outgoing President and Vice President.

An appropriation of up to $900,000 for any one Presidential transition was authorized and funds appropriated will remain available during the fiscal year in which the transition takes place and in the following fiscal year.

ADMINISTRATIVE CONFERENCE ACT

In 1954–55, President Eisenhower, responding to pressure from the bar, the public, and some of the regulatory agencies, established an Administrative Conference to study problems caused by the expansion of regulatory and administrative agencies. And in 1961–62, President Kennedy established a second temporary Conference. Both were established by Executive order. One of the recommendations of the Conference established by President Kennedy, the establishment of a permanent administrative conference, led to the enactment of a very significant piece of legislation during the second session of the 88th Congress.

The Administrative Conference Act establishes a permanent Administrative Conference of the United States to formulate recommendations for the improvement of administrative procedures within Federal agencies. The main body of the Conference will be an assembly consisting of a Chairman, appointed by the President for a 5-year term; an 11 man Council, appointed by the President for 3-year terms; and a flexible number of members which may vary from 75 to 91. The number of members drawn from the Government will constitute one-third or two-fifths of the total number, depending upon the number of members. The nongovernmental members will be selected in such a manner as to provide broad representation of the views of private citizens and will be members of the bar, scholars in the field of administrative law or government, or others especially informed by knowledge and experience with respect to Federal administrative procedure.

The power of this Conference will be limited to study and making recommendations to the Congress, the President, and/or the Judicial Conference.

This is a very important act. The administration of regulatory and other statutes enacted by Congress substantially affects large numbers of private individuals and many areas of business and economic activity. The protection of public and private interests requires continuing attention to the administrative procedure of Federal agencies to insure maximum efficiency and fairness. Only a conference such as this can provide the overall view of administrative problems which is necessary if they are to be solved. An appropriation of $250,000 is authorized but this act will save a great deal of money in the long run, not only for the agencies but also for the citizens who must deal with the agencies and departments of the Federal Government.

COIN SHORTAGE

A very severe shortage of coins, which has caused inconvenience and hardship for many businesses, has been felt in all sections of the country in the past year. The solution to the shortage, of course, is the production of more coins, and that is what the Treasury Department is undertaking to do. Congress provided the funds for around-the-clock operation of both mints, 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. We also provided the funds for a new mint which should be in operation in Philadelphia within 3 years and should produce as many coins as the two present mints combined. A more immediate alleviation of the shortage can be anticipated as a result of temporary legislation passed in August of this year.

This legislation permits the Secretary of the Treasury to continue to have coins inscribed with the year "1964" until any July 1 or January 1 after the enactment of the legislation, whenever he determines that an adequate supply of coins is available. This measure is designed to discourage the continued hoarding of 1964-date coins by making it uneconomical. If there are 16 billion coins bearing the inscription "1964" as compared to about 4 billion for 1963, it is unlikely that any of the 1964 coins will acquire much numismatic value by reason of their date. The Treasury estimates that as many as a billion new coins which are now being hoarded will come into circulation as a result of this legislation.

ALASKA

The Alaska Omnibus Act of 1959 authorized Federal grants of $28.5 million over a 5-year period to help Alaska convert from territorial status to statehood. The grant authorization was scheduled to expire on June 30, 1964. By that time Alaska was expected to meet, from its own revenues, the cost of governmental responsibilities which had formerly been met by the Federal Government.

However, on March 27, 1964, one of the worst earthquakes in modern history hit the State of Alaska. Severe damage, estimated at $750 million, was inflicted over a 450,000-square-mile area. The State's fishing and canning industries were virtually destroyed and its petroleum industry was extensively damaged.

On April 1, President Johnson announced that he would ask Congress for $50 million in new funds. On April 6 a bill providing this amount for emergency relief was passed by both Houses of this Congress and on the following day it was signed by the President.

Technically this measure, Public Law 88–296, did not appropriate money for Alaska, but, rather, for the emergency disaster relief fund. This fund is administered by the Office of Emergency Planning to assist in the restoration of public facilities in disaster areas. That fund had fallen to approximately $19 million, an amount inadequate to meet the situation in Alaska. The funds appropriated by this act were made available to the Office of Emergency Planning for allocation to the Government agencies which are participating in Alaskan relief work.

On the same day—April 7—President Johnson announced that he would ask Congress for additional funds to help keep Alaska's State and local government from bankruptcy in the fiscal years 1965 and 1966. He said that he would seek the funds by an amendment to the Alaska Omnibus Act in the form of a 2-year extension of the grants under that act. On April 23, President Johnson recommended this action to Congress.

On May 27, 1964, President Johnson signed Public Law 88–311 authorizing $23.5 million for this purpose to run through June 30, 1966. This act also extended until June 30, 1966, the period in which Federal agencies may continue to provide services which are normally provided by the State and during which property used for such purposes may be transferred to the State.

This was very necessary legislation. That portion of Alaska which normally provides over 50 percent of the State's revenues was the portion which suffered the most serious earthquake damage. As the report of our Interior and Insular Affairs Committee noted:

> The State's ability to carry on its normal functions, to supply matching funds for essential Federal grant-in-aid programs, and to finance other programs has been crippled.

A third action taken by the Congress for the relief of Alaska was contained in Public Law 88–317, the deficiency appropriation for the fiscal year 1964. Included in this measure were $41,370,000, for various programs in Alaska. These included repair and replacement of damaged facilities by the Forest Service, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Public Health Service, Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, and the Alaskan Railroad. Also included were funds for the Federal Reconstruction and Development Planning Commission, for the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and for the extended transition grants to the State government authorized by Public Law 88–311.

And in August, President Johnson signed into law a further measure designed to aid Alaska. This legislation was based upon the recommendations of the Federal Reconstruction and Development Planning Commission which had been set up by President Johnson in April to make proposals for long-range reconstruction of the State's economy after the earthquake of March 27. On May 27 he asked Congress to amend the Alaska Omnibus Act of 1959 to provide special assistance for Alaska in Federal programs. Public Law 88–451 does just that. It authorizes an increase in the Federal share for reconstructing Alaskan highways from the existing 50 percent to 94.9 percent and authorizes an appropriation of up to $15 million to cover the increase.

It also authorizes the Farmers Home Administration, the Rural Electrification Administration, and the Housing and Home Finance Agency to adjust or cancel the indebtedness of Alaskan borrowers owning earthquake-damaged property. The Housing and Home Finance Agency is authorized to make grants of up to $25 million for Alaskan urban renewal projects and to increase the 75 percent Federal share of costs in disaster areas to 90 percent, with the remaining 10 percent to be paid by State or local funds.

The Small Business Administration is authorized to make disaster loans with a maximum maturity of 30 years—instead of the current 20 years—to homeowners in Alaska and those areas of California and Washington declared to be earthquake disaster areas.

The Army Corps of Engineers was granted authority to modify previously authorized civil works projects to deal with earthquake damage and $10 million was authorized for this purpose.

The President was authorized to make additional grants to the State of Alaska of up to $5.5 million to match, on a 50–50 basis, any funds provided by the State to pay the costs of retiring or adjusting outstanding home mortgage obligations.

Finally, this act authorized a maximum of $55,650,000 to carry out the obligations authorized by the other provisions of the bill. This authority runs through June 30, 1967.

PUERTO RICO COMMISSION

In my report last year, I spoke of the United States-Puerto Rico Commission on the status of Puerto Rico. At that time, both Houses of the Congress had passed legislation establishing such a commission but minor differences in the bills delayed final action until the second session. On February 20, President Johnson signed Public Law 88–271, the measure establishing the Commission.

The Commission, to be composed of seven U.S. members and six members to be designated at the option of Puerto Rico, is directed to study all factors bearing upon the present and future relationship between the United States and Puerto Rico, including existing applicable laws, treaties, constitutions, and agreements. Its powers will be purely advisory.

The Commission is required to render a report to the legislatures and heads of Government of the United States and Puerto Rico by the opening day of the second session of the 89th Congress—January 1966—but not sooner than 1 year from the date of the organization of the Commission or the date of the appointment of the six Puerto Rican members, whichever date is latest.

This act also authorizes an appropriation of up to $250,000 from the U.S. Treasury to finance the operations of the Commission. Expenses will be shared equally by the United States and Puerto Rico. The appropriations act for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year 1965 included an appropriation of $250,000 for the Puerto Rican Commission, the full amount authorized by Public Law 88–271.

HISTORICAL DOCUMENTS

In my report at the close of the 1st session of the 88th Congress, I referred briefly to the historical documents bill which, at that time, had been passed only by this House. I am happy to report now that the Senate has also passed that measure and that on July 28 it became Public Law 88–383.

The legislation was recommended by the National Historical Publications Commission and endorsed by President Kennedy in 1963. In a February 5, 1964, letter to the General Services Administrator, President Johnson expressed hope that the Senate would join the House in approving the measure this year.

This legislation is intended to make possible more extensive collecting, preserving, compiling, microfilming, and publishing of documentary source materials significant to the history of the United States. Prior to the enactment of this legislation, these activities were carried on by private groups with occasional Government help. But because of the limited finances of these groups, much material of historical significance is not available to those who have need of it. Government grants will provide means of implementing and extending the activities of the private groups.

As passed, this measure authorizes the General Services Administrator to allocate funds to public and nonprofit private organizations for carrying out these activities. The Administrator is requested to consult with the National Historical Publications Commission before making the grants. It authorizes an appropriation to the General Services Administration of $500,000 annually for 5 years, beginning in the fiscal year 1965, for allocation.

An editorial in the Washington Post of August 15, 1964, rightly referred to this act as "the most significant governmental program of this kind in our history.

The Supplemental Apropriations Act for 1965 included $350,000 for historical publications grants.

JOHN F. KENNEDY CENTER FOR THE PERFORMING ARTS

In 1958, the Congress authorized the construction of a National Cultural Center in the District of Columbia provided that within 5 years a board of trustees could raise the estimated $45 million needed. By 1963 only $13 million had been raised and, as I noted in my report last year the 88th Congress extended to September 2, 1966, the time in which funds could be collected by the board of trustees.

In January of this year President Johnson signed Public Law 88–260, a measure which renamed the National Cultural Center as the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts and designated it as the "sole national memorial" to President Kennedy within Washington, D.C., and its environs.

This act also authorizes an appropriation of up to $15.5 million in Federal grants for the construction of the Center but any such grants will have to be matched dollar-for-dollar with funds from private donations. The trustees are granted authority to borrow up to $15.4 million from the Treasury to finance necessary parking facilities for the Center.

On July 7, 1964, President Johnson signed Public Law 88–356, which made appropriations for the Department of the Interior and other related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965. That act appropriated up to $15.5 million for construction of the Center, the full amount authorized for Federal matching funds by Public Law 88–260. An additional $2.5 million was appropriated for the purchase of additional land and $225,000 to assist business firms which will have to be relocated because of the construction.

This legislation is fitting and proper. The new name adopted more closely defines the type of performances which will be held in the Center. It will be an architectural ornament to the Capital City of this Nation, a useful facility, and a fitting token to the memory of a many-sided President. As the report of the Public Works Committee of this House observed, President Kennedy was not only concerned with the immediate problems of everyday government but also—"with the quality of the American civilization which he led. Nothing could serve as a better tribute to this spacious view than a national cultural center."

NATIONAL ARTS AND CULTURAL DEVELOPMENT ACT

In August of this year, this Democratic-controlled Congress passed legislation creating in the Executive Office of the President a 25-member National Council on the Arts. This is another famous "first" for the 88th Congress, a particularly dramatic "first" because of the long history of efforts to enact legislation of this nature. A bill to create a Federal Arts Council was first introduced in the Congress in 1877; many efforts have been made since that time to do what we have done this year. The basic principles of this legislation have the endorsement of former President Eisenhower, the late President Kennedy, and President Johnson. Success after so many years is indeed gratifying.

The National Council on the Arts authorized by this act will be composed of a full-time Chairman and 24 members appointed by the President from among private citizens widely recognized for their broad knowledge, experience, or profound interest in the arts.

The Council is directed to recommend ways to maintain and increase the cultural resources of the United States, to propose methods to promote private initiative in the arts, to advise and consult with Government agencies at all levels on methods of coordinating existing resources and facilities and of fostering the arts nationally and internationally, and to conduct studies and make recommendations on promoting creativity and increased opportunity in the arts and on encouraging greater citizen enjoyment of the arts. A specific section of the act assures that the Federal Government is not permitted to direct, supervise, or control the policy or program of any group, State, or State agency involved in the arts. A ceiling of $150,000 was set on funds to be appropriated for the Council.

The encouragement and support of the arts, while primarily a matter of local and private initiative, is also an appropriate matter of concern for the Federal Government. The arts fulfill basic human needs, and the arts and the creative spirit which motivates them and which they personify are a valued and essential part of the Nation's resources. In a speech at Amherst College, President Kennedy said:

> I look forward to an America which will steadily raise the standards of artistic accomplishment and which will steadily enlarge cultural opportunities for all of our citizens. And I look forward to an America which commands respect throughout the world not only for its strength but for its civilization as well.

Certainly this act should bring that America a little closer to reality.

The Supplemental Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1965 included $50,000 for this Council.

AGRICULTURE

In his message on the agricultural economy, transmitted to Congress on January 31, 1964, President Johnson enumerated the three basic goals of the present administration's agricultural policy: "higher farm income, reduced farm surpluses, and lower governmental costs." During the past 3 years, under two Democratic Presidents working with a Democratic-controlled Congress, great progress has been made toward the achievement of these goals. In 1963 gross farm income was $3.2 billion higher than it was in 1960, an increase of 8 percent. During that same period, net farm income per farm rose from $2,961 to $3,425 for a gain of 16 percent. Government stocks of feed gains have declined from their 1961 high of 85 million tons to 63 million tons, enabling the Government to save $230 million a year on storage and other carrying charges. Agricultural exports in 1963 were $5.6 billion, the highest in history. Farmers were able to purchase an estimated $800 million more in farm equipment from 1960 to 1963 than they would have been able to buy with a 1960 level of income. This is indeed a remarkable record.

Many are prone to dwell upon urban problems and to give too little heed to the agricultural economy. What must be remembered is that in a closely interrelated economy such as ours, the health of one sector affects all others.

Those who would attempt to make agriculture appear insignificant often cite the fact that farms account for only a little over 7 percent of the total employment in the United States. But this is a very misleading figure. A gross farm income estimated at $40 billion in 1963, farm expenses in 1963 of about $27.7 billion, including a multitude of purchases from the nonagricultural sectors of the economy, and 1963 capital equipment outlays by farmers of approximately $5 billion, or nearly 13 percent of the total for the economy as a whole, are significant figures. Any decline in net farm income reduces the profitability of farming and will be reflected in the income and employment of the nonfarm sectors of the economy.

It is just and prudent that the Congress of the United States devote itself to the prosperity of the individual farmers and of the agricultural sector as a whole. This Democratic-controlled Congress has done just that. The entire Nation will benefit from the programs enacted in the past 2 years.

The Department of Agriculture, of course, is the agency primarily concerned with the agricultural economy. For the fiscal year 1964, we appropriated $6,224,370,215 to enable that Department to carry on its activities in the areas of research, education, conservation, marketing, regulation, agricultural adjustment, surplus disposal, and rural development. The Supplemental Appropriation Act passed in 1963 appropriated an additional $32,610,000 for that Department.

And in 1964 we appropriated $5,137,162,200 for the Department for the fiscal year 1965. This was in addition to a deficiency appropriation of $31,250,000 for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year 1964.

FEED GRAINS

One of the most important bills designed to augment recent advances in the agricultural economy was passed during the 1st session of the 88th Congress. The voluntary feed-grains program, authorized in 1961 and extended in 1962, marked the beginning of a solution to the crucial problem of exorbitant surpluses in feed grains.

Legislation extending and amending the earlier feed grains acts was passed last year. I described the provisions of the 1963 act in detail in my report at the end of the first session. Here I need only say that the 1963 act continued the feed-grains acreage diversion program under which the Government offers incentives, such as land diversion payments and price supports, to farmers who take feed-grain acreage out of production. This has been a highly successful program in eliminating the expensive surpluses of feed grains.

WHEAT–COTTON

A grave concern of both President Kennedy and President Johnson, as well as of this Congress, was the drastic decline in the income of wheat producers. Because of the rejection of mandatory Federal controls in a referendum in the spring of 1963, it was expected that wheat prices would plunge from $1.82 per bushel last year to $1.25 in 1964. It was also estimated that in the absence of legislation, wheat producers would receive between $500 and $700 million less in 1964 than they had in 1963. In his message on the agricultural economy, transmitted to the Congress on January 31, President Johnson urged the prompt enactment of legislation to avert this decline.

The plight of the cottongrowers was no better. In my report at the close of the first session I described the problems of those farmers in some detail. Here I will repeat only the broad outlines of the problem. Increased production, the rapid growth of imported cotton, and the competition to cotton from textiles made with artificial fibers have made the earlier cotton programs no longer workable. Up to this time, the Government has supported domestic raw cotton prices and provided exporters with a subsidy to make the supported cotton competitive in world markets. Because of the changes in the cotton industry to which I have referred, the Government's support program had resulted in a decline in cotton sales, an increase in the stockpiles of cotton, and a decrease in the growers' acreage allotments. It was obvious that the existing legislation was not meeting the needs of the producer, the cotton handler, the mill, or the consumer.

In his message on the agricultural economy, transmitted to the Congress on January 31, President Johnson recommended that Congress enact legislation designed to meet the present needs of the cotton industry, the second largest industry in the United States.

In December 1963, this House passed a bill covering just the cotton program. On March 6, the Senate passed a bill providing for a cotton program very similar to the one favored by this body. But the Senate bill added a program for the wheatgrowers. On April 8, this body agreed to the Senate version of the bill and on April 15 it was signed by President Johnson. By that time the wheat planting season had already begun and this Congress was very anxious that a program to avert the drastic decline in income for the wheat producers be enacted as quickly as possible.

The provisions of this very important act may be summarized as follows:

For cotton: First, it authorized the Secretary of Agriculture, through July 31, 1966, to make subsidy payments, with cotton from Government stockpiles, to domestic cotton handlers or domestic textile mills on their purchases of U.S.-grown cotton. This provision is intended to lower the costs of cotton purchased by domestic mills to a level comparable to the export price of U.S. cotton. As I explained last year, domestic cotton prices have been supported at a level of nearly 32½ cents a pound, but the world market price of cotton is 24 cents a pound. Therefore, U.S. cotton can be sold in foreign markets for considerably less than it can be purchased in the United States. This situation has discriminated against U.S. textile manufacturers and accentuated the surplus problem by encouraging the substitution of synthetic fibers for cotton. Until August 1, 1964, the level of the subsidy to domestic mills was set by the Secretary of Agriculture. Since then he has been required to set the subsidy at a level which will assure the mills of cotton at a cost not exceeding the export price of U.S. cotton. The effect is to require that the domestic mill subsidy be at the same rate as the export subsidy.

Second, it establishes new acreage allotment and price support systems for the years 1964 and 1965. The details of these two systems need not be enumerated here. I might point out that these systems are intended to reduce cotton production and lower the cotton market price in the United States while permitting smaller farmers, with high production costs, to receive a high return on their crop.

Third, it authorizes the expenditure of $10 million each year by the Secretary of Agriculture to establish a special research program to lower the cost of growing cotton.

Fourth, it establishes export acreage programs for 1964 and 1965 under which farmers, if they wish to plant cotton above their regular allotment for sale into export channels at the low world price, may do so at the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture. The Secretary is authorized to allow this only to the extent, if any, that such overplanting will not prevent the reduction of the cotton surplus.

For wheat: This act sets up a voluntary wheat marketing certificate program for 1964 and 1965 under which farmers who comply with their acreage allotments and agree to participate in a land-diversion program will receive price supports and land-diversion payments.

On April 11, 1964, President Johnson signed the wheat-cotton bill into law. On that occasion he "thanked all the Members of the Congress who worked so long, so courageously, so hard, to bring this legislation to final success. They acted in the highest traditions of the Congress. They acted promptly, effectively, speedily."

He also very well summed up the purposes and anticipated results of this act when he called it "a piece of legislation that I think will bring new hope, new encouragement, and new prosperity to the farms of America."

AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATIONS

I spoke in my last report of the bill passed during the first session of this Congress which authorized $12 million in matching grants to be apportioned among the States for the construction of research facilities at State agricultural experiment stations. This is a 3-year authorization and is intended to facilitate further utilization research—the finding of new markets and new uses for agricultural products. The results of this research contribute much to the well-being of the Nation's agricultural program. As President Johnson pointed out in his special message on the agricultural economy, our agricultural problems are "problems of abundance, not of scarcity." Certainly, then, the search for new markets and new uses for our agricultural abundance are essential.

FOOD MARKETING STUDY

In his message on the agricultural economy, transmitted to Congress on January 31, 1964, President Johnson said:

> The recent changes in the marketing structure for distribution of food are as revolutionary as those in production. There are some 200,000 retail grocery stores, but we know that $1 out of every $2 spent for groceries goes to fewer than 100 corporate, voluntary, or cooperative chains. Our information about how this greatly increased concentration of power is affecting farmers, handlers, and consumers is inadequate. The implications of other changes that take place as vertical integration and contract farming have not been fully explored.

In his March 29 news conference, President Johnson announced that he was preparing draft legislation and letters to congressional leaders embodying his recommendation that Congress establish a bipartisan commission "to study and appraise the changes taking place in the American food industry." On April 1, he submitted draft legislation to accomplish this purpose.

In June of this year, Congress enacted a bill establishing a National Commission on Food Marketing. This body will be composed of five Senators, five Members of this House, and five members appointed by the President from outside of the Government. It is directed to study and appraise the marketing structure of the food industry; to make such interim reports as it deems advisable; and to submit a final report on its "findings and conclusions" to the President and Congress by July 1, 1965. An expenditure of $1,500,000 was authorized.

This is a very significant piece of legislation. At this time, information which would permit an informed judgment concerning the effects of the recent changes in the food industry is not available. As President Johnson pointed out in his letters to Congress accompanying the draft legislation:

> We do not know whether benefits of advanced technology are being fairly distributed among farmers, processors, distributors and consumers. We do not know whether shifts in bargaining powers require new laws. We do not know enough about the new character of the industry to determine the extent of the benefits and the need for any relief from hardship which may be necessary.

What we do know is that since 1947 the amount received by the farmer for $10 worth of foodstuffs has declined 15 percent while the price paid by the housewife has risen 18 percent. The spread between what the farmer receives and what the consumer pays has widen 2 to 3 percent in each of the last 10 years. In fact, the farmers share of the consumers' food dollar declined from 47 cents in 1950 to 37 cents in 1964. It is important that these changes be studied and appraised so that farmers and business people make appropriate adjustments and so that the Government may properly discharge its responsibility to the consumers of this Nation. It is anticipated that the findings of the Commission will aid the President and the Congress in this area.

The Supplemental Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1965 included an appropriation of $700,000 for this Commission.

NATURAL RESOURCES

The recognition by Congress of the vital need to protect and develop this Nation's rich heritage of natural resources is unquestionably of benefit to all citizens. Our record in this area over the past 2 years has been outstanding. Indeed, as I pointed out earlier, many commentators have begun to refer to this as "The Conservation Congress."

The National Park Service in the Department of the Interior is charged with promoting and regulating the use of national parks, monuments, and similar reservations in order to "conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wildlife therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." The appropriation for the National Park Service for the fiscal year 1964 was $112,524,500 and for the fiscal year 1965, $115,573,600.

OUTDOOR RECREATION ACT

The development of our outdoor recreation resources will be accelerated by the Outdoor Recreation Act passed in 1963. I described the background and provisions of this major piece of legislation in my report last year. Here I might briefly repeat the purposes and general outline of the act. It is the result of a 1962 report of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission which found a tremendous demand for outdoor recreation areas and facilities. Accordingly, this act gave to the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, established in the Department of the Interior in 1962, overall leadership responsibility in the nationwide recreation effort. It is charged with the responsibility of formulating a nationwide outdoor recreation plan, of encouraging regional and intergovernmental cooperation, of sponsoring and engaging in research and of promoting the public use of outdoor recreation facilities.

This act and the activities of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation to implement its objectives will constitute the affirmative program which is needed to insure the best possible use of those resources which will be rapidly swallowed up for other uses if they are not adequately protected and utilized.

For the fiscal year 1964, we appropriated $1,900,000 for the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation. And the appropriation act for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year 1965 included an appropriation of $2,700,000 for that Bureau.

FIRE ISLAND NATIONAL SEASHORE

The 1962 report of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Commission, mentioned above as the impetus for the Outdoor Recreation Act, said:

> Highest priority should be given to acquisition of areas located closest to major population centers and other areas that are immediately threatened. The need is critical—opportunity to place these areas in public ownership is fading each year as other uses encroach.

Probably no action of the Congress could be more in line with this recommendation than the act passed during this session establishing the Fire Island National Seashore.

Fire Island is a natural barrier reef just off the south shore of Long Island, in the State of New York. Its overall length is 31 miles and its width varies from some 200 yards to one-half mile. Its surface area is unspoiled and there are no roads on the island. The western end of the island is within 50 miles of New York City and more than 16 million people in several States live within a 100-mile radius. It is one of the few remaining stretches of ocean beach in the New York metropolitan region which possesses any considerable degree of unspoiled natural beauty; in fact, it is one of the few unspoiled beaches now remaining on the entire east coast with its vast population.

This act authorizes the expenditure of $16 million for the acquisition of 4,300 acres on Fire Island. It also establishes a 15-member Fire Island National Seashore Advisory Commission, to be composed almost entirely of local residents, to consult with the Secretary of the Interior on the development of the seashore. The development will include both conservation and recreation.

The establishment of the Fire Island National Seashore is a major accomplishment of a Congress which has shown itself to be very mindful of the need to preserve our natural resources.

OZARK NATIONAL SCENIC RIVERWAYS

The Ozark National Scenic Riverways Act, passed during the second session, will preserve for the future and for future Americans two of the loveliest small rivers in the United States, the Current River and the Jacks Fork River in the State of Missouri. This marks the first inclusion in the national park system of a recreational and scenic area the essential feature of which is a free-flowing river.

This act establishes a national park through the acquisition of land along 99 miles of the Current River and 37 miles of the Jacks Fork River, not to exceed 65,000 acres. In addition, it is expected that the State of Missouri will donate somewhere between 15,000 and 22,000 acres, and 800 acres will be transferred by the Forest Service to the National Park Service. The total area within the Ozark National Scenic Riverways will be in the neighborhood of 80,000 to 85,000 acres.

The act also establishes a seven-member Ozark National Scenic Riverways Commission, to exist for 10 years, to advise the Secretary of the Interior on the development of the area. Development costs are estimated at $2,100,000 and this act authorizes $7 million for land acquisition.

The Ozark National Scenic Riverways is so located as to be readily accessible to almost 25 million people. It is within 175 miles of St. Louis, 200 miles of Memphis and Little Rock, 250 miles of Kansas City and Nashville, 300 miles of Louisville, 350 miles of Des Moines, Indianapolis, and Wichita, and 400 miles of Chicago, Lincoln, and Oklahoma City. It is an area of national, not merely local, significance.

The two rivers are in their pristine state. They are spring-fed streams of great purity and beauty. We have insured that they will stay that way for the enjoyment of all our citizens.

CANYONLANDS NATIONAL PARK

In September of this year, the Congress enacted legislation establishing the Canyonlands National Park, a 257,640-acre area along the Green and Colorado Rivers in southwestern Utah. Of the land to be included in the park, 90 percent is already owned by the Federal Government and 10 percent by the State of Utah. The act authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to acquire the 10 percent owned by Utah through the exchange of other Federal lands.

This park constitutes the central portion of a mighty arid valley filled with mazes of canyons, gigantic standing rock formations, towering buttes, natural bridges or arches, balanced rock formations, and other evidences of mighty geologic forces and millions of years of erosion. It is a remarkably unusual and beautiful area and rivals our finest parks in breathtaking scenery. Until recently, this area was quite inaccessible and for this reason it is well preserved. Because of the construction of highways in recent years it is already drawing visitors and tourists, even though it is undeveloped and there is no access to its interior attractions. The increased accessibility makes the opening of this area as a national park feasible, but it also makes the protection of the area from depredation and spoilation necessary.

The establishment of a national park in this area will also help to solve the serious economic problems there. Southwestern Utah had a tremendous boom in the fifties as a result of the discovery of uranium and the construction of facilities for its production. By 1961, a downtrend had started as a result of the termination of Government uranium purchase contracts. Unemployment and underemployment spread and remain a serious problem to this day.

The University of Utah has made a study of the economic effect of the creation of the new park. It reported that Government and tourist expenditures will run $11 million in the first 5 years. This would mean wages and other net income of $2.9 million in the area and the generation of $5 million of secondary local income.

In the sixth year, the study estimates that park visitors will be running at the 250,000 level and tourist expenditures at $3.5 million annually. These figures are expected to triple in 15 years and quintuple in 25 years.

The new Canyonlands Park, then, will be a vast boon to the economic security of the area. But it will also be a vast boon to all of the citizens of the United States as one of the most magnificently beautiful areas ever set aside for them.

WILDERNESS ACT

One of the most outstanding accomplishments of this Democratic-controlled Congress was the enactment of the Wilderness Act in August of this year. Proposals for legislation of this nature have been before the Congress since 1956; it had the wholehearted endorsement of both President Kennedy and of President Johnson.

For the first time, as national policy, parts of the wilderness will be protected forever from the clutter of civilization. Since 1924, the Chief of the Forest Service and the Secretary of Agriculture have set aside areas within the national forests for wilderness preservation, but until this act, there was no statutory authority to set aside and retain areas of federally owned lands in their natural state. Having been established by administrative action of the executive branch, any of the wilderness, wild, and primitive areas could be similarly declassified and abolished by administrative action. Also, the administrators could, if they so desired, change the rules governing the uses allowed or prohibited within such areas. We have now set forth guidelines to govern wilderness preservation. This act will permit long-range planning and assure a proper balance in the designation of such areas. It is a realistic and prudent balance between the need for effective wilderness preservation and the need for land-use programs or legitimate economic or commercial use.

This act establishes a national wilderness preservation system and provides that all national forest areas already designated as wilderness, wild, or canoe be brought into the system. All areas brought into the system will continue to be administered by the Federal agency which had jurisdiction before their inclusion. To be designated as wilderness, an area must contain at least 5,000 acres of land or be of sufficient size to make practicable its preservation and use in an unimpaired condition.

The act directs that within 10 years the Secretary of Agriculture must review each primitive national forest area, hold public hearings, and recommend their inclusion in or exclusion from the wilderness system. The Secretary of the Interior is directed to review roadless national park and monument areas and wildlife refuges and game ranges to the same end. Their recommendations will be made to the Congress and inclusion will require an act of Congress.

Commercial enterprises and permanent roads are prohibited within the wilderness system, subject to existing private rights. Temporary roads are also prohibited except as necessary to meet requirements for the administration of the wilderness areas. Prospecting is permitted if carried on in a manner compatible with the preservation of the wilderness environment and mining and mineral leasing laws are extended to the wilderness areas through December 31, 1983. No new patents under the mining laws will be issued after that date except for valid existing claims. As of January 1, 1984, minerals in the wilderness system will be withdrawn from appropriation under the mining laws, except for valid existing rights.

The President may authorize prospecting for water resources, the establishment of reservoirs, power projects, transmission lines, and other facilities in the wilderness areas if he determines that such uses will serve the public interest.

This act places approximately 9.1 million acres of federally owned land permanently in the wilderness system. The primitive national forest areas to be reviewed by the Secretary of Agriculture cover approximately 5.4 million acres; the roadless national park areas, approximately 22.1 million acres; and wildlife refuges and game ranges, another 24.4 million acres.

Between 1946 and 1960, the population of the United States increased by 27 percent. In the same interval, however, visits to national parks and forests and to State parks increased by 221 percent. Demand for outdoor recreation has unquestionably accelerated. In 1963, for every person in the United States there were three visits to recreation areas operated by the Federal Government. In terms of looking to the future, in terms of providing for the recreation needs of the people, in terms of the preservation of the great resources of America and the need of a growing population to know something of the scenic wonders of the United States as they were when white men first saw them, no act is more significant than this. Once destroyed, our priceless wilderness heritage can never be replaced. Population growth has brought such pressure on our open land that without firm legislative action there would be a continued reduction and, finally, an elimination of these beautiful wilderness areas. By this act we have secured the benefits of an enduring resource of wilderness for the American people of present and future generations.

PUBLIC LAND LAW REVIEW COMMISSION

The first public domain of the United States was created when the Original Thirteen States ceded their lands westward to the Mississippi River to the Federal Government as part of the compromises attendant upon the formation of the Union and the adoption of the Constitution. The acquisition of the public domain which began in 1781 with the State cessions was completed in 1867 with the purchase of Alaska. The last acquisition in the area now constituting the contiguous 48 States was accomplished in 1853. Alaska and the exchange of lands aside, then, there have been only reductions in the public domain in the last 110 years.

From the beginning, Congress followed a policy of disposing of the public lands. Statutorily, the policy of the United States envisions ultimate disposal of the public lands unless specifically directed otherwise by the Congress. The Bureau of Land Management statistics indicate that at the present time there are approximately 438 million acres of public lands which have not been committed to specific use. Of this total, 271 million acres are in Alaska and 167 million acres are in the 48 contiguous States.

At present, the various agencies managing public lands are operating under a complex system of public land laws which have developed in a patchwork fashion since the beginning of the Republic. Thousands of laws now govern the management, use, and disposition of the public lands of the United States and many of them reflect the social and economic conditions of the 19th century and early 20th. They are, therefore, predicated upon essentially obsolete concepts.

With this in mind, the Congress, in September, enacted legislation authorizing the creation of a Public Land Law Review Commission. This Commission is charged with the responsibility of studying existing statutes and regulations governing public lands, of reviewing policies and practices of Federal agencies in this field, of compiling the information necessary for a determination and understanding of the various demands on the public lands which now exist and which are likely to exist in the future, and of recommending the modifications deemed necessary in existing laws, regulations, policies, and practices.

The Commission will be composed of 19 members. Twelve of them will be from the Senate and House Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs and six will be private citizens appointed by the President. These 18 will select another person to be the Chairman of the Commission. It will issue its recommendations by December 31, 1968 and will cease to exist after June 30, 1969.

The act also established an Advisory Council to the Commission to be composed of a liaison officer appointed by the head of each Federal department and agency interested in public lands and 25 citizens appointed by the Commission.

An appropriation of $4 million is authorized.

The enactment of this legislation will permit a comprehensive review of public land law and modifications in that law which will result in the retention, management, or disposal of the public lands in the manner providing the maximum benefit to all citizens.

The Supplemental Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1965 included $350,000 for this Commission.

LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND

Another measure passed during the second session of this Congress is based upon the recommendations of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission. It is also one of the most farsighted conservation steps ever taken by the Congress.

The report of the Commission, submitted to the President and to Congress in January 1962, emphasized that the key elements in the total effort to make outdoor recreation opportunities available to our citizens are the States, local governments, and private enterprise. It recommended that the role of the Federal Government should be one of cooperation with the States through technical and financial assistance and that such financial assistance should be in the form of grants for planning, for the acquisition of land and water areas, and for the development of facilities for outdoor recreation. The Land and Water Conservation Fund Act embodies these recommendations.

This act establishes a land and water conservation fund, beginning January 1, 1965, to permit the States to plan, acquire, and develop outdoor recreational facilities and to permit the Federal Government to acquire recreation areas. The life of the fund is limited to 25 years plus such additional time as is required to repay the advance appropriations from the Federal Government which I shall describe below.

Sixty percent of the money to be appropriated annually by the Fund is exclusively for State planning, acquisition, and development of outdoor recreation facilities. But for the first 5 years the President may alter the State-Federal share by up to 15 percentage points. Within this 60 percent, the Secretary of the Interior is directed to allocate 40 percent equally among all participating States and the remaining 60 percent on the basis of need. In determining the relative needs of the States, the Secretary is directed to consider their population, the use of their facilities by nonresidents, and the extent of Federal programs in the various States. No State may receive more than 7 percent of the total funds and the Federal funds must be matched by the States on a 50–50 basis. Funds for acquisition and development will be made available to the States only after they have submitted a statewide recreation plan satisfactory to the Secretary of the Interior.

The 40 percent of the fund which is set aside for Federal agencies will be used partially to offset capital costs for recreation and fish and wildlife benefits at newly authorized Federal water development projects and for land acquisition in the national park system, national recreation areas, fish and wildlife preservation areas and for the acquisition of inholdings within wilderness areas of the national forest system and within existing boundaries of other national forests where the primary value is outdoor recreation. The acquisition of up to 500 acres per forest of land adjacent to existing boundaries is permitted if this new land will comprise an integral part of a forest recreational management area. At least 85 percent of the forest lands acquired must be in the Eastern United States because the greatest need at the present time is for the acquisition of lands near centers of population. Appropriations from the fund are not available for land acquisition which is not otherwise authorized by law and no money may be used for publicity purposes.

The fund will be financed from four sources: The first source is admission and user fees. The act provides that all admission and user fees collected by the National Park Service, the Bureau of Land Management, the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Forest Service, the Corps of Engineers, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the U.S. section of the International Boundary and Water Commission will be paid into the fund.

The President is authorized to designate the areas administered by these agencies at which fees will be collected, and to establish the fees. Admission fees may be charged only at land and water areas administered primarily for scenic, scientific, historical, cultural, or recreational purposes and only at areas administered by a Federal agency at which recreation facilities or services are provided at Federal expense. No fees may be charged by a Federal agency for the use of waters.

The second source of money for the fund is surplus property sales. The act provides for the payment into the fund of net proceeds from the sale of Federal surplus real property.

The third source is the motor fuels tax. Provision is made for the payment into the fund of proceeds from the existing tax on motorboat fuels. These proceeds were previously allotted to the highway trust fund.

The fourth source, to which I referred above, is appropriations. The act authorizes advance appropriations from the Treasury Department to help start the fund. These appropriations cannot average more than $60 million annually. They will begin in the fiscal year 1969 and are authorized for 8 years. In the 11th fiscal year the fund's operations—the fiscal year 1976—the fund will repay the advance appropriations by turning over to the Treasury one-half of its annual revenues.

This is a very important bill for the future recreational needs of all our citizens. It is also a fiscally responsible bill.

WATER RESOURCES ACT

Abundant, good water is essential to the economic growth and progress of the Nation. But at this time water shortages of overwhelming proportions are hampering our industries, our agriculture, our recreation, and our individual health and happiness. If current practices are continued, by the year 2000 there will not be enough usable water to meet the water needs of parts of 28 of our States. It is obvious, then, that a dominant conservation issue now and for the next several decades is the development of an adequate water supply for the expanding needs of the Nation. In addition to assuring an abundance of water, there is a real need for the stimulation of research, investigation, and experimentation, and for the training of scientists to engage in water research.

Public Law 88-379, the Water Resources Act, is designed to meet all of these needs. It authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to make annual grants to each State and to Puerto Rico of $75,000 in the fiscal year 1965, $87,500 in the fiscal years 1966 and 1967, and $100,000 thereafter, to help establish and carry on the work, including the training of scientists, of water resource research centers or institutes at one land-grant college in each State. The funds can be allocated to another institution rather than the land-grant college if that institution is designated by the State legislature. In those States with more than one land-grant college, the Governor will designate the recipient. And two or more States may pool their grants in order to form regional centers.

The act also authorizes an appropriation to the Secretary of the Interior of $1 million in the fiscal year 1965, increasing by $1 million in each of the succeeding 4 years, and continuing at $5 million each year thereafter, to make grants to the States and Puerto Rico to pay 50 percent of the cost of carrying out specific water-research projects. These projects will be approved by the Secretary.

This act also authorizes an appropriation to the Secretary of the Interior of $1 million each year from the fiscal year 1965 through the fiscal year 1974 for grants, contracts, matching, or other arrangements with educational institutions—other than those establishing research centers as described in the first grant program above—with foundations, private firms and individuals, and with Federal, State, and local agencies for water research related to the responsibilities of the Department of the Interior.

Finally, it directs the President to establish a center for cataloging current and projected research on water resources, to clarify the responsibilities of various Federal agencies for water resources research, and to coordinate their programs.

In signing this bill on July 17, 1964, President Johnson rightly declared that it "fills a vital need."

COMMERCIAL FISHERIES RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ACT

In the past 10 years, the U.S. fishing industry has dropped from second to fifth place in the total world catch and is currently facing a crisis. In order to aid those States with ailing fishery industries and to promote the development of new commercial fishing projects, Congress in 1964 passed the Commercial Fisheries Research and Development Act.

This act authorizes a general appropriation of $5 million each year for 5 years in matching grants to promote State commercial fishery research and development projects. An apportionment formula for the funds was established on the basis of the value of the fish landed and processed in each State.

It also provides an additional annual appropriation of $400,000 for the first 2 years and $650,000 for the following 3 years to be used primarily to restore commercial fisheries affected by disasters.

Another annual appropriation of $100,000 for 5 years, for use in developing new State commercial fisheries, is authorized.

State projects are to be approved by the Secretary of the Interior and in order to receive a matching grant a State must contribute at least 25 percent of the total cost of the project.

Finally, the act authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to make loans to commercial fishermen who wish to charter vessels pending construction or repair of those lost or damaged as a result of the Alaskan earthquake of March 27, 1964.

PUBLIC WORKS PROJECTS APPROPRIATIONS

The appropriation for public works projects for the fiscal year 1964 included $1,633,603,700 for water resources and power, of which $1,102,577,500 was for construction projects of the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation in the Department of the Interior. Seventy-six new construction starts were funded by this appropriation.

The Public Works Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1965, passed in August of this year, included $1,649,336,700 for water resources and power projects. Fifty-nine Corps of Engineers and five Bureau of Reclamation construction starts were funded by this act.

These funds represent the determination of this Congress to develop for present and future generations the water resources of the Nation's great river basins and drainage areas; namely, the New England, the Great Lakes, the Middle Atlantic, the Gulf and South Atlantic, the Lower Mississippi, the Upper Mississippi, the Souris and Red, the Arkansas, White, and Red, the Rio Grande and Gulf, the Missouri, the Columbia, the Great, the Colorado, the Central Valley, the Central and South Pacific, the North Pacific, and the Tennessee Valley basins and drainage areas.

PUBLIC WORKS ACCELERATION

The Public Works Acceleration Act of 1962 authorized the President to allocate $900 million to initiate or accelerate, in eligible areas, previously authorized Federal public works projects or State or local public works projects. The President was to allocate the funds to areas of chronic unemployment. This was a significant milestone in the effort to strengthen the economy and provide economic security for the unemployed.

The Supplemental Appropriation Act passed by this Congress in 1963 appropriated $450 million for this program. And the Public Works Appropriation Act, passed in December 1963, appropriated an additional $30 million for the fiscal year 1964 toward this effort. Finally, the Public Works Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1965 included an appropriation of $4 million for the accelerated public works program.

RIVER BASIN DEVELOPMENT

In my report at the close of the first session, I included a brief description of the river basin authorization approved on December 30, 1963. That action was taken after prolonged debate and compromise with the coordinate body. Its enactment assured the continuation of work on various flood control and navigation projects.

That act, Public Law 88-253, authorized a total appropriation of $816,847,000 for the fiscal years 1964 and 1965.

COLORADO RIVER PROJECTS

In 1956 Congress passed the Colorado River Storage Project Act which provided for the development of the Upper Colorado River Basin. In addition to three major dams, the act designated 25 projects. Two of them, the Navajo and the San Juan-Chama irrigation projects, were authorized by the Congress in 1962.

This year we passed legislation authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to construct three more irrigation projects as part of this comprehensive development of this river basin. The three authorized this year are the Savery-Pot Hook, the Bostwick Park, and the Fruitland Mesa projects. These projects comprise a series of dams, reservoirs, canals, recreation, and fish and wildlife facilities at a total cost of $47 million.

These projects will provide irrigation water to approximately 65,000 acres of land, and will maintain and strengthen the local economies and, concomitantly, encourage new industry to settle in the area.

MISSOURI RIVER BASIN

The Flood Control Act of 1944 authorized the construction of a comprehensive plan of dams, reservoirs, irrigation canals, powerplants, and other works for the utilization and control of the waters of the Missouri River Basin, with the construction work divided between the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of the Interior. A total of $826 million has been authorized for the prosecution of the Interior Department's portion of the project. Most of the main-stem works authorized by the 1944 act have been completed and are in operation, and many of the works on the tributaries have either been completed or are under construction. The River Basin Development authorization of 1963, to which I referred above, did not contain provision for reclamation fund needs in the Missouri River Basin for the fiscal year 1965.

To enable the Department of the Interior to continue its reclamation program there without interruption, we increased the authorization for the prosecution of going construction work by $120 million. This amount, plus an estimated balance of $22 million in unused funds, will meet the estimated fund needs for the fiscal years 1965 and 1966.

This act also stipulated that no part of the funds authorized to be appropriated will be available to initiate construction of any unit on the project, whether it is included in the comprehensive plan of 1944 or not, unless it is first authorized by act of Congress. This provision has the effect of requiring the reauthorization of all units which are not presently under construction. It was inserted because the comprehensive plan authorized in 1944 is too far out of date to be considered adequate. Also, each unit must be considered in relationship to the financial and economic feasibility of the overall project. This provision will provide Congress with the proper surveillance and control over future developments and expenditures in the Missouri River Basin.

DIXIE PROJECT, UTAH

The Dixie region of southwestern Utah has an average annual rainfall of only a little more than 8 inches. An adequate and dependable water supply for irrigation and for municipal use is a paramount need in the area and plans to provide this water supply have been under study by the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of the Interior since 1918. This year we passed legislation authorizing such a project.

As passed in August of this year, this act authorizes $42,700,000 for the construction of a multipurpose project in the Virgin River Basin of southwestern Utah. The principle project facilities will be two reservoirs, one powerplant, canals, and distribution and drainage systems. A total of about 21,000 acres will receive irrigation water as a result of this project and a revitalized agricultural economy, hydropower, outdoor recreation facilities, and the enhancement of fish and wildlife conditions will accrue.

IDAHO LOWER TETON PROJECT

In September of this year, we enacted legislation authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the lower Teton division of the Teton Basin Federal reclamation project. This will consist primarily of a dam and reservoir at the Fremont site, and water distribution, a powerplant, and other facilities in the upper Snake River Valley, Idaho.

This act authorizes $52 million for the construction of the multiple-purpose project, with the bulk of the funds—$38 million—allocated to irrigation.

The irrigators, or water users, are given up to 50 years from the time water is first delivered to them to repay construction costs. The costs which the Secre- of the Interior determines to be greater than the irrigators can repay will be reimbursed from funds derived from the sale of power marketed through the Bonneville Power Administration and attributable to Federal projects in Idaho.

In addition to irrigation, the project will include power, flood control, fish and wildlife protection, and basic public outdoor recreational facilities.

TRANSPORTATION

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY ACT

The present Federal aid highway program came into existence in 1956. The accomplishments of that program are many: Certainly, it has played a vital role in contributing its share to the full-scale development of our national economy. It has encouraged the more efficient State administration of road building and has supplemented the highway activities of State and local governments. It has promoted an integrated national highway system; in some States the building of highways—particularly primary routes—would have been virtually impossible without Federal aid. Finally, the Federal-aid program has made possible the exchange of valuable information on improved practices; and Federal-State cooperation has encouraged uniformity and a high level of performance in highway construction.

Under the Federal-aid program, highway appropriations are made to the States biennially from two sources: general revenues and the highway trust fund. The so-called ABC program—Federal aid for primary, secondary, and urban highway systems—is financed from the Trust Fund; other Federal construction is financed through the general revenues.

In August, President Johnson signed a bill which authorizes $1,179 million for highway construction in each of the fiscal years 1966 and 1967. It authorizes $1 billion in each fiscal year from the highway trust fund for Federal aid to primary, secondary, and urban—ABC—highway programs, and $179 million each year for strictly Federal roads, such as roads in national forests, park roads, and trails, and Indian reservation roads.

FEDERAL AID HIGHWAY ACT AMENDMENTS

In my report last year I included the Federal Aid Highway Act amendments signed by President Kennedy on October 24, 1963. Most of the provisions had to do with improving the planning and administration of the existing interstate highway program. The only provision which I elaborated on was that which extended for 2 years the program of Federal incentives for billboard control. Under that program, a State must pass legislation prohibiting billboard advertising within a prescribed number of feet along the Interstate Highway System and States which pass such legislation receive half of 1 percent bonus on the Federal funds apportioned to them for construction. This program has been very beneficial in preserving natural beauty, in preventing erosion, and in permitting landscaping and reforestation.

URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ACT

Since the end of World War II, this country's population has risen by one-third, from 140 to 190 million people. At the time, there has been a continuation of the historical movement from rural to urban living. Over the past 25 years, the population of our central urban areas has been moving out to the suburbs and the surrounding countryside—and at an accelerating pace. As a result, central cities and their surrounding areas have fused into increasingly larger and more complex metropolitan areas. Today, 8 out of every 10 Americans live in metropolitan areas. The 11 metropolitan areas of New York, Chicago, San Francisco, Philadelphia, Los Angeles, Detroit, Cleveland, Boston, St. Louis, Pittsburgh, and Washington, D.C., make up 28 percent of the Nation's population and 30 percent of the total employment. They also account for approximately 40 percent of all personal income taxes collected by the Federal Government.

Other smaller urban centers are growing at a rapid rate also. It is predicted that in less than 20 years half of our national population will live in 40 major urban centers, each of which will have a population of over 1 million. Further, it is predicted that in 25 years 80 percent of the Nation's total population will live in metropolitan areas. This is a trend of countrywide proportions and of national consequence. The urban complexes of today and of tomorrow will be the centers which perform all of the essential services for the people of this country except that of growing the food we eat. They will perform these services only if people and goods can be moved quickly and easily within the urban complex.

The present status of urban mass transportation is not good. The great majority of commuter railroads throughout the country are operating at a loss and public and private bus and transit systems are struggling to remain solvent. The ever-increasing deficits have been compounded by years of impoverishment, deferred maintenance, and neglect.

State and local governments have done what they could to meet the growing demand for improved facilities for the mass movement of people; but funds adequate to meet this and all other State and local needs and demands are simply not available.

Of course, automobiles and trucks perform an essential function even in the heart of the city. But highway builders cannot possibly do the whole job. The seemingly insatiable demand for more highways and freeways and loops and parking spaces is a fiercely expensive proposition. Total State and Federal expenditures for highways increased approximately 123 percent between 1950 and 1960. It was recently estimated that to build a commuter railroad capable of carrying 80,000 passengers from a New York suburb to the city would cost $283 million; to carry the same number of people on new highways would cost $4,752 million. It seems only reasonable that Federal tax money be used to augment mass transit as it is used to augment highway construction. It is, in fact, essential to the health of the national economy that Federal assistance be extended for the solution of what is truly a national problem.

In his 1962 transportation message to Congress, President Kennedy recommended a program of Federal grants to States and localities for "revitalization and needed expansion of public mass transportation." In 1963 he renewed his request. President Johnson repeated this recommendation in his state of the Union, budget, and housing messages. And on July 9 he signed the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964.

As enacted, this act authorizes the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency to make Federal grants and loans to States and localities for acquiring, constructing, and improving facilities and equipment for mass transportation systems owned, operated, leased, or otherwise used by public transportation authorities. It authorizes Congress to appropriate $375 million for grants, as follows: up to $75 million in the fiscal year 1965 and up to $150 million in each of the fiscal years 1966 and 1967. Any amount not appropriated will remain available for future years.

It also extends indefinitely a $50 million fund for low-interest loans to metropolitan agencies for the construction of mass transportation facilities.

The Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency is authorized to make grants covering two-thirds of the net cost of the project when he determines that the Federal assistance is needed to carry out a program, approved by him, for a unified or officially coordinated urban transportation system which is part of the comprehensively planned development of the urban area. He is also authorized, until July 1, 1967, to carry out an emergency program of grants to cover one-half of the net project costs in localities where planning is incomplete but where an urgent need for the preservation or provision of mass transit facilities is demonstrated. When full plans are completed, the Federal share can be increased to the full two-thirds allowed in the long-range program.

One hundred percent Federal grants are provided for the payment of relocation expenses to families and organizations.

The use of $30 million of the $375 million is authorized over a 3-year period for 100-percent Federal grants for research, development, and demonstration projects. The continuation of an existing $25 million demonstration grant authority established under the Housing Act of 1961 is also authorized; but the provision of the 1961 act requiring that the $25 million be available for only two-thirds of the cost of a demonstration project was rescinded.

Finally, this act requires, as a condition of Federal aid, that fair and equitable arrangements be made to protect the interests of the transit workers affected by Federal assistance. This section is designed to protect the employee rights of the workers affected.

In signing this bill into law, President Johnson rightly heralded it as "by any standard one of the most profoundly significant measures to be enacted by the Congress during the 1960's."

The Supplemental Appropriations Act for the fiscal year 1965 included $60 million for urban mass transportation grants, $5 million for urban mass transportation loans, and $11,325,000 for urban planning grants.

FEDERAL AIRPORT ACT AMENDMENTS

In 1946, the Congress passed the Federal Airport Act, which authorized Federal matching grants for airport construction and expansion. Although the regulation of air traffic has been a Federal Government responsibility since 1926, it was not until 1946 that Congress realized that Federal aid was needed to help localities bear the cost of meeting the national need for airports and safe facilities.

This year, by Public Law 88-280, we extended for 3 years, through June 30, 1967, the $75 million annual authorization for this program. Of the total each year, $66.5 million is for the 50 States and the District of Columbia, with 75 percent of the money apportioned on the basis of State area and population and 25 percent distributed at the discretion of the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency.

This act continues the provision of the original act which prohibits Federal contributions for terminal buildings and other items not directly related to safety, as well as the provision which limits the Federal share to 50 percent on most items, with the exception of certain landing aids where a Federal contribution of 75 percent is allowed.

The provision of the 1946 act which authorized the Federal Aviation Agency to reimburse airport builders for 50 percent of the costs of advance planning and engineering studies was continued; but these amendments allow the Agency to make the reimbursement in advance of the beginning of construction, without first having entered into an agreement to help support the construction, and regardless of whether the project is actually undertaken later or not.

These amendments also specify that proper zoning of the land adjacent to the airport is a condition of a Federal grant and requires that projects seeking Federal aid be "reasonably consistent" with the plans of the public agencies for the development of the airport area.

SHIPPING SUBSIDIES

On July 11, 1964, President Johnson signed Public Law 88-370. This act extends for 1 year a program originally set up by the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. The basic concept of that earlier act was to place the operators of American ships on a parity with their foreign competitors. To accomplish this, it set a subsidy on the construction of ships at a maximum of 50 percent. This subsidy represents the differential between construction costs in the United States and in foreign shipyards and is paid to U.S. shipbuilders who in turn pass it on to the ship purchaser.

The Merchant Marine Act was amended in 1960 to raise the subsidy to 55 percent and in 1961 reconstruction and reconditioning were brought under the 55-percent maximum. In 1962 the increased subsidy was extended to June 30, 1964, and the reconstruction maximum subsidy was raised to 60 percent. This new amendment extends the existing subsidies through June 30, 1965.

MERCHANT MARINE VESSEL CONSTRUCTION

Under the terms of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, any ship operator may apply to the Maritime Administration for a subsidy to construct a vessel in a shipyard in the United States. If the petition is approved, the construction contract is awarded to the lowest bidder. However, the law allows one exception to the low bid policy: in cases where the Secretary of Commerce determines that certain shipyards should be encouraged, he may assign or allocate the construction of a vessel to a shipyard which was not the lowest bidder. This exception has its roots in the national defense needs of the Nation. Defense considerations require that the Nation have effective and adequate shipyard capacity on all of our seacoasts; consequently, the Secretary of Commerce was given the authority to allocate vessel construction in order to assure that adequate shipyard capacity be maintained in all essential areas.

Recent experiences have demonstrated that the allocation of vessel construction can place unexpected and unfair burdens on vessel owners. To end this inequity, this Congress has passed a law designed to reimburse shipping lines for the additional expenses incurred by them when the Federal Government orders their vessels to be constructed in a shipyard other than the one which had submitted the lowest bid. The expenses involved are those of maintaining additional inspection teams at distant shipyards and the cost of transporting the finished ship from the shipyard back to its home port. These expenses do not bring any benefit to the shipowner and are incurred solely as the result of a policy decision by the Federal Government. This is a matter of simple justice.

By the amendment to the Merchant Marine Act, the Secretary of Commerce is required to reimburse the shipowner who has incurred additional expenses as a result of the allocation of a contract to other than the lowest bidder. However, if a saving accrues to the shipowner as the result of an allocation, a repayment to the Government is required by the new law.

LABOR

The Department of Labor, created in 1913, is charged with administering and enforcing those statutes which are designed to advance the public interest by promoting the welfare of the wage earners of the United States, by improving their working conditions, and by advancing their opportunities for profitable employment.

To enable it to carry out these functions, we appropriated $350,078,000 for that Department for the fiscal year 1964. This was in addition to the supplemental appropriation of $25,250,000.

The appropriation for the Department of Labor for the fiscal year 1965 was $565,904,000. The deficiency appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1964 included an additional $25 million for that Department.

EQUAL PAY ACT

The Equal Pay Act, signed by President Kennedy on June 10, 1963, is one of two pieces of legislation covered in my report last year which are of great significance for the welfare of the wage earners of the United States. This act is the culmination of attempts, since 1945, to enact legislation prohibiting discrimination in wages because of sex. Its enactment is a forward step in the drive for full equality of economic opportunity.

Briefly, this act amends the Fair Labor Standards Act to require that an employer of persons working in interstate commerce grant equal pay "for equal work on jobs the performance of which requires equal effort and responsibility, and which are performed under similar working conditions." In other words, it requires that no employee can be paid a wage rate less than that given to another doing the same work because of his or her sex. President Kennedy, in signing this bill, rightly heralded it as "another structure base to democracy."

MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACT AMENDMENTS

Certainly another significant action of the 1st session of the 88th Congress was the enactment of the amendments to the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962. These amendments strengthen, expand, and extend the program to deal more effectively with the hardcore unemployment problems of unskilled and inadequately educated teenagers and older workers. It is estimated that the amendments will permit the training of an additional 93,000 persons.

The amendments waive the State matching requirement for the fiscal year 1965 and extend the Manpower Development and Training Act for an additional 2 years, with the requirement that the State match one-third and one-half, respectively, in the fiscal years 1966 and 1967.

They authorize training in basic education for those unable to qualify for occupational training, providing evidence exists of an intention to undertake training. For this group, an additional 20 weeks of training allowances are authorized.

The age limit for allowances is lowered from 19 to 17, subject to the restriction of a 1-year waiting period for school dropouts. Twenty-five percent of those receiving allowances may be youths under 22 years of age. Previously, the amount that could be spent on youths was limited to 5 percent of the total training allowances paid to all trainees.

In addition, the amendments permit increases in weekly training allowances to $10 above the State unemployment compensation payment. This is intended to encourage the unemployed to seek training rather than to draw unemployment compensation pay.

Finally, trainees are allowed to work 20 hours a week without any loss in training allowance and they are made eligible for training with 2 years of prior work experience rather than 3 as under the original act.

To carry out this expanded program, we increased the authorization for the fiscal year 1965 from $165 to $411 million and authorized an additional $285 million for the fiscal year 1966.

In signing this measure into law, President Johnson said:

> Under this legislation we are taking some very necessary and very imports steps to continue the success achieved under the Manpower Development and Training Act enacted last year.

The Democratic Party, the party of the majority of the Members of both the 87th and the 88th Congress, is justifiably proud of its record in this area.

The appropriation for the Department of Labor for the fiscal year 1965 includes $307,906,000 for manpower development and training.

NATIONAL COMMISSION ON TECHNOLOGY, AUTOMATION, AND ECONOMIC PROGRESS

A related action taken by the 2d session of the 88th Congress is the establishment of a National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress. Technological change has become the characteristic of modern industrial society. It is essential to economic growth but it poses a dilemma. On the one hand, we must achieve continuous technological change if we are to have rising productivity and, hence, rising incomes. On the other hand, we must ease the problems which both labor and management face in their attempts to adjust to technological change. This is not a new dilemma; we have faced it to a greater or lesser degree almost from the founding of the Republic. What enhances the seriousness of the dilemma at this time is the accelerated pace of technological development.

No one denies that automation has many good effects. It can create more consumer goods of better quality at less cost. In addition to promising a better material life for mankind, it can free people from long hours of monotonous physical labor and allow them to employ their uniquely human qualities in appropriate human activities. In many cases the jobs which are eliminated by automation are unpleasant, odious, unsafe, and unhealthy.

This is the promise of automation and it is welcomed by all. However, we must concern ourselves with the less pleasing consequences as well. In a relatively short time, it has perceptibly changed the structure of our job requirements. Persons are dislocated from the economy and denied a life of productivity and dignity.

The total impact of automation upon the economy now and in the future is unknown. This is the most disturbing element. As Secretary of Labor, W. Willard Wirtz, said in testimony before the House:

> It is a startling thing that we do not know whether the machines will, within the next 5 years, throw an additional 5 million people out of work, or put to work the 5 million who are presently out of work * * *. This is the worst form of ignorance.

It is in an attempt to dispel this ignorance that this Democratic-controlled Congress passed Public Law 88-444, an act to establish a National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress. President Kennedy, in his railroad-labor dispute message to Congress in July 1963, called for the establishment of a National Commission on Automation. President Johnson, in his state of the Union message and his economic message, both transmitted to the Congress in January 1964, proposed the establishment of a Commission on Automation, Technology, and Employment. On March 9, he repeated this proposal in his manpower report and sent draft legislation to Congress. His accompanying letter stated that the purpose of this Commission was to "study current and future trends of technological change, and to recommend the most constructive action that can be taken to secure maximum benefits with the least possible harmful effects upon the Nation."

This is the purpose envisioned by the majority of the Members of this body in enacting legislation creating the Commission.

The act establishes a 14-man Commission from among persons outside the Government with demonstrated high-level skills and competency in the field to be investigated. The members will be broadly representative of the various segments of our industrial and academic life directly concerned, including at least two members representing labor and two members representing management. Appointments to the Commission will be made by the President by and with the consent of the Senate.

The Commission is directed to identify and assess the past effects and the current and prospective role and pace of technological change. It will identify and describe the impact of technological and economic change on production and employment, including new job requirements and the major types of worker displacement. It will study the specific industries, occupations, and geographic areas which are most likely to be involved, and the social and economic effects of these developments on the Nation's economy, manpower, communities, families, social structure, and human values. Further, it is directed to define those areas of unmet community and human needs toward which application of new technologies might most effectively be directed. This will encompass an examination of technological developments that have occurred in recent years, including those resulting from the Federal Government's research and development programs. Finally, it is directed to recommend specific administrative and legislative steps which it believes should be taken by the Federal, State, and local governments in meeting their responsibilities to support and promote technological change in the interest of continued economic growth and improved well-being of the people.

The act also provides for the establishment of a Federal Interagency Committee consisting of the Secretaries of Agriculture, Labor, Defense, Commerce, and Health, Education, and Welfare and the heads of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Council of Economic Advisers, Office of Science and Technology, Atomic Energy Commission, and the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. This committee will advise the Commission and maintain an effective liaison with the resources of the executive branch of the Government.

During the course of its investigations, the Commission may file interim reports and recommendations. It is directed to submit the final report of its findings and recommendations to the President and Congress by January 1, 1966. It will cease to function 30 days thereafter.

The act authorizes such sums as may be necessary to carry out its provisions, not to exceed $1 million.

In short, it is intended that the Commission undertake a deep and sober appraisal of the future. It is true, of course, that we cannot foretell the future with certainty, but it is imperative that we develop an overall national policy to deal with the critical issue of technological change in the various sectors of our economy and that guidelines be set forth for business and labor, and for Federal, State, and local governments. It is certainly true that we cannot intelligently seek solutions to automation's problems, or even discuss them rationally, until we know the facts about automation's impact on our industries, on our jobs, and on our lives. The Commission is directed to discover those facts.

The Supplemental Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1965 included $825,000 for the Commission.

FARM LABOR CONTRACTOR REGISTRATION ACT

Certainly one group of citizens who have not shared in the abundance of this Nation and who live with at least economic insecurity, and most often with poverty, are the 400,000 of our citizens who leave their homes every year to cross State lines and engage in agricultural employment. Often these workers are undereducated; in many cases, they are completely uneducated. Their literacy level is low and their ability to understand their rights is minimal.

In addition, many of these workers have no voting residence. They have no Congressman to whom they can complain, nor do they have access to other officials who could help them with their problems. These are people particularly subject to exploitation.

In 1960, the Department of Labor made a study of crew leader practices. The results indicate that the crew leaders—the middlemen in making work arrangements between growers and migratory farmworkers—are, in large part, responsible for the abuses to migrant workers. Often it is the crew leader who recruits, transports, houses, feeds, pays, and oversees the work of the employees. In short, the welfare of the migrant worker is in his hands.

Among the abuses most frequently attributed to crew leaders are overcharging for transportation advances, underpaying workers by giving them reduced figures for total weight or units produced, overcharging growers by inflating production figures, abandoning workers without their pay, illegal traffic in liquor, gambling, narcotics, prostitution, and overcharging workers for services, housing, and food.

Many of the States regulate the activities of the crew leaders; but the problem is that the States which do regulate crew leaders and which do require that they meet certain standards cannot enforce their regulations across State lines. It is obvious that action is needed and that it must come from the Federal Government. This year Congress took action to protect these workers.

The act passed this year requires certificates of registration to be issued by the Secretary of Labor to any person who transports 10 or more migrant workers for interstate agricultural employment. The certificates will be issued only upon the submission of satisfactory information regarding the contractor's conduct and method of operation. The certificate of registration can be refused, revoked, or suspended if the abuses to which I have referred are discovered. The crew leaders must also produce proof that they are financially responsible or have liability insurance on vehicles used to transport migratory workers to and from their jobs. This should mean fewer instances of trucks turning over and loss of life and limb without recompense to the injured.

Practically none of the benefits or protective measures of Federal law enjoyed by other workers are extended to migratory laborers. They are excluded from protection under the Fair Labor Standards Act and have been denied the safeguards of the National Labor Relations Act. It is surely time that the plight of these workers be recognized and that steps be taken to ameliorate it.

The Supplemental Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1965 included $350,000 for farm labor contractor registration activities under this act.

DAVIS-BACON ACT AMENDMENTS

The Davis-Bacon Act of 1931, as amended, requires that contractors, and subcontractors, when working on Federal construction contracts and various other federally aided or federally insured contracts amounting to $2,000 or more, pay laborers, and mechanics not less than the prevailing cash wages for workers on similar projects in the same area.

A great change has occurred in the construction industry, as in all industry, since 1931, but the provisions of the act did not reflect that change. The basic hourly wage rate no longer constitutes the actual hourly labor costs on construction projects, since World War II, fringe benefits have become very widespread and are viewed by workers as an important part of their wages. The amendments passed this year are designed to reflect this development.

As passed, Public Law 88–349 includes health and welfare fringe benefits, and any other bona fide fringe benefit, or contributions to funds, plans, or programs, in the determination of prevailing wages on construction jobs subject to the Davis-Bacon Act. The costs of fringe benefits will now be combined with cash wages in determining whether the contractor or subcontractor is meeting his obligations. The fringe benefit contributions will not be used in the calculation of overtime wages, and fringe benefits which a contractor or subcontractor is already required to provide by other Federal, State, or local laws are excluded from the requirements of the act.

These amendments bring the Davis-Bacon Act up to date and make it once more a truly meaningful piece of legislation.

RAIL LABOR DISPUTE

On August 28, 1963, just 6 hours before a national railroad strike which would have been disastrous in its consequences was scheduled to begin, President Kennedy signed into law a joint resolution adopted almost unanimously in both Houses of the Congress. In my report of last year I chronicled in some detail the history of the dispute which made this action necessary. Suffice to say here that 4 years of negotiation, litigation, and attempts to resolve the basic questions at issue had failed.

The joint resolution created a seven-member arbitration board to resolve the two primary issues: firemen on diesel locomotives and the manning of train crews. It provides that the arbitral award would be made within 90 days, would take effect 60 days later, and would be in effect for 2 years unless the parties to the arbitration agreed otherwise. The five secondary issues in the dispute were not put within the purview of the arbitration commission. They were, instead subjected to further collective bargaining and a strike over any of these issues was prohibited for 180 days.

I might add a postscript to this account. On April 9, 1964, the specter of a national railroad strike was revived. The dispute did not concern the two primary issues which had been submitted to the arbitration commission by the joint resolution of 1963. Rather, it concerned the secondary issues—pay scales, interdivisional runs, combination of road and yard work, extra holidays, layover expenses, and the like.

On April 9, President Johnson won a dramatic 15-day strike reprieve only 100 minutes before the threatened shutdown. From that date until April 22, intensive collective bargaining between representatives of the railroad brotherhoods and management and mediators from the Department of Labor and from outside of Government continued.

On April 22, in a nationwide television broadcast, President Johnson announced a "just and fair" settlement of virtually the last important issues in the dispute. He called the settlement a "common victory for collective bargaining and for industrial democracy." It represented, he said, "American business and American labor operating at its very best—at the highest levels of public responsibility." That a settlement was imperative is obvious from the statement of President Johnson to the American Society of Newspaper Editors on April 18:

> A strike would cost us the loss of 7 million jobs in a very short time. A strike would cost us a downturn in our gross national product of 10 to 15 percent. A strike would cost us great dangers in health throughout the Nation. A strike would paralyze our entire system.

PRESIDENT'S COMMITTEE ON EMPLOYMENT OF THE PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED

The President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped was established in 1947 to facilitate the development of maximum employment opportunities for the physically and mentally handicapped. The achievements of this Committee since the beginning of President Kennedy's administration are notable indeed. In 1960, when a $300,000 appropriation was first authorized, 88,300 persons were rehabilitated through the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration. This year, the number is expected to increase to 126,000. Over the past year, 102,000 disabled veterans were placed in employment and 9,000 handicapped persons found employment in the Federal Government. Total placements of handicapped applicants during 1962 swelled to nearly 280,000, or an increase of 9.1 percent over 1961. These successes are in good part due to the many activities of the Committee in cooperation with public and private agencies and organizations.

This year, we increased the amount authorized to be appropriated each year for this Committee from $300,000 to $400,000. The purpose is to enable the Committee to expand its efforts in promoting the employment of not only the physically handicapped, but the mentally restored, the mentally retarded, and the mentally ill.

A Democratic-controlled Congress, dedicated to creating those conditions which will allow all of our citizens to develop their full potential, can rightly be expected to devote itself to the special employment problems faced by a large number of our citizens. One person in 10 in the United States has an impairment which limits his normal activities. It is well to remember, too, that every single handicapped person who is employed becomes a productive member of society and costs to Government are measurably decreased. But most important of all, the handicapped person who is employed is enabled to help himself and to retain his human dignity.

The Supplemental Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1965 included an appropriation of $40,000 for the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped.

ECONOMY AND FINANCE

The Treasury Department is charged with responsibility for managing the financial affairs of the Nation. To enable it to carry on the many diversified activities which are encompassed within this directive, we appropriated $1,103,650,000 for the Treasury Department for the fiscal year 1964. An additional $8,544,900 for that Department was included in the supplemental appropriation bill.

And this year, we appropriated $1,214,330,000 for the Treasury Department for the fiscal year 1965. In addition, the deficiency appropriation for the fiscal year 1964 included $10,300,000 for the Treasury Department.

REVENUE ACT

In my report at the close of the 1st session of the 88th Congress I described in some detail the reasons for President Kennedy's proposals for the revision of the income tax structure. At the close of the first session, an omnibus tax reduction bill had been passed by this House and was being considered by the coordinate body. On February 20, 1964, President Johnson signed into law the $11.5 billion tax reduction bill, the largest in the Nation's history.

This measure was assigned top priority by President Kennedy. In a speech before the American Federation of Labor-Congress of Industrial Organizations on November 15, 1963—just 1 week before his death—he said:

> If jobs are the most important domestic issue facing this Nation today, then clearly no single step can be more important than the prompt passage of the pending tax-cut bill.

He had recommended this departure in fiscal policy in his state of the Union message and he continued to recommend it in messages to the Congress and in speeches before private groups.

In his first speech to a joint session of the Congress on November 27, 1963, President Johnson said:

> No act of ours could more fittingly continue the work of President Kennedy than the early passage of the tax bill.

He repeatedly urged its enactment by the Congress; and after full and deliberate consideration of its vital and complex provisions, this, the 88th Congress, enacted that historic bill.

The basic purpose of this act is to eliminate the obsolete tax system which for too long exerted a drag on private purchasing power, profits, and employment. It is intended to strengthen the economy, provide more jobs, more wages, more profits, and, ultimately, more tax revenues. In signing the bill, President Johnson heralded its passage as "the single most important step we have taken to strengthen our economy since World War II." An analysis of the effects of the tax cut by Paul A. Samuelson, professor of economics at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, published in the Washington Post on July 26, 1964, states:

> While it is too soon to give a definitive answer to so complicated a question, we have had enough experience this spring and summer to give a tentative jury verdict.
>
> The economic verdict is a very favorable one. The tax cut is working out just about as favorably as the experts had hoped for.

The experts are the economists of the Kennedy-Johnson administration who had forecast that the tax cut would eventually increase consumer spending by more than $20 billion a year, provide 2 to 3 million new jobs, increase the annual investments for new industrial plants and equipment, new homes, schools, roads, and other public works by $12 billion, and increase local tax yields by $12 billion.

On March 23, 1964, Chairman Walter E. Heller, of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, said, in a speech before the Economic Club of Detroit, that the Nation's economy, spurred by the tax cut, offers "solid" prospects of "breaking the stubborn grip of unemployment, which has stood at 5 percent or above for 76 months and still stands at 5.4 percent."

In July of this year, unemployment fell to 4.9 percent; for the first time in the Nation's history, employment passed the 72 million mark. There are 1½ million more Americans at work today than there were a year ago. In July of this year, the jobless total was one-half million below a year ago, and was at its lowest July level since 1959.

In June, Secretary of Labor, W. Willard Wirtz, reported that the number of jobs in the Nation is increasing more rapidly than the number of workers for the first time since 1957. September marked the 43d consecutive month of uninterrupted advance in the economy. This is the longest peacetime period of uninterrupted advance in 110 years, with the single exception of the rise from March 1933 to May 1937. Business expenditures on new plants and equipment during 1964 are estimated at the record figure of $44 billion, an increase of nearly $5 billion, or 12 percent, over last year. Corporations paid $4.2 billion in dividends during the first quarter of 1964, an increase of 10 percent over the comparable period in 1963. Corporate profits after taxes are expected to reach $31 billion for 1964, an increase from $21.8 billion in 1961, $24.6 billion in 1962, and $27.1 billion in 1963. The Federal Reserve Board reported that industrial production rose in June to 131.8 up six-tenths of a point from May, a record.

Finally, the gross national product rose in the March–June quarter to an annual rate of $618.5 billion, up $10 billion. And total personal income in the quarter rose $11.4 billion, to $491.3 billion.

This is a truly remarkable record and is attributable in no small part to the tax cut, as well as to the many positive programs of President Kennedy and President Johnson, supported by two Democratic Congresses.

The provisions of this act are much too complex, numerous, and lengthy to detail here. In its major tax reduction provisions, the act provides for a two-step reduction in the percentage rates of taxes levied on individual incomes. Prior to the act, the rates ran from 20 percent at the bottom bracket to 91 percent at the top. For the calendar year

1964, the act applied a new range of rates running from 16 percent at a revised bottom bracket to 77 percent at the top. In 1965 these revised percentage rates will drop to a range of 14 to 70 percent.

The act cuts the old law's 52 percent tax on corporate incomes to 50 percent this year and to 48 percent in 1965 and later year. It provides a special break for small companies by giving an extra deep reduction for corporate income below $25,000.

Other changes in the tax law include a cut in the withholding tax, changes in taxation on stock dividends, stock options, sick leave pay, casualty losses, deductions for medicine for older persons, taxes on group insurance, on child care for working mothers, on capital losses, employees' moving expenses, on large donations to charity, and on the use of the investment credit.

President Johnson described this act as "an expression of faith in our system of free enterprise." It is certainly that. The current vigor of our economy proves that that faith was not misplaced.

CORPORATE AND EXCISE TAXES

During the 1st session of the 88th Congress, the 52-percent corporation incometax rate and the existing rates of excise tax on distilled spirits, beer, wine, cigarettes, passenger cars, automobile parts and accessories, general telephone service and passenger travel by air were extended for 1 year. That action was expected to result in the collection of $2.8 to $2.9 billion for the Federal Treasury during the fiscal year 1964.

And during the second session, we again extended for 1 year the excise taxes due to expire on June 30, 1964. The excise taxes alone account for $1.9 billion dollars in the Federal Treasury each year.

The extension of the corporation income tax rate was a temporary measure because the revenue bill which I have just described revised this rate. But the more comprehensive measure had not been enacted when this piece of legislation was passed.

The 1-year extension of the excise taxes may also be a stop-gap measure. In June 1964, the Ways and Means Committee of this House began a comprehensive study of the entire excise tax structure. This study will provide the background information which is necessary before wise adjustments in the excise tax structure can be made.

NATIONAL DEBT LIMIT

On three occasions during the 1st session of the 88th Congress, the national debt limit of the United States was raised. I described the provisions of the three relevant acts in my report last year. Suffice it to say here that the ceiling established in the third act in November 1963 was $315 billion and was to carry the Treasury through June 29, 1964.

In his budget message of January 21, President Johnson requested that Congress approve an extension of that limit for an entire fiscal year. He pointed out that short-range extensions make it difficult to plan borrowing strategy.

On June 29, 1964, President Johnson signed Public Law 88–327. This measure increased the temporary national debt limit to $324 billion through June 30, 1965. This was a necessary measure to give the Secretary of the Treasury reasonable means to finance adequately the operations of the Government. Had Congress not acted before the end of the fiscal year 1964, fiscal and financial chaos would have occurred.

The raising of the debt limit does not increase spending. It merely allows the Government to finance the spending decisions which have been made. As President Johnson pointed out in his news conference of June 2, 1964:

> The debt limit is not a magic formula for promoting economy in Government.

In relationship to the gross national product, the Federal debt has declined from 127 percent just after World War II to about 50 percent now. The tremendous economic growth since the war would have been impossible without the expansion of the credit and money supply. And it is certainly foolish economy to force the Treasury to manage the debt in inefficient, expensive ways.

SECURITIES ACTS AMENDMENTS

In 1961 the Congress directed the Securities and Exchange Commission to make a study of conditions in the various stock exchanges. After a 2-year study, the Commission made certain recommendations, many of which are embodied in amendments to the Securities Act of 1933 and the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 passed this year.

These amendments are of a highly technical nature and I shall not go into the specifics of all of the provisions here. However, I shall sketch the broad outlines and intent of the two main aspects of the act. The main effect of the disclosure section of the act is to apply to unlisted securities—over-the-counter traded securities—the same disclosure and financial requirements, proxy solicitation, and insider trading requirements as formerly applied only to companies listed on the stock exchanges. This will affect the 3,000 larger industrial concerns whose stock is sold in the over-the-counter market. It is estimated that unlisted securities dealt with by this act represent trading of $20 billion a year in securities; that is approximately 35 percent of all securities traded on the regular stock exchanges. These new requirements affect directly the holdings of 17 million American holders of American securities.

Several other provisions of this act deal with qualification standards and controls over those in the securities business. Self-regulation by industry organizations under the supervision of the Securities and Exchange Commission has proved to be an extremely valuable means of providing effective regulation against unethical conduct on the part of brokers and dealers. It was felt that some type of regulation of all brokers and dealers in the over-the-counter stocks is necessary in order to provide maximum protection for the public. Therefore, the Commission was given the authority to regulate those dealers who do not choose to join a registered securities association in a manner similar to that used by the association and to charge them for the additional regulation.

This is a landmark act in the area of securities regulation. It provides new and comprehensive safeguards for the investing public while broadening and strengthening the tested concept of self-regulation by the securities industry. It was advocated by President Johnson in his special message on consumer interests, transmitted to the Congress on February 5. It was heralded by Keith Funston, president of the New York Stock Exchange, as "undoubtedly the most important legislation in this area in almost a quarter of a century."

CHANGES IN CONTROL OF FEDERALLY INSURED BANKS

Since March 1964, five insured banks have failed. All of these failures were preceded by a change in control or management, and sometimes both, and a rather sudden deterioration in the character of the bank's assets. It became evident that some changes in the control and management of insured banks are made with the deliberate intent to raid the bank. The new group seizes control of the bank and then proceeds to exchange substandard or even fraudulent assets for cash in the bank. The impairment of the capital structure of the bank results in insolvency and then the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation must pay the insured deposits.

This year we enacted legislation designed to remedy this situation. The act we passed requires that whenever a change occurs in the voting stock of an insured bank which will result in a change in the control of the bank, the chief executive officer of the bank must promptly report this fact to the appropriate Federal banking agency. He must also report certain additional facts relating to loans on recently acquired bank stock and changes in executive officers and directors.

This act does not give the Federal banking agencies any additional power. It merely gives the supervisory agencies notice of changes in management so that the Federal and State supervisory agencies can take any steps which are necessary under the circumstances.

SMALL BUSINESS

The Small Business Administration is the first peacetime comprehensive agency devoted to small business problems and is an independent agency under the general supervision and direction of the President. It was established to aid, counsel, assist, and protect the interests of small business concerns; to insure that a fair proportion of the total Government purchases and contracts for supplies, services, research, and development be placed with small business enterprises; to make loans to small business concerns; to charter, license, and regulate small business investment companies; to make loans to small business investment companies, and to State and local development companies; and to make grants for studies, research, and counseling concerning the managing, financing, and operation of small business enterprises.

The 88th Congress enacted two pieces of legislation designed to sustain the successes of the small business investment program by liberalizing the investment provisions of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958. The first, Public Law 88-264, authorizes the Small Business Administration to make loans from its disaster fund to small businesses which sustain economic injury from any natural disaster, including disease and toxicity. Previously, the administration was authorized to make disaster loans only in the event of drought or rainfall disasters.

It also provides that criminal charges can be brought against anyone who "conceals, removes, disposes of or converts" to his or someone else's use any property mortgaged to the Small Business Administration as security for a loan.

The second measure, Public Law 88-273, is designed to liberalize regulations on Small Business Administration investment in small business investment companies and to increase the capitalization of small business investment companies in order that they may realize more profitable liquidation of their investments. The provisions of this act are too technical to recount here and it need only be repeated that both of these acts will contribute to the viability of the very important small business investment program.

An appropriation of $7,150,000 for the Small Business Administration for the fiscal year 1965 was included in the appropriation act for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce and related agencies.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

Peace must be among the first concerns of good government, for without it the resources of the Nation cannot be devoted to the creation of those circumstances which will make it possible for every one of our citizens to develop his full potential. In this nuclear age, the preservation of the peace requires the strength to wage war and the wisdom to avoid it.

Provision for the security of the United States through the establishment of integrated policies and procedures is the primary responsibility of the Department of Defense. Public Law 88-149, enacted during the first session of this Congress, appropriated $47,220,010,000 to that Department for the fiscal year 1964. Not included in this amount were funds for military assistance abroad, military construction, civil defense, the flood control work of the Army Engineers, or the military pay raise. This figure did include $12,850,700,000 for military personnel, $11,714,033,000 for the operation and maintenance of our forces, $15,706,047,000 for procurement, and $6,949,230,000 for research and development.

The supplemental appropriations bill for 1963, also passed during the first session, included an appropriation of $220,162,000 for the Department of Defense.

For the fiscal year 1965, we appropriated $46,752,051,000 for the Defense Department. This included $14,568,000,000 for military personnel, $12,313,484,000 for the operation and maintenance of our forces, $13,422,047,000 for procurement, and $6,448,520,000 for research and development.

The deficiency appropriation bill passed during this session also included an appropriation of $1,004,900,000 for the Department of Defense.

VIETNAM

On August 2, the U.S. destroyer *Maddox* was attacked by three North Vietnamese PT boats in international waters about 30 miles east of North Vietnam. The *Maddox* was on routine patrol in the Gulf of Tonkin when the attack occurred. Four planes from the U.S.S. *Ticonderoga* assisted the *Maddox* in returning the gunfire and the attacking boats were driven off. This attack followed several months of increasing tensions in southeast Asia.

On August 3, President Johnson announced that he had directed the Pacific naval command to continue the patrols in the Gulf of Tonkin, to double the destroyer force off North Vietnam, to provide a combat air patrol over the destroyers, and to attack any force which attacked U.S. naval patrols "with the objective of not only driving off the force but of destroying it."

On August 4, the Department of Defense announced that an attack had been made on two U.S. destroyers by an undetermined number of North Vietnamese PT boats. The *Maddox* and the *C. Turner Joy* were fired on while cruising on routine patrol in international waters in the Tonkin Gulf about 65 miles from the nearest land. The two destroyers and their covering aircraft returned the attack and apparently sank at least two of the attacking PT boats.

Shortly before midnight of August 4, President Johnson, in a nationally televised address to the Nation, announced that "air action is now in execution against gun boats and certain supporting facilities of North Vietnam which have been used in their hostile operations."

He described the American response as "limited and fitting" and vowed that "we still seek no wider war."

In the same address, he announced that he had urged congressional leaders of both political parties to facilitate prompt passage of a resolution "making it clear that our Government is united in its determination to take all necessary measures in support of freedom, and in defense of peace, in southeast Asia."

Congress began prompt consideration of the resolution and on August 7 voted overwhelming approval of President Johnson's actions and pledged U.S. determination to assist any member or protocol state of the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty—SEATO—which requests aid in defense of its freedom. This is very much in line with our commitments in that area. These commitments were first made in 1954 by President Eisenhower and were further defined in the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty approved by the Senate in February 1955. The resolution approved by the Congress was very similar to other resolutions enacted by Congress to meet the threat to Formosa in 1955, the threat to the Middle East in 1957, and the threat in Cuba in 1962.

President Johnson hailed the action of the Congress as a demonstration to the world of American unity and thanked the Members for their "patriotic, resolute and rapid action." In signing the resolution on August 10, he said that "the unanimity of the Congress reflects the unanimity of the country." And, he added, "Americans of all parties and philosophies can be justly proud—and justly grateful" for the congressional resolution.

CIVIL DEFENSE

Civil defense is correctly recognized as an essential nonmilitary defense program. Consequently, the Federal Government has recently taken an active part in promoting civil defense preparedness. In 1958, the Congress amended the Civil Defense Act of 1950 and gave the Federal Government and the States joint responsibility in civil defense programs. The 1958 act directed the Federal Government to provide the necessary direction, coordination, guidance, and financial assistance to the States.

On June 30, 1964, President Johnson signed Public Law 88-335, which extended for 4 years, through June 30, 1968, three expiring programs which had been established in 1958. This new act extended the program which provides the States with one-half of the administrative and personnel costs of State and local civil defense activities, that program under which the Federal Government pays up to 50 percent of the travel and per diem living expenses of trainees attending civil defense schools, and the program of Federal provision to the States, through donation or loan, of equipment to detect and measure atomic radiation.

The value of these programs was vividly attested during this past year. As the gentleman from Alaska, Representative RALPH J. RIVERS, pointed out during consideration of this measure, the earthquake in Alaska provided "one of the best demonstrations of the worth of Federal assistance to State and local governments for civil defense preparedness."

And the Governor of that State said:

> If this type of disaster agency had not been fully functioning at the time of the Alaska earthquake, I personally believe the first hours following the earthquake would have been ones of tragic confusion.

The Supplemental Appropriations Act for the fiscal year 1963, enacted in May 1963, appropriated $15 million for surveying, stocking, and marking civil defense shelters.

The Independent Offices Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1964, passed in December 1963, included $70,319,000 to continue the established civil defense programs, $41,250,000 for research, a shelter survey, and the marking of civil defense shelters, and $27,500,000 for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to enable it to procure additional emergency civil defense hospitals, to maintain the 2,680 hospitals acquired in prior years, and to continue the emergency health training and preparedness activities of the Department.

And the Independent Offices Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1965 included $105,200,000 for civil defense activities of the Department of Defense and $8,875,000 for civil defense activities of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

NATIONAL STOCKPILE

The national stockpile is composed of goods acquired to meet estimated needs in time of war. The Kennedy-Johnson administration has always demanded that the stockpile not exceed national emergency requirements. The excessive storage of any material is an unnecessary burden on the taxpayers and a possible source of questionable profits for contractors.

In line with this policy, the 88th Congress passed several laws designed to hold down the supply of stockpiled materials. In each case, the act waived the 6-month waiting period which is required by the Strategic and Critical Materials Stockpile Act prior to the disposal of stockpiled material. Bills were passed authorizing the sale of cadmium, waterfowl feathers and down, lead, zinc, and molybdenum.

DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT EXTENSION

The Defense Production Act was passed in 1950 in response to a message on the Korean war transmitted to the Congress by President Truman on July 19 of that year. The act was designed to increase the flow of war goods to the Korean front with a minimum of hardship in the United States. It provided for a system of priorities and allocation of defense materials and facilities and for the guaranteeing of defense loans.

The act has been extended many times, the last time in 1962. On June 30, 1964, President Johnson signed Public Law 88-343. This measure extends the Defense Production Act for 2 years, to June 30, 1966. In addition, it amends the 1950 act to extend the Government's authority to contract for disposal or purchase of materials under the act from June 30, 1965, to June 30, 1975, but prohibits new purchases under the act after June 30, 1964, unless the President determines that the materials are necessary for national security. New purchases are limited to $100 million.

RENEGOTIATION ACT

On June 30, 1964, President Johnson signed legislation extending the Renegotiation Act of 1951 until June 30, 1966, and making the provisions of the act applicable to contracts with the Federal Aviation Agency. The act was scheduled to expire on June 30, 1964.

The Renegotiation Act of 1951 established a procedure by which the Government may regain excessive profits charged by private firms in the fulfillment of defense and space contracts and subcontracts with certain specified departments. Renegotiation began during World War II and the process has been authorized ever since except for a lapse of approximately 2½ years between 1945 and 1948. The current Renegotiation Act took effect on January 1, 1951, and has been extended ever since.

The act is necessary because rapid technological changes and development in the aircraft, missile, and space fields often make previous pricing and contracting experience inadequate to prevent excessive profits on new materials and excessive charges to the Government.

ATOMIC ENERGY

The Atomic Energy Commission, created by the Congress in 1946 as an independent agency of the Federal Government, directs the development, use, and control of atomic energy for the defense and security of the United States, and for peaceful applications.

Appropriations made for the operation of the Atomic Energy Commission for the fiscal year 1964 were $2,742,669,000 and for the fiscal year 1965, $2,624,573,000.

AMENDMENT OF THE ATOMIC ENERGY ACT OF 1954, ATOMIC ENERGY COMMUNITY ACT OF 1955, AND EURATOM COOPERATION ACT OF 1958

Public Law 88-394, signed by President Johnson on August 1, 1964, embraces several amendments to the basic laws in the atomic energy field. They are meant to clarify and modify our atomic energy legislation in order to keep our laws current with new developments in the nuclear field.

Section 1 of the amending act extends the Atomic Energy Commission's authority to require the licensing of certain patents for a 5-year period. This authority was initially included in the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 with a 5-year limitation; in 1959 Congress approved a 5-year extension until September 1, 1964. This year's amendment continues the authority until September 1, 1969. This authority has never been used but it is considered to be an important reserve power which would be useful in preventing the creation of patent monopolies during the formative period of this new industry.

Sections 2 and 3 of the act clarify the Price-Anderson indemnity provisions of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954.

Section 4 empowers the Atomic Energy Commission to lease real property and to sell or lease personal property located in the Hanford project of the Atomic Energy Commission near Richland, Wash. Disposals of Commission property under this authority can be for the conduct of activities not related to atomic energy. The Atomic Energy Act of 1954 confers upon the Commission the authority to dispose of Government property for use by the transferees for purposes related to the development and utilization of atomic energy; and this amendment merely extends this authority to property to be used for activities not related to the development or utilization of atomic energy.

Section 5 amends the Euratom Cooperation Act of 1958 by authorizing the Atomic Energy Commission to transfer an additional 40,000 kilograms of uranium 235 and an additional 491 kilograms of plutonium to the European Atomic Energy Community.

AMENDMENT TO THE ATOMIC ENERGY ACT OF 1954

In August, the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 was further amended to effectuate the most far-reaching change in that law since 1954. As it was written prior to these amendments, the act required that title to all special nuclear material— fissionable material or nuclear fuels—be held by the U.S. Government. The reasons for this requirement lie in the conditions as they existed when the 1946 and 1954 Atomic Energy Acts were passed.

In 1946, very little was known about the atom. The United States had a complete monopoly over atomic weapons and a virtual monopoly in fissionable materials and the preservation of this monopoly was a cardinal principle of U.S. atomic policy. Consequently, the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 specified that title to all special nuclear materials in the United States would remain with the Government.

By 1954 there was a widespread demand for private participation in the peaceful uses of atomic energy, and the United States had acquired sufficient experience in the handling of nuclear materials to realize that they could be effectively controlled through the implementation of strict regulatory requirements. Consequently, the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, permitted private persons to possess and use special nuclear materials under license from the Atomic Energy Commission. Private persons could also own and operate nuclear reactors. But the requirement of mandatory Government ownership of nuclear material was retained.

Since 1954, the Congress has come to realize that, even in the absence of Government ownership, the Congress can act to control the security and safety of special nuclear materials. Powers clearly granted to the Congress by the Constitution are an ample basis for such action. These changed circumstances, coupled with the important strides made in the development of civilian nuclear power, require a revision of the provisions of the Atomic Energy Act concerning the ownership of special nuclear materials. That revision was made this year.

This is a complex piece of legislation but its main outlines may be drawn here.

First. It repeals the requirement for mandatory Government ownership of special nuclear materials. Provision for the continued effective regulation and control of these materials is assured in other amendments to the Atomic Energy Act. The authority and responsibility of the Atomic Energy Commission to control fissionable materials for the common defense and for the protection of the public health and safety are in no way diminished.

Second. The Atomic Energy Commission is authorized to sell or lease special nuclear material. After December 31, 1970, the Commission will not be able to distribute special nuclear material, except by sale, to a person owning or operating a nuclear power reactor if the material is intended for use in the reactor. As of June 30, 1973, unless otherwise authorized by law, all special nuclear material previously leased to a person owning or operating a nuclear power reactor will have to be converted to private ownership.

This is a carefully drafted act—the result of more than 2 years of hard work. It gives careful attention to the public interest and to the needs of the atomic energy industry. Basically, it permits the private development of a nuclear industry in this country. If Government ownership were to continue—particularly in the years ahead as the atomic industry burgeons—the enormous inventory of special materials necessary for this development would be financed by the taxpayers. And it would become increasingly difficult for the Government to get out of the atomic power business without serious economic dislocations. No one would question the wisdom, then, of permitting the orderly termination of mandatory Government ownership before a large-scale expansion in the atomic industry occurs.

MILITARY

MILITARY ACADEMIES

On March 3, 1964, President Johnson signed Public Law 88–276, a measure designed to increase the authorized strength of the Military and Air Force Academies to equal that of the Naval Academy. This will enable the Military and Air Force Academies to provide a larger proportion of the young officers who accept Regular commissions for the purpose of undertaking a military career.

By permitting an eventual graduating class of approximately 930 at each of the academies, as compared to 550 at present, this act will enable the Military Academy to provide about 50 percent of the required annual Regular officer input of about 1,950 officers and, for the Air Force, about 31 percent of the annual input of 3,100 Regular officers. The present academy classes fulfill only 26 percent of the requirement for the Army and 18 percent for the Air Force.

Specifically, this act authorized strengths for the Military and Air Force Academies, as well as for the Naval Academy, at 4,417 cadets each. Each Member of Congress is authorized to appoint five principals to each of the three academies in any 4-year period and may name five alternates for each principal. From this pool of congressional alternates each academy must annually appoint 150 men to each academy on the basis of merit.

The act also establishes a system of priorities in admission to each academy and special provisions governing admissions to the Military and Air Force Academies during the years before each reaches its newly authorized strength of 4,417 students.

All future students at the three service academies and at the Coast Guard Academy will be obligated to a statutory minimum of 5 years of active duty after graduation.

MILITARY PAY RAISES

In my report at the close of the 1st session of the 88th Congress, I described in detail the provisions of the military pay raise which was passed last year. Briefly, that act authorized military pay increases of an estimated $1,243,084,000 a year. Of that amount, $1,213 million was for the military forces in the Defense Department and the remainder was for the Coast Guard, the Public Health Service, and the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

In August of this year, the Congress passed and sent to the President another military pay raise bill. It authorized a total of $207,519,000 annually for increases in military compensation rates. Of the total, $202,441,000 was for the Department of Defense and $5,078,000 for the Coast Guard, Public Health Service, and Coast and Geodetic Survey. Two million seven hundred sixty-two thousand persons, including 1,833,000 on active duty and 879,000 in the Reserves, are affected by this act.

The bulk of the funds—$187,753,000—are allocated to increase the basic pay of active duty officers and enlisted men by providing a 2.5 percent increase in the basic pay of all personnel with over 2 years of service and an 8.5 percent increase in the basic pay of commissioned personnel with less than 2 years of service.

The purpose of both of these measures is to provide a reasonable balance between military compensation trends and the trends of earnings in other sectors of the economy. The 1963 raise was the first such increase since 1958. Surveys made by the Department of Defense showed that military men lost ground with their civilian counterparts in the interval between the enactment of these two raises. Commissioned personnel with less than 2 years of service have had no increase in their basic pay since 1952.

In signing the 1963 act, President Kennedy, in referring to the military personnel, said:

> Every citizen of this country owes them a greater debt than they realize, that they are able in a very prosperous and peaceful country to live as secure as they do because of the dedicated service of so many hundreds and thousands of our fellow citizens who serve in this country and all around the globe.

Certainly this is as true in this year of 1964 as it was in 1963.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

The military construction appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1964 appropriated $1,585,880,000 for construction at military bases in the United States and abroad and for the construction and maintenance of military family housing.

And in August of this year we passed a bill making appropriations for the same purposes for the fiscal year 1965. The total appropriation made was $1,570,968,000. Of this, $939,817,000 is for military construction and $631,151,000 is for construction, operation, maintenance, and debt payments on military family-housing projects.

VETERANS

In my report last year, I quoted from President Kennedy's budget message transmitted to the Congress on January 17, 1963, in which he said:

> This country has recognized that the Government's primary obligation for veterans' benefits is to those who incurred disabilities in the defense of our Nation and to the dependents of those who died as a result of military service.

The continuity of the Kennedy-Johnson administrations and their adherence to the same basic philosophy relative to legislation for the welfare of veterans is obvious from this statement from President Johnson's budget message, transmitted to the Congress on January 21, 1964. There he said:

> We have a lasting obligation to those who died or were disabled in the defense of the Nation, and to their dependents.

A brief summary of some of the legislation enacted by the Democratic-controlled 88th Congress will prove that we are well aware of this obligation. Among the acts passed during this Congress are the following:

Public Law 88–3 amends the United States Code so that burial allowances may he paid in those cases where discharges were changed by competent authority from dishonorable to other than dishonorable after the death of the veteran.

Public Law 88–20 provides additional compensation for veterans having a service-incurred disability of deafness of both ears.

Public Law 88–21 provides a 10-percent increase in the monthly payments to children and parents of veterans who died from service-connected causes.

Public Law 88–22 provides additional compensation for veterans who are suffering from a complete loss of speech as a result of military service.

Public Law 88–134 increases the basic monthly rate of dependency and indemnity compensation to widows of veterans who have died from service-connected causes.

Public Law 88–355 amends the United States Code to authorize the inclusion of a new total disability income provision in national service life insurance policies. It provides for the payment of total disability income benefits if the insured becomes so disabled prior to age 65.

Public Law 88–359 amends the law relating to the payment of the $250 veterans' burial allowances to delete the language which requires that amounts paid by burial associations toward burial and funeral expenses be deducted prior to payment of the allowance. In lieu of this provision in the law, we substituted a uniform prohibition of payment of a claim for burial allowances when the allowance would revert to the funds of a public or private organization or would discharge such an organization's obligation without payment.

Public Law 88–361 provides educational benefits, under the War Orphans' Educational Assistance Act of 1956, for the children of veterans who have become permanently and totally disabled as a result of service-connected disabilities suffered during wartime or, under certain conditions, during any peacetime period since September 16, 1940.

Public Law 88–364 amends the United States Code to extend from age 60 to age 65 the delimiting age before which a person insured under a national service life insurance policy must become totally disabled to be eligible for waiver for premiums on such insurance.

Public Law 88–401 amends the United States Code to permit a blind veteran to obtain a $10,000 grant under the paraplegic housing program to enable him to acquire a specially equipped home even though he is able to move about without the aid of a wheelchair. Prior to this amendment blind veterans with loss or loss of use of one lower extremity were eligible for a grant only if they were in such a condition as to preclude locomotion without the aid of a wheelchair.

Public Law 88–450 authorizes programs of nursing care for aged veterans. Included in the program are provisions for at least 4,000 nursing-care beds in Veterans' Administration hospitals, private nursing care for veterans who have exhausted their hospital benefits, and matching grants for the construction of nursing-care facilities in State old soldiers' homes.

Public Law 88–481 amends the definition of "veteran of any war" in the United States Code to include any veteran awarded the Medal of Honor. The effort is to provide hospital, medical, and domiciliary care for non-service-connected disabilities to veterans awarded the Medal of Honor, regardless of whether the veteran served during peacetime or wartime, on the same basis as such care is now provided to veterans who served during a period of war.

VETERANS PENSION ACT AMENDMENTS

A landmark piece of legislation of benefit to veterans was passed in the closing days of the 88th Congress. Because of its great significance I should like to devote more time to it than I have to the more limited enactments described above.

The act passed this year amends the Veterans' Pension Act of 1959 to make improvements in the non-service-connected pension program for veterans of World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict and their widows and children; and also liberalizes several other provisions of that basic act.

No one can question the need for these amendments. In the 5 years since the enactment of the Veterans Pension Act, the cost of living has risen by 6.1 percent. Consequently, the 1,129,219 veterans on the disability pension rolls today are caught in the squeeze between rising costs and static income. These amendments overcome an inequity which has no place in the care which should be accorded those who have risked their lives and suffered disabilities in our behalf.

These amendments are the result of extensive study and hearings and the efforts of many persons and organizations who have quite properly interested themselves in the welfare of our veterans. It is a just and meritorious piece of legislation.

The provision which has received the most publicity is that which reopens the national service life insurance program for 1 year to those veterans who served between October 8, 1940, and December 31, 1956, who have service-connected disabilities or who are unable to buy commercial insurance because of a disability not related to their service. In all cases, the administrative costs will be borne by the insured.

In addition to this extension of opportunity for the commencement or reinstatement of insurance, several other provisions will result in increased eligibility and benefits. Among these are the amendment adding new exclusions of income in determining eligibility. For example, under the original legislation, the first $1,200 of a wife's income was excluded from the determination of annual income but the balance of her income was counted. Under the new amendment, either the $1,200 or her entire income, whichever is greater, is excluded.

Cash benefits to pensioners, their widows, or children are increased by an average of approximately 5 percent, with the greatest increases going to those in the low income brackets.

We have provided a substantial increase for those veterans requiring aid and attendance and an additional rate is allowed for a newly created category of pensioners called housebound. Finally an additional allowance is provided for drugs for those in the aid-and-attendance category.

Even this summary discussion of the amendments passed this year should indicate why this is such an appropriate law. We have related pensions to need, need based upon serious disability or upon low income. By so doing, we have carried forward the principle that the greatest degree of help should be extended to those who are most in need of it. And by basing our veterans' pension plan upon this principle we best discharge our debt and our responsibility to those who have served us so well.

To enable the Veterans' Administration to administer these and other laws passed by Congress which authorize benefits for former members of the Armed Forces and for the dependents and other beneficiaries of deceased former members of those forces, we appropriated $5,384,784,000 for the administration for the fiscal year 1964. This was in addition to the supplemental appropriation of $46,300,000 for the fiscal year 1963, passed in May 1964.

The Independent Offices Appropriations Act for the fiscal year 1965 included an appropriation of $5,434,473,000 for the Veterans' Administration.

INTERNATIONAL

The Department of State is the chief adviser to the President in the field of foreign policy. We appropriated $322,696,000 for that Department for the fiscal year 1964. This was in addition to the $7,870,300 appropriated in the supplemental appropriation bill.

For the fiscal year 1965, we appropriated $346,427,000 for the Department of State. And the Supplemental Appropriations Act for 1965 included $1,666,000 for that Department.

The foreign aid program is one of many instruments used by the United States in the defense and advancement of free world interests. For the fiscal year 1964 we appropriated $3,298,705,607 for the foreign aid program. And for the fiscal year 1965 we appropriated $3,250 million.

DUTY-FREE ALLOWANCE

One of the most serious and difficult problems faced by this country in recent years has been the continuing deficit in our international balance of payments. In the period from 1958 to 1960, that deficit was running at an annual average of $3.7 billion. Thanks to the broad and vigorous attack on this problem by the Kennedy-Johnson administration, the deficit was cut to an average annual rate of $2.4 billion in the period from 1961 to 1963.

In addition, the U.S. gold outflow, which is directly related to our balance-of-payments position, has been sharply curtailed. In the period between 1958 and 1960, it averaged approximately $1.7 billion; in the 1961 to 1963 period, it was cut to an average of about $700 million.

Encouraging as this improvement is, it falls short of the basic objective of eliminating the deficit entirely. Correctly, then, this 88th Congress has turned its attention to the drive to achieve equilibrium in our international payments position.

One means of attacking this problem of the balance-of-payments deficit was the reduction from $500 to $100 in the total value of articles acquired abroad which might be brought in duty free by a resident returning to the United States. Legislation providing for this was enacted in 1961 and, as I reported at the close of the first session, extended for an additional 2 years in 1963.

INTEREST EQUALIZATION TAX ACT

Another action taken by the Congress in this area is the interest equalization tax enacted during the second session. This was first proposed by President Kennedy in his special balance-of-payments message transmitted to the Congress on July 18, 1963. In February of this year, President Johnson declared that he fully supported this measure as an interim remedial device while other measures which are more acceptable as long-range solutions are initiated and allowed to take effect. The majority of the Members of this Congress believe that of all possible answers to the present needs and circumstances, the interest equalization tax is the most workable and the most acceptable. It has the distinct advantage of meeting the serious external balance-of-payments problem without in any way conflicting with essential, internal considerations.

This is a highly technical amendment to the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and I do not intend to detail all of the provisions here. However, I should like to delineate its main thrust. The interest equalization tax is a charge on the purchase, by U.S. citizens, residents, or domestic corporations, of debt obligations or stock of foreign persons but only where the obligation or stock was purchased from a foreigner.

The tax on the transfer of stock is 15 percent of the value of the stock and the tax on debt obligations varies from 15 percent on those with a maturity of 28½ years or more down to 2.75 percent on those with a maturity of 2 to 3½ years. No tax is imposed for obligations with maturity of 3 years or less.

The purpose of this tax is to reduce the rate of return on foreign securities by about 1 percent per year. Since the burden of the tax is likely to be shifted to the foreign seller, this means that in most cases the foreign seller will have to pay a tax which has the same effect as a 1-percent higher interest rate for the use of money which he obtains from the American market.

The Treasury Department has estimated that the imposition of this tax will improve the U.S. balance of payments by from \$1¼ to \$1½ billion a year. But this is not an untried and untested tax proposal. Just the prospect that this tax would be enacted during the second session of Congress has had a very beneficial effect upon our balance-of-payments position. During the 9 months preceding President Kennedy's proposal for this tax, capital outflows into foreign securities amounted to \$1,985 million at seasonally adjusted annual rates. In the 9 months since the announcement, these outflows have amounted to only \$290 million at seasonally adjusted annual rates. This represents a reduction of \$1.7 billion in the annual rate of outflow—clear evidence of the effectiveness of this tax.

This is not a permanent tax. The act provided for a termination date of December 31, 1965. By that time it should no longer be necessary.

This is a proven and effective means of meeting a problem which we cannot ignore. It success is imperative for it involves nothing less than the continued soundness and stability of the dollar. And that is of vital importance of all of our citizens.

FOOD FOR PEACE

Food for peace is the name often given for the programs which are carried on under Public Law 480, the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act. The basic purpose of that act is to provide for the use of excess farm products—

> to expand international trade, to promote the economic stability of American agriculture and the national welfare * * * to encourage economic development * * * to promote collective strength and to foster * * * the foreign policy of the United States.

This act was passed in 1954 and it has been of incalculable benefit to the many recipient countries of the free world as well as to the United States during the 10 years of its operation. As I pointed out earlier in this report, our agricultural problem in the United States is one of abundance. This act has opened up effective outlets for our food and fiber, thus helping to stabilize the agricultural economy. In the past 10 years, \$12.3 billion worth of agriculture products have been shipped overseas under this program; this is 27 percent of all agricultural exports for the period.

Over the same period, the food-for-peace program has enabled the United States to combat famine, malnutrition, and hunger in less developed countries. It is estimated that assistance has been rendered to approximately 100 million people through this program. It has also promoted the economic growth of these less developed countries; and their economic growth will eventually mean enlarged export markets for United States agriculture and industry.

As amended, this act contains four titles under which surplus American agricultural commodities are distributed to friendly countries. Our action this year concerns titles I, II, and IV. Title I authorizes the sale of farm products for foreign currencies. This program accounts for the largest volume of food-for-peace programs—62 percent of Public Law 480 shipments. Under this title, foreign countries buy American farm products with their own currencies instead of dollars. The foreign currencies realized from these sales are controlled by the United States and can be used for several purposes, such as to pay some of the oversea costs of American embassies and other Government programs, to be loaned, under certain circumstances, to U.S. private enterprise overseas, or to be turned back to the government of the cooperating country as loans or grants for economic development. This year, we extended title I for 2 calendar years, through 1966, and authorized \$2.7 billion in addition to any unused previous authorization.

Title II of Public Law 480 authorizes the use of U.S. farm products in emergency assistance programs, such as are required following earthquakes, floods, drought, and other disasters. Title II commodities are also used to support economic development projects in the emerging countries. Exports under this title in the past 10 years account for 9 percent of Public Law 480 shipments. This year we extended title II for 2 years and authorized expenditure commitments of up to \$400 million each year in addition to unused previous authorizations. We also provided that up to \$7.5 million Commodity Credit Corporation funds under this title may be used each year to purchase title I foreign currencies for use on self-help activities designed to alleviate the causes of the need for assistance.

We also amended that act in several ways to enable the Congress to exercise more control over the supervision and operation of Public Law 480 and to assure that the United States receive the maximum possible benefit from surplus commodities exported under the act. I should like to mention some of these provisions.

First, we provided that this country will receive the highest applicable currency exchange rate granted in the recipient country and in no event shall the rate of exchange be less than the most favorable rate granted to any other country in the world for the same type of transaction.

Second, we provided for the convertibility of currencies acquired under title I "to the extent consistent with the effectuation of the purposes of this act." We require that the maximum amount possible of these currencies be made convertible and, in any event, that enough be made convertible to pay the costs to the United States for all U.S. Government purposes in the host country.

Third, in order to protect American shipping, we have required that the recipient country pay the basic freight charges on shipments, and that to the extent that the goods are shipped in American bottoms, the charges must be paid in dollars.

Fourth, we have lifted the limitation on the amount of foreign currencies acquired under title I which can be used for Cooley loans and have provided that as much of these funds as can be used for Cooley loans shall be so used. Cooley loans are loans which are made in foreign currencies to provide concerns or persons who wish to invest in the development of the foreign country.

Fifth, we have provided for the establishment of an advisory committee to consult with the executive on the use of funds acquired under title I. We did so because we felt the need for closer liaison between the legislature and the executive on this matter.

Sixth, we prohibited sales of any kind under Public Law 480 to any country which the President determines to be an aggressor or to be using U.S. funds in a manner inimical to the interests of the United States.

Seventh, we have redefined the phrase "friendly nation" as used in the act to exclude any nation controlled by a Communist government whether or not it is controlled by the organization controlling the world Communist movement. From now on, sales under title I will be prohibited to countries which do not come under the new definition of "friendly nation" or which have ships or airplanes under their registry carrying on trade with Cuba.

Title IV provides for the expansion or maintenance of export sales of U.S. farm products for dollars through long-term supply and credit contracts. We will permit dollar sales for credit under this title only with those countries presently defined as "friendly nations," and in the case of any country which has not heretofore been eligible for such dollar sales, we have limited the credit period to 5 years.

Food for peace has been a very worthwhile and beneficial program. It has proven to be a most effective instrument for converting our agricultural surpluses into good will. It was well to extend it this year and it was prudent to tighten up some of its provisions.

INTER-AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK

The agreement establishing the Inter-American Development Bank became effective in December 1959, when it was accepted by 19 Latin American Republics and the United States; and the Bank commenced operations on October 1, 1960.

This Bank was established to promote the economic development of the member countries, individually and collectively, by making loans to either governmental or private entities. Such loans are usually made for specific projects, but they may also be granted to development banks and institutions in member countries for relending for projects not large enough to warrant direct credits from the Bank. Loans to private borrowers may be made either with or without a governmental guarantee.

The Bank also provides technical advice and assistance in preparing, financing, and executing development plans and projects.

In January, the Congress authorized additional U.S. contributions to the Bank to enable it to continue and to enlarge its lending activities. Public Law 88-259 authorized the Secretary of the Treasury, the U.S. Governor of the Bank, to approve certain changes in the structure of the Bank, to vote for increases in the capital stock and fund for special operations, and to agree to the subscription of the proportionate U.S. share in the increases—$411,760,000 to increase the capital stock and $50 million for the special fund.

INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND FINANCE—WORLD BANK

The Inter-American Development Bank is patterned after the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development—World Bank. The latter institution came into existence in 1945 to assist in the reconstruction and development of its member countries. It has proved to be a very valuable and successful agency for the betterment of international economic relations.

In my report last year, I described in some detail the background of this organization and the legislation enacted in 1963 to enable it to continue and to expand its activities. Here I need only say that Public Law 88-178 authorized the U.S. Governor to vote for a $1 billion increase in the capital stock of the Bank. That increase was required to permit new member countries of the Bank to subscribe and to enable present members to increase their subscriptions when appropriate.

INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION

The International Development Association which came into existence on September 24, 1960, is an affiliate of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development—World Bank. Its purposes, as set forth in its articles of agreement, are:

> To promote economic development, increase productivity and thus raise standards of living in the less developed areas of the world included within the Association's membership, in particular by providing finance to meet their important developmental requirements on terms which are more flexible and bear less heavily on the balance of payments than those of conventional loans, thereby furthering the developmental objectives of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and supplementing its activities.

By March 31, 1963, it had extended 36 development credits totaling $450 million in 18 countries for improved transportation, agriculture, electric power facilities, industry, education, and municipal water supplies. These are 50-year, interest-free loans which carry a three-quarters of 1 percent service charge and are repayable in hard currencies.

The original subscription by member countries was $1 billion, but all of that amount which was available for hard-currency loans was expected to be in use by the end of the fiscal year 1965. Thereafter, major loan operations would end unless new currencies were provided.

In May 1964, the Congress sent to the President a bill authorizing $312 million as the U.S. contribution to a proposed $750 million increase in the financial resources of the Association. These contributions are payable in three installments of $104 million each, beginning in the fiscal year 1966. This action had been recommended by President Johnson in his message on foreign assistance, transmitted to the Congress on March 19, 1964. There he described the activities of the Association as "international sharing in the aid effort at its best." He hailed the passage of this legislation as:

> A major victory for the American people, for an effective foreign policy and for commonsense in our international dealings.

UNITED NATIONS DEBT

As of June 30, 1964, the deficit position of the United Nations was $134.5 million. As of the same date, the unpaid assessments of United Nations members—for both the regular budget and the peacekeeping operations—amounted to $123 million. This is $22 million more than the total regular budget of that organization for the calendar year 1964. A major element in this loss of financial integrity is the fact that this year, for the first time in the history of the United Nations, 15 member nations are more than 2 years behind in their assessments.

Article 19 of the United Nations Charter provides that a member which is in arrears in the payment of its financial contributions to the organization shall have no vote in the General Assembly if the amount of its arrears equals or exceeds the amount of the contributions due from it for the preceding 2 full years. Many of the Nations which are currently in arrears have objected to the peacekeeping operations of the United Nations and on this ground have refused to pay their assessments. However, in an advisory opinion on July 20, 1962, the International Court of Justice held that expenditures for peacekeeping operations constitute expenses of the organization and shall be apportioned among the members by the General Assembly under article 17 of the charter. Further, this advisory opinion was accepted by the General Assembly in a resolution on December 19, 1962. There is, therefore, no question about the financial obligations of the member or about the automatic application of the provisions denying these members their vote in the General Assembly.

But the certainty of these points has not deterred the defaulting nations in their defiance. The executive branch of the U.S. Government has made it abundantly clear that the United States supports prompt and vigorous application of article 19. However, it was the judgment of many Members of this Congress that there remained doubts among the defiant nations about the firmness of our resolve. For that reason, this session of the 88th Congress has passed a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the President should direct the permanent U.S. delegate to the United Nations to continue efforts toward securing payment by these defaulting nations and to make every effort to assure invocation of the penalty provisions of article 19.

It was the intent of the Congress, in passing this resolution, to demonstrate the unity and strength of our resolve and thereby to dispel any doubts on the part of the defiant. The United Nations serves a very useful and important function in promoting international understanding, cooperation, and world peace. But it cannot long operate while its budgetary decisions are flouted.

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION FOR SUPERVISION AND CONTROL IN LAOS

When Laos first gained its independence in 1954, there was created an International Commission for Supervision and Control in Laos, popularly known as the ICC. It consisted of three Commissioners—an Indian, a Canadian, and a Pole—representing a neutral power, a pro-Western power, and a Communist power. Their responsibility was to assure that foreign intervention in Laos was brought to an end. By 1958 Laos felt confident that it could maintain itself and the work of the ICC ended.

By 1961 the Communists had stepped up their activities in that country and the situation in Laos had deteriorated seriously. To meet this threat, the ICC was reestablished. A conference of 14 interested nations was convened in Geneva and out of that conference came a declaration on the neutrality of Laos and a protocol to that declaration. The protocol gave to the ICC the responsibility to make certain that the provisions of the Geneva Conference were carried out. Specifically, it was instructed to supervise and control the withdrawal of foreign military personnel from Laos, to supervise and control the cease-fire, to investigate cases of illegal introduction of foreign military personnel into Laos, to assist the Government of Laos in cases of the illegal introduction of armaments into Laos, and to investigate other possible violations of the protocol and agreement.

The life of the ICC is indefinite. The 14 parties to the Geneva Accord agreed to make recommendations regarding its continuation not later than 1965. Thus, a determination on the future of the Commission will be made next year.

Article 18 of the protocol of the declaration of neutrality of Laos provided for the sharing of the costs of the ICC. The United States assumed an annual assessment of 17.6 percent of the cost of the Commission. It was possible to appropriate funds for the fiscal year 1963 under the authority given to the Department of State which permits the payment of assessments in international bodies such as the ICC for 1 year without congressional approval. Beyond the 1-year period, congressional authorization is necessary for continued financial support.

This year we approved a bill which authorized the appropriation of such sums as may be necessary from time to time for the payment by the United States of its share of the costs of the operations of the ICC. The budget for the current fiscal year has not been finally agreed upon but the estimated figure is $3,780,000. The U.S. share of 17.6 percent would be about $655,000.

The United States undertook an international obligation as a signatory of the agreement. That obligation must be met; the act passed by this Congress assures that it will be met. It is in the national interest of the United States to have the ICC continue to operate in

Laos and our continued support of that body is one more piece of tangible evidence that we intend to exert our efforts to maintain peace in that part of the world.

SOUTH PACIFIC COMMISSION

The South Pacific Commission was established in 1948 and currently has five participating member countries—Australia, France, New Zealand, the United Kingdom, and the United States. Its purpose is to advise and assist the participating Governments in promoting the economic and social welfare and advancement of the peoples of the territories in the South Pacific area. The U.S. territories of American Samoa and Guam, as well as the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, are covered by the Commission's activities.

The Netherlands recently withdrew from membership in the Commission when it ceased to administer the Netherlands New Guinea. This action necessitated a reapportionment of the percentage contributions of the remaining members. In order to permit an increase in the U.S. contribution to the total budget of the Commission, as well as to make possible a moderate increase in the Commission's work program, the 88th Congress, by joint resolution, authorized the appropriation of $150,000 for each of the fiscal years 1965 and 1966. This is an increase of $50,000 over the former annual limitation on the U.S. contribution.

The Commission has been highly successful and this increase in the U.S. contribution reflects a recognition of the benefits derived by the U.S. territories. It is also a recognition of the importance of the Pacific Islands to the security of the United States and of the free world.

INTEROCEANIC CANAL STUDY

In 1910, when the Panama Canal was first opened, an average of five ships transited each day. The canal now averages 30 transits per day and it is forecast that by 1980 interoceanic travel will exceed the capabilities of the canal. Thereafter, ships will have to wait in line for the privilege of passage, at great expense to the shipowners and, ultimately, to the consumers.

The physical inadequacy of the canal requires that plans be made immediately for the construction of a new and wider canal, one which would permit the passage of modern aircraft carriers and many tankers and passenger liners. Such a restriction on the free flow of commerce is of vital concern to the United States, since 70 percent of the cargo tonnage now transiting the Panama Canal involves goods which either originate in or are destined to the United States.

There are many advantages to a sea-level canal. It would require far less maintenance than a lock-type canal and would prove less vulnerable to nuclear attack. The time of transit through a sea-level canal would be reduced by approximately 50 percent, with a resultant reduction in the costs of shipping.

With these facts in mind, this Congress, in September, enacted legislation authorizing the President to appoint a commission of five men from private life to determine the feasibility of, and the most suitable site for, construction of a sea-level canal connecting the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans. This act also directs the Commission to determine the best means—conventional or nuclear excavation—for constructing the canal and the estimated cost of construction.

This Commission will continue until the President determines that its duties are completed, but not beyond June 30, 1968. It is directed to issue a progress report to the President, for transmission to Congress, each July 31.

Finally, we authorized an appropriation of not more than $17,500,000 to enable the Commission to carry out its functions.

The Supplemental Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1965 included an appropriation of $400,000 for the Interoceanic Canal Commission.

EL CHAMIZAL TREATY FUNDS

The Chamizal Treaty, signed August 29, 1963, by the United States and Mexico, settled a century-old dispute over ownership of the "El Chamizal" tract of land. A shift in the course of the Rio Grande River in the middle of the 1800's had separated the "El Chamizal" from Ciudad Juarez, Mexico, and attached it to El Paso, Tex. Over the years numerous attempts were made to reconcile and arbitrate this boundary issue; in fact, every administration since 1910 had tried to settle the dispute.

In June 1962, President Kennedy and President Adolfo Lopez Mateos announced that they had agreed to instruct their executive agencies to recommend a complete solution. The resulting Chamizal Treaty provided that the United States would cede 366 acres of the disputed Chamizal tract, plus a nearby 264 acres, to Mexico in return for 193 acres of land currently held by Mexico.

The implementation of this treaty requires the stabilization of the Rio Grande River in a concrete-lined channel which will become the new boundary line between the United States and Mexico. It will also require the relocation of an estimated 4,500 U.S. citizens and commercial properties, bridges, port of entry and El Paso city facilities, and railroads within the area.

On April 29, 1964, President Johnson signed Public Law 88-300. This measure authorizes the appropriation of up to $44.9 million to implement the convention on the Chamizal. Without this implementing legislation, the significant treaty which was finally negotiated by the Kennedy administration after a century of failure would have been worthless.

The appropriation act for the fiscal year 1965 for the Department of State included an appropriation of $30 million to implement the El Chamizal Treaty.

AMENDMENTS TO THE TARIFF ACT OF 1930

In August of this year we enacted compromise legislation designed to protect the U.S. cattle industry without harming our tariff negotiations or adversely affecting the consumers of this country.

The bill, as originally passed by this body, concerned only the free importation of wild animals and wild birds which are intended for exhibition in the United States. Prior to this act, wild animals, including birds and fishes, imported for use in any scientific public collection for exhibition for scientific or educational purposes were admitted duty free. As finally enacted, the measure passed this year amended the Tariff Act of 1930 to extend the duty-free treatment to imports for sale for use in scientific public collections.

The other provisions of the act are the result of compromise with the coordinate body. That House amended the bill passed by this body to include the imposition of quotas on meat imports. The majority of the Members of this body agreed to the recommendations of a conference committee composed of Members from each House because they offer the protection desired by the domestic meat industry without damaging our vital foreign trade in other agricultural and industrial commodities.

As agreed upon, this act directs the Secretary of Agriculture, for each year beginning with the calendar year 1965, to calculate a target figure for imports of chilled, frozen, and fresh beef, veal, mutton, and goat meat. This target figure will equal the average annual level of imports over the 5-year period 1959 to 1963, adjusted upward or downward by the same percentage that domestic production of the same meats has increased or decreased in comparison with average annual levels for 1959 to 1963. It directs the President to impose quotas in order to limit imports of these meats to the target figure whenever the Secretary of Agriculture estimates that, in the absence of such quotas, imports will reach or exceed 110 percent of the target figure. The quotas may be removed when it is estimated that without them imports will fail to equal 110 percent of the target level.

The quotas will be allocated among the supplying countries on the basis of their share of the market during a previous representative period.

Finally, the act enumerates three categories of circumstances upon the occurrence of which the President may suspend or increase quotas previously proclaimed. He may increase or suspend the quotas if such action is required by overriding economic or national security interests of the United States when the supply of these meats is inadequate to meet domestic demand at reasonable prices, or if trade agreements entered into after the enactment of this act accomplish the intent of the bill.

FOREIGN FISHING VESSELS

In the summer of 1963 numerous Russian fishing vessels, including trawlers and large factory ships, were spotted by the Coast Guard off the east coast, close to the U.S. territorial limit. Others were sighted west of Alaska, some within the 3-mile U.S. territorial limit. Under existing law at that time, the United States was not authorized to penalize these trespassers.

On May 20, 1964, President Johnson signed legislation which established penalties for foreign vessels which fish within the territorial waters of the United States or take any "fishery resource"—

shellfish—from the Continental Shelf adjacent to the United States. Any person violating the act may be fined up to $10,000 or imprisoned up to 1 year, or both. And any vessel used in connection with violation of the act is subject to forfeiture.

In signing this measure, President Johnson referred to it as the fulfillment of a "longstanding need."

CONCLUSION

Mr. Speaker, this concludes my detailed description of the more significant legislation enacted by the 88th Congress. In each case I have attempted to point out not only the provisions of the act, but also the reasons for the legislation and the manner in which the solution we have offered will meet the existing problem.

In any report of this nature, it is difficult not to become overburdened with detail. The result would be an enumeration of seemingly unrelated facts which has little meaning in the broad sense. If this report leaves such an impression, I have done a great injustice to this Congress. For one of the remarkable things about the 88th Congress is the comprehensiveness of the legislation enacted. Our record is not a hodgepodge of isolated enactments. Rather, our record is made up of a host of acts which complement each other and which, taken together, form a coherent whole.

It is not difficult to find the reasons for the inner unity of our record. Such unity inevitably exists when a Congress has attacked problems in their complicated relationships. I have attempted to make it clear that in seeking solutions to national problems we have considered causal relationships and the interaction between various factors in our society. Because of this we have not initiated programs which will operate at the expense of each other. Rather, they attack the basic problems of our time in their various aspects and manifestations and complement each other in mitigating or eliminating them.

More basically, the coherence in our program is the result of a fact to which I devoted myself at some length at the beginning of this report. There I pinpointed, as the wellspring of our activities of the past 2 years, the condition of man. This is the element which is common to all of the problems which we have met and which has dictated the solution which we have offered. Our enactments are in harmony with each other because they are all designed to care for our citizens, to care for them in the real sense. For this Congress has rightly realized that man is truly cared for by his government only when that government creates those conditions which enable him to develop himself to his full capabilities.

I truly believe, Mr. Speaker, that by our actions in the past 2 years we have enabled our people to lead richer and more meaningful lives. We have realized that every need—indeed, the deepest needs—are not material and that progress must ever be the servant of man's needs. We have extended opportunity to those segments of our population which are most in need of it and increased opportunity for those who already possess it in some measure. We have recognized that the creation and maintenance of the conditions which make individual self-realization possible is perhaps more essential in this mid-20th century than ever before precisely because the forces in this complex, anonymous society tending toward the destruction of those conditions are so strong and all pervading. But our faith in man's ability to develop his full potential and in the ability of American society to meet and solve its problems is undiminished. Our accomplishments are proof of that. For they speak a confidence in man's awareness of what constitutes a finer and happier life, in his desire to live such a life, and in his ability to do so if he is given an opportunity.

Final Report of 88th Congress to the People of the 3d Congressional District, New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, in this Congress I have sent out to my constituents three comprehensive reports on my activities in Washington. The following is the last of these three:

YOUR WASHINGTON REPORT

(From: STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN, Representative, Third District, New York)

DEAR FRIEND: The 88th Congress, now closes its books, after 2 long, busy years of proposals, deliberations, debates, votes—and solid accomplishments.

A legislative body must be judged not only by the wise, prudent, necessary laws it enacts, but also by the unwise, imprudent, unnecessary measures it rejects. The 88th has had its share of both. On balance, this Congress has been one of achievement. It has been a long Congress; our 1963 session lasted until Christmas, and this 1964 session continued far beyond our normal summer adjournment date. Even so, I have been recorded on better than 92 percent of our House votes.

After the late President Kennedy submitted his 1963 legislative program, I sent you my first report (March 1963) on the prospects for the 88th Congress. In March 1964, after President Kennedy's tragic death and the succession of President Johnson, I sent you my second report covering 1963 and the outlook for 1964. This, my third and final report on the 88th, summarizes what we've accomplished in the past 8 months.

The tax cut has become law. I voted for the 1964 tax-cut bill because (unlike the 1963 proposal) it was coupled with the President's firm promise to cut spending, and his budget trimmed to that end. As a member of the tax-writing House Ways and Means Committee, I have always supported lower taxes, as a stimulant to individual and business initiative—the foundation of our free enterprise system. But—lower taxes mean less Government income, and therefore must be matched by less U.S. spending, to prevent big deficits and increased debt. The President's bill recognized this principle of balance between income and expenses.

It's simple enough to promise a balanced budget, but only stern attention to Government economy can assure that the promise is kept. I have voted no on those Presidential and congressional spending proposals which are unnecessary or too high, and which would throw the budget into the red.

There is still plenty of room for improvement in our tax structure. I was most pleased to hear the President propose 1965 cuts in consumer excise taxes on items ranging from lipsticks to auto tires to phone calls. For years, I have been urging that such taxes be eliminated. Most of them were passed as temporary, "emergency" wartime levies; the emergencies have long ended, and these taxes must go.

A stabilized U.S. debt limit would encourage balanced budgets. If our national debt (now more than $1,700 for every person in America) hits a firm, legally limited ceiling, there can be no more borrowing to cover new deficits caused by excessive spending—which must then stop. This June, I cast my fourth vote of this Congress against another increase in the debt limit, this time to $324 billion. Unfortunately, the increase passed; the "debt limit" is really no limit at all.

The Civil Rights Act of 1964 has become law. I voted for it, as I have for earlier laws to protect the rights of all Americans regardless of race, creed, color, or national origin. We must now give this new law a chance to work—to be tested in the courts and in practice, the American way.

Violence, bloodshed, bombing, looting, destruction, attacks on law-enforcement officers—none of these has any place in our country. Wherever these crimes occur, whoever may be responsible for inciting them, they hurt the cause of freedom. Terror in the streets must stop.

Americans believe in the rule of law—not the rule of the mob.

"Busing" of schoolchildren beyond their home neighborhoods is the concern of many people who've communicated with me. There is a Federal interest here; we are regularly asked to help the States cover expenses of their schools. Extra distance "busing" would add to those expenses—unnecessarily, I feel.

I firmly believe that carting children away from nearby schools, whether to achieve a greater "racial mix" or for any other reason, is wrong. Parents buy homes with neighborhood schools in mind; no mother, whatever her race, wants her child to spend extra, tiring hours riding between home and a distant school. I oppose any use of Federal funds to finance the breakup of our neighborhood school system.

The right of Americans to pray in public places still is not guaranteed. Since I signed the petition to force House consideration of the "school prayer amendment," stalled in committee, hearings have been held. If and when the amendment reaches the floor, I shall vote for it. Failure to add the right to public prayer to our specific constitutional guarantees cannot be postponed.

An increasing flood of obscene and pornographic material in the U.S. mails, directed mainly at impressionable youngsters, led me to support new legislation strengthening the ban on use of the mails by profit-seeking smut peddlers.

Reapportionment of State legislatures is a major issue, now that the Supreme Court has told all the States to reapportion both their legislative houses on the basis of population alone. As an attorney and a student of constitutional law, I do not agree that this was ever intended by the Founding Fathers—who deliberately set up the U.S. Senate on the geographical basis of two Senators per State, without regard to population. Why an opposite standard for the States? Of the remedies suggested for this unprecedented ruling, I prefer the DIRKSEN, Republican, of Illinois, approach: a delay, to amend the Constitution leaving the matter in the hands of the people of the States, where it properly belongs.

The Urban Mass Transport Act, a Presidential proposal designed to help States solve their mounting problems of large-scale transportation of people and goods through ever-more-congested city and suburban areas, has become law. I voted for it; it should prove beneficial to Long Island's residents and economy.

The Defense Department must shoulder the blame for new unemployment in our aircraft and defense-related industries which depend largely upon U.S. contracts. The ingenuity, efficiency, and capability of our local firms are every bit as great as they ever were—but the Department's arbitrary policy of sudden and unannounced contract shifts and cancellations, abandonment of multimillion-dollar projects, closing of vital installations, and deactivation of Reserve units has caused undue hardship.

All of our Long Island Congressmen, regardless of party, have voted for the Defense Department's fund requests. Through the bipartisan "New York Steering Committee" of six, headed by Representative CELLER, Democrat, of Brooklyn, and of which I am a member, we are protesting this hasty downgrading of Long Island defense industries and lack of reconversion planning, and demanding to know the reasons behind it.

"Medicare," the King-Anderson bill to provide limited hospital and nursing-home accommodations for the aged under social security, died in our Ways and Means Committee when its own author, Representative KING, Democrat, of California, declined to offer it for a vote. He proposed instead a new social security amendment raising payments 5 percent (with higher taxes and wage base to cover them), making widows eligible at 60 and covering certain groups previously omitted. Our committee approved Mr. KING's proposal, 25 to 0, and I voted for it when it passed the House.

Promedicare witnesses before our committee have not been able to prove their claim that this law is badly needed; to learn for myself the extent of the need in our area, I asked (in my March 1964 report) for information about any residents 65 or older who were denied physician-prescribed hospital or after-hospital nursing-home care because they were unable to pay for it. I am sincerely interested in this matter.

My request was sent to more than 90,000 homes in our district. In the ensuing 7 months, I have received exactly four replies, which are being appropriately handled—without any so-called pauper's oath.

Our foreign policy continues to drift in what I again say is a risky, futile, foredoomed attempt to conciliate the Communists while spending billions to keep them in check. My request that the administration convert its shotgun foreign aid program to the intelligently pinpointed plan recommended by students of the problem, whereby our true friends abroad would be helped, has been ignored. I voted "no" on what I considered an excessive budget for this present slapdash aid, and "no" on U.S. export payments for products shipped to Communist countries, as well as the sale of surplus farm goods to Red Poland and Yugoslavia. There is ample evidence that much of what we send is diverted to the U.S.S.R.

The hapless Lao control commission, a United States mistake which has permitted Laos to fall largely into Communist hands, thereby becoming a "privileged" corridor for Red troop movements into embattled Vietnam, asked us for an uncontrolled, "open-end," unbudgeted appropriation of "necessary" funds. My vote was "no."

In Vietnam itself, Americans die. Defense Secretary McNamara commutes between Washington and Saigon, issuing alternately cheerful and gloomy statements as one government after another is toppled by student mobs or military coups—while the Red Vietcong pushes closer toward a victory which would surrender the heart of southeast Asia to Red Chinese domination.

The House unanimously supported President Johnson's naval counterattack against North Vietnamese warships which attacked units of our 7th Fleet, and against their land bases. We would have approved a stronger resolution, had one been offered. Attacks against Americans cannot be permitted to go unpunished—anywhere.

The House also voted unanimously that the United States keep trying to have U.N. arrears paid up by delinquent nations. The U.N. Charter (art. 19) takes away a member's vote in the General Assembly when unpaid assessments equal or exceed its 2-year payments. This should be enforced; it hasn't been. The United States now pays a heavy share of the U.N.'s expenses. We shouldn't have to pay other people's bills.

Castro remains in tight control of Cuba. The Russians, brought in 2 years ago, leave only after they've taught Cubans how to fire surface-to-air missiles that knock our intelligence planes out of the sky. There is no effective embargo against sales or shipments to Cuba by other countries—the embargo I have been urging since 1962. And we still aren't sure those big missiles are gone. However, the Organization of American States (OAS) has finally accepted as fact what I have been pointing out for 2 years—that Castro is exporting Communist revolution throughout Latin America. All OAS governments (with the important exception of Mexico) have voted to end diplomatic and economic ties with Castro. Even though our State Department says it wasn't, this was a victory for U.S. policy in this hemisphere.

Our outdated immigration laws must be changed. By bill (H.R. 10893) to reunite families here by granting nonquota status which permits relatives abroad to enter the United States more easily, has been referred to the proper committee. I shall press for its passage; fortunately, I have been able to help in individual hardship cases in the past—now the law itself must do the job.

Our farm policy needs an overhaul. Continuing subsidies to wheat and cotton growers amount to bread and garment taxes, because they keep the cost of food and clothing high—while 80 percent of subsidy payments go to 20 percent of the farmers, the larger co-ops. Other subsidies to mill owners and exporters make this a triple handout of your tax money. I voted against this program and against the meat import quotas and price-pegging coffee deals which artificially boost consumer prices of these items.

The cleverly named antipoverty bill became law—without my support. I've been in Congress long enough not to vote for a bill just because of its high sounding title. We now spend $32 billion yearly aiding those who need help—only national defense gets a bigger share of the U.S. budget. The $1-billion-per-year poverty program, duplicating 42 U.S. programs now in effect, will cost New York taxpayers $200 million in 1965, without finding any jobs for anyone or helping the elderly. There are two ways to end poverty in America: promote the economy by building confidence, and focus special efforts on real problem areas. This law does neither.

Some other major bills acted upon since last March (with my vote and my reasons, if not self-evident, and final House action) include pay increases for U.S. employees, including Congressmen (yes, but only if effective after a new Congress is elected; passed). Better housing for servicemen (yes; passed). Establishment of a Technology Commission to study the effects of automation (yes; passed) and a land and water conservation fund (yes; passed). Earmark of 35 percent of Navy funds for private shipyards (no; this would have supported U.S. closing of the Brooklyn Navy Yard. It passed).

Revise veterans' disability and death pensions (yes; long overdue; unanimously passed). Housing Act of 1964 (yes; passed). A Canal Study Commission to report on a second transoceanic canal to supplement the obsolescent Panama Canal (yes; passed). Pesticide research to determine overall effects of bug killer drugs (yes; passed). The Agricultural Trade Act to sell surplus U.S. farm goods abroad, except to Red governments (yes; passed).

Again let me say that I do appreciate your letters, wires, calls, and visits to my office (room 1627, New House Office Building, Washington, D.C., 20515). I have been able to represent you better because you have let me know where you stand and why. Please keep your comments coming. I continue to be proud and honored to represent you.

Yours Congressman,

STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN.

Last Report to My Constituency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY

OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, at the close of each session of Congress, it has been my practice to submit a report to my constituency. For reasons known to you, this will be my last report to the residents of the district as their Congressman. I find it no easy task to prepare this, my "final report."

It has been a most rewarding and challenging experience to serve in the Halls of Congress. The friendships developed with colleagues, both Democratic and Republican, and residents of my district will always be cherished. I am most grateful for the opportunity made possible by the voters of my district. In this report, I thought it might prove interesting to look back regarding some of the significant developments during the past 10 years.

When I arrived in Washington in 1954, the most important issue, at least to the congressional district, was the construction of flood control dams, and in particular the Tuttle Creek Dam. As I have stated on numerous occasions, the addition of a permanent water storage area to the previous dry dam flood control plan, made possible a compromise resolution of the long-standing conflict that had held back the development of our water resources in Kansas. Perhaps this compromise has been my most important contribution as a Congressman from our State.

My first major legislative activity on the floor of the House came in the 85th Congress when the House adopted a precedent-making proposal I submitted in the form of an amendment to a reclamation bill. The proposal stipulated that for 10 years no new lands could be used to produce farm crops which are in surplus supply. This same limitation has been written in every reclamation bill to pass Congress since that time.

Some of the Avery bills that have been enacted into law include a proposal to permit duty free entry of experimental flour milling equipment for Kansas State University; legislation to provide payment for certain losses to displaced property owners in the Tuttle Creek Reservoir; a proposal to provide health benefits for retired civil service workers; an amendment to the Social Security Act to eliminate age 50 requirement for disability insurance benefits; a bill to provide for the appointment of a third Federal judge for Kansas—a general bill was passed including our State; introduced legislation which was incorporated into the feed grain program to extend the conservation reserve of the soil bank for 3 years; in 1962 your Congressman introduced a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide a tax reform for small and independent business—the investment credit provision in the tax bill of that year is a partial form of the Avery proposal.

Another Avery bill to become public law was a veterans' benefit provision. It eliminates certain inequities in the law pertaining to VA dependency and indemnity compensation awards to certain widows of veterans who die as a result of service-connected disability.

During many sessions of the past five Congresses, one issue which had the continued attention of your Congressman was legislation to expedite efforts to develop new industrial uses for farm products. The numerous conferences with Agriculture Department officials and appearances before congressional committees merely indicate in a small fashion my interest in this proposal. Today, the research efforts of the Federal Government are much more intensified in this area. Your Congressman observed that "utilizing farm products in industry can focus industrial development activity in the State of Kansas."

It was a distinct honor to serve on the various committees assigned to me during my tenure. While serving on the Veterans' Affairs Committee, a request from the chairman to inspect VA hospitals throughout the Nation was a most challenging opportunity. With my background, that of a farmer, my service on the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee and the Small Business Committee provided me with an exposure to the legislative problems facing the business and industrial communities. More particularly, my service on these committees provided an opportunity to become acquainted with the problem of Kansas industry as it relates to the overall national scene. Probably the least known of my committee service was that on the Private Calendar Committee. It was our job to be the so-called watchdog over private bills and claims. This legislative work provided one of the very rare opportunities to deal with people and human interest problems on an individual basis—small problems in big government.

In 1961, during the 1st session of the 87th Congress, it was the honor of your Congressman to receive a recognition which only one other Kansas Congressman has enjoyed. Out of 173 Republican Representatives, your Congressman was selected to serve as one of five on the important Rules Committee. Generally, the membership of the committee is chosen to represent all areas of the country.

As one discusses significant congressional events during this period of time, obviously all is completely overshadowed by the tragic assassination of President John F. Kennedy. But there were some worthy events of note. A most dramatic one, but not necessarily first in importance, was the admission of Alaska as the 49th State, followed by Hawaii. During this period, the largest defense budget in peacetime history was approved. The Senate this year for the first time in history invoked the cloture rule for a civil rights bill.

The principle of Federal aid to colleges, first commenced under the land-grant college program 100 years ago, was broadened to apply to facilities for all colleges and universities across the Nation, both public and parochial. This significant policy decision was established during the first session of this Congress. This is a symbol of the changing nature of the American economy. Naturally, many more activities could be mentioned if space permitted.

As I think back over the tenure of office, several observations crystallize in my mind. In a sense, each year the sessions of Congress have been longer and more intensified. Last year we were in session for the entire calendar year. With longer sessions have come greater demands on the congressional office. Each year the workload increased. As a freshman Congressman in 1955, I heard little talk about congressional reforms. Today, as a result of the trend, you hear much serious discussion about the need for improving the efficiency of the Congress. Because of the failure of Kansas to keep up with the national population growth rate during the late 1950's, our delegation was reduced to five Members.

One of the activities of "your office in Washington" which proved most fulfilling was writing the weekly news report. I am proud to report in almost 10 years of congressional service, this report was sent each week Congress was in session to all newspapers, radio stations and wire services in the district. Also, I found the many replies to the legislative issue questionnaires sent in by constituents most helpful and stimulating.

As I reflect, I find that probably one of the most rewarding and challenging experiences was the exposure to fine young Kansas men and women who participated in our "Week in Washington" educational project or competed for selection to the service academies.

The "Week in Washington" program was a nonpartisan educational project for college juniors to learn government firsthand. Students selected by the faculty of Kansas University, Kansas State, Washburn, St. Benedict's, Mount St. Scholastica, and St. Mary College spent 1 week interviewing Congressmen, congressional aides, and Government executives. In addition to attending committee hearings and congressional sessions, conferences were held with officials of the Supreme Court, Library of Congress, and both national party headquarters. The program has been in operation for a period of 5 years with 30 students participating. I am pleased to report that some of the students have later been awarded Rhodes and Fulbright scholarships while others have been awarded Woodrow Wilson fellowships. A considerable number of these students have indicated their desire to continue their education with an objective of entering public service or a teaching career.

Shortly after my official swearing-in as a Member of Congress in January 1955, conferences were held with officials in the academy appointment sections of the military services. The objective of these conferences was to develop the most impartial and effective method for filling service academy vacancies available to our district. A system was developed which would give every young man an equal opportunity. At the same time, every effort was made to choose the best qualified individual. The impartial selection was made by experts—the academic board at each academy.

Your Congressman is of the opinion this should not be a political matter. It would be unfair to our Nation and to the young men competing to not use an impartial process of selection. The academic record of the young men clearly manifests the merits of the system. One of the first cadets at the Air Academy to be selected as a Rhodes scholar was from Topeka. Out of 22 appointees to the Army and Air Force Academies, not one cadet had to be dropped because of academic deficiencies. At all three academies, there have been a number of outstanding achievement awards received by young men from the district.

Before concluding, I want to give a very brief rundown on the 2d session of the 88th Congress.

One bill introduced by your Congressman during this session is worthy of note since it served to stimulate some Federal administrative action. Actually, there were two bills introduced relating to essentially the same basic problem. One was described as imposing import limitations on certain meat and meat products and the other was designed to "restrict imports of beef, veal, and mutton into the United States."

One of the high points this session, which could well serve as a harbinger of things to come, was the flareup into the open of the conflict between the Congress and the Supreme Court. This was most vividly manifested by the debate in the Senate over the Dirksen-Mansfield amendment providing for stay of proceedings for the reapportionment of State legislatures. It is very possible this controversy will spread to other matters during subsequent sessions of Congress.

As has been my custom, for the information of residents of the district, here is a brief summary of the appropriations for Federal projects and functions this session of Congress for the Second District: civil works, $21,146,000; military construction, $17,235,000; soil conservation and ACP work, $1,583,320.

The following is a rundown of my position on some of the important issues voted on by the House during this session:

Supported program for educational assistance to children of veterans who are permanently and totally disabled from service-connected disability.

Voted against Urban Mass Transportation Act.

Opposed authorization for foreign aid program.

Voted for increased rate of pension for veterans with non-service-connected disabilities.

Supported Civil Rights Act of 1964.

Voted for a proposal to establish a wilderness preservation system.

Favored legislation to limit jurisdiction of Federal courts in reapportionment cases.

Supported the establishment of water resources research centers.

Voted for a provision that the Federal Communications Commission may not prescribe standards with respect to length or frequency of broadcast advertisements.

Supported funds for continuing works in the Missouri River Basin.

Favored the establishment of a National Council on the Arts.

Voted to make grants to public or nonprofit agencies for special projects of health and related facilities.

Supported the Nurses Training Act of 1964.

Voted against the administration poverty bill.

Following is a record of my voting attendance since my election to Congress in 1954 as compiled by the Library of Congress. My attendance record for the last session is not in conformity with my 5-term average.

	Number of rollcalls	Percent present
84th Cong., 1st sess	76	82
84th Cong., 2d sess	73	95
85th Cong., 1st sess	100	97
85th Cong., 2d sess	93	91
86th Cong., 1st sess	87	100
86th Cong., 2d sess	93	99
87th Cong., 1st sess	116	99
87th Cong., 2d sess	124	88
88th Cong., 1st sess	119	75
88th Cong., 2d sess	272	48

It has been a high honor to represent you in the Congress of the United States.

Hon. Clarence Kilburn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, when Mr. KILBURN of New York announced that he would not be a candidate for reelection upon the expiration of his present term of office, the Congress of the United States lost one of its foremost experts in the field of banking.

As a ranking member of the minority on the Banking and Currency Committee he is asked to serve as a congressional adviser to the Secretary of the Treasury at International Monetary Conferences. He also serves on the Joint Economic Committee and is required to review the President's economic policies.

More than all this, both he and the members of his office staff have always been helpful, cooperative, and courteous to the staff members of my Committee on Veterans' Affairs whose offices are adjacent to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KILBURN]. Speaking for them, I want to say that we will all be sorry to see the gentleman from New York [Mr. KILBURN] leave the Congress.

The Late Dr. Robert H. Levin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PHILIP A. HART

OF MICHIGAN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement by me concerning Dr. Robert H. Levin.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Early in July, Dr. Robert H. Levin, his wife Alicia, and his two children, Mark and Julie, moved from nearby Maryland to Connecticut for a year of study by Dr. Levin at Yale Medical School. In a few short years, Dr. Levin had achieved a growing reputation as a research specialist for the National Institutes of Health in the field of hematology, with respect to cancer and leukemia.

Dr. Levin and his wife still considered themselves Michigan residents and voted as such though they had left Michigan some years ago. Dr. Levin's parents, Mr. and Mrs. A. J. Levin, live in Franklin, Mich. The last time I had the pleasure of meeting Bob and Alicia was last year when they both attended a meeting on current affairs which I addressed.

On July 9 last, Bob Levin and three other doctors from NIH were on their way to a conference of hematologists at Oak Ridge where Bob was scheduled to deliver a paper. The plane in which they were flying crashed in Tennessee. Among the dead was Bob Levin.

His passing is not only a tragic loss to his loved ones, but in his brief career he left a gap which will be most difficult to fill. It is eminently fitting that I describe for you what this young man accomplished in his 30 years of life.

Dr. Robert H. Levin came to the National Cancer Institute on July 1, 1961. He was selected for appointment as a clinical associate in the Medicine Branch of the National Cancer Institute. This appointment reflected his outstanding academic record, since such appointments are highly competitive.

In 3 years, Dr. Levin achieved a brilliant reputation in his field. His colleagues at NIH tell me that during his first year, he developed an interest in the physiology and function of the blood platelets. Over the next 2 years he became an authority in the field of platelet physiology. He was held in high regard not only by his fellow scientists, but by clinical investigators working in his field throughout the world. In that short period of time, his bibliography included more than 17 scientific manuscripts, many of which are yet to be published.

He made major contributions to our understanding of the techniques for the collection and transfusion of platelets to give maximal effectiveness in recipients. In addition, he worked on the relationship of the morphology of leukemic cells, that is, the way they look under the miscroscope as related to their behavior in the patient. He found that the most malignant cells correlated with a poor prognosis in patients with acute leukemia. He also studied the first bone marrow homografts in man derived from transfusion of leukocytes from peripheral blood. Finally, he did important work in immunology. He showed that in man certain drugs were capable of significantly suppressing the immune response in humans.

In addition to these accomplishments, Dr. Levin has left a heritage of ideas which his colleagues will carry forward in their own research for many years to come. He demonstrated tremendous energy, efficiency, organization, and effectiveness in every aspect of his work.

As a result of his research, he was appointed to the permanent staff of the National Cancer Institute shortly before his death. Moreover, the Yale University School of Medicine offered him an appointment for 1 year as a clinical hematology fellow. He had just left for New Haven to receive this additional year of training. After completion of that year, it was his plan to return to the National Cancer Institute.

As an outstanding physician, Bob Levin's relationships with the families and patients for whom he cared were full of warmth and competence. Everyone who watched him perform his duties had the highest regard for his skills. In addition, all who knew him found him to be a very attractive person. His personality was marked by a tremendous vivacity. He characteristically wore a smile and his conversation was sprinkled with humorous comments which put everyone around him in a pleasant mood.

All of us who knew Bob Levin grieve at his passing. Our hearts go out to his wife, his children, his parents, his brothers, whose loss is incalculable. Our country too has lost a brilliant scientist who could have made tremendous contributions to humanity.

Peruvian Airlines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, Aerolineas Peruanos—Peruvian Airlines—with offices in principle cities throughout this hemisphere including Washington, D.C., and Miami, Fla., started flying in 1957 and now operates modern American manufactured aircraft including jets and flown by veteran American captains to more countries in South America than any other airline.

I wish to commend this airline and its technical director and general manager, Mr. C. N. Shelton, on the American pioneer spirit of its operation and excellence of service without Government subsidy or governmental financial assistance of any kind whatsoever. This is typical of the great spirit needed to promote better relations with our Latin American countries in making valuable ties with transportation, tourist trade and the general exchange of people within these countries.

A Promising New Approach to True Urban Renewal in the Nation's Capital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, a promising new approach to the stalled 4-year drive to provide urban renewal in downtown Washington's commercial districts would be authorized by a new bipartisan bill, cosponsored by Representative Abraham J. Multer, Democrat, of New York and me. Introduced in the closing days of the Congress, the bill will strengthen and improve urban renewal in the District. Chairman John L. McMillan of the House District Committee probably was referring to the amendments in this new bill when, in putting off S. 628, he said that "Two Members had as high as five amendments each to offer and some of them certainly would have been adopted." My bill is H.R. 12779, while Congressman Multer's bill is H.R. 12818.

The new bill was introduced for "study purposes." The ranking position of its sponsors on the House Banking and Currency Committee, the parent committee in charge of housing and urban renewal legislation, would seem to guarantee that Federal and District agencies, and the Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia would, indeed, study it. Many of the provisions of the new proposal were in the national housing bill, H.R. 9771, introduced by me on January 28, 1964. The proposals in that bill, for code enforcement, and rehabilitation, were singled out for praise by President Johnson when he said:

> The plight of property owners in urban renewal areas is recognized in this measure. Provision is made so that they can rehabilitate their homes and businesses instead of having to move from the path of the bulldozers.

Dr. Robert C. Weaver, Housing Administrator, writing in the September 28 New York Times said of the Widnall provisions signed into law by President Johnson on September 2:

> The Housing Act of 1964 affords new tools for coping with rehabilitation and relocation. The act provides that no displacement of families or businesses can be made from a renewal area until the Housing Administrator has determined that rehabilitation is not suitable for the area. And the act authorizes low-interest modernization loans to families and businesses.

Senator Paul H. Douglas, and Chairman Albert Rains likewise have singled out the code enforcement, and rehabilitation features of the Housing Act of 1964 for praise, as has the New York Times, and many other publications, as well as national groups concerned with good housing.

Chairman Albert Rains said, during consideration of the housing bill on August 13, 1964:

> [From the Congressional Record, Aug. 13, 1964, p. 19298]
>
> Mr. Rains. I can announce the feeling of a committee, I say to the distinguished gentleman, and this bill has given particular emphasis toward trying to achieve it. It is the philosophy of this legislation and of this bill in particular, because we took more than passing pains to do something about it, that in no instance should people be uprooted by urban renewal or any other governmental program unless adequate provision is made for the rehousing of those people in decent, sanitary, and good housing, either public or private housing.
>
> This bill, thanks to my distinguished friend, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Widnall], makes a great deal of effort toward reaching the very problem the gentleman has stated.
>
> Mr. Kyl. I thank the gentleman for his response, because I want that in the Record.
>
> Mr. Rains. I will continue with that thought for a minute. I wish to credit my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Widnall], for the leading role he played in the development of the provisions of this bill which authorize the 3 percent direct loan program to enable the owners of property in urban renewal areas to finance needed repairs and rehabilitation. The existing programs designed to stimulate private rehabilitation of property in urban renewal areas have not been successful. I have great confidence that this new 3 percent interest program will make possible the private repair and rehabilitation of a substantial amount of property in urban renewal areas. It will provide a source of financing to those persons who own property in urban renewal areas presently who are unable to undertake the necessary rehabilitation of their property because they cannot obtain loans in sufficient amounts or on terms they can afford.
>
> I ask Members to note this well, because it is a very fine section, in my opinion.
>
> Another important innovation in this bill which we owe largely to the efforts of the gentleman from New Jersey is that which emphasizes the role of code enforcement in urban renewal objectives. In recognition of this, the bill authorizes urban renewal projects which consist entirely or substantially of a program of intensive code enforcement. Thus, it provides that Federal grant assistance shall be available to help pay the cost of enforcing codes in such project areas, and as a corollary, requires that the locality shall be required to increase proportionately its total expenditure for code enforcement.
>
> In further support of these objectives, the bill provides that beginning 3 years hence no workable program, which is a prerequisite for urban renewal assistance, will be approved or recertified unless the locality is carrying out an effective program of housing code enforcement. That is quite a section. Very frankly, this particular section is aimed at putting onto the local authorities the responsibility so after 3 years they cannot qualify unless they have an adequate code enforcement at the local level. Had it been carried out over the long years past, we would not have the slums and blight we now have in the cities of this country.
>
> I compliment my distinguished friend from New Jersey [Mr. Widnall] for the good work he has done on that particular section.

Regarding code enforcement, Senator Douglas said on July 31, 1964, when the housing bill was under consideration in the Senate:

> I think we should particularly commend Representative Widnall, of New Jersey, in the House, and Senator Javits in the Senate for calling to our attention the problems of housing code enforcement. and for having a provision incorporated in the act which will encourage towns and cities to adopt and enforce housing codes.
>
> If the cities would enforce their housing codes, we could head off a great deal of urban blight, which now calls for urban renewal. The Representative from New Jersey [Mr. Widnall] first raised this issue in the House, and Senator Javits raised it before our committee. The code enforcement provision is included in the bill. We owe them a great debt. It is an instance which shows the way in which we can cooperate across party lines and of how the legislative branch can step out ahead of the executive.

Senator Douglas had this to say on October 1 on the subject of the rehabilitation section of the Housing Act of 1964:

> [From the Congressional Record, Oct. 1, 1964, p. 23311]
>
> Mr. Douglas. Mr. President, the Housing Act of 1964 contained an authorization of $50 million for a program of direct loans by the Housing and Home Finance Agency to rehabilitate homes and small businesses in urban renewal areas. Section 312 of that bill would authorize 3-percent loans with a maximum maturity of 20 years to help save the so-called gray areas, or the deteriorating areas in the Nation's towns and cities. Let me say that the program was originally proposed by Representative Widnall, of New Jersey, and other Republicans on the House Banking and Currency Committee. I think it is one of the most constructive suggestions which have been made in the field of housing in a great many years and Congressman Widnall is deserving of great praise. He has been very constructive throughout and has shown public spirit of the highest order.
>
> The housing bill which the Congress enacted contained this new rehabilitation loan proposal. I have pointed out that it is vital that an effective rehabilitation loan program be implemented since the existing rehabilitation programs have not been fully successful.
>
> Mr. President, the situation that we have faced has been roughly as follows: Areas are allowed to deteriorate because the owners and occupants do not have the money to rehabilitate the buildings in which they live. Because we do not have adequate programs to rehabilitate these areas, they continue to slide rapidly downhill until they are marked for bulldozing under the urban renewal program. In too many cases the families and small businesses in these areas are forced to relocate elsewhere because large numbers of high-rent dwelling and business units are constructed on the site which has been cleared with Federal grant funds.
>
> This new loan program would prevent the bulldozing of areas suitable for rehabilitation and would permit individuals owning property in those areas to preserve them so they would not have to be completely bulldozed and destroyed.
>
> The members of the Banking and Currency Committee who were conferees on the housing bill strongly supported the new loan program and the conference report drew attention to it. When the President signed the bill on the 2d of September, he specifically endorsed this new loan program. The President said:
>
> "The plight of property owners in urban renewal areas is recognized in this measure. Provision is made so that they can rehabilitate their homes and businesses instead of

having to move from the path of the bulldozers."

In spite of the strong support from the President and Congress, apparently the Budget Bureau has been opposing any formal request for funds to implement the program. Therefore the question of funding this program was not raised in the Appropriations Committee during its consideration of the supplemental bill. I have a generally high opinion of the work of the Budget Bureau. I think a majority of the staff is made up of devoted public servants. But there is a tendency on the part of certain officials who have bureaucratic views to become infuriated at congressional proposals or new ideas generated by the Congress.

The Budget Bureau, in this instance, reminds me of the cruel Marshall Davoust, one of Napoleon's generals. Passing down the lines of his troops for review, Davoust screamed in fury "They breathe." Angered that they should show signs of animation, Davoust tore out from their roots the mustaches of several of his grenadiers.

The Bureau of the Budget appears to have been behaving in a similar fashion over the initiative of Congress in developing good housing programs. It is time it was put in its place. It should be "on tap" but not "on top."

This is a proposal joined in by the Republicans and the Democrats. I am glad in this case our distinguished friend from New York, Senator JAVITS, is a cosponsor.

I think it is about time that we in the Congress assert our rights when the Bureau of the Budget stands in the way of programs, when the Bureau tries to impose bureaucratic opposition not only against Congress but a program which the President of the United States has endorsed.

It is perhaps unusual for me to be proposing an additional $10 million of expenditures, but in this case I feel that it is imperative that the will of Congress be expressed vigorously. I hope that this amendment will be accepted.

The proponents of S. 628, which was taken off the calendar by Chairman JOHN L. MCMILLAN on September 29, when District of Columbia bills were considered, have stated that the bill's opponents should take their case to the Banking and Currency Committees of the Congress, which have jurisdiction over urban renewal. The most constructive of the critics have clearly done so, and H.R. 12779 and H.R. 12818 offers a new and significant departure from S. 628. There is not one line from the controversial S. 628 in the new bill, and the new bill's sponsors cannot be charged with lack of sympathy for urban renewal, or of any lack of knowledge or concern for the housing problems of America's cities, large or small.

When S. 628 was under consideration on September 29, 1964, Congressman MULTER, a member of the House District Committee said, regarding it, that:

> I say that instead of arguing with the committee, it (the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency) should actually develop some plans for low-income housing and middle-income housing in the District, and also some plans for protecting small business in the District of Columbia. If the District agencies devote themselves to that, I believe that when the bill is called up it will have a much easier road, and probably can be enacted. The agencies by their actions can eliminate the necessity for some of the proposed amendments.

The Widnall-Multer bill begins by extending urban renewal to the downtown commercial area of the District of Columbia. It does this by adopting the language of section 216 of S. 3049, the Senate housing bill which passed the Senate July 31, this year. Section 216 had the support of downtown urban renewal proponents. It was not brought up in the House because of a parliamentary objection. This section would meet the demands of the proponents of downtown commercial renewal who maintain that all they want is what other cities have. Since it passed the Senate a year later than S. 628 it represents the latest Senate position on downtown Washington renewal.

Sections 2 and 3 of the Widnall-Multer bill would write into law the housing regulations of the Housing Administrator and the Federal Urban Renewal Commissioner, which apply to U.S. cities and towns. There is no question but that these housing regulations do not adequately protect homeowners and small businessmen in urban renewal project areas, and must be reviewed, revised, and strengthened in the overall public interest by the 89th Congress. Their inclusion in the new Widnall-Multer bill is for study purposes, to bring them to national attention, so that the force of public opinion can be "focused" upon them, and better housing regulations drafted.

Section 4 of the new bill would require that "not less than 50 percent of any rental housing or cooperative housing which may be constructed" in an urban renewal area will be designed for occupancy by low- and middle-income families. The provision was made necessary by the fact that only 4 acres of the 550-acre southwest urban renewal project is given over to such housing, while 546 acres is devoted to luxury housing.

This section based on an amendment offered by Representative LEONARD FARBSTEIN, Democrat, of New York, who was deeply disturbed by luxury housing in urban renewal projects, especially in New York City where apartments in urban renewal areas rent as high as $246 a room.

Section 5 of the Widnall-Multer bill is a home rule provision requiring that the District Commissioners not approve any redevelopment urban renewal project unless a majority of eligible voters, voting in a referendum, shall approve it. A similar referendum provision was in the original Widnall housing bill, H.R. 9771. This provision is strongly supported by the opponents of the present Adams-Morgan plan, who claim they have been ignored by District officials. Most U.S. citizens have permitted and arranged for referendums on urban renewal bond issues, and citizens everywhere but in Washington can vote city officials out of office, who displease them on urban renewal matters.

Title II of the new Widnall-Multer bill provides just compensation and replacement payments for homeowners and businessmen. Several States have recently rewritten their eminent domain procedures and laws, most notably Pennsylvania, and this new section of this bill is based on these State laws. At the present time, homeowners and small businessmen bear a disproportionate share of the cost of urban renewal, and the Congress has set up a Subcommittee on Real Property Acquisition to develop remedial legislation which will make its report in the near future. Title II of the Widnall-Multer bill is adapted from the original Widnall housing and urban renewal bill, H.R. 9771. Early action in the 89th Congress is expected on just compensation legislation by members of both major parties.

Title III contains several miscellaneous sections, including the tax arrangement adopted by the citizens of Arlington County, Va., after they turned down Federal urban renewal as a means of developing their business and residential sections. Both Congressman WIDNALL and Congressman MULTER have long been concerned over the District's tax system, which penalizes property owners who improve their property, and rewards slumlords who let their property deteriorate. Taxes go up on improved property, and down on deteriorating and slum properties.

Title III would permit higher buildings in the District, a proposal long advocated by Engineer Commissioners Clark and Duke, and Walter N. Tobriner, president of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

Finally, title III of the Widnall-Multer bill would end the present system of grants-in-aid for commercial downtown renewal, and put Federal aid for such commercial renewal projects on a loan basis. Many cities have self-help programs of urban renewal which have not cost the Federal Government a dime. The urban renewal project in Arlington County is a notable example of such self-help, which has not cost the Federal Government money. Its proud citizens, including Representative JOEL T. BROYHILL, have said Arlington's successful program should be an example for the entire Nation. Other examples of self-help are: the Rochester, N.Y., Midtown Plaza project; the Pittsburgh, Pa., Golden Triangle project; and the urban renewal project of Indianapolis, Ind.

Congressman MULTER stated, in introducing H.R. 12818, that:

> There are several amendments to S. 628, recommended by the House District of Columbia Committee, which must be considered in any new bill, although not included in the study bill I have introduced today.

I include, as part of my remarks, the text of H.R. 12779, the bill I have introduced to provide true urban renewal in the Nation's Capital, a bill identical to H.R. 12818, which the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] cosponsored with me.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "District of Columbia Redevelopment, Planning, and Just Compensation Act of 1964".

TITLE I—DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REDEVELOPMENT ACT AMENDMENTS

SEC. 101. Section 20(i) of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945 is amended by striking out the first parenthetical phrase and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "(as such projects are now or may hereafter be defined in title I of the

Housing Act of 1949, including but not limited to projects authorized without regard to the residential or nonresidential character or reuse of the urban renewal area)".

SEC. 102. Section 3 of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945 is amended by striking out subsection (r) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(r) 'Slum area' or 'blighted area' is a residential or nonresidential area, or combination thereof—

"(1) which contains at least two environmental deficiencies,

"(2) in which at least 20 per centum of the buildings contain at least one building deficiency, and

"(3) in all parts of which environmental or building deficiencies are present to a reasonable degree (unless the redevelopment objectives or the necessity of bringing the project to a sound boundary require otherwise).

"(s) 'Environmental deficiency' means—

"(1) overcrowding or improper location of structures on the land,

"(2) excessive dwelling unit density,

"(3) conversions to incompatible types of uses, such as roominghouses among family dwellings,

"(4) obsolete building types, such as large residences or other buildings which through lack of use or maintenance have a blighting influence,

"(5) detrimental land uses or conditions, such as incompatible uses, structures in mixed use, or adverse influences from noise, smoke, or fumes,

"(6) unsafe, congested, poorly designed, or otherwise deficient streets,

"(7) inadequate public utilities or community facilities contributing to unsatisfactory living conditions or economic decline, or

"(8) other equally significant environment deficiencies.

"(t) 'Building deficiency' means—

"(1) defects to a point warranting clearance,

"(2) deteriorating condition because of a defect not correctable by normal maintenance,

"(3) extensive minor defects which, taken collectively are causing the building to have a deteriorating effect on the surrounding area,

"(4) inadequate original construction or alterations,

"(5) inadequate or unsafe plumbing, heating, or electrical facilities, or

"(6) other equally significant building deficiencies."

SEC. 103. The District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 25. Notwithstanding subsection (1) of section 20 or any other provision of this Act, after the date of enactment of this section the District Commissioners shall not approve any slum clearance and redevelopment project (as such term was defined in section 110(c) of the Housing Act of 1949 as amended by section 311 of the Housing Act of 1954) unless the project area is an area—

"(1) in which either—

"(A) more than 50 per centum of the buildings (other than accessory outbuildings) are structurally substandard to a degree requiring clearance, or

"(B) more than 20 per centum of the buildings are structurally substandard to a degree requiring clearance, and additional clearance, in an amount bringing the total to more than 50 per centum of the buildings, is warranted to effectively remove blighting influences; and

"(2) which does not contain—

"(A) an unjustifiably large number (i) of buildings proposed to be cleared which are structurally sound, or (ii) of parcels proposed to be acquired which are of basically sound property involving high-acquisition costs, or

"(B) any building proposed to be clearer which is (i) of such quality and potential use that its retention is compatible with the achievement of the redevelopment objectives for the affected area, and (ii) capable of being improved and successfully integrated into such area after redevelopment."

SEC. 104. Subsection (d) of section 7 of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945 is amended by striking out "and (3)" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "(3) give satisfactory assurances that not less than 50 per centum of any rental housing or cooperative housing which may be constructed on such real property under the plan will be designed primarily for occupancy by persons from the low- and middle-income segments of the population (as determined by the Agency); and (4)".

SEC. 105. (a) The first sentence of section 20(d) of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945 is amended to read as follows: "The Administrator is authorized to allow and credit to the District of Columbia such local grants-in-aid as are approvable pursuant to section 110(d) of the Housing Act of 1949 with respect to any project or projects undertaken by the Board of Commissioners under a contract or contracts entered into under this section and assisted under title I of the Housing Act of 1949."

(b) Section 20(d) of such Act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "For the purposes of this subsection, the regular annual Federal contribution to the District of Columbia shall not be considered as a grant or subsidy within the meaning of section 110(d) of the Housing Act of 1949."

SEC. 106. The District of Columbia Redevelopment Act is amended by adding after section 25 the following new section:

"SEC. 26. (a) After the date of enactment of this section the District Commissioners shall not approve any redevelopment project unless a majority of the eligible voters, voting in a referendum conducted in accordance with subsection (c), approve such project.

"(b) For the purposes of this section—

"(1) the term 'eligible voter' means—

"(A) a qualified elector (as defined by section 2 of the Act of August 12, 1955 (D.C. Code, sec. 1–1102)) who resides within the project area;

"(B) a person conducting a business which has an establishment within the project area; and

"(C) a person who owns real property located within the project area.

"(2) the term 'person' means a person as defined in section 1 of title 1, United States Code.

No person shall be entitled to vote more than once in any referendum conducted under this section.

"(c) Each referendum referred to in subsection (a) shall be conducted by the Board of Elections of the District of Columbia (hereinafter referred to as 'Board'). Such referendums shall be held on a date fixed by the District Commissioners which shall be at least thirty days after the District Commissioners direct the Board to conduct such referendum. The Board shall announce the referendum not later than three days after the District Commissioners direct it to hold such referendum, and the Board shall register eligible voters during a two-week period after such announcement and preceding such referendum. No person may vote in such referendum unless he is so registered. The Act entitled 'An Act to regulate the election of delegates representing the District of Columbia to national conventions, and for other purposes', approved August 12, 1955 (D.C. Code, sec. 1–1101 et seq.), shall apply to this section insofar as it is applicable."

TITLE II—JUST COMPENSATION

SEC. 201. The Congress finds that because the courts have given a restrictive construction to the constitutional requirements that private property not be taken without just compensation, owners of and tenants on property condemned by the District of Columbia have suffered financial losses for which they have no legal recourse. The Congress therefore establishes a policy of just compensation with the aim of compensating owners of land and their tenants as fully as possible for losses suffered by reason of the condemnation of such lands by the District of Columbia.

SEC. 202. For the purposes of this title—

(a) The term "parcel" means a contiguous area of land in the District of Columbia in which one person has a possessory or fee simple interest, or several persons have an undivided possessory of fee simple interest.

(b) The term "interest" means any interest in real property in the District of Columbia and includes future, nonpossessory, and leasehold interests.

(c) The term "District of Columbia" includes any department, agency, or instrumentality of the District of Columbia which takes or damages an interest in real property in the District of Columbia.

SEC. 203 (a) Except as provided in subsection (b) the owner of an interest in a parcel taken or damaged (within the meaning of section 7) by the District of Columbia shall receive compensation equal (in the case of a complete taking) to the actual value of the interest taken, or (in the case of damage or a partial taking) to the net diminution in actual value of the interest taken or damaged.

(b) The owner of an interest in a parcel taken or damaged (within the meaning of section 7) by the District of Columbia shall receive compensation equal to the replacement cost of his interest in the parcel if—

(1) he replaces or reproduces his interest in the parcel as a proximate result of—

(A) such taking or the imminence thereof, or (B) such damage or the imminence thereof if such damage will render the parcel substantially unfit for the use to which he theretofore put it, and

(2) replacement cost exceeds the compensation to which he is entitled under subsection (a).

(c) Any person entitled to compensation under subsection (a) or (b) shall also be entitled to reasonable attorney's fees incurred in securing such compensation.

SEC. 204. Each head of a department, agency, or instrumentality of the District of Columbia, as soon as he ascertains that he will take or damage an interest in a parcel, shall estimate the amount of compensation to which each person will be entitled under section 3 by reason of such taking or damage. Upon application of the person so entitled, such head of a department, agency, or instrumentality shall make an advance payment of 90 per centum of such estimated amount. Advance payments shall be available to such person not later than fifteen days after notice of taking of the parcel (or, in the case of damage, notice of taking of the adjacent parcel). In the event that the amount due such person, after final judgment in eminent domain or other proceedings, exceeds the amount of the advance payment, the excess shall bear interest from the date of such notice.

SEC. 205. (a) For the purposes of this title, actual value of an interest (other than a tenant's interest in a leasehold) is the greatest amount a prospective purchaser would have offered for the interest had it been offered for sale on the date of taking.

(b) The actual value of a tenant's interest in a leasehold is the greatest amount that would be offered to purchase the tenant's interest by a prospective assignee willing to assume the obligations of the lease.

(c) Net diminution of actual value is the amount by which the actual value of an interest in a parcel before the parcel is taken or damaged exceeds the market value of such interest after such taking or damage.

(d) In computing the actual value of an interest under subsections (a), (b), and (c), there shall be excluded any change in value resulting from the imminence of the taking or damage of the interest.

SEC. 206. (a) For the purposes of this title, replacement is the entire cost of acquiring a substantially similar interest to reproduce the interest which the owner or occupant previously possessed, including—

(1) the purchase price of land, buildings, improvements, and equipment necessary to reproduce the interest which the owner or occupant previously possessed;

(2) all moving expenses, including expenses incidental to the move for storage, insurance, and temporary quarters;

(3) profits lost and overhead expenses incurred during any period of interruption of a business and, in the case of a landlord, loss of rentals resulting from tenants' departure because of the imminence of the taking;

(4) installation of fixtures and equipment in the new location;

(5) costs of advertising and special promotions incidental to reopening a business;

(6) attorney's fees, commissions, and other costs incidental to acquiring the new property; and

(7) duplication of taxes, interest, and rent.

(b) In cases where a person replaces an interest which he previously possessed with property substantially different in value, allowance shall be made in the computation of the purchase price under subsection (a) (1) to reflect such difference. Market value of the interest which such person previously possessed may be considered in fixing the allowance.

(c) In cases where this section applies to parcels partly taken or damaged there shall be a deduction from replacement cost equal to the market value (after the taking or damage) of the parcel replaced.

SEC. 207. (a) For the purposes of this title, a taking is any acquisition by means of eminent domain of the right of possession to any parcel or to a part of a parcel or the title to any interest in a parcel or part of a parcel.

(b) For the purposes of this title, a parcel is damaged if—

(1) the exercise by the District of Columbia of the power of eminent domain results in a net diminution of the actual value of the parcel, and

(2) the parcel is adjacent to a parcel taken by the District of Columbia.

SEC. 208. This title shall not apply to any proceedings in eminent domain commenced before the date of enactment of this Act.

TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS

SEC. 301. The following provisions of law regulating the height of buildings in the District of Columbia are repealed:

(1) An Act entitled "An Act to regulate the height of buildings in the District of Columbia", approved June 1, 1910 (36 Stat. 452; D.C. Code, secs. 5-401—5-409), as amended.

(2) Section 6 of the Act of June 20, 1938 (52 Stat. 798; D.C. Code, sec. 5-418).

SEC. 302. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, real property in the District of Columbia shall be assessed for purposes of the real property tax at its fair market value (or at a ratio of such value applied uniformly throughout the District), determined on the basis of its highest and best use in conformity with applicable zoning laws and regulations regardless of the actual improvements or lack of improvements thereon.

SEC. 303. (a) Section 102 of the Housing Act of 1949 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(h) In connection with any project on land in the District of Columbia which is to be redeveloped for nonresidential and nonpublic use, the Administrator may make loans to the District of Columbia or local public agencies. Such loans shall be in such amounts not exceeding two-thirds of the aggregate net project cost of the projects, be secured in such manner, and be repaid within such period (not exceeding ten years from the date of the obligations evidencing the loans), as may be deemed advisable by the Administrator. Such loans shall bear interest at such rate (not less than the going Federal rate plus one-half of 1 per centum) as the Administrator may specify; except that such a loan shall bear no interest for any period prior to the date on which the land involved is sold or otherwise disposed of by the District of Columbia or local public agency for redevelopment. The provisions of this section which are applicable to loans made pursuant to subsections (a) and (b) shall apply to loans made pursuant to this subsection to the extent not inconsistent with the provisions of this subsection."

(b) Section 103(a)(1) of such Act is amended by adding before the period at the end thereof the following ": *And provided further*, That the Administrator shall not make any contract for capital grant with respect to a project in the District of Columbia the reuse of which will be predominantly nonresidential and nonpublic, except as specifically provided in clause (2) of the last paragraph of section 110(c)".

(c) Section 110(c) of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"With respect to the District of Columbia, financial assistance shall not be extended under this title with respect to any urban renewal area in the District of Columbia which is not predominantly residential in character and which, under the urban renewal plan therefor, is not to be redeveloped for predominantly residential or public uses; except that (1) if the governing body of the local public agency determines that the redevelopment of such area for predominantly nonresidential or nonpublic uses is necessary for the proper development of the community, the Administrator may extend financial assistance under section 102(h) for an urban renewal project in such area providing such redevelopment, and (2) if the governing body of the local public agency certifies to the Administrator, and the Administrator affirmatively finds, that all residential redevelopment which is necessary or appropriate in the community (including but not limited to the residential redevelopment necessary to carry out the workable program in full) has been completed, and that specific additional nonresidential redevelopment is necessary for the proper development of the community, the Administrator may extend financial assistance under section 102(h), or under section 103(a) (but only within the limits imposed by this paragraph as in effect immediately prior to the enactment of this Act), for a project in such area providing such additional nonresidential redevelopment."

The Titanium Industry and the Trade Expansion Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALAN BIBLE

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement by me pertaining to the titanium industry.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BIBLE

There are many important governmental functions which move forward in the executive branch from day to day. Many of these matters are of vital concern to Members of Congress.

One such function is the continuation of the work of the Trade Negotiations Committee, a committee established after the passage of the Trade Expansion Act by Congress in 1962. The committee for many months has been actively engaged in making up a list of products which will hopefully be excepted when members meet in Geneva for the Kennedy round of trade negotiations. Other countries will also have similar lists and this is where the bargaining will begin. This list, I am advised, will be ready by early November. It has been a sizable chore and one which undoubtedly has called for long hours of detailed study.

Each State produces items which it is hopeful will be exempt. Many of these domestic products have been squeezed pricewise by foreign competition. My State is no exception and we have an important industry—important to Nevada and more so to our Nation and its defense.

This industry is Titanium Metals Corp. of America. Since its founding in 1950, it has made capital investments totaling $41 million, covering titanium sponge and ingot producing facilities at Henderson, Nev., and specialized mill conversion facilities at Toronto, Ohio. Large and costly inventories must be maintained, as the military demand for prompt deliveries continues to this day. To improve its processes, to lower costs, to develop new products and to guard against obsolescence, TMCA has built up an experienced research department of well over 100 people. Research and development on a new metal in a new industry is costly and it is estimated that the titanium industry has spent over $35 million of its own funds on R. & D. to date. Since 1958, the year of the correction following the severe slump in the industry, TMCA's R. & D. expenditures have been over twice its net profit, and its capital investment 1½ times its net profit. Sooner or later, the return on these heavy investments must come. The total net expenditure to the Government itself for all titanium programs has amounted to a significant figure of approximately $105 million.

Since its inception, the industry has been faced with extremely wide swings in the military demand for titanium. The most dramatic swing occurred in 1957 when even as Government agencies, fearful of a shortage, were suggesting expansions, the Government demand for titanium mill products collapsed, plunging the industry into a sharp downtrend. Industry mill products shipments in April 1957 had reached a record high of nearly 1,500,000 pounds, but had fallen to a serious low of 190,000 pounds in December 1957. Such fluctuations in production volume have a severe impact on the economics of titanium manufacture. Even in 1963, the domestic titanium metal industry operated at only 57 percent of capacity, which is far below the level of other domestic metal industries.

TMCA today is one of the largest employers in the State of Nevada. In 1957, Henderson personnel numbered 1,250 before the sharp setback. Employment subsequently fell to near 500 before it began a slow but steady increase to today's present level of 800 employees. Some 850 additional TMCA employees work at its Toronto, Ohio, plant and other locations. In 1956, TMCA purchased an obsolete steel mill in Toronto, Ohio, and at a cost of many millions of dollars converted it into the only mill in the United States devoted exclusively to the production of titanium mill products. This plant employs over 750 workers, and has been an aid in changing this depressed area from one of relatively substantial unemployment to one of moderate unemployment. Some operations are also carried on for TMCA in Pennsylvania and New York plants of Allegheny Ludlum Steel Corp. Small fluctuations in volume are severe enough on employment in the titanium metal industry; any further increase in titanium metal imports could cause serious reductions at both TMCA plants. Neither Henderson, Nev., nor Toronto, Ohio, are located in areas where retraining would be feasible.

Wages and living standards of industrial workers in foreign countries are substantially lower than the wage and living standards prevalent in the United States. Wage differentials between countries are reflected not only in direct labor costs but also in cumulative labor costs—wages paid for developing, designing, and constructing manufacturing plants as well as research and distribution costs. As titanium metal products are upgraded from basic materials to finished products the value added by manufacture reflects an increasing differential when low-wage countries are compared with high-wage countries. Imports from countries having lower wage levels and lower standards of living reflect those factors in their production costs. There is no reason why a foreign producer should receive an unfair advantage because he has lower costs. This would only deprive our economy, as well as our national defense potential, of reliable and competitive domestic sources for essential titanium products.

At the encouragement of our Government, the domestic titanium metal industry has made every effort to expand its export trade in an endeavor to help maintain a favorable balance of payments. Despite declining prices, considerable progress has been made in the last few years toward reversing the previous unfavorable balance. It would be difficult to say that foreign tariffs and taxes on unwrought and wrought titanium have been either an obstacle to the industry's export trade or an incentive. It is noteworthy that the import duties are lower in those countries which do not have titanium sponge producing facilities of their own. In these countries, under strict competitive conditions, the domestic titanium industry has been able to gather a reasonable share of the EEC market. Lowering of the U.S. titanium metal tariffs would only serve to lower the domestic industry's ability to compete in this market, to the detriment of the common defense of the NATO nations.

Under the tariff schedules of the United States, 1963, the tariff schedule for titanium metal is arranged as follows:

Schedule 6, "Metal and Metal Products," paragraph 2, subpart J: Item 629.15, titanium unwrought, waste, and scrap, 20 percent ad valorem; item 629.20, titanium wrought, 18 percent ad valorem.

In the United Nations Standard International Trade Classification, 1960 revision, titanium metal sponge (unwrought), waste, and scrap, and titanium metal mill products (wrought) are included in division 68, Nonferrous Metals Group 689, Miscellaneous Nonferrous Base Metals Employed in Metallurgy, and specifically in subgroup 689.5, Base Metals, n.e.s., corresponding to Brussels Tariff Nomenclature (BTW) 81.04B.

In view of the information presented herein, recommendations have been made asking careful consideration be given the following factors:

1. Japan has fared well in its export trade to the United States under existing titanium tariffs, by persistently selling under the domestic price.

2. The United Kingdom offers its titanium metal industry overriding protection by insisting that metal going into end-use items purchased by the British Government be made domestically.

3. No European economic country engages in exportation of titanium metal to the United States.

4. Further lowering of U.S. titanium tariffs would only increase U.S. imports of titanium metal with the following adverse effect on our domestic industry: (a) Reduce its volume, raise the cost of the titanium products produced, and cause personnel layoffs; (b) reduce the expenditures which could be made on research and development for improved processes and for improved product, thus retard the lowering of the cost of titanium products, which has been characteristic of the industry operating under existing tariff conditions; (c) require the restriction of its market development efforts, thus reducing the volume, and restrict the research effort being devoted to supplying the technical data and the improved products constantly being requested by the military services and commercial users. Despite low earnings, TMCA has maintained an orderly and continuing R. & D. and market development program, which has to date met well both domestic and foreign free nation requirements; (d) require the restriction of its export efforts which have helped toward maintaining a favorable balance of payments.

Titanium metal is essential in an extreme degree to the national defense of the United States, and is continually growing in its strategic importance.

A cut in the U.S. import duties on titanium metal would have an adverse economic effect on the domestic titanium metal industry.

Any reduction in the existing U.S. tariffs on titanium metal would reduce rather than expand titanium metal exports to the European Economic Community, which does not export titanium metal products to the United States.

Will the current U.S. import duties of 20 percent ad valorem on unwrought titanium and 18 percent ad valorem on wrought titanium be maintained, or will the United States place itself in the hands of foreign suppliers for this strategic and critical commodity? Should we shut down our remaining titanium sponge plants, and abolish a titanium metal export program which has not only helped toward maintaining a favorable balance of payments, but has also given the countries of Europe a dependable source of titanium metal for building up and helping to maintain their own military strength?

Since the Tariff Commission and Trade Information Committee hearings last February, the U.S. Office of Emergency Planning, a staff arm of the President, has designated titanium metal a strategic and critical material and has established a national stockpile goal of 20,500 short tons of titanium sponge. This most significant action lends heavy support to the belief that the national defense importance of titanium metal far outweighs all other factors in making it imperative that titanium be placed on the administration's list of U.S. commodities to be exempt from tariff negotiation at Geneva.

Existing U.S. tariffs on titanium metal are not out of line for a young American industry—the titanium metal industry is only 14 years old, whereas the magnesium metal industry is over 50 years old, aluminum over 75 years old, and steel over 100 years old. After many years, the U.S. import duties on these older metals are in some cases substantially higher than on titanium: magnesium up to 40 percent ad valorem, aluminum up to 19 percent ad valorem, and steel up to 25 percent ad valorem.

In its brief history, the U.S. titanium industry has had severe ups and downs. It was founded in 1950, as a result of the keen insight of the military, principally the Air Force and Army Ordance. At the Government's urging and with its assistance, American firms, such as National Lead Co., Allegheny Ludlum Steel Corp., and the Du Pont Co., accepted the challenge and the risk, and brought the new industry to the threshold of maturity within the framework of our free enterprise system in less than a decade, essentially without tariff protection. Under the umbrella of a U.S. Government barter program, two Japanese companies place 30 percent of the titanium sponge in the present Government titanium inventory during the formative years of the domestic industry—1950 to 1960—and duty free. Six U.S. companies and the U.S. Bureau of Mines supplied the balance. While a seventh U.S. company entered the business during this period, five of the original American firms went out of the titanium metal business. The 20-percent duty on titanium sponge proved to be no deterrent to the Japanese—upon completion of the barter program in early 1962, Japanese imports into the United States for other than Government inventory increased at even lower price levels than the guaranteed or support level of the barter program. The first American titanium sponge producer (Du Pont) and the largest sponge producer (Union Carbide) succumbed at this point. Japanese imports continue in 1964 at an ever higher level than in the final quarter of 1963.

In mid-1963, British imports began to enter the United States at prices far below the U.S. domestic selling price, despite the 20 percent ad valorem U.S. import duty. Since the Tariff Commission and Trade Information Committee hearings, it has also become known that Britain, a non-EEC country, effectively prohibits the use of any foreign titanium sponge or mill products in items which it purchases for Government end use. This policy affords British producers full protection and disregards completely the first principle of GATT, nondiscrimination in trade. It can be readily seen also that low export prices and overriding Government protection in Japan and the United Kingdom ignore the second principle of GATT that protection shall be afforded each nation's domestic industries exclusively through the customs tariff. A 50-percent cut in the titanium tariffs will not expand U.S. titanium metal trade one iota. U.S. exports of titanium sponge have been negligible for obvious reasons. U.S. exports of titanium mill products to the EEC countries will decrease substantially, if the present duty of 18 percent is cut even slightly.

The strategic and critical importance of titanium metal was actually recognized from the start of the industry when titanium was placed on the positive list of commodities, which bans shipments by American firms to Sino-Soviet bloc countries. Shipments to these countries are still prohibited. Japan has, on the other hand, been able to secure CoComm's approval, despite U.S. objection, to export titanium metal to Russia. Japan, in this way, enjoys a market not available to the U.S. companies. Titanium from Japan, in turn, frees Russian titanium capacity for military production items, which in some measure must strengthen the Soviet military arm. It would be foolhardy, to allow the U.S. titanium metal industry to be weakened by a 50-percent across-the-board cut in tariffs.

Titanium is the ninth most prevalent element in the earth's crust and the fourth most abundant structural metal. The ductile metal is silvery gray and is extremely useful because of its high strength-weight ratio, its heat and corrosion resistance, and its resistance to scale formation in many chemical environments. It is especially immune to attack by salt water. It also has excellent cryogenic or low-temperature properties. Titanium is machined as easily as stainless steel and is highly weldable—it is available in the annealed or heat-treated conditions.

TMCA, jointly owned by National Lead Co. and Allegheny Ludlum Steel Corp., is the world's largest producer of titanium sponge and mill products. At Henderson, Nev., TMCA chlorinates rutile ore to produce titanium tetrachloride, a water-white liquid when pure. The pure $TiCl_4$ is reduced with pure magnesium under a blanket of helium gas to produce titanium sponge and byproduct magnesium chloride. The titanium sponge chips are subsequently leached and blended for melting. TMCA recycles its byproduct magnesium chloride and the magnesium and chloride values are reused in its process.

Blended titanium sponge, scrap, and alloys are melted in electric arc, consumable electrode, vacuum furnace to produce ingots weighing up to 5 tons each. Ingots are shipped from Henderson, Nev., to the TMCA mill at Toronto, Ohio, where specialized equipment has been installed at considerable cost to produce titanium bar and billet, sheet, strip, and plate, seamless and welded tubing. Wire is produced for TMCA by one of its parent companies.

A Rand Corp. report of 1948 might be considered to have sparked the major interest of Government, and industry also, in titanium's potential. It stated: "The data presented indicates that titanium and titanium base alloys are potential engineering construction materials of great importance, whose development should be followed diligently." Certainly this has proved accurate by subsequent events.

Today, titanium is used extensively in jet engines and in subsonic as well as supersonic airframes, including the A-11 and the proposed supersonic transport; in missile solid fuel cases and gas tankage such as the Minuteman and Titan III, respectively; in the Davy Crockett weapon; in the Mercury, Gemini, and Apollo space capsules; in the X-15 space plane; plus many individually small but important other users. Here its basic attribute is its high strength-weight ratio. Interest by the Navy is substantial, particularly for the deep-diving submarine.

Civilian uses of titanium are growing, but are still only a small percentage of the total consumption; in 1963, 9 percent for civilian airplanes; 6 percent for industrial uses; balance military uses. In the commercial field, substantial uses are developing because of the metal's corrosion-resistant characteristics—it is outstanding in its resistance to salt water, chlorides, hypochlorites, inhibited sulfuric acid, nitric acid, acetic acid, and a host of other media.

Historically, each new aircraft has contained more titanium than its predecessor. This will probably be true of missiles, space vehicles, chemical plants, and future naval vessels as well. It is imperative, therefore, that the United States maintain a healthy and vigorous domestic titanium metal industry. Lower tariffs are not the answer.

Notice of Change of Office and New Government Telephone Number

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following information to the constituents of my congressional district to the change of my daily office hours and also the new Government telephone number of our Pittsburgh office:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR FRIENDS: The present session of Congress has now adjourned, after being in session since January. We are now transferring our Washington office records to our Pittsburgh office, as a new Congress is elected on November 3, to begin sessions in January 1965.

It has been a busy session in changing times for all of us, and I have tried hard, sincerely to represent the people of our district, and our good country.

As many of our people in our district have asked me to help them on their problems and to keep in close touch with our district, my Pittsburgh office is now open 6 days a week through the fall to serve you.

I am keeping your name on my personal list for our new congressional district, and want you to feel free to call on me for any advice or friendly assistance that our office staff and I can give regarding our Federal Government in Washington. It is a pleasure to be of service to you personally at any time.

With my good regards,

JIM FULTON.

(NOTE.—Same Pittsburgh office—but new Government phone No. 644-2876. New Federal Building scheduled opening now postponed indefinitely.)

Need for Postal Pay Increase Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, one of the most essential actions taken by Congress in this session was the passage of legislation to provide salary increases for our career Federal employees.

In 1962 we passed the Federal Salary Reform Act, which the late President Kennedy termed "the most important Federal employee pay legislation in 40 years." In this act Congress established the policy that Federal salaries shall be comparable to private enterprise salary rates for the same levels of work and set up the administrative machinery to determine the proper annual adjustments necessary.

Now, for the first time, we have acted to implement this policy, by approval of H.R. 11049. However, it was not merely a matter of carrying out a policy. It was, more importantly, a question of keeping faith with our dedicated career employees by fulfilling our commitment to assure them of fair and realistic salaries.

We know that H.R. 11049 will not bring about complete comparability for all levels, but it is certainly an essential first step.

Mr. President, I was particularly concerned about the need for the increases provided our postal employees under H.R. 11049. Our dedicated and capable postal workers, without a doubt, are most urgently in need of more equitable and adequate salaries.

Prior to enactment of this legislation, the starting salary of a letter carrier was only $4,690 a year—which means $90.19 a week, or $2.25 an hour. Estimates presented at the Senate hearings showed that the average letter carrier today is in step 7 of level 4 of the postal field service schedule. He received $5,650 a year, or $108.66 a week or $2.72 an hour. And this was received only after 6 years of service.

Consider the difficult position this placed the average postal clerk or letter carrier in, with respect to one of the basic needs of life—housing. The majority of postal workers are located in the metropolitan areas. Testimony presented at the hearing showed that in the Washington, D.C., area, this average letter carrier, earning $5,650 a year, could not meet the income requirement to qualify for either an FHA or a VA loan on available moderate-priced houses.

We all know that a great many postal employees are forced to work at second jobs just to make ends meet. As one New Jersey letter carrier wrote me:

> I just cannot live on this money. I have one part-time job and I am looking for another now. Every letter carrier I know is in the same boat. We are for the most part men who like and are proud of our job, but we need help.

Mr. President, these are employees of whom we can well be proud. These are workers who should not have to ask for help. In my judgment, it is a simple matter of justice and commonsense to establish a fair and realistic Postal Field Service Schedule. It is not only our moral obligation to our capable career postal employees. It is also the basic requirement for a truly effective and efficient postal system. In future years we must similarly act, building upon this year's legislation, to assure adequate and equitable postal pay levels.

Dr. Edward D. Re, of Bay Ridge, Is Man of the Year in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, at one of the outstanding testimonial dinners given each year in the Nation's Capital, a dedicated public servant and member of our executive arm of Government, Hon. Edward D. Re, was honored as Man of the Year. The award made by the Lido Civic Club of Washington was presented at a banquet held in his honor at the Mayflower Hotel here in Washington on Saturday evening, October 3. Many persons prominent in government, education, the military, and in professional associations were present.

The Lido Civic Club is composed of prominent Italo-Americans in Metropolitan Washington. The chairman of the affair was Dr. Salvatore J. Latona. Incidentally, Mr. Speaker, Secretary Celebrezze and Senator PASTORE were recent recipients of the club's award which is given to a person who has distinguished himself in public life.

Ed Re serves our Government as Chairman of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission. But his service to humanity, as expressed in the plaque presented to him by the president of the Lido Club, Dominic J. Lozupone, has long been apparent. Educator, author, attorney, and government official, Ed Re's notable achievements in those and other fields have been recognized many times and by many associations here as well as in his home State of New York.

May I add that there are many reasons why I am gratified by this most recent honor for Ed Re. Not only is he a good friend of mine, but he was also one of my law school professors. His wife was a law school classmate of mine, and I have seen the family grow. I am particularly proud that his home in New York is in the Bay Ridge area which I am privileged to represent.

Many people came from all parts of the country to pay him respect. The speakers who address the Man of the Year banquet indicate the national scope of the esteem and affection which so many have for Ed Re. The toastmaster of this affair was a Washingtonian, Dean Paul R. Dean, of Georgetown Law Center, while the principal speech was delivered by the Very Reverend Joseph T. Tinnelly, of New York, a former dean of St. John's University Law School where Ed Re has taught and from which I graduated. In addition, remarks of esteem and indeed affection were delivered by Archbishop Vagnozzi, the Apostolic delegate to the United States, as well as by the Italian Ambassador to the United States through Count Gian Luigi Milesi Ferretti, personal representative of Ambassador Fenoaltea. An additional award was presented Ed Re by Dr. Mario Tagliagambe on behalf of Monsignor Barilla, pastor of the Shrine Church of St. Bernadette in Brooklyn, N.Y.

Among the prominent persons who attended, in addition to His Excellency Archbishop Egidio Vagnozzi, were the Under Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Honorable Ivan A. Nestingen; James J. Rowley, Chief of the Secret Service; the Honorable Michel Cieplinski, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State; the Honorable Joseph P. McMurray, former Chairman of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board; and the dean of St. John's University Law School, Harold F. McNiece.

Congratulatory messages were received from hundreds of friends, former students, colleagues in Government and officials in education, legal associations, and in the military where Ed Re serves as a lieutenant colonel in the Air Force Reserve. Included among them were messages from His Excellency Most Rev. Patrick A. O'Boyle, archbishop of Washington, His Excellency Most Rev. Bryan McEntegart, bishop of Brooklyn, His Excellency Most Rev. John J. Boardman, auxiliary bishop of Brooklyn, and His Excellency Most Rev. Joseph M. Pernicone, auxiliary bishop of New York.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to include a message from the President of the United States, Lyndon B. Johnson, and from Senator JOHN O. PASTORE, of Rhode Island, and the address of Father Tinnelly and Dr. Re's response which was truly a moving expression of the contribution of Italian-Americans to our country:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
October 3, 1964.

Dean PAUL R. DEAN,
Toastmaster, Lido Civic Club Banquet, Washington, D.C.

DEAR DEAN DEAN: I deeply regret that I am unable to be present with you and the members of the Lido Civic Club to participate in honoring a distinguished member of my official family.

Dr. Edward D. Re was appointed Chairman of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States because his scholarly background and experience in the field of international law particularly qualified him for that sensitive post. Throughout the 3½ years of his administration he has served in that important post with distinction and success, raising a unique Federal agency to a high level of competence in the service of the American people.

The responsibilities of Government have been carried out more effectively because of the ability, dedication, and integrity of an outstanding public servant.

It is a privilege to join you in paying tribute to your Man of the Year for his contribution in making ours a better Government and a better America.

My heartiest congratulations to Edward D. Re and to the Lido Civic Club.

Sincerely,

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

SEPTEMBER 29, 1964.

Mr. DOMINIC J. LOZUPONE,
President, Lido Civic Club, Washington, D.C.

DEAR PRESIDENT LOZUPONE: The selection of Dr. Re honors all of us no less than it expresses our fraternal admiration for him.

Few men who have come to the Washington scene have added such luster both to Government service and to the amenities that make human society in the Capital City a constant delight.

We who look back with the affection of affiliation to the proud history of the land of our ancestors, experience a precious fraternal pride in the achievements of a great leader who is at the same time the humble and prized personal friend.

My friendship with Dr. Re—reinforced by mutual interests and the sharing of many occasions private and public—has been one of the finest chapters of my service in Washington.

But, then, lives beyond number have been enriched by contact with this young man in the meteoric career that has been his life.

An Italian by birth—an American by choice—an "international" by marriage—a parent extraordinary—a patriot of devotion—a teacher of distinction—dedicated public servant—outstanding author—superb orator—Dr. Re crowns this catalog of his character with the qualities of the trusted and treasured friend.

May this night of October 3—within the historic light of Columbus Day—be remembered as a night of discovery, too—the fraternal recognition of a distinguished traveler, like Christopher, to these shores—and the maker of a better America for his passing this way.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN O. PASTORE.

REMARKS DELIVERED BY VERY REV. JOSEPH T. TINNELLY, C.M.

I am most grateful for your kind invitation to address you this evening. Like the Irish, the sons and daughters of Italy have emigrated to many parts of the world. Not only do millions of Americans claim Italian descent, but one-third of the population of Argentina, nearly a fifth of Brazil, and large percentages in Chile, Uruguay, and Venezuela are of Italian origin.

In the United States as in every other country where they have found new homes, Italian immigrants and their descendants have identified themselves and their interests with the people and interests of their newly adopted country. They have demonstrated time and time again their loyalty in time of war and peace. They have contributed to the building of a greater America physically, spiritually, financially, militarily, artistically as well as culturally.

Yet, withal, they have retained a love and affection for the country of their ancestors which has not detracted from their new allegiance but rather has fostered the continuance and growth of the qualities and virtues which have constituted the major contribution of Italy to the cultural development of America.

And so when opportunity arises I am happy, yes, and proud to pay tribute to Americans of Italian descent and to give testimony of the respect and affection and admiration which Americans of other ethnic and cultural backgrounds have for them.

But I am particularly pleased to play such a role this evening for the guest of honor is not only a dear and long-time friend and colleague of mine, but also one whom I know to be most worthy of the honor which you have conferred upon him.

The Honorable Edward D. Re is most certainly Italian. He was born of Italian parents and born in Santa Marina, Salina, Italy on October 14, 1920. Yet he is as American as any American can be. His parents from whom he derives his American citizenship brought him to this country in 1928 and educated him in the public schools of Brooklyn until he graduated from New Utrecht High School in that borough. He then entered St. John's University where he received the degree of bachelor of science, cum laude in 1941, and the degree of bachelor of laws, summa cum laude in 1943. He was admitted to the New York bar that same year but World War II delayed his receipt of the degree of doctor of the science of jurisprudence from New York University until 1950.

In the spirit of Taliaferro, Finizzi, and Vigo in the Revolutionary War, of DeCesnola, Spinola, Fardilla, and Gerero in the Civil War and of a host of Italian Americans who wore the uniform of the United States in both World Wars I and II, the young lawyer served in the American Air Force where his talents as a teacher, linguist, and legal expert won for him important and difficult assignments as well as ultimate promotion to his present rank of lieutenant colonel, U.S. Air Force Reserve, Office of the Judge Advocate General.

As an undergraduate law student, our guest of honor had been a member of the staff of the St. John's Law Review, of which I was then editor. I was delighted, therefore, when upon his discharge from the Air Force after the war he joined the faculty of law of the university of which I was then a member. From that day to this we have been close friends and I have had the satisfaction of witnessing his growth and progress through many trials and triumphs and his gradual development from the eager, tireless, young law student to the mature, able, and still tireless public servant which he is today.

It is a tribute to the genius of the late President John F. Kennedy that in selecting our guest of honor to be Chairman of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States, he chose a man who seemed to have been trained for that particular post.

The Chairman had to be an articulate man. Our guest of honor had compiled an awesome list of published books and articles, he had lectured for 15 years in St. John's University School of Law, in Army and Air Force classes, before bar associations, and other professional, civic, or religious organizations, and he had written a book on "Brief Writing and Oral Argument."

The Chairman had to deal with representatives of foreign governments. Our guest of honor spoke Italian as well as English from his earliest years. He had taught Spanish and he had been so proficient in French that he had been assigned by the American Air Force as liaison officer with the French Air Force. He had, moreover, traveled and lectured extensively in Europe, had received the degree of doctor of pedagogy (honoris causa) from the University of Aquila, Italy, and in 1960 had been tendered the Order of Merit by the Republic of Italy which he was unable to accept by virtue of his status as special hearing officer, Department of Justice.

The Chairman had to be a just man. Our guest of honor had been a practicing Catholic all his life and had achieved a reputation for the greatest honesty and integrity. He had had formal training in the science of ethics and he was and is one of the Nation's leading authorities on the law of equity—that branch of jurisprudence which seeks to correct or prevent the inequities and injustices which the law or its rigid enforcement might otherwise effect. Not only had he taught equity, but he had written a case book on the subject in collaboration with Zechariah Chafee, Jr., of the Harvard Law School, and had edited a volume of "Selected Essays on Equity."

No wonder, then, that Dr. Re has worked such wonders in the Commission and no wonder that he has won the respect and confidence of claimants and Government officials alike.

The outline of Dr. Re's biography covers nine pages. One of his outstanding contributions to Government and to public education has been his service as a member of the Board of Higher Education of the city of New York. Another activity which deserves lengthy comment but can only be mentioned in passing is the work he has accomplished in his capacity as lieutenant colonel, U.S. Air Force Reserve, office of the Judge Advocate General.

The honors which he has received, his professional achievements, his impressive record as a public speaker, his skill and prestige as an author on legal, educational, and military matters can only be hinted at.

But I wish to pay express tribute to Dr. Re for his refusal to allow his public and professional activities to interfere with his devotion to his family. The same affection which he received from his wonderful father and mother he now lavishes on his wife and children.

God has blessed him with a wife, the former Margaret Corcoran, who has complemented him in every way. A lawyer like her husband, she can discuss legal matters with the skill of many of his colleagues. A secretary par excellence, she has been an indispensable factor in his prolific writings. A homemaker in every sense of the word she has managed to make a haven for him in the bosom of his family in which he can forget the cares of public life.

We all regret that she cannot be here this evening to witness and to share the honors and accolades which have been showered upon her husband. But we rejoice to know that she will soon be able to return from the hospital with little Mary Ellen to pick up her loving though demanding duties as mother of 11 children and wife of a husband from whom so many require so much.

The Lido Civic Club is to be congratulated on its choice of Dr. Re as Man of the Year. We are grateful for having been permitted to share in this public recognition of his merits.

REMARKS OF THE HONORABLE EDWARD D. RE, CHAIRMAN, FOREIGN CLAIMS SETTLEMENT COMMISSION, AT MAN OF THE YEAR BANQUET, LIDO CIVIC CLUB, MAYFLOWER HOTEL, OCTOBER 3, 1964, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Dean Dean, Your Excellency Archbishop Vagnozzi, very reverend and reverend fathers, distinguished guests, friends, one would have to be less than human not to be deeply moved by your manifestation of esteem and friendship. The warmth of your greetings, the graciousness of your remarks, and the outpouring of good will and good wishes have made this evening's dinner a truly memorable event in the life of all of the Res.

I am genuinely grateful for your display of confidence and for the honor that you have all bestowed upon me this evening. I am, of course, particularly indebted to the Lido Civic Club for having selected me its Man of the Year, and for having tendered this magnificent banquet in my honor.

Since I know of the achievements and accomplishments of the distinguished recipients who have been so honored in prior years, I accept your selection of me this year with profound humility.

This banquet, with its avowed purpose of honoring someone for his contribution to our society, affords me the opportunity to express certain thoughts concerning the significance of this function.

As a humble American, grateful to Almighty God for all of the blessings that I have reaped from His bountiful hands, this occasion has a special meaning for me. With your indulgence I should like to express a few thoughts that come to my mind as I look about and see so many kind friends here assembled. Indeed, this banquet is unique for each of you has either made it possible for me to obtain the appointment that brought me to Washington, or has helped to make my stay here rewarding and pleasant.

There are so many here this evening who deserve to be singled out for the special role that they have played in my career. I hope that you will pardon me if I mention but a few. We are all indebted to Dean Dean for the interesting and masterful way in which he discharged his duties as toastmaster. I wish to thank Father Tinnelly, the former dean of St. John's University School of Law, for his many kindnesses and for having encouraged me to write my books. As for his kind remarks here this evening, may I simply say that the things that he said are the things that I have tried to be. I am very indebted for the message of His Excellency Ambassador Fenoaltea and to His Excellency Archbishop Vagnozzi for his kind remarks and for having graced this occasion. Thanks are also due Dean McNiece, who was good enough to be with us this evening, and to my other colleagues on the St. John's University Law School faculty.

This testimonial to an American of foreign birth is a tribute to America. It is a tribute to the system that offers freedom and promise to all those who will work and take advantage of the opportunities that America offers. All of you are witnesses to the truth that the American freedom of opportunity is a reality and can be taken advantage of by all Americans regardless of place of birth or national origin.

So as we depart at the conclusion of what is a splendid testimonial, may we leave with renewed faith in the United States of America and the society that it has made possible. Each of us ought to be grateful for the rich blessings of liberty and freedom that we have reaped in this land of opportunity dedicated to God and the equality of all men. And with renewed dedication we ought to resolve that each of us will extend to all Americans the same opportunities and freedoms that we enjoy and take for granted for ourselves.

By performing acts of brotherhood and good citizenship, we will have the great satisfaction of knowing that we are contributing to make the America of tomorrow an even better place to live than the America of today. Only thus can we repay America for the blessings that we have received, and only thus can we be truly worthy of the American heritage and the ideal that we are working to achieve. And although we are closer to its attainment today than ever before in our history, it remains for each of us to strive toward its complete attainment by conquering all forms of prejudice, intolerance, and bigotry.

The law, particularly under the leadership of Presidents Kennedy and Johnson, has made gigantic strides. Yet the final gulf cannot be bridged by law alone, for law can only point the way. It is for each of us, as individuals, to respond by putting into daily practice the moral standard of conduct that is inherent in our Judeo-Christian tradition. Only our genuine and conscious efforts are worthy of the moral greatness of our goal.

Thank you all for having honored me with your presence here this evening.

Address of President Lyndon B. Johnson at Brown University, Providence, R.I., Monday, September 29, 1964

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN O. PASTORE

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, Brown University at Providence, R.I., has been observing its 200th anniversary with many notable events in its celebration.

Probably the greatest hour in its observance came on Monday, September 28, 1964, with the visit and address of Presiden Lyndon B. Johnson to a distinguished convocation of educators and a resplendent representation of citizens in the Meehan Auditorium at the university.

To the State of Rhode Island and to Brown University, the President of the United States expressed the Nation's debt for the "quality of manhood they had produced."

Interrupted by applause many times in his masterful address the loudest acclamation in this land of Roger Williams came when the President pledged himself to devote every effort "to defending against all enemies the freedom of conscience, the freedom of belief, and the spirit of free inquiry on which our American system stands."

The cheering auditorium audience of 4,700 was dwarfed by the 150,000 Americans who formed a guard of honor from airport to university. It was a personal ovation taking 2 hours to cover the 8 miles.

I believe the experiences of the day will linger all through the lives of those who shared them. And I am sure that the tribute to education voiced by President Johnson will be in the immortal annals of Brown University as other centuries are added to its life and labor of usefulness.

Our Rhode Island is bursting with pride in the twin triumph of Brown's anniversary and the President's tribute; and I feel that his address belongs in our Congressional Record as part of our national history of education and opportunity.

Therefore I ask for unanimous consent that the address of President Lyndon B. Johnson at Brown University on September 29, 1964, be printed in the Record at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Remarks by President Johnson at Brown University, September 28, 1964

President Keeney, my old and valued friend Senator Pastore and Senator Pell, Congressman Fogarty, Congressman St Germain, Governor Chafee, Governor Gallogly, distinguished scholars, my fellow Americans, this is a proud day for this university—and for the citizens of this great State.

In these times, the greatness of States is measured not by their size, but by the worth of their schools. By that measure, no State stands larger than the homestate of Brown University.

For 200 years, Brown has honored that charter of 1764 by "forming the rising generation" into—"a succession of men duly qualified for discharging the offices of life with usefulness and reputation."

From this campus have come many of the most useful figures of our national life—great educators, like Horace Mann—great leaders of business, like John D. Rockefeller, Jr., and Tom Watson, Jr.—great public servants, like Tom Corcoran, four Secretaries of State and many distinguished U.S. Senators.

I speak with personal appreciation today on this subject. In the Senate, I had no more trusted counselors or no more cherished friends than Theodore Green and John Pastore. And your brilliant young Senator Claiborne Pell is taking his place as a leader and statesman. Today I am proud to have in my administration two men who have served as deans at Brown—Dr. Robert W. Morse, and Dr. Donald Hornig.

For all that has gone before, Brown's service to the Nation has never been greater than it is today. On behalf of the Nation, I am proud to salute you—and all who have made Brown University one of the really great universities in the world.

In other times, we might have come to this convocation looking back upon the past—but not today. I know that the face of New England—the face of America—is turned toward the future—and it is of the future that I come to New England to speak today.

I want to consider with you the future of an old and fruitful American partnership—the partnership of campus and country.

That partnership was formed in 1787 when our forefathers gave us the command, that: "The means of education shall forever be encouraged."

From that Northwest Ordinance to the Land Grant College Act, from the Smith-Hughes Act to the enactments of this present education Congress, America has kept faith with that command.

In all history, no other nation has trusted education—invested in it—or relied upon it as a means to national progress so much as we.

A former great president of the Republic of Texas, Lamar, once said that the educated mind is the guardian genius of democracy. It is the only dictator that free men recognize, and the only ruler that free men desire.

Yes, our partnership has paid us priceless returns.

From a backward position, American scholarship has flourished. Today wherever our country leads, that leadership traces to the contributions of the campus.

Our partnership is challenged now by new dimensions.

From 1776 until the present, our universities have grown—from 9 in the beginning to more than 2,000 today. From the present until 1980, our existing institutions must double in capacity—and 1,000 more must grow with average enrollments of 2,500 each.

But before the total of American scholars has doubled, the sum of human knowledge shall have doubled—or more.

These are challenges that we should welcome—and that we should go out to meet. For the increase in scholarship is not a burden, but a blessing. The growth of knowledge is not a curse, but cure for the ills of our age.

Our concepts must change—in both education and in politics. But our confidence and our courage must grow.

At the desk where I sit in Washington, I have learned one great truth. The answer for all of the problems of the world—comes down when you really analyze it to one single word—education.

Thus, I take a hopeful view—and I call on you of this campus to join with us who are entrusted with the affairs of country to help us chart a hopeful course.

President Keeney said last week that knowledge is developing so rapidly that "we can take no comfort in the belief that what appears to be the whole truth today will be the whole truth tomorrow."

I believe our partnership must be committed, deeply committed, to seeking the truth—for actually it is truth alone that will finally keep us free.

Knowledge is not something which threatens to overwhelm us. Knowledge is our salvation—and we must seek after it, and nurture its growth and we must spread it among all our people so each one has some of it.

Over the years, leadership of our university system has come from a relatively few great institutions, public and private. I believe we must regard our existing centers of excellence as national resources—to set standards, supply teachers, and furnish researchers for the new centers of excellence we must develop.

That is a first responsibility.

A great nation and a great civilization feeds on the depth of its scholarship—as well as the breadth of its educational opportunity.

In the sciences, in the arts and in our understanding of human behavior, all of our tools must be sharpened. Our public policies must encourage further the spread of research and scholarship throughout our system of higher learning.

In our graduate schools, your Federal Government awards 12,000 fellowships and 35,000 trainees in science and engineering. We spend $850 million, almost $1 billion, on the support of research in our universities alone. The partnership of the Government, your Government—not an enemy way off yonder but something that belongs to you—the partnership of your Government and the universities is closest in the advanced education of postgraduate students. Twenty-nine percent of engineering students, thirty-seven percent of the students in physical science, forty-six percent of those in life sciences and ten percent of those in humanities are aided. And there simply must be no neglect of humanities.

The values of our free and compassionate society are as vital to our national success as the skills of our technical and scientific age. And I look with the greatest of favor upon the proposal by your own able President Kennedy's Commission for a National Foundation for the Humanities.

We must also make certain that there is no neglect or compromise of the American devotion to democracy of educational opportunity.

Universal free public education is the very foundation on which our entire society rests today. Our goal must be to open the doors to education beyond the high school to all young Americans—regardless of the status or station of their families.

You and I have an opportunity that is not unlike that of the men and women who first formed these New England States.

We have the opportunity to plant the seed corn of a new American greatness and to harvest its yield in every section of this great land.

On the response of our partnership depends the vigor and the quality of American life for many generations to come.

As a party to that partnership, let me urge you of the campus to admit no compromise in charting our course to excellence. Concern yourselves not with what seems feasible, not with what seems attainable, not with what seems politic—but concern yourself only with what you know is right.

Your duty is the vision. The duty of the world I represent is the reality.

There is one thing more I would like to emphasize.

Three hundred and twenty-eight years ago, Roger Williams founded Providence. He brought into American life a bright flame which must never be allowed to grow dim. For he said: "I humbly conceive that it is the express and absolute duty of the civil powers to proclaim an absolute freedom of conscience in all the world."

Our partnership is not—as same would have it—a conspiracy against liberty. That partnership exists to reinforce the freedom of higher learning—and it much never be otherwise.

So long as I hold any public trust or private responsibility, I shall devote my every effort to defending against all enemies the freedom of conscience, the freedom of belief, and the spirit of free inquiry on which our American system stands.

The statue atop the statehouse of Rhode Island is dedicated to the independent man. Man cannot be independent if he or his society are imprisoned in dogma, or bound by bias, or borne down by hate or fear or suspicion or discrimination.

At this moment I believe we have a great opportunity in this country to move forward—as President Keeney has put it—move forward toward "making our society what we know it should be."

If we turn away from knowledge and truth, we will not succeed.

If we believe the worst and suspect the best, we alone will suffer.

If we deny our progress, if we are against all of it, if we tear down our accomplishments, we will fill the world with sorrow and we will blemish our name with shame.

But if we are courageous and foresighted and foreseeing, if we have no fear of the truth, if we seek only after light, then we and our children and our children's children shall know the greatness of this wonderful, beautiful land we call America.

I pray that when historians write the story of this time in our lives, it may be recorded that this President tried to lead his Nation with justice, with compassion, and with courage—and that there was faith and there was firmness in his heart.

And may it further be written that the people of the United States cast out their doubts, took great pride in their achievements, and bravely made of this land and this world a brighter, happier place for all mankind.

This is our choice. This is our decision. Let us all be greatly determined that this society shall survive and this society shall succeed—and what it should be, will be, for all time to come.

And as I return to my large room and my lonely desk in the White House to cope with the decisions that have come to that desk through the day from all countries of the world, and when I review the problems of our men in uniform and those on strike, when I see the farmer and the laborer seeking justice and believing that his Government will do what is right, my mind will wander back here to the little State of Rhode Island, far away from what was once the largest State in the Nation, where I was born. And I will remember 10 months ago when a terrible tragedy befell the people of this Nation and I was called upon, as best I could, with all of my limitations, to attempt to carry on. And I will think of Presidents Hoover in New York, and Mr. Truman in Independence, Mr. Eisenhower in Gettysburg, all of whom sent me their good wishes and their prayers, who told me that they were at the service of this Nation in this crisis. And I will remember how the butcher and the baker and the candlestick maker, the little children on the sidewalks, the folks sitting in the old folks home as I drove by, how they all gave me their hopes and their prayers, that somehow we might be able to carry on. But there is nothing I'll be more thankful for than the contribution of the people of this State, because in my moment of trial Congressman St Germain and Congressman Fogarty, Senators Pell and Johnny Pastore, all walking in the tradition of that great Democratic leader Senator Theodore Francis Green, they marched up by my side and said: "You have our talents and our energy and our prayers." And however long I may be permitted to continue in my work, I shall always feel deeply at the debt of this great university for the inspiration it has given me through the years, and for the little State of Rhode Island for the quality of the manhood it has produced.

Urban Issues: The Role of the Federal Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT TAFT, JR.
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, because of the great importance of the subject of urban problems, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Congressional Record an article explaining my views on the role of the Federal Government in this field. This article appeared in the October issue of Ohio Cities and Villages which is published by the Ohio Municipal League:

URBAN ISSUES: THE ROLE OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

(By Robert Taft, Jr., Congressman-at-large, candidate for the U.S. Senate)

American cities today face serious problems which threaten to stifle the vitality of our industrial society. Our streets are clogged, our neighborhoods are congested, our hospitals are crowded. Our air and water are despoiled by foreign substances.

Public action—responding to public demand—must meet these diverse challenges to our community welfare. But in the halls of government, a debate rages over the proper mixture of local, State, and Federal participation in action programs. Some believe the Federal Government should be the prime force in our effort to meet the new needs of urban living.

I do not share this belief. Instead, I prefer to rely upon the citizen's capacity to conceive solutions to his own problems without interference and intrusion by external authority. Historically, we Americans have placed our faith in individual initiative and imagination. We must not weaken that faith by becoming dependent upon a central government to meet our community needs.

REVENUE SOURCES

Local communities, in one significant way, are hindered by Federal policy. Local needs are best met through the use of local revenues, administered under local direction and control. But certain Federal tax laws actually impede the accumulation of these sorely needed funds.

The Federal Government has preempted the excise tax field, thereby closing off as a practical matter a potential source of revenue which might otherwise be available to local governments. Federal excise tax revenues for the current fiscal year are estimated at $14.7 billion. Repeal-reduction plans now under consideration in Washington could cut this amount by $1 billion to $4.7 billion, but even this is hardly a massive reallocation of an important tax source. Because this avenue to additional revenue has been grabbed off by the Federal Government, more and more cities are being forced to turn elsewhere for financial aid. Unfortunately, they usually turn to the Federal Government. The Federal income tax can be considered one cause for this trend. Because it is so high, it produces a situation in which income taxes levied at other governmental levels are regressive. In reality, it is the Federal income tax which is regressive. We have no better evidence of this than the admissions of those who favored the recent tax cut bill.

If the Federal Government stopped gobbling up local sources of revenue, cities would be better able to cure their own financial malnutrition. I have joined with a group of my congressional colleagues in calling for immediate revision of the prevailing tax structure with the simple goal of returning additional tax sources to local units of government. Such action would enable local governments to be more self-sufficient in their own right.

In 1961, I cosponsored a measure in the Ohio General Assembly which asked Congress to authorize each State to keep 1 percent of the Federal income taxes collected in that State. This money was to be earmarked for educational expenditures, and would be administered solely by the State. The cost of sending money to Washington, where a broker's fee is deducted before it is returned to the States, could be eliminated by this procedure. Ohio, for instance, sends $1.36 to Washington for every $1 it receives back in Federal aid. Expensive delay and troublesome bureaucratic redtape could be avoided. The measure passed the House but the session ended before the Senate took action on it.

Local governments are denied a distinct collection advantage because municipal income taxes are not withheld from the paychecks of Federal employees who work within city limits. Nine Ohio cities—Akron, Canton, Cincinnati, Columbus, Dayton, Hamilton, Springfield, Toledo, and Youngstown—are hampered by the lack of Federal withholding procedures. And yet, local and State authorities are required to withhold Federal income taxes from the paychecks of their authorities.

As you well know, the absence of reciprocity increases administrative costs borne by local governments. A high rate of delinquency generally is found where there are no withholding procedures. It has been estimated that the cost of collecting delinquent taxes can be twice that of collecting taxes paid on time.

By far the most beneficial action that could be taken by the administration in Washington would be to urge Congress to release to local and State governments certain revenue sources now controlled by the Federal Government. In this way our cities would be in position to meet their needs more adequately—and without topheavy reliance on the Federal bureaucracy. Such a move could not be made, of course, until Federal expenditures are brought into line with revenues—and cost-cutting measures are effected to offset the release of Federal tax sources. At the same time, this approach certainly would encourage a return of present Federal programs to State and local entities, where they properly belong. Gradual reduction of the Federal share in grant-in-aid programs would spur States and cities to assume greater responsibilities in these areas, and produce Federal economies simultaneously.

URBAN RENEWAL

In Ohio, one of the most important programs in which the Federal Government is a participant is urban renewal. Twenty-two cities in our State are partners in this ambitious effort to revitalize and rebuild population centers which have deteriorated with age. With reservations for these cities—ranging from the smallest (London) to the largest (Cleveland)—total $213 million.

I am in agreement with the goals of this program, and for this reason I voted for the Housing Act of 1964 which authorized an additional expenditure of $725 million for urban renewal work. I believe, however, that the scope of urban renewal must be confined to reasonable amounts which we as taxpayers can afford. Above all, we should never permit our governmental efforts to replace those carried on by private enterprise with private financing.

In conducting an urban renewal program, I believe maximum emphasis should be placed on providing new housing, especially low-cost housing units for deprived families who need it most. I do not favor an increase in the present restriction—30 percent—upon the amount of Federal money which can be spent on nonhousing projects.

AIR AND WATER POLLUTION

I have serious doubts about the constitutionality of the air pollution bill recently enacted by Congress. By establishing stringent reporting requirements, the bill could result in forced self-incrimination. Freedom from this type of harassment is guaranteed by our Constitution, and no matter how lofty the aims of the program involved, this freedom should not be overturned.

The Federal Government does have a role to play in curbing pollution of the air we breathe and the water we drink. Foremost among proper Federal activities is research, and important work in this field is progressing at the Taft Sanitary Engineering Center in Cincinnati. By serving as a constant source of information, and by developing workable corrective techniques, the Federal Government can serve the States without interference.

Tax incentives also can be used to encourage private industry to install abatement facilities. The Ohio General Assembly last year enacted legislation which provides tax relief to companies which take steps to curb air pollution. I supported this bill when it came before the State legislature in 1961, and I'm pleased to see it has been enacted. There appears to be no reason why the same approach should not be utilized by the Federal Government as a facet of its antipollution program.

The Federal Government can give cities valuable assistance by encouraging enactment of interstate compacts designed to deal with the problems of pollution. Water and air do not recognize State boundaries, and neither do the pollutants they carry. Collective action by States, in which each is an equal partner, can be an effective weapon in this crucial campaign.

HIGHWAYS

The vast highway construction program underway in Ohio illustrates vividly the kind of local-State-Federal cooperation which can be of great value to our communities. In 1955, the citizens of Ohio accepted responsibility for paying their share in this tremendous endeavor by passing a $500 million highway bond issue. Last spring, another issue—this one also for $500 million was approved by the voters. This money has been, and will continue to be, used to augment the Federal Government's contribution to the cost of building the new highways so vital to our entire economy. The cities, in turn, share proportionate responsibility by paying part of the construction costs and all of the maintenance costs.

Ohio's highways—those in use as well as those under construction or being planned—represent one of our most valuable assets. New industry is attracted to a State which offers speedy and efficient transportation from marketplace to marketplace. The Interstate System, being built as defense insurance in case of war, is of equal value in time of peace. Trucks and tourists travel our beautiful countryside without bothersome waste of time. At the same time, intracity traffic proceeds under more favorable conditions.

HOSPITALS

As our Nation's urban population has grown, hospital facilities built for less crowded cities have been hard pressed to meet the increased demand for their services. Small antiquated structures must be replaced by large new buildings. Scientific and technological advances have increased the costs of equipment needed to treat the illnesses of our people. The financial pressure created by these requirements imposes a heavy burden upon local governments.

The extraordinary hospital demands produced by the boom in our population is of genuine national concern, and justifies a Federal contribution. The Hill-Burton Act, which I have supported in Congress, enables local communities to supplement their own financial resources with Government aid. This type of program is proper, considering the grave circumstances which necessitated its adoption, and I favor its continued use.

UNEMPLOYMENT

Employment is concentrated in our cities. Unfortunately, so is unemployment. The Federal Government's obligation in this field is to encourage local communities to provide jobless workers with the skills they need to make their own way in an industrial society. This is best achieved through programs such as the Manpower Development and Training Act and vocational education. Although Federal funds are used to underwrite the costs of these programs, control and direction is retained at the State and local levels of government. This is as it should be, since the citizens of a community are best qualified to determine how their needs should be met.

As a member of the House Education and Labor Committee, I have supported these efforts in the belief that they are specific approaches to specific problems. The use of Federal funds is proper as long as local control is assured, for without local control the community becomes the servant of central government rather than the master of its own needs.

GRANT-IN-AID REVIEW

In all these endeavors, though, one thing must be remembered. These programs are intended to alleviate current problems. If the problem is cured, the program becomes unnecessary. If the problem changes course or magnitude, the program must be revised to accommodate new challenges.

For this reason, I believe a periodic review of all Federal grant-in-aid programs is essential if the proper role of government in the solution of urban problems is to be maintained. Legislation calling for such a periodic review has been proposed in Congress. I am wholeheartedly in favor of this policy and will give it my earnest support. Programs devised to meet certain problems, no matter how effective they might be at a given time, frequently grow obsolete. To make certain they retain their vitality and effectiveness, we must subject them to frequent and regular reexamination. Otherwise, our efforts could be wasted on an exercise in frustration.

SUMMING UP

Representative DEL CLAWSON of California, a former mayor and my able colleague in Congress recently summarized the basic principle involved in the need for strong, unfettered local government when he said: "Next to the family, the community is a fundamental foundation unit of society and derives its strength from meeting and solving its own problems, just as does the family."

Despite the troubles which now beset them, American cities have retained the capacity for growth and greatness. We must make certain their remaining potential is realized, because their continued vigor is essential to our welfare as a nation.

This can best be accomplished through reliance on local initiative and ingenuity, with the Federal partner as a limited participant only when there is authentic cause for national concern.

Tribute to Congressman Clifford Davis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I will never forget the fairness, the courtesy, the dignity, and the astute wisdom with which CLIFFORD DAVIS presided so magnificently over the subcommittee it has been my honor to serve on with him. I have watched him there and closely observed him presiding over the full committee on numerous occasions, and again here on the floor fighting for legislation that affected the Nation from one end to the other. CLIFFORD DAVIS was a successful leader in the committee and on the floor.

The whole country has felt the impact of his genius and has been benefited. CLIFFORD DAVIS' courage, integrity, and faith in his fellow man will always be an inspiration to me. I will be a better Congressman having associated with this great American. This distinguished son of Tennessee and Southerner served his Nation in the tradition of Sam Houston and Andrew Jackson. I predict that Judge CLIFFORD DAVIS will serve the Nation again in the near future as judge, Senator, or as an administrator.

Mrs. Dorn and my family join in wishing for Judge DAVIS and his lovely wife, "Miss Carrie," much happiness, success, and best wishes always.

Voting Record of Hon. Steven B. Derounian

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, in order to collect in one place information which is scattered through thousands of pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include here a report of my voting in the two sessions of this 88th Congress.

For 12 years the people of the Third Congressional District of New York have given me the privilege of serving my country, as their Representative in Congress. I have tried to use this opportunity to improve the welfare of my constituents and of all Americans. As my record indicates, I am independent of thought; I have supported our President when I believed him to be right and opposed him when I felt his program not the wisest course for our country.

I proposed legislation seeking to ease financial hardships of the retired and the elderly, to broaden social security and amend the tax law; to reform Federal tax rates and establish tax credits and exemptions, and to remove certain excise taxes; to ease hardships caused by oversubscribed immigration quotas, making it possible for many families to be reunited; to control backdoor spending of Federal funds; to permit a noncompulsory nondenominational prayer in public schools; to investigate misdeeds of Members and employees of the Congress; to require financial reports from officials and employees of the Government, of news media, lobbyists, and others who do business with the Federal Government.

I have been given a distinguished service award from Americans for Constitutional Action; a watchdog of the treasury award from the National Associated Businessmen, and the 10th anniversary commemorative medal of the Assembly of Captive European Nations.

I have substantially assisted businessmen on Long Island in their contacts with the Federal Government, as well as hundreds of individuals who have asked for my help.

I was successful in obtaining the funds needed to conduct a study of Hempstead Harbor, to determine the work needed to improve navigation; and in obtaining authorization for a similar study of Manhasset Bay.

Following is the record of my votes for which I was present.

88th Cong., 1st sess., 1963

Date	Measure, question, and result	Derounian's vote
Jan. 9	H. Res. 5, making permanent the packing of the Committee on Rules, a precedent which could lead to the packing and purging of any and all Committees of the House.	
	On ordering previous question. (Agreed 249 to 183.)	Nay.
	On passage. (Passed 235 to 196.)	Nay.
Feb. 27	H.J. Res. 284, making supplemental appropriations for Department of Agriculture for use of Commodity Credit Corporation. Has abused taxpayers' money. There is no justification for this further support.	
	On passage. (Passed 254 to 154.)	Nay.
Feb. 27	H. Res. 249, authorizing funds for expenses of Committee on Un-American Activities.	
	On agreeing to resolution. (Agreed 386 to 20.)	Yea.
Mar. 11	H.R. 2438, extending induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act.	
	On passage. (Passed 388 to 3.)	Yea.
Mar. 12	H.R. 4374, proclaiming Sir Winston Churchill an honorary citizen of the United States of America, an honor he had refused when offered him previously. American citizenship entails exclusive obligation to this country, which must be recognized.	
	On passage. (Passed 378 to 21.)	Nay.
Mar. 13	H.R. 2440, authorizing appropriations for aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels, $500,000 in excess of President's request.	
	On amendment to increase funds for research and test on RS-70, from $332,986,000 to $686,686,000. (Passed 226 to 179.)	Nay.
	On motion to recommit. (Defeated 149 to 258.)	Yea.
	On passage. (Passed 374 to 33.)	Nay.
Apr. 4	H.R. 5366, appropriating funds for Treasury and Post Office Departments, Executive Office of the President, and independent agencies.	
	On passage. (Passed 386 to 17.)	Yea.
Apr. 10	H.R. 5517, appropriating supplemental funds for fiscal year 1963.	
	On passage of amendment accelerating funds for public works to $450,000,000, the sum deleted from the bill after the Committee on Appropriations had determined the programs concerned to be unjustified. (Passed 228 to 184.)	Nay.
Apr. 10	H.R. 5389, repealing legislation relating to purchase of silver.	
	On passage. (Passed 252 to 122.)	Nay.
Apr. 24	H.R. 12, Health Professions Educational Assistance Act. It has been shown that the need lies, not in the lack of scholarships but in lack of adequate educational facilities.	
	On motion to recommit with instructions. (Failed 171 to 239.)	Yea.
	On passage. (Passed 288 to 122.)	Nay.
Apr. 25	H.R. 4997, extending the feed grain program, increasing payments by $200,000,000 since 1961 for the same amount of acreage and delegating unwarranted authority to the Secretary of Agriculture—practically unlimited authority over the market price of feed grain and over a significant portion of the income of feed grain farmers. Too great a political temptation for any man.	
	On motion to recommit. (Failed 196 to 205.)	Yea.
	On passage. (Passed 208 to 195.)	Nay.
Apr. 29	H.R. 1762, promoting coordination and development of effective Federal and State programs relating to outdoor recreation.	
	On passage of amendment, which requires Secretary of the Interior to file annual reports itemizing source, value, purpose, and use of each donation accepted or used in connection with this program. (Passed 292 to 50.)	Yea. Yea.
May 7	H.J. Res. 245, providing that Members of Congress shall be limited to per diem allowances and necessary transportation costs in connection with travel outside the United States.	
	On passage. (Passed 387 to 2.)	Yea.
May 8	H.R. 5517, making supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1963.	
	Conference report on motion to recommit. (Agreed 207 to 190)	Yea.
May 9	H.R. 950, amending the Internal Security Act of 1950, to provide for maximum personnel security in the National Security Agency.	
	On passage. (Passed 340 to 40.)	Yea.
May 14	H.R. 5517, making supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1963.	
	On adoption of conference report, with the unjustified $450,000,000 of accelerated public works remaining in the bill. (Adopted 242 to 129.)	Nay.
	On passage of Senate amendment No. 76, concerning the Philippine war claim, a matter on which Senate hearings and investigation not yet completed. (Failed 168 to 207.)	Nay.
May 14	H. Res. 340, granting additional travel authority to Committee on Education and Labor.	
	On agreeing to resolution. (Failed 153 to 217.)	Yea.
May 15	H.R. 6009, increasing the public debt to $309,000,000,000, the 4th request for increase in less than 2 years.	
	On motion to recommit and continue temporarily present debt limit of $305,000,000,000. (Failed 195 to 222.)	Yea.
	On passage. (Passed 213 to 204.)	Nay.
May 23	H.R. 6060, prohibiting discrimination on account of sex in the payment of wages by employers engaged in commerce or production of goods for commerce.	
	On resolution providing for consideration of bill. (Passed 362 to 9.)	Yea.
May 29	H. Res. 368, authorizing Speaker to appoint delegates and alternates to attend the International Labor Organization Conference in Geneva.	
	On agreeing to resolution. (Passed 278 to 52.)	Yea.
May 29	H.R. 5497, amending title V of the Agricultural Act to extend Mexican farm labor program, a program which hurts the family farm, aggravates the unemployment situation, and depresses earnings of American farm labor.	
	On passage. (Failed 158 to 174.)	Nay.
June 4	H.R. 3496, further amending the Reorganization Act of 1949 as amended to apply to reorganization plans transmitted to Congress at any time before June 1, 1965.	
	On amendment prohibiting its use in creating any new executive department, abolishing or transferring an executive department or its functions, or consolidating any 2 or more executive departments or functions.	
	On passage. (Passed 226 to 175.)	Yea.
June 4	On motion to adjourn. (Failed 53 to 276.)	Nay.
June 6	H.R. 6754, appropriating the excessive sum of $6,000,000,000 for Department of Agriculture, the largest item in the Federal budget except for defense and paying the interest on the national debt.	
	On passage. (Passed 288 to 79.)	Nay.
June 11	H.R. 6868, appropriations funds for legislative branch for fiscal year 1964.	
	On passage. (Passed 271 to 122.)	Nay.
June 12	H.R. 4996, amending provision of the Area Redevelopment Act, authorizing additional funds for loans and grants, notwithstanding the fact that large portion of funds previously authorized remains unused, and of every $5 spent, only $2 has gone into hard-core industrial, depressed areas.	
	On passage. (Failed 204 to 209.)	Nay.
June 13	H.R. 6755, providing a 1-year extension of existing corporate normal tax rate and of certain excise taxes.	
	On passage. (Passed 283 to 91.)	Nay.
June 18	H.R. 7063, appropriating funds for Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and the judiciary and related agencies for fiscal year 1964.	
	On passage. (Passed 301 to 93.)	Yea.
June 19	H.J. Res. 247, suspending for the 1964 campaign the equal opportunity requirements of the Communications Act for nominees for the offices of President and Vice President.	
	On passage. (Passed 263 to 126.)	Nay.
June 24	H.R. 6177, amending District of Columbia Revenue Act relating to annual payment to the District of Columbia by the United States.	
	On motion to recommit with instruction to increase Federal payment from $34,000,000 to $42,000,000. (Failed 99 to 237.)	Nay.
June 26	H.R. 7179, appropriating funds for Department of Defense.	
	On passage. (Passed 410 to 1.)	Yea.
July 9	H.R. 3179, providing judges of U.S. Court of Military Appeals shall hold office during good behavior, i.e., life tenure.	
	On passage. (Passed 314 to 82.)	Nay.
July 16	H.R. 4897, repealing subsection of title 18 of the United States Code to extend geographical application of laws relating to seditious activities affecting the Armed Forces.	
	On motion to recommit. (Failed 40 to 339.)	Nay.
July 17	H.R. 5279, appropriating funds for Department of the Interior and related agencies.	
	On motion to recommit conference report and insist on House disagreement to Senate amendment providing $40,000,000 for construction of a National Air Museum. (Failed 144 to 245.)	Yea.
	On adoption. (Adopted 333 to 50)	Nay.
July 18	H.R. 5171, authorizing the Administrator of the General Services Administration to provide for purchase, lease, maintenance, operation, and utilization of electronic data processing equipment by Federal departments and agencies. An arbitrary bill on a subject requiring further study.	
	On motion to recommit. (Failed 96 to 258.)	Yea.
July 25	H.R. 4638, promoting orderly transfer of executive power in connection with expiration of term of office of a President and inauguration of a new President.	
	On motion to recommit with instruction to eliminate the authorization of appropriations. (Failed 29 to 343.)	Nay.
July 30	H.R. 3872, increasing lending authority of Export-Import Bank of Washington, to extend period within which the Bank may exercise its functions.	
	On conference report and motion to insist on its disagreement to Senate amendment and ask further conference. (Passed 379 to 11.)	Yea.
July 31	H. Res. 453, providing for consideration of and waiving point of order against conference report on H.R. 5207, amending the Foreign Service Buildings Act, authorizing appropriations to pay balance of payment for Philippine war damage.	
	On agreeing to resolution. (Passed 234 to 166.)	Yea.

88th Cong., 1st sess., 1963—Continued

Date	Measure, question, and result	DEROUNIAN'S vote
Aug. 1	H.R. 7500, authorizing appropriations to National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and administrative operations.	
	On resolution providing for consideration of bill. (Passed 387 to 1.)	Yea.
	On passage. (Passed 335 to 57.)	Yea.
Aug. 5	S. 1652, amending the National Culture Center Act to extend termination date and to enlarge Board of Trustees.	
	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 293 to 33.)	Nay.
Aug. 6	H.R. 4955, strengthening and improving quality of vocational education and expanding vocational education opportunities.	
	On motion to recommit with instructions to insert language requiring all vocational education programs to be conducted on a racially nondiscriminatory basis. (Failed 181 to 217).	Yea.
	On passage. (Passed 378 to 21.)	Yea.
Aug. 7	H.R. 7824, continuing for the period ending Nov. 30, 1963, the temporary increase in the public debt.	
	On agreeing to resolution providing for consideration of bill. (Passed 303 to 72.)	Nay.
Aug. 8	On motion to recommit with instruction to limit the extension to Oct. 31 and to fix the debt increase at $307,000,000,000 in lieu of $309,000,000,000. (Failed 164 to 229.)	Yea.
	On passage. (Passed 221 to 175.)	Nay.
Aug. 14	H.R. 6143, authorizing assistance to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education in financing the construction, rehabilitation, or improvement of needed academic and related facilities in undergraduate and graduate institutions.	
	On passage. (Passed 287 to 113.)	Yea.
Aug. 23	H.R. 7885, amending the Foreign Assistance Act, but lacking restrictions on aid to Communist countries and countries which trade with Cuba.	
	On motion to recommit with instructions to reduce funds by $585,000,000 and to encourage better planning. (Passed 222 to 188.)	Yea.
	On passage. (Passed 224 to 186.)	Nay.
Aug. 28	H.R. 7500, authorizing appropriations to National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and administrative operations.	
	On motion to recommit conference report with instructions. (Failed 176 to 200.)	Yea.
	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted 248 to 125.)	Nay.
Sept. 10	S. 1576, providing assistance in combating mental retardation through grants for construction of research centers and grants for facilities for the mentally retarded and assistance in improving mental health through grants for construction and initial staffing of community mental health care centers.	
	On passage. (Passed 335 to 18.)	Yea.
Sept. 11	H. Res. 504, creating a select committee to investigate research programs conducted by or sponsored by the departments and agencies of Federal Government.	
	On agreeing to resolution. (Agreed 336 to 0.)	Yea.
Sept. 24	H.R. 8363, amending the Internal Revenue Code, reducing individual and corporate income taxes and making certain structural changes with respect to income tax.	
	On agreeing to resolution to consider the bill. (Passed 324 to 67.)	Yea.
Sept. 25	On motion to recommit with instructions. (Failed 199 to 226.)	Yea.
	On passage. (Passed 271 to 155.)	Nay.
Oct. 1	H.R. 5555, increasing rates of basic pay for members of the uniformed services.	
	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted 333 to 5.)	Yea.
Oct. 1	H.R. 7044, amending Public Law 83-193, relating to the Corregidor-Bataan Memorial Commission.	
	On agreeing to resolution. (Agreed 314 to 12.)	Yea.
Oct. 7	H. Res. 541.	
	On resolution agreeing to Senate amendment extending for 1 year the life of the Civil Rights Commission. (Passed 265 to 80.)	Yea.
Oct. 8	H.R. 7179, appropriation funds for Department of Defense.	
	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted 336 to 3.)	Yea.
Oct. 15	H.R. 6237, amending sec. 503 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act authorizing grants for collection, reproduction, and publication of documentary source material on the history of the United States. This is now accomplished through private organizations and free of any political influence.	
	On passage. (Passed 158 to 154.)	Nay.
Oct. 21	S. 1576, assisting in combating mental retardation through grants for construction of research centers and grants for facilities for the mentally retarded and assistance in improving mental health through grants for construction and initial staffing of community mental health centers.	
	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted 299 to 13.)	Yea.
Oct. 22	H.R. 8821, revising the provisions of law relating to the methods by which amounts made available to the States pursuant to the Temporary Unemployment Compensation Act and Social Security Act are to be restored to the Treasury.	
	On passage. (Passed 350 to 1.)	Yea.
Oct. 23	H.R. 5945, establishing a procedure for the prompt settlement in a democratic manner of the political status of Puerto Rico.	
	On passage. (Passed 320 to 44.)	Yea.
Oct. 28	H.J. Res. 782, making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1964, with no explanation of why Committee on Appropriations does not complete work which should have been finished prior to July 1.	
	On passage. (Passed 280 to 11.)	Nay.
Oct. 28	H. Res. 314, granting additional travel authority to the Committee on Education and Labor.	
	On agreeing to resolution. (Failed 119 to 164.)	Nay.
Oct. 31	H.R. 6500, authorizing certain construction at military installations.	
	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted 356 to 1.)	Yea.
Nov. 6	H.R. 6143, authorizing assistance to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education in financing and construction, rehabilitation, or improvement of needed academic and related facilities in undergraduate and graduate institutions.	
	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted 258 to 92.)	Yea.
Nov. 6	H.R. 8920, revising the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act to make it conform to existing code allowing discretionary authority for the Board to waive the application of special numbering process during the holiday season of gift-wrapped merchandise.	
	On motion to recommit. (Passed 258 to 98.)	Nay.
Nov. 7	H.R. 8960, providing for an increase in the public debt limit to $315,000,000,000. The 3d such request in a year, the 6th in 2 years, with no evidence of any effort to control excessive spending programs.	
	On resolution providing for consideration of bill. (Passed 212 to 149.)	Nay.
	On motion to recommit. (Failed 172 to 197.)	Yea.
	On passage. (Passed 187 to 179.)	Nay.
Nov. 14	H.R. 8864, implementing the International Coffee Agreement, increasing drastically the cost of coffee purchased by the consumer and giving the President the authority to manipulate the domestic coffee market.	
	On passage. (Passed 181 to 145.)	Nay.
Nov. 18	H.R. 2988, providing for participation by members of the Armed Forces in international sports activities.	
	On motion to suspend the rules and pass. (Passed 285 to 30.)	Yea.
Nov. 18	H.R. 8135, authorizing $1,100,000 to establish public recreational facilities at the Sanford Reservoir area, Texas, without approval of Department of Interior and with no knowledge of the actual cost of the project.	
	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 283 to 30.)	Nay.
Nov. 18	H.R. 9139, appropriating funds for military construction for the Department of Defense.	
	On passage. (Passed 332 to 5.)	Yea.
Nov. 19	H.R. 9140, appropriating funds for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, agencies of the Department of the Interior, Atomic Energy Commission, St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, Tennessee Valley Authority, and certain river basin commissions.	
	On passage. (Passed 358 to 27.)	Yea.
Nov. 20	S. 777, amending the Arms Control and Disarmament Act, increasing authorization for appropriations and modifying personnel security procedures for contractor employees. The annual report of this agency reflects the philosophy of those who advocate surrender to the Communists; to accept this measure is to condone and encourage the police state of the Kremlin.	
	On passage. (Passed 251 to 134.)	Nay.
Dec. 2	H.R. 9124, vitalizing the Reserve Officers Training Corps programs of the Army, Navy, and Air Force. This measure, at a 500-percent increase in cost, expands the high school ROTC program, for which the Secretary of Defense says, "There is no direct military requirement." It holds no provision to assure that those individuals given Government scholarships do become officers in the Regular service, as intended.	
	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Failed 177 to 154.)	Nay.
Dec. 2	H.R. 10, extending apportionment requirement in the Civil Service Act to temporary summer employment.	
	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 301 to 18.)	Yea.
Dec. 4	H.R. 6196, creating a triple subsidy for cotton. Under this bill, the cotton mill operator will be subsidized, as well as the cotton farmer and the cotton exporter. This is a dangerous concept of what the responsibility of Government in trade really is. The cost of the subsidy of this one segment of our economy will run close to $1,000,000,000 annually—which exceeds the total worth of the U.S annual cotton crop.	
	On motion to recommittal. (Failed 179 to 224.)	Yea.
	On passage. (Passed 216 to 182.)	Nay.
Dec. 10	H.R. 8747, appropriating funds for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices.	
	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted 356 to 22.)	Yea.
	On motion to concur in Senate amendment providing for a veterans hospital at Bay Pines, Fla., for which a need has been shown. (Failed 170 to 204.)	Yea.

88th Cong., 1st sess., 1963, and 2d sess., 1964—Continued

Date	Measure, question, and result	DEROUNIAN'S vote
Dec. 10	H.R. 6518, improving, strengthening, and accelerating programs for the prevention and abatement of air pollution.	
	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted 273 to 109.)	Yea.
Dec. 10	H.R. 7457, providing legal assistance for indigent defendents in criminal cases in U.S. courts.	
	On agreeing to resolution providing for consideration of bill. (Agreed 345 to 12.)	Yea.
Dec. 11	On motion to adjourn. (Failed 214 to 166.)	Nay.
Dec. 12	H.R. 9140, appropriating funds for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and certain river basin commissions.	
	On adoption of conference report, as agreed in conference, this bill includes $30,000,000 for accelerated public works projects. Also, the criteria established for the building of power transmission lines would be disastrous for private enterprise. (Adopted 330 to 47.)	Nay.
Dec. 12	H.R. 4955, strengthening and improving the quality of vocational education opportunities in the Nation.	
	On motion to recommit conference report with instructions, to include a clause assuring that the federally financed program will be available to all citizens without discrimination because of race or color. (Failed 180 to 193.)	Yea.
	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted 301 to 65.)	Yea.
Dec. 13	H.R. 9139, appropriating funds for military construction for the Department of Defense.	
	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted 301 to 4.)	Yea.
Dec. 16	H.R. 9499, appropriating funds for foreign aid and related agencies.	
	On motion to recommit with instructions to incorporate language to bar use of funds of the Export-Import Bank to guarantee credit of Communist governments. (Adopted 218 to 169.)	Yea.
	On passage. (Passed 250 to 135.)	Yea.
Dec. 17	H.R. 8667, authorizing additional appropriations for the prosecution of comprehensive plans for certain river basins.	
	Motion to insist on its disagreement to Senate amendment authorizing the construction of a public powerline in the Bonneville project, costing an additional $160,000,000.	
	Disagreement insisted upon, 329 to 41	Yea.
Dec. 17	H.R. 9413, providing for the coinage of 50-cent pieces bearing the likeness of John Fitzgerald Kennedy.	
	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 352 to 6.)	Yea.
Dec. 19	H.J. Res. 875, making supplemental appropriations for certain activities of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare related to mental retardation.	
	On passage. (Passed 324 to 4.)	Yea.
Jan. 14	S. 1153, extending the Federal Airport Act for 3 years and authorizing expenditure of $75,000,000 per year.	
	On motion to recommit with instructions to reduce the proposed authorization by $15,000,000 per year. (Defeated 110 to 201.)	Yea.
	On passage. (Passed 298 to 11.)	Yea.
Jan. 21	H.R. 4879, extending Federal aid to public libraries in nonrural areas, increasing authorized appropriations from $7,500,000 to $25,000,000 for fiscal 1964, authorizing a new program for matching Federal grants for library construction with $20,000,000 for 1964 authorization with unspecified amounts for 1965 and 1966.	
	On amendments confining aid to rural and small town areas but eliminating Federal grants for library construction. (Defeated 179 to 183.)	Yea.
	On recommittal with instruction to cut out the proposed library construction grant programs. (Defeated 174 to 188.)	Yea.
	On passage. (Passed 254 to 107.)	Nay.
Jan. 28	H.R. 6041, amending the Bacon-Davis Act to include fringe benefits in making of prevailing wage determinations. Bacon-Davis Act generally provides that workers on most Federal construction contracts, etc., be paid not less than prevailing wages for same area, as determined by Labor Secretary.	
	On motion to stop effort to pave way for amendment providing for judicial review of prevailing wage determination which would only delay badly needed revision of the act, presently a hodgepodge resulting in confusion. (Passed 297 to 105.)	Yea.
	On passage. (Passed 357 to 50.)	Yea.
Feb. 8	H.R. 7152, Civil Rights Act.	
	On motion to adjourn, thus postponing further consideration of civil rights bill and vote on its passage. (Passed 220 to 175.)	Nay.
Feb. 10	On passage. (Passed 290 to 130.)	Yea.
Feb. 18	H.R. 7381, simplifying and consolidating laws relating to employment of civilians in more than 1 Federal civilian position, and laws concerning Federal civilian employment of retired members of the uniformed forces, liberalizing dual compensation provisions in regard to Federal employment of retired Regular officers.	
	On motion to recommit, to prevent passage. (Defeated 83 to 262.)	Nay.
Feb. 20	H.R. 9637, authorizing $17,000,000,000 for defense research and development and for ship, aircraft, and missile procurement.	
	On passage. (Passed 336 to 0.)	Yea.
Feb. 25	H.R. 8363, amending the Internal Revenue Code (the tax bill).	
	On conference report. (Passed 326 to 83.)	Yea.
Feb. 26	H.R. 9022, authorizing an additional U.S. contribution of $3,200,000 to the International Development Association which makes 50-year loans interest free but with a ¾ of 1 percent annual service charge, to underdeveloped nations. Percentage of American financial participation excessive as are liberal terms of the loans, some of which might be counter to American interests and policy.	
	On motion to recommit. (Passed 208 to 188.)	Yea.
Feb. 27	H.R. 8316, prohibiting the Federal Communications Commission from interfering in operation and development of radio and TV industry.	
	On passage. (Passed 317 to 43.)	Yea.
Mar. 4	H.R. 9666, authorizing $115,000,000 for Peace Corps for fiscal 1965.	
	On motion to recommit with instructions to reduce authorization to $95,700,000, the sum authorized in fiscal 1964. (Defeated 90 to 309.)	Yea.
	Passed by voice vote.	
Mar. 5	H.R. 8000, taxing purchase of most foreign securities by Americans from foreigners, discouraging foreign investments which bring us long-term benefit through their yield of profits and help develop private enterprise abroad without charging the American taxpayer, as is done in case of foreign aid.	
	On passage. (Passed 238 to 142.)	Nay.
Mar. 10	H.R. 8070, establishing a Public Land Law Review Commission unwieldy in size, to conduct a 4-year study, and authorizing $4,000,000 for this purpose. The mass of testimony and material to be collected will leave unresolved, 4 years hence, the problems now existing. This is a task which must be undertaken by the Congress.	
	On passage. (Passed 339 to 29.)	Nay.
	H.R. 8986, increasing pay for Federal workers, Members of Congress, and employees of the U.S. Congress, including excessive increases for some specific positions and giving a reckless delegation of power to the President in allowing him to fix certain salaries.	
Mar. 11	On rule to consider the bill. (Passed 251 to 147.)	Yea.
Mar. 12	On passage. (Defeated 184 to 222.)	Nay.
	H.R. 5838, allowing transfer of funds to the Bureau of Standards from other agencies, to cover costs of research and testing for those agencies, subject to Budget Bureau approval but without approval of Appropriations Committee.	
Mar. 19	On adopting open rule. (Passed 264 to 99.)	Nay.
Mar. 23	On motion to recommit. (Defeated 151 to 173.)	Yea.
Mar. 23	On passage. (Passed 164 to 162.)	Nay.
Mar. 24	H.R. 10532, Treasury-Post Office appropriations.	
	On amendment to restore $10,000,000 deleted in committee following its investigation of the budget requirements. (Defeated 160 to 193.)	Nay.
	On passage. (Passed 326 to 20.)	Yea.
Mar. 25	H.R. 10456, authorizing $5,200,000,000 for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for fiscal 1964. Establishing an Electronics Research Center in Boston, Mass., without benefit of congressional consideration of this and other sites, including a proposed site on Long Island.	
	On adopting open rule. (Passed 357 to 0)	Yea.
	On passage. (Passed 283 to 73.)	Nay.
Apr. 6	S. 1828, establishing the Battle of Lake Erie Sesquicentennial Commission and authorizing appropriations for the celebration.	
	On passage. (Passed 233 to 39.)	Yea.
Apr. 8	H.R. 10222, expanding and permanently establishing a food stamp program. This legislation will not lessen farm surpluses and states that where this program is in effect, no distribution of surplus food will be allowed. It gives the Secretary of Agriculture excessive powers.	
	On recommittal motion with instructions to require participating States to pay half the costs. (Defeated 195 to 223.)	Yea.
	On passage. (Passed 229 to 189.)	Nay.
Apr. 8	H. Res. 665, a resolution concurring to Senate version of cotton-wheat bill, establishing special 2-year programs of acreage allotments and price supports for cotton and wheat. The cotton subsidy holds a dangerous concept of what the responsibility of Government in trade really is. It is a triple subsidy for the cotton industry: the cotton farmer is subsidized by the taxpayer, the cotton exporter is further subsidized and this bill subsidizes the cotton mill operator, too.	
	On passage. (Passed 211 to 203.)	Nay.
Apr. 14	H.R. 10809, providing $6,000,000,000 in appropriations for Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies.	
	On passage. (Passed 347 to 21.)	Yea.
Apr. 15	S. 2394, authorizing funds for implementing the Convention of the Chamizal, settling a boundary dispute between the United States and Mexico at El Paso, Tex.	
	On passage. (Passed 348 to 5.)	Yea.

88th Cong., 2d sess., 1964—Continued

Date	Measure, question, and result	DEROUNIAN'S vote
Apr. 22	H.R. 10939, providing $46,759,267,000 in appropriations for Defense Department.	
	On passage. (Passed 365 to 0.)	Yea.
May 6	H.R. 11134, providing $1,700,000,000 in appropriations for Department of State, Justice, Commerce, and related agencies and for the Federal judiciary. On passage. (Passed 314 to 40.)	Yea.
May 13	S. 2214, authorizing additional U.S. contribution of $312,000,000 to International Development Association. Similar to H.R. 9022, with only minor differences.	
	On recommittal. (Defeated 132 to 247.)	Yea.
May 18	H.J. Res. 1020, authorizing the issuance of a gold medal to Henry Kaiser.	
	On passage. (Failed 150 to 143—⅔ majority vote needed because of suspension of rules.)	Nay.
May 20	H.R. 11202, authorizing appropriations for Agriculture Department.	
	On passage of amendment appropriation $1,600,000 for construction of a peanut research center at Dawson, Ga. (Defeated 181 to 198.)	Nay.
	On motion to recommit with instructions to insert language preventing use of funds for payment of export subsidies on surplus agricultural commodities sold to Communist countries unless approved by the President and reported to Congress. (Defeated 186 to 187.)	Yea.
	On passage of bill. (Passed 311 to 64.)	Nay.
May 26	H.R. 11369, authorizing $1,600,000,000 for Defense Department military construction.	
	On passage. (Passed 340 to 5.)	Yea.
May 27	H.R. 5130, increasing Federal insurance coverage on depositors' accounts in banks and savings and loan institutions from present $10,000 to $20,000, a bill submitted to House without benefit of committee hearings or consideration of proposed provisions seeking to protect depositors, stockholders, and the public.	
	On resolution for consideration of measure. (Passed 218 to 115.)	Yea.
	On motion to recommit. (Passed 197 to 142.)	Yea.
June 10	H.R. 11380, authorizing $2,000,000,000 in new appropriations for foreign aid, this in addition to the $1,500,000,000 in the pipeline.	
	On motion to recommit with instructions to reduce funds by $222,000,000. (Defeated 193 to 211.)	Yea.
	On passage. (Passed 230 to 175.)	Nay.
June 11	H.R. 11049, Federal employees' pay raise, cutting back proposed increase for Members of Congress, and for other specific positions.	
	On passage. (Passed 243 to 157.)	Yea.
June 16	H.R. 11579, appropriating $4,300,000,000 for civil public works functions.	
	On passage. (Passed 361 to 11.)	Yea.
June 17	H.R. 11376, extending excise taxes.	
	On motion to recommit with instructions to reduce retailer's excise taxes on jewelry, furs, toilet preparations, luggage and handbags. (Defeated 185 to 207.)	Yea.
	Bill was passed by a voice vote.	
June 18	H.R. 11375, increasing public debt limit to $324,000,000.	
	On passage. (Passed 203 to 182.)	Nay.
June 25	H.R. 3881 (S. 6), authorizing Federal program of grants to States and localities to build or improve mass transit systems.	
	On amendment regarding job protection for employees in transit companies which would receive Federal aid or be purchased with help of Federal aid, offered on House floor without benefit of committee consideration of the complicated problems involved. (Passed 234 to 170.)	Nay
	On motion to recommit. (Defeated 190 to 214.)	Nay.
	On passage. (Passed 212 to 189.)	Yea.
June 30	H.R. 11812, appropriating funds for foreign aid.	
	On passage of resolution waiving points of order allowing action on appropriation bill before authorization bill cleared the Congress. (Passed 222 to 162.)	Nay.
July 1	On motion to recommit H.R. 11812 with instructions to reduce appropriation by $248,000,000. (Defeated 198 to 208.)	Yea.
	On passage, providing $3,300,000,000 for foreign aid and $400,000,000 for related activities. (Passed 231 to 174.)	Nay.
July 2	H. Res. 789, concurring with Senate amendment to the civil rights bill and clearing it for Presidential signature.	
	On passage. (Passed 289 to 126.)	Yea.
July 21	H.R. 319, to protect postal patrons from obscene mail matter and Communist propaganda by permitting addressee to return such mail to Post Office Department to notify sender to remove his name from mailing list.	
	On passage. (Passed 326 to 19.)	Yea.
July 21	H.R. 11611, establishing National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress.	
	On passage. (Passed 261 to 76.)	Yea.
July 22	H. Res. 738, rule providing for consideration of H.R. 3846, establishing a land and water conservation fund.	
	On passage. (Passed 338 to 8.)	Yea.
July 28	H.R. 3873 (S. 978), permitting certain owners of fishing boats to receive free medical care and hospitalization at hospitals of the Public Health Service.	
	On passage. (Passed 202 to 170.)	Nay.
July 29	H.R. 11865, increasing benefits under social security.	
	On passage of resolution providing for consideration of the bill. (Passed 350 to 29.)	Yea.
	On passage of bill. (Passed 388 to 8.)	Yea.
July 30	H. Res. 803, disagreeing to Senate amendments to H.R. 11049, Federal employees pay raise bill, and agreeing to conference.	
	On adoption of resolution. (Adopted 246 to 131.)	Yea.
Aug. 3	H.R. 1096, authorizing Secretary of the Interior to cooperate with State of Wisconsin in designation and administration of Ice Age National Scientific Reserve in that State. The land and water conservation bill, passed on July 23, makes H.R. 1096 unnecessary.	
	On passage. (Failed 164 to 154—under suspension of rules a ⅔ majority is needed.)	Nay.
Aug. 3	H.R. 3672, provides for construction, operation, and maintenance of Savery-Pot Hook, Bostwich Park, and Fruitland Mesa, participating reclamation projects under Colorado River Storage Project Act. The purpose of this bill is to promote the production of feed grains for livestock, at a cost of approximately $27,000,000, notwithstanding the fact that we now have an overabundance of feed grains and an overabundance of domestic beef.	
	On passage. (Passed 250 to 67.)	Nay.
Aug. 4	H.R. 10939, appropriating funds for Department of Defense.	
	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted 359 to 0.)	Yea.
	On adoption of Senate amendment making 34 percent of funds for repair, alteration, and conversion of naval ships available for work in privately owned shipyards. (Adopted 186 to 178.)	Nay.
Aug. 7	H.J. Res. 1145, to promote the maintenance of international peace and security in southeast Asia.	
	On passage. (Passed 416 to 0.)	Yea.
Aug. 7	H.R. 11377, the Economic Opportunity Act.	
	Motion to strike out the enacting clause. (Failed 197 to 225.)	Yea.
	On amendment substituting text of S. 2642, a similar bill. (Passed 228 to 190.)	Nay.
Aug. 8	On motion to recommit the bill. (Defeated 117 to 295.)	Nay.
	On passage. (Passed 226 to 185.)	Nay.
Aug. 11	H.R. 1927, to revise the pension program for veterans of World War I, World War II, and the Korean war, and their widows and children.	
	On passage. (Passed 389 to 0.)	Yea.
Aug. 11	H.R. 5990, amending the District of Columbia Charitable Solicitation Act, requiring certain findings before issuance of a solicitation permit thereunder.	
	On passage. (Passed 301 to 81.)	Yea.
Aug. 12	S. 1451, conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to render judgment upon certain claims arising under the Trading With the Enemy Act.	
	On adoption of the rule for consideration of the legislation. (Adopted 375 to 3.)	Yea.
	Bill was passed by a voice vote.	
Aug. 12	S. 1627, enabling the United States to contribute to the International Commission for Supervision and Control in Laos. Authorizing appropriations without knowledge of actual cost and for an abortive attempt to neutralize Laos.	
	On passage. (Passed 268 to 89.)	Nay.
Aug. 13	H.R. 11296, appropriation for independent offices.	
	On motion to recommit with instructions to reduce the bill by an unjustified sum of $250 million, which, if needed, would not be used for another half decade. (Defeated 114 to 271.)	Nay.
Aug. 14	S. 1006, increasing authorization for subsidizing the construction of fishing vessels, without justifying need to the fishing industry.	
	On passage. (Passed 198 to 124.)	Nay
Aug. 14	H. Res. 663, providing an additional $10,000 for the expenses of the Committee on Education and Labor, establishing a precedent of irregular procedure.	
	On passage. (Defeated 115 to 156.)	Nay.
Aug. 17	H. Con. Res. 343, expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the enforcement of the provisions of article 19 of the United Nations Charter, which article subjects to a loss of vote in the General Assembly those 15 countries, more than 2 years behind in paying assessments, who fail to reduce their arrears before the Assembly meets in November.	
	On passage. (Passed 352 to 0.)	Yea.
Aug. 17	S. 524 (H.R. 6242), providing for registration of contractors of migrant agricultural workers.	
	On passage. (Passed 343 to 7.)	Yea.

88th Cong., 2d sess., 1964—Continued

Date	Measure, question, and result	DEROUNIAN'S vote
Aug. 17	H.R. 9000, amending Federal Coal Mine Safety Act. This measure, which will cause the collapse of thousands of small, independent enterprises and bring unemployment to tens of thousands of workers, is only remotely concerned with mine safety. Such a controversial measure should not be voted on without full debate and careful examination. On passage. (Failed 202 to 151—⅔ majority required on suspension of rules. Such a controversial bill not possible under suspension of rules.)	Nay.
Aug. 18	H.R. 1839, providing for free importation of certain wild animals and for the imposition of quotas on certain meat and meat products, threatening increases in meat prices. Adoption of conference report. (Adopted 232 to 149.)	Nay.
Aug. 18	H.R. 8864, implementing the International Coffee Agreement. On acceptance of conference report. (Rejected 183 to 194.)	Nay.
Aug. 18	H.R. 8000, Interest Equalization Tax, imposing tax on acquisitions of certain foreign securities. The long-term effect of this measure will be adverse to our balance of payments; it is inequitable; deals with a symptom, not a cause; would remove New York City as financial capital of the world; and is a step backward. On passage. (Passed 221 to 147.)	Nay.
Aug. 18	S. 1007, guaranteeing electric consumers in Pacific Northwest first call on electric energy from Federal plants in the area. On adoption of conference report abrogating the House position lines cannot be built without congressional authorization. (Adopted 230 to 134.)	Nay.
Aug. 20	H.R. 9586, providing for the establishment of a National Council on the Arts. This measure seeks a new control, another area of responsibility for the Federal Government, which is attempting to enter every facet of American life, every such step increasing the cost of Government and placing a greater burden on the taxpayer. On passage. (Passed 213 to 135.)	Nay.
Sept. 1	S. 2701, providing for a study to determine a site for construction of a sea-level canal between the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans. On passage. (Passed 320 to 23.)	Yea.
Sept. 1	H.R. 4487, to prevent or minimize injury to fish and wildlife from the use of insecticides and pesticides. On passage. (Passed 235 to 111.)	Yea.
Sept. 3	H.R. 12298 (S. 2687), extending the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act and providing for the use of excess foreign currencies obtained from sale of surplus agricultural commodities be used to promote development of resources of less developed friendly foreign nations. On motion to recommit with instructions to tighten the definition of "friendly nations." (Adopted 183 to 175.) On passage. (Passed 349 to 6.)	Yea. Yea.
Sept. 3	S. 2220, to forgive student loans to doctors and dentists, furthering Federal control over the individual; a step toward socialism; establishing dangerous precedents. On passage. (Defeated 140 to 161.)	Nay.
Sept. 22	H.R. 12633, making supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1965. The largest sums in this bill are for the food stamp and poverty program, both of which I oppose. On passage. (Passed 209 to 103.)	Nay.
Sept. 23	H.R. 1096, authorizing Secretary of the Interior to cooperate with State of Wisconsin in designation and administration of Ice Age National Scientific Reserve in that State. On passage. (Passed 180 to 118.)	Nay.
Oct. 3	H.R. 12633, making supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1965. On motion to adopt conference report. (Adopted 211 to 78.)	Yea.

The Honorable Lester Johnson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GAYLORD NELSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, in March LESTER JOHNSON, the fine Wisconsin Congressman, announced his retirement. I want to take this occasion at the end of the session to say a few words of well-deserved praise.

Since winning a special congressional election in 1953, LESTER JOHNSON has represented the people of the old Ninth District with great distinction.

As chairman of the Dairy Subcommittee of the House Agriculture Committee he has demonstrated an enlightened understanding of the problems facing the dairy industry.

He was a leader in the fight to defend the Rural Electrification Administration from continuous, unfounded attacks by the private power interests.

Conservation legislation is very close to LESTER JOHNSON's heart. His imaginative support for wetlands preservation and his fight for passage this session of the Ice Age National Scientific Reserve in Wisconsin have earned him the gratitude not only of the people of his district and of Wisconsin, but of all those in the Nation who value the heritage of the land.

As a Democrat I am particularly proud of LESTER JOHNSON. He was the first Democrat elected to Congress from his district and one of the first Democrats to gain office in the resurgence which our party has enjoyed in Wisconsin in the last dozen years. No small part of that resurgence is due to the efforts and excellence of LESTER JOHNSON.

I want to wish him and his wife, Marjorie, all of the best.

In Celebration of the 600th Anniversary of the Founding of Jagiellonian University in Cracow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to bring to your attention this year's celebration of the 600th anniversary of the founding of Poland's Jagiellonian University, the second oldest institution of higher learning in central Europe. It was in 1364 that King Casimir the Great signed permission for the construction of this university, an institution that has added distinction and achievement to the history of the Polish State.

Originally called Cracow University, this center of learning was renamed for the Jagiellonian dynasty in 1815. The statute of the institution was patterned after the law schools of the universities of Bologna and Padua, but the Polish university was more liberal and autonomous in nature.

Even during a period in its history when its academic character became increasingly ecclesiastical, the university remained influential in shaping the Polish national conscience. It boasts as one of the earliest members of its distinguished student body, the mathematician and scientist, Nicolaus Copernicus. From 1500 to 1535, the zenith of its development as part of an independent Poland, it drew to its doors all Polish writers and scientists, as well as students from the surrounding central European countries.

By the beginning of the 16th century, Jagiellonian University displayed distinction in its physical features, as well, with the addition of the beautiful Colleguim Maries, still today a jewel of Cracow Gothic architecture.

Under the influence of Hugo Kollataj, a renowned scholar and writer, much needed reform in teaching was instituted and the university ultimately reached, in 1869, another period of "flowering and supremacy." Historical studies were particularly outstanding at this time.

But after 500 years of academic and cultural eminence, the two World Wars of the 20th century did not spare this seat of learning. The intellectual strength of the university was weakened by the First World War but not destroyed. However, the Nazi occupation during the Second World War stripped the institution of many of its accomplished faculty and left it with a tremendous task of rebuilding its scientific faculty and activities.

Nevertheless, today this oldest Polish house of learning has recovered and is proclaiming its well-deserved pride in a long history of achievement. It has awarded honorary doctorate titles to nine Polish scholars and scientists as well as others from the Soviet Union, Czechoslovakia, France, Holland, Yugoslavia, East Germany, Great Britain, and the United States. Among the recipients from our Nation are William Bloom, biologist from the University of Chicago; Linus Pauling, chemist and Nobel Prize winner; and Dudley White, cardiologist.

In a world where education and learning are universal goals, I take great personal pride in commemorating the 600 years of Poland's commitment to the attainment of such goals.

The Activities of the House Small Business Committee, 88th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, during the 88th Congress the House Small Business Committee undertook and completed a rather heavy schedule of studies and investigations regarding various problems facing the 4½ million small business concerns operating in our country at this time.

All members of the committee, representing both sides of the aisle, participated in these studies and worked diligently and conscientiously to find the best possible solutions to the various matters receiving attention by the committee. Without the full cooperation of all of the members the achievements and accomplishments of the committee would not have been possible. Accordingly, I wish to take this opportunity to express my appreciation for their efforts and their cooperation.

Recently, Mr. Speaker, I forwarded to you a letter in which I reported upon the work of our committee during this Congress. Since all Members of the House are interested in small business problems and the work of this committee, with your permission, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of this communication be reprinted in the RECORD.

The chairman's progress letter to Speaker MCCORMACK follows:

SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C., October 1, 1964.

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: As the 88th Congress approaches adjournment, I wanted to submit to you this brief summary of the work carried out by the House Small Business Committee during the 2 years comprising this Congress.

As you will recall, upon adoption by the House of the resolution creating the committee, it was your desire that the following Members serve thereon: Representatives JOE L. EVINS, Democrat, of Tennessee, chairman; WRIGHT PATMAN, Democrat, of Texas; ABRAHAM J. MULTER, Democrat, of New York; TOM STEED, Democrat, of Oklahoma; JAMES ROOSEVELT, Democrat, of California; JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI, Democrat, of Illinois; JOHN D. DINGELL, Democrat, of Michigan; WILLIAM M. MCCULLOCH, Republican, of Ohio; ARCH A. MOORE, JR., Republican, of West Virginia; WILLIAM H. AVERY, Republican, of Kansas; H. ALLEN SMITH, Republican, of California; HOWARD W. ROBISON, Republican, of New York; and RALPH HARVEY, Republican, of Indiana.

The resolution authorized the committee, among other things, to investigate problems of small business enterprises generally and to obtain all facts possible in relation thereto which would be of public interest and which would aid the Congress in enacting remedial legislation.

Pursuant to appointment of this committee and the adoption of the resolution by the House our committee set forth on an active and vigorous program during the 88th Congress.

ASSISTANCE TO MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE

Perhaps one of the more important aspects of the work carried on by the House Small Business Committee consists of the assistance the committee provides Members of the House seeking to help their small business constituents. The committee and its professional staff performed a considerable volume of this "casework" for Members who sought such assistance. The problems presented usually required the staff to contact various governmental agencies and frequently entailed independent legal research in order to provide satisfactory answers to the Members and their small business constituents.

In accordance with the well-established policy of the committee, all such requests of Members of the House received priority consideration.

FULL COMMITTEE HEARINGS

1. During the early days of the 88th Congress, groups of small business retailers were stunned by an advisory opinion of the Federal Trade Commission announcing that the placing of joint advertisements, featuring prices of the articles offered for sale by the cooperating stores, would be illegal. Immediately following that ruling the House Small Business Committee held public hearings which "cleared the air" and which, in effect, brought about a reversal of this decision of the Commission.

The practice in question consisted of an arrangement applied in various communities or States wherein independently owned local small business grocers, druggists, hardware stores, or others, would place joint advertisements in behalf of all of the members of the group. In this way, and only in this way, could the independent retailers gain the benefits that flow automatically from the use of newspaper display advertisements. Without such advertising, the small businesses could not hope to compete against the large chain organizations operating in the same market.

Testimony delivered by the committee from the Chairman of the FTC and from the Attorney General, Antitrust Division, Department of Justice, provided assurances that small retailers need not abandon their joint advertising programs; that groups of them could continue to purchase joint display space in newspapers as before and thus carry forward their efforts to stay in business.

The hearings and the report entitled "FTC Advisory Opinion on Joint Ads" (H. Rept. 699) received widespread acclaim from the newspapers and small business retailers who benefited from the hearings. The committee's proceedings were characterized as an example of a congressional committee acting promptly, boldly, and without hesitation to provide constructive and affirmative help to small business at the exact time when such help was needed.

2. The full committee held extensive hearings on small business and foreign trade. In these hearings the committee documented more than 400 pages of testimony from Government agencies, trade associations, export firms, and small business concerns pertaining to foreign trade opportunities for small business. Testimony was received regarding the implementation of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, with special attention given to those portions of the act relating to adjustment assistance for firms damaged as a result of trade concessions.

It is felt that the printed record of these foreign trade hearings contains the most complete documentation of information relative to small business opportunities in foreign trade that is now available. An announcement that appeared in a Kiplinger Letter about the hearings resulted in hundreds of extra requests for copies of the printed hearings being received, which exhausted the commttee's supply.

The late President John F. Kennedy complimented the committee and wrote to the chairman that the hearings should "act as both a guide and spur to small businessmen considering ventures into foreign markets and to Government officials responsible for assisting them."

3. Our committee has held rather comprehensive hearings on the organization and operation of the Small Business Administration.

As an appendix to the printed record of these hearings, a tabulation was added showing the number of loans and their amounts granted by the SBA to small business concerns located in each congressional district of all States.

The committee is presently in the process of completing its report based on these hearings.

4. During March 1964, the full committee held public hearings on the Implementation of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 for the purpose of ascertaining the extent to which small business is being assisted by this program.

During the course of these hearings, the committee heard testimony from representatives of small business investment companies with diversified types of operations located in various sections of the United States. The Honorable Eugene P. Foley, Administrator of the Small Business Administration, and the new Deputy Administrator for the Investment Division, Richard E. Kelley, presented a complete report of that agency's investment program.

SUBCOMMITTEE HEARINGS

Immediately after the committee was organized during the early days of the 88th Congress, a number of subcommittees were created and it has developed that a major portion of the work carried on by the committee has been handled by these subcommittees.

The chairman of the full committee as well as the ranking minority member, Representative WILLIAM E. MCCULLOCH, serve as ex officio members of each of the subcommittees.

Subcommittee No. 1: Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, Democrat, of Texas, serves as chairman of this subcommittee. Its jurisdiction includes the tax-exempt foundations and their impact on small business. Other Members serving on this subcommittee include Representatives JOE L. EVINS, JAMES ROOSEVELT, WILLIAM H. AVERY, and RALPH HARVEY.

The subcommittee's study of the impact of 534 tax-exempt foundations on small business included an investigation of their income and the sources of that income; their expenditures and the purposes for which made, together with stock manipulations and intercorporate dealings. These inquiries were necessary to learn whether the operations of the foundations are charitable and not mercenary.

The subcommittee is developing information regarding the use of foundations to achieve corporate control, to secure special favors, and to utilize their economic power to create unfair competitive conditions.

The study covers the extent to which large corporations are using foundations to evade taxes, however legally.

It is noteworthy that the 534 foundations under study by the committee had accumulated (unspent) income of $906 million at the close of 1960, as against $271 million at the close of 1951.

The first report of the subcommittee chairman was submitted in the 87th Congress. The second report, submitted during October 1963, deals with the commercial activities of certain foundations which appear to defeat the intent and purpose of tax exemption. It also brings to light the fact that the use of foundations as business devices and for tax avoidance, in the subcommittee chairman's view, has become a major economic evil which has too long been tolerated and must now be terminated.

In response to the great demand for reprints of the first two reports, 5,000 additional copies of each were published.

During March 1964, a third report of the subcommittee chairman was issued. It constitutes a detailed analysis of the Alfred I. du Pont estate, including its affiliate, the Nemours Foundation of Jacksonville, Fla. This report, among other things, describes the adverse effects that this and similar foundations exert upon the tax base.

The subcommittee held public hearings in July, August, and September, 1964.

Secretary of the Treasury, Douglas Dillon, in testifying, acknowledged the desirability of the Congress and the administration reexamining those areas where tax exemption and tax deductions are provided.

The Secretary also stated that the Treasury does not know the number of foundations that may be in existence and that the House Small Business Committee's studies have been of great value to the Department of the Treasury. For example, Secretary Dillon acknowledged that the self-dealing exposed in our subcommittee's studies was very illuminating and certainly required legislative reforms. Moreover, he indicated that, as a result of our studies, the Treasury was now attempting to tabulate the number of foundations.

Former Commissioner of Internal Revenue Mortimer Caplin outlined to the subcommittee the measures his agency had taken to bring about compliance with the tax laws by exempt organizations and suggested that consideration be given to imposing some limitation upon the life or the capital of the foundations.

Manuel F. Cohen, Chairman-designate of the Securities and Exchange Commission, testified concerning the relationship of the SEC to tax-exempt foundations and charitable trusts. Mr. Cohen stated that, prior to the issuance of our studies, the SEC had been unaware of the abuses in stock market trading by certain foundations.

Acting Commissioner, Internal Revenue Service, Bertrand M. Harding was asked about the commercial and other activities of certain foundations which defeat the intent and purpose of the tax-exemption statutes. During his testimony, the fact that foundations are used as devices for tax avoidance was highlighted.

Subcommittee No. 2: Representative Abraham J. Multer, Democrat, of New York, is chairman of Subcommittee No. 2 which was assigned the duty of considering problems of small business and Government procurement. Other members of this subcommittee include: Representatives Tom Steed, James Roosevelt, H. Allen Smith, and Howard W. Robison.

The staff of the subcommittee surveyed Government agencies and prime contractors in the West Coast area to determine the effectiveness of the small business subcontracting program authorized by Public Law 87–305 (subsec. 8(d)(1), Small Business Act). The staff conferred with the commanding general, U.S. Air Force Western Contract Management Region, Mira Loma Air Force Station, Calif., who is charged with the responsibility of managing Air Force contracts awarded prime contractors in that area.

Conferences were also held with responsible officials of the Lockheed Aircraft Corp., Burbank, Calif.; Hughes Aircraft Co., Culver City, Calif.; and North American Aviation, Inc., El Segundo, Calif. Their small business subcontracting practices and procedures were examined and reviewed to determine their effectiveness.

Public hearings were held in Washington, D.C., on November 12, 1963, during which testimony was received from representatives of the three military departments as well as the Defense Supply Agency. Hearings also were held on November 13 and 14, 1963, at which time testimony was presented by representatives of Federal Communications Commission, Communications Satellite Corp., Atomic Energy Commission, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, General Services Administration, Agency for International Development, Bureau of Public Roads, Department of Commerce, and Department of the Interior.

At hearings held during June and July 1964, representatives of private industry testified regarding procurement practices of Government agencies and their effect upon small business. The subcommittee concluded its inquiry with a final hearing on August 12, 1964, when the Deputy Administrator of SBA testified.

The subcommittee protested a General Services Administration gasoline procurement in which only large refiners were able to participate. This plan was subsequently abandoned and the agency was thereupon urged by the subcommittee chairman to review its procurement procedures in other industries to remove any restrictions which might prevent small business from receiving a fair share.

The subcommittee and its professional staff handled a considerable volume of complaints respecting instances of procurement practices believed to be inimical to small business. In each instance the subcommittee investigated the matter to determine the validity of the objections.

Subcommittee No. 3: Representative Tom Steed, Democrat, of Oklahoma, is chairman of Subcommittee No. 3. Other members serving on this subcommittee are: Representatives Abraham J. Multer, John Dingell, Arch A. Moore, Jr., and Howard W. Robison.

The matters referred to this subcommittee for study and investigation related primarily to the impact of taxation upon the small business sector of the economy.

This subcommittee and the members of the full committee cooperated with the Ways and Means Committee and worked diligently for the enactment of the $11.5 billion tax reduction bill enacted into law this year. This subcommittee has for a number of years studied the impact of taxation upon small business and repeatedly made recommendations for tax reduction for small business. This subcommittee assisted materially in developing facts and sentiments in support of the passage of this measure. Passage of the tax reduction legislation has been received with gratification by American small businesses.

Another area of study assigned to this subcommittee was the investigation of the effects of imports of foreign crude oil upon the domestic petroleum industry. During the preceding Congress, the subcommittee held extensive hearings and issued its report. Since then, certain interpretations of the controlling regulations have been made which have altered somewhat the quota system formerly in effect. In addition, responsibility for administering the petroleum import program has been transferred from the President to the Secretary of the Interior.

The staff of the subcommittee, from time to time, has observed and considered the effects upon small business of the Presidential Proclamation 3541, of June 10, 1963, adjusting imports of petroleum products other than residual fuel oil.

Subcommittee No. 4: Representative James Roosevelt, Democrat of California, is chairman of Subcommittee No. 4 which studies and investigates distribution problems affecting small business. Other members of the subcommittee are: Representatives Tom Steed, John C. Kluczynski, Arch A. Moore, Jr., and William H. Avery.

The subcommittee has developed information indicating there is an increasing tendency for manufacturers to take over the functions previously carried on by small businessmen in the several levels of distribution and fabrication. A growing number of firms throughout the economy appear to be supplying their customers and also competing with them. This competition by large, integrated firms, has, in many cases, been highly detrimental to independent businesses.

On the basis of this preliminary study, the subcommittee proceeded to make a thorough investigation of "The Impact Upon Small Business of Dual Distribution and Related Vertical Integration." Commencing on May 8, 1963, 29 public hearings were held over a period of 8 months. Altogether, 8 printed volumes of the record of these comprehensive hearings were compiled, covering dual distribution and related problems in 46 different industries. A total of 176 witnesses participated, and testimony was received from representatives of 43 trade associations.

At present, a proposed report is in the hands of the members of the subcommittee for review and consideration.

On January 24, 1964, the subcommittee held a hearing in Baltimore regarding small business problems stemming from the vast changes which many metropolitan shopping areas are experiencing. Urban renewal, new highways, the exodus to suburbia, and "neighborhood blight" are prime factors in this complex of problems threatening to destroy small business concerns operating in the older existing neighborhood shopping areas.

A similar hearing is scheduled to be held in Los Angeles on November 23 and 24.

The subcommittee held hearings on August 31, September 1 and 2, 1964, regarding the impact upon small business of U.S. softwood lumber standards.

Testimony was received from Representatives George F. Senner, Jr., of Arizona; Edith Green, of Oregon; Compton I. White, Jr., of Idaho; and Arnold Olsen, of Montana; as well as from officials of the Department of Commerce, spokesmen for the American Lumber Standards Committee, industry trade associations, and a number of representatives of small business interests.

Since the hearing, the Department of Commerce has announced its intention to reconstitute the American Lumber Standards Committee to make it more broadly representative of the entire lumber industry. Under the Department proposal, small businesses and independent firms would have far more representation than is true on the present committee.

On April 20 of this year, the Supreme Court of the United States in a precedent-shattering decision ruled, in the case of *Simpson* v. *Union Oil Company of California*, that consignment sales of gasoline may not be used as a means to control small business operators of service stations. The Court in its decision quoted at length from hearings held by Subcommittee No. 4 during the 85th Congress. Subsequently, inquiry was made by the chairman of the subcommittee concerning the effect of this decision on the west coast petroleum consent decree, which appears to specifically permit the consignment form of distribution. The Assistant Attorney General in charge of antitrust informed the subcommittee that it was the position of the Antitrust Division that those firms operating under the provisions of the west coast consent decree must conform with the decision in the Simpson case. A hearing is scheduled to be held by the subcommittee in Los Angeles on November 20 and 21 to determine the extent to which these companies are complying with the principles articulated by the Court.

As a result of the expression of more than 20 Members of the House, including the Speaker, and 20 Members of the Senate, this subcommittee has scheduled plans for hearings with respect to the methods of distributing automobile parts and dealer relationships by the Chrysler Corp. Conferences with officials of the corporation, small business, and other persons interested are now in process on this current issue affecting small business in the automobile industry.

SMALL BUSINESS SEMINARS, ADDITIONAL FIELD WORK, INVESTIGATIONS AND CONFERENCES

1. Pursuant to a request of some of the members of the committee, Government-industry seminars for small businessmen of the Indiana-Ohio area were held in April and again in September 1963. The program featured prominent Government and industry leaders expert in the fields of (1) development of foreign markets; (2) Government procurement; (3) Federal financial assistance to industry; and (4) market research. Approximately 115 businessmen were present and they praised the House Small Business Committee for its service and assistance.

2. In an endeavor to be of optimum assistance to small businesses located in the Appalachian area, Representatives in Congress from that region were invited by the chairman of the Small Business Committee to attend a briefing session on April 26, 1963, in the chairman's office. At this meeting, John Horne, then Administrator of the SBA, explained and discussed the various SBA programs which are available, as well as those of the Area Redevelopment Administration. Members of the House or staff who attended represented nine congressional districts in the States of Alabama, Georgia, Kentucky, North Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, and West Virginia.

3. In order to develop firsthand information regarding the manner in which the Small Business Administration conducts its disaster program, a member of the committee's staff visited the various SBA offices in the Ohio River Valley during March 1964. The places visited included Pittsburgh, Pa., Marietta and Cincinnati, Ohio; Covington and Louisville, Ky., as well as the areas adjacent to each.

4. At the instance and under the direction of the chairman of the full committee, the staff conducted preliminary studies and inquiries into certain problems of small business inventors and patentees. The matter of the lack of protection for small business inventors during the "patent pending" period is the area to which the staff particularly addressed itself.

5. The staff report on "Mergers and Superconcentration," which was issued during the 87th Congress, is being brought up to date by developing additional information regarding the acquisition of small business firms by large industrial and merchandising concerns.

6. The committee undertook to bring up to date an important House document entitled "Congress and the Monopoly Problem: 56 Years of Antitrust Development, 1900–56." Upon completion of this revision the report will include all antitrust legislation developments up to and including action taken by the 88th Congress. This report is being prepared in cooperation with the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress.

7. In response to demands for a complete cataloging of all of the committee's hearings and reports issued since the creation of the committee in 1941, an indexed compilation of these publications was prepared, printed, and widely distributed to Members of Congress, libraries, and small business firms throughout the United States.

8. The committee's staff at this time is developing preliminary information regarding small business problems associated with the Renegotiation Act of 1951, as amended.

9. During the remaining months of the 88th Congress, the committee and its professional staff stand ready at all times to supply any assistance desired by any Member of the House in connection with small business problems confronting their constituents, and American small business.

CONCLUSION

A final report describing in detail the studies, investigations, hearings, and work of the committee during this Congress will be prepared, and following full committee action and approval, will be transmitted to the Speaker and the Clerk of the House of Representatives prior to expiration of this session of the Congress.

As indicated above, however, I wanted to provide you, Mr. Speaker, with this report concerning the work performed by our committee on behalf of small business during the past 2 years.

With highest esteem, kindest regards, and best wishes, I am

Sincerely your friend.

JOE L. EVINS,
Member of Congress,
Chairman.

Report to the People of the Fifth District of Kansas, 88th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOE SKUBITZ

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, the 2d session of the 88th Congress has come to an end and I feel that I owe a duty to the people of my district to submit a report to them of the actions of this Congress and the part I have played therein.

I have always believed that, to be an effective Congressman, one must not only know his district, the problems of his district, but also the "thinking" of the people whom he represents. As a Congressman for the past 2 years and prior to that as an assistant to two Kansas Senators, I think I know my district, its problems and what must be done. I have known no other job than to shuffle back and forth between Kansas and Washington serving my State and my district in the Nation's Capital.

So that I may know the views of the people I represent—and so they might know my thinking—I have been in constant contact through comprehensive questionnaires, weekly newsletters, radio reports, news releases and visits back to the district. I have maintained district offices with full-time employees for the convenience of my constituents so that their problems can be more expeditiously and effectively served. Through these means of communication together with a steady flow of correspondence it has been possible for me to understand my district, my constituency and vice versa.

Although the primary duty of a Congressman is to assist in the formulation of legislative solutions to the knotty economic, social, and political problems that confront our Nation, State, and his district, a Member of Congress must always stand ready and willing to assist any citizen or community who may need help. He must be ready and willing to assist any citizen who has a grievance and feels that he is getting unfair treatment at the hands of some Federal agency.

Thousands of requests have been received by me during the past 19 months requesting information regarding Government programs, grants-in-aid, social security, veterans' benefits, welfare, school aid, hospital and nursing home assistance, agricultural bulletins, debate materials, and so forth. You name it and we have received a letter about it.

Over 3,500 letters have been received from individuals having problems relating to social security, veterans' benefits, immigration, passports, Indian claims, FHA and veterans' loans, small business loans, acreage allocations, flood control, watershed programs, Federal buildings, jobs, VA hospital care, income tax, academy appointments, improved mail routes, surplus equipment, and so forth.

Through my district office and a competent staff, we have been able to be of helpful assistance to hundreds of people. This assistance is given regardless of race, color, creed, or party affiliation.

THE 88TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION

My first term of Congress has gone on record as the longest session in peace time history. It lasted for the entire calendar year of 1963. Adjournment did not come until Christmas Eve, leaving less than 2 weeks between sessions. My attendance record for this session shows that I was present 93 percent of the time on all rollcalls.

As one looks back over the 88th Congress, obviously all is completely overshadowed by the tragic assassination of President John F. Kennedy. No greater blot could have been placed on our Nation's history. Along with scores of my colleagues, I inserted a special memorial tribute to the late President in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on December 5, 1963.

The Congress, reflecting the mood of the country, assumed a conservative approach to all spending programs and the administration sensing this feeling focused its attention on foreign affairs. New spending programs were received with little enthusiasm. Perhaps the two most important measures enacted by the Congress were the tax reduction bill and the Civil Rights Act. During the debate on civil rights, the Senate for the first time in history, invoked the cloture rule for a civil rights bill.

LEGISLATION

Although the civil rights bill and tax bill received the bulk of publicity, there were other significant legislative proposals adopted. Here is a summary and my vote on each of them:

My vote	Summary of bill	Action
Yea	Military procurement authorization (H.R. 2440), which authorized $15,900,000,000 for armament procurement and research development, passed Mar. 13, 1963. This bill included funds for the RS-70 plane and for 2 additional nuclear submarines.	Passed.
Nay	1963 supplemental appropriation (H.R. 5517) which was to restore $450,000,000 for the accelerated public works program (WPA spelled backwards).	Passed.
Nay	Silver legislation (H.R. 5389): This bill authorized the issuance of $1 Federal Reserve notes to replace $1 silver certificates. It represented a final victory of paper money over coin by providing for the withdrawal of the last kind of paper money with 100 percent metal backing. (Roosevelt did away with gold certificates.)	Passed.
Yea	Medical education bill: This bill authorized $175,000,000 in construction grants to help build teaching facilities for training more doctors, dentists, nurses, etc. It also authorized student loans for doctors.	Passed.
Yea	Feed grain program (recommittal motion): I favored this legislation but voted to hold up any action until after the growers wheat referendum.	Defeated.
Yea	Agricultural research (H.R. 40) authorized matching grants to the States to expand research facilities at State farm experimental stations	Passed.
Yea	Congressional foreign travel (H.J. Res. 245) proposes a tightening up on Government-paid foreign travel	Passed.
Nay	Increasing public debt limit (H.R. 6009), a bill to increase the national debt limit to $309,000,000,000	Passed.
Yea	Equal pay for women (H. Res. 362)	Passed.
Nay	Area redevelopment funds (H.R. 4996) authorized $455,000,000	Defeated.
Yea	Vocational education bill (H.R. 4955) authorized $450,000,000 over a 4-year period for vocational education aid	Passed.
Nay	H.R. 6143: Authorized $1,200,000,000 in grants and loans to build more buildings for both public and private colleges	Passed.
Nay	Foreign aid (H.R. 7885) authorized $3,500,000,000 for fiscal year 1964	Passed.
Yea	NASA authorization (H.R. 7500): I supported a recommittal motion. House had cut 10 percent of the $1,200,000,000 requested. The Senate restored the cut. This was a move to restore the House recommendation.	Defeated.
Yea	Mental health program (S. 1576): Authorized $238,000,000 of grants to State and mental institutions to help combat mental illness	Passed.
Yea	Tax bill (H.R. 8363): This was a motion to recommit the tax cut. The effect would be to put the tax cut in effect if the administration kept spending at $97,000,000,000. I favored a tax cut if spending would be cut accordingly.	Defeated.
Yea	Extension of the Civil Rights Commission (H.R. 541)	Passed.
Nay	Increase national debt limit (second time)	Passed.
Nay	Cotton bill (H.R. 6196) which provided a subsidy of 8½ cents a pound not to the farmers but to the textile mills. I favored a tariff increase instead to keep out foreign competition which was underselling American mills.	Passed.
Yea	Public works appropriation for flood control projects	Passed.
Nay	Foreign aid appropriation (H.R. 9499) with proviso for sale of wheat to Russia and Communist nations on credit	Passed.

THE 88TH CONGRESS, 2D SESSION

The 2d session of the 88th Congress did an about face. With President Johnson at the helm, foreign affairs were relegated into the background and domestic programs became the order of the day. The conservative mood Congress had assumed during the first session disappeared and this session may well go down as one of the "spendingest" Congresses in peacetime history. President Johnson's spending budget of $98 billion was higher than the previous year—and $22 billion more than the last Eisenhower budget. The 1964 Congress, however, went a step further than the President and voted $104.2 billion in appropriations. A record high, except for two World War II sessions, it promises a deficit of $10 billion more to be added to our $315 billion debt.

It was to guard against just this sort of congressional action that caused me to introduce two bills in 1963 relating to budget operations. One of them provided for "one general expenditure authorization." Unless we place an annual limitation against all expenditures including current appropriations we invite waste, and chaos is inevitable. The other bill would create a joint committee on the budget. At the time I introduced it I said:

> The growth of government has made it mandatory for the legislative branch to modernize its procedures—a close relationship between the House and Senate tax raising and tax spending committees must be established.

In this connection, your Congressman was pleased to receive special recognition regarding my overall position on matters of sound fiscal policy. The National Association of Businessmen, Inc., a nonprofit business group, organized first, to work toward getting the Federal Government out of competition with private business; second, economy in Government; and, third, legislation to promote small business has just published an "Economy Voting Record." Your Congressman received a perfect voting record for his stand and support of a sensible, sound fiscal policy. The association presented him with its "Bull Dog Award."

LEGISLATIVE ACTION

Your Congressman introduced bills which reflect the trends of our district. In this connection, the livestock producers of Kansas have been facing major problems. Your Congressman personally appeared before the U.S. Tariff Commission to call special attention to the disastrous effects that beef imports are having upon the livestock producers in this country. In the course of the testimony, he said:

> In spite of the fact that the U.S. tariffs offer little or no protection to the livestock and meat industry, records show that other countries not only maintained but have increased their import duties, as well as other import controls.
>
> The American livestock producer is willing to compete on a fair and equitable basis but with the United States cost of production much higher than costs in our importing nations, and with these nations maintaining relatively high import controls, he realizes that he is at a disadvantage.

In addition to the special appearance before the Tariff Commission, conferences were held with Agriculture Department officials and the State Department regarding the problem. Also, a bill was introduced to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to impose additional duties on cattle, beef, and veal imported each year in excess of annual quotas. The bill was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means. A much milder bill finally passed the Congress.

Another significant bill introduced was the Anti-Government Competition Act. This provides for the termination or limitation of business-type operations in the Federal Government which are conducted in competition with private enterprise. The Hoover Commission recommended legislation of this nature. While the Budget Bureau now has a directive to carry out the aims of the legislation, it is important that bills of this type be introduced in the Congress to alert the Budget Bureau of its continuing responsibility to implement the directive.

As a further manifestation of your Congressman's deep interest in the matter of adequate educational opportunities for our young people, H.R. 4802, was introduced. This bill provides that 1 percent of all Federal income taxes derived from each State shall be given to that State for educational purposes free from Federal control. Relating to the field of education is H.R. 11011, which authorizes and provides for a uniform method of proving entitlement for income tax deductions for educational expenses of teachers.

Aware of the importance of lead and zinc legislation to southeast Kansas, two measures affecting these minerals were introduced. One was entitled the Lead and Zinc Act and the other was called the Lead and Zinc Stabilization Act. Both bills were aimed at the matter of imports. They provided for limitations as to the amount of lead and zinc which may be imported. Portions of the bills were included in legislation passed by the House and Senate and signed into public law by the President.

Another bill of importance to the district was one establishing a quota limitation on certain imports of foreign residual oil. The Maritime Advisory Committee is presently involved in studies pertaining to provisions covered in this bill.

A bill was also introduced to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp honoring Maj. Gen. Frederick Funston.

For years southeast Kansas has been vitally interested in the national recognition of certain important historical sites in the area. However, the National Park Service and the Congress have not exhibited much genuine interest. During this Congress, your Congressman was able for the first time to convince the Department of Interior that a favorable report should be submitted to the Congress supporting the Skubitz bill providing for the commemoration of certain historical events and strife occurring in the State of Kansas from 1855 to 1856. The Fort Scott area is vitally affected. Your Congressman was able to arrange for a special congressional committee visitation to southeast Kansas to personally inspect the sites involved. This unusual congressional interest is most important in order to achieve favorable action. Your Congressman has been personally assured there will be priority action given this vital legislation.

For the interest and information of the residents of the district, the following is a brief summary of the appropriations for Federal projects, activities, and functions for the 88th Congress:

Department of the Army, Corps of Engineers, flood control projects

Big Hill Reservoir, Labette County, fiscal years 1964 and 1965, for planning	$135,000
Elk City Reservoir, Montgomery County, fiscal years 1964 and 1965, for construction	13,100,000
Fall River Reservoir, Greenwood County, fiscal years 1964 and 1965, for operation	225,000
John Redmond Reservoir, Coffey and Lyon Counties, fiscal years 1964 and 1965, for construction and maintenance	7,363,000
Melvern Reservoir, Osage County, fiscal years 1964 and 1965, for planning	480,000
Pomona Reservoir, Osage County, fiscal years 1964 and 1965, for construction and maintenance	1,987,000
Toronto Reservoir, Woodson County, fiscal years 1964 and 1965, for maintenance	194,000
Fort Scott Reservoir, Bourbon County, fiscal year 1965, for planning	100,000
Total	23,584,000

Department of Agriculture

Watersheds:	
Little Walnut-Hickory, Butler and Greenwood Counties	$2,113,500
Grant Shanghai, Chautauqua County	524,100
Big Caney, Chautauqua, Elk, and Cowley	4,463,500
Muddy Creek, Butler, and Cowley	294,000
Soil Conservation Service	1,630,000
Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service (ASCS)	2,906,305
Farmers Home Administration, fiscal years 1964 and 1965, approved loans, 1,021	7,531,118
Total	19,462,523

General Services Administration

Wellington, Sumner County, post office building	$407,000
Girard, Crawford County, repairs to existing post office building	33,850
Total	440,850

Federal Aviation Agency, Federal aid airport program

Fort Scott, Bourbon County, funds for municipal airport	$72,000
Wellington, Sumner County, funds for municipal airport	22,200
Total	94,200

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

Public Health Service:	
Wellington, Sumner County, Nursing Home, Hill-Burton funds	$277,862
Winfield, Cowley County, William Newton Memorial Hospital (Hill-Burton funds)	954,876
Total	1,232,738

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—Continued

Federal Water Pollution Control Act:	
Carbondale, Osage County	$13,560
Lebo, Coffey County	9,750
Americus, Lyon County	9,810
Osage City, Osage County	47,250
Reading, Lyon County	6,260
Uniontown, Bourbon County	8,012
Emporia, Lyon County	110,670
Total	205,312
Accelerated public works program:	
Columbus, Cherokee County	125,000
Scammon, Cherokee County	53,000
Arma, Crawford County	181,000
McCune, Crawford County	22,000
Coffeyville, Montgomery County	76,000
Edna, Labette County	20,000
Oswego, Labette County	71,000
Parsons, Labette County	257,150
Total	805,150
Office of Education: Public Law 874, impacted area assistance, 1963 and 1964, 5th Congressional District (total)	264,852
Manpower development and training:	
Chanute Junior College, Neosho County	420,442
Kansas State College of Pittsburg, Crawford County	38,065
On-the-job training:	
Coffeyville, Montgomery County	21,198
Pittsburg, Crawford County	52,443
Total	532,148

Listed below is a summary of key measures I have been required to vote upon. My final vote was cast only after careful study and analysis to determine how each of them affect the best interests of my county, State, and district:

Voting record of Congressman JOE SKUBITZ, 2d sess., 88th Cong.

My vote	Issue	Action
Yea	To recommit bill extending program of Federal aid for airports to reduce proposed authorization by $15,000 per year for 3 years	Defeated.
Yea	After defeat of recommittal motion, House passed bill providing for 3-year extension with modifications of the program of Federal aid for airport construction.	Passed.
Yea	Library services amendments proposed to confine Federal library services aid to rural and smalltown areas, while increasing the authorization for such aid, but eliminating a proposed new program of Federal grants for library construction.	Defeated.
Yea	After failure of efforts to limit the scope and cost of the library aid program, the bill passed. It increased the authorization for Federal aid for library services from $7,500,000 to $25,000,000 for fiscal 1964 and authorized a new program of matching Federal grants for library construction with $20,000,000 for 1964 and authorizations with unspecified amounts for 1965 and 1966. Starting with fiscal 1965, the programs were extended to urban in addition to rural and smalltown areas.	Passed.
Yea	This bill proposed amending the Bacon-Davis Act to include most fringe benefits in making prevailing wage determinations. The Bacon-Davis Act generally provides that workers on most Federal construction contracts be paid not less than prevailing wages for the same area.	Passed.
Yea	Civil rights	Passed.
Yea	Authorized $17,000,000,000 for defense research and development for ship, aircraft, and missile procurement	Passed.
Nay	Vote on the conference report on the $11,500,000,000 tax cut bill which reduced individual income tax and corporate tax rates. Various other changes were made in the tax laws, benefiting some taxpayers and hurting others. In my opinion, a tax cut without a consistent policy of reduced spending could result in large budget deficits and inflation with a further lowering in the purchasing power of the dollar.	Passed.
Yea	Bill proposed authorizing an additional U.S. contribution of $312,000,000 to the International Development Association which makes 50-year loans interest free but with a ¾ of 1 percent annual service charge, to underdeveloped nations. A vote for this recommittal motion was a vote against the bill. I objected to the bill on economy grounds, to the high percentage of American financial participation, to the liberal terms of the loans, and to the possibility that some of the loans might be counter to American interests and policy.	Passed.
Yea	House passed this bill amending the Communications Act of 1934 to prohibit the Federal Communications Commission from making certain rules relating to the length of frequency of radio and TV advertisements.	Passed.
Yea	This recommittal motion was designed to limit the fiscal 1965 Peace Corps authorization to the 1964 figures of $95,700,000 instead of the proposed $115,000,000. After failure of the recommittal motion, the bill passed by a voice vote.	Defeated
Yea	This bill establishes a Public Land Law Review Commission of 19 members to conduct a 3-year study of public land laws and regulations	Passed.
Nay	Bill proposing a $545,000,000 pay raise affecting approximately 1,700,000 Federal workers. $10,000 increase in the salaries of Congressmen, from $22,500 to $32,500 was provided for by this bill.	Defeated.
Nay	Bill authorizing $5,200,000,000 for National Aeronautics and Space Administration for fiscal year 1965. (Issue was increasing costs of man-on-the-moon project.)	Passed.
Yea	Recommittal motion to add provision to the food stamp bill requiring States participating in the program to pay half of the costs	Defeated.
Nay	This bill expanded and made permanent the food stamp program. On a pilot basis the program cost $44,000,000 in 1964. The bill carried an authorization of $400,000,000 over a 3-year period. The program may eventually mean food at below wholesale prices to 4,000,000 people at a cost to the Federal Government of perhaps $360,000,000 per year.	Passed.
Nay	Bill establishing special 2-year program for wheat and cotton	Passed.
Yea	Appropriations of $6,900,000,000 for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies	Passed.
Yea	Defense Department appropriations bill of $47,000,000,000 for fiscal 1965	Passed.
Yea	Appropriation of $1,700,000,000 for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, for related agencies and for the Federal judiciary	Passed.
Yea	Bill authorizing $2,600,000,000 for the Atomic Energy Commission for fiscal 1965	Passed.

Voting record of Congressman J*OE* S*KUBITZ*, *2d sess., 88th Cong.*—Continued

My vote	Issue	Action
Yea	Recommittal motion which was in effect a vote to kill bill proposing an additional U.S. contribution of $312,000,000 to the International Development Association.	Defeated.
Nay	Amendment to provide $1,600,000 for construction of a National Peanut Research Center at Dawson, Ga.	Defeated.
Yea	Vote on recommittal motion to insert language to prevent use of any funds for payment of export subsidies on any surplus agricultural commodities sold to Communist countries unless approved by the President and reported to Congress.	Defeated.
Yea	Bill providing appropriations of $5,200,000,000 for the Agricultural Department and related agencies.	Passed.
Yea	House voted $1,600,000,000 in funds for Defense Department military construction for fiscal year 1965.	Passed.
Nay	Vote to recommit a bill proposing increasing Federal insurance coverage on depositors' accounts in banks and savings and loan institutions from the present $10,000 to $20,000.	Passed.
Yea	Bill authorizing $1,175,000,000 per year for 2 years for Federal-aid for highway construction and for Federal highway programs	Passed.
Yea	Vote on recommittal motion with instructions to reduce the foreign aid authorizations for development loan funds and for the President's contingency funds by $222,200,000 of requested amount.	Defeated.
Nay	Bill authorizing $2,000,000,000 in new appropriations for foreign aid, bringing total foreign aid spending to $3,500,000,000 for 1965.	Passed.
Nay	Following defeat of a 1st Federal pay raise bill because of its proposal to increase congressional salaries by $10,000, this 2d pay raise bill handled controversial question of congressional pay by proposing an increase of $7,500 plus additional automatic increases at the times of future general Federal pay increases.	Passed.
Yea	Bill providing $4,300,000,000 appropriation for civil public works projects, water resources construction, reclamation, and the Atomic Energy Commission.	Passed.
Yea	Vote to reduce retailers excise taxes on jewelry, furs, toilet preparations, luggage, and handbags from 10 to 5 percent on July 1, 1964, and repeal such taxes on July 1, 1965.	Defeated.
Nay	Bill to increase temporary national debt limit to $324,000,000,000 through June 30, 1965.	Passed.
Nay	Authorization of a new Federal program of grants to States and localities to build or improve mass transit systems. An authorization of $375,000,000 over a 3-year period was included in the bill.	Passed.
Yea	Vote to effect a cut of $248,000,000 in foreign aid appropriations through reductions in economic assistance funds	Defeated.
Nay	Foreign aid appropriation bill providing $3,300,000,000 for foreign aid and $400,000,000 for related activities	Passed.
Yea	Resolution concurring with Senate amendments to the civil rights bill to clear it for Presidential signature	Passed.
Yea	Bill proposing grants to States for establishing water resources research centers at colleges and grants to States for water research projects	Passed.
Yea	As originally passed by the House on this vote, the social security benefit and tax increase bill did not include medicare provisions. It provided for a 5-percent increase in benefits, raised the wage base for deductions from $4,800 to $5,400, slightly liberalized eligibility requirements, and increased the social security taxes paid by employees, employers, and self-employed people.	Passed.
Yea	Establishment of a national wilderness preservation system. Bill placed 9,000,000 acres of Federal land in it permanently with provisions for its further expansion.	Passed.
Yea	Conference report on adopting defense appropriations bill for $46,800,000,000 for fiscal year 1965.	Passed.
Yea	Bill to protect postal patrons from receiving unsolicited mail which they regard as "morally offensive." Person receiving such mail can request the Post Office to notify a specific mailer not to mail him or his children any unsolicited material.	Passed.
Yea	Vote to reconsider a bill to establish a land and water conservation fund to assist the States and Federal agencies in meeting outdoor recreation needs.	Passed.
Yea	Motion to recede and concur with a Senate amendment to defense appropriations authorizing the Defense Secretary to make at least 35 percent of the funds for repair, alteration, and conversion of naval vessels available for work in privately owned shipyards. It was in place of a House provision which would have had a more limiting effect on the allocation of work to private shipyards to the advantage of Government navy yards.	Passed.
Yea	This resolution pledges support, including the use of armed force, as the President determines, to aid SEATO nations in southeast Asia which request assistance in defense of their freedom. It supported the President in taking necessary measures to repel armed attack against us and in preventing further aggression.	Passed.
Nay	This poverty bill included a package of programs to be administered by an Office of Economic Opportunity. Among them were a Job Corps, a work training program, a work study program, a Domestic Peace Corps (Volunteers in Service to America), urban and rural community action programs, loans to small farmers and businessmen. The bill authorized programs for 3 years, with a fiscal 1965 authorization of $947,500,000.	Passed.
Yea	This bill proposed revising the nonservice disability and death pension program for veterans of World War I, World War II, and the Korean war and their widows and children. It proposed various pension increases and liberalization of income limitations.	Passed.
Yea	Vote to recommit the conference report on independent offices appropriations bill to reduce by $200,000,000 funds provided for NASA research and development. The funds in question were part of those for the man-on-the-moon project.	Defeated.
Nay	The housing bill as passed by the House authorized $992,000,000 in spending for fiscal year 1965.	Passed.
Yea	Proposal to extend Federal inspection and safety requirements to coal mines.	Defeated.
Yea	This resolution was to express the sense of the Congress that we should make efforts to get financially delinquent U.N. nations to pay up and that the United States should urge that provisions of the U.N. Charter providing loss of votes in cases of continuing financial delinquency be enforced.	Passed.
Yea	This bill provided for import quotas on chilled, frozen, or fresh beef and veal whenever imports threatened to rise 10 percent above the average import levels of 1959–63 adjusted for market growth. Under certain circumstances, the President was given the power to suspend or increase quotas. This legislation was designed to benefit beef producers, in a situation where the United States has become the world's largest importer of beef. Beef producers do not get Federal price supports which are granted to various other groups of farmers.	Passed.
Nay	House rejected conference report on this bill to implement the International Coffee Agreement which had been ratified by the Senate as a treaty. It felt that the coffee agreement hurt the American consumer by in effect putting a floor under the price of coffee, and would point out coffee prices have risen since the agreement was ratified.	Defeated.
Nay	This so-called interest equalization tax was actually a tax on the purchase of most foreign securities by Americans from foreigners. The object of this bill was stated as being to ease our balance-of-payments deficit by discouraging foreign borrowing from U.S. sources. In opposition, it was argued that the balance-of-payments deficit could be easily reduced by cutting foreign aid, without discouraging private American investment abroad. Foreign investments bring us a long-term benefit through their yield of profits. At the same time, they help develop private enterprise abroad.	Passed.
Nay	This bill guaranteed electric consumers in the Pacific Northwest first call on electric energy generated at Federal hydroelectric plants in that region. Its enactment cleared the way for construction of an intertie between northwestern and southwestern power grids with surplus northwestern power to go to the Southwest. In effect it represented a compromise between public power and private power.	Passed.
Nay	This bill authorized $1,100,000,000 for housing and urban renewal programs. It included new programs for rehabilitation loans to property owners in urban renewal areas, for building rental housing for farmworkers, for grants to train urban development administrators, fo graduate fellowships in city planning.	Passed.
Yea	This bill proposed taking away from the Federal courts, including the Supreme Court, jurisdiction on the subject of reapportionment of State legislatures. Proponents felt that the Federal courts had exceeded their power in assuming jurisdiction over apportionment of State legislatures.	Passed.
Nay	Provided for the establishment of a National Council on the Arts to assist in the growth and development of the arts in the United States, at a cost of $150,000.	Passed.
Yea	Authorized the President to set up a Commission to study the feasibility of and to find a suitable site for construction of a sea-level canal between the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans to supplement the Panama Canal.	Passed.
Yea	This bill proposed coordination of Government programs in minimizing the effects of pesticides and insecticides on fish and wildlife. It proposed raising the Interior Department's authorization for pesticide research.	Passed.
Yea	Extended the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act for 3 years with new authorization of $4,450,000,000. The funds were for titles I and II of the act: sales of surplus American farm products to foreign nations for foreign money and for U.S. donations of food to foreign nations.	Passed.
Nay	This bill proposed partial forgiveness of student loans received under certain Government programs to doctors and dentists practicing in areas where there is a shortage. Opponents did not feel the inducement was necessary to attract doctors or dentists and that these persons must be motivated by a real desire, not lured to rural areas by a promise of something for nothing.	Defeated.
Nay	A bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes	Passed.
Yea	Bill to authorize the Secretary of Interior to cooperate with the State of Wisconsin in the designation and administration of the Ice Age National Scientific Reserve in the State of Wisconsin, and for other purposes.	Passed.
Nay	Resolution to make continuing appropriations for fiscal 1965. This resolution related only to the foreign aid appropriation bill which provides for a number of oversea activities of the U.S. Government.	Defeated.
Yea	Final passage of 3-year extension and amendment of National Education Defense Act of 1958. Bill passed extends for 1 year federally impacted area acts.	Passed.

At the beginning of the 2d session of the 88th Congress I was honored to be chosen by the members of the 88th Club to serve and represent the 88th Club on the all important Republican policy committee.

During the week of April 27, 1964, the 88th Club honored me by selecting me as "Freshman Congressman of the Week" for my continued efforts in behalf of the farmers and ranchers of this Nation.

During my first term as your Congressman, it was most gratifying to have so many visitors from the district stop by my office. Visitors are always welcome and we shall always do our best to make their visit to Washington a wee bit more interesting.

Report of U.S. Service Academies and Notice of Examination on October 31, 1964

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following item concerning the U.S. service academies and notice of examination to be held on October 31, 1964:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR FRIENDS: I am writing to tell you this is now the time, during October, when applications can be made to me as your Congressman for the civil service exam to be held on October 31. These exams are for congressional appointments from our district to the four U.S. Academies, for high school graduates in June 1965. These are fully paid scholarships at Air Force Academy, West Point, Annapolis, and Merchant Marine Academy—are for 4 years, leading to engineering degrees. U.S. expenditures on these average $8,000 to $10,000 per year for each cadet.

Our office works hard each year on a program to get good candidates—while each Congressman is allotted one principal appointment to each Academy yearly—in the current year, we got appointed two cadets to the Air Force, two to West Point, six cadets to Annapolis (the tops in the United States), and one to Merchant Marine.

So there is good opportunity for appointment. Let me hear any good recommendation and my office will contact the young man and send him an application.

Here is good news on the cadets from our local area—Dormont and Greentree—that I have appointed to the U.S. Academies from our large congressional district: Jim Wessel, of Dormont, son of Judge and Mrs. Art Wessel, made the dean's list at West Point, is now captain serving in Germany with the 34th Cavalry in armor. Frederick Burdette, of Greentree borough, entered West Point this year highly recommended by the American Legion post and is already succeeding. Fred writes on September 23: "I like it more and more each day."

Tom Grimm, of Dormont, graduated at Annapolis in 1958, is now serving with the 6th Fleet in the Mediterranean Sea. He is an engineer on the submarine *Irex*—really demanding service. Jim Davis, Greentree, a graduate of Dormont High, son of Mrs. Margaret Davis, a widow, just returned from Japan in July. Jim graduated at Annapolis and has just been selected for promotion to commander. George Meighen, former president of the student council at Dormont High, has returned from Army duty on Okinawa. George graduated at West Point and is now a major at Norfolk, Va. Jim Mitchell, of Dormont, started at Annapolis, switched to the Air Force, and is now attending Geneva College.

We in our district are proud of this fine record.

Sincerely,

JIM FULTON.

A Session Ends, an Era Begins

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the historic 2d session of the 88th Congress has drawn to a close. It will long be remembered, for it has seen many programs of great import brought to successful fruition. Soon its deeds will be proudly recorded in the annals of time. The wisdom of its decisions and the thoughtfulness of its actions will rank high among the accomplishments of men. The ideas it has given effect to and the intent it has prescribed will assuredly be far reaching. May I congratulate those on both sides of the aisle who have played a positive role in this epochal session of the 88th Congress, for they have contributed generously of their time, energy, and foresight to the writing of acts that will be given more than mere footnote attention in the historical documents of the near and distant future.

At one time, some tried to convince us that this Congress was a dawdling one, and this institution, a "stopgap" body of Government. The legacy we leave behind in this second session is an unequivocal refutation of this charge. It is also a tribute to a recently deceased President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, and a strong "vote of confidence" for his successor, Lyndon Baines Johnson. Whereas Mr. Kennedy had said, "Let us begin," Mr. Johnson has said, "Let us continue." I think that we have begun and we have continued—thanks to this remarkable session of the 88th Congress. In doing so, we have helped to make our Nation a little healthier, a little stronger, and a little wiser.

The greatness of any session of Congress is ultimately measured by the progress which it has been instrumental in promoting. Writ in another dimension, its greatness is determined by the extent to which it has conscientiously and consistently acted on the wishes of the people as articulated in the political platform of the major party in power. With these criteria in mind, I venture to say that this generation and the generations which come after it will long remember this Congress, and its second session in particular; and they will say that this Congress ushered in a new era—an era which, among other things, is making striking gains in the fields of economic expansion, civil rights, and economic opportunity.

I mention these gains first and presently discuss the ways in which they will move this mighty Nation to hitherto unattained heights of progress. I do so, because they manifestly represent the determination of this Congress to come to grips with weighty problems crying out for solution in a crisis-ridden age.

ECONOMIC EXPANSION

Two of the most pervasive legislative measures acted on in this session which are benefiting our economic system are the tax reduction and revenue acts of 1964. In a landmark session for our economic system, this Congress imaginatively sought to make use of some of the tools put to its disposal in our capitalistic democracy by manufacturing a potent weapon against possible recession and by creating an appropriate stimulus to employment.

The entire impact of the tax cut is of course incalculable. Only time will reveal its full effect. However, facts and figures drawn up since its passage last February indicate an encouraging degree of measurable economic growth—growth which promises no sign of letup in the near future.

By enacting the most comprehensive program of income-tax reduction in our Nation's history, this session of Congress has given new and unprecedented vigor and buoyancy to our system of free enterprise. Because of it, approximately $11.5 billion annually has been added to the take-home pay of Americans in every income group and to business profits across the board.

In mid-August, the Council of Economic Advisers released these impressive figures on the economic gains that have been recorded since November of 1963: The gross national product, based on current prices, has increased nearly $20 billion, or 3.3 percent; industrial production has gone up 5.2 percent; employment in nonfarm occupations has increased by 1.4 million; the unemployment rate is down from 5.9 to 4.9 percent; the average weekly earnings in manufacturing is up $2.12, or 2.1 percent; personal income has risen $17 billion, or 3.6 percent; after-tax personal income has increased $20 billion, or 5 percent; the after-tax personal income for a family of four is up $360, or 4.2 percent; corporate profits—after taxes—have risen nearly $3.5 billion, or 12 percent; and, in stock values, Dow-Jones is up from 711 to 840, which comes to 18 percent; and the total share value is up in excess of $100 billion.

Now, it is to be recalled that the figures which I have just cited represent growth measured from the fourth quarter of 1963, not the first quarter of 1964, when the tax cut was passed into law. Therefore, it is impossible to judge with exactness the full extent of our economic growth in the period following this legislation. But, undeniable is the fact that we have made unprecedented strides forward in our growth rate since last February.

One respected index for measuring this rate is, of course, the gains reflected in our gross national product. A reading of comparative figures will reveal that for the second quarter of 1963 the gross national product was $577.4 billion, and for the second quarter of 1964 the current estimate is $618.6 billion, which is an increase of more than $41 billion in 1 year's time. Another way of calculating this year's gains over last year's is to compare the percentage of increase from the first to the second quarters of 1963 and 1964, respectively. In 1963, the gross national product went from $571.8 billion for the first quarter to $577.4 billion for the second, an increase of 0.98 percent. In 1964, the increase is more dramatic, with the gross national product going from $608.8 billion for the first quarter to $618.6 billion for the second—an increase of 1.6 percent.

These spectacular increases of the gross national product are bound to continue. On the basis of present trends, the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, Walter Heller, has recently indicated that the gross national product will rise to a figure somewhere between $640 and $650 billion in the first quarter of 1965.

If we take another index for measuring gains recorded in our economic system—that of employment and unemployment figures—we shall find further encouraging growth patterns. A comparison of seasonally adjusted jobless rates for the first month of the third quarters of 1963 and 1964 indicates that 5.6 percent of the civilian labor force were unemployed in July of last year; and 4.9 percent were unemployed in July of this year. These figures represent a drop of about 300,000 more than usual from June to July. Also encouraging is the fact that the total of 3.8 million jobless was half a million below that recorded in July 1963, and was the lowest July level in 5 years. Furthermore, last July was the first time in 4½ years and the second time in 7 years that the number of unemployed dropped below 5 percent of the civilian labor force.

In spite of the daily reduction of jobs through automation, employment rates have also been increasing to record highs. In July, the number of Americans holding jobs climbed to a little less than 72.5 million, an alltime high in our history and the first time employment has passed the 72 million mark.

We have not of course made a reality of the full employment principle articulated by the 79th Congress back in 1946. But, the recent increases in employment and decreases in unemployment have brought us encouragingly closer to that goal. And, without doubt, the tax reduction act has been largely responsible for our moving in that direction.

However, the gains recorded in this new economic era cannot be attributed to the tax cut alone. Sorely needed structural reforms in our tax laws have likewise contributed to a greater period of prosperity. In this regard, I am delighted to say that the 1964 reform act included important measures which reduced by three-quarters of a billion dollars the tax burden shouldered by many upon whom it weighed inequitably.

Both of these measures—the tax reduction and tax reform acts—have prompted major gains in our economic life. In the words of the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, Walter Heller, these acts have assisted in "first, providing an initial stimulus of over $8 billion to consumer purchasing power, together with a major strengthening of business incentives; second, creating a healthy climate for expanding private economic activity and broadening the range of freedom of consumer and investor choice; and, third, restoring the vitality of our free economy and also restoring the prospect for a balanced budget in a balanced economy."

CIVIL RIGHTS

An accomplishment of paramount importance that this historic session wrote into law as the most effective declaration of civil rights since the period of Reconstruction. I might further say that there has been only one instance since it first deliberated back in 1789 when the other Chamber resolved to limit debate on a civil rights bill—and that occurred in this session preparatory to the successful passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

The Civil Rights Act is one of the most historic measures ever passed in the entire life of our country. This act will go a long way toward approaching a major credo in our American way of life, that of equality of opportunity for everyone—regardless of race, color, creed, and national origin. Under 11 comprehensive titles, the Civil Rights Act makes a reality of such respected principles as equality in voting, equality in public education, and equality in obtaining and holding a job. The machinery of Government is now prepared to move in behalf of the aggrieved citizen who has, until now, frequently been unable to seek relief from the despair of discrimination.

I should like to take some issue with those textbooks which herald the 19th amendment as signaling the beginning of universal suffrage in America. Although the 19th amendment extended suffrage to women back in 1920, we did not then embark on an era of truly universal suffrage. I submit that it is the Civil Rights Act of 1964 which marks the actual beginning of the realization of this great principle, a principle which no one will deny is essential to the practice of representative democracy. For, it was with this legislation that the same standards will apply to all individuals seeking to register and vote in Federal elections; that no one can be denied the right to cast his vote because of some minor mistake on an application for voting in these elections; that literacy tests which are written are the only tests which will be considered valid in establishing the qualifications of an individual in such elections; and that a person who has completed the sixth grade in a predominately English language school is sufficiently literate, unless the State can prove otherwise.

The various titles of the act are clear and specific, concerning various aspects of civil rights, the purposes of which are to guarantee to all Americans, without regard to race, color, or creed the free exercise of their constitutional rights, which in whole or in part have been denied or infringed to millions of Americans in the past.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY

It is with resolve and dispatch that the Congress has in this session acted to render archaic the terrible paradox of poverty in a nation of plenty. The antipoverty bill, or Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 as it is entitled, is this Congress' answer to problems existing in what some have called the other America, or the invisible America. In attempting to open wide the exits from poverty for so many of our fellow Americans, a multifaceted program is now being put into operation under the leadership of the Director of the eminently successful Peace Corps, R. Sargent Shriver.

Even though the poverty of America is out of sight to many of our citizens, it is no longer out of mind. It is indeed distressing to know that of the 47 million families in this country, at least 9 million of them—or approximately one-fifth of these families, consisting of 30 million persons—have a total income of less than $3,000 per family, per year. Of these 9 million families, more than 5 million—consisting of more than 17 million people—have a total income of $2,000 or less, per year. This is not to mention the fact that a great number of family-less individuals try to live on incomes of less than $1,500 a year.

Probably the most vital aspects of this act center on our youth. Sad indeed is the fact that not since the great depression has this Nation been confronted with such problems relating to youth unemployment and unemployability as the ones we face today. Sad, too, is the evidence that joblessness and poverty constitute a twin condition which is "inherited," so to speak; and that there is a depressingly low degree of mobility from the "have not" to the "have" strata in our society. As a result, there is a continual and ever-increasing breeding ground of poverty in this country. With the Economic Opportunity Act, however, we can have reasonable hope for a more economically healthy environment for a great number of Americans who do not, as of this time, enjoy it.

To meet the challenge of replacing despair with opportunity, this session has considered and passed a brilliant program which seeks to help people help themselves and to eliminate some of the root causes of poverty, not just its symptoms. In an attempt to enhance the employability of our youth, $190 million has been appropriated for establishing conservation camps and training centers for the disadvantaged. Enlistees between the ages of 16 and 21 will be selected from those who, by accident of background, health, and education, are least fit for useful work. After a period of up to 2 years at these camps and centers, however, members of the Job Corps will emerge better qualified to play a productive and otherwise positive role in American society.

A second vital facet of this war on poverty is the $150 million work-training program. Through cooperation between the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity and State and local agencies, as well as private nonprofit organizations, projects will be developed to provide employment and training for young men and women between the ages of 16 and 21 who would live at home. Certainly, hundreds of thousands of our youth are desperately in need of the experience, the income, and the sense of purpose which useful, part-time work can bring. For many, work-training projects may mean the difference between finishing school and dropping out.

A third and final aspect of the act which centers on youth is the work-study program. With a $72.5 million appropriation, many thousands of young Americans from low-income families who would otherwise be denied the opportunity to either enter college or continue their college education will now be able to defray part of their expenses by working at or near their college. The jobs will deal with projects at the institution or at public agencies and nonprofit organizations by arrangement of the institution; furthermore, they will either relate to the student's educational objectives or contribute to the public interest.

Thus far, I have stressed largely the benefits that will accrue to youth in this Congress' determination to assist the Nation's poverty stricken. Of additional and equal significance are the urban and rural community action programs, special programs to combat poverty in rural areas, business investment incentives, and a type of domestic Peace Corps.

Under the provisions of the urban and rural community action programs section of this act, Federal assistance to mobilize the public and private resources of the community will help in the battle to combat poverty at the local level. Grants are also earmarked for initiating projects to raise the basic education skills of those 18 years of age and over whose inability to read and write constitutes a serious impediment in obtaining gainful employment. These provisions are clearly predicated on traditional principles of democracy which encourage the members of the body politic to help each other in strengthening the society of which they are a part.

Abject poverty in rural areas is another target for those waging the most noble peaceful campaign in our history. A new life, it is hoped, will be brought to low-income rural families by providing them with loans up to $2,500 where such extra funds might reasonably effect a permanent increase in their incomes. Such loans, I might add, will be made if there is reasonable assurance of repayment, if credit with reasonable terms is otherwise unavailable, and if the loan is adequate to achieve the purposes for which the loan is made.

Under this same section, assistance will be given to establishing programs for helping seasonally employed agricultural workers and their families as well as certain dairy farmers who have had to withhold temporarily their milk from market.

Loans up to $35,000, financed from the Small Business Administration's revolving fund, will also be made to small business concerns and, in some cases, on the condition that management skills be improved through a training program. Surely, small business plays a vital role in our system of free enterprise and is worthy of any sound investment we can give it when the need arises.

The final but by no means least significant aspect of this Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is the creation of a domestic counterpart to our Peace Corps, called Volunteers in Service to America, or VISTA. Enlistees in this program will constitute a small army of dedicated people who will wage a campaign against poverty at the State and local levels to meet the health, education, and welfare needs of those requiring such services. Certainly, our Peace Corps has fired the imagination of our youth and served the cause of peace by the assistance it has rendered to many on distant shores. Now, we are about to direct attention to our own shores, as well, by calling on those who are eager to bring advantage to our disadvantaged, security to our insecure, and hope to our hopeless.

HOUSING

This session of Congress, with all due deliberation and resourcefulness, cast a ray of hope into the lives of countless numbers of our fellow citizens when it enacted Public Law 88-560. This—the 1964 omnibus Housing Act—approaches solution to several problems which seem to know no limits. With an appropriation of more than $1.1 billion to implement a broad-gaged program in the housing field, this act will make it possible for our Nation to come ever closer to fulfilling its goal of "a decent home and neighborhood for every American."

It seeks this goal on several different, but nevertheless related, fronts: it authorizes the public housing program to construct 37,500 housing units; it permits the Federal Housing Administration to insure mortgages on one-family homes up to $30,000 instead of the former $25,000 ceiling; it provides added protection against foreclosure if a home buyer fails to meet payments on time because of circumstances beyond his control; it allows savings and loan associations to make loans on homes within 100 miles of their main place of business instead of the former 50-mile limit; it provides $150 million for farm-housing loans; it earmarks $10 million for low-rent housing for migrant farmworkers; it sets aside $30 million for urban planning grants and $25 million for open-space grants for parks and recreation facilities; and it provides $75 million for the construction of housing for the elderly.

In addition to these, the Housing Act seeks to tackle anew the recurrent vexing problems of the slums. As the first major addition to the concept of urban renewal since rehabilitation was included in 1957, it attempts solution to urban problems in this area by seeking to preserve more buildings and to decrease large-scale razing. The chief means of solution are two: First, to provide Federal loans at a below-market interest rate of 3 percent for tenants and landlords who are required to restore rundown housing and businesses in urban renewal areas; and, second, to allow a more generous relocation payment schedule for people and businesses displaced by urban renewal. Under this latter provision, small businesses with a gross annual income of less than $10,000 a year will receive up to $1,500 plus moving expenses, and families and single persons 62 years of age and older will receive a rent subsidy of up to $500 maximum for a 12-month period.

Certainly, the dilemmas of city and suburb are both deep-seated and widespread. Particularly vexatious are the twin problems of substandard housing and urban blight. For this reason, the 2d session of the 88th Congress has justly given one of the highest priorities to an area of concern that admits of no easy or quick solution.

TRANSPORTATION

Substandard housing and slums, however, are not the only problems plaguing our metropolitan areas. Would that they were, but transportation systems within and around our congested cities represent yet another point of concern—and a concern to which this session has attempted to bring relief. Under the provisions of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964, $375 million in Federal grants is authorized for distribution over a 3-year period to many of the Nation's public and private municipal transit systems. The purpose of the act is twofold: First, to render assistance in developing improved mass transit services and facilities; and, second, to encourage rational planning in devising areawide transit systems. The program, which will be administered by the Housing and Home Finance Agency, will assist in the construction and rehabilitation of commuter bus, subway, and train facilities, and other capital projects which local authorities cannot pay for out of transit fares. The Federal share will be two-thirds of the net cost of a given project.

HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

This session of Congress has also been responsibly alert to the health, education, and welfare needs of the Nation. In the field of health, the Hill-Burton amendments of 1964 have extended Federal grants to the States for 5 more years to help them pay part of the costs of constructing public and other nonprofit hospitals, public health centers, long-term care facilities, rehabilitation facilities, and diagnostic or treatment centers. Since the Hill-Burton Act was originally enacted in 1946, more than 7,300 projects have been recommended by the States and approved for Federal assistance. State Hill-Burton agency reports to the Public Health Service indicate that we still need 133,000 additional new hospital beds if the Nation's requirements are to be met; of this number, more than 13,000 hospital beds are required annually just to take care of the annual increase in our population. These reports also show that of this Nation's 2,443 health service areas, only 979—or 40 percent—are considered by State health departments as having met 100 percent of their general hospital bed needs. The other 1,464 health service areas need to construct additions to existing hospitals or to erect new hospitals. Successive Hill-Burton

Acts and the 1964 amendments represent a model of Federal, State, and local grants-in-aid. The 5-year extension will now allow this vital program to go forward without interruption in meeting future needs for hospitals and other health and medical-care facilities.

This 88th Congress has justly been called the Congress which has done more for education than any other Congress of the last 100 years. It has acted in response to the needs of education because it has recognized that civic enlightenment and responsibility in our democratic order are possible only through a sound sysem of education. It has also realized that education is an all-important tool in developing the talent of free world leadership and buttressing our national security. For this reason, this session has amended and extended the National Defense Education Act of 1958. Over the course of the last 6 years, approximately 600,000 students have been helped to obtain or continue a college education through loans made available under this act. About one-half of these loans have provided the necessary financial assistance to students preparing to teach in our ever-expanding elementary schools. Approximately two-thirds of the loans have gone to prospective teachers or to students possessing superior talents in the fields of science, mathematics, engineering, and modern foreign languages. The act, as amended, would provide opportunities to persons pursuing a life's work in the teaching of English, reading, history, and geography. Furthermore, it would give Federal support to the preparation of teachers working with disadvantaged youth, to librarians, guidance counselors, and educational media specialists. Finally, it provides funds to increase National Defense Education Act loans and fellowships through June 30, 1968.

A second major assist given to education by this session of the 88th Congress is the Library Services and Construction Act of 1964. When President Johnson signed the act last February, he remarked:

> The central fact of our times is this: Books and ideas are the most effective weapons against intolerance and ignorance.

This is the underlying thought that motivated the Congress to continue to make public library services available to those who have inadequate services, or none at all. Until last February, Federal funds—under the Library Services Act of 1956—were administered by the States and their local units in rural areas only; with the 1964 amendment, however, urban areas are also eligible to receive such assistance. The second part of the act authorized a sizable appropriation for fiscal year 1964 plus unspecified amounts for the following 2 fiscal years for constructing library buildings in communities where the inadequacy of facilities prevents the development of library services. This provision, which was absent in the previous Library Act, should go a long way in meeting the requirements of a democracy which must thrive on knowledge if it is to remain viable.

A final major contribution to education made by this session of Congress is the Nurse Training Act of 1964. Its aim is to alleviate the grievous shortage of bedside nurses, and it attempts this goal through four basic approaches. First, it establishes a 4-year program of $90 million in grants for constructing and rehabilitating nursing schools. Next, it creates a $58 million program to assist collegiate, associate degree, and diploma schools of nursing to meet the costs of improving their training programs. Third, it extends for 5 more years the existing program of traineeships for the advanced training of professional nurses for teaching and administration. And finally, it establishes a student loan program modeled on the National Defense Education Act for students of nursing at collegiate, associate, and diploma schools of nursing. Eighty-five million dollars will be provided for this purpose for a 10-year period.

Lastly, in the field of assistance to the needy, we can rest assured that this session of Congress acted responsibly and wisely in writing into law the food stamp program. This law, which expands a pilot project initiated back in 1961, provides that food stamps be administered to improve the diets of the needy. According to the provisions of the act, a local welfare agency will determine how much money an eligible family spends on food. For the price of what the family usually pays for food in a given period, it will receive from the agency food stamps worth a larger amount of money. The stamps will be redeemable at retail stores which will, in turn, redeem the stamps through wholesale food concerns or banks. Operations to date indicate that a needy household buying $6 worth of stamps usually receives about $10 worth of food. Appropriations have been made to meet needs in this area for this fiscal year plus the next 2 years in order to bring about a fourfold expansion of this very vital program.

CONSERVATION

It is with great pride and satisfaction that I reflect on the accomplishments that this second session has recorded in the field of conservation. This Congress justly deserves the appellation, "Conservation Congress," for it has written some of the most significant conservation legislation in the history of the Nation. At least two of several measures passed are considered landmark decisions.

The first is the Wilderness Preservation Act, which puts more than 9 million acres of public lands already classified as "wilderness," "wild," or "canoe" under legal protection. Eventually, 14.7 million acres may be added to the National Wilderness Preservation System after review by the President and the Congress. The pristine beauty of wilderness areas in national forests, parks, and wildlife refuges can now remain roadless, undeveloped, and much like the way nature created them.

The other landmark measure is the land and water conservation fund, which seeks to create an eventual sum of $180 million a year for the purchase of vitally needed outdoor recreation areas. State agencies as well as the National Park Service and the Forest Service will draw upon this fund to buy scenic areas and playgrounds and to prepare them for public use. The revenue for such a fund will be derived from nominal admission and user fees at certain recreation areas, an existing motorboat fuels tax, and net proceeds from the sale of Federal surplus real property.

In addition to these two measures, I should like to point out that the Ozark National Scenic Riverways Act will protect 101 miles of the famous Current River in Missouri, 39 miles of its tributary, and some 87,000 acres of adjacent valley and hill land. Finally, the Canyonlands National Park will preserve some of the Nation's most spectacular desert and canyon scenery in southeastern Utah.

RELIEF TO ALASKA

On March 27 of this year, one of the worst earthquakes in modern history inflicted awesome damage in the young State of Alaska. In response to this calamity, Congress moved with alacrity to provide $50 million in emergency aid to bring relief to Alaskans. The funds appropriated were made available to the Office of Emergency Planning for allocation to Federal agencies participating in Alaskan relief activities, the most active of which were the Departments of Agriculture, Commerce, Interior, and Treasury, the Army Corps of Engineers, the Small Business Administration, and the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

In May, $23.5 additional million was appropriated for Alaska's State and local governments to help offset severe revenue losses expected from the destruction wrought in the wake of this devastating earthquake. This sum—which is based on estimates of revenue loss—will be provided through June 30, 1966. In addition to supplying Federal funds, the legislation extends until the end of fiscal year 1966 the period in which Federal agencies can continue to provide services that normally belong to a State and during which property used for providing such services might be transferred to the State. Certainly, the loss of life and property was an unspeakable tragedy. Let us hope that the positive role played by this session of Congress can restore, at least in part, some of these material losses and bring increased viability to the Alaskan State economy.

PUBLIC DEFENDERS

I think that no conscientious American will question the requirement in a democracy of equal protection under the laws for all. Clearly, this principle is an absolute essential to the preservation of individual rights. However, there have been too many instances when "equal protection" was not provided for all, largely because rising costs of litigation have made court action prohibitive to those unable to pay for their own defense. Therefore, this 88th Congress, early in its 2d session, moved quickly to bring greater equity to the judicial process by passing the Criminal Justice Act. Now, a person who is accused of a Federal crime and is unable to pay for legal aid will be provided assistance without cost at every stage of criminal proceedings. Counsel will be appointed by the district court judge or U.S. commissioner from a panel of lawyers in private practice, or made available by a bar association or legal aid society. This legislation brings us decidedly closer to a society wherein legal relief is obtainable by all—not just by those who are financially able.

COTTON-WHEAT PROGRAM

Early in this session, the Congress passed the cotton-wheat bill, which will bring benefit to the Nation's farmers and consumers as well as effect a major reduction in Federal farm expenditures. The chief feature of the cotton provisions is a 2-year subsidy for domestic textile mills which will reduce the cost they pay for domestically grown cotton. Its purpose is to help domestic mills to compete with imported goods and to make raw cotton prices for mills more competitive with artificial fibers. The ultimate goal is to prevent cotton from being priced out of the domestic market.

The wheat program section is designed to replace previous legislation that would have given farmers complying with allotments only about $1.26 a bushel in price supports. With this new program, farmers complying with wheat acreage allotments in 1964 will receive supports of approximately $2 a bushel on wheat for domestic food use, $1.55 on the portion of their wheat grown for export, and $1.30 on the portion grown for feed and seed use. Similar scales would apply in 1965.

This legislation is designed to bring solution to several potential agricultural problems. In short, the control, support, and subsidy features of the program will help to maintain reasonable farm incomes—especially for the small farmer—save the market for U.S. cotton, and avoid building up huge surpluses of cotton and wheat.

GOVERNMENT PAY RAISES

One of Emerson's aphorisms—"We often pay dear for a small frugality"—was a guiding idea that prompted this session of Congress to raise the salaries of both civilian and military personnel of the Federal Government. All levels of government have lost many outstandingly qualified individuals to the private sphere because of the more attractive salaries that the latter can offer. The Federal pay raise attempts to retain men and women of talent and to attract more of the talented, as well. It did this by revising and upgrading Federal salary rates so that compensation for Government jobs is roughly comparable to similar jobs in private enterprise. This resulted in an overall 4.3-percent raise for 1 million classified civil servants, a 5.6-percent increase for the 600,000 postal workers, and a 2.5-percent increase for those commissioned and warrant officers and all enlisted personnel who have 2 years of service. The salaries of Federal judges, U.S. attorneys, Members of Congress, legislative employees, and Cabinet as well as high-level administrators were also increased. Rises in the cost of living through the years require Congress to bring Federal salaries into line with these costs. I am glad that this session saw fit to bring equity to the salary system at this time, and, in the process, dissuade valuable men of Government from leaving the civilian and military services in search of more lucrative employment outside the Government.

GOVERNMENT COMMISSIONS

Three major Commissions have been authorized by this session of Congress to undertake studies of critical national importance. In August, legislation created a National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress to undertake a searching inquiry into the problems bred by automation and the means by which they can be prevented or solved. Certainly, automation can be this Nation's boon or its bane. It is with determination, then, that this Congress seeks, on the one hand, to utilize the vast advantages which can be derived from automation and, on the other, to prevent automation from disrupting the benefits that can be reaped from our economic system.

In June, Congress authorized the creation of a National Commission on Food Marketing to investigate the operations of the food industry covering the gamut from producer to consumer. The establishment of this bipartisan Commission reflects the concern over the widening spread between what the farmer receives for his products and what the consumer pays in the retail market, as well as apprehension over the rise of big retail food store chains. The recommendations that will be made by this Commission in 1965 are likely to protect farmers and consumers alike.

The efficiency and fairness with which Federal administrative practices and procedures are carried out constitute a continuing concern of Congress. For this reason, this Congress, in August, voted to establish a permanent Administrative Conference of the United States to formulate recommendations for the improvement of administrative procedures within the Federal agencies and departments. The main body of the Administrative Conference will be an Assembly, consisting of a chairman, appointed by the President for a 5-year term; an 11-man Council, appointed by the President for a 3-year term; and a flexible number of members from both government and private life. The Conference will have no enforcement powers, but will submit its recommendations to the President, the Congress, and/or the Judicial Conference of the United States.

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

In the international sphere, this 2d session of the 88th Congress has assisted this Nation in charting a positive course toward the realization of world peace. The El Chamizal Convention Act, the increase in U.S. funds for Special Operations of the Inter-American Development Bank, the contributions to the International Development Association, increased appropriations for the Peace Corps, and the Vietnam resolution—all of these have contributed to creating greater harmony and understanding among the nations of the world.

Certainly, the El Chamizal Convention represents an accord that is consonant with the longstanding friendship that has guided the conduct of relations between Mexico and the United States. The Chamizal Treaty, signed in 1963, settles a century-old dispute over ownership of the "El Chamizal" tract of land which, as a result of a shift in the course of the Rio Grande some 100 years ago, had separated from Ciudad Juarez, Mexico, and become a part of El Paso, Tex. The treaty provided that the United States would cede 366 acres of the disputed Chamizal tract, plus a nearby 264 acres, to Mexico, in return for which the United States would receive 193 acres of land held by Mexico.

In April, Congress authorized appropriation of up to $44.9 million to implement the Convention on the Chamizal. Implementation includes the stabilization of the Rio Grande in a concrete-lined channel which will become the new United States-Mexico boundary line. It also includes relocation of an estimated 4,500 U.S. citizens and commercial properties, bridges, port-of-entry and El Paso city facilities, and railroads within the area.

Early in the session, Congress authorized more than $461 million in additional U.S. contributions to the Inter-American Development Bank. Of this amount, $50 million goes for the Special Operations Fund, which makes loans with more flexible interest and repayment terms; and more than $411 million goes to the regular lending operations. This Bank, which is modeled on the World Bank, serves as an effective tool in our program of bringing greater economic viability to the Americas.

In addition to authorizing more funds for the Inter-American Development Bank, this session authorized $312 million as this Nation's contribution to a proposed $750 million increase in the financial resources of the International Development Association. The $312 million will be payable in three installments of $104 million each, beginning this fiscal year. As an affiliate of the World Bank, the IDA provides 50-year loans to underdeveloped nations, mainly in hard currency. The loans are interest-free, but carry a three-quarters of 1 percent service charge and are repayable in hard currencies.

Increased appropriations for the Peace Corps is yet another way in which this session of Congress has shown its determination to bring peace to the world. More than 10,000 young men and women dedicated to fostering international understanding are today working on distant shores in various capacities. This kind of people-to-people program is essential to the progress of countless millions of people. The Congress endorses this aim and supports the Corps in all its admirable endeavors.

On August 2 and 4, North Vietnamese PT boats made unprovoked attacks on two U.S. destroyers in the international waters of the Gulf of Tonkin. In response to this inexcusable action, the President requested, and received from

Congress a resolution overwhelmingly in support of the American air attack reprisals on North Vietnamese gunboats. The resolution also pledges the determination of this Nation to assist any member or protocol state of the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty—SEATO—which requests assistance in defense of its freedom. This bipartisan action reflects the united agreement, which is found in all areas of this land, that we stand solidly behind the President in his determination to keep the peace.

CONCLUSION

Such are some of the major components of the public record of this epochal 2d session of the 88th Congress. The American public can take pride in the oft-demonstrated fact that this session has been instrumental in helping to shape a better society, and that strong action was taken for a powerful national defense, and a firm foreign policy. This body's handiwork has introduced a new era, an era which offers greater hope and opportunity for every individual.

But, the work of the Congress is far from over. As Oliver Wendell Holmes once remarked, "The work is never done while the power to work remains." More work has yet to be completed, for democracy's tasks are never ending. The people's representatives and the Democratic controlled Congress have performed their tasks well in this last session; and the satisfaction that they derive from a job well done is sufficient inducement for them to renew their determination to tackle anew some of the unfinished business that awaits their attention in the first session of the new Congress that will meet in January.

Statement by Senator Claiborne Pell Regarding the Eighth Anniversary of the Hungarian Revolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIBORNE PELL

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues the eighth anniversary of the Hungarian revolution of October 23, 1956.

The Hungarian Freedom Fighters are holding their commemoration of this anniversary in New York City. Their organization, the Hungarian October 23 Movement, Inc., is under the excellent leadership of Odon Pongratz, president, and Erno Hoka, secretary general.

As one who served with the International Rescue Committee on the Hungarian border during those tragic and yet inspirational days of October 1956, I am personally aware of the magnificent spirit of courage demonstrated by the Hungarian Freedom Fighters—a spirit which continues to give the free world an abiding faith in steadfast valor and determination.

As we ourselves oppose the forces of tyranny, the Hungarian Freedom Fighters exemplify those qualities which are deeply significant to the future of mankind.

Press Veteran of the Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROLAND V. LIBONATI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, the celebrated columnist, Milburn P. Akers, editor of the Chicago Sun Times, was selected by the Chicago Press Veterans Association as the Press Veteran of the Year. He was honored at the annual banquet of the association, and presented a plaque descriptive of his long career in journalism for more than three decades.

Robert Howard Springfield, correspondent of the Tribune, presented the plaque with the most precious compliment one newspaperman can pay to another—"He has been a good reporter through the years."

A recent series of articles treating with the critical east Asian problems confronting the United States in that theater of operations, were written by Editor Akers. He viewed the situation from on the spot observation and study. His masterful treatment of the subject, both from the political and military aspects, were presented to the reader with clarity of thought and logical conclusions. He is to be complimented for his fairness in developing honest conclusions from basic facts. His judgment in these matters is unassailable. The accepted authorities on the critical Vietnam situation, both in the Pentagon, the State Department, and their assigned personnel at the theater of operations, have not questioned his findings. He is to be complimented for his efforts to acquaint the American people with the true facts and actual conditions to be met before success can be realized.

Mayor Richard J. Daley of Chicago was warm in his compliments of the honored guest—making reference to the prominent role that Mr. Akers played as press secretary to the late Governor, Henry Horner, especially during his late illness. It was Mr. Akers who championed his dying leader's cause, presswise, to the very end.

Editor Akers, in graciously accepting the plaque, entered upon a most serious subject, the advance to maturity by the Chicago newspapers during his generation in news work. It was both interesting and educational. His closing statement was a summation of journalistic philosophy. He said:

> The newspapers are only as good as their reporters, and it is my considered judgment, that Chicago today has the best reporters in the world.

It can be truly said, that Milburn P. Akers enjoys the respect and admiration of the members of the press, those under his employ, the people of Chicago, the political, civic and business leaders of the community, and last but not least, his publisher, Marshall Field, Jr. May the Lord bless and guide his efforts to disseminate the written word in truth and with justice.

SS "Hope" Starts Fifth Year With Visit to Guinea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. BATES

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, as this Congress approaches adjournment, it is appropriate that we have an up-to-date report on the progress of that great humanitarian program, Project Hope. It has been my privilege to encourage and assist this program as much as possible since its inception in 1958; and since 1960 we have all witnessed the heartening good-will achievements of the project's SS *Hope*, and those who have served aboard her.

For the past 4 years the SS *Hope* has demonstrated to the people of Asia and Latin America that we in the United States are dedicated to helping those who wish to help themselves.

In mid-October the white hospital ship docks at Conakry, Guinea, on the west coast of Africa. Perhaps more than any of the other countries the floating medical center has visited, Guinea will test *Hope*'s resources and abilities.

The Republic of Guinea is just 4 years old. This new nation, under the leadership of President Sekou Toure, is attempting to stand on its own feet and is anxious for the kind of people-to-people assistance *Hope* is bringing.

President Toure, who is considered one of the most promising leaders of Africa, has personally requested the aid of Project Hope, and has invited medical personnel from Mali, Sierra Leone, Liberia, Senegal, and the Ivory Coast to participate in the program.

The eyes of the world will be focused on *Hope* in the next year. But I have no doubt that the dedicated men and women of *Hope* will acquit themselves in the same miraculous manner as they have in Indonesia, South Vietnam, Peru, and Ecuador.

During 4 years in these four countries, the *Hope* doctors and nurses have trained thousands of medical counterparts in the modern techniques of American medicine. At the same time, they have conducted thousands of operations, treatments, and inoculations.

But, most importantly perhaps, the simple, nonpolitical dedication of these Americans, in the prime of their lives, has captured the hearts of people wherever they have gone.

In strife-torn Saigon, the Communist-infested outer islands of Indonesia, the slums of Peru, and the jungles of Ecuador, these men and women in white, through their professional skills and personal interest, have waged their unselfish war against disease, poverty, and ignorance.

Project Hope originated in 1958 when Dr. William B. Walsh, a noted heart specialist and assistant professor of internal medicine at Georgetown University in Washington, D.C., was appointed cochairman of the people-to-people health program by President Eisenhower.

The same year, Dr. Walsh outlined the plans for an organization known as Project Hope, which was to become the principal activity of the People-to-People Health Foundation, Inc. Two years later, a converted hospital ship was launched as the SS *Hope*.

On its maiden voyage in September 1960, the gleaming white hospital ship steamed into various Indonesian ports, then journeyed to Saigon, South Vietnam.

In Indonesia, the *Hope* staff trained more than 500 Indonesian physicians, surgeons, dentists, nurses, and medical technicians.

At Saigon, 28 Vietnamese interns and residents and 200 nurses worked side-by-side with their American counterparts, who also introduced oral surgery and orthopedic rehabilitation to the country.

In Asia, 700 major surgeries were performed and 18,000 patients were treated by the *Hope* medical staff. On the second trip in 1962, to Salaverry, Peru, and the third in 1963 to Guayaquil, Ecuador, *Hope* services touched more than 80,000 persons directly and hundreds of thousands indirectly in South America. Hundreds of doctors and nurses were trained.

Project Hope's $5 million annual budget is primarily financed by private donations. Private industry has contributed millions more in the form of food, medicine, and other supplies and equipment that has been donated during the past 4 years.

The vessel itself is on loan from the U.S. Navy. The American medical personnel aboard the ship during an entire year-long voyage are paid fractions of their regular salaries. The specialists flown to the ship in 2-month intervals work without pay.

When the good ship *Hope* weighed anchor in Guayaquil last September 4, thousands lined the pier to tearfully wave goodbye to the Americans who had devoted a part of their lives to helping them. Similar farewells will be repeated next year in Conakry, and wherever else *Hope* goes with its contributions toward better health for all it serves.

Ossining Honor Day at World's Fair

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. BARRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, September 3, 1964, was a historymaking day for Ossining, N.Y. Under a special events program set up by the New York State Commission on the World's Fair, representative nonprofessional performing groups from every community in the State perform from 10 a.m. to 10 p.m. daily, making the New York State exhibit the "Star of the Fair."

September 3 was Ossining Honor Day at the New York State pavilion. The town was ably represented by 5 groups who gave a total of 14 performances. The five performing groups were: Sons of Tunje, an instrumental and dancing group of teenagers who are very interested in African culture; Ax-Cents, consisting of a lead guitarist-vocalist, a rythm guitarist, and a drummer, specializing in popular music; Jimmy and Joan Bason, singing a program of rock and roll and popular music; Justice and the Peacemakers, a quartet of sixth-grade girls who compose and arrange their own songs; and Viceroys, composed of three high school boys, playing bass guitar, drums, and guitar, with vocal arrangements.

One of the highlights of the day occurred when Mrs. Irving N. Valentine, of Ossining, presented a plaque bearing our national motto "In God We Trust" to assistant project director, Harold J. Kiley, who accepted her donation on behalf of Lt. Gov. Malcolm Wilson, chairman, New York State Commission on the World's Fair. Mrs. Valentine previously, in 1957, donated a similar plaque to the Ossining post office. I understand that the Ossining post office was the second in the country and the first in New York State to display our national motto, thanks to Mrs. Valentine.

The Vital Role of Transportation in Economic Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. PEARSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, I recently addressed the Kansas Motor Carriers' Association annual convention at Wichita, Kans., regarding the vital role of transportation in economic development.

In view of the vital nature of national transportation policy to the economic development and future welfare of my State, I request unanimous consent that this address be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE VITAL ROLE OF TRANSPORTATION IN ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

(Address by JAMES B. PEARSON, U.S. Senator, Republican, of Kansas, Kansas Motor Carriers' Association Convention, Hotel Broadview, Wichita, Kans.)

This country is the major economic power of the world. It achieved that position for good reason.

We have urged each person to choose his own job. We have encouraged each person to do that which he can do best. We have been blessed with many rich natural resources.

When there are many people with diverse talents and a rich supply of resources the potential for economic development is excellent. With freedom to apply initiative, that potential can be fulfilled. Today we are the beneficiaries of these assets and a long and great heritage of this kind of free enterprise system.

All of this could not have taken place, however, without one essential element. That element is the freedom and capability of movement. Economic development and transportation are absolutely interdependent. It is vital for our national economic growth that we have a flexible, low cost, and strong transportation system.

Early Kansas was a laboratory example of this fact. The Oregon and Santa Fe Trails through Kansas opened the transportation routes of the frontier to settlers and later to commercial ventures. The Chisolm Trail through Wichita to Abilene was the route for the eastward movement of our western cattle. These routes provided only the crudest form of transportation but they served the needs of the time. When Wichita was finally linked by rail with Chicago in 1872, it became a major trade and transportation center. But early Kansans were not satisfied with merely providing the route for transporting livestock. With better transportation available they began to hold the cattle for feeding. Our State's livestock industry was born. So we in Kansas have been acutely aware of the importance of transportation because of its contribution to our early economy.

As the number of new industries have increased around the country, transportation service has become a vital link between supplier and customer. We have been able to develop our resources because there has been a market for almost everything somewhere. With expanded and improved transportation have come more markets, and consequently more new industries and more jobs.

It would be a mistake, however, to think that all of the frontiers are past. Development continues. There are many trends which point to new opportunities, and with them, to new demands on the transportation system.

Our population is growing at a fantastic rate. Today there are twice as many people in the United States as there were at the beginning of World War I. From 1940 to 1960, the movement of population to the West was greater than anything since the 1870's. As in the 1870's, Kansas is in the center of that movement.

As our people spread throughout the country, they place increasing demands on the transportation system. People in even the smallest town enjoy and, in fact, demand the benefits of our country's diverse production. To reach all people everywhere requires more miles of transportation service, and a great variety of services and schedules to handle raw materials, manufactured components, and finished products ranging from ore to transistors to giant missiles.

We are experiencing a new era of production. There are products today we never dreamed possible. Even the old familiar elements in our diet are manufactured and processed in revolutionary ways. There are, for example, so many processing steps between the farm harvest and the housewife's kitchen shelf that new, specialized industries have grown up to handle each stage.

A product is seldom manufactured in one location and then simply shipped to its market. It may travel from one plant to another, and even to several, before being completed. Firms thus take advantage of the special contributions of each area of the country.

Kansas has benefited from this trend as we have experienced the development of several major industries. The Goodyear Rubber Co., for example, constructed one of its largest manufacturing and distribution centers at Topeka. Certainly an essential factor in that decision was the existence of the transportation facilities necessary to take advantage of our geographical location for regional distribution.

The completion of the new Interstate Highway System will be the most significant development in our national transportation system in years. The Interstate System composed of 41,000 miles—to which your dollars have contributed so much—opens a new era in transportation and especially in motor freight transportation. A recent study sponsored by the Rockwell Standard Corp. and conducted by the American Foundry Association concluded that the availability of good highways is a number one factor in choosing a plant site. The improvement of our highways will continue to increase that importance.

We have and we will continue to witness a series of railroad mergers. This innovation in corporate ownership and transportation management provides the rail industry with a new national status.

All of the carriers have been moving forward in the field of technological innovation. Specialized facilities, such as the Big John hopper cars of the Southern Railroad, represent new dimensions in rail carriage. The disturbance in rate parity between bulk wheat and flour rates stimulated by the availability of Southern's new cars provided a good example of how closely industry and transportation are linked.

Developments in intermodal carriage will have definite effects on the whole concept of intercontinental transportation. Policies adopted regarding new piggy-back proposals will certainly be of vital concern to all those involved.

Improvements in motor carrier design, power, and safety have made it feasible and possibly reasonable to construct and operate larger vehicles.

There appears to be nothing in view to arrest these developments. Certainly our population will continue to grow and spread about the country. Industry will become increasingly flexible with regard to its location. Distribution, whether of raw materials, components, or completed products will become more vital to the efficient functioning of our diverse and changing economy. Innovations from technology will continue at the present or even at a greater rate. With all of these trends will come increasing reliance on efficient transportation.

Most significant is the fact that these developments will maintain constant pressure on our existing concepts of operation and regulation. A look at transport legislation and regulatory practice would therefore seem in order.

In 1935, the motor freight industry was brought under ICC regulation. Since that time, so many changes have taken place that today's world could not possibly have been foreseen by those who drafted those laws. I seriously question whether it was then possible to anticipate what a vital industry yours would become. The need at that time was to correct abuses rather than to plan for the future. In the interim, transportation laws have been keyed to locking the barn door after the horse is stolen. There are too few examples of legislation designed to encourage an energetic and innovative transportation industry. It is no wonder we hear constant complaint from the suppliers and consumers of transportation that much of our transportation legislation and regulation is obsolete.

This, then, is where we stand today. Our Nation's economic strength lies in its ability to develop new and different goods and means of producing them. This requires a flexibility which is becoming more evident as markets and industry diversify and expand. A strong and healthy transportation network provides the freedom of movement which is necessary for this type of growth to continue. The transportation industry constitutes a major but too often a latent force which, if allowed to use its potential, could be a prime mover in regional and national economic development. In contrast, our transportation policies, laws, and regulatory practices make it difficult, or impossible, for you to use new technology, new concepts—or even your present equipment—as efficiently as you know how.

We cannot tolerate a transportation policy keyed to the past. The close interdependence of industry, transportation, and economic growth dictates a more realistic approach. If this important historical relationship between our expanding economy and our vital transportation system is not understood, the new era of growth will be restricted. Only by channeling your emerging strength and your energy, working with it instead of against it, can we hope to see our economy continue to move forward. Only in this way can our country be guaranteed that ingredient so essential to its expansion, the freedom and capability of movement.

We must keep this perspective as we approach the next and subsequent sessions of Congress. The issue has been raised and the coming year will be one of new suggestions for laws and regulations. If petty arguments prevail and if the concentration is on seeking solutions to minor difficulties, we will be repeating the mistakes of the past. We will create more patches in an already chaotic patchwork.

These are matters of deep national concern. They will receive national attention. Of that, you can be sure. But, I am concerned about the impact of these proposals and new policies upon Kansas.

You in this audience have a great stake in the economic future of Kansas and this region. Its growth is your future. Barriers which inhibit our State's natural development cannot be tolerated. We must, in fact, insist on the form of law and regulatory policy and attitude which will accelerate our State's growth.

In recent months, since the institution of the new rail rate structure for bulk agricultural commodities, four flour mills have announced their plans to close Kansas operations. The existence of a rate structure beneficial to a non-Kansas location has been cited as the critical ingredient in these decisions. We are compelled to acknowledge that the rate situation weighed in the company considerations and they balanced out against Kansas.

You can undoubtedly cite many other examples of the critical influences of transportation policies unfavorable to Kansas and its otherwise promising future.

What can we do about this problem? We needed, of course, to give immediate attention to the rate problem. But I suggest we need to take a long, hard look at the future of this State and this region as it is influenced by transportation. We need to ask ourselves if the State and national transportation policies are designed to encourage new Kansas industry. Are they oriented to the industry and agri-business for which Kansas appears to have a major attraction? Are they keyed to the right sources of supply or the most promising emerging markets? Do the State and national laws and regulations encourage our common carriers to maximize their potential to encourage the growth of Kansas industry and their own position? Or, on the other hand, are we struggling with a system which is an outgrowth of past requirements?

The time has come for Kansans to take the offensive. We must understand our needs and bend every effort to influence policy at every level to our benefit. I suggest that we give serious consideration to the creation of a conference to study transportation policy as it relates to our State's industrial development. I would urge the inclusion of all interested parties, including State agencies, industrial groups and the transportation community.

We need desperately to know how well suited we are to handle the emerging trends in transportation and in industry which I have discussed. I especially emphasize that policymakers at all levels need recommendations concerning proposed and pending Federal legislation and regulatory acts which have a bearing on our State's development. These are highly technical matters, the consequences of which are not always obvious to the layman or on cursory analysis. The critical need is for informed detailed proposals, comment, and amendment early in the consideration of new policy. I am afraid we have too often reacted to the thrusts of others rather than assume the initiative in our own behalf.

The knowledge and counsel I cite as so essential is lacking today, yet it is vital to our future. With proper commitment, well advised, we stand on the threshold of developing new industrial frontiers for Kansas just as we stood in earlier days at the frontier of the great western development.

Hon. John Lesinski

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROLAND V. LIBONATI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, our good friend, Hon. John Lesinski, after serving seven terms—82d to 88th, inclusive, from 1950 to 1964—is leaving the Congress. The recent results of the Michigan primary, under the remapping of congressional districts, denied him the nomination. Thus, John's political ascendancy was cut off by the doctrine of political improvement for the Republican Party controlled Michigan Legislature. In other States there are instances where the Democrats have reversed this action also.

John was a firm believer in principle—he voiced his opinion with independence and a firm belief that what he averred was true, and he was not afraid to say it. He wore his heart on his sleeve reflecting the sensitive nature of his entire being. He was sincere, candid, and earnest in his personal relationships, as well as in his political convictions.

He did not like to be "managed," yet respected party leadership for harmonious and decisive action.

He was quiet and gentle in his demeanor toward others, as well as kindly and considerate.

His handling of bills in debate on the floor reflected the true characteristics of a born gentleman. It was an interesting contrast to the brazen type of pugnacious approach of the brassy overemotional exhibitionist who seeks to hypnotize all with a clatter of meaningless oratory. In his quiet, unobtrusive way, John passed his committee bills.

In his work, he reflected the same fearless courage that won for him the Purple Heart and citations in the last war.

John loved his family—his darling five children and his wife, the beloved Margaret. He worshipped his dad, a former Congressman, who left him a great heritage. John has earned a similar right to distinction and leaves to his own family a great heritage.

A political turn away is not a repudiation, but rather a change of course in selection that may represent purely the fickle attitude of the public mind. Every politician knows that the recipients of public acclaim must someday move back again among the common citizenry and list his importance in anonymity as one who was—is not now but just a hasbeen. Some seek to return, but the majority are happy to reminisce in the glories of the past—feeling that to be at home among warm friends, family and associates holds the greatest blessings in his life. May the good Lord bless John and his family with happiness and prosperity.

Congressman Stratton Reports on the Accomplishments of the 88th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, as this 2d session of the 88th Congress comes to a close, I would like to take this opportunity to report to the people of the 35th District of New York, whom I have the honor to represent here, on the accomplishments of this Congress, just as I have done each year I have been privileged to serve in this body. As their Congressman I believe I have an obligation to keep them posted on how their elected Representative has tried to discharge the heavy responsibilities entrusted to him. Because Congress remained in session all year last year, it was not feasible for me to report on the record of that first session of this Congress. For that reason this report will cover both sessions, 1963 and 1964.

MAJOR ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Even its critics will, I think, agree that the 88th Congress has been a most productive one, with more major legislation enacted than any other Congress in recent years, perhaps in our entire history. We got off to a slow start, but we have more than made it up in what has been written into law since the tragic events of last November. I would not be honest, however, if I did not acknowledge that most of these major legislative achievements would not have been possible except for broad bipartisan support. Only because substantial numbers of members of both major political parties voted for these bills were they passed. So it is clear that the achievements of this Congress are not the exclusive property of any one party. In the following paragraphs I would like to review for you some of the more important of these accomplishments, and try to point out the specific impact which each has on the particular problems of our own 35th District.

Three of the most important bills we passed were the nuclear test ban treaty, adopted in the first session; the historic civil rights bill, representing the greatest single advance in this field since the Emancipation Proclamation 100 years ago; and the $11.5 billion tax cut bill. The tax cut bill has a special significance for our district because for some time six of our eight counties have been suffering from heavy unemployment. The tax cut bill, favored overwhelmingly by business and having broad bipartisan support, was designed to stimulate business activity, generate more profits and thus in turn more actual tax revenue, and put more people to work. Already we have begun to feel the effects of this unique economic gamble. After all, nearly $2 billion of this total of $11.5 billion comes into New York State, a tremendous shot in the arm. Partly because of this bill, and partly because of several other pieces of legislation, unemployment has now declined sharply in our district, with three counties recently dropping off the serious unemployment list. This is good news. Incidentally, Congress also agreed to try to eliminate those wartime excise taxes next year, if the economy continues to move upward.

Besides the tax cut, Congress took other steps to stimulate business and end unemployment. Last year we voted more funds for the accelerated public works program—APW. In all, more than $4 million in Federal assistance under this program has now come into our 35th District, all in response to local requests, thereby helping not only to put people to work, but also to build needed hospitals, water and sewer lines, streets, and public buildings. The six counties eligible for this help, by the way—Ontario, Yates, Seneca, Cayuga, Otsego, and Montgomery—have fared considerably better than most other congressional districts have done. Perhaps this is partly because, at my suggestion, the Community Facilities Administration held a special conference on how this program operates almost 2 years ago in Geneva, in December 1962. Understanding what the bill could do, and how to go about applying, our areas were therefore better prepared to take full advantage of it. Unfortunately, the funds for this APW program have now run out, although many communities are still seeking help under it. I have been trying hard to get the program reactivated, but Congress adjourned without acting on my proposal. I still hope, though, that APW can be revived in the next Congress.

In addition, the 88th Congress passed a Manpower Training Act, to help unemployed persons pick up new skills to help them find new jobs. Projects under this act are already in progress in Cayuga, Cortland, Chenango, and Montgomery Counties, and are under consideration elsewhere. We also passed a Vocational Education Act, and training programs in these fields are underway in Amsterdam, Geneva, and Auburn. We passed the food stamp plan to help needy families enrich their diets with some of the Nation's surplus foods, purchasing them through their own neighborhood grocery store rather than by direct handouts. And the antipoverty program was enacted. Basically this bill is intended to help unemployed people, especially young people, get the extra schooling and training they need to qualify for available jobs in today's complex technical world. Amsterdam and Auburn are both already planning projects to take advantage of the help this legislation provides. I was especially pleased that the Youth Conservation Corps, which I have been pushing since I came to Congress, was included in the antipoverty bill. This corps will give young men without jobs an opportunity to keep busy, be paid, and also receive training while at the same time carrying out useful conservation and reforestation projects in the outdoors. What better place to do this than our district. Because of its emphasis on training and education some people have suggested that the 88th Congress may come to be known as the Education Congress. Besides the bills already mentioned, we passed two pieces of legislation of benefit to colleges and college students. One was the college facilities bill, which will help colleges build needed new classrooms and laboratories. The other was an expansion and extension of the popular National Defense Education Act—NDEA—which should now make it possible for any student who can handle college-level work to go to college even if his family cannot afford to pay the bill; he can borrow the money from the Government and pay it back after graduation. Both these pieces of legislation are of importance to our 35th District, because we have some nine colleges and one more in the development phase. Congress also passed bills this year to help medical schools train more doctors, help train more nurses, and help train more optometrists. We renewed the popular Hill-Burton program for help in building hospitals, and extended it to cover repairs as well as new construction. This, too, is good news, considering the hospital expansion programs either underway or planned at Geneva, Penn Yan, Canandaigua, Clifton Springs, Auburn, and elsewhere. And we passed a bill to stimulate work in mental retardation. The city of Geneva is hoping to start a project under this bill, as a memorial to the late President Kennedy.

People interested in conservation and the outdoors will also find that this has been a productive Congress. We passed the wilderness bill, to preserve some 9 million acres across the country in their original state, much like the "forever wild" features of our own New York State forest preserve, for the enjoyment of hikers, and campers, and fishermen. We created a national seashore on Fire Island, off the south coast of Long Island, one of the few still unspoiled natural beach areas in the country. And we enacted the land and water conservation bill, which will provide Federal grants on a matching basis to States for developing new recreational areas. Under this bill the land the State acquired a couple of years ago on Otsego Lake, for example, can now be developed for recreational purposes. And the bill should also prove of great value in increasing tourist business in the whole Finger Lakes region.

Incidentally, our 35th District is the largest farm district in New York State, and the fourth largest dairy district in the entire United States. In agriculture, the most significant bill for us was one to restrict imports of foreign beef, which have been threatening our own dairy industry. And another piece of farm legislation we considered was the wheat and cotton bill. As you may already know, I strongly opposed this bill and voted against it, even though my own party leadership was pushing hard for it. The bill was opposed by the vast majority of our farmers and was clearly not in the interests of our dairy district.

Foreign aid legislation was passed each year, but it should be noted that Congress, both this year and last, took major steps to reduce the size of the program. We cut nearly a billion dollars off the request of President Kennedy in 1963. This year President Johnson submitted a much smaller request to us. But we cut that one, too. Still it should be remembered that foreign aid has an important role which often is overlooked. Not only does it make it possible for us to resist communism in places like South America and Vietnam; it also provides jobs and business right here in our own district. You may not realize that 80 percent of all foreign aid funds are spent in the United States of America, a large chunk of them, by the way, in New York State. Much of the activity at the ALCO plant in Auburn, for example, has been made possible these past years because of locomotive orders financed out of U.S. foreign aid funds. Any drastic cut in foreign aid, therefore, would throw people out of work in Auburn, and I for one would not want to see that happen. Two other important foreign policy bills we passed were a resolution backing President Johnson in whatever steps he feels are needed to win the war in Vietnam, and another calling on the U.N. to see that the Russians pay up their overdue assessments or else lose their voting rights in that body, as the charter itself provides.

Having served in both World War II and the Korean war, and holding the rank of captain in the Naval Reserve, I have long been deeply interested in our national defense. During the 6 years I have been in Congress I have been proud to be a member of the Armed Services Committee. This past year I had the honor to serve as ranking member of an important new Subcommittee on Defense Research and Development. It is perhaps well to remember that more than 50 percent of all Government spending is for national defense. This year, I am glad to say, we have held the line on defense spending; in fact we even cut it below what it was a year ago. Yet we have, I believe, continued to build up our effective military strength so that our superiority over the Russians is even more impressive today than at any time in our history. One of the difficult aspects of holding the line on defense spending has been Secretary McNamara's decision to close down certain military installations. I am happy to say that the one installation in our district, the Seneca Army Depot at Romulus, was unaffected by this move, however, and continues strong. But two others nearby our district are to be phased out over the next 3 years, the Schenectady Army Depot and the Rome Air Materiel Area. This decision has been a bitter one to take. Our bipartisan congressional delegation fought hard to save both bases. Though we were not successful in rescinding the orders, we did persuade the Defense Department to move more slowly and carefully, and I am hopeful we may yet find some way of keeping these installations active on useful work. After all, as long as the facilities are there and the trained people are available there should be some useful job they can be working on rather than have the Government build new installations in some other part of the country.

One important aspect of defense is defense contracting. Over the past 2 years I have fought hard to see that our upstate areas get a better, fairer share of this defense business. I have worked personally with a number of our business concerns to help them present their case to the procurement people. And last spring at my suggestion the first government procurement conference in upstate New York was held in our district, at Geneva. All these things have now begun to pay off. I was happy to see that the latest figures show that the percentage of defense contracts coming into New York State has risen to the highest level it has been at in some 5 or 6 years, 12.9 percent.

Congress also passed a bill this year to increase pensions to disabled veterans, a measure which I had cosponsored. And we passed a new housing bill, to provide needed funds for continuing those senior citizens' housing projects like the ones being planned in Geneva and Cortland, and to carry through urban renewal projects such as those now underway or planned in Amsterdam, Oneonta, Norwich, Cortland, Auburn, Geneva, and Penn Yan.

FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY

I know you are also interested in whether Congress, in doing all these things, also acted prudently and responsibly with your tax dollars. I am happy to say we did. When the tax cut bill was up, most experts pointed out that if we cut taxes, and thereby deliberately incurred a temporary deficit, we should certainly make a determined effort to hold the line on spending and if possible even reduce it a bit. This we have done. Congress cut the President's budget by almost $6.5 billion in 1963. This year President Johnson came up with one which was even smaller than President Kennedy's last budget. Yet even that we reduced by more than $4 billion. This, I believe, is prudent fiscal management of your money.

WHAT WE DIDN'T GET DONE

But although this Congress did a lot, there were some things it did not get around to doing before we adjourned that should have been taken care of. Perhaps the most serious was our failure to enact the bill boosting social security benefits. Instead the bill died in conference committee, still deadlocked over whether or not to include medicare. What makes it worse, none of us in the House had any chance to vote on the committee's decision to let the bill die. Personally I think that was a serious mistake. At least we should have passed the increase in benefits. I certainly think this whole social security matter should be given top priority in the new Congress. Also unacted on was a bill I have had in the hopper for years to increase the amount a retired person can earn on the outside without losing his social security. It should be included in any general bill we eventually pass.

We also failed to take action on State reapportionment. The bipartisan Dirksen-Mansfield rider, which would have given New York the time we need to deal with the Supreme Court decision, was finally watered down in the Senate to a meaningless "sense of Congress" resolution. Then a House-Senate conference committee knocked even that provision out, again without bothering to consult the membership as a whole. I tried twice to get the House to support the Dirksen-Mansfield rider, but was not successful. It will still be possible to bring a constitutional amendment up to a vote next year, of course, and I would certainly support an amendment to allow one house to be apportioned on the basis of factors other than population. But by the time such an amendment can be adopted much of the damage, as far as upstate New York is concerned, will already have been done.

DAIRY PROBLEMS

Congress adjourned without taking any action on dairy legislation. As the representative of the State's major dairy district, I called a meeting 2 years ago in Syracuse of all farm organizations to try to work out some dairy legislation reflecting the views of the majority of our farmers. Surprisingly we found wide agreement on such a bill, and I then introduced it in the House and went to bat to try to get it passed. I arranged for upstate dairy groups to meet with other Members of Congress to push for this legislation. But Congress never passed the bill. I have been called on often during the past 2 years by various dairy organizations to help on other legislative matters and to testify at dairy hearings. You may remember I fought against the procedures for amending our milk market order, which to me seemed to represent more a sham rather than a real referendum. Recently I met with Secretary Freeman to try to get him to grant price relief to our dairy farmers because of heavy financial losses suffered as a result of this summer's drought. While we have not yet gotten a satisfactory answer I continue to be optimistic, and hope that some relief will still come our way. Actually Congress did pass one piece of legislation helpful to dairy farmers. It has always disturbed me that the connection between what the farmer gets and what the consumer pays is so remote. Nobody has ever explained to me satisfactorily why the farmer can get only 9 or 10 cents a quart for his milk and yet the consumer pays as much as 28 or 30 cents a quart. Well, Congress decided this year to find the answer to this puzzle: We established a commission to look into the price spread, hoping that maybe we could eventually find a way to give the farmer more for his product and still save a bit on the price the consumer pays.

Another measure that Congress did not enact that should have been passed was a bill that I have been pushing for years to give parents a tax deduction on money they spend to educate their children. Still another was a bill I have repeatedly introduced to allow volunteer fire companies to be eligible directly for surplus Government equipment, like fire and water trucks, without having to go through civil defense or bid on them directly. And nothing was done, I am sorry to say, on my resolution to establish a Captive Nations Committee in the House, to dramatize our determination to insure that countries like Poland, Lithuania, Latvia, and Ukrainia will one day be free of Communist control. I am proud, though, to have been selected recently, as a result of my efforts in this field, for a special award from the Assembly of Captive Nations.

OTHER IMPORTANT ACHIEVEMENTS

Reviewing the record of the past 2 years in Washington, several other achievements of interest to our district ought to be mentioned. Foremost is the action of the Agriculture Department and the Area Redevelopment Administration in granting Cayuga County a sugarbeet quota, the first awarded east of the Mississippi, thereby bringing an important new multimillion-dollar industry into upstate New York. I have been working on this problem from the Washington end for more than 2 years, and am delighted to have had a share in making this new development possible.

Another important event was the opening of a new milk plant at Fort Plain, financed with a sizable ARA loan. This plant should add to the stability of our district's dairy industry. Incidentally, last year, in response to a request from area farmers suffering the effects of the 1962 drought, we were also successful in getting the railroads to authorize special cheaper rates for hay and grain shipments into drought areas in our district.

INCREASING EMPLOYMENT

As always, one of my major concerns these past 2 years has been to do everything possible to increase jobs in our district. This means fighting to try to keep a Government contract in Amsterdam, for example, as with Empire Devices, and helping the new ElectroSensitive Products Co. get on its feet when Empire Devices moved out. It means helping Gould Pumps in Seneca Falls bring to the attention of the Health and Welfare Department the damaging effects to their business that could have resulted from a carelessly drawn "model law" on water systems they were planning to publish, and getting the law withdrawn and revised so as not to hurt one of our district's leading employers. It has meant continuing to press the cause of businesses in our district who are fighting the economic damage of excessive foreign imports, such as General Electric in Schenectady, Wickwire in Cortland, Columbia Rope in Auburn, Sylvania in Seneca Falls, and Mohasco in Amsterdam. It means working with many smaller companies to help them get assistance from the Small Business Administration so they can expand and put more people to work. I am glad to report we have been successful in a very large percentage of these cases. It means helping the city of Amsterdam finance a special survey to determine how to improve employment in the Carpet City. It means having the Department of Commerce make a special employment census of the areas served by the Bendix plant at Scintilla, from which we found that Scintilla was eligible for special consideration on Government contracts because it was located in an unemployment area. It means persuading the Army to put the old Sampson Airfield in Seneca County up for bid, as the Seneca Falls Chamber of Commerce had recommended, so that a private operator might use the facility to enhance the economy of the whole Finger Lakes area. It means helping to put the STAMINA Conference in Washington this spring, to assist local New York State communities in taking advantage of available Government programs, on a full bipartisan basis so it could be even more effective. It means fighting to keep the FAA flight reporting services operating out of Elmira so as to make it easier for private aircraft to fly into our district on business as well as for pleasure. It means working with the Army Corps of Engineers to find ways to eliminate seaweed and improve the level of Cayuga Lake, thereby increasing its tourist appeal. It means working with the local officials in Fair Haven to persuade those same engineers to consider deepening the access channel to Little Sodus Bay so that our district's one "seaport" can take full advantage of the oceangoing shipping now moving through the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence Seaway. And it meant helping Canajoharie overcome redtape obstacles and getting a sizable Federal grant for their new sewage treatment plant, thereby insuring more stable employment at the Beech-Nut plant.

RECREATION

In response to requests from people in Unadilla we got action started last year to turn the East Sidney dry dam into a small lake for use of people in Otsego and Chenango Counties. The Interior Department has also moved to expand the Montezuma Wildlife Refuge in Seneca County. And the Farmers Home Administration boosted rural recreational possibilities with loans to a new recreational center in Cortland County, at Marathon, and another at Clifton Springs in Ontario County. Three historic sites in our district were honored by designation as national shrines—the Seward Homestead in Auburn; the Jethro Wood Home in Poplar Ridge, Cayuga County; and Boughton Hill at Victor in Ontario County. That portion of the Susquehanna River that originates in Cooperstown and runs through our district was selected for possible preservation in "its original state" as a kind of historic monument to the great rivers of America. With Government help a new private recreational pond was added in Yates County.

FLOOD AND WATER PROBLEMS

Another area of constant activity has been the problem of flooding and flood threats in our district. We finally got the Army Engineers to dredge a portion of the river at Oneonta, thus giving some temporary relief from flooding to that city. The banks of the Tioughnioga River at Cortland were riprapped to decrease flooding. Teams from the Army Engineers moved swiftly in at my request to deal with the severe floods earlier this year at Oxford, and survey teams later made studies in both Oxford and Norwich. Other studies are now being made at my request of ways to prevent a recurrence of last spring's floods in Marathon and Cortlandville. The floodwall for South Amsterdam has now been completed. And those extensive hearings that have been held this year as part of the Army's overall survey of the Susquehanna River have shown that the threat of more big dams in our area—which I have fought since coming to Congress—is decreasing today.

We also succeeded in getting machinery underway to help both New Berlin and Oxford pay for the heavy costs of their recent search for new water supplies. Speaking of drilling, I was glad to have been able to get experts from the U.S. Bureau of Mines up into Oneonta last summer when that leaking gasoline scare erupted. They helped local officials track down the source of the leak and put a stop to it. We also helped Amsterdam get assistance for an extension of its water system.

Several other cases may be of interest too. We succeeded in getting local mail delivery for Victor, and a much wanted downtown mailbox installed in Weedsport. Both Oneonta and Unadilla have been chosen for new post offices; with Worcester and Milford, I hope, not far behind. We also supplied background data for a possible special census in Canandaigua to the mayor and the common council. And I was glad to have been able to get the Veterans' Administration to slow down its campaign to close out domiciliary facilities at the Bath Hospital. This VA hospital serves Yates County, and any such change would have imposed an almost impossible burden on this county. By the way, the U.S. submarine, *Pulaski*, which I was pleased to have had a hand in persuading the Navy to name for the great Polish patriot, was launched and also commissioned during the tenure of this 88th Congress.

KEEPING IN TOUCH

I have always felt that one of the most important obligations of a Congressman was to keep in close touch throughout the year with the people he has the honor to represent. Not just listening to them, but also reporting to them and keeping himself available to be of service to them whenever they may need him. I have tried hard to do this these past 2 years, even though the unusual size of our "submarine" district—about 250 miles from one end to the other—has made it more difficult and time consuming than was the case with our old 32d District. But I have set up and maintained two full-time district offices, one in Amsterdam and one in Auburn. One member of my staff is on duty at each of these locations to help you on immigration, veterans, or any other matters, and another part-time staff member is also available regularly in Cortland County, near the geographic center of our district.

I have also made it a point to get back into the district myself almost every weekend for the past 2 years, which may establish some new kind of record. Besides that, I have tried to keep you posted by regular newsletters, radio and television, and have sought your advice through our annual questionnaire. In spite of these regular trips back home, by the way, I have kept my attendance record in the House over the 90-percent mark, so as to be on the job for you down here where I am supposed to be when I am supposed to be.

I have especially enjoyed the opportunity each summer to utilize in my Washington office the help of students from colleges in our district as "congressional interns" during the summer months. Coming this time from Hobart, Cortland State, Wells, Hartwick, and Keuka, they have added greatly to the effectiveness of our office, and I hope they have also gained some insight into the day-to-day operations of Congress. This intern program has grown so popular over the 6 years I have been using it that we found ourselves almost literally running out of office space this summer to seat our new assistants.

As a naval reservist and a member of the Armed Services Committee, I have always felt that the selection of young men to our three service Academies—West Point, Annapolis, and the Air Force Academy—was one of the most important responsibilities of a Congressman. After all, these boys will be our top military commanders of the future. For that reason we ought to see that the boys finally selected are those best qualified to become top-flight career officers. To insure that, I have constantly tried to encourage the largest number of boys to apply for these appointments, and I have made a point of selecting my nominees on the basis of merit, without regard for partisan considerations. Every boy has an equal chance to compete with every other boy. I do think this policy has paid off in the high level of performance being maintained by the boys at the Academies from our district. Appointments will be made again this year on this same basis, after the results of the written examinations, the physicals, and the personal interviews are in.

CONCLUSION

May I conclude by expressing my sincere thanks, and that of my wife, Joan, and our whole office staff to all of you for the kindness and consideration you have extended to us over these past two full and exciting and, I hope, genuinely productive, years. You have been most considerate and patient with us, and most cooperative in your suggestions, comments, and even criticisms. We have tried to do the kind of job you would want your Congressman to do. I hope we have succeeded. Serving in the House of Representatives is both a great privilege and a tremendous challenge. That challenge is perhaps nowhere better expressed than in a quote from Daniel Webster that is painted on the wall of the House Chamber over the Speaker's chair:

> Let us develop the resources of our land, call forth its powers, build up its institutions, promote all of its great interests, and see whether we too, in our day and generation, may not perform something worthy to be remembered.

Tribute to Congressman Clifford Davis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, as the distinguished dean of the Tennessee delegation in Congress, Hon. CLIFFORD DAVIS, retires, I want to take this means of paying tribute to him for his fine service to his district, the State of Tennessee, and the Nation.

Congressman DAVIS was a great Congressman in the highest tradition. His years of service have been marked with great accomplishments and many achievements. Space would not permit a recitation of the great legislative work to which he has so highly contributed—in the building of highways, great projects of conservation, the development of our waterways, and the Tennessee Valley Authority—will stand as monuments of progress on which Congressman DAVIS as a member of the Committee on Public Works served with such ability and dedication.

Congressman DAVIS was the principal champion of the bill to provide for self-financing by the Tennessee Valley Authority—the Revenue Bond Financing Act—which has contributed to the strengthening of this great agency of our Government, serving Tennessee and the South.

Congressman DAVIS was a great legislator and a great Democrat and dean of our Tennessee delegation. We shall miss him; but as he seeks retirement, we will wish for him and his lovely wife, Carrie Davis, years of good health and happiness and a continued life of success.

Good luck, Congressman DAVIS. You have served Tennessee well.

Congressman Sickles' Statement on State Urban Water and Sewer Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLTON R. SICKLES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations issued a comprehensive report on "Intergovernmental Responsibilities for Water Supply and Sewage Disposal in Metropolitan Areas." In that report, the Commission recommended that States enact legislation "endowing the appropriate State and local agencies with regulatory authority over individual wells and septic tank installations, with a view to minimizing and limiting their use to exceptional situations consistent with comprehensive land use goals."

This recommendation of the Commission was based upon findings that first, ground water depletion and pollution of both ground and surface waters are serious problems arising from large-scale use of individual wells and septic tanks in urban areas; second, many homeowners were confronted with major expenditures because of the necessity of abandoning inadequate wells or septic tanks and connecting to community systems; and third, local governments can provide needed public facilities in orderly and timely fashion at minimum costs if community water and sewerage systems are planned and installed wherever economically feasible. This local planning for water and sewerage facilities should take into account all aspects of community development planning, zoning, population estimates, engineering, and economics.

The need for legislation to implement this recommendation was promptly thereafter recognized and endorsed by such organizations as the American Municipal Association, the U.S. Conference of Mayors, the National Association of Counties, and the Association of State and Territorial Health Officers.

The Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations is a bipartisan organization established by Congress in 1959 to bring together Members of the Congress, the President's Cabinet, State legislatures, county governing bodies, and the general public as well as a number of outstanding Governors and mayors from across the country. This Commission has been tackling some of the most vexing intergovernmental problems of our time—problems which include, in addition to water and sewer problems, mass transportation, transferability of credits between State and local retirement systems, time uniformity, water resource planning, the coordination of Federal urban development programs, and reapportionment of State legislatures. The House of Representatives is fortunate to be represented on the Commission by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Fountain], the gentleman from New York [Mr. Keogh], and the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. Dwyer]. When the Commission speaks, it represents a considerable degree of consensus among all levels of government.

Following up its recommendation in the water supply and sewage disposal report, the Commission collaborated with the U.S. Public Health Service, the Conference of State Sanitary Engineers, and the Association of State and Territorial Health Officers in preparing model State legislation to permit implementation of the Commission's recommendation.

The need for a recommendation such as the Commission made with regard to regulating wells and spetic tanks in urban areas was borne out independently by a recent survey the Public Health Service made of State legislation. This survey showed that although every State in the Union has broad authority to regulate sanitary practices, no State has legislation specifically establishing policies which would limit the use of individual wells and septic tanks in urban areas on the basis of comprehensive plans for population distribution and for the provision of public water and sewer systems.

Often the existing type of State legislation can do little to prevent water and sewerage problems until a crisis has arisen. This has been brought home to us in Maryland just within the last couple of months by the closing of some very essential shellfish beds on the Chesapeake Bay and its tributaries, some of which became polluted by seepage from the growing numbers of septic tanks in resort communities. For a number of years, the Baltimore area has been seeking the kind of authority envisioned in the Commission's model State legislation. Our experience in Maryland clearly shows that regulation of individual water and sewerage systems on the basis of comprehensive planning must be undertaken by local governments to a much greater extent in the future than in the past.

Unfortunately, some groups misunderstood the Commission's work and that of the Public Health Service, and they threatened to oppose the model act every step of the way in State legislatures. In their trade journals, the well drillers and pump manufacturers issued what they termed a "call to arms." Headlines in lead articles read, "Everyone Can Help Fight Model Law," "Industry Forces Meet To Combat Model Law," and "The Model Law: Public Health or Public Planning?"

To thoroughly explore these charges and to make such technical and clarifying changes in the bill as appeared justified the Public Health Service, in cooperation with the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, promptly formed an Advisory Committee to the Service for State Legislation on Planning of Urban Water Supply and Sewerage Systems. The Committee to advise the Service was made up of representatives of Federal agencies, organizations of State and local governmental officials, and industry groups.

The Surgeon General of the Public Health Service has just reported, on October 1, that following a third meeting of the advisory committee, agreement was reached among all members on an improved and clarified version of the bill to be known as the Urban Water Supply and Sewerage System Act.

I insert the Surgeon General's press release at this point:

> Surg. Gen. Luther L. Terry announced today that agreement has been reached among representatives of key Federal agencies and of several industry groups on a model act to provide orderly planning of urban water supply and sewerage systems in order to protect the public health. The proposed legislation will be known as the Urban Water Supply and Sewerage System Act.
>
> The agreement was reached at a meeting September 29–30 in Washington, D.C., of the Advisory Committee to the Public Health Service for State Legislation on Planning of Urban Water Supply and Sewerage Systems.
>
> The model State act is one segment of a three-part legislative package. The other two segments are a water supply installations act and an individual sewage disposal systems act. The documents will be recommended by the Public Health Service for passage as law in each State. They are expected to be ready early next year. Work on the latter two acts and accompanying regulations has begun and some members of the study group will reconvene during the next several weeks for this purpose.
>
> The 2-day meeting was the third session held since the committee was established in June. During the sessions, the State law suggested by the Service last November was reworked to improve and clarify the legislation provisions and reach agreement on basic issues involved.
>
> Members and organizations participating in the series of meetings were as follows:
>
> FEDERAL AGENCIES REPRESENTED ON THE COMMITTEE
>
> Water Industries and Engineering Services Division, U.S. Department of Commerce: K. L. Kollar; Milton Frank.
>
> Geological Survey, U.S. Department of the Interior: C. L. McGuinness.
>
> Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations: Norman Beckman.
>
> Housing and Home Finance Agency: Thomas Morehouse.
>
> Office of General Counsel, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Sidney Edelman, David A. Schuenke.
>
> Public Health Service: Wesley E. Gilbertson, chairman, and Malcolm C. Hope.
>
> ORGANIZATIONS REPRESENTED ON THE COMMITTEE
>
> American Municipal Association: Donald A. Slater.
>
> American Society of Planning Officials: Robert M. Leary.
>
> Conference of Municipal Public Health Engineers: Joel Beall.
>
> National Association of Counties: Robert B. Mathias.
>
> National Association of Home Builders: Joseph A. Singer.
>
> National Water Well Association: Edward Martin.
>
> Urban Land Institute: Max S. Wehrly.
>
> Water Systems Council: Thaddeus Snell.
>
> Conference of State Sanitary Engineers: Robert M. Brown.
>
> Septic Tank Industry: James Spear.

The statement of findings and policy in the agreed-upon model bill states the objectives of the legislation:

> (a) The (State) legislature finds that properly planned and installed individual and community water supply systems and sewerage systems in and near urban areas (1) assure the availability of safe and adequate water for various purposes, including drinking and culinary use, (2) promote the health and welfare of citizens of this State by preventing the pollution of ground and surface water, (3) eliminate nuisances and hazards to the public health, (4) contribute to proper conservation and use of ground water, and (5) encourage economical and orderly development of land for residential, industrial, and other purposes, and are essential to the orderly processes of urban growth.
>
> (b) It is, therefore, declared to be the public policy of this State to eliminate and prevent health and safety hazards and to promote the economical and orderly development and utilization of water and land resources of this State by encouraging planning and provision for adequate individual and community water supply systems and sewerage systems and by providing for the standards and regulations necessary to accomplish these purposes.

The model bill's purpose is not to arbitrarily and unnecessarily limit or outlaw private water supply and sewage systems in urban areas. Rather the model bill would endow State and local agencies with the regulatory authority over the installation of such wells and septic tanks in urban areas and encourage the use of community water supply and sewerage systems in urban areas of current or anticipated high density and individual systems in the areas of low population density, in accordance with comprehensive plans for orderly development of the area.

The Public Health Service, along with the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations and other organizations, will recommend the passage of this legislation in each State. It is hoped that the pump manufacturers, well drillers, and other industry groups will actively support this legislation which they helped prepare. Most important, I, for one, certainly hope that the States and localities will promptly take up the challenge of enacting this model bill and providing orderly planning and provision of safe and efficient water supply and sewerage systems in our burgeoning suburban areas throughout the country.

Manpower Development and Training Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, because of the widespread interest in my State in the retraining programs undertaken as a result of the enactment of the Manpower Development and Training Act in the 2 years of its operation, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD a letter I have received from the Secretary of Labor, together with attachments showing the manpower development, retraining, and research activities which have taken place in Oregon through June 30, 1964.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Because of widespread interest in retraining programs for the unemployed, I am forwarding to you the enclosed summary of activity in your State under the Manpower Development and Training Act.

The act has just celebrated its second anniversary in operation. It has provided a constructive solution to many unemployed citizens of the Nation—to those who have lost jobs through technological change and to those lacking the skills needed in today's labor market.

The program authorized by the act requires the cooperation of local, State, and Federal officials as well as that of private citizens. For this reason our story of accomplishment is one in which we can all take pride.

Yours sincerely,
W. WILLARD WIRTZ,
Secretary of Labor.

Manpower development, retraining, and research activities in Oregon—summary data cumulative through June 30, 1964

PROGRAM APPROVALS TO DATE

	Trainees and individuals served	Estimated cost	Number of projects
Total	969	$1,048,412	28
Retraining projects	969	1,048,412	28
Manpower Development and Training Act:			
Institutional	937	1,036,458	26
On-the-job	32	11,954	2
Experimental and demonstration			
Manpower research projects	X X X		

	Percent
Participation as a percent of U.S. retraining approvals:	
Trainees	0.4
Funds	.4
State unemployment (1963) as a percent of U.S. total	.9
State work force (1963) as a percent of U.S. total	1.0

SUMMARY DATA FOR PROJECTS COMPLETED THROUGH DEC. 31, 1963

Enrolled in completed projects	225
Percent completed	90.2
Dropouts	22
Completed	203
Employed	89.2
Training-related jobs	76.8
Non-training-related jobs	4.9
Dropped-out-training related	7.4
Unemployed	9.4
Other (including awaiting referral)	1.5

PROJECTS APPROVED UNDER MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACT THROUGH JUNE 30, 1964

Project No.	Labor market area or county	Occupational goal	Approved		
			Duration (weeks)	Trainees or persons serviced	Total funds
	INSTITUTIONAL				
3005.000	Astoria	Forester aid	52	25	$95,636
4212.000	Bend	Automobile-service-station attendant		20	24,070
4217.000	do	Clerk, general office		40	61,780
3004.000	do	Forester aid	52	25	88,692
3011.000	do	do	38	20	52,651
	Total(4)			105	227,202
4214.000	Eugene	Dental assistant		20	54,507
3003.000	do	Forester aid	52	25	73,543
	Total (2)			45	128,050
4208.000	Medford	Farmhand, fruit (orchard pruner)	2	50	2,460
4218.000	North Bend	Clerk-stenographer		20	31,568
3007.000	North Bend-Coos Bay	Forester aid	52	25	99,438
4213.000	Ontario	Farmhand, general		15	54,353
3002.000	do	Tractor operator	30	40	73,420
	Total (2)			55	127,773
4215.000	Pendleton	All-round-farm operator		75	17,257
4210.000	do	Automobile-service-station attendant		15	12,738
4209.000	do	Clerk, general office	20	20	20,527
3010.000	do	Farm equipment operator	3	50	7,422
3006.000	do	Forester aid	50	25	91,063
4207.000	do	Psychiatric aid	12	45	26,215
	Total (6)			230	175,222
3009.000	Portland	Chambermaid	1	40	587
4204.000	do	Insurance specialist	18	60	30,579
4205.000	do	Stenographer	18	60	39,998
3008.000	do	Waiter/waitress, formal	5	90	8,473
3001.000	do	Waiter, formal	6	40	7,268
	Total (5)			290	86,905
4206.000	Salem	Stenographer	37	40	26,934
4211.000	The Dalles	Carpenter	4	33	8,519
4216.000	do	Clerk, general office	33	19	26,742
	Total (2)			52	35,261
	Grand total (26)			937	1,036,458
	ON THE JOB				
4202.000	Astoria	Fish filleter	10	12	6,717
3001.000	Astoria (Clatsop County)	do	10	20	5,237
	Total (2)			32	11,954

Hon. Harold M. Ryan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROLAND V. LIBONATI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable HAROLD M. RYAN of Michigan, did not attain political success by accident. It was the result of hard work, indomitable perseverence, tireless energy, deep study, and carefully regulated, meticulous habits of life.

As one of a large family of 13 children, in less than average circumstances, he struggled during the depression years to obtain a law degree. As assistant prosecuting attorney of Wayne County and State senator—1948-62—serving as minority leader 6 years he came well prepared to assume his duties in the Congress—elected to vacancy upon death of our distinguished colleague, Louis C. Rabaut, of Michigan, February 1962.

He came to the Congress to work and did so with enthusiasm and energy. He has contributed much to the splendid accomplishments of the Public Works Committee. He has served the public interest with marked distinction. Few people realize the amount of laborious application and effort given by dedicated men on such onerous legislative work in committee. Mr. RYAN worked for the common good of all in the public interest.

He is a kindly man, easy to approach and considerate of the problems of others. He is quiet and reserved under ordinary circumstances—but once aroused becomes a formidable and virile opponent. He is well liked and respected by his colleagues.

It is unfortunate that political fortunes cannot be compromised with fate. With the redistricting of Michigan's congressional districts at the last primary, Mr. RYAN was denied the nomination. His retirement returns him to his home city where he once more will find loyal hearts among the honest folks whose sympathetic understanding will nurse the wounded pride of one who served them so well. He leaves Washington with the good will and high respect of his colleagues and the sustaining thought that he served his constituency and the Nation admirably. May our good friend, HAROLD and his family, enjoy great prosperity and happiness with God's blessings.

Anniversary of Cambodia's Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, November 9 will mark the 11th anniversary of Cambodia's independence. Since the House will not be in session at this time, we wish to take this opportunity to extend warm felicitations to His Royal Highness Prince Norodom Sihanouk, Chief of State of Cambodia; and to the Cambodian people.

The Kingdom of Cambodia is one of the few countries in southeast Asia which is not being troubled by serious internal difficulties at this time. To the north the struggle between factions in Laos is bringing that country closer to ruin and possible domination by the Communists. To the east and south a war is being fought in deadly earnest between the Government of South Vietnam and Communist-led guerrillas.

We are very much involved in the struggles of both these countries and it is a relief that the situation in Cambodia is relatively calm and free from crisis. We have our hands full as it is, and a Communist thrust into Cambodia would only compound the problems and difficulties we already face.

Cambodia is the oldest state of the Indochinese peninsula; and, although today it is only about the size of the State of Missouri, it once was the center of a vast empire that covered mainland southeast Asia from the Bay of Bengal to the South China Sea. An almost unbroken line of kings stretches back to the beginning of the Christian era.

The latest of these reigning monarchs was King Norodom Suramarit who died in 1960. His son Prince Norodom Sihanouk, the Chief of State of Cambodia, abdicated the throne because he wanted to continue to participate in the political affairs of his country. As the King he would have had to remain above politics and serve as a royal figurehead for the Cambodian people.

Prince Sihanouk is the head of his own political party called the People's Social Community. Together the Prince and his party have swept every election in which they have taken part, and they have effectively dominated the politics of the country ever since.

Prince Sihanouk has won the affection and support of the Cambodian people and enjoys the great respect they have accorded him as the leader who obtained the country's independence. He makes a determined effort to maintain a close and personal relationship with the people of his kingdom. He makes frequent and sometimes unannounced trips to villages and hamlets in a special helicopter to talk to the people directly about their problems and their hopes for the future.

November 9 is the 11th anniversary of Cambodia's independence. For over a decade it has been able to lead a surprisingly tranquil life in a part of the world torn by turmoil and trouble. One of the most important reasons for this has been the exceptional qualities of leadership that Prince Sihanouk has displayed in leading his people forward. He sets a fine example for the rulers of many countries in south and southeast Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

On the occasion of this important anniversary, I take the opportunity to salute the people of Cambodia and their youthful and vigorous leader Prince Sihanouk. I am sure that all Americans join me in this gesture of friendship and good will.

Final Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM H. HARSHA

OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, periodically, I report to the citizens of the Sixth Congressional District of Ohio the activities of Congress. I am making my final report for the 88th Congress and, because it deals with a serious problem that demands the attention of everyone, I include it in my remarks. It contains facts and figures gleaned from various agencies and official documents. Following is my report:

> This is my final report to you on the 88th Congress. While Congress did enact some worthwhile legislation and did, on occasion, do some constructive work, it ended on a sour note.
>
> This Democrat-controlled Congress refused to give the social security pensioner a meager raise (I had introduced legislation designed to strengthen the social security system and increase payments by at least 10 percent) yet, in the final days, while denying the pensioner a modest increase, Congress authorized foreign aid in the amount of $3.5 billion. Foreign aid has gotten so far out of hand and, as presently applied, is so detrimental to our economy, that I think it is time to call a halt. I'm devoting my entire report to foreign aid so you will have a better understanding of what this State Department is doing with your money.
>
> When Congress authorized the expenditure of $3.5 billion in additional foreign aid, there was already $7 billion of appropriated, but unexpended, funds available—enough money to continue our aid program for 2 years without the need of another cent. But this is only a small fraction of our annual foreign aid outlay.
>
> Our Government agencies have funds buried in their budgets for foreign aid programs. It is practically impossible to accurately account for these sums. In addition, the World Bank has callable assets of $21 billion, 27 percent of which was contributed by the United States. The International Development Association has assets of $1 billion, about 50 percent contributed by the United States. The International Finance Corporation has assets of $128 million, over one-fourth of which was contributed by the United States. The Export-Import Bank has assets of $3 billion, practically all contributed by U.S. taxpayers. All of these institutions provide loans to underdeveloped nations, so to say our foreign aid program is a "bareboned" one, is tommyrot.
>
> In addition, Congress passed a $4.7 billion food-for-peace program for the next 2 years authorizing the gift and "sale" of our surplus food in the sum of $4.7 billion to foreign nations. The money derived from the "sale" of this food, by agreement, stays in the nation making the "purchase." It is used for the development of that nation, thus adding additional billions to our aid outlay. It does not come back to the United States.
>
> As you see, there is far more of our taxpayers' dollars going into foreign aid than one realizes. This Nation cannot afford this much drain on its resources. Too much remains to be done in our own country. Furthermore, these vast outlays are exporting American jobs overseas. Our foreign aid makes it possible for such countries as Japan and Italy to export steel products and shoes into this country at far cheaper prices than American industry can produce them, thereby causing orders in American plants to be canceled, creating unemployment in U.S. factories. Steel and shoes are only two examples—there are many more. Some argue that 80 percent of our foreign aid money is spent by the recipient nations here in the United States thus creating jobs—this is not accurate. On July 31, 1964, testimony presented to the Senate Committee on Appropriations established that in fiscal 1963, only $855 million out of $5.1 billion in foreign aid grants and loans was spent in the United States. Thus, 78 percent of the money was spent overseas, not in the United States.
>
> The waste and misspent funds in this program are appalling. The United States has sent to the little country of Bolivia over $334 million in economic and military aid. Bolivia has a population of only 4 million people. This expenditure of U.S. aid is the equivalent of more than $80 per person in Bolivia, yet the average annual income today in Bolivia is only about $95 per year. What happened to all this aid? Who got it? What good has it done?
>
> Under our Alliance for Progress, this Nation has committed itself to a $330 million housing program. Homes are being constructed for families in the upper one-fourth income bracket of Latin America. Think of it—instead of building homes for the poor who live in hovels and shacks, your hard-earned money is building homes for those in the highest income bracket in Latin America.
>
> Brace yourself. Here are some shocking items that your tax money purchased—over $16,000 for Metrical for Cambodia; over $10,000 for Airwick, a household deoderant, for Turkey; over $2,000 for eye shadow, lipstick, and Odorono, for Turkey; over $5,000 for hops, an ingredient of beer, for the Dominican Republic; over $17,000 for sex stimulants for China, and over $22,000 for sex stimulants for Vietnam. These are hardly the necessities of life and I resent the fact that your hard-earned tax dollars are used to make such improper purchases.
>
> Some argue these amounts are infinitesimal in so large a program as foreign aid, but

these are only a few examples. Such improper expenditures totaled almost $25 million in 1963 alone—hardly an infinitesimal sum. I don't think the American taxpayer can afford to let this continue. I, for one, don't intend to let them continue this practice.

Add to this the fact that the State Department is providing assistance to Communist nations, and you can understand why I have so strenuously opposed foreign aid.

Summary of Activities of Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, 88th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON

OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a summary of the activities of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs during the 88th Congress.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR JACKSON

I am happy to submit a summary of the activities of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs during the 88th Congress. This Congress has produced an excellent record in the field of conservation and utilization of our natural resources. We have accomplished more in this area in the past two sessions than in any comparable period in recent years. Other noteworthy legislative advancements within our committee's jurisdiction have also been achieved. I am grateful to all of the members of the committee for their cooperation and bipartisan support and especially to the chairmen of our subcommittees. In addition, I want to express my gratitude to the leadership in the Senate on both sides of the aisle, and especially to our majority leader, Senator MANSFIELD, for his unceasing assistance and advice toward the passage of our committee legislation.

At the conclusion of the 1st session of the 88th Congress, I submitted a report of our accomplishments up until that time. At this time I would like to continue and summarize briefly the major legislative highlights which shall be followed by a more specific detailed analysis that is broken down into the various subcommittees.

The shortage of water and the burgeoning population can be regarded as a critical issue on the contemporary scene. For many years States have differed over the supply and distribution of water, as well as what possible solutions could be offered to help alleviate the shortages now and in the future. The enactment of S. 2 into public law on July 17, 1964, is a beginning. In essence, it parallels the agriculture research stations of the Hatch Act with water research centers in the 50 States' land-grant colleges, State universities, or other institutions of higher education in a particular State. The serious and ever-increasing shortages of water supply and the decisive lack of trained hydrologists could both be improved by university programs that could attack regional problems in the step-by-step approach that is needed to find answers to our water needs, and could at the same time train new water scientists. The Secretary of the Interior is given the discretion of determining the effective use of funds, but the centers are to be effectively independent in order to promote more individual investigation.

The preservation of natural resources has continuously been an omnipresent problem in the United States, and it is in this field that the most stalwart record of accomplishment has been achieved, particularly with the passage of S. 4, the wilderness bill, and H.R. 3846, the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act. The enactment of S. 4 provides for the statutory establishment of a national system of wilderness preservation. It will provide protection on a permanent basis. H.R. 3846 will establish a land and water conservation fund to help the States and Federal agencies in meeting the present and future outdoor recreation demands and needs of the American people.

In addition, there have been a number of other important bills enacted into law during the 88th Congress. The role of public lands in the United States is inherently attached to the development and maintenance of our natural resources. Perhaps one bill that will greatly enhance the understanding and mitigate many problems pertaining to public lands was the act establishing a Public Land Law Review Commission. This Commission will study laws in existence and procedures relating to the administration of the public lands of the United States, and make revisions of such laws which are deemed necessary in accordance with present and future needs of the American people. These are only a few of the many measures passed by this "Conservation Congress." I have prepared a detailed history of the bills considered by our committee, many of which have become public law.

FULL COMMITTEE, HENRY M. JACKSON, CHAIRMAN

S. 2, introduced by Senator ANDERSON, et al., January 14, 1963: To parallel the agricultural research stations of the Hatch Act with water resources research centers in the 50 States' land-grant colleges. The serious and ever-increasing shortages of water supply and the decisive lack of trained hydrologists could both be improved by educational and research programs under this act. The Secretary is given the discretion of determining the effective use of funds, but the centers are to be independent in order to promote more individual investigation. If two of more States should desire to combine in one station, they may. The amount to be granted starts at $75,000 and increases to $100,000 annually for the establishment of the centers, and a dollar-for-dollar matching with the States of $1 million increasing by the same amount for 4 years, for special projects, or cooperation with another State. In addition, there is under title 2 a 10-year $50 million program. Passed the Senate April 23, 1963. Passed House, amended, June 2, 1964. July 2, 1964, Senate and House agree to conference report. Bill became Public Law 88-379 on July 17, 1964.

S. 4, ANDERSON, et al.: A bill to establish a national wilderness preservation system. This legislation was passed by the Senate in the 87th Congress, but final action was not concluded then in the House of Representatives. After introduction in this Congress, Senator JACKSON scheduled hearings on the bill, and it was reported by the committee and passed by the Senate in early April of 1963. The House passed the bill as amended on July 30, 1964, and after conferences the final legislation was agreed to by both Houses and President Johnson signed it on September 3, 1964. The bill establishes immediately by statute a permanent wilderness system consisting of over 9 million acres. Other additions to the system will have to be by affirmative act of Congress. Mining and grazing activities will be continued but under the strict regulations issued by the Secretary of Agriculture. It became Public Law 88–577.

S. 20, Senator ANDERSON, et al.: A bill to promote the coordination and development of effective programs relating to outdoor recreation. This legislation is known as the Organic Act of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation in the Department of Interior. The act authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to perform several tasks in the field of outdoor recreation including a continuing inventory of outdoor recreation needs, a classification of recreation resources, and to formulate a comprehensive and nationwide plan providing technical assistance and advice to the States and private interests on request. It became Public Law 88–29.

S. 859 (H.R. 3846), Senator JACKSON, et al.: A bill to establish the land and water conservation fund to assist the States and Federal agencies in meeting the present and future outdoor recreation needs of the American people. Probably no other legislation compared in significance to this bill in the field of outdoor recreation resources in this Congress. This proposal authorizes a fund to provide financial assistance to the States and to Federal agencies to develop outdoor recreation opportunities for future generations of the American people. The fund will be composed of entrance and user fees, revenues derived from the sale of surplus Federal real property and motorboat fuel taxes. This bill followed the recommendations of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission in its report to the President and the Congress. Hearings were held in March of 1963 on the Senate bill, but in view of the revenue implications involved, the measure was first passed by the House of Representatives. Thus when H.R. 3846 passed the House the Senate immediately began consideration of it, and it passed with only one dissenting vote. The President signed it into law on September 3, 1964, and it became Public Law 88–578.

S. 1007, introduced by Senator JACKSON et al.: A bill to guarantee electric consumers in the Pacific Northwest first call on electric energy generated at Federal hydroelectric plants in that region and to guarantee electric consumers in other regions reciprocal priority.

This legislation opened the way for the final agreement between the Pacific Northwest and the Pacific Southwest for interconnected power transmission systems. Now the surplus power which can be generated in the Northwest will be utilized in the power-short Southwestern area of the United States. This legislation afforded the needed protection for the energy consumers in the Northwest while at the same time it will allow the sale of surplus power into the Southwest. The bill passed the Senate in April of 1963. Final approval did not come until August 1964 following several conferences with the House committee. It is a landmark effort in regional cooperation. It became Public Law 88–552.

S. 2719, introduced by Senator Jackson, et al.: A bill to amend the Alaska Statehood Act for the purpose of providing retroactive insurance benefits to the citizens of Alaska as a result of the earthquake disaster in the spring of 1964.

The bill would establish an Office of Alaska Reconstruction for the purpose of administering the benefits of this proposal. This measure and its consideration was the first real step toward enactment of legislation to provide aid to Alaska following this unprecedented disaster. Hearing was held by the full committee in April and May 1964, but action was deferred on the bill in order to proceed with other legislation.

S. 2772, introduced by Senator JACKSON, et al.: A bill to amend the Alaska Omnibus Act. This bill was submitted and recommended by the President to provide aid to

Alaska by providing an additional $23½ million in transitional grants to the State of Alaska. These grants were originally provided when Alaska achieved statehood to assist the young State in carrying on the services normally provided by a State which had been performed by the Federal Government. It became Public Law 88–311.

S. 2881, introduced by Senator BARTLETT, et al.: A bill to amend the Alaska Omnibus Act to provide assistance to the State of Alaska for the reconstruction of areas damaged by the earthquake of March 1964.

This legislation was submitted and recommended by the President. The recommendations were made by the Alaska Planning and Reconstruction Commission established by the President immediately after the earthquake disaster. The bill provides new authorizations up to almost $56 million. In addition, other relief has been made available to citizens of Alaska owning homes which were destroyed or severely damaged by the earthquake. A provision incorporated in the act authorizing the purchase of up to $25 million of Alaska State bonds to assist the State to finance its reconstruction program. The bill was enacted into law on August 19, 1964. It became Public Law 88–461.

S. 3143, introduced by Senators SALINGER and KUCHEL: A bill to designate as Clair Engle Lake the reservoir created by the Trinity Dam, Central Valley project, Calif. This measure was introduced in the memory of the late Senator Clair Engle, who as a member of the House of Representatives and chairman of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs had authored much of the legislation relating to the development of the great Central Valley project in California. It passed the Senate September 8 and the House on October 2, 1964, and became Public Law 88–662.

Senate Joint Resolution 17, Senator MCGEE, et al., introduced the bill: To designate the lake formed by the Flaming Gorge Dam in Utah and extending for most of its 91 miles into Wyoming as O'Mahoney Lake in memorial to the late Senator from Wyoming who had served as the chairman of the Interior and Insular Committee of the Senate. It passed the Senate in June of 1963 but died in the House of Representatives.

H.R. 11162, a bill granting the consent of Congress to an amendment to the Break Interstate Park Compact between the Commonwealths of Virginia and Kentucky. This legislation would enable the two States to amend the present compact which had previously been approved by Congress in 1954. This amendment to the compact simply allowed the Commission set up by the States to administer the park to exercise the power of eminent domain. It became Public Law 88–602.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS, HON. FRANK CHURCH, CHAIRMAN

The Subcommittee on Indian Affairs has legislative responsibility over matters involving the relations of the Federal Government with approximately 500,000 Indians, Eskimos, and Aleuts, about half of whom reside on reservations; over Indian landholdings and reservations which, subject to varying degrees of Federal control, total approximately 52 million acres in 29 States; and over the administration of the Bureau of Indian Affairs. In addition, the Indian health and sanitation program supervised by the Division of Indian Health in the U.S. Public Health Service is of concern to the subcommittee, as is the Indian Claims Commission.

Of the 103 measures referred to the subcommittee, 49 were reported and 39 were enacted into law.

The following Indian bills of general applicability throughout Indian country were enacted or passed by the Senate during 1963–64:

S. 48 (ANDERSON, GOLDWATER): To amend the 1955 Indian Leasing Act (69 Stat. 539) by increasing the maximum term of such leases from 50 to 55 years, which pertained to leases of individual and tribal lands for public, religious, educational, recreational, residential, and business purposes. This proposed amendment to the 1955 act would facilitate loans to developers for construction and improvements on reservations. The House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee did not take favorable action on this bill.

S. 50 (ANDERSON, CHURCH) (H.R. 3306) Public Law 88–168: To authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make loans to finance the testimony of expert witnesses before the Indian Claims Commission—loans out of any funds available in the revolving fund created pursuant to section 10 of the act of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 986). This legislation is important to facilitate the work and eliminate backlog of the Indian Claims Commission. A total of $900,000 was authorized for these loans.

S. 1049 (CHURCH): Relating to the Indian heirship land problem. The primary purpose of this proposed legislation is to provide the Secretary of the Interior with authority that will enable him to reduce the rapidly increasing number of Indian allotments in multiple ownership by (1) partition or sale of lands in heirship status, upon application of the requisite number of Indian owners, where such partition or sale is found to be in the best interest of the Indian owners, and not detrimental to the Indian tribe; (2) providing for judicial partition or sale where non-Indian interests so require; (3) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to represent owners who are minors, non compos mentis, or are unlocatable; (4) establishing procedure for selling heirship lands that will afford the owners full opportunity to obtain fair market value for their property and give the Indian owners and tribes preference rights to purchase the land; (5) increasing the Indian revolving credit loan fund by $35 million in order that individual Indians and tribes may borrow funds with which to purchase heirship tracts; and (6) providing for tribal land consolidation programs to permit maximum economic utilization of the land resource by Indians. The bill passed the Senate on October 11, 1963, but was not acted on by the House Interior Committee.

S. 1565 (CHURCH), Public Law 88–301: This act amends two sections of the act of June 25, 1910, which deals with the sale of Indian timber, to modernize harvesting practices and to facilitate sales of timber on allotments that are in fractionated heirship status.

S. 1718 (CHURCH): This bill would amend the law with respect to trade with the Indians to eliminate obsolete provisions of law. The bill was introduced as the result of an executive communication from the Department of the Interior. It passed the Senate on October 22, 1963, but was not acted on by the House.

S. 1868 (CHURCH), Public Law 88–230: This legislation amends the act of August 3, 1956, relating to adult Indian vocational training. The program is increased from $7,500,000 to $12 million annually in order to meet the needs of Indians between the ages of 18 and 35 who are seeking skills to aid in their employment. This program has been one of the most successful operated by the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Arizona

S. 90 (GOLDWATER) (H.R. 11329), Public Law 88–462: Authorizes the sum of $269,500 from funds available for the Painted Rock Dam, Ariz., for the relocation and reestablishment of the Indian village of Sil Murk adjoining the Gila Reservation. These funds will be used for land and for construction of 10 concrete dwellings to house approximately 100 Indians who must be relocated out of the reservoir area.

S. 912 (MOSS), Public Law 88–182: The act gives approval to an agreement between the Navajo Tribe, the Shell Oil Co., and the Humble Oil & Refining Co., dated May 1, 1959, as amended. It also authorizes the tribe to enter into an oil and gas lease with the two companies in accordance with the terms of the agreement.

S. 2111 (CHURCH), Public Law 88–302: Declares the Colorado River Reservation, with the exception of certain Federal improvements and improvements placed on the land by assignees and Indian colonists, to be the property of the Colorado River Indian Tribes. Certain Hopi, Navajo, and Havasupai colonists who settled on the reservation during the late 1940's will be treated as members of the tribes if they accept enrollment as Colorado River Indians within 2 years.

S. 2210 (GOLDWATER, HAYDEN) (H.R. 8334), Public Law 88–465: Transfers title to approximately 27.3 acres of surplus Federal land on the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Reservation near Scottsdale, Ariz., to the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian community. It is needed to assist the tribe in working out plans for the most beneficial use of the land and the improvement of economic opportunities on the reservation through industrial and recreational uses.

California

H.R. 2635, Public Law 88–167: Amends the act of August 9, 1955, for the purpose of permitting leases of Indian land on the Fort Mojave Reservation in Calif., Ariz., and Nev. for business and other purposes to be made for a term of 99 years or less, instead of the present 25 years with right of renewal for another 25 years. H.R. 2635 is needed to permit a lease with a term long enough to enable a prospective lessee to obtain financing for the contemplated tourist-recreation development.

H.R. 7833, Public Law 88–419: Extends the provisions of the California Rancheria Termination Act of 1958 to all Indian reservations and rancherias lying wholly within the State boundaries. It is necessary to assist in accomplishing the intent of House Concurrent Resolution 108 that all Indian tribes in California should be freed from all disabilities and limitations specifically applicable to Indians.

H.R. 11562, Public Law 88–453: Authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to sell Enterprise Rancheria No. 2 to the State of California and to distribute the proceeds of the sale to certain persons. Need for the legislation stems from construction of the Oroville Dam.

Colorado

S. 1564 (CHURCH) (H.R. 5883), Public Law 88–112: Corrects an error in the form of an excess comma in a land description in the act entitled "To provide for an exchange of lands between the United States and the Southern Ute Indian Tribe, and for other purposes." The comma broke the description, making it cover two tracts, one of which the Southern Ute Tribe does not own.

Idaho

S. 1582 (CHURCH): Amends section 3 of the act of August 31, 1954, providing for the construction of the Michaud Flats project, Idaho, by adding a new subsection (c) to facilitate the execution of contracts for the delivery of water to individual Indian allotments. Passed the Senate August 28, 1963, but no action taken in the House.

S. 2139 (CHURCH), Public Law 88–231: Introduced as a result of an executive communication, the bill provides for the distribution of an award to the Kootenai Tribe of Idaho by the Indian Claims Commission of approximately $380,000.

Minnesota

S. 3035 (McCarthy, Humphrey): Authorizes the judgment ($1,800,000) of the Indian Claims Commission in favor of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians to be used for any purpose authorized by the tribal governing body and approved by the Secretary of the Interior. The bill became Public Law 88–663.

H.R. 11425, Private Law 88–293: Provides for the conveyance of 10 acres of federally owned land on the White Earth Reservation to the Minnesota Annual Conference of the Methodist Church. The land is excess to the needs of the Bureau of Indian Affairs and will be used by the church in connection with religious activities.

Montana

S. 1531 (Metcalf, Mansfield), Public Law 88–640: To increase the appropriation authorization from $1 million to $6,200,000 for continuing the construction of the irrigation and power systems of the Flathead Indian irrigation project in Montana. The amounts expended will be added to project construction costs and will be reimbursable. The funds are needed for an adequate power distribution system and the extension of facilities. The bill became public law.

S. 1757 (Mansfield, Metcalf): To ratify certain conveyances of land on the Crow Indian Reservation. S. 1757 passed the Senate December 6, 1963, but was not considered by the House.

S. 2279 (Mansfield, Metcalf) Public Law 88–304: Authorizes the transfer of the Piegan unit of the Blackfeet Indian irrigation project, Montana, to the landowners within the unit, and authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to cancel construction, operation, and maintenance charges of about $47,000. It is uneconomical for the Bureau of Indian Affairs to operate this unit, since most of the landowners wish to dry-farm their lands or use them for grazing and have made little use of the irrigation system.

S. 2961 (Mansfield, Metcalf), Public Law 88–559: Provides for the disposition of a judgment of the Indian Claims Commission to the Northern Cheyenne Indians in the amount of approximately $4 million. The funds will be used for developing individual and family type plans, education, and an economic development program.

Nevada

S. 1885 (Bible, Cannon): Declares that the United States holds in trust for the Indians of the Battle Mountain Colony certain lands which are used for cemetery purposes. Some 6.25 acres are to be used for this purpose. Passed the Senate on October 22, 1963, but not acted upon in the House.

New Mexico

S. 1594 (Allott, Anderson, Dominick, Mechem): Authorizes the Navajo Tribe or the Ute Mountain Tribe to commence litigation to determine the location of a part of the common boundary between their two reservations. The litigation would be before a district court of three judges in the U.S. District Court for the District of New Mexico, with a statutory right of appeal direct to the Supreme Court. The district court would base its decision on "such principles as may be just and fair in law and equity." S. 1594 passed the Senate October 22, 1963, but was not acted on by the House.

S. 1931 (Anderson), Public Law 88–303: Provides that the United States shall hold 80 acres of surplus Federal land in trust for the members of the Alamo Band of Puertocito Navajo Indians. The lands and buildings were formerly used for school purposes. The band will use them for community purposes.

New York

H.R. 1794, Public Law 88–533: Authorizes the payment for certain interests in lands within the Allegany Indian Reservation, N.Y., required for the Kinzua Dam project, and provides for the relocation, rehabilitation, social and economic development of the members of the Seneca Nation. Three categories of payments are made to the Senecas for a flowage easement over some 10,000 acres of tribal land reserved to the Nation under the Pickering Treaty of 1794: Direct damages, $1,289,060; indirect damages, not ordinarily compensable, $945,573; rehabilitation, $12,128,917. The latter sum will be used for relocation, housing, education, utilities, community facilities, family plans, industrial and recreational purposes. The act also directs the Secretary of the Interior, after consultation with the Seneca Nation, to submit to Congress a plan for complete withdrawal of Federal supervision over the Senecas.

North Dakota

H.R. 2905, Public Law 88–194: Donates in trust to the Devils Lake Sioux Tribe of the Fort Totten Indian Reservation 276 acres of land. The land is no longer required by the Federal Government and the transfer will permit the tribe to make beneficial use of it and the improvements.

Oklahoma

S. 1820 (Edmondson, Monroney) (H.R. 6496), Public Law 88–461: Provides for a conveyance to the Cherokee Indian Tribe of a 40-acre tract of surplus Federal land near Tahlequah, Okla. It also provides that the land be taken in fee simple and subject to set off against any claim the tribe may have before the Indian Claims Commission. The tribe plans to use the land to improve economic opportunities of its members.

S. 2482 (Monroney, Edmondson) (H.R. 10672), Public Law 88–474: Provides for the disposition of judgment funds now on deposit to the Pawnee Tribe of Oklahoma. The funds may be expended for any purpose authorized by the tribal governing body and approved by the Secretary of the Interior. The amount of funds available to the tribe after deductions is $6,439,000. It is planned that these funds will be distributed on a per capita basis since there is no tribal reservation.

S. 2655 (Monroney, Edmondson) (H.R. 10483), Public Law 88–413: The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to sell 58.19 acres of Eastern Shawnee tribal land in northeastern Oklahoma, upon request of the tribal governing body. Because this is the sole remaining tribal property and is no longer used by the tribe, the disposition would be of advantage to the tribe and would relieve the Federal Government of some of its responsibility over the tribe.

H.R. 7215, Public Law 88–421: Authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to convey all right of the United States, together with all improvements, in certain land totaling 255 acres near Shawnee, Okla., to the Citizen Band of Potawatomi Indians and to the absentee-Shawnee Tribe of Indians, both of Oklahoma. Conveyance will be in fee. The bill is necessary to enable these tribes to carry out their plans for use of this land, which is no longer needed by the Federal Government.

H.R. 8834, Public Law 88–457: Provides for distribution of funds appropriated in satisfaction of a judgment awarded the Shawnee Tribe or Nation of Indians by the Indian Claims Commission. The amount of the award, $1,269,338.02, was appropriated by the act of September 30, 1961, and deposited in the Federal Treasury. After deducting attorneys' fees and expenses ($135,620.10) and adding accrued interest, the amount in the Treasury credited to the tribe was $1,203,103.31 on June 30, 1964. Three bands of Shawnee Indians will share in a portion of the funds.

H.R. 10204, Public Law 88–632 (S. 2581, Monroney and Edmondson): Extends for an indefinite period the mineral estate that was temporarily reserved to the Osage Tribe of Oklahoma when the tribal lands were allotted to individual members under the act of June 28, 1906. The original mineral reservation, which was for a 25-year period, has been extended from time to time. Under present law it will expire on April 8, 1983, unless terminated before that time by act of Congress.

Oregon

H.R. 1713, Public Law 88–456: Approves an order of the Secretary of the Interior canceling $329,301 in construction costs and $72,139 in operation and maintenance costs on non-Indian owned lands in three units of the Klamath irrigation project. The effect of the act is to place non-Indian owners in the same position as the Indians who were terminated by Public Law 83–587, the Klamath Indian Termination Act of 1954.

H.R. 8080, Public Law 88–464: Provides for the distribution of $550,000 awarded to the Snake and Paiute Indians of the former Malheur Reservation. The Secretary will prepare a roll of persons eligible to share in the fund.

H.R. 11118, Public Law 83–506: The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to distribute an award by the Indian Claims Commission to the Nehalem and the Tillamook Band of the Tillamook Indians of Oregon in the amount of $72,162.50 and $97,025, respectively. He is authorized to distribute the shares of the living enrollees directly to them.

South Dakota

S. 136 (Mundt, McGovern), Public Law 88–463: Places in trust for the Rosebud Sioux Tribe approximately 10,495 acres of land located within the boundaries of their reservation. The land is surplus to the needs of the Bureau of Indian Affairs. The tribe will use it for grazing and hay purposes.

H.R. 844, Public Law 88–166 (S. 84, McGovern and Mundt): Conveys in trust status 5,422.68 acres of land formerly used for the benefit of the Oglala Community School to the Oglala Sioux Tribe of the Pine Ridge Reservation in South Dakota. The United States will hold the land in trust for the tribe. The land is no longer used for pasturing and the Bureau of Indian Affairs has no further use for it.

H.R. 845, Public Law 88–169 (S. 85, McGovern and Mundt): The bill conveys in trust status the Federal Government's interest in 40 acres of land used for the Wakpamni Lake Day School to the Oglala Sioux Tribe of the Pine Ridge Reservation in South Dakota. The Government has no further use for the land or improvements.

H.R. 2467, Public Law 88–196 (S. 711, McGovern and Mundt): Authorizes the Secretary of the Interior, upon request of the Rosebud Sioux Tribe, to sell or exchange the tribal interests in isolated tracts of land in Tripp, Gregory, and Lyman Counties, S. Dak. It further requires the tribe to use the proceeds of such sale to purchase substitute land and thus consolidate its holdings. Need for the bill arises from the fact that the tribe owns many isolated tracts of land in these counties which are of little use to the tribe and which cannot be effectively consolidated.

H.R. 2977, Public Law 88–418: Permits the Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe of South Dakota to sell isolated tracts of land in Stanley, Haakon, Pennington, and Meade Counties, S. Dak. Requires the tribe to use the proceeds of such sale to purchase substitute land, and permits the tribe, with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, to encumber by mortgage or deed land which it is authorized to sell. The tribe owns many tracts of land in these counties which are of little use to it and cannot be effectively consolidated into tribal holdings. Some of the tracts would be valuable to nearby landowners, but there is no authority to sell or encumber them.

H.R. 11052, Public Law 88-483: Declares that 80 acres of land acquired for the Flandreau Boarding School is held by the United States in trust for the Flandreau Santee Sioux Tribe. The land is surplus to the needs of the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Indians plan to use it for community, ceremonial, recreational, and agricultural purposes.

Washington

S. 1169 (JACKSON and MAGNUSON, by request), Public Law 88-551: Authorizes a per capital payment of $350 to members of the Colville Confederated Tribes from funds arising from judgments of the Indian Claims Commission. Subcommittee held field hearings on the legislation in October 1963.

S. 1442 (JACKSON and MAGNUSON, by request): As introduced, the bill provided for closing of the tribal roll of the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation preparatory to submission of proposed legislation for the termination of Federal supervision over the property and affairs of the tribes and their members. Field hearings were held in Spokane, Nespelem, and Seattle on October 24, 25, and 26, 1963. Numerous suggested amendments offered by tribal witnesses were incorporated in the substitute bill as reported on August 17, 1964. As passed by the Senate on August 18, the legislation calls for a one-step termination program closely patterned after the Klamath Indian Termination Act of 1954. No action was taken on S. 1442 by the House Interior Committee.

H.R. 10973, Public Law 88-412 (S. 2608, JACKSON): Provides for the disposition of Indian Claims Commission judgment funds on deposit in the U.S. Treasury to the credit of the Lower Pend d'Oreille or Kalispel Tribe of Indians. The funds may be advanced or expended for any purpose authorized by the tribal governing body and approved by the Secretary of the Interior. A total of $2,669,000 is available for the 155 members of the tribe. The committee directed that the tribe's plan for the use of the funds not be implemented until the Bureau of Indian Affairs investigates the practicality of placing the administration of the program in the hands of a private trustee.

H.R. 5837, Public Law 88-540: Amends the act entitled "An act to authorize the purchase, sale, and exchange of certain Indian lands on the Yakima Indian Reservation" to correct difficulties that the Yakima Tribes have met in acquiring and disposing of lands. The act authorizes acquisition by the Secretary of the Interior of reservation and ceded land from anyone by gift or relinquishment as well as purchase; it also authorizes exchange of tribal land for other land within the reservation or the ceded area as well as sale and exchange of lands held in multiple ownership.

S. 3079 (JACKSON, by request): Authorizes the disposition of a $205,000 judgment awarded to the Quinaielt Tribe by the Indian Claims Commission. The Quinaielt Business Committee would be permitted to decide how to use the funds subject to approval by the Secretary of the Interior. The bill was reported to the Senate on September 3, 1964, but was not passed before adjournment.

S. 3114 (JACKSON, by request): The purpose of the bill is to permit Indian lands in the Lummi diking project to be included in a new diking district formed under Washington State law. All outstanding construction and operation and maintenance charges, amounting to approximately $200,000, against the project would be canceled. The organization of the State district will be advantageous to the Government in that responsibility for future betterment and construction would be transferred to the district, and the Government would be relieved of any further responsibility. The legislation passed the Senate on September 4, 1964, but was not acted on by the House.

Wyoming

H.R. 6710, Public Law 88-116: Grants congressional approval to an order of the Secretary of the Interior canceling irrigation charges of $1,134.99 on 80 acres of land against Clarence R. Jacobson, a non-Indian landowner on the Wind River Indian irrigation project in Wyoming. Mr. Jacobson purchased the land with a water right for 80 irrigable acres, but the land was not susceptible to irrigation. Consequently, Jacobson did not pay the irrigation charges.

In addition to the bills enacted or passed by the Senate, the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs took the following action on legislation referred to it:

Senate Joint Resolutions 170-171 (MAGNUSON): Regarding Indian fishing rights. On August 5-6, 1964, hearings were held on these two resolutions that relate to the treaty rights of Indians in the Northwest to fish at their usual and accustomed places. Testimony was received from many interested parties. The hearings were in the process of being printed at the end of the session. No action was taken on the joint resolutions.

S. 143 (METCALF, MANSFIELD): To permit States to assume jurisdiction over criminal or civil causes of action with the consent of the tribe occupying the particular Indian country affected by the assumption of jurisdiction as consent of the United States. Hearings were held by the subcommittee on May 1, but no further action taken.

S. 156 (ALLOTT): Relating to membership in Indian tribal organizations. No individual who is otherwise qualified for membership in an Indian tribe, band, etc., can be denied membership regardless of whether or not he resides on or off the reservation or on the basis of his parents' nonresidence on the reservation at the time of his birth. Hearings were held on September 17, 1963, but no further action has been taken.

S. 410 (YOUNG, North Dakota): To authorize the Secretary of the Interior to receive from the Devils Lake Sioux Tribe of the Fort Totten Reservation, N. Dak., a deed conveying certain property on such reservation to the United States, and for other purposes. Any property conveyed to the United States in accordance with the provisions of the first section of this act shall be held in trust by the United States for the benefit and use of the Devils Lake Sioux Tribe of such reservation. A hearing was held by the subcommittee on October 4, but nothing further has been scheduled.

S. 2532 (GRUENING and BARTLETT): The bill authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to lease lands or improvements located within the Pribilof Islands of St. Paul and St. George, in Alaska, to the inhabitants for the purpose of fostering self-sufficiency among the inhabitants. Leases will be for no more than 55 years and at an annual rental determined by the Secretary. Hearing by subcommittee on April 24, 1964, but no further action taken.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON MINERALS, MATERIALS, AND FUELS, HON. ERNEST GRUENING, CHAIRMAN

Forty bills and joint resolutions were referred to the Subcommittee on Minerals, Materials, and Fuels during the 88th Congress. In addition, the subcommittee held full exploratory hearings on the state of the domestic minerals industry in general, and conducted continuing studies of the same, as well as the interpretation and administration by the executive agencies of laws relating to mineral resource development.

Twenty-three public hearings were held on these measures and were given executive consideration; 13 were reported to the Senate, and 11 passed the Senate. Nine were enacted into law.

Specifically, the measures on which the Minerals Subcommittee took action were:

S. 73, by Senator SMATHERS, authorizing the sale of certain mineral interests reserved by the United States in a tract of land in Florida to the surface owners thereof. Hearing held April 24, 1963. House companion measure, H.R. 1492, substituted and reported favorably (S. Rept. No. 252). Passed Senate June 26, 1963, and became Private Law 88-10.

S. 100, by Senator DOMINICK, directing a study of, and executive action with respect to, the domestic gold mining industry. Hearings held July 15, 16, and 17, 1963. Adverse reports from executive agencies. Action merged with that on S. 2125, Senate Report No. 804.

S. 164, Senator ALLOTT and Senator BENNETT, to establish a national mining and minerals policy. Hearings held May 9 and 10, 1963, in connection with those on state of the domestic minerals industry. Considered by full committee on June 12, 1963, but no action taken. Subsequently, adverse reports received from executive agencies.

S. 167, by Senator HOLLAND, to authorize sale of phosphate rights reserved by the United States in Florida. Hearing August 29, 1963. Favorably reported to the Senate November 26, 1963 (S. Rept. No. 662). Passed the Senate November 27, 1963.

S. 883, by Senator BIBLE, to authorize leasing of geothermal steam deposits on the public lands. Hearings held July 12, 1963, and October 25, 1963. Ordered favorably reported to Senate August 17, 1964 (S. Rept. No. 1508), and passed the Senate on August 21, 1964.

S. 1013, by Senators LAUSCHE, SCOTT, and HARTKE, to direct nationwide study of strip and surface mining operations. Hearings held March 25 and July 27, 1964. The measure was reported to the full committee, but further action was indefinitely postponed because the substance of the measure, with broadened authority, was contained in section 205 of the Appalachia bill, S. 2782 and H.R. 11946, which was passed by the Senate on September 25, 1964.

S. 1066, by Senator MCGEE, to authorize reinstatement of E.L.K. Oil Co. lease of Cheyenne, Wyo. Hearing held April 24, 1963; reported to the Senate on June 13, 1963 (S. Rept. No. 240; approved August 28, 1963, Private Law 88-45). (This measure was the basis for favorable action by the committee and the Senate on S. 1984, by Senators GRUENING, MCGEE, HOLLAND, ENGLE, SIMPSON, MOSS, BIBLE, CANNON, KUCHEL, and MECHAM, which passed the Senate September 1, 1964, S. Rept. No. 1518.)

S. 1154, by Senator HUMPHREY, to authorize sale of mineral interests retained by the Federal Government in a tract of land in Minnesota to the surface owners. Hearing May 27, 1963; reported to the Senate with amendments June 17, 1963 (S. Rept. No. 254) and passed the Senate June 19, 1963. Private Law 88-64.

S. 1166, by Senator HART, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to enter into contracts and make grants for research and development to further purposes of law establishing the Bureau of Mines. Hearing August 29, 1963. Considered by full committee, and ordered held over November 22, 1963.

S. 1273, by Senators GRUENING, MCGOVERN, BARTLETT, KUCHEL, MUNDT, and BIBLE. To establish a Gold Procurement and Sales Agency in the Department of the Interior. Adverse reports from executive agencies. Hearings on July 15, 16, and 17, 1963. See report (S. Rept. No. 804) and action on S. 2125.

S. 1326, by Senator THURMOND, to authorize sale of mineral interests retained by the United States in a tract of land in South Carolina to the surface owners thereof. Hearing, May 27, 1963. Reported June 17, 1963

(S. Rept. No. 253); passed Senate June 19, 1963, Private Law 88–31.

S. 1429, by Senator Burdick, to amend authorization for operation of three minerals experimental stations. Hearing, May 10, 1963, and reported to the full committee. Measure held over in full committee.

S. 1534, by Senators Anderson, Jackson, Allott, Bartlett, Bennett, Bible, Cannon, Carlson, Church, Dirksen, Dominick, Edmondson, Engle, Gruening, Hayden, Jordan, Long of Missouri, Magnuson, Mansfield, Mechem, Metcalf, Monroney, Moss, Nelson, and Symington, to stabilize domestic lead and zinc industry by establishing flexible import quotas based on differences between domestic consumption and production, with foreign exporters assured a share of the market. Hearings held August 14 and 20, 1963, with administrative agencies in opposition. Amended bill favorably reported to Senate (S. Rept. No. 758) on December 10, 1963, and rereferred to Committee on Finance for consideration of import quota aspects.

S. 1984, by Senators Gruening, McGee, Holland, Engle, Simpson, Moss, Bible, Cannon, Kuchel, and Mechem, to amend Mineral Leasing Act so that deposit of oil lease rental payment on or before anniversary date will constitute timely payment even if not received by land office by that day. This bill was based on the facts and practices of the Bureau of Land Management brought out at public hearings on S. 1066. S. 1984 was reported favorably (S. Rept. No. 1518) on August 31, 1964, and passed the Senate on September 1, 1964.

S. 2125, by Senators Gruening, Bartlett, Bible, Kuchel, Metcalf, and McGovern, to revitalize the American gold-mining industry by establishing a program whereby domestic producers would be paid the difference between the costs of production of gold as they were in 1940 and such costs today. S. 2125 was drafted and introduced as a direct outgrowth of the subcommittee's hearings on S. 1273 and S. 100, held July 15, 16, and 17, 1963. Conferences were held with Secretary Udall and Treasury officials on November 1, 1963. Reported to Senate on December 18, 1963 (S. Rept. No. 804).

S. 2327, by Senator Moss, to increase the amount of coal acreage any one individual or group may hold on the public lands to 46,080 acres. Hearing by subcommittee on July 27, 1964; reported to Senate amended, August 18, 1964 (S. Rept. No. 1714); passed Senate August 19; action reconsidered on August 20 and identical House-passed bill, H.R. 8960, passed and became Public Law 88–526.

S. 2500, by Senators Metcalf, Mansfield, Church, Jordan of Idaho, and Moss, to increase maximum phosphate acreage one person or group may hold under Federal lease to 20,480 acres on the public lands. Hearings held May 20, 1964; reported to Senate August 17, 1964 (S. Rept. No. 1459). August 19 Senate passed House companion bill, H.R. 9638, which became Public Law 88–538.

Senate Joint Resolution 7, by Senator McGee, to determine susceptibility of minerals to electrometallurgical and other newly developed processes. Hearing on August 24, 1963, and ordered reported favorably to full committee. Full committee considered on June 12, 1963, but no action taken.

H.R. 1233, by Congressman Sisk, to authorize reinstatement of an oil and gas lease in California which had terminated as a result of a mistake by the Bureau of Land Management. Hearing held August 29, 1963; reported to Senate December 9, 1963 (S. Rept. No. 751); passed Senate December 10, 1963, and became Private Law 88–114.

H.R. 3120, by Congressman Udall, to enlarge coverage of Lead-Zinc Small Producers Act and to simplify procedures thereunder. Hearing on May 27, 1963; reported favorably to Senate on June 13, 1963; (S. Rept. No. 241); recommitted to committee after floor debate on July 16, 1963.

H.R. 3845, by Congressman Aspinall, to correct inequities in Lead-Zinc Small Producers Act. Hearing, April 24, 1963; reported favorably June 13, 1963 (S. Rept. No. 239); passed Senate July 16, 1963, and became Public Law 88–75.

H.R. 4479, by Congressman Talcott, to release to State of California reserved mineral rights in a tract of land to be used for a public park by the State. Hearing on August 29, 1963; reported favorably December 9, 1963 (S. Rept. No. 752); passed Senate December 10, 1963, and became Public Law 88–216.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS, HON. ALAN BIBLE, CHAIRMAN

The Subcommittee on Public Lands has jurisdiction over legislation dealing with the general administration and management of our public land resources. The subcommittee's jurisdiction also includes the establishment and control over new units created as part of our national park system. In this capacity in the 88th Congress the subcommittee has contributed a monumental effort toward the development of outdoor recreational resources.

A review of the legislation considered by the subcommittee follows:

S. 16, Symington and Long of Missouri: Provides for the establishment of the Ozark National Rivers in the State of Missouri. The Secretary of the Interior will designate an area not exceeding 94,000 acres and may acquire lands and waters within the area designated. Any owner of improved property in the area may retain right of occupancy for noncommercial purposes until his death. October 22, 1963, passed the Senate, amended. On August 11, 1964, passed the House with amendments, and on August 14, 1964, the Senate concurs in House amendments. Public Law 88–492.

S. 18, Randolph: To change the name of Harpers Ferry National Monument to Harpers Ferry National Historical Park, in order to conform with other national park administered areas and to more aptly describe the nature of the area. It passed the Senate April 9, 1963, passed the House May 20, 1963, and on May 29, 1963, it became Public Law 88–33.

S. 22, Church: To release U.S. right, title, or interest in certain streets in Heyburn, Idaho, and to repeal the reverter in patent for public reserve. The act releases any right, title, or interest of the United States in streets that were dedicated when the townsite plat was filed, and repeals the reversionary clause in the patent. Public Law 88–14.

S. 27, Moss: Establishes the Canyonlands National Park in Utah. This is an outstanding area because of the display of erosion forces, including the future course of the Colorado where it slices down through the sandstone layers. Total area is approximately 260,000 acres, and the park has potential for being an outstanding recreational area. On August 2, 1963, it passed the Senate, amended. On August 19, 1964, it passed the House, amended. Became Public Law 88–590.

S. 41, Anderson, et al.: The bill provides that public land States may, in exchange for land owned by the States within the boundaries of a military reservation, select other public lands (unreserved) belonging to the United States and located within the boundaries of the State, which are of equal value. These States may make exchanges in a similar manner for lands owned by the State and taken by the United States in condemnation proceedings for military or other public use. Written notice of such selection must be given to the Secretary of the Interior to the acquiring agency and to the U.S. attorney concerned. August 6, 1963, subcommittee hearing.

S. 91, Goldwater: Authorizes the establishment of the Fort Bowie National Historic Site in Arizona. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to designate for preservation the structures of Fort Bowie in Cochise County, Ariz., together with additional improvements and land not exceeding 1,000 acres. August 1, 1964, passed the Senate, amended August 3, 1964, House passed H.R. 946, a companion bill. August 14, 1964, Senate passed H.R. 946 in lieu of S. 91. Became Public Law 88–510.

S. 117, Carlson: Establishes Fort Larned as a national historic site. Authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to acquire for preservation not more than 700 acres of land, or interests in land, which comprise the site and remaining historic structures of Fort Larned, located in Pawnee County, Kans. August 17, 1964, H.R. 3071 reported in lieu of S. 117 to the Senate where it passed August 18, 1964. Public Law 88–541.

S. 138, Metcalf: To change the name of Big Hole Battlefield National Monument to Big Hole National Battlefield, and to revise its boundaries to include 466 acres of private and national forest lands that contain historically interesting sites. The House amended the bill with the appropriation limit of $20,000 for the purchase of the lands. Passed Senate April 9, 1963. Passed House May 6, 1963. Public Law 88–24.

S. 187, Burdick, et al.: Authorizes the establishment of Fort Union Trading Post National Historic Site, N. Dak. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to acquire the historic remains of Fort Union and other lands not exceeding 400 acres in Williams County, N. Dak., and Roosevelt County, Mont. June 26, 1964, passed the Senate amended. The House committee has taken no action.

S. 247, Bartlett, Gruening: Extends the Native Townsite Act to the filled-in tidelands that form an integral part of the Juneau Indian village in Alaska so that Indians may own their own homes. April 11, 1963, passed the Senate. May 20, 1963, passed the House. Public Law 88–34.

S. 249, Sparkman: Directs the Secretary of the Interior to adjudicate a claim to certain land in Marengo County, Ala. If the Secretary determines that B. A. Cogle satisfies the requirements of the Color of Title Act, he may issue Cogle a patent to such land without regard to the acreage limitation of the act. June 22, 1963, subcommittee hearing. No further action.

S. 346, Cannon, Bible: Provides for the conveyance to the city of Henderson, Nev., of certain lands. The Secretary of the Interior is directed to issue, after receiving the fair market value of the land, a patent for approximately 15,000 acres in the State of Nevada. June 12, 1963, H.R. 2461 ordered favorably reported, amended in lieu of S. 346. Public Law 88–73.

S. 386, Stennis and Eastland: To consolidate and more effectively display the Vicksburg (Miss.) National Military Park by rerouting the city traffic with the establishment of a park tour road, and the sale of the southern part of the park, so as to change the present entire encirclement of the city, and the purchase of 544 acres to round out the main part of the park from its long, narrow shape, principally in order to prevent the soil erosion that threatens some of the park roads. April 10, 1963, passed Senate. May 20, 1963, passed the House, amended, so as to place a top limit on the funds to be allocated; namely, $2,050,000 to be specifically used for the acquisition of lands and construction and relocation of roads. June 4, 1963, enacted. Public Law 88–37.

S. 394, Bartlett: To patent certain lands under the Homestead Act and to permit the sale of other land entered under the Homestead Act to Leo Reeves, of Alaska, despite the current requirements of the homestead laws, because of extenuating circumstances. February 11, 1963, passed the Senate. February 7, 1963, passed the House. May 17, 1963, enacted. Private Law 88-4.

S. 503: Authorizes the addition of certain donated lands to the administrative headquarters site, Isle Royale National Park. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to acquire by donation a tract of land comprising 6.07 acres, located in Houghton, Mich. Introduced by Senator HART on January 24, 1963. April 4, 1963, subcommittee hearing. September 11, 1963, subcommittee hearing. October 8, 1963, subcommittee executive. No action taken.

S. 535: Extends the time limit for filing of proof of compliance with requirements for Alaska Public Sale Act beyond the statutory 3-year regulation when there is no evidence of bad faith and extenuating circumstances prevented the filing even though the requirements had been fulfilled within the time limit. Introduced by Senators BARTLETT and GRUENING on January 25, 1963. June 24, 1963, passed the Senate. July 8, 1963, passed the House. July 19, 1963, enacted. Public Law 88-66.

S. 605: Authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to acquire the Graff House site for inclusion in Independence National Historical Park. The site is historically significant, because it was in the Graff House that Thomas Jefferson wrote the Declaration of Independence. Introduced by Senators CLARK and SCOTT on January 31, 1963. May 29, 1964, subcommittee hearing. July 29, 1964, full committee, executive, and ordered reported H.R. 988 to the Senate, amended. July 31, 1964, H.R. 988 reported instead. August 1, 1964, H.R. 988 passed the Senate, amended. August 7, 1964, House agrees to Senate amendments. August 21, 1964, H.R. 988 approved. Public Law 88-477.

S. 606: Authorizes the establishment of Tocks Island National Recreation Area in Pennsylvania and New Jersey, for the purpose of providing for public outdoor use and enjoyment. The area will include the Tocks Island Reservoir and lands adjacent in the States of Pennsylvania and New Jersey. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to establish and administer the area, and he may make boundary adjustments. He may utilize available statutory authorities concerning national park areas to carry out the act, and he is directed to adopt a land and water use management plan. Hunting and fishing will be permitted in the area. Introduced by Senators CLARK, CASE, JAVITS, SCOTT, and WILLIAMS on January 31, 1963. July 6, 1964, subcommittee hearing. No further action taken.

S. 653, BIBLE and CANNON: Administration of Lake Mead National Recreation Area. The Secretary of the Interior is to acquire inholdings, through exchange and the provision of an estimated $1,200,000 to equalize different values in the shifting of lands. Fishing and hunting are authorized when in accordance with State and Federal laws. August 3, 1964, passed the House amended. Became Public Law 88-639.

S. 673, BEALL and BREWSTER: Provides for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States on the University of Maryland campus to the State of Maryland. Subcommittee hearing. No action taken.

S. 758, GRUENING: Establishes in the Office of the Secretary of the Interior a Board of Public Lands Appeals. There will be a chairman and two associate members in the Board, which will be appointed by the Secretary of the Interior. The Secretary will establish rules and regulations for the Board, which will hear appeals on behalf of the Secretary from any final decision of the Bureau of Land Management or the Geological Survey concerning the uses of or claims to public lands under the Interior Department. March 6 and 7, 1963, subcommittee hearing.

S. 792, HART and MCNAMARA: Establishes in the State of Michigan a Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore. The Secretary of the Interior is directed to exercise the administration, protection, and development of the lakeshore along Lake Michigan. December 19, 1963, passed the Senate, with committee amendments.

S. 873: To allow Lincoln County in Nevada to develop lands north of Caliente for industrial purposes, since the land is of little use presently, but reserving to the United States the mineral rights in a Senate amendment. Acreage is 2,644, and there will be no cost to the United States. Introduced by Senators BIBLE and CANNON on February 20, 1963. April 11, 1963, passed the Senate. May 6, 1963, passed the House. April 16, 1963, enacted. Public Law 88-35.

S. 932: To permit the Secretary of the Interior to set maximum and minimum age limits for the hiring of U.S. Park Police, as the present regulation does not allow because they are civil service employees. The intended limit of approximately 30 years would mean that they would be more physically fit for the more rigorous demands of this particular job. Introduced by Senator BIBLE on February 23, 1963. April 9, 1963, passed the Senate.

S. 986: Authorizes the establishment of the Prairie National Park in Pottawatomie County, in the State of Kansas. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to designate the boundaries of the park and to procure land and interests in land through purchase, exchange, or donation. An advisory commission is established and administrative jurisdiction over lands administered by the Corps of Engineers in the area is transferred to the Secretary of the Interior. Introduced by Senators PEARSON and CARLSON, March 4, 1963. August 8, 1963, subcommittee hearing. September 11, 1963, tabled in subcommittee.

S. 1039: Authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to exchange 391 acres of now surplus land at Blue Ponds, Md., for 783 acres adjoining the Virginia State Park at Great Falls, which is now under a 50-year lease by the National Capital Park System with the option to purchase. The scenic, historic, and recreational value of this Virginia land has been recognized since the George Washington Memorial Parkway Act of May 29, 1930. The fair market value of this land is estimated at $975,000, the limit being $1 million, which is payable to Potomac Electric Power Co. Introduced by Senator BYRD of Virginia on March 5, 1963. June 25, 1963, passed the Senate.

S. 1122: Allows for the reconveyance of a parcel of land in Powell, Wyo., from the State to the Presbyterian Retirement Facilities Corp., since the land is to be used for a retirement home and there is a restriction, dating from 1906 that the land be used for public purposes. A substitute area will be given and any differences in value made up as well as any administrative costs.

S. 1143, HART and MCNAMARA: The bill authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to take appropriate action to establish the Pictured Rocks National Lakeshore in the State of Michigan. The Secretary is authorized to acquire land, water, and other property, and improvements within the Lakeshore's boundaries by donation, purchase, transfer, exchange, or condemnation. Owners of improved property acquired by the Secretary retain the right of occupancy and use of such property for residential purposes for a period of no more than 25 years, if such purposes are not incompatible with the purposes of this act. The bill further authorizes the appropriation of necessary funds. A subcommittee field hearing was held on the measure on July 20, 1964, but no further action was taken. Introduced by Senator SIMPSON on March 19, 1963. June 24, 1963, passed the Senate. July 9, 1963, passed the House. August 8, 1963, approved. Public Law 88-91.

S. 1137, NEUBERGER: Establishes the Oregon Dunes National Seashore in the State of Oregon. The area entailed will be that land, water, and submerged land area on the Oregon coast, lying between the Siuslaw River on the north, to Tenmile Creek on the south. The seashore will be administered by the Secretary of the Interior, who will appoint an Oregon Dunes Advisory Board to assist him in matters of policy relating to seashore development. Owners of improved property may retain the right of occupancy for noncommercial purposes until their death. May 8, 9, and 22, 1963, subcommittee hearings. November 27, 1963, reported to the Senate with amendments.

S. 1175, ANDERSON: Revises the boundaries of the Carlsbad Caverns National Park in the State of New Mexico to make a net reduction of 1,815.57 acres. The bill is also aimed at permitting the exchange of lands with the State of New Mexico and private individuals, and at facilitating the administration and protection of the area. August 28, 1963, passed the Senate. December 7, 1963, passed the House. December 30, 1963, approved. Public Law 88-249.

S. 1185, MORSE: Arranges for the transfer of 80 acres used and owned by the University of Oregon for agricultural experimentation as stipulated when the land was patented to the State, to the C. & B. Livestock Co., Inc., in the Hermiston area. Equal value lands or compensation shall be paid to the State, which lands are to be used for the same purposes, and the administrative costs are to be sustained by the State and the livestock company. June 19, 1963, passed the Senate with committee amendment. October 17, 1963, approved. Public Law 88-125.

S. 1243: Changes the name of the Andrew Johnson National Monument to the Andrew Johnson National Historic Site, and adds certain property thereto, i.e., the home of Andrew Johnson. Introduced by Senator Kefauver on April 1, 1963. September 25, 1963, subcommittee hearing. October 21, 1963, passed the Senate amended. December 2, 1963, passed the House, amended to strike all after the enacting clause and to insert the language of H.R. 5345. December 11, 1963, approved. Public Law 88-197.

S. 1364: Removes for and on behalf of the State of Montana a cloud on the title of a certain island in the Yellowstone River. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to quitclaim to the State of Montana without consideration any right of the United States to such land. Introduced by Senators METCALF and MANSFIELD on April 25, 1963. December 11, 1963, subcommittee hearing.

S. 1365: To establish the Fire Island National Seashore. The purpose is to preserve certain unspoiled shoreline areas. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to designate and acquire not more than 7,500 acres of land on the Great South Beach, in Islip and Brookhaven, Suffolk County, N.Y. No plan for visitor convenience is to be undertaken, if it is incompatible with the preservation of the area's natural beauty. The Secretary will administer and develop the area, and $50,000 is authorized for necessary studies. Introduced by Senators KEATING and JAVITS on April 25, 1963. August 6, 1964, passed the Senate. August 20, 1964, passed House, amended. Public Law 88-587.

S. 1374: Amends the act providing for the admission of Alaska into the Union with respect to the selection of public lands for the development and expansion of communities. Introduced by Senators BARTLETT and GRUENING on April 25, 1963. July 12, 1963, subcommittee hearing. August 22, 1963, indefinitely postponed. H.R. 6118 reported to full committee with amendment.

S. 1477: Directs the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain lands in Arizona to the Kaibab Lumber Co. Payment of the fair market value is required, and the United States reserves all mineral rights, including oil and gas. Introduced by Senator HAYDEN on May 8, 1963. January 22, 1964, subcommittee hearing. May 26, 1964, subcommittee, executive, and ordered reported to full committee, amended. House bill H.R. 5514 enacted Public Law 88–252.

S. 1481: Provides for the establishment of the Agate Fossil Beds National Monument in the State of Nebraska. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to acquire not more than 3,150 acres of land in township 28, north, Sioux County, Nebr. He may within acreage limitations designate and modify the monument's boundaries. The area is quite important because of the outstanding paleontological finds made there and because of the valuable collection of Indian artifacts and relics. Introduced by Senators HRUSKA, CURTIS, SIMPSON, ALLOTT, DOMINICK, MCGEE, and MUNDT on May 8, 1963. August 3, 1964, passed the Senate, amended.

S. 1598: Amends section 8 of the Taylor Grazing Act. It now provides that the Secretary of the Interior may accept a gift of land and may exchange for privately owned lands, when such gift or exchange will in his opinion be in the public interest. Such acquired lands will become public lands. Either party to an exchange may reserve minerals, easements, and other rights. Introduced by Senator BIBLE on May 27, 1963. August 6, 1963, subcommittee hearing.

S. 1870: Provides for the establishment of Valle Grande National Park in New Mexico. The Secretary of the Interior may acquire land and improvements in the State of New Mexico, Baca location No. 1, and administer said area as the Bandelier National Monument. Funds necessary for execution of the act are hereby authorized. Introduced by Senators ANDERSON and MECHEM on July 15, 1963. May 29, 1964, subcommittee hearing.

S. 1878: The purpose of the bill is to give Alaska an additional 5 years from January 3, 1964, in which to select lands under Federal mineral lease. The need arises from the fact that the Alaska selection program has suffered from a series of unforeseen delays. The result has been that only about 1 million out of the 103 million acres granted to Alaska have been patented to Alaska so far. Alaska needs these lands to carry out its State responsibilities. Therefore, S. 1878 amends the act providing for the admission of Alaska into the Union by extending the time for the filing of applications for the selection of certain lands. Introduced by Senators BARTLETT and GRUENING. November 27, 1963, passed the Senate. March 25, 1964, approved. Public Law 88–289.

S. 1909: Amends the joint resolution establishing the Battle of New Orleans Sesquicentennial Celebration Commission to authorize an appropriation to enable the Commission to carry out its functions under such joint resolution. But the authorized sums shall not exceed $25,000. Introduced by Senators LONG and ELLENDER on July 18, 1963. September 25, 1963, subcommittee hearing. July 29, 1964, full committee, executive, and ordered reported without amendment. August 3, 1964, passed the Senate.

S. 2048: To establish the Big Horn Canyon National Recreation Area. The bill sets aside approximately 63,300 acres along the Bighorn River above Yellowtail Dam as a unit of the national park system. The acreage is located in south-central Montana and north-central Wyoming. The committee amendments adopted by the Senate provide that "the Crow Indian Tribe shall have the exclusive right to develop and operate * * * water-based recreational facilities, * * * along that part of the shoreline of Yellowtail Reservoir which is adjacent to lands comprising the Crow Indian Reservation." They further explain that the term "shoreline" means that land owned by the Bureau of Reclamation which borders both Yellowtail Reservoir and the exterior boundary of the Crow Indian Reservation, together with that part of the reservoir necessary to the development of such facilities. This recreation area is needed to serve the water-oriented recreation needs of people from the Rocky Mountain region and the Great Plains, and it is notable for its scenery and sites of historical significance. Introduced by Senators METCALF, MCGEE, MANSFIELD, and SIMPSON on August 15, 1963. July 29, 1964, full committee, executive. September 5, 1964, passed the Senate with committee amendments.

S. 2082: Authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to accept a transfer of lands within the Everglades National Park, Dade County, Fla., for administration as part of said park. The transfer concerns approximately 4,420 acres of land and will be made to the Secretary by the Administrator of the Farmers Home Administration, Department of Agriculture. The FHA has been agreeable to such a transfer but has lacked the necessary statutory authority. The committee amendment to the bill limits the authorization for transfer of funds to $452,000. Introduced by Senator HOLLAND on August 26, 1963. June 25, 1964, passed the Senate, amended. Public Law 88–588.

S. 2122: To provide additional time to certain homestead entrymen in Arizona to establish permanent residence. The act provides that certain homestead entries in Arizona "will not be considered invalid for failure of the entrymen to establish residence, if the entrymen establish actual permanent residence upon said land within 1 year and after the approval this act." Introduced by Senator CANNON on September 6, 1963. July 6, 1964, subcommittee hearing.

S. 2128, JACKSON: The Secretary is authorized to establish the Assateague Island National Seashore in the States of Maryland and Virginia and to administer the Seashore "for general purposes of public outdoor recreation, including conservation of natural features. * * *" The seashore is to include an area within Assateague Island and the small marsh islands adjacent to it, in addition to water areas: "not more than one-half mile beyond the mean high waterline of the land portions. * * *" Within the Seashore's boundaries the Secretary is authorized to acquire lands, waters, and other property by donation, purchase, exchange, or in other ways compatible with the interest. Owners of improved property acquired by the Secretary "may reserve for themselves and their successors * * * a right of use and occupancy of the improved property for noncommercial residential purposes" for a term of not more than 25 years. The State of Maryland will have the right to acquire from the United States land on the island north of the State park area, if such land is needed for the park. August 11, 1964, subcommittee hearing. No further action this Congress.

S. 2134: The bill directs that the trustee of Saxman, Alaska, under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, shall convey to said city all right held by him to lands within the city which are unoccupied and not held in trust for an Indian or Eskimo. Introduced by Senators BARTLETT and GRUENING on September 10, 1963. July 23, 1964, subcommittee hearing and ordered H.R. 8523 reported to the Senate, without amendment, in lieu of S. 2134. Public Law 88–429.

S. 2183: To terminate a restriction on use with respect to certain land previously conveyed to Fairbanks, Alaska, and to convey to such city the mineral rights in such land. Introduced by Senator BARTLETT on September 26, 1963. June 23, 1964, subcommittee hearing and ordered reported to full committee without amendment. June 29, 1964, no further action necessary. Full committee ordered H.R. 8654 reported to the Senate without amendment. Public Law 88–409.

S. 2249: To provide for the establishment of the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to establish and administer the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore, which is to include approximately 11,732 acres in Porter and LaPorte Counties, Ind., including the 2,181 acre Indiana Dunes State Park. The area is notable for its picturesque, tree-covered dunes, cattail marshes, and sandy beaches. The Secretary is authorized to acquire lands within the proposed boundaries, but his authority to acquire property by condemnation is suspended with regard to improved property. He is to issue regulations giving standards for approval by him of zoning ordinances—standards aimed at preventing commercial corruption of the beautiful area. Owners of improved property will be allowed continued occupancy of if for noncommercial purposes for 25 years. But the Secretary may terminate such right at any time, if an occupant violated the Secretary's regulatory standards. An Indiana Dunes Advisory Commission is provided for, with a life-span of 10 years. The Secretary will appoint its members. Introduced by Senators JACKSON, DOUGLAS, HARTKE, BAYH, et al. March 5, 6, and 7, 1964, subcommittee hearings. Passed the Senate, September 29, 1964.

S. 3015, HAYDEN: The bill authorizes and directs the Secretary of the Interior, subject to the conditions described below, to convey without monetary considerations to the Pascua Yaqui Association, Inc., all right, title, and interest of the United States in approximately 202.76 acres of land. The Pasqua Yaqui Association shall use this property "only in accordance with its corporate purposes set out in its original articles of incorporation" and shall hold title to such property for the common benefit of all the association's members. The land is needed by the Yaqui community because of insurmountable problems resulting from urban encroachment. Companion measure H.R. 6233 substituted for S. 3015. Passed the Senate September 24, 1964. Became Private Law 88–350.

S. 2841, NELSON: To authorize the Secretary of the Interior to cooperate with the State of Wisconsin in the designation and administration of the Ice Age National Scientific Reserve in the State of Wisconsin, and for other purposes. H.R. 1096 passed in lieu and became Public Law 88–655.

S. 2326, CHURCH and JORDAN of Idaho: The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to establish and administer the Nez Perce Historical Park in Idaho, after he has made suitable land acquisitions. The Secretary may designate as the Nez Perce National Historic Park "various component sites in Federal and non-Federal ownership relating to the early Nez Perce, culture, the Lewis and Clark expedition, the Nez Perce War of 1877, and such other sites" as will depict the role of this country in America's westward expansion. He may acquire lands by donation or with donated funds and he may purchase 1,500 acres of land or less to accomplish the purposes of the act. He may designate not to exceed 1,500 acres of Indian trust lands for the site and may enter into cooperative agreements with property owners and with the State of Idaho. August 18, 1964, subcommittee hearing. Field hearing at Lewiston, Idaho, on October 9, 1964.

S. 2682, CASE, PASTORE, PELL, and WILLIAMS: The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to acquire by purchase, donation, or otherwise, not in excess of 281 acres of land necessary for the "proper administration and interpretation" of the Morristown National Historic Park in the State of New Jersey. The lands to be acquired are historically associated with the winter encampment of George Washington's Continental Army in 1779–80; $281,000 is authorized to be appropriated for such acquisition. H.R. 3396, companion measure passed Senate on September 8, 1964. Public Law 88–601.

S. 3116, MILLER: To establish the Lewis and Clark Trail Commission and for other purposes. H. R. 12289 was placed directly on Senate Calendar on September 24, 1964, and passed the Senate the same day. Became Public Law 88–630.

S. 2275: To revise the procedures established by the Hawaii Statehood Act, Public Law 86–3, for the conveyance of certain lands to Hawaii. The bill provides that whenever, after August 21, 1964, Federal lands which were ceded to or set aside for the United States by Hawaii are determined to be surplus property by the Administrator of General Services, they shall be conveyed to Hawaii by said Administrator. No monetary consideration is to be involved. The need for the bill arises because without its enactment Hawaii would lose its residual interest in such lands. Introduced by Senators INOUYE and FONG on December 31, 1963. November 12 and 13, 1963, subcommittee hearing. December 4, 1963, passed the Senate. December 16, 1963, passed the House. December 23, 1963, approved. Public Law 88–233.

S. 2419: Authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to condemn certain property in the city of St. Augustine, Fla., within the boundary of Castillo de San Marcos National Monument. The bill authorizes funds to be appropriated. Introduced by Senators HOLLAND and SMATHERS on January 10, 1964. June 22, 1964, subcommittee hearing. July 29, 1964, full committee, executive. August 3, 1964, passed the Senate. August 17, 1964, passed the House. Public Law 88–495.

S. 2984: Authorizes an exchange of lands between the Secretary of the Interior and the Atomic Energy Commission. Approximately 10,000 acres of public lands now withdrawn and reserved for the Hanford project will be transferred to the AEC's jurisdiction, and approximately 7,000 acres of project lands previously acquired from non-Federal ownership will become public domain lands. Introduced by Senators JACKSON and MAGNUSON on July 8, 1964. August 11, 1964, favorably reported by the subcommittee. August 17, 1964, executive session, ordered reported to the Senate. Reported by Senator JACKSON, with amendments. House passed H.R. 11960, which was placed on the Senate Calendar. August 18, 1964, S. 2984 passed the Senate. August 19, 1964, Senate rescinded its action of August 18, 1964, and passed H.R. 11960 in lieu of S. 2984.

Senate joint resolutions referred to Public Lands Subcommittee

Senate Joint Resolution 33, ANDERSON: To grant consent for an extension of 4 years of the Interstate Compact to Conserve Oil and Gas. Specifically, the resolution gives the consent of Congress for an extension of 4 years, from September 1, 1963, to September 1, 1967, of the Interstate Compact, which was originally signed in Dallas, Tex., on February 16, 1935. Thirty States, accounting for an overwhelming proportion of oil production are signees. Passed Senate August 19, 1963. Became Public Law 88–115.

Senate concurrent resolutions referred to the Public Lands Subcommittee

Senate Concurrent Resolution 13: To identify and mark the Lewis-Clark Trail from St. Louis to the Pacific Northwest. The resolution states that it is the sense of Congress that the route of the Lewis-Clark Expedition of 1804–06 should be identified and marked. All agencies of the United States administering lands along the route should act together in the preservation and marking of the trail. All State and private agencies are invited to assist and cooperate. Introduced by Senator MILLER on January 28, 1963. August 2, 1963, subcommittee hearing. August 22, 1963, indefinitely postponed. House Concurrent Resolution 61 reported to full committee.

Senate Concurrent Resolution 40: To express the sense of Congress in respect to the Lewis and Clark Trail from St. Louis, Mo., to the Pacific Northwest. The resolution is identical to House Concurrent Resolution 13, except that all States are not invited in No. 40 to assure public access to the route of the expedition. Introduced by Senator BURDICK on May 9, 1963. August 2, 1963, subcommittee hearing. August 22, 1963, indefinitely postponed. House Concurrent Resolution 61 reported to full committee.

Senate Concurrent Resolution 44: Similar to Nos. 13 and 40, except that the U.S. Territorial Expansion Memorial Commission is specifically authorized to cooperate in the project. Introduced by Senator BURDICK on May 16, 1963. August 2, 1963, subcommittee hearing. August 22, 1963, indefinitely postponed. House Concurrent Resolution 61 reported to the full committee.

House bills referred to Public Lands Subcommittee

H.R. 277: To extend for 5 years the time for the Nevada-Colorado River Commission to submit its plan for development of certain areas of public land previously authorized for purchase, and to extend for 10 years the time limit to make this purchase, by amending the act of April 22, 1960. March 18, 1963, passed the House. April 11, 1963, passed the Senate. April 26, 1963, enacted. Public Law 88–15.

H.R. 976: To authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire and add certain lands to the Salem Maritime National Historic Site in Massachusetts. Specifically, the bill provides for the acquisition by the Secretary of the 17th century Narbomne House in Salem, Mass., and for its administration as part of the Salem Maritime National Historic Site. This house is historically significant, being one of the three houses in Salem known to have been built before 1675. July 8, 1963, passed the House. October 8, 1963, subcommittee hearing and reported to full committee with recommendations. November 21, 1963, additional hearing by subcommittee. November 27, 1963, passed the Senate. December 12, 1963, approved. Public Law 88–199.

H.R. 988: To authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire the Graff House site for inclusion in Independence National Historical Park. The site's historical significance arises from the fact that Thomas Jefferson wrote the Declaration of Independence in the Graff House. December 2, 1963, passed the House. August 1, 1964, passed the Senate, amended. August 21, 1964, approved. Public Law 88–477.

H.R. 439: Provides that the Secretary of the Interior may acquire certain lands in Martinez, Calif., and establish the John Muir National Historic Site thereon. The estimated costs involved are as follows: (1) Cost of acquisition, $169,000; (2) cost of restoration and improvements, $128,000. The authorization for these purposes is $300,000. August 3, 1964, passed the House. August 11, 1964, heard and favorably reported to the full committee. August 17, 1964, executive session. Ordered reported to the Senate, August 19, 1964, passed the Senate. Public Law 88–547.

H.R. 1087: Clears title for certain owners in Heyburn, Idaho, where the United States may have some claim to the streets, even though the plots have all been patented. Releases any right, title, or interest of the United States and repeals the reverter clause that required the land's use for public purposes. April 1, 1963, passed House. April 11, 1963, passed Senate. April 26, 1963, enacted. Public Law 88–14.

H.R. 1544: To authorize suit against the United States by the Forman's of Maricopa County, Ariz., in order to quiet title to nine acres disputed as to claim by the Salt River Federal reclamation project and Mr. Forman. Both purchased the same area in good faith due to a confusion about the rights acquired from the Grand Canal Co. April 2, 1963, passed House. April 11, 1963, passed Senate. April 26, 1963, enacted. Private Law 88–1.

H.R. 1892: The bill provides for the repeal of the act of October 22, 1919 (41 Stat. 293; 43 U.S.C. 351–355, 357–360). [The Pittman Act.] The Pittman Act authorized grants of certain public lands in Nevada. The act has failed to serve its purpose of encouraging the reclamation of lands, as only three economic farm units have been developed in the last 40 years. March 18, 1963, passed House. June 23, 1964, hearing by subcommittee and ordered reported to full committee without amendment. July 29, 1964, full committee, executive. August 1, 1964, passed the Senate. August 11, 1964, enacted. Public Law 88–417.

H.R. 2291: To reinstate the homestead claim of L. S. Cass, waiving the time requirements, because his entry was accepted on land that was actually unavailable at the time and so was then canceled. But the land (on which he had made improvements) again became available, and so he is to be given first chance to develop it, fulfilling the requirements within a reasonable time. April 2, 1963, passed House. April 11, 1963, passed Senate. April 26, 1963, enacted. Private Law 88–2.

H.R. 2294: To authorize the sale of land in Alaska to Mrs. Beltz, subject to the retention of mineral rights by the United States and subject to outstanding gravel permits and rights-of-way, and payment of the standard fees. Her husband's death had prevented them from fulfilling the residence requirements. The survey shall be without cost to Mrs. Beltz. April 2, 1963, passed House. April 11, 1963, passed Senate. April 26, 1963, enacted. Private Law 88–3.

H.R. 2461: Provides for the sale of lands in Henderson Nev., to the city for fair market value. These public lands of 15,000 acres will help the orderly growth of the city. Legislation is needed because the public land sale law does not permit sales of this size. In setting the fair value, the Secretary shall use the effective date of this act. June 6, 1963, passed House. July 11, 1963, passed Senate. July 22, 1963, enacted. Public Law 88–73.

H.R. 2942: Directs the Secretary of the Interior to adjudicate a claim to certain land in Marengo County, Ala. Specifically, the claim is that of Mr. B. A. Cogle to 234.90 acres of public lands. Need for the bill arises from the fact that the Color of Title Act limits conveyances to any one claimant to 160 acres. Thus Mr. Cogle cannot apply for title to the 234.90 acres since he already holds 160 acres. Enactment of the bill would allow the Secretary to adjudicate the claim notwithstanding the acreage limitation. July 9, 1963, passed House. July 22, 1963, subcommittee hearing. July 23, 1963, further report requested from Interior.

H.R. 3574: Authorized the Air Force to extend the withdrawal and reservation it has had since 1956 at Cuddeback Lake Range in California for 10 years with the designated further extension of another 5 years before it would have to come up for another legislative review for the purpose of gunnery practice. April 22, 1963, passed House. June 19, 1963, passed Senate. June 21, 1963, enacted. Public Law 88–46.

H.R. 3887: Authorized the Secretary of the Interior to accept 525 acres of land from the State of North Carolina for a scenic entrance to the Park's Cataloochee area. Need arises from the fact that although 5 million people visit the park each year, lack of an adequate entrance road prevents this park from being accessible to most of the visiting public. May 6, 1963, passed House. August 2, 1963, subcommittee hearing. August 28, 1963, passed Senate. September 9, 1963, approved. Public Law 88-120. (Note: See Nos. 21 and 22 for H.R. 4152 and H.R. 4588. See No. 25 for H.R. 4149 and No. 29 for H.R. 4018.)

H.R. 5159: Authorizes and directs that certain lands exclusively administered by the Secretary of the Interior be classified in order to provide for their disposal or interim management under principles of multiple use and to produce a sustained yield of products and services. The Secretary is to develop and promulgate regulations containing criteria by which he will determine which lands shall be disposed of and which shall be retained for multiple use in Federal ownership, under the control of the Bureau of Land Management. If the lands so classified are in tracts in excess of 2,860 acres, the Secretary must give public notice at least 60 days before taking the proposed action, i.e., before selling the lands.

The need for H.R. 5159 arises because no previous act sets forth any range management objectives or guidelines for public land administration. April 6, 1964, passed the House. June 29, 1964, subcommittee hearing. July 29, 1964, full committee executive and ordered reported to the Senate amended. Passed as amended on August 21, 1964. Public Law 88-607.

H.R. 5222: Provides for the withdrawal and reservation for the Department of the Navy of certain public lands of the United States at Chorolate Mountain Gunnery Range, Imperial County, Calif., for defense purposes. 132,572 acres will be withdrawn. June 6, 1963, passed House. July 22, 1963, subcommittee hearing. August 28, 1963, passed Senate. September 6, 1963, approved. Public Law 88-119.

H.R. 5302: To direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands in the Newton area, Calif., to Clarence J. Wilder. The lands are near Placerville, Calif., and contain approximately 3 acres. Conveyance will be made upon payment of the fair market value of the land. December 17, 1963, passed House. June 23, 1964, subcommittee hearing and ordered reported to full committee, without amendment. July 29, 1964, full committee, executive, and ordered reported to Senate, without amendment. August 1, 1964, passed the Senate. August 13, 1964, enacted. Private Law 88-281.

H.R. 5498: Provides temporary authority for the sale of certain public lands. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to dispose of public lands which he has classified for disposal under H.R. 5159. Testimony has shown that such lands are required for the growth of communities or that they are valuable for "residential, commercial, industrial, or public uses." Ninety-day notice must be given to the local governing body before sale. Only lands classified for disposal under regularized procedures may be sold. April 6, 1964, passed House. Passed Senate (amended). June 29, 1964, subcommittee hearing. July 31, 1964, full committee, executive, and ordered reported to Senate, without amendment. August 17, 1964, full committee reconsidered action of July 31, amended the bill and again ordered it reported to the Senate. August 21, 1964, passed the Senate, amended. Public Law 88-608.

H.R. 5514: Directs the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain public lands in the State of Arizona, namely 160 acres of public lands to the Kaibab Lumber Co. The company cannot obtain financing for the development of its facilities unless it has title to the land, which is not required for any Federal program. The company is willing to pay fair market value, but the Secretary has no authority to sell it. March 17, 1964, passed House. June 25, 1964, passed Senate. July 7, 1964, approved. Private Law 88-252.

H.R. 6118: Amends the act providing for the admission of the State of Alaska into the Union. Alaska may now exercise its right of selection of Federal lands for community expansion purposes in tracts of not less than 160 acres, rather than the 5,760-acre limitation of the Statehood Act. The need for this change arises from the fact that 5,760-acre blocks are in many cases unnecessary for community expansion purposes, and may prove unsound utilization of public lands. The 160 acres is considered a reasonable minimum. October 8, 1963, approved. Public Law 88-135.

H.R. 6218: The bill extends by no more than 3 years the time within which desert-land entry holders in the lower Palo Verde Mesa, Riverside, Calif., may complete the reclamation and cultivation of their entries. If the entryman can show adequate financing, he may have up to 3 additional years of further extension. The need arises from the fact that financing has been unavailable for these entrymen. July 8, 1963, passed House. July 22, 1963, hearing by subcommittee. Reported to the Senate September 29, 1964. Passed Senate September 30, 1964. Became Public Law 88-645.

H.R. 6756: Revised the boundaries of Mesa Verde National Park, Colo. October 7, 1963, passed the House. November 27, 1963, subcommittee hearing. December 16, 1963, passed Senate. December 23, 1963, approved. Public Law 88-325.

H.R. 8070: For the establishment of a Public Land Law Review Commission to study existing laws and procedures relating to the administration of the public lands of the United States. The purpose is to permit a comprehensive review of the policies applicable to the use, management, and disposition of the public domain lands of the United States. The need for the Commission has arisen because (1) the public land laws of the United States have developed over a long period of years through acts of Congress not fully correlated with each other; (2) those laws may be inadequate to meet the present and future needs of the American people; and (3) administration of the public lands and the laws relating thereto has been divided among several Federal agencies. March 10, 1964, passed House. June 29, 1964, hearing by subcommittee. July 31, 1964, full committee, executive, and ordered reported to Senate with amendments. August 15, 1964, reported to the Senate by Mr. BIBLE with amendments. Passed Senate September 3, 1964. Became Public Law 88-606.

H.R. 4152: Authorized the Secretary of the Interior to accept a donation of 6 acres of land in Houghton, Mich., for use as part of the administrative headquarters site of the Isle Royale National Park. There is a definite need for housing accommodations for seven employees and their families. May 6, 1963, passed House. September 11, 1963, subcommittee hearing. No further action.

H.R. 4588: Provides for the withdrawal and reservation for the Department of the Navy of certain public lands at Mojave B Aerial Gunnery Range, San Bernardino County, Calif., for defense purposes. The withdrawal entails 306,555 acres of land. May 6, 1963, passed the House. July 22, 1963, subcommittee hearing. October 21, 1963, passed the Senate. October 29, 1963, approved. Public Law 88-161.

H.R. 7096: Authorizes the exchange of two pieces of property in Philadelphia, one piece of 15,700 square feet under the National Park Service, and another of 9,300 square feet under the Philadelphia Redevelopment Authority. The Park Service property is used for administrative purposes in the Independence National Historical Park, but is "inadequate and poorly located for these purposes." The PRA's land has two substantial buildings on it and would suit the Park Service's needs much better. The lands are of approximately equal value. May 18, 1964, passed the House. August 18, 1964, subcommittee hearing. September 8, 1964, passed the Senate. Public Law 88-604.

H.R. 2753: To disclaim any title of the United States to certain real property in Modoc County, Calif. May 7, 1963, passed the House. September 24, 1964, passed the Senate. Became Public Law 88--626.

H.R. 8523: Authorizes the trustee of the city of Saxman, Alaska, under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, to sell the 328 acres of land within Saxman that are unoccupied and not held in trust for an Indian or Eskimo under existing law. The bill is necessary for the development of the State of Alaska and its transition to full statehood, and the Interior Department has maintained that the townsite trustee does not have such authority to sell this land otherwise. April 6, 1964, passed the House. July 31, 1964, reported to Senate, without amendment. August 1, 1964, passed the Senate. Public Law 88-429.

H.R. 8654: The bill "will release the mineral reservation retained by the United States in 1.2 acres of land previously conveyed to the city of Fairbanks, Alaska," and "remove the restriction that prohibits the use of the land for other than school purposes." The Geological Survey of the Interior Department reports that the land is not valuable for mineral development, but the mineral reservation blocks financing for a residential development under urban renewal. April 6, 1964, passed House. August 1, 1964, passed the Senate. August 10, 1964, enacted. Public Law 88-409.

H.R. 4149: The bill "provides procedures to assure that scrip holders will have a reasonable selection of public lands from which to choose in satisfying rights they hold." It also provides that a cash settlement will be effected, "if these rights are not exercised by January 1, 1970, or in the case of soldiers additional homestead claims, by January 1, 1975." All scrip will be retired under this legislation by January 1, 1975. April 6, 1964, passed the House. August 11, 1964, subcommittee hearing and favorably reported. August 17, 1964, executive session and ordered reported to the Senate. Passed Senate August 18, 1964. Public Law 88-543.

H.R. 3071, companion bill of S. 117: The bill provides for the establishment of Fort Larned as a national historic site in Pawnee County, Kans. August 3, 1964, passed House. June 22, 1964, subcommittee hearings. August 17, 1964, executive session, ordered reported to the Senate. Passed Senate August 18, 1964. Public Law 88-541.

H.R. 8135: Provides for the establishment and administration of public recreational facilities at the Sanford Reservoir area, Canadian River project, Texas. The bill authorizes an appropriation of $1,100,000 for recreational purposes. Need for the bill arises from the fact that, although the 1950 Sanford Reservoir Act included recreation as a project purpose, there is no authority for making the cost nonreimbursable. The Secretary of the Interior will develop a recreation plan for the reservoir, and will construct and operate basic public outdoor recreational facilities. August 11, 1964, subcommittee hearing and ordered reported to full committee. August 17, 1964, reported to the Senate by Mr. JACKSON, without amendment. August 18, 1964, passed the Senate. Public Law 88-536.

H.R. 931: The bill authorized the Secretary of the Interior to establish the Allegheny Portage Railroad National Historic Site in Blair and Cambria Counties and the Johnstown Flood National Memorial in Cambria County, Pa., and to maintain them as units of the national park system. The railroad, built in 1831-34, used inclined planes to overcome a 1,400-foot rise between Hollidaysburg and Blair's Gap and played an "important role in the development of the trans-Appalachian region. August 3, 1964, passed the House. August 11, 1964, subcommittee hearing. August 17, 1964, executive session; ordered reported to the Senate.

Significant facts: (1) The Secretary is authorized to acquire up to 950 acres of land; (2) cost of acquisition and development, $2 million; (3) annual operating costs, approximately $75,000. Public Law 88–546.

H.R. 4018: Authorized the Secretary of the Interior to acquire without cost the home of Augustus Saint-Gaudens at Cornish, N.H., and other buildings and lands associated with it. He is authorized to establish said area as the Saint-Gaudens National Historic Site. The bill further provides for the acceptance of a gift of $100,000 or more which the present owners of the property expect to donate. Augustus Saint-Gaudens was "one of the most important figures in American cultural history and one of the great sculptors of his day. August 3, 1964, passed the House. August 11, 1964, subcommittee hearing. August 17, 1964, executive session and reported to the Senate August 17, 1964. Public Law 88–543.

House joint resolutions referred to Public Lands Subcommittee

(1) House Joint Resolution 180: Authorizes the continued use of certain lands within the Sequoia National Park by portions of an existing hydroelectric project. The resolution is needed to extend a permit held since 1912 by Southern California Edison Co., for a hydroelectric plant within Sequoia National Park. The waters are diverted and used in the Kaweah No. 3 powerhouse and returned to the river, all this taking place within the park. It would be extended only till 1974, August, to allow the extensive review desirable after the long run of the previous 4-year lease. April 22, 1963, passed House. June 19, 1963, passed Senate. June 21, 1963, enacted. Public Law 88–47.

House concurrent resolutions referred to Public Lands Subcommittee

(1) House Concurrent Resolution 61: Expresses the sense of Congress with respect to the Lewis and Clark trail from St. Louis, Mo., to the Pacific Northwest. The purpose is to promote the enjoyment of the Lewis and Clark trail of 1804–06 with accessibility, clear marking, and protection through the Government agencies that have jurisdiction over any portion of the trail and by encouraging the private interests to care for the route where it crosses their land or State or local government lands. May 20, 1963, passed the House. August 2, 1963, subcommittee hearing. August 28, 1963, passed Senate.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION, FRANK E. MOSS, CHAIRMAN

The Irrigation and Reclamation Subcommittee considered and acted upon many measures providing for the construction and development of much needed water resources projects. A number of specific projects in several States were authorized as a result of our committee's deliberations. As the 88th Congress came to a close, there were important projects reported by our committee, but on which final congressional action had not been taken. Our committee will begin immediate consideration of these proposals in the 89th Congress.

The measures which were before the subcommittee follow:

S. 26, Mr. Moss: Authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Dixie project, Utah. The Dixie project would be a multipurpose development in the Virgin River Basin in Washington County in southwestern Utah. It would provide for supplemental irrigation water to 9,445 acres of developed land and for a full irrigation supply to 11,615 acres of presently dry land. It would also provide for the production of electric energy, furnish municipal water supplies, etc. Introduced by Senator Moss. October 30, 1963, passed the Senate, amended. Public Law 88–565.

S. 46, Mr. ANDERSON: Provides that the cost of certain investigations by the Bureau of Reclamation shall be nonreimbursable. Specifically, the investigations are preauthorization studies of potential reclamation projects for the Secretary of the Interior. Passed the Senate, amended on August 28, 1963.

S. 178: Authorizes the construction of the Garrison diversion unit, Missouri River Basin project, North Dakota, by the Secretary of the Interior. The bill is deemed of great importance to North Dakota and the Missouri River Basin. Introduced by Senators BURDICK, YOUNG, and MCGOVERN. February 18, 1964, passed Senate, amended. Approved by House Interior Committee. Died in House Rules Committee.

S. 283: Amends the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956. The bill is designed to (1) increase the present authorization ceiling from $100 to $200 million; (2) provide that where an interest charge is required on any portion of the proposed works, it would be in conformity with the 1958 Water Supply Act; (3) permit the Secretary of the Interior to advance up to half the funds needed for planning a project. There exists an urgent need that this program be extended to accommodate applications and to make Public Law 984 more effective. Introduced by Senators Moss et al. Passed Senate amended, October 17, 1963. No action by House committee.

S. 351: To authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Auburn-Folsom south unit, American River division, Central Valley project, California, under Federal reclamation laws. The purpose is to increase the supply of water available for irrigation and other beneficial uses in the Central Valley. The principal works in the unit will be three dams, including the Auburn Dam, the Auburn Reservoir, a hydropowerplant, canals, and diversion works. Introduced by Senators Engle and KUCHEL. Reported to Senate with amendments, July 31, 1964.

S. 388: Authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the mid-State reclamation project, Nebraska. The purpose is to include the Nebraska mid-State unit in the Missouri River project so that the two may be integrated, physically and financially. An assured water supply to the Platte River Valley is seen as essential to the economy and growth of the area. This project would provide a regulated gravity and well combination water supply for 140,000 acres of land, as well as producing flood control, recreation, and fish and wildlife benefits. Introduced by Senators HRUSKA and CURTIS. Passed the Senate, amended, June 29, 1964.

S. 502: To preserve the jurisdiction of the Congress over construction of hydroelectric projects on the Colorado River below Glen Canyon Dam. The purpose would be achieved by preventing the FPC from issuing licenses or permits for the construction of power facilities on the Colorado River between Lake Mead and Glen Canyon until December 31, 1964. The Committee feels that it is essential that Congress not be deprived of full freedom of action in this area. Introduced by Senators Hayden, Bible, Engle, Cannon, Anderson, and Moss. Public Law 88–491.

S. 614: The bill provides that the Secretary of the Interior may make 50,000 acre-feet of water available for the initial filling of a permanent pool in the Cochiti Reservoir, N. Mex., and such water to come from the San Juan-Chama unit of the Colorado River storage project. After the pool has been filled, the Secretary may divert 5,000 acre-feet annually into the reservoir to offset evaporation and to make the reservoir useful for fish and wildlife and recreational purposes. The House committee found an urgent need in the area for additional fish and wildlife and recreational facilities. Introduced by Senators ANDERSON and MECHEM. Passed the Senate, June 19, 1963. Passed the House, amended, March 16, 1964. Approved, Public Law 88–293, March 28, 1964.

S. 638: Authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to modify the repayment contract with the Grand Valley Water Users Association by deducting from such obligation the unaccrued construction charges in the amount of $109,158.19 and by crediting to the organization's next annual installment $4,531.93. Introduced by Senators ALLOTT and DOMINICK.

S. 770: Provides for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Savery-Pot Hook Federal reclamation project, Colorado-Wyoming, the Bostwick Park Federal reclamation project, Colorado, and the Fruitland Mesa Federal reclamation project, Colorado, as participating projects under the Colorado River Storage Project Act. Said act is amended to include these three projects, and the amount authorized in the act to be appropriated is increased by $46,795,000 for construction costs. The projects are to be constructed and operated according to the engineering plans set out in the reports of the Secretary of the Interior to the 87th and 88th Congresses. Introduced by Senators SIMPSON and ALLOTT. Ordered reported to the Senate (H.R. 3672) August 17, 1964. Public Law 88–568.

S. 793: Establishes the conservation interests as the most important use of the Tule Lake-Klamath water areas. These national wildlife refuges serve as the center section of the international flyway, and the maintenance of the water levels must remain at a certain high level for the health of the birds. But any water which can be spared shall be used by the agriculturists. An additional 6,891 acres of public land shall be added to the areas. Introduced by Senators Kuchel, Robertson, Engle, Jackson, et al. Passed the House, amended, April 20, 1964. Senate disagrees with House amendments. Conferees appointed, May 7, 1964. Public Law 88–567.

S. 851: The Secretary of the Interior is allowed to market the power from Amistad Dam on the Rio Grande in coordination with the present system for the better use of all the power. He may dispose of the power and may cause to be constructed the integrating transmission lines, with the sister project, Falcon Dam. Introduced by Senator ANDERSON, November 27, 1963. Senate acted on H.R. 4062, companion bill. S. 851 indefinitely postponed.

S. 982: Permits the Secretary of the Interior to continue to deliver water to lands in the third division, Riverton reclamation project, Wyoming. Introduced by Senators MCGEE and SIMPSON on March 4, 1963. House passed H.R. 4423, April 1, 1963. Public Law 88–10. (S. 982 laid aside in favor of H.R. 4423.)

S. 1111: Provides for the optimum development of the Nation's natural resources through the coordinated planning of water and related land resources, by means of the establishment of a water resources council and river basin commissions, and by providing financial assistance to the States in order to increase State participation in such planning. The Council will conduct studies on the adequacy of the Nation's water supplies, on the relation of regional or river basin plans and programs to the requirements of larger regions of the Nation, and on the adequacy of existing and proposed policies and programs. Introduced by Senator ANDERSON, et al. December 4, 1963, passed the Senate. September 12, 1964, reported to the House, amended. Died in House Rules Committee.

S. 1123: Provides for the construction of the Lower Teton division of the Teton Basin Federal reclamation project, Idaho. The project will consist of Fremont Dam, reservoir, and powerplant; of a conveyance system and 40 ground water wells; and of works to serve the dry lands. Introduced by Senators CHURCH and JORDAN of Idaho. June 30, 1964, passed the Senate with committee amendments. August 17, 1964, passed the House, amended. Public Law 88–583.

S. 1186: Amends the act authorizing the Crooked River Federal reclamation project to provide for the irrigation of additional lands. Introduced by Senators MORSE and NEUBERGER. June 29, 1964, passed the Senate, amended. September 1, 1964, passed the House, amended. Public Law 88–598.

S. 1275: To clarify the relationship of interests of the United States and of the States in the use of the waters of certain streams. The bill provides that the withdrawal or reservation of surveyed or unsurveyed lands, hereafter or heretofore made, shall not affect any right to the use of water acquired pursuant to State law either before or after the establishment of such withdrawal or reservation. Introduced by Senator KUCHEL, et al. Subcommittee hearings were held on March 10, 11, 12, and 13, 1964. No further action was taken.

S. 1299: The Secretary of the Interior is directed to defer without interest the collection of irrigation, operation, and maintenance charges of the Eden Valley irrigation district, Wyo., due for the last one-half year of the calendar year 1964, with certain provisions. Introduced by Senators MCGEE and SIMPSON. October 21, 1963, passed the Senate, amended. March 16, 1964, passed the House, amended. Public Law 88–291.

S. 1584, MOSS: Approves a contract negotiated with the Newton Water Users' Association, Utah, by the Secretary of the Interior and authorizes its execution. The contract extends the period for repayment of the reimbursable construction cost of the Newton project and establishes a variable repayment schedule. Introduced by Senator Moss. October 21, 1963, passed the Senate. Passed House May 18, 1964. Became Public Law 88–314.

S. 1658, HAYDEN and GOLDWATER: To authorize, construct, operate, and maintain the Central Arizona project, Arizona-New Mexico, and for other purposes. The main purposes of the bill are: (1) To augment the existing water supply in the Lower Colorado River Basin; (2) to remove the threats of water shortages in the area; and (3) to secure to Arizona, California, and Nevada the shares of the river apportioned to them by the Supreme Court; namely, 2,800,000; 4,400,000; and 300,000 acre-feet respectively. Introduced by Senators HAYDEN and GOLDWATER. August 6, 1964, reported to the Senate, as amended.

S. 1687: Approves the January 1963 reclassification of land of the Big Flat unit of the Missoula Valley project, Montana, and authorizes the modification of the repayment contract with the Big Flat irrigation district. The purpose of the bill is to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to negotiate and execute with the Big Flat irrigation district an amendatory contract which would reduce the construction charge obligation of the district by $7,190. Introduced by Senators MANSFIELD and METCALF. October 21, 1963, passed the Senate. May 18, 1964, passed the House. Public Law 88–315.

S. 2035: Reauthorizes the Riverton extension unit, Missouri River Basin project to include all of the Riverton reclamation project except the Muddy Ridge area. Further, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to negotiate and execute an amendatory repayment contract with the Midvale irrigation district. This contract is to extend the repayment period for water users and to reduce the amount to be paid in any year by the Midvale irrigation district. Introduced by Senator MCGEE. October 29 and 30, 1963, there were subcommittee hearings held. No further action necessary as H.R. 8171 passed in lieu.

S. 2053: Provides for the acquisition of rights-of-way for canals and ditches by the Secretary of the Interior through purchase or eminent-domain proceedings. The acquisitions pertain to Federal reclamation projects under the act of June 17, 1902. Introduced by Senators Bible, Burdick, Engle, and McGee. April 1, 1964, subcommittee hearing. Passed companion measure H.R. 130. (Public Law 88–561.)

S. 2447: Authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Whitestone Coulee unit of the Okanogan-Similkameen division, Chief Joseph Dam project, Washington. The plan of development proposed includes a new diversion dam, a canal and siphon, a natural lake, a dike, small pumping plants, and expansion of a distribution system. This project would insure an adequate future water supply for the area. Introduced by Senators JACKSON and MAGNUSON. March 6, 1964, passed the Senate. September 1, 1964, passed the House, amended. September 18, 1964, became Public Law 88–599.

S. 2493: Authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to determine that certain costs of operating and maintaining Banks Lake and Potholes reservoir on the Columbia Basin project for recreational purposes are nonreimbursable. The bill is intended as an interim arrangement pending complete development of the Columbia Basin project. The committee believes that it is both inconsistent with long-standing policy and inappropriate to include in the water charges of these districts the cost of pumping in additional water to reduce reservoir fluctuations. Introduced by Senators JACKSON and MAGNUSON. March 6, 1964, passed the Senate.

S. 2533: Authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Manson unit, Chelan division, Chief Joseph Dam project, Washington. The purpose of the bill is to rehabilitate, improve, and enlarge in the existing district in central Washington the 20-mile water collection system and the distribution system. Introduced by Senators JACKSON and MAGNUSON. June 25, 1964 passed the Senate, amended. June 29, 1964 reevaluation satement from the Department of the Interior.

S. 2630: Amends the act of June 12, 1948, in order to provide for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Kennewick division extension, Yakima project, Washington. The purpose is to bring an additional 6,300 acres of land under irrigation in the Columbia River Valley in the southern part of Washington by providing for the necessary additional works. Introduced by Senators JACKSON and MAGNUSON. June 25, 1964 passed the Senate, amended.

S. 3053: Amends the act of March 10, 1964, by substituting the figures "$3,200,000" for the figures "$2,000,000." The act of March 10 provides $2 million to buy out settlers of the third division of the Riverton project who wanted to sell their holdings at the appraised price. Introduced by Senators MCGEE and SIMPSON. August 19, 1964, reported to the Senate. August 21, 1964, indefinitely postponed. H.R. 12128 passed in lieu.

Senate joint resolutions referred to Irrigation and Reclamation Subcommittee

Senate Joint Resolution 6: Cancels any unpaid reimbursable construction costs of the Wind River Indian irrigation project, Wyoming, chargeable against non-Indian lands of such irrigation project. Introduced by Senator MCGEE. August 20, 1964, passed the Senate amended.

Senate Joint Resolution 49: Authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to carry out a continuing program to reduce nonbeneficial consumptive use of water in the Pecos River Basin, in New Mexico and Texas. The purpose of the resolution is to prevent further decreases in the area's water supply and to increase and protect such water for municipal, industrial, recreational, and agricultural uses. Introduced by Senators ANDERSON, YARBOROUGH, and MECHEM. October 22, 1963, passed the Senate, amended. August 17, 1964, passed the House, amended. Public Law 88–594.

House bills referred to Irrigation and Reclamation Subcommittee

H.R. 130: Provides for payment of compensation, including severance damages, for rights-of-way acquired by the United States in connection with reclamation projects the construction of which began after January 1, 1961. As amended, the bill is applicable to ditches and canals. December 2, 1963, passed the House. August 21, 1964, passed the Senate. Public Law 88–561.

H.R. 131: Assures the renewal of some municipal, domestic, and industrial water supply contracts, if the water taken from the Federal reclamation projects is beneficially used. April 1, 1963, passed the House. June 19, 1963, passed the Senate. Public Law 88–44.

H.R. 641: To approve an order of the Secretary of the Interior canceling and deferring certain irrigation charges, eliminating certain tracts of non-Indian-owned land under the Wapato Indian irrigation project, Washington. The bill is needed to complete action taken by the Secretary with respect to the Wapato project under authority of the act of June 22, 1936. May 20, 1963, passed the House. October 21, 1963, passed the Senate. Public Law 88–159.

H.R. 2821: Readjusts the Grand Valley Water Users Association's contract in Colorado by reducing the amount they owe for unaccrued construction charges by $109,158.19 for the 1,366.2 acres which have just been reclassified as permanently unproductive, and by crediting their next installment with $4,531.93 after the construction costs already paid on 123.6 acres of canceled farm units in the above acreage. This makes disposal of the land more economically feasible. March 18, 1963, passed House. June 17, 1963, passed the Senate. Public Law 88–43.

H.R. 3672: To provide for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Savery-Pot Hook, Bostwick Park, and Fruitland Mesa participating reclamation projects under the Colorado River Storage Project Act. August 3, 1964, passed the House. August 20, 1964, passed the Senate, amended. Public Law 88–568.

H.R. 4062: Amends the act authorizing the transmission and disposition by the Secretary of the Interior of electric energy generated at Falcon Dam on the Rio Grande to authorize him also to market power generated at Amistad Dam on the Rio Grande. The bill further provides authority to construct necessary transmission lines to integrate the power facilities at the Falcon and Amistad Dam projects, if such interconnection is economically feasible. This legislation is necessitated by the fact that the original authorization for the construction of Amistad Dam made no provision for such marketing or interconnecting as are needed. July 8, 1963, passed House. November 27, 1963, passed Senate, amended December 23, 1963. Approved, Public Law 88–237.

H.R. 4423: Permits the Secretary of the Interior to continue to deliver water to lands in the third division, Riverton reclamation project, Wyoming. April 1, 1963, passed House. April 9, 1963, passed Senate April 19, 1963. Approved, Public Law 88–10.

H.R. 5949: Gives the consent of Congress to the amendment by the States of Colorado and New Mexico of the Costilla Creek Compact. The amendments make minor changes in the allocations for diversion of the natural flow of Costilla Creek for beneficial use in the two States and in the schedule of deliveries of direct flow water to Colorado by New Mexico. Need arises because the Jarosa Ditch Co. wishes to change the point of diversion and the point of delivery of some 5.88 cubic feet of water. October 7, 1963, passed House. November 27, 1963, passed Senate. December 12, 1963, approved, Public Law 88–198.

H.R. 8171: Authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to acquire lands including farm units and improvements thereon, in the third division, Riverton reclamation project, Wyoming, and to continue to deliver water for 3 years to lands of said division. The bill is needed to provide the basis for settlement of the physical, economic, and financial problems that have plagued the third division. December 17, 1963, passed House. February 26, 1964, passed Senate. Approved, March 10, 1964. Public Law 88–278.

H.R. 9521: Increases the authorization for appropriation for continuing work in the Missouri River Basin by the Secretary of the Interior. The act provides for an additional $120 million for fiscal years 1965 and 1966. April 20, 1964, passed the House. August 5, 1964, passed the Senate. Public Law 88–442.

House Joint Resolutions referred to IR

House Joint Resolution 733, Senate Joint Resolution 130: The resolution designates the powerhouse on Clear Creek at the head of Whiskeytown Reservoir in northern California as "Judge Francis Carr powerhouse." Francis Carr was a famous attorney and jurist of Shasta County, Calif., whose vision and dedication played an important part in development of the water resources of the Central Valley of California. May 4, 1964, passed the House. August 19, 1964, passed the Senate, amended. Public Law 88–555.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON TERRITORIES AND INSULAR AFFAIRS—HENRY M. JACKSON, CHAIRMAN

The Subcommittee on Territories and Insular Affairs has responsibility for measures relating to the insular possessions of the United States, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, except those measures affecting their revenue and appropriations.

Of the 12 bills referred to the subcommittee, 7 were reported and subsequently enacted into law. The bills are as follows:

General legislation

Public Law 88–183 (H.R. 2073): H.R. 2073 authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain tracts of submerged lands surrounding the territories of Guam, the Virgin Islands, and American Samoa, upon request of the respective Governors, when the lands are required for a specific economic development or to satisfy a compelling public need, and grants these governments concurrent jurisdiction over persons found, acts performed, and offenses committed on lands which are owned, controlled, or reserved by the United States in and around these islands.

Virgin Islands

Public Law 88–180 (H.R. 1989): H.R. 1989 amends the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands to authorize the Government of the Virgin Islands to issue general obligation bonds for certain specified purposes, including schools, firehouses, slum clearance, libraries, etc. Because of limitations in the 1954 Organic Act many of these projects could not be financed except by current taxes. Enactment of Public Law 88–180 will reinstate the power to issue general obligation bonds to finance certain specified projects, thus permitting the construction of a variety of needed facilities.

The subcommittee also conducted hearings (printed) on the subject of leases on Naval properties on St. Thomas, Virgin Islands. A formal report has been adopted by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs making specific recommendations to the Departments of the Interior and Navy on the manner in which these leases should be handled before the lands and buildings affected are declared excess to the needs of the Navy and sold to the Government of the Virgin Islands.

Guam

Public Law 88–170 (H.R. 6225): H.R. 6225 provides for the rehabilitation of Guam. The purpose is to authorize appropriations against which the Government of Guam may draw in order to finance public works and community development projects; $45 million is the ceiling. The law provides also for a joint Federal and Guam Government Committee to prepare a long-range economic development plan for the island. Need for the legislation arose from the fact that Guam was never rebuilt properly after its World War II damage and from the severe destruction caused by typhoon Karen in 1962.

Public Law 88–171 (H.R. 6481): H.R. 6481 permits the Government of Guam to authorize a public authority to undertake urban renewal and housing activities and to participate in Federal programs of assistance in this field. The law also ratifies the action of Guam's Legislature, which has created such an agency. The legislation is necessitated by the extensive damage inflicted on Guam in 1962 by the typhoon Karen.

Puerto Rico

Public Law 88–271 (H.R. 5945): H.R. 5945 establishes a United States-Puerto Rico Commission on the status of Puerto Rico to study all factors affecting the present and future relationship between the United States and Puerto Rico. The 13-member Commission will review all laws, treaties, constitutions, and agreements which may have a bearing on United States-Puerto Rico relationships and will render a final report no later than the opening day of the second session of the 89th Congress.

Trust Territory

Public Law 88–485 (H.R. 1988): H.R. 1988 for its purpose the settlement of certain claims of residents of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. It provides compassionate relief of not more than $950,000 for certain residents of Rongelap Island affected by the atomic bomb fallout from the explosion of March 1, 1954. Funds will be distributed to the 82 Rongelap inhabitants or their heirs or legatees. The Secretary of the Interior is to give advice to the Rongelapese on how to best conserve their funds. The payment pursuant to the act is in full settlement and discharge of all claims against the United States arising from the 1954 explosion.

Public Law 88–487 (H.R. 3198): H.R. 3198 improves the economic and social conditions among Micronesians in three ways. First, it makes available to the government of the trust territory scientific or technical assistance, at the request of the Secretary of the Interior from agencies of the executive branch of the Federal Government, either with or without reimbursement. Estimated nonreimbursable costs may not exceed $150,000 per year. Other programs of the Federal agencies may also be extended, other than grant-in-aid programs, to the trust territory at the request of the Secretary of the Interior, the cost thereof to be borne by the government of the trust territory from its regular appropriations.

The bill also permits the licensing of qualified Micronesian radio operators by the Federal Communications Commission notwithstanding the fact that they are not American citizens.

In addition this legislation abolishes a revolving fund established in 1956 and transfers approximately $355,000 to a development fund for use in financing economic projects in the trust territory.

The District of Columbia Has Expended $134,108,000 in Cash on Urban Renewal and Contributed Only $4,000—The Rest Has Been Contributed by the Federal Government—Explanation Requested

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, in looking into the District's urban renewal program recently I found that the latest available figures on the expenditures made in behalf of it show an estimated gross project cost of $165,205,000, with $134,108,000 actually expended. Of these totals, the District of Columbia contribution has been $4,000 in cash, and $31,098,000 in noncash grants-in-aid.

The position of the District of Columbia Government seems to be that all it is called upon to contribute to its urban renewal projects are noncash grants-in-aid. Frankly, I do not believe that members of Congress of either party will be willing to continue to support the appropriation of funds by the Congress for urban renewal projects in the District of Columbia in which the Federal Government has to supply almost all of the cash contribution.

Recently I wrote to the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, Walter N. Tobriner, advising him that I would appreciate a prompt reply explaining the District's position on its cash contributions to its urban renewal projects.

The failure of the District of Columbia government to provide its share of cash funds needed to carry out its urban renewal projects is a matter of national concern, and underscores the need to put urban renewal on a loan basis, in commercial areas, and to drastically overhaul the program.

Recently, I introduced a bill, H.R. 12779, to revise urban renewal in the District of Columbia. The housing affairs letter of Washington, D.C., edited by Ash Gerecht, hailed my new bill, and pointed out its national significance. It called particular attention to certain provisions of my measure, in the following language:

> WIDNALL BILL ON DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA RENEWAL HOLDS NATIONAL HOUSING IMPACT
>
> Bill introduced for study as Congress adjourned, by Republicans' "Mr. Housing," Mr. WIDNALL, of New Jersey, points to likely proposals for national legislation in 1965.
>
> His bill, H.R. 12779, was picked up by Representative MULTER, Democrat, of New York, as H.R. 12818.
>
> Here are provisions of the District of Columbia bill, ostensibly aimed at breaking the impasse on permitting nonresidential urban renewal in the District of Columbia, with national consequences to housing and urban renewal programs:
>
> It includes present agency regulations on defining blighted areas—but with the intent that this is for study only, and should be revised and strengthened in the next Congress.

Mr. Widnall might abandon a present definition allowing 20 percent of buildings to be structurally substandard so as to require clearance, and go back to a straight 50-percent substandard definition for a blighted area.

At least half the rental or co-op housing in an urban renewal area must be designed for occupancy by low- and middle-income families.

A referendum, with a majority of eligible voters approving, is required for approval of an urban renewal project. (From Mr. Widnall's 1964 housing bill.)

Just compensation and replacement payments for homeowners and businessmen. This is based on revised eminent domain procedures and laws, such as in Pennsylvania. This is also adapted from Mr. Widnall's housing bill, H.R. 9771.

Real property shall be assessed at fair market value based on its highest and best use in conformity with applicable zoning laws and rules. This could be adapted on a national scale, to have first consideration for renewal aid given to those localities with such a tax arrangement.

Federal aid to nonresidential, nonpublic use projects would be switched from a grant to a loan basis, repayable in 10 years, at going Federal rate plus one-half percent.

At the very end of the bill is its most interesting provision:

No aid is to be extended to a nonresidential or nonpublic project unless all residential redevelopment which is necessary or appropriate in the community has been completed.

I include as part of my remarks my letter to Commissioner Tobriner, and a letter from Robert C. Baker, president, Downtown Progress, the National Capital Downtown Committee:

Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Hon. Walter N. Tobriner,
President, Board of Commisisoners,
District of Columbia,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Commissioner: Your letter in acknowledgement of my letter transmitting my new bill, H.R. 12779, amending the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945, to you for comment has been received. My bill, which was introduced for study purposes, would greatly expand the District's urban renewal program, authorize urban renewal in commercial areas, and improve and humanize local urban renewal operations in general.

In looking into the District's urban renewal program recently I found that the latest available figures on the expenditures made in behalf of it show an estimated gross project cost of $165,205,000, with $134,108,000 actually expended. Of these totals, the local contribution has been $4,000 in cash, and $31,098,000 in noncash grants-in-aid. Giving the best possible interpretation to the Federal Urban Renewal Administration's figures, the District of Columbia contribution is definitely below the two-thirds Federal, one-third local contribution required by law. Even if we placed the District of Columbia in a depressed area classification—and it definitely is not a depressed area—the law would seem to have been flouted. When we take into consideration the $4,000 contributed in cash by the District of Columbia we reach the point of absurdity.

The position of the District government seems to be that almost all it is called upon to contribute to its urban renewal projects are noncash grants-in-aid. Frankly, I do not believe that Members of Congress of either party will be willing to continue to support the appropriation of funds by the Congress for urban renewal projects in the District of Columbia in which the Federal Government has to supply well above 90 percent of the funds required.

A deeply disturbing aspect of the District's urban renewal program is that it is above and beyond effective control by the citizens of the District who are most deeply affected by it, especially the homeowners and small businessmen. Budgetary control by the District government, as well as by District citizens, is lost when a cash contribution of only $4,000 shows up but once in the 14 years the District's urban renewal program has been underway. Interested as the District Commissioners are in home rule, I would urge that they seek a remedy to the situation which would give District citizens control and review of urban renewal. The president of the Federation of Citizens Associations, John R. Immer, has called my attention to the following statement on this very point which was part of the joint testimony of the Federation of Citizens Associations and of the Federation of Civic Associations of the District of Columbia, representing the taxpaying citizens of the District of Columbia, before the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia on the District budget:

"We urge a realinement of all budgetary items constituting the District of Columbia contribution to urban renewal projects so as to permit review by the Commissioners and citizens. There must be budgetary control over urban renewal projects which we do not now have. There should be no items in this budget which are intended for use as the District of Columbia contribution to urban renewal projects not yet approved by the District Commissioners."

I am sure that there must be some explanation of the figures I have mentioned in this letter regarding the District's contribution to its urban renewal projects. Since I do not now have such an explanation, and inasmuch as you are much closer to the situation, I would appreciate a prompt reply explaining the District's position on local contributions to such projects. If such an explanation is not readily available, would you please advise my office?

With kind personal regards, I am

Sincerely,

William B. Widnall,
Member of Congress.

Downtown Progress,
Washington, D.C.

The Honorable William B. Widnall,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Widnall: Thank you very much for sending us a copy of H.R. 12779, described as a "new approach" to provide urban renewal for downtown Washington, and for the accompanying comments in the Congressional Record.

You may be sure we shall give this proposed legislation our careful study and consideration, after which we shall be in touch with you to discuss the matter further.

You have our deep appreciation and best wishes.

Sincerely,

Robert C. Baker,
President.

Tribute to Hon. Elizabeth Kee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, it has been my pleasure to sit by the gracious and charming gentlewoman from West Virginia on the Veterans' Affairs Committee for many years. I have never known a greater lady who was always kind, friendly and dedicated in the discharge of duty. Elizabeth Kee kept, uppermost in her mind, the welfare of the country and the welfare of the veterans, their widows, dependents, and orphans. She was always devoted and dedicated to the service of others. I visited her district and know firsthand the high esteem and admiration in which she is held by her constituents. I am a better Representative having known and served with this great lady, who has served in the greatest traditions of womanhood and those principles that made this country the greatest in all history.

Her husband, Judge Kee, served with honor and distinction as chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee during a critical period in world history. The gentlewoman from West Virginia [Mrs. Kee] was a superb helpmate to her husband while he lived and loyal and devoted to his memory. Mrs. Dorn joins me in wishing for Mrs. Kee a pleasant rest and much happiness always.

End of Session Report on the 88th "Performance" Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, it has been my practice since I was elected to the House of Representatives in 1960 to make periodic reports on the work of Congress, reprint them at my own expense and mail them to my constituents.

With the adjournment of the 88th Congress I am pleased to summarize its record for the residents of the 15th District whom I am privileged to represent.

Of this "workhorse" Congress President Johnson spoke as follows:

> This last session of Congress has enacted more legislation, met more national needs, disposed of more national issues than any other session of this century or the last.

A PERFORMANCE CONGRESS

This Congress has had the longest sessions in peacetime history. It can be described as a diligent, hard-hitting, effective Congress that got things done.

The Washington Post, the constant observer of congressional activity in the Capitol, stated that in quantity and quality the 88th Congress is destined to rank as one of the top performers of our time and added:

> It can never be said of the 88th that it "rubberstamped" anything. Nearly every administration bill that rolled out for action has been the subject of a swift and roughneck rumpus.

While historic advances have been made in many areas, the two titles most often applied to the 88th Congress by observers are the "education Congress" and the "conservation Congress."

As the "education Congress" it passed more measures to aid in the intellectual development of all young Americans than any other Congress in history. The laws that were enacted were the result of the work of one of two committees on which I serve, the House Committee on Education and Labor.

As the "conservation Congress" its passage of the great wilderness bill, the land and water conservation fund bill, and such others as the Fire Island National Seashore, of which I was a sponsor, will assure to future generations that our vast open lands, parks, and recreation areas will be adequate to their needs. This far-reaching legislation to preserve our "great green legacy" in America is the responsibility of the other committee on which I serve, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Within the brief scope of this report it is possible only to highlight the key measures passed in this Congress beginning with my principal interest, education.

EQUAL OPPORTUNITY IN EDUCATION

There are two major principles in which I deeply believe and strongly advocate in all school aid legislation. The first is the parent's right to control the education of his children. The second is that every American child has an equal birthright to all the educational excellence the Nation can afford in any school, public or private.

I am pleased to state that every piece of new legislation which passed the 88th Congress was consistent with these principles and made adequate provision for all interests in education without difference or discrimination.

Public and private institutions and all eligible students participate equally in measures such as the Health Professions Act, the Nursing Education Act, teacher training under the Mental Retardation Act, the Higher Education Facilities Act—which I described in full in my last report—and the greatly revised new Vocational Education Act. There is so much detail in this new legislation that time and space will not permit full reference to appropriate provisions. Therefore should any of our constituents desire more data for planning education such information may be obtained from any of our district offices.

I would like to cite, however, two major programs enacted through the deliberations of my committee since our last report.

The first is the Economic Opportunity Act—the so-called antipoverty bill. This is essentially a bill for job training and education and hence was referred to our committee for action.

This act, for me, typifies this Congress. It represents a hard fight every inch of the way—a "hassle" over every word and phrase to make it a better, more workable bill. Many of its provisions were pounded out in around-the-clock sessions in my office with the able administrator of the program, Sargent Shriver. It was my purpose to make certain that every disadvantaged child or student who needed remedial or special education would participate in the program regardless of his school of attendance, public or private. The bill, as amended and enacted, embodies this concept. This is a major achievement in elementary and secondary education following the aid to the individual method which directs the benefits under the law to everyone as an individual. It was the legislation of this principle by a Carey amendment to the basic bill which is considered a major contribution in the direction of equal treatment for all schoolchildren.

In its job training and other provisions, this is an honest labor, hard work bill. It stands simply for this: that every person will have a full opportunity to develop his potential without the indignity of "breadline" or "handout" type relief. It means a decent chance for everyone but a free ride on an endless gravy train to no one.

You might well ask why a middle and high income district like ours would have any interest in a "poverty program."

The answer is that the taxes on real estate and personal income which are generated in our district are paying for welfare programs that continually increase without solving problems.

I felt that it was time to do something when we found that some families were on the relief rolls for the third generation, that sons of welfare were begetting children of welfare with unemployment and lack of skills being passed on and on.

I was convinced of this when the number of people on welfare in our State, during our greatest era of prosperity, reached an alltime high of 420,000 in June of 1964. It is sad to relate that of every 100 new jobs created last year only 1.6 were in New York State compared with 18 in California.

Jobless persons drain off the revenues needed for police and fire protection, schools, and a host of other critical needs. That is why the people of our district should have an interest in a program which is aimed at making taxpayers out of "tax eaters," to get the chronic and congenital welfare client off the back of the homeowner and taxpayer.

In addition, if we want to stop violence, addiction, and crime it is necessary that we do something about the 75,000 young people between ages 16 to 21, in New York City who are out of school and out of work. Their number is four times the size of our police force and equal to five army divisions.

With idleness their custom and mischief and "kicks" their diversion, something drastic has to be done. This is why the economic opportunity bill calls for the following:

First. A Job Corps to provide 100,000 youth, age 16–21 with a 2-year vocational training and work experience.

Second. A work-training program to enable 200,000 youths to work and train in their own communities on projects selected by local organizations or governments.

Third. A work-study program to provide part-time employment for 140,000 needy students to continue college.

Fourth. A community action program to encourage communities to prepare long-range plans to assist low-income individuals and families obtain education, employment, job training, and counseling, and vocational rehabilitation. I note with satisfaction that the American Legion at its national convention endorsed the antipoverty program.

The other new program which completed our work in education was the amendment and expansion of the National Defense Education Act. The act was changed in two principal provisions as a result of the efforts and sponsorship of your Representative.

First, the loan forgiveness for schoolteachers had previously been available to public school teachers only since 1958 may now be obtained by both public and private school instructors.

Second, my "quality education bill" to provide for special training institutes for teachers who wish to improve their skills is now a part of this act and again, is available to teachers in public and private schools.

This bill by its title and its provisions stands for the proposition that education, which is second only to our national defense in cost, is, in the words of Admiral Rickover actually "our first line of defense." Its expansion in this Congress to provide us with more and better trained teachers and librarians, ample student loan funds to lighten the burden of educational cost to the parent and support for audiovisual education and other modern facilities is proof that we are living up to the responsibility entrusted to us by the First Congress. In 1787 they said in their very first acts that "the means of education shall henceforth forever be encouraged in this land."

In summation, through the progress we made in education we are moving steadily toward the day when we will have equal and fair Federal aid at every level of eduction.

It remains for succeeding sessions of Congress to follow the guidelines of the 88th for the improvement of elementary education. The best means of doing this is the GI bill for junior which I cosponsored with Representative JAMES DELANEY and which now has more sponsors than any similar bill before the House.

It would not be appropriate to leave the subject of education without making reference to the matter of prayer in our public schools.

I support voluntary prayer in our schools as a matter of parental right and testified before the Judiciary Committee in support of my own resolution, House Joint Resolution 1036, which reads as follows:

> SECTION 1. No parent shall be denied the right to have any of his children engage in voluntary religious exercise in any public school, but no child or public employee shall be compelled to join therein.
>
> SEC. 2. No parent shall be denied the right to financial support from any governmental entity for the education of his children by reason of the attendance of his children at a nonpublic school of the parent's choice.

Obviously this measure would not only provide religious freedom to public school parents but insure that the interest of Congress and the States extends to the children in nonpublic schools also, should measures for their assistance be authorized by the States.

In addition to its extensive record in education and conservation, this Congress can claim the following to its credit.

THE TAX CUT

Taking one of the most momentous steps in Federal fiscal history, we voted the largest tax cut since the inception of the income tax. The administration, dedicated to frugality in spending and stability in business, took this bold step as one of the single best ways of insuring prosperity without interruption for many years to come.

The act, retroactive to January 1, reduced individual and corporate income taxes by $11.5 billion. Individual reductions alone increase consumer purchasing power by more than $9 billion a year; corporate reductions in this and two previous tax cuts will create new job opportunities through capital expansion programs.

The Revenue Act lowered the tax rates on individuals from a range of 20 to 90 percent to a new range of 14 to 70 percent and cut corporate taxes from 52 to 48 percent over a period of 2 years. Congress also revised the rates to give special benefits to small businesses, and persons over 65 years of age.

The tax cut, equaling $25 million a day, already has helped spark the longest peacetime business expansion in U.S. history. Four million more people are working today than in January 1961. Personal incomes are reaching new all-time peaks, and so are corporate profits. The total output of goods and services—gross national product—will hit about $625 billion this year, up $120 billion from 1960. And business plans to invest 13 percent more in plant and equipment this year than in 1963. This means still more jobs.

In spite of this unprecedented economic expansion, due in large measure to the tax cut and the general climate of business confidence, the U.S. record of price stability exceeds that of any other nation. Inflation has been kept under control and with further cutbacks in Government spending, we can look forward with confidence to even greater business expansion and the creation of more jobs.

What does the tax cut of 1964 mean to individual taxpayers?

Income tax rate reductions in 1965 will average about 20 percent. Here are some average cuts per income level:

	Reduction in percent
Up to $3,000	39.0
$3,000 to $5,000	26.9
$5,000 to $10,000	20.6
$10,000 to $20,000	17.0

I am wholly in accord with President Johnson's thinking that the tax cut is "the single most important step that we have taken to strengthen our economy since World War II."

CIVIL RIGHTS AND SCHOOL BUSING

We in New York have traditionally been noted for offering equal rights under the law and equality of economic opportunity to all our residents. In fact, this philosophy has been so well established in statutes on our State and local levels that the vaunted Civil Rights Act of 1964 does not go as far as laws already existing on our books.

I do feel, however, that credit should be given where credit is due and so, even though these gentlemen are of a different political camp, I would like to acknowledge the Nation's indebtedness to such Republicans as Congressman WILLIAM M. MCCULLOCH and Senate GOP leader, EVERETT DIRKSEN. Without their support, the administration's civil rights program would never have become law. The support of the churches and religious leaders of the Nation was also a decisive factor in winning passage of the bill.

Because of widespread misunderstanding of the act, I should like to point out some of the things it does not require. It does not permit the Federal Government to tell a home or apartment owner or real estate operator to whom he must sell or rent; it does not affect job seniority rights and it does not require quota hiring of minority groups. It does not permit—in fact, it specifically forbids—the Federal Government to transfer students among schools for racial "balancing"—the so-called busing of students. If there were such a prohibition on our books at the State level much of the tensions in the schools of our community would be eased.

On the very critical matters of "busing" of pupils, I have steadfastly fought against anything that would take children away from a neighborhood school. As a longtime leader in the cause of parental rights I hold that the essential principle here is that State authorities must acknowledge that the parent has the right to control the education of his children and that the child is not the creature of the State.

PEACE THROUGH STRENGTH

The lion's share of every tax dollar, roughly 55 percent, as you know, goes into national preparedness. This sum is eight times more than the total financing of all health, education, labor, and welfare programs.

We have increased our nuclear tactical forces in Western Europe, raised the pay and allowances of servicemen both on duty and retired, and continue to lead in the development of new weapons, among them the Minuteman II, the revolutionary TFX fighter-bomber, and the Polaris A-3 submarine-launched intercontinental missile.

Since 1961 we have enormously strengthened our defense posture against possible challenge from the Communist world. As President Johnson said on June 3, 1964:

> In every area of national strength America today is stronger than it has ever been before. It is stronger than any adversary or combination of adversaries. It is stronger than the combined might of all nations in the history of the world.

I have consistently voted for military strength while pursuing the cause of the very valuable contributions our area is able to make in the field of national preparedness at present and in the future.

One of my deep concerns for those on defense employment in our district is the matter of our Brooklyn Navy Yard. I am dedicated to the preservation of this yard at high employment levels. I have been named by my colleagues to serve on the nationwide, bipartisan committee to save the public shipyards. It is our purpose to legislate in the next Congress to knock out the 65 percent limitation on public yard repair work and provide that 50 percent of all new construction must go to public yards.

In addition I am supporting an expanded program of subsidized domestic flag merchant marine construction to be built in private shipyards in this country to advance the cause of American maritime supremacy.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

We can take heart that our realistic and imaginative approach of fighting the spread of communism in the Western Hemisphere through the Alliance for Progress is making headway by strengthening the ties between South America and the United States. As evidence of this we can point to the successful defeat of the leftist bid in the elections in Chile; the overthrow of the leftist regime in Brazil; the failure of Communist terrorism in Venezuela and over all, the fact that all of our neighbors, with one remaining exception have voted sanctions against Cuba. The exclusion of Cuba from the OAS has effectively isolated it from the rest of this hemisphere. We must pursue a constant, determined, and relentless policy of harassing and finally eliminating the Castro government in Cuba. The plight of the desperate Cuban economy spells doom for this dangerous and un-American regime if we continue our present policies.

I am a strong believer in export trade and supported the Trade Expansion Act which brought vastly increased tonnage over our Brooklyn waterfront. However, I have opposed any trade agreement which might benefit Communist bloc countries. As proof of this I voted to withhold credit as a means of financing private grain exporters of wheat shipments to Russia. I did so by supporting the Findley amendment to recommit the foreign aid bill on December 16, 1963.

In the same vein I have actively supported the congressional resolution calling for all appropriate measures in our national interest in the Caribbean and backing a firm stand in Vietnam as a warning to Red China that we will not back down as defenders of freedom anywhere in the world.

VETERANS BENEFITS

Of the more than 25 veterans measures which have passed this Congress and been signed into law of particular note is Public Law 88-361, which provides educational assistance to the children of veterans who are permanently and totally disabled from injuries incurred during their war service. Another notable advance provides 4,000 additional beds and nursing home care facilities for veterans some of which will be assigned to our own hospital at Fort Hamilton.

You will recall that I was the sponsor of a bill to provide 300 additional beds at

Fort Hamilton and this will soon be realized through the allocation which Brooklyn will receive.

SENIOR CITIZENS

I believe that the first work of the 89th Congress must be an increase in social security benefits and a practical plan for health care for our 14.5 million senior citizens. I supported the passage of the increased benefits in the closing days of the session only to see the measure die in conference through the votes of three Republicans and one southern Democrat.

DISTRICT MATTERS

During this period of breakneck pace in the Capitol, your representative has worked 44 of the previous 48 months in Washington. Last week I made the 117th plane trip this year back to the district to be on hand Saturday morning as I have these past 4 years, in the two district offices we maintain for rapid service to constituents. Only two such trips per session are paid for by the Government, the rest come out of the Member's pocket. The only regret I have is that the press of legislative duties did not allow time for even a greater number of personal visits.

We maintain two district offices: one located in Bay Ridge at 7718—Fourth Avenue—TE 9-2300—and the other at the U.S. Courthouse, 225 Washington Street—596-3839. These are open 6 days a week and are staffed by competent personnel to handle any matter such as social security, small business, military service and veterans claims and the host of other problems a constituent may have are swiftly forwarded to me as your personal and closest link between you and the Federal Government.

TRIBUTE TO THE ADMINISTRATION

This has been a performance Congress, led by two great Presidents noted for their outstanding records of progressive leadership. We face the future with confidence. Though dedicated to calm preparedness, they have actively sought out all means of securing and insuring peace. With forces equal to any challenge, no segment of the population, nor problem, either at home or abroad has been neglected.

I shall always be deeply grateful to the people of our district, who gave me the opportunity to be part of the 1,000 days of John Fitzgerald Kennedy. It is to the credit of the 15th District that you showed your confidence in him during his life by returning your Representative to the 88th Congress on a record of support for President Kennedy without reservation.

Since President Kennedy's death the mission of carrying on programs destined to cover our unmet needs at home and preserving strength, justice, and freedom in the world has fallen to the man whom he asked to succeed him, President Lyndon B. Johnson.

I feel that this Congress working with the President has written a great record in continuation of that mission.

I know of no experience more rewarding or gratifying than having been your Representative since 1960, and to you who sent me to Washington I am humbly thankful for the privilege of serving you.

Six Years of Unprecedented Achievement—The Greatest Progress in Alaskan History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERNEST GRUENING

OF ALASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Congressional Record a statement by me summarizing Alaska's progress since becoming a State.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Engraved on the statues at the entrance of our National Archives are two phrases: "What Is Past Is Prolog," and "Study the Past." Nearly 6 years as a State have brought to Alaska tangible results impossible during 92 years as a territory. Neglected, her principal resource, the fisheries—depleted by absentee interest and Federal mismanagement—Alaska, in 1959, entered the Union politically equal to her sister States, but starved economically and virtually undeveloped.

The years since statehood have been important. At the Federal level, the work of Alaska's Senators, my distinguished friend and colleague, Mr. Bartlett, and myself, aided by Representative Ralph Rivers in the House of Representatives, often has necessitated correcting the exigencies which accumulated for nearly a century.

Alaska's congressional delegation has spent much of its time in the effort to make existing and proposed Federal programs suitable for Alaska's unique needs. Highways, for example, are scarce in an area one-fifth the size of the contiguous 48 States since Alaska, for nearly all of its territorial existence, was excluded from the Federal Government's highway development programs which have so successfully tied together the communities of the lower 48 States. Alaska, of necessity, turned to the highways of the sky, and today proudly wears the title of "the flyingest State." Roads gradually are being built, and the State is participating in most aspects of the Federal-Aid Highway Act.

This fall a report prepared cooperatively by the Federal Bureau of Public Roads and the State of Alaska, containing a highway program for Alaska and recommendations to improve existing road links with Canada or build new roads, will be made public. The study has been made following congressional approval by the 87th Congress of my Senate Joint Resolution 137, now a part of the Federal-Aid Highway Act. The legislation authorized the appropriation of $800,000 and subsequently $400,000 for the study by Wilbur Smith & Associates, consulting engineers, of New Haven, Conn., and Transportation Consultants, Inc., of Washington, D.C., was appropriated.

The 88th Congress has written an encouraging prolog to the great society, and Alaska has cause to be grateful to this Congress which so promptly and—in the end, generously—came to its side in time of disaster, demonstrating the remarkable unity of our 50 States.

President Johnson has expressed his determination "to do what needs to be done to meet the needs of this great State." The President has no doubts about Alaska's future. On October 3 he said, "Our last great land frontier will grow and prosper far beyond past expectations or present hopes."

The 88th Congress has given to all of the States a record of achievement during 21 months which also included a terrible and senseless man-made tragedy and a terrible natural disaster in Alaska.

The assassin's bullet which killed President John Fitzgerald Kennedy on November 22, 1964, and stunned all of us and citizens of other nations did let the rest of the world learn that our democratic system of government is stable and must never be misjudged by friend or foe. That terrible act evoked a nationwide citizen response which confirmed John Kennedy's own belief expressed in Anchorage, Alaska, on September 3, 1960, when he said:

"The untapped energies of the American people which are more powerful than the atom itself must once again be committed to great national objectives."

In Alaska that day, John Kennedy had described the Alaska of the future he envisioned.

It would be a State with a rampart dam electrifying a giant grid "stretching all the way from Juneau to Anchorage and beyond" and its land would be the storehouse of minerals and lumber and fish and waterpower and all the things that make life abundant "for those of us who live in this great Republic."

When President Lyndon B. Johnson addressed the Congress on November 27, 1963, he asked for its help in translating into effective action the ideas and ideals John Kennedy so nobly represented.

President Johnson called for congressional action in the fields of civil rights, tax reduction, education, employment opportunities, foreign aid, and expenditures.

Much has been written of the accomplishments to date of the 88th Congress, for they include the most far-reaching civil rights bill ever written, the largest and most carefully calculated tax reduction in history, approval of the nuclear test ban treaty, antipoverty legislation, and education and conservation legislation of historic import.

These progressive measures were enacted into public law because men of courage and wisdom in the three branches of our Federal Government supported them. The Civil Rights Act passed the Senate after a lengthy filibuster. Cloture was voted, but not until opponents had been given a reasonable length of time—83 days—in which to be heard.

The 88th Congress and President Johnson responded promptly when the severest earthquake ever recorded on the Richter scale struck south central Alaska. The area stricken extended 1,500 miles from east to west and 300 miles from north to south. Scores of after-shocks and seismic waves of incredible force followed the initial quake. By midnight of Good Friday, March 27, 1964, President Johnson had communicated with the Alaska congressional delegation and made arrangements to have us flown immediately to Anchorage in his Presidential jet. With us would be the President's personal representative, Director of the Office of Emergency Planning, Edward McDermott.

FEDERAL EARTHQUAKE LEGISLATION

The tragic, unprecedented March 27 earthquake in Alaska called for equally unprecedented legislative actions and for maximum possible speed.

On April 2, 1964, President Lyndon B. Johnson appointed a Federal Reconstruction and Development Planning Commission for Alaska under the Chairmanship of Senator Clinton B. Anderson, of New Mexico, former chairman of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.

Four days later, on April 6, 1964, the House and Senate acted within hours of each other in passing a special $50 million appropriation requested by President Johnson for the Federal Disaster Relief Fund, out of which the Office of Emergency Planning could draw to provide for certain Alaskan relief costs.

Meanwhile legislative "ways and means" meetings were being held by the combined Alaska and Washington congressional delegations and their legislative staffs in Washington. It was decided that the most expeditious method of proceeding was through the introduction of a bill containing an idea put forth by Senator HENRY M. JACKSON, of Washington. Senator JACKSON's idea was for the establishment of a system of retroactive earthquake insurance, applicable initially only to the State of Alaska, but ultimately, it was hoped, to be extended to all the States of the Union. This would be accomplished by a bill amending the Alaska Statehood Act to establish such a system. Such a bill would then be referred to the Senate Interior Committee, of which Senator JACKSON was chairman, thus giving that committee immediate jurisdiction so as to enable it to hold hearings not only on the earthquake insurance proposal, but also other proposals for needed legislative action dealing with that subject.

On April 8, 1964, a bill to establish a retroactive earthquake insurance system was introduced, sponsored by Senators Jackson, Warren Magnuson, of Washington; Bartlett; Thomas Kuchel, and the late Claire Engle, of California; Wayne Morse and Maurine Neuberger, of Oregon; Hiram Fong and Daniel Inouye, of Hawaii; Alan Bible, of Nevada; Frank E. Moss, of Utah, and myself. The bill was referred to the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee and Senator JACKSON called for hearings beginning April 14 on the bill before the full committee, but with Senator ANDERSON acting as chairman in view of his role also as Chairman of the President's Reconstruction Commission for Alaska. An identical bill in the House was introduced by Congressman RALPH RIVERS.

During the 2 weeks that followed there was a further assessment of legislative needs to repair the physical and economic damage wrought by the earthquake and subsequent seismic waves.

Having first made certain that the Office of Emergency Planning had sufficient Federal funds to undertake emergency repairs of public facilities, President Johnson and the Congress then turned their attention to temporary repairs of the economic underpinning of the government of the State of Alaska.

On April 25, 1964—less than a month after the disaster—President Johnson recommended an increase in the so-called transitional grants to the State of Alaska in the sum of $22,500,000. A bill to accomplish this was introduced the same day sponsored by Senators JACKSON, ANDERSON, KUCHEL, MAGNUSON, BARTLETT, and myself. A similar bill was introduced in the House of Representatives by Congressman RALPH RIVERS.

Transitional grants to the State of Alaska had been included in the Alaska Omnibus Act of 1959 as a means of providing for the orderly transition of Alaska from a dependent territory to a State of the United States. These transitional grants were part of the recognition on the part of the Federal Government of the difficulties faced by the new State in assuming burdens formerly borne by the Federal Government which still owned over 99 percent of the land area.

Thus, after the earthquake and the great loss in revenues to the government of the State of Alaska, this device was again used.

The transitional grant was raised $1 million by the Senate Interior Committee and the amount finally authorized to be appropriated was $23,500,000 to be available for use until June 30, 1966.

With the more immediate legislative concerns thus taken care of, both the executive branch of the Federal Government and the Congress could turn their attention to the many other areas in which Federal legislation would be needed to bring needed relief to Alaska.

After considerable study, President Johnson, on the recommendation of the Alaska Reconstruction Commission, proposed additional amendments to the Alaska Omnibus Act on May 27, 1964—exactly 2 months after the earthquake. The proposals would authorize:

1. An increase in the Federal share (from 50 to 94.9 percent) of the cost of repairing and reconstructing the nonforest Federal aid highways damaged by the earthquake;

2. The Farmers Home Administration and the Rural Electrification Administration to adjust the indebtedness of some of their borrowers to enable them to overcome losses suffered from the earthquake;

3. The Housing and Home Finance Administrator to enter into contracts for urban renewal projects in Alaska up to a maximum of $25 million;

4. The Small Business Administration to increase the maximum term of disaster loans to home owners from 20 to 30 years;

5. The Corps of Engineers to make modifications in previously authorized civil works projects in Alaska to overcome adverse effects of the earthquake;

6. The Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide Federal assistance to the State of Alaska in marketing up to $25 million in State bonds to assure a favorable interest rate; and

7. The Housing and Home Finance Agency to compromise or release any portion of any FHA-insured mortgage held by the Agency as the Agency finds necessary because of the loss or damage to the property caused by the earthquake.

A bill to carry out President Johnson's recommendations was introduced in the Senate the next day sponsored by Senators BARTLETT, JACKSON, MAGNUSON, and myself. Congressman RIVERS introduced an identical bill in the House on the same day, and hearings were held by the Senate and House Interior Committees promptly.

While the bill's provisions would be helpful as far as they went, they did not—in my opinion—go far enough in helping the severely damaged economy of Alaska.

The bill was deficient in at least four respects:

1. The matching ratio for urban renewal projects should have been 90–10 rather than 75–25 because the tax base for many of the communities needing urban renewal had been severely damaged;

2. The proposal for relief for the homeowners whose homes had been severely damaged applied only to FHA-insured mortgages still held by the Federal National Mortgage Association (Fannie Mae) and did not apply to FHA-insured mortgages sold by Fannie Mae or never purchased by Fannie Mae.

3. The interest rate to be charged on State of Alaska bonds was to be 3¾ percent. With respect to disaster loans by the Small Business Administration to homeowners and businessmen in Alaska, I had, ever since shortly after the earthquake, been urging the Small Business Administration to lower the interest rate from 3 percent to three-fourths of 1 percent. That was the rate charged to foreign borrowers of billions of dollars under our foreign economic aid program. I reasoned that if that rate of three-fourths of 1 percent (with a 10-year moratorium on capital repayment) was the rate charged to foreign countries on loans of billions of dollars even where there was no disaster, why should not the same rate be charged on borrowings by the disaster-stricken State of Alaska?

4. There should have been authorized the purchase of an additional amount of bonds to be issued by the State of Alaska to carry out its previously authorized public works program.

Accordingly, I introduced amendments to carry out these four additional aids for the people of Alaska. Congressman RALPH RIVERS did the same thing in the House.

In the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, I was able to secure the adoption of the 90–10 matching ratio for urban renewal projects in all communities except Anchorage and the purchase of State bonds for the State public works program.

The House Interior Committee went further. It included Anchorage as well as all other Alaska communities in the 90–10 urban renewal matching ratio, provided relief for all FHA-insured homes that had been severely damaged, and set the interest rate at 3 percent on the State of Alaska bonds to be purchased.

When the Senate version of the bill was called up in the Senate, I objected to the attempt to accept only the House amendment making the 90–10 matching ratio applicable to Anchorage as well as to other communities, thereby transmitting the bill to the House on a take it or leave it basis. The bill was therefore forced into a conference between the two Houses. Both Congressman RIVERS and I were appointed members of the conference committee. At the conference, Senator JACKSON proposed that all homeowners of severely damaged homes—including both FHA and conventional mortgages—be provided relief on a matching basis, 50 percent Federal funds and 50 percent State funds.

And that is the way the bill was passed by both Houses and signed into law by President Johnson.

According to the September 1964 report of the Commission, Federal assistance to Alaska in loans or grants will range between $325 million to $414 million. The specific breakdown prepared by the Commission follows:

Table II.—Estimated Federal assistance to Alaska resulting from Mar. 27, 1964, earthquake

	Total Federal costs[1] *(amounts in millions of dollars)*
I. FEDERAL AID TO STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS	
Disaster relief (OEP)	$60.0 to $70.0
Transitional grants (President)	17.0 to 23.5
Highways (Commerce)	43.0 to 63.0
Urban renewal grants (HHFA)	25.0 to 40.0
Purchase of Alaska bonds (HHFA)	10.0 to 25.0
Planning advances (HHFA)	.3 to .4
Subtotal I	155.3 to 221.9
II. FEDERAL AID TO PRIVATE INDIVIDUALS AND GROUPS	
Loans by SBA, Interior, Agriculture	60.0 to 70.0
Forgiveness and other adjustments on outstanding loans (Agriculture, HHFA, VA, and President)	7.0 to 10.0
Tax refunds and offsets (Treasury)	20.0 to 30.0
Subtotal II	87.0 to 110.0
III. RESTORATION OF FEDERAL FACILITIES AND DIRECT FEDERAL OPERATIONS	
Defense facilities, etc. (Defense)	35.6
Alaska Railroad (Interior)	27.0
All other Federal agencies	19.6
Subtotal III	82.2
Grand total (nearest million)	325.0 to 414.0

[1] Single figures have been added into both totals.

The lessons for the Nation from this legislative history of the Alaska earthquake relief bills in the 2d session of the 88th Congress are that while we have the necessary machinery to move quickly and effectively through the Office of Emergency Planning and the Armed Services to take emergency steps to repair the public facilities damaged by a disaster of the magnitude of the earthquake which struck Alaska, we are not prepared to aid adequately the private sector of a stricken economy or to bolster the economies of State and local governments, the income-producing base of which have been destroyed or severely damaged. Legislation is sorely needed in these areas before, not after, disaster strikes.

A GREAT STEP FORWARD

The people of this land may feel more secure about their civil rights as a result of the action of the Congress this year. Heavy bipartisan majorities in the Senate and the House of Representatives enacted into law the most comprehensive civil rights measure in history. The groundwork has been laid for making real to all Americans the constitutional right to vote, the right for all to enjoy equal public accommodations, and equal right to public facilities and public education and a right to enjoy equal opportunity.

The law is fair and restricts no individual's freedom so long as he respects the rights of others. It has taken a century for us to move this far and the path is long.

On August 28, 1963, I sat on the steps of the Lincoln Memorial, one of 200,000 American citizens gathered there for the peaceful march for jobs and freedom. Ten months later the Senate approved the Civil Rights Act. This notable achievement was accomplished by the bill's floor manager, Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, who used skill, tact, and gallantry to secure adoption of this epochmaking legislation. President Johnson provided superb leadership and the opponents of the bill fought a good, clean, and hard fight against its passage.

I do want to sound a note of caution.

With the final passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the millenium for our colored fellow citizens in the United States will not have arrived. The inequalities and inequities built up against them over a hundred years cannot be erased overnight by the mere passage of a law. I wish that were the case, but it is not.

More is needed to wipe away the century-old inequalities and inequities than the passage of this much-needed bill. There must be vigorous enforcement of its provisions.

But more is called for than vigorous enforcement. Inequalities have come about through lack of equal educational opportunities. Much more in the way of educational facilities must be made available. Negroes who cannot compete in the employment market because of missed educational opportunities must have readily available such training as is necessary to permit them to catch up. This will take time and patience and a desire to learn.

But a great step forward in the attainment and protection of the civil rights of all Americans has been taken with the enactment of this bill. Its passage comes far too late and not a moment too soon.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

As a member of Senator HUMPHREY'S Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations, I undertook a study late in 1962 and early in 1963 of the U.S. military and economic assistance programs in 10 Middle Eastern and African countries (Turkey, Iran, Syria, Lebanon, Jordan, Israel, Greece, Tunisia, Libya, and Egypt). Subsequently, I submitted to the Senate a lengthy report analyzing the U.S. AID program in each of these countries and recommending 21 ways in which the administration of the AID program could be improved.

Since coming to the Senate, I have, as a firm believer that the U.S. AID program should be improved in its administration if it is to be an effective tool of our foreign policy, sought to change the manner in which it is being administered. Many of the changes which I suggested were resisted initially by the AID administrators but later were incorporated in the law and have proved to be helpful to the program.

For example, in 1960 I offered an amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act which would require every nonmilitary public works project under the foreign assistance program to meet the same standards of economic justification, as established by the Bureau of the Budget, which must be met by similar projects in the United States. This proposal was vigorously resisted by the AID administrators. In the Senate vote on my amendment, it was narrowly defeated, 40–45. And yet, the very next year, without fanfare, this same provision was incorporated in the Foreign Assistance Act with the blessing of the AID administrators. This provision is still the law.

Similarly, in my Middle East report, I pointed out that each time we made a development loan under the foreign assistance program at terms of three-fourths of 1 percent interest, repayable in 40 years with a moratorium on repayment of principal for the first 10 years, we were making a hidden grant to the recipient nation. This is so because the United States must pay about 4 percent interest on the money it borrows to make these loans.

My attempts to amend the Foreign Assistance Act to require that interest be charged foreign countries at the same rate paid by the United States for its borrowings were fiercely resisted.

However, progress is being made in this area. This year the interest rate was raised from three-fourths of 1 percent for the first 10 years to 1 percent and from 2 to 2½ percent thereafter. Even this change—inadequate as it might be—will save American taxpayers $100 million during the course of the repayment of the foreign aid loans made this year alone.

With respect to foreign affairs generally, I have vigorously opposed further foreign aid to Egypt so long as that nation continues to arm for aggression against its neighbors, indirectly using our foreign aid for that purpose and engaging as it is in an aggressive war in Yemen. Indonesia, as we know, pursues a similar aggressive tack in southeastern Asia and I have opposed aid to Indonesia.

I have also opposed our armed intervention in South Vietnam contending for months now that the conflict in that country can be settled not by military means but by diplomatic efforts at a United Nations conference table.

CONSERVATION OF NATURAL RESOURCES

The 88th Congress has been keenly aware of the need for preserving this Nation's natural beauty and for providing recreational facilities for the public, thereby continuing the work begun in the 87th Congress. Padre Island National Seashore in Texas, Point Reyes National Seashore in California, and Cape Cod National Seashore in Massachusetts were created by the 87th Congress.

In the 88th Congress, we have added the Ozark Rivers National Riverway in Missouri, Canyon Lands National Park in Utah, and Fire Island National Seashore in New York. The Senate has approved two other areas of particular interest—the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore in Michigan, and the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore. The projects are all a part of the same important movement to save in as nearly possible their primitive state the still not fully developed and built-up areas for the future pleasure of all the American people.

After 8 years of study and compromise, the Congress has approved the wilderness bill. Public Law 88–577 sets aside a 9.2-million-acre preservation system which may be expanded to 14.7 million acres of federally owned land as a wilderness unavailable for commercial use. The Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee on which I serve did not want the Wilderness Preservation System to hurt the economy. In our report we specified:

"There will be no withdrawal of lands from the tax base of the counties or communities; no withdrawal of timberlands on which lumbering operations depend, nor any withdrawal of present grazing or mining rights."

The public law specifies that each recommendation of the President for designation as "wilderness" shall become effective only if so provided by an act of Congress.

We have authorized under Public Law 88–379 a 10-year, $82.5 million program of Federal aid to land-grant colleges and universities to expand water resources research and scientific training. This program is one of the most important to be started by the Congress and to be conducted by the States, because, under present methods of management and utilization, water requirements will exceed usable supply in all or parts of 26 of our 50 States, including California, Oregon, Nevada, Utah, Idaho, and Montana, as well as the populous Eastern States. Alaska's water supply at present is sufficient.

Alaskans, better than residents of other States, know the urgency for modernizing our public land laws and regulations. This Congress has approved Public Law 88–606, which establishes a 19-member bipartisan commission to conduct a review of this problem.

Since I have been a Member of the Senate, homesteaders throughout the State have been writing to me to describe their problems with representatives of the Bureau of Land Management and the Geological Survey.

Obviously the application today of laws designed for the 19th century tends to obfuscate the problems. Alaskan homesteaders face enough challenges. They do not need the added impediment of arbitrary bureaucratic action.

The review commission established will, I hope, make it unnecessary to establish in the Office of the Secretary of the Interior a Board of Public Lands Appeals which I first suggested and introduced authorizing language to create on April 4, 1962, in the 87th Congress and subsequently reintroduced this Congress. Many Senators sponsored this bill. Congress must make certain the laws and regulations governing the use and disposition of public lands are interpreted and applied uniformly and equitably.

The land and water conservation fund established by Public Law 88–578 will help our States and Federal agencies meet present and future outdoor recreation demands. The Senate Interior Public Lands Subcommittee, on which I serve, held extensive hearings on this legislation, and the bill was amended to prevent arbitrary action by officialdom. I personally would object to charging an entrance fee to our Alaska national parks and monuments, although it is customary in other parts of the United States. But where, as in Mount McKinley National Park, Glacier Bay National Monument, and Katmai National Monument—areas of superb scenery—there has been little or no installation of facilities or accommodations by the Federal Government, I would find it highly objectionable if visitors were charged a fee merely to go in and look at the wonderful scenery provided free by nature.

No fees of any kind may be charged under authority of this act: First, for use of any waters; second, for travel through areas on Federal-aid highways or any road within the national forest system or a public land area; third, for access to private inholdings; fourth, for any commercial or other activities not related to recreation; or fifth, as a Federal hunting and fishing license.

Some provisions of the act are open to doubt. In the years ahead Congress may find it necessary to amend the act which now provides for a State-Federal cost-sharing program to provide the facilities in our recreation areas.

Alaska depends on its water resources and the action of this Congress in appropriating funds for river and harbor improvements, as well as power development, has been helpful.

1. Public works appropriations, 1964: Last year Alaska's congressional delegation sought and won support to add to the public works appropriation bill the $921,000 badly needed to construct the Sitka small boat harbor. The President's budget has included a $225,000 request for preconstruction planning of the Crater-Long Lakes division of the Snettisham project near Juneau authorized by the 87th Congress.

Added to the 1964 budget were funds for the following studies: Hydaburg harbor navigation, $10,000; King Cove harbor navigation, $10,000; Ketchikan Creek flood control, $20,000; and Nenana River flood control, $20,000.

Retained in the budget were these items requested by the President: Flood control investigations—Clark's Point, $20,000; Knik River, $50,000; Seward, $15,000; Tanana River at Nenana, $19,000; Valdez glacier streams, $5,000; and navigation investigations—Dry Straits-Wrangell Narrows, $2,000; Hoonah Harbor, $17,000; Knik and Turnagain Arms causeways, $45,000; and Kake Harbor, $17,000.

The total appropriation for fiscal year 1964 was $1,396,000.

2. Public works appropriations, 1965; Senate and House conferees approved a public works appropriation totaling $1,693,000 for Alaska for fiscal year 1965. The total included $500,000 added by the Senate Appropriations Committee for investigation of approximately 27 navigation projects to determine the extent, if any, of earthquake damage and to make repairs.

The conferees kept $25,000 added by the Senate—to start a navigation survey on the Kobuk River, $10,000, and to initiate a breakwater protection and harbor facilities study at Auke Bay, $15,000.

Other projects approved include Snettisham, $750,000 for preconstruction planning; navigation surveys—Dry Strait-Wrangell Narrows, $72,000; Gastineau Channel, $25,000; Hydaburg Harbor, $21,000; King Cove, $21,000; Knik and Turnagain Arms, $27,000; Kodiak, $15,000; Sergius Narrows, $15,000; funding was provided for: Ketchikan Creek flood control survey, $25,000; Kachemak Bay beach erosion survey, $32,000; and three operation and maintenance programs: Dillingham Harbor, $100,000; Nome Harbor, $62,000; Stikine River, $3,000.

Included in the 1965 act was $450,000 for Bureau of Reclamation investigations and an estimated $305,000 for operation and maintenance of the Eklutna hydroelectric project near Anchorage.

HARNESSING OUR WATERS TO UTILIZE OUR RESOURCES

This 88th Congress appropriated the necessary $197,000 to complete the Rampart Dam project study approved on April 24, 1959, at my request by the Senate Public Works Committee. That resolution requested the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors "to determine the advisability of improvements in the interest of hydroelectric power and other water uses in the Yukon River basins, Alaska, with particular reference to the Rampart Canyon site."

The total appropriation by the Congress to date for the complete investigation of the Rampart Canyon hydroelectric project is $1,136,000.

Rampart would be the largest dam in the free world in power production capacity, approximately 5 million kilowatts. Power could be produced to sell at 2 mills per kilowatt-hour at the busbar or 3 mills transmitted to tidewater on Cook Inlet or Prince William Sound. Total cost of the dam is estimated to be $1⅓ billion—a loan which will be repaid both as to principal and interest from the power revenues generated.

The Rampart study was initiated in 1959 with a modest appropriation of $48,750. That start came when the Congress overrode the veto for the first time in the Eisenhower administration.

This fall, the comprehensive information collected is under review by the Corps of Engineers. In the coming Congress we shall try to take the necessary steps toward Rampart's construction and work for its authorization in the Rivers and Harbors Act.

CADASTRAL SURVEYS

Under the Statehood Act, Alaska was allotted 103.5 million acres of Federal land and given 25 years in which to select it. Completing survey work on land masses approximating the size of the State of California required speed, use of modern methods, and agreement between the State and Federal Governments as to what constituted a proper cadastral survey.

When the Bureau of Land Management early in 1963 announced its intention to reduce its budget request for surveys in Alaska, Senator BARTLETT and I asked the Senate Appropriations Committee what could be done to follow the intent of the Statehood Act since section 6(g) specified:

"Where any lands desired by the State are unsurveyed at the time of their selection, the Secretary of the Interior shall survey the exterior boundaries of the area requested without any interior subdivision thereof, and shall issue a patent for such selected area in terms of the exterior boundary."

The Senate Appropriations Committee subsequently directed:

"A reading of the statute and the committee reports on the legislation which was enacted into law leads to the clear and definite conclusion that Congress intended that so long as the State selections meet the specifically stated requirements of the act there should be an exterior boundary survey of each land selection made by the State of Alaska.

"Therefore, the committee directs that the Secretary of the Interior cause surveys of Alaskan land selections made under the terms of Public Law 85–508 (the Alaska Statehood Act) to be executed in compliance with this report. It is also the desire of the committee that the Department proceed as promptly as possible with the surveys in order that the time limitations of the act admitting Alaska to the Union will be met."

To speed work on the Alaska cadastral surveys, the committee added $300,000 over the budget estimate of $1,960,000 for cadastral surveys in Alaska. That amount was retained by the conferees who also agreed, "* * * that the directive included in the report of the Senate committee with regard to surveys of Alaska land selections made under the terms of the Alaska Statehood Act (Public Law 85–508) will be satisfied by surveys of the exterior boundaries of full townships (even if composed of as many as four land selections) with monumentation at an average of 2 miles around the perimeter."

GLACIER BAY NATIONAL MONUMENT

This Congress approved the request of the National Park Service to start construction of visitor facilities at Glacier Bay National Monument. The approval of the expenditure of $845,000 is needed and one I have long supported. It should be increased substantially next year if we are to provide adequate accommodations for visitors. Within the boundaries of this monument's 2.3 million acres, situated less than 50 air miles from Juneau, are glaciers of grand scale.

Freeman Tilden, author of "The National Parks: What They Mean to You and Me," writes: "* * * here on the coast of southeastern Alaska is the unrivaled place to see the life of the glacial ice of our continent."

Visitor facilities will make the exploration of this vast and beautiful area possible where now there is no access except in extraordinary circumstances.

AIDING THE FISHING INDUSTRY

Alaska's fishery resources will be strengthened and our fishermen aided as a result of action taken by this Congress.

Public Law 88–308 prohibits fishing in territorial waters of the United States and certain other areas by persons other than U.S. nationals or inhabitants. This bill, S. 1988, was introduced by Senator BARTLETT and Congressman RIVERS and became public law on May 20, 1964. Putting teeth into the law makes sense. Violators of our 3-mile limit now can be fined or imprisoned and their catch and gear forfeited. This provision will apply equally to the 12-mile limit when Congress authorizes it—a course I have urged.

The new law also prohibits the taking by foreigners of resources of the Continental Shelf claimed by the United States, including crab and shrimp.

Public Law 88–309 coordinates aid to States as they develop their commercial fisheries. It authorizes a multimillion-dollar aid program under a special apportionment of funds formula. No State may receive more than 6 percent of the funds available nor less than one-half of 1 percent.

Public Law 88–424 restores to self-employed U.S. fishermen eligibility which existed from 1798 to 1954 for medical care in hospitals, outpatient clinics, and other medical facilities of the Public Health Service in the event of illness or injury incurred while engaged in their hazardous and essential occupation.

The Senate ratified the protocol amending the interim convention on conservation of North Pacific fur seals.

My bill to extend our territorial fishing waters to a more realistic 12 miles, S. 1816, cosponsored by the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], has been favorably received and I will reintroduce it next Congress. We could, of course, hold to our 3-mile limit, but the days of 1805 when the limit was established have passed. Three miles were chosen because that was the distance that a round cannon ball could be expected to travel and hit its target.

We must make a realistic appraisal of the deleterious effect our outdated 3-mile limit has on our fishing industry before we slide from fifth place to an even lower position among the fishing nations of the world. Our fishermen do a remarkable job, considering the handicaps under which they operate.

ACHIEVEMENTS IN EDUCATION

This Congress has enacted more educational legislation than any Congress in our Nation's history.

Accomplishments include: (1) Construction grants for health-teaching facilities; (2) low interest loans to assist students of medicine, dentistry, and osteopathy; (3) a $1.2 billion 3-year college construction program to meet the expected yearly enrollment increase of 350,000; (4) expanded vocational education and construction program; (5) expanded Library Services Act extending Federal aid to urban and rural library facilities; (6) expanded and improved National Defense Education Act; (7) expanded teachers training and adult education program; (8) a program for training teachers of exceptional children; (9) extension of the Juvenile Delinquency Control Act; (10) expansion of the War Orphans' Educational Act; (11) extension of long-term, low-cost loans to include students of optometry.

Federal aid to schools in impacted areas under Public Laws 874 (operating expenses) and 815 (construction) is of great importance to Alaska where school enrollment includes a high percentage of pupils whose parents are employed by the Federal Government. Since the program began in 1951, Alaska has received $57,740,000 under Public Law 874 and $34,695,000 under Public Law 815. Both programs have been extended through June 30, 1967.

The amendments to the National Defense Education Act increase amounts available for student loans, extend the loan provisions to students in postsecondary schools such as accredited business and technical institutions, include among eligible institutions of higher learning public and other nonprofit collegiate and associate degree schools of nursing and allow part-time students carrying at least one-half of a standard academic workload to receive loans.

Loan limits for graduate students will be raised from $1,000 to $2,500 and aggregate limits for such students from $5,000 to $10,000. The National Defense Education Act now includes financial assistance for strengthening instruction in science, mathematics, and foreign languages.

Estimates of amounts Alaska will receive for student loans, by fiscal years, are as follows: 1965, $65,807; 1966, $72,255; 1967, $76,567; 1968, $78,581. The State will receive $50,000 per year for guidance counseling and testing, while for acquisition of equipment for science, mathematics and modern foreign languages and other critical subjects $95,345 will be available annually as grants for public schools and $3,727 for loans to nonpublic schools. For State administration and supervision of the equipment acquisition program $50,000 annually in Federal funds will be provided.

Public Law 88–230 increased from $7.5 to $12 million per year the amount authorized to be appropriated for the Indian vocational training program.

Public Law 88–214 waived the State matching requirement of the Manpower Training Act for fiscal year 1965, and extended the act for 2 additional years with the requirement that States match one-third and one-half, respectively, in fiscal years 1966 and 1967.

IMPROVING THE ECONOMY

Despite the continuing prosperity for a majority of Americans, at least 20 percent of our citizens are impoverished. Yet, during the past decade and a half, we have spent more than $100 billion to aid other countries. Surely we can afford to spend less than 3 percent of that amount to provide the same opportunity for American unemployed as we have offered the unemployed in 107 foreign countries.

My bill, S. 1121, would have increased by $1.5 billion the $900 million authorized by the 87th Congress for the Accelerated Public Works Act. Funds were appropriated, $880 million, but the act ran dry early in 1963 leaving undone $717 million of worthwhile public works projects approved but unfunded. Hundreds of other projects simply pended. The Congress regretfully did not act on the proposed extension of the APW program although the Senate Public Works Committee of which I am a member reported S. 1856 on June 1, 1964, following extensive hearings.

The Federal Government's war against poverty will be aided under the programs planned in the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 for which $800 million has been appropriated. The antipoverty program will establish youth job corps camps on public lands and at residential vocational centers. It sets up work training and work study programs and community action programs which are to be developed and administered locally. It includes adult training programs and loan programs to low-income rural families, small businessmen, and migrant worker families. It establishes a domestic peace corps known as VISTA (Volunteers in Service to America).

I support the concept of the Economic Opportunity Act which immeasurably helps individuals and communities. I believe, however, that the program, while presenting an admirable beginning, simply is not enough. Americans living in poverty need jobs now. The accelerated public works program has proved itself to be one of the fastest means of creating such jobs. I intend to reintroduce my bill to extend the program when the 89th Congress convenes.

This Congress has improved our economy by approving the 1964 Revenue Act which reduced individual and corporate income taxes by $11.5 billion. The individual reductions increased consumer purchasing power by more than $9 billion a year. The corporate reduction amounts to more than $2 billion a year, which is added to business tax cuts of $2.5 billion a year provided by the investment tax credit and depreciation reform of 1962.

This stimulus to investment and consumption has spurred our economic growth and helped give us the longest and strongest peacetime economic expansion in this century.

The Senate approved, on September 25, the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1964 which gave to that plucky but impoverished area tools designed to make possible the economic development and rehabilitation of the Appalachian region, covering an 11-State area containing 165,000 square miles and inhabited by 15 million Americans. The bill was not approved by the House. As a member of the Senate Public Works Committee which reported the measure, I shall urge that it be enacted early next year.

Need exists, too, to implement the existing legislation which created the Area Redevelopment Administration which has created more than 500 new jobs in Alaska alone.

As we battle constantly to improve our economy we must realize that continuing poverty and the population explosion problem will not permit much change until both dilemmas have been solved. Runaway population will not permit our society to prosper, and family planning in one country does very little to change the entire picture if population is exploding in other areas. Ten thousand people die of malnutrition or starvation each day. More than one-half of the world's 3-plus billion inhabitants live in constant hunger. In our own United States 30 million Americans go to bed hungry each night.

Our world population growth last year was 2 percent, confined primarily to the poverty-stricken areas of Africa, Asia, and Latin America. The increase is disturbing when one considers that a 3-percent-per-year world growth rate means that our world population doubles in less than 25 years.

Congress is becoming concerned. The senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] and I have cosponsored a Senate concurrent resolution proposing—

(1) That the President create a Presidential Commission on Population to get the real population facts and to report what they mean; and

(2) That the President substantially increase our research in the field of human reproduction and make our findings freely available to countries requesting assistance.

Identical legislation has been introduced in the House of Representatives by MORRIS UDALL, of Arizona. Other Members have expressed interest, and our mail on this subject is thoughtful and encouraging. We can solve the population-poverty problem if we mobilize the knowledge available and keep in mind that we do not have to ask anyone to do anything which is opposed to his own particular beliefs, thereby assuring that individual choice prevails.

COLA TERMINATION OPPOSED

The Alaska congressional delegation vigorously opposed the 1964 Civil Service Commission proposal to terminate cost-of-living allowances paid Federal employees in Alaska and other offshore but nonforeign areas. I testified before the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee and cited statistics which proved that the 25 percent cost-of-living allowance in Alaska has been inadequate. For example, goods and services are 23 percent higher than the U.S. average at Ketchikan, 27 percent at Juneau, 29 percent at Anchorage, 42 percent at Fairbanks, and 72 percent at Nome. The bill, H.R. 7401, was not reported by the House committee. The Civil Service Commission, however, has ordered a review of COLA in Alaska and other areas this fall. The survey in Alaska will be conducted by the Bureau of Labor Statistics and turned over to the State Department for analysis.

HEALTH CARE

A legislative milestone was reached this fall when the Senate by a vote of 49 to 44 incorporated a hospital and home nursing care provision in amendments to the Social Security Act. Senator BARTLETT and I voted for this measure. Regrettably, the House-Senate conferees could not come to agreement. President Johnson has said, "Most Americans want medical care for older citizens, and so do I."

So do I. The ever-present danger of hospitalized illness is the gravest threat to the economic security of the elderly. Our social security system works and can be properly amended to include hospital care for the men and women who would benefit immediately—the people who have helped build the foundation of our great society. I am confident that we shall see this proposed legislation approved by the 89th Congress.

The legislation has been and is misnamed. It does not provide medical care; it does provide hospital care.

A SQUARE DEAL FOR HOMEOWNERS—THE HOUSING ACT OF 1964

The 1964 changes in the National Housing Act includes the Gruening amendment which gives added meaning to the words "FHA insured." For more than 2 years, I have sought this new protection against structural defects for buyers of homes covered by FHA-insured mortgages. Heretofore the words "FHA insured" referred only to the bank or lending institution insuring the mortgage.

No legal liability upon the Federal Housing Administration existed to insure that the houses delivered met the standards of specifications established by the FHA. This deplorable situation was called to my attention in the 87th Congress when the purchasers of approximately 50 prefabricated houses in Eagle River, near Anchorage, Alaska, told me of the sorry condition of their FHA-insured homes. Deficiencies included loose and buckling wall paneling, leaky roofs, excessive heat loss, interior frost accumulation, sloppy installation of windows and storm doors and storm windows, bathroom exhaust fan not vented to the outside, and other examples of poor workmanship which caused kitchen cabinets to pull away from the walls. No legal recourse existed although at my request the FHA caused the builder to correct the defects.

My investigations revealed that similar conditions existed in other States and many Senators cosponsored my proposed legislation. Senate Banking and Currency Committee Housing Subcommittee Chairman JOHN SPARKMAN held hearings October 17 and 18, 1963. The legislative need became increasingly apparent. The Senate-approved bill of July 29, 1964, contained a new section for title V of the act which would give meaning to the words "FHA insured." The House bill did not. In conference the Senate conferees agreed to amend the language by striking out the retroactive provision and removing the words "and other provisions" limiting the coverage to structural defects.

Thus, the owner of an FHA-insured home has a long-needed new protection, dating from September 2, 1964. If he finds structural defects he is to request assistance from the Federal Housing Administration Commissioner not later than 4 years after insurance of the mortgage and if the property is encumbered by a mortgage insured under the act after September 2, 1964. The FHA Commissioner is directed to issue regulations on the new consumer protection.

ALASKA CENTENNIAL STUDY

The 88th Congress approved my bill, S. 49, as amended, which authorizes a study to determine the manner in which and the extent to which the United States shall participate in the 1967 Alaska Centennial. The Senate and House Appropriations Committee conferees have explicitly directed the Department of Commerce to make this study with existing funds in salaries and expenses, general administration. The report is to be submitted to Congress by March 15, 1965. New Public Law 88-610 was cosponsored by Senator BARTLETT and Representative RIVERS.

OTHER ALASKA LEGISLATION

Legislation of primary interest to Alaskans, not referred to previously, includes:

1. Public Law 88-266 permits the Federal Government to pay for transportation of motor vehicles of its employees transferred to and from Alaska;
2. Public Law 88-229 permits forgiveness of debts owed by the cities of Haines, Skagway, and Hoonah under the Alaska Public Works Act;
3. Public Law 88-429 authorizes conveyance of 328 acres of federally owned land to the native village of Saxman;
4. Public Law 88-289 gives Alaska 5 more years, until January 3, 1969, in which to select Federal lands leased under the Mineral Leasing Act;
5. Public Law 88-135 permits selection of land by the State of Alaska for community development purposes to be in units as small as 160 acres;
6. Public Law 88-157 increases percentage of federally allotted highway funds useable by the State for preliminary and preconstruction engineering and design on primary, secondary, and urban roads from 10 to 15 percent saving Alaska $1 million a year;
7. Public Law 88-34 authorizes survey and establishment of a townsite for the Juneau native village;
8. Public Law 88-389 authorizes the Secretary of the Navy to produce and sell petroleum from the Umiat field, Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 4, for the purpose of aiding petroleum exploration and development in nearby areas outside the reserve;
9. Public Law 88-409 authorizes termination of a restriction on the use of land previously conveyed to the city of Fairbanks;
10. Private Law 88-351 agrees to relieve certain employees of the Alaska Railroad from having to refund to the Government amounts erroneously paid them as retroactive wage increases;
11. Public Law 88-173 reduces the annual installment requirement on repayment of the debt of Alaska's employment security system to the unemployment trust fund (Reed fund); and
12. Public Law 88-66 makes possible equitable principles in adjudicating sales.

MINERALS, MATERIALS, FUELS SUBCOMMITTEE

It has been my privilege this Congress to serve as chairman of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Subcommittee on Minerals, Materials, and Fuels. Subcommittee members have worked hard to help solve the problems of the domestic mining industry. We held hearings May 9 and 10, 1963, and called in witnesses from public and private life to provide every possible bit of technical information.

Our attempts to help revitalize the gold mining industry has been handicapped by the administration's refusal to realize that the industry cannot survive so long as its product will bring only $35 per ounce. Attempts to establish a Gold Procurement and Sales Agency in the Department of the Interior to be the official agency for sale of gold for nonmonetary purposes have been unsuccessful as have attempts to persuade the Secretary of the Interior to make a study of conditions of the gold-mining industry in order to make recommendations to the President for remedial measures.

My Gold Mine Revitalization Act, designed to compensate domestic gold miners for differences of costs in production today and costs incurred for the same work in 1940 was cosponsored by Senators BIBLE, KUCHEL, BARTLETT, METCALF, and MCGOVERN. The bill, S. 2125, was reported unanimously by the subcommittee and by the full Senate Interior Committee, but adament opposition of the executive branch to any legislation in aid of gold miners prevents enactment. The bill was widely approved by the gold mining industry. Its principles will form a basis for future legislation.

I have introduced a bill, S. 1807, applicable to all mining, to remove completely the limitations on deductions for exploration expenses. The Treasury Department vigorously opposed the bill because it felt that exploration expenses are, in fact, capital investment recoverable through depletion allowances; thus, says Treasury, their allowances as deductible expenses would result in a double deduction. I countered by introducing S. 3073 to allow full deduction of exploration expenditures by mining industries as they are paid or incurred, without regard to the $400,000 total, $100,000 annual limitation now in the internal revenue law. This bill will be considered again when I reintroduce it next year.

NEW MINERAL LAWS

1. Public Law 88-526, introduced by Senator Moss, of Utah, provides for acreage limitations increases for leasing of coal on the public domain.
2. Public Law 88-548, introduced by Senators METCALF, MANSFIELD, CHURCH, JORDAN of Idaho and Moss, increases acreage limitations on phosphate lands on the public domain available for leasing under provisions of the Mineral Leasing Act from 10,240 to 20,480.

SENATE ACTION

Senator BIBLE introduced S. 883, to authorize leasing of the public domain for development of geothermal resources. This legislation is required to allow leasing of the public domain for this purpose. There is now no provision in law for this. It passed the Senate August 21, 1964.

My bill, S. 1984, would liberalize regulations governing payment of oil and gas rentals under terms of the Mineral Leasing Act by changing the law to provide that the postmark date of the lease rental would govern the determination of timely payment rather than date of receipt in the land office. This bill passed the Senate September 1, 1964.

BUDGET REVIEWS

The best way to determine if the needs of Alaska are being met is to trace interdepartmental budgets of key governmental departments serving the State. This budget information from statehood to estimated fiscal year 1965 has been supplied by the Department of Agriculture, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Department of the Interior, Army Corps of Engineers, and the Department of Commerce. It appears in chart form on a year-by-year basis.

Since statehood, nearly a billion dollars has been expended and invested in Alaska by but five departments of the Federal Government—the Department of Agriculture, the Department of the Interior, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Department of Commerce, and the Corps of Engineers. I have asked these departments for a year-by-year breakdown and their responses follow.

This is not intended to be a complete listing of Alaskan development, but rather it is to show that the Government is increasing its investment in the State and that that investment expands each year.

The departmental breakdown is as follows:

Department of Agriculture

Agricultural Research Service:	
Expended:	
1959	$342,786
1960	346,044
1961	384,674
1962	402,247
1963	422,399
1964 estimate	425,200
1965 estimate	435,600
Total	2,758,950
Forest Service:	
Expended:	
1959	2,390,665
1960	2,594,569
1961	3,661,012
1962	4,569,259
1963	5,805,867
1964 estimate	6,669,624
1965 estimate	6,860,100
Total	32,551,096
Soil Conservation Service:	
Expended:	
1959	132,356
1960	135,314
1961	159,933
1962	164,545
1963	181,869
1964 estimate	203,877
1965 estimate	215,000
Total	1,192,894
Farmers Home Administration:	
Expended:	
1959	131,708
1960	377,356
1961	459,063
1962	1,345,688
1963	1,306,235
1964 estimate	1,031,951
1965 estimate	4,000,000
Total	8,652,001
Rural Electrification Administration:	
Expended:	
1959	875,000
1960	5,155,000
1961	2,524,000
1962	6,596,000
1963	6,338,000
1964 estimate	35,290,000
1965 estimate	(1)
Total	56,778,000
Federal Extension Service:	
Expended:	
1959	107,993
1960	107,993
1961	111,429
1962	138,190
1963	158,008
1964 estimate	193,871
1965 estimate	194,000
Total	1,011,484

See footnote at end of table.

Department of Agriculture—Continued	
Agricultural Marketing Service:	
Expended:	
1959	$222,060
1960	249,696
1961	322,109
1962	320,204
1963	432,155
1964 estimate	441,839
1965 estimate	(1)
Total	1,988,063
Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service:	
Expended:	
1959	75,345
1960	84,078
1961	89,304
1962	115,254
1963	131,461
1964 estimate	144,776
1965 estimate	190,160
Total	830,378
Commodity Credit Corporation:	
Expended:	
1959	13,523
1960	20,909
1961	16,654
1962	33,659
1963	42,878
1964 estimate	37,000
1965 estimate	(1)
Total	164,623
Cooperative State Research Service:	
Expended:	
1959	218,143
1960	223,099
1961	225,773
1962	248,070
1963	250,938
1964 estimate	282,995
1965 estimate	330,980
Total	1,779,998
Statistical Reporting Service:	
Expended:	
1961	21,224
1962	29,720
1963	21,799
1964 estimate	28,605
1965 estimate	30,500
Total	131,848
Total, Department of Agriculture	107,839,335
Department of the Interior	
The Alaska Railroad:	
Appropriated: 1964	$20,000,000
Expended:	
1959	17,174,000
1960	17,464,000
1961	14,335,000
1962	14,480,000
1963	16,402,000
1964	15,800,101
1965 estimate	53,971,000
Total	149,626,101
Bureau of Commercial Fisheries:	
Appropriated:	
1959	3,336,970
1960	4,617,778
1961	5,272,302
1962	4,816,309
1963	3,089,000
1964	3,700,400
1965 estimate	3,775,400
Total	28,608,159
Department of the Interior—Continued	
Bureau of Commercial Fisheries—Continued	
Expended:	
1959	$4,655,797
1960	4,421,775
1961	5,264,781
1962	4,816,309
1963	3,456,000
1964	3,501,000
1965 estimate	3,377,000
Total	29,492,662
Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife:	
Appropriated:	
1959	655,475
1960	813,670
1961	787,610
1962	919,050
1963	1,088,750
1964	824,140
1965 estimate	865,800
Total	5,954,495
Expended:	
1959	641,513
1960	801,506
1961	765,809
1962	919,050
1963	1,070,750
1964	766,000
1965 estimate	848,000
Total	5,812,628
Bureau of Indian Affairs:	
Appropriated:	
1959	9,130,402
1960	7,250,813
1961	8,737,564
1962	13,195,497
1963	16,029,989
1964	22,398,471
1965 estimate	19,200,829
Total	95,943,565
Expended:	
1959	8,703,083
1960	8,606,399
1961	9,851,590
1962	13,849,749
1963	15,500,437
1964	17,342,282
1965 estimate	19,200,829
Total	93,054,369
Bureau of Land Management:	
Appropriated:	
1959	4,850,249
1960	4,817,774
1961	4,637,098
1962	4,099,938
1963	4,510,956
1964	4,247,165
1965 estimate	4,195,000
Total	31,358,180
Expended:	
1959	4,892,140
1960	4,812,055
1961	4,682,014
1962	4,004,028
1963	4,428,354
1964	4,300,878
1965 estimate	4,195,000
Total	31,314,469
Bureau of Mines:	
Appropriated:	
1959	423,900
1960	428,100
1961	420,000
1962	391,200
1963	395,000
Department of the Interior—Continued	
Bureau of Mines—Continued	
Appropriated:	
1964	$507,000
1965 estimate	517,000
Total	3,082.200
Expended:	
1959	420,169
1960	425,189
1961	418,320
1962	391,200
1963	388,000
1964	502,000
1965 estimate	512,000
1965 estimate	3,056,878
Bureau of Reclamation:	
Appropriated:	
1959	504,808
1960	522,422
1961	552,002
1962	643,700
1963	647,735
1964	1,263,400
1965 estimate	1,608,400
Total	5,742,467
Expended:	
1959	617,469
1960	504,026
1961	542,912
1962	643,700
1963	631,143
1964	1,192,912
1965 estimate	1,608,400
Total	5,740,562
Geological Survey:	
Appropriated:	
1959	2,720,000
1960	2,968,000
1961	3,049,000
1962	2,787,000
1963	3,336,000
1964	3,614,000
1965 estimate	3,170,000
Total	21,644,000
Expended:	
1962	3,020,000
1963	3,336,000
1964	3,614,000
1965 estimate	3,170,000
Total	13,140,000
Office of Minerals Exploration:	
Appropriated:	
1962	11,000
1963	48,218
1964	92,000
1965 estimate	79,000
Total	230,218
Expended:	
1963	48,218
1964	92,000
1965 estimate	79,000
Total	219,218
Office of the Secretary:	
Appropriated:	
1962	23,800
1963	32,694
1964	36,300
1965 estimate	36,300
Total	129,094
Expended:	
1963	32,694
1964	36,300
1965 estimate	36,300
Total	105,294

See footnote at end of table.

Department of the Interior—Continued

Office of the Solicitor:	
Appropriated:	
1959	$114,400
1960	109,900
1961	111,500
1962	122,635
1963	98,743
1964	117,700
1965 estimate	122,281
Total	797,159
Expended:	
1959	114,400
1963	98,743
1964	117,700
1965 estimate	122,281
Total	453,124

National Park Service:	
Appropriated:	
1959	959,626
1960	1,418,932
1961	1,231,239
1962	627,280
1963	1,045,748
1964	1,618,900
1965 estimate	1,951,200
Total	8,852,925
Expended:	
1959	1,829,044
1960	955,137
1961	1,387,294
1962	1,225,142
1963	623,801
1964	1,606,223
1965 estimate	1,951,200
Total	9,577,841

Office of Territories:	
Appropriated:	
1959	5,461,660
1960	290,000
1961	250,000
1962	78,000
Total	6,079,660
Expended:	
1959	6,001,010
1960	4,582,783
1961	1,667,863
1962	----------
1963	1,309
1964	595
1965 estimate	600
Total	12,254,160
Total expended, Department of the Interior	353,847,306

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

Food and Drug Administration:	
Appropriated:	
1959	$1,000
1960	1,000
1961	1,000
1962	1,000
1963	2,643
1964	3,390
1965 estimate	4,000
Total	14,033
Obligated:	
1959	1,000
1960	1,000
1961	1,000
1962	1,000
1963	2,643
1964	3,390
1965 estimate	4,000
Total	14,033

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—Continued

Office of Education (some State funds required):	
Appropriated:	
1959	$5,467,943
1960	9,203,206
1961	10,327,413
1962	8,683,638
1963	12,209,614
1964	10,369,866
1965 estimate	12,465,930
Total	68,727,610
Obligated:	
1959	5,417,941
1960	9,132,798
1961	10,281,275
1962	8,683,638
1963	12,088,118
1964	10,292,418
1965 estimate	12,451,404
Total	68,347,592

Vocational Rehabilitation Administration (State funds required):	
Appropriated:	
1959	136,610
1960	145,612
1961	172,950
1962	252,210
1963	305,463
1964	544,483
1965 estimate	406,843
Total	1,964,171
Obligated:	
1959	111,151
1960	119,464
1961	118,966
1962	169,912
1963	181,764
1964	444,379
1965 estimate	367,236
Total	1,512,872

Public Health Service (some State funds required):	
Appropriated:	
1959	23,608,834
1960	12,897,709
1961	14,299,271
1962	14,990,310
1963	15,898,777
1964	22,581,631
1965 estimate	21,788,420
Total	126,064,952
Obligated:	
1959	16,633,559
1960	19,159,681
1961	13,684,308
1962	13,842,013
1963	15,681,949
1964	21,935,708
1965 estimate	21,788,420
Total	122,725,638

Welfare Administration (State funds required):	
Appropriated:	
1959	2,147,648
1960	2,216,424
1961	2,217,717
1962	2,257,923
1963	2,426,215
1964	2,670,180
1965 estimate	2,979,971
Total	16,916,078

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—Continued

Welfare Administration (State funds required)—Con.	
Obligated:	
1959	$2,147,648
1960	2,216,424
1961	2,217,717
1962	2,257,923
1963	2,426,215
1964	2,670,180
1965 estimate	2,979,971
Total	16,916,078

Social Security Administration:	
Appropriated:	
1959	3,840,474
1960	4,321,758
1961	4,656,569
1962	5,339,375
1963	5,934,388
1964	6,178,740
1965 estimate	6,428,439
Total	24,092,564
Obligated:	
1959	3,840,474
1960	4,321,758
1961	4,656,569
1962	5,339,375
1963	5,934,338
1964	6,178,740
1965 estimate	6,428,439
Total	36,699,693
Total expended, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare	246,215,906

Corps of Engineers, U.S. Army

Appropriated:	
1959	$2,008,000
1960	498,000
1961	1,522,000
1962	3,045,000
1963	1,522,000
1964	2,635,000
1965 estimate	1,578,000
Total	12,808,000
Expended:	
1959	1,606,000
1960	1,396,000
1961	1,089,000
1962	2,361,000
1963	3,230,000
1964	2,651,000
1965 estimate	3,600,000
Total	15,933,000
Total expended, Corps of Engineers	15,933,000

Department of Commerce

Area Redevelopment Administration:	
Expended:	
1962	$1,555,106
1963	2,514,209
1964	458,959
1965 to date	3,739
Total	4,532,013

Bureau of the Census:	
Expended:	
1960	179,402
1961	1,904
1962	2,006
1963	1,844
1964	3,074
1965 estimate	12,741
Total	200,971

Department of Commerce—Continued

Domestic and international business:	
Expended:	
1963	$12,887
1964	26,118
1965 estimate	28,500
Total	67,505
Coast and Geodetic Survey:	
Expended:	
1959	930,300
1960	914,700
1961	1,283,000
1962	1,061,200
1963	923,100
1964	851,200
1965 estimate	2,108,400
Total	8,071,900
National Bureau of Standards:	
Expended:	
1959	170,680
1960	171,003
1961	176,240
1962	167,849
1963	169,250
1964	202,218
1965 estimate	249,000
Total	1,306,240
Weather Bureau:	
Expended:	
1959	2,292,000
1960	2,298,000
1961	2,164,000
1962	2,668,000
1963	2,474,000
1964	2,902,000
1965 estimate	3,014,000
Total	17,812,000
Maritime Administration:	
Expended:	
1959	297
1964	1,028
Total	1,325
Bureau of Public Roads:	
Expended:	
1959	15,402,904
1960	16,573,556
1961	12,600,117
1962	16,795,839
1963	19,631,902
1964	22,488,079
1965 estimate	28,849,900
Total	132,342,297
Total expended, Department of Commerce	164,334,251
Grand total expended by five departments	888,169,798

[1] Figure not available.

Tribute to Hon. J. L. Pilcher

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, J. L. PILCHER is a southern gentleman. I have visited his beautiful home in Georgia, I have visited his apartment in Washington, and in his office many times. He was always balanced, calm, affiable, and friendly. His service here in Congress was marked by a greatness of character that will always be to me an inspiration in dealing with my colleagues and fellow man. Not only hospitable, kind, and courteous, but a man of integrity and courage who can stand up and be counted.

J.L. will continue to be heard from in the years to come. I predict he will be called upon to serve his country again in another capacity and the Nation will benefit from his experience and leadership.

Mrs. Dorn joins me in wishing for our colleague and his lovely wife much happiness and every future success.

Hon. James C. Auchincloss

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. KUNKEL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, this year one of the great men of Congress is retiring after 22 years of outstanding service in this body on behalf of the people of New Jersey and the Nation. I refer, of course, to a man for whom Members of the Congress, Republicans and Democrats alike, have the highest personal and professional admiration—JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS.

Since 1942, when he was elected to the 78th Congress, he has not spared himself in the discharge of his duties and responsibilities as an able legislator. He has always been a dedicated and ardent supporter of sound government and the free enterprise system under which our Nation has prospered.

As a successful businessman before entering the political arena, JIM AUCHINCLOSS came to know the true meaning of fiscal responsibility and sound financial policy. As the deputy police commissioner of New York City he knew what crime on the streets and the exercise of responsibility by local law enforcement agencies meant long before they became political issues of the magnitude of which they are today. As a member of the city council and later as a three-term mayor of Rumson, N.J., JIM AUCHINCLOSS knew the tribulations and operations of a municipal government.

I cite these past experiences of JIM AUCHINCLOSS not necessarily to relate his previous successes, although they are indeed praiseworthy and commendable, but rather to illustrate that his understanding of the business community and the interests of local government through those positions made his service in the Congress truly representative.

Having served with him during the 78th through the 81st Congresses and later during the 87th and 88th Congresses, I know personally that he is one of the most dedicated men to have ever served in this Chamber. I have served with him on the Committee on Public Works, and I can personally attest to the sound reasoning, tireless devotion, and dedicated service which he demonstrated on the committee. His efforts on the Committee on the District of Columbia, the House Office Building Commission, and his endeavors with organizations and committees of the Grand Old Party have been equally outstanding.

I have great admiration and respect for JIM AUCHINCLOSS. His presence in this Chamber will be missed during the coming years, but his accomplishments here will have added much to making our future tasks more meaningful.

Second Annual Conference of the National Committee for Support of the Public Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, during 1964 there took place in Washington, D.C., on May 17, 18, and 19 the Second Annual Conference of the National Committee for Support of the Public Schools. This committee which has been established under the leadership of Agnes E. Meyer, in my judgment, is making a significant contribution to the improvement of the American public education. It is a bipartisan effort whose roster includes community leaders in business, labor, agriculture, and the professions in all of the 50 States and the District of Columbia. It is a nonprofit organization financed entirely by voluntary contributions which, while it does not lobby for specific legislation, nevertheless, through studies on school financing and conferences such as the May meetings contrives the essential factual basis for sound legislation. My thanks, as chairman of the Education Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, go to Agnes Meyer and her dedicated associates, together with my hope that in the future as in the past we shall continue to have the benefit of the work being done by the National Committee for Support of the Public Schools.

I ask unanimous consent that the major addresses delivered at the Second Annual Conference of the National Committee for Support of the Public Schools together with biographical notes of the program participants be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WELCOME TO THE CONFERENCE

(By Agnes E. Meyer, chairman, National Committee for Support of the Public Schools)

In the name of the committee, I want to extend a warm welcome to all our guests—and especially to the members of the National Committee for Support of the Public Schools who have traveled at their own expense from every part of the country.

They have made this sacrifice because they are community leaders who realize the importance of education to the future of our democracy and to the freedom of man. For this meeting, if we face the crucial issues of the day, could become a turning point in the war on poverty.

Sometimes, since I gave our convention the title "Education and Poverty," I feel sorry that I did not call it "Education and Destitution," for there is a sharp distinction between the two. When I grew up, in a small American village and, by the way, in a first-class public school, we would all have been considered poor by American standards today.

Certainly nobody in that village had an income of $3,000 a year, which is now considered the borderline of poverty, but since the automobile, television, and refrigerator had not yet been invented we did not realize that we were deprived, that we were by any means destitute—and yet that is the cruel fate of millions of Americans today. We had enough to wear and eat, and we lived in our private homes. Never did we think of ourselves as being impoverished. As a result, we cared about things of the mind, rather than material possessions.

Today, this convention must realize, conditions are very different. Confronted by the educational demands of automation, we are in danger of splitting our country into two elements, those who are educated enough to become a part of a highly technological society, and those who are truly destitute because they are deprived of the chance to become educated. If we do not meet that challenge at this convention we face the possibility that our so-called democratic society will come to resemble a great hospital in which the educated, well-to-do citizens will be obliged to become the sick nurses to the ignorant and the indigent.

The only answer to this dreary future is an education which will equip every American to become a contributing member of our economic structure. This committee has the kind of knowledge and courage needed to awaken the American people to their peril and their opportunity.

The constructive possibilities of public education are limitless. Let's go; let's explore. For you, the members of this committee, are the kind of people whose dynamism is now the essential force which can save our society from falling into drab stagnation.

EDUCATION AND NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

(By John Kenneth Galbraith, professor of Economics, Harvard University)

It is very good to be here this morning. I must say that I shared with all of you that sympathetic and touching account of Mrs. Meyer's early poverty. [Laughter.] I was reminded that when I was here before, speaking to the National Committee on Pockets of Poverty, I suggested tentatively (and with all the modesty of someone putting forth a new scientific proposition) that one remedy for poverty was for the poor to develop energy, ambition, and inherit a good department store. [Laughter.] To that scientific formulation I just want to add, this morning, another impeccable proposition. Those who find that first possibility a little difficult might want to marry someone like Eugene Meyer. [Laughter.]

I am permitted to make that point because, some years ago, I reviewed for the Herald-Tribune and the New York Times the very charming and really distinguished autobiography of Agnes Meyer. If you haven't read it, you should get it. This might bring it back into print. She makes that point herself, about marrying somebody like Eugene Meyer. She says this was her own well considered remedy. [Laughter.]

You are all aware of speeches by educators. They have their own well-defined liturgy. They are essentially Episcopal in character; they draw not on Papal authority but on the currently approved doctrines of the educational Episcopate. They are also impeccably and reliably on the side of virtue. And they do not require the attention of the audience. [Laughter.] I am conscious, this morning, that I am speaking in this tradition. Accordingly, since I am a traditionalist, I shall begin with a careful obeisance to the commonplace.

We live in a culture of high and increasing technology. The simplest meaning of this is that machines steadily replace both skilled and manual tasks and steadily appropriate the new tasks which we devise for ourselves. This process specified to a remarkable degree its type of man: a very high level of training and intelligence is required to design the machines that replace muscular and manual effort. And, on the whole, a rather superior type of attainment is required to keep machines supplied with materials, to sell their products and organize and manage their environment.

Radicals, reformers, and humane scholars once watched the rise of the machine civilization or the machine age with great misgivings. They feared that it would reduce its people to automatons—they would be little more than the routine appendages of the apparatus they served. Karl Marx said, "The miserable routine of endless drudgery and toil in which the same mechanical process is gone over and over again is like the labours of Sisyphus. The burden of labor, like the rock, keeps ever falling back on the wornout labourer." We now know that these fears were misplaced. The machine is most easily adapted to heavy, repetitive, and hence drudging tasks. It has a strong back, fast hands, and a weak mind. These are the human traits which it first replaces. Its effect is to lower the physical and raise the intellectual demands upon the working force.

The commonplace task is to urge upon you the importance of preparing people for their more demanding roles. We must have the scientists who will map the course of the new technology; we must have the engineers who will bring it into being; we must have the technicians who can operate and maintain its machinery; we must have the very great army of white-collar workers and managers who do its paperwork, find its markets, program its computers, keep its accounts, write its advertising, wangle its contracts, provide its management, collect its taxes, and administer its government. To a greater extent than we realize, automation is a process by which we take people off the assembly line and put them into the front office, into sales conferences or into Washington. And whatever the task, from inventing the product, to designing the machine that makes it, to creating its demand, to getting it approved by the Food and Drug Administration, or to having it effectively suppressed, a fairly high level of education is required.

Although at least one presidential candidate is a stubborn defender of the contrary view, the American people have a fairly shrewd view of their own salvation. They have recognized the helplessness of the person without preparation. This, and not much else, is behind the current anxiety about college admissions. And back of that is the rising concern for the quality of primary and secondary education for these determine whether one—or one's offspring—will survive the competition for college places.

This tension will increase. It will also, in the most reliable of our tendencies, make itself felt in politics. Increasingly, those who take their stand for economy, ignorance, and the McGuffey readers will get swept aside. This is a serious political prediction: the economic need for education is evident to a large majority of our people. They have the political means for making this need felt. The consequences are fairly certain. We shall have to increase greatly the volume of resources going into education but we are reasonably certain to do so. The much more acute problem arises from the very unequal distribution, both in quantity and quality, of these resources. A man arriving in the next few years from Mars may well report that we still do better in providing everyone with a television set and automobile than with the right education. But he will marvel most, after first meeting some of our people on their way to the moon, at the specimens he encounters in eastern Kentucky or northeastern Mississippi.

The drastic unevenness of present preparation is only one of the problems of education in a highly technical society. There is also the question of whether such a society can employ all who seek employment, however well they are prepared. There is obvious danger, if it cannot, of loading too great a task on the educational system. And there is the familiar, and all but tedious, question of the educational requirements that are associated with increased leisure. I want to say a word about each of these matters, but first let me comment on the effect of the present inequality in the distribution of educational opportunity.

The profile of present unemployment and low incomes shows clearly the effect of this inequality. In March 1962, according to testimony last autumn before Senator CLARK's Senate Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower, when unemployment over the country was at 6 percent, it was 10.4 percent among those with 4 years of schooling or less and 8.5 percent among those with 5 to 7 years of schooling. Forty percent of those without work had eight years of schooling or less although this group accounted for only 30 percent of the labor force.

In 1961, the median income of those with less than 8 years of schooling was $3,279 (a bit more for whites; quite a lot less for Negroes). For those with 4 years of high school it was $6,302. For those with 4 or more years of college it was $9,264.

The man who is unemployable because of lack of education has become one of the problems of the highly technical society. He cannot produce; he requires support by others. He is also a national problem. Heavy concentration of such unemployables is to be found in the parts of the country where schools are bad—the rural areas of the Southern Appalachians and the South—or where the educational environment is regressive—notably in the urban slums and especially among Negroes, Puerto Ricans, Mexicans and other minority groups. But these people are not immobile; they seek work and find their way onto the unemployment and welfare rolls in all parts of the country.

It is why I have suggested that we make this unemployment, and the poverty which it produces and perpetuates, the basis for a new look at Federal aid to education. This issue has now been on dead center for years partly for religious reasons, partly because of fear of Federal control, mostly because of the resistance of those who make talk of liberty, economy and fiscal soundness a stalking horse for what, in more plainspoken times, was called simple selfishness. Instead of continuing the debate over aid to all schools, I would urge that we get ahead with a program of improving the poorest districts—the districts that are producing those who are uneducated and hence unemployable. Since there is no question of assisting all schools, the question of aid to parochial schools—or of discrimination in withholding such aid—does not arise. The people who most fear Federal control are generally in the well-to-do school districts. They would have an admirable safeguard against

Federal intrusion for they would not be eligible.

The poorest and most difficult school districts—the ones which need the best teachers—are presently the ones with the poorest. And many such districts, whatever their deficiencies in other respects, have a fully developed capacity for misusing money. So, as a further step, part of the help should be supplied in the form of a corps of teachers, school administrators, specialists and counselors enrolled at very good pay by the Federal Government with the specific mission of going by invitation into the substandard areas and districts and teaching, attracting other good teachers, helping with the rehabilitation of plant and otherwise bringing these schools up to a standard level of performance.

Here then is the program. Let us designate the problem districts, urban and rural, whence come the poor and the unemployable. Let us make Federal funds available for the schoolplant in these areas—enough to bring it fully up to standard. And to make sure this money is well used, let us establish a National Teaching Corps, recruited from the very best of our teachers, to serve in these areas. I think we might aim at an initial corps of 10,000 to 12,000, to be expanded further in accordance with need. We should insure that we get the very best teachers by the simple device of paying for it. The minimum salary should be around $12,000.

I am not throwing this out as another interesting idea. It is something on which I urge (and indeed I venture to expect) the active, eager, energetic, personal effort of everyone here this morning and everyone you are able to persuade.

To reduce to the absolute minimum those who are unemployable in a highly technical culture is a matter of elementary importance. We do this through education not because we are educators, but because the absence of education is the cause of unemployment. (All concerned with unemployment and poverty must see this—must see in particular that education is not just another good idea for dealing with their problems.) We shall also reduce unemployment as well as unemployability as we raise the general level of educational standards. In 1962, when unemployment among those with 4 years of education or less amounted to 10.4 percent, it was only 1.4 percent among those with at least some college education. Reasonable equality in the chance to hold jobs is important; within the limits of natural aptitude and ability it is what education accomplishes. However, we must not load on the educational system the whole task of preventing unemployment in a highly technical society.

Modern technology—automation and its associated changes—enables us to get more and more goods from given effort. The answer of many economists to the problem of unemployment that this poses is to urge the production of more and more goods so that the demand for workers remains constant despite the diminished labor effort that is required. And then still more production is urged to take care of the increase in the labor force. I doubt if this is more than a temporary solution.

Machinery, as I have said, enables us to produce things with less effort. Sooner or later—and it will be sooner rather than later—we will have to accept the logic of a machine civilization and expend less effort. To be more exact, we shall have to continue to accept the logic of the machine because for decades now we have been steadily reducing the workweek. The 40-hour week is not the end of this road.

I do not think a shorter workweek or longer paid vacations would be a tragedy. We still have numerous needs to fill. But we must be skeptical of the notion that more goods are inherently a mark of greater production than more leisure. Like relief and unearned income, too much free time is something that is always thought peculiarly debilitating for other people. We are invariably much more sanguine about the effect of well-earned leisure on ourselves. The average American will survive a further shortening of the workweek, a further increase in paid vacation time and with remarkably little damage. The story is told in Massachusetts of an incident during the senatorial campaign in 1962 of Mr. EDWARD KENNEDY, the extremely able brother of the late President. By the standards of this age of septuagenarians and octogenarians, he was rather young. Inevitably his age and experience were an issue. Campaigning outside a factory early one morning he was saluted by another Celt—elderly and gnarled. The old workman said: "TEDDY, me boy, I hear ye've never done a day's labor in yere life. Well, let me tell ye lad, ye haven't missed a thing." [Laughter.]

I am less sure about the nature of education for a society with more leisure time. Obviously we can't spend our free time breathing gasoline fumes in traffic jams. [Laughter.] Perhaps the answer is an increasing emphasis on liberal education. This, according to some of my friends, will insure that factory workers and service station attendants will perform their allotted stint and then betake themselves gratefully to long hours with Proust and Mozart to the extent that they are not busy replacing these with yet greater compositions. [Laughter.] Perhaps, for a while, we should set more modest goals.

The first of these is to insure that we continue the diverse, experimental, and progressive tradition of American education. This provides the setting for a diverse and exploratory view of life; it is right for a society in which the individual is trained not for a particular economic function but for a resourceful use of all his time. One gathers that those who argue for a return to fundamentals—to homely virtues, the three R's and regular morning prayers—hope to manufacture a more tractable type of citizen—one who works hard, foreswears complaint, has no inconvenient aspirations, no disturbing ideas, and does not join unions. One wonders what happens if their man gets tired of his rocking chair. He might be the most obstreperous of all. [Laughter.]

Certainly our educational system must have a dual function. One task is to equip people for making a living. The other and increasingly important task is to provide everyone with the interests that make living worthwhile. This is related to a further task.

We sometimes imagine that science and technology are the final frontiers. We press these back year by year; beyond them is nothing. This is not so. Beyond the frontiers of science and technology are those of taste, charm, and beauty. There is nothing effete or precious about this; it is the most commonplace of sequences. Once a man had provided himself with shelter, he began as a matter of course to consider its architecture. Once clothing was available, he began to consider its design. Similarly with his pottery, conveyance, and sarcophagus. The preparation of food soon became not a problem in nutrition but an exercise in art. It seems likely that a fairly early stage after women were devised, men became additionally interested in how they looked. [Laughter.]

We have had far more success in the last 20 years in pressing the technical than the esthetic dimension of progress. Fifty years ago the United States was far less technically advanced and far less prosperous than it is today. It was not less beautiful. On the contrary it was much more beautiful. Every time a politician or an economist tells you that the gross national product has gone up, you must promptly ask what the cost was in public charm and beauty. We are surely not industrializing for the sake of making all of the United States look like Jersey City. [Laughter.]

As we understand that technology is not the final frontier, we will give increasing attention to the world of esthetics that lies beyond. Our educational system will seek understanding and appreciation of this world. We will prepare ourselves and our children for the even more difficult task of bringing symmetry, charm, and beauty to our environment. We have barely begun to assert the claims of beauty against billboards, roadside commercial pollution, the utility towers and telephone poles, the progenitors of urban sprawl. There is still a measure of indignation that anything or anyone should interfere with technological and economic convenience. However, this next step is also inevitable. As I've said, beyond a certain point in economic and technical accomplishment, all people want charm and beauty in their lives. Americans are no exception. We are not, in contrast with all other cultures, more resolutely Philistine in our attitudes. The next great task of our schools is to insure that they are not.

EDUCATION AND CULTURAL POVERTY

(By Harold Taylor, vice chairman, National Committee for Support of the Public Schools)

In the discussion which will follow these talks by Mr. Galbraith and myself, I'll leave to Mr. Galbraith the definition of poverty in economic terms and say only, for my part, that poverty is a human condition in which food, shelter, and clothing are in such short supply that the human person suffers harm—malnutrition, loss of vitality, disease, continual discomfort and, very possibly, an early death. That's what I mean by a situation of poverty.

The definition of poverty is measured in terms of annual income for a year of a family's life is in many ways ambiguous, since $2,000 or $3,000 a year for a family in one part of America may mean some kind of deprivation, and in another part of the world would mean affluence.

I will therefore assume that the economic intricacies and implications of being poor will become sufficiently complicated in discussion, and I will turn to some other matters related to our poverty-stricken culture in what is to me one of the most underdeveloped countries in the world, the United States.

I suggest that we take a very hard look at where we are in American history. We must look first at the fact that one of the characteristics of modern education, as of education in each phase of the development of Western man, has always been a considerable number of years behind the needs of the society in which the education has taken place.

In the 19th century the need was for a shift toward a democratic form of education and away from the education of an elite, in order to keep up with the social changes which the industrial revolution had brought. Education was inadequate to meet those new challenges of the 19th century. The world has now changed so radically that, within a matter of 40 years, for example, the office of the President of the United States has been transformed from its leisurely workday of 9 or 10 o'clock till 4 in the afternoon, with long weekends in which you couldn't find the President unless you spoke to him through his wife. World peace was then a matter of the control of a few governments, and relatively minor weapons.

Now the President's workday is from dawn until midnight, 7 days a week, and one cannot help thinking that if there were a way in which Mr. Johnson could wire himself up at night to use his unconscious and his dreaming time for affairs of State, he would do so and give the press the results in the morning.

The radical shift in world affairs has made of world peace, national welfare, security, and the national well-being, things which not merely have to do with the control of a few governments in Europe, conversations among elderly diplomats, and the control of guns and bombers.

These matters are now of enormous size, of a size which we never knew before and which too few people now recognize. We are dealing with single bombs which can kill entire cities and 10 million people at once, governments which can control the entire lives of 650 million people at once, machines which do replace thousands and thousands of workers, universities containing 40,000 students, television broadcasts which can reach the world's millions with a single message, poisons which can kill millions of fish, drugs which can cure millions of sick people, books for the millions, films for the millions, everything for the millions and very little for the individual.

Yet, all the things in life which matter have to do with individuals, the individual human being's mind, his wants, his aspirations, his needs, his loves, his hates, his children, and his friends. They have to do with his place in the world, and the world's problems, gigantic as they are in scale and seriousness, are simply the problems of individual human beings raised to the millionth power.

When we look at the chief characteristic of education in the 20th century we find that it is its capacity for reducing the individual to the status of a unit in a mass. We have discovered the relationships, as Kenneth Galbraith has been describing them, between the economic situation of any society and its educational system. We have also discovered the relationships of inequality, which have to do with social habits, bred into each culture as new generations of young people are taught the social habits of segregation through succeeding generations of teaching.

As we look at the gap between the days of the 1920's and 1930's and the issues of the 1960's, we find that we are now in the middle of the greatest challenge in this country's history. Our last enormous challenge was the Second World War; the one before that was the period of the depression.

I suggest we look at the 1930's for a moment to see what happened to the economy then and the relation which it then had to education. In the 1930's our economy lay in ruins. The political system was bankrupt, the social structure was shaken from top to bottom. What was required then was the total reconstruction of the social order, to bring back hope and belief, to make life for the individual American possible again.

It was then that the educator and the teacher were confronted with the social reality in the 20th century. Education was, in fact, an instrument of social change. It had to be, and the educators went to work through a variety of Government agencies and national projects with the universities and schools; along with all the other newly-formed agencies of reform which rose to meet the challenge of a society on test, to give youth a sense of purpose and a place within the society.

Those problems of the 1930's, economic, social, and educational, were never solved. Unemployment, inequality, social injustice, economic instability and political corruption—all these were brushed to one side as we united our resources to fight the war.

When we emerged from that war we immediately found ourselves in the tensions and districtions of the cold war, neurotically concerned about communism on the one hand and affluence on the other, busy with making money and making America into a fortress. Throughout all those years of the 1950's, the problems of the 1930's lay dormant, unnoticed, while we shot off our rockets and our propaganda messages about American white democratic values. The unsolved problems of the 1930's now face us bluntly again, in large part because of the dignity, courage, democratic instincts and social protests of the Negro people.

It is they who are helping, and who have helped now, through their revolution, to make us politically honest and morally healthy. It is the demand of the Negro for equality which speaks to the entire demand of all Americans; that we turn our attention once more to the human questions and social problems which we have been neglecting through these postwar years.

The difficulty is that, as we have moved through those postwar years, our attention has been turned almost entirely to the technological problems—to technological progress and to the concern for building an economy which could sustain America's place in a competitive world order. As the tensions in that world order increased, our national goals swerved toward an over concern with that kind of safety which is related to military security, economic security, and political security.

Heavy emphasis on national goals of military and economic security has diverted our attention from the major issues in education which are at the heart of all issues in social change. As these national goals made demands on the educational system for the development of young technologists, young scientists and those who could man the military and industrial establishment, the educational system itself shifted. The curricular changes were in the direction of developing programs in which the academically able could fit, in order to move up through the high school into the colleges and into the graduate schools those whose scholastic aptitudes had been revealed at an early age and whose talents could then become useful to the managerial elite, later to occupy those places within the society where managerial and technological leadership was needed.

We have imperceptibly accepted the goals of the white American middle-class society without looking at the effect which this has had upon the young people themselves, in what I have referred to as their cultural poverty. As the curricula have been reformed by such extraordinary efforts as those put forth by Professor Zacharias in the revision of the physics curriculum, the mathematics curriculum, and now the social studies, one finds that for the first time large sums of money are being expended to reform curricula.

But it is not without significance that the reforms in the curriculum are those most adapted to the needs of the white middle class and well-to-do students for the academic high school, and that those desperate needs for economically deprived persons (for whom the Negro stands as the greatest symbol) have not received that degree of attention and concern until just these recent months when the protests of the underprivileged have grown to the extent of a national movement.

In the city of New York, for example, it has been true all along that the integration of the schools has been a slow-moving process, in which the difficulties of the schools have to do with the lack of funds, as well as segregated patterns of residence. This is true of all the major cities. In the cities, the relationship of the economic support of the public school system and the segregated patterns of education themselves is direct. The poorest schools in educational terms, as Professor Galbraith has pointed out, are those with the least money. Those with the least educational opportunity are those whose families have the least money.

It has been calculated by a special committee advising the Commissioner of Education of New York State that $250 million in additional funds would be necessary to achieve integration in New York City, if the schools are to be of a quality appropriate to the needs of the children and their parents. There is this kind of direct relationship between the economics of education and social justice. We must turn our attention to the political problem of using our economic resources to develop a fully democratic society. We need to look at the fact that, when we conduct a national talent search for gifted young people, the search itself is conducted with certain national goals in mind dominated by the goal of economic prosperity. There is very little concern in this search for what Professor Galbraith has been referring to in his comments as the development of an esthetic value system consonant with our political and economic system.

The method of selection now used for the discovery of talent is to classify the country's youth in terms of their ability to pass academic tests which screen out the less able and identify those with the most aptitude for training in those academic subjects which one finds in the average college. It seems to me that this academic approach, without a concern for those whose economic situation prevents their being able to develop the academic skills necessary to enter this competition, is distracting us from the central issues of the education of individuals, wherever they may be.

What point is there in testing for ability and aptitude children who have had no education which could prepare them to meet the tests, which are irrelevant to the discovery of their particular talent? Or, to put it broadly, if the search for talent is merely to discover talent which is already developed through the privileged educational institutions of white children of middle- and upper-middle-income parents, this is bound to divide the society into an elite of the educated and a mass of semi-illiterates, when many of the latter are brimming with talent if this could only be developed by wise and generous teaching.

The problem of developing good teaching and new situations for teachers is the central issue in the release of talent of all kinds. It is impossible to have good schools and good community life, or a cultural and intellectual environment suited to the development of new talents, without considerably more attention being paid to the quality of American teaching. We need in our American communities the kind of indigenous leadership which can only come when those within the community—its school system, parents, and children—form together an environment through which children can be taught how to assume the responsibilities of citizenship.

In this matter we could do no better than to consider seriously the use of the resources of the 10,000 young college students across the country who are already exercising their teaching talents by using the summer months, and their after-school hours during the college year, to tutor students in the areas of underprivilege. By doing so, they are learning about the reality of their society and are adding their talents and skills to the improvement of human life in the rural slums and in the urban areas.

Seven hundred young college students are going to Mississippi this coming summer to help with the education of the underprivileged, both white and Negro. Those who have dropped out of school, those who have not had a chance to go in school, and those who need education in citizenship, in political science, in sociology, and those who need elementary training in the skills of reading, writing, and arithmetic.

These young people are part of a new body of the American youth who are aware of the demands which the society is making upon them and who wish to respond to those demands. I would urge that we couple a national teaching corps with a national youth corps of the kind so many people here in Washington have been talking about—the domestic service corps, which can capture that form of idealism which exists in American youth and give it a chance to express itself in action.

Gifted high school students can contribute their talents by teaching elementary school children who are having trouble with their studies, and who need the help of those willing to make the effort to understand them. I suggest that we must think of America as a series of small democratic communities, each overlapping with the next community, with each person called upon to contribute what he can to the total community of the United States. There is no better way to teach this democratic ideal than by asking American students to teach each other.

There has recently been a welter of public speaking on the subject of the weaknesses in the American system of education. The favorite juxtaposition has been to cite the advantages of the Soviet system of education with its heavier academic content, as against the weak-kneed sort of attitude which American education is said to have taken, because of the heavy influence of John Dewey and other such "anti-American" philosophers.

The Soviet system of education does have a heavy academic content. But that content is possible because there are first-rate teachers in every classroom throughout the Soviet Union. There are teachers who do not need to test continually the students whom they are teaching because the teachers know by personal experience who are the slower students who need help, and who are the intellectually able who need to be given advanced instruction. The kind of incessant testing which has afflicted the American system of education is not necessary in the Soviet Union, except in the case of the screening examinations for those who are to go to the universities.

But the reason these comparisons have not been made accurately is because the basis of comparison has not been stated. The true comparison is that the Soviet Union spends twice the amount on education, in comparable figures, as does the United States of America. The direct relationship between the priority of education on the Soviet agenda, and where we put it on our national agenda is the difference between the lack of intensity of effort in this country about education and the intensity of effort which built the Soviet system of education in 40 years into one of the most powerful instruments of the present age.

I would suggest, therefore, that we turn our attention back to the ways in which the individual student, in every segment of the American community, is given the kind of teaching which is only posible when the teacher is at liberty to know his student, not merely by name, but by a total conception of what his student needs.

I suggest that we return to the American tradition of a personal relationship between the teacher and student, with the teacher at the center of the educational system, not considering himself to be part of a mass system of instruction but as a member of a community of scholars and students who are learning together.

We have become fascinated during these past few years with the possibilities of technological invention in speeding up the learning process, without thought for what is being learned, and for what purpose. Teaching machines, record players, films, television classes, objective examinations graded mechanically, the use of computers in recordkeeping, and speeded-up schedules—these are all devices to hasten the coverage of certain academic materials and curriculums.

But we need to ask: What is the rush? Where are we all going in such a hurry? What is education for, and what knowledge is of most worth? As we look at what our students are learning it is clear that we are forgetting the rich diversity of American culture; we are forgetting that we have a Puerto Rican culture, a Spanish-American culture, an Indian culture, a Negro culture.

Rather than treasuring the individual contributions of these inner groups within the American society, we tend, by our present curriculum, to transmit American white middle-class values in a kind of brandname approach to education. Nor have we been willing, until recent months, to ask ourselves how we can provide economic aid to the depressed minorities—all those minority groups whose social and economic situation has blocked them from the main entries to American society.

"There are more teachers and counselors in this country than there are teamsters," says Arthur Pearl, "and yet their influence on the political structure is considerably less." We who are teachers, educators, and citizens concerned with education have, over these next 5 to 10 years, an enormous responsibility for the affairs of education in their political dimension. Without political action of the kind which our educational circumstances now make necessary, there will be too many people who will vote against expanded education on the argument that poor people can't have it simply because they don't have the money. Education is now a powerful political issue and persons are being elected, and not elected, in States across the country by the platforms on which they stand in the field of education.

I suggest, therefore, that we move in the direction of political action across a broad field of economic, social, and political issues. I suggest to you that education is at the center of all these political and social issues, and that one's attitude to education in general, and to public education in particular, is a measure of one's interest in the future of the country. Without the interest of citizens, and without the interest of teachers who will act politically, we are not going to be able to bridge the gap between the educational needs of the country and the present neglect of large segments of the population.

The American Government is now reviving the sense of possibility that used to exist in the 1930's, when serious social problems were linked to educational remedies. We now have, for the first time since those earlier years, a surge of attention, not merely to the problem of poverty, but to the problem of solving social problems by means of education. This is a shift in attitude on the part of the Government concerning the relation of the economy to education, and a shift on the part of the Government in its work in the whole system of agencies.

In the Department of Commerce, in Agriculture, in the Office of Education, there are persons who now are working directly at the social and practical problems of linking the educational system to the cure of economic and social injustice.

This seems to me to be one of the most important facts about the way in which the question of poverty is being discussed in public and in private. Educators are now forced to become concerned with the way in which education can once more become an instrument of social change. It has always been such an instrument. It has never fully exploited the use to which it can be put.

These are the developing ideas in the relationship of the economy to the political structure and to the educational system with which all of us must be concerned. There are new ideas in the minds of the young for new kinds of teaching, for new contributions which they can make in their own domestic service corps, with or without Government help.

Through educational research sponsored by the Office of Education, through new forms of alliances between municipalities and State commissioners of education, through new forms of energy generated by the young people who are concerning themselves with the problems of the poor, we can come to a deeper realization of the possibilities in education of reforming the entire American society.

We can put education to work on the key issues of social change. We can take as our mission the transformation of the entire American society from its present separation of whites and Negroes, haves and have-nots, rich and poor, educated and illiterate, into a society richly endowed by the talents and gifts of all, in which each citizen can gain the chance to cultivate to the full the talent which is his.

I conclude by an American statement from one of our most interesting and original Americans, Martha Graham, who, by her approach to the arts and that particular combination of individualism and imagination which marks the great artist, has been able to make a new instrument for esthetic values, combining design, theater, music, and dance in a new form. Miss Graham makes what is a peculiarly American statement. She says:

"There is a vitality, a life force, an energy, a quickening which is translated through you into action; and because there is only one of you in all time, this expression is unique. And if you block it, it will never exist through any other medium and be lost. The world will not have it."

It seems to me that the entire function of education—in its biggest scope and its deepest meaning—is to be found here: it is true that each one of us has something to give to the world, and if the circumstances of one's life are such as to prevent that unique contribution from coming to the world, then the society itself is to blame. The society must rearrange itself in its economic, in its social, in its political structure, in order to make it possible that each may unblock the thing which is his so that the world will have it.

EXCERPTS FROM THE DISCUSSION

(Presiding: John A. Baker[1])

MEMBER (to Mitchell Sviridoff). In connection with your Community Progress project in New Haven, I wonder if you would comment on your concept of the community school which, I gather, has a kind of "8 in the morning until 11 at night" approach to fighting the problem of poverty.

Mr. SVIRIDOFF. The idea of the community school is that, since poverty really grows out of a complex web of circumstances, no one institution can solve the problem. That is, the schools can't solve it by themselves—nor can the unemployment system, the housing system, or the social welfare system. All of these systems must work together around certain common objectives. The community school, as it has developed in New Haven, has taken this form.

The policy statement of the board of education says, first, that the school is a center for education for young people—and adults; second that, in the urban setting, it must become the center for leisure time and recreational activity; third, that it might well be the center for social services, because social services in the city have become highly centralized * * *; and fourth, that the school might well be a center for social action, because if, in fact, we are serious about the development of indigenous leadership we had better find a way through which it can be developed or all our talk about it will be no more than well-meaning platitudes.

---

[1] Mr. Baker, originally invited to serve as a panel member, consented to preside at the entire session in the absence of James G. Patton, who was ill and unable to attend. New York City's commissioner of welfare, James R. Dumpson, was also unable to serve on the panel due to illness. The panel thus consisted of Professor Galbraith, Dr. Taylor, and Mitchell Sviridoff, executive director, Community Progress, Inc., New Haven, Conn.

According to this concept then, the school has these four functions. * * * There is no such thing as "schoolday" and an "after school day." The schoolday starts at 8 in the morning and it ends at 10 or 11 or even at midnight—and the school functions on Saturday and even on Sunday. And these various functions are not separate functions. They are all a part of educational process and they nourish one another.

So, in the community school in New Haven, in addition to the school principal, there is an assistant principal for the community school program whose exclusive function and responsibility it is to see that this concept works, and to provide the leadership, as an educator, for all of these vital functions.

In addition to the assistant principal, there is also a neighborhood service coordinator, who works out of my organization—and there's not enough time to explain that except to say that the organization I represent is really a coalition of the various basic forces in the community which have a stake in the solution of poverty: education, unemployment, the mayor's office, redevelopment, housing, and so on.

Our neighborhood service coordinator is located in the school and works in a tandem relationship to the assistant principal for the community school program, but his primary responsibility is the social action aspect and the coordination of the social services program.

In addition to these two leaders, we also have a park and recreation supervisor in the school; a work group supervisor; and now even a lawyer. There are health services in the school, too, and a tremendous range of leisure time, recreational, and cultural activities—all centering in the school, so that it becomes truly the nerve center of the neighborhood. Services are decentralized and close to where the people are who need them. And hopefully, these services will become more relevant in their substance to the needs of people, as a result.

These various services, which are so closely interrelated and which parallel the interrelationship of needs of the poverty population, working together, strengthen one another. This, in very general terms, is the concept of the community school.

One of the byproducts which we expect we will achieve in time * * * is that all of these things going on in the school during the schoolday * * * will have a significant feedback effect into the classroom. From it, we believe, the teacher will indeed learn more about life in the neighborhood, and about the nature of poverty, and she will have accessible to her a tremendous range of resources.

Incidentally, the employment program which is centered in the school (and which has grown into so large a program that it is now receiving as much in the way of financial support as a wide range of special educational programs), the employment program also offers the teacher and, more important, the pupil, a source of motivation. Because in that program, centered in the school and leading to jobs and job opportunities and the development of skills, the child in the classroom begins to see that there is a purpose in learning; that there is a reason for motivation to learn.

Can this be transferred to other communities? I would say it can be, if the local community can bring together an effective coalition of politial leadership, can bring together the leadership of the basic institutions, or enough of them to get this kind of concept started, and if the resources can be found. And they can be found, in my opinion, at least in enough substance for a start. Clearly, however, it will take a massive input of new resources at all levels if this kind of program is to be implemented on a national level.

Member. I regard as prophetic the statement by Mrs. Meyer that society must either educate the poor so as to make them self-sustaining or else eventually support them in some manner. Are we, however, simply going to train and educate more and more people so that, ultimately, we will have more trained, skilled men to add to the unemployment list?

Dr. Taylor. It's necessary to rethink the whole concept of what is called vocational education. We have confined ourselves to a conception that's about 25 years out of date. In terms of the craft unions, I think we have both a political and an economic problem for the unions—in a new kind of society where certain skills are no longer in as great demand, and we've got a kind of craft guild approach to dealing with it. I also think, although this isn't directly in response to your question, that when we think of "vocation" we should think not merely of college vocations but also in terms of the vocation of the arts, the vocation of political science, the vocation of those who enter politics, with some kind of education in high school which fits them for such careers.

Many times these things are not dealt with properly in colleges, so one has a professional school on one hand or a college on the other, when the high school itself should be a center for this kind of vocational education.

My general comment would be: Let's change the pattern since we're moving into a society in which young people want to identify with gainful activity, both in terms of employment and the use of leisure time. Let's revise our conception of vocational education to include the possibilities of life for the young person beyond anything we've ever thought of.

Mr. Sviridoff. I think Dr. Taylor has dealt very well with the broader and even philosophical aspects of th question, but * * * I spent 20 to 25 years in the labor movement * * * and I earned my "doctorate" in the shop and I learned a trade. So I think I can deal with this question, and I am itching to.

Now * * * about the training of more unemployed. This is a fear I have heard expressed over and over again, and not just by trade union leaders out of the craft unions. It is a question which grows out of two or three basic concerns, and particularly where craft unions are involved.

First, there is a fear that apprentice standards will be diluted through hastily improvised training programs. It's a legitimate fear. If the Manpower Development and Training Act is used as a substitute for apprentice training, apprentice standards will, in fact, be diluted. But there is no reason why the Training Act need be used as an alternative to apprentice training, no reason why there cannot be combined a degree of institutional training with apprentice training, as the National Institute for Labor Education has, in fact, begun to do.

The second concern grows out of a fear that there will be an increase of labor supply in areas where there are labor surpluses. This is a legitimate fear, too, where there are in fact labor surpluses, but sometimes the argument is made even in areas where there are no labor shortages. We've got to be very careful that we separate the truth from the exaggeration.

The third reason why there is concern about the misuse of manpower training, or the danger that manpower training will lead merely to a better trained body of the unemployed, is that there have been, unfortunately—in the first year of experience with the Manpower Training Act—training programs in areas where jobs did not exist. This was particularly true in the most depressed areas of this country.

But it need not be true. There is no reason why training programs cannot be geared, cannot be designed, to meet the needs of the economy. We must certainly train people for jobs that exist and, if possible (as in our manpower program in New Haven), involve the employers and the unions directly, even in advance of the training program and obtain, where possible, job commitments before the training starts.

Let me just give you a few areas where there are very serious shortages, where training can play a very vital role: the whole range of service—oil burner service, air conditioner service, television service * * * and the culinary trades * * * [and] what about the use and the training of what some people call (an expression I dislike) the "subprofessionals"—in social work, in medicine and public health, even in education? If it's wrong for some unions to insist on a high school diploma when there are other ways, it is equally wrong for some professions to insist on extremely high academic requirements when, in fact, high school graduates and many without a high school education—with a minimum of concentrated, carefully designed training—can learn to perform many of these vital functions in our educational system, our health system, our employment system, and in our recreational system.

There is a tremendous amount of critical need in a number of areas. I could take you through just one community to show you at least 25 training programs in the course of a year that had a 90-percent success in placement. We shouldn't judge the Manpower Training Act, or the whole business of manpower training, by these isolated examples of failure or, even more serious, by some of our rather self-centered fears.

Member. How do you excite educators to enter the arena of politics? And how do you have them supported by the community?

Professor Galbraith. A number of these questions will be discussed during the next 2 days. However, one point you raise is extremely important: that the teaching profession, the educational profession, must get away from this mystique of political neutrality and join political parties—especially those which are most actively and energetically working for larger educational resources—and become influential in them.

We have yielded, as educators, to a particular political point of view whenever we have stood down on political issues. There is nothing that the people who want to save money, who value frugality and want to go back to McKinley and Mark Hanna, like more than to have educators who are "above politics." Indeed, that phrase was invented by people who—if not, at a minimum, wanting to go back to McKinley—are at least enthusiastic about the contemporary substitute from Phoenix. [Laughter.]

This must not continue. The lesson of European education is the lesson of an educational system which was, in very large part, the result of the energetic political efforts of educators who were part-time political leaders in their communities. I think this is the lesson for us.

Introductory Remarks

(By Howard K. Smith, commentator, American Broadcasting Co.)

Ladies and gentlemen, my name is Howard K. Smith. I am obliged to place the letter "K" between the first and last names. It is my only recourse in order to lessen the confusion with a more prominent citizen of our town. [Laughter.]

I am vitally concerned about education. At any moment, I am told, one-third of the American people is involved in education, either being taught or teaching.

Therein lies the opportunity to mould minds and spirits. Therein lies the only ultimate way to meet every problem that besets us. In the end, only education can meet the question of poverty. Only education can end or diminish racial fears or hatred. Therein lies, I am convinced, the answer to war, and even the cold war.

I went into journalism because I wanted to take part in education. I thought the education of the young was being adequately done, but I worried about the grownups. I agree with Nicholas Murray Butler, who said: "Most Americans die at the age of 25. They are just not buried until they are 65." [Laughter.]

Those were the people I had hoped to get to, and journalism, especially picture journalism, which I am in now, has the best access to them. But I am no longer convinced that our formal education of the young is adequate. It has certainly improved, but the times have changed faster, and have demanded better comprehension faster, than our education has provided for.

If our education were good enough we would not today be worried about Governor Wallace in Maryland tomorrow, and that is only the most immediate indication that our education has not been meeting fully the purpose for which education is designed.

My primary purpose is to introduce a remarkable American. In any objective list of the 10 outstanding Americans of our time you have to display his name very close to the top of the list. He suffers from not merely being a real figure but from being a legend in his own time. The other night, in this same hotel, I was present at a highly formal dinner, and across the table from me sat an eminent elderly Senator (who faces imminent defeat in November, so I shan't mention his name) and next to me sat a very fluent young woman. She asked me—as if I would know—who was going to be the vice-presidential candidate on the Democratic ticket.

There is no answer to questions like that. Not even the President knows the answer yet; but there is a manner—the people in my business learn how to develop the manner, but before I could even arrange my voice in the appropriate pear-shape [laughter] the Senator leaned across the table and growled, "It'll be whoever Walter Reuther wants it to be." [Laughter.]

I mention this only so you will know, if you did not know before, the responsibility you have in the next few minutes. If Walter Reuther were not so finely geared to our time and to the future I would be tempted to call him an Elizabethan, a man of wide range and great depth in thought, and yet a man of strong action. His annual suggestions to the managers of the automobile industry about how to run their industry, his frequent suggestions to the managers of the United States on how to run the Nation, remind one of young Winston Churchill, before he attained the highest office. He was considered a talented nuisance but lo, when crisis came and they called him to the helm to run the whole shebang he really knew how to do it, and he ran it better than any man before or since.

I often think the same thing might happen here, since Walter Reuther has been called the only American who can reminisce about the future. [Laughter.] Critics say that he has solutions for all problems, including some that don't exist yet. [Laughter.] But his primary sin in the eyes of his critics is that he challenges assumptions.

A man's mental and spiritual life may be likened to an inverted pyramid raised on its tip. The tip consists of a man's assumptions about life. If those assumptions turn out to be wrong the whole structure is likely to collapse, so man clings to his assumptions with fierceness, and is occasionally even willing to use violence to maintain them.

Mr. Reuther is the outstanding assumptions challenger of our time, and another word for assumptions challenger is teacher, in the best sense of the world. Ladies and gentlemen, I would like to present to you now a man who, whether he is fully conscious of it or not, has devoted a whole turbulent life to what you are discussing here today, education. Walter Reuther. [Applause.]

EDUCATION AND THE CONTINUING INDUSTRIAL REVOLUTION

(By Walter P. Reuther, president, United Auto Workers Union)

It has been said many times that the genius of a free society is its diversity, and I think that there is perhaps no more dramatic illustration of the great diversity in our society than the diversity between the two Howard Smiths. [Laughter.] The difference between the "K" and the "W" is tremendous. I think that we all share the view that the question of education and poverty are inseparably bound together and that they both need to be made matters of the highest priority and the greatest urgency in the list of America's unfinished business.

We were all much encouraged by the President's call for a total war against poverty and I believe that it is the responsibility of each of us to enlist in that poverty struggle for the duration.

As one American, I believe that this is a time of testing, and that the crisis in our society is essentially a crisis in our value system. We profess to believe in the worth and the dignity of each human person, and yet somehow we do not live by those noble professions. I believe we need to realize that the quality of the society must be measured not by what it has but rather by what it does with what it has. We are going to be judged not by our tremendous material wealth, or by our accelerated technological progress, or by our expanded gross national product. We will be judged by a very simple test: what do we do as a society to develop the economic and social and political mechanisms necessary to give this great material wealth we possess a social purpose so that it is reflected in the lives of people?

We had an income last year in excess of $600 billion in our gross national product, and yet, depending upon where we draw the line in our definition, between 30 and 50 million Americans live in poverty. They are the "have not" peoples of America, who live in the subbasements of our social structure. They are denied and deprived, they are disadvantaged, and they are discriminated against.

Now, there is poverty all over the world. I had the privilege of going to Kenya last year. It was the last thing that John Kennedy asked me to do—to be one of his special ambassadors at the freedom independence celebration in Nairobi. I poked around a number of countries in Africa—Uganda, Tanganyika, and there one sees ugly, naked poverty. The per capita income in Tanganyika is $55 a year. Yet poverty there is less destructive of human values than poverty in the United States, because a person getting $55 per year in Tanganyika has a sense of belonging. He is a part of and is participating in the social structure of his society.

But the people of America who live in poverty, who are the denied and the deprived, are not only robbed economically and materially, they are robbed socially and culturally and spiritually. They are shut out of our society. This is why poverty in the United States is so tragic.

Mr. Khrushchev states to everyone he talks to that history is on his side, that in due time his system will bury our system. I spent, as you know, some time with him. I believe that he feels that our free society is composed of competing and conflicting, irreconcilable, economic pressure groups and that we as a free people are incapable of achieving a sense of common national purpose in the absence of war.

He knows that when we are faced with the challenge of war we are capable of a total effort, but he does not believe we are capable of a comparable effort in meeting the challenges of peace, in dealing with the problems of poverty, in wiping out the tragic deficits in education and in the other areas of our society where there are serious problems.

Therefore, I believe Mr. Khrushchev is counting primarily upon our failures rather than upon his own successes, and when he looks at education he must conclude that this is one of the areas where America is making its most tragic failure.

What is the problem? As a Nation we have been more concerned with the condition of our plumbing than the adequacy of our school system. If you look at the record you'll find that in community after community, where there was on the ballot a bond issue for new sewers and a bond issue for new schools, the new sewers have carried 10 to 1 over the new schools. We have not understood the importance of education.

Last year a sweeper in a General Motors plant received more in income than a large percentage of our elementary school teachers. Now the sweepers that I represent at the bargaining table are not getting too much; the teachers are getting too little. [Laughter.] The reason we treat teachers as second-class economic citizens is that we have not put education where it belongs in our system of values—and that is why teachers are treated as they are.

And because of overcrowded schools and overworked, underpaid schoolteachers, we are denying millions of our young people the kind of educational opportunities which are essential if we are to facilitate their maximum growth and development so that they can achieve a sense of personal fulfillment, and so that they can be equipped to make their maximum contribution to the well-being of our whole society.

As I see it, the problem in America is that we have been too long on pious pronouncements—we say our children are "our most valuable national asset"—but far too short on the practical performance needed to give substance to the principles we profess to believe in. This is why we get in trouble.

The dimensions of the problem of education are tremendous, and until we fully comprehend its true dimensions and are prepared to commit resources adequate to resolve the problem, we will make no real substantial progress. The key to breaking the cycle of human poverty—where poverty breeds more poverty, where each generation of poverty breeds the next generation of poverty—is a massive educational effort.

If we are going to deal with this problem we have to raise our sights. I agree with Secretary Willard Wirtz when he calls upon this country to make education the No. 1 industry; but to make it the No. 1 industry we will need to raise our sights and, first of all, we will need to commit ourselves and then commit adequate economic resources to that task.

I ask this simple question: Why is it that we plow in billions and billions of dollars to expand our productive resources to meet the threat of war and yet are unwilling to make a comparable investment in expanding our human resources through adequate education to meet the challenge of peace? If tomorrow morning we were suddenly faced with the kind of challenge we faced at Pearl Harbor—although we know that nuclear wars don't give us a comparable period for military buildup—but if it did, there would not be a politician in this city who would not be prepared to forget about the budget and appropriate billions and billions and billions to teach and equip millions of young Americans to die in war.

We will not meet the challenge on the educational front until we are prepared to spend billions and billions to educate our young people to live in peace. The dimensions of the problem, I believe, require that kind of an approach.

This problem requires an offensive against both the quantitative and the qualitative aspects of our educational deficits. We need more facilities and we need more teachers, but until we are prepared to offer our teachers salaries commensurate with their training and their responsibilities we are not going to attract into the teaching profession the number of qualified teachers we need.

Now when we deal with the problems of the disadvantaged, the children in the slums of the big cities and the children in the slums on the land, we deal not only with the normal problems of education, which are costly, but we deal with the problems that reflect the social neglect of our society for many years.

We can break this cycle, we can salvage these children, only if we really commit to this program the kind of resources that Ken Galbraith, who spoke to you this morning, has proposed in these hundred projects he recommended.

We have to give the slum children a higher educational ladder, because they have a long way to come. We have to make a special effort to deal with their problems, to give them first of all a sense of belonging, a sense of worth, because without that sense of worth and belonging we will not get the kind of motivation we want.

The President's report on manpower resources, pointed out that more than 50 percent of our young Americans at the age of 18 are being rejected by draft boards because they do not meet the minimum standards of the armed services; and when we look at the difference between what the best States in the North were able to do, as compared to the worst State in the South, we get some appreciation of the disadvantages accruing to young people growing up in areas of America where they are the victims of educational inequalities.

While some of these young Americans were rejected because of physical disabilities, the great bulk were rejected because they lacked adequate educational background. In the North, only 3 percent of the young people in the best State were rejected because of lack of educational background. In the South, in one State, 67 percent were rejected.

Now, the discrepancy does not lie in the difference in human potential. It lies almost exclusively in the fact that one group of children had access to more nearly adequate educational opportunities and the other group were denied that kind of educational opportunity.

Therefore, we have to make a tremendous effort to overcome these great educational inequalities in our society. The only way we can do that, I believe, is by a massive attack against the deficits of education. If we will do this, in the dimensions of the need, it will not only make a great contribution in terms of facilitating the growth of our young people but it will make a tremendous contribution to the task of dealing with the basic unresolved problem in our free society. And that problem is: how do we achieve and maintain full employment and full production?

In 1946 we adopted the Full Employment Act, which commits this Nation to achieve and maintain maximum employment, maximum production and maximum purchasing power. Some of us in the labor movement have been suggesting that that bill is as good as new, because it has never been used. We have to get it out of the congressional mothballs and we have to effectively implement its purposes. We will not solve the problems of poverty, education, civil rights and the other serious deficits in the quality of our society in a vacuum. They are all related one to the other and we must take them on together.

What good is it to give a young Negro an education, and give him new skills, unless there is a job waiting that he can use those skills in? What good is it to give a Negro, now, the right to eat in a restaurant and have him stand outside and wish that he had the money to make it possible? We have to work to solve all these problems together because they are inseparably woven together.

I would hope that the great national coalition of conscience, of the church groups, and the civil rights groups, and the labor movements and civic organizations who are working together on the civil rights front, can forge a national citizens' crusade against poverty and work on the poverty front, work on the education front, so that we can make meaningful progress in this direction.

We have all the resources to do this job. There is much learned discussion about juvenile delinquency. I as one American, believe we have a more serious problem than juvenile delinquency, and that problem is adult delinquency, because we adults are not using the resources at hand to build a society that has no room for juvenile delinquency.

Our children are not failing us. We are failing our children. We, the adults, have the resources; we have the know-how to solve these problems, but we have not demonstrated the good judgment and the moral courage to commit ourselves and our resources in the measure necessary to bring about a solution. Simply look at the tragic economic fact that, in the last 10 years, we have wasted 25½ million man-hours of potential economic production because of chronic and continuing unemployment.

I have been pointing out that an hour of human labor is the most perishable economic value in the world. You can make a ton of steel and, if you don't need it immediately you can put it in storage and consume it at a later date. You can raise a bushel of corn and, if you don't need it when you have produced it, you can save it for the future—but you can't store an hour of human labor. If you don't use it when it's available it represents a total, irretrievable economic loss, and we have thrown away 25½ million man-hours of potential economic production.

If we had used that manpower, if we had used our capacity to its maximum, if we had achieved adequate economic growth during the past 10 years, we could have produced $700 billion more in our gross national product. And if we had used only 25 percent of that unrealized economic potential for educational purposes we could then have had resources adequate to the dimensions of the problem. We could have made meaningful progress.

But we have been piddling on the outer fringes of the basic educational problem and we have been unwilling to commit to this job the kind of resources we need. Therefore, our first decision has to be to put America back to work, to achieve and realize the full and maximum economic potential that full employment and full production in our 20th century technology will make possible; and then we must allocate those resources on the basis of priorities in which wiping out the educational deficits and eliminating poverty must be high on our list.

I believe we need to extend compulsory education to 18 years. I believe we need to provide free public educational opportunities that will remove all of the economic roadblocks to every young American for 2 years beyond high school; for those who can go to college, we must provide college and university opportunities; and for those who may not want to go to college or do not have the qualifications, we have to develop vocational and technical schools to give them the new skills. We have to bring our vocational school system up to date.

In many parts of the country a majority of the students enrolled in vocational training courses are involved in home economics and, by and large, many of the skills we are teaching are the now obsolete skills of yesterday.

Therefore, we have to broaden the vocational training program and we have to update it. But nothing could be more tragic in our free society than for us to believe that the purpose of education is to grind out engineers and technicians. We obviously need an increasing number of people who have these special skills to meet the problems of the 20th century technology, but the purpose of education in a free society is more than just grinding out technicians.

The purpose of education, I believe, is to facilitate the maximum growth and development of each human person so that, as a person, he can achieve a sense of human fulfillment, but in the process he can also acquire the skills and competence needed to do the work of our society. However, at the point where we think that the purpose of education is just to compete with the Russians in the physical sciences and then proceed to neglect the human and social sciences, where the real purpose of education must pay off, we are in deep trouble. Because the purpose, I believe, is not only to achieve competence that will give us greater and greater scientific and technical and production know-how, but also to develop a society in which we can find comparable social and moral and human know-why.

Education is the key to both the progress we must make in the physical sciences and the progress we must make in the human and social sciences, and to do this nothing less than a total war against poverty and a total war against our educational deficits will give us the answer.

Now, when we talk about doing this kind of a job, by raising our sights, by many billions of dollars, there are always the people who say, "Yes, but who is going to pay for it?" Well, there are no economic Santa Clauses in the world. The only way we can create wealth is by the application of human effort and human skill to the tools of production as we use them upon the economic resources at hand. We will need to create the wealth to make these things possible.

We need to accept what Thomas Paine meant when he wrote, "Those who expect to reap the blessings of freedom must undergo the fatigue of supporting it." And if we are to reap the blessings of education then we have to be prepared to undertake the fatigue of supporting it.

Each State, each community, I believe, must make its maximum contribution. However, the dimensions of this problem are so great that they are beyond the resources of the State and the local community. Only massive Federal aid can give us the resources and make us equal to the dimensions of this challenge.

We need to find a way to end the sterile debate about Federal aid and Federal control. We can have Federal aid without Federal control. I gave the commencement address at Michigan State University in March of this year. That university is 109 years old. It came into being because of the Morrill Act, passed way back in the 18th century. Anyone who knows that university knows that although they have had Federal aid for more than a hundred years they have not yielded control to an all-powerful Washington bureaucracy.

You can have Federal aid without Federal control and those who think not have no faith in the vigor and vitality of American democracy at the local and State level. I would suggest that those who shout against Federal aid ought to stop their propagandizing long enough to look at the economic facts of life.

If you see what happened in the period of 1949 to 1960, you will find that the national debt went up 20 percent but the debt of local and State communities, because they have been forced to carry the heavy burdens, have gone up 450 percent. As a matter of fact, the national debt has been coming down, relative to gross national product. That is the only rational way to measure the size of the national debt. It is not something in a vacuum. We have to measure the national debt relative to the gross national product, the Nation's income. Measured against 1948, the Federal debt came down by half by 1963.

In 1948 it took 271 days of economic effort in producing goods and services to create as much wealth as the size of the national debt. In 1963 we created as much wealth in terms of goods and services in 136 days, so that, relatively, the national debt is coming down.

The real opposition to Federal aid is not the fear of Federal control, because in many, many situations the same irrational and irresponsible voices that are raised against Federal aid do the same dirty work in the State capitals and in the local communities whenever a bond issue is proposed to support public education. Why? Well, I heard a fellow say, "The reason education is a very controversial question is because it's an area in which people's pocketbooks and their children come in conflict," and this is why these people oppose education—they are unwilling to pay the price necessary to really deal with this problem, whether it be in terms of local taxes, State taxes, or Federal taxes.

Here is the kind of attitude they have. Let me read this very short editorial from the Chicago Tribune. It is entitled, "Let's Throw the Slobs Out of School." It says, "The ignoramuses have had their chance. It's time to make them responsible for their actions. Sweep through the schoolhouses with a fiery broom. Remove the deadwood, the troublemakers, the no-goods, the thugs. The teachers can tell on the first day which student is dissatisfied, the misfits, the illiterates, the undeserving. Throw them out. We have become the victims of a great fraud, a deceit upon a generation of psychiatrists, guidance counselors, none of whom spend any more time in the classroom dealing with these apes than they have to."

Now this is what is wrong with America. There are these people who believe that the problem of the dropouts is that they don't care. They believe that the problem of a child in a third grade slum school is that child's own personal responsibility. Well, this attitude is merely a way to escape the broader responsibilities of citizenship.

We need to recognize that that kind of mentality, that kind of complacency and indifference, that kind of social and moral irresponsibility, is the biggest roadblock standing in the way of adequate education, because it is that kind of mentality that immobilizes the national will and prevents us from moving forward.

Thomas Jefferson had a dream. He said, "We must dream of the aristocracy of achievement arising out of the democracy of opportunity." Education is the key to a democracy of opportunity. Education is that magic key that unlocks the human potential. There is, deep within every human being, a great capacity for growth and development. And whether that finds expression, so that human beings can live a more meaningful, purposeful life depends upon whether society provides the child with the opportunities for growth and development, or whether society denies him that opportunity.

When we talk about freedom prevailing over the forces of tyranny, we need to understand that we are being judged by the people of the world. I believe the one thing by which we can judge the quality of a society is: what does that society do for its young people? What kind of a start does it give them, in terms of education?

This is an area of great and tragic neglect in our country. We need to arouse ourselves. We need to make more people angry about these problems when they go to bed at night. Not the people who have the problems—they are already angry, but they have no leverages of power.

Those of us who are affluent, those of us who can escape these problems of poverty and lack of education, must get more of our kind of people to go to bed angry at night. If we can, then maybe we can arouse the conscience of America, maybe we can make our children more important than our pocketbooks in our system of values and maybe we can get on with this job.

This is a troubled period in the history of the human family. Woodrow Wilson wrote, back in 1910, "We live in an age disturbed, confused, afraid of its own force. It is our duty to find ourselves."

I believe it is the duty of every American in 1964, in these crucial and critical years, to help America find itself; to help America achieve a greater sense of urgency, to brush aside the complacency and the indifference that prevails in too many places in America, and get America to understand that there is much unfinished work in making real the dream of that better society that we talk so much about.

I believe we must make education the number one top priority item. I want to salute what the National Committee for Support of the Public Schools is doing—and my good friends Agnes Meyer, General Bradley and the other people. Carry on, because we somehow have to penetrate the conscience of America so that more and more people will be prepared to make education the number one industry of this country. [Applause.]

New Trends in Planning Education

(By Ole Sand, Director, NEA Center for the Study of Instruction)

If you'll bear with me, I'll try to give you my three-semester course in the next 20 minutes. I'm delighted to know that you all have the seven-volume report of the NEA project on instruction—the four major documents and the three others—at your bedside table. [Laughter.]

As I've sat through this very exciting day, I am reminded that this great citizens committee does not fall into the situational defeat we occasionally used to fall into in our faculty meetings. I don't know if any of you have ever attended faculty meetings like this one, but one of my colleagues had had a rather serious coronary and we urged him not to come to faculty meetings. He said, "No, I want to come to the faculty meetings because, if I should have the fatal attack, I would like to be there * * * because the transition from life to death would be scarcely perceptible." [Laughter.] Well, we haven't had that problem at this meeting, and I'm sure we won't.

We educators, especially, must act and encourage our students to act as if the triumph of reason is assured. We can begin by applying this to our own work, by bringing some order and reason to the "chaos" in our own field. One way to begin is to ask the right questions of ourselves—and that is what we, working with the Project on Instruction, have attempted to do.

Our project's national committee began by posing 12 central questions in some of the crucial decision areas affecting and affected by education. These questions dealt primarily with two central problems—deciding what to teach; and planning and organizing for teaching.

These issues and recommendations, and the reasoning behind them, are discussed in detail in the four-volume project report. I propose to touch on only four or five of them here today—the issues concerning decision making, research and innovation, educational priorities, selecting content, organizing the school and classroom, and a balanced program—and will refer you to the published report for the others.

Our first question dealt with decision making: who should make what decisions about education? Our committee made six recommendations about these decisions but, almost more important, it analyzed the decisions and classified them in three categories—the instructional decisions, the institutional decisions, and the societal decisions.

The first of our recommendations having to do with decision making deals with the role of the local school board—the legal instrument through which the State fulfills its responsibility for education.

The distinction between lay control of school policies, determined by the board of education, and implementation of these policies by the professional staff, with the leadership of the local superintendent, should be delineated, understood, and respected. (Recently, in the city of Chicago, there has been quite a controversy because of the failure to distinguish between the role of the board and that of the professional staff.)

The committee recommended, second, that the Federal Government should provide the types of assistance needed to improve local and State systems of education. I shall only comment, here, that the committee did not feel that the Federal Government was a "foreign power" of some sort, but rather that it belonged to the people—and in the national interest—has an important role to play in providing general financial assistance for the improvement of public education and, through the U.S. Office of Education, in disseminating information about educational problems and promising practices.

A third recommendation dealt with the role of local school faculties. We believe that instructional decisions must be made by the teacher. In one great university in the West where I talked recently, I found members of the academic senate who would have been quite upset if their own academic freedom had been tampered with, but were quite willing to take it away from their colleagues in the elementary and secondary schools.

A fourth recommendation dealt with the role of the State educational authorities. We were convinced that there is a great need to strengthen both the State departments of education and the professional associations.

The State legislature—and this was our fifth recommendation dealing with decision making—should set forth general goals for the schools, provide adequate financial support and delegate broad powers of implementation to the State and local educational authorities. It should not, however, prescribe curriculum content or legislate specific courses.

One of the more potent forces for accomplishing the ends which Professor Galbraith, Dr. Taylor, and Mr. Reuther have so eloquently espoused here today would be the strengthening of what I would call the liaison organizations in American education, those in the mainstream of elementary, secondary, and college education—organizations like the National Science Foundation, the U.S. Office of Education, the NCSPS, the NEA, and the Ford Foundation.

I might add that right here in the city of Washington there exists a tremendously rich laboratory for future education leaders. My own organization is hopeful that, in the not too distant future, it will be possible to have 30 or 50 bright young education leaders from each State come to Washington and use the Nation as their campus; because they would bring a breath of fresh air to the bureaucracies and because they would gain a better knowledge of themselves. And I would hope that the NCSPS, among other groups, would have such a bright young educator associated with them, using their organization as a training laboratory.

Turning to research, innovation, and experimentation, let me point out first that, while industry spends 5 to 10 percent of its budget on research, education spends only one-tenth of 1 percent on it. Our committee recommended that not less than 1 percent of the educational budget should be devoted to research, and that this should start right away.

One of the essential elements in all this is the time needed by teachers for planning as distinct from teaching. When people advocate that the important thing is for the teacher to be with the youngsters all the time, it is as if General Motors took all of its research people and put them on the assembly line. The NCSPS should strongly support an instructional ratio for elementary schoolteachers comparable to that of their colleagues in higher education—12 to 15 hours a week with the children, 30 to 40 hours a week for research, planning, and evaluation and for taking care of one's liberal education, which frees one of ignorance, prejudice and academic provincialism.

Education could learn something from medicine in this respect. Just as the doctor "practices" medicine, the teacher should "practice" teaching. From the Newton, Mass., schools—where elementary schoolchildren went home at noon on Tuesdays and Thursdays—we got the idea that perhaps our teachers should have "Thursdays for thinking."

Another recommendation in this general research and experimentation area is that adequately staffed and supported regional curriculum and instruction centers should be encouraged. The committee proposed that there be established, very soon, at least four regional curriculum and instructional centers, in major universities around the country, working in cooperation with organizations such as the NCSPS. Personally, I would like to see one in every State, with at least 30 cooperating schools.

Furthermore, it is time for another study like the 8-year study of 30 schools conducted a generation or so ago. This time, perhaps 50 (or maybe even 1,500) experimental schools could take part, many of them attacking poverty problems in the big cities, while others focused on the cultural poverty in the rural areas.

The third question asked by the committee (and this is my favorite one) concerned the establishment of priorities for the school. This, of course, is the prime question for a citizens committee to address itself to. What are the distinctive responsibilities of the school, in contrast to those that are distinctive to the family, the church, industry, and various youth-serving agencies? Secondly, what responsibilities should the school share with other institutions and with other youth-serving agencies? What, then, should be included in the school program, and what should be excluded from it?

Certainly, what has been said this morning about the school being "the community center" is terribly important. The one-room school in which I first taught had been used, in those depression days (though perhaps they did not know why they were doing it), as a sort of community center. Maybe one should bring back some of the good educational values of such schools, where the 14-year-olds worked with the 6-year-olds, and so on.

In the matter of priorities, one has to decide what knowledge, what values, what skills our children and youth need to learn. Next, one must decide which of these the school can best contribute to and which can best be done outside of school; and, finally, which of the learnings requires joint responsibility.

In brief, the committee felt that reading was more important than cheer leading—a startling point of view to all of you, I'm sure. You may recall that Mr. Hutchins, when challenged with having ended football at Chicago, admitted that this was one of his minor accomplishments and said to the committee before whom he was testifying, "You've convinced me. If I go back into higher education I'll support intercollegiate athletics, but we won't have football; we'll have racing stables. That way the jockeys can wear the school colors and the horses won't have to pass entrance examinations." [Laughter.]

Seriously—any decision on priorities must be made on a formula, in which the priority rating equals data, plus values, plus reality. The data come always from three sources: from the learner, from society, and from the field of study itself. The values have already been well stated by other speakers, but for every goal that a board of education, with community support, adopts, one must have support in the form of data, from the sources stated. One must also be able to support the priority by the values and, obviously, it must be in terms of the reality situation in the school. If the teaching of languages in, say, the fourth grade is supported by legislation but teachers are not available to teach it, we're in trouble.

Now these first three questions have been concerned with decision making, research and priorities. The fourth is concerned with content. In the physical sciences, taking the birth of Christ as the beginning of a time line, the first doubling of knowledge occurred in 1750, the second in 1900, the third in 1950, and the fourth only 10 years later, in 1960. This is not as true in the humanities and social sciences, of course.

What does this mean for the school program? Well, in my one-room school, I was always worried about covering content until I realized that I might be so busy covering content that I was not uncovering learning. It is now impossible to cover the content available; one has to select, and this involves delimiting the subject matter and controlling the methods of inquiry, the ways of knowing.

The problems of what to learn and how to learn it require a different approach today. We need to find ways to move from memorization of facts to discovery of facts; ways to help young students think as physicists think, as historians think, as artists think. One scholar puts it this way: the problem is one of moving from a rhetoric of conclusions to an experience in inquiry.

Our recommendations on content said, among other things, that the objectives of the schools, with a clear statement of priorities, should give direction to all curriculum planning, whether adding or eliminating content, or changing the emphases on various topics and fields of study. We suggested, too, that each curriculum area should be under continous study and evaluation and should be reviewed periodically; and that, in selecting content, school staffs should study the results and recommendations of curriculum projects sponsored by nationally oriented groups with a view to applying promising findings.

The next issue deals with organizing the school and the classrooms. The headline issues relate more to such questions as: What about the nongraded school? What about team teaching? What about instructional technology?

How should the school and the classroom be organized to make the most effective use of the time and talents of students and teachers? Here is where one's data sources really come out. You look at the learner and immediately recognize one key thing: that human variability demands alternatives.

The research has proved that in a given class of 30 fourth graders there are usually only about 4 really at that level. You have everything from prenatal to Ph. D. [Laughter.]

You recognize that the achievement spread is always the same as the year. If you say, "I teach third grade" the spread is 3 years. If you teach seventh grade the spread is two-thirds of the mean age of the group—eight. Any 7th grade teacher knows she has third graders and she has 11th graders. Human variability demands alternatives. I notice the New York City schools are now recommending the nongraded approach for their primary grades, but Dr. Goodlad, who wrote our report, "Planning and Organizing for Teaching" gave them some very good advice this week when he said, "You don't jump into nongrading until you do a little studying."

Our committee's recommendation was (and this is one of our most important recommendations, incidentally): the vertical organization of the schools should provide for the continuous—these are key words—the continuous unbroken, upward progression of all learners, with due recognition for the wide variability among them in every aspect of their development. The school organization should, therefore, provide for differentiated rates and means of progression toward achievement of educational goals. Nongrading and multigrading are, clearly, promising alternatives to the traditional graded school and should receive careful consideration.

I predict that when this national committee meets 10 years from now the graded school will be an interesting historical phenomenon. I also predict that colleges of education, as we have known them (and I'm very much in favor of colleges of education) will be interesting historical phenomena.

How do we feel about team teaching? Well, this is one of the things that really gets people excited. Some people endorse the self-contaminated—the self-contained—classroom as if it's motherhood. [Laughter.] Others say team teaching is nothing more than two or more teachers horsing around in the same classroom.

Our committee says: "The horizontal organization of the school should permit flexibility in assigning pupils to instructional groups that may range in size from 1 pupil to as many as 100 or more. Well-planned cooperative efforts among teachers—efforts such as team teaching—should be encouraged and tested."

My last point deals with a balanced program. With all the emphasis on mathematics and science, and on the technology which we need for survival, the question logically arises: why survive if you cannot lead a life of taste and grace? And certainly we've heard our speakers today testify eloquently about the great importance of the humanities; I think we probably need a national humanities foundation.

I think one of the greatest comments the late President Kennedy made was spoken at Amherst last October in honor of Robert Frost: "I look forward to an America which will not be afraid of grace and beauty, which will reward achievement in the arts as we reward achievement in business or statecraft, which will steadily enlarge cultural opportunities for all of our citizens."

I wish I had time to talk about educational space. You all realize that "the egg crates are breaking up" as Harold Gores, of the Educational Facilities Laboratories, says; that we don't want these buildings that look like boxes; we want flexibility and amenity. Let me quote from him as I close: "I think the directions in which we are going are from the group to the individual." There is maybe one other key phrase that I would like to have you remember. "In individually planned programs for learners, we are moving from memory to inquiry; moving from a spiritless climate to a zest for learning."

Do any of you remember the days when the principal's job was to keep the school quiet, sort of funereal? I'm sure when I go into a school that unless I hear one good belly laugh coming from some room at least once every half hour it's a poor school; just as I am sure that if I don't find "Horton Hatches the Egg" and "Charlotte's Web," it's a poor school.

I haven't time to talk about school libraries as I should, but it really frightens me when I see some elementary schools without excellent libraries. The libraries should be larger than the gymnasium, and they should be well staffed—and you should really be cross if you don't have excellent school libraries.

We are moving from the graded school to the nongraded school, from scheduled classes to appointments and independent learning. I understand that in most of your high schools now you've gotten rid of these schedules where groups exchange boxes.

We are moving from the school building use geared to an agrarian society—a 9-month year limited to children—to a school building use reflecting urban society—a 12-month year available to all age groups. I do not necessarily mean a longer school year for the youngsters. When I see the studies about some teachers spending 50 percent of their time scolding children I want to make sure we make better use of the time we now have.

We are moving from classrooms that are like kitchens—have you ever noticed: you go into a school and every room looks like a kitchen—to classrooms that are like libraries, living rooms.

We are moving from teaching as telling to teaching as guiding; moving from a teaching schedule of 30 hours a week with children in class and 15 hours for planning and correcting, to a schedule of 15 hours a week with children in class, 30 hours for research, planning, and development; in brief, to a teaching schedule which presumes that "Thursdays are for thinking." Thank you.

INNOVATIONS IN TEACHING AND LEARNING

(By Neil V. Sullivan, superintendent, Prince Edward Free School Association, Prince Edward County, Va.)

I'm elated to be here with you today. When I was invited to come, several months ago, the committee offered to pay my expenses—from Virginia—and I thought this was excellent planning. However, I have been in Berkeley and Honolulu for the past few days, so the expenses are a little bit higher. [Laughter.]

Before acquainting you with all the concomitants of the Prince Edward free school situation, I think perhaps I should give you a brief run-through of my years in education.

I started out, as Mrs. Kohler said, in the Northeast—and what I found to be successful there, and what I found to be successful in the sophisticated suburbs of New York City, I found to be equally if not more effective in the very dichotomous situation which confronted me in the rural South.

My first years as a superintendent were happy ones. I was serving in an area of the industrial Northeast where the family income was one of the highest in the United States. And then, suddenly, without warning—during a summer in which I was studying at Stanford—I read in the papers one morning that there had been a fast stock deal and the Burlington Mills had closed down. And that closed out good old Stanford, for me at least; and I stopped my studies to go home and find out what to do about rehabilitating a city where 4,000 mill workers were now out of work. This was 90 percent of the work community.

Of one thing I was sure, and that was that priorities had to be set up—and I wanted to make sure that the top priority was to be public education. This was a community where we had a dual school system. Just as many children were going to parochial schools as were going to the public schools. I was convinced that if we were to retrain these workers we had to have more money for public education, and more and better vocational schools and we had to keep these schools open around the clock, without a National Manpower Act. So, with the help of the chamber of commerce, and the clergy, and the board of education, we did assign priorities—and the top priority became public education.

And, surprisingly, during a period when over 90 percent of the people in this town were making no money, they voted more money for public schools. They built a new vocational education building and we changed from a college-oriented high school to a comprehensive high school. We made a major effort to keep these older boys (who normally would go to work when a father or mother are thrown out of work) in school. And we brought 21 new industries into the community—in a period of 24 months. And, once again, this community today can boast of one of the highest per capita incomes in the United States.

I moved from that situation to one of the marvelous suburbs of metropolitan New York, in Nassau County, where student achievement was average but capability was extremely high. And here again, with the help of the board of education, we set some educational priorities. Here, for the first time, large sums of money were assigned for research; and I was permitted to experiment and innovate; and we introduced many of the changes which Mr. Sand discussed with you earlier. In a period of 5 years, we took children and moved them from traditional levels to levels they had never expected to achieve. Many of our youngsters were entering fine colleges as sophomores rather than as freshmen.

More important, probably, was taxpayer satisfaction with the schools. Last year, for example, the school budget in this community was passed 990 to 90, and the tax rate had gone up faster, during the preceding 5-year period, than in any other community in Nassau County. During these same years, incidentally, a vast number—altogether too many—of the tax levies elsewhere in Nassau County were being defeated.

And this takes me to Prince Edward County where, in the summer of 1963, I was given 2 weeks to open the schools for 1,600 children. I soon realized that a combination of all the things that had worked in the Northeast and in the sophisticated New York suburbs should and could be brought to bear on the complex problems of this rural Virginia county.

This is truly a poverty-stricken area, whether or not it is so described by Walter Reuther or Sargent Shriver. These people were not only going to bed hungry but they were going to bed with many physical defects. And, unfortunately, they were not going to bed hungry and mad—but simply hungry and patient.

I knew that most of the children were undernourished, poorly clothed, and that they had all of the physical defects resulting from little or no medical help. The average family income was less than $1,800 a year. The State of Virginia had no compulsory school attendance law. The first problem—how can we make the school attractive to these children and hold them day after day?

We knew that they would have to be fed and clothed. We established one large central kitchen—we took advantage of every Federal dollar and all surplus equipment. Those children whose parents were employed were charged 15 cents for the full meal—all others were fed free. We are feeding 80 percent of these children free today. We made arrangements with northern school districts to conduct clothing drives. We outfitted every child. They looked good the first day on the TV cameras but one little boy told me that the shoes he was wearing were his "wedding" shoes that he wore on special occasions.

We used every medium of communication to reach the parents and brought community pressure on them, when necessary, to send and keep their children in school. Attendance officers were employed to visit the homes and, when a child was absent, to ascertain the reason why and do something about it. We made arrangements with the State Department of Health to have a full-time dentist assigned to our schools. He has been with us 3 months and, ladies and gentlemen, he's still spending 8 hours a day just pulling rotted teeth. Similar arrangements were made to assist the child with all of his problems associated with his physical condition. In the first few weeks of school we found many of the children were falling asleep. They fell asleep because they were hungry and undernourished.

Now we face up to the problem of the curriculum. We were to educate children who had been deprived of schooling for 4 long years. Most of them had lost whatever basic skills they had acquired. They were subdued by their physical isolation and had lost the ability to communicate. They were returning to society and knew not what to expect. We had to convince them that they were wanted—that they had the ability to be successful—that education was absolutely essential—that the program would be designed to meet their individual needs.

The first few weeks were spent in organizing the students into what we call "compatible groups." We did not use any grade designation. We found test scores—both intelligence and achievement—unreliable. One simple test question will reveal the plight of the Southern Negro child. He was asked to select from a paint brush, a hair brush, and a hatchet as to what he would use after he brushed his teeth in the morning. The child selected a hatchet because he chopped wood in the morning after he supposedly brushed his teeth. He didn't have a toothbrush. We had interage groups covering the 6- to 9-year-old groups, the 10 to 12, the 13 to 15, and the 16 and older groups. We had "compatible grouping" in the language arts and regrouped for science and mathematics—we regrouped again, this time on an age basis, for physical education, the fine and practical arts, health and family living.

The schedule was set for every child, beginning with the 6-year-old, so that he would have our most qualified reading teachers for reading—our most qualified mathematics and science teachers for mathematics and science. This meant that one team of teachers taught reading during the entire day. Every teacher was assigned a special field and was trained in that area. Consultants were brought in and special inservice courses were required of all teachers. Teacher aids were employed to carry out routine classroom assignments and the teacher was given extra time for planning her work. All teachers were asigned to a "team" and planned their work in a single area.

My experience as a superintendent had convinced me that few elementary teachers had the talent to be skillful and knowledgeable and successful in every field. They, therefore, tended to spend a disproportionate amount of time teaching the subject that they enjoyed and in which they felt comfortable. I wanted to make sure that every subject was covered in the free schools, and covered by a teacher who felt confident in the selected area and who possessed the unique skills required to teach the subject.

I know that some members of my staff were better prepared than other members. Was it fair to the children to give one group a superior teacher and another group the inferior teacher? Certainly not. We would all share the "top" teacher and all share the teacher with less than superior ability. We would, however, have teaching teams, whereby the superior teacher could help all teachers in a single area prepare, plan, and carry out assignments.

One of the great problems faced by boards of education today is merit pay and the organization to which I belong, and which Mr. Sand represents—the NEA—opposes merit pay for teachers. I have found, however, that paying team leaders, teachers of great experience, to work with young teachers is completely acceptable by the teaching group. It certainly was in Prince Edward County.

The children have reacted splendidly to the teaching teams. They enjoy having several teachers and our research indicates that this team arrangement has resulted in marked student achievement and high student morale. We were pleasantly surprised with the attitude of the 6-, 7-, and 8-year-old group who had several different teachers during the course of a single day. They responded equally well to our plan of having children in different groups for different subjects. We experienced no problems of having different age groups in a single class. The program was endorsed and accepted by the children because they felt comfortable in the group; because the work was always kept challenging; because each teacher was a specialist in her field and because they were successful.

The staff has also reacted positively. The arrangement was not completely new for secondary teachers. The elementary teachers have indicated that teaching special areas exclusively is much more demanding physically and mentally because they have no time to relax. They report that they were able, in a traditional organization, to ease off during social studies or art and music. They were unanimous in reporting that they were teaching more children more effectively than they ever had before and that there was more teacher satisfaction with their new roles.

The program we designed, and recommend, is more demanding of a classroom teacher and this is one reason why teacher aids are essential in this new program. It is also necessary to have sufficient clerical help available. Teachers should not be expected to mimeograph, ditto, make out hot-lunch reports, and handle the other picayune responsibilities which are necessary, but which can be carried out expeditiously by a clerk. Teachers must be freed to teach. This is a full-time responsibility and we must not permit minor clerical details to interfere with the teachers' major assignments.

The nongraded concept was accepted quickly by the staff. We had to develop a design that was completely flexible and would permit a child to be reassigned to another group if he was moving at a different rate than the majority. We didn't wait for the end of the year or the end of the semester. He just picked up his little ole chair and moved to a different group. Many different textbooks were used with each group. No ends were fixed. We encouraged use of library materials other than encyclopedias. Major emphasis was placed on reading. If a group was not making normal reading progress, we doubled the amount of time they were spending on the subject; their classes were reduced in size; when necessary, they were given tutorial help.

We urged the staff to avoid "rote assignments." We encouraged every teacher to plan work which would require a creative student response. Questions requiring a "yes" or "no" answer were discouraged. Special attention was given to the use of audiovisual equipment and educational films were presented daily. Every type of activity was planned and used in an effort to stimulate student response.

The youngsters were culturally deprived and we focused our attention on this problem. The school day was lengthened and late buses operated for Negro children in Virginia for the first time.

The school was opened on Saturday and Sunday. Cultural programs were presented during the week and again on Sunday afternoons. The theater in the community was not available to the children or their parents so we arranged a special movie night for parents during the middle of the week and a family movie night on Friday or Saturday. We had an integrated theater.

Field trips in the community were required. They had conducted tours of the U.S. post office, the fire station, the county courthouse.

Field trips on weekends were encouraged. Most of our students had never been to Richmond, the State capital, and others had never been as far away from home as the county seat in Farmville. We planned trips to these areas and to all cultural and historic sites in Virginia. Over 90 percent of the children had never been 25 miles away to Appomattox. And none of them had ever been to Monticello, the birthplace of freedom through Jefferson and Monroe and Adams and Marshall; it has not, incidentally, been the birthplace of freedom for the Negro children I have been working with this year.

Television sets were placed in most classrooms and the children participated in an educational television program for 1 hour a day with emphasis on art and community living. Maximum use was made of teaching machines.

We built up our school libraries. We found the school libraries pleasant rooms but when we went in there, we had to dust the cobwebs off the first thing. And if the schools were "separate and equal" I wonder what the white schools must have been like because the schools I opened did not have textbooks nor supplies, and the libraries did not have even one volume backing up one child. Today, we boast of libraries equaling minimum standards recommended by the American Library Association. We built up a record library and encouraged the students to listen to good music. We helped each child build a home library and each child was given a dictionary. One book we found in most of the homes was the family Bible. Often it was the only book we found. The children were not only encouraged to read, they were required to read.

We arranged to have our students visit northern metropolitan communities, where they attended integrated schools, visited museums and cultural centers, and participated in athletic and social events.

The high school curriculum was designed to meet individual needs. Local college students worked with students requiring special help. We found the white students at Hampden-Sydney and Longwood College anxious to help and they gave their time willingly to help individual students.

The older students who could not go to college spent one-half of their day in a vocational area, and the remainder of the day studying language arts.

The youngster, who was of college potential—and we found 9 of them among the 23 students in the 18-year-old group—received special attention. Guidance personnel worked on an intimate basis with these students and helped them in an effort to receive needed scholarship assistance. Nine of them will be entering college this year.

The parents were encouraged to visit schools, and an active parent-teacher group was formed. We asked and received their help in supervising special activities. We used the local radio station to discuss pertinent subjects with them. We received the cooperation of some local merchants and used their windows to display student work. We invited the entire community to attend all school activities. We communicated almost daily with the parents.

The student was happy in school, because his needs were being met and embarrassing situations were avoided. We provided all children with free textbooks, unique in Virginia, and free supplies. He was provided with a noon meal. Clothing was made available. He succeeded in school, because he worked in a compatible group, and the work was kept challenging. He did not repeat material. He knew he would be moved ahead immediately if he had the ability.

Emphasis was placed on creative activities. A modern dance group was formed, dramatic clubs, rich art activities, music groups, and literary experience provided.

In order to get the job done properly it is necessary to have a qualified staff. I found it difficult to do this in the most sophisticated northern community. I found it difficult in Long Island. It is even more difficult in deprived areas. I had success in Prince Edward County, because I was able to bring together a group of dedicated professionals from the North, South, East, and West who represented all races and religions. No one section can lay claim to all the good teachers. The South, unfortunately, has not been able to train enough people properly. Eli Ginsberg cogently describes the problem as follows: "In terms of formal education qualifications, Negro teachers in many parts of the South are at least as well prepared as white teachers. On the average, however, Negro teachers are much less able than white teachers in spite of the fact that they have had about the same amount of formal education. Like other young Negroes, those preparing to teach are usually handicapped by poor schools and deprived backgrounds." As a result, many southern public school teachers are ill-equipped to meet the needs of the deserving youngsters found in their classrooms. I strongly recommend that northern teachers, both white and Negro, be employed in the South and team arrangements, similar to those used in the free schools of Prince Edward County, be followed. This is a recommendation that would be only a stopgap arrangement. In the long run we must work to improve conditions in all southern schools beginning in grade 1. Attention must be given at the college and university level, but we cannot spend our time improving the top of the mountain and ignoring the roads at the foothills.

I further recommend interracial faculties working in fully integrated schools. It will take time before we have fully integrated schools but my daily experience indicates that northern teachers are anxious to teach in the South. They must not be denied this opportunity. Fair employment practices dictate that a qualified person, regardless of color, must be permitted to teach in southern schools, or any school, regardless of location. Not only will their presence raise the level of teaching but it will go a long way toward the elimination of the unfortunate image which most southern Negro children have of their white brothers and sisters. The children of Prince Edward County—and their teachers—lost the color concept once they were initimately exposed to one another. This rich, rewarding experience enjoyed by me and my staff is something that I would recommend for all Americans.

In conclusion I would make the following recommendations.

Textbooks and supplies must be free in every public school in the United States.

Food and clothing must be available to every child.

A flexible nongraded type of organization designed to meet individual needs must be mandatory in every community.

Attention must be given to general improvement of education at every level in the South. The colleges preparing teachers must improve their curricula but elementary and secondary school programs must also be improved. Proper teacher-pupil ratios must be maintained at all levels.

There must be strong legislation requiring school attendance of every person to the age of 16 or through completion of high school. It is rather ironic that, yesterday I left Berkeley, Calif., where children are required to study in school until they are 18 years of age and I return to Virginia tonight where no one has to go to school at all. And is this one of the reasons why, in the election of 1960 in the West where compulsory attendance was high, we had close to 90 percent of the people voting and in Virginia, the birthplace of freedom, fewer than 33 percent of the eligible voters voted. I merely raise the question.

Proper treatment of the Negro and his culture must be given by our textbook publishers. He must stop reading textbooks about the middle-class privileged American. Pictures of Negro children, pictures of their environment as well as pictures of children of other races, must be found in beginning reading books and in other appropriate places in the textbooks used by our children.

Area schools must be built providing education for the mentally and physically handicapped. We had Robert Kennedy with us last week and he was elated to discover that we have three classes for mentally retarded children. These schools are really a living memorial to his late brother—and being able to do something with the mentally retarded children, I am sure, is one thing that would have pleased John F. Kennedy.

Area schools must be built providing broad opportunities in vocational education.

Children with college ability must be provided an opportunity to attend college.

Inservice courses must be designed to improve the ability of teachers to deal with special education problems.

Federal and State help should be available to all communities where local initiative is high but ability to support public education is low.

School districts must be encouraged to share the services of specialists so that groups such as the emotionally disturbed are properly treated.

Adult education courses should be available.

School buildings should be kept open during the entire week and entire year. They should be used as centers of community activities. The free schools of Prince Edward County will not close until August 31. They will be open all summer.

In conclusion, our greatest strength as a nation lies in the skills and abilities of our people. Our greatness as a nation will never be fully realized as long as we neglect educating large segments of our population. The standards of all citizens will be raised when we raise the level of our socially and economically deprived. We must bring the newest successful techniques used in our best school systems into our poorest school systems. Our most talented people must be encouraged and permitted to work in all school systems. Finally, we must all join together and truly become not our brother's keeper but we must become our brother's brother.

THE COST OF QUALITY EDUCATION FOR ALL

(By Frank Pace, Jr., independent consultant)

I think the first duty of a speaker is to put himself in perspective with his audience. Now, I am associated here with men who have spent a lifetime mainly in the field of education. I have only been exposed to it on the fringe, but I think you can probably get the best picture of my competence if you will go back with me to the day when I was Director of the Budget and my daughter was pressing me to help her with her math problems.

For a Director of the Budget, of course, this was a very simple thing to do so I sat down with her to solve her problems. At 7:30 I had my coat off, at 8:30 I had my sleeves rolled up, by 9 o'clock my shirt was off, and at 9:30 I had them solved.

I came home a little early the next evening and said, "Well, what did the teacher say about your work?" She said, "Well, dad, I regret to tell you but we had three wrong." My face fell and she said, "But you shouldn't feel badly, because the teacher said those weren't really fourth grade problems; they were fifth grade problems." [Laughter.]

Item No. 2 in terms of my qualifications: Mrs. Pace said to me, "You are Director of the Budget and we have these two daughters; they ought to know how the Government of the United States functions. You know about what is happening. Sit down and tell them."

I said, "They are too young." Well, you know how families are—I sat down to explain the Government to my daughters. [Laughter.] I went through the executive branch, the legislative branch, the Supreme Court and I found to my amazement that they didn't kick each other, and they didn't kick me. I thought, "She's probably right. I am getting this across here."

I asked, "Are there any questions?" One said, "Tell me, is President Truman a boy or a girl?" [Laughter.] I think I have adequately established my qualifications to speak to you on this subject. Mind you, the first 16 years were with the Government in a variety of activities and the last 10 in the world of business, so I speak from both points of view and bring to you, hopefully, a perspective on what I see might happen in this field if we address ourselves adequately to the task.

I feel a little cheated because I would like to have heard more from my two fellow speakers. They pushed to get through, and we were denied the privilege of having their thinking in depth.

I come to this meeting without prior association. What you seek to do in the committee is of compelling importance, and you are seeking to do it in the right way. You are arranging to let the people know what the problem is and then relying on them to do something about it.

I remember a quote that always interested me by a former Prime Minister of Pakistan who said, "Democracy without education is hypocrisy without limitation." It's well worth rolling over on your tongue, because, while we have good education, it is the improvement of the quality of our education that will be the sustenance of our democracy.

So what I intend to do is to take, very quickly, six premises, develop them, and out of it will come, hopefully, a sense of where public education might move.

The first premise is probably best stated by Well's oft-quoted statement that human history is more and more a race between education and catastrophe. It's a quote that sort of rolls off the tongue a little too quickly and I think we need to examine it because it's not only meaningful, it's compelling.

It is my personal belief that the improvement of the quality of our education is the basis both for world leadership and for survival because I think the two are probably synonymous. I would like to develop that premise by saying that in my judgment achievement of world leadership, and retention of it in the future, is going to depend largely upon our capacity to do three things, all of which depend in one way or another on the improvement of our educational process.

The first is a strong and sustained defense. The second is a competitive, growing economy. The third is internal self-discipline and the capacity for moral leadership.

Let me explain to you why I think education is compelling in each of these cases. It takes a knowledgeable people to accept the burdens of taxation in support of our substantial defense program, when clearly other nations do not bear the burden to the same degree.

It takes an even more knowledgeable population to support the research and development and hardware which will insure our continuing superiority. Only by constantly improving education can we be sure that this pillar will remain secure.

As for the second pillar—that of a competitive economy and a growing one—I recently traveled on a very interesting assignment to almost all the capitals of the world. I wish I had time to tell you the nature of my work. I met with key people in each country. Among these were top businessmen—both natives of the country to which I went—and American businessmen.

In trying to assess where the difference lay between our capacity to remain ahead in the competitive field of free enterprise, I found it lay principally in three areas. First, we were far ahead in the field of middle management; that's the junior executive, foreman, supervisor type.

Second, we were well ahead in the field of commercial research and, third, we were well ahead in the field of entrepreneurship.

It is interesting to note that each of these reflects the quality of our education. Because when you touch, let us say, on commercial research, it relates to the size of the pool of trained scientists, physicists, engineers on which industry has to draw that permits us to remain ahead.

When you talk of middle management, it is again the number of educated men from whom industry can select as well as their subsequent training that allows us to retain leadership.

Thirdly, there is no question but that the breadth of our exposure to the educational process is generating the man who is willing to take the chance, the entrepreneur. It is not just what you learn in the classroom, but the freedom and lack of regimentation in our public schools.

I talked to an American businessman now working in Argentina. I said, "How about the schools here, as compared with your own in California?" He said, "Frank, I think they get a little better quality of education here in the schools to which my children go, but I think of those kids in blue jeans back in the States, wandering home under their own steam, doing things a little differently—that's what makes them grow up with the capacity to be an individual."

These are the things in our system, together with a sound program of law, that have permitted us to encourage the individual to drive ahead and have permitted us to remain a leader in this field.

Finally, on self-discipline and moral leadership: a free society has no imposed discipline. Therefore, the requirement for self-discipline is infinitely greater and if we are to provide moral leadership for the world, we must do the things that we ask others to do.

And so it is my hope, and possibly my belief, that whereas the twenties was the era of the salesman, the thirties and forties the era of the production man, the fifties and sixties the era of the scientist, it may be that the seventies, eighties, and nineties may be the era of the local leader—the minister, the teacher—the man and woman to whom the moral progress of the community is above the dollar.

Hopefully so, because to the teacher, far more than money, acceptance as an essential cog in the survival of this Nation is a compelling factor.

Now let me move on to premise No. 2. That is that there is a clear correlation between money spent on education and improvement in education. I won't document it because the NEA has done so, I think, very abstractly and very thoughtfully, running back over the studies as far back as 1920 to identify the fact that where you spend more money you generate better education.

This, as you all know, has dangers as well as benefits, because recognizing that money is a sine qua non, we are likely to make it the primary, and in some cases the only, requirement. Not only is that dangerous internally, but externally; the thought that what we seek to do is solely to get more money is the sort of thing that constitutes a block toward the real support that is needed.

I think it is fair to say that we have to recognize that we have to use existing funds and facilities more effectively. I cite you the case of the oil companies in this country. For 5 years the price of crude has gone down. The standard for returns has been less each year. They've made more money each year because they've examined themselves in a tough, hard, tight fashion and have produced a better result.

I don't think there's a man or woman here today who would gainsay me that we need to do a better job internally. We need to use our plant better. We need to use our teachers better. We need to orient our administration more effectively. We need to ascertain a predetermined goal of the end product we desire which may permit us to reduce the time requirements upon the student, which in the long run mean dollar reduction.

Doing these things, coming into equity with clean hands, we not only serve the educational process but when we approach those segments of the population whose support we need, I think they will lend a more tolerant ear.

The third premise is that at this stage in history there is in this country a vast reservoir of competence that needs to be tapped in terms of providing better education without the additional expenditure of dollars.

I refer to the fact that, as usual, it is the young who show the way. I happen to know about this through my oldest daughter, who told me 2 years ago that she would not stand for vice president in her class because she wanted to tutor two children in the public school system in Philadelphia.

I was not aware at that time of the innate wisdom of her decision, but I followed her through her junior year, in which she and another girl worked on the tutorial project, and now in her college 50 girls are doing this work. I gather from an editorial in the New York Times that this is not uncommon throughout the United States, this do-it-yourself business. Sure, they'll do it wrong; they'll make mistakes, they won't quite fit the approved pattern, but they are out there making a contribution.

I think the thing that meant most to me was that Paula said, "Daddy, the big gainer is I. It's I who've learned more. I've learned more about my America. I've learned more about human beings; I've learned more about social requirements."

This is the sort of thing that is beginning to happen. I find in my own university of Princeton that this summer, for the first time, they are going to use the facilities to instruct 40 young men who are designated by their school districts to come there to be upgraded so that they might qualify later for a university education. A number of professors will stay on. Nine members of the junior class will volunteer their time. So this just isn't an educational project but the growth that comes through human association.

The same thing is happening on a broader basis at Antioch where, for the first time, they are bringing in young Negro men and women for summer study, because the college believes that while it has accepted all of the applications that met the criteria of the college there just were not enough qualified applicants.

So the young have led the way, and I have a notion that as we get more leisure time, as people begin thoughtfully to assess the utilization of this extra time, that it isn't just going to be golf courses or tennis courts or football or baseball but a reaching to understand and support the fundamentals of America. If we are wise enough to make our people understand how exciting is the process of improving our educational system, it may be a basis for a giant stride forward. So I say to you that the times are propitious, and now we need to assess what is needed to excite this particular group.

My fourth premise is that expenditures of one-tenth of 1 percent for basic research in education is incredible. No business could survive on this basis. I think that the time is ripe for the kind of explosion in educational research and development that occurred in the physical sciences.

I think—and I will specify why—that hand in hand with the do-it-yourself operation must go the improvement of research and development. The foundations, which have done a remarkable job, experimenting for over 10 years have been in the research and development field.

Ideals and programs have been tested in the human laboratory that are now ready to come out for functional use, not ideas that have been dreamed up but programs that have been tested practically, that teachers have tried out and that are ready to work.

You heard a remarkable exposé of what the teachers themselves are doing through the NEA in research. These are the things that can spark an explosion. The schools of education—I serve on the visiting board at Stanford—have made remarkable progress in the whole field of teaching.

As I look at what Stanford presented to our board 3 years ago and what they came up with this spring, it constitutes a whole new order of magnitude: sound criteria, real capacity for self-evaluation.

There has been extensive testing in the technical field. I remember 5 years ago teaching machines were going to solve the whole problem. The profession said, "They have a part to play. They have to be identified. They have to be incorporated into the system. Let's test them. They are not the whole answer." Said the critics, "These are the bureaucrats; these are the diehards; these are the restrainers of progress."

But these cautious voices were sound, and the testing has been done. It has been done in a very practical way. And now, for the first time, we are in a position to reach out and take advantage of these methods of assistance that free the teacher to do the job that needs to be done. But this needs to be pressed and constantly supported.

There are other areas that are just beginning to come into focus: preschool training—all men certainly aren't created equal, all men don't enter school on an equal basis. Preschool training undertakes to see that, not only do they go to school equally prepared, but that they continue with an equal opportunity throughout the course of their school years. We are feeling our way in this area, but we know that the opportunity is there. So I say to you that here lies another opportunity that can be achieved without substantial monetary expenditure which can bring about an exciting revolution in the whole field of education.

Finally, premise No. 5 is that there are major segments of the population that are becoming aware of the critical importance of education in our national life. I refer first to politics. I have traveled recently to maybe 10 States, stayed in small towns, and I was amazed to see how many of the candidates were talking about education, about what they were going to do for education.

In a country that has given to its citizens more control over the education process than any country in history, this is one way to see that the story is told. Once the issue of the correctness of our educational approach is put before the people in the political arena, it commands general attention. The facts are not always accurately stated, but the importance is established.

In business, which by and large will not contribute directly to public education, there is a greater willingness to contribute to groups which are trying to improve the status of public education. In addition, business is honestly urging their young men to participate in the educational process, in the public educational process, both from the point of view of what it does for the business, and what it does for its employees as part of the understanding of their broad stake in America.

Today, in the unions, there is a recognition that possibly they have the greatest stake of all in public education. It was a pretty exciting thing to read in the New York Times yesterday morning that, for the first time in collective bargaining, they had included an educational fund; and that here, through the process of collective bargaining by two opposing factions, it was recognized on both sides that education was an area in which advance was needed. Thus, major segments of our population are recognizing the importance of education.

The final premise is that we come to a period in which great things can be done. Shakespeare, in "Julius Caesar," said, "There is a tide in the affairs of men which, if taken at the flood, leads on to fortune. * * *" And for education, this is the time.

There is no question but that time can run out. But the signs and portents are propitious. If we take and mold and spark these series of related opportunities which are coming into existence at the same time; if we create a recognition that survival itself depends upon not doing it a little better slowly but doing it a lot better quickly; if we recognize that the marvels of science are limited compared to the marvels of education, then this may be the great opportunity both for America and for education.

I like to think, you know, of that remarkable statement that Toynbee made, because it rather fits my own sense of what can be done. He said, "You know, a historian looking at these United States of America 300 years from now might say that the greatest thing in this century was not that we fought three great wars, not that we created marvels of transportation and communication, unheard of in history, not that medical miracles like Salk vaccine came in our time, not even the tremendous implications that come with the splitting of the atom both for peace and for war, but that this century might be remembered as the time when mankind spread the benefits of their civilization to all men."

This can only come in an educated America. Believe me, without the spark we will lose both the capacity for world leadership and survival. This can't be done just with money. Money is an ingredient, but if it becomes the banner, the war cry, we won't carry the day.

However, if we tie it to bettering ourselves, using our talents, recognizing our opportunity, in my estimation this can be the golden age of American education.

EXCERPTS FROM THE DISCUSSION

(Presiding: Mrs. Mary Conway Kohler)

MEMBER (to Dr. Sullivan). What were your criteria for choosing teachers?

Dr. SULLIVAN. We interviewed some 300 to 400 teacher applicants but, unfortunately, many of these people seemed to be coming to the county to solve personal problems. There simply were not many qualified teachers, and there were very few Virginia teachers—very few southern teachers. So, ultimately, we decided we would take any teacher who had a degree, a compatible personality, and wanted to give it a try.

MEMBER. With regard to lack of available teachers, generally, throughout the country, does the panel believe that others than professional teachers might be of help in the classroom?

Dr. SAND. * * * I believe we ought to utilize all our human and material resources, still remembering that we must have at the center this person who is a professional teacher. I think schoolmen, scholars, and workmen, all together, have an important role to play.

Dr. SULLIVAN. I agree completely. * * * I think the schools will have to recruit these people. * * * It is a selling job in the community, and you work on this all the time. You bring in competent men and women with the available time. * * * You turn to places like Antioch and Northeastern University and you bring these young people into the schools. They have many different titles—I call them teacher's aids. Certainly we are not training enough professional teachers to get the job done.

Mr. PACE. * * * Our problem is to recognize that the educational resource is equally as important as, let's say, the scientific resource. We have to direct the interest of top Government, top business, top union, and top citizens to what is a problem well beyond either the capacity or the requirements of the professional teacher.

Dr. SULLIVAN. It's interesting to note that the State of New York, in common with some other States, has legislation prohibiting what is being proposed here. For instance, in New York State, you cannot have a lay man or woman supervise a cafeteria; a professional person has to be there at all times. I think this is carrying the rule altogether too far. I want the professional person in the classroom, but I would be very happy to have competent adult supervision of playgrounds, corridors, cafeterias, and so forth.

MEMBER. * * * The biggest conflict (in my New York suburb) has to do with how the school dollar income is going to be spent. * * * The educators, I find, are unable to convey the sense of direction and urgency about education to the people responsible for allocating the necessary funds. * * * We have got to get to the point where a man like myself, and others present here, can go back to our communities and have a bill of goods to sell. And it cannot be a bill of goods based on the techniques of educators. * * * I am sorry to disagree with Mr. Pace: the dollar is the criterion, and it will be as long as you have to go to your communities on the subject.

Mrs. KOHLER. I don't think you meant to imply that it is "either/or" but that you, as a grassroots person, have to have some practical help.

MEMBER. It is "either/or." As Mr. Reuther said, they will vote the sewer in, but they won't vote for the school project.

Mr. PACE. * * * There are very real reasons for contributing the dollar; however, if you make the dollar the only factor that you ask for, if you do not generate some capacity for self-improvement, if you do not go to the businessmen in your community and say, we are undertaking to run this business within the limitations we have, you are not going to get the dollars. Maybe you aren't going to get them anyway, but if you're going to try, you'll have to do it through this route.

DAVID SCOLL. * * * The direct power of the taxpayer is always felt on the budget of the schools. To the extent that local councils are overlapping, with services that might be performed more efficiently so that money can be saved to put into education, this is an area that all our members—and the people in the various communities—can certainly take a look at and be effective in. * * * The nub of the political point is this: How you use the community tax dollar, and how much you use for education as against the other services, making sure that you have as much efficiency in the use of the tax dollar for other community services as you do in the use of the school dollar.

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

(By Herbert L. Block, cartoonist, the Washington Post)

I want to thank Dr. Harold Taylor for his very kind and warm introduction. If I were smart I would quit now, while I'm ahead, and sit down and let somebody else do this. But I was asked to do a little talking along with the chairmanship.

At this dinner of the Conference on Education and Poverty, the original idea was to serve a simple meal of bread and water with a few food stamps on the side. [Laughter.] This proposal was frowned upon by the Mayflower, but it is evident that today's meetings got the message across anyhow, because I noticed that when dinner was served several delegates fell to their knees and grasped the waiter's hands and said, "Bless you, sir." [Laughter.]

This evening it is going to be my happy chore to introduce some speakers who need no introduction, but I'm supposed first of all to stand here and filibuster for a while [laughter] as you hunger and thirst for the speaking goodies that are to come.

Let me start by telling you how I happen to be here. I heard first from Dr. Taylor, who didn't have to do any arm twisting, or even any telephone cord twisting to persuade me to come, but I received also a phone call from Agnes Meyer, and her word is my command. [Laughter.]

Mrs. Meyer is a one-woman army, and if General Bradley had had her in Europe he could have released at least two or three divisions for service elsewhere. [Laughter.] Fortunately, she has devoted herself, instead, to a unique and irreplaceable role in fighting ignorance and prejudice and squalor and injustice. She was a field general in the war against poverty long before any government official proclaimed that war or gave it a name. [Applause.]

Now, I hope she won't mind my telling you about an infirmity of which she has told me. On one of her days when she began by flying up to New York to deliver a speech and flying back to testify before a congressional committee, and then beating out a deadline on a magazine article in the afternoon, and attending a meeting afterward, we had dinner and went to a benefit concert. [Laughter.]

After we returned to her home about 11 o'clock, we talked about the state of the world and finally she lowered her voice and looked around and leaned forward and confided to me that she was worried about herself because, after a routine day like that, sometimes she felt a little tired. [Laughter.]

After having tried to keep up with her for part of that day I had just enough breath and energy left to say, "Mrs. Meyer, that's too bad. Maybe you should take some vitamin pills or something." I urged her to go upstairs and get some rest at once while I tottered to the door and fell into a taxicab in a small heap—and she went upstairs to dash off a few letters.

Mrs. Meyer is the greatest practitioner of adult education in America. Besides being concerned about how the other half lives, she prods the more fortunate half into doing something about it. She founded this organization because she has done so much for so many: for liberties, for rights, for the arts, for younger people and for the U.S.A., generally. I am delighted to have this chance publicly to express my great admiration and affection for that girl, and I wish she would please stand up for a moment and receive our applause. [Sustained applause.]

The three distinguished men from whom you will hear a little later are at present here as exhibits of the finest products of our public schools. All three of them have been teachers as well. My role is somewhat different. I am here as an example and proof of the vitality of the public school system, particularly the Chicago public school system which, for some 11 or 12 years, survived my attendance as a student, and as a cartoonist and writer on school papers. [Laughter.]

Whenever a public official worries about the press, he can be comforted by knowing that his anguish is shared by faculty advisers of school papers all over the country, whose faith in a free press is constantly tested as they lie awake nights wondering what a bunch of teenagers with a printing press is going to do next.

Mrs. Meyer and Dr. Taylor suggested that I talk some about my own public school experiences, and the first thing that came to mind was something I heard the other day about a boy who came home and told his father, "Dad, you've been invited to a small PTA meeting this evening." His father said, "What do you mean, a small parent-teachers meeting?" The boy said, "You and me and the principal." [Laughter.]

Now in my time the PTA had not yet reached full flower, but I think there were the beginnings of it in what were called Parents' Nights, or a kind of open house evening at school. These occasions I generally neglected to tell my parents about until they were over. I usually found some peachy movie to tell them about on the nights when these things were taking place. Without having, at that time, learned much about government or diplomacy or anything of that sort, I did have a certain basic idea that parents, fine as they were, represented authority and that teachers, however good, also represented authority, and that a coalescing of these forces might result in a combination of power too great for the general welfare of one little kid. [Laughter.]

I think one reason I discouraged my parents from visiting school was because of the practice, which is probably still current, of emblazoning on the blackboard of each room a large honor roll of students who were very good to excellent in every subject. These honor rolls were usually done with drawings of scrolls, sunbursts, eagles, stars and whatnot, in six colors of chalk. If they had had neon tubing then, they would have used that.

So it would have been impossible for my parents to walk into that schoolroom without having seen this blackboard technicolor spectacular, or to have avoided noticing that their boy's name not only did not lead all the rest but seldom appeared on that angelic list at all.

I might add that those of us who devoted our modest drawing abilities to drawing cartoons and posters and things like that regarded the students who contributed their artistic talents to these illuminated honor rolls as a bunch of fakes who betrayed their schoolmates and prostituted their art. [Laughter.]

There have been many changes since then and today's meetings between parents and teachers are more frequent, more helpful and, I think, less fearsome to all concerned, including the parents and teachers. As for report cards, I don't know what terms are used now, but if a term like "group adjustment" is something of a euphemism, it is, for the student at least, an infinite improvement over the dreaded word "deportment," which was so easy to understand and on which the grades were sometimes so hard to explain. [Laughter.]

Now, having told you about the usual fears of my generation of schoolchildren, let me add that I found also in the public schools great enjoyment in the companionship, in the stimulation of classwork and many of the teachers, and particularly in the activities on the school publications where I, like so many others in journalism, got started and got a chance to see my stuff in print for the first time.

The fact is that in a day when it was customary, in cartoons and writing, to depict stereotype schoolchildren as hating school and loathing teachers (which was possibly a holdover from the old days of nearby swimming holes and hickory-stick teaching) at that time, I felt a little guilty about the fact that I really liked school.

Well, thanks to people like yourselves, we have come a long way from the days when schools were regarded, even in popular mythology, as dreaded places and now have recognized the need for them as, often, the only bright and hopeful spots in what might otherwise be areas of complete blight, and lives of utter squalor.

I was interested in your recent report, "The Businessman Looks at the Schools," which shows how you've provoked new thinking and new interest in education among many influential laymen. However, I notice that there are always a few who don't get the word. In looking over some of the comments that were sent in I couldn't help pausing at the comment of one signed, Aircraft Company Executive, who is probably working constantly for faster jetplanes and who says of school progress, "Granted progress is slow, but I feel this is proper."

Among those anonymous notes there was also one from president, power company, who fears "the schools are moving too far away from basics and fundamentals, resulting in too heavy a financial burden" and that we should eliminate the frills and save money by "getting back to the little red schoolhouse."

This fellow is right out of an executive coloring book. [Laughter.] To all the gold we would save by getting back to the little red schoolhouses, we could add a few billions more to build big gray jails, reformatories, and workhouses—and color the future black. The future is brighter, however, for the work that you and others have done even in the bleakest areas.

We have only to consider Prince Edward County, Va., about which Dr. Sullivan spoke to you today, where the public schools were closed for over 4 years. No one can read or hear of that experience without knowing what school means to children today. Newspaper reporters here who went to Prince Edward when the free schools were opened, with the aid of the Federal Government and private agencies, found families where the children were so excited they couldn't sleep the night before. They found some of the children (children up to 9, 10, and 11 years of age) up at dawn dressed in their meager best awaiting the supreme moment of their lives, the chance to enter a schoolroom.

Let me say that whatever opinions I express here are my own. They are not those of your organization, which is interested only in the promotion of education in general, nor of your dinner committee or anyone else. I say that because I cannot resist telling you that, in my opinion, the closing of those schools in Virginia—this taking it out on the humblest and poorest children by politicians, the taking out by them of their hatred of the Federal court was to my mind one of the most wanton and cruel acts ever performed by any political machine in the history of this country. [Applause.]

Reading about the children down there who proudly recited in those Prince Edward schools recalled a couple of recitations of my own schooldays. One was the Preamble to the Constitution, in which we lifted our voices to "establish justice and insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense and promote the general welfare." Well, we were just kids. We didn't realize what we were saying. We didn't know 'til years later that "welfare" was a dirty word.

The result was that a lot of us never got over the idea that the founders meant what they said and that the business of government is to promote the general welfare, which is never promoted better than through public education.

Another thing we recited was a pledge of allegiance to the flag "and to the Republic for which it stands, one Nation, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all." Since then, this pledge has been amended, and awkwardly, in a couple of ways, notably to say, "One Nation, under God, indivisible." In our earlier day we thought that the original form was all right. We didn't mean any harm. We didn't know that God might get sore and strike us all dead for failing to give Him a plug in that pledge. We didn't even know that He needed the publicity [laughter] or that He needed all of us to remind Him daily that our territory came under His jurisdiction.

We needn't stop with the couple of changes that have already been made in that pledge. There is no reason to let the kids get away with a simple declaration, "I pledge allegiance." This could be changed to, "I, Johnny Jones, who am not now and never have been a member of any subversive organization * * *." [Laughter.] The word "Republic" is OK, and that can stand, because the Birchers say it's a Republic and not a democracy; but with some States righters the word "indivisible" may have to go.

And, at the conclusion, the words "with liberty and justice for all" might be followed by some reservations to explain that this doesn't necessarily include all those of a certain race or color, or those too poor to afford education, or bail, or legal fees and so on. In time sufficient amendments might be added to this pledge to eliminate any possible loopholes, along with eliminating the original cadence and simple beauty and meaning it used to have.

But the current big effort is not to amend the pledge, but to amend the Constitution itself to provide for prayer in the public schools. This effort is supported by many sincere and devoted people—but also by a number of others of more questionable motives.

I envy those Congressmen who are on such intimate terms with God that they know all about Him—about what denomination He belongs to, what He wants done and how He wants to be prayed to, and are going to save Him by putting Him in the public schools. This is very generous of them. They are busy and important men, but not too busy to give God a great big hand and show how they can help put Him across.

But I can't help noting that many of the Congressmen who are hellbent for religion in the schools have never been much for education in the public schools. [Laughter.] Many of these pious politicians have never been much concerned about children on part-time education, or less, or about children being denied educational opportunities at all. But to hear them weep and carry on about how the children are being, as they put it, "denied the right to pray" you would think all the homes and churches and Sunday schools had been closed and the kids were in school on a 24-hour-a-day schedule under lock and key.

The fact is that if the Government were to propose that, through tax-supported public schools, it wanted to take over responsibility for all of children's needs and beliefs, these same Congressman would be the first to cry "totalitarianism" or "communism."

Still speaking only for myself, I think there are also some today who cry out about the need for religion in the schools who have done a switch on the biblical idea that God created man in His own image. There are demigods who have created a god in their own image, a white god filled with hatred for a Supreme Court, not only because it stands for freedom of religion, but primarily because it stands for free and equal education, and I don't think most Americans believe in a god who is inspired by shabby political campaigns.

By now you may have gathered I am opposed to religion in the public schools, and I am. But for those who feel that there should be some form of religious observance, the best suggestion I've heard is for the use of some quotations from the highest authority, and from one of the greatest of all religious passages, the Sermon on the Mount.

First, there are the lines in which the multitude is told to be "not like the hypocrites that do their praying in public, but when thou prayest enter into thy closet, and when thou hast shut thy door pray to thy Father in secret." And this is followed shortly after by the words, "When ye pray use not vain repetitions as the heathen do for they think they shall be heard for their much speaking."

I commend these religious passages for frequent and fervent use by the Chaplains of both Houses of Congress. [Applause.] Well, whatever varying opinions there may be on specific points, I am strong for the work of this committee, whose meeting last year was summed up in the pamphlet, "Light a Fire." You are keeping alive and glowing the flame in the lamp of learning, a light that you and the President, and all of us, want to see not turned out but turned up bright.

But I am not one of those who believes in the frequent editorial statements which constantly say that we need, on any subject, more light and less heat. Whenever it is necessary, I trust you will not hesitate to apply the flame of learning to the seats of power. [Laughter.] To insure proper education for the children of this country, I hope you will not only provide light but will turn on enough heat to get action.

Let us now praise famous men—and this is the happiest part of the evening. My line of work is one in which criticism necessarily outruns praise and it is not noted for showing undue reverence for public officials. It is, therefore, a special pleasure for me to be able to introduce some public men this evening whom I have admired for a long time, and about whom I've been complimentary even in the cartoons. [Laughter.]

Our first speaker is General Bradley, whose honors and whose services to his country would fill many books, which will undoubtedly be written about him. For tonight, I will only remind you that he has often been referred to as the GI's General, and whatever disagreement soldiers or different members of the Armed Forces have had about other things, this man has been so respected by all and (I am not afraid to use the word) so loved, that he is in a class by himself.

I would feel awed in presenting him to you if it were not for the fact that he is so warm and so gentle and so comfortable a person. We hear talk sometimes about the military mind, of which there must be many kinds, because we read some statements and letters-to-the-editors by some military men who sound as if they are all friends of Dr. Strangelove. [Laughter.]

In talking about his own public school experiences this evening, I hope General Bradley will give us some clue as to what made him the way he is because, to paraphrase and extend a famous remark, whatever he eats or drinks and whatever he read or studied should be prescribed for all the other generals and all the other members of the Armed Forces, and for all American civilians as well.

I think of him as being, incidentally, one of the greatest generals in our history and always one of our greatest and most conscientious citizens.

It is literally an honor to present to you Gen. Omar Bradley. [Applause.]

PUBLIC SCHOOL EDUCATION

(Remarks by Gen. Omar N. Bradley)

I was asked to speak about my public school experience. At first I thought it was so unique that maybe it would not have any application to what we are trying to do today, but maybe by stretching it a little bit and using a little imagination, it is.

The public school education I had would be almost impossible to get today. For my first 6 years I went to a one-room country school. Some of you may have done that, but on top of that, for 4 of those 6 years my father was my teacher. [Laughter.]

And, of course, having the teacher in my house every night, I had to do my homework. He very carefully told me that I had to set the example. But if you have never gone to a one-room country schoolhouse you may not have the picture. There are children from all grades, from beginners on up to high school age, and the one teacher teaches all classes in the same room.

That means you have small classes, you have to answer questions and express yourself, many times a day. And how different that is from what we have today, where you have 30 or 40 kids in a room. But on top of that, if you knew your lessons (and I must insist that I knew mine before I went to school) you could sit there and listen to the classes above you recite, so that not only were you taking your own work but you were getting some idea of what the people above you were studying.

They did not have school boards in the same sense we have today. We did not have Parent-Teacher Associations but they used to have what they called a board of visitors, from the parents, and I was asked to tell a story which I told last year. If those of you who heard it last year will bear with me, I will tell it again.

If you ever went to a country school you will remember that they came around, usually before Christmas and then again in the spring; and these farmers would sit there and listen to the kids recite, and then finally the teacher would say, "Do any of you have any questions?" and they would ask questions. Which reminds me of the school down in Texas where there was one of the students of Mexican descent who came to the school, and his name was Jesus Christ.

That was a little unusual, so to make sure that there was no misunderstanding the parents, the first day, sent along a note saying that "this boy's name really is Jesus Christ." When the board of visitors came around and asked various questions, and one of these Texans with a great 10-gallon hat said he wanted to ask a question. He wanted to know if anybody in the class could spell such and such a word.

Jesus Christ shot up his hand (like this) and the teacher, knowing he was a very poor speller, tried to divert the question to somebody else. She said, "Jesus Christ, you can't spell that." Whereupon, this big Texan with a big hat got up and said, "Well, God dammit, let him try." [Laughter.]

There was one other advantage which was unique about my school situation in that not only did I spend the evenings with my teacher, but I spent the other 4 months of the year with my teacher; furthermore, we walked to and from school, and I remember one year we lived 3 miles from the schoolhouse and walked 3 miles to school in the morning and 3 miles back in the afternoon.

My father was a great companion. During the summer and the fall, on Saturdays, we hunted and fished together, and I was under the influence of my teacher, as I say, all the time. He made me become interested in various things—history, military history—and at that time I had no idea of making the military my career; we used to work mental arithmetic problems together.

I would say that in my early life, for the first 6 years of my schooling, he was the one greatest influence on my education and my future, because he taught me interest in things; he taught me a lot about nature. He got me into the right study habits.

Unfortunately, he died when I was 14 years old, before I was 15, and I went on and finished school in a neighboring town where I again was blessed with comparatively small classes, and where I had excellent teachers. In those days teachers were pretty well paid. I know my father was pretty well paid. He got $50 a month, which was pretty high in those days. Anyhow, I had good teachers.

Probably, during this period, the most influential thing that happened to me was meeting my future wife in my class. We were married 8 years later, and since then she has been the one greatest influence in my life. You might say, What does this have to do with our problems today? It's so unique. Is it applicable today? I think it is.

What can we do to decrease the numbers in our classes? We may not get it down to 2 or 3, but at least we can get it under 40. What can we do to get good teachers? I had good teachers all the way through, which was very lucky, and I was fortunate in being surrounded at home by somebody who was interested in education. Can't we get the people at home, through your PTA's and so forth, can't we get the parents interested in the kids' education, not only in providing better school facilities, but a better environment at home?

Some of us were fortunate in having this home environment. We know that today some of our children are not so lucky. You know that some of these children go home and hear poor English; their parents are uneducated; they pay no attention to the kids. Can we do anything about that? Maybe not too much, but I think there is one thing we can do, and this is beside the subject, probably: what do these kids watch on televison these days? They watch a lot of silly stuff, a lot of violence. Maybe we could have some influence on this home environment by working for better television shows for the kids, something that would help make up this deficiency in the home environment.

So, while my experience was unique, and I was very fortunate, maybe we can do something for those kids today who are not so fortunate, by taking various steps.

And I am sure that that is what is in your minds or you would not have taken the trouble to come here to this meeting at your expense and participate in it. Thank you. [Applause.]

HERBERT BLOCK. Thank you, General Bradley. If the kind of schoolhouse that General Bradley went to was responsible for what he is, I am for manufacturing them in large quantities. The trouble is that I don't know if we can get fathers for teachers, or more General Bradleys.

The next speaker this evening is Secretary Wirtz. One of the most well meant but worst things that a chairman can do is to put a speaker on the spot by telling you at length about what a wonderful speaker you are about to hear. I am not going to do this to the Secretary, particularly because I happen to know that these days he is so busy that he seldom has time even to prepare talks in advance; but he is one of the few men I know who could surmount that kind of billing if it were given him.

Some years back, if I had been introducing him, I would probably have offered a long and detailed introduction. But he is today so distinguished a Cabinet member and his ability is so well known and he is so widely respected that we can dispense with any who's who about him. No one who reads the papers and who read of things like the recent successful settlement of the long and seemingly impossible-to-settle railroad dispute needs to be told about the qualities of the Secretary of Labor.

What I particularly like about him is that he is the kind of public official who does not gloss over our problems, or point out how dandy things are when they are only pretty good, even in election years. When the statistics show that employment has gone up some, and unemployment has gone down a little, he reports these facts, but he says that this is not good enough for the United States.

Our Secretary of Labor is definitely good enough for the United States and I am happy to present him to you now. Secretary Willard Wirtz. [Applause.]

PUBLIC SCHOOL EDUCATION

(Remarks by Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz)

Yea, though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death I shall fear no greater evil, for I have spoken following Herb Block and Gen. Omar Bradley and before Hubert Humphrey, and no greater harm can befall me all the rest of the days of my life. [Applause.]

Thank you, Herb. The only false note I heard in the 15 minutes of your introduction was your repeated suggestion that "the views expressed here tonight by me are only my own," and then you said, later, "I'm still speaking for myself." It is going to be a very remote day in history when Herb Block is speaking only for himself. [Applause.]

Let me start by telling you how I happen to be here. I heard from Mrs. Meyer. Her command is my word. [Laughter.] Mrs. Meyer, let me say only this: a good deal of publicity has attended the President's suggestion that he insisted upon getting 50 women into office within 30 days.

I am in a position to reveal a lesser known element in that same command. His instructions were "50 women within 30 days, or their equivalent." We asked him what he meant by the "equivalent." He thought a moment and said, "Agnes Meyer working half time." [Laughter.] It is at Mrs. Meyers special request that I come here tonight—and also because of the pleasure I took from this same discussion, from this same group, a year ago.

She asked me to testify to my good fortune in having attended public schools. I did not know how to react to that; whether to assume that the result would necessarily have been different if I had gone to private schools, or what the situation might have been, and I demurred a little.

She said, well, General Bradley was going to testify about how good the public schools had been to him, and Herb Block and HUBERT HUMPHREY, and I finally agreed that on the basis of equal time for the other point of view I would be glad to appear here this evening.

Not knowing exactly what to say, and asking her, she said, "Well, will you please tell them, then, about the President of the United States," and I am glad, Mrs. Meyer, to testify here tonight not to my own good fortune in attending public schools because the truth of the matter is, in De Kalb, Ill., nobody ever did anything else but go to public schools. [Laughter.]

But as far the President is concerned, it was interesting to look in his biography in "Who's Who." I don't believe anybody has looked in "Who's Who" about the President of the United States until this afternoon. I did, and I found a little statement saying that he did attend public schools and then, "Teacher: Houston, Tex., public schools, 1930 to 1932." I speak, then, on behalf of the President of the United States, formerly a teacher in the Houston public schools.

And then I picked up one other little anecdote bearing on this subject. When Mr. Johnson, Professor Johnson, or whatever they called them in the Houston public schools, left in 1932, the Sam Houston High School editorial carried this little item: "Mr. Johnson has made the right decision. We expect to hear great things from him." [Laughter.]

Mrs. Meyer, I went one step further, I inquired, too, into the education of one Claudia Taylor and I am in a position to announce that Claudia Taylor also went to the public schools. In fact, she too went to a one-room schoolhouse, Fern School, a rural school in Texas in which, they tell me, during the cotton-picking season she was the only person in school. Then she went to the public high school in Marshall, Tex., from which she graduated at the age of 15. You would identify her better today as Lady Bird Johnson. It's a marvelous thing to at least have that kind of an illustration from which to proceed this evening, but I'm worried about what's going to happen to Linda and Luci. I'm not so sure about them. [Laughter.]

I can't speak in the way Herb has, or General Bradley, because it takes a good deal more preparation for that kind of presentation of this problem than it's been my opportunity to bring to this evening. So I would like to improve the 5, 6, or 7 minutes which are allotted to me to speak, if I may, very seriously, beyond what the hour of the evening justifies, about the subject of your day's discussion on education and poverty.

The responsibility which is most closely identified with the office of Secretary of Labor is the responsibility for full employment, not for settling labor disputes or something of that kind, but for seeing to it that the people in this country are put to the use to which they could be put if the opportunity were given them.

I should like to say, only very briefly, how unimportant it seems to me that that part of this problem is which it is within the province of the Department of Labor to do anything about. If I had gone to a private school that last sentence would have been a better sentence.

I can't tell you how increasingly you feel the despair of trying to meet a problem such as the full employment problem, realizing that the answers lie some place else, and that the place they lie is in the schools.

I spent a part of the week before last and the week before that on the poverty tour through the Appalachian area—and then Friday and Saturday of this last week Mrs. Wirtz and I went up into Harlem to take a look at the problem there. It is so perfectly obvious that the roots of unemployment in this country are simply poverty and lack of education, and nothing else.

Let me give you just one or two statistics, and I will narrow it to the Harlem situation because it is so fresh in my mind. It was with a shock bordering on disbelief that I was advised of the study that has been made of the boys and girls who graduated from junior high school, ninth grade, in Harlem in 1959—1,276 of them in central Harlem. Three years later, of that group only 385 finished high school and only 43 with an academic diploma which would permit them to go on.

Or over in another part of Manhattan, where we worry about the Puerto Rican problem let us simply start, and almost end, with the fact that 75 percent of the Puerto Ricans in New York don't ever enter high school at all. And what are we to do about the unemployment problem after that kind of base has been laid? I hardly know.

Another figure, a Harlem figure: when the children in the elementary schools in Harlem enter the first grade, their reading comprehension is about the same as that for the city at large. By the third grade the reading comprehension is below average, for 30 percent of them; and by the sixth grade the reading comprehension is below average for 80 percent of them.

These are figures from which you can draw almost any of a number of conclusions. They may be indictments of the school system, or they may be indictments of a broader context of circumstances which attends this situation. It is at least relevant that by the sixth grade there shows up a close correlation between those who fall short in reading comprehension and those who come from families which are broken, from situations in which there is difficulty of one kind or another. But it does not make any difference. The problem is one which has to be met, not just as a problem of individual fault—but as a problem of social fault, whether it is the fault of the schools or whether it is the fault of the larger community that creates the situation in which this kind of circumstance develops.

Some of you who were here at this meeting a year ago will remember that General Bradley said something in his remarks about what he understood to be the unbelievable rejection rate as far as the Armed Forces qualification test is concerned.

What you said, General, set me to thinking—and when I got back, even that same afternoon, I asked our people to start looking into it. Some of you may have seen, in the papers, the result of the little fire which you, sir, started. Because we did find, again contrary almost to the possibility of belief, that half of the boys who are drafted for the Army and take the Armed Forces qualification test fail it, and that half of those who fail it do so because of the inadequacy of their mental equipment or education.

And so we set out to see what could be done about it; and with President Kennedy starting a project which President Johnson has carried forward, we have now set out to see what we can do, in some way, about salvaging the human waste which is reflected in these failure facts; because it is perfectly obvious that boys who aren't fit for military service aren't fit for civilian living either.

I would like to tell you in a moment about what we have found out about these boys, half of whom are failing. In November we made an intensive study of 2,500 of them to see what we could find out about them, and the story is the same as the story I have tried to suggest in connection with the Harlem figures, although this story is one which applies to boys of various races.

Looking at the 2,500 boys who failed the Armed Forces qualification test for mental reasons, we found (and it won't surprise you at all) that 80 percent of them had dropped out of school before they finished high school.

As a matter of fact, 40 percent of them (1 out of every 5) stopped either at the eighth grade or at a point below the eighth grade. We found too that, at least in their own explanation of the reasons, 40 out of every 100 who dropped out did so because they had to support either themselves or their families.

And let me interject at this point one figure which bears not on the elementary education but on the more advanced education, and which bears out the same point. If you take last year's high school graduating class—the 1963 high school graduates—and line them up on the basis not of their ability but of their parents' income you will find today that, among the top 30 percent in terms of their parents' income, 61 percent are in college. If you look at the bottom 30 percent in terms of their parents' income you will find that only 19 percent of them are in college.

Public education? I am just not sure how public it is today, or whether it's private—at least to the extent that only those who attain a cerain measure of success see their children go on to use that education.

Returning to the boys, over 50 percent of those who failed the Armed Forces qualification test were the sons of fathers who never finished the eighth grade. More and more it is becoming clear that poverty and unemployment and ignorance are inherited characteristics in this country, and if there is one place we can do anything about it, it is in connection with the school system.

There is another point which is raised wherever this matter is brought up—and I am talking about boys, but the figures for girls parallel the situation; we just don't have the same approach to it as far as getting a cross section is concerned. The point is raised that these boys are beyond salvage and that they are no longer interested in education; that something adverse has happened, either in the inheritance in the genes of the slums or in some other way. (And I want to make it clear that when I talk about these being inherited characteristics I am talking about inheritance through the social genes, not through the physical genes at all—through the slums, the broken homes, the bad schools, or whatever it may be.)

When you inquire as to whether anything can be done about these boys, there is at least this answer. Of those boys we talked to in November, the 2,500 who had busted out of the Army, 88 percent said that they wanted very much to go back to school to get the basic education which was lacking, and which they knew was lacking.

Now, don't jump to the conclusion that that's just the easy answer, because we asked that same question in five different ways, in an attempt to get at the real answer, and it showed up the same way in all five of the questions. We are completely convinced that they will come back to the training programs which can be offered, and for the education programs if they are the right kind.

Interestingly enough, we took these figures on a racial basis, and the percentage of boys who have busted out—who want to return for more education, or for the right kind of training—is higher among the Negro boys than it is among the white boys.

When you get to this point of dereliction, the boys who have busted out—so that they can't even pass the test which is involved here—you find no racial characteristics which are controlling. The controlling characteristic is the poverty from which they come, the lack of education which they have at a particular point, the broad circumstance under which they have developed.

Let me say only this in conclusion. There has been increasing consideration of the suggestion that something ought to be done about the public school system—either to add another couple of years at the top, or to pick up another 2 or 3 years at the bottom. I think it's interesting that it is now a little more than 135 years since Massachusetts passed the first public school law which provided for 12 years of public education, and we are still working on that same basis.

It is about 100 years since one of the States first decided there should be compulsory education up to age 16, and that is still the law in almost all the States. Either they were wrong then or we are wrong now, because the circumstances have changed so drastically that this is just no longer the answer.

It just does not make any sense today to let a boy or girl out of school without preparation for some kind of skilled job. It was all right before, but now there is no longer unskilled work for them to do. It won't make any sense, either to hold them another 2 years in the same kind of school and give them all the same kind of education they have been getting. If there is to be an additional period of time within the public school system, as I think there should be, it will have to include vocational education, and that kind of thing, for those who are not going to college.

I think we have got to think more about starting our public education at an age below 6, at least in some parts of the country, in some parts of the cities, and in some other areas. I rather think that more unemployment is brought into people's lives between the ages of 3 and 6 than during any other period.

I think that is true—but there is no way of proving it. Now it may be that the right kind of education would correct whatever that problem may be; but I know that we are going to have to go back into the period of largest motivation, and I think that period probably picks up about that time—between the ages of 3 and 6. I don't suppose that the politicians of today would go along with the platonic suggestion, in "The Republic" I think it was, that children should be taken out of the home and put into another environment. I don't suggest that as a pragmatic matter.

I do suggest that, if there is a public responsibility which is reflected in the system of public education, it is sheer nonsense to disregard what goes on it children's minds, in the development of their futures, between the ages of 3 and 6. I would like to suggest that if we really mean business about public education we probably ought to put up our best schools in the slums instead of the suburbs.

I would like to leave with you, if I may, a note less gentle in some ways than what General Bradley has suggested—and Herb Block has said, in a much nicer way—but it is a note which I am compelled to strike.

I don't think that the public education system, or the education system as a whole, is measuring up today to the demands upon it; and I don't think it can possibly measure up to the demands upon it with the present personnel which it has, as far as numbers and training are concerned.

I don't think the physical plant will today support the kind of education which there has got to be. I think that education ought to be the number one, largest, industry in the country. You would cure the unemployment problem if you put enough people into the teaching of the next generation.

It could be the largest industry in the country. If we kept these boys and girls who need more education in school another 2 years it would do three things: it would mean that they would get the training they need; it would mean that you would take 2 or 3 million children out of the job market who are today competing with the heads of families for the limited number of jobs which are available; and it would give us the largest industry in the country, which we very much need.

I am not in a position to testify on the subject of public education against private education. I believe in public education, so that I have been responsible for half of a decision (and the other half of the decision is here tonight) which has shaped our lives—our married lives—around putting our children where there were the best public schools.

After the war Mrs. Wirtz and I moved to a town because we had investigated and found, we felt, that it had the best public schools in the Chicago area. And when we came to Washington, we came first to find what part of this city seemed to have the best public school in it. We believe in it and all that is in it, but I submit that the real question is perhaps not the question of public against private education. It's one of more education of the kind and quality which the next generation demands. Thank you. [Applause.]

HERBERT BLOCK. I thank Secretary Wirtz for his magnificent speech and I think you can all see now, those of you who have never had the opportunity to hear him before, why I said it was impossible to overbill Secretary Wirtz as a speaker when he speaks extemporaneously.

I think the reason is also quite clear: because he has so much information at his fingertips about things on which he feels so deeply.

Our final speaker is Senator HUMPHREY. I first met Senator HUMPHREY when he came to Washington in 1948, and since I got here early in 1946 I have always felt that I have a little seniority on him. He has worked hard and fought hard for great causes and, recently, in what the pollsters and analysts would call his public acceptance rating, he runs high in all areas.

At an editors' convention which was held here a couple of weeks ago, one quite liberal editor told me in a somewhat challenging manner that he was strong for HUBERT HUMPHREY, as if he expected me to give him an argument. The same evening I met, at a dinner party, the editor of a conservative paper who glowered at me as he announced that he was strong for HUBERT HUMPHREY, in the same challenging tone. In both cases, when I told them what I thought, they said they were interested to know that I liked Senator HUMPHREY, too. All of us, I know, admire the fight that he is waging today, which is really a continuation of the fight he has waged ever since he got here, for the rights of all Americans.

The last time I heard Senator HUMPHREY, he made some kidding remarks about the length of some of his previous speeches and said he was cutting down. He does not run too long for me—and if he speaks more briefly these days it is probably because events have caught up with him. People have found out that he was right about education, civil rights, civil liberties, and other things he used to have to explain, and he has less missionary work to do than he used to.

In our case, we are glad to hear Senator HUMPHREY on any basis, but I will have to warn him that, as a Senate leader currently trying to curtail extended talk, anything he says here beyond 25 minutes may be held against him by some of his colleagues. [Laughter.]

Senator HUMPHREY, the floor is yours. [Applause.]

PUBLIC SCHOOL EDUCATION

(Remarks by Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY)

Thank you very much, my good friend Herb. When you have subtly attempted to remind me of what the hour is, and I have ignored it completely, I want you to know that I am a frustrated Senator. I have been listening to a filibuster now for 56 days, and have I got an audience tonight that is going to listen to me. [Laughter.] It is now my turn.

I suppose throughout life there is always something that happens that sort of brings the balance of forces to you. I looked back over the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of some years ago and I noted that I had taken up a good deal of the space in that record and now my colleagues are heaping cruel, and inhuman punishment upon me—but I left the filibuster this evening. It's my job to see that the Senate gets up in the morning, and it's my job to see that the Senate is put to bed at night, and in betwixt I occasionally try to find something that is interesting. [Laughter.]

When everybody else is suggesting how they got here tonight, I want to tell you how I got here. I remember your program last year, and I recall meeting several of the people that came from this program, and it sounded unusually exciting. I read the newspaper report of it. I heard the comments of some of the Governors that were here last year; and I made up my mind that if this group came back to Washington once again I'd be here with you. So, I'm not quite sure when I did it, or just how I did it, but I'm quite sure that I told Agnes Meyer that I wanted to be invited, and I got invited. [Laughter.] I surely want to thank her for accepting my not too subtle suggestion that this would be the kind of group that I should like to associate with, at least for a few moments.

You have had some wonderful speeches this evening. They are more than speeches. They are concise philosophical dissertations. You heard the one and only Herblock—and after hearing Herb, and after hearing the great general and after hearing this illustrious public servant and intellectual giant, the Secretary of Labor, I feel so downtrodden, so oppressed that I feel the living example of spiritual and intellectual poverty. [Laughter.]

One nice thing about being the final speaker is that you are supposed to be the cleanup hitter. That presumes that somebody is on first and somebody is on second and somebody is on third and the game is tight. The fact is that everybody up to now has hit a home run, and if I should strike out you have already had a big evening.

I want to take a few minutes to tell you about a very favorite place of mine, and if my family were here tonight you would know that you were in for a long, long talk, because I grew up in a little town called Doland, S. Dak. There were 660 people in that town, and at least 654 were of the most interesting people that you could find; and then I would like to include my mother and father, making it 656, and then there were four young Humphreys, and you will have to judge them on their own.

That whole community was centered around the church—we had two churches, the Methodist Church and the Catholic Church—and the schools. There was Doland High School Independent School District, and just the town.

My best friend was Julian Hart, who today is a professor of philosophy and theology at Yale University. I started out in the first grade at Doland, and graduated from Doland High School in 1929.

What I liked about it was that you could be in everything. If you were warm and alive, you had potentialities as an athlete. If you could even swallow a pebble, much less keep one in your mouth like Demosthenes, you could be a debater.

If you had legs you could be on the track team. If you could even as much as squirm, you could play on the basketball team. In other words, there was a chance to be something—and whether you know it or not, my dear friends, people like to be something.

I think the great need in America today is to be needed, and most people don't feel that they are really needed. I think another fact about our life today is that most people are so impersonal. It's just big, and the number one problem facing this country is how to preserve individuality in the mass. I don't even like the word "mass." I graduated once in pharmacy, and we used to talk about a "pill mass." I told the professor then, as we were preparing in what we called the practical aspects of pharmacy—"I wish they could find a different word for it, maybe 'a compound.' Don't call it 'mass' because that's the ugliest word I can think of." It loses all character, all identity, all personality. It means nothing and, regrettably, many people keep mouthing it.

The concept of "the mass" is a repudiation of everything that we believe in: our whole concept of brotherhood, of spirituality, of individuality, of conscience—it has no place in what I consider to be our way of life, for lack of a better phrase.

I represent Minnesota in the U.S. Senate, but I came there late. I came there to the university, and I will tell you why; but first I want to tell you about Doland.

We had wonderful teachers, General, just like your wonderful father. It was a small school, but we were in it—and we knew what it was about, and the community had community pride. We liked our high school and we had keen rivalry with our neighboring towns.

Why, I can remember being so thin that when I stood sideways the teacher, as they say, marked you absent. [Laughter.] And yet I was on the football team. The first year I was just a tackling dummy. Maybe this has been one of the things that has been responsible for some of my problems since. [Laughter.] The second year I was a substitute back, and the third and fourth years I played regularly.

I like to remind my wife, who came from a large metropolitan area (of at that time approximately 6,000 people) that we took 'em to the cleaners, but good, because if you didn't, you didn't amount to much. The coach taught us that we were supposed to be good and that coming in second was coming in last in a two-man sport, and that you weren't supposed to come in last.

I know those are pretty rugged standards, but they had some effect. It even made people that weren't very good, fairly good, and it made some that were fairly good reasonably good, and occasionally we produced a right top good one. I never had the chance to be a star, but I participated, and I think the greatest thing in life is to be a participant. This whole Nation is filled up with observers. We need people that participate—participate in politics, participate in community activities, participate in the PTA, participate in church, participate in whatever they belong to, and don't just sit around waiting for somebody to entertain them.

Nobody entertained anybody in Doland. We were in it, all of us. There weren't many of us, and everybody had to man the ramparts, particularly when the enemy approached, and we always found an enemy, because that kept the spirits high.

So, Doland, S. Dak., I salute you. I had many good writeups in the local paper, because I was the editor of the high school column. I always feel that if you don't deserve it, you ought at least to take charge of it. [Laughter.]

We had as our favorite activity in high school, debate. Maybe that's why I like to talk, but we did debate. We debated everybody about everything, and we kept winning State championships, though we were just a little town.

I, and my brother before me, went on the debate team and then went on to college and did the same thing there. I think that was good for us too. A little later they got around to where you didn't debate, you "discussed." Now let me let you in on something. I have been a teacher too: I am a refugee from a classroom, and all this discussion stuff is a lazy man's way to use up time.

When you debate you have to work at it, get ready. When you discuss you just sort of "discuss." [Laughter.] Now, a discussion with adequate preparation is a reasonably good substitute for debate, but debate puts you to the task.

We had declamation, and we had oratory, and generally we didn't have very many participants so if you were, again, reasonably good you were in on it and you went to the district tournament—or the regional tournament if you won in the district, and the State tournament if you won the regional. It was all that way.

Now, let me tell you just a little bit about some of the teachers. We had wonderful teachers. Frankly, I keep meeting schoolteachers now and they are a lot prettier than they were then, it seems to me. But, actually, we had very fine teachers. I don't know how much they were paid, but they obviously were paid more than dad was making in the drugstore, because I think I heard him say something about that once or twice. [Laughter.]

But, truly, our teachers were a part of the community and we liked them. One of my favorite men is Guy Cook, who was superintendent of high schools and another is Irvin Herther, coach. I'll tell you something about Herther, the coach: when some young fellow got smart with him one time and thought he was going to run over him, he didn't take him back and give him a psychological analysis. He took him back period, and gave him a working over [laughter] and that bully, who had been bullying everyone in high school for years, quit bullying and became the outstanding athlete of our State. Up until then he was a bum. I don't say that's the way you always do it, but that one worked.

I point out that teachers were close to the student. I remember my teachers. I loved my teachers. Oh, I used to think some were better than others, and I pulled all the pranks. As a matter of fact. I almost hestitate to talk about Doland High School lest you think that my performance since those days is to be related to Doland High School. It was a great school and it still is.

I go back there. I went back and made the commencement address there some years ago and I was just as proud of it then as I am now and as I was when I was a student there.

But let me also add that there was a community around that high school, and this is what bothers me. I guess I'll never get quite used to the big city. I liked the city of Minneapolis where, later on, I became the mayor because it wasn't just a city; it was a series of communities.

I spoke in every grade school, junior high school, and high school in that city and I said to those people, in those schools, parents and students alike, what Willard Wirtz said here tonight; that, regrettably, the better schools in Minneapolis and its suburbs were in the areas where the people needed the least the better schools, and the poorer schools were in the areas where the people needed them most.

Where the poverty areas were, where the poor areas were, where the run-down areas were—there were the run-down schools.

Where the richer people were, the more affluent people—we never know that word in Doland, that is a fact—I never heard the word "affluent" until I got to Washington. [Laughter.] But where the more affluent people were, there you found the better schools.

Naturally, they were newer areas, but the duty of public servants is to keep some balance in our social structure because, after all, the primary duty of government is justice; and it is not just to the student to have one school in which they have counselors, a band, music, extracurricular activities, medical attention, a fine cafeteria, athletics, fine fields, and go to another school and find there is no band, no reasonably good library, inadequate teachers, inadequate classrooms. That's not justice; that's not fair.

But it is, regrettably, the pattern in many areas of the Nation. But the best teacher I had, General, was my dad. I think of him many days, in fact, every day. I was so pleased to hear you. General Bradley, speak of your father because my dad was my teacher too. He never was a schoolteacher; my mother was a schoolteacher and a wonderful schoolteacher, but my dad was my adviser, my friend, my pal, my consultant.

I have often said that my father never told me what time to go to bed, and that's a true statement, but he was the best getter-upper in the State of South Dakota. [Laughter.] The later I stayed out the earlier I got up, and he had some very simple formulas: "Self-pity is the bane of all evil."

He used to say to me, "Action, activity, son—go to work. You're not too smart, but you can compensate for it by long hours and hard work." [Laughter.]

Simple little lessons, but the best lesson of all was that he was there, and this is regrettably what many of us do not do, and I am a living example of it. It is very difficult. Modern society makes it more difficult for parents to be there.

And since parents can't be there, and it is a fact of life that parents frequently cannot be there (we can't all live in towns of 600, or 1,000 or 5,000, and we are not going to), it therefore becomes all the more important that there be something built in that compensates for this lack of parental advice and counsel.

I don't say it's the same. I don't say it will take its place, but it can help, and that is why the school becomes more important.

That school—again I go back to my early days as a child, a young fellow—needs to be more than just classrooms and teachers. It needs to be surrounded by a sense of pride and of competitive excellence that makes people proud to live in the community. I think we need a kind of national competition in America today, friendly competition, cooperation and competition, to see which of our communities can produce, not the highest per capita income as such, but the school that is the better which, in turn, will produce a higher per capita income. It just follows, as a logical part of the whole story.

I notice that President Johnson has now made preparations for the presentation of certain citations and medals to young students, and I am pleased at this. I hope that what I am about to say will not be misunderstood, because some people could misunderstand it and some people may. But one of the things that I found out when I went to the Soviet Union in 1958 was that the Soviet Council of Ministers took 1 full week to present honors to the best students of all the schools in the Soviet Union and the students and their parents were invited at the expense of the Government to come to Moscow and be heralded as heroes of the Soviet Union. We don't hear much about that over here.

I don't like their system of education. I don't care for all of its compulsion, all of its strict control, but don't forget for a single minute that that country didn't rise from nothing, from poverty and illiteracy and ignorance to where it is today, without emphasis on education.

I am pleased, now, that in this great free country at long last we are going to honor students before they graduate from college. Youngsters appreciate it more than oldsters. And by the time you have completed 4 years of college or graduate school you are not nearly as impressed with a medal or some honor as you are when you come out of junior high, or out of senior high.

I think these little honors are surely of the greatest importance, and to have them come from the President, indeed. We give "E" awards to industry. Why don't we have some "E" awards for education across this land? I have yet to see a school that flies a flag that says that it is a school of excellence. Most anybody can get by today. We've got that all fixed up, but we live in the space age, when "OK" means that you fail. It's "A-OK" that keeps you in orbit. We need excellence.

Yes; I said I had a great teacher, and I did, my dad. I'll tell you what else he did. He taught me the value of books. I like the idea of the paperback, provided we don't look upon literature as being cheap. There is one danger to a paperback. It has a tendency to promote cheapness. But the same paperback (and I don't want to be misunderstood on this) this same paperback industry, can do amazing things for America.

It can make available to the American people a great library at little or no cost. Some time ago, when I was participating with the Book-of-the-Month Club on a program, I suggested that we have, instead of food stamps, which nourish the body, some book stamps. Because, Mr. Secretary, when we go into a poverty area to feed the body we might also want to do something with the mind.

And there is a sense of possession which does something for you. When it's your book, and you own it, it belongs in your home by your bed, or in your room, or with you in your pocket; it becomes a part of you. Good books. Our home was filled with good books. I had a wonderful break in life. I remember my father decided to study opera when he was 50 years of age—in Doland, S. Dak. [Laughter.] That's right.

He used to get in his car and every so often he and mother would drive down to Minneapolis to hear the Minneapolis Symphony—not across the street, but 310 miles. And then when he became a little older and we moved to a larger city called Huron, S. Dak., my dad used to get on the airplane and go to New York and listen to the opera.

He bought the finest collection of records in town. Of course, mother needed new furniture. She didn't get as much of that as she would have like to have. Dad was a very clever fellow. He'd put in our store a line of records, Columbia and Victor Red Seal, and they didn't sell well. [Laughter.] So he used to tell mother, "Well, mother, I made a bad deal, a bad purchase, and we might just as well get some good out of them." [Laughter].

Dad has gone to his heavenly reward, but even to this day there is that magnificent library of records, and in his will he bequeathed that library and those records to his son Hubert. They're mine. I love them. We learned something about good music.

He bought a whole library of books about opera and music and musicians. He said, "You never should stop learning." That was all in a little town.

A library is a part of a school, and I want to say to my friends in the District of Columbia: this is a news flash for this city. [Laughter.] Yes, it is, and let me say that the Nation's Capital ought to set the example for education and it sets a bad one.

Four years ago a group of students came to my office, five of them; they had been tramping around Capitol Hill for weeks with their books, books that were antiquated, obsolete, useless for all practical purposes. A science book that talked about the possibility of electrical refrigeration. The year was 1961. A science book that had nothing about nuclear fission or nuclear physics.

We are supposed to teach languages and here is the seat of government, here we are with the State Department telling everybody, "Study languages; equip yourself for languages," and half of the schools in the District of Columbia didn't have language books for their own students—right here in the District of Columbia. And they still don't.

Mrs. Meyer. Then do something about the District Committee in the Senate. [Applause.]

Senator Hubert Humphrey. May I say that I will take that challenge from my good friend, Mrs. Meyer, who does things about such matters. I try to do something about these things, but I want to say: this Capital is your city, not just mine. This Capital is very proud of its great buildings, of its cherry trees, of its boulevards, of its parks, and so am I; it is one of the loveliest cities in the world.

But we forgot education here, and the reason we forgot it is because nobody was tending to it. We have no local self-government. I happen to believe in home rule. We don't elect a school board. And the Congress of the United States, frankly, has other things to do besides watch over the District of Columbia, and that's why it wasn't watched over.

But some of us took some interest and finally we did get some books. We got $500,000 for them one year, $280,000 for them last year. We are going to get some more this year, and we are going to get some libraries, and then we are going to get a librarian or two. That's going to come, too, because I happen to believe that a school system is not merely bricks and mortar and teachers; it's libraries, it's books, it's a librarian, it's audiovisual aids. Because modern education requires that.

It's also counselors. (Not one counselor for 500 sophomores in one of the best high schools, but one counselor serving a much smaller group.) It's psychologists, psychiatrists. This is all part of the educational pattern.

You say, "Well, this costs a lot of money," and I know it does, but I am one of those who believes that education is an investment, and I've never been one of those who has been known in public life as being so worried about the fact that we are spending a little money. Maybe I shouldn't confess all these things but I was brought up to believe that if you don't have enough money you have two choices—either to cut back or earn more and, frankly, I don't like to cut back. I prefer to earn more. I think that's the way it ought to be, because the needs are here and the needs are going to continue to be here.

You've heard tonight, for example, the relationship between the lack of education and poverty, you've heard tonight the relationship between education and national security. We all know this, but somehow or another there have been forces at work in America that have been able to convince a substantial number of people that education is not a national concern.

Let me say with all due respect—as a legislator, as a former mayor, as a local public official—that public officials and representatives generally do what their constituency wants them to do—generally, or they don't last long. And when we make education as important to America as fear of communism, we'll get things done about education. And when we get to a point in America at which the Advertising Council, for example, instead of showing a nice peach, or some other sort of attractive item, will show a school and young men and women coming in and out of that school, making that a social status symbol, there'll be better schools and there'll be more young people in those schools.

When we start to ask ourselves, "Why the school dropouts?" and quit counting them, maybe we'll know what's wrong in education. I don't know; I'm not an educator, but I know this as a politician: that if I go home and start to make talks to my constituents and start losing voters, I am making the wrong talk. I know that.

And I know that if students drop out of school something's wrong somewhere. It may not all be in school; it may be some other cause. But, very frankly, when I see the way history is frequently taught in schools I can well understand why young people don't like history.

We need to have people who are excited about education. We need to have an America that looks upon education as a great revealing experience. We need, instead of talking about economic aid abroad, to be talking about educational aid. We ought to be known, not as the nation of the atom bomb but the nation of the teachers and of the educators. But I think it is fair to say that we are not really quite known as that.

We are a great nation. We are a powerful nation, and I think that our educational structure basically is a good one, but I don't believe in comparing America with anybody else. I think we ought to have our own standards, and that is the reason that I believe that the biggest deficit that we ought to be concerned about is not a fiscal deficit, but other types of deficit—deficits in health, deficits in education, deficits in welfare, deficits in community facilities. Because each of these deficits is more dangerous in the long run to the financial solvency (if that's what your standard is for the American community) than any budgetary deficit of the Federal Government.

That's about my lecture for the evening. I want to commend this organization for what it does—and I surely want you to know that some of us are not only with you, we've been with you a long time. You have done great work. The fact of your presence in this city is welcomed at this particular hour.

May I give a word of compliment to the District of Columbia, since I also gave a word of chastisement. I think it's done right well with its integrated schools. It started out with great difficulties, as any community will, because there was not separate but equal education. There was separate education. And I know of no State that has enough money to provide for two educational establishments for people of the same age group, and of the same educational desire.

In this District we have begun now to do something about making education a better program for all of our people. Once we pass this civil rights bill, which we are going to do—and it will be done before summer is officially proclaimed, June 21 or somewhere around there; at least we ought to be able to do it by the middle of summer, the middle of June—then we are going to have the task of tooling up America to make civil rights more than a legal promise, to make it a living reality.

And civil rights, and the fulfillment of civil rights, will depend in no small measure upon how well we provide for the education of the American people. That's a long term project, but as President Kennedy said, in January, 1961, "Let us begin." And as President Johnson said only a few months ago, "Let us continue."

I think it's a reassuring note to have a former teacher in the White House; and I think it is a very reassuring note to have you in Washington to remind all of us that we who are in public life should be teachers, teaching from what we've learned; and not only teachers but actionists, activators for the public welfare and the public interest. [Sustained applause.]

Herbert Block. I wasn't referring to the hour or being subtle, only reminding Senator Humphrey that we are delighted to hear him for as long as he would like to talk.

Also, he said he is no teacher. He was a teacher and he is still a teacher. I was going to say, "I disagree with the distinguished Senator." You go to the Senate and hear them refer to each other as "the distinguished Senator from * * *" and I would like to refer to him as the "honest, no-fooling distinguished Senator." [Applause.]

He talked about paperback books, but he neglected to mention a very good one that is just coming out, written by himself, with some speeches of his own, and others by President Johnson, President Kennedy, and Senator Kuchel. It is called "Civil Rights, the Moral Crisis."

I also particularly want to give the Senator my heartfelt thanks for what he said about home rule for us second-class citizens of the District of Columbia.

I think we can sum up this evening by saying that the schools are not at all what they ought to be, but with actionists, activators—with teaching public servants, like the three men you heard tonight, things are going to be better. [Applause.]

THE SOURCES OF STRENGTH—WHERE ARE THEY?

(By Stephen K. Bailey, dean, Maxwell Graduate School of Citizenship and Public Affairs, Syracuse University)

Few words, singly or in juxtaposition, have greater prophetic consequences for the human race than the words chosen for the theme of this conference. Having recently returned from an extended visit to south Asia and east Africa, I am perhaps acutely aware of the international dimensions of your theme. There were, in fact, moments in Calcutta and in parts of Tanganyika when, reflecting upon the contrast in opportunity between the low-income nations and the United States, I was reminded of an essay on poverty written by an eighth grader in Westchester County.

The essay began, "This is a story about a very poor family. The father was poor, the mother was poor, the children were poor, the chauffeur was poor, the butler was poor, and the upstairs maid was poor." [Laughter.] As your sponsors were quick to recognize, however—scooping the White House by a number of months—poverty, like charity, begins at home.

Education is the basic investment without which the urban poor and the rural poor of this great Nation are doomed to hopelessness. And if we look ahead to what the sage of Santa Barbara, Mr. Hutchins, has called the wantless, workless world of an automated future, education is the key to sustained meaning in the lives of all of us—if we are not to face an endless poverty of the human spirit. This is why you people are engaged in the most important of enterprises.

I have been asked this morning to speak briefly about "The Sources of Strength—Where Are They?" Well, fortunately, the sources of strength for support of public education are legion. Any comprehensive list would necessarily include at least the following: The hunger of tens of millions of parents to provide opportunities for maximum personal development for their children; the interests of business, commerce, agriculture, labor, and the professions for insuring an adequate supply of trained manpower for these respective fields; the concern of democratic government for an educated citizenry and for talent to man the military and civilian, domestic, and oversea responsibilities of the United States; the desire of educators, and of friends of education, to meet and to improve professional standards in education. These are the interests—sacred and profane, idealistic and prudential—which constitute the basic sources of strength for increased support for the public schools in the United States.

But these sources of strength are diffuse and often inchoate. The mobilization of strength for purposes of concrete action is the high function of democratic politics broadly conceived but precisely applied. Politics has been defined as the struggle to control or influence the authoritative allocation of values in the society. If education is to receive the moral and financial support of citizens, political forces must be mobilized to insure the authoritative allocation of values on education's belief.

The irony is that fewer strictures are more likely to raise the hackles of teachers and professional educators than those directed toward the necessity of political action. This antipolitical bias is ironical because no thoughtful observer can possibly escape the conclusion, on the basis of the evidence, that education is up to its eyeballs in politics—and should be. As a political scientist I can take no other position than that public schools are political phenomena. More public money is spent for education than for any other single function of State and local government. No public school in America exists without State legislative sanction. All over the United States school boards are elected or appointed through a highly political process—often most supremely political when called nonpolitical. Educational planks are increasingly found in partisan platforms at all levels of American politics. The size, location, cost, looks, and facilities of school buildings are frequently matters of high political controversy. The size, scope, and influence of State departments of education are inevitably conditioned by political forces. The differences between salary schedules for teachers and school administrators in California on the one hand, say, New Hampshire on the other, cannot be effectively explained by reference to State economic indices alone.

In short, education is one of the most thoroughly political enterprises in American life or, for that matter, in the life of any nation.

It seems to me of great importance that we should face squarely the politics of mobilizing support for public education and understand how the process works.

I want to base my discussion today on a very limited part of the United States which four of us in political science have recently analyzed. I am sure that some of what we have found is not relevant to all parts of the Nation; but I am equally sure that much of what we have discovered about the politics of educational support in the northeastern part of the United States has meaning across the land.

Our study is called "Schoolmen and Politics: A Study of State Aid to Education in the Northeast." It is an attempt to get at the question of how friends of public education have acted politically to increase the amount of State aid allocated by State legislatures for local school districts. Basing our findings on literally hundreds of interviews and as careful an examination of the record as possible, we have discovered, in every case where there has been a major breakthrough in increasing State aid to education, the State teachers' associations and other professional associations of educators have been either at the forefront or in the middle of the political campaign for increasing such State aid. We have found that by and large State teachers' associations can operate effectively only if they relate to other group interests in the society, such as school board associations, superintendents' associations, parent-teacher associations, Leagues of Women Voters, federations of women's clubs, and so on, but in many cases the real energizing force for increased public expenditures for education has come from the teachers' associations themselves.

In the northeastern part of the United States, no more successful educational lobby has existed over the past generation than the New York State Educational Conference Board. This conference board is a coalition of group interests, but no one would deny that the New York State Teachers' Association has been by far the most powerful force in organizing and implementing the conference board's activities.

Let us take a brief look at the conference board and the way in which it works. The New York State Educational Conference Board was created in 1937 by the then secretaries, respectively, of the New York State Teachers' Association and the New York State School Boards Association. The board was almost precisely modeled on the New York State Conference Board of Farm Organizations, which had been created in 1918 in an attempt of a half dozen farm organizations to reach unanimous agreement on broad questions of agricultural policy which involved State legislative action. The farm conference board had pooled its impressive lobbying power with extraordinary success. Witnessing this strength and this unity, the New York State Teachers' Association and the New York State Boards Association saw in the farm conference board a possible model for public education. These two organizations were particularly concerned in the 1930's with the destructiveness of the frequent misunderstandings between school boards and schoolteachers; school boards frequently looking at teachers' demands as exorbitant; teachers looking at school boards as penny-pinching management. The obvious area of possible cooperation between school boards and schoolteachers was additional State aid. Additional State aid could help satisfy teachers' demands without imposing impossible fiscal burdens upon local school boards. The solution seemed to be for the State teachers' association and the State school boards association to form a united group of all statewide organizations concerned with the betterment of education, to strive for policy unity on the single subject of State aid, and to present a united front to the board of regents, the legislature, and the Governor.

How does the State educational conference board operate? Each year the conference board prepares a report summarizing the condition of public education in the State of New York and proposing revisions in formulas designed to increase the State's contribution to local school districts. Until 1962 when he died, these reports were written under the direction of Paul R. Mort, of Teachers College, Columbia. But the studies were financed in large part by the State teachers association and the State school boards association. In draft form, these reports are discussed and modified by the conference board as a whole, and decisions are made for the ensuing year's legislative campaign.

Once the conference board has approved its annual report, it moves into political action. It is at this point that one of its most important constituent organizations, the New York State School Boards Association, moves into special prominence.

Believing that a grassroots selling job by the State teachers association for greater State aid would look like crass self-seeking, the school boards assume major responsibility for cultivating hometown sentiment behind the conference board proposals. By and large, school board members are distinguished lay members of local communities. Their sponsorship of conference board recommendations, cannot be viewed in any sense as direct self-seeking. With this fact in mind, the school boards association enters into a forceful grassroots campaign. Conference board recommendations are mailed to every school board member in the State. These mailings are followed up with regional conferences which attract school board members, key superintendents, principals, and teachers, and local State senators and representatives. Experts from the State capital and from New York City are invited to attend and to answer questions about the conference board recommendations.

In the meantime, similar grassroots conferences are being held by the other member agencies of the conference board. By the time a legislative session is about to open in Albany, there is scarcely a legislator who is not aware of the conference board's recommendations and of substantial and influential local support beyond these recommendations.

Once grassroots support has been developed, bills are introduced—through friendly legislators—reflecting the educational goals of the conference board. Both executive and legislative leaders are soon acquainted with the most important of the State aid proposals. During the legislative session, grassroots opinion stimulated by the earlier activities of the members of the conference board becomes manifest in letters, telegrams, personal visitations, and telephone calls. Although most legislators are under some pressure from their local constituencies, key legislative leaders receive special attention. This is particularly true of the speaker of the house and the majority leader of the Senate. In the meantime, contacts are developed and pressed in the Governor's office and in the division of the budget.

At some point in each legislative session tensions begin to develop between the recommendations of the conference board and the politician's views of what the budget can stand. The outcome of this tension depends upon the infighting skill of the schoolmen—represented at this stage especially in the activities of the State Teachers Association's executive secretary.

In the final hectic days of the New York legislative sessions, the schoolmen from the State Teachers Association and the leading professional associations haunt the legislative chambers and are at the disposal of key legislative leaders in adjusting legislative bills to political reality. The key official activity is a small caucus of legislative and party leaders called by the Governor, or by legislative leaders themselves, to determine a final figure or formula for State aid. This is normally rubberstamped by an obedient legislature.

The relative success of State aid to public education in the State of New York has been due in no small measure to the effective work of the State Teachers Association in cooperation with other members of the educational conference board.

I emphasize the New York story because in some of the other States we studied it became quite obvious that failures to increase State aid could be attributed to failures of the education lobbies to operate effectively. The fact is that State teachers' associations and other educational groups have frequently made their own programs easy to oppose. They have been unable to work and speak as one for a responsible general-school-aid bill. Actually I must say in all frankness that effective organization is exceptional. Most of the time, in most of the State, disorder and naivete are the schoolmen's outstanding political characteristics. To begin with, public education is almost endlessly organized. In every State there exist at least four kinds of official educational agencies—the State board, the State department, the local boards, and the local departments; and local boards commonly have their own independent and State association. These official agencies rarely act in unison. The real proliferation, however, is on the private and professional side. Every State has its education association—sometimes at war with a teachers' union in a major metropolitan area. There are statewide associations of school principals and of school superintendents, of guidance counselors, of teachers of vocational education, of coaches and teachers of physical education, and of classroom teachers. The public joins in the parent-teacher associations and has its own councils for better schools. Associations of university women, leagues of women voters, federations of women's clubs, women's legislative councils all have strong concern for schooling. Associations for mental health and for retarded children represent special educational interests in many Northeastern States. Furthermore, many members of these groups really care about the organization's impact, and their officers work hard at representing the real or divided wishes of the membership. Each of these public and private groups has its own pet concern and its special momentum. The number of special educational interests stirs up a vast and often infuriating buzzing in a lawmaker's ears. The wily lawmaker finds it easy to ignore educators disunited—or to play one educational group off against another.

The root difficulty is that too few States have a permanent forum where ardent schoolmen can organize their interests and coordinate their activities into orderly, clear political campaigns.

It is, of course, no easy thing to get schoolmen—especially professionals—to agree on State aid allocations. Indeed, educators in the Northeast can be found in a variety of distinct camps. There are backers of general State aid: State subsidies for local operating expenses, to be allocated as the local jurisdiction wishes. There are also backers of general unrestricted school construction assistance. These two are across-the-board financial programs with few strings attached. Far and away the bulk of State school aid is of this sort, but schoolmen differ on which is needed most at a particular time.

But these general "aiders" are frequently at war with the defenders or sponsors of more limited categorical aid. Under categorical aids, funds go for special education of some variety or even for special schools—for the deaf, the blind, the crippled; for Americanization, for veterans or their orphans; for home economics or for agriculture. By and large, the amounts currently devoted by States to these restricted programs are only a very minor portion of State aid, but categories could logically be multiplied to include almost every facet of schooling. While the overall cost of general aid as opposed to the totality of special aids might theoretically be the same, the political and institutional implications differ radically. General aid implies that schoolmen can and should stand or fall together in legislative campaigns. Categorical aid implies professional independence for every special educational interest and the devil take the hindermost. There has been no explicit comparison of the political strength of these two approaches. Universally, however, the Northeastern States have moved away in the last 15 years from bundles of categorical subsidies to general programs except for schools for handicapped children. The question is insistent, however: Would not general State aid have moved faster and further if the depressant of categorical aids—with all of the divisiveness therein implied—had not had to be negotiated?

In sum, all too often political activity by schoolmen in the Northeast has been amateur politics, with all the zeal and disorder the phrase conveys. On balance, this lack of political sophistication and discipline among schoolmen assumes major proportions in depressing State assistance. Many lawmakers would respond favorably to financial appeals that schoolmen can make when they agree on common goals. Most legislators, smalltowners or not, find it difficult to withstand coordinated pressure from their grassroots. Special pleading by splinter educational groups stirs up an uneasy suspicion of excess among responsible statesmen, whether legislators or Governors. Governors may honestly disagree with responsible schoolmen on school finance, but the schoolmen's case, if orderly and well organized, cannot be brushed aside. In many Northeastern States, schoolmen have handicapped their own political success by their failure to understand, develop, and use political machinery available within their own ranks.

In balance, then, it can be said that the role of the State teachers' associations and other professional educational groups is of the utmost significance to the success of the educators' causes. At best, teachers in politics, through their associations, mobilize consent within their own organizations; they develop linkages with each other in an attempt to build a common political front; they fertilize grassroots; they exploit mass media, and develop mass media for their own; they build fires under lethargic officialdom; they lobby and cajole legislators and Governors; they provide a continuity of energy and concern in the fact of temporary defeats and setbacks. Sometimes they work at cross-purposes, but when they work together under strong and coherent leadership they perform an indispensable function in the political process. State teachers' associations, teachers' unions, school boards' associations, PTA's, associations of educational administrators, other civic and professional societies—separately and as amalgams—have played essential roles in the politics of State aid to education.

In our study we have placed major emphasis, then upon the interest group coalitions outside and inside the State governments which have assiduously worked to increase support for public education. But it is important to note that we conclude with a statement of the effect that the success of State aid to education in the Northeast has depended equally upon the quality of gubernatorial and legislative leadership. In part, of course, political leadership is derivative; that is, it is responsive to effective intellectual, private interest group, and bureaucratic leadership. But the findings of our study suggests that political leadership is also an independent force. No amount of group analysis can account for the commitment to education of Governors like Muskie, Bowles, Roberts, Bradford, Smith, Harriman, and Rockefeller; or of legislators like Haskell, E. O. Smith, Mahoney, Bridges, Mahar, and Murray. These politicians have been sponsors and energizers of specific proposals; they have built consent behind educational policies among their own partisans; they have worked across party lines on behalf of State aid; they have defended education's cause in the fact of insistent demands for increased State appropriations for other State functions; they have taken leadership in increasing the State revenue base—often with additional support to education as their major goal; they have sponsored special committees and commissions to study educational needs with full knowledge that the recommendations of such study groups would inevitably push up the cost of State aid to education; they have developed public support for education through messages, speeches, press releases, and party platforms.

It is, in short, evident that political leadership is the keystone to the arch of State educational finance. Political leadership establishes the effective climate within which intellectual, private interest group, and bureaucratic leadership operates. It is for this reason that schoolmen cannot ignore the ballot box if they wish to advance their causes.

Here, then, are the political realities of State aid to education. For those who believe that State governments must share an even larger burden of the cost of public education in the years ahead, the lesson is clear. The road to increased State aid is political. Those who would travel that road successfully must understand the political process in all of its ramifications. They must develop intellectual, private interest group, bureaucratic, and political leadership capable of defining goals and of mobilizing effective power for the realization of those goals.

The future of public education will not be determined by public need alone. It will be determined by those who can translate public need into public policy—by schoolmen in politics. Since the quality of our society rests in large measure upon the quality of our public education, a widespread recognition that schoolmen must be not only aware of politics, but influential in politics, may be the key to our survival as a free and civilized nation.

A SUMMARY OF THE CONFERENCE

(By Agnes E. Meyer,[1] chairman, National Committee for Support of the Public Schools)

We are not an organization of educators, but of citizens concerned with education. In keeping with our broad representation of the entire community we applaud the greater participation in the NCSPS of representatives of labor, agriculture, and business. And in keeping with our purpose we went beyond a statement of problems at this conference and considered how to get something moving.

We should note progress where there has been progress. Last year we were exhorted to light fires in our own communities: to start spreading the practical, basic importance of education in the life of a solvent, healthy community. In our first conference Drs. Schultz, Ginzberg, Norton, Marion Folsom and others showed us in careful scientific terms that the education dollar is an invested dollar and belongs on the asset side rather than the liability side of our ledgers.

Now, with the direct relationship between education and poverty, and with the reiterated assertion of Secretary Wirtz that we must make education the No. 1 business in the country, the interrelation between education and the economy has become a truism. I would like to think that the NCSPS had something to do with the acceptance and circulation of this concept. We should not exaggerate, but neither must we minimize the speed and power of a new idea when it reaches the heart of a universal problem. Now, as Howard K. Smith succinctly stated, we assert that "in the end only education can solve poverty. Only education can end or diminish racial fears and hatreds. There lies the answer to war and to cold war."

First, I would like to summarize briefly the common themes that were stressed by our distinguished speakers during these days—themes which point to areas where the NCSPS can exert further leadership. For we do not assemble simply to mull and muse over vital statistics. We are summoned together to act toward a common goal.

And although we are aware, as Dr. John Galbraith told us, that many of the enemies of education are simply "selfish," we are equally aware that the basic problem lies in us as citizens. We have seen patterns of activity, as in Prince Edward County, and we know that determined people prove effective when they start working together.

Looking ahead, then—in the glow of present recognition of the educational problems in the communities—we must stir local and State organizations into greater and more disciplined action. We must create what Walter Reuther described as a "national coalition of conscience." And we must do it while maintaining and protecting, in Harold Taylor's words, "the magnificent diversity of American culture, cherishing the richness of the diversity, and giving to each culture its chance to be known and valued." For this, as he said, "is our strength and the special quality of the American proposition." And, as Mr. Reuther added, we "must brush aside complacency to build the dream."

In his keynote speech, Dr. Galbraith encompassed our goals with his accustomed eloquence, noting that only through education can youth avoid being excluded from the productive segment of our society. Contrary to Marxist theory, our mechanical development has liberated the worker and given him increased leisure. Our aim is to take people from the assembly line into the front office but we must realize that, without education, they would be unemployable in their new surroundings. Our economic future is tied to education and those who remain politically unaware of this will be swept aside because of their own devotion to economy, ignorance, and the McGuffey reader.

Dr. Galbraith called for a practical program that would isolate areas of extreme poverty and transform them through specific and massive Federal support. Since the affluent areas would not be involved, he wryly commented, they could hardly complain of Federal control. They would simply not be eligible. Into these areas of knowledge blight would go more than 10,000 skilled and highly paid teachers backed up by new schools and educational aids.

Professor Galbraith said he would deal with a large and complex problem by reducing the target and making it recognizable, for a thing is easier done when its dimensions are visible. And it is in the educational slums, the Negro ghetto, that we have the most manageable and the most doable situations.

It was Harold Taylor's proposal that, in addition to such a National Teaching Corps, a volunteer group of from 1 to 10,000 young college students could reach the areas of greatest deprivation each summer, possibly using local college buildings, and that this figure be regarded as a beginning. He also pointed out the opportunities that existed in Mississippi this summer.

Dr. Galbraith concluded with a vision reaching beyond the physical changes of the automation revolution. Science and technology, he pointed out, are not the final frontiers. Beyond these are taste, charm, beauty, the human things which establish values in our life and make leisure meaningful. America, the affluent, is not America the beautiful, and the gross national product has expanded with ugliness in its wake.

Thus, by reaching through economics to philosophy, he challenged us with an action program. And Dr. Galbraith, the university man, proved in his own person the finest argument for universal education.

Harold Taylor emphasized that public education has become primarily an instrument of national policy dominated by military and economic goals. It is these goals that have determined the qualifications for talent and, in their pursuant, we have excluded other goals with wider horizons. Moreover, he stated, we are constantly distracted from dealing frontally with the education of the poor, which creates a permanent threat and danger to our entire social and economic structure. It is already too late for us to abandon our thinking that education is simply a way of transmitting white middle-class Protestant culture.

Walter Reuther looked at the same facts with an equal insistence that education is a national problem, calling the Federal-aid-to-education issue a sterile debate. He found the enemies to be complacency and indifference, calling for—instead of these two human characteristics—an "aristocracy of achievement resulting from the democracy of opportunity."

Deploring current thinking that equates education with the ritual of grinding out larger numbers of technicians and scientists, he addressed himself to the millions who live in the "subbasement of our social structure." And he repeated that only through civic anger and action can the national coalition of conscience disprove Khrushchev's belief that the United States is only capable of total effort in the face of total war.

Throughout all of the conference we heard the strong call for political action, with a much greater role for the teacher in the field of public policy. As Arthur Pearl was quoted as saying: "There are more teachers than teamsters but their influence on the political structure is a lot less than the teamsters."

Dean Bailey challenged the teachers to abandon their traditional aloofness, their isolation from the active forces of the community. Dr. Bailey noted that the most effective organization among teachers for this type of activity is the most unusual. "In most States," he said, "disorder and naivete are the schoolmen's outstanding political characteristics." Educators are overorganized, with a myriad of small and special groups, but no sense of common direction and program.

"The root difficulty," according to Dr. Bailey, "is that too few States have a permanent forum where ardent schoolmen can organize their interests and coordinate their activities into orderly political campaigns."

We can all learn and profit from the successful operation which Dr. Bailey sets forth as the northeast pattern. Here a conscious effort was made by the advocates of public education to get behind a consensus to increase State aid for local school districts. The key was cooperative effort between teachers' associations, women voters, school boards, parent groups, civic clubs, and other organizations. The energy at first came through organized effort by the teacher organizations, who coordinated the groups to present a unified front before the State government. It was the school board that did the actual persuading before the public bodies.

Dr. Bailey exhorts the teacher to recognize that public education is one of the most thoroughly political enterprises in America. Public need must be translated into public policy and the schoolman must not only be politically aware, but he must be influential in politics if education is to move forward.

Addressing us were some of the most effective leaders of American life. These speakers had two things in common, their talent for practical accomplishment, and their commitment to public education.

Frank Pace made it clear that: "Business is finally becoming aware of the necessity for education." So are unions. Three hundred years from now, he said, this will not be the century in which we broke the atom or fought great wars but the century in which mankind spread the benefits of civilization to all mankind. We must now start the movement of the future.

Senator HUMPHREY made it clear that the important thing, in his judgment, is to foster the individual—and that only our education system can cultivate the individual. "When we give the same thought to education as we do to our fear of communism, then there will be progress."

The sincerity of our greatest living general, Omar Bradley, emphasized again the quality of the individual, an education developed through the careful, patient process of the public school, where the love of learning can become the delight of youth, a youth undistracted and truly able to develop his mind and his curiosity .

And Secretary Wirtz challenged us with the fact that if it was right to go to school until 16, in Massachusetts 100 years ago, then it must somehow be wrong now. We cannot make education the No. 1 business of the country by applying the criteria of the last century—and "we have to make education the No. 1 business of America."

No member will forget, for a long time, the comments of Herbert Block. Mr. Block's particular way of expressing himself about education places him very close to the center of American life, education, and social comment. I wish that there were more educators who could speak as well as Herb Block about education, even if they do not draw cartoons.

Our Monday afternoon discussion got us to the bedrock of education. Ole Sand laid out for us the questions and answers reached by the national committee for the NEA's project on instruction. The problems they examined and reported on are the basic ones: what to teach and how to teach it.

---

[1] Mrs. Meyer was unable to give her conference summary in person. In her absence, the summary was delivered by NCSPS Vice Chairman Harold Taylor.

As he told us, "It is no longer possible for students to learn even summaries of existing knowledge. Thus the school problem that was once known as 'coverage' is meaningless and obsolete, for coverage is no longer simply difficult. It is impossible." And, at its best, education moves from a "rhetoric of conclusions to an experience in inquiry." This means closer attention to the humanities so that an automated society, when it does have its own created excess leisure time, will be able to use that extra time intelligently, and for the benefit of society and the person.

Dr. Sand put these goals together in a wisely chosen phrase from the late President Kennedy, in which the President told us that we must look forward "to an America which will not be afraid of grace and beauty."

We were given insight into a most unusual experiment, in a sense a perfect test-tube situation. In a report presented by Dr. Neil Sullivan on Prince Edward County, those of us who had not yet heard learned that for 4 years (1959–63) there were no public schools there at all. As Superintendent Sullivan of the Prince Edward Free School Association told us, these children "were returning to society and knew not what to expect." Quite unusual methods were required and Dr. Sullivan happily brought with him a wide and varied experience in other communities.

He was able to experiment fully since there were no precedents in the community and, of course, the rest of the country can surely benefit from the innovations which permitted the rebirth of learning in Prince Edward County, Va.

There was no single road to a single goal. There was need in every direction and a compelling responsibility to answer each need. Traditional grade patterns were scuttled in favor of "compatible groups" that permitted the teaching process to move into instant action. Even more important in the educational limbo which was existent in Prince Edward County was compatibility among teachers. The crisis in Prince Edward County afforded neither the time nor the patience for the usual teaching habits that permit teachers to work in fields where they are not at their best. "Teaching teams" were formed for the full utilization of precise and individual teaching abilities.

The elimination of rote learning, the use of modern teaching aids, and the reawakening of dormant functions outside the curriculum created pride among the students themselves and this developed simulanteously with an expanded community program that brought citizens into full and rich contact with both teachers and students.

Thus, from the tragedy of Prince Edward County came a challenge that brought an educational renaissance and a practical lesson. The problem of racial integration became less real each day for, as Dr. Sullivan pointed out, "the children lost their color concept once they were intimately and directly acquainted with each other." As he told us in his closing sentences: "We must join together and truly become not only our brother's keeper but our brother's brothers."

In the same vein, Mitchell Sviridoff told us of the community schools in New Haven, where the philosophy being applied in Prince Edward County was introduced outside the crisis situation. This project, in fact, was its own model for what the school of the future can be, a direct translation of this philosophy of brotherhood and community service into the school.

The purpose of our annual conference is to exchange knowledge and experience, to inspire, to make known our conclusions to the country. But the ultimate purpose must be to devise a course whereby we may each act, each in his own sphere, to advance a common purpose.

It is certainly the conclusion of this conference that the public school issue must be attacked at the local and State level by each of us working in coordination with other groups, be they civic, educational, or economic. The pattern of State organizations for public education so effectively developed in some of the northeastern communities may become the pattern in other States.

The panel session this morning brought us exciting reports from every section of the country. They were highlights of a trend toward concerted action that will make our fires light up the educational horizon. It is this coalition of effort that must be our theme and our purpose, for this brings us together with common goals, and avoids the fragmentation of wasted effort on divergent projects. Thus we have found a way of carrying out a basic National Committee for Support of the Public Schools purpose. This committee has no single face; it walks no isolated path. Its members were described last year as fire lighters in their communities or, as one member of the committee put it, "it is a committee of pyrotechnical experts" that in their communities must interweave their efforts to help bring the educational coalition to full maturity.

Although, last fall in Oregon, as Mrs. Robert Wiener pointed out, the coalition may have failed in its special assignment, it has succeeded since then in doing other things, including one very important thing: it brought together and in united action, a united front in education that will win victories in the future. Witness Mr. Fred McLaughlin's report from New York, where the largest educational pressure group in the history of the State marked out prime targets for common action. Nor are these areas the only ones to feel the trend toward some sort of statewide citizens coalition.

The Citizens Committee of Philadelphia has been working along these lines for over 10 years, as Mr. Robert Blackburn informed us, and it is now more than 6 years since the Tennessee Better Schools Committee was formed, as we learned from Mrs. E. R. Reisman, who made the classic comment of the conference, "If we're happy with our present legislative representation on school support matters, we had better try, through the democratic process, to find people who do not represent the people."

A more recent drive in forming a coalition was described by Lewis E. Harris in the "Ohio Project-School Finance," and James O'Neil explained the hard facts of political action for schools from the standpoint of a New Hampshire legislator.

Entangled with these various State and city experiences is the recognition of the need for an active and enlightened coalition for education. The NCSPS has done, and will continue to do, its part in making this coalition as effective as possible.

We can say to each other that over these past 2½ days we have been informed, and we would agree we have been educated, with the inspiration of such persons as Galbraith, Reuther, Humphrey, Herblock, and the others and by all of you who participated in the discussions. I emphasize that the purpose of any such citizens gathering is not to put on an exciting intellectual pageant. The test of organization is not what is said in the meeting, but in what happens afterward. An organizer is judged by what he leaves behind, and what is left behind determines the work of the organization.

I think all of us appreciate the cumulative value of all our efforts in the NCSPS. The many of you who have felt your commitment strongly enough to journey here, and the many who are in close touch and who write to me through the mail—these together make a powerful force throughout the country because we are working and building together.

My friends, we are winning the education fight by educating. The lay leaders of every State are becoming active. We are getting more requests for our materials from those who have heard about their usefulness. The battle can be won if we make this year as effective as the past has been. We are building soundly because we ask for help from localities who can afford it and we ask for help from States that can afford it. We only ask for Federal help for the impoverished areas which urgently need assistance.

Unless we do this, the Nation will be split—not only between the affluent and the impoverished, but between the educated and the ignorant.

As our new NCSPS policy statement put its, "The question of financial support of the public schools is of particular significance at a time of radical increase in the immigration of families, many of whom are educationally and economically deprived, from the rural areas and small cities, to the urban centers—with subsequent tax burdens and fiscal responsibilities on the citizens of particular communities and States. The extreme mobility of population exchange from State to State and from rural to urban areas, now demands reconsideration of the entire financial structure of the system of public education."

The new consensus, which is now shared by the Government, that education is the answer to the blight of poverty, must be followed by the new coalition—the joining together at the community and State level of many individuals and organizations working for the immediate purpose of creating a militancy for education. This must be a militancy which goes now beyond protest, which goes instead to the specific solutions of our local and national problems; and these solutions, in turn, must contain the meanings as well as the hope of a society where quality will be measured in human values.

This will be the ultimate triumph for the committee when it is achieved, and it will also be the ultimate triumph of our democratic society.

Tribute to Hon. Clifford G. McIntire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I am going to miss CLIFF McINTIRE on this side of the Capitol. CLIFF was a truly great member of the Agriculture Committee. He loved the soil and the great out of doors and did his best to improve the role of that great independent, self-reliant group of the American public—the American farmer. As one who has always lived on the farm, I will never forget the outstanding service rendered in this House to the cause of agriculture by CLIFF McINTIRE.

CLIFF McINTIRE is not only a great legislator, devoted to his beautiful State and his wonderful people, but CLIFF McINTIRE is a great American and Christian. I have seen him Sunday after Sunday attending the Vaughn Bible class here in the Nation's Capitol and I have heard his eloquent teaching of the Gospels. CLIFF was a faithful member of the Christian breakfast group of the House.

Cliff McIntire's service here in this House was fearless, forthright, and courageous. He was dedicated and devoted to those New England principles which contributed so much to the founding of this country.

Cliff McIntire is a young man and his State and Nation will hear more of him in the near future. Mrs. Dorn joins me in wishing for Cliff and Mrs. McIntire much continued success.

Congressman Ed Roybal Reports From Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to insert in the Congressional Record the text of my October 1964 newsletter, the eighth in a series of regular "Reports From Washington" which I have made during the past 2 years to the residents of the 30th District of California on my activities as their Representative in the Nation's Capital.

These, plus five special reports, were designed to cover all major items of legislation considered by Congress, events of national and international significance, and particularly those matters of special concern to Metropolitan Los Angeles and southern California.

After 21 months of almost continuous session, the 88th Congress has been one of the longest and most productive in our Nation's history.

Great strides were made toward reaching the goals of a more prosperous economy, equal opportunity for all citizens, a strong defense posture, and the achievement of world peace with freedom.

I am proud to have had a part in building this constructive record of progressive action, and I have attempted to outline some of the highlights of the 88th Congress in this October 1964 "Report From Washington."

The report follows:

CONGRESSMAN ED ROYBAL REPORTS FROM WASHINGTON, OCTOBER 1964

VOTE YOUR CHOICE NOVEMBER 3

The right to vote is our passport to freedom. We must treasure and protect it. This can be done, however, only if we vote on election day, November 3, 1964.

Unfortunately, many people seem to feel that their single vote may be of little value among all those cast in an election. But in reality, a single vote can be, and often is, the deciding factor in important elections.

For instance, an average of just one vote per precinct determined the final outcome of the 1960 presidential election. And remember—vote and the choice is ours, don't vote and the choice is theirs. Vote your choice November 3.

EIGHTH REPORT FROM WASHINGTON

This is the eighth in a series of regular "Reports From Washington" made to the residents of the 30th District on my activities as your Representative in the Nation's Capital.

These, plus five special reports, were designed to cover all major items of legislation considered by Congress, events of national and international significance, and particularly, those matters of special concern to Metropolitan Los Angeles and southern California.

I believe my 13 years' service on the Los Angeles City Council has been of great assistance in performing the duties and fulfilling the responsibilities of a Member of Congress to consider the issues carefully and to work with the objective of promoting the best interests of his constituents.

Above all, I deeply appreciate the opportunity I have had as your Representative in Washington to be of personal service to many of you. The satisfaction of being able to help out with some of the problems and questions that arise from time to time is perhaps the greatest reward a Congressman can expect from his work.

During the 11 months since Lyndon Johnson became President, we have all witnessed an impressive demonstration of the true inner strength of America's democratic traditions.

After the tragic assassination of our dynamic and beloved young President, John F. Kennedy, the new President firmly and quickly took up the reins of leadership, to assure continuity of the Government in the midst of a great constitutional crisis, to begin to heal the Nation's wounds, and to reinstill in our people a sense of unity and brotherhood and faith in the future.

It is a tribute to this legislative skill, and to his more than 30 years' experience at the highest levels of National Government, that President Johnson has been able to renew the confidence of the country and the world in the vitality of American democracy.

Equally important, by his many executive actions, as well as by the remarkable record of accomplishment he has achieved by working in close harmony with Congress, President Johnson has succeeded in striking very near a national consensus for considered and prudent conduct of the Government's fiscal business, while adopting progressive and forward-looking programs to meet the essential needs of a rapidly growing modern society of nearly 200 million citizens.

88TH CONGRESS RECAP

After 21 months in almost continuous session, the 88th Congress has been one of the longest and most productive in our Nation's history.

In reviewing its accomplishments, President Johnson declared that the 88th Congress "has enacted more major legislation, met more national needs, and disposed of more national issues than any other Congress of this century or the last."

Great strides were made toward reaching the goals of a more prosperous economy, equal opportunities for all citizens, a strong defense posture, and the achievement of world peace with freedom.

I am proud to have had a part in building this constructive record of progressive action, and I have attempted to outline for you some of the highlights of the 88th Congress in this "Report from Washington."

HISTORIC CIVIL RIGHTS VICTORY

The most notable congressional response to President Johnson's leadership was a resounding bipartisan victory for the administration's comprehensive civil rights bill.

This action is an encouraging step forward in our effort to guarantee every American, regardless of race, creed, color, or national origin, equal rights and equal opportunities in such vital areas as voting, education, employment, the administration of justice, use of public facilities, and access to public accommodations.

With such protections already on the California statute books, and as early pioneers in the fight to extend our American constitutional heritage of freedom and individual rights to all the State's residents, we Californians may sometimes tend to take this great heritage for granted.

THE $11.5 BILLION TAX CUT

President Johnson was also able to obtain overwhelming congressional approval of the largest Federal tax reduction in U.S. history.

Called the "single most important step we have taken to strengthen our economy since World War II," the $11.5 billion tax reduction has benefited the Nation's 80 million taxpayers by cutting the average American's tax bill 20 percent—the equivalent of a 7½-cent hourly raise for the average wage earner.

For Los Angeles, this has meant literally millions of dollars of added purchasing and investing power for our citizens, and a much brighter and more secure economic future.

A bold approach to solving the problems of the American economy, it is also an expression of faith in our system of free enterprise, for, by placing maximum reliance on the initiative and creative drive of individual businessmen and workers, the tax cut is helping improve the country's economic health, not by more Government spending, but by releasing the pent-up energies of the American private enterprise system.

YOUTH OPPORTUNITIES—J.F.K. PLAYGROUND

At contract signing ceremonies for Los Angeles' unique youth opportunities program are: Robert Goe, of Los Angeles, Under Sceretary of Labor John Hennings, and Congressman Roybal.

The original pilot project, financed under the Federal Manpower Development and Training Act, has recently been expanded into a comprehensive Federal-State-local program to combat youth unemployment and juvenile delinquency in the east and south central "target areas" of Los Angeles.

Also set for early completion: an unusual "John F. Kennedy Playground" featuring modern creative-play concepts to be located on part of the remaining portion of East Los Angeles' Hazard Park.

The new J.F.K. youth recreation facility should go a long way toward meeting the urgent recreation requirements of the East Los Angeles area.

These requirements will increase sharply next year when two-thirds of Hazard Park is taken over by the Veterans' Administration to put up the new $22 million, 1,000-bed hospital for which we have just been successful in getting Congress to appropriate funds.

THE EDUCATION CONGRESS

The 88th Congress will be remembered for doing more in the education field than at any time since passage of the GI bill of rights after World War II or enactment of the Land-Grant College Act of 1862:

College construction: First general higher education aid in history—provides a 5-year program of matching grants and long-term, low-interest loans for construction of urgently needed academic facilities at the Nation's 2,000 colleges and universities—a serious effort to meet the needs of the 7 million young Americans who will be in college in 1970 (double the number enrolled just 10 years earlier in 1960)—vitally important to California because nearly 1 million, or more than one-eighth of the exploding U.S. college student population, will be studying on California campuses.

Medical-dental school aid: To help alleviate the critical shortage of doctors, dentists, nurses, pharmacists, and other public health specialists—a 3-year matching grant program for construction or rehabilitation of medical, dental, and related teaching facilities—plus a unique new loan program for struggling students of the various health professions—a progressive step toward assuring continued high quality health care for the Nation's citizens.

Vocational education: The first major expansion and redirection of earlier vocational training objectives since 1946—with concentrated emphasis on giving unemployed urban youth occupational training in skills demanded in today's modern world of rapidly changing industrial technology and automation.

LEGISLATIVE RECORD

House Speaker JOHN MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts, a highly respected legislative leader and veteran of 36 years' service on Capitol Hill, who deserves considerable credit for the impressive record of the 88th Congress, discusses improved prospects for passage early next year of such must bills as an across-the-board social security benefit increase and medicare hospital insurance protection for the elderly.

Since much of the detailed work in Congress is done in the various specialized committees, I was lucky to have been selected to serve on two major committees dealing with matters of immediate interest to residents of Los Angeles: Interior and Insular Affairs, and Post Office and Civil Service.

Interior handles legislation providing for vital future water and power development throughout the entire Pacific Southwest, including such key projects as the Colorado River water resources plan, the new saline water conversion program, and the just completed Pacific Northwest electric power intertie agreement—all essential to building a firm economic base for southern California's fast-growing population, expected to more than triple within the next 35 years.

Post Office and Civil Service has jurisdiction over our 2.5 million Federal career service employees, and actively works toward achieving cost-conscious, businesslike management of the Federal agencies which play an increasingly important role in promoting the welfare of our citizens and in assuring the defense of the Nation.

ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS

Los Angeles Public Health Supervisor Henrietta Villaescusa discusses her recent appointment as Human Resources Officer for the Latin American Bureau of the State Department's Agency for International Development with Mrs. Roybal and Alliance for Progress Coordinator William D. Rogers.

Dedicated by President Johnson as a living memorial to the faith and idealism of John F. Kennedy, the Alliance for Progress calls for a peaceful, democratic social and economic revolution in the underdeveloped countries of the Western Hemisphere.

Offering a positive and constructive answer to the false claims of international communism, the Alliance is also in line with the objectives of Franklin Roosevelt's good neighbor policy of the 1930's.

NUCLEAR TEST BAN: A FIRST STEP

The Senate spoke for the great majority of Americans when it overwhelmingly approved the historic limited nuclear test ban treaty. This action, halting nuclear testing and stopping the further spread of dangerous radioactive contamination in the atmosphere, in space, and underwater, plus nearly unanimous endorsement of the treaty by the entire world community of nations, and the more recent U.N. resolution banning nuclear weapons from outer space, give us all reason to believe that lasting peace is not just a frail hope of mankind, but may become a reality.

They are also a heartening indication of a deep-seated desire for peace among the peoples of the world, as well as a hopeful sign that the movement toward increased communication and greater understanding between nations may continue to gain momentum as we come to realize that there will be no winner in the next war.

LOS ANGELES POSTMASTER

As a member of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, I congratulated Mr. Leslie N. Shaw on his appointment this month as new postmaster of the Los Angeles Post Office.

Postmaster Shaw, together with his 10,000 Los Angeles employees, were also recipients of the Postmaster General's coveted citation for excellence for outstanding customer service and superior performance as the Nation's third largest post office.

NATURAL RESOURCES

Two landmark recreation and conservation programs were also enacted after years of legislative struggle: (1) the Wilderness Preservation Act to establish a national system for protecting and expanding the few unspoiled natural wilderness areas remaining in the United States, "where the earth and its community of life will be untrammeled by man, and where man himself is a visitor who does not remain," and (2) the land and water conservation fund to assist State and Federal agencies in meeting the present and future outdoor recreation needs of our growing population.

MASS TRANSIT

Congress enacted a new administration program designed to provide assistance to States and local communities in improving their urban mass transportation systems. Los Angeles is in a position to obtain substantial benefit from this program.

CLEAN AIR ACT

Congress also took positive action to strengthen our national program to control and prevent air pollution. More funds were provided for research, and technical and legal assistance to help State and local authorities develop more effective smog prevention techniques. Particular emphasis was placed on serious air pollution problems in high-density population areas such as Los Angeles.

FARM SUBSIDIES AND CONSUMER PRICES

I voted against this year's $1.3 billion wheat and cotton subsidy bill (as I had also done last year when the cotton subsidy came up for consideration alone), because I believe the time has come to stop spending the taxpayers hard-earned money to support food prices at an artificially inflated level, adding unnecessarily to the high cost of living and increasing the food budget of every housewife and consumer in the country.

PRESIDING OVER THE HOUSE

As a freshman Congressman, I was fortunate to have been able to take an active part in the discussion and floor debate on many of the important issues to come up during the past 2 years.

In addition, I had the unusual opportunity and valuable experience of presiding over the House of Representatives on several occasions in the temporary absence of Speaker MCCORMACK.

ROYBAL TAX REFORM BILL

Ten years of legislative effort were finally rewarded with success last month when President Johnson signed into law a Federal tax reform bill which I had the honor to sponsor in the 88th Congress.

The new Public Law, officially designated as Public Law 88-570, will eliminate serious and long-standing inequities in the tax code, save substantial sums for thousands of affected taxpayers across the country, and, at the same time, make significant savings to the Government by relieving the Treasury Department of considerable administrative expense and redtape.

In the legal jargon of the tax expert, the new law is a technical amendment to the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as amended, which permits release of taxpayer liability under bonds filed in accordance with section 44(d) of the earlier Revenue Code of 1939, with respect to certain installment obligations transmitted at death. (Such taxpayer bond liability release has been permitted since 1954, but did not apply retroactively to those who came under rules established by the 1939 code.)

Enactment of this tax reform measure has been a source of great personal satisfaction to me, because, in correcting admittedly inequitable provisions of the Nation's tax law which unfairly discriminated against many taxpayers, I think it demonstrated once again that the American system of Government can still provide a vigorous and effective means of relief for the average citizen from the oppressive burden of unjust or discriminatory laws.

PROMOTING JOBS AND INDUSTRY

Secretary of Commerce Luther Hodges, conferring on plans for expanding job opportunities and diversifying Los Angeles' defense-oriented industrial base, announced that the President's "E" Award for Excellence in Export Promotion has been won by the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce for its outstanding contribution to the increase of U.S. international trade and the sale of California-produced goods abroad.

"LET US CONTINUE * * *"

I consider it one of the outstanding privileges of my life to have known personally and worked closely with our martyred 35th President, John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

Though nearly a year after the tragedy at Dallas, it is still difficult to believe that this young, dynamic, and courageous champion of peace is no longer with us, but rests forever among the Country's heroes in the hallowed ground of Arlington National Cemetery.

As he did not shrink from his responsibilities in peace or in war, but rather welcomed them, so he would not have us shrink from carrying on his work.

In this spirit, therefore, as he gave his country the last full measure of devotion, let us face the future with confidence, and resolve that John F. Kennedy did not live—or die—in vain.

THE 1965 PRIORITY: SOCIAL SECURITY—MEDICARE

Two items of important unfinished business, delayed in a parliamentary tangle during the session-end adjournment rush this year, are scheduled for top priority treatment as soon as Congress convenes for its next session.

The first item, a long overdue cost-of-living increase in social security benefits for some 20 million Americans, will be a real help to these persons by raising the minimum level of their basic economic protection.

The second, a limited medicare hospital insurance plan, would allow California's 1½ million senior citizens, and 17 million other Americans over the age of 65, to prepay in their earlier, more productive working years, most of their own hospital and related health expenses during retirement.

I am convinced that the elderly are not asking for charity, but they do want and deserve a system that will offer them an opportunity to prepay their own hospital expenses, and permit them to live their remaining years in earned dignity, secure in the knowledge that they have provided adequately for their own health needs during retirement years.

INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

The House reversed itself this spring, and voted to reconsider its earlier rejection of continued U.S. participation in the 17-member International Development Association, an affiliate of the World Bank, which provides long-term, low-interest loans to stimulate economic growth in industrially backward nations.

Organized in 1960 under former President Eisenhower to encourage wealthy Western

European countries to shoulder more of the foreign aid burden we had been carrying almost alone since the end of World War II, IDA has proved its worth as a cooperative approach to foreign economic assistance extended on a multilateral basis.

In voting for IDA on both occasions, I was glad to make my small contribution toward promoting responsible, progressive U.S. leadership in what the late President John F. Kennedy called the struggle "to make the world safe for diversity."

THE 1965 SERVICE ACADEMY CANDIDATES

For the third year in a row, I want to offer every young man in the 30th District who is interested, an equal chance to compete for the valuable educational and career opportunities provided at our national service academies at West Point, Annapolis, Colorado Springs, and Kings Point, N.Y.

To qualify for one of the nine freshman cadet openings available next year to residents of the district at the Military, Naval, Air Force, and Merchant Marine Academies, I am asking all applicants to take the Civil Service Commission's special academy designation exam to be given in the Federal Post Office Building in Los Angeles on Saturday, October 31. A makeup exam will be held December 1 for those unable to report for the October test.

For more information, application blanks, and a letter of authorization to take the exam, interested students should contact my Los Angeles field representative, Alex Garcia, phone: 688-4870.

CALIFORNIA REAPPORTIONMENT

In August, the House passed, 218 to 175, a bill to nullify the Supreme Court's historic decision of last June that the districts of both houses of State legislatures must be substantially equal in population. I voted against this measure because I believe that the equal representation rule, upheld by the Court, is among the most fundamental principles of our American constitutional democracy.

California is one of the classic examples of denial of the right of equal representation, as aggravated in recent years by rapid population growth and a continuing movement from rural areas to the cities.

It is now possible, for instance, for only 11 percent of California's voters to elect a controlling majority of the State senate. And Los Angeles County, with over 6 million residents (almost 40 percent of the State's population), is represented by one State senator, as is the smallest three-county senatorial district with a population of 14,294.

This means that the vote of a man in California's most sparsely settled district is worth over 400 times that of a Los Angelean.

Fortunately, the House and Senate were unable to agree on an antireapportionment bill, and under last June's interpretation of the law, Los Angeles County stands to gain several additional State senators, and may finally obtain the equal representation it should have had all along.

WAR ON POVERTY

Sargent Shriver, Director of the world-famous Peace Corps, and recently appointed chief of President Johnson's antipoverty program, describes the new Economic Opportunity Act as an effective tool in mobilizing the Nation's human and financial resources to attack the basic causes of poverty and high unemployment among America's 30 million disadvantaged citizens.

As one of the original sponsors of this measure, I am confident that Los Angeles, and our other large U.S. metropolitan centers, will be the chief beneficiaries of this promising new approach to solving the tragic paradox of extreme poverty in the midst of plenty.

In addition to the Job Corps, which will offer basic education and job training for young people who are both out of school and out of work, the war on poverty includes a work-training program to keep teenagers from dropping out of high school, a work-study program to help needy college students continue their education, a comprehensive community action program to assist local groups in antipoverty projects tailored to special community needs, and a domestic peace corps of highly qualified volunteers to serve in areas of intense urban or rural poverty.

Report of Activities of the House Committee on Armed Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL VINSON

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I report to the Members of the House of Representatives on the activities of the House Committee on Armed Services during the 88th Congress. This record of the committee's accomplishments during the past 2 years speaks for itself. I wish to take this opportunity to thank each and every member of the committee and the committee staff for their contribution and cooperation in bringing about this outstanding record. The report follows:

REPORT OF ACTIVITIES, HOUSE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES, 88TH CONGRESS

COMMITTEE MEETINGS

During the 88th Congress, 366 meetings were held by the full Committee on Armed Services and its subcommittees, a breakdown of which follows:

	1st session	2d session	Total
Full committee	74	53	127
Subcommittees:			
No. 1	16	5	21
No. 2	8	8	16
No. 3	63	4	67
Central Intelligence Agency	5	4	9
Construction of Military Hospital Facilities	------	13	13
Defense Intelligence Agency Building	------	1	1
National Military Airlift	5	------	5
Real Estate and Construction	11	8	19
Research and Development	27	30	57
Special Investigations	20	11	31
Total meetings	229	137	366

COMMITTEE ACTIONS

A total of 80 bills and resolutions were reported to the House—38 during the first session and 42 during the second session. Of this number, 79 were passed by the House, resulting in 2 private laws, 57 public laws, and approval by the House and Senate of 2 concurrent resolutions. Eighteen House-passed bills were left pending before the Senate.

In addition to these legislative actions, 228 acquisition and disposal projects were referred to the Real Estate and Construction Subcommittee for consideration; 201 of these projects were approved, 1 approved in part, 3 disapproved, and 8 withdrawn by the department which made the submission.

There were 69 printed hearings and special reports, containing in excess of 10,600 pages of printed hearings and reports.

RÉSUMÉ OF COMMITTEE ACTIONS

Private laws

Private Law 88-35—H.R. 2192, To Authorize the Readmittance of Walter Sowa, Jr., to the U.S. Naval Academy

Mr. Sowa was admitted to the U.S. Naval Academy as a congressional candidate from the Second District of New Hampshire on July 1, 1957, and discharged on July 11, 1960, for reason of physical disability caused by deafness. After thorough examination, approved by the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery, Department of the Navy, Mr. Sowa was found to be physically qualified for reinstatement to the Academy. Legislation was necessary, however, because Mr. Sowa exceeded the maximum age established by law for appointment to the Academy; and since the number of midshipmen at the Naval Academy may not exceed limitations established by law.

Private Law 88-292—H.R. 11064, To Provide for the Conveyance of Certain Real Property of the United States Situated in the State of Virginia

This legislation authorizes the Secretary of the Army to transfer to the Woodlawn Baptist Church of Fairfax, Va., 2.9792 acres of land which are part of the Fort Belvoir Military Reservation, Fairfax County, Va.

The conditions of such transfer are that the Woodlawn Baptist Church pay the fair market value of the property as determined by the Secretary of the Army and that such conveyance shall reserve to the United States the right to operate and maintain an existing 10-inch gas pipeline located on the premises or, in the alternative, that the grantee shall relocate the pipeline to a location approved by the Secretary of the Army without expense to the United States.

Public laws

Public Law 88-2—H.R. 2438, To Extend the Induction Provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, and for Other Purposes

This law extends the authority to induct individuals into the Armed Forces from July 1, 1963, to July 1, 1967, a period of 4 years.

Also, it extends the suspension on strength limitations of the Armed Forces from July 1, 1963, to July 1, 1967, a period of 4 years.

It also extends the Dependents Assistance Act, the law under which E-1's, E-2's, E-3's, and E-4's with 4 years of service or less are entitled to increased allowances, because of dependents, from July 1, 1963, to July 1, 1967, a period of 4 years.

In addition, it extends the so-called doctors draft law from July 1, 1963, to July 1, 1967, a period of 4 years.

Finally, it extends from July 1, 1963, to July 1, 1967, the authority to grant special pay to physicians, dentists, and veterinarians who are ordered to active duty before that date.

Public Law 88-8—S. 1089 (H.R. 307), To Authorize the Sale, Without Regard to the 6-Month Waiting Period Prescribed, of Cadmium Proposed To Be Disposed of Pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act

This legislation provides congressional approval of the disposition of 2 million pounds of cadmium held in the national stockpile. In addition, the bill waives the 6-month waiting period ordinarily required for the disposal of strategic and critical materials from the national stockpile.

Public Law 88-28, H.R. 2440, To Authorize Appropriations During Fiscal Year 1964 for Procurement, Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation of Aircraft, Missiles, and Naval Vessels for the Armed Forces, and for Other Purposes

Public Law 88-28 provided authorization in the amount of $15,314,291,000 for defense programs for fiscal year 1964 in two major areas.

It included authorization of appropriations in the amount of $11,915,200,000 for the procurement of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels in form identical to previous enactments of the fund authorizations required pursuant to section 412(b) of Public Law 86-149, as initially approved August 10, 1959.

It also included a similar authorization of appropriations in the amount of $3,399,091,000 for the research, development, test, and evaluation of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels as required for the first time by the amendment to section 412(b) contained in Public Law 87-436, approved April 27, 1962.

Section 412(b) of Public Law 86-149 provided that:

"No funds may be appropriated after December 31, 1960, to or for the use of any armed force of the United States for the procurement of aircraft, missiles, or naval vessels, unless the appropriation of such funds has been authorized by legislation enacted after such date."

Public Law 87-436 added to the authority quoted above:

"The research, development, test, or evaluation of aircraft, missiles, or naval vessels * * *."

Public Law 88-41—H.R. 2439, To Authorize the Secretary of Defense To Lend Certain Army, Navy, and Air Force Equipment and Provide Certain Services to the Boy Scouts of America for Use in the 1964 National Jamboree, and for Other Purposes

This legislation authorized the Secretary of Defense to lend certain Army, Navy, and Air Force equipment and to provide other logistical services as may be necessary to support the Sixth National Jamboree of the Boys Scouts of America to be held at Valley Forge State Park, Pa., during the period beginning in July and ending in August 1964.

Public Law 88-63—H.R. 6681, To Improve the Active Duty Promotion Opportunity of Air Force Officers From the Grade of Major to the Grade of Lieutenant Colonel

This law permits the Department of the Air Force to exceed the numerical limitations on the number of officers who may serve in the grade of lieutenant colonel by 4,000 for a period of 1 more year.

Public Law 88-77—H.R. 2998, To Amend Titles 10, 14, and 38, United States Code, With Respect to the Award of Certain Medals and the Medal of Honor Roll

This law expands the authority for the award of the Medal of Honor, the Distinguished Service Cross, the Navy Cross, the Air Force Cross, the Silver Star by the various military departments, and the Coast Guard, with respect to the Medal of Honor, so our Government can give proper recognition to acts of heroism and gallantry which may occur during "cold war" conditions short of situations when our Armed Forces are at war with an enemy of the United States. Personnel receiving the Medal of Honor under the qualifying provision of this law will have their names placed on the Medal of Honor Roll and receive the certificate and pension provided by sections 561 and 562 of title 38, United States Code, beginning at age 50.

Public Law 88-82—S. 546, To Authorize the Secretary of the Navy To Grant Easements for the Use of Lands in the Camp Joseph H. Pendleton Naval Reservation, California, for a Nuclear Electric Generating Station

This legislation authorizes the granting of an easement for the use of approximately 90 acres of land located in the extreme northwest corner of Camp Pendleton, Calif., to Southern California Edison Co. and San Diego Gas & Electric Co. The easement, to be granted at fair market value, will permit the two companies to construct and operate a nuclear generating plant on the land. Additional easements will be granted for access roads, railroad sidings, and transmission lines.

Public Law 88-107—Senate Joint Resolution 51 (House Joint Resolution 367), To Authorize the Presentation of an Air Force Medal of Recognition to Maj. Gen. Benjamin D. Foulois, Retired

The purpose of this law is to appropriately recognize the outstanding contribution of Maj. Gen. Benjamin D. Foulois, retired, to the development of airpower.

Public Law 88-110—H.R. 6996, To Repeal Section 262 of the Armed Forces Reserve Act, as Amended, and To Amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as Amended, To Revise and Consolidate Authority for Deferment From, and Exemption From Liability for Indication for, Training and Service for Certain Reserve Membership and Participation, and To Provide a Special Enlistment Program, and for Other Purposes

The purpose of the legislation is to consolidate into one provision of law the authority for the special enlistment active duty for training programs available to Reserve personnel.

The law provides the Department with authority to continue in effect a modified form of the so-called 6-month training program available to non-prior-service personnel. The program would permit enlistments for a 6-year period of Reserve service, 4 months or more of which would be performed on active duty for training.

The law will provide equity in the Reserve program by establishing a maximum 6-year Reserve obligation for all personnel.

Public Law 88-132—H.R. 5555, To Amend Title 37, United States Code, To Increase the Rates of Basic Pay for Members of the Uniformed Services, and for Other Purposes

This law is the Uniformed Services Pay Act of 1963. It provides:

(1) Increases in basic pay for members of the uniformed services with over 2 years of service.

(2) Permanent professors at the Military and Air Force Academies after 36 years of service are entitled to a pay supplement of $250 a month, not to be included in computing retired pay.

(3) Increased special pay for physicians and dentists at the 6-year point from $200 to $250 a month; and from $250 to $350 at the 10-year point.

(4) Recomputation of retirement pay:

(a) Persons retired prior to June 1, 1958, who are paid retired pay under the Career Compensation Act, may elect to recompute their retirement pay under pay scales in effect on September 30, 1963, or receive a 5-percent cost-of-living increase, based upon their retirement pay, whichever is greater.

(b) Persons retired after June 1, 1958, but before April 1, 1963, receive a 5-percent cost-of-living increase based upon their retirement pay.

(c) All persons originally retiring after April 1, 1963, will compute their retirement pay based upon the new pay scales in Public Law 88-132.

(d) Persons retired under laws other than the Career Compensation Act receive a 5-percent cost-of-living increase.

(e) Retired and retainer pay in the future will be adjusted to reflect changes in the Consumer Price Index. In January of each calendar year after 1963, the Secretary of Defense shall determine the percent that the annual average of the Consumer Price Index (all items—U.S. city average) published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics for the preceding calendar year has increased over that for 1962 or, if later, for the calendar year preceding that in which the most recent adjustment in retired or retainer pay has been made under this law. If the Secretary determines the percent of that increase to be 3 or more, the retired or retainer pay of a member or former member of the Armed Forces who became entitled to that pay before January 2 of the year in which the Secretary makes that determination shall, as of April 1 of that year, be increased by that percent, adjusted to the nearest one-tenth of 1 percent.

(5) Submarine pay for certain members training for duty on nuclear-powered submarines is authorized.

(6) Incentive pay for duty inside a high- or low-pressure chamber is authorized.

(7) Multiple payments of incentive pay is authorized.

(8) Special pay for duty subject to hostile fire providing $55 a month is authorized. It is not retroactive.

(9) Foreign duty pay is hereafter permissive. The President is given the authority to authorize foreign duty pay in the locations outside the continental United States that he selects.

(10) A new family separation allowance of $30 a month is authorized for those serving in grade E-4 (more than 4 years of service) and above, where dependents are prevented from being with their service sponsor. It is not authorized for those occupying Government quarters.

(11) Officers in the grade of major and above who are without dependents may elect not to occupy Government quarters even though they are available, and at the same time be eligible to receive their quarters allowances.

Public Law 88-145—S. 812, To Provide for the Release of Restrictions and Reservations on Certain Real Property Heretofore Conveyed to the State of Arkansas by the United States of America

The purpose of this law is to authorize the Secretary of the Army to release certain restrictions and reservations on certain real property previously conveyed to the State of Arkansas by the Secretary of the Army upon payment by the State of Arkansas to the United States of the fair market value of the property concerned.

The objective of the legislation is to grant relief to the Arkansas State Board of Education which is the unwitting victim of circumstances over which it had no control.

Public Law 88-154—S. 1994, To Authorize the Disposal Without Regard to the Prescribed 6-Month Waiting Period, of Certain Waterfowl Feathers and Down From the National Stockpile

This legislation authorizes disposal of approximately 5,800,000 pounds of waterfowl feathers and down from the national stockpile and waives the requirement for a 6-month waiting period before this disposal could begin.

Public Law 88-174—H.R. 6500, To Authorize Certain Construction at Military Installations, and for Other Purposes

The purpose of this legislation is to provide military construction authorization and related authority in support of the military departments during fiscal year 1964.

The total authorization granted is as follows:

New authorization:	
Title I (Army)	$199,633,000
Title II (Navy)	202,462,000
Title III (Air Force)	488,367,000
Title IV (Defense agencies)	24,403,000
Title V (Housing)	685,312,000
Subtotal	1,600,177,000

Deficiency authorization:	
Title I (Army)	$3,209,000
Title II (Navy)	87,000
Title III (Air Force)	166,000
Total	3,462,000
Title VII (Reserve components):	
Army National Guard	7,500,000
Army Reserve	4,700,000
Naval and Marine Corps Reserve	5,700,000
Air National Guard	15,970,380
Air Force Reserve	4,600,000
Total	38,470,380
Deficiency authorizations:	
Army National Guard	84,000
Army Reserve	60,000
Total	144,000
Grand total of all authorities	1,642,253,380

Public Law 88–228—S. 1767, To Authorize the Secretary of the Army To Convey a Certain Parcel of Land to the State of Delaware, and for Other Purposes

This law authorizes the Secretary of the Army to convey to the State of Delaware certain property located at the Fort Miles Military Reservation which is now excess to military requirements.

Public Law 88–236—H.R. 3005, To Amend Sections 510 and 591, of Title 10, United States Code, To Remove the Requirement That an Alien Must Make a Declaration of Intention To Become a Citizen of the United States Before He May Be Enlisted or Appointed in a Reserve Component

This law eliminated an obsolete requirement in the statutes relating to enlistments and appointments in the Reserve Forces.

Public Law 88–238—H.R. 4338, To Amend Title 37, United States Code, To Authorize Travel and Transportation Allowances for Travel Performed Under Orders That Are Canceled, Revoked, or Modified, and for Other Purposes

This law authorizes reimbursement to a member of the uniformed services for travel performed by himself and/or his dependents, or both, under orders that direct him to make a permanent change of station and that are canceled, revoked, or modified, directing his return to the station from which he was being transferred, or are modified to direct him to make a different permanent change of station.

This law is retroactive to October 1, 1949.

Public Law 88–276—H.R. 7356, To Amend Title 10, United States Code, Relating To the Nomination and Selection of Candidates for Appointment to the Military, Naval, and Air Force Academies

The purpose of this law is as follows:

1. It increases the authorized cadet strength of the U.S. Military Academy and the U.S. Air Force Academy from 2,529 to 4,417, which is the strength of the U.S. Naval Academy.

2. It revises the appointment provisions of the law applicable to the U.S. Naval Academy as well as the Military and Air Force Academies, so as to increase the number of authorized cadets and midshipmen from congressional sources from the level of 61 percent to approximately 75 percent.

3. It makes uniform the statutory provisions relating to the appointment of cadets and midshipmen to the Military, Air Force, and Naval Academies.

4. It increases the obligated period of active duty service for cadets and midshipmen entering the Academies, including the Coast Guard Academy, after enactment of this law, from the present requirement of 4 years to a new requirement of 5 years of active duty.

Public Law 88–288—H.R. 9637, To Authorize Appropriations During Fiscal Year 1965 for Procurement of Aircraft, Missiles, and Naval Vessels, and Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation for the Armed Forces, and for Other Purposes

Public Law 88–288 provides authorization in the amount of $16,914,800,000 for defense programs for fiscal year 1965 in three major areas: Authorization for appropriations for the procurement of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels; authorization of appropriations for research, development, test, and evaluation associated with aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels; and all other research, development, test, and evaluation within the Department of Defense.

This is the first legislation in which the committee has exercised the authority vested in it over research, development, test, and evaluation for items other than aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels.

Public Law 88–319—H.R. 10774, To Authorize the Disposal, Without Regard to the Prescribed 6-Month Waiting Period, of Cadmium From the National Stockpile and the Supplemental Stockpile

This law provides congressional approval of the disposition of 5 million pounds of cadmium held in the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile. In addition, the law waives the 6-month waiting period ordinarily required for the disposal of strategic and critical materials from the national stockpile.

Public Law 88–335—H.R. 10314, to Further Amend the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as Amended, To Extend the Expiration Date of Certain Authorities Thereunder, and for Other Purposes

This legislation extends for 4 years three civil defense authorities which would have expired on June 30, 1964. These authorities are—

(1) the program to provide financial assistance to States for necessary and essential State and local civil defense personnel and administrative expenses;

(2) the program to make payments for travel and per diem expenses of trainees at civil defense schools; and

(3) the program to procure and maintain radiological equipment and to donate it to States by loan or grant.

This legislation will provide authority for the appropriation of a maximum of $24.4 million for fiscal year 1965. All programs involve some form of assistance for State and local civil defense organizations.

Public Law 88–360—H.R. 2664, To Amend Section 6(o) of the Universal Military Training and Services Act To Provide an Exemption From Induction for the Sole Surviving Son of a Family Whose Father Died as a Result of Military Service

This law provides exemption from induction for the sole surviving son of a family whose father died as a result of military service.

Thus, with this amendatory act, exemptions from involuntary induction for a sole surviving son are now applicable where a son, daughter, or father died as a result of military service, except during a period of war or national emergency declared by the Congress.

Voluntary induction is permitted regardless of the fact of being a sole surviving son.

Public Law 88–373—H.R. 11257, To Authorize the Sale, Without Regard to the 6-Month Waiting Period Prescribed, of Lead Proposed To Be Disposed of Pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act

This legislation provides congressional approval for the disposition of 50,000 short tons of lead held in the national stockpile.

In addition, the bill waives the 6-month waiting period ordinarily required for disposal of strategic and critical materials from the national stockpile.

Public Law 88–374—H.R. 11004, To Authorize the Sale, Without Regard to the 6-Month Waiting Period Prescribed, of Zinc Proposed To Be Disposed of Pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act

This legislation provides congressional approval of the disposition of approximately 75,000 short tons of zinc held in the national stockpile. In addition, the bill waives the 6-month waiting period ordinarily required for the disposal of strategic and critical materials from the national stockpile.

Public Law 88–377—H.R. 11235, To Authorize the Disposal, Without Regard to the Prescribed 6-Month Waiting Period, of Approximately 11 Million Pounds of Molybdenum From the National Stockpile

This legislation provides congressional approval of the disposition of 11 million pounds of molybdenum now held in the national stockpile. In addition, the bill waives the 6-month waiting period ordinarily required for the disposal of strategic and critical materials from the national stockpile.

Public Law 88–384—H.R. 393, To Make Retrocession to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts of Jurisdiction Over Certain Lands in the Vicinity of Fort Devens, Mass.

This law provides the Secretary of the Army authority to retrocede to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts any part of the legislative jurisdiction he deems desirable at the Fort Devens Military Reservation.

Public Law 88–385—H.R. 10736, To Authorize the Secretary of the Navy To Adjust the Legislative Jurisdiction Exercised by the United States Over Lands Comprising the U.S. Naval Hospital, Portsmouth, Va.

This legislation transfers legislative jurisdiction now exclusively held by the Federal Government to the State of Virginia in order that adequate police protection may be provided by local authorities on the military reservation.

Public Law 88–387—H.R. 7499, To Authorize the Secretary of the Air Force or His Designee To Convey 0.25 Acre of Land to the City of Oroville, Calif.

This law authorizes the Secretary of the Air Force to convey approximately one-quarter acre of land to the city of Oroville, Calif., without consideration.

Public Law 88–388—H.R. 7248, To Change the Designated Use of Certain Real Property Conveyed by the Department of the Air Force to the City of Fort Walton Beach, Fla., Under the Terms of Public Law 86–194

This law amends Public Law 86–194 to permit the use of the property previously conveyed by that law to include "educational purposes." The property was originally conveyed to the city of Fort Walton Beach, Fla., by the Department of the Air Force at fair market value with a condition that it be used for "recreational purposes" only. This law permits the use of the property for the construction of a junior college.

Public Law 88-389—H.R. 6299, To Authorize the Secretary of the Navy To Produce and Sell Crude Oil from the Umiat Field, Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 4, and for the Purpose of Making Local Fuel Available for Use in Connection With the Drilling, Mechanical, and Heating Operations of Those Involve in Oil and Gas Exploration and Development Work in the Nearby Areas Outside Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 4, and for Other Purposes

This law authorizes the Secretary of the Navy, until January 1, 1969, to produce and sell petroleum under title 10, United States Code, section 7422(a), from the Umiat Field, Alaska, Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 4, for the purpose of aiding petroleum exploration and development in the nearby areas outside the naval petroleum reserve.

This legislation would not involve the expenditure of any Federal funds.

Public Law 88-390—H.R. 10300, To Authorize Certain Construction at Military Installations, and for Other Purposes

The purpose of this legislation is to provide military construction authorization and related authority in support of the military departments during fiscal year 1965.

The total authorization granted is as follows:

New authorization:	
Title I (Army)	$292,587,000
Title II (Navy)	225,639,000
Title III (Air Force)	303,348,000
Title IV (Defense agencies)	10,505,000
Title V (Housing)	660,605,000
Subtotal	1,492,684,000
Deficiency authorization:	
Title I (Army)	17,000
Title II (Navy)	38,000
Title II (Air Force)	3,255,000
Subtotal	3,310,000
Title VII (Reserve components):	
Army National Guard	10,000,000
Army Reserve	5,100,000
Naval and Marine Corps Reserve	6,500,000
Air National Guard	12,800,000
Air Reserves	4,600,000
Subtotal	39,000,000
Grand total of all authorities	1,534,994,000

Public Law 88-393—H.R. 10322, To Extend the Provisions of the Act of August 11, 1959, Public Law 86-155, as Amended (74 Stat. 396), To Provide Improved Opportunity for Promotion for Certain Officers in the Naval Service

This law extends the provisions of the Navy and Marine Corps "hump" law to June 30, 1970, so as to continue to provide equitable opportunity for promotion of officers in and behind the "hump," that is, the large group of officers commissioned during World War II.

This law also preserves the experience level in the grades of captain in the Navy and colonel in the Marine Corps by phasing the retirement and replacement of World War II officers in those grades over a number of years, beginning in fiscal year 1966, rather than having large numbers of them retire within a period of little more than a year in the early 1970's.

Public Law 88-398—H.R. 4177, To Authorize the Secretary of the Army To Convey to the City of St. Paul, Minn., All Right, Title, and Interest of the United States in and to Certain Lands Heretofore Conveyed to Such City

This law provides the Secretary of the Army authority to release an existing restriction on the use of land originally transferred by the War Department to the city of St. Paul in 1928. The original transfer to the city was effected pursuant to an act of Congress (45 Stat. 946) at fair market value.

The conveyance authorized is subject to the condition that the city of St. Paul, Minn., pay to the United States an amount equal to the fair market value of the property interest to be conveyed, as determined by the Secretary of the Army after appraisal.

Public Law 88-400—H.R. 9021, To Authorize the Conveyance of Two Tracts of Land Situated in Salt Lake City, Utah, for Public School Purposes

This legislation permits the city of Salt Lake, Utah, and the Mount Olivet Cemetery Association to convey to the board of education of Salt Lake City two small parcels of land totaling about 1½ acres for school purposes. Both parcels were part of an original conveyance to the Mount Olivet Cemetery Association provided for under the act of January 23, 1909, and the underlying interest of one tract still remains with the cemetery association. Both tracts are subject to present public use for State and highway purposes.

Public Law 88-406—H.R. 8954, To Amend Section 409 of Title 37, United States Code, To Authorize the Transportation of House Trailers and Mobile Dwellings of Members of the Uniformed Services Within the Continental United States, Within Alaska, or Between the Continental United States and Alaska, and for Other Purposes

This law amended section 409 of title 37, United States Code, by increasing the maximum allowance payable, from 36 to 51 cents per mile, to members of the Armed Forces who transport their mobile homes or trailers upon change of their permanent duty stations.

Public Law 88-422—S. 3001, To Amend Title 37, United States Code, To Increase the Rates of Basic Pay for Members of the Uniformed Services

This law provides a 2.5-percent increase in basic pay for all members of the uniformed services with over 2 years of service for pay purposes.

Commissioned officers and warrant officers with under 2 years of service receive an 8.5-percent increase in basic pay; cadets at the Military and Air Force Academies and midshipmen at the Naval Academy and aviation cadets receive an increase of approximately $9 per month, since, by law, these men are authorized one-half the pay of an O-1, second lieutenant, with less than 2 years of service.

On a 12-month basis, the cost of this law is $207,519,000, and $172,321,000 for the remainder of fiscal year 1965.

This law became effective on September 1, 1964.

Public Law 88-428—H.R. 2989, To Further Amend the Missing Persons Act To Cover Certain Persons Detained in Foreign Countries Against Their Will, and for Other Purposes

The Missing Persons Act, with this amendatory law, now includes specific coverage in cold war situations for military and civilian personnel employed by the Federal Government who are in this situation.

Also, this law will assist further in an equitable administration of existing law by reestablishing the former policy of deferring Federal income tax reporting and payment during the period such personnel are in a missing status.

Public Law 88-431—H.R. 4739, To Amend Section 406 of Title 37, United States Code, With Regard to the Advance Movement of Departments and Baggage and Household Effects of Members of the Uniformed Services

This law provides authority for the advance return of dependents, household goods, baggage, and privately owned vehicles of military members from oversea areas to locations in the United States and its possessions, when such return is determined to be in the best interests of the member or his dependents and the United States, and authorizes the return transportation to the United States or its possessions, of unmarried children of a member who becomes 21 years of age while the member is assigned to oversea duty. Dependents may not thereafter be returned to the oversea station from which departed unless the service sponsor has received a permanent change of station to another duty assignment in an oversea area, or unless the return of the dependents to the oversea station is for the convenience of the Government.

Public Law 88-432—H.R. 9634, To Authorize the Secretary of Defense To Lend Certain Army, Navy, and Air Force Equipment and Provide Certain Services to the Girl Scouts of the United States of America for Use at the 1965 Girl Scouts Senior Roundup Encampment, and for Other Purposes

This legislation authorizes the Secretary of Defense to lend certain equipment and provide services to the approximately 11,000 Girl Scouts and officials who are to attend the 1965 Senior Roundup Encampment at Farragut Wildlife Management Area, Idaho.

Public Law 88-436—H.R. 10319, To Amend Title 10, United States Code, To Authorize Increased Fees for the Sale of U.S. Naval Oceanographic Office Publications

This law authorizes the Secretary of the Navy to determine the prices at which U.S. Naval Oceanographic publications may be sold. This will enable the Secretary to recover all reasonable costs incurred in the production and handling of navigational charts, maps, and related publications which are made available for sale to the public by the U.S. Naval Oceanographic Office. Money received from the sales shall be covered into the Treasury.

Public Law 88-437—H.R. 11035, To Authorize the Extension of Certain Naval Vessel Loans Now in Existence

This legislation authorizes extension of the existing loans of 40 ships to 12 countries. It does not involve the expenditure of any Federal funds.

Public Law 88-500—H.R. 189, To Authorize the Conveyance of Certain Federal Land Under the Jurisdiction of the Naval Ordnance Test Station, China Lake, California, to the County of Kern, State of California

This law authorizes the conveyance of 105.5 acres of land by the Secretary of the Navy to Kern County, Calif., at a price equal to 50 percent of the fair market value as determined by the Secretary of the Navy.

Public Law 88-501—S. 2369, To Retrocede to the State of Kansas Exclusive Jurisdiction Over Certain State Highways Bordering Fort Leavenworth Military Reservation and the U.S. Penitentiary at Leavenworth

This legislation retrocedes exclusive jurisdiction over State highways bordering the

Fort Leavenworth Military Reservation and the U.S. Penitentiary at Leavenworth, Kans. Since 1961, when a local court ruled that neither the State nor its municipalities had jurisdiction over portions of these highways within the boundaries of Federal installations, the Federal Government has been unable to properly exercise law enforcement over the highways traversing this land. This legislation permits this situation to be corrected.

Public Law 88–553—H.R. 12278, To Authorize the Secretary of the Navy To Convey to the City of Sunnyvale, State of California, Certain Lands in the County of Santa Clara, State of California, in Exchange for Certain Other Lands

This legislation authorizes the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the city of Sunnyvale, State of California, approximately 95.229 acres of land in exchange for certain lands to be conveyed by the city of Sunnyvale, Calif., to the United States.

Public Law 88–562—H.R. 11338, To Remove Certain Conditions Subject To Which Certain Real Property in South Boston, Mass., Was Conveyed to the Massachusetts Port Authority

This legislation repeals that portion of Public Law 88–602 which imposes conditions for recapture of certain lands to be transferred by the Secretary of the Navy in South Boston, Mass., to the Massachusetts Port Authority in exchange for certain lands owned by the United States.

Public Law 88–572—H.R. 9803, To Authorize the Secretary of the Army To Acquire the Building Constructed on the Fort Jay Military Reservation, N.Y., by the Young Men's Christian Association

This legislation authorizes the Secretary of the Army to purchase a building constructed on Fort Jay Military Reservation, N.Y., by the Young Men's Christian Association for $150,000.

Public Law 88–574—H.R. 11594, To Authorize the Secretary of the Navy To Convey to the State of California Certain Lands in the County of Monterey, State of California, in Exchange for Certain Other Lands

This legislation is to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the State of California approximately 6.95 acres of land of the U.S. Naval Postgraduate School, Monterey, Calif., together with abutters' rights to the remaining land fronting on the proposed freeway in exchange for 6.30 acres of land to be conveyed by the State of California to the United States.

It also authorizes the Secretary of the Navy to accept from the State or subdivision thereof such appropriate interests in other lands as are necessary to protect the interest of the United States.

Public Law 88–613—H.R. 11626, To Authorize the Payment of Expenses Incident to the Evacuation of Dependents of Military Personnel From Panama and Cyprus

This law authorizes the payment from the Department of Defense appropriations to military personnel whose dependents were evacuated from Panama and Cyprus to the United States in January and February 1964, of allowances at the same rates as have been authorized under similar circumstances for civilian employees of the Government pursuant to Public Law 87–304.

Public Law 88–615—H.R. 11913, To Authorize the Disposal, Without Regard to the 6-Month Waiting Period Prescribed, of Antimony From the National Stockpile and the Supplemental Stockpile

This legislation provides congressional approval for the disposition of 5,000 short tons of antimony held in the national and supplemental stockpiles.

In addition, the bill waives the 6-month waiting period ordinarily required for the disposal of strategic and critical materials from the national stockpile.

Public Law 88–617—H.R. 12091, To Authorize the Disposal, Without Regard to the Prescribed 6-month Waiting Period, of Approximately 9,500,000 Pounds of Sisal From the National Stockpile

This legislation provides congressional approval for the disposition of 9,500,000 pounds of sisal held in the national stockpile.

In addition, the bill waives the 6-month waiting period ordinarily required for the disposal of strategic and critical materials from the national stockpile.

Public Law 88–618—H.R. 10328, for the Relief of Certain Commissioned Officers of the Army or Air Force Who Were Erroneously Paid Uniform Allowance Under the Provisions of Section 305 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as Amended, and for Other Purposes

This law relieves all ROTC distinguished military graduates who were ordered to active duty in a Reserve component while being considered for appointment in the Regular component of a particular service of the Armed Forces of all liability to refund amounts paid them as a uniform allowance.

This law also authorizes any such individual who had made repayment to the United States of any amount paid him as a uniform allowance to have such amount returned to him.

Public Law 88–620—H.R. 2501, To Authorize the Promotion of Qualified Reserve Officers of the Army and the Air Force to Existing Unit Vacancies

This law provides temporary authority until July 1, 1965, for the Army and Air Force to exceed present statutory ceilings for the authorized number of Reserve officers in each grade below lieutenant colonel for the purpose of promoting Reserve officers to fill unit vacancies and to appoint Reserve officers to fill mobilization requirements.

Public Law 88–621—H.R. 2512, To Clarify the Status of Members of the National Guard While Attending or Instructing at National Guard Schools Established Under the Authority of the Secretary of the Army or Secretary of the Air Force, as the Case May Be, and for Other Purposes

This law clarifies the eligibility of National Guard personnel for the protective provisions of statutes providing disability and related benefits to reservists who suffer disability or death while participating in authorized training functions beyond the 48 unit drills and 15 days' training specifically authorized by law for National Guard personnel in sections 502 and 504 of title 32, United States Code.

Public Law 88–624—H.R. 2509, To Authorize Reserve Officers To Combine Service in More Than One Reserve Component in Computing the 4 Years of Satisfactory Federal Service Necessary To Qualify for the Uniform Maintenance Allowance

This law clarifies section 416 of title 37, United States Code, so as to clearly establish the right of Reserve officers to combine service in more than one Reserve component in computing the 4 years of satisfactory Federal service necessary to qualify for the $50 uniform maintenance allowance.

Public Law 88–636—H.R. 9718, To Authorize the Crediting of Certain Military Service for Purposes of Reserve Retired Pay

This law authorizes the retroactive crediting, for Reserve retirement purposes, of wartime military service performed by members of the U.S. Public Health Service or the U.S. Coast and Geodetic Survey when such agencies or individuals were under the jurisdiction of a military department.

Public Law 88–637—H.R. 12308, To Authorize Removal of a Flight Hazard at the U.S. Naval Air Station, Norfolk, Va.

This legislation authorizes certain construction at the Naval Air Station, Norfolk, Va., for the purpose of removing a serious flight hazard which has resulted in several accidents and loss of life at this installation.

Public Law 88–643—H.R. 8427, To Provide for the Establishment of a Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System for a Limited Number of Employees, and for Other Purposes

This law provides for an improved retirement system for a limited number of employees of the Central Intelligence Agency. Under this law the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency may involuntarily retire certain individuals with immediate annuities, if they have completed at least 25 years of service or are age 50 and have 20 years of service, provided that in both instances such individuals shall have had not less than 10 years of service with the Central Intelligence Agency and 5 years of "qualifying" service. Between now and 1974 not more than 800 such employees may be so retired. The new law also makes applicable to this retirement system the automatic cost-of-living adjustment in annuities, and raises the survivor annuities from 50 to 55 percent.

Public Law 88–647—H.R. 9124, To Amend Title 10, United States Code, To Vitalize the Reserve Officers' Training Corps Programs of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, and for Other Purposes

This law vitalizes and improves the Reserve Officers' Training Corps program by—

(a) providing for the continuation and expansion of the junior ROTC program;

(b) providing for the continuation of the 4-year senior ROTC program and the establishment of an optional 2-year senior ROTC program; and

(c) authorizing the military departments to provide financial assistance to selected students in the senior ROTC program.

House concurrent resolutions

House Concurrent Resolution 300, Authorizing the Disposal of Approximately 98,000 Long Tons of Pig Tin From the National Stockpile

This legislation provides congressional approval of the disposition of 98,000 long tons of pig tin held in the national stockpile.

House Concurrent Resolution 320, To Express the Sense of the Congress on Disposal From the National Stockpile of Certain Materials

This legislation authorizes the disposal of portions of 10 materials now held in the national stockpile. The specific lots are a small portion of the same materials which are now excess to requirements, and the proposed disposal is designed to clear the inventory of limited use forms of excess materials which are nonobjective or are of nonstockpile grade.

Bills reported to House upon which action was not completed:

(1) Pending on House Calendar: H.R. 6600: To amend title 10, United States Code, with respect to the appointment of the members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

(2) Passed by the House and pending in the Senate:

H.J. Res. 113: Authorizing the Secretary of the Army to receive for instruction at the U.S. Military Academy at West Point two citizens and subjects of the Republic of Vietnam.

H.J. Res. 375: Providing for appropriate ceremonies in connection with the raising and lowering of the flags of the United States surrounding the Washington Monument.

H.J. Res. 1048: Authorizing the Secretary of the Army to receive for instruction at the U.S. Military Academy at West Point two citizens and subjects of the Kingdom of Thailand.

H.J. Res. 1072. Authorizing the Secretary of the Army to receive for instruction at the U.S. Military Academy at West Point a citizen and subject of the empire of Iran.

H.J. Res. 115: Authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to receive for instruction at the U.S. Naval Academy at Annapolis two citizens and subjects of the Kingdom of Thailand.

H.R. 384: To amend title 10, United States Code, to provide that members of the Armed Forces shall be retired in the highest grade satisfactorily held in any armed force, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2500: To equalize the treatment of Reserves and Regulars in the payment of per diem.

H.R. 2502: To provide for the remission or cancellation of an indebtedness due the United States by enlisted members of the National Guard.

H.R. 2988: To amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for participation by members of the Armed Forces in international sports activities.

H.R. 3179: To provide that judges of the U.S. Court of Military Appeals shall hold office during good behavior, and for other purposes.

H.R. 6000: To amend title 10, United States Code, to change the method of computing retired pay of certain enlisted members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps.

H.R. 6767: To amend title 10, United States Code, to provide gold star lapel buttons for the next of kin of members of the Armed Forces who lost or lose their lives in war or as a result of cold war incidents.

H.R. 8200: To further amend the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended, to provide for shelter in Federal structures, to authorize payment toward the construction or modification of approved public shelter space, and for other purposes.

H.R. 8265: To confer jurisdiction over the Iowa ordnance plant reservation upon the State of Iowa.

H.R. 8676: To amend section 2634 of title 10, United States Code, so as to authorize the military departments, in certain cases, to ship automobiles to and from the State of Alaska by commercial motor carrier via highways and the Alaska ferry system.

H.R. 10320: To amend section 1485 of title 10, United States Code, relating to the transportation of remains of deceased dependents of members of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

H.R. 12193: To amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for the establishment of a program of cash awards for suggestions or inventions made by members of the Armed Forces which contribute to the efficiency, economy, or other improvement of Government operations.

H.R. 12435: To authorize the sale, without regard to the 6-month waiting period prescribed, of zinc proposed to be disposed of pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stockpiling Act.

RÉSUMÉ OF ACTIVITIES OF SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEES

Special Subcommittee on Construction of Military Hospital Facilities

On February 27, 1964, the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services announced the establishment of the Special Subcommittee on Construction of Military Hospital Facilities. The subcommittee, consisting of L. Mendel Rivers, of South Carolina, chairman; F. Edward Hébert, of Louisiana; Porter Hardy, Jr., of Virginia; William G. Bray, of Indiana; Alexander Pirnie, of New York; and Durward G. Hall, of Missouri, was established for the purpose of inquiring into Department of Defense policy on hospital construction in order to assist the committee from a policy standpoint with respect to future authorizations of military hospital construction. It was emphasized that the subcommittee would have the widest possible authority in examining all of the problems relating to hospital construction, including the hospitalization of retired military personnel and their dependents. In this connection, it was also emphasized that the committee's approval of the hospitals in the fiscal year 1965 program which contain no beds for retired personnel would not serve to prejudice or restrict the subcommittee in its deliberations regarding the inclusion of retired beds in future military construction programs.

The subcommittee conducted a thorough review into the policies and programs of the construction and operation of military hospital facilities. It looked into the question of eligibility for care, factors to be considered in the programing of new or replacement hospital facilities, and the method by which medical care best can be provided to those eligible to receive such care.

The subcommittee concluded that the Government has the obligation to provide medical care not only to active-duty military personnel but also to their dependents. The subcommittee is convinced, based on the preponderance of the testimony, that the traditional benefit of hospital care to military retirees and their dependents must be continued. The subcommittee further finds that the current policy of the Department of Defense which eliminates all beds for this group in new military hospital construction will destroy the availability of space for such personnel.

Therefore, in order to continue the traditional benefits promised by the services in their recruitment literature and retention efforts, and in addition, to assist in the medical mobilization requirements, the subcommittee believes that a limited number of beds should be programed in each new military hospital over and above the number required for active-duty military personnel and their dependents. In addition, the subcommittee believes that medical mobilization requirements would be served by including in new military hospitals, on bases where there is a substantial dependent population, obstetrical facilities which could be utilized as an emergency operating room in case of future need.

The hearings and report of the subcommittee were printed as Committee Documents No. 64 and No. 67, respectively.

National Military Airlift Subcommittee

March 1, 1963, the chairman appointed a special Subcommittee on National Military Airlift to review the actions taken to implement the recommendations contained in the 1960 report of the previous Airlift Subcommittee.

The subcommittee was to determine the degree to which the previous recommendations had been implemented, updated all the salient points pertinent to military airlift, and determine whether or not any new problems had arisen during the 3-year interval.

The review revealed that of the 11 recommendations made in the 1960 report, 10 had been implemented in whole or major part. The one recommendation on which no action had been taken was the redesignation of MATS as the Military Airlift Command. At the conclusion of this year's review the subcommittee reiterated its conviction that sound reasons exist for this redesignation.

The subcommittee was gratified to learn that the long-range airlift capabilities of MATS have been increased by 60 percent over the past 3 years, and that this capability will be quadrupled by 1968 if the current C–141 procurement program is fully implemented. However, deficiencies in airlift capabilities remain because of the Army reorganization under the ROAD concept and because of increased emphasis on maintaining a quick reaction capability to move Army forces to any trouble spot in the world.

The deficiencies result in part from the fact that substantial tonnages of very heavy and outsized equipment that is organic to an Army division cannot be air transported at all, or can now be transported only in the C–124 and C–133 aircraft. Both of these aircraft currently are planned to be phased out of the active inventory in the 1968–69 time period.

It is the judgment of the subcommittee that a new, very large, turbine-powered aircraft must be developed as a followon for the C–124's and C–133's. The subcommittee recommended the earliest possible approval of plans for the development of such an aircraft.

The hearings and report of the National Military Airlift Subcommittee were printed as Committee Documents Nos. 28 and 29, respectively.

Subcommittee on research and development

Public Law 88–174 (sec. 610), enacted on October 7, 1963, gave the Armed Services Committee the responsibility of reporting authorizing legislation to the Congress for funds to support all military research, development, test, and evaluation programs after December 31, 1963.

In anticipation of this responsibility, Chairman Vinson, on February 19, 1963, announced to the committee his intention to create a permanent subcommittee, whose primary concern would be research and development in the Defense Department. After consultation with the Honorable Les Arends, ranking minority member of the committee, he established the subcommittee with the following members: Congressman Melvin Price, chairman; Congressman Frank J. Becker; Congressman Samuel S. Stratton; Congressman Durward G. Hall; Congressman Jeffery Cohelan; Congressman Robert T. Stafford; and Congressman Otis G. Pike.

In preparation for this new responsibility, the subcommittee held some 27 meetings during the closing months of 1963, to review existing research and development programs of the Department of Defense. In addition, during January of this year, the subcommittee met on 12 occasions to continue its review of the programs requested for fiscal year 1965. Following this extensive review, the subcommittee submitted a report to the Armed Services Committee, making recommendations which reflected a reduction of $362.5 million to the amount requested in the President's budget for the Department of Defense. These recommendations were accepted in toto by the committee and by the House.

Following the enactment of the authorization legislation, the subcommittee received an additional 18 briefings on specific research and development programs, such as vertical and/or short takeoff and landing (V/STOL) aircraft and night vision. During these reviews, testimony was received from the Department of Defense, each military department, and the defense industry. The V/STOL aircraft hearings will be printed and it is planned that a report will be submitted to the Committee on Armed Services prior to the end of the year. The hearings will be printed as Armed Services Committee Paper No. 68 and the report as Paper No. 69.

Subcommittee for special investigations

House Resolution 84, passed by the House, January 31, 1963, authorizes the Committee on Armed Services, acting as a whole or by subcommittee appointed by the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of all matters—

1. relating to the procurement, use, and disposition of material, equipment, supplies, and services, and the acquisition, use, and

disposition or real property, by or within the Department of Defense;

2. relating to the military and civilian personnel under the jurisdiction of the Department of Defense;

3. involving the laws, regulations, and directives administered by or within the Department of Defense;

4. involving the use of appropriated and nonappropriated funds by or within the Department of Defense;

5. relating to scientific research and development in support of the armed services; and

6. all other matters within the legislative jurisdiction conferred by law or the rules of the House of Representatives upon the Committee on Armed Services.

House Resolution 146, passed by the House February 27, 1963, appropriated $75,000; and House Resolution 607, passed by the House January 29, 1964, appropriated $75,000 for the expenses of conducting the investigations and inquiries authorized by House Resolution 84.

On January 29, 1963, by Committee Resolution 5, the Committee on Armed Services authorized a special investigations subcommittee, with the members of the majority to be selected by the chairman of the committee and those from the minority to be selected upon recommendation of the ranking minority member of the full committee. Pursuant to this authority, Chairman VINSON, by letter dated January 31, 1963, to Hon. PORTER HARDY, JR., appointed the following as members of the subcommittee: Hon. PORTER HARDY, JR., chairman; Hon. RICHARD E. LANKFORD, Hon. OTIS G. PIKE, Hon. WALTER NORBLAD, Hon. CHARLES S. GUBSER.

This subcommittee has jurisdiction over such matters as are assigned to it by the chairman of the full committee in accordance with House Resolution 84.

The subcommittee operates within the general scope of subcommittees previously organized by the Committee on Armed Services, under successive resolutions since the 81st Congress. The subcommittee's rules appear in a document entitled "Rules and Organization of the Subcommittee for Special Investigations of the Committee on Armed Services, U.S. House of Representatives, Under Authority of House Resolution 84, 88th Congress." The rules were adopted at an executive session of the subcommittee on March 5, 1963, and ordered to be printed for the information of persons having business before the subcommittee.

The professional staff and clerical assistance of the subcommittee consist of a special counsel, an investigator, and three clerical employees.

The monthly and cumulative expenses of the subcommittee are reported in its monthly report, submitted by the chairman of the full committee to the chairman of the Committee on House Administration. These expenses also were reported in detail in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

STUDIES RESULTING IN REPORTS AND/OR HEARINGS

1. Relation of cost data to military procurement

The authority of the General Accounting Office to examine cost data was challenged by a contractor from whom the Department of the Air Force had purchased electronic equipment under a contract which totaled approximately $2 million. The contractor, Hewlett-Packard Co., of Palo Alto, Calif., sought support for its position in part in Public Law 87-653. The immediate purpose of the subcommittee's inquiry was to review the facts to determine the need for or desirability of recommending legislative action to clarify the intent of Congress in existing legislation.

After several weeks of investigation both in Washington, D.C., and at Dayton, Ohio, a hearing was held on May 22, 1963, at which representatives of the General Accounting Office and the Department of Defense testified. Representatives of the Department of the Air Force and Hewlett-Packard Co. attended as observers.

The subcommittee has taken no further action, since the General Accounting Office and Hewlett-Packard Co. agreed to submit the dispute to the courts for judicial determination. The matter is now pending in the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California.

The hearings have been printed.

2. Russian trawler traffic in U.S. territorial waters

The subcommittee received reports concerning the activity of the Russian fishing fleet, particularly along the coast of Florida. After several weeks of investigation, both in Washington and the field, public hearings were held on July 9 and 10. Testimony was received from representatives of the U.S. Coast Guard, the Department of State, the Department of the Navy, and a private charter-boat operator. The hearings were printed.

The subcommittee submitted a unanimous report to the chairman of the full committee which recommended, among other things (1) that the Departments of State and the Navy, and the Coast Guard adopt a uniform national policy which would permit the Coast Guard to take such immediate and unilateral action as may be required in the national interest whenever vessels having electronic or other capabilities which constitute a threat to the security of our country are found transiting our territorial waters; and (2) that the Seventh Coast Guard District publicize the assistance which civilian sources could render to augment its surveillance activities, and, particularly, invite commercial and private boatowners to report all sightings of Iron Curtain craft in U.S. coastal waters.

The agencies concerned were requested to comment on the recommendations. Their responses indicated general agreement; the Coast Guard response contained the details of the national policy on the surveillance of the Russian trawlers, as well as the procedures established by the three agencies to implement the policy. The policy, if fully implemented, would meet generally the subcommittee's recommendations.

3. Air defense system changes

On April 26, 1963, the Department of Defense, through its Office of Public Affairs, announced "a realinement of the U.S. air defense forces." The announcement identified by location the 6 semiautomatic ground environment (SAGE) direction centers and 17 long-range radars that would be closed.

At the direction of the chairman of the full committee, an investigation was initiated in May 1963 to determine the procedural manner in which the decision was made and the effect of the planned changes on our defense system. The investigation entailed the review and analysis of several thousand pages of Department of Defense, North American Air Defense Command, and Air Defense Command documents, the interview of numerous military and Department of Defense personnel and 3 days of hearings, June 20, and July 11 and 18, which, because of the nature of the security information involved, were held in executive session.

The subcommittee's unanimous report, also classified, was transmitted to the chairman of the full committee by letter from the chairman of the subcommittee on October 28, 1963. Chairman Vinson, in turn, transmitted copies of the report to the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of the Air Force, inviting any comments they cared to make, particularly with respect to the report's salient conclusions. Secretary Zuckert's reply of November 6, 1963, indicated his support for the Air Force position expressed to the subcommittee by Assistant Secretary Imirie and General LeMay. An interim acknowledgment of November 1, 1963, was received from the Office of the Secretary of Defense, but no official comment on the conclusions has been made by Mr. McNamara.

4. Negotiation and award of research contracts by the Air Force

In order to examine certain stated Air Force procurement policies, procedures, and practices and compare them with actual performance, the subcommittee chose as a case study contracts between the Air Force and TYCO Laboratories, Inc. The contracts call for basic research in the field of energy conversion. The contracts are sponsored by the Air Force Cambridge Research Laboratories, one of the tenant organizations at Hanscom Air Force Base, Bedford, Mass.; the laboratories are a part of the Air Force Office of Aerospace Research. Procurement services are provided the laboratories by the Electronic Systems Division (ESD), the host organization at Hanscom. ESD is a part of Air Force Systems Command.

Five days of public hearings were held, August 21, November 12, 13, and 14, and December 2, 1963, and the hearings were printed.

The report is a step-by-step account of how, under cover of scientific complexities, the chief of a relatively minor scientific branch in the Air Force Cambridge Research Laboratories started with a $44,000 contract with a small research firm of his choice, expanded it into one of more than a million dollars that may reach $10 million before the work is completed, and avoided the regulations that impeded him and invoked those he found useful.

This maneuvering within the armed services procurement regulation had the effect of eliminating competition, and it could not have been accomplished if the Air Force contracting organization had fully met its responsibilities. The contracting officer, the subcommittee found, had permitted the requiring agency to preempt his contract authority and responsibility. This led the subcommittee to recommend that laboratory participation in contract negotiations be limited to matters of a scientific character and that contracting officers be instructed to exercise their full contractual authority.

Following the hearings, the Secretary of the Air Force, Eugene M. Zuckert, wrote the subcommittee chairman that he had taken the following corrective measures:

(1) revised evaluation procedures to provide a better system of checks and balances;

(2) defined territorial limitations as exceptions to normal policy and requiring review by the division commander;

(3) issued instructions that requests for quotations are to include a clear definition of the availability of Government-furnished property;

(4) issued instructions to enforce regulations for the control and handling of unsolicited proposals; and

(5) emphasized procedures authorizing the assistance of scientifically qualified individuals in the preparation of timely facilities capability reports.

5. Deterioration of runway facilities at Selfridge Air Force Base

In May 1964, the subcommittee issued a report based on its investigation of the rapid deterioration of a recently completed main runway at Selfridge Air Force Base, Mount Clemens, Mich. The airfield improvements were completed in September 1959 under a contract cost of $9.9 million. The additional cost of repairing pavement constructed under this contract will be $2.7 million. The Corps of Engineers was the construction agent of the Air Force.

The subcommittee found that the source of the concrete failure was the use in the mix of aggregate which did not meet Corps of Engineers specifications. The subcommittee's investigation disclosed that the aggregate was used after the specifications were changed by a corps engineer without the knowledge and clearance of the Detroit District and the north central division of the Corps of Engineers. This led the subcommittee to recommend that the Corps of Engineers require prompt documentation of district "engineering judgments" that are not consistent with established Corps of Engineers standard and practices.

The corps engineer who had changed the aggregate specifications resigned his position with the Detroit District after the contract was completed and emerged as sales manager of the subcontractor who supplied the inferior aggregate.

This subcommittee recommended that the Corps of Engineers include in its prime contracts and subcontracts a clause permitting cancellation of such contracts in event the contractor employs or offers to employ any corps personnel charged with contract supervision or administration; also that the Corps of Engineers adopt regulations to require disclosure by its personnel of all activities and associations which might constitute a conflict of interest.

The Secretary of the Army, Stephen Ailes, by letter, advised the subcommittee chairman that the Department has—

(1) reissued its conduct and discipline regulation requiring disclosure of all outside interests or employment and to preclude private outside employment which could be expected to bring discredit to the Government;

(2) issued supplementary instructions to insure against inadvertent omissions from the daily record of such items as engineering determinations and other matters of interest for each contract; and

(3) issued guidance on material testing which follows or is more restrictive than that of recognized organizations such as the American Society for Testing and Materials, the American Concrete Institute, and the American Association of State Highway Officials.

6. Cost of morale and recreation benefits for defense contractor employees

For the purpose of determining the manner in which Government contract auditors and negotiators are interpreting the Armed Service Procurement Regulation sections which permit defense contractors to pass on to the Government much of the cost of employee morale and recreation, the records of 28 prime contractors at 36 locations were reviewed. Of these, 10 major contractors were selected for more detailed investigation in the field.

The subcommittee held public hearings on July 21, 22, and 23, 1964, and heard testimony from General Accounting Office and Department of Defense witnesses and 27 negotiating and auditing personnel of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force. The hearings have been printed.

In the 12-month period examined by the subcommittee, employee welfare expenditures in 36 plant locations totaled approximately $6 million. About $3½ million of this amount was spent for athletic and club activities. Other total expenditures were cafeteria losses, $1,500,000; Christmas gift turkeys, $434,000; parties and entertainment, $386,000; and picnics and outings, $162,000.

In general, the subcommittee found that in their present form the ASPR sections relating to employee morale can be and are interpreted to allow a wide variety of activities, including picnics and outings, visits to Disneyland, cocktail parties, Christmas parties, crab feasts, and dinners at restaurants and in the homes of contractor executives. Such is the variety that the subcommittee could find no pattern either in industry or geographic area.

Food service losses are charged to the Government, while profits from the major source of food service income, vending machines, are often given to employee welfare organizations (frequently in amounts exceeding the requirements of the organization) without first deducting other food service losses. The subcommittee notes, however, that a few defense contractors have found it possible to conduct all employee activities at little or no expense to the Government by prudent use of food service profits.

The subcommittee made specific recommendations for changes in Department of Defense contracting policy and ASPR provisions to promote better fiscal control in this area of Government spending.

During the hearings the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics) Thomas D. Morris, said that the testimony developed by the subcommittee had shown the need for certain policy changes and administrative improvements. Subsequent to the hearings, the Department informed the subcommittee by letter that the Department had "(1) issued instructions for increased staff training; (2) initiated action to clarify that income from activities, such as vending machines, should, for contract cost allowance purposes, be treated as a credit for the overhead accounts of the contractors; and (3) initiated action to provide ASPR language which would disallow planned food losses on food service activities as contract costs."

GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE AND SUBCOMMITTEE ACTIVITIES

The reports of the General Accounting Office on subjects within the purview of the subcommittee are referred to the subcommittee as they are issued.

CONTINUING STUDIES

The subcommittee has under continuing study a number of specific cases which fall into rather definite groupings. Practically all of these relate to procurements, including such categories as sole source, small business, inadequacy or restrictiveness of bid invitation specifications, etc.

MEMBERSHIP, COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES, OCTOBER 3, 1964

Carl Vinson of Georgia, chairman; L. Mendel Rivers of South Carolina; Philip J. Philbin of Massachusetts; F. Edward Hébert of Louisiana; Arthur Winstead of Mississippi; Melvin Price of Illinois; O. C. Fisher of Texas; Porter Hardy, Jr., of Virginia; Charles E. Bennett of Florida; Richard E. Lankford of Maryland; George Huddleston, Jr., of Alabama; James A. Byrne of Pennsylvania; Samuel S. Stratton of New York; Jeffery Cohelan of California; Victor Wickersham of Oklahoma; Otis G. Pike of New York; Joe M. Kilgore of Texas; Richard H. Ichord of Missouri; Lucien N. Nedzi of Michigan; Clarence D. Long of Maryland; Everett G. Burkhalter of California; Leslie C. Arends of Illinois; William H. Bates of Massachusetts; Alvin E. O'Konski of Wisconsin; William G. Bray of Indiana; Bob Wilson of California; Frank C. Osmers, Jr., of New Jersey; Charles S. Gubser of California; Frank J. Becker of New York; Charles E. Chamberlain of Michigan; Alexander Pirnie of New York; Durward G. Hall of Missouri; Donald D. Clancy of Ohio; Robert T. Stafford of Vermont; Ed Foreman of Texas; Richard S. Schweiker of Pennsylvania; Bill Stinson of Washington; and A. Fernós-Isern of Puerto Rico.

Professional staff: John R. Blandford, chief counsel; Philip W. Kelleher, counsel; Frank M. Slatinshek, counsel; William H. Cook, counsel; and Earl J. Morgan.

Clerical staff: Oneta L. Stockstill, executive secretary; Berniece Kalinowski, secretary; L. Louise Ellis, secretary; Dorothy R. Britton, secretary; Edna E. Johnson, secretary; Doris L. Scott, secretary; and James A. Deakins, bill clerk.

Subcommittee for special investigations staff: John T. M. Reddan, counsel; Walton Woods, investigator; Phyllis Seymour, secretary; Rose C. Beck, secretary; and Adeline Tolerton, clerk.

Committee Prints, Hearings, and Legislative Reports Published by the Banking and Currency Committee During the 88th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Banking and Currency has published a number of special studies relating to banking and finance. These are in addition to the publication of hearings and reports on legislation and are designed to provide information that is needed in the public interest. Because of widespread popular interest in many of these publications we have advised the Superintendent of Documents of instances where it might be desirable to print copies for sale, and this has been done in a number of cases. Following is a list of these publications showing the Government Printing Office price for all of them that are available there. The committee will endeavor to supply requests within the limits of our supply of these publications:

LEGISLATIVE ACTIVITY OF THE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY, 1963

"Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1963," section-by-section summary (H.R. 3881), March 1963.[1]

"Chain Banking," stockholder and loan links of 200 largest member banks (committee print, Apr. 15, 1963, 542 pp.).

"Area Redevelopment Act Amendments of 1963," section-by-section summary, April 1963.[1]

"Bank Holding Companies—Scope of Operations and Stock Ownership" (Subcommittee on Domestic Finance), May 20, 1963, 131 pages.

Staff analysis of H.R. 5874, May 1963.

"Futures Trading in Sugar on the New York Coffee and Sugar Exchange" (Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs), August 5, 1963, 25 pages.

"Comparative Regulations of Financial Institutions" (Subcommittee on Domestic Finance), September 20, 1963.[1]

"Comparative Regulations of Financial Institutions" (Subcommittee on Domestic Finance), revised and final edition, November 22, 1963, 401 pages, obtainable from Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., at $1.25 a copy.

"Banks Holding Treasury Tax and Loan Account Balances as of October 15, 1963" (Subcommittee on Domestic Finance), December 12, 1963, 276 pages.

---

[1] Committee supply exhausted.

"A Study of Federal Credit Programs: Volumes 1 and 2" (Subcommittee on Domestic Finance), volume 1, 304 pages, at 75 cents a copy; and volume 2, 895 pages, at $2.50 a a copy, obtainable from the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.[1]

"Some General Features of the Federal Reserve's Approach to Policy" (Subcommittee on Domestic Finance), February 10, 1964, 41 pages.[1]

"Commercial Bank Reporting Practices to Stockholders" (Subcommittee on Domestic Finance), March 10, 1964.[1]

"The Impact of Examination Practices Upon Commercial Bank Lending Policies" (Subcommittee on Domestic Finance), April 10, 1964, 97 pages.[1]

"The Federal Reserve's Attachment to the Free Reserve Concept" (Subcommittee on Domestic Finance), May 7, 1964, 64 pages.[1]

"The Prevalent Monetary Policy and Its Consequences" (Subcommittee on Domestic Finance), May 8, 1964, 106 pages.

"A Primer on Money" (Subcommittee on Domestic Finance), August 5, 1964, 144 pages. Obtainable from the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., at 40 cents a copy.

"The Federal Savings Bank Bill—A Staff Analysis of H.R. 12142, H.R. 12167, and S. 3050" (Subcommittee on Bank Supervision and Insurance), October 2, 1964, 29 pages. Obtainable from the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., at 15 cents a copy.

"An Alternative Approach to the Monetary Mechanism" (Subcommittee on Domestic Finance), August 21, 1964, 131 pages.

"Twenty Largest Stockholders of Record in Member Banks of the Federal Reserve System as of May 1962" (Subcommittee on Domestic Finance), 1,355 pages. This is in five volumes, each covering a region of the country. Volumes are obtainable from the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., at the following prices: Volume 1, $1.50; volume 2, $1.25; volume 3, $1.75; volume 4, $1; volume 5, $1.75.[1]

IN PROCESS OF RELEASE

"Money Facts" (Subcommittee on Domestic Finance). In print but not yet released, 35 pages.

"The Federal Reserve System After 50 years—Proposals for Improvement of the Federal Reserve and Staff Report on Hearings Before the Subcommittee on Domestic Finance of the Committee on Banking and Currency" (Subcommittee on Domestic Finance), August 25, 1964, 94 pages. Obtainable from the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402, at 30 cents a copy.

"The Structure of Ownership of Member Banks and the Pattern of Loans Made on Hypothecated Bank Stock" (Subcommittee on Domestic Finance), 57 pages.

"Correspondent Relations—A Survey of Banker Opinion" (Subcommittee on Domestic Finance), 58 pages. This is the first in a series of three volumes.

(NOTE—The hearings and legislative reports published by the Banking and Currency Committee during the 88th Congress are listed below.)

HEARINGS

Amendment to section 14(b) of the Federal Reserve Act (H.R. 11499), June 1964. (H. Rept. 1473, June 11, 1964.) (Public Law 88–344.)

Area Redevelopment Act amendments (S. 1163), July 1963. (H. Rept. 633, Aug. 3, 1963.) [1]

Area Redevelopment Act Amendments of 1963 (H.R. 4996), April 1963. (H. Rept. 276, May 6, 1963.) [1]

Bank holding company legislation (H.R. 10668, 10872), April–June 1964.

Commemorative medals and coins legislation (medals: H.R. 2380, 3488, 3575, 4003, 6014; coins: H.R. 1611, 2621, 6026), May 1963. (H. Rept. 766 (H.R. 3488), Sept. 25, 1963.) (Public Law 88–184.)

Conflict of Federal and State banking laws, April–May 1963.

Construction set-aside amendments (H.R. 2029), August 1963.

Defense Production Act of 1950, extension of (H.R. 10000), March 1964. (H. Rept. 1456, June 3, 1964.) (Public Law 88–343.)

Export controls, June 1963.[1]

Export-Import Bank Act extension (H.R. 3872), February 1963. (H. Rept. 86, Mar. 11, 1963.) (H. Rept. 578 (Conf. Rept.), July 25, 1963.) (H. Rept. 688 (Conf. Rept.), Aug. 15, 1963.) (Public Law 88–101.)

Federal charter legislation for mutual savings banks (H.R. 258), October 1963.

Federal Reserve System after 50 years (H.R. 3783, 9631, 9685, 9686, 9749):

Volume 1—January–February 1964.[2]

Volume 2—February–March 1964.[2]

Volume 3—April 1964.[2]

FHA self-insurance on acquired multifamily property, June 1963.

Housing and community legislation (H.R. 9751), February 1964.

Increased flexibility for financial institutions (H.R. 5845, 7878, 8230, 8245, 8247, 8459, 8541), September–December 1963. (H. Rept. 1099 (H.R. 8230), Jan. 20, 1964, Public Law 88–341.) (H. Rept. 1024 (H.R. 8459), Dec. 10, 1963, Public Law 88–353.)

Insurance of deposits and share accounts (H.R. 5130), April 1963. (H. Rept. 1098, Jan. 20, 1964.) [1]

Inter-American Development Bank Act amendment (H.R. 12010), August 1964.

International banks (H.R. 7405, 7406), July 1963. (H. Rept. 651 (H.R. 7405), Aug. 12, 1963, Public Law 88–178.) (H. Rept. 652 (H.R. 7406), Aug. 12, 1963, Public Law 88–259.)[1]

International Development Association Act Amendment (S. 2214), March 1964. (H. Rept. 1312, Apr. 9, 1964). (Public Law 88–310.)

International Home Loan Bank, establishment on an (H.R. 8143), August–September 1963.

Investigation of the circumstances surrounding the disappearance of $7.5 million of U.S. Government securities from the vault of the Federal Reserve Bank at San Francisco, Calif., April 1963. (H. Rept. 354, May 29, 1963.)

Meetings with Department and agency officials, and trade organizations, January–February 1963:

Banking and trade organization, February 19–20, 1963.

Comptroller of the Currency, February 18, 1963.

Department of Agriculture, February 7, 1963.

Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, Export-Import Bank of Washington, Federal Home Loan Bank Board, February 5, 1963.

Federal Reserve System, January 29, 1963.

Housing and Home Finance Agency, January 31, 1963.

Small Business Administration, Social Security Administration, February 6, 1963.

Treasury Department, January 30, 1963.

Notice of change in control of management of insured banks (H.R. 12267, 12268), August 1964. (H. Rept. 1792 (H.R. 12267), Aug. 13, 1964.) (Public Law 88–593.)

Recent changes in monetary policy and balance-of-payments problems, July 1963.

Resources of the International Development Association, expanding the (H.R. 9022): December 1963, January 1964. (H. Rept. 1093, Jan. 8, 1964.)

Physically handicapped families and persons, housing for (H.R. 7394), October 1963.

Prohibit banks from performing certain nonbanking services and from engaging in the business of personal property leasing, legislation to (H.R. 9548, 9822), February 1964.

Proposed Federal Banking Commission and Federal Deposit and Savings Insurance Board (H.R. 729, 5874), May 1963.

Silver legislation (H.R. 4413), March 1963.[1]

Silver policy of the United States (H.J. Res. 1140, 1156; R.H. 10534, 10550, 10571, 10559, 10561, 10563, 10583, 10560, 10562, 10564, 10584), August 1964. (Not printed yet.)

Small Business Investment Act Amendments of 1962 (H.R. 799), May 1963.

Small business legislation (H.R. 799, 5480; S. 298, 1309), August–December 1963. (H. Rept. 1084 (S. 298), Dec. 20, 1963; H. Rept. 1129 (conference report), Feb. 5, 1964; Publice Law 88–273.) (H. Rept. 1097 (S. 1309), Jan. 16, 1964, Public Law 88–264.)

Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1963 (H.R. 3881), February–March 1963. (H. Rept. 204, Apr. 9, 1963.) [1]

Urban renewal: Part 1—October 1963,[1] part 2—November 1963.

REPORTS

Area Redevelopment Act Amendments of 1963. (H. Rept. 276, May 6, 1963.)

Area Redevelopment Act Amendments of 1963. (H. Rept. 633, Aug. 3, 1963.)

Battle of Lake Erie Sesquicentennial Medals. (H. Rept. 769, Sept. 25, 1963.)

Defense Production Act, Extension of. (H. Rept. 1456, June 3, 1964.) (Public Law 88–343.)

Change in the Requirements for the Annual Meeting Date for National Banks. (H. Rept. 1011, Dec. 9, 1963.) (Public Law 88–232.)

Coinage of John Fitzgerald Kennedy 50-Cent Pieces. (H. Rept. 1038, Dec. 13, 1963.) (Public Law 88–256.)

Export-Import Bank Act Extension. (H. Rept. 86, Mar. 11, 1963.) (H. Rept. 578 (Conf. Rept.), July 25, 1963.) (H. Rept. 688 (Conf. Rept.), Aug. 15, 1963.) (Public Law 88–101.)

Extension of Section 221 Mortgage Insurance Authority. (H. Rept. 386, June 13, 1963.) (Public Law 88–54.)

Federal Credit Union Act, Amendments to. (H. Rept. 648, Aug. 12, 1963.) (Public Law 88–150.)

Federal Credit Union Act Amendments. (H. Rept. 1024, Dec. 10, 1963.) (Public Law 88–353.)

Federal Deposit and Savings Insurance, Increase in. (H. Rept. 1098, Jan. 20, 1964.)

Federal Reserve Direct Purchase Authority, Extension of. (H. Rept. 1473, June 11, 1964.) (Public Law 88–344.)

Federally Insured Banks, Report of Changes in Control of. (H. Rept. 1792, Aug. 13, 1964.) (Public Law 88–593.)

Gold Medal for Henry J. Kaiser. (H. Rept. 1383, May 6, 1964.)

Golden Anniversary of Naval Air Station, Pensacola, Fla. (H. Rept. 1397, May 13, 1964.) (Public Law 88–318.)

Housing Act of 1964. (H. Rept. 1703, Aug. 5, 1964.)

Housing Act of 1964. (H. Rept. 1828 (Conf. Rept.), Aug. 18, 1964.) (Public Law 88–560.)

Housing for the Elderly. (H. Rept. 754, Sept. 19, 1963.) (Public Law 88–158.)

ILGWU Health Center 50th Anniversary Medals. (H. Rept. 767, Sept. 25, 1963.) (Public Law 88–185.)

Increase in Authorized Capital Stock of International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. (H. Rept. 651, Aug. 12, 1963.) (Public Law 88–178.)

Increase in Federal Deposit and Savings Insurance. (H. Rept. 1098, Jan. 20, 1964.)

---

[1] Committee supply exhausted.

[2] For sale by Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402.

Increased U.S. Participation in the Inter-American Development Bank. (H. Rept. 652, Aug. 12, 1963.) (Public Law 88–259.)

Indiana Statehood Sesquicentennial Medals. (H. Rept. 766, Sept. 25, 1963.) (Public Law 88–184.)

Insured Housing Loan Program for Elderly in Rural Areas, Temporary Extension of. (H. Rept. 1472, June 11, 1964.) (Public Law 88–340.)

International Development Association Act. (H. Rept. 1093, Jan. 8, 1964.)

International Development Association Act, Amendment to. (H. Rept. 1312, Apr. 9, 1964.) (Public Law 88–310.)

Investment Powers of Federal Savings and Loan Associations. (H. Rept. 1100, Jan. 20, 1964.)

Maximum Amount of FHA Section 207 Rental Housing Mortgages. (H. Rept. 650, Aug. 12, 1963.)

Medals Commemorating National Historic Shrines in New York City. (H. Rept. 1081, Dec. 20, 1963.) (Public Law 88–262.)

Medals Commemorating the 200th Anniversary of the Founding of St. Louis. (H. Rept. 1083, Dec. 20, 1963.) (Public Law 88–270.)

Mysterious Disappearance of $7.5 Million of U.S. Securities From Vault of the Federal Reserve Bank at San Francisco, Calif. (H. Rept. 354, May 29, 1963.)

National Bank Loans on Forest Tracts. (H. Rept. 1099, Jan. 20, 1964.) (Public Law 88–341.)

Nevada Statehood Centennial Medals. (H. Rept. 770, Sept. 25, 1963.) (Public Law 88–147.)

Padre Junipero Serra 250th Anniversary Medals. (H. Rept. 768, Sept. 25, 1963.) (Public Law 88–143.)

Retention of "1964" on All Coins Temporary. (H. Rept. 1644, Aug. 3, 1964.)

Silver Legislation. (H. Rept. 183, Apr. 3, 1963.) (Public Law 88–36.)

Small Business Act Amendments. (H. Rept. 1097, Jan. 16, 1964.) (Public Law 88–264.)

Small Business Investment Act Amendments of 1963. (H. Rept. 1084, Dec. 20, 1963.) (H. Rept. 1129 (Conf. Rept.), Feb. 5, 1964.) (Public Law 88–273.)

Transfer of Certain Property Purchased for Low-Rent Housing Project in Detroit, Mich. (H. Rept. 649, Aug. 12, 1963.) (Public Law 88–141.)

Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1963. (H. Rept. 204, Apr. 9, 1963.)

The Hon. Charles B. Hoeven

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, during the time when agriculture in the United States had its back to the wall, I think of CHARLES HOEVEN as one of the men who has saved our agriculture and helped develop it so that it is the wonder of the entire world. We have never heard CHARLIE HOEVEN complain about the surplus. He believes this surplus to be the greatest weapon in the fight for freedom and in the defense and strength of our Nation.

CHARLIE is from the great heartland of America, where people are still self-reliant, independent, and devoted to the free enterprise system. CHARLIE HOEVEN, here in the Congress, exemplified the very best in American traditions and ideals. He is a Christian gentleman, and although we will miss his service here, this Congress is a better body having known him and will always benefit from his leadership and example.

I join his many colleagues in wishing for him every future success and much happiness.

Fitchburg Celebrates 200th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, February 3 of this year marked the 200th anniversary of the incorporation as a town of the thriving city of Fitchburg, Mass., in my district. It was my great privilege and honor on that date to introduce in the Congress House Resolution 620 to mark this outstanding event by extending congratulations of the House to the people of this historic Massachusetts community.

Actually, the history of Fitchburg goes farther back in time than the 200 years of progress which are being elaborately celebrated throughout this year with such outstanding events as civic parades, concerts, balls, historical pageants, and other patriotic events.

Fitchburg's story of progress and achievement actually began in the early 1700's when the community was known as the "westerly part of Lunenburg" after the Duke of Lunenburg, one of the many titles of George II.

Courageous bands of early settlers including John Fitch, of Billerica, after whom the city is named, helped to carve out from the wilderness the early beginnings of the Fitchburg settlement. These brave settlers helped to establish a civilization, a tradition, a way of life, and a history which live to this very day in the heritage which is so fortunately ours.

These early Fitchburg pioneers helped to establish for all America the basic institutions of democratic government. They helped to forge a record of magnificent achievement that lives to this day.

In observing its 200th anniversary, Fitchburg pays a justly deserved tribute to these early settlers whose struggles and bitter sacrifices have made possible for our posterity the remarkable legacy of accomplishment which has made our great Nation what is it today.

There were less than 200 people in the area when the petition setting up the separate township of Fitchburg was granted by the General Court of the Commonwealth on February 3, 1764.

On April 19, 1775, the alarm from Lexington reached the little Fitchburg settlement and the first company of minutemen numbering 42 rallied to the cry for aid from the embattled farmers at Concord. Earlier, Fitchburg had made known its willingness to fight British oppression in this brave reply to Boston after the Boston Tea Party:

> We are fully persuaded that liberty is a most precious gift of God and no person or community can justly part with it.

The Fitchburg of today embodies these same pioneer qualities of outstanding leadership, patriotism, and devotion to basic values and fundamental institutions.

Fitchburg, which became a city in 1872, is now a thriving, bustling community of about 45,000 population. There are some 107 diversified industries employing more than 11,000 workers with an annual payroll over $39 million.

While the basic economy of Fitchburg has centered for more than a century around paper, machinery, tools and textiles, the skilled workers in its many, small diversified plants now turn out every possible kind of product from potato chips to plastics.

In addition, Fitchburg is an important trading area for some 175,000 people in northern Worcester County with its attractive downtown shopping district which does an estimated $75 million retail business annually.

Among Fitchburg's large employers are the Fitchburg division of General Electric, the Simonds Saw & Steel Co., the Crocker Burbank & Co. Association subsidiary of the Weyerhaeuser Co., the Independent Lock Co., and the Fitchburg Paper Co.

One of the city's oldest concerns is the Parks-Cramer Co., which pioneered in the development of controlling humidity, temperature and atmospheric conditions for industry.

Papermaking is perhaps Fitchburg's biggest single industry and Fitchburg ranks among the important paper cities of the Nation. Many specialized types of paper are made in Fitchburg including technical papers, saturation papers, map papers and industrial papers. The paper used for the ration stamps of World War II was made in Fitchburg.

Turbines made in Fitchburg by the General Electric Co. go all over the world to such foreign markets as Japan, Sweden and Norway. Our merchant marine and Navy look to Fitchburg for GE's turbines and turbine generators.

Another old Fitchburg industry is the Simonds Saw & Steel Co., founded in 1832. It is one of the oldest companies in the Nation manufacturing cutting tools for the woodworking, metalworking, pulp and paper, plastics and printing industries. The first windowless plant in the world was built by Simonds in 1929.

The famed Fitchburg Yarn Co. was the first mill in the world to produce spun rayon.

While paper, machinery, tools and textiles are Fitchburg's basic products, much diversification of industry has taken place in recent years. The Fitchburg business and industrial picture remains bright and the future holds great promise for the city's continued growth and progress.

In observance of its 200th anniversary, Fitchburg is holding an elaborate program of events. Among the highlights was a historical pageant in June with a large local cast to depict the growth and development of the city from the time of its early settlement to the present century.

A huge parade later this month is among the many features of Fitchburg's year-long celebration. With participating units from the Army, Navy, and Air Force, the parade will be one of the largest ever to be conducted in the central Massachusetts area.

At the request of my good friend, Bernard J. Molaghan, a member of the bicentennial parade committee, I was privileged to extend invitations to the Fitchburg celebration to the armed services and it has been gratifying indeed to obtain such splendid cooperation from the various branches of the service.

Maj. Gen. B. F. Evans, Jr., commanding general at Fort Devens, is assigning two honor guard platoons from the U.S. Army Security Agency Training Center and the 18th U.S. Army Band to take part in the parade. Col. John W. Carroll, former commander, Headquarters, 814th Combat Support Group—SAC—Westover Air Force Base, has arranged for the participation of Westover Air Force Base units for the parade. Hanscom Field, through the help of Col. Grover C. Wilcox, Jr., former base commander, will be represented by a four-man color guard.

In addition, earlier this year Capt. P. J. Smenton, acting commander, 1st Coast Guard District, gave assurances of Coast Guard participation, and Rear Adm. W. B. Sieglaff, commandant of the 1st Naval District, made available the U.S. Naval Base Boston Band.

Through the cooperation of Maj. P. C. Walker of the U.S. Marine Corps Reserve unit at Worcester, the U.S. Marine Corps will be represented in the parade by the 1st Communications Company.

Fitchburg, after 200 years, looks to the future with vibrant confidence born of its illustrious heritage and past successes, inspired by an able and vigorous leadership and sustained by a loyal and devoted people.

Mr. Speaker, I was privileged to introduce on February 3 the special resolution bringing attention to the 200th anniversary of Fitchburg and extending the congratulations of the House of Representatives to the people of this fine community. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the text of my resolution and the text of my telegram of felicitations to Fitchburg on February 3, 1964, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

H. RES. 620

Whereas the year 1964 marks the two hundredth anniversary of the incorporation of the city of Fitchburg, Massachusetts, as a town on February 3, 1764; and

Whereas from the time of its settlement about 1730 the people of Fitchburg have figured conspicuously in the founding, growth, and defense of this Nation; and

Whereas the observance of the two hundredth anniversary of Fitchburg will be celebrated with impressive community ceremonies, large public gatherings, and widespread participation of Massachusetts citizens and visitors from other States and places; and

Whereas Fitchburg is a beautiful community, rich in historic interest, well known for its patriotic contributions, noted for its many famous sons and daughters who distinguished themselves in many fields of endeavor and many facets of American civilization: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives extends its greetings and felicitations to the people of Fitchburg, Massachusetts, on the occasion of the two hundredth anniversary of this community and the House of Representatives further expresses its appreciation for the splendid services rendered to the Nation by the citizens of Fitchburg during the past two hundred years.

FEBRUARY 3, 1964.

Hon. GEORGE J. BOURQUE,
Mayor, City Hall, Fitchburg, Mass.:

Hail and salute to the great city of Fitchburg upon its 200th anniversary. I could not possibly enumerate the many outstanding, glorious accomplishments of your beautiful city and its citizens throughout the years. Its brilliant leadership in civic and political affairs, in industry and in business, as well as in the lofty realm of patriotic, cultural, and spiritual endeavors could not possibly be excelled. The steadfastness, loyalty, and devotion of your people of every group, class, and station is a gleaming inspiration and a forecast of your continued greatness in the future. Heartiest congratulations and many happy returns. I am gratified and very proud indeed as your Congressman and friend on this extraordinary and meaningful anniversary to send all the citizens and residents of Fitchburg my very best wishes for ever-increasing success, noteworthy advancement, and God-given happiness in the years to come.

Regards all.

Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN.

Tribute to Congressman Eugene Siler

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, GENE SILER'S service here in the House of Representatives was marked by strict honesty, integrity, and devotion to the principles of the Founding Fathers. GENE SILER is a great orator and uses this talent throughout the Nation for good. I know of no Baptist layman in America who spends more of his time and his great talents in the cause of the church.

EUGENE SILER is devoted to the private enterprise system. He believes that the best way to employ people, and create taxable revenue, is through business expansion, employment, jobs, and security through the capitalistic system and the profit motive. I have heard GENE say that if a businessman is losing money, he cannot meet payrolls and cannot employ more people. GENE SILER believes the great free enterprise system is what is needed in the undeveloped nations of the world.

GENE SILER is a young man and will continue to serve his community, State, and Nation. While we will miss him here, his great and wonderful people in Kentucky will continue to benefit from his dynamic energy and dedication to Americanism.

Mrs. Dorn joins me in wishing for him and his lovely wife the best always.

Congressman James C. Cleveland Evaluates the 88th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES C. CLEVELAND

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, in the closing days of the 88th Congress, I have read with much interest the numerous reviews and evaluations by many of my colleagues of this session's accomplishments. It appears to me that their practice of evaluating the work of Congress upon its conclusion, rendering an account of their stewardship, and having these printed at their own expense and mailed to their constituents, is commendable. To supplement the biweekly reports that I have sent to my own district for the past 2 years, I have decided to adopt this practice.

A review of the 88th Congress, in which it has been my great good fortune to have represented the Second Congressional District of New Hampshire, is to recall great and historic events. The year 1963, particularly, is one that history shall claim for all time. It was a year of sorrow, but hope.

1963—YEAR OF SORROW

The milestones of that year's sorrows were many. In New Hampshire, the tragedy of the *Thresher* was a grim reminder of the cold war. All Christians and the entire world mourned the passing of Pope John XXIII whose efforts on behalf of Christian unity, as a meaningful foundation for peace, brightened the prospects of humanity. But, perhaps the sorrows of 1963 can best be recaptured by recalling the anguish of three widows, Jacqueline Kennedy, Mrs. Medgar Evers, and Madam Nu. The unfortunate events that made these ladies widows are too well known to recount in detail, but certainly, in varying degrees, they symbolize the year and the era. For 1963 was the year when racial discord erupted in the United States. It was the year when the grim cold war between communism and democracy flared into the dirty, hot war in Vietnam. But above all, it was the year marked by the determined efforts of men of good will to bring about peace and understanding, not only at home, but throughout the world.

SEEDS OF HOPE

So if 1963, the first year of the 88th Congress, was marked by sorrow, it was also a year in which were sown the seeds of hope. Of the many complex issues that face us today—at home and abroad—certainly the central issue and the all-pervading one, is the issue of war and peace. All thoughtful Americans share an abiding aspiration for effective and realistic steps toward peace and a meaningful reduction of world tensions. In Milford, N.H., in a Memorial Day address delivered in May 1963, I expressed my own convictions this way:

> We must not let our aspirations for peace be interpreted, as they have in the past, as weakness. Nor can we permit firmness to

develop into unbridled belligerency. Theodore Roosevelt expressed this well. "We should speak softly and carry a big stick." If we are to preserve peace, we must maintain a posture of unquestionable strength and firmness. History shows clearly that weakness and indecision invite attack and lead to war. On the other hand, we must strongly support the U.N. in spite of inadequacies. We must strive for a workable test ban treaty and have an Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

SUPPORT OF THE UNITED NATIONS

Since that speech, I have continued my support of the United Nations by both speeches and votes on the floor of the House. I also voted to continue the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. Although as a Congressman I did not have an opportunity to vote on the nuclear test ban treaty, I felt the matter to be of such importance that in one of my biweekly Washington Reports, I specifically stated that had I been given the opportunity to do so, I would have voted for the treaty.

In speaking of steps toward peace and hope in the first year of the 88th Congress, I would like to emphasize the word "seeds." In New Hampshire, we know well that seeds, when sown, do not spring into full flower immediately and that they do not bear fruit without thought, patience, and a great deal of hard work. It is immensely important that we remember this and do not fall prey to wishful thinking that the struggle for peace has been won. Nor should we forget that peace is the ultimate reward bestowed only on those who fully appreciate it and who in all ways are prepared to sacrifice to preserve it.

In a speech which I made on the floor of the House on United Nations Day last year, in which I pledged my support of the U.N., I made a point which should be repeated here. The U.N., being an organization of men, can hardly be expected to be perfect. Some criticism of that body comes from people who expect too much of it, just as some people expect too much of their schools or their churches, or even their legislative bodies. After all, we are all human. Secretary of State Dean Rusk wrote me a warm letter of appreciation in response to my speech. He expressed his wholehearted agreement with my observations that the U.N. is a proven step toward the sensible solution of the great problems of war and peace. Improvements in that organization are needed, however, and certainly its costs should be fairly shared.

CONSTRUCTIVE CRITICISM—NOT OBSTRUCTION

There is a disturbing tendency today to confuse constructive criticism with obstructionism. This point is worth repeating now, because so often the tendency to confuse constructive criticism with obstructionism defeats the purposes of democracy, which is, after all, based on a free exchange of ideas and honest debate. With emotionally charged issues, such as war and peace, or civil rights, or poverty, or foreign aid, this tendency often results in total cleavage. Too frequently, if one does not embrace each and every suggestion of those who have preempted some special area of endeavor, one is considered to be against the proponents and, of course, against the noble principles for which they stand. As I pointed out just the other day here in the House, in commenting on the excessive misrepresentations being resorted to in the present presidential campaign, an important issue today is whether or not we as a nation are maintaining the integrity of our decision-making techniques.

88TH CONGRESS HAS ESTABLISHED A CONSTRUCTIVE RECORD

As one who prefers to accentuate the positive, I have noted with understandable pride and pleasure the near unanimity of opinion to the effect that the 88th Congress has compiled a commendable record of accomplishment. To be candid, I must confess that some of the measures which we have passed that my colleagues have pointed to with pride, are ones that I have voted against. Examples of such measures are the wheat-cotton bill, the food stamp bill, mass transit, the poverty bill, the Area Redevelopment Agency, acccelerated public works, and I am on record, in committee, as having opposed Appalachia. I opposed these measures because they did not conform to my standards of budgetary restraint and because of potential waste, excessive duplication, and general inadequacy. When I voted for the tax cut but against increases in the national debt, and against congressional pay increases, I did so with the thought that fiscal restraint would have to be rigidly adhered to by the Federal Government in order to avoid the ravages of inflation. For this reason, it is interesting to me to note that Appalachia, the Area Redevelopment Agency, and accelerated public works have not been brought to the House for final action. In my opinion, this is tacit admission that these proposals were seriously lacking in merit. But as I have stated, the 88th Congress has established a constructive record and most of its finest accomplishments enjoyed broad bipartisan backing and received my own active and energetic support.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

The accomplishments of the 88th Congress in foreign affairs and in a meaningful reduction in world tensions have unfortunately been tarnished by the administration's failure to maintain a truly bipartisan foreign policy. In times of crisis, all Americans will rally behind their administration, as indeed Congress did at the height of the Cuban missile crisis, and again by unanimous vote when this House placed its stamp of approval last August 7 on the administration's actions in the Gulf of Tonkin.

But the Republican leadership is not being fully consulted on important matters, and our foreign affairs are in regrettable disarray. Following administration insistence last December that wheat sales to Russia could be financed by tax-supported dollars through the Export-Import Bank, the divisions among our allies became painfully obvious. These ordinarily friendly countries stepped up their trade with Cuba and other Communist nations. France went even further along its own path. The situation in South Vietnam continued to deteriorate, and throughout the world, Communist-inspired trouble spots flared anew.

Against such a background, to have the Secretary of State appear before the platform committee of the Democratic National Convention for the first time in history emphasizes anew the need for reestablishing a bipartisan approach to foreign affairs.

For my own part, I have fully supported the foreign aid programs of this administration after sensible reductions in budgetary requests were made. More remains to be done. In my opinion, there is presently an overemphasis on economic aid as compared with technical assistance, educational assistance, Peace Corps programs, and other people-to-people and privately financed programs. I think economic aid should be confined to situations where there is a real need that otherwise cannot be met and where there is a fair chance of encouraging local initiative. Economic aid poured in at the top too often stays at the top, fails to attain its intended goal, and only serves to enrich already wealthy and undemocratic ruling classes.

FOREIGN TRADE—GOOD OR BAD?

Closely related to our conduct of foreign affairs is the matter of foreign trade. Generally speaking, I am in favor of a national policy which will foster and increase healthy and fairly competitive foreign trade. If this is properly done, it will strengthen our economy, strengthen our foreign policy, and further reduce world tension. This laudable objective, however, cannot be accomplished at breakneck speed or by sacrificing entire domestic industries on such an altar.

As I have stated many times on the floor of this House, our tariff structure should be reformed to reflect wage differentials between the various foreign nations with whom we compete and trade. If this is not done, it will serve only to place our own industry at an unfair disadvantage and it will retard the advance of wages in countries with whom we trade. Also, our tariff structure should be reformed to reflect and take into account, subsidies—direct or indirect—given by foreign governments to their industries who export to the United States.

My experience with the problem of foreign imports has also led me to believe that the Department of State is not adequately situated or equipped to deal with this problem, and that primary responsibility for it might well be placed in the Department of Commerce or another Government agency.

IMPACT OF IMPORTS ON NEW HAMPSHIRE SOBERING

The impact of foreign imports on my own congressional district is sobering. The shoe industry, the electronics industry, and the ball-bearing industry are among examples of those businesses which are faced with an accelerating flood of foreign imports that has far exceeded expectations or the reasonable requirements of expanding foreign trade.

Even worse is the plight of the wool manufacturer. More than 30 plants in the United States have been closed in the last 2 years, with 6,000 jobs down the drain in spite of the almost unbelievable fact that this administration solemnly promised quantitative restrictions on wool imports more than 3 years ago. This same promise was made to the powerful cotton interests and was kept, with the passage of the wheat-cotton bill, giving the cotton textile industry a subsidy in excess of $200 million a year. The fact that the promise to the wool manufacturers has not been kept—presumably because of their political impotence—has been a distressing revelation to me and raises the fundamental question as to whether or not people can believe in and trust their own Government. Just a few weeks ago the closing of a J. P. Stevens mill in Lisbon Falls, Maine, the second wool mill closing in that town this year, etched with tragic and shattering impact the enormity of this bad faith. I am encouraged, though hesitantly so, by the fact that this administration just recently repeated its promise to the wool industry, and I can only hope that this time the promise will be kept before more factories close.

CIVIL RIGHTS

The most significant bill enacted by both branches of the 88th Congress was the civil rights bill. Having introduced meaningful civil rights legislation myself prior to the introduction by the administration of its civil rights bill, and having done so with the hope that this matter could be handled on a bipartisan manner, it has been disappointing to me to find the laudable objectives of this legislation enmeshed in politics. The legislation which we finally enacted, however, is meaningful and should be given a full opportunity to be tested. It is unfortunate that many people in this country labor under the illusion that the mere passage of a law will settle complex problems. The civil rights problem eventually will have to be solved in the minds and hearts of men. But, hopefully, the enactment of this legislation will remove the problem from the streets and place it in the courts. Impressive progress will be made by voluntary compliance with the new law if the role of the demagog can also be diminished. If the American tradition of fairplay and tolerance can be allowed full rein, then there is hope this this important legislation will be a successful milestone in mankind's long struggle for freedom and equality of opportunity.

TAX CUT

Congress passed in 1964 an $11.5 billion tax cut which I supported after the administration agreed to a Republican recommendation that a reduction be made in the Federal budget first before the tax cut would go into effect.

As a Republican, I favor tax cuts. Historically, the Republican Party has believed that high taxes stifle our Nation's economic growth. Since the turn of the century major tax cuts have been made 8 times in 34 years of Republican administrations compared with only 3 times in 30 years of Democratic administrations.

But, as a Republican I also feel a tax cut should be coupled with budgetary restraint, because otherwise continued high Federal spending with reduced tax revenue means greater inflationary deficits. When the administration brought out the tax cut for House action, it refused to adopt the Republican proposal that the tax cut be coupled with a budget request limited to $98 billion or less for the following year. In the face of the administration's unwillingness to balance a tax cut with a needed cut in Federal spending, I voted against the tax cut bill in September 1963. Thereafter, the forces of economy in the House and Senate trimmed more than $6 billion off last year's budget before we adjourned Christmas eve. Then last January the administration did an about-face. They acceded to the Republican economy proposal and offered a budgetary request this year of $97.9 billion. This broke the logjam in the Senate, and upon return of the tax cut bill to the House in improved form, I voted for it.

My constituents should be warned, however, that for some of them, the tax cut will prove to be illusory because withholding rates were lowered at a greater rate than the actual tax cut for 1964. This means that next April, some taxpayers who rely upon the withholding system to pay their taxes will have to pay an additional tax.

ADDITIONAL TAX CUT VOTES

As one who believes in tax cuts and tax reforms as the only sensible ways to stimulate the private sector of the economy and to create more jobs, I would also like to point out that I voted in 1963 and also again in 1964 against a renewal of wartime excise taxes which the administration successfully insisted on retaining at the expense of the American consumer. Imposed upon us during World War II and the Korean war and never repealed since, these so-called luxury taxes represent for consumers a discriminatory charge against many items such as airplane travel, telephone service, and even ladies' handbags—hardly a luxury to women.

I sponsored legislation to permit tax deductions for hardpressed parents sending their children to college, and was keenly disappointed that this proposal was killed in the Senate, the killing votes being cast by Senators of the majority party who had themselves sponsored and introduced such legislation. Other bills introduced by me would have reformed our tax structure by depreciating property more equitably and reasonably, taxing more fairly shares in mutual funds, and providing tax reserve deductions for recreational enterprises subject to losses from inclement weather.

In considering the tax record of the 88th Congress, it should be remembered that in addition to the Republican record during the last 64 years of cutting taxes eight times as compared to only three times under the Democrats, Republicans have raised taxes only twice compared to 13 raises in taxes under Democrats. During this same time Republicans have balanced the budget 22 times; the Democrats only 3 times.

EDUCATION

Education benefited by several important new assists from Congress, all of which I strongly supported. Colleges were made eligible to receive construction grants and loans for classrooms, labs, and other academic facilities under the 3-year, $1.2 billion Higher Education Facilities Act. This measure was of critical importance since college attendance is jumping an estimated 94 percent between 1960 and 1970. While the program provides needed funds to colleges, the act wisely requires that schools themselves undertake a share of the costs of new construction. The Federal Government thus provides an incentive for educational expansion without taking over local responsibility.

Seeking to meet the acute needs for new job skills in this fast changing technological age, Congress enacted an additional $958 million Vocational Training Act providing an improved and expanded program of vocational training in high schools across the country. And new amendments to the Manpower Training and Development Act will provide important job training to jobless youths and workers needing new skills. Passage of this legislation was vital to help meet the problems of job obsolescence and technological unemployment created by automation.

HEALTH EDUCATION

The Health Professions Assistance Act provides $175 million in matching grants over a 3-year period for the construction or improvement of medical, dental, and related schools. A loan program of $30.7 million is provided to assist medical and dental students in completing their education. Since the United States is not graduating nearly enough doctors, dentists, and medical personnel to meet the needs of its growing population, this legislation is necessary to help our Nation maintain high standards of medical care in the years ahead. Unfortunately, the legislation did not include a proposed plan of partial forgiveness of student loans to doctors and dentists who agree to practice in rural areas—where the need for medical personnel is greatest. Senator COTTON and I later introduced this plan as a separate bill and although it passed the Senate, it was narrowly defeated in the House.

The Nurse Training Act provides grants for the improvement and expansion of nursing schools and establishes traineeships and student loan funds for nursing students. This program was designed to combat a severe shortage of nurses both at the present time and in the years ahead.

EDUCATION—KEY TO ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Additional student loan funds were authorized in legislation to extend and expand the National Defense Education Act which also increased funds for science, mathematics, and foreign language training programs, and for school counseling services. New summer training programs were provided for teachers of English and social science.

Local school aid was continued to areas having high Federal employment. New and expanded aid was given for the improvement and construction of libraries.

My support of these programs in education is based on a deep-seated conviction that in this fast changing world we cannot afford to allow our progress to be impeded by lack of learning and skilled personnel. These programs will help in the battle against unemployment and assist the meaningful economic development of our country.

SOCIAL SECURITY

Social security benefits were raised 5 percent and extended to cover more people by the House of Representatives—only to be killed by the Senate which under administration pressure insisted on tying medicare to social security. Millions of older persons were thus denied the needed and promised increases in social security necessary to compensate for the drop in value of pensions over the last 5 years caused by inflationary rises in the cost of living. The administration's adamant insistence on social security-financed medicare killed the social security bill, modest as it was. Thus we have the somewhat sorry spectacle of a Congress, which voted itself a fat pay increase, refusing to recognize the needs of older citizens. Older people have been repeatedly told by all responsible leaders here in Washington that social security benefits would be increased. This is another broken promise. It raises anew what I consider to be a basic issue of today—can people trust in and believe their own Government.

MEDICARE

If partial hospital care financed through social security is ever adopted, coverage and benefits will be rapidly expanded at least every 2 years. Personally, I think that the Kerr-Mills bill, which I have supported, is a better solution to the problem, as it is based on Federal-State partnership and limits its benefits to those who need them. One possible compromise is to increase social security benefits to permit the purchase of special insurance which would be handled by private insurance companies under suitable Government sponsorship. Another possible solution would be to allow tax deductions for the purchase of old age medical and hospital insurance. As people live longer and as medical expenses increase, the one thing that everybody agrees on is that the general problem is one that must be met. To me, it is unfortunate, however, that there isn't more emphasis being placed on the good news that people are living longer thanks to the marvelous achievements of science and the medical professions.

CONSERVATION AND RECREATION

Significant advances were made by Congress in the field of conservation. Our fast-growing population and commercial development threaten the preservation of our natural resources and create new demands for recreational areas. Under the wilderness bill, 9 million acres of mountains, forests, and streams will be forever protected in a natural and undisturbed state as in the days when the Indian roamed this continent. With the approval of Congress, additional acres can be added to the system during the next 10 years. In New Hampshire, we are fortunate to have included in the wilderness system the only area in the Northeast—the 5,400-acre Great Gulf wild area in the White Mountains.

Designed to insure the acquisition of needed land for recreation at a time when available land is fast disappearing, the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act establishes a systematic means of financing State and Federal land purchases for new parks. The proceeds from motorboat fuel taxes, Federal park and recreation area admission fees, and sales of surplus Federal land will be collected into a land acquisition fund that will be partly distributed to States in the form of matching funds and partly made available to the Federal Government. New Hampshire, because of its large number of out-of-State visitors, will particularly benefit from these funds.

Legislation was also passed establishing water resource centers at our State universities, and several new Federal park areas were authorized. My bill to make Sculptor Augustus Saint-Gaudens' home in Cornish, N.H., a national historic site, the first in New Hampshire, was enacted into law.

The record of the 88th Congress for conservation is so good that many persons have called this the "Conservation Congress."

As Secretary of Interior Stewart Udall expressed it in a personal note to me last September:

> Glad to note your strong interest in, and support for, conservation. Thanks to people like you it's been a great year for the out of doors.

HOUSING

The Congress passed a housing bill, with my support, which extended for 1 year FHA, urban renewal, public housing, and other similar programs.

The Federal Housing Administration was given authority to insure one-family homes up to $30,000 instead of the current $25,000. The legislation also provided for construction of special housing for the elderly, funds for urban planning grants, and open-space grants for parks and recreational facilities within urban areas.

Urban renewal has often in the past involved the complete destruction of whole areas in our cities without a discriminate attempt to preserve and restore salvageable buildings. Thus, I was particularly pleased to see included in the bill a Republican proposal for low-interest loans to property owners in urban renewal areas to help these owners rehabilitate their property and thereby avoid costly and wasteful total demolition and reconstruction.

VETERAN'S LEGISLATION

Americans have long believed that the men who have defended this country in wartime deserve the protection of pension programs if they are in financial need. Congress enacted legislation to increase and liberalize the non-service-connected pension program for veterans because so many veterans and their widows are caught in the tragic squeeze between rising costs and static income. The new pension law, in addition to raising pensions for low-income veterans and their widows, allows new exclusions from income in determining pension eligibility. For example, it provides that a veteran or his widow may exclude as income, 10 percent of the total social security payments received in a year. All of the wife's earned income can be excluded, instead of only the first $1,200 of her income. It increases the additional allowance for aid and attendance cases from $70 to $100 a month, and also provides an increase of $35 a month to any veteran who is permanently disabled. A limited 1-year reopening of national service life insurance is permitted. This legislation largely included the same language of two bills I had introduced on veterans' pensions and national service life insurance.

A new veterans' nursing care bill passed by Congress provides for at least 4,000 nursing care beds in Veterans' Administration hospitals, private nursing care for veterans who have exhausted their hospital benefits, and matching grants for the construction of nursing care facilities in State old soldiers' homes.

WILLEY BILL PASSED

Congress enacted a legislative proposal of mine to correct an inequity in the granting of pensions to Congressional Medal of Honor winners. My bill, which was enacted into law at the last minute, permits veterans who won the Congressional Medal of Honor at a time when their country was not engaged in a declared war, to receive the monthly pension received by all other holders of our Nation's highest honor. My particular interest in this bill arose from the case of Charles H. Willey, of Penacook, who received his Congressional Medal of Honor for heroism during the Santo Domingo Insurrection. Only 17 people are similarly situated. Of interest to New Hampshire is the fact that several of them received their medals for bravery during the *Squalus* rescue operation off the Isle of Shoals near Portsmouth, N.H.

CONGRESSIONAL PAY RAISE

The $556.8 million Federal pay raise included a hike in congressional salaries of $7,500 and also large boosts in salaries to top officials, but it provided only small increases for lower paid Government employees. Although these raises were defensible, I could not in good conscience support such an inflationary increase in the cost of the Federal Government at a time when labor and business were being asked to hold the line on wages and prices, when the budget was unbalanced, and when the threat of inflation was haunting the Nation's economy. When I voted for the tax cut, I did so with the pledge that I would vote against all costly programs unless absolutely necessary.

EQUAL PAY FOR WOMEN

Significant and long overdue legislation was enacted by Congress to grant women employees equal rights with men. The Equal Pay Act amends the Fair Labor Standards Act to require that employers engaged in interstate commerce grant equal pay "for equal work on jobs the performance of which requires equal effort and responsibility, and which are performed under similar working conditions." In other words, it requires that no employee can be paid a wage rate less than that given to another doing the same work because of his or her sex.

HEALTH

Mental illness and retardation is our Nation's greatest health problem. Congress enacted legislation authorizing grants to aid in the construction of facilities for research and treatment of the mentally ill and retarded, to help construct community health centers, and to train teachers for mentally retarded and handicapped children.

To meet the general shortage of hospital space, the Hill-Burton program of hospital construction aid was extended and improved.

FINE ARTS

A National Council on the Arts was established by Congress which wisely recognized that the problems and needs of maintaining the arts in our country should be studied. Consisting of a Chairman and 24 members appointed by the President, the Council will make recommendations on how the United States can strengthen and support its vital resource, the arts. The John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts in Washington, D.C., was approved, and I was happy to vote for it because it will beneficially enhance the cultural prestige of our Nation's Capital. Successful enactment of my bill establishing Augustus Saint-Gaudens' home, near Cornish, N.H., as a national historic site gave a fitting tribute to one of America's greatest sculptors. Students of art and the general public are now assured of always having the opportunity of visiting and studying the home and studios of Saint-Gaudens with their notable collection of his sculpture.

ATTENDANCE

The two sessions of the 88th Congress were among the longest in our history. Of 256 rollcalls in our first session, I missed but one. This year, however, largely as a result of being in New Hampshire to vote in the presidential primary, I missed 6 of the 272 rollcalls.

BIPARTISAN SUPPORT

I received one of the highest Republican scores last year in either House or Senate for bipartisan support of legislation before the U.S. Congress according to the Congressional Quarterly. My score of 95 percent was equaled by only three other Republican Representatives. The study of bipartisan voting by the noted independent research journal was designed to reveal how often a majority of voting Democrats agreed with a majority of voting Republicans. The study was based on 61 rollcall votes of the House on which a majority of both parties agreed. Republicans and Democrats each voted with bipartisan majorities an average of 71 percent of the time.

Legislation which is good for the country receives support from both Republicans and Democrats. I am pleased to be recognized for having supported such measures last year. This has not kept me from constructively and vigorously opposing bad legislation which I will continue to do.

CONGRESSIONAL REFORM

Congressional reform has been a principal interest of mine. Unfortunately the majority leadership has been unwilling to push for any real reforms in the legislative process. Congress is in danger of losing touch with the American people it represents. One reform would be the speeded-up scheduling of bills for congressional consideration to allow Members of Congress to finish up their business in Washington earlier in the year and to have time to return to their districts to consult and keep in touch with citizens. Another needed reform would be the increasing of minority staffing on House and Senate committees.

MINORITY STAFFING

One of the major problems of effective government that I have been concerned with is the lack of staff assistance available to the minority party in Congress. The committee work of Congress requires legislative staff research to help legislators to gather information and to study and prepare legislation. Staff members appointed by the majority party, however, outnumber minority staff members in the House 10 to 1 although the actual party division of Congressmen is 3 to 2. Some committees have no staff members responsible to the minority. The minority party is, therefore, handicapped in analyzing legislation proposed by the majority and in drafting appropriate alternative legislation. Such a condition seriously weakens our two-party system.

I was appointed to a special Republican conference committee on minority staffing to study this problem and to work for an improvement of the situation.

Last spring I wrote an article for the George Washington Law Review on the question of minority staffing and in my discussion of staffing abuses, I mentioned abuses on the House Public Works Committee, which focused national attention on this vital issue.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT RESEARCH

Science has received high priority from Congress. Our Nation continued its exploration of space with the Ranger probes of the moon which provided valuable information for an eventual manned flight to the moon. More than $15 billion a year in Federal funds are being spent on scientific research and development. To evaluate our Nation's Government-supported science program, the House of Representatives established a Select Committee on Government Research. I was one of nine Congressmen selected to serve on this important committee. We have held hearings, made investigations, and issued several preliminary reports recommending basic changes in the Federal Government's handling of scientific research and development. Serving under Congressman CARL ELLIOTT, the distinguished "father of the National Defense Education Act," has been a great experience for a junior Congressman. It is a matter of regret that he will not return next year. I am proud of a recent letter from Congressman ELLIOTT in which he thanked me for expressing this thought and concluded by saying to me:

> I go with the firm conviction that as long as Americans elect to Congress men like you, our basic institutions will be safe and our system will continue sound.

ACCELERATED PUBLIC WORKS

When the administration got Congress to approve the accelerated public works program in 1962, this program was held out as a means of reducing unemployment, with a special appeal to areas of high unemployment and to communities which wanted Federal help in constructing local projects. In 1963 the administration successfully pushed through a $450 million increase in funds for accelerated public works despite the fact that the program had had no appreciable effect on reducing unemployment. Much of the limited employment the additional funds would create would be in trades, in which evidence indicated there was no shortage of work. There would be no lasting benefit to the unskilled and semiskilled workers who constituted the hard core of the unemployed.

POVERTY BILL

The poverty bill, so-called, was passed although the measure was opposed by those of us who felt that it oversimplified the problems of the poor and was a hastily conceived, politically motivated, and unsound means of fighting poverty. Having an initial cost of almost $1 billion, the poverty program will involve a variety of different activities. A "Job Corps" will establish urban training centers and conservation camps for 40,000 unemployed youth at a cost of $190 million for the first year. A "work-training" program, intended to permit young people to remain in school or to increase their employability, will provide jobs for enrollees at a first year cost of $150 million. These two programs for young people will at best largely duplicate provisions of the existing Manpower Development and Training Act and the Vocational Education Act, and at worst will offer useless and costly make-work that will not improve the employability of young people or their chances of future success.

Other features of the poverty program include a "work-study" plan costing $72.5 million which will give federally financed jobs to needy college students despite the fact that Federal loans are now available to college students under the National Defense Education Act. "Community-action" programs will subsidize public and private projects on the local level to attack poverty, but no standards or criteria are established for the plan and the Federal Government is given sweeping authority to approve or reject any project as it wishes. The remaining items of the poverty program grant forgivable loans to poor farmers, work experience for unemployed fathers, and employment and investment incentives for businesses hiring the hard-core unemployed. These items also either largely duplicate existing Federal programs or, in the case of farm and business loans, establish somewhat unrealistic conditions for the granting of Federal loans.

Perhaps most objectionable about the legislation is that it almost totally bypasses the States in favor of setting up a new all-powerful Federal bureaucracy to run the program. A Republican-sponsored alternative program enlisting joint Federal-State cooperation to fight poverty, which I supported, was defeated. At a time when the Federal Government is spending $32 billion and all levels of government plus private groups are spending $100 billion to prevent and alleviate poverty, it seems unwise to add a new bureaucratic layer to the Federal Government authorized to spend even more money. A coordination and modification of existing Government programs would appear more sensible and effective. After this program was adopted, however, I felt this new legislation should at least be given a fair chance and voted for funds to finance it. Although such a vote could be construed as a vote for the poverty bill, I wish to make my position against the poverty bill quite clear.

APPALACHIA

The administration succeeded in getting its billion-dollar-plus Appalachian regional development bill through the Senate. However, in the House the majority leadership did not even bring the bill to the floor of the House for a vote because of its shortcomings. The proposal is designed to develop the Appalachian area in 11 States. As a member of the House Public Works Committee the House Public Works Committee which considered the bill, I opposed the measure because it would provide preferential treatment for one region of the United States and thereby discriminate against all other areas of the Nation which have equal or greater unemployment and lack of economic development. The bill fails to set standards and lacks justification for all of the named counties, many of which are economically prosperous, to receive Federal grants under the program. The Federal Government has veto power over all phases of the program and consequently can bypass almost entirely State and local agencies. The $840 million highway program, almost 85 percent of the proposed expenditure under the bill, is particularly discriminatory against other portions of the country in authorizing an additional highway program for the Appalachian region almost as large as the entire annual program for Federal-aid highway construction. My chief objection to the Appalachian proposal is the vast sums of money that will be diverted to that area for highways when parts of my district are sorely in need of better roads.

AREA REDEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION

As is the case with most proposals, there is, of course, some merit in the Area Redevelopment Administration. My decision to vote against it was based on evidence of waste and inefficiency, since supported by highly critical reports by the Comptroller General. The fact that the Area Redevelopment Administration funds have built shoeshops, tissue mills, pulpmills, and plywood plants in the West that compete with hard-pressed New Hampshire industries, reinforces my opposition. The fact the administration did not bring this measure to the floor of the House for a vote again after its first defeat apparently supports the prevailing belief that the proposal, as now drafted, is seriously lacking in merit.

DEFICITS AND UNBALANCED BUDGETS

In 27 of the past 33 years we have had Federal deficits. We have had a deficit each year during this administration as the Federal Government has spent an average of $14 million a day more than it has collected in revenue. The current budget plans a $4.9 billion deficit. Despite cutting of the President's budget by Congress, we still continue to operate in the red.

The national debt steadily rises and now amounts to an obligation of $5,042 on every family in the Nation with each family paying an average of $232 in yearly interest charges. Nonproductive interest on the national debt comes to $11 billion, the next largest single expense of the Federal Government after national defense.

Six times in the past 2 years the administration has had Congress raise the temporary debt limit from $285 billion on up to $324 billion. I opposed each of these moves, because I felt that some limit should compel the Federal Government to reduce spending and to live within its means—particularly during these times of relative prosperity. Continued deficits perilously weaken the dollar and undermine our strength in the world.

BILLS I INTRODUCED

During my first term in Congress I was fortunate to have six of my legislative proposals enacted into law.

Successful legislation enacted into law included the establishment of the Saint-Gaudens home near Cornish, N.H., as a national historic site; the reinstatement of Walter Sowa, Jr., in the Naval Academy after the disappearance of a temporary hearing impairment; the creation of the Norwich, Vt.-Hanover, N.H., joint school district; the awarding of high military decorations to Armed Forces personnel engaged in armed conflict during peacetime such as in South Vietnam today; the granting of a pension to a small group of peacetime Medal of Honor winners now excluded from receiving the pension given to wartime winners of the Nation's highest decoration; and the granting of loans to optometry students.

The bill raising veterans' pensions which passed Congress incorporated most features of a measure I had introduced, providing for increased pensions and exclusion of various sources of income from counting against the pension. Also included in the final version of the veterans bill was a limited reopening of national service life insurance similar to a legislative measure I had earlier introduced.

COTTON-CLEVELAND BILL

The House turned down a bill that Senator COTTON and I had introduced to encourage doctors and dentists to practice in rural areas. Hopefully, this important and urgently needed bill will be passed in the next session of Congress.

Hearings were held on a number of other bills I introduced. These bills dealt with the right of States to apportion one house of their State legislatures on factors other than population; the right of attorneys to represent their clients before Federal agencies; a revision of U.S. immigration policies; and the right of prayers in school under certain conditions.

Other bills of mine which I hope will receive favorable action in the future include revisions of the income tax laws to permit parents to deduct the costs of sending their children on to higher education; establishment of a fairer, more efficient means of computing income tax depreciation; creation of a national cemetery for New England; the establishment of a Federal program of mica research; enlargement of the Federal share of highway funds to States having national forests; protection of the right of stations to broadcast paid-for opinion programs without incurring liability for providing equal free time for answering views; and creation of a special House committee to study the Federal lands of the United States and to determine whether it is possible to dispose of lands in some areas and to acquire lands in other areas.

NONLEGISLATIVE DUTIES

As my colleagues are aware, and indeed many of my constituents, some of the important functions that I have performed as a Congressman in the past 2 years have not directly involved legislative matters. Space does not permit me to recount them all. The rising flood of imports, particularly wool, the CAB's decree decapitating Northeast Airlines, residual oil quotas that raise New Hampshire heat and light bills, discriminatory feed grain shipment rate differentials, and the infamous Livermore Dam proposal, have been problems to which I have devoted considerable time and energy. Individual constituent problems in the thousands have also concerned me on a daily basis. The list of these problems is endless and reflects the complexities of our lives and the deep and ever-increasing and sometimes alarming intrusion of the Federal Government into almost every area of human endeavor. Whether this trend can be halted, I cannot say. But I am glad that I can say that there have been thousands of people whom I have been able to help with relative quickness and dispatch. Many may never need to ask their Congressman for assistance but all should realize that he is there and that this is one of his most important functions. The fact that a Congressman can cut through redtape and unravel the complexities of Government regulation so that Government serves people rather than enslaves them, is, in my opinion, one of the chief reasons why our representative Government still functions and has not yet perished from the earth.

It is for this reason that I view with extreme distaste and positive alarm proposals to establish a "grievance man"—in other words, another bureau—to investigate complaints about the work of bureaucrats. My experience with constituent problems and complaints has been that they furnish me with the raw material of the legislative process. These problem cases give me an indication as to the adequacy of present laws and constructive ideas for their improvement. To the greatest extent possible in spite of year-round sessions of Congress, I scheduled office hours in my district and twice circulated questionnaires to help bridge the dangerous and ever-widening gap between Washington's power centers and Main Street, U.S.A.

FUTURE AND PROBLEMS

Congress faces many yet unresolved problems with which it still has to come to grips. Solutions will take dedicated effort and integrity. Tax reform; the reduction of unnecessary Federal interference and competition with business, labor, and private organizations; and the encouraging of private and local initiative are key issues that Congress must face. A sound economy with a strong dollar can only be insured by a Federal Government that maintains a balanced budget.

Fiscal irresponsibility is Congress greatest shortcoming. Legislators have not been able to keep in check their desire to spend and spend for everything that looks politically appealing. Combined with an executive department following a similar philosophy of spending, sensible economy seems almost impossible. However, with rising prices and inflationary pressures, attention to this critical matter must be given.

Unemployment; education, vocational and technical training; improvement of health programs; and meaningful programs for the aged are problems that Congress has attacked but must continue to pursue vigorously. The effects of automation must be closely studied and dealt with to alleviate the human suffering caused by dislocation of workers having obsolete skills or no skills at all. Congress made a start on this problem by creating a Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress this year. Tariff reform and protection must be given to American industries being crippled by floods of foreign imports because we can ill afford the costly price of lost industries and more serious unemployment.

MORE TO DO

Although impressive progress has been made in conservation, more can be done to protect and preserve our land, water, and natural resources. Agricultural program reforms and a wider application of research and development are badly needed. Efforts must be increased to combat crime and to insure equality of opportunity.

Congress has an obligation to remind the President and his executive department that they must exert strong and effective leadership around the world. We cannot afford to discount communism's menace. A firm will to win the war in South Vietnam is needed; and in Communist Cuba where Soviet soldiers and arms still remain, greater economic pressures on Castro are called for by the United States.

Hard and dedicated work is needed to meet the challenge. The central issue of war and peace which has faced every generation of recorded time is etched in sharper focus now that man has Armageddon at his fingertips. The age-old scourge of poverty is presented in new dimensions as population increases outstrip our scientific and productive genius. The Negro's status in our country still torments the land. The Ecumenical Council in Rome freshens hope that those of us who believe in God can act together in His name. The tragic and senseless assassination of President Kennedy has raised the question of Presidential succession. Supreme Court decisions have resulted in great debate concerning the separation of church and state, the role of prayer in our public schools, and apportionment. Last year's longest peacetime session of Congress and its failure to investigate its own shortcomings have freshened interest in reform of this great deliberative body. Debate concerning tax cuts, the national deficit, inflation, the outflow of gold, subsidies, tariffs, unemployment, dropouts, rejects from the draft, crime, research and development, defense policies, care for the aged ring throughout the land.

DRAMATIC CHALLENGE

The conduct of our foreign policy, the United Nations, NATO, Cuba, South Vietnam, Berlin, Red China, and other trouble spots around the world will challenge us. The list of issues we face is longer, of course. Great events ebb and flow at home and abroad in ceaseless change and dramatic challenge.

A mere reciting of some of the complex and troublesome issues facing us, indicates how important it is to analyze political issues and problems. Such an analysis requires hard work, searching inquiry, a bit of skepticism and, above all, commonsense. As a country lawyer and a politician, I believe strongly in the two-party system. Just as in the courtroom, competition between two legal minds brings out the closest thing to fact and truth that is possible in situations involving complicated human problems and human relationships, so does competition between our two great political parties within the framework of our Constitution result in the best Government that imperfect men have yet devised to order their affairs. But the commonsense of an informed and participating citizenry must be reflected in our political parties.

It is the return of commonsense to the marketplace of politics that I consider to be the great hope for the future of representative government. A return of commonsense to politics is overdue.

To my constituents who have made my service in Washington possible, I am deeply grateful. I have done my best to use wisely the power which they have vested in me, and to be worthy of the trust. Thank you.

Hon. James C. Auchincloss

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. McCULLOCH
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, among those Members of this body who have announced that they would not return in 1965 was my good friend, JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS, of New Jersey. I am sorry, indeed, that he will not be with us, but JIM's able representation will long live in the House, for he has been a most dedicated, faithful, and conscientious legislator during his 22 years' of service. He will be missed by his many friends, but I am sure all of his friends join with me in wishing for JIM many years of happiness and good health.

James C. Auchincloss

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, one of the great men of Congress will retire in January. I speak of the distinguished Congressman from New Jersey, JAMES AUCHINCLOSS, known affectionately as JIM to his many Republican and Democratic friends. His presence in this Chamber over the past 22 years has added much to the stature and integrity of what it means to be called Congressman. His tireless and dedicated service as a Member of Congress has contributed much to the legislation passed by it.

A man of diverse interests, JIM was a soldier, businessman, stockbroker, deputy police commissioner, city councilman, and mayor before he entered the Congress in 1943. He was a member of the New York Stock Exchange and served on its board of directors for 18 years. Partially as a result of these past experiences, JIM was truly a representative of the people. He knew well what the practical applications of public law would mean to people in various walks of life.

We here in the Nation's Capital know JIM best for his service in Congress. In the Congress he has served on the Committee on Public Works, the Committee on the District of Columbia, and the House Office Building Commission. He served with distinction in all the positions which he held.

His efforts on behalf of the Republican Party was indeed commendable. During the Eisenhower administration, JIM was a frequent and welcomed guest of the White House. President Eisenhower avidly sought his wise counsel and advice on legislative matters and policy decisions. Other Presidents as well have sought his opinions.

In 1953–54 he served as an able chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Grounds of the Committee on Public Works. He has been the ranking minority member on the Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors of that committee. In the forties he was a member of the Subcommittee on Beach Erosion. He knows well the functions and responsibilities of the committee and its members.

Since 1959, JIM has been the ranking minority member on the full committee, and he has been a good one. When you consider that the ranking minority member must be accurately and thoroughly informed on such matters as highways, navigation improvements, flood control, beach erosion, water pollution, public buildings and grounds, watershed development, water supplies and public works acceleration, JIM's outstanding service is even more meaningful.

After I came to the Congress in January 1955, I soon learned of JIM's many abilities. To cite just a few examples of the legislation handled by the Committee on Public Works while he was the ranking minority member, there were the Federal Aid Highway Acts, the amendments to the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, the Rivers and Harbors and Flood Control Acts, the Public Works Acceleration Act, and the Appalachian Regional Development Act. The Special Subcommittee on the Federal-Aid Highway Program and the Select Subcommittee on Real Property Acquisition were organized during this period. Although JIM was critical of certain aspects of these proposals, his constructive ability to get to the crux of the issues and problems and his suggestions on the proposals made them better pieces of legislation.

During the 88th Congress I have served a direct apprenticeship under JIM, and my future decisions on the committee will be wiser ones because of this apprenticeship.

I could talk for great lengths about JIM AUCHINCLOSS and his outstanding career and ability, but these things are not easy to put into words. But let me say one further thing, above any other attribute of JIM AUCHINCLOSS', he had character. His ethical values and character are beyond reproach. People may have criticized JIM on occasions, but they never doubted his integrity. If more people in this world were like JIM, this would be a better world.

I served 10 years with JIM, and I wish it could have been longer. We will all miss him in this Chamber, but I understand that he intends to spend much time in and around the Nation's Capital after his retirement. I am sure I speak for everyone when I welcome him to return to this Chamber.

Mrs. Cramer joins with me in wishing for him and his lovely wife much happiness, continued success, and best wishes.

Tribute to Hon. Ross Bass

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, ROSS BASS' service here in the House has always been marked by complete frankness. He never offered any apology for being a southerner or for being a liberal. I have admired his forthrightness and we have all enjoyed his wonderful sense of humor, his friendliness, and genial manner.

ROSS BASS is a dynamic, restless individual who will never be content with mediocrity. His political star will continue to rise. He will rank high in the councils of those who lead our country and indeed the cause of freedom throughout the world. We, in South Carolina, are proud of his lovely wife who is a beautiful South Carolinian and who best exemplifies those great traditions of southern womanhood.

Mrs. Dorn and the family join me in wishing for Ross and his magnificent Avanell every success and much continued happiness.

The Great Manpower Grab: A Hysterical Attack Upon the U.S. Employment Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, as the chairman of the Select Subcommittee on Labor, which recently conducted hearings on our Federal-State public employment service, I call the attention of my colleagues to the fact that an article, bearing the title "The Great Manpower Grab," has recently been published in the Reader's Digest.

This article is a truly hysterical attack upon the U.S. Employment Service. The attack consists of a remarkable compendium of half-truths, inaccuracies, distortions, and wildly dramatic charges—all cloaked in language apparently chosen to frighten the reader into believing that a plot has been concocted in Washington to restrict the rights of American workers to seek employment wherever, with whomever, and by whatever means, they desire.

The underlying purpose of this attack is revealed only in the final page of the article, when readers of the Digest are urged as follows:

> Insist that your Congressman and Senators vote down funds that fuel USES expansion. Demand that Congress force the Bureau of Employment Security to live within its budget.

Mr. Speaker, I have no doubt that in the months ahead many of my colleagues will receive communications from constituents who have been deceived by this article and thrown into a state of needless alarm over the imaginary spectre of a "mammoth manpower grab." For that reason, I am placing on record an analysis of some of the more important misstatements and false allegations that this article contains. I urge my colleagues to read this analysis, and to draw upon the facts it contains in reassuring those of their constituents who may fall into this propaganda trap set before the millions of readers of the Reader's Digest.

The article attempts to seize the reader's attention, at the outset, by charging:

> The U.S. Employment Service is undermining one of our basic freedoms—the right to choose one's life work. If it succeeds, every working man and woman in America will one day be forced to seek work through Government employment offices.

This fantastic accusation does not contain a shred of truth. Neither the U.S. Employment Service nor any other Federal agency has any plan whatsover to force Americans to seek work through public employment offices. No activity of the Employment Service, by the wildest stretch of the imagination, can be described as "undermining the right to choose one's life work."

On the contrary, our Federal-State employment service system provides facilities—for those who voluntarily choose to avail themselves of them—whose purpose is to assist Americans to make a more intelligent and informed choice of career. Our Employment Service offices furnish occupational aptitude testing and counseling services, through which workers may gain a better understanding of their own abilities and potentialities, and receive labor market information which aids them to make their own better informed choices of careers in which they may use their abilities most effectively. The Employment Service offices also stand ready to provide workers with information both on current job openings and on the longer term trends in job opportunities. Through their extensive collection of information on present and future job possibilities in the labor market, they can give workers the essential information they need to recognize the occupations where demand for labor is shrinking, the occupations likely to be virtually wiped out or transformed by forthcoming technological change, and the occupations where properly trained and retrained workers will meet a growing demand for their services.

These aptitude testing, counseling, and labor market information services are especially important to the young Americans who will be seeking employment in steadily increasing numbers throughout the 1960's. The Reader's Digest can only do a great harm to these young workers by attempting to terrify them into failing to take advantage of the assistance which our Federal-State Employment Service offices are prepared to give them.

Incredibly enough, the Reader's Digest article attacks the longstanding, entirely voluntary, cooperative arrangements between the Federal-State employment service and a large proportion of American high schools, under which the employment service provides occupational aptitude testing and counseling services to graduating seniors and other young people who are entering into the job market. This is one of the most important functions which our employment service performs—the function of assisting our Nation's youth to make the often difficult transition from school to work. This function has become especially vital today, in a time when rapidly changing technology makes it more essential than ever before that young workers receive guidance and support in finding their places in our increasingly complex economy.

The author does not explicitly call for the abandonment of the testing and job counseling services which are provided every year to hundreds of thousands of young Americans, as they prepare to leave school. But the Reader's Digest article sneers at the value of these services and takes a tone calculated to discourage our young people from availing themselves of them. I must express my amazement that the author of this article would seemingly wish to deny to American youth the opportunity to receive information and guidance from employment service counselors who are familiar with the many complexities and difficulties of the labor market into which our youth are entering.

In an all-out attempt to cast discredit upon the competence of our Federal-State employment service personnel, the Reader's Digest article cites one alleged instance of improper evaluation of the results of an occupational aptitude test given to one individual. It then soars off in a flight of rhetoric to warn its readers:

> It is impossible to calculate how many young people—potential doctors, lawyers, scientists—have been steered into wrong careers by such tests.

Indeed, it is impossible. It is impossible to calculate whether even one young person has been steered into a wrong career. More important, it is impossible to calculate how many young people will enter the job market crippled by inadequate knowledge of their own abilities, and inadequate knowledge of the careers in which they can best use their abilities, if the author of this article and his allies should succeed in a campaign to destroy or injure the occupational testing and counseling services provided to youth by our Federal-State employment service system.

The crucial role of the counseling activities of the employment service received particular emphasis in the hearings I conducted, as chairman of the Select Subcommittee on Labor, this summer. These hearings showed that in many of our States the employment service does encounter difficulty in recruiting and retaining an adequate number of well-trained counselors, in the face of growing demand for personnel with counseling skills, and the higher salaries being offered by private industry, school systems, and even other Government agencies. The Reader's Digest article, whose purpose appears wholly destructive, is pleased to jeer at the employment service's problem of recruiting professional counselors.

My own purpose is quite different. It is my belief—and I trust it is one that will be shared by the majority of Members of this House—that the time is at hand for the Congress to examine what legislative action may be necessary to assure that our Federal-State Employment Service system will be adequately staffed with well-qualified job counselors. The great increase in the number of youth who will be seeking entry into our work force in the years immediately ahead, and the rapid changes in the content of jobs and in the composition of demand for labor, make it more important today than ever before that extensive, high-caliber counseling services be available to American workers.

Turning from the high school to the college student, the Reader's Digest article goes on to charge that "USES is out to handle the job placement of every college student in the country."

This statement is false. The Federal-State Employment Service has no plan whatsoever to become involved in the job placement of "every college student in the country." This would be a truly heroic task indeed. Nor does it have a plan to supplant the placement offices that are maintained on campuses by the colleges and universities themselves. Employment Service counselors and interviewers conduct placement activities on college campuses only at the request of the officials of those colleges. In general, such requests have tended to come from colleges with limited resources, which are not financially well prepared to maintain their own on-campus placement offices for students.

Of the approximately 2,000 institutions of higher education in the United States, there are less than 80 in which State employment service personnel have been engaged in on-campus placement activities—at the request of the institutions themselves. These facts give a picture which bears little resemblance to the distorted presentation of the Reader's Digest.

The author of this article refers to past criticism directed against the Employment Service by the College Placement Council, the association which represents placement officers in a large proportion of our leading universities. But he is very careful not to make clear to his readers that, months before his article was published, discussions between officials of the College Placement Council and the U.S. Employment Service had already resulted in a resolution of most of the area of disagreement between them. In a statement submitted on behalf of the College Placement Council to my subcommittee, during our hearings this summer, the council's representative pointed out that a year ago the council and the U.S. Employment Service "reached a working agreement wherein each could make its unique contribution to the needs of college youth. The accord then reached has been honored by all concerned for almost a year."

Certainly, the council and the Employment Service have not reached completely identical points of view with respect to the role of the Service in providing on-campus placement facilities for students of those colleges which request such facilities. But the council is not, as the Reader's Digest apparently wishes its readers to believe, an organization which considers itself to be fighting desperately for its life against a ruthless Federal agency.

The article goes on to charge that Mr. Louis Levine, Director of the U.S. Employment Service, has announced a plan to "build the Employment Service into the manpower agency for the Nation, through which all job hiring would be funneled."

This statement is shockingly misleading. Neither Mr. Levine nor any other Federal official has called for all job hiring to take place through the employment service. The overwhelming majority of job placements in the United States now occur—and will continue to occur—through arrangements made directly between employers and workers themselves, without the immediate assistance of either the public employment service or private employment agencies. Anyone with an understanding of the American labor market knows that it is utterly inconceivable that all job placements would ever be made through the employment service.

The term "manpower agency" has frequently been used to describe the potential role of the Federal-State employment service, but this term has no such sinister meaning as the Reader's Digest article seeks to give it. In recent years, responsible individuals—in government, in business, in our universities, in the labor movement—have been increasingly concerned over the need for positive steps to prevent the waste of America's manpower resources, which result from unemployment and our lack of adequate information about the labor market and job opportunities. This concern for the proper use of our manpower led the Congress in 1962 to enact the Manpower Development and Training Act, which I had the honor of sponsoring in this House, and upon which my subcommittee held extensive hearings. Likewise, it has led Congress to enact such legislation as the National Defense Education Act of 1958, the Vocational Education Act of 1963, and now the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. This surge of legislation directed toward upgrading the quality of our Nation's manpower and encouraging its effective utilization has placed new and extensive responsibilities upon our Federal-State employment service. Accordingly, many analysts of our manpower problems have recommended that the Federal-State employment service be considered the appropriate organization to serve as a "manpower agency"—to serve, that is, as an agency to gather and analyze information about our manpower resources, to coordinate the many programs now designed to train our manpower for new employment opportunities, and to carry out the essential function of assisting properly trained and counseled workers to find their places in the American job market.

The Reader's Digest has sought to delude its audience into believing that the term "manpower agency" implies governmental restraint of the freedom of workers and employers to make their own hiring arrangements. There is absolutely no basis for such an implication.

This misleading article next attempts to arouse fear over the cost of our Federal-State employment service program by making inaccurate and exaggerated statements of the funds and personnel devoted to the program, and by carefully avoiding any reference to our rising work force and other factors which have necessitated an increase in expenditures for the employment service as well as for virtually all other Federal, State, and local public services.

The article states that the employment service budget doubled between 1959 and 1964, that the staff of the Bureau of Employment Security had risen to almost 60,000 by 1964, and that in fiscal 1965 the Bureau of Employment Security will gobble up more than $455 million for the purpose of operating our employment service offices.

These statements constitute an inaccurate and one-sided presentation. For an honest and responsible evaluation of the costs of the employment service, these costs must be viewed, at the very least, in relation to the size of the American labor force which our public employment service has the obligation to serve. Between 1947 and 1960, while the Nation's labor force grew continuously, the number of personnel assigned to carry out the duties of the Federal-State employment service did not grow at all. On the contrary, the employment service had, in 1960, a staff which was actually smaller than in 1947. A scholarly study published by the W. E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research has called attention to this disturbing fact. The study reports that in these postwar years, 1947–60, while the American civilian labor force grew approximately 17 percent, the number of people engaged in the Federal-State employment service was allowed to shrink by almost 15 percent. In the 8 years of the Eisenhower regime, the employment service was notably the victim of neglect by an administration more anxious to conserve dollars than to conserve our manpower resources. With the coming of the Kennedy-Johnson administration, in 1961, the financial starvation of the employment service was relieved at last.

Naturally, those who seek to damage our employment service emphasize the increase in the funds allotted to the service since 1961, while neglecting the fact that the service had been allowed to shrink so greatly in the period preceding the Kennedy-Johnson administration. The fact, of course, is that the number of personnel allotted to employment service work is still smaller today, in relation to the size of the American labor force, than in 1947.

Funds made available for employment service activities did not double between fiscal 1959 and fiscal 1964, as this article alleges. The actual increase, according to data furnished by the Bureau of Employment Security, was approximately 62 percent. Much of this increase was simply due to the fact that salary scales rose in the State employment services as well as in the offices of private employers throughout the United States during the period 1959–64.

Other factors that brought about a necessary rise in the employment service budget were rent increases for the quarters occupied by local offices, the continuing growth in the size of the American work force to be served, and the assignment by Congress of additional duties to the employment service, under such legislation as the Manpower Development and Training Act.

Not only did the budget rise much less than the Reader's Digest claims, but the article is also gravely misleading in its implication that employment service staff expanded in proportion to the increase in the budget. Between 1959 and 1964, the number of employment service personnel in the local offices of the 50 State agencies rose by approximately 30 percent. This increase, as I have already pointed out, has still not brought the staff of the employment service back up to the size, in relation to the American work force, which it had in 1947.

The article's statement that the staff of the U.S. Bureau of Employment Security was almost 60,000 in 1964 is apparently designed to deceive the reader both with respect to the number of personnel assigned to employment service activities and the role of the Federal, as opposed to the State authorities. The fact is that the 1964 budget for the Federal-State employment service system provides for approximately 21,000 State agency local office employees and approximately 750 Federal employees. The large majority of the "nearly 60,000" employees that the Reader's Digest incorrectly attributes to the U.S. Bureau of Employment Security are employees of the 50 States, hired by the States under civil service regulations and salary scales determined by the States, and engaged in the operation and administration of the Federal-State unemployment insurance program.

In attacking the Federal-State employment service, the Reader's Digest artfully manages, by implication, to grossly overstate the staff of the service by simply including in it the thousands of State employees who examine and process workers' claims for unemployment compensation, make weekly benefit payments to unemployed workers found eligible, and perform all the other functions involved in our unemployment insurance program. These employees assigned to unemployment insurance activities are not employment service personnel, and they do not carry out the counseling, testing, interviewing, and job placement functions that are the duties of employment service personnel.

Let me emphasize this point to the Members of this House, to give them a clear perspective on the size of the employment service. The approximately 21,000 State employees and 750 Federal employees who make up our Federal-State employment service system constitute a total which is actually smaller than the number of people who are at work today in the several thousand private employment agencies throughout America.

The statement that the Bureau of Employment Security will "gobble up" more than $455 million in fiscal 1965 gives a totally misleading picture of the cost of employment service operations, entirely aside from the offensive innuendo contained in the author's choice of words. The Reader's Digest would trap its readers into believing that this entire sum is to be spent for the employment service. On the contrary, $455 million is the amount appropriated by the Congress for fiscal 1965 and allocated to the 50 States to cover not only the costs of the employment service program but also the cost of administering the Federal-State unemployment insurance program. These are quite distinct programs. Of the two, the unemployment insurance program is allocated the larger amount of funds.

The actual expenditure for Federal-State employment service activities in the latest fiscal year, 1964, was approximately $172 million, of which $164 million represents the funds allocated to the 50 States for operation of their respective employment services. The remaining $8 million is the budget of the U.S. Employment Service, the Federal agency which coordinates the activities of the 50 State system, provides program planning, research, and other technical services to the system, and gives individual State agencies assistance with their operating problems, as they may arise. This amount, $172 million, is well under half of the $455 million figure which the Reader's Digest prefers to dangle before its audience.

One of this article's most outrageous distortions of fact, apparently concocted for its shock value to the uninformed reader, is contained in a passage which warns:

> Legislation is now before the Congress * * * that would make all job placement activities exclusively a public service. In short, a Federal closed shop would be clamped tightly on the whole Nation.

The microscopic basis upon which the Reader's Digest conjures up this monstrous phantom of a "Federal closed shop" is the fact that one of the approximately 13,000 bills submitted to the 88th Congress by Members of the House contained language which recommended the establishment of a study commission to consider the eventual abolition of private employment agencies. This bill was neither proposed by, nor endorsed by, the Department of Labor. Like the vast majority of the thousands of bills presented to Congress each session, this bill was never reported out of committee.

Heaping one wild inference upon another, this Reader's Digest article then paints for its readers a lurid picture of life under its wholly imaginary "Federal closed shop," a life in which "you will have to win the approval of a Government clerk before you can be referred to a new position. You may very well need the OK of the political party in power before you can get a chance at the better jobs."

I can only say that this chamber of horrors created by the Reader's Digest is spun out of pure—more accurately, impure—fantasy. Though the Reader's Digest would hoodwink them into believing otherwise, American workers need not have the slightest fear that any threat exists to their freedom to seek any job they wish to have, by any means they wish to employ.

The Reader's Digest article is guilty of another gross distortion in its statement that so-called "exclusive agreements," entered into by some business firms with the employment service, in effect "give the Government closed-shop control over company hiring policies." The term "closed shop" is again being waved before the Reader's Digest audience for whatever scare value it may contain.

The facts are that a relatively small number of American employers have made arrangements whereby their job applicants in some occupational categories are requested to go first to the local employment service office for an interview and occupational aptitude testing, where applicable. The employer remains perfectly free to hire, or not hire, as he wishes, those applicants whom the employment service then refers to him, on the basis of the interviews and tests. Indeed, he remains perfectly free to hire anyone he pleases, whether or not referred to him under his arrangement with the employment service. Such arrangements, where they exist, have been entered into voluntarily by the employers concerned. And it should hardly be necessary to add that employers are free to discontinue them at any time. To describe such voluntary arrangements as "Government closed-shop control over company hiring policies" is to indulge in a deceitful twisting of the English language.

The Reader's Digest article then turns its attention to Walter Reuther, president of the United Auto Workers, AFL-CIO. Employing its usual technique, it apparently seeks to leave the reader with two false impressions: that Mr. Reuther wishes to force "all Government contractors to hire through USES"; and that Mr. Reuther is a spokesman for the U.S. Employment Service.

The proposal that the Reader's Digest prefers to identify with Mr. Reuther is one that has, in fact, been suggested by many of those who are concerned with our unemployment problem and the efficient functioning of our labor market. The proposal is, most emphatically, not one that would force "all Government contractors to hire through USES." It would merely require that those business firms working on U.S. Government contracts notify the employment service of job vacancies they are trying to fill. Such notification would give the employment service an opportunity to refer qualified workers, who had registered as jobseekers with the service, to these Government contractors with job openings. But the contractors would be under no obligation whatsoever to hire the job applicants referred to them from the employment service, in preference to other job applicants. They would remain fully as free as they are now to hire those job applicants whom they consider best qualified, whether the applicants come to them via the employment service, private employment agencies, in answer to newspaper advertisements, or by any other of the many means through which workers and employers are brought together in our economy.

In proposing that Government contractors give notification of their job openings, Mr. Reuther and others are not acting as spokesmen for the U.S. Employment Service. Officials of the USES have not instigated or sponsored this proposal. The arguments in favor of it have come independently from many experienced labor analysts who believe that it is in the public interest to allow jobseekers registered with the employment service to be informed of the job openings presently available on Government contract work being financed by American taxpayers. The more rapidly these job openings can be filled, the more promptly and efficiently work on Government contracts can be carried out. The time lost in our economy through unemployment would be reduced, and the financial burden of our unemployment insurance program would be lightened. For these reasons, much support has developed for a system of prompt job vacancy notification which would assure the Federal-State employment service, with its network of approximately 1,900 local offices, an opportunity to help reduce the time now required to place qualified workers in the job openings that business firms holding Government contracts are attempting to fill.

Another legislative proposal which the Reader's Digest assigns to Mr. Reuther would offer individual employers a slight reduction in their unemployment insurance tax rate in return for their agreement to notify the employment service of job vacancies in their work force, as they occur. Again, this proposal has come from many people in addition to Mr. Reuther. And it has not been endorsed by officials of the U.S. Employment Service.

This proposal to offer employers an incentive, in the form of a slightly lower payroll tax rate, in return for listing their job openings, stems in large part from the fact that one of the most serious deficiencies in our knowledge of the American economy is in the area of job vacancies. Extensive information on the unemployed is collected every month in the United States. But we have no comparable information on job vacancies—the number, geographical distribution, and types of jobs for which American employers are currently seeking workers. This serious gap in our economic data has been a source of concern to many Members of this House, of both our political parties—among them, notably, the distinguished gentleman from Missouri, the Honorable THOMAS CURTIS. Along with our detailed knowledge of the unemployed, we need detailed knowledge of current unfilled job openings, in order to have a more balanced picture of the economic situation and a firmer basis for choosing the policies that will help us achieve full and efficient employment of America's manpower.

If detailed job vacancy data for the American economy is to be collected regularly, the logical choice for this task would certainly appear to be the Federal-State employment service system. The approximately 1,900 local offices of this nationwide system are best situated to maintain close contact with the employers in their respective areas and gather up-to-date reports from them concerning the unfilled jobs they have available.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to make this point absolutely clear. The legislative proposals I have described do not threaten, in the smallest degree, the freedom of a single American employer or a single American worker. These proposals would require nothing more than a report by the employer, to the employment service, of the job vacancies which he wishes to fill. No employer would be required to hire workers referred to him by the employment service. No worker would be required to seek a job through the employment service. Both employers and workers would have every bit of freedom they have today to come together by any means they wish in our free American labor market.

Continuing with its attack, the Reader's Digest article makes an implied charge that the Employment Service is now neglecting the unemployed workers registered with it. The only basis it offers for this sweeping allegation is the fact that there has occurred, in recent years, a relative rise in the number of placements through the Service of workers in the occupations categorized as "professional, technical, and managerial." The article attempts to mislead readers into believing that most, or a very high proportion, of the job placements in these categories are of highly paid scientists, engineers, and executives. The far less glamorous reality is that the "professional, technical, and managerial" placements are heavily weighted with such workers as laboratory technicians, librarians, surveyors, dietitians, office supervisors, restaurant managers, and social workers.

The fact, of course, is that the increase in the number of "professional, technical, and managerial" placements does not constitute even the flimsiest scrap of evidence that the Employment Service has slackened in its efforts to place the unemployed. Unemployment, I need hardly say, is not a problem confined to manual workers. "Professional, technical, and managerial" workers can also become unemployed. There is no logical connection whatsoever between increased placement of these workers and a decrease in the service rendered to unemployed workers in other occupational categories. Indeed, the author displays contempt for the intelligence of the Reader's Digest audience by trying to plant in their minds two essentially contradictory beliefs: first, that the Federal-State Employment Service has been wastefully oversupplied with operating funds; second, that the Service is not devoting adequate resources to the task of finding jobs for unemployed workers.

The Reader's Digest article carefully avoids mentioning the fact that the vast majority of nonagricultural workers who find jobs through the Employment Service each year are unemployed at the time they are placed. A conservative estimate, from the Bureau of Employment Security, is that 95 percent or more of the Service's nonagricultural placements are of currently unemployed workers. Reality simply has no resemblance to the spurious picture presented by the Reader's Digest of an employment service which is turning its back on the unemployed in order to find more lucrative positions for a handful of highly paid scientists and executives.

The anguished concern the author professes for our unemployed workers should be taken by his readers with more than a grain of salt. Neither the author, the Reader's Digest itself, nor others who are attempting to damage the Employment Service are generally notable for past efforts on behalf of America's less advantaged citizens, including the unemployed. There is no reason to believe they have an interest in helping the Employment Service to perform more effectively in finding jobs for the unemployed. Their ostensible concern for our unemployed is a cloak for their real motivations in attacking the Employment Service.

Whatever other motivations the author may have, there can be no doubt that this Reader's Digest article is the product, in large part, of his apprehensions that a more effective employment service may threaten the profits of private employment agencies. The article does refer briefly to the National Employment Association, the trade association which represents the fee-charging private employment agencies, but does so in a manner calculated to downplay the association's role in instigating attacks against our Employment Service.

I shall not speculate on the question of the extent to which the National Employment Association is responsible for the current campaign of abuse directed against the Employment Service. But I do not hesitate to inform the Members of this House that this association is the single conspicuous organization that has been fighting bitterly to hamstring the employment service by attempting to reduce the funds available to it. The National Employment Association has not concealed its goal. In 1962 it reported to its members, the fee-charging private agencies, on its plans for a lobbying campaign in Washington to bring about, in its words, "a major cutback in tax-supported employment operations." If the campaign were successful, the association stated, then "increased business, greater prospects for growth will be inevitable side benefits for private agency owners."

Since then, the association has worked vigorously to attempt to persuade Members of Congress that budgets for Employment Service operations should be slashed and that the provision of job placement facilities for presently employed workers who are seeking better jobs should be left to the private agencies.

This campaign against the Employment Service has been so persistent that 2 months ago the Senate Committee on Appropriations felt it necessary to comment upon it and reply to the claims made by opponents of the Service. In its August 17, 1964, report on appropriations of funds for the Department of Labor for fiscal 1965, the Senate committee stated:

> Members of the committee have recently been the recipients of a barrage of communications attacking the public employment system. It is repeatedly asserted that the placement of employed workers should be the prerogative of the fee-charging agencies and that the public Employment Service should be arbitrarily restricted to serving unemployed workers.

In reply to this barrage of communications, the Senate Committee on Appropriations stated in its report:

> Congress in framing the Wagner-Peyser Act in 1933 stipulated that a placement service be provided for all persons "who are legally qualified to engage in gainful occupations." Accordingly, the Employment Service * * * cannot deny service to a certain portion of the public such as employed workers, or those in professional and technical occupations. It must be staffed and organized to meet the needs of all applicants * * * whether employed or unemployed, highly skilled, or semiskilled and unskilled.
>
> The Employment Service, as it is now operating * * * is properly reflecting the spirit of the Wagner-Peyser Act.

Mr. Speaker, not only is the Employment Service now charged by law with the duty to make its facilities available to all employers and workers who wish to use it, but an attempt to restrict the service to the placement of unemployed workers alone would be to the great disadvantage of the unemployed themselves. The Service can only place unemployed workers if it receives placement requests from employers with job vacancies. If employers know that the Service can refer to them no workers except the presently unemployed, and is forbidden to register and refer capable workers who are presently employed but seeking better jobs, employers obviously will be less willing to turn to the Employment Service for help in filling job vacancies. If employers do not use the service, the Service can do little for the unemployed. While spokesmen for the National Employment Association sanctimoniously proclaim their concern that the Employment Service is neglecting our unemployed workers, their program—if it were carried out—would seriously injure the Employment Service's capacity to find jobs for the unemployed.

The author of this article does not merely understate the role of the National Employment Association as the outstanding lobbyist against the employment service. He also fails to inform his readers of his own close contact with the National Employment Association. The author was a featured speaker at the 1963 annual convention of the association, and has also been scheduled to give a major address to the coming 1964 convention. In his speech to the 1963 NEA convention, the author enthusiastically praised the lobbying and publicity campaign that had been undertaken against the employment service, and told the assembled operators of private fee-charging employment agencies.

> I take a great and genuine pride in carrying a musket in your ranks in this battle.

Those who read his article in the Reader's Digest, however, can hardly be expected to know that the author is one who a year ago publicly dedicated himself to "carrying a musket" in the ranks of the private employment agencies, in their battle against the employment service.

Actually, the hysteria with which private employment agency operators have reacted to any proposals for improving the Federal-State employment service is, in my opinion, wholly inappropriate. On this point, I would refer Members of this House to a recent statement by Mr. Edward T. Chase, whose July 1964 article in Harper's magazine, entitled "The Job-Finding Machine," is—by contrast with the Reader's Digest article—a responsible and honestly informative portrayal of the employment service and its problems. Mr. Chase, in his recent speech to the conference of the National Committee on Employment of Youth, stated:

> The anxieties of the private fee-charging employment agencies should be recognized as being both exaggerated and untempered by any anxieties about the public interest. They are exaggerated because there isn't the slightest prospect that their legitimate role will ever be taken away from them. The American fee-charging industry has continued to grow and prosper. But there are a vast number of Americans * * * who are seeking to upgrade themselves vocationally, who are not considered desirable clients by the private agencies, who can't afford these agencies, and who desperately need the kind of objective, comprehensive counseling, referral and placement service the U.S. Employment Service can render if given the means to do so.

As Mr. Chase points out, the private fee-charging agencies have indeed continued to grow and prosper. The U.S. Census of Business for 1954 reported 3,153 private employment agencies in the Nation, with total annual receipts of approximately $63 million. By the time of the 1958 Census of Business, the number of agencies had grown to 3,892, with total annual receipts of approximately $101 million. And the latest estimate available indicates that there are now approximately 4,300 private employment agencies in the United States, with annual receipts of about $145 million. Thus, in the past 10 years, the number of agencies has grown by almost 37 percent, and their total dollar receipts from placement fees charged to workers and employers have risen even more sharply—by approximately 130 percent.

The number of private employment agencies and the total number of dollars they collect annually from their clients have, in fact, grown significantly more rapidly in the past 10 years than have the funds allotted to our Federal-State employment service. Private employment agencies are most decidedly not—as their spokesmen would have us believe—fighting with their backs to the wall against imminent extinction at the hands of the employment service.

Private employment agencies have not, moreover, been able to produce any substantive evidence that their volume of placements or their profits would decline, if the Federal-State employment service were provided with more adequate resources for carrying out its responsibilities. There is more than ample room in the American labor market for both an efficient public employment service and efficient private employment agencies. It is generally estimated that today the Federal-State employment services and the private employment agencies combined are placing only about 20 percent of the millions of American workers who annually find new jobs. The remaining 80 percent of new jobs are found by workers through word-of-mouth information from friends and relatives, through newspaper advertisements, through direct application to employers, and through other informal means. With approximately 80 percent of job placements still untouched by either public or private agencies, and with rapidly increasing numbers of workers coming into our labor market to seek jobs, the private employment agencies have no rational basis for fear that their revenues and profits are going to shrink in the years ahead—whether or not the Federal-State employment service receives less inadequate financing for its own activities.

In another attempt to erect a mountain of accusation upon a molehill of fact, the Reader's Digest article makes a sweeping attack upon the accuracy of the job placement figures regularly reported by the Federal-State employment service. It cites one episode of falsification of job placement data in Cleveland, Ohio, and a statement by a former official of the Ohio State Employment Service—who was in charge of the Cleveland area at the time this episode occurred—that he believed false reporting of job placements to be widespread. On this slim basis, the article tries to convert its readers into believing that employment service placement data is largely made up of "bogus statistics" and "phony figures" reported from the "natural desire of clerks to justify their jobs."

There have, indeed, been occasional instances of false reporting of job placements by individual employees of the Federal-State employment service—as there have also been occasional instances of embezzlement and dishonesty by individuals employed by banks and other private business firms. The Reader's Digest, however, has no more justification for printing a charge that employment service personnel are typically engaged in manufacturing fake statistics, than it would have for printing a charge that bank employees are typically embezzlers.

The one specific instance cited is a case in which, for a period of several months in 1963, a small fraction of the placement interviewers on the staff of the Ohio State Employment Service in Cleveland did report inflated figures concerning the number of placements they had made. The falsification of data was soon discovered, and disciplinary actions were taken with respect to those involved. With the exception of this one episode, for a brief period in 1963, there is no evidence to indicate that placement data reported in Cleveland have been inaccurate in the past, or are inaccurate today.

In discussing the Cleveland episode, the author of the Reader's Digest article states:

> Because of pressure from Washington to increase placements, as many as half of all placements claimed by the office were fraudulent.

This statement invites the unwary reader to draw the entirely false conclusion that Federal officials of the U.S. Employment Service tacitly encouraged the Cleveland staff to report exaggerated placement figures. On the contrary, when USES officials received an anonymous letter charging that some placement data had been falsified in Cleveland, they promptly urged the administrator of the State employment service in Ohio to conduct an investigation. The investigation was conducted, the falsification was uncovered, and action was taken with respect to those responsible.

What the author of the Reader's Digest article does not tell his readers is that the U.S. Bureau of Employment Security requires the 50 State employment service agencies to make systematic checks on the validity of the job placement figures reported by the local offices in each State. These validation surveys, as they are called, involve the use of standard procedures to contact directly samples of those for whom successful job placements have been reported, so that the actual placements can be personally verified by the workers and employers involved. The Bureau of Employment Security has informed me that such validation surveys were made in approximately 400 local employment service offices, in 47 States, during fiscal 1964, and that surveys will be carried out in all States during fiscal 1965. Since the fall of 1962, the Bureau reports that only eight instances of data falsification have been revealed, and that State officials imposed disciplinary penalties upon the employees involved.

Mr. Speaker, among the many false statements this Reader's Digest article contains, the one that most touches me personally is found in this passage:

> This summer USES trotted out a platoon of academic "experts" to pave the way for an even bigger expansionist push with hearings before a House labor subcommittee.

The House labor subcommittee referred to is the one of which I have the honor to be chairman. The academic witnesses whom this article wrongly and contemptuously refers to appeared before the subcommittee at my invitation.

The Reader's Digest statement I have just quoted does not display the forthrightness to question explicitly the knowledge and competence of these witnesses. Instead, it resorts to the underhanded technique of sneering at them by attaching quotation marks to the term "expert." These witnesses whom the statement maligns are, in fact, faculty members of leading American universities—Yale, the University of California, the University of Chicago, Harvard, the University of Michigan, and others. They hold well-earned reputations as distinguished observers and analysts of the American labor market and of our problems of unemployment, retraining of displaced workers, and achieving effective use of our manpower. Through our subcommittee's hearings, they were able to give the Members of this House the benefit of their long experience and offer their well-informed advice concerning the role the Federal-State employment service can play in helping us to solve our manpower problems.

These witnesses were not—as the Reader's Digest falsely states—"trotted out" before my subcommittee by the U.S. Employment Service. They appeared at the subcommittee hearings at my request, to express their own independent views as scholars with nationwide reputations. The testimony they gave was entirely their own. It was not prepared for them by the U.S. Employment Service, nor did officials of the Service attempt, in the slightest degree, to influence their testimony.

Mr. Speaker, I have informed the author of this article that he will be welcome to appear before the Select Subcommittee on Labor to offer any explanation he cares to make of his baseless accusation that these distinguished witnesses were "trotted out" by the Employment Service. We shall see whether he wishes to avail himself of the opportunity to substantiate his charges.

Before concluding my analysis of this Reader's Digest article, I must comment upon the magazine in which it appears. To those who are familiar with the history and background of this publication, it is notorious as one of the most insidious purveyors of rightwing propaganda in the United States. In its pages, each month, are many articles that are entertaining and instructive. But carefully planted among these will usually be found other articles that have been cleverly designed to infect the naive reader with the reactionary prejudices of the Reader's Digest publishers. The huge audience of the Reader's Digest is first lulled into unwariness by the friendly, heart-warming, and inspirational stories which make up the bulk of the magazine's standard material. Then, in this receptive mood, the audience is presented with loaded, deceitfully worded articles that seek to arouse fear and hatred of our Federal Government, to dismiss our grave unemployment problem as a statistical hoax, to portray labor union members as the captives of corrupt and power-mad union leaders, and to whip up mindless antagonism to virtually every enlightened public program this country has developed in the past 30 years to ease the hardships of our citizens who may be ill, unemployed, poverty stricken, physically handicapped, or otherwise disadvantaged.

The title borne by this magazine undoubtedly still deludes many of its readers into believing that it is an objective "digest" of the best articles published, each month, in other magazines. In fact, however, many of the very articles that propagate the ultraconservative biases of the Reader's Digest publishers never appear in another magazine. They are the products of the Digest's own staff, or of other writers who submit their work directly to the Digest.

"The Great Manpower Grab" is such an article. It is not "digested" from any other source. Indeed, I question whether any responsible and reputable magazine would have accepted an article of such an obviously misleading and deceptive nature. Articles of this type, however, represent the ideological hook which the Reader's Digest regularly conceals in the tasty fare it presents each month to millions of Americans.

Mr. Speaker, let me remind the Members of this House of an assault which the Reader's Digest made not long ago upon another branch of the U.S. Department of Labor. In September 1961 the Reader's Digest published an undigested article by one James Daniel, entitled "Let's Look at Those 'Alarming' Unemployment Figures." This article attacked the integrity of the economists and statisticians of the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, and implied that they were engaged in a conspiracy to magnify America's unemployment problem by deliberately publishing unreliable, inflated figures on the number of unemployed workers.

The vast Reader's Digest audience was exposed to this unwarranted attack upon the Bureau of Labor Statistics, but it was carefully sheltered from any exposure to the Bureau's response. I know of no other mass circulation magazine in the United States which does not afford those who have been maligned and misrepresented in its pages at least some opportunity, if only in the form of a brief letter to the editor, to reply to the charges made against them. But the Reader's Digest prefers to practice its own ugly brand of hit-and-run journalism. It publishes no letters to the editor, nor does it make space available in any other form to those seeking to answer attacks. When the distinguished former Secretary of Labor, Mr. Arthur Goldberg, personally requested an opportunity to make a reply to the Digest's September 1961 attack on the Bureau of Labor Statistics, his request received no response.

In December 1961, shortly after the Reader's Digest published its charges against the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the Subcommittee on Economic Statistics of the Joint Economic Committee, under the chairmanship of Senator William Proxmire, held hearings on the problems involved in measuring the number of unemployed. The subcommittee invited James Daniel, the author of the Digest article, to appear before it and discuss his accusations concerning the honesty and validity of the official unemployment statistics. Neither letters of invitation, nor personal telephone calls were able to persuade Mr. Daniel to come before the subcommittee. Remaining faithful to the hit-and-run tactics of the Reader's Digest, he refused to give this congressional subcommittee any opportunity to ask questions which would have exposed the baselessness of the charges the Digest had spread before millions of its readers.

During the following year, an independent committee of economists and statisticians, appointed by the late President Kennedy, made a thorough study of the methods by which our unemployment statistics are gathered and analyzed. This committee, under the chairmanship of Prof. R. A. Gordon, of the University of California, made its report and recommendations to President Kennedy in the early fall of 1962. The report showed that no grounds whatsoever existed to support the charges the Reader's Digest had made against the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

I cite this episode in order to indicate to the Members of this House that this current attack by the Reader's Digest upon a branch of the U.S. Department of Labor is part of a pattern which has appeared before. And I can assure my colleagues that the present attack upon the employment service is fully as unjustified as the Digest's 1961 attack on the Bureau of Labor Statistics—the attack which the author did not dare attempt to defend before a congressional subcommittee.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I wish to warn my colleagues in this House that we will hear more, in the months ahead, of these imaginary hobgoblins called a "Federal closed shop" and a "great manpower grab." But there is no "manpower grab." It does not exist. What does exist is a campaign, on the part of selfish private interests, to cripple our Federal-State employment service. This Reader's Digest article is only one of a number of propaganda efforts that will be undertaken in this continuing campaign of misrepresentation and slander. Those who have mounted this campaign appear to have no scruples which inhibit them from deluging the American public with the grossest distortions of the employment service's activities. Their real purpose, as I have pointed out, is to persuade Congress to slash away the funds that will be needed to enable the employment service to meet its growing responsibilities—responsibilities that are being imposed upon it by our increasing efforts to conserve, train, and fully employ of America's manpower resources.

James C. Auchincloss

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD DAVIS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, Jim Auchincloss, of New Jersey, has been a Member of the House of Representatives 22 years. It has been my privilege to know him during this period. I have worked shoulder to shoulder with him in the Committee on Public Works. I know of his work in the committee and the contribution he has made to the outstanding legislative record of that most important committee. I have seen him in action on the floor of the House speaking out for what he believed was right. Jim Auchincloss has been truly a representative of the people.

More important than this is the fact that I have known Jim Auchincloss as a friend. I know of his sense of humor, of his devotion to his family and to those he called friend. It has been a high honor for me to have been included in that circle of those who were friends of Jim Auchincloss.

He leaves us now with the well wishes of all those who knew him. I hope to know him in the years to come and to continue to enjoy the many pleasant days of association I had with him in the past. Jim Auchincloss brought something into the lives of all of us and we will miss him. The best of luck to Jim and to his lovely wife and until we meet at the next "yeas and nays meeting," good luck, Jim.

Hasty Defense Cuts Indefensible

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I have stressed many times in this body the urgency of efficiency, economy, and accountability in conducting the affairs of this Government.

The application of principles of economy and efficient management to governmental affairs must not only be of great concern to Members of Congress, but the achievement of this worthy objective must be our constant goal.

It is for us to recognize that our economy, free enterprise system, and other free institutions, including our great national defense, are moving through a period of great, unprecedented change. We must keep pace with national growth and the urgent need for national development at every level which confronts us today.

This means that we must give our attention, not only to maintaining and, where necessary, extending the vital services of this Government, but wisely and prudently bringing them into play as an instrument for furthering the sound progress and advancement of the economy and the Nation and the well-being and happiness of the people.

At the same time, it is up to us as representatives of the American people, charged with providing for the national defense and security of this great Nation, to realize that we cannot practice indiscriminate, meat-ax economy at the expense of our national safety and security. We must not hamper, impair, or handcuff our powerful armed services, upon which we must depend to preserve our security and carry out our commitments to freedom.

Such a course would not only be ill-considered economy, but it could well have disastrous results, because we are living in a very dangerous world, and must be prepared and equipped at all times to meet every and any contingency or emergency that develops as the result of Communist aggression, subversion, or any other type of threat that would imperil this Nation and the American people.

I am irrevocably committed to the cause of peace, to the rule of law, and to the settling of conflicts and disputes between nations through the instrumentalities of civilization, through justiciable agencies and methods, through rational arguments and persuasions carried out under the principles of abstract and applied justice.

Until we can live in a world organized for peace on the basis of the rule of law, which we all hope for and strive for, it is necessary for us to maintain striking and defensive forces to protect this Nation. Until such time as we can manage through our own good efforts, our good will toward others, our understanding of the problems of others and every measure of wholehearted international cooperation we and other free nations can apply, to reduce or limit armaments and to control thermonuclear energy for peaceful purposes rather than for force and destruction, it is of course, necessary for us to make certain that we will remain strong in every sense, militarily, economically, and spiritually, since, until others join in our quest for universal peace, that deterrent is the best way we can defend and protect our security and our democratic institutions and the integrity, strength, and greatness of our country.

Let us, therefore, be resolved never to practice indiscriminate economy at the expense of our armed services and our national strength and defense. The problem of achieving and maintaining a balanced national strength in all categories is an extremely difficult one which cannot be left to snap judgments or precipitate action.

Such a program must be carefully thought out and carefully carried out and that is what we have been doing in this Congress with the results that are well known to all of us. For, if it were not for our overwhelming strength, which is the great deterrent to war and aggression, can any man doubt that communism would be threatening this Nation and even more of the world than it is threatening at present?

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, let us intensify our efforts to maintain our national strength at satisfactory, efficient, and adequate levels.

Until communism ceases its forays against peace, let us continue to mount the strongest, most powerful defense system in the world, because this is the way to security, and it is the best, if not the only, present way, to peace, and I think that fact is becoming increasingly clear to the leaders of the Communist world who appear to be coming more and more to the conviction that competition with the free world in terms of armament and armed strength is both a futility and a waste of time and money and a sure way in the end of weakening their own faltering systems. Perhaps this will bring us hope for real cooperation for peace.

I urge, therefore, Mr. Speaker, the continuance of a strong, national defense policy which will maintain our national strength across the board and maintain our armed services at highest point of efficiency and adaptation to modern developments in science and industry, that will command for us the respect of potential adversaries, wherever and whoever they may be.

While advanced forms of missilery are increasingly playing their part in our defense system we would make a great mistake, in my judgment, at this time, not to recognize the need for a well-equipped, completely modern Air Force, implemented with manned aircraft of various necessary types, range, and power; also a mobile, mechanized, modern Army, equipped with latest weapons, and a powerful, up-to-date Navy, able to cover the high seas with every component necessary to defend the coasts and protect the interests of the Nation at home and abroad.

One of the great contributions, perhaps the greatest contribution of our retiring, great distinguished chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, the able, patriotic, beloved gentleman from Georgia, the Honorable CARL VINSON, has been his keen recognition of the problems of defense and his untiring, brilliant work in moving doggedly toward the goals he has urged and achieved of providing adequate national defense. These efforts, if they stood alone in a long, luminous career of great achievement, command our deepest gratitude.

Our present state of readiness and power, which is due in such large measure to this great American, will long remain the greatest tribute that can be paid him, and it behooves all of us to take inspiration from the stirring example of this fearless, farsighted American, and devote ourselves in a truly dedicated spirit, as he has done, to the maintenance and improvement of our national strength on land, sea, and in the air, and in space as well as in economic, social, cultural, and spiritual areas which have always been so important to this Nation, and never have been more important than they are today.

The point, Mr. Speaker, is that at this crucial time we must work for a truly balanced national defense and avoid the extremism of some present programs of hasty, ill-considered, defense cuts that are dispersing our know-how and weakening our overall defensive and offensive posture.

I have been greatly disturbed about many of the defense cuts in the armed services, starting with some in my own district and area, and extending all over the world that seemed to me to be well-intentioned, but accomplished in a very hasty manner without first giving proper notice of intention to our congressional committees and the Congress.

It has been said by the able, distinguished Secretary of Defense that there are some 6,000 or 8,000 installations in our defense setup and that "every one of them is in jeopardy." I take it that this statement was meant to pinpoint, and perhaps even to dramatize, the zeal for economy and streamlined efficiency that moves high officials of the Defense Department these days. But I think, with utmost respect to those officials, that before any extreme, fundamental cuts are made, or indeed any policy looking toward basic curtailment and major realinement of our defense system is undertaken, Congress should be both advised and given the opportunity to assent to or dissent from reductions and changes proposed.

There are many in Congress, who, by reason of long years of service and experience in defense matters, are in a position to contribute valuable knowledge and informed viewpoints to proposed changes in the national defense, and who, in addition, under the Constitution, like other Members of the Congress, have primary responsibility under our system of government for providing and maintaining truly adequate defenses and striking forces for the country.

It is quite natural, therefore, under these circumstances that there should be considerable, widespread dissatisfaction and disapproval concerning certain proposed defense cuts and the manner in which they have been handled, as well as reported, sweeping changes yet to come.

There are also sharp differences of opinion in well-informed channels over new weapons and weapon systems and the speed, and lack of speed, which have been utilized administratively to provide them, or to discontinue them.

I do not believe that the defense of this country should be made subject to ill-considered, political argumentation, but I do believe that in matters of military development, whether conventional or nuclear, whether ground, sea, air, or space is involved, the judgment and opinions of the great body of military expertness and experience that we have in the Congress and in the Nation should not lightly be brushed aside by administrative executive department officials, however highly placed.

If it is desirable, as I believe it is, to streamline the lopsided, overweighted complex of layer upon layer of bureaucracy in the Pentagon, that work should be done, the sooner the better, and it should be done only with congressional knowledge, approval, and collaboration.

Very serious questions have been raised concerning the strength and efficiency of our Defense Department under new proposals.

Serious charges have been made that we are lacking in vital strategic areas, that research and development has been impeded, that advanced systems have been unwarrantedly delayed.

How much have they been delayed? To what extent have vital programs been canceled, or toned down, largely or principally to save money?

Whether our overall, military and related space systems are proceeding on schedule?

Whether proposed new types of manned aircraft, authorized and appropriated for by the Congress are going according to schedule, or have been hindered for any reason?

Whether our military procurement procedures are following the law as laid down by the Congress, or are being colorably administered without adherence to clear, legal requirements, or other formalities, intended and provided by law?

Whether current cuts are injuring our overall defense potential? Whether these cuts are moving too far and too deep, and dispensing with valuable, technical skills that are urgently needed in the defense system and the economy?

These are questions that the Congress must consider and promptly try to answer. Many of us want to know where we stand on the new, strike reconnaissance bomber, and our antisatellite systems, our over-the-horizon

radar, our Nike X, antiballistic missile, our attack naval aircraft and other programs.

Many would like to know, too, in the light of what is going on in Vietnam, why there has been such a delay in providing suitable airworthy aircraft in sufficient numbers for that exasperating operation, and what real conditions are today regarding the quality and technical efficiency of the planes that American boys are using in this strangest of all wars in which many have given their lives.

Congress would like to know, I think, how refinements of the Nike-Zeus system and the aircraft Thor rocket are working out.

I think the question is not so much what our strength is now in terms of military power and potential for the next several years. The real question is whether we are maintaining our program in research and development of new concepts and ideas in weapon systems, in communications, in manned aircraft, and in the phasing of these advances efficiently and effectively into our armed services.

Obviously, it is not an answer to any of these questions to raise them and take no further action. The times and the climatic movements of history are too grave for that.

The Congress and the American people are entitled to have concrete satisfactory answers to all questions of our defenses. We normally would not expect voluntarily to get them in entirety from administrative officials. We can get them best and for the most part in the course of appropriate inquiry and hearings by the committees of Congress charged with responsibility for the proper defense of the United States.

As in other areas, questions of this type and gravity should be examined by the Congress in collaboration with representatives of the Defense Department and the Commander in Chief, and I personally believe that one of the compelling tasks of the next session of Congress should be to give all these questions of the national strategic, tactical, logistical, operational, organizational, and procuremental and the rest, closest attention.

To my mind, only a very careful examination of our complete defense and military posture would suffice to let Congress and the American people know where we stand, what we are doing, and the reasons therefor.

A study of policy and its implementation and any inadequacies that appear or shortcomings that may exist—manpower, hardware, equipment, production, and procurement.

In this connection we should not underestimate either the intelligence, the intellectual potential or the progress that other nations have made in this and other important fields, and I make specific and special reference to the progress which Russia has made.

We should take judicial notice of the fact that the security of this country and the world, our safety, future well-being and welfare might well depend upon some scientific breakthrough that is accomplished in the next few years.

If any potential enemy should accomplish this breakthrough, it might well overnight outmode our entire defense structure and its related supports and leave us virtually at the mercy of those who are working for the destruction of our political and economic systems, as well as our liberties.

For one, I do not believe that we can afford to temporize with this type of situation, and I think we must move to make as sure as we reasonably can, that everything is being done, that can be done, to keep our defense system and our Nation strong and powerful in every sense and thoroughly competitive in scientific research and development as in other matters, so as to insure as best we can under the circumstances that this Nation will not be left in the lurch in the field of scientific inquiry and progress or in the implementation of a truly adequate national defense, because, until world conditions and the attitude of the Communist world make it possible for us to agree upon disarmament, control of nuclear and thermonuclear energy, and set up a true rule of law under judicial institutions in this world and establish wholehearted cooperation for peace and betterment, rather than destruction, this Nation must be prepared, and must continue to prepare itself better, to meet every eventuality, every contingency, every challenge, that involves the security, safety, and freedom of our shores and our people and our friends and allies of the free world.

In a word, we cannot gamble, in terms of ill-advised economy of dangerous risks with the security and freedom of the country and I hope and urge that the Department of Defense will desist from doing so in the interest of our defense-supporting economy and our own safety.

Hon. James C. Auchincloss: A Great American Congressman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, one of the best friends I ever had in this Congress—JIM AUCHINCLOSS—has decided to retire after 22 years of important and distinguished service in the House and after a lifetime of active labor in other public and business responsibilities. It is unthinkable that one so accustomed to arduous work all his life would ever go into full retirement, and I confidently expect JIM will be as busy as usual in the years ahead in some activity which he enjoys. He has served his country faithfully in both war and in peace.

As high-ranking member of the Committee on Public Works, Congressman AUCHINCLOSS contributed his great vision and talent to the shaping of the gigantic Interstate Highway System, now under construction throughout the Nation. He has contributed mightily to all of the important public works projects over which this committee had jurisdiction.

Never one to shirk any responsibility he was asked to assume, he consented to serve and he rendered outstanding service upon the District of Columbia Committee, an assignment which many of us seek to avoid because of the press of other committee duties. This is a job which seldom leads to glory and really very little appreciation, but it is a necessary function; and JIM AUCHINCLOSS fulfilled it with intelligence and devotion to the people of the District.

Although bothered by arthritis in recent years, he still retained his unfailing sunny disposition, his keen sense of humor, and his warm friendliness. He will be sorely missed in this Chamber. He leaves with the deep affection and good will of every Member of this body, on both sides of the aisle.

He has been one of my most loyal friends ever since he entered this House. Personally, it will never seem the same without him.

Aiken and Prouty Charge Politics With REA Voting Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WINSTON L. PROUTY

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, for nearly 30 years, through every administration, Republican or Democratic, the Rural Electrification Administration has remained strong and healthy because it has been kept out of politics.

Now, for the first time, in Vermont and throughout the country, sordid attempts are being made by overly ambitious men to drag the good name of REA into the arena of shabby politics.

Even the most valiant fighters for REA are being characterized as enemies of rural electrification, as Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN pointed out in his speech given at the annual meeting of the Vermont Electric Cooperative, Inc.

This speech pins down for all time and fully exposes the ugly tactics which may weaken or ultimately destroy the REA program.

To enlighten and inform those who may be unaware of how REA matters are being distorted for political purposes, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the splendid speech by Vermont's senior Senator.

I also ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a performance chart which proves clearly that REA programs have made great strides under both Democrats and Republicans, and as a

Republican, who has always supported REA during my entire 14-year service in Congress, I take pride in that bipartisan record.

There being no objection, the speech and chart were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Speech Given by Senior Senator George D. Aiken at the Annual Meeting of the Vermont Electric Cooperative, Inc.

Walter, folks, thank you for telling them I'm not running for office—I have met with this group 6 times when I have been running for office and about 18 times when I have not been running for office and to the best of my knowledge I have never asked you for a vote and never made you any promises and we got along pretty well on that basis because I feel that you folks here know enough to make up your own minds and I hope I use good judgment in just working with you because I feel the work you have been doing and other cooperative work in the State has meant more to me, and I think, more to the State, than anything else we could have done.

Now, I understand that there are a few folks who are a little troubled by what I said in Barre yesterday when I said the REA must be prepared to face a little rougher road in the future and perhaps—to calm your nerves or something—I might tell you just what I meant by that.

As a matter of fact, this reapportionment program that they are beginning to put on us now is not going to be any help to the REA or rural areas in any way, but it will not affect us so much in Vermont because of Vermont legislation or Vermont convention or whatever we have, but in some States in this country it is going to make it real hard for the REA and other rural endeavors of these cooperatives. When I spoke in Barre, I was thinking back and I did not explain just what the background of my statement was.

You know since I have been down there—I have been there 24 years—for the first 20 years, the REA had no trouble whatsoever with either branch of Congress and had no trouble with the executive branch of Government and then in 1962 they put a concerted attack on REA which was started by the utility companies of the States of Alabama, Georgia, Florida, Mississippi, and Louisiana. Now, first let us understand that an REA cooperative is set up under State laws and, thank goodness, Vermont is one of about eight States that has good laws relating to REA co-op operation, but the financing of the cooperatives is carried by loans from the Federal Government. So these companies from these Southern States, and I am happy to say that none of our own electric utility corporations from Vermont have joined in, at least openly. As far as I know, the attacks have come from these five Southern States who are fronting possibly for others, and their aim is to cripple the financing of the rural electric cooperatives, thinking in that way they can whittle them down, forcing them to sell out to the companies or at least beat them down where they are not as potent and effective as they are now.

It is true that for a long time the rural electric cooperatives have borrowed money from the Federal Government for 2 percent. That has been to enable them to extend lines into sparsely settled areas where the public utility companies could not afford to go and earn their 14 percent or whatever it is that they think they have to have over and above their cost, but this 2-percent interest to the cooperatives is called, by the opposition, a subsidy, but it is a pretty small subsidy compared to the tax benefits which the utility companies have received by virtue of Government legislation and largess from the Federal Government. Now I have been in the midst of a lot of these fights. I am on the Agriculture Committee which handles the REA itself and I am on the Agriculture Appropriation Subcommittee which determines the appropriations for the rural electric cooperatives and I have been in the midst of these fights and the number of us who have been standing up and fighting (for your program) has been diminishing year by year. We still have members of both parties who will stand up and fight but we still have increasing courage on the part of the opposition who would like to whittle down the operations of this great cooperative enterprise.

The opposition has gained on us in several ways. You know when a cooperative needed more power, they used to go to the REA in Washington and borrow money for a powerplant. Now, they are told that in order to get money for generating and transmission, they must show that they can produce that power at a lower cost than they can buy it from the local power company. That sounds very good, but a power plant today (again to make low-cost electricity) must be of considerable size and very few REA's by themselves could afford the cost and it would be high-cost production—so we say a dozen of them get together, or six or eight of them get together, and say, "We will borrow money for a powerplant for all of them." The power company says, "We will sell you the power for less than you can produce the power for this REA here" and that is probably true, but you take the other cooperatives who may be located 50 or 100 miles away and equally dependent on the source of power and you will find that they will have to pay through the nose. So that while the proposal they make shows that they can produce power for less than the cooperative can, sounds good on the surface, there is a catch to it which is designed to cripple the REA cooperatives themselves.

Now there are other ways in which the attack is being carried on—one is what they call a section 5 loan. This comes right home to you here. As far as generating and transmission loans go, you are not immediately affected, but the section 5 loans, the money which you borrow to buy the appliances purchased by you cooperative members—the money which buys the milking machine or the washing machine or whatever appliances you may be buying does affect you. Up to this year, it has been possible to borrow that money as usual. This year our cooperatives have been coming down to Washington, going to Mr. Clapp of the REA and trying to borrow the money and he says, "No, no, our policy has changed. You have got to get it from the local bank." The local bank says, "We don't want your business, we don't make any money on a $50 or $100 loan." So there you are. I want to say that Walter Cook has been down there at least three times, I think, this year fighting to continue the section-5-loan work for this cooperative and I have been working with him. I have been getting after Mr. Clapp and telling him that he should make these loans where local banks are not willing—I will not say not willing—I will say, reluctant to take the business because they cannot make any money on loans that size and the last I heard from Mr. Clapp was on October 1 saying that he got some more material from Walter and they would go over it, and over it, and over it, and see what it reads like. I've got an idea that probably after November 4, Walter, you may get some decision but I am afraid it will not be good unless someone here tells Mr. Clapp what I have been saying in which case he might change his mind and decide to make the loan to you. I hope that is true.

Two or three years ago you remember they set up the rural area development, the rural electric cooperatives were to be the key agencies in expanding businesses in the area served by the cooperatives and it looked kind of promising. Do you know how many loans they made under that RAD program in the United States this year? Just exactly three up to last of September. Whether they will improve the situation any under the President Johnson's poverty program or not, I don't know at this time because they have not come out with the program in full.

One other thing we got clipped on was the other tax bill—this is not a partisan matter—and I am not getting into politics. I am just giving you the facts as they occurred. The last tax bill passed last February gave the utility companies another good big chunk of benefits. And to make sure that no State or anyone would require them to pass those benefits on to the purchasers of power, there was written into the law a provision which virtually prohibited the flow-through of benefits to consumers. This section of the bill was aimed directly at the municipal electric plants and the rural electric cooperatives. I faced it on the floor of the Senate, as did Senator PROUTY. I inserted letters from the Rural Electric Cooperative Association, also from the Municipal Public Power Association, but we were beaten by a vote of 43 to 48. And now when the power company says, "Oh, no; we are not going to pass those benefits on (to the consumers)—in fact, Congress doesn't want us to"—they are telling you the truth. We were licked and that is all there was to it but a few years ago we wouldn't have gotten licked. That's what makes me feel bad. Senator PROXMIRE, from Wisconsin, offered an amendment to knock this section out and, as I say, we tried to knock it out. Senator PROUTY and I both voted against it and we were defeated. The provision in the act which blocked the flow-through of benefits from the utility companies to the consumers was supported by Senator LONG of Louisiana. You can imagine my surprise when I found that the NRECA was sending out ratings of Members of Congress to the members of cooperatives all over the country showing Senator LONG had three times as good a rating as I did. In fact, they reported that I voted against the rural electric cooperatives 28 times and for them only 34 times over a period of years. I have been waiting patiently for a retraction or an explanation of that rating. It is not only false to me, but it is false to other people, too, and I advise you not to pay any attention to it because it is rigged and, to the best of my knowledge, I have not voted against REA or worked against them in any way since I have been down there and I am naturally quite resentful that this report should have been sent out to all the REA members all over the country. I think the explanation is that in making up the voting record, a lot of issues were included which we might call ideological questions which had little to do with the work (basic or original) of the rural electric cooperatives themselves.

So I am giving you the facts on this. I want to say that I have lost quite a lot of my respect for the national organization and its general manager. I do not take directions from this national organization which apparently has too many other interests but I do listen to the Vermont electric cooperatives—and I tell you now—I came close to making a promise—that I shall do everything I can to speed your work here in the State of Vermont, but when you need something, I want to hear from Walter Cook, Sailey Ennis, or Ruby Snow and I don't want some so-and-so in Washington coming to me and telling me what you think. I want you to tell me directly. Your managers and your directors are fighting for you every minute and I intend to fight with them. Thank you.

Rural electrification program, 28 years old

Distribution loans:	
20 years Democrat administration	$2,655,014,286
8 years Republican administration	$1,055,562,544
Customers added (farms):	
20 years Democrat administration	4,694,621
8 years Republican administration	1,257,019
Generation loans:	
20 years Democrat administration	$1,074,423,098
8 years Republican administration	$514,062,479

Telephone program, 15 years old

Telephone loans:	
7 years Democrat administration	$458,647,116
8 years Republican administration	$630,680,973
Customers added:	
7 years Democrat administration	797,836
8 years Republican administration	1,175,227

James C. Auchincloss

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. CLEVELAND

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, Congressman JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS, known affectionately as JIM to his many friends, will be retiring in January after 22 years of distinguished service in the Congress. While I had the distinct pleasure of serving with him for 2 years, and I wish it had been for a longer period, I think I can speak for colleagues on both sides of the aisle in saying that his presence in this Chamber will be missed greatly during the coming years.

During my 2 years in the Congress, JIM has given me wise counsel on the important issues which have confronted us. Serving with him on the Committee on Public Works, a committee on which he has been the ranking minority member for 6 years, has indeed been a rewarding experience. On that committee and on the floor he exercised effective leadership in the development of legislation in the best interest of all of the people.

JIM AUCHINCLOSS ably demonstrated his ability to get to the essentials of important legislation. His keen perception of reality added much to the improvement of legislation in the Congress. Should the Republicans have been fortunate enough to have become a majority in the Congress, JIM AUCHINCLOSS would have been an outstanding committee chairman, and he would have guided the committee with an effectiveness and thoroughness which this Congress rarely sees.

Since JIM came to the Congress in January 1943, five Presidents of this Nation have transmitted their legislative proposals to this body, and JIM AUCHINCLOSS acted on these matters with a bipartisan fairness. In his mind the interest of all the people of the United States is always paramount.

JIM AUCHINCLOSS will go down in history as one of the great Congressmen and one of the great Republicans. We will miss his genial and affable manner, but the memory of the man from New Jersey will long remain with us.

The Honorable Luis Muñoz-Marín

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. L. BARTLETT

OF ALASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, at the end of this year one of the great statesmen of the free world, Luis Muñoz-Marín, will relinquish the governorship of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

The decision to step down was his own. Fortunately for Puerto Rico and the United States, he will continue in public life in a lesser capacity and will lend his great talents when they are needed.

Puerto Rico today is not only a beautiful tropical island and a delight to tourists; it is a seat of industry and trade, with a soundly diversified economy. Many of America's largest industries operate manufacturing plants there, and new ones are established every year.

This economic growth during the era of Luis Muñoz-Marín has transformed Puerto Rico from the poverty level to a place with a standard of living well above that of any other tropical area of comparable population. Its per capita income now compares with those in Western Europe, and there is reason for hope that it will eventually approach that of the United States itself.

Muñoz-Marín's administration quite properly placed great stress on improving the living standards of the Puerto Rican people, but it did much more than that. It educated the people to a full appreciation of democratic government and the freedoms and opportunities democracy offers. It also encouraged their interests in their rich cultural heritage.

The result is that the Puerto Rican of today is a proud man, who possesses freedom and dignity. He has self-respect, not the apathy of the colonial era. He has a special identity. He has learned to live with the United States without being overwhelmed by it.

Many people believed a generation ago that the Puerto Rican people could not achieve this serenity without becoming an independent nation. Luis Muñoz-Marín came to realize early in his career that independence would mean hopeless poverty for his people. He sought and eventually achieved, by means of the Commonwealth, a status that has given the Puerto Rican people an identity without depriving them of any of their rights and opportunities as Americans.

This was a monumental accomplishment, for which Luis Muños will long be honored. May he be spared for many more years to observe the benefits of his brilliant leadership.

Summary of Record and Accomplishments of the Committee on Ways and Means During the 88th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILBUR D. MILLS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Ways and Means has again completed one of the busiest and one of the most productive periods in its entire history. The jurisdiction of this committee, as is well known, is exceedingly broad and complex, including legislation which affects the day-to-day economics and activities of all of our citizens. During the second session of the 88th Congress just concluded, the committee considered and reported legislation in every major area of its jurisdiction.

To afford some indication of the accomplishments of the committee in each of these major areas during the past 2 years, four major measures stand out as prime examples.

In the field of internal revenue taxation, the Revenue Act of 1964 represents the largest single tax cut in the history of the United States. In addition to this very significant reduction in the burdens carried by the American citizens, the Revenue Act of 1964 made many beneficial changes in the Internal Revenue Code. A second major example in the area of internal revenue taxation is the Interest Equalization Act of 1964, a measure which became necessary to help correct a balance-of-payments deficit and which was put into effect in 1964.

In the field of social security legislation, the committee reported the "Social Security Amendments of 1964," H.R. 11865, which unfortunately due to the controversy over certain amendments added by the other body was not enacted into law. A second major example in the social security field was H.R. 9393, a bill which made it possible for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to award disability insurance benefits to many thousands of individuals who otherwise would have been ineligible due to the technical requirements of the existing legislation.

In the field of tariff and custom law, the committee reported H.R. 11253, the "Tariff Classification Act of 1964." Again unfortunately, this measure was not finally enacted into law because of the controversy which arose over amendments added in the other body during the closing days of the second session.

In addition to the above examples, it was necessary for the committee to consider and report legislation in the area of the public debt, specifically bills extending the debt ceiling, and legislation to extend for an additional temporary period of time the excise taxes which normally would expire or be reduced on each June 30.

The foregoing measures indicate the intensive and productive activity of the Committee on Ways and Means, but that should not obscure the fact that the committee also reported and there was enacted into law many additional bills of less major import.

As I have pointed out in the past, and can again state without reservations, the members of the Committee on Ways and Means have devoted themselves diligently and conscientiously to the heavy work of the committee. The members of the committee have been assiduous in pursuing their responsibilities and in the attendance of the meetings of the committee almost daily throughout two sessions. Because of the nature of the work of the committee it was again necessary to conduct many executive sessions for the consideration of the complex measures which the committee had before it. While we as individual members of the committee have of course not always agreed on all of the measures considered by the committee, certainly every member can be justly proud of the work which he has done and the record which he has established.

As I have pointed out on numerous past occasions, it is abundantly clear that the nature of legislation falling within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means is quite complex and is of vital importance to each and every American citizen and to our Nation as a whole. It is therefore necessary that our committee must always proceed with great caution, prudence, care and statesmanship in carrying out the legislative responsibilities which we have.

During the course of this Congress the Committee on Ways and Means held public or executive hearings on a total of 59 days, exclusive of executive sessions, and has directly received testimony from more than 645 individuals during those hearings. In addition, comments, recommendations, and statements of views were received for the printed record from many hundreds of other interested persons and organizations. The hearings are printed in 25 volumes covering approximately 9,000 pages of testimony. Table 1, which follows, shows the subject and the details of these hearings:

TABLE 1.—*Hearings held by Committee on Ways and Means, 88th Cong.*

1ST SESS.

Subject	Number of days	Number of witnesses	Number of pages	Number of volumes
President's 1963 tax message	26	267	4,036	7
Continuation of present debt ceiling	1	3	73	1
Tax features of Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1963	1	12	112	1
Public debt ceiling	1	4	75	1
Interest Equalization Tax Act of 1963	4	28	540	1
Temporary increase in debt ceiling	1	2	55	1
Tax treatment of beer concentrate	1	9	127	1
Medical care for the aged [1]	5			

2D SESS.

Subject	Number of days	Number of witnesses	Number of pages	Number of volumes
Medical care for the aged [2]	5	174	2,502	5
Temporary increase in debt ceiling and extension of certain excise tax rates (executive hearing)	2	2	58	1
Federal excise tax structure	12	144	1,421	6
Total, 88th Cong	59	645	8,999	25

[1] Hearings were then suspended until Jan. 20, 1964. See "Medical care for the aged" under 2d sess.

[2] Resumed from Nov. 22, 1963. There was a total of 10 days of hearings.

In addition to the public hearings, during the course of the 88th Congress the full Committee on Ways and Means met in executive session 166 times.

Of the 15,296 public and private bills and resolutions introduced in the House during the course of this Congress, there was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means a total of 2,163 bills and resolutions in addition to the 51 executive communications. In addition, 17 messages of the President of the United States were on subjects within the jurisdiction of the committee. Of the total of 2,164 such bills and resolutions, there were 916 tax bills, 680 tariff bills, and 453 social security bills, in addition to some 115 bills of a miscellaneous character falling within the committe's jurisdiction. This represents more than one-sixth of all the public bills and resolutions introduced in the House of Representatives in this Congress. Table 2, which follows, sets forth the breakdown of the measures referred to the committee:

TABLE 2.—*Bills and resolutions referred to the Committee on Ways and Means, 88th Cong., by category*

Tax	916
Social security	453
Tariff	680
Miscellaneous	115
Total	2,164

During this Congress, the committee favorably reported to the House of Representatives a total of 77 bills, which breaks down as follows: 25 tax bills, 34 tariff bills, 11 social security bills, and 7 miscellaneous type bills. It should be noted in this connection that it is the practice of the committee to report from time to time omnibus legislation which, statistically, appears as one bill but which in fact may combine the provisions or subjects covered in a large number of individual bills which were pending before the committee. For the further information of the Members, I shall insert at this point table 3 which sets forth the statistics on the status of the bills reported by the committee during this Congress:

TABLE 3.—*Status of bills reported by the Committee on Ways and Means during the 88th Cong.*

	Tax	Social security	Tariff	Miscellaneous	Total
Reported to House	25	11	[1] 34	[2] 7	[1][2] 77
Passed House	23	11	[3] 28	[2] 7	[2][3] 69
Reported to Senate	18	11	[3] 25	[2] 7	[2][3] 61
Passed Senate	18	11	[3] 25	[2] 7	[2][3] 61
Enacted into law	17	10	22	[2] 6	[2] 55

[1] Includes 2 concurrent resolutions.

[2] Includes 1 Senate bill.

[3] Includes 1 concurrent resolution.

Mr. Speaker, also for the information of the Members, there is presented below a brief summary and digest of all bills reported from the Committee on Ways and Means during the 88th Congress, including a statement of the stage in the legislative process reached by each bill:

SUMMARY OF BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS REPORTED FROM THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS DURING THE 88TH CONGRESS

I. THE REVENUE ACT OF 1964

H.R. 8363, by Mr. MILLS; Public Law 88-272, signed February 26, 1964: This legislation provided the largest tax reduction in the history of the United States—$11.5 billion annually. The President submitted his recommendations for a tax cut and other structural revisions in our Federal tax system early in 1963. There followed some 13 months of assiduous effort on the part of the Congress and the congressional and departmental staffs during which various alternatives and ramifications of the President's proposals were analyzed and evaluated in the most minute detail and the comments from thousands of individuals and groups were received and carefully considered. Although the bill as ultimately enacted into law modified and revised the President's original recommendations—for instance, the deletion of the provision relating to the taxation of capital gains—the Revenue Act of 1964 constitutes a dramatic and historic effort in loosening the constraints the tax system had imposed on our free enterprise system.

In general, this legislation provides tax incentives designed to bring about a higher level of economic activity, fuller use of our manpower, more intensive and prosperous use of our plant and equipment, and with the increases in wages, salaries, profits, consumption and investment, it is expected there will be increases in Federal tax revenues. A brief summary of the provisions of the bill follows:

The basic provisions of the bill reduce the tax rates for both individuals and corporations. The individual income tax rates are reduced from a range of 20 to 91 percent to rates ranging from 16 to 77 percent in 1964 and from 14 to 70 percent in 1965. The withholding rate of tax was reduced from 18 to 14 percent effective shortly after enactment of the law. The tax rate for corporations is reduced from 52 to 50 percent in 1964 and to 48 percent in 1965 and the rate applicable to the first $25,000 of corporate income, beginning in 1964, is reduced from 30 to 20 percent. In addition, corporations are placed on a full pay-as-you-go basis for all of their corporate tax liability above $100,000 so that this liability eventually will be payable in the year in which earned.

The investment credit provision of prior law was amended in several respects. That provision permits a taxpayer to reduce his tax liability by a tax credit amounting to 7 percent of the cost of depreciable machinery and equipment which he puts into operation. In addition, prior law provided the amount of the credit must be subtracted from the basis on which depreciation allowances are computed. The most significant respect in which that provision was amended was to repeal the requirement for a downward adjustment in basis by the amount of the credit (the so-called Long amendment). In addition, lessees of distributors are to base their investment, for purposes of computing the credit, on the "fair market value" of the equipment rather than its cost. Escalators and elevators are added to the category of items eligible for the investment credit. In the case of Federal regulatory agencies, the act provides that the agencies are not to require the "flow through" to the consumer of the benefits of the investment credit at any time in certain cases, and in others, only over the life of the asset.

The act contains a number of provisions designed to alleviate hardship:

(1) A minimum standard deduction is provided of $300 for each taxpayer plus an extra $100 for each additional exemption, including the additional exemptions for taxpayers aged 65 or over, or blind, up to a maximum of $1,000.

(2) The deduction for expenses of child care and care of disabled dependents is liberalized by raising the limit of children covered to those under 13 years of age, by increasing the maximum deduction to $900 in the case of two or more dependents, and by increasing the income limitation for married women from $4,500 to $6,000.

(3) The 1-percent floor on deductions of medicine and drug expense for taxpayers over 65 is eliminated.

(4) The provisions governing deduction of moving expenses are liberalized to cover employees required to move in order to accept a new job.

(5) A taxpayer age 65 or over who sells his personal residence will be permitted to exclude any capital gain attributable to the first $20,000 of the sales price; but this can be done only once in the taxpayer's lifetime and the taxpayer must have held and used the property as his personal residence for 5 out of the last 8 years.

(6) Taxpayers whose income fluctuates widely from year to year, such as authors, actors, artists, athletes, etc., will benefit from a new income averaging provision which permits averaging of that income over a 5-year period.

(7) The retirement income credit of present law is liberalized to provide that a couple, both over 65, making a joint return may, at their election, have a total retirement income credit of $2,286, rather than $1,524, applicable to the retirement income of either or both if either spouse meets the 10-year earned income requirement.

The act contains a number of provisions designed to reduce special advantages, including:

(1) The value of group-term life insurance provided by an employer in excess of $50,000 will have to be added to the employee's taxable income although retired persons would be exempt.

(2) The 4-percent tax credit for dividend income is repealed and the amount of the dividend exclusion from tax is increased from $50 to $100 ($200 in the case of a joint return).

(3) The rules governing stock options are tightened to limit the practice of using such options as a device to offer executives a profit above and beyond their salary.

(4) An interest deduction would no longer be allowed for an indebtedness for what is popularly called a "minimum or bank loan deposit insurance."

(5) The tax avoidance device of selling property for deferred payments without specifying the interest charges is eliminated.

(6) With respect to corporations, the rules governing the grouping of properties for tax purposes in the oil and gas industries is tightened.

(7) The rules defining a personal holding company are tightened so that this device cannot be used to shelter dividend and other investment income as corporate income and thus to pay much lower taxes on it.

(8) Large corporate enterprises availing themselves of multiple surtax exemptions through forming chains of corporations will have to pay an additional penalty tax to retain this advantage.

(9) The rules governing tax treatment of real estate, other than land, are tightened so that the portion of capital gain resulting from excess depreciation will be taxed at ordinary tax rates, rather than at much lower tax rates.

(10) Amends the provisions of prior law by reducing to $25,000 from $35,000 the exclusion allowed U.S. citizens who are bona fide residents of a foreign country for more than 3 years.

In addition, the act contains provisions designed to contribute to a much fairer tax structure. Such provisions are:

(1) Minor estate and local taxes, such as tax on alcohol, tobacco, cigarettes, auto license tags, and drivers' licenses will no longer be deductible for Federal income tax purposes except where they are deductible as a business expense. However, major State and local taxes such as real estate taxes, personal property taxes, income taxes, sales taxes, and use taxes as well as gasoline taxes will continue to be fully deductible for Federal income tax purposes.

(2) The old law which allowed deductions up to 30 percent of adjusted gross income for contributions to charitable organizations such as churches, schools, and hospitals, is extended to cover contributions to any publicly supported organization to which the 20-percent limitation on deductions previously applied. This will include such organizations as the Red Cross, Boy Scouts, Cancer Society, etc. With respect to charitable contributions, the act also tightens the provisions relating to the unlimited deduction and gifts of future interest. In addition the act extends the carryover of excess charitable contributions made by corporations from 2 to 5 years and grants a similar carryover of excess contributions made by individuals.

There are certain provisions of the act which incorporate the provisions of other bills which had been ordered favorably reported by the Committee on Ways and Means:

(1) H.R. 4040, providing in brief that where a taxpayer contests a tax or other liability, he is, nevertheless, to be permitted a deduction for the item in the year in which he makes the payment if this is earlier than the year in which the contest is settled.

(2) H.R. 5468, permitting persons who paid self-employment tax and who are later covered for the same period by a retroactive social security agreement entered into by a State to obtain a refund of the self-employment tax.

(3) H.R. 6995, providing that regulated investment companies are to be given 45 days after the close of their taxable year rather than 30 days to give notices to their shareholders as to the treatment by the shareholders of income received from the companies.

(4) H.R. 8798, providing that in the case of subchapter S corporations, certain distributions of money after the close of a taxable year may be treated as made during the year; and that a corporation member of an affiliated group may elect subchapter S treatment if the only other members of the group are inactive subsidiary corporations.

Many other structural reforms were included in the act, such as the limitation of deductions for casualty losses from nonbusiness property to the amount of each loss in excess of $100;

Amending the sick pay provisions of prior law to provide that the waiting period before sick pay becomes excludable from income is 30 days, if the empolyee receives more than 75 percent of his weekly wages; and the repeal of the limitation on deducting certain travel expenses in connection with business trips within the United States.

II. OTHER TAX LEGISLATION

H.R. 98, by Mr. Keogh; Public Law 88–539, signed August 31, 1964: As unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means and as passed by the House, the purpose of this legislation was to provide for the refund or credit of the internal revenue taxes paid or determined with respect to distilled spirits, wines, or beer which have been imported into the United States where three conditions exist: (1) the alcoholic beverage has been found to be unmerchantable or not to conform to sample or specifications; (2) the beverage has been returned to customs custody within 6 months; and (3) the beverage has been exported or destroyed in customs custody. Substantially similar treatment is already available in the case of domestic distilled spirits, wines, and beer, and the committee was of the opinion that his discrimination against imported alcoholic beverages which have been found after entry not to be suitable for certain uses should be removed.

The Senate passed the bill without change in the provisions of the House bill but added amendments relating to the installment method of reporting income for tax purposes and to the provision adopted in the Revenue Act of 1964 with respect to revolving credit-type plans. The Senate amendments were accepted by the House and the bill became law as thus amended.

H.R. 780, by Mr. Keogh; passed House February 26, 1963: As unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means and passed by the House of Representatives, this bill would amend section 814 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 (providing an election to take a credit against estate tax for estate taxes paid on certain prior transfers) to make it applicable to estates of decedents dying after December 31, 1949 (instead of December 31, 1951), to make the credit against estate tax for the amount of estate tax paid on certain prior transfers available where the death of the first spouse to die occurred within the 3 years prior to that of the decedent in question but after December 31, 1947 (instead of within 2 years of the decedent), and by providing that, where the deaths of the husband and wife occurred more than 2 years apart, the credit for prior estate taxes is to be 80 percent instead of 100 percent. At adjournment, the bill was pending in the Senate Committee on Finance.

H.R. 1597, by Mr. Friedel; Public Law 88–9, signed April 10, 1963: This legislation dealt with the tax treatment of redeemable ground rent, both with respect to the buyer of a home subject to a redeemable ground rent and the person selling this property. Under the bill as unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means and as it became law, for the home buyer the ground rent paid is treated as a mortgage interest payment and, therefore, is deductible by him for tax purposes. The seller of the real property subject to the redeemable ground rent is treated as if he had sold the property subject to a mortgage in a face amount equal to the redemption price of the redeemable ground rent. As a result, the redeemable ground rent is taken into account in determining his sale price for the property and, therefore, is reflected in any gain (or loss) recognized to him. The deduction of the ground rent as the equivalent of a mortgage interest payment is available for 1962 and subsequent years. In the case of the seller of the property, however, the new treatment in general applies prospectively only. The bill, enactment of which was favored by the Treasury Department, was amended in the Senate to provide a statutory definition of the term "redeemable ground rent," and became law as so amended.

H.R. 2085, by Mr. Green of Pennsylvania; Public Law 88–4, signed April 2, 1963: The purpose of this bill, which became law as reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, was to liberalize the child care expense provisions of the income tax law in the case of wives who have been deserted by their husbands. The legislation provides that a gainfully employed wife who has been deserted by her husband need no longer file a joint return with him to be eligible for the child care deduction and the deduction allowed her will no longer be decreased where the combined adjusted gross income of the husband and wife exceeds $4,500, thus treating a woman who is legally married but who has been deserted by her husband in the same manner as a single woman for purposes of the child-care deduction.

H.R. 2826, by Mr. Boggs; reported to the House February 4, 1963: The purpose of this bill, as unanimously reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means, was to provide involuntary conversion treatment, for income tax purposes, for property other than stock which is disposed of as a result of civil antitrust proceedings instituted under the Sherman Act or the Clayton Act. Under the bill, no capital gains tax would be incurred where property is disposed of as a result of a judgment or decree in such a case and the proceeds are reinvested in other property, similar or related in service or use to the property disposed of, but instead the new property, to the extent acquired with the proceeds from the property sold, would have the same basis as the old property. Safeguarding provisions were included in the bill, which except for a minor date change is the same as H.R. 8846 of the 87th Congress (which was passed by the House and favorably reported by the Finance Committee to the Senate). At adjournment, H.R. 2826 was pending before the House.

H.R. 2855, by Mr. Derounian; passed House August 4, 1964: As unanimously reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means, this bill provided that in the case of the sale of electric light bulb sets or strings by the importers of the sets or strings, the 10 percent manufacturers' excise tax on light bulbs is to apply to the bulbs in these sets or strings in the same manner as where a domestic producer acquires bulbs and incorporates them in a set or string. The tax would be based on the price for which these or similar light bulbs are sold in the ordinary course of trade by manufacturers, producers, or importers. At adjournment the bill was pending in the Senate Finance Committee.

H.R. 2875, by Mr. Green of Pennsylvania; reported to the House February 4, 1963: As reported to the House, this bill would amend the provisions of the present law permitting the Federal Government upon request to enter into an agreement to withhold State or territorial tax from compensation paid Federal employees who are employed in the State or territory so as to also provide for withholding of city taxes by the Federal Government, with respect to its employees who are employed in a city with such a tax, if the city has a population of 60,000 or more. The bill would also delete from these provisions of law references to territories, as being no longer necessary. Restrictions of existing law applicable to State withholding taxes would also apply to the city withholding taxes under the bill, which was the same as H.R. 2017 which had been reported by the Committee on Ways and Means in the 87th Congress. Enactment of this legislation was favored by the Treasury Department, and at adjournment it was pending before the House.

H.R. 3297, by Mr. Fallon; passed House June 27, 1963: The purpose of this bill, which was passed by the House without amendment and at adjournment was pending before the Senate Finance Committee, is to move forward from September 1, 1957, to January 1, 1963, the date before which certain mutual deposit guarantee funds must be organized in order to qualify for income tax exemption. The other requirements for the exemption, which are left unchanged by the bill, provide that the organizations must be mutual, nonprofit organizations without capital stock and operated to provide reserves and insurance for building and loan associations, cooperative banks, or mutual savings banks. These organizations perform essentially the same types of services as the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, Federal corporations which are exempt from income taxation.

H.R. 3846 (title II), by Mr. Aspinall; Public Law 88–578, signed September 3, 1964: The tax provisions of this bill, the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act, were drafted by the Committee on Ways and Means and formally transmitted to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs for inclusion as title II of the bill. As approved by the Committee on Ways and Means, and as the bill became law, all Federal excise taxes paid on special motor fuel and gasoline used in motorboats, rather than going into the highway trust fund, are to be placed in the new land and water conservation fund. No change was made in rates of tax or refund provisions of prior law.

H.R. 4040, by Mr. Keogh. See Public Law 88–272 (H.R. 8363), the Revenue Act of 1964.

H.R. 4649, by Mr. King of California; Public Law 88–653: As unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means and passed by the House, the purpose of this legislation was to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to authorize the use of certain volatile fruit-flavor concentrates in the cellar treatment of wine, thus permitting winemakers to take advantage of this technological development. The bill also makes it clear that this process will not be considered as making the wine an imitation wine.

The Senate amendments (not affecting the provisions of the House bill) repealing the 8-percent manufacturers' excise tax on rebuilt automotive parts and making the 10-percent manufacturers' excise tax on radio and television components inapplicable to so much of the price of rebuilt television picture tubes as is represented by the fair market value of the used picture tube traded in, were accepted by the House and the bill became law as thus amended.

H.R. 4844, by Mr. Roybal; Public Law 88–570, signed September 2, 1964: As unanimously reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means, the purpose of this bill was to provide that gain from installment obligations which were transferred to a taxpayer from a decedent in taxable years to which the 1939 code applied (generally, years beginning before January 1, 1954), but with respect to which installment payments are still being made, may be reported by the recipient on a pro rata basis as he receives installment payments without the necessity of maintaining a bond with the Internal Revenue Service to assure this reporting of the income. The committee was of the opinion that there appears to be no reason to continue these bonding requirements if the holders of the installment obligations which were acquired while the 1939 code was still in effect are willing to enter into a binding agreement to have the 1954 code rules apply (but without the deduction for estate tax). Thus the taxpayer is saved the premiums he must pay to maintain the bonds as well as the bother of applying for a reduction in the bond from time to time as installment payments reduce the size of the gain still to be reported, and the Internal Revenue Service is saved the necessity of handling the administration of the bonds. The Senate passed the provisions of the House bill without change, but added a provision to the bill relating to the income tax treatment of certain reacquisitions of real property. In conference, this amendment was accepted and as thus amended, the bill became law.

H.R. 5389 (title II), by Mr. Patman; Public Law 88–36, signed June 4, 1963: Title II of this bill as agreed to by the Committee on Ways and Means, the language for which was formally transmitted to the Committee on Banking and Currency for inclusion in that committee's report on the bill, provides for a repeal of the tax on transfers of silver bullion. This title of the bill became law without amendment.

H.R. 5468, by Mr. Miller of California; see: Public Law 88–272 (H.R. 8363), the Revenue Act of 1964.

H.R. 5739, by Mr. Herlong; Public Law 88–571, signed September 2, 1964: As unanimously reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means and as passed by the House, this bill made three modifications in the provisions of law relating to the tax treatment of life insurance companies: first, by extending the area of application of the 8-year loss carryover, presently available for new life insurance companies only when they are not affiliated with another company (other than a fire or other casualty insurance company), to new life insurance companies without regard to whether they are affiliated with other companies; second, by correcting an imperfection in present law which permits a double inclusion in the "shareholders surplus account" with respect to the excess of net long-term capital gains over net short-term capital losses. This double inclusion, which is removed by the bill, permits the distribution to shareholders of an amount equal to twice this capital gain without the payment of a tax at the time of distribution (with certain other adjustments) under what is called phase 3, and third, by correcting an imperfection in the additions which are required to be made to the "policyholders surplus account."

The Senate passed the bill with numerous amendments making minor modifications in the provisions of the House bill and adding other provisions relating to the taxation of life insurance companies as well as other tax matters. Under the conference agreement and as the bill became law, in addition to revisions in the tax treatment of life insurance companies provisions were included in the bill making the percentage depletion rate for all ores of beryllium 2 percent and providing a 10-year carryover of certain foreign expropriation capital losses.

H.R. 6246, by Mr. Mills; Public Law 88–153, signed October 17, 1963: This legislation, which was enacted into law without amendment, provided a 2-year continuation of the tax treatment which has been afforded in the case of accrued vacation pay. Prior law provided that, for taxable years ending before January 1, 1963, a deduction for accrued vacation pay is not to be denied solely because the liability for it to a specific person has not been fixed or because the liability for it to each individual cannot be computed with reasonable accuracy. However, for the corporation to obtain the deduction, the employee must have performed the qualifying service necessary under a plan or policy which provides for vacations with pay to qualified employees and the liability must be reasonably determinable with respect to the group of employees involved. This bill, the enactment of which was unanimously recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means, makes this treatment applicable with respect to taxable years ending before January 1, 1965.

H.R. 6455, by Mr. Byrnes; Public Law 88-360, signed July 17, 1964: The purpose of this legislation, which was unanimously reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means, was to provide an exemption from the tax on unrelated business taxable income in the case of labor unions and agricultural or horticultural organizations where (1) the income is used to establish, maintain, or operate a retirement home, hospital, or similar facility for the exclusive use of aged and infirm members of the labor union or agriculture or horticultural organization, (2) the income is derived from agricultural pursuits conducted on ground contiguous to the home, hospital, etc., and (3) the income represents not more than 75 percent of the cost of maintaining and operating the home, etc. The amendment of the Senate making the bill effective with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1963, rather than after December 31, 1962, as provided in the House bill, was accepted by the House and the bill was enacted into law as thus amended.

H.R. 6755, by Mr. Mills; Public Law 88–52, signed June 29, 1963: This bill, which was enacted into law without amendment, extended for 1 year, through June 30, 1964, the combined corporate tax rate of 52 percent and certain excise tax rates; namely, on distilled spirits, beer, wine, cigarettes, passenger cars, automobile parts and accessories, general (local) telephone service, and the transportation of persons by air. In the committee report on the bill, it was explained that the committee had not yet completed its consideration of the President's 1963 tax recommendations, which involved a reduction in corporate income tax rates, and that it was not "intended that any inferences be drawn" from the interim action taken in H.R. 6755 as to "what the committee may recommend with respect to the corporate tax rate with respect to the President's major tax program." It was also pointed out that in the absence of this legislation, there would be a revenue loss of $4.1 to $4.2 billion in a full year of operation, that the Secretary of the Treasury in his appearance before the committee had suggested that at such time as excise tax reductions were determined to be appropriate "it would be desirable to review all excise taxes rather than to automatically select for reduction those excise taxes which were increased at the time of the Korean conflict, or have been added to the list of excises extended on a year-by-year basis since that time," and that any failure to extend these existing tax rates at the present time would lessen the committee's and Congress opportunity subsequently to determine the most appropriate form of any tax reduction which may be provided.

H.R. 6995, by Mr. Keogh; see: Public Law 88–272 (H.R. 8363), the "Revenue Act of 1964".

H.R. 7267, by Mr. Ullman; passed House June 29, 1964: As unanimously reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means, the purpose of this bill was to provide for the refund of the full 4-cents-a-gallon tax for gasoline used in farming in an aircraft by an aerial applicator if the applicator is the purchaser of the gasoline and the farm owner, tenant, or operator waives his right to obtain this refund. Presently, this 4-cents-a-gallon tax refund is available only to the farm owner, tenant, or operator. At adjournment, the bill was pending in the Senate Committee on Finance.

H.R. 7301, by Mr. Utt; Public Law 88–484, signed August 22, 1964: The purpose of this bill as unanimously reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means was to amend the "collapsible corporation" provisions of the tax laws so that they will not apply to the sale of stock in a corporation which consents to a special tax treatment on any later disposition by it of its assets. Under the bill, the corporation must consent to the recognition of gain on dispositions by the corporation of its assets in the same manner as if these assets had been sold for their fair market values. The gain recognized will be ordinary income, if ordinary income would have been recognized on a sale of the assets by the corporation, and will be capital gain if capital gain would have been recognized on such a sale. The amendments of the Senate, making minor modifications in the provisions of the House bill and adding an amendment dealing with the definition of rents in defining personal holding company income, were accepted by the House and the bill became law as thus amended.

H.R. 7307, by Mr. Baker; passed House June 29, 1964: As unanimously reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means, the purpose of this bill was to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the apportionment of the depletion allowance between parties to certain contracts for the extraction of minerals (other than oil or gas), so that a contracting party in the case of the extraction of minerals other than oil or gas is not to share in the percentage depletion deduction if (1) he is neither an owner nor lessee of the property; (2) he is required by the contract to deliver the minerals extracted to another party; and (3) he is paid under the contract a fixed sum per unit delivered which does not vary in accordance with the amount received by the other party upon the disposition of these mineral units. At adjournment, the bill was pending in the Senate Finance Committee.

H.R. 8000, By Mr. Mills, the "Interest Equalization Tax Act of 1964"; Public Law 88–563, signed September 2, 1964: This legislation which was enacted at the request of the President is designed to stem the heavy drain of gold and dollars from our shores. Its purpose is, by bringing the cost of capital raised in the U.S. market by foreign persons more nearly into alinement with the cost prevailing in markets in other industrial countries, to help resolve the problem of our balance of payments deficits.

The interest equalization tax is a temporary excise tax effective for the period July 19, 1963, through December 31, 1965. The bill imposes a tax on the purchase by U.S. citizens, residents, domestic corporations, and other U.S. persons of debt obligations or stock of foreign persons but only where the obligation or stock was purchased from a foreigner. The tax on the transfer of stock is 15 percent of the value of the stock and the tax on debt obligations varies from 15 percent on those with a maturity of 28½ years or more down to 2.75 percent for those with a maturity of 3 to 3½ years. No tax is imposed for obligations with a maturity of 3 years or less.

The act contains a series of exemptions designed primarily to give assurance that our export efforts and the normal recurring financing of international business will not be hampered by this tax. The principal exemptions relate to:

(1) Securities acquired from a prior American owner;

(2) Securities received in connection with a wide range of export transactions;

(3) Debt obligations received by commercial banks in the course of their commercial banking business;

(4) Direct investments in 10-percent-owned corporations;

(5) Securities of "less-developed-country corporations" and obligations of less-developed countries;

(6) New security issues which the President exempts in the interest of international monetary stability;

(7) Reserves maintained by insurance companies doing business in foreign countries; and

(8) Investments of foreign membership dues by labor unions and other exempt organizations.

H.R. 8050, by Mrs. Griffiths; passed Senate with amendments September 28, 1964: As unanimously reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means, the purpose of this bill was to extend the tax exemption now available to nonprofit business leagues, chambers of commerce, real estate boards, or boards of trade, to nonprofit nurses' professional registries. These registries are organizations listing nurses available for duty and are supported, in large part, by registry fees, although support from other sources, such as hospitals, is also frequently received. To qualify for this exemption, the registries must be operated by, or associated with, exempt nurses' professional associations, must not be organized for profit, no part of their net earnings may inure to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual, and the organization must not charge anyone other than the nurses who are registrants for the use of the registry.

The Senate in passing the bill deleted the provisions of the House bill entirely and inserted in lieu provisions relating to the personal holding company tax, foreign expropriation losses, and the deduction of certain assessments. At adjournment the bill was on the Speaker's table, the House having taken no action on the request of the Senate for a conference on the bill.

H.R. 8268, by Mr. Watts; Public Law 88–342, signed June 30, 1964: The purpose of this legislation, as unanimously reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means, was to eliminate a tax inequity in connection with the importation into the United States for reprocessing of certain domestically produced tobacco products and cigarette papers and tubes which have been previously exported. Double taxation in such cases is prevented under the bill by providing that tobacco products and cigarette papers and tubes previously exported and otherwise subject to duty may be released, without payment of that part of the duty attributable to the internal revenue tax, for delivery to a manufacturer of such articles in accordance with such regulations and under such bond as the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate shall prescribe. Favorable departmental reports were received on the bill, and it was enacted into law as reported by the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 8798, by Mr. Thompson of Texas; See Public Law 88–272 (H.R. 8363), the "Revenue Act of 1964."

H.R. 10467, by Mr. Mills; Public Law 88–554, signed August 31, 1964: As unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, and as passed by the House, this bill provided for a further 2-year continuation of the rules relating to the deductibility, for income tax purposes, of accrued vacation pay (as described in H.R. 6246 (Public Law 88–153), above), so that the deduction is not to be denied for any taxable year ending before January 1, 1967, under the circumstances set forth.

The Senate passed the provisions of the House bill without amendment, but added several other provisions. Under the conference agreement and as the bill became law, in addition to the original provisions of the House bill the legislation contained provisions (1) relating to the determination of the value of the taxable estate of Carbon P. Dubbs; (2) authorizing the Commissioner of Internal Revenue to enter into a closing agreement under which certain deductions will be allowed in computing the taxable estate of Anna Gould de Talleyrand; (3) authorizing and directing the Secretary of Commerce to investigate and study the feasibility of imposing taxes on those transit and commuter systems which are the beneficiaries of Federal financial assistance under the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964, for the purpose of raising revenues to defray Federal expenditures under that act; and (4) eliminating the "sidewise attribution" effect under the rules of constructive ownership applicable in determining ownership of stock under certain provisions of the 1954 code.

H.R. 11376, by Mr. Mills; Public Law 88–348, signed June 30, 1964: As reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means, this bill provided a 1-year extension, to July 1, 1965, of certain excise tax rates which would in the absence of legislation have been reduced or terminated. These included the excise tax rates on distilled spirits, beer and wines, cigarettes, passenger cars, auto parts and accessories, general (local) telephone service, and the transportation of persons by air. The rate extensions provided by the bill were in conformity with the recommendations of the administration, and the decision for such action was implicit in the earlier action taken by the Congress in reducing income taxes, in the Revenue Act of 1964. Additionally, the Committee on Ways and Means was of the opinion that in the consideration of any significant reduction in excise taxes, there should be a thorough study and review of all excise taxes rather than for action to be taken on one specific category. The Senate in passing the bill adopted numerous amendments reducing or repealing excise taxes not involved in the House bill, as well as a provision revising the provision of the Revenue Act of 1964 relating to losses arising from expropriation by the Government of Cuba. Under the conference agreement and as it became law, the bill retained unchanged the provisions of the House bill with the addition of the Cuban loss provision only.

III. CUSTOMS AND TARIFF LEGISLATION

H.R. 370, by Mr. Knox; reported to the House February 4, 1963: This bill, which was reported unanimously by the Committee on Ways and Means, was designed to deal with a situation faced by U.S. bakers who market their products in cities located close to the Canadian border. Under the bill, there would be provided a duty assessment of 7½ percent ad valorem on imports into the United States of pan loaf bread and pan-type loaf bread, made with the use of yeast as the leavening substance, whether or not such bread is sliced. The duty would not be applicable during any period when the principal supplying country of such bread in the year 1961 extends duty-free treatment to U.S. bread of the same kind imported into that country. At adjournment, the bill was pending before the House.

H.R. 1608, by Mr. Glenn; Public Law 88–334, signed June 30, 1964: This legislation, which became law as unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, was designed to make it clear that it shall be irrelevant for duty-exemption purposes whether aircraft engines and propellers, and parts and accessories thereof, temporarily admitted duty-free under bond for repair are removed from the United States as cargo or as an operating part of an aircraft departing the United States in international traffic. Favorable departmental reports were received on the bill, and the committee was advised that its enactment would "facilitate and ease the flow from foreign airlines of repair work to American firms engaged in this type of business."

H.R. 1839, by Mr. Teague of California; Public Law 88–482, signed August 22, 1964: As unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means and passed by the House of Representatives, this bill extended the existing free importation provisions for wild animals and wild birds intended for exhibition in zoological collections for educational or scientific purposes to wild animals and wild birds imported by any importer for exhibition for any purpose, or imported by a person or firm who in turn woud sell them for ultimate use in exhibitions for any purpose. The committee concluded that enactment of the legislation would serve to eliminate certain customs procedures which surround dutiable importations and thereby permit rapid customs clearance of specimens which could be damaged by delayed customs clearance, and further that in the light of the noncompetitive character of the imports involved, all animal and bird exhibitors should be able to purchase directly or from dealers those live specimens which they believe enhance the quality of their exhibitions without having to pay import duties, either directly, or indirectly.

The Senate amended the bill, deleting entirely the House provision and inserting new text imposing quotas on the imports of certain meats and meat products. Under the conference agreement and as the bill became law, the tariff schedules of the United States were amended to permit the free entry of wild animals (including birds and fish) imported for use, or for sale for use, in any scientific public collection for exhibition for scientific or educational purposes, and there was included a modified provision for the imposition of quotas on certain meat and meat products (fresh, chilled, or frozen meat of cattle, goats, and sheep (except lambs)).

H.R. 2053, by Mr. Schneebeli; Public Law 88–32 signed May 29, 1963: As it became law, this bill provided a 3-year (to the close of May 29, 1966) suspension of duty on imports of cork insulation. As unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means and passed by the House, the bill would have provided a 3-year suspension of duties on cork insulation and certain cork stoppers; however, the bill was amended in the Senate to make the suspension applicable only in the case of cork insulation, the existing tariff treatment on all cork stoppers to be retained. The House accepted this amendment, and the bill became law as so modified.

H.R. 2221, by Mr. Gubser; Public Law 88–87, signed August 5, 1963: The purpose of this bill, which was enacted in the form unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, was to provide for the duty-free entry of the mass spectrometer (and its accompanying spare parts assortment) imported during October 1962, for the use of Stanford University, Stanford, Calif. The committee was advised that at the time Stanford University determined its requirements and specifications for the instrument (which was being used at the time of consideration of this legislation for research in organic chemistry sponsored by various governmental agencies), no domestic instrument of equivalent scientific value or adequate performance characteristics was available from domestic sources. Enactment of the legislation was consistent with prior congressional enactments.

H.R. 2330, by Mr. Boggs; reported to the House March 24, 1964: The purpose of this bill, which at adjournment was pending before the House, was to provide for the duty-free importation of certain antiques made at least 100 years prior to the date of entry. Under the tariff schedules of the United States, duty-free entry is provided for certain antiques made prior to the year 1830, and the Committee on Ways and Means was of the opinion that in the case of antiques generally, it is preferable to provide a criterion based on a certain number of years of age rather than on production prior to a fixed date. Favorable departmental reports were received on the bill, and the committee was advised that its enactment would be in keeping with present international practice.

H.R. 2513, by Mr. Herlong; pocket veto (memorandum of disapproval of President, December 31, 1963): As presented to the President for his approval, this bill provided that, with respect to every imported article removed from its container and repackaged, the new package must be marked with the name of the country of origin if, under present law, the original container must be so marked, with failure to do so subjecting the repackager to penalty. The Senate had amended the bill by adding a provision which, as agreed to by the conferees and incorporated in the bill sent to the President, would require that all imported sawed lumber and wood products be marked with the country of origin.

The President withheld approval from the bill, thus invoking a pocket veto, and in his memorandum of disapproval indicated that he felt there was no need for the legislation, and that its enactment would hinder trade relations and would impose new costs upon our merchants and consumers.

H.R. 2652, by Mr. Burke; Public Law 88–331, signed June 30, 1964: As unanimously reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means and as it became law, this bill provided for the duty-free treatment of Karakul wools and certain other coarse wools imported for use in the manufacture of pressed felt for polishing plate and mirror glass. The committee was advised that wool imported for the manufacture of polishing cloths is a coarse type of wool not available in significant quantities domestically, and was of the opinion that enactment of the bill would be of significant benefit to domestic manufacturers who use this raw material in the production of polishing felts. Favorable departmental reports were received on the legislation.

H.R. 2675, by Mr. Keogh; Public Law 88–92, signed August 8, 1963: The purpose of this bill, which was enacted into law without amendment, was to continue for 3 years, to September 30, 1966, the period during which certain tanning extracts, and extracts of hemlock or eucalyptus suitable for use for tanning, may be imported free of duty. The suspension of duty on these items has been in effect continuously for several years, the original suspensions having been enacted in view of the lack of domestic availability of tanning extracts resulting from the blight which virtually wiped out the chestnut trees along the Appalachian Range. The Committee on Ways and Means was advised that there is no information to indicate that these considerations do not continue to be pertinent.

H.R. 2827, by Mr. Boggs; Public Law 88–49, signed June 29, 1963: As reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, this bill provided for a 3-year continuation, to June 30, 1966, of the suspension of import duty on crude chicory and reduction in duty to 2 cents per pound on imports of crude chicory. This duty treatment has been in effect continuously since April 16, 1958. No chicory has been grown in the United States since 1954, and domestic processors of chicory have depended on imports of crude chicory for their supplies of the raw material. Favorable departmental reports were received on the bill, which became law as unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2874, by Mr. Green of Pennsylvania; passed House August 17, 1964: The purpose of this legislation, which was unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means and passed the House without amendment, was to transfer from the free list to the duitable list of the Tariff Act of 1930, electron microscopes, and parts or accessories thereof, imported by or on behalf of certain nonprofit organizations. The committee had recommended enactment in the 87th Congress of legislation (Public Law 87-95) which provided for the free importation of electron microscopes; but upon receipt of information to the effect that advancements which have occurred in the technology of the production of these items have had the result that domestically produced electron microscopes are now not essentially different in construction and capabilities from some of those which are imported, the committee reexamined the subject and concluded that further importations of such articles should be subject to duty. Subsequently, a bill identical to H.R. 2874 (H.R. 9414) was reported to and passed by the House in the 87th Congress. At adjournment, H.R. 2874 was pending in the Senate Finance Committee.

H.R. 3272, by Mr. STEPHENS; Public Law 88-83, signed August 5, 1963: This bill, which was enacted into law without amendment, authorized and directed the Secretary of the Treasury to admit free of duty an orthicon image assembly for the use of the Medical College of Georgia, Augusta, Ga. The assembly has been installed at the medical college hemodynamic center and is used in medical diagnosis, research, or education to enlarge and display X-ray views of the human anatomy. The Committee on Ways and Means concluded that the legislation was meritorious and consistent with prior congressional enactments, and was unanimous in favorably reporting the bill.

H.R. 3498, by Mr. DEROUNIAN; reported to the House May 12, 1964: As unanimously reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means, the purpose of this bill was to provide for the individual marking (as to country of origin) of printed paper labels or bands imported into the United States. Among the labels and bands which would be so required to be marked would be printed (including lithographed) paper cigar bands, cigar labels, and whisky labels. At adjournment, the bill was pending in the House.

H.R. 3674, by Mr. BURKE; Public Law 88-86, signed August 5, 1963: The purpose of this bill was to correct an unintended anomaly in tariff provisions which had developed over the years, as a result of which polished sheets and plates of iron or steel could be brought into the United States at a lower rate of duty than unpolished sheets and plates. Although the new tariff schedules provided for by the Tariff Classification Act of 1962 recognized and corrected this situation, there had been a delay in implementation of the new schedules and the Committee on Ways and Means was of the opinion that, in view of the very substantial increase in volume of polished stainless steel imports which had occurred, there was no justification for the continued existence of this rate anomaly in the tariff law. The committee was unanimous in urging enactment of the bill, which provides that polished sheets and plates of iron and steel shall be subject to the same duty as unpolished sheets and plates, and which became law without amendment.

H.R. 3781, by Mr. MILLS; reported to the House June 21, 1963: As unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, the purpose of this bill was to make hat bodies made of toquilla fiber, commonly known as Panama hat bodies, dutiable at the same rate as hat bodies made of ramie fiber. As explained in the committee report on the bill, upon the implementation of the revised tariff schedules of the United States provided for in the Tariff Classification Act of 1962, a single rate of duty would be effective for such natural fiber hat bodies. Since negotiations had not been completed and the implementation of the revised schedules had not been effected, the Committee on Ways and Means deemed further delay in bringing about uniformity in their duty treatment unjustified; however, the U.S. tariff schedules did become effective on August 31, 1963, and H.R. 3781 was not acted on by the House.

H.R. 4174, by Mrs. GRIFFITHS; Public Law 88-50, signed June 29, 1963: This legislation continued for 1 year, to the close of June 30, 1964, the existing suspension of duties on metal scrap. The bill continued the existing limitations and provisos of law that the suspension shall not apply to lead, zinc, and tungsten scrap or alloys thereof, etc., and it also provided that the exemption from duty of any article under it will not affect the applicability of section 4541 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, relating to certain copper-bearing ores and concentrates and other articles of which copper is the component material of chief value or containing 4 percent or more of copper by weight.

Favorable departmental reports were received on this bill by the Committee on Ways and Means, and no information indicating any opposition to its enactment was presented. The bill, which was reported unanimously by the committee, became law in the form reported.

H.R. 4189, by Mr. Shelley; Public Law 88-337, signed June 30, 1964: The purpose of this bill, which was enacted into law as amended and unanimously reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means, was to provide for the free importation of soluble or instant coffee (containing no admixture of sugar, cereal, or other additive). The United States has been a net exporter of soluble coffee for a number of years, both the domestic production and the net exports having increased substantially in the period 1956-62. Favorable departmental reports were received on the legislation, and the Committee on Ways and Means was advised that while its enactment would have very slight economic significance as far as the domestic soluble coffee industry is concerned, it would prove to be of particular benefit to the United States internationally, especially with respect to our efforts under the Alliance for Progress to encourage economic growth in Latin America.

H.R. 4364, by Mr. NORBLAD; Private Law 88-317, signed August 31, 1964: As unanimously reported to and passed by the House, this bill provided for the free importation of one mass spectrometer for the use of Oregon State University and one mass spectrometer for the use of Wayne State University (the latter provision representing the substance of H.R. 9014). The Committee on Ways and Means was advised that no equivalent instruments were available from domestic producers at the time the requirements and specifications were determined, and it was of the opinion that the legislation was meritorious and consistent with prior congressional enactments. The Senate, while accepting the provisions of the House bill, provided also for the duty-free entry of one rheogoniometer for the use of the University of Tennessee, one rheogoniometer for the use of Ohio State University, one microcolorimeter imported for the use of the University of Colorado, and all stone imported before enactment of the bill for use in construction of Sheldon Memorial Art Gallery at the University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Nebr. These amendments were accepted in conference, and, as thus amended, the bill became law.

H.R. 5712, by Mr. BOGGS; Public Law 88-93, signed August 8, 1963: The purpose of this bill was to continue for 3 years, to the close of August 8, 1966, the suspension of import duty on heptanoic acid. Heptanoic acid is used in making special lubricants and brake fluids for use particularly in military aircraft. The Committee on Ways and Means was advised by the Department of Commerce that at the present time there is no U.S. production of this acid. Favorable reports on the legislation were received from the Departments of State, Treasury, Commerce, and Labor, and the committee was unanimous in recommending its enactment.

H.R. 5986, by Mr. COLLIER; passed House August 11, 1964: As unanimously reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means, the purpose of this bill was to adjust the rate of duty applicable to imports of certain brooms made wholly or partly of broom corn. The specific rates provided by the bill would yield duty of $2.88 per dozen for floor brooms and 96 cents per dozen for whiskbrooms. While these duties would fall short of equalizing the costs of production as found by the U.S. Tariff Commission between brooms manufactured in the United States and imported brooms, the Committee on Ways and Means was of the opinion that the rates provided would be of substantial benefit to the domestic industry.

At adjournment, this bill was pending in the Senate Finance Committee, although that committee had adopted its substance as an amendment to H.R. 12253, the Tariff Schedules Technical Amendments Act, which was passed by the Senate with various amendments and at adjournment was on the Speaker's table.

H.R. 6011, by Mr. BETTS; Public Law 88-90, signed August 8, 1963: The purpose of this bill, which was enacted into law without amendment, was to continue for 3 years, until September 5, 1966, the suspension of duty on dressed or manufactured istle or Tampico fiber. The duty on such fiber, the principal use in the United States of which is in the manufacture of brushes, has been suspended continuously since 1957, the purpose of the suspension being to reduce the burden of higher prices on domestic users of the fibers. Favorable departmental reports were received on the legislation, and the Committee on Ways and Means was unanimous in recommending its enactment.

H.R. 6791, by Mr. MILLS; Public Law 88-53, signed June 29, 1963: Enactment of this legislation was recommended by the Secretary of the Treasury as a part of the continuing program to counter our unfavorable balance-of-payments position. The bill continued for 2 years, to July 1, 1965, the temporary reduction, from $500 to $100, in the amount of purchases made abroad that a returning resident of the United States may bring back into this country free of duty. The Committee on Ways and Means was of the opinion that this action had proved to be a useful tool in the balance-of-payments program and that its continuation for another 2 years was warranted.

As reported by the Committee on Ways and Means and passed by the House of Representatives, the bill extended to all insular possessions of the United States the duty-free entry of up to $200 (no more than $100 of which may have been acquired elsewhere than in an insular possession) which already applied in the case of American residents returning directly or indirectly from the Virgin Islands. The bill was amended in the Senate to eliminate the $200 provision in the case of all insular possessions, including the Virgin Islands. Under the conference agreement and as the bill became law, the $200 provision was applicable only in the case of the Virgin Islands and only to the close of March 31, 1964—see H.R. 10170, below.

H.R. 7480, by Mr. JENNINGS; Public Law 88-338, signed June 30, 1964: The purpose of this legislation, which was enacted into law as amended and unanimously reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means, was to suspend for a temporary period (until June 30, 1967) the import duty on manganese ore (including ferruginous ore) and related products. The committee was advised that domestic production of manganese ore, which is used principally for metallurgical purposes in the production of steel and, in much smaller amounts, in the production of dry cell batteries and in the manufacture of manganese chemicals, accounts for a very small percentage of domestic consumption. Favorable departmental reports were received on the bill, and the committee was of the opinion that its enactment would be desirable from the standpoint of domestic producers of ferromanganese and other manganese alloys, by reducing costs to those processors and resulting in the enhancement of the competitive position of domestically produced alloys in the market.

H.R. 8461, by Mr. Watts; reported to the House, March 24, 1964: The purpose of this bill was to amend section 311 of the Tariff Act of 1930 to permit the manufacture in bonded manufacturing warehouses of cigars made of tobacco imported from more than one foreign country. Favorable departmental reports were received on the bill, which at adjournment was pending before the House.

H.R. 8975, by Mr. Knox; Public Law 88-333, signed June 30, 1964: This bill, which was enacted into law as amended and unanimously reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means, provided for the tariff classification of certain particleboard imported during the period beginning July 11, 1957, and ending August 31, 1963. The inequity rectified by the bill will not be encountered for entries after August 31, 1963, since the new tariff schedules of the United States, which were effective as of that date, make specific provision for wood particleboard. Prior to the adoption of the new tariff schedules, it was the practice of the Bureau of Customs to classify imports of particleboard in standard wallboard sizes, such as 4 by 8 feet, as wallboard, at the rate of 5-percent ad valorem, provided such particleboard had not been treated, processed, or finished in any manner described in the pertinent paragraph. However, the addition of 1 inch to the length and width of the particleboard—to protect the true 4 by 8 foot size from damage during handling and shipping—served to preclude such classification and resulted in duty assignment, in terms of ad valorem equivalent, of approximately 400 percent. This legislation provided a uniform treatment for such entries by providing that wood particleboard entered or withdrawn from warehouse during the period specified, is to be dutiable under the provision for wallboard at the rate of 5-percent ad valorem (if not excluded from classification thereunder by reason of any processing specified therein), with appropriate provision being made for reliquidation and refund of such entries that may have become final. Favorable departmental reports were received on this legislation.

H.R. 9014, by Mrs. Griffiths; See: H.R. 4364—Public Law 88-317, above.

H.R. 9311, by Mr. King of California; Public Law 88-362, signed July 7, 1964: The purpose of this bill, as unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means and passed by the House, was (1) to continue for 2 years, until July 16, 1966, the suspension of duty on alumina when imported for use in producing aluminum, and (2) to make bauxite ore and calcined bauxite permanently free of duty. Favorable departmental reports were received by the committee on the bill. The Senate passed the bill with an amendment deleting the permanent effect of the suspension of duty on bauxite and providing instead a 2-year continuation of the suspension of duty both on alumina when imported for use in producing aluminum, and on bauxite ore and calcined bauxite. The House accepted the amendments of the Senate, and the legislation became public law as so amended.

H.R. 10170, by Mr. Mills; passed House March 10, 1964: As unanimously reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means, the purpose of this legislation was to continue, until the close of June 30, 1965. the additional $100 tariff exemption afforded returning residents of the United States with respect to articles acquired in the Virgin Islands. The legislation enacted in 1961 (Public Law 87-132) as a part of the President's program on the balance of payments reducing to $100 the exemption with respect to U.S. residents returning to this country had been extended (Public Law 88-53, H.R. 6791 above) to July 1, 1965, but the provision with respect to the additional $100 of exemptions for residents returning from the Virgin Islands was extended by that act only to April 1, 1964, in order to afford the interested executive agencies an appropriate period of time within which to make a study and report back to the Congress as to the direct and indirect effect of these provisions on the economy of the Virgin Islands. It was the opinion of the Committee on Ways and Means that the findings contained in the report subsequently submitted justified the extension of the additional $100 exemption to July 1, 1965. At adjournment, the bill was pending in the Senate Finance Committee.

H.R. 10463, by Mrs. Griffiths; Public Law 88-324, signed June 29, 1964: The purpose of this bill, which was enacted into law without amendment, was to continue for 1 year, to the close of June 30, 1965, the existing suspension of duties on metal scrap (see H.R. 4174, Public Law 88-50, above). Favorable departmental reports were received on this legislation, and the Committee on Ways and Means was advised that the conditions which prompted the initial suspension of the duty on metal scrap, and the continuations thereof to the present time, have not changed. The committee was unanimous in recommending enactment of the bill.

H.R. 10465, by Mr. Mills; Public Law 88-323, signed June 25, 1964: The purpose of this bill, which was unanimously reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means and was enacted into law without amendment, was to extend for 2 years (to the close of June 30, 1966) the provisions of law relating to the free importation of personal and household effects brought into the United States under Government orders. Temporary provision for the free entry of such effects was provided by the act of June 27, 1942 (Public Law 77-633), and has been extended by legislative enactment from time to time since that date. The basic provision is safeguarded from abuse both by restrictions contained in the act and by appropriate departmental regulations. The interested departments recommended passage of the legislation, regarding the exemption as important both in the inducement of getting people to serve abroad and in contributing to the morale of U.S. personnel on duty outside the customs territory of the United States.

H.R. 10468, by Mr. Mills; Public Law 88-336, signed June 30, 1964: The purpose of this bill was to continue until the close of June 30, 1966, the suspension of duty on certain copying shoe lathes. This suspension of duty, which was originally enacted on August 6, 1956, and has been in effect continuously since that date by means of temporary extensions from time to time, was done in order to make available to domestic shoe last manufacturers highly specialized and expensive copying lathes which the Committee on Ways and Means is advised can only be obtained from foreign sources. No opposition to this duty suspension has been made known to the committee, and the committee was unanimous in recommending its enactment. It became law without amendment.

H.R. 10537, by Mr. Harvey of Michigan; Public Law 88-329, signed June 29, 1964: The purpose of this legislation, which was enacted into law without amendment, was to continue for 2 years, until July 1, 1966, the suspension of duty on natural amorphous graphite, crude and refined, valued at $50 per ton or less. This mineral has a wide variety of industrial uses, such as for foundry facings and in the manufacture of carbon brushes, dry cell batteries, pencils and paints, lubricants, and brush stock for electric motors. The Committee on Ways and Means has been advised that the United States has long been dependent on imports for nearly all of its requirements for natural amorphous graphite despite extensive exploration for suitable domestic deposits, and that since 1959 domestic output has ceased. Favorable departmental reports were received on the bill, and the Committee on Ways and Means was unanimous in recommending its enactment.

H.R. 12253, by Mr. Mills; passed Senate with amendments September 30, 1964: This bill, the "Tariff Schedules Technical Amendments Act of 1964," was designed to provide clarifying language and to correct certain errors, oversights, and inadvertencies in the tariff schedules of the United States.

The tariff schedules of the United States were put into effect on August 31, 1963, by Presidential proclamation under the authority of the Tariff Classification Act of 1962 (Public Law 87-456), the purpose of the new schedules being to provide a revision and consolidation which is logical in arrangement and which is adapted to the changes which have occurred since 1930 in import trade, to eliminate anomalies and simplify tariff classification.

In the process of the development of the tariff schedules of the United States, involving as they do literally hundreds of thousands of foreign products, it was inevitable that some unintended rate changes and other inadvertencies and oversights would occur. The purpose of H.R. 12253, as unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means and passed by the House of Representatives, was to supply clarifying language where necessary, and to correct certain of the errors, oversights, and inadvertencies that were brought to the committee's attention in the period, involving nearly 8 months, during which the committee received submissions from interested parties on the subject of tariff classification.

In reporting the bill to the Senate, the Committee on Finance amended the bill in a number of respects. The Senate-passed bill incorporated additional amendments added on the Senate floor, including amendments to the Sugar Act of 1948. Subsequently, the request of the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means for unanimous consent to take the bill from the Speaker's table and agree to the conference requested by the Senate was objected to, and further action on the bill was precluded by the adjournment of the 88th Congress on the following day.

House Concurrent Resolution 57, by Mr. Watts; reported to House February 4, 1963: See summary of Senate Concurrent Resolution 19, below.

Senate Concurrent Resolution 19, by Senator Morton; passed House May 4, 1964: This concurrent resolution expressed the sense of Congress that the appropriate agencies of the U.S. Government should be aware of the fact that bourbon whisky is recognized as a distinctive product of the United States to the end that such agencies will take appropriate action to prohibit the importation of whisky designated as bourbon whisky.

House Concurrent Resolution 57, which had been unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, was substantially similar in purpose to Senate Concurrent Resolution 19, expressing the sense of the Congress that importation of bourbon whisky be prohibited unless it is labeled to show the country of origin as an integral part of the name.

Senate Concurrent Resolution 19, having passed the Senate by voice vote, was unanimously reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means and passed the House by voice vote under suspension of the rules.

IV. SOCIAL SECURITY LEGISLATION (INCLUDING BILLS AMENDING PUBLIC ASSISTANCE, UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION, FUTA, ETC., LAWS)

H.R. 287, by Mr. Baring; Public Law 88–382, signed July 23, 1964: The purpose of this bill, which became law as unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, was to amend title II of the Social Security Act to add Nevada to the list of 17 States which are permitted to divide their retirement systems into two parts for purposes of old-age, survivors and disability insurance coverage, one part consisting of the positions of members who desire coverage and the other consisting of the positions of members who do not desire coverage.

H.R. 2651, by Mr. Baldwin; Public Law 88–48, signed June 29, 1963: This bill, which became public law without amendment, extended for 1 year the provision of the Public Welfare Amendments of 1962 (Public Law 87–543) which permits the responsibility for the placement and foster care of dependent children under the program of aid to needy families with dependent children (title IV of the Social Security Act) to be exercised by a public agency other than the agency which regularly administers this program.

Under the permanent provisions of existing law, Federal matching is made available as to certain children placed under foster care pursuant to court order. The 1962 legislation provided an exception to the requirement that the responsibility for placement and care must reside solely with the State or local agency administering the title IV program so as to take care of the situation in a few States where it has been the practice for other public agencies, particularly juvenile courts, to be responsible for arranging the placement and providing for the supervision of children who the courts have decided should live in homes other than those of their own families. As originally enacted, this provision would have expired on June 30, 1963, and this bill, which was reported unanimously by the Committee on Ways and Means, extended the provision for 1 year to June 30, 1964.

The bill also extended to December 31, 1963, the date by which the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare must submit to the President, for transmission to the Congress, a full report of the administration of this provision, including the experiences of each of the States in arranging for foster care, together with recommendations as to continuation of, and modifications in, the procedure authorized by the provision.

H.R. 3348, by Mr. Tupper; Public Law 88–350, signed July 2, 1964: As unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, this bill, amended the provisions of law governing the old-age survivors' and disability insurance program in two ways: first by including the State of Texas among the States which may obtain social security coverage, under State agreement, for State and local policemen and firemen under retirement systems (thus incorporating the substance of H.R. 6620); and second, by reinstating, until July 1, 1965, a provision of law which permitted the State of Maine to modify its existing agreement under section 218 of the Social Security Act to provide that teaching and nonteaching employees who are actually in the same retirement system be treated as though they were under separate retirement systems for social security coverage purposes, thus enabling the State of Maine to complete the desired extensions of coverage. The bill was passed by the House and Senate and became law without change.

H.R. 4655, by Mr. Mills; Public Law 88–31, signed May 29, 1963: As unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, this bill provided three changes in the laws relating to the unemployment compensation system. These were: (1) a reduction in the Federal unemployment tax attributable to the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1961 from 0.4 to 0.25 percent with respect to wages paid in 1963, making the combined net Federal unemployment tax for 1963 wages 0.65 percent (apart from any reduced credit provisions that might apply in particular States); (2) the provision of a flexible ceiling, with respect to fiscal years 1964 and thereafter, in lieu of the $350 million limitation, on grants to the States to cover the administrative costs of unemployment compensation and the employment service, of 95 percent of the estimated receipts under the regular 0.4 percent net Federal unemployment tax; and (3) the extension from 5 to 10 years of the period during which States may obligate, for administrative purposes, certain funds transferred from excess Federal tax collections.

The Senate adopted the provisions of the House bill without change, but added an amendment increasing the ceiling on amounts which may be granted to States for administrative expenses for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, to $407,148,000. This amendment was accepted by the House and the bill became public law as thus amended.

H.R. 6620, by Mr. Thompson of Texas; see H.R. 3348 (Public Law 88–350), above.

H.R. 7544, by Mr. Mills; Public Law 88–156, signed October 24, 1963: This legislation, entitled the "Maternal and Child Health and Mental Retardation Planning Amendments of 1963," was designed to carry out a number of the recommendations in this area resulting from urgent needs discovered by the President's panel as a result of the extensive studies it conducted. Its enactment will assist States and communities in preventing and combating mental retardation through expansion and improvement of the maternal and child health and crippled children's programs, through provision of prenatal, maternity, and infant care for individuals with conditions associated with child-bearing which may lead to mental retardation, and through planning for comprehensive action to combat mental retardation.

Specifically, the legislation provides for (1) expanding the existing programs of maternal and child health services and crippled children's services; (2) authorizing grants for maternity care projects designed to prevent mental retardation; (3) authorizing grants or contracts for research projects related to the maternal and child health or crippled children's services programs that show promise of advancing these programs; and (4) authorizing one-time grants to States to encourage planning and other activities that promote State and community efforts to combat mental retardation.

In the report of the Committee on Ways and Means on this bill, it was pointed out that the cost of institutional care, facilities construction, and special care in the family for the mentally retarded is estimated at more than $1 billion per year, and that payments for mentally retarded persons under the public assistance and social security programs amounted to about $100 million in the fiscal year 1963. The report continues: "Significant reductions in these burdens to families, to States and localities, and to our society as a whole amply justify increased expenditures that will prevent and reduce mental retardation as a social and economic problem." The additional cumulative cost authorized by this legislation will total approximately $265 million for the 5-year period, fiscal years 1964 through 1968.

Except for a minor clarifying amendment of the Senate, which was agreed to by the House, the bill became law in the form reported by the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 8821, by Mr. Mills; Public Law 88–173, signed November 7, 1963: The purpose of this legislation was to facilitate the restoration to the Treasury of moneys made available to the States under the Temporary Unemployment Compensation Act of 1958 and title XII of the Social Security Act (in the case of advances made before September 13, 1960) by modifying the rate of employer repayment and by permitting, at the option of the State each year, installment repayment by a State in lieu of additional employer taxes. No "forgiveness" of any amount was provided by the bill, but rather the effect is to provide a "stretch-out" for repayment of the amounts involved. More specifically, as unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means and as ultimately enacted into law, the bill (1) provides a tax rate for repayment of advances under title XII of the Social Security Act of 0.15 percent for 5 taxable years, 1963–67. After taxable year 1967, the rate is increased by a 0.15-percent step each year until the advance is repaid. It is provided that a State can avoid the automatic tax increase on its employers for any year by an installment repayment (or, as under prior law, by total repayment) made before November 10 of the taxable year; (2) freezes the rate of restoration of the costs of the TUC program of 1958 at 0.30 percent, the 1964 level under prior law until the funds are restored. For taxable year 1963, the rate remains at 0.15 percent. It is provided that a State can avoid the tax increase for any year by an installment restoration (or, as under prior law, by total restoration) made before November 10 of the year; and (3) provides for installment repayment by the State for either TUC moneys or title XII advances, the installment to be computed by applying the tax rate for the year involved to State taxable wages for the prior year adjusted for the excess, if any, of the State taxable wage base over the Federal taxable wage base.

H.R. 9393, by Mr. Mills; Public Law 88–650: This legislation, as unanimously reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means and passed by voice vote, provided various improvements in the provisions of law relating to the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program: (1) an amendment to title II of the Social Security Act to permit a disabled worker to establish the beginning of his disability, for purposes of social security protection, as of the date he actually became disabled regardless of when he files his application; (2) a provision amending the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to extend generally through April 15, 1965, the time within which ministers (including Christian Science practitioners) can elect to be covered under social security; and (3) the validation of certain earnings reported under social security of engineering aids working for local soil and water conservation districts in Oklahoma who were reported in good faith, but erroneously, as State employees under the coverage agreement between the State of Oklahoma and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The Senate passed the bill without change in the provisions of the House bill, but adding provisions (1) excluding from the definition of wages for social security and unemployment insurance purposes certain payments representing reimbursement for moving expenses, and (2) allowing the States to extend the duration of the income exemption for certain needy blind who have State-approved rehabilitation plans. The House accepted the Senate amendments and the bill became law in this form.

H.R. 9688, by Mr. Baldwin; Public Law 88–345, signed June 30, 1964: The purpose of this legislation, which was enacted into law without amendment, was to further extend, until June 30, 1967, the provision of the Public Welfare Amendments of 1962 (Public Law 87-543) which permits the responsibility for the placement and foster care of dependent children under the program of aid to needy families with children to be exercised by a public agency other than the agency which regularly administers this program. (See H.R. 2651, Public Law 88-48, above.) The report of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare indicated that there had been insufficient experience under the temporary provision to permit an evaluation either of its effectiveness or as to whether modifications are desirable. The Committee on Ways and Means was unanimous in recommending that the provision be extended until June 30, 1967. The Advisory Council on Public Welfare will thus have the opportunity to consider this provision and to give the Congress the benefit of its views before its expiration.

H.R. 10466, by Mr. Mills; Public Law 88-347, signed June 30, 1964: The purpose of this legislation, which was enacted into law without amendment, was to extend for 3 years, until June 30, 1967, the provisions of sec. 1113(d) of the Social Security Act which authorize provision of temporary assistance to U.S. citizens returned from foreign countries under certain circumstances. Under this program, which was initiated in 1961, temporary assistance is provided to citizens of the United States and to dependents of such citizens if they are identified by the Department of State as having returned, or having been brought, from a foreign country to the United States because of the destitution of the citizen or the illness of the citizen or any of his dependents or because of war, threat of war, invasion, or similar crisis, and if they are without available resources. The program is administered through State and local public welfare agencies. The Advisory Council on Public Welfare will have the opportunity to give the Congress the benefit of its views on this provision, along with others scheduled to expire on June 30, 1967, well before that date. Extension of the provision was recommended by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the bill was unanimously reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 10473, by Mr. King of California; Public Law 88-641: As unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means and passed by the House, the purpose of this bill was to extend until June 30, 1967, the provision of the Public Welfare Amendments of 1962 (Public Law 87-543) which permits Federal participation in payments under the program of aid and services to needy families with children (title IV of the Social Security Act) for certain children requiring foster care who are in nonprofit private child-care institutions. The Senate accepted the provision of the House bill without change and added a provision extending to age 21 the age limit for the extension of Federal matching as to payments of aid to families with dependent children where the child is still attending high school or a vocational school. The amendment of the Senate was accepted by the House, and in this form the bill became law.

H.R. 11865, by Mr. Mills; passed Senate with amendments September 3, 1964; House agreed to conference September 15, 1964: This bill, the "Social Security Amendments of 1964," as reported by the Committee on Ways and Means and passed by the House of Representatives, contained numerous provisions making revisions and improvements in the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program under title II of the Social Security Act. The major provisions of the bill, as passed by the House, can be summarized as follows:

First. Provision for a 5-percent across-the-board increase in benefits for all of the 20 million beneficiaries presently on the rolls and future beneficiaries. For the first full year of operation, it is estimated that $925 million in additional benefit amounts would have been paid under this provision.

Second. A special "transitional insured status" provision to liberalize the eligibility requirements so that certain aged people who do not meet the work requirements in present law could qualify for benefits on the basis of as few as three-quarters of coverage. Upon attaining age 72, a worker or widow who could qualify under this provision would get a monthly benefit of $35; a wife who could qualify would get a benefit of $17.50. It is estimated that some 400,000 individuals would have been added to the social security benefit rolls by this provision.

Third. Provision for the payment of a child's insurance benefit until the child raches age 22, provided the child is attending school, including a vocational school, or college as a full time student after he reaches age 18. It is estimated that some 275,000 children would have benefited from this provision.

Fourth. Provision for the payment of benefits to widows beginning at age 60, at their election, with the benefits payable to those who claim them before age 62 actuarially reduced to take account of the longer period over which they would be paid. In the first full year that this provision would have been effective, 1965, it is estimated that some 180,000 widows would have taken advantage of it and made election for receipt of benefits between ages 60 and 62.

Fifth. Provisions for changes in existing law with respect to coverage requirements so as to expand the coverage of the existing social security program in the direction of more universal coverage of all individuals:

(a) Doctors of medicine and interns: Provision for repeal of the exclusion in existing law with respect to self-employed doctors of medicine, and interns. Some 170,000 such individuals, who are excluded from coverage under present law, would have been brought under the system by this provision.

(b) Cash tips: Provision to include in the definition of "wages" for social security purposes cash tips received by an employee in the course of his employment. This provision would have made improved social security protection available for more than 1 million employees and their families.

(c) Policemen and firemen: Provision for the removal of the general exclusion in existing law relating to the coverage of policemen and firemen in retirement systems. Coverage would have thus been made available in all States to policemen and firemen in positions covered under State or local government retirement systems—but only on the initiative of the State or local government and under the present referendum provisions. Moreover, policemen and firemen could not have been brought under coverage as part of a group which included persons in positions other than firemen and policemen positions.

(d) Extension of time for election of coverage: Provision for affording a further opportunity, through 1965, for the election of coverage by employees of States and localities who had not previously elected coverage under the provision permitting specified States to cover only those members of a retirement system who desire coverage.

(e) Self-employment income from agriculture: Provision for increasing the maximum amount of gross farm income that farmers may use in computing covered farm self-employment income, under the operational reporting method based on gross income, from $1,800 to $2,400.

In accordance with established congressional policy, the bill as passed by the House contained financing provisions to support the benefit increases and the measure's other provisions, and, in addition, it was designed to improve the long-range actuarial status of the social security trust funds. To accomplish this, the bill provided for an increase in the earnings base, which is used for tax purposes and in computing benefits, from the present $4,800 to $5,400, effective in 1965. It also made changes in the tax rate schedule of existing law, evening out the schedule between 1965 and 1971 (increasing the rate for some of these years and decreasing it for others), and finally providing for an increase in 1971 and thereafter from the present 4.625 to 4.8 percent each for employees and employers. For the self-employed, the 1971 rate would be 7.2 percent as compared to the provision in existing law which provides for a rate of 6.9 percent.

In addition, the bill provided for a reallocation of contribution income between the old-age and survivors insurance trust fund and the disability insurance trust fund. This was designed to strengthen the financing of the disability insurance program and to provide for a more reasonable distribution of contribution income between the two parts of the social security system.

The net effect of all the changes made by the bill, as passed by the House, would have been to improve the actuarial position of the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program. The estimated actuarial deficit of 0.24 percent of taxable payroll for the present system would have been reduced to 0.19 percent.

The Finance Committee reported the bill in the Senate with amendments to the provisions of the House bill as well as with the addition of other provisions, some of which affected the public assistance titles of the Social Security Act. On the Senate floor further amendments were adopted, including an amendment to provide a system of health insurance for the aged under the social security system. The financing provisions of the House bill were likewise amended on the Senate floor, with the provision of a $5,600 wage base and a tax rate schedule revised upward from the House provision.

After several days of meetings, the conference committee was unable to reach agreement and on October 2, 1964, the committee adjourned. Any possible further action on the bill was precluded with the adjournment of the 88th Congress on the following day.

V. LEGISLATION RELATING TO THE RENEGOTIATION OF DEFENSE CONTRACTS, THE PUBLIC DEBT LIMIT, AND MISCELLANEOUS BILLS

H.R. 6009, by Mr. Mills; Public Law 88-30, signed May 29, 1963: This legislation provided a temporary increase in the public debt limit, which in the absence of legislative enactment would have reverted on July 1, 1963, to the permanent ceiling of $285 billion. As reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, this bill provided a ceiling of $307 billion from the date of enactment through June 30, 1963, and of $309 billion for the months of July and August 1963. In the committee report on the bill, it was stated that the extension of the temporary ceiling through July and August was designed to give the committee and the Congress "more time to consider the appropriate limitation for the balance of the fiscal year 1964," and it was also pointed out that "congressional action on appropriations can be expected to have progressed to the point where it will be possible to obtain a much clearer picture of probable expenditures for the fiscal year 1964." The bill was amended by the Senate Committee on Finance to extend the $309 billion temporary ceiling through the entire fiscal year 1964, but this amendment was rejected by the Senate and the bill ultimately became law in the form originally reported by the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 7824, by Mr. Mills; Public Law 88-106, signed August 27, 1963: The purpose of this legislation was to extend for an additional 3 months, through November 1963, the temporary public debt ceiling of $309 billion. The bill, which was enacted into law without amendment, was in accord with the recommendation of the administration. The committee report on the bill stated that "very little more was known about the revenue, expenditure, and debt levels for the latter part of the fiscal year 1964 at the present time than was known" in May when the earlier bill was enacted, and for that reason the temporary ceiling was extended for the 3-month period rather than for the entire fiscal year.

H.R. 8864, by Mr. MILLS; conference report rejected by House and further conference requested, August 18, 1964: The purpose of this bill was to authorize the procedures required in order that the President might carry out the obligations of the United States under the International Coffee Agreement of 1962. That agreement has been signed by the United States, and the Senate has given its advice and consent to ratification.

The bill would authorize the President to require all coffee entering U.S. markets and all exports of coffee to be accompanied by a certificate of origin or a certificate of reexport; to limit imports of coffee from countries which have not joined in the agreement; to require the keeping of certain records, statistics, and other information; and to take such other action as he may consider necessary to implement the obligations of the United States under the treaty.

The bill also authorized appropriations necessary to carry out the obligations of the United States under the treaty. Certain obsolete provisions of law would also be repealed.

The Senate passed the bill without change in the provisions of the House bill but adding a new section authorizing and directing the President to cause written notice of withdrawal from the International Coffee Agreement under certain circumstances. The conference agreement as reflected in the conference report subsequently filed was rejected by the House, and the bill was sent back to conference. No further action was taken.

H.R. 8969, by Mr. MILLS; Public Law 88-187, signed November 26, 1963: The purpose of this bill, which was enacted into law without amendment, was to extend the existing temporary debt limitation of $309 billion for the remainder of fiscal year 1964, and to provide an additional $6 billion leeway to be available during the year for seasonal variations in the receipt of revenues and payment of bills owed by the Federal Government. The additional $6 billion, however, in the absence of further legislation would expire on June 29, 1964. The Committee on Ways and Means was of the opinion that this legislation provided the minimum debt limitation consistent with a policy of sound debt management, and that further restrictions on the debt ceiling would have serious implications for our balance of payments and for the sound management of our debt.

H.R. 10669, by Mr. MILLS; Public Law 88-339, signed June 30, 1964: As reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means and enacted into law, the purpose of this bill was to extend for 2 years, until June 30, 1966, the Renegotiation Act of 1951, under which the Government is authorized to recapture excessive profits on certain Government contracts and related subcontracts. The legislation also provided that the provisions of the Renegotiation Act would be applicable to contracts with the Federal Aviation Agency, and related subcontracts, to the extent of amounts received or accrued by a contractor or subcontractor after June 30, 1964. The Committee on Ways and Means was of the opinion that under existing world conditions and those reasonably foreseeable, the continuation of statutory renegotiation is essential in the national interest. The vast governmental expenditures made in the defense and space areas are often made under circumstances that make a guarantee against excessive profits impossible, regardless of the diligence of procurement officials, and renegotiation is needed to eliminate such excesses wherever they occur. The committee also concluded that substantial amounts of material purchased by the Federal Aviation Agency are sufficiently similar to items purchased by other departments whose contracts are already subject to renegotiation that a distinction in this case is not justified.

H.R. 11375, by Mr. MILLS; Public Law 88-327, signed June 29, 1964: This legislation provided a temporary debt limitation of $324 billion from the date of enactment through fiscal year 1965, to June 30, 1965. Under the bill, the permanent statutory debt ceiling remains at $285 billion. The provisions of the bill were in accordance with the recommendations of the administration, and it was enacted into law without amendment.

S. 1359, by Senator DOUGLAS; Public Law 88-58, signed July 8, 1963: The purpose of this legislation was to authorize an additional Assistant Secretary in the Treasury Department. Under prior law, provision was made for only three presidentially appointed Assistant Secretaries in the Department of the Treasury. The Committee on Ways and Means was advised that the limitation to three Assistant Secretaries had become a distinct administrative handicap in the Treasury Department, and that authorization of one additional Assistant Secretary would result in more efficient and expeditious administration within the Department. The committee was further advised that enactment of this bill would result in no additional personnel in the Treasury Department and would not result in any additional costs to the Government. The bill was reported unanimously by the Committee on Ways and Means, and became public law without amendment.

Tribute to Hon. James C. Auchincloss

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN L. McMILLAN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the House Committee on the District of Columbia and on behalf of the committee, I wish to commend the Honorable JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS, ranking minority member of the committee, upon the completion of 22 years of faithful and outstanding service as a Member of the House of Representatives.

Also, I wish to express the committee's regrets at his retirement from public office at the end of the 88th Congress.

In appreciation of his contributions and services to his country, as well as to the Nation's Capital, which he loves so deeply, the committee unanimously approved the following resolution which, under leave to extend my remarks, I ask to be included in the RECORD:

RESOLUTION

Whereas the Committee on the District of Columbia of the United States House of Representatives views with heartfelt regret the departure from the House of the distinguished Representative from the Third Congressional District of New Jersey, the Honorable JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS, at the end of his present term in the 88th Congress; and

Whereas Representative AUCHINCLOSS, during his twenty years of outstanding service as a Member of the House and of the Committee on the District of Columbia, has been a most vigorous champion of the ideals and programs which he believed would be to the best interest of his district and the State of New Jersey, and to the District of Columbia and his country as well; and

Whereas in the years ahead the committee will sorely miss the leadership, the reasoned guidance, the gentle humor, the unfailing courtesy and kindliness, and the warm companionship of the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the members of the Committee on the District of Columbia extend our deep appreciation to our colleague for his most exemplary service in the House and on the committee, and our sincere good wishes for many years of good health, happiness, and satisfaction for him and the members of his family; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution, as approved by unanimous vote of the members of the Committee on the District of Columbia, be suitably prepared and presented to Representative AUCHINCLOSS as a permanent reminder of the high esteem with which he is held by the members of the committee.

Attest:

JOHN L. McMILLAN, *Chairman.*
THOMAS G. ABERNETHY.
HOWARD W. SMITH.
WILLIAM L. DAWSON.
JOHN BELL WILLIAMS.
ABRAHAM J. MULTER.
JOHN DOWDY.
GEORGE HUDDLESTON, Jr.
BASIL L. WHITENER.
JEFFERY COHELAN.
FERNAND J. ST GERMAIN.
JAMES W. TRIMBLE.
B. F. SISK.
CHARLES C. DIGGS, Jr.
G. ELLIOTT HAGAN.
WILLIAM L. SPRINGER.
ANCHER NELSEN.
ALVIN E. O'KONSKI.
WILLIAM H. HARSHA.
CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, Jr.
FRED SCHWENGEL.
FRANK J. HORTON.
RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH.

Tribute to Hon. Harry Sheppard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, one of the truly great men of all time with whom we have served is our good friend HARRY SHEPPARD.

HARRY SHEPPARD, as chairman of his great subcommittee, served with alacrity and decision. There was never any doubt about where our colleague stood. He did not waste time, always efficient, capable, and able. His service here will be remembered as a Congressman's Congressman. This House has been the training ground for many great leaders. I know of none greater than HARRY SHEPPARD.

He believed that the only way the United States can remain free is to remain strong. Every man, woman, and child in this great Nation is safer in a hostile world today because of the dedication, patriotism, and genuine Americanism of this distinguished colleague. He served on the firing line here for a strong defense with the same courage that men face the enemy on the field of battle.

I will be a better Congressman having known and associated with this great leader. I join his colleagues and his constituents in wishing for him the best always, as we hold him in the highest esteem.

Czechoslovak Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERNARD F. GRABOWSKI

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, October 28 will be the anniversary of Czechoslovakian Independence Day. Czechoslovakia is at the center of central Europe, and its stout-hearted inhabitants have been very much in the center of European affairs during most of modern times. This rough and rugged home of John Huss and Comenius, of Thomas Masaryk and Eduard Benes, was overrun by invaders and dominated by foreign overlords for more than 400 years. Before World War I most of what is now Czechoslovakia was part of the multinational Austro-Hungarian dual monarchy. Alien rule could not, however, subdue the spirit of freedom and independence among these indomitable Czechs and Slovaks. Brought up in the school of adversity and inspired by the leadership of many true patriots, they vowed to fight for the attainment of political independence during the war years from 1914 to 1918. They earned the sympathy and support of the democratic world for their cause. And, on October 28, 1918, Czechoslovakia was indeed proclaimed independent.

Unfortunately, this much-deserved independence was not destined to last more than two decades. After a vigorous and very promising beginning, the youthful Czechoslovak Republic was faced with mortal threats in the late 1930's—1939 saw the partition of Czechoslovakia among her three neighbors—Germany, Poland, and Hungary. The partition was ironic in that the latter two countries were, in their turn, partitioned by their own more powerful and ruthless neighbors—Nazi Germany and the Soviet Union.

After World War II Czechoslovakia was reconstituted once more. But the fond hopes her people had of enjoying and preserving their regained independence were never realized. In 1948 she was taken over by and became a Soviet satellite.

We in the free world will join with Americans of Czechoslovak origin in the celebration of their Independence Day, and we hope that all Czechoslovakians will soon be free to do the same, for, in their country no celebration of this occasion is permitted. It will be a solemn day but in their hearts these dauntless fighters for freedom will silently celebrate a future independence that must surely come.

The 88th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. BYRNE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the two sessions of the 88th Congress have been lengthy and productive, and it has been my privilege and pleasure to support the many programs begun by our late beloved President John F. Kennedy and continued by our new President Lyndon B. Johnson.

We have enacted some very important legislation and, for easy reading, I list the following:

The tax bill which reduced individual income tax and authorized large write-offs to industries as incentives to improve, enlarge, and modernize their plants and equipment.

Manpower Development and Training Act amendment, making it possible for more people to receive more education and training, plus more money on which to live while being trained.

The Food Stamp Act, amended and extended, authorizes the starting of new projects.

The Housing Act extends FHA activities, public housing for the elderly, and urban renewal.

Mass Transportation Act provides that urban areas may inaugurate "mass transit" systems.

Clean air and water pollution which will be beneficial as a health measure as well as providing recreational facilities.

Economic Opportunity Act which is the beginning of our fight to eliminate hardship and poverty from our land.

Davis-Bacon Act, amended, to require those doing business with the Federal Government to pay employees fringe benefits of the area, as well as the going wage.

Hill-Burton Act extended for 5 years, to June 30, 1969, expanded to include grants for hospital modernization.

Higher Education Facilities Act, to help build colleges and junior colleges for the future.

Health Professions Education Act, to assist presently established and newly established schools of medicine, dentistry, and health, in order to educate and train sufficient personnel.

Vocational Education Act which provides authority for States to upgrade and modernize present vocational programs and create technical schools.

Nurse Training Act authorizes additional facilities and expansion of present facilities; provides student loans for nurses and traineeships for professional nurses.

Library Services Act, amended, to aid libraries in urban areas.

National Defense Education Act, amended, to extend the student loan program to junior colleges, business schools, and part-time students; also expands the program for acquiring equipment and State supervision by adding English, reading, history, geography, and civics.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it can be truthfully said that by the passage of this legislation we have enabled our people to lead richer and more meaningful lives. We have extended opportunity to those segments of our population which are most in need of it and increased opportunity for those who already possess it in some measure. Our accomplishments bespeak a confidence in man's awareness of what constitutes a finer and happier life, in his desire to live such a life, and in his ability to do so if he is given an opportunity.

Hon. Samuel Friedel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROLAND V. LIBONATI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, among the several Members of the House who have extended their personal efforts to alleviate the economic problems, both private and public, of the membership—no one has been more diligent and effective than our dear friend the Honorable SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL, Seventh District, Maryland.

His legislative contribution to the well-being of the membership was accomplished through his frankness and commonsense presentation of the purport of the legislation. He attacked the problem head on. His extraordinary ability to correlate the factual data in debate with the various facets of the problem made his position strong.

He never resorted to trickery but courageously faced the opposition and fought for what he thought was right and just. He loves the membership of the House and is their truest and most loyal friend.

He enjoys the respect and confidence of its membership because he never lacked the courage to maintain and defend his convictions.

His clear-cut, concise statements cannot be misunderstood—his great ability, simplicity of manner, rugged integrity, and wide experience have earned for him the admiration of the Members and the respect of the leadership as an industrious and valuable public servant, not only to the House, but to the Nation, his State, and the constituency of the Seventh District, Maryland. His high quality of statesmanship is needed in the

House of Representatives. He should be returned to pursue his valuable duties by a decisive majority.

Changing Libya

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, Libya marks its 13th anniversary as an independent state on December 24. Since the House will not be in session at this time, we wish to take the opportunity now to extend warm felicitations to His Majesty King Idris I, of Libya; and His Excellency Fathi Abidia, Libya's Ambassador to the United States.

Libya was the first country to receive its independence wholly under the auspices of the United Nations. Its 13th anniversary is a time of ever-accelerating change and domestic and international tension for this constitutional monarchy on the Mediterranean shores of Africa, sandwiched between Nasser's expansive Egypt on the east and Ben Bella's revolutionary Algeria, as well as Tunisia, on the west.

Part of Mussolini's empire until the German and Italian forces were conquered in the desert fighting of World War II, Libya's two most populous provinces, Tripolitania and Cyrenaica on the Mediterranean, were placed under British administration The Fezzan, the largely desert area of the interior, was administered by the French. The Italian peace treaty provided that, failing agreement on the disposition of these areas, the problem should be submitted to the General Assembly of the United Nations. In 1949, the Assembly decided that Libya should be administered by a United Nations Commissioner and that it was to become independent by January 2, 1952. King Idris I proclaimed a hereditary monarchy in Bengazi a few days before that date, on December 24, 1951, the day which Libyans honor as the beginning of their independence.

Until a few years ago, the population of Libya, numbering somewhat more than 1 million, was considered to be among the most hopelessly poor in the world. Libya was apparently blessed by no industrial resources, and a largely agricultural and pastoral economy limped along in a country where only some 2 percent of the land is arable. Libya was dependent on foreign assistance and the direct and indirect revenues resulting from a number of small British bases and the massive Wheelus Air Force Base of the United States, a key NATO installation.

Breathtaking changes in Libya's economic status began with the discovery of oil under the Sahara in 1959. Some indication of the impact of this discovery can be gained from a glance at Libya's exports. In 1960, these totaled $8.6 million. By 1963, they had skyrocketed to $374 million, and Libya had a favorable balance of trade for the first time in recent history. Oil exports accounted for $367 million, almost all of the 1963 total.

Libya's new-found prosperity has of course only begun to help solve some of its pressing problems, while creating some additional ones. In the economic field, while progress is being made, poverty is still desperate for most. Unemployment is widespread; housing is abysmal. Agriculture is backward and neglected as the farm population presses toward the cities and towns and urban forms of employment. Medical services and schools are inadequate, and there is a heavy dependence on Egypt for teachers as well as government technicians and administrators.

Libya's wealth beneath the Sahara has reduced its dependence on revenues from British and American military installations, at the same time making the country a more tempting target for its more powerful neighbors. Nasser's verbal attack in February on these bases finds response in segments of the population which lean more toward socialism and Arab nationalism than does the traditionally pro-Western and conservative government. These crosscurrents have involved bloodshed and repression, and their final outcome is far from clear.

With the economic prospects so tremendously improved as Libya completes its 13th year of independence, we may all hope that better things are in store for the Libyan people as they strive for the advancement of their country.

James C. Auchincloss

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. BUCKLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. BUCKLEY. Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege to be a Member of this body for the last 30 years and during that period of time I have met some outstanding and dedicated public servants. One of the finest of these is the ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Works who is retiring from Congress after 22 years of public service. I refer, of course, to my old and dear friend, Jim Auchincloss. As a Member of Congress and as chairman of the Committee on Public Works it has been my privilege to have worked closely with Jim Auchincloss. His intelligent approach to problems, his devotion to the truth and his efforts to bring forth the best legislation for all have contributed mightily to the fine record of achievement that the Committee on Public Works has accomplished over the years.

Jim Auchincloss was a representative of the people in the true sense of the word. He will be missed in the Halls of Congress; but he has earned the retirement into which he is going. I might add that as far as Jim is concerned retirement will probably mean continued active work in those fields in which he has shown so much interest in the past.

I wish him many happy years to come and Mrs. Buckley and I extend our best to Jim and his lovely wife.

Report to the People of Alabama

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, legislation considered and passed by the 88th Congress will show that it was a working Congress.

There were many measures considered that I could not, and did not agree with and so indicated by my vote. On the other hand many measures were considered that were most beneficial to the Nation, accordingly I supported those measures.

Mr. Speaker, I recently made a report to the fine people of Alabama on the accomplishments of the 88th Congress which I would like to insert in the Record at this point:

The 88th Congress came to a close after remaining in session almost continuously for 21 months and I would like to make a report to the fine people of the great State of Alabama whom I have had the honor to represent in the House of Representatives during a most historic time.

I am particularly proud of the fact that the Subcommittee on Public Health and Safety, of which I am chairman, and the parent Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce have reported out of committee more legislation in the health field than has been enacted into law in any previous Congress.

The first session of the Congress was one of the longest in history, yet there were but few legislative accomplishments. Overshadowing the activities of the first session was the terrible tragedy—the assassination of our President John F. Kennedy. We cannot understand, in the enlightened age we live, how such an incomprehensible, shocking deed could occur. On December 5, 1963, I joined with other Members of the House in a memorial tribute to the 35th President who laid down his life for his country.

It would be impossible to list all the accomplishments of the 88th Congress, but I would like to touch on some of the major issues. Of course, there were many bills introduced and considered—many of which did not pass. However, the success of a Congress must be based on the quality of laws enacted and not by the number.

Encouraged by congressional economic legislation, we are currently enjoying the strongest peacetime expansion in our history. Our gains in prosperity are evident by every mode of measuring—personal income, employment, corporate profits, industrial expansion and production—and our gross national product have all been on the upswing. At the same time, the Congress moved by promoting the general well-being and improving the lot of the poverty stricken minority and invisible American. We have made a strong effort toward erasing individual want in the midst of plenty.

The fiscal policy of the Nation is one of deep concern, so I shall first make comments on this matter.

Under the Tax Reduction Act of 1964, personal and corporate tax cuts totaling $11.5 billion were accomplished. I supported this measure at the time it was brought to the floor of the House and am happy to say that as a result of this reduced taxation, we have shown a more vital and stronger purchasing power. During the course of debate on this legislation, an amendment was rejected which would provide the reduction of the excise tax which would have repealed such tax on cosmetics, handbags, furs and jewelry. However, I believe that this will be accomplished during the next Congress in view of the tremendous progress we have made.

Congress was also called upon to again raise the debt limit from $315 billion to $324 billion. I believe that we should do a great deal more in an effort to balance the budget in future years and to ultimately reduce our national debt. And while the national debt seems exorbitant and I believe is tremendously high in comparing the national debt with the gross national product, the country is still on very safe ground.

The health and welfare of the people of the Nation are of great importance to us all. The Congress passed legislation during the 88th Congress to extend the Hill-Burton Hospital Construction Act for 5 years, until June 30, 1969. I was happy to have played a part in this legislation for the extension of this act will certainly enable us to obtain needed health care facilities.

The Congress also enacted the Nurse Training Act of 1964 which was handled by my committee. The purpose of this act is to increase the supply of nurses in the United States through a variety of approaches recommended by a consultant group on nursing appointed by the Surgeon General. This act will establish a 4-year program of grants for construction and rehabilitation of nursing schools. It will also establish a program over a 4-year period to assist collegiate-4-year and associate-degree 2-year schools of nursing to meet the additional costs of strengthening, improving and expanding their training programs and will establish a program of grants to aid-diploma-hospital-schools of nursing. In addition, such legislation will extend for 5 years the existing program of traineeships for advanced training and professional nurses to be teachers, administrators and supervisors. Further, it establishes a student loan program modeled after the National Defense Education Act for students of nursing at collegiate, associate-degree and diploma-schools of nursing.

Congress also passed legislation which will provide for a 3-year program to expand facilities of medical, dental, nursing, and related type colleges. The construction grant must be matched by the institution and, also, the legislation includes a student loan program. This measure was also one which my committee considered most carefully. There is no question that the aid programs under their various and sundry names have not been without mistake of both original decisions and administration.

Over the years, I have supported the basic objective of our national security programs under both Democratic and Republican Presidents. I have differed, however, with each from time to time on specific items in the program and the dollar amount to be spent. The foreign assistance program helps protect and build the strength of the free world. Two-thirds of all military assistance funds requested for next year are earmarked for Greece, Turkey, Iran, Pakistan, India, Thailand, Vietnam, Laos, the Philippines, Nationalist China, and Korea. Together these nations maintain 3½ million men under arms—not Americans, but their own manpower for a common defense. But I must say again that there is no question but that the aid programs under the various names have not been without mistakes of both original decision and administration. How could it have been otherwise when there were 11 directors in 15 years? The consequent changes of reorganization and poorly defined shifting lines of responsibility in authority paint a tragically clear picture. However, in spite of all this, aid has had the purpose of (1) strengthening the will and capacity of emerging countries, (2) reminding us and others of the soundness of freedom as an alternative to the slavery of communism, and (3) building a system whereby people control the government rather than the reverse.

We must recognize the fact that what we hope to accomplish by our foreign aid program is a very difficult and complex task. This program has many problems, yet it remains the most important asset to our foreign policy.

As a result of the ever increasing urban population, during the remainder of this century we will have to construct homes, highways, and facilities equal to all those built since the country was first settled. Already, three-fourths of the American population is urban and migration is continuing at a rapid pace. We must provide a decent home and a suitable living environment for every citizen. The 88th Congress moved forward in this area in several ways.

The growing national problem of polluted air causes annual damages estimated at $3½ billion with untold adverse effects on health. My committee held hearings on this subject and, as a result of these hearings, the Congress improved the program (first originated in 1955) by accelerating Federal participation and authorizing new programs to encourage State and local prevention and enforcement activity.

The Mass Transit Facilities and Service Act was passed by the Congress to my regret and I might add that I strongly opposed this measure. Not only do I believe that we should limit new programs, but I also objected to the mass transit program because of the complete lack of provision calling for private and municipal transit systems to be self-supporting through the fare box.

The 88th Congress' record is a dramatic illustration of the national consensus that education is indeed America's first line of defense.

The 1960's are a critical time in education. The number of college students will rise 94 percent between 1960 and 1970. The last 10 years have already seen an 86-percent increase in tuition fees. Currently one-third of our brightest high school graduates fail to enter college mainly because of financial consideration. Under the Higher Education Facilities Act, $1.2 billion in grants and loans were authorized for the construction of academic facilities for public and private non-profit graduate schools, 4-year colleges, 2-year community colleges, and public technical schools. Funds are not available to academic institutions for religious purposes.

The 88th Congress also approved far-reaching legislation in the area of vocational education. Federal effort in vocational education is as old as the 1917 Smith-Hughes Act. It has been 17 years, a period during the greatest move toward automation, since Congress enacted meaningful provisions for vocational education. Considering that an individual's loss of 1 year's income due to unemployment costs more than 12 years of education through high school, it is clear that such legislation is sound fiscal policy. The act authorizes $958 million for increased support of vocational education, gearing the program to the technical aids and directing it to those who need it most—young people in or out of high school who want and need specialized training, unskilled school dropouts, employed adults who wish to improve their skills because of job insecurity, and workers displaced by automation.

Congress passed the Economic Opportunities Act or the poverty program during the 88th Congress. I voted in opposition to this measure for I feel, as I have stated before, that we should not undertake new programs until such time as we are able to balance the budget and get on a sound fiscal policy.

There is no doubt that our cities in certain rural areas need help in providing opportunities for those who for one reason or another are in destitute circumstances and I would be the last one to say that there is no need in this country for assistance to those who are unable to live decently and to take their legitimate part as full citizens of this great country. I do not believe, however, that the only way to do it is to establish a new agency with complete Federal control of all areas covered by this legislation under the direction of one man who would have absolute power.

One of the first and primary concerns of good government is peace, for without it the resources of a nation cannot be devoted to the creation of those circumstances which would make it possible for each citizen to develop his full potential.

The security of the United States is the responsibility of the Department of Defense. The Congress enacted during the first session legislation appropriating $47,220 million to the Defense Department for the fiscal year. Not included in this amount were funds for military assistance abroad, military construction, civil defense, flood control work of the Army Engineers or for a military pay raise. This figure did not include $12.850,700,000 for military personnel, $11,714,033,000 for the operation and maintenance of our forces, $15,706.047,000 for procurement, and $6,949,230,000 for research and development.

In addition, the supplemental appropriation bill for 1964 which was also passed during the first session included an appropriation of $220,162,000 for the Department of Defense.

For the fiscal year 1965 we appropriated $46.752,051,000 for the Defense Department. This included $14,568 million for military personnel, $12,313,484,000 for the operation and maintenance of our forces, $13,422.047,000 for procurement, and $6,448,520,000 for research and development.

The deficiency appropriations bill passed during this session also included an appropriation of $1,004,900,000 for the Defense Department.

These appropriations account for almost one-half of the total budget, but I believe they are absolutely essential in order that our country can stay not only abreast but ahead of all other countries of the world militarily and so that we may be ready for any emergency.

The civil rights bill was enacted over the strong protests of many Members of the House. I took the floor on numerous occasions to point out the fallacy of such legislation and stated that not only did I feel that the legislation was unnecessary and unwarranted but that I believed it to be unconstitutional.

In my judgment, the provisions of the Civil Rights Act are morally wrong, unsound, and socially unnecessary. In addition, I believe that the provisions of the act usurp the rights of the individual States guaranteed by the Constitution.

I have briefly given you some of the highlights of the activities of the 88th Congress, but many other legislative activities were acted upon, such as the Food Stamp Act, housing, general Government reorganization, the coin shortage, and agriculture (which included feed grains, wheat-cotton and food marketing studies).

In addition, we considered the natural resources, outdoor recreation, water resources, public works projects, public works acceleration, river basin development, labor, and many other problems.

The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of which I am third ranking member (chairman of the Public Health and Safety Subcommittee) amassed one of the finest records of any Congress. We passed the Clean Air Act in which I played a vital part. We passed the mental health and mental retardation bill in which I played a major part. We passed legislation which I introduced to provide safety standards for automobile seat belts and safety standards for Government passenger-carrying motor vehicles. We passed the graduate public health training legislation, medical care for fishingboat owners, the Nurses Training Act, and the Hill-Burton Act. I am proud of this most enviable record and the fact that I am chairman of the subcommittee that handled the majority of this legislation and had the privilege of managing the legislation on the floor of the House.

Algerian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, November 1 marks the 10th anniversary of the outbreak of the nationalist revolt in Algeria. Since the House is not going to be in session at that time, we wish to take this opportunity to extend warm felicitations to His Excellency the President of Algeria Ahmed Ben Bella; and to His Excellency the Algerian Ambassador to the United States, Cherif Guellal.

November 1, 1954, was the beginning of the grueling, 7½-year war which led to Algerian independence, finally achieved on July 3, 1962. At that time, following the Algerians' overwhelming 99.6 percent vote for independence 2 days earlier, French President Charles de Gaulle proclaimed Algerian independence and the end of 132 years of French rule. Also on that date, the United States, in a special message by President Kennedy, recognized Algeria as an independent and sovereign state.

Much of Algeria's vast territory is made up of the oil-rich Sahara Desert, and most of its 11 million inhabitants are concentrated in the northern coastal region along the Mediterranean. In geographic area, Algeria is about four times the size of France and is the largest state in North Africa. Together with Morocco on the west and Tunisia on the east, it comprises the Maghreb, the western part of the Arab world.

The present plight of the Algerian nation is far from happy. The long years of bitter struggle against the French, with its toll of life and its disruption of the whole fabric of the nation, would have made an inauspicious background for the launching of a new state, in the best of subsequent circumstances. However, on the eve of independence in 1962, two serious developments occurred which further jeopardized the new state's chances of survival. Algerians of European extraction, who numbered about a million, and who possessed most of the nation's managerial, administrative, and technical skills, began a massive flight from the country. By the end of 1963, less than one-tenth remained. In addition, a bitter struggle for power broke out among leaders of the nationalist movement. Political and economic chaos threatened, and threatens still.

Algerians endorsed a new Constitution in September 1963, by popular referendum, although thousands of Berbers in the Kabylia region east of Algiers reportedly boycotted the election. The Constitution states as an aim "the building of a Socialist people's democracy" and provides for a controlling role by the National Liberation Front as the only political party. Deputies to the National Assembly, designated by Premier Ahmed Ben Bella and numbering 138, were approved nearly unanimously by the voters in a one-party parliamentary election last month. The Government stated that just under 85 percent of the registered voters participated.

The Berber opposition to the Government has involved intermittent guerrilla warfare in the mountainous Kabylia and Aures regions, and Algeria is intermittently rocked by rebellion, assassination, and sabotage. After originally avoiding imprisonments and executions, Premier Ben Bella declared last year:

> It is an illusion to think that you can have a revolution without prisons.

Executions have become frequent.

In the economic sphere, conditions are also serious. Unemployment is heavy, hunger widespread. American food for peace supplies are sustaining a substantial part of the population. French economic assistance is reportedly facing further cuts. Dependence on military and massive economic aid from Communist states has been markedly increasing.

The people of Algeria, who struggled so long and with such dedication for their independence, deserve a better fate than the last 2 unhappy years have brought them. I hope that the next anniversary of the revolt that began Algeria's heroic march to independence will see better things for these courageous people.

Tribute to Congressman E. L. Forrester

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, we are going to miss Tic Forrester on this floor. I have never known a man more dedicated to his country, the Constitution as written, the Bill of Rights, justice, and all of those great principles that made this Nation the greatest in the world. Tic Forrester was a fighter, who fought aboveboard. His service here was marked by integrity, forthrightness, and absolute honesty. Tic Forrester served here in the tradition of those great Georgia leaders so characteristic of the empire State of the South. I have served with no one more dedicated to the cause of individual freedom and States rights.

Tic Forrester is a restless, dynamic individual and will never retire from the arena of public service. He will continue to fight for his convictions and to keep our country free as the heart and core of the free world.

Mrs. Dorn joins me in wishing for him and his loyal and faithful wife the very best always and I hope he will come back to Washington to see us often.

The Metropolitan Challenge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLTON R. SICKLES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, on October 1, Senator Edmund S. Muskie delivered an enlightening speech on the problems of our Nation's metropolitan areas before the 13th Annual Commissioners' and Governors' Conference on Metropolitan Washington Problems, sponsored by the Council of Governments.

The text of his remarks follow:

THE METROPOLITAN CHALLENGE

(By Senator Edmund S. Muskie, Democrat, of Maine, before the 13th Annual Commissioners' and Governors' Conference on Metropolitan Washington Problems, Marriott Motor Hotel, Arlington, Va., October 1, 1964)

By the year 2000, 85 percent of our population will live in urban areas, experts tell us. Here, in our own National Capital region, 3 million new residents will be added by the end of the century.

The pressures of a metropolitan America already pose the greatest threat to our traditional Federal-State-local relations, as well as the greatest challenge to the maintenance of a strong, representative, and flexible Federal system.

There are the physical problems. We face water shortages, transportation snarls, urban blight, and wasteful land use.

There are the social problems. We face increased juvenile delinquency, rising crime rates, and uneasy race relations.

There are the political problems. We face shifting metropolitan boundaries, fragmented local government, and conflict between the central city and the suburbs.

There are the financial problems. We face limited revenue resources and almost limitless expenditure needs; soaring tax rates in the suburbs and falling tax bases in the cities. State and local debts are mounting, while State and local revenue sources fall behind.

Metropolitan areas currently require: $600 million annually for sewage treatment facilities; $400 million annually for pure water; $200 million annually to rebuild each square mile of slums; and $1¼ million annually so commuter railroads can stay in business.

These problems stagger the imagination. They tax our ingenuity as well as our purse.

The metropolitan area is a new type of community, one in which its inhabitants have little or no feeling of community. It is neither a neighborhood, city, State, nor nation. There are no anthems, flags, or mottoes. Loyalties are mixed, and problems grow with growth.

While our population has skyrocketed, the land most of us occupy has diminished. In 1940 nearly a quarter of our population lived in rural areas. In 1962 less than 8 percent still lived in the country. The remainder, victims of a technological revolution, moved from farms to urban areas. Mechanized farming, hybrid seeds, better planting methods, and more efficient animal husbandry add to our wealth with continually less human effort. And as this agricultural revolution advances, even more rural Americans will stream into our cities.

What does the new arrival find in our metropolitan centers? Is his environment a liberating influence? Or does he see urban living as a necessary evil, imposed by a technological revolution that has made him an alien in his own land?

The truth lies somewhere between these extremes. Our cities are large and exciting; they house our cultural and educational centers. The standard of living, for most, is higher. On the other side of the ledger, inadequate transportation, excessive noise, dull architecture, and air pollution are strong barriers to safe and sane urban living. We have responded to the economic necessities and this press of population accompanying the transformation of the American landscape, on a haphazard basis. In spite of gallant efforts, we have not rendered our urban areas either beautiful or really habitable.

The press and flux of population made suburban development inevitable. The city—dirty, crowded, and noisy—accelerated this exodus. The city dweller fled in his automobile to find cleaner air, less congestion, and a slower pace of living. For this, however, he ransomed much. As one commentator put it, "he entered the land of 'no.' No storm drainage, and no sewers. No curb, no gutter, and no sidewalks. No parks, no playgrounds, and no street lights. No fireplugs, no firehalls, and no firetrucks. No public garbage collection. No modern policing. No zoning and no subdivision control." Look-alike residential housing, and gaudy commercial strip development quickly dotted the pastoral landscape the suburbanite sought.

This portrayal is both a historic analysis and a recitation of current events. As President Kennedy put it: "In a few short decades we have passed from a rural to an urban way of life, and in a few short decades more, we shall be a Nation of vastly expanded population, living in expanded urban areas and housing that does not now exist, served by community facilities that do not now exist, moving about by means of systems of urban transportation that do not now exist."

How are we going to meet these needs?

The Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, in its report "Alternative Approaches to Governmental Reorganization of Metropolitan Areas," explores various proposals designed to create a sense of community in metropolitan areas. The Commission found there can be no "pat" solution for easing the problems of political and structural complexity at the local level. One approach called for the merging of outlying districts with the core city, thereby abolishing governmental fragmentation. Another, apparently more feasible, approach called for areawide functions to be performed by a regional government, with each local unit having representation. This federated approach has been adopted by only one metropolitan area in the country.

The establishment of metropolitan councils on a voluntary basis, composed of elected officials, is yet another alternative. Few such bodies exist. You, along with 9 or 10 other agencies, have been pioneers in developing the voluntary regional council as a happy compromise between those who want no change and those calling for the centralization of all metropolitan functions.

The Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments is the institutional recognition of the fact that yours is a regional community. More than 5 million people will live here in another generation. And most of this growth will take place mainly in the suburbs. This staggering increase will require a sharp rise in public facilities. Federal, State, and local funds will all be required to finance independently planned and executed construction programs. Greater coordination, then, is vital. For example, metropolitan water supply and sewage disposal projects demand an areawide attack and a cooperative program. No one level of government alone can handle such regional problems.

Your council understands this need for coordination. You act as a forum where members can meet and discuss common problems. As a study group you make recommendations to member counties, cities, and States. But you have never lost sight of the fact that planning is of no value unless it leads to appropriate action. The adoption of the year 2000 plan and the construction of the Potomac interceptor sewer bear witness to this.

One of the council's most recent and significant accomplishments is receipt of a Federal urban renewal demonstration grant. The purpose of this grant is to assist in bringing together for the first time various local governmental data. This in turn will encourage a greater degree of standardization for metropolitan land-use and housing classification. Federal efforts to bring about greater uniformity will also be aided. The project will demonstrate the feasibility of voluntary local cooperation as the basis for regional action. Despite these accomplishments, much work remains to be done.

The final report of the congressional Joint Committee on Washington Metropolitan Problems, although dated in some respects, is still a fair assessment of the conference's basic difficulty. The report declared, in part, that "despite such welcome steps as the establishment of an operating budget, and the employment of its own executive secretary, the conference has still far to go before it will be dealing effectively with Washington metropolitan problems."

The council has yet to become the authentic voice of the National Capital region. Metropolitan problems cannot be solved unless there are strong advocates able to reach and educate area residents, able to persuade local units that vitally needed action requires joint effort. The council must develop and fight for its own views on issues of areawide concern.

State governments must also bear a responsibility for encouraging regional solutions. Most States have tended to react to the metropolitan challenge in a haphazard fashion. The fiscal, jurisdictional, research, and planning needs of the large urban centers have commonly been ignored or handled on a piecemeal basis.

As a result, cities have turned to the Federal Government. This has alarmed many defenders of States rights. But demands for the preservation of States rights must be matched by an acceptance by the States of their responsibilities toward their major population centers.

The Council of State Governments and the Advisory Commission, the latter of which I am a member, have made several legislative proposals designed to assist State governments in meeting this urban challenge. If the States are to remain viable partners in our Federal system, they must adjust their operations and organizations in light of the revolution on the urban frontier. Both groups, therefore, have recommended the establishment of a new agency of State government for metropolitan or local affairs. This new agency would assist the metropolitan areas with respect to the problems of local governmental planning, structure, organization, and finance. Neither Richmond nor Annapolis has such an office, although both provide some of these services. Such a department could also assist the Governor in formulating effective policies to meet metropolitan problems.

The national character of many metropolitan questions makes Federal participation necessary. Several existing Federal programs have already had a significant impact on our metropolitan areas. In addition, three current proposals could make a substantial contribution to orderly urban growth and development.

First, a dimension of the National Capital region's water pollution difficulties is covered in S. 649, which I introduced in the first session of this Congress. It would amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act concerning grants for construction of municipal sewage treatment works. Of special concern to metropolitan areas is the provision that these grants may be increased by 10 percent for a project that is part of a comprehensive regional plan. The Senate, by a vote of 69 to 11, passed this needed legislation. If passed by the House, this measure will do much to strengthen the position of metropolitan planning agencies.

Second, metropolitan area planning would be further assisted by the enactment of S. 855. Senators HUMPHREY, MUNDT, and WILLIAMS joined me in February 1963 in sponsoring this Advisory Commission proposal. It was considered at length by the Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations and unanimously passed the Senate last January. The bill would require:

(1) Establishment of a legally constituted metropolitan agency, charged with the responsibility for areawide planning; and

(2) An assessment by this agency of certain Federal grant applications made by local governments before being acted upon by the relevant Federal departments and agencies.

Planning agency approval of applications is not a prerequisite to Federal assistance under this bill. But the proposal recognizes the role of adequate planning as crucial to achieving metropolitan objectives relating to open-space land projects, airport construction, waste treatment works, urban renewal, public housing, hospital construction, and urban highways. These projects would be viewed as part of a regional plan. The bill strengthens the concept of a metropolitan community.

It would also establish a frame of reference for all Federal activities affecting an urban area. Programs covered under this measure must be related to each other as well as to local development, if Federal funds are not to be spent on conflicting objectives. Economy, then, also demands this full exchange of information among the political subdivisions within a metropolitan area prior to the allocation of a Federal grant.

And finally, I have supported proposals for the establishment of a Federal Department of Urban Affairs. Until now, the Federal Government's reaction to the emergence of a metropolitan America—like that of the States—has generally been disjointed, sporadic, and unplanned. Such a department is necessary for coordinating the numerous Federal programs that have an impact on metropolitan areas.

These three proposals for congressional action differ in many respects, but all have one feature in common: They seek to establish the foundations for a viable metropolitan community.

A memorable passage from Prof. Kenneth Galbraith's book, "The Affluent Society," portrays our dilemma. He described "the family which takes its * * * air-conditioned, power-steered, and power-braked automobile out for a tour (and) passes through cities that are badly paved, made hideous by litter, blighted buildings, billboards, and posts for wires that should long since have been put underground. They pass on through a countryside that has been rendered largely invisible by commercial art. * * * They picnic on exquisitely packaged food from a portable icebox by a polluted stream and go on to spend the night at a park which is a menace to public health and morals. Just before dozing off on an air mattress, beneath a nylon tent, amid the stench of decaying refuse, they may reflect vaguely on the curious unevenness of their blessings."

Galbraith may exaggerate, but there is indeed an "unevenness" of blessings. Our citizens, and their representatives at all levels of government, are becoming more aware that action in the public sector must be as imaginative and progressive in providing the public services we require as the private sector in providing the luxuries we want.

Joint Federal-State-local cooperation and innovations in government are needed now.

President Kennedy said: "The challenge is great, and the time is short. Shall we begin?"

The council, just by its existence, represents a beginning.

Now, as President Johnson has said, "Let us continue."

Salute to Kenya

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on December 12, Kenya will celebrate the first anniversary of its independence. Since the House will not be in session at this time, we wish to take the opportunity now to extend warm felicitations to His Excellency Jomo Kenyatta, the Prime Minister of Kenya; and to His Excellency Burudi Nabuera, the Kenyan Ambassador to the United States.

The first year has not been uniformly smooth, but the people and leaders of Kenya can be justifiably proud of the way difficulties have been handled and of the progress that has been achieved during Kenya's first year of independence. Kenya has met its problems rationally and intelligently. The spirit of the country has been one of cooperation and negotiation; the results have been substantial progress toward a society of law and order founded on a stable and developing economy.

Already Kenya has begun to play an important role in East Africa, on the whole African Continent, and in the world community. Shortly after independence Kenya became a member of the United Nations. In East Africa Kenya has been working tirelessly for a federation of Kenya, Uganda, and the Republic of Tanganyika and Zanzibar in the belief that a larger union would strengthen the area economically and would give it more weight politically in world affairs. Currently Prime Minister Kenyatta is chairman of the commission recently set up by the Organization of African Unity to help the Congo work out a solution for its internal strife. In all these arenas the voice of Kenya has been one of moderation and restraint, but also one of determination to work diligently and patiently toward a solution of the tasks set before it.

One of the major internal problems facing any newly independent country is how to speed up the development of its economy. Kenya has also set itself assiduously to the solution of this problem. A 6-year development plan reported in June 1964 proposes a "blueprint for prosperity" which would raise family incomes by $84 a year to a national average of $560 by 1970. The Government does not pretend that this objective can be easily achieved. It has honestly informed its citizens that attainment of this target depends on the initiative, hard work, and sacrifice of everyone in the country. One of the basic methods by which Kenya hopes to finance its growth is by increasing the productive capacity of the individual farmer. In order to do so it proposes improving the productivity of land already in use, bringing new land into production through irrigation schemes, and expanding the production of cash crops to rural families now living at a primitive subsistence level outside the cash economy.

Kenya also hopes to expand its infant industries, and the new development plan envisions the manufacture of many goods now imported. Another major focal point of the plan is the encouragement of tourism. With its breathtaking snowcapped peaks, broad valleys, and shimmering lakes and with a good supply of national parks loaded with many varieties of birds and game, Kenya is a veritable tourist paradise. The richness of Kenya's natural beauty may prove to be an important asset in the development of the country's economy.

All the problems have not been solved in the first year of independence, but Kenya has made substantial progress. The economy is still heavily dependent on a few basic agricultural crops such as coffee and tea. Negotiations for an East African Federation seem to have reached a stalemate. But we are confident that Kenya will continue to pursue its goals with determination and reason. We salute you, Prime Minister Kenyatta and the people of Kenya, on the first anniversary of independence. May the coming year be even more fruitful than the last.

Retirement of the Honorable James C. Auchincloss

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK M. CLARK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I have served with JIM AUCHINCLOSS on the House Public Works Committee for almost 10 years. It has been a privilege to know him both as a member of the committee and as a friend. He has made many valuable contributions to the committee and we shall miss him. I wish Mr. and Mrs. Auchincloss much happiness in the years to come.

A Short Report on Immigration Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, as we near the closing hour of this 88th Congress, I desire to make a short report on the status and progress of pending immigration legislation.

Our Subcommittee on Immigration and Nationality began public hearings on pending bills on June 11, 1964. As chairman, I took that action only after it became certain that adequate funds would not be provided to activate the Joint Committee on Immigration and Nationality Policy during this session. Over the course of 1 year, covering both sessions of this Congress, I sought by every proper means to secure funds to activate the joint committee. It was my conviction that Congress could not act intelligently on pending immigration legislation without a full scale uninhibited and objective review of all the factors, domestic and international, upon which a sound immigration policy must be based. To expect Congress to act without such a review, incidentally a long overdue review, was to call upon Congress to act in the dark, without the facts upon which sound policy rests.

Our subcommittee has provided an opportunity for all interested in our immigration program to appear as witnesses or to present statements for inclusion in the record of our hearings. Orderly and purposeful procedure was employed in the course of our hearings. We opened phase I of our hearings with testimony from interested Members of Congress. Phase II took up testimony from the executive branch of Government including the Secretary of State, the Attorney General, the Secretary of Labor, the operating level of the Department of Justice which includes the Immigration and Naturalization Service and the operating level of the Department of State—the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs. Phase III took up testimony from nongovernmental organizations and interested individuals.

This task required hearings, both public and executive, over a course of more than 3 months. Those hearings have been completed and all the reports thereon should be available to Members, the press, and the public in the very near future. Separate reports are being made for each of the three phases of our hearings.

When the hearings had been underway for 2 months, when we had completed testimony from interested Members of Congress and the executive branch and had commenced taking testimony from nongovernmental organizations, I introduced H.R. 12305 on August 10. I did so because it was then apparent that H.R. 7700, the administration bill, could not be enacted into law and the revisions required to make it acceptable would be so basic and far reaching as to alter the original proposal as to make it unrecognizable. In these circumstances I presented a bill which sought to accomplish these purposes:

First. To use the authorized but unused quota numbers over a trial period of 2 years under a new system which conformed to Supreme Court decisions on the responsibility of Congress to regulate immigration into the United States.

Second. To use the unused quota numbers to reunite families, to bring in skilled workers needed to expand our economy without displacing an American worker and to provide a haven for our fair share of the victims of Communist tyranny under conditions which does not attach the stigma of parole to their admission.

Third. To provide an opportunity for Congress to benefit from the practical results of this 2-year trial period while Congress through the Joint Committee on Immigration and Nationality Policy would undertake and complete the long overdue review of immigration policy.

Fourth. To remedy the most urgent, the most human problems of our present immigration program while Congress was making a determination on what our new immigration policy should be.

The provisions of the bill which I introduced were supported overwhelmingly by the testimony taken up to the time of its introduction. I was encouraged by the rapid and affirmative responses which I received to the action I had taken.

Witnesses appearing during our hearings after August 12 were invited to comment on the provisions and purposes of H.R. 12305. A large number of national organizations rallied their support behind my bill. Our colleague, Congressman Edward Derwinski, of Illinois, introduced an identical bill on September 4, 1964. In his explanatory remarks he called for bipartisan support and action during this session of Congress, noting that the Republican Party supported the bill which he had introduced.

H.R. 12305 was given full and careful consideration by members of the House Committee on Immigration and Nationality. One major revision of the bill was agreed to, a revision of the definition of a refugee. I was encouraged by the members of my subcommittee, at least a majority thereof, to believe that they would support enactment of that bill.

Over a period of no less than 3 weeks I sought to get a quorum of the subcommittee to take final action on H.R. 12305. Meeting dates and times convenient to the members were set. But a quorum did not result. I then notified each member by telegram on two separate occasions that a meeting was set to vote up or down on H.R. 12305. But again a quorum did not result.

I was somewhat amazed to learn that during that critical period a quorum of the subcommittee was met with Mr. Emanuel Celler, chairman of the Judiciary Committee, to discuss staff personnel—a matter on which I will have more to say at a later date. It is worth noting in this connection that the gentleman from New York, Congressman Celler, stated to me more than 1 month ago that there would be no immigration legislation this year. It now appears that his purposes as stated to me have been realized.

During the last 2 days of this Congress, I nevertheless continued my efforts to secure a majority vote on H.R. 12305. Here I was confronted with a new problem. The gentleman from New York [Mr. Celler] had departed Washington and had left word that he would not authorize a poll of the full membership of the Judiciary Committee.

Those are the basic facts related to pending immigration legislation and the 3 months of hearings thereon by the House Subcommittee on Immigration and Nationality. That record speaks for itself.

Congressman Lester Johnson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I want to take this opportunity to convey a personal tribute to Congressman Lester Johnson, of Wisconsin's old Ninth District. Congressman Johnson is retiring from the House at the end of this session.

Lester Johnson has served the State of Wisconsin and the Nation well. He came to the House in 1953 and was at that time the only Democratic Congressman from Wisconsin.

His primary concern in the House has been with the problems which face rural communities throughout our Nation. He has served for many years on the House Agriculture Committee and has worked in the best interests of small farmers and farm communities. Since 1959, he has been chairman of the Dairy Subcommittee of the House Agriculture Committee.

Lester Johnson has been a leader in recognizing the value of conservation for farm communities. He has worked steadfastly and hard for many conservation measures, including additional wet lands, the watershed conservation program and, most recently, the Ice Age National Scientific Preserve. He has worked ceaselessly for REA cooperatives.

Lester Johnson's most specific interest has been in dairy legislation. No one will doubt his sincere concern for dairy farmers. These farmers, whom Lester Johnson knows so well, will always have a warm spot in their hearts for the efforts which Lester Johnson has put forth in their behalf in the Congress.

Lester Johnson's congressional career has been marked by support for progressive, forward-looking legislation. He has voted for measures to strengthen the Nation and the economy, to expand opportunities for our youth, to assist senior citizens, and, most notably, to develop and protect our natural resources for the benefit of future generations.

Lester Johnson's presence will be sorely missed in the Congress. His judgment and his advice have been a great help to members of the Wisconsin delegation and to his other colleagues in the Congress. I am sure, however, that he will continue to make his services and his experience available to the Nation and to those of us who have relied on him so heavily in the past.

Our best wishes go with him.

Salute to Tanganyika

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on December 9, the Republic of Tanganyika will celebrate the third anniversary of its independence. Since the House will not be in session at this time, we wish to take the opportunity now to extend warm felicitations to His Excellency Julius Nyerere, the President of Tanganyika; and His Excellency Othman Shariff, their Ambassador to the United States.

Although a new republic, the history of the people is long and distinguished. Anthropological discoveries indicate that the land was inhabited by man 14 million years ago, and parts of Tanganyika's coast were known by Persians, Egyptians, and Indians when the Christian era began. In the 19th century Lakes Tanganyika and Victoria were discovered by various explorers, and despite continuous opposition the African country was declared a protectorate by Germany. In the First World War, the British drove out the Germans and Tanganyika became a League of Nations mandate. After the Second World War it became a United Nations trusteeship administered by the British.

Under British rule preparations and training for self-government began that placed the people of Tanganyika in readiness for independence. The legislative council was enlarged and gradually included more and more Africans. The first elections were held in 1958 and in March 1961 a constitutional conference was held to work out the arrangements for independence. On the 9th of December 1961, Tanganyika became an independent country.

The President of the Republic of Tanganyika, and the man who led it to independence, is Julius Nyerere. He came to the United States last year on an official state visit and was hailed as one of Africa's most influential and respected leaders. Son of the chief of a tribe which lives in the region of Lake Victoria, President Nyerere has a master's degree from Edinburgh University and is a Roman

Catholic. His constant aim has been to fight three enemies—poverty, ignorance, and disease. He urges his people to help themselves in raising their living standards and building their country.

The land of Tanganyika has been called a wonder to the eye. Kilimanjaro, which is the highest mountain in Africa, is capped with snow although it is only three degrees south of the equator. Lake Victoria is the second largest freshwater lake in the world, second only to Lake Superior. The scenery changes from tropical shores of sandy white beaches to open savanna abounding with wildlife and again to cool highlands.

On April 26, 1964, Tanganyika and Zanzibar merged into the United Republic of Tanganyika and Zanzibar. Tanganyika has long been the champion of federation for all the countries which were once British East Africa. President Nyerere has expressed the belief that the Africans must think in terms of building bigger nations, and that the "balkanization" of Africa should be abolished. The world will be watching to see if the union with Zanzibar is the first step in this direction.

Toward the rest of the world Tanganyika is trying to follow a course of independence and nonalinement. It is a difficult policy to pursue in a world so divided as ours, and we in America should understand that it is a policy which necessarily means the taking of actions which are displeasing to our side as well as, on other occasions, to the other. But the right to take such actions is the meaning of independence, and the essence of a free world.

As Tanganyika completes its third year as an independent nation, we in the United States extend it our best wishes. May the fourth year bring the continued progress which has marked Tanganyika's history till now. May it continue to exercise an important influence in the direction of freedom and peace.

The Honorable Frank J. Becker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I could not conscientiously let this session close without a word for our great all-American colleague, FRANK BECKER. I know of no one who has labored more diligently to preserve our Constitution as written than FRANK BECKER. I will always remember his service here in behalf of those Christian principles upon which this Nation was founded. He believed that our American philosophy was founded on the philosophy of the Man of Galilee.

FRANK BECKER's great speeches and untiring efforts in behalf of prayer and Bible reading in the public schools will be an inspiration to all of us and we will endeavor to carry on his great work. FRANK will continue to be active in the fight to save our country and freedom everywhere.

Mrs. Dorn and the family join me in wishing for him the very best, always.

Hon. James P. Mitchell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROLAND V. LIBONATI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Labor, throughout the years of its operation, has had as it leading and propelling force, Secretaries well qualified for the responsibilities of their office.

Few realize that one important function of the office is to increase the opportunities for those who are qualified to be used by industry, and so forth, in order that the economy be strong through the realization of full employment.

In recent years, the labor level of employment problems, and labor crisis with industry were resolved and solved by exceptionally capable Secretaries—namely, James P. Mitchell, Arthur J. Goldberg, and the present Secretary, W. Willard Wirtz.

Their contributions to labor and industry have, in a great measure, been the guidelines to our growing economy and prosperity.

To me, President Eisenhower's appointment of James P. Mitchell, a management man, was an intriguing challenge to the modus operandi of labor unions.

But the opposite resulted and labor accepted him as a man of great stature, obedient to the needs of both unions and management.

Mr. Mitchell represents greatness in its true light, and he has compassion for the troubles of humankind, which is reflected in his splendid achievements in the important positions he has held, both in public life and industrial assignments. He is no ordinary man.

Mr. Mitchell's identification with management did not prevent him from thinking straight in his duties as Secretary of Labor. His brilliant analysis of labor problems, presented to him during his term of office, won for him praise and acclaim from both management and labor.

Labor leaders, disappointed, at first, by his Presidential appointment, were quick to acknowledge their mistakes in gaging him as being prejudiced to their interests.

His perfect sense of mental balance only weighed the facts—and with honesty of purpose his major premise—the final decision, was unassailable.

Similar to the early lives of many of our Nation's leaders, life's struggle prevented him attending college. Equipped with a high school education, he earned his way and trained his mind in the school of self-study and experience.

Later in life, these teachings and experiences of his early youth were not forgotten. He proved it by being fair and honorable in his labor decisions and in the responsibilities of his office as Secretary of Labor. The statement made, at that time, by President George Meany, "Mitchell is the greatest Secretary of Labor the country ever had"—is authoritative proof of his competency.

Secretary Mitchell has a heart as big as his body. He is kind and considerate to everyone who seeks his advice or services. He is a strong, sturdy type of individual who loves humanity. And he is honest and decisive in his judgments. He holds the admiration and respect of management, labor, and officialdom in public life. He still receives praise from all, including the press and news media. He contributed, as Secretary, a steady, studied influence over the affairs of our Nation in the field of labor. The people of the Nation accept him as a true champion of protecting the economy—labor and management; a true judge of industrial relations. We are proud of his great record in the field of labor.

A Great Congressman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES R. GROVER, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, Congressman JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS, prior to the primary election this year, decided not to run for another term, and he will retire from the Congress next January. JIM, as he is affectionately known to his many friends, has rendered distinguished service to the Third Congressional District of New Jersey, and the Nation as a whole, for the past 22 years.

He has played an active role in the passage of much good legislation, and his wise counsel and advice is frequently sought by his colleagues in the House of Representatives. As ranking minority member of both the Committee on Public Works and the Committee on the District of Columbia he has exercised effective leadership in the development of needed legislation in the best interest of all of the people. His unerring ability to quickly get to the crux of issues and problems and to arrive at realistic and practical solutions, which often have been the basis for opposing factions to reconcile their differences, is a hallmark of his outstanding ability as a legislator.

We, who have had the privilege of serving in Congress with JIM, will miss him greatly, both as a good friend and as a fatherly adviser, and the entire country will suffer a loss by his retirement from active public life. We sincerely hope that as a private citizen he will maintain his interest in public affairs and continue to make his views known on matters of national importance.

Summary of Joint Committee on Atomic Energy—2d Session of the 88th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN O. PASTORE

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, I have had the Joint Committee staff prepare a summary of the activities and accomplishments of the Joint Committee during the 2d session of the 88th Congress.

This report, along with the report for the first session which I submitted for the Record on January 10, 1964, summarizes the activities of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy during the period of my first tenure as chairman of the committee.

I believe the record of the Joint Committee during this period has been one of positive accomplishments and contributions to the security of the Nation and the free world. This record will also show progress in developing atomic energy for peaceful purposes.

Mr. President, I believe the summary of the activities of the Joint Committee during the 88th Congress should be a source of pride to the Members of this Congress. I want to thank the majority and minority members of the committee, both in the Senate and in the other body, for their cooperation, in making this record of accomplishments one of which I am proud to report. I ask unanimous consent to have the report of the activities and accomplishments of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy during the 88th Congress, 2d session, inserted at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Activities and Accomplishments of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy in the 88th Congress, 2d Session, 1964

FOREWORD

The following report on the activities of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy during the 2d session of the 88th Congress (1964) has been prepared at the direction of chairman for the information of the Congress, the executive branch, and the public. (For report of activities in 1st session, see Congressional Record, Jan. 10, 1964, p. 264.)

The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy is a House-Senate committee consisting of nine members from each body, of which no more than five from each can be members of the majority party. Following is a listing of the present membership:

John O. Pastore, of Rhode Island, chairman; Chet Holifield, of California, vice chairman; Richard B. Russell, of Georgia; Clinton P. Anderson, of New Mexico; Albert Gore, of Tennessee; Henry M. Jackson, of Washington; Bourke B. Hickenlooper, of Iowa; George D. Aiken, of Vermont; Wallace F. Bennett, of Utah; Carl T. Curtis, of Nebraska; Melvin Price, of Illinois; Wayne N. Aspinall, of Colorado; Albert Thomas, of Texas; Thomas G. Morris, of New Mexico; Craig Hosmer, of California; William H. Bates, of Massachusetts; Jack Westland, of Washington; and John B. Anderson, of Illinois.

The Joint Committee is unique in several respects. It is the only joint committee of the Congress with legislative functions, including the initiation and reporting of legislative proposals. The committee is also charged by law with legislative responsibility as "watchdog" of the national atomic energy program. It follows closely the classified activities of both the Atomic Energy Commission and the Defense Department in the military applications of atomic energy.

Of equal importance, the committee plays a major role in stimulating the peaceful applications of the atom. Specifically, the committee has encouraged such programs as the development of civilian nuclear power, the preservation of food through irradiation, and the application of nuclear power in space.

In all these activities, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, as the representative of Congress and the public, seeks to assure the implementation of the following statutory policy expressed in the Atomic Energy Act of 1954: "The development, use, and control of atomic energy shall be directed so as to make the maximum contribution to the general welfare, subject at all times to the paramount objective of making the maximum contribution to the common defense and security."

During the 88th Congress, 2d session, the Joint Committee conducted a total of 65 public and executive hearing sessions. The hearings occupied a total of 138 hours. Of the 65 hearing sessions held, 35 were public, and 30 were executive.

I. LEGISLATIVE ACTIVITIES

(a) AEC Authorization Act (Public Law 88-332):

This year, pursuant to legislation enacted during the 1st session of the 83th Congress (Public Law 88-72), the Joint Committee reviewed, for the first time, the authorization for all appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission, including both construction and operating funds. Under prior law, the committee's responsibility for reviewing the atomic energy budget was essentially limited to construction funds and the cooperative power reactor demonstration program.

The committee held extensive hearings on the AEC recommended fiscal year 1965 authorization bill over a period of 6 weeks beginning January 22, 1964, and reviewed each major atomic energy program in considerable detail. The hearings culminated in the introduction of clean bills by Chairman Pastore (S. 2755) and by Vice Chairman Holifield (H.R. 10945). These bills were reported in the House and Senate on April 21, 1964 (S. Rept. No. 987; H. Rept. No. 1532). The report included comprehensive statements by the committee on virtually every major atomic energy activity.

Briefly, the bill which was passed without amendment by the House and the Senate authorized appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission fiscal year 1965 in the amount of $2,636,577,000, as follows:

Operating expenses	$2,298,467,000
Plant and capital equipment	338,110,000
Total authorization	2,636,577,000

Section 101a of the authorization bill provides approximately $2.3 billion for "operating expenses" for the AEC's 13 principal programs. Among the highlights of this authorization are the following:

(1) In the civilian power reactor program: the committee authorized a total of $72 million—$4 million less than the amount requested by the Atomic Energy Commission. The Commission had requested $5 million for a 5-year cooperative program with the Government of Canada in the development of heavy water reactors. The committee allowed an authorization of only $1 million. The cooperative program with Canada in the development of heavy water reactors is a 5-year program and it was the committee's view that the Congress should have an opportunity to pass judgment on the program on an annual basis. Accordingly, only $1 million was allowed for the program in fiscal year 1965.

(2) In the cooperative power reactor demonstration program: Although no new authorization was requested, the committee in its report, included important statements of policy guidance with respect to the future of the program. The committee noted that although no power reactor is yet producing competitive electricity, substantial gains have been made in recent years. On this basis, the committee stated that: "further assistance in the cooperative power reactor demonstration program for light water-moderated and cooled reactors of the types proposed by utilities in the past year cannot be further justified."

The committee called for a "shift in emphasis" to reactors which show the promise of significantly enlarging the Nation's energy resources—the so-called converter and breeder reactors which produce almost as much, or more, fuel than they consume. This statement was a logical extension of the position first expressed by the joint committee in its report on the fiscal year 1964 AEC authorization bill.

(3) In the merchant ship reactor program: The committee rejected a requested authorization of $13.5 million for the development of a merchant ship gas-cooled reactor prototype. The request for this program was submitted by the AEC in the form of an amendment subsequent to the completion of the committee's public hearings on the authorization bill. It was the committee's position that a program of such significance should be reviewed on the public record prior to authorization. Accordingly, the committee refused the Atomic Energy Commission's request but stated its willingness to reconsider the matter at a future time when the Atomic Energy Commission would be prepared to present the full details of the program in public hearings. No proposal has yet been submitted to the committee.

(4) In the SNAP (Systems for Nuclear Auxiliary Power) program: The committee added $14.5 million for a flight test in outer space of the SNAP 10-A reactor. Although the Atomic Energy Commission had requested funds for such a flight test in its submission to the Bureau of the Budget for fiscal year 1965, funds for this program were not included in the Commission's final submittal to the Congress.

SNAP 10-A is a compact reactor designed to produce approximately 500 watts of electrical power for space applications. It has been under development for a period of over 7 years at a cost of approximately $100 million. Early in fiscal year 1964, the Department of Defense placed the SNAP 10-A development flight test in a lower priority category on the basis that "no immediate and urgent requirement exists for SNAP power units." As a result of this decision, the flight test portion of the program was canceled despite the fact that the project stood on the threshold of a final test in space and its payoff.

In the course of the hearings on the AEC authorization bill, the committee held special hearings on the SNAP program at which representatives of the AEC, the Air Force and the principal contractors in the SNAP 10-A program presented testimony. The hearings plainly indicated that authorization of a SNAP 10-A flight test was in the national interest.

In adding funds for a SNAP 10-A flight test, the committee stated that "the flight test of SNAP 10-A will be invaluable in demonstrating to potential users the reality of nuclear reactor systems for space applications." The committee also noted that "the flight will be another 'first in space' for the United States—a demonstration of the practical use of nuclear reactor systems for power in outer space."

Finally, the committee noted its "grave concern" over the developing trend toward cancellation of successful development projects immediately prior to their actual demonstration. The committee noted that "if this trend continues, it is the committee's view that research and development programs will be increasingly called into question by the Congress and the public with unfortunate consequences for the Nation's scientific and technical development."

In order to partially offset the additional funds required for the SNAP 10-A flight test, the committee reduced the requested authorization for advanced SNAP reactor development work. The committee noted that even if this advanced development work proved successful, it would not be incorporated in practical devices "unless there is a path-breaking test of the SNAP 10-A reactor."

(5) The committee rejected the Atomic Energy Commission's request for funds to develop an advanced Pluto reactor. The Pluto project was aimed at the development of a nuclear reactor to power a supersonic military vehicle in the earth's atmosphere.

The Pluto project which was started 8 years ago has been carried out by the Atomic Energy Commission's Livermore Radiation Laboratory. The total expenditure by the AEC and the Air Force for the Pluto project was approximately $200 million through fiscal year 1964.

The reactor development phase of the project under the Livermore Radiation Laboratory was exceedingly successful. The development objectives were met and demonstrated in ground tests.

On the basis of the committee's hearings, it was clearly demonstrated that the next logical step in the Pluto program was a flight test of the Pluto reactor, the so-called Tory II-C. However, instead of requesting a flight test, the Air Force and the AEC proposed to place the successful Tory II-C on the shelf and commence the development of an advanced reactor concept.

In imposing a $1.5 million cut from the $8 million requested by the Atomic Energy Commission, the Joint Committee reasserted its belief that the next logical step in the Pluto program was a flight test and therefore refused to approve any proposed "make work" activity in the program.

(6) In the physical research program the committee recommended a reduction of $4 million below the AEC request for $222 million. In taking this action the committee called for a "definitive and approved national policy on high energy physics." The committee requested that the AEC, in conjuction with other appropriate Federal agencies, prepare a study to be submitted to the President and the Congress on high energy physics research.

Finally the committee recommended a "tightening-up" on "off site" research contracts in such programs as high energy physics, chemistry, biology, and medicine, and training, education, and information. Each of the committee recommendations was enforced with appropriate reductions in the requests submitted by the Atomic Energy Commission.

The authorization bill also provided $338 million for "plant and capital equipment" in the atomic energy program for fiscal year 1965.

On May 7, 1964, the AEC authorization bill was considered and passed in the House of Representatives on a rollcall vote of 340 to 3. On June 22, 1964, the bill was considered in the Senate and passed by a voice vote.

The authorization bill was then forwarded to the President and was signed into law on June 30, 1964, as Public Law 88-332.

(b) Private ownership:

On March 15, 1963, during the 1st session of the 88th Congress, the Atomic Energy Commission transmitted to the Congress proposed legislation to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 in order to eliminate the statutory requirement for mandatory Government ownership of all special nuclear material in the United States, and to permit the enrichment of privately owned uranium in the Government's diffusion plants. The bill was introduced by Chairman PASTORE (by request) as S. 1160, and by Vice Chairman HOLIFIELD (by request) as H.R. 5035 on March 21, 1963.

In the 1st session the private ownership legislation was the subject of detailed hearings over a period of 3 days from July 30 to August 1, 1963. In the course of these hearings the committee probed in depth into the legal and economic consequences of private ownership and identified a number of important policy problems that had to be resolved prior to the enactment of the legislation. The complete hearing record was published in 1963 under the title of "Private Ownership of Special Nuclear Materials."

In the ensuing months the private ownership legislation was the subject of extensive study and discussions within Government and industry. In the 2d session of the 88th Congress, on April 22, 1964, the joint committee announced further hearings on the private ownership legislation, indicating the following matters of special interest on which it desired further testimony:

1. Should some restriction be imposed upon the importation of foreign uranium concentrates for enrichment and ultimate sale on the domestic market? Should some restriction be placed on the importation of foreign-enriched uranium?

2. Should toll enrichment be permitted during the duration of the Government's uranium procurement contracts?

3. Should the legislation be amended in any way to protect the competitive structure of the atomic energy industry?

4. Should the buy-back of plutonium by the Government be assured and, if so, for what period?

The resumed hearings on the private ownership legislation were held before the Subcommittee on Legislation on June 9, 10, 11, 15, and 25, 1964. The hearings, with extensive supporting data, were printed by the joint committee under the title "Private Ownership of Special Nuclear Materials, 1964."

On August 4, 1964, the Subcommittee on Legislation met and voted to file "clean bills" incorporating significant changes from the legislation as submitted by the Atomic Energy Commission. These bills were introduced by Chairman PASTORE as S. 3075, and by Vice Chairman HOLIFIELD as H.R. 12228 on August 4, 1964. The full committee met on August 5, 1964, and voted to report out the legislation as recommended by the Subcommittee on Legislation (H. Rept. No. 1702; S. Rept. No. 1325).

The following are the highlights of the legislation as reported by the joint committee:

First, the legislation repeals the requirement for mandatory Government ownership of special nuclear materials. Provisions for the continued effective regulation and control of such materials is assured in other sections of the Atomic Energy Act as amended by the private ownership legislation.

Second, the legislation authorizes the Atomic Energy Commission to sell or lease special nuclear material. However, after December 31, 1970, the Commission will not be able to distribute special nuclear material, except by sale, to a person owning or operating a nuclear power reactor if the material is intended for use in such a reactor. As of June 30, 1973, unless otherwise authorized by law, all special nuclear material previously leased to a person owning or operating a nuclear power reactor will have to be converted to private ownership.

Third, the Atomic Energy Commission is instructed to establish guaranteed purchase prices for plutonium produced in a licensed reactor and delivered to the Commission before January 1, 1971. A specified cutoff date is thus imposed in the legislation on the period for guaranteed purchase prices for plutonium. With respect to U^{233}, the Commission may establish purchase prices for periods of up to 10 years.

Fourth, the legislation authorizes the Atomic Energy Commission to enter into contracts for the furnishing of uranium enrichment services. Under this system of "toll enrichment" the Commission could, for instance, agree to accept delivery of normal uranium and deliver to the purchaser an appropriate quantity of enriched uranium. The purchaser would pay the Commission's charges for enrichment services—a charge based generally on the cost of doing necessary processing or "separative" work in the Government's diffusion plants. This service, however, could not commence until January 1, 1969.

In general, the bill authorizes the Atomic Energy Commission to enter into similar arrangements with respect to the distribution and purchase of special nuclear material and the furnishing of enrichment services on an international basis.

This legislation, which has been described as "the most far-reaching revision of the Atomic Energy Act since 1954" was considered and passed in the Senate on August 6, 1964, and approved by the House of Representatives on August 18, 1964.

The bill was signed into law (Public Law 88-489) by President Johnson at White House ceremonies on August 26, 1964.

(c) Omnibus bill:

On May 6, 1964, the Atomic Energy Commission transmitted to the Congress a proposed 1964 omnibus bill which contained four amendments to the Atomic Energy Act of 1954. The proposed bill was introduced by Chairman PASTORE (by request) on May 7, 1964, as S. 2816, and by Vice Chairman HOLIFIELD (by request) on May 7, 1964, as H.R. 11180.

Hearings on the bills were held before the Subcommittee on Legislation on May 19, 1964.

The committee also had pending before it the AEC 1963 omnibus bill introduced by Chairman PASTORE (by request) as S. 1795 and by Vice Chairman HOLIFIELD (by request) as H.R. 7300. Hearings on these bills had been held on July 17, 1963, during the 1st session of the 88th Congress, but action was deferred pending the clarification of financial arrangements in connection with the sale of special nuclear materials to EURATOM, authorized by the bills.

After the completion of executive deliberations by the Subcommittee on Legislation, the full Joint Committee met on June 24 and 26, 1964, and voted to approve and combine, with some changes, the 1963 and 1964 omnibus bills as recommended by the Subcommittee on Legislation. In accordance with the instructions of the full committee, "clean bills" S. 2963 and H.R. 11832, were introduced respectively by Chairman PASTORE and Vice Chairman HOLIFIELD on June 29, 1964. The committee also voted to adopt a committee report on the bills (S. Rept. No. 1128; H. Rept. No. 1525).

As reported by the committee, the bill contained the following major amendments to the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, the Atomic

Energy Community Act of 1955, and the EURATOM Cooperation Act of 1958:

Section 1 of the bill amended subsection 153h of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 by extending for an additional 5 years the Atomic Energy Commission's authority to require the licensing of atomic energy patents. The Commission's authority would have expired on September 1, 1964. The amendment extended this authority to September 1, 1969.

Section 2 clarified the Price-Anderson indemnity provisions of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954. The amendment was designed to make it clear that a reactor for which the Commission issues a construction permit prior to August 1, 1967, will be afforded Price-Anderson indemnity coverage extending through the period of its operation without regard to whether or not the operating license for the facility is issued prior to that date.

Section 3 of the bill provided a parallel clarification with respect to facilities used for educational activities and operated by nonprofit educational institutions.

Section 4 of the bill amended the Atomic Energy Community Act of 1955 to authorize the Atomic Energy Commission to make certain dispositions of real and personal property located in the Commission's project area at Richland, Wash. The purpose of this amendment is to encourage the attraction of nonatomic energy activities to the Hanford area in order to diversify and improve the economic base of the Richland community.

(d) Legislation on "202" hearings:

On January 22, 1964, Chairman **Pastore** and Vice Chairman **Holifield** respectively introduced S. 2448 and H.R. 9711, bills to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 in order to eliminate the mandatory requirement that the committee hold annual hearings on the "development, growth and state of the atomic energy industry"—the so-called "202" hearings.

Prior to the enactment of this legislation, section 202 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 required that the joint committee conduct hearings within the first 90 days of each session of the Congress on the development, growth, and state of the atomic energy industry. The effect of the amendment approved by the committee was to make the holding of so-called "202" hearings permissive and within the discretion of the committee.

As noted above, as a result of legislation passed during the first session of the 88th Congress, the joint committee was required to review both the operating and the construction portions of the AEC budget for fiscal year 1965. During the course of the hearings on the AEC authorization bill, the committee received testimony from representatives of the Atomic Energy Commission, other Government agencies, representatives of the national laboratories, industrial contractors and the coal industry.

In effect, these extensive hearings on the AEC authorization bill accomplished many of the same purposes as the annual hearings on the "development, growth, and state of the atomic energy industry." Accordingly, the committee proposed the amendment eliminating the requirement for mandatory "202" hearings in order to avoid unnecessary duplication and to provide the committee with the flexibility to adjust its schedule in accordance with the requirements of congressional business.

The legislation eliminating the requirement for mandatory "202" hearings was reported by the committee on February 25, 1964 (S. Rept. No. 877; H. Rept. No. 1151).

The bill was considered and passed in the Senate on February 26, and approved by the House of Representatives on March 16, 1964. It was signed into law by the President on March 26, 1964, as Public Law 88-294.

II. AGREEMENTS FOR COOPERATION

(a) Peaceful uses of atomic energy:

In accordance with provisions of section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 amendments to 11 existing agreements for cooperation in the peaceful uses of atomic energy were submitted to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy by the Department of State and the Atomic Energy Commission during 1964. The amendments to the agreements for cooperation with the Kingdom of Greece, Iran, Republic of China, Republic of Vietnam, Kingdom of Thailand, the Argentine Republic, and the Republic of France, were the subject of hearings before the Subcommittee on Agreements for Cooperation on June 30, 1964. These hearings combined with 1963 hearings on agreements for cooperation, are being published under the title "International Civilian Agreements for Cooperation."

Subsequent to the hearings, the committee received amendments to agreements for cooperation with the Governments of Israel, Portugal, the United Kingdom, and Brazil.

With respect to the amendment to the agreement for cooperation with France, a new provision would remove the present enrichment limitation of 90 percent in transferring uranium to France for research purposes. With respect to the other agreements for cooperation, the new amendments provide that the agreeing parties will promptly request that the International Atomic Energy Agency assume responsibility for safeguards inspection to insure against the diversion of fissionable materials to military purposes.

(b) Agreement for mutual defense purposes:

On June 30, 1964, a new proposed agreement for cooperation with the North Atlantic Treaty Organization was submitted to the Congress by the President in accordance with subsection 123 d. of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 as amended by Public Law 85-479. Executive and public hearings on the proposed agreement were held on July 30 and August 18, 1964, respectively, before the Subcommittee on Agreements for Cooperation.

The new proposed agreement supersedes an earlier 1955 agreement with NATO. Basically, the new agreement broadens the area within which atomic energy information may be communicated to authorized personnel in connection with NATO missions. The 1955 agreement limited the transmittal of such information to NATO civilian agencies and military commands. The new agreement permits such communication to appropriate officials, both civilian and military, in NATO and its member states in order to carry out functions related to NATO missions.

On August 17, 1964, prior to the public hearings held by the committee, four concurrent resolutions were introduced in the House of Representatives expressing disapproval of the proposed NATO agreement. In this connection, the joint committee report (see reference below) stated, "On the basis of its exhaustive review of the proposed NATO agreement and supporting data and in consideration of the clearly stated positions of the interested executive agencies, it is the committee's view that the concern expressed in the foregoing concurrent resolutions, although responsibly and legitimately expressed, is not well founded."

The new agreement also permits the communication of additional atomic energy information specifically authorized by the 1958 amendments to the Atomic Energy Act but not covered in the 1955 agreement. For example, the new agreement would permit the transfer of information necessary to the development of compatible delivery systems for atomic weapons.

After executive deliberations on the proposed agreement, the committee issued a comprehensive report, interposing no objection to the proposed agreement which went into effect on September 24, 1964. (S. Rept. No. 1592; H. Rept. No. 1890.)

III. INFORMATIONAL HEARINGS

As noted in other sections of this report, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, during the second session of the 88th Congress, held extensive hearings connected with its legislative activities on such matters as the AEC authorization bill for fiscal year 1965, the AEC omnibus bill, and the legislation on private ownership of special nuclear materials.

In addition, the committee also conducted a number of informational hearings on a diversity of subjects. In total during the second session of the 88th Congress, the joint committee and its subcommittees held 65 public and executive hearings, occupying 138 hours. The committee conducted 35 public and 30 executive sessions during the year.

A total of 21 publications consisting of reports, hearings, and committee prints were published or are in the process of publication by the joint committee in the second session of the 88th Congress.

(a) Stanford linear accelerator power supply:

On January 29, 1964, the joint committee held a public hearing on current plans for supplying the electric energy requirements for the Stanford linear accelerator project.

The Stanford linear accelerator project was authorized by the Congress in 1964 at a cost of approximately $114 million. When completed in 1966 it will be the world's largest electron accelerator. The first phase of operation of the Stanford accelerator project is estimated to require approximately 100,000 kilowatts of electricity. During the course of its hearings, the committee looked into the latest cost estimates and plans associated with supplying electric energy to the Stanford project. The hearings were published under the title "Stanford linear accelerator power supply."

(b) Tarapur reactor project:

On April 22, 1964, the committee, in executive hearings received testimony from witnesses representing the Agency for International Development (AID) and the Atomic Energy Commission on a proposed AID agreement with India for the construction of the 380 megawatt Tarapur atomic power station.

The committee had held hearings during 1963 on the proposed agreement for cooperation with the Government of India which provides the legal framework for U.S. assistance in connection with the Tarapur reactor plant—a central station plant consisting of two power reactors of American design and manufacture. Under the arrangements with India, up to $80 million will be provided by a loan from the U.S. Agency for International Development. The agreement also provides for safeguards to be implemented by the International Atomic Energy Agency in order to assure the use of the Tarapur station and its fuel for peaceful purposes.

The hearings during 1964 on this subject were aimed at obtaining the precise details of the arrangements for the Tarapur atomic power station, with particular emphasis on the costs associated with the facility.

The 1963 and 1964 hearings on this subject are in the process of publication by the joint committee. The Tarapur reactor project hearings are being included in the "International Agreements for Cooperation" print referred to earlier.

(c) Water desalination hearings:

On August 18, 1964, the joint committee held public hearings on Government programs for the development of methods to produce fresh water from salt water.

Representatives of the Atomic Energy Commission testified on the Commission's programs and plans for the development and utilization of nuclear power in connection with water desalination applications.

Representatives of the Department of Interior testified on the Department's plans for the development of processes to convert salt water into fresh water. The testimony of the Department of Interior updated earlier testimony on this subject presented to the committee during the hearings on the "Development, Growth, and State of the Atomic Energy Industry" in February 1963.

The committee's hearings on this subject are in the process of publication under the title of "The Use of Nuclear Power for the Production of Fresh Water from Salt Water." It is expected that further hearings on this subject will be held by the committee during the next session of the Congress, at which time representatives of interested industrial firms may be invited to testify.

(d) Confirmation of Presidential appointees:

The Senate section of the joint committee met in public session on April 24, 1964, to consider the nomination of Dr. Mary I. Bunting to be a member of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission. Dr. Bunting was nominated to serve the remainder of the term expiring June 30, 1965, of Dr. Robert E. Wilson. Dr. Bunting's nomination was reported favorably on April 24, by the joint committee and approved by the Senate on April 25, 1964.

The Senate section of the joint committee met in public session on Wednesday, May 20, 1964, to consider the reappointment of Mr. James T. Ramey as a member of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission for a term expiring June 30, 1969. Mr. Ramey had been initially appointed a Commissioner in August 1962, to fulfill the unexpired term of Commissioner John S. Graham. Mr. Ramey's nomination was reported favorably on May 20, and approved by the Senate on May 22, 1964.

IV. CLASSIFIED ACTIVITIES

In addition to the hearings described in previous sections of this report, the joint committee conducted an extensive number of hearings on classified matters in executive sessions.

The subject matter of these hearings proved to be as broad as the worldwide defense and security interests of the United States.

(a) Intelligence briefings:

On March 18, 1964, the full joint committee received an intelligence briefing on recent intelligence developments affecting the field of atomic energy, from Mr. John A. McCone, Director of the Central Intelligence Agency. This meeting was a continuation of the regular practice of briefings by CIA on vital matters affecting the security interests of the United States.

(b) Loss of the nuclear submarine *Thresher:*

On April 10, 1963, the nuclear submarine, *Thresher*, was lost while undergoing sea trials approximately 200 miles off the coast of Cape Cod. The ship went down with 112 naval personnel and 17 civilian technicians aboard.

Immediately upon being notified of the loss, the chairman of the joint committee instructed personnel of the committee staff to represent the committee as official observers to the court of inquiry appointed by the Navy. These staff personnel were present during the taking of testimony by the court, in both open and closed sessions. Periodically, reports were made by the joint committee staff personnel to the full joint committee in executive session.

The committee itself held executive hearings on the loss of the nuclear submarine, *Thresher*, on April 22, June 20, 24, 26, 27, and July 23, 1963.

Testimony was received from the Secretary of the Navy, and the President of the Naval Court of Inquiry, as well as ranking naval officers familiar with the design, construction, and maintenance of nuclear submarines. The committee obtained information on all factors which could reasonably be considered in relation to the loss of *Thresher*. The committee also reviewed planned action to improve submarine design and obtain greater quality assurance in the nonnuclear portions of the construction of submarines.

As a followup to these hearings, the committee, on July 1, 1964, held an executive hearing on corrective measures taken since the loss of the *Thresher*. The committee received testimony from representatives of the Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of Navy, including the Honorable Kenneth E. BeLieu, Assistant Secretary of the Navy. In particular, the testimony covered changes made in the design, construction, operation, and maintenance of nuclear submarines subsequent to the date of the loss of the *Thresher*.

The foregoing hearings, with classified information deleted, are in the final stages of preparation for publication by the joint committee under the title of "Loss of U.S.S. *Thresher*."

(c) NATO multilateral force:

The joint committee has maintained a continuing interest in negotiations for a NATO multilateral nuclear force.

During the first session of the 88th Congress, on February 20, 1963, Ambassador Livingston Merchant, then Special Assistant to the Secretary of State for Multilateral Force Negotiations, outlined the proposed MLF concept. The briefing, in executive session, took place just prior to Ambassador Merchant's visit to Europe to explore the concept with our NATO European allies.

On May 7, 1964, Secretary of State Rusk briefed the joint committee in executive session on the current status of the multilateral nuclear force discussions. In general, the Secretary of State outlined the progress of the discussions and the reactions of our NATO allies to the proposal. The committee was assured that, if and when the agreement for a NATO multilateral force is concluded, the agreement will be submitted to the Congress for full legislative scrutiny and action.

During the period June 2–8, 1964, a member of the joint committee's professional staff visited NATO Headquarters and SHAPE in Paris. The purpose of this trip was to review planning activities and security arrangements in connection with the proposed multilateral nuclear force (MLF). Senior U.S. officials including Ambassador Finletter and General Lemnitzer were interviewed, as well as U.S. personnel responsible for this program.

(d) Weapons requirements and cutbacks in the production of special nuclear materials:

The level of production of special nuclear materials for weapons purposes has long been a matter of special interest to the committee. In particular, the committee has been interested in the military requirements for special nuclear materials and the means used to establish production levels.

On January 10, 1964, the committee held an executive hearing with witnesses from the Department of Defense and the Atomic Energy Commission, including the Honorable Roswell L. Gilpatric, then Deputy Secretary of Defense, and AEC Chairman Dr. Glenn T. Seaborg. The hearings were designed to receive classified studies by the Department of Defense and the Atomic Energy Commission on nuclear weapons and fissionable materials requirements. The hearings were held following a January 8, 1964, announcement by the President concerning a reduction in the production of both enriched uranium and plutonium for weapons purposes.

On April 20, 1964, the committee again held hearings on further reductions in the production of enriched uranium. The committee received testimony on reductions in the rate of production of special nuclear material from AEC Chairman Seaborg and other Commission officials. A Presidential announcement setting forth additional reductions in the production of enriched uranium was issued following the committee's hearings.

On April 28, 1964, the committee received testimony in executive session from Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, then Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, on projected military requirements for special nuclear materials.

(e) NATO nuclear weapons arrangements:

On March 12, 1964, the full committee met in executive session to receive testimony from Gen. Lyman C. Lemnitzer, Supreme Allied Commander, Europe.

In connection with NATO matters, the joint committee has maintained a continuing interest in the policy aspects involved in the command and control of nuclear weapons. In particular, the committee has followed closely progress in the development of so-called "permissive action links," a system designed to prevent the unauthorized firing of nuclear weapons. The committee has also followed very closely arrangements for the security and custody of nuclear weapons deployed in Europe. General Lemnitzer reviewed and updated all developments in the foregoing areas of concern to the committee. In addition, the committee was able to have an exchange of ideas with General Lemnitzer on NATO activities and plans.

(f) The nuclear weapons program and safeguards under the nuclear test ban treaty:

The Joint Committee continued to closely follow the Atomic Energy Commission's nuclear weapons program. In particular, the committee devoted its attention to the Commission's research and development, testing, test readiness, and test detection programs to assure that these activities are carried out at a level of effort sufficient to assure the undiminished strength of the United States.

These activities are of particular significance in the light of the nuclear weapons test ban treaty which was signed on October 10, 1963. The President of the United States, in a letter to the Congress, assured the Congress that certain safeguards would be instituted in order to reduce the risk involved in an abrupt abrogation of the treaty by the Soviet Union. Briefly, the safeguards as outlined by the President are:

"1. The maintenance of vigorous weapons laboratories;

"2. The conduct of comprehensive and continuing underground nuclear weapons tests;

"3. The maintenance of a readiness capability to resume atmospheric testing should this be deemed essential to national security; and

"4. The improvement of our capability to monitor the terms of the treaty and the maintenance of our knowledge of Sino-Soviet nuclear activities, capabilities, and achievements."

During the 1st session, 88th Congress, in November of 1963, the Joint Committee, accompanied by staff personnel and representatives of the Atomic Energy Commission, the Department of Defense, and the White House, visited selected installations in the worldwide atomic energy detection system. The committee's inspection trip underscored its interest in assuring the effective implementation of the test ban treaty safeguards, particularly that safeguard pledging an improvement in our system for the detection of clandestine nuclear tests and maintenance of our knowledge of Sino-Soviet nuclear activities. During the committee's visit of selected stations of the atomic energy detection system, they were apprised of recommended improvements in the system.

Subsequent to that time most of these improvements were authorized and initiated by the executive department. In this connection it should be noted that the Secretary of State on September 29, 1964, forwarned the public of the imminence of the initiation of nuclear testing by the Communist Chinese Government.

The committee continued its active role in assuring the effective implementation of the test ban treaty safeguards during the course of the authorization hearings on the AEC fiscal year 1965 authorization bill. (See sec. IA. of this report.)

The committee held hearings in executive session on January 22 and 23, 1964, with witnesses representing the Atomic Energy Commission. These witnesses reported on the AEC's program for implementing the test ban treaty safeguards. The committee reviewed in detail the Commission's requests for funds for the development, testing, production and storage of nuclear weapons. In addition, the committee carefully examined the Commission's requests for funds for off-continent test readiness and special test detection activities.

In connection with the committee interest in the program of readiness to resume atmospheric testing a member of the committee's professional staff has been assigned to make an inspection of the facilities and activities that the Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of Defense operate in the Hawaiian Islands and Johnston Island in the Pacific for the purpose of maintaining the test readiness posture. This inspection is to take place in October 1964.

During this period, operations of the 8th Joint Task Force, the organization responsible for carrying out oversea tests, were also observed. The 8th Task Force exercises, involving both air and sea operations, were carried out in the vicinity of Johnston Island in the Pacific. The exercises were designed to test the adequacy of the readiness preparations.

The objective of the test readiness program is to achieve and maintain a status of readiness which would permit resumption of atmospheric testing within 2 to 3 months after a decision is made to conduct such tests.

After examining the nuclear weapons program in considerable detail, the committee stated the following conclusions: "Nuclear weapons are the essential backbone of America's deterrent strength. It is the committee's view that the funds requested by the AEC for the nuclear weapons program should provide the resources necessary to assure a vigorous program in which new developments are fully exploited."

(g) Pluto program: On July 28 and 29, 1964, the Subcommittee on Research, Development, and Radiation held hearings in executive session on the status of the Pluto nuclear ramjet project.

On July 1, 1964, the Atomic Energy Commission had announced that the Pluto nuclear ramjet program was being canceled because of lack of support from the Department of Defense in carrying out the flight test phase of the program.

Witnesses representing the Department of Defense and the Atomic Energy Commission summarized the highly successful reactor development and ground test phase of the Pluto program since the date of the committee's last hearings in September 1962. The committee also received testimony from Department of Defense witnesses on the reasons for the termination of the Department's interest in the nuclear ramjet.

V. OTHER ACTIVITIES

(a) Third International Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy: A member of the committee participated in the Third International Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy at Geneva, Switzerland, during the period August 30 through September 9. This multination technical conference highlighted the fact that civilian nuclear power is on the threshold of economic competitiveness.

(b) International Atomic Energy Agency Eighth General Conference: Congressional business this year precluded participation in the Eighth General Conference of the International Atomic Energy Agency by members of the committee. The committee was represented at the Conference, which was held in Vienna during the week of September 14, by a member of the committee staff.

Highlighted in the Conference was a report by Director General Eklund concerning the use of the IAEA for inspection to assure that special nuclear material was not being diverted for military uses. The director general reported that 17 out of the 38 countries having nuclear reactors have already accepted inspection by IAEA to assure that such diversions of special nuclear material for military purposes are not being made.

(c) Atomic energy installation inspection trips:

The committee members and staff continued their practice of obtaining firsthand information by visiting Atomic Energy Commission, Department of Defense, and U.S. Government contractor installations. During the 2d session, 88th Congress, visits were made to the following facilities: Argonne National Laboratory, Lemont, Ill.; Atomics International, Canoga Park, Calif.; Brookhaven National Laboratory, Upton, L.I., N.Y.; Elk River reactor, Elk River, Minn.; Hanford Laboratories, Richland, Wash.; Lawrence Radiation Laboratory, Berkeley, Calif.; Lawrence Radiation Laboratory, Livermore, Calif.; Lockheed Missiles and Space Center, Sunnyvale, Calif.; Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory, Los Alamos, N. Mex.; Marine Products Development Irradiator, Gloucester, Mass.; National Reactor Testing Station, Idaho Falls, Idaho; Nevada test site, Nevada; Nuclear merchant ship, N.S. *Savannah;* Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, Tenn.; Paducah gaseous diffusion plant, Paducah, Ky.; Pathfinder atomic powerplant, Sioux Falls, S. Dak.; Peach Bottom reactor, Peach Bottom, Pa.; Pinellas Peninsula plant, St. Petersburg, Fla.; Piqua nuclear power facility, Piqua, Ohio; San Onofore nuclear powerplant, Camp Pendleton, Calif.; Savannah River Laboratory, Aiken, S.C.; Stanford accelerator project, Stanford, Calif.; United Nuclear Corp., White Plains, N.Y.; U.S. Army Radiation Laboratory, Natick, Mass.

In addition committee members and staff visited the following foreign atomic energy installations engaged in cooperative research and development projects with the United States: CERN (European Nuclear Research Center), Geneva, Switzerland; Hahn-Meitner Nuclear Research Institute, West Berlin, Germany; International Atomic Energy Agency Laboratory, Seibersdorf, Austria; Ispra Research Center (EURATOM), Ispra, Italy; Seibersdorf Atomic Research Center, Seibersdorf, Austria; Selni Nuclear Power Station, Trino, Italy; SENN Nuclear Power Reactor, Scauro, Italy.

The Honorable James C. Auchincloss

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I could not let this session close without paying tribute to the distinguished and able minority leader of my committee, the great Committee on Public Works, a committee which authorizes billions of dollars and which has contributed much to the defense and the advancing economy of the United States.

JIM AUCHINCLOSS played a leading role in our great Interstate Highway System, in the development of our rivers and harbors, and the great progress which has been so paramount in the recent history of our country.

JIM AUCHINCLOSS is one of the great Americans of our time. Through his dedicated efforts to strengthen America, he has strengthened the cause of freedom everywhere. JIM AUCHINCLOSS, in committee, had a wonderful sense of humor which eased many tense situations. His courage, integrity, and genuine character will always be to me a source of great inspiration.

I hope JIM will come back to see us often. He carries with him my best wishes, warmest regards, and highest esteem.

Salute to Zanzibar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on November 10, Zanzibar will celebrate the first anniversary of its independence. Since the House will not be in session at this time, we wish to take the opportunity now to extend warm felicitations to His Excellency Abeid Karume, the President of Zanzibar; and His Excellency Othman Shariff, their Ambassador to the United States.

When Zanzibar celebrates this first anniversary, a year of uneasiness, change, and decision will be in the past. Zanzibar's first year of independence was far from a dull one. Little more than a month after independence a coup d'etat deposed the Arab coalition government, and Zanzibar was proclaimed a republic under an African President. Subsequently, American diplomats were expelled, politicians identified with Moscow and Peking seemed to be in control, and westerners began talking of Zanzibar as an "African Cuba." Then, by the end of April, just as suddenly, a union of Zanzibar and Tanganyika was proclaimed. Fears of an "African Cuba" were allayed.

The speed with which these events took place surprised even seasoned observers of the African scene, but in a sense perhaps nothing really should seem startling in Zanzibar, for it is a land unique to itself. First, Zanzibar is an island—or rather two islands, Zanzibar and Pemba—which lie off the coast of Africa in the Indian Ocean. Because the islands are on one of the world's most important sea routes, however, they had been discovered and explored when the rest of Africa was still unknown to the world outside the African Continent.

As early as the seventh century B.C. Arab traders stopped at Zanzibar on their way to and from the East. Second, Zanzibar's chief industry is an unusual one—the production of cloves. Zanzibar is, in fact, often called "the isle of cloves," for clove trees cover a large part of the islands, and their spicy odor is carried across the islands by the breezes. Cloves account for three-fourths of Zanzibar's export income.

In addition, Zanzibar has a racially mixed population of Arabs and Africans, with the Arabs comprising a small—perhaps 19 percent of the whole population—but influential group. For the most part the owners of clove plantations are Arabs. This racial mixture has contributed importantly to the uniqueness—and volatility—of Zanzibar's politics since independence.

Perhaps the most significant event of Zanzibar's first year of independence was its union with Tanganyika, for it appears that this union has established the basis for a stable but dynamic economic and political development of the "isle of cloves." Under the terms of the union, patterned on the union between Britain and Northern Ireland, Zanzibar has retained its separate identity and has its own Parliament and Government. The powers of the Government of the United Republic, specifically reserved to it, cover foreign affairs, trade, security, immigration, and citizenship. The police of the two countries has already been integrated, and plans call for integration of the armies as well.

On the first anniversary of their independence we congratulate President Karume and the people of Zanzibar on their wise choice in uniting with Tanganyika. We are convinced that union is the best path to more stable and speedier development in east Africa. On this important date we extend our best wishes to the "isle of cloves" for its continuing prosperity.

Hon. James C. Auchincloss

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARNOLD OLSEN

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to our friend and colleague, JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS, of New Jersey, who has announced his intention of retiring from the House of Representatives at the close of this 88th Congress. I note that he has spent the greater part of his life in the public service, with his congressional career having given him the opportunity to act on all the major issues of our time. In carrying out his duties, he has given an example of sincere adherence to his convictions that has benefited all of us who have had the privilege of serving with him, on the floor of the House and in the committee rooms. I join his many friends in wishing him all happiness and good health in the enjoyment of his well-earned rest from the arduous task facing every Congressman—that of serving both conscience and constituents well and truly.

Come On In, Politics Is Fine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GAYLORD NELSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, during the 88th Congress, Senator CLAIBORNE PELL has taken an active and leading interest in the problems and challenges confronting our Nation's youth.

Demonstrating his concern for our young people and his desire to stimulate in them a wish for service on behalf of our country is an article in the October issue of Seventeen magazine, entitled "Come On In, Politics Is Fine."

This is a timely and excellent article. I am happy to call it to the attention of my colleagues and ask unanimous consent to place it in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COME ON IN, POLITICS IS FINE

Politics in a democratic country is a reflection of that country's life, of its vitality. The United States, in my judgment, is a vital country. Its politics is vital: sometimes rough and tumble, sometimes misdirected, sometimes immensely idealistic, on occasion motivated by unattainable hopes; but most often keenly practical—and always alive, always subject to change, always moving, never static, never quite the same.

I think the word "politician"—the person who practices politics—has lost its proper meaning. Look it up in the dictionary and you will find that a politician is one "versed or experienced in the science of government." The further synonym of "statesman" is used—although I have found that to be called a statesman, one usually has to be a successful, and no longer active, politician.

It would be difficult to maintain that all who enter our political life are supremely dedicated to the welfare of their fellow man, but neither are all human beings of the highest purpose. The great majority of politicians in a democracy reflect their fellow man, his beliefs or disbeliefs, his philanthropy or his self-interest, his compassion or his callousness. And I have found they usually have a sense of honor, ethics, and service higher than that of their general community. The point is, though, there is always room for improvement among human beings, and that includes not only politicians but the people who elect them—the voters.

Recognizing our shortcomings, we must learn more and more how best to work together—as politicians and as voters—in the great enterprise, the great adventure of strengthening our country and developing its full potentials.

This is a common task and a common goal. In the effort to achieve it, young people can be of enormous assistance. They have the opportunity of shaping the future of our country, but to use this opportunity effectively they will need intelligent minds.

That is why education is so important, and why the school dropout problem must be solved if we are to reach our goal. Our Government must make certain that the finest educational facilities are available to all those who wish to learn. But the wish, the real desire for knowledge, cannot be artificially stimulated. It comes from the individual and from a realization that a partial education, or one cut short unnecessarily, means a partial fulfillment in life, an incomplete share in the benefits our country can provide, a limited contribution to its growth and prosperity. "Profile of Youth," a two-volume report prepared at my request by the Library of Congress, shows that young people who leave school before gaining a diploma—and there will be an estimated 7.5 million of them during the decade of the 1960's—are not necessarily lacking in mental ability. Rather, the breaking off of their education is related to a lack of interest in their work, to a lack of participation in athletics and extraclass activities.

These are enemies to which young people need to direct their attention. Those who believe in education, who clearly recognize its value, can point out the way to others less aware. They can help others to gain that added incentive which can mean the difference between dropping out and staying on, between a successful career and one tragically abbreviated. Some young people are already engaged in just such an enterprise, helping students in poverty stricken areas where the incentive for education is often stunted and where particular understanding is required.

I have an abiding confidence in the ability of intelligent young people to come to grips in meaningful fashion with their own problems. Enlightened guidance from an older generation is, of course, advantageous; but youth is a time of challenge and of self-expression when patterns of the past are examined and perhaps found inadequate, when new and fresh ideas occur. In a free society the youthful spirit of discovery is our greatest resource.

It renews our country's vitality and it keeps our politicians alert in their tasks. It puts a breath of fresh air in the proverbial smoke-filled room, which is becoming less and less a symbolic chamber of decision. Both our major parties are looking for young leaders—and so they should.

During my 3½ years in the Senate, I have come to know numbers of young people, almost 200 of them, who have served in the intern program established in my office. My purpose is to help stimulate their interest, their participation in government and politics regardless of party, and in public service. These young people serve as volunteers, not for pay but for the sake of knowledge.

A great many of these teenagers are taking political science courses in Rhode Island colleges. My home State may be relatively small, but I believe I have the largest such program in the Congress.

Two students are with me during each week of the fall, winter, and spring terms. More are with me during the summer, some spending more than a month of their vacations in my office. They are eager to learn at first hand about the processes of Government. They are full of enthusiasm, and, men and women alike, they are full of ideas. They have been an education to me. They have convinced me that in these extremely complicated times in which we live, we need to hear clearly the intelligent voice of youth.

With this in mind, I am now urging the concept of a "dialog with youth" on a nationwide scale, so that young people can have a better forum for expressing their opinions on the issues they believe are most important—on their wants and needs, on the problems and challenges they feel most acutely.

As a further means of assisting young people in all their undertakings, and so that the problem areas can be more sharply defined and legislative action taken where it would be beneficial, I would like to see established in the Congress a special Committee on Youth.

So let us work together to make our democracy function with true purpose, accepting new ideas and testing their worth, reaffirming old and tested ideals when they remain valid. If all of us embark on this course, we will all become interested, versed, and experienced in the science of government. In the highest meaning of the word, which befits a democratic and free society, all of us will become "politicians."

(CLAIBORNE PELL, 45-year-old freshman Senator from Rhode Island, was elected to the U.S. Senate by the largest plurality in the State's history after becoming the first unendorsed candidate in Rhode Island ever to win a statewide Democratic primary. As a Senator, he has undertaken both official and private fact-finding missions to Cuba, Eastern Europe (including several trips to Berlin), Africa, and Asia.

(Senator PELL, whose father served as Minister to Portugal and to Hungary and as a Member of Congress, is married and is the father of two sons and two daughters.)

Salute to South Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, the 1st day of November will mark the anniversary in South Vietnam of the revolution that overthrew the regime of President Ngo Dinh Diem. Since the House is not going to be in session at that time, we wish to take this opportunity to extend warm felicitations to the people of South Vietnam; and to the South Vietnamese Chargé d'Affaires ad interim to the United States, Mr. Phan Khac Rau.

There was hope at the time of the revolt 1 year ago that the change would lead to a stronger and more stable Government. But, instead, it ushered in a year of uneasiness, of twists and turns in the politics of the country. In a period of less than 12 months there have been three different groups of leaders in Saigon. Each of them has taken over the reins of Government by force and so far all have failed to solve the two major problems that jeopardize the future of South Vietnam.

The first of these problems is the threat that is posed by the Communist-led guerrillas, the so-called Vietcong. Backed by Communist North Vietnam and dedicated to destroying the Government in Saigon, the subversive movement has been able to spread its control over large areas of South Vietnam. The struggle has been going on for almost 8 years, but the last 12 months have seen an alarming turn for the worse.

The second problem has been the Government's lack of success in winning the support and allegiance of all the Vietnamese people. It is related, of course, to the first problem. In the rural areas and even in the cities there are some people who do not feel a bond with the Government in Saigon. Some of these are in sympathy with the Communist-led rebels and their goals.

These are the problems that must be solved if South Vietnam and its people are to have a strong and stable Government. Only then can they look forward to the benefits of lasting peace and progress.

As South Vietnam observes the first anniversary of the revolution, we are reminded that there are few people in the world today who have had to fight so steadfastly to uphold their freedom and independence. They are proving again that it is possible to stand up to the forces of Communist aggression and terror. They deserve our admiration and I know that many other Americans join me in saluting them on this important occasion.

The Honorable James Auchincloss

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, a quarter of a century in the House of Representatives of the United States opens the door to a platform on which stands perhaps the most diversified group of individuals in the world. On the platform stand men and women of different political persuasion, of opposing philosophies, representing people of diametrically opposite views. Conservatives, liberals, moderates, middle of the roaders—you name it; this platform has always found space for such individuals. The longer a Member serves in this body, the greater his privilege to meet and know, some less, some better, but at least the opportunity presents itself to know all of them. Naturally there are some who stand out more than others and linger longer in our memory.

JIM AUCHINCLOSS, of New Jersey, is one of them.

One of my fondest memories and greater privileges has been the knowledge that I can call JIM AUCHINCLOSS a friend. With the close of this Congress he retires from the scene and walks off the platform, but the space that he occupied during his years in the Congress will always be revered and always a reminder that there stood a great American.

My life has been fuller for having known JIM AUCHINCLOSS. I am sure this is shared by many, especially those particular friends of his to whom each year he played host as the head of the gleeful yeas and nays marching and barbecue group.

I have never known a man with the capacity of JIM AUCHINCLOSS for making friends, or with the capacity of unselfish devotion to make his fellow man happy. There is consolation to be found, if there is any consolation at all, in the fact that JIM AUCHINCLOSS will remain close to us in Washington after he retires from Congress following this session. It will be some compensation to know that we can look forward to visits from him on the floor of the House which he served so well for so many years.

I am sorry to see JIM AUCHINCLOSS go, but I am glad that I am able to anticipate and continue the warm feeling of friendship which has existed between us for so many years. Quite well can we say to him on his departure from the Congress: "Well done, thou good and faithful servant."

Can any finer tribute be paid to any man?

Senator Humphrey on Farm Policy Issues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE McGOVERN

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, the national cornpicking contest held at Sioux Falls, S. Dak., provided Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, the Democratic vice-presidential nominee, an ideal opportunity to present to farmers and to the Nation the sharp contrasts between the agricultural policies of the Democratic candidates and those of Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, Republican standard bearer.

Speaking to his fellow South Dakotans, Senator HUMPHREY reminded his listeners of the dark days of the 1930's, "days of drought, dust, crop failures, and depression," and the historic decisions made by the people and their Government to meet the needs of the people and the land. He spoke of the dreams of Franklin Delano Roosevelt and George Norris, of Nebraska, that became accomplished realities: the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Rural Electrification Administration, the soil conservation systems, and shelterbelts of the Great Plains. He spoke of past accomplishments and of new goals to be achieved to develop and strengthen the farm economy. He quoted the words spoken by President Lyndon Johnson to a farm audience in Iowa:

> I look forward to the day when we can rely less on cutbacks, and more on programs to sell abroad all we produce above our own needs.
>
> We must get on with the job of stimulating worldwide demand to use our tremendous God-given production.
>
> We will continue to develop new ideas, new approaches, and new solutions.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of Senator HUMPHREY's speech be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BY SENATOR HUBERT HUMPHREY, NATIONAL CORNPICKING CONTEST, SIOUX FALLS, S. DAK.

It is wonderful to be back here where I spent my youth. As a native son, I share with you a love of this land and its people.

It was here in South Dakota and in the rest of the Midwest that historic decisions were made in 1932 and 1936.

We decided to take positive steps to move America forward so that all of us might enjoy a better and more productive life. Now the temporary spokesman of a faction of a fraction of the Republican Party is proposing to reverse that decision.

Senator GOLDWATER tells us he wants to go back to the "good old days." I remember those days of drought, dust, crop failures, and depression—they don't bring back fond memories.

Once the tides of human affairs are running strongly forward, nations which attempt to reverse that flow do so at their own peril. The American people must ask themselves: Shall we continue to move ahead, or shall we turn back—shall we register a failure of nerve?

In the thirties we faced two disasters.

First, we were struck by the Great Depression, with its jobless army of 15 million, its starving children and soup lines, the collapsing banks, the stricken businesses everywhere, the 12-cent wheat, the 5-cent hogs, and farms falling under the foreclosure hammer.

Second, mid-America suffered from the drought of the 1930's. Many of us still remember the drough-stricken years—the dry wells and streambeds, the cropless fields, the burned pastures, the dying cattle, and the duststorms. We can never forget the savagery of those natural forces.

The individual [illegible] matter how rugged—found that he could not cope with those forces, drought and depression.

Alone, individuals were helpless. But united, we could save mid-America.

We reached those historic decisions this campaign will either ratify or reverse. We decided—in 1932 and in 1936—to use the institution of democratic government to help us meet those urgent needs.

The Government was recognized as an instrument of the people, capable of acting for them in crises. And we made this decision consciously and joyously—for we know government is the people.

We are gathered today in one of our country's great river valleys which have been the cradle of so much of our history. But these rivers, too, with their recurrent waste of precious water and soil in devastating floods, have required the common constructive action of all the people through the processes of democratic government.

In 1936 two famous Americans faced a vast campaign rally a short way down the Missouri from here.

Both men had demonstrated the vitality of democratic government in meeting urgent human needs. Both men had achieved stirring results in harnessing our tremendous river systems and putting them to work for the people.

One man was Franklin Delano Roosevelt. The other was George Norris, of Nebraska, father of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

In 1936, the American people said "Yes" to Franklin Roosevelt and George Norris.

And the people of America also said "Yes" to the system of rural electric cooperatives that light and energize the Nation's farms.

And the people of America said "Yes" to the TVA which is now the model for such systems of flood control, powerplants, irrigation, and navigation as are now a reality on the Missouri.

And the people of America said "Yes" to the nationwide system of soil and water conservation which helped farmers preserve their land.

Rich blessings have come to every American from the wise decisions made in 1936. Before the advent of Roosevelt and Norris, the great Missouri River was more of a threat than a priceless asset. We called it the "Big Muddy" and quipped that it wasn't thick enough to walk on nor thin enough to swim in. While we dreamed of blue-water fish, we fished for bullheads. It was a flooding, foul, and polluted river.

Now it is a powerful resource-rich river, and it will become ever greater unless the clock is turned backward. In the Great Plains around our rivers—once parched and eroded—we find a succession of clean lakes behind the Missouri's power dams—full of fish, available for recreation. We see sailboats and motorboats on trailers everywhere in farmyards and town driveways in the once dry Dakotas.

Wind and water erosion have been checked by soil conservation systems and shelterbelts. Manmade farm ponds sparkle in the sun. Every one of the Missouri's big cities has a modern sewage system either built or in the process of being built.

The once undisciplined river now flows through the powerplants. Everywhere REA electricity from those powerplants lights and gives energy to the Dakota farm homes that for so long were dark and powerless. The REA is a matchless asset to us all.

Need you wonder why this election is looked upon as a time of trial? Senator GOLDWATER comes as a candidate seeking to persuade the country to turn its back on the blessings that have flowed from our learning of the hard lessons of yesterday. Senator GOLDWATER would seek to repeal the past and veto the future.

Senator GOLDWATER says he intends to sell the TVA. He intends to sell this magnificent system that has tamed floods and lighted farms of a vast Southland. The temporary spokesman of the Republican Party opposes REA. He says REA has outlived its usefulness.

His policies would destroy our hopes of expanding the Missouri Valley system, the dams and reservoirs—vital to all of us.

No one can underestimate the importance of your vote on November 3.

The leader of the Goldwaterites intends to make a shambles of agriculture and all related business.

He was the author of these immortal words:

"Doing something about it means—and there can be no equivocation here—prompt and final termination of the farm subsidy program."

This declaration has revealed a chasm between him and every nation farm group. It has separated him from the ablest Republican farm spokesmen in Congress. You know that such a Federal policy would bankrupt American agriculture and erode the businesses that depend upon agriculture for their income.

The cries of alarm over his statement have forced Senator GOLDWATER to initiate a predictable series of devisions, retractions, and reexplanations. But his votes in Congress, as well as his public statements, show one thing: the Goldwater wrecking crew is ready to roll. And the wreckage would be something to see.

Imagine the impact on the main streets of South Dakota if the American people should ever ratify Senator GOLDWATER's philosophy—getting rid of the farm problem by getting rid of the farmers?

Imagine the empty stores—the empty cash registers. Imagine the farm foreclosures—the abandoned farm houses.

We had a trial run of GOLDWATER's final solution to the farm problem back in the Benson years. Managed deflation of farm prices and income was the policy—and this policy had one objective: to force the farmers off the farms, reduce farm production, and thus eventually boost farm prices and income for the few lucky ones who survived.

And what happened during the Benson years?

In 1960 there were 25 percent less farms than there were in 1952 and the total number of those working on farms decreased 23 percent from 1952 to 1960. Meanwhile, total net income of the remaining farm operators fell 26 percent, and the total personal income of the farm population fell about the same amount.

The merchants lost about 25 percent of their farm customers—and their remaining farm customers had 25 percent less income to spend.

The Benson program came close to meeting its objectives—too close.

But the leader of the Goldwaterites would make Benson look like a bushleager.

Fortunately, America has a far better alternative on November 3.

We have a President with his own family roots deep in the soil. He understands you. He understands your problems. And he cares. That is the most important fact of all. Lyndon B. Johnson cares about American agriculture.

He showed the depth of his understanding during the recent speech in Iowa, when he said: "Farmers want freedom to grow and prosper, freedom to operate competitively and profitably in our present economic system."

"Farmers are farmers in the first place because they have the deep-seated instinct to raise crops, not to cut them back, not to leave the land unproductive.

"America's farmers want and need and deserve—not promises—but more income and more opportunity."

President Johnson is not going to let your farm economy collapse. And neither am I.

President Johnson and I are not just concerned with getting you fair prices for what you produce.

We are even more concerned about developing expanding markets, to make fuller use of your potential to produce. We are determined to improve and broaden our food-for-peace program that has already meant so much to you, the Nation, and the world.

Winning the war on poverty means expanded domestic consumption. Raising living standards of developing countries means large new export markets.

President Johnson has shown his awareness of the future in telling Iowa farmers, "I look forward to the day when we can rely less on cutbacks, and more on programs to sell abroad all we produce above our own needs.

"We must get on with the job of stimulating worldwide demand to use our tremendous God-given production.

"We will continue to develop new ideas, new approaches, and new solutions."

These are the words of President Lyndon Baines Johnson—the man rural America and all of America will keep as President of the United States.

Hon. James C. Auchincloss

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER H. B. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret that we in the New Jersey congressional delegation say farewell to the dean of our delegation, the Honorable JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS. His retirement after many years of quiet and effective service will affect most particularly those residents of the Third Congressional District, but all of us will miss him. For 22 years this House has been fortunate to know this man and to share his wisdom and his humor.

My own ties to Jim Auchincloss have been close since I first ran for office in 1952. At that time, and until 1962 when that area was made into a new district, he and I shared responsibility for Middlesex County. He has been an invaluable adviser and personal friend whom I shall miss greatly.

Like all of us here regardless of party, I join in wishing Jim well in his years of retirement. I know that he will remain close enough so that we who have relied on him these many years will still be able to learn and profit from his political ideals. He was a great member of this House; he remains a great citizen of this land.

Mauritanian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on November 28, 1964, the Islamic Republic of Mauritania will celebrate the 4th anniversary of its independence. Since the House will not be in session at this time, we wish to take the opportunity now to extend warm felicitations to His Excellency Moktar Ould Daddah, the Mauritanian Prime Minister; and the Mauritanian Ambassador to the United States, Ahmed-Baba Miske.

Four years have passed since Mauritania obtained its independence. In those 4 years the prospects for success have grown from dim to bright, and the people of Mauritania are to be congratulated.

Geographically Mauritania forms a bridge between north and west Africa. Bordered on the west by the Atlantic Ocean, most of its area is arid desert. In the south, however, there is a fertile valley watered by the Senegal River. Except for the farmers in the Senegal Valley, most of Mauritania's population of some 650,000 have traditionally been nomads, herding camels, goats, sheep, or other animals in the desert interior.

In its long history Mauritania experienced a succession of plunderings and conquests, but the independent spirit of the people was never eradicated. The Moors trace their history back to the 10th century, and as early as the 15th century they had contacts with the West. In the middle of the 19th century the French won Moorish tribal support, and in 1904 the territory became a French colony. It was then administered as one of the territories of French West Africa until, in a referendum of 1958, the people of Mauritania voted to become autonomous within the French community. Finally on November 28, 1960, the Territorial Assembly formed itself into a Constituent Assembly and proclaimed the birth of the Islamic Republic of Mauritania.

Since it achieved independence the development of Mauritania has been described as dramatic. Under French rule Mauritania had been administered from Saint-Louis in Senegal. At the end of 1957 the then Prime Minister and now President Moktar Ould Daddah declared that it was essential that the new capital be within Mauritania. Nouakchott was chosen as the site for the new capital because of its nearness to the ocean, proximity to agricultural and mining regions, and historical significance. Since then the new creation has grown to a modern city of 10,000 residents. Where formerly there was empty sand and a small administrative post, there can now be found a parliament, courts, schools, markets, dwellings, paved streets, city water, and electricity.

Other accomplishments of the new republic include the mining of some 6 million tons of iron ore annually, transporting it by modern railroad, and exporting it from a modern seaport. They include the building or strengthening of national institutions, such as a school system, an army, civil service, and a presidential form of government. Rapidly the attributes of a modern unified nation are being acquired.

Some of the success in Mauritania may be attributed to good fortune, such as the discovery of a major deposit of high-grade iron ore and a deposit of copper ore. Some of the success may be attributed to outside assistance, particularly from France. Most of the credit, however, belongs to the people of Mauritania and their leaders. Through diligence, sacrifice, and determination, they are laying firm foundations for a stable society with continuous economic growth. On the fourth anniversary of the Islamic Republic of Mauritania, I join with the American people in wishing the Mauritanians continued success.

Military Posture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, because of the volume of testimony before the committees in this House, and of the other body, on major legislation and appropriations, it is becoming increasingly difficult for the individual Member to digest all pertinent material in advance on the floor debate.

This is a matter of particular concern when we are confronted with items which have come into controversy in the area of the national defense.

In this connection, I should like to direct the attention of the House to a book just published by the Center for Strategic Studies, Georgetown University. This work, entitled "Military Posture," by James H. McBride and John I. H. Eales, is a digest of contentions and supporting data presented with respect to 14 key strategic issues which came under consideration during committee studies of the defense authorization and appropriation bills this year. Frankly, I do not know where else this material can be found in such convenient form. My understanding is that the book was in the nature of an experiment, and further references of this kind may be undertaken by the center, if this one proves to be of value to the Congress.

Navy-Marine Residence Foundation a Worthwhile Undertaking

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN STENNIS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the Navy-Marine Resident Foundation is a most worthwhile undertaking. An article by Mrs. Virginia Weldon Kelly, a member of the board of trustees of the Foundation, entitled, "Proposed Navy-Marine Residence Will Be Especially for Widows," has recently appeared in the Honolulu Star-Bulletin and other newspapers. This interesting and timely article gives general information concerning the Foundation and plans for construction in the Washington area of a 300-unit Navy-Marine residence to be known as Vinson Hall.

Administrative director of the Foundation is Vice Adm. Laurence H. Frost, U.S. Navy, retired, and the Foundation's present address is building 54, U.S. Naval Observatory, Wash.

In order to give this worthwhile undertaking general circulation, I ask unanimous consent that the article by Mrs. Kelly be inserted in the Congressional Record, along with the letter from the Honorable Carl Vinson, chairman of the House Armed Services Committee to Mr. William C. Allen; and statements endorsing the Foundation by the Honorable Paul H. Nitze, Secretary of the Navy; Adm. David L. McDonald, Chief of Naval Operations; and Gen. Wallace M. Greene, Jr., Commandant, U.S. Marine Corps; along with a copy of the current list of members of the Board of Trustees of the Foundation.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Proposed Navy-Marine Residence Will Be Especially for Widows

(By Virginia Weldon Kelly)

Washington.—President and Mrs. Johnson have been invited to serve as sponsors of the Navy-Marine Residence Foundation. The invitation was extended by William C. Allen, president of the board of trustees, a U.S. Naval Academy graduate, class of 1929.

This reporter predicts the President and First Lady will accept, for they have always been compassionate to the elderly and those in limited financial circumstances.

The proposed tax-free, charitable, and nonprofit Navy-Marine residence will house 300 widows of regular Navy and Marine officers; widows of Reserve officers who die on active duty or retire after at least 20 years of active duty; retired officers (men and women) and their spouses; and retired officers, on a space-available basis. The minimum age requirement is 62.

The Air Force plans to build a residence. The Army already has a distaff residence functioning successfully.

The Navy-Marine residence will be named Vinson Hall, honoring the retiring chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, Representative CARL VINSON, Democrat, of Georgia, who has served 50 years in Congress—longer than any other man in the history of this country.

This is the first time that Representative VINSON has ever permitted any building or project to be named for him. He has endorsed the Navy-Marine Residence Foundation.

The next chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, Representative MENDEL RIVERS, Democrat, of South Carolina, has given complete endorsement to the project.

Representative CRAIG HOSMER, Republican, of California, has also endorsed the Navy-Marine Residence Foundation. The California Congressman, a World War II veteran, and captain, U.S. Naval Reserve, is always among the first to help widows of servicemen, the elderly, and those in need.

Navy Secretary Paul H. Nitze has said, "The foundation has my enthusiastic support as a much needed and worthy undertaking."

The Chief of Naval Operations, Adm. David L. McDonald said, "Most Navy and Marine officers make the best provision they are able against the day when their wives may suddenly be left alone * * * but it is generally recognized that even these best efforts may not be enough."

The Commandant of the Marine Corps, Gen. Wallace M. Greene, Jr. said, "The career of a military officer is primarily one of service rather than one of reward. All too frequently retired officers and especially widows of officers find themselves approaching their golden years with no suitable place to live.

"The Foundation is a worthy undertaking. It is sponsored by capable and responsible individuals. It has begun on a sound financial basis but needs assistance to continue. It merits the support of all of us. The Marine Corps is squarely behind this project."

The Coast Guard has been invited to full participation. The Commandant, Adm. Edwin J. Roland has endorsed the project, even though the decision has not yet been made as to whether the Coast Guard will participate.

It is hoped the chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL, Democrat, of Georgia; Senator JOHN STENNIS, Democrat, of Mississippi; second ranking member of the committee; Senator WILLIS ROBERTSON, chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee and powerful on the Appropriations Committee, will also endorse the foundation.

In his remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on September 29, Representative HOSMER said Vinson Hall will fill a great need and that:

It will be a clublike residence charging reasonable costs commensurate with the ability to pay.

The project has sponsorship of the highest caliber. Vice Adm. Laurence H. Frost, U.S. Navy, retired, is administrative director of the foundation.

Fleet Adm. Chester Nimitz is honorary chairman, and Fred Bantz, former Navy Under Secretary, is chairman of the National Fundraising Committee.

When completed, Vinson Hall will cost about \$4½ million. Its building loan will be paid from income and no contributive funds will be used for support of any resident who is financially able to pay his own way. As a tax-free organization, at least one-third of its residents must receive at least partial assistance.

The Navy and Marine officers' wives clubs, servicewide, have raised \$120,000 through contributions, bazaars, and membership subscriptions to start the Residence Foundation on its way. The foundation's Welfare Committee carries on the work of disseminating information and fundraising.

This committee is chaired by Mrs. A. M. Shinn, wife of Admiral Shinn, and has as its advisers: Mrs. David L. McDonald; Mrs. Horacio Rivero, wife of the Vice Chief of Naval Operations; and Mrs. B. J. Semmes, Jr., the wife of Vice Admiral Semmes, Deputy Chief of Naval Operations for Manpower and Personnel.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C.,
October 1, 1964.

Mr. WILLIAM C. ALLEN,
President, Board of Trustees,
Navy-Marine Residence Foundation,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ALLEN: I have your letter of October 1, 1964, in which you inform me that the Navy-Marine Residence Foundation plans to establish a dignified residence of 300 units for elderly widows of officers, retired female officers, and a limited number of couples of retired Navy and Marine officers.

For 50 years, it has been my great privilege to know many of the great men of our Navy and Marine Corps who have contributed so much to the security of this Nation. I shall always cherish my association with the many outstanding officers who have served in our Navy and Marine Corps and who have added so much to the magnificent record of our naval history.

It is honor enough that I can claim friendship with so many of these distinguished officers but when you ask that I permit your Foundation to name this residence "Vinson Hall," I am humbled by the great honor you pay me.

When I consider the Navy and Marine officers of the past and present who are far more worthy of this recognition, you will understand my humbleness in agreeing to your request.

Nevertheless, I am of course most flattered that you have selected my name.

Please extend my very deep appreciation to all members of the Foundation and to those who are contributing so much of their time, effort, and money to the success of this Foundation for this high distinction which you have bestowed upon me.

Sincerely,

CARL VINSON,
Chairman.

THE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY,
Washington, August 14, 1964.

The Navy-Marine Residence Foundation is incorporated in the District of Columbia and was certified on December 19, 1963, as a tax free, nonprofit and charitable foundation. It will provide elderly persons according to need, on a nonprofit and charitable basis, with housing facilities specially designed to meet their needs.

The Foundation has been most ably promoted since 1961 by the Navy and Marine Officers' Wives' Clubs. They have raised over \$120,000 through contributions, bazaars, and membership fees.

The Foundation has my enthusiastic support as a much needed and worthy undertaking.

PAUL H. NITZE.

CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS.

Most Navy and Marine Corps officers make the best provision they are able against the day when their wives may suddenly be left alone. Most similarly provide for their own advanced age. But it is generally recognized that even these best efforts may not be enough.

The whole purpose of the Navy-Marine Residence Foundation and the facilities they aspire to build is to help close this gap for those elderly retired officers and/or their spouses who need help.

The plans of the Foundation are attractive and impressive. But, as we all know, this job must be done without appropriated funds. I fully support the efforts of the Foundation, the Navy and Marine Officers' Wives' Clubs whose labors have built up the existing fund, and all others who in the future will lend a hand to the ultimate success of the task.

DAVID L. MCDONALD.

HEADQUARTERS, U.S. MARINE CORPS,
Washington, D.C., August 18, 1964.

The career of a military officer is primarily one of service rather than one of reward. All too frequently retired officers, and especially widows of officers, find themselves approaching their golden years with no suitable place to live.

The Navy-Marine Residence Foundation, a chartered, tax free, nonprofit organization, has undertaken to provide suitable retirement housing for elderly career retired Navy and Marine Corps officers, both regular and reserve, and their wives or widows.

The Foundation is a worthy undertaking. It is sponsored by capable and responsible individuals. It has begun on a sound financial basis, but needs assistance to continue. It merits the support of all of us. The Marine Corps is squarely behind this project.

WALLACE M. GREENE, Jr.,
General, U.S. Marine Corps.

BOARD OF TRUSTEES: NAVY-MARINE RESIDENCE FOUNDATION, INC.

Mr. William C. Allen, U.S. Naval Academy, 1929, president.

Rear Adm. Preston V. Mercer, U.S. Navy, Retired, vice president.

Vice Adm. Stephen R. Edson, U.S. Navy, Retired, treasurer.

Capt. Will J. Davis, Jr., U.S. Navy, Retired, secretary.

Rear Adm. H. Lamont Pugh (MC) U.S. Navy, Retired.

Rear Adm. A. C. Husband (CEC), U.S. Navy.

Rear Adm. F. J. Harlfinger, II, U.S. Navy.

Lt. Gen. R. H. Pepper, US. Marine Corps, Retired.

Rear Adm. James O. Cobb, U.S. Navy.

Capt. Viola B. Sanders, U.S. Navy (Wave).

Brig. Gen. Alvin S. Sanders, U.S. Marine Corps.

Col. Barbara J. Bishop, U.S. Marine Corps.

Mrs. Frank Virden.

Mrs. John S. Oldfield.

Mrs. C. J. Van Arsdall.

Mrs. A. M. Shinn.

Mrs. R. F. Skylstead.

Mrs. Virginia Weldon Kelly.

Wilbur D. Matson: Country Editor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK J. LAUSCHE

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, Mr. Wilbur D. Matson, editor of the Morgan County Herald, published at McConnelsville, Ohio, recently retired. I ask unanimous consent that my comments concerning Mr. Matson's outstanding career be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the comments were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Mr. Wilbur Matson, editor and publisher of the Morgan County Herald, a weekly newspaper published in McConnelsville, Ohio, has written "30" to his brilliant newspaper career. The "sage" of Morgan County, his editorials were read and appreciated throughout the country and frequently reproduced in the Chicago Tribune, the New York Times, and other metropolitan newspapers.

I refer to Mr. Matson, whom I have had the profound privilege of knowing personally for many years as "country editor." It is a title which he has borne with dignity and responsibility. He is a man whose principles have been firmly established on solid ground. As a leading conservationist, Editor Matson through the columns of his newspaper has waged a relentless battle to require restoration of the beautiful hills and valleys of his area made desolate by unscrupulous strip mine operators.

In today's field of journalism there are too few men of the purpose, patience, and perseverance of Country Editor Matson. Perhaps they lacked the environment, the closeness to nature and the tranquillity of a small town and its residents.

Editor Matson wrote fluently and with ease. His style left the reader with a feeling of warmth and closeness to the subject matter.

Although Mr. Matson has retired after 46 years as editor of the Morgan County Herald, I hope he will not deprive his many friends of the benefit of his wisdom but will continue to express his views.

James C. Auchincloss

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, one of the great rewards of serving as a Member of the Congress of the United States is the privilege of being associated with men who have dedicated their lives and abilities to the service of the Nation. Such a man is James C. Auchincloss, who, to the detriment of the Congress and the Nation, has decided not to seek reelection to the congressional seat which he has occupied for 22 years.

I have become well acquainted with Jim Auchincloss during our years of service together—particularly in our joint efforts on the Committee on Public Works, of which he has been ranking minority member for the past 6 years. I have always had great respect for his ability and for him as an individual, and am proud to be able to count him as a friend.

He always contributed a thorough knowledge of the subject at hand and a keen awareness of the immediate impact and ultimate effect of each legislative proposal. And he did this with an affability and ready wit which relieved tensions and created harmony and understanding when this was most needed.

No single word can best describe the abilities and character of Jim Auchincloss, but outstanding was his integrity, and he fought for his beliefs, strongly and effectively. Never was I in doubt as to his position, nor that he deeply and sincerely expressed his convictions.

The many coworkers and numerous friends of Jim Auchincloss will all miss him, but all of us sincerely hope that the fruits of his life-long activities in behalf of others will return to him many years of retirement filled with satisfaction as he considers the past and much contentment as he contemplates the future.

The U.S. Employment Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT TAFT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Canton, Ohio, Congressman Frank Bow, is one of the outstanding Members of Congress. He is highly respected because of his wide range of interests and expertise in many fields of knowledge. For some time he has been interested in the U.S. Employment Service and the direction in which the Service is headed. Since coming to the Congress, I also have become interested in seeing that our Public Employment Service is made as effective as possible in its job to help the unemployed find work. Because of the grave unemployment problem in the United States today, every Member of Congress has a vital interest in the record of the U.S. Employment Service. Recently a subcommittee of the Education and Labor Committee began hearings with the purpose of studying the Service and determining how well it has done its job. I had hoped that the subcommittee, after hearing all the facts, would determine what, if any, additional assistance the U.S. Employment Service needs to better perform its job. Unfortunately, the subcommittee cut its hearings short, did not permit many interested witnesses to appear, and never met in executive session. What was even more unfortunate was the fact that the hearings were not well publicized. Indeed, many Members of Congress themselves were not aware of the existence of these hearings—probably due to the fact that they were scheduled late in the session when other priority matters were of greater concern. I believe that first we must learn the facts about the present record of the Service and then, with the facts as a background, proceed to determine what role we want the U.S. Employment Service to play in our manpower policies. Then, and only then, can we in the Congress know what legislation may be necessary to improve or expand the Service.

In this regard, I commend to all Members of the Congress and to the public at large, an article which appeared in the October Reader's Digest. The author of this article, Congressman Frank Bow, does an excellent job of informing us of some of the problems the Employment Service faces. He also discusses some of the new areas into which the U.S. Employment Service has recently expanded. Against this background, Congressman Bow details some aspects of the Service which appear to him to be unwise.

This article entitled "The Great Manpower Grab," has brought a large and favorable response from all over the country as our citizens have been informed about the situation. Therefore, I would like to insert the article into the Congressional Record so that it can be read by every Member of the Congress:

THE GREAT MANPOWER GRAB

(By Frank T. Bow, U.S. Representative from Ohio)[1]

(Note.—Almost unnoticed, the U.S. Employment Service is undermining one of our basic freedoms—the right to choose one's life work.)

While the Johnson administration wages an alleged "unconditional war on poverty" the Federal agency chosen to fight in the frontline of that war is brazenly using it to advance one of the most ambitious power grabs in U.S. history. If it succeeds, every working man and woman in America will one day be forced to seek work through Government employment offices.

The agency is the U.S. Employment Service, a division of the Labor Department's ubiquitous Bureau of Employment Security (BES). In the war on poverty, USES machinery will be charged with "mobilizing the troops"—the hard-core unemployed, the young people of Sargent Shriver's Youth Job Corps, the Home Town Work Training force, and other make-work battalions. Already USES exerts iron-fist financial control over some 1,900 State employment offices. Now it is extending its hand into high school counseling, college placement, company personnel offices, union hiring halls, and even into private industry's executive suites.

USES is doing all this—and more—under the guise of "helping the unemployed." But it makes no bones about its ultimate goal. That goal, according to USES Director Louis Levine, is to build the Employment Service into "the manpower agency" for the Nation, through which all job hiring would be funneled.

NEITHER NEEDED NOR WANTED

Originally established as a World War I labor-mobilization agency, USES remained a feeble, almost forgotten arm of Government with a lowly $1 million annual budget until the Wagner-Peyser Act gave it power to flex its muscles. That was in 1933, in the depth of the depression, and Congress clearly intended that the Nation's unemployed, which then numbered nearly 13 million, be USES's prime concern.

Today, USES's budget is around $200 million—double what it was in fiscal 1959. In addition, it received the lion's share of the $47 million the Labor Department got for the Manpower Development and Training Act retraining program in fiscal 1964 and says it will have to have another $75 million via Manpower Development and Training Act funds in fiscal 1965 to complete the job. On top of that, untold millions more will be earmarked for USES's role in the war on poverty.

Despite these skyrocketing expenditures, there is mounting evidence to support the charge that the USES has "turned its back on the unemployed." Instead of concentrating on helping our jobless, the agency is expanding more and more into fields where it is neither needed nor wanted. If this is permitted to continue it can only result in absolute control of American manpower and its allocation. The surrender of our free enterprise system will be complete.

---

[1] Representative Frank T. Bow, Republican, of Ohio, is a ranking member of the House Appropriations Committee.

The way for this total control has already been prepared in enabling legislation now before the Congress. The measure would empower the Secretary of Labor to handpick a special committee to draft new laws that would make all job placement activities "exclusively a public service." In short, a Federal closed shop would be clamped tightly on the whole Nation.

Here is just what this will mean to citizens. If you are a high school or college student, you will have to accept the guidance of a Government employee or risk being numbered among the forgotten unemployed. If you wish to change jobs and thereby better yourself, you will have to win the approval of a Government clerk before you can be referred to a new position. If you are an employer, you will have to accept whoever is sent to you to fill a job or you will risk getting on the Government's black list.

If you know what is going on in the Federal Government today, you can add one more dimension. Federal employment is based too largely on political reliability. If USES becomes the community manpower center, as it has stated, you may very well need the OK of the political party in power before you can get a chance at the better jobs.

GROWING EVER STRONGER

USES, however, is not waiting for new legislation. Growing ever stronger with liberal transfusions of tax money, it is picking up telling yardage in its sweeping end run around the battered line of our free enterprise system. Almost unnoticed, it has scored an impressive series of first downs on five important fronts:

1. Seniors in over 10,000 high schools—about half of all high schools in the country—are being tested and counseled by the Federal-State Employment Service.

USES promises to extend this activity to all high schools. Aptitude tests and counseling services are given to thousands of students despite the fact that some psychologists seriously question the qualifications of Employment Service personnel to operate in this delicate area. Many of these testers and counselors do not have a college degree, let alone specialized training in psychology that would fit them to guide young people into life careers.

The ineptitude of USES testers is pointed up by the experience of Marcellus S. Merrill, president of the Merrill Engineering Laboratories in Denver. An electrical engineer, he numbers among his many inventions an electronic wheel-balancing device for automobiles, and precision gyroscopes for space satellites.

Out of scientific curiosity, Merrill dropped by an employment office in Denver and took a 2½-hour aptitude test.

"They told me I might make a teacher, but only in the junior grades of a rural school," Merrill reported. "They also thought I might do as a file clerk or a male nurse or possibly even a testing clerk. But they said I could never hope to make the grade as an electrician or engineer."

It is impossible to calculate how many young people—potential doctors, lawyers, scientists—have been steered into wrong careers by such tests.

2. USES is out to handle the job placement of every college student in the country.

Thus far, USES boasts that nearly 300 institutions of higher learning have accepted Employment Service counselors and guidance. The bait is the money the institutions can save on their own placement operations by letting Government employees do the job.

However, the USES campus campaign has run into formidable opposition. Some 200 college and university presidents wrote the College Placement Council denouncing the USES blitz. Many of the council's 1,800 affiliates in industry joined them. In September 1963, Congressman ROBERT TAFT, JR., of Ohio, introduced a bill to bar USES from the Nation's campuses. Alarmed, the Labor Department suddenly beat a tactical retreat, agreed to halt its promotional activities among colleges and piously swore it intended "only to supplement college placement facilities, not to supplant them."

Nonetheless, Dr. Eric A. Walker, president of Penn State, feels that in the end the $50,000 to $100,000 a year that many colleges spend on their own placement offices will tip the scales in favor of USES. "I suspect," he says, "that it is on this basis that the Government scheme will win out."

3. USES is signing more and more companies to "exclusive agreements" under which they pledge to do all their hiring through the Employment Service.

Under these pacts, firms agree to adopt a technique known as "closing the gate." In Georgia, California, Ohio, and a score of other States, jobseekers are confronted with signs at plant and store entrances telling them they must file applications through the State offices. In effect, this gives the Government closed-shop control over company hiring policies.

4. Labor unions have turned over their own hiring halls to the USES' State subsidiaries. They are concentrating their efforts on a campaign to force companies to get on the USES bandwagon.

Walter Reuther, president of the United Auto Workers, speaking for the AFL-CIO, has gone so far as to suggest a form of fiscal pressure to whip recalcitrant employers into line. He has called for a law "to require employers, as a condition for obtaining reduced unemployment compensation rates, to list with the public Employment Service all job vacancies." Meanwhile, Reuther is calling for a Presidential Executive order requiring all Government contractors to hire through USES.

5. Instead of devoting all its effort to placing America's 4 million unemployed, USES is now finding new jobs for more than a quarter million professional and managerial personnel each year.

More and more, USES is concentrating on placing people whose talents and skills are in high demand—engineers, scientists, schoolteachers, nurses, and even high salaried executives. USES placements in this field have nearly tripled in the last decade and zoomed an impressive 50 percent since 1960.

Newspaper advertisements are widely used to hook professional applicants. Typical is an ad placed by the Ohio State Employment Service in the Cleveland Plain Dealer. It was topped by announcement of an opening for an open-hearth superintendent to work in Argentina at $23,754 per year. Beneath this was another for a mechanical engineer at $15,000. And under that was a third for a job analyst in Tanganyika at $14,000.

To further entice easily placed executives and scientists, USES has outfitted 160 new offices in its professional office network. In 52 of the largest cities employment offices are located separately from the Unemployment Compensation Service facilities. Many of these offices are outfitted with expensive draperies, tasteful furnishings, and attractive receptionists.

Curious as to how efficient this network actually is, a young journalist friend of mine stopped by the professional office in Pittsburgh and inquired about openings for writers in California. He later gave me a complete account of what happened.

"The receptionist promptly ushered me into a large room with a dozen desks, all except one of them emptied by the lunch-hour exodus," he reported. "The lone 'counselor' was a breezy, brush-cut young man with an athletic build. When I told him what I was interested in he searched a 3-week-old catalog of openings from the California State Employment Service. The only thing listed for a writer was in the technical field—and it specified female. I was out on both counts.

"There followed one of the weirdest 'interviews' I ever had. For 40 minutes I was treated to a lecture on the horrible job situation in Pittsburgh, the 'brutal facts' of economic life generally, and the outstanding ability of my counselor to place technical people despite the fact he had 'never had a day of college' or any formal training in personnel work. He never asked whether I was employed or unemployed, nor did he pose one single question about my qualifications or background. He never troubled to ask my name or where he might get in touch with me if a job turned up."

CONFORM OR ELSE

In many State offices, USES and the Unemployment Compensation Service, both of which come under the Bureau of Employment Security, share the same offices and personnel. And BES' total staff rose from 46,000 to nearly 60,000 in the last 10 years, with more than half of the increased staff added since 1960.

Except for special funds for Manpower Development and Training Act, Area Redevelopment Administration, and the war-on-poverty programs, BES funds come from the unemployment taxes paid entirely by employers. But in order to stay in business, employers are forced to pass this tax along to consumers in the form of higher prices. Thus everyone pays. And the bill is astronomical. In fiscal 1965 BES will gobble up more than $455 million over and above the estimated $3 billion the States will haul in for unemployment-compensation payments.

USES officials in Washington claim that the Employment Service is really a decentralized Federal-State system. "The heart of that system" the agency contended in a fact sheet issued in 1962 "is found in the 1,900 local offices operated and administered by the States."

This is a deliberate distortion. First of all, every dollar the States collect for their Employment Service operation is channeled through the Federal Government. Second, each State must have its employment service budget approved by the U.S. Labor Department. And finally, to get this approval, the States must conform completely with the policies concocted by the Federal bureaucracy.

Any lingering thoughts that USES control over the State agencies is something less than absolute were buried forever in July 1963. Wielding a financial nightstick, the Labor Department clubbed down a bill in the Pennsylvania Legislature that would have limited State employment offices to helping only the unemployed and underemployed.

The bill had already sailed through the State senate when the Labor Department moved in. It informed Pennsylvania officials that the legislation raised "serious conformity questions" that could jeopardize Federal funds. There was also the implicit threat that Washington might call its longstanding $192 million loan to the Pennsylvania unemployment compensation fund. Faced with the State's possible bankruptcy, Gov. William W. Scranton discreetly let the bill die in the lower house.

PADDED FIGURES

One State administrator, however, has courageously stood up to USES' ambitious bureaucrats. Willard P. Dudley, director of the Ohio Bureau of Unemployment Compensation, discovered last October that placement figures at the Cleveland employment office were padded. Because of pressure from Washington to increase placements, as many as half of all placements claimed by the office were fraudulent.

Dudley said USES officials deplored releasing the results of his investigation because the agency's appropriation was pending before the Congress.

Padding the figures is, however, apparently nothing new with USES. In Akron, Ohio, 140 placement claims turned out to be jobs an Employment Service supervisor assigned to his three sons, one of whom was simultaneously drawing unemployment compensation. Ward A. Riley, former Employment Service chief in Cleveland, shrugs off the hiking of placement figures as old stuff.

"You'll find that in every employment office in the country," says Riley. "They do it in Chicago, Pittsburgh, and Podunk. I don't care where it is. It applies not just to Cleveland, but from Maine to California. It's been the pattern everywhere since the 1930's."

There is more involved in the practice than the natural desire of clerks to justify their jobs. The bogus statistics make it appear as though USES is doing such a fine job that it deserves public support for its expansion. Furthermore, the employment offices work under a quota system imposed on them by the USES hierarchy, and the phony figures help to fill the quota. Under this quota system—which USES officials deny exists but which the manager in Cleveland affirms—local offices are required to register, counsel, test and place a specified number of applicants each month.

Fast action. To all criticism of USES, the bureaucrats have a stock answer: it is "inspired" by fee-charging employment agencies through their National Employment Association. Undoubtedly, private agencies have a deep stake in preventing further USES expansion. NEA has supplied Congress with a good deal of information on the Employment Service's empire building. But the most damaging information about the agency's goal is gratuitously provided by USES officials themselves and their supporters.

This summer USES trotted out a platoon of academic "experts" to pave the way for an even bigger expansionist push with hearings before a House Labor Subcommittee. In monotonous chorus many contended that the only thing wrong with USES is that it still does not have enough power and that employers should be made to register all job openings with the Government. Several have held up Sweden's Socialist manpower monopoly as the shining example America should emulate.

The director of the Colorado State Employment Service, Bernard Teets, has openly boasted: "In 5 years, if we are not hampered by new restrictions, and if we can get adequate funds from Congress, we'll be handling 90 percent of the business. We are not living in a free enterprise system, but rather operating under a controlled economy."

If the American people hope to halt the USES drive toward this kind of regimentation, they will have to act fast and forcefully. Under pressures of the war on poverty, Congress is being cowed into approving ever-increasing appropriations for USES expansion. But there are four steps an aroused citizenry can take to block the Government's mammoth manpower grab:

1. Insist that your Congressmen and Senators vote down funds that fuel USES expansion.

2. Demand that Congress force the Bureau of Employment Security to live within its budget. No fewer than five times since 1954, BES has gone back to Congress for supplemental appropriations totaling $133,305,000.

3. Request your State legislators to pass laws limiting State employment offices to finding jobs for unemployed or partly employed people.

4. Ask that the Federal Government find new ways to make USES more efficient and effective in carrying out its legitimate task of getting our unemployed back to work.

Unless you take these steps now, you may well find that your most basic freedom—the right to decide your own life career for yourself—will soon be the real battlefield victim of the war on poverty.

The Fate of the Urban Renewal Rehabilitation Loan Program Appropriation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, a vital section of the Housing Act of 1964 has been left without funds as a result of the conference committee action on the supplemental appropriations bill this week. I know that this unfortunate and unnecessary delay will disappoint thousands of homeowners and small businessmen throughout the country now threatened by the urban renewal bulldozer. It is also a deep disappointment to the members of both parties in Congress who have worked so hard to provide new hope for these citizens. As the author of this approach, I am particularly disturbed that an executive agency, the Bureau of the Budget, placed itself in the position of telling the Congress when and if it could have a program Congress designed. That the conferees, through lack of time and study, followed the lead of the Bureau rather than of the Senate is to be regretted.

The story of this rather unique legislative development is worth relating in sequence both for the benefit of my colleagues and the public and for those scholars who have an interest in the legislative process. It begins with passage of a $50 million, low interest rate, 20-year rehabilitation loan program in the Housing Act of 1964, by the House. The Senate, although it had not considered this provision either in committee or on the floor, accepted the program in conference, with several worthwhile suggestions by Senator Paul Douglas, of Illinois, added to it.

When the President signed the act into law, he took special heed of the new rehabilitation provision which he said would be of great assistance to those now in the path of the bulldozer. It appeared, at this point, that the battle had been won. In fact, there was so much bipartisan support for this provision, as the House debate in the Congressional Record of August 13 indicates, that there was never any controversy over the program.

Senator Douglas, however, was immediately concerned over the funding for the program, and on August 19, 1964, he wrote to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, Kermit Gordon, urging that funds be provided for the program in the next supplemental appropriations bill. I will include at this point the text of his letter:

August 19, 1964.

Hon. Kermit Gordon,
Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Gordon: The omnibus housing bill which the Congress has just passed contains a new 3-percent direct loan program to rehabilitate structures in urban renewal areas. This program was originally proposed by Congressman Widnall and Senator Tower. Along with other Democrats, I strongly supported, in conference, this new 3-percent loan plan. I believe that it will prove to be a vital tool in helping to generate the rehabilitation of blighted areas in the Nation's urban centers. This new bipartisan program is, in my opinion, one of the two or three most important provisions in the new housing bill.

However, I am aware that in the past there have been ideological objections by some of the technicians in the Budget Bureau to any program which provides for direct Government loans and a below-market interest rate, regardless of the merits of the particular legislative proposal. Therefore, I am concerned that the Budget Bureau might not push as vigorously as it should to see that this program is amply funded through the appropriations process in the forthcoming supplemental appropriations bill.

I hope that you will review immediately the history of the existing programs for rehabilitation of properties in urban renewal areas and the merits of this new 3-percent direct loan program. The existing rehabilitation loan programs for urban renewal areas are not working very effectively. It is imperative that new approaches to help rehabilitate these urban renewal areas receive the highest priority. I believe the facts will demonstrate that the Budget Bureau ought to give top priority to assuring that an ample appropriation is approved for this new program this year.

If, on the basis of such a review of this new program, there should still be any reservations on the part of the Budget Bureau about pushing ahead immediately to assure that this program will be funded to the fullest extent this year, I would appreciate it if you would contact me so that we could discuss this matter in more detail.

With best wishes.

Faithfully,

Paul H. Douglas.

On September 4, 1964, I wrote to the Budget Director also urging the funding of the program, and I include that letter at this point:

September 4, 1964.

Hon. Kermit Gordon,
Director, Bureau of the Budget,
Executive Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Gordon: This past Wednesday, President Johnson signed into law the Housing Act of 1964. In so doing, he made particular mention of the new 3-percent direct loan program for rehabilitating homes and businesses in urban renewal areas. The President pointed out that this new program would give new hope to those citizens who otherwise would have to move from the path of the bulldozer.

As the originator of this approach, I am deeply concerned with its future effectiveness. Senator Douglas, in his letter of August 19 to you, ably sketched the reasons why this program and sufficient funds to operate it are needed. I join him in urging you to see that the Bureau of the Budget provide ample funds for the program's operation in any supplemental appropriation recommendations.

I would appreciate it if you would keep me informed of Budget Bureau developments with respect to this program.

Very best wishes.

Sincerely yours,

William B. Widnall,
Member of Congress.

On September 12, the Budget Director sent a reply to Senator Douglas and a copy of that reply to me, rejecting our requests and putting off until at least next year a program originated by Congress and passed and signed into law. The text of Mr. Gordon's letter follows:

Executive Office of the President,
Bureau of the Budget,
Washington, D.C., September 12, 1964.

Hon. Paul H. Douglas,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Douglas: Thank you for your letter of August 19, 1964, relating to the new direct loan program for rehabilitation in urban renewal areas authorized by the Housing Act of 1964.

We agree that rehabilitation must be a key element in a national program of urban renewal, and that lack of adequate financing has on occasion hindered rehabilitation projects. Private lenders are often reluctant to make loans under $6,000 or $7,000 at reasonable interest rates. Some homeowners in urban renewal areas cannot afford to take on new debt. The administration, as you know, proposed a new program of FNMA purchase of low-interest-rate loans to elderly homeowners in urban renewal areas to help them rehabilitate their homes. The new loan program contained in the Housing Act of 1964 can help fill a gap in the urban renewal program.

There are, however, a number of difficult problems that have to be worked out in connection with this direct loan program. For example, care will have to be taken to assure that the owner of a property restored to good condition with a 3-percent loan does not capitalize the interest subsidy and make an unwarranted profit in selling his property. The provision allowing loans to tenants for rehabilitation could, if administrative regulations are not carefully drawn, result in windfall gains to landlords who have refused to cooperate in rehabilitating their property.

Although $50 million is a large sum of money, it will not provide loans for a large number of units. If the average loan (business and home) is $5,000, loans can be made only to 10,000 borrowers. Rehabilitation was begun on more than this number of housing units in urban renewal areas in the last 6 months of 1963, the last period for which figures are available. The legislative history is clear that loans should be made only to those who cannot afford or cannot get other financing. It will not be easy to devise and enforce regulations to assure that undeserving borrowers do not receive loan funds which should be reserved for those in need.

It is not yet clear how the Housing and Home Finance Agency will organize to administer the new loan program. If the program is to succeed, a strong and capable organization will be required to administer it. Although HHFA is engaged in many loan and loan insurance programs, none of its constituents is now equipped to make direct loans to individuals. Neither is HHFA experienced in making small business loans.

These problems are of course not insuperable, but the solutions have not yet been developed. In this situation, we believe it would be premature to go immediately to the appropriations committees for funds to operate the program. The appropriations committees will, quite properly, want answers to these questions before recommending the necessary appropriations.

We are now working with HHFA to find the solutions to the problems involved. We hope to be in a position to recommend to the President that he request a 1965 supplemental appropriation for this program when he submits his budget in January.

If you have any additional questions about our approach to this program, I will be glad to discuss it with you further.

Sincerely,

Kermit Gordon,
Director.

The efforts of those who were interested in this new and necessary program, and in returning the legislative initiative to the Congress where it rightfully belongs, continued. On September 23, 1964, I wrote to the President, recalling his words when he signed the bill into law, and asking President Johnson to send a special request to the Senate for the appropriation. My action was based on the fact that the House the day before had passed the supplemental appropriations bill without any funds. The reason for this lack of funds was indicated in a colloquy I had with the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Thomas] on the floor on September 22. I include that exchange at this point, followed by my letter to the President:

Mr. Widnall. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask a question of either the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Mahon] or the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Thomas] with respect to the supplemental appropriations for the Housing and Home Finance Agency. We just passed a housing bill by one of the largest votes that I can recall in the time that I have spent in the Congress. President Johnson pointed out in his message at the time he signed that bill that one of the few new programs was the $50 million rehabilitation loan program that was addressed to helping the low-income people and the small businessman and the tenants and property owners who were being bulldozed out of the urban renewal areas. Is there anything in this bill for this program and did the administration request any funds for that purpose?

Mr. Thomas. It is my understanding there is no budget estimate for it at this time.

Mr. Widnall. There is no request from the administration?

Mr. Thomas. It is a very popular program and I am sure our colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Ostertag] will advise you that when we get a budget estimate, we will go into it very carefully. You have two or three of these rehabilitation programs and we think they are all starting off pretty well. We want to congratulate the gentleman from New Jersey and his committee for the program. I am sure there is no disposition on the part of our subcommittee to scuttle it.

Mr. Ostertag. May I join the gentleman from Texas in responding to the gentleman from New Jersey and say that our subcommittee has received no formal budget request for these funds.

Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C., September 23, 1964.

The President,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President: When you signed the Housing Act of 1964 on September 2 you said "It provides new support for greater success in the future. The plight of property owners in urban renewal areas is recognized in this measure. Provision is made so that they can rehabilitate their homes and businesses instead of having to move from the path of the bulldozers."

The rehabilitation program which you so accurately described requires a budget appropriation of $50 million. In a colloquy with Representative Albert Thomas, chairman of the Independent Offices Appropriation Subcommittee, on the floor of the House on Tuesday of this week, I was informed that there has been no budget request to fund this program made by the administration at this time. Thus an opportunity has now been lost with the passage by the House of the final Independent Offices supplemental appropriation bill, H.R. 12633, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, to gain an early start on this much needed program. The only remaining hope for it to be rapidly implemented lies in your hands.

In view of the interest you have publicly expressed in this legislation, its bipartisan support in the House and Senate, and the strong need for this urban renewal rehabilitation program, I am confident that you will want to recommend to the Senate the steps necessary to make this program an immediate reality.

Very sincerely yours,

William B. Widnall,
Member of Congress.

As I said later in the debate on September 22, at page 22428 of the Congressional Record, I had hopes of action in the Senate to restore this regrettable oversight. On September 25 I received a reply from the White House from Lawrence F. O'Brien, Special Assistant to the President, to my letter asking for help in funding this program. The reply indicated a routine buckslip operation on the part of the White House, sending my letter to, of all places, the Budget Bureau. I include the reply at this point:

The White House,
Washington, September 25, 1964.

Dear Congressman: For the President, may I acknowledge your letter of September 23 regarding funds to implement the provisions of the Housing Act of 1964.

Your recommendation that a request for supplemental appropriations be submitted to the Congress has been called to the attention of the Bureau of the Budget.

Sincerely yours,

Lawrence F. O'Brien,
Special Assistant to the President.

In a remarkable display of bipartisanship and statesmanlike action Senator Douglas continued his efforts to secure funding for the program on the Senate side. It was decided that the best place to try to add it on to the bill would be on the Senate floor. Senator Douglas, and Senator Jacob K. Javits, my Republican colleague from New York, cosponsored an amendment to add $10 million to the supplemental appropriations bill for a start on the program. The amendment passed with full bipartisan support, as can be seen by reading the Senate debate of October 1, 1964, on this amendment, at page 23311 of the Congressional Record. Senator Saltonstall, speaking for the Senate minority, and Senators Sparkman and Clark of the majority, actively supported the measure.

Despite these efforts, the provision of funds was dropped in conference committee in the rush to adjourn. I am sure it was not for lack of Republican support. Those in need of assistance to rehabilitate their homes must now wait upon the whim of the Bureau of the

Budget. I can only hope that a program, designed to lower costs, both in economic and human terms, of the urban renewal program, will not be overlooked in any misguided attempt to economize. A third supplemental appropriations bill is clearly called for in January when we reconvene.

The Housing and Home Finance Agency has indicated its interest in this program, which is directly connected with the effectiveness of the new code enforcement program and the new stress on rehabilitation authorized in the Housing Act of 1964 also. I cannot believe that there was any real substance to the claim by the Bureau of the Budget that the difficulty of providing regulations for the program necessitated delay.

There certainly can be no reason to delay this program any further. I would hope that the Housing and Home Finance Agency and the Urban Renewal Administration will take this program into account in reviewing plans for urban renewal projects so that as little time is lost as possible. And I trust that this same Agency will push for funds for this program. There is certainly no lack of support for it on either side of the aisle here in Congress.

Report on Cadets Appointed to the U.S. Service Academies From the 27th Congressional District of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following report on cadets appointed to the U.S. service academies from the 27th Congressional District of Pennsylvania for the interest of my constituents.

Paul Strain, of Ashland Street, 20th ward, at Annapolis, graduated at Holy Innocents High. Paul is making high grades and is on the debate team. He placed sixth in United States in the Catholic Forensic League debate finals. Leo Lukenas, high honor student in high school, of 20th ward, graduated at Annapolis, is now Navy lieutenant at Pensacola, Fla. Jim Irwin, of 28th ward, is on the swimming team at U.S. Merchant Marine Academy and graduated at Langley High. Bill Machett, also from Langley High and 20th ward, is on the swim team at U.S. Merchant Marine and is in the first third of his class. Bill Klemm, of Lovelace Street, 20th ward, received the honor star for high marks at U.S. Merchant Marine Academy. Bill was an Explorer Scout at Langley High. Jim Hutchinson, Jr., Clairhaven Street, 28th ward, graduated at U.S. Merchant Marine Academy last July, and is now an engineer for Maritime Overseas Corporation in New York. Park Anderson, at Air Force Academy, is on the honor roll continuing his honor record started at Holy Innocents High.

Henry Tyler and Nicholas Michalisin, June grads from Coraopolis High, whom I have appointed to Annapolis, as your Congressman, entered on July 1, and the Academy reports both are doing very well.

Joseph Seigman, assistant supervising principal of Moon Township schools, advises his son Kenneth, an appointee from our congressional district to the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy, is now in his second year, and is aboard the training ship on his way to France, Greece, and Turkey.

Jim McBride, son of James and Agnes McBride, of Coraopolis, our appointee, graduated from the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy in 1961, is now lieutenant in U.S. Naval Reserve. Jim and his wife Nancy now live in Evanston, Ill.

Joseph Johnson, whom I appointed to the U.S. Air Force Academy in 1959, graduated in 1963, and is now Lieutenant Johnson, at McChord Air Force Base, Tacoma, Wash. Joe's father, now principal of Coraopolis High, advises me Joe is now in charge of base engineering, is married, and he and his wife Jo Ann have a daughter, Wendy, 7 months old. Kennedy Township can really be proud of Lieutenant Johnson.

Oleg Komarnitsky of Moon Township, graduate of Moon High, who was appointed by me to the Air Force Academy in 1957, is now a first lieutenant and doing well at Hanscom Air Base, Bedford, Mass.

Larry Kozak, of Robinson Township, graduate of Montour High, our appointee to the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy is now on sea duty in the Dominican Republic area.

Scott Swain, son of the Ted Swains, and Upper St. Clair High graduate, 1964, entered Annapolis Naval Academy on July 1, and is now doing well as midshipman. Scott was on the football and baseball teams at high school, and an exchange student to Sweden in 1963, and is now playing "plebe" baseball.

Ronald Deep, son of Thomas and Elizabeth Deep—a Lincoln High School, Bridgeville, graduate, was appointed to the U.S. Air Force Academy and finished in 1960. Ronald's twin is his brother, Donald Deep, and both boys were well known locally. Ronald is now a pilot of jet transports in the U.S. Air Force, attending squadron school at Montgomery, Ala., and is being promoted to captain, U.S. Air Force, in December.

Lawrence Miller is the son of Mrs. Ruth Miller, a widow; was appointed to the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy, after graduating sixth in his class of 110 at Upper St. Clair High School. Lawrence is a senior at the academy and graduates in 1965.

Robert Gilleskie entered Annapolis Naval Academy on July 1, 1964, and the Academy reports Bob is doing well. Bob graduated at Canevin High and was president of the student council—also a letterman in football, wrestling, and track. His parents are Alex and Stella Gilleskie of Heidelberg. Dennis Coll, son of Ed and Alice Coll of Scott Township, is a cadet in the fourth class at West Point, and his father, Postmaster Ed Coll of the Pittsburgh Post Office, tells me Dennis is doing fine scholastically, and is now company athletic sergeant, and is on the "B" football team. At South Catholic High he was honor student and class president. Edward Hepp, Jr., of Thornburg, son of the Edward Hepp, is on the honor list at Annapolis, plays battalion football, and will be home for the Pitt-Navy game. David Ferrall Dally, son of the Crafton Dallys, graduated at Annapolis, and is now Lieutenant Commander Dally, U.S. Navy. David is a grandson of longtime Justice of the Peace Dally of Crafton, and nephew of now Rear Adm. Pete Ferrall of Crafton, submarine commander. Jim Howard of Crafton, whom I appointed to Annapolis, and who chose to graduate from the U.S. Coast Guard Academy, is now lieutenant commander at the Coast Guard main offices in Washington, D.C.

David Spooner, "Dave" or "Spoon," entered Annapolis Naval Academy on July 1, 1964. His parents, John and Ruth Spooner, of Oakridge Drive, Whitehall, report Dave is getting organized, thinks the Academy is great, and hopes to play basketball on the team. Dave graduated from Baldwin High eighth in his class of 557—3.86 average—was a member of the National Honor Society, student senate, and Key Club.

Robert Bruce, son of Robert and Ruth Bruce, of Baldwin, entered the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy on Long Island in 1963. Bob is doing well, enjoys his studies, and is now manager of the sailing team. Bob graduated from Baldwin High and was a member of the student senate, science club, and an offier of the Sea Explorer Scouts.

Richard Knight, of Whitehall, son of Mr. and Mrs. R. G. Knight, of Oakridge Drive, graduated from West Point in 1964. Dick was an A student at Baldwin High, senior class president, a member of the National Honor Society and Key Club, and played in the band. Dick is now doing well as a second lieutenant in the U.S. Army, stationed at Homestead Air Base in Florida.

James Homer, formerly of Crestline Drive, Baldwin, son of Joseph and Edythe Homer, graduated at Annapolis in 1962. Jim was on the track team and played in the band at Baldwin High. At Annapolis Jim made the Superintendent's list of distinguished midshipmen. He is now a lieutenant, junior grade, U.S. Navy, and is attending the Navy Submarine School, New London, Conn.

Harry Solbach, Jr., now living at 4785 Sherwood Drive, Whitehall, graduated at Brentwood High, and Annapolis Naval Academy. He became a captain in the U.S. Marine Corps, and has now completed his time in the service. Harry is making an outstanding record as manufacturing superintendent at the light metal plant of Dravo. Harry is married to Dolores Hilty, of Brentwood, and they have a son, Scott.

In 1963 Mike Trapuzzano, of Stowe Township, entered the Air Force Academy. Mike is now an honor student, and graduated top in his class at Stowe High. Andy Kasprik, of McKees Rocks, at

Annapolis has just received a silver star for high grades. Dale Welch graduated at Merchant Marine Academy and is now third assistant with Moore-McCormack Lines. Dale was in Key Club at Neville High. Steve Wolfgang, of McKees Rocks, graduated at Annapolis and is now captain in the U.S. Air Force. Steve was honor society at Stowe High. John Lyons, of Stowe, is in his fourth year at West Point, and was president of the National Honor Society at Stowe High. Ken Ludovici, of Stowe, graduated at West Point, a paratrooper of the fine 82d Airborne Division, spent 10 months in Vietnam. Stephen Halupa, of Stowe, entered Annapolis last year, and is doing well. Steve was senior class president and graduated with high honors from Stowe High.

William Kirchner, of our 32d ward, entered U.S. Merchant Marine Academy at Long Island this summer. His parents, Clarence and Marie Kirchner, of Fairland Street, tell me Bill is enjoying the Academy and is studying chemistry to become a chemical engineer. He is on the sailing and debate teams. Bill graduated from Carrick High, played basketball, tennis, and was captain of the chess club.

James Kronz, of Brentwood, graduated from the Merchant Marine Academy and is now in the U.S. Navy. Jim is the son of Charles and Kathryn Kronz of Bauman Avenue. At St. Wendelin High, he played football and basketball and was in the debate club. Jim is now in school in Rhode Island training to be a chief engineer on a destroyer. Jim is married and has two children.

Jerry Garlitz, son of Mr. and Mrs. J. Edward Garlitz, graduate of Carrick High and Annapolis, is now a lieutenant commander on the U.S.S. *Kitty Hawk* operating in the Pacific Ocean. Jerry is a competent naval aviator, flying in Fighter Squadron 121, and in such planes as F3D and F4H fighters. He is married and is based at San Francisco.

Michael Cronin, of the 32d ward, graduated from Annapolis in 1963. Mike is presently training to be a Navy pilot at the Naval Training Base at Corpus Christi, Tex., and will receive his wings next January. He graduated from Carrick High and participated in football, swimming, and track. Mike's sisters are Maureen and Sheila.

Albert Trautmann, of Carrick, son of Mr. and Mrs. Elmer Trautmann, graduated at Annapolis and is now a captain in the U.S. Air Force. He graduated from Carrick High and played football and track. Albert and his wife, Louanne, are at Sawyer Air Force Base, Mich.

James Clark, of Bethel Park, entered the U.S. Air Force Academy this year. His parents, Mr. and Mrs. J. Robert Clark, live at 206 Iroquois Road. Jim is doing well in his courses at the Academy and is on the freshman soccer team. In Bethel High Jim was a member of the National Honor Society, a national merit scholar, and earned a cross-country letter.

Jim Wood, also of Bethel, is in his second year at Annapolis. His parents, Robert and Alma Wood, of Patterson Road, tell me Jim is doing well at the Naval Academy. He spent 7 weeks cruising to France, Denmark, and England on the U.S.S. *Essex*. At Bethel High Jim was in the National Honor Society, the student council, and worked on the school newspaper.

Bill Daniels will graduate from the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy next year. He is the son of Mr. and Mrs. Cloyce R. Daniels, of Oaklyn Road, Bethel Park. Bill is taking French and navigation at the Academy and has made the dean's list three times. At Bethel High Bill played football, was basketball manager, and in the varsity club.

Jim Mucci, of Bethel Park, entered the Merchant Marine Academy this year. His parents, Adam and Vera Mucci, say he is studying hard, belongs to the drill team, and plays football. At Bethel High Jim was publicity director of the Key Club, active in the "Y" and sports.

Jack McMichael is a graduate of the U.S. Naval Academy. He is the son of the John C. McMichaels, of Bethel Borough. Jack is now a Navy lieutenant attending graduate school near Santa Barbara, and he previously flew with the 6th Fleet in the Mediterranean. Jack and his wife, the former Diane Ramsey, of Pleasant Hills, have a 3-year-old daughter, Michele.

Bob Zargan of the 19th Ward, graduate of West Point, is now a U.S. Army major attending staff and command school at Fort Leavenworth, Kans. He is the son of Mrs. James G. Zargan and the late Jim Zargan of Brookline, active leader in veterans affairs. Bob is a graduate of South Hills High. He recently served with the Army in South Vietnam. Bob is married and has a boy and two girls.

Lou Hamel, an Annapolis graduate, is a lieutenant commander in the Navy. His parents are the Louis Hamels of Pioneer Avenue, Brookline. Lou is going to Hawaii as an electronic officers adviser with the admiral's staff of the 6th Fleet. Lou was one of the youngest commanders of his own ship, an LST. At South Hills High he was in the National Honor Society, senior class president and on the yearbook staff. He played baseball for Beechview American Legion Post. Lou is married and has two children, Richard, 6, and Dianne, 4.

Don Graham of Beechview graduated from the Air Force Academy. He is now a lieutenant taking pilot training at Webb Air Force Base, Tex. Don is the son of Ralph and Lillian Graham of Tropical Avenue and a graduate of South Hills High. He was married last June, just 2 days after his graduation from the Air Force Academy.

Stuart Johnson graduated from the Naval Academy with distinction this summer. His mother is Mrs. Sara Johnson of Rockland Avenue, Beechview. Stuart is now with Navy Air Command in Pensacola, Fla., taking pilot training. At South Hills High he was active in baseball, football, golf, archery, and swimming. He was a member of the Boys Leaders Club and Methodist Church Youth Council.

George Sweger graduated from the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy last year. His parents, George and Mildred Sweger, formerly of Brookline, now live at Girard Road, Pittsburgh. George is now sailing with the Moore-McCormack Lines on his way home from Brazil. A graduate of South Hills High, George is married to Marlene Gebhardt, also of Brookline.

Richard Reinheimer of Brookline entered Annapolis this year. His parents, Rudolph and Agatha Reinheimer, live on Southcrest Drive. Richard graduated from South Hills High. He was in the National Honor Society, Varsity Club, cocaptain of the football team, and active in track and field events.

Richard Bordone, a Naval Academy graduate, is now a lieutenant with Attack Squadron 75. He is the son of the late Peter Bordones of Mount Washington, and a graduate of St. Justins High.

James Ragano of Brookline graduated from Annapolis in 1963. His parents are the Anthony D. Raganos of Fordham Avenue. He was on the superintendent's list at the Naval Academy and in the National Honor Society at South Hills High. James is now at Nuclear Power School, Mare Island, Calif.

Walter Teichgraber of Brookline is on the superintendent's list at Annapolis for the third straight year. He lived with his aunt and uncle, Mr. and Mrs. Guy Aiello of Bellaire Avenue. At South Hills Catholic he was president of the Catholic Youth Council, Math Honor Society, manager of baseball team and played basketball.

Our district is proud of this fine record of accomplishments of these outstanding young men from our area.

Hon. James C. Auchincloss

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, it is with regret that we in the House of Representatives see a man of the sterling worth which JIM AUCHINCLOSS possesses, retire from Congress. His character, integrity and courage were of the highest—he has been a "Rock of Gibralter" to many of the newer House Members, and was always ready to grant his sage counsel and impart of his wide knowledge to us freshmen when we sought his advice.

JIM AUCHINCLOSS' 22 years of service have indeed been creditable ones. He has served the Third District of New Jersey, as the dean of the New Jersey delegation in numerous capacities; service has been one of his keynotes; service and progress for the district and State he represented so well over the years, and for his country. He gave unselfishly of his time to Republicans and Democrats alike; he served the District of Columbia in more ways than one man can count during his service on the District Committee, and as ranking minority member of the House Public Works Committee, where I also serve, I have firsthand knowledge of his capabilities and judicious knowledge.

One could always turn to JIM AUCHINCLOSS—he was always ready with a smile and reassuring words when the going became a little rough and a helping hand was needed. His counsel was always available. His never-failing sense of humor always stood him in good stead. He had infinite patience and understanding of the problems at hand, and while I did not have the benefit of his friendship as long as many of our other colleagues did, I know that I can in good conscience say that he goes into retirement with the knowledge back of him, and the words of his many colleagues echoing "A job well done—enjoy your rest and relaxation." To this outstanding citizen and legislator, and to his lovely wife, I wish Godspeed.

Salinity of Colorado River Waters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, for many years the waters of the Colorado River, which flows for some 1,200 miles through or bordering upon seven of our great Western States before entering Mexico and emptying into the Gulf of California, has been a subject of spirited controversy—political controversy, judicial controversy, and diplomatic controversy.

The States of both the Upper and Lower Colorado River Basins, and the industrial States within each basin, have vied with each other in the Congress and in the courts for what each has considered its fair and just share of the waters of the river so necessary to the well-being of its people and its future development. Meanwhile, in order to bring some measure of physical control over the waters of the highly variable stream in which devasting floods alternate with searing drought, the people of the United States have spent hundreds of millions of dollars in constructing great multipurpose dams and reservoirs and ancillary works.

The need of our States and their people for the waters of the Colorado necessitated agreement with Mexico whose people also need and use the river waters. A treaty was entered into in 1944 between the United States and Mexico which took into account proposed development in the Colorado River Basin. The interpretation of this treaty recently has been a subject of discussion between the United States and Mexico, and on September 6, last, the Washington Post published a news story from Mexicali, Mexico, giving what I considered a somewhat one-sided picture of the situation. Accordingly, I prepared a letter to the editor of the Post which I hope may help clarify the situation.

I ask unaimous consent, Mr. President, that the news story and my observations on the situation as presented by this news story be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SALT ISSUE IS AN EARTH SHAKER

(By George Natanson)

MEXICALI, MEXICO.—"I blame the United States. You are bad neighbors," said Campesino Jose Fernandez.

Fernandez, whose wife and six children sat in an adobe ranchhouse as we spoke, owns a plot of land in the Mexicali Valley not far from the United States-Mexican border at Calexico, Calif.

Fernandez and his family are representative of the 300,000 Mexican farmers in this area whose lands have been damaged over the past several years by the increased amounts of salt found in the waters of the Colorado River.

Fernandez protested calmly but his words betrayed the smoldering political passion of the small farmers which has surfaced several times. The good relations enjoyed by the United States and Mexico thus are in danger of a breakdown.

Fernandez said, "I used to get four to five bales of cotton per hectare (2.5 acres). Now I get nothing. The salt in the river coming from your country has killed it."

In 1944, the United States and Mexico signed a treaty which guaranteed Mexico water from the Colorado River for "municipal and domestic uses, agriculture, and other beneficial purposes." But since 1961, the saline content of the river has risen alarmingly, making it worthless for irrigation and causing severe crop damage to 450,000 acres of land in the Mexicali Valley.

Under the 1944 treaty, the United States guaranteed to deliver to Mexico 1,500,000 acre-feet of Colorado River water annually. This is enough to cover 1,500,000 acres of land to the depth of 1 foot, sufficient to irrigate 300,000 acres of cotton in the Mexican valley.

Normally, the Colorado contains a salt content of roughly 900 parts per million—high, but not enough to damage the soil. But after 1961, Mexicali farmers claimed that salt had increased to more than 2,800 parts per million.

This means that about 5,000 more tons of salt were being deposited on Mexicali Valley soils every 24 hours

Mexico argues that the United States must provide this country with water as pure as that which Imperial Valley farmers get from the Colorado River. The California Valley water is channeled into the All-America Canal at a point in the Colorado just below the Imperial Dam.

Across the river, running east, is the canal taking Colorado water into the Wellton-Mohawk. This is circulated throughout the Arizona Valley and returned to the Colorado near the Morales Dam. However, the waters now have increased saline content from the deep water wells.

Pointing to the Yuma Valley, south of the river near the border downstream from the Wellton-Mohawk drainage, the Mexicans note that the Yuma farmers have no cause for concern. Here the water is taken from the All-America Canal and piped under the Colorado into the Yuma Valley, thus saving that valley from Wellton-Mohawk contamination.

The U.S. Government took steps to rectify the situation, but most of these were stopgap measures. Three years ago, the U.S. Government arranged to increase the Colorado flow from Hoover Dam, upriver. The fresh waters served to dilute the saline content at Morales Dam below the Wellton-Mohawk drainage. However, the six Western U.S. States which depend on Colorado water took a dim view of this arrangement, protesting the waste of precious water.

To a proposal that Wellton-Mohawk drain off used irrigation waters to the east, away from the Colorado River, protests were heard that Arizona would not then get the credits needed from the return flow.

Spokesmen on the U.S. side believe Mexican claims are exaggerated. They also suspect that Mexico is using this as an excuse to get more water above its legal allotment.

It is argued that Mexico has done nothing to prepare for use of salty water and that no effective drainage system has been installed in the Mexicali Valley to relieve the problem. It is also maintained that Colorado River water is less than 1,500 parts salt per million parts of water They point out that this proportion is not damaging to crops if suitable precautions are taken to drain the Mexicali acreage.

At the same time, it is claimed that Mexicali's overall cotton production in recent years has increased rather than fallen off.

Mexicans proudly admit that their cotton production has increased but answer that this is in spite of, and not because of, the Colorado River water.

To the argument that Mexico has no drainage system, the Mexicans reply that this is of no concern to the United States. What the United States must worry about, they say, is a "just and fair" interpretation of the 1944 treaty.

Mexico is demanding quick action and has threatened to take the matter to the World Court or to an inter-American tribunal. While this could drag the problem out for years, U.S. prestige abroad would suffer considerably from the suit.

Washington has become alarmed. Presidents Kennedy and Johnson assured Mexican President Adolfo Lopez Mateos of their intention to find a "permanent and effective solution at the earliest possible time."

In Mexico City, a U.S. spokesman has described the problem as "urgent." Another U.S. official declared recently, "the question of salinity in the Colorado River is one of the most pressing that the United States faces in Latin America."

Mexican Communists have been quick to exploit a ready-made issue which provides sympathetic appeal to all Mexicans and Latin Americans, whatever their politics. A Mexican Government spokesman said recently in Mexico City, "Unfortunately, the Communists are taking the credit as leaders in demanding retribution from the United States simply because they are making the most noise. The people listen to them, but you can't blame them for doing so."

Typical of these is Francisco Garcia. "I farmed in this valley for more than 25 years but my 500 acres are useless now," he says. "So I took part in the demonstrations in front of the U.S. Consulate 2 months ago and I am ready to do so again."

Garcia made it clear he is no Communist. "I am a farmer and I want my land to produce. If my government helps me, then I will follow my government. But if the Communists are the ones to help, then I'll follow the Communists."

Garcia showed a mimeographed circular issued by the independent campesino. It had been given wide circulation throughout Mexico 2 months ago. It called for "workers, teachers, students, industrialists, businessmen, artists, and intellectuals" to join the Nation's Campesinos to protect this "act of provocation" by the United States.

Early this month, the United States submitted a plan to the Mexican Government which is presently under study. While it is believed the Mexicans might agree with the U.S. proposals, there is fear that opposition in the United States might break down the negotiations once the terms are made public.

The proposals include prompt construction of a bypass canal to divert saline water flowing from the Wellton-Mohawk Reclamation District, a far more extensive tile drainage system in the Wellton-Mohawk area, and a temporary remedy which would allow saline water to pass down the Colorado River to the Gulf of California during those periods when Mexico could interrupt water deliveries by closing off the Morales Dam.

These ideas call for an extensive outlay of U.S. public funds.

Thus, it is believed by observers here that a solution to the problem is still far off. The Communists, aware of the conflicting issues, have not ceased their agitation. Among other things, they are now demanding that the United States pay millions of dollars in damages to Mexicali farmers.

Mexico is seeking a technical solution which will be the "most adequate and economic method of insuring the elimination of present and future damage." The political solution, they point out, should take into consideration the national and particular interests of both nations, but should have "a wider panorama than the locality of the Colorado River."

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR
AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
September 23, 1964.

The EDITOR,
The Washington Post,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The feature story in your September 6 issue by George Natanson on the salinity of the Colorado River waters reaching Mexico, "The Salt Issue Is an Earth Shaker" is, I fear, rather more political propaganda than factual reporting. As a Senator from a Colorado River Basin State and a senior member of the committee of the Senate that has initial responsibility for Federal legislation affecting the development of the water and land resources of the Colorado, I would like to make a few observations that I hope may help set the record straight and give credit where credit is due.

First, let us consider a few basic geographic and historical facts. The Colorado River rises wholly within the United States and this country is the sole source of all of its waters. The stream from its headquarters in north central Colorado to the Mexican border runs a course of more than 1,200 miles; from the border to the Gulf of California its course is 75 miles. Significant portions of seven of our great Western States; namely, California, Arizona, New Mexico, Nevada, Utah, Colorado, and Wyoming, are within its basin and the river plays a vital role in the economy of each.

The point is that by the time the Colorado reaches Mexico it has run more than 90 percent of its course, and has drained an area of some 242,000 square miles, or approximately one-twelfth of the continental United States excluding Alaska. The inescapable fact of geography is that the short Mexican stretch of the river is at the very end of a long, long flow through hundreds of miles of mineralized land, and that even without the uses to which we put them the waters inevitably would contain significant quantities of salt at the end of their journey.

Mr. Natanson states that "normally, the Colorado contains a salt content of roughly 900 parts per million." It would be difficult indeed, scientifically, to say what salt content the Colorado has "normally." Its salinity depends on several variable factors, such as the point on the 1,300-mile stream that is used as the base for normalcy—in its upper reaches the salt content may be 50 parts or less per million—the amount of water in the river, which will vary from a trickle to a torrent, depending on the time of year and the amount of precipitation in our western mountains the preceding winter, the amount of the land irrigated with a given quantity of water, and the salinity of the soil itself before water is put on it.

A number of irrigated areas in the United States use waters with as high, or higher, a saline content than those that we regularly deliver to Mexico. I refer to the Carlsbad project in my own State of New Mexico, the South Gila, the Roosevelt, and the Delta projects, among others. The figure chosen by Mr. Natanson, 2,800 parts per million, is that of the most saline of all of our water deliveries; it has been reached but once, and that 4 years ago. The current average is more in the neighborhood of 1,100 to 1,200 parts per million. Many a farmer in New Mexico would consider himself lucky indeed to have water that good. How much salinity is permissible is like trying to say how many drinks of whisky are permissible. The amount varies with the individual, the time, the place, and what the individual is doing or going to do.

In the opinion of qualified agronomists, Mexico has substantially more land under cultivation than the water to which she is entitled from the Colorado will support, in view of the prevailing agricultural patterns, the lack of adequate drainage facilities, and the use of water only for production, rather than apportioning some for flushing as our farmers are required to do. However, as conceded by Mr. Natanson, the agricultural yield in the Mexicali Valley has been increasing. A year ago cotton production broke all records per hectare; this past winter was a record season for wheat.

It would seem that the farmers Mr. Natanson chose to interview and quote were more interested in anti-American politics than in farm production.

Prior to the construction of Hoover Dam on the Colorado River, irrigated agriculture along the lower Colorado River, and particularly in Mexico, was entirely at the mercy of seasonal fluctuations in the river. Huge spring floods followed by severe water shortages in the late summer and early fall months were the rule rather than the exception. These factors greatly limited the number of acres which could be developed in Mexico. The United States, at a cost of over $225 million, first constructed in the United States, Hoover Dam and then Davis Dam to control the floods and regulate downstream flows. Mexico did not pay any of the cost of these structures even though she is a prime beneficiary of their benefits.

In 1922 our basin States initiated a compact "to provide for an equitable division and apportionment of the use of the waters of the Colorado River system * * * to secure the expeditious agricultural and industrial development of the Colorado River Basin." This compact, which was approved by the Federal Government in the Boulder Canyon Project Act, and which is a basis for much of the Colorado River development, is devoid of any provisions whatever pertaining to the quality of the water thus to be distributed. The States representatives, and those of the Federal Government, were well aware of the fundamental physical fact that the waters of the river used for irrigation inevitably would dissolve minerals in the soil and hence when returned to the stream would carry with them some of the salts. The degree of salinity would vary with the amount of water available and the lands irrigated. This same physical fact was well known to and within the contemplation of the negotiators of the Mexican Water Treaty in 1944.

Thus, the treaty, by which Mexico receives a minimum of 1,500,000 acre-feet of water a year and which is the controlling agreement spelling out carefully and in detail the rights and obligations of the two countries, also deliberately is silent with respect to quality of water. On the contrary, in at least three separate provisions there is affirmative language showing that Mexico agreed to accept whatever water the river brings to her at the boundary. Article 10 of the treaty states:

"Of the waters of the Colorado River, from any and all sources, there are allocated to Mexico:"

Article 11, in subsection (a), provides:

"(a) The United States shall deliver all waters allotted to Mexico wherever these waters may arrive in the bed of the limitrophe section of the Colorado River, with exceptions hereinafter provided. Such waters shall be made up of the waters of the said river whatever their origin."

The report of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations recommending that the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of the treaty explained that:

"Certain limitations are placed upon the schedules of delivery so as to insure to the United States credit for substantially all return flows and other waste waters emanating from projects within the United States and generally reaching the river at points too low on the stream to be susceptible to further use within the United States. This is largely composed of water which has been used for irrigation of lands within the United States and which returns to the river through drainage canals or through underground seepage." (Executive Report No. 2, 79th Cong., p. 4.)

In submitting the proposed treaty to President Roosevelt, the Secretary of State, Cordell Hull, stated in setting forth the amounts of Colorado River water to be delivered under the agreement:

"These quantities, which may be made up of any waters of the Colorado River from any and all sources whether direct river flows, return flow, or seepage, will be delivered by the United States in the boundary portion of the Colorado River." (Letter, Secretary Hull to the President, Feb. 9, 1944.)

The point of the foregoing is that the United States did not, and indeed its negotiators could not, consent to assume a higher obligation to Mexico with respect to the quality of water in the Colorado than did the signatory States to each other.

Again, Mr. Natanson states that the treaty "guaranteed Mexico water from the Colorado River for 'municipal and domestic uses, agricultural and other beneficial purposes'." The inference is that the quotes are from the treaty itself. I would be very interested indeed to have any such provision in that agreement pointed out to me. In what is accepted as an official text, that published in 59 U.S. Statutes-at-Large, beginning on page 1219, I do not find those words at all, nor any other declaration or commitment in either the English or the Spanish version as to what purpose the waters the United States undertakes to deliver to Mexico are to be put. The only reason for mentioning this perhaps technical point is to emphasize again the fact that the United States neither expressly nor implicitly made any guarantee or commitment whatever with respect to the quality of the water to be delivered. Rather, Mexico agreed to accept the water "as is" upon arrival at the border.

It is significant that the treaty has been in effect for more than 22 years. Throughout this period we have delivered substantially in excess of the guaranteed minimum of 1,500,000 acre-feet. However, in the last few years, with the abnormally low runoff plus the need for filling our reservoirs, such as Glen Canyon, of the Upper Colorado Basin, we have had to curtail our excess deliveries. One cannot but wonder whether this fact is not the real basis for the complaints; that what certain landowners in Mexico want is not a "just and fair" interpretation of the treaty, to use Mr. Natanson's words, but continued largesse at the expense of the American water users and taxpayers.

At the present time, water projects in the United States already authorized or in the legislative process have reached the stage where we will need every drop of Colorado River water to which we are entitled for our own citizens. I cannot but feel that newspapers and public officials alike should exercise every care not to misstate facts nor to place improper emphasis so that the United States is in a false position in this very delicate matter. In view of the needs of our own people, we must use extreme care not to give away, so to speak, our unassailable legal position, and to avoid words or action which would establish a precedent by which we become responsible for solving Mexico's salinity problem.

Sincerely yours,

CLINTON P. ANDERSON.

On-the-Job Training: Key to a Better Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS H. KUCHEL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement by me concerning on-the-job training.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ON-THE-JOB TRAINING: KEY TO A BETTER FUTURE

The management and workers in many States have benefited from the on-the-job training section, section 204, of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962. This law was enacted with overwhelming bipartisan support.

Two dramatic success stories as a result of this act have already occurred in California. As you will recall, the Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training of the Department of Labor is responsible for implementing the on-the-job training section. In December 1962, Mr. Al Clem, business manager of Operating Engineers Local Union No. 3, in San Francisco, requested the Bureau's regional office to assist them in establishing a training program under this section.

In checking the health and welfare records of their industry, the operating engineers had found about one-third of their members were working less than 1,000 hours, or half time during a calendar year. Another one-third of their members were working less than 1,500 hours, or three-quarter time during a calendar year. This was directly attributable to a lack of skills by their journeyman members. It was also found that during periods of peak employment acute shortages existed for certain skilled men, such as finish blade operators. Yet, unemployed members were in their hiring halls who could not be dispatched to fill these jobs due to a lack of skill and/or experience. Many of these were oilers and assistants to engineers who could qualify as operators if training could be provided. By upgrading these men to operators, new men could be put to work in the assistant to engineer classification, through their apprenticeship program. This program, by the way, has just been presented the Patterson Award by the Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training for program excellence in region XII, comprising California, Arizona, Nevada, and Hawaii.

Thus, the operating engineers proposed a training program far in excess of 10,000 men within their local's jurisdiction in the States of northern California, northern Nevada, Utah, and Hawaii. They also proposed that if the program proved successful, local No. 12 in Los Angeles be encouraged to participate. Such a program would require an extensive training area for use of heavy earth-moving equipment. The area needed to be centrally located and one where climactic conditions were favorable for winter training when unemployment was the greatest. In addition to this, provision had to be made for housing and feeding the trainees. It was anticipated that a training program of this magnitude would be expensive, therefore Federal land was desired, as no rental would be involved and any benefits in the way of roads, check dams, and so forth, which resulted from the training, would revert to the public good. Inquiry was directed to the National Park Service, Forest Service, and Bureau of Land Management, but no suitable area was available.

Mr. Bruce M. Stark, Bureau field representative in San Francisco, submitted a proposal to Lt. Gen. Frederic J. Brown, commanding general of the 6th Army, Presidio of San Francisco, for the use of Camp Roberts, a nearly inactive post except during summer Reserve training sessions. General Brown was most anxious to assist in implementing this new program, and directed a study be made of the Army's capabilities by his deputy chief of staff for logistics, Col. Thomas O'Neil. Assisting Colonel Neil were Mr. Chester Hibbert, Colonel Simpson, Col. Chester Stratton, Mr. John Robatti, and Col. Henry Settle.

Based on General Brown's report, an agreement was entered into on December 4, 1963, between the Secretary of the Army, and the Secretary of Labor. This agreement permitted the Department of Labor to use certain buildings and training areas at Camp Roberts for 5 years in order to carry out approved training programs.

The Bureau and the Army then signed the local memorandum of agreement providing for certain Army support. Due to budgetary limitations, any support furnished by the Army had to be on a cost reimbursement basis by the Department of Labor. Past experience by the Army indicated this would be $1 per day per man.

The Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training developed a pilot project to accommodate 300 men; 150 men in each of two 6-week training sessions. They would be trained in one of the following classifications: Heavy equipment mechanic, technical engineer (surveying), blade operator, bulldozer operator, rubber-tired equipment, or loader.

Equipment was leased from cooperating contractors in the area. Blakemore Equipment Co. of Oakland, Calif., donated the use of over $70,000 worth of LeTourneau-Westinghouse equipment for 2 weeks, along with an instructor and training material. Other equipment dealers furnished films and training aids.

Instructors, 1 for every 10 men, were job superintendents and foremen for California contractors who had taken leave from their regular jobs to instruct. They were paid their regular rate of pay, plus subsistence.

Trainees were selected on the basis of length of time in the industry, with 18 months as a minimum, past work record, which demonstrated prolonged unemployment due to a lack of skills; and eligibility for training under the act, i.e., 3 years' work experience, over 22, head of household, and unemployed. Selection was made on this criteria alone, without regard to race, creed, color, national origin, sex, physical handicap, or union membership. For this pilot project, all trainees came from California.

Trainees were entitled under the act to a training allowance equal to their normal unemployment compensation, or the average being paid in California ($43 a week), whichever was greater. In addition to this, trainees were entitled under the act to transportation from their homes to Camp Roberts and return. Payment for transportation was based on common carrier bus rates.

Trainees were also eligible for $5 per day subsistence allowance while in training at Camp Roberts. As stated above, $1 per day of this was to go to the Army for their support of the program which included water, gas, electricity, maintenance of the barracks, and messhall, beds, blankets, etc. Trainees were housed and fed at Camp Roberts during training.

From the remaining $4 per day of the trainees' subsistence allowance, three meals per day had to be arranged. Private catering firms were contacted, but none could meet this price.

Mr. Clem was afraid his engineers program had been stymied. He contacted his old friend, Ed Turner of the Marine Cooks & Stewards Union, in San Francisco, and asked his help.

The Marine Cooks & Stewards have operated a combination retirement, vacation, and training center at Santa Rosa for a number of years. The number of Marine Cooks & Steward trainees at Santa Rosa is predicated in a large part by the number of residents to consume the product of their training, i.e., meals. During the winter this number is small, yet the need for the training is high due to the fact that winter-trained, spring graduates fill the industries' vacation schedule. Mr. Turner stated it was not only possible, but most desirable, that they expand their present training efforts at Santa Rosa with a similar program at Camp Roberts to feed residing operating engineers, trainees, and instructors.

When the Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training representative explained the intent of the act to Mr. Turner, he decided his program would be directed to unemployed youth, particularly minorities, who lacked any training, but who wanted a career opportunity. Mr. Jerry Posner, representing the union, and Mr. Earl Phillips, representing the Pacific Maritime Association, jointly screened over 400 applications to select 35 trainees, and 10 instructors.

On January 15, 1964, in San Francisco, Under Secretary of Labor, John Henning signed the contracts approving the projects at a formal signing ceremony. Mr. Clem and Mr. Turner signed for their organizations, as interested parties from the Department of Labor, Department of Army, maritime industries, construction trades, and press, looked on.

Five days later on January 20, 1964, an advance party of Marine Cooks & Stewards and operating engineers moved into Camp Roberts to set up operations. Barracks, in disuse since the Korean war, were opened, and furnaces fired up to drive out the winter's dampness. Beds, linens, blankets, pillows, and so forth were checked out from post supply and moved in. Water and electricity were turned on and checked.

The messhall, now a galley, posed a special problem. It had been used as a warehouse for over 2,000 metal cots and mattresses. These were moved via Army truck into another warehouse in a driving rainstorm. Cooking equipment, tables, benches, and chairs were moved in. Then came the task of removing preservative from all the stoves, fixtures, and other metal kitchen equipment. Refrigeration equipment was turned on, stoves and ovens checked, and still more equipment moved in. The Marine Cooks & Stewards worked from dawn to midnight. A Wac christened the messhall, or "galley," the U.S.S. *Never-Sail*. The rain, the preservative, the winter cold, the lack of heated sleeping quarters, and cold food never daunted their spirits. All were dedicated to the fact that this training program "must go" as the eyes of the country were on them to perform. And perform they did.

Food was ordered, minor equipment items not available from the Army were purchased or rented, crockery was loaned by the American President Lines for table service and delivered from San Francisco to Camp Roberts, vending machines and newspaper racks were set up, barracks cleaned and made ready, raising ovens were made for the bakers, credit established locally, ad infinitum. On Monday, January 20, Camp Roberts was a deserted relic of the Second World War and Korea; on Wednesday, January 22, a training center had been established and the first hot meals were being served. All this had been accomplished by the concerted teamwork of Mr. Harley Davidson, project manager for the Operating Engineers, Mr. Don Schelly, chief steward for the Marine Cooks & Stewards, and Col. Henry Settle, commanding officer of Camp Roberts. Only 1 week had elapsed from the signing of the contract to actual operation.

For the Marine Cooks & Stewards only the instructors' salaries, insurance, and small administrative expenses were charged to training. All other costs were met from the $5 per day charged all trainees and instructors for room and board. The costs for setting up this operation were advanced by the Stewards' Training & Recreation, Inc., a joint industry trust fund. This amounted to several thousand dollars and without this advance there would have been no program.

All Marine Cooks & Stewards trainees and instructors were on a 7-day week for the entire operation. A day off was given when available. A typical trainee day was as follows:

Turn to, 0500.

Report to chef, 0530.

Prepare and serve breakfast 0530–0730.

Breakfast for Marine Cooks & Stewards' trainees, 0730–0800.

Clean up, 0800–1000.

Instruction and free time, 1000–1100.

Lunch preparation and serving, 1100–1230.

Lunch for Marine Cooks & Stewards' trainees and clean up, 1230–1400.

Instruction and free time, 1400–1600.

Prepare dinner, serve, clean up and Marine Cooks & Stewards' trainees eat, 1600–1900.

Instruction and free time, 1900–2100.

Instruction was given to the trainees during breaks in the classification for which they were assigned, such as cooking, butchering, baking, or salad work.

During the evening when all classifications of trainees were assembled, instruction was given, coupled with movies, in the following areas: Orientation to shipboard life; lifeboat drill; psychological lessons on cooperation and close living conditions; crews' quarters; respect for authority; chain of command at sea; ship's personnel (officers and men); neatness and cleanliness of person and ship; courtesy to passengers and officers; teamwork.

The U.S. Public Health Service lectured and showed films on sanitation and health. This subject was covered by all concerned for no other subject was so important to this training. The Public Health Service inspected the messhall and gave it their highest rating for cleanliness.

The Maritime Administration and the Coast Guard lectured and showed films on maritime law, sea vessel protection, fire, storm, safety, and one's obligation to passengers and ship during distress.

The Pacific Maritime Association lectured on opportunities, promotion, insurance protection, laws at sea and in foreign port, fringe benefits, and obligations to passengers, ship, and crew.

The above type of training distinguishes a Marine Cook & Steward from the usual cook, waiter, or baker found on shore.

While the operating engineers' training program consisted of two 6-week programs, the Marine Cooks & Stewards had one 12-week session.

On Sunday, January 26, 1964, the operating engineer trainees began to arrive. An induction line was set up to check referral to the program, issue bedding, assign rooms, and start processing with the California State Employment Service. The Salinas office of the CSES, under the direction of Mr. Ray Kelly, sent a special crew to Camp Roberts to expedite the filing of the necessary forms.

On Monday, January 27, processing continued for late arrivals; private autos of trainees were registered with the provost marshal, and records checked for assigning men to instructors. Fueling of equipment began; lubrication and other maintenance items were accomplished. The heavy duty mechanics shop was set up for operation. Instruction began for surveyors.

Tuesday, January 28: First muster of the trainees, head count, announcements, and assignment of trainees. Instructors familiarized trainees with equipment, operation, and maintenance. Safety was stressed as a paramount concern. Instruction had begun for all. That evening Project Manager Harley Davidson and Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training Representative Stark met with the trainees to explain Army regulations and rules of conduct contained in the Department of Labor's use permit, the program, and other related matters. Questions were answered from the trainees.

It soon became evident that there was not enough equipment for the number of trainees. A ratio of 1 piece of equipment to every 5 trainees was needed, but only 1 to 10 was provided. Therefore, training groups were divided into two sections, a.m. and p.m. One section of 10 trainees and the instructors went to the field in the a.m. to use 2 pieces of equipment while the p.m. section and their instructors remained in camp for technical instruction.

However, the intended nature of this project was primarily in-the-field, on-the-job instruction. There was not enough technical instruction required, available, or pertinent to keep the trainees occupied for half a day. Technical instructions could easily be accomplished in not over an hour per day, in the field with the equipment.

The schedule for training days ran as follows:

Rise at 0600.

Breakfast, 0645–0730.

Muster, rollcall, announcements, etc., 0730–0745.

A.m. section to field, in buses, 0745; p.m. section to camp buildings for technical instruction.

All instruction begins, 0800.

Lunch, 1200–1230.

Mail call, 1230–1245.

P.m. section to field, 1245; a.m. section to technical instruction.

Instruction resumes, 1300.

Dinner, 1700–1730.

Mail call, 1730–1800.

Evening training sessions begin (described below), 1800.

Some trainees were quite proficient in one phase of the industry only and were therefore unemployed about 50 percent of the time. While at Camp Roberts, these trainees were able to acquire additional skills. However, their special talents were also of benefit to trainees lacking those specific skills. During the evenings special training sessions were arranged with these trainees teaching others their specialty. For example, a top welder would instruct others in the evening while, during the day, he took training on loaders. Evening training was set up in grade setting, welding, survey, plans and blueprint reading, and maintenance. In this way, trainees could benefit in several training areas during the 6 weeks.

In addition to these evening training sessions, programs were arranged in other areas. Films were shown on safety, mechanical operations, and maintenance. Army films were borrowed on construction equipment, safety, first-aid, and field maintenance. Various equipment dealers loaned films and other training devices on their particular lines as well as lecture records used with a slide projector on special equipment. The California Highway Patrol sent in an officer, Mr. Jerry Fredericks, to lecture and show a film on highway safety. It was outstanding. Camp Roberts sent the base fire marshal over to give a demonstration and lecture on fire prevention and firefighting.

The post engineer at Camp Roberts, Major Wall, was particularly helpful in supplying plans, blueprints, maps, topographical surveys, and specifications for training. The engineering office also provided an auxiliary pump in the field to fill the water supply tank.

The project proposal provided for the benefits of this training to revert to the public good—hence the use of Camp Roberts as a training site. The following are some of the improvements rendered the U.S. Army at Camp Roberts as a result of this training program:

1. Three earthfill dams for water conservation for wildlife and sheep on the reservation. The three dams are 15,000, 17,000, and 40,000 cubic yards. Spillways were made for two dams.

2. One mile of road was leveled, widened, compacted, and graded.

3. An area 2,000 feet by 1,500 feet was leveled, compacted, and graded for any future use the Army may decide.

4. A mock village, used for training exercises by the Army, was completely removed and buried as it had become a safety hazard.

5. Several concrete bunkers and walls were likewise buried.

6. The post garbage dump was cleaned up and buried and two additional burial trenches were dug 500 by 15 feet wide by 12 feet deep. Earth was stockpiled nearby for easy coverage.

7. A dangerous intersection was removed and rebuilt to freeway specifications. This dirt road in the post training area caused many accidents due to a large hill which obscured drivers' view. The hill also made a section of the road narrow and dangerous. Therefore—

8. The hill was removed and used for fill to improve the road, the intersection, and so forth.

9. Material was spread on 3 miles of tank road.

10. Trainees on the loaders loaded material on Army trucks for numerous projects.

11. River rock was stockpiled for future use by the loader crew.

12. Trees and brush removed from training areas were strategically piled for wildlife refugees as part of the Army's game conservation program.

13. Fifty cubic yards of topsoil were hauled to a radar station 4 miles away.

14. A new material pit was opened for future use.

15. And many more.

HOUSING

Trainees were housed in two 70-man barracks and one 50-man barrack—1 and 2 to a room. All essentials were checked out from the Army. A 22-man BOQ barrack was set aside for instructors.

MAIL

Delivered to Camp Roberts Post Office and picked up twice daily by mail clerk deputized by the postmaster, Paso Robles.

RECREATION

A serious problem. The nearest theater was in Paso Robles, 16 miles away, at a price the unemployed hesitated to pay with families at home, and even if they did there were only two different movies weekly. Camp Roberts personnel would have liked to open their base theater and NCO club to the men to boost faltering reserves, but Colonel Settle, the camp commander, informed those in charge of the training program that this was prohibited under the lease arrangement and Army regulations. Permission has been granted to use these facilities for any subsequent program. The Army learned a long time ago that if recreation isn't provided for the men, they usually find some unacceptable diversion elsewhere, which only causes trouble.

LAUNDRY

Bed linens were picked up weekly by local private firm. Personal laundry done in nearby town of San Miguel or Paso Robles.

GRADUATION CEREMONIES

Two were held—one on March 6, and another on April 17, with specially printed cards issued by the union in recognition of the training received. Quite an occasion was made of the event with the usual publicity. Industry leaders were present to speak and award cards.

SAFETY

In addition, Mr. Jacob Gold, safety expert with the Bureau of Labor Standards of the U.S. Department of Labor visited the facility and lectured on safety for 1 day. A full-time safety-first-aid man was always present. Special arrangements were made with doctors and the hospital in Paso Robles. There was no time lost due to accidents in the entire program. Flu accounted for some sick time during the project, but only 10 men had to see a doctor. In the Paso Robles area, this past spring, flu was near epidemic proportions. The trainees escaped this. This is largely due to the high degree of sanitation maintained by the Marine Cooks & Stewards. Indeed, the U.S. Public Health Service inspected the facilities and reported them among the cleanest they had ever inspected.

SPECIAL SERVICE

The California Vehicle Code requires operators of heavy equipment to have special endorsements on their drivers' licenses to "road" or operate heavy equipment on the highways. This is usually difficult to get. Department of motor vehicle personnel must visit construction projects and get attestments from employers as to a man's ability and witness his operation of the equipment. Both the department and the employer are jealous of their time to spend it on a few individuals, or shut down a job for inspection in mass. Yet, many men lose employment for lack of this endorsement. Therefore, the department of motor vehicles sent personnel to Camp Roberts to issue these endorsements to trainees in mass. Time was available at Camp Roberts for demonstration of ability on equipment. This one item alone improved employability of most trainees.

HEAVY DUTY MECHANIC PROGRAM

The original proposal called for 20 trainees for the heavy duty mechanic program. It was found that there was more interest in this area than expected. The number of trainees allocated for this area could have been tripled and still not satisfied the demand. A complete machine shop was set up to rebuild loaned equipment and to maintain leased equipment used in the program. An example of the type of work done involved a motor grader which had been wrecked on a construction project and burned. The insurance company settled with the owner and put the wreck on the auction block. The original owner, Frank Pozar of Fresno Paving, purchased the machine back from the insurance company and sent it to Camp Roberts for rebuilding. All parts needed for this rebuilding operation were paid for by Mr. Pozar. This made an ideal training project for the machine had to be rebuilt from the ground up. It required 6 weeks' labor. When the motor grader was in operating condition it was donated, free of charge, to the training program for use in the field, for the remainder of the program. This was a situation which benefited an important contractor in the area as well as the operating engineers' program for a rebuilding operation of this sort would have been out of the question in view of current labor and parts costs. As a result of this mutual cooperation, the contractor received a useful piece of equipment at a nominal cost to himself and the engineers received valuable training not otherwise available.

Another important aspect of this phase of the training was that it allowed older men in the industry, who were becoming physically unable to keep up the pace on equipment, to learn another valuable skill within the industry in which to serve out the balance of their years. One man with a wooden leg has found new hope for employment as a result of this training.

SURVEYORS' PROGRAM

Here, again, 20 trainees were allocated for this phase of training and again the interest generated was more than could be satisfied in this program. The Army insisted that all work undertaken on the reservation be built to the specifications of the post engineers. It became the task of this training team to lay out the projects and do the survey work necessary before the equipment operators could move in.

In addition to the projects completed for the Army, outlined above, a six-lane freeway with divider strip was laid out by the surveyors, as well as a small housing tract. This tract included building plots on different elevations which included easements, sidewalks, curbs, and gutters, sewerlines, etc. Interest among the trainees seemed to be highest with this group. They were the first ones on the job in the morning and the last ones in from the field at night. After dinner, in the evening, night instruction began on a voluntary basis with both the instructor and the trainees. This became an every-night affair.

Here, too, older men expressed a high degree of interest. In any subsequent program, I feel this area of training should be expanded.

From the outset of the program, guests were a daily occurrence. People from all over the State came to see what was going on at Camp Roberts; Army personnel, State employment service representatives, youth consultants, correctional institutions' personnel, social welfare representatives, contractors.

In view of this interest, an open house was planned on March 13, 1964, for all interested parties. Hunter Wharton, IUOE president, was the special guest. The Marine Cooks & Stewards' trainees prepared a special luncheon a la a captain's banquet on board ship. No one could believe such a feast could come from an Army messhall. The menu included salads and appetizers of all varieties, standing prime sirloin, roast beef, shrimp Newburgh, and divers cold roast and game. For dessert there was cherries jubilee, rainbow parfait, and assorted petit fours and French pastries. The guest book reads like a who's who of the building and construction trades unions, Associated General Contractors, Engineering Grading Contractors Association, maritime, city, State, and Federal Government representatives, State legislators, and Army personnel.

On April 17, 1964, the program was completed. Barracks were closed, and the mess hall was deactivated. Colonel Settle assured the Department of Labor that the program would be welcomed next year, for all concerned were perfect guests. But should the program be continued? Were the results worth the investment? Many, many letters have poured in attesting to the value of this program, but what of the trainees?

For the Marine Cooks & Stewards program of 35, 33 trainees successfully completed and were issued seamen's papers. Within 6 weeks of completion, 32 trainees were employed on American-flag ships. One man was unfit for duty due to a broken leg. These were young men who, 12 weeks before, had never had an occupation, had little to look forward to, and possessed no skills. Now they were respectable members of an honorable industry paying their fair share to society. The cost? A little over $28,000, but a sum recovered within the first year through income taxes and savings from unemployment compensation. But how can you measure a man's life in dollars and cents? This training literally saved some lives by giving self-respect and a chance.

For the operating engineers reports from contractors who have hired the trainees indicate a high degree of satisfaction. Many show outstanding leadership ability and self-confidence with potential of becoming foremen. Last year these same men were discharged for inefficiency.

Two hundred and seventy men completed training from the program designed to accommodate 300. A survey of completing trainees conducted by the California Department of Employment indicated a large majority felt the training helped them in their jobs. But word of mouth from a trainee to his fellow workmen on the job is perhaps the best indicator of all. Engineer business agents report the degree of interest from members in a new program almost unbelievable. A new program proposal designed for 500 men is pending before the Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training. This will accommodate but a small percentage of those showing interest. Why? Because men in the field can see the difference, both in skill and pay, between those who took training and those who did not. The additional taxes paid on the higher wages earned by these trainees, the less unemployment benefits paid, the new apprentices brought into the engineers award winning program from the unemployed, and savings to the contractor will more than offset the small investment made by the Government. Indeed, the benefits which accrued to the Army at Camp Roberts more than paid for the program. Of a training budget of $240,000, the engineers economized and received donated equipment which resulted in nearly $20,000 being returned to the Government.

Can success be measured in interest? Inquiries have come into the Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training for assistance in many States. Using deactivated military bases for youth training centers no doubt was inspired in part from this program.

In January 1963 Secretary of Labor Wirtz told a small gathering of Labor Department officials in San Francisco, "I want new and novel approaches to training undertaken to combat unemployment." Mr. Al Clem of the Operating Engineers, Mr. Ed Turner of the Marine Cooks & Stewards, General Brown of the 6th Army, and Mr. Hugh Murphy of the Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training certainly took Secretary Wirtz at his word.

They should all feel justly proud of their outstanding staffs for making the Secretary's word a reality. For no training idea is newer and nothing more novel than seeing a building and construction trade union, contractor's associations, maritime union, shipowners, the Department of the Army and the Department of Labor joining forces for a common objective.

I commend all who participated, in this worthwhile effort at the local, State, and national levels. It is a sound guideline for the future.

Report to the Seventh District, Chicago, Ill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROLAND V. LIBONATI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, if any Congress is fairly entitled to claim a high place in the historical annals of lawmaking, in the total public interest—the 88th Congress certainly has written an enviable record in the fields of education, conservation, civil rights, and veterans' legislation.

For personal reasons necessitating my retirement, this is my last report to the residents of the seventh District, Chicago, Ill. It has been a privilege and an honor to serve as your Representative, in the Congress of the United States. I find it a most difficult task to prepare this final report, and bid you adieu as your public servant.

In completing my fourth term in the Congress, I am most appreciative of having had the opportunity, made possible through the efforts of the great political leaders and their organizations, comprising the most efficient and active precinct captains and workers in the Nation, to apprise the electorate of my sincerity and earnestness of purpose to serve in the public interest.

It has been a provocative and educational experience. I have enjoyed the pleasant association with all my colleagues, regardless of party, and resulted in developing friendships that I shall cherish all my life. Many of my colleagues took time on the floor of the House to compliment me on my work—as I stood listening in my favorite corner, called by our late and distinguished Speaker, the Honorable Sam Rayburn, the "Cherokee Strip," the splendid encomiums, garnished with adjectives in the superlative degree, commending me—I honestly wondered just who they were talking about. I must confess that, even though I did not deserve their high praises, it did tickle my vanity. I feel deeply grateful to each one, and thank each for this generous, proffered kindness to me.

Speaker McCormack is a master of logic in debate. He speaks convincingly and with a deep sense of sincerity, characteristic of his nature.

His religious convictions of propriety instill one with a feeling of complete trust in his positive statements. As Speaker, he seldom takes the floor, unless an important bill, sponsored by the administration, is in heated controversy. Then, as a seasoned legislator, he proceeds cautiously in the treatment of the subject matter, much like the old professor—modulating his voice, with the words flowing in slow cadence. Suddenly, as though the sharpness of his alert mind, accelerated by pregnant thought of the seriousness of the issue—the forensic ability of the eloquent orator sparks out the words of warning, with bitterness and scalding sarcasm.

And then, in sonorous tones, he extolls the purposes of the bill in the public interest and, later, with soft, mellifluous-tongued words, pleads for its enactment. He is truly the master of the spoken word.

I enjoyed his every confidence and I am indebted to him for his advice and support. You can be sure that no one leaves the gallery or the floor during his magnificent performances.

Both as majority leader and as Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCormack] has had a difficult chore. With the former Speaker, Sam Rayburn, at the helm, as a team the Democratic delegation splits on legislation were rare—except where local questions or States rights interfered with party solidarity. Yet, to the surprise of everyone—the new leadership, consisting of Speaker McCormack, Majority Leader Carl Albert, and the Whip, Hale Boggs, have directed, successfully, the administration-sponsored legislation, even though sectional division made the issue controversial.

The quality of successful leadership is best measured in the success of the program. The team worked wonders, although no one should minimize the tremendous influence of President Lyndon Johnson, whose record as majority leader under President Eisenhower endeared him to the powerful Republican leadership—resulting in bipartisan cooperation on many issues.

Majority Leader Carl Albert has functioned superbly as majority leader. His brilliant treatment of the subject matter under discussion was learned and analytical. It reflects the training he received as a Rhodes scholar. He is friendly, understanding and cooperative. Although quiet, cool, and deliberate, when aroused can be vituperous and deadly repartee. He is a fine, able leader, and has earned the respect, admiration and confidence of the Congress.

The whip, the gentleman from Louisiana the Honorable Hale Boggs, added stature to the strength of the leadership. He is clever in debate and realistic in presenting facts to support his reasonable contentions. His loyalty to the party is unquestioned. His agile mind and sterling presentation on controversial questions has turned the tide in favor of legislation that otherwise would have been defeated. He is a man of courage, and fearlessly debated on questions that were sensitive to the local opinion of his electorate, but he could disagree without being disagreeable.

The important work of the Congress is accomplished in the committee. If the committee fails to act, the legislation is doomed. On the other hand, if agreed to favorably by the majority of the committee and reported, the legislation very seldom fails to pass. Unless the committee reports it, passage becomes a myth.

I was fortunate in being assigned to two important committees of the Congress—Judiciary and Veterans' Affairs. The members who comprise these committees are specialists in their fields. These mental giants cannot be denied their importance in setting up policy, closely based on public interest.

There is one authority on veteran matters in the House of Representatives, Chairman Olin E. Teague, undoubtedly the recipient of the most praises when he pleases the wishes of service organizations, and the most abused when the administration rejects new proposals necessitating increased appropriations. He is an individual blessed with patience, cool reserve, and understanding. He has fought through the years valiantly with the administrations, the Bureau of the Budget, the Senate, and even members of his committee to push through legislation for the veterans in need of hospitalization, raise in pensions, expansion of facilities, housing and special legislation for the totally handicapped, widows and orphans, to say nothing of increased bed quotas, medical personnel increases, medical school proximity to Veterans' Administration facilities and out- and in-bed patient care—nursing homes.

As an honored veteran for distinguished service in World War II, he completely reflects a great service to the Nation and its veterans in the Halls of Congress. He carries the respect and admiration of everyone. I am greatly indebted to him and the members of the committee for selecting H.R. 1927, the Libonati bill amending title 38 of the United States Code, to revise the pension program for veterans of World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict, and their widows and children and for other purposes, enacted into Public Law 88-664. I shall miss the friendly faces and sincere interest and cooperation of my pals, the Honorables, "Fats" Everett, Dulski, Dorn, Haley, Baring, McDowell, Kornegay, Roberts, Secrest, Rooney of Pennsylvania, Marsh and Brown together with Ayres, Adair, Fino, Saylor, Teague of California, Halpern, Schadeberg, Ellsworth and my neighbor, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Bromwell].

The Committee on the Judiciary receives about three-fifths of the legislation introduced, especially in the area of claims against the Government at all levels of Government operation, including the military.

Chairman Manny Celler thrives on controversial measures. He is a man of total energy. No one realizes what a workhorse he is. It is impossible to measure the great vitality, both mentally and physically, of this legal genius. He handles his committee in classroom style. The great judgment that he is endowed with makes itself the dominant influence in committee recommendations. He is a tough opponent, and is immovable from his position once he makes up his mind. He also can outthink, talk, and confound the opposition. By nature and disposition, he is loyal to friends and considerate of foes. His advice is judicious, and his interest is genuine. He belongs to the team, and lives by the record. His cleverness is unmatched in legalistic thinking. Some of his provincial expressions are cryptic, yet devastating. He is one of the most studious and smartest legislators in Congress for decades. His word is good, and his utterings are honest and to the point. He can become as stubborn as a mule, and will equally kick back the opposition with hard blows. His name is carried on more legislation than anyone who ever served in the Congress of the United States. As a liberal, he is the spearhead of his people, and enjoys the admiration and respect of the Congress and the people of the Nation. He never hesitates to join in battle. He is a man of courage and will fight alone if necessary. His imagination is as broad as he is resourceful. He will help a foe in trouble, as well as a friend. He is one of the few men in Congress who has dedicated his full life to his work.

Hours of time spent in legislative pursuits are never counted by this great servant of the common people. He is dedicated to their interests, and seldom does a bill leave his committee recommended against his will or opposition. As a diplomat, he has no equal, and as a friend, no greater strength can benefit a man. His subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILLIS], the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FORRESTER], the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. ASHMORE], and the successor to the deceased, lamented, and distinguished patriot, Mr. Walter, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN], are respectful of his position, and cognizant of his power. He has at times used a sledge hammer instead of a gavel. Strong leadership requires, and expects, cooperation. All in all, this spirited human, a great storyteller, and chuck-full of anecdotes, loves the human family, and has served its interests throughout his long career.

I regret my departure and loss of association with my colleagues on this most important committee. I have learned to value their profound legalistic abilities in shaping legislation for the Nation.

I salute and embrace my friends and intimates of the Committee on the Judiciary, Messrs. CELLER (chairman), FEIGHAN, CHELF, WILLIS, RODINO, FORRESTER, ROGERS of Colorado, DONOHUE, BROOKS, TUCK, ASHMORE, DOWDY, WHITENER, TOLL, KASTENMEIER, GILBERT, CORMAN, ST. ONGE, SENNER, EDWARDS, MCCULLOCH, MILLER of New York, POFF, CRAMER, MOORE, MEADER, LINDSAY, CAHILL, SHRIVER, MACGREGOR, MATHIAS, BROMWELL, KING of New York, and MARTIN of California.

The analysis expertly prepared in the first session has received lukewarm public commendation on its record of accomplishments. Well meaning critics have commented on a flaw here and there—especially in certain important areas of inaction, and others in the committee stages of consideration—either shelved or delayed. Yet, in the main, what had been enacted was good and in the public interest. A number of proposals presented to the Congress were new in legal concept and required involved study; numerous hearings whereat hundreds of witnesses were heard, both pro and contrary to the proposals for legislative enactment. Several of such hearings started in the first session, were completed during the second session—1964—such as medicare, Youth Corps, tax reform, civil rights, and so forth, and received the attention of the Congress during the second session. The record of the 1st session of the 88th Congress follows.

First. Presidential recommendations: Congressional and Senate action in the 88th Congress to date.

Second. Appropriations for fiscal 1964 as of December 20, 1963:

Presidential Recommendations—Congressional and Senate Action in the 88th Congress to Date

With the new recommendations submitted by President Johnson, there have been a total of 129 legislative recommendations. There are 15 appropriations including the 2 supplementals for fiscal 1963. The combination makes a total of 144. There are three on which specific draft legislation has not been submitted: Narcotics control, user charges—fuel and air freight, and urban affairs department. Excluding these 3 we have a total of 141. Based on 141, the following figures apply:

		Percent
Action completed	63 or	44
Conference report filed	1 or	.70
Passed Senate	30 or	22
Total	94 or	66.70

Action Status of Presidential Recommendations (Legislative: 126*—Appropriations: 15)—Senate Democratic Policy Committee, 88th Congress, 1st Session

Recapitulation: Action completed (63), conference report filed (1), passed Senate (30), Senate Calendar (2), passed House (2), House Calendar (7), committee action (21) no action (14), rejected (1), no legislation (3).

ACTION COMPLETED (62)

1. AEC authorization, Public Law 88-72.

2. AEC supplemental authorization, Public Law 88-189.

Appropriations

3. Agriculture supplemental for 1963, Public Law 88-1.

4. Supplemental, 9163, Public Law 88-52.

Fiscal year 1964

5. Agriculture, Public Law 88- .

6. Defense, Public Law 88-149.

7. District of Columbia, Public Law 88- .

8. Foreign aid appropriations, Public Law 88- .

9. Independent offices, Public Law 88- .

10. Interior, Public Law 88-79.

11. Labor-HEW, Public Law 88-136.

12. Legislative, Public Law 88- .

13. Military construction, Public Law 88- .

14. Public works, Public Law 88- .

15. State, Justice, Commerce, judiciary, Public Law 88- .

16. Supplemental for HEW, Public Law 88- .

17. Treasury-Post Office, Public Law 88-39.

18. Civil Rights Commission extension, Public Law 88-152.

19. Clean Air Act, Public Law 88-206.

20. Corporate-excise tax extension, Public Law 88-52.

21. District of Columbia fiscal affairs, Public Law 88-104.

22. District of Columbia National Cultural Center, Public Law 88--100.

23. Disarmament Agency—increased authorization, Public Law 88-186.

24-25. Education: Exceptional children—teachers, Public Law 88-164; higher education, Public Law 88-204; Manpower Training Act Amendments, H.R. 8720, Public Law 88-214. Medical education, Public Law 88-129; vocation education—National Defense Education Act—impacted areas, Public Law 88-210.

29. Equal pay for women, Public Law 88-38.

30. Export-Import Bank extension, Public Law 88-101.

31. Feed grains, Public Law 88-26.

32. Foreign aid authorization, Public Law 88-205.

33. Foreign Service buildings, Public Law 88-94.

34. Housing for elderly—increased authorization, Public Law 88-158.

35. Kennedy 50-cent coin, H.R. 9413, Public Law 88-.

36. Mental health, Public Law 88-164.

37. Mental retardation—child health, Public Law 88-156.

38. Military construction authorization, Public Law 88-174.

39. Military pay, Public Law 88-132.

40. Military procurement authorization, Public Law 88-28.

41. Outdoor recreation, Public Law 88-29.

42. Peace Corps expansion, Public Law 88-200.

43-45. Public debt—increase celling; To August 30, 1963, Public Law 88-30; to November 30, 1963, Public Law 88-106; to June 29, 1964, Public Law 88-187.

46. Railroad labor dispute; Public Law 88-108.

47. Railroad retirement amendments; Public Law 88-133.

48. Reorganization plan I—Roosevelt Library; effective July 26.

49. Silver Policy Repeal; Public Law 88-36.

50. Space authorization; Public Law 88-113.

51. Tax on air passenger transportation—extend at 5 percent; Public Law 88-52.

CONFERENCE REPORT FILED (1)

1. Pacific Northwest Power, S. 1007.

PASSED SENATE (30)

1. Airport construction extension (August 26), House Calendar.

2. Area redevelopment (June 26), House Calendar; Rule hearing September 24.

3. Dairy program (October 10).

4. Equal time suspension; House Joint Resolution 247 (October 2).

5. International air rates, S. 1540 (November 26).

6. Juvenile Delinquency Act extension (September 25), House subcommittee approved October 8.

7. Land-use adjustments, S. 1588 (October 11).

8. Kennedy Art Center, Senate Joint Resolution 136 (December 18).

9. Library services and construction, S. 2267 (November 26).

10. Mass transit (April 4), House Calendar.

11-14. Migratory labor, four bills: S. 521, S. 523, S. 524, S. 525.

15. National Council on the Arts, S. 2379 (December 19).

16. National Defense Education Act, extend loan forgiveness provision, S. 569. (October 24.)

17. National Service Corps. (August 14), House Labor Subcommittee approved December 11.

18. President's Transition Act, passed Senate, amended October 17.

19. Public defenders (August 6) House Calendar.

20. River basin planning, (December 4).

21. SEC amendments (July 30). House hearings November 19–21, December 3–5.

22–24. Shorelines: Lake Mead—House Calendar, Canyonlands, Ozark national rivers.

25. Sleeping Bear Dunes, S. 792. (December 19.)

26. U.N. Participation Act amendments. (December 6.) House Calendar.

27. Water pollution control. (October 16.) House Public Works hearings, December 4–6, 10, 11.

28. Water resources research program (April 23). House Interstate Subcommittee approved December 5.

29. Wilderness. (April 9.)

30. Youth employment. (April 10) House Calendar—rule requested April 22.

SENATE CALENDAR (2)

1. Inter-American Development Bank, H.R. 7406; agreement to vote January 14, 1964.

2. International Development Association, S. 2214; agreement to vote January 14, 1964.

PASSED HOUSE (2)

1. Coffee agreement—implement (November 14) H.R. 8864.

2. Reorganization Act extension (amended) (June 4), Senate Government Operations Committee.

HOUSE CALENDAR (7)

1. Adult basic education, H.R. 5542.

2. Civil Rights Act of 1963, H.R. 7152.

3. Equal employment opportunity, H.R. 405. Senate Labor Committee, executive, December 12.

4. Interest equalization tax, H.R. 8000.

5. Land conservation fund, H.R. 3846.

6. Patent fee increase, H.R. 8190. Rule hearings, December 16.

7. Pay bill, H.R. 8986.

(See Passed Senate: Airport construction, rule hearings December 16; area redevelopment; Lake Mead; Library Services, rule hearings December 16; mass transit; migratory labor, contract registration; public defenders, rule hearings December 4; U.N. Participation Act; youth employment. House Calendar.)

COMMITTEE ACTION (21)

1. Airports—Dulles and National—management. House Interstate Committee executive consideration underway.

2. Bureaus of Community Health and Environmental Health in NIH—create. H.R. 2410: House Interstate Committee hearings April 23–26; May 14, 15; June 10.

3. Civil service retirement financing, S. 1562; Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee hearings concluded August 14.

4. Cotton subsidy. H.R. 6196: Passed House December 4; Senate Agriculture Committee hearings May 20, 27.

5. District of Columbia home rule. H.R. 5794; House District of Columbia Committee hearings November 18–20.

6–8. Education: Cooperative research. H.R. 8408; House Education Committee ordered reported August 27. Elementary and secondary school construction. H.R. 5344; House subcommittee hearings underway. Teacher quality, H.R. 6013; House subcommittee reported August 27.

9. Fallout shelters. H.R. 8200: Senate Armed Services Subcommittee hearings adjourned subject to call December 13.

10. Food stamp plan. S. 1387; Senate Agriculture Committee. H.R. 8107; House Agriculture Committee, executive October 30.

11. Foreign Affairs Academy. S. 865; Senate Foreign Relations Committee markup July 10. H.R. 3668: House Foreign Affairs Committee.

12. Housing for elderly—make single persons eligible for moderate income housing. S. 1170: Senate Banking Committee hearings October 2–4.

13. Medicare. S. 880: Senate Finance Committee. H.R. 3920: House Ways and Means Committee hearings November 18–22; suspended until next session.

14. Minimum wage coverage expansion. H.R. 5958, H.R. 6075; House Labor Subcommittee hearings underway.

15. National forest roads and trails. S. 1147: Senate Public Works Subcommittee concluded hearings July 31; executive August 15.

16. Presidential Commission on Automation. Senate Joint Resolution 105: Senate Labor Committee hearings suspended December 5.

17. Stockpile disposal. S. 2272: Hearings March 7, 1962, January 30, 1963, December 3, 4.

18. Tax reform cut. Passed House September 25. Hearings October 15 through December 10; executive started December 12.

19, 20. Transportation policy (two bills). S. 1061, S. 1062; Senate Commerce Committee hearings concluded October 24. H.R. 4700, H.R. 4701; House Interstate Committee executive October 15–17; November 12.

21. Watershed Act Amendments—multiple use. S. 566: Senate Agriculture Committee hearings June 3.

NO ACTION (14)

1. Air carriers—limit subsidy payments. S. 1884: Senate Commerce Committee.

2. Bank accounts—savings and loans—increase insurance coverage. S. 1799: Senate Banking Committee will wait for House. H.R. 7404: House Banking Committee.

3. Civil defense—foodstuffs stockpile. S. 1711: Senate Armed Services Committee. H.R. 5121: House Armed Services Committee.

4. Food and drug amendments. H.R. 6788: House Interstate Committee.

5. General university extension. H.R. 1779: House Education and Labor Committee.

6. Group practice facilities—mortgage insurance. S. 1426: Senate Labor Committee. H.R. 4534: House Interstate Committee.

7. Hill-Burton Act—extension and expansion. S. 894: Senate Labor Committee.

8. Immigration amendments. H.R. 7700: House Judiciary Committee. S. 1932: Senate Judiciary Committee.

9. Mental health—vocational rehabilitation. S. 968: Senate Labor Committee.

10. Political campaign tax incentives. H.R. 7308. House Ways and Means Committee.

11. Public welfare work-training. S. 1803: Senate Finance Committee. H.R. 7262: House Ways and Means Committee.

12, 13. Social security amendments. S. 1357, 1358: Senate Finance Committee. H.R. 5839, 5840: House Ways and Means Committee.

14. Unemployment compensation—permanent program. S. 1542: Senate Finance Committee. H.R. 6339: House Ways and Means Committee.

REJECTED (1)

1. District of Columbia rapid transit, December 9—recommitted.

NO LEGISLATION (3)[1]

1. Narcotics control. President reviewing Advisory Commission report.

2. User charges—fuels—air freight.

3. Urban Affairs Department.

Status of Appropriation Bills Fiscal Year 1964 and Supplementals for 1963 as of December 20, 1963

Enacted into law (14): Defense, District of Columbia, foreign aid, independent offices, Interior, Labor-HEW, legislative, military construction, public works, State-Justice-Commerce-judiciary, supplemental for HEW, Treasury-Post Office-Executive Office, Agriculture supplemental, 1963, supplemental, 1963.

In conference (1): Agriculture.

Subject Report of Presidential Recommendations (Legislative: 126[1]—Appropriations: 15) Senate Democratic Policy Committee

AGRICULTURE AND AGRICULTURE RESOURCES AND STATUS

1. Feed grains program (B, SPM January 31), Public Law 88–26.

2. Cotton program (B, SPM January 31), H.R. 6196, passed House December 4. Senate Agriculture Committee hearings, May 20–27.

3. Dairy program (B, SPM January 31), S. 1915, passed Senate October 10. Additional, House hearings, September 17, 18.

4. Expand food-stamp program (B, SPM January 31), S. 1387, Senate Agriculture Committee. H.R. 8107, House Agriculture Committee, executive, October 30.

5. Amend Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act to permit development of available sites for multipurpose use (SPM January 31), S. 566, Senate Agriculture Committee hearing, June 3.

6. Land-use adjustments—raise limitation (SPM January 31), S. 1588, passed Senate October 11. H.R. 6491, House Agriculture Committee hearings, June 24–27.

AREA REDEVELOPMENT

7. Area redevelopment—increase limitation (B), S. 1163, passed Senate June 26. House Calendar (rule hearing, September 24).

ATOMIC ENERGY

8. AEC authorization, 1964. (*) Public Law 88–72.

9. AEC supplemental authorization, 1964. (*) Public Law 88–189.

CIVIL RIGHTS (SPM FEBRUARY 28, JUNE 19)

10. Omnibus. S. 1731: Senate Judiciary hearings started July 16; recessed September 11, H.R. 7152: House Calendar (rule requested November 27). Discharge petition filed December 9. Rule hearings start January 9. S. 1732: Public accommodations—Senate Commerce ordered reported October 8. S. 1750: Omnibus minus public accommodations—Senate Judiciary hearings started July 16; recessed September 11.

11. One-year extension of Civil Rights Commission; Public Law 88–152.

12. Equal employment opportunity, S. 773, S. 1210, S. 1211; Senate Labor Subcommittee approved September 16; executive December 12. H.R. 405: House Calendar.

13. Public defenders, (SU), S. 1057: passed Senate August 6. H.R. 7457: House Calendar (rule December 4).

14. Immigration amendments. (B) S. 1932, Senate Judiciary Committee; H.R. 7700, House Judiciary Committee.

15. Equal pay for women. (*) Public Law 88–38.

16. Manpower Training Act amendments—postpone date of matching requirements and increase fiscal year 1964 authorization; illiterate training and age reduction, Public Law 88–214.

17. Public welfare work training, S. 1803, Senate Finance will wait for House. H.R. 7262, House Ways and Means Committee.

COMMERCE AND TRANSPORTATION

18. Strengthen National Transportation Policy, (B, SU, E) S. 1062, Senate Commerce hearings concluded October 24. H.R. 4701, House Interstate executive October 15–17, November 12.

---

[1] Not included in totals for Presidential recommendations.

[1] Excludes 3 which have not had specific proposals submitted.

19. Minimum rate transportation. (B, SU, E) S. 1061, Senate Commerce hearings concluded October 24. H.R. 4700. House Interstate executive October 15–17, November 12.

20. Urban mass transit ($500 million, 3-year program—$100 million first year) (B, E, SU), S. 6, passed Senate April 4; H.R. 3881, House Calendar (rule hearings concluded June 13).

21. Extend airport construction program (B), S. 1153, passed Senate August 26. House Calendar.

22. Consolidate management of Dulles and Washington National Airports (B), H.R. 826. House Interstate executive underway.

23. National forest roads and trails. (*) S. 1147, Senate Public Works Subcommittee markup August 15.

24. International air fares. (E/C) S. 1540, passed Senate November 26. H.R. 6400, House Interstate.

25. Limit right of certain air carriers to receive subsidy payments. (*) S. 1884, Senate Commerce.

DEFENSE

26. Fallout shelter program. (B), H.R. 8200, passed House September 17. Senate Armed Services special subcommittee hearings adjourned subject to call December 13.

27. Military pay increase—effective October 1, 1963 (B), Public Law 88–132.

28. Military procurement authorization. (*) Public Law 88–28.

29. Extend universal military training to July 1, 1967 (B), Public Law 88–2.

30. Authorize Secretary of Agriculture to provide essential foodstuffs for civil defense needs (B), S. 1711, Senate Armed Services; H.R. 5121, House Armed Services.

31. Stockpile disposal (B), S. 2272, Senate Armed Services hearings December 3, 4.

32. Military construction. (*) Public Law 88–174.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

33. Increase existing authorizations governing appropriations to District of Columbia; authorize Federal loans (B), Public Law 88–104.

34. Home rule, S. 1650, Senate District of Columbia Committee; H.R. 5794, House District of Columbia Committee hearings, November 18–20.

35. Rapid transit system for District of Columbia (SPM May 27), S. 1647, Senate District of Columbia Committee; H.R. 8929, House recommitted December 9—278 to 76.

36. National Cultural Center extension. Public Law 88–100.

37. Vocational education—amended to include National Defense Education Act and impacted areas extension, Public Law 88–210.

38. Higher education, Public Law 88–204.

39. National Defense Education Act—extend loan forgiveness, S. 569, passed Senate October 24.

40. Library services and construction, S. 2265, passed Senate November 26; H.R. 4879, House Calendar.

41. Exceptional children—teachers, Public Law 88–164.

42. Cooperative research, H.R. 8408, ordered reported August 27.

43. Adult education, H.R. 5542, House Calendar.

44. Teacher quality, H.R. 6013, House subcommittee reported August 27.

45. Elementary and secondary education, H.R. 5344, House subcommittee hearings underway.

46. General university extension, H.R. 1779, House Education and Labor Committee.

GENERAL GOVERNMENT

47. Improve financing of Civil Service retirement system (B), S. 1562, Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee concluded hearings August 14.

48. Kennedy Art Center (E/C) Senate Joint Resolution 136, passed Senate December 18.

49. Revise silver policy (E), Public Law 88–36.

50. Bank deposits—savings and loans, increase insurance coverage. (*) S. 1799, Senate Banking will wait for House; H.R. 7404, House Banking.

51. National Council on the Arts, S. 2379, passed Senate December 19.

52. Kennedy 50-cent piece, E/C December 10, H.R. 9413, Public Law 88– .

HEALTH

53. Hill-Burton Act—extension and expansion, S. 894, Senate Labor.

54. Medical school aid—doctors, dentists, nurses, Public Law 88–129.

55. Create new Bureaus of Community Health and Environmental Health, H.R. 2410. House Interstate Committee hearings, April 23–26; May 14, 15; June 10.

56. Group practice medical and dental facilities, S. 1426: Senate Labor. H.R. 4534; House Interstate.

57. Food and drug amendments—consumer protection, H.R. 6788; House Interstate Committee.

58. Air pollution control, Public Law 88–206.

59. Water pollution control, S. 649: Passed Senate October 16; H.R. 3166: House Public Works Committee hearings, December 4–6, 10, 11.

60. Narcotics control (B), Presidential reviewing Advisory Commission report; excluded from total since specific proposal has not been submitted.

HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

61. Urban Affairs Department, establish (B), excluded from total since specific proposal has not been submitted.

62. Increase present maximum authorizations for direct housing loans for elderly and moderate income families (B, SPM February 21); Public Law 88–158.

63. Amend 1961 Housing Act to make single elderly persons eligible for housing financed under section 221(d)(3) (SPM February 21); S. 1170; Senate Banking Committee hearings, October 2–4.

INTERNATIONAL

64. Enlarge resources of International Development Association (B), S. 2214: Senate Foreign Relations Committee hearings, November 15, December 4; Senate Calendar; H.R. 9022, House Banking and Currency Committee hearings, December 3.

65. Nuclear test ban treaty, ratified September 24.

66. Authorize U.S. Governor of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development to vote for an increase in the Bank's authorized capital stock (B), Public Law 88–178.

67. Authorize $50 million payment as U.S. share of Fund for Special Operations of Inter-American Development Bank (B), H.R. 7406, Senate Calendar.

68. Extend life of Export-Import Bank to June 30, 1968, to increase its resources (B), Public Law 88–101.

69. Foreign aid authorization for fiscal 1964, Public Law 88–205.

70. Foreign Service buildings program (B), Public Law 88–94.

71. Establish National Academy of Foreign Affairs (B), S. 865, Senate Foreign Relations markup July 10; H.R. 3668, House Foreign Affairs Committee.

72. Disarmament Agency authorization increase, Public Law 88–186.

73. Coffee Agreement, International (SPM–68), ratified May 21.

74. International Coffee Agreement—implement, H.R. 8864, passed House, November 14. S. Finance.

75. Amend U.N. Participation Act to give President wider discretion in assignments. (*) S. 949, passed Senate, December 6, H.R. 6283. House Calendar (in Rules).

76. Consular convention with Korea, ratified October 22.

77. Consular convention with Japan, ratified October 22.

78. Protocol to amend International Civil Aviation Convention, ratified October 22.

79. Extradition treaty with Sweden, ratified October 22.

80. Extradition treaty with Israel, ratified October 22.

81. Amend extradition treaty with Brazil, ratified October 22.

82. Chamizal Treaty, ratified December 17.

LABOR

83. Unemployment insurance, permanent program (B, E), S. 1542, S. Finance. H.R. 6339): House Ways and Means Committee.

84. Extend minimum wage coverage (E), H.R. 5958, 6075; House Education and Labor Subcommittee hearings started November 20.

85. Railroad retirement amendments (B), Public Law 88–133.

86. Migratory agricultural workers—fair labor standards. (*) S. 523, passed Senate June 11.

87. National Advisory Council on Migratory Workers. (*) S. 525, passed Senate June 10.

88. Registration of interstate farm labor contractors. (*) S. 524, passed Senate June 11. H.R. 6242, House Calendar (in Rules).

89. Educational opportunities—migratory farmworkers. (*) S. 521, passed Senate June 10.

90. Railroad labor dispute (SPM July 22), Public Law 88–108.

91. Presidential Commission on Automation. (*) Senate Joint Resolution 105, Senate Labor Committee hearings started November 15, adjourned subject to call December 5.

MENTAL HEALTH PROGRAM (SPM FEBRUARY 5)

92. Maternal and child health and mental retardation planning amendments of 1963, Public Law 88–156.

93. Mental health community centers and retardation, Public Law 88–164.

94. Expand Vocational Rehabilitation Act to include programs for mentally retarded, S. 968, Senate Labor Committee; H.R. 5194, House Education Committee.

NATURAL RESOURCES

95. Land conservation fund, including user fees (facilities and water transportation) (B), H.R. 3846, House Calendar; Senate Interior Committee hearings concluded March 8; executive, August 26.

96. Reserve necessary power supplies for Pacific Northwest (B), S. 1007, conference report filed.

97. Outdoor recreation. (B, SU), Public Law 88–29.

98. Water resources research program (B), S. 2, passed Senate April 23; House Interior Subcommittee approved December 5.

99. River basin planning (B), S. 1111, passed Senate December 4.

100. Wilderness bill (B), S. 4, passed Senate April 9, House Interior Committee.

SHORELINE AREAS (B)

101. Canyonlands, S. 27, passed Senate August 2.

102. Lake Meade National Recreational Area, Ariz., S. 653, passed Senate August 2; H.R. 4010, House Calendar.

103. Ozark National Rivers, S 16, passed Senate October 21, House Interior Committee, executive, December 4.

104. Sleeping Bear Dunes, S. 792; passed Senate December 19.

POLITICAL CAMPAIGNS

105. Political campaign tax incentives, H.R. 7308; House Ways and Means Committee.

106. Presidential Transition Act. (*) H.R. 4638; passed Senate, amended October 17.

107. Equal time suspension. (*) House Joint Resolution 247; passed Senate, amended October 2.

PUBLIC DEBT

108. Temporary $307 billion debt limit through June 30, 1963; $309 billion through August 30, 1963 (B), Public Law 88-30.

109. Temporary increase in debt limit to November 30, 1963 (E, B), Public Law 88-106.

110. Temporary $315 billion debt limit through June 29, 1964 (E, B), Public Law 88-187.

REORGANIZATION

111. Extend President's authority to transmit reorganization plans to Congress, (B) H.R. 3496: Passed Senate, amended June 4; Senate Government Operations Committee.

112. Reorganization plan I—Franklin D. Roosevelt Library (SPM May 27), plan effective July 26.

113. Amendments to SEC Act. (*) S. 1642: Passed Senate July 30. H.R. 6789: House Interstate Committee hearings, November 19-21, December 3-5.

SALARY ADJUSTMENT AND REFORM

114. Pay legislation (B. SPM April 29), H.R. 8986: House Calendar. Senate Committee hearings, September 4.

SENIOR CITIZENS (SPM FEBRUARY 21)

115. Medicare—effective January 1, 1965. Pay benefits for those not covered by social security from regular appropriations. S. 880: Senate Finance Committee. H.R. 3920: House Ways and Means Committee hearings, November 18-22. Suspended until next session.

116. Amend the Social Security Act to provide assistance in development of new or improved programs to help older persons through grants to the States for community planning and services for training, through research, development, or training project grants, through grants for construction or recreational activity centers, and through grants to stimulate employment opportunities. S. 1357: Senate Finance Committee. H.R. 5840: House Ways and Means Committee.

117. Improve public assistance provisions of Social Security Act relating to aged individuals. S. 1358: Senate Finance Committee, H.R. 5849: House Ways and Means Committee.

SPACE

118. NASA authorization for 1964. (*) Public Law 88-113.

TAXES

119. Tax cut and reform (B, SPM January 25), H.R. 8363: Passed House September 25; Senate Finance hearings October 15-December 10. Executives started December 12.

120. Temporary interest equalization tax (SPM July 18), H.R. 8000: House Calendar.

121. Extend excise taxes to July 1, 1964, and corporate rates to December 31, 1963 (B), Public Law 88-52.

USER CHARGES

122. Extend air passenger transportation at 5 percent, Public Law 88-52.

123. Effective January 1, 1964, enact user charges: (B) (a) 2 cents a gallon on all fuels used in commercial air transportation, including jet fuels; (b) 5 percent on air freight; (c) 3 cents a gallon on all fuels used in general aviation; (d) 2 cents a gallon on all fuels used in transportation on waterways. Excluded from total since specific legislation has not been submitted.

124. Increase patent fees (B), H.R. 8190: House Calendar.

VETERANS BENEFITS AND SERVICES

125. Increase benefits of children and dependent parents of veterans who died as a result of military service (B), Public Law 88-21.

YOUTH (SPM FEBRUARY 14)

126. Youth Employment Act, S. 1: Passed Senate April 10. H.R. 5131: House Calendar. (Rule requested April 22.)

127. Establish National Service Corps, S. 1321: Passed Senate August 14. H.R. 5625: House Labor Subcommittee. Approved December 11.

128. Peace Corps expansion ($180 million). Public Law 88-200.

129. Juvenile Delinquency Act extension, S. 1967; Passed Senate September 25; H.R. 5866: House Labor Subcommittee. Approved October 8.

(Symbols: SU, state of Union message; B. budget message; E, economic message; SPM, special message; (*) in accord with the President's program; P/S, passed Senate; P/H, passed House; E/C, Executive communication.)

STATUS OF APPROPRIATION BILLS, FISCAL YEAR 1964, AND SUPPLEMENTALS FOR 1963, AS OF DECEMBER 20, 1963

Enacted into law (15): Agriculture, Defense, District of Columbia, foreign aid, independent offices, Interior, Labor-HEW, Legislative, military construction, public works, State-Justice-Commerce-judiciary, supplemental HEW, Treasury-Post Office-Executive Office, Agriculture supplemental, 1963, and supplemental, 1963.

RECORD OF 88TH CONGRESS

This year Congress convened on January 9 and on January 14 the biennial struggle over rule 22, the cloture rule, kept the Senate occupied until February 7, thereby delaying committee assignments until February 14. In the meantime, on February 6, the House Ways and Means Committee opened hearings on the President's tax cut and reform proposal. After many months of hearings and 80 executive sessions, the House sent the bill to the Senate on September 25. Although hearings have been completed and executive consideration underway, it will possibly be late January before the Senate can complete action on the bill.

One of our earlier actions this year was to authorize President Kennedy to proclaim Sir Winston Churchill an honorary citizen of the United States. It was an unusual action to give tangible form to the high esteem in which the 88-year-old former Prime Minister of Britain, the son of an American mother, is held in this Nation.

Another of the early actions of 1963 was to give statutory authority to the Interior Department's Outdoor Recreation Bureau which had been established by Executive order in 1962 to formulate a nationwide outdoor recreation plan.

In order to obtain more effective Federal performance on scientific and technological programs, the Senate, on March 8, took positive action to establish a Commission on Science and Technology. By April 10 the Senate had sent to the House a bill establishing a Youth Conservation Corps and a Home Town Youth Corps in answer to the President's special message on February 14 in which he said:

"To the extent that the Nation is called upon to promote and protect the interests of our younger citizens, it is an investment certain to bring a high return, not only in basic human values but in social and economic terms."

Prior to action on the Youth Conservation Corps, the Senate, on April 4, passed the mass transit bill, authorizing $375 million in grants based on the concept of $2 in Federal grants for every $1 in local or other non-Federal funds, to establish a long-range program of assistance to urban areas in solving their mass transportation problems. In the President's letter of February 18 to Congress, he stated:

"Urban mass transportation is one of the most urgent problems facing the Nation and the Congress. * * * Nearly three-fourths of our citizens live in urban areas, which occupy only 2 percent of our land, and if mass transit is to survive and relieve the congestion of these cities, it needs Federal stimulation and assistance."

On April 9 the Senate passed a bill establishing a national wilderness preservation system, placing 8.2 million acres of national forest, already classified as wilderness, permanently in the wilderness system and an additional 57.2 million acres of public lands conditionally in the system.

By April 23 the Senate had acted on an administration bill guaranteeing electric consumers in the Pacific Northwest first call on hydroelectric energy generated at Federal plants in that region. On the same day the Senate completed action on another administration bill establishing water resources research centers at land-grant colleges and State universities to stimulate a national program of water research.

Since 1946 the Congress has had before it a recommendation to require equal pay for equal work, regardless, of sex. President Kennedy, in signing the bill into law on June 10, said:

"I am grateful to those Members who worked so diligently to guide the Equal Pay Act through the Congress. It is a first step. It affirms our determination that when women enter the labor force, they will find equality in their pay envelopes."

The Senate took rapid action on the President's request to ratify the International Coffee Agreement, making the United States a party to the agreement. This action was designed to stabilize coffee prices and insure exporting countries that their foreign exchange reserves would not be severely depleted by low coffee prices on the world market.

Early in the year, President Kennedy sent down his special message on "Mental Illness and Mental Retardation," calling for a bold new approach by Federal, State, and local governments to combat mental disability. The Senate, on May 27, approved part of this request by completing action on a bill expanding facilities for treatment of mental disabilities. The President in his message pointed out that there were currently 800,000 patients in mental institutions across the Nation, including 200,000 who are retarded; altogether, an estimated 5 or 6 million Americans are mentally retarded and need assistance. Facilities, in turn, are needed to provide this assistance.

Congress sent the late President a law responding to his request for amendments to the Social Security Act to provide additional Federal assistance to States and communities in preventing and combating mental retardation, by providing for both new grant programs and expansion of the existing maternal and child health and crippled children's programs. In this measure we also included a program for training teachers of exceptional children.

On June 10 of this year the late President sent down his omnibus civil rights message in which he said:

"I am proposing that the Congress stay in session this year until it has enacted—preferably as a single omnibus bill—the most responsible, reasonable, and urgently needed solutions to this problem, solutions which should be acceptable to all fairminded men."

The House Judiciary Committee reported its bill a few weeks ago, and it is now before the House Rules Committee—with a discharge petition filed on December 9. Although final action will not be taken on this measure until early next year, a 1-year extension to the Civil Rights Commission was voted together with additional funds to carry on this valuable work.

The Senate took final action on an administration request authorizing Federal judicial circuits to establish a public defender system at public expense, citing the 1963 Supreme Court ruling in *Gideon* v. *Wainwright* in which the Court stated:

"That Government hires lawyers to prosecute and defendants who have money hire lawyers to defend are the strongest indications of the widespread belief that lawyers in criminal courts are necessities, not luxuries."

The life of the Export-Import Bank was extended for 5 years, and its borrowing authority was increased to $8 billion. The limitation on outstanding loans, guarantees, and insurance was also increased to $9 billion, as well as an increase to $2 billion in the maximum amount allowable at any one time for insurance and guarantees.

After debate disclosed that during the past 10 years the U.S. fishing industry had dropped to fifth place in the total world catch and was currently facing a crisis, the Senate, this year, authorized a 5-year program of $28,250,000 in matching grants to the States to promote State commercial fishery research and development projects.

Congress succeeded in clearing a badly needed pay raise for the military, amounting to approximately $1.2 billion a year, effective on October 1, 1963, the first such raise for the military since 1958.

And on August 14 the Senate completed action on an administration bill establishing a domestic National Service Corps patterned after the Peace Corps and authorizing $15 million for the 2-year pilot program.

On July 22 President Kennedy sent to Congress a proposal that solutions to the 4-year-old work-rules dispute between railroad management and labor over the composition of traincrews be submitted to the ICC. On August 28, just 6 hours before a nationwide rail strike was to begin, President Kennedy signed into law a resolution creating an ad hoc seven-member arbitration board to resolve the two primary issues—manning the traincrews and firemen on diesel locomotives—thus averting a nationwide strike. This action marked the first time in peacetime labor relations that Congress imposed arbitration in a labor-management dispute.

In the area of education, it has been said that the 88th Congress has "the greatest record in the field of education in the history of this Nation." In response to the President's request he was sent, on September 12, the medical training aid bill authorizing a 3-year program of matching Federal grants for construction or rehabilitation of medical, dental, and related professional schools and a 6-year loan program for students of medicine, dentistry, and osteopathy. Similar legislation had been considered without success by every Congress since 1951. Two additional bills requested by the late President have been signed into law by President Johnson. One authorizes a 3-year $1.2 billion program of grants and loans for construction of college academic facilities at public and private higher education institutions. The other is a vocational education bill authorizing new matching grants to the States to expand vocational education programs while extending the National Defense Education Act and the impacted areas program. In addition, the Senate has completed action on a library services bill to increase Federal aid for expanding public library improvements to urban as well as rural areas and to authorize matching grants for construction of public library buildings. At the same time Congress has extended the provisions of title II of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 relating to cancellation of loans, to teachers in private nonprofit elementary and secondary schools and in institutions of higher education.

Finally, there has been enacted a Clean Air Act authorizing $95 million over a 4-year period to provide a greatly expanded national effort to control air pollution through research, the establishment of pollution and control agencies, and legal action to halt existing causes of pollution.

With action hoped for next year on the tax cut proposal, the civil rights program, and aid for the aged in ill health, the most far-reaching impetus in many decades toward social and economic improvement within the Nation and toward a more stable peace in the world, will have received a sound legislative base. In cooperation with President Johnson, the Congress will strive to complete this base as a lasting testament to the life and work of John Fitzgerald Kennedy, 35th President in the service of the people of the United States.

Below is a detailed description of our 3-year review highlights, which includes Presidential recommendations and measures initiated by the Congress.

YEAR 1963

Feed grains: Extends through 1964 and 1965 crop years the feed grains program in effect in 1962 and 1963, providing price supports for producers who make voluntary acreage reduction. Public Law 88–26.

Dairy program: Clarifies Secretary of Agriculture's authority to provide for allotments under milk marketing orders so that producers will receive a higher return on milk covered by allotments and a lower return for milk in excess of allotments, instead of a uniform blend price. (S. 1915, passed Senate October 10.)

Mexican farm labor: Extends the Mexican farm labor program to December 31, 1964; Public Law 88–203.

Federal crop insurance coverage: Expands the Federal crop insurance to permit it to be offered in 150 additional counties. (S. 277, passed Senate August 28.)

Agricultural development in Alaska: Authorizes a $1,250,000 Alaskan farmland development program to aid in clearing, draining, shaping, and conditioning land for crop production and pastures. Limits maximum payments to $125,000 for any one year. (S. 623, passed Senate June 25.)

Tobacco allotment leasing authority: Extends for an additional 2 years the authority to transfer, by lease, tobacco acreage allotments from one farm to another within the same county for a more economical operation; Public Law 88–68.

Misuse of relief feeds: Establishes civil and criminal penalties for misuse of feed made available for relieving distress or to preserve and maintain foundation herds. (S. 400, passed Senate June 25.)

Producer livestock programs: Permits voluntary programs for promotion, research, and education relating to livestock. Public Law 88–61.

Agricultural experiment stations: Authorizes Federal assistance to States, on a matching basis, to help finance additional research facilities at State agricultural experiment stations; Public Law 88–74.

Rice acreage allotments: Permits a rice producer permanently withdrawing from rice production to transfer his history for allotment purposes without transferring his land (as required by existing law). S. 1604, passed Senate July 22, H.R. 3742, House Calendar.)

Rice acreage: Validates all 1956–62 crop rice acreage allotments properly apportioned on the basis of producer history and allocates to the farm by the county committee in good faith; applies only in States where rice allotments are made on the basis of the producer's history of rice production; Public Law 88–160.

Conservation reserve—Land-use adjustments: Increases the limit on annual payments under the land-use adjustment program from $10 to $20 million; and authorizes extension of conservation reserve contracts (soil bank) through 1965 which expire in 1963 and 1964. (S. 1588, passed Senate October 11.)

Youth employment: Authorizes a 5-year program to employ and train jobless youngsters between the ages of 16 and 22 in a youth conservation corps and a hometown service corps. (S. 1, passed Senate April 10; H.R. 5131, House Calendar.)

Manpower Training Act amendments: Waives the State matching requirement for fiscal 1965 and extends the act for 2 additional years with the requirement that States match one-third and one-half, respectively, in fiscal years 1966 and 1967; authorizes training in education at the basic level for those unable to qualify for occupational training provided evidence exists of intention to undertake training and for this group an additional 20 weeks of training allowances are authorized; provides for the expansion of the program by lowering the age limit for youth training allowances from 19 to 17, subject to a restriction of a 1-year waiting period for school dropouts, by increasing the proportion of youth receiving training allowances to 25 percent of those receiving allowances and restricts the allowances to those in special youth training projects; and authorizes $50 million in new funds for fiscal 1964 and $100 million for fiscal 1965; Public Law 88–214.

District of Columbia fiscal affairs: Authorizes a permanent annual Federal payment to the District of Columbia of $50 million. Increases the borrowing authority from a flat $75 to $175 million; Public Law 88–104.

Area redevelopment amendment: Authorizes an additional $455 million in Federal funds for loans in urban and rural areas and public facility grants. (S. 1163, passed Senate June 26; House Calendar.)

Public works planning: Authorizes an additional $10 million for Housing and Home Finance Agency's program of advances for public works planning. (S.J. Res. 129; passed Senate November 19.)

Public debt ceiling: Places a ceiling of $307 billion for the remainder of fiscal 1963 and $309 billion through August 31, 1963; Public Law 88–30.

Public debt ceiling: Extends the temporary debt limitation of $309 billion to November 30, 1963; Public Law 88–106.

Public debt ceiling: Raises the ceiling to $315 billion to June 29, 1964; Public Law 88–187.

Duty-free allowance: Extends for 2 years, to June 30, 1965, the $100 exemption from import duties allowed on foreign goods brought back from outside the United States, but continues the $200 exemption for the Virgin Islands until April 1, 1964, when it will drop to $100; Public Law 88–53.

Tax-rate extension: Continues for 1 year, to July 1, 1964, present corporate tax rate of 52 percent and the present rates of excise tax on distilled spirits, beer, wine, cigarettes, passenger cars, automobile parts and accessories, general telephone service, and transportation of persons by air; Public Law 88–52.

Unemployment tax rates: Eases Federal unemployment insurance taxes established to repay the Government for extra compensation payments made to unemployed workers between 1957 and 1960; Public Law 88–174.

Accrued vacation pay—deductible: Extends to January 1, 1965, period during which accrued vacation pay may be deducted as a business expense for income tax purposes even though liability to a specific individual has not been established; Public Law 81–153.

Unemployment tax: Reduces the 1963 tax for unemployment compensation and readjusts allotments to States for administrative expenses; Public Law 88–31.

Taxes: Permits deduction for child care by a wife who has been deserted by her husband; Public Law 88–4.

Ground rent: Provides a deduction from income taxes for payment of redeemable ground rent; Public Law 88-9.

Supreme Court Justice widows—annuities: Increases the annuities of widows of Supreme Court Justices from $5,000 to $10,000 a year, payable monthly. (S. 1686, passed Senate November 5.)

Mortgage insurance authority: Extends for 2 years, to June 30, 1965, authority of FHA to insure mortgages for sale and rental housing for low- and moderate-income groups; Public Law 88-54.

Housing for elderly: Authorize an additional $50 million for loans to nonprofit corporations and consumer cooperatives to provide housing for the elderly designed to meet their special needs; Public Law 88-158.

Silver purchase: Withdraws silver backing of paper currency, averts shortage of silver for coinage by repealing the tax on silver transfers and other obsolete sections of Silver Purchase Act of 1934; Public Law 88-36.

Cadmium: Authorizes disposal of 2 million pounds of surplus cadmium from the national stockpile valued at about $4 million; Public Law 88-8.

Corkboard insulation: Authorizes a temporary (3-year) suspension of import duty on corkboard insulation; Public Law 88-32.

Chicory—Duty free: Extends to June 30, 1966, existing suspension of duty on crude chicory except endive, and continues for the same period the statutory rate of duty of 2 cents a pound for chicory, ground or otherwise prepared; Public Law 88-49.

Metal scrap—Duty suspension: Extends to June 30, 1964, suspension of duties on metal scrap; Public Law 88-50.

Heptanoic acid: Continues for 3 years the existing suspension of import duty on heptanoic acid; Public Law 88-93.

Tanning extracts: Extends for 3 years the period during which tanning extracts may be imported free of duty; Public Law 88-92.

Tampico fiber: Continues to September 5, 1966, the existing suspension of duty on dressed or manufactured istle or Tampico fiber; Public Law 88-90.

Attorneys' fees—Bankruptcy: Permits courts, on their own motion, to examine into the reasonableness of attorneys' fees in bankruptcy proceedings; Public Law 88-17.

Bankrupt funds: Permits the deposit of funds of bankrupts' estates in interest-bearing accounts; Public Law 88-16.

Small Business Act amendments: Increases by $34.3 million SBA's revolving fund bringing the total authorization for the fund to $1,700,300,000 and broadened the causal basis of SBA's authority to make loans from its disaster fund to cover all natural disasters. (S. 1309, passed Senate November 21.)

Small business investment amendment: Liberalizes investment provisions of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 and encourages increased capitalization of SBIC's by raising the amount of capital that SBA may invest in an SBIC, on a matching basis, from $400,000 to $700,000. (S. 298, passed Senate November 21.)

Some may be critical of the 88th Congress as a body that swallowed, and sometimes swallowed hard in spots, to complete digestion in legislative action for the administration's agenda of must legislation. Although the campaign season grew late, the leadership kept the membership in constant turmoil, firing the boilers of debate to procure final action on important measures.

Despite the rather inauspicious start of the 1st session of the 88th Congress, the 2d session will be remembered for its proud record of achievement. It showed a fondness for the preservation and expansion of wilderness areas, the test ban treaty for peace, the civil rights law for the elimination of second class citizenship, the $11.5 billion tax cut for rich and poor alike, the antipoverty program for the dream of a new chance for a new life, a sheaf of bills to further the educational programs of our Nation, the readjustment of veterans' pensions, together with their widows and orphans, and many other important measures.

It was said that President Lyndon Johnson's appeal for votes was answered through the action of the Congress in supplementing successfully his program. The Members of the Congress in bipartisan effort, established a progressive partnership with the electorate at home. It has reestablished a public confidence in the Congress of the United States. President Lyndon Johnson had much to do with the successful accomplishments of its great record in behalf of the public interest.

My voting record in the 2d session of the 88th Congress, together with the statements and comments on the floor of the House during the consideration of the legislation and passage, are herein reported as follows:

Voting record of Representative R*OLAND* V. L*IBONATI*, *7th District of Illinois*

No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
	1964		
1	Jan. 7	Quorum call	Present.
2	Jan. 8	Quorum call	Present.
3	Jan. 8	Quorum call	Present.
4	Jan. 14	Quorum call	Absent.
5	Jan. 14	S. 1153: To recommit to committee the bill to amend the Federal Airport Act in order to reduce the authorization of funds by $15,000,000 a year for each of 3 years. (Defeated 110 to 201.)	Not voting.
6	Jan. 14	S. 1153: On final passage of the act to amend the Federal Airport Act. (Passed 298 to 11.)	Not voting.
7	Jan. 15	Quorum call	Present.
8	Jan. 20	Quorum call	Present.
9	Jan. 21	Quorum call	Present.
10	Jan. 21	Quorum call	Present.
11	Jan. 21	H.R. 4879 (S. 2265): To amend the Library Services Act to eliminate the library construction program, to confine Federal aid to rural areas, and to make more money available for rural libraries. (Defeated 179 to 183.)	No.
12	Jan. 21	H.R. 4879 (S. 2265): To recommit the Library Services Act to committee in order to eliminate the library construction provision from the bill. (Defeated 174 to 188.)	No.
13	Jan. 21	H.R. 4879 (S. 2265): On final passage of the Library Services Act extending Federal aid to urban as well as rural areas and increasing the authorization for 1964 from $7,500,000 to $45,000,000. (Passed 254 to 107.)	Yes.
14	Jan. 22	Quorum call	Present.
15	Jan. 22	Quorum call	Present.
16	Jan. 28	Quorum call	Present.
17	Jan. 28	H. Res. 582: On a motion to order the previous question on the resolution to take up H.R. 6041, amendments to the Davis-Bacon Act, in order to provide for consideration of an amendment permitting judicial review of decisions by the Secretary of Labor. (Passed 297 to 105.)	Yes.
18	Jan. 28	Quorum call	Present.
19	Jan. 28	H.R. 6041: On passage of the bill to amend the Davis-Bacon Act to include fringe benefits in prevailing wage determinations. (Passed 357 to 50.)	Present.
20	Jan. 31	Quorum call	Present.
21	Jan. 31	Quorum call	Present.
22	Feb. 1	Quorum call	Present.
23	Feb. 1	Quorum call	Present.
24	Feb. 3	Quorum call	Present.
25	Feb. 4	Quorum call	Present.
26	Feb. 5	Quorum call	Present.
27	Feb. 6	Quorum call	Present.
28	Feb. 7	Quorum call	Present.
29	Feb. 8	Quorum call	Present.
30	Feb. 8	On a motion to adjourn at about 10 p.m. during consideration of the civil rights bill. (Passed 220 to 175.)	Yes.
31	Feb. 10	Quorum call	Presen
32	Feb. 10	H.R. 7152: On final passage of the civil rights bill. (Passed 290 to 130.)	Yes.
33	Feb. 17	Quorum call	Presen
34	Feb. 18	Quorum call	Presen
35	Feb. 18	H.R. 7381: To recommit to Committee on Post Office and Civil Service the Dual Compensation Act relative to the employment of civilians in more than 1 position and the civilian employment of retired members of the Armed Forces. (Defeated 83 to 262.)	No.
36	Feb. 19	Quorum call	Presen
37	Feb. 19	Quorum call	Presen
38	Feb. 20	Quorum call	Presen
39	Feb. 20	H.R. 9637: To authorize an appropriation of $16,900,000,000 for the procurement of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels. (Passed 336 to 0.)	Yes.
40	Feb. 24	Quorum call	Present
41	Feb. 25	Quorum call	Present
42	Feb. 25	Quorum call	Present
43	Feb. 25	H.R. 8363: To adopt the conference report on the Revenue Act of 1964. (Passed 326 to 83.)	Yes.
44	Feb. 25	Quorum call	Present
45	Feb. 26	Quorum call	Present
46	Feb. 26	Quorum call	Present.

Voting record of Representative Roland V. Libonati, *7th District of Illinois*—Continued

No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
	1964		
47	Feb. 26	Quorum call	Present.
48	Feb. 26	H.R. 9022: To recommit to committee the bill to amend the International Development Association Act to authorize the United States to participate in an increase in the resources of the International Development Association. (Passed 208 to 188.)	No.
49	Feb. 27	Quorum call	Present.
50	Feb. 27	Quorum call	Present.
51	Feb. 27	H.R. 8316: To amend the Communications Act of 1934 to prohibit the FCC from making rules relative to the length and frequency of radio and TV commercials. (Passed 317 to 43.)	Yes.
52	Mar. 3	Quorum call	Present.
53	Mar. 3	Quorum call	Present.
54	Mar. 4	Quorum call	Present.
55	Mar. 4	Quorum call	Present.
56	Mar. 4	H.R. 9666: To recommit to committee the Peace Corps authorization bill in order to reduce the authorized funds for 1965 from $115 to $95,900,000. (Defeated 90 to 309.)	No.
57	Mar. 5	Quorum call	Present.
58	Mar. 5	Quorum call	Present.
59	Mar. 5	H.R. 8000: To impose a tax on acquisitions of certain foreign securities as a means of alleviating the balance-of-payments problem. (Passed 238 to 142.)	Yes.
60	Mar. 9	Quorum call	Present.
61	Mar. 10	Quorum call	Present.
62	Mar. 10	Quorum call	Present.
63	Mar. 10	H.R. 8070: To establish a Public Land Law Review Commission to study laws and procedures relating to the administration of the public lands of the United States. (Passed 339 to 29.)	Yes.
64	Mar. 11	Quorum call	Present.
65	Mar. 11	H.R. 650: To adopt the resolution calling for consideration of H.R. 8986, the bill to increase salaries of Federal employees and officials, including Members of Congress. (Passed 251 to 147.)	Yes.
66	Mar. 12	Quorum call	Present.
67	Mar. 12	H.R. 8986: To increase salaries of postal and Federal employees and certain officers of the Federal Government including Members of Congress. (Defeated 184 to 222.)	Yes.
68	Mar. 16	Quorum call	Present.
69	Mar. 17	Quorum call	Present.
70	Mar. 17	Quorum call	Present.
71	Mar. 18	Quorum call	Present.
72	Mar. 18	Quorum call	Present.
73	Mar. 18	Quorum call	Present.
74	Mar. 19	Quorum call	Present.
75	Mar. 19	Quorum call	Present.
76	Mar. 19	H.R. 556: To adopt an open rule providing for 2 hours debate and waiving points of order against H.R. 5838, a bill relative to the Organic Act of the National Bureau of Standards. (Passed 264 to 99.)	Yes.
77	Mar. 19	Quorum call	Present.
78	Mar. 23	Quorum call	Present.
79	Mar. 23	Quorum call	Present.
80	Mar. 23	H.R. 5838: To recommit to committee the bill relative to the Organic Act of the National Bureau of Standards in order to amend it to require that no transfer of funds in excess of $250,000 shall be made without submission of the proposed transfer to the Appropriation Committees of the House and Senate and if no adverse action is taken by either committee within 30 days the transfer is approved. (Defeated 151 to 172.)	No.
81	Mar. 23	H.R. 5838: To approve the bill amending the Organic Act of the National Bureau of Standards. (Passed 164 to 162.)	Yes.
82	Mar. 24	Quorum call	Present.
83	Mar. 24	Quorum call	Present.
84	Mar. 24	Quorum call	Present.
85	Mar. 24	H.R. 10532: On a motion to add $10,000,000 to this appropriation bill to provide additional funds for construction and repair of Coast Guard vessels, etc. (Defeated 160 to 193.)	Yes.
86	Mar. 24	H.R. 10532: On final passage of the $6,200,000,000 appropriation bill for the Treasury and Post Office Departments and the Executive Office of the President and certain independent agencies. (Passed 326 to 20.)	Yes.
87	Mar. 25	Quorum call	Present.
88	Mar. 25	H.R. 660: On adoption of an open rule for the consideration of H.R. 10456, the NASA authorization bill, totaling $5,100,000,000. (Passed 357 to 0.)	Yes.
89	Mar. 25	H.R. 10456: On final passage of the $5,100,000,000 NASA authorization bill. (Passed 253 to 73.)	Yes.
90	Apr. 6	Quorum call	Absent.
91	Apr. 6	S. 1828: To amend the joint resolution establishing the Battle of Lake Erie Sesquicentennial Celebration Commission in order to authorize the appropriation of not more than $13,553.23 for use of the Commission. (Passed 233 to 39.)	Not voting.
92	Apr. 7	Quorum call	Present.
93	Apr. 7	Quorum call	Present.
94	Apr. 7	Quorum call	Present.
95	Apr. 8	Quorum call	Present.
96	Apr. 8	Quorum call	Present.
97	Apr. 8	On a motion that the House adjourn (the time being about 9:20 p.m.) (Defeated 173 to 239.)	No.
98	Apr. 8	H.R. 10222: On a motion to recommit to the Committee on Agriculture the Food Stamp Act in order to add a provision requiring the States to finance 50 percent of the cost of the free stamps issued under the act. (Defeated 195 to 223.)	No.
99	Apr. 8	H.R. 10222: On final passage of the Food Stamp Act. (Passed 229 to 189.)	Yes.
100	Apr. 8	H.R. 665: To agree to the Senate amendment (wheat provisions) to H.R. 6196, the cotton bill previously passed by the House. (Passed 211 to 203.)	Yes.
101	Apr. 9	Quorum call	Present.
102	Apr. 9	On a motion to dispense with further proceedings under quorum call No. 101. (Passed 222 to 132.)	Yes.
103	Apr. 9	Quorum call	Present.
104	Apr. 9	On a motion to dispense with further proceedings under quorum call No. 103. (Passed 232 to 122.)	Yes.
105	Apr. 9	Quorum call	Present.
106	Apr. 9	Quorum call	Present.
107	Apr. 10	Quorum call	Present.
108	Apr. 10	Quorum call	Present.
109	Apr. 10	H.R. 10723: To recommit to committee the legislative appropriation bill in order to require the records of expenditure by congressional committees and the Architect of the Capitol to be available for public inspection. (Passed 188 to 131.)	No.
110	Apr. 14	Quorum call	Present.
111	Apr. 14	H.R. 10809: On approval of the 1965 appropriation bill in the amount of $6,900,000,000 for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies. (Passed 344 to 21.)	Yes.
112	Apr. 15	Quorum call	Present.
113	Apr. 15	Quorum call	Present.
114	Apr. 15	S. 2394: To authorize an appropriation of $44,900,000 to carry out the provisions of the convention on the Chamizal made with Mexico relative to exchange of land at El Paso, Tex. (Passed 347 to 5.)	Yes.
115	Apr. 21	Quorum call	Present.
116	Apr. 21	Quorum call	Present.
117	Apr. 22	Quorum call	Present.
118	Apr. 22	H.R. 10939: To approve the $46,700,000,000 appropriation bill for the Department of Defense. (Passed 365 to 0.)	Yes.
119	Apr. 29	Quorum call	Present.
120	May 6	Quorum call	Absent.
121	May 6	H.R. 11134: To approve the appropriation bill for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies in the amount of $1,700,000,000. (Passed 312 to 40.)	Not voting.
122	May 7	Quorum call	Present.
123	May 7	H.R. 10945: To adopt the bill authorizing appropriation of $2,600,000,000 for the Atomic Energy Commission. (Passed 340 to 3.)	Yes.
124	May 11	Quorum call	Present.
125	May 13	Quorum call	Present.
126	May 13	S. 2214: To recommit to committee the bill to provide additional funds for the International Development Association, an affiliate of the World Bank. (Defeated 132 to 247.)	No.
127	May 18	H.J. Res. 1020: To authorize the expression of appreciation and the issuance of a gold medal to Henry J. Kaiser. (Defeated 150 to 143; a ⅔ vote being necessary under "suspension of the rules" procedure.)	Yes.
128	May 19	Quorum call	Present.
129	May 20	Quorum call	Present.

Voting record of Representative ROLAND *V.* LIBONATI, *7th District of Illinois*—Continued

No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
130	*1964* May 20	H.R. 11202: To add $1,600,000 to the appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture for the construction of a national peanut research facility at Dawson, Ga. (Defeated 181 to 198.)	Yes.
131	May 20	H.R. 11202: To recommit to committee the agricultural appropriation bill in order to provide an amendment prohibiting export payments or export subsidies on any agricultural commodities sold to a Communist country. (Defeated 186 to 187.)	No.
132	May 20	H.R. 11202: On final passage of the $5,100,000,000 appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture. (Passed 311 to 64.)	Yes.
133	May 20	Quorum call	Present.
134	May 21	Quorum call	Present.
135	May 26	Quorum call	Present.
136	May 26	H.R. 11369: To approve the military construction appropriation bill in the amount of $1,590,000,000. (Passed 340 to 5.)	Yes.
137	May 27	Quorum call	Present.
138	May 27	H. Res. 724: To adopt the rule for consideration of H.R. 5130, a bill to increase the insurance on deposits in banks and savings and loan associations. (Passed 218 to 115.)	Yes.
139	May 27	H.R. 5130: To recommit to the Committee on Banking and Currency the bill to increase from $10,000 to $20,000 the insurance coverage on banks and savings and loan associations. (Passed 197 to 142.)	No.
140	June 3	Quorum call	Absent.
141	June 3	H.R. 10503: To pass the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1964 authorizing appropriations for fiscal years 1966 and 1967 for construction of certain highways. (Passed 294 to 0.)	Yes.
142	June 3	Quorum call	Present.
143	June 3	On a motion to adjourn the House. (Defeated 10 to 289.)	No.
144	June 3	Quorum call	Present.
145	June 3	On a motion to adjourn the House. (Defeated 16 to 271.)	No.
146	June 4	Quorum call	Present.
147	June 4	Quorum call	Present.
148	June 9	Quorum call	Present.
149	June 9	Quorum call	Present.
150	June 9	Quorum call	Present.
151	June 10	Quorum call	Present.
152	June 10	H.R. 11380: To recommit to committee the foreign aid authorization in order to reduce the amount for the Development Loan Fund by $172.200 000 and the contingency fund by $50,000,000. (Defeated 193 to 211.)	No.
153	June 10	H.R. 11380: On final passage of the bill authorizing new appropriations in the amount of $2,040,000,000 for foreign aid. (Passed 230 to 175.)	Yes.
154	June 11	Quorum call	Present.
155	June 11	H.R. 11049: To approve the bill increasing salaries of Federal employees, administrative and judicial officers, and Members of Congress. (Passed 243 to 157.)	Yes.
156	June 16	Quorum call	Present.
157	June 16	H.R. 11579: To approve the public works appropriation bill in the amount of $4,300,000,000. (Passed 360 to 11.)	Yes.
158	June 17	Quorum call	Present.
159	June 17	Quorum call	Present.
160	June 17	H.R. 11376: To recommit to committee the bill extending certain excise taxes for 1 year in order to reduce from 10 percent to 5 percent for 1 year and then to eliminate the retailer's excise tax on jewelry, furs, toilet preparations, luggage, and handbags. (Defeated 185 to 207.)	No.
161	June 18	Quorum call	Present.
162	June 18	H.R. 11375: To increase the public debt to $324,000,000,000 until June 30, 1965. (Passed 203 to 182.)	Yes.
163	June 22	Quorum call	Present.
164	June 23	Quorum call	Present.
165	June 24	Quorum call	Present.
166	June 24	Quorum call	Present.
167	June 25	Quorum call	Present.
168	June 25	H.R. 3381: To amend the Mass Transportation Act relative to its provisions concerning labor-management. (Passed 233 to 171.)	Yes.
169	June 25	H.R. 3381: To recommit to committee the Mass Transportation Act in order to defer action pending the evaluation of certain engineering studies. (Defeated 190 to 215.)	No.
170	June 25	H.R. 3381: In final passage of the Mass Transportation Act with an initial authorization of $375,000,000. (Passed 212 to 189.)	Yes.
171	June 30	Quorum call	Present.
172	June 30	Quorum call	Present.
173	June 30	H. Res. 793: To adopt the rule waiving all points of order against H.R. 11812, the foreign aid appropriation bill, and providing 6 hours of debate on the legislation. (Passed 222 to 162.)	Yes.
174	June 30	Quorum call	Present.
175	July 1	Quorum call	Present.
176	July 1	H.R. 11812: To recommit to committee the foreign operations appropriations bill in order to reduce the funds for economic assistance by $247,800,000. (Defeated 198 to 208.)	No.
177	July 1	H.R. 11812: On final passage of the foreign operations appropriations bill in the amount of $3,700,000,000. (Passed 231 to 174.)	Yes.
178	July 2	Quorum call	Present.
179	July 2	H. Res. 789: To approve H.R. 7152, the civil rights bill as passed by the Senate. (Passed 289 to 126.)	Yes.
180	July 2	Quorum call	Present.
181	July 2	H. Res. 795: To approve the appointment of a special committee of the House to investigate campaign expenditures of candidates for election to the House. (Passed 264 to 92.)	Yes.
182	July 2	S. 2: To approve the conference report on the bill to establish water resources research centers and to promote water research. (Passed 347 to 0.)	Yes.
183	July 21	Quorum call	Present.
184	July 21	H.R. 319: To protect postal patrons from morally offensive mail matter. (Passed 325 to 19.)	Yes.
185	July 21	H.R. 11611: To establish a National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress. (Passed 260 to 76.)	Yes.
186	July 22	Quorum call	Present.
187	Julh 22	H. Res. 738: To adopt rule providing for 4 hours of debate on H.R. 3846, the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act. (Passed 338 to 8.)	Yes.
188	July 23	Quorum call	Present.
189	July 28	Quorum call	Present.
190	July 28	H.R. 3873 (S. 978): To permit certain owners of fishing boats to receive medical care and hospitalization without charge at hospitals of the Public Health Service. (Passed 202 to 170.)	Yes.
191	July 29	Quorum call	Present.
192	July 29	H. Res. 802: To adopt closed rule with 5 hours of debate on Social Security Amendments of 1964. (Passed 350 to 29.)	Yes.
193	July 29	H.R. 11865: To increase benefits under the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system, improve actuarial status of trust funds and to extend social security coverage. (Passed 388 to 8.)	Yes.
194	July 30	Quorum call	Present.
195	July 30	H. Res. 803: To agree to a conference with the Senate on H.R. 11049, the Federal employees pay raise bill. (Passed 246 to 131.)	Yes.
196	July 30	Quorum call	Present.
197	July 30	H.R. 9070 (S. 4): To establish a national wilderness preservation system. (Passed 374 to 1.)	Yes.
198	Aug. 3	H.R. 1096: To authorize the Secretary of the Interior to cooperate with the State of Wisconsin in designation and administration of the Ice Age National Scientific Reserve in the State of Wisconsin. (Defeated 164 to 154; a ⅔ majority required.)	Yes.
199	Aug. 3	H.R. 3672: To provide for construction, operation, and maintenance of the Savery-Pot Hook, Bostwick Park, and Fruitland Mesa participating reclamation projects under the Colorado River Storage Project Act. (Passed 250 to 67.)	Yes.
200	Aug. 4	H.R. 10939: To adopt conference report on appropriations for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1965. (Passed 359 to 0.)	Yes.
201	Aug. 4	H.R 10939: To adopt the Senate amendment to the defense bill providing 35 percent of funds for repair, alteration, and conversion of naval vessels available for work in privately owned shipyards. (Passed 186 to 178.)	No.
202	Aug. 4	Quorum call	Present.
203	Aug. 4	Quorum call	Present.
204	Aug. 5	Quorum call	Present.
205	Aug. 5	Quorum call	Present.
206	Aug. 6	Quorum call	Present.
207	Aug. 6	Quorum call	Present.
208	Aug. 6	Quroum call	Present.
209	Aug. 7	Quorum call	Present.
210	Aug. 7	H.J. Res. 1145: To promote the maintenance of international peace and security in southeast Asia. (Passed 416 to 0.)	Yes.
211	Aug. 7	Quorum call	Present.
212	Aug. 7	H.R. 11377: To strike the enacting clause from the so-called antipoverty bill. (Defeated 197 to 225.)	No.
213	Aug. 7	H.R. 11377 (S. 2642): On motion to substitute the text of S. 2642 which modified in a number of respects H.R. 11377, the so-called antipoverty bill. (Passed 228 to 190.)	Yes.
214	Aug. 8	Quorum call	Present.
215	Aug. 8	H.R. 11377: On motion to recommit to committee in order to substitute H.R. 11050, the Human Resources Development Act of 1964. (Defeated 117 to 195.)	No.
216	Aug. 8	H.R. 11377 (S. 2642): On final passage of the antipoverty bill. (Passed 226 to 185.)	Yes.

Voting record of Representative R*OLAND* V. L*IBONATI*, *7th District of Illinois*—Continued

No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
217	*1964* Aug. 11	H.R. 1927: To revise the pension program for veterans of World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict, and their widows and children. (Passed 388 to 0.)	Yes.
218	Aug. 11	H.R. 5990: To amend the District of Columbia Charitable Solicitation Act to require the Commissioners to make certain findings before issuing a solicitation permit. (Passed 301 to 81.)	No.
219	Aug. 12	H. Res. 836: To grant a rule for consideration of S. 1451, conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to render judgment upon certain claims arising under the Trading With the Enemy Act. (Passed 374 to 3.)	Yes.
220	Aug. 12	S. 1627: To enable the United States to contribute its share of expenses of the International Commission for Supervision and Control in Laos. (Passed 268 to 89.)	Yes.
221	Aug. 13	Quorum call	Present.
222	Aug. 13	H.R. 11296: On a motion to recommit to committee the independent offices appropriation bill in order to reduce by $250,000,000 the funds provided for research and development by NASA. (Defeated 114 to 270.)	No.
223	Aug. 13	Quorum call	Present.
224	Aug. 13	H.R. 12175: On a motion to recommit the housing bill to committee in order to add a provision permitting FHA to continue to insure loans beyond Oct. 1, 1965. (Defeated 184 to 194.)	No.
225	Aug. 13	H.R. 12175: To extend and amend laws relating to housing, urban renewal, and community facilities. (Passed 308 to 68.)	Yes.
226	Aug. 14	Quorum call	Present.
227	Aug. 14	Quorum call	Present.
228	Aug. 14	S. 1006: To authorize an increase in subsidies for the construction of fishing vessels and an annual appropriation of $10,000,000 for 5 years for the subsidies. (Passed 198 to 124.)	Yes.
229	Aug. 14	H. Res. 663: To provide an additional $10,000 for expenses of the Committee on Education and Labor. (Defeated 115 to 156.)	Yes.
230	Aug. 17	Quorum call	Present.
231	Aug. 17	H. Con. Res. 343: To express the sense of Congress that the President continue U.S. efforts toward securing full payment of U.N. assessments by all United Nations members and to apply the penalties if assessments are not paid. (Passed 351 to 0.)	Yes.
232	Aug. 17	H.R. 6242 (S. 524): To provide for the registration of contractors of migrant agricultural workers. (Passed 343 to 7.)	Yes.
233	Aug. 17	H.R. 9000: To amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act to provide more Federal control relative to safety measures in coal mines. (Defeated 202 to 151; ⅔ majority required to suspend rules.)	Yes.
234	Aug. 17	Quorum call	Present.
235	Aug. 18	Quorum call	Present.
236	Aug. 18	H.R. 1839: To adopt the conference report on the bill altered by the Senate to provide for the imposition of quotas on beef, veal, and mutton. (Passed 232 to 149.)	No.
237	Aug. 18	H.R. 8864: To adopt the conference report on the bill to carry out the obligations of the United States under the International Coffee Agreement of 1962. (Defeated 183 to 194.)	Yes.
238	Aug. 18	H.R. 8000: To adopt the conference report on the bill imposing a tax on acquisition of certain foreign securities. (Passed 221 to 147.)	Yes.
239	Aug. 18	S. 1007: To adopt the conference report on a bill guaranteeing electric consumers in Pacific Northwest first call on electric energy generated at Federal hydroelectric plants in that region and to guarantee electric consumers in other regions reciprocal priority. (Passed 230 to 134.)	Yes.
240	Aug. 19	S. 3049: To adopt the conference report on a bill to extend and amend laws relating to housing, urban renewal, and community facilities. (Passed 310 to 70.)	Yes.
241	Aug. 19	H. Res. 845: To adopt rule for consideration of H.R. 11926, the bill to remove from the jurisdiction of Federal courts cases involving apportionment of State legislatures. (Passed 242 to 148.)	No.
242	Aug. 19	H.R. 11926: To deny to the Federal courts jurisdiction over apportionment of State legislatures. (Passed 218 to 175.)	No.
243	Aug. 20	Quorum call	Present.
244	Aug. 20	Quorum call	Present.
245	Aug. 20	H.R. 9586: To provide for the establishment of a National Council on the Arts to assist in the growth and development of the arts in the United States. (Passed 213 to 135.)	Yes.
246	Sept. 1	Quorum call	Present.
247	Sept. 1	S. 2701: To suspend rules and pass a bill to provide for a study to determine a site for construction of a sea-level canal between the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans. (Passed 320 to 23.)	Yes.
248	Sept. 1	H.R. 4487: To pass the bill designed to prevent or minimize injury to fish and wildlife from the use of insecticides and pesticides. (Passed 236 to 110.)	Yes.
249	Sept. 2	Quorum call	Present.
250	Sept. 2	Quorum call	Present.
251	Sept. 3	Quorum call	Present.
252	Sept. 3	H.R. 12298: To recommit to committee the bill amending the Food-for-Peace Act in order to tighten the definition of friendly governments which may receive surplus agricultural products. (Passed 183 to 175.)	No.
253	Sept. 3	H.R. 12298: On final passage of the bill to extend and amend the Food-for-Peace Act. (Passed 349 to 6.)	Yes.
254	Sept. 3	Quorum call	Present.
255	Sept. 3	Quorum call	Present.
256	Sept. 3	S. 2220: To recommit to committee the bill to encourage physicians and dentists who have received student loans under certain governmental programs to practice in areas having a shortage of physicians or dentists. (Defeated 140 to 160.)	Yes.
257	Sept. 14	Quorum call	Present.
258	Sept. 22	Quorum call	Present.
259	Sept. 22	Quorum call	Present.
260	Sept. 22	H.R. 12633: On final passage of the supplemental appropriation bill of 1965 in the amount of $998,600,000, including $750,000,000 for the antipoverty program and $77,600,000 for mass transportation. (Passed 208 to 103.)	Yes.
261	Sept. 23	Quorum call	Present.
262	Sept. 23	H.R. 1096: To adopt the bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to cooperate with the State of Wisconsin in the designation and administration of the Ice Age National Scientific Reserve in the State of Wisconsin. (Passed 180 to 118.)	Yes.
263	Sept. 30	Quorum call	Present.
264	Oct. 1	Quorum call	Present.
265	Oct. 1	H.R. 892: On adoption of the rule making in order the consideration of H.J. Res. 1183, making continuing appropriation for fiscal 1965. (Defeated 159 to 193.)	Yes.
266	Oct. 1	Quorum call	Present.
267	Oct. 1	Quorum call	Present.
268	Oct. 1	S. 3060: To recommit to the conference committee the bill to amend the National Defense Education Act in order to delete funds for institutes and equipment for teaching of history, civics, geography, and English literature. (Defeated 107 to 236.)	No.
269	Oct. 1	S. 3060: On final passage of the conference report on the bill to extend and amend the National Defense Education Act. (Passed 320 to 20.)	Yes.
270	Oct. 2	Quorum call	Present.
271	Oct. 2	Quorum call	Present.
272	Oct. 3	H.R. 12633: To agree to the Senate amendment to the supplemental appropriations bill providing about $5,000,000 for the schools of the District of Columbia as being in an impacted area. (Passed 211 to 78.)	Yes.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Chairman, the amendments approved by the Committee on Education and Labor consisting of the fringe benefits including group hospitalization, disability benefits, and others to be included in prevailing wage determinations under the Davis-Bacon Act is an important step in establishing by law—affecting 85 million employed—these benefits are a form of compensation. The protection afforded to the employed by the enactment of these proposed amendments carries out the basic purpose of the Davis-Bacon Act, to determine prevailing wages, labor practices, and customs in an area or locality. The thousands—over four—of welfare funds in the construction industry are supported financially by the employer's contributions of a certain amount—generally starting at 10 cents per hour—for each working hour. In excess of 70 percent of the workers in this industry are so covered, as a result of collective bargaining, the fringe benefits were accepted and considered in reality as an increase in compensation in lieu of wage increases.

The States—eight—have recently added fringe benefits to their prevailing wage laws. In certain areas employers contribute 25 or 35 cents per hour to these health and welfare funds. The industry has accepted this type of contribution as a bargaining factor in wage disputes.

These costs are figured by the employer in bidding for projects. It is a significant figure in dollars and cents to be calculated in the employment costs under the contract. Contributions by the employer to health, welfare, pension, apprenticeship, and training plans have increased steadily because of the modern trend in labor's thinking to seek security for the worker's family unit and his old age. Therefore, these costs should be recognized and established by law as an integral part of a basic figure in determination of the prevailing wage rate.

MANMADE LAWS CANNOT DENY RIGHTS

Mr. Chairman, the Constitution of the United States was written by our forefathers at Philadelphia after a series of conferences lasting 9 years—from 1780 to 1789. Although the Negro was considered a chattel, there was not one word in the Constitution denying him as being a member of the human race.

Later, Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation and subsequent articles adopted through procedures established his status in society as a freeman and, consequently, restored to him the so-called inalienable rights that all statesmen past and present so boastfully and with forensic splendor represent as God-given rights to God-fearing human beings. These rights are inherent to the members of the human race and could not be denied by statutory law.

Manmade laws cannot negate, deny or disregard these rights.

The United States exemplifies in its historical role as the most powerful freedom-loving nation of the world the dream of every other nation of freemen whose ambition is to perfect a government similar to our own. And, yet, the issue before us today disturbs the minds of men of the world as to the true meaning of our democracy. The loyalty of the American Negro belongs to no other flag. His lineage can be traced to no other nation. He was a captured human being. Yet, 100 years after his emancipation throughout the land he is denied the rights of citizenship and the opportunities of education, employment, and social status enjoyed by his fellow Americans. We can no longer tolerate this condition. We must act now. We must implement the law to carry out this purpose. It is a mandate that we cannot deny, if we love our country, our fellow man and the historical tradition of respecting the God-given belief in the inalienable rights of man and of nations. To preserve these rights, millions of Americans and men of our allies have died—and billions of dollars have been spent in the defense of these concepts of freedom and peace.

A good law is that law enacted for a certain intention and specific purpose for the promulgation of the public interest.

In its purpose it can be regulatory. remedial, or principled in terms for the common good.

Its sociological value must be reflected in its effect upon the masses in serving their needs and increasing their responsibilities to society.

H.R. 7152 would meet these fundamental requirements and contribute much to the advancement of our social well-being and economic strength.

Mr. Chairman, provision VI is the strong core of this bill. There is no question about it. The arguments against it are based on the question of the abuse of power as against the determination that men must abide by the law. I would rather that we would not need this provision in the bill, but where you have to have drastic action to enforce the rights and liberties of men, then you must have this type of instrumentation in a bill that will bring about the desired result.

In my questioning of the Attorney General on the various provisions in the bill we came upon a discussion of this provision:

"Mr. LIBONATI. Of course, on the other hand you said that sound discretion would control any activity on your part to determine the values of destroying the whole community school system where they had integrated, and one unit had not. So that is within your power to make that determination.

"Attorney General KENNEDY. Yes, sir.

"Mr. LIBONATI. And certainly in the public interest, no one need give you guidance on that, because you are a man of integrity and understand the responsibilities of your position."

Then below on page 2758, serial 4, part IV, October 15–16, 1963, commenting on the question of the Federal assistance programs:

"Mr. LIBONATI. On the question of the Federal assistance programs, I think there again will come into play the sense of discretion of the enforcement officer as the Attorney General, who makes the determination, especially affecting matters where prejudice may result from the fact that labor unions won't cooperate and further problems will be presented to Government in that no general contractor will bid being confronted with problems with labor that he has no control over in activating his contract."

This section VI of the bill is the enforcement section to eliminate all the prejudices practiced against the Negro in the labor market, in the schools, on questions of relief and other questions. Now, you can dilly-dally all you want to with the questions of reasonableness of this provision or question the wide powers of discretion of the officer who has been given the authority to enforce it or the honesty of purpose of the bureau that has control of it, but you have to rely on the sound reason and the analytical evidentiary facts developed by the authority; certainly the sensible decision would be not to disturb a whole community over the question of a departure by a minor unit of that community as indicated by the answer of Attorney General Robert Kennedy as above quoted. This provision is a necessary adjunct to this bill if you are going to write any purposeful bill at all. The conditions complained of do not affect only a section or part of this country. These practices are general throughout the United States. Our southern brethren here are carrying the brunt of criticism, but you and I know that some of these practices, especially in labor and in other situations, such as schools and so forth, are also a problem in the North, and if you are in any way honest with yourselves, you will either vote this bill for the purposes intended, or you will abandon it. You have here in this provision real power for enforcement, and provision VI does it. You can leave it or take it. If you are honest with the people you are trying to help, if you have the integrity within yourselves to determine that in this effort you are going to do a job at the legislative level that will bring out a bill that will give these people basic confidence in what you believe is to be accomplished and so stop their criticism of this legislative body which represents their only hope—then do not let them feel that we are only making empty gestures. This is a strong bill and this is the strongest provision in the bill, and you must vote for this provision if you vote for any bill to meet the age-old problems at hand affecting loyal and patriotic Americans—crying and pleading for equality and public acceptance.

TITLE VII: EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY

Mr. Chairman, title VII: Equal Employment Opportunity treats with one of the most widespread forms of discrimination against the Negro race—a racial discrimination at all levels of employment, professional or otherwise. This one factor in human relations not only results in destroying economic advancement but in utter desperation weakens the character and contributes to the many social ills that beset many of the individuals of the race. A bar to employment regardless of the qualification of the individual whether professional, technical, or mental nullifies the spirit of hope in humans and stifles ambition and reason.

The provisions of the bill are worthless of further pursuit toward realization if the individual whether student or artisan knows that employment opportunities are nil. The right to vote, to be served one's needs in public places including accommodations, desegregation of public education, receiving community relations service, and the Federal assisted program lever of forcing conformance mean nothing to a person who has no job and consequently no money. We have only to be reminded in the words of the greatest humanitarian of our time, President Delano Roosevelt, that every man who is qualified and wants to work should have a job in accordance with his talents. The Negro is at best relegated to menial and unskilled employment and even then punctuated by layoffs and rewarded in low wages. All over America this indictment stands. And, further, the Negro is the last hired and the first fired. Promotional practices relegate the Negro to bottom levels.

Financial, institutions, advertising agencies, insurance companies, trade associations, management firms, and publication companies employing young prospects are the chief offenders.

Department of Labor statistics prove that there are three times as many heads of families unemployed among the nonwhites in comparison to the whites. Further nonwhites represent 11 percent of the total working force yet, 25 percent of these workers have been unemployed for the long period of 26 weeks and increasing progressively at this period.

Nonemployment rate

[Percent higher than white]

In 1947	64
In 1952	92
In 1957	105
In 1962	124

It must be remembered that the nonwhites are employed at lower salaries and less desirable jobs. Seventeen percent of nonwhites have white collar jobs compared to 47 percent of the whites. Fourteen percent of nonwhites in total employment are unskilled labor—in urban areas—compared to 4 percent for the white.

Secretary of Labor, Mr. Wirtz, stated that Negroes comprise 90 percent of the nonwhite population and receive the brunt of discrimination. Of all professional engineers—nonwhites—equal one-half of 1 percent—no more than 3 percent—males—employed in each of the 19 standard professional occupations surveyed, for example, accountants, architects, chemists, farm assistants, and lawyers. In 1960 there were 250 professional male Negro architects; the largest number in any of the 19 professions were doctors—4,500.

Also we must consider that for many skilled jobs there is a dearth of qualified nonwhite applicants due to the patterns of discrimination practiced that discourage Negroes from registering in preparatory courses in a field that excludes members of their race.

Even if this discrimination should be ceased, it would take a generation to rectify the damage in the curtailment of these talents through economic and cultural deprivation perpetrated against the Negro. To permit a continuance of these practices of discrimination is to destroy the ambitions of a race of Americans and stunt our economy.

Title VII, section 701(b), states that the provisions are necessary "to remove obstructions to the free flow of commerce among the States and with foreign nations" and to "insure the complete and free enjoyment by all persons of the rights, privileges, and immunities secured and protected by the Constitution of the United States. Title VII is simply supported by Congress power to regulate commerce among the States and with foreign nations—article 1, section 8, clause 3.

Title VII covers employers engaged in industries affecting commerce—interstate, and foreign commerce and commerce within the District of Columbia and the possessions.

The title also applies to employment agencies procuring employees for employers and labor organizations engaged in such industries.

Unlawful employment practices: Title VII provides that it is an unlawful employment practice to discriminate on account of race, color, religion, sex, or national origin in connection with employment, referral for employment, membership in labor organizations, a participation in apprenticeship or other training programs—sections 702, 704.

The industries affecting interstate commerce are covered if employing 100 persons or more during the first year after the effective date of this act are considered employers and after the second year of the act having

75 employees or more are considered employers; and third year 50 employees, and after fourth year 25 employees.

Labor organizations are under the same regulations with the added requisite that having 25 or more after the third year qualify.

The provision exempts governmental bodies, bona fide membership clubs, religious organizations, and situations in which religion or national origin is a bona fide occupational qualification, reasonably necessary to normal business operation—sections 702 (b)(c), 704(e).

The Commission consists of five members appointed for staggered 5-year terms appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate created to administer the law. No more than three from the same political party—section 706a. The Commission would be empowered to receive and investigate charges of discrimination and to attempt through conciliation and persuasion to settle disputes involving such charges—section 707. The Commission has no powers of enforcement of its orders. This is the court's prerogative. The 29 States and Puerto Rico has some legislation designed to effect equal employment opportunity in private employment. Experience in this field through State and its local commissions indicate that a great deal can be accomplished in achieving fair employment opportunities through sagacious and earnest persuasion, meditation, and conciliation.

Enforcement: In the case of refusal to comply, the Commission may seek relief in the Federal district court—section 707(b). If Commission does not act, the aggrieved party can secure permission from one of the Commissioners to file a civil suit himself to obtain relief—section 707(c). Thus a trial will be held. It would include injunctions against future violations and orders of reinstatement and, in some cases, payment of back pay in court—section 707(e).

No suit can be filed in complaint that has not been filed with the Commission within 6 months of its occurrence—section 707(d).

Utilization of State and local commissions are preserved in title VII and present State laws are effective except where there is a conflict with Federal laws. Further, where State operations are effective, the Commission will seek agreements with the State agency and refrain from prosecuting such cases. The Commission is authorized to use the employees of the State and local agencies in carrying out its duties, with proper reimbursement. This cooperation is highly desirable.

The effective date of the act in order to allow the employers, employment agencies, and labor organizations to perfect their policies and procedures is set at 1 year after its enactment.

Investigations: Powers granted to investigate, issue subpenas, require keeping of records of employment and factual data descriptive of employees pertinent to determinations of whether unlawful employment practices have been committed—sections 709–710.

Presidential action: The President is vested with the power to act in discriminatory practices in employment in the Federal services and in contractual relations between the Federal Government and business concerns and contractors on Federal projects and so forth.

The President is directed to hold conferences with Government representatives and representatives of groups affected by this legislation so that plans can be made for the fair and effective administration of this act—section 719(c).

A review prepared by the Department of Justice of the present State and local legislation sets out the following data:

"Legislation passed in 1963 has altered somewhat the situation set forth in the Library of Congress memorandum.

"Iowa, formerly a State with a hortatory nondiscrimination law, now has a mandatory provision enforcible by criminal sanctions (Laws of Iowa, 1963, ch. 330).

"Vermont, a State with no previous nondiscrimination statute, now has a mandatory law, enforcible by fine for willful violations (Laws of Vermont, 1963, No. 196).

"We are informed by the Department of Labor that Indiana, a State with mandatory provisions only for public contracts, now has a generally applicable mandatory statute, and that Hawaii, a State which formerly had no law, now has a generally applicable mandatory law.

"A revised summary, taking into account these changes, show that 25 States and Puerto Rico have mandatory provisions applicable to private employment generally. (Of course, there are varying exemptions under these statutes.) These States are Alaska, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Vermont, Washington, Wisconsin.

"Two States, Arizona and Nebraska, have mandatory provisions relating to employment on certain public contracts.

"One State, Nevada, has mandatory provisions for employment on public contracts and hortatory provisions for other private employment.

"One State, West Virginia, has only hortatory provisions.

"Thus, in all, 29 States have some legislation designed to effect equal employment opportunity in private employment."

LAW ENFORCEMENT IN THE FIELD OF CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 7152 incorporates into the law of our land provisions of a drastic nature that call for direct and summary law enforcement in the field of civil rights. The appeal for fairplay in the questions affecting the Negroes' rights is being denied the right to vote, to service in public accommodations, to the protection under constitutional rights in education; the discrimination suffered in federally assisted programs and at all levels of employment have long since failed to bring about the needed and desired change. Prayers alone did not serve the purpose although many religious groups have taken the lead in sponsoring reforms toward that end in recent years.

Certainly, the several provisions in this bill will deter the corporations, agencies, and individuals who are the chief obstructionists from their longtime illegal and widespread practices of discrimination.

The bill also provides for corrective enactments affecting labor unions' programs that are inimical and prejudicial to Negro employment and job training.

The enforcement provision if properly activated can bring about a practical solution of many of the basic problems confronting the Negro due to unfair practices that victimize him in everyday life and activities.

The Commission can enforce its findings through the Federal district courts. Although the bill in its entirety is not an answer to the problems that beset the Negro race—its ultimate purpose can be realized—namely, to create a better atmosphere for the Negro in the enjoyment of his rights and privileges as an American citizen—and protect him from the proselytizing vultures of society that scorn them as members of our free society.

The community relations service, if properly administered, can alleviate the many problems and help in their solution.

No matter how humble one's social caste as in all other races facing poverty conditions, encouragement through public acceptance will fortify one to meet any social or cultural situation that one may experience. The importance of the Negro's relation to the community life is the difference between being ostracized or becoming an integral part of its civic and spiritual life.

No one should deny Negro participation in the affairs of the community. He is an integral part of the community and can render fine contributions to its operation for the good of the community.

A strong bill shows a determined and lasting effect on these specific purposes. And in this instance it is of the greatest importance to all of our society. This effort to purge a great series of wrongs against our fellow Americans must not fail. It will give impetus to our economy and raise human beings to their rightful level and standards of American life.

God's will demands that this be done for the preservation and unity of our Nation. Our leadership of the liberty-loving nations of the world would be secure in that this total effort incorporated into law by its highest legislative body proves that our Nation practices for itself what it preaches for freemen of other nations to follow.

We shall merit, in the success of this program, the plaudits and blessings of all God-fearing freemen and turn back the pages of our history 100 years—accomplishing that which would have been accomplished if our martyred President Abraham Lincoln had lived.

Mr. Speaker, the tax cut plan formulated at the suggestion and exhortation of our deceased President John Kennedy and pressured into enactment by President Johnson as a simple and direct way of stimulating the economy and increasing the potential of employment for the 5½ million unemployed by putting more funds at the disposal of the millions of consumer spenders thus giving the purchasing public who keep the dollars circulating from merchant to banker for deposit to manufacturer—loans for production of goods—to merchants' sales shelves, et cetera, to the consumer public and so the cycle continues for a prosperous business economy.

Thus the Government will collect more income and excise taxes to meet the expenses of Government estimated in 1964 as $5 billion although the late President Kennedy's proposals in January 1963 have been changed in some instances—by reducing some rates less than he had suggested and "watered down" the raising of revenues as suggested in the reform measure. Still the administration predicts that by 1967 the tax cuts will help balance the Federal budget—yielding higher revenues in public spending at lower rates.

Presidents Kennedy and Johnson used every method of aproach to stir up public support behind this legislation. The political pressures were primarily alleged to have been used in measurable quality in the Senate. The lightning flash by President Johnson in presenting a 1965 budget at one-half the estimated deficit of the 1964 budget placed the conservatives on the defensive, and won their approval and confidence that the President's pledge would be carried out to reduce Federal expenditures. The House principle thus was substantiated by Presidential action in exerting a restraint in Federal spending. The signal changes were:

First. The taxation of capital gains in the House version of the bill was deleted by the Senate. The House version would have cost the Treasury $230 million income annually.

Second. The stringent House provision for allowing exclusion of sick pay from capital income was slightly changed and liberalized by the Senate and agreed to by the conferees.

Third. Deleted Senate provision of allowing tax deductions for political contributions up to $50 per individual and $100 for a married couple filing a joint return.

Fourth. Estimated Senate provision to extend benefits of the head of a household to other persons who are not now qualified.

Fifth. Also removed Senate provision for tax subsidies to companies that install air and water pollution equipment.

Sixth. Struck out provision—Senate—allowing disabled persons costs of commuting to work. Also giving $600 to those too disabled to work.

Seventh. Sustained deductibility of State and local gasoline taxes. Disallowed deduction on drivers' licenses, taxes on autos, alcoholic beverages, tobacco, and selected excise taxes.

Eighth. Also adopted Senate's liberal provisions for deductibility of child care cost by working wives.

Ninth. Adopted the House provision extending from 5 years to an indefinite period the time during which taxpayers may carry forward their capital losses.

Tenth. The various structural reforms adopted both to close loopholes in the law and also liberalize other areas where hardships result.

Eleventh. The open loophole plugged was the elimination of the 4-percent dividend tax credit while doubling the dividend exclusion to $100 for an individual and $200 for a married couple filing a joint return.

Twelfth. An important hardship alleviation corrected will permit low-income individuals to take standard deduction above the 10-percent maximum. The provision will remove about 1½ million persons from the tax roll.

Thirteenth. Also companies will be allowed to claim depreciation deductions for the full cost of new equipment even though 7 percent of the cost is subsidized by the Government.

Fourteenth. The rules were tightened for computing oil and gas deletion allowances. Tax benefits were also restricted for corporation executives who receive stock options.

Fifteenth. The wage earner on the average will receive a 19- to 20-percent tax cut under the bill. The withholding tax will be reduced from 18 to 14 percent bringing an increase of $800 million a month in take-home pay.

These cuts are being relied upon that affect individuals and corporations to stimulate the economy by consumer spending and business investment creating jobs and preventing a recession—without inflation, which the Congress must guard against by holding down the future appropriations in the Federal spending program.

Individual tax rates will be reduced from the present range of 20 to 91 percent to a lower range of 16 to 77 percent on 1964 income and 14 to 70 percent on 1965 income.

These rates will not affect tax returns now being filed on the 1963 income.

Thus the rates for an individual average taxpayer for 1965 will be 20 percent reduction. Although structural reforms will raise more revenues than are lost, the effect at most will be 1 or 19 percent remaining as a tax reduction.

Corporation rates are reduced from 52 to 50 percent in 1964 income and 48 percent in 1965. A sharper reduction is set for those corporations earning less than $25,000 per year.

The bulk of the reduction will result in 1964 as follows: Considering tax reductions and structural changes a tax reduction amounts to $11,480 million, with the greatest amount in 1964.

Individuals amount estimate $9,120 million of the reduction and corporations $2,360 million.

Although the House version of the bill provided for more revenue raising thus costing the Treasury about $11.2 billion and the Senate bill as passed—amended—$11.9 billion.

The bill, at least at present predictions, is considered the answer to relieving the problems of unemployment in the future—1967—and create more or maintain physically the prosperity of the present economy in excess of $600 billion. It is expected that this bill will in effect add some $30 billion to our economy in 1964–65—and thus in a statistical projection insure a balance of our economy.

RULEMAKING OF FEDERAL AGENCIES

Mr. Chairman, ordinarily the Congress does not interfere with the rulemaking procedures of Federal agencies if formulated to set up the operative conduct of its business both as to hearings and basic programs to protect and promulgate the public interest.

H.R. 8316 seeks to clarify the Communications Act of 1934 by reserving to the Congress the power to deal with the regulations relating to the length or frequency of broadcast advertisements. There can be no question that the Congress must reserve to itself such powers that inherently cannot be delegated by the Congress to any other body or agency only within the jurisdiction of its legislating basic controls or rules that lie only within the jurisdiction of its legislative prerogatives.

The determination by rules of the FCC affecting the length or frequency of broadcast advertising arrogates to this body control over the very lifeblood of the industry—its revenue. Certainly it was never intended that the Congress abandon its legislative jurisdiction over the industry on a level of regulatory control of such magnitude as suggested by the whims and caprices of an agency that owes its very existence to the Congress itself.

This bill reiterates the principle that the Congress reserves unto itself jurisdiction to regulate the length or frequency of broadcasting commercials. It would be unreasonable to vest in an agency of Government (or other body) such broad powers of authority in making regulatory rules so as to transfer to itself those legislative powers that even the Congress cannot by law delegate to the FCC.

It is maintained by the opponents of the legislation that its passage would curb needed powers of the Commission that are necessary if regulation of the industry is to serve the public interest. Further that although there is no question that the Congress has the power to delineate the applicable policies established by the Commission, yet the Commission in reality, in order to serve the public interest already has the power to prescribe these standards. Thus the Commission in adopting the rule asserts that the delegation of power by the Congress in the 1934 act was in reality conferring control over the revenues even though determined by the industry itself under its right to enjoy the privileges of our free enterprise system.

The industry itself regulates the revenue-producing income to maintain its operative costs. Different types of operating stations are subject to different conditions as to the time-hour periods and weekday preferences that are revenue producing.

The FCC is seeking to take upon itself a terrific responsibility in a field that at best would result in futile, empty, and pointless gestures irritating to its membership—impractical setups of rate structure for advertising (which they have not the power to establish) charges, thus creating chaos in the industry.

If the purpose of the Government is to take over the broadcasting industry then this usurpation of control over its business relationship with its patrons and customers is a sure method of accomplishing it by policing its existence for a takeover. The National Association of Broadcasters radio and television codes proposed by the Commission for adoption has alerted the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to its important responsibility to the public interest as well as a strong determination to preclude an agency of Government regulatory in nature arrogating to itself the right to legislate. Its powers under the strict interpretation of its mandate—act of 1934—given by the Congress for regulatory purposes must not be changed by Commission just to change the specific intention of a congressional act. The committee has done the people of the Nation a great service in being adamant on this important question. It has also saved the Congress and the industry the greatest headache of the age in protecting the public interest in time—to say nothing of protecting free enterprise. Regulation of a business does not mean Government participation and interference in the management, control, and conduct of its competitive nature in accordance with the customs and practices of the trade. The FCC has enough troubles now without seeking new avenues of controversy. It should be proud of its honest record in its specialized field of endeavor—to protect the industry against autocratic power of politics, the organs of dissemination of information, and without the tycoons of the broadcasting industry itself—all for the protection of the public industry and the health of the industry. Let us not forget that there are many stations that are operating throughout the Nation that are conducted free of advertising—fine programs, educational and musical—but with few viewers in comparison to the commercially supported stations.

Further the commercially supported stations present football, basketball, baseball, and so forth, even golf and tennis matches—world series and Olympics as well as wrestling and boxing contests—without financial commercial support these presentments would be impossible.

The advertising programs are not only interesting but strengthen the economy with sales of gigantic proportions—giving thousands employment and setting up a fine market for serviceable articles for human use and consumption—to say nothing of household, autos, radio and television sets, and other innumerable concoctions—medical and otherwise—for human consumption. Food, cigars, and staple articles are to be seen to attract business.

All one has to do to escape the advertising media is to shut off the set. The public exerts a strong corrective pressure if over-advertising becomes a nuisance by closing off the market appeal felt by the sponsors of the program. The sampling of the public interest in programs is determined through advertising agencies by spot checking the viewing audience. The artist professions would be sadly affected by FCC interference at the advertising level. These matters reflect the public interest. Advertising is a stimulant to sales of genuine products. Regulation of fraudulent advertising can be dealt with by other agencies of Government to protect the public. A favorable vote for this legislation is a protection of the public interest in the freedom of an industry to conduct its honest business without Government interference.

PROBLEMS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. Chairman, there is no question that the requests submitted by the District were in line with the cost of the many services rendered the public through its agencies. A thorough study of the requests were considered by the committee. The treatment accorded the requests was in conformity with the economic values involved.

The budget estimates amounted to $357,702,300 including an amendment of $1,850,300. The appropriations recommended in this bill totaled $338,205,200, a reduction of $19,497,100 in the budget requests—but an increase of $25,089,538 over the fiscal figure in 1964.

The Federal contribution amounts to $40,720,000—$37,500,000 to the general fund—same as 1964—$2,047,000 to water fund, and $1,173,000 to the sanitary sewage fund.

These last two allowances represent increases of $123,000 and $229,000, respectively, above the 1964 appropriations—the amounts are based on actual services to the Federal buildings and installations in the area.

The committee also approved $20 million as a Federal loan for partial financing of the capital outlay portion of the budget. Also the amount of some $1,400,000 for the highway fund and $5 million for the sanitary sewage works fund—thus totaling $26,400,000. The loan appropriation is $7,100,000 above that of 1964—and $12 million above the budget estimate. There are adequate balances in the present authorization to meet this increase.

The District is confronted with many problems that have been disregarded over the years because of the refusal of Congress to take a realistic view of the growth of the city and incident thereto, an increase in the demands of the services to be rendered to its growing population. Further, the tremendous increase in the erection of Federal structures and installations that increased the costs of services furnished by the District to these properties that were not properly considered in the light of adequate reimbursement to the District.

The District Commissioners have, under the most trying conditions, endeavored to carry out the responsibilities of their office. An increase in taxes was necessary—gasoline increase of 1 cent per gallon estimated to raise $2 million for highway purposes—real estate taxes and other proposals to raise accumulative funds to meet the deficits.

The employees numbering 28,432 were increased by 750—although 11,021 were requested.

The severe crime problems, the school population, and welfare increases resulting in mounting costs—also the important factor of the general fund financing because of high current operating expenses. The committee recommended an appropriation of $18,677,000 for these expenses—an increase of $794,122 over 1964—yet $734,000 below budget request.

The Executive Office appropriation of $523,000—a decrease of $569,400 from 1964. The Department of General Administration receives $8,002,000—increase of $443,627 over 1964—decreases were as follows:

Regulatory and miscellaneous agencies—about $169,000 budget request to $2,497,000 appropriation 1965.

The library appropriation $3,816,000, for 1965—increase of $337,605 over 1964. Increase for new books $92,000 et cetera.

Department of buildings and grounds appropriated $3,016,000—1965 reduction of $225,000.

Public Safety—appropriated $69,841,000 increase of $3,069,340 over 1964.

Office of Corporation Counsel—$1,155,000—1965 increase of $89,477 over 1964.

Fire department 1965—$15,692,600—$330,070 over 1964.

Office of Civil Defense—$129,000—1965 courts—$7,228,000 increase of $456,537—1964.

Department of Correction, $8,995,000 increase $591,093—1964.

Education—$67,910,000 increase of $4,049,407—1964—less $697,000 requested. A total of 234 new teachers provided for, 268 were requested.

Parks and recreation, $4,166,000—increase of $509,995—1964.

Health and welfare, $74,833,000—increase of $4,306,952—1964. Includes public health activities, $48.246.000; an increase of $1,336,464—1964—and the Department of Welfare—$25,865,000—increase $2,746,645—1964.

Highway and traffic, $13,573,000—increase of $1,165,016 over 1964.

Sanitary engineering, $21,750,000 appropriated.

Metropolitan police, $283,000; expenses incident to inaugural of 1966—repayment of loans and interest, $5,364,000.

Capital outlay projects, $55,887,000—increase of $9,350,500—1964.

The committee has endeavored to meet its obligations in making fiscal determinations in accordance with the important expansion needs to carry out the purposes of District government. The enormous sums needed and demanded by the District Commissioners for expansion of the school system both in personnel and buildings—the welfare for the unfortunate on relief and the many critical needs of the majority of the cities in the United States are self-evident. At least a new attitude has evinced itself in the committee deliberations. The results are at least exemplary of a new look at the problems of the city we love, our Capital of the United States. We must make further progress in the near future toward remedying the problems that confront the five Commissioners who have labored in this beautiful city.

TO INCREASE VOLUNTEERS OF THE PEACE CORPS

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 9666 is the authorization of $115 million to finance the increase in the number of volunteers from 10,500 to 14,000. To meet these financial obligations the committee recommended the increase—the appropriation for 1964 was $95,963,971.

The accomplishments of the Peace Corps since its inception—March 1, 1961—have astounded even those who as sponsors expected only a long-range contribution to the development of the present 46 countries overseas being serviced by the 6,976 volunteers and trainees. The successful efforts of these emissaries—primarily made up of engineers and teachers—to teach and help the common people meet their problems of everyday life at the local level.

In appreciative numbers these college-trained persons are now operating at their respective tasks in Africa—among 17 nations, 2,257 in number—the Far East—4 nations and 2 provinces—1,187; Near East-south Asia—8 nations, 825; and Latin America 17 nations—2,707; a total of 46 countries with 458 in training—a total of 6,518 emissaries functioning making a grand total of 6,976.

Their assignments are varied as follows: 428 in agricultural extension, 1,218 rural and 324 in urban community action. In the field of education including elementary, 615; secondary, 2,086; university, 309; adult, 7; vocational, 141; physical, 168, totaling 3,386. Other categories include health, 529; multipurpose, 63; and public works, 165. There are also in training in these various employments 878 individuals making a grand total of 6,991 of whom 4,280 are men and 2,711 women.

The Nation's recipient of these services have indicated a high sense of appreciation and with few exceptions have requested a substantial larger number of volunteers to be given assignments to them.

In the 3 years that the Peace Corps has functioned it has demonstrated its need and its contribution to the peace and economical progress of all the nations that were fortunate to receive the services of their skilled talents.

Although many brilliant leaders both in its professional and educational ranks have made possible its exemplary record—there is one person who has lived its very existence at every level of its climb to universal acceptance as a worthwhile project—he forded the stream of political pressures that result from any new programing needing appropriated public moneys.

Further he sold his dream of its success to the Congress. He spelled out the adventure of a lifetime to the spirited youth of our colleges whose pioneeric spirit permeates every effort of the Peace Corps programs. He made good on every promise that he made to the Congress; first, that the behavior overseas would be exemplary; that the volunteers would live at normal levels in their new habitat; that the emissaries would work with the natives and fit in with the life of the community; that in every way their work and travel would be comparative to the United States in an austere manner. He has earned the respect and commendation of every American. His confidence in the salutory effects of the program has been realized as far as the contributions made by the volunteers to the betterment of local conditions both in educational, farm, and engineering accomplishments. These messengers of good will have had a tremendous impact upon the nationals that they have served so well. As to the question of their impact upon the peace—3 years is a short time to determine what effect their activities will have upon that score. But we can at least feel that the improvement of local conditions in living will in the end have a total effect upon the community, and by example influence the several communities creating a unified effort to raise the standards of living. Men will fight to keep their national identity and protect their community when the enjoyment of the opportunities of this life are theirs for the asking.

Education and training in all fields—vocational or otherwise—builds up the economy and increases employment and results in prosperity of all the people. Tyranny does not thrive where the family tie is strong and men have opportunity to improve their lot in life and give opportunities to their children.

We owe a great deal to the leadership exemplified by the Director of the Peace Corps Robert Sargent Shriver, Jr. He has operated the program with a view to strict economy and returned some in the use of appropriated funds set up for its purposes. I desire to reiterate what I stated as to the qualifications of Director Shriver—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 107, part 4, page 5282.

"The Peace Corps is in good hands with Sargent Shriver, the former president of the board of education, city of Chicago, as its Director."

And further in the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, House, page A1572, in a discussion of the Peace Corps on its first anniversary:

"The members of the Corps have quietly assumed, each in his or her individual capacity, the responsibilities under a personal assignment—the efficiency of each operation has earned merited praise.

"Director R. Sargent Shriver presented a review of the Peace Corps' activity on the NBC–WRC television program, Saturday night, February 24. He stated, 'They tell us that the Peace Corps is achieving a very important success at the local level in these foreign countries. Certainly, we in Washington hope that it is. And we hope that many more Americans will volunteer.'

"The great humility of Director R. Sargent Shriver is reflected in this understatement, for the tremendous number of requests for more Corps assignments, by the host nations and others, is indicative of the great demand for their exceptional services."

LEVYING OF TAX—H.R. 8000

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of H.R. 8000 is to levy a tax upon an American investor or purchaser of a foreign stock or bond, only if his or her purchases are made from a foreigner. The tax will reduce the outflow into these securities in a projected determination—first half of 1963—of from $1¼ million to $1½ million; during the last 6 months of 1963 a savings of $1.8 billion.

The tax was proposed because of the critical results suffered in the purchases by

Americans in the first half of 1963 of nearly $2 billion—practically doubling the rate of 1962 and tripling the rate of investment in 1961. Thus our international payments became a critical problem in an endeavor to balance our international payments and was a determining factor in the payment deficit of $5 billion at the annual rate in the second quarter of 1963—a rate which could not be sustained. A limitation date of December 31, 1965, considered a sufficient time interval for the accomplishment of its purposes—the imported opportunities for investment in the United States and perhaps also foreign—and further the accomplishing of the goal of $1 billion in Government expenditures overseas.

The tax rate on foreign bonds is 15 percent, while the rate is graduated from 2.75 to 15 percent on foreign bonds depending upon the time of maturity. The rate of the tax raises the cost of foreign borrowing in the United States by about 1 percent per year. There is no tax if the foreign security is purchased by another American. The brokerage agencies function in this capacity. The American holder of foreign stock can sell it in the market designated for such sale and escape the 15-percent charge on the value of his or her stock. If a purchase is made from a foreigner he is subject to the tax. One liable for the tax must file a quarterly interest—failure to do so results in a fine of $1,000 as well as a criminal penalty for a willful failure to file—similar to violation imposed in the case of tax returns.

The following questions and answers are in conformity with the prescriptions of the bill:

"Question. Can an American escape the tax by purchasing foreign securities outside the country?

"Answer. No. The liability for tax is incurred whether the purchase from a foreigner is made within or outside the United States. Enforcement of this requirement will be comparable to enforcement of income tax provisions applicable to Americans living abroad.

"Question. Must information returns be filed by brokers?

"Answer. Brokers will be required to report purchases by them on behalf of customers who are liable for the tax.

"Question. Are brokers required to withhold the tax on the purchase of foreign securities?

"Answer. No. The American purchaser must file a return and pay the tax.

"Question. How does the seller establish that he is an American?

"Answer. Certificate of American ownership forms have been supplied on which sellers certify that they are Americans, and purchasers from them are not subject to the tax. These forms must be filed with the seller's broker, and a single form can suffice for an entire brokerage account.

"Question. Does the bill provide penalties for executing false certificates of American ownership?

"Answer. The willful filing of false certificates of American ownership is punishable by a fine of not more than $1,000, imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both.

"Question. What is the effective date of the tax?

"Answer. The tax applies to purchases of foreign securities made on or after July 19, 1963. This effective date is necessary to avoid an acceleration of foreign borrowings during the period in which Congress is considering the proposal, which might cause irreparable damage to our balance of payments in the short term. In the case of purchase made on stock exchanges, August 17, 1963, is the effective date.

"Question. Why does the bill apply to outstanding as well as new issues?

"Answer. Inclusion of outstanding issues within the bill's coverage will achieve balance-of-payments savings of as much as $500 million annually and prevent substitution of untaxed outstanding securities for taxed new issues. If the tax did not apply to both new and outstanding securities, it would be a relatively simple matter for foreigners to sell issues which they now hold on a tax-free basis to Americans and use the proceeds to invest in new issues.

"Question. Why does the tax apply to both stocks and bonds?

"Answer. Stocks are an alternate means of raising capital for private foreign borrowers and failure to include them might cost $500 to $600 million annually in outflows.

"Question. Does the tax apply to the purchase of all foreign debt obligations, regardless of maturity?

"Answer. The tax does not apply to purchases of obligations with less than 3 years remaining to maturity. These short-term obligations play an important role in financing U.S. exports.

"Question. Will the tax have a restrictive effect on U.S. exports?

"Answer. The bill has been carefully drawn so as not to interfere with export financing, since an increase in exports is one of the best ways of reducing the deficit in the U.S. balance of payments.

"Question. Does the tax apply to direct investments made by U.S. firms in foreign corporations?

"Answer. No tax is due if the American firm owns 10 percent or more of the stock, or the purchase brings ownership to 10 percent or more, of the foreign corporation since direct investment of this type implies active participation in the management of the foreign corporation and is not concerned with interest-rate differentials.

"Question. How does the bill affect bank loans?

"Answer. Commercial bank loans are excluded from tax if made by a bank in the ordinary course of its commercial banking business. This exclusion recognizes the important role of commercial banks in financing U.S. exports and the international business of American firms.

"Question. What is being done to prevent use of the bank exclusion to avoid the tax on otherwise taxable borrowings?

"Answer. Because of the possibility of abuse of the bank exclusion, the bill authorizes the collection of data on foreign bank lending to provide a basis for determining whether this exclusion should be continued and, if not, the way in which it should be modified.

"Question. Does the tax apply to purchases of securities of less developed countries?

"Answer. No. The bill excludes from tax purchases of governmental securities of less developed countries as well as securities of companies doing the bulk of their business in less developed countries.

"Question. Does the tax apply to new issues of all developed countries?

"Answer. The bill provides that the President has authority to exempt new issues of a foreign country where he determines that application of the tax to the securities of that country imperils or threatens to imperil the stability of the international monetary system. In such a case, the United States would want to avoid disruption of the international payments system since this could bring serious damage to our own economy as well as to other countries. Such action would be in accordance with the treaty obligation of the United States to the International Monetary Fund to help promote exchange stability.

"Question. Is it expected that this authority will be exercised?

"Answer. It is anticipated that new Canadian issues will be exempted from tax. This does not mean, however, that the U.S. balance-of-payments gains we sought will be sacrificed since the Canadians have undertaken not to borrow in the U.S. market amounts that would increase their international reserves. The exemption can be revoked or limited if Canadian borrowings exceed amounts required to maintain their international reserves and reach the abnormally high levels of 1962 and early 1963.

"Question. Does the tax apply to foreign companies controlled by Americans?

"Answer. The bill excludes from tax foreign corporations traded on U.S. stock exchanges if the principal market is in the United States and more than 50 percent of the stock is owned by Americans.

"Question. What is the expected revenue from the tax?

"Answer. It is estimated that this bill will result in an annual revenue gain of up to $30 million in a full year of operation."

The passage of this legislation will contribute to the protection of our economy in that the reduction of investments (bonds and stocks) abroad will serve to prevent the depletion of our gold reserves and reduce the outflow of our monetary deficits as a result of heavy foreign investments.

PUBLIC LAND LAW REVIEW COMMISSION

Mr. Chairman, the laudable purpose of H.R. 8070 establishing of a Public Land Law Review Commission to study laws and procedures relating to the administration of the public lands of the United States to correlate the same with a view of proper revision to meet the current needs and future development of their uses for the American people in the public interest, is surely needed. A Commission alone can serve the purposes intended to accomplish these merited goals. No committee of the Congress could possibly amass and analyze the tremendous research material necessary to assimilate and codify the legislative specificity under this public responsibility. Members chosen must be expert in their training in order to comprehend the proper revisions and other purposes included in H.R. 8070 provisions.

The Commission consists of 19 members selected as follows:

Three minority and majority Senate members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs appointed by the President of the Senate. A similar number as above appointed by the Speaker of the House. Six members appointed by the President of the United States—excludes those holding Federal appointment within 1 year of consideration—also anyone holding an appointment or position with the executive branch of Government—time waiver not to exceed 130 days of the previous 365-day period.

The Chairman shall be elected by the 18 members. Vacancies are filled in similar manner as respective appointments. One of the members appointed by the respective appointing officer of the Congress shall be designated as a senior member. The organization meeting will be called by these senior members. Ten members are considered a quorum to do business—a lesser number may conduct hearings. Only Members of the Congress shall serve without pay, but will receive reimbursement for travel and subsistence. Others receive $50 per diem when actually performing services—also reimbursement for travel and subsistence. Twenty-five additional members will be representative of those interested in public lands.

The Commission is given full powers to carry out its purposes—subpena of witnesses and documents—not to be served for hearing outside State of domicile—the material or testimony may be classified if procured from undisclosed or secret sources. May secure material and evidenciary facts from employees of agencies, and so forth, to be held confidential.

An appropriation of $4 million is authorized.

The all inclusive definition of public lands, reservations—excluding Indian lands—lands permanently or temporarily withdrawn, reserved, or withheld from private appropriation and disposal under public land laws including mining laws, outstanding interests of the United States in lands patent, conveyed in fee or otherwise, under the public land laws, national forests, and the surface and subsurface resources of all such laws, including the disposition, restriction, or disposition of the mineral resources in lands defined by appropriate statutes, treaty or judicial determination as being under the control of the United States in the Outer Continental Shelf.

Thus the enactment of H.R. 8070 will permit a comprehensive affirmation of the policies of the United States in treating with public lands in all matters concerning the carrying out of the public interest. It is considered that a 4-year study will contribute much to the formulation of the future policy of our Government in treating with public lands and their relation to the public interest. Each agency concerned with public lands will have a liaison representative to work with the Commission staff. The Commission will file its report to the President and Congress by December 31, 1967, and ceases its functions on June 30, 1968.

The committee and its distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. Aspinall], are to be congratulated upon its splendid approach to solve an intricate and delicate level of controversy in Government—the Department of Interior under the positive leadership of Hon. Stewart Udall have persistently sought congressional action in this area of Government operation. His action to modernize the Department of the Interior in both its operational and its improvement for the public acceptance of its facilities and purposes in the uses of lands and facilities are a credit to our national progress in the recreational services of the Department and the conservation of public lands for future generations of Americans.

FEDERAL PAY RAISE

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 8986, the Federal pay raise bill is in reality a pay readjustment measure. The $545 million measure is supported by the administration and executive and business leaders throughout the Nation. It provides for an increase in pay for 1.7 million Government employees and an increase of $10,000 in the salaries of Members of Congress.

The pay raises for Federal executives and employees are in conformity with those wages paid by private industry for comparable positions. The last pay raise voted—1962—initiated this principle as a basic consideration for future legislation at this level.

Since 1945 the Government employees have received through congressional enactment 10 raises. The 590,000 postal employees received a 6.2-percent increase and other employees numbering 1.1 million—classified and other white-collared help—received 4.86-percent increases. All throughout the history of these raises by the Congress the greater pressures were activated by the better organized Federal groups of employees, thus the emotional or political advantages of pressures resulted in a superficial and loose consideration of the problem as a study—no comparative figures developed between industrial compensatory tables of wages and those of Government workers thus establishing a basic relationship between the Federal salary system and those of industry, as reflected in comparative employment statistics prepared by the Bureau of Labor Statistics in their statistical tables, which estimate the average annual adjustments of between 2½ and 3 percent will establish the comparability law in Government.

It is contemplated that the comparability principle in fixing of Federal salaries will effect a 50-percent decrease in the expense incurred in increased salary expenses.

The BLS survey of 1961–62 is used as the basis of the rates in the bill. A 1962–63 study advocated a 3-percent increase above those of the administration in Federal pay, but also recommended a cut in the salaries of the middle and higher bracketed employees—below the 1961–62 figures.

The administration approves the bill with the reservation that in the future a bill to correct the inequities in the middle and top grades be enacted to fulfill the principle of complete comparability with similar positions in industry and business.

As far as the judges of the courts no one can deny that their judicial abilities and talents would in private fields of their profession earn far more than their Federal salaries.

An equally important provision of the bill provides for an increase of $10,000 for the Members of the Congress—the uninformed citizen would be critical of the Congress voting a pay raise for its Members at what critics say is an ill opportune time period when the financial stability of the Nation is continuing in the deep red side of the ledger; and all sorts of suggestions in public, business, and political circles are advanced on theories to secure a total economic conservatism in Government spending.

Just what is the financial situation confronting the Members of the Congress relative to questions involving the inadequacy of the present level of salary? Although the present salary—$22,500—appears to the same as substantial sum as compensation for the Federal services at this level—yet few citizens realize the terrific expenses incurred by the Members of the Congress in meeting the financial responsibilities of this office.

To begin with the income tax retention as the part of the Government amounts the average case of one married with one dependent at 17½ percent of salary equal to about $3,800 per year.

The contributions at all levels of charities and programs for medical research aid foundations, school groups visiting Washington, travel fares—incidental to required return to attend district functions and congressional business; further the maintenance of two homes and offices far beyond the Government allowances. No small item is the wide range of gifts, donations, and emoluments given to constituents, and services—tips and cab fares. Further the obligations of a political nature including the contributions to churches, medical programs, and above all the dinners to visitors in Washington. Substantial sums are also a needed outlay of 7½ percent of salary for the pension fund and policies insuring life at $10 to $12 per month and health at $10 to $12 per month for family protection. Many of the Members who are elected from districts sans political organizations must wholly finance their own political units in order to perfect a working and functioning campaign for their election. Many are in a serious financial condition due to the heavy costs between yearly interval campaigns each 2 years. The Members with growing families are beset with problems of school and college tuition, also subsistence costs of education.

Unless the salary increase as proposed in this legislation in a few years only persons of affluence can be expected to place their names upon the lists as candidates for congressional office.

There are less than 1,600 offices and positions covered in the congressional, executive, and judicial salary provisions at an aggregate cost of $15.7 million and represents but 2.6 percent of the total cost of the bill. These changes have been recommended strongly by recognized authorities on the subject both in Government and private life. The bill establishes basically a sound salary system for all levels of Government. Also, the continued application of the comparability principle to salaries of postal and other career Federal employees depends in the final analysis on the salary levels of Federal executives, judges, and Members of Congress.

Fair and substantial salaries will retain in the Government employ executives in key posts—judges of high repute and talented abilities, authorities in their profession—and attract and continue at the legislative level of Government capable and skilled legislators and individuals who are fit to accept the heavy responsibilities of the office and in dedication to this service are not beset by financial deficits in their public and family obligations.

The committee in its proposal has presented a realistic bill in H.R. 8986 as a result of long study and thorough research of the problem. My compliments and appreciation are extended to its illustrious Chairman Tom Murray and the members of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service for their inestimable valued contribution to the perfection of good sound Government operation insuring, through efficient and intelligent personnel, a strong functioning Government.

APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Appropriations should be congratulated in its efforts to balance the cost of the Department of the Interior and related agencies including the U.S. Forest Service for 1965 and excluding the Bonneville Power Administration, Bureau of Reclamation, Southeastern Power Administration; the bill provided a net increase over the 1964 appropriation of 1 percent—a net increase of $9,439,100.

As to revenues earned it was projected that the activities are forecast to bring in a sum equal to $687,900,000—an increase of $90.2 million over 1964.

The most important responsibilities to the citizens of the Nation and the future generations of Americans are embodied in the purposes of this legislation—the conservation of our natural resources, the care of the Indians, and the development of the recreational facilities of our public lands—so ably accomplished in this administration by terrific activities of modern methods and the intelligent progressive ideas of our former colleague, Secretary Stewart Udall, and his efficient and talented staff of workers identified with the operations of the Department of the Interior and its related agencies.

It is significant that the committee has provided wide reforms in the field of education especially for the Indian children as well as other developments in Indian programs expanding their activities and benefits—approximately one-third of the appropriation figures are adapted to Indian affairs.

Also the necessary implementation for the Federal contribution to the establishment of the President John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts as authorized by Public Law 88–260 approved earlier this year—January 23, 1964—this is the accomplishment of another milestone in the establishment of a cultural center whose activities will reflect the realization of the realistic dream of our martyred President, whose classical mind envisioned the great contributions to the cultural progress of the Nation—fittingly emanating from the Capital City of the United States. There is no question that under the leadership of his artistic widow, Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy, that the great impetus needed to generate the public confidence in the ultimate aims of its sponsors will be realized—namely the success of establishing this institution through the matching of funds both public and Federal appropriated under this bill—not to exceed $15,400,000.

The many services of great public import provided under this bill are dedicated to a real public interest—no one can deny that the dollars spent to preserve and revitalize the recreational facilities and lands of our Nation that belong to our people as well as the advancement of the cultural and educational level is a signal contribution to public purpose. A great deal of credit belongs to the committee under the leadership of a great American and our colleague, Mr. **Michael Kirwan**, who again as he has in other fields, touching the true values of legislative contributions to our way of American life, guided the committee—and also instilled confidence in the Congress to foster and perpetuate the new programs proposed to conserve, improve our lands, and give guidance to the Department of the Interior whose demanding leadership petitions the Congress to make possible by legislation these reforms. This is a splendid bill for the purposes intended and should be unanimously supported by the Congress.

MILITARY PROGRAMS

Mr. Chairman, the passage of H.R. 10300 marks the passing of the master services of a great legislator, **Carl Vinson**, who for the past 30 years of his 50 years as a Member of the House has in his committee advised, guided, and directed legislation for the military departments considered by the Committee on Armed Services. His dedication to strengthening the defensive and offensive might of the United States as a military power is reflected in the superior if not supreme punishing and deterrent power of our military forces. The Nation and the Congress are deeply indebted to him in appreciation for his skillful and discerning statesmanship.

The many facets considered at all levels of military operational programs and projects were provided for after minute examination and study by the committee of the various proposals submitted for authorization during the fiscal year 1965.

The approved bill totals $1,590,666,000 and provides construction authorization in support of the Active Forces, the Reserve components, defense agencies, and military family housing.

The total authorization granted were as follows: Army, $300,482,000; Navy, $238,536,000; Air Force, $345,727,000; Defense agencies, including Atomic, Support, Supply, National Security, and Office of the Secretary, $10,805,000; family housing: Army—2,135 units; Navy—4,056 units; Air Force—3 695 units, amounting to $177,758,000; general support, $482,847,000 thus totaling for these items, $660,605,000; the Reserve forces—Army, Navy, Marine, and Air Corps Reserve and similar Army, and Air National Guard, totaling $34,450,000—a grand total of $1,590,666,000. The request for new facilities submitted by the military departments totaled over $2.1 billion and an additional three-quarters of a billion dollars for family housing. After study and analysis by the Department of Defense and the Bureau of the Budget—also the Secretary of Defense nearly half—49 percent—approximately $1 billion was rejected or deferred. The totals for military construction authorization for fiscal year 1965 amounts to $1,839,507,000.

The proposed acquisition of land amounted to 1,460,289 acres at a cost of $32 million—the committee approved the purchase of 204,282 acres at an estimated cost of $21.5 million, saving $10.5 million.

H.R. 13000 authorizes $75 million for medical facilities of which $56 million is provided for the erection of 11 hospitals.

The committee provided $17.5 million for emergency construction projects, a modified sum for a limited authority, and a strict guide against using these funds as an added reprograming authority but only for an unforeseen construction requirement.

The bill authorizes the construction of 585 military bases throughout the world; also 9,886 individual units of military family housing, minor construction authority for improvements of adequate quarters, rental guarantee payments, operating expenses, leasing of family units, 5,000; maintenance of the entire inventory of the military family, 368,000 units; credit debt payments and serviceman's mortgage insurance authorization.

The bill provides new authority to build 65 Army permanent installations, 3 on foreign shores, also cadet housing facilities, $137 million; operation and training facilities; surface-to-air missiles facilities, $39 million; medical facilities, $24 million; administrative facilities, $7 million; and land, $19 million. Also facilities for the Army Security Agency in the United States and at Army bases in foreign countries.

The provisions in the bill relative to the replacement of deteriorated temporary facilities—outdated basic plants necessitate the programing of $300 million per year over a 10-year period in new or improved facilities—are in conformity wth both the services and the committee's studies.

The bill provides certain moneys for a contemplated change in the removal of the 5th Army Headquarters at the Southside of Chicago, Ill., to Fort Sheridan, Ill.—appropriating $323 million to facilitate this change as an initial cost for preliminary preparation for plans and so forth. The estimated sums necessary to complete the proposed turnover will necessitate further continuing appropriations for housing facilities in the amount of about $10 million.

The advocates of the changes have not given any substantial reason for the transfer except to aver that it belongs there. The thousands of civilians employed giving related services to the operational unit headquarters will be thrown into the ranks of the unemployed. The broad scope of the operations of the 5th Army Headquarters, including the Midwestern States—Colorado on the west—carrying on the administrative business of the Army. This unit should be located at Chicago, Ill. It is easily accessible from all parts of the area by rail, air, or auto, certainly all lines of communication are at one's elbow. The committee showed acute alertness in response to the will of Chairman **Vinson**, in rejecting the O'Hara amendment submitted by the Chicago delegation striking the appropriation incorporated in the bill for this stupid scheme against the public interest of the citizens of Chicago. Chicago has been the victim of these military proposals under the pretense of economy—through consolidation of various services located in Chicago with other services in other cities—by transfer of the same to those cities without any regard to the employment problems resulting or the deprivation of the rights of those who had gained civil service status in their employment—in most instances, unless employees transfer—lose seniority and Federal employment.

The all inclusive items in the bill are varied and all encompassing of the military needs and intense operational worldwide scope of our military family. This all important subject has been treated by the committee with meticulous treatment of excellent legislative finesse. The perfected work glows with the brilliant and deft abilities of our estimable chairman, **Carl Vinson**, who enjoys a national reputation as the supreme authority on matters affecting the military policy of the services, as related to their legislative purposes. Chairman **Carl Vinson**, the Illinois delegation salutes you in appreciation of your dedication as a guide and guard of the military powers of our Nation through the years and today stands as the strongest, militarily, of all the nations of the world. Her position is in the forefront of the supreme defenders of the liberty-loving nations of the universe.

APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. Chairman, the appropriation for the Treasury, Post Office, and Executive Office for 1965 as incorporated in H.R. 10532 provides the sum of $1,207,080,000, some $179,954,000 in excess of the 1964 appropriation and a cut of $29,910,000 under the budget request.

Mandatory increases such as the Military Pay Act—of 1963—and the civilian pay increase—year of 1964—account for $121 million. Other costs and capital expenditures—purchase of electronic data processing equipment—to reduce rental costs, the replacement of aircraft and vessels—Coast Guard—account for $84 million. This volume and workload increases account for the increases.

The permanent appropriation and trust funds over which the Congress action remains at status quo amount in 1965 to $11,175,295,000, an increase of $390,880,000. The interest on the public debt included in this figure estimated at $11 billion, an increase over 1964 of $400 million.

The increases in personnel allowed over 1964 were as follows: 1,650 for Treasury and 700 in the Post Office.

The Treasury Department was provided with an appropriation of $1,207,080,000, an increase of $103,430,000 over 1964. Increase of civilian personnel 1,600—including 1,400 for the Internal Revenue Service. The entire Department of the Treasury is represented by about 82,000 employees exclusive of nonappropriated and revolving fund employment.

The increase in funds were a result of mandatory increases in costs—both military and civilian pay raises—about $48.6 million—equipment and facilities, $32 million; and the vessel and aircraft replacement program of the Coast Guard, $29 million.

Office of the Secretary: Committee recommends $5,550,000 increase of $550,000 over 1964. Office of the Director of Practice was transferred from Revenue to the Office of Secretary. Seven new positions were provided for.

Bureau of Accounts: Salaries and expenses, $33 million—less than 1964, $1,800,000.

Bureau of Customs: $76 million—$3,630,000 more than 1964—workload increasing continuously. Increase travelers at port of entry for 1965 estimated at $171 million—$158 million, 1962. Formal entries of merchandise increased from $1.5 million in 1962 to $1.8 million in 1965.

Bureau of Engraving and Printing, 1965, $5,750,000.

Bureau of the Mint, 1965, $9,380,000; increase of $1,880,000 over 1964. Salaries and expenses, $600,000, to be used exclusively to mint an increased number of coins to serve a critical need, and $650,000 for minting of

100 million silver dollars—100 employees increase allowed.

Construction of mint facilities: $16 million appropriated. New mint construction in Philadelphia, and for the improvement of machinery for coin production.

Bureau of the Public Debt: Appropriated for 1965, $49 million; increase of $1 million over 1964.

Bureau of Narcotics: Appropriated 1965, $5,500,000, increase of $200,000 over 1964 mandatory costs and oversea programs.

Coast Guard: $270 million 1965, $21 million over 1964—to provide for mandatory cost in salary increases and full year round operations of vessels, aircraft, and shore installations.

Internal Revenue: $583 million, an increase of $31 million over 1964. Mandatory increases including purchase of automatic data processing equipment and the increase of personnel—1,400.

Office of the Treasurer: $6 million, 1965; a reduction of $10,700,000—1964.

Secret Service: $7½ million, 1965; increase of $670,000 over 1964.

White House Police: $1,730,000, 1965; $30,000 increase—1964. Guard Force: $420,000, 1965; $20,000 increase—1964.

Post Office: Appropriation 1965, $5,001,500,000, an increase of $76 million over 1964—$72 million represent mandatory costs increases such as salaries, increased mail volume, increase in personnel, amounting to $23 million. Also an increase of 700 in personnel. Also in addition to the 380 accruing for consolidation of the accounting centers, making the total increase 1,080—a total personnel of 594,000.

Independent agencies: Tax court, $1,960,000, 1965; an increase of $70,000 over 1964.

Advisory Commission of Intergovernmental Relations: $395,000, 1965, an increase of $10,000—1964.

President's Advisory Committee on Labor-Management: $150,000, 1965, $50,000 less than 1964.

The committee is to be congratulated on its thorough evaluation of the needs of these Government divisions both as to their financial needs and in terms of personnel and mechanical modernization of the improvements in machinery implementation of use to the efficient operational services of the various bureaus and departments considered by this bill.

The passage of this legislation marks the end of the legislative chairmanship of the distinguished Congressman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] whose diligent and intelligent leadership has guided the efforts of his committee through the years of his chairmanship. At each session he was secure in his determination to procure the basic data and evidentiary facts to sustain the decisions of his committee. There is no more important matter than that of fixing the financial costs for the functioning offices and bureaus of Government—hence the excellent results of the committee in serving so well these heavy responsibilities of the whole Congress calls for a salute in appreciation for this splendid report reflecting the accomplishments of Chairman VAUGHAN GARY and the members of his efficient and dedicated committee.

NASA APPROPRIATION

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 10456 authorizes certain appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. The total appropriations amount to $5,193,810,500, necessary to support operational administration, research and development, construction of facilities, and for other purposes.

The separative appropriated figures for research and development $4,327,950,000; construction facilities, $248,335,000; and administrative operations $617,525,000.

The committee is to be congratulated for its consistent laborious application to its responsibilities throughout lengthy deliberations based upon the host of witnesses, except in their fields, who gave testimony on the various facets under consideration.

The committee in conformity with the desire of the Nation to establish superiority in space placed strong emphasis on the Apollo or moon project. The control of space in superiority by the United States is assurance of the continuation of peace among all nations. We are pledged to develop space for peaceful purposes. Nuclear armed space weapon systems in the control of any enemy power will give that nation the power to dictate terms at the bargain table.

Therefore, in order to prevent nations inimical to the interests of the pro-Western nations by implementing its policies for peace or war through its space weapon superiority forces the United States to pursue this goal with the moon shot, thus experimenting from inner to outer space.

The President determines the degree of emphasis to be placed in this area of operation.

In view of Russia's success in inner space, new earth operational vehicles, and the proposal of the United States and U.S.S.R. joint venture in an effort toward manned lunar landing which involves classified information, as well as other events, have caused a slowdown in the lunar program although NASA has enjoyed a steady growth—1963's accomplishments have not been too impressive in the practical sense of planned probing of space; only 10 of 40 major space probes were lifted into space.

To concentrate on this program is most important for our national security. The national space goals must be realized if we are to retain our supremacy as the most powerful nation militarily and as the most powerful deterrent to prevent war.

The many space programs and projects including the Gemini, $308,400,000; Apollo, $2,677,500,000; advanced missions, $22.1 million; geophysics and astronomy, $174.2 million; lunar and planetary exploration, $283.1 million; sustaining university, $46 million; launch vehicle development, $128.2 million; bioscience, $31 million; meteorological satellites, $37.5 million; communication satellites, $11.4 million; advanced technological satellites, $31 million; basic research, $21 million; space vehicle systems, $37 million; electronic systems, $27 million; human factor, $15.5 million; nuclear electric, $47.1 million; nuclear rockets, $57 million; chemical propulsion, $62.8 million; space power, $12.5 million; aeronautics, $37 million; tracking and data acquisition, $255.9 million, and technology, $4.750 million.

The university provided for the performance of research and development of projects under contractual arrangements under grants—training of students—to nonprofit educational institutions of higher learning; also including facilities grants and research grants—titles of facilities vests in United States—under such conditions that the benefits realized are of adequate proportions to justify the grants in this sustaining program.

Any accomplishment in this field becomes of wordly notice immediately upon its operational manifestation in space. We must persevere to become the first in outer space discoveries and exploration. We owe it to our people as well as our allies to control outer space for the purpose of maintaining the security of all nations for the preservation of peace.

Chicago's interest denied

The placement of the Electronic Research Center near Boston, Mass.—40 miles—with a continuing—in futuro—expenditure of millions of dollars involving the establishment of 10 different research facilities at different levels of the study of electronics—should have been divided by placement in other areas of the Nation. The report bears out the advantages on the educational level—colleges of higher learning in the area—but the city of Chicago the center of electronic production—Borg-Warner and Western Electric—with its worldwide recognized universities—Northwestern, Illinois, Chicago, Loyola, DePaul, Illinois Tech—and being the most important manufacturing and tool and die production center of the Nation should have been considered more favorably not only by reason of its location but due to the further fact that the city has lost the U.S. Army Research—Food and Canteen. Then the removal of the 5th Army Headquarters and several other important installations. The Midwest is being denied a participation in Federal programs to a point where it hurts.

FOOD STAMP ACT

Mr. Chairman, the road to poverty is footworn by the millions of hunger stricken humans whose withered bodies harbor near dead souls without ambition or substance. The most innocent in responsibility for their impoverished condition are the children who through the misfortunate circumstances of birth are wasting away without succor or substance. These can be truly called the resulting loss of a decadent generation.

We, as a God-fearing people, with charity in our hearts, have sponsored and supported tremendous international charity programs among the people of the earth—to give impetus to their self-uplift and to so stimulate their economy to increase their opportunities to pursue and enjoy normal living standards and remunerative employment.

And thus we have in these world encompassing projects spent enormous sums of money—$130 billion, including the Marshall plan—while being strict in the regulation of limitations and a too conservative control over our relief food program.

H.R. 10222 is designed to extend the Food Stamp Act Plan of 1964 over the Nation and further expand to thousands of our needy citizens the benefits under the act.

The expanded program will further strengthen the agricultural economy, increase the use of food abundances, reduce storage and other costs, stabilize the health, and insure the well-being of our needy, to regulate through cooperative Federal-State programs of food assistance through normal trade facilities and merchants in private enterprise as outlets for distribution to the recipients.

There are 43 such local areas operating under the stamp programs since 1961—under H.R. 10222 the program is under congressional direction and further provides specific legal authority for the program.

The accumulation of surplus foods should not be considered solely for oversea negotiations but should serve a most salutary and righteous purpose in being placed at the disposal of indigent persons for home consumption.

Under the bill any area organized through an agency "set up" to administer public assistance programs can submit a request for the establishment of a food stamp program—its plan of operation, factual data—incident to the scope and statistical basic determinations are presented to the authority petitioned.

Each State is responsible for the costs of operation including costs of administration, the determination of eligible households, together with the investigations, conferences with citizens seeking participation, the control, issuance and protection of the coupons upon their transfer by the Federal authority. The collection of data as to households certified as not being on the public assistance rolls—being of a Federal interest for aid—such costs will be met at the Federal expense.

The Secretary of Agriculture will pass upon the State and local plans of operation presented for approval.

From previous statistics it was determined that 60 percent of the households approved as participants of the program are not on the relief rolls or receiving public assistance—but whose eligibility to participate was based on their economic status. This indicated that help was needed if the attainment of a nutritionally adequate diet should be realized. Each State would establish these standards subject to the approval of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Any foods are eligible for consumption except alcoholic beverages, tobacco, imports or foreign foods so identified or packaged by mark or brand; also soft drinks, and luxury foods—including those frozen.

The member of the eligible household makes application to the local welfare agency for the right to participate in the stamp program. The welfare agency determines the percentage of the household income which would normally be spent for food which can be purchased with food stamps.

Upon being given approval the member takes his authorization and the money allocated from his budget for food purchases, and buys his allotment of food stamps at the issuing agency—usually a local bank. He makes his purchases at a participating retail store having received $10 in stamps for about $6-plus cash. The Government redeems the stamps by Government check upon a deposit of the same at his bank, the stamps can be used to pay the merchants' bills to wholesalers who are listed as participants. The stamps are redeemable through the banking systems.

This bill will upgrade the diet of those who are not able to, because of their low income and family responsibility to provide proper nutrient foods for their consumption. The bill will also reduce the cost of maintaining tremendous surplus foods in storage plants at high rental and preservation costs.

The costs of the program for an estimated 4 million persons is estimated at $360 million per year.

The net savings to the Government under the direct system of distribution would be between $185 million and $280 million per year. This wide range of estimates of savings reflect the difference between the value of the surplus food involved in the entire range of the operations of the program. Also the consideration of the surplus foods at costs when purchased and the value of the same at time of distribution.

An additional expense in the perfecting of the system is listed as $175 million the cost of the surplus foods or as low as $80 million at market value at period of distribution. A survey indicates that the present 1,500 counties participating under the present act will seek certification under H.R. 10222.

H.R. 10222 is a real contribution not only to the welfare of the people in need but a stimulant to the prosperity of the farmer and our economy. Its application will increase the number of participants from some 380,000 persons and 43 areas in 22 States covering 1,500 counties—the present program—to a nationwide expansion of 4 million persons and makes the food stamp program permanent. There are now on file 234 requests for the program from other localities.

The increase in the demand for vegetables, fruit, and meat resulted in the stimulus given by this program, and also resulted in the increase in the use of feed grains. Thus not only were diets increased in quantity but the varied selection of other foods were made possible. Thus the food stamp program also benefits the food industry as well as the consumer. And the cost to the Government is the same. The violations were less than 1 percent.

The studies made of the pilot food program together with the research agencies determinations attest as to its future effectiveness under H.R. 10222—the benefits to the Nation resulting from its operation will prove the food stamp program as an essential instrumentation in the war on poverty.

LEGISLATIVE APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Appropriations has completed a practical and significant analysis of the financial needs of the legislative and related agencies for 1965.

The appropriations indicated for the respective classifications are as follows:

House of Representatives, $53,777,945 plus joint items, $6,150,865; Architect of the Capitol, $19,607,000; the Botanic Garden, $500 million; the Library of Congress, $23,419,100; the Government Printing Office, $23,562,000; Office of Sergeant at Arms—Capitol Police, $180,700—$955,000; franked mail expense, and so forth, $1,833,560; education of pages, $79,925; the General Accounting Office, $46,900,000; Clerk, $1,240,000; agency of the legislative branch: Reference Bureau, $2,300,000; Copyright Office, $1,828,000; building of a new Government Printing Office plant, $46,723,000; books for the blind, $2,446,000; Capitol Power Plant, $2,700,000; Rayburn Office Building, $8 million, for items toward completion; extension of the Capitol, $125,000; Capitol Grounds, $665,000; Doorkeeper $1,174,000; thus the major items including the new proposed Government Printing Office plant—$46,723,000—reach a total appropriation of $173,916,910—$9,703,784 below 1964 and $48,670,445 below budget requests. Also some $11 million will inure to the benefit of the Treasury on direct cash income from sales of Library catalog cards and Government publications and copyright operations.

The committee is to be congratulated upon its efficient and thorough study given those complex questions presented to it well as the new proposals and projects submitted through the various agencies for determination. Chairman STEED and his committee are to be commended for the fine results attained in its final presentation for our consideration.

The controversial amendment related to the reactivation of the Joint Committee on Immigration and Nationality policy providing an appropriation of $160,000, for specific investigatory purposes, including alleged departures and fraudulent practices on the part of persons in interest—both sponsors in the Congress and others—in accepting moneys for such services against interest; also as a factfinding committee to study the proposals for a new basic immigration act submitted by our martyred President, John F. Kennedy. The opponents allege that the joint committee has no legislative powers or power to investigate except for making policy, and that Subcommittee No. 1 on Immigration of the Judiciary Committee is well equipped to carry on the purposes intended. It has investigatory powers of the subject matter under a resolution passed by the House in January 1963. My bill on immigration, H.R. 3323, introduced on February 4, 1963, rewriting the Immigration Act, is still pending. Its provisions incorporate the administration's recommendations made by the late President John F. Kennedy and President Lyndon B. Johnson.

In view of the representations made by Chairman EMANUEL CELLER that his full cooperation would be given to facilitate its functions—both as to requests for an appropriation enabling act before the Committee on House Administration and the free choice of qualified personnel and, further, that he would approve the issuance of subpenas as requested, the amendment was defeated.

The appropriation of $320,000—both House and Senate appropriations—was deemed unnecessary to reactivate the joint committee, in that under the law each body, the Senate and the House, must pay one-half of the expenses. The amendment was defeated by voice vote, division and tellers, 69 to 69. Personally, I was impressed with the arguments against the amendment and felt that the joint committee without legislative powers would only delay the legislation.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] explained his position relative to his support of his amendment and in positive terms pledged his every effort to carry out the responsibilities of his chairmanship of the subcommittee and his membership on the joint committee; but under the complicated involvement of a legislative prerogative of the House against joint committee action—affecting only policy—he was unsuccessful.

CONSERVATION OF WILDLIFE

Mr. Speaker, the purposes of S. 793 to promote the conservation of the Nation's wildlife resources on the Pacific flyway in the Tule Lake, Lower and Upper Klamath, and Clear Lake National Wildlife Refuges in Oregon and California; and to aid the Klamath reclamation project. The enactment of S. 793 does not involve additional costs. These important areas of wildlife in the refuge system are strategically located on the Pacific flyway. About 80 percent of the migratory waterfowl in the Pacific concentrate in the Upper Klamath Basin as they pass through this area. A heavy concentration of millions of ducks, geese, and shore birds of various marsh dwelling species feed and rest in this area. The whole refuge operation is concentrated and dependent upon the Klamath reclamation project; there is a critical need for the expansion of land and waters for wildlife refuge purposes here and new procedures were necessary for making the availability of such resources. The holding of the waterfowl in these areas before harvest prevents the depredation of the rice and other crops in the Central and Imperial Valleys—the local crops in the refuge area are sufficient to hold them there and also delay their migration to the wintering grounds. The crops in the valleys are harvested without serious depredation problems. Thus the food supply must be kept at sufficient quantity and availability so as to prevent crop losses in the valleys. This economic value is important as well as the license fees derived from hunting, leases, and other income at a recreational tourist attraction.

This legislation was necessary to provide a permanent basis for management purposes of the resources within the four refuges. The bill will establish guidelines in reclamation activities and thus stabilize Federal ownership of the lands so recovered as well as the lands owned by the United States within the four refuges for the purposes intended. Also includes several additional tracts of public lands to be retained permanently for this specific purpose. Provides for 25 percent of income from leased lands to inure to the benefit of the respective counties based on the location of the same—a 50-percent limitation is placed on payments comparable to the average local taxes assessed on similar lands. A reimbursement payment of $197,315 to the Klamath drainage district for outlay of moneys on irrigation projects on passage of title to the Government. The present practice of leasing lands for agricultural purposes is to continue. Row crops limited to 25 percent of total leased lands. In the Tule Lake area reduction of sumps limited to present 13,000 acres. Also water levels must be maintained adequate for waterfowl management purposes. The Secretary to complete study related to the development of water resources and the waterfowl management potential of the Clear Lake refuge.

Chairman Aspinall, as well as the members of the committee, have formulated a bill worthy of the high standards necessary to preserve the wildlife and lands that protect and feed, in refuges, our migratory fowl life. The utility of these lands are dedicated to the purposes intended. The Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall and his Department were sorely in need of such legislation in order to maintain successful operation of these lands in the public interest and to preserve for the enjoyment of the future generations of Americans the conservation of wildlife and to maintain the recreational advantages of these refuge areas. We compliment members of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, its illustrious chairman, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. Aspinall], as well as the Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall for their dedication to the conservation of our wild lands and preservation of our wild life for posterity.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATION

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 10939 reported favorably by the Committee on Appropriations for the funds required by the Department of Defense for 1965. It provides for the regular military functions of the Department excluding military construction, family housing, and civil defense levels considered, under other bills.

The various items in summary classification were considered and approved: Military personnel, $14,565,000; operation and maintenance, $12,280,000; procurement, $13,437,-947,000; research, development, and evaluation, $6,476,320,000—totaling $46,759,267,-000—divided as follows to the various services and agencies: Army, $11,346,125,000; Navy, $14,263,528,000; Air Force, $18,489,333,-000; defense agencies, $2,660,231,000.

The importance of this bill is that it makes more secure the progressive advance and incremental increase of the military strength of our Nation. The financial costs of equipping, feeding, and clothing our Armed Forces of $2.687,000 on active duty. Also provides for 687 military installations and 875 naval vessels, 30,000 aircraft, and the addition of 2,655 military aircraft. Also the construction of 53 vessels and 7 vessels for conversion purposes and over $1.6 billion for procurement of equipment.

The strategic retaliatory forces are the striking force in a nuclear war—long-range bombers, air-to-ground and decoy missiles, aerial refueling tankers, land-based and submarine-based strategic missiles, and systems for their command and control. The increase in missiles, weapons, and their megaton quantity and quality in 3 years are doubled and trebled. The bill provides for 50 Minuteman silos, retrofit of others with Minuteman II missiles. Also retrofit of Polaris A1 missiles range 2,500 nautical miles A–3. Also research moneys for study of bombers. The cost of the strategic retaliatory forces supported by the bill approaches $5.2 billion.

The Continental Air and Missile Defense Forces equipment needed to detect, identify, track, and destroy unfriendly forces approaching the North American Continent. Its main problem to survive a missile attack requires research effort in the direction of reaching significant improvements in satellite detection and tracking capabilities. There are appropriated $1.7 million to this end.

The General Purpose Forces include the Army combat units, Navy unit, Marine Corps units, and the Air Force.

Certain reductions were made, as for instance pay and allowances of military personnel, because of former deficiencies having been reduced by the 1964 appropriations. The regular defense budget has varied with the years in accordance with the needs. This bill is $7 billion above the level. Management has been good and the need for the increase is obvious. The committee's desire to maintain the military strength of the United States superior to that of any other power in order that its voice and power as a deterrent to war would be respected by friend and foe alike. In international matters, firmness of position is guaranteed by superiority of an adequate military striking power. Thus, President Lyndon Johnson cannot only give strong talk but also enjoys a flexibility in dealing with the world's problems.

The funds provided under the bill are adequate to insure the development of a realistic continuing research leading toward a future new weapons system. Also the committee recommends the coordination of antisubmarine warfare effort on the part of the Navy. The protection of the coastal United States—both against ballistic- and marine-launched missiles; of merchant shipping; and the naval fleet. The question of research and operational tactics are thus the forces designed to perform the entire range of combat operations short of nuclear war. This group cost some $13.5 billion—$18.3 billion requested, 1965—and preclude the military personnel of 1.3 million men.

Airlift forces are the Military Air Transport Service transport aircraft; the Air Force Tactical Air Command troop carrier aircraft, the Air Force Tactical Air Command troop carrier aircraft; the troopships, cargo ships, and tankers operated by the Military Sea Transportation Service and forward floating bases—it costs $1.4 billion for the accounts covered in this bill.

The Reserve and National Guard forces—1,065,000, 1965—at the cost of $2 billion for research and development, appropriated, $5.4 billion; retired pay appropriated, $1.5—supporting 466,100 retirees, an increase of $53,700 for 1965.

Thus, the committee throughout its work kept in mind the question of the military superiority of our Nation in order to protect and lead the freedom nations of the world and to also perfect as a deterrent force against these enemies who would seek to destroy God-fearing men. Chairman George Mahon, of Texas, and his committee are to be congratulated in guaranteeing by adequate appropriations the military integrity of our forces to defend the peoples of the world who worship God, and whose symbol of freedom given guidance and hope to the hearts of these patriots of the captive nations who live to die in their fight for deliverance by us from our common enemies.

RENEGOTIATION ACT

Mr. Chairman, the extension provided in H.R. 10669 of the Renegotiation Act of 1951 which authorizes the Government to recover moneys determined as excess profits on certain Government contrasts and related subcontracts. The act expires on June 30, 1964, and hereunder is extended for 2 years until June 30, 1966. The Federal aviation contracts are included as well as related subcontracts, accruing or paid after June 30, 1964, to contractors or subcontractors.

The need for a renegotiation system of determination of costs and profits in the fields of modern aircraft, missiles, space vehicles, and other procurements. The production of items and costs cannot be fully ascertained because of no prior basis to fix a contract price and the actual cost to the contractor. In most instances the specifications for instrumentation are general in specificity necessitating sometimes experimentation and research for the final practicability of the instrumentation for use for desired results. Also substantial amounts of material purchased by the Federal Aviation Agency are somewhat similar to the items purchased by the other departments under the act and even as to making purchases from the same contractors.

To terminate this practice in the public interest under this act would create a void in the operation of doing business under conditions where costs cannot be determined. The act serves as a protection to small business and facilitates the consummation of contracts with contractors who otherwise would encounter delays because of the inability of the Government or themselves to reach basic cost figures agreements. The act is a protection to both industry and the Government—and also protects the public interest. Chairman Carl Vinson and the committee have rendered the people of the Nation a great service in recommending the continuation of the life of the Renegotiation Act.

PROTECTING HEADS OF FOREIGN STATES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7651) to provide authority to protect heads of foreign states and other officials.

The Speaker. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. Gross. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask someone in connection with this bill if it is the intent of Congress to give State Department police the authority to arrest on suspicion only where it is deemed necessary to protect a foreign official?

Mr. Libonati. That is true. This covers about 330 persons, and has to do with the State Department or Minister, and also the Chancellor or Prime Minister.

Mr. Gross. Let me ask the gentleman this question: What happens if a foreign diplomat assaults a citizen of the United States?

Mr. Libonati. That is not preemptive at all. He would be under color of both violations, Federal and State, depending upon the nature of the assault.

Mr. Gross. He would not be able to claim diplomatic immunity in that case?

Mr. Libonati. No.

AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION

Mr. Chairman, the appropriation for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for 1965 as reported in H.R. 11202 total $5,182,665,000, an amount less than the 1964 appropriation in the sum of $1,059,632,215.

One of the important items is an appropriation of $1,500,000 for a study research of tobacco at the University of Kentucky Tobacco Research Laboratory—adjacent to the Medical Research Center. The purpose of the study is to remove such ingredients that are detrimental to public health of the user.

Another item for additional research is the pesticide residue problem including insecticides together with the effects of sprays, and so forth, used in agricultural production. The effect upon fish of certain agricultural pesticides as well as the chemical insolubility of certain substances comprising the pesticide formula resulting in stream pollution will be studied. An appropriation of $1½ million has been recommended in the bill. The use of fertilizers, insecticides and pesticides insures higher quality foods and an abundance of crop return. Otherwise the production of food crops would decline—and the ravages of insects and pests if unabated would result in a shortage of essential foods. A strong agricultural economy insures a strong national economy. Industry and agriculture are dependent on one another to maintain the financial stability of the Nation.

The committee is to be congratulated in its refusal to follow the recommendation of the Bureau of the Budget to eliminate marketing research which has been of controlling importance to the interest of the consumers. These stations located at Chicago, Boston, Philadelphia, New York, Pittsburgh, Detroit, and many other cities, conduct marketing studies to improve marketing facilities an activity extremely valuable to the consumers of the Nation. The appropriation of $662,000 to protect the consumer by slicing an equivalent amount from the appropriation for the Agency for International Development, whose purpose is to train our competitors in technical assistance, and so forth, in world agricultural markets.

The general activities in its various divisions and classifications receive $1,393,687,000, the credit agencies $55,885,000; corporations, including Public Law 480 and other assistance programs, $3,733,093,000 and Farm Credit Administration $2,876,000.

It is with a deep sense of appreciation that we commend Chairman JAMIE L. WHITTEN and the work of his committee in giving special emphasis to consumer interest and the problems that confront industry and agriculture necessitating wide and broad programs of research in order to arrive at a basic solution. H.R. 11202 represents a fine contribution to strengthening the agricultural economy and the national economy and secures for the consumer a real protection of their interests both in food quality and cost levels. It constitutes much to the stability of farm interests at every level and continues our interest in international world markets and competitive problems. As an important legislative act it stands alone as a masterful treatment of a most sensitive area of our national activity which controls the very life of our total economy.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 11369, the military construction appropriation bill, has for its purpose also family housing totaling $1,599,014,500, an increase of $13,134,500 over 1964. The funds made available for these obligations are $1,378,480,000 for the Regular forces and $59,971,000 for the Reserve forces; for family housing, $650,358,000; military construction, for defense agencies, $12,656,000; Air Force, $346 million; Navy, $247 million; Army, $301 million.

Thus the subcommittee under the leadership of its chairman, HARRY RICHARD SHEPPARD, has accomplished a superlative work in bringing this legislation to the floor. The many requests in the budget estimates must be determined. Many witnesses are heard and the committee then, after laborious work, sifts out the chaff and unnecessary cost expansion programs—finally in agreement—draws the sums necessary as approved. The committee reduced the budget requests by $279,985,500.

Mr. Chairman, the presentment of the military construction bill for 1965, H.R. 11369, by the distinguished Congressman HARRY RICHARD SHEPPARD, chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations closes the career of a practical legislator whose deep knowledge of business management and operation contributed much to solution of the many problems confronting his committee through the years.

He served 13 terms in the Congress having been elected first to the 75th Congress in 1934. His employments previous to his election were in the fields of railroad transportation—Santa Fe—mining—Alaska copper industry—and several business interests—president and general manager of King's Beverage and King's Laboratories Corp. of California. His interests carried him into several continents on a competitive scale.

Congressman SHEPPARD is a quiet, understanding individual who earned by hard work his way through life. Under great handicaps he prepared himself for the law. His study of human nature in his business travels did not destroy his confidence in human beings. His experience made him a realistic opponent or friend. His greatest strength of character is his steadfast determination to weigh the facts carefully—then as a tough fighter stand by his decision. He is kind and considerate in his dealings with his fellow man. His high sense of integrity has never been questioned.

His darling wife Kay is the joy of his family life. Although he regrets leaving the House of Representatives—his decision rests upon a desire to enjoy the remaining years in retirement with his precious lady in travel and recreation. No one can deny that he and his mate have earned a respite from the heavy duties of governmental affairs.

HARRY SHEPPARD will be missed in the Congress of the United States. His work has not gone unnoticed. His valuable services to his State and Nation are reflected in the powerful assignments to which he was appointed by the Speakers of the House through the years. May God light his way to great happiness with a restive spirit of peaceful enjoyment of his remaining years with his loyal mate Kay by his side.

We will long remember this great man who lived to serve others so that in their lives life's problems would be lessened. May God bless him and Lady Kay forever.

"I WILL" NATIONAL MONUMENT COMMISSION

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 11554 was introduced for the purpose of establishing a Federal Commission to be known as the "I Will" National Monument Commission composed of six members—four appointed by the President, one appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate, and one by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The members of the Commission shall serve without salary, but shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

The Commission is authorized to appoint and fix compensation of necessary personnel; also, to receive private donations for the erection in the harbor at Chicago, Ill., of a statue to be sculpted under the direction of Trygve A. Rovelstad in accordance with Illinois Senate Joint Resolution 34 passed on the 21st day of May 1963 by the senate and adopted in the house on June 25. It reads as follows:

"PRESENTATION OF RESOLUTIONS

"Senators Little and Bidwill offered the following senate joint resolution:

"'*Senate Joint Resolution 34*

"'Whereas the Associated "I Will" Sculptors of Chicago, Inc., a not-for-profit Illinois corporation, has volunteered its services to the State of Illinois to construct, free of charge, an "I will" statue; and

"'Whereas it is proposed that this colossus be located on an artificial island just out from the Buckingham Fountain between Navy pier and the Adler Planetarium on Lake Michigan just off the coast of Chicago; and

"'Whereas this modern colossus will rise to the majestic height of 500 feet above the water, and

"'Whereas this fabulous statue will be unique among the world's marvels and will attract sightseers and art fans from the four corners of the world: Therefore be it

"'*Resolved, by the Senate of the Seventy-third General Assembly of the State of Illinois (the house of representatives concurring herein)*, That this general assembly approve the placing of the "I Will" statue in Lake Michigan, 3,000 feet out an artificial island in Illinois territory and acceptance of title thereto by the department of conservation on behalf of the State of Illinois.'

"Senator Little having asked and obtained unanimous consent to suspend the rules for the immediate consideration of the resolution, moved its adoption.

"The motion prevailed and the resolution was adopted.

"Ordered that the secretary inform the house of representatives thereof and ask their concurrence therein.

"Senator Larson offered the following senate resolution and, having asked and obtained unanimous consent to suspend the rules for its immediate consideration, moved its adoption:

"'An appropriation not to exceed $500,000 to pay one-half the cost of the erection of the "I Will" statue.

"'The Secretary of Interior is authorized to accept the island as a unit of the national park system.'"

Trygve Rovelstad envisioned a gigantic statue 500 feet above the waters of Lake Michigan in Chicago Harbor in 1939. It is the project of the associated "I Will" sculptors of Chicago, a nonprofit organization chartered by the State of Illinois. Trygve Rovelstad is the president of the "I Will" corporation. Mrs. Rovelstad is vice president, and Oliver L. Rodin, a Chicago sculptor, is secretary.

The site of the statue is 3,000 feet out into the harbor from Buckingham Fountain between the Navy pier and the Adler Planetarium.

Rovelstad has made several models. Rodin, codesigner of the statue, was born in Belgium. Both admit that it will take years of hard work even before the preparation of the site. Most of the artwork would be in hammered copper or cast aluminum.

The fabulous statue will be unique among the world's marvels and will attract thousands of sightseers, tourists, and art students. An elevator is proposed to carry viewers to the top.

It is fitting that the Federal Government should participate in this program. The motto of Chicago, "I Will," reflects the determination that the spirited pioneers of early Chicago struggled to make Chicago the great city that it is today. The city of Chicago under the great leadership of Mayor Richard Daley is passing through a transition period of rebuilding and improvements, both public and private, that foretells its future, great destiny as the leading modern metropolis of the Nation and the greatest inland seaport of the Americas via the St. Lawrence gateway for oceangoing ships. The statue is a symbol of Chicago's spirit—it is well for the Nation to honor her in this way.

H.R. 9124

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. LIBONATI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisina?

There was no objection.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of H.R. 9124 is to enable the continuance under modern changes of the military system of instruction the support of the junior ROTC units in approximately 255 schools in the Nation. The proposals submitted by the Department of Defense after a thorough study are as follows:

First. The establishment of a new 2-year senior ROTC program and continuing the present 4-year program.

Second. In addition, authorizes the establishment of a program of scholarship assistance for students in the Army and Air Force program:

First. Payment of tuition, books, and so forth, not to exceed $800 per year for each of the 2 academic years.

Second. Also retainer pay of $50 per month for 10 months in each academic year—in lieu of existing $27 per month.

Third. Travel allowance of 6 cents per mile.

Fourth. Increased summer training camp pay from $78 per month to $111.15.

Fifth. Also Department given authority to increase retainer pay from $27 to $50 per month for all students in the ROTC program if justified.

The salutary effect of this program will improve the quality of young men as officer material for the armed services. These modern changes will give impetus to the ambition of young men to follow military careers and give to them the necessary training to develop their abilities in this field without the handicap of financial worries and incidental loss of time hours in earning their way to pursue their studies.

The precommission courses in the colleges and universities would broadly enhance the interest of junior ROTC candidates to pursue further the military training provided for in the proposed programs to compete for commissions. The one requisite on the part of the candidate under the scholarship and retainers proviso is the agreement to serve 4-year tour of active duty and to accept a Regular or Reserve commission, if offered.

It is said only 37 percent of these candidates remain in the service but this small investment is not only an aid to education but also prepares an emergency reserve in case of a national emergency when officer-trained personnel among the civilian population will be the greatest asset to the national defense. The chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Louisiana, **Edward Hébert** and the members of the committee are to be complimented on reporting H.R. 9124 favorably as an important contribution to the national defense and the educational development of our youth not only at the military level but in fields of special or general education including the professions.

SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 11865 treats with needed social security amendments presented to the House after a far-reaching study of this program by the Ways and Means Committee under its distinguished chairman, **Wilbur Mills**, of Arkansas.

The purpose of the bill is to improve the benefit and coverage provisions of the 1958 act, together with the recommendation of improvements in the financial structure of the Federal old-age survivors and disability insurance—OASDI—system. The changes were primarily a result of the increases in the basic costs of living, together with other influencing factors in a growing economy. The increase in insurance benefits recommended are a 5-percent across-the-board provision. Also an increase in contribution and the benefit base.

The bill contains a special provision to enable certain aged people who do not presently qualify under the social security work requirement periods of employment by reducing the covered work requirements for these aged workers, aged wives, and aged widows. Benefits would accrue to these aged individuals at the age of 72.

Also child benefits to be received in education were extended from 18 to 22 years of age.

The widow participation was lowered to the age of 60 on an actuary and voluntary reduced basis.

Those receiving tips, such as at the personal service levels, for example, waiter, waitresses, busboys, bellboys, porters, and so forth, whose major portions of salary are based on these contributions, would be, under this bill, permitted to receive credit for benefits and contributions.

A most important amendment covers professional groups and the self-employed, permitting those self-employed to join the social security program.

There is a provision covering policemen and firemen in the employ of bodies politic, where the group organizes or is presently organized—by a majority vote of its membership may qualify to enter the system. This is purely a permissive arrangement.

Under present law that coverage would only include those who desire to participate. But to all future members of the system social security would be compulsory. But also in the existing law is a provision in the nature of a declaration of congressional policy that the protection afforded members of a State or local government retirement system should not be impaired as a result of the extension of social security coverage to the members of the system.

A delegation representing the patrolmen of the city of Chicago, Ill., visited the Congress last week, questioning the advisability of this provision, feeling that its enactment would jeopardize the present retirement system for patrolmen and firemen in the city of Chicago. The congressional members of the Illinois delegation from Chicago conferred with Chairman **Wilbur Mills** and the city delegation representing the policemen, M. J. Higgins, and Chicago Patrolmen Association President Frank Carey, with their counsel, Leon Belinsky, on this question. Chairman **Mills** explained that the fire and police departments in the smaller cities and towns throughout the various States were in need of this provision—and especially those units whose members worked at part-time jobs—seeking to unify the benefits under social security, thereby increasing their benefits, and questioning the stabilizing of their local police and firemen pension systems whose reserves were small and represented in funds weakened financial guarantees for a lasting integrity of investment return to meet the financial needs for pension payments.

He also stated that under the closed rule no amendment could be offered to affect the provision covering this subject matter. Congressmen **Dawson**, **Rostenkowski**, **Murphy**, **Finnegan**, **Pucinski**, **Kluczynski**, **O'Hara**, **Price**, **Gray**, **Shipley**, and myself—as well as our visiting officials representing the patrolmen of the city of Chicago, were appreciative of Chairman **Mills'** cooperation and discussion of the question so important to the retirement programs of our city affecting the interest of these worthy and honored, dedicated men to the public interest and protection.

Arrangements were made for interviews with our distinguished Senators—**Dirksen** and **Douglas**—to resolve the question, if necessary, through amendment in the Senate upon its passage in the House of Representatives.

One thing is certain that the contractual obligation between the present recipients under the present independent retirement systems and the city of Chicago cannot be affected by any legislation permissive in nature affecting the future action of individuals or groups voting coverage under the provisions of this bill—the individual pensioner determines his own course and enjoys the protection of his local retirement system unless he or she elects to join the others under social security coverage.

The great mayor of the city of Chicago, Richard Daley, would never let them down—he is the pensioners friend. As a member of the house of representatives and the senate in the general assembly, he fought in the front line for added benefits to pensioners in all retirement systems.

The bill affects 40 million individuals under the social security law and the increases are estimated as costing $925 million. Yet the changes made in the revised schedule of social security tax rates and the increase in taxable earnings base result in improving the actuarial balance to meet these obligations and thus the system will continue to be self-supporting through the adequate financing under this bill. Thus these changes will not affect the funds to disturb the sound actuarial base upon which the system operates.

The committee and its distinguished Chairman **Wilbur Mills** are to be congratulated upon their painstaking efforts and meticulous research in drafting this much-needed legislation for the relief of the masses of workers and self-employed individuals who rely upon the integrity of the Congress and the Government to carry out their promises to the workers of the Nation that the Government would keep the faith in maintaining an adequate recompense to them as a reward for their years of useful employment, thus strengthening and contributing to the growth of the economy. We make good our promises to the aged that comfort and happiness would crown their declining years without want under the greatest humanitarian program of the aged—social security.

H.R. 9070

Mr. Chairman, it is with a deep feeling of satisfaction that I join with the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. **Aspinall**] and his discerning Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in support of H.R. 9070, which has for its purpose a far-reaching proposal to assume jurisdiction by our Government over some 9 million acres of the Nation's unspoiled wilderness areas in order to preserve their natural state and prevent encroachment.

The Federal Government now owns some 61 millions of acres of undeveloped wilderness areas. The bill reserves to the Congress any future addition to preserve other areas for this specific purpose. Under the Senate version of this act the Secretary of Interior is empowered to extend this coverage to other lands held by the Government for their preservation as wilderness areas. The House bill seeks to prevent the Secretary of Interior from exercising this power by reserving to the Congress the power to extend expansion control over wild areas.

The purpose of the act seeks to prevent exploitation of these lands by humans in our increasing population and the detrimental effects on these lands of our mechanical expansion. This act guarantees to this generation and future generations of Americans the enduring resources of the wilderness as well as a great contribution to the enjoyment and its unimpaired future use for recreational purposes only experienced in such areas. The use must be protected by certain standards of control or rules that will protect and not defeat the public purposes of recreational, scenic, scientific, educational, conservation, and historical uses.

A minimum requirement of roads shall be built—but autos, motorboats, motorized equipment, landing aircraft, and other form of mechanized transport, structures, or installations are barred from such areas. The exception being that where these uses are presently established, such may remain, under specific restrictions of the Secretary of Agriculture. Also as to safety control or health—fires, insects, and diseases—subject to such conditions as the Secretary of Agriculture deems desirable.

Prospecting or the gathering of information about minerals and other resources is permitted if the preservation principle is respected.

Further consultations between the Secretary of the Department of the Interior and the Secretary of the Department of Agriculture for the surveying on a planned basis in such areas again consistent with the policy of preservation through the Geological Survey and the Bureau of Mines to determine mineral values. The results of such surveys shall be available to the public, the President, and the Congress. All laws on mining and mineral leasing shall be applicable to this act and with the further stipulation that the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior have the power to make such reasonable regulations as deemed necessary to the preservation of the area. These individuals now enjoying certain rights, leases, and so forth, are protected under certain prescriptions in this act. The rights of the several States or State in wildlife or wilderness areas are also preserved—their responsibilities and jurisdiction remain intact under this act. State and private lands surrounded by wilderness areas are permitted reasonable ingress and egress to and from their lands. Also exchange of lands may be permitted—such as similar lands within the State owned by the Federal Government for land of like value held within the wilderness area.

Secretary of Agriculture may accept gifts or bequests of land within the wilderness areas. The Secretary of the Interior also may accept gifts or contributions from private persons to be used in furtherance of this act. Advance notice must be given to the President and the Congress within 60 days of the offer. A joint annual report must be submitted to the Congress through the President of the United States.

A consideration of other areas for inclusion as wilderness areas or abandonment of such lands now under act fitting other purposes shall be determined by both the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior and their recommendation submitted to the President for a report to the Congress. This program can be instigated within 10 years of the act's enactment.

Chairman ASPINALL and his conscientious committee have spent years of study and research in this field—certainly such meritorious work cannot go unnoticed. The Congress and the American people are indebted to this intelligent committee and its splendid leader, Chairman ASPINALL, for this forward-looking legislation to protect our wildlife and wilderness areas. Generations of Americans in the future through this needed legislation will have preserved for them the lands of the wilderness to enjoy its great contribution to the recreational, educational, and scientific enjoyment of areas so protected. This act is far reaching in its effect upon the Nation's citizens and its blessings will be enjoyed by the whole population now and in the future by generations of Americans.

H.R. 11377

Mr. Chairman, the history of the human race is replete with the struggle of man against want, the elements, and natural enemies bent toward his destruction.

The Neanderthal man, a primeval species of man in the paleolithic period, widespread throughout Europe, were preoccupied with these same problems relative to the struggle for existence. He survived because of an inner awareness of the external world between acts of self-interest that were within his power to accomplish and those not within his power—he so disciplined his will.

The greatest deterrent to the continued existence of my form of human society has been the disrupting effect and decadence through progressive growth at the poverty level. The curse of poverty has caused the capitulation of the most powerful nations of antiquity and has contributed to the death of millions of human beings throughout the ages. It is like a serpent that crushes the body and poisons the mind of reason.

The most contributing factor to the continuing prevalence of poverty is due to ignorance—based on illiteracy and lack of training for vocational pursuits. Further, the individual remains static through the resulting loss of opportunity in the field of employment. Gradually the fading of hope gives way to despair. Human pride is lost, and a state of lethargy destroys any trace of ambition in the individual. Humans suffering from poverty no longer exert any stimulating interest in the community or their personal lives. The resulting environmental conditions, both spiritual and physical, steep the individual into a mental abyss of failure and despair.

The United States, in spite of its great wealth and $530 billion, the highest economy ever in 1963—productive of its industry, farming, and commerce, and so forth—numbers 30 million Americans within this category of need, suffering in human misery, living in hunger and despair.

Certainly, our Nation, with its great wealth, tremendous income, specialization in all fields of knowledge and terrific productive capacity is well equipped to combat and eliminate poverty among our people.

The initiative must be taken by the concentrated effort at all levels of government, communities, civic and private organizations, and so forth, to lend their efforts to insure the success of the program.

The legislation, first, expands the opportunities for youth to gain the education, skills, and experience to develop talents for competitive entry into our society.

Second. Stimulate local action in communities to foster programs conducive to the elimination of poverty.

Third. A program of small grants and loans to destitute rural families to increase their income.

Fourth. Expanding of small business activities in depressed areas of our great cities, thus creating a basic rehabilitation program for the deserving businessmen.

Fifth. Special programs for undereducated adults and migratory agricultural workers.

Sixth. Stimulate more States to use public assistance to aid families to overcome their impoverished condition.

Seventh. Recruit and train volunteers to serve in capacities to help eliminate poverty.

The costs of direct public assistance amounts to $4 billion a year. The indirect costs of impoverished conditions, resulting in juvenile delinquency, crime, health hazards, and increased fire and police protection account for more billions.

The tremendous loss of man-hours in unemployment and underemployment affect our production and the loss in spending of of millions of job-earned dollars that would greatly strengthen our economy and reduce unemployment compensation costs.

A survey of the city of Chicago conducted by the welfare council was illuminating. The council report determined that 1 of 6 Chicagoans live in poverty circumstances—the Cook County figure was 1 of every 7 citizens—in suburbia Cook County, excluding the city, 1 out of 16. Nationally the average is one out of five. The basic income was determined at $3,000 for family, and $2,000 per individual. The Bureau of Labor Statistics studies determined that in the Chicago area, a family of four needs $6,500 income for modest living. The costs of living are the highest in comparison with other cities.

The council reported that 700,000 in Cook County live in poverty, of which only half are receiving assistance from Government agencies. For example, in April, 280,000 persons received welfare aid—amounting to 40 percent of the total poor.

The poverty group study showed that 145,000 families in Cook County in this category consist of 511,000 persons—many of them children.

The study disclosed that certain groups, for instance, nonwhites, women as heads of family, and the elderly are more susceptible to impoverishment. Further, the figures show that 37 percent of the low-income households are nonwhite, while only 15 percent of the country's households are nonwhite. Half of the low-income households are headed by women—but only 21 percent of the county households are headed by women. Also 34 percent of the low-income households are headed by an elderly person, but only 15 percent of the county's households are headed by persons 65 years or older.

One hundred thousand persons are seeking work. The education levels of these were part of the answer. Fifty-nine percent of the males in Cook County over 25 years of age do not have a high school education; 38 percent have received eighth-grade education or less; and 31,000 have not completed a year of schooling. Thus, the council perfected a most revealing analysis of the problem. It conducted the survey on the same basis as the national studies on poverty have been conducted. Certainly, Ruth Moore, feature writer for the Chicago Sun-Times, is to be complimented for her article on this interesting phase of our problem in studying this legislation. These figures are appalling if studied in the light that Chicago is the third largest city in the United States—known as the greatest manufacturing center in the United States, to say nothing of its other business and commercial operations. One person out of every six are in the toils of poverty.

The city of Chicago represented by the distinguished mayor of Chicago Richard A. Daley in his testimony in favor of the bill before the committee revealed that a cooperative program being conducted there almost entirely by three independent agencies—the YMCA, the Boys Club, and the Chicago Youth Center—cooperating with such public and private agencies as the Illinois Employment Service, the Cook County Department of Public Aid, Chicago Commission of Youth Welfare, the Welfare Council of Metropolitan Chicago. This pilot youth program project numbering 1,000 youths—with no more than a sixth-grade education—are schooled in such skills that will qualify each for a remunerative employment. Thus public and private agencies cooperate in an effort to prevent the increase of the poverty cycle. Under 1B of the bill a similar program is established.

Most of these youths between the ages of 17 and 21 were dropouts—high school, second year—showed poor averages in arithmetic and reading exercises. At the fifth grade level most had never been accepted in employment, others spasmodically employed. Although attendance was voluntary in the first 24 weeks, 80 percent participated in the program. The two principal activities—first about 50 percent were given instruction in writing, reading, arithmetic, and employment discipline.

The others received instruction in vocational workshops, training as automobile service station attendants, as duplicating machine operators, mail handling, and clerk-typists. Mayor Daley further stated that their placement in jobs has been arranged. Also in this bill under title II the youth under educational disadvantages would be so trained. The urban youth program sets the ages between 16 and 21 years.

This affects the most sensitive area of unemployment among youths. The unemployment rate of youths between 16 and 24 is twice the average for workers of all ages. Last year among the 16- to 19-year-olds, 17 percent were jobless, unable to procure employment—three times the average rate of all unemployed. In their age group—16 to 24—by comparison, one out of every three are unemployed. The nonwhite—3 employed out of 10—ages 10 to 19—about twice as many as the white group. Nonwhite girls average unemployment one out of three, and nonwhite boys one out of four. It is certainly a terrible situation to continue to disregard these conditions of employment. With automation releasing an estimated 1 million per year and 1½ million new jobs needed for new workers entering the labor market—something must be done, remedial in nature, at the Federal legislative level to reduce this growing army of unemployment not only among adults but also the youths of our land who it is said are now on family relief and represent 40 percent of those on relief whose fathers' parents were also on relief. Thus a dangerous pattern is observed that poverty continues to dominate generation after generation.

There are some hundred programs in the city of Chicago attended by a little less than 10,000 individuals who are being taught to enter various employments as trained employees—cooks, chauffeurs, nurses, machine operators, tool and die workers, and so forth as well as jobs requiring special skills, white collar, in technical and professional capacities. There are five groups on the job training programs to turn out, electronic assemblies, punch press operators, busdrivers, press operators, instrument calibrators, auto repairers, screw machine operators. Thus a practical opportunity for young and old to start over again and seize upon a new chance to join the work force of our economy—and abandon the relief rolls for remunerative employment.

The Economic Opportunity Act is the only answer to carry forward the battle against poverty. The sapping of our financial strength through relief and dependency programs calls for a modern method of creating incentive and opportunities toward expanding the labor pool of qualified workers to enter the various levels of employment—and by their hard-earned dollars stimulate the economy instead of draining the coffers of city, State and Federal Governments for a pittance that plunges men and youths willing to work deeper into the toils of poverty.

According to the Social Security Bulletin, November 1963, the sum of $66.5 billion was spent by all levels of Government for social welfare purposes in 1962. Also during that year an additional $33.5 billion was spent by private organizations for the same purpose—a total of $100 billion. The Government was sponsoring 42 individual programs designed to combat the effects of poverty. Bureau of the Budget in the fiscal year 1964—almost $32 billion were appropriated—earmarked for carrying out these programs in the hands of organized Government agencies. To reduce these figures we must train men to a needed job.

This act appropriates $962.5 billion for the purposes intended. Programs to be carried out during the year 1965 and the 2 succeeding fiscal years. Also authorizes an appropriation of $10 million for fiscal year ending June 30, 1965. For the next 2 fiscal years Congress may appropriate sums required to carry out the purposes of the act. The $412,500,000 appropriated for 1965 are reserved for the first three parts of the title including title I—youth programs; title II—urban and rural community action programs; and title III—special programs to combat poverty in rural areas.

The millions of dollars appropriated by the several State legislatures throughout the Nation for public aid and aid to dependent children are increasing from year to year—and when added to the expanding other services of State, county, township, and city demanded by its citizenry—without taking steps to divert these thousands of relief recipients to gainful employment. Then our bodies politic will be on the brink of bankruptcy and the homeowner taxpayers will become tenants. Now is the time to act—by passing substitute S. 2642, as amended, in the House at this sitting of the Congress. President Lyndon Johnson is to be congratulated in his presentment of this program for the welfare of the thousands who need the help and confidence of their fellow Americans to adjust themselves by proper training programs to gain remunerative employment and contribute to the economy of our Nation and regain the respect of their dependents and the plaudits of their fellow men in community life. Position in the community is regained and family pride restored.

ESTABLISHING A PROGRAM OF CASH AWARDS FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. Rivers of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 12193) to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for the establishment of a program of cash awards for suggestions or inventions made by members of the Armed Forces which contribute to the efficiency, economy, or other improvement of Government operations.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Speaker. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

Mr. Gross. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wish to propound a question to the gentleman.

This is similar to the incentive awards program in the civil service, is it not?

Mr. Rivers of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. Gross. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. Rivers of South Carolina. This proposal, by the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Libonati], is very, very similar to—almost identical with—what is now carried on for civil service workers in the Government in respect to incentive ideas and awards therefor.

Over the past 10 years these awards for the civilians have averaged about $20 or $30 per idea for the incentives. This will give the military men—primarily the enlisted men—the same right, because they are working side by side. It is only just.

That is all the bill will do.

Mr. Gross. I thank the gentleman for his explanation.

Mr. Libonati. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 12193 has for its purpose the establishment of a program of cash awards for suggestions or inventions made by members of the Armed Forces which contribute to the efficiency, economy, or other improvements to Government operations.

The Navy and the civilians under civil service regulations now enjoy statutory provisions for carrying out these purposes.

The Coast Guard when not operating as a service in the Navy may authorize the payments of cash awards. The acceptance of the award waives by agreement any question of the right for permissive use of the idea, method, or invention by the United States; neither does it subject the Government to any further claim whatsoever.

The President determines the desirability if he sees fit of making the award. As to the Coast Guard—not operating under the Navy—the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of the Treasury are authorized to make the award. A progress report, through the President, by the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of the Treasury shall be transmitted to the Congress annually. Any member of the Coast and Geodetic Survey or of the Public Health Service serving with an armed force shall be included as if a member of the armed force.

It has come to the attention of the Congress that millions of dollars have been saved to the Government through the practical application of new ideas and the working out of new methods of operation by individuals in their respective capacities with the Armed Forces. Even formulas and inventive machinations have been worked out through resourceful individuals which have contributed to many problems confronting the Department of Defense in perfecting or accomplishing its programs.

Further great incentive is gained through the stimulating effect of the granting of recognition to those worthy of the honor conferred.

As a practical matter the true level of these determinations for the granting of an honorary reward rests with those who are best cognizant with the facts and the successful results realized. When claims are submitted to the Congress generally years later the facts are transmitted through a written report from the respective service involved. Individuals who submit the facts have in most cases relied on bits of information gathered through second and third parties or letters on file—generally inadequate to base any fair decision because of the lack of firsthand knowledge. The result is not at all satisfactory for an intelligent decision by the committee.

The same procedures as under this bill now in operation at other levels of government have functioned well toward the accomplishment of these purposes.

There is no question of the need of this legislation. Its effect will do immeasurable good in lifting the morale of the men of the services and stimulating efforts toward improving the efficiency and spurring a desire for the solution of the many difficult problems of operation and method.

The distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Subcommittee, the genial L. Mendel Rivers, and his discerning committee have given this problem considerable attention. At the hearing each facet of the bill was thoroughly discussed. The expert testimony of the officials of the various services—Army, Air, and Coast Guard, together with representatives of the Geodetic and Public Health divisions of Government—was given in support of the bill. Chairman L. Mendel Rivers and the committee are to be congratulated in recommending the passage of H.R. 12193.

Its purposes establish a high ethical standard of justice to those who give meritorious service to our Government and the armed services to grant an honorary award is the right thing to do. A high sense of appreciation results in a stimulation of confidence in each individual receiving this high recognition. We as a nation owe a great deal more to these dedicated Americans.

FOOD FOR PEACE ACT

Mr. Chairman, the major provisions of H.R. 12298 are in conformity with the prevailing attitude that to serve the national interest the enlargement of the outlets for U.S. farm products not only exert an essential stabilizing influence on the American agricultural economy, but also create distribution, a forceful influence among the 100 million people in more than 100 nations against the spread of communism. These food-allotments-for-peace are distributed among the less-developed nations of the free world whose lack of funds fail to meet urgent food requirements among their peoples. This action on our part has promoted their economic growth and saved the lives of millions of unfortunate people.

Under H.R. 12298 the act is extended for 3 years—until December 31, 1967. It governs the sale of farm commodities with foreign currencies—at the same average heretofore established—about 1.7 billion a year. It removes the 25-percent limitation on foreign currencies for loans to private business for the development of free enterprise under the Cooley loan program (1957). This is a stimulant to hasten the promotion and expansion of the free enterprise system to build the economy of the developing nations.

Increases from 10 to 20 percent the proportion of foreign currencies to be absolutely devoted to U.S. uses.

Authorizes the use of excess foreign currencies—accumulated in six countries—for special programs by the appointment of a top-level committee to act only after advice of the President.

Establishes grants of foreign currencies for economic development subject to aforesaid committee approval.

Authorizes the use of surplus food commodities by the President during periods of disaster, relief, and community development projects overseas—not to exceed $450 million annually.

Authorizes the use of foreign currencies—to a limited extent—to supplement the use of surplus foods in community improvement and self-help work projects—church owned or operated facilities used for secular purposes are excluded for construction or maintenance programs.

The most favorable foreign legal exchange rate must be the measuring stick for sales of surplus commodities—and not less in comparison with rates for any other nation.

Authorizes sales of foreign currencies to tourists and other private persons to curb American dollar outgo.

Handling of food commodities donations must be, as far as practical, directed through community action and other self-help activities designated to alleviate the causes of the need for such assistance.

This program, a godsend to the needy peoples of the world, has functioned well, even considering the selfish weaknesses of human kind, both in administrative and distributive functions of its operation. Chairman COOLEY, through the years, has conducted a masterful job in working out the intricacies of the vast operations necessary to carry out the purposes of the act. The great challenges have been met as each problem was presented to the illustrious members of his committee. Criticism after criticism leveled at the program disclosed the pitfalls of trusting honest operation to weak leadership—but all in all much of the practices were eliminated and real leadership rectified the wrongs. When temptation becomes the master of the human mind, dishonesty is certain to prevail in the dealings of trusted men in high places. Yet all in all the program served America well and contributed a terrific impact upon the thinking of freemen seeking against adversity to maintain a free world. Public Law 480—the Food for Peace Act—is the one instrumentality at the legislative level that reflects the true American attitude toward the hungry people of the free world—the unselfish sharing of our abundance with freemen faced with misfortune and hunger. Chairman COOLEY and his admirable committee have established a symbol in this legislation that all men throughout the world can understand and give their wholehearted blessing to God for the perfection of the American way of life.

PROPOSED IMMIGRATION LAW

Mr. Speaker, our Nation reflects the powerful influence exerted by the teeming immigrant populations that came to our shores to seek the opportunities of a new life in an underdeveloped land whose ideologies contributed to the dignity of the human race. Its laws and social norms guaranteed the liberties and freedom of every individual. Its democratic way of life stimulated human effort to seek by hard work the pursuit of a better life and greater accomplishment.

The family in its inner strength of establishing a proud heritage became the sinews of government. The father, as head of the household, and the mother as its religious guidance, sacrificed to prepare their offspring as specialists in their educational business, and scientific careers to serve humanity in the ranks of an accomplished and great citizenry. Thus each new generation added to the power and greatness of a new land.

The future of a new land depends largely upon the immigrant movement to its shores. The United States was exceptionally fortunate in attracting millions of men, women, and children to settle within its borders.

To be sure, these immigrants were not only seeking a new chance for financial independence, but also had a burning desire to become citizens of a new type of government—where basic concept was the guarantee of equality among men and justice and liberty for all.

This exodus of humans from continental Europe was in the nature of a peaceful revolution against the old social order—that mobility is a sacred heritage and that mediocrity cannot be permitted to use in social status or educational accomplishment above their forebears. There were some who came to enjoy religious freedom—others to escape famine—still others banishment under political or criminal decrees, and the majority to seek a new life in a new world.

History reveals that the building of our great Nation rested in the hands and mentality of these millions of persevering people who, without invitation, under unsurmountable handicap of language, unskilled and uneducated, steeped in continental customs, tradition, and folklore, traveled to the distant shores of a strange and vast land without funds to make their fortune. The sacrifices to be endured—the fierceness of competitive tribulations—the cruel sufferings in a hostile climate, the struggles and deprivations to be suffered in the beginning—did not dim the bold spirits of the new adventurers. They came on, they stayed and prevailed. Their success contributed to the Nation's wealth and established her place among the great nations of the world.

Yet today, we the citizens of our beloved country, have forgotten American history—and now examine with a critical eye any proposal to revise our strict and unbending immigration, naturalization, and refugee laws which in effect contradict American ideals and relegate certain alien petitioners for entrance as undesirable individuals, merely because the quota system is based on a narrow national origin formula.

The problem created by the quota system based on national origin must not be confused as the result of the numerical total volume of immigration to America. And, of course, no authority on this subject would recommend the total admission of would-be immigrants to the United States—unregulated immigration limitations would not be the answer. But, on the other hand, the specific limitations for each nation is not the realistic approach—for it renders ineligible the majority of those who are qualified of talent and ability to contribute benefits to our Nation.

It is unfortunate that the unused quotas of Great Britain, 65,361; Germany, 25,814; Ireland, 17,756; are not made available to Poland, 6,488; Italy, 5,666; Netherlands, 3,136; France, 3,069; Czechoslovakia, 2,859; Norway, 2,365; Switzerland, 1,698; Sweden, 1,698; Denmark, 1,175; Austria, 1,405; Belgium, 1,297; Yugoslavia, 942; Hungary, 865; Portugal, 438; and Greece, 308.

As the leader of the freedom-loving nations of the world, the American image created by the quota-origin formula refutes every logical argument that basically we recognize the equality of all nations in their relationship as to human values established by our free institutions. The quotas set for the Asian, African, and island nations are an insult to human reasoning—fractions equal to a hundred or more. Also, nations with vast populations—India, Australia, Japan, Formosa, and the African republics are given a ridiculous quota of 100—excepting Japan—185. Such reasoning is beyond the realm of honest thinking.

The law is cruel at many levels—it does not provide for the unification of families divided through its arbitrary operative effects. It disregards our public policy in its complete disregard for emergency world refugee problems.

Its provisions are inadequate to permit the entrance of immigrants with needed skills at the industrial trades level—also in the scientific and medical fields.

It is interesting to study the changes in American policy from the period before World War I—purely regulatory as to quality prescriptions only. The only persons refused were those who failed to pass minimum tests of health, literacy, and behavior records—criminal.

The drastic changes were enacted in 1921—quota law—and the Johnson-Reed Act of 1924 that limited the immigrant quota to 150,000, and provided for the national origin quota system—that the annual quota for any nationality should bear the same ratio to 150,000 as the number of inhabitants of that nationality bore to the "total number of inhabitants of the United States in 1920." Thus the formula was fixed to the existing national structure of our population. It further excluded the descendants of slave immigrants from total population figures—a sad commentary upon honest thinking to disclassify in citizenship almost the entire Negro population.

The Johnson-Reed Act was a national indictment against the southern Europeans including Italy and Greece and the nonwhites from Asia and Africa, as well as a negation of the Emancipation Proclamation.

The Judiciary Subcommittee on Immigration and its distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Ohio, MICHAEL FEIGHAN, are to be complimented in determining that hearings should be held to give an opportunity to those interested in the subject to present their views. It is my intention to support the administration position in this matter as recommended by our martyred President, John F. Kennedy, President Lyndon B. Johnson, and our Speaker, John McCormack, as incorporated in H.R. 7700. My companion bill is H.R. 7798. A number of alternative proposals have been introduced, each with approaches that have for their basic proposal the ultimate elimination of the quota system.

But, these proposed reforms, although deserving meritorious consideration, would become more controversial and no doubt create a stalemate. However, H.R. 7700 through the unified action of these seeking to support reform and the present favorable public reaction to its acceptance would have the best chance of being enacted into law.

President John F. Kennedy's message, including the endorsements of the then President of the Senate, Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson, and Speaker John W. McCormack, on July 23, 1963, sets out in pointed terms the history of the question including the precise weaknesses of the present law in its inapplicability to meet present conditions and changes in Government policy. The work was a monumental contribution to the solution of these problems in a practical and efficient manner.

An analysis of the bill presented by the Department of State, Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs, in a prepared summary was also included.

Even though some of its provisions were modified by the McCarran-Walter Act, the basic concepts inimical to sound policy today remain in the law.

The total quota figure in itself is not a problem, but the application of the distribution formula again violates our concepts and runs contrary to our understanding and our ideals.

The figures released by the Government indicate that in the last decade 2½ million persons entered as immigrants—yet only about 1½ million of these entered through the McCarran-Walter Act controls. The others were the recipients of some eight or nine special statutory acts passed by the Congress as well as under special regulations and other arrangements. These facts in themselves dictate a reformation of the present regulatory provisions.

Presidents Eisenhower, John F. Kennedy, and Lyndon B. Johnson have demanded positive legislation in party platforms and political campaigns including messages to the Congress. Each called to our attention the injustices of the quota theory based on the national origin system—and pointed out its negative effect on foreign policy. At our very doorstep, the nations of South America, numerous citizens of those nations remember that their progenitors seeking entry into the United States were barred by our antiquated and conciliatory immigration policy—our good will policy at other levels of our relationship with these nations have never been too fortuitous.

Yet Congress has had to circumvent the present act many times through the legislative process to reflect its honest decisions on pertinent policies dealing with immigration questions. Every Member of Congress is personally identified with many perplexing problems every session because of the inadequate provisions of our present laws.

To be sure, our Nation can and should relate its immigration numerical absorption quotas to the rate of our economic growth, for the protection of our labor market against unemployment, a wide open policy of unlimited immigration could be disastrous to our economy.

But the changes in H.R. 7700 primarily effect the granting of:

First. Nonquota preference to the parents, spouses, and children of U.S. citizens—having a minor effect on quotas. These are now subject to second preference, always exhausted. The resulting separation is a travesty. The same category should include parents of permanent resident aliens.

Second. Nonquota preference to natives of the independent island nations of the Western Hemisphere. Present law grants this privilege only to those islands independent at the time of its passage—excludes those who gained their independence since its enactment.

Third. Establishes a fourth preference category for those aliens with needed occupational talents such as tailors, stonemasons, and so forth. A special Immigration Advisory Board is established having jurisdiction over these matters. Members appointed—three by the President, two by the Speaker of the House, and two by the President of the Senate.

Another interesting problem presents itself specifically to the Italian American veterans of World War I who as alien residents served with the U.S. Forces and later returned to their homeland—married and had offspring born there—certainly these offspring should be given a nonquota classification. An American Legion mandate in this regard has been introduced by me—H.R. 6931.

The study of the deportation question of those losing their citizenship is not only challenging but promulgates a practice of a twisted philosophy of legal standards based on an illogical premise that no equities inure to the benefit of the deportee or his family.

I learned of several cases where individual citizens were deprived by court order of their rights and privileges as citizens and also expunging the order of court of many years' standing granting them citizenship status. Both individuals had sons who served in the military forces during and after World War II, were honorably discharged and received both Presidential citations and citations of the command. Also in one instance a son-in-law as a commissioned officer served honorably.

In one of these matters the President of the United States, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, weighing these facts, canceled the order of deportation giving as his reason that the separation of the family head from his loyal patriotic sons who served with distinction as members of the Armed Forces during the war in itself was a sufficient reason for his action.

In the other matter an interesting question developed where the country of his birth refused to accept him on the grounds that the swearing of allegiance to the United States—in taking citizens oath—relieved it of any responsibility to him or the United States. This reasoning was based upon the premise that such proceedings granting citizenship represent, as to his native land, a permanent separation from his native citizenship, and regardless of a subsequent cancellation of the order granting citizenship in the proceeding—the question of his allegiance to his newly adopted country has been determined. The recalling of the citizenship grant does not restore him to the status of being a subject of the land of his birth.

There are split legal contentions on the part of authorities in these matters and the law should be explicit in the consideration of these problems. The further practice of banishing one to any other land accepting him—upon the refusal of his native land to permit his entry is purely an illegal device to dump him anywhere, just to get rid of him, disregarding what vested rights inure to him or his family that equity and good conscience dictate. The separation from family is of momentous importance to one's kinfolk as well as to the individual and must be considered important enough to spell out the law to prevent injustice.

The principal purpose of H.R. 7700 is to abolish the national origins system and to permit entrance to those filing within preference categories on a first come first served basis.

Each country's quota will be reduced 20 percent the first year and 40 percent the second year, 60 percent the third year, 80 percent the fourth year, and 100 percent in the fifth year. The present total annual quota of 157,000 will be increased to 165,000. The increase of 8,000, as a result of increasing the minimum quotas from 100 to 200. Thus this gradual elimination of the national origin quota system is accomplished without disturbing by abrupt action the operative quality of procedures.

The bill also contains a special provision granting the President to reserve up to 50 percent of the pool after consultation with the Board; first, to avoid undue hardship resulting from quota restrictions; second, in the national security interest.

The President may also retain 20 percent of the pool for refugees.

Also provided that no more than—10 percent of the total—16,478 visas may be allocated to any nation's quota area except under the President's authority to reserve numbers from the pool.

Under the present regulations as much as 50,000 unused quota numbers are lost to the system annually.

The immigration figures for a test year ending June 30, 1963—about 306,000 immigrants were admitted. The quota was 157,000—but only 103,036 were admitted under the McCarran-Walter Act. Thus, two-thirds of these admitted were outside the act. The same is true as to other years. Thus the national policy must operate outside its prescribed act through the passage of special legislation and other procedures. Therefore, in its practical application, the act is a nullity and its purposes outmoded. It is not only offensive to friendly foreign nations, but is discriminatory—an insult to our preachments of racial equality.

It is interesting to note that the Johnson-Reed Act determined the basic quota numerical computation of national origin on population figures of 1890. Certainly prejudicing the people of Southern Europe, Asia, and Africa. The McCarran-Walter Act in accepting population figures of 1920 also paralleled this bias built into the Johnson-Reed Act.

But even so, under public pressure, the Congress has amended and modified the Johnson-Reed Act from time to time.

Finally in 1952 over President Truman's Presidential veto, the Congress passed the McCarran-Walter Act. It codified under one act all laws affecting immigration incorporating the old statutes and early conceptions of the Nation's policy in this field.

As herein before stated the Quota-Origin Act computation was adopted as the operating formula for the unit national admission of immigrants.

It reflects in its applicability and formula racial discrimination against our very allies in a sensitive area of national policy. The token quotas of 100 per year assigned to nations numbering millions in native population is a senseless and asinine system. The administration bill is more realistic and reasonable.

After 5 years with the fading out of the national origin system, immigrant visas would be available to any alien meeting the qualifications without regard to the country of his birth. The qualifications, rigid as they may be under the McCarran-Walter Act, are preserved in H.R. 7700 with certain modifications.

Again the 10-percent limitation visas issued in any one year to any one nation prevents monopolizing the visas available under other visa prescriptions in the bill.

The bill thus meets the critical needs and balances out the inequities and impractical controls now prevalent in the law. In specific terms it eliminates the false conception that the bars to limited immigration are down.

As a member of the Judiciary Committee, I shall support H.R. 7700, and urge the subcommitee to report H.R. 7700 favorably to the full committee for passage.

COLUMBUS DAY LEGISLATION

Mr. Speaker, the distinguished chairman of Subcommittee No. 4 of the Judiciary Committee, the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. E. L. FORRESTER, placed upon the agenda for a hearing my bill H.R. 8189 declaring October 12 to be a legal holiday honoring Christopher Columbus. Many leaders of the Italo-American communities throughout the Nation appeared to address the committee in support of the legislation. May I compliment the estimable gentleman from Georgia and his eminent subcommittee for considering this legislation.

My address to the subcommittee and the text of the bill follow:

"Mr. Chairman, it is with a deep sense of appreciation that your distinguished committee extended to me as sponsor of H.R. 8189, the privilege of addressing you on the question of establishing by statutory enactment, October 12 as Columbus Day—a national holiday.

"The greatness of a man is best measured by the impact upon the future of mankind through his works. Christopher Columbus in his four voyages to the West startled the nations of the world with his discoveries.

"He had the courage and tenacity in his belief of the principle advanced by Galileo that the world was round and by sheer persistence for proof prevailed upon the Royal Family of Spain to finance this perilous experiment to find a new western route to the Indies by sailing due west.

"His Christian faith gave to him a religious incentive to thwart the piratical activities of the Turkish marauders preying upon the trading ships of the Christian world. The freedom of the seas for merchantmen were at stake and he visioned that the earnings could be used to spread the doctrine of Christianity throughout the world.

"The ultimate results of his important geographical discoveries have been recorded in the history of nations for centuries. Next to our Lord Jesus Christ, he and Abraham Lincoln rank as the most written of personages in the world.

"Although the geographical discovery was of the greatest importance—yet the aftermath of his discovery resulting in the development of a new type of government founded by the Thirteen American Colonies based upon the inherent rights and liberties of free men given by God became a symbol to dedicate Columbus' memory.

"Upon this Nation, do nations of the free world, loving liberty, depend for the leadership to protect and defend their spiritual, cultural, and economic institutions and guarantee their way of life.

"We owe to this great emancipator and nobleman of the seas a signal national debt of gratitude in discovering the New World, and should pay lasting homage to his memory. Columbus belongs to all nations, but represents to us the first immigrant to the Americas—the land of liberty and justice for all. The several States have set aside this day to commemorate the glory of his name. It is fitting and proper that we as a Nation honor one whose day of discovery is celebrated in thousands of communities throughout the land as a patriotic day to rededicate ourselves to the institutions protecting our freedoms and guaranteeing our liberties for ourselves and the freedom loving nations of the world. Let us rediscover our obligation to free the captive nations and thus reinvigorate our efforts to release them from their bondage. Columbus Day is America's day to celebrate the advent of the New World.

"I again thank the committee for its kind consideration in making possible this hearing for the establishment of Columbus Day as a day of national meditation in keeping alive the fires of freedom throughout the world—a Christian nation with Christian faith that opened its shores to men of every faith to worship at the altars of freedom and liberty—forever."

H.R. 8189

A bill declaring October 12 to be a legal holiday

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the 12th day of October of each year, to be hereafter celebrated and known as Columbus Day, is hereby declared to be a legal holiday of the same character as the 1st day of January, the 22d day of February, the 30th day of May, the 4th day of July, the 1st Monday of September, the 11th day of November, the 4th Thursday of November, and Christmas Day.

Hon. James C. Auchincloss

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT T. McLOSKEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. McLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, it has been a privilege and an honor for me to have been able to serve in the U.S. House of Representatives with Congressman James C. Auchincloss of the Third District of the State of New Jersey.

Upon my assignment to the Public Works Committee of which Jim was ranking Republican member, he went out of his way to be helpful in teaching me the work and the proper way to handle legislation under consideration. All of us on the committee, from both sides of the political aisle, shall miss his wisdom, patience, and good humor. Jim Auchincloss has indeed been a friend to all of us.

Jim Auchincloss has served his constituency and the Nation ably and well for 22 years and I join with his many friends here in the Congress in wishing him good health and great happiness in his retirement from the House of Representatives.

Statement to the U.S. Civil Service Commission on Examination Given July 13, 1964

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following results of the candidates from my 27th Congressional District of Pennsylvania who took the Civil Service Commission examination on July 13, 1964, at my request as Congressman, have been received. I have gone over carefully the ratings of candidates in these examinations for designation to the U.S. West Point, Air Force, Annapolis, and Merchant Marine Academies.

As I have previously served on appointment of the judges of our county four terms on the board of law examiners of this county, I have been particularly interested in developing good candidates for the U.S. Academies. Our congressional district to date will show an outstanding record of admissions to these Academies, as well as a good record of results on the civil service examinations.

It is therefore a surprise and a real disappointment to me to receive the results of the candidates from my district from the July 13, 1964, examination held by the U.S. Civil Service Commission. These men attend the same schools and take the same courses, as the previous candidates, but it will be noticed that out of 73 candidates, there is only 1 candidate who made a rating on the total examination of 81 percent, 1 candidate who made a rating of 79 percent, 3 candidates who made a rating of 78 percent, and 1 candidate that made a rating of 77 percent. All others were below 77 percent.

I have further noted that there are only 14 candidates of the 73 that took the examination who even made a 70-percent rating on the total examination.

I have been particularly interested in the ratings given on this examination on algebra. Only 16 candidates out of the 73 candidates that took this civil service examination even made a 60-percent grade, and only 3 candidates made above an 80-percent mark in algebra. It is hard for me to believe that with the type of instruction we have in mathematics in our Pittsburgh and South Hills area in Allegheny County, that actually 45 made marks of 50 percent and below in this examination. In fact, 30 candidates made marks of 35 percent and below.

As the high schools and parochial schools from which these students come are high standard and competent, I do not understand the meaning of such low marks.

I am therefore, by this letter, advising you that I am writing to each of these applicants, scheduling the candidates for the Academies for the U.S. Civil Service Commission examination to take place on October 31, 1964. The present exam results leave me almost no choice of competent people to recommend for admission to the U.S. Academies.

Under these circumstances I would request that the U.S. Civil Service Commission check on the examination questions to see whether there were similar results in other areas as something might have been wrong with the questions on the examination in relation to the curriculum which these students have studied at the various high schools and preparatory schools.

I do request this particularly, as you will recall my unhappy experience with the U.S. Civil Service Commission examination last year when many examination papers, constituting half of the total examination papers of the candidates who took the examination for my district were lost by the Civil Service Commission and have not been found to date.

I firmly believe it is my duty as Congressman to obtain good candidates for these U.S. Service Academies, which I believe to be vitally necessary in these difficult times for the security of the United States. To overcome this deficiency in our District, I am sending out letters to various portions of my District requesting the names of good candidates for nomination to the U.S. Service Academies, and asking that applications be made to my office for designation to take the October 31, 1964 U.S. Civil Service examination.

This is a serious matter to me, and one which I take deep responsibility, as I have been a Navy serviceman in World War II, and have served for 20 years in the U.S. Naval Reserve.

Would you kindly have a survey made of this situation and give me your prompt advice.

Retirement of Congressman James C. Auchincloss

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, it is with regret that my colleague from New Jersey and I look upon the retirement of James C. Auchincloss from the Halls of Congress. For the past 22 years, Congressman Auchincloss has been continuously returned to the House of Representatives by the electorate of the Third Congressional District in New Jersey, which he has served with diligence and distinction.

As the senior member of the New Jersey congressional delegation, he gave unstintingly of his time to his colleagues in matters relating not only to our State but to our country. He served his constituency with unselfish devotion. There was no such thing as a party label when it came to a constituent who had a problem, large or small.

Jim Auchincloss has served in public life the best part of his years. Much as he will be missed by his colleagues and constituents, it can be denied by no one that his retirement is well deserved and well earned. I join in wishing him and his wife many more years of happiness and to say to him again: "Well done."

The 88th Congress: A Review

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK WESTLAND
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, the 88th Congress was a busy, and in many ways productive, Congress. I know that the people I represent want to learn about the activities of Congress during these last 2 years; therefore, I have made this the subject of an October newsletter to my district, the Second Congressional District of Washington State. I think my newsletter will be of interest to Members of Congress as well and therefore, under leave to extend my remarks, I ask that it be inserted at this point in the Record:

THE 88TH CONGRESS REVIEWED

The 88th Congress—one of the longest and busiest on record—is now history. When the Speaker's gavel adjourned the House of Representatives October 3, the Congress had been in session nearly 321 days. During that time, more than 12,000 public and private measures were introduced; some 820 were finally enacted into law.

The 88th Congress marked some important, though controversial, "firsts." It passed a comprehensive civil rights bill, and approved tax cut legislation providing for an $11.5 billion reduction in Federal income and corporation taxes. In the Senate, lawmakers ratified the limited nuclear test ban treaty, the first agreement of its kind to result from the cold war. Whatever one's personal feelings, it can at least be said that the 88th Congress made history by dealing with these matters.

Striking closer to home were three bills of particular importance to the Pacific Northwest. Regional power preference legislation was enacted into law, guaranteeing that hydroelectric power produced in the Northwest will be used first to meet the private and industrial needs of the Northwestern United States. After nearly 6 years of work to satisfy all interests, Congress also enacted a "wilderness" bill giving the first statutory protection to some 9 million acres of "wilderness" area. The land and water conservation bill was approved, enabling the Federal Government to aid the States in the needed development of recreational facilities. Because of my membership on the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, I was able to play a major part in the writing and passage of these bills.

Important military construction and public works projects for the second district also resulted from legislation passed by the 88th Congress. Public works funds totaling $2,163,000 for fiscal 1964 and 1965 cleared the way for further improvement to the Snohomish, Stillaguamish, Skagit, and Nooksack Rivers. Small boat harbors at Port Townsend and Quilcene received additional benefit from public works appropriations. Funds totaling $693,000 for military construction were passed to bring major improvements to Paine Field and the Blaine Air Force station during fiscal 1964; another $459,000, appropriated for fiscal 1965, will build a needed aircraft holding apron and new telephone exchange at the Whidbey Island Naval Air Station.

There were, however, some disappointments, including the failure of the administration to act on my bill, H.R. 7961, legislation I introduced to help Northwest mills meet Canadian competition by permitting the shipment of American lumber in foreign-bottom vessels when U.S.-flag ships are unavailable. I believed this bill could be of real benefit to the local economy, but the administration failed to act, and even vetoed the one bill passed by Congress that might have granted some small relief. This was the lumber-marking bill, approved by the first session of the 88th Congress, but vetoed by the President. Beef import legislation was finally approved—despite opposition from the administration—but my bill to provide similar protection for the Northwest dairy industry, remains unpassed.

Of great disappointment for the Nation's older citizens, certainly, was the "death" of the 5 percent social security increase. I voted for this increase in the House, because it was obvious to me that the inflationary policies of this administration made some cost-of-living increase necessary. What happened is now history. The bill passed the House with virtually no opposition, but was blocked in the Senate by Democrats who insisted on adding a compulsory "medicare" amendment. A squabble within the Democratic Party erupted, and the Democrats, unable to agree among themselves, chose to kill the 5-percent increase. Given the choice of a bill or an issue, the administration took the issue.

The Nation's veterans were more fortunate. Though the President declared the bill would be "inconsistent with the objectives" of his administration, the Congress passed H.R. 1927, providing pension increases to a half million veterans of World War I, World War II, and the Korean war. Additional payments for helpless and blind veterans requiring the regular aid of another person, also were increased. Though less comprehensive than some would have liked, H.R. 1927 marked the first major veterans' pension legislation in over 5 years. This bill, incidentally, passed the House without a single dissenting vote, and I joined others in the Congress in voting for this legislation. Similarly, I supported pay increases for the Nation's uniformed servicemen and for 1.7 million civil service workers and postal employees.

Bills to expand vocational education, to provide Federal aid for the fight against mental illness and retardation, to extend "impacted" areas Federal school aid under Public Laws 874 and 815, to provide increased Federal housing and to expand college construction passed the 88th Congress and, likewise, had my support. These were forward steps on the domestic front.

On the foreign policy front, the 88th Congress ended on an ominous note. Despite official talk of "peace," it is clear that we are engaged in a real war in South Vietnam. I backed the congressional resolution endorsing the President's action in retaliating to unwarranted attacks against our Navy in the Bay of Tonkin. And I also supported a resolution insisting that the United Nations work to collect the back debts of Communist and other member nations.

Cuba: Communism's "fortress" only 90 miles from our shores—remains virtually forgotten by the present administration and American foreign aid continues to finance Communist regimes. Consistently throughout the 88th Congress, I voted for reductions in foreign aid and for an end to wasteful handouts. I voted against the sale of American wheat to Russia—and eventually to Cuba. And I voted for amendments that would have stopped the sale of American surplus foods to Communist-controlled and dominated nations. I'm happy to say that I was joined by others—both Republicans and Democrats—who believe America's foreign policy should be strengthened. I think most of you would agree.

Summing up, I would say the 88th Congress solved some problems, but left a great many others to be answered. I hope I will again be privileged to help find some of those answers when the 89th Congress convenes.

Visitors: Alderwood Manor: Mr. and Mrs. C. H. Hutsell. Bellingham: Mrs. Frank McKinney, Mr. and Mrs. L. V. Townley. Burlington: John F. Conrad, Ted Conrad. Oak Harbor: Gary Powell. Port Angeles: Mrs. A. B. Barrie, Harry Cotton, Mrs. Donald B. Hetrick, Virginia Hetrick. Quilcene: Mr. and Mrs. George Huntingford and family. Redmond: Bruce Boyd, Hoyt S. Boyd, Mr. and Mrs. W. Fritz and family, Edward D. O'Brien, Robert Olney. Sedro Woolley: Mary Ann Johnson, Mr. and Mrs. T. H. Palmer and Annette. Snohomish: Mr. and Mrs. Lawrence Bickford, Mr. and Mrs. Roy Marler. Stanwood: Mr. and Mrs. Edwaad Iverson, Macushla Reilly.

Sincerely yours,
Congressman Jack Westland.

The 20th Year of the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIBORNE PELL
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, October 1964, marks the beginning of the 20th year of the United Nations.

In 1945 I had the privilege of working as a special assistant at the San Francisco United Nations Conference. Since that time I have followed closely the progress of the United Nations; I have watched it develop into a respected and influential organization helping to bring peace and well-being to the peoples of our world.

During the past two decades, this body has taken significant steps forward in preventing international conflicts and disputes from igniting another global war. It is not yet a perfect instrument, but it is the best we have.

The public forum the United Nations provides is one of its most useful functions; for the U.N. is where the nations of the world must stand up and be counted. This forum for free expression is of profound value to all nations, including those newly emerging and sharing in the responsibilities for international peace and the bettering of human welfare.

As we look ahead, let us fervently hope that the United Nations will continue its accomplishments in bringing us closer to understandings and to the concepts and principles of lasting peace, and that it will be appropriately strengthened in these meaningful endeavors.

The U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency—Let's Set the Record Straight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement by me concerning arms control and disarmament.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, on October 2 Senator SIMPSON inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD what was described as "a timely and factual report on the Council for a Livable World—prepared by a group of Senators and their staffs."

I know little about the "Council for a Liveable World," other than that it was founded by the late Dr. Leo Szilard, a prominent physicist who contributed to the development of the atomic bomb.

It was contended in this report, however, that a goal of this Council for a Livable World is "unilateral disarmament"—"a totally defenseless United States." I understand the council has publicly denied this accusation. In any event, this is certainly not the policy of the United States. Ever since arms control and disarmament negotiations were initiated, the United States has always insisted on balanced and verified mutual arms reductions as essential to the U.S. position. The record of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency is heavily documented in this respect. Its objective is to enhance our security by controlling and reducing the warmaking capabilities of all nations in a manner in which no country could gain an advantage over us.

What really struck my attention about this so-called factual report was its oblique attack on the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, an Agency whose creation was supported by a large majority of both Republicans and Democrats in Congress.

The report contends that there is heavy participation in the research operations of the Disarmament Agency by the Council for a Livable World, espousing its cause of a disarmed, helpless America in a world of continued tensions, continued armaments. It further contends that this activity is made all the more frustrating since taxpayers find themselves paying for this Council for a Livable World adventure in politics whether they approve it or not. In support of these allegations, nine people, claimed to be members of the council, are identified somehow or other with the Arms Control Agency or its research program. They are Donald Glaser, Roger Fisher, Matthew Meselson, Freeman J. Dyson, Richard Barnet, Hans Morgenthau, Bernard Feld, Robert Gomer, and Hudson Hoagland.

Because of my interest in the vital work the Agency is doing, I requested some pertinent information from it. I was informed that of the nine people mentioned in Senator SIMPSON's report, six of them had some connection with Agency contract or grant research. Of the six identified with particular contracts or grants, none was a major contributor except for Roger Fisher in a small grant to Harvard University, a grant which was incorrectly identified in the Simpson report. Four of the six—Glaser, Gomer, Morgenthau, and Feld—were merely consultants to the contractor or grantee, and one, Meselson, sat in on a seminar meeting held pursuant to the contract with which he was identified. Meselson has also acted as a consultant to the Agency, a fact which the Simpson report did not mention. One of the nine, Hudson Hoagland, was not connected with the Agency or its research program at all.

According to the Agency, all of the people mentioned in the report who were in fact associated with the Agency or its research program, including Richard Barnet, a former Agency employee, and Freeman Dyson, a consultant, had been given top Government security clearances based on full background and loyalty investigations by the Civil Service Commission or the FBI. Obviously, these people would not have been cleared if they belonged to a group inimical to national security interests. The Council for a Livable World is not on the Attorney General's list of subversive organizations.

Moreover, all of the people mentioned in Senator SIMPSON's report have had distinguished careers of professional or public service.

Richard J. Barnet is a distinguished lawyer specializing in taxation and international law. He served with the Army's Judge Advocate General's Corps in Europe, practiced tax law in Boston, and has been a lecturer and research assistant at various American universities, including Harvard, New York University, Indiana, and Wisconsin.

Freeman Dyson is a physicist of wide experience, was a research fellow at Trinity College, Cambridge, England, was a professor of physics at Cornell and has been associated with the Institute for Advanced Studies at Princeton since 1953.

Roger Fisher served in the Air Force during World War II, graduated from Harvard Law School with honors, was an assistant to the Deputy U.S. Special Representative to the Economic Cooperation Administration in Paris—Marshall plan—an assistant to the U.S. Solicitor General, a consultant on disarmament to the Defense Department, and is a professor of law at Harvard University.

Bernard Feld is an outstanding physicist who worked on the Manhattan project and in the AEC's Los Alamos Laboratory. He is a member of innumerable honorary and professional groups and has been associated with MIT, the University of California, Harvard, Northwestern, Columbia, Yale, and Princeton.

Hans Morgenthau is a lawyer, writer, and educator of international repute who came to the United States from Germany in 1937. He graduated from the University of Munich magna cum laude in 1927. He has attended or taught at a number of Western European and American colleges and universities, including the University of Kansas and Brooklyn College. In 1961, he was named professor of political science and modern history at the University of Chicago, with which he had been associated since 1943.

Matthew S. Meselson is an outstanding young scientist who has taught chemistry and biology at the California Institute of Technology and at Harvard.

Among other achievements, Donald Glaser received the Nobel Prize in Physics in 1960 was named a National Science Foundation fellow in 1961, a Guggenheim fellow in 1961–62, and received awards from the University of Michigan and the American Physics Society.

Robert Gomer is a physical chemist, who is a professor at the University of Chicago and who was named an Atomic Energy Commission fellow in chemistry at Harvard in 1949–50.

Finally, the total amount of Agency funds that went to the six people mentioned for the research efforts with which they were identified was less than $15,000, as compared to a total research effort, as of June 30, 1964, involving over $8 million. This is hardly "heavy participation in the research operations of the Disarmament Agency," as alleged in Senator SIMPSON's report.

Obviously, Mr. President, this is not a "factual" report at all but a deliberate and misleading attempt to infer that the U.S. Arms Control Agency is being led down the path of unilateral disarmament—an attempt that has no basis in fact or in the fiction of this report. Irresponsible charges like this have been made ever since the Eisenhower administration made the first comprehensive U.S. disarmament proposal. However, the fact remains that American disarmament policy required then and requires now that any arms reductions agreed upon with the Soviet Union and other countries be mutual, balanced, and verified. Indeed a large proportion of the Agency's research effort is devoted to discovering means by which the United States can verify compliance with arms control and arms reduction agreements. It is apparent that such research would be unnecessary if American policy contemplated unilateral disarmament—a fact that seems to have escaped the attention of Senator SIMPSON's own research team.

Hon. James C. Auchincloss

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I have many times said, and I will always say, that one of the most meaningful rewards of serving in the Congress is the privilege of associating with men and women from all sections of our great country and from all walks of life. It has been my privilege to serve in the Congress for 30 years. During this period I have come to know many who have been an inspiration to me. During this period I have made friendships I shall forever cherish.

One such is my beloved colleague JAMES AUCHINCLOSS, who is retiring from Congress after 22 years' service. No man could have a better friend than he. No district could have better representation than he has given the Third District of New Jersey. Few leave the Congress with as many friends as he has acquired and with as many achievements as he has achieved.

I want JIM to know that he will be greatly missed. He has left his mark not only on the official records of the Congress; he has left his mark on the minds and hearts of all of us who have been privileged to know him and to work with him. He leaves us with the best wishes of all of us. We shall never forget him. We hope he will not forget us but will frequently visit the Halls of Congress to consult with us, that we may have the benefit of his wisdom and the inspiration of his presence.

The Major Issues Facing Pennsylvanians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Congressional Record a statement by me on the major issues facing Pennsylvanians.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

As this Congress draws to a close I want to discuss briefly what I regard as the major issues confronting the people of Pennsylvania and the Nation in this year of decision. In my judgment, they are three: freedom, jobs, and peace.

Issues involve people. And of paramount importance to individual citizens are the protection of their liberties, the retention of their jobs, and the maintenance of world peace. These issues are closely interrelated; indeed, they are interdependent. Only in a climate of peace can freedom and jobs flourish. One must have the economic security provided by a job in order fully to enjoy the blessings of liberty. Security without freedom is tantamount to imprisonment.

As Pennsylvania's junior Senator, I have helped the working men and women of our Commonwealth to build a prosperous Pennsylvania through more jobs. My record reflects my continuing efforts.

In the area of union security, I steadfastly oppose all so-called right-to-work laws and favor repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act which would permit States to outlaw the union shop.

As a stanch advocate of the buy-American principle in Government procurement, I almost single-handedly prevailed upon the late President Kennedy in 1962 to change a longstanding Government policy and reverse a contract that the Government had planned to make with a foreign steel producer. My action resulted in a major shift in Government buying which has increased by $30 million per year Government purchases of American-made steel, hydraulic turbines, construction equipment, medical and dental supplies—all of which come in large part from Pennsylvania.

I have sponsored and shall continue to fight for the steel shipping container bill and measures to tighten our antidumping laws so as to keep foreign countries from dumping their surplus goods in the United States, thereby depriving Americans of jobs.

As one of the sponsors of the Mass Transit Act of 1964, I am pleased with this new program of Federal assistance to our cities to develop needed mass transportation facilities. It will provide Pennsylvania with 28,000 man-years of employment and about 1,000 permanent new jobs in the construction, electrical equipment, and transportation industries.

As a strong supporter of the Area Redevelopment Act, I intend to push for my amendment to that act to obtain more funds for Pennsylvania communities.

I enthusiastically voted for the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 and the 1963 amendments broadening its scope and coverage. This legislation is an indispensable weapon in the continuing fight to get our unemployed citizens back to work.

Finally, in the important area of jobs, I have voted to increase the minimum wage, and to bring more and more workers under the coverage of the overtime and other provisions of the Federal wage and hour law.

All of these measures, while important and necessary, will not by themselves lead to full employment. I shall continue to sponsor and support whatever legislation is necessary to attain this objective.

There is more to life than a job. One cannot enjoy life without the freedom that comes from the individual liberties with which we have been blessed under our Constitution and system of government. We cannot take these freedoms for granted, for they are always vulnerable and in jeopardy from within as well as without.

As a member of the Senate Judiciary Committee, I devote my continuing attention to the fair and impartial administration of justice. Individual freedom depends upon the integrity of our courts and law enforcement agencies.

In this connection, I am proud to be a sponsor of two important bills. The first, S. 1801, would provide individual defendants with additional guarantees of a speedy trial. The second, S. 1802, is intended in criminal cases to guard against trial by the news media instead of juries in the courtrooms where such cases rightly belong. The sensational events attendant to the tragic assassination of President Kennedy are but one example of the excesses which S. 1802 are designed to curb.

Jobs and freedom are meaningless abstractions in a world of turmoil and violent conflict. I therefore have consistently supported policies designed to achieve and maintain peace based on a strong national defense. I have worked with and supported four Presidents of the United States for this principle: Harry Truman on Korea, Dwight Eisenhower when he ordered the Marines to Lebanon, John Kennedy in the Cuban missile crisis, and Lyndon Johnson in the Tonkin Bay incident barely 2 months ago.

Every one of these Presidents—Democrats and Republicans alike—has publicly commended me. But I have not hesitated to differ with them when I felt that our national interest was not being served.

Mr. President, on these three vital issues as on all others, I am proud and pleased that I am a difficult Senator to label. There is no national pressure group that gives me an "A" or 100-percent rating.

During my 22 years in Congress, I have fought for more jobs, in defense of our cherished freedoms, and to preserve the peace. I shall continue to wage this battle as long as I am privileged to be a Member of the Senate of the United States.

Hon. James C. Auchincloss

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVID N. HENDERSON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, a few months ago I was stunned to learn that my friend and ranking minority member on the Public Works Committee was retiring from public life. His retirement is certainly a loss to the House of Representatives, to the people of the United States, and most especially to the Third Congressional District of New Jersey.

Even though I served with my friend, Jim Auchincloss, for only 2 years on the Public Works Committee, I quickly noted his sincerity and his fairness. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Auchincloss] and I may not have agreed on all issues, but I certainly respected his decisions and I feel that he did mine. The outstanding contributions he has made to the Committee on Public Works and to the House will be greatly missed.

My friend and colleague, Jim Auchincloss, has earned the retirement because he has served well his people. I wish for him the very best in the years ahead.

Report of Activities of Committee on the District of Columbia, 88th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALAN BIBLE

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Congressional Record a report of the activities of the Committee on the District of Columbia during the 88th Congress.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Mr. Bible. Mr. President, as chairman of your Committee on the District of Columbia, I am honored to present to the Senate a report of the activities of the committee during the 88th Congress.

In the conduct of its legislative responsibilities, the Senate District Committee in some respects is not unlike a State legislature and city council combined, by virtue of the great variety of problems and proposals that come before it.

Mr. President, I am aware that few Members of this distinguished body aspire to serve on the District of Columbia Committee; however, I sincerely believe that my colleagues on the committee are most deserving of the gratitude of the Congress, the people of the District of Columbia, and the people of the entire country generally for the long hours that they spend in conferences, hearings and executive sessions in order to attend to the business of the Nation's Capital City. Likewise, I should like to take this opportunity to express my deep personal appreciation to the various members of this committee who gave unselfishly of their time during this session of Congress with respect to legislative problems affecting the District of Columbia. I want to express my wholehearted appreciation to the very effective and hard working senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse], who has been a member of the committee, a keen student of District affairs for many years, and who is chairman of the Public Health, Education, Welfare, and Safety Subcommittee; to the distinguished junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. Hartke], whose energies and skills and experience in municipal government have been invaluable to our committee as chairman of the Judiciary Subcommittee; and to my warm friend and the capable junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. McIntyre], who has handled a great deal of the committee's work as chairman of the Business and

Commerce Subcommittee. To the other committee members, the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], whose long service both in the Senate and the House made his work most valuable to the committee; the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], whose past service in the House has been most helpful to the committee; and to the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], whose experience in the House of Representatives and in the legislature of his home State has done much to assist the committee with its many problems, I wish to express my sincere thanks for the hours they gave to our committee.

I would also like to express my deep appreciation for the cooperation I received personally as committee chairman from the Honorable JOHN MCMILLAN, chairman of the House Committee on the District of Columbia, and the individual members of his committee. I also wish to commend the cooperation and assistance that the staff members of the House District Committee have extended to the staff members of my committee during this Congress.

During the 88th Congress, the upsurge of crime in the District of Columbia was the foremost problem considered by the committee and no single subject has received greater attention by the committee in more than 10 years.

As part of the committee's overall study of the crime problem, the committee gave careful and thorough consideration to the House-passed bill, H.R. 7525, which proposed changes in existing law in five separate titles and which included modifications in the complex and controversial Mallory and Durham rules.

In order to formulate an in-depth understanding of the crime problem, the committee held more than 12 days of hearings. During the hearings, the committee heard from more than 50 witnesses, including outstanding legal scholars, some prominent law scholars, practicing defense attorneys, nationally recognized psychiatrists, Federal prosecutors, local law-enforcement officers, and police chiefs from the Nation's major cities, penologists, and representatives from radio, television, and motion picture industries. Also, many Washington residents and community leaders appeared at the hearings and gave testimony.

After careful study and consideration of the testimony adduced at the hearings, the committee amended H.R. 7525 in several ways and reported the bill to the Senate.

Title I of the Senate-amended bill dealt with the modification of the Mallory rule. Under its provisions, standards and safeguards were written in for in-custody interrogation of persons arrested on probable cause. In addition to providing these safeguards for an accused during a period of detention, the Senate version also spelled out the maximum period of time that law enforcement officers would be able to detain an accused for interrogation.

In addition to making this change in existing law, the Senate amendments to H.R. 7525 also included the following:

Title II amended existing law so as to require an accused in a criminal case to give notice of an insanity defense.

Title III expanded existing law so as to provide more extensive procedures for the detention of material witnesses to criminal offenses.

Title V made certain changes in the maximum and minimum sentences for crimes of violence and other criminal offenses in the District of Columbia. Also, this title amended the law relating to indecent publications.

It is the feeling of the committee that this omnibus crime bill, which is a major undertaking to strengthen the Criminal Justice Code in the Nation's Capital City, will provide law enforcement agencies, the courts, and the citizenry as a whole with more effective tools to deal with crime.

In addition to the consideration given the crime problem during the 88th Congress, the committee dealt with a variety of other legislative matters. There were favorably reported to the Senate from the committee a total of 53 bills, of which 23 were Senate bills and 30 House bills. Of the 53 bills favorably reported, 40 were enacted into public law. The committee also acted on 10 nominations and several resolutions during this Congress.

Again, as in other sessions of the Congress, the fiscal problems of the District of Columbia were important matters for consideration.

H.R. 12196 was enacted into law by the Congress and its provisions increased salaries of teachers, policemen, and firemen in the District. The bill provided a 7½-percent increase in the salaries of teachers and school officers, and generally an 8.9-percent increase for officers and members of the police and fire departments of the District of Columbia. Under these salary increases, the starting salary for teachers with a bachelor degree is $5,350 per annum; and for policemen and firemen, the starting salary is $6,010 per annum. The overall effect of these salary increases is important as they will help the District of Columbia maintain a competitive position with adjacent county jurisdictions in the recruitment of competent personnel for the District schools and police and fire departments.

Also, during this session, the Fiscal Affairs Subcommittee was busy formulating legislation that would tend to make the annual and sick leave benefits of various departments more effective and equitable for the employees under their jurisdiction.

In accordance therewith, the following leave bills were reported by the committee and enacted by both the Senate and the House:

1. H.R. 10215 extends to officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force, the Fire Department, White House Police force, and the U.S. Park Police, the sick leave benefits accorded to civilian employees of the Federal Government under the provisions of the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951.

2. H.R. 5337 amends existing law with respect to partial pay of the educational employees of the public schools of the District of Columbia who are on leave of absence for educational improvement purposes. The enactment of this legislation should have the desirable effect of increasing the number of teachers engaging in baccalaureate study as the legislation increases a teacher's salary while on education improvement leave from $1,380 to $3,190 per annum.

3. H.R. 9995 amends existing law to provide that any member of the Secret Service Division appointed from the White House Police force shall receive credit toward retirement under the Police and Firemen's Retirement and Disability Act for periods of prior police service with the Metropolitan Police force, the U.S. Park Police force or the White House Police force.

In connection with other fiscal matters reported by the committee, the Senate joined with the House in enacting the following bills that provide for the exemption from District taxes of certain organizational properties:

H.R. 9975 exempts from District of Columbia taxation the real property connected with the Woodrow Wilson House located at 2340 S Street NW., in the District of Columbia. The tax relief provided by this bill will further the congressional policy of providing for the preservation of historic American sites and buildings of national historical significance. The relief extended under the terms of this bill is of particular significance to the District of Columbia as no other memorial to the distinguished World War I President exists in the Nation's Capital at the present time.

Under the provisions of H.R. 8451 the Congress extended an exemption from the District of Columbia sales tax of property used by the Washington Terminal Co. in the repairing of railroad rolling stock operating in interstate commerce.

S. 2944 provided the Greater Southeast Hospital Foundation with an exemption from payment of District of Columbia real estate taxes on land acquired for the construction of a community hospital. The tax exemption would apply during the period commencing with the acquisition of the land to be used as the site for the construction of a hospital and ending on the date such construction actually commenced.

H.R. 11652 provides for the tax exemption of certain property of the United Supreme Council, 33d degree, Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite of Freemasonry. The exemption granted under the bill was based on the property being used exclusively for charitable purposes.

In the area of judicial legislation, the committee also made some important headway during this session.

H.R. 5871 was enacted by the Congress and establishes a more realistic and equitable retirement law for the judges of the District of Columbia court of general sessions, the District of Columbia court of appeals, and the juvenile court of the District of Columbia. The bill made three important changes in retirement benefits for the judges of these courts. They are: First, retirement after 10 years of service on the bench, at 62 years of age; or, a reduced annuity at retirement at age 55; second, disability retirement for a judge after 5 years or more of service; and, third, survivor benefits similar to those now provided for other Federal judges under the current Retirement Act.

In making these improvements in the retirement program, the judges of the various courts are required to deposit 6½ percent of their annual salary into the retirement and survivorship funds which contribution is substantially the same as the retirement contribution made by civil service employees to their retirement fund.

The Judiciary Subcommittee also acted upon a "blue sky" law for the District of Columbia. Both the Senate and the House passed H.R. 9419 which provides for the licensing and effective regulation of securities and registration of broker-dealers in the District of Columbia. The bill is based upon the Uniform Securities Act, a model law proposed for State legislation by the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws. H.R. 9419, as amended, contains: First, a fraud section; second, a part providing for registration of broker-dealers, agents; and, third, a part providing for procedures, subpenas, penalties, liabilities, judicial review, and administration.

It was the view of the committee that this securities licensing bill will provide greater protection to the citizens of the District who invest in stocks and other securities.

This session of the Congress also was a busy one for the Business and Commerce Subcommittee of the Senate District Committee. The subcommittee during the first session held hearings on S. 646, a bill to regulate the location of chanceries in the District of Columbia. After careful study of the chancery problem by the subcommittee, S. 646 was reported to the Senate where it passed. The House later passed S. 646 in amended form. Subsequently, the House and Senate conferees met and agreed to a bill that permits chanceries to be built or occupied in medium and high density apartment zones of the District of Columbia. S. 646, as it was agreed to in conference, is important to our relations with foreign nations as it permits the Department of State, in its negotiations with foreign governments seeking chancery sites in the District of Columbia, to be able to explain with precision whether or not a proposed site is appropriate for the establishment of a chancery.

The Business and Commerce Subcommittee acted upon a number of insurance bills which should help to simplify, as well as to increase the effectiveness of life insurance regulation in the District of Columbia.

H.R. 8355 was enacted by the Congress. Under this bill, the capital stock requirements of life-insurance companies in the District of Columbia are increased from $100,000 to $200,000. Also, the bill permits changes in the corporation charter with the consent of stockholders representing two-thirds of the controlling stock, as well as authorizing the retention by insurance companies of unissued stock for certain limited insurance purposes.

H.R. 6128, another insurance bill, was also enacted into law. Under its provisions a life-insurance company in the District of Columbia is permitted to maintain the required record of stockholders at either the company's principal place of business or at the office of its stock transfer agents in the District of Columbia.

In addition to its consideration of the aforementioned bills, the Business and Commerce Subcommittee also acted favorably upon the following bills, which were enacted into law:

H.R. 6413, to amend the act approved March 3, 1921, as amended, establishing standard weights and measures for the District of Columbia. The effect of this bill will be to bring the District's packaging law into conformity with modern packaging techniques and improvements.

H.R. 8313, to repeal the District of Columbia Credit Union Act, to convert credit unions incorporated under the provisions of the act to the Federal credit unions. The enactment of this bill will place all District of Columbia credit unions under the sole jurisdiction of the Federal Credit Unions Act and thereby remove the duplicity of regulations that now exists in the District with regard to their operation.

Also, the Business and Commerce Subcommittee, during the course of this Congress, gave extensive study and consideration to S. 1184, a bill to amend and consolidate the laws providing for the regulation of certain insurance rates in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

In the area of public health and welfare, the Public Health, Education, Welfare, and Safety Subcommittee made progress with several bills that were favorably reported by the subcommittee during this session of the Congress. Upon being reported by the committee, the Senate passed the following two bills:

S. 860, to amend the District of Columbia minimum wage law. The enactment of this bill would have the effect of correcting a deficiency in existing law by bringing male employees under the District of Columbia minimum wage law. The bill would also extend minimum wage protection to a large number of workers in industry and occupations located in the District of Columbia, and not covered by existing wage orders. In the overall, the bill should provide improved minimum wage and overtime protection for workers entitled to its benefits.

S. 763 relating to the Kerr-Mills medical assistance program. Under its provisions, the District of Columbia will be authorized to come within the Kerr-Mills medical assistance program as provided by the Social Security Amendments of 1960.

In addition to the aforementioned bills, the subcommittee also gave consideration to the following bills which were enacted into law:

H.R. 7441, a bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District to remove dangerous and unsafe buildings and for other purposes. The enactment of this bill makes three important changes in existing law as follows:

First. Provides for a uniform assessment of costs incurred by the District government in connection with work done in making repairs to unsafe structures.

Second. Includes dead, dangerous, or diseased trees among the nuisances which the Commissioners may abate under the act.

Third. Provides new sections to the act relating to notice to owners and evacuations of unsafe buildings.

H.R. 5044 provided that all parties to mutual aid firefighting agreements, which includes the District of Columbia and adjacent counties of Virginia and Maryland, would be required to indemnify each other from all claims arising from the operation of firefighters outside their jurisdictions.

H.R. 6350 provides that the District of Columbia Board of Dental Examiners is authorized to waive any theoretical examination of an applicant for a license as a dental hygienist if the applicant holds a certificate from the national board of dental examiners.

H.R. 6353 amends the District of Columbia Unemployment Act so as to provide the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Board with authority to provide the District of Columbia department of public welfare and the U.S. General Accounting Office with certain information concerning an individual's status with regard to unemployment compensation.

H.R. 2485 amends the act regulating the prevention and control of communicable diseases. Under its provisions, the department of Public Health shall be authorized to treat minors for venereal diseases upon their own consent when they present themselves voluntarily to the department's health clinic.

In recommending this legislation for congressional enactment, the committee was of the view that the procedures providing for a minor to receive prompt medical care should in some measure be instrumental in reducing the high rate of venereal disease in the District of Columbia.

Hon. James C. Auchincloss

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CARLSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the Honorable JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS, affectionately known to all of us as JIM, will be greatly missed in the next session of Congress.

He has rendered outstanding and distinguished service to the Third Congressional District of New Jersey, the State, and the Nation for 22 years. During this period he has served on many important committees and is held in high regard by members of both the majority and minority parties.

JIM is a personal friend of mine. I have had the pleasure of working with him in many capacities and, personally, regret his leaving.

I wish for him and Mrs. Auchincloss many years of well-earned and well-deserved rest.

Polish Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERNARD F. GRABOWSKI

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, all peoples and nations in Central and Eastern Europe have had more than their share of misery and misfortune in recent times. They all were involved, much against their wishes, in the two world wars. They all suffered the fearful consequences of those wars. But among these peoples some lost more and suffered more, and for a longer period, than others. And none perhaps did so more than the unfortunate people of Poland.

The modern history of the Polish people, especially their history during the last two centuries, has been an unending struggle to preserve and maintain their independence and sovereignty. As a matter of tragic fact, they had lost their independence late in the 18th century, and their historic homeland was parcelled out among greedy neighbors—Austria, Prussia, and Russia. This callous and cruel fact did not, however, put an end to the Polish people's desire for freedom. While suffering under alien regimes for more than 100 years, they kept alive this most cherished of their national goals. In their homes, their churches, and in their schools they succeeded in instilling this idea in the hearts and minds of the nation's young men and women. When the appropriate time came, during the First World War, Poland had become a land of freedom-loving patriot-warriors.

In that war they fought in legions, in volunteer groups, and in isolated bands for their freedom. Their national goal came to be inseparably associated with the goal of the Allied and associated powers. Toward the end of the war, when the victory of the democratic forces was in sight, the Poles were justly heartened. Under the unrivaled leadership of Paderewski their cause was ably presented to the statesmen of the Allied Governments. These men lent their support to the Polish cause. Finally, on November 11, the day on which the armistice was signed between the victors and the vanquished, Poland proclaimed her independence. That memorable day marks a great turning point, a great landmark, in Poland's turbulent modern history.

Unfortunately, today the independence achieved 46 years ago has again been lost. An independent and sovereign Poland no longer exists. Free Poland, born in 1918, was ravished by the Nazis and the Soviets very early in the last war. Poland is not the free country for which her patriotic people fought and died. Even under the present distressing circumstances, under Communist totalitarian dictatorship, Poles are making the best of a sad situation. We are confident that on the 46th anniversary of Poland's Independence Day, the spirit of freedom and independence still lives and we pray that Poland will again attain her goal of freedom.

Two Gentlemen From New Jersey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, as we prepare to leave this Chamber for the last time in this 88th Congress, we cannot but have mixed emotions about our departure. On the one hand, we can be extremely proud of the legislative record we have achieved. On the other, we know that long, hard days lie ahead as we return to our districts and stand before the electorate who will tell us in 1 month if our accounting of our stewardship has been satisfactory. And finally, there is the sadness that comes with the contemplation that many in our midst will not be with us when we reconvene in this Chamber next January.

Among this latter group are two gentlemen who have decided to withdraw from this scene of action. In both cases, their decisions are prompted by entirely personal reasons, for if given the opportunity, their constituents would not have allowed them to retire.

The gentleman from Rumson, N.J. [Mr. Auchincloss], I shall miss, as we all shall, for the wisdom and willingness with which he served his colleagues. I shall never forget how when I first came here, Jim went out of his way to make me feel at home. We were from different parts of the State, of different parties; but that never affected the warmth with which he treated me from the very beginning. I depended on his counsel. I welcomed his friendship. Now, 16 years later, that counsel, that friendship remains a vital part of my life here.

The gentleman from Maplewood [Mr. Wallhauser], I shall miss, but not as much. Not that I value his counsel less, or his friendship. It is just that when he resumes his business, his office address will make him one of my constitutents. So, I am counting on George's counsel, and want here to assure him that he will have no need to rely altogether on his successor to represent him. It will be my privilege and pleasure to accept him into my constituency, and I do hope he will continue to give me the benefit of his thoughts on legislation affecting our community, our State and our Nation.

I have every confidence that the gentlemen who represent the 3d and 12th Districts of New Jersey in the 89th Congress will be competent, dedicated representatives of their constituents. They had better be, for they are following the footsteps of two of the most competent and dedicated Members of this body.

Jim and George, may God grant you good health and spirits to enjoy the years that lie ahead. Though you will not be with us here every day, we shall not forget you. And should you find the time, do come see us and brighten our day in Washington.

Jim Auchincloss, a Great Guy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, it is with a deep sense of regret and loss that I note the retirement of my dear friend and most able and influential colleague, James C. Auchincloss, of New Jersey.

Jim Auchincloss came to the Congress in 1943 as a youngster of 58. During the ensuing 22 years that Jim Achincloss served as a Member of Congress, he has served well and with distinction the United States, his State of New Jersey, and the Republican Party.

He is the ranking Republican on the Public Works Committee and it is largely through his efforts and contributions that the Interstate Highway System was formulated in 1954 and this legislation is a tribute to his work in the Congress.

Particularly are the residents of the District of Columbia the better off because of his service in the House. During his long tenure as a member of the Committee on the District of Columbia, his interest in District of Columbia matters has been wide and intent. He has worked hard and long for urban renewal in the District of Columbia; for adequate police protection for District residents; for fiscal integrity and for fire safety. Truly, he has left a mark on the District of Columbia that will be long remembered.

I submit, however, that Jim Auchincloss' distinguished service in the House of Representatives came as no surprise to those who had known him prior to the time he first came here—and those who know him are legion. His service here in the House has been but the culmination of a career of life-long service.

Eighteen years as a member of the board of governors of the New York Stock Exchange; 12 years as a member of the council, Borough of Rumson, N.J.; and two full terms plus a partial third term as mayor of Rumson. These are some of the positions held with honor by Jim Auchincloss.

Mr. Speaker, I join my voice with those wishing Jim Auchincloss health and happiness in his retirement. However, I must say to him that his voice will be sorely missed during debates in the House of Representatives and during our party councils. But we are not losing him entirely as I understand he will be spending some of his time in and about Washington and I will look forward to our continuing friendship.

Address Delivered by Representative Clarence D. Long at His Testimonial Dinner, September 14, 1964, Baltimore, Md.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL B. BREWSTER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, a short time ago I was privileged to attend a testimonial dinner in behalf of the Honorable Clarence D. Long, Member of Congress from Maryland's Second Congressional District, which comprises Carroll, Harford, and Baltimore Counties. The latter is my home county, and I preceded Congressman Long as representative of that district. During those years, Mr. Long was nationally prominent as a professor of economics at Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore. Since becoming a Member of Congress, he has compiled a distinguished record for timely and effective action on behalf of his constituents. I am confident that he will continue to serve them for many years to come.

Mr. President, Congressman Long's remarks at his testimonial dinner will be of interest to many Marylanders—to many Americans—who are not his constituents. I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the Congressional Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY REPRESENTATIVE CLARENCE D. LONG AT HIS TESTIMONIAL DINNER ON SEPTEMBER 14, 1964, BLUE CREST NORTH, BALTIMORE, MD.

Mr. Speaker, Mrs. McCormack, Mrs. Tydings, Senator Brewster, our next Democratic Senator Joseph Tydings, my lovely mother, honored guests, and fellow Democrats, the presence of so many of my friends, and their kind words, touch me deeply, even allowing that at testimonials the naked truth is customarily clothed with white mendacities.

My freshman year in Congress has been exhilarating. I have undertaken three new enterprises. First, a business desk to get Government contracts, technical information, and financial aid. Second, a job desk to help the unemployed locate work in Government and in private industry; indeed, my efforts in behalf of the unemployed have seemed so excessive to the private employment agencies that they have been moved to protest. Third, the practice of "riding the circuit" to a different post office each week—to meet the scores of people waiting to seek my help in locating jobs, winning contracts, getting stop lights, persuading post office trucks to make less noise at 4:30 in the morning, obtaining relief for a man who had a towel left in him years ago in an Army hospital, getting sons out of jail or husbands into jail. The accomplishment of which I am most proud was to get 17-year-old Radmila Lomsky from behind the Iron Curtain where she had been since she was a year-and-a-half old. You will recall, Mr. Speaker, your pleasure in greeting her on the occasion when I brought her to Washington to meet you and President Johnson.

This work has given me enormous satisfaction; it is the kind that enables a Congressman to know what his people want in order better to represent them, the type that humanizes big Government growing ever more remote, as the great bureaus add new miles of corridors. I shall continue this endeavor for my district. For the remainder of this term and for the next I plan an intensified program of attracting defense contracts and building our science-industry complex; of setting up a job-finding clinic, to enable workers, especially older men and women, to learn how and where to look for jobs; of controlling pollution in our Chesapeake and fresh water streams, of attracting the new health center to the Baltimore area; of protecting our rural beauty and preserving open spaces against urban and suburban sprawl; of reducing the poverty which persists among the old, the sick, the poorly trained, and the uneducated; and finally of locating a new bay bridge in Baltimore County, thus opening up new industries, jobs, and recreation for the three-fifths of the people of Maryland who live in this area.

But the main thing for which a Congressman is elected is to vote wisely. I am proud that I have maintained one of the best attendance records in Congress—well over 90 percent—and did not miss a really important vote while attending nearly 1,000 meetings in my own district.

I am proud to have served on the Armed Services Committee under the magnificent chairmanship of Carl Vinson and to have played a part in building an armed force probably greater than that of all the nations that have ever existed—an armed force so overwhelming that it—along with a moderate policy of being firm but not threatening—has caused the Russians to step down the armament race.

I am proud, above all, to have served in the 88th Congress under the generalship of Speaker John McCormack, one of the kindest, most foresighted men ever to preside over the House of Representatives, as well as under Presidents Kennedy and Johnson, with their visions of a great society whose fruits grow and ripen and fall on the well-to-do and the humble alike—without respect to color, sex, age, or religious creed—a society in which the stairway of economic and social opportunity is commodious enough to accommodate all who aspire to climb it.

I have sought to be an effective member of the team; at the same time to preserve my right to differ from that leadership, whenever I have felt I could not follow. The people of the Second District have no wish to be represented by one who could say in the words of Gilbert and Sullivan, "I've always voted at my party's call, and I never thought of thinking for myself at all." Any Congressman worth his salary has a core of convictions which he cannot abandon, however great his loyalty to party.

My own convictions, acquired from some years studying and writing in economics and history, are:

First, that free enterprise, capitalism, if you will—is the best society ever developed. In its short 200 years it has provided the only pervasive prosperity the human race has ever known and the only widespread freedom it has ever enjoyed. I accept the role of Government in setting the Marquis of Queensberry rules of free enterprise—making sure it is not undermined by monopoly; increasing the supply and quality of human resources; providing minimum guaranties against want; maintaining overall stability against recession and stagnation; and defining and enlarging its goals. So much and no more. I do not accept the role of Government in superseding or destroying that system.

Second, essential to the free enterprise system are both right to profit and competitive prices. I deplore the ever-new interference with the price system and the stubborn refusal to abandon them when obsolete or unwarranted.

Third, self-help, not charity—should be our policy for helping the unfortunate. Helping people to help themselves is the cheapest help in the long run. It is the only kind that builds happiness and self-respect. It is the only kind that gets results. It is the only kind that yields gratitude.

Fourth, essential to free enterprise is faith in it. Just as parents must trust their children enough to let them go on alone without endless interferences and cluck-clucking, so we must trust that free enterprise will continue in the future, as in the past, to produce and sell limitless quantities of goods and services and to absorb as many workers as seek gainful work. I cannot believe we need substitute Government for private investment, limit hours of work, or establish control of prices and wages, in order to keep the Nation prosperous or fully employed.

Fifth, no principles are absolute. Property rights are as important to human rights as human rights are to property rights. He who takes my property takes my independence and therefore my humanity. He who takes my freedom deprives me of dignity and self-respect, and therefore the most valuable property I have.

Finally, if there are times when extremism is justified, surely we are not in them now. Prosperity has never been greater; unemployment in peacetime has seldom been lower; poverty is too large, but it is shrinking and is smaller than ever before or anywhere else among the nations of the world. The wealthy have been increasing in number and affluence by any standard—even after taxes. Scientific investigation opens new frontiers every hour. World tension with our major adversary is the lowest in a generation. Losses in Vietnam, certainly deplorable, have been smaller than in a few hours in the Korean war. The armament race seems under control, at least for the present. We are in the midst of a great—if highly unstable—equilibrium.

In view of these facts, it would be the crime to take on a pilot who promises to sail this ship of state recklessly. I urge you, therefore, to reelect President Johnson, a navigator with a warm heart and a cool head—a warm heart to ease the misery that plagues the world, a cool head to keep us afloat as extremists about to put into uncharted waters. I urge you to reject the pilot who has, instead, a cool heart and a hot head—a heart cool to the poor and old and sick and unemployed, a head hot enough to hurl us all into utter and possibly permanent destruction.

If you reject this foolish helmsman and take on the wise President Johnson and his tried mate, Hubert Humphrey, by all means give him the help he needs from intelligent, honest, courageous, and independent men like Joseph Tydings and Carlton Sickles. Then you will have the men you need to take us on the high adventure to a greater society than the world has ever known.

The First Anniversary of the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIBORNE PELL

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, October marks the first anniversary of the limited nuclear test ban treaty—a historic event for all Americans and for all peoples throughout the world.

This treaty underwent exhaustive and comprehensive debate in the Senate; and it was the concensus of the great majority of those in this Chamber that the treaty's ratification would have a deep and constructive meaning for all mankind. I was proud to give my full support to the treaty a year ago. In retrospect, and as an alternate delegate to the Geneva Conference on disarmament, I believe that our Senate ratification constituted one of the most significant accomplishments of the 88th Congress in terms of the lasting peace we hope fervently to secure.

On September 18, 1963, during the debate on ratification in this Chamber, I said:

> The continuous injection into the atmosphere of the poisonous strontium 90, resulting from atomic tests, has already gone higher than we as parents, and as progenitors of yet unborn generations, can permit.

In his message to the Nation on the anniversary of ratification, President Johnson pointed out that the residues of strontium 90 have already decreased by 50 percent within the past year's span, and that other poisonous and contaminating materials, pervading our world prior to the treaty, have disappeared.

As both President Kennedy and President Johnson have stated, one single step is necessary before a lengthy journey can be achieved. A year ago we embarked on that lengthy journey. Let us hope we can continue on our way, and in the company of all other nations with a nuclear capability, so that the concepts of this treaty may be universally applied.

Hon. James C. Auchincloss

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speak, one of the Congress most dedicated, faithful, and conscientious Members will retire next January after 22 years of distinguished service. I speak of Jim Auchincloss of New Jersey.

I have served with Jim for 6 years on the Committee on Public Works where he demonstrated his outstanding ability to perceive the real issues before us. Although we understandably disagreed on occasions over the legislation before the committee and the Congress, his keen perception of legislative matters accounted for better pieces of legislation.

I have great admiration and respect for Jim. His presence in this Chamber will be missed in future years. His accomplishments have added much to the Congress.

I am sure all of his friends join with me in wishing him many years of happiness and good health.

The Race for Inner Space

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I request unanimous consent that the text of my recent remarks on conservation, "The Race for Inner Space," and the text of my letter of October to Secretary of the Interior Udall be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"THE RACE FOR INNER SPACE"—REMARKS BY MR. KEATING, OCTOBER 1964

Our Nation has spent a great deal of time and money in our race to conquer outer space.

But there is another area of national effort which in the end may be more important to each individual—particularly to city dwellers—than our drive to reach the moon.

I refer to the campaign to preserve America's "inner space," the parklands, the recreation areas, the wilderness, and the seashores which are fast disappearing.

Theodore Roosevelt once observed that "there is nothing more practical in the end than the preservation of beauty." For years, these words fell on deaf ears, for America's endowment of unspoiled land seemed limitless.

Today, we know we must act to preserve these resources for ourselves and our grandchildren. From the redwoods in California to the seashore at Fire Island our national wonders must be saved.

I am proud of the part I played in the field of conservation in the 88th Congress.

During these 2 years I:

1. Authored the Fire Island National Seashore bill which brought the State of New York its first and only national park to serve the 16 million Americans who live within 100 miles of the park;

2. Cosponsored the wilderness bill which will preserve millions of acres of unspoiled land for future generations of Americans;

3. Supported creation of a land and water conservation fund, which will enable the Federal Government to purchase and develop parklands and recreation facilities in areas of high population density;

4. Obtained for the Seneca Indians of Salamanca, N.Y., a $15 million compensation payment which will be used, in part, to develop recreation and cultural facilities for the public on their reservation;

5. Introduced and supported legislation to preserve our Nation's historic sites, such as Sagamore Hill, Ansley Wilcox House, Bowne House, and the Oriskany Battlefield;

6. Fought for the preservation of the greatest trout fishing streams in New York State, the Beaverkill, and the Willowemoc, and I have asked the New York State Commissioner of Conservation to reconsider plans to bring the highways and traffic of the State to the very shores of these unsurpassed streams;

7. Urged that the Federal Power Commission make no decision on the Consolidated Edison project in the Hudson River Valley until the members have had an opportunity to tour the area and evaluate the proposal in this scenic setting;

8. Blocked legislation to encourage the importation of wild birds and animals for commercial exploitation; and

9. Prevented efforts to nullify the Keating Golden Eagle bill.

I have supported the creation of our magnificent national park system and hope that every New Yorker will, at some time during his life, have an opportunity to view and enjoy these wonders of the West.

But, I have always believed that parks should be where the people are. The Northeast has the highest concentration of population and the smallest number of national parks in the Nation.

The Grand Canyon is too far from Grand Central.

A new campsite at Yellowstone Park means little to the apartment dweller on Yellowstone Boulevard.

By the year 2000, there will be 350 million Americans, most of them concentrated in urban areas.

The race for inner space—for unspoiled land within large metropolitan areas—will be gathering force during the next 35 years, as will the demand for more outdoor recreation facilities.

Our efforts to preserve the land and to provide those facilities must keep pace with that drive.

Specifically, I propose the following 3-year action plan and pledge, during my next term in the Senate, to work for these goals:

1. By 1967, the Fire Island National Seashore, now authorized by the passage of my bill, must be in full operation. Sufficient funds must be appropriated to purchase all necessary land. The work of the Army Corps of Engineers to preserve the Fire Island dunes must be completed.

2. By the year 1967, the Tocks Island National Recreation Area must be established and operating. This scenic and unspoiled area offers magnificent recreation potential for the people of the metropolitan area. Located in the Delaware River Valley, it is only 75 miles from the city and would offer excellent swimming, boating, camping, and hiking facilities for New Yorkers.

3. By the year 1967, Ellis Island should be developed in coordination with the proposed New Jersey waterfront project as a combination recreation area and historic site for the people of the two States. The Department of the Interior has endorsed this proposal, and I intend to see to it that this park—like the Fire Island Seashore—becomes a reality.

4. By 1967, the Breezy Point Park which has been established by the city and the State of New York must be completed by adding to it the 312 acres of Federal land now known as Fort Tilden. This property lies between two large beaches—Breezy Point and Jacob Riis. The three together would form a 1,000-acre park and recreation area, easily accessible to 8 million New Yorkers, for the price of a subway token.

5. By 1967, the Federal Government, in cooperation with State and city health officials, must complete a survey of the possibility of purifying the waters of New York City in order to make swimming and recreation possible.

It is incredible that a city composed of islands and peninsulas, a city surrounded by water, has inadequate water recreation facilities.

There is park area, for example, all long the Hudson River from Yonkers to the midsixties. But no one can safely swim in the water that borders it.

There is a large lake in Flushing Meadow Park, but raw sewage is pumped into it.

There are beaches in this city which used to afford clean water facilities, but that water, long ago, was polluted.

If the city of New York won't clean up the lakes and rivers and bays, I intend to ask the Federal Government to help us out.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare can offer assistance in combating the pollution. The Army Corps of Engineers can aid in dredging. A comprehensive plan and the allocation of responsibilities for carrying it out should be prepared within the next 3 years.

Without the space to play and explore, without the opportunity to rest and reflect away from the tumult of the city, without the room to see and appreciate nature's wonders, the life of the city dweller is claustrophobic and unbalanced.

If we are to set up parks and preserve unspoiled areas for ourselves and for future generations, we must act now.

The timetable I propose is realistic, and I pledge that I will keep it on schedule if I am reelected.

The office of U.S. Senator KENNETH B. KEATING today released the text of the following letter received recently by him from Carl W. Buchheister, president of the National Audubon Society (1130 Fifth Avenue, New York City):

DEAR SENATOR KEATING: Now that adjournment is at hand, I want to thank you for your outstanding personal contributions to the rather remarkable conservation record compiled by the 88th Congress.

You were one of the sponsors of the wilderness bill, and you worked actively for its passage.

You can always be proud, and Americans will always be grateful to you, for your successful sponsorship of S. 1365, the bill that became the law establishing a Fire Island National Seashore.

In July the Senate was about to pass a bill that would have encouraged a cruel commercial exploitation of wildlife and put new pressure on endangered species, by removing import duties on wild birds and animals. You stepped in and won adoption of an amendment that eliminated this threat.

And we are not forgetting that you were one of the leading sponsors of the law passed in the preceding Congress to protect the Golden Eagle. When another Senator tried to take the teeth out of that law this year, you acted quickly to stop the effort dead in its tracks.

This is only a partial account of your splendid leadership for which all conservation-minded citizens are grateful.

Sincerely yours,
CARL W. BUCHHEISTER,
President.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: As you know, the last Congress was known as the Conservation Congress because of the number of important measures that were taken in the field of natural resources preservation and protection.

Among the measures of particular interest to the State of New York, of course, was my own bill to create a national seashore on Fire Island, New York's first national park.

I am greatly concerned that land on Fire Island that is to become a part of the park is now being rapidly developed for private profit. The towns concerned have taken all steps possible to prevent such exploitation, but unless the Interior Department moves promtply, some of the finest property on Fire Island may be fully developed before the park comes into being. This, of course, would greatly increase the cost to the Federal Government of acquiring the land.

I am also deeply concerned over the future of another island that is important to all New Yorkers—Ellis Island. As you know, the Interior Department originally recommended against Federal development of the island, but under strong pressure from Senator JAVITS, myself, and other members of the Senate Government Operations Committee, you have recommended that the island now be designated a national historic site. I concur in this recommendation, made in June 1964. It could be implemented at once by the President by public proclamation under 16 U.S.C. 431 and the site could be set aside immediately. I strongly urge that action be taken along these lines promptly.

Third, New Yorkers are deeply concerned over the conservation aspects of a number of highway projects financed by Federal funds in different parts of New York. I understand the Interior Department has studied the conflicting demands for roads and recreation in connection with the construction of Route 17 where it adjoins the Beaverkill and Willowemoc streams and Route 87 in Westchester County—two projects on which I have been in touch with your Department in the past. Yet these recommendations have not been made public. It would be most useful if the recommendations of the Interior Department could be published before final action is taken and I would appreciate for my own use a copy of your reports on these projects.

Fourth, as you know, the Consolidated Edison project involving considerable work near Storm King Mountain, as well as the construction of additional overhead transmission lines east of the Hudson, is still pending before the Federal Power Commission. The joint legislative committee on natural resources of the New York State Legislature is preparing hearings on the entire issue of hydroelectric development in the Hudson Valley. I have been in touch with you in the past about the Federal interest in such efforts and know it would be helpful for the Interior Department to make known to the Federal Power Commission its substantive recommendations for this project. Your interest is well known and I believe testimony from you would be valuable in assessing the merits and disadvantages of the proposed project.

Fifth, on October 5, I proposed that the Federal Government undertake a survey of the waters around New York City—particularly the Hudson River—with a view toward eliminating pollution and making these waters suitable for swimming. I would appreciate your comments on the feasibility of such a study, and the efforts which could be made by the Interior Department, in conjunction with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, to accomplish this end.

These problems are among the major conservation issues troubling the people of New York at this time. It would be most helpful if the Interior Department could make its views known promptly and take appropriate action as soon as possible so that New York's irreparable natural resources will not be threatened with unnecessary commercial exploitation or despoliation. Since you have indicated to me that you will be in New York State on October 21, I think it is important for you to take the occasion to clarify the position of the Interior Department on these issues.

Very sincerely yours,

Kenneth B. Keating.

Hon. James C. Auchincloss

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. T. A. THOMPSON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, James C. Auchincloss has been a Member of Congress for the past 22 years. He has represented his district, his State, and his country with distinction in the House of Representatives.

During my years of service in the Congress, I have come to know Jim as a personal friend and as a fellow member of the Committee on Public Works. I know of his record in the Committee on Public Works and on the floor of the House. I know of his interest in the problems and the welfare of the people of this Nation and the many contributions he has made for the advancement of good government.

I salute him on his well-earned retirement and I wish to Jim and his lovely wife all the best in the years to come.

The 250th Anniversary of Littleton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, it is a great honor and privilege for me to salute the wonderful town of Littleton, Mass., in my district, which is observing its 250th anniversary this year.

It was on November 2, 1714, that the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts approved the petition of some 23 citizens of the Nashoba area to incorporate the township of Nashoba. Later, on December 3, 1715, the town was officially named Littleton.

Located in an area of Massachusetts which was settled by pioneer colonists in the early days of American history, Littleton has grown from this small beginning into a thriving and active community. From earliest days, Littleton has been literally steeped in religious and patriotic dedication. The town was founded by resolute, God-fearing people, hardy souls, who did not know the meaning of the words "fear or doubt," determined pioneers, unalterably devoted to belief in divine providence and determined to live under conditions of freedom, liberty, and peace.

While Littleton was incorporated as a town in 1714, its history goes back to the very earliest days of American history. In 1654, Nashobah was established as the sixth "praying Indian" town established by the famed John Eliot, English missionary to the Indians.

The settlement grew slowly because the times were troubled. The constant threat of Indian wars and actual fighting between ominous periods of peace did little to encourage the growth of frontier settlements, but despite all these hazards the small community continued to grow and progress.

Like most New England settlements of those early days, Littleton originated in travail, painstaking work and bitter sacrifice. The early colonists and settlers lived under primitive conditions, their rock-strewn farms were but small openings in the vast expanse of forest. Living in a veritable wilderness beset by wild beasts and hostile Indians, these hardy pioneers set up their villages separated by intervening woods and wilderness.

And in the center of their community, they set up their meeting houses, which became the center of their profound religious spirit and the focal point of worship, law and order and free democratic government.

The early founders were devout and patriotic people. They placed their faith in their God and their reliance in the developing strength of their free institutions and their courageous fellow countrymen.

Their powerful spiritual strength, their incredible faith and courage, amazing resourcefulness and determination, their persistency and sacrifices and their courage continue to inspire and guide this great Nation of ours to new heights of progress and advancement.

Mr. Speaker, the early settlers of Littleton played a vital and important role in the historic beginnings of this Nation. Town records show that Littleton men fought in the French and Indian wars of 1754 to 1763, taking part in several expeditions into Canada and other campaigns.

On that fateful and historic day of April 19, 1775, Littleton quickly responded to the cry for help from Concord and Lexington. The local militia formed and immediately marched to Concord, thence to Cambridge. Revolutionary War records show that 150 men served from Littleton, a distinctly good representation since the male population of the town over 16 in 1777 was only 209.

In war and peace, in struggle, joy, and sorrow, in adversity, and times of smooth sailing, the men and women of Littleton have always rallied with fortitude and fidelity to the Nation's call wherever that trail might lead. From Bunker Hill to Korea and Vietnam, Littleton has shown its mettle and demonstrated its allegiance to the proud standards of freedom.

In June, Littleton conducted a week-long program of impressive exercises to mark 250 years of progress and growth and to recall the accomplishments and deeds of the courageous early settlers. At that time it was a great honor and privilege for me to join the townspeople as guest speaker at impressive commemorative exercises on Littleton Common.

The Littleton anniversary program, which was so well planned by hardworking committees for the entertainment of townspeople and the many visitors from neighboring communities, was truly impressive, and I am very thankful that it was possible for me to participate in these memorable exercises.

I congratulate the people of Littleton on attaining 250 years of growth and progress and extend to its distinguished officials, religious, civic, and business leaders, and all its citizens sincere good wishes for a truly glorious future.

Mr. Speaker, in recognition of Littleton's 250th anniversary, I would like to include as part of my remarks the text of my anniversary message to Littleton and the prize-winning essays of Littleton High School students which appeared in the official 250th Littleton anniversary program book:

AN ANNIVERSARY MESSAGE TO THE LITTLETON COMMUNITY

I take great pleasure in saluting the historic town of Littleton upon its 250th anniversary and extend heartiest congratulations and good wishes to this beautiful New England community on this outstanding and memorable occasion.

In looking back over Littleton's great past, we can take pride in the strength of character, the goodness of heart, and the faith in God of Littleton's citizens down through the years. Settled by pioneer colonists as early as 1642, Littleton has every reason to be proud of the remarkable record of achievements and glorious accomplishments of its people throughout the years.

Some families residing in Littleton today can trace their beginnings to these early settlers who helped to carve American civilization out of the wilderness and forge the great tradition, eventful history and proud heritage which have made our Nation what it is today among the peoples of the world. All its people share and loyally embrace this great American heritage.

Under brilliant leadership in civic and political affairs, in industry and commerce, and in patriotic, cultural and spiritual endeavors, Littleton is an inspiring symbol of American growth and progress.

As your U.S. Representative in Congress and as neighbor and friend, I am most gratified and very proud indeed to send greetings, salutations and my very best wishes to all the citizens and residents of Littleton on this meaningful and wonderful 250th anniversary celebration.

With greetings, warm regards, and best wishes to all, I am

Sincerely yours,

PHILIP J. PHILBIN.

LITTLETON: PAST, PRESENT, AND FUTURE

(By Marcia Killay, first prize)

"In 1713, 23 inhabitants of Concord, Chelmsford Stow, and Nashoba petitioned the general court for a grant of Nashoba in order to settle a township. A committee from the general court looked over the proposed area and submitted its report. The House of Representatives then recommended that the area be granted a township. On November 2, 1714, an act incorporating the town of Littleton was entered into the General Court of Massachusetts." In this manner did the town of Littleton originate, proudly taking its place among the towns, villages, and cities that make up the United States.

Because Littleton was settled in the area between two ponds, the town was originally called "Nashoba," the Indian name for double water. In 1715 it was decided to rename the town "Lyttleton," in honor of George Lyttleton, a prominent political figure in England. However, because of an error in spelling, the name adopted was "Littleton."

Like the other early towns of the untamed New World, Littleton's first years were filled with hardship and sorrow. Although many of the Indians were friendly, the struggling white settlement was frequently plagued by angry savages, causing the townspeople to live constantly with fear. It was in this atmosphere that the people of Littleton worked and prayed to create a home for themselves and their children. There are many stories attesting to the bravery and courage of the early settlers, but the one Littleton is especially proud of relating is the tale of one courageous 15-year-old girl. One peaceful Saturday morning, Mary Shepard was watching for Indians on Quagana Hill while her brothers worked in their barn. A band of unfriendly Indians steathily crept up behind Mary, stifled her cry of warning, and dragged her away to captivity. The same night, after darkness had dropped its protective covering over the forest, the brave girl stole a horse and saddle and rode through the wilds to safety. The type of courage which this act typifies could be found in most of the settlers of Littleton; that is, Mary Shepard's story is a shining example of the type of hardy and courageous people from whom we of Littleton today are descended.

Since that period of time when the Indians were the main menace to the settlers, Littleton has encountered and weathered other serious problems. The people of Littleton have always served their country with bravery and intelligence, being represented in each conflict and every war in which the United States was engaged. We should be especially proud of our town's performance in the Revolutionary War, when the very ideals of freedom and democracy were being contested. Littleton was well inhabited by patriotic citizens, the leading patriot being William Henry Prentice, a tavern keeper. Since Littleton is located so near the "seat of the Revolution," her townspeople were directly involved with the struggle for independence. Luther Blanchard, a young patriot from Littleton, was the first man to be hit by a British bullet at the famous old North Bridge in Concord. The inhabitants of our town were also active in the World Wars, serving the United States not only "on the front," but also here at home. Yes, Littleton has sound reasons for being proud of its heritage and of its inhabitants who worked, fought, and prayer to create a free America for us.

Today Littleton is a thriving community and an attractive site for new industry and the development of the individual. With a steady increase in population, Littleton is expanding culturally, industrially, and spiritually. A tour through our town would include such major industries as the United Elastic Co., Bowl-Mor, Warren Manufacturing, and the new branch of the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. Such a tour would also visit our several houses of worship—the churches that are the living symbols of the American ideals of freedom. The Reuben Hoar Library, which is remarkably well equipped for a town of Littleton's size, would be visited next to remind the tourist that the inhabitants of Littleton realize the need for keeping informed and broadening one's range of knowledge. This realization is further strengthened by the publication of our own newspaper, the Littleton Independent. Next the imaginary tour would visit our three schools, the two for grammar grades and the high school. These schools are well equipped with materials and good teachers to provide the youth of Littleton with the sound education which they must have in order to exist and succeed in modern American life. Of course a town meeting would have to be seen by the tour, since such a meeting is democracy at work in Littleton. We who live here are fortunate in that the town is small enough to allow anyone to attend the meetings, and thus we all have the opportunity to watch and participate in our town government and proceedings. Time would run out before the tour could visit the countless other establishments which mark Littleton as a modern American town. The visitor would fail to see the supermarkets, the garages, the barber and beauty shops, the dress shops, the gift shops, and the many "unknown" small businesses. Yes, the tour would only scratch the surface of our "little town," but we who live here should be aware of the activity under the surface, and then transform this awareness into a sense of pride and loyalty.

At this period in history when Littleton is proudly celebrating her 250th anniversary, we "Littletonites" can look back upon our heritage and forward into the future. We of Littleton may be justly proud of the role our town has played, is playing, and will continue to play in the building and strengthening of the principles of freedom and democracy for which our country stands. Now is the time for each Littleton citizen to reevaluate his position as a citizen of the United States, to remember once again how very lucky he is to be living in a country where freedom and democracy are practiced and not just preached. And then the citizen must not forget that his beliefs and his attitudes are the factors which will mold and form his town in the future. Littleton—a small town in Massachusetts, a tiny black dot on the map of the United States, a blank space on the map of the world—and Littleton, the center of the universe for those who live here.

LITTLETON: PAST, PRESENT, AND FUTURE

(By Ronald Foeley, second prize)

"December 3, 1715: Resolve. The ownership of a grant made November 2, 1714, is corrected and it is ordered that the name of the township to be henceforth called Littleton." Such was the humble beginning of the town of Littleton. The above quotation represents the tireless efforts of the pioneers and settlers of the Nashoba Valley, specifically the Nashoba Plantation of Littleton in forming a home, community, and town. The past history of Littleton is actually very colorful and intriguing to study. One cannot just live in the past, however; one must think of the present, for it is through progress and growth that those qualities most precious to us are maintained and preserved. And one cannot live day to day without thinking about the future.

The variegated history of Littleton is a fascinating journey back in time. The date of the incorporation of the town of Littleton is erroneously recorded as December 3, 1715; it should have been November 2, 1714. During the period from November 2, 1714, to December 3, 1715, however, the town bore the name of Nashoba. Furthermore, that area of which Littleton or Nashoba was a part, was familiar to white settlers as early as 1640. Therefore, the picturesque history of the area of Littleton goes back in time almost to that of Plymouth, Boston, and other old towns of Massachusetts. Initially, the name of this town, Littleton, was chosen to honor Hon. George Lyttleton, M.P., a commissioner of the Treasury of the Commonwealth. From the incorporation of the town in 1714 until the Revolution in 1775, Littleton maintained a steady rate of growth. By this time certain parts of the town and designated names such as the Common, Old Common, and Nashoba. Of course the town had to have a church, a minister (one of the stipulations of the town charter) and also a meeting house. All of these were acquired shortly after incorporation. During this time Littleton attracted settlers thus increasing the population considerably. This growth in population resulted in the construction of homes, roads, a store, a tavern, and the cultivation of many farms. At the same time agitation for self-government became more vociferous. During the Revolutionary War, Littleton played a highly significant role in the struggle for freedom. Following the Revolutionary War, Littleton's area growth increased steadily, simultaneously the population growth soared, and with this expansion in population came the cultivation of more land, the opening of grammar schools, and the founding of industries such as the old Warren Street saw and grist mill, the apple factory by the depot, and the elastics works adjacent to the Common. During the Civil War the town supplied the Union with well over the required quota of 100 men. But the "War of the Rebellion" (as it was termed in the town records) was not as important as the Revolutionary War, and did not carry quite the same amount of enthusiasm as the earlier war. Nevertheless, Littleton did participate in one Civil War movement, the underground railroad.

The end of the Civil War did not result in a spiraling upward movement in population growth; it did, however, foretell a marked expansion in the construction of public buildings. With a significant contribution from Mr. Reuben Hoar, Littleton's first public library was erected. By now many new roads had been built between Littleton and surrounding towns. A few more one-room school houses were also built during this period as well as a post office and telegraph station. Because of 250 years of growth, Littleton is very hard to describe in detail. Naturally, Littleton has increased in population over these 250 years; and many, many homes have been built to accommodate all of the present families and people of the town. Littleton today is a thriving town whose industries and agricultural pursuits form the basis of its economy. The town has a combination townhouse-fire station, a library, two large grammar schools supplying the educational needs of its pre-high school children, and a modern high school incorporating the latest techniques in education. These constitute the public buildings of Littleton. In addition, churches of various denominations maintain spiritual guard over her people; finally many stores and shops supply the material wants of her residents. Littleton also boasts the existence of such institutions as the historical society, Lyceum, American Field Service, and the present 250th Anniversary Committee Inc., whose raison d'etre is the satisfaction of the desire of her citizens for intellectual improvement.

But the present always becomes the past in a following instant and the future is always before us. Yet, it is an unqualified axiom of life that the seeds of the past are contained in the present, and the present heralds the advent of the future. In closely scrutinizing the Littleton of today we may discover the characteristics of the Littleton of tomorrow. Some of these characteristics may be found in industry, for Littleton has much land that is already being offered for sale as industrial land. Because of the ever improving network of highways, Littleton, now a remote suburb of Boston, will become an actual suburb of the Hub. Naturally, the population growth will continue. Concurrent with this population increase will be an increase in public facilities. But discussion of the future must necessarily be speculative; in this uncertain world the only certainty is uncertainty. All one can do is live the present, remember the past, and advance with the future.

The history of Littleton is typical of many New England towns in its development. The words and deeds of all of us today are writing the present history of Littleton with the future obscured in the foggy mists of time which can be penetrated only by the immortal eye of the omnipresent and omnipotent Almighty, to whose mercy we must commend our beloved town.

LITTLETON: PAST, PRESENT, AND FUTURE

(By James Lounsbury, third prize)

Ponds, corn, and apples dominated the scene of Littleton, or Nashoba, as it was called in 1654, when the Reverend John Eliot with his "praying Indians" founded Littleton. Tahattawan, the Indian for whom the street was named, is thought to have been responsible for the first settling in Littleton because he was the leader of his tribe.

In the past we have heard of the legend of the strange rumbling noises which seemed to come from the pond which we know as Nagog Pond. At first the Indians thought that the hills adjacent to the pond were hollow, and that the wind was held captive inside them. Because of this superstitious belief, the "praying Indians" held their civil and religious order near the hills. Since we no longer hear these noises they have been attributed to early earthquakes.

Mr. John Hoare seemed to be a predominant figure in the times and through his efforts the Indians helped to cultivate the land that would later come to be known of as "apple valley." It was these early settlers, the "praying Indians," who laid the foundation for our town.

Crazy teenagers, sympathetic parents, and friendly elders, make up the present scene of Littleton, which has changed quite a bit since the Indians left. Its three schools, six churches, townhouse, two post offices, and library, make up the public life, while there are many gas stations, two dairies, one supermarket, two drugstores, two florists, two hardware stores, a restaurant, three diners, two banks, three industries, and many small variety stores, to comprise the business life.

The teenagers are continually complaining that "There's not a thing to do." While the older onlookers can't see how we find time to do all that there is for us. But with all their complaints we must realize that they will be the senior citizens of tomorrow.

As for the future, who can say what there is in store for us. Maybe the town will become completely modern and industrialized, or perhaps it will be kept as a historic landmark. Will the teenagers still complain that there is nothing to do, and will the farmers still raise apples and corn? Will the town still have its lovely views and valleys? Will the summers still be green, the falls a burnished gold, the winters a blanket of white? Who can say? The only way we will ever know is to wait.

Through all the years of superstition, settlement, farming, industrialization, and population, Littleton has in the past and present had a friendly glow which is contagious. I hope, as I know we all do, that Littleton always stays just as it is.

LITTLETON: PAST, PRESENT AND FUTURE

(By Jay Pacsay, honorable mention)

When the Pilgrims landed in America, they found a land where they could be free to live as they wished. Of the many towns settled by courageous men and women such as they, Littleton is one. When Littleton was first settled, it was called Nashoba. The white man came to Littleton primarily because the Indians failed to come back to the area after the King Philip War, and the settlers found Littleton to be an area of rich soil suited for farming and living.

Through the years, Littleton men have served in every war our country has been engaged in beginning with the Revolutionary War. During the Revolutionary War, a Littleton man, Luther Blanchard, was the first man to receive a wound at the Battle of Concord. During the Civil War, Littleton supplied more than her quota of men and aided immeasurably the Northern cause. Once again in the First and Second World Wars the men of Littleton served their country faithfully by joining the armed services and fighting their country's enemies.

Today, Littleton is a modern rural community. Ever since the end of World War II there has been a movement away from the congested districts of the cities to the rural areas. This is why Littleton's population has increased tremendously. But people settle here in our town not just to get away from the crowded city, but also because Littleton is graced with an abundance of natural beauty and because Littleton is a fine place in which to raise a family. Perhaps many people moved away from the city because they did not believe a growing boy or girl could live a clean wholesome life in the city, as they can here in our town.

For although Littleton has no place where a teenager can go for amusement, such as a bowling alley or movie, it has a wonderful recreation club which helps the town's teenagers tremendously by providing dances and sports activities for their enjoyment.

To accommodate the increasing number of children, Littleton has built a new high school and a new elementary school within the past few years. These are in addition to an older elementary school. So, between the number of schools and the number of pupils, Littleton has adequate facilities to insure the pupil a proper education.

In the past Littleton High School graduates have been proud of the school from which they graduated, and they had good reason to be. For Littleton has always had a high standard of education and always will as long as the townspeople care enough to insure the preservation and maintenance of such excellence, and there is every reason to believe that they will. I believe they will because the people of Littleton are proud of their town and they should be. They are proud of the products produced in their town which are sent to all parts of the Nation. They are proud that, in the past, Littleton has given her sons and daughters to defend our God-given rights and our liberty.

At these crucial times let us not forget that Littleton increased its farm production to help out in its own way the cause for which our country was fighting. For these reasons, Littleton is assured of a bright and happy future if the townspeople make beneficial changes when need warrants it, and if they keep on living their lives as true and honest Americans. For Littleton and communities similar to her are necessary to our State and our country, if this Nation is to continue to be the world leader, as I pray to God she always will be.

American Good Government Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THRUSTON B. MORTON

OF KENTUCKY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the attached remarks be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In those last few momentous days of this historic Congress when we were striving vigorously toward the golden goal of sine die adjournment, the junior Senator from Montana spread upon the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD what must be considered as an unfortunate and hastily conceived attack on one of the Nation's most vital industries. The statement to which I refer begins on page 22935 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for September 25 and is entitled "Private Power Support of the Rightwing." This statement attempts to tar with the black brush of extremism what the junior Senator from Montana calls "radical rightwing groups" and questions the propriety of some contributions made by a few electric companies to these groups.

It grieves me that the junior Senator revealed the shallowness of his research and his lack of appreciation for the contribution made to one of these groups he brashly attacks—the American Good Government Society. The reason I am grieved is that just a few months ago this same American Good Government Society honored the Senate minority leader by awarding him one of their annual Good Government Awards at the George Washington dinner on April 30.

Perhaps the junior Senator would have been well advised to counsel with his senior colleague, the able and distinguished Senate majority leader, before he made his intemperate remarks, because the same distinguished majority leader, the Honorable Mike Mansfield, graciously honored the minority leader by making this presentation.

Mr. President, the majority leader said on that occasion, "May I, first, compliment the American Good Government Society on its wise procedure. By selecting two recipients of the George Washington Award—a Republican and a Democrat—the society underscores a reality of American life, sometimes overlooked in an election year. Neither political party has a monopoly on ability for public service or on dedicated patriotism. We can never have too much of these attributes in the Government of the United States."

In addition to our distinguished minority leader, this organization has honored in the past the following present and former Members of this distinguished body: 1964, Senator Frank J. Lausche; 1963, Senator A. Willis Robertson and Senator John J. Williams; 1961, Senator Spessard L. Holland; 1960, Senator Barry Goldwater; 1959, Senator John L. McClellan; 1958, Senator Richard B. Russell and Senator William F. Knowland; 1957, Senator Karl E. Mundt; 1956, Senator Walter George; 1953, Senator Harry F. Byrd and Senator Robert A. Taft.

I do not think the majority leader would have made such statements about an organization that the junior Senator calls a radical rightwing group.

Tribute to the Honorable James C. Auchincloss

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES HARVEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to join in paying tribute to my good friend and colleague, Jim Auchincloss, who is retiring after 22 years of continuous service in the House of Representatives. It has been my privilege to work with Jim Auchincloss on the House Committee on Public Works, of which he is ranking minority member, and I have never known a more devoted or conscientious public servant. I consider myself especially fortunate to have served on this committee under his leadership through my 4 years in the House.

Jim Auchincloss has served his district, his State, and our Nation with great distinction. He has always displayed great courage and unquestioned integrity and his colleagues have never been doubtful as to where he stood on an issue when it was presented for consideration. I am sorry that he finds it necessary to retire, thus ending an illustrious career as an outstanding legislator. Without any doubt whatsoever, he will be sorely missed.

It is my sincere wish for Jim that he will have many, many years of good health, good fortune and a happy retirement, all of which are so richly deserved.

Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, more than 20 years ago the United States began its programs of foreign aid and technical assistance in Latin America. This assistance was on a limited scale and pertained to a limited number of technical fields of development. Subsequently the point 4 program extended this assistance to other nations in other areas of the world, and simultaneously the famous Marshall plan programs for assisting in the rebuilding of the war-devastated countries of Europe were launched.

There can be no doubt that the Marshall plan was effective as an instrument for rebuilding the economies of the European nations, and the present high level of their economies speak to this unselfish effort on behalf of international understanding and development. The assistance provided elsewhere under the foreign aid programs of the United States can also be credited with having done much to assist the underdeveloped and newly emerging nations of the world in their struggle against poverty, hunger, disease, and ignorance.

Annually the Congress has appropriated billions of dollars for this purpose, and in my early years in the Congress I supported this effort. It was not until 1963 that I chose to vote against further expenditure of this type, and I have voted similarly against the present bill. It is my understanding that during the years of these programs the United States has helped support 118 nations or territories, and that we are currently continuing this support to 98 countries. I am much disturbed, and I believe the American people are similarly disturbed, by the continued outlay of billions of dollars for questionable purposes and to questionable governments.

Despite whatever good may have been accomplished by segments of the foreign aid program, the United States finds itself today in an extremely precarious relationship with many of the recipient nations. Today the United States is being cursed, its flag insulted and its embassies assaulted by the peoples of the nations which we have assisted so generously. Our officials, including one of our recent Vice Presidents, have been assaulted and spat upon by nationals of the countries to which we have extended the hand of friendship and the generous hand of financial assistance. On every hand we hear that our efforts have been forgotten, and that the nations whose economic life we saved in some instances are now ready and willing to attack us.

Much of this behavior results, I believe, from maladministration of our aid programs and policies. The Agency for International Development and its predecessors have had an unceasing stream of changing administrators and assistant administrators, most of whom seem unaware that they have been charged by the Congress with assuring that the foreign aid program is administered in the national interest of the United States. We have been generous to a fault, mistakenly assuming that we can buy the love and friendship of the world, and forgetting that it is more important that we have the respect of the nations.

We have chosen to play down the fact that we are the strongest nation in the world, with the highest living standards in the world, and that this strength and these standards came to us only through the application of democratic thought and life within our society. We have chosen to assist practically any and all other nations which are willing to accept our aid, regardless of their beliefs, their behavior, and their questionable alliances with our enemies. We have chosen to support dictatorial governments which pattern themselves after our opponents, and whose leaders continue to persecute and oppress their own people in order to assure their own continued power.

During these years we have provided not only American money and American skills to aid these people. We have, in addition to sending thousands of technicians abroad to assist in developmental projects, trained more than 80,000 foreign nationals in the United States in the hope and expectation that they, assisted by other thousands whom we have trained abroad either in their own countries or in neighboring countries of the area, can spearhead the developmental processes at home. Yet too often these people return to find that their new knowledge and abilities are not properly put to work, and that little genuine effort is being made by their governments to bring about the promised and hoped-for economic and social reforms necessary to the nation's development.

The people of other countries often resent the fact that our aid is utilized to help keep unpopular governments in power. These governments gladly take our aid but use it for the benefit of those who rule rather than for the needy of their countries. Too often U.S. aid does not reach down to the levels where it is needed most; instead, the rich and the powerful use it to further extend their power and add to their riches. Thus we find ourselves accused of maintaining the status quo, of supporting political dictatorships which must pass if the people are ever to know the benefits of freedom, democracy, and development which they are entitled to and which we desire to see them acquire.

Just a few years ago we were providing aid to Cuba, yet it could not prevent what happened there, and I need not remind you what exists there today, or what distorted image of the United States and its people has been painted there. There are a number of Latin American nations which we assisted generously, but which still retain their suspicions concerning our country, and it has been a most difficult job to persuade them to cease doing business as usual with Castro's Cuba. They have been extremely reluctant to recognize that Cuba today constitutes a Communist threat to the whole Western Hemisphere, and that their independence is forfeit if they espouse any part of Castro's cause.

Despite our assistance and our eagerly expressed desire to be liked, several nations of Europe have proceeded steadily in permitting the development of strong Communist parties. Among these is Italy, a major recipient of Marshall plan aid, yet Italy today has the strongest Communist Party of any non-Communist nation in the World. France, another major recipient which benefited greatly from U.S. assistance, has also developed a powerful Communist Party, and while this party is not in power, U.S. relations with France during the last 4 years have declined to their lowest ebb.

If we are to have a foreign aid program, then let it be administered with the national welfare of the United States in mind. Let its targets be carefully chosen, firmly substantiated, and let us help those who have demonstrated that they have common goals with us in pursuing the freedoms and democracy which we, the United States, has sought and continue to seek. Let us turn aside from those who would make fools of us, who would play both ends against the middle, who hint subtly or even openly that if we fail to assist them they will turn to the Communists for assistance. If there are nations or peoples or rulers so blind that they would prefer to entrust their future to the Communists rather than stand firmly with this Nation, which has traditionally since its inception fought and stood for democracy and peace in the world, then are we so foolish as to think we can buy their security for them?

I want the rest of the world, friend and foe alike, to know that we will try earnestly to be fair, to pursue peace, and to assist our friends who are seeking the same goals for themselves. But I also want them to know that we will not tolerate acts of violence against us, against our flag, against our property, and against our conscience. The world knows that the United States seeks peace; the peoples of other lands are not so unaware, nor so ignorant that they cannot understand our peaceful motives. We have demonstrated our willingness for three centuries to help those who are hungry, those who are ill, those who are uneducated and those who are poverty ridden. We still stand ready to help those who are willing to help themselves. But let us make sure that our help does not become a boomerang. Let us make sure that our policies and our assistance work in our national interest.

Tribute to Congressman John Lesinski

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, over the years it has been my pleasure and privilege to serve in this great legislative body with many outstanding men and women. None have been more dedicated and devoted than JOHN LESINSKI. His service here in the House was always characterized by loyalty to his country, his congressional district, and his great State.

This patriotic American enlisted in the U.S. Navy at the early age of 18 and served for 4 years. He was called to active duty again in February 1941 and served with honor and distinction until October 1945. JOHN LESINSKI loves his country and almost died for it when his ship, the *St. Lo*, was bombed by the Japanese in the Pacific during World War II.

Our national defense and economic structure is stronger today as a result of JOHN LESINSKI's untiring efforts as a member of the Appropriations Committee. Each section of our great country and every citizen has benefited from his legislative genius and skill.

This House is a greater body for having known JOHN LESINSKI. He stood up for what he thought was right and voted his convictions regardless of pressure and intimidation. I predict for him a great future. Mrs. Dorn and family join me in wishing for him, his wonderful wife, and fine family much happiness and success always.

James C. Auchincloss

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CATHERINE MAY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, JIM AUCHINCLOSS, of New Jersey, has been an outstanding Member of the House of Representatives for 22 years and, at this time of his retirement, I wanted to take this occasion to wish him the very best and to say that he certainly will be missed in Congress.

Everyone serving in the House realizes how valuable it is to have sound guidance and the advice and wisdom and experience during his freshman year. JIM AUCHINCLOSS, as a ranking Member of the House when I came to Congress in 1959, was never too busy to take time from his heavy office and committee responsibilities to give me the kind of help and guidance I needed. I shall never forget his many generous courtesies and helpful advice during this term—and ever since—as we served together in the House. I share many fond memories with all my colleagues who had the pleasure and the privilege of experiencing JIM's untiring willingness to extend, without question, whatever assistance he could, not only to his colleagues, but more importantly, to his district, his State, and his country.

In saying farewell to JIM, I wish him many, many years of happiness and joy.

The 88th Congress Enacts Dynamic Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it has been my practice since coming to the House of Representatives in 1959 to send a summary of the major legislative actions taken by each Congress to my constituents every 2 years.

Following is a copy of this report:

EIGHTY-EIGHTH CONGRESS ENACTS DYNAMIC RECORD

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., October 1964.

DEAR CONSTITUENT: The 88th Congress has just adjourned and, as I have done at the conclusion of each Congress, I am anxious to send you this report to keep you fully informed of what has been accomplished in the last 2 years.

The Congress passed highly important legislation in the areas of education, defense, foreign policy, tax reduction and reform, nuclear testing, and antipoverty, as well as updating existing programs in manpower retraining, the Peace Corps, problems of senior citizens, housing, mass transit. The Congress scored a legislative "first" in the field of mental health.

This 88th Congress has quite properly been called the most dynamic Congress in the history of our country.

The programs we have enacted have given our Nation 44 consecutive months of economic expansion, the longest in the history of any nation in the world.

Members of Congress, both Democrat and Republican, have given long and conscientious consideration to their responsibilities.

The Washington Post said that, in quantity and quality, the 88th Congress is destined to rank as one of the top legislative performers of our time and added: "It can never be said of the 88th that it 'rubber-stamped' anything."

On the inside of this letter, you will find my traditional listing of the major bills which have been passed by this Congress and which I supported.

My vote on this legislation to a great extent reflects the majority opinion of the people in our 11th District. I have supported the President when I believed he was right and have not hesitated to oppose his proposals when I thought he was wrong.

I am sure that the people of our district know of my independent voting record. But it would be wrong to vote against legislation just for the sake of being contrary.

This report is necessarily brief and centered on my primary duties as lawmaker. Of course, I also spend a large portion of my time helping 11th District citizens on such personal matters as veterans' problems, social security, small business and military service, and immigration; working to bring new industries and Government contracts to our area; seeking approval of new and improved postal service, in short, serving as a link between you and your Federal Government.

ROMAN C. PUCINSKI,
Member of Congress.

THE ECONOMY IS BOOMING

The State of Illinois and the 11th District have been sharing in the extraordinary expansion of the U.S. economy since early 1961.

We have experienced the full impact of the longest economic upswing in the history of our country.

The current business upswing, already the longest on record for a period of peace, shows no signs of coming to an end. The advance has been so smooth that it has failed to develop the distortions in costs, prices, inventories, and investments that often in the past have brought on a recession.

More jobs: Four million more people are working today than in January 1961. The total number at work is the highest on record—over 72 million. The number of long-term unemployed has shrunk nearly 30 percent from early 1961.

Bigger incomes: An average factory worker now earns $103 a week—a new high. That compares with $89 in January 1961. He can buy 11½ percent more with his paycheck now.

The $11.5 billion tax cut this year and the growing prosperity are boosting personal incomes to new all-time peaks. The estimated after-tax income of Americans in the first half of 1964 is running at an annual rate of almost $30 billion above a year earlier. And it is running $60 billion higher than in 1961.

Higher profits: Dividends for the country's 20 million stockholders were 11 percent higher this spring compared to a year ago. Corporate profits after taxes are at a current annual rate of $31 billion—up nearly $10 billion since 1961.

More stable prices: The wholesale price level is actually slightly below its average for 1961. Consumer prices are edging up only 1.2 percent per year, compared to 1.4 percent per year during the previous 8 years (1953–61). The U.S. record of price stability exceeds that of any other industrial nation.

Economic expansion: The total output of goods and services (gross national product) this year will be about $625 billion, up $120 billion since 1960). Allowing for price changes, this is almost a 20-percent increase in 4 years—more than 4 percent a year. The corresponding average annual increase in the previous 4 years (1956–60) was 2.4 percent per year. Capital investment by U.S. business this year will be 12 percent higher than in 1963. Since 1960, gross farm income has risen by almost $4 billion.

INCREASE IN AMERICA'S MILITARY MIGHT, 1961–64

"We must be strong enough to win any war, and we must be wise enough to prevent one."—President Lyndon B. Johnson, 1964.

Number of nuclear warheads up 150 percent.

Total megatonnage in strategic alert forces up 200 percent.

Tactical nuclear force in Western Europe up 60 percent.

Combat ready Army divisions up 45 percent.

Tactical fighter squadrons up 44 percent.

Airlift capability up 75 percent.

Special forces trained for counterinsurgency up 800 percent.

Modernization of fleet up 100 percent in funds for general ship construction and conversion.

Along with increased military might, Secretary McNamara's cost reduction program, with its stress on an efficient and streamlined Defense Department, has achieved economies of $2.5 billion in fiscal year 1964 and is expected to cut costs by an estimated $4.6 billion by fiscal year 1967.

It is an insult to the American people to suggest that a nation which spends as much as we do on defense could be "soft on communism."

MAJOR LEGISLATIVE ACTION TAKEN BY THE 88TH CONGRESS

On these two pages you will find a brief digest of legislation enacted by the 88th Congress. Space would not permit listing of all the measures approved into law, but this will give you a fairly good cross section of the many subjects I must study as your Congressman.

Thousands of you have written me about specific legislation and I have tried to include in this list many of those measures about which you inquired. Should you wish additional information on any of these laws, please write to me here in Washington and specify the public law number in which you are interested. It will be a pleasure to send you additional information explaining the measure.

First session

National Defense and Internal Security

Public Law 88–2: Extends for 4 years, to June 30, 1967, authority of President to draft 18½–26-year-olds into military service. Also extends Doctor Draft and Dependents' Assistance Acts, and the suspension of personnel strength limitation on Armed Forces.

Public Law 88–28: Authorizes $15.3 billion for procurement, construction of planes, missiles, ships in fiscal 1964; includes $363.7 million additional for RS–70 manned bombers.

Public Law 88–174: Authorizes $1.6 billion for construction projects at Armed Forces bases at home and abroad, including 10,000 family housing units for members of Army, Navy, and Air Force.

Public Law 88–113: Authorizes $5.3 billion for National Aeronautics and Space Administration in fiscal 1964, for research, development, construction of facilities, and administration.

Public Law 88–27: Permits prosecution in U.S. district courts of offenses against this country committed abroad.

International Affairs

Public Law 88–205: Authorizes $3.59 billion for mutual security programs, continuing economic assistance and military aid to our allies for 1964; includes $1 billion military aid, $925 million development loans, $225 million grants and technical aid, and $160 million contingency fund.

Public Law 88–186: Authorizes $20 million for operations and research of Arms Control and Disarmament Agency for 1964 and 1965.

Public Law 88–101: Extends Export-Import Bank 5 years to June 30, 1968; increases its lending authority from $7 to $9 billion and its authority for guarantees and insurance, under the export credit program, by $1 billion to a total of $2 billion.

Public Law 88–53: Extends for 2 years the reduction from $500 to $100 the value of duty-free imports allowed returning American tourists.

Public Law 88–200: Increases authorization for U.S. Peace Corps to $102 million, number of volunteers to 11,300.

Public Law 88–6: Proclaims Winston Churchill an honorary American citizen.

Treaties

Executive M: Treaty banning nuclear weapons tests in the atmosphere, in outer space, and underwater, signed at Moscow, August 5, 1963, by the United States, the United Kingdom, and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Ratified September 24, 1963.

Executive H: International Coffee Agreement, signed at New York, September 28, 1962, by 58 nations, to be effective for 5 years after ratification, to stabilize and regulate prices of coffee by a world system of export quotas established by an International Coffee Organization. Ratified May 21, 1963.

Executive N: Convention with Mexico, signed August 29, 1963, for solution of problem of the Chamizal (parcel of land north of the Rio Grande near El Paso). Ratified December 17, 1963.

National Economy

Public Law 88–214: Extends to June 30, 1967, the Manpower Development and Training Act; waives for 1965 requirement that States match Federal grants for training allowances for unemployed but requires one-third matching in 1966; increases authorization for 1965 from $161 million to $422 million; broadens program to train uneducated and jobless youth.

Public Law 88–157: Apportions through 1971 funds for completion of Interstate and Defense Highway System; fixes January 1965 as cost estimate deadline; raises Federal payments for construction engineering; continues billboard control program for 2 years.

Public Law 88–187: Increases temporary limit on national debt from $309 billion to $315 billion through June 1964.

Public Law 88–36: Withdraws silver backing of paper currency, averts shortage of silver for coinage by repealing tax on silver transfers and other obsolete sections of Silver Purchase Act of 1934.

Public Law 88–201: Requires that auto seat belts shipped in interstate commerce meet certain safety standards.

Governmental Reorganization

Public Law 88–256: Authorizes the coinage of a 50-cent piece bearing the likeness of the late President John Fitzgerald Kennedy.

Public Law 88–202: Authorizes the Commission investigating the assassination of President Kennedy to compel attendance of witnesses and production of evidence.

Senate Resolution 78: Grants former Presidents of the United States privilege of the floor of the Senate and right to address that body.

Social Security, Health and Welfare

Public Law 88–129: Authorizes 3-year program of $175 million in matching grants to expand teaching and research facilities of medical, dental, and related-type colleges, and $30.7 million in student loans to increase health personnel.

Public Law 88–204: Authorizes 3-year, $1.1 billion program of loans and grants to aid colleges and universities in financing construction of academic and related facilities.

Public Law 88–210: Expands vocational education programs; authorizes annual increases through fiscal 1967 in scale of grants to States, on matching basis beginning in fiscal year 1965; extends National Defense Education and Aid to Impacted Areas Acts to June 30, 1965.

Public Law 88–206: Strengthens air-pollution control program by: encouraging State and local prevention and enforcement activity, increasing fund authorizations for grants-in-aid through fiscal year 1967.

Public Law 88–156: Authorizes 5-year, $350 million to increase aid to States for maternal and child health services and for crippled children's programs; provides for maternity care and research projects to prevent mental retardation.

Public Law 88–164: Authorizes 3-year, $238 million program to aid States in providing mental retardation research facilities, construction of community mental health centers and grants for training teachers of deaf.

Public Law 88–158: Authorizes increase of $50 million, from $225 to $275 million, for direct loans to nonprofit corporations and cooperatives for construction of housing for elderly.

Public Law 88–54: Extends for 2 years, to June 30, 1965, authority of FHA to insure mortgages for sale and rental housing for low- and moderate-income groups.

Public Law 88–4: Grants deserted wives tax relief for child-care expenses.

Public Law 88–38: Requires equal pay for persons performing same work, regardless of sex, by amending Fair Labor Standards Act.

Public Law 88–133: Increases contributions and benefits under the Railroad Retirement and Unemployment Compensation Acts; strengthens fund's financial position.

Public Law 88–132: Provides $1.2 billion increases, effective October 1, 1963, in basic pay and subsistence for all members of the Armed Forces and Reserve components, except personnel with less than 2 years' service, and for the Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and the Public Health Service; and readjusts retirement pay.

Public Law 88–110: Permanently fixes 6 years of service, including 4 months of active duty, for enlistees in Reserve program to fulfill their military obligations.

Public Law 88–21: Increases payments to parents and children of veterans who died of service-connected disabilities.

Public Law 88–134: Increases payments to widows of veterans whose death was due to service-connected disabilities.

Public Law 88–151: Permits Veterans' Administration to waive recovery on default on home loans in certain hardship cases.

You hear a great deal about economy in Government. I am happy to report to you that I have supported reductions in every single request made by every agency in both the first and second sessions. I have supported reductions in Government spending totaling more than $6 billion during the 88th Congress.

Departmental appropriations, 88th Cong.

Title	Fiscal 1964, 1st sess.		Fiscal 1965, 2d sess.	
	Requested	Amount enacted	Requested	Amount enacted
Interior	$674, 169, 000	$612, 061, 750	$1, 047, 728, 000	$1, 042, 277, 200
Related agencies	354, 340, 000	346, 394, 750		
Treasury	1, 153, 230, 000	1, 103, 650, 000	1, 236, 990, 000	1, 214, 330, 000
Post Office	4, 976, 964, 000	4, 925, 500, 000	5, 018, 000, 000	5, 002, 000, 000
Executive Office of President	14, 058, 000	13, 841, 000	14, 446, 000	14, 438, 000
Labor	427, 220, 000	350, 078, 000	757, 580, 000	565, 904, 000
Health, Education, Welfare	5, 301, 314, 000	5, 090, 904, 000	6, 773, 566, 000	6, 476, 629, 000
Supplemental, 1963	1, 641, 507, 106	1, 467, 430, 491		
Supplemental, 1963 (CCC)	508, 172, 000	508, 172, 000		
Agriculture	1, 582, 417, 000	1, 548, 973, 315	1, 573, 421, 600	1, 506, 747, 200
State	359, 721, 000	322, 696, 000	401, 712, 000	376, 827, 000
USIA	208, 236, 000	166, 220, 000	174, 890, 000	154, 400, 000
Justice	355, 506, 000	343, 899, 000	367, 887, 000	364, 036, 000
Judiciary	59, 084, 900	58, 127, 000	61, 827, 000	60, 360, 800
Commerce	996, 572, 000	804, 500, 000	911, 969, 000	725, 501, 000
Defense	49, 014, 237, 000	47, 220, 010, 000	47, 417, 000, 000	46, 752, 051, 000
Military construction	1, 966, 400, 000	1, 585, 880, 000	1, 879, 000, 000	1, 570, 038, 000
Economic and military assistance	4, 525, 325, 000	3, 000, 000, 000	3, 516, 700, 000	3, 250, 000, 000

Second session

National Defense and Internal Security

Public Law 88–288: Authorizes $16.9 billion for procurement and construction of planes, missiles, ships, and for research, development, tests, and evaluation in fiscal 1965.

Public Law 88–332: Authorizes $2.6 billion for Atomic Energy Commission for fiscal 1965, including $771 million for reduced weapons program and $13.5 million for prototype reactor for atomic merchant ship.

Public Law 88–390: Authorizes $1.5 billion for construction projects at Armed Forces bases at home and abroad, including 9,800 family housing units for members of Army, Navy, and Air Force.

Public Law 88–290: Strenthens security provisions of National Security Agency.

S. 2136: Tightens requirements under the Foreign Agents Registration Act.

International Affairs

Public Law 88–408: Approves and supports the determination of the President, as Commander in Chief, to repel attacks on U.S. forces and to prevent further aggression jeopardizing peace and security in southeast Asia.

H.R. 11380: Authorizes $3.25 billion for economic and military assistance to our allies in fiscal 1965; includes $125 million additional for Vietnam military and economic uses.

Public Law 88–285: Authorizes expansion of Peace Corps and $115 million for fiscal 1965.

Public Law 88–308: Prohibits fishing by foreign vessels in U.S. territorial and Continental Shelf waters under penalty of ship seizure and fine or imprisonment or both, except as provided by treaty or license by the Treasury Department.

H. Con. Res. 343: Expresses sense of the Congress that every effort be made in United Nations to obtain payment of dues by nations now delinquent, failing which the penalty of loss of votes in General Assembly be invoked.

S. 2701: Authorizes study to determine site for construction of a proposed sea-level canal between Atlantic and Pacific Oceans.

National Economy

Public Law 88–452: Creates Office of Economic Opportunity to administer job corps of urban and rural youth, work-training and work-study programs, encourage local action to reduce poverty; authorizes $947.5 million for fiscal 1965.

Public Law 88–272: Lowers rates of personal and corporate income taxes; makes numerous changes in Internal Revenue Code for net reductions of $11.5 billion, partially effective in 1964.

Public Law 88–348: Extends for 1 year, up to July 1, 1965, the current schedule of excise taxes on cigarettes, liquor, automobiles and parts, telephone service, and airline tickets. (I voted against this bill.)

Public Law 88–365: Authorizes 3-year, $375 million program of grants and loans to help States and communities provide mass transit facilities and service.

Public Law 88–354: Establishes a National Commission on Food Marketing to study trade procedures and price relationships from producer to consumer; authorizes $1.5 million.

Public Law 88–444: Establishes National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress.

Public Law 88–467: Brings trading in over-the-counter securities under control of the Securities and Exchange Commission; provides for qualification standards and discipline over brokers, dealers, and their employees.

Public Law 88–580: Authorizes minting of "1964" coins up to July 1, 1965, if necessary, to relieve coin shortage.

Public Law 88–316: Prohibits schemes in interstate commerce to influence by bribery the outcome of sporting events.

Public Law 88–339: Extends for 2 years to June 30, 1966, the Renegotiation Act for recovery of excess profits on defense contracts, including contracts with Federal Aviation Agency.

Public Law 88–349: Amends Davis-Bacon Act to require Federal contractors to conform to local area fringe benefits as well as prevailing wage scales.

Governmental Reorganization

Public Law 88–352: Provides for enforcement of voting rights; injunctions against discrimination in public accommodations; protection of rights to education; extends Civil Rights Commission for 4 years to January 31, 1968; establishes a Community Relations Service and a Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity.

Public Law 88–260: Renames National Cultural Center as the John Fitzgerald Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts; authorizes funds to match public contributions.

Public Law 88–426: Adjusts basic pay rates of postal and classified employees and certain officers of all three branches of Federal Government, generally effective July 1, 1964.

Public Law 88–579: Establishes a National Council on the Arts in the Executive Office of the President.

Social Security, Health and Welfare

H.R. 11865: Increases monthly payments to 19½ million old-age, survivors and disability beneficiaries; provides hospital and nursing care for the aged; liberalizes eligibility provisions; includes self-employed physicians; lowers optional retirement age of widows to 60. Increases taxes, beginning January 1, 1965—on a rising scale thereafter to 1971. (Approved by House and Senate but, killed in conference.)

Public Law 88–368: Extends for 2 years, to June 30, 1967, the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act; authorizes $15 million including $5 million for special project in District of Columbia.

Public Law 88–443: Extends for 5 years to June 30, 1969, Hill-Burton Act providing Federal aid for construction, modernization of hospitals, nursing homes, and other medical centers; authorizes $1.3 billion, including funds for areawide planning of health facilities on a 50–50 matching basis.

Public Law 88–581: Authorizes $287 million, 5-year program to combat shortage of nurses, including grants for construction and rebuilding of school and college facilities, traineeships for advanced professionals, and loans for students.

Public Law 88–497: Extends for 5 years, with authorization of $70 million, programs for traineeships to increase number of professional public health personnel and expand health project grants to schools of medicine, dentistry, engineering, social work, and pharmacy.

Public Law 88–560: Housing Act of 1964, authorizes $1.2 billion for urban renewal, loans for housing for elderly, for farm housing, and other existing programs; extends maturity of FHA-financed home mortgages, and lowers downpayments; provides compensation for persons and businesses dislocated by urban renewal projects.

Public Law 88–269: Extends Federal assistance under Library Services Act to urban areas; provides matching grants for construction of library buildings; authorizes $45 million for 1964.

S. 3060: Extends National Defense Education Act for 3 years to July 1, 1965, increases authorization for college student loans from $135 million currently to $195 million for fiscal 1969.

H.R. 9393: Liberalizes requirements of Social Security Act relative to filing time for benefits under disability provisions.

H.R. 319: Protects postal patrons from morally offensive material delivered by mail.

H.R. 10088: Establishes Administration for Aging in HEW; authorizes $6.5 million in grants to States for 1965 to encourage programs helpful to welfare of persons over 65. (In my committee.)

Veterans and Servicemen

Public Law 88–422: Authorizes pay increases, totaling $207.5 million monthly for all men and officers of the Armed Forces, except those in service less than 2 years.

H.R. 1927: Liberalizes non-service-connected pensions for needy veterans and widows; revises limits of permissible income without loss of pension.

Public Law 88–361: Provides educational assistance to children of veterans with total and permanent service-connected disability.

Public Law 88-450: Authorizes 5-year, $5 million-a-year program of aid to States on matching basis for nursing-home facilities in State veteran homes.

Public Law 88-355: Extends disability income provisions of national service life insurance policies through age 65 under certain conditions.

Public Law 88-360: Exempts from draft induction sole surviving son of a family whose father died as a result of military service.

Agriculture

Public Law 88-297: Continues present cotton price support and subsidy for exporters; provides new subsidy to permit domestic processors to compete with foreign manufacturers. Authorizes new wheat marketing certificate program.

Public Law 88-305: Requires registration and Department of Agriculture approval of pesticides before they can be sold to public.

Public Law 88-525: Broadens and makes permanent stamp program for distribution of surplus and other foods to needy by Department of Agriculture to States requesting such aid.

S. 2687: Extends for 3 years to December 31, 1967, surplus commodity "food for peace" program under Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act; expands loans from counterpart funds to private enterprise abroad.

Natural Resources

Public Law 88-578: Establishes a 10-year $2 billion land and water conservation fund to assist States in developing outdoor recreation programs.

Public Law 88-577: Establishes a National Wilderness Preservation System on 35 million acres closed to commercial use and retained in their primitive state.

H.R. 4487: Requires labeling of pesticides to warn against hazards to fish and wildlife; authorizes increased appropriation for research from $2.5 to $3.2 million for 1965, and $5 million annually thereafter.

Public Law 88-523: Increases payments to counties in which wildlife refuges are located.

Public Law 88-537: Provides for criminal punishment of violation of regulations to protect national forests and grasslands.

This has been a very hardworking Congress. We have been in session almost continuously for the past 22 months and have participated in strong debates on extremely controversial issues affecting the safety and security of our Nation.

Obviously, a Member of Congress who takes a strong position on controversial legislation, and is willing to fight to defend his position, is bound to draw fire from those he opposes.

As you know, among the many projects I have sponsored here in Congress has been the establishment of a commission which would suggest constitutional means to deal effectively with the mounting flow of smut and pornographic literature which is flooding our Nation.

It should come as no surprise, therefore, that a magazine which has a national reputation for being one of the worst offenders in publishing smut has tried to strike back by questioning the effectiveness of myself and others, including our senior Senator from Illinois, PAUL DOUGLAS, who have taken a similar forthright stand on this whole issue.

My constituents are familiar with my effectiveness because they have read the many editorials in the press praising my work and are familiar with the many projects I have actually put into effect, as well as the legislation I have supported and seen enacted. We all know that in America men in public office are constant targets of special interests whose cause we refuse to serve.

Following is status of the various proposals which I sponsored or cosponsored.

This record of positive achievement speaks for itself and is the best method for measuring my effectiveness as your Congressman.

Placement of tape recorder in cockpit of airplane so pilot can record at least some idea of what happened before a disaster—FAA approved plan, now being installed.

Peace Corps enacted into law.

Mobile trade fair ships to exhibit American products all over the world so that we can create more jobs by creating new world markets for U.S. industry, enacted into law; first ship sailed October 17.

Appropriation of funds for extension of southeast-northwest runway at O'Hare to divert jets from our area, approved by FAA, construction to start soon.

Urban Mass Transportation Act to give Chicago aid in developing rapid transit in median strip of Kennedy Expressway, approved by Congress; construction to start soon.

Across-the-board tax cut to sustain prosperity—enacted into law.

Liberalize disability qualifications for social security benefits and increase permissible annual amount of supplemental earnings for those past 50 years of age—in committee.

Youth opportunities program patterned after CCC camps of the 1930's—enacted into law.

More realistic depreciation schedules for American industry—approved and now in effect.

Income tax exemption for tuition paid by parents to private schools—in committee; Internal Revenue also considering.

Long-term loans for needy college students—approved.

Bar discrimination in hiring practices because of a person's age if he otherwise qualifies; thousands of middle-aged people can't get work today for no other reason than their age—pending in committee.

Income tax deduction for money spent by owners of private single-family dwellings (non-income bearing) on normal wear and tear repairs, or special assessments, to maintain their property—Ways and Means Committee has promised to consider this proposal next year.

Establish National Scientific Research Information Center in Chicago—in committee.

Move Patent Office to Chicago—in committee.

Bring electronic laboratories for manned orbital space platform to Chicago—Air Force is considering.

Limit terms of Supreme Court Justices to 14 years—in committee.

Make bombings a Federal offense—in committee.

There are many more—too numerous to mention.

Jet noise at O'Hare has been one of my biggest concerns here in Congress.

I have remained in constant touch with officials both at O'Hare and the Federal Aviation Agency to reduce noise to a minimum.

We have had some very bad periods when either the wind conditions required an unusually heavy use of the east-west runway or when the other runways were shut down for repairs.

Records, however, which are kept of the daily frequency of use of runways show that the east-west runway is used less often than any other runway at O'Hare.

On those days when there may be 40 eastbound departures on runway 9, there are as many as 491 jet departures on the other runways.

We can look to more lasting relief when extension of the parallel southeast-northwest runway is completed and when the industry scores a breakthrough in designing a quieter engine.

I am sure you will be happy to know that engine manufacturers feel extremely confident of such a breakthrough in the near future.

Hospital coverage for our senior citizens under social security and an increase in monthly cash benefits were both killed in the last hours of the Congress when the House and Senate conferees were unable to agree on an acceptable plan.

This is regrettable because the compromise which we were trying to get through, would have provided funds for social security recipients to purchase their own insurance policies from private insurance companies or Blue Cross, if they so desired.

Opponents of medicare have tried to create the impression that it would cost the average worker $100 a year more to provide hospital care under social security. This figure is not true. The annual increase for hospital care would be approximately $13 a year or 25 cents a week under the administration proposal. This means that a young man who started paying this increase at age 25, would, by the time he reached age 65, have paid a total of $520 over a 40-year span to assure himself and his wife hospital care for the rest of their retired lives. But, it would also mean that those now receiving social security benefits would have their hospital needs, in the hospital of their choice and through their own family physician, assured upon enactment of this legislation.

My intensive battle against communism has given me a national reputation for being one of the Communists' most aggressive foes. I was particularly thrilled to be honored with the following citation by the Assembly of Captive Nations for my fight to help liberate the captive nations from Communist rule:

"The Assembly of Captive European Nations award their 10th anniversary commemorative medal to the Honorable ROMAN C. PUCINSKI, Member of Congress, in recognition of outstanding services for the cause of freedom in East-Central Europe.

——— ———,
"Chairman.

——— ———,
"Secretary General.

"(Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Rumania.)

"NEW YORK, *September 20, 1964."*

May I take this opportunity to tell you what great pride I experience in representing you here in Congress.

It is a most rewarding experience in human values, even though I must confess I have never worked harder in my life. Yet I wouldn't trade places with anyone, as I can think of no finer challenge than to serve in the legislative branch of a government run by and for the people.

May I take this opportunity to thank the thousands of my constituents who, during the past 2 years, exercised their rights as free people by writing to their Congressman. This indicates to me how intensely interested the people I represent are in their Government.

Sincerely yours,
ROMAN C. PUCINSKI,
Member of Congress, 11th District, Illinois.

Tribute to Hon. Elizabeth Kee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDNA F. KELLY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, when the 89th Congress convenes in January 1965, those of us who are fortunate enough to be returned by our constituents will find a true and loyal friend missing from among our ranks. The Honorable ELIZABETH KEE has elected to return to private life and we, her friends and colleagues, wish her well.

She has served the people of West Virginia and the Nation for 13 years as a Member of Congress, and for many more years as the able assistant to her husband, the late Congressman John Kee. She has worked unceasingly for our Nation's veterans and the physically handicapped.

Though I will miss her warmth, her advice, and her companionship, I extend to her my very best wishes that she will enjoy the voluntary retirement which she so well deserves.

Hon. James C. Auchincloss

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN L. McMILLAN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the House Committee on the District of Columbia, I want personally to express my regrets at the departure from the House of our distinguished colleague, the Honorable JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS, ranking minority member of the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Congressman AUCHINCLOSS has been a most conscientious member of the committee, and I shall be ever grateful for his cooperation, his devotion and service to the committee, and for the assistance he personally gave to me as chairman on so many occasions during the time he was a member of the committee.

He is a gentleman of deep and earnest convictions and through the years sponsored and supported much legislation which he deemed necessary and important to his Third District of New Jersey, to his State, to the Nation's Capital and to the country at large. They all have benefited greatly from his labors, and he will be sincerely missed by us all.

May he continue to receive deserving rewards in the golden years which lie ahead of him.

Tribute to James C. Auchincloss

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. HARSHA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret the 88th Congress bids a fond, reluctant farewell to one of the finest Members of Congress.

Congressman JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS, from the great State of New Jersey, after many active dedicated years of service in Congress, has decided to retire, effective January of 1965. The privilege of serving with him for 4 years has been a most significant part of my life as his guidance, leadership strength, and wise counsel shall indeed be missed.

My association with JIM on the Public Works Committee, a committee on which he has served as ranking minority member for 6 years, has been a rewarding and invaluable experience. The effective leadership in the development of legislation in the best interest of all the people of our Nation, which he so ably exercised on the committee and in the Chamber, is a most enviable leadership.

JIM's friendship, congenial manner, and valuable contributions to this body will be greatly missed.

I wish him many years of good health and happiness and may continued success be his.

The Honorable James C. Auchincloss

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL W. RICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 3, 1964

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, as the 88th Congress draws to a close, I would like to take this opportunity to offer a tribute to one of the truly outstanding Members of the House of Representatives, who has saddened his colleagues by announcing his retirement at the end of this year. The Honorable JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS has served the people of the Third District of New Jersey faithfully and most ably during his 11 terms in the House and he can indeed take pride in the record of his many accomplishments during those years. He has played an important role in the work of the Public Works Committee since his election to the 79th Congress and has served as the ranking Republican member of the committee since 1959. Congressman AUCHINCLOSS has added much strength to the Congress and has always strived to maintain the high ideals and principles which have made our country great. He certainly will be missed by his many friends and colleagues whom I am sure join with me in saying, "The best of everything always, JIM."

n
e
e
s
s
g
r.
s
-
st
se
ne
r-
n-
ic
to
ne
n-
u-
ne
to
es
He
ny
re
of